AUG 7 - 1951

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 96—PART 18

SEPTEMBER 23, 1950, TO JANUARY 2, 1951

(PAGES A6879 TO A8014)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1950

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

A Sound National Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, since 1918 the problems of agriculture have been a matter of national concern. For 30 years the farmers, the farm organizations, and Congress have worked toward the solution of those problems—and with a good deal of success.

Any program of such nature must be in the best interests of the whole country. We have approximately 27,000,000 farm people, and of those 27,000,000 approximately 10,000,000 are considered farm operators and farm workers. They are a unit on which 30,000,000 other persons—processors, wholesalers, and retailers—depend.

It has been established, time and time again, that a healthy and prosperous agriculture means a prosperous economy for our Nation, in the best interests of all our citizens. I have sincerely believed that prosperity for the entire country depends—and to a large extent—upon a prosperous agriculture.

The farmer today is an efficient, well-trained businessman. With the job of farming he must know marketing, purchasing, finance, bookkeeping, engineering, and tax regulations; as well as plant rotation, pest control, soil conservation, scientific breeding, and sanitation.

The American farmer's big struggle has been to get a fair price in the market place. Through hard work he has made progress under the parity-price formula which was set up under the leadership of farm organizations in the 1920's. Years of education have convinced the public and both political parties that parity is fair to both the farmer and the consumer.

Finding a workable and sound method to dispose of national and local farm surpluses continues to be the problem confronting American agriculture. While many proposals to accomplish this purpose have been suggested or tried out during the past 25 years, the problem remains largely unsolved for a peacetime economy.

For the immediate future, with the United States again mobilizing for an all-out war effort, it is vital to the economy of the country to secure maximum production of all essential farm products. Abundant production of food will help win the war and also materially curb a run-away price inflation. However, to secure full production for the emergency, satisfactory price-support floors should be provided to protect producers of both basic crops and vital perishable commodities from drastic market declines. No one can predict the length of the present war emergency or the demand that will be made on American farmers for food and other farm products to win the war and take care of domestic needs.

Congress should now study and prepare legislation for a sound and permanent long-range farm program. Such action is vital to the future economy of our country. Instead of following unsound agricultural proposals to solve the farm problem, I propose that we correct the objectionable features of the present farm program, and proceed to repeal administration policies that work to the detriment of agriculture. This should be our first goal. There are many desirable features in the present farm program, which I helped to enact, which should be retained and improved. In connection with this action, I am proposing changes in the long-range farm program. The development of this program should be free from political manipulation. My proposal contemplates equality in economic opportunity for the men and women who produce the food and fiber for the Nation.

If parity means anything, the farmer should receive parity prices in the market place, and not be made dependent on the Government for a substantial portion of his annual income. With less than 20 percent of our population engaged in agriculture, one does not need to be an expert to figure out that any farm program will be a complete failure when its success depends on securing billions of dollars in annual appropriations to be used as production payments to farmers. If appropriations fail, farmers particularly engaged in the production of dairy products, poultry products, livestock, and other perishable commodities would be left holding the bag and headed for bankruptcy. These farmers produce the bulk of American farm income, and if they go into an economic tailspin, depression will overtake the entire country.

REMOVAL OF DOMESTIC TRADE BARRIERS

Domestic trade barriers which stop or retard the free flow of quality farm products between various areas in the United States, should be abolished. Such action is vital to the future welfare of Midwest dairy farmers, who are now stopped from selling their milk and cream in 36 of the large consuming areas of the United States under the Milk Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and because of local and State regulations.

RESTORE TO BUTTER ITS HISTORIC YELLOW COLOR

For the past 60 years the oleomargarine industry has tried to steal the natural yellow color of butter to be used in coloring oleomargarine so that this synthetic product would look like butter. During this period a Federal law has prohibited the coloring of oleomargarine in imitation of butter without the payment of a 10 cent per pound tax.

Since the beginning of the Democratic Roosevelt Administration in 1933, the oleomargarine industry intensified its drive to repeal this Federal law. Until the Eighty-first Democratic Congress, this onslaught was successfully stopped by groups representing dairy farmers and Congressmen from dairy States. The repeal of the tax was never an issue. The fight was over the color "yellow."

However, in the Eighty-first Democratic-controlled Congress, the Democratic Party joined hands with the oleomargarine industry and succeeded in passing a law that legalized the coloring of oleomargarine yellow in imitation of butter. President Harry S. Truman signed and approved this law on March 16, 1950. The law went into operation on July 1, 1950, and I am convinced that it will do untold damage to dairy farmers in the Midwest butter-producing States. It will also permit fraud and deception on the consuming public.

In the past 10 years butter consumption has decreased from 17 pounds to 10 pounds per capita, and oleomargarine consumption has gone from 2 pounds to around 6 pounds per capita. The law repealing the tax on oleomargarine should stand, but I insist and will fight

to repeal the law which permits oleomargarine to be colored yellow in imitation of butter for shipment in interstate commerce.

IMPORTS OF COMPETITIVE FARM PRODUCTS

Parity tariffs on competitive imports of farm products should be established to protect American farmers. Imports of pork products, butter, cheese eggs, fresh fruits, and vegetables and other competitive farm products of which a sufficient amount is produced in this country to meet domestic requirements, can only serve to break the domestic price structure, destroy the support program, and work great injury to American farmers.

In January 1950, President Truman reduced the duty on imported butter from 14 to 7 cents per pound and fixed the annual quota of butter imports at 60,000,000 pounds. Congress enacted a law authorizing the President to place an embargo on the importation of butter and other fats and oils, which is in operation at the present time. Since the authority contained in this law leaves it at the discretion of the President to continue the embargo, it is assumed that President Truman for political reasons would not permit imports of butter to come into this country until after the congressional elections on November 7, 1950.

The support price on butter is now 60 cents per pound and nearly 200,000,000 pounds of butter is in the hands of the Government under the support program. Butter from foreign countries that have devalued their money by as much as 30 percent can now ship butter into the United States, if the President removes the embargo, including tariff duty and transportation paid, at less than 50 cents per pound. Imports of butter would competely destroy any program devised to protect the integrity of the American dairy farmer who generally operates a so-called family-sized farm. It is our duty to protect American producers, and, when we do so, we safeguard the entire economy of the country.

FAMILY-TYPE FARM

Special recognition should be given to encourage farm-home ownership for the development of the family-sized farm.

CONSERVATION OF SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES

It is vital to the future welfare and security of the American people to conserve the fertility of our soil. Soil-conservation practices should be encouraged in every manner under the appropriate programs now in operation. These programs can be improved for the benefit of our economy.

Soil erosion and devastating damage caused by floods is a problem that demands the immediate attention of Congress and the country. With the limited funds that have been made available by the Federal Government, the soil-conservation districts through farmer cooperation have done magnificent work. Funds should be substantially increased to provide the required technical help for the soil-conservation districts, and also inducement should be provided under the Service for terracing of land, and planting of trees and grasses, where floods cause soil erosion and other damages due to the topography of the land.

A well-rounded soil-conservation program must take into consideration the following farm practices:

Contour farming, strip cropping, pasture improvement, seeding pasture, wildlife-area improvement, woodland management, tree planting, terraces, field diversions, farm drainage, tilling field windbreaks, prevention of grazing damage, fence-row management, and stream-bank management.

CROP INSURANCE

The over-all crop insurance program should be strengthened on a sound actuarial basis to afford Nation-wide crop coverage to American farmers on a voluntary plan.

TRADING AMERICAN SURPLUSES FOR FOREIGN CRITICAL PRODUCTS

To remove burdensome surpluses, authorization should be given to trade American farm surpluses for foreign-produced critical commodities that are not produced in the United States.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. Speaker, I have always supported a sound rural electrification program. I believe that program should be expanded and that the REA should be supported as in the past. This is but part of our program to bring to the family farm a better standard of living and better living conditions.

I supported the $800,000,000 of REA loan appropriations passed by the Eightieth Congress. This is almost half of the total loan funds voted by Congress over the previous 15 years of the REA's history. It was by far the largest amount for REA provided by any one Congress. I also supported and voted for an amendment which, if it had been enacted, would have further increased the amount of one of the Eightieth Congress' loan appropriations for REA by $25,000,000.

LET'S HAVE A SOUND FARM PROGRAM

Such a program should provide: A fair price for the farmers' products in the market aided by a system of price supports; constructive programs and research for more and better production and uses of agricultural products in industry; American markets should be preserved for American farmers; there should be adequate development and restoration of our soil and water through conservation; there should be an expansion of animal agriculture as a means of reducing surpluses and rebuilding our soil; there should be rural development and improvement—meaning better roads, better schools, better telephone service where needed, expanded rural electrification and a host of other things—including encouragement for ownership of family-sized farms; we should develop greater export markets for surplus crops.

This is the kind of a farm program worked out and supported by most of the great farm organizations of the country. In Congress, it has been supported by Members representing the great agriculture sections of the country.

It is American in its concept, and, while no one would contend that the entire answer to the farm question has yet been discovered, a program based on these principles and adjusted by experience, will give the farmer his fair share of the national income without interfering with his initiative and self-reliance, and without putting his liberty in jeopardy.

The American farmer has proven himself to be the most resourceful and productive on earth. For example, during World War II, with less hired labor, less machinery, less fertilizer, and less transportation, he increased his production 35 percent. How? By hard labor—by long hours—by good management—and by new methods.

We must never forget that our farm families are the backbone of a free and prosperous America. Let us keep them that way.

Summary of Legislation Enacted by Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in accordance with the permission granted me earlier in the day, I present for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of legislation enacted by the Eighty-first Congress from January 3, 1949, to September 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, JANUARY 3, 1949, TO SEPTEMBER 21, 1950

(By Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY, United States Senator from Nebraska)

The 2-year record of the Eighty-first Congress indicts the Democratic administration and its leadership in House and Senate for insincerity, lack of direction, extravagance, mismanagement, and irresponsible conduct of foreign affairs.

The Democratic Party, in control of Congress and the administration, proved itself morally and intellectually bankrupt. It operated on a day-to-day, politics-as-usual, opportunistic basis with its sole intent to perpetuate itself in office.

In the peacetime program it proposed prior to the invasion of Korea in June 1950, the Democratic leadership irresponsibly committed the Nation to deficit financing for Government hand-outs.

In the conduct of foreign affairs both before and after the Korean invasion, the Democratic leadership of the Nation floundered from one crisis to another with no long-range program of world-wide scope to meet the global challenge of Communist aggression. The Congress, not alert to protect the American people from the blunders

and mismanagement of the administration in both domestic and foreign affairs, has demonstrated to the people the need for a new membership that will serve as a watchdog on administration leadership rather than act as a rubber stamp to every new pronouncement and change of policy that issues from the Executive.

The Eighty-first Congress was organized on January 3, 1949, with Democratic majorities in both House and Senate.

These majorities were won in the campaign of 1948 during which the electioneering President and all the vast army of Federal propagandists deliberately falsified the record to malign the real achievements under Republican leadership in the Eightieth Congress. The Democratic majorities in the Eighty-first Congress were won by distortion and smear tactics leveled against the Republican Eightieth Congress. The majorities were won by grossly fraudulent promises which the Eighty-first Congress has not delivered in the 2 years of its existence.

By contrast with the failures of the Eighty-first Congress, the record of the Eightieth Congress has regained the respect and reputation which were clouded by the vituperation and falsification of the administration spokesmen in the campaign year of 1948.

Events of the past 2 years have provided the American people with facts by which the solid achievement of Republican leadership in the Eightieth Congress is contrasted with the inadequate performance of Democratic leadership in the Eighty-first Congress.

The Eighty-first Congress, despite unwise reduction of military spending in the 1950 and 1951 budgets, could not achieve the balanced budgets which the Republican Eightieth Congress gave the Nation for the first time since a Democratic President took office in 1932.

The leaders of the Eighty-first Congress ignored the struggle of the Republican Eightieth Congress to force attention of a reluctant administration on the disastrous consequence of inaction in the Far East. It defended the President's indifference to communism in Asia until open conflict with Communist forces followed the invasion of South Korea on June 25, 1950.

The Eighty-first Congress, without strength to repeal the sound labor legislation enacted by the Republican Eightieth Congress and endorsed by the people of the Nation, refused to consider proposals of Republican leaders to vote sensible, perfecting amendments suggested by 3 years of successful operation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Eighty-first Congress killed the peril-point provision written into the Reciprocal Trade Act by the Eightieth Congress in order to offer moderate protection of American workmen from competition of imports produced by foreign sweat-shop labor. The Eighty-first Congress voted down this proposal to require the President, in making trade agreements, to be advised by a nonpartisan Tariff Commission of the point below which tariff reduction imperils American job security.

The Democratic leadership of the Eighty-first Congress obstructed the crusade carried on in the Eightieth Congress to eliminate Communists and Communist sympathizers from the Federal payroll. It set up a committee to "whitewash" substantiated charges that Communists have been or are now operating in the executive branch of Government. Only the full pressure of public opinion following conviction or confession of Communist activity in Government could induce Democratic leadership to bring to a vote in the closing hours of Congress a subversive-control bill for which Republicans had been pressing. The measure was passed over a Presidential veto, despite opposition of administration spokesmen.

On June 25 the Democratic leadership in the Eighty-first Congress was forced by the outbreak of hostilities in Korea to recognize the seriousness of the Communist threat in Asia and the world, concerning which Republican leaders in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses had issued prophetic, unheeded warnings.

The Korean crisis forced the administration and the Democratic leadership in Congress to repudiate their previous position of "letting the dust settle" in Asia. Belatedly, attention was given to Republican demands for affirmative action to block Communist aggression and for enactment of legislation curbing subversive activities on the home front. The action of the administration in these two fields was welcomed by Republicans in Congress. Full cooperation was given by Republicans in both Houses in enactment of legislation to build up the armed services and provide necessary controls for the domestic economy.

THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD

Increased taxation, domestic controls, and legislation directly concerned with the defense effort following the Korean invasion were passed in the closing weeks of the Eighty-first Congress. Prior to the emergency, the major effort by Democratic leadership in the Congress was directed toward extending and implementing programs initiated in preceding Congresses.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Eighty-first Congress voted in both sessions to continue the activities of the Economic Cooperation Administration inaugurated in the Eightieth Congress. The ECA program, intended to be reduced each year and terminated in 1952, was given substantially reduced funds for its operation in both fiscal years 1950 and 1951. The Democratic leadership in Congress, supporting the policies of the administration, was hostile to constructive criticism of Republicans based on the experience of ECA in operation. An amendment offered by Republicans to halt the transfer by European nations of ECA grants to Russia was fought by administration leadership despite the open scandal of shipment of war materials and potentials to Russia by Britain and other governments.

The Eighty-first Congress, carrying out the intent of the Vandenberg resolution of the Eightieth Congress, ratified the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949 and subsequently appropriated funds for transfer of arms to countries participating in a mutual defense pact. Military aid inaugurated by the Eightieth Congress for Greece, Iran, Turkey, the Philippines, Korea, and other nations, was continued by the Eighty-first Congress in the mutual defense program and was stepped up after the Korean invasion.

The administration, however, was slow to execute the will of Congress in respect to building up the defenses of other nations. Of $27,400,000 appropriated in 1949 for Iran, Korea, and the Philippines, for example, only a negligible part had been spent when Korea was invaded in late June of 1950. Even more striking was the failure of the administration to use funds appropriated in 1948 and 1949 for aid of forces fighting communism on the China mainland.

The attitude of the Democratic leadership in the Eighty-first Congress and the administration toward Republican demands for a firm policy in Asia expressed complete indecision prior to the Korean invasion. In January of 1950, when Republican leaders in the Senate called for assurances that Formosa would not fall into Communists' hands by default, Democratic leaders in Congress termed Republicans "warmongers." Administration spokesmen, including the President and the Secretary of State, were critical of Republican Senators and declared a line of strategic defense in the East that excluded Korea and Formosa.

Of course, the administration was forced by events in Korea to make a complete reversal of this policy and adopted the Republican point of view 6 months later when Korea was invaded.

Administration proposals for Point 4 were presented to the Eighty-first Congress in the second session without adequate preparation or programing. In effect, only increased activity in technical assistance programs now carried on were proposed. But the scope of increased activity and the joint operation of the new program by the United Nations, cooperating with the United States, were outlined in very vague and general terms. The Congress allowed less funds than those requested and attempted, despite administration protests, to define more clearly the scope of Point 4 activities intended by Congress.

Republicans played a major part in the Eighty-first Congress in earmarking funds for loans to the Spanish Government. Following the advice of military experts that Spain is essential to an integrated defense program for Europe, the Congress forced through a Spanish loan provision that was opposed by the President and his congressional leadership. The President has declared his intention to ignore the congressional directive that Spain be aided in its fight against communism.

APPROPRIATIONS AND EXPENDITURES

The Eightieth Congress provided for 2 years the first balanced budget for the Federal Government since the Democrats assumed office in 1932.

During the Eighty-first Congress, the Federal Government was returned to deficit spending by congressional leadership which gave cooperation to the President in many new, large-spending projects. Leaving out fixed charges of the Government such as those for interest on the national debt, and leaving out payment for national defense, foreign aid, and veterans' affairs, the other cost of Government climbed steadily from $5,000,000,000 in 1947 to nearly $11,000,000,000 in 1950.

Republican attempts to achieve economy in Government spending during the Eighty-first Congress were vigorously opposed by administration leadership and were, for the most part, unsuccessful. The many attempts made to cut amounts appropriated to individual items were fought off by Democratic leadership both in the Appropriations Committees and on the floors of House and Senate.

Appropriations for 1951 were presented to the Congress in one bill for the first time in history. The so-called omnibus appropriations bill, largely the result of Republican effort over several sessions, presented all appropriation items in one bill rather than in the customary 10 separate appropriation bills of prior years.

The omnibus appropriations bill offered economy-minded legislators their first major opportunity to cut expenditures. In the Senate, the Bridges-Byrd amendment was offered to the bill making an across-the-board percentage reduction in appropriations with proper exemptions for defense items and fixed payments. The potential savings of this amendment approximated $500,000,000. A similar amendment to the bill had been adopted in the House.

In the House-Senate conference on the bill, the Bridges-Byrd amendment was

dropped and general instructions were given the President to reduce appropriations by $550,000,000. Republicans, who had given full support to the Bridges-Byrd amendment, accepted the conference compromise, although the directive to the President constituted a wide delegation of congressional power to the Executive in determining where reductions in expenditure should be effected.

After the invasion of South Korea, supplemental appropriations were voted for the war effort with Republican support. Republicans were critical, however, of the failure of the Executive to trim nonessential spending not related to defense. They were equally critical of the failure by the President to outline an overall program of defense and overseas activity to indicate the extent of the burden the American people will now be asked to carry in support of their Government.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Republicans gave full cooperation in Congress to the building up of an adequate national defense. They supported the legislation providing for reorganization of the armed services along the lines set forth as a result of creation of the Hoover Commission in the Eightieth Congress. They gave full support also to appropriations for the military.

Republicans played a major part in forcing through Congress against administration opposition funds necessary for a strong air force. These funds were subsequently impounded by the President and the Air Force strength was not built up until the outbreak of hostilities in Korea forced the President to recognize the wisdom of congressional action in this area.

Republicans, committed to the principle of economy in Government and reduction of nonessential expenditures, never stinted in appropriating funds for adequate defense. In all, some $90,000,000,000 were provided for the military after World War II, despite which the administration was caught unprepared to carry out the limited action demanded in the early months of Communist hostilities in Korea.

DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

One of the major accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress was the revision of social security legislation which was brought about by Republican support. The new amendment of the law grew out of suggestions made by a study group created in the Eightieth Congress to re-examine the social security program.

Largely as a result of Republican demand, the new social security law carries provision for a commission to make further study of the system and the advisability of adopting a "pay-as-you-go" policy with more nearly universal coverage.

The farm law passed by the Eighty-first Congress embraced the principles of the Hope-Aiken law passed in the Eightieth Congress as the first permanent price-support legislation. The production-payment scheme spelled out in the Brannan plan made no headway in the Eighty-first Congress, largely because of opposition by the Republican Party and the major farm organizations.

The President's proposals for socialized medicine were completely disregarded in the Eighty-first Congress when they faced the total opposition of Republicans and the hostility of the medical profession.

Action taken in the Eighty-first Congress made a start toward carrying out the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission on reduction of expenditures in the executive branch of Government. In the first session of the Congress, the President was given wide powers to reorganize and streamline executive agencies, subject to the veto power of the Congress. This veto power was exercised in several incidents in which the President sought to use reorganization powers for political ends, exemplified in his proposal to change the Taft-Hartley law in reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board, or to advance his socialized medicine program in creation of a Welfare Department not in conformance with Hoover recommendations.

The Congress, on its own initiative, executed some of the Hoover reforms, notably in the National Defense Department and the Department of State. It is estimated that total reorganization to date may effect savings of $1,400,000,000 out of a potential total savings of four to five billion dollars by adoption of the Hoover proposals.

No major labor legislation was enacted in the Eighty-first Congress, although Democratic Party leaders continued to attack the Taft-Hartley law, echoing the labor bosses. In the first session of the Congress, perfecting amendments to the law were adopted in the Senate with Republican support. The Democratic leaders chose to kill such amendments in the House, however, rather than lose their issue of outright repeal. The successful operation of the law since its passage in the Eightieth Congress has been attested by the lessened number of strikes, the increased prosperity and growth of unions, and the general endorsement given the law by the American people.

Republicans in the Eighty-first Congress gave support to continuing programs for reclamation, flood control, housing construction, veterans' benefits, and the normal operations of Government that must be carried on within the limits that the Nation can afford.

DEMOCRATIC INSINCERITY

In carrying out the legislative program in the Eighty-first Congress, the administration and its leadership in House and Senate displayed a flagrant insincerity and political cynicism.

The bills for Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood, which passed the House in the first session of Congress, were held on the Senate Calendar. Contrary to promises of Democratic leadership, they had not been brought up for consideration by the time Congress adjourned in September.

Similarly, civil-rights measures were exploited by Democratic leadership without sincere effort to secure passage.

The Ferguson antilynch bill, reported favorably out of committee in the first session, never was brought to the floor for action by the Senate majority leadership although prospects for shutting off debate and passing the measure were excellent. An anti-poll tax measure was mishandled in the same fashion.

A fair employment practice bill, highly controversial in many of its provisions, was brought to the Senate floor late in the second session and there discarded by the majority leader after token attempts to shut off debate by exercise of the new Wherry-Hayden cloture rule. In voting for cloture, Republicans overwhelmingly favored the closing of debate while Democrats could not muster half their votes to carry out civil-rights promises written into the campaign platforms of both major political parties.

MAJOR LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, (JANUARY 3, 1949-SEPTEMBER 23, 1950)

The Presidential pay raise

(Public Law 2. Approved January 19, 1949)

Congress suspended rules to increase the President's salary from $75,000 to $100,000 and that of the Vice President from $20,000 to $30,000 a year. It also voted a tax-free allowance for the President of $50,000 a year; and for the Vice President, $10,000 a year.

Agriculture

Farm Price Supports

(Public Law 439. Approved October 31, 1949)

The farm price support bill rushed through in the closing hours of the first session compromised the Senate revision of the Aiken law and the House demands for 90 percent support levels. The Brannan plan never was put to a vote by administration leaders who found no support for its production-payment provisions in either House of Congress. The new farm law provides that basic crops—wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, peanuts, and rice—will be supported at 90 percent of parity in 1950, at 80 to 90 percent of parity in 1951, and at 75 to 90 percent thereafter. Farmers are given the option of two parity formulas to achieve maximum support levels. Milk and milk products will be supported on a sliding scale of 75 to 90 percent of parity. Wool, potatoes, and a few other nonbasic crops will have 60 to 90-percent support. Other commodities will be supported at levels up to 90 percent at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. The law resembles the Aiken law passed in the Eightieth Congress, which was the first permanent farm legislation.

Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act Amendment

(Public Law 85. Approved June 7, 1949)

This legislation, introduced by a bipartisan group, modifies the charter of the Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation was given its first permanent Federal charter by the Eightieth Congress. The charter also was revised to provide for storage facilities for agricultural products.

Rural Telephones

(Public Law 423. Approved October 28, 1949)

Introduced by a large bipartisan group, the legislation authorizes the Rural Electrification Administration to make loans to finance expansion, construction, and operations of rural telephone service.

Crop Insurance Act of 1949

(Public Law 268. Approved August 25, 1949)

The legislation continues the crop-insurance program on an experimental basis as begun in the Eightieth Congress, but provides for gradual expansion of crop insurance to additional counties. It contains other modifications of the law pursuant to the program initiated in 1947.

Oleomargarine

(Public Law 459. Approved March 16, 1950)

Passed with support of both parties, this law repeals Federal taxes on oleomargarine and contains provisions regulating the sale of colored margarine.

Cotton and Peanut Acreage Allotments and Potato Supports

(Public Law 471. Approved March 31, 1950)

The law provides for the establishment of minimum farm allotments for cotton for the year 1950 equal to the larger of two different percentage computations, except that no farm under this provision could receive an allotment over 40 percent of the acreage on the farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation. It allows marketing penalty for excess peanuts to be avoided by marketing through designated agencies and limits reduction of 1950 peanut allotments. The Secretary of Agriculture is given discretionary authority over disposition of Irish potatoes acquired under the 1949 price-support program, so that those potatoes may be used for human consumption rather than destroyed. It prohibits price support on 1950 crop of Irish potatoes where marketing orders have been disapproved, and prohibits price support in 1951 and thereafter unless marketing quotas are in effect.

TABLE OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, 81ST CONG., 1ST SESS.

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates [1]	House				Senate				Public law		
			Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Date approved	Amount as approved	Law No.
H. J. Res. 112	Disaster relief	$1,000,000	Jan. 27	$500,000	Jan. 27	$500,000	Jan. 27	$500,000	Jan. 27	$500,000	Jan. 28	$500,000	3
H. J. Res. 136	do	500,000	Feb. 3	500,000	Feb. 3	500,000	Feb. 3	500,000	Feb. 3	500,000	Feb. 7	500,000	5
H. R. 2632	First deficiency, 1949	562,533,148	Feb. 14	466,882,177	Feb. 16	471,895,177	Mar. 22	538,453,473	Apr. 13	542,303,473	May 24	524,649,473	71
H. R. 3082	District of Columbia, 1950	103,878,727	Mar. 1	98,923,621	Mar. 2	98,923,621	June 17	103,132,153	June 21	103,142,153	June 29	102,754,447	145
H. R. 3083	Treasury-Post Office, 1950	3,176,266,750	Mar. 1	3,072,817,903	Mar. 3	3,072,817,903	Apr. 29	3,113,068,503	May 11	3,113,068,503	June 30	3,090,528,903	150
	Treasury	1,096,594,450		1,027,608,403		1,027,608,403		1,045,184,403		1,045,184,403		1,036,318,403	
	Post Office	2,079,672,300		2,045,209,500		2,045,209,500		2,067,884,100		2,067,884,100		2,054,210,500	
H. R. 3333	Labor-Federal Security, 1950	2,234,389,285	Mar. 8	2,211,794,085	Mar. 9	2,211,794,085	Apr. 14	2,396,337,265	May 17	2,409,827,265	June 29	2,387,799,885	141
	Labor	16,766,200		16,550,000		16,550,000		16,766,200		16,766,200		16,766,200	
	FSA	1,500,805,585		1,478,426,585		1,478,426,585		1,495,901,565		1,509,391,565		1,487,364,185	
	Related agencies	716,817,500		716,817,500		716,817,500		883,669,500		883,669,500		883,669,500	
H. R. 3734	Civil functions, Army, 1950	772,458,220	Mar. 23	586,762,000	Mar. 29	593,292,270	May 10	751,440,690	May 20	751,440,690	Oct. 13	664,178,190	355
H. R. 3838	Interior, 1950	624,810,436	Mar. 28	536,211,908	Mar. 30	536,461,908	July 13	590,685,911	Aug. 25	595,262,257	Oct. 12	584,098,797	350
H. R. 3997	Agriculture, 1950	727,906,908	Apr. 4	701,122,079	Apr. 5	701,122,079	May 10	723,083,249	May 19	723,083,249	June 29	715,601,607	146
H. R. 4016	State, Justice, Commerce, 1950	740,362,956	Apr. 5	684,616,102	Apr. 7	684,616,102	June 1	671,782,281	June 7	671,782,281	July 20	677,972,102	179
	State	285,313,756		271,405,656		271,405,656		260,172,456		260,172,456		265,305,656	
	Justice	132,566,500		132,579,141		132,579,141		130,971,000		130,971,000		132,663,141	
	Commerce	301,248,500		259,927,605		259,927,605		259,904,105		259,904,105		259,269,105	
	Judiciary	21,234,200		20,703,700		20,703,700		20,734,720		20,734,720		20,734,200	
H. R. 4046	Second deficiency, 1949	900,699,334	Apr. 6	671,047,172	Apr. 8	671,069,672	June 1	859,675,510	June 2	862,563,510	June 23	854,838,710	119
H. R. 4146	National Military, 1950	13,248,960,700	Apr. 9	13,272,815,800	Apr. 13	13,272,815,800	July 22	[2] 13,165,803,089	Aug. 29	[2] 13,165,803,089	Oct. 29	[3] 12,949,562,498	434
	Army	4,604,875,700		4,481,834,200		4,481,834,200		4,570,907,089		4,570,907,089		4,380,644,298	
	Navy	4,403,751,000		4,375,327,600		4,375,327,600		4,388,079,000		4,388,079,000		4,285,382,200	
	Air Force	4,033,887,000		4,222,954,000		4,222,954,000		4,000,887,000		4,000,887,000		4,088,386,000	
	Other	206,447,000		192,700,000		192,700,000		205,930,000		205,930,000		195,150,000	
H. R. 4177	Independent offices, 1950	8,051,343,830	Apr. 11	7,104,571,603	Apr. 14	7,103,506,553	July 8	7,636,006,873	Aug. 2	7,663,429,323	Aug. 24	7,617,739,361	266
H. J. Res. 222	Veterans' readjustment benefits	595,890,000	Apr. 12	595,890,000	Apr. 13	595,890,000	Apr. 13	595,890,000	Apr. 14	595,890,000	Apr. 15	595,890,000	43
H. R. 4830	Foreign aid, 1950	6,322,544,000	May 23	5,542,470,000	May 26	5,617,470,000	July 30	5,647,724,000	Aug. 8	5,647,724,000	Oct. 6	5,659,990,000	327
H. R. 5060	Legislative, 1950	73,582,184	June 8	62,200,705	June 9	62,200,705	June 14	62,262,110	June 15	62,262,110	June 22	62,262,110	118
H. R. 5300	Third Deficiency, 1949	214,730,794	June 23	127,032,243	June 24	127,032,243	Aug. 5	136,318,469	Aug. 25	193,078,469	Oct. 10	177,740,619	343
H. J. Res. 327	Insect control	3,500,000	July 27	1,500,000	July 27	1,500,000	July 28	3,500,000	July 28	3,500,000	Aug. 8	1,750,000	215
H. R. 6008	Supplemental, 1950	90,832,963	Aug. 16	75,790,521	Aug. 19	72,790,521	Sept. 20	103,591,789	Sept. 26	104,172,589	Oct. 14	78,005,129	358
H. R. 6427	Second supplemental, 1950	1,100,633,695	Oct. 14	1,038,506,380	Oct. 14	1,038,506,380	Oct. 17	1,076,511,658	Oct. 18	1,083,161,658	Oct. 28	1,079,082,880	430

TABLE OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, 81ST CONG., 2D SESS., AS OF SEPT. 22, 1950 [4]

H. R. 7207	Urgent deficiency	$830,911,600	Feb. 8	$732,485,500	Feb. 9	$732,485,500	Feb. 27	$749,379,100	Mar. 9	$758,729,100	Mar. 27	$739,653,500	468
H. R. 7786	Omnibus bill:												
Ch. VI	Agriculture	810,626,946	Mar. 21	764,032,701	May 10	764,032,701	July 8	780,336,574	Aug. 4	780,374,074	Sept. 6	773,208,924	759
Ch. IX	Army civil functions	834,867,500		632,620,000		630,820,000		762,924,620		763,464,620		687,043,270	
Ch. I	District of Columbia	12,000,000		12,000,000		10,800,000		12,000,000		12,000,000		10,800,000	
Ch. X–B	Foreign aid	4,855,073,729						4,522,158,729		4,599,873,729		4,387,373,729	
Ch. VIII	Independent offices	8,466,982,724		8,024,877,007		8,021,827,007		8,017,871,977		8,018,289,977		7,996,140,947	
Ch. VII	Interior	674,971,505		621,634,130		622,134,130		617,061,433		617,061,433		620,396,325	
Ch. V	Labor-Federal Security	2,463,008,500		2,271,099,614		2,271,099,614		2,273,385,034		2,276,842,274		2,272,428,614	
Ch. II	Legislative	87,820,747		56,822,450		56,322,450		79,305,795		69,308,211		69,290,211	
Ch. X	Military Establishment	13,376,865,000		12,825,342,300		12,910,702,300		13,294,581,821		13,294,581,821		13,294,299,443	
Ch. III	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	1,185,612,897		1,110,870,462		1,110,870,462		1,066,096,732		1,066,260,732		1,035,627,962	
Ch. IV	Treasury-Post Office	1,132,379,100		947,105,000		948,105,000		1,079,305,360		1,079,305,360		[5] 1,076,846,000	
H. R. 8567	Deficiency	605,024,943	May 19	625,756,494	May 22	625,493,694	June 21	660,299,681	June 22	660,272,508	June 29	653,761,608	583
H. R. 8568	District of Columbia	121,209,575	May 19	112,840,340	May 23	112,840,340	June 27	119,019,562	July 5	119,019,562	July 18	118,049,256	616
H. R. 9526	Supplemental, 1951	16,852,484,598	Aug. 24	16,771,084,479	Aug. 26	16,771,384,479	Sept. 13	17,192,530,669	Sept. 14	17,196,735,669	Sept. 27	17,099,902,285	843

[1] These estimates include any additional amounts which may have been submitted to the Senate after the bill was acted on by House Appropriations Committee.
[2] These figures include $433,968,611 to be rescinded as effected by sec. 702; the branches of the service and the amount to be rescinded from each were to be determined by the Secretary of Defense.
[3] Rescissions to be effected by sec. 702 were allocated to the various appropriations affected.
[4] This table includes only cash appropriations.
[5] The total of the Post Office appropriations is $2,207,500,000 payable from postal revenues to the extent such funds become available and the remainder from the Treasury. Estimated revenue is $1,081,000,000.

Civil rights

Cloture rule

(Adopted March 17, 1949)

Offered by Republican leadership during the filibuster on civil-rights legislation early in the Eighty-first Congress, the rule provides that a constitutional two-thirds may cut off debate on a motion to take up legislation. The cloture rule is the most significant action taken in many sessions toward obtaining consideration for civil-rights legislation, since, for the first time, it becomes possible to shut off debate in the Senate on a motion to take up. First tested in a vote on the motion to take up the FEPC bill in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, it was supported by 33 of 42 Republican Senators, and failed because only 22 of 54 Democratic Senators would vote to close debate.

Communism

Subversive Control Act

(Public Law 831, over the President's veto, September 23, 1950)

Republicans led the drive for the enactment over the President's veto of legislation to protect this country from internal sabotage by Communists. Not until the pressure of public opinion grew too strong to ignore did Democrat leadership in this Congress schedule any subversive control bill for action. As finally agreed upon by both Houses, this act combines the original Republican bill as amended with a number of other provisions relating to our internal security. The compromise bill provides, among other things, for registration of Communists and officers of "front" organizations, bans members of either group from holding Federal jobs or receiving passports, labeling of their literature by Communists, and detention of Communists in case of invasion, insurrection, or declaration of war.

Education

Emergency School Aid

(Public Law 306. Approved September 10, 1949)

The law authorized appropriations of $7,500,000 to continue Federal assistance through 1950 to local school agencies that are overburdened with defense-incurred school enrollments or that provide schools for children on Federal reservations or other federally owned property.

Finance and commerce

Export Control Act of 1949

(Public Law 11. Approved February 26, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress continued the authority of the President through 1951 to control exports of certain commodities, excluding fats and oils, when in domestic surplus. The law conforms to laws passed in the Eightieth and prior Congresses.

Import Controls Over Fats, Oils, Rice

(Public Law 590. Approved June 30, 1950)

The Eighty-first Congress continued through June 1951 the import controls over fats and oils and rice and rice products.

Extension of Rubber Act

(Public Law 575. Approved June 24, 1950)

This act extends for 2 years the effective period of the Rubber Act of 1948, enacted by the Republican Eightieth Congress, to provide for a synthetic-rubber industry.

Tax Act

Designed as a start toward financing the Korean war, this act increases individual income taxes by about 20 percent. The act increases corporate income taxes beginning with income earned after July 1, 1950. Among provisions designed to plug loopholes in existing tax laws is one under which life-insurance companies will pay income taxes for 1949 and 1950.

General government

Reorganization Act of 1949

(Public Law 109. Approved June 20, 1949)

Introduced by a bipartisan group, this legislation carries out some of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, which was created by the Eightieth Congress and which submitted its report early in 1949. The act gave the Chief Executive wide powers to correct the waste and mismanagement found in the present administration. Under the terms of the act the reorganization plans submitted by the President become law if not disapproved by a constitutional majority of either the Senate or the House within 60 days.

Thirty-four plans were presented pursuant to this legislation in the Eighty-first Congress. Plans No. 1 of 1949 and No. 27 of 1950 were voted down in the Senate by a strong majority because they seemed to jeopardize creation of a separate governmental unit to direct public health activities, as recommended by the Hoover Commission. Plans 2 through 7 of 1949 went into effect on August 19, 1949. They are:

No. 2. Transfers the Bureau of Employment Security from Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor.

No. 3. Strengthens top-level organization of the Post Office Department.

No. 4. Transfers National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.

No. 5. Makes Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission its chief executive and administrative officer.

No. 6. Makes Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission its chief executive and administrative officer.

No. 7. Transfers Public Roads Administration from Federal Works Agency to the Department of Commerce.

In the second session 27 plans were submitted, of which 7 were rejected by the Congress. Those rejected are:

No. 1. Proposed vesting almost all functions of Treasury Department in Secretary of Treasury. Opposition centered around transfer of functions of Comptroller of Currency. See plan No. 26 below.

No. 4. Proposed vesting almost all functions of Agriculture Department in Secretary of Agriculture.

No. 7. Proposed vesting administrative responsibility in the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and transferring power to select Chairman from members of the Commission to the President.

No. 11. Proposed transferring administrative responsibility for the Federal Communications Commission from the Commissioners to the Chairman.

No. 12. Proposed reorganizing the National Labor Relations Board, including abolishment of the Office of General Counsel.

No. 24. Proposed transfer of Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Commerce Department.

No. 27. Proposed creation of a Department of Health, Education, and Security.

The remaining plans submitted which went into effect are:

No. 2. Vests almost all functions of the Justice Department in the Attorney General. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 3. Vests almost all functions of Interior Department in the Secretary of the Interior. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 5. Vests almost all functions of Commerce Department in Secretary of Commerce. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 6. Vests almost all functions of Labor Department in Secretary of Labor. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 8. Vests administrative responsibility in Chairman of Federal Trade Commission. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 9. Vests administrative responsibility in Chairman of Federal Power Commission. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 10. Vests administrative responsibility in Chairman of Securities and Exchange Commission. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 13. Vests administrative responsibility in Chairman of Civil Aeronautics Board. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 14. Vests in the Secretary of Labor responsibility for labor standards enforcement. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 15. Transfers responsibility of the General Services Administrator for public works programs in Alaska and the Virgin Islands to the Secretary of Interior. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 16. Transfers school assistance and water pollution control activities of the General Services Administration to the Federal Security Agency. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 17. Transfers administration of Federal grants to State and local governments for advance planning of public works from the General Services Administration to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 18. Transfers to General Services Administrator functions of Federal agencies respecting leasing, custody, etc., of Federal office buildings. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 19. Transfers from Federal Security Agency to the Labor Department, the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and Appeals Board. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 20. Transfers from Secretary of State to General Services Administrator certain record keeping and certification functions pertaining to official documents. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 21. Abolishes Maritime Commission and establishes a Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce. Effective May 24, 1950.

No. 22. Transfers Federal National Mortgage Association from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Effective September 8, 1950.

No. 23. Transfers lending functions of Reconstruction Finance Corporation regarding prefabricated houses to Housing and Home Finance Agency. Effective September 8, 1950.

No. 25. Transfers functions of National Security Resources Board to its Chairman with full powers of delegation. Effective July 9, 1950.

No. 26. To meet congressional objection to Plan No. 1 of 1950, the Treasury reorganization plan was resubmitted making exempt from the transfer of functions those of the Comptroller of the Currency. Effective July 9, 1950.

Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

(Public Law 152. Approved June 30, 1949)

This legislation was enacted to carry out recommendations of the Hoover Commission in regard to the handling of Government property, procurement of Government supplies, and establishment of General Services Administration. Public Law 754 of the second session further implements Hoover Commission advices in this field by amendment to this act.

State Department Organization

(Public Law 73. Approved May 26, 1949)

The reorganization of the State Department provided for in this legislation carries out recommendations made by the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch.

Executive Pay Bill

(Public Law 359. Approved October 15, 1949)

Salary increases granted heads and assistant heads of departments and agencies in this legislation are in general compliance with the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission.

Federal Employees' Classification Act Revision

(Public Law 429. Approved October 28, 1949)

This legislation revised the Classification Act granting salary increases to classified employees, supplementing the cost-of-living increase for Government employees granted in the Eightieth Congress.

Postal Pay Raise

(Public Law 428. Approved October 28, 1949)

Introduced by a bipartisan group, this legislation grants postal employees a salary increase.

Post Office Financial Control Act of 1950

(Public Law 712. Approved August 17, 1950)

With the objective of carrying out recommendations of the Hoover Commission relative to accounting and auditing for the Post Office Department, the Congress implemented the necessary procedural changes in this act.

Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950

(Public Law 784, Approved September 12, 1950)

Stemming from Hoover Commission recommendations seeking to modernize the Federal budgeting and accounting system, this measure provides the framework for bringing the budgeting, accounting, and auditing procedures up to date.

Housing and community facilities

Housing and Rent Act of 1950

(Public Law 574. Approved June 23, 1950)

This legislation continues the Rent Act of the Eightieth and prior Congresses to December 31, 1950, with a local-option provision for further extension through June 30, 1951, unless sooner terminated by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution by Congress.

Housing Act of 1949

(Public Law 171. Approved July 15, 1949)

Introduced by 11 members of each party, this legislation is the culmination of the efforts of a bipartisan group that has worked through several past sessions to enact a comprehensive housing law. Construction of 810,000 low-rent housing units in the next 6 years is authorized. Federal aid is provided for slum clearance and for construction of farm dwellings.

Alaska Housing Act

(Public Law 52. Approved April 23, 1949)

This legislation raises the dollar ceilings on mortgage loans on housing in Alaska and provides a secondary market for securities.

Alaska Public Works Act

(Public Law 264. Approved August 24, 1949)

Expenditure of $70,000,000 is authorized for a public-works program in Alaska for schools, hospitals, sewers, wharfs, docks, etc.

Advance Planning of Public Works

(Public Law 352. Approved October 13, 1949)

This legislation, introduced by a bipartisan group, is a renewal of a similar program authorized in 1944 and carries on through October 13, 1951. Appropriation of $100,000,000 is authorized for loans and grants to States and other non-Federal public agencies to undertake advance planning of public works.

Federal Grants for Minor Airport Projects

(Public Law 445. Approved February 9, 1950)

Under terms of this law congressional approval of Federal grants for class 4 or larger airports would carry over for 2 succeeding fiscal years. Also, improvements of $50,000 or less at such airports would be exempt from requirements of specific congressional approval.

Housing Act of 1950

(Public Law 475. Approved April 20, 1950)

After rejecting the President's new, highly controversial middle-income, cooperative housing program, a bipartisan majority of the Congress enacted an omnibus housing measure which improves and modifies the several FHA mortgage-insurance programs; provides for disposal of war and veterans' housing; liberalizes terms of GI bill home loans; and authorizes loans to educational institutions for student housing.

Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Acts of 1950

(Public Law 516. Approved May 17, 1950)

Title I authorizes construction, repair, and preservation of 94 public works on rivers and harbors, amounting to $203,723,125; and title II authorizes the prosecution of 58 flood-control projects, amounting to $1,249,691,200.

Federal Aid to Highways

(Public Law 769. Approved September 7, 1950)

This is an authorization for Federal aid to highways and other road construction for a 2-year period ending June 30, 1953.

International affairs

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

(Public Law 307. Approved September 26, 1949)

Extension of reciprocal agreements in the Eighty-first Congress continued a program that has been in existence since 1934. The Eighty-first Congress voted down a Republican-sponsored amendment which would have directed the Tariff Commission to set the rate of duty below which the United States could not go in trade negotiation without endangering American industry. This amendment, which was added to the bill in the Eightieth Congress and operated successfully for a year, required the President to explain his action to the Congress and the people whenever he ignored the findings of the Tariff Commission. This provision, which offered a reasonable safeguard to American industry against the competition of cheap foreign labor, was defeated by the Democratic leadership on the grounds that it was restrictive legislation although the only possible restriction under the amendment was that imposed by public opinion.

Relief of Palestine Refugees

(Public Law 25. Approved March 24, 1949)

This legislation authorized a special contribution of $16,000,000 to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees.

Institute of Inter-American Affairs Continued

(Public Law 283. Approved September 3, 1949)

The Eightieth Congress merged two Government corporations to form the institute with a charter for 3 years. The Eighty-first Congress extended the life of the charter for 5 years and authorized an appropriation.

North Atlantic Pact

(Ratified by Senate July 21, 1949)

The North Atlantic Pact was ratified by the Eighty-first Congress to fulfill part of the promise expressed in the Vandenberg resolution adopted in the Eightieth Congress. The pact was ratified with strong bipartisan support.

International Wheat Agreement

(Ratified by Senate June 13, 1949)

The international wheat pact, unanimously deferred in the Foreign Relations Committee of the Eightieth Congress, was ratified by the Eighty-first Congress, and the Government was authorized to pay a subsidy necessary to encourage the export of 168,000,000 bushels of wheat for each of the next 5 years. The Congress later authorized Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out operations to fulfill United States commitments under the agreement. (Public Law 421, approved October 27, 1949.)

Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950

(Public Law 447. Approved February 14, 1950)

The law extended to June 30, 1950, the President's authority to obligate funds for economic aid to certain parts of China and authorized $60,000,000 for economic aid to Korea until June 30, 1950.

Continuation of Economic Cooperation Act of 1948

(Public Law 47. Approved April 19, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress renewed authorization for ECA in substantially the same form as the original authorization which was enacted in the Eightieth Congress under bipartisan leadership. See also Public Law 535 below.

Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950

(Public Law 535. Approved June 5, 1950)

Continuing the major international economic assistance programs begun during the Republican Eightieth Congress, members of both parties approved this measure. Title I amends the ECA act and provides $2,700,000,000 plus unexpended balances for fiscal year 1951, $600,000,000 of which is to be used to promote European trade liberalization. Title II reserves $40,000,000 of previous appropriations for China aid for non-Communist-dominated China, authorizes $8,000,000 for disaster relief in China, and $6,000,000 for educational assistance to selected Chinese in the United States. Title III authorizes United States contributions up to $27,450,000 for Palestine refugees. Title IV, the so-called Point 4 amendment, provides for technical assistance to underdeveloped countries, but does not include the other Point 4 request for guaranties of private investment abroad. Title V authorizes $15,000,000 for fiscal 1951 to support the United Nations' international children's welfare work.

Displaced Persons Amendment

(Public Law 555. Approved June 16, 1950)

Originating with the Republican Eightieth Congress, the displaced persons program was continued with modification until June 30, 1951, by Republicans and Democrats in the Eighty-first Congress. Changes enacted include increasing the number of displaced persons in the general category who can be admitted from 202,000 to 301,500, and advancing the eligibility date from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949.

Military Assistance Program Extension

(Public Law 621. Approved July 26, 1950)

In line with the basic policy of mutual defense aid established by Public Law 329

in the first session of the Congress, the Republicans and Democrats, with only one dissenting vote, authorized additional funds for continuing the military assistance program. New funds authorized a total of $1,222,500,000, broken down as follows: North Atlantic Treaty nations, $1,000,000,000; Turkey, Greece, and Iran, $131,500,000; Philippines and Korea, $16,000,000; and general area of China, $75,000,000. An amendment adopted provides for discontinuance of such aid to North Atlantic Treaty countries not making their full contribution to mutual defense.

Labor

Minimum Wage Increase

(Public Law 393. Approved October 26, 1949)

This legislation, offered by a large bipartisan group, increased the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour. The law does not follow the President's recommendation for greatly extended coverage. The new law clarifies the status of retail-store employees and others where administrative decisions were overriding congressional intent.

Overtime on Overtime

(Public Law 177. Approved July 20, 1949)

Legislation was enacted by the Congress to clarify overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The law is retroactive and results from claims filed by employees and pending in the court.

National defense

National Security Act Amendments of 1949

(Public Law 216. Approved August 10, 1949)

These amendments follow recommendations of the Hoover Commission to revise the action taken by the Eightieth Congress toward unifying the armed services. The law passed in the Eightieth Congress, to which these amendments are offered, was the first unification legislation enacted although all previous Congresses since Pearl Harbor had voiced the need for unification.

Under Secretary of Defense

(Public Law 36. Approved April 2, 1949)

Following the Hoover Commission recommendations, this law revised the unification law enacted by the Eightieth Congress to create this new position.

Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949

(Public Law 110. Approved June 20, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress revised the administration of this Agency which was established under the terms of the Unification Act of 1947, enacted by the Eightieth Congress.

Military Career Compensation Act of 1949

(Public Law 351. Approved October 12, 1949)

The Eighty-first Congress revised the military-pay schedule on the basis of information gathered by the Hoover Commission established in the Eightieth Congress.

Long-range Proving Ground for Guided Missiles

(Public Law 60. Approved May 11, 1949)

This legislation authorized expenditure of $75,000,000 for construction of installations necessary for development of an existing program.

Land-based Air Warning System—Radar

(Public Law 30. Approved March 30, 1949)

Continuing a long-range program for adequate national defense, this legislation authorized the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations and facilities and authorized expenditure of $85,500,000.

Unitary Wind Tunnel Plan and Air Engineering Development Center

(Public Law 415. Approved October 27, 1949)

This legislation enlarged the present program of national preparedness by authorizing construction of experimental and testing facilities in the field of transonic and supersonic aeronautics.

Rental Housing Near Military Installations

(Public Law 498. Approved May 2, 1950)

As a means of encouraging rental housing construction near military installations, this measure amends the National Housing Act to permit the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force to negotiate for the services of architects and engineers without regard to civil service and classification laws.

Uniform Code of Military Justice

(Public Law 506. Approved May 5, 1950)

Both parties joined in supporting this measure as an additional step in unifying the Armed Forces. Providing a uniform code of military justice, the act revises, unifies, and codifies the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard.

Alien Enlistments in Army

(Public Law 597. Approved June 30, 1950)

The Eighty-first Congress authorized until June 30, 1953, 5-year period enlistments of unmarried aliens between 18 to 35 years of age in the Regular Army.

Extension of Selective Service Act

(Public Law 599. Approved June 30, 1950)

As a national defense measure immediately following the Korean invasion, the Eighty-first Congress extended selective service to July 9, 1951, and gave the President authority to order Reserve components into active Federal service.

Free Postage for GI's in Korea

(Public Law 609. Approved July 12, 1950)

Both parties joined in sponsoring and supporting this law providing free postage for servicemen in Korea.

Construction of Modern Naval Vessels

(Public Law 674. Approved August 8, 1950)

To strengthen the sea power of the United States, Congress authorized $350,000,000 for the construction or conversion of modern naval vessels.

Suspending Restrictions on Authorized Personnel Strength of the Armed Forces

(Public Law 655. Approved August 3, 1950)

This measure suspends the restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces until July 31, 1954.

Army and Air Force Authorization Act

(Public Law 604. Approved July 10, 1950)

Under this act the Eighty-first Congress provided for the composition of the Army and Air Force and put into basic law authority for Air Force activities. Later, the Congress suspended ceilings on size of the Armed Forces as a temporary measure stemming from the Korean war.

Extension of Enlistments in the Armed Forces

(Public Law 624. Approved July 27, 1950)

In view of the gravity of the Korean situation, the Congress took steps to strengthen the Armed Forces. Under this act the President is permitted until July 9, 1951, to extend all enlistments in the Armed forces for 1 year.

Facilities for Training Reserves

(Public Law 783. Approved September 11, 1950)

Another defense measure, this law provides facilities for training National Guard, Air National Guard, and Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard Reserves.

Extension of Authority to Maintain Tin-Smelting Industry

(Public Law 723. Approved August 21, 1950)

This legislation continues prior law by providing a 5-year extension of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's authority to maintain a domestic tin-smelting industry in the interest of national security. Included is authority for operation of the Government-owned Texas City smelter.

Drafting Medical and Dental Specialists

(Public Law 779. Approved September 9, 1950)

The law establishes a priority of obligation for military service among physicians, dentists, and allied categories of personnel under the Selective Service Act.

Servicemen's Family Allowances

(Public Law 771. Approved September 8, 1950)

Without show of partisanship the Congress agreed to provide allotments of from $85 to $165 monthly to GI families, including the serviceman's contribution.

Defense Production Act of 1950

(Public Law 774. Approved September 8, 1950)

As a means of preventing severe economic dislocations and of assuring fulfillment of rapidly expanding national defense requirements, the Congress passed the Defense Production Act. This law contains economic mobilization, inflation control and defense production assistance powers. Among other things, it provides for mandatory controls on a selective or industry-by-industry basis when the President finds prices in the industry are rising at an unreasonable rate, with the requirement that if price ceilings are set in a given industry, he must freeze wages; priorities and allocations powers; penalties for hoarding; requisitioning authority; aid to expanding private business; for settlement of labor disputes; and consumer and real estate credit controls.

Science

National Science Foundation

(Public Law 507. Approved May 10, 1950)

Bipartisan efforts throughout three Congresses to encourage basic research in the sciences culminated in the enactment of this measure. The law establishes a National Science Foundation as an independent agency of the Government, directed by a 24-member board and administered by a Director appointed by the President. Among other things, the Foundation would initiate and support basic research in the mathematical, physical, medical, etc., sciences, grant scholarships and graduate fellowships, and foster international exchange of scientific information.

Health Research

(Public Law 692. Approved August 15, 1950)

With the announced purpose of improving the health of the people of the United States this act amends the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in arthritis and rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, poliomyelitis, blindness, leprosy, and other diseases.

Social welfare

Hospital Survey and Construction Amendments of 1949

(Public Law 380. Approved October 25, 1949)

This act, introduced by two Members of each party, extends an existing program from 1951 to 1955, increases the annual authorization of expenditure of $150,000,000, and increases the Federal share of expenditure from one-third to a maximum of 66⅔ percent.

President's Commission on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week

(Public Law 162. Approved July 11, 1949)

Seventy-five thousand dollars is authorized for the expenses of this Commission which promotes national interest in the employment of handicapped persons.

Rehabilitation of Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes

(Public Law 474. Approved April 19, 1950)

The law authorizes $88,570,000 for Navajo and Hopi Indian rehabilitation, including amounts for soil and water conservation, irrigation, surveys of physical and human resources, industrial and business development, employment and resettlement off the reservation, roads and trails, communications, loans, hospitals, schools, housing, and common service facilities.

Social Security Act Amendments of 1950

(Public Law 734. Approved August 28, 1950)

The extensive study and research into social-security problems conducted during the Republican Eightieth Congress bore fruit in 1950 with the passage of this law. Supported by an overwhelming majority of both parties, the law makes substantial changes in the social-security system, nearly doubling old-age benefits and covering an additional 10,000,000 workers.

Territories

Government for Puerto Rico

(Public Law 600. Approved July 3, 1950)

In line with United States policy of self-government of territories where possible, the Eighty-first Congress provided under this law for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico.

Civil Government for Guam

(Public Law 630. Approved August 1, 1950)

Complying with the wishes of local inhabitants, the Congress provided by law for a civil government for Guam, where, since 1898, all powers of government have been exercised under Presidential Executive Orders.

Transportation and Communication

Post Office Research Program

(Public Law 231. Approved August 16, 1949)

This legislation provides for research on equipment used by the Post Office Department and complies with recommendations found in the task-force report submitted by the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch.

Continuation of Maritime Commission Authority to Sell, Charter, and Operate Vessels

(Public Law 147. Approved June 29, 1949)

The legislation grants extension to 1950 of laws extended in the Eightieth Congress and prior Congresses.

Marine War-Risk and Liability Insurance

(Public Law 763. Approved September 7, 1950)

Under this law the Congress has authorized the Secretary of Commerce to provide war-risk and certain marine and liability insurance for the protection of passengers, crew, vessels, and cargoes, when endangered by war conditions or threats of war. It is restricted to domestic companies.

Security Control of Air Commerce

(Public Law 778. Approved September 9, 1950)

Whenever the President so declares by Executive Order, the Secretary of Commerce and Civil Aeronautics Board are authorized to control air traffic when the national security is endangered. This is designed to prevent a sneak attack by enemy aircraft masquerading as United States civil aircraft.

Veterans

Disabled Veterans' Special Housing

(Public Law 286. Approved September 7, 1949)

This act expands coverage of Public Law 702 of Eightieth Congress, authorizing up to $10,000 for specially adapted housing to additional groups of veterans with serious service-connected disabilities.

Omnibus Disabled Veterans' Benefits Act

(Public Law 339. Approved October 10, 1949)

Amending existing law, this act increases compensation for World War I presumptive service-connected cases, provides minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis, increases certain disability and death compensation rates, liberalizes requirement for dependency allowances, and redefines "line of duty" and "willful misconduct."

Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1950

(Public Law 610. Approved July 13, 1950)

Nonpartisan in sponsorship, this law seeks to clarify the rights of veterans to take courses of study under the GI bill of rights and to amend provisions relating to contractual arrangements between the Veterans' Administrator and educational institutions.

Jewry, an Old Foe of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a propitious time to direct the attention of my colleagues to an item which appeared in the September 1950, issue of the Metropolitan Star, entitled "Jewry, an Old Foe of Communism."

The Metropolitan Star is the official publication of the Metropolitan Council of B'nai B'rith.

May I also, at this time say, as stated in the Metropolitan Star, and I quote, "just for the record," B'nai B'rith at its convention in May 1938, adopted the following resolution:

Communism which rests upon a denial of democracy, upon the destruction of civil liberties, upon the suppression of the fundamental bases of human liberties—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, of peaceful assembly, of religious worship—upon a philosophy which incites the overthrow of constitutional democratic government by force and violence—for all of these reasons and more, communism is abhorrent to the Jew whose very history, tradition, religious, and spiritual training holds him near and dear to every ideal and principle which is sought to be annihilated by the vicious philosophy of communism. So that there may be no possible doubt as to the position of the B'nai B'rith on this question,

Be it resolved by the B'nai B'rith in convention assembled, that it does hereby solemnly condemn communism, both as a philosophy of government and of life.

Similar resolutions have been adopted by B'nai B'rith at every supreme lodge convention held since 1938.

The article first above referred to is as follows:

JEWRY, AN OLD FOE OF COMMUNISM

The time was October 1935. Adolf Hitler has just deprived the Jews in Germany of their rights as citizens. In the United States a prophetic statement was issued by three great Jewish leaders, Alfred M. Cohen of B'nai B'rith, Cyrus Adler of the American Jewish Committee, and B. C. Vladeck of the Jewish Labor Committee.

The document—issued in New York on October 21, 1935—was entitled, "A Public Statement on Communism and Jews."

We republish it today as an historic document with the knowledge that the attitude of Jewry toward the evil of communism and fascism has not changed one iota.

Here it is:

"To Our Fellow Citizens:

"On Sunday, September 15, the present National Socialist Government of Germany, at the behest of its Chancellor, Adolf Hitler, dictator of the German people, decreed a series of laws that put Jews beyond the legal and social pale of the German people, and deprived them of claims to German citizenship. This debasement of the Jews in Germany was not the result of a sudden decision. Long prepared for and premeditated, pledged by the National Socialist Party at its foundation, these laws were only the official culmination of a series of measures degrading and oppressing German Jews.

"This official denial of civil rights is directed against men and women whose ancestors have lived in Germany for over a thousand years; who have made signal contributions to German economic, political, and cultural life; who have shed their blood in defense of their fatherland; and who have contributed their best talents to the peaceful development of the German state. This injustice was perpetrated under the cloak of a so-called link between Jews and communism, which has no existence in fact, but which is being used to confuse the minds not only of Germans, but of people all over the world.

"When the Jews of the United States first learned of these pretexts for persecution, they deemed it beneath their dignity to take notice of them. However, because of the censorship of free expression in Germany and the enormous propaganda carried on by Nazi Germany outside its borders, the time has come for us to make answer to the libels and unjust insinuations, and to make clear that these falsehoods have the same motive that has always inspired tyrants and despots—that of seeking a scapegoat for their own sins and, under cover of a false issue, of deceiving their people by fomenting suspicion, discord, and hatred.

"It is high time that these facts be known:

"While communism, having its roots in economic forces, no doubt influences some Jews as well as some non-Jews a study of German conditions indicates that the majority of the Jews who were permitted to vote in Germany during the Republic were affiliated with the liberal democratic parties.

In the presidential elections in which Hindenburg, Hitler, and Thaelmann were candidates Jewish leaders appealed to the German Jews to vote for Hindenburg and against the Communist and National Socialist candidates. German Jews were chiefly engaged in occupations and in callings from which Communists are not recruited; indeed, their own economic interests made them diametrically opposed to communism. The most influential German dailies in the pre-Hitler period, such as the Frankfurter Zeitung and the Berliner Tageblatt, which were owned by Jews, were bitterly opposed to communism. Not one prominent or even well-known German-Jewish leader was ever identified with the Communist Party in Germany. According to authentic figures given under the auspices of the present government, there was only 1 Jew among the 70 Communist deputies in the Reichstag of 1930, and not a single Jew among the 81 Communist deputies of the Reichstag of 1933. Finally, not even the most brazen official mendacity can obscure the fact that while there were less than 300,000 German Jews who were enabled to vote, there were fully 6,000,000 Communist votes cast during the republic.

"The facts about Soviet Russia and the Jews are equally illuminating. Among the 36 commissars who constitute the Soviet Government, only two are Jews. Neither the president of the Council of Commissars, Ryckoff; the president of the U. S. S. R., Kalinin; the general secretary of the Communist Party, Stalin; the president of the Third International, Dimitroff; nor the founder of the Communist Party, Lenin, are Jews. A large percentage of the millions of Jews in Russia before the Revolution were trades people, members of the class whom the Bolsheviks attacked most violently, and who had most to lose by the victory of communism. Indeed, after the Revolution the Soviet Government declared fully half of the total Jewish population in Russia as declassed, as hindrances to the development of the Revolution. Jewish workers in Russia were organized in an association called the Bund, which opposed the Bolsheviks until the very last. Orthodox Jews and Zionists, whose numbers were preponderant in Russia, are regarded as counterrevolutionaries by the Soviet Government.

"An examination of the lists deliberately circulated by anti-Semitic agents in attempts to establish their thesis that nearly all of the Bolshevik leaders are Jews reveals that a large number of those classified are not Jews at all, and that a number of others, far from being Bolsheviks, were leaders of the anti-Bolshevik movement. While Trotzky was a Jew, many of the leaders of the Mensheviki, the sworn foes of bolshevism. were Jews. The official statistics of the Petrograd Communist Party in 1918, shortly after the revolution, showed that there were 124,021 members of whom 74.3 percent were Russians, 10.5 percent Latvians, 6.3 percent Poles, 3.7 percent Esthonians, 2.6 percent Lithuanians, and 2.6 percent Jews.

"It is plain from the above how little evidence there is for the malicious charge of a so-called Jewish Communist link. If the Jews are to be condemned because there are some Communists amongs them—men who have never in the slightest degree concerned themselves with Judaism—then there is not a people on earth that might not with equal right be condemned.

"Those who have even an elementary acquaintance with the traditions cherished by our people during the 2,000 years since the destruction of the Jewish state know that complete and unequivocal loyalty to the country of one's citizenship is a basic principle of Jewish life. Ever since the Babylonian exile, spiritual leaders from Jeremiah down have adjured the Jewish people to seek the peace and prosperity of the land in which they live, to pray unto the Lord for it; for in the peace thereof they would enjoy peace.

"Students of the origin of the American form of government have pointed to the debt which the colonial fathers owed to the inspiration of the Hebrew Bible. Lecky, the distinguished historian, expressed this debt in the famous dictum: 'Hebraic mortar cemented the foundation of American democracy.' To millions of American Jews as well as to millions of Jews in other lands, therefore, the tenets of liberalism and democracy are the most dearly prized ideals: Jewish emancipation has always gone hand in hand with the progress of democracy. Any form of government or economic system which is based on, or maintains itself by, the suppression of the elemental bases of human liberty—freedom of speech, of the press, of association, of religious worship—is, therefore, abhorrent to them.

"The real reason for the propagation of this falsehood becomes apparent in Chancellor Hitler's words when he refers to 'Marxism and its related parliamentary democracy.' Under the pretext of an attack on bolshevism, many of whose tyrannical features have been adopted by the National Socialists, the Nazi Government has in practice robbed the German people of their civil rights, suppressed freedom of speech, of the press, and assembly, has destroyed the free labor unions and confiscated their funds; and it is now engaged in a pagan assault upon the religious conscience of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jew alike. Is it not plain that his thunderbolts against Marxism are only a smoke screen for his sinister designs upon the liberties of the German people and the peace of the world?

"Because we have an abiding faith in the spirit that animates the true American, we call upon him not to permit this campaign of slander and libel to go unreproved. We are confident that our fellow Americans of all faiths, familiar with the lesson of history that oppression sets no limit to its victims, will add their voices in protest against the destruction of the innocents in Germany.

"We are firm in our belief that the American sense of justice and fair play will influence our fellow citizens to express themselves unmistakably against the ruthless suppression of liberty of conscience, against the destruction of human lives and human ideals, and against the revival of pagan barbarism in the heart of the civilized world.

"CYRUS ADLER
(For the American Jewish Committee.)
"ALFRED M. COHEN
(For the B'nai B'rith.)
"B. C. VLADECK
(For the Jewish Labor Committee.)
"NEW YORK, N. Y.,
October 21, 1935."

Particular note should be made of the fact that that resolution was adopted on October 21, 1935.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent who has been confined to a hospital for some time, devotes most of his waking hours to ventures in writing both prose and poetry. This man, a veteran, has forwarded to me his views on the Taft-Hartley Law. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it at this point:

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Our Government is a government of law as contradistinguished from a government of functionaries. Our Government is devided into three coordinate branches. The legislative branch or Congress which makes the laws, the executive branch or the President who enforces the laws, and the judicial branch or the courts that interpret the laws.

The Taft-Hartley Act was passed over President Truman's veto and became a law on the 23d day of June 1947. Since then the leaders of the various labor unions have entered the field of political action and stormed the halls of Congress shouting for its repeal on the grounds that it is a "slave labor law."

Section 1 of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdicition."

The Taft-Hartley Act has been in effect for 3 years and 2 months, during which time the representatives of labor have had ample opportunity to submit their cause to the Federal courts, and secure a judicial interpretation of the so-called slave-labor provisions of the act. It would not be a novel question for the courts, for as late as January 12, 1942, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that the Georgia contract labor law violated the antislavery amendment and an act of Congress forbidding peonage.

In submitting their case to the courts the labor leaders would not be in danger of falling into a capitalistic "booby trap," because all of the United States Supreme Court judges and practically all of the appellate and district court judges were appointed by either President Roosevelt or President Truman. And they should not be solicitous about the costs of legal proceeding, when every labor union worthy of the name has a stable of "striped pants" gentlemen called labor relation counselors, commonly known as lawyers, retained on an annual fee basis, who are ever ready, able and willing to enter legal combat on a moment's notice.

The slogan "Slave Labor Act" sounds like a product of the late Charles Michelson school of political philosophy. Well, regardless of who coined the slogan it is rapidly losing its vote-drawing potential, for time seems to have a way of its own to deflate canards, half-truths, slogans, and diatribes coined to appeal to hate, prejudice, and our other base emotions. The persistent repetition of the "slave labor" slogan is more insulting to the intelligence of union members than to the authors of the Taft-Hartley Act. The act has enslaved no one. During the time it has been in effect, union membership has grown, many factories and places of business not heretofore unionized have been brought within the orbit of organized labor, and innumerable new contracts have been negotiated with the management of union shops providing for an increase in pay and welfare benefits.

VETERAN.

Senator Tobey's Reply to the Chicago Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is absent

on official business, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement prepared by the Senator from New Hampshire referring to an editorial in the Chicago Tribune of September 21, together with a copy of a letter written by Joseph Medill, founder of the Chicago Tribune, in 1863. The Senator from New Hampshire wishes to raise the question: If the advice set forth in this letter from the founder of the Chicago Tribune in 1863 had been followed, what would have been the effect upon this country?

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHARLES W. TOBEY

Col. Robert R. McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune, has seen fit to attack me and other members of the Republican Party in strange terms. In an editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune of September 21, he has pontificated as follows:

"The Tobey - Morse - Dewey - Vandenberg crowd are the Tories and the doughfaces of the Republican Party. * * *

"The name 'doughface' was generally used up to the Civil War to designate a politician who betrayed the policies of his own party. It was the doughfaces of the Whig Party who prevented it taking a stand on the slavery question and so destroyed it, making the formation of the Republican Party a national necessity."

Now I had not been aware that I, as the colonel implies, have been "proslavery."

Perhaps most Americans also have not been aware of the type of republicanism from which this colonel and this editorial springs. I have here a letter which may throw some light on this question and give pause to consider what might have been the fate of our Federal Union had the advice of the Chicago Tribune been heeded in the past.

This letter was written by Mr. Joseph Medill, the founder of the Chicago Tribune and grandfather of this colonel. The letter speaks for itself, having been written in the darkest days of the Civil War and representing an effort by Medill, who called himself a Republican, to force the Union into an abject truce with the Confederate States.

Here is the letter which, I believe, never before has been published in entirety. It was addressed to Congressman E. B. Washburn, then chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee:

OFFICE OF THE DAILY TRIBUNE,
Chicago, January 14, 1863.

E. B. WASHBURN.

SIR: Prepare to hear some painfully plain talk. In the first place we may as well admit to each other that the rebs can't be conquered by the present machinery. Second, the Treasury is about on its last legs, the currency of the country is deteriorating fearfully fast and if the coin of W. & M. issue hits a three hundred million more the bottom will tumble out. Third, this Republican Congress will terminate in a few weeks and the next Congress will be hostile to the administration. Fourth, the people are growing exceedingly tired of the war and are becoming very much discouraged. Fifth. The opposition of the Democrats is taking a bolder shape daily. The cry for an armistice is increasing every day. When that is granted there will be no more fighting by this administration. The war for a time will be over. An armistice is bound to come during the year '63. Next April and May the period of enlistment of all the 9-months men expire, also the this-year men. No more volunteers can be obtained to fill up the ranks nor can men be had by drafting.

I believe all these premises must be admitted by you and every other cool reflecting man.

Well, what then? Why, we have to fight for a boundary, that is all now left to us. The first and most important thing to be done is to take Vicksburg and Port Hudson and clear the river. Far better to let Washington and Maryland go than the control of the Mississippi. If peace be made leaving the Southern Confederacy in possession of the lower Mississippi there is no certainty that Southwest will stay in the Union. The democratic demagogues will have in their hands a lever by which they can split off the West from the East. The rebels would hold a prize which would enable them to bring the West to its knees and make it coincide with the most exhorbitant demands and do the most degrading things. I shudder at the bare contemplation of an armistic leaving Vicksburg in the rebel's possession when it is made. They will have a ring in our nose and the string in their hands. The first thing then is to take Vicksburg. To this end the Government ought to bend its whole power. The Potomac Army is idle, inert, and useless, making war only on the resources of the country through the Treasury.

I would dispatch 60,000 men from it to New Orleans as fast ships could be chartered to convey them to help Banks take Port Hudson. I would send Grant to Vicksburg with every man that can be raked up—withdraw the garrisons from all the little places. Sherman has proven himself wholly unfit to command. Steele is a proslavery hound, less than half loyal, whom it is unsafe to entrust with a large command. Ask your brother what he is. As to McClernand—he is truly too small caliber to entrust. You knew that, willing but not weighty. Grant is the ablest, though I do not estimate him as high as you do by any means. But he can plan and fight—the others can't.

Vicksburg taken and the river open from Cairo to the Gulf, we have the rebel confederation cut in two. The army can quickly conquer Arkansas and Texas as they would be unsupported. All of Louisiana would fall into our hands like a ripe pear. Reduce the Potomac army to just sufficient strength to hold the Potomac line—say 80,000 or 100,000 men. Send the balance, say 40,000 to 50,000 forthwith to help Rosecrans clean the rebs out of east Tennessee. He must get help or the fruits of his vast victory will be utterly lost as the Richmond army is reinforced. Bragg, while Burnside sleeps at Talmouth.

Well, what next? You ask. I answer, an armistice. We will then be in a respectable attitude for a truce. Look at the map. All the territory west of the Mississippi will be in our possession. We shall have control of the navigation of the river and an outlet to the Gulf. The short-cut canal at Vicksburg will forever prevent the bluffs at that place annoying us again. We shall have Delaware, Maryland, western Virginia, Virginia, Tennessee, Missouri, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, and all the territories and all the Northern States—population 25,000,000 to start with. The rebel confederation will be reduced to the coast slave States, seven in number. We shall have as much slave territory on our hands as we can digest for a few years. Emigration from Europe and the North would in 3 or 4 years settle forever the status of those acquired slave States. We, Republicans could be able to retain the Government in our hands. The national strength would not be seriously impaired by the loss of the seven seceded States. We should soon outgrow it. After a truce of 60 to 90 or 160 days while the rebs might fiercely object to our proposed boundary line, they would be obliged to succumb. They would be in no condition to recommence the war. (Like a man after stopping a few hours from a terrible fisticuff, he is not likely to begin the fight again until his cuts and bruises heal up.) European powers would insist on preserving peace and on the boundary I have named. In a few years the seven slave States or some of them would grow tired of their confederacy and ask for readmission. At all events 10 years hence we would be able to pitch into them some fine morning and lick them out of their boots in one round; and swallow them, if we wanted to. Meanwhile we might grab Canada to indemnify us for loss of territory. England deserves this punishment and some day must catch it.

I can understand the awful reluctance with which you can be brought to contemplate a divided union. But there is no help for it. The war has assumed such proportions—the resistance is desperate and stubborn. Our finances are so destroyed and exhausted. The Democratic Party is so hostile and threatening that complete success has been a moral impossibility. The war has been conducted so long by "central imbecility," Seward critique, and McClelland, Buell, Porter, Halleck, Steele, Franklin, Nelson, McCook, and other proslavery half secesh generals, that the day of grace is past. It is now "save what we can." If there is to be reform it comes too late. But I see no prospect of reform with anything. Halleck and his gang are still being retained. Lincoln is only half awake, and never will do much better than he has done. He will do the right thing always too late and just when it does no good.

You may combat the views here put forth, but each day will verify their correctness. I write what I have after a full and careful survey of the situation. Some weeks ago I threw out a hint or two to Colfax, but he said "he could not bear to think of it." But we must think of it. It is that or far worse. It is the boundary I mention with abandonment of the Government to the Democrats absolutely who will surrender to the rebels if the latter will accept them on any terms; if not, then separation on the line of Mason and Dixon. I think the rebel leaders are intent on separation absolutely and unqualifiedly but they might be coaxed to claim some of the Western States, with New England and the New England parts of the other States "left out in the cold." None of these things can we consent to. We must then make the most of the situation. Seize Vicksburg, cut off and conquer the territory west of Mississippi and make peace.

Yours truly,

J. MEDILL.

The Farmer Must Prosper if the Nation Is To Prosper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN H. GUILL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. GUILL. Mr. Speaker, farm supports are going to be cut right out from under the farmer's feet unless the farmer makes himself heard both through the ballot box and the mail box. Farm supports have been under heavy fire here in Congress and they will be eliminated entirely unless the farmer presents a solid front against those who would destroy him.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture I want to raise my voice here in protest against any attempt to eliminate those supports. The farmer

and the entire Nation need farm supports badly.

The propaganda machines of the left-wing elements in the big metropolitan centers of the North and the East have been trying to fool the public into believing that the farmers of this country have been gouging the consumer with high prices and unnatural profits. As one propagandist puts it, "we are keeping the city worker broke just to maintain the country cousin in clover." Many honorable people who are ignorant of the reasons for supports have also followed this line.

The argument against farm supports is wrong. It is also typical of the traditional attitude of people in the big cities. They consider the rural areas of America in much the same way that England used to consider her colonies—as sources of revenue and supply, with no obligation on England's part to assist the colonies in return. The big-city dwellers believe it is wicked for the farmer to make money.

The whole argument is based on false assumptions.

HOW MUCH DO OUR FARM SUBSIDIES COST US?

The Government has spent more than $8,000,000,000 on loans and purchasing of farm products during the last 17 years but figures up to April 30, 1950, show the total loss has been only $212,858,871.

Perhaps you will say: "That can't be right; we lost more than that on potatoes and eggs alone last year." That is true—and bad administration caused most of that loss—but the Government made a profit on purchases of wheat, tobacco, oats, corn, rice, flax, and cotton—items which account for more than 85 percent of the total loans made—and this profit brought our losses down to $212,000,000. The United States Government has spent five times that amount in aid to Greece alone during the last 5 years.

SUPPORTS HAVE BEEN GOOD INVESTMENT

Actually, the money spent on the farmer by the Commodity Credit Corporation has been the best investment the Government has made in the last 20 years. If prices had not been supported, farm income would have dropped, national income would have dropped, business would have dropped, millions of men would have been out of work, a depression would have resulted and the Government would have lost many, many billions of dollars in income.

It has been determined, after years of research and study, that every single dollar of farm income generates $6 additional of national income. In other words, a dollar's worth of wheat, for instance, is transported to processing plants, and by the time it has made the rounds and comes back to the consumer in the form of bread, or wheaties, or what have you, it has given birth to $6 more of income on its way through the cycle of distribution.

NATIONAL PROSPERITY IS TIED TO AGRICULTURAL PROSPERITY

The following figures should prove that if the Nation is to be prosperous the farmer must be prosperous. The national income over the years averages seven times the farm income. They rise and fall together in that ratio.

Year	Gross farm income	National income
1929	$13,000,000,000	$87,300,000,000
1930	10,500,000,000	75,000,000,000
1931	7,600,000,000	58,800,000,000
1932	5,700,000,000	41,700,000,000
1933	6,400,000,000	39,600,000,000
1934	7,800,000,000	48,600,000,000
1935	9,000,000,000	56,800,000,000
1936	10,000,000,000	66,900,000,000
1937	10,600,000,000	73,600,000,000
1938	9,400,000,000	67,200,000,000
1939	9,900,000,000	72,500,000,000
1940	10,300,000,000	81,300,000,000
1941	13,100,000,000	103,800,000,000
1942	17,700,000,000	136,400,000,000
1943	23,000,000,000	168,200,000,000
1944	23,600,000,000	182,200,000,000
1945	24,000,000,000	182,800,000,000
1946	27,100,000,000	178,300,000,000
1947	33,000,000,000	202,500,000,000
1948	32,500,000,000	226,500,000,000
1949	30,500,000,000	221,000,000,000

The discrepancies in the 7-to-1 ratio in individual years can be explained by the lag as farm crops go to the market but the 7-to-1 average maintains over the years. During the years of the depression we lost an average of $27,000,000,000 in national income each year for 10 years. That amounts to $270,000,000,000, or a total $10,000,000,000 higher than our national debt. If farm prices had been supported in those years as they are now—instead of trying to prime the pump, as we did, through artificial means such as WPA—we would not have had 12,000,000 citizens out of work and the depression, if it came at all, would not have been nearly as serious as it was.

The farmer today is a $30,000,000,000 customer of American business. He uses an estimated twice as many industrial products per capita as does the city dweller. Today, for example, there are four times as many tractors on farms, 14 times as many combines, and 33 times as many mechanical corn pickers as there were in 1929.

A slump in farm income would strike at the manufacturer of every single item in the Sears, Roebuck catalog—and would therefore strike at the workers in those industries. If we were to remove farm-price supports altogether and drop back to, let us say, 1939-price levels—our national income would be one-third of what it is. Figure out for yourself what would happen to our bonds, employment, business. Where would we get the taxes to operate our enormously expensive Government?

COMPARE THE INCOMES

The antifarmer propagandists would have us believe the American farmer is rolling in wealth while the American laborer is having a hard time making ends meet. Let us examine that claim.

In the peak year of 1948, the average farmer's net income was $906. In that same year, the average city dweller's net income was $1,565. In his peak year the farmer received only 60 percent as much money as did the average city worker.

One-fifth of the Nation's population lives on farms. They receive only one-seventh of the national income.

It is true that a farmer can eat off his own land at a cost less than what the city dweller must pay. Still, that is counterbalanced by his poorer living conditions, poorer educational and health facilities. The farmer is also constantly at the mercy of the elements. Insects, floods, droughts, and storms can ruin in a short while the labor of a lifetime.

FARM SUPPORTS ARE FAIR

The big city consumer wants the farmer to compete in an open market without any supports whatsoever. He talks smugly about supply and demand.

What does this boil down to? It means that he expects the farmer to sell in an open, unprotected market and buy in a closed, protected and highly supported market. Every item he buys, whether it be the clothes he wears, or the tractor he uses or the car he drives, is protected directly or indirectly, and those who produce these goods or materials are subsidized directly or indirectly.

Perhaps the farmer could compete in an open, unprotected market if he could buy a New Zealand suit of clothes, a Swiss plow, a Swedish prefabricated barn and a Japanese set of dishes, tariff-free, at the low prices which cheap labor and cheap production costs in foreign countries would permit him to purchase them for. I do not think his city cousins in industry would be very happy about that state of affairs, however.

Here are some figures on how the Government is subsidizing private enterprise. These figures are from the 1951 budget:

Federal aid to housing	$1,700,000,000
Federal aid to roads	500,000,000
Federal aid to aviation	250,000,000
Federal aid to ocean shipping	250,000,000
RFC aid to commerce and finance	200,000,000
Federal aid to hospital construction	150,000,000
Federal aid to education	140,000,000

This does not include such indirect subsidies as the annual postal deficit—which in the last fiscal year totaled $555,000,000. This money was lost in second-, third-, and fourth-class mails—categories used almost exclusively by business houses and publications. This money is an indirect subsidy to business. Why should the farmer be the only nonsubsidized citizen in the United States?

FARMERS CANNOT STRIKE

The farmer cannot fix the price of things he sells. He has no control over prices. No individual farmer can do a thing about what he gets for his product. All he can do is take it to market, ask what the price is, and if he does not like the price, haul it back home. Most farm produce is perishable or semiperishable. That means it has to be sold at a certain time, so the farmer is at the mercy of the consumer and the buyer. Unlike the city boys in labor and industry, the farmer cannot go on strikes or stop production in order to hike prices. Food consumption in this country has gone up 16 percent, but agricultural production

has gone up 35 percent, as compared with prewar levels. This is true, despite the fact that there are fewer people on the farms today. The population trend is away from the farm and toward the city.

Suppose the farmers, instead of hiking their production 35 percent, had effected a general slowdown to keep production at the prewar levels. Where would farm prices be today? They would be astronomical.

But farmers do not strike. Farmers do not conspire to slow down. The farmers just plug along at being good citizens and supplying the Nation with food. They do want a fair return for their labor and risk, however, and they should have it.

FARM RECEIPTS AND WAGES

All this goes to show that the laws of supply and demand really are working insofar as the farmer is concerned. When the city boy talks about the law of supply and demand, he does not mean what he says. He has in mind a law which would put all the emphasis on supply and none on demand.

Since 1920 cash receipts from farm marketing and the wage earnings of factory workers have been almost identical each year, except during the war years when there was no effective ceiling on wages and a very effective ceiling on farm prices. For instance, in 1946 the cash receipts from farm marketings were $24,500,000,000 and wage earnings of factory workers were $24,200,000,000. In 1947 farm receipts were $30,000,000,000 and wage earnings of factory workers were $29,500,000,000.

Every time the industrial workers get a wage increase they force up the price of farm goods. That's the law of supply and demand in action, and the industrial workers have no cause for complaint. The folks in the eastern and northern metropolises would evidently like to see an OPA on farm prices and let wages and other prices go hog-wild.

CONCLUSIONS

The facts are these: The farmer must be adequately supported if he is to prosper and he must be adequately supported if the Nation is to prosper.

There are some inequities in the present farm program. That is why I introduced H. R. 514, my own farm bill, which will allow the farmers themselves to participate in the formation of a new farm program. It is my firm belief that the farmers have just as much ability to solve their own problems fairly as do the Washington bureaucrats, some of whom have never been on a farm except for a visit. I hope, as a member of the powerful House Agriculture Committee, to have my bill included in the farm program of the Eighty-second Congress in 1951.

But the most important thing to remember is this: if we have a reduction in farm income we shall have a reduction in national income seven times as great. Every depression is farm-led and farm-fed. Historically, farm prices go down before, faster, and further than other prices. Our economy is so integrated that we cannot reduce drastically the purchasing power of one-fifth of the Nation's population without seriously affecting the prosperity of the other four-fifths of the Nation.

This has always been true in the past. It is truer than ever today, because agriculture is a bigger customer of industry than ever before in history.

If we reduce farm incomes drastically by removing supports, we must look forward to soup lines, foreclosures, misery, poverty, and a depression which would make us pushovers for the world Communists.

I think our economy is too much subsidized, but I can never vote against supports for the farmer until every business is willing to forego Government support. This does not appear possible in the predictable future.

Where To—After Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, how far can this country go in attempting, singlehandedly, to solve the social, economic, and military problems of other nations of the world and still be able to maintain its security and defend its freedom at home?

How many Koreas will there be, and how many of such expeditions can the American people swallow and digest?

These are reasonable questions, and the public is entitled to have them answered by those who are directing the war and our foreign policy today. This country stands united behind our efforts in Korea. Once our troops are sent to a foreign country to do battle, every loyal American is left with but one choice, and that is to give them unlimited and undivided support in order that their efforts will be successful. But we are entitled to ask the President some questions, and we are entitled to frank and honest answers. Have we embarked on a program of fighting Russian satellite countries no matter in what part of the globe such aggression breaks out? Are we committed to a program of exhausting our manpower and dissipating our resources in far-flung corners of the globe and, thus, weakening ourselves while our real enemy, the Soviet Union, sits on the sidelines reserving its military strength? These are questions that deserve forthright answers from the present administration, because our very survival depends upon it.

When we review our foreign policy since the end of World War II it is easier to understand the reason for the tragic mess we are in today. It was at Yalta in 1945 that our Government cut the heart out of China by giving Manchuria to the Soviet Union. The Russians had not lifted a hand in the Pacific war against Japan, and yet our Government rewarded them by handing over the richest industrial and agricultural part of China to Joe Stalin. This was bad enough, but to add insult to injury, we forced the Chinese Nationalist Government to collaborate with the Chinese Communists; and paved the way for complete communistic control of China. Thus, by two diplomatic strokes we turned over 500,000,000 Chinese to the Kremlin. But we did not stop there. We permitted the Communists to take over Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel, which was bound to result in a political and economic upheaval in that country.

We spent millions of dollars in economic aid for the rehabilitation of South Korea, and maintained a large army to defend it. In June of 1949 Secretary of Defense Johnson ordered our troops out of South Korea, and Secretary of State Acheson announced that both South Korea and Formosa were outside of our defense perimeter. Then, after putting the world on notice that we did not consider South Korea worth defending, the North Koreans commenced their invasion. Overnight the President reversed the policy previously established, and decided to send our troops to South Korea. How ill-prepared we were for this expedition has been well demonstrated by subsequent events, particularly in the blood of American soldiers.

During the 4 years prior to Korea we spent more than $50,000,000,000 in national defense. Where has the money gone? In that 4-year period only $1 out of every seven defense dollars has been spent on actual war equipment—on tanks, planes, guns, and so forth. The rest of the money went for so-called administrative costs, out of which we got nothing in the way of military equipment. The armed might which we had at the end of World War II—the finest and the best in history—was steadily reduced to a mere shell. This, in spite of the fact that Congress has consistently appropriated every defense dollar asked for by the President. On at least two occasions Congress has voted funds for a 70-group Air Force, but each time the President limited the Air Force to 48 groups. In 1949 Congress appropriated $189,000,000 for a superaircraft carrier. The President scrapped the plan to build this carrier after nearly $5,000,000 had been spent in laying its keel.

Between 1945 and 1950 there were no new modern tanks, no big artillery guns, no rifles, no machine guns, and no naval guns built, and not a single new Navy ship put on the ways. All of these things seem unbelievable in view of the billions that were appropriated for our defense, and the fact that we were supposedly getting ready to defend ourselves against Communist aggression.

We talk about defending the freedoms of the rest of the world at a time when we are ill-prepared to defend our own borders. The time has come when we must look to the future on a realistic basis. We must gear our efforts to save

the world's freedoms on our actual ability and capacity to carry such a burden, rather than upon the false premise that our manpower and resources are without limit.

Even the richest nation in the world can go bankrupt if its economy is stretched beyond the breaking point. Let us see how near to reality such a situation may be approaching. Since the end of World War II it has cost us approximately fifteen billions per year to maintain a manpower potential in the Armed Forces of about a million men. If we raise this level to 5,000,000 men, our cost will immediately skyrocket to seventy-five billions per year, to say nothing of the cost of additional armaments which may easily add another fifteen billion per annum. Add to this our nonmilitary expenditures and you would have an annual budget of about $130,000,000,000, which would be nearly 60 percent of our total national income. When you take 60 cents out of every dollar earned by every American citizen you are nearing the breaking point. Moreover, this does not encompass the cost of fighting on foreign battlefields. If we are to send our Armed Forces to all parts of Europe and Asia, the cost will run into hundreds of billions of dollars more, and can only be financed by further additions to our already towering national debt.

It must be plain to everyone by now that settling the world's problems is pretty much of a singlehanded job so far as we are concerned. We have allies at the council table. We have allies who gladly accept our money and resources, and we have allies who are with us in spirit if not in action. But the war in Korea has proven that when it comes to fighting, the United Nations means the United States. Outside of small token contributions it is our boys who are doing the fighting and dying in Korea.

This same noncooperative spirit obtains in Europe, where demands have been made that American troops be sent to defend European soil before they recruit armies to defend their own countries. As a matter of fact, it is common knowledge that western Europe regards Russian aggression as an American problem. They regard it as a fight between the United States and Russia in which they have no primary concern. Actually, Mr. Speaker, they have so little concern over Russian aggression that during the past 2 years western European countries have shipped to Russia and her satellite nations hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of iron, steel, copper, rubber, machine tools, petroleum, trucks, and other manufactured articles, all of strategic importance and usable by Russia in her preparation for war. These are facts, Mr. Speaker, and only stupid men will avoid facing them.

We have had no foreign policy or program. Our plans have been made hour by hour, day by day, and subject to change without notice. We talk in one manner, and act in another. We have vacillated, stumbled, and fumbled our way along from one problem to another until we have become embroiled in what appears to be world war III, and one of the most tragic entanglements in our entire history.

We must finish our job in Korea. But when that has been concluded we must pause to get our bearings and determine our future course. It is time that we did some straight thinking with respect to foreign policy. It is time that the President took the American people into his confidence on these matters. Where is he taking us, and why?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we can contribute our share toward the settlement of world problems, but we cannot assume the whole burden. We must base that contribution on our own ability and capacity. We must put first things first. Our own defenses are in a woeful state of disrepair. Our first duty is to provide an adequate defense for this Hemisphere. Only after that job is completed will we be able to assess our ability, in terms of manpower and resources, to help solve the problems of Europe and Asia.

We must keep America strong and free. We will profit little by protecting the liberty and freedoms of people in other countries if we lose our own in the process.

H. R. 4800

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. WILSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on September 6, 1950, the President signed into law H. R. 4800. I wish to take this opportunity to express my own gratitude for his action. I originally introduced H. R. 2500 in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress to give relief to farmers in my district and elsewhere who had purchased resettlement homes under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Those farmers who purchased such land between 1936, the date of passage of this law, and 1946, when it was amended, received but a portion of the mineral interest in their lands. The remaining portion was retained by the Government.

These farmers have since that time encountered difficulties of serious consequence. Where they have desired to sell their land they have been unable to do so advantageously because of the outstanding mineral rights. A prospective purchaser of their land in many cases could not secure a loan because of the outstanding mineral rights. Further it has been next to impossible for the owner of such land to lease his land for oil and gas development. The slowness in obtaining a lease from the Government for its fractional interest is a major factor in deterring the leasing of the farmers' interest. As a consequence neither the owner of the land nor the Government has been able to benefit from the high prices of mineral rights and leases that prevail when a well goes down near such land. Further than this there are instances in my district where wells producing oil and gas have been completed on land adjoining such resettlement farms. Those wells are draining the oil from under such farms but because of the leasing difficulties the farmer cannot lease his own interest and secure an offset well to protect himself from drainage. Thus both the Government and the farmers lose.

Mind you, this situation did not prevail as to those farmers who purchased such lands after the 1946 amendment. The changed policy provided in those amendments was just and proper, but of course it was not retroactive to assist those who had purchased resettlement homes between 1936 and 1946.

Despite the changed policy in this respect in 1946, the Government has continued to hold those scattered fractional mineral interests for speculative purposes. The truth of the matter is that these retained mineral rights have been a windfall to the Government. For example, the Government purchased one farm in my district for $12,000 with minerals intact and then sold the same land for the same price but retained three-fourths of the minerals. This has been repeated over and over in other instances.

Because other Congressmen had similar problems in their districts, several related bills were considered by the House Agriculture Committee at the same time. The result was H. R. 4800, reported on June 14, 1949. As passed by the House of Representatives on June 20, 1949, this legislation provided for the disposition of retained mineral rights reserved or acquired by our Government under any program heretofore administered by the Resettlement Administration or the Farm Security Administration, or now administered by the Farmers Home Administration with certain minor exceptions. This bill provided for the sale of these retained mineral rights to the present individual owners of the surface rights where there was some value. An appraisal would fix that value, thus being both fair to the farmers, who could clear up his title and lease his land for the first time, and fair to the Government. Where the mineral rights have no value, applications accompanied by a fee of $1 would result in the simple quitclaim of the outstanding mineral rights to the individual owner of the surface.

This bill as passed by the House was considered in the Senate Agriculture Committee in the present session of Congress and reported with amendments on March 8, 1950. It passed the Senate on August 23, 1950, and the House agreed to the Senate amendments the next day. As signed by the President, this measure

allows the Department of Agriculture 90 days in which to prepare to receive applications for the outstanding mineral rights administered by it. Application must be made in 7 years of the date of the act, September 6, 1950, or within 7 years of the acquisition of the mineral interests, whichever is later.

I am proud of the part that I have been able to play in securing fair treatment to those farmers affected by this legislation. These farmers are grateful for the opportunities brought by the programs under which they purchased their land. They have not been demanding in any respect despite the inequity worked on them as distinguished from later purchasers who acquired the entire mineral rights with their lands. Ours has always been a land of equality of opportunity and fairness of treatment where we could make it so. This legislation is another milestone in making and keeping America the land of opportunity and fair treatment.

Red Threat to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL T. WAGNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, the free world is united against the Reds. The people of this country are aroused to the pitch of military action against the Communist plot to enslave the world.

In the light of open warfare now in Korea and in the shadow of the looming cloud of Red invasion of Formosa, shall we forget the friendship of the peoples of the Philippines?

In this crisis can we afford to forget that for us the Republic of the Philippines is the outermost bastion of the free world in the East?

Can we afford to neglect the most valid reports that come to our desks telling us that while all the democratic world is roused to the pitch of arms against Red aggression, the Reds are even now, because of our folly, growing to formidable strength right behind our lines in the mountains of the Philippines?

It is late in the day for us to awaken, but not too late for us to take note with alarm that the strength of communism in the Philippines, growing on the destruction of free trades-unions and the smashing of legitimate strikes under the eyes of American businessmen and American Government official observers, is now at such a peak that Red Hukbalahaps joined by discontented and impoverished workers could probably today take the capital city of Manila.

The United States is a democracy. The American flag stands for free labor. It is time that the influence of the American flag should be recognized as an influence of friendship for free-trades unionism.

The strength of the free countries, their backbone, is in free labor, free unions, and in living wages for the families of their workingmen. The poison of communism feeds on poverty and on the oppression and destruction of free unions.

If ever a worker of any land was in need of free and bona fide trades-unionism, it is the worker of the Philippines today who is receiving less than a hundred dollars a month to feed himself and his family.

The right to strike has been practically abrogated by the courts. About 2 years ago, the then secretary of justice declared that picketing on the part of striking employees and laborers was illegal. The workers of the country are herded between a phony labor movement of racketeers countenanced and in league with some Government officials, company unions, and factions of Communist-dominated organizations.

Those workers who want no part of Government or racketeer bondage or communism, and who seek the same ideals in free unionism as the American worker, are squeezed between the police, the courts, and short-sighted big business.

Those workers who still hold high the standards that we Americans believe in, in their efforts against overwhelming odds to preserve the spirit of democracy in the Philippines, look to us for support.

If we are to keep democracy alive in the Orient, we must keep it alive in the Philippines.

And if we are to keep it alive in the Philippines, the Philippine worker must have whatever support we can give him toward achieving free trades-unionism.

The families of the Philippine workers gave aid to our allied soldiers before. Can we justly look for their help again if we stand idly by now and see him ground to desperation between the two millstones of communism and economic need?

A History of Communism in New Deal Washington Down to Truman's Veto of the Communist Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, before the New Deal, communism was an underground, outlaw movement in the United States. Barred from the ballot by 18 State legislatures, the Stalinites were without legal standing. Their party was treated as the thing it was, a wrecking movement of Godless outlaws and violent revolutionaries. Four Presidents faithfully had preserved the United States policy of nonrecognition of the lawless Communist Russia.

All this was changed by the New Deal. Early in 1933, soon after President Roosevelt's inauguration on March 4, talk was heard of immediate recognition of the Moscow government. Before the year was out recognition had been accomplished.

Thenceforth, the outlaw breed of wreckers and despoilers of civilization were taken into the family of nations, offered a place at the council table of humanity and, in the United States, invited to become a part of government.

And precisely at this point began the most treacherous betrayal of America since the founding of the Republic.

Today, after 17 years of organized Communist penetration in America, we have the whole story in the public record, the story of Moscow's treacherous infiltration of every major department and agency of our own United States Government, both in Washington and throughout those States in which large Federal payrolls are controlled by the Washington bureaucrats.

On August 28, 1950, Lee Pressman, formerly an attorney in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Under oath, he acknowledged that he had been a member of a Communist Party cell in Washington in 1934 and 1935. He named three coworkers in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the first of the New Deal recovery agencies, as collaborators in the Communist underground then operating within the Federal departments under the Roosevelt-Wallace-Tugwell program to reorganize the American economic and political system.

In the 12-year record of the House Committee on Un-American Activities there is no earlier date established for the launching of the Communist network within the structure of the American Government. The Communist cell in the State Department, which came to light in the Alger Hiss trial, began operations in 1938–39. The Marzani cell in the State Department did its work in 1940–43. The Judith Coplon ring in the Department of Justice was active in the years 1943–46. The Amerasia spy ring, which operated in both the State and Navy Departments as well as in the Office of Strategic Services, sent its secrets to Moscow in the years 1943–45. The atomic-energy spy ring did its work in 1942–46. Pressman's testimony was the first from a former Government employee who had been himself a member of the Moscow network in Washington during the first months of the New Deal, dating from March 4, 1933.

The three other Communist Party members who worked closely with him in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration's Kremlin cell were named by Pressman in his testimony as first, Nathan Witt, who later became secretary of the National Labor Relations Board, and shaped our Federal labor policy for years; second, John J. Abt, who was chief of the legal section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in 1933, became assistant general counsel for Harry Hopkins' Works Progress Administration in 1935, and assistant to the Attorney General in 1937–38; and third,

Charles Kramer, who left the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to become general counsel to the Senate Labor Committee, in which capacity he was, with Chairman Robert F. Wagner, of New York, one of the principal authors of the Wagner Act, which gave communism a free hand in the American labor movement.

In a very real sense, Pressman's testimony forms the vital missing link in the Communist trail in New Deal Washington. The many-sided Moscow network which came to light in later years in all the major departments of the Government, was seeded originally in 1933 in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, when Henry A. Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture, with Rexford Guy Tugwell as Under Secretary and top administrator of the first—unconstitutional—incarnation of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Pressman was first named as an influential king-pin of the Washington Communists in the early New Deal era, in the testimony of Whittaker Chambers, in August 1948. When the House Committee called him on that occasion, Pressman dismissed Chambers' charges as "the stale and lurid mouthings of a Republican exhibitionist." In the same manner, Alger Hiss had denied Chambers' accusations with unrestrained vehemence. Two years—and one Presidential election—were to pass before the record would be completed by Pressman's frank admission—after the Communist aggression in Korea—that he had himself suggested Alger Hiss for appointment as general counsel for the Senate Munitions Investigating Committee in 1935, from which post Hiss had moved on to larger fields of public service in the State Department and the United Nations Preparatory Commission.

After leaving Federal service in 1936 Pressman became a national figure as general counsel for the CIO, at $19,000 a year. As legal guide and mentor to the late Sidney Hillman, Pressman was a moving force in the CIO Political Action Committee, which reelected Roosevelt for the third and fourth terms, put Henry Wallace in as Vice President and then Secretary of Commerce, and extended its stranglehold on Congress.

As long ago as December 1948, the House Committee on Un-American Activities reported:

> Communist espionage has broken through the security forces of the United States Government and made off with secret information of both military and diplomatic plans, policies, and actions. This espionage system has been carefully developed over a period of more than 15 years, and it has been successful to a degree critical to the welfare and safety of the people of this Republic.

It is significant that the development period of this Communist network in Washington—"more than 15 years," as of 1948—links perfectly with Pressman's testimony that his own Communist activity in AAA dated back to the very launching of AAA in 1933–34. Thus, there is now established in the printed public record an unbroken chain of organized Communist activity, at the direct expense of the United States taxpayers, within the very structure of our own Federal establishment, continuously since the first days of the New Deal.

In the light of this public record, the New Deal now stands exposed as the spawning ground of organized communism within the structure of American Government. Under the protective shelter of the New Deal's alphabetical wonderland, communism ceased to be an outlaw, underground movement, to become an active, directing force in government.

Following official acceptance at the White House, communism gradually penetrated every department and agency of the executive branch. When Congress, in 1948, began to expose this Communist infiltration with unanswerable evidence, President Truman ridiculed the work of the Un-American Activities Committee with the flippant rejoinder "Red herring"! But this complacent tolerance of Kremlin-directed communism in Washington had been foretold in an earlier campaign utterance of President Truman, who had said of Stalin, at Eugene, Oreg., on June 11, 1948:

> I like old Joe. He's a decent fellow, but he's a prisoner of the Politburo.

Now it appears our own Harry is a prisoner of a politburo, American variety.

As a fellow prisoner with "Old Joe," President Truman's acceptance of communism as a benign world power came more than 10 years after the House Committee on Un-American Activities had begun a systematic delineation of world Communist sabotage and espionage in the United States.

That committee was set up first by House Resolution No. 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, May 26, 1938, and on January 3, 1945, was made a permanent standing committee of the House.

During its first 10 years, under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, the committee was the object of almost continuous bitter abuse and violent scorn from the White House. Congress was bombarded with petitions and requests to kill the Un-American Activities Committee. Since 1948, President Truman has sought to dismiss all charges of communism in Washington as only more "red herring." Many of his administration leaders in Congress have sought to whitewash it and ridicule the extent of its existence.

Yet this committee's files today hold more than 50,000 pages of testimony supported by literally tons of exhibits, tracing the growth of communism and its propaganda and political organization in the United States.

In 1939 the committee published the names of 10 international CIO unions then under complete domination and control of known Communists.

On October 30, 1939, the committee published the names, positions, and salaries of 563 Federal employees in Washington known to have been affiliated with an avowed Communist-front organization, the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Yet it was not until March 21, 1947—7 years later—that President Truman appointed the Loyalty Review Board, to check on Communists and fellow-travelers in the Federal departments and bureaus.

That Board examined the records of more than 9,200 suspected security risks in the Government service. Only 4,575 of these cases finally were cleared for future Federal employment. In 691 cases the FBI investigation was suspended when the suspected employee left the Government service voluntarily.

Renewing its inquiry into Communist penetration of the labor movement, the committee on March 29, 1944, named 21 CIO organizations as Communist-controlled. Later the committee published a list of 160 educational, political, and propaganda organizations known to be Communist fronts. During the war the committee investigated Communist propaganda broadcasts at Government expense by the Office of Price Administration. This inquiry was abandoned when two subofficials in charge of OPA radio resigned their Federal posts; Later the committee put a stop to pro-Soviet propaganda then being broadcast at Federal expense by the Department of Agriculture. In 1947, Gerhart Eisler was exposed as the No. 1 agent of the Communist International in the United States. Convicted and sentenced to prison for passport fraud, Eisler jumped bail, escaped from the United States aboard the Polish freighter *Batory*, and soon became Stalin's chief propaganda agent in Berlin.

On May 10, 1948, the House committee reported to Congress:

> The Communist Party of the United States of America advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. * * * The American Communist Party is now, and always has been, under the direction of an international Communist organization dominated by the leaders of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union. * * * In other words, what the Chinese and Greek Communists are doing today is what the American Communists plan to do tomorrow under similar circumstances. * * * The harm that can be done by the international Communist movement in the event of a national emergency must not be minimized.

Evidence that American Communists are financed directly by Moscow is found in the report of the House Un-American Activities Committee for December 31, 1948. After a 5-hour cross-examination of Whittaker Chambers on December 28, the committee reported:

> Mr. Chambers said the espionage ring recruited its personnel primarily in the United States for operation in other countries, including Japan, Germany, France, Finland, and China. Mr. Chambers also disclosed to the committee that, in his position as courier for the party, he on one occasion took a money belt from New York to San Francisco containing approximately $10,000 for the purpose of financing west coast spy operations.

Such was the web and extent of Communist operations in the United States Government as disclosed up to May 1950, when the details of the celebrated Amerasia case was revealed to an un-

suspecting American public, through a long-suppressed report of another committee of the House.

Shortly before midnight on Sunday, March 11, 1945, Federal agents entered the offices of the pro-Communist magazine Amerasia, 225 Fifth Avenue, New York. They seized some 1,700 secret documents stolen from the Department of State, War Department, Navy Department, Office of War Information, Federal Communications Commission, and the Office of Strategic Services. Security classifications on these documents ranged from "restricted" and "confidential" to "top secret."

The official report of the House Judiciary Committee on this raid, however, was not made public until May 22, 1950. In presenting the report on that date—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 22, 1950, page 7428—Chairman SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, explained that the original report had been filed with the Clerk of the House in a routine manner on October 23, 1946, during a recess of Congress. It had never been printed.

Over the period of 5 years and 2 months between the Amerasia raid in New York and publications of the Judiciary Committee's report, all the essential material in these 1,700 secret documents had been available to Moscow. During those 5 years the orbit of Stalin's overlordship had expanded from 170,000,000 population in Russia to more than 800,000,000 population in Europe and Asia, including Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, eastern Germany, Albania, the Baltic Provinces, China, Manchuria, and North Korea. But during those critical 5 years of the cold war the American people never were told by President Truman that the most vital military and diplomatic secrets of the United States Government had been stolen by the Kremlin's spy ring in Washington.

Informed observers have expressed the conviction that this case—one of the weirdest in American political history—is the key to America's postwar diplomatic debacle in Asia. The suppression of the Amerasia evidence for 5 years served one great purpose; it sheltered and protected the pro-Communist ring in the State Department until their treacherous work of national betrayal had been accomplished fully.

About 10 a. m. in the morning following the Amerasia raid in New York—March 12, 1945—some of the more important recovered documents were laid before Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, head of the Office of Strategic Services, and Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, in Washington. General Donovan instantly demanded that the material be turned over to the district attorney for immediate grand-jury proceedings, to be started that day, so that the Government officers involved or suspected might be subpenaed en mass, without opportunity to compare notes on their testimony.

But this plan did not go through. President Roosevelt, then in the last month of his life, directed that the case be turned over to the FBI for full investigation. All public discussion of the Amerasia material was to be avoided during the FBI investigation.

Thirteen weeks later, on May 29, 1945, the FBI report to the Attorney General recommended six arrests in the Amerasia case. But on May 31 the Attorney General hastily informed the FBI the whole case must be held in abeyance until the conclusion of the San Francisco conference then organizing the United Nations. Publication of the recovered Amerasia documents, it was contended officially, might embarrass the San Francisco conference, of which Alger Hiss had been named Secretary General. Owen Lattimore, unofficial State Department adviser on Asiatic affairs, had been a member of the Amerasia editorial board from 1937 to 1941.

On June 6, 1945, six persons in the Amerasia case were arrested by FBI agents on charges alleging conspiracy to violate the espionage laws. A few days later these charges were reduced to conspiracy to violate title 18 of the United States Code, having to do with the embezzlement and mutilation of Government documents.

The grand jury failed to return true bills against three of those arrested. But on August 10, 1945, true bills were returned against Phillip Jaffe, the Russian-born editor of Amerasia; Emanuel Larsen, a State Department officer; and Lt. Andrew Roth, of the Office of Naval Intelligence.

On October 2, Jaffe entered a plea of guilty and was fined $2,500.

On Saturday afternoon, November 2, a curious hour when Washington courts are not normally in session, Larsen entered a plea of guilty and was fined $500. This session of court lasted less than 15 minutes.

On February 13, 1946, the last remaining Amerasia indictment, against Lieutenant Roth, was quashed on motion of the Department of Justice.

The net of the Amerasia disclosures, therefore, was six arrests, three releases without indictment, one fine of $2,500, another fine of $500, and one indictment quashed. Somewhere high in the Government powerful forces had succeeded in smothering from national view and public discussion the whole shocking story of 1,700 secret documents stolen from the sensitive departments in Washington for reproduction in a Communist magazine in New York.

To date only the high lights of these 17 years of treasonable betrayal in Washington have been sketched in the public record. Some day, when all the records may be examined, the whole frightful story of New Deal treachery, sabotage, and espionage will be unfolded for public appraisal.

That story will tell exactly how many Communists and fellow-travellers found employment in the Federal bureaus after 1933. It will tell who, in 1945, lifted the ban against enlisting avowed Communists in the United States military services, and why we have as alleged by Browder over 13,000 Communists in the armed services. It will explain why, during and after the war, known Communists and sympathizers so often found themselves in pivotal strategic posts in the State Department.

The broad outlines of the story already are at hand. Lee Pressman has filled in an important gap between 1933 and 1938. The Amerasia case supplies another vital link between 1945 and 1950.

It is now crystal clear that the infiltration is so great that every chance exposure of flagrant Communist intrigue and espionage in Washington since 1933 somehow has been shielded and smothered by determined White House intervention. On every hand, full and complete exposure of communism in the Federal establishment has been obstructed and frustrated from 1933 down to the present hour.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence outlines a picture with many a dark shadow still unexplored. But the evidence is now complete that the Communists have infiltrated one of the great political parties. This admission is reported in a recent review of the Un-American Activities Committee. The Honorable Martin Dies, former chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, was threatened by Mr. Roosevelt himself. At a conference between the President and Mr. Dies in 1938 at the White House the President warned Mr. Dies that the Democratic Party could not win if the Un-American Activities Committee investigated the Communists in the CIO. Such an investigation, said the President, would cause the CIO to turn against the party and, said he:

> Without their support the Democratic Party would be defeated.

Then after ridiculing Dies for seeing things under the bed the President said:

> There is nothing wrong with Communists. Some of the best friends I have got are Communists.

Perhaps the reason is not far to seek. A President who found Joe Stalin "a decent fellow" in 1948 hardly could be expected to become really indignant and incensed that a foreign power with a propaganda machine "at least equal to that of the United States Marines," actually had penetrated every department of his own government.

Finally Norman Thomas and Earl Browder have announced that the Socialists and the Communists have secured most of their program through the Democratic Party. They have virtually dissolved the Socialist and Communist parties as separate units. They are now masters of the once-great Jeffersonian Democratic Party. Thomas and Browder write with satisfaction and say in effect that:

> Our work is done. We are satisfied. Our followers numbering about 900,000 are now in the New Deal Democratic Socialist-Communist Party—the party of the future.

But a surge of robust patriotism sweeps America today. Our people want a housecleaning in Washington. They demand vigorous congressional action to root out the Communist spies, traitors, and saboteurs. But the people themselves must crusade and make manifest their will.

About the Kerr Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much of propaganda, misinformation, and misstatement of facts about the so-called Kerr amendment to H. R. 1758, to clarify the Natural Gas Act of 1938, that I feel a statement should be made in regard to that proposed legislation.

In time, and when the facts are completely brought to light, I am sure the consumers and the general public will understand and acknowledge the truth about this bill.

The consumers will ultimately find out that a vote for the Kerr amendment was in their best interest and an effort to give them cheaper fuel by bringing more and more natural gas to them, and competing in the American way with other fuels admittedly costing more.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Since the passage of the Natural Gas Act of 1938, the Federal Power Commission has had jurisdiction of sales of natural gas shipped in interstate commerce.

This 1938 act specifically exempted "production or gathering of natural gas" from the Federal Power Commission's jurisdiction.

In 1947, the United States Supreme Court decided the Interstate case, which aroused speculation as to whether the Court might not permit the Federal Power Commission to regulate "arm's length" sale of natural gas by independent producers and gatherers to interstate pipeline companies.

Arm's length sales are transactions between two parties which are unlinked by reasons of ownership or control, and which do not violate the Sherman Antitrust Act. Independent producers are those who do not own transmission facilities and have no connection with interstate pipeline firms.

KERR BILL

The so-called Kerr gas bill was to do one thing, and one thing only—it said in clear and unmistakable language that the provisions of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 which specifically exempt the independent producers and gatherers of gas from the control and regulation of the Federal Power Commission meant what it said.

The Kerr bill did not affect the legal authority of the Federal Power Commission as it has existed since 1938.

It did not exempt any company or individual that has been or presently is subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

It did not affect the price of natural gas sold by independent producers.

It did not have as its purpose the increase of the cost of gas to the consumer.

DECREASE IN COST TO CONSUMER

Over the past 12 years, the cost of natural gas to the consumer has gone down 12 percent while the cost of practically every other heating fuel has increased.

FIELD GAS CHEAP

These housewives might be glad to know that 4 cents would be a generous estimate of the field price of the gas they use in a month's cooking. They might also be glad of the reassurance of Speaker RAYBURN, who is at least as well informed on the subject as Senator DOUGLAS, that the Kerr bill would not increase the price of gas by one red cent.

The Daily News is for low gas prices. We are convinced that the way to have them is to encourage producers to find more gas and to sell it to the pipelines. Transmission costs drop as volume increases, and the more high-priced manufactured gas that is displaced by natural gas, the greater the saving. (Chicago Daily News.)

PRESIDENT'S VETO

The President has vetoed the Kerr bill, and therefore the Natural Gas Act of 1938 was not amended as proposed by the Kerr bill.

It remains to be seen how far the Federal Power Commission will go in attempting to regulate the price of gas down at the source, and just what may result regarding the status of independent producers and gatherers and ultimately regarding the cost of natural gas to the consumer.

The following is editorial comment by the Boston Herald, one of the outstanding newspapers of New England, on the President's veto of the Kerr bill.

REGULATORY MADNESS

Here are a few facts that make Mr. Truman's position seem more glittering than sound.

The price of natural gas, like oil and coal, is now unregulated. The FPC regulates the pipelines that carry the gas and also the companies that both produce gas and operate the lines. But the 86 percent of the gas that is produced by the independent companies has been unregulated, and the Kerr bill would have insured that it remained so, against an evident intention of the FPC to take over control. So, if Congress sustains the veto, as seems likely, we shall have all gas going into interstate commerce regulated.

Mr. Truman fears a monopoly because once a pipeline company builds to a gas field it has to take the prices set by the owner of that field, since pipeline can't be shifted easily. Result, he implies, would be rocketing prices.

But someone didn't fully inform the President. No company spends millions building a pipeline to a gas field without making certain that the price of gas won't get out of hand. They aren't that simple in the industry. They make long-term-price contracts, and most gas today is already under 25-year agreements. The President is naive in thinking otherwise.

Competition is further limited, the President says, by the concentration of ownership of gas. It happens that 35 companies control 70 percent of the known reserves, and that among them are those horrible aggregations of capital—Standard Oil and Phillips Petroleum. (Horrible to the liberals.) But even if a single corporation held 70 percent of the reserves, it would still have to set a price that would lure consumers from the fuels they now use. It is like the monopoly of the railroads that no longer exists.

In fact, Mr. Truman's veto may have exactly the opposite effect he intends. It takes heavy capital to find productive gas fields, risk capital, for the danger of loss is great. Risk capital is scarce today, and the standard 6-percent return that regulatory agencies usually allow isn't enough to attract very much.

We now have known gas reserves for 30 years at the present rate of consumption. In 1955 the increased consumption will reduce those reserves to 9 years' supply—unless a sufficient incentive exists to expand exploration and production programs. The oil industry, without price control, has kept about 13 years' supplies in sight for the last 20 years, due to the operation of economic laws Mr. Truman would repeal. Control in gas is likely to mean less gas and higher prices. Less gas, incidentally, for national defense.

But whatever will happen by the President's veto, this passion for regulation is driving us into a kind of economic madness. If we keep coal prices up and gas prices down, what shall we do with oil? Already some of the oil companies with byproduct gas to sell scent a move in their direction, and they may deem it cheaper to burn their gas off than sell into regulation. If the gas price is kept down, the sick coal industry will have to turn up its toes, for price minimums won't save it.

We may as well make our choice now, either we stop our drift into regulation or we must just give up and regulate everything there is.

Representative PAUL SHAFER, of Michigan, said:

VETO IN ERROR

Because many consumers of natural gas are of the opinion that the President's veto has warded off the threat of higher rates for this popular fuel, I believe that it is well that you should know that there is far more danger of higher gas rates now than there would have been had the President signed the gas bill. In spite of all the fog that was thrown up during consideration of the Kerr bill, it was purely a measure simply to retain to the various States the control over their natural gas resources they hitherto have enjoyed; also control of distribution of gas within their borders.

So, I submit to you, that a vote for the Kerr bill was a vote for lowering gas prices to the consumer, and for ever-growing supplies of gas. The Kerr bill was well designed to prevent further socialization of the natural gas industry and to maintain States' rights. It was a bill to protect gas consumers and not to exploit them.

AFTER VETO—APPLICATIONS RECENTLY FOR INCREASE OF RATES

Charges are made that the Kerr bill would have raised the price of gas. What has happened since the veto of the Kerr bill?

On September 2, 1950, I released the following statement to some of the newspapers in Minnesota:

I note in the Twin-City newspapers of August 29, 1950, that the company which supplies Minnesota with natural gas has applied to the Federal Power Commission for an increase of rates. Many other gas companies throughout the country also have applied for increases since the President's veto of this bill.

My political opponents must be for this increase of price which I was against.

If my political opponents' view is to prevail, the prices of natural gas will go higher and higher. There will be a shortage of production of gas, and that shortage, with the increase in demand because of the present large and ever-increasing number of users, will result in higher prices as well as an insufficient quantity of gas for the users.

You will remember what happened during the last days of the OPA, when regulation and control made it impossible for you to obtain meat to feed your families. At that time because of the prospect of continued regulation and price controls on meat the producers just simply did not produce and sell beef, and the consumers could not obtain meat in the stores.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION STATEMENT

In 1947, Congressman PRIEST, of Tennessee, introduced a bill which was in

effect much the same as the Kerr bill. Here's what the Federal Power Commission said in a letter dated July 10, 1947, to the Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, at that time the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request of July 9 for an early comment by the Commission regarding H. R. 4099, a bill introduced by Congressman PRIEST, of Tennessee.

The Federal Power Commission urges the enactment of this bill at this time to make it perfectly clear that independent producers and gatherers of natural gas are exempt from the provisions of the Natural Gas Act and the jurisdiction of this Commission.

The enactment of this bill would dispel the uncertainty regarding the status of such independent producers and gatherers which has been created following the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Interstate case. Such action by the Congress now should dispose of this important and noncontroversial matter.

This procedure would enable the Congress to defer action on the many other aspects of natural gas regulation involved in the complexities, uncertainties, and ambiguities of H. R. 4051 (the Rizley bill), to which we referred in detail in our statement of July 1 to you and the members of your committee. As you know, all these problems are being carefully analyzed by the Commission, in cooperation with all interested parties, in the natural gas investigation (docket No. G–580). A full report on this investigation will be submitted to the Congress for its consideration within the next few months.

I am authorized to state that the position of the Commission in this matter is fully in accord with the legislative program of the President.

Respectfully yours,

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
By NELSON LEE SMITH, *Chairman.*

CONGRESSIONAL COMMENT

Here's what the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, who was majority leader of the House in the Eightieth Congress, said:

MR. HALLECK URGES ITS ADOPTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that we can have a little light on this measure as well as heat.

First, may I say that a bill similar to this, except the opponents of this bill say it went much further, was passed in the Eightieth Congress. It did not come to passage in the other body.

This bill is almost identical with a bill introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] in 1947 which was approved by the unanimous vote of the Federal Power Commission. It was approved by the Department of Defense. It was said by the Commission to be in line with the President's program.

In this Congress, the Eighty-first Congress, that bill was introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]. It was reported by the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on which it was my privilege to serve some years ago. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives and went to the other body where an amendment has been put on, that again may I say quite respectfully from the standpoint of the opponents of the measure should make the bill better rather than worse.

What is the situation that is now before us? Simply this: Shall we adopt the amendment that was agreed to in the other body and be done with this matter, or shall it go on to conference? I say that under the circumstances certainly there is no reason that I can see why anyone who supported the bill before should not support it now.

Now, what are the circumstances back of this legislation? In 1938 legislation for the regulation of the transportation of gas in interstate pipelines was introduced and brought to passage. I was on the committee at the time. I am making these brief remarks here because of the participation I had in that debate at that time. Here is what I said in connection with that legislation:

"In the past few years the interstate transportation of gas in large pipelines at high pressure had been growing by leaps and bounds. Gas is brought from the producing areas in these pipelines and sold at the city gates to the public utilities which distribute the gas to the consumers. It is obvious the distribution of the gas by the local distributing company is subject to State regulation and the interests of the consumers are protected by State regulation. However, the transportation of gas in interstate commerce in the pipelines and its sale to the distributing companies for resale is not subject to State regulation, and as a result we have had a situation under which the price charged the distributing company at the city gate has been fixed wholly by the judgment, discretion, or action of the interstate company. It is charged that in many cases that price is excessive. This bill seeks to regulate those prices."

That is the reason I supported the legislation. Now, then, specifically the question is, Shall the Federal Power Commission extend its control to the production and gathering of gas? May I say at that point that if such control could be so extended, might it not as logically be said that the production and gathering of oil shall be controlled by the Commission as a public utility? Might it as well not be said that the production of coal in the mines shall be controlled by the Federal Power Commission as a matter of controlling a public utility?

The bill that we passed in 1938 specifically exempted by its terms the production and gathering of gas, written in after careful consideration.

A specific question was put to the great chairman of our committee, Mr. Lea, of California, who voluntarily retired from this body a year or so ago. He was asked specifically if it was designed to apply to the production and gathering of gas, and he said this: "The bill does not apply to the production and gathering of gas."

The Commission, may it be understood, has in the 12 years that this law has been on the books never asserted the right to control the production and the distribution of gas. No one ever thought they had any such power under the legislation. I do not think they have now, but as sometimes happens, there was a case in the Supreme Court a few years back, and there were certain words used in the opinion that were outside of the necessities of the decision that seemed to indicate the possibility that the Commission might have the power to invade this entirely local field or such field as has heretofore been said by the Congress to be local, and assert the right to control the production and gathering of the gas. That is the situation that gave rise to the introduction of legislation similar to this in the Eightieth Congress. It is the situation that has given rise to the introduction of this legislation in this Congress, yes, to the adoption of the legislation by the House and the adoption of the legislation with one amendment that I have already referred to by the Members of the other body.

Now, then, I have beyond all of that, may I say, Mr. Speaker, a deep conviction, as I am sure all of you who have served with me know, that if, for instance, the right to regulate the production and gathering of gas at the source is to be invested in the Federal Power Commission, the Congress of the United States ought to make that decision. That power should be granted by the Congress of the United States. It is quite obvious it could not be obtained from any other source rightfully, and to attempt to apply the statute in a way that I say strains the statute is, in my opinion, not the way that the affairs of Government should be administered.

The gas is produced and gathered at the source, even as oil is produced or coal is produced. Then a pipeline company buys it at arm's length from competing producers and puts it into the pipelines. If it goes across State lines it is then in interstate commerce.

Until we passed the act of 1938 there was no power anywhere to regulate the price to be charged for that gas moving in interstate commerce, so to fill that gap, and that gap only, the Congress enacted this legislation.

Carried with that is the right in the Federal Power Commission to control the price of gas at the city gate, to see to it that the city is not charged too much for the gas. Then the matter of fixing the rate to the consumer as he pays it to the distributing company becomes a matter of local regulation. That is all there is to this whole business.

I say again, the Federal Power Commission never asserted this right. As a matter of fact, it specifically disclaimed it in 1947. The Court has not specifically held that it has the right. So I say again, it is simply a matter of clarification and a definite delineation of what was obviously the purpose and intent of the Congress of the United States.

Here is what the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, present Democratic Speaker of the House, said:

SPEAKER RAYBURN REQUESTS AMENDMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, with my long record in this House of Representatives, starting way back, being a member of the subcommittee that wrote the Federal Power Commission Act, being a member of the subcommittee that wrote the Federal Trade Commission Act, and being the author of the Securities Act of 1933, of the Stock Exchange Regulation Act of 1934, and of the Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935, I do not think I could be accused of having any great desire to serve the interests over the people.

If I felt as my distinguished and beloved friend from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has indicated he feels, that the Federal Government should own and control all the natural resources of this country, then my position on this and much other legislation would certainly be changed.

We have been going along the other line for more than a century and a half, and our country has grown to be the greatest and the most prosperous country in the history of the world.

The difference between this amendment and the bill we passed in the House is simply this, practically nothing more or nothing less: As a concession to some people who said they wanted to carry on this thing and not make this final, the Senate amendment in which we are seeking to concur today, in addition to the bill that passed the House, says, "We are going to pass this legislation but we want to carry on the study to see whether or not in passing this legislation we have done the proper thing."

In being for this bill, as I was when it originally passed the House and as I am now in favoring concurring in the Senate amendment, I have some pretty good company. The Federal Military Establishment was asked about this bill, and this is the guts of what they said, after all elements of the Department of Defense had studied it:

"Enactment of the bill will remove uncertainties now existing as to the extent of the application of the Natural Gas Act and

will clarify its terms. Its effect should be to encourage the development of oil and gas resources and thus would be of benefit to the national security."

That is what our whole Military Establishment says about this legislation.

This bill simply says that the little fellow, who goes out and strikes some gas, is not going to be hauled up to Washington and tried before the Federal Power Commission, and that the independents in gathering, not in the transportation in interstate pipelines or anything of the sort, shall not be placed under regulations that they would be in interstate commerce.

In my opinion—and I state this to you deliberately; I would not deceive you; you know that—this will not raise the price of natural gas to any consumer in the United States one red penny. I think this thing should be gotten out of the way. We should concur in this Senate amendment and then have this study and see where we go from there.

Here's what the Honorable J. PERCY PRIEST, Democratic whip of the House, said:

MR. PRIEST SPEAKS FOR AMENDMENT AS NEEDED AND CONSISTENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, because several references have been made throughout the debate in this Chamber last year and in the other body to the Priest bill, references showing that the Priest bill of 1947 is rather largely the same as the bill now pending with the exception of the Senate amendment providing for continuation of a study, I want to take a few minutes to point out one or two important considerations in connection with the bill.

Reference was made by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], I believe it was, to the Rizley bill that was before the Eightieth Congress. The Rizley bill was before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for quite a while. Extensive hearings were held. I was not for that bill; I thought it went too far. At that time the Federal Power Commission came before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. They came to my office and requested me to introduce a bill as a substitute for the Moore-Rizley bill. That request came also from the White House.

In a letter to the then chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], the Federal Trade Commissioner said this:

"This is in response to your request of July 9 for an early comment by the Commission regarding H. R. 4099, a bill introduced by Congressman PRIEST, of Tennessee.

"The Federal Power Commission urges the enactment of this bill at this time to make it perfectly clear that independent producers and gatherers of natural gas are exempt from the provisions of the Natural Gas Act and the jurisdiction of this Commission.

"The enactment of this bill would dispel the uncertainty regarding the status of such independent producers and gatherers which has been created following the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Interstate case. Such action by the Congress now should dispose of this important and noncontroversial matter."

The last paragraph of the letter reads:

"I am authorized to state that the position of the Commission in this matter is fully in accord with the legislative program of the President."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that the bill that passed the House last August, H. R. 1758, and the amendment that was passed by the Senate and sent over here, which is before the House at this time, is exactly the same thing and has for its purpose the exemption of independent producers and gatherers of natural gas where the sales are at arm's length?

Mr. PRIEST. Exactly, and that is the law as it has been in effect since 1938. This makes no change whatsoever. It says that a law which has been in effect for 12 years, during which time the retail price of natural gas has declined 12 percent, shall continue to operate on that same basis.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that if a driller were drilling for oil and found gas, that he would inadvertently find himself in the public-utility business?

Mr. PRIEST. Assuming that the Commission has the jurisdiction which some claim it does, but which the law does not give it, and which was made perfectly clear in all of the legislative history of the act.

Here's what the Honorable OREN HARRIS, said:

COPY OF WIRE TO THE PRESIDENT BY MR. HARRIS, CHAIRMAN, PETROLEUM SUBCOMMITTEE

APRIL 4, 1950.

I want to strongly urge your approval H. R. 1758, Kerr amendment, Natural Gas Act, passed by House and Senate. Speaker RAYBURN, House Majority Leader MCCORMACK, Majority Whip PERCY PRIEST join in wholehearted support this bill. As chairman House subcommittee, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I am thoroughly familiar with this proposal. Committee reported it in my name as chairman, slightly amending original bill I introduced January 24, to fully conform with the purposes and intent of the FPC proposal introduced by Congressman PRIEST, a member of the committee 2 years ago and which was testified by the Commission to be in full accord with your, the President's program. It passed House in August as reported by our committee by a vote of 183 to 131. The Kerr bill as amended to conform to only the purposes and intent of the proposal passed the Senate. It was in different language but the same purpose only with an additional provision of a continuing study by the FPC on the subject in the public interest. The House agreed to the bill as amended by the Kerr amendment last Friday by a vote of 176 for it with 26 Members voting for the bill as passed the House in August being absent and not voting Friday.

This amendment, Mr. President, merely clarifies the intent of Congress when the original act was passed in 1938, to the effect that independent producers and gatherers of natural gas would be exempt from FPC regulations where sales by such producers and gatherers are at arm's length, at or prior to inception of interstate transmission or trunk lines of interstate natural gas companies. It conforms to the FPC order 139 issued August 1947, on being necessary because of confused interpretation Court decision in the Interstate case, June 1947.

This amendment, Mr. President, does not change any procedures or authority exerted in the history of the Natural Gas Act. It does not change the stated intent of the act when passed in 1938. It merely clears up a confused and uncertain status by court interpretation. Grave misrepresentations have been made to the effect it will increase cost of gas to consumers. This I respectively submit is gross misrepresentation. The history of the administration of the act shows the cost on a national average to consumers to gradually be reduced by 12 percent, during the 12 years of the Natural Gas Act administration.

I join with Speaker RAYBURN in confidently stating that this will not have adverse effect on the cost of gas to consumers. On the other hand, it will benefit consumers reducing their fuel cost by making more gas available to them.

The price of natural gas to consumers has steadfastly gone down and the cost of other fuels increased tremendously over the same period of time.

The contention that this is not competitive fuel, I respectfully submit, is in error. The competitive element is in the field where there are thousands of leases from which gas is produced and the competitive element prevails in the usual business way as the big natural gas companies bid for it.

The FPC definitely has authority over rates at wholesale prices for resale and any grossly unfair or unusually high rates as in the past be prohibited by Commission. Furthermore, State utility commissions have regulatory authority over rates by distributing companies and can likewise continue to exert authority where the regulated monopoly business prevails. I urge your approval.

OREN HARRIS,
Member of Congress.

DANGER SIGNAL

There are some who feel that everything should be regulated at the Federal level. Right now natural gas is their target. If they are successful in this attempt, who can predict what commodity will be next to be removed from private enterprise and placed under bureaucratic restrictions? (Senator EDWARD MARTIN, Republican, Pennsylvania.)

CONCLUSION

When the consumers of natural gas in the Second District of Minnesota find that gas is increasing in price as a result of the President's veto of the Kerr gas bill, they will realize that those who voted for the Kerr bill voted in the best interest of the consumers and in an effort to give them cheaper fuel by bringing more and more natural gas to them.

Despite all the hysterical distortions and malicious mistatements—and despite the vicious propaganda to the contrary—it is an unanswerable fact—which time will emphasize—that the President's veto of the Kerr bill has resulted in increased prices to the consumer.

Address by Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, at Prince Georges County Republican Rally, Hyattsville, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at a Republican rally at Hyattsville, Md., on September 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, something is radically wrong with this Nation today.

Five years ago we had the most powerful military force the world has ever seen assembled. At that time our military juggernaut, with no difficulty, could have rolled across the Elbe River, over the Ural Mountains, across the Siberian Plains and on to the Pacific Ocean without even a noticeable stop for mopping up operations in Korea.

Today, 5 years later, a nation so small that it can hardly be seen on the map thumbs its nose at the mighty United States and degrades us in the eyes of the world. Their Communist forces show such complete disdain for us that they tie the hands of captive Americans and deliberately murder them and then leave them lying in the mud of Korea to notify the world of the contempt in which they hold Americans.

Why? And why also must this Nation use its entire resources to accomplish a task which one of Patton's armored columns would have considered a minor diversion 5 years ago?

Of course, we will win in Korea—but after a vast number of lives have been senselessly squandered and much of the economic lifeblood has been drained from this Nation.

The sands in the hourglass of time are fast running out. We are losing the world to international atheistic communism at a fantastic rate of speed. Five years ago there were within the tentacles of the atheistic communistic octopus 180,000,000 people. Today that figure is over 800,000,000. If this tempo of Communist victories continues, in another 5 years those of us here tonight will be faceless pawns working, living, and dying as ordered by the commissar.

Why? Is it because we are less intelligent than the Communists? Is it because we can't match them in courage? Is it because their devotion to atheism is greater than our devotion to God? Is it because we are less willing to stand up and fight for what we think is right? The answer is "No." Then what is the answer? Is it in our leadership? To that my answer is "Yes," and I challenge anyone to find another answer.

I have been naming names and presenting evidence against those leaders who have been responsible for selling into communistic slavery over 500,000,000 people—those leaders responsible for the creation of Communist stepping stones to American shores.

Those in power in Washington say that this is not so; that those are not the men. Now if I have named the wrong men, then the American people are entitled to know the names of the traitors who plotted the Communist victory in Asia and the dismal American defeat—the greatest defeat any nation has suffered in war or peace.

We must put the spotlight of exposure on those who are responsible for America's continuing disasters. This is important, not for the purpose of exposing past failures, but because those same men are now doing America's planning for the future—men whose shadows will long hover like vultures over the corpse of China and the corpse of Poland—men whose actions today are ripping at the very backbone of freedom in America. Unfortunately, they have become so deeply entrenched that almost every power of the Government is used to sabotage any attempt to expose and root them out.

Now, as you know, I brought to the attention of the Senate some of the evidence of Communists in the State Department. The Senate appointed a committee to investigate. A tip-off of what could be expected came from the administration Democrat leader, SCOTT LUCAS. On February 21, 1950, on page 21106 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he said that the reason for giving the investigation to the Tydings-McMahon committee was to keep any other committee from conducting an investigation. The Senate special investigations committee which was created for the purpose of making such investigations, was barred from looking into this. In other words, the Tydings-McMahon committee was formed to prevent an honest committee from doing an honest job.

The Tydings-McMahon committee has now announced to the world that its job is done. They officially state that there is not a single Communist or pro-Communist in the State Department—that everyone there is an ideal, loyal, normal American.

If this is true, then this Nation is in no danger of communistic enslavement. As a great historian once said, if this Nation dies, its death will not be caused by enemies from without but rather because of enemies from within.

If, however, as I have stated, the LUCAS-created Tydings-McMahon committee has done a dishonest job and was interested in protecting Communists for political reasons, then this Nation has not long to live and the blood of the young men who are today dying in the hills and valleys of Korea stains not only the hands of the masters of the Kremlin but stains also the hands of those men in this Nation who cannot rise above politics—who cannot rise to the challenge of the problems of 1950. Yes, staining—if you please—the hands of those who place cheap political considerations before the welfare not only of this Nation but of civilization as a whole.

It is, of course, easy to make general statements about the incompetence of that committee. Therefore let's get down to some of the specific, recorded examples of how TYDINGS and MCMAHON operated. Then you—the American people—can decide from the record whether they are protecting and hiding Communists and traitors in governments, and whether you want more of it.

Example No. 1 deals with a well-known Communist, Earl Browder. Earl Browder was called by the Tydings-McMahon committee apparently as a character witness for Owen Lattimore. Browder was head of the Communist Party in America. He was Stalin's right-hand man.

Tydings, while trying to get Browder to testify that all our State Department planners were good loyal Americans—the Browder-type of loyal Americans, of course—said to Browder:

"You are defeating the purpose of this inquiry in a way that you perhaps do not realize. If you feel that you could answer, I would be very grateful to you" (hearings, p. 706).

Do you get the awful import of that? Do you get the import of the chairman of our Armed Services Committee saying to America's top Communist, "If you only realized how I am trying to cover up, whitewash, protect, and keep in Government jobs your fellow Communist Party members and their dupes, you would help me."

TYDINGS coaxed and cajoled. Browder finally said: "All right, they are not Communists." TYDINGS then leaned across the table and said, "Oh, thank you, sir."

That is the sort of thing that the Democrat majority, under the leadership of LUCAS, officially approved on July 20 by a straight Democrat Party line vote. If you approve, vote Democrat in November. If not, vote Republican.

Now let's make it clear—when I refer to the Democrat Party, I refer to the administration Democrat Party. As we all know, there are two Democrat groups. There are the millions of loyal Americans who have long voted the Democrat ticket and there is the administration Democrat Party which is no longer an American Party.

In this connection, I'd like to pay high tribute to the over 100,000 Democrats who helped to nominate a Democrat Governor but who refused to take part in the Democrat senatorial primary (something unheard of in American politics).

They, of course, were fully acquainted with TYDINGS' record and wouldn't vote for him—and they didn't know enough about the two fine men who were opposing TYDINGS to make a decision between them—and, therefore, didn't vote.

This type of intelligent action is a good omen for America. It is also a good omen that well over half of those who voted in the Maryland primary, refused to vote for TYDINGS, chairman of the whitewash committee.

Example No. 2: The case of Gustavo Duran, who was one of Acheson's "experts" in the State Department. I presented to the committee a complete and detailed report of Army Intelligence showing that Duran had been active in secret Communist operations in Europe and that he was regional head of SIM, a counterpart of the Russian secret police. Immediately there came from the State Department the usual high-pitched screaming and squealing to the effect that MCCARTHY was a liar. This time they said, "Sure the record is black on that Gustavo Duran, but he is not our Gustavo Duran. This is a case of mistaken identity and MCCARTHY is smearing an innocent man." I thereupon produced pictures of Duran in the uniform he wore at the time he was with the secret police which proved that that Duran was truly the State Department's own Gustavo, who, incidentally, had been quietly promoted on Acheson's recommendation to a higher salaried job in the United Nations. I hold the picture in my hand. His job in the UN is to screen displaced persons and decide which ones should be allowed to enter the United States.

But what did the committee do? Absolutely nothing. Duran was not called. They were not interested in knowing who placed him in the State Deparement, or why Acheson recommended him to a higher-paid job with the United Nations.

If you approve of this dangerous coddling, hiding and protecting of Communists, dupes, and fellow travelers in Government, then vote the Democrat ticket. That is what every Democrat present in the Senate voted to approve. Every Republican voted against it.

If on the other hand you feel that when Army Intelligence gives a detailed account of a man's having been head of European secret police, that then the American people should know why the Secretary of State promotes him to a better job; if you feel that a committee should want to know all about this man, then vote the Republican ticket. That is the only way we will have a decent, honest investigation.

The fight against communism should not be a political fight. It should be a fight between the roughly 150,000,000 honest, loyal Americans against the forces of atheistic communism, for certainly if communism wins there will be neither a Democratic nor a Republican Party. Unfortunately, the men of little minds who control the administration Democrats, and who do not represent the millions of loyal American Democrats, have placed themselves on the side of the Communists, traitors, and dupes in order to gain a short-term political advantage.

Apparently, the Tydings, the McMahons and the Lucases do not realize that they cannot save the face of the Democrat Party if the face of America is lost.

I do not ask the Democrats in this country to desert their party. I do ask them in the name of America to realize that at long last the administration Democratic Party has deserted them and has made it a party which protects Communists and hides corruption.

Example No. 3: This is another typical example of what the Tydings-McMahon-Lucas combine ask you to vote your approval of this November.

This is the case of the man who is now our Ambassador at Large, Philip Jessup. I have here a few of the photostats of the evidence in his case. I hope that each of you will take a copy with you. Keep in mind if you will that this man holds one of the highest jobs in our State Department. His task is to lead the fight against communism in Asia.

In presenting Jessup's case, I stated that he had editorial control of the magazine of the I. P. R. which was officially named as a front for the Communist Party. The State Department again issued the usual press release saying that this was not true, that their Philip Jessup was only one of the 50 trustees of that Communist front and that he did not know what was going on. Now here is the photostat showing that their Philip Jessup was chairman of the Research Advisory Committee which had absolute unquestioned control of this Communist-front magazine, in other words, the head man, the chairman.

Incidentally, the same board of trustees who controlled Jessup's publications, also controlled Amerasia. This magazine was listed by the FBI as, and I quote, "a tool for Russian espionage."

Next are the photostats of $6,000 worth of Communist checks used to support this magazine which preached the Communist line on Asia.

Next is the data on the Communist-front organizations with which Ambassador Jessup was affiliated.

Next is a photostat of a petition, dated February 16, 1946, signed by Jessup in which he follows the Communist Party line and urges that we "at once stop the production of bombs," and that we dump atomic bomb material into the ocean.

These photostats were all sent to the President. After he received the photostats showing that (1) Jessup headed a magazine of a Communist-front organization heavily supported by Communist money; (2) Jessup's affiliation with the five organizations which were officially named as fronts for the Communist Party; and (3) that he had signed a petition urging that we destroy our atomic bomb material, the President took immediate action. What do you think his action was? He immediately gave Jessup top secret clearance to all atomic and hydrogen bomb information. Sufficient copies of these photostats are available for all of you.

Incidentally, when Frederick Vanderbilt Field, self-proclaimed as the Nation's leading Communist, appeared before the committee, he was asked about his relationship with Jessup. His answer was: "I refuse to answer on the grounds that that information might incriminate me."

Later the Tydings-McMahon committee when asked by the press, said they were considering citing Field for contempt. But the millionaire Communist playboy did not like communism quite well enough to go to jail for 2, 3, or 5 years. So he sent word to the committee that he was willing to talk—that he would now tell all. The Tydings-McMahon committee then frantically held a late night meeting. Clearly it would wreck their whitewash plans if Frederick Vanderbilt Field was actually to tell all. So the next day they announced that they would not let this sacred Communist come back and spill everything he knew about Communists in Government.

And incidentally, on page 732 of the hearings, which I hold in my hand, you will find the most fantastically shameful exhibition which you will perhaps ever witness on the part of a chairman of a Senate committee. Mr. TYDINGS here says to Field, the self-proclaimed Communist, "Are those people whom MCCARTHY has named disloyal to the Government of the United States?" Communist Field says, "No, of course, they were not disloyal." And TYDINGS and MCMAHON heaved a sigh of relief and concluded: "That proves they are all loyal."

And we find here in the record which I hold in my hand that Senator MCMAHON leaned across the table and said, "Dr. Jessup, I am proud of you. I am delighted that you are a constituent of mine." And listen to this—I quote verbatim—"I think you are entitled to the thanks of all of our people for the magnificent work which you have done."

If you agree with TYDINGS and MCMAHON that this man who was editor of the magazine of a Communist-front organization, which was supported by Communist money and which spearheaded the Communist Party line—if you agree that this man who was affiliated with 5 organizations which were officially named as fronts for the Communist Party and who signed a petition urging that we destroy our atomic bombs—if you agree with TYDINGS and MCMAHON that here was the type of man we want doing our planning, then vote the Democrat ticket because you will get more of them. But if your stomach is full of this sort of thing, then vote Republican.

Example No. 4 is that of William Remington who was one of the 81 cases which TYDINGS and MCMAHON voted to clear. In their book it was a "fraud" for MCCARTHY to have named him in the first place. When I named him, he was holding a position high in the Commerce Department, working closely with the State Department on exports. As you know, it was the State and Commerce Departments, working hand in glove, that succeeded in keeping the badly needed arms and ammunition from the South Koreans which the Congress had voted for them.

When the TYDINGS-MCMAHON committee said Remington is a loyal American and it is a "fraud" for MCCARTHY to have named him, luckily the House Committee took up his case as did the grand jury with the result that he has since been indicted because of his Communist activities.

Among the photostats being made available to you tonight is one revealing that 8 young men had the job, over a 5- or 6-month period, of cleaning out of the 16,000 State Department employees' files anything which showed them to be either Communists or perverts. The statement shows that these men were hired by the State Department and instructed to do this job. I suggest that you read this signed and witnessed statement.

Incidentally, after this fight to clean the Communists out of Government started, the State Department testified under oath that they had finally gotten rid of 91 perverts. It might interest you to know that as of tonight, 14 of the 91 are already back in Government work and most of them at higher salaries.

Another two photostats being given you are of almost unlimited value in deciding whether the word of the chairman of the whitewash committee can be depended upon—whether he speaks the truth or whether he lied whenever he thought he could get away with it. And I do urge you take these two documents with you.

First is the photostat of the recording made by the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune of the press conference called by Mr. TYDINGS. This is dated June 22—and remember that date, June 22. You will note Mr. TYDINGS stated that the FBI had examined all the files and established as false the statement that any evidence that State Department employees were Communists had been destroyed. This, of course, was meant to be a clincher—the fact that the FBI had examined all files while the committee was looking at them and found that everything was there.

But let's look at the next photostat—a photostat of a letter containing the signature of J. Edgar Hoover which says: "Tydings does not speak the truth. We did not examine the files. We do not know how badly they were raped."

To make this attempted deception even more shameful and to compound the lie, the FBI was ordered, after the committee had ended its farce—and listen to this if you will—the FBI was ordered first to send over all material which should have been in the files in the first place. This was done. Then the FBI was ordered to come over and look over the files and see whether or not the material that it had sent over had then been put in the files. These orders were issued to the FBI so that the chairman during his political campaign might be able to say, "Look, the FBI says now those files, which the committee of course no longer has access to, are complete."

Obviously, if the committee was interested in having the files complete, this order to supply the missing material would have been issued to the FBI before the committee looked at the files instead of long after they were through.

If you want more of that you can get plenty of it by voting Democrat this November. If, however, it makes you sick way down deep inside as it does me, you can get rid of it by voting Republican this November.

And now for the master planner for disaster—Dean Gooderham Acheson. This is the Acheson, who in 1939 before Hiss did all of his damage at Yalta said: "Don't investigate Hiss; I will vouch for him completely." When Hiss was convicted after 10 years of treasonable activities and a record of betrayal, Acheson said: "I will never turn my back on Alger Hiss." This is the Acheson who sent Hiss to Yalta, where Hiss, Gromyko and a third person drafted the Yalta Agreement. This agreement was described by our American Ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, as follows: "As I glanced over the document, I could not believe my eyes. To me, almost every line showed a complete surrender to Stalin."

This is the Acheson who while discussing the Communist victory in China said: "A new day has dawned in Asia." His adviser, Owen Lattimore, described the same Communist victory as "the opening of limitless horizons of hope."

This is the Acheson who notified the world that we would not stand in the way of United Nations recognition of Communist China. Three times he publicly stated that Korea was not included in our defense plan. He thereby gave an engraved invitation to the Communists to take over. Incidentally, the President's last-minute decision to enter the Korean conflict was the first time we have double-crossed Stalin during Acheson's 9 years in the State Department.

Let me give you a brief story and listen to this, if you will, ladies and gentlemen—a brief story of Acheson's aid to the Communists who were fighting to take over Poland.

From October 1945, to March 1947, Acheson's law firm was retained by the Communist government of Poland to obtain a $90,000,000 loan from the United States. The loan was put through and Acheson's firm received a cut of over $50,000, according to his sworn testimony.

During this time, Acheson was Assistant Secretary of State. He admitted in January 1949, that he was charged with sole responsibility of making or refusing that loan.

Fifty million dollars of that ninety million went to equip and arm the Communist army and the dreaded U. B.—the Communist secret police just then being set up in Poland.

He did not do this blindly. He was fully advised as to what the money would be used for. Listen to the words of our Ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, who pleaded with Acheson not to make the loan:

"With the greatest earnestness of which I am capable, I beg the Department not to approve the extension of any credits at this time. When the terroristic activities of the Security Police come to an end, when freedom of the press is restored, and when American citizens are released from Polish prisons—not until then should United States public funds be used to assist the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity."

But Acheson loaned $90,000,000 of your money to the Communists. Ambassador Lane could not stomach this. He resigned to tell his story of the State Department's help to the Communists in his book entitled "I Saw Poland Betrayed." Lane and the other anti-Communists in the State Department went. But Acheson remained. Acheson always remained.

Lenin and Stalin long stressed that the turning point in world revolution would come when China was conquered by communism. William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in this country, in December of 1945, said, "The war in China is the key to all the problems of international communism."

Now, let's see how closely the State Department plans tied in with the plans of Lenin, Stalin, and Foster: A short time after Foster's statement, General Marshall was sent to China with secret instructions, which as a soldier, he obeyed. Now who do you think wrote those instructions? None other than Dean Acheson. This is proven by his initials on the blue copy of the instructions which now rests in the Archives.

Marshall's actions were (1) to place an embargo on ammunition to the troops fighting communism; (2) to force the anti-Communist troops to withdraw from the two mountain passes to Mongolia and Manchuria, making it possible for Communist forces to move freely and obtain arms from the Russians; and (3) to force Chiang to reduce his army by more than 1,000,000 men, many of whom, after 8 years of war, having no occupation, were forced to enlist with the Communist forces. 1946 dragged by. Marshall came home. The Communist army—grown from 300,000 to 2,000,000 men—armed, trained, directed, and even officered by the Soviets—was ready for the offensive by late 1947. But the Marshall embargo made it impossible for the troops fighting the Communists to buy ammunition in America or England, the only source.

Marshall was given the job of cutting off all arms and ammunition to the forces fighting communism in China, if they would not agree to take the Communists into partnership. Marshall did this and commented, "As Chief of Staff I armed 29 anti-Communist divisions. Now, with a stroke of the pen, I have disarmed them."

At the time the Acheson group was writing the secret instructions under which Marshall was, in his words, disarming 29 anti-Communist divisions with a stroke of the pen—at that very moment, according to documents supplied by Ambassador to China Patrick Hurley, this same group was "openly advising the Communists to refuse unification * * * unless the Chinese Communists were given control"—a weird, traitorous double-deal, if ever there was one.

Here the treason of Yalta was brought to full bloom. Here was signed the warrant condemning to atheistic communistic slavery 400,000,000 of our allies who fought so well with us during the entire war. Here was signed the death warrant of the young men who have been dying today in the hills and valleys of Korea. Here was signed the death warrant of the young men who will die tomorrow in the jungles of Indochina. Here was signed the death warrant of the young men who will die on the sands of Iran the next day. Here was signed the death warrant of the young men who will die in the streets of Berlin and Paris the day after that.

Now keep in mind that this Acheson-conceived mission of Marshall was launched just a few days after the head of the Communist Party said, in effect, "The Communists must win China to win the world."

Long before this mission of Marshall, however, the State Department crowd was putting into operation the plan for the betrayal of our Chinese allies.

When the war with Japan ended, there was stored in India—as a way-station to China—billions of dollars worth of lend-lease arms and ammunition. We then had the manpower, we had the ships, we had the supply route to promptly deliver those sorely needed supplies to our Chinese allies who were fighting the Communists.

For 8 months, 18 Liberty ships were being loaded with those mountains of ammunition. Loaded they left the port and returned empty time after time to be reloaded and leave again. One hundred and twenty thousand tons of ammunition did those ships take from the ports of India. Every day during this entire 8-month period, the artillery of Chiang Kai-shek remained silent.

Did this ammunition reach the silent guns of Chiang Kai-sheks' army? Ladies and gentlemen, the answer is "No." The State Department orders were: Dump it 200 miles at sea—dump it in the ocean.

And listen to this—all of that vast amount of equipment that was destroyed by us is still carried on the administration's books as aid which we gave to China.

Here in my hand, ladies and gentlemen, I hold a copy of a letter from Maj. Gen. Edward Witsell, the Adjutant General of the Army, in which he admits that this ammunition was dumped in the Pacific Ocean. Of course, there is the usual double-talk. You find the claim that the ammuntion was corroded—that it was improperly stored. Now I was in the Pacific and I can assure you that we just did not store even one bomb where it would be ruined by corrosion—not unless you wanted to be court-martialed.

If you want more of that sort of thing, you can get it easily. Vote Democrat this November.

This problem is right smack in the laps of the American people. If they have had enough, there is only one way to end the bungling and traitorous acts. That is by voting Republican.

If, however, the American people favor dumping into the ocean billions of dollars worth of goods which they paid for and earmarked for the anti-Communist forces in China; if they believe in having that done and then kept secret from them for 5 years with the hope that they would never learn about it; if they favor that sort of thing, they can get more of it by voting for the Tydings - McMahon - Lucas type of whitewash—by voting Democrat.

The Congress last year voted millions of dollars to furnish necessary planes, tanks, antitank guns, rifles, and ammunition so that the South Koreans might be able to defend themselves. We voted one item of $75,000,000, any part of which could be used in Korea. We voted another item of $10,-300,000, all of it to be used to arm South Korea. The President signed those two bills without a word of protest. Democrats and Republicans alike, almost unanimously, voted that money. Then what happened? At that point, the State Department stepped in and, ladies and gentlemen, how much of that money do you think was actually spent to arm South Korea? The answer—not one ounce of gunpowder, not a single shot. Out of the $10,300,000 which was appropriated for the defense of South Korea, only $200 was spent and that was to load some baling wire.

We are a patient people. However, I think you will agree that the time has run out for the men who today are covering the tracks of their blunders with plans that will lead us to further disaster.

It does not take a foreign policy expert to realize why China is writhing today under the heel of a Soviet boot. It does not take an expert to realize the extent to which the American taxpayer has bought and paid for the Communist domination of Poland today.

This man, Dean G. Acheson, who worked on the team of world strategy to create a Red China and a Red Poland, should be removed from the high command of our foreign policy at once. The people cannot afford to wait until the elections of 1952.

Let's speak briefly of the trio who have successfully labeled the administration Democrat Party as the party which protects Communists and hides corruption.

I refer to (1) LUCAS, the administration's front man in the Senate who selected TYDINGS and MCMAHON to do their whitewash job; (2) MCMAHON, who bragged on the Senate floor that it was he who read and approved the whitewash report. This is the same MCMAHON who suggested in the early part of this year that the United States disarm and that we give $50,000,000,000 of American money to Russia and her satellites on condition, of course, that Russia would promise to be peaceful. MCMAHON, of course, was sure that Russia would keep her promise after she had spent our 50 billions to build up her industry so that she might be able to successfully fight us; (3) MILLARD TYDINGS, whom the administration made chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the whitewash committee. Those jobs certainly call for a vigorous, fearless, intelligent watchdog for the American people. But what do we get in that job? TYDINGS, the administration's lap dog.

LUCAS provided the whitewash when I charged there were Communists in high places in Government; MCMAHON brought the bucket; TYDINGS the brush.

This trio—TYDINGS, MCMAHON, and LUCAS—in my opinion, have done more than any others in this Nation to shield the traitors, protect the disloyal, and confuse Americans in their desperate fight to clean out the Communists.

These are the men who engineered the whitewash. These are the men who whipped the Democrat Party into line. These are the men who ordered the sideshow and called in their Communist witnesses who obligingly testified: "All's well with the world". This is the trio who paraded before the Nation the most crass and dangerous display of deceit in the history of the Senate.

TYDINGS, LUCAS, and MCMAHON are not themselves evil men. They are men of little minds who tragically are in positions of tremendous power today, at a time when the survival of western nonatheistic civilization hangs in the balance—men of little minds who have neither the mental nor the moral capacity to rise above narrow partisan politics. They are the men who arise on the Senate floor and make eloquent speeches against communism generally, but who promptly yield the whitewash brush when we try to get rid of the individual Communists and the dupes and stooges of the Kremlin.

We can be thankful that in this Nation the people themselves still have the power to clean house. The 152,000,000 American people have the power to get rid of the Achesons, the Jessups, the Lattimores, and the Services. They have the power to say we want in our Government normal Americans, who are for this Nation first, last, and all the time. They have the power to say we will not have the dupes and stooges of the Kremlin nor will we have men who are hip deep in their own failures. It is up to you, the American people. The case is in your hands.

Report to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to report to the people

of Berks County, the Thirteenth District of Pennsylvania, whom I represent in Congress. As a Democrat I felt duty-bound to support the 1948 platform pledges the Democratic Party made to the people of the United States before the election of President Truman and Members of the Eighty-first Congress.

I make this report to my constituents because I believe the people want to know what their Representative has done.

The people of Berks County, like myself, are predominantly of Pennsylvania Dutch stock, although we have many other good people of Polish, Italian, German, and other extractions who together make up one of the most progressive and thrifty communities in Pennsylvania or in the Nation.

I know these sturdy people expect their Representative to support the platform of the party on which he campaigned for election. That I have done faithfully. I have supported the Truman administration program on domestic issues such as social security and public housing.

On foreign policy I have supported the administration in economic aid to friendly democratic nations in order to bolster their economies and to strengthen them against Communist aggression. I have also supported military aid for Atlantic Pact nations and for Korea.

In the 2 years I have served in Congress I have received the impression that Congress is just a reflection of the Nation as a whole. The same differences which exist between people at home we find also in Washington.

Differences very often are not held on a very high plane. There is a tendency to evade real issues and to resort to name calling and deception. But, overall, one finds the Members of Congress, whether Republican or Democrat, all good Americans doing and working for what they believe best for the Nation.

Among those with whom I differ I have made some very close friends. There again it is much like back home where I can count among my friends some who have differed with me politically. They include such men as former Mayor John Keim Stauffer, Hunter Rick, Joseph Eisenbrown, Frank Hilton, and others.

My association with community leaders representing people in all walks of life has made it less difficult to understand the views of others on issues which come before this Congress. I have served over the years as a member of the board of directors of the Community General Hospital, the YMCA, the Berks County Red Cross, Community Chest, War Manpower Committee, Rationing Board, Housing Authority, and in many other community activities.

I have sincerely tried to serve, well and faithfully, the people of Berks County. As a lifelong resident of the community whose parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents have been reared in and around Reading and Rockland Township, I believe I understand the sentiments and the wishes of the people I represent.

In my younger days as an apprentice printer I learned to know and admire such men as the late Thomas Shoemaker and Danny Hoch, with whom I worked for many years at the Reading Eagle, and who later served so well as a Member of Congress.

I have been confirmed as a Lutheran as were both my children, but I have always tried to be tolerant in respecting the convictions and the rights of others.

In my younger days I was very active in amateur athletics. I believed in good clean sport as a builder for strong bodies and minds and lasting friendships.

As in sports, I believe that politics should be clean. Differences should be honestly and fairly discussed and decisions made on what is deemed best for the greatest number.

It was in that spirit, so prevalent among the Pennsylvania Dutch, that I have served as a Member of the Eighty-first Congress.

FULL-TIME SERVICE

This Congress has broken a record for long sessions. I have been absent only 1 day except for the short period I was back in Berks County during my primary election campaign.

I have given my full time and attention to the job. Every possible courtesy was given to my constituents. Each person who contacted me got my fullest cooperation regardless of who he was or to what political party he belonged. I tried sincerely to represent all the people of my district and I am certain that those who found it necessary to seek my cooperation and help will so testify.

I have publicly offered to attend any meeting of any group of interested citizens to discuss, debate, or answer questions on any of the important issues that came before this Congress. I take this opportunity to repeat that offer. I especially welcome requests from groups and individuals who may differ with administration policies which I have supported.

I have opened an office in the Reading Post Office in order that I can always be in close touch with my constituents. The office is located on the second floor of the Reading Post Office where any citizen of Berks is welcome to bring his problems.

I have had the honor and opportunity to preside over the House of Representatives, on one occasion, substituting for the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

I endeavored to get favorable action on improving the Railroad Retirement Act. Perhaps my long association with problems of laboring people has made me very sympathetic to the needs of retired workers. The big rise in prices and living costs has made increased benefits for the former railroad workers long overdue. Because Reading has large railroad shops, many Berks citizens would benefit by the improvement of the Railroad Retirement Act.

SOCIAL-WELFARE LEGISLATION

After I left high school I worked as a printer for many years at the Reading Eagle Co., and continued my education by going to school at night. I became acquainted with problems which affected working people and I began to understand the need for legislation to protect our citizens and their families during times of distress which come with industrial accidents, unemployment, advancing age, and other misfortunes. I became an ardent advocate of social security when opposition was most bitter and powerful. In Congress I immediately gave my full support for improved social security. I wanted disability benefits included in the present law. I favored a much wider coverage so that many additional millions of people not now protected would be covered. I consider social security a great institution today. It has raised the health and moral standards of our people and has materially helped in bringing prosperity to our people and progress to the Nation.

It was very interesting to me to see how long-time Republican opponents of social security were forced to accept and support the improved social-security bill that we passed in this Congress. They used to call it statism and welfare state legislation. They said it would mean slavery for the American people. Now today they vote for this most far-reaching welfare measure of the New Deal. But this Republican opposition did keep us from getting some of the improvements that many of us thought were so necessary.

I tried to get a provision in the social-security law which would help aged people who are not covered by social security. Many did not have the opportunity for coverage and benefits before reaching age 65. They must depend on State public assistance.

I consider our old-age-assistance laws in Pennsylvania most unjust and inadequate. Many needy aged folks are denied public assistance on flimsy excuses about relatives who are expected to support them. That policy destroys many good family relationships. It puts a burden upon many young people with incomes not adequate for their own family needs. It also embarrasses the old folks, many of whom suffer in silence because of our disgraceful State public-assistance law.

Since the Federal Government contributes to State public-assistance funds, I tried to make it mandatory that States like Pennsylvania be forced to liberalize the law to qualify for Federal funds. I introduced a bill which would force States to abandon the policy of refusing aid to aged people on the grounds that support must come from relatives.

ECONOMY

I voted for all the proposals of the Hoover Commission for economy in Government that came to the House floor. I was opposed to such false economy moves by the Republican leadership which voted to make blanket appropriation cuts which would cut the efficiency and effectiveness of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—FBI—and other essential Government agencies.

TAX LEGISLATION

I have favored taxation based on the ability to pay. I favored and fought with the liberal Congressmen for immediate enactment of an excess-profits tax before this Congress adjourns.

I considered it unfair to raise taxes on low-income families and on incomes under $5,000 a year without taxing war profits which were mounting rapidly since Korea.

I have introduced a bill which would raise personal income-tax exemptions to $1,000 in order to take the lowest income

groups out of the tax-paying class. This group is already heavily taxed because of many hidden and indirect taxes they pay when buying the necessities of life.

NATURAL RESOURCES

I have favored legislation to preserve and develop our natural resources. I voted for expansion of TVA and have favored other great power-development programs, soil conservation, and flood control. I supported legislation for rural electrification and telephones. All of which I contend helps make our Nation more strong and our people more prosperous.

I opposed the bill to remove restrictions from the gas monopoly. That bill would have resulted in big increases to the consumers of gas in the Nation.

VETERANS

Pennsylvania has the honor of having more war veterans serving as Members of Congress than any other State. I am proud to be one of these veterans and a member of Gregg Post, American Legion.

I have supported legislation to aid the veterans of the Nation. I was especially active in pressing for adequate hospital beds for veterans in need of hospitalization and medical care. There is a serious bed shortage and I have opposed the reduction in hospital beds and the closing of veteran hospitals as false economy.

From personal experience and contacts I have learned of the need for legislation to aid World War I veterans who are suffering from varied physical defects causing them serious financial problems and loss of jobs. For that reason, I supported pension legislation to aid the men who served their country in time of need. Many of their ailments are the result of war service although the records do not always show it.

COMMITTEE WORK

During my term in Congress I served as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. On a number of occasions, I served as chairman of subcommittees. I played an active part in bringing several important bills to the House floor after undue delay because of strong opposition inside the committee.

One of these bills was to increase the salaries of low-income postal employees. Another was a bill to restore the postal service, the curtailment of which I opposed as another example of false economy. I have opposed the policies which put the Post Office Department in a bad light because of the big deficit charged against it.

I have asked that subsidies to magazines and newspapers, to railroads, steamship lines, and airlines be charged directly to the Government rather than against the post office. The policy of listing such subsidies as part of the postal deficit is misleading and deceptive and gives the public a false picture of the post-office management. The maintenance cost of public buildings used by the Department of Agriculture, Treasury, Labor, Armed Services, and other Federal agencies is wrongly charged against the Post Office Department. I have opposed this policy believing that the people are entitled to a true picture of the Nation's postal service.

ALASKA AND HAWAII

I have supported statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. I consider statehood for these territories important to the security of the United States. We need the complete loyalty of the citizens of these outposts and the granting of statehood would give full citizenship to these people and strengthen their ties and loyalty to our country.

I supported the administration bill to remove the restrictions on the sale of oleomargarine. On a teller vote I supported the Granger amendment in regard to restrictions on coloring. I felt that some compromise which might be acceptable to the dairy farmers would be a step in the right direction.

When the amendment was defeated on the teller vote I then supported the administration on the roll-call vote on the oleo issue.

SUBVERSIVES

I supported legislation designed to curb Communist and subversive activities. I voted for the appropriation for the Committee on Un-American Activities at this session of Congress. The committee has been most effective in this Congress. It did not resort to cheap political trickery and smearing which discredited the committee in the Eightieth Congress under the chairmanship of J. Parnell Thomas, and which caused me to oppose the committee appropriation bill in the first session.

New members added to the Un-American Activities Committee in the Eighty-first Congress, including Representative FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, gave prestige to the committee, which was far more successful in its work, accomplished with fairness and dignity.

I have always believed that the most intelligent and most effective method of fighting communism is to raise the economic and health standards of the American people. Depressions, lack of decent housing, lack of adequate care for the aged and needy, make it possible for Communist propaganda to take root.

Social security, public housing, unemployment insurance, high employment, and prosperity have done much to prevent people from being influenced by Communist propaganda.

The recent declaration of the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Charles C. Ralls, supports my position. Rails announced that the VFW is opening a campaign against communism here at home by trying to reduce the poverty, hunger, and misery on which communism breeds. The VFW has decided on a wise course by taking positive action to eradicate the conditions that nurture communism.

KOREA

Communist aggression in Korea brought prompt action by President Truman for military resistance. Republican opponents of the President criticized what they called our unpreparedness to meet the invaders. But the records show that these same critics opposed economic and arms aid to South Korea and to other anti-Communist nations.

The events since the Communist attack gives promise that Korea may be a great turning point in history, and perhaps the end of Communist advance and the beginning of its decline.

Korea has given new strength to the United Nations and added moral and spiritual strength to the free people of the friendly democratic nations in their fight against Communist totalitarianism.

Despite the terrible sacrifices, and despite the constant danger of world conflict, Korea does hold out much promise of preventing another world war and in building for world peace.

I have been deeply moved by the heartaches of parents and families of young men who have been called to the service or who are fighting in Korea. Nothing is more difficult to answer than communications asking why we must always have war and killing. They want to know why their boys have to fight on foreign shores.

Of course, there are many reasons and answers why we must resist the forces of aggression and tyranny. It is essential for our own security as a Nation and for the survival of human freedom.

GENERAL MARSHALL

When Secretary of Defense Johnson resigned Gen. George Marshall was nominated by President Truman to succeed him. I supported legislation to pave the way for the approval of General Marshall.

I consider criticism of General Marshall by the Republican leadership to be most unfair because Marshall is a man of great ability and wide experience. He was one of the great war leaders and is one of the great men of our time.

Party politics should not be used to discredit one who has served his country as General Marshall has. His selection strengthens the faith of the free peoples of Europe and Asia in the United States, as they hold General Marshall in high esteem.

The Botanist, Passaic, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, more than 75,000 copies of the Botanist, a publication by and for the employees of the Botany Mills, Inc., Passaic, N. J., are mailed monthly to people throughout the United States. Every Member of Congress receives a copy.

I wish that millions of copies of the August 1950 issue could be distributed to the Communist countries behind the iron curtain. A running story of activities in one of our country's greatest mills, it would provide a most effective answer to those seeking to malign and distort our way of life.

The August cover carries a photostatic reprint of the American's Creed by William Tyler Page, and the first story is that of the seventeenth annual picnic of Botany's Foremen's Association at Fairlawn, N. J., on August 13, when 1,500 fun-loving adults and children were entertained by the Botany band and chorus

and treated to tantalizing eats, games, and prizes, the latter including a large number of television sets and household appliances.

The President's Corner is a monthly contribution by Col. Charles F. H. Johnson, who heads this great organization and in the current issue he indulges in some down-to-earth comment on troublemakers and liars. Speaking of the Russian worker, Colonel Johnson says:

In 1941 he could purchase one-tenth as much food as a United States worker, while today it is only one-thirteenth. Most Russians—

He continues—

live on black bread and it takes 7 weeks of a worker's full pay to buy a suit of clothes.

In other parts of the President's Corner Colonel Johnson discusses the dangers of foreign imports, the need for domestic economy as we build up our armed strength to repel aggressors, and he indulges in a tribute to the longshoremen who refused to do business with and for Russia.

The August issue is replete with pictures of the children of Botany workers and, of course, there are "shots" of Botany products and style shows. There is a special article giving information on social-security benefits and an editorial page with quotes from world leaders.

Here are just a few of the hundreds of personal items:

Gene Roehrich of the billing department has just completed a total of 22 years for Botany. Ann Anderson, of the wool shoppe, is spending a week at Atlantic City and another week at Middletown, N. Y. Altha Griffin, of the drawing department, is vacationing at New Orleans. Arthur and Eva Garand, of the twisting department, are motoring to Canada. Congratulations to a grand old couple who have been Botany employees for a long time and are now celebrating their forty-ninth wedding anniversary—Mr. and Mrs. Scheirek. Maj. Gen. Irving J. Phillipson, our director of industrial relations, has been named head of the Passaic City Civil Defense Council. Helen Mahalko and Tillie Wierzbecki are thrilled over their recent cruise to Bermuda. Carl Lombardo, of the wool store, was recently honored by an appointment to the Lodi Board of Health. The Botany baseball nine are now leaders in the City Industrial League. The Botanist's photo contest ends October 2. Charles Macek, an oiler in the engineering department, and Stanley August, foreman in the weaving yarn cellar, are proud of the record catch of 90 bluefish made by their party on a recent fishing trip off the Atlantic Highlands. Stanley Byra, office janitor, is a member of the Fiftieth Armored Division band of the National Guard and is at Pine Camp, N. Y. for 2 weeks' training maneuvers.

I congratulate the editorial staff of the Botanist, which includes Mary E. Sattan, editor and business manager; Edward Gras, sports editor; Howard Greene and John Gregory, cartoonists; Walter Carlock, staff photographer; and numerous reporters who make contributions.

Among the quotes on the editorial page is this one from Abraham Lincoln:

I like to see a man proud of the place in which he lives; and also live that the place will be proud of him.

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

The report includes all record votes, quorum calls, and my votes on other important measures acted on in this session of the Congress. The purpose of this report is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through some 15,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It also contains information which is not obtainable from any public record but which I feel should be available to the people of my district.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions as contained in the report are for the purpose of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. I believe this word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are taken from the official titles of the bills which unfortunately do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the first session of the Eightieth Congress. This is the fourth report of my voting and attendance record. These four reports show how I voted on 654 issues which have been before the House of Representatives. Based on the quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 95 percent. The report follows:

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950		
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 9	do	Present.
3	Jan. 18	do	Present.
4	Jan. 19	do	Present.
		H. R. 5330, authorizing economic aid for the Republic of Korea:	
5	do	On recommittal to Committee on Foreign Affairs for further study and hearings. (Defeated, 190 to 194.)	Yea.
6	do	On passage. (Defeated, 191 to 193.)	Nay.
7	Jan. 20	Quorum call	Present.
8	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 161 to 255.)	Yea.
9	do	H. Res. 133, amending rules of House by repealing 21-day discharge rule which permits chairmen of legislative committees to bypass the Committee on Rules. (Defeated, 183 to 236.)	Yea.
10	Jan. 23	Quorum call	Present.
11	do	do	Present.
12	do	do	Present.
13	do	do	Present.
14	do	do	Present.
15	do	Motion ordering the previous question, thus ending debate on H. Res. 217, providing a rule for the consideration of H. R. 331, a bill to provide statehood for Alaska. (Passed, 373 to 25.)	Yea.
	do	H. Res. 218, providing for consideration of H. R. 49, a bill to provide statehood for Hawaii. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
16	Jan. 25	Quorum call	Present.
17	do	do	Present.
18	do	do	Present.
19	do	do	Present.
20	Jan. 27	do	Present.
21	do	do	Present.
22	do	do	Present.
23	do	do	Present.
24	do	do	Present.
	1950		
25	Jan. 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H. J. Res. 398, increasing the cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended:	
26	Jan. 31	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 136 to 239.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.
27	Feb. 1	Quorum call	Present.
28	do	Motion that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with. (Defeated, 104 to 271.)	Nay.
29	do	Quorum call	Present.
30	do	do	Present.
31	do	do	Present.
32	Feb. 2	do	Present.
33	do	do	Present.
34	do	do	Present.
35	Feb. 6	do	Present.
36	Feb. 7	do	Present.
37	do	do	Present.
38	do	do	Present.
39	Feb. 8	do	Present.
		H. R. 2945, increasing certain postal rates:	
40	Feb. 9	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 150 to 218.)	Nay.
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		S. 2319, authorizing economic assistance to Korea and certain parts of China for a period ending June 30, 1950:	
41	do	On motion to recommit to Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to reduce amount of authorization from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000 and limiting amount advanced by RFC from $30,000,000 to $10,000,000. (Defeated, 137 to 239.)	Yea.
42	do	On passage. (Passed, 240 to 134.)	Nay.
43	Feb. 14	Quorum call	Absent.
44	Feb. 15	do	Absent.
45	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. (Approved, 257 to 82.)	Absent.[1]
46	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 97 to 236.)	Absent.[2]

[1] Would have voted "yea."
[2] Would have votee "nay."

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950		
47	Feb. 15	Motion to dispense with Calendar Wednesday. (Defeated 94 to 238.)	Absent.[2]
48	...do.....	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 109 to 218.)	Absent.[2]
49	...do.....	Quorum call	Absent.
50	...do.....	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 126 to 198.)	Absent.[2]
51	...do.....	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under cal. of the House. (Approved 243 to 102).	Absent.[1]
		S. 2734, promoting the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes and provide for a better utilization of the resources of their reservation:	
52	Feb. 21	On amendment extending State laws to cover certain offenses to the Navajo and Hopi Reservations. (Defeated 142 to 196).	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
53	Feb. 22	Quorum call	Present.
54	...do.....	...do	Present.
55	...do.....	Motion to adjourn and thus prevent consideration of H. R. 4453 (FEPC). (Defeated 127 to 278).	Nay.
56	...do.....	Motion to dispense with the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday and prevent consideration of H. R. 4453 (FEPC). (Defeated 121 to 285.)	Nay.
57	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
58	...do.....	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. (Approved 290 to 115.)	Yea.
59	...do.....	Motion to adjourn and thus prevent consideration of H. R. 4453 (FEPC). (Defeated 127 to 284.)	Nay.
60	...do.....	Motion to consider H. R. 4453, the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act. (Approved 287 to 121.)	Yea.
61	...do.....	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated 165 to 239.)	Nay.
62	...do.....	Motion to consider H. R. 4453. (Approved 270 to 134)	Yea.
		H. R. 4453, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin (FEPC):	
63	...do.....	On amendment inserting the text of H. R. 6841 providing for voluntary compliance and removing the compulsory provisions of H. R. 4453. (Adopted, 221 to 178.)	Yea.
64	Feb. 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4453, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin:	
65	...do.....	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 177 to 239.)	Nay.
66	...do.....	On passage. (Passed, 240 to 177.)	Yea.
67	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Absent.
68	...do.....	...do	Present.
69	Feb. 28	...do	Present.
70	...do.....	...do	Present.
		Conference report on S. 1008, defining the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (basing point bill):	
71	...do.....	Motion to send to further conference. (Adopted, 240 to 144.)	Yea.
72	...do.....	Motion to table a motion instructing House conferees to insist on amendment of the House. (Adopted, 210 to 161.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5953, authorizing contributions of $1,229,240 to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc. (CARE), to supply educational and scientific equipment and material to European libraries:	
73	Mar. 1	Motion to strike out the enacting clause, thus killing the bill. (Adopted, 265 to 163.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4846, creating a National Science Foundation to support and initiate scientific research:	
74	...do.....	On motion to recommit to the committee for further study. (Defeated, 134 to 240.)	Yea.
75	...do.....	On passage. (Passed, 247 to 125.)	Nay.
76	Mar. 2	Quorum call	Present.
77	Mar. 3	...do	Present.
78	...do.....	H. R. 331, providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union. On passage. (Passed, 186 to 146.)	Yea.
79	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
80	Mar. 7	H. R. 49, providing statehood for Hawaii. On passage. (Passed, 262 to 110.)	Yea.
81	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
		Conference report on H. R. 4406, establishing an International Claims Commission for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States and American nationals against foreign governments:	
82	...do.....	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 209 to 165.)	Nay.
83	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
		Conference report on H. R. 2023, regulating oleomargarine and to repeal certain taxes relating to oleo:	
84	...do.....	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 262 to 106.)	Nay.
85	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 87, providing promotions for veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department. On passage (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.
86	Mar. 9	Quorum call	Present.
87	...do.....	...do	Present.
88	...do.....	H. Res. 481, making in order the consideration of H. R. 874, providing a grant of $36,400,000 to the States for Public Library Service Demonstration. (Adopted, 209 to 140.)	Nay.
89	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 874, providing a grant of $36,400,000 to the States, for Public Library Service Demonstration:	
90	...do.....	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 162 to 176.)	Yea.
91	...do.....	On passage. (Defeated, 161 to 164.)	Nay.
92	Mar. 13	Quorum call	Present.
93	...do.....	...do	Present.
94	...do.....	...do	Present.
		H. R. 3247, amending the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of 1934 of the District of Columbia:	
95	...do.....	On motion to consider bill. (Rejected, 69 to 241.)	Nay.
96	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
97	...do.....	...do	Present.
		Conference report on S. 1008, defining the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (basing-point bill):	
98	...do.....	On motion to recommit to committee of conference. (Defeated, 175 to 204.)	Nay.
		On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, voice vote.)	Yea.
99	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
100	...do.....	H. R. 4703, relating to the internal security of the United States by tightening safeguards against espionage and sedition, on passage. (Passed, 368 to 2.)	Yea.
101	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		Conference report on H. J. Res. 398, increasing the cotton and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938:	
102	Feb. 22	On motion to recommit to committee of conference. (Defeated, 116 to 225.)	Yea.
		On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, voice vote.)	Nay.
		S. 2105, to provide subsidies to certain mines for the exploration for and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals:	
103	...do.....	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 155 to 161.)	Yea.
104	...do.....	On passage. (Defeated, 144 to 166.)	Nay.
105	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7057, relative to deductions by land-grant colleges of certain estimates of cost presented to the Veterans' Administration.	
106	...do.....	On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 245 to 101.)	Nay.
107	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7402, to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families, and for other purposes.	
	...do.....	On amendment to prohibit discrimination because of race, creed, or color. (Teller vote—Defeated, 111 to 139.)	Yea.
108	...do.....	On amendment deleting middle-income housing section. (Adopted, 218 to 155.)	Yea.
109	...do.....	On passage. (Passed, 261 to 10.)	Nay.
110	Mar. 23	H. Res. 482, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Adopted, 248 to 12.)	Yea.
		Conference report on H. J. Res. 398, increasing cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.	
111	...do.....	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 197 to 156.)	Nay.
112	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
113	Mar. 24	...do	Present.
114	...do.....	...do	Present.
115	...do.....	H. Res. 518, the rule providing for consideration of H. R. 7797, providing foreign economic assistance. (Adopted, 262 to 22.)	Yea.
116	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
117	...do.....	...do	Absent.
118	Mar. 27	...do	Present.
119	...do.....	...do	Present.
120	Mar. 28	...do	Present.
121	Mar. 29	...do	Present.
122	Mar. 30	...do	Present.
123	Mar. 31	...do	Present.
		H. R. 7797, providing for foreign economic assistance and authorizing program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas and for other purposes:	
	...do.....	On motion to strike out title III relating to program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. (Defeated, teller vote, 141 to 189.)	Yea.
124	...do.....	On motion to recommit with instructions to strike out title III. (Rejected, 150 to 220.)	Yea.
125	...do.....	On passage. (Passed, 287 to 86.)	Nay.
126	...do.....	H. Res. 531, providing for House agreement to Senate amendment to H. R. 1758, amending the Natural Gas Act. (Adopted, 176 to 174.)	Yea.
127	Apr. 3	Quorum call	Present.
	...do.....	H. R. 4386, tightening the Foreign Agents Registration Act. On passage (passed, voice vote).	Yea.
128	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
129	...do.....	...do	Present.
130	...do.....	...do	Present.
131	Apr. 4	...do	Present.
132	Apr. 5	...do	Present.
	...do.....	H. R. 7846, authorizing Army, Navy, and Air Force to contract for plans and specifications and to take options on sites, to expedite construction of rental housing on defense posts. On passage (passed, voice vote).	Yea.
133	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
134	...do.....	...do	Present.
135	...do.....	...do	Present.
136	Apr. 20	...do	Present.
137	Apr. 21	S. J. Res. 166, providing for posthumous award of appropriate medals to crew of plane who lost their lives over the Baltic Sea in performance of their duty. (Adopted, 333 to 0.)	Yea.
138	...do.....	Quorum call	Present.
139	Apr. 24	...do	Present.
140	Apr. 25	...do	Present.
141	Apr. 26	...do	Present.
142	Apr. 27	...do	Present.
143	...do.....	...do	Present.
	May 1	S. 277, making it a criminal offense, and fixing penalties, to reveal information about official secret codes. On passage (passed, voice vote).	Yea.

[1] Would have voted "yea."
[2] Would have voted "nay."

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950		
144	May 1	Quorum call	Absent.
145	do	do	Absent.
		H. R. 7185, providing open competitive examinations for veterans for position of apprentice in the Federal service:	
146	do	On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 209 to 93.)	Absent.[1]
		H. R. 6354, authorizing District of Columbia Board of Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia:	
147	do	On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 194 to 87.)	Absent.[1]
148	May 3	Conference report on H. R. 5472, authorizing construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control. (Adopted, 210 to 137.)	Nay.
149	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
150	May 1	Conference report on H. R. 1243, amending the Hatch Act relative to penalties for violations of this act by Federal civil-service employees. (Adopted, 203 to 140.)	Yea.
151	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
152	do	do	Present.
153	May 6	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 98 to 170.)	Nay.
154	do	Quorum call	Present.
155	May 8	do	Present.
156	May 9	do	Present.
157	May 10	do	Present.
		H. R. 7786, making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951:	
	do	On Rooney amendment authorizing Secretaries of State and Commerce to terminate the employment of any employee in their Departments when they deem such termination advisable in the interest of the United States. (Adopted, voice vote.)	Yea.
158	do	On Gore amendment increasing the funds for grants for hospital construction under the Public Health Service from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000. (Adopted, 258 to 131.)	Nay.
159	do	On Case amendment reducing funds for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration by $2,950,000. (Adopted, 222 to 163.)	Yea.
160	do	On Thomas amendment as amended by the Taber amendment specifying certain percentage reductions of nonmilitary operation expenditures effecting a reduction of $600,000,000. (Adopted, 274 to 112.)	Yea.
161	do	On Jensen amendment reducing number of Federal employees by not filling vacancies that occur in certain civilian agencies. (Adopted, 201 to 185.)	Yea.
	do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, voice vote.)	Yea.
162	do	On passage of bill. (Passed, 362 to 21.)	Nay.
163	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
	do	S. 2596, defining the authority of Veterans' Administration in carrying out veterans education program under "GI bill of rights":	
		On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 102 to 145, division vote.)	Nay.
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
164	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
165	do	do	Present.
166	do	do	Present.
167	do	H. Res. 567, providing for the consideration of H. R. 5990. (Adopted, 194 to 32.)	Nay.
		H. R. 5990, providing for construction, development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway as a part of the District of Columbia park system:	
168	do	On motion for consideration of bill. (Adopted, 192 to 29.)	Nay.
	May 16	H. R. 5074, authorizing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to equip and operate research stations. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
169	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7941, amending and supplementing the Federal-Aid Road Act to authorize appropriations for the construction of highways:	
	May 19	On motion to recommit reducing authorization by $200,000,000. (Defeated 24 to 143, division vote.)	Yea.
170	do	On passage. (Passed, 246 to 34.)	Yea.
	do	H. R. 7579, extending Government synthetic-rubber-manufacturing program to June 30, 1952. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
171	May 23	Quorum call	Present.
172	do	Conference report on H. R. 7797, extending the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and authorizing program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. (Adopted, 247 to 88.)	Nay.
	do	H. R. 7764, authorizing naval ship-construction program, including modernization of submarines. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
	do	S. 2440, authorizing 2-year program of construction of public works at Army, Navy, and Air Force stations in United States and abroad. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
173	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
	do	H. R. 6826, extending the Selective Service Act for 1 year to continue registrations and with authority to President to call up National Guard and Reserves in the event of emergency. (Passed, 216 to 11 division vote.)	Yea.
	June 5	H. R. 6217, providing for out-patient treatment of veterans of Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, and Philippine Insurrection. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
	do	H. R. 7827, increasing criminal penalties for violation of Sherman antitrust laws:	
		On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
174	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
	1950		
		H. R. 7468, omnibus claims bill, for relief of sundry claimants:	
175	do	On adoption of amendment deleting title III, for relief of Harry Tansey. (Adopted, 184 to 119.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
	June 7	H. R. 8198, modernizing internal organization of the Army. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8276, extending the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended (rent control):	
176	June 13	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 143 to 227.)	Yea.
177	do	On passage. (Passed, 202 to 163.)	Nay.
178	June 21	Conference report on H. R. 6567 increasing $2,000,000,000 the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. (Adopted, 235 to 81.)	Yea.
179	do	Conference report on S. 3181, extending the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 by providing 6-month extension and giving local governing bodies the option of continuing rent control for another 6 months. (Adopted, 176 to 145.)	Nay.
180	June 22	H. J. Res. 334, amending certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in certain international organizations by increasing United States share of expenses in 5 international organizations. (Adopted, 209 to 91.)	Nay.
181	do	H. Res. 649, making in order consideration of S. 2269, providing for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army. (Adopted, 232 to 61.)	Yea.
182	do	S. 2269, providing for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army. On passage. (Passed, 201 to 84.)	Yea.
		Veto by the President of H. R. 87, relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department:	
183	June 26	On motion that bill and message be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed. (Rejected, 115 to 165.)	Yea.
184	do	On overriding veto. (Overridden, 213 to 72 (⅔ majority necessary).)	Nay.
185	do	Quorum call	Present.
186	June 27	do	Present.
187	do	H. R. 6826, extending the Selective Service Act of 1948 to July 9, 1951. On passage. (Passed, 315 to 4.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8920, reducing excise taxes:	
188	June 29	On recommittal to Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report it back as 2 separate bills, the first bill containing those provisions relating to excise taxes and the second bill containing the remaining provisions of H. R. 8920. (Rejected, 147 to 238.)	Yea.
189	do	On passage. (Passed, 375 to 14.)	Yea.
		S. 3550, extending import-control authority over fats and oils and rice and rice products for a 1-year period from June 30, 1950, but discontinuing authority to control import of coconut oil:	
	do	On amendment to provide import control authority over potatoes, cheese, and hams. (Rejected, 32 to 51, division vote.)	Yea.
190	do	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with an amendment to include import control authority over coconut oil and cheese. (Rejected, 72 to 264.)	Yea.
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.
191	do	Quorum call	Present.
192	June 30	do	Present.
		S. 3336, providing for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico:	
193	do	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with amendment providing that an island-wide referendum shall be held in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. (Defeated, 1 to 260.)	Nay.
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
194	do	Quorum call	Present.
195	July 10	do	Present.
	do	H. R. 7954, to promote the development and maintenance of American flag shipping on the Great Lakes. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
	do	S. 2591, authorizing the U. S. Public Health Service to support research and training in rheumatism, arthritis, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, etc. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
	do	H. R. 6533, authorizing Federal aid to States for fish restoration and management projects. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
196	do	Quorum call	Present.
197	do	H. Res. 647, disapproving Reorganization Plan 27, creating a Department of Health, Education, and Security. (Passed, 249 to 71.)	Yea.
198	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8083, authorizing the Export-Import Bank of Washington to guarantee United States private capital invested abroad:	
199	July 12	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 156 to 184.)	Yea.
200	do	On passage. (Passed, 195 to 151.)	Nay.
		H. R. 7439, to protect the national security of the United States by giving power to summarily dismiss employees for security reasons to Attorney General, Secretaries of State, Commerce, Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force and Treasury, and Chairmen of Atomic Energy Commission and National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:	
201	do	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with an amendment providing an additional right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission from any action by the heads of such agencies or departments. (Defeated, 144 to 193.)	Nay.
202	do	On passage. (Passed, 327 to 14.)	Yea.

[1] Would have voted "yea."

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950		
	July 13	H. R. 8909, establishing Civil Defense Organizations for District of Columbia. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
203	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
		S. J. Res. 2, proposing constitutional amendment abolishing Electoral College and apportioning count of electoral votes in proportion to actual vote in each State:	
204	...do	On motion to suspend rules and pass the bill. (Defeated, 134 to 210 (two-thirds vote necessary).)	Yea.
		H. J. Res. 502, continuing until June 30, 1951, the exemption of certain import taxes on copper:	
205	...do	On motion to suspend rules and pass resolution. (Passed, 283 to 58 (two-thirds vote necessary).)	Yea.
206	...do	Quorum call	Present.
	...do	H. R. 8763, giving Government right to sue for damages in violations of Clayton Antitrust Act and fixing statute of limitations at 6 years:	
		On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
207	...do	Quorum call	Present.
208	...do	H. R. 10, facilitating the deportation of undesirable aliens from the United States and providing for the supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of United States. On passage. (Passed, 326 to 15.)	Yea.
209	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
210	July 19	S. 3809, extending the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 and authorizing appropriations therefor through the fiscal year 1951. On passage. (Passed, 362 to 1.)	Yea.
	...do	H. R. 8975, extending for 3 years Government program for development of synthetic liquid fuel. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		S. 2822, amending the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and increasing the insurance coverage of individual deposits by the Corporation from $5,000 to $10,000 and simplifying the computation of the assessments charged insured banks:	
211	July 20	On amendment authorizing $15,000,000 for a site and a new building for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. (Defeated, 90 to 227.)	Nay.
	...do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
212	...do	Quorum call	Present.
213	July 24	...do	Present.
		H. R. 6454, authorizing the appointment of 2 additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois:	
214	...do	On motion to recommit to the committee with instructions to reduce from 2 to 1 the number of judges to be provided by the bill. (Defeated, 116 to 163.)	Yea.
215	...do	On passage. (Passed, 163 to 110.)	Nay.
		H. R. 6240, authorizing the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana:	
216	...do	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to provide that the judgeship created by the bill be temporary. (Defeated, 102 to 171.)	Yea.
	...do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.
217	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
	...do	S. 3937, extending for 1 year expiring enlistments in armed services. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
	...do	H. R. 9178, to remove indefinitely the limit on the size of the Armed Forces. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
	July 26	H. R. 9038, authorizing the President to draw up business-type budget and modernize accounting procedures. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
218	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
	...do	S. 3859, authorizing President to control movements and to search foreign vessels in United States waters. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
	...do	S. 3653, to improve the fiscal and accounting methods of Bureau of Engraving and Printing. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9109, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to increasing the national acreage allotments for cotton, wheat, and peanuts:	
219	July 31	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 120 to 179.)	Yea.
	...do	On passage. (Passed, 160 to 85, division vote.)	Nay.
220	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
221	Aug. 3	...do	Present.
222	Aug. 4	...do	Present.
223	Aug. 7	...do	Present.
		H. R. 8396, authorizing President to grant financial assistance to States and local governments in major disasters:	
224	...do	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with an amendment providing for congressional approval of such grants. (Defeated, 25 to 232.)	Yea.
	...do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.
	...do	S. 3959 (H. R. 9129), amending the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act to effect economies and increase efficiency in handling Government property and records. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5967, amending the Interstate Commerce Act, to clarify the status of freight forwarders and their relationship with motor common carriers:	
225	Aug. 8	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 145 to 233.)	Yea.
	...do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.
226	...do	H. R. 7009, making permanent the temporary district judgeship in the eastern and western districts of Missouri. On passage. (Passed, 240 to 133.)	Nay.
227	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9176, to provide for defense production and economic controls:	
	Aug. 9	On Kunkel amendment to strike out authorization to impose selective control of prices. (Adopted, 118 to 96, teller vote.)	Yea.
228	Aug. 10	On Spence amendment providing authority to stabilize prices and wages by either voluntary controls or by establishment of ceilings. (Adopted, 393 to 3.)	Yea.
		On Wolcott amendment exempting new construction from credit controls. (Adopted, 202 to 188.)	Yea.
230	...do	On Wolcott amendment limiting control of credit to consumer credit and real-estate credit. (Defeated, 173 to 224.)	Yea.
231	...do	On Cooley amendment deleting from the bill provisions relating to control of commodity speculation. (Adopted, 198 to 194.)	Yea.
232	...do	On passage. (Passed, 383 to 12.)	Yea.
233	...do	H. Res. 749, citing Julius Emspak for contempt of Congress by reason of failure to answer questions before Committee on Un-American Activities. (Adopted, 372 to 1.)	Yea.
234	Aug. 14	Motion to adjourn. (48 to 274)	Nay.
		H. R. 8195, rescinding the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services:	
235	...do	On motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H. Res. 667, providing for the consideration of H. R. 8195. (Adopted, 248 to 81.)	Nay.
236	...do	S. 192, conferring jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties. On passage. (Passed, 295 to 4.)	Yea.
237	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
	...do	H. R. 8594, authorizing building program of armories and other facilities for National Guard and Reserves. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8195, rescinding the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services:	
238	Aug. 16	On amendment directing that other essential postal services shall not be curtailed or terminated by reason of the bill and authorizing appropriation of sufficient funds to restore former postal deliveries. (Rejected, 159 to 213.)	Yea.
239	...do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 111 to 261.)	Yea.
240	...do	On passage. (Passed, 264 to 108.)	Nay.
		Conference report on H. R. 6000, extending and revising the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system and amending the public-assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act:	
241	...do	On motion to order previous question on motion to recommit. (188 to 186.)	Yea.
	...do	On motion to recommit to committee of conference with instructions to authorize coverage for public employees presently under the Wisconsin Retirement Fund. (Rejected, voice vote.)	Yea.
242	...do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 374 to 1)	Nay.
243	...do	H. Res. 716, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6277, giving military discharges to the members of the Russian Railway Service Corps. (Defeated, 91 to 242.)	Nay.
		H. R. 7570, providing for the appointment of 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio.	
244	Aug. 17	On motion to recommit to committee until such time as any vacancies existing in the northern district of Ohio have been filled. (Defeated, 142 to 146.)	Yea.
245	...do	On passage. (Defeated, 133 to 148.)	Nay.
246	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
247	...do	...do	Present.
	...do	S. 2317, providing for 3-year program of Federal aid for construction in school districts overburdened as a result of defense or other Federal activities. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
	...do	H. R. 9141, authorizing Government-guaranteed loans to encourage improvement and construction of terminal markets for perishable farm products. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
248	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
	...do	H. R. 8850, creating 2 additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture and an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture:	
249	...do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 122 to 220.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.
250	Aug. 24	H. R. 3775, providing for an additional district judge for the third division of the District Court for the District of Alaska. On passage. (Passed, 196 to 147.)	Nay.
251	...do	H. R. 9477, providing allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services and suspending certain provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. On passage. (Passed, 361 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8677, providing for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal and to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone:	
252	...do	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to amend bill to provide that no tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in coastwise trade of the United States. (Defeated, 20 to 330.)	Nay.
	...do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		S. 456, authorizing the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of an additional public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia:	
253	Aug. 25	On motion to recommit to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study and investigation. (Defeated, 124 to 226.)	Yea.
	...do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.
254	...do	Quorum call	Present.
		Conference report on H. R. 7786, making appropriation for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951.	
	...do	On agreeing to Senate amendment providing for loan to Spain. (Adopted, 164 to 80, division vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9526, making supplemental appropriation of $16,700,000,000 additional funds for armed services and military assistance abroad to meet Korean situation.	
	Aug. 26	On Teague amendment increasing funds authorized for Office of Civilian Defense in the District of Columbia. (Defeated, 141 to 73, division vote.)	Yea.
255	...do	On passage. (Passed, 311 to 1.)	Yea.

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		S. 868, providing for dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry:	
	1950 Aug. 28	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
256	do	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3357 to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
257	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
258	do	H. Res. 826, making in order consideration of H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. (Adopted, 357 to 1.)	Yea.
259	do	H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, barring Communists from Government jobs, requiring labeling and identification of Communist propaganda, denying passports to members of the Communist Party and prohibiting contributions by Government officials to Communist-front organizations. On passage. (Passed, 354 to 20.)	Yea.
260	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
261	do	S. 4029, providing for authorizations through which the Armed Forces can meet the demands for additional personnel in the medical, dental, and allied categories to support the expanding forces without requiring the large-scale call to active duty without their consent of Reserve officers who have had substantial periods of service in World War II. On passage. (Passed, 363 to 1.)	Yea.
262	do	H. Res. 834, citing Edward A. Rumely for contempt of Congress for failure to furnish certain information to the Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 183 to 175.)	Nay.
263	do	H. Res. 835, citing William L. Patterson for contempt of Congress for failure to furnish certain information to the Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities (Adopted, 238 to 106.)	Nay.
	do	H. R. 9320 (S. 3995), providing system of policing airways. over populous centers and defense areas. On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
264	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
265	do	do	Present.
266	do	H. Res. 836, citing Joseph P. Kamp for contempt of Congress for failure to furnish certain information to Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 215 to 115.)	Nay.
267	do	Quorum call	Present.
268	do	H. Res. 818, providing for consideration of S. 784, for the relief of the First, Second and Third National Steamship Co. (Defeated, 139 to 159.)	Nay.
269	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
270	Sept. 13	do	Present.
271	do	do	Present.
		H. Res. 842, providing for sending H. R. 8920, tax-revision bill, to conference:	
272	Sept. 14	On motion ordering the previous question. (Rejected, 106 to 226.)	Yea.
273	do	On Eberharter amendment requiring the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee to report a bill to levy an excess-profits tax before the adjournment of the 81st, Cong. (Adopted, 331 to 2.)	Yea.
274	do	H. Res. 847, providing for sending H. R. 9490, Communist-registration bill, to conference. (Adopted, 324 to 9.)	Yea.
		Veto by President of H. R. 6217, providing out-patient treatment for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, and Philippine Insurrection:	
275	1950 Sept. 14	On overriding veto. (Overridden, 321 to 12.)	Yea.
		Veto by President of H. J. Res. 238, providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence:	
276	do	On overriding veto. (Overridden, 307 to 14.)	Yea.
277	Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9646, amending the National Security Act to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army George C. Marshall to the office of Secretary of Defense.	
278	do	On passage. (Passed, 220 to 105.)	Nay.
	Sept. 18	S. 2609, providing a correctional system for youth offenders convicted in the courts of the United States:	
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
	do	S. 2875, extending for 5 years the Federal Airport Act:	
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
	do	S. 4088, authorizing the States to establish military forces, other than as part of National Guard units, to serve in the absence of the National Guard:	
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
279	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
280	do	Conference report on H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. (Adopted, 303 to 20.)	Yea.
		Conference report on H. R. 9526, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1951:	
281	do	On motion to concur in Senate amendment dispensing with bonds for imported seasonal agriculture labor. (Defeated, 160 to 172.)	Yea.
		S. 3437, to strengthen the Atomic Energy Act by increasing the salary of the Commissioners and by establishing 3-year term of office for General Manager and amending patent provisions.	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
282	Sept. 21	Quorum call	Present.
283	do	do	Present.
		Conference report on H. R. 9526, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1951—motion to concur in an amendment of the Senate cutting off all aid to countries that ship commodities that may be used in manufacture of arms to Russia or its satellites with a House amendment providing that such aid should be cut off upon determination by the National Security Council that such trade is against the best interests of the United States:	
284	do	On ordering the previous question. (Ordered, 167 to 149.)	Nay.
285	do	On concurring and adoption of amendment. (Adopted, 286 to 30.)	Yea.
286	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
287	do	Conference report on H. R. 8920, increasing individual and corporate income taxes and closing certain loopholes. On adoption of report. (Adopted, 328 to 7.)	Yea.
288	do	Veto by President of H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. On overriding veto. (Overridden, 286 to 48.)	Yea.
	do	H. Con. Res. 287, providing for recess of the Congress until Nov. 27.	
		On ordering the previous question. (Ordered 224 to 64, division vote.)	Nay.
		On adoption of resolution. (Adopted, voice vote)	Nay.

AN EXPLANATION OF TERMS

Of necessity the report contains parliamentary and legislative terms with which the reader may not be familiar. An explanation of some of these terms may, therefore, be helpful:

A. A quorum call consists of a calling of the roll of Members to determine whether or not a quorum—a majority of Members—is present. No business may be conducted when it is found that a quorum is not present.

B. Recommittal: Generally, on all important bills, a motion to recommit the bill to a committee, with or without instructions, is voted upon by the House before it votes upon passage of the bill. If such a motion is adopted, it means that the bill will be changed, delayed, or even killed. However, when a motion to recommit is accompanied by instructions, the vote generally indicates whether the Member is in favor of or opposed to the change in the legislation proposed by the instructions and does not necessarily indicate his position on the bill as a whole. A motion to recommit with instructions, if adopted, does not kill the bill.

C. The type of bill can be determined by the letters which precede its number. All bills that originate in the House are designated by an H; those that originate in the Senate, by an S. There are four main types:

First. H. R. (S.) designates a bill which, when passed by both Houses in identical form and signed by the President, becomes law.

Second. H. J. Res. (S. J. Res.) designates a joint resolution which must pass both Houses and be signed by the President before becoming law. It is generally used for continuing the life of an existing law, or in submitting to the States a constitutional amendment, in which case it does not require the signature of the President but must be passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses.

Third. H. Con. Res. (S. Con. Res.) designates a concurrent resolution. To become effective it must be passed by both the House and Senate but does not require the President's signature. It is used to take joint action which is purely within the jurisdiction of Congress. Many emergency laws carry the provision that they may be terminated by concurrent resolution, thus eliminating the possibility of a Presidential veto.

Fourth. H. Res. (S. Res.) designates a simple resolution of either body. It does not require approval by the other body nor the signature of the President. It is used to deal with matters that concern one House only, such as changing rules, creating special committees, etc.

D. Rule: Important bills, after approval of the committee concerned, go to the House Committee on Rules where a rule, in the form of a House resolution (H. Res.), is granted covering the amount of debate, consideration of amendments, and other parliamentary questions.

E. Conference: Representatives from both Houses of Congress meet in conference to work out differences existing in the legislation as passed by the two bodies. Upon conclusion of their conference, a report is submitted to each

House setting forth the agreements reached. Each House then must act by way of adopting or rejecting the report in whole or in part.

F. Ordering the previous question: A motion to order the previous question, if adopted, shuts off further debate on the question before the House and prevents further amendments to such proposition.

G. A bill may pass, or be defeated, by one of the following kind of votes:

First. Voice vote: The Speaker first asks all in favor to say "aye," then those opposed to say "nay." If there is no question as to the result, this is sufficient.

Second. Division: If the result of the voice vote is in doubt, the Speaker asks those in favor to stand, then those opposed to stand. He counts in each instance and announces the result. If he is in doubt, or if demand is made by one-fifth of a quorum, then—

Third. Tellers are ordered. A member on each side of the question is appointed as tellers, and they take their places at each side of the center aisle. Those in favor walk through and are counted. Those opposed do likewise. The result settles most questions, but any Member, supported by one-fifth of a quorum, can ask for a roll call. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution.

Fourth. Roll calls place each Member on record on the particular measure involved. Each Member's name is called, and his vote recorded. Roll calls constitute the official voting record of the House. The results of the roll calls are indicated in parentheses in the record above. The "yeas" are shown first; the "nays" last.

Poland Will Rise Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, time and again I have raised my voice in protest against the unrighteous treatment that was accorded Poland at Yalta. It is a wrong that must be righted. This is our obligation as a freedom-loving nation. I expressed my views on this subject in an address I delivered at the dedication of the Polish-American Community House on Saturday, March 18, 1950, at Camden, N. J. In accordance with the request granted to me by the House, I am including that address as part of my remarks. It is as follows:

I deeply appreciate the invitation that you have given me to participate with you on this memorable occasion that means so much to your organization and the civic life of the city of Camden.

The Polish population in our city is one of the most progressive and civic minded segments of our entire population. This organization and the splendid building you have erected to carry on its activities is evidence of this fact that cannot be disputed. I congratulate you most sincerely.

As I have said on other occasions, and I repeat it now, there is no nationality that is more thoroughly embued with patriotism, love of America, and the principles upon which it is founded—liberty, freedom, justice, and equality for all—than those of Polish ancestry.

The history of Poland through the centuries and up to and including the present time demonstrates that the Polish people have always been a liberty-loving people. They have sacrificed, fought, and died in their homeland and in this land for liberty and freedom. No people have been more consistent in their attachment to the principles that underlie freedom and true democracy.

Our Nation shall ever be appreciative of the high order of your patriotism, exemplified by those two outstanding Poles—Generals Kosciusko and Pulaski—who assisted us in winning our independence. The spirit that they displayed has ever been a worthy example of the patriotism displayed by all Poles in each of our national emergencies.

The greatness of Kosciusko and Pulaski is indicative of the greatness of Poland. The spirit of these two men has always been a true example of the spirit of Poland. Wherever freedom needs a friend there you will always find Poland the first to bleed and suffer. No soil of any nation the world over is so saturated with blood shed for freedom as it is in Poland. There in that land at all times freedom had a loyal and trusting friend. Kosciusko and Pulaski are dead—but their spirit still guides Poland and its people.

Let us go back just a few years to 1938 and 1939. The whole world was afraid of a little paperhanger from Austria, then the big man of Europe. The leaders of the world licked the boots of the tyrant. They went to Munich. Chamberlain even took an umbrella with him, hoping that he might get the privilege and high honor of protecting the paperhanger from the rain. Shaking in their boots the powers of Europe appeased and fought for the favors of the big man of Europe. Even the mighty Red bear of Russia embraced the madman of Europe and plotted with him the murder of small and helpless nations.

In all the world during these tragic years, 1938 and 1939, there was only one nation and one people courageous enough to call the paperhanger's bluff. True to the spirit of Kosciusko and Pulaski, the people of Poland said, "We care not what course other nations take, but as for us we shall stand up and fight. The cause of freedom is at stake. We would rather fight and die for that freedom than lick the boots of any tyrant."

How courageously the people of Poland fought is written in the records of recent years. To the last man, woman, and child they stood up. In the long struggle there could not be found in Poland a single quisling. The spirit of Kosciusko and Pulaski was prevalent in the hearts, minds, and breasts of every single Pole—fighting and dying for their freedom, as well as ours.

Meeting the mightiest military power in all history, they fought on. Alone they bore the brunt of the killers of Europe. After 19 days of glorious resistance, they were stabbed in the back by one of Hitler's pals—Stalin of Russia. The bank robber of Georgia—not a Russian—and the paperhanger of Austria—not a German—were now butchering and dividing the spoils and carcass of prostrate Poland. Now Poland was attacked from both sides by two of the mightiest powers the world had ever known. Still they fought on. Still the spirit of Kosciusko and Pulaski urged them on. Never in the history of mankind has there been such an exhibition of glorious courage and resistance. Poland did not get lend-lease to spur on their courage. The spirit of Kosciusko and Pulaski was all the inspiration these people needed.

As members of the Polish-American Congress, you know the story full well. Poland was not a warring nation. All they had to offer was courage, life, and blood. But that was not enough to stop the bank robber of Georgia and the paperhanger from Austria. Poland was overrun and destroyed. The paperhanger enslaved the Poles in the west in labor and concentration camps and the bank robber from Georgia took the Poles from the east and sent them to Siberia.

But it takes more than murder to destroy the spirit of Poland. Enslaved and betrayed by the rest of the world, Poland still fought on. They fought harder and longer than any of the Allies of this war. A few months after Poland fell, a Polish Army was fighting in France in the Maginot line. When mighty France folded up, the Poles were the last to lay down their arms in the Maginot line. From there the Poles went to England. Six months after Poland fell, 12,000 Polish boys were flying in the British Royal Air Force. They shot down one out of every five planes during the London blitz. One of the Polish squadrons was named the Kosciusko Squadron.

The only help the Allies sent Norway was a small contingent of Polish boys and what was left of the Polish Navy. All this after Poland was destroyed and overtaken by the Red and Brown Fascists of Europe. By now Hitler was running wild in Africa. It was a group of Polish boys that gave Hitler his first defeat at Tobruk. This after Poland had been overrun. This Polish Air Force helped in the evacuation of Dunkerque. So did what was left of the Polish Navy. The spirit of Kosciusko will never be destroyed, nor will the spirit of Poland.

What American is there who does not remember the deadly battle of Monte Cassino Hill? It was a Polish general and a Polish Army that captured that murderous fortification and paved the road for the Allies on their march to Rome. Nor did Poland refuse to play a part in the invasion of Normandy. Side by side with the Allies, Polish forces marched through France, Holland, Belgium into Germany. Never in the annals of history have so few done so much for the cause of freedom and humanity. Wherever there was a fight there you found Poland. The first to resist—the first to be destroyed—yet out of the ashes of that destruction Poland contributed manpower for the air forces exceeded only by the United States and England. The first to resist and the first to be destroyed—yet Poland provided fighting troops in an amount larger than all the nations combined outside the United States, the British Empire, and Russia.

If this were all it would be more than enough. But the people who stayed in Poland—what part did they play? True to the spirit of Kosciusko and Pulaski the people of Poland organized the largest and most effective underground in Europe. Every Polish man, woman, and child was a part of that underground. The Polish underground was the most effective weapon the Allies had in their march through Europe. In one uprising—the Warsaw uprising—alone, in August of 1944, 250,000 Polish men, women, and children laid down their lives. Even though betrayed by its own allies, the underground fought on. With true Kosciusko spirit, they had faith in Almighty God.

The courage and the sacrifice by Poland in this last war has no parallel in the annals of history. More than 8,000,000 of her people gave their lives. That comprises almost one-fourth of her population. When in the annals of man has any nation paid so high price for freedom? If Kosciusko and Pulaski were alive today they would be proud of their native land and its people, to whom freedom means more than life, and to whom freedom is so priceless that it can never be compromised.

But I am sad to say that there is one thing Kosciusko and Pulaski would not be proud of. I might also say that there is one

thing Lincoln would not be proud of. I might add that there is one thing that decent people of the world over are not proud of. It is the shameful and unprecedented betrayal of a brave and a gallant people by its own allies.

Poland has had a sad history. It was dismembered time and again. Three times before the nineteenth century—the fourth time by a bank robber and a paperhanger in fateful September 1939. But these partitions were by enemies. That is to be expected and endured. If you, as a person, are robbed by your enemies, it is sad but understandable. However, when you get robbed by your own brother or sister, that is hard to understand, let alone endure. Yet that is what happened to Poland. It was partitioned by its brothers and enslaved by its brothers, as a result of the crime of Yalta. What a shameful reward to a brave and gallant people—a people who gave us a Kosciusko and Pulaski, and a people who gave 8,000,000 dead for the same cause for which we gave more than 300,000 dead.

Shame on us. Shame on Britain. Shame upon the world for such cowardly appeasement. Shades of Munich. Shades of Chamberlain. But Munich is a Sunday-school picnic compared to Yalta, and Chamberlin a Sunday-school teacher compared to the big men of Yalta. I say Yalta will go down in history as worse than Munich and its conspirators worse than Chamberlains.

What did Poland ask for its sacrifice? Did they ask for four or seven billions dollars from American taxpayers? No. Did they ask for the atom bomb? No. Did they ask for us to ever bail them out and rebuild Poland? No. Poland did not even ask for bread.

Then what did Poland ask? They merely asked for their own land and their own government. In the name of truth, mercy, and freedom Poland had a right to expect that simple and honorable request to be fulfilled. But the answer Poland received from one of the White House palace guards was, "You Poles are just like the Irish; you are never satisfied."

So lo and behold—all this gallant blood of Poland was shed in vain—because Poland by the acts of greedy and power-hungry men of Yalta—lies prostrate again. But mark you, fellow citizens—Poland is not this sad drama's closing act. Its tragic curtain will rise anew again and again. On Poland's gashed breast today the beast of Red communism plants his hunger and counsels what nation's breast shall next be gored. This is just the beginning. There will be more and more stupendous slaughters of the free.

To gallant Poland we can well say—as other nations fall one by one—then and only then will they know what it means to be betrayed like Poland was betrayed. When these nations fall one by one they will miss Poland. As they fall one by one and plead for mercy on bended knee—then and only then will they understand the glory that belongs to Poland.

To you members of the Polish-American Congress, I wish to say that the fall of the Polish eagle, caused by betrayal, is big with fate to man. If the New World is to begin by a broken word, it would be better not to be born. Our own strife is coming. You cannot sell out the freedom of your friends and neighbors and keep your own secure. The beast of Red communism from the ashes and blood-soaked soil of betrayed Poland shall forge the fetters and fate of our sons yet unborn. It will not be a kind fate. It will be a hideous, murderous, and shrieking fate. Today it's Poland—tomorrow it will be another—after that another, one by one, and us, too. It is nearer than you think. Someday and soon the world will understand the words, "Poland's setting star is the world's disaster-rising morn."

In conclusion, Poland, the world will someday mind how you bore the brunt of fate and how you bled for humankind. Poland, so hallowedly have you played your part that freedom-loving people everywhere have your name written on their heart. Poland, your sorrow in nobility transcends. Your conquerors' and betrayers' joy make their own cheeks blush. But shame never has and never will tinge the cheeks of Poland. Thank God that Poland never has and never will change her conscience, cause, and name for all the wealth and all that goes with a felon fame.

Poland might be dead for awhile. Poland has died before. But the spirit of Poland has never died and never will die. The spirit of Kosciusko and Pulaski inspire Poland to rise again and live again as it has before. Why do I say that?

I say Poland will arise and live again, because the Polish people have a patriot's spirit, an unconquerable spirit. Just a few days ago, for instance, 50 young Polish orphans left India for the United States to seek haven in various convents in America. When they boarded the ship in India, in unison they sang "Jescie Polska nie Zginela," which means Poland is not yet lost. All the orphans of Poland, morning, noon, and night, sing in their hearts, "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 250,000 Polish troops who bled all over the world for their freedom and ours. They are now in the beet fields of Canada and in the mines of England, but morning, noon, and night, they sing "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 12,000 gallant Polish airmen scattered over the four corners of the world without a country and without a home, and morning, noon, and night, they sing "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 6,000,000 Poles in America, proud and happy citizens of our own native land, yet morning, noon, and night, they sing, "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 25,000,000 Polish people being tortured under the heel of Red communism in Europe, but morning, noon, and night, in their hearts and minds are the words of the immortal Polish song "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." That is the spirit of Poland; that is the spirit of Kosciusko and Pulaski. It is an unconquerable spirit that will never die.

I say that Poland will arise and live again, because they have a profound affection for their native land. I might mention that it is an old custom in Poland that when a citizen leaves that country, his last deed is to pick up a bit of Polish soil to take with him so that it can buried with him in case he never returns to Poland. Such profound affection for a native land is unique among all people of the world.

I say Poland will arise and live again, because the Polish people everywhere have an abounding faith in Almighty God. You can steal their country and the Poles will be sad, but they will sing and pray, "There is a God." You can murder their loved ones, but the Poles will sing and pray, "There is a God." You can destroy every last segment of their nation, and the Poles will pray and sing, "There is a God."

With the immortal spirits of Kosciusko and Pulaski, with profound and everlasting love for their country, and with an abounding faith in Almighty God, Poland will arise again, and live again, and be forever free.

Tragically, but with no surprise, honest Americans now learn the sad truth that the architect who at Yalta was largely responsible for the selling out of Poland to Communist Russia, was none other than the convicted perjurer in America, Alger Hiss. Tragically, we now learn that he was the planner appointed by President Roosevelt and our State Department who had the most to say regarding the future of Poland at Yalta. Poland today is a sad victim and lies prostrate because of the work of Alger Hiss.

As Americans, we must repudiate this unrighteous work at Yalta and declare ourselves openly and loudly for a free and independent Poland. If we do not do so then the moral fiber of America has become weak. Let us show to the world that our moral fiber has not weakened, and that the true spirit of America still lives.

Communism Is a Big Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria (Ill.) Star:

COMMUNISM IS A BIG ISSUE

Nothing in the administration of President Truman has proved him more wrong in judgment, in the opinion of the people, than the adoption of the Communist control bill by both Houses of Congress and by an overwhelming majority in each.

Both the Senate and the House are Democrat in majority. The President had declared his opposition to the tough legislation against Communists. But the opinions of constituents back home were obviously more important to Members of Congress than were the demands of the President and leader of their party.

President Truman has lost much public confidence through the years by his refusal to take a realistic view of American Communist activities. He could not have helped knowing that they were in high Government positions, but it was politically embarrassing to recognize their presence there, and the President, as always, placed political expedience above the greatest good of all. At any time he could have declared that he inherited a gang of Communist government employees from the Roosevelt administration, but that, too, would have cost him votes.

So President Truman chose to bluff it through. With characteristic flippance, he called the investigation of Alger Hiss a political "red herring." That wisecrack may have been the beginning of the end for Mr. Truman. Alger Hiss was convicted, only of perjury, but of perjury in such a connection that he was proved to have aided a Communist spy while Hiss held a responsible position in the State Department.

President Truman might have let the people know the truth about the shameful scandal, the Amerasia case. He chose not to. But the people were not deceived. They just lost a little more confidence in their President.

A thorough investigation of charges that Communists still wield big influence in the State Department might have contributed much, last spring, to our national security. But the President saw it as political suicide for the Democratic Party. So his hatchetmen, led by Senator TYDINGS, broke up that investigation and substituted a whitewash which protected the Reds whom all Washington knows still occupy important places in the State Department.

When it became apparent that Congress was going to give serious consideration to legislation to bring American Communists under control, President Truman was still enjoying false hopes that he had wisecracked and whitewashed Communists out of the public mind. He told Congress he would veto the stringent measures under consideration.

The answer of Congress was not only a blow to the President but was definite evidence

that Communist activities in the United States are a major political issue in the 1950 elections. After the decisive action of Congress, whoever uses the hackneyed expressions, "witch hunt" and "Red baiting" is likely to evoke nothing but laughter.

The people are awake at last to the motives and methods of the Red fifth columnists in America, and not even the President can long stand against aroused public opinion.

Civil Defense Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lexington (N. Y.) Herald of August 31, 1950:

CIVIL DEFENSE NEEDED

One day some 30 years ago, when reporters were scarce, a red-haired youth came into the office of the Lexington Herald and said he would like to have a job to work at night so he could go to school in the daytime. He was hired and went to work and completed a term at the university before other events called him away. At any rate, GORDON CANFIELD, of Paterson, N. J., is now a Republican Member of Congress, highly respected on both sides of the aisle for his intelligence and patriotism. He is worried now, as many others, about the problem of civil defense.

CANFIELD'S views are given more than passing notice. He kept on working on newspapers and studying, too, and was graduated from the New Jersey Law School, at Newark. Then he came to Washington as secretary of Representative George Segar, of Passaic, N. J., whom he succeeded. While a secretary he kept on going to school and completed law studies at National University. He has been a Member of Congress five terms and is a member of the Appropriations Committee. He was in the Signal Corps in World War I and World War II and also served in the merchant marine. He was in London during the robot blitz, was requested by General Eisenhower to make an inspection of Buchenwald and went with a congressional committee to visit Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

Today, as he points out, civil defense on the national level is headed by Dr. Paul J. Larsen, Director of Civilian Mobilization for the Security Resources Board. However, Dr. Larsen is virtually limited to authority in planning and making recommendations.

There has been much study about civil defense including the Hopley blueprint and other reports. Until a crisis developed there was very little chance to put these plans into action.

It is apparent, however, that if there is a real war of world-wide proportions this will be one of the most essential measures of defense. Even the tactics of Stalingrad wouldn't be of value in dealing with modern instruments of war.

A civil-defense plan ought to be Nationwide in scope and coupled with the military defense program.

No doubt strong measures will be developed and in calling for them ahead of time, Congressman CANFIELD is undertaking to exercise that type of vigilance which may be necessary to protect not only liberty but life itself.

Partial Payoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Worth Press of September 20, 1950:

PARTIAL PAYOFF

President Truman has asked and received the resignation of Robert N. Denham as general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

That, coming just ahead of the congressional elections, is an obvious payoff to Philip Murray, William Green, and other union leaders for their political support, given in the past and avidly desired in the future, of the President and his branch of the Democratic Party.

It is, to be sure, only a partial payment.

Mr. Truman has not been able to deliver on his promise to bring about repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

That's what the union leaders really want, and want more than ever just now, since it would restore their power to enforce legalized closed shops and impose compulsory union membership on present and new workers in expanding defense industries.

AFL craft unions, in particular, used such power ruthlessly to enrich themselves in World War II. They exacted outrageously high fees and dues from workers seeking jobs on defense projects—workers who, in countless cases, got only what amounted to temporary work permits and never were given the real or theoretical benefits of full union membership.

But Mr. Truman has failed to convince many Democrats and most Republicans in Congress that the Taft-Hartley Act is as bad as he and the union leaders say. He could have had it modified, to meet reasonable objections, but he could not get it repealed and the biased Wagner Act restored.

So, as the next best thing, he has ousted Mr. Denham, whom the union leaders denounce as an enemy of labor. He tried unsuccessfully to do that a few months ago, by asking Congress to abolish the independent office of general counsel to the NLRB, in the name of Government reorganization. Now he has done it on the theory that the general counsel must be someone who will work in harmonious relationship with the NLRB's members.

When the Taft-Hartley Act became effective in 1947 Mr. Truman appointed Mr. Denham and the NLRB members and told them that, much as he disliked the new law, he wanted them to enforce it as written and as Congress intended.

Mr. Denham and the members have differed frequently, and at times bitterly, as to how the law should be enforced. The relationship certainly has been far from harmonious—but whether that was the fault of Mr. Denham or of the Board members is a quite different question.

This newspaper believes that Mr. Denham tried conscientiously and courageously to enforce the law as Congress wrote and intended it, and a preponderance of court decisions seems to support that belief.

What results from harmony between a new general counsel and the Board may please the union leaders and enhance their power. How well it will please the rank and file union members and the general public remains to be seen.

Short Memories Are Convenient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, Wednesday, September 20, 1950:

SHORT MEMORIES ARE CONVENIENT

Sometimes people who live in glass houses insist on throwing stones.

We have in mind W. Averell Harriman. According to the United Press, Mr. Harriman let loose a political blast at Senator TAFT yesterday. The Ohio Senator shouldn't be reelected, Mr. Harriman says, because he follows policies in line with "Communist objectives."

If there is an iota of truth in this, it has escaped our attention. But we'd like to ask Mr. Harriman a couple of questions.

Who was Ambassador to Russia during the war when we were playing footsie with Joe Stalin? Who helped arrange, and who attended, such conferences as those at Yalta and Potsdam, which encouraged Russia's postwar expansion into the Far East and into western Europe?

In case you can't wait for the answer, we'll give it to you—W. Averell Harriman.

Stop Sending Material to Russia and Its Satellites That Can Be Returned in Bullets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the special committee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, investigating shipments of critical and strategic materials, I have been astounded to learn the extent of the laxity that exists in the conduct of our export control program. The investigation has demonstrated the necessity of immediately tightening up our whole control policy as well as the procedures under which it is operated.

It was the purpose of Congress in passing the Control Act to prevent the exportation from this country of all materials in short supply and which are important from the standpoint of maintaining our national security. The necessity for such a policy has been apparent for a long time. It is plain that Russia is planning and preparing for an aggressive war. That such is the opinion of the administration cannot be denied, as otherwise there would be no sense in our spending billions of dollars to strengthen the nations of western Europe. Furthermore, the Korean war is unmistakable evidence of the purpose and interest of Russia.

Under these conditions there is no other sensible policy to adopt than to stop the shipment of critical and strategic materials to Russia and its satellite countries. To do otherwise will undoubtedly bring the same results that followed our shipment of scrap iron to Japan prior to World War II. It was returned to us in the form of bullets that carried death to our American boys.

But, the strange situation that has developed as result of our investigation arises from the fact that, notwithstanding our policy not to ship to Russia and its satellites, yet, we do ship these materials to western European nations, supposed to be our friends and allies, and they in turn ship the same or similar goods of their own production to Russia, and its satellites. To what extent this has been done our committee is endeavoring to find out. The only excuse that has been offered by the Government witnesses, from the Departments of State and Commerce and the ECA who have appeared before us, is that we cannot control the policies of other nations. It seems strange to me that under the circumstances now existing, whereby we are extending billions of dollars in military aid to protect them from Russia, that we cannot even influence them to do what is so obviously necessary for their own security as well as our own.

I am inclined to believe that the reason that western European nations have carried on these practices with Russia, and the countries behind the iron curtain, and the reason we have not cracked down upon them, is because there is too much of a willingness or desire to keep open trade channels for the financial returns that follow. I am not insensible to the advantages to be gained by trade, but when it means traffic in critical and strategic materials that can later mean death to our boys then it is indefensible and those who engage in such trade are unpatriotic.

It is furthermore my opinion that the names of all persons who have facilitated traffic of this kind should not be held secret as is now being done by the departments of Government. I am hopeful that there will be a change in this policy of secrecy in the near future.

The limitations of these remarks will not enable me to give in detail the quantities and dollar value of the materials being shipped to Russia, and its satellite from western European nations. The amount is astounding. It is a general practice and seems to be on a business-as-usual basis.

It is unfortunate if we cannot stop this dangerous practice upon the part of European allies, but, that is no excuse for our not closing the loopholes in our own procedures and policies, that now make it possible for the countries of western Europe to obtain critical and strategic materials from us and pass them on to unfriendly hands. It is our duty to know where and to whom the goods are to be ultimately delivered. We should not permit critical and strategic goods to go out of this country to be sold on the open market. It is an open invitation to Russia and its satellites to buy. There should be a certification required from the exporter as to the end use to be made of the material, and, a check made by our representatives in the country to which the materials are shipped to make certain that the materials are to be used for a useful and legitimate purpose and not to be transshipped to Russia or to any nation within its orbit of influence. The matter is so important that, in my opinion, we could with propriety require the nation to whom we ship to make the certification. If we withheld shipment until such a guaranty was given, I am certain it would be given and without any great delay.

It is time for this Nation to be realistic. We cannot carry on business in critical and strategic materials as usual. The times are too critical. Our danger is too great. Let us make certain that we do not make again the same mistake we made in shipping scrap iron to Japan prior to World War II. This time let us use common sense.

Address by Hon. Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, Before Oklahoma State Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in accordance with permission heretofore granted, I submit for printing in the RECORD, an address to be delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] before the State Democratic Convention at Oklahoma City, Okla., on September 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Oklahomans, it is good to be back home "out where the sky is a little bluer; out where the sun is a little brighter; out where the hand clasp is a little warmer." It is good to be back home.

It is wonderful to be in a great Democratic convention.

I am happy to be here with the nominees of my party for our State offices. I want to pay a tribute to each and every one of them.

I want to salute our nominee for Governor, the Honorable Johnston Murray. Some Republicans have made great efforts to create doubt in our party as to his Democracy. Let us meet this issue head on.

I have personally known Johnston Murray most of the years of his life. I honor him as a working Democrat. I knew him as the chairman of the Democratic Central Committee of Kay County in 1940. I knew him as chairman of the Democratic Central Committee of the Eighth Congressional District in the early thirties. I knew him as chairman of the Democratic Central Committee of Oklahoma County in the early forties. I knew him again as a Democratic elector chosen by the Democrats of Oklahoma in 1940 and again in 1943.

I'll tell you why the Republicans are seeking to create doubt as to our nominee for Governor being a working Democrat. They are trying desperately to camouflage the fact that their nominee for the United States Senate is not and never has been a working Republican.

Proving the eligibility of Johnston Murray to walk with Thomas Jefferson is easy. Qualifying Bill Alexander to march shoulder to shoulder with Abraham Lincoln is impossible.

The Republicans in Oklahoma have chosen as their nominee for Governor a typical, reactionary Old Guard Republican. In fact, they picked the oldest and coldest they had. Bill Alexander can't find any New Deal measure he would repeal. Jo Ferguson can't find any he would keep.

We know from experience how a Governor can prevent progress in our State by fighting the development of Federal projects. I know of no man more hostile toward flood control, and the development of hydroelectric power, irrigation, and reclamation than Jo Ferguson.

During the past 8 years, the close cooperation of a Democratic State administration with a Democratic national administration has meant much to Oklahoma in the development of her natural resources.

I know this important program would be jeopardized if Jo Ferguson should become Governor of Oklahoma. The people can't afford to let that happen.

I am happy to be here today in the company of my distinguished colleagues in the United States Congress.

I want to pay tribute to one of Oklahoma's greatest Democrats, the Honorable ELMER THOMAS. We are proud of the outstanding service he has rendered our State throughout his long public career.

The man who will take his place in the United States Senate is one of Oklahoma's finest sons. He has achieved acclaim for himself and fame for his State as the very distinguished Congressman from the Fifth District, the Honorable MIKE MONRONEY.

All Oklahomans can well afford to be proud of their congressional delegation in Washington. Each one is serving his State vigorously and effectively on an important committee.

Over in the First District, where we needed a Congressman so badly for so long, a fighting Democrat, Dixie Gilmer, was elected 2 years ago. He is now serving on the Judiciary Committee. We aim to keep him there.

The Second Congressional District has long been well represented by one of our hardest working Congressmen, BILL STIGLER. He is a member of the all-important Appropriations Committee.

Down in "Little Dixie" the Democrats of the Third District are mighty well satisfied with their "Little Giant," CARL ALBERT. He is an influential member of the Agriculture Committee which handles Federal legislation affecting Oklahoma's foremost industry.

The Fourth District is ably represented by one of the outstanding first-term Congressmen, TOM STEED. He is on the Education and Labor Committee.

The Democratic nominee for Congress in the Fifth District is the very capable former State Senator, John Jarman. We will welcome him to Washington.

TOBY MORRIS will return to Congress by the overwhelming vote of the people of the Sixth District. He is a member of the Public Lands Committee and Chairman of its Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.

In the Seventh District, the genial and very active VICTOR WICKERSHAM will return to Congress as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

GEORGE HOWARD WILSON has made one of the finest Congressmen the Eighth District has ever had. We are determined that he shall continue to represent them on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I am proud to be a part of this team of courageous Democrats.

I am honored to join them in reporting the progress that has been made in the Eighty-first Democratic Congress.

We not only point with pride to its accomplishments, we pledge ourselves to still further and greater progress in what will be the Democratic Eighty-second Congress.

The attendance and spirit of this convention spike the rumors and refute the claims that the ranks of Oklahoma's Democracy are divided. Those claims have been made by Republican candidates; those rumors have been spread by Republican newspapers. They were born in Republican hopes for an otherwise unattainable victory. But, my fellow Democrats, those hopes have died aborning.

Some of our Democrats may be a little mad at other Democrats. But we are all much madder at the Republicans. It is true that the Democrats have been calling each other names, "so-and-so's" and all that, which is bad, quite bad. But listen—are you listening? The Republicans have been calling the Democrats "Socialists" and "Reds." Now they label us "Un-American." And that is worse, much worse!

Yes; a few weeks ago, on every highway, Republican billboards branded Democrats as Socialists. The storm of protest from this insult caused the Republican high command to change its strategy. They are now covering up those same billboards with signs which read: "Vote Republican—Vote American".

Who are these holier-than-thou, self-righteous paragons of patriotism who claim the exclusive right to be called Americans? Republicans have a perfect right to solicit votes on the basis of their program and for their nominees. I do not approve of either, but I would fight to preserve the rights of both.

As Democrats, we are proud of our record of devotion to our Nation. Democrats have met every test of service, fidelity, and sacrifice to our country. Whether on the field of battle or on the home front, we have fought and worked side by side with all the other tens of millions of loyal Americans. Today, we are stunned to hear Republican candidates ask the citizens of Oklahoma to vote Republican—not as Americans—but in order to qualify as Americans.

I do not believe these Republican nominees are entitled to a single vote until they have apologized for this affront to the patriotism of the people of Oklahoma.

We are here to call the Democrats to arms.

This is a privilege we cherish, a responsibility we are happy to fulfill. We are not here to meet a Republican challenge. We are here to hurl a Democratic challenge to the Republican opposition.

We are here to haunt them with the record of our achievements—achievements won by the Democratic Party in spite of Republican opposition. We are here to taunt them with our purposes and plans for a brighter future—purposes which they do not comprehend—plans which they do not understand.

Yes, we are here to lay down the gage of political battle on the basis of what the Democratic Party has done and will do, and on the basis of what the Republican Party has not done and cannot do.

But while Republican leaders have mighty little to show for it, they are never idle. They can brag more and complain louder; they can whip up more fear and confusion, without justification, than any other group of political leaders I ever saw.

In this regard, I am reminded of some verses of scripture. I am sure the Republican nominee for the United States Senate will bear me no ill will if I refer to the scriptures. My acquaintance with Holy Writ is limited, but I have long known that it is both nonpolitical and bipartisan.

The rantings of the Republican leaders remind me of the first verse of the second Psalm: "Why do the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing?"

But they cannot escape the pronouncement in the fifteenth verse of the ninth Psalm: "The heathen are sunk down in the pit that they made, in the net which they hid, is their foot taken.

As I understand this majestic language, it means about the same as saying that they got caught in their own bear trap.

Let me say, my friends, that I have no personal differences with the Republican nominee for the United States Senate. I cherish him as a personal friend. I respect him as a minister of the Gospel. He had convinced me that he had been divinely called for that work. Imagine my surprise when I saw how easy it was for him to be seduced by the lure of political ambition.

When I first knew Bill Alexander was thinking about running for the United States Senate, he claimed to be a Democrat. He was asking the Democrats to send him to Washington to "liberalize the Democratic Party." The next I heard of him, he had become a Republican candidate. He now asks the Republicans to send him to Washington to "conservatize" the Republican Party.

A few months ago, Oklahoma newspapers carried the headlines that on the following Sunday, the Right Reverend William H. Alexander would advise his congregation—and the world—whether or not he would run for the Democratic nomination to the United States Senate. Many came that Sunday morning to hear the fateful decision. It was given to them. It was then dramatized and publicized as few political events in our history have been. He told the people that he had spent the long hours of the previous night on his knees in his study. He said he had wrestled with himself and prayed with the Lord until the early morning hour. He told how the Lord put his arm around his shoulder and said: "Bill, go and get into the race for the Democratic nomination to the United States Senate."

In obedience to the heavenly vision, he became a Democratic candidate. He said he was doing just what the Lord had told him to do.

Then, lo and behold, a few weeks later, the people of this State were astounded by a strange announcement from Bill Alexander. He said he had abandoned his purpose to seek the Democratic nomination as directed by the Lord. He then declared himself a candidate for the Republican nomination to the United States Senate.

Now, what Bill Alexander hasn't told, and what I challenge him to tell the people of Oklahoma is: With whom did he wrestle? With whom did he sit up all night? And whose arm was around his shoulder when he changed his mind? I know the Lord didn't change because the Bible says: "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today and forever." Hebrews 13: 8.

Bill's refusal to do as the Lord told him reminds me of the story of Jonah. Now you know what happened to Jonah. He refused to go where the Lord told him to go. He insisted on going where he wanted to go. And old Jonah wound up in the belly of a whale! In just 3 days, he saw that he had made a terrible mistake—whereupon he repented.

At the latest report, Bill was still ignoring his divine order to seek the Democratic nomination for the United States Senate. He is still hobnobbing with the Republicans. Now I have often felt sorry for old Jonah down there in the belly of the whale, but I would a lot rather be there than in the hopeless fix that Bill is in.

Now, then, he tells us he is going to bring Roy Rogers and his famed horse, Trigger, to Oklahoma to team up with him in his campaign. That sure will be something. I can see them now—Roy Rogers, Trigger, and Bill, sweeping across the Oklahoma prairies running for the United States Senate. Now, Roy Rogers wouldn't be such a bad candidate if he had the right identification and the right affiliation. But he isn't on the ticket; he isn't even a citizen of Oklahoma.

Then, there's Trigger, and I'll say this for Trigger—he plays the part of a horse and looks and acts a lot more like a horse than Bill does like a United States Senator. But the people of Oklahoma can't vote for Trigger; we can't vote for any horse—not even a whole horse. That leaves only Bill of this barnstorming trio. And, my fellow Democrats, I don't believe the people of Oklahoma are going to vote for him.

Mr. Alexander came to Washington the other day. He was previewed by Republican Senators, interviewed by the press, and star-viewed by the women. One reporter said he talked more and said less than any candidate he ever saw. The women said he promised more and performed less than any speaker they ever heard. One Republican Senator said that Bill had the greatest windup, but the weakest delivery he had ever witnessed.

I heard him on the radio program, "Meet the Press." Boy, oh boy, what a wind-up. He pitched out a lot of wild and sarcastic generalities. He denounced all past legislation of the New Deal and all future plans of the Fair Deal. Then, in broad and sweeping language, he condemned them as socialism.

After the vigorous windup, the press began to call on him for delivery. They pressed him for specific answers. I never know a man get more embarrassed. His face was redder than his hair and his generalities were down to his shoe tops.

It was soon apparent that his campaign was to create false fears and was supported only by phony phrases. He was struggling in political quicksand where it was too treacherous to stand still and too thin to walk forward. How long, oh, how long will it be before the Republican Party will nominate candidates to high office who will offer the people something except opposition to progressive legislation by calling it socialism?

I challenge the Republican nominee to the United States Senate to tell the people of Oklahoma what legislation enacted by the Democratic administrations of the last 17 years is socialistic. I dare him to tell the people of this State which of these laws he would repeal. Under withering cross-examination by the press, I heard him admit that he wouldn't repeal social security, bank insurance, unemployment insurance, slum clearance, or the TVA.

In a recent speech, he has endorsed rural electrification, and referred to what he calls his farm program. I wish time would permit me to show just how ignorant he really is about a farm program. He says he is against controls, but favors 100 percent parity. If he favors 100 percent parity, he has no business in the Republican Party. The Republican Eightieth Congress enacted a farm program providing for 60 percent of parity, not without, but with the most rigid controls of production.

He says he would make the farmers of Oklahoma free. If he had either memory of the past or knowledge of the present, he would know that Oklahoma farmers are free today—that their emancipation proclamation from proverty, privation, depression, and want was issued early in 1933 by a Democratic Congress and Democratic President.

And what a contrast their freedom of today is to the freedom they knew during the 12 long years from 1921 to 1933. They were free then—free to sell their cotton for 4 cents a pound; free to sell their oats for 10 cents a bushel, their corn and wheat for 20 cents. They were free to mortgage everything they had to try to buy meat and bread for their

families. They were free to pay up to 25 percent interest on the money they borrowed. Then, when their ability to borrow was exhausted, they were free to starve to death without the slightest interference from a Republican Congress or a Republican President.

"Stop, look and listen!" All of our farmers are keenly aware of how they have prospered in these 17 years of Democratic administrations.

In 1930, Oklahoma's total farm income was less than $150,000,000. In 1945, it had grown to $457,000,000; in 1949, it was very close to $700,000,000. Mr. Alexander, we dare you to tell Oklahoma farmers that this is un-American.

In 1933, just a bare fraction of the farm families in Oklahoma were blessed with electric service. Today, over 60 percent of them have been rescued from drudgery and darkness through rural electrification. And it is our purpose to expand this program until the lights shine and electricity is working in every farm home.

Is that socialistic, Mr. Ferguson?

Before 1933, Uncle Sam never did anything about conserving and rebuilding the soil. Today, Oklahoma farmers and ranchers have 81 soil-conserving districts which cover all of our State except small portions of two counties. And the Eighty-first Congress has stepped up and broadened this program.

Until a few years ago, Uncle Sam never tried to help the farmers get out of the mud. Since 1944, one dollar out of every three of Federal highway aid has been spent on farm-to-market roads. In August of this year, a Democratic Congress provided for an even better farm-to-market road program. This was accomplished in spite of bitter Republican opposition.

Is this socialism, or un-American, Mr. Ferguson?

And my fellow Oklahomans, thanks to a Democratic majority, the Eighty-first Congress has a proud record of service to all the people.

It has moved with wisdom and courage to meet the needs of peace and the requirements of war.

Among the outstanding accomplishments, in addition to those already mentioned, are the following:

A better farm program, including higher price supports for Oklahoma crops, more adequate crop storage space, and a vast expansion of rural telephones;

An expanded social security covering an additional 10,000,000 people and providing greater benefits to those already covered;

Constructive school aid legislation;

The most comprehensive urban and rural housing program in the Nation's history;

Authority to the President to reorganize and streamline executive departments and agencies for greater efficiency and economy;

Legislation increasing minimum wages from 40 to 75 cents an hour;

The finest legislation in history for the development of our natural resources. This includes much that is vital to Oklahoma. Authority for the comprehensive survey and planning for the Arkansas-White and Red River Basins is just a part of what was done for Oklahoma;

More adequate provision for veterans and their surviving dependents;

More substantial allowances to families of servicemen;

An expanded military preparedness program that will make this Nation impregnable;

Bold but sound legislation to enable our country to secure and develop that cooperation with other free nations which gives us the best possible chance for world peace;

An integral security law that will enable us to prevent and stamp out the growth or expansion of any Communist or other subversive effort here at home.

Listen, Bill Alexander, and you, Jo Ferguson—Are you listening? Are these measures socialistic or un-American? If so which one? My fellow Oklahomans, it is time for these Republican nominees to "put up or shut up!"

We will never forget 1932 when there were more than 14,000,000 Americans seeking jobs that did not exist and work that could not be found. Thirty-two thousand small businesses went bankrupt in that one year. Literally thousands of banks closed their doors. The American economy collapsed. This Nation was driven to its knees in depression and despair. These things we suffered under the Republicans

Today, after 17 years of Democratic administration, we are the most prosperous Nation on the earth. The number of gainfully employed has increased from 38,700,000 in 1932 to 62,400,000 today. Our national income has risen from $39,000,000,000 in 1932 to something like $250,000,000,000 today. I cannot remember when a bank has failed in Oklahoma, during these years, where the depositors lost a penny. And yet, Republican nominees are now asking the people to vote against the party that has brought these things about.

What reason do they give? They say they are against socialism. They are against the Fair Deal. They want the people to vote against the New Deal. They claim they want you to vote "American".

There is nothing new in this Republican bid for support. All they want to do is take over and operate that which they had neither the vision to plan nor the ability to construct. It's the same old version of the same old Republican song. They sing it at every election. It goes like this: "Anything you can do, I can do better; anything you can sing, I can sing louder; I can sing anything louder than you."

I have heard of "free wheeling" for a number of years, but what the Republicans are trying to give the people of Oklahoma is nothing but "free spieling."

They have grown fat in a prosperity they could not create. They are secure in an economy they do not understand and which they constantly predict will soon collapse.

From the citadel of this abundance, Republicans continue to hurl their smoke bombs and tear gas, smoke bombs of confusion, tear gas of opposition.

The people don't mind these smoke bombs or the tear gas. But, the Republican Old Guard, finding out how ineffective these two weapons are, have recently devised another which is even less worthy. They have now begun to use stink bombs.

One was exploded a week ago yesterday on the floor of the United States Senate by Republican Senator WILLIAM JENNER of Indiana. I heard this Republican Senator slander one of the greatest Americans of all time. In my book there is no finer patriot than Gen. George C. Marshall. And yet I heard this Republican Senator actually call General Marshall "a living lie and a front for traitors."

Since the President named Marshall as Secretary of Defense, I know every American fighting man feels more confident. I know their families, without exception, feel more secure. One hundred and fifty million Americans were thrilled when the news was flashed that George Marshall was back at the helm. And yet, Republican Senators voted 2 to 1 against the bill to permit the President to bring him back.

All this demonstrates how low they will stoop to oppose and smear the Truman administration in a vain effort to gain their own selfish, political ends.

A few years ago these same men were hurling criticism at another Democratic captain. They persecuted him, too. The harder he worked the more vicious were their false charges. I said then, and in the light of the proof of passing years, I repeat now: The greatest President since Lincoln, the most courageous humanitarian of our time, democracy's most intrepid and peerless leader in a hundred years, was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

When he died the mantle of leadership passed to the shoulders of another. He is a man of humility but he is as brave as he is humble. Sure, he has made mistakes, even as you and I. I have seen him veto bills that should have been signed. I have seen him sign bills that should have been vetoed. I have heard him speak when he should have been silent; I have seen him silent when he should have spoken. But I want to say to you that one of the most courageous, loyal, patriotic Americans I have ever known is that stout-hearted man from Missouri, President Harry S. Truman.

The good thing about Harry Truman is that most of the time he is right. The awful thing about the Republican leadership is that most of the time they are wrong.

The Jenner stink bomb was their worst. Others nearly as bad had been set off by MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, and SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas.

But, none of these stink bombs hurled by a desperate opposition has damaged the Democrats. They only reflect on the Republicans who throw them. Their odor lingers on.

My fellow Oklahomans, there are solemn decisions ahead. One will be made by the people of Oklahoma on November 7.

The people know that the Democratic Party has served them best, both in peace and in war.

The Democratic Party seeks their support on the basis of its record of service.

Under Democratic leadership we are today doing what we failed to do after World War I. Woodrow Wilson believed that the League of Nations could prevent another World War. The Democratic Party believed that the welfare of our country and the peace of the world required responsible cooperation between peace-loving nations to prevent aggression. The Democratic Party was defeated, however, and the hope for the League of Nations was shattered.

That which we had failed to prevent moved in to haunt us. The aggression that we failed to kill while it was yet aborning forced World War II upon us. It reached such awful proportions as to threaten our very existence as a Nation. All of our strength and that of our Allies was required, and we succeeded then only after the most heroic and sacrificial effort in history.

Sadder but wiser, we said it must never happen again. We resolved to profit by the mistakes of the past and so we led in the creation of the United Nations. Its only purpose is to prevent aggression and conquest. Its only aim is to achieve peace. Its only goal is to help build a world in which all nations, including our own, may develop their own security and promote their own prosperity. It is the servant of its members. We will keep it so. We will never permit it to become a world government nor any other kind of government.

The events of our lifetime have proved that this Nation cannot secure these priceless objectives alone. Isolationism is as dead as King Tut, and not nearly as well preserved. Either, we work within the United Nations and make it work for all its members, or we face the constant threat of war, without any hope for peace.

We are today engaged in a mighty effort to make the United Nations succeed. Within the framework of the United Nations, we are helping to wage the Korean war. Our fighting men march under two flags—under the stars and stripes of Old Glory, and under the globe and olive branch of the United Nations. Our purpose is to prevent aggression, if possible. Failing that, we are determined to stop it where it starts.

My fellow Oklahomans, do not ever lose sight of this fact. The United States of America is the most coveted prize spurring the greedy and avaricious lust in every aggressor in this world. It matters not what devious trails the men in the Kremlin and their partners in crime may travel, their ultimate goal—yes—their prime objective is to seize and plunder the fabulous riches of America.

Here is where man's hope for a better way of life has found its finest fulfillment. And if we would avoid the terrible task of meeting and stopping aggression on our own shores, we must stop it beyond the seas.

This will require eternal vigilance and complete unity of physical resources, mental effort, and spiritual strength. This will require sacrifice and devotion higher than we have ever known.

But, by doing this, we will be working for ourselves and not for foreign masters. Our sacrifices will be to preserve our security, not to enrich those who would conquer us. Our sacrifices will be those of free-men and not of slaves.

As we look into the future and understand the tasks ahead we feel a deep humility, but no fear. We have the confidence which comes from the knowledge that our party has kept the faith.

We know our cause is just.

We know our purpose is right.

On November 7 we choose our leaders for the years just ahead.

We have achieved our present security and prosperity under democracy's banner.

Under Democratic leadership, we have won two World Wars and are now winning the present world-wide struggle against the powers of darkness.

Under that proud Democratic banner and with that peerless leadership America can and will move ever upward and onward.

Let Us Not Accept the Theme That Bigness in Industry Is Within Itself Bad, and That Bigness Means Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a double-edged campaign is being carried forward throughout the world today to destroy individual freedom. One phase of this campaign is easily recognized—the direct, physical attack which our boys are so courageously meeting and repulsing in Korea. The other phase—while just as dangerous to individual liberty—is not so easily recognized or understood. It is the indirect attack upon the minds of the people and is based upon the anti-Christian principle that if you repeat a lie often enough, some people will accept it as truth, regardless of all evidence to the contrary.

An example of this is the oft-repeated charge that unless we curb the power of big business monopolists in this country, free enterprise will be destroyed and the American worker will be enslaved in an imperialist Fascist state controlled by the big-business monopolists.

Such a charge is, of course, predicated on the belief that big-business monopoly already exists in this country. If this is true—and it remains to be proved—then it can only exist because of the failure of the antitrust division of the Department of Justice to enforce existing antitrust statutes.

In my 30 years as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, I have been a consistent foe of all types of monopoly—whether big business, big government, or big union monopoly. A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee conducted lengthy and exhaustive hearings into the question of the existence of a big-business monopoly in this country.

An impartial study of those hearings will establish that no evidence—acceptable in any court in this country—was produced to prove that a big-business monopoly now exists in this country.

In spite of this, the charge is repeatedly dinned into our ears that "we must take immediate steps to curb monopoly in this country or free enterprise will be destroyed and the workers will be enslaved by the monopolists."

Considering this oft-repeated, unsubstantiated charge, I wish to call the attention of the House to an article by Willard Edwards published in the Washington Times-Herald for September 20, 1950. In this article, Mr. Edwards exposed the new program of the American Communist Party as laid down by its Chairman, William Z. Foster, in an article written by Foster and published August 11, 1950, in the official organ of the Communist Cominform, the Soviet propaganda agency. In that article, Foster, according to Mr. Edwards, wrote:

> It must be solidly emphasized that our [American Communist Party] orientation is for a people's front government stated in terms adapted to American conditions. The trade-unions and every other organization of the workers and their allies would have to throw their whole strength into the struggle for a people's front.
>
> One of the most important factors is the development of a deep economic crisis. It is possible in the United States, during such a time, to elect a coalition, anti-Fascist, anti-imperialist government. A people's front party would have to orientate to the left or it would be destroyed. It would be compelled to attack monopolists in their economic military, and political spheres.
>
> It would have to orientate toward nationalization of banks and industries, breakup of big landholdings, the beginning of a planned economy, elimination of reactionaries from all State institutions. Such a people's front government operates within the framework of the bourgeois state, curbing the power of the monopolists.

And American Communist Party Chairman Foster closes his new policy pronouncement with this dire warning:

> Eventually, the Soviet army must play the decisive role.

Again, from the September 1950 issue of Intelligence Digest, published in London and recognized throughout the world as an authority on secret plans and programs of the Soviet, we are told that orders have been issued from Moscow to all teachers in schools in satellite countries behind the iron curtain to continually and consistently preach to their students that American workers are the slaves of big-business monopolists and the Communist world revolution cannot meet with complete success until the power of American monopolists is curbed.

Is this, then, the real source for this demand to "curb monopolists" in this country?

Let us remember that our one great secret weapon which has helped us win two world wars and which is helping our boys in Korea to win that battle for individual freedom is our mass production system. That system is entirely dependent upon the coordinated activity of the three great components of our free enterprise system—little business, medium business, and big business. Destroy any one of these three components and you destroy our secret weapon—our mass production system—which is so greatly respected and feared by the Communists. Let us not be tricked—by lying propaganda—into helping the Communists, the enemies of individual liberty—to destroy one important component of our mass production system—big business. Let us not accept this un-American theme that bigness is, within itself, bad, and that bigness means monopoly.

Upholsterers' Union's Fine Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House two resolutions adopted by the general executive board of the Upholsterers' International Union, AFL. It seems to me that they are timely, forceful, and constructive expressions of the best American trade-union sentiment. They deserve very wide circulation both in America and overseas.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION OF WARNING ON PHONY COMMUNIST PEACE PETITION FOR DUPES

Whereas the launching of fully armed and long prepared military aggression by the North Korean puppets of Stalin's Communist Russia on June 25, 1950, clearly shows that the Communist dictatorship of Russia has taken up the course of world domination by deception, infiltration, and military violence in which Stalin's one-time ally Hitler died amid world-wide destruction and bloodshed only 5 years before; and

Whereas the world-wide Communist fifth column for paralysis by propaganda, disruption, and sabotage of the free world, maintained by the Russian Communists under the form of National Communists Parties ever since it overthrew the only democratic government ever to exist in Russia, has now swung into action along with the North Korean puppet troops; and

Whereas one of the main Communist efforts now in operation in the United States is the fraudulent world peace appeal, launched on the world by the international Communist apparatus of the World Committee in

Defense of Peace in Stockholm in March of 1950 and in the United States by the Daily Worker and assorted stooges on May 1 and directed through a so-called peace information center in New York; and

Whereas the sole purpose of this petition is to distract the attention from Stalin's armed aggression by protesting the possible use of atomic weapons, the only field in which the Communist dictatorship has not built up overwhelming superiority over the free world, which mistakenly rushed to disarm after the death of Stalin's one-time pal Hitler; and

Whereas those subscribing to this fraudulent world peace appeal petition are consciously or unconsciously making themselves part of the Communist enemy's sabotage and conquest apparatus: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the general executive board of the Upholsterers' International Union of North America directs this resolution to the attention of the officers, members, families, employees, and friends of the union and asks their cooperation in exposing this Communist maneuver and its sinister purpose and in taking appropriate action against any sponsor of such petition; and be it further

Resolved, That in accord with the mandate of our twenty-sixth biennial convention, this general executive board endorses the bill proposed by Congressman WALTER, of Pennsylvania, for complete registration of Communists and their organization in the United States and directs our political education department to consult with friendly political leaders on the possible State and Federal legislation for complete registration, identification, and disclosure of the source of financial and other support by all organizations seeking to influence public opinion in our free and open society in accordance with the recommendations of the 1947 report of the President's Commission on Civil Rights.

RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL AND SUPPORT OF OUR GOVERNMENT AND THE UNITED NATIONS IN KOREAN CRISIS AND SOVIET COMMUNIST WAR ON PEACE AND ALL FREE PEOPLES

The general executive board of the Upholsterers' International Union in its August 1950 quarterly meeting on behalf of the union members in the United States and Canada expresses its unanimous and enthusiastic support of their governments and the United Nations in their prompt action to meet with force and truth the military attack of the Communist aggressors upon the Republic of Korea and upon the peace of the world in June of this year.

We recognize that this is only the beginning of the post World War II open military phase of Communist aggression against the peace, resuming the stage reached once before in the attacks on Poland, Finland, and the Baltic countries when the Russian dictatorship was the open ally of its brother Nazi dictatorship of Hitler in 1939 and 1940, and that the Soviet regime has been conducting its cold war against world peace and order since it denounced its peace treaty with Turkey in 1945 before the end of World War II and entered upon the imperialist course of the czars on a round-the-world scale.

We pledge our support to our governments and the United Nations in the enduring effort to control the effort of Stalin and his evil Communist Party machine dictatorship to make themselves the heirs and assigns of Hitler and we will support governments in every necessary and effective measure to preserve the peace in the greatest possible measure until the Communist dictatorship dies and its fanatical forces disperse as did those of Genghis Khan and all the bloody imitators of the great conquerors and murderers to this date.

We recognize that the curbing of the present-day conqueror can only come with the organization of preponderant force through the instrumentality of the United Nations representing all the free and independent nations of the world and such subordinate alliances of the free countries such as the North Atlantic Pact and Pan-American Defense Union. We solemnly recognize further that until the aggressor is so overawed, or if he resorts to full-scale war, destroyed, that we as citizens of free nations must make the sacrifices necessary to rearm and live in at least a semiwar economy for possibly 10 or more years ahead. We believe most earnestly that given plain-spoken and vigorous leadership such as that given by President Truman to the United States and other free countries in the United Nations upon the launching of the North Korean attack in June, the people of the democracies like ourselves will make the sacrifice and exert the self-discipline required to win the peace and the freedom which alone makes peace permanent and worth having.

Democracy to win the peace with freedom requires only that the principle of equality of sacrifice be put at center of all special armament and defense measures and the overwhelming majority given leadership and the always selfish and profiteering few the minimum of coercion required to gain success in the greatest common enterprise of all time, world peace, and order with freedom.

Facing a world in which the aggressor dictatorship of communism has temporarily acquired military superiority in every arm except atomic power, we urge upon our countrymen and the freemen of the world in the great contest and sacrifices ahead the mighty spirit of John Dickinson of Pennsylvania's proud boast to a nearly defeated Continental Congress here in Philadelphia—that "our towns may be destroyed, but they will grow again. We compare them not with our rights and liberties." Only a determination to prefer death to loss of liberty in the literal sense of Patrick Henry can win the peace for the free world in 1950.

We respectfully submit this resolution of our principles and desires to our President and Members of Congress and to the Ambassador of Canada for transmission to his government on behalf of our Canadian members and to our members for their certain ratification in action to our Nation's political leaders in this crisis that tries men's souls again.

Our Social-Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, one of the outstanding achievements of this Eighty-first Congress is the enactment of a law expanding and bringing up to date our social-security system. This law extends security in their old age to 10,000,000 additional Americans as a matter of their earned right, not as a matter of charity or a public dole. It raises social-security benefits to conform with higher costs of living.

I believe that our social-security system should be extended even further, so as to cover all working men and women. But the new law passed by the Eighty-first Congress is a great step forward, and I was glad to cast my vote for it.

In view of the widespread interest in this law I think it will be helpful to set forth the changes in our social-security system which it brings about.

MAJOR CHANGES SUMMARIZED

Summarized in a few sentences, the major changes are:

First. Larger benefits: The people of Illinois now receiving social-security payments will find that in the checks to be mailed out October 3 their benefits will be, on the average, roughly, 75 percent greater than they have been. For those who will retire after June 1952 benefits will be twice what they are now, on the average.

Second. Broader coverage: On January 1, 1951, many Illinoisans who up to now have not been covered by social security will come under the system. For the first time the nonfarm, self-employed persons in business for themselves, such as grocery-store, retail-store, or gas-station owners, will have the opportunity to earn security in their later life under the social-security system.

Third. Easier eligibility: In general, it will take fewer years of social-security coverage before you are eligible to draw benefits. Specifically, persons who are now 65 or over, and who have had six quarter-years—a year and a half—of social-security coverage can and should apply immediately for benefits. Any retired worker as well as survivors and dependents will be able to earn $50 a month as against the present limit of $15—without losing their benefit payments.

Here, in more detail, are the answers to questions I think will be of most general interest:

HOW MUCH LARGER BENEFITS?

First, how much larger will benefits be under the new law? Benefit increases will go to two main groups of people: (a) those who are currently receiving them before 1952; and (b) those who will reach retirement age after June 1952. These are called new starts. Let me explain more fully how the new bill affects each of these groups.

IMMEDIATE INCREASE AVERAGE SEVENTY-SEVEN AND ONE-HALF PERCENT

There are approximately 188,828 people in the State of Illinois who are now receiving social-security benefits. In the checks which they will receive early in October—their September payments—they will find that their payments will be, on the average, 77½ percent greater than they have been up to now.

The table below shows what the increases will be for an insured wage earner without any dependents, and for a married couple:

Retired wage earner without dependents

Now:	*New law*
$10	$20.00
$11	22.00
$12	24.00
$13	26.00
$14	28.00
$15	30.00
$16	31.70
$17	33.20
$18	34.50
$19	35.70
$20	37.00

Retired wage earner without dependents— Continued

Now:	*New law*
$21	$38.50
$22	40.20
$23	42.20
$24	44.50
$25	46.50
$26	48.30
$27	50.00
$28	51.50
$29	52.80
$30	54.00
$31	55.10
$32	56.20
$33	57.20
$34	58.20
$35	59.20
$36	60.20
$37	61.20
$38	62.20
$39	63.10
$40	64.00
$41	64.90
$42	65.80
$43	66.70
$44	67.60
$45	68.50
$46	68.50

Retired wage earner and wife

Now:	*New law*
$15	$30.00
$16.50	33.00
$18	36.00
$19.50	39.00
$21	42.00
$22.50	45.00
$24	47.55
$25.50	49.80
$27	51.75
$28.50	53.55
$30	56.50
$31.50	57.75
$33	60.30
$34.50	63.30
$36	66.75
$37.50	69.75
$39	72.45
$40.50	75.00
$42	77.25
$43.50	79.20
$45	81.00
$46.50	82.65
$48	84.30
$49.50	85.80
$51	87.30
$52.50	88.80
$54	90.30
$55.50	91.80
$57	93.30
$58.50	94.65
$60	96.00
$61.50	97.35
$63	96.70
$64.50	100.05
$66	101.40
$67.50	102.75
$69	102.75

These same increases apply to anyone who retired before June 1952.

The following table shows the benefits that will appear in September checks of a widow with two children who is currently receiving benefits:

Widow with 2 children

Present benefit:	*New benefit*
$20	$40
$25	46
$30	53
$35	59
$40	67
$45	76
$50	92
$55	110
$60	117
$65	122
$70	128
$75	133

INCREASES SENT AUTOMATICALLY

You do not have to apply for the increases; they will be sent to you automatically. If, for any reason, the increase fails to show up in your October check, it will show up very soon, in full. Recipients are asked not to start writing in for information because the more letters that have to be answered the slower the program will be in getting under way.

An Appeal to President Truman To Revive American Shipbuilding Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the situation with respect to the shipbuilding industry of this country has become so serious that I have communicated directly with the President. I have brought to his attention the distressing condition resulting as a result of 3,000 workers being laid off at the Camden, N. J., yard of the New York Shipbuilding Co. I have emphasized the importance of having a long-range shipbuilding program to provide continuity of employment, as otherwise skilled workers are lost to the shipbuilding industry. We cannot afford to let this happen as it seriously weakens our defense effort in times of emergency.

My letter to the President reads as follows:

SEPTEMBER 23, 1950.

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of United States,
White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to call to your attention the distressed condition of the shipbuilding industry in this country. Many shipyards that have had long and honorable careers in ship construction are closed and the workers disbanded.

Last week 1,000 skilled workers were laid off at the New York Shipbuilding plant at Camden, N. J. This week 2,000 more have been laid off. This is a serious matter from the standpoint of the distress it brings to the discharged workers and their families. It is likewise serious from the standpoint of our national defense. It takes time and effort to build up an efficient shipbuilding organization of skilled workers. Such an organization cannot be gotten together overnight. Consequently, when such a force is disbanded it is a serious blow to our national security when an emergency, such as the present Korean incident, comes upon us without warning.

Giving full consideration to the present necessity for an expanded shipbuilding program, it seems strange to me that it has become necessary at this time to lay off 3,000 shipworkers at the Camden yard of the New York Shipbuilding Co., either because of change of plans, lack of plans, or policy for a long-range shipbuilding program.

May I respectfully call to your attention that foreign shipyards are busy, even in Japan. I am informed there are 17 shipyards busily engaged there in building ships. At the same time our shipyards are closed, or shortly will be, if work is not provided.

I am bringing to your attention the distressing situation that presently exists at Camden, N. J., as an illustration of what is happening, or, has already happened, throughout our country. I appeal to you to take immediate remedial action through appropriate departments of Government to the end that there be an immediate resumption of shipbuilding, and the adoption of a long-range program that will prevent the feast-and-famine condition that has heretofore and presently exists in the shipbuilding industry.

I am enclosing with this letter copies of the remarks I have made in the Congress during the last few days relating to the conditions existing at Camden, N. J., at this time, and, also copy of Courier-Post editorial, issue of September 18, 1950, that is one of the strongest and most logical appeals for a realistic shipbuilding program that it has been my privilege to read.

I will deeply appreciate your giving this matter your earliest consideration to the end that relief may be speedily granted.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,
Respectfully yours,
CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Member of Congress.

General Mobilization in France Is Reported To Be Impossible at the Present Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the translation of an ominous article appearing in the De Gaullist Weekly Carrefour on the military position of France. I am among those who believe we ought to take the risk of endeavoring to strengthen the forces in western Europe that are still free. But we ought to be fully aware of the desperate gamble that is involved. The translation of the article follows:

GENERAL MOBILIZATION IN FRANCE IS IMPOSSIBLE AT THE PRESENT TIME

(By Albert Palle)

Thunder strikes. Simultaneously, the U. S. S. R. invades Norway whose coasts she wants to control, and Turkey in order to close the Black Sea. At the same time, she strikes at the center. The Communist armies of Poland, eastern Germany, and the Soviet armored divisions roll toward the West. All the pacifist masks of the "peace-fighters" are being discarded. This is general war.

This is not a foolish hypothesis. The war in Korea proves it. Invasion threatens the French territory once more. Within 2 years. Within 6 months. Tomorrow, perhaps. And if it came tomorrow, what would we do?

WHERE ARE OUR SOLDIERS?

Mr. Auriol would surely issue a proclamation. He would say, "I have given orders that the land, sea, and air forces proceed to meet the aggressor." This is the best that may be said under the circumstances, and it is close to what Mr. Truman said after the Communist aggression in Korea. And afterwards? The ministers will be looking at each other in surprise. "Armies," they will say, "what armies?"

"But, yes," the Minister of National Defense will answer, "armies I do have, and you'll see, I am going to give them their order." But he will also make a retreat. "By golly," he will say, "I forgot. We don't have a chief of staff of the armed forces. To whom shall I give my orders? There is going to be jealousy." He will ring for the guard and hiss at him: "Tell them to mobilize." The guard will do his best.

There will be posters. "How; what?" the French will cry. "Where are we? Indeed, only yesterday my deputy told me that butter is more valuable than guns. Help! How about our benefits, and our salaries, and social justice, and Christian charity, and Aunt Mary's money-marriage?" "My poor man, it's all over so far as Aunt Mary is concerned; some of the Red-Star Kalmucks have taken her as their girl friend. * * *"

Then the French will let out another big yell: "Our soldiers, where are they?" But only one cavernous voice will answer them, the sinister echo of a well-known voice, that of Mr. Ramadier: "We have accomplished the minimum. Soldiers? There aren't any. They cost too much."

This is the truth: On July 25 of this year we have no national defense. The way things are going, there is no indication that we shall have one by next Easter or by next Trinity Sunday.

SWITZERLAND SPENDS MORE ON HER DEFENSE THAN WE DO

We shall have spent 420,000,000,000 [francs] this year for national defense, not to mention the additional appropriations for investments. But these amounts do not have the relative importance which is customarily ascribed to them.

Since 1946 the progress in military expenditures has been the following:

	Billions
1946	185
1947	245
1948	312
1949	388
1950	420
1951	500

But as of 1950, if the percentage point of military expenditures used to be 2.1, that of the budgetary expenditures has gone up to 2.46, and the retail price index to 2.84. The proportion of the military expenditures is, then, less today than in 1946. Since the liberation our military expenditures have decreased:

According to the report on budgetary expenditures: from 33 percent to 26 percent;

According to the report on public expenditures: from 33 percent to 20 percent;

According to the report on the national income: from 6 percent to 4.5 percent.

The supplementary 80,000,000,000 foreseen by Mr. Pleven for 1951 will not in any way upset this development. They will not permit the strengthening of the military potential, but only cover the costs of wage and price increases.

Let us remember, for purposes of comparison, that in the United States, before the Korean war, the percentage of the military expenditures, according to the report on public expenditures, was 33 percent, and according to the report on the national income, 7 percent. Today, these figures have risen to 75 percent. The American military budget is over five times the total French budget.

In fact, we have never spent less on our defense, except in 1924, 1925, and 1926. The smallest country behind the iron curtain spends relatively more than we do. We spend much less than Switzerland, Spain, Yugoslavia.

ONLY NINE DIVISIONS

What forces do these insufficient sums permit us to maintain? In 1950, the active members of the land, sea, and air forces total 598,028 men, to which should be added 52,000 gendarmes. The 47,000 members of the R. S. C. (Republican Security Company) are not considered as belonging to the army but fall under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Interior.

The army proper comprises 310,000 men stationed in France, north Africa, Germany, and Austria. Another 174,000 men are based in overseas territories, 131,000 of whom are fighting in Indochina.

The number of fighting men available in Europe and Africa hardly permit the formation of nine divisions (French type) which are supposed to have an active soldier contingent of 332,000 men.

In fact, this active soldier contingent is even smaller than it appears to be. If the period of service under the law is twelve months and a half, it has, in effect, for budgetary reasons been reduced to six months and a half. On the other hand, exemptions, dispensations, permissions, have to date been handed out in a miraculously liberal manner. As late as 1948, there were 85,000 exemptions for a contingent of 340,000 men. This year the Assembly voted the dispensation from (active) service for conscripts classified as "auxiliary service." This law deprives the army of 6,000 men able to fill desk and maintenance jobs. And what is one to say about this measure, unanimously approved by the Committee on National Defense, excusing from service the oldest sons of abandoned unwed mothers?

What weapons do these land forces have? Until a few months ago they used the leftovers of the armaments of the first army. Last year Mr. Max Lejeune bought 37 used (armored?) cars which were stored in Belgium. After modernizing these cars we should have at our disposal today 440 medium- and light-weight cars dating from the last war. This old war matériel is divided among two armored and three infantry divisions. In principle, the new American matériel should permit us this year to begin to reequip these five divisions with new armaments. Four others would receive the old matériel of the former. Let us mention, however, that according to the report on provisions, the shipment of the American arms is very much delayed. On the other hand, since the equipment of one armored division costs eighty billions, we receive, in principle, only one hundred and fifty billions [worth] of new armaments in 1950. It is doubtful that under these conditions it is possible to arm five divisions effectively with new equipment within the prescribed time limit.

Does our manufacturing industry develop at such a rate so as at least to compensate for the inadequacy of the American armaments? But only 27 percent of the credits are earmarked for war matériel. From 1949 to 1950 there were cuts to 30 percent on certain items, notably for manufactured goods whose "programs," according to the spokesman for an assembly committee, "are cut to pieces."

What kind of weapons do we manufacture? For our land forces, only light weapons. However, according to Mr. Pleven, models should be ready "within a few weeks." We should also have a good automatic "Panhard" machine gun, a tank destroyer, a heavy, 50-ton car, and various light weapons. But it really wasn't models of which there was talk already last September. Their manufacture has not been undertaken.

It is undoubtedly the insufficiency of the key skeleton organization which constitutes the most sorrowful aspect of our military distress. The defeat of 1940, the bondage, the split in the army which resulted from the loyalty of some to Marshal Pétain and of the rallying of others around General de Gaulle and the resistance, the purge which no doubt affected tens of thousands of career officers, the lack of equipment of the regimental staffs—all these factors have caused a grave crisis in the key skeleton organization. A single example will go a long way.

At Saint-Cyr, before the war, there were four candidates for one position. Today, there are less than two candidates. Also, certain specialists say, the niveau of Saint-Cyr has fallen very low, below the B. S. (bachelor of science). In fact, the élite elements who had always been present in the army no longer suffice to raise the average level.

As concerns the noncommissioned officers, the crisis is still more serious. Their salaries are at starvation levels. The long-term enlistments continued to dwindle until 1949. In the meantime, according to Mr. Plevin, the total long-term enlistments this year have risen to 2,688, as over against 2,100 in 1948. But this slight improvement does not make disappear the Army's grave lack of noncommissioned officers and career soldiers.

Under these circumstances it is easy to understand that the training of the troops can only be mediocre; not to say, impossible. In other words, the mode of incorporation obstructs all effective organization of training. The contingent is, in effect, incorporated in two sections, half a contingent every 6 months. As 3 months are required to give the troops basic training, it is the result of this system that over a period of 1 year the active trained force varies from single to double [training]. These variations involve inevitable disorders in the appropriations and a serious lowering of efficiency in training. Finally, there is no longer a uniform doctrine to which the instructors on all levels may refer.

The weakness of the contingent, and therefore of the armed forces immediately available, is extremely obvious. Can we, in turn, count on a large number of properly trained and key reserves? The situation is still more serious in that field.

Outside of the small armistice army of the forces of the fighting French, of those of the First French Army, the classes that became eligible for service between 1940 and 1946 received no training other than sometimes very cursory training in the Maquis. There has been no training of reservists since 1940. The Government is only now beginning to set up programs to remedy this situation. In fact, all training of reserves is impossible within the framework of the present credits for military expenditures.

Likewise is mobilization impossible today. No doubt there are mobilization plans in existence. They are pure abstraction. Without adequately trained reserves, without weapons, without equipment, without key units (cadres), the mobilization can only be effected on paper.

To top this memorial—a triple flop. There is no chief of staff on whose person the parties have been able to agree. Today there exists a civilian secretariat of national defense, and a military secretariat which is a staff committee without a chief. Since the liberation, no government has been able to force approval of a law on the organization of the national defense. No law on the programs, key units, active service, has been voted. In other words, there is no French military policy nor an organization of the armed forces possible. And the political powers are chiefly responsible for our military flop.

THE LEAST EFFORT

The training period under the law is 12½ months. In England, it is 18 months. The first step in strengthening the military would involve the doubling the time of service. It has been rumored that the French Government would favor this measure. The Minister of National Defense flatly denied this.

IMPACT OF THE WAR IN INDOCHINA ON THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

We maintain 174,000 men overseas, 135,000 of whom are in Indochina. The latter are all volunteers. The war in Indochina deprives the French army of its best elements. Furthermore, the replacements draw a great number of career key units (cadres) from our metropolitan units. The key organization of the metropolitan forces and their training are in a state of disorganization.

The growing of the active forces in Indochina has resulted in a reduction in the active forces in the other territories. In Madagascar they will be cut in half within 2 years, the A. O. F. (East African Corps) by 20 percent.

As to the four hundred and twenty billions in budgetary credits, one hundred and forty billions are absorbed by overseas France, 85 percent of which are reserved for Indochina.

It might be emphasized that France has been able to find 135,000 volunteers for the fight in Indochina. That is a remarkable result. And yet, the moral isolation of those fighting soldiers is deplorable. Insulted by the Communists, suspected by the Socialists, in no way protected by the government forgotten by the nation, their sacrifice is great. Every year there is a starlight county fair for the second D. B. (Armored Division) who have certainly deserved this (expression of appreciation) for their country. But what is done for the soldiers of Indochina?

MISERABLE PAY

The army pay is the same as in 1939. A soldier's pay is 6 francs per day, plus a tobacco allowance which, in effect, raises the pay to 12 francs per day. In grade 1 (an officer's) candidate with more than 5 years of service gets close to 17,000 francs a month; a sergeant, 11,000 francs. These figures speak for themselves.

THE ACME OF ANARCHY

"We have come to know, successively, a combination of the Minister of the Armed Forces and Minister of Armament. Then we have come to know a Minister of National Defense with an Undersecretary of State for (War) Matériel. Then we have come to know a Minister of National Defense with two Secretaries of State" (statement of a deputy of the majority).

CONDEMNATION OF A SYSTEM

"Experience has taught me that in spite of all the good will of the chiefs of government, for them the task of national defense is not the first order of business" (statement of a deputy of the majority).

AN ELECTION SLOGAN

Everyone repeats it in the assembly, in the press, in the streets: "The financial situation does not permit us to do more in military matters." Mr. Truman also said it on the eve of the Communist aggression in Korea. This did not prevent him from increasing his military budget by 75 percent 2 weeks later. It is not the budget which must dominate the national defense, but the national defense must dominate the budget.

THE ASSEMBLY HAS OTHER THINGS TO THINK ABOUT

"I believe that there is something dramatic in the present circumstances in seeing the national defense budget discussed before a so poorly equipped parliamentary assembly" (statement of a deputy of the majority).

Excess-Profits-Tax Hearing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following notice of public hearing of the House Ways and Means Committee to consider excess-profits-tax legislation released to the press by Chairman ROBERT DOUGHTON, is inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Committee on Ways and Means, announced today that the committee has scheduled public hearings on an excess-profits tax to begin Wednesday, November 15, 1950, and that the time for receipt of applications to be heard will terminate with the close of business on Friday, November 1.

Meanwhile, in compliance with the directive of the Congress and in order to have an excess-profits-tax bill ready for consideration by the House when it reconvenes on November 27, Chairman DOUGHTON stated that the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation will, within the next week or so, begin a series of conferences with the staff of the Treasury Department. It is contemplated that these conferences may result in the preparation of a report on excess-profits-tax proposals for submission to the committee which may then be used as a basis for testimony before the committee.

Witnesses desiring to be heard should address their application to the clerk, Committee on Ways and Means, room 1102, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C., in time to be received by November 1. Chairman DOUGHTON said, "The committee desires that, whenever possible, a single spokesman be designated to appear for an industry group in order to expedite the hearings."

The Tidelands Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today received a resolution from the Freeport, Tex., Lions Club addressed to the Congress of the United States of America. It reflects a widespread feeling concerning the title to the Texas tidelands—a feeling with which I am in entire accord.

I hope that Members of Congress will read the resolution with care and that they will bear it in mind when acting on legislation designed to clarify the tidelands controversy.

The resolution follows:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

On June 5, 1950, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a 4 to 3 decision which attempted to give title to the Federal Government of the tidelands off the shore of Texas. In 1845 the United States Government entered into a written contract with the people of Texas which specifically provided that these lands would remain the property of Texas after the Republic of Texas became a State. This decision of the Supreme Court, if allowed to stand and become effective would be a clear-cut breach of this contract. Today, more than ever before the United States is looked upon over the entire world as the example of a democratic country which keeps its obligations and treaties faithfully and to the letter. The United States of America should not allow the world to witness it breaking a contract, which its representatives made in good faith, and has stood for over 100 years.

In writing its decision, the Supreme Court refused to allow the attorney general of Texas to present and develop the multitude of evidence he had regarding this case. In making its decision the Supreme Court completely ignored the historical facts which are relative to this case. The entire citizenship of Texas is greatly disturbed and insulted by this action. The documented facts of history stand, regardless of the varied political interpretations which come and go with the generations of time. We, the people of Texas, ask you to look at the facts:

1. After winning its independence from Mexico on the battlefield of San Jacinto in 1836, the first congress of the Republic of Texas fixed its limits by a boundary act of December 19, 1836, as follows: "Beginning at the mouth of the Sabine River, and running west along the Gulf of Mexico three leagues from land, to the mouth of the Rio Grande." Thereafter, in 1837, President Andrew Jackson advised the Congress of the United States as follows:

"The title of Texas to the territory she claims is identified with her independence."

2. On April 12, 1844, after formal negotiations, a treaty was signed between Texas and the United States, providing for the annexation of Texas. In this treaty Texas was to give up its public land and property. The United States was to assume the public debt of Texas and was to annex Texas as a Territory. On April 22, 1844, President Tyler sent this treaty to the Senate of the United States, which on June 8 voted and defeated the treaty by a vote of 36 to 16. One of the main reasons stated on the floor of the Senate for the defeat of this treaty was the allegation that Texas' lands were worthless and would never amount to enough to pay the indebtedness of that Republic. One Senator said, "Let Texas keep her lands and pay her own debts."

3. Accordingly, the same Congress submitted a counterproposal to the Republic of Texas for annexation. From December 10, 1844, until February 14, 1845, 17 drafts of a counterproposal came before the United States Congress. Some of these had provisions which would have required Texas to cede its minerals, mines, salt lakes, and springs, and to give up its land and mineral rights. None of these proposals passed. Finally Representative Milton Brown of Tennessee, who had previously introduced a resolution stipulating that Texas cede her minerals, offered again the general proposals of his original resolution, but omitted the

ceding of mineral clauses, which his earlier resolution had contained and which had just been defeated in the rejection of an amendment of Representative Burke, of New Hampshire, which stipulated that Texas cede its minerals and mines. Brown's revised resolution was adopted by a vote of 120 to 98. Thus the claim of the United States to the minerals of Texas was considered and rejected by the House of Representatives in its formation of the resolution which was submitted to and accepted by the Republic of Texas as the basis of its admission to the Union.

This House resolution that finally passed contained two paragraphs; the first proposed that Texas should be admitted to the Union as a State, with a republican form of government adopted by the people of Texas and approved by the Congress of the United States. The second paragraph specified the details of the annexation; namely, that the constitution of the new State must be submitted to Congress before January 1, 1846, and that new States, not exceeding four in number in addition to the State of Texas might be formed out of Texas. The most important of these specific provisions was that Texas was to retain its public debt and was to retain title to all of the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within the limits of the Republic of Texas. Nothing was in these first two paragraphs about equal footing with other States.

The United States Senate amended this resolution and added a third paragraph which gave the President of the United States the option at his own judgment and discretion to negotiate the annexation of Texas by treaty which would admit Texas into the Union on an equal footing with the existing States, instead of submitting to the Republic of Texas the proposals of the first and second paragraphs as prepared by the House.

President Tyler chose not to exercise this option to negotiate by treaty and instead submitted the provisions of only the first two paragraphs of the joint resolution. President Anson Jones of Texas submitted this to the Texas Congress, which unanimously approved it, and then called a convention of the people of Texas to prepare a State constitution and to ratify the acceptance by the Texas Congress. This convention passed an ordinance of acceptance which states, "* * * we, the deputies of the people of Texas, do ordain and declare that we assent to and accept the proposals, conditions, and guaranties contained in the first and second sections of the resolution of the Congress of the United States * * *" On December 29, 1845, James K. Polk, President of the United States, signed a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States, which referred to the offer by the United States and the acceptance of Texas of the provisions of the first and second paragraphs of the initial joint resolution of March 1, 1845, which made the offer, and declared that effective upon December 29, 1845, and upon those terms, Texas was a State in the Union. Thus, although the President of the United States was authorized by the third paragraph of the resolution, at his own discretion to offer Texas an opportunity to come into the Union on "equal footing" by treaty, he instead submitted the alternate proposal which outlined specific provisions allowing Texas to retain her lands. The proposal actually submitted to and accepted and ratified by Texas contained no mention of the "equal footing" idea.

One of the specific proposals, conditions, and guaranties offered by the United States in good faith and accepted faithfully by the people of Texas was that Texas was to retain the public domain which had belonged to it while it was an independent nation. These lands consisted of an estimated 237,906,000 acres of public lands which extended to three leagues offshore. The new State of Texas retained the General Land Office, which had been established by the republic to administer the ownership of these lands. And for over 100 years Texas has had possession of these lands and has administered them accordingly, and its ownership has been recognized by all parties, including the United States Government.

These are the facts of history. It is not the romantic imagination of Texas, nor is it a wishful dream of ours. It is true, pure, and clean factual history. To violate this written contract made in good faith by both parties and kept by both for over 100 years is to cast a dark shadow of dishonor upon the whole of American life, public and private, which rests upon the integrity, the faithful observance of agreements.

Four members of the Supreme Court of the United States, less than a majority of the full nine member court, have ignored the provisions of the annexation contract by which Texas retained these lands and minerals. In justification therefor, these four members have cited and relied upon the alternative "equal footing" provision which was never submitted by the President of the United States to Texas and was never considered, accepted, or agreed upon by the Republic of Texas. It was contained in none of the proposals to or negotiations with Texas except the above-mentioned alternative and rejected third paragraph. The result is that an alternative proposal which was rejected both by the United States and Texas has been allowed by the Supreme Court to control over the proposal specifically submitted by the Congress and people of Texas, and which provided that they retain all lands "lying within its limits."

The ruling of the Supreme Court should not be allowed to stand. As Chief Justice John Marshall said, suits involving constitutional issues and treaties should not be decided by less than a majority of the full Court. In no event should four members of the Court, over the protest of three dissenters, be allowed to break a provision of the solemn contract between the United States and the Republic of Texas and take away from the State 2,680,000 acres of land which has been in its possession for over 100 years. If the Court persists, then Congress should remedy the injustice.

Since it was a joint resolution of Congress which established the provisions of Texas' affiliation with the United States, we, the people of Texas, appeal to you whose high privilege it is to make the policies of this Nation, to uphold the dignity of our great country by enforcing the agreements made by our predecessors over 105 years ago. Today, the United States is the leader of nations in the fight to uphold the high moral principles of honor, and good faith in government. Now, while its representatives are negotiating treaties and agreements with nations all over the earth, is no time for the Government of the United States to exhibit to the world that it will stoop to the depth of regarding a written document made in good faith by two nations as a "scrap of paper." The people of Texas cannot accept such a conduct of government. We respectfully urge that the Eighty-first Congress by a joint resolution uphold the honor and dignity of the Twenty-ninth Congress and support the provisions of its annexation agreement with Texas, and declare that all right, title, and interest in the public domain of Texas, including its tidelands, three leagues into the sea, remains and is vested in the State of Texas.

Passed by the board of directors of the Freeport (Tex.) Lions Club this 28th day of August, 1950.

F. W. ARRINGTON,
President, Freeport, Tex., Lions Club.

Health Legislation That Has Provided Additional Facilities and Research Programs for the Benefit of Our People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it has given me a great deal of personal pleasure to have been a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This committee has an exceedingly extensive jurisdiction covering outstanding activities such as all forms of transportation, including rail, bus, motortrucks, inland and coastal waterways; communications, which includes radio, television, telephone, telegraph, and cables; security exchange and certain types of investment legislation; Federal power, relating to interstate transmission of all forms of power, including electricity, natural gas, and related subjects; Federal trade, which covers trade practices; civil aviation, and all that relates to the operation and control of all types of civil aircraft; food and drugs, to insure safety and honesty in the administration of such to our people; Bureau of Standards, relating to scientific development; enemy property, to provide for the administration and settlement of alien property in the custody of the Government taken over by it as a result of the last war; petroleum, in all its different aspects, including production, refinement, distribution, and sale.

The last, but by no means the least, is the jurisdiction over public health. It is this more than any other subject within the jurisdiction of our committee that has given me a feeling of genuine pleasure and appreciation of doing something constructive and worth while for all of our people.

The accomplishments of our committee, and in which I feel honored to have had a part, have been widespread, and have materially advanced the welfare of our people. The work of the committee has covered those subjects in which it was particularly appropriate for the Federal Government to supplement by Federal aid activities within the several States and territories. Care has at all times been observed to keep these Federal programs within limits that would preclude the Federal Government from taking over, substituting or replacing private practice of medicine or the conduct of private institutions carrying on medical services or research activities. The whole thought and purpose is to supplement and encourage all such endeavors and thereby make greater progress and advancement in the cause of human welfare.

I include, as a part of my remarks, a partial list of bills that have come out of our committee and are now law. I am pleased that some of this legislation bears my name, and all of the bills have had my active support. The list is as follows:

Federal Security Agency, Public Health Service—Statutory authority for grants for health services

	Authority
Venereal-disease control.	Sec. 314 (a), Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 693, as amended), Public Law 410, 78th Cong., approved July 1, 1944.
Tuberculosis control.	Sec. 314 (b), Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 693, as amended), Public Law 410, 78th Cong., approved July 1, 1944.
General health	Sec. 314 (c), Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 693, as amended), Public Law 410, 78th Cong., approved July 1, 1944.
Mental health	Sec. 314 (c), Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 693, as amended), National Mental Health Act, Public Law 487, 79th Cong., approved July 3, 1946.
Heart disease	Sec. 314 (c), Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 693, as amended), National Heart Act, Public Law 655, 80th Cong., approved June 16, 1498.
Water pollution	Sec. 8 (a), Water Pollution Control Act (62 Stat. 1159), Public Law 845, 80th Cong., approved June 30, 1948.
Hospital survey and planning.	Sec. 613, Public Health Service Act (60 Stat. 1042, as amended), Hospital Survey and Construction Act, Public Law 725, 79th Cong., approved Aug. 13, 1946.
Hospital construction.	Sec. 625, Public Health Service Act (60 Stat. 1045, as amended), Hospital Survey and Construction Act, Public Law 725, 79th Cong., approved Aug. 13, 1946.
Cancer control	Annual appropriation act.
Rapid-treatment centers.	Do.
Venereal-disease demonstration.	Do.

It is very gratifying to realize the extent to which our State of New Jersey has directly benefited, under the above laws, by way of Federal grants for the conduct of the various activities in our State health service. Payments to the State of New Jersey for health services from 1945 to 1950 are as follows:

Federal Security Agency, Public Health Service—Payments to the State of New Jersey for health services, fiscal years 1945–50

	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Venereal-disease control	$143, 767. 00	$173, 846	$140, 368. 71	$141, 375	$143, 828	$119, 675
Rapid-treatment facilities	0	82, 060	57, 316. 60	34, 240	77, 356	34, 915
Venereal-disease demonstration	0	0	0	0	50, 000	0
Tuberculosis control	33, 900. 00	119, 499	104, 501. 00	129, 888	136, 303	141, 767
General health	211, 271. 83	238, 853	349, 381. 00	263, 332	282, 273	326, 210
Mental health	0	0	0	84, 593	115, 496	120, 573
Heart-disease control	0	0	0	0	0	53, 715
Cancer control	0	0	0	68, 302	64, 574	89, 712
Water pollution	0	0	0	0	0	18, 085
Hospital survey and planning	0	0	16, 050. 00	26, 765	11, 965	0
Hospital construction contract authorization	0	0	0	1, 328, 053	1, 328, 053	2, 923, 571
Total	388, 938. 83	614, 258	667, 616. 71	2, 106, 548	2, 209, 849	3, 828, 223

APPROVED PROJECTS—HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

	Project No.	Project name	Date approved	Amount		Total
				1949	1950	
Camden	25	Our Lady of Lourdes Hospital, Camden, N. J.	Jan. 16, 1950	$130, 181. 23	$43, 578. 77	$173, 760
Salem	6	Salem County Memorial Hospital, Salem, N. J.	Jan. 6, 1950	200, 000. 00	245, 960. 00	445, 960

In addition to the above there have been grants and awards to institutions and individuals in the State of New Jersey for the purpose of research, study, and teaching, that have increased from $2,400 in 1946 to $237,349 in 1950–51 fiscal. The list in detail is as follows:

National Institutes of Health grants and awards to institutions and individuals in the State of New Jersey, by fiscal year[1]

	Total		Fiscal year—											
			1951		1950		1949		1948		1947		1946	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Research grants:														
Cancer Institute	1	$15, 000	1	$15, 000										
Dental Institute	1	12, 417	1	12, 417										
Heart Institute	3	22, 296	1	11, 394	1	$10, 152	1	$750						
Other	19	72, 726	4	12, 782	7	30, 996	3	12, 426	3	$13, 597	2	$2, 925		
Total research	24	122, 439	7	51, 593	8	41, 148	4	13, 176	3	13, 597	2	2, 925		
Teaching grants: Mental health	3	34, 380			1	10, 260	1	12, 260	1	11, 860				
Control grants: Cancer	2	54, 775			1	26, 200	1	28, 575						
Fellowships:														
Cancer Institute	6	9, 520			2	3, 170	3	5, 550	1	800				
National Institute of Health (general)	5	11, 435			1	3, 753			2	3, 016	1	1, 666	1	$2, 400
National Heart Institute	1	4, 800					1	4, 800						
Total fellowships	12	25, 755			3	6, 923	4	10, 350	3	4, 416	1	1, 666	1	2, 400
Grand total	41	237, 349	7	51, 593	13	84, 531	10	64, 361	7	29, 873	3	4, 591	1	2, 400

[1] Does not include National Institutes of Health control grants which are administered through the Bureau of State Services.

I am particularly proud of the fact that the Hospital Construction Act has already proved highly beneficial to the First Congressional District in the construction of two new hospitals that have come within the provisions of the bill since its passage in 1946. I refer to the allotments made in 1949 and 1950 to Our Lady of Lourdes Hospital, Camden, N. J., amounting to a total of $173,760, and allotments in the same years to the Salem County Memorial Hospital, Salem, N. J., amounting to an aggregate of $445,960. Of course, it will be realized that the counties of Camden, Gloucester, and Salem have likewise shared in a substantial way in the disposition of the funds allotted to New Jersey for the conduct of health services from 1945 to 1950, amounting to the aggregate total for the State of New Jersey of $9,815,432.54.

I have introduced a bill modeled after the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation legislation and designed to solve the problem of health services in the Nation without socializing medicine, even as the FDIC secured deposits without taking over the banks.

The key point is that by reinsuring the heavier losses for health insurance it will be possible for the local Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and other local farm cooperative and union hospitalization and medical care plans to give much more attractive and comprehensive contracts to the subscribers at a reasonable charge. Within a brief space of time this should cover the medical economic problem in the Nation.

The bill will largely solve this health problem without bringing the Government into the patient-doctor or patient-hospital relationship. It will confine the Government's contact to the local voluntary insurance nonprofit associations.

The bill is, of course, a first draft and is subject to improvement and modification as it is analyzed and considered by various interested groups, professions, and associations.

The Eighty-First: The Did-Something Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this article from Newsweek magazine for the week of September 25 to my mind sums up with a pat on the back the work of the Eighty-first Congress.

I supported practically every measure that Newsweek gives Congress credit for, except the increase in price support for cotton and peanuts. I have made several speeches on the fact that I am for a sensible farm program but not one completely out of hand. As a farmer myself, I feel that I know that most intelligent farmers do not expect a program which cannot be justified on either moral, political, or social grounds.

I believe that all of the people in my district will be interested in knowing just exactly what the Congress did, and when a magazine like Newsweek gives this editorial pat on the back, I think that is an endorsement not only of the Congress but of your Congressman, who had a great deal to do with the fine record of the Eighty-first Congress. The above-mentioned editorial follows:

THE EIGHTY-FIRST: THE DID-SOMETHING CONGRESS

The Eighty-first Congress, wearily packing to go home, could look back on a prodigious amount of completed work. Here are the important things it has done since going to work in January 1949, after the 1948 election.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Authorized wage, price, and credit controls, rationing, allocation of war-essential materials, and Government assistance to defense plants.

Appropriated, after the Korean war broke out, nearly $17,000,000,000 additional funds for the armed services and for military aid abroad.

Removed limits on the size of the Armed Forces, authorized a 70-group Air Force, extended selective service for a year, included doctors, dentists, and other professional men in the draft, authorized calling up of the National Guard and Reserves.

Voted allowances to dependents of men in service.

Authorized $596,000,000 Army, Navy, and Air Force construction at bases in United States and abroad.

Authorized $350,000,000 naval ship construction.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Required Communists to register and authorized their confinement in wartime.

Authorized summary dismissals, for security reasons, in 10 Governmenta agencies.

TAXES AND NATIONAL ECONOMY

Increased tax rates enough to produce $4,500,000,000 additional revenue to meet defense needs.

Repealed oleomargarine tax.

Extended rent control on local-option basis.

Authorized Federal insurance of bank deposits on accounts up to $10,000.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Authorized $3,100,000,000 in economic aid abroad under Marshall plan, point 4, etc.

Authorized $1,200,000,000 military aid to friendly nations in Europe, Near East, and Asia.

Abolished discriminatory provisions of the Displaced Persons Act and liberalized it.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

Extended social security to 10,000,000 more persons and doubled benefits.

Expanded Federal housing for moderate-income families, raised limit on Government's purchase of mortgages, liberalized financing for FHA-insured rental housing.

Provided 3-year Federal-aid program for school construction in Federal impact areas.

Established National Science Foundation and authorized United States Public Health Service to support research in rheumatism, arthritis, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Accepted 20 proposals to streamline Federal establishment, rejected 7.

AGRICULTURE

Authorized $2,000,000,000 increase in CCC borrowing capacity to continue farm price supports, and increased acreage eligible for price support by 1,200,000 acres of cotton and 100,000 acres of peanuts. Made 1950 potato crop subject to producer agreement on marketing quotas.

Transportation and Its Related Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the study of transportation and its problems by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been one that the committee has carried on over a period of years. It was first started by Hon. Clarence Lee, who for upward of 26 years was a member of the committee and in more recent years its distinguished chairman. During my chairmanship of the committee, in the Eightieth Congress, I continued the study. In the work that was done by the committee during these years of study the committee was greatly assisted by Dr. Fredericks, a member of our staff, and, a professor at the University of Maryland. Words cannot adequately describe or do just credit to the valuable and painstaking help that was rendered by him. Much of the thoughts and views I have expressed in the speech I delivered before the Camden Traffic Club and its guests on Monday, May 15, 1950, and, which by unanimous consent granted to me, I herewith make a part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, OF NEW JERSEY

It is a pleasure to be present with you this evening, although I do not think I am entitled to the honor you bestow in inviting me to address such a distinguished group.

During my service in the House of Representatives, covering nearly 24 years, I have been a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for most of that time. It has been a privilege that I value very highly to have had the opportunity of service on such an important committee.

There is no committee on the House that has such widespread jurisdiction, nor covers as many varied and important activities as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is the third oldest committee, having been set up by the Congress in and continued through all the intervening years until the present.

The jurisdiction of the committee covers a wide field of activities. It has legislative jurisdiction over all forms of transportation operating on land, inland waterways, certain types of coastal carriers, and air. It also has jurisdiction over interstate power, Federal trade, all forms of communications, including telephone, telegraph, cables, radio, and television. Also over petroleum, security exchanges, public health and science, Bureau of Standards, Weather Bureau, and, believe it or not, in the last few days our jurisdiction extended even to slot machines or "one-arm bandits," as they are commonly known.

I realize that of all these subjects you are interested most in transportation. Hence my remarks this evening will relate to a short history of its development in this country, the growth of regulation pertaining to it, and if time permits some reference to existing problems and possible solution.

The transportation industry of the United States is composed of water, rail, highway, pipeline, and air carriers. These different carriers did not all come into being at one time or in the same way. They did not all come within the area of Federal regulation for the same reasons, at the same time or in the same manner. As they have all developed it has become apparent that each has its own economic problems; each is highly competitive with the others; yet each is a most useful part of our transportation system.

Today the United States has the best transportation system in the world. The intercity carriers operated 78,372,000,000 passenger-miles of transportation and hauled 890,848,000,000 ton-miles of freight in 1947. To handle this traffic, the carriers employed 2,800,000 people and paid $6,000,000,000 for labor. Carrier-operating revenues were $13,000,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1948. To help support the Government it paid out in income taxes alone $1,500,000,000 for the year 1944. In addition, the users paid over $590,000,000 during 1948 for excise taxes imposed as a wartime measure in part to check civilian uses of transportation.

Transportation effects the daily life of every citizen of the country. Hence, each citizen has a stake in the transportation system whether he is a manufacturer, shipper, merchant, traveler, or individual consumer. Good service and reasonable rates are his immediate interests in transportation system.

The user being a typical American will continually demand that the system and the function it performs be constantly improved. To meet these user demands in the face of constant changes in business conditions, growing Government regulations and diminishing financial returns constitute the major problem confronting the transportation industry today.

To assure good service at reasonable cost, Government and business jointly must try to maintain and further develop an efficient and dynamic intercity transportation system—rail, highway, air and water—for moving mail, raw materials, goods, men, and machines. Furthermore, it must be fully appreciated by all groups and individuals that the transportation system assumes greater and greater importance to the national economy and security as the country continues to grow and develop.

At the outset, it is evident that the further development of a strong and healthy transportation system in the United States will require encouragement of proper government attitude toward existing problems and a sincere desire by all concerned to arrive at practical and acceptable solutions.

And, regardless of shipper and carrier desires, it must be recognized that public interest is always paramount.

Public interest dictates that the carriers be given a healthy business atmosphere in which to operate—one that is not burdened with excessive and duplicating taxes and other adverse features that discourage traffic, such as the continued use of the wartime imposed excises.

This interest also requires that competition be maintained between the various forms of transporation on a fair basis. Only through such terms of competition will the users profit and the transportation industry become stronger.

Public interest further calls for legislative adjustment in transportation regulations so as to promote and encourage development of a well-balanced transportation system capable of greater flexibility in its operation to meet changing demands in requirements of today and the foreseeable future.

Transportation, like any other business, must expect to share good and bad times. Unless transportation investments are attractive in good times, the public will not risk its money and the development of the industry will be retarded. The users, general public and carriers will suffer because of the resulting inadequate service. Recognizing how important it is to keep the transportation industry functioning as a strong, healthy, and financially sound business, and to keep transportation service the best in the world, free to grow and able to keep pace with changing economic conditions, it is necessary that all forms of transportation be afforded a healthy business atmosphere in which to operate, competitive opportunities which will conserve for the public good the advantages of each, and that they be regulated only to the degree clearly required by the public interest.

DEVELOPMENT OF REGULATION

At this point it might be well to consider the development of regulation during the past as it applied to the several types of carriers.

Railroads

Federal regulation of railroads began with the Act to Regulate Commerce in 1887, which has two major objectives: (1) to insure a just and reasonable rate structure, and (2) to prevent discriminatory practices. The Interstate Commerce Commission was established for the purpose of carrying out these objectives. Owing to the open hostility of the railroads and a series of court decisions which left the Commission no power to fix rates and control long-and-short haul discriminations, Federal regulation was relatively ineffective for 20 years. In 1906, however, the Hepburn Act, added greatly to the powers of the Commission; extended its jurisdiction to include express and sleeping-car companies, pipelines, and industrial railways; granted the power to fix maximum rates after complaint and hearing; extended Commission powers to include those of inspection and audit; and directed the courts to enforce the orders of the Commission, provided they were "regularly made and duly served."

A new phase of regulation began with passage of the Transportation Act of 1920. Prior to this time regulation had been directed mainly toward securing just and reasonable individual rates. Congress now realized that the railroad system of the country must be placed on a stable basis, and that rates should, therefore, be high enough to enable the railroads to perform their function in the economy of the country. To this end the act provided that rates were to be established to afford an opportunity for the carriers, as a whole or in groups, to earn a fair return upon the aggregate value of their properties used in rendering transportation services. This act also gave the railways permission, subject to the Commission's approval, to form pooling arrangements and combinations. It gave the Commission control of new construction, of abandonment of existing lines, and of other aspects of service; and it also gave the Commission supervision over security issues and provided for the establishment of new machinery for controlling labor disputes.

The Transportation Act of 1940 was fundamentally a product of the competitive situation which had developed in transportation, and its primary object was to restrain this competition, at least to a limited extent, and to strengthen the railroads in particular. In this act Congress broadened the declaration of the national transportation policy which had previously been partially enunciated in the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 and the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Especially vital points in the policy, as stated in 1940, were the following: Impartial regulation of all modes of transportation, preservation of the inherent advantages of each type of transportation, promotion of sound conditions in the transportation industries, condemnation of destructive competitive practices, and encouragement of fair wages and working conditions. Decision as to the actual meaning of these elements of policy was left in the hands of the Commission. This act also liberalized the Commission's authority over combinations, pooling, unifications, mergers, and acquisition of control of railroads.

Pipelines

Federal regulation of pipelines (other than those transporting water or natural gas) was first established by the Hepburn Act of 1906, which declared them to be common carriers and placed them under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Since these pipelines transport only liquids in bulk, which move in large and continuous volumes, their operations are intimately related to the producing and refining branches of the oil industry. Practically all the lines are integrated with the operation of oil companies and no important lines are operated by interests not affiliated with the oil industry.

Water carriers

The act to regulate commerce of 1887 and the Panama Canal Act of 1912 provided for some regulation of water transportation, but only in connection with services rendered jointly with railroads or by water carriers under the control of railroads. However, it was not until the adoption of the Shipping Act of 1916 (amended in 1920) that general Federal regulation of water transportation was provided.

This act created the United States Shipping Board and required common carriers by water operating in interstate commerce to file maximum and joint rates with the Board. Such rates were to be reasonable and might be fixed by the Board if found to be otherwise. Other provisions of the Shipping Act were directed toward the interrelations between water carriers. More legislation applicable to water transportation was provided in the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933, as amended in 1938. This law required common carriers engaged in the intercoastal, coastwise, and Great Lakes service to publish and observe actual rates of charge; made it necessary to give 30 days' notice of changes in rates; and authorized the Shipping Board to suspend proposed changes in rates for a period of 4 months. The Maritime Commission was empowered, after 1938, to prescribe maximum and minimum rates for common carriers on the high seas, and maximum rates for such carriers on the Great Lakes. In the intercoastal service the Commission had limited jurisdiction over the rates of contract carriers.

The Transportation Act of 1940 added the present part III to the Interstate Commerce Act. With important exceptions, this act extended Federal regulation to all common carriers in interstate transportation on the inland waters and oceans, and transferred the regulatory functions of the Maritime Commission to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Motor carriers

In the earlier years of highway transportation, the legal status of motor-vehicle operations was loosely defined. Generally, the only laws applicable to motor highway transportation were requirement for the payment of State license fees for the vehicles. It soon became apparent, however, that there was a need for regulations as to size and speed of vehicles. Therefore, starting in 1913, most States passed laws limiting the gross weight of motor vehicles using their highways. These laws, however, applied only to the vehicle itself with no regard for the nature or purpose of its use.

The next development was a growing public appreciation that some distinction ought properly to be made between the use of the highways for pleasure, or as an incident of ordinary business activities, and their commercial use for profit by operators of motor transport for hire. This led to the start of Government regulation of the business of commercial highway transportation.

Until 1935, all regulation of highway transport operations was under the exclusive jurisdiction of the States. State regulatory legislation provided for fairly thorough and comprehensive supervision of commercial carriers, but there often was little or no provision made for the enforcement of their statutes. Until 1925, regulation by the States applied not only to operations which took place wholly within their boundaries, but it was believed that they also had power to regulate interstate traffic at the same time, and to the extent that it took place within the boundaries of a State. In that year, however, a decision of the Supreme Court denied to the States the right to exercise any but a limited control over operations which crossed State boundaries. This decision left a wide gap in the regulation of the business of highway transportation and a large number of operations became exempt from all control since all an operator need do, to exempt himself from any legal control of his business, was to cross a State line, even for a short distance.

Such lack of control of rates or service, either State or interstate, at this particular period in the development of highway transportation encouraged chaotic conditions and, particularly after the start of the general business depression in 1929, brought into the carrier field many unreliable operators. The industry was wide open and competition was virtually unrestrained. Public and industry recognition of this bad situation in the business of highway transportation brought about enactment of the Federal Motor Carrier Act of 1935, which became part II of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The act of 1935 applies to motor carriers the same principles as those underlying the regulations of railroads but went further than any previous legislation dealing with transportation as it contains a broad declaration of congressional policy. Important objectives of this policy were to preserve the inherent advantages of motor transportation, foster sound conditions in the motor-carrier industry, promote an adequate motor-carrier industry, promote an adequate motor-carrier service at reasonable rates, encourage coordination among the different agencies of transportation, and facilitate cooperation between Federal and State regulatory authorities. With certain exceptions, the Interstate Commerce Commission was given jurisdiction over motor-vehicle carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce as to rates, services, and other operations.

Except for safety regulation the exemptions included (a) school busses, taxicabs,

hotel vehicles, trolley busses, and motor vehicles used incidentally to aircraft transportation; (b) motor vehicles controlled and operated by farmers or farmer cooperatives and those engaged in transporting agricultural products, livestock, or fish for hire; and (c) motor vehicles used exclusively in distributing newspapers. Those exemptions apply to substantial volume of interstate traffice. Probably accounting for the largest tonnage of exempt freight movement is that which applied to trucks used in hauling livestock, fish, and agricultural products (and no other freight) for hire.

Air carriers

Prior to 1925, the only legislation pertaining to air transportation had to do with rates of pay for carrying mail. Under this and subsequent legislation, the Postmaster General exercised some authority over and prescribed the extent the location of airmail and passenger service. This legislation was repealed by the Air Mail Act of 1935, which placed supervision and control of airlines under the Government agencies. The Department of Commerce was given power to regulate safety and was charged with the development and maintenance of airways. The Interstate Commerce Commisson was given authority to set fair and reasonable rates for mail pay. Mail contracts were to be awarded by the Post Office Department under competitive bidding, subject to specified maximum rates.

However, financial results from operation of air transport continued to be highly unsatisfactory, leading to a difficult financial situation for some of the airlines. The Congress then enacted the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which set up a Civil Aeronautics Authority, with broad powers to regulate carriers engaged in scheduled air transportation, and their rates, and to issue certificates of convenience and necessity for entrance into operation. Under a Presidential reorganization plan in 1940, the Civil Aeronautics Authority was transferred to the Department of Commerce, but the five-member tribunal administering economic regulation retained its independence as an administrative body, with the title of Civil Aeronautics Board. Thus, the regulation of air transportation is separately administered from the regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of all other types of common-carrier transportation. In addition to its regulatory functions the Civil Aeronautics Board is also charged by law with the promotional duty to foster and encourage air transport and to protect the annual revenues of certificated airlines by adjustment in payments for carrying mail.

Freight forwarders

Freight forwarders perform services between the shippers and carriers. As such they assume the responsibility for shipments while in the course of transportation, and charge rates covering the entire service. They come under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, through the addition of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act in 1942. By the law the Commission was granted substantially the same authority over forwarders that it had over the carriers already within its jurisdiction. It is also provided that forwarders cannot lawfully control any carrier, but that carriers may acquire control of forwarders on the grounds of promoting greater efficiency. In addition, forwarders are not allowed to use any but common carriers in providing their services, thus eliminating the contract carriers by water, highway, or air.

THE NEED OF A NEW APPROACH

The perfect hodgepodge of enactments characterizing the development of our national transportation policy from 1887 on down, the result of attempts to comprise the conflicts between various competing and opposing carriers as they have been brought under Federal jurisdiction, leaves us now with too much regulation, too much conflict in regulation, and a system better adapted to conditions of the past than today. The function of government in transportation now extends far beyond public need and too little is left to management.

What we need is an honest and objective approach to the entire problem so that we may adjust our national transportation policy to conditions now existing in fact, not in theory.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION INQUIRY

Congress is aware of the necessity of reappraising our existing regulatory policies and providing an over-all national transportation policy that will more fully recognize present-day conditions and requirements.

In furtherance of this objective, a national transportation inquiry was authorized by House Resolution 318, adopted March 7, 1946, during the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress. This resolution authorized and directed the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to investigate the transportation situation with a view to recommending legislation that will result in a consistent public policy fair to all competing agencies of transport, to the using and investing public, and to labor, to the end that the country's commerce may be moved with the greatest possible degree of economy, safety, and dispatch.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce immediately thereafter began its work by preparing a list of topics suggesting many of the postwar transportation problems faced by the country and by carriers and users of their services. This list, accompanied by an invitation to discuss these suggestions, was widely circulated. Though addressed to individuals and organizations, it was an invitation to anyone who had experience, knowledge, or constructive suggestions, which he felt might be helpful, to submit his views to the committee. By this means it was hoped that any defects and injustices prevailing under existing transportation laws would be brought to light accompanied by proposals of remedies. The effort to secure such opinions was conceived by the committee as the first step toward adjusting legislation and administrative control to a new set of transportation conditions; toward the improvement of our national transportation policy; toward what might develop into a comprehensive rewriting of our transportation policy and its implementation by new legislation.

Nearly 500 statements were received. These were analyzed and summarized in House Report No. 2735 (79th Cong., 2d sess.). It was recognized from the beginning that these statements were necessarily ex parte made without open hearings or an opportunity for cross-examination. Nevertheless, they were an important contribution to the basic information required in the survey. The results of the study were published in the hope that further discussion by interested parties would develop prior to the formulation of any new over-all transportation legislation.

ACTIVITIES DURING EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

The continuance of the national transportation inquiry by the committee was authorized by House Resolution 153 of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, approved on May 12, 1947, and it did so by continuing its fact-finding activities with a view to (a) submitting the issues of the transportation problem for study and recommendation of various economic groups of the country; and (b) drafting for consideration of the Congress any essential changes which might be found desirable in our national transportation policies. In this process the committee operated on the general basis that all transportation agencies were engaged in useful and necessary work; that the services of the various types of carriers constituted a basic industry of the Nation; and that Government regulation should be designed as a constructive aid to the public and to the carriers. The committee assumed that the broad purposes of regulation contemplate that the Government should use its regulatory powers to secure good services and fair treatment to the public; exercise just and reasonable regulation of the carriers; and maintain fair competition based on privately owned transportation facilities.

Subsequent to the publication of the report on the national transportation inquiry, in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress, numerous interested groups and individuals proposed to aid the committee further by doing additional work on various problems covered by the inquiry. Such assistance was welcomed by the committee; but at the same time it was pointed out that little progress would be possible, with so complicated a problem, if the various groups adhered to past procedures, usually involving promotion of their own particular theories and positions. The committee sought, so far as possible, a common meeting ground where all our transportation agencies can unite in justice to the public interest and with fairness between them in their competitive relations to each other. By encouraging additional study on the part of those disposed to carry on such work it was the hope of the committee that every appropriate step would be taken to reconcile points of view and bring about common accord on the issues of the problem. The committee thought we should retain all that is good and where deficient improve our system of regulation which has developed based upon principles applicable to conditions existing 30 years ago rather than those of the present.

The work of those cooperating with the committee reached a point, in April 1948, where it was deemed advisable to hold the first public hearings in connection with the inquiry. Hearings were, therefore, conducted. These dealt particularly with the following current problems of our national transportation policy: (a) Should or should not the regulation of all common-carrier forms of transportation be centralized in one agency? (b) Under present conditions of national defense and competition among carriers, what should be the policy of the Federal Government regarding promoting one or more types of common carriers and in aiding others? (c) Do our present regulatory bodies, working within the framework of existing statutory authority, have sufficient scope of authority and operate under administrative practices adequate to deal with the rapid movement of economic events?

Witnesses appeared at this hearing, made statements, and were questioned by members of the committee. Results confirmed the position of users of transportation services and the carriers which had already been brought to the committee's attention by the written statements filed with it at the start of its inquiry.

Subsequently, hearings were held on the defense aspects of the national transportation policy. Testimony on our defense transportation system come from the various carriers and the industries supplying them with maintenance materials and equipment. In its examination into the status of our national transportation system from the point of view of national defense, the committee was conscious of the experience preceding and during the last war and was concerned with what this past performance may have meant, and left to us in the way of a vital transportation system; of our ability again to meet such an emergency demand, and of the changes which have taken place or may be occurring. Witnesses appeared, made statements, and were questioned by committee members as to their present financial and manpower resources, condition of physical

plant and equipment, and their ability to handle any increased demands for service.

Testimony presented at this hearing again emphasized the indisputable fact that the national security requires an adequate and efficient transportation system, and that all types of carriers can best contribute to that security when they are enabled to maintain their properties and their organizations in sound condition, both physically and financially. There can be no adequate transportation system in wartime unless there is, in time of peace, a sound and efficient group of carriers. The basic capacity must be built into the whole transportation system when time, materials, and labor are available—conditions which do not apply after an emergency develops. Good transportation requires planning, which takes time; and it requires execution of the plans which takes not only time but competent management, an adequate supply of materials and a reasonable relationship between revenues and expenses. Governmental policies looking to these ends are in the public interest, both in times of actual or threatened national emergency and in times of peace.

In addition to the activities already mentioned, the committee conducted two special studies as a part of the national transportation survey during the Eightieth Congress. One of these was concerned with transportation in Alasaka (H. Rept. 1272, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) and the other with public aid to air transportation (H. Rept. 1612, 80th Cong., 2d sess.).

COOPERATIVE PROJECT ON TRANSPORTATION POLICY

During the Eightieth Congress various organizations were of assistance to the committee. Among the organizations of special assistance have been Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Transportation Association of America, Aircraft Industries Association, Association of American Railroads, National Federation of American Shipping, American Trucking Associations, Air Transport Association of America, Freight Forwarders Institute, National Industrial Traffic League, National Association of Motor Bus Operators, National Council of Private Motor Truck Owners, Automobile Manufacturers Association, American Railway Car Institute, American Automobile Association, American Waterways Operators. One of these, the Transportation Association of America, undertook to cooperate on a scale beyond anything that has heretofore occurred in this country with a view of solving our transportation problem. This association, with some 8,100 business enterprises and hundreds of individuals as members, undertook to create the machinery for a complete reappraisal of transportation and the national policies and regulation with respect thereto.

Obviously, such a project involved the creation of an organization competent to appraise the economic issues involved and to seek public reaction in all areas of the country. It was necessary, therefore, to first define the areas of common interest among users, investors, labor, and carriers; and, having done so, to establish a procedure to interpret and implement these interests. A steering committee composed of leading shipper, carrier, and investor representatives was formed to gather the issues, instruct the association's legal and research divisions as to the studies required for each issue, and then submit the subjects, with research analysis, to various panels located in different sections of the country. Panels were organized, including groups representing users of transportation, investors in transportation enterprises, and transportation agencies.

After the various panels have studied and debated the issues and reached tentative conclusions, the results will be reviewed by 21 regional forums in areas of common economic interest throughout the country. The personnel of the regional forums are experienced leaders of agriculture, industry, finance, labor, and transportation, and range in number from 30 to 75. Each forum will test opinions of all localities in their areas as well as farm, trade, and civic groups. A real grass-roots appraisal of the individual problems entering into the national transportation policy is, therefore, obtainable.

As a result of consideration of panel proposals, each forum submits its conclusions to the association, supported by economic argument in support of, or rebuttal to, the panel recommendations. If conflict arises between any forum and the national panels, or between forms, the association will establish the machinery for further efforts to reconcile differences. If complete reconciliation is not reached, procedures provide for successive steps by which the majority and minority views of either panels or forums will reach the association's board of directors and will be included in the board's final report. The purpose is to obtain a constructive proposal to improve our system of regulation where found necessary irrespective of what the law or practices may be at present and regardless of conjectures as to what the Congress will or will not accept.

Probably never before has a national economic problem been approached for solution on such an elaborate basis as this cooperative endeavor. The opportunity is here provided for the information and suggestions of all interested persons and groups to be considered by persons selected from the different areas of the country. All persons interested in transportation problems can give of their experience and skill to the solution of the great economic problems of transportation under democratic processes and with the purpose of giving primary regard to the public rights in the operation of our transportation system.

CONTINUING THE SURVEY

It has been claimed that we lack a clearly defined and thoroughly integrated national transportation policy and that such a lack has continually hampered the constructive, free development of transportation service in the United States. This possible lack of a definitive and constructive governmental policy has been held in large part to be responsible for what is now referred to as our national transportation problem. There are many aspects to this complex problem which now assume the great importance of adapting our laws and administrative practices to meet present day and future economic and competitive conditions. Not only are the issues broad but the legislative field is as broad as the problems themselves.

In approaching the many problems, it must be realized that they involve a general transportation system, a system composed of important competing agencies including railroads, highway, water, air, and pipelines. The problems are, moreover, complicated by the fact that each of these types of transportation is capable of performing a service that in some respects has advantages over all of its competitors. This makes the transportation problem of this Nation essentially one of competition. Some way must be found to use the different types of carriers with a view to best serving the interest of the shipping and traveling public and at the same time with fairness to the competing agencies. In this connection, it must be borne in mind that to a very large extent, all forms of transportation have been developed without proper coordination with one another. Each has its own economic problems; each is highly competitive with the others; yet each is a useful part of our transportation system.

Transportation is a vast enterprise of the Nation and basic to our economic welfare and its importance. The public necessarily pays a tremendous bill for all of its transportation services, both through direct charges and taxation. The services of all agencies intimately touch the daily life of every citizen. Those engaged in agriculture and industry are dependent on efficient transportation to move their products to consumers at the lowest practical cost. This Nation cannot prosper, and can scarcely exist, without an adequate and efficient system of transportation. Therefore, in the light of profound changes in the economy of the transportation industry and its relation to the country, it is apparent that we must adjust legislation and administrative control to the new conditions of today and those of the foreseeable future.

At the same time it seems to be agreed that no regulation should be imposed upon, or continued in force with respect to, any means of transportation unless such regulation is specifically required in the public interest; likewise, that no regulations should be imposed on any means of transportation merely because the public interest requires that it be imposed upon one or more other means of transportation. With this understanding of the problem, it is not the committee's intention to arbitrarily rewrite the law, but it is within its province to consider whether some regulations, now law, should be (a) continued with their present application; (b) extended to some or all other means of transportation; (c) further limited so as to exclude some or all of the means of transportation to which they are now applicable; or (d) modified in some respects, and, as so modified, then extended or limited in their application.

The widespread interest in transportation with so much effort being expended by various groups throughout the country is evidence enough of the necessity for a continuing activity by the committee and an increasing interest by Congress. It is essential that our transportation system, composed as it now is of various types of carriers, be kept efficient, particularly in view of possible decreased traffic which may come in the future. If income cannot be maintained there is a decided question as to what may happen in any period of depression. While our carriers must expect to share good and bad times with the rest of the country, the country should be greatly interested in securing their efficient operation at all times.

In any private enterprise progress is made through the investment of the savings of many people who are free to choose where they put their money. Transportation enterprises are no exception. If they are to go forward in the service of the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense, transportation investments must attract investors on the basis of their economic value. This state of affairs is not achieved by deprivations of well-deserved and well-earned Government aid; nor by threats that regulatory acts must impose unwarranted restrictions; or that there must be compulsory consolidations between carriers; nor by rate hearings that leave carriers hanging so long over the precipice of bankruptcy that stockholders give them up for lost.

In a popular form of government, the sound solution of the national transportation problems can be founded only in an informed public understanding that makes it able and willing to deal constructively and justly as between both carriers and the public. When the public understands and supports such policies, Congress will be able to accomplish much more to approve such policies as will best serve the Nation as a whole.

This transportation survey was conceived and is pursued with a design to contribute to that great purpose.

Johnson Committee Busy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Temple (Tex.) Daily Telegram of September 19, 1950:

JOHNSON COMMITTEE BUSY

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S "watch-dog committee" on the war effort has already more than justified its existence, and is just getting well started.

Primarily, the specially appointed committee, generally similar to the Truman committee of early World War II, has worked to jolt certain Government branches, including parts of the Military Establishment, out of what Senator JOHNSON aptly termed their "siesta psychology." But it also halted the pending sale of an important synthetic rubber plant, and had a "freeze" put on all proposed sales of war-surplus properties.

The committee plans now to tackle such points as the sudden price jump in natural rubber, Alaskan defenses, steel inventory and capacity, and manpower policies.

Clearly, this committee, if it continues to operate above the political level, with the good of the Nation its only objective, can accomplish a great deal. It can be not only the "watchdog" but the governor and regulator which makes our war machine run smoothly. And there could hardly have been a better choice as its chairman than Senator JOHNSON, who is young enough to be an aggressive leader, has long Washington experience, and enough military background to be of value.

Who Is the Liar Now?—Who Was Right on China Policy, Dr. Judd, the Washington Post, or General Marshall?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, General Marshall starts his job as Secretary of Defense under a cloud. The Washington Post, in an editorial for September 22, 1950, raises the serious question of the General's veracity in connection with his mission to China. This is no light matter, but the record is clear that Mr. Marshall by his own testimony did not recall where he was the night before Pearl Harbor.

The Post used fancy language in the editorial when it charged:

General Marshall was less than candid in his testimony about China before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

And so forth. The New York Times reported that Marshall disavows China policy. Mr. Marshall testified that the policy had been announced in Washington when he was en route to China, says the editorial. This left the impression that before Marshall started for China he did not know just what his mission was or else he was to be advised later. It is no wonder the Post is amazed.

So the editor puts the lie on George Marshall and proceeds to say:

Let us look at the record. General Marshall departed from Washington within an hour or so after the President's announcement of China policy, December 15, 1945. He carried with him not only the documents, but also a personal letter from the President which epitomized the policy in these words:

"Specifically, I desire that you endeavor to persuade the Chinese Government to call a national conference of representatives of the major political elements to bring about the unification of China and, concurrently, to effect a cessation of hostilities, particularly in North China."

Elsewhere in the letter the President said: "I understand that these documents have been shown to you and received your approval." The President restated this policy on December 18, 1946. In the course of it, he said: "I asked General Marshall to go to China as my representative. We had agreed upon my statement of the United States Government's views and policies regarding China as his directive."

There you have it, Mr. Speaker. Is the general downright forgetful or was his statement to the committee one of avoidance in view of the debacle of our foreign policy in China? Was the President in error when he says that Mr. Marshall and he agreed on policy in China? Or is it the truth as stated by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], who long ago expressed the opinion that Marshall was a dupe for Communist sympathizers in the State Department. It is crystal-clear that he was, Mr. Speaker.

It is also clear that the Truman-Acheson policy for China was to effect a coalition government in China, but Chiang Kai-shek refused, to his great credit. This administration cannot deny appeasement of the Red Chinese.

When Marshall accepted the China assignment, Mr. James Byrnes was Secretary of State and he has stated that the job was to bring the two groups in China together. The Post editorial concludes by saying:

General Marshall had his eyes open and his mind receptive when he accepted it.

And this statement puts the lie on Mr. Marshall once again.

Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Washington Post on the following day, September 22, 1950, again hit hard in an editorial and charged that the President sidestepped a question about Marshall's mission to China. It said:

It is odd, looking over the Truman statements on China policy and General Marshall's subsequent exposition of that policy, to think of General Marshall as a robot, speaking lines after he had been cranked up.

Could it be, Mr. Speaker, that the general will be a robot for Acheson and Truman as Secretary of Defense? It could be, in view of the record today. Surely the public's faith in General Marshall has been impaired by this exhibition.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include the editorial of the 22d, so all Members may read it. It follows:

ALAS, POOR CLIO

The President preferred to sidestep a question at his press conference yesterday on the concurrence or otherwise of General Marshall in the instructions which he took with him on his mission to China in 1945–46. Mr. Truman says he was a special envoy of the President, and went to China to carry out the President's written instructions. In other words, the general even in his retirement behaved like a good soldier, and the general's disclaimer at the Senate committee the previous day of any responsibility beyond that thus stands unqualified on the historical record. It will now be added to the Republican indictment of the State Department in the November elections.

It is odd, looking over the Truman statements on China policy and General Marshall's subsequent exposition of that policy, to think of General Marshall as a robot, speaking lines after he had been cranked up. There can be no precedent for it. When a person of General Marshall's eminence is given a mission, the usual thing is to talk over the instructions, so as to find out whether the envoy believes in and approves of his mission. Only in that way can you be sure of a sincere prosecution of the mission. General Marshall's career has hitherto supported the view that this has been his practice. "Give me the facts," he is wont to say, "and I will make up my own mind." The function of State Department officials in the China matter was to dish up the facts; as hired help they could do no other.

The understanding that this newspaper has hitherto entertained about the Marshall mission was the logical one—that when civil disorder broke out in China the diplomatic experts supplied the briefs on all possible alternatives of American action. One was nonintervention (which would have been our own preference), another was all-out intervention on the side of Chiang Kai-shek, yet another was all-out intervention on the side of the Communists, and the fourth was mediation. These alternatives are said to have been given to General Marshall. He is said to have plumped for mediation. If, in spite of the Truman assurance in 1945 and 1946, he wasn't consulted, and urged mediation on the Chinese without having committed his own beliefs, then the situation is passing strange.

The way that the public has been misled both on the GOP side and on the administration side on China is hard to stomach. The President has avoided the issue before; now he avoids it again. The administration seems ashamed in 1950 to acknowledge what in 1945 was regarded by almost everybody in America as a noble experiment. So the buck is passed to the hired help, and the Republicans are left with more material further to tar and feather the career officials. In sympathizing with them, let us also condole with the muse of history.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has been castigated by the editors of the Washington Post for his position on China. His views were based on first-hand knowledge of the facts; the Post editors on what somebody in the State Department told them. Now if they are the men the public expects them to be as responsible newsmen, they should be big enough to apologize to Mr. JUDD.

A Tribute to Dr. Ralph Bunche, Winner of the 1950 Nobel Peace Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, a great honor has come to a great man. Dr. Ralph Bunche has been awarded the 1950 Nobel Peace Prize for his services as United Nations mediator in the Palestine war, in arranging armistice agreements between Israel and the Arab States.

He is the eleventh American to win this honorable award. In being awarded this honor he joins a group of distinguished Americans who previously received this high honor. A group composed of Theodore Roosevelt, Elihu Root, Woodrow Wilson, Charles G. Dawes, Frank B. Kellogg, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, Jane Addams, Cordell Hull, John R. Mott, and Emily G. Balch. The honor is increased by the fact that it is reported that there were 28 persons nominated for the award this year, including President Truman; Winston Churchill; Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, of India; and George C. Marshall. Something of the greatness of the man can be judged by the modest manner in which he received word of the award. He replied:

I accept it with deep humility.

The service for which Dr. Bunche received the award was a most difficult task. Something of the extreme difficulty, as well as dangerous character, of the task he assumed can be judged from the fact that his immediate predecessor, Count Bernadotte, United Nations mediator, had been assassinated while engaged in the work of bringing peace to the troubled Holy Land. For Dr. Bunche to accept an assignment of this dangerous character is proof of a heroic soul.

Dr. Bunche was a professor at Howard University prior to being called into Government service. He has been called to one important assignment after another since 1941. He has been the first of his race to occupy many of these Government posts, but he refused an appointment as Assistant Secretary of State, stating that racial segregation in Washington was one of his reasons. In addition to this he said he was more interested in his work as Director of the United Nations Trusteeship Council, which has the responsibility for the administration of Pacific islands taken from the Japanese and League of Nations mandates in Africa.

The life story of Dr. Bunche is most interesting and fascinating. Born in Detroit, he is now 46 years old. His grandmother was born in slavery. He was educated at the University of California, Harvard, Northwestern, the London School of Economics, and Capetown University. He was made a member of Phi Beta Kappa at the University of California, and received a doctor of philosophy degree from Harvard. In recognition of his accomplishments, he was awarded the Spingarn Medal from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The American Association for the United Nations presented Dr. Bunche an award for distinguished service at a dinner attended by 1,000 guests. The National Father's Day Committee named him "Father of the Year," for 1949.

His life is a Horatio Alger story in real life. It should be an inspiration to all. It demonstrates what can be done in America by one who has the will to do. The story of his life and accomplishments will give courage to all who are faced with difficulties. It is hoped that he may continue to add luster to an already great career.

A Bankrupt Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include a letter addressed to members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It follows:

MUSKEGON, MICH., *September 11, 1950.*
To Members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs:

I received from the State Department Dean Acheson's address, Crisis in Asia, an examination of United States policy by Acheson, and also the extemporaneous remarks by the same gentleman at the dinner meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, April 22. Being busy, it is only lately I have had an opportunity to look them over. I also listened to Dr. Philip Jessup's speech in Virginia and read The Twilight of Honor, by Fulton Oursler, in June Reader's Digest. All this coupled with the Newsweek report on the disastrous situation in Korea, lead me to an even more convinced conviction that Dean Acheson has fumbled and bumbled disastrously in his dealings with Soviet Russia.

He is so cautious and speaks so constantly of delicate situations and uses so much double talk and is so much in love with his qualifications for the job he holds that his wait-and-see policy has played right into the Russian hands and they dangle him like a puppet at the end of their diplomatic strings. The Russians are great chess players and they certainly can outwit and circumvent Acheson at every turn. We must seem like a bunch of simpletons to them and they have every right to laugh at us for we have suffered a succession of diplomatic defeats ever since the war ended and Russia started out on her conquest of the world, beginning with the veto in the San Francisco UN Charter. We have seen Russia hold the upper hand in practically every session of the UN Assembly, Security Council, and committee meetings, and the other 53 nations have stood helpless under scourges and indictments by Russia that should make a red-blooded nation cringe and lose respect for itself. Mr. Acheson speaks of the duress and suffering of United States diplomats as though it was something noble instead of something a nation should be ashamed of—not able to protect its own citizens or to retaliate. No, soft words and kindness and lofty ideals are supposed to win them over just because he, Mr. Acheson, wishes it so. Contrast all this with the ruthless, dynamic policy that wins for Russia whole continents. How long before the wrath and anger of the American people will be felt at this inept vacillation of our so-called leaders.

If Dean Acheson's ethics and morals are so lofty and high-minded, he would not have placed his traitorous friend Alger Hiss above the security and welfare of the American people who entrenched him in the position he holds because of President Truman and who pay his salary. The coddling of State Department pro-Communist personnel which is still going on today is another point the American people haven't forgotten.

In his Meet the Press broadcast the other night Dean Acheson was shrewd enough to take up most of the time explaining his policy in Europe, leaving his Asiatic policy, so disastrous to this country, for a few words of double talk, in which it could be still seen he thinks Asia should be written off to the Russians. His policy there resulted in the Korean conflict and is a direct result of Dr. Jessup's one-man trip to China to explore events when he had already made up his mind before leaving this country what this policy was to be—appeasement of Russia. Fortunately General MacArthur still has a little influence and he was defeated. Public reaction was so strong they could not brazenly advocate this now but I still have no confidence in our State Department. When once they make a mistake like President Truman and many others, they are not big enough to admit it except under pressure and try in every way to vindicate their mistake like Mr. Truman does with his "red herring" policy and soft treatment of Communists, avowed enemies of our way of life. Personally I think our State Department is infiltrated from the top down with pro-Communists—that is the Russian method of conducting war, not with bullets but by infiltration and the sucking in of dupes and fellow travelers, who in spite of all they see and hear, close their eyes and merrily carry out the Russian pipeline orders. For Dean Acheson to demand perfect democratic countries before we will help them, when China for centuries has been plagued with the "squeeze" business methods, is absurd. Look at our own country—the connection between crooked racketeers and crooked legislators and others. The millennium will come before we are all perfect and our State Department should embrace anyone who will fight communism, for once they get hold no people will get a chance to revolt. We have seen that in the Russian satellite countries. How can they overthrow a police state, when death is the punishment for deviation. Let Mr. Acheson explain that one when he says the people should have a will to overthrow their communistic leaders. And now we are to have again General Marshall and his disastrous policy of denouncing Chiang Kia-chek at the State Department pro-Communists orders. I have a great respect for General Marshall personally but I think he was made a dupe of the pro-Russians in the State Department, and it remains to be seen if he is another of those who feel they will have to vindicate their mistakes in order to retain their own ego of "statesmanship."

With France joining the "me too" parties in recognizing the Chinese Communists in the UN it looks to me as if secretly the

State Department has given the green light to this policy which they always believed in, and talk furiously and loudly out of the other side of their mouth in order to stay in power, for they know the American people would not stand for our country's recognition of this Chinese goverment without a proper vote of the people. It seems as if conquest by force and fait accompli are now to be made the standard of justice in the UN and they might just as well paste this over their door. I for one will lose all confidence in the UN if this happens. They are establishing a precedent and no matter what country now takes over, including all of Europe, perhaps they will have this same standard of justice to throw in the UN faces and they will have nothing to say in return.

I notice when "Deacon" Acheson speaks before committees and on the radio he makes himself sound so impressive and assured (that's the kind of diplomacy he thinks so important), his talk of delicate situations, total diplomacy watch and wait that worked so disastrously in China, it never occurs to his listeners that all that imposing appearance is a front to hide a fundamental weakness in that he is never able to best the Russians at their diplomatic game of chess.

If unity has to be purchased at the price of coddling and appeasing Russia, I am against unity. As for me I'll never trust Acheson, Jessup, Service, Hiss, at all, and also Owen Lattimore and the whole tribe they have in the State Department because they willingly or unwarily have made themselves dupes and fellow travelers of a nation so steeped in cunning intrigue, and police state methods as to enable them to gain everything with a fifth-column war without firing a shot and with our State Department utterly unwilling and unable to cope with or understand what is being done to our country.

The only way we as citizens can remonstrate and retaliate against such leaders is to write letters such as this (and how many will take the time or trouble to do this?) and the next thing is to pull a straight Republican lever at the elections. I am an independent voter but this I intend to do in spite of the fact that I voted Democratic since Roosevelt. Not that I have too high hopes of the Republican Party with its wishy-washy platforms, but at least it will mean a change and let the present administration know a lot of us are completely dissatisfied and it will knock a little of the cocksureness and "I" business out of our present leaders, who have gotten into the frame of mind they think they can get away with anything. Some day the wrath of the American people will be felt and a lot of heads will fall.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPHINE VANDERBURG.

P. S.—I have been listening for over 3 years to the UN Assembly meetings and Security Council and other sessions, and the above letter doesn't even begin to express the fear, frustration and apprehension at the cowardly appeasements that have led us into this mess. This "do-nothing policy" and the softness of the State Department toward communistic aggression, their failure to take up the complaint of China Nationalists against the real aggressor, just shows the whole sorry picture of cowardice and ineptitude that has made Russia laugh at us and feel she can get away with anything, which is just exactly what she has done. Instead of coming right out openly and accusing Russia straight out with words of conducting clandestine war in every nation of the world, and giving her the punishment that they can so quickly hand out to smaller nations who break the peace, they just sit there and let her go on making propaganda by lies which in the beginning were not even answered. Some day history will assess this cowardly weakness and failure to stand up for justice and freedom as we believe in it, at least the way the American people still believe it. The State Department evidently has a different conception.

J. V.

National Planning Association Case Study on Marathon Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hands what I firmly believe to be a thrilling document. It is entitled "Causes of Industrial Peace Under Collective Bargaining." It was issued as Case Study No. 8 by the National Planning Association. This 65-page study was prepared as the eighth in a series, attempting to determine why it is that some companies have had such outstanding records of peaceful collective bargaining with unions.

The National Planning Association is a nonprofit, nonpolitical group. It was established in 1934, and since then has been a real constructive beacon, as in this specific case study.

The report was written by Mr. R. W. Fleming, director of the Industrial Relations Center of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, and Prof. Edwin E. Witte, chairman of the department of economics at the same great university. Its focus is the Marathon Corp., the second largest employer in the Wisconsin paper industry—a corporation whose very name has come to symbolize the finest in the American paper industry—a corporation which is distinctively the product of its major architect and industrial genius—a dear friend of mine, Mr. D. C. "Clark" Everest who, until recently, was president of the 40-year-old corporation and is now the distinguished chairman of its board.

PAPER INDUSTRY IS CRUCIAL

The paper industry is a crucial industry in Wisconsin. It employs over 27,000 people and is principally concentrated in the river valleys—the Fox, the Wisconsin, and the Chippewa. The Marathon Paper Corp. has contracts with seven unions and it can rightly be proud of the fact that it has never had a strike or lockout in its history. It has had to resort to conciliation but twice. All of its contracts call for the arbitration of differences over interpretation and meaning, but arbitration has never actually been used.

Quoting from the very first chapter of the book:

Neither the company nor any of the unions has ever resorted to the courts. Governmental administration agencies have been called in only where the law gives the party no choice.

The company has prospered. The unions have grown strong. Sales have soared. Profits have increased. Marathon is one of the wage leaders in Wisconsin industry and competes in a market which is intensively competitive.

We of Wisconsin have always pioneered in industrial and social justice, and I am perfectly delighted that the National Planning Association has honored us with this fine study of a great corporation and indirectly a great man, D. C. Everest, of Rothschild, Wis.

We hope that this study will be an inspiration to other American industries and unions, showing them that management and labor can prosper together, work together as a team, with neither taking advantage of the other, neither sacrificing its rightful position and both serving in the public welfare.

I congratulate the NPA on this fine job as well as its two distinguished authors. I congratulate, moreover, the corporation, its management, and its employees which have been so honored, as well as the communities in which Marathon plants are located.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of an NPA release which was issued yesterday, Friday, September 22, describing this case study.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., A NONPROFIT, NONPOLITICAL ORGANIZATION, ESTABLISHED IN 1934, DEVOTED TO PLANNING BY AMERICANS IN AGRICULTURE, BUSINESS, LABOR, AND THE PROFESSIONS

(Officers: Chairman, H. Chr. Sonne; vice chairmen: M. H. Hedges, Frank Altschul, Clinton S. Golden, Donald R. Murphy, Beardsley Ruml; secretary, H. W. Fraser; treasurer, William L. Batt; chairman, editorial committee, Morris L. Cooke; chairman, finance committee, Thomas Roy Jones; counsel, Charlton Ogburn; director, E. J. Coil.)

The National Planning Association's eighth case study on the Causes of Industrial Peace Under Collective Bargaining issued today adds strong new evidence that constructive and reasonable attitudes of employers and of union representatives toward bargaining are far more important in achieving industrial peace than outside factors such as the size, profitability, or location of the company or the number of unions involved.

The company analyzed in the newest case study is the Marathon Corp., one of Wisconsin's leading companies in the highly competitive paper industry. The company deals with seven unions, composed of all of the company's production and maintenance workers—about 3,000. The bulk of these are members of AFL's twin paper unions, the International Brotherhoods of Paper Makers and Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers. The balance are members of four AFL printing unions and the International Association of Machinists, which is independent.

The NPA Committee on the Causes of Industrial Peace is responsible for the report like others in the projected series of 15 case studies. The committee is under the chairmanship of Clinton S. Golden, adviser on labor policy of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and is composed of 28 business and labor leaders, university professors, and professional consultants. Interviewing of company and union representatives and preparation of the report were the work of R. W. Fleming, director of the industrial relations center of the University of Wis-

consin at Madison, and Edwin E. Witte, chairman of the department of economics at the same university.

The authors of the case study conclude that there are twenty factors which have contributed in varying degrees to the remarkable record of industrial peace at Marathon. There seems no question to them, however, that most important are the facts that Marathon's management officials act on the principle that "a company gets just about the kind of labor relations it asks for" and that the unions with which Marathon deals have a record of responsibility and maturity.

In a statement accompanying the author's analysis, the NPA committee stresses the value of this particular study as a companion piece to case studies 1 and 7, which dealt with paper companies on the west coast and in New England. "We have made these three studies in the same industry in order to see how unions which have peaceful relations with one company fared with other companies in different geographical locales and under different bargaining conditions. We wanted, too, to explore the effects that the size of the bargaining unit and the presence of multiunion bargaining had no specific relationships."

The committee notes that important differences exist in the three paper companies. For example, Crown Zellerbach Corp. (case study 1) is the second largest pulp and paper company in the country and it bargains as part of a region-wide employer group on the Pacific coast. Nashua Gummed and Coated Paper Co. in New Hampshire (case study 7) has less than 1,000 employees and it bargains individually with 7 unions. Marathon is between the two, both geographically and in size, and it bargains with 7 unions individually. Nevertheless the authors and committee find significant parallels in the basic causes of industrial peace found in the three paper companies as well as in the other case studies of other companies in other industries.

The Marathon study reaffirms the importance of these factors found in the seven previously studied situations:

1. There is full acceptance by management of the collective-bargaining process and of unionism as an institution.

2. The unions fully accept private ownership and operation of the industry; they recognize that the welfare of their members depends upon the successful operation of the business.

3. The unions are strong, responsible, and democratic.

4. The company stays out of the union's internal affairs; it does not seek to alienate the workers' allegiance to their unions.

5. Mutual trust and confidence exist between the parties. There have been no serious ideological incompatibilities.

6. Neither party to bargaining has adopted a legalistic approach to the solution of problems in the relationship.

7. Negotiations are problem-centered—more time is spent on day-to-day problems than on defining abstract principles.

8. There is widespread union-management consultation and highly developed information sharing.

The 13-year record of Marathon's peaceful relations at four Wisconsin plants and one Michigan plant has been marked by integrity, good faith, and a willingness to bargain on the part of the management and the unions. Both company and union representatives at Marathon credit D. C. Everest—until recently president of the 40-year-old company—as the "principal architect" of the relationship. But all express confidence that his philosophy is "so well soaked in all the way up and down the managerial structure that most of the others share his views." Mr. Everest has vested genuine authority over labor-relations matters in other officers of the company, and for the last 5 years or so few labor-relations problems have had to go to him.

The record shows there has never been a strike or lockout at Marathon. Arbitration has never been resorted to, although contracts call for arbitration of differences over the interpretation and meaning of the contract. Neither the company nor any of the unions has resorted to the courts, and governmental administrative agencies have been called in on labor-relations matters only when the law required it. Conciliation has been resorted to but twice, and on one of these occasions the matter was beyond the control of both the company and the local union.

The committee and the authors show that the company, the union, and the public have gained from this constructive relationship. The company has prospered and steadily expanded. Its sales have increased about five and one-half times; employment has almost quadrupled; and profits—figured on sales or net worth—are satisfactory. The workers have received wages above local levels, comparable to competitive rates within the industry as a whole, but somewhat below metropolitan standards. In addition, fringe benefits account for a sizable amount of the company's wage bill. Employment has been steady and turnover low. Both the company and the unions recognize the peril of losing customers due to work stoppages. There has been no collusion against the consumer through arbitrarily high prices.

Some of the special factors listed by the authors as significant in this case have to do mainly with features of the paper industry or the local environment—others to company or union policies and procedures. Among these factors, explained in detail in the full report, are:

THE INDUSTRY AND THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

The paper industry has a better record of industrial peace than industry at large. It has not been greatly affected by fluctuations in the business cycle, so stability of employment has not been a major problem. And Marathon itself has made every effort to stabilize employment by diversifying operations to avoid seasonal ups and downs. Investment per employee in the paper industry is heavy, thereby giving companies an incentive to make the conditions of work attractive to avoid turnover.

The continually expanding employment—as Marathon grew from one plant to a wholly integrated operation from the cutting of pulpwood to the final printing of the package—has done away with questions which might have arisen in connection with technological changes.

In normal times no one paper company in Wisconsin has to set the pace in negotiations with unions. Any one of several, of which Marathon is one, may be asked to do the leading.

The cities where Marathon plants are located are small; the company is an important employer in each, and the largest single employer with the best and most stable working conditions in several. The individual Marathon plants are sufficiently small to permit an intimacy of contact between employers and employees.

Use of the allied printing label, which in turn depends upon the presence of the printing unions, is now important to Marathon in terms of customer demand.

MUTUAL ACCEPTANCE

The company from its inception has operated on the belief that it is sound business tactics to maintain wages and working conditions equal to any in the area.

Unionization was accepted without a battle, leaving no scars or background of bitterness. The company accepts the unions as representatives of its employees, making no effort to distinguish between the employees and the union, nor to drive a wedge between them. The company early established with its employees—and when the unions arrived with them—a reputation for absolute integrity, and a willingness to sit down and talk about any subject. Throughout the relationship, particular stress has been placed by management on periodic communications to employees about company affairs.

The seven unions which have contracts with Marathon all operate within the framework of the traditional American political economy. They have been relatively undisturbed by ideological questions. They have demonstrated their responsibility repeatedly. As a result the company is willing to discuss almost any subject with them whether the contract calls for such discussion or not.

Company-union conferences cover a wide variety of routine matters—a safety program, recreational activities, pensions, etc. For example, invaluable experience in living together was gained by the parties when, in 1937, they worked together on the installation of a job evaluation plan. The fact that this cooperative effort was underaken at a time when it was unfashionable for companies to work with unions on job evaluation served to develop mutual confidence.

Rival unionism has never been a serious problem, largely because of the nature of the relationship between the company and the incumbent unions.

Since 1937 the company has elevated many members of the union to supervisory positions, with the result that the union point of view is well understood. On the other hand, there are now international representatives of both paper unions who formerly were employed by Marathon.

MANAGEMENT PREROGATIVES AND UNION SECURITY

This has never become a fighting issue at Marathon. Employees have not questioned the company's responsibility to manage the operations, and the company shows no fear that this attitude will change. At the start, the company granted the union shop because it cut down friction among union and nonunion employees. Down through the years the company has never been asked to discharge an employee as the result of the union-shop clause except for failure to pay dues, and few of these cases have actually resulted in dismissal. The unions have never asked for a check-off, preferring that dues be collected in person.

NEGOTIATIONS

Multiple bargaining was established in the west coast paper industry by the time the paper unions had succeeded in organizing several of the Wisconsin companies. Despite this fact, individual bargaining has always been the rule in Wisconsin's paper industry. Management and the unions have, from time to time, considered but decided against multiple bargaining.

Marathon bargains with the paper unions on a system-wide basis, and the sessions are attended by about 70 people. From the company there are usually the vice president in charge of manufacturing, personnel director and his manager of wage and salary administration, all plant managers as well as some of their superintendents, and all plant personnel supervisors; from the unions several international representatives plus local presidents and their bargaining committees. Neither side calls in lawyers or other outside consultants. Both groups come armed with the authority to make a decision. No transcript of the record of sessions is kept but minutes are compiled and distributed to both company and union people. These minutes are invaluable in interpreting the contract, because they both amplify and modify the agreement.

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

The manner in which the parties administer the contract is a major reason why there

has never been a serious conflict. Both sides show respect for the contract, but at the same time they have sufficient confidence in each other to make changes where daily events seem to make this advisable. Though seniority is a troublesome problem, experience has demonstrated that the company and unions can work out satisfactory solutions. The contract permits unilateral action on the part of the company with respect to discipline and discharge, but in practice the company consults the unions on such cases, a fact which management says does not undermine effective discipline.

The grievance procedure set forth in each Marathon contract follows a common pattern of progression. In practice, most of the grievances that are ever formalized are settled at the plant manager's level. It is company policy for such officials to spend more than the average amount of time on grievances in order to give employees an opportunity to discuss the problem with the boss and to give line officials an opportunity to acquaint employees with collateral problems of management.

PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT

The well-developed personnel department which exists at Marathon today came into being in 1945, but the company has shown a consistent interest in good employee relations. The department is respected up and down the line, and operating officials rely on it heavily for advice. Though the company has purposely built up the prestige and importance of the personnel department, it still expects line executives to participate extensively in labor relations work.

FUTURE SURVIVAL OF THE RELATIONSHIP

The authors warn that "the fact that the past has been rosy offers no complete assurance that the future of Marathon will be as good. Some of the problems of the future may be tougher than anything the parties have had to face in the past. It does not take much effort to conjure up a few of them."

Among those the authors mention are: What will happen if bargaining sessions do not result in wages or fringe benefits during lean years? What will happen if the company stops expanding and technological changes are proposed which will displace workers? What about seniority? Will this fast-growing company successfully organize itself to meet its vastly larger problems? How will future changes in leadership in the company and union affect the relationship? Can the personal contacts of the past be maintained? Will the practice of writing one thing in contracts and then modifying or negating it in the minutes of meetings rise to plague the parties? What will happen if a number of potential points of friction between the incumbent unions should break out?

The authors are not pessimistic about the future outlook of this relationship. "Company and union officials up and down the entire line have worked hard and long to achieve and maintain the record of industrial peace." Both groups seem confident that they can continue to keep the peace.

Chairman Golden announced that future studies in the series will be issued at staggered intervals. Their selection, like those already studied, was made on the basis of the following criteria:

1. Important industries, strategic to the country's over-all economic health.
2. Geographic distribution, so no one section of the United States would be overrepresented.
3. Substantial size, with at least a thousand employees.
4. A competitive situation, where it was impossible to "buy peace at a price."
5. Where peace could not be explained by a personality or unique factor.
6. Where problems represented important industrial relations questions.
7. Finally, the absence of strikes—though "How many strikes?" was as a rule less crucial than "How much and what kind of freedom does the employer enjoy in his relationship with the union? How much mutual confidence have both parties? Have the company, the union, and the general public gained or lost from the relationship?"

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE CAUSES OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE

Clinton S. Golden (chairman), adviser on labor policy, Economic Cooperation Administration.

E. Wight Bakke, director, Labor and Management Center, Yale University.

J. Douglas Brown, director, Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University.

Eugene Burgess, vice president in charge of industrial relations, General Mills, Inc.

Stuart Chase, author and consultant.

Philip J. Clowes, international representative, United Steelworkers of America.

Walter L. Christon, director of industrial relations, Houdaille-Hershey Corp.

William H. Davis, attorney, Davis, Hoxie & Faithfull.

Alvin E. Dodd, honorary president, the American Management Association.

John T. Dunlop, associate professor of economics, Littauer School of Public Administration, Harvard University.

Sander Genis, vice president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Frederick H. Harbison, executive officer, Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago.

Marion H. Hedges, special assistant to labor advisors, ECA.

L. Clayton Hill, professor of industrial relations, School of Business Administration, University of Michigan.

Lawrence E. Joseph, vice president, Blaw-Knox Co.

Clark Kerr, director, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California.

Fred A. Krafft, consultant on labor and industrial relations, National Security Resources Board.

William M. Leiserson, director, Labor Organization Study, Johns Hopkins University.

Douglas McGregor, president, Antioch College.

Earl McKay, director of labor relations, Wheeling Steel Corp.

Eric Nicol, vice president, P. Brennan Co.

Herbert W. Payne, vice president, Textile Workers Union of America.

Eric Peterson, general secretary-treasurer, International Association of Machinists.

Anna M. Rosenberg, labor relations consultant.

Joseph N. Scanlon (project codirector), Industrial Relations Section, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Louis Stark, Washington bureau, New York Times.

George W. Taylor, professor of industry, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce.

Charles R. Walker (project codirector), Labor and Management Center, Yale University.

R. B. Wolf, industrial consultant.

Mr. Sabath on Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of our colleagues a distinguished article on brotherhood by our senior Member, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH. This latest evidence of devotion to the best ideals of democratic thought will be no surprise to any of us. It is nothing more than a reflection of what Mr. SABATH has stood for in the House for more than four decades. I am proud to commend it to the attention of Americans of every race, color, and creed:

[From the Sentinel, Chicago, Ill., of September 7, 1950]

A CODE FOR TOMORROW—DEAN OF CONGRESS GIVES HIS CREDO—"TEN COMMANDMENTS OF GOOD WILL" OFFERS AMERICANS A REALISTIC PROGRAM FOR UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD

(By Representatitve ADOLPH J. SABATH)

There are various approaches to such a subject as the role of brotherhood in building a better America. A cynic would point to the failures of our past and predict that, short of a miracle, we are doomed to the same dismal record for the future. A sophisticate would scoff at so trite a concept as the idea of brotherhood. I can only approach it with a sense of profound humility. For I seriously believe that the effective force of human brotherhood is one of those fundamental truths which is so important to our way of life that no one has ever been able to express completely the way he feels about it. There is always the temptation to fall into stereotyped phrases when words seem inadequate.

Actually, of course, the kind of brotherhood we can feel—even if we can't describe it—is expressed in action and in attitudes far more effectively than it can be said in words. I shall not try, therefore, to give you a definition of brotherhood. But perhaps we can, together, recognize some of the glaring inadequacies in our present practices. We can try to be sure that we are not concerned with a form of sentimentality, with a cult of intellectual snobbery, or with censoriousness. Instead we can try to free the genuine product from the misconceptions produced by slipshod thinking. We can then set it on an open stage to startle the world into some sort of vigorous action.

PRACTICAL AND DYNAMIC

I am thoroughly convinced, as I am sure you are, that the spirit of brotherhood is something which is at once very dynamic and very practical for the world in which we are living today. A true spirit of brotherhood, if I may paraphrase Chesterton, has not been tried and found wanting. It has, rather, too often been found difficult and not tried.

Clearly, I think, we have not yet fully achieved the kind of brotherhood which will build a better America. There is great need for a realistic attitude toward this fundamental spiritual problem of our age. We cannot in the mid-twentieth century fall back on the easy optimism of the late nineteenth century, or find reassurance by retreating into small groups of like-minded men and women. For all of us, the last vestiges of complacency were shattered by the atomic bomb. Our present challenge is to make sure that complacency is not displaced by more confusion, because confusion breeds fear and fear can produce such a bevy of gods that it is terribly hard to decide which one to follow. There is always the danger that some people will choose to devote themselves exclusively to their nation or race, while others surrender to an economic or social class. Some men may seek solace in a laboratory while others find refuge in demagoguery.

OUR BEST INSTINCTS

But another attitude is possible—an attitude which draws upon our best instincts without discounting our worst. It would

recognize that prejudice is real and often deeply entrenched, but that there is something we can do about it. It is the mood of an early circuit rider who took as his text the verse, "They that have turned the world upside down have come hither also." "This text shows three things," he said. "First, the world is upside down. Second, it should be turned right side up. And third, we are the ones to do it."

We can start by building a better America. But to build a better America we must also build a better world, for the good reason that our future depends upon our ability to make the basic spirit of American democracy real to the world, particularly to the strategic areas of Europe. We must neither underestimate what Americans can do to strengthen the faith of western Europe in our political and economic future, nor overlook the fact that some western Europeans have some serious reservations about both our stability and our freedom.

NO LONGER A PROBLEM

Racial and religious discrimination in the United States is no longer a domestic problem. It is, perhaps, the greatest obstacle to European-American understanding which exists and the most powerful weapon in the hands of the opponents of our way of life. We must understand that, in a cold war, every incident of race violence of discrimination is played up in the overseas newspapers or over the radio, with no indication of the progress which has been made in recent years. Indeed, it is very difficult to explain this progress to Europeans without seeming to defend the scandal of racial, religious segregation, and discrimination.

Europeans naturally see the discrepancy between American ideals and American practice in simpler terms than we do. Even so conservative and strongly anti-Communist a paper as Le Monde questions the sincerity of our democratic ideals. Last fall, for example, Pierre Emmanual, a well-known French writer, described in its pages the coming American fascism, by putting together some half truths about our prejudices, the power of American capitalists, and the FBI. Stressing the immaturity of American political traditions, he concluded that fascism is a real possibility in the United States because, "Its traditions are not strong enough to free it from this result."

For the most part, those Europeans who have visited America are wiser and more charitable because they have been impressed by the spirit of our people, by our inexhaustible interest in social experimentation, and by our generosity and friendliness. Through these visits they are beginning to understand that there are many sides to American life which have an important contribution to make to the world. But at the same time they are especially aware of the curious contradictions of our traditional idealism and democratic political system. Syed Adam Edward Hogan-Shaddali, of Malaya, one of 10 students from nations in the Near East, Far East, and southern Asia, commented wonderingly to a reporter, "Discrimination is willfully done here by individuals who have been taught to think and reason, whose intelligence has been developed high enough to know right from wrong and to correct wrong. * * * What good is your fine system of free public education if it has failed in this essential?" We cannot afford to disregard such criticism.

CHALLENGE POINTED UP

I have stressed those aspects of American life which puzzle our friends from across the seas because they point up the challenge in our effort to reduce the source of these tensions. It is not enough to export food and supplies. Our ECA program calls for dollars—but even more important in the long run is confidence. There must be the assurance that we are a Nation whose democracy is healthy, whose fundamental tolerance of differences is great, and whose determination to stand for the principles of freedom and human integrity is more than a disguise for economic and political aspiration. The strength of the United States, as seen from abroad, is both a great and a frightening thing. Sometimes we are told, it seems to be magnanimous and responsible; at other times irresponsible and evil.

The task of building a better America which faces us in 1950 has, perhaps, never before in our history been so directly important to so many people all over the world. In this connection, Rabbi Louis I. Newman has pointed to the importance of realistic positivism. We cannot meet the challenge unless we recognize our weaknesses but neither, he suggests, can we genuinely achieve it if we lose sight of our strength. "There are universal items," says Rabbi Newman, "such as the love of liberty, an appreciation of character and integrity among citizens, and to improve the people's welfare, which, if emphasized, can lead to cooperation with other like-minded peoples. We must underscore the factors that unite rather than divide us."

LESSON UNDERSCORED

Let us, therefore, underscore one of the very special lessons which we have learned in this country—a lesson which seems to me to be of fundamental importance. We have here learned in a unique way the importance of creative minorities. We have come to understand the American way as a system of listening to new ideas, testing them out against old ideas, and balancing the interests of all of us as well as we can with the interests of the few. We are convinced as a Nation that diverse points of view and contrasting backgrounds can produce a dynamic fusion of interest, instead of perpetuating the chaos of ancient animosities. But as we look into our past and then forward into the future, it becomes increasingly clear that we cannot allow ourselves to become overconfident in an easy victory. Neither can we be paralyzed by fear of an unavoidable defeat as we seek to carry forward the development of creative good will at home and abroad.

Because of their special awareness of our peculiar heritage in this vital field of human values, I should like to call to witness three of the outstanding men of our time: one a scientist and administrator, one a statesman, and one an educator.

At the point of his retirement from the Atomic Energy Commission, David E. Lilienthal put his conviction of the power of our highest ideals into magnificent prose. "Our democratic faith is an expression of our sense of what is right and what is wrong, of what is fair and decent and of what is just crude use of arbitrary power," he wrote. "We do have weaknesses, and they must be carefully assessed. * * * Nevertheless, because the burdens of world leadership have been thrust upon us, it is even more necessary that we remember how strong we are, and why. * * * This faith is the chief armament of our democracy. It is the most potent weapon ever devised. Compared with it, the atomic bomb is a firecracker."

Our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, in his April address to the Society of Newspaper Editors named the ideas of freedom and diversity as the two great sources of our security and our well-being. These ideas, he said "have survived and flourished here in the United States because we accept and practice a third idea—and that is tolerance. We say and we believe 'my freedom, my right to be different, depends on yours. I can be free only to the extent that you are free, too.' "

ANTIDOTE TO FEAR

Charles S. Johnson, the president of Fisk University, finds in the mentality and spirit of younger Americans the antidote to fear and the sense of futility which are the enemies of that spirit of brotherhood with which you and I are concerned. "It is a positive and constructive approach to the world, a sense of direction that is realistic and free from the constricting mythologies of the past," he writes. The wide appeal of such a new and creative force is especially exemplified by "the swift contagion of the doctrine of human rights." He sees a growing acceptance of the principle of action in "the sweeping extension of suffrage, the beginning of rebellion of college youth against the snobbishness of fraternities and sororities, the relaxation of racial and religious quota systems in colleges, the growth of organizations for democratic action, and the mounting protests of segregation and discrimination throughout the Nation and, in fact, throughout the world. This is a new front," he concludes, "a new orientation, a new values stress that is different in texture and character from the unhealthy fears that possess the minds of cynics."

As we catch the vision of these great men, who in their lives and careers are representative of the dynamic power of diversity, we can move forward in our own spheres toward that way of life which is an expression of our deepest convictions and our highest ideals. We recognize that our individual lives are shaped and directed by the action of others. A community is made up of men and women who share common values and aspirations. But each of us learns best to recognize the spirit of the true brotherhood in that community by the action that shows it. Man is seldom neutral in the presence of a fellow man. He either approves or disapproves of his style of life, and the effect of that attitude inevitably influences the community. In acting in the spirit of a brother a man learns that he is like other people, that he can rely on them, that they are a part of his community as he is a part of theirs. The power generated from his concept of brotherhood—the power which, according to Mr. Lilienthal, makes the atomic bomb a mere firecracker—develops as much from the small acts of many men as it does from great causes or words of a few great men.

AN UNUSUAL OPPORTUNITY

We have had, in this country, an unusual opportunity to understand the true principles of brotherhood. Our forefathers found a rich and spacious country with room for new ideas. We have drawn on the strength and productivity of our land. We have also drawn on the cultures and convictions of those people from all over the world who have come to America to make it their home. Our Nation was born during a period when the ideas of the rights of men and of tolerance were taking on new meaning, and widening in their scope. The toleration acts in the seventeenth century granted permission only to exist, to a restricted number of religious groups. Then men such as John Milton and Jock Locke began to enlarge this meaning to include everything in political, religious, and artistic life except the "obviously great evils." The principles which inspired the American Revolution, and which guided those great men who founded our form of government, were a further extension of the idea of tolerance. We have not always succeeded in carrying out these principles, but we have never, as a nation, surrendered the right to aspire to them. We are confident that the idea of tolerance—of creative good will—grows slowly, perhaps, but that it increases in circles of ever-increasing diameters.

The late Reverend Peter Marshall, in opening the United States Senate, once said this prayer: "Help us, O Lord, when we want to do the right thing, but know not what it is. But help us most when we know perfectly well what we ought to do and do not want to do it." This is the kind of help which all of us need today. We know that if we fail to translate creative ideas into the reality of everyday life, the result is very likely to be frustration, fear, confusion, and uncertainty. We believe that the individual human spirit is the source of our strength: that the private thinking of each of us helps to determine public attitudes. This is our personal and private challenge. In a public sense we have the opportunity and the responsibility to help place these principles of brotherhood in the fabric of our governmental structure and in the law of our land.

TEN COMMANDMENTS

Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk has set down what he calls the Ten Commandments of Good Will. I should like to include them here:

"1. I will respect all men and women regardless of their race or religion.

"2. I will protect and defend my neighbor and my neighbor's children against the ravages of racial or religious bigotry.

"3. I will exemplify in my own life the spirit of good will and understanding.

"4. I will challenge the philosophy of racial superiority by whomsoever it may be proclaimed, whether they be kings, dictators, or demagogs.

"5. I will not be misled by the propaganda of those who seek to set race against race or nation against nation.

"6. I will refuse to support any organization that has for its purpose the spreading of anti-Semitism, and anti-Catholicism, or anti-Protestantism.

"7. I will establish comradeship with those who seek to exalt the spirit of love and reconciliation throughout the world.

"8. I will attribute to those who differ from me the same degree of sincerity that I claim for myself.

"9. I will uphold the civil rights and religious liberties of all citizens and groups whether I agree with them or not.

"10. I will do more than live and let live—I will live and help live."

These principles must be applied to our actions and our thoughts. We can begin to apply them each morning as we read the paper or listen to the radio. We can continue to use them throughout each day as we express an opinion or cast a vote. They are the key to the enactment of good labor legislation, or sound foreign policy, or wise social security and welfare programs, or a genuine civil rights act.

THE SHOCK FORCES

President Truman has said, "The Protestant church, the Catholic church, and the Jewish synagogue, bound together in the American unity of brotherhood, must provide the shock forces to accomplish a moral and spiritual awakening. No other agency can do it. Unless it is done, we are headed for the disaster we deserve." We know that the true basis of the democratic idea—our real security—does not derive from bullets or atomic bombs. The men of science who understand the secret of the atom have been the first to point out that a dynamic democracy depends upon ideas rather than upon weapons. We recognize that the forces of hatred and destruction seem sometimes to pravail. But we know, too, that it is precisely in times such as these that people find courage and strength out of their very extremity. In this crisis friendship and teamwork among Jews and Christians and all the groups that make up America is essential. We believe in the people—the people of every race, creed, color, class, and kind.

Laying the Foundation for a Stronger America Through Leadership and Racial Team Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THT HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to bring before the House a bill which had for its objective the making possible of funds for the establishment in Diamond, Mo., of a national shrine at the birthplace of the late eminent Negro scientist, George Washington Carver. Four years previous to this, it was also my privilege to assist in the sponsoring of legislation which authorized the coinage of 5,000,000 Booker T. Washington memorial half-dollars to be sold at a premium to aid in the establishment of a memorial at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington—America's greatest Negro leader. I also cooperated in securing a United States post office known as Booker Washington Birthplace, Virginia, which I understand now has been a second class post office for 3 years. Three Nationwide good will building contests have been conducted with a total of more than 7,000,000 pieces of mail passing through the post office, in addition to the regular mail handled.

AMERICA'S LARGEST MINORITY GROUP

The Negro makes up America's largest minority group. He has grown sufficiently large in numbers to make a definite contribution to national welfare or to serve as a menace to national progress—depending upon the opportunities for development or the lack of it whichever is afforded him.

I have been interested in working with the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial idea and the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation because it is my opinion that through pride of race and efficient service, the Negro can earn for himself a respected place in the economic life of America, at the same time that he contributes his share to national progress. I further believe that as lawmakers and members of a majority group, it is our duty to seriously consider the needs of these 15,000,000 struggling Americans.

SAFE, SANE LEADERSHIP

Properly helped and intelligently led, the Negro is in position to make large contributions to our American way of life. This has been plainly evidenced in the lives of the large number of Negroes who have measured up in a most commendable way to American standards and ideals—particularly in the case of useful and successful lives like those of George Washington Carver and Booker T. Washington. Just what the Negro can accomplish through safe, constructive leadership is being evidenced too in the very worth-while program that is being headed by S. J. Phillips, president of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial and the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation. I have cooperated closely with S. J. Phillips and have seen the very telling results of his leadership. Through his efforts and those associated with him, a national program for Negroes in agricultural development, health, trade, and industrial training, and interracial good will is making itself felt over the Nation in general and in the South in particular. Dr. Phillips is well educated, trained, and efficient, an untiring worker, and an ardent apostle of the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington—but above all this, he has sufficient courtesy and humility to appeal to men of all races and creeds. He is definitely laying a foundation upon which whites and Negroes can work together for the welfare of the Nation.

EXAMPLES IN PULLING TOGETHER

Through the efforts of S. J. Phillips, the makers of Royal Crown Cola, the Nehi Corp. of Columbus, Ga., has spent a large sum of money to help develop the birthplace of Booker T. Washington, in Franklin County, Va., as an incentive to greater racial pride for the Negro and to help to make possible trade and industrial training to Negroes below high school level. This is an outstanding example of what can be accomplished through understanding and friendship. Because these qualities were injected by S. J. Phillips, this corporation was sold on Booker T. Washington's idea of "helpfulness toward others"—and not only has the Negro benefited materially by this cooperation, but so has the South and the Nation in general.

Hundreds of Negro families in Roanoke and Franklin County in Virginia are being benefited by programs of trade and industrial training which have been set up by Dr. S. J. Phillips, in trade schools established at Roanoke and at Booker Washington Birthplace, Virginia. These schools are efficiently staffed, meet State educational requirements, and are helping to fill what is possibly one of the greatest needs among Negroes today—the need for training adult Negroes of low educational status.

Recently Dr. Phillips has caused to be set into motion in the State of Georgia, a campaign for the establishment of a Negro agricultural service center at Camp John Hope near Fort Valley, Ga.; the object of which is to give help to the thousands of Negro farmers and farm families in the State of Georgia. It is significant to note that the Department of Education of the State of Georgia has set aside a tract of land on which the Agricultural Service Center will be erected and that some of Georgia's most eminent southern leaders are working side by side with Negro leaders of the State and with the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial to initiate the help which this agricultural service center can give to the Negroes of Georgia.

At Diamond, Mo., the birthplace of George Washington Carver, Dr. Phillips is working with the banks of the State and many outstanding Missourians to get under way the program of the George Washington Carver National Monument

Foundation, which has the following objectives:

First. To promote racial understanding and harmony.

Second. To help underprivileged youth through opportunity scholarships.

Third. To establish community service clubs which will work toward the higher development of Negro community life.

Fourth. To aid Negroes in the field of agriculture and rural leadership.

Fifth. To secure funds to financially assist nonprofit educational institutions.

BUILDING AN INVINCIBLE AMERICA

Ours is a land of many races and creeds. We must pull together if we would build an invincible nation. To make a strong team, each man must be in position to do his share of the pulling. The Negro can, in the words of Booker T. Washington, offer 30,000,000 hands in our forward pull—or use the same number of hands to retard our progress—depending upon the opportunities which America gives him for development.

The type of race-building program being carried out by the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial under the guidance of Dr. S. J. Phillips, is an example of the type of program that will help in the building of a stronger America. This is the type of program that definitely deserves the help and cooperation of Americans of all races and creeds. The Negro has made wonderfully rapid strides during the 85 years of his freedom. If he is willing to accept the fundamental teachings of men like Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver, under the type of leadership offered by Dr. S. J. Phillips—his future will be secure.

Anyone interested can receive more detailed information about these projects by writing Dr. S. J. Phillips, president of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, Booker Washington Birthplace, Virginia; and Dr. Phillips, as president of the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation, at Diamond, Mo.

Panama Canal Zone Employees and Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this body a section of the conference report on House bill 8920, under which Federal employees of the Panama Canal Zone will begin to pay Federal income taxes.

For many years, because of the problem of obtaining qualified American citizens to work in the Canal Zone, these these employees have been exempt from payment of such taxes.

Both the House and Senate versions of House bill 8920 were in agreement that these employees should now become liable for the levy on income. This was in accord with the policy approved by both Houses of seeking additional revenue to help liquidate our present extraordinary defense spending and to help curb inflation. However, the bill passed by this body fixed the effective date of the tax upon Canal Zone employees as January 1, 1950, while the Senate-approved version of the measure made the tax effective January 1, 1951.

In conference, the Senate agreed to the House provision on this point, and the United States citizens employed by our Government in this zone will be required not only to pay a tax from which they have been exempt for approximately 28 years, but they will have to pay retroactively for the entire calendar year 1950.

It would be well for the Members of this body to note that the wages and salaries paid the Panama Canal employees have been fixed with the full knowledge that these workers have not been subject to the tax in previous years. In addition, heavy reductions in force have occurred in the Canal Zone recently, which have resulted in many former employees leaving their place of employment and returning to the States.

Our approval of that portion of the conference report on H. R. 8920 establishing the Panama Canal employees' income-tax liability as of January 1, 1950, will result in these workers being subjected retroactively to payment. Since past wages have been disbursed by the affected group during 1950 without knowledge of the impending tax, they will suffer serious financial strain in comparison with their fellow United States citizens in the States.

As a simple matter of justice to all citizens subject to increased tax payments, I would suggest that the newly covered Panama Canal employees have the opportunity of rebudgeting their incomes between October and December 1950 so that they and their families will be able to withstand the additional financial strain caused by effectuating the income tax in January 1951. Otherwise they will not only have to accept the new responsibility in the year to come, but will have to face severe economic hardship in paying the taxes due for the entire calendar 1950.

It seems to me, therefore, that the reasonable approach to the problem of the few employees involved in comparison with our entire tax-paying population is to have them commence paying income taxes with the beginning of the new calendar year 1951.

A Truth Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, nearly 4 years ago I urged and advocated larger appropriations for our Voice of America broadcasts. Unfortunately, at that time, many gentlemen opposed it because in order to be effective these broadcasts had to be done by individuals familiar with the respective foreign languages, many of which represented countries behind the iron curtain. Because of this fact, a great deal of opposition has been raised to the Voice of America concept. Those in charge of these broadcasts and its publicity were severely criticized for employing announcers and assistants who were directly familiar with the conditions that exist in these countries and their languages.

A welcomed change has taken place as manifested in an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor dated September 15, 1950, entitled "A Truth Program." These very gentlemen who opposed the Voice of America broadcasts and its appropriations now feel, as I have always felt, that a great deal of constructive good has been realized as a result therefrom. A larger appropriation for this purpose is justifiable and will be forthcoming. The article aforementioned follows:

A TRUTH PROGRAM

For a long time the American State Department's information program has been symbolized by the Voice of America broadcasts. But the program has more sides to it than radio alone.

Thus it is gratifying that the Senate Appropriations Committee has voted to restore cuts in the fund for this activity. It is to be hoped that the Senate and House of Representatives will follow the committee judgment in raising the amount to the $97,212,000 which the Department requested.

The $77,868,000 which the House earlier approved would have provided for the radio broadcasts but the cuts it made would have restricted severely some other types of useful propaganda work, particularly in motion pictures, libraries, and information centers, and the exchange-of-persons program.

There is great need for use of the printed as well as the spoken word in many of the fringe countries between the western and the Communist worlds. American libraries or information centers can be extremely useful. Books, magazines, and pamphlets, including serious matter in comic-book format, can go where radio receivers, especially shortwave, are rare if not forbidden.

Similarly, educational films can make a lasting impression and a wholesome supplement to American-made commercial entertainment. As for the "exchange of persons," the House objected to bringing 85 Titoist leaders from Yugoslavia to observe American agricultural and industrial methods but this could have very practical results in favor of the United States.

Part of the cost of the broad propaganda effort, it may be noted, will be paid for out of counterpart funds which foreign governments have put up to match Marshall plan aid to their countries. This part of the sum, in fact, amounts to slightly more than the $19,344,000 which would be put back by the Senate committee action.

The broad governmental effort to place America before the world in an accurate light has been characterized as a "great campaign of truth."

To call it a "truth campaign" is more than a matter of convenience for headline writers. It emphasizes the variety of media by which reliable information must be spread. It emphasizes, too, a great responsibility to keep the information materials scrupulously factual—which, in this instance, is to say that they should be more interesting than fiction.

National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the resignation of Hon. Robert N. Denham as General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and the politically desperate, as well as emotional, effort of certain Republican Members of Congress to make a political issue over it, it might be well to recall that in the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments made an investigation of Mr. Denham and severely criticized him.

Under consent granted, I include a copy of the drastic report made, signed by 13 Republican members of the committee, among these several leaders of the Republican Party for the Eightieth Congress in the House of Representatives.

The majority report, signed by 13 Republican members is one of the most severe made against any public official.

It will be noted in the findings of a subcommittee and confirmed by a majority of the full committee, the charge was made that Mr. Denham was construing the Taft-Hartley Act contrary to the intent of Congress; also about certain interpretations by the Board or the General Counsel will not be "in keeping with the will or the intent of Congress"; also the direct finding and charge that in an interpretation of the Taft-Hartley Act made by Mr. Denham it "is not warranted either by the previous history of interpretation and administration of the Wagner Act, by the debates on the bill or by the terms of the act itself"; and also "the subcommittee looks upon this proposed interpretation as an attempt, by administrative interpretation, to give the country administrative law in the place and stead of law enacted by the Congress." There is in the report the charge that Mr. Denham was attempting "to override, in effect, repeal—legislative enactment."

These are charges made by a Republican controlled commttee about the Honorable Robert N. Denham. We now witness Republican Members of the Congress criticizing President Truman for asking Mr. Denham for his resignation.

In view of this report, President Truman has treated Mr. Denham most considerately.

In any event, this report, signed by 13 prominent Republican Members of the House places the Republicans in a very embarrassing and untenable position in trying to make a political issue out of the matter.

In view of this report, the issue is on the side of the Democratic Party—not the Republican Party.

The report follows:

INVESTIGATION TO ASCERTAIN SCOPE OF INTERPRETATION BY GENERAL COUNSEL OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD OF THE TERM "AFFECTING COMMERCE," AS USED IN THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

On May 26, 1948, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments had before it for consideration the report of the joint subcommittees of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the House Committee on Education and Labor, investigating the scope of the interpretation by the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board of the term "affecting commerce," as used in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

The report of the joint subcommittees was unanimous, except that O. C. FISHER, Democrat, of Texas, because of other official duties, was unable to participate in the hearings or the writing of the report.

After full consideration of the report as submitted by the joint subcommittees, upon motion duly made and seconded, the report of said joint subcommittees was approved and adopted as the report of the full Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The chairman of said committee was directed to transmit a copy to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In the forenoon of May 6, 1948, complaints were made to the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives by Representatives of hotels and taverns, alleging that Mr. Robert N. Denham, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, was about to issue an interpretation of the term "affecting commerce," as it was written in the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, hereinafter referred to as the Taft-Hartley Act.

It was alleged that the new interpretation enlarged the meaning of that term as it had been interpreted by the National Labor Relations Board functioning under the so-called Wagner Act and as construed by the Federal courts.

It was contended by the complainants that the new interpretation of the language would bring within the purview of the act and the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board practically every retail establishment and industrial plant, no matter how small or how restricted its operations.

The chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments appointed a subcommittee of that committee and, because the House Committee on Education and Labor was the author of the original act, requested the chairman of that committee, the Honorable Fred A. Hartley, Jr., to appoint a subcommittee of that committee to sit with the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The Honorable Fred A. Hartley, Jr., graciously complied with that request and appointed RALPH W. GWINN, Republican, of New York; WALTER F. BREHM, Republican, of Ohio, and O. C. FISHER, Democrat, of Texas.

Appearing on the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments were: CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan, chairman; RALPH HARVEY, Republican, of Indiana; and J. FRANK WILSON, Democrat, of Texas.

On the following day hearings were held, and at that time Mr. J. W. Brown, general counsel for the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, appeared as a witness.

Also appearing as witnesses were: Bruce Anderson, representing the American Hotel Association; James W. Foristel, executive director, Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business, House of Representatives; Kenneth Lane, director, employer-employee relations, American Hotel Association; and M. O. Ryan, Washington representative for the American Hotel Association.

At the afternoon session, Mr. Robert N. Denham, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, appeared and, in answer to questions, outlined the new policy of the Board. He frankly stated that he was about to place a new interpretation upon the term "affecting commerce" which would be a radical departure from the meaning of the term as it had previously been interpreted and administered by the Board under the Wagner Act. He did not deny that the new interpretation was more inclusive than the meaning which had been given the same term by the Supreme Court in cases construing the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Wagner Act.

He expressed the thought that the new and broader construction was necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of the Taft-Hartley Act. He cited, as some of the reasons for that opinion, the fact that the Taft-Hartley Act gave protection to one union against another, to union employees from certain activities by union officers and unions, and to certain employers.

Mr. Denham, queried as to the new interpretation, testified (p. 16 of hearings):

"The present thought of the Board * * * is that it is a rare case in which business does not affect commerce in some degree, and that where commerce is affected, the Board has jurisdiction."

This new interpretation of the term "affecting commerce" (which is the same language used in the Fair Labor Standards Act and in the Wagner Act) will bring within the purview of the Taft-Hartley Act, and under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board, not only all those businesses and industries heretofore held to be operating within the meaning of that term, but banks, insurance companies, hotels, restaurants, taverns, many of those operating and occupying office buildings and many other private enterprises which were never heretofore considered to be engaged in interstate or foreign commerce.

Mr. Denham contended that his interpretation was mandatory under section 10 (a) of the Taft-Hartley Act (p. 17 of hearings).

That section is as follows:

"The Board is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice (listed in sec. 8) affecting commerce. This power shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, law, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the Board is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State or Territory to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases in any industry (other than mining, manufacturing, communications, and transportation except where predominantly local in character) even though such cases may involve labor disputes affecting commerce, unless the provision of the State or Territorial statute applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith."

In response to a question as to the extent of the jurisdiction which he proposed to exercise. Mr. Denham testified (p. 18 of hearings):

"The CHAIRMAN. Am I correct, then, in the assumption that where any material comes in from across a State line and is used by the local industry, under the Taft-Hartley Act you have jurisdiction?

"Mr. DENHAM. I my opinion, yes sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. And if complaint is made you will take it?

"Mr. DENHAM. Oh, yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. You are forced to?

"Mr. DENHAM. Unless it would come within the de minimis doctrine of a few dollars involved, I think we would have no option but to accept it.

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, there is no business, then, that you would not have jurisdiction over?

"Mr. DENHAM. I can conceive of very few businesses over which there is not at least technical jurisdiction."

Mr. Denham, to give an illustration of the new interpretation, explained that a local laundry, doing but a regular house-to-house business, probably would not fall within the meaning of the new interpretation. He added, however, that if a laundry handled uniforms for General Motors Corp., that laundry handling the uniforms of employees of a corporation which was engaged in interstate commerce would be within the Board's jurisdiction (pp. 19 and 20 of hearings).

Mr. Denham was asked (p. 18 of hearings):

"The CHAIRMAN. Well then, assume, for example, that they did not mine any coal in Indiana, which they do, and there is an industry there which ships in coal, which sells its product wholly within the State, operating on coal which comes in from West Virginia.

"Mr. DENHAM. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. You would have jurisdiction there and would have to take it?

"Mr. DENHAM. Definitely."

Mr. Denham also called attention to a case where a window cleaner, washing windows in an office building where there were tenants transacting interstate business, had been held to be engaged in an occupation affecting interstate commerce.

Another illustration offered in the hearings covered the case of a small tavern which employed one bartender. In this hypothetical case, the tavern sold only beer and wine. The beer was manufactured locally. But the hops were shipped to the brewery from California to make the beer in another State.

Mr. J. W. Brown, general counsel for the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, referring to a conversation with Mr. Denham which occurred a few days previously, in which the proposed action was discussed, testified (pp. 2 and 3 of hearings):

"Mr. BROWN. Let me give you an example of it.

"The CHAIRMAN. Are you giving this now as one which he cited?

"Mr. BROWN. Yes; I am giving you an example that we discussed.

"Take the smallest establishment in the field that I am concerned with—the little tavern—where there is a single bartender employed. There is an owner and perhaps one bartender. Suppose it were in a field where they only sell beer and wine. The beer is manufactured locally, but the hops were shipped in from California—or say another State.

"Mr. Denham's view is that he is inclined to feel that since the hops were shipped in, if there were a labor dispute in that particular tavern, the shipment of hops would be obstructed or at least would cease, and there is something affecting commerce.

"The CHAIRMAN. You say 'hops' in this tavern. Does the tavern keeper make the beer?

"Mr. BROWN. No; he purchases the beer, but the ingredients that go into the beer are shipped in interstate commerce to the manufacturer in his own community. Thus, with a definition of that sort, every industry that you can think of affects interstate commerce.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is to say, then, that if a hotel man bought a pie, if the eggs in that pie came from Michigan and the pie was sold down here in Washington, that would be interstate commerce. Is that it?

"Mr. BROWN. That is the general tendency under this term in the present administration of the law.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then, there would be no distinction between interstate and intrastate commerce?

"Mr. BROWN. Exactly what I would say."

The foregoing illustrates the line of reasoning by which the National Labor Relations Board presumes to assert jurisdiction over every tavern, small restaurant, small business in the land.

The statement of the subcommittee members, repeated many times in the hearings, was that, since the language of the jurisdiction section of the Taft-Hartley Act had been taken verbatim from the old Wagner Act, Congress did not intend to enlarge the range of jurisdiction under the new law.

Mr. J. W. Brown testified that the new range of jurisdiction would bring within the authority of the Board at least 400,000 members of his union, the hotel and Restaurant Employees International Union.

All of these workers previously had considered themselves engaged in purely intrastate commerce, and hence not within the jurisdiction of the Board. It was indicated by Mr. Brown that many such rulings on jurisdiction might bring under the Board and subject to the Taft-Hartley Act a new army of several million local workers who are now engaged in what heretofore always has been considered intrastate business.

By such interpretation of the act, every corner grocer and every two-man shop in the country, which received or shipped material which crossed a State line, would find itself within the range of NLRB authority, save where the Board itself elected not to assert jurisdiction under the de minimis rule.

Mr. Brown argued insistently that such application of the act would impose a grievous and unfair burden on the small-business men of the Nation, by reason of the fact that they were not familiar with NLRB law and procedures and would be compelled, therefore, to bear heavy legal expenses to conform to all NLRB rules and orders.

Mr. Brown also contended that the new interpretation, if adopted, would create confusion in labor's ranks and render it more difficult for the unions to operate successfully. He vigorously protested the adoption of the new meaning.

Certainly it was never the intention of Congress to impose such a burden on the small business of the United States.

On the contrary, the legislative history of the Taft-Hartley Act demonstrates that it was the firm intention of the Congress not to enlarge or expand the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board in this respect.

FINDINGS

Your subcommittee is certain that it was not the intention of Congress to include in the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board every small, local business which drew a small portion of its supplies or merchandise from beyond the borders of a State or Territory.

The members of the subcommittee are of the opinion that any attempt on the part of either the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board or the Board itself to enlarge upon its own jurisdiction by interpretation is not in keeping with the will or the intent of Congress.

The members of the subcommittee are further of the opinion, after due consideration of the testimony, that the term, used in both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, "affecting commerce," is too general and will, in the future, be subject to conflicting interpretations, will lead to confusion, so that many businessmen and labor organizations will be uncertain whether they are or are not under the act.

From an examination of the debates while the Taft-Hartley legislation was being considered by the Congress, and from the prior administrative and judicial decisions, the subcommittee is of the opinion that it was not the intention of the Congress to enlarge or extend the meaning of the term "affecting commerce" so as to bring within the terms of that act, or within the jurisdiction of the Board, or of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, small mercantile or industrial businesses doing a local business. Businesses of that nature had always heretofore, by the old National Labor Relations Board, by the enforcement division of the Department of Labor, and by the courts, been held to be businesses engaged in intrastate, not interstate, commerce; as not engaging in business affecting commerce.

The subcommittee is of the opinion that this new interpretation proposed by the General Counsel of the Board to be placed upon the term "affecting commerce" is not warranted either by the previous history of interpretation and administration of the Wagner Act, by the debates on the bill or by the terms of the act itself; that such interpretation is not necessary to effectuate the purposes of the act.

The subcommittee looks upon this proposed interpretation as an attempt, by administrative interpretation, to give the country administrative law in the place and stead of law enacted by the Congress.

It is the thought of the subcommittee that, as long as we have a Congress charged with legislating for the national welfare, and while the legal presumption, at least, exists that the Congress is competent to legislate, the executive-administrative agencies should not attempt—as it seems apparent this agency proposes to attempt—to override—in effect, repeal—legislative enactments.

We find that the definition of interstate commerce, as now applied in most of our Federal agencies, is one which has been developed largely by administrative and judicial decrees over the last 50 years.

We believe that Congress should itself define and limit the term "interstate commerce" in a way harmonious with the practical needs of business.

Such a definition would at once eliminate large areas of conflict, misunderstanding and uncertainty regarding the application of many Federal statutes, and would facilitate Federal administration in those areas which lie truly within the range of interstate commerce.

It is of the utmost importance to the economic life of the Nation that administrative encroachments upon purely local business operations be halted and restrained. We are unanimous in the opinion that the proposed administrative expansion of NLRB jurisdiction, as indicated by our hearings here, presents a dangerous abuse of administrative discretion. Under the new interpretation, unless restrained by Congress, NLRB would have every busines establishment in the United States within its power. Our national history does not afford a more striking example of bureaucratic aggrandizement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to limit the confusion that will result from this proposed interpretation, we recommend that the House Committee on Education and Labor, which is charged with initiating legislation affecting labor and industry, or the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is charged with initiating legislation affecting interstate commerce, or any other appropriate committee, redefine the terms "interstate commerce" and "affecting commerce," and, by bill, submit a proposed definition of "interstate commerce" and "affecting commerce" to the Congress.

We further recommend that, until Congress has an opportunity to act, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and the Board withhold any new interpretation of the term "affecting commerce."

Approved by:

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.
GEORGE H. BENDER,
WALTER H. JUDD.
ROBERT F. RICH.
HENRY J. LATHAM.
FOREST A. HARNESS.
CLARENCE J. BROWN.
ROSS RIZLEY.
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH.
FRED E. BUSBEY.
MELVIN C. SNYDER.
WALTER RIEHLMAN.
RALPH HARVEY.
CARTER MANASCO.
HENDERSON LANHAM.
PORTER HARDY, JR.
J. FRANK WILSON.

Voted present:

WILLIAM L. DAWSON.
JOHN J. DELANEY.
FRANK M. KARSTEN.
LEO ISACSON.

ACCOMPANYING VIEWS OF HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK

An examination of the evidence, particularly that of R. N. Denham, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, clearly shows that the purposes and objectives of the Taft-Hartley Act differ in important respects from the Wagner Act, and in a manner, evidenced by this report, that the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act never contemplated.

A reading of Mr. Denham's testimony clearly supports this statement.

The evidence in the hearing brings out forcibly the vast delegation of power vested in the General Counsel by the Taft-Hartley Act, practically unlimited in his interpretation of the words "affecting commerce." The evidence also portrays the anguish of the proponents of the Taft-Hartley bill in waking up to what they have done.

Mr. Denham's testimony sharply presents the fact that the relationship developed between the Federal Government under the Wagner Act and the several State governments under their labor legislation has been seriously disturbed and in at least the case of one State completely terminated.

As Mr. Denham points out on page 16 of the hearings—

"Under the Wagner Act there was just one class of complainants. These were the labor organizations or individuals who desired to file charges, and there was only one class of respondents, and that was the employer. So all charges were directed to employers, and all unfair labor practices were unfair practices of employers as they were defined in the Wagner Act."

He also said in this connection, on page 17 of the hearings:

"Under the present act, we have several different types of elections that are different from what were provided for in the Wagner Act. We have cases where elections may be inaugurated on petitions filed by the employees themselves. The authority of an employer to petition for an election is very greatly broadened over what it was under the regulations of the old Board. The union-shop election is a brand-new thing we had never heard of before. And, in the field of unfair labor practices, now an employer may file charges of unfair labor practices against labor organizations if certain things are committed. Employees themselves may file charges against either employers or against labor organizations, and, in fact, in some cases one labor organization can file a charge against another.

"So that the complexion of the act is very greatly changed. Under the old act, the Board had a very happy relation with the New York State Labor Relations Board, which operated under a little Wagner Act practically identical with the one that preceded the Taft-Hartley Act here; and there, under that arrangement, the old Wagner Act Board ceded jurisdiction over quite a large number of classes of cases to the State labor relations board, allowed them to proceed, and they would not assert jurisdiction over them."

In relation to hotels, banks, loft buildings, and then a miscellany of small business (p. 17), he testified:

"We not only do have jurisdiction, Mr. HOFFMAN, but I think our assertion of jurisdiction is almost mandatory. I refer to section 10 (a)."

His testimony emphasizes that under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act jurisdiction would have to be taken over practically all activities; that the Taft-Hartley Act is mandatory in this respect.

On page 20, he testified:

"As I have said before, it is very difficult to find any business that does not have some effect on commerce."

In this connection he was referring to the changed conditions produced by the Taft-Hartley Act.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then there is a change in policy in interpreting the law, or in the interpretation of the term 'affecting commerce'; is there not?

"Mr. DENHAM. There is a broadening of the application of it.

"The CHAIRMAN. Which you think is rendered necessary by this act?

"Mr. DENHAM. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. And because of the provisions which were not contained in the old act?

"Mr. DENHAM. Yes, sir."

Consistently throughout his testimony, Mr. Denham contended and maintained that the application of the term "affecting commerce" under the Taft-Hartley Act is different than it was under the Wagner Act. It is apparent from his testimony that practically the whole economic life of our country in its relationship to business and labor or management and labor, even down to a corner store, comes within the purview of the Taft-Hartley Act and that this is mandatory under the Taft-Hartley Act.

The following testimony of Mr. Denham, appearing on pages 21 and 22 of the hearings, is also significant as to the extent of the coverage of the Taft-Hartley Act, a coverage that Mr. Denham states in his testimony is mandatory and not discretionary by the Taft-Hartley Act, and showing its effects on existing State laws:

"Mr. DENHAM. Section 10 (a) has to do with the ceding of jurisdiction to the agencies of States and Territories that deal with the handling of unfair labor practices, and it permits the ceding of that jurisdiction only where the applicable State law is consistent with our law that we are now administering, and where the application of that law is consistent with the application that we make of it.

"Inherent in that is that we cannot cede jurisdiction either passively or actively so as not to assert jurisdiction when it is claimed, unless those conditions exist.

"The CHAIRMAN. What is this? I do not quite get this. It says: '*Provided*, That the Board is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State or Territory to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases in any industry,' and it mentions certain exceptions 'even though such cases may involve labor disputes affecting commerce.'

"Mr. DENHAM. Read the next three or four lines of that thing. There you get the bug in it.

"The CHAIRMAN. It says: 'unless the provision of the State or Territorial statute applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith.'

"That is the whole of 10 (a).

"Mr. DENHAM. Yes, sir. In other words, we may do that when the State law is consistent with this one, and the application of the State law is consistent with the application we make of the Taft-Hartley Act.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, then, for instance, with reference to New York, what you would be doing, then, is to make your Federal practice conform to the State practice.

"Mr. DENHAM. No, sir; we are not ceding anything. That is just the trouble.

"The CHAIRMAN. You are not ceding anything; you are just following the interpretation put on the law by New York.

"Mr. DENHAM. No; the New York State law is the same as the old Wagner Act, and that is thoroughly inconsistent with the present law, so we do not do business with the New York State board any more.

"The CHAIRMAN. You mean the Wagner Act is inconsistent with the present law?

"Mr. DENHAM. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. In what particular with reference to affecting commerce?

"Mr. DENHAM. It is not a question of affecting commerce; the substantive provisions of it.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is what I am talking about. The only thing we are interested in here today is the interpretation or application of this affecting commerce.

"Mr. DENHAM. There is no relation between the New York act and this act on that score.

"The CHAIRMAN. I understood you to say a while ago that in New York——

"Mr. DENHAM. That was under the old Wagner Act.

"The CHAIRMAN. And under the New York State law?

"Mr. DENHAM. Yes, sir; the Wagner Act and the New York State law were almost identical.

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and in that situation New York handled those cases because they affected commerce, but the Federal agency did not?

"Mr. DENHAM. No; the New York State board just handled them, not because they affected commerce.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, they handled them because they came under the State law.

"Mr. DENHAM. Yes; they brought them under the State law.

"The CHAIRMAN. And the National Labor Relations Board considered that they did not affect interstate commerce.

"Mr. DENHAM. I would not say that. They found it to be easier to let the New York State board handle them and it would effectuate the policies just as well.

"The CHAIRMAN. And now you propose that we handle them under the Federal law?

"Mr. DENHAM. Yes, sir; and under the Allegheny-Ludlum-Bethlehem Steel case we are forced to.

"The CHAIRMAN. My point was, inasmuch as this statute here says: 'unless the provision of the State or Territorial statute applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency'—that is, the State agency—'is inconsistent with the correspondent provision of this act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith.'

"I got the impression that what you were doing now was to make the Federal practice conform to the State practice.

"Mr. DENHAM. Not at all.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, you get to the same destination.

"Mr. DENHAM. We have made no cessions of jurisdiction to any of the State agencies.

"The CHAIRMAN. I understand that, but you are not following, in your interpretation or proposed interpretation, the same thought or idea that ran through the New York board?

"Mr. DENHAM. I do not think so. I do not know what thought it was that ran through the New York board.

"The CHAIRMAN. They had jurisdiction over these businesses.

"Mr. DENHAM. They were within the State.

"The CHAIRMAN. Within the State.

"Mr. DENHAM. Absent the Federal jurisdiction, they would have jurisdiction over them.

"The CHAIRMAN. And now you take jurisdiction over those same industries?

"Mr. DENHAM. We had jurisdiction, but we simply did not assert it.

"The CHAIRMAN. I see; all right.

"Mr. DENHAM. It was more convenient to let them do it."

The hearings are interesting in that they clearly show that the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act were not aware of the extent it went in its application as distinguished from the Wagner Act. The hearings are also further evidence of the hasty consideration of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

If the findings of the two subcommittees are correct that the action taken by the National Labor Relations Board, or by Mr. Denham, its General Counsel, in certain cases is contrary to the intent of the Congress, such findings are clear evidence that the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act are disturbed with and fearful of their own creation.

In connection with these findings, and his evidence that the provisions of section 10 (a) are mandatory, the following testimony of Mr. Denham, on page 27, is significant:

"My job is to take the law as it is written and apply it as I understand it to be."

There is no question but what his position as stated above is a correct one. He considers it his duty, mandatory under the Taft-Hartley Act, to take steps that the two subcommittees criticize, and inferentially, at least, condemn him for taking. It is plainly apparent from the hearings that proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act did not realize what a creature they had brought into legal being.

The hearings bring out in a prominent and convincing manner the mistake that was made in the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

While I make no objection to the two recommendations made by the subcommittees, I think it only fair to the National Labor Relations Board, and to its General Counsel, to observe that if it construes section 10 (a) of the Taft-Hartley Act to be mandatory, as testified to by Mr. Denham, compliance with the second recommendation might place the Board and the General Counsel in an embarrassing position. Compliance with this recommendation might be construed as submitting to legislative dictation, or amounting to executive abdication, or something of that nature, even if the suspension of Mr. Denham's interpretation is only temporary.

So far as the first recommendation is concerned, if carried out properly, some good may result if the Taft-Hartley Act is improved upon. However, if any bill is considered in and reported out of committee, it should be watched and followed closely, because it could easily be used in amending the Taft-Hartley Act to make it more repressive against labor.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

A Report on the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, at a meeting in Chicago sponsored by the United Nations Association of Chicago in association with the American-Scandinavian Foundation, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations, the Chicago Junior Association of Commerce and Industry, and the Library of International Relations, Friday, September 8, 1950:

A REPORT ON THE UNITED NATIONS

Governor Stevenson and distinguished guests, I am glad to be able to revisit the Middle West and this great city under such distinguished and friendly auspices.

I met your Governor before I was introduced to his native State of Illinois. That was almost 5 years ago in London when he was a member of the United States delegation to the First Assembly of the United Nations and I was Foreign Minister of Norway and chief of the Norwegian delegation.

It was Adlai Stevenson and his chief, the late Edward R. Stettinius, who asked me to accept nomination as Secretary-General of the United Nations. I am afraid Governor Stevenson, in his desire to lure me from a post in which I was quite happy and from the home I loved, painted the job of Secretary-General in somewhat more cheerful and peaceful colors than events have justified. But I do not blame him for that. He and I both knew very well that the work of peacebuilding was going to be hard and discouraging, although we did not expect it to be quite as difficult as it has proved to be.

In spite of everything that has gone wrong with the world since 1945 I am grateful to him for his part in putting me on the spot—even though it is right on the front line of the battle for peace where everybody, from Pravda in Moscow to the Tribune in Chicago, can take plenty of shots at me.

Governor Stevenson, as a United Nations delegate, also helped to bring the United Nations permanent headquarters to the United States.

Some of my European colleagues wanted the headquarters in Europe, but I agreed with Governor Stevenson. This was because I thought it was essential that the extremely important role of the United States in the struggle for world peace be recognized both by the people of the United States and by the peoples of other countries.

As a United Nations delegate your governor exemplified the progressive, enlightened and democratic statesmanship that the world needs from America. He was respected and beloved by his colleagues and he has maintained his place in our hearts undiminished in the 2 years since the voters of Illinois took him away from us.

Other distinguished citizens of Illinois have joined in recognizing the special responsibilities and opportunities of the United States in the struggle for peace. I know quite well that many here tonight have been pioneers in that respect.

The United Nations Association of Chicago and organizations associated with it as sponsors for this meeting here tonight, have been leaders in awakening the people of this area to the terrible dangers of a third world war for every individual and every family in the world, no matter where they live, and to the opportunities that exist for preventing such a disaster. They deserve the gratitude of their fellow citizens.

As a Norwegian I can understand and sympathize with the desire to stay out of the mess that is at the bottom of what has been called isolationism in the United States. Norway is a small country and we had that same desire to avoid the consequences of power politics and to stay out of what we used to call other people's wars. Because of this, my country followed its policy of neutrality in the First World War and attempted to follow it in the Second World War.

The lesson that war anywhere in the world is a threat to peace everywhere in the world is not an easy one to learn. We in Norway were given a lesson in April 1940, when the Nazis invaded our country without warning. You in the United States were given a lesson when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor without warning.

It is not surprising that the lesson is hard to learn. Science has reduced distances much too drastically and rapidly for society to keep pace. Measured in terms of the time it takes to get there, Chicago is closer to my own city of Oslo today than it was to Springfield—the capital of your own State—little more than 100 years ago.

We have reduced distances in terms of time so drastically that the whole world has been shrunk in a century to the size of the State of Illinois. At the same time we have just as drastically increased our power to destroy the lives and property of our fellow men. This means that Oslo, Norway, and Chicago, U. S. A., and every other major city in the world will be within range of battle in any great war from now on, and all the people in these cities would also be in danger of total destruction, by atom bombs or worse, in such a war.

In these circumstances it is quite clear that the nations of the world must learn to live peacefully with each other and without war if they are to survive. It is equally clear that they are poorly prepared to do so. They have been used to fighting wars and to living comfortably far apart from each other for thousands of years. Now modern science has suddenly confronted them with the necessity for abolishing war and for living closely together before they have learned how to get on together. If the world is no bigger now than Illinois was a hundred years ago, then the 59 member countries of the United Nations may be thought of as like 59 counties in this State—but each county with its own language, customs, religion, and form of government instead of all alike. That is our dilemma.

I put the matter in this way because I want all who are listening to me tonight to understand, in terms of their own lives and their own experience, first, why it is necessary for the United Nations to succeed; and second, why this is so immensely difficult. In the third place, I want to consider with you what the peoples and their governments might be able to do to reduce the chances of failure and increase the chances of success.

The conflict in Korea has confronted the world with its most serious crisis since 1945. Only 5 years after the end of the last war and the establishment of the United Nations, the prospect of preventing a third world war has been placed in the gravest danger. At the same time the crisis has placed before the members of the United Nations the necessity of making a great new effort for world peace.

Let us recall for a moment that the establishment of the United Nations did not, of itself, guarantee peace. The United Nations was created in order to achieve peace by promoting the peaceful settlement of disputes whenever possible; by taking enforcement action to prevent or suppress a breach of the peace whenever necessary; and, by helping the nations to work together to reduce poverty, hunger, and misery in the world, to raise the standards of living and to widen the opportunities for individual advancement and social progress in all parts of the world.

Up to last June 25, when the North Koreans launched their attack, the United Nations had made a good beginning in the work of promoting peaceful settlements of disputes between nations. Together with the specialized agencies, the United Nations had also made a promising start in its economic

and social work and in its work for dependent peoples. This was in spite of the fact that from the very first the United Nations was faced with a steadily worsening conflict of power and ideology between the western nations on the one hand and the Soviet Union and its allies on the other hand.

It is not surprising that in these circumstances the United Nations has had failures. What is surprising is that the United Nations has been able to do so much constructive work. Even during the past year, when the cold war reached its greatest intensity, good work has been accomplished. In my annual report to the members on the work of the Organization this summer, I was able to point out 14 major actions of the United Nations during the past 12 months—aside from the action in Korea—which have been or can be of constructive benefit to the world. These include such matters as:

The decision of the General Assembly in favor of the independence of Libya within 2 years. The independence of the Republic of Indonesia after a 3-year effort in which the United Nations played a major role. The renewed effort of the Security Council to settle the dispute over Kashmir between India and Pakistan. The successful maintenance of the armistice regimes between Israel and her neighbors. The part played by the United Nations in the progressive pacification of the northern borders of Greece. The launching of the United Nations' expanded program of technical assistance for economic development. The establishment of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

Against these and many other accomplishments of the United Nations must be balanced the major failure so far—the failure to establish the system of collective security envisaged by the United Nations Charter. The main components of this system were to be: First, United Nations armed forces which would be at the disposal of the Security Council at all times for the suppression of breaches of the peace; second, a system of international control for atomic energy and the elimination from national armaments of atomic bombs and all other weapons of mass destruction; and, in the third place, the regulation and reduction of all other armaments with the goal of universal disarmament.

Because of the world tension virtually no progress was made toward agreement on any of these elements of a United Nations collective security system during the past 3 years.

Thus it was in a world without a collective security system that the fighting in Korea began.

This was not the first armed conflict that had occurred since the United Nations was established. There had been fighting in Palestine between Israel and the Arab countries, in Indonesia between the Dutch and the Indonesians, and in Kashmir between the Pakistani and the Indians.

In all these cases the United Nations intervened and by peaceful methods of persuasion was able to stop the fighting and to promote peaceful settlement of the disputes.

In the other two areas of most widespread armed conflict since 1945, the civil wars in China and French Indochina, the United Nations has not stepped in.

The case of Korea differs from the other cases of armed conflict in several ways. In the first place, it is more directly involved in the Great Power conflict over the peace settlements of the last war. The thirty-eighth parallel exists as a boundary line between North and South Korea only because Soviet forces were responsible for taking the surrender of Japanese troops in Korea north of that line and the United States forces south of the line. The military occupation that followed was supposed to bring unification of Korea but did not because the two Great Powers could not agree. A 5-year trusteeship prior to independence had, in fact, been agreed upon in principle but was never carried out.

Then, in 1947, the United States asked the United Nations to take over. The history of United Nations action in Korea is the second reason why Korea differs from the other cases of armed conflict that have confronted the United Nations. For 2½ years the United Nations tried to bring about the peaceful unification of Korea under a government freely chosen by all the people of Korea. It failed because the North Koreans refused to negotiate, refused to permit the United Nations Commission even to cross the thirty-eighth parallel and refused to accept the recommendations adopted by overwhelming votes in the United Nations General Assembly. So the United Nations and its Commission went ahead as best they could in the circumstances. Elections were held in South Korea. The Government of the Republic of Korea was established there and recognized by the General Assembly as the only lawful government in Korea.

Now the North Koreans had the legal right—whatever one may think of the wisdom and morality of their position—to refuse to accept the recommendations of the General Assembly. But they had no right—legal, moral, or otherwise—to attempt to overthrow by armed force the majority decisions of the United Nations. Nor did they have the right to attempt to impose their government by force upon all Korea, whether they liked the government in South Korea or not.

The North Korean attack upon South Korea was the most direct challenge to the peaceful aims and purposes of the United Nations. The power of the attack showed how long and carefully prepared it was. The attack came in such overwhelming strength that it almost succeeded in winning the whole country by force of arms within a matter of days.

It would have been disastrous for the United Nations and for the cause of world peace if an act of armed aggression had succeeded in these circumstances. It did not succeed because of the immediate action of the Security Council and the equally prompt intervention of armed forces of the United States, later backed by other members of the United Nations.

The world owes a great debt to the President and people of the United States for the courageous decisions they made between June 25 and June 27 and for the leadership they were able to give in the United Nations as a result of those decisions. The debt has continued to mount up in the weeks that followed—a debt to the American soldiers and sailors and airmen who, by force of circumstances, have had to do most of the fighting so far in Korea. They are fighting for the United Nations under the United Nations flag and their United Nations Commander, General Douglas MacArthur. Their bravery and sacrifice in the face of great odds have saved the day and may at last begin to turn the tide of battle.

From the beginning the United States forces have been joined by units of the armed forces of several other members of the United Nations. Now additional units are joining in the battle or are being recruited for service in Korea. On the basis of the offers already made, it is safe to predict that between 30,000 and 50,000 fighting men will be contributed to the United Nations armed forces for service in Korea by other members of the United Nations.

Thus, for the first time in the history of the world, the enforcement of peace has been undertaken by a world organization. This has happened in spite of the Great Power deadlock that prevented the creation of the United Nations armed forces contemplated in the Charter. It has happened in response to a recommendation of the Security Council, rather than a command. Even if the Security Council had been blocked by use of the veto, the General Assembly, where there is no veto, could have made the same recommendation, and the whole United Nations action in Korea could have followed exactly as it has, in fact, occurred.

The potential significance of this United Nations action in Korea, if it succeeds, for future collective security from aggression is tremendous. Canada, which is one of the countries raising a force for action in Korea, has already proclaimed its intention of continuing this force as a permanent United Nations force in the Canadian army, ready to answer future calls, should they come, for enforcement action by the United Nations. I believe other countries may come to similar decisions.

Of one thing we can be quite sure. The precedent of Korea will not be forgotten. The world will find it more difficult than ever before, if not impossible, to permit any future cases of armed aggression to pass unchallenged. Enforcement action to restore peace should now become a matter of course.

There are many reasons—both immediate and long-range—why the United Nations action must be brought to a successful conclusion in Korea. This requires first of all increased military aid by the other members of the United Nations. It also requires enlightened political planning and action by all the members of the United Nations.

It will not be enough to win from the North Koreans obedience to the Security Council's cease-fire order of June 25 and their withdrawal to the 38th parallel. The aim of the United Nations is and must be a united and independent Korea in which all the people of Korea are able freely to elect a government of their own choosing. To accomplish this may take a long time and will certainly require, among other things, an effective United Nations program of relief and reconstruction. Korea will be a devastated land after the fighting is ended. It will need time and help in order to recover. It must have that time and help from the United Nations.

A permanent solution in Korea will require more than the freely given consent of the Korean people. Remember that Korea is a peninsula about the size of Florida extending into the sea from Chinese Manchuria and the Soviet Union. It will be necessary for Korea to have good and peaceful relations with China and the Soviet Union, as well as with Japan and the rest of the powers of the Pacific area.

How can this be brought about?

Thus we are brought once more face to face with the question of what to do about the bitter conflict between the western world and the Soviet Union and its allies.

I continue to believe that universal peace requires a universal organization in which nations with all kinds of governments and social systems participate. Within this universal framework there is room for regional groupings and alliances. These may, and often do, serve a very useful purpose. But they are not a substitute for the United Nations and they cannot be. Anything less than a universal organization merely brings the world back to the old system of alliances and counteralliances that has always led to war in the past. It does not matter whether the competing groups are in the form of federal unions or regional organizations. The effect is the same as if they were alliances.

We must remember the fact that the Soviet Union, Communist China and their allies have about one-third of the world's population. What is called the Western World also has about one-third. The newly rising countries of Asia and Africa, who do not desire to belong to either camp, compose the other third. In such a world it would be the height of wishful thinking to suppose that either side could impose its will upon the others by force without pre-

cipitating a third world war that would be destructive of civilization as we know it.

What, then, is the answer?

I see none expect to make the United Nations work more effectively in the cause of peace as a world organization with all parties represented in it.

We have first to demonstrate beyond any doubt that armed aggression does not pay. This we have set out to do in Korea. We must carry that task through to its conclusion with unflinching purpose and all the resources that the member governments can supply. It will not be easy, but it can and will be done.

We have next to find a permanently peaceful solution for the future of Korea. That may take a great deal of time and patient effort. A permanently peaceful solution for Korea is not likely in the present state of critical tension between East and West. But it can be achieved as part of a general settlement between East and West on many issues.

This brings me to my third point, a new effort to negotiate between East and West in the United Nations.

Many people in this audience tonight will recall that I made a trip this spring to the four Great Power capitals—Washington, London, Paris, and Moscow. I carried with me a memorandum of 10 points for consideration in developing a Twenty-Year Program To Win Peace through the United Nations. I discussed this memorandum with the heads of governments and foreign ministers of the four countries in a preliminary way. I was exploring, and I neither asked for, nor received, commitments from anyone. Then I sent the proposals to all the 59 member governments and I have put them on the agenda of the coming session of the United Nations General Assembly, which opens in New York on September 19.

This memorandum is what people who are in government service call a "working paper." Fundamentally it is an appeal to the member governments to give the United Nations approach to peace a higher priority in their foreign policies—to make a new effort to use all the resources of the United Nations as the really primary means of achieving peace. Until the Korean crisis came along no government really gave the United Nations the top priority. One glance at the budget of any member government will make that apparent.

Now there are some signs of a new attitude and a new awakening to the meaning of the United Nations.

When the United Nations has won its enforcement action in Korea—as we must—I want to see a new and great effort to start the wheels of negotiation turning again between east and west in the United Nations.

The first of the 10 points I proposed before the Korean crisis was that we start a series of special meetings of the Security Council, as the Charter provides, with foreign ministers or heads of state in attendance. I believe it is necessary to bring the policy-making officials of the governments together in periodic meetings of this kind. We should not expect dramatic results from such meetings. But if they were properly conducted, with private, informal sessions the rule, I believe they might in time lead to constructive results. Certainly I do not see how we can make and progress at all toward a peaceful settlement of the conflicts that divide the world unless the two sides can be brought around the conference table in genuine and honest negotiation.

During my term as Secretary-General I have sought consistently to bring the two sides together. Now it is getting very late indeed. But it is never too late to negotiate in order to prevent a third world war. I do not believe it is too late today.

This is no time for despair.

This, above all, is the time to work and fight for a United Nations peace—a peace based squarely on the principles of the Charter, a peace of genuine collective security dedicated to the advancement of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all peoples.

If the peoples and their governments will support the United Nations—in Korea and throughout the world—with the same all-out spirit they gave to winning the last war, the world may still win such a peace, and win it for a long time to come.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial appearing in the September issue of the publication entitled "Made in America Monthly":

We most certainly cannot speak for every American, but editorially speaking for ourselves, we are becoming increasingly tired of hearing the dire predictions and pessimistic opinions continually rampant to the effect that the United States Government, political and economic system, labor-management relationships, the average citizen, etc., etc., is "going to the dogs."

Foremost in every mind with the advent of Labor Day, is the subject of labor—unionized or not. Loud have been the voices in the past that labor unions as a whole in the United States are ripe subjects for communism—that strikes are Communist-inspired. But let us sanely consider that subject. True, there always seems to be a strike in one industry or another and these are a source of annoyance to many. The question of whether or not these unions are justified in striking, or whether management is at fault, we will not attempt to answer here. But, unquestionably and rightly in this country labor has the right to strike, just as management has the right to stop production if they so desire. Also quite true is the fact that there have been one or two isolated cases of a communistic labor leader, but when considered as a group the latter percentage is so small as to be negligible. When taken as a whole, labor has proven its worth in our country by the irrefutable evidence of the huge volume of production which no other nation in the world can match.

Management, on the other hand, has always been the target of such accusations as profit-making, ruining the country by thinking of their capital first and the well-being of the Nation last—the "big business" bugaboo, in short. With it all, however, industry has continually come to the Nation's rescue when needed in time of emergency. American industry pays its labor the highest wages in the world, and is without a doubt the instigator of our living standards, which also are the highest in the world. Industry, too, is responsible for the fact that the United States ranks high among the wealthiest nations of the world.

With the coming elections in November, undoubtedly as has happened during every election in our history, politicians will shout to the rooftops that the Nation will be ruined if their opponents are elected. Democrats will warn that this terrible thing will happen to the county, if the Republicans are elected. Likewise the Republicans will predict that such-and-such dire happenings will occur, if the Democrats are put in office. Our history has shown that the Nation goes on, regardless of political winnings. Undoubtedly we have made mistakes in the past, and will likewise err again in the future, but with it all we have survived our mistakes without noticeable damage.

And what of the average American citizen? He has been called selfish, lackadaisical in matters of national interest, profiteering, hoarder, Communist, Fascist, Socialist, isolationist, and many other comparable terms. Still, he is always on hand when the need arises, whether it be to work 24 hours a day if necessary or to fight and give his life for his country. "The proof of the pudding is in the eating."

We do not intend to sound like "Pollyanna," nor do we recommend just riding along with the tide and let it take us where it will. It is absolutely essential to at all times be watchful to preserve and safeguard our Nation as the democracy it is. Democracy enables us to criticize and promulgate just such dire philosophy and warning as we have mentioned herein. This is one of the advantages we have in our country, and its merit lies in the fact that we are always kept aware of the dangers laying in wait for the unwary or unthinking. But let us never lose sight of the obvious—that this Nation of ours, the United States of America, is a very good place in which to live and one of which each American can be proud. We have done a darned good job in this country in the past; and all criticism to the contrary, we will do just as good a job in the future, whatever the job to come may be.

Essentials for the Improvement of the Administration of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Harold J. Gallagher, president of the American Bar Association, before the dinner of the section of judicial administration of the American Bar Association at Washington, D. C., September 19, 1950:

ESSENTIALS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

The words, "The true administration of justice is the strongest pillar of good government," are carved large in stone on the facade of the New York County Supreme Court Building in the city of New York. No one doubts their truth. Man has sought for justice since the beginning of time. Webster has said that justice is the greatest interest of man on earth. Too frequently in history and over long periods it has been denied by tyrannical rules. In a totalitarian state it is unknown. In a free government it is a basic freedom.

We recognize that only divine justice can be administered with perfection; but representatives of a democratic government, judges and lawyers alike, must always earnestly strive to show forth perfection as far as it is humanly possible in the administration of justice by mortal man.

Such an administration of justice in human affairs cannot be fairly administered without honest, impartial, and competent judges. That is the first and foremost requisite in the true administration of justice. A just judge is a good judge. He need not be the most brilliant, learned, or profound student

of the law; if he is reasonably intelligent and possessed of good, common sense; if he is patient, industrious, and imbued with a passion for administering justice to rich or poor alike, according to law; if he is not improperly influenced in his judicial action by popular clamor or by any biased personal, political, social, or economic views of his own, he is worthy of his high office.

There can be reposed in any man no greater measure of honor and trust than the duty and power to pass judgment upon his fellow men and to determine their rights and obligations. The most sacred and valued rights of man depend upon the judge for their protection and enforcement. Man's rights to life, liberty, property, and pursuit of happiness, as guaranteed by the Constitution, have no reality other than that which is accorded them by the judges who give actual expression to those rights.

This great power for good or for evil in the daily lives of every human being in the land, which rests in the judges of our courts, imposes a solemn obligation on the appointing powers or the electorate, as the case may be, to see to it that the men who are most worthy are selected. This obligation is axiomatic, at least among lawyers, and needs only be stated to insure the lawyer's acceptance of it. If all people really understood how important a good and just judge might sometimes happen to be in their own lives, and that all men are not equally competent and worthy to be good judges, they would, I am sure, demand that only the most able and worthy men be chosen for the bench.

It is necessary for the preservation of our liberties that public confidence in the judiciary and in the judicial process shall never be impaired. No system of free government can long endure without public confidence. The esteem of the public can be retained only so long as the judges meet the rigorous requirements of their sacred trust, and thereby earn and retain the respect and the faith that goes with a proper discharge of their judicial function.

In view of the great importance of right standards in the selection of judges, the lawyers, and the various bar associations, including the American Bar Association, have a duty to promote and, as far as possible, insure such a selection of judges that the interests of the people will be safeguarded. Because of this responsibility, I speak on this subject this evening in behalf of the organized bar.

The American Bar Association last met in Washington in 1932. During the intervening 17 years, approximately 75 percent of all of the judges now sitting in the Federal courts have been appointed. They have been appointed under the administration of two Presidents and a single political party, and all but a comparatively few, 8 out of nearly 200, I believe, have been appointed from a single party.

During the last 17 years, there have been too many occasions when judges have been selected because infinitely more weight was attached to the political desirability of appointing them than to anything else. It is wrong to appoint men to the bench purely because they have rendered political service to the party in power. If such men are entitled to some reward, let them be rewarded in some other way. Political leaders should not be consulted or have anything to do with the selection of judges. When I speak of political leaders, of course I do not mean the Members of the Senate who have a solemn obligation in the matter imposed on them by the Constitution.

No one party, Republican or Democratic, should predominate so overwhelmingly in the Federal courts of the land as is the case at the present time. We need at all times a nonpartisan or a bipartisan judiciary. Judges are members of a separate, equal, and coordinate branch of the Government. They must never be looked upon as subordinate either to the executive or the legislative departments. There was a long period in our history when the Supreme Court of the United States was almost in political balance and it was a period of its greatest prestige. It may well be, and I do not doubt, that judges appointed from a single party can rise entirely above party affiliations in their judgment on the issues of a particular case. But a high predominance of members of a single party as judges of our courts unmistakably lessen public confidence in the nonpartisan character of the judiciary and is, I believe, detrimental to the best interests of the courts and of the country.

The policy of restricting Federal appointments to the membership of the party in power is contrary to our best precedents and marks a reversion to a spoils-system policy from which lawyers have sought escape through the course of many years. The bar acclaimed the wisdom of President Taft, when as a matter of uniform practice he made appointments to the Federal bench without regard for party affiliations. Where the complexion of the membership of the judiciary is so predominantly of one party, a very large segment of the population is apt to ascribe political motives to decisions. And even though there is no basis to justify such a conclusion, it is a natural enough layman's conclusion which is detrimental to the maintenance of public confidence in the courts.

In the handling of international affairs it has been decided that politics must stop at the Nation's boundary, and that a nonpartisan or bipartisan foreign policy is necessary to the country's welfare. That the judges of all courts should be chosen on a nonpartisan basis and solely on merit is equally essential to the country's welfare. No finer statement of the fundamentals involved in this issue can be given than that recently made in the Senate of the United States by Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, in opposing a nomination of a man to the Federal District Court for the Southern District of Iowa. He said: "Mr. President, when the founding fathers wrote into the Constitution of the United States their concepts of a Government composed of coordinating and cooperating powers, they had in mind the surpassing importance of the judiciary, and of the judicial branch of the Government, and it was their desire to keep it as far removed as possible from the vicissitudes, contentions, hostilities, and prejudices of party politics. The language of the Constitution, as every Senator knows, is that the President shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint the members of the Federal judiciary. In the instant case, Mr. President, believing as I do that this was a wise provision, and that so far as they could do it, the framers of the Constitution had tried to isolate members of the Federal judiciary from the influences that might be brought to bear on their decisions of the utmost moment to the lives, the welfare, and the destinies of the people, I for one have been insistent, so far as in my poor power lay, to see that members of the judiciary were of the highest caliber that it was possible to secure, to see that partisan consideration should be eliminated, so far as could be done; to eliminate to the nth degree manipulation, partisan horse trading, and factors of that type that might jeopardize the high quality and standard and dignity of the judiciary."

This power to confirm appointments places a heavy responsibility upon the Senate of the United States. It is to be hoped that in the public interest, both the President of the United States when he makes appointments and the Senate when it gives its advice and consent, will cooperate to correct the exceedingly high political unbalance that presently exists, and that due weight will be given to the fine standards stated by Senator GILLETTE.

The criticism is not alone however that the vast majority of our Federal judges are members of the party in power. An additional criticism, that can properly be leveled at certain of the appointments that have been made, is that the best available person has not been selected. It is true that many excellent appointments have been made. But my thesis is that they should all be excellent. There isn't a circuit in this country that does not abound with men of both parties whom the bar would instantly recognize as outstanding material for the bench.

To appoint a truly good man to the bench is a noble act, and so we say give us distinguished men for judges. Let them be men of high character and of devotion to their country. Let them be men learned in the law. Let them be men who have had experience in courtrooms and above all, let them have that fine sense of integrity, honor, and courtesy that makes a courtroom a temple of dignity as well as a temple of justice. Let the recommendations made by the bar of men worthy to fill these most distinguished positions be given the respect and weight they deserve. No one can better appraise the qualification of a candidate for judicial office than his brother lawyers. The bar, in turn, pledges itself to submit for approval only men of the highest caliber, competence, and character.

The American Bar Association has long advocated a plan for the selection and tenure of judges for States having elective judiciaries. As stated by its special committee of that name in its report for the current year, the plan proposes, as a substitute for direct election of judges, (1) that judicial vacancies be filled by appointments by the Executive from a list named by a nonpolitical nominating committee; (2) that at the expiration of the judicial term of office, the electorate vote, with no opposing candidate, as to whether the appointee shall be retained in office; and (3) that if the appointee be rejected by the electorate, the vacancy be filled by appointment in the same manner as the original appointment. Advocacy of this plan grows among the lawyers and laymen as they learn more of its advantages. The special committee urges that each State bar association appoint a committee to consider and report on the applicability to that State of this plan, or possible variations thereof. Influential laymen should be called in to aid in creating a favorable public opinion for the adoption of the plan in those States where the State bar association thinks it applicable. This work is educational in character and favorable results are necessarily slow in coming. But much progress is nevertheless being made—and the good work that is being done should be encouraged and assisted in every practicable way.

Judges of both Federal and State courts are entitled to receive adequate compensation. Due to inflation, the compensation paid to judges in most places is far from sufficient to permit persons with large family obligations to accept judicial office. The judges on the Federal court fortunately have a satisfactory retirement pension system; but much remains to be done in many of the States to provide proper and adequate retirement allowances for judges either on reaching 70 years of age or earlier if disabled after a specified period on the bench. For both Federal judges and State court judges, provision should be made for appropriate allowances to the widows of deceased judges, along the lines of H. R. 7593, which was endorsed and approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association last February.

Another requisite for the true administration of justice is the prompt and expeditious dispatch of the business of the courts. Justice delayed is often justice denied. The importance to the individual litigant of a prompt decision is well illustrated by a story of an experience of a one-time Prime Minister

of Algeria whose name was Khereddine. He was passing on horseback through the city of Tunis when an Arab rushed to him, stopped the horse and clamored for justice. Amused, the Minister listened and said, "Thy case is a well-known one, I have studied it throughly and since thou wantest it to be decided at once, I decide, as in duty bound, against thee." Kneeling, the man kissed the hand of Khereddine. "Thou hast misunderstood me," said the Minister, "I have pronounced against thee." "I have understood thee very well," said the man, "but I am full of gratitude; now it is finished."

We hear constantly of the dissatisfaction of businessmen with the slow, expensive and cumbersome procedures in our courts. So common has been this attitude among laymen that many prefer to sacrifice their rights rather than to enter into litigation; and many prefer to settle their disputes by reference to boards of arbitration, not always made up of lawyers.

That these conditions do prevail is evident to anyone who will face the facts. No one recognizes better than the members of this section that something must be done to improve the administration of justice.

The section of judicial administration has long recognized what needs to be done and has valiantly striven for many years to do something about it. Progress is being made, but far too slowly, in effecting improvements through acceptance in the various States of minimum standards of judicial administration. These standards were adopted by this association in 1938 upon the recommendation of distinguished committees under the chairmanship of Chief Judge John J. Parker. Your own section, in recently publishing a handbook on judicial administration to assist in this work, has made a very valuable contribution, and you are to be complimented on its very able presentation of the problems. Chief Justice Vanderbilt, of New Jersey, a former president of this association, has recently edited a notable book entitled, "Minimum Standards of Judicial Administration," which should have a profound influence in bringing about these essential reforms.

The law continues to be one of the great professions. Its primary function is in the orderly resolving of conflicts. Social order is impossible without the intelligent and honorable discharge of that function. This function expresses itself in leadership. If need be, we must lead unpopular causes which are not subscribed to by many of our fellow men. We dare not hesitate to fight ill-founded or unreasonable demands, and we cannot stand back when the call comes to serve human needs. Without the work of judges and their advisers, the lawyers, the American concepts of liberty would not be what they are today, and for the future above the whir and din of our engrossing life, we may be depended upon to hold fast to the highest aspirations of our calling.

One of the major efforts of this section of judicial administration has been to drive home to the members of the judiciary the fact that their responsibility for the administration of justice is not confined to the courtroom itself.

In our present crisis the greatest contribution that members of the judiciary can make to the preservation of human freedom under law and to assure the perpetuation of the American system of justice is to simplify and to modernize and to render effective the judicial process from the highest court in each jurisdiction down to the local police courts. No one can perform this urgent task as well as the judiciary. It must be undertaken by the judiciary in each State where needed without delay, with a seriousness of purpose, a vital consciousness of the objective sought to be achieved, and a fixed determination to allow nothing to interfere with the prompt accomplishment of this work. It is hoped that inertia and indifference will not be permitted. This is something the members of the judiciary owe to the country, to themselves as judges and to the profession. If in any State the judiciary cannot unaided do the job, they owe a duty to their country, to themselves, and to their profession to call in the aid of lawyers and of competent laymen who will be glad to help if they will but give them directions. The history of judicial reform in England and in the United States affords many examples of what laymen can do if given competent professional leadership in reforming, modernizing and simplifying an antiquated court system.

There is no time to lose—our institutions are under attack. Let us then, judges and lawyers alike, respond to this call of duty, that justice and freedom under law shall be preserved undiminished for ourselves and our posterity.

Fairness for Red Channels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I am including a prefatory statement which appears in the book, Red Channels, together with excerpts from a recent issue of Counterattack—Facts To Combat Communism, which publication prepared and issued Red Channels.

In recent weeks, Red Channels has been vilified as an instrument of thought control, and its publishers have been accused of seeking to establish their own dictatorship over the entertainment industry in the United States.

It was understandable that the book should provoke bitter attacks from Communist Party organs and leftist newspapers generally. It is difficult to comprehend, however, the joinder in this hue and cry on the part of conservative newspapers. Clearly, the content and purpose of Red Channels has been misrepresented grossly, and it seems only fair that the record be set in order.

Red Channels is a small book containing an alphabetical listing of persons active in radio and television. Under each individual's name appear the names of various organizations in the Communist Party line group with which that person has been associated, according to public records. Much of the information contained in the book is to be found in the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities of this House.

No individual is called a Communist in this book. The record is offered for evaluation by the general public. The basis for each association attributed to an individual is given.

This preface appears in Red Channels:

The information set forth in the following report is taken from records available to the public. The purpose of this compilation is threefold. One, to show how the Communists have been able to carry out their plan of infiltration of the radio and television industry. Two, to indicate the extent to which many prominent actors and artists have been inveigled to lend their names, according to these public records, to organizations espousing Communist causes. This, regardless of whether they actually believe in, sympathize with, or even recognize the cause advanced. Three, to discourage actors and artists from naively lending their names to Communist organizations or causes in the future.

Despite this reasonable, temperate statement, Red Channels has been called a "blacklist" and an effort by its publishers to "police the air waves."

For the information of the House, and in the interest of fair play, I offer the following excerpts from a statement by Ted C. Kirkpatrick, managing editor of Counterattack:

Ted Kirkpatrick has never made a statement, or hinted, that he intended to police the air waves. He has never said, or implied, that anyone mentioned in Red Channels must come to him for clearance or to be absolved, or that he will prescribe what they must do to clear their names. * * *

It is Counterattack's policy that no individual should have the right to "absolve" or convict anyone, in or out of radio, of pro-Communist leanings. Kirkpatrick has helped set this policy and has followed it as long as Counterattack has been in existence.

When all the facts are brought out—as they should be—the public will decide such issues. No one else is qualified to do so.

Counterattack is fighting communism. Its policy is to help and induce individuals involved in the conspiracy to break with it.

If any non-Communist, named in Red Channels or not, who has innocently or otherwise aided the Communist cause, wants help in setting the record straight, Counterattack will gladly aid that person in every way possible.

This has been done in the past. It has been Counterattack's policy for over 3 years. More than one former party member has come to Counterattack for help and has received assistance in getting straightened out, securing a job, etc.

Others, in different circumstances, have received help in clarifying their stand in the public eye. * * *

Red Channels is not Counterattack's record. The people named in the report made this record themselves. For years many of them reaped the benefit of their affiliation with the Communist-front groups listed in Red Channels. Their names were ballyhooed by the Communists in pseudo-liberal circles (and a wide range of other groups in which the Communists had power and influence) in all parts of United States. Even their non- and anti-Communist following was increased by Communist propaganda.

But now that their past actions are catching up with them, they want to dodge responsibility.

While many of them knowingly advanced the Communist conspiracy by the aid they gave Communist fronts, their own economic fortunes were helped. They gladly accepted this part of the bargain. Now that times have changed, they refuse to accept the unfavorable effects of the things they have done.

In the name of liberalism, the objection has been made that in publishing Red Channels, Counterattack has failed to label or classify the people listed in the report. How was the public to know just where each individual named in the report stood?

Could anything be more illiberal than the suggestion that Counterattack should, even if it had personally interviewed everyone mentioned in the report (which it made no attempt to do), pin a tag on them?

In any survey of the extent of Communist influence in any field, the facts uncovered vary greatly. In every phase of American

life, the extent to which the CP has succeeded in swaying individuals ranges from the secret CP member who, on orders of the party, may belong to one or two or dozens of fronts, to the naive innocent who has just joined only one front in a lifetime and that through purely altruistic motives.

Between these two extremes, there are all shades of innocents, not-so-innocents, fellow travelers, and party-liners.

No one, not even the FBI, has enough information to pass judgment on the exact status of all the individuals in such groups. For any individual or group to attempt to so judge would be a gross perversion of their right of free speech.

Red Channels was not published to classify anyone. It is as its subtitle indicates, a report of Communist influence in radio and TV * * *.

Counterattack was established a little over 3 years ago to publish current facts exposing Communist activity in the United States and to name those persons who were involved in this activity.

The three officers of American Business Consultants, Inc., publishers of Counterattack, are ex-FBI agents. All had good FBI records. All, in the course of their FBI careers, were engaged in investigating Communist activity and espionage.

Quite some time after resigning from the FBI, they started publishing Counterattack primarily because they were convinced that the American public was not getting all the facts it should have on Communist activity.

The United States press, with few exceptions, was not giving, and is not yet giving, its readers all the information about communism it could give if a real effort were made to do so. * * *

Counterattack has evidence that for years, loyal, anti-Communist Americans have been blacklisted in radio and TV industry. It has brought this fact to the attention of the public and its subscribers in Red Channels and, at other times in the past, in the pages of its weekly newsletter.

For some strange reason, the press which became so irate about the falsely reported blacklist of anyone mentioned in Red Channels, has not expressed a word of resentment about this blacklist of loyal Americans. In all the hullaballoo about Red Channels they have failed to mention it.

The American Federation of Radio Artists (AFRA), at its annual convention in Chicago last month, took official cognizance of this evil. The members of this union, the working artists in the radio and TV industry, know that it exists, resent it and want to correct it.

They passed a resolution ordering the executive boards of their local bodies to investigate the matter and work out plans to combat it.

This blacklist is un-American, undemocratic, and a menace to the integrity of the most powerful propaganda media in the Nation and all those associated with it.

It is revolting that such a condition should exist in America when freedom in every part of the world is threatened by the ruthless conspiratorial forces of communism.

Why doesn't the United States press initiate a campaign to destroy this, the real blacklist?

Mr. Speaker, with reference to Mr. Kirkpatrick's mention of a blacklisting operation, I quote from testimony of Director John Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, February 7, 1950:

Communists, masters of pressure tactics, are always on the alert to chastise those who would oppose them. One front group boasts of having thousands of monitors in every section of the country, who will take up a letter-writing campaign against any commentator who disagrees with what they advocate.

Such an organization, Mr. Speaker, goes by the clean-sounding name, Voice of Freedom. This group, which includes in its leadership persons with extensive records of association with Communist-inspired meetings, rallies, and front organizations, exhorts its monitors to use pressure on broadcasters in ousting anti-Communist commentators and performers.

"They fear you in Radio City" Voice of Freedom declares to its adherents.

It sent repeated alerts to these monitors in regard to the legislation which culminated in the Internal Security Act of 1950, recently enacted by the Congress. It termed this measure, designed to strengthen us against subversion, a vicious bill.

In one directive, it urged:

Monitors in Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Washington, D. C., get in touch with your local National Lawyers Guild chapter immediately.

The purpose was to organize opposition to the legislation.

The Members of the House will recall the recent documented report of its Committee on Un-American Activities, establishing beyond refutation that the National Lawyers Guild serves as the legal bulwark of the Communist Party in the United States.

Is it not appropriate to inquire: "Why has the non-Communist press, which has excoriated and misrepresented the efforts of Mr. Kirkpatrick and his associates, ignored the blacklisting and pressuring of the Voice of Freedom, one of the radio heroes of which has been a commentator sponsored by the Communist-dominated United Electrical Workers?"

Questions Vitally Affecting Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest blessings that fate has bestowed upon our country in recent years was the discovery of two sources of raw material in South America, bauxite from which our aluminum is made and high-grade iron ore from which our steel is produced. The latter will replenish our diminishing supply of high-grade iron ore in the Mesabi Range and enable our factories to continue the production of steel and iron during the critical years ahead.

We are manufacturing four times as much aluminum now as we were in 1939, and are bringing most of the bauxite from which that aluminum is made from South America; and our supply of high-grade iron ore in the Mesabi Range is rapidly diminishing. But fortunately an unlimited supply of that material has been found in Venezuela, as will appear from an article in the October issue of the Reader's Digest which I shall insert as a part of these remarks.

These two developments render it imperative that we appropriate sufficient funds to speed up the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway, which will provide a slack-water route for the transportation of these materials to Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Alcoa, St. Louis, Kansas City, Omaha, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and all other points on the Ohio, the Tennessee, the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, the Missouri, and the Great Lakes where they are needed for the production of steel, iron, and aluminum that are absolutely necessary for our national defense, as well as for our civilian use.

It will also reduce the water distance between the Gulf at Mobile and our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge by 800 miles, cut the cost of transportation between those points to the irreducible minimum, and at the same time save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article on the discovery of the large iron ore deposit in Venezuela which, as I said, appeared in the October issue of the Reader's Digest, and which reads as follows:

DISCOVERED JUST IN TIME—MORE IRON ORE WHEN WE NEED IT MOST

Conspicuously alone on the savanna—the flat grassy plain which sweeps across eastern Venezuela—stands a great jungle-covered mountain, 11 miles long and 2,100 feet high. For years no one suspected it was anything but useless rock. But prospectors who detoured around it on their way to the diamond and gold fields 100 miles to the south were bypassing riches far surpassing anything they could hope to find farther on. For the mountain, Cerro Bolivar—until recently called La Parida—contains at least 500,000,000 tons of almost pure iron ore, probably the greatest deposit ever discovered.

The riches locked in Cerro Bolivar were brought to light by a geological survey party sent out by the United States Steel Corp. after a search that lasted 2 years. Centuries-old Ciudad Bolivar, 60 miles away, is now buzzing with talk of the iron boom to come. For to get the ore from Cerro Bolivar to United States blast furnaces United States Steel must invest one hundred to two hundred million dollars in the area of which Ciudad Bolivar is the hub.

The discovery comes in the nick of time. The high-grade iron ore of Minnesota's Mesabi Range, which has been supplying about 60 percent of United States requirements, is running low. Taconite—low-grade ore containing 25 to 35 percent iron—is plentiful, but it must be blasted out, then processed to remove waste materials. This low-grade ore requires huge investment and makes high steel prices inevitable, affecting the cost of everything from carpet tacks to automobiles.

In 1945 big John Munson, United States Steel's vice president in charge of raw materials, went to the company's president, Benjamin Fairless: "If we pour hundreds of millions of dollars into a taconite program," said Munson, "and then some competitor discovers a cheap new source of high-grade ore, we'll be in a bad spot. I'd like to make one last check of all possible foreign ore deposits."

So when the war ended United States Steel searchers and mining engineers went out—to Sweden, Labrador, Mexico, Honduras,

Guatemala, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Brazil, Liberia, Venezuela.

The presence of iron ore in Venezuela had been known for centuries, but little systematic exploration had been done. What formations were known were close to the Atlantic, in a range of low, jungle-covered mountains along the south bank of the Orinoco. In this dense area Bethlehem Steel was already preparing to mine a 60,000,000-ton deposit of extremely high-grade ore.

To direct its Venezuelan ore hunt United States Steel called in Mack Lake, a veteran mining engineer. Lake assembled a crew of engineers, geologists, and prospectors who knew the jungle country. Together with native brush cutters they began hacking trails thorugh growth so tangled and heavy that progress in most places was step by step.

It was a country of alligators, jaguars, boa constrictors, and anacondas as well as poisonous snakes—the dreaded bushmaster, fer-de-lance, coral snake, and rattler—and millions of ticks and flies. The hunt proceeded methodically and unsensationally. The parties found some ore, but it was not of high enough grade to excite them. Meanwhile Dr. Cayford Burrell, chief geologist, growing disgusted with prospecting in brush so thick that it was impossible to get any idea of the terrain except that immediately underfoot, discovered that the United States Army had photographed the area during the war. He got a set of the pictures from the Venezuelan Government and retired to Ciudad Bolivar headquarters to study them. Gradually, checking air photos against information brought back by exploration parties, Burrell and Folke Kihlstedt, chief engineer of the party, traced the iron-ore-bearing rock structures south from the Orinoco into the back country.

By this time United States Steel's exploration parties had been tramping the jungle for more than a year. Prospects seemed about exhausted. In mid 1946 it was decided that, unless there were more promising developments, Venezuelan exploration would be stopped at the end of the year.

Then Cay Burrell, still piecing together old Army photos, made a stirring discovery. He was convinced that the iron-bearing rocks, after doubling back and forth southward, suddenly swept westward in a great bow extending across the Caroni River (which flows into the Orinoco from the south) and out into the savanna. Army photos showed that the savanna was broken by several spectacular mountains. To Burrell and Kihlstedt this indicated exciting possibilities. But the Army photos of this area had been taken from an angle and were hard to read. Burrell ordered a new aerial survey.

While waiting for the pictures, Kihlstedt sent a party to investigate a small hill in the region. A local ranch owner noticed their interest, filed a claim for the mineral rights to the hill, then proceeded to ask a large sum for his holdings. The company refused to buy—but the experience was an eye opener.

East of the Caroni River—in the recognized ore zone—all mineral rights were reserved to the Government. It would negotiate a concession only with people capable of developing the deposits. But west of the Caroni anyone could claim mineral rights to land merely by filing a denouncement, or claim, good for 50 years and renewable for 50 more. In this area, local businessmen and farmers, watching every move, might easily beat United States Steel to the claim office.

Kihlstedt, an ingenious Swede, discovered that with the help of a stereoscope he not only could identify iron-ore formations on aerial photos but could virtually put his finger on high-grade deposits. Most of them were covered by copei, a small, tangled jungle tree with light foliage and dogwood-like flowers. On aerial pictures the light-colored copei stood out.

When the new aerial survey was finished, Kihlstedt went to work with his stereoscope. Several mountains west of the Caroni and 50 to 60 miles back from the Orinoco showed signs of huge ore deposits. One in particular, a long rugged mountain sitting alone on the savanna, had rock slides and vegetation indicating an ore body miles in length.

It was then late March 1947. Kihlstedt bided his time until Easter week, when there are big local celebrations. At 4:30 a. m. on Good Friday morning the engineer and three helpers slipped out of town in a jeep. That night they slept at the base of La Parida. The next morning the little party began working up the mountain. Suddenly they came to a 30-foot cliff. It was solid iron ore. "From then on all day," says Kihlstedt, "we walked on high-grade iron ore."

Kihlstedt hopped a plane for Caracas. After almost a week with a Venezuelan lawyer, preparing documents which defined boundaries and listed the legal owners of the land on which United States Steel wanted to claim mineral rights, he walked into the government claim office in Ciudad Bolivar and made his denouncement. He was late. A group of three local businessmen had filed 11 claims in the same area the day before.

Kihlstedt was crushed. But detailed study developed the fact that their claims overlapped his by only a hundred yards and that the rival interests had not claimed La Parida.

How much ore was there in La Parida? It looked big, but in other areas iron formations had often proved to be only a few feet deep. Magnetometers flown over the mountain recorded the largest response for any ore body in the world. The figures were sent to be checked by an outstanding authority in the United States. He replied that the calculations appeared to be correct, but that the decimal point must be in the wrong place.

By the end of 1947 test drilling had confirmed the discoverers' highest hopes. Continued drilling in 1948 and 1949 showed that the ore body runs 4 miles along the crest of the mountain and hundreds of feet in depth. Cerro Bolivar contains more ore than the great Hull-Rust-Mahoning mine in Minnesota, hitherto the world's greatest open-pit mine. Furthermore, in its natural state the ore averages 59 percent iron content compared with 51 percent for present Mesabi shipments.

United States Steel staked two other claims to round out its holdings for a major, long-range development program. Now the Venezuelan Government has closed the area to further denouncements, making it a reserve zone. Anxious to develop its resources, the government welcomes the foreign investment. How much ore United States Steel now owns in Venezuela, not even the corporation knows. Of its new claims it has drilled only Cerro Bolivar. The company talks in terms of 500,000,000 tons proved and another billion tons probable. Some experts believe the total holding will prove greater than the 2½ billion tons taken out of the Mesabi since its discovery in the 1890's.

In the offices of the Orinoco Mining Co., a new United States Steel subsidiary formed to develop the property, engineers are working out the thousands of details necessary to deliver Cerro Bolivar ore to United States blast furnaces. There are two ways in which the ore could be brought out. One is to build a railroad running 274 miles due north to a deep-water port at Barcelona; the other and possibly the cheaper method is a 93-mile railroad running to the junction of the Caroni and the Orinoco. In the latter case the Orinoco would have to be dredged so that huge ore boats could come 170 miles up the river. Meanwhile, other divisions of United States Steel are rushing plans for a new steel mill which will soon rise from the flat New Jersey farmland along the Delaware River. By the time it is in operation, in 1955, Venezuelan ore is expected to be flowing in ample tonnage to supply it—at a rate of at least 10,000,000 tons a year. The company hopes to mine in Venezuela cheaply enough to compete with other ore as far west as Pittsburgh and Youngstown, perhaps even to the shores of the Great Lakes.

American steel companies will continue to develop their taconite programs, will continue to study the possibility of developing promising ore deposits in Labrador. In the meantime, however, every ton of Venezuelan ore used means 1 more ton of high-grade Mesabi ore saved for war or other emergency.

Fire Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Protests Article on Insurance," written by Harry Perlet and published in the June 1950 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. Mr. Perlet's article is in reply to an article on the same subject written by W. Jefferson Davis, and published in the April 1950 issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTESTS ARTICLE ON INSURANCE

This letter is written to protest the printing of an article on the value of a fire insurance policy by W. Jefferson Davis appearing in 36 A.B.A.J. 275. To anyone who is in a position to know the actual facts, the article is so obviously biased and based upon such a complete lack of knowledge, or at best a misunderstanding, of the operations of the fire insurance business that it must be challenged. While I am not in favor of any type of censorship, and I believe that nothing clears the air like a good argument, nevertheless I do not believe that it is in the best interests of the American Bar Association to print articles of this type vilifying a great American industry without at least a check on the facts.

For the record, I would like to submit the following in answer to the indictment made by Mr. Davis and to correct, if possible, the many false impressions which, undoubtedly, he has created.

In the first place, it is apparent that either Mr. Davis or a client had a fire loss and they were not satisfied with the adjustment. In view of the thousands of claim settlements made each year, each involving the determination of such an uncertain thing as the actual cash value of property at time of loss, it would indeed be strange if there were not an occasional dissatisfaction, but contrary to Mr. Davis, dissatisfaction is the rare exception rather than the rule. This will be borne out by the complaint department of any State insurance department and by the fact that in the past 5 years out of all fire insurance claim settlements, and the number is stupendous, less than one-half of 1 percent has become the subject of litigation.

The article is replete with broad, unsupported statements bordering upon viciousness and having no foundation either in law or in fact. Examples of these are "the

shock that the average burned-out policyholder experiences," the company offer, as is the custom, is negligible and "customary latitude of overinsurance" to mention but a few. In addition, he makes some wildly extravagant statements, such as, that in event of total loss the usual practice is to offer 10 percent. That is not usual practice and even in those cases where the company might refuse to pay the face amount of the policy because of a lower cash value at time of loss, it is reasonable to assume that the offer would be in the neighborhood of 80 percent to 90 percent unless the owner has deluded himself into believing that his $10,000 home is worth $20,000, or unless there are indications of fraud. These irresponsible generalities could be easily refuted if the time and space were available but in the interest of brevity I will confine my answer to the three principal allegations contained in the article.

1. PROBLEM OF ACTUAL CASH VALUE

It apparently is Mr. Davis' contention that if a person carries $20,000 insurance on a building he should recover $20,000 in case of total loss, regardless of the actual value of the building at the time of loss. He quotes the section of the policy regarding "all loss or damage by fire" but neglects to continue on to the provision "to the extent of the actual cash value." It is a well-known fact among laymen, lawyers, and insurance men that "actual cash value" does not mean the same as the original cost of the building or even its present replacement cost. It means the actual value at time of loss which generally is the replacement cost less depreciation. If a $20,000 building has depreciated $5,000 by the time of loss it would certainly be unconscionable to require payment of $20,000 as the owner would then stand to make a $5,000 profit.

Insurance is supposed to restore a person to the condition which he was in immediately prior to the loss but if he gets the value of a new building he would be in a better position. I don't believe that any policyholder could honestly expect to receive the price of a new house for an old one which burned. The amount stated in the policy is a maximum limit only and is not intended as an agreement that at any particular time the building is worth so much.

Mr. Davis deprecates the existence of the so-called moral hazard in insurance, probably through ignorance of what that term encompasses. Moral hazard does not merely include those cases where a person deliberately starts a fire but extends to the mental attitude of the insured who gets forgetful and doesn't keep the place as clean as he used to do or doesn't maintain it as well and all the other little things which can be of great help to start a fire, although not directly responsible for the fire.

That the condition is very real can be illustrated by the following: Let us assume we have a building worth $20,000 in 1947 at the top of the real-estate market. It is not unreasonable to assume that this same place in 1950 is worth only $15,000 in many areas. We must also consider at this point the fact that a great majority of fire policies are written for a term of 3 to 5 years. We then have the situation of a person paying out a mortgage on a piece of property which cost him $20,000 originally but which now is worth only $15,000. It must be admitted that under the circumstances if he can be sure that he will collect $20,000 he will tend to become a little careless. In other words, even though the property was worth $20,000 when the policy was written and is now worth only $15,000, it is Mr. Davis' contention that the insured should get the full $20,000. To state the proposition is to show its absurdity.

The only argument which he advances to support the proposition is that the insured has paid premiums on these values and should recover. This no more follows than would the argument that in case of a partial loss he should collect the face of the policy. He is purchasing indemnity and the face amount of the policy is merely the limit on the amount of the indemnity and not necessarily the amount which the company will pay. It agrees to pay for actual loss sustained and that is the basis of premium computation. In addition, when we consider that the premium probably runs from $2.50 to $5 per thousand per year, it would indeed be a foolish man who would not intentionally overinsure if he knows that he will collect the face of the policy under any conditions. It should be pointed out that if values drop the insured can always cancel off any amount he desires to bring the amount of insurance in line with the actual value and this is rightly his responsibility and not that of the insurance company.

2. VALUED POLICY LAWS

Part of Mr. Davis' difficulty with this whole matter is his lack of knowledge of insurance law and his unfortunate assumption that the laws of other States follow the laws of California, whereas, in fact, California is unique in many respects from all other States in the country. Thus, he speaks about "valued policy" laws having in mind sections 2052 to 2054 of the California Code. This is not a "valued policy" law but at best might be termed an "agreed amount" law. I shall discuss this presently but first we must consider the actual "valued policy" laws.

The modern standard fire policy has always agreed to insure only to the extent of the actual cash value of the property. However, in some States back about 1890 it seems that a few policyholders, either through their own negligence or greed or through the negligence or greed of the company or agent, were overinsured and upon having a loss did not recover the face amount of the policy. These people promptly took their troubles to their legislatures as we are all too prone to do even today in the belief that there ought to be a law. The so-called valued-policy law started with the Wisconsin law of 1895 and in the next 5 to 10 years other States passed such laws until at one time there were approximately 20 States with these laws. It is interesting to note that no new laws of this type have been passed in the past 20 to 30 years and of the three latest insurance codes in the country, each of which contained this provision originally, it was reenacted in only one.

These statutes, in effect, provide that in case of total loss the face amount of the policy is prima facie the amount due and payable under the policy. The statutes were designed to force the insurer to inspect and place a fair value on the property and charge premiums on that amount. Such statutes were poorly conceived and did not take into consideration the fluctuating value of real property as well as the increased cost to the insurance companies if appraisals were actually made. The net effect has been that the companies do not make appraisals of the usual dwellings because the total premiums only run $20 to $30 per year. As a result they rely upon the inherent honesty of most insureds to set a fair value. Because of the fact that probably about one fire in 100 is a total loss the companies, rather than increase rates for all policyholders, take the calculated risk of not appraising dwellings in those States. It is reasonable to assume that such statutes have caused losses to increase to some extent and that in turn increases rates.

Mr. Davis appears to believe that companies voluntarily offer a choice of what might be termed "actual cash value" and "agreed amount or valued" policies. This false impression is created by the beforementioned sections of the California Code which do contain provisions whereby the insured can get an appraisal (by paying for it himself) and then enter into what can be termed an "agreed amount" contract with the company. However, this peculiar California law bears no relation to the true valued policy law.

Contrary to his statement that in many if not all States, provision is made for issuance of the valued policy, comparatively few, if any, are written, the only State in which the kind of "valued policy" which he has in mind is available in California. In the 18 States having the true valued-policy law there is no choice on the part of either the insured or the insurer as to whether a valued policy will or will not be written. The law merely provides, in effect, that in the event of total loss the face amount of the policy will be paid. There is no question of writing one type or the other because the provision is contained in the statutes as a law governing adjustment of losses. It is not even incorporated into the policy as distinguished from the "agreed amount" provision of the California law.

The new legislation in California which Mr. Davis refers to as being watched with interest is really the true valued-policy law which, as we have seen, is at least 55 years old and has been so soundly discredited that it has not been inserted in any code in recent years. The move in California to enact this unfair legislation is not a typical move, contrary to his statement, but just another recurrence of an old problem.

3. UNCONDITIONAL AND SOLE OWNERSHIP

If Mr. Davis had taken the time to ascertain the facts he would have found out that the so-called "1943 New York Policy" is now used in the District of Columbia and all States, except California, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Texas. It is not used in these latter States because their legislatures have chosen to enact mandatory forms which, in many cases, are not as favorable as the 1943 policy. Contrary to his statements, in every case where the insurance business had the option it introduced the new form.

Further, if Mr. Davis had read the "1943 New York Policy" he would have found that the subject upon which he spent over a page, namely, "unconditional and sole" ownership is now moot. That provision is no longer contained in the "1943 New York" form which, as stated above, is in general use in 44 States and the District and has been since about 1945. As to what his own legislature may choose to do, that is their business, but certainly he should not place the blame on the insurance companies. In addition, it might be added that even when the provision was contained in the policy it was used only for protection of the company and the companies waived its application unless there was some indication of fraud.

For the record, I would also like to correct a few more of the many false impressions which he has created. He speaks of the "fabulously fattened coffers" of the insurance business, implying that the business has made an unconscionable profit over the past few years. I assume that he is referring specifically to the fire business. For the record, it should be set forth that for the 25 years ending 1947 the companies comprising the National Board of Fire Underwriters had an underwriting profit of 1.7 percent. For a business that is continually exposed to conflagration and catastrophe hazards it is submitted that this is a very low profit margin.

He also refers to the $30,000,000,000 of assets of the insurance companies. He does not state the date of his figures, but for the record, as of December 31, 1948, all fire-insurance companies had aggregate assets of $5,600,000,000, all casualty companies had aggregate assets of $4,950,000,000, and all life companies about $56,000,000,000, making a total of $66,250,000,000.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate my opinion that an article of this type which is so plainly the product of a person whose

feelings and pride have been hurt by what he believes to be an unfair loss adjustment should not have been printed in the Journal, especially in view of the obvious misstatements which it contains. Certainly sufficient material of a constructive nature is available for publication without devoting space to articles of this type.

HARVEY PERLET,
United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

It Took a Bridge of Ships To Defeat the Enemies of Democracy in World War II—But the Bridge Has Fallen Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of Local No. 1, of Camden, N. J., affiliated with International Botherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders and Helpers of America, Lodge 801, A. F. of L., have adopted a novel, but, what I believe is an effectual means of bringing home to the American people the need of maintaining our shipbuilding industry in an active and prosperous condition. The method they adopted consisted of a newspaper advertisement in the Courier-Post, Camden, N. J., issue of Monday, September 18, 1950. The advertisement carried a large picture of a long line of workers. Over the picture were the words in very large bold type, "No ships are built this way." Under the picture were the words, "Last of the 1000 shipyard workers who were laid off last week at the New York shipyard, lined up for their final pay." The advertisement was headed in large bold type with the following words: "If you believe in America and American principles read this and act now." In the body of the advertisement the following was stated:

IT TOOK A BRIDGE OF SHIPS TO DEFEAT THE ENEMIES OF DEMOCRACY IN WORLD WAR II—BUT THE BRIDGE HAS FALLEN DOWN

The price of maintaining our Nation in peace and prosperity is preparedness.

Twice in recent history, the ability of friendly nations to stem the tide of aggression in Europe has given us the time we need to prepare our machinery of war for final victory. Are we sure that we will have sufficient time in the event of any future emergency?

The world looks to America for the tools to build a lasting peace. The products of American industry must be shipped to the four corners of the globe * * * we should send those products in American ships. Our merchant fleet is not large enough to do that job—and it is woefully inadequate to transport the men and weapons of war if our country is ever attacked by an aggressor.

The amphibious landings in Korea have again proven the value of a strong Navy America must maintain her power on the sea to safeguard our shores from foreign attack.

PREPAREDNESS PAYS OFF

When a fire breaks out and threatens our homes it's too late to organize a fire department.

All of the vessels now under construction in the United States will be completed by June of 1951. Shipways will be empty, shipyard employment at a standstill, and the shipyards idle—and the skilled workmen who are needed to build ships will be scattered in other industries. Experience has proven that once these skilled workmen leave their shipbuilding trades they cannot be replaced.

WE NEED SHIPS—AND WE NEED SHIPBUILDERS

There's only one way to meet those needs—our Government must undertake a program of shipbuilding adequate to meet our needs for security and prosperity, and it must insure that our ability to produce sea power for a national emergency is kept intact in the same manner as our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Let our Government know that we are vitally concerned about the state of our merchant marine and our Navy, and urge our officials in Washington to take immediate steps before it is too late.

The advertisement concluded with a request to clip out and send to the President a letter, giving the name and address of the sender, and reading as follows:

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Our shipyards are part of our machinery for national defense. Our future safety requires that we be ready and alert to meet any danger.

I urge you to insist upon the immediate construction of an adequate American merchant marine in order to help defend our country in the event of a national emergency and in order to insure domestic prosperity.

Funds To Enforce Our Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, from time to time when I have had occasion to request the Federal Trade Commission to enforce the laws within its jurisdiction and to urge the prosecution of law violators, I have been informed that it is impossible because of reduced appropriations. I am told that the funds are insufficient to enable them to employ the necessary investigators and staff to carry out their statutory responsibilities. Their recent recommendations for additional appropriations have been turned down.

Certainly the Federal Trade Commission is deserving of and should receive much larger appropriations in order to carry out their statutory duties and enforce the laws now on the statute books.

Mr. Speaker, this same reasoning applies to our Department of Justice. They too are unable to investigate and enforce the laws on the statute books, to a large extent, because of the lack of funds. I hope that these departments or law enforcing arms of our Government will be treated with greater consideration than has been accorded them in the past.

I realize that we are criticized and urged to constantly reduce our expenditures. However, these demands to reduce expenditures invariably come into issue whenever our law-enforcing agencies and departments request funds to carry on. Certainly, I have been and am now an advocate of economy in government, but not at the expense of enforcing the laws presently in force and on the statute books. Our laws should and must be properly and adequately enforced, and this requires sufficient appropriations. I trust that due consideration will be given to these agencies for it is our responsibility. Let us put teeth into our extant laws!

The American Legion, Department of Tennessee, Urges Expansion of TVA Power Capacity in the Interest of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include a copy of a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Tennessee, at its recent annual convention held at Knoxville, Tenn., concerning the expansion of the power capacity of the TVA and inclusion of the Cumberland River in the TVA development.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas numerous posts of the American Legion Department of Tennessee have already strongly endorsed the proposal for congressional action annexing the Cumberland Valley to TVA; and

Whereas at the time this action was taken the prospects of a power shortage that could severely cripple the national-defense effort was much less than it is today and it grows more acute every day; and

Whereas it is clear now that in addition to the full power resources of the Cumberland River, TVA also needs authorization for rushing construction on power generating units on the Tennessee River, its steam plants, and at least two additional steam plants; and

Whereas the alternative to this is a power-rationing program on all civilian consumers in the valley by late 1951 that will mean each citizen will have to cut his power use in the home or on the farm by as much as 50 percent; and

Whereas the war in Korea has thrown a demand upon all of our vast defense production establishments in Tennessee, new burdens that require huge additional blocks of electric power; and

Whereas the way to meet this need in time and to reduce the necessity for civilian power rationing is to get every possible bit of power capacity into production as quickly as possible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Tennessee Department of the American Legion at its regular State convention on August 27–28–29 at Knoxville, Tenn., strongly endorse the appropriation of additional funds by Congress for a speed-up program on all of TVA's present power generating construction program; that it urge the need for at least two new major steam plants; that it endorse strongly the inclusion of the Cumberland River in TCA, and that it instruct its adjutant to forward copies of

this resolution to all Tennessee Members of Congress, the State departments of the American Legion for Alabama, Kentucky, and Mississippi, President Truman, and the Governor of Tennessee.

The above resolution unanimously adopted by the American Legion Department of Tennessee in annual convention at Knoxville, Tenn., on August 29, 1950.

H. I. CARRELL,
Department Adjutant.

Marcus Daly—A Great Mining Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, nowhere in the West is the romance of mining better exemplified than the history of the great copper mines of Butte, Mont.; and the man that took over and brought the copper properties into production by opening the copper-bearing veins in the richest hill on earth.

For the information of my colleagues there is inserted herewith a short biography of the late Marcus Daly—the Irish emigrant boy that left a lasting impression on the State of Montana and the Nation's copper-mining industry:

RECORD OF A PIONEER MINING MAN OF MONTANA—MARCUS DALY

The memory of Marcus Daly on each succeeding anniversary bestirs his friends and brings back recollections of the man and his ways and the power and influence wielded by this captain of industry from the time of his arrival in Montana until the day of his death.

Marcus Daly was born in the year 1841 in County Cavan, Ireland. When a mere lad he came to the United States and, after a brief sojourn in New York, reached California over the route traveled by the early Argonauts, took up mining as an occupation, and followed that pursuit until he died, at first working as an ordinary miner and later as superintendent and director of mining operations. He left the Comstock where he had been employed in the heyday of Virginia City, went to eastern Nevada and was there engaged in the capacity of mining expert; thence to Utah in which territory he was placed in charge of important mining development work by the Haggin-Hearst syndicate; R. C. Chambers; the Walker brothers, of Salt Lake City; and others. Subsequently in 1876 he arrived in Montana, his destination being Walkerville, where at the behest of the Walkers he took charge of and operated the Alice silver mine, and, by reason of the ability he had shown as a miner in Utah, obtained an interest in the property. Selling his interest later on for something like a hundred thousand dollars, Mr. Daly contemplated investing a part of his fortune in property at Grass Valley, Calif., but fortunately changed his plans upon his attention being called to the Anaconda, then but a prospect, with a shaft but 60 feet in depth.

The Anaconda mine was bought by Mr. Daly in 1881 for $30,000, and soon after its purchase he succeeded in enlisting capital for its development, within a comparatively short time making the property a wonderful producer; and when its mineral wealth, together with that of other mines later acquired, was established, laid out the town of Anaconda, built smelters and subsequently a railway to transport the ores from mine to smelter. All this accomplished by his energy and pluck, for had he become discouraged at the outset as others before him, Butte might yet be in its infancy.

When the outlook was the blackest and this far-seeing indomitable captain of men had practically exhausted his resources, it is said a fortunate circumstance placed in his hands a sufficient sum of money to transform otherwise inevitable defeat into certain victory. J. B. Haggin, with Senator George R. Hearst and Lloyd Tevis, of San Francisco, who had been visiting their Homestake properties in South Dakota, stopped at Butte on their way back to California to take a look at the new camp. Marcus Daly knew them well, having formerly been in their employ. He was up against it financially and appealed to them for aid, saying that in his judgment an additional 100 feet or so in depth would demonstrate the Anaconda to be a mine and not a prospect. In the Nevada country, where Mr. Haggin and his mining partners had operated extensively, the ledges had petered out at depth and there was no telling whether a similar situation did not exist in the Butte district. However, having confidence in his judgment, they advanced Mr. Daly the necessary funds with which to continue operations and secured an equal interest in the property, each becoming a one-fourth owner; and for years, until the Anaconda and other mines owned by the four men were acquired by the Amalgamated Copper Co., the Anaconda Mining Co. was what is generally known as a close corporation. But, up to the date of his death, Lloyd Tevis always declared that, though he had confidence in Marcus Daly's judgment, he thought he was chasing a chimera; that the theory upon the elaboration of which Mr. Daly had spent many sleepless nights and all his substance was fallacious, and that no abiding silver-copper deposits would ever be found in the Butte hill. Mr. Tevis and his partners never dreamed that the Anaconda would prove a more veritable bonanza than the Comstock lode. As for Mr. Daly, he never doubted that he would be ultimately successful, and when a few months after the visit of Mr. Haggin and his associates, the shaft of the Anaconda penetrated, as he had always believed it would, the richest and most extensive silver-copper deposit in the known world, Mr. Daly conveyed the news to his California partners in a brief telegram.

Until he came to Butte, Marcus Daly had been given little chance to manifest his genius, but when afforded opportunity he quickly showed himself a master mind, and all who came in contact with the man bowed to his superiority. Marcus Daly was the giant of the Rockies. On every subject connected with his labors he had his own point of view, and what he willed was done, his wish the law, and those with whom he came in contact vied with each other in endeavoring to learn his pleasure. I do not know that any man ever comprehended him, or was capable of fully understanding Mr. Daly, for one of his distinctive characteristics was trusting the very few; yet had he done otherwise, I doubt whether Butte would now be on the map. It may be that at first he did not realize what was under the surface of the ground, but when the fact of the mineral wealth underlying became apparent, Marcus Daly did not hesitate, and forthwith proceeded to pioneer the way and lay the foundation for not only the greatest mining town but, as well, its neighbor, Anaconda, the smelter city supreme.

Three Forks and the Big Hole River near Divide were also considered suitable locations for the reduction works, but the choice eventually fell upon the tract of land on a portion of which the city of Anaconda was afterward laid out, this on account of the short distance from the mines in Butte and the plentiful supply of water furnished by Warm Springs Creek, a spur of the Montana Union Railway being constructed from Stuart to the site of the town and smelters. Anaconda grew apace and the notable and impressive Montana Hotel, when finished, was the apple of his eye. It is said that as originally planned the structure was to have been three stories high. Before its completion, however, Senator Hearst visited the city, and, looking at the building in its unfinished state, said: "Better give it another story. It looks squatty." And that was done, with the result that the edifice when completed was a harmonious whole.

There was but one man Mr. Daly ever appeared in awe of, and that was J. B. Haggin, and why I could never quite make out, although we know that he was the one who made the clock work, and that had it not been for Mr. Haggin and his financial resources the foundation of the present gigantic Anaconda Copper Mining Co. might not have been laid, and the Butte Hill, notwithstanding the marvelous perception of Marcus Daly, still peacefully aslumber; by reason of his extraordinary foresight and faith, Mr. Daly brought it to life, and by his indomitable energy and ability brought forth its hidden treasures and thereby contributed to the wealth and happiness of mankind.

My Record in the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a mandate from the Bible to "render an account of thy stewardship." Throughout my public life, over a period of 18 years in municipal and Federal Government, I have respected and complied with that mandate. I have made it a rule to submit, at the end of each term of office, a summary report of my activities to the people I represent. I regard such action as a moral obligation upon me, as well as a duty owed to the voters of my area who have repeatedly honored me with elective positions of high trust.

Although this Eighty-first Congress is not yet concluded, and I will vote against it concluding, while we are engaged in the conduct of a war, this recital is necessary, now, so that an account of my stewardship will be available for the consideration of my people, as a basis for their voting judgment, next November 7, in the Fourth Massachusetts Congressional District, where I am a candidate for reelection.

It is, of course, manifestly impossible to report my every word and action, in detail, in the brief period allowed. I am prevented from full comment on each and every one of the more than 700 varied pieces of legislation which have, so far, come before this Congress. However, I wish to make clear my personal stand upon some major issues, not perhaps so much in any order of importance, but because they achieved a certain public prominence, in these 2 years of 1949 and 1950.

I returned here in January of 1949, to begin my second term as Congressman, with a few prominent convictions up-

permost in my mind, all of great importance. The need to promote efficiency and economy in Government departments; the need to achieve strategic and tactical coordination in our Armed Forces, to meet the ever-increasing threat of communistic aggression which was on the horizon; the need to maintain, in accordance with what the American people could reasonably afford, the operation of the Marshall plan abroad, for the purpose of halting the atheistic, communistic forces in their announced intention to devour the other democratic, liberty-loving nations of the world, and thus endanger American national safety.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY

For many years it was my considered judgment the vast, complicated and unwieldy structure of the Federal Government was in vital need of thorough overhauling. It was, therefore, a pleasant duty for me, as a Member of the Eightieth Congress, in 1947, to support and vote for the measure which became Public Law 162, of the Eightieth Congress. It provided for a Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, which became known as the Hoover Commission.

When I was reelected and came back to the Eigthy-first Congress, I was honored, along with being retained as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, through additional appointment to the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. To this committee the great majority of the of the Hoover Commission economy recommendations were referred. After consideration and hearings of the committee, on the Hoover Commission Reports, it was the duty of the committee to advise the Congress on the different plans, submitted by the President, to place the objectives of the Hoover recommendations into effect. As a member of the Expenditures Committee, I actively supported and encouraged the enactment into law of every reasonable plan submitted to the Congress to carry out the Hoover Report. I am proud to say that, so far, during this Eighty-first Congress, 26 of the 35 plans, embodying in whole or in part the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for improvements in Government organization and procedure, are this day approved and in operation; one further plan was fulfilled by separate legislative enactment. Another measure of signal importance drafted by our committee is the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. This is now on the books as Public Law 784. It is one of the most constructive laws which the Eigthy-first Congress passed. Public Law 784 reorganizes the budgeting and bookkeeping of the Federal Government so that the budget, accounting, and auditing systems of our governmental departments are brought into line and up to date with modern, sound, commercial practices. I have long fought for and favored this accomplishment. I should like two emphasize, in passing, that this act repealed, in whole or in part, 106 provisions of existing law which were outmoded and obsolete. I think it fair to say it is a special tribute to the House Committee on Expenditures to record that competent nonpartisan observers of the current reorganization program—e. g., Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University, and chairman of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report—have stated that this is the best reorganization record of any Congress in history.

ARMED SERVICES STRATEGIC AND TACTICAL COORDINATION

Realizing the necessity, because of uncertain world conditions, as well as economy, of encouraging efficiency and integrity in the armed services, it was my pleasure, as a Member of the Eightieth Congress, to vote in favor of the National Security Act in 1947. Howerer, it became apparent, in the ensuing year, the full intent of the Congress had not been completely fulfilled through this measure. I was, therefore, very glad to support and take part in the adoption, in this Congress, of the National Security Act amendments of 1949, now Public Law 216. Among other things, this act provides that the Military Department shall be under the direction of the Secretary of Defense; that fiscal management in the National Military Establishment is to be reorganized to promote economy and efficiency through the setting up of uniform budgetary and fiscal procedures; it includes authority for the organization of inventories of the military departments into stock funds, for the operation of activities in a manner similar to commercial business enterprises. Fiscal authorities and military strategists have noted publicly that this act is one of the outstanding forward military steps in our history.

The unification of the Armed Forces is, in my opinion, of primary importance for the conduct of modern warfare. It was and is my belief that any nation of wealth and resources invites predatory attack by being weak in defense. It has been my continuing policy, as a Member of Congress, to constantly favor sound proposals to keep this Nation reasonably strong. In this connection, I favored an enlarged Air Force to provide for an instantaneous air resistance to any sudden attack from without.

I also supported the adoption of Public Law 110 to define the powers of the Central Intelligence Agency and improve its operation; Public Law 581, which modernizes the internal organization of the Army; Public Law 506, which establishes a Uniform Code of Military Justice for all branches of the armed services and the Coast Guard; as well as many others too numerous to mention now.

FORESTALLING COMMUNISM

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the adoption, in 1948, of the so-called Marshall plan to assist in European recovery was one of the most important decisions ever made by a United States Congress. I felt it my duty to speak in support of this measure and I should like to quote from the speech I made on the floor of the House on March 31, 1948; quote:

The economic illness of Europe, and the prolonged inability of the peoples of Europe to see clearly in the future a time when economic health and hope will be restored, have served to intensify a political struggle between those who wish to remain freemen living under the rule of law and those who presume that tolerable living conditions can only be regained by ruthless subjection of the individual to the Communist power.

The next few years can determine whether the countries of Europe will, in fact, be able to hold to their heritage. Economic collapse, spreading through Europe, may persuade the peoples of these countries to accept the counsel of despair that their basic wants of food and work can be met only by the subjection of their rights under law to Communist control.

The stake of the American people in the success of the European recovery program is great. While the risks are real, they must be faced with courage and boldness. Without an essential margin of American assistance, western Europe cannot be expected to achieve economic and social recovery, the foundation for the maintenance of the institutions of freemen. The rise of totalitarianism would not be stemmed; it would be fostered by economic want and desperation. If totalitarianism were to sweep Europe, its repercussions throughout the world would operate slowly but inexorably to compel adoption by the United States, in its own defense, of measures inconsistent with American traditions and the opposite of American hopes. With the persistent slow progress of freemen thus brought to a pause, there could in the future be little justice, no stability, hazardous and transient peace, and the ultimate degradation of the subordination of men to a Communist state.

When the subject of authorization for continuance of the Marshall plan was brought up in the House, during April of last year, my sentiments were of the same nature as expressed above and I favored it. So long as the friendly nations, whom we are assisting, demonstrate a sincere desire to help themselves, and not waste the American taxpayers' generous contribution, I deeply feel it is in accord with practical wisdom and security for our own country, that we maintain this program to a reasonable degree.

If the ruthless communistic power, now stalking through the world, with aggressive purpose, decides to force America in this all-out combat, it would certainly be most foolish of us to discourage the ability of friendly nations to help us defeat the aggressor. For that primary reason, I have supported and encouraged the adoption of the various measures designed to give strength to the smaller oppressed powers in the world whom we have good cause to believe will stand by our side in an emergency hour.

Among the measures approved in this Eighty-first Congress, embodying the above purpose, were Public Law 327, extending aid to Greece and Turkey; Public Law 447, authorizing economic aid to South Korea and Chinese Nationalists; Public Law 535, authorizing economic aid to the European Marshall-plan countries and others; and Public Law 621, authorizing military aid for the North Atlantic Pact nations. I also voted for the omnibus antisubversion act, to require the registration of Communists and otherwise curb their opportunities for sabotaging our war efforts.

Mr. Speaker, there were, of course, many other outstanding and far-reaching problems dealt with in this Congress.

There is no better way to concisely and factually present the truth of my actions and judgments on these issues than including, from the RECORD, actual quotations taken from my speeches and remarks. This I shall proceed to do:

[Excerpts from speech in the House, May 10, 1950]

DOMESTIC ECONOMY—THE OMNIBUS APPROPRIATION BILL

I deeply feel the American people are entitled to a practical demonstration of economy-mindedness in this body, and I fully believe the over-all objective of the reduction which will result from the Taber-Thomas amendments should be accepted. I want to show our own people, our own citizens, by definite gesture, that we know the great personal sacrifices they are shouldering and that we want to ease their load as much as we can. The reduction proposed seems sensible to me; it will be an honest step toward trying to balance the budget. It may well be accomplished by careful administration and provide a morale lift to the taxpayers, which is why I favor it.

As the result of the combined efforts of myself and many other Members of the House, following debate on the above measure, the President was instructed, by law, to reduce through Executive administration the over-all Government appropriation expenditures by $550,000,000, without impairing the national security. I also worked for and supported the creation of the so-called congressional watchdog committees to carefully scrutinize military expenditures to eliminate waste, duplication, and extravagance.

[Excerpts from remarks in the House on Wednesday, August 16, 1950]

SOCIAL SECURITY COMBATS COMMUNISM

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to speak in favor of expanding and liberalizing the provisions and benefits of our present social-security law, because I have steadily fought for this objective since becoming a Member of Congress.

I support this bill in substance because I am among those who earnestly feel it is a responsibility of the Government to aid the men and women who have spent a lifetime in the development of this great Nation.

In my firm judgment, adequate social-security legislation is a sound barrier against the advancing scourge of communistic propaganda and philosophy which is challenging us this very hour and is forcing us to fight for our very survival. How much stronger, how much more resistant to Communist intrigue and entreatment our Nation will be when its citizens are assured that our great business system and our Government, working harmoniously together, have established a dignified, humane way to make them eligible for that which every loyal citizen of this great democracy is entitled to receive, namely, security in time of adversity and need. Because this measure is founded upon humane, progressive principles calculated to strengthen our democratic free-enterprise system, I am supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, the above-discussed measure—the Social Security Act amendments of 1950—is now Public Law 734, of the Eighty-first Congress.

[Excerpts from speech in the House on September 1, 1950]

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

I know the valiant soldiers in Korea, many of whom have already given their lives, and the people whom we individually represent, are turning their eyes toward us for leadership in this crisis. We must not fail them. We have already discussed this problem fully. I earnestly feel there is need of expediency in our action. It is my conviction that, on the whole, the committee bill and conference report is an adequate and sufficient measure for the conditions currently existing. Of course, if current conditions change, then we can wisely move in accordance. In that respect, I will vote for Congress to remain in session to deal promptly with any sudden emergency which may unexpectedly arise.

[Excerpts from speech in the House on September 1, 1950]

EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES AND CONGRESSIONAL ADJOURNMENT

I most earnestly urge that this Congress be kept in session without adjournment until this emergency is over.

Right now, I wish to state my belief that an effective excess-profits tax should be imposed as soon as possible as the cornerstone of a tax program which will as nearly as practicable, place us on a pay-as-you-go basis. When we speak of a new system of taxes on our individual citizens to help pay for our war program we should also reimpose a substantial excess-profits tax which, in my conviction, should be based on current earnings. Today, and as long as this emergency period continues, we must persistently strive for as nearly a balanced budget as we can get. In my opinion there should be no objection to a true excess-profits tax, because war is not, never has been, and never should be a game of profit for anyone, and I think I am expressing the feeling of every fighting military man when I make that statement.

[Excerpts from speech in the House on July 19, 1950]

MILITARY DEFENSE ASSISTANCE ACT EXTENSION

Mr. Chairman, the bill we are discussing this afternoon merely proposes a continuation and extension of the Military Defense Assistance Act as approved in 1949.

No one would be foolish enough to say the adoption of this program is a guaranty that communistic aggression will stop.

Obviously there are calculated risks in this venture. Cooperation with the free is costly, risky, and often exasperating. Fighting alone, by ourselves, is costlier still. We can carry our part of the burden of mutual defense assistance. We may not be able, alone, to successfully carry the whole burden of defending the free world.

This bill is a realistic step forward in the determined struggle of this country to obtain peace, security, and freedom for ourselves and the world.

[Excerpts from speech in the House, August 11, 1949]

MINIMUM WAGE RAISE

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising at this moment is to appeal to my colleagues to concentrate their attention on what is now the outstanding feature of his legislation. An amendment has been included to raise the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour. Mainly because of that fact, it is my intention to support this measure.

The figure of 40 cents an hour, presently existing, was determined in 1938. Even then the Congress recognized that the statutory minimum wage of 40 cents an hour did not give a wage sufficient to maintain what we would like to regard as the minimum American standard of living. Let us accept and adopt the vitally necessary, long-awaited improvement of the basic establishment of a 75 cents per hour minimum wage for our American workers and then direct our further efforts to equitable adoption of the exemption discriminations at the earliest possible moment.

[Excerpts from speech in the House, June 29, 1949]

HOUSING BILL OF 1949

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to speak in favor of and urge immediate enactment of this housing bill.

Since becoming a Member of Congress, I have constantly advocated congressional recognition of a relief for the housing shortage admittedly existing in this country. I have personally introduced several bills, one of which was bottled up in the Rules Committee of the Eightieth Congress, that I sincerely felt would materially contribute toward correction of the deplorable housing situation. I am, therefore, very happy to, at long last, have the opportunity of voting in favor of this measure as a constructive step toward providing decent housing for the American people.

We have been genuinely concerned with the difficulties of peoples all over the world, and have appropriated billions of dollars to help them rehabilitate themselves, but we have done little or nothing to demonstrate our concern for our transcendent domestic problems. I submit that the time has come to prove to our own citizens that this is a legislative body primarily existing for the benefit and welfare of the American people.

Just about a year ago, when we were discussing this same subject, I expressed the earnest hope that the early days of the Eighty-first Congress would see proper action taken to encourage the production of homes and rental units for the people of the United States, at prices they can afford.

May I repeat, I am very glad the hour has finally come for me to cast my vote in favor of initiating a program to provide decent housing for the American people who need it most, and I urge you, my colleagues, to adopt this measure without further delay.

[Excerpts from speech in the House, May 3, 1949]

LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. Chairman, as I see it, the fundamental principle involved in this discussion of labor-management legislation is whether or not labor should be treated as a commodity, to be purchased in the competitive market, at a price to be determined solely by the law of supply and demand.

Two years ago, we were asked to believe that the way to American security and abundance, to peace and progress, was along the path of reaction in punitive moves directed against all forms of labor security.

Up until 2 years ago, the consistent policy of this Government has been based upon the promotion and encouragement of free collective bargaining. Where there are admitted and demonstrated weaknesses, we must remedy and strengthen them. At the same time, we must beware of the creation of voluminous and complicated rules which can only result in transferring the conduct of industrial relations, from the parties vitally concerned, to a specially trained group of legal experts, which I submit would be a most disastrous development.

At a time when this Nation and the world is entering a fateful hour of history, let us act without passion and emotion; let us judiciously avoid any threat to our national economy and security by excitement toward industrial strife. Let us reestablish the faith and confidence of both management and labor, in our Government, by inspiring them to reach a commonly advantageous understanding through the peaceful processes of industry-wide collective bargaining.

The task of the Congress is to place the relationship between management and labor upon a sound and workable foundation.

[Excerpts from speech in the House June 2, 1949]

DISPLACED PERSONS ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. Chairman, the bill under discussion here affords us the opportunity to rightfully liberalize provisions for displaced persons admission and correct the inequities in the existing Amergency Displaced Persons Act.

When this subject was being debated here a year ago, I expressed, at that time, the earnest plea and hope for the adoption of a measure providing a wider acceptance of our responsibilities than was evidenced in the proposal then presented. I am pleased to observe that H. R. 4567, while not perfect, is a real attempt to extend a fuller measure of just treatment to those suffering thousands of displaced freedom seekers who are yearning for a new life in a new world. We all know in our hearts that their terrible predicament surrounds them through no personal fault of their own.

In advancing our position of world leadership, in these hesitating days, we can speak more convincingly for freedom everywhere when we have done our utmost to give real freedom to those now faced with Communist extinction. Let us implement our European recovery program with this further demonstration of willingness to assume a just obligation toward these persecuted refugees. They are the kind of people in whose behalf the original American tradition of asylum was established and whose immigration to these shores has enriched our country from its earliest days right up to this hour.

I heartfully urge you, my colleagues, to enact this bill into law without further delay.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

It has been my privilege to serve on the House Veterans Affairs Committee in both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses. My activities on behalf of our veterans, their families and dependents, are well known and have been publicly recognized. I have been accorded personal commendations by the Disabled American Veterans, the Order of the Purple Heart, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion, as well as several other veterans organizations.

The Eighty-first Congress, as of September 1, 1950, devoted a considerable percentage of its time on deliberation effecting veterans. The record indicates that nearly 20 percent of the approximate 700 laws passed by Congress, related to veterans and their dependents. Among the more prominent actions in this regard are the following: Legislation permitting payment to veterans of retroactive benefits during hospitalization; legislation extending the time for filing in certain cases for benefits and compensation; legislation increasing from 75 to 100 percent the rates of payment for presumed service-connected disabilities and providing liberalization of certain other benefits; legislation granting additional allowances for veterans who have been paralyzed from service-connected brain injuries; legislation defining authority of Veterans' Administration in carrying out veterans' education program under GI bill of rights. Assistance to veterans was rendered in many regards in certain provisions of housing legislation enacted by the Congress.

Right now, the committee is preparing to hold hearings, when the Congress returns in November, on the bill, H. R. 9437, which will provide automatic insurance protection for all those entering any branch of the Armed Forces during an emergency.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS—PROTECTING OUR DOMESTIC EMPLOYMENT AND INDUSTRIES

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to include an excerpt from the statement I made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, in Washington, on June 14, 1950. The excerpt follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am not personally opposed to the cooperative economic theory at the basis of our trade agreements program. However, it has been my understanding, which I am sure is shared by every other member of this Congress, and the President himself, that the fulfillment of such a program was not intended to eliminate domestic employment or promote the disintegration of our own domestic industries.

It appears to me to be quite contradictory to overextend ourselves in helping foreign countries, through too favorable trade concessions, when such concessions may well result in the dissipation of our own domestic industries and disappearance of employment opportunities throughout many large home areas. I very deeply feel the American taxpayer has been making and is making all the generous sacrifices that can reasonably be asked for the rehabilitation of certain doubtful foreign allies. Any further impositions, by unreasonable tariff reductions, may inflict a dangerous blow to American morale, which must be kept at an increasingly high level during these threatening times.

[Excerpts from speech in the House on August 14, 1950]

POSTAL CURTAILMENT ORDER

Mr. Speaker, I personally introduced a bill, H. R. 8505, similar to the one which we will consider tomorrow, to rescind the Postmaster General's order to curtail residential mail delivery service, because of my intense conviction this order was an unjust imposition upon the average taxpayer and would not result in an improvement of postal efficiency.

Without question, one of the most essential of all Government services, to the ordinary citizen, as well as the business firms, is the Post Office Department. In my opinion, the average person and family in this country has just as much right to expect and receive prompt delivery of personal mail as any department store, industrial plant, bank, or business.

I should like to remind you that, with the Korean War and the expanding military mobilization, prompt and efficient residential mail delivery service is vitally necessary for the maintenance of a high morale in the people of this country and is in the best interests of our national welfare.

I earnestly hope this House will act promptly tomorrow to rescind the postal delivery curtailment order and give back to our citizens the full service to which they are rightfully entitled.

Mr. Speaker, limitations of space and time prevent me from dwelling on multitudinous other bills we discussed here, but I will report on them, at length and in detail, during the course of the coming congressional campaign.

However, this necessarily brief summary would be highly inadequate if I did not list, in part, some of the bills I introduced in the Eighty-first Congress. They follow:

BILLS INTRODUCED IN EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

H. R. 3182. A bill to provide an equitable rate of compensation for specific service-incurred disabilities.

H. R. 5428. A bill to create, and assign duties to, the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps, and to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps in relation to that of the other Armed Forces.

H. R. 5957. A bill to raise the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

H. R. 7723. A bill to increase permanently the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States.

H. R. 8391. A bill to amend Veterans Regulations for 5 years psychoses presumption.

H. R. 8703. A bill to allow to corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000.

H. R. 8704. A bill to encourage expansion of business by allowing a deduction for income tax purposes of certain capital expenditures.

H. R. 8714. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to investigate and make recommendations with respect to the distribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue within the framework of our Federal, State, and local systems of government.

H. Con. Res. 215. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries.

H. R. 9741. A bill to authorize the naturalization of parents of veterans without regard to certain requirements of the naturalization laws.

H. R. 9742. A bill to establish a Federal Commission for the physically handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes.

H. R. 9743. A bill to provide for the payment of retroactive death pension to widows and children of veterans after 7 years' continued and unexplained absence.

H. R. 9744. A bill to permit holders of bonds issued under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to assign such bonds for the purposes of making payment on certain loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

H. Res. 865. Resolution calling upon Congress to take effective action against the spread of inflation and the high cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, following my release from active military service, I presented my qualifications to the voters of the Fourth Congressional District, in Massachusetts, for the honor and privilege of representing them in the United States Congress. They accepted me in November of 1946 and reelected me in 1948.

No man could help but be deeply inspired and gratified by the confidence the people of my district demonstrated in electing me as their national representative in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses.

Since the day of assuming the responsibilities of Congressman, I have conscientiously worked to justify that confidence and trust. The full facilities of my office have been energetically and courteously extended, at all time, for personal service to my constituents. I have cooperated, on every occasion, with

the community agencies, social, fraternal, and racial organizations of my district in the promotion of their various objectives.

The expressed wishes of the majority of the people I represent, and a thorough study of the issues involved, have been the foundation for my judgment and action on legislation to advance the best interests of my district and the Nation.

I am happy to present this summary of my voting record on domestic and foreign legislative measures to my people, as the basis for my respectful request for reelection as United States Representative to the Eighty-second Congress, from the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts.

H. R. 9313

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, early this afternoon when the legislative situation seemed likely to improve in the other body, I sent a telegram to the President in the hope that he would act vigorously and promptly to insure passage of H. R. 9313 before adjournment. This is the bill which passed the House unanimously on August 22 and provides additional authority for disposing of surplus foods before they spoil.

The telegram was as follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

As you know H. R. 9313 was on September 15 placed on the Senate schedule of business to be definitely completed before any recess. With the situation existing at this moment in the Senate it is not clear that any definite action will be taken. In the light of the accumulated losses for unnecessary storage and the probability that at least $3,840,000 would be the amount of the continued waste between now and November 27 and with the threat of extensive spoilage, I do urge you to make every possible effort to see that this bill is passed so that you may sign it and so that these wholesome food commodities can be shipped promptly to people who could and would eat them but cannot afford to buy them.

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

I have computed the amount of money paid for storage on 16 food commodities between February 2, when I filed H. R. 7137 which would have accomplished the same purposes as H. R. 9313, to June 30. It amounts to the staggering sum of $21,088,580.40, which is a completely unnecessary and indefensible waste of the taxpayers' money. Taking that as the average continuing cost, and it certainly is no less because of the sharply increased holdings reported up to September 11, this waste now amounts to $26,188,580.40. If the recess occurs without final legislative action, there will be 64 days between tonight and Monday noon, November 27. The additional loss in that period will not be less than $3,840,000. Of course it cannot be recaptured, but it is tragic to think that it will have been spent so uselessly when we have passed a bill sharply increasing the taxes of everybody. It is even more shocking to contemplate that when we think of how much vitally needed war equipment could have been purchased with such a sum.

Of course, it is equally clear that with each day lost, the probability of spoilage greatly increases. That probability can become a reality. If it occurs, the American people will be greatly shocked and properly wrathful.

Now that the other body had adjourned without taking action on this bill, it seems to me that the only constructive action any of us can take is to urge the President to instruct Secretary Brannan to take immediate action to dispose of so much of these commodities as are threatened with spoilage. He came before the House Committee on Agriculture to urge favorable action on H. R. 9313 because of the probability of substantial spoilage. He admitted in examination that he had the power and responsibility of preventing loss by spoilage under another provision of existing law. If there has been any spoilage the responsibility is clear.

Consequently, I have sent the President another telegram this evening, reading as follows:

SEPTEMBER 23, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

I am deeply disappointed as I know millions of Americans belonging to the American Council of Voluntary Services will be to learn that the Senate has adjourned without taking any action on H. R. 9313, the bill to provide for disposal of surplus foods. As I telegraphed you early this afternoon the probability is that at least $3,840,000 will be the amount of wasted taxpayers' funds between now and November 27 to continue this unnecessary storage. In the light of Secretary Brannan's testimony as to threat of spoilage and because of his admission that under other existing law he would have the power to dispose of any commodities threatened with spoilage I strongly urge that you order this action to be taken at once. It seems clear to me that the Secretary must recognize this mandate of Congress in the legislation you approved. Any failure by him to invoke this law and prevent spoilage will be shocking to the American people.

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

I have made repeated efforts to get the facts as to the extent of spoilage or destruction in the past. I have been unsuccessful. Although I shall continue my efforts to secure the facts, to which the American people and the Congress are clearly entitled, I hope the House Committee on Agriculture will schedule hearings immediately upon the return to Congress to bring out the full facts. If there has been no spoilage or destruction, that should be made known. If there has been spoilage or destruction, the extent of it and all facts surrounding it, should be made known. With that in mind, I have written to Chairman COOLEY, requesting that action. My letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 23, 1950.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HAROLD: I know you will be as disappointed as I am that the Senate took no action before adjournment on H. R. 9313, which your committee recommended and which you supported so vigorously on the floor of the House.

You will have in mind Secretary Brannan's testimony before your committee as to the probability of spoilage of food if this bill did not become law. You will also recall that other existing law was called to his attention with reference to his power to prevent spoilage.

You will find at page A6633 in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the letter from the President to Senator THOMAS, dated September 14, urging action on this bill, "in order to forestall spoilage and waste."

I have tried to obtain the facts as to any past spoilage without success. I shall continue my efforts because I know that the American people and the Congress are entitled to the full facts. I am confident that you and the members of your committee agree with me. Since there is the probability of extensive spoilage in the days ahead, unless vigorous action is taken by the Secretary to prevent that, under existing law, I urge that you schedule hearings immediately upon the return to Congress to bring out the truth. If there has been no spoilage, that fact will be welcome news. If there has been spoilage by November 27, the full extent of it should be reported to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN.

For the benefit of all my colleagues, I now want to make available two letters I have received recently as to the locations of the stored milk, cheese, butter, and eggs, with a tabulation, and as to the estimated quantities of these and other commodities as of September 11. They follow:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., September 11, 1950.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: This refers to your letter of August 24, 1950 in which you request the storage locations of certain inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation which were estimated to be available as of August 18, 1950.

The inventory estimates which were quoted by the Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY on August 22, 1950, represent operating data on availability of commodities and not those which were already in storage. These estimates included the commodities which were already on hand together with any contracts to purchase additional commodities which had not yet been delivered to the Corporation, reduced by commodities committed for sale or otherwise obligated as of August 18, 1950. The summary data from which such estimates are prepared are not compiled in a manner to disclose location of the inventories.

However, location inventories are developed as of the end of each month. Enclosed is a tabulation which provides, for those commodities in your request, the quantities in storage in each State as of July 31, 1950. These quantities do not include commodities purchased and en route to storage nor commodities sold and en route to claimant.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

Location, by State, of selected commodities in storage as of July 31, 1950

[Quantities in pounds]

State	Milk	Cheese	Butter	Eggs
N. H.	300,135			
Vt.			95,480	
Mass.	8,779,317	398,662	668,877	
R. I.			76,825	
Del.	365,604			
Md.	9,596,155		174,953	
N. J.	8,221,335		4,026,461	466,704
N. Y.	34,718,292	11,750,305	7,986,083	155,792
Pa.	4,019,240	835,817	1,801,686	
W. Va.	180,750			
Ill.	19,113,687	10,467,951	54,542,606	7,478,509
Ind.	10,266,407	1,101,506	2,762,945	1,908,946
Iowa	9,074,586	463,559	10,302,783	1,764,290
Mich.	8,302,735	503,752	4,581,986	8,322,371
Ohio	17,792,572	5,839,109	2,140,327	5,476,205
Ala.	179,562	1,283,613	320,521	
Ky.	513,095	1,417,844		
Miss.	143,060	264,569	98,000	
N. C.			102,488	
Tenn.	1,316,415	2,647,452	2,579,610	
Va.	5,039,032	308,044	271,019	
Okla.	45,000	84,796	4,079,712	6,674,380
Tex.	8,596,732	85,462	1,857,986	4,710,113
Calif.	4,968,333		1,002,769	
Minn.	55,145,313	802,402	30,041,568	9,728,787
N. Dak.			2,415,065	
Wis.	99,650,708	5,144,631	8,958,841	7,530,371
Colo.			135,333	
Kans.	1,977,525	11,675,444	4,822,675	27,824,248
Mo.	29,574,438	5,418,084	14,594,849	8,421,972
Nebr.		21,508	8,125,417	6,375,870
Idaho	627,090		139,447	
Oreg.	5,158,290		1,837,812	
Wash.	3,618,401		385,560	
Total	347,283,809	60,614,510	170,929,678	96,838,558

Source: PMA, Fiscal Branch, Financial Analysis Division. Prepared from records of Transportation and Warehousing Branch.

On September 12 I wired Assistant Secretary Hutchinson as follows:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1950.

Mr. KNOX T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

Re my letter August 24 to Secretary Brannan and second paragraph your letter September 11; please advise latest inventory estimates milk, cheese, butter, eggs, beans, peas, rice, Mexican meat, soybeans, grain sorghum.

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

The reply to this wire follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., September 15, 1950.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: This refers to your telegram of September 12, 1950, in which you request our most recent estimates of quantities of certain commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The following are the estimated quantities on such commodities as of September 11, 1950:

Milk, pounds	320,700,000
Cheese, pounds	106,100,000
Butter, pounds	191,800,000
Eggs, pounds	110,595,296
Beans, dry edible, hundredweight	9,427,000
Peas, dry edible, hundredweight	766,000
Rice, rough, hundredweight	75,000
Mexican meat, pounds	52,623,504
Soybeans	
Grain sorghum, hundredweight	30,525,000

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

I also, on September 12, wrote two letters to Mr. Hutchinson, asking for information on the amount of spoilage or destruction of certain commodities, and requesting the exact location of the inventories of milk, cheese, butter, and eggs in certain States. Those letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 12, 1950.

Mr. KNOX T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUTCHINSON: I enclose a confirmation of a day letter I have sent to you.

I would also like to have your current advice as to the amount of spoilage or destruction of any of these commodities and of Irish potatoes, prunes, raisins, turkeys, peanuts, and sweetpotatoes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. HESELTON.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 12, 1950.

Mr. KNOX T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUTCHINSON: Referring to your letter of September 11 with the attached data as to the location of inventories, may I request that I receive the monthly reports when they are available. If the report for August is now ready, I would appreciate having that.

I would also appreciate having the exact locations of milk, cheese, butter, and eggs in the States of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. HESELTON.

Eleven days have passed without a reply but I hope it will be sent to me so that I may advise my colleagues before the final RECORD is printed. I have in mind that we in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania would like to make individual inspections of these storages in our districts. And I hope that my colleagues in West Virginia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Ohio, Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Oklahoma, Texas, California, Minnesota, North Dakota, Wisconsin, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington will wish to make requests for similar information and to make like inspections. In any event, I do promise to make a report in the final RECORD either with the information if furnished or with a statement that the Department of Agriculture has failed to furnish it.

Why I Am Proud To Be a Mississippian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article written by Mr. Louis Cashman, a distinguished Mississippi newsman. It follows:

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE A MISSISSIPPIAN

(By Louis Cashman)

Proud to be a Mississippian? Our answer is very emphatically in the affirmative. And we welcome each opportunity to extol the virtues of our native State and to tell its story wherever we go.

We love Mississippi. Here we were born. Here our father founded one of Mississippi's great daily newspapers. Here, in Mississippi, we found our beloved helpmate and raised our family. Here we took over the reins of the newspaper when our father passed to his reward. Here we have reached a measure of success in a great Mississippi community. Mississippi has, indeed, been good to us.

We are not blind to the deficiencies of our native State. We know that in the parade of States, our economic level is still low. We are fully aware that, measured by some standards, we cannot match some other States, particularly in the field of education and industrial development. But we also know we are making enormous strides along these lines and no State can match Mississippi in the rapidity of the progressive march.

DEEP SOUTH CULTURE

The great State of Mississippi has always had the charm of the deep South. The people of Mississippi have heart and courage, and the gentle art of living is practiced with dignity and with zest by our people.

Beset by the terrible scourge of the War Between the States, and the subsequent exploitation during reconstruction days, Mississippi gave to the world a great object lesson in courage. Its people, with heroic hearts, set about to rebuild from the ruins. The courage of Mississippians, displayed under conditions unbelievable to people from other parts of the country, has been, down through the years, one of the great traits of our people. And we are still battling against odds.

We have viewed with immense pride the transformation of Mississippi's economy. The second largest cotton-raising State has learned the hard way to diversity and to get away from the one-crop system. Mississippi's farm population, and we are a rural State, which at the turn of the century devoted its entire time to cotton, now proudly harvest great crops of hay and corn and beans and potatoes. We have, in our State, one of the finest truck-farm belts in the country and the production of beef cattle and hogs is a major item of farm income. Our farming methods have undergone a complete change, and Mississippi has been aided by some of the finest agricultural experimental stations in the United States.

INDUSTRY ON THE MARCH

Through the efforts of public-spirited Mississippians industry has been attracted to our State. Careful planning, wise and well-planned presentations of our advantages and our resources, has resulted in strong appeal to industry, which is on the move, and Mississippi's case is daily being convincingly told. Industrial expansion in Mississippi has been exceptional and is a source of great pride to us.

Our natural resources, the things we have in abundance, are a source of envy to other States. We have climate, we have great soil fertility, we have unexplored mineral resources, and we have already become one of the leading oil-producing States.

We have touched on a few of the reasons that make us proud of our Mississippi. Our greatest asset is our people, a people who are warm and sincere in their friendship—a people whose ideals of honor and loyalty are pure—a people of courage, of vision, and of devotion to Mississippi and her progress.

GROWING ALL THE TIME

Mississippi has made many mistakes in the past and there will be others. But they are not mistakes of the heart. For Mississippi has been blessed with leadership of the type that is devoted to the public good. Her history is replete with stout-hearted, courageous leaders who have guided Mississippi through the wilderness. We are now far out into the open land and the horizon brings promise of more greatness in the years to come. The family income in Mississippi is growing each year and the wealth of Mississippi is increasing. There is faith in Mississippi, by Mississippians, and that feeling is now being shared by others not of our State, because Mississippians are proudly telling her story.

We have been proud to live our life, thus far, in Mississippi. And our eyes are turned to the future, for, as sure as night follows day, Mississippi will go forward and will take her place as one of the great States of the Union. To that end, we will bend every influence and exert every effort. This pledge we renew with every fiber in our being.

We are happy to hold membership in the Helping Build Mississippi Club, because we are proud of our Mississippi.

Address by Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues the ensuing excerpt from a speech delivered by the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, before the American and Canadian Bar Associations in Washington on September 20. It will interest everyone who is searching for the preservation of American freedoms. The above-mentioned excerpt follows:

One of the vexing problems of our time, to which all three branches of the Government have given their attention, is what might be labeled the domestic containment of communism. To understand the policies adopted so far, and to gage what should be done in the immediate future, regarding domestic communism, there should be clarity of understanding as to what the problem is and what the dangers are which require the application of criminal laws.

In my view, the problem is one of guarding our internal security, and the principal dangers requiring sanctions are espionage, sabotage, and subversion. If that can be made clear, much misty, obscure thinking can be dispelled. Communism as a political doctrine has never had success with, or appeal to, the overwhelming majority of the American people. As a political party, the Communists have captured only a minute portion of the total vote and have won virtually no office of national importance. In the American marketplace of competitive ideas, freely exchanged, present-day communism is bankrupt. The "dictatorship of the proletariat" looks no different, and offers no more, than the dictatorships of the Fascists and the Nazis.

Is it, then, to suppress the expression of bankrupt ideas that we must enact criminal laws, tread upon the constitutional guaranties of free speech, and in general conduct ourselves with complete lack of confidence in our institutions? Obviously, such a course would amount to nothing less than pinning the wings of martyred angels upon the devil's advocates.

But when, to serve the ends of a foreign power and to destroy or weaken our Government, Communists, or any others engage in espionage or sabotage or other unlawful acts of subversion, then we are confronted with a clear and present danger warranting the taking of swift penal and remedial action. Our national security statutes and administrative security programs cover these activities. The statutes and programs deal with treason, seditious conspiracy, advocating the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, sabotage, espionage, registration of foreign agents, perjury and the making of false statements, exclusion and deportation of subversive aliens, exclusion or removal of disloyal persons from Government employment, denial or cancellation of passports, and denial of income tax exemptions to subversive organizations or of tax deductions for contributions made to them. Under the criminal statutes, to name but a few of the cases, there were convicted of treason Chandler, Best, Gillars (Axis Sally), Toguri (Tokyo Rose), Monti, Burgman, and Kawakita. Dennis and 10 other leaders of the Communist Party of the United States were convicted of conspiracy to advocate and teach the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, and to organize the Communist Party of the United States to so teach and advocate. Viereck was convicted of violating the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Coplon and Gubitchev were convicted of espionage, and Gold and others are currently being prosecuted for espionage. Hiss and Bridges were convicted of perjury, and Marzani of false statements to his superiors in Government service. In the case of aliens advocating or teaching overthrow of the Government by force and violence, in the period 1947–50, approximately 200 Communists were excluded from entry into the United States at the borders and ports of entry, and deportation cases are now in process against over 200 Communists on similar charges. As I stated earlier, the Government employee loyalty program required a check by the FBI of about 2,500,000 employees. Full field investigations were made in about 12,000 cases, resulting in dismissal of 128 Government employees and exclusion from employment of 102 applicants and conditional employees.

In some few particulars, the basic statutes I have mentioned need improvement. The President so urged in his recent message to Congress on August 8, 1950, and there are a number of pending bills which contain provisions to accomplish this. For example, certain language of the espionage laws should be clarified, the statute of limitations for peacetime espionage should be lengthened, the coverage of the Foreign Agents Registration Act should be expanded, and stricter supervision should be provided in the case of aliens against whom there are orders for deportation but who cannot be deported because no country will accept them. Most important, the President should be authorized, in time of war or national emergency, to extend antisabotage regulations for protecting military installations and facilities to include other property and places as he shall designate in the interest of the national security, in order that there may be excluded from industries and facilities relating to the national security persons suspected of a purpose to engage in sabotage or espionage. If we are able to exclude potential saboteurs from defense plants, and keep the individual troublemakers out of vital places, as was done during World War II, we can afford to ignore the soap-box oratory. Proposed registration of Communist Party and front organization memberships, and labeling of their printed political publications, count for little in fighting wily persons trained in and bent upon intrigue and deception.

We appear to be going through a period of public hysteria, in which many varieties of self-appointed policemen, and alleged guardians of Americanism, would have us fight subversion by prescribing an orthodoxy of opinion, and stigmatizing as disloyal all who disagree or oppose them. This hysteria appears in vigilante groups who decree and execute beatings of purported Communist sympathizers; or, who, in more polite circles, intimidate radio advertisers into silencing performers whom they say have Communist leanings. Another manifestation is the recent proposal to investigate the fitness of the Federal judiciary because of displeasure with a decision directing the release on bail of Harry Bridges pending his appeal of a conviction for perjury.

Some proposals for legislation contain the same shrill overtones of hysteria. One proposal to alter our naturalization and nationality laws (H. J. Res. 238), which the President vetoed on September 9, was drafted so broadly as to permit depriving naturalized citizens of their citizenship if they were affiliated with organizations which advocate changes in our form of government even by constitutional means. Not very long ago Mr. Justice Jackson stated for the Supreme Court in the famous flag salute case (*Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 U. S. 624)), the resounding answer to proposals that would coerce uniformity of sentiment and opinion, when he said:

"If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

Techniques of suppression and compelling adherence to the party line are the very mark of communism itself in lands where it holds sway. We cannot afford to be misled into believing that we will be providing machinery to combat espionage and sabotage by adopting such techniques.

If, in truth, our object is to counteract at home, as well as abroad, Communist ideology and propaganda, we have at hand much more powerful and enduring weapons and defenses than repression. It is well recognized that communism has been most successful in taking over in places where human misery has prevailed, where economic security and recognition of human rights were nonexistent for the great majority of the people. To the downtrodden, communism has offered the lure of security and freedom, though always postponing the realization. It has been shrewd enough to aline its propaganda with the just as well as the unjust complaints, and has not hesitated to invent a few of its own. It has played for all their worth alleged differences and inequalities of class, of race, and of religion.

We are not unaware of the imperfections of our society, and, aided with the handglass of our own self-appraisal, we have set out to correct our shortcomings and eliminate inequalities. In the fields of employment, housing, education, and social security, large-scale programs have been put into effect, and have made tremendous inroads upon the poverty, ignorance, and suffering from disease and old age which existed even in this land of plenty. We have not stopped. The programs in this direction have been renewed and expanded to enable Americans to realize a higher standard of living and a greater measure of economic security than ever before. Certainly this is assured, if peace in the world can be maintained.

In addition, we have instituted, and are realizing, more slowly perhaps, programs to eliminate inequalities in opportunities and in the enjoyment of civil rights.

The most heartening progress has been made in the field of education, where slowly

but surely the paralyzing grip of segregation is being loosened. The recent decisions of the Supreme Court, in the field of higher education (*Sweatt* v. *Painter* (339 U. S. 629); *McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma State Regents* (339 U. S. 637)), are landmarks in this field. There is a spreading feeling of the people expressed in local determinations, many of them voluntary, to eliminate grade school and other forms of segregation. I need not go into the details of the programs, as yet unrealized; or the progress in such matters as the elimination of segregation in interstate transportation, the striking down of racially restrictive covenants in the sale and use of land, and the protection of racial minorities against discrimination in collective bargaining arrangements. The point is that, in total, these programs represent a goal, the gradual attainment of which is being worked for by all thinking Americans, and which is now in sight. As accomplishments are achieved in reaching the goal, they will eradicate division and class consciousness, they will unify us in meeting hostile threats from abroad, they will solidify our international relationships with the many nationalities and races of the world.

If Communist propaganda is a threat, our best answer is this kind of actual demonstration that democracy works, that democracy provides for its people security, equality, and freedom.

The American Bar Association has not been unmindful of the special significance and importance of safeguarding civil liberties. In 1938, upon recommendation of one of the great presidents of the association, the late Frank J. Hogan, there was created a special committee on the Bill of Rights, which is now a standing committee, charged with the duty of investigating substantial violations, actual or threatened, of the Bill of Rights, and of taking such steps as it may deem proper in defense of such rights in instances which might otherwise go undefended.

This was and is a large order. But such is the need. It requires constant attention, and vigilance, and the willingness to risk discomfort when controversy arises. The burden cannot be met by Government alone. This the association has recognized. It has recognized that the defense of civil liberties is the task of lawyers everywhere, with special responsibilities in the organized bar.

May I therefore importune this great association, adding the new note of urgency created by America's position in the international community, to renew the vigorous spirit that gave impetus to establishing a Bill of Rights committee, and to provide the forward-looking leadership which will maintain the unity of our people in the difficult days ahead. Teamwork built this country. The voluntary teamwork of a sturdy citizenry, nurtured by equality of opportunity and rights, will make it even greater.

History of Optimist International and the Optimist Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following brief history of Optimist International and the Optimist Creed.

If we could live by the principles taught by this worthy club, we would live in a world of justice and peace. The aforementioned follows:

HISTORY

The first known Optimist Club was formed through the initiative of E. L. Monser, a young insurance man and a newcomer in Buffalo, N. Y., in 1911. Records now in the hands of the present president of the Buffalo club show that the Optimist Club of Buffalo was formally organized on April 1, 1911.

The Optimist Club of Washington, D. C., seems to have been the next to be formed. Its organization was entirely separate from and without knowledge of the Buffalo club; the exact date of organization is not known, but the late past secretary, G. E. S. Williams, claimed at the time of his death in 1927 to have been a member of the club for 15 years.

It rained in Indianapolis on April 15, 1916. Several businessmen stood grazing out of the window into the dripping, sloppy, murky street. One of those present exclaimed: "There is just one more organization needed for businessmen, and that is an Optimist Club." Agreed," chorused the others, and the idea at once became a reality. Three weeks later, 15 businessmen met for luncheon at the Claypool Hotel and formed the Optimist Club of Indianapolis.

Businessmen of Louisville, Ky., caught the spirit and the Optimist Club of Louisville was formed. As Optimist ideals became known, other cities organized clubs.

In March 1919, at Indianapolis there was a meeting of representatives of the Optimist Clubs then formed in the United States and the first convention planned to be held in Louisville the following 19th and 20th of June.

At Louisville 11 clubs finding that each had previously adopted bylaws so similar in ideals of service, banded together and formed headquarters for the purpose of developing and spreading this gospel of optimism. These clubs were Indianapolis, Louisville, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Denver, Chicago, Kansas City, Mo., St. Joseph, Kansas City, Kans., Buffalo, Syracuse.

It is a remarkable coincidence that these clubs, knowing little or nothing about each other, adopted constitutions and pledged themselves to big objectives so similar that later, when they came together, were one in purpose and high enthusiasm. One can ask no further proof of the fundamental need for and spontaneous acceptance of the principles and practical program of optimism.

The 11 clubs assembled proceeded to complete the international association. Constitution and bylaws were adopted and headquarters was located at Indianapolis, with William H. Harrison, of Louisville, Ky., as first president.

Optimist International is the present name of this international organization of Optimist Clubs in the United States and Canada. Its purpose is to foster Optimist ideals of loyalty, patriotism, goodfellowship, better business, help for the underprivileged boys and personal development; to build and charter Optimist Clubs, and to direct, supervise, and inspire their functioning and activities; and to manage the business and funds of the international association. The present slogan is "Friend of the boy," which suggests the personal idealist leadership to every member for which the organization stands.

Optimism has a creed which is beyond comparison. The 10 tenets of the Optimist Creed are a guide in the practice and belief of every Optimist.

Optimism has in its constitution objects which are matchless:

To internationally develop optimism, as a philosophy of life.

To promote an active interest in good government and civic affairs; to inspire respect for law; to promote patriotism and work for international accord and friendship among all people.

To aid and encourage the development of youth throughout the world.

Both the creed and objects are applicable in the life of every right-thinking man, and when sincerely followed, their influence and inspiration are dynamic.

Optimist is a service organization with ideals for the highest achievements. It challenges the best that is in men of high caliber, and through the activities of its constituent clubs, realization of its worthy objects is brought about in the clubs' respective communities.

THE OPTIMIST CREED

Promise yourself—

To be so strong that nothing can disturb your peace of mind.

To talk health, happiness, and prosperity to every person you meet.

To make all your friends feel that there is something in them.

To look at the sunny side of everything and make your optimism come true.

To think only of the best, to work only for the best, and to expect only the best.

To be just as enthusiastic about the success of others as you are about your own.

To forget the mistakes of the past and press on to the greater achievements of the future.

To wear a cheerful countenance at all times and give every living creature you meet a smile.

To give so much time to the improvement of yourself that you have no time to criticize others.

To be too large for worry, too noble for anger, too strong for fear, and too happy to permit the presence of trouble.

—*Christian D. Larson.*

Tribute to Hon. Chan Gurney, of South Dakota, by Hon. Milton R. Young, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I regret that I was absent from the floor of the Senate earlier this week at a time when many fine and well-deserved tributes were paid to my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared regarding the Senator from South Dakota be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I regret there are many outstanding Members of the Senate who have served for years in this great legislative body, who will not return this next year. There is one in particular that I would like at this time to pay my respects to while there is still an opportunity.

There are few, if any, Members of the Senate who enjoy greater respect and admiration from all their colleagues than does Senator CHAN GURNEY, of South Dakota. He

has earned the esteem and respect of his colleagues by the high type of service he has rendered to his State and Nation. He has approached every problem from a statesmanlike viewpoint, regardless of what might have been the politically expedient thing to do.

Coming from the sister State of North Dakota, and having worked very closely with CHAN, I will probably feel his loss more keenly than any other Member. On many, many occasions CHAN has gone out of his way to give consideration and assistance to problems concerning North Dakota. North Dakota has much to thank CHAN GURNEY for—particularly with respect to the help and cooperation he has given our water projects and Bureau of Reclamation transmission line projects.

CHAN has rendered his Nation great service in the manner in which he has handled the affairs of the Armed Services Committee during the period in which he was chairman in the Eightieth Congress, and all the years of his service on that very important committee.

He has been one of the most diligent and hard-working members of the Appropriations Committee. Few, if any Members have kept themselves better informed on the vast scope of Federal appropriations than has he. While rendering this great service to the Nation, CHAN never at any time slighted the interest of his State.

Probably the finest proof of his attitude and devotion to the interest of his State was the effort he put forth, following his defeat in the primary election, on behalf of the water projects of his State and particularly his securing of the sizable appropriations to build the badly needed Bureau of Reclamation transmission line for REA cooperatives in South Dakota, both east and west of the Missouri River.

CHAN GURNEY and the people of South Dakota may well be proud of the fine record he has achieved in the Senate of the United States. I am very fortunate to have been associated with one who has rendered such marked service to his State and Nation.

Activities of National Association of Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by my colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

There being no objection, the statement and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. WILLIAM BENTON OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. President, I have received the attached letter from the three Connecticut directors of the National Association of Manufacturers. I am well acquainted with Mr. A. V. Bodine, president of the Bodine Corp., a most remarkable independent business manufacturing machine tools in my neighboring city of Bridgeport. I am sure that these three men are representative of the great traditions of American industry, as represented by the board of the NAM. It happens, however, that I disagree with some sections of this letter, and I have hoped that I could meet with these three directors in my State, to discuss my views on the issues covered by this letter with them, prior to the adjournment of Congress. It has been in this hope that I have postponed inserting their letter in the RECORD. Now that Congress is about to adjourn, and my meeting has been unhappily delayed, I ask permission to insert the letter but with the suggestion to the Congress, and also to the board and the membership of the NAM, that the Congress read the testimony, and my speeches on the floor before reaching any conclusion on the issues. To tell the truth, I am doubtful that Mr. Bodine and his two associates can have studied the testimony and speeches. I do not criticize them for this because I know the dependence of busy executives on their trade association staffs. I deny categorically certain sections of this letter, and I further deny certain implications in it.

THE BODINE CORP.,
Bridgeport, Conn., July 27, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BENTON: Our attention has been called to statements made by you on the floor of the Senate which we think gave an unfair and inaccurate picture of the operations of the National Association of Manufacturers.

As directors of the National Association of Manufacturers and also residents of Connecticut, we feel that it is our duty to bring the facts to your attention.

In your Senate speech on May 11, 1950, you questioned the right of George E. Folk, adviser to the patents and research committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, to testify for the association before a Senate committee in opposition to the President's Reorganization Plan No. 5.

Mr. Folk contended that this plan would abolish the independence of the Patent Office and place it under the control of the Secretary of Commerce.

Your complaint seems to us to narrow down to this:

1. That Mr. Folk had no right to testify for the association until each of the more than 15,000 members of the association had read and specifically approved his statement.

2. That each of the more than 15,000 members of the association, before passing on the merits of Mr. Folk's statement, should also have been familiarized with the arguments of opposition witnesses before the committee—some of whom appeared the same day that Mr. Folk testified.

Now, Senator, you must know that such a procedure not only would be impossible, but also would be fraught with grave danger.

It would mean that organizations of more than a very few members would be prevented from ever presenting their views on current legislation to congressional committees and Members of Congress.

They would have no opportunity to point out the benefits of certain legislative proposals or the perils of others. They would have to accept whatever legislation Congress decreed—and Congress would have to act without the benefit of advice and information from those most affected. Surely you will agree that this would be an intolerable situation from the standpoint of the national welfare.

Your proposal also would result in a serious abridgment of the right of petition and the exercise of the right of freedom of speech.

It is not necessary to point out to you that congressional hearings, even on legislation of highest importance, are called with only a few days' notice.

For example, the Senate Finance Committee met on a Monday and announced that hearings on the tax bill would start the following Wednesday—and the hearings probably would have started a day earlier had Tuesday not been July 4.

How then, would it be possible on such short notice for the National Association of Manufacturers, or any other organization of more than a few members, to prepare testimony and have it considered by every member before its presentation?

And how would it be possible for each member of the Association, before considering the proposed testimony, to become familiar with the arguments of opposition witnesses when those witnesses had not yet appeared before the congressional committee?

Your Senate speech indicates that you felt aggrieved because the more than 15,000 members of the National Association of Manufacturers, before passing on Mr. Folk's statement (assuming that this could have been done), had not been acquainted with the arguments presented to the committee by Secretary Sawyer, Mr. Flemming, and Mr. Lawton.

But you yourself said that these three men testified on the morning of the day that Mr. Folk appeared. It would be interesting to know how our more than 15,000 members could have been acquainted with this testimony before they considered Mr. Folk's testimony presented on the same day.

There is another obstacle to your proposal. Suppose an association witness is testifying before a Senate committee and you ask him a question. According to your contention, before he could answer he would have to poll all of the more than 15,000 members of the association for their viewpoint.

This would be required for each question you and other committee members asked. If this procedure were followed a committee would never complete its work.

Now, having demonstrated the impossibility of your proposals, we wish to make clear that Mr. Folk had every right to appear as a witness for the association.

The position taken by Mr. Folk, that the Patent Office should be an independent bureau, was evolved in years of consideration by the NAM patents and research committee and by the NAM board of directors.

The National Association of Manufacturers formulates its policy positions through various committees and the board of directors.

Each committee, such as the one on patents and research, is composed of members selected primarily on the basis of their expression of interest in a given subject, the geographical distribution, and the size of the businesses represented. We are enclosing a list of the members of the patents and research committee. You will notice that there are 125 members on this committee and that many small companies are represented. Each member has one vote, regardless of the size of his business.

These members are experts in this particular field and constitute a cross section of NAM membership. They consider what NAM's position should be in regard to various proposals affecting patents and research. After the committee's position is adopted it is presented to the board of directors.

The board is composed of 157 members from 42 States. The members come from all branches of industry, from large, small, and medium-size companies. Each director has one vote, regardless of the size of his company.

The board passes finally on recommendations by the various committees. A committee proposal can be approved, rejected, modified, or held in abeyance.

You will recognize that this method of procedure is similar to that followed by Congress. Congressional committees act first on legislative proposals, followed by action by the Senate and the House. In the NAM the various committees act first, followed by action by the board of directors. Congress represents the people; the NAM board of directors represents the NAM membership.

Needless to add, whenever an association witness appears before a congressional com-

mittee, he presents a viewpoint approved by the board of directors as the representative of NAM members.

This does not mean that every word of his testimony has to be specifically approved by the board or the membership. But the viewpoint he presents must have been approved.

Mr. Folk's testimony conformed with previous board action. The actual text could not have been submitted to every member of the association, because, as you will recall, the hearings of Reorganization Plan No. 5 were called suddenly. To have followed your proposal would have denied the association the opportunity of presenting its view.

The hearings would have been completed long before the association could have heard from its more than 15,000 members.

Actually, the testimony was submitted to as many committee members as was possible within the time limitation. In addition, many letters protesting the reorganization plan were received from NAM members.

After Mr. Folk's testimony, the substance of his statement appeared in the NAM News, which is distributed to every member of NAM. If he had not presented the NAM viewpoint there would have been protests. Not one has been received.

You also made the point in your speech that the association should approve the Hoover Government reorganization proposals in order to obtain economy in Government operations. We assure you that we are heartily in accord with the principles of the Hoover Commission proposals and are on record to that effect. We also have been, and still are, one of the leading advocates of Government economy.

But what we opposed was that portion of Reorganization Plan No. 5 which transferred the Patent Office to the Secretary of Commerce and abolished its independence. Three things should be borne in mind:

1. The Hoover Commission made no specific recommendation for revision of the Patent Office setup. Mr. Hoover was Secretary of Commerce for many years and was intimately acquainted with the operations of the Patent Office.

2. Secretary of Commerce Sawyer promptly redelegated his new authority over the Patent Office back to the Commissioner of Patents. This is one of the strongest arguments against the proposal, because the Secretary of Commerce himself acknowledged by this action that the reorganization plan was undesirable.

What will happen, though, if in the future a Secretary of Commerce is appointed who seeks to destroy the patent system which has contributed so much to the Nation's greatness? Under the reorganization plan he can seize the power to control the Patent Office which Secretary Sawyer has relinquished.

3. There was no showing whatsoever that any economy would result from the transfer. Secretary Sawyer by implication acknowledged this when he redelegated his authority.

We regret that this letter is of such length but we wanted to give you a clear picture of NAM operations so that there will be no further misunderstanding.

Since your original remarks were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we request that you place this letter also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the readers of that publication will have accesss to the facts.

Sincerely yours,

A. V. BODINE,
President, The Bodine Corp., Bridgeport, Conn.

L. A. DIBBLE,
President, the Eastern Malleable Iron Co., Naugatuck, Conn.

R. E. GAY,
President, the Bristol Brass Corp., Bristol, Conn.

Statement by William M. Boyle, Jr., Chairman, Democratic National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by Mr. William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman, Democratic National Committee, dated September 12, 1950. I overlooked placing it in the RECORD sometime ago.

I will say to the distinguished minority leader that it mentions the recent elections in the State of Maine.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. The way Maine goes, so goes the Nation.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will take a look at the statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Democratic candidates cut deeply into normal Republican majorities in every one of the three congressional districts and in the governorship race in yesterday's election in Maine. If the Democratic gains in Maine reflect the attitude of the voters in the other States, we will make gains all over the country in November. The total vote cast in the Maine election was higher than that in 1948, a presidential year, and was the highest for a nonpresidential year since the record set in 1938.

In the election of a governor the Democratic vote was up from 76,544 2 years ago to 93,000 this year, while the Republican vote fell off slightly.

Democratic gains in the three congressional district contests were even more impressive.

In the First District Mrs. Lucia M. Cormier, the Democratic candidate, received over 41,000 votes compared to a Democratic vote of 31,528 in this district 2 years ago. The Republican margin was cut to 7,000, compared to 22,000 in 1948; 12,600 in 1946; and 20,000 in 1944. The Democratic percentage of the total vote in this district increased from 37.5 percent in 1948 to over 46 percent this year.

In the Second District John J. Maloney, Democrat, polled in excess of 36,000 votes, where the Democratic candidate in 1948 received 24,098. The Republicans carried this district by 26,000 in 1948 and 44,000 in 1944, and by only 13,000 votes this year.

In the Third District the Democratic vote for John Keenan was over 22,000 votes, an increase of 6,000 from 1948, which cut the Republican majority to about 15,000. This district went Republican by 23,000 2 years ago, by 20,000 in 1946, and by 25,500 in 1944.

The vote in the Democratic city of Lewiston was particularly gratifying. Mr. Maloney received 10,758 votes, with the count still incomplete. This was the largest vote ever cast for any candidate for Congress of either party in the city of Lewiston.

These are impressive Democratic gains in a traditionally Republican State. They reflect what I have said all along is an overwhelming popular support for President Truman and for the policies that are being followed by this administration. I believe the defection of many Republican voters also indicates disapproval of the attempts that were made by Republican candidates in Maine to make political capital out of the situation in Korea. The record off-year vote in Maine indicates that the people are alert to the vital importance of this year's congressional elections. As Democrats, we confidently hope for a record vote throughout the country in November.

The Battle Between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Reserve-Treasury Fight Shifts to Bank Meeting in New York," written by J. A. Livingston and published in the Washington Post of September 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVE-TREASURY FIGHT SHIFTS TO BANK MEETING IN NEW YORK

(By J. A. Livingston)

NEW YORK, September 19.—The American Bankers Association convention, scheduled for the Waldorf-Astoria here next week, couldn't have been better timed. Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder is to be an honored guest and receive a testimonial. A. L. M. Wiggins, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, president of the Bank of Hartsville, Hartsville, S. C., and chairman of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, is to be the first speaker on the formal convention program Tuesday, September 26.

Will Wiggins take sides in the present battle between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury? Wiggins, as a banker and a businessman, carries great weight among his own kind—bankers and businessmen. Were he to open up, he might cause a surprise. Most bankers are partial to the idea of higher interest rates on short-term Treasury obligations. If the interest rate goes up, as the Reserve Board argues it should, then bankers will make more money on their large holdings of Government securities.

Wiggins is still an active functionary of the Treasury. Even now, as a special assistant without compensation, he is helping Snyder work out a tax program for next year. Therefore, Wiggins may disassociate himself from the conventional banking point of view. He might even let loose a blast at the Federal Reserve Board. For the Treasury still is unreconciled to the Reserve argument that an increase in short-term money rates will help to control inflation by deterring borrowing. As a matter of fact, since the Reserve announced a rise in its rediscount rate from 1½ percent to 1¾ percent, bank loans have increased at an accelerating rate.

The Treasury's case against the Reserve Board runs like this: The Reserve Board seems willing to accept the idea of a 2½ percent interest rate on long-term Government bonds. Yet it wants the short-term rate to rise. Already it has raised 13-month rates from about 1.25 percent to 1.35 percent. But it's doubtful if such tiny increases can have any effect on either businessmen or banks. Businessmen won't shy away from borrowing just because of an extra one-half

of 1 percent or even 1 percent. And banks will find the higher rates which they'll be able to charge on commercial loans even more attractive than they are now.

What's more, the Treasury argument continues, the long-term Government bond rate of 2½ percent sets a limit on how effective the Reserve Board's policy can be. The Reserve Board isn't really operating in a free money market. It can't raise the rediscount rate to 7 percent as it did in 1920 or to 6 percent as in 1929. Whenever banks need money they can simply sell their 2½ percent United States bonds and the Federal Reserve would have to buy those bonds. Thus the rediscount rate, to all intents and purposes, is ineffective.

The argument goes on: The Reserve is merely raising the cost of carrying the $257,000,000,000 Government debt, and the cost already amounts to over $5,000,000,000 a year. Each half percent rise in the interest adds more than $1,250,000,000 a year in carrying charges. Hence, the Reserve is operating with the obsolete tools of 1920 and 1929, not the tools of 1950 when the United States debt comprises more than half the total of all debt in the country.

The Federal Reserve, of course, has a ready reply. Only about $55,000,000,000 of the United States debt outstanding is in short-term paper—bills, certificates, or notes. Hence a rise in the short-term rate of one-half percent would add only $275,000,000, in interest charge. And, if the short-term rate went up, there would be less inducement for the Treasury to refund maturing obligations with short-term paper. The saving would not be so great as it is now. In addition, the Government's financial position would be a lot stronger if a larger proportion of the debt were held by long-term private investors instead of by the banks and, hence, constantly turning over in the market.

Conceivably, Wiggins might decide not to wash dirty linen in public. But the subject will haunt the smoke-filled rooms and cocktail bars wherever bankers foregather. For it's the hottest financial issue of the day. The difference of opinion affects not only the cost of money but how credit will be restricted. The Treasury would resort, where possible, to direct controls and maintain easy money. But the Reserve is more inclined to try the classical route, via higher interest charges. And so you have it: A perfect issue for a bankers' convention.

Award of Nobel Peace Prize to Dr. Ralph J. Bunche

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, it is most gratifying to note that the coveted Nobel peace prize has been awarded to the grandson of an American Negro slave. The recipient is Dr. Ralph Bunche, who has made such a lasting contribution to friendly international relationships as a representative of the United States Government.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article appearing in the Baltimore Sun of today, September 23, giving an interesting account of the details of this award, which is so richly deserved.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE GOES TO DR. RALPH BUNCHE—AWARD ANNOUNCED TO AMERICAN NEGRO WHO ACTED AS UN MEDIATOR IN PALESTINE DISPUTE

OSLO, September 2.—Dr. Ralph Bunche, grandson of an American Negro slave and United Nations mediator who brought an end to conflict in the Holy Land, has been awarded the Nobel peace prize for 1950.

As far as is known here, Dr. Bunche is the first Negro ever to be awarded a Nobel prize in any field. Certainly he is the first of his race to receive the peace prize. It will be presented to him December 10.

Announcement of the award was made tonight by the Norwegian Nobel Committee, which never gives the reason for its choice. The prize this year amounts to 164,303 kroner (about $23,000).

NOW WITH UN UNIT

At Lake Success, N. Y., Dr. Bunche said he had received the news "with deep humility." He was busy at work as principal director in the trusteeship division of the United Nations.

"I, more than anyone, recognize the extent to which my peace efforts in the Near East flowed from the strength of the United Nations," he said.

Dr. Bunche, who succeeded Count Folke Bernadotte, of Sweden, as the United Nations mediator in Palestine, after Bernadotte was assassinated in 1948, effected an armistice that ended the bitter clash between Jews and Arabs and threatened the entire Middle East soon after World War II.

He paid tribute to his predecessor for laying the essential foundations of the Palestine agreements, calling Bernadotte "the great and courageous man who gave his life in the determined effort to bring peace to Palestine."

"At this moment I cannot forget that Count Bernadotte and 10 other members of our team gave their lives in the effort to restore peace to Palestine," Dr. Bunche said.

Dr. Bunche risked his own life in the days that followed his succession to Bernadotte's post.

TWENTY-EIGHT PERSONS WERE NOMINATED

Six organizations and 28 persons were nominated for the peace prize last February. Among the individuals were President Truman, Gen. George C. Marshall, Winston Churchill, India's Premier Jawaharlal Nehru, Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, founder of the Pan-European movement, and Dr. Herbert Evatt, Australian statesman.

Dr. Bunche is the eleventh American to win the peace prize. The first was President Theodore Roosevelt, who received the 1906 award. Others were Elihu Root, Woodrow Wilson, Charles G. Dawes, Frank B. Kellogg, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, Jane Addams, Cordell Hull, John R. Mott, and Emily G. Balch.

The annual prizes are awarded from a trust established by the will of Alfred Nobel, Swedish inventor of dynamite, who died in 1896. The awards are made to those judged to have served humanity best during the last year in medicine, chemistry, physics, literature, and the effort for peace.

FOR PROMOTING BROTHERHOOD

Swedish institutions make all the awards except that for peace, which is made by a committee of five persons elected by the Norwegian Parliament.

For the peace prize, candidates may be proposed by parliaments and governments all over the world and by certain institutions and individuals.

The will of Dr. Nobel, who bequeathed $9,000,000, the interest from which provides the prizes, stipulates the peace prize should be awarded to the candidate "who has worked most or best for promoting brotherhood among people, and for abolition or reduction of the standing armies, and for the establishment and spread of peace congresses."

BUNCHE BORN IN DETROIT

Dr. Bunche, who is 46 years old, is a native of Detroit. He went to the University of California in Los Angeles on an athletic scholarship. He played baseball, football, and basketball, and between classes worked as a janitor.

He won Phi Beta Kappa honors upon graduation in 1927 and then went to Harvard, where he won his master's degree in 1928 and his doctorate in 1934. He was married in 1930 and has three children.

Dr. Bunche joined the State Department in 1944 and was loaned to the United Nations 2 years later. The following year he resigned from the State Department to devote his entire time to the United Nations.

REFUSED POST IN WASHINGTON

After bringing peace to Palestine, Dr. Bunche was the recipient of many honors. President Truman offered him an appointment as Assistant Secretary of State, one of the highest official posts ever offered to a Negro.

He declined to accept the position and there were reports his feeling about racial segregation in Washington was a factor in his decision.

Natchez, On the Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, Natchez, Miss., has, perhaps, the most interesting history of any city in the United States. Once a nearly perfect example of the ante bellum South, Natchez today is a picture of contrast. Pre-Civil War homes still remain among busy industries and flowing oil wells. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article appearing in the Natchez Times, edited by Hon. J. B. Snider, which compares the old Natchez to the new. The article from the Times follows:

NATCHEZ, ON THE MISSISSIPPI

Natchez owes its name to a tribe of sun-worshiping Indians, the original inhabitants of the area. The history of this city—third oldest in the South and oldest in the Mississippi Valley—stretches back over more than two centuries to 1662 when the French under LaSalle first visited the Natchez Indians. In 1700 Iberville and Bienville, the explorers, selected this commanding, 200-foot bluff as the site for a fort completed in 1716. Called Rosalie after the Dutchess of Pontchartrain, this fort was the seed of modern Natchez.

Held successively by France, Great Britain, Spain and the United States, Natchez grew steadily in importance. The city was the first capital of the Mississippi Territory and for many years the history of the Southwest centered here. Thriving on cotton, Natchez once boasted of having more millionaires than any other city in the Nation. But in the years just after the Civil War, prosperity, like the mighty river at her feet, seemed to roll on by Natchez.

A STUDY IN CONTRASTS

Natchez in her golden era never matched the surging activity that is taking place now. Oil and gas flows within sight of splendid old

plantation homes. As a matter of fact, 30 percent of Mississippi's $100,000,000 annual oil production comes from wells within a 50-mile radius of the city. Once peaceful plantation fields are the sites of modern factories. There has been a steady and continuous increase in the amount and value of manufactured products over the past 20 years. The forests of the area are the basis for numerous industries which include logging operations, sawmills, paper pulp and woodworking plants turning out large amounts of flooring, wallboard, furniture and boxes.

Forest resources have attracted the International Paper Co., now completing a $20,000,000 plant. With this addition, five large national companies will have major operations centered in Natchez and Adams County. These include Armstrong Tire & Rubber Co., whose production has been tripled recently to 6,000 tires and tubes a day; Blue Bell Inc., garment makers; Johns-Manville Products Corp., makers of wallboard, insulation and related products; and Wilson & Co., meat packers. Such manufacturing industries employ over 3,100 workers, or more than a third of Natchez' labor force.

BASIC GROWTH

The rapid industrial development of the area has jumped the population of the city from 15,296 in 1940, to cover 30,000 today—and it is still growing. Natchez' strategic location for national and world trade was a major attraction for industry, and its position as a trading center also spurred growth. Natchez is the natural retail and wholesale trading center for a seven county area (three Louisiana and four Mississippi counties). There are no other population centers within a 50-mile radius. Well over 100,000 people live within 25 miles of the city. Transportation is superior, including the river, 4 railroads, and radiating highways.

RAW MATERIAL

You have already seen the part played by forests, as well as oil and gas, in the development of Natchez. Woodlands cover more than 40 percent of this trading area—over 117,000 acres. Upland woods are mostly short-leaf and loblolly pine; those of the lowlands are predominantly hardwood—oak, gum, sycamore, pecan, cypress, cottonwood and willow.

Agricultural products range from cotton, corn and sugarcane to the increasingly important livestock and dairying activities. Climate and soil are especially adapted to seed crops and livestock farming. The 9 month growing season allows year around pasturage; add to this an ample rainfall for near-ideal farmers' country.

The highly favorable fuel and power situation is a definite asset. Natchez was first served by gas in 1854. The first electric service was supplied in 1888. Since 1929, Mississippi Power & Light Co. has provided an abundance of dependable, low-cost electric power, constantly kept ahead of the city's growing needs. Today's needs are covered by a two-way 110,000-volt interconnected transmission system, and under construction is an up-to-the-minute 66,000 kilowatt, $8,000,000 steam-electric generating station. The city is also supplied with gas by the Mississippi Power & Light Co., with lines connected to the world's largest dry gas fields.

THE PILGRIMAGE

It would be impossible to leave Natchez without learning of the famed "Natchez Pilgrimage," as much a part of the city as its most modern industry. Since 1932, visitors from all over the world have enjoyed a trip into America's golden past. Opened annually to visitors are a score of historic structures, preserved through wars and economic changes, many of them retaining their original furnishings and decorations.

Natchez has a proud heritage and today is more prosperous than in the most splendid days of great plantations, formal gardens and luxurious homes. Here, the old and the new thrive side by side. Unique is the word for Natchez on the Mississippi.

Hysteria in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix, an editorial by Al Waxman, editor of the Eastside Journal, a newspaper published in my district in California.

With civil liberties gradually being whittled away by scared or vicious men under the guise of patriotism, it is heartening to note that a few real Americans still have the courage to fight back against the wave of hysteria that is sapping the inherent democratic strength of free speech, free press, and free play of "ideas in the market place." The editorial follows:

HYSTERIA IN THE UNITED STATES
(By Al S. Waxman)

What is happening to us? Have we lost our sense of reasoning, have we become a mob instead of a sane nation? Are we going to follow some Pied Piper until we all go over the brink into the chasm?

A wave of patriotic hysteria has taken hold of some of our leaders and they are whooping it up to a point where others, who can distinguish right from wrong, are moving away from their rightful places and staying in the shadows with a hope that all will come out right.

Innocent people are being hurt and righteous citizens are afraid to lend a helping hand for fear they too will be dragged into and through the mire. The hysteria is now so wild it is difficult to distinguish sanely right from wrong, red from pink, Communist from liberal, American from enemy. At least, it is dangerous to admit publicly that you can tell the difference.

Laws and ordinances are being passed without consideration for the general public. Instead of shooting swift arrows into the hearts of the enemy, we are using shotgun methods and not giving a hang whether innocents get hurt at the same time.

The anti-Communist laws which have been passed by the city and county of Los Angeles are dangerous. Very dangerous. Power is being given to officials to determine whether your thinking and mine are American or patriotic. Remember this day, and remember it well, when the officials walk into your front room and declare your thoughts to be unsafe because they disagree with you. Then you will wish you had watched the actions of your city council and board of supervisors.

We agree that genuine enemies of the country should be under constant surveillance. We agree that the safety of this Nation comes uppermost. We agree we have a home front to defend while our boys and men are on the battle front. But, shouldn't we be careful that innocent people are safeguarded against the merchants of hate who prey on the public in times such as these?

A few self-righteous persons can ruin an entire community with their venomous character. Take the recent case of actress Jean Muir. She lost a radio role, and possibly her career, because an accusing finger was pointed at her. Mind you, she was accused of being a fellow traveler—not an enemy—and she lost what she had spent years to build. It might have been you, or you, or you. There was no hearing; no day in court; just an execution.

There is an element of people in this country who have given of their time, effort, fortune, and ability to right wrongs against others. These people have worked and fought for those unable to protect themselves against the vultures of our society. At one time these people were called New Dealers, then they were called liberals, then they were named pinks, now they are labeled fellow travelers. They are accused of working with the enemy. Why?

Why? Why? Why? Because they contributed to the fight against Franco Spain (now acknowledged as the proving ground for Hitler); because they tried to finish the job of freeing the Negroes here (started by President Abraham Lincoln); because they fought slums and blighted-area housing so that "Oakies" (Americans, if you please) could raise their families decently and build a worth-while society for tomorrow; because they fought corrupt politicians and political machines in this country; because they fought to get justice in our American courts for people of foreign extraction (Latin-American and Negro youths included); because they bolstered the USO programs in World War II; because they tried to preserve the Constitution and Bill of Rights of this country? Are these the reasons they are "fellow-travelers?"

They are accused of aiding Russia. They did! You did! I did! In World War II, we were told Russia is "our ally"; that she is "helping us fight Hitler." We worked for aid to Russia, aid to Britain, aid to France. Can that past be used today against these people? No! A thousand times no! But it will be by the self-imposed righteous, patriotic people who want a method to destroy the finer things here.

State Senator Jack Tenney proposes to introduce legislation which would:

1. Outlaw the Communist Party.
2. Bar Communists and fellow travelers from holding public office.
3. Bar Communists and fellow travelers from teaching in public or private schools.
4. Require all candidates for State office to take a loyalty oath at the time of filing for nomination in the primary election.
5. Safeguard labor unions against civil suits resulting from the expulsion of members who are Communists or have Red affiliations.
6. Safeguard employers against civil damage suits which might result from firing of Communists or fellow travelers.
7. Provide for registration of Communists should a pending Federal bill, which so provides, be defeated.

Maybe the Senator's points are good. This writer, however, believes Tenney can't do good—and wouldn't if he could. From the first to his last point, there is a drop from zero to below-zero; if the Communists are outlawed in point 1, where will he find them for registration under point 7?

Tenney would bar fellow travelers from this and that. How are we going to determine who is a fellow traveler? What will be our yardstick? Who will do the measuring? Pray, not people like Tenney. He has used people and people and people as scapegoats for his publicity ambitions.

Even now he has a program of attack against former Superior Court Judge Isaac Pacht, a man who ranks head and shoulders far above Tenney. He has singled out Jewish institutions for attack—because he knew it would merit publicity for him. Are people like Tenney to be the ones who will identify "fellow travelers"? Heaven protect the innocent.

We are in serious danger of forcing the real culprits, enemies of our Nation, underground. From there they will not register. We are building a fifth column now to destroy us. We alone will be guilty when the catastrophe happens (please, God, never).

Let's face realities. Let's be rational. Let's avoid hysteria and mob rule. Let's retain our place in the sun as the greatest Nation on earth. Let's not run over each other in an effort to shout loudest "I am good, he's bad."

Do You Conform to These Principles?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following excellent editorial written by Mr. J. O. Emmerich and appearing in the McComb (Miss.) Enterprise-Journal on September 18, 1950:

DO YOU CONFORM TO THESE PRINCIPLES?

Not so very long ago a man from the East asked this editor about the States' rights principles. He seemed skeptical. He had read a lot of propaganda that had him confused. So we commenced asking him some basic questions. His answers were about the same as we ourselves would have given had we been asked the same questions.

We said, "You are a States' righter even though you do not know it." Then we outlined what we considered these basic political concepts.

Perhaps you may be a States' righter and not know it. The following principles which are basic in States' rights thinking are presented for your consideration. Read them carefully and weigh each thought as you read.

A States' righter not only professes but acts on these basic American principles which form our priceless heritage of freedom:

1. "I believe in the United States of America—the greatest Nation of free men and women on earth, where the poorest is far richer than the richest of all other lands where opportunity still exists for those who have the will to work and provide for themselves.

2. "I believe in the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States: 'The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.'

3. "I believe in the right of each State to govern its own internal affairs without dictation or interference from outsiders.

4. "I believe in local self-government as opposed to the concentration of all governmental power in Washington.

5. "I believe in individual freedom as opposed to a welfare state of a superplanned economy for every individual.

6. "I believe in my right to worship as I please, work for whom I please, employ whom I please, determine my own present and future without the meddling of bureaucrats who want to plan my every thought and movement for me.

7. "I believe it my duty to help keep America and Americans free and untied by selfish and power-mad politicians and bureaucrats who dream of the superstate.

8. "I believe the best way to keep America free is to preserve and maintain the rights of the various States and of the citizens thereof to determine their own internal affairs as they see fit."

Don't be led to believe that the States' rights organization and those who espouse the principal outlined here hope to create a new party. This is far from the basic thought in mind. A new party would have hard sledding under almost any circumstances. But the organization does believe that there is room for much educational work to be done. The States' rights movement is educational in its basic conception. The last Presidential fight was not to create a new party but to offer a protest to what was happening in our own party. Neither Republicans nor Democrats were given comfort by those who sought to uphold the basic principles. Both parties abandoned principles for expediences. Thus the protest was made.

Do you believe in the principles outlined above? If so you are more of a States' righter than you really know.

No Job for Amateurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the September 15 issue of the Christian Science Monitor offers sane comment on a subject which has produced too much hysterical thinking and action. Effective control of Communists and communism in this country cannot be brought about through the type of hysteria which produced—and influenced such an overwhelming number of national legislators to vote for—the Wood-McCarran bill. I commend the Monitor editorial to the attention of my colleagues. It follows:

NO JOB FOR AMATEURS

We would stake a good deal on an assertion that everybody in the United States, from archconservatives in both major parties clear through the ranks of the Socialists would heartily support legislation which would thoroughly dispose of the actual menace in domestic communism.

The Kilgore portion of what has come to be known as the McCarran bill aims at the core of the danger. In event of declaration of war, or imminent invasion, foreign-inspired insurrection, or other circumstance declared a national emergency by Congress and the President, it would empower the Government to round up and intern all foreign agents, saboteurs, spies, and members of the Communist party. It also would protect and facilitate the individual's right to judicial review.

The trouble is, Congress seems likely either to drop the Kilgore sections or to lump them with provisions which threaten not only to smother freedom of opinion and to harm many sincere and loyal people, but also actually to hamper apprehension of the real subversives. And the President will have no choice but to sign or veto in toto what comes to him.

This newspaper already has pointed out how the arbitrary power to declare any group subversive and compel it to label everything it says or prints "Communist Front" could be turned to choke off any reform at the moment unpopular or misunderstood.

Of more immediate concern is the prospect of swamping the FBI with the task of seeing to it that every one of some 60,000 Communists registers, and that the roster of every alleged "front" organization is complete and correct. The dangerous spies and saboteurs won't register. In fact, not many take the risk of tying up with suspect organizations. The few that have would go underground while the FBI ferrets out political ideologists whose attempts to persuade Americans already have failed dismally.

As we have remarked before: We don't like rats around the national farmstead. But we are chary of amateur exterminators who propose a little poison for the general water supply—especially when even that wouldn't get many rats.

The Infamous Katyn Forest Massacre of Polish Army Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the name "Katyn" evokes horror in the mind of every decent citizen of the world. Why? Because it was in Katyn Wood, near Smolensk, Russia, that there was found the graves of several thousand heroic Polish Army officers murdered by Communist Russia. These officers had been taken prisoners by the Red Army following the diabolic Soviet attack on Poland in September, 1939. That attack was in accordance with the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement to divide that free and independent nation—Catholic Poland.

The horrible story of the Katyn massacre, though long suppressed, has once more emerged before the eyes and in the conscience of mankind. The dreadful murder of these heroic Polish soldiers will never be forgotten by the civilized inhabitants of mankind.

WHY DID DEMOCRATS SUPPRESS REPORT?

One of the most shocking aspects of the Katyn massacre was that a report on the massacre by a United States Army officer was suppressed for seven long years. I repeat—the United States report was suppressed for 7 years. Now it turns out that the original copy of that report somehow became "misplaced or lost." That is just one coincidence after another.

Friends of Poland have a right to ask why this report was so long suppressed. They have a right to ask how come it became "misplaced or lost." Friends of Poland know that it was the present Democratic administration whose diplomats negotiated the infamous Yalta agreement. That secret treaty divided and partitioned Poland, turned over its most valuable lands to the godless Reds. What a vicious stab in the back.

The whole handling of the news of the Katyn massacre is enough to arouse the conscience of every American, just as the horrible deed itself that occurred in that forest is a blot on the record of civilization.

MAGAZINE OF KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS WROTE UP MASSACRE

I have in my hand the New York Times article describing the statement by the Army officer who had prepared the report. I ask unanimous consent that this article, as well as an article published in the Knights of Columbus magazine, Columbia, in September 1948, by Julius Lada, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I think that after reading these items, the American people will more clearly recognize why our Republican Party has been fighting against Democratic double crosses.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 19, 1950]

UNITED STATES AIDE BLAMES SOVIET ON KATYN—SUPPRESSED REPORT BY OFFICER SAYS RUSSIANS MURDERED THOUSANDS OF POLES

WASHINGTON, September 18.—A report by a United States Army officer who saw the freshly opened graves of several thousand Polish officers in Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, and reached the conclusion that the mass murder was committed by Russians, was released by the Department of Defense today after having been suppressed for 7 years.

The officer was Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., now serving in the Army's Far East command. He was a prisoner of war of the Germans in 1943, and was taken to the scene of the atrocity to be an Allied witness, presumably for German propaganda purposes.

Realizing the international implications of the German action, Colonel Van Vliet refused to go from his prison camp, near Rotenburg, Germany, to Smolensk except under duress, and he refused to express to the Germans any opinion as to the probable guilt for the crime. So far as he knew, the German propaganda authorities never made any use of his visit to the scene.

Capt. Donald Stewart, of the field artillery, a Lieutenant Colonel Stevenson, a South African signals officer, and Capt. Stanley S. B. Gilder, a British medical officer, were sent from prison camps on the same mission, likewise under duress, the report said. A statement by Captain Gilder was also released today. It confirmed Colonel Van Vliet's account of the forced journey they made to Smolensk, but indicated no conclusion as to guilt.

Colonel Van Vliet was finally liberated and reached United States lines on May 5, 1945. Through the intervention of Gen. J. Lawton Collins, now Army Chief of Staff and then commanding the Seventh Corps, he was sent back to Washington to report on this matter to Maj. Gen. Clayton Bissell, then Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2 (Intelligence), War Department General Staff.

As a result of his interview with General Bissell, he was instructed to dictate a full account of his experience. He was then ordered by General Bissell to say nothing further about the matter to anyone, and he obeyed these orders until last April 26. At that time, Maj. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, Army Chief of Information, asked him for a new statement, the original deposited with General Bissell having become misplaced or lost.

"I believe that the Russians did it," today's statement said. "The rest of the group that visited the site stated to me that they believed the Russians did it."

It had the following to say about Colonel Van Vliet's frame of mind at the time of the inspection trip

"At the beginning of the newspaper publicity concerning Katyn, I believed the whole thing to be one huge, well managed, desperate lie by the Germans to split the Western Allies from Russia. I hated the Germans. I didn't want to believe them."

[From Columbia of September 1948]

NEW LIGHT ON THE KATYN MURDERS

(By Julius Lada)

In accordance with the Polish-Soviet agreement of July 30, 1941, signed after the German attack on the Soviet Union, the formation of a Polish Army on Soviet territory was begun. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, released from Soviet captivity, was appointed its commander in chief under the authority of the Polish Government in London. This army was to be formed of Polish citizens taken prisoner by the Soviet Army after its attack on Poland on September 17, 1939, and of those deported from Polish territory during the Soviet occupation whom the Soviet Government undertook to set free. Accordingly, on August 12, 1941, the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Soviet Union issued a decree of amnesty, and the Poles began to gather at the recruiting center of their army.

Soon, however, officers from the army command noticed that many officers personally known to them, and whom they knew had been taken into Soviet captivity in 1939, failed to report. When asked to give information on the whereabouts of the missing Poles, the Soviet liaison officers answered that they were unable to give any, and mentioned in a general way that a great number of the Polish prisoners of war were set free in Poland in 1940. Since the Polish authorities knew, from letters received from the families of the missing officers prior to the opening of German-Soviet hostilities, that they had never returned to Poland, instructions were given to the Polish underground to find out whether they had not been detained in German prisoner-of-war or concentration camps. At the same time a bureau for the investigation of this matter was formed by the command of the Polish Army in the Soviet Union. Major, then Captain, Joseph Czapski was appointed its chief.

REPORT PUBLISHED RECENTLY

This bureau, both during and after the war, collected all the available material on this question and published recently a report in book form for which General Anders wrote the foreword. It has appeared in Polish under the title Zbrodnia Katynska w Swietle Dokumentow, published by Gryf Publications Ltd., 56–61, Hatton Gardens, London E. C. 1, at 12/16. "This book," writes General Anders, "is the product of several years' hard work, carried out most carefully by many men under one editor. It contains new and authentic evidence, published for the first time, collected by men whose names for obvious reasons (if their families are in Soviet-controlled lands) cannot in many cases be disclosed. The aim of the book is to reveal the truth about a case which has been until now purposely kept dark and unsolved in the eyes of the world's public opinion."

On September 17, 1940, the official organ of the Soviet Army, the Red Star, affirmed that during the fighting which took place after September 17, 1939, about 10,000 Polish officers were taken prisoners by the Soviets. After General Anders was released from a Moscow prison in July 1941, he was informed by Lieutenant Colonels Berling and Dudzinski that about 15,000 Polish prisoners, predominantly officers but including also a number of police and frontier guard NCO's, were detained in three big camps in Soviet territory, namely, Kozielsk, Starobielsk, and Ostaskow. Lieutenant Colonel Berling later became commander of a Polish division which the Soviet authorities formed after breaking off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government on April 26, 1943, and is now a general in Poland. His evidence, as given by a man who collaborates with the Communists, is of particular value. He said that about 400 officers were transferred from these camps, in the spring of 1940, to the camp of Pavlishehev Bor, from where they were later on taken to the camp of Griazovietz. This information was subsequently fully confirmed by the officers from Griazovietz, who joined the Polish Army and gave the following evidence.

All three camps were, oddly enough, organized in former orthodox monasteries. In Kozielsk, situated approximately 150 miles southeast of Smolensk, about 4,500 officers had been imprisoned since the end of November 1939, including four generals of whom General Bohatyrewicz and General Smorawinski were among those identified in the Katyn mass graves. Half of the prisoners here were reserve officers, others included professors and university lecturers, physicians, surgeons, and many hundred lawyers, teachers, journalists, industrialists, merchants, and so forth. There was among them one woman, pilot officer Lewandowska. In Starobielsk, situated on the river Aydar southeast of Charkov, about 3,910 officers had been detained since the end of November 1939. Among them were eight generals. At least half of these prisoners had been taken by the Soviet Army after the surrender of Lwow on September 22, 1939, in spite of an agreement that the defenders of that city would be set free. In Ostaskow, situated on the border of Lake Seliger northwest of Kalinin, about 6,500 prisoners of war had been confined, including 400 officers, 300 of whom were police. The rest consisted mainly of members of special corps such as the frontier guards, prison warders, intelligence corps and so forth.

Before Christmas 1939, priests and chaplains detained in these camps were removed with the exception of the senior chaplain, Jan Ziolkowski, who, owing to an oversight remained in Kozielsk. His body was later identified in the Katyn mass graves. This measure was taken by the Soviet authorities in an attempt to break down religious life which remained vigorous till the end.

In spite of the opposition, moving examples of these religious practices are to be found in the memoirs and statements of those who remained alive. "Common evening prayers," writes a former prisoner at Kozielsk, "are an old tradition in the Polish Army. The prisoners attempted to maintain this practice which, however, was strictly forbidden by the authorities. These orders were ignored and the services were continued, but after some of us had been punished for taking part in them, we substituted a few minutes silence instead of praying aloud.

TIME FOR SILENT PRAYER

"Imagine the interior of a former Orthodox church in which 600 prisoners were accommodated. Five-tiered bunks covered every inch of the floor space. The church building was plunged into semidarkness, which a few electric bulbs could hardly dispel; here and there candles and small kerosene lamps added a flicker of light. Every night at about 9 o'clock the hum of voices and the din of comings and goings which filled the place were sharply stilled by a voice from the completely dark choir: 'Silence, please.' At once every movement in this human beehive stopped and everyone stood still. A silence fell as at the consecration of the Host during mass. Remote sounds from the outside were deadened by the walls of the church. Prisoners of many creeds—Catholics, Protestants, Orthodox, Jews, Free-thinkers—all observed these few minutes of silence as an expression of their common belief in the spiritual life.

"In November and December 1939 divine services were organized in the camp at night. Army chaplains said mass and distributed

holy communion in the form of ordinary ration bread. The night, the darkness, the background of the Orthodox church, all added a queer and impressive touch to the ancient Latin service. Very soon the camp authorities heard of these services and some of the priests were punished by solitary confinement in the so-called 'carcer.' This made no difference, and real religious feeling grew notwithstanding all the efforts of the reeducators."

Of all the priests removed in December 1939 only one, Father Kantak, who is now in the Middle East, was heard of again. He owed his survival to the fact that he was a citizen of Danzig. The others disappeared without trace. Father Ziolkowski, considered by the authorities as an ordinary major, carried out his ecclesiastical duties in secret till the liquidation of the Kozielsk camp.

The prisoner were very carefully examined by the NKVD. They were questioned individually, frequently for many hours, and had to give extremely detailed accounts of their lives and of their views, and fill endless forms. Each prisoner was photographed from various angles and the reproductions were kept in his dossier. In Kozielsk, General Zaroubin was in charge of these investigations.

At the beginning of April 1940 a simultaneous, carefully prepared liquidation of the three camps started and, by early May 1940, these camps no longer existed. Statements published in the book describe in detail how the prisoners were gradually removed in parties numbering from 1 to 300. In the case of Kozielsk a telephone call from Moscow, usually about 10 a. m., gave the orders for a transport on a given day, enumerating the prisoners by name. The receipt of such a call took a long time, and frequently the prisoners were able to hear the names as the recipient repeated them aloud. Sometimes names were read out of typed cards dated in Moscow.

LITTLE KNOWN ABOUT PRISONERS

The first party left Kozielsk on April 6, 1940, believing that they were to go to distributing centers from which they would be set free. The last three transports left Kozielsk on May 10, 11, and 12. Two transports, totaling about 200 prisoners, one on April 16 and the other on May 12, reached the camp of Palishchev-Bor. The fate of the remaining 4,250 officers remained unknown till their bodies were identified in the mass graves of Katyn Wood 3 years later.

The only fact known before was that the transports from Kocielsk were unloaded at a station situated some miles west of Smolensk. Nothing was heard either about the 10,000 prisoners from Starobielsk and Ostashkov, except for about 200 of them who also reached Palishchev-Bor. Thus, about 14,500 Polish prisoners of war, including about 8,000 officers, vanished. Three percent of them remained alive. Information collected later shows that the prisoners from Starobielsk were murdered near Charkov, but their graves were not discovered. According to some statements the prisoners from Ostashkov were drowned in the White Sea.

While the above information was being collected, the Polish Government and the High Command of the Polish Army continually inquired from the Soviet authorities about the 8,000 missing officers. These representations became more insistent, particularly after the Polish Underground reported that the missing officers were neither back at home nor in the German camps. When visiting Premier Stalin in Moscow in December 1941, General Sikorski, the Polish Prime Minister, again requested the release of all Polish prisoners and gave him a list of missing Polish officers, compiled by their former fellow prisoners, and containing 3,845 names. Stalin assured Sikorski that all Polish citizens had been set free and suggested that perhaps those missing escaped to Manchuria, although flight through the entire territory of the Soviet Union could obviously never have taken place.

On March 18, 1942, General Anders delivered to Stalin an additional list of 800 other missing officers. In reply to all verbal and written requests concerning the missing prisoners, the Soviet authorities firmly maintained that all prisoners had been set free, officers first of all, and that the fate of those missing was unknown to them. When, on July 8, 1942, the Polish chargé d'affaires, Sokolnicki, asked M. Vishinsky for a list of those set free, drawing his attention to the fact that detailed lists of prisoners of war in camps were made by the Soviet authorities. Vishinsky declared that he had no such lists.

The silence about the missing officers was suddenly broken on April 13, 1943, when the Berlin radio announced that the German authorities discovered in Kosogory, in the Katyn Wood, a mass grave containing the bodies of about 3,000 Polish officers, among them the body of General Smorawinski. In the following German communiqués it was announced that another grave containing 1,500 bodies were discovered and that medical and investigation committees, as well as foreign journalists, had already arrived in Katyn. Two days later, on April 15, the Moscow radio retaliated by stating that these officers fell into German hands in the summer of 1941, and were murdered by them. Thus the Soviet authorities were immediately ready to give precise information about the missing prisoners, whilst up till the German announcement, all of them, including Premier Stalin, M. Molotov, M. Vishinsky, General Panfiloff, and General Rajchman, continually stated that nothing was known about the fate of these people.

In addition to this, the fact that all prisoners without exception were ruthlessly evacuated by the NKVD before the advancing German Army overran Soviet territory, contradicts the Soviet allegations that the Polish officers in question might have fallen into German hands. Eyewitnesses' terrifying accounts of how this was done, how prisoners who could not be evacuated were killed or burned alive and how those unable to walk fast enough were shot out of hand by the Soviet guards, form a separate chapter of the book under review. Similar accounts are to be found in Victor Kravchenko's I Chose Freedom.

On April 17, the Polish Government announced that it had instructed its representatives in Switzerland to request the International Red Cross in Geneva to send a delegation to investigate the true state of affairs on the spot. At the same time they made it clear that the Germans, being themselves guilty of innumerable atrocities against the Polish people, had no right to set themselves up in this affair as defenders of international justice. On the same day, the Polish Minister of National Defense issued a communique in which he disclosed the Polish Government's information about the missing officers and explained that, in view of the above facts and of national anxiety over the fate of those missing, the newly discovered mass grave should be investigated by a competent international body. On April 25, the Soviet Union, instead of agreeing to the requested investigation as was expected, broke off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government. The International Red Cross then declined to carry out investigations on the ground that it could only act at the request of all parties concerned.

The book contains the official collection of documents published by the Germans; the official Soviet communique; the report of the International Medical Commission and that of Dr. M. Wodzinski; and numerous witnesses' accounts of what was found in the mass graves. Dr. Wodzinski, who before the war was one of the official Polish pathologists, went to Katyn as early as April 29, and worked there till June 3, 1943, personally supervising all the excavations. He gave the following verdict.

Four thousand one hundred and forty-three corpses, buried in layers, mainly face downward, were found in eight graves in Katyn Wood. After careful examination of their uniforms, personal documents, identification cards of various sorts, certificates of vaccination issued at Kozielsk camp, diaries, notes, correspondence and photographs, they were positively identified as the Polish officers from Kozielsk camp. They were all murdered in precisely the same manner—by a shot in the back of the head, the bullet coming out at the top of the forehead. A number of bodies wearing either old Soviet military uniforms or clothing typical of that country, were found in other graves nearby. Examination showed that these corpses had been buried between 5 to 15 years prior to the massacre of the Polish officers, leading to the conclusion that that wood had already been used for similar executions for a period of years. This was also confirmed by some local inhabitants. Judging by the large amount of cartridge cases and bullets found in and around the graves, it must be concluded that the executions took place beside, or even inside, previously prepared pits.

No traces of any struggle were found and it can therefore be assumed that the victims were rendered powerless before being executed. In about 20 percent of the cases, the hands of the victims were tied with a rope behind their backs. The execution of those found in the first seven graves took place at the end of March and during April 1940. All dated personal notes, diaries or correspondence found on these bodies stopped abruptly then. Soviet papers, mostly in Polish and published at Kiev, which were found on the victims, were also of the same period. The winter outfits of the victims also point to the fact that they were killed before the warm season. In the case of grave No. 3, where the bodies were wearing summer uniforms and the papers found on them were often dated in early May, Dr. Wodzinski estimated that the executions took place in the first half of May 1940.

The murder of thousands of Polish officers in Katyn Wood is a fact that has been recognized by all the commissions, even including the official Soviet Commission which carried out investigations, and by numerous people who visited the mass graves. However, contrary to all evidence collected by those who had been on the spot during the exhumations in the spring of 1943, the Soviet Commission, composed solely of Soviet citizens, tried to prove that the Poles had been murdered by the Germans between September and December 1941. The date of the murder is, of course, of paramount importance in the case. Katyn lies in Soviet territory and an organized mass execution could not possibly have been carried out by the Germans in the spring of 1940, a year before Hitler invaded the Soviet Union.

The book also provides very detailed and complete evidence to the effect that the Katyn executions took place in April and May, 1940. It points to the fact that the Poles had been killed in the same manner as Soviet citizens whose bodies had been found in graves nearby and who had been shot between the years 1928–38, at a time when only Soviet authorities could have carried out executions in Katyn. It includes accounts of eyewitnesses who testified to the effect that the Poles had been executed by the NKVD, and demonstrates the discrepancies and contradictions in the Soviet statements on the subject of the missing officers.

In spite of the fact that the mass murder in Katyn Wood is one of the most notorious

war crimes which not only shook world opinion but created the first rift in the Allied camp; in spite of ample material evidence and numerous witnesses available at the time of the Nuremberg trial; and in spite of the fact that the indictment in the Nuremberg trial included the Katyn crime, the International Military Tribunal failed to pass judgment on this case. The Tribunal's judgment, promulgated in October 1946, does not mention the Katyn crime and consequently no German has ever been convicted of the murder.

This omission throws particular light on the whole case. A Soviet general sat as one of the four judges on the Tribunal and a Soviet legal officer was one of those who prosecuted the accused. It was obviously in the Soviet interest to be cleared of any possible suspicion as having been the guilty party. The Soviet representatives had no doubt every opportunity to produce sufficient evidence to condemn the Germans. In spite of this, the Katyn crime is the only crime mentioned in the indictment which has been passed over in silence in the judgment of the Tribunal.

It is in the interest of justice, and of the prestige of the institutions guarding international order, that the murderers of these thousands of Poles should be brought to trial. The Poles demand a fair and impartial international trial and are ready to produce all relevant evidence in their possession.

Welfare Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following speech which I gave at the National Democratic Conference in Chicago on May 15, 1950:

I want to talk directly and plainly about the President's health program because that's the kind of program it is. Nothing difficult or complex or technical involved. This is a clear, forthright program designed to meet a real need and there's no reason why we can't discuss it in those terms.

There are seven main sections in this well-rounded program to improve the Nation's health.

Briefly, they are:

1. Federal aid to medical education.
2. Aid to medical research.
3 An increase in grants-in-aid to States for hospital construction.
4. Special aid for rural and other physician shortage areas, together with assistance to farm-health cooperatives.
5. Aid to States for State and local public health work.
6. Aid to States for maternal, child health, and crippled children's services.
7. This is the controversial national health insurance system, so often and falsely dubbed "socialized medicine" by people who do or should know it is nothing of the kind.

I'll outline the details of this simple insurance system in a minute, but first I want to make clear the enormous difference between national health insurance and socialized medicine.

We don't plan to take over any hospitals, we don't plan to give orders to any doctors, we don't propose any changes in the way American medicine—the finest in the world—will be practiced. That would be socialized medicine, but we seek no part of it, plan to make no move in that direction.

Instead we propose national health insurance, designed to see that all, not just some citizens of this country get the finest medical care available, that and no more. Calling that socialism is being downright moronic—or what is worse, deliberately distorting the truth.

At this point, let me tell you a story about Pat and Mike. It isn't a funny story, not even a pleasant one, but it illustrates the basic situation with which we are concerned.

Both Pat and Mike had accidents a year ago. Pat was working in a machine shop. He slipped on a grease slick and half an hour later was in a hospital with a broken leg. Mike also worked in a machine shop, but he was crossing a public street when he too skidded on a grease slick and wound up in a hospital with a broken leg.

Pat and Mike were laid up for quite a while. They both had tricky compound fractures. Plenty of time in the hospital and a lot more at home. Well, so what?

Just this. Pat was injured at work, so everything went well for him. Since it was an industrial accident, he and his family received workmen's compensation. He got enough money to cover his hospital and medical bills and partially support his family. With his savings he got through the crisis without going into debt. Pat's back at work, healthy and happy, building for the future. And nobody I know called it socialism.

Not so for Mike. He, too, worked in a shop, but because his accident happened elsewhere he got no support money from anybody. When he went off to the hospital he was on his own. His small savings were wiped out in 2 weeks.

Before Mike got back to work he was deeply in debt, his wife and children had been on the relief rolls, and Mike himself was bitter and unhappy. When he did get well he wasn't building for the future like Pat; he was and still is in debt to the past. This tragic situation may pass—or it may not. The point is that it need never have existed.

There is no reason why we shouldn't have a program to help Mike just like the one that helped Pat help himself. In all fairness, I ask you, is there any basic difference in the two cases so far as their effect on family life and the physical and mental health of society as a whole are concerned? I don't think so.

There are four basic financial worries in the minds of the great majority of the people of this country. One springs from old age, another from unemployment, and a third from industrial accidents. The fourth, and often the greatest fear of all—comes from the cost of medical care, from the tremendous cost of chronic or catastrophic illness and the mounting day-to-day expenses for the thousand less serious ailments or accidents which are the lot of all of us.

Important steps have been taken to remove the first three fears through Government insurance programs, but we have as yet done nothing about the costly burden of medical care.

What could be more natural than to look to a comprehensive national health insurance system to round out a full social-security program?

I think the events of your lives and those of the people you know are sufficient proof of the need for such a program. Unless you are one of the fortunate wealthy who can afford the best care at all times, or one of the very poor who are eligible for what is usually good charity care, the chances are that a case of cancer in your family might wipe out every asset you have in the world inside of a year.

If you live close to the margin—and most of us do, because we must—a prolonged case of pneumonia or a major operation might well be almost as devastating financially.

If those of us who are neither rich nor poor get adequate care in emergencies, it is because we mortgage our lives to the future. What is the solution then to this crucial problem?

The same solution we have applied to our social-security problems—insurance.

That, that alone, is the administration proposal for a prepaid medical care system. The provisions of the proposal are clear and direct. Each wage earner would pay a small amount each week into a national health insurance fund—exactly as he now does under old-age and survivors insurance. He would pay in proportion to his income—1½ percent of income, but not more than $72 a year. Employers would make an equal contribution, just as they now do in our other social-insurance systems.

The money would be collected through the social-security system without requiring any new agency and only slight additional overhead expenses. The funds would then be returned to local plans run by local citizens and doctors. The measure guarantees freedom of choice to both doctors and patients. All medical matters remain in the hands of medical men, free from interference. Just one basic change from the present system is involved. The money paid into the health-insurance fund will be used to pay all medical bills. Our system of medical care remains the same, but the national health-insurance fund pays the bills through local agencies.

There are some who have objected that the fact the money passes through the hands of a national agency will overcentralize control. I recommend that such critics actually read the bill. It contains the most effective possible safeguards for local autonomy.

The basic unit of the entire plan is the local health service area, most frequently covering a city or county. The State will decide and control the membership of the area's health-service administration and all officers and employees would come under the State's civil service merit system.

This is a simple, but effective plan to remove the barrier that stands between so many American people and adequate prepaid medical care—the barrier of the almighty dollar.

What's the opposition all about then? Well, it has many voices, heard in many places, but it is all in some degree inspired by the American Medical Association. Virtually every protest can be traced to the AMA's multimillion dollar publicity campaign against national health insurance.

Now, I don't think any of us should be surprised at the attitude of this professional organization, although I admit myself sometimes a little flabbergasted at the no holds barred, questionable circuslike tactics being used by the huckster hirelings of our dignified doctors.

The truth is that the AMA has fought almost every kind of public-health progress in this country. Its entrenched leadership has been consistent in only one respect through the years; they have resisted change of any kind, be it good or bad.

Their history of reversal, non sequitur and turn-about on national health insurance and voluntary health insurance plans is too well known to be repeated here, but I think a bit of current history on another important part of the President's health program is useful in making clear the shenanigans of which the AMA is capable.

I speak of Federal aid to medical education. Because of the limits of time, I'm not going to document this story right now. But I have every necessary document here with me and anybody is more than welcome to examine them.

Back in 1946, a number of highly placed doctors, including a Dr. Herman Weiskotten, now chairman of the AMA's council on medical education, were making such statements as, "More than half of the medical schools of the country are so inadequately supported that they are hardly in a position to conduct a thoroughly satisfactory undergraduate program of medical education." The feeling was close to unanimous and two possibilities were discussed by the AMA council, a voluntary fund-raising program and Government aid. The voluntary fund-raising project flopped and local governments declared themselves unable to help.

Deans of medical schools and educators throughout the country then began to plead for Federal aid to medical education.

Quickly the AMA began to back pedal verbally, sometimes in very unfortunate phrases. There was, for instance, the contention of Dr. Donald Anderson, secretary of the AMA council on medical education and hospitals, in October 1947, that "the maximum deficit that could possibly be forecast for 1960 does not exceed 15,000 physicians." This by way of pooh-poohing desperate need to train doctors for some of the areas that you ladies and gentlemen from rural areas particularly have reason to know exist. Fifteen thousand physicians. If, as is sometimes said, one doctor is needed to serve every thousand people, that means Dr. Anderson was saying we didn't need to do anything about the doctor shortage because there would be only 15,000,000 people without medical service at best. Shades of the Hippocratic oath.

The rest of the story is soon told. Recognizing the real need for Federal aid to prevent severe cutbacks in quality and quantity in the training of our future doctors and nurses, the Senate last year passed an aid bill and sent it to the House.

The AMA, still more concerned with its closed medical shop than anything else, fought on. It submitted a series of amendments, many of which were adopted, but the organization still refused approval.

Largely for that reason the bill is still in a committee of the House, delayed for more than a year because the AMA persists it is not needed. Well, is it?

I think the answer should come from the medical schools themselves.

In addition to the wires and letters which have poured in from medical school deans and administrators, this is what Joseph C. Hinsey, chairman of the Committee on Financial Aid to Medical Education of the Association of American Medical Colleges wrote me in January.

"The action of the AMA opposing H. R. 5940 (the aid bill) after it had passed your committee and . . . the Senate, was taken independently of our Association and without a poll of our membership. Our Committee on Financial Aid to Medical Education decided unanimously that we should poll the individual medical colleges by telegrams * * * the poll of the membership with returns in from 63 schools shows 47 favorable and 16 opposed."

And there's a lot more we won't go into today. The facts are clear. The AMA knows a need exists, but is attempting to deny it in the face of proof from the medical schools the AMA lobbyists claim to be protecting. It's a farce, the same kind of farce staged by the AMA anytime its monopolistic grip has been threatened in the last 25 years.

I think that's enough to show you how the only real opposition to the President's health program is motivated. I hope that next time somebody spouts the AMA line about so-called socialized medicine or aid to medical education in your presence you'll straighten them out. And we can get on with the job of improving the Nation's health without false issues and the kind of "now you see it, now you don't," shell game, the AMA has attempted to palm off as ligitimate argument.

As I said earlier, this country has the most advanced medical knowledge and facilities in the world. We must and will put them within the reach of every American citizen with the President's health program. Thank you.

Newspaper Comment Regarding Hon. Alexander Wiley's Record in Public Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared regarding reactions which I have received from the press of Wisconsin and the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that this statement and a series of appended newspaper quotations be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. President, during my 12 years in public office I have tried to keep the closest contact with the newspapers of my State and with editorial comments throughout the Nation. I have always felt that the press is one of our foremost guardians of the public welfare. We of Wisconsin are proud of our papers.

I WELCOME EDITORIAL VIEWS PRO AND CON

Like all men in public life, there have been times when I have disagreed with some particular newspapers. Yes, there have been times when I have come in for my share of being on the receiving end of constructive criticisms. However, I welcome such constructive comments. I feel that no man in public life should be immune to the frank and open comments of the free press of our country.

Everyone of us benefits from advice from outside observers. No man is so all-wise that he can be right all the time. No man can find universal agreement of all his policies all the time.

APPRECIATION OF FINE EDITORIAL SUPPORT

I am, however, tremendously grateful for the fact that throughout my years as United States Senator I have received literally hundreds upon hundreds of very gracious editorial comments from the daily and weekly newspapers and magazines of Wisconsin and the Nation. I am humbly appreciative for their editorial support.

I am not taking any bows or asking for any pats on the back, but I am merely stating the facts.

There are those in the ranks of my opposition who have tried to defame my record, who have tried to distort criticisms of me. Boys will be boys, smear artists will be smear artists.

But for the sake of the record, I am presenting below some of the selected quotations which have appeared down through the years in the newspapers of Wisconsin commending my efforts in Washington.

I think that these comments will show that by and large I have had the support of the press, because they recognize that I have humbly been on the job 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year, trying to do a genuine, sincere, honest job for the people of our State and Nation—for peace, for prosperity, for freedom, for fair treatment of all groups.

THESE EDITORIALS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

As I stated at the start, no man can be right 100 percent of the time. But a man can sincerely try as I have tried, to be right as much of the time as possible and to win the support of as many of our people and as many of our newspapers as possible by conscientious public service.

In a spirit therefore of humility, I am presenting the facts and letting those facts speak for themselves. I am presenting these excerpts from a few of the hundreds upon hundreds of gracious column writeups and editorials which have been carried in the press regarding my efforts in the people's behalf.

I hope that my readers, after reviewing these comments, will feel more strongly than ever before on the wisdom of voting Republican Tuesday, November 7, 1950.

NEWSPAPER EDITORIALS FROM WISCONSIN AND OTHER STATES ENDORSING SENATOR WILEY'S EFFORTS

PART I. NEWSPAPER COMMENTS DURING 1950

[From the Palmyra (Wis.) Enterprise]

SOUTHERN WISCONSIN WEEKLY SUMS UP MANY REASONS FOR SUPPORT OF SENATOR WILEY

ALEXANDER WILEY, the senior Wisconsin Senator from Chippewa Falls, just now completing 12 years of service to the people of Wisconsin, is presently a candidate for reelection to the United States Senate on the only ticket he knows, the Republican ticket.

Senator WILEY has been labeled the man who works for his constituents; diligently safeguarding the interests of Wisconsin's prime industry for all of his 12 years, he is well known for his strict policy of making the interests of his constituents his first consideration; be they widow, orphan, farmer, or small-business man, or veteran, he can be relied upon to do the things asked of him.

Throughout the entire State one can hear hundreds of instances of poor and rich alike who, perplexed over some personal problem, have written their senior Senator for aid, and at all times his help was forthcoming.

He has in his 12 years demonstrated the fact that he is a man who can be relied upon to do all in his power to preserve the American way of life, ready at all times to battle the left-wing labor leaders who are even now, as in 1944, spreading their gospel of hate in an effort to unseat him. Thousands of dollars are being spent in Wisconsin to do the bidding of the administration, "Beat WILEY."

But the honest workers, farmers, professional men, doctors, lawyers, bakers, grocers, Mr. Average Citizen wasn't fooled then and won't be now.

Senator WILEY has always maintained that America should have a Cabinet Department for Peace. He can be depended upon to fight for an adequate approach to our world problems. He is the kind of man Wisconsin needs in his high office to safeguard America from another war—a world war III—bloodier than all other wars combined.

Wisconsin and America need more men like WILEY in office. Men who have the interest of the common man at heart and who are willing to go to bat for them. We know he is endowed with the courage of his own convictions, and with full and complete knowledge of that for which he speaks.

Senator WILEY has always been the champion in the Senate of the St. Lawrence seaway and other causes dear to the Midwest.

Senator WILEY can be depended upon to support the principles of promotion of the system of private enterprise, of conservation of resources, of equitable taxes, effective

foreign relations, of fairness to the consumer, and an effective farm program..

The people of Wisconsin will go to the polls in November knowing that the man they want in the United States Senate will be ALEXANDER WILEY and that the rantings and ravings of his enemies are not something new, but a rehash of the 1938 and 1944 campaigns, designed to tear down and defeat the principles of check and balance in the Government. They know that placed in the hands of men like Senator WILEY, the American way of life will survive.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal]

MADISON PAPER CHEERS WILEY VOTE TO PROTECT CONSUMERS

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY wins a pat on the back for his pledge to protect natural-gas consumers from the gouge that presently threatens them.

Senator WILEY's declaration that "consumer rights must be protected" means one vote that calls for unanimous praise from a State just beginning to get the blessing of natural gas and thus a target for the hungry rate raisers.

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette]

WILEY IS SPOKESMAN FOR AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

Senator WILEY made an impressive showing in his two previous campaigns. In 1938 he smothered his rivals on two party tickets. In 1944 he triumphed over the Democratic nominee by about 100,000 votes, which was no mean margin in a Democratic Presidential year.

Senator WILEY, in fact, is as strong, in our view, as are the Republican Party and its philosophy as a whole in Wisconsin. There are yet no signs that we can see that Republican hegemony here will be overturned soon. Those who oppose Senator WILEY inevitably oppose the Republican Party too, for he is a firm disciple of the principal tenets of the Republican idea.

It is one of Senator WILEY's articles of faith that the free-enterprise system is inherently preferable to socialism. If the Republican Party has any meaning in mid-century, it is as the political vehicle for the free-enterprise idea.

It is noteworthy that the most violent condemnations of Senator WILEY's record come from those who have advocated the Socialist principles and purposes with which he has stanchly disagreed.

[From the Janesville Gazette]

JANESVILLE PAPER EDITORIALIZES FOR WILEY REELECTION—WILEY ENDORSEMENT SETS NATIONAL PACE

The public generally is ignorant of what might happen if Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, and six other Senators now facing the election test, are not sent back to the Senate. Fortunately, Wisconsin Republicans saw the need and endorsed ALEXANDER WILEY for reelection in November.

With the present schemes of the administration aiming toward spending of billions for a number of socialistic ventures, the only hope of keeping this country from a $75,000,000,000 budget is to retain Senators and Congressmen who are known to be sound thinkers.

Unless these men are returned to the Senate there is little hope of keeping the administration from running hog wild, jumping the Federal budget by whatever number of billions fits their Brannan plans, socialized medicine, business financing, Federal dam projects, federalized steel industry, etc.

Senator WILEY has proved his worth in the Senate. He serves Wisconsin well. More important, he serves the Nation as a leader in our National Legislature. He should be returned to the Senate.

[From the Waukesha Daily Freeman]

WAUKESHA PAPER PRAISES FIGHT FOR MAIL SERVICE

The people of Wisconsin should recognize the fine work of United States Senator ALEX WILEY is doing with respect to having postal service restored. He called Postmaster Donaldson's order an outrage the day it was issued and has continued to hold to the belief that the service could be restored without a cent of additional expense to the taxpayer.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Press-Register]

ALABAMA PAPER LAUDS FIGHT AGAINST SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

When Senator WILEY warns of the fallacy and danger of socialized medicine, he does the Nation a genuine good deed.

He has just sounded such a warning from the floor of the United States Senate.

He declared that "Government control of medicine will result in a lowering of America's health standards and in a further move down the road to state socialism in the United States."

Moreover, he pointed to the further great waste of tax money that can be expected if Federal bureaucracy gets its hands on medicine.

"Government control of medicine will mean," he said, "more national deficits because uncounted billions of dollars will be squandered by bureaucrats."

Senator WILEY is correct when he says Government control of medicine would be detrimental to the public welfare.

[From the Shawano County (Wis.) Journal]

NORTHERN WISCONSIN WEEKLY AFFIRMS WILEY SUPPORT

There is probably not a single home in the county that has not heard of the efforts this outstanding Senator has put forth to help the dairy farmers of Wisconsin.

Senator WILEY was first elected to the United States Senate in 1938. He has since been reelected. He had been a lawyer and businessman and farmer, having successfully operated a dairy farm for some 30 years.

Senator WILEY has visited often in this county and has many friends in Shawano.

* * * * *

The third highest ranking Republican in the Senate is ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. He has sufficient seniority to be in a very strong position to serve Wisconsin. This is particularly important in this grave hour of international need arising out of the Korean war. In time of crises, you need men of experience in public office—not novices who would take years to find out what government is all about.

Most of the work of Congress is necessarily done in committees. Senator WILEY occupies committee posts of a higher rank than has ever before been attained by a Wisconsin legislator in 102 years of Badger statehood.

During the Eightieth Congress, Senator WILEY was the chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee which handles the Nation's antitrust affairs, civil liberties, anti-Communist efforts, etc. The Senator is the only Wisconsin man who has ever been chairman of this influential committee.

PART II. COMMENTS PRIOR TO THIS YEAR

[From the Washington Times Herald]

CAPITAL PAPER LAUDS HIS INDUSTRY

He works hard. As chairman of the important Judiciary Committee, which handles a third of all Senate legislation, he personally reported out 205 bills last session, more than any other man in the House or Senate.

He is very religious, hates "synthetic thinking," such as Henry Wallace's "cockeyed ideas."

[From the Reserve Officer]

LEADER FOR PREPAREDNESS, PEACE

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY has scored a long list of legislative "firsts" in his career in the United States Senate, including his warnings long before the advent of World War II, of the danger of an attack on Pearl Harbor, the potential danger of critical shortages of wartime materials, the dangers of overcentralization of government and industry. His pioneering suggestion for a permanent liaison group between the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Department of State was acclaimed during the war by the Christian Science Monitor as "the most important, constructive and forward-looking suggestion on behalf of the future peace which has come from Congress since the United States formally entered the war."

[From the Brillion (Wis.) News]

WISCONSIN NEWSPAPER APPLAUDS FIGHT AGAINST SOCIALISM

"It is well that Senator WILEY has so faithfully discharged his duty to his constituents and his country. Would that we had more people so diligently devoted to our way of life and the comforts it has brought us compared to the unfortunate victims of socialistically dominated countries."

[From the Young People's Friend, Anderson, Ind.]

CHURCH MAGAZINE DESCRIBES WARMTH

Fifty of the Church editors met in the Senate dining room. There were two regular waiters serving our group but our time was limited and Senator WILEY got up and helped serve. He did this in a natural, unstrained manner out of the goodness of his heart. It looked to me like a good example of Christian brotherhood and fellowship.

Earlier the Senator made a good speech. He emphasized what I have believed and advocated for a long time. "It is not by legislation alone but by increased spiritual knowledge and activity that the way will be opened for us to advance."

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press]

DEMOCRATIC PAPER BOOSTS WILEY PROCHEESE BATTLE

Senator WILEY took the floor last week in an address calling attention to the so-called Plymouth-plus plan which has penalized Wisconsin producers of cheese more than $3,000,000, and still the order prevails. We want to compliment and congratulate him for making such an important contribution in the interest of an industry that made Wisconsin tops as the cheese-producing State before the war and until MPR 289 was put into effect by the Government.

[From the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News]

PROTECTOR OF RIGHTS OF 48 STATES

There has been much talk about the disappearance of State rights explicitly reserved in the Constitution but very little if anything has been done about it. It remained for United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, to take the first practical step to attempt to gain relief.

It is all but too late unless the people are stirred to action. Senator WILEY proposes an investigation to determine just how far this trend of encroachment and obliteration of the States has proceeded * * *.

Mr. WILEY says the situation urgently demands such an inquiry, and we say that he is exactly right.

We hope that something comes of Senator WILEY's far-seeing and courageous resolution.

[From the Boston Herald]

WILEY'S FAIR LABOR PROGRAM HAILED BY MASSACHUSETTS PAPER

It is good to hear that out of the confused and frightened discussions in Washington about practical ways and means of controlling monopolistic labor at least one definite, straightforward program has emerged. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin, has announced that he will sponsor in the new Congress a 10-point program * * *.

You cannot fail to agree with him on the imperative need of finding some method to end for once and for all time shutdowns in industries essential to public safety and health.

[From the New York Sun]

NATIONAL COLUMNIST ENDORSES PROPEACE EFFORT

Billions are spent for war and war preparation but virtually nothing is spent to prevent war except when a crisis arises.

There is no department of Government which gives its undivided attention to the subject of peace. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, Republican, had a good idea about this and made a speech about it in the Senate a year ago. He suggested that a Department of Peace be established to concentrate and specialize on the maintenance of peace.

[From Through the Washington Keyhole]

PRAISED FOR VISION, COURAGE, STATESMANSHIP

Wisconsin's Republican senior Senator, ALEXANDER WILEY, has done a consistently fine job for the American free enterprise system. Few Senators have as long a list of legislative "firsts" and of constructive bills introduced as ALEX WILEY. He has demonstrated the vision, courage and statesmanship that his State and Nation recognize they need so desperately in these critical times.

Tax Bill Aids Oil Interests, Lawyers Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article from the Washington Post of September 19, 1950, regarding the Senate amendment to H. R. 8920, the pending tax bill, which would have converted ordinary income from oil production to capital gain:

TAX BILL AIDS OIL INTERESTS, LAWYERS TOLD

The Federal tax bill which may soon become law contains gross, almost crude inequities and favors "oil interests and everything that smells of oil," Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard Law School, declared yesterday.

The noted educator teed off on the pending tax bill in a speech to the tax section of the American Bar Association convention.

He told the tax lawyers it was their duty to do something to remedy the situation, that they owe a duty to "John Q. Public" as well as to the moneyed corporations.

"In times when taxes must be high, it is most essential that they should be entirely nondiscriminatory," he said. "But we are about to enact a tax law which contains gross, almost crude inequities."

Particularly discriminating, he said, were the provisions favoring the oil equities.

"Where was the voice of the tax section on that matter?" he asked. "The tax section ought to be quick to act in the public interest. John Q. Taxpayer needs our help, too."

Giving a review of recent trends in Federal taxation, Griswold urged the lawyers to stop grumbling about taxation.

He declared:

"Certainly, we as tax lawyers ought to complain very little about the taxes. I will venture the thought that there is scarcely a person in this room who is not better off because we have had high taxes than he would be without taxes or even lower taxes. * * * We are all so accustomed to groaning about the burden of taxes, and to thinking about how much we would have if we had for ourselves all of the money we have paid for taxes that we are apt to forget that we would never have had the money in the first place if it were not for taxes. Most of us would not have as much left after taxes if it were not for the taxes.

"We have long had death and taxes as the two standards of inevitability. But there are those who believe that death is the preferable of the two. 'At least,' as one man said, 'there's one advantage about death—it doesn't get worse every time Congress meets.'"

A Record of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have considered it a great pleasure and honor to have served in the Congress of the United States over a period of years, during which problems of great importance have come before the Congress for solution. I do not believe that in any similar length of time in our Nation's history, except of course, the years surrounding our birth as a Nation, and its subsequent preservation in the war between the States, have so many and varied problems affecting the welfare of our Nation and its people been presented.

In the early years of my service the Nation had a period of so-called prosperity. We learned to our sorrow in 1929 that it was not of an enduring character. There followed a period of distress that brought great hardship to our people. Many were reduced to the mere necessities of life. In some instances it was difficult to get even such. There was hardly a segment of our people who did not experience hard times. Never was there a greater need for sympathetic understanding upon the part of legislators in Congress. Never was there a time that called more clearly for help from the Federal Government. Businessmen, farmers, and workers of every kind and character were calling for relief. My experience as a small child, during the Cleveland depression in the early 1890's gave me an understanding and sympathetic heart for those who suffered in this last depression. I considered it a privilege to be a Member of Congress and help in every way possible by word and vote to support those measures that gave promise of help to a distressed and discouraged people. While some were inclined to doubt the constitutional right to enact Federal legislation of this character, I can say that never did such doubt arise in my mind. I was ever mindful of the fact that this Nation was founded to provide for the life, liberty, and happiness of our people, and, that under the all-inclusive welfare clause of the Constitution, it was not only our right but our duty to pass legislation of a helpful character. As I look back on those days it is with the feeling that I was privileged to be in Congress and help in the work so necessary to be done in those fateful days.

In this period of depression many acts of substantial character to promote the welfare of our people were adopted. Of course, there were the several types of relief measures to provide employment for the unemployed, assistance to municipal bodies in the form of public works projects that enabled localities to build schools, and other necessary construction that would not have been possible without Federal relief to the hard-pressed local taxpayers, mortgage assistance to stem the tide of foreclosures, Federal assistance to farmers to enable them to overcome obstacles with which they were faced, loans to businessmen to enable them to carry on and thereby increase employment, Federal guaranty of bank deposits that was necessary to revive confidence, and many other measures of so many and varied kinds that it is impossible in the short confines of these remarks to enumerate them all.

I gave support to all this legislation. I endeavored so far as my influence and vote was concerned to further its adoption. It was gratifying to see the good that was done as a result of its enactment.

As we emerged from the depression period we were engulfed in World War II. Pearl Harbor came upon us a bolt out of a clear sky. We were caught unprepared. Following our entrance into war it was necessary to build up our military strength, make provision for the welfare of our service men and women, make financial arrangements to enable our industries to increase their production. Questions of policy, both domestic and foreign, were arising continually. All of this required time and effort to solve. Congress was in continuous session and worked day and night in an effort to do its part.

We came out of the war victorious but with problems that were staggering. Problems that required prayerful consideration. Problems of future peace, world security, and the rehabilitation of nations destroyed and the relief of suffering people. I saw these conditions first hand. I was appointed to a special committee by Congress to study the post-war problems of Europe. We visited England, France, Belgium, Luxemburg, Norway, Sweden, Germany, Russia, Iran, Egypt, Greece, and Italy. We met and conferred with the leaders in government in all of these countries. We were the only committee of Congress that had

a direct across the table conference with Stalin. The meeting was held in the Kremlin. We also met in conference His Holiness, Pope Pius. We came in contact not only with leaders in government, but, also the businessmen and the rank and file of people. We heard their pleas for help. We saw the need. In addition to all of this, we conferred with our own Ambassadors and other representatives of our own country. We met and talked with our military leaders from General Eisenhower through all the grades to privates in the field and the 17,000 service men on the ship by which we returned. If any committee of Congress ever got first hand information, our committee did. Upon our return, we made our report to President Truman in the White House. We informed him of what we had seen and heard. We made recommendations direct to him. We did likewise with respect to Congress. There is no doubt in my mind that we performed a very useful service to Congress and the people of our country. It helped us greatly in meeting those early postwar problems.

But, the war had also left us with many perplexing problems at home. Controls of one kind and another that were necessary in time of war, became irksome after the war was ended, high cost of living, inflation in other forms, heavy taxation, and, many other perplexing problems had to be decided.

And, now that we are hardly out of World War II, and before all of its problems, foreign and domestic, had been settled we are in the Korean war. And, again we are faced with problems that are pressing in character. Caught unprepared and without proper and sufficient military equipment we must build again the military machine that went out of existence with the ending of World War II.

As a Member of Congress it has been my privilege to serve on the Naval Affairs Committee, Military Affairs Committee, and now the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In my two previous assignments the information that I gained has been very helpful to me in deciding issues of a military character. The committee to which I am presently assigned has an exceedingly extensive jurisdiction covering outstanding activities such as all forms of transportation, including rail, bus, motortrucks, inland and coastal waterways; communications, which includes radio, television, telephone, telegraph, and cables; security exchange and certain types of investment legislation; Federal power, relating to interstate transmission of all forms of power, including electricity, natural gas, and related subjects; Federal trade, which covers trade practices; civil aviation, and all that relates to the operation and control of all types of civil aircraft; food and drugs, to insure safety and honesty in the administration of such to our people; Bureau of Standards, relating to scientific development; enemy property, to provide for the administration and settlement of the property in the custody of the Government, taken over by it, as a result of the last war; petroleum, in all its different aspects, including production, refinement, distribution, and sale. The committee also has jurisdiction over public health. It is this, more than any other subject within the jurisdiction of our committee, that has given me a feeling of genuine pleasure and appreciation of doing something constructive and worth while for all of our people. The accomplishments of our committee, and in which I feel honored to have had a part, have been widespread, and have materially advanced the welfare of our people. I am pleased that some of this legislation bears my name, and all of the bills have had my active support.

No better advice has ever been given to the people of a congressional district, than that given some years ago, by Champ Clark, Democrat, when he was Speaker of the House of Representatives. He said:

> Men should be sent to Congress because they can be of service, and having proved that they are of service, wisdom dictates that they should be kept here so long as they continue to be of service, and it may be confidently asserted that the value of the services of a man of capacity, character, industry, and good habits increases in exact proportion to his length of service.

I have gone into some detail in setting forth my experience in Congress because I believe that we need men of experience in Congress at this critical time in our history. I trust that my experience and sincerity of purpose will enable me to do my part as manfully, courageously, and as well as our boys are doing their part in Korea. And, with God's help I will do my part to the best of my ability.

Retailers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the retailers of America are entitled to full recognition for their great services rendered to the people at the country crossroads, in the villages, towns, and cities of America. From the very beginning of the history of our great and powerful Nation the retail merchants have been an indispensable influence toward our progress and prosperous development. Our national economy, our great industries, and our everyday way of life could not function without the services of the retailers, the grocery store, the general store, the drugstore, the hardware store, feed stores, equipment stores, the clothing store, the furniture store, the garages, hotels, restaurants, the filling stations, the specialty shops and stores and others. They are service institutions and the channels through which our great commerce flows and depends upon. They are essential in every community, and the retailer is a civic leader in the affairs and progress of every community.

My first job was in my father's grocery store. It was hard work. The hours were long and the work was confining. Retailing is a skilled occupation. A man needs the power of Samson, the resourcefulness of Napoleon, the determination and patience of Job, and the wisdom of a jury of Solomons. However, my early training, working for my father in the grocery store, was a valuable education and experience of nostalgic memories.

Mr. Speaker, elementary rules and principles applicable for the success of retailers should be applied in Government affairs. Our Government is a combination of political, business, and social science, and in order to succeed in our endeavor to render governmental services for the general welfare of the people, we must, insofar as expenditures and finances are concerned, conduct and administer governmental affairs and services on sound business methods.

It has been said that "the nearest approach to self-esteemed immortality on earth is a Government bureau," and I believe that Members of the Eighty-first Congress are fully aware of and sensitive to the fact that various bosses, heads, or department executives of Government bureaus and agencies, as well as many of their assistants and other employees, are inclined to be contemptuous of the duly elected representatives of the people in Congress, and frequently thumb their noses with derision at Congress.

We must not jokingly say or believe that a bureaucrat is a Democrat holding a Government job which a Republican wants. In fact, thousands are Republicans, but, in my opinion, the majority of such Government jobholders are neither Democrats nor Republicans; they are Government bureau politicians and specialists in obtaining and keeping influential positions in our Government.

Waste and red tape are twin brothers. They go hand in hand. Our present civil-service system permits, encourages, and results in bureau expansion by ambitious bureaucrats. This is what one Government official said several years ago:

> "I have seen guys take a job that used to be done by two girls and build it into a special section employing more than a dozen people. That way they could point to the number of employees under their supervision and get themselves a higher civil-service rating and a boost in pay. I once watched a man who took a simple job, subdivided it into eight functions, wrote lots of memoranda, hired more people, called staff conferences, had the minutes of the conference recorded, mimeographed, and distributed, and so forth, and so on. He became a big shot."

Mr. Speaker, you will recall my statement and argument on the 29th day of June, last year, when I said: "We must strive to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the executive branch of the Government. We are employed by the people as their Representatives in Congress to provide the proper legislation for the efficient execution of their Government business."

As a Member of the Eighty-first Congress, I am proud of my support and vote for H. R. 2361, a bill providing for the reorganization of Government agencies and for other purposes, which was approved and passed by the House of

Representatives on the 20th day of June 1949. This bill, H. R. 2361, was passed by the Senate, signed and approved by the President and is now Public Law 109, Eighty-first Congress.

Under the provisions of the bill, now Public Law 109, Eighty-first Congress, the President is authorized to examine, and from time to time reexamine, the organization of all agencies of the Government and determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

1st. To promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;

2d. To reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

3d. To increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

4th. To group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

5th. To reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

6th. To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

Public Law 109, Eighty-first Congress, declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in the above-numbered subsections 1 to 6, inclusive, and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of the act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

Since the enactment of that law the President has submitted numerous governmental reorganization plans and I have vigorously supported and voted for such plans, which I hope the executive department will effectively execute to achieve the purpose of Public Law 109, passed by this Congress. If not, then we should pass specific legislation to compel the achievement of our goal for efficiency and economy in our Government so that it will give better service at lower costs to all citizens.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the RECORD as part of my statement an editorial published in the Columbia Daily Tribune, May 15, 1950, as follows:

MOULDER VOTES FOR ECONOMY

When it came time to act on an amendment to cut $600,000,000 off the general appropriation bill in the House last week, Representative MORGAN MOULDER was the only Democrat among the Missouri delegation who voted for economy in Government. When it came time to act, all the rest of Missouri's Democratic Congressmen voted for spending, in spite of the fact that some of them had previously indulged in a lot of talk about economy.

Added to cuts already made by the House Appropriations Committee before the bill reached the floor, the omnibus appropriations measure is now more than $2,000,000,000 below the sum requested by President Truman. If the House cuts stand up, general appropriations for the fiscal year starting next July 1 will be approximately $28,500,000,000.

We believe a big majority of the people of America—particularly those in rural areas—are opposed to the kind of big spending the Federal Government has carried on since the war. In every case where the people have gotten their hands on a ballot to pass on a tax increase they have voted it down by a thumping majority.

This being the sentiment of the people, then those Members of Congress who do a lot of talking about economy in Government and then vote for a continuation of big spending are out of step with their constituents. They haven't the courage to stand hitched when the time comes to really do something about reducing the cost of Government so that deficits can be wiped out and taxes reduced. They could go on talking economy forever, but unless they are willing to vote for it, there is no hope for the overburdened taxpayers of this country.

Representative MOULDER stands out as an exception to this unfortunate rule that seems to prevail among Members of Congress. He says he is for economy. And, lo and behold, he votes for economy.

Since the date of that editorial our country has been compelled to expand its military operations and national defense program, and additional billions of dollars have been necessarily appropriated by Congress for that purpose. I am in complete accord with that policy and program to provide for our national defense and security, which policy and program received my vigorous support and vote in Congress. Even so, such necessary additional appropriations make it more important than ever that we limit other expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with efficient performance of essential duties, by eliminating duplication and overlapping of service, by consolidating governmental services, and by abolishing unnecessary governmental functions, services, and activities.

"Expansionism" in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of September 22, 1950:

EXPANSIONISM IN ASIA

In undertaking to present the Soviet Union as the apostle of peace and the western democracies, and especially the United States, as the imperialist exponent of expansionism, Mr. Vishinsky returned to some familiar falsehoods in his first major address to the General Assembly. "The Soviet people," he declared, "is alien to military tendencies and expansionist plans such as those which influence and lead the influential circles in control of capitalistic countries." A little later he became more explicit and charged that General MacArthur had expounded upon expansionist plans against China and against the whole Pacific region.

Apparently expansionism is the keynote in the present vocabulary of abuse, taking its place alongside the familiar fulmination against imperialism and colonialism. It has long been the theme of the North Korean Communists and their Russian mentors that the aim of United States policy was to make Korea an American colony. Presumably Mr. Vishinsky is trying to put some rhetorical meat on the skeleton of this lie with his present concern with expansion.

In any case it will be worth while to look at the record of the expansionist capitalistic countries in Asia in recent years. It may be worth while to see how it compares with the record of the Soviet Union in the same area. For the time being we can disregard the mammoth depredation of Soviet expansion in the west and see what the imperialists and the Communists have done in Asia. Here is a small part of the record:

Great Britain: Granted independence to India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon; established Malayan citizenship and instituted a greater degree of self-government in Malaya in the express interest of the indigenous population; retroceded the Weiheiwei naval base to China; gave up extraterritorial positions in Shanghai's international settlement and other Chinese cities; expressed the willingness to enter negotiation with China on the retrocession of Hong Kong whenever the Chinese were prepared to take over the obvious obligations; undertook the substantial reduction of military and naval establishments in Asia wherever possible.

France: France has not moved as rapidly as Great Britain in modifying the colonial position, nor as rapidly as many persons would desire. But France has recognized the right of Indochina to self-government and has set up at least partially independent regimes for Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Likewise the colony of Chandernagor has been returned to India after a plebiscite. What action has been take has all been away from expansionism rather than toward it.

The Netherlands: Granted political independence to Indonesia and refrained from retaliation when the Indonesians modified the agreement against Dutch wishes by creating a unitary state.

The United States: Granted complete independence to the Philippines; provided for the institution of civil government in Guam and Samoa; placed the former Japanese-held islands under a trusteeship and invited United Nations inspection and criticism; renounced all special privileges and unequal rights in China; made and is still making every effort to end the occupation of Japan.

In that record there is a significant absence of territorial expansion. Annexation somehow doesn't appear. No fresh spheres of influence have been created. Everywhere there have been changes and they have all been in the direction of greater liberties for more persons.

Now for a quick look at the corresponding record in Asia of the Soviet Union, the fountainhead of this antiexpansionist sentiment. Will it bear a similar inspection? What Asiatic people has the Soviet Union made independent of its rule?

The Soviet Union: Annexed Tannu Tuva; annexed southern Sakhalin; annexed the Kuriles; took complete control (virtual annexation) of outer Mongolia; set up the Autonomous Border Area of western Manchuria and inner Mongolia under complete Russian domination; took control of Dairen and Port Arthur, Manchuria's major seaport and naval base; took control of the Manchurian railways; took special privileges amounting to complete economic domination in Manchuria and in Sinkiang (Chinese Turkestan); set up a completely subservient regime in North Korea and sponsored and defended its aggressive invasion on the Republic of Korea; strengthened enormously its military, naval and merchant marine installations in the Pacific area.

There is obviously some imperialism and some expansionism rampant in Asia. But a look at the record reveals whence they come and in what guise. It is an old trick of Communist double-talk to accuse one's opponent of what the Communist has already done. There is no better example than this propaganda about designs upon Asia. It is not merely false; it is ridiculous in its impudence.

Internal Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have been a most vigorous advocate of checking communism and Communists at home and abroad. On very many occasions I have denounced the activities of subversive groups and warned the American people of the dangers of this determined and widespread antidemocratic movement.

The present so-called security bill goes very far afield of achieving effective control of communism. It has been so materially altered during its recent legislative course that I regard some of its provisions as being, in effect, not only unnecessary but actually dangerous to our American constitutional system.

In my opinion, in order to control the activities of Communists in this country, it is not necessary to scrap the Constitution.

To the contrary, it is most imperative at a time when there is so much apprehension and concern among our people that our representatives in Government should make special efforts to be calm and dispassionate in their judgments and strive to be free from the clutches of that hysteria which frequently runs through the Nation during a crisis and which could very easily lead us into the abandonment, or at least the serious curtailment, of our God-given constitutional liberties.

Free speech and free expression is a precious American right. Like freedom of conscience, freedom of worship, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly, and the other great principles of the Bill of Rights, it must be zealously guarded by our leadership against encroachment, limitation, and ultimate suppression.

If the Government but chooses to enforce them, there are laws on the statute books to check and punish espionage, sedition, and sabotage, and to bring before the bar of justice for swift prosecution those who teach and urge the overthrow of the Government by force. That was demonstrated by the recent Communist trials in New York.

But it is most unwise and highly dangerous as well as entirely unnecessary to enact a law like this one which is modeled after the principles and practices of the totalitarian police state and which grossly violates the fundamentals of the American Constitution.

Now is the time for all Americans to stand by our free institutions which we will preserve only if we are vigilant and work aggressively against efforts to check, limit, and weaken them.

The way to do this is to protect the constitutional safeguards of the individual and scrupulously to avoid hysterically conceived measures which are capable of doing greatest violence to the American way of life in that they set up the patterns of totalitarianism in this country and thus destroy precious liberties.

The Importance of Rural Electrification to Colorado Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, although I have represented an urban district during my service in Congress, I have done my best to encourage the rural electrification program in the farm areas of Colorado and the rest of the Nation.

The more than 40,000 farm families which are served by Colorado's 22 rural electrification associations are well aware of the benefits of REA power. It is no exaggeration to say that the rural electrification program has transformed the lives of persons living in rural areas in Colorado as well as other States.

When the rural electrification program began about 15 years ago, only 1 in 10 of the farm homes in Colorado had electricity. Ninety percent of our farm population lived without electric lights or the other electrical appliances which city people have accepted as an essential part of their existence. Ninety percent of the farms in the State could not use electrical machinery. This last fact is especially important, since in some parts of Colorado the use of electricity is essential to pump water for irrigation.

Today, only 15 years after the REA program was initiated, only 10 percent of Colorado farms are not electrified. Now, nine-tenths of the farm population of the State may enjoy the advantages of electric lights, electric washing machines, and refrigerators, and electrical machinery for irrigation and other uses on the farm. Electricity has lightened the farm wife's drudgery and has decreased the workload of the farmer.

As I say, the people in the rural areas of Colorado are well aware of the benefits of REA. They know it is not socialism or communism—rather, it is a typically American solution to the problem of bringing American living standards to thinly populated areas.

Nevertheless, an attempt has been made by some private utilities and their political hangers-on to misrepresent and distort the REA program. Therefore, I wish to emphasize to all the residents of Colorado—those who live in the cities as well as in rural areas—that the REA program has been a boon to businessmen throughout the State as well as farmers.

The farmer-owned and farmer-operated rural electrification associations are going business concerns. They not only are bringing low-cost power to areas which would otherwise have no electricity; they also are paying back their loans from the Government, plus interest, ahead of schedule. In addition, they are making a major contribution to Colorado's wealth through increasing the State's business activity and productive resources.

Nearly 13,000 miles of line have been built and energized by Colorado Rural Electrification Associations at a cost of approximately $25,000,000. These lines carry nearly 100,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy to consumers each year.

The operating revenue of Colorado REA's is nearly $3,500,000 a year. Colorado REA's have paid the Government approximately $1,500,000 in interest on their loans, and in addition, are repaying the principal ahead of schedule.

The REA program in Colorado means new business for the State. The 13,000 miles of REA line were built by private enterprise. Much of the power transmitted to consumers by Colorado REA is bought from private utility companies. The electrification of Colorado farms has resulted in the sale of more refrigerators, electric washing machines, electric irons, and other electrical appliance and farm equipment. In turn, the use of electrical farm equipment such as machinery for the pumping of irrigation water has resulted in increased production of foodstuffs, and has added to the agricultural wealth of Colorado.

One of my chief concerns in Washington has been the encouragement of the system of Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines designed to bring power to REA's and municipalities. The basic reclamation law wisely states that public instrumentalities, such as cities and rural electric associations, should have the first opportunity to obtain power produced by reclamation projects. These huge projects are built by the people, and public agencies should have preference in obtaining reclamation power. As part of this program, the Bureau of Reclamation has built a network of transmission lines extending across the northern and eastern section of Colorado, and additional lines are in the process of construction.

During recent years, private utilities have made a determined effort to cripple or halt this transmission line program. They have brought out the old argument that the reclamation transmission lines are useless duplications of lines already built by private utilities. Actually, the reclamation lines have served to bring additional power into areas where the private utility lines have been inadequate to supply the demand.

In my opinion, there is no legitimate reason for conflict between private utilities and the Government transmission line and REA programs. REA's are serving areas where the private utilities have been unable or unwilling to serve. Therefore, I have noted with pleasure a recent agreement between the Public Service Co. of Colorado and the Bureau

of Reclamation whereby the Public Service Co. contracts to carry power over its own lines to REA consumers wherever feasible. It is my earnest hope that this arrangement will work out to the satisfaction of REA members throughout the State. I wish to assure these REA members, however, that I intend to keep careful scrutiny upon the operation of this agreement, and that I shall do everything possible to assure that the REA's are getting fair treatment. I intend to see that this wheeling arrangement is used to benefit the farm consumers of Colorado, and not as a disguised means of shackling or curtailing the REA program.

Secondly, I shall do everything in my power to assure that the wheeling agreement is not used as an excuse to halt further necessary development in the construction of the Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines system. Certain additional construction is necessary before this system can give adequate service to Colorado REA's. This construction is not inconsistent with the wheeling of power by the Public Service Co., and it should be continued.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize the importance of the REA program. When this subject was under consideration on the floor of the House earlier this year, I received many letters from Colorado farmers, telling what REA has meant to them. I remember especially a letter from a 70-year-old farm woman who writes that she had lived on a farm within a few miles of the city of Denver for more than 20 years and had never had electricity in her home until a REA was formed in her neighborhood a year or so ago.

Persons such as these have not been served by private utilities, because it would be unprofitable for a private company to bring power to their doors. Their only hope of receiving the benefits of electrical energy is through the REA program.

As I stated before, the number of electrified farms in Colorado has increased from 10 to 90 percent since the REA program was initiated. This revolution in farm life would not have occurred had the REA program not been in existence. The effectiveness of REA is graphically illustrated by the fact that during the period when electrified farms in Colorado were increasing ninefold, the number of farms with telephones has remained almost static. It was for this reason that I gave my active support to the rural telephone bill passed by the Eighty-first Congress, which has given farm families the same opportunity to obtain telephones as the REA program has given them with regard to electricity.

I am proud to have been able to fight alongside with Colorado farmers in their battle for the REA program during the past 4 years. I have worked and voted for adequate funds for the REA program upon every occasion. I have appeared before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation transmission line program, and I have fought for these transmission lines in debate on the floor of the House. These actions have aroused the ire of powerful vested interests, but I am confident that Colorado farmers will continue to give me their support in my work for the REA program. In the years to come, Colorado REA's will continue and expand their program of service to the farm areas of the State. No special-privilege group can be allowed to stifle the farmers' typically American desire to share in the benefits made possible by American freedom and enterprise.

Excerpts From Committee Reports on S. 784

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, little time was used for the explanation of the bill, when S. 784 came up under House Resolution 818 of the Committee on Rules, on August 31. The time allotted for the rule on consideration was largely used to speak "out of order," in a somewhat heated debate on President Truman and a defense of his actions in an important matter. However, thereby many Members of the House learned little about the private bill.

The following "quoted" excerpts are from the 38 pages of the latest committee report, House Report No. 2135, Eighty-first Congress, second session, on the bill:

The following congressional reports on this subject matter are the result of legislative exhaustive inquiries:

Report by the late Senator Gibson, reporting on behalf of a subcommittee of the Senate Claims Committee; this report is dated May 6, 1936; it is referred to on pages 10 and 11 of Senate Report No. 548.

Senate Report No. 2313, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session.

House Report No. 3066, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session.

House Report No. 2733, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

House Report No. 3005, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

Senate Report No. 1717, Eightieth Congress, first session.

Senate Report No. 548, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

Report by the Congressman, the Honorable SAM HOBBS, a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House. This report is dated May 25, 1950. (It includes the aforesaid report by Judge HOBBS.)

The above congressional reports record the fact that the Government, as the successor in interest of the Fleet Corporation and as its liquidator, still retains at present (May 1950) the companies' funds in the amount of $384,256.26, without moral, equitable, legal, or justifiable warranty; the restitution of these funds, as provided in S. 784, as a matter of fact and in reality, does not come from any source of public funds or taxpayer funds and is not a drain on such public funds; this restitution only does constitute, in effect, a return of private funds, of which the Government is a custodian without having any right to continue such custody.

THE PREROGATIVE OF THE CONGRESS

Congress has the prerogative and constitutional right to act as a tribunal in this case. The following extracts from a Senate publication are pertinent thereto.

"Memorandum on Proceedings Involving Contempt of Congress and Its Committees, United States Senate, January 6, 1947. Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary."

This memorandum was prepared by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of the Eightieth Congress; it was approved by all its members; it was prefaced by remarks by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, then chairman of the committee.

"The power of Congress to investigate facts is well settled by our history and precedents. The Constitution makes the legislative grant to Congress and implied in the grant is the power to do those things necessary to bring the grant into being. One means which Congress has taken to carry out the power is the committee process.

"The general lack of understanding of the status, duties, and powers of the congressional committees is a matter for concern in an age when the efficient functioning of legislative bodies is the principal bulwark of freemen against totalitarian ideologies.

"A legislative inquiry may be as broad, as searching and as exhaustive as is necessary to make effective the constitutional powers of Congress. * * *

"A judicial inquiry relates to a case, and the evidence, to be admissible, must be measured by the narrow limits of the pleadings. A legislative inquiry anticipates all possible cases which may arise thereunder, and the evidence admissible must be responsive to the scope of the inquiry, which generally is very broad."

Senate bill S. 784 is in accord with our constitutional law, which warrants that—

"Private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation."

It is evident that the published reports of exhaustive investigations by congressional committees have recorded a full exposition of the facts, and have cited their judgment that the funds herein concerned must be returned to the citizen companies as provided for in S. 784.

The conclusions in the above congressional reports had always the same objective, namely, to bring about a return and restitution of the companies' cash property remaining "unreturned" in the custody of the Government, acting in its capacity as the successor in interest of the Fleet Corporation, as a result of the effect of the mandate of Congress, i. e., the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The cash funds herein involved are in the custody of the Treasury Department, having become placed there in such custody as the result of the congressional mandate which put into effect the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (sec. 203A thereof).

The Fleet Corporation was discontinued by the mandate of the Congress; it appears a matter of simple justice to have the Congress use its discretion to mandate the successor of the Fleet Corporation to return to the companies the balance of their cash surety funds which the Fleet Corporation should have returned when due.

An identical bill passed the Senate in the Eightieth Congress, but was referred to the committee too late to be given consideration before adjournment. This bill passed the Senate on July 6, 1949, and referred to the committee.

Seldom, if ever, has the Congress of the United States taken such a continuing interest in a controversy between a citizen and governmental agencies.

This interest by the Congress in this case is fully warranted. It commenced in 1936, when the late Senator Gibson, on behalf of a Senate committee consisting of himself,

the former Senator Townsend and the former Senator Black, concluded a report dated May 6, 1936, on behalf of this committee, to wit:

"Thus there still remained (after the return of $250,000 by the Fleet Corporation's check to the companies) in the hands of the Government unreturned funds amounting to $384,256.26."

The published Senate reports of the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congresses pertinent to this subject matter declare that—

There is a factor of public interest in this case.

The Congress has always pursued the policy that the foundation of good government rests squarely on justice.

The Congress has always maintained the policy that there cannot ever be finality on the part of the Government without justice.

The Senate bill, S. 784, will correct the injustice inflicted on the companies for so many years.

The refusal to return the funds of the companies had been consistently based by Government counsel on the alleged contention that the companies and Schundler had breached contracts for the purchase of the vessels; this contention was a misapprehension of the facts.

The Executive disapprovals were grounded upon invalid assertions and upon representations made to the former President that the Government had been damaged by breach of contracts of sale of the vessels and that the Government could confiscate the unreturned cash property, unreturned by the Fleet Corporation and withheld in its custody, as liquidated damages.

The Court of Claims found that this was not true and that these assertions were invalid; the court determined and held that there were no sales and that the companies did not breach any contracts that there were no liquidated damages; to quote the court itself verbatimly, to wit: "There were no valid contracts to sell. Plaintiffs breached no contracts," and as the court's commissioner summarized it, to quote him verbatim—

"Plaintiff companies, therefore, did not breach any contracts, and thereby damage the United States to the extent of $384,256.26 or any part thereof."

It is noteworthy that in early 1921 Admiral Benson appointed a committee consisting of the then Commissioner Frederick I. Thompson; Commander A. B. Clements, who was the special assistant of Admiral Benson; Hon. W. W. Nottingham, assistant general counsel of the Board-Fleet Corp.; and Hon. J. A. Philbin, ship sales manager and vice president of the Fleet Corp. for many years. This committee directed in early 1921 the escrowed cash funds to be returned to the companies and set up the formula of accounting of disbursements in keeping with the operating contract, and it is this method which the internal revenue applied in its determinations. The directive of this committee was not carried out by the Fleet Corp. at that time and failure to do so became the commencement of the delay in the return of the funds due the companies.

CONCLUSION

It is noteworthy that up to this time every Member of Congress has recognized the equity and morality of this demand of the companies for the return of their cash property herein involved. Reference is made to page 1 of Senate Report No. 548, to wit:

"After this case came to the attention of the Congress and was fully investigated by Members of the Senate and of the House, and reported on to Congress, Congress has consistently endeavored to provide the relief due to these companies, which common sense and justice, honorable and equitable consideration of the facts do require."

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this session is about to come to an end. We have considered many problems of major importance to our people; and the Korean war has come along in the middle of our domestic program to interrupt it. We therefore have not passed upon many problems which otherwise should be disposed of immediately.

The tidelands problem is one of those which have been pending for many years. At first it seemed that the claim of the Federal Government to the ownership of these lands was preposterous; and many persons did not treat it seriously. As time has gone by, the claim has gradually become more serious until now it is threatening the very existence of any State right or interest in these lands.

I think this problem which means so much to many of our States should be settled as soon as possible. In fact, it should be settled before we adjourn this Congress. Further delay may mean the complete loss of any serious claim which tideland States may have in these valuable properties.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most serious matter which the State of Louisiana must face. Already a large part of its revenues comes from tidelands; and the State is going to be seriously punished by any act of the United States in taking away revenues previously coming to it from the tidelands. Just what these revenues amount to in dollars and cents, I do not now have the total amounts; but I do know that the complete loss of this revenue from Louisiana tidelands will mean perhaps additional State taxes must be levied upon our people to meet the deficiency caused by this loss.

I was deeply concerned the other day to learn that the Attorney General of the United States was asking for an accounting by the several States of its tideland revenues collected in the past. Such an accounting is another threat to the financial ability of the State of Louisiana. It will again force upon our people in Louisiana the realization that some day we may be compelled to readjust our State finances on a different basis as a result of the dispute over the title to the submerged oil lands off the coast of Louisiana.

All of this means one thing, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment. The time for further delay and procrastination has passed. This issue must be met and met now. Delay will not improve the position of the State in this dispute and delay will not make our case stronger. Every additional delay means loss of further strength to the States which are carrying on this fight against the further encroachment of the powers of the Central Government. I am sorry that we have not been permitted to vote on this matter during the course of this session; but I hope that when we reconvene in November, the Congress will set to work to bring this matter forward to an issue and a final vote.

Harvard Dean Urges Bar Association To Oppose Senate Loopholes in the Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, it must be gratifying to those Members who have been critical of the Senate amendments to H. R. 8920, the pending tax bill, which would have reopened many loopholes closed by the House and have added even larger new loopholes, to see the splendid work of the managers on the part of the House. It is regrettable, however, that the Government must continue to lose $190,000,000 a year through tax avoidance by coupon clippers because of the opposition of the Senate to withholding on corporate dividends in the same manner as taxes are now withheld on the salaries and wages of working people.

In view of the active sponsorship by some of the leading members of the tax section of the American Bar Association of some of the Senate loopholes, I think it particularly appropriate and timely that the dean of the Harvard Law School, Mr. Erwin N. Griswold, should have publicly raised the question about the role of the tax section on these important issues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a portion of an address by Dean Griswold delivered before the tax section of the American Bar Association in Washington, D. C., on Monday, September 18, 1950:

* * * now we must look ahead, and I would like to venture a few words for tax lawyers for the days to come. The history of the 1920's is not going to repeat itself. We are not going to have the era of economic plenty and lowered taxes which we had looked forward to. Probably we should have foreseen that it was not to come, but we did allow ourselves to hope. Now we are confronted with reality and the pleasant dream is gone—or going. As tax lawyers, whether for the Government or for private clients, we have a great responsibility in the difficult days to come.

Way down in the South Seas somewhere there is a little island where there is no unemployment, no crime, no beggars, no radios, no taxes—and no inhabitants. We are likely to forget that taxes are a necessary concomitant of organized society, and that we are all undoubtedly very fortunate that our society is organized.

Certainly, we as tax lawyers ought to complain very little about the taxes. I will venture the thought that there is scarcely a man in this room who is not better off because we have had high taxes than he would be without any tax law to practice. Tax law has become a highly specialized field, which

has required trained practitioners. It has not been my observation that they have gone generally unrewarded.

But I will go farther than that. I will suggest that there are few members of the bar, indeed, few citizens, who are not better off physically and financially because there are high taxes than they would be without taxes at all. We are all so accustomed to groaning about the burden of taxes, and to thinking about how much we would have if we had for ourselves all of that money we have paid for taxes that we are apt to forget that we would never have had the money in the first place if it were not for the taxes, and that most of us would not have as much left after taxes if it were not for the taxes. Holmes put it succinctly when he said that taxes were what he paid for civilization; and that is even more true now than it was when he said it.

I do not mean to condone waste and extravagance in Government expenditure. I am all for controlling that in any way we can. But by far the largest part of our tax load comes as the result of two things: (1) Our highly complex industrially organized society, presenting many problems that must be taken care of and can be handled effectively only on a collective basis, (2) the present state of the world, and the need for protecting ourselves from the threats directed at our society.

A large part of our taxes during the past 10 years was devoted to protecting us against the Nazi aggression. Can it be doubted what would have happened if we had not organized and provided that defense and paid for it in part by taxes? And have we not all got more than our money's worth? And is the present situation much different? We can all regret desperately that there is such a threat to our security. But if there is a threat, is there any expenditure we make which benefits us more than that we pay to the Government in taxes?

We should not forget, too, that taxes not only provide us the means of defense, but they also serve another important function in times like these. They are one of our most effective protections against inflation. For most of us inflation is a far more serious financial threat than the amount we actually pay out in taxes. If the war can be kept localized, we should surely pay its cost currently, and we will be better off in the long run if we do.

I do not for the moment mean that the tax lawyer should not work for his client, help him minimize his taxes, and fight hard for him when necessary. That is all part of our adversary system, which I believe to be in general a good system. Many tax questions are necessarily complex, and they are likely to be worked out best when there is an able practitioner making the best possible presentation on each side. What I am saying is that I hope that tax lawyers will keep their perspective. They should sell their services to their clients—I hope they do—but not their souls. Taxes are not a necessary evil. They are, in times like these, a downright blessing. We should surely be quickly lost without them. Let us not forget that fact even as we act as ministers in particular cases to see that the system operates in accordance with law. But where the law is inadequate, or could be improved, let us recognize that fact, too. As the leading organization of tax lawyers in the country the tax section has a great and grave responsibility in times like these.

Tax law is necessarily technical, and we are people who are peculiarly qualified to deal in those technicalities. We are rather quick to move to action when there is some portion of the law which affects some particular group of taxpayers. But we ought to be equally quick to act in the public interest. Just plain John Q. Taxpayer needs our help, too. If we do not exert our talents to guard against discrimination and special privilege, there will be few others who can help him.

It is quite clear that the tax section has made much progress in this direction. Let us strive even more than we have to maintain our professional independence and to contribute to the building of a tax system that will really spread the burdens of our times with fairness and equality.

It has been a great source of satisfaction to me over the years to see the growing strength and maturity of the tax section. I think we are all greatly indebted to Cecil Kilpatrick for his fine leadership during the past 2 years. A lot of fine and important work has been done. But the tax section has a great public responsibility which it is not yet fully meeting. In times when taxes must be high, it is most important that they should be fair and nondiscriminatory, that they should not be full of loopholes and special privileges. Yet right now, in the midst of a real shooting war, we are apparently about to enact a new tax law which contains some gross, almost crude, inequities. Where has the voice of the tax section been on these matters. What about family partnerships and stock options? Is there really any decent justification for the handouts which are reportedly about to be given to a special few taxpayers on these matters? What about the gross inequities of the law in favor of the oil and gas interests and everything that smells of oil? Is there any justification for adding to that discrimination now by the so-called "in oil" provision of the present bill? Where was the voice of the tax section on that matter?

Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting to see what the tax section of the American Bar Association does about this gentle hint by the dean of the Harvard Law School.

Plot To Overthrow Our Present Form of Government by a Fascist Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee for a Fascist Government alias the Committee for Constitutional Government, organized by and operated by E. A. Rumely, is making an all-out effort to change fundamentally our form of government. I do not charge that there is an effort to overthrow our Government by force, except an attempt is made to mislead and deceive the people into believing that changes should be made that would cause a radical departure from our form of government under the present Constitution.

Rumely and his gang are trying to make it impossible for Congress to have enough money to provide for things this Fascist group is opposed to. An effort is made to change our Constitution through petitions by 32 States as provided in article V of the Constitution but which has never been used. This is an effort to sneak through an amendment to the Constitution that will limit to 15 percent the income taxes on any person or corporation and not permit Congress to levy an inheritance or estate tax at all. This limitation will effectively do what this Fascist group would like to have done and that is to destroy our programs on social security, for veterans' relief, improvement of rivers and harbors, public roads, soil conservation, support prices for farmers, the Government lending its credit for an interest charge, which is repaid, to farmers and families in the city to buy farms and homes on long terms at low rates of interest, and other programs of benefit to the people.

NEWSPAPERS NOT CARRYING THIS

You will not see much about this organization in the newspapers. For some unknown reason, the newspapers have not advised the people of this serious plot that is aimed at the heart of our fine Government, which has made our country prosperous.

As long as a majority of the people own their own home and farms as they do today and as long as people have good jobs at good pay under good working conditions, there is no danger of socialism or communism; but there can be danger from the extreme right in the form of fascism; so while we are zealously fighting any intrusion from the left in the form of communism or socialism, let us not overlook an equally devastating enemy approaching us from the right in the form of fascism. Public sentiment is a powerful weapon.

Rumely, the court records disclose, was guilty of treason against the United States during World War I. He was a German propagandist. He has been in propaganda work ever since. Since World War I, he has been propagandizing against the Federal Government of the United States, using any of its powers to help the people in any way, shape, form, or fashion. He has been trying to get the Constitution amended in a way that would cause our Government to take an "about face." He has carried on a persistent and ruthless campaign against labor and farmers and strictly in the direction of helping those who have the most and especially the privileged group. His whole campaign has been in the direction of making the rich richer and the poor poorer.

ANY LAW LIBRARY HAS THE FACTS

Anyone who wants to know more about this man, Rumely, should go to the nearest law office and examine 293 Federal Reporter, which contains the case of Rumely et al. against United States. The Circuit Court of Appeals, commencing on page 532 of that volume.

Reports to the People of the Ninth Congressional District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, since my election to the Eighty-first Congress I

have attempted to maintain close communication with the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Illinois in order that they should know of my activities in their behalf and so that they should be in a position to judge my efforts.

Each week while the House has been in session I have prepared a newsletter summarizing the work of the Congress for the preceding week. I have done so in the belief that a Representative should report to those who bestowed their trust and confidence in him and, incidentally, in the hope that a first-hand review of congressional activity might prove of interest. On the whole, I believe these messages have been important.

I am presenting copies of my last four newsletters, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 22, 1950.

DEAR FRIEND: If you were a Member of Congress, would you vote for a bill which you believed to be a bad one, perhaps harmful to the best interests of your country? Would your opinion be changed merely because the bill had been described and widely publicized as an anti-Communist bill? Would the fact that election for your office was only a few weeks away alter your opinion?

The vote on the McCarran bill conference report last week tested many a Congressman's conscience. Political realists who are friends of mine, advised me that a vote against the bill, even though made in complete good faith, might result in my political defeat, despite the fact that my entire voting record has been anti-Communist and I have time and again reaffirmed my strong conviction that the threat of Communist imperialism and aggression against the free nations of the world must be strongly opposed; and that the danger of Communist sabotage and subversion in our own country must be fought tooth and nail if we are to protect our American heritage and ideals.

To the best of my ability, I try to follow the rule for political conduct laid down by a great fighting Irishman, Daniel O'Connell: "Nothing is politically right which is morally wrong." I voted against the McCarran bill, refusing to believe that a record of fighting the menace of communism made over the entire Congress would be disregarded unless I voted for this bill. I have been a strong supporter of the Marshall plan, the military assistance program of furnishing arms to democratic European nations, the Truman policy to fight communism in Turkey and Greece, and the bill granting aid to Korea. I have voted for appropriations to strengthen our military forces, for creation of the Central Intelligence Agency, and for the bill to strengthen the Nation's internal security, which had been approved by the Department of Justice and the Department of Defense. The Communists have violently opposed all of these bills.

There are a number of reasons why I voted against the McCarran bill, but I think the predominant one is the fact that J. Edgar Hoover has indicated his opposition to the bill. I am no expert on fighting Communist espionage and sabotage, so that I rely on experts like Hoover for advice. Hoover is opposed to driving the Communists deeper underground and making his job of keeping check upon them almost impossible, which the McCarran bill will do. Another counterespionage expert named Paul Jensen, described the bill as an amateurish attempt at counterintelligence, designed to catch headlines, but not spies.

I voted against the bill, too, because it creates an instrumentality which would permit the hate-mongers and smear technicians to ruin the reputation and effectiveness of fine liberal anti-Communist people and organizations by a campaign of inference and not fact. The bill destroys much of our American freedoms and places in jeopardy the right of an American to have a different opinion.

The President vetoed the bill and sent over a powerful message asking that the bill be rejected. Two passages impressed me: "H. R. 9490 (McCarran bill) would not hurt the Communists; it would help them * * * It would actually weaken existing internal security measures and would seriously hamper the FBI and other security agencies * * * Spies and saboteurs would willingly spend years of effort seeking to find out the information that this bill would require the Government to hand them on a silver platter." I supported the President and voted to sustain his veto.

When one of the Congressmen expressed concern over his vote against the bill, Congressman CARROLL, of Colorado, smilingly reminded him of the marine sergeant of World War I, who waved his men over the top with the cry: "Come on, you so-and-so's—do you want to live forever?"

Sincerely,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—As I write this, I have just received word that Senator LANGER, who also vehemently opposes this bill and who has been fighting valiantly against it in the Senate, has exhausted himself after a 6-hour speech and has been rushed to the hospital. He had intended to speak indefinitely against it in order to prevent overriding the President's veto.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 15, 1950.

DEAR FRIEND: Congressmen returning to Washington this week after a 10-day recess found themselves in the center of a legislative rebellion. They had been home either for their primary elections or to begin their campaigns for the November election, and they anticipated going home again quickly after cleaning up the few remaining legislative matters. Rumor had it that Congress might adjourn this week end if the conference reports on the new tax bill and the McCarran-Wood bill could be disposed of. That expectation seemed to vanish, however, when Congressmen EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, CARROLL, of Colorado, and several of their colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee led a rebellion to disapprove sending the tax bill to conference until provision had been made for an excess-profits tax at once. They proposed that the House do not adjourn until such a tax had been approved.

Earlier this year, before the outbreak of the Korean conflict, the House had passed the new tax bill, a bill which was designed to remove excise taxes on retail sales of such items as jewelry, furs, etc., and to close up many of the loopholes existing in our present tax structure. While the bill was under consideration by the Senate, however, the fighting in Korea began, making necessary the raising of additional money with which to fight the war and build our defenses. House provisions for removal of the excise taxes were quickly eliminated, and income-tax rates on individuals and corporations were increased. When the bill finally passed the Senate 192 amendments of various kinds had been approved, but none providing for the imposition of an excess-profits tax, although Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, had fought to have one incorporated in the bill.

In view of the tremendous number of changes, the job of reconciling differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill promised to be a long, arduous task. The attempt to begin that job was made during the recent recess by a motion to send the bill to conference. Inasmuch as there were not sufficient members of the Rules Committee in Washington to make up a quorum and grant a rule, the only manner in which the bill could be sent to conference was by unanimous consent, but Congressman EBERHARTER objected and prevented the bill from going to conference.

This week the rule was obtained and EBERHARTER shifted his attack for an excess-profits tax by moving that the House instruct the Committee on Ways and Means to provide for a tax on excess profits now. It is very difficult to amend a rule on a conference report, but EBERHARTER, CARROLL, and Congressmen YOUNG, of Ohio, and KING, of California, undertook the fight. In a joint letter to the Members of the House, they pointed out that the great majority of Senate amendments made only technical changes which legalized new tax avoidance loopholes or reopened loopholes closed by the original House bill. They pointed out that the Senate had made no provision for a tax on excess profits now, but as the letter put it, innocuously attempted to direct the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee of the next Congress to report a bill for an excess-profits tax.

The floor fight by the Eberharter group received quick support from those of us who want to check war profiteering and unjust price rises. Congressman CARROLL pointed out that we must take additional steps to curb inflation. An excess-profits tax will do much to curb the drive for higher prices and stem the tendency toward inflation. "Everywhere," he said, "the consumer, the farmer, the small-business man is caught in an economic trap—the trap of rising prices with increased taxes. How can we in good conscience go before the people and say that we will do nothing to stop war profiteering?" Congressman EBERHARTER took the floor to state that more was involved than a matter of the revenue which we so sorely need. "It is a moral issue," he said; "the American people have a right to expect equality of sacrifice in the present emergency."

The Eberharter group carried the House with them. EBERHARTER'S first motion to amend the rule by writing in an excess-profits tax provision was ruled out of order by the Speaker on the ground that it was not properly a part of the present bill. But EBERHARTER'S second motion which was to direct the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee of this Congress, not the next one, to report out an excess-profits tax bill as early as practicable in this session, carried on a roll call vote by 331 to 2.

Sincerely,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 1, 1950.

DEAR FRIEND: The flu laid me low last week and I spent most of the week in bed. It was the first bad cold I have had in over a year, so I really have no cause to complain; but I regretted very much having to miss the debate and voting on the bills which came to the floor during the week.

The cold did not catch me until Saturday night, after the House had met in one of its rare Saturday sessions to dispose of the $17,000,000,000 supplemental appropriations bill. This bill added $11,500,000,000 to the amount previously appropriated for military use and made the total for this purpose for the year approximately $25,000,000,000, not including funds for the Atomic Energy Commission, Foreign Assistance Program, and stockpiling projects.

A large sum? It certainly is, but as Congressman GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, pointed out, it is woefully inadequate for total global warfare. MAHON, who is the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, spoke for more than an hour on military appropriations in the recent past and

what was in prospect for the immediate future. He explained in some detail where the monetary appropriations for the last 5 years had been spent and showed the reasons why it is almost impossible to be fully prepared in all the troubled spots in the world at the same time.

"Preparation for total world-wide warfare, said MAHON, "would cost us a minimum of $100,000,000,000 a year, if we were to seek maximum preparedness. If that be so," MAHON asked himself, "why are we not spending the $100,000,000,000 in an all-out preparedness effort, rather than the mere $25,000,000,000?"

He answered his own question by saying that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, our top military personnel, upon whose decisions our entire military policy is based, do not believe that world war III has begun, even though we are fighting in Korea. They believe world war III may still be averted and there is no need yet for all out military spending. The present appropriations, MAHON indicated, provide for all the needs of the Armed Forces in creating a strong mobilization base.

In the absence of war, MAHON went on, we must operate from a strong mobilization base rather than being completely mobilized for war. "Nothing would release a potential enemy more than to have us bankrupt our country and destroy our economy by maintaining over a period of years, complete readiness for armed conflict. Our country proceeds upon the theory that our best interests are promoted by taking certain calculated risks." What happened in Korea could happen in Yugoslavia, Iran, Germany, or any one of a dozen places where we have relatively a handful of men. MAHON pointed out: "It has either been a matter of taking calculated risks of some degree, or mobilizing millions of men, arming them to the teeth and stationing them at strategic places all the way around the perimeter of the free world".

There is never a moratorium on politics in Congress. Unheard, apparently, was MAHON's fine speech and his final statement that "actually, absolute security is unattainable" for no sooner had he concluded than Congressman WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, one of the ranking Republican members of the Appropriations Committee, took the floor to sound the charge for what will probably be the keynote of the Republican campaign this fall. "Mr. Chairman," he cried, "the people of America are demanding to know what has been done with the billions of dollars approved for national defense since World War II. They are demanding to know how we were caught so lamentably unprepared and so unequipped in Korea."

Sincerely,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 25, 1950.

DEAR FRIEND: I have received many letters from people who are much concerned with our preliminary setbacks in the Korean war, asking "Where did the money go which we appropriated for defense?" I thought a discussion of this point would be timely. Ordinarily I do not like to write a letter which contains many figures and statistics, but in this instance, I believe it is the only way the subject can be properly presented.

Approximately $90,000,000,000 were appropriated and spent for the military functions of the Department of Defense for the fiscal years 1946 to 1950. Of this amount approximately $42,000,000,000, or 45 percent, went to pay for the cost of liquidating many of the expenses of World War II, most of this sum having been spent during the year 1946 when our Nation was speeding its demobilization and reducing its Armed Forces from 12,000,000 men to the peacetime level of 1,500,000 men and women. This liquidation cost included the amounts paid for terminal leave to military personnel who were demobilized, the amount paid to contractors whose wartime production contracts were terminated, and items of that character.

After deducting such liquidation costs, the remaining total amount available for postwar needs of the Armed Forces was approximately $48,000,000,000. Most of this money has gone toward payment of maintenance costs. The cold war has been primarily a maintenance operation. Occupation of conquered countries required by international law has been expensive. Then, there has been the necessity for incurring special costs which cropped up when our Navy was sent to various parts of the world in the interests of preserving peace and when we were suddenly compelled to undertake special operations such as the Berlin airlift.

This is the breakdown of the distribution of such costs:

	Billions of dollars	Percent
Military personnel costs (pay, food, clothing, etc.)	19.86	41.0
Maintenance and operation (aircraft, ships, installations, etc.)	12.78	26.4
Major procurement (weapons, planes, ships, etc.)	8.53	17.6
Research and development	2.25	4.6
Civilian components (National Guard and Reserves)	1.86	3.8
Service-wide administration and classified projects	1.39	2.9
Retired pay	.78	1.6
Military public works	.49	1.0
Mobilization and war readiness	.39	0.8
Other	.11	0.2
Total	48.44	100.0

This breakdown indicates that two of each five defense dollars were spent on military personnel costs such as pay, food, clothing, and transportation.

One and one-quarter of each five defense dollars went for overhead costs such as maintenance and operation of aircraft, ships, installations, and other such necessary expenses.

This means that substantially more than half of our defense outlay—approximately $3.25 from each $5 was paid out just to keep our manpower fed, clothed, housed, paid, and our equipment maintained.

One of each five defense dollars has been spent for such essential activities as research and development on new weapons, maintenance of the National Guard and Reserves, administrative work and classified projects such as the atomic-bomb tests, retired pay, military public works, planning for mobilization and war readiness, and other such work.

Less than one dollar of each five defense dollars, approximately 75 cents, has been used to procure weapons, ships, and planes.

These figures are rounded and approximate, but they tell the story of where the money has been spent for military purposes in the last 5 years.

Sincerely,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

The Peekskill Incidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I extend my remarks by including herein the presentment of the October 1949 grand jury of Westchester County, N. Y., dated June 12, 1950, on the so-called Peekskill Communist riots on August 27 and September 4, 1949:

PRESENTMENT OF THE OCTOBER 1949 GRAND JURY OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY—THE PEEKSKILL INCIDENTS

(Supreme Court of the State of New York, county of Westchester. In the matter of the investigation of certain alleged incidents in the town of Cortlandt and elsewhere in the said county of Westchester on August 27 and September 4, 1949.)

To the Supreme Court of the State of New York held in and for the county of Westchester:

The October 1949 grand jury respectfully presents and reports to this court as follows:

This grand jury was impanelled for the October 1949 term of this court and was charged on October 3, 1949, by Hon. James W. Bailey, justice of the supreme court, "To conduct an investigation into the unfortunate disorder which accompanied the assemblage of a certain communistic group in the vicinity of Peekskill on August 27 and September 4 last." The charge related to two concerts in the town of Cortlandt on said dates at which Paul Robeson was to sing.

As a further part of his charge to the jury, Justice Bailey read the following portion from a statement by the Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, in which he directed a grand jury investigation:

"I have instructed the district attorney of Westchester County, in addition to completing the investigation of the incidents of August 27, to make a complete, unlimited, and exhaustive grand jury investigation of all of the incidents which occurred, including the following:

"All the disorders which broke out after the meeting of September 4, and whether these disorders were the result of organized planning on the part of any individual or group.

"Whether the meeting was initiated and sponsored for the purpose of deliberately inciting disorder and a breach of the peace, and

"Whether it was part of the Communist strategy to foment racial and religious hatred."

Governor Dewey's statement also directed that the investigation consider:

"Whether the Communist-led guard forces are a quasi-military force."

This grand jury had been drawn in the regular course from the panel of grand jurors to serve as the regular grand jury for the October 1949 term, but was not directed to devote itself exclusively to these incidents.

SCOPE OF INQUIRY

Since being impanelled in October, the grand jury has held 46 morning sessions and 22 afternoon sessions; 247 witnesses have been heard and examined and some of these have been recalled for reexamination from time to time as occasion required. The witnesses have included officials of New York State and Westchester County, members of the police departments of New York State, Westchester County, and local communities, representatives of the Westchester County sheriff's office, organizers and supporters of the Robeson concerts, officers and members of various veteran organizations, residents of the city of Peekskill and the town of Cortlandt and its vicinity, and a large number of persons who were present on one or both of the occasions under investigation, either as concert-goers or as onlookers, some of whom sustained either property damage or personal injury. Witnesses were also heard who were especially competent to discuss the ideological, racial, and social issues that may have been involved.

All persons who requested to be heard by the grand jury were given such an opportunity, and their testimony was taken at great length, even though this proved frequently repetitious.

The leaders of the veterans' organizations who testified waived immunity in addition to all Westchester County officials and New York State Police officials. All persons who made arrangements for or who were actively connected with sponsoring the concerts, including officials of certain Communist-dominated unions which supported the concert of September 4, 1949, who were called to testify, refused to waive immunity.

In the course of its investigations, the grand jury had called to its attention certain reports on the disturbances in the town of Cortlandt on August 27 and September 4 which had been prepared and released by private organizations. To make certain that no evidence was overlooked which might be material to a complete investigation and understanding of these affairs, the grand jury examined the investigators who prepared them; and many persons mentioned therein who had not already served as witnesses.

The testimony taken by this grand jury amounts to more than 5,500 pages.

In addition to the witnesses, voluminous documentary evidence was examined, including still photographs, motion pictures, maps of the area, certain relevant newspaper matter, telegrams and letters, police records, and posters and circulars relating to the concerts.

The "incidents of August 27" and "the disorders which broke out after the meeting of September 4" arose from attempts that were made by certain Communist-dominated groups to hold concerts at which the baritone Paul Robeson was to be the principal attraction. These concerts were staged for the benefit of the Civil Rights Congress, a group organized for and serving solely the interests of communism. The concert planned for August 27, 1949, was prevented from being held by persons hostile to Paul Robeson and his Communist associates. Elaborate precautions were taken to prevent interference with the second concert, and it was held on September 4 with Paul Robeson singing as scheduled. On August 27 a substantial number of persons interested in attending gained admittance to the concert grounds in the expectation that Robeson would appear. A much larger number of persons attended the concert held on September 4. At both the affair scheduled for August 27 and the concert held on September 4, certain disorders and violence occurred resulting in serious injury to various individuals and damage to personal property.

The investigation into these matters has now been completed and the grand jury herewith submits its report.

In order to understand the nature of and underlying causes for the disturbances on August 27 and September 4, it is necessary to have a concept of the character of the community in which these events occurred.

Both the incidents of August 27 and September 4 took place in the town of Cortlandt, Westchester County, N. Y. Cortlandt lies approximately 40 miles north of New York City on the east bank of the Hudson River and has a year-round population of about 15,000 people spread over an area of 42 square miles. Adjacent to it, but not a legal part of it, is the incorporated city of Peekskill with 18,000 residents.

Each summer the year-round population of this region is augmented by large numbers of summer residents and vacationists. To Cortlandt and the adjacent town of Yorktown alone come approximately 20,000 persons, and for this entire area of the mid-Hudson River Valley, the number of summer residents is estimated as high as 50,000. A large majority of these people come from New York City.

Many of these people settle in so-called colonies, located at various points outside Peekskill. Over the years these colonies have developed their own community interests and activities and to a large extent have led a life apart from that of the local residents. There are active minorities of Communists and Communist sympathizers in some of these colonies.

In addition there are Communist-supported camps in the area and adjoining counties which accommodate another large segment of the summer population. Camp Beacon, the largest of these, accommodating up to 1,400 persons at one time, lies about 17 miles north of Peekskill. A dozen or more other Communist camps are located within 40 or 50 miles of Peekskill. Differing from the colonies with their individually owned homes, the camps are organizations, incorporated in some instances, which provide living accommodations for large numbers of people, central dining rooms, and the usual recreation facilities of the summer resort. On the surface these would seem to have no different purpose from that of the many hotels and resorts which are found throughout this popular vacation area. Others are set up as sponsored by labor or fraternal organizations.

These camps, however, constitute important units in the Communist organization, offering inexpensive vacation facilities, but serving also as recruiting and indoctrination centers and in some cases as training schools for the Communist Party. Except at certain times the camps are open to anyone regardless of affiliations but it is interesting to note that their advertising is concentrated in the pages of the Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party. Their general atmosphere and their daily programs are openly and aggressively pro-Communist. Week-end guests of honor and speakers, as announced in the Daily Worker, include many nationally known leaders of the Communist Party. After Labor Day certain of these camps become schools secretly offering to selected groups of Communist Party members intensive training in Marxism, Leninism and methods of overthrowing the United States Government.

The Communists are using these camps as recruiting and training grounds and as potential centers of militant party action when occasion requires. Any attempt to understand fully the background of the incidents under investigation should take into account this record of Communist activities in the area.

The plans and sponsorship for the concert of August 27, 1949, were similar to those for concerts held previously in the area and were designed to appeal to the same public which had supported such gatherings in prior years. In the years 1946, 1947, and 1948 organizations known to be Communist-dominated sponsored concerts featuring Paul Robeson as the principal singer. These were held at Lake Mohegan, in the city of Peekskill, and near Peekskill respectively. These concerts were supported actively by residents of the colonies and camps and attracted audiences numbering up to 4,000 people. No disturbances developed on any of these occasions.

Those interested in holding a Paul Robeson concert in 1949 were repeating a pattern which was developing into an annual custom of staging some "cultural" event to financially aid some Communist purpose.

Publicity about the concert was released through the Daily Worker and the Compass. Local supporters of the concert in the Cortlandt area sold tickets and promoted attendance among their friends. The concert was to be open to anyone who cared to buy a ticket. This was all in general accord with the pattern which was followed in previous years.

The acts and statements of Paul Robeson during 1949 and the growing awareness on the part of the American people of the inherent dangers of communism to the United States were the underlying causes of the outbreak of the disorders in Cortlandt on the evening of August 27, 1949.

In the months prior to August 1949, revelations of Communist activity in the United States focused public attention on this threat to our system of government. The investigations by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the lists of subversive organizations released by the Attorney General of the United States, the trial of the 11 Communists before Judge Medina, the Hiss trial, the Coplon trial, the disclosure of a Communist spy ring in the United States and Canada intent on obtaining military secrets of the highest importance, and general publicity about communistic activities in the Nation's press all tended to create a background of distrust and resentment by loyal Americans against Communists and their supporters.

More specifically, Paul Robeson himself had been quoted widely in the Nation's press in statements derogatory to his native land and favorable to Communist Russia. These statements, quickly challenged by other prominent Negroes, served to emphasize in the public mind Robeson's position as a Communist leader. Thus Paul Robeson in 1949 became a symbol of communism itself.

The cumulative effect of these events was a definite resentment against Robeson's appearance in the town of Cortlandt in August and September 1949 and this resentment was the basic cause of the violence which developed.

The disorders on August 27 were not the result of organized planning on the part of any individual or group. This conclusion is based on a full study of testimony and evidence relating to the events and actions during the week preceding August 27, including local newspaper publicity and the organization of a protest parade.

Prior to 1949 the Peekskill Evening Star, which is the only daily newspaper in the area, gave only a minimum of news coverage and no editorial comment to the several Robeson concerts described above. In 1949, however, when it became known that a fourth Robeson concert was scheduled, the Star devoted considerable space to the approaching affair in both its news and editorial columns and, in addition, printed letters from subscribers, some supporting and some opposing the concert.

The following editorial appeared on the front page of the Star on August 23:

"THE DISCORDANT NOTE

"It appears that Peekskill is to be 'treated' to another concert visit by Paul Robeson, renowned Negro baritone.

"Time was when the honor would have been ours—all ours. As things stand today, like most folks who put America first, we're a little doubtful of that honor, finding the luster in the once illustrious name of Paul Robeson now almost hidden by political tarnish.

"Paul Robeson rose to preeminence as an American artist on stage and radio, and was applauded by an America that was oblivious to his color. In spite of modest background, he rose with highest academic honors through our college system, and was chosen an All-American football star.

"His magnificent voice, which thrilled millions, opened up a brilliant career for him that easily could have led to a place in the halls of American fame. His influence with his people, properly directed, could have won a place for him beside Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver, as truly great Negro Americans.

"Any possibility of such attainment is now, in the opinion of most Americans, lost to him forever.

"The local concert will be held this coming Saturday at the Lakeland Acres Picnic Grounds. The singer is being presented by the People's Artists 'for the benefit of the Harlem Chapter, Civil Rights Congress,' according to posters appearing in the neighborhood. Inasmuch as the Civil Rights Congress has been cited as 'subversive and Communist' by Attorney General Tom Clark, and has been referred to by the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities as being 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party,' it becomes evident that every ticket purchased for the Peekskill concert will drop nickels and dimes into the till basket of an un-American political organization.

"If the Robeson 'concert' this Saturday follows the pattern of its predecessors, it will consist of an unsavory mixture of song and political talk by one who has described Russia as his 'second motherland,' and who has avowed 'the greatest contempt for the democratic press.'

"The time for tolerant silence that signifies approval is running out. Peekskill wants no rallies that support iron curtains, concentration camps, blockades, and NKVD's, no matter how masterful the decor, nor how sweet the music."

The full effect and significance of this publicity in the Star cannot be established clearly, but this grand jury believes that it served to bring to the surface and intensify the latent resentment against communism which already existed in the community. There is no evidence, however, that this publicity was intended to incite disorders or that it led to organized planning of disorders on the part of any individual or group.

The veterans of Peekskill and the surrounding area decided to hold a protest parade along Hillside Avenue in front of the grounds that had been chosen for the concert. The grand jury finds no evidence that it was organized for any purpose other than the expressed one of an orderly protest against communism.

The plans made by the police authorities for policing the concert scheduled for August 27 were adequate in the light of previous experience and reasonably foreseeable expectancies.

The town of Cortlandt does not maintain a police force and has only one constable whose duties are limited to service of civil process. So the town officials on August 26 requested the sheriff, the principal law enforcement officer of the county, to assign a few men to the scene and also requested the State police, who patrol the area, to assign a couple of men to handle traffic. The sheriff thereupon assigned three deputies, and on August 27, the captain of the State police assigned two uniformed troopers to handle traffic at the main intersection nearest the concert grounds, three plain clothesmen to the scene, and a reserve force of 18 troopers to be held at the Putnam Valley substation, this being the headquarters covering the Cortlandt area. Westchester County had a long history of orderliness and similar Robeson concerts had been held in preceding years without violence. In the light of their experience the precautions taken by those peace officers met the standard of good police procedure.

Telegrams signed by a group of persons interested in having the concert proceed without interruption were first published in the newspaper, and then sent to certain officials in the county and State, being received on August 26. Although the signers of the telegram lived in the area and were aware that it was patrolled by the State police, they failed to contact either the State police or the sheriff of Westchester County.

Early on the evening of August 27 the deputies and State police went to the scene as ordered. About 200 persons were already within the concert grounds, which was an open field, whose entrance was a dirt road leading from Hillside Avenue, the main highway. When the parade started a large number of local residents, including women, young girls, and families with their young children, were along both sides of the road and some of these had parked cars just off the highway. The parade was orderly and without violence. While it was taking place, heckling and name calling went on between the Robeson followers gathered at the entrance and the crowd of onlookers, with some of the marchers joining in.

More than 2,000 people were expected for the concert and of this number about 200 had arrived by 7:30 p. m. A half hour later no further admission to the grounds by car was possible because of the parade, the congestion caused by concertgoers, and general traffic along Hillside Avenue to and from Peekskill. This highway is two lanes in width, one for traffic in each direction.

The veterans marched and countermarched past the entrance to the grounds on Hillside Avenue. At its conclusion the leaders ordered the marchers to disperse and return home. It was then between 8:15 p. m. and 8:30 p. m.

At this time it was dark and various persons had gone part way down the dirt road leading into the concert grounds. The parade being over, they were joined by spectators, curiosity seekers, and individual veterans. As this group advanced down the narrow road the concertgoers brought a truck up from the concert area and parked it across the road at a culvert about 100 yards from the entrance to the concert grounds at Hillside Avenue. Some 25 or 30 of the concertgoers, some wearing arm bands, indicating they were ushers or guards, formed a defense line in front of the truck in order to prevent the oncoming crowd from going further.

As time passed various individual arguments ensued between members of the two groups, various epithets were hurled back and forth, fist fights took place, and stones were hurled indiscriminately by both factions. Some veterans, nonveterans, and concertgoers were injured. While the two groups faced each other on the dirt road near the culvert one of the veterans was stabbed by one of the so-called ushers associated with the sponsors of the concert. This injured veteran was carried to Hillside Avenue where large numbers of spectators learned that he had been stabbed. Up to this point the deputy sheriffs on duty at and near the culvert had been successful in preventing serious disorders and in keeping the two groups from coming together in a manner threatening widespread violence. It was then about 8:30 p. m. The news that a veteran had been stabbed spread rapidly among the hundreds of people along Hillside Avenue, who became enraged at the Robeson followers. This stabbing provided the spark which converted all of these people into an unruly crowd determined to prevent the concert from being staged. When this crowd pushed down the dirt road to join those already there, the concert guards retreated, and the crowd ran down to the concert area and broke up some of the chairs and burned folders containing blank checks, containers, and other forms relating to donations. Some of the containers were clearly marked as having been used to solicit funds for the Lenin memorial. A deputy sheriff succeeded in preventing further serious trouble by turning off the floodlights which illuminated the stage area.

During this time a large wooden cross was burned on a nearby hill. This was an unfortunate prank by a few teen-age boys and had no relation to the Ku Klux Klan or any other antisocial or antireligious organization; nor was it connected in any way with the veterans' organizations.

The dirt road, particularly from the culvert to the highway, was still crowded. One of the deputy sheriffs had earlier left the grounds and called the sheriff's office to send all available deputies from the jail and any who could be reached at their homes throughout the county. Believing that this force would soon arrive, that deputy ordered those of the concertgoers who had gone to their cars, parked near the stage, not to go up this road. Some of the drivers, disregarding or not hearing this order, started up the dirt road and the first of these attempted to speed through the crowd. Boulders and timbers were thrown across this road, and some of the cars were stoned. Eight were halted, their occupants ordered out, and the cars overturned. All efforts to leave the grounds ceased. In a few minutes the sirens of the arriving State police cars were heard and the crowd scattered. Together with the first few of the additional deputy sheriffs this force began to restore order. By 10 o'clock the police forces under the command of the captain of the State police and of the sheriff totaled 23 State troopers and 21 deputy sheriffs and complete order was restored.

This force threw a protective cordon around the concertgoers, escorted those with cars to the highway, and arranged for transportation for those who had come from New York City and other places in the county outside the Cortlandt area.

All of the car owners and all of the concertgoers known to be injured were given an opportunity to testify. None has been able to identify his assailant. With the exception of the stabbed veteran and one concertgoer, no others were seriously injured.

THE INCIDENTS OF SEPTEMBER 4, 1949

The concert of September 4 was planned by the Communist Party to take full advantage of the events of August 27 and as a demonstration of the power of its supporters to hold a meeting in a hostile area.

The leaders of the Communist Party in the New York area went far beyond a reasonable protest of the events of August 27. They used the situation as a means of obtaining sympathy and support for their activities and as an opportunity for stirring up religious and racial issues. Furthermore, they organized a tremendous demonstration of strength in which for the first time they used, on a large scale, their "goon squads," organized as a security guard.

On August 28 a large rally was held in Katonah in Westchester County at which speakers from various Communist-controlled organizations in New York City and Westchester County described the events of the night before and stirred up interest in holding another concert. On August 29, the officers of the Communist-controlled fur workers unions issued a joint statement urging a second concert and pledging to defend and support one—a pledge which was fulfilled with men and money. On August 30 Paul Robeson addressed a mammoth rally in Harlem in which he stated that "From now on we take the offensive" and that he would bring his own protection with him on his return to Peekskill. On September 1, announcement was made by People's Artists, Inc., of New York City which was the sponsor of the August 27 concert, and by the group in Westchester County who were interested in the first affair, that Paul Robeson would return on September 4 to sing at the former Hollow Brook Country Club, about a mile from the scene of the first proposed concert.

The Daily Worker called for a gigantic turn-out. It listed automobile routes to the concert and also eight points in Manhattan where chartered busses would be available. Specific locations and times of departure were given for members of the

Communist-dominated United Office and Professional Workers Union, Local 65 of the Wholesale Warehouse Workers Union, and the International Fur and Leather Workers Union. In its editorial which appeared on September 3, the Daily Worker called for attendance by at least 20,000.

In accordance with the statements of Paul Robeson a security guard consisting of several thousand men was provided by the concert organizers. Plans were adopted for transporting this guard to the grounds in busses chartered for the purpose and in private cars. Thus the Communist led forces prepared themselves to hold their meeting in an area which was antagonistic to their reappearance.

It was part of the Communist strategy in connection with the September 4 concert to foment racial and religious hatred. During the week before September 4, the Daily Worker repeatedly emphasized that the August 27 incident was wholly anti-Semitic and anti-Negro. Mass meetings held in Westchester County and New York City under Communist auspices reiterated this same charge. National and local leaders of the Communist Party in statements and speeches used such phrases as "an attack on minority groups led by the Ku Klux Klan," "Anti-Semitism and Negro baiting." Robeson made the usual Communist attempt to ally the party with Negroes and Jews as the likely victim "if the Fascist-inspired prowar forces win." A leaflet emphasizing the alleged "anti-Negro and anti-Semitic Lynch Mob" was distributed by the Civil Rights Congress, the American Labor Party, the Tenants Council, and the Communist Party, which outlined the locale of the concert, directions for autoists, and locations for interested persons to board buses to be provided. .

In Harlem a poster was distributed reading "People of Harlem * * * the Ku Klux Klan held a lynching party in Peekskill yesterday." The Communist Civil Rights Congress issued a news letter entitled "Stop the anti-Negro terror."

The testimony before the grand jury shows that more than 2,500 men were assembled at the concert as the security guard. They came from Brooklyn, Manhattan, the Bronx, Long Island, from Westchester and from Communist camps located in other counties. About 300 men assembled at 5 a. m. near Communist Party headquarters in Brooklyn. A leader and his aides divided them into groups which filled nine busses. Most of these men carried baseball bats. The men were a strong-arm group and made up a part of a "security guard" charged with the responsibility of protecting the concert area. On the trip to the town of Cortlandt Communist songs were sung and threats were made against the veterans whom they blamed for the disorders of the previous week. In excess of 1,000 men were transported to the former Hollow Brook Country Club in this manner. Other groups came in private cars and helped make up the "security guard" of over 2,500 men.

Although the concert was scheduled for 2:30 p. m. most of these men reached the grounds before midmorning. Their leader wore the uniform of a United States lieutenant. They were stationed in military formation, shoulder to shoulder, in two huge circles, one circle around the perimeter of the concert grounds, another inner circle with a third ring around the stage area itself. This force remained in position for from 8 to 10 hours. They were armed with baseball bats, bottles, pepper, and can openers.

When the police arrived on the scene in the morning and saw the situation, they called the leader and demanded the surrender of the weapons from the security guard. Some 30 bats were surrendered, but the rest were concealed within the concert grounds. The police decided not to force the guards to relinquish the remaining weapons lest such action provoke serious trouble.

This was the first time that the Communists had disclosed their organized and militant forces on so large a scale in the Nation. These forces, usually described by their leaders as "defensive and protective," have been used many times on lesser occasions and in smaller numbers in an offensive and aggressive manner.

The Communist use of small groups, commonly known as "goon squads," for intimidation, coercion, and incitement of trouble has been frequently revealed in industrial strife, race riots, and other social disorders in this country. What the American people had not hitherto witnessed was a full-scale demonstration of the power of the Communists to mobilize their militant forces quickly and in sufficient strength to constitute a potential challenge to the authority of government. The concert of September 4 supplied the opportunity for such a demonstration.

The security guard was a disciplined force and conducted itself in a military manner under the direction of leaders as a quasi-military force, but did not come within the definition of a "military company or organization" set forth in the military law of the State of New York.

While the security guards provided by sponsors of the concert were prepared to use force if necessary, they conducted themselves in an orderly and peaceful manner, with the exception of two incidents within the concert grounds which necessitated minor police action.

The veterans groups of Peekskill and its neighboring towns planned another protest parade on the road leading past the entrance to the concert grounds. This parade was held according to plan without serious incident and at its conclusion, the commander ordered the colors furled and the marchers were directed to return home.

Widespread publicity arising from the violence on August 27 and the feeling created by the stabbing of a veteran on that occasion attracted thousands of spectators who lined the road during the parade and remained in the area after its conclusion.

Although violence did break out after the concert this did not result from planning or organization on the part of any individual or groups or people to incite or foster such disturbances.

It was obvious to the Westchester County authorities that if the concert planned for September 4 was to be as tremendous a demonstration as was being promised in New York by Paul Robeson and his followers, a severe traffic problem would be created on the few narrow roads leading to the concert area. Furthermore, it was apparent that the campaign of hate being whipped up by Communist propagandists and the establishment of their own security guards on the scene in close proximity to the parading veterans organizations could provide the setting for a full-scale riot. The police authorities took every precaution and did all that they could within their powers to ensure proper and adequate policing at the September 4 concert.

The authorities decided to use none but trained and uniformed police. In addition to the State police regularly located in Westchester County, the Governor of New York, at the request of Westchester County authorities, ordered all available members of the force from other areas to be present. Arrangements were further made for half of the Westchester County Parkway police to be transferred from their regular duties on the busy Labor Day week end. All deputy sheriffs, except those needed at the jails, the sheriff's emergency force, and volunteers from the police departments of 31 municipalities of the county were also directed to be on hand.

Finally, the Peekskill police and auxiliaries were assigned to duty within that city and on its highways up to the northern boundary about 2 miles from the concert grounds. Fifty Putnam County police and deputy sheriffs were patrolling that county and its highways about 2 miles north of the concert scene.

Altogether 904 experienced police officers were on duty covering the concert area and its environs on September 4.

Prior to the day of the concert, the authorities responsible for policing the affair studied the terrain, chose the position for a command post and drew up a plan for disposition of the police forces. A helicopter was chartered to observe and report conditions from the air; a State police radio-equipped trailer, radio police cars, walkie-talkies, and loud-speakers were provided. Preparations were made to have at the scene a field hospital, staffed by a doctor and three nurses, and two ambulances; also such emergency equipment as fire trucks, wrecking units, portable flood lights, and generators.

In contrast to the affair of August 27, the concert announced for September 4 was held as planned. An audience of over 15,000 people assembled at the scheduled time and place, having entered the concert grounds under police protection, and listened to a program of music and speaking without interference.

During this time veteran groups paraded on the nearby highway approximately one-fourth of a mile from the concert stage in protest against communism as represented by the concert's sponsors and participants. The parade was conducted in an orderly manner. Only one individual created a disturbance by riding a horse into the entrance, but he was immediately stopped by police and arrested. At its close the marshal ordered the veteran to return home.

Crowds of spectators, estimated at more than 5,000, lined the highway past the entrance to the concert grounds. Many of these were women and teen-age boys and girls. Their attitude toward the concert-goers was indicated by booing and cries of "Commies!" and "Go back to Russia!" and similar epithets, including isolated and anti-Semitic and anti-Negro expressions. The concertgoers in turn shouted derogatory remarks at the spectators. Nothing developed to interfere with access to the concert and all who wished to attend were able to do so.

Whatever the potentials for disorder at this time, the police were able to maintain order and to prevent interference with the concert.

The New York State troopers, Westchester County Parkway police, deputy sheriffs and the police from the various municipalities of the county were assembled and organized into a single effective policing unit. Many of the police served voluntarily and all of them did so at great personal risk, and since they were serving outside of their communities, they were not protected in their pension rights, if they were disabled on that occasion. Most of the local police had been on duty from midnight to 8 a. m. and then all day at Cortlandt and had to return to their respective homes and go on duty again from midnight to 8 a. m.—a stretch of 32 hours without rest of any kind. All of the State police from upstate had to drive home the night of September 4, some as far as the Canadian border, and go on duty on Labor Day, September 5, without any rest. One of the State troopers received a deep gash in the skull from a thrown rock.

At the conclusion of the concert a heavy concentration of police moved the crowd back from the only exit and cars started to leave the grounds. A short distance away the first group of about a dozen cars was stoned by hostile spectators. A mobile squad was immediately rushed to that point, the area

cleared and traffic rerouted. No further incidents occurred near the exit.

The terrain in the Cortlandt area is hilly and wooded and in many places along the roads there are high wooded banks from which stones could be hurled without detection. Some hoodlums were arrested on the spot and are being prosecuted but under the circumstances it was not possible for even the large police force on the scene to apprehend all of those guilty of stone throwing. Most of the stonings took place within a mile or two of the concert grounds but some occurred miles away. Stonings occurred as far away as Tarrytown, approximately 20 miles from the point where the police were required to be concentrated.

Some of the marchers and some of the spectators had heard the master of ceremonies refer to the veterans as "un-American filth." This remark inflamed many who heard it.

Orders had been issued to the police forces lining the roads to keep the concertgoers and spectators apart at all costs. To make certain that no one broke through their lines, the police were told to stand their ground and not to leave their posts. This strategy necessarily enabled hoodlum elements in some instances within sight of the police, to harass and stone cars and busses leaving the concert area. Nevertheless, had those in charge of the policing not followed this plan, more serious violence, and possibly mass killings, might well have occurred.

When reports of stonings came in to emergency headquarters by phone, walkie-talkie or by radio from the helicopter, squads in police cars were dispatched to the trouble points. Arrests were made in some cases, and in others the culprits fled as the police cars approached.

Most of the security guards maintained their positions for hours after the concert. Hundreds of them were in the grounds until long after dark. This made it necessary to keep a large force of police in the immediate vicinity of the concert grounds at a time when they were also needed along the roads.

Many persons riding in cars and busses suffered bodily injury as a result of these stonings. Some people were hurt critically. Nine members of the police forces were also injured. In addition three private automobiles were overturned at points located a mile or more from the concert grounds. One of those responsible has been indicted by a previous grand jury, and criminal proceedings were instituted against 10 others arrested by police along the highways.

As the afternoon drew to a close, there was great confusion in the concert area. Many of the bus drivers deserted their vehicles. Some of these busses were later driven by qualified drivers chosen from the concertgoers.

By 6 o'clock most of the concertgoers had left the area. The remaining members of the security guard started to leave in private cars and busses. On the way out of the grounds one of the guards swung at a policeman with a baseball bat. Thereupon all remaining cars and busses were stopped and their occupants were searched for weapons. More than 200 baseball bats and many tire irons and bottles were confiscated. Then this group was permitted to proceed.

As darkness approached approximately 700 of the security guard who were stranded without transportation gathered and demanded permission to march in a body to Mohegan Colony about 2 miles distant. Permission was refused and the group was taken there under police escort in busses commandeered for that purpose and driven by regular drivers under orders as deputy sheriffs. The concert area was finally cleared at about 10: 30 p. m.

The plans for policing the concert of September 4 were well executed in the light of the circumstances which existed, and, moreover, the police did not use any more force than was justified in the emergency, and in the tense, inflammable situation which confronted them.

GENERAL FINDING AND CONCLUSIONS OF THIS INVESTIGATION

The previous sections of this report have been devoted specifically to presenting the findings and conclusions of the grand jury with respect to the charge made to it by the Honorable James W. Bailey, justice of the supreme court, and the statement directing the investigation made by the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York.

In addition, the jury has made certain findings and conclusions of a general character which either relate directly to the events which transpired in the town of Cortlandt on August 27 and September 4 or are considered pertinent to the investigation. This section of the report, therefore, will be devoted to a presentation of such findings and conclusions.

1. While this grand jury was engaged in its investigation, the American Civil Liberties Union undertook to make public what it described as a report of violence in Peekskill and which purported to be an accurate description of the two incidents which occurred in the town of Cortlandt. Definite conclusions as to these affairs were included. The report was signed also by several other national organizations, but it was initiated and prepared by the American Civil Liberties Union. A copy of the report was sent by the director of the American Civil Liberties Union to the foreman of this grand jury in the early stages of this investigation.

When the report was submitted, the grand jury undertook to conduct a thorough inquiry into its text, sources of information, and conclusions in order to make certain that no evidence pertinent to the grand jury's investigation might be overlooked.

Testimony by the investigators of the American Civil Liberties Union revealed that the inquiry was based from the start on a biased assumption as to the underlying cause of the disorders. An examination of the report itself indicated that gossip, rumors, and unverified stories of prejudiced persons were accepted as evidence in support of this premise, while competent testimony which did not support it was rejected. A careful checking of certain statements quoted in the report and the descriptions of certain incidents therein proves them to be inaccurate as to the facts and grossly misleading in the implications conveyed.

Inasmuch as the American Civil Liberties Union has considerable influence on a large number of persons, this grand jury feels an obligation to point out the flimsy foundation upon which the report was based. Much of its text and some of its conclusions are so far from the truth as to be scandalous.

The wide distribution of its report by the American Civil Liberties Union and the resulting press publicity can hardly have failed to obscure rather than clarify public understanding of the real nature and significance of these incidents. Thus the Communists were supplied with an effective propaganda weapon, ideally suited to their technique of using exaggerated social tensions, false issues, and confused liberal thinking to conceal, while at the same time furthering, their real purposes.

2. The grand jury is convinced that the violence which developed on both occasions at the town of Cortlandt was basically neither anti-Semitic nor anti-Negro in character. Despite the surface indications of racial and religious prejudice in some of the epithets hurled at the concertgoers, it is clear from the evidence that the fundamental cause of resentment and the focus of hostility was communism.

The two parades of the veterans, in each of which the local post of the Jewish War Veterans voluntarily participated, were conceived and executed as protests against communism, and communism alone.

Scurrilous anti-Semitic pamphlets and stickers found in the area on September 4 were traced to the activities of two professional anti-Semites from other parts of the State and were not distributed or posted by the veterans or local residents. The attempts of these two to give out the literature was stopped by veterans and spectators who resented their activities, and who drove them from the concert area. The public boasts of one of these linking himself with the veterans are not true to the facts.

To the extent that community resentment centered in Paul Robeson, it was directed against him not as a Negro but as one whose reported acts and utterances identified him in the public mind as a leading proponent of communism.

Notwithstanding these facts, the Communist Party lost no time in exploiting this situation for its own purposes. As described in an earlier section of this report, every weapon of Communist propaganda was immediately put into action after the August 27 incident in order to build up a false picture of racial and religious hatred at Cortlandt.

By this barrage of condemnation and protest over anti-Semitism, Negro-baiting, and Ku Klux violence, to which the incident of September 4 gave fresh impetus, the Communists succeeded in diverting attention from the simple fact that hatred of communism itself lay at the root of the disorders.

All of this followed the usual Communist strategy, in line with the official instructions laid down by Moscow. The present instance is important in revealing how quickly and skillfully the Communists can seize on any civil disturbance and by distortion and misrepresentation twist it into a "cause" with which to rally their own front organizations and at the same time enlist the sympathy and support of outside individuals and groups.

3. This jury cannot condemn too strongly the un-American, unwarranted, and lawless acts of violence which took place at Cortlandt on August 27 and September 4. That such crimes were committed against persons sympathetic to the cause of communism does not excuse the acts in the slightest.

Their perpetrators are to be censured in the strongest manner as having caused serious injury to the best interests of the community and of the United States.

These disorders were materially beneficial to the cause of communism. Avowed Communists, fellow travelers, and left-wing sympathizers are not turned from their beliefs by such demonstrations of violence. The Communist cause undoubtedly gained sympathizers among many who sincerely resented the disorderly acts on both occasions.

In addition the situation which was created at Cortlandt gave the Communists propaganda material which could not have been more perfect had they designed it for themselves. The disorders and violence were publicized throughout the world at a time when this country was engaged in a world-wide effort on the diplomatic front to maintain and win over adherents to the side of democracy.

It is tragic that the type of behavior which loyal Americans find repugnant in communism was resorted to by misguided patriotic citizens as a protest against communism.

Unfortunately only a few of the perpetrators of these acts at both the August 27 and September 4 affairs were arrested and prosecuted for their crimes. At the August 27 incident the disorders were committed in the darkness when the law enforcement officers present already had their hands full controlling the mob, and observation was difficult. On September 4 the police could not chase and capture all the culprits because of the necessity of maintaining assigned positions and of keeping the opposing groups apart in order to prevent mass violence.

Since that time the authorities have made a determined effort to identify those who committed crimes through a mass of photographs and by questioning a large number of individuals. These efforts, on the whole, have proved fruitless. In a few instances, the lack of credible corroborative evidence has made indictments impossible.

Patriotic and loyal Americans, both as individuals and as groups, must be on the alert against being drawn into Communist traps which may be set for the purpose of inviting situations that might encourage violence. Throughout the county of Westchester and the Nation, responsible local organizations such as churches, schools, professional, and business associations, veterans' organizations and other civic groups should actively discourage their members from being present when affairs sponsored by subversive groups are being held.

In addition, local officers should be given sufficient authority to permit them to exercise the widest discretion in preventing the development of conditions which might result in an outbreak of violence.

4. It is a part of the Communist strategy to create a distrust of public officials by distortion and magnification of incidents such as these, and also to bring about incidents to harass those officials and distract them from their functions of serving the community. This grand jury believes that all police officials of and in Westchester County are able and ready to fulfill their obligations to all citizens to the limit of their available manpower. But if the situation of September 4 should recur, there are not enough police available to cover the roads and bordering fields in a rural area. To deputize untrained persons is not the answer. This grand jury respectfully suggests to the officials of the county and the State that liaison be established and plans made now to handle any future incident, and that State guard units numbering thousands of uniformed men, trained in riot duty, be made available to supplement local and State police.

5. Two methods for meeting the threat of communism are apparent to this grand jury.

First, legislative bodies should continue to consider appropriate laws to combat the Communist problem. Citizens should keep themselves informed about legislative proposals and should express their opinions in that regard to their duly elected representatives.

Second, education concerning the true purposes and meaning of communism should be undertaken in every community. Many unsuspecting persons are hoodwinked into becoming associated with Communist activities because they are not informed about the real manner in which the party operates. Communists frequently identify themselves with worthy causes and then infiltrate the organizations which have been set up to pursue them. Ultimately, under a cloak of respectability, the Communists use these organizations to follow their own nefarious purposes.

In addition, the Communists often create their own welfare organizations with names that would lead innocent people to lend their support to them believing that they are devoted solely to achieving what appear to be desirable objectives.

This grand jury doubts that the potential risks of having Communist cells in Westchester County are fully appreciated by its residents. Community leaders and local organizations should undertake to make certain that ignorance regarding this movement is dispelled.

6. The grand jury's investigation has shed important light on certain aspects of Communist organization, resources, and purposes as disclosed on August 27 and September 4. The specific actions under study were local to Westchester County and the New York area; what these actions revealed has a far wider significance.

The speed and dexterity with which the Communists organized the demonstration of September 4, assembling with only 3 days of preparation in a rural community 40 miles from New York City an audience of 15,000 people and a security guard of 2,500 men, points to an alert and thoroughly prepared organization. That this organization is not confined to New York City but has its ramifications throughout Westchester County and adjacent areas is clearly established by the evidence relating to both incidents.

Its proximity to New York City makes Westchester County an ideal field of operation for the Communist Party and convincing evidence indicates the existence throughout the county of a network of Communist cells. The camps and colonies referred to earlier in this report constitute larger centers of Communist activity, important both as recruiting and as training sources. These cells, camps, and colonies are well known to all of the police authorities having jurisdiction in Westchester County.

Whatever the number of party members in the county may be, their activities in front organizations and their infiltration into other, entirely reputable, organizations gives them an influence out of all proportion to their actual numbers.

Of chief significance locally is the fact that in Westchester County there are individuals and groups professing an alien ideology controlled by the absolute discipline of the Communist Party, and ready to serve its purposes at any time and in any way. Since the Communist Party is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government by whatever means necessary, including violence, the grand jury is convinced that the presence of these Communist groups in Westchester County constitutes a serious potential menace to the community.

A close study of the concert of September 4 indicates that on that day Westchester County was used by the Communist Party as a proving ground to test its machinery for mobilizing its forces, manipulating public opinion, and, more important, for rehearsing its strong-arm forces.

These strong-arm forces, whose militant strength was revealed in the security guard at Cortlandt, must be recognized for what they are—the shock troops of a revolutionary force which is controlled by a foreign power and committed to methods and ultimate ends incompatible with our constitutional system.

Respectfully submitted.

Howard R. Pugh, Foreman; Philip C. Sayres, Acting Foreman; Charles Adolfson, Clerk; Harold Blakelock, William J. Boyd, George W. Breckwoldt, Henry W. Butterfield, Ernest J. Carruthers, John J. Condon, Harry S. Downey, William J. Grant, Edward L. Greene, R. Curt Hasenclever, Adrian A. Henigson, James Innes, Thomas G. MacLachlan, John A. Mayers, Torry C. Miner, Mrs. Minnie Schupp, Marvin A. Searles, John W. Strasser, Allen S. Wilber, Jurors.

Dated June 12, 1950.

Reservists Face Employment Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended editorial from the September 9, 1950, issue of Armed Force deals eloquently with the problem faced by many citizens because of their membership in the Reserve components:

JOB FOR THE CCPB

Very real—though sometimes hidden—penalties are now being paid by hundreds of thousands of men throughout the Nation because of the mere fact of their membership in civilian component organizations, or because they fall within foreseeable draft-age limits. In many instances, these men are being denied employment or blocked from deserved promotion because of the fear of employers that their tenure in specific jobs may not be sufficient to hire them or advance them.

From the employers' standpoint, a good argument often can be raised to support this reluctance to become involved with employees who may be yanked out of civilian clothes and garbed with a uniform in the near future. This is particularly true with reference to the more desirable, and more remunerative, positions, which generally call for varying degrees of on-the-job training or special skills attainable only by practical experience. In smaller firms, or those less secure financially, vital economic considerations may overrule the employer's latent desire to be unselfishly patriotic.

This is small comfort, however, to the man whose own economic necessity or domestic responsibility demands that he get employment, remain employed, or that he advance his career, and whose progress is blocked by his own patriotic participation in Reserve or National Guard activities. If he happens to be one of several men competing for a coveted job, he cannot avoid a suspicion that his civilian component activity is acting to his detriment.

One tragic aspect of this is that many who are affected by this particular aspect of war psychology may well be never called into service. For some there will be no war-service demand, for others, dependency ties or unsuspected physical deficiencies will make them ineligible. Under the present deferment regulations, however, there will be no way for them to ascertain this until they actually are summoned for active duty.

With full realization of the complex problems faced by the Armed Forces in determining present and future needs, it admittedly would be next to impossible, as matters now stand, to rule in advance on all cases of this sort. With most Reserve policy matter now falling within the purview of the Regular establishments, perhaps a study of the problem, leading to recommendations to ease this situation, could properly be instituted by the Civilian Components Policy Board. This group should, by its very nature, have the most intimate first-hand knowledge of civilian component problems, and perhaps could make room on its agenda for an exploration of the impact on individual welfare of the present type of mobilization.

At the very least, possibly some system could be devised to offer those reasonably sure that they will not become subject to call a chance to find out for certain. It seems logical to presume that some way could

be found to reassure those with chronic disabling ailments, or with insoluble dependency situations, that their eligibilty for service is almost nil. The ordinary hardships inflicted on the individual during war, or even during partial mobilization, are taken for granted, and generally are borne without undue complaint. The CCPB would perform a real service, both to the individual civilian component members and to the Armed Forces, if it could point the way to minimizing unnecessary personal hardships and penalties on the Nation's civilian soldiers.

A Few Highlights of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I shall be returning within a few days to my neighbors and friends in the Second District of Illinois. During the sessions of the Eighty-first Congress I have resided at a hotel across the street from my office, so that desk and bed have been separated by not more than 5 minutes, and this arrangement has enabled me to give the fullest possible measure of my time in an earnest effort to serve at least with industry the men and women whom I have the great honor to represent.

For the many gracious and helpful considerations accorded me by the Speaker and the leadership of the House I am deeply appreciative, the more so because it has been these recognitions that have made it possible for me to serve my constituents better than otherwise would have been the case. My assignment to the Banking and Currency Committee, the only member from Chicago, I accepted as a compliment, not to me, but to the people of the Second District of Illinois, who were so vitally affected by the conditions growing out of the housing shortage.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the sound and constructive housing legislation framed in our committee and enacted by the Eighty-first Congress has been a legislative achievement of major importance. The effect has been reflected in the current home construction figures, which have reached an all-time high.

I shall not be satisfied, however, until we have attained the objective of a decent roof within the means to buy or to rent of every family in America. I was the cosponsor of a bill in the Eighty-first Congress which at least would have started us on the road. This bill would have brought the monthly shelter cost from $90 to $60, a difference of one-third, which with many families in the middle-income group means the difference between having or going without. It was an honest and a practical attempt to bring home ownership under the present high-cost conditions within the reach of many more people. After a hard fight it was defeated on the floor of the House, but only after the real-estate lobby had been forced to its last reserve of pressure. I shall reintroduce this bill in the Eighty-second Congress, and I expect it to pass.

MINIMUM WAGE

During the period when I was Lieutenant Governer of Illinois and chairman of a committee that attracted national attention to the low wages paid to women in employment, many of the clerks then in the fashionable stores of Chicago receiving $5 a week and less, the first State minimum wage laws were passed. This was the beginning of the minimum-wage movement. It was a very happy moment for me when as a Member of the Eighty-first Congress I could vote for a bill that assured the humblest worker in our land a wage of at least 75 cents an hour. The bill was passed and became a law.

PENSIONS FOR THE AGED

Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak only on one other matter. I never have been happy with the provision we make in our industrial society for the aged. We wear out men and women, and when the years come on and they cannot keep the pace and are replaced we make provision for them all too meager. I do not like to think of an aging man or woman, who has given to the world years of service and of toil, suffering all the agonies of trying to eke out an existence on a pittance.

Despite the demands of my office work and attendance at my committee meetings and on the floor of the House I have found the time to attend and participate in every conference since I have been a Member of the Eighty-first Congress and of which I had knowledge, the purpose of which was to hurry the day when every person in the United States on reaching 65 would receive on the first of every month sufficient for not eking out existence but for comfortable living.

I shall continue in the Eighty-second Congress to work for that objective. A comfortable living for all our aged is the required condition of any society which meets the concept of decent people.

SOCIAL SECURITY BROADENED

Among the great achievements of the Eighty-first Congress has been the enactment of the amendments expanding the Nation's social-security system.

The new law extends security in their later years to some 10,000,000 additional Americans. It raises benefits to conform with higher costs of living. Furthermore, it liberalizes eligibility requirements; potential recipients of benefits will not be required to work so many years under social-security coverage as before, and retired workers, survivors, and dependents will be able to earn more money without forfeiting the right to their benefit payments.

These benefits are made to the people not as a matter of charity nor as a public dole, but as their earned right. It must be kept in mind that social security is fundamentally an insurance plan.

BROADER COVERAGE

The 10,000,000 new recipients of social-security benefits are, for the most part, persons who have been self-employed, such as grocers, retail-store and gas-station owners, and life-insurance salesmen—full time. Beginning January 1, 1951, these persons will have the opportunity to earn security in their later life under the social-security system.

Also provided for under the new law are agricultural workers—although farmers, in the strict sense, are not yet included under social security. Included under the term "agricultural worker" are persons engaged in such work as raising livestock or fur animals, processing or delivering crops to storage or to market, doing household work on a farm, and handling fruits and vegetables for commercial firms.

Domestic workers in nonfarm homes will be eligible to join the system next January, as will the following: Federal employees not covered already by a Federal retirement system; State and municipal employees, provided the particular State wishes to enter into an agreement with the Federal Government whereby it will be set forth specifically which groups of employees will be covered under social security—any State or city employee already covered by an existing retirement system will be, of course, ineligible for social security—employees of nonprofit institutions, such as churches, hospitals, and schools, provided the employer agrees to pay his share of the tax contribution; certain full-time traveling salesmen—other than house-to-house—many delivery-truck drivers; and home industrial workers, provided they satisfy certain conditions.

LARGER BENEFITS

Immediately effective is an increase in social-security payments; checks to be mailed out October 3 will offer the recipient, on the average, about 75 percent more than he has been receiving.

The table below shows what the increases will be for an insured wage earner without dependents:

Now	*New law*
$10	$20.00
11	22.00
12	24.00
13	26.00
14	28.00
15	30.00
16	31.70
17	33.20
18	34.50
19	35.70
20	37.00
21	38.50
22	40.20
23	42.20
24	44.50
25	46.50
26	48.30
27	50.00
28	51.50
29	52.80
30	54.00
31	55.10
32	56.20
33	57.20
34	58.20
35	59.20
36	60.20
37	61.20
38	62.20
39	63.10
40	64.00
41	64.90
42	65.80
43	66.70
44	67.60
45	68.50
46	68.50

The table following shows what the increases will be for a retired wage earner and wife:

Now	*New law*
$15.00	$30.00
16.50	33.00
18.00	36.00
19.50	39.00
21.00	42.00
22.50	45.00
24.00	47.55
25.50	49.80
27.00	51.75
28.50	53.55
30.00	56.50
31.50	57.75
33.00	60.30
34.50	63.30
36.00	66.75
37.50	69.75
39.00	72.45
40.50	75.00
42.00	77.25
43.50	79.20
45.00	81.00
46.50	82.65
48.00	84.30
49.50	85.80
51.00	87.30
52.50	88.80
54.00	90.30
55.50	91.80
57.00	93.30
58.50	94.65
60.00	96.00
61.50	97.35
63.00	98.70
64.50	100.05
66.00	101.40
67.50	102.75
69.00	102.75

The table below shows what the increase will be for a widow with two children who is currently receiving benefits:

Now	*New law*
$20	$40
25	46
30	53
35	59
40	67
45	76
50	92
55	110
60	117
65	122
70	128
75	133

After June 1952 a new formula may be used to compute benefits. This formula will yield approximately twice the benefits now being received. A person can begin to use this new formula just as soon as he has worked for six quarter years—a full year and a half—under the social-security system after January 1, 1951.

The table below shows, roughly, what the benefits will be under this new formula:

Average monthly wage	*Single*	*Married*
$50	$25	$38
$100	50	75
$150	58	86
$200	65	98
$250	72	109
$300	80	120

The minimum primary benefit has been raised from $10 to $20, and the maximum family benefit has been raised from $85 to $150.

EASIER ELIGIBILITY

In the future persons will not have to work so long in order to be fully insured and eligible to receive payments upon reaching the retirement age of 65. The table below indicates how the new law compares with the old law as to the number of quarter years of social-security coverage required for wage earners of various ages before they can be eligible for payment.

Age reached in first half of 1951	Present law	New law
76 or over	6	6
75	8	6
74	10	6
73	12	6
72	14	6
71	16	6
70	18	6
69	20	6
68	22	6
67	24	6
66	26	6
65	28	6
64	30	6
63	32	6
62	34	6
61	36	8
60	38	10
59	40	12
58	40	14
57	40	16
56	40	18
55	40	20
50	40	30
45 or under	40	40

All of the time a person has worked under social security up to now is, of course, still applicable to the new coverage requirement.

This means that any insured worker now 65 or over who has had six quarter years of social-security coverage can draw benefits immediately.

Again, any worker who is 62 or over on January 1, 1951, even if he starts his social-security coverage only next year, will be eligible to draw benefits as soon as he becomes 65.

Finally, the relaxation of coverage requirements will greatly assist those who have just been allowed by the new law to come under social security—e. g., the self-employed businessman. It will not be so difficult for them to attain the requirements for eligibility, so that they might begin to draw payments as soon as possible after reaching the age of 65.

As to how much a retired worker, his survivors, or his dependents can earn without losing the right to receive benefits, the limit has been raised from $14.99 to $50 per month.

BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS

Survivors and dependents of the insured worker will, on the whole, receive the same proportion of the primary benefit—the basic payment made to an insured wage earner who has no dependents—as at present; therefore, their benefits will increase, on the average, 75 percent—and after 1952, 100 percent—over the present levels.

Other major changes in the law concerning survivors and dependents are:

First. A retired worker's wife who is under 65 can receive benefits, provided she has a child in her care.

Second. The divorced former wife of a deceased insured worker may in some cases receive benefits on his record if she is caring for his children.

Third. The benefit for a dependent parent has been raised to three-quarters of the primary benefit of the wage earner—formerly one-half.

Fourth. A dependent husband or widower of a fully and currently insured woman who is entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefits or who died after August 1950, is now eligible for insurance payments when he becomes 65.

Fifth. Lump-sum death payments, though reduced to three times the primary benefit of the wage earner, are now payable to the family of every insured worker. Formerly, these payments were made only when no other member of the family was entitled to survivors' benefits at the time of the wage earner's death.

Veterans of World War II also are affected by this new law in that it provides wage credits of $160 for each month of active military or naval service to men and women who had 90 days or more of active military service between September 16, 1940, and July 24, 1947.

I was happy to give my active support and vote for this legislation because of the increased benefits it will bestow upon our people. But as the representative in the Congress from the Second District of Illinois, I will not be satisfied until we have reached, as reach we must and will, the objective of an assured really comfortable living for every person in our country who has reached the age of 65.

Address of Former New York Congressman John J. O'Connor on Constitution Day, September 17, 1950, at the New York University Hall of Fame, Under the Auspices of the American Defense Society

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest and most courageous Members who ever served in this House is our former colleague from New York, the Honorable John J. O'Connor, who was chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules.

On last Sunday, September 17, 1950, he delivered an informative and inspiring address at the New York University Hall of Fame on the one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of our American Constitution.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this outstanding and patriotic American address which I hope all the lovers of liberty in our own country and all over the world could read and live by:

Today, thoughtful Americans, everywhere, will pause, momentarily, at least, on this one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of our American Constitution—to contemplate on what that unparalleled document means to them, and to our children, and to to the entire world.

That hallowed instrument, defining liberty, in plain words, which all might understand, was substantially the first prescription for Government which was placed in written form, so that all who runs may read. It was in fact our second attempt at putting into the written word the principles upon

which a free people would establish a government. The insufficient Articles of Confederation was the first edition of our Constitution of the United States.

Prior to those writings, governments and their rulers, emperors, kings, Princes, Sultans and dictators, and all other bosses, self-appointed or otherwise, dared not, or, at least, disdained to condescend to put on parchment or on paper, the rights, or the restrictions placed on their peoples or more especially on themselves, or the liberties and privileges of their subjects. Government was conducted hit or miss—mostly hit, with the club—and as variable as the weather vane. It was fashioned for each moment and every occasion, to suit the whims and the fancies, and the passions, and the madnesses of those in power at the particular hour, and whether those bosses had been placed there by some of the people, or were sitting on thrones by divine right—a sacrilegious phrase—or by usurpation following the force of arms.

Election by the people was not yet included in common parlance. Who bossed them was just none of their business. The people were too dumb to have any concern, a sentiment not entirely obliterated even in our day, if you recall the expressions of New Deal spokesmen, of the present decade.

It was a world-startling and novel experiment, which these 55 delegates—from 12 States—appointed to the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia—framed, and which 39 of those illustrious Americans approved, over their signatures, on that fateful day of September 17, 1787.

Several of those immortal leaders of our Nation are enshrined here in our presence, in this great Hall of Fame. Before you leave these impressive surroundings, gaze once again on the faces of three of those delegates, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison. It will accentuate that veneration which you express here today.

From May 12 of that year 1787, 4 months before, they had given their all to the creation of this masterpiece, which the renowned English statesman, Gladstone, praised as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Look around you in this Hall of Fame of Great Americans and you will see some of those men, who possessed that brain and that purpose, which we have inherited.

You will also see over 70 other great Americans, including 7 American women illustrious and honored for their achievements and their contributions to our country and to the world.

You may know that this distinctive pantheon for American leaders was conceived and begun in about 1900; that every 5 years 100 distinguished Americans, from every State in the Union, meet and vote on the candidates to be included in this honor roll, and a bronze statue placed here to commemorate each one so elected.

Incidentally it was most thoughtful of the founders of this memorial, that one of the qualifications of each candidate be, that he must have been dead at least 25 years. That restriction gives rise to contemplation as to which—if any—of our contemporaries, now living or recently demised, will be nominated for the honor.

Before you leave here today, please traverse the course of the colonnade, from the first replica, of George Washington, along through John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Paine, on to the last placed, and last elected, in 1945, Booker T. Washington. In no other country in all the world, could we find such a line-up, as the school athlete would say—from George Washington, the aristocrat, to Booker T. Washington—born a slave.

Those great Americans, men and women, are remembered here because our Constitution made it possible. They were not picked out, in some smoke filled room, by political bosses, on the sole qualification of race, creed, or religion.

We have currently witnessed that disgraceful and abhorrent method of selection, in the designation of political candidates for New York's State and city offices—a Jew here, a Catholic there, a Protestant for this place, then to the races—an Italian here, a normally Catholic one, then an Italian against him, this time an anomaly, a Protestant Italian, then an Irishman, and so on, ad nauseam. The Communist American Labor Party features the gullible and unsuspecting Negro.

Such a flaunting of the precepts of our Constitution and our American traditions should be challenged by our people, and their disgust emphatically registered.

In the limited field within which to express a choice, there may well be difficulty in registering that protest at the polls, but as long as free speech, guaranteed by our Constitution, is preserved to us, we can utter—and loudly I suggest—our denunciation of this non-American and anti-American method of selecting our public officials.

That spirit of bigotry is a fit companion for its counterpart—subversiveness. And strangely those two usually go hand in hand. No real American entertains either.

When challenged as to lack of sufficient Americanism, such types almost invariably fall back on our Constitution and especially article V, of its sacred Bill of Rights.

Samuel Johnson, the great author, coined the phrase "Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel."

We may append to that, and prove, that the last refuge of the subversive, who would destroy our form of Government, in aid of Russia, or its communism, is the fifth amendment, which provides that "no person * * * shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

All the spies who have been apprehended, as agents of Russia, all the Hollywood fellow travelers and the Hisses, and the Pressmans, the Abts, the Witts, and all their ilk, have enshrouded themselves within the protecting folds of that shield, designed by our forefathers as a guard against oppression, such as the colonists suffered under King George the Third, rather as an aid to subvert the very purposes of our fundamental law. Red herrings. The descriptive color is, at least, correct.

Likewise with certain committees and groups, labeled civil rights this and civil rights that. The good old fifth amendment is seized up, by them, as a protection to those charged with being enemies of our country.

They all leer at the oath all our public officials and our military must take "to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic."

It is the latter, today, the domestic enemies among us, who constitute our greatest danger. That fifth column has been among us, building since 1933, under Government auspices, political patronage, and blessings from high places.

The pattern is similar to happenings in other countries, many now apparently irretrievably behind Russia's iron curtain. Those countries did not just bust through that curtain, when it was lifted. They were invited, coaxed or cajoled in, and they offered little resistance.

Some observing folks wonder, if Stalin and his Russia, and its communism, did succeed in planting a firm foothold on the soil of New York City, for instance, whether there would be resistance enough to prevent the surrender of this greatest metropolis of all the world, to the atheistic, Mongol hordes. Keep asking yourselves that question, and ask it of your neighbors. At the moment I cannot give you an encouraging answer. I can only hope that our people, themselves, will see to it that the officials whom they place in authority, will rigidly enforce all available laws, to save us from any such appeasement and surrender.

That would be the end of what has distinguished our country from the rest of the world—yes, from all of it—freedom.

Repeat that word, freedom, often, so it "echoes in the hilltops and recoils upon the dell." Let it "roll from soul to soul."

Not one freedom do we have—but many.

Read them, again, in the very first amendment to our Constitution, article I of our Bill of Rights:

Freedom of religion.

Freedom of speech.

Freedom of the press.

Freedom of assembly.

Freedom to petition our Government for the redress of every grievance.

Does any such freedom—any single one of them—exist in Russia, or in any of her satellite countries?

Add to those freedoms, specifically listed, the many others, long established as our inalienable rights; such as—

Freedom to go, when and where we please.

Freedom to work where we please—somewhat abridged, I am compelled to admit, in recent years, due to the same anti-American and Communist influences, found in some labor unions.

Freedom to own property, and to pass it on to our children.

Freedom to think—even that freedom is not acknowledgedly granted in Russia or in those states which have copied her pattern.

All such freedoms, with which we are blessed, stem directly from our Constitution, in the same fountainhead manner the moral precepts of most religions flow from the Bible. Appropriately, has our Constitution been well called the Civil Bible of Americans. And that volume might well be found on every family table, alongside the religious Bible, for close study and frequent reference.

These United States of ours are still referred to as a young Nation, still in its immaturity. While we should not resent this compliment of eternal youth, we might well give thought to the impressive fact that, today, after only 163 years, we have the oldest Constitution and the oldest form of government in existence.

Mark you, that.

Despite the predictions of great statesmen and historians, a hundred years ago and since, that our experiment, or our form of "democracy," or "republic," could not long endure, we now, happily find at this good hour, that the form of every government on earth has changed, at least once, since that September 17, 1787—except ours.

It is an unparalleled tribute to our founding fathers that each one of them "builded better than he knew" and certainly better than he ever dreamed would be accomplished, when he left Constitution Hall, on that fateful September afternoon.

So fundamentally sound and appealing to peoples seeking freedom, has our great document been, that it has served as a pattern and many countries have copied it, in whole, or in substantial part, as the expression of their aspirations and the form of government they desired.

Witness some such followers of ours: Canada, Mexico, the five Republics of Central America, nine South American republics, Australia, South Africa, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Ireland, Israel—yes, and even Germany, after World War I—and undoubtedly again, soon, after its World War II.

All those complimentary reproductions constitute a thrilling answer to the prayer of George Washington, uttered when he was chosen to preside over the Constitutional Convention. In that hour, filled with doubts and misgivings, as to what the future might

hold, our country's leading citizen implored the delegates, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

The countries just mentioned, which have used our Constitution as a pattern, have indeed repaired to this standard, our great Constitution. Many more will undoubtedly resort to it, as the keystone of their hoped-for freedoms—if we can but continue to preserve it, substantially intact, from the assaults of the subversives among us, both "foreign and domestic." Those are the termites who are gnawing at its foundations.

To so preserve it, we should take new heed the the counsel of Abraham Lincoln, when in speaking of our Constitution, he said:

"Let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in our legislatures, and enforced in our courts of justice."

Please, God, permit us again, to stand here, 1 year from today, in the year of our Lord 1951 and still be under the protecting pages of that great document which we solemnly and proudly and publicly revere here, today, on the one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of its birth.

UN Flag Program Wins Wide Support

REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a notable activity of the National Grange.

The idea of making and flying a hand-made flag of the United Nations along with the American flag in every community on United Nations Day, October 24, has caught the imagination of America. Plans are going into action everywhere. Sponsored by the National Citizens Committee for United Nations Day, the flag-making plan is being taken up by churches, schools, farm organizations, business, labor, youth, home demonstration, and 4–H clubs as one concrete way of supporting a plan for peace and learning more about the United Nations organization. In short, it is a means of bringing the United Nations to the grassroots of America, and to make the UN flag a symbol of hope for the world.

The idea of encouraging women and girls to make United Nations flags was conceived by Albert E. Johnson, director of public relations for the National Grange. Mr. Johnson is also chairman of the agricultural advisory group of the National Citizens Committee for United Nations Day. The plan was first announced publicly on August 12 as a cooperative program of the national farm organizations and the Cooperative Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Radio stations and the press are showing increasing interest in the idea. Excellent radio programs have already been featured in many States. A national magazine is developing a series of color photographs on the making of the flag, while other national publications will carry feature articles in their October issues. Both the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation will use the flag-making theme on the cover of their national magazines in October, together with feature articles. The story of the plan is being carried overseas through the facilities of the Voice of America and special bulletins to United Nations information centers throughout the world. It is hoped that other nations belonging to the UN will carry out similar projects to demonstrate their faith in the world organization.

I wish to include in my remarks the following report on UN flag-making activities by the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture:

The idea of making and flying a flag of the United Nations along with the American flag in every community on United Nations Day, October 24, has caught the imagination of America. Plans are going into action everywhere. Sponsored by the National Citizens' Committee for United Nations Day, the flag-making idea is being taken up by churches, schools, farm organizations, business, labor, and youth groups, and home demonstration and 4–C clubs, as one concrete way of supporting a plan for peace and learning more about the United Nations organization.

The local home demonstration agent's office is serving as a center of information on how to make the flag. Reports from Chicago late Wednesday evening showed that more than 5,000 flag-making kits had been shipped. With all but four States represented, this indicates that very shortly patterns and directions for making the flag will be available in every county.

The State fair was timed just right to be used as a springboard for launching the idea in Massachusetts, New York, New Mexico, and Washington. Thousands of women visitors to the New York Fair took one stitch in the flag being made there and left their names on the permanent record to be hung with the flag in the building housing the home economic exhibits. Two United Nations flags are being shown at the New Mexico Fair, one on the Avenue of Flags at the entrance of the fairgrounds and the other in the auditorium of the youth building. In addition a training school for agents and volunteer leaders on the making of the flag is being held on the fairgrounds. The flags of each of the United Nations, as well as the United Nations flag, itself, are being featured at the Washington State Fair.

After the presentation of hand-made flags to President Truman and Secretary Acheson, Indiana home demonstration clubs planned to join with the Grange in making and presenting a flag to the Governor. Virginia and New Jersey Governors will likewise receive hand-made flags made by the rural women of their States. South Carolina is laying plans for a similar presentation to the presidents of Winthrop and Clemson Colleges. Other organizations are planning to send hand-made flags to affiliated groups overseas. For example, the headquarters staff of the American Home Economics Association is making a flag for the Greek Home Economics Association. In many States, counties and communities are arranging for the making and presentation of United Nations flags to officials to be displayed with the American Flag in public places on October 24.

In Arkansas the plan was launched in time to be presented to the 560 women attending the State home demonstration council meeting last week. They endorsed it unanimously. South Carolina already has a Betsy Ross party planned for the annual conference in September. Minnesota's 4–H conservation camp this month will use the United Nations flag along with the American flag at flag-raising ceremonies.

A flag in every community was chosen as the slogan in Arkansas, Louisiana, Missouri, and Virginia. Alabama is including men and boys in its plans as well as women and girls. The fine new sewing center at Jackson's Mill, West Virginia's permanent 4–H Club camp, is planning to make samples for groups wanting to make flags. The Minnesota Farm Bureau women's short course is discussing the making of the flag and its significance. North Carolina has set a goal of 8,000 flags, of which 500 are to go overseas.

Radio stations and the press are showing increasing interest in the idea as it gathers momentum. Excellent radio programs have already been featured in many States. A magazine is developing a series of color pictures on the making of the flag. Nation's Agriculture, organ of the American Farm Bureau Federation, features the United Nations on the October cover. The story goes overseas through the Voice of America and special reports on what Americans are doing to UN information centers. Plans are afoot to provide each of these information offices with a flag made by American women. Local papers are looking for good stories just as soon as they begin to materialize. The problem here in Washington is to keep up with events in order to meet the demand for more information.

Many national organizations serving rural people are taking up UN flag-making activities. The American Home Economics Association through its student clubs and homemakers' groups expects to get many flags made. The headquarters staff is starting the ball rolling by making two flags—one for the new president, Mrs. Florence Follgetter, to be saved for the new headquarters building. The American Library Association is thinking in terms of a flag for every local library. The Citizens' Committee for United Nations Day procured 5,000 copies of the fact sheet for the United Council of Church Women. The junior chamber of commerce has asked for enough copies of the fact sheet to send one to each of the member organizations. The Grange is sponsoring Betsy Ross projects to be carried on through the home-economics chairmen of subordinate granges. In addition, Grange lecturers have been asked to arrange a program on the United Nations.

The idea has been launched and the possibilities are just beginning to be sensed by many groups of people. The results can be far reaching if, in the making of the flags, many people get a better understanding of the United Nations plans for preserving the peace.

My Friend Al Vreeland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following is a copy of a letter to a New Jersey friend in reply to an inquiry:

I was very pleased to learn my friend, former Congressman Albert L. Vreeland, of the Eleventh Congressional District of New Jersey, has been nominated by the people of that district as the Republican candidate for Congress.

Al's record in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses was outstanding and he distinguished himself in many ways, besides making a host of friends among his colleagues, in those times of stress, prewar. He was conscientious, hard-working, and a real patriotic American. His first committee assignment, after being sworn in in 1939, was on the Civil Service Committee and the District of Columbia Committee. In the former committee he was a stalwart supporter

of legislation for the benefit of and the betterment of civil-service employees and voted for many pieces of legislation furthering the interests of the Government employee. In the District of Columbia Committee, he championed a bill to raise the pay of the police and firemen of the District and for the two-platoon system in the Fire Department. As a member of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Institutions, after a visit to the Gallinger Hospital and noting the deplorable conditions existing in the psychopathic wards, he realized the necessity of changing the lunacy laws of the District to prevent the many injustices and deplorable conditions existing, relating to these unfortunate mental cases. He thereupon prepared and introduced in the Congress of the United States a complete revision of the laws governing insane persons. After many conferences with the local bar association, medical staffs of the hospitals, and civic organizations, with a few amendments his bill was voted out of the District Committee to the floor of the House and was passed. It is still the present existing law of the District and it was one of the few bills at that time passed by the House and Senate of a major nature carrying the name of a Republican, the then minority party. He received wide commendation from the residents, the bar association, and civic groups in the District of Columbia.

In 1940, because of the outstanding work Al Vreeland had done, not only in the House but in the two committees, he was appointed to the Judiciary Committee, one of the major committees of the House. On this committee he again exhibited his ability and his tireless efforts in studying legislation before that committee and actively supporting it in debate. He was particularly active in the revision of the espionage laws. In 1941, Judge Hatton Sumners, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, appointed him on a special subcommittee to investigate the alleged irregularities existing in the Federal district court in Delaware. As a result of this committee's work, the irregularities were cleared up and those responsible were properly penalized.

During the year 1941, with the war clouds gathering, he made many speeches on the floor of the House, urging a stronger national defense and pointing out the many phases of unpreparedness and lack of equipment existing in our Armed Forces. As late as August of 1941, after a 3 weeks' tour of duty with the Fourth Armored Division, he made a stirring appeal to the House for arms and equipment for our then small Army, pointing out, from his experience, the lack of equipment with which not only to train the Army but to arm it should a war occur. He also made several speeches in Congress on behalf of veterans of World War I, and also for the improvement of the new Army, which was fast being built up to meet the strained conditions of the world. He constantly urged we be adequately prepared should we become involved. He also introduced several bills for the betterment of conditions in the Army and particularly for the Reserve and National Guard being inducted into the Federal service. Among those was a bill to allow promotions based on merit rather than time in grade, to allow credit for longevity for service in the Reserve and National Guard, and to allow credit for service to enlisted men for their enlisted time after being commissioned as an officer.

Al was one of the most ardent, patriotic Members of the House and I remember well, after the House voted a declaration of war on December 8, 1941, on December 9 Al requested a leave of absence, without pay, from the House of Representatives and entered the United States Army in his Reserve rank of captain and remained in the Army until President Roosevelt in July of 1942 ordered him back to the House of Representatives to finish his term. During the period in the Army he attended the Infantry School at Fort Benning and when ordered back was serving with the Seventy-sixth Infantry Division. Upon his return to Congress he addressed the House of Representatives and advised them, in accordance with the orders of the Commander in Chief, he would finish out his term in Congress but would refuse to seek reelection and enter the Army for the duration of the war. Accordingly, Al did refuse to seek reelection and on January 3, 1943, he bade his many friends in the House of Representatives farewell and entered the United States Army, where he served with distinction in the southwest Pacific theater of war.

His many friends were sorry to see Al Vreeland leave us and leave the Congress for what Al considered to be a greater duty, that of fighting the war which he voted to declare. We, his many friends in the House of Representatives, will be happy to have Al back among us to carry on the job he left. Like so many veterans in other walks of life, who left their jobs to enter the service and were returned to their jobs after the war, he is seeking to return to his. I am sure the people of the Eleventh Congressional District, recognizing Al Vreeland's sincerity, patriotism, and ability, will elect him with an overwhelming majority in November and we, his colleagues, will welcome him back among us in January 1951.

Address by Dore Schary at B'nai B'rith Convention, August 9, 1950, San Diego, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include an address delivered by Mr. Dore Schary at a recent B'nai B'rith convention held in San Diego on the occasion of his receiving the humanities award of that organization.

Mr. Schary is known and respected throughout the country for his liberal views and his outstanding abilities as a film producer. It is my pleasure therefore to include Mr. Schary's remarks in the RECORD:

I am very grateful for the Humanities Award at B'nai B'rith District No. 4, which has been given to me tonight. I am grateful for the spirit behind it. For the good will, and for the seal of approval that you have given my work. For those sentiments that you have included in the award. I can assure you that, while I have won this plaque in 1950, I will try and earn this honor by my work and by my intent in years to come.

I feel perhaps that it would be more fitting and more proper that any humanities award should go, however, to those men who today are fighting for world-wide humanities in Korea under the flag of the United States, the flag of the United Nations, and, very soon, the flags of many other countries.

All of us who back in 1945 had a feeling that we were entering some era of peace, some era of agreement between world powers, can only view this situation in Korea with regret and with apprehension. The same old confusions come back into our minds, into our consciousness, into our very souls. Nobody likes to see other men die to keep alive simple words like "freedom," "liberty," "truth," and "morality." I am quite certain that very few, if any, soldiers die with those words on their lips. I am sure most men fighting for those words die regretfully, die angrily, or perhaps suddenly, and unaware of what has come to them. And yet these men are there, and they fight with tanks, and with guns, and grenades, and with flames for these words that sometimes we take too loosely, words that become sounds and lose their meaning. And yet the meanings are there. And they must be reaffirmed, and we must examine them to clear our minds.

In the casualty lists that are coming back from Korea is again the age-old American example of democracy, of many kinds of people, fighting for one kind of a principle. Those lists include these wonderful, odd American names: names like Klisusky, and Ginsberg; Hopper and Spinelli; Brown and O'Reardon; Jones and McPherson; Olson and Rodrigues. All American names. Now, because of these lists, it occurs to me that this might be a good time to examine our own position in this world crisis because again we are besieged by many varying points of view.

Only a few weeks ago, when we moved into Korea, there was a wild acclamation, a loud cheer of approval, for the prompt action. Then we had to face the realities. The realities of a small group of men; of sparse equipment; of a well-organized attack that could not be averted by what little we had to offer in this new fight for freedom. And then the doubts began. And then, the fears began. Along with these doubts and fears we had to face, once more, the confusion of the party line, and I'm talking about the Communist Party line. Once again as in late 1939 and 1940, we had to face the strange situation of the far left wing being allied in thought and action with the far right, reactionary wing. Once again this strange coalition took place. Damning what we were doing, screaming madly for peace, and not knowing what kind of a peace they were talking about. Certainly no one in this room tonight, and certainly very few people in the Nation, want war. We've been there—we know what it is. Hardly a family is left unscarred from World War II. None of us looks forward to what has to be looked forward to, and yet what are the alternatives? What kind of a peace do we want?

There is the peace of the regimented mind and the regimented soul. There is the peace of the slave camp. There is the peace that includes those things that you must read and those things that you must say; and those things that you must not read and you must not say. There is the peace of science that is dictated by politics; of art that is dictated by politics; of family life, religious life, of all that we hold important—dictated. Sworn to and subscribed. I don't think that this is the peace we Americans want. It is not the peace we dream of. We do not want a peace surrounded by an iron curtain of ignorance. We want a peace where the sun shines and the stars light up. Where hope is in our hearts, where faith is in our souls, and we want to live in an atmosphere where we can raise our children, dreaming always of the best for them, and not in a miserable regimented life that brings ultimately despair, defeat, and death.

We have to look back quite far to develop and perceive the pattern that is being cut for us today by the Communists. All Americans must see this pattern clearly, and we here tonight in this room, as Americans Jews with a heritage from our Nation and from our religion, must examine this pattern, identify it, and never become confused by it. The word "liberal" today, in some places—in most places, is a rather dirty word. It is a word that is interchangeable in some places with "fellow traveler," "parlor pink," "red," and all the rest of the opprobrious

words. But let us not be afraid of the word ourselves, let us be sure of our definitions. I identify myself as a liberal, and I'm not confused, nor as I frightened, because I know what I stand for. The word "liberal" means precisely "those political forces that tend to the direction of democracy." Mark that well. "Tend to the direction of democracy." No totalitarian government, whether it is communistic or fascistic, tends to the direction of democracy. Therefore, a liberal cannot ever be attracted by the thought behind totalitarian government. There is this one distinction that you must always keep in mind. Liberalism criticizes democracy in an effort to improve it. The Communist criticizes democracy in an effort to destroy it.

Now let's examine the liberal line. Let's examine the stand that the liberals have made from 1939 to the present day, and I'm talking about Liberals, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. In 1939, the liberal was for the support of England and the Allies. The liberal knew that this was a war that had to be fought. The liberal knew that fascism must be destroyed. He had seen the evidence of this years before. He knew that in 1931, when Japan invaded Manchuria, we should have moved to destroy aggression, and if we had moved then, we might never have faced as strong a Japan as we had to ultimately. The liberal knew that we should have moved again in 1933 when Hitler moved into the Ruhr. History tells us now that if we had moved at that time, we never would have had to fight a Nazi army as powerful, as effective, or as strong as the one we eventually met and defeated. The liberal knew that we should have moved against Italy when she invaded Ethiopia because the principle, the same principle, was at stake. The principle that stands opposed to aggression.

But the Communists in 1940 shifted from the strong anti-Fascist position. The Communists after the Russian-German pact was created, began to make apologies. Began to tell us that the war in Europe was an "imperialistic war"; that it was a "phony war"; a "cold war"; that there was a "deal" on. All sorts of explanations—all sorts of apologies. The Communist was part of a big peace mobilization at the time. He also was opposed to our defense program. All these things are on the record, and all this maintained up until the time that Germany attacked Russia. Then it was a people's war, suddenly. Then it was a war that had to be fought. And we were all together, fighting the battle. But not the way the Communist wanted it fought. We began to hear from the American Communist Party that Eisenhower didn't know what he was doing; that there was sabotage going on; that the second front should be launched immediately. There were more "generals" cropping up at political meetings than there were in the Army. The liberal tolerated this point of view because a war was being fought. Fascism was being destroyed, and finally and ultimately came that great day when nazism crumbled and fell in flames. The liberal again declared his consistent anti-Fascist, antitotalitarian point of view. He never deviated from it. But the Communist began his political hedge-hopping immediately after the peace. Then came the attacks on the United Nations.

When Russia walked out from the Security Council, where were the screams of outrage from the American Communists, as they screamed when Italy walked out of the League of Nations? And then, the attack on Korea. The rationalization began. The liberal wasn't confused though certainly he wasn't happy about the circumstances; but the liberal knew that the United Nations charge against northern Korea was based on fundamental morality, and the United States accepted this responsibility and went into action. But the Communist rationalization begins now: "Well, after all, the Koreans in South Korea really want the North Koreans to impose their government on them." This is like the argument Hitler gave us about the Sudetenland. Then they say, "Well, after all, the people in South Korea don't know what's good for them." This is the argument Mussolini gave about Ethiopia. "Well, after all, there have been skirmishes on the border, and the South Koreans have really done some of the shooting." This is the argument Japan gave when they attacked China. "Well, after all, South Korea really belongs to the Koreans." This is the argument Hitler gave when he moved into the Ruhr. Those arguments made no sense at that time, and they make absolutely no sense in the Korean question at all.

The facts are crystal clear and they're simple. And they have nothing to do with whether it's right or wrong, to admit Red China into the United Nations, or whether or not Russia participated in the elections in Korea. One set of facts has nothing to do with the basic morality of these facts; a parallel had been agreed upon—the thirty-eighth parallel—by the United Nations. The North Koreans attacked and crossed that parallel. The United Nations met, and agreed on military sanctions. They presented a cease firing order—a cease firing order that had been obeyed 6 times previously; it had been presented in Indonesia, Palestine, in Greece, and in other places, and it has always been obeyed; but this time it was not obeyed, and the United Nations had to stand or fall by the only principle with which it could possibly exist. The principle that was opposed to aggression.

Russia is part of the United Nations. And she must learn to live by the law of the member nations that comprise this great organization. And if she does not choose to live with law and order, then we can see clearly the direction that she has taken and the direction that we must take.

So let's not become confused by loose interchangeable words. Let's not become confused by illogical arguments that are presented emotionally and are designed to cover up the basic issue. Let us only be concerned with the one alterable fact—there is a world organization dedicated to peace—dedicated to law and order—that Organization has been challenged: that Organization has begun now to function. Those nations that support the United Nations are for it. Those nations that do not support the United Nations are against it. I believe that there is no hope in this world, there is no future in this world, if the United Nations crumbles. And as a liberal I argue that we must maintain, we must make, the United Nations live.

We face, all of us in the country face, hard, critical times that will do much to dampen our spirits and lessen our vitality. But there is justice on our side; and with justice must come firmness; and with firmness, determination; and with determination will come victory. And with that victory will come all those things that we dream about.

Perhaps some people will say that the idea of world peace and eventual world law and order is a dream. Well, what's wrong with dreaming? Our early American patriots were dreamers. They dreamed of independence. They were sentimental men who fell in love with words like "liberty" and "freedom"; but they made their dreams come true. There have been other dreamers—like Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And dreamers outside of our Nation; dreamers like Gandhi, Simon Bolivar, Weizmann, and Masaryk. In every nation, in every age, there have been these sentimental dreamers; but they have used action to make their dreams come true. They have used their arms, their hearts, and their souls to build these dreams when other men were cynical and scornful.

In the show South Pacific today, there is a song called Happy Talk, and in this song are the beautiful words "You got to have a dream, if you don't have a dream, how you gonna have a dream come true?"

Well, I say that we Americans, all of us, Jews, Catholics, Protestants, white, brown, black—whatever we are; we've got to have a dream, and if we've got that dream, perhaps we can make that dream come true.

Thank you very much.

1950 Amendments to Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

WISCONSIN

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, one of the outstanding achievements of this Eighty-first Congress is the enactment of a law expanding and bringing up to date our social-security system. This law extends security in their old age to 10,000,000 additional Americans as a matter of their earned right, not as a matter of charity or a public dole. It raises social-security benefits to conform with higher costs of living.

I believe that our social-security system should be extended even further, so as to cover all working men and women, and I will support legislation to accomplish this. But the new law passed by the Eighty-first Congress is a great step forward, and I was proud to cast my vote for it.

In view of the widespread interest in this law I think it will be helpful to set forth the changes in our social-security system which it brings about.

MAJOR CHANGES SUMMARIZED

Summarized in a few sentences, the major changes are:

First. Larger benefits: The nearly 63,612 Wisconsinites now receiving social-security payments will find that in the checks to be mailed out October 3 their benefits will be, on the average, roughly 75 percent greater than they have been. For those who will retire after June 1952, benefits will be twice what they are now, on the average.

Second. Broader coverage: On January 1, 1951, over 200,500 people in the State of Wisconsin, who up to now have not been covered by social security, will come under the system. For the first time the nonfarm self-employed—persons in business for themselves, such as grocery store, retail store, or gas-station owners—will have the opportunity to earn security in their later life under the social-security system.

Third. Easier eligibility: In general, it will take less years of social-security coverage before you are eligible to draw benefits. Specifically, persons who are now 65 or over, and who have had six quarter-years—a year and a half—of social-security coverage can and should apply immediately for benefits. Any retired worker as well as survivors and

dependents will be able to earn $50 a month—as against the present limit of $15—without losing their benefit payments.

Here, in more detail, are the answers to questions I think will be of most general interest:

HOW MUCH LARGER BENEFITS?

First. How much larger will benefits be under the new law? Benefit increases will go to two main groups of people: (a) Those who are currently receiving benefits, or who will begin receiving them before 1952; and (b) those who will reach retirement age after June 1952; these are called new starts. Let me explain more fully how the new bill affects each of these groups.

IMMEDIATE INCREASES AVERAGE 77½ PERCENT

There are nearly 68,612 people in the State of Wisconsin who are now receiving social-security benefits. In the checks which they will receive early in October, their September payments, they will find that their payments will be, on the average, 77½ percent greater than they have been up to now.

The table below shows what the increases will be for an insured wage earner without any dependents, and for a married couple.

Retired wage earner without dependents		Retired wage earner and wife	
Now	New law	Now	New law
$10	$20.00	$15.00	$30.00
$11	22.00	$16.50	33.00
$12	24.00	$18.00	36.00
$13	26.00	$19.50	39.00
$14	28.00	$21.00	42.00
$15	30.00	$22.50	45.00
$16	31.70	$24.00	47.55
$17	33.20	$25.50	49.80
$18	34.50	$27.00	51.75
$19	35.70	$28.50	53.55
$20	37.00	$30.00	56.50
$21	38.50	$31.50	57.75
$22	40.20	$33.00	60.30
$23	42.20	$34.50	63.30
$24	44.50	$36.00	66.75
$25	46.50	$37.50	69.75
$26	48.30	$39.00	72.45
$27	50.00	$40.50	75.00
$28	51.50	$42.00	77.25
$29	52.80	$43.50	79.20
$30	54.00	$45.00	81.00
$31	55.10	$46.50	82.65
$32	56.20	$48.00	84.30
$33	57.20	$49.50	85.80
$34	58.20	$51.00	87.30
$35	59.20	$52.50	88.80
$36	60.20	$54.00	90.30
$37	61.20	$55.50	91.80
$38	62.20	$57.00	93.30
$39	63.10	$58.50	94.65
$40	64.00	$60.00	96.00
$41	64.90	$61.50	97.35
$42	65.80	$63.00	98.70
$43	66.70	$64.50	100.05
$44	67.60	$66.00	101.40
$45	68.50	$67.50	102.75
$46	68.50	$69.00	102.75

These same increases apply to anyone who retires before June 1952.

The following table shows the benefits that will appear in the September checks of a widow with two children who is currently receiving benefits:

WIDOW WITH TWO CHILDREN

Present benefit: $20; new benefit: $40.
Present benefit: $25; new benefit: $46.
Present benefit: $30; new benefit: $53.
Present benefit: $35; new benefit: $59.
Present benefit: $40; new benefit: $67.
Present benefit: $45; new benefit: $76.
Present benefit: $50; new benefit: $92.
Present benefit: $55; new benefit: $110.
Present benefit: $60; new benefit: $117.
Present benefit: $65; new benefit: $122.
Present benefit: $70; new benefit: $128.
Present benefit: $75; new benefit: $133.

INCREASES SENT AUTOMATICALLY

You do not have to apply for the increases; they will be sent to you automatically. If, for any reason, the increase fails to show up in your October check, it will show up very soon, in full. Recipients are asked not to start writing in for information because the more letters that have to be answered, the slower the program will be in getting under way.

BENEFITS DOUBLED IN 1952

For anyone who retires after June 1952 a new formula may be used to compute benefits, which will yield, roughly, twice the benefits now being received. You can begin to use this new formula just as soon as you have worked for six quarter-years—or a full year and a half—under the social-security system after January 1, 1951.

The following table shows, roughly, how much the benefits will be according to this new formula:

Average monthly wage	Single	Married
$50	$25	$38
$100	50	75
$150	58	86
$200	65	98
$250	72	109
$300	80	120

The minimum primary benefit has been raised from $10 to $25 in most cases, and the maximum family benefit has been raised from $85 to $150. These changes are long overdue in bringing our social-security system into line with high living costs.

WHO WILL BE COVERED NOW?

Second. What new people will be covered under the new law? On January 1, 1951, over 200,500 people in the State of Wisconsin—nearly 10,000,000 in the Nation as a whole—will come under the social-security system for the first time.

THE NONFARM SELF-EMPLOYED

The largest and most important group to come under the system are the nonfarm self-employed—numbering about 113,000 in Wisconsin. For the first time the druggist, the grocer, the gas station owner, and thousands of other persons who are in business for themselves can look forward to security in their later years as an earned right, to which they have contributed during their working lifetime.

Farmers are still not included under social security; nor are many professional people, such as doctors and lawers.

ELIGIBLE FOR BENEFITS MUCH SOONER

At this point, I should emphasize, for the benefit of these businessmen, as well as all those who will come under the social-security system now, it will be much easier for you to become eligible for benefits under the new law. If you are 62 or over on January 1, 1951, and begin your social-security coverage on that date, you will need to work only a year and a half under the system in order to be fully insured and eligible for benefit payments upon retirement. That means that you will begin to draw benefits just as soon as you reach the retirement age of 65.

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Some 29,000 agricultural workers in Wisconsin will come under the social-security program on January 1. This includes not only persons who regularly work on farms, but also the so-called borderline agricultural workers—those who work, say, in raising livestock or fur animals; or in processing or delivering crops to storage or to market; or those engaged in household work on a farm. Employees of commercial handlers of fruits and vegetables are included in this borderline group, as are employees of farmer cooperatives.

Those who regularly work on farms must work for one farm operator for 3 months before their social-security coverage even begins. After that, they must work for him for 60 full days and earn $50 in cash during each 3-month period. If they change employers, they must work regularly for 3 months before their work with the new employer begins to count for social security.

DOMESTIC WORKERS

About 18,000 Wisconsin domestic workers in nonfarm homes will join the system next January, provided they work 24 days for one employer and receive cash wages of at least $50 during each quarter-year.

VOLUNTARY COVERAGE FOR STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

With regard to the inclusion of employees of the State, and of cities, towns, or counties, this is the situation: Some time after January 1, the State of Wisconsin may, if it wishes, enter into an agreement with the Federal Government. That agreement will set forth specifically which groups of employees of the State, or of cities, towns, or counties, will be covered under social security. Any State or local employee who is covered by an existing retirement system cannot be included in such an agreement. In this way, existing retirement systems will be fully protected. If any group of State or local employees is included in the agreement, then social-security coverage for all members of the group will be automatic. There are in Wisconsin about 40,500 State and local employees who are not covered by existing retirement systems who might be included in the social-security system.

Employees of the Federal Government in Wisconsin who are not presently covered by a Federal retirement system, will be included under social security.

EMPLOYEES OF NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

Employees of nonprofit institutions—hospitals, churches, schools, and the like—will be covered only if the employer agrees to pay his share of the tax contribution and if two-thirds or more of the employees favor social-security coverage.

Ministers and members of religious orders will continue to be excluded.

SALESMEN AND TRUCK DRIVERS INCLUDED

The new bill will also include all full-time life-insurance salesmen, certain full-time traveling salesmen—other

than house-to-house—many delivery truck drivers and home industrial workers who satisfy certain conditions.

HOW LONG TO QUALIFY?

Third. How long will you have to work under social security before you can start drawing benefits?

One of the greatest advantages of the new social-security law is that although the retirement age is still 65, in the future you will not have to work under the social-security system nearly as long before you are fully insured and eligible to draw benefits upon reaching the retirement age of 65.

The following table shows how many quarter years of coverage under social security you will have to have under the new law, as compared with the present law. Simply look at the figure next to your age on January 1, 1951:

Quarter-years of coverage required to be fully insured

Age reached in first half of 1951	Present law	New law
76 or over	6	6
75	8	6
74	10	6
73	12	6
72	14	6
71	16	6
70	18	6
69	20	6
68	22	6
67	24	6
66	26	6
65	28	6
64	30	6
63	32	6
62	34	6
61	36	8
60	38	10
59	40	12
58	40	14
57	40	16
56	40	18
55	40	20
50	40	30
45 or under	40	40

All of the time you have worked under social security up to now still counts toward meeting your coverage requirement.

This change means three main things.

MANY AGED 65 CAN GET BENEFITS IMMEDIATELY

First, any insured worked who is now 65 or over, and who has had six quarter years—or a full year and a half—of social-security coverage, can draw benefits immediately. He should apply for them at the nearest Social Security Administration field office.

In Wisconsin, these offices are located in Eau Claire, Fond du Lac, Green Bay, Janesville, Kenosha, La Crosse, Madison, Milwaukee, Oshkosh, Racine, Sheboygan, Superior, and Wausau. Your local post office should be able to tell you how to address your request.

Second, any worker who is 62 or over on January 1, 1951, even if he only starts his social-security coverage next year, will be eligible to begin drawing benefits just as soon as he reaches the retirement age of 65, if he has had six quarter years—a year and a half—of coverage.

ELIGIBILITY MUCH EASIER FOR THE NEWLY COVERED

Third, and most important to the thousands who will become eligible to join the social-security system next year, it will be possible for them to begin drawing benefits upon retirement—at age 65—with much less social-security coverage than now. The table above shows the tremendous improvements brought about by this law.

BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS

The fourth main question of general interest is: How much will dependents and survivors receive under the new law?

The primary benefit is the basic payment made to an insured wage earner who has no dependents. Generally speaking, dependents and survivors will receive the same part of the primary as at present. This means that their benefits will also be about 75 percent higher than at present, up until 1952, and double the present levels after that.

MAJOR CHANGES LISTED

The major changes in dependents' and survivors' benefits are:

(a) A retired worker's wife who is under 65 can receive benefits if she has a child in her care.

(b) The benefit for a dependent parent has been raised to three-quarters of the primary benefit of the wage earner—it has been one-half.

(c) Lump-sum death payments, though reduced to three times the primary benefit of the wage earner, are now payable to the family of every insured worker. Formerly, these payments were made only when no other member of the family was entitled to survivor's benefits at the time of the wage earner's death.

(d) Retired workers, survivors, or dependents may now earn $50 a month—as against $14.99 under the present law—without losing their benefit privileges.

NEW LAW A LANDMARK IN SOCIAL LEGISLATION

This new social-security law is a landmark in the field of social legislation. The improvements in our social insurance system which it brings about are long overdue. In my opinion, they do not go far enough. I believe that our insurance system should include the permanently and totally disabled, who are entitled to security as a matter of right, and not a matter of charity. I believe that the system should extend to all working men and women—for old age is a problem shared by all Americans alike. I believe that the retirement age for women should be lowered from 65 to 60. I believe that all insured workers should receive a minimum benefit of $75.

We have taken a great step forward but there is still room for progress and improvement. There is still a challenge for the future.

Harper's Magazine: One Hundredth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few moments at this time to bring to your attention the eminently distinguished record of one of America's great magazines.

This week there will appear on the newsstands throughout the country the October 1950 issue of Harper's. With this issue Harper's marks the beginning of its second century of continuous publication. This in itself is a record that has been attained by few publications of any kind anywhere. But the achievements of Harper's go far beyond its record of having reached its hundredth milestone, enviable and rare as that might be. Month after month, down through the years from its beginning, the pages of Harper's have been consistently alive with the great names of literature as well as those who have carried the torch of progress and enlightenment.

However, it is to the October 1950 issue of Harper's that I particularly want to pay tribute. This centennial issue is far more than just another anniversary number. Its pages are a historical record of the achievements and progress, as well as a tribute, not only to Harper's, but to America, her people, her customs, her culture, her industries, and her times during the past century.

I commend it to the attention of our Congress and to our people.

American Shame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the easiest ways for us to lose our form of government is to lose it by default. I have confidence that if every citizen would utilize the sacred right to vote which is his, we would have no fear of becoming a totalitarian state. The responsibility today of maintaining our American form of government rests on the shoulders of every citizen who is eligible to vote. It is his Government. He pays for it. Let us vote to insure that the men who represent us in our Government are men who can be trusted.

I wish to include as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the September 20, 1950, issue of the Alpena News, one of northern Michigan's leading dailies. I commend this editorial to all citizens.

AMERICAN SHAME

We Americans don't like to be preached to about our shortcomings. But sometimes there's no other way to stir us up. Take, for instance, this matter of voting. Apparently it doesn't do any good to talk in general terms about voting as a solemn duty or a rare privilege. Lectures along that line have been delivered for years. But in 1948, as a Presidential election year, only about half of all eligible voters actually went to the polls. If blunt language is needed to make Americans understand the shamefulness of this performance, then it ought to be used.

We think we have the greatest democracy in the world. Yet in free elections in the past few years, Britain, Australia, Italy, and

even west Germany have vastly outstripped us in the basic democratic job of voting. Note that two of these countries had had long experience under dictators. Yet each found that more than 80 percent of the people voting when their first real elections were held.

We sneer at Russia and her satellites because they are limited to a single slate of candidates when they vote, and can merely record "yes" or "no." But 50 percent of our own prospective voters didn't even exercise that much choice in 1948.

Constantly we have it dinned into our ears nowadays that if we're to lick world communism we must sell democracy abroad. The uncomfortable fact is we haven't been practicing it as well as some of the people we're supposed to be selling it to; the west Germans, for example.

None of this means, of course, that we don't care about freedom and its rights and duties. It just means that we've allowed the complexity and fascination of our big-city industrial life to distract us from our responsibilities.

By now, though, we ought to have seen enough of the world's present perils to realize that our beautiful, gadget-filled existence might be wiped right off the face of the globe if we don't make the right decisions. Those decisions are fundamentally the people's job. And they can only make them at the polls.

November 7 is another voting day, the first general election since 1948. The world will be watching to see whether Americans have learned to prize their voting rights more than another rubber of bridge, or a day at the ball game, or a regular place on the washing-machine schedule.

Civil Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the civil defense proposals of Chairman W. Stuart Symington of the National Security Resources Board, received by the House last week, make it even more urgent that this Congress do everything in its power to strengthen the Nation's medical resources. The lives of millions of Americans may be lost if we fail to face the issue: Will we have enough adequately trained medical personnel to protect men, women, and children on our home front in case of the kinds of radiological, bacteriological, or chemical attack envisioned in the civil defense proposals?

Here is the blunt warning from Mr. Symington:

> The civil defense program for this country must be in constant readiness because for the first time in 136 years an enemy has the power to attack our cities in strong forces, and for the first time in our history that attack may come suddenly, with little or no warning.

I was especially struck by this statement in the report:

> Granted a few minutes' warning, casualties could be reduced by over 50 percent through proper organization and training in civil defense.

What progress can we report? Are we heeding this warning? Are we strengthening with all possible speed our first line of security—the health of our civilian population—against enemy attack?

The bitter truth is that we are not training more doctors or moving rapidly to cope with the possible dangers our civilian population faces, although there was legislation before the House to help accomplish this end.

The bitter truth is that we cannot report our medical schools are being rescued from their grave financial crisis or enabled to extend high quality training to more qualified students. Four times in the last few months legislation to accomplish these vital goals was blocked—blocked solely at the insistence of one group—the medical lobby.

I charge that if these American Medical Association lobbyists continue their policy of obstruction, this Nation can be led into the catastrophe of a medical Pearl Harbor. God grant the day may never come that atomic bombs or radiological warfare shall be turned against our cities. But if that terrible day should come, will our people call desperately for doctors and nurses, but not find enough to care for them?

Since the AMA lobbyists seem too blind to read the handwriting on the wall, let me at least read to them this trenchant warning from the civil defense report:

> An enemy attack on American cities using new technological weapons might introduce some new medical and health problems from such effects as radiation and chemical and bacteriological contamination.

And the report continues:

> Training for professional, technical, and auxiliary lay personnel will be necessary to prepare for the new problems. Thorough organization will be necessary to provide adequate professional and technical personnel; and also the supplies, hospitals, and related facilities for the care of the many thousands of casualties which could occur among the civilian inhabitants of a large city.

The National Security Resources Board declares that, even under the best circumstances:

> This increase in casualties will require many auxiliary volunteer workers to be recruited and trained, in order to supplement the services of available professional and technical personnel.

Every word of the civil defense report that deals with health and medical services underscores the number-one requirement to meet an attack on any important city or target area—more trained personnel.

Yet, it is a fact, according to a recent study of the United States Assistant Surgeon General, that this country today has fewer physicians per 100,000 persons than 4 decades ago. And the report estimates that the shortage is growing all the time and just a few years hence this Nation will be at least 17,400 doctors below minimum level.

Increased strain on our limited medical resources is certain as this Nation stands resolved to oppose Communist aggression everywhere in the world. Yet, in the face of this clearly demonstrable need, why has Federal aid to medical education—so obviously in the national interest—been killed?

It was not killed because of lack of bipartisan approval. Aid to medical education was sponsored in the Senate by Democrats and Republicans ranging from Senator PEPPER to Senator TAFT. And it was passed unanimously. Professional organizations, including the American Dental Association and the American Hospital Association, expressed their concern and the need for action. Vigorous support came from the country's medical-school deans, individually and through their professional associations. Support came from many lay organizations, including the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

This measure was killed solely through the efforts of the AMA's multimillion-dollar lobby. Now, as it has so many times in past years, organized medicine is pursuing a course of political obstruction that may well be without parallel among the members of any fiduciary profession.

It seems to me that the AMA, which is spending $1,110,000 during October and lining up $19,000,000 in tie-in advertising to fight the bogeyman of creeping socialism, is playing right into the hands of America's enemies. While the AMA spends millions to talk anticommunism, its policies are weakening our defenses against the military forces of communism. The AMA is blocking measures which would protect the families of our fighting men from Communist military aggression.

The warning of Mr. Symington has been sounded with equal bluntness by one of America's greatest medical authorities—Brig. Gen. James S. Simmons, retired, dean of the Harvard School of Public Health. General Simmons, an authority on preventive medicine, bluntly called the action of the AMA in blocking House committee passage of Federal aid to medical education "a tragic mistake and a crippling blow to the Nation's military and civil preparedness program."

I repeat that the AMA lobbyists are leading us into a medical Pearl Harbor. Every day that we delay the work of training a larger corps of doctors and other medical personnel also delays the day when the boys on the fighting front can feel that their loved ones are being protected just as adequately and competently as this Nation's great resources can protect them. Every day that the American Medical Association blocks Federal aid to medical education makes it surer that, if we are again forced into a total war, there will not be enough doctors to go around. Only this week, the Journal of the American Medical Association reminded doctors that, during World War II, 40 percent of the medical men of the Nation were called into active military service. Next time, if there is another world war, can we successfully protect our civilian population from effects of direct attack, when 4 out of every 10 doctors are far away from home?

The American Medical Association is the only road block. If we are called back in November, I again intend to press for action on this vital piece of legislation. Perhaps, by then, the people of the country will have had a chance to study the import of the civil defense report and will insist that we act.

Democracy's New Symbol—Ball Bat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, political campaigns preceding general elections in Michigan are always fraught with much interest. The usual pattern is amplified in the present campaign. At the moment, intraparty disagreements, controveries, and rivalries are more in evidence than interparty contests. This condition is spectacularized in an editorial in the Detroit Free Press of September 23, to which my attention has been called. If this editorial is indicative of what is to happen between now and November 7, certainly lively days are here again.

Pursuant to the permission granted by the House, I am including that editorial which reads as follows:

DEMOCRACY'S NEW SYMBOL—BALL BAT

Governor Williams, Democratic nominee for reelection, was said to have won a resounding victory in Wayne County when his cohorts, the left wingers of the Americans for Democratic Action and the CIO-PAC, captured control of the Democratic Party machinery in Wayne County congressional district conventions.

But whatever it means to the political fortunes of Governor Williams, it was no victory for democratic processes of orderly government.

In all but one district, the caucuses were marked by sluggings and the Communist techniques of beating down opposition by violence.

The ADA-PAC combination brought back to Michigan the sitdown-strike methods which have been disavowed in labor disputes, and applied them to government.

The goon squads took over, and the gavel, that traditional symbol of orderly parliamentary procedure, was discarded for the sawed-off baseball bat.

In all but one district—the sixteenth—there was near rioting as the strong-arm squads took over.

Delegates representing the old-line Democratic elements were beaten and thrown bodily out of the halls by the shock-troop goon squads.

In the fourteenth district, the ADA-PAC chairman, Nicholas Rothe, presided with a baseball bat instead of a gavel.

His tactics of intimidation caused Democratic National Committeeman George Fitzgerald and his following to walk out.

"After this," Fitzgerald declared, "the theme song of the Nation should be God Save America instead of God Bless America.

"I have just watched socialism take over the Democratic Party by communistic processes," he added.

And another Democratic leader, high in CIO circles, echoed Fitzgerald's sentiments.

"You can see," he said, "what happens to democratic government when the Socialists move in."

So outraged were many of the delegates, it was reported, that they tore off their polka-dotted bow-tie pins, the campaign emblems of Governor Williams. This was the insult direct to "Soapy."

It was 15 years ago that Michigan was stricken by the wave of sitdown strikes—an imported device of the Communists to create violence and disruption.

The power behind the sitdown strikes was the gangs of goon squads, the professional thugs, armed with their clubs and ball bats.

It was the goon squads which, in utter defiance of law and public safety, closed streets in Detroit and forbade their use by citizens while the police stood by helplessly and watched.

It was the goon squads which invaded the capitol in Lansing and took over the government of that city, closing up business, and terrorizing the people.

Only when the goon storm troopers moved into East Lansing and tried to take over Michigan State College were their ranks broken. They came up against brawny American college kids who would not be intimidated like the politicians were. These youngsters threw the hoodlums into the river. That act so stiffened the backbone of the American people all over the country that the sitdown strike no longer could effectively be used.

But if the great mass of organized labor discarded this Communist technique, the left-wing political aspirants, the fellow travelers, the bleeding hearts, and the ADA-ers did not.

For them the goon squad was a useful device, to be used any time or any place it would further their interests.

No means is unlawful to their ends, and they do not hesitate to use it, always bleating, meanwhile, about their constitutional privileges and the Bill of Rights.

Governor Williams and his ADA backers may have won a big victory by using strong-arm methods to take over control of the Democratic Party in Wayne County.

But they may find it difficult to convince the public which is not prepared to surrender its right to ball-bat-wielding goon squads who would fit better into a picture of the Kremlin than of America.

All-American Conference To Combat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include volume I, No. 1, and volume I, No. 2, of the Analysis and Information Service of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism.

The All-American Conference To Combat Communism has established temporary headquarters in Washington, D. C., at 3147 Sixteenth Street NW. The mail address for the All-American Conference is post-office box 921, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Experts on communism are warning us that a new peace offensive can be expected from the Soviet Union. Every effort will be made by the U. S. S. R., short of getting entangled immediately itself, to drag on the Korean affair and to pin down as many American troops and as much American matériel as possible. But when the tide of battle turns and the United States-United Nations forces go on the offensive, that will be the likely signal for the Kremlin to begin its next peace offensive. It will be directed primarily at the United States.

Naturally, the purpose of that offensive will be to slow up the processes of mobilization and preparedness in this country. Stalin has a sincere respect for the United States productive capacity. He knows, once we are geared up for war, he cannot start anything without risking defeat. He doesn't want us to get geared up. He would prefer to sacrifice Red Korea if it will send us back into a stage of somnolence, or at least to cut down on the date of rearmament.

Stalin, say the experts, was surprised at the American reaction to Korea. He had thought it would be a quick trick. He thought it would not arouse this country as it did. The tactic, since the Soviet Union needs more time for its own preparations and to digest its own great gains in China and elsewhere, is to allay American alarm. Permitting us to win the war in Korea without throwing in the Chinese Communist armies by way of reinforcement, plus an all-out peace offensive, is counted on to do the trick—shift the American war machine back into low gear.

The point is: Don't get caught napping by this sudden shift in tactics. Because they are simply tactics. Stalin, himself, once declared: "It is not for nothing that the proverb says, 'An obliging bear is more dangerous than an enemy.'"

Beware the obliging bear that not only walks like a man but talks like a man of peace.

Remember that the Stockholm peace petition was being circulated by Stalin's minions even while his satellite troops invaded South Korea. It was a case of talking peace and acting war. Under the cover of the peace talk and the attempt to lull us into a sense of false security, the Soviet Union could continue to get ready for war, behind the iron curtain, without any letdown of its own. In the months ahead it could effectively reduce the disparity in atomic weapons. It could bring its stockpile of bombs nearer to the critical point. That critical point is reached when the Soviet leaders figure they could do as much damage to us with their fewer bombs as we could do to them with our larger number. The point is in our greater vulnerability through tighter concentration of people and industry.

The experts also warn against the propaganda line that we still do business with Uncle Joe.

If a person bought stock—took stock—in a firm which had gone bankrupt 28 times before, wouldn't he need to have his head examined? Well, the Soviet Union has bankrupted its international credit no less than 28 times between 1920 and 1940, by shattering into fragments the treaties it entered into with other countries, solemnly, freely and without duress. Is anyone so naive that he would continue to take stock in such a morally bankrupt regime? And yet, doubtless, there will be the outcry that we ought to make one more attempt to understand the Russians, clasp the proffered hand of Stalin, do business with Uncle Joe.

Anybody who is interested can get a list of all 28 treaties broken by Stalin before

1941, by looking in the appendix of William C. Bullitt's the Great Globe Itself. I cite a few examples:

1. Violation of the Covenant of the League of Nations by seizing Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

2. Violation of the same covenant by conspiring and acting with Germany to partition Poland;

3. Violation of the Treaty of Riga by incorporating southeastern Poland into the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic;

4. Violation of the treaty of nonaggression with Finland by attacking and invading Finland ir the winter war of 1939–40, and

5. Violation of its pledge to respect the sovereignty of Rumania by seizing and absorbing into the U. S. S. R. the Rumanian Provinces of Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina.

Many post-1945 violations of treaties are on record, so many that one wonders why it is considered useful, at all, to get the signature of the Soviet Union to any treaty. For instance, there was the pledge at Yalta to permit free and democratic elections in Poland and the Balkans. There was the pledge, also at Yalta, that the Soviet Union would give its support to the Nationalist Government in China and only to that government. Looking back on that one, from the hindsight of what has happened in China since, gives a true perspective of how treaties are regarded, if not observed, by the rulers of the Soviet Union.

It was rather significant that the experts, in Washington and in New York, took the view, on the whole, that a succession of Koreas is not to be expected in the next few months. To the contrary, they think the Soviet Union will avoid a direct clash with the United States for the next 2 years, at least.

And something of a corollary, they were not particularly alarmed lest Mao Tse-tung send in his own Chinese Red army to help the North Koreans. They pointed out, in the first place, that Mao was not too anxious to get involved with the United States at this juncture; and, in the second place, Russia would not want it because it would confront the United States with such an insuperable task of fighting in the great vastness of China, against millions of Asiatic troops, that our people and leaders would all the sooner reach the conclusion that it was preferable to strike at the pyromaniac who set all the fires instead of exhausting ourselves trying to put out every fire he set. This approaches the proposition voiced by Harold Stassen recently that we hold the Soviet Union strictly accountable for the actions of its satellites.

While the majority view was that war was not imminent with the Soviet Union, direct, nevertheless a respectable minority at both meetings, held that the third world war is imminent; that Korea is just one of many like incidents in a force-play which the Soviet Union is preparing. The plan they see is to force the United States to commit all its available manpower and equipment, as fast as they can be mobilized, to peripheral wars of subatomic character. Once we are engaged fuliy and without any surplus, then will be the time for the Soviet Union to make a move which will cause us either to have to fight the U. S. S. R. directly or abandon the world to communism.

The inevitability of a show-down was admitted by all. No one in either group took the attitude that there was still any hope of peaceful accommodation between the Soviet Union and the west. This quite hopeless situation stems from the belief that the Soviet Union is intent on world conquest either by force of arms or by internal subversion. If internal methods fail, then the Red army will be brought into play.

The United States has twice fought bloody wars against a country and an ideology which sought to rule the earth. We are formally pledged to come to the aid of various countries in Europe which suffer aggression. On top of this, there are various other countries, not members of the Atlantic Union, whose territorial integrity will be protected by this country, as a matter of policy—just as in the case of South Korea.

While there was no difference about the inevitability of the conflict, there was a sharp difference on when it would come and how. The majority view was that Stalin needed 2 years in which to stockpile his atom bombs, consolidate and digest his gains, regroup and generally make ready for world war III. They did not think that he would be greatly pushed by our rearmament program—which, at best, would take a full year to get going. If, by a successful peace offensive, this period could be stretched out to another year, then it would be all to the good for Stalin, permitting him that much more time for preparation and maneuver.

However, the success of this particular peace offensive depends on the Soviet Union not creating other Koreas in the meantime, to rouse us up anew.

The chief way in which we will be "bled," during this period, is by the rather ineffectual armament of Europe. Thirty-five divisions would be quite a job to equip and that is the absolute minimum for a holding operation. From the Communist standpoint, the rearmament could be made doubly ineffective if a propaganda of defeatism and of neutrality could be made to sweep those countries. You may be sure that the propaganda drumfire on this will be tripled in the next few months, in the effort to make our allies unreliable allies.

The minority view was that two great forces were rushing at each other like uncontrollable torrents and that they would clash much sooner than most people expected. They expressed the thought that the world would be very lucky if western Europe had not been invaded in the next 365 days. Yugoslavia and Germany would be the key targets.

The heightened tempo of events can be judged from the fact that two highly placed persons, one the Secretary of the Navy and the other a major general in the Air Force, had to be reprimanded recently for their own advocacy of a "preventive war" against Russia. This not only fits in neatly with the propaganda which Moscow has been putting out all over the world that the "imperialist" United States wants war, but it also could have the effect of speeding up war between the two countries. When a stage is reached in the preliminaries where responsible officials talk openly about "preventive war" then a hair-trigger condition exists. The Kremlin may actually come to feel menaced to the point that it would launch a "preventive war" of its own to forestall what it thought might be a "preventive war" by us. At any event, an excuse for aggression is given to Russia which is of invaluable moral assistance. Most important of all, the tempo toward war is noticeably quickened. The minority view was that many more such unforeseen events would occur to push the antagonists into early and open warfare.

Some of the most interesting discussion took place on the modes by which the Russian peace offensive might be furthered by our own allies. One idea expressed was that, within the next 4 or 5 months—before the United States-United Nations forces could reach the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea—the United Nations would pick an administrator or UN trustee for Korea. This would be done through either open or behind-the-scenes intervention by the British. The British are extremely concerned over the situation in Asia, hoping they can still save Hong Kong and the Malay peninsula. They are not on the same side with us about Formosa because of this concern, which led them to recognize the Chinese Reds. In the opinion of one member of the Analysis Board, the British wish to force a show-down over the recognition of Red China in the UN. They think there might be a chance of achieving a certain amount of appeasement on the part of other Council members on this recognition. The United States has already said it will go along with the majority. In that case, the Korean thing can be settled. And on Stalin's original terms, that is, by kicking the National Government off UN and putting the Red Korean puppet in.

Psychological warfare can be used to split off the Russian people from the Soviet regime.

There is good hope that techniques and means are at hand to penetrate the iron curtain.

If psychological warfare, through these techniques and means, were pushed effectively—repeat, effectively—the rewards could be staggering. Perhaps world war III could be avoided altogether.

In Washington and New York, our boards of experts on communism discussed this matter of psychological warfare at four meetings.

Some of the things which were brought out:

The iron curtain is not a caprice on the part of Stalin. It is sheer necessity. Once the iron curtain is effectively penetrated by ideas and truth from the outside world, then one-half of the Stalin system, the twin system of propaganda and terror, is rendered useless. Stalin pays the utmost tribute to the fact that he cannot afford to let truth in. He goes to any length to keep it out because he knows his system would fall, otherwise. The principal problem, then, is to penetrate the iron curtain with a sufficient freightage of truth.

Our main method of trying to penetrate, heretofore, has been by means of the Voice of America. It has not been very effective because few Russians have suitable receiving sets. Moreover, the programs which are not very hard-hitting, anyway, are jammed.

The written word is more effective than the spoken word. It is necessary that the Soviet people get pamphlets and leaflets, of a hard-hitting character, preparing them psychologically for revolt; organizing them in small groups, for security reasons; freeing them from their pathological fear of the MVD, the secret police; giving them missions which can be accomplished without too much danger; giving them the feeling that they are not alone, either in their own country, or abroad, in the high task of freeing their land of a greater tyranny than the czars'.

Our boards were told there was more than one underground operating either in Russia, the satellite states, the militarily occupied countries, or all three, which were attempting to do those very things.

NTS—AN UNDERGROUND

One of them is called NTS. Its initials form, in the Russian language, the twin slogans of "We bring death to tyrants" and "We bring freedom to the people."

A representative of NTS, Mr. Constantine Boldyreff, appeared at the last two meetings of the board in New York and Washington. He is a registered foreign agent with the Department of Justice, representing this Russian underground here. He is an instructor at the Institute of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, of Georgetown University.

Mr. Boldyreff, who gave permission to name both him and his organization, said the group had been in existence for about 20 years. He said it had managed to distribute 3,000,000 leaflets in 1949 alone. A large part of them were distributed by means of balloons, equipped with clockwork

mechanisms, which explode the balloons over Soviet territory at points which are carefully calculated from wind directions and velocities.

Mr. Boldyreff said he thought the Russian people are very ripe for revolution. For one thing, nearly every family in Russia has friends or relatives in slave-labor camps. This is necessarily so with 15,000,000 victims of these camps.

Millions hate the regime but they are held down by fear of the MVD, by the constant propaganda, by the denial to them of information as to what is going on outside the Soviet Union or, for that matter, inside the Soviet Union. With the MVD breathing down their necks they cannot organize in large groups or procure arms.

RED ARMY IS REAL ACHILLES HEEL

But the NTS regards this as surmountable. It argues that the Achilles heel of the whole Soviet system is Russia itself, where the regime is more hated because better known than anywhere else. Further, the Achilles heel of Russia proper is the Red army.

A very large part of their propaganda is directed toward the Red army—and the Red army is organized and has weapons. Furthermore it is directed by human beings who may be like other human beings, high officers in the Red army, before them.

Take the Tukhachevsky conspiracy in 1937. Here was the case of a Soviet marshal accused of plotting against the life of Stalin and seizing the state apparatus. His conviction and death was accompanied by a wave of arrests which caught up 457 generals. Some were shot, others imprisoned, cashiered, or sent into exile. It all but decapitated the Red army. Such an operation, just 2 years before the Second World War broke out, certainly argues that the regime had cause to fear its generals and, through them, the loyalty of the Red army as a whole.

Then there was the business of the two million or more Russian soldiers who surrendered to the Germans, after token resistance, shortly after the Nazis crossed the line into Russia in 1941. About 800,000 Soviet Nationals joined the German Army and fought against Stalin, some of them organized into all-Russian divisions by General Vlassov.

This much to show by historical precept that it is not utterly absurd to speak of, and hope for, mass defections in the Soviet Army. The experts agreed that the best time to work for the internal dissolution of the Red army is before the atom bombs begin to fall. Then—unless the targets are picked most carefully and unless the whole Soviet system is quickly rocked to its foundations by the destruction of its military potential—the use of atomic bombs might boomerang and solidify the Russian people in support of the regime.

There are atomic bombs of the mind, too. For years the Soviet people have been intensively indoctrinated with the Leninist slogan: "Turn imperialist war into civil war." By that they mean for soldiers in the army of a capitalist state to turn their guns on their own officers and to fraternize with the enemy—especially if that enemy happens to be the Soviet Union. What if the officers and men of the Red army got the idea in reverse—that, after all, the Soviet Union is the "imperialist" state against which their guns should be turned?

One of the best stunts to the credit of NTS, Mr. Boldyreff recounted, was to give several Soviet divisions, on occupation duty, the opportunity to read some anti-Communist facts. The army newspaper, Soviet Army, came out on this occasion in two editions. One was the simon-pure Communist version. The other edition was a reproduction of the whole top of the page of the Communist version—headline for headline and word for word. But after reading a few sentences down the page, things began to go giddily anti-Communist. Soldiers began to read things they never dreamed would come out under the Soviet Army imprimatur. There was very little the Communist authorities could do about it except confiscate all papers—including the one they had just distributed themselves.

WORLD WAR III MIGHT BE AVERTED

The main purpose of propaganda such as this is to weaken the fighting morale of the Red army. It is largely directed at Red army officers who doubtless still have Vlassov potentials. If there could be enough of it to cause the MVD or the Politburo to question the reliability of the army, then world war III might never come to pass. The Red leaders would never send it rolling across international boundaries. Maybe Stalin, himself, feels that he made two mistakes in the last war—to let western Europe see the Red army and let the Red army see western Europe.

It was brought out at the meetings that, in cost, the carrying on of propaganda by balloon leaflets and other underground means, could be carried on for peanuts, compared to the VOA. A few thousand balloons a week, each carrying 1,000 or so leaflets, would mean 1,000,000 or more leaflets every 7 days.

REACTION OF GROUPS

The Washington group expressed itself uniformly as being impressed by Mr. Boldyreff and the NTS program. In New York, three members of the group expressed dissent. One raised questions as to actual accomplishments of NTS, saying its claims were exaggerated. Others disagreed with methods of organization and ideological perceptiveness.

All, however, agreed: 1. Theoretically, the work which NTS is doing, or claims to be doing, is highly necessary; and 2, it can best be done by private organizations, especially while this country is not in a state of declared war against the Soviet Union.

Some members of both panels expressed the view that a great opportunity existed in an almost totally neglected field. Support of the right sort of organization, in carrying on underground activities and psychological warfare in the heartland of communism, the Soviet Union itself, offers dazzling possibilities. Nothing less than the peace of the world could be involved.

And one of the great points to be remembered is that at the present time, at least, private organizations can operate in that field more effectively than certain agencies of the Government.

MUST GO ON PSYCHOLOGICAL OFFENSIVE

One of the most interesting things about the New York meetings was the keen insistence on adopting more aggressive methods of psychological warfare. This country should go on the psychological offensive, they say, and make it plain that we will settle for nothing less than the liberation of the Soviet and satellite people from Communist slavery. We must get out the message that we have not lost sight of nor lost interest in the people who have been submerged.

The primary consideration in psychological warfare is to drive a wedge between the people and the regime.

Perhaps the greatest master of propaganda of this century—Dr. Joseph Goebbels—bears witness to the effectiveness of such a course. He said in his diary in 1942: "A much more clever form of propaganda has been proposed in the United States. The idea is not to go against the German people but against nazism. I sense a certain danger. If I were on the enemy side I should have, from the first day, adopted the slogan of fighting against nazism and not against the German people."

The same thing now applies in fighting the Red totalitarianism as in fighting the brown.

Last week in New York this same attitude was expressed, coupled with a suggestion for action. It was adopted as the sense of the meeting that an organization be formed to be known as American Friends of the Russian People. News of the formation of a mass-supported organization of anti-Communists in this country would penetrate within the iron curtain and would perform the valuable functions of letting the people there know that they were not hated by the American people; that, in fact, the American people sympathized with them and wished to aid them. It would give them a certain release from the sense of aloneness and helplessness which it is one of the chief functions of the whole Soviet state apparatus to impress upon the Soviet citizen.

It would inevitably serve, also, the highly valuable purpose of driving a wedge between the Russian people and the masters in the Kremlin.

OPPORTUNITIES EXIST ALSO IN CHINA

Although the groups were concentrating on the Russian and nearby satellite scene, it was very cogently commented that there were opportunities for psychological warfare and underground work in China also.

Whereas there are not now any known revolts or uprisings going on in the Soviet Union (30 of them have occurred since 1921) the situation is different in China. There the Red Chinese Government is confronted with wide-scale insurrections. Mao Tse-tung, himself, has admitted that half a million guerrillas are harassing his regime. Peasant groups, as well as numerous secret societies, are revolting against the excessive Communist requisitioning of food, confiscatory taxation, and ruthless treatment, generally.

A rather small investment in trying to bind together some of these islands of resistance in China proper, would pay high dividends, it was thought.

SUMMARY

Means and techniques are either at hand or can be found for piercing the iron curtain. The regime is placed in danger if that curtain is pierced with regularity and with effective propaganda.

Already at least one Russian underground—the NTS—is using balloons and other means to get leaflets into Russia and the satellite states.

It is specializing on the Red army, with the idea that other Vlassovs, other Tukhachevskys can be found. While the people are disorganized and unarmed, the Red army is neither. It is the principal hope, from the historical standpoint, of resisting the regime.

If sufficient impress can be made on the Red army, if the Leninist slogan: "Turn the imperialist war into civil war" can be turned on the aggressors, there could be an uprising in the army.

Fear of this, or nonreliance in the army by the Kremlin, could cause the Politburo to change its mind about aggression. It might even prevent world war III.

Counterrevolutionary work, such as being done by NTS can be increased and carried on for "peanuts," yet promises to be more effective than Voice of America.

Private organizations can carry it on more effectively than governmental.

One of primary points to be remembered in all psychological warfare is that a wedge must be driven between the Russian people and the Soviet Government. We must make it plain we are not fighting the Russian people.

Sense of meeting was that "American Friends of Russian People" be organized and pushed.

China should not be forgotten as a locale for psychological warfare. Half a million people are already in revolt against Mao.

American Liberalism at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Harold J. Gallagher, president of the American Bar Association, delivered at the seventy-third annual meeting, Washington, D. C., September 18, 1950:

AMERICAN LIBERALISM AT THE CROSSROADS

This is the seventy-third annual meeting of the American Bar Association. As one looks back over its record of almost three-quarters of a century, it will be recognized that the greatest opportunities of the legal profession are before us. This is because the problems which confront us are more numerous and complicated than ever before. The history of the American Bar Association is a record of substantial achievement in public service. In the discharge of its responsibilities it has measured well up to what the people have a right to expect from the legal profession.

Of the purposes of the American Bar Association stated in its constitution the most fundamental is to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and to maintain representative government. Nothing is more important than this for the protection of our liberties, particularly at this time when our institutions are in such serious danger. We should take note that today we commemorate the one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, which occurred on September 17, 1787. When the Federal Constitutional Convention began its deliberations, Benjamin Franklin said, "The institutions of this country are dependent upon the spirit of the legal profession." To uphold those institutions is one of the important tasks before the organized bar of the United States.

The past 20 years have witnessed substantial, we may even say revolutionary, changes in the powers and functions of our Federal Government. The Supreme Court has held that the Federal Government has powers which for more than a century no one supposed it had. In so holding, it was required to reverse many of its own previous decisions. The changes effected have threatened both our system of free enterprise and the form of our Government itself; the power of the States has been greatly reduced and the liberties of the people endangered by the breakdown of representative government and by the destruction of local self-government due to the shift of power from the States to the Federal Government. What was once a Federal Union of States has been largely superseded by a centralized National Government of unlimited power.

At the time that these changes are being made, we are faced with the conflict of ideologies raging between the Soviet Union and the United States and other western powers. The American Bar Association, long ago, registered its warning to our people of the grave danger of communism and of its serious and predatory threat to our way of living and our system of free government. No one here doubts that communism is a powerful and ruthless conspiracy to destroy democratic government and the liberties we cherish. Yet the Communists advocate their policies in the name of democracy and liberalism. With these dangers facing us from within and without, traditional American liberalism seems to be at the crossroads. It is well therefore to consider some fundamentals:

At the time of its adoption, our Constitution marked the high tide of the world's liberalism in government. It combined a fine expression of a true spiritual idealism regarding the rights of man, with provisions which secured an equitable division of the blessings of liberty among the people. To the founding fathers, it was clear that man is a creature of God and that his innate and essential dignity requires the recognition of his free individuality. Man is not to look for his rights or for his abundance to the state. He has them within himself. Long before, Milton had said, "Our liberty is not Caesar's. It is a blessing we have received from God Himself. It is what we are born to. To lay this down at Caesar's feet, which we derived not from him, which we are not beholden to him for, were an unworthy action and a degrading of our very nature." This same philosophy of government appeared near the opening words of the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. That among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed, * * *." Man, as the ultimate sovereign, creates and is the master of his government. He is a citizen and not a subject.

When the Constitution was drafted, this issue of the liberty of the individual as against the supremacy of the coercive state had been successfully fought out in our Revolutionary War on the battlefield and during the centuries-long struggles of the English people to establish their liberties. This history made the background and basis for the foundation of our Republic. These struggles were ideological conflicts. Their goal was to establish individual liberty as a reality. Which shall predominate—the divine right of kings, which means the divine right of the government, or the divine right of man?

Thus, the philosophy of government, expressed in our Declaration of Independence and carried into our Constitution and Bill of Rights, had a spiritual foundation and came from the very soul of the people. The dignity and integrity of the individual is a fundamental tenet of the Christian faith which has had its highest manifestation in our system of government and way of living. Our historical liberalism was something much deeper than the materialism of the modern intellectual, who lays false claim to liberalism and who is able to accept the fruits of great historic movements without having to fight for them.

The founding fathers' conception of what man is explains many of the provisions of the Constitution. Those which express the powers of the state are largely limitations upon the government's power to interfere with the citizen. Our Constitution guarantees to the people rights which constitute our basic freedoms, freedoms which no totalitarian state gives to its citizens—the right to the liberty and to the security of the individual person; to equal treatment before the law; to freedom of religion, of thought and of speech; to assemble peaceably and petition for the redress of grievances; to criticize the Government; to own property to contract about their own affairs; to manage and operate any legitimate enterprise; to buy and sell in a free market so long as this freedom does not conflict with the public interest; to be protected against unreasonable search and seizure of person and property; to be protected against double jeopardy, and from being compelled to give testimony in a criminal case against themselves, and from being deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; and to be secure against the Government taking property for public use without just compensation. These provisions, written into the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, gave recognition to the human and divine dignity of man. They were the results of the experience of the people showing the need for provisions to safeguard man's individuality against a coercive government. As Woodrow Wilson, the great liberal and historian, said: "Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it."

Our Government, with such a background, has certain plain characteristics:

First. It is not authoritarian. The Constitution established no final seat of authority in any man or position. It contains a carefully worked out system of checks and balances designed to secure the liberty of every man.

Second. It protects minorities. The drafters were familiar with past political experience and knew the dangers of majority rule, under the democratic form of government, to the freedom of those in minority groups. The abuses of pure democracies were well known and had been commented upon by students of government as early as Plato. In order, therefore, to insure liberty, a representative and republican, not a purely democratic, form of government was established.

Third. It protects local self-government. The colonists had always objected to the denial of the right of local government by the British Crown. Local government is an essential of self-government. Therefore, the functions of local government were carefully preserved excepting in those fields which are essentially national.

Fourth. It contemplates a free-enterprise system. The free-enterprise system is necessarily the natural expression of the fundamental freedom of man to express the fullness of his being. He was not to be deprived of the opportunities of his freedom and industry.

Citizens are the slaves of the state if they depend upon its will for their means of life. Consistently, the Constitution contains provisions protecting the fruits of man's labor. These were of the very heart of his freedom.

Fifth. It contemplates individual responsibility for personal economic security. Under this conception of freedom, it is intended that man look for his economic security to the abundance which is the natural product of his own untrammeled liberty, intelligence, and work. The colonists had made their choice between liberty and security. They had established a home in the wilderness of an unexplored continent where there was complete freedom from social or political limitations but little other security. The free-enterprise system, which is inherently a system of risk, thus became a fundamental which has permeated American life ever since. For man's welfare, the founding fathers relied not on the Government but on man's God-given, individual responsibility, intelligence, and industry under the stimulus of freedom. It was by no means inappropriate that the words "Liberty" and "In God we trust" were inscribed

upon our coinage although it is the very symbol of material wealth.

So designed, this Nation has prospered materially. It has been a leader among nations in its high productivity of wealth and in the breadth of its distribution among its people. At the high tide of that abundance we are witnessing, however, great activity by certain groups of our people toward reversing these traditional concepts. This attack is part of a world-wide swing toward socialism. The danger to our liberty from the military and political efforts of Russia to rule the world in the name of communism has now been made entirely clear to our people. But our danger from within is more subtle, is little understood by most of our people, and is, therefore, more of a threat to our liberties. I refer to the trend away from our American liberalism indicated by the centralization of power in the Federal Government and the corresponding loss of local self-government, the breakdown of representative government of the type contemplated by the Constitution, the attempted substitution of socialization in the place of our free-enterprise system, and the growth of what is often referred to as the welfare state, but which more appropriately should be called the service state. Observe the changes:

1. Instead of self-government being insured by the maintenance of local government, we are witnessing the twilight of the State governments. In our lifetime, the Federal Government has been converted into the major power in the lives of our people. The Federal Government has taken control of the important phases of the conduct of local and intrastate business, transportation, finance, production, and distribution. An absentee centralized government has thus been substituted for local self-government. Great responsibilities have been vested in a central state which is already heavily burdened and which has a bad but clearly deserved reputation for inefficiency and extravagance. The eligible voters in the last election were so uninterested in its operations that only 50 percent of them voted.

The representatives of the States in the Congress are very willing, and we might say eager, to support what would speedily be recognized and avoided as a consistent policy of extravagant spending if made by the States, but which does not appear extravagant when done with Federal funds. But Federal funds are drawn directly from the people of the several States, largely through the income tax. This extravagance must be paid for through such taxes. The tax is on the industrious citizen, and the wage earners. It falls heaviest on the man who works with his hands, the artisan, the farmer, the skilled laborer; all of whom must be taxed, and heavily, to provide funds for these Federal disbursements. There are enough rich individuals and corporations to pay only a small part of the cost. It is the plain man who in reality pays. People lose their capacity for self-government by failing to govern. If we are to continue to enjoy self-government in these United States, the people must again resume the burden from which they have sought to escape.

2. Observe the trend away from individualism toward socialization. Although the founding fathers certainly never intended to create a government designed to engage in private enterprise, it is plain that our Government is turning from a system based upon the energies of individual men to a system based on his socialized efforts. As an illustration, the Federal Government proposes to duplicate the existing capacity of the private electric generating plants. The discouraging effect of this program on private enterprise is plain, particularly when it is projected against a background of other socialization projects, including the Tennessee Valley and Columbia River developments, the socialization of medicine, the declared intention to secure authority from Congress to build Government steel mills, and such comprehensive planned-economy programs as the Brannan agricultural plan. Necessarily, such systems of planning require central control to the exclusion of the right and initiative of the individual. Necessarily, they involve the denial of free markets, free enterprise, and economic freedom.

3. We have moved rapidly in the direction of the service state. In Britain, the service state was used as a prelude to the more serious forms of socialization. In this country, we are now engaged in an exploitation of the idea of the service state, designed to give material good to certain restricted groups of our people which have great voting power—the veterans, labor, the farmers and those groups of voters who will benefit specially by socialized medicine, the Federal subsidization of education, old-age pensions, housing legislation, employment insurance and so on. Many of these things are good in and of themselves. But man is induced to look for his material good to the socialized action of the state, whereas it should be found in an economy which preserves the individuality of man, and encourages him to rely upon the exercise of his own skill, energy, and talent for his personal advancement and individual prosperity.

Edmund Burke said "People never give up their liberties but under some delusion." Therefore, they resort to delusion who seek to take away the liberties of the people. It is important to observe that generally the changes, which put emphasis on the socialized, not the individual, efforts of man, are proposed and defended on the ground that they are an expression of what is said to be a true "democracy." This conception, however, was repudiated by the drafters of the Constitution. These changes are also declared to be an expression of a modern "liberalism." But this so-called liberalism is not only a denial of the liberalism under which the Constitution was drafted but a denial of true and fundamental liberalism.

The word "democracy" has more than one meaning. In a political sense, it signifies a government designed to depend fully on the rule of the majority. In the social or economic sense, it means equality of social or economic status. It was not discussed in either sense in the historic documents defining the nature of our own Republic.

As I have said, the Government of the United States was set up not as a democracy, using the word in the political sense, but as a republic. The founders of the Government knew the danger to minorities from majority action in a fully democratic government. It is always the minorities which are prejudiced. In their care to protect the freedom of man from his government, the founders intended to safeguard against this danger. No one would question that the New England town-meeting type of pure democracy is ill adapted to our governmental needs, but that we must depend upon representatives duly elected by the eligible voters.

The Constitution did not attempt to create economic equality by a democracy. It is true that the Declaration of Independence declares that all men are created equal. But it was a standard of political, social, and economic opportunity that the Declaration stated. It did not purport to command that the wealth be shared equally. Individuals necessarily reflect different ancestry, environments and training, and these differences produce inequalities in capacities and skills. Under a system of political equality, by which the free play of man's individual intelligence and industry was fully protected, it contemplated that the natural products of man's capacity and energy would be his. Its heart was individual liberty, not a socialized status. The Constitution fully protected property rights and intended to safeguard every man in his right to retain the fruits of his own individual effort.

The modern so-called liberals, however, have adopted a materialistic concept of liberalism and a concept of democracy in the economic sense. They say that social justice requires action by the government to create economic equality. They customarily place what they call human rights above property rights, even though the right to own and hold property is one of the most precious of human rights. The service state is a natural implement of the materialistic liberalism. Social legislation to provide services at government expense to certain classes of the population has a common and very strong appeal because of its material beneficence. On the surface it promises material good. Nevertheless, the dangers of the service state as in instrument of materialistic liberalism should be obvious.

The proposal to equalize men from a material standpoint involves the limitation of the liberty of other men, where it is accomplished by taking wealth from those who have and giving it to those who have not. Legislation designed for such purposes is essentially discriminatory when it confers benefits or privileges upon certain favored groups at the expense, directly or indirectly, of other groups. Such legislation violates in spirit the provisions of the Bill of Rights which guarantees to all persons equality before the law. If this kind of legislation is to meet that test, it should not coerce or discriminate between the different groups of citizens.

I do not suggest that the government, as well as private enterprise, has no functions to perform in matters broadly categorized as welfare. Society should protect the unfortunate persons who are unable to rely upon themselves through the accident of physical or mental disability or personal disaster. But this does not require that where such welfare measures are justified they shall be undertaken by the Federal Government rather than by the States or within the framework of the free-enterprise system. Government bounty should not be spread among persons well able to stand on their own feet and to be the masters of their own destinies. The people can be broken morally by such schemes, which substitute subservience for self-reliance. A healthy man needs no crutches. Through their use his limbs will wither. Where private enterprise can provide the security called for, it will embrace the opportunity.

Of course, individual liberty may not remain absolutely unrestrained. No one today would say that the old doctrine of laissez faire should be tolerated. We are all aware of the corruptive influence of power on persons and organizations. We have seen abuses flow from large aggregations of corporate power. When such corporations refused to use self-restraint, Congress has properly enacted antitrust laws or other regulatory legislation employing restrictive power. And paradoxically we have seen that restrictive power itself grows hugely until in some instances it is a choking threat to free enterprise. As a people, we are not mature enough to eliminate all restrains upon individual freedom. But again there is a vast difference in restraint and control. Here the function of the Government in limitation and not in the complete regulation which essentially is control. Control is but a few paces short of pure socialism and is a far cry from our heritage of true liberalism.

I do not propose any limitation on the abundance of the product of industry which is to be distributed to our people. The great volume of that abundance is one of the wonders of the world. I am considering here not ends but means. The question is not whether the distribution of abundance shall be reduced. The question rather is how it shall be provided—by the state through

socialism or within the framework of the free-enterprise system? Where shall the emphasis be—on the freedom of individualism or on the limitations upon individualism which are the heart of socialization? The free-enterprise system in America, in point of its productivity and the distribution of the bounties of that abundance to the public, is without parallel in human experience. All experience indicates that a governmental system of production will not equal it in productivity. Within the framework of the free-enterprise system and without striking down human liberty, free enterprise is capable of producing a greater measure of bounties than a service state can provide.

It is significant that the basic philosophy of our Government with its emphasis on spiritual values has manifested itself in such a measure of material prosperity. Our country's use of the free enterprise system is a way to attain a goal. The goal is not the free enterprise system. This goal is not really materialistic. The purpose is the full development of man. The spiritual aspects of free enterprise may not be recognized by all businessmen. But whether recognized or not, it is clear that the fundamental of the American system is, and always has been, this spiritual freedom of man. The effort of today's materialistic liberals is to make material welfare the purpose of our Nation's being at the expense of freedom. This is a perversion of the American ideal.

People naturally love liberty. They will surrender liberty only through misunderstanding. I do not believe that the departures from our traditional position, which the lawmakers have made, represent an understanding choice by the people. The people have not understood. The departures have been made under the impact of the severe depression of the 1930's and of the World War, when the stress was upon haste and upon temporary and emergency conditions. In some instances they reflect, furthermore, the selfishness of individuals and organized pressure groups. The prime purpose of too many people has been to get something out of the State in subsidies, bonuses, and Government aid of one sort or another for special groups. Too few have been trying to protect the Nation against such selfish demands.

Under an absolute government, it is not necessary for the people to understand; but the preservation of liberty requires the light of understanding. Consequently, it is vital that every citizen of our Republic fully understands the fundamentals of our representative form of government and the principles necessary to the retention of the freedom of the individual. Without such knowledge, the citizen cannot intelligently determine whether or not the policies which are pursued by his representatives in the government will lead to the destruction of our form of government and the loss of basic freedom.

Our fundamental liberties today are accepted as commonplace. This is because many people do not know how those liberties were won. To retain our freedom, we must understand it. We must want to retain it and be willing to make all sacrifices necessary to that end. We must not take freedom as something that is free; that is, guaranteed to us forever without our own continuous effort. Such complacency can lead only to our own destruction. Lawyers should be the last to forget that not only the eternal vigilance but eternal effort is essential for the preservation of liberty. As Woodrow Wilson said, "No more vital truth was ever uttered than that freedom and free institutions cannot be long maintained by any people who do not understand the nature of their own government."

There is no present danger of a sudden collapse of our country as a free country. Freedom is not lost by a sudden breaking of the governmental structure. It is destroyed by an imperceptible nibbling away of one essential liberty after another, each nibble seemingly, at the time, innocuous. It is a gradual process and extends over a long period of time. It is like the fall of a great oak. In outward appearance, the tree has great strength, and when it falls, in what seems to be a moment of great stress, it is actually the culmination of the slow and imperceptible deterioration of the years.

On every possible occasion, we lawyers, therefore, should expound fearlessly the principles of the true American liberalism writen into our Constitution. This requires courage, perseverance, and a strong faith in that liberalism. Some lawyers feel that the political stream is running too strongly toward some form of collectivism to be halted. Many think that the problem is so big that their individual efforts are futile. These are mere counsels of despair. They are unworthy of our profession and of our American heritage. The Nation was born in a battle of ideas. Today we face a new battle of ideas. The cause is not hopeless unless we will it so.

There is an old Chinese proverb which says "It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness." The lawyer's candle should burn far brighter than any other citizen's. He is trained in law and advocacy; his opinions on public questions gain special attention because of his profession; he has many opportunities to speak and to advise. Frequently, he is a man of prestige in his community and often he holds political office or is active and influential in a political party. In any battle of ideas, he should be—he is—the best equipped and the most effective soldier in the field. The battle to retain our free American society and to defend it against further inroads must not be lost by the default of lawyers. There are many positive actions which lawyers may perform:

We can advise the managers of private enterprise, with some of whom every lawyer has contacts, to study and to deal constructively, in their own organizations and trade associations, with the problems which, unless handled effectively and promptly by the private enterprise system itself, ripen into legislative proposals of governmental action. In this respect, the managers of the system have an important duty. The public will demand that the system fully measure up to its responsibility to serve the public good. It is in competition with the forms of socialistic endeavor and must bear the full brunt of ministering best to the public needs, if the public is not to turn elsewhere.

We can resist the permanent fastening upon the Nation of authoritative measures, proper and necessary in times of war but which are not natural to nor a part of the peactime economy. We are today confronted with the threat of another world-wide conflict. We are faced with the all-out mobilization of industry and manpower Steps have necessarily been taken within the past week to set in motion wartime controls for the emergency. But after the real emergency has passed, we should stand stoutly in defense of freedom and be quick to insist that emergency measures, designed to meet war needs, shall be given no more than temporary life and shall be permitted to make no permanent inroad upon our liberal institutions.

We can convince our fellow citizens that Government cannot furnish the solution of every economic ailment and that history shows that the increased assumption of the functions of private enterprise by the Government not only destroys individual freedom but brings economic decline and insecurity.

We can challenge every measure which would transfer to the Federal Government additional functions that have been and can be performed by private organization and enterprise. There is no such challenge from any political party. It must come to the political parties from the people.

Serious questions may be involved in formulating social legislation, which meets the needs of a modern industrial state and does not at the same time destroy the individual rights of the citizen. What we have done in recent years to break down the sovereignty of the States, and to impair local self-government, and the action we have taken in all fields of social and economic legislation, should be carefully reexamined. Congress should without delay authorize and direct to be made an authoritative study by a commission of distinguished and impartial experts.

The Commission should be directed to report what steps should be taken by recommended constitutional amendments, legislation or otherwise:

1. To restore local self-government and return to the States the responsibility of handling such affairs as can best be dealt with on a State or local level rather than by the Federal Government;

2. To give to the States exclusive power to collect certain types of taxes so that the States themselves may be in a position financially to resume their proper functions of government;

3. To withdraw from the Federal Government and transfer to local governments or private enterprise control over matters involving social welfare to the greatest extent deemed possible;

4. To reexamine generally all legislation now in effect which has a tendency to involve or promote the socialization of business and to hamper individual initiative and the continued development of the free-enterprise system.

The examination should be divorced from considerations of an emergency, selfish or political nature. Only the best interests of all the people, and the protection of their freedom and the preservation of our form of government, should be considered. In this study, the issue should be considered with the same high measure of intelligence that guided the founders of our Republic when the original Constitution was drafted. Let the same wisdom and light in which our Nation was born show forth to save it in this critical hour.

All Americans, who are sincerely devoted to the future welfare of their country, stand today at the crossroads. Many of their fellows have already been misguided in the name of a false liberalism down the road that leads toward autocratic materialism. The other road follows the true spiritual liberalism which is the basic constitutional principle of the Republic. Before it is too late, it is the duty of the bar and of all others whose training and abilities enable them to recognize where these two roads lead to devote every talent vouchsafed them by their Creator to guide their fellow men along the path of liberty.

Where Do We Go From Here?—A Report on Events That Led Up to the Korean War

---

REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, technically speaking, we are coming to the close of the Eighty-first

Democratic controlled Congress, and I would like to make a few observations on some of the important events that led up to the Korean war.

There are many vital domestic problems that still require the attention of the people and Congress. These will be taken up when Congress reconvenes on November 27, and in the Eighty-second Congress which convenes on January 3, 1951. We have passed legislation directing the President to protect our domestic economy from the ravages of a disastrous inflation. I trust that he will show wisdom in exercising his powers in this respect.

Our first obligation is to back our country's war effort to the fullest extent. During the present session, Congress has appropriated more than $30,000,000,000 for financing the Korean war and for increasing our military strength. This legislation received my support. I have urged and still insist upon the utmost haste on the part of the President and the military authorities in Washington to supply our fighting forces in Korea and elsewhere, with an abundance of the right kind of weapons and war materials so that they can win speedy victory and save American lives.

Extraordinary war powers have been conferred upon the President of the United States. Such authority should be used by him to win the war and not for the purpose of initiating reforms in our Government structure and domestic economy. There are too many people in high places who would like to use war powers to create a socialistic state in this country.

As in the past 16 years, I will continue to vigorously oppose communism and socialism in any form or by any other name. The war against communism in Korea will be fought and won by Americans who believe in freedom and a peaceful world, and the American people will make every sacrifice to back our fighting men for victory. When the war is won, we want our armed men and boys to come back home to the kind of a free country which they fought to save.

Our fighting forces in Korea are making excellent progress, and we pray that an early victory will be theirs. They are engaged in a full-scale war. It is no longer the police action ordered by President Truman on June 27, to stop the Russian directed and armed Communist invasion of South Korea. The situation in Korea is still serious, and we must therefore mobilize our resources and strength against communistic aggression. Whether we like it or not, our country has again become involved in a tragic war, and I hope and pray that the war in Korea is not the beginning of world war III.

THE PEOPLE WANT THE TRUTH

Perhaps no real benefit can be expected from a resurvey of the historical past. Merely to locate the blame for the mess in which we now find ourselves may not serve immediately a useful purpose. Nevertheless, an indirect byproduct might conceivably be the realization by President Truman and Secretary Acheson that we fight best when we are kept informed of the reasons for our fighting. And if this induces greater frankness on the part of the administration, if it brings better teamwork between Government and public, then something will have been accomplished through public realization of the background of this war.

Give the people the truth and they will make the right decision. That the full truth was not given us about Yalta and subsequent diplomatic events should not be a precedent for future mistakes of a similar nature.

We are in for a hard war and it can and will be won. But we must know exactly why we are fighting and for what we are fighting. That kind of partnership between those in authority and those who take their orders is absolutely essential.

HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

Under the Constitution, the President of the United States has full control in shaping our country's foreign policy. For the past 17 years under two Democratic Presidents, the foreign policy has been to appease Communists at home and abroad. As a result of such a policy, our American boys are giving their lives and making tremendous sacrifices in the Korean war.

On June 27, 1950, President Truman suddenly discovered that he could not trust or take the word of Joe Stalin or the leaders in Communist countries dominated by Russia. He found out that the Russian objective was to take over control of the world and to destroy freedom and religion for all people. The President thereupon reversed his appeasement policy in Asia and ordered American troops into Korea to stop Communist aggression by force. This action was taken in the name of the United Nations.

WHY WERE WE CAUGHT SHORT IN KOREA?

It is the right of the American people to secure an honest answer to this question from President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson.

The people were told that the Communist attack on South Korea was a surprise. But what are the facts? For the past 2 years, our military intelligence reported the concentration of heavily armed Communist troops north of the thirty-eighth parallel. By June 30, 1949, the last of the 50,000 American troops were withdrawn from South Korea to appease the Russian Communists, which actually turned out to be an invitation for a Russian-directed Communist drive to take over South Korea. On June 12, 1950, Secretary of State Acheson wrote off South Korea and Formosa as not being vital to our national security, which constituted another invitation for the northern Communists to wage war on South Korea. On May 10, 1950, the following Associated Press dispatch appeared in the Washington Star which gave additional notice to President Truman and the Secretary of State of the impending attack upon South Korea. I quote from the Star:

INVASION IS IMMINENT, SOUTH KOREANS WARNED

(By the Associated Press)

SEOUL, May 10.—Defense Minister Sihn Sung Mo warned South Korea today that invasion by Communist North Korea is imminent.

Sihn said intelligence reports indicated the North Koreans were moving in force toward the border.

He asserted the North Korean Army totals 183,000 trained men; has 173 planes, 173 tanks, and 32 naval vessels, and is supported by 9,000 guerrillas, plus constabulatory and youth corp units.

With all of this information in the hands of the President and the State Department, the attack on South Korea should not have been a surprise. However, on June 27, 1950, the President reversed his Communist-appeasement policy in Asia to one of fighting Communist aggression. Overnight young Americans of 18 and 19 years were thrown into battle, ill-prepared and ill-equipped and outnumbered, into what the President called a police action, which later turned out to be a full-scale war against hordes of crack Russian trained and armed Communist troops. Hundreds of our men have lost their lives because of the woeful weakness of our military forces and our almost total lack of preparedness.

A majority of the American people are bitterly opposed to communism. They approve the President's change in foreign policy from appeasing Communists to opposing Communist aggression. However, they do not excuse the lack of preparation to meet the new war crisis, as they know that Congress had appropriated $95,000,000,000 since the termination of World War II and prior to the Korean war for the Defense Establishment. The Congress and the people felt that our country was fully prepared to meet any attack because Defense Secretary Johnson said that if we were attacked at 4 in the afternoon our forces would be fully equipped and ready to fight at 5 o'clock the same afternoon, and only 27 days before ordering American troops into Korea, President Truman stated that—

We are closer to permanent peace than at any time in the last 5 years.

THE FOURTEEN QUESTIONS

The American people have a right to learn the truth about our preparedness and the President's foreign policy, as well as to secure honest facts on foreign commitments made by the executive branch of the Government. They want truthful answers to the following questions:

First. What happened to the $95,000,000,000 spent on national defense since World War II?

Second. Why did only one dollar out of every seven defense dollars go for combat equipment between 1946 and 1950?

Third. Why did President Truman limit the Air Force to 48 groups when the Republican Eightieth Congress ordered the Air Force expanded to 70 groups?

Fourth. Why, if communism was a menace in Asia, were there only 6 General Pershing tanks, only 30 propellate—tactical—combat planes, only 1 aircraft carrier, and not a single combat marine in the Japanese area when we entered the Korean conflict?

Fifth. Why did President Truman on December 15, 1945, officially announce that unless our ally, China, admitted Communists to its government, China would get no more American aid?

Sixth. Who was best serving America—the administrations which for 50 years defended the open door in China, or the Truman administration which abandoned China to Soviet exploitation?

Seventh. Why when Congress had voted $10,500,000 military aid for South Korea 8 months earlier, had South Korea received only $200 worth of Signal Corps wire when the Communists struck, June 25?

Eighth. Whose advice was the administration following when it asked last year for $150,000,000 in economic aid for South Korea—that of its long-time adviser, Owen Lattimore, who said in July 1949 that "The thing to do is let South Korea fall but not to let it look as though we pushed it"—hence, the recommendation of a parting grant of $150,000,000?

Ninth. Why did Secretary of State Acheson virtually invite the Communists to take Korea, Formosa, and the balance of China by announcing January 12, 1950, that they were beyond our defense perimeter?

Tenth. On what basis did President Truman declare—only 27 days before ordering American troops into Korea—that we were closer to a permanent peace than any time in the last 5 years?

Eleventh. Which was wiser, the administration's appeasement policy that enabled Russia, in the 5 years after World War II, to extend its domination from 170,000,000 people to 800,000,000 people, or Republican insistence on a firm anti-Communist policy?

Twelfth. After the Korean Communists are pushed back to the thirty-eighth parallel, then what?

Thirteenth. What will the administration do in Asia in the future, return to appeasement?

Fourteenth. What hope can there be for peace under any Democratic administration?

WE NEED A FIRM AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Within the past 35 years our country has been involved in two devastating World Wars under two Democratic Presidents, and we are now on the brink of world war III. A strong American foreign policy may have prevented these conflicts. Diplomats make war, but the rank and file of the people fight and pay for them in blood and material resources.

What we need in this country is a strong American foreign policy that our enemies will understand, backed up by a strong domestic economy under our American system, and military strength to demonstrate that we mean business if some dictator attempts to start trouble. Such a program will be our best insurance to secure a lasting peace in the world. One does not need to be an expert in foreign affairs to figure out that Democratic foreign policies have materially contributed to our involvement in three major conflicts.

WE LOST THE PEACE IN WORLD WAR II AT YALTA

We lost the peace in World War II in 1945 at Yalta when the United States teamed up with Russia to launch the Reds' conquest in Asia by secret agreement, giving Russia control of Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, Port Arthur, Dairen, the Sakhalins, and Kuriles. It was at Yalta that our Government cut the heart out of China and handed it to Stalin, because good "Old Joe," as President Truman calls him, wanted it. It was at Yalta that President Roosevelt with Hopkins, Harriman, and Hiss and the whole crowd of appeasers at his side, secretly gave Manchuria to Russia, thus breaking our solemn promise to faithful China. It is no wonder that William C. Bullitt, Democratic United States Ambassador to Russia, has said this about the Yalta agreement:

> No more unnecessary, disgraceful, and potentially disastrous document has ever been signed by a President of the United States.

I could continue at great length to tell about how Russia was permitted to take over the Balkan countries and eastern Germany and Austria. This vast area is behind the iron curtain and under control of the Communists. They are all trouble spots threatening the security and peace of the United States and the world. I want the people of the United States to have the full truth about our foreign policies which have again involved our country and the world in another war. As a result of these policies, I ask President Truman and his Secretary of State to honestly answer the question that everyone is asking, Where do we go from here?

FIFTY-FOUR THOUSAND AMERICAN COMMUNISTS

J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, reports that there are at least 54,000 American Communists and 500,000 fellow travelers who work with these agents of Moscow, running at large in the United States. He reports 727 Communists in Minnesota and more than 7,000 fellow travelers. These American Communists receive their orders from Stalin. They are prepared to sabotage our war effort and to destroy our freedom and religion.

I have vigorously fought Communists since they infiltrated into key positions in our Government in 1933. There should be no place for them in our Government or in the United States. I will not be satisfied until they are confined or sent to Russia where they properly belong.

To illustrate how the Truman administration has coddled communism, we need only turn to the sickening case of Alger Hiss. When Hiss was caught in red-handed betrayal of his country, President Truman called the case a red herring. Secretary of State Acheson proudly refused to turn his back on the polished Mr. Hiss. Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed went to New York to testify for him.

No wonder the Hisses, the Wadleighs, the Pressmans, the Abts, the Witts, the Coplons, the Marzanis and all the other Communists and fellow travelers were welcomed with open arms in the Government.

President Truman's veto of the anti-Communist bill, which was approved by Congress over the veto, clearly demonstrates the desire of the President to continue his Communist appeasement policy toward Communists in the United States. Who is the power behind the President that dictates such a policy? The people would like to have an answer to this question. I voted to override the President's veto as my choice could only be to stand by Americans who are fighting Communists at home and abroad.

SOCIALISM

I am as much opposed to socialism as I am to communism. Both seek to destroy our American form of government and way of life. Socialism is a twin brother of communism. Socialism creates a vast government bureaucracy to regiment and direct the lives of the people. It seeks to nationalize every profession and vital industry on the promise of giving the people something for nothing. Such promises can never be carried out, because someone must pay the bill. I am bitterly opposed to socialized medicine or any other scheme, by whatever name it is called, that seeks to impose the socialistic system on the American people.

Socialism has been unable to deliver on its promises in Britain, even with the United States Marshall plan billions backing it, for the same reason it has been unable to deliver whenever and wherever it has come to power. It cannot deliver because it is a system of government that represses and suppresses the best instincts of the human race. It is a system that undertakes to make everybody to share the poverty of the moment, rather than to inspire everybody to create wealth in greater abundance through personal enterprise.

DEMOCRATIC HIGH COMMAND STOOPS TO NEW LOW IN AMERICAN POLITICS

In the desperate attempt of the Truman administration and certain left-wing CIO labor leaders to elect a left-wing majority in the coming Eighty-second Congress, the Democratic high command has stooped to a new low in American politics. The most insidious and false propaganda publicized by the Democratic Fair Deal committee, with the blessings of President Truman, is the charge that the Republican minority in the Eighty-first Congress is responsible for the war in Korea because the Republican Members of the House did not vote for economic aid to Korea on January 19, 1950. This propaganda is being broadcast in every district represented by a Republican Congressman. What are the facts?

The vote was taken on January 19, 1950. The economic aid proposed in the legislation authorized funds to build cement, fertilizer, and electric plants in South Korea. I, and most Republicans, as well as many Democrats, fought against this type of economic aid to Korea because President Truman and Secretary Acheson had abandoned South Korea to the Communists prior to January 12, 1950, and we did not want to use the American taxpayers' money to build cement, electric, and fertilizer plants for the North Korean Communists to take over.

Another insidious statement used by Labor's League for Political Action was a vote on August 18, 1949, to reduce military aid assistance to Korea by $50,000,000. Ten million, five hundred thousand

dollars was finally agreed upon for military aid for Korea, and up to June 27, 1950, when the war began in South Korea, the President and Secretary of State had only used $200 of the appropriated money for signal wire to arm the Korean soldiers. The facts are that American soldiers had been withdrawn from Korea by June 30, 1949, under orders of the President. The President and the Secretary of State had written off Korea and they had no intention whatsoever to arm the South Korean Army out of any funds appropriated by Congress. Do you not remember what Owen Lattimore, the long-time adviser to the State Department said in July 1949, that—

The thing to do is let South Korea fall but not to let it look as though we pushed it.

And the Truman administration followed the recommendations of Mr. Lattimore.

The Democratic committee has issued a new scandal sheet, which will be used in every State falsely charging that I and other "GOP Congressmen follow Red Party line," for voting against the above proposals. The facts are that I and other Republicans have been fighting Communists at every turn of the road, both at home and abroad. And the Democratic high command and left-wing CIO labor leaders are the officials and individuals with their organizations who have been consorting and appeasing Communists everywhere. The left-wing Democratic Congressmen who are completely controlled by the Democratic high command and the CIO, are the representatives who voted for the above measures following the Red party line in order to secure the Communist vote in national elections. The people will not be fooled with this sort of false and clever trickery.

The American people will not be deceived by this kind of last-minute distorted propaganda which will flood the country during the next 6 weeks.

THE HIGH COST OF GOVERNMENT AND TAXES

The high cost of Government is primarily responsible for the high cost of living. The consumers of the country pay for the cost of Government in hidden and direct taxes. Under the new tax law signed by the President on September 23, 1950, the average person in the United States will work between 3 and 4 months each year to pay for the cost of Government. Reduce the cost of Government and the cost of living will be lowered.

Corporations and persons engaged in business pay taxes out of profits realized from the sale of their products or services to consumers. If there are no profits, they pay no taxes. Unfortunately, persons living on fixed incomes such as frozen salaries, wages, annuities, and pensions are not able to pass their hidden and other taxes on to other persons. Most farmers are in this category. These groups bear the greatest burden from the high cost of Government and inflation. In many instances, persons living on fixed incomes do not have sufficient means to secure the bare necessities of life. Their only remedy is to reduce the cost of Government and eliminate the causes for inflationary spirals.

Deficit Government spending in a peacetime economy should not be permitted. The budget should be balanced and taxes lowered. In the past 20 years, the Federal budget has only been balanced in one Congress, and that was in the Eightieth Republican Congress. This Republican controlled Eightieth Congress cut the cost of Government, reduced individual income taxes, balanced the budget, and left a large surplus in the Treasury to apply on the national debt which now exceeds $257,000,000,000.

With our country engaged in another war, it will not be possible to balance the budget on account of tremendous war expenditures. But I insist that all other Government expenditures should be reduced as far as possible, and when the war comes to an end, the budget must be balanced and taxes lowered to save our country from bankruptcy.

I have been a member of the economy bloc in Congress for the past 16 years. I favor that the Government should run on the same principle as you run your household. That is one reason why I have voted against many highly publicized administration programs that will cost the taxpayers and consumers billions of dollars in direct and hidden taxes to pay the bill. As long as I remain a Member of Congress, I will continue my effort to eliminate duplication, waste, and unnecessary spending in our Federal Government. The Hoover Commission recommendations to cut the cost of Government by eliminating waste and duplication is a step in the right direction to reduce taxes and the cost of living.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from a fine congressional district in Minnesota, I regard my position as a sacred trust to the people I have the honor of representing in this body. I have endeavored to be a representative of all of the people in my district and to work for the welfare and security of our country.

I have vigorously fought proposals which I believed would injure my constituents or in any manner attempt to destroy our American form of government and way of life. I will continue to advocate and support proposals that seek to strengthen our security and afford greater opportunities for every American citizen in accordance with the ideals that have made our country great. Equality of opportunity for every segment of our economy is vital for the future progress and unity of the Nation.

I firmly believe in the principle that the Government should be the servant of the people and not its master. Those who advocate that the Government must do everything for everybody are only leading the American people down the road to socialism, loss of freedom, and bankruptcy.

Our country is engaged in a war against Communist aggression. With the help of our allies in the United Nations, we hope and pray for an early victory. We must and will win this struggle against the forces that seek to destroy our freedom and the peace of the world. I have dedicated my efforts to backing our fighting forces for victory in order to save American freedom and to secure a lasting world peace.

Vursell's Labor Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks today which will give the laboring men the facts as to my support of legislation favorable to labor in Congress.

Having come up the hard way as a laboring man myself, starting in by working on the section and later becoming a locomotive fireman in Centralia, Ill., I have never lost interest in seeing that the laboring men are fully protected so far as I can have it done as a Member of Congress.

I do not believe there is a more sincere friend of labor in the Congress than I have constantly been. I have considered the best interests of the laboring men and tried to be helpful to them in all such legislation coming before the Congress during my service here.

Since my record has been falsely publicized by some of the labor publications, I would like to point out some of the measures I have supported, and start with legislation affecting the railroad men.

Due to the fact that the railroad men have settled most of their problems through negotiation under the Railway Labor Act, only a few of their legislative problems have come before the Congress. In practically every instance I have supported legislation in favor of them, asked for by their legislative representatives here in Washington.

For instance, several years ago when the railroad men in the maintenance department were asking for an 8-cents-an-hour raise, and the matter was before the Railway Mediation Board, I spoke on the floor of the House urging that the Railway Labor Board should grant their request. I pointed out that the lowest-paid workers at that time were getting as little as 36 cents an hour. I did all I could in an effort to help them get a raise.

Mr. Speaker, in the Eightieth Congress when the Crosser bill came before us, in a hard fight on the floor of the House, I supported amendments to increase their retirement fund by 20 percent, and voted for the bill giving them additional benefits.

When a bill came before the House seeking to prevent railroad men from suing in the district courts in the larger cities where they could get higher jury verdicts for injuries sustained in their work, I helped to defeat that bill, reserving their present rights under the law.

I introduced a bill in this session seeking to increase railroad retirement for all railway men and their widows by 33⅓ percent or more, which bill should come up as legislation in the next Congress. I will continue to support this bill to increase these benefits in the next Congress if I am reelected.

At the suggestion of W. D. Johnson, legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors in Washington, who has always contacted me when legislation came before the Congress in which your national officers are interested, I have not only voted for the legislation requested by them, but have been active in helping to secure the votes of other Members of Congress favorable to legislation sought by the railroad employees.

Mr. Speaker, at Mr. Johnson's suggestion, and that of other labor officers, I appeared before the Appeal Board of Rivers and Harbors of the United States Army engineers and spoke against the building of the Hennipen Canal from Peoria to the Mississippi River, which would have carried a vast volume of freight, and would have thrown hundreds of railroad men out of work who were hauling the coal by rail in that northern section of the State.

I was congratulated by the attorney representing the railroad men in Washington for the strong fight I made against the building of such canal. My efforts were successful in defeating the proposition, saving the jobs of hundreds of railroad men.

Mr. Speaker, again, at the suggestion of W. D. Johnson, of the ORC, as a member of the Committee on Public Works and Flood Control, I helped to prevent the consideration and possible passing out of our committee a bill providing for the expense of $700,000,000 by the Government to build the St. Lawrence waterway, which again would throw thousands of railroad men out of work.

On the same committee I helped to prevent the spending of many millions of dollars to build waterway transportation on the Big Sandy River in Kentucky which would have thrown hundreds of railroad men out of work.

These are just a few of the things I have done as your Representative in Washington to protect the interest of the railway workers.

POSTAL WORKERS

During the past 8 years I have been in Congress, I have voted to increase the salaries of the 450,000 postal workers, all of whom are members of organized labor, but do not have the right to strike against the Government.

In one session I voted to give them a $400-a-year increase; in a later session another $400-a-year increase; and in the Eightieth Republican Congress a $450-a-year increase. In that same session of Congress we greatly increased the retirement benefits for all postal workers.

OTHER LABOR LEGISLATION

When the war was on, I led the fight to kill the work-or-fight bill that would have cost the Government and the laboring men billions of dollars in taxes.

This bill would have caused every worker up to 65 years of age to register and be sent anywhere in the Nation to work wherever the Government desired. It was a most drastic and unnecessary piece of legislation. We defeated the bill which prevented all workingmen from being regimented as never before and saved them as taxpayers a great deal of money.

In the Eightieth Republican Congress I helped to pass the tax bill that exempted 7,500,000 men and women in the lowest income bracket from paying any taxes. This bill reduced the taxes of practically all workers by about 20 percent, giving them the benefit of lower taxation from 1947 to the present time.

I spoke for and voted for the raise of the minimum wage from 40 cents an hour to 75 cents an hour.

I voted for and spoke for increasing the benefits of social security for all workers passed in this Congress which gives them a raise of 75 percent, or more in some cases.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. Speaker, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, I voted for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law by supporting the Wood bill, which, when written, removed 20 objections complained of by labor embodied in the Taft-Hartley Act.

If this new bill had been approved by the Congress, it would have been accepted almost unanimously by the rank and file of labor. After this bill was passed by the Committee of the Whole House by 14 votes, it required yet another vote with the Speaker in the chair before it could be approved in the House of Representatives. Congressman MARCANTONIO objected to the final vote being taken at once, and under the rules of the House, the vote had to be delayed from Friday until the next Tuesday.

The President and the national democratic chairman, Mr. Boyle, and the big labor bosses in Washington, joined in a tremendous effort to line up enough votes to have the bill recommitted to the committee for further study. When the final vote was taken, the bill was recommitted by five votes. The administration and the labor leaders in Washington blocked our efforts to have the bill brought back to the floor of the House in that session, or the session just closed. They kept the Taft-Hartley law from being repealed. They refused to let it be repealed.

Mr. Speaker, the administration and the big labor leaders in Washington took this action, preventing labor from having a better bill to work under, in order to hold it over for a campaign issue in this campaign. They are clearly using labor as a political football. They knew if we were able to pass this better bill which would be fully acceptable to labor, that they would not be able to make a campaign among the laboring men to raise money for this election.

They knew that the labor vote in large numbers would swing back to the Republican Party because the Wood bill would have settled the labor question satisfactorily to the rank and file of labor.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the rank and file of labor has lived under the Taft-Hartley law for the past 3 years, and have become aware of the fact that even though it needs some changes, it has not been anything like as bad a bill as the labor bosses have tried to make them believe it was. The facts are that many provisions of this bill have protected the rank and file of labor from the labor bosses themselves. It has taken some power away from the top men in labor and given it to the little locals of the country.

Mr. Speaker, the proof of this is in the fact that labor has continued to write the best contracts under the Taft-Hartley law year after year they have ever written. Labor is employed at the highest wages in the history of the Nation and you can hardly pick up a newspaper unless you read of better contracts being signed with higher wages up to this very day. That is proof in itself that labor can see in any direction it looks, that labor has done better under the Taft-Hartley bill than ever before.

There are still some sections of the Taft-Hartley bill that should be taken out of the act and would have been taken out if the President and the big labor leaders in Washington would have supported the Wood bill as they should have done when we made that effort.

They will be taken out of the act when enough Members are elected to Congress who have the courage to do what they know should be done, and quit using the great rank and file of labor as a political football in order to gain political ends.

The General Motors contract, hailed by Walter Reuther as the finest contract ever written, was negotiated without hardly a threat of a strike, section by section, under the Taft-Hartley law.

The Ford Motors contract, the Chrysler contract, and various other contracts written within the past few months were all negotiated by genuine collective bargaining under the present law, and they are the best contracts ever written to date for the laboring men.

The rank and file of labor are beginning to wake up to the fact that they have been "kidded" and deceived by the big labor bosses in Washington solely in an effort to gain political advantage.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of the Members of Congress who want to do the right thing by business, labor, and agriculture, of which I am proud to be a Member, will continue to treat labor fairly and justly in the future, and in fact that is all that the rank and file of labor want.

We realize that labor is 50 percent of free enterprise, management and the public are the other 50 percent. We realize that labor has made a great contribution to the upbuilding of this country and the high standard of living we enjoy.

We want labor steadily employed at good wages under the best possible working conditions, and I shall continue as one who will insist that labor must have equal justice in legislation at all times.

Address of Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, let me bring to the earnest attention of my colleagues the full address on America's place in a progressively free world, presented by the Honorable Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, before the sixty-ninth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in Houston, Tex., on September 22, 1950:

I am proud to stand before the members of the American Federation of Labor at this great convention, and beside your beloved statesman, William Green. I am proud to report to you—as I did last year—that the fight for American progress goes on amidst the tensions of international crisis and the confusions of reactionary obstructionism.

In this midcentury year, as we look back to the advances we have made since 1900 and as we look forward to the future, we rededicate ourselves to the primitive principle that life itself means progress. Neither Korea, nor the Kremlin, nor the National Association of Manufacturers, nor the American Medical Association, nor anyone else is going to stop the people of this country in their efforts to maintain their liberty and promote their security and happiness.

As we tighten our belts for the struggle against communism, as we mobilize the home front to cope with emergency, as we send our men into battle against the Communist aggressors in Korea, we do so for the sake of the liberty, the security, and the human happiness which are the American promise. We have no designs on the rest of the world. We have only the grand design of a progressive America in a free world, and we are prepared to make whatever sacrifices are needed to fulfill this grand design—because we know that the only alternative is stagnation, slavery, and death.

We do not indulge in wishful thinking. There are sacrifices for all of us to make in the difficult times ahead—sacrifices that some of us are already making. The men risking their lives in Korea today do not need to be reminded of this. The young people now going into our Armed Forces do not need to be reminded of this. And the rest of us—the working people, the businessmen, the farmers, the housewives, the Government officials—all of us willingly accept our new and heavy responsibilities. Already the President has been armed by Congress with the power to tighten up our domestic economy, and he has acted with his accustomed speed and firmness. We are proud of the wisdom, the courage, and the common humanity that Harry Truman has demonstrated once again in this time of crisis.

Now, there are some stupid people who want to use the international situation as an excuse to throw away every gain this country has made since Franklin D. Roosevelt became President 17 years ago. These people are not only stupid; they are dangerous. They tell us that we must fight the totalitarians by throwing democracy out the window. They tell us that America can protect itself only if it stops being the America we know and love. This they tell us in the sacred name of patriotism.

Well, we aren't having any of it. It is true that, whereas in 1933 the greatest single threat to the American people was the poverty and misery caused by the depression at home, today in 1950 the greatest threat comes from abroad. It is true that we must give top priority to the challenge of the slave world. It is true that the conduct of our foreign policy is the overriding concern of our people and our Government.

But these stupid, dangerous people do not understand that, in our time, domestic affairs are the bulwark of our foreign policy. How strong would our foreign policy be if our country were weak, if our people were hungry, if our workers were dissatisfied, if we had millions of unemployed roaming our streets? How could we stop aggression if our people were diseased, and discontented? How far could we get if our factories were idle, and our industrial plant stagnating? How could we gird ourselves for action if there were no production for the new National Production Authority to supervise, and no economy for the new Economic Stabilization Agency to stabilize? And how many friends would we have in the world if we confronted the Communists with a way of life that was no freer than theirs, no more promising than theirs, no more respectful of human dignity then theirs?

Yes, we must lead the way in the international situation, and we must do it with courage and determination. We can do so only if our own country increases in strength, only if our own house is in order, only if our own people are dedicated to the principles of American freedom, security, and happiness. That is part of the home-front mobilization today, and no amount of reactionary stupidity can remove it.

I remind you of President Truman's own words when he addressed the Nation a few days ago:

"All of us—whether we are farmers, or wage earners, or businessmen—must give up some of the things we would ordinarily expect to have for ourselves and our families. The danger the free world faces is so great that we cannot be satisfied with less than an all-out effort by everyone. We have not given up our goal of a better life for every citizen in this great country of ours. But, for the time being, we must be absolutely sure that our economy turns out the guns and planes and tanks and other supplies which are needed to protect the world from the threat of Communist domination."

As Federal Security Administrator, I am responsible to the President, to the Congress, and above all to you and all other members of the American public, for the Government's activities in health, education, and family security. These responsibilities have for years been among the most controversial in our domestic affairs. There have been running arguments about social security—many of them now happily resolved by the new amendments which expand coverage and increase the benefits to bring them more closely in line with present-day living costs. Despite the inclusion of the Knowland amendment, the American Federation of Labor can pride itself on the steam it put into this great advance in the social-security program. There has been even greater argument about ways of making American education bigger and better for more of our children. And there has been something worse than argument about the simple mathematical problem of helping the average American family pay for the high costs of medical care.

I think the time has come, as we find ourselves in the midst of crisis, to look at these controversies in their true light—in the light of their total significance and value to our national welfare.

Let us look, for a moment, at one of these proposals—the proposal to establish a program of Federal aid to education. Think, for a moment, of the children who recently started to school for the first time this year. Perhaps your child is among them. Remember that some of them are going into classrooms crowded to bursting, into double sessions, even into firetraps—and some children are not even able to go to school at all—because we have not yet agreed to bring our educational system up to par in all parts of the country.

What does this have to do with our role in the international situation? A very great deal. Nearly everybody in this country is the product, to a controlling degree, of what he got out of our public educational system. The extent to which he can judge the ideological questions in the world rests in large measure on what contribution our public schools made to him. The business, industrial, and professional caliber of our country is directly related to what the people in these occupations gained through our public schools. And, most important, the American fighting man of today is just about as good as the public education he got.

Let us look at the picture of the Nation's health today. Let us consider the people who too often live in fear of sudden, serious illness because they fear the costs of medical and hospital care; people who have put off going to the doctor because of their financial worries; people who have died needlessly, not because science could not cure them but because our society is not yet set up to allow science to cure them.

Some of the unions in your great organization have tackled this problem head-on through union health programs. But they know from experience that there are limits to their gains in this direction through collective bargaining—that a universal system is needed to accomplish the national job. Today the overwhelming majority of the people in this country are not financially able to cope with serious or chronic disease—in this very country where medical research and medical practice have pushed further than anywhere else to the outer limits of good health.

Can we afford to ignore this problem—in its individual human terms or in the national interest? Of course not.

Is anything more important to the role of America in the international picture than the health of our people? Is anything in actual warfare more important than a healthy, energetic labor force at home turning out the weapons and equipment for healthy, robust American fighting men at the front? The decision in international conflict could well turn on the physical well-being of the workers in war plants and of the fighting men using their products.

We can debate, perhaps, the timing and the priorities which we may give to our solutions of this problem. But we must recognize—and proclaim—that good health of the American people—a social necessity in peacetime—is a critical weapon in wartime.

We cannot afford to surrender now to apostles of reaction who have formed an unholy alliance to destroy the very principles of American humanity and national security. Today we are confronted by such an alliance, spearheaded by one profession, but joined in by every misanthropic force in America and by a large number of well-meaning people who are allowing themselves to be roped into something they cannot really believe in.

The American Medical Association has allocated the sum of $1,110,000—a sum amassed by a compulsory levy on the doctors of this country—for a concentrated advertising campaign in the week of October 8 that will reach into the daily newspapers, the national

magazines, and the radio stations of the United States. On the advice of its public-relations counselors, this campaign will be supplemented by a so-called tie-in advertising—to an amount reported to run as high as $19,000,000—chipped in by business firms, manufacturers, patent-medicine companies, insurance companies, railroads, and power companies.

That adds up to a very large sum of money—$20,000,000—to be spent on a single concentrated week of hammering at the minds of the American people. It would make a cigarette company lick its chops with advertising jealousy.

Since the AMA alone is putting up, in one single gesture, so large a sum as $1,110,000, we could perhaps assume that its aim is to improve the quality of medical care in America. What, for instance, would this money buy in the interest of better health?

It could pay for a brand-new general hospital.

It could pay for 11 completely equipped health centers.

It could finance research in a disease like multiple sclerosis, which is considered incurable today for the simple reason that we do not know enough about its cause, prevention, or cure. Since 1946, only $500,000 have been raised for research in this disease—which afflicts between 75,000 and 100,000 people each year. A million dollars from the AMA might very possibly help cure thousands of these sufferers.

Or it might pay for training hundreds of heart specialists, at a time when we have in this country only one such specialist for every 2,600 heart cases—and when 600,000 people die every year from this disease alone.

A million dollars from the American Medical Association could put some 2,000 young scientists through 2-year fellowships in universities or hospitals for advanced medical research.

Possibly it would help solve the problem of synthesizing and using cortisone, or it could push forward research in cerebral palsy or polio, or, in these times of tension, it could help develop blood substitutes and improve our defenses against biological warfare.

At a time when we are confronted with a dreadful shortage of medical personnel, it could put 500 additional medical students through 4 years of medical school—or it could be invested at 4 percent, and the interest would pay the tuition for 75 new medical students each year.

Yes; $1,110,000 could do many useful things. It is a pretty big piece of cash, and the AMA must have a truly inspiring—a truly essential—advertising message if it has, after due consideration, decided to spend that much money on a single project. What, then, is the message of all these advertisements? I will tell you that message, but, first, I ask that every one of you—and every thinking American—study the advertisements when they appear, for the doctors' trade association has given much thought to them, and it has determined on them as the best way to spend its millions during this time of crisis.

I have seen the copy of some of these advertisements. They are a tribute to the shrewd skill of the professional propagandist. These professional propagandists set up the imaginary target of socialized medicine—which nobody in this country wants—and sail into the target with fists flying. You and I, perhaps, marvel at the extravagance of this campaign in a period when we are supposed to be tightening our belts—the extravagance and waste of spending as much as $20,000,000 to fight something that nobody is for.

It's ridiculous—or is it? Not if the real reason for this campaign is to vilify every progressive idea in this country. These professional propagandists haul out the old and exploded labels of welfare state and socialism and Government control. These professional propagandists seek to undermine the whole social program that the American people have approved for the past 17 years. These professional propagandists serve the medical profession poorly, but they serve the reactionary forces in American politics very well, indeed, and they make us wonder: Is there a doctor in the lobby?

It is time we dragged these facts out in the open. When so many millions of dollars are being spent to achieve such a purpose, there is no reason for us to be dainty and delicate about it. There is something significant about the fact that this campaign is concentrated on the week of October 8, just before the crucial elections in November. There is something significart about the way in which every reactionary special interest in the country has rallied round the AMA at this particular moment, waving their checkbooks as though they were the new banners of freedom.

The plain fact is that the powerful men who run the American Medical Association are using their organization to promote the political ends of reaction. They have created the 1950 war chest of reaction.

Here is what the president of the AMA, Dr. Elmer L. Henderson, told the house of delegates in San Francisco last June: "We doctors are proud of the work we have done, and there has been no attempt at concealment of either our objectives or the methods we have used to achieve these objectives. Out of medicine's campaign has come a great public crusade, not only to save the freedom in medical practice, but to protect all the basic freedoms of the American people and to stop the march of state socialism in this country." (As you very well know, the Communists are not the only ones who use a double-talking Aesopian language; the reactionaries have their own Aesopian language, too, and when they say "state socialism," they do not mean socialism at all, but rather every progressive social idea that has been accepted by honest-to-God Americans since 1933.)

All over the Nation, Dr. Henderson continued, doctors are campaigning actively for candidates whose convictions (and I quote) "square with sound American principles, and are just as actively opposing those men in public life who are espoused to the alien philosophy of socialization." Translated from the Aesopian language of the reactionaries, this simply means that the AMA has tried to mobilize doctors in a drive to defeat every liberal-minded candidate for office this year, and to elect reactionary, backward-looking, labor-hating candidates in their place.

Who in this country has been more active than the AMA in distributing copies of that notorious primer of reaction, John T. Flynn's book The Road Ahead? They have passed out a million copies so far, with the blessing and cooperation of the even more notorious Committee for Constitutional Government—an organization that I suggest our doctors learn at least as much about as did the congressional committee which has been investigating its malodorous behavior.

Yes, I repeat my invitation to every American who thinks for himself to read these ads and study every word of them. Let him see for himself what the American Medical Association—at a time when we are committed by blood in Korea and by determination throughout the world to fight for human freedom—let him see what the AMA thinks is truly important.

With apologies—very deep apologies—to James Whitcomb Riley, I have an adaptation of one of his poems that I think fits this case well. I call it The Song of the AMA, and it is dedicated to the public relations team of Whitaker & Baxter, an old labor-hating couple who handle the AMA account at $100,000 a year. Here it is:

"Whitaker & Baxter's come to our house to stay,
An' write the ads and copy up, an' brush the truth away,
An' shoo the Fair Deal off the porch, an' scare the folks, an' weep,
An' write a speech, an' hate the Reds, an' earn their board an' keep;
An' all us other people, when the daily work is done,
We set around the kitchen fire an' has the mostest fun
A-list'nin' to the witch-tales 'at doctors tell about,
An' the welfare state 'at gits you
Ef you don't watch out!

"An' Whitaker & Baxter say, when the blaze is blue,
An' the lampwick sputters, an' the wind goes woo-oo!
An' you hear the crickets quit, an' the moon is gray,
An' the lightnin'-bugs in dew is all squenched away—
You better mind yer doctors, when they enter politics,
An' churish them 'at bill you, an' let them git their licks,
An' trust their propaganda stuff 'at clusters all about,
Er the welfare state'll git you
Ef you don't watch out!"

This would normally have been a time when, in all decency, the doctors' trade association might have been concerning itself with the dreadful shortage of medical personnel. During the past few weeks, the entire public has been revolted by the awful significance of that shortage. We have had to resort to a draft law in order to make sure that we will have medical personnel in sufficient quantities for the needs of our Armed Forces. This is no new shortage. I myself have warned about it for years. So have many, many others. We have tried to find a solution to this shortage, which is in large part caused by the bottleneck in medical education—caused by the fact that our medical schools are financially unable to expand their student bodies. We have proposed Federal aid to medical education, which would make it possible for medical schools to produce hundreds and perhaps thousands of new doctors. Four times this proposal has come up in congressional committees, and four times has been voted down.

Who is against this program? The people? No. The soldiers and sailors and airmen and marines of our Armed Forces? No. Labor? No. The medical schools themselves? No; their deans came to Congress and pleaded for it. The 17,000 young men and women who this year applied to three or four medical schools each, but could not get in because there was no room for them? No. Does the American Hospital Association oppose it? No. The American Dental Association? No. Any Member of the United States Senate? No; it was passed by the Senate unanimously last year. Only one pressure group in America opposes Federal aid to medical education—and that group is the American Medical Association, which has been powerful enough so far to kill the plan in the House of Representatives.

Why are they against Federal aid to medical education? Well, they claim, it will mean Federal control of medical education. Is that true? Of course not. Do the deans of the medical schools believe it? Ask them: their answer is no. Do you believe it? Of course not. Does the AMA itself believe it? I doubt it.

But they say they believe it, because they do not want to admit that the only conceivable reason for their opposition is that

it would give the American people the number of doctors we ought to have. I will tell you what the newly awakened apostles of free enterprise are afraid of. They are afraid of free enterprise. They are afraid of competition. They are afraid of having the proportion of doctors which this country, in God's name, ought to have.

I cannot believe that the average doctor really understands what is being done in his name—that he honestly wants his professional organization to follow in the footsteps of the know-nothings of the last century—of the American Liberty League, of the Committee for Constitutional Government, of Merwin K. Hart and his prejudiced, labor-baiting subscribers—of the whole bund of bewildered bigots who would sell the country's stake in human progress and security for the sake of their own pocketbooks.

I cannot believe that the average doctor—whatever he may think about national health insurance—wants to be sold down the river to the most reactionary forces in this country. I cannot believe that he wants to promote suspicion and division in our land at the very time when national unity is our crying need.

I believe that, in the field of health, we must now give high priority to increasing our output of doctors. That is what the AMA ought to be thinking about on October 8—instead of wasting its efforts on a futile attempt to turn back the clock.

Yes, the fight for progress goes on. We will wage this fight together, and we will win it together. Just as we shall in the end restore peace and freedom to the people of Korea, just as we shall in the end achieve a world where men feel free and safe and hopeful, so here at home we shall keep on building a progressive America dedicated to freedom, security, and happiness.

Senator Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I cannot let this session close without a tribute to our majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois. Under the severe handicap of a strenuous campaign for reelection, Senator LUCAS has done an excellent job in getting enacted all the necessary legislation. Not only has the usual peacetime program been enacted but he has also pushed through extremely important and complicated legislation essential to the prosecution of the Korean war and the strengthening of our Armed Forces.

Senator LUCAS, better than anyone I know, is well suited by temperament and ability to reconcile the diverse elements in the Democratic Party and bring about by wise adjustments legislative results which are sound and absolutely necessary to the welfare of our country.

Mr. President, we all owe a great debt to SCOTT LUCAS for the fine leadership he has given us, and I, for one, sincerely wish him success in his battle for reelection.

Their Record Gives Democrats Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me over the American Broadcasting Co. network on September 21, 1950:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow citizens, let me explain at the outset that William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, has asked me to speak to you tonight. Chairman Boyle himself had planned to talk to you about the issues of the campaign which is now underway, but the sudden pressure of duties in Washington prevents him from coming into your homes to visit with you. I think he's doing a great job for the Democrats, and I'm glad to do a small one for him.

As chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee, I am grateful to the American Broadcasting Co. for making available this 15-minute period tonight so that we may discuss the political situation together. As free Americans, citizens in the world's greatest democracy, we have no more important subject to consider than the workings of our democratic processes and the stand of parties and candidates on public issues.

Each of us has an obligation to himself or herself, to our country, and to the world, to study carefully the questions of policy and the positions of responsibility that are at stake in the election on November 7 and to participate fully in the decisions that will be made at the polls. Those decisions will affect the daily lives and welfare of every one of us.

The Democratic Party is conducting this campaign on the record of its past achievements and the constructive program to which it is now committed.

After almost 18 years under which the Democratic Party has had the responsibility of government, this country is enjoying the greatest and most widespread prosperity in the entire history of the world. Our people have the highest standard of living that any people have ever experienced anywhere at any time in the history of the world. Doesn't that tell quite a story in itself?

But we are living in an unsettled and dangerous world and in a critical time in the history of mankind. Our future, which can be brighter than any we have yet known or dreamed of, is still for us to win. And each of us must play his full part if we are to achieve it.

I can tell you that President Truman's one thought, one hope, one prayer is that we can find and lead the way to a just and lasting peace in the world. Under his guidance and with the overwhelming support of the people, our country has chosen the only road to eventual peace. It is the route of firm resistance to determined Communist aggression and of mutual cooperation with the free nations of the world.

President Truman's prompt and courageous attack and denunciation of those who would disturb the peace of the world, his condemnation of Reds for leading the Communists against the Republic of Korea, has united the free nations and inspired the people with new hope. Our boys who are fighting in Korea under the banner of the United Nations are doing more than again writing a glorious chapter in military annals. History may yet record that their sacrifices have saved humanity from a new and terrible world war by serving notice that we, with other peace-loving peoples in the United Nations, are determined that there must be no more easy conquests of Manchuria, such as the world saw in the early thirties, no more invasions of Ethiopia at a dictator's whim, that armed aggression against world peace will be met by armed resistance whenever and wherever it occurs. If our goal of a just and secure peace can be achieved, the way will be open for a new and enrichening era of progress and prosperity in America.

But if we are to realize fully the bright promise of the future, we must continue to have a Government which believes in progress and which is devoted to the welfare of our people. We should never forget that one of the three purposes for which this Union was formed—as set forth explicitly in the Constitution—is to promote the common welfare. This is an objective that too frequently has been lost sight of during the past 80 or 90 years. Some of our opponents even sneer at the word "welfare" and at one time they attempted to use it as a term of reproach against the Democratic administration. They cried out against the welfare state. They have some new slogans now, but they are not much better.

Our Democratic Party is, and always has been, the party of progress—the party of the people. President Truman has well described it as the party of the main stream of American life.

We are proud of our stewardship.

Since March 4, 1933, our party has enacted the greatest program of progressive and constructive legislation this country has ever known. Let me mention only some of the high spots in that record of achievement for the people.

There is the social-security system, created by Congress over bitter Republican opposition. This law has been improved by the present Eighty-first Congress to cover millions of additional men and women and to provide greatly increased benefits.

There is rural electrification, which has lightened the work and enriched the lives of hundreds of thousands of farm families. We established the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has benefited those it serves and gives guidance to public-power developments all over the entire country. TVA power made possible our great expanded production of aluminum for airplanes during the World War and, as well, contributed enormously to the production of the atom bomb.

The Democratic Party was responsible for the enactment of a farm-price-support program to assure to our millions of farm families a fair share of the national income.

We adopted the Wagner Labor Relations Act to protect workers and their rights to organize for collective bargaining. The Democrats are now fighting for new and better labor legislation to replace the Taft-Hartley Act and return some of the more just provisions of the Wagner Act. We established a minimum-wage scale, and the Eighty-first Congress has raised the floor under wages to 75 cents an hour.

We have instituted, pressed, and seen blossom into being great reclamation projects to develop the resources of the West.

We launched a housing program which saved more than a million homes from mortgage foreclosure, enabled millions of others to own their own homes through the assistance of Federal home-loan organizations, and provide as well in other neighborhoods low-rent homes in place of slum tenements for low-income families.

Every segment of our society—farmers, workers, consumers, and businessmen—have shared in the national prosperity which has

been promoted by these and other progressive policies of Government.

The work of the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress typifies the manner in which the Democratic administration has fought to serve all segments of our national life. In every field, from foreign relations to farm policy, the Senate thought and actions have been dedicated to bringing about an enduring strength that will enable us to meet our national and international responsibilities.

Senate accomplishments toward strengthening our farm structure were notable. We gave Commodity Credit the right to help the farmer buy, build, or rent storage for his crops. We raised the minimum levels at which basic farm commodities would be supported. We approved the principle of giving the Secretary of Agriculture added discretion to support other nonbasic items. We put crop insurance on a sound business basis and permitted production disaster loans. On the long-range front, we made provisions for restoring depleted grazing lands and for reforestation of old forest areas. This Democratic Party of ours really believes in looking and moving ahead.

Another critical problem—housing—came under serious consideration in the Senate. The result was approval of far-seeing legislation, designed to improve both urban and rural living conditions. Extension of rent control was approved, with provisions for fair treatment to both tenants and landlords.

The Senate—and the whole Congress—moved to meet growing problems in our educational system. It authorized supplements to aid State governments in expanding and modernizing facilities, on the principle of giving the most money to areas where there was the most need.

A National Science Foundation was approved to insure that our national position will not be undermined by lack of new developments in any field.

In line with the Democratic position that we must take all possible steps to keep our economy both flexible and expanding, the Senate authorized $100,000,000 to aid local and State governments in undertaking and planning public works, and recommended that they maintain a backlog of projects ready for immediate inauguration if economic developments made it desirable.

In the field of international affairs, the Congress approved the Marshall plan and I am proud of the part the Democrats played in beating down all efforts to cripple it with amendments. It agreed to the North Atlantic Pact, binding 12 free nations into a defensive alliance, and to military assistance of those nations dedicated to the purpose of the United Nations Charter by creating a system of collective self-defense among free countries. The record of how the Democrats in the Senate and House stood by the President in these notable efforts to strengthen the free world is inspiring. I think it is likely to be the factor on which the November elections may swing—and, of course, swing in our direction. Conditions in the House of Representatives races are not familiar to me, but I expect the Democrats to hold their present Senate membership and add from two to four seats.

At the outbreak of the fighting in Korea, necessity caused the Congress to revise its legislative program. Recognizing the need for quick but wise action, it wrote the Defense Production Act of 1950, designed to absorb the shock of a strongly increased defense machine without disrupting the internal economy. Earlier, it had approved unification of the services and the establishment of a radar fence around the Nation.

There were many other accomplishments by the Senate and Eighty-first Congress completing a proud record of intelligent service to the immediate welfare and for the security of the entire Nation.

We must all redouble our efforts now to make sure that we have a Congress that will support the President and will press forward along constructive lines.

Democracy does not begin at the top. Democracy begins with the people and it can function only if the people make known their opinion and their wishes.

We urge every one of you—every man and woman—to register and to vote in November. Now, more than at any time in our history, we should exercise this basic right of citizenship. We should vote in November, not only to strengthen our own Government, but in order to show all of the peoples of the world—yes, even those behind the iron curtain—that our system of democracy is strong and virile.

The Republicans seem anxious to make Korea the issue. We will meet them on that ground. Back of the events in Korea stretches the long history of world leadership by American Presidents—who happened to be Democrats—as they sought world peace.

On that page is written the name of Woodrow Wilson and his struggle with a little handful of willful men over the League of Nations.

On that page is written the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt who had seen the failure of Wilson's dream and set himself to achieve a better outcome. He took the leadership for the United Nations and he lived almost long enough to see it take form.

But until the name of Harry S. Truman was written on that page, the United Nations had form, but little else. Was it to die? Was it to lie crumbled in the dust where other attempts toward world federation had fallen?

President Truman said, "No." He breathed life into that inert form. He saw that worldwide aggression must be stopped if civilization itself was to survive the perils of an atomic age. He saw—more clearly than any man I know—that if aggression was to be stopped, it could only be stopped by many nations acting together. He laid his cause before the United Nations.

His action was consistent with his whole foreign policy. By the Truman doctrine, he had brought strength to those who resisted communism in Greece and Turkey. By the Marshall plan, he had encouraged the free peoples of western Europe. By the Berlin airlift, he had lifted up the morale of those Germans who did not want their land overrun by the hordes of Communist Russia. By the North Atlantic Pact, the military-assistance program, and the point-4 plan, he had continued to lay stone on stone in the structure of strength for a free world.

I say to you tonight that the Democratic Party is ready to meet the Republican Party on any battleground that its leaders can agree upon. They are divided on social security, divided on isolationism, divided on the virtues of slander, divided on the path to peace.

We, at least, know where we are going at home and abroad.

But we will need the help of forward-looking voters in every city and crossroads of our Nation. We plead that you hold fast to the gains already achieved and stand beside President Truman as he leads us onward to a peaceful world.

Scare Buying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the American people are aware of the disastrous results which will follow if hoarding and scare buying occur on a large scale in this country. On August 14, 1950, the Lithonia Exchange Club, of Lithonia, Ga., adopted a resolution urging that in this period of crisis everyone assist in keeping down inflation and preventing scarcities by refusing to purchase on a hoarding or scare-buying basis.

This resolution is in keeping with the prevailing sentiment in the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia. The Lithonia Exchange Club is to be commended for its action in adopting this resolution.

Under leave previously granted, I insert this resolution herewith as a part of my remarks:

This organization urges that all citizens be level-headed Americans: Freedom is everybody's job. Hoarding and scare buying is unnecessary. It causes the sort of damage to our economy which the enemies of our way of life want.

We are unpatriotic if we hoard. A rush to buy any item forces prices up. This causes excessive spending for living commodities. It produces scarcities and inflation. It is costly and dangerous.

There is no basis for hoarding and panic buying. Such action is stupid and foolish. We deeply regret there exists those in our community, our State who will aid the enemy of America by stocking up on items they believe may be in short supply if we go to war. Therefore this organization respectfully requests that those leaders in top positions in city, State, and National Government take what necessary steps are necessary to curtail hoarding, profiteering, and inflation.

We ask that everyone think clearly and do all he can to aid our fighting forces now involved in battle in Korea.

We also urge that our leaders take any necessary steps to again place into action the various set-ups to safeguard our home front. Civilian defense is important. Much can be accomplished by an organized, disciplined group of men and women striving for protection of our friends, neighbors, and homes.

That the leaders might know that the good people of Lithonia, Ga., are pledged to aid the war effort in every manner possible, to buy only what they need, and to be available in time of emergency, we, the Exchange Club of Lithonia, accept these resolutions and vote their immediate adoption.

Speech of Hon. Aaron Jacoby, of Brooklyn, N. Y., Nominating Hon. Walter A. Lynch for Governor, at the Convention of the Democratic Party in Rochester, N. Y, September 7, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues, the Honorable WALTER A. LYNCH, has become the Democratic nominee for the governorship of the great State of New York. He is well known by everyone in the House and deeply revered and admired by the Members on both sides of the aisle.

Personally, I have never met any individual whose every thought, word, and deed was more deeply colored than his by the spirit of human love in all its highest manifestations. He is a tender husband, a devoted father, and a true and steadfast friend. His nature is too generous and tolerant to countenance sectional prejudice, partisan rancor, or sectarian bigotry. One of the happiest moments of his life was when he, a practicing Christian, was presented with the good-citizen award by the American Jewish Congress in recognition of his patriotism and zeal in sponsoring legislation to maintain and protect the blessings of democracy in the spirit of American liberalism.

Good nature, humility, and benevolence radiate from him as light and warmth radiate from the sun. I want to personally testify to that fact. When I first arrived a stranger in Washington in the cold and bleak February of 1949, I found in WALTER LYNCH a mentor and a guide to the practical know-how of getting things done in Washington. His sage advice, his homely wisdom, and his expert knowledge of Washington techniques have been freely extended to and eagerly sought after by his colleagues. It was with extreme pleasure that I supported the nomination in the Democratic convention of WALTER A. LYNCH as Governor of New York State.

I request that the speech of Mr. Aaron L. Jacoby nominating Congressman LYNCH be inserted in the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, by the favor of my colleagues I speak for the united and militant democracy of Kings County. Brooklyn, the impregnable citadel of democracy has given to Democratic standard bearers of yesteryear majorities ranging from 250,000 to upward of 500,000. Brooklyn assures to the nominees of this convention that it will do all that within its power lies to match the latter figure.

We foregather in this delightful presence in response to a mandate of the enrolled Democrats of our great State. The tasks that devolve upon this convention are serious and sacred. Here we shall select not only the Democratic candidate for governor, but indeed the next Governor of New York.

On November 7 next the electorate will ratify overwhelmingly the action of this convention. They will do so cheerfully because they trust the Democratic Party and approve its candidates. They will do so eagerly because they believe in our party's philosophy and the political program which we have evolved to give that philosophy force and effect.

The government of the State of New York must be restored to the people.

The people know that during the 20 years of uninterrupted Democratic leadership in Albany our State was in the vanguard of the forward march of social progress and political reform. Under the leadership of the three greatest governors in the history of any commonwealth, the great Empire State acquired a heart and a soul. Under their leadership the State succored the distressed and aided the needy. It provided for the mentally ill and physically ill, the orphan and the widow, the unemployed, and the aged. The record offers undisputed and eloquent testimony of our party's devotion to the public weal.

Almost all major achievements in labor, social, liberal, and progressive legislation have issued from Democratic leadership. The old-age pension law, the Widow's Pension Act, the social-security law, the unemployment insurance law, State Labor Relations Act, Antilabor Injunction Act, State Mediation Act, the State housing and slum clearance law, the savings bank-life insurance law, the public utility regulation law. These are but a few from the endless catalog. They recite only some of the goals attained by the Democratic governors, beginning with the "Happy Warrior," Alfred E. Smith. He blazed a trail for others to follow. Unfailingly devoted to his State and those who dwell within its borders, he gave unstintedly of himself. He was followed by the greatest exponent of social reform in political annals, Franklin D. Roosevelt. The governorship of the State of New York was but a proving ground for him. His unsurpassed record as President of these United States will serve as a shining example worthy of emulation to any who may one day occupy the White House.

During one of the most critical periods of our national life, while the world was engaged in bitter conflict, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, as Governor of the State of New York, labored with unflinching courage and unflagging zeal to give New York a humane and business administration. His term of office was marked by a reduction in the cost of government by $100,000,000 and upon his departure from the governorship there was a surplus of $54,000,000 in the treasury of the State.

We must follow in this tradition—Smith, Roosevelt, and Lehman—an American epic—America at work.

Smith, Roosevelt, and Lehman—what a wealth of rich connotation. Each of a different religious persuasion. Americans all three in pursuit of American ideals.

Today the burden placed upon this convention is to select one worthy of their honored names.

When we reflect upon conditions as they exist today, more particularly in benighted lands lashed by distant seas, our duty becomes increasingly clear. Half the world is engulfed in a night of ignorance and fear. Official crime flourishes. The authority of brute force is supreme. Right is crushed beneath the iron chariots of power. Parts of the world are peopled by slaves and masters. War clouds are gathering. The ideals and principles of American democracy are to these Communist-victimized countries are as a star of indescribable glory shining through the clouds of storm-rent skies upon a sea of blood. The Communist enslaved cry out to us in unmistakable syllables to bring to them some measure of relief. These cries are a warning to us to beware. There is danger, too, that our own liberties may be threatened; that our own way of life may be destroyed.

The immortal spirits whose hands guided the infant steps of this Republic, whose blood consecrated and made our liberty's dearest shrine and religious freedom's most sacred altar, cry out to us in whose hands the further destinies of this Republic have been lodged to keep the faith, to carry on, to hold high the banners of democracy.

Our National Government is meeting the challenge boldly.

The times demand that our own State government be in complete harmony and accord with our national administration. It is essential to the proper prosecution of our country's day-to-day responsibilities that a sympathetic State government be restored to Albany.

The times require rare qualities of leadership.

We know one who meets the test.

We urge upon this convention the selection of one who through the years, in season and out of season, in storm and in fair weather has given of himself wholeheartedly to the service of his State and country. Neither the baubles of wealth, nor the prestige of power and position have any allurements for him. Modest, self-effacing, he moves with a quiet dignity and acts most effectively. Diligent, resourceful, conscientious, and painstaking, he has made incalculable contributions toward the betterment of our society.

The product of our teeming city, his formal education was completed at Fordham University School of Law. Such were his achievements at the bar, that early in his professional career he was appointed a New York City magistrate. In 1938 his exceptional talents served him and the State of New York most fruitfully as a delegate to the New York State Constitutional Convention. His abilities and contributions as a member of the convention whose labors were directed toward a revision of our State constitution, attracted wide attention. As a consequence he was urged to stand for election as a candicate for Congress.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Ccmmittee in the early days of his congressional career, he labored tirelessly in the preparation of legislation to curtail inflation and was a most effective advocate of price and rent controls. Perhaps he was persuaded by causes and reasons other than those that occur to one as obvious. Could it be that he was aware of the sacrifice that the flower of our youth were called upon to make in those bitter, trying, uncertain years? Could it be that as the husband of a woman who gave her only two sons tc the service of their country—one as a captain in the Air Force and another as an ensign in the United States Navy, that he was unwittingly or subconsciously activated toward this end?

Later he won high praise for his labors as a member of the Special Commitee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning and served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works and Construction. He was unanimously selected by the House Democrats to serve on the important Ways and Means Committee in 1943 and has been a most useful member since then.

He has won the lasting gratitude of myriads who ask little legislative aid in the conflict of life because of his generous and intelligent consideration of their well-being, as revealed by his leadership in preparing legislation for broader coverage under social security and unemployment insurance. He was responsible for the inclusion of the maritime workers in the unemployment-insurance program. Due to his incessant labors 11,000,000 more of our citizens were added to the rolls of those who are to enjoy the benefits of social security. One and one-half million people in our own State will be the direct beneficiaries of his unceasing efforts on their behalf.

Almost single-handed he fought against the inclusion of the antilabor Knowland amendment to the Social Security Act. He alone of the 12 conferees refused to sign the conference report on the social-security bill because it excluded total and permanent disability insurance. He was chairman of the subcommittee which considered a measure for the taxation of life-insurance companies which since 1947 have paid no income taxes. As a result of a formula devised by him, the coffers of the Federal Treasury would be enriched by some $163,000,000.

His greatness lies in the deep strength of his humanities. His deep religiosity and the catholicity of his nature move him to broad, generous humanitarian impulses. He was presented with the good citizen award by the American Jewish Congress "in recognition of his patriotism and zeal in sponsoring legislation to maintain and protect the blessings of democracy in the spirit of American liberalism; his devotion to the well-being of his fellow citizens, without regard to race, creed, or position, in his endeavors for the social, philanthropic, and spiritual advancement of the community."

Brooklyn commends to the favorable consideration of this convention one who will lead the forces of democracy into battle unafraid, for the achievement of those goals, to which we have directed our talents and energies and engaged our hearts and minds.

Confident that he will so acquit himself as to earn the favor and deserve the approval and approbation of a grateful and discriminating citizenry, Brooklyn is honored to nominate for governor, a brilliant lawyer, able judge, distinguished legislator, stalwart Democrat, sterling American—Congressman WALTER A. LYNCH.

One of America's Worst Security Risks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement in regard to what I consider one of America's worst security risks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American industry is being forced to produce vital war material, including some of our top-secret military and naval weapons, in plants under the complete domination of the Communists.

Some of the largest industrial concerns in this country, as well as hundreds of smaller ones, are compelled by law to bargain collectively with a union whose leaders have been officially declared enemies of the United States.

These industrial establishments produce weapons, instruments, and materials which are vital to the defense of the United States.

The Communist-led union with which they are compelled to bargain collectively is the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, hereinafter referred to simply as the UE.

Seven UE officials were recently cited for contempt of Congress for refusing to say, under oath, whether or not they are Communists. Among the seven were the two top undisputed bosses of the UE, James Matles, who holds the position of UE director of organization, and Julius Emspak, who is UE general secretary-treasurer. Despite this UE record of defiance of the Congress of the United States, industrial concerns—large and small—are compelled by the procedures of the National Labor Relations Board to bargain with these UE leaders.

Almost a year ago, the UE was expelled from the CIO on the ground that it is a Communist-dominated organization. The resolution of expulsion, adopted on November 2, 1949, declared: "We can no longer tolerate within the family of CIO the Communist Party masquerading as a labor union." Stronger language has never been used to indict the UE. The representatives of this union, which has been declared by a responsible labor union federation to be nothing more than a mask for the Communist Party, are supported by the United States Government in their right to sit at the bargaining table with the representatives of responsible American industries.

In urging the expulsion of the UE from the CIO, Philip Murray who did an excellent job in this respect, declared: "They—the UE Communist leaders—dare not stand upon their dirty feet and give any expression of opposition to anything that the Soviets are doing. They are inbred with a feeling of hatred against democratic institutions and democratic countries. * * * They would spread their doctrine of fear and hatred among the people of the United States. * * * If our country were engulfed in another war—and God forbid that it ever should be—they would go underground and undermine the people of the United States of America and this Government of ours. * * * Their allegiances are pledged to a foreign government." These words were not spoken by any "labor-baiting, union-busting Wall Street reactionary." They were the measured words of an outraged leader of organized labor. This CIO action is encouraging proof that responsible labor leaders are exerting Samsonian efforts to destroy Communist influence in labor unions.

Nevertheless, the representatives of Westinghouse, General Electric, and Sylvania are called upon by law-enforcement agencies to sit at the bargaining table with traitors of the stripe depicted in the colorful, but wholly accurate, language of Philip Murray.

Letting loose a final blast against the UE leaders, Philip Murray declared: "This is not a fight over trade-unionism, and these hypocrites who pretend to tell you that it is a fight over trade-union policies are lying—they are lying out of their mouths, and they are lying out of the pits of their dirty bellies, and they know it."

If Philip Murray was right in declaring that the issue was not one of trade-unionism or trade-union policies, and if the CIO convention was correct in describing the UE as "the Communist Party masquerading as a labor union," why must the NLRB treat the UE as a bona fide labor union? Why must industrialists negotiate collective-bargaining contracts with traitors under the fiction that they are negotiating with honest labor-union representatives?

This country is now engaged in a war, a war that may any day assume global proportions. Our entire national policy is, presumably, in the process of being geared to the possibility that world war III is not far off. At the heart of our American hopes and confidence lies the belief in our ability to outproduce any power or combination of powers which may decide to make war against us. Short in manpower though we may be, we believe that we are long in industrial resources.

We shall be negligent beyond belief if we continue to permit traitors to hold the leadership of hundreds of thousands of men and women who are employed in industries which are vital to our defense and even to our continued existence as a free people.

To illustrate the strategic importance of the electrical industry in which the UE is recognized as a collective-bargaining agency, let us take the billion-dollar corporation, the General Electric Co.

During World War II General Electric produced more war materials, including electronic devices and instruments which are beyond the comprehension of the layman, than any other industrial establishment in this country. A mere listing of these materials, devices, and instruments would contain words which are unintelligible to the average American. Not only is the highest scientific skill and efficiency required for their production—to say nothing of the miracles of industrial management—but the unqualified loyalty of all those engaged in their manufacture is an absolute prerequisite. Any sabotage which produces a "dud" may mean loss of life among our fighting men at the battle front. Traitors and those who follow the leadership of traitors should be as far removed from the manufacture of these essential instruments of our national security as it is possible for government and management to remove them, whether this means to remove them from the assembly lines, the research laboratories, or the "collective-bargaining" table. One Klaus Fuchs is one traitor too many. One Julius Emspak or one James Matles is one tool of Moscow too many. One anonymous saboteur on the assembly line is one risk too many.

A few days ago, General Electric signed a collective-bargaining contract with the UE which covered some 45 of its plants and 37,000 of its employees. Although this contract was negotiated and concluded in compliance with the procedures of the NLRB, it was an agreement in which one of the contracting parties represented the interests of the Kremlin. To assume that a Communist-dominated union, such as the UE, represents the interests of the employees, management, the stockholders, or the United States is an inexcusable perversion of plain facts. If "the Communist Party masquerading as a labor union" cannot be tolerated in the family of CIO, why should it be tolerated inside the plants of General Electric, Sylvania, General Motors, Westinghouse, or the Radio Corp. of America?

The recently signed collective bargaining contract between the UE and General Electric covered the latter's giant plants at Schenectady, N. Y., and Erie, Pa., where the company is at present manufacturing such vital defense products as turbines, motors, ordnance, and electronics equipment.

In the General Electric plant at Lynn, Mass., not covered in this recent labor contract, there is a UE local with some 6,000 members. (The GE establishment at Lynn is now engaged in the manufacture of jet engines and radar equipment.) These 6,000 employees of General Electric follow the long-exposed leadership of the Communist Party masquerading under the guise of the UE. Contract or no contract, this UE local at Lynn, Mass., is a danger spot in national security.

Altogether, the UE today has from 200,000 to 250,000 members at work in the electrical industry of the United States.

Last spring, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation warned a Senate subcommittee that the Communists have stepped up their activity in our basic industries, and he pointed specifically to the electrical industry as one of the places where this has occurred, remarking that "48 percent of the party membership is in the basic industry of this country, as in this manner they would be able to sabotage essential industry in vital defense areas in the event of a national emergency."

For a long time, it has been fashionable to condemn the Communist leadership of a union in one breath, and to flatter the rank and file of the same union in another breath by declaring that the latter are, of course, good and loyal Americans.

Today, however, the employees in the electrical industry have an alternative to the UE. It is no longer necessary for any reason whatsoever for them to follow and support the Communist leadership of the UE. The International Union of Electrical Workers, CIO, known as the IUE, is one of the employees' alternatives, wherever and whenever they wish to repudiate the UE agents of the Kremlin. The IUE is anti-Communist.

When 200,000 to 250,000 members continue to support the Matles-Emspak Communist machine of the UE, it is time to take another look at the alleged "solid Americanism" of the rank and file. It is no longer a matter of any serious dispute that the leadership of all the unions which have been expelled from the CIO owes its first and only allegiance to the masters of a foreign power which is bent on the destruction of the United States. The rank and file, in the UE or any other union, which supports such a treasonable leadership, must share the criminal responsibility adhering thereto, regardless of the alleged patriotism or ignorance of the rank and file.

There are no mitigating circumstances in the present state of world affairs. Innocence can no longer be claimed on grounds of ignorance.

The exposure of the UE as a Communist-dominated organization has been too complete to leave room for any doubts.

The most recently published volume of hearings of the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, released the end of September 1950, contains overwhelming and conclusive proof of the Communist character of the UE.

One of the key witnesses in this latest exposure of the UE was Victor Decavitch. For almost 10 years, Decavitch was a member of the UE, rising eventually to the position of one of the UE international vice presidents by virtue of his position as president of UE district 7, which embraces Ohio and Kentucky.

As a member of the UE international executive board, Victor Decavitch had first-hand acquaintance with all the top leaders of the UE. As president of UE district 7, he knew all the Ohio and Kentucky field organizers and international representatives personally. He himself had signed up as member of the Communist Party. He was, therefore, in a position to testify of his own first-hand knowledge concerning the Communist leadership of the UE. In his sworn testimony, he said: "Within the UE—I am speaking of paid people working in UE today—they are 99.9 percent Communists. That is no exaggeration. That is basically the God's truth as far as the UE is concerned."

Earlier this year, Matt Cvetic also testified before the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities with respect to the Communist Party membership of the UE leaders in Pennsylvania. Cvetic was for many years an undercover agent of the FBI in Pittsburgh and, like Decavitch, was able to testify of his own first-hand knowledge that the UE leaders in his area were members of the Communist Party.

In previous congressional hearings such former UE officials as James Conroy, of New York, and S. M. Vottis, of Schenectady (both of whom were one-time members of the Communist Party), have helped to swell the immense volume of irrefutable evidence that the present UE leaders are traitors to their country.

The following paragraphs which give an account of the fraudulent beginning of UE Local 301 in Schenectady, N. Y., are based upon the sworn testimony of S. M. Vottis, who was speaking from first-hand knowledge.

UE Local 301 is among the most important in the entire union. Its membership, during World War II, reached the figure of some 27,000. Today there are about 13,000 employees of General Electric at Schenectady who are covered by the recently signed contract with the UE.

Julius Emspak, identified by Louis Budenz as the "Comrade Juniper" of the Communist Party, got his start in UE Local 301. Communist Leo Jandreau has been the big shot in the local's affairs for many years.

The fraud by which the Communists took over control of the union in the GE plant at Schenectady is illustrative of some of their unscrupulous tactics.

In May 1935 Israel Amter, then New York State chairman of the Communist Party, went to Schenectady, where he gathered a small group of GE employees and local Communists together to confer on strategy.

At this meeting Amter appointed Sadie Doran, local Communist Party organizer, to direct the strategy of taking over the union in the GE plant. She was in Schenectady until late in 1936 when the party sent Dorothy Loeb and Joseph Klein to replace her. In recent years, Dorothy Loeb has written the labor news column of the Daily Worker.

Later on the Schenectady Communists were told that they would receive their instructions on union matters from James Matles. In 1936, the Communist Party strength in Schenectady was a half-dozen active members, and the union had enrolled between 250 and 300 members in the GE plant. With this negligible strength, a half-dozen obscure employees set about to pit their force against a billion-dollar corporation.

After learning that approximately 3,500 dues-paying union members would be required, before the NLRB in Washington would authorize a collective bargaining election, the half-dozen Communist zealots sat down night after night to make out that many fraudulent union cards and dues receipts. They simply copied names and addresses from the telephone directories of the vicinity.

The NLRB then sent its representative, one John Moore, from Washington. Mr. Moore took a casual glance at the fraudulent cards and ordered an election. The Communists won the election, and from that time to the present day they have dominated the union local at the GE plant.

UE Local No. 301 at Schenectady is looked upon as something of the "mother local" throughout the UERMWA. Reliable witnesses report that the Communist Party has pursued a course of relentless determination to retain control of the local regardless of cost, having sent in scores of organizers and spent thousands of dollars whenever its grip seemed threatened. Probably no other industrial plant in the United States is more important to the national defense than the GE plant at Schenectady.

UE COMMUNISTS JAILED FOR DESECRATING AMERICAN FLAG

This country has penal statutes which forbid the desecration of the American flag by using it as a receptacle for the placing or depositing of money.

On many occasions, UE Communist leaders have shown their contempt for both the American flag and the penal statutes of the United States. This is not at all surprising in view of the fact that all Communists have only one loyalty, the Soviet Union.

Eight members of UE Local No. 441, Elizabeth, N. J., were found guilty of violating the statute which expressly forbids the use of the American flag as a receptacle for depositing money. Charles MacLaren, president of local No. 441, was among those found guilty of this offense. The others were Charles Pecukaities, Elmer Stafford, Wesley Mitchell, Walter Pidgeon, Bert Eckstein, Hadley Daggett, and William Karp.

In finding them guilty, Presiding Justice Henry H. Curran of Special Sessions in New York said: "This is a shocking and disgraceful way to use the American flag."

These UE leaders of local 441 were marching in the Communist May Day parade in New York City at the time of their violation of the statute respecting the American flag. (That fact alone is evidence enough of their Communist sympathies.) The eight of them carried a large American flag and shouted to spectators along the line of the Communist march to toss coins into it.

By the time they reached the end of the march in Union Square, the flag contained only $58.38 in coins, but these eight able-bodied men were allowing the center of the flag to drag in the dirt of the streets. They were promptly arrested by Patrolman Edward Cooley.

The penalty for this desecration of the flag ranges as high as 1 year in prison and a fine of $500.

Although he found all of the men guilty, Special Sessions Judge Curran sentenced only three of the ringleaders—MacLaren, Stafford, and Mitchell—to jail terms. The others received suspended sentences.

In pronouncing sentence, Judge Curran said: "Our flag is not merely a piece of cloth. Old Glory cannot be dragged in the dirt of the streets. Ordinary decency and respect would have prevented such an occurrence."

It is significant that most of these eight leaders of local 441 have had other affiliations with Communist enterprises than their marching in the Communist May Day parade. MacLaren, Stafford, Mitchell, Pidgeon, and Eckstein have sent greetings to the Communist Party's newspaper, the Daily Worker, Mitchell has also been affiliated with the Civil Rights Congress, a Communist-front organization which has been listed as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

UE LEADERS IN COMMUNIST PARTY CONVENTION

UE Local 601 (Westinghouse in East Pittsburgh) has made the charge that the following UE leaders were delegates to the national convention of the Communist Party in 1948:

John T. Bernard, legislative director of UE district 6, former Member of the House of Representatives and prominent in scores of Communist-front organizations.

William Bonafide, organizer of the Communist Party shop unit in local 409, Newark, N. J.

Neil Brandt, vice president of New Jersey Industrial Union Council and international representative of UE district 4.

Nat Cohen, executive board member of UE local 475 and former member of the national committee of the Communist Party.

David Davis, business agent of UE Local 155, Philadelphia, and member of the national committee of the Communist Party.

Julius Emspak, secretary-treasurer of the UERMWA and identified as "Comrade Juniper" by Louis Budenz.

William W. Hill, president of UE Local 130, Baltimore, Md.

John Leto, president of UE Local 103, Camden, N. J.

Robert Logsdon, international representative of UE district 8, St. Louis.

James Lustig, representative of UE district 4.

William E. Mauseth, organizer of UE district 12, Minnesota.

James McLeish, president of UE district 4.

William Sentner, president of UE district 8.

Ted Smorodin, representative of UE Local 103.

Edward Wiggan, representative of UE district 12, Minnesota.

Josephine Willard, executive board member of UE Local 203, Bridgeport, Conn.

Ruth Young, secretary-treasurer of UE district 4.

UE Local 601 challenged these 17 UE leaders to deny that they were delegates to the national convention of the Communist Party.

The charges of local 601 mean that more than 6 percent of the delegates to the last national convention of the Communist Party (1948) were leaders of the UERMWA. Out of a total of 275 delegates from all parts of the United States, 17 were UE leaders.

Aside from the salaried functionaries of the Communist Party (organizers, editors, secretaries, etc.) who naturally constituted the largest group of delegates, the UERMWA was the most largely represented organization in the 1948 national convention of the Communist Party.

It has been known for a long time that there are scores of officers and organizers on the UE payroll who are little or nothing more than Communist Party organizers masquerading as labor union functionaries. This disproportionate number of UE leaders who were delegates to the national convention of the Communist Party is striking confirmation of this knowledge. It must be borne in mind that only top Communist Party figures are delegates to the party's biennial convention.

The 1948 national convention of the Communist Party was the fourteenth in the history of the Communist Party in the United States. It was convened in the ballroom of the Riverside Plaza Hotel, West Seventy-third Street off Broadway, New York City, on the morning of August 3, 1948.

Every precaution was taken by the Communist Party to keep secret the identities of the 275 delegates to this biennial convention. Even well-known Communist Party figures were compelled to produce their credentials. The credentials committee was composed of Steve Nelson, Albert Lannon (real name Viteri), and Joseph Dougher. This credentials committee worked under the close supervision of Sidney Stein and Claudia Jones. At the close of each session, all records of attending delegates were impounded for the night and taken to the national headquarters of the Communist Party. During the night, they were watched over by special agents of the Russian MVD.

Despite these elaborate precautions, the identities of all the delegates are known to Government agencies and others.

UE SUPPORT OF CONVICTED COMMUNISTS

For the time being, the Communist Party has concentrated most of its attention upon the defense of its 11 convicted leaders. During and after the trial, the party has organized fronts, protests, and demonstrations to agitate for its leaders' release.

On June 3, Judge Medina sent three of the Communist defendants to jail for their contumacious conduct in court. The behavior of the defendants (and their counsel, too) was not a matter of hasty, ill-considered action. It was carefully planned and coolly calculated in an unsuccessful attempt to force Judge Medina to commit trial error. From the inception of the Communist movement, there has been a deliberate practice of bad courtroom behavior on the part of Communist defendants who are brought before the bar of "bourgeois" justice.

Henry A. Wallace was not such a complete and utter fool that he was wholly unaware of these Communist tactics, and his rush to denounce the court, therefore, meant only one thing, i. e., that Wallace has been made captive to the purposes of the Communist Party.

It becomes increasingly unlikely, with every passing week, that innocent "liberals" can be drawn into the mesh of Communist Party trickery. Consequently, those who are now letting out loud shrieks of indignation and anguish over the conviction of the 11 defendants may be catalogued as Communist Party members or the most willing of Communist Party tools. Period!

The following leaders of the UERMWA put the finger on themselves by their vehement attacks upon Judge Medina for his action in jailing the three Communist defendants in June:

Clarence Bingham, president of UE Local 810, St. Louis, Mo.

Fred Blycher, department chairman of UE Local 203, Bridgeport, Conn.

Ethel Carpenter, field organizer of UE district 4, Newark, N. J.

David Davis, business representative of UE Local 155, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ernest DeMaio, president of UE district 11 and international vice president, Chicago, Ill.

John Dillon, chief steward of UE Local 448, Jersey City, N. J.

Charles Frank, delegate from UE Local 475, New York.

James Garry, business manager of UE Local 1227, New York.

Fred Haug, field organizer of UE district 7, Cleveland, Ohio.

Herbert Hirschberg, international representative of UE district 7, Cleveland, Ohio.

Sam Kanter, business agent of UE Local 475, New York.

Harry Kelner, field organizer of UE district 4, Newark, N. J.

Koorken Koortbojian, business agent of UE Local 448, Jersey City, N. J.

Joseph Kres, business agent of Local 735, Cleveland, Ohio.

James Lustig, representative of UE district 4, New York.

Lucille Margolin, secretary of UE Local 209, Bridgeport, Conn.

Lem Markland, president of UE district 7, Cleveland, Ohio, and international vice president.

Dave Mates, representative of UE district 9, Detroit, Mich.

James McLeish, president of UE district 4 and international vice president.

Tom Neill, field organizer of UE district 4, Newark, N. J.

Ernest Pollock, business agent of UE Local 437, Newark, N. J.

Talmadge Raley, representative of UE Local 766, Cleveland, Ohio.

Marie J. Reed, business agent of UE Local 735, Cleveland, Ohio.

Henry Rhine, international representative of UE district 1.

Tony Rodriguez, field organizer of UE district 4, Newark, N. J.

Marcel Scherer, educational director of UE district 4, Newark, N. J.

David Scribner, UE general counsel, New York, N. Y.

Joe Sheetz, president of UE Local 758, Cleveland, Ohio.

Joe Squires, secretary of the fair-practices committee of UE district 4, Newark, N. J.

Al Stearn, business manager of UE Local 430, New York.

John Thomas, representative of UE Local 776, Cleveland, Ohio.

Sam Verano, field organizer of UE district 4, Newark, N. J.

Josephine Willard, member of executive board of UE Local 203, Bridgeport, Conn.

Jack Zucker, organizer of UE district 1.

A total of 34 leaders of this union who have publicly recorded themselves as Communist Party stooges in attacking Judge Medina, showing conclusively that it is a political organization subservient to the Communist Party.

The political character of the UERMWA is revealed further by the violence and abusiveness of the statements which its leaders have prepared for the Daily Worker, Communist Party newspaper. The National Non-Partisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist Leaders is the most important of the Communist fronts charged with agitating on behalf of the convicted Communist leaders. The members of this committee include the following prominent UE leaders: David Davis, Ernest DeMaio, Leo Jandreau, and Ruth Young.

Paul Robeson and Judge Norval K. Harris are cochairmen of the National Non-Partisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist Leaders. Robeson is known well enough for his pro-Soviet activities. Judge Norval K. Harris is a newcomer to the Communist-front fold. This judge, incidentally, served a prison sentence for stealing veterans' checks after World War I.

The secretary of the committee is Harold Christoffel, Communist leader of the Allis-Chalmers strike in the period of Communist sabotage strikes during the days of the Stalin-Hitler pact. Other well-known Communists and party liners on the committee include Hugh Bryson, Albert Maltz, Grant W. Oakes, Sam Burt, W. E. B. DuBois, James H. Durkin, Ben Gold, Uta Hagen, Vito Marcantonio, William Howard Melish, William L. Patterson, Gene Weltfish, and Donald Henderson.

It requires no intimate nor profound knowledge to realize that as long as these representatives of Moscow continue to dictate the labor policies of a quarter of a million workers in strategic American plants we face a dangerous and possibly a tragic situation. It should be changed immediately.

In this connection I call attention to the fact that the Taft-Hartley law provides that unless the union heads file a non-Communist affidavit, the union shall not be recognized as the bargaining agent. It also provides heavy penalties for those who file false affidavits—penalties in the form of fines and jail sentences.

The question which the American people are entitled to have answered at this time is: "Why has not the Justice Department started prosecution on these false affidavits?"

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has furnished the complete and detailed evidence to the Justice Department, but Mr. Peyton Ford, the Assistant to the Attorney General, who received all of this proof, has under administration direction turned a deaf ear and buried the information in the files.

This is extremely dangerous playing with our national security for the purpose of getting some additional left-wing votes. It is in the same pattern as the shameful and dangerous Tydings-McMahon-Lucas whitewashing of Communists in Government.

Inflation—Will It Lead to Repudiation or the Return to a Sound Currency Redeemable in Gold and Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there is submitted herewith for the consideration of the Members of Congress an editorial on inflation taken from the September 22, 1950, Spokesman-Review, of Spokane, Wash., and a timely response of Frank Lilly, research analyst, also of Spokane:

WAR'S BIG OBJECTIVE IS THE UNITED STATES DOLLAR

The most dangerous threat to America's security today may not be Russia's military might. It is inflation here at home.

Communism's long-range plan is to force the democracies to exhaust their energies and resources in a long series of little wars and military preparations until they go down in economic collapse. This strategy holds out far more hope for Russian domination of the world than would any plan for military conquest.

Our most sensible defense is to protect the American economy against inflation, especially during the time we are building our military strength. It is not an easy way, but the only way to check communism and at the same time prevent world war III.

Camille Gutt, manager of the International Monetary Fund, has warned that "neglect of the inflationary danger can destroy all progress made in the last 4 years toward economic recovery from World War II." Mr. Gutt pointed the way, for America as well as Europe: Credit must be limited, and while taxes go up it is even more vital to limit unnecessary expenditures by governments.

Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin repeated the warning that inflation is the greatest danger facing American labor. He urged that no general wage rise be sought at this time, adding that "wage increases would again be reflected in increased prices and we would be in another inflationary

spiral that would benefit nobody, labor least of all."

While Congress hurries to adjourn without enacting adequate anti-inflation measures and the President is trying to postpone use of his anti-inflationary powers until after election, the danger is not being combated. Higher taxes, even price ceilings, are not enough. We need most of all to stop nonessential Government spending.

The situation calls for determined, intelligent, bipartisan effort in our Federal Government if we are to avoid the economic anarchy that Russia has planned for us.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1950.

JAMES BRACKEN,
Editor, Spokesman Review,
Spokane, Wash.

DEAR JIM: The statement in your editorial of September 22 to the effect that "the most dangerous threat to American security today * * * is inflation here at home, is timely and should be repeated and emphasized over and over again.

I wish, however, that the real reason for inflation had been given. As matters stand, inflation is something that everybody talks about and warns against but which almost nobody seems to realize is a result and not a cause. In other words, inflation is the fever and not the disease; or, to say it another way, the gas and not the overeating of the wrong food that creates the gas.

Our real concern, therefore, is with the cause of inflation, for only by correcting the cause can we eliminate inflation itself. To merely alleviate the fever, or get rid of the gas is not going to do very much good in the long run.

The cause of inflation, briefly stated, lies in the fact that our currency is debt-based, and it therefore increases in about the same proportion as our debt increases. Incidentally, according to no less an authority than Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, debts on homes and commodities, including automobiles, now total over $60,000,000,000, an increase of over $10,000,000,000 during the past year. Many people do not understand that under our present monetary system most of these debts are discounted by the Federal Reserve banks, who issue the Federal Reserve notes that constitute most of our currency.

It is not too much to say that the "debt bomb" is more dangerous to American security than the A-bomb or even the H-bomb. Incidentally, Lenin and the other Russian leaders have never made a secret of the fact that the Communists' plan is to debauch our currency by inducing the United States to spend itself into bankruptcy, which is what we are now well on our way toward doing.

If all our currency were convertible into gold and/or silver, there could not be any appreciable inflation or deflation because convertibility acts as a brake which is useful when, for any reason we are stopping going uphill or when we are going downhill. When gold backing was taken out of our monetary system, it was equivalent to taking the brakes out of an automobile. Brakes are just as necessary to the proper functioning of an automobile as is the engine. You can, after a fashion, run an automobile on level ground with nothing but the motor, but the brakes are needed for the safety of both the driver and others.

Increasing taxes and arbitrary Government controls are at best palliatives, like spirits of sweet niter for fever and soda mints for gas. Neither course, nor both, will correct the cause of inflation. The only cure is a sound, honest currency, backed by, and freely convertible into gold and/or silver. Unless this cure is applied, our country must inevitably resort to repudiation, which would be fatal to the American way of life.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK I[illegible]Y.

Undesirables in Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me together with newspaper articles in reference thereto.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

Mr. President, in a speech on the Senate floor on September 5, 1950, I referred to the activities of a number of individuals, some of whom are in the Department of Interior.

I referred to records and data and findings which resulted from hearings in the Congress of the United States, more particularly, before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives. In that speech I referred to the activities of certain individuals within the Territory of Alaska as appeared of record, and as set forth in my statement.

There were matters referred to in my speech of September 5, which, in my judgment, offered a fertile field for proper inquiry by a committee of the Senate of the United States, and which I thought should be brought to the attention of the American people.

I offered suggestions for the consideration of the committee as to witnesses who should be called, records, and data that should be obtained, all to the end that a complete basis for investigation would be provided. I felt that this committee had the authority to do this, and the facilities for the handling of this important type of inquiry.

These things I urge you to keep in mind for it is my intention to say more about them in the future.

We can easily recall the loud cries of anguish from the uninformed and the misinformed which arose when I first called attention on September 5 to many of these conditions and situations existing in the Interior Department, and the conduct of other individuals referred to. In my opinion, these matters needed to be investigated, thoroughly and completely, and that need still exists today.

I have been accused of not knowing whereof I spoke. These accusations do not disturb me. There were even, at the time of the drum beatings of denial and in the anxiety to protect many of these individuals named in my speech, statements that as a Republican I was motivated in my utterances by reason of politics. Let's look at the record with reference to this.

Let me remind the Senate and the people of this country that in May of this year 1950 a Member of Congress, a Democrat from the State of Virginia, in a public speech in his State, not only raised many of the same questions I raised in the Senate, concerning Mr. Chapman, but, my friends, a good many more. Here I want to refer to photostats of three newspapers:

1. Chicago Daily Tribune, May 17, 1950.
2. The Staunton News-Leader, May 12, 1950.
3. The Times-Herald, May 17, 1950.

Congressman BURR P. HARRISON, of Virginia, who is a member of the House of Repsentatives and a member of the Un-American Activities Committee of that body, spoke boldly, forthrightly, and courageously. I urge you to read and refer to what he had to say. Photostatic copies of newspaper reports of his remarks I am offering for the record at this point:

"[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 17, 1950]

"DEMOCRAT HITS APATHY TO REDS IN GOVERNMENT—CHAPMAN BLIND TO PERIL, HE SAYS

"(By Willard Edwards)

"WASHINGTON, May 16—A Democratic Congressman today ripped into the Truman administration's indefensible apathy concerning Communists in the Government and named Interior Secretary Chapman as unfit for office because of Communist front associations.

"Capitol Hill buzzed over a speech made by Representative HARRISON, Democrat, Virginia, a former circuit judge at Staunton, Va., last Thursday, the main features of which he repeated in an interview. The speech was reported only by Virginia newspapers at the time.

"The Harrison speech betrayed the secret alarms of many prominent Democrats over the administration's complacency in dealing with charges made by Senator MCCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin, and other Republicans about Communist influences in the State Department and elsewhere.

"CHARGES UNFITNESS

"HARRISON, a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, said he was not accusing Chapman of being either a Communist or disloyal but he read the record of the Cabinet officer's front affiliations as indicating his unfitness to detect security risks in his own department.

" 'I am convinced there are many persons with unsavory and dangerous connections still employed by the Government despite the assurances by President Truman and other top officials that the loyalty program cleaned them out,' he declared. 'Statements to the effect that there are no "known Communists" in the Government are not reassuring.

" 'The unknown Communists are the effective ones. Disclosures made by our committee do not give me a feeling of security. Obviously, the Communists are intensifying rather than diminishing their efforts to infiltrate our Federal establishment.'

"INDEFENSIBLE APATHY

" 'But for a reason wholly inexplicable to me, there has been no intensification of the efforts on the part of our Federal officials to weed out undesirables. On the contrary, there is an indefensible apathy, a continued effort to convince the public that hunting for Communists and fellow travelers in the Government merely hurts the morale of the employees and damages public confidence in public officials.

" 'This is a senseless attitude. Attorney General Clark [now Supreme Court Justice] was telling a CIO convention there were no Communists in the Government at the very moment Judith Coplon was busy stealing confidential information from the files of his own Department.'

"FRONTS LISTED

" 'State Secretary Acheson stood by Alger Hiss even after Hiss had been convicted by a jury as a common liar. There are a number of officials who should not be working for the Government. Among them is the Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman, who seems inclined to join Communist-front groups without investigation as to their true character.'

"Chapman's former affiliations, as listed in the files of the House committee, Harrison said, include the American League Against War and Fascism, cited as subversive by the Justice Department; Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, similarly cited; and Descendants of the American Revolution,

labeled 'a Communist imitation of the Daughters of the American Revolution' by the House committee; and others."

"[From the Staunton (Va.) News-Leader of May 12, 1950]

"UNDESIRABLES SAID ON FEDERAL LISTS

"Representative BURR P. HARRISON declared last night that he is convinced many persons with unsavory and dangerous connections still are employed by the Federal Government, despite assurances from President Truman and other top officials that the loyalty check program has proved an adequate safeguard.

"Mr. HARRISON, a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, spoke at a public meeting of the Beverly Manor Ruritan Club.

"He was introduced by Gilbert R. Kinzie. A dinner, presided over by Roscoe Masincupp, president of the group, was served by the ladies of the Hebron Church. The Reverend W. W. Trimble gave the invocation, and Boyd Shaner was accepted as a new member at the monthly meeting.

"It was announced that at the next meeting the boys and girls of the FFA will be honored as guests of the Ruritans.

"Statements to the effect that 'there are no known Communists in the Government' are not reassuring, in the light of the shocking facts which have come to light in recent years—and still are being revealed," he said.

" 'We must go beyond the matter of "known Communists." The unknown Communists are the effective ones. The disclosures which have been made in the proceedings of the Committee on Un-American Activities do not give me a feeling of security. Obviously, Communists are intensifying, rather than diminishing, their efforts to infiltrate our Federal establishment. But, for a reason wholly inexplicable to me, there has been no intensification of the efforts on the part of our Federal officials to weed out undesirables.'

"SCORES APATHY

" 'On the contrary, there has been an indefensible apathy—a continuous effort to convince the public that hunting for Communists and fellow travelers in the Government merely hurts morale of the employees and damages public confidence in public officials.'

"Mr. HARRISON called this 'a senseless attitude.' He pointed out that Attorney General Tom Clark (now a Supreme Court Justice) was telling a CIO convention that there were no Communists in the Government, insofar as was known, at the very moment Judith Coplon, now under a Federal penitentiary sentence, was busy stealing confidential information from the files of his own department, where she was working.

"He also recalled that Secretary of State Dean Acheson insisted on standing by Alger Hiss, a former trusted official of his Department, even after Hiss had been convicted 'as a common liar' in denying he passed confidential information to a Communist courier.

"Mr. HARRISON warned that adequate security controls in the Federal Government must go beyond the theory of loyalty risk and embrace the idea of security risk.

"There are many persons working for the Government who have no right to be there,' he said. 'As a matter of fact, no one has a right to a Federal job. It should be regarded as a high privilege. The people of the United States have the right to be choosy about who works for them—and their officials in Washington should keep that in mind. A worker who is loyal to the Nation still may be unfit to serve as a Federal employee because of his habit of joining Communist-front organizations or keeping the company of Communists and fellow travelers,' he pointed out.

"NAMES INDIVIDUALS

"Mr. HARRISON said he had selected at random the names of several individuals he believed should not be working for the Government. One of these was that of Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman. He read from files of the Committee on Un-American Activities the names and descriptions of several organizations with which the files showed Mr. Chapman to have been affiliated in the past. The organizations subsequently were cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as Communist front. Mr. HARRISON emphasized he was not calling Mr. Chapman a Communist, or accusing him of being disloyal, but merely mentioned him as one of those public officials who seemed inclined to join Communist-front groups without investigating their true character.

"The Seventh District Representative also reported on his recent service in Hawaii as a member of a special subcommittee investigating Communist activities there.

"He revealed that public hearings conducted in Honolulu established the existence of a well-organized and effective plan to seize control of the economy of the Territory and of the administration of its affairs generally.

"Mr. HARRISON said testimony presented to the subcommittee under the direction of Committee Counsel Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., of Woodstock, showed the extent to which the Communists had been successful in achieving domination of the dock workers' union organization, thereby controlling the islands' trade. It also established the startling fact that a small group of Communists had been able to take command of the Democratic Party in Hawaii, Mr. HARRISON added.

"One of the most appalling incidents to be uncovered in the hearings, he told the Ruritans, involved a veteran who was sent to the mainland, the taxpayers paying his way, in order that he could take instruction under the GI bill of rights.

" 'And where do you suppose he studied?' Mr. HARRISON asked. 'At a reputable college or trade school? Not at all. He was enrolled, at public expense, in the California Labor School. This institution was a notorious Communist front, well known to the FBI as a training ground for Communists and would-be Communists, where Marxist philosophy was taught and students were shown how to further the objective of subversion.' "

"Mr. HARRISON said the Hawaiian trip gave him "a startling picture of how a small group of experienced Communists—perhaps no more than 200—had neared the objective of control of an entire Territory, under the noses of patriotic and anti-Communist citizens."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 17, 1950]

"SECRETARY CHAPMAN ASSAILED BY VIRGINIA DEMOCRAT FOR RED LINKS

"(By Willard Edwards)

"A Democratic congressman yesterday ripped into the Truman administration's 'indefensible apathy' concerning Communists in the Government and named Interior Secretary Chapman as unfit for office because of Communist front associations.

"Capitol Hill buzzed over a sensational speech made by Representative HARRISON (Democrat, Virginia) at Staunton, Va., last Thursday, the main features of which he repeated in an interview.

"MANY DEMOCRATS ALARMED

"The Harrison speech betrayed the secret alarms of many prominent Democrats over the administration's complacency over charges made by Senator MCCARTHY (Republican) of Wisconsin and other Republicans about Communist influences in the State Department and elsewhere.

"HARRISON, a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, said he was not accusing Chapman of being either a Communist or disloyal, but he read the record of the Cabinet officer's front affiliations as indicating his unfitness to detect security risks in his own Department.

" 'I am convinced there are many persons with unsavory and dangerous connections still employed by the Government despite the assurances by President Truman and other top officials that the loyalty program cleaned them out,' he declared. 'Statements to the effect that there are no known Communists in the Government are not reassuring.

" 'The unknown Communists are the effective ones. * * *'

"INDEFENSIBLE APATHY

" 'But for a reason wholly inexplicable to me, there has been no intensification of the efforts on the part of our Federal officials to weed out undesirables. On the contrary, there is an indefensible apathy, a continued effort to convince the public that hunting for Communists and fellow travelers in the Government merely hurts the morale of the employes and damages public confidence in public officials.

" 'This is a senseless attitude. Attorney General Clark (now Supreme Court Justice) was telling a CIO convention there were no Communists in the Government at the very moment Judith Coplon was busy stealing confidential information from the files of his own Department.

" 'State Secretary Acheson stood by Alger Hiss even after Hiss had been convicted by a jury as a common liar. There are a number of officials who should not be working for the Government.'

"Chapman's former affiliations, as listed in the files of the House Committee, HARRISON said, include the American League Against War and Fascism, cited as subversive by the Justice Department; Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, similarly cited, and Descendants of the American Revolution, labeled 'A Communist imitation of the Daughters of the American Revolution by the House committee, and others."

Surely, Mr. Chapman and his fellow Democrats had Mr. Harrison's remarks called to their attention. But strangely enough, there were no drum beatings—no wails of denial—no calls for investigation—no shouting of "politics" or "foul play."

Mr. Chapman and his friends certainly should have known or had the oportunity to know that these charges were made by a member of his own Democrat Party, elected by the people of his State and renominated for election to his responsible office in the House of Representatives of this Nation.

In this instance there was a great silence with reference to the charges which were made by this courageous Congressman who spoke out of the fullness of his heart and from a knowledge of what had transpired while he was a member of the committee of Congress.

There was, for me, denunciation, some charges of petty politics, accusations of using smear tactics and a degree of vilification that reeks of the type of pressure which should be exposed and held up for exactly what it is to the eyes and ears of the people of this country.

Mr. Chapman has used the prestige of his office as a platform for ringing denials and very little more. He has referred to me as a "little man in a high place." I accept Mr. Chapman's estimate, but the senior Senator from Kansas wishes at this time to remind him to trim his vision down to my size.

Some of us are little people concerned with other little people. None of them to my knowledge, has ever repeatedly joined organizations supported by the Communists, attended dinners honoring Communists, or defaced a sacred oath of office, even for ceremonial purposes, or refused to reaffirm at any time the phrases printed in that oath.

Perhaps, as Mr. Chapman says, such procedures are commonplace in the Department of Interior. I am informed that they are not commonplace in the Department of Justice, the Department of State, and the Department of Commerce. They are not even tolerated there.

Many questions were raised in my Senate speech regarding the Department of Interior. Many of these questions are still unanswered.

How many other oaths of office in the Interior Department are defaced, and when were they defaced?

What do the people of Alaska have to say about the thousands of dollars spent to pay the exorbitant lobby fee of a man who apparently did little more than submit expense accounts?

Who has heard the likes of the vilification of a Senator's assistant, such as Mr. Frank Bow endured?

Mr. Bow is a good American, deeply concerned with the facts as he found them to exist in the Department of Interior. Facts that stand the test, despite abuse, of vilification and confusion.

We have a way in America of being patient for the truth. The people will be patient now. They were patient through the heavy rains of red herrings that fell upon them in other days.

They were patient through the so-called investigations of strange influences in other Federal Departments. The people look upon this body to supply them with the facts. To them, we in the Senate have the obligation of forceful inquiry, of deliberate, thorough investigation. If the citizens of our country do not get that from us, they have a way of making their voices and demands heard. Not in the discord of confusion that greets us now, but in the manner of little men, exhausted from hearing double talk and demanding the truth.

All-Out Mobilization and All-Out Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, Congress should immediately enact legislation requiring all-out mobilization and all-out controls.

It is not fair to pass the buck to the President. Congress should bear the responsibility.

Billions of dollars can be saved if we have all-out mobilization and all-out controls pegged at a certain date, preferably May 15, 1950, beyond which prices and wages could not climb and cause a spiral of inflation. Likewise our action would prevent the greedy from making millions unnecessarily out of the war.

Russia has had all-out mobilization of men and materials for some time. They are operating around the clock.

We must prevent inflation which would bring disastrous effects to our economy; we must act quickly to prevent extreme hardships on our aged, small businesses, large families, laboring people, municipalities, and to prevent excessive war costs.

We should allow the aged to work without regard to any old-age assistance now being received by them.

We should draft wealth as well as men, enact an excess-profits tax, make use of the services of all persons of all ages to the best advantage possible in an effort to win the war without delay.

When we win the Korean conflict we must not relax, but must redouble our efforts in order to be fully prepared at all times.

We should greatly expand the ROTC training program in high schools and colleges, and prepare our young men in a manner similar to the training given them in the United States Military Academy at West Point and the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, thus preserving their high moral standards.

Increased Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to finally have the opportunity of voting for a bill to improve our social-security law. For years it has been evident to me that the act should be improved, particularly by extending its coverage and increasing the amount to be paid to those entitled to benefits under the act. The number of persons to come within the provisions has been increased by approximately 11,000,000.

The fear of insecurity in old age is one that is ever present in the life of most persons. To remove that fear will add years and happiness to the life of everyone as they grow older. Time and again, innumerable times, I receive letters of the most pathetic character from old people fearful of what the future holds in store for them. These old people do not want to be a burden to the members of their families. They do not want to be dependent. They want to be independent. Those that are able are willing to work, but in this fast-moving industrial life of today, the demand is for young persons. Thus, the old and aged are placed upon the shelf, and, therefore, the need by appropriate laws to enable the aged to live a self-respecting old age. I am now, and always have been, strongly in favor of all legislation to provide security in old age.

As I have previously said, I am gratified that additional persons to the number of 11,000,000 are brought within the terms of the act by the amendments proposed. There are other classes of our citizenship that should likewise have been brought within the act. It is disappointing that they are not. However, I look forward to the time, and I hope it is not distant, when all such will be brought within our social-security coverage.

Another amendment to the Social Security Act that is long overdue, but is being corrected or improved by the legislation before us relates to the amount of benefits received. The amounts being paid under the present law are so meager that they might well be considered an insult to the aged. In no instance are they sufficient to meet the high cost of living that now exists. The only defense that might be offered would be that the cost of living when the original act was adopted was not as high as it is now, and, furthermore, that the law was new and lessons had to be gained by experience. Whatever justification there may be for such in the past the fact remains that for a long time it has been apparent that justice to the aged requires that payments to them should be greatly increased.

The legislation, now before us offers considerable improvement over present conditions by liberalization of benefits to be received under the act.

About 2,600,000 persons currently receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits would have their monthly benefits increased on the average about 77 percent for highest benefit groups to as much as 150 percent for lowest benefit groups. The average primary benefit is now approximately $26 per month for a retired insured worker and under the bill it would be approximately $44. Illustrative figures for individual cases are shown in the table below:

Present primary insurance benefit:	*New primary insurance amount*
$10	$25
$15	31
$20	36
$25	44
$30	51
$35	55
$40	60
$45	64

Furthermore, a very important matter, the bill will increase the amount that can be earned by a beneficiary without losing the monthly benefits to which he is entitled. Under the present law the amount a beneficiary is permitted to earn per month, after retirement and in addition to the monthly payment rereceived is only $14.99. The amount is so trifling that in practice it is no real help at all. Under the bill now before us this situation is corrected. The amount a beneficiary may earn in covered employment without loss of benefits would be increased from $14.99 to $50 per month. After age 75, benefits would be payable regardless of amount of earnings from employment.

There are many other worth-while improvements and additions to the existing law that will prove highly beneficial to many thousands of people. For instance—

Old-age and survivors' insurance benefits to World War II veterans.

World War II veterans will be given wage credits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program of $160 per month for the time spent in military service between September 16, 1940, and July 24, 1947.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND WELFARE SERVICES

Under extension of State-Federal public-assistance programs aid will be extended to persons not now eligible for assistance, as follows:

The mother, or other adult relative with whom an eligible dependent child is living, would become eligible as a recipient under the aid-to-dependent-children program, and the Federal Government would share in the costs of the aid furnished such mother or relative.

Increase in Federal share of public-assistance costs: The bill will strengthen financing of public assistance in all States, and, particularly, will enable States with low-average payments to

raise the level of payments to needy recipients under the State-Federal program. Federal funds will be made available to the States under the following matching formula:

(a) For old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the totally and permanently disabled, Federal funds will equal four-fifths of the first $25 for recipient plus one-half of the next $10 plus one-third of the next $15 with a maximum of $50 on individual assistance payments.

(b) For aid to dependent children, Federal funds will equal four-fifths of the first $15 per recipient, including one adult in each family, plus one-half of the next $6, plus one-third of the remainder, with maximums on individual assistance payments of $27 for the adult plus $27 for the first child plus $18 for each additional child in the family.

Public medical institutions: The Federal Government will share in the payments made by the States and localities to the needy, aged, blind, and permanently and totally disabled recipients residing in public medical institutions, instead of limiting Federal participation to payments made to recipients residing in private institutions as provided in present law.

Direct payment for medical care: States will be authorized to make direct payments to medical practitioners or institutions furnishing medical care to recipients of State-Federal public assistance. Under existing law the Federal Government does not participate in the cost of medical care for recipients unless payment for such is made directly to the recipient.

Child-welfare services in rural areas or areas of special need will be increased from $3,500,000 per year to $7,000,000. The use of child-welfare funds would be authorized for purposes of returning interstate runaway children to their homes. Notwithstanding the good that is in the bill there are some changes and additions that should have been made, but, unfortunately a gag rule prevented any amendments being offered. I think it was wrong to bring the bill before the House with such restriction on amendments.

The amendments to the Social Security Act which this bill seeks to make effective are necessary and worth while. While they may not cover every situation or condition that needs to be ratified, yet they do go a long way in making improvements to our social-security structure. I am pleased to give my support to the bill, and I hope that it will have the approval of the House.

Social Security Past 15-Year Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article entitled "Social Security Past 15-Year Mark" which appeared in the Sheet Metal Workers Journal, September 1950 issue:

SOCIAL SECURITY PAST 15-YEAR MARK

More than $24,000,000,000 have been paid out in the last 15 years under the various programs authorized by the Social Security Act, according to a report made marking the anniversary of the signing of the bill. The late President Frankin D. Roosevelt signed the measure making the bill a law on August 14, 1935.

The Social Security Administration released a summary of benefit payments on the fifteenth anniversary of the passage of the act. The report was issued on the eve of final passage by Congress of the 1950 amendments which will add 10,000,000 persons to the retirements rolls.

TWO MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND BENEFICIARIES

Best known of all the programs, perhaps, is the old age and survivors insurance phase. Under the law, before the 1950 amendments, approximately 2,100,000 aged beneficiaries and 750,000 younger mothers and children were receiving payments. The average monthly benefit for a retired worker is $26. Cumulative benefits under this program have exceeded $3,375,500,000.

Under the old-age-assistance program some 2,900,000 are being aided with an average monthly payment of $44. This program is operated by the States with the Federal Government and the States sharing the costs. Payments under this program have totaled $9,985,000,000 as of June 1950.

Aid to dependent children has been stepped up sharply under social security. In 1934 an estimated 280,000 children were being aided under State and county programs. Great variation and inconsistency prevailed, however. Today all States except Nevada have jointly financed programs with an average monthly payment being made of $47 for each of more than 1,600,000 children. The pre-social-security payments averaged $11 a month. Cumulative payments since social security began 15 years ago total $2,756,000,000.

Before the Social Security Act was passed 27 States had some sort of statutes providing for aid to the blind. While complete reports are not available it is estimated that the total being helped was less than 34,000 and the average payment was $20 per month per person. Today 77,000 are receiving monthly payments with an average of $47 per person. Cumulate payments under this program total $287,000,000.

Grants are made to States by the Federal Government to finance child health and welfare programs. These grants take the form of services provided rather than of payments made directly to individual. Since August 1935 total grants to States for programs of this sort have totaled nearly $190,000,000.

Another phase of social security which has attracted considerable attention and is often in the news is the authorization for unemployment insurance. In 1935 only one State, Wisconsin, had provision for unemployment compensation. Now all States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia have such provisions. Federal standards prevail and the Federal Government pays the States for costs of administration, but by and large the program is a State-operated procedure.

The social-security programs are financed by revenues from both Federal and State sources. Unemployment benefits are financed by State payroll taxes. Old-age and survivors insurance is financed entirely by a Federal payroll tax. The programs to aid dependent children and the blind is financed jointly.

1950 AMENDMENTS HELPED

The Social Security Administration pointed out in its report that the payments under the 1950 amendments would greatly increase the annual sum of money reaching eligible citizens. With some 10,000,000 added to the retirement rolls and retirement benefits hiked by an average of 77 percent, payments in the next 15 years are likely to exceed by a wide margin the payments since 1935.

While the new amendments recently enacted by Congress represent real progress in the long road of recent social welfare goals, labor is apprehensive about one amendment. This amendment, known as the "Knowland amendment," would restrict the power of the Secretary of Labor in the matter of unemployment compensation payments and could conceivably lead to the forcing of union workers to scab, say some observers.

Are You Going To Lose the Strongest Safeguard of Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important provisions of the United States Constitution guarantees to every citizen the right to vote. It is more than a right; it is a privilege which carries with it the positive duty to use it.

There is no other country on the face of the earth where periodically, on fixed dates, known well in advance, every citizen can go to the polls and freely exercise his choice as to who shall be his legislators to make the laws of the land; who shall be the judges to interpret those laws; and who shall be the heads of government to enforce those laws.

Yet, nowhere is this privilege valued so little and ignored so much.

In the City and State of New York this year, we will elect Members of Congress, members of the State legislature, a mayor, and a governor, as well as many judges. Thousands upon thousands of our citizens will lose their right to participate in these important elections solely because they fail to register.

In New York City, unless you personally register each year you lose your right to vote. This year you must register on any one of 6 days, October 9 to October 14, inclusive. It matters not whom you intend to vote for, it is important that you should vote. In order to vote, you must register.

Are you going to lose the strongest safeguard of democracy?

Crusade for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly encouraged by the reports coming to me of the rapid organization in New England for the crusade for freedom drive.

The State chairman of Massachusetts, a personal friend of mine, Nathan Tufts, of Greenfield, has developed an amazingly complete program which has received immediate response throughout Massachusetts.

As is well known this crusade will be conducted until October 24, United Nations Day, when the signatures of Americans who have enlisted in the crusade will be placed in the base of the freedom bell and the bell itself will be installed and dedicated in Berlin as a permanent shrine to freedom and a tribute to those who today are fighting for freedom and against the malicious and false Stockholm peace petition. It is a healthy development.

The Communist sheet, the Daily Worker, of Sunday, September 3, reported that over 2,000,000 Americans had signed this Communist peace petition. On September 4, that official organ of the Communist Party stated that in the world there had been 273,470,566 signatures attached to the fake peace petition. It is significant that 115,275,000 were reported under the U. S. S. R., 18,000,000 under Poland, 17,046,000 under the Soviet-dominated portion of Germany and 44,000,000 from China. Surely it is not too much to expect that those who are now circulating the American Crusade for Freedom petitions will be assisted by all of our organizations and groups in making certain that just as many loyal Americans as possible will have the opportunity to sign this sincere and responsible petition.

I want to include an excellent editorial from the Times Picayune, of New Orleans, in its September 4 issue. That issue also contained a most effective cartoon entitled "A Real Peal To Answer the Phony 'Stockholm Appeal,'" showing an American ringing the freedom bell before a microphone called Radio Free Europe. The bell carries the inscription, "That This World, Under God, Shall Have a New Birth of Freedom." The editorial is as follows:

CRUSADE FOR FREEDOM

I believe in the sacredness and the dignity of the individual.

I believe that all men derive the right to freedom equally from God.

I pledge to resist aggression and tyranny wherever they appear on earth.

This declaration and pledge begin to go today, in the name of individual Americans, on scrolls throughout the United States, for deposit on United Nations Day, October 24, in the base of a freedom bell in Berlin.

Signatures are being collected by local committees of the Crusade for Freedom, a program of the National Committee for a Free Europe, which was organized last year by private citizens. Contributions also will be accepted, in whatever small amounts, to defray expenses of this project and of Radio Free Europe broadcasts from Germany into iron-curtain land.

This expression of American purposes and steadfastness is counted upon to strengthen the hopes of those isolated and enslaved individuals who have been bound in the net of Russian and local communism. The freedom bell itself will be a memorial to all who have given and who may give their lives in the struggle for human freedom.

This is a spontaneous movement, apart from government and statecraft, which nevertheless has demanded intense organization. It is one of the answers that will be made to the "big lies" of communism. The crusade itself is headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

We believe every person subscribing to this credo, with or without a financial contribution, will help in some measure in the struggle the Kremlin has forced upon the free world. Means have been provided, in display advertisements, for response by persons who may not be contacted.

The declaration stands also as a rebuking rejoinder to the fallacious premises and falsities of the so-called Stockholm declaration—a rejoinder and, at the same time, a positive affirmation, along lines the Red sponsors of the phony peace petition did not dare introduce. On that basis, we hope that in due time the committee will extend the circulation of this scroll to western Europe and elsewhere.

I also want to include a very interesting report from Los Angeles in the Christian Science Monitor of September 13, by Kimmis Hendrick, chief of the Pacific news bureau of that paper. It is entitled "Freedom Crusade Stirs Action in West." The article is as follows:

FREEDOM CRUSADE STIRS ACTION IN WEST

(By Kimmis Hendrick)

LOS ANGELES.—Westerners are awakening to the spiritual potential of the Crusade for Freedom and throughout the region volunteer committees are forming ranks to make the drive successful.

Early editorial response to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's Denver radio address which opened the crusade officially shows how much eagerness there is to offer the world a positive alternate to communism.

As workers start out to get signers for the freedom scrolls and contributions to Radio Free Europe, they have the backing of newspaper publicity and comment more than ordinarily tuned to spiritual idealism.

GROWING AWARENESS

There seems to be a growing awareness throughout the West that the plan of private American citizens to support a chain of free radio stations in western Europe offers a gripping opportunity. It is sensed, obviously, that the time has come for Americans themselves to realize how much more than material achievement they have to share with mankind.

California's Governor, Earl Warren, proclaiming a Crusade for Freedom Week, referred to this bigger sharing as freedom of thought and action. The declaration of freedom which signers will put their names to includes the statement, "I believe that all men derive the right to freedom equally from God.'"

FREEDOM BELL TO RING

On October 24, when a 10-ton freedom bell will ring out in Berlin, to be heard by radio here, everywhere else in the free world, and doubtless behind the iron curtain, its essential message will echo the words of Lincoln inscribed in paraphrase on its rim: "That this world, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

In an editorial headed "Freedom is individual," the Hollywood Citizen-News hailed the freedom crusade, to make possible this bell and an enlarged free radio plan for Europe, as a new affirmation of faith in God.

The writers of the American Constitution, the Citizen-News said, believed that a good society could be established only with God as its foundation. This foundation, it continued, Marxism ignores, Marxism overlooks mankind's divine diversity which has lifted man above all the rest of God's creatures.

As the crusade for freedom was launched here, Walter Wanger, motion-picture executive, told press and radio representatives that what the world wants of us is assurance that freedom is a spiritual possibility. It does not merely want the things we produce.

AWAKENING URGED

"We must wake up to the fact," he said, "that we are not the only people in the world who can produce some things. We know that the slave system of Russia can never produce our most valuable products of freedom and human decency and individual dignity."

In San Francisco, in Portland, Oreg., in Vallejo, in small cities like San Jose and Santa Monica, as in Los Angeles, newspapers are greeting enthusiastically our chance to fight for freedom, as the Coos Bay (Oreg.) Times calls the crusade editorially. "This is in reality a world war struggling for men's minds," that paper says, repeating a phrase frequently heard as the nature of today's basic problem becomes apparent.

The Los Angeles Times says the need for championing mental freedom is so great that it needs not schoolmasters, but evangelists, to tell the story. It quotes Dr. Charles Malik, UN representative from the tiny Republic of Lebanon, whose view differs decidedly from that of the chief Russian delegate of similar name.

"Communism cannot be met by a mere nay," Dr. Malik has said; "it requires a mighty yea which will do full justice to man's material needs but will at the same time place them in their subordinate position in the scale of values."

For the Pacific coast's share in the crusade for freedom, L. M. Giannini is serving as regional chairman. Governor Warren is honorary State chairman for California. The drive to get every loyal American of Boy or Girl Scout age and upward to sign the freedom scrolls and contribute up to $1 must be completed by October 16.

Wisconsin Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter I wrote to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] regarding the Wisconsin Farmers Union.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1950.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: I understand that yesterday on the Senate floor you discussed at some length the alleged Communist infiltration of the Farmers Union. I am sorry I was not present on the floor to hear the discussion, but hope to read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

While I have never had extremely close contact with the Farmers Union in Wisconsin, I do know the president, Kenneth W. Hones, very well by reputation. He has the reputation of being militantly and intelligently anti-Communist. I feel in fairness to Mr. Hones this should be made very clear. I have, therefore, instructed my office to have this letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am not well acquainted with many of the officers of the Wisconsin Farmers Union.

However, I have no information to indicate that any of them are communistically inclined, nor do any of them, to my knowledge, have such a reputation.

Very sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

Expediency in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor of the New York Times of September 5, by William S. Reisman, which I believe to be of special interest at this time:

EXPEDIENCY IN FOREIGN POLICY—RECORD OF ALLIANCES CITED WITH ANTI-DEMOCRATIC POWERS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The necessity from a political and military point of view for an alliance with the Spain of Franco is open to honest difference of opinion. It is up to men more experienced in this field than myself or Fritz Moses, whose letter you recently published.

Mr. Moses' argument against expediency contrary to ethical conduct in the affairs of nations disregards historical instances of "immoral" expediency on the part of our great leaders throughout the years.

A superficial glance at our own past should suffice to show how often we have been forced to resort to expedient alliances with governments and philosophies inimical to ourselves.

Consider, for example, our close military and economic ties with the absolute monarchy of Louis XVI of France in our first struggle with England. Actually the England of George III was a veritable new-deal paradise compared to the autocratic government of Lafayette, Rochambeau, and DeGrasse. An alliance was contracted with this despotic nation, but for whose aid our independence could never have been achieved.

Andrew Jackson, faced in 1815 with the flower of England's Peninsular Army before New Orleans, allowed no moral qualms to disturb him when he accepted a pirate's offer to fill the gap at the Rodriquez Canal, Jean Lafitte and his felons were welcomed for the help they could give. Expediency, fortunately had won again over "ethics."

CIVIL WAR ALLY

Abraham Lincoln courted the friendship and aid of Czar Alexander II of Russia when England was about to side with the Southern Confederacy. This was the same England that had successfully quelled her own slave trade years before the partial emancipation of our Negroes in 1863. The Russian men-of-war anchored reassuringly in northern harbors had sailed from a land whose serfs, although nominally freed, labored as literal slaves in a feudal society. Lincoln knew that Russia had no love for a democratic America but gladly took advantage of the Muscovite hatred of England and Napoleon III.

The United States under Woodrow Wilson fought against German imperialism with armies from practically every other imperialist nation in the world.

In our own time we have seen America allied after 1941 with a Soviet Russia whose philosophy differed not one whit from that of our Nazi foe.

It is not my intention to support Señor del Castillo's claim for recognition of Spanish claims to alliance on moral grounds. But I submit for the benefit of confused liberals that refusal to accept reality on "moral" grounds is equally indefensible.

Republicans Are Poor, Pure, and Honest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are poor, pure, and honest, and there is no reason why they should be otherwise. The party, at least nationally, has neither enough money nor influence to tempt any crooked individuals. Second-story workers never hang around a poorhouse. Crooks and racketeers are smart. Those who are after the "big money" know that only the party in power has lucrative jobs, opportunities for grafting, juicy contracts, protection for syndicate gambling or any other form of vice, to allocate or sell.

DEMOCRATS WELCOME

Republicans seek to welcome those Democrats who have been ousted from their traditional political home.

There is in Congress no formal coalition between Democrats and Republicans nor have the battle lines there been consistently drawn between Democrats and Republicans. For more than 15 years, the alinement has been between so-called liberals, progressives, humanitarians, "share the wealth," "the Government owes me a living" advocates and so-called "horse-and-buggy" conservative Democrats and Republicans who believe in constitutional government, the right of the individual to equality of opportunity, but who also believe that—except as adequate aid should always be given to the unfortunate who are unable to care for themselves—every man when able should be required to earn his own livelihood—that is, that no part of the population should be required to support another group in idleness.

The Democratic Party—pardon me, the Fair Deal Party—has been in control since 1932, and quite naturally the big-time gamblers, the racketeers, and the extortionists have muscled their way into it just as they would into any other party where loot was to be found.

But that is not the whole story. Sincere, serious-minded extremists, with what they term new but which are really old, fallacious schemes and policies proven unworkable centuries ago, accompanied by over-book-educated "do-gooders," pinks, and Reds, have taken over the National Democratic Party organization.

THE RECORD IS CLEAR

That there is a Nation-wide crime syndicate collecting millions of dollars each year because of protection given them by those in power is a matter of common knowledge, and court records substantiate the charge that the present administration, as well as the last, has not only tolerated, but encouraged, Communists in policy-making Government positions.

The recent expulsion of a number of Communist-dominated CIO union affiliates by the CIO proves the charge frequently made that Communists had infiltrated into labor as well as educational organizations and the executive department of the Government.

That the CIO has taken over the Democratic Party of Michigan is shown by an editorial captioned "Democracy's new symbol," from the Detroit Free Press of September 23. Permit me to quote:

The left-wingers of the Americans for Democratic Action and the CIO-PAC captured control of the Democratic Party machinery in Wayne County congressional district conventions. * * *

In all but one district, the caucuses were marked by slugging and the Communist techniques of beating down opposition by violence.

The ADA-PAC combination brought back to Michigan the sitdown-strike methods which have been disavowed in labor disputes, and applied them to government.

The goon squads took over, and the gavel, that traditional symbol of orderly parliamentary procedure, was discarded for the sawed-off baseball bat.

Here in the Nation, President Truman has long had as his advisers known pinks, left-wingers like Frankfurter, Niles, and Rosenman; and in the executive department, such known Communists as Lee Pressman, Nathan Witt, Hiss, Coplon, and many others.

As his political pals and advisers, Mr. Truman has called to the White House CIO President Phil Murray, who, overlong, retained many a Communist in his organization; AFL President William Green, the head of the railway unions, and the Communists who have wormed their way into the State and other executive departments of the Federal Government, notwithstanding the opposition of long-time Democratic leaders, now shape the Democratic Presidential policy.

The people should now, regardless of party affiliation, elect to Congress individuals who believe in this country, in its institutions, and who will make a vigorous effort to oust the crooks, the racketeers, the extortionists, and the Communists.

Elect then, a Congress—and in 1952 a President—who will think first of your welfare and of the security of the Republic.

Tuesday, November 7, is the day.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, my voice has been raised in this Chamber, before

committees, and elsewhere at every opportunity in behalf of the St. Lawrence deep-water development. The most recent bill which was introduced by me to accomplish this purpose was considered by the Committee on Public Works and extensive hearings were held, but because of the tremendous organized opposition to this measure—House Joint Resolution 271—from a combination of selfish interests, and because of an insufficient amount of support from interested parties to counterbalance, the bill was not reported.

In many ways, in fact in every way, I have striven to bring about the project's completion, but the half-hearted support given to those who have so consistently and unselfishly given of their time and energies has not been encouraging. For the most part it is only lip-service or fanning the wind. The effort is as poorly directed as it is financed. Only the fervor and the sense of righteousness keeps alive the little band of visionary zealots who refuse to give up, who always spearhead the movement. Like crusaders they are far away from home, in enemy territory, unsupported and harassed by a wicked combination of selfish and rapacious interests who live only for today and for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I warn the people of the Great Lakes region, of Michigan and of Detroit in particular, that unless the waterway is completed soon that steel production will shift to the East or wherever else the highest grade of iron ore is delivered at the lowest price per ton. The steel and other heavy industries dependent upon cheap water transportation and steel, like the automobile industry and a thousand others in the Great Lakes and inland areas, will shift in the same direction and in close proximity to their basic steel supply. Corporations do not have a heart; they are created for profit, for advantage. When either is endangered there is no sentiment to guide or deter; expediency governs the course. It is cheaper to abandon a plant than to abandon the business for lack of raw material—iron ore in this instance—which can be had by competitors in new locations in a higher grade, in greater supply, delivered at a cheaper cost.

It is inevitable, therefore, that Michigan's industry, the center of which is in the Detroit metropolitan area, with the greatest production in the world, must without basic materials shrivel and die. Our businesses and homes, our real estate, schools, and churches, too, will shrivel and die. Without the St. Lawrence deep waterway Detroit, the arsenal of democracy, the industrial Klondike, "where (today) life is worth living," tomorrow will become the world's biggest ghost town. A sad distinction; earned while the State and its great cities were asleep. And it is later than you think. Wake up and spend more than just your time. Become aggressive people of Michigan, control the blind and selfish railroad and Lakes shipping interests and anyone else who stands in the way of the earliest possible completion of the tidewater program, involving the mighty St. Lawrence River.

This great development will make of every Great Lakes port a deep-sea port carrying on direct business with the whole world. To do such business we must preserve our industries dependent upon the basic steel which in turn is dependent upon the basic element, iron ore. Michigan alone should spend a million dollars per year for an educational program for as many years as is necessary to accomplish the purpose. Every other Great Lakes State should do likewise. To date the combined annual expenditures have been inadequate and hardly sufficient to pay the postage costs of a real effective campaign. The St. Lawrence development has been the dream and the inspiration of a pitifully small group, zealous and determined, but they cannot succeed in time unless a real, aggressive, and well-financed program is outlined and backed by the unified action of the interested States. Money should be available to whatever extent is necessary to combat the entrenched opposition. This should be a crusade, a war to protect our industries and in defense of our homes, our business institutions, and our churches. We should give no quarter and ask for none. Tomorrow may be too late.

The high grade or competitive iron ore of the Mesabi Range nears exhaustion. At the present accelerated rate of consumption it will be gone in 20 years. It may take 6 to 10 years to fully develop the St. Lawrence locks and deepen the channels of the Great Lakes to accommodate deep-sea shipping and make available the rich ore of Labrador, Quebec, and Venezuela. Wake up, Michigan. Rouse yourself, Detroit. Get busy today, your life is at stake, tomorrow may be too late. The St. Lawrence undertaking will never be completed after the Mesabi ore is exhausted and industrial erosion follows the production shift to the eastern seaboard. There will be no further need for it and the cost of the development would not be justified. Either you demand of your States and cities their effective cooperation in the solution of the matters now or plan for a shift to follow your lost industries.

Mr. Speaker, the attached article entitled "Cerro Bolívar—Mesabi of the Future," by John L. Beckley, taken from Dun's Review of September 1950, indicates clearly what the future holds for the entire Great Lakes area:

CERRO BOLÍVAR—MESABI OF THE FUTURE

(By John L. Beckley)

Conspicuously alone on the savanna, the flat, grassy plain which sweeps down across eastern Venezuela, is a great mountain, a dark-green, jungle-covered hump, 11 miles long and 2,100 feet high. No one suspected the solitary mountain was anything but useless rock.

Natives whose scattered farms and ranches extended to its base regarded the place with almost superstitious dread. There were tales of ancient rock slides and of a farmer and two sons who had gone there to hunt and never returned. Its Spanish name, La Parida, bordered on the vulgar.

On their way to the diamond and gold fields 100 miles to the south, prospectors used to detour around the great hogback. They were bypassing riches far surpassing anything they could hope to find beyond, for the mountain, renamed Cerro Bolívar, has been found to contain at least 500,000,000 tons of almost pure iron ore—probably much more—perhaps the greatest deposit ever discovered. It was found by a geological survey party sent out by the U. S. Steel Corp., after a search that had lasted 2 years.

Centuries-old Ciudad Bolívar, 60 miles away, has seen gold, diamond, cattle, and lumber booms; oil, chicle, and wild-rubber hunters. Now its bars and shaded paseo buzz with talk of the iron boom to come. For to get the ore from Cerro Bolívar to United States blast furnaces, U. S. Steel must invest $100,000,000 to $200,000,000 in the area of which Ciudad Bolívar is the hub. And there is no doubting U. S. Steel's desire to get the ore moving rapidly.

For American steelmakers the discovery comes in the nick of time. It is no secret that the high-grade iron-ore reserves of Minnesota's Mesabi range are running low. And Mesabi has been supplying about 60 percent of United States iron-ore requirements.

There is no shortage of iron ore, of sorts, in this country. Taconite, low-grade ore containing 25 to 35 percent iron, is plentiful. But to shift to low-grade ore will require the investment of billions of dollars. High-grade Mesabi ore can be scooped up in huge shovels, crushed, and used directly in blast furnaces. Taconite must be blasted out, ground fine, then processed to remove waste materials. Low-grade ore makes high-cost steel inevitable, and higher steel prices would be reflected in the cost of everything from carpet tacks to automobiles; it is difficult to think of any development that would have such profound effects on the American economy.

United States Steel Corp. still holds enough high-grade Mesabi ore for about 20 years, almost twice as much as the average steel company. But even for Big Steel, representing about 30 percent of the country's steel capacity, the ore crisis is uncomfortably close.

In 1945 big John Munson, United States Steel's vice president in charge of raw materials, went to the company's president, Ben Fairless. "If we pour hundreds of millions of dollars into a taconite program," said Munson, "and then some competitor discovers a cheap new source of high-grade ore, we'll be in a bad spot. I'd like to make one last check of all possible foreign ore deposits. It will cost three or four million dollars, but, at the very least, we might find an ore supply for an eastern steel mill."

"Go ahead," said Fairless.

When the war ended, United States Steel searchers and mining engineers went out to Sweden, Labrador, Mexico, Honduras, Guatemala, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Venezuela, Brazil, and Liberia.

From the first Venezuela offered interesting possibilities. The presence of iron ore there had been known for centuries. In 1595 the Spaniards built a fort on top of a low-grade iron-ore deposit on the banks of the Orinoco and repulsed Sir Walter Raleigh when he tried to sail up the river. Most important, Venezuela's known iron-ore formations were close to the Atlantic in a range of low, jungle-covered mountains which crowded the south bank of the Orinoco.

In this dense, poorly explored area—about the size of New Jersey—Bethlehem Steel was preparing to mine a 60,000,000-ton deposit of extremely high-grade ore. A local hunter had stumbled across it in the late 1920's. And where there was one good deposit, there might be more.

To direct the Venezuelan ore hunt, United States Steel called in Mack Lake, a veteran mining engineer. Lake assembled a crew of engineers, geologists, and some bushmen and prospectors who knew the jungle country.

First headquarters were on a cabin cruiser in the Orinoco. Then the party expanded into a second-floor apartment over the movie house in Ciudad Bolívar. Two rooms to sleep in, one to cook and eat in, and the

porch for a business office with maps, charts, filing boxes, and a typewriter.

INTO THE WILDERNESS

Half a dozen parties, usually consisting of two geologists or mining engineers, a bushman, a cook, a muleskinner, and 10 brush cutters, began hacking trails through the jungle. The growth was so tangled and heavy that progress in most places was step by step.

It was a country of alligators, jaguars, boa constrictors, and anacondas—a water boa which grows 35 to 40 feet in length and hunts by lying in a stream or water hole with its tail wrapped around a tree root. It can seize a full-grown steer by the snout and drag it into the water to be crushed and swallowed at leisure.

With a machete in hand the natives had little fear of a boa or anaconda. They would wade in and lop off its head. But poisonous snakes—the dreaded bushmaster, fer de lance, coral snake, and rattler—were another matter, as were the millions of ticks and flies.

As the party became jungle-hardened veterans, the ore hunt proceeded methodically but unsensationally. For a long time the best prospect was Piacoa, a hill near the Orinoco containing 200,000,000 tons of iron ore. The ore was only 45 percent iron, but possibly worth mining if nothing better could be found.

Meanwhile, Cay Burrell, a Ph. D. geologist, was growing disgusted with jungle prospecting. The brush was so thick that it was impossible to get any idea of the terrain except that immediately underfoot. Lake had discovered that the United States Army had photographed the area during the war, searching for possible Nazi submarine bases. So Burrell got a set of the photos from the Venezuelan Government and retired to Ciudad Bolivar headquarters to study them.

No one had ever prospected for iron ore by air, but Venezuelan mining engineers who had used air photos to hunt oil showed Burrell how to determine various kinds of rock structures from the pictures. Gradually, checking information brought back by exploration parties against them, Burrell, Lake, and Folke Kihlstedt, chief engineer of the party, discovered they could trace the formation of iron-ore-bearing rock. It doubled back and forth, moving away from Orinoco toward the south.

With this discovery, prospecting parties no longer went out aimlessly across the jungle. They were directed to hills which lay on the ore formation and to bends in the strata where larger ore bodies were likely.

The system worked, but results were still unexciting. Using aerial photos, prospectors staked out the La Grulla concession, a cluster of ore bodies 30 miles back from the Orinoco. But they contained a relatively small amount of ore.

By this time United States Steel's exploration parties had been tramping the jungle for more than a year. The area had been thoroughly searched and prospects were about exhausted. In mid-1946 Munson reported to Fairless that, unless more promising results developed, further Venezuelan exploration would be stopped at the end of the year.

NEW HOPE

But in Ciudad Bolivar, Cay Burrell, still piecing together old Army photos, had made an exciting discovery. He was convinced that the iron-bearing rocks, after doubling back and forth to a point 60 miles south of the Orinoco, suddenly swept westward in a great bow. They extended across the Caroni River, which flows into the Orinoco from the south and out into the savanna.

Furthermore, Army photos showed that the savanna in that area—far back from the Orinoco—was broken by several spectacular hills and mountains. To Burrell and Kihlstedt this indicated the possibility of big iron-ore deposits in an area where they had never been suspected.

The Army photos in that area back from the river were too indefinite to identify one peak from another, but Burrell thought the possibilities of finding ore strong enough to warrant a new aerial survey of the area. This would cost another $185,000, but United States Steel decided to go ahead—either to find a big ore body or to know that, if it did not, none of its competitors would either.

While waiting for Fairchild aerial surveys to complete the job, engineer Kihlstedt sent a party to investigate a small hill west of the Caroni and close to the Orinoco. According to Army photos it showed indications of iron ore. It did contain ore. But while Kihlstedt's men were studying the hill, a local businessman who owned a ranch in the neighborhood noticed their interest. He filed a claim for the mineral rights to the hill, then proceeded to ask a large sum for his holdings.

The company refused to buy. But the experience was an eye opener. East of the Caroni—in the recognized ore zone—all mineral rights were reserved to the Government. It would negotiate a concession only with people capable of developing the deposits.

Prospecting west of the Caroni River was a different proposition, a wide-open area in which anyone could claim mineral rights to land merely by filing a denouncement. A denouncement, or claim, was good for 50 years and renewable for 50 more. In this area, local businessmen and farmers, watching every move, might easily beat United States Steel to the claim office.

Kihlstedt, an ingenious Swede who thrives on obstacles, had a high card up his sleeve. With the help of a stereoscope, he discovered he could not only identify iron-ore formations on aerial photos, but could virtually put his finger on high-grade deposits. Most of them were covered by copel, a small tangled jungle tree with light foliage and dogwood-like flowers. On aerial pictures, the copel stood out in lighter shadings.

When the new aerial survey became available, the real prospecting was done in the Ciudad Bolivar office. As the pictures were studied, excitement mounted. Several mountains west of the Caroni and 50 to 60 miles back from the Orinoco showed signs of huge ore deposits. One in particular, a long rugged mountain sitting alone on the savanna, had rock slides and vegetation indicating an ore body miles in length.

Kihlstedt bided his time. It was then late March 1947. Easter week, a time of big local celebrations, was at hand. At 4:30 on Good Friday morning the Swedish engineer slipped quietly out of town in a jeep. He took with him three helpers to help cut brush on jungle-brown slopes of the mountain.

That night they slept in a native hut at the base of La Parida. The next morning the little party began working up the side of the mountain. Suddenly they came to a 30-foot cliff. It was solid iron ore. "From then on all day," says Kihlstedt, "we walked on high-grade iron ore."

The great strike caught the exploration party oddly unprepared. For 2 years they had concentrated solely on finding ore. Previously they had operated in a reserve zone. Now no one knew precisely how to file a denouncement in free territory. Kihlstedt headed for the airport and hopped a plane for Caracas to see Dr. Travieso-Paul, a Venezuelan lawyer.

With Travieso's help they prepared the necessary documents. It took the better part of a week, defining boundaries and determining and listing the legal owners of the land to which they were claiming mineral rights. When everything was in order, Kihlstedt walked into the Government claim office in Ciudad Bolivar and made his denouncement.

He was too late. A group of three local businessmen had filed 11 claims in the same area the day before.

Kihlstedt was crushed. But luck had not deserted him completely. When surveyed, it developed that the claims overlapped by only a hundred yards. The rival interests had claimed several promising ore mountains, but not La Parida, which air photos indicated was the greatest of all.

How much ore was there in La Parida? It looked big, but in other areas iron formations had often proved to be only a few feet deep. Magnetometer experts were brought in and flown over the mountain. They recorded the largest response for any ore body in the world. The figures were sent to be checked by an outstanding authority in the United States. He replied that the calculations appeared to be correct, but that the decimal point must be in the wrong place. The figures were too big.

HIGHEST HOPES CONFIRMED

Final proof of the ore body lay in drilling it. Diamond drills were rushed to the mountain. By the end of 1947 the discoverers had drilled enough holes to confirm their highest hopes. Continued drilling in 1948 and 1949 showed they had been far too modest. The ore body ran 4 miles along the crest of the mountain and ranged hundreds of feet in depth. It contained more ore than the great Hull-Rust-Mahoning mine in Minnesota, heretofore the world's greatest surface mine. In its natural state the ore averaged 59 percent iron content compared with 51 percent for present Mesabi shipments.

Several mountains 15 to 40 miles to the east also contained excellent ore deposits, though none so spectacular as La Parida, now renamed Cerro Bolivar. United States Steel staked two other claims to round out its holdings for a major, long-range, development program. When the Government closed the area to further denouncements, making it a reserve zone, United States Steel also bought the claims staked by the three local businessmen. Though they had missed Cerro Bolivar, they had his several desirable ore properties.

How much ore United States Steel now owns in Venezuela, not even the corporation knows. Of its new claims it has drilled only Cerro Bolivar. The company talks in terms of 500,000,000 tons proved and another 1,000,000,000 tons probable in all its holdings. But steel-company estimates of iron-ore reserves are traditionally low. Some experts believe United States Steel's holding alone will prove greater than the 2,500,000,000 tons taken out of the Mesabi since its discovery in the 1890's.

WORK OUT DETAILS TO DELIVER ORE

In the offices of the Orinoco Mining Co., a new United States Steel subsidiary formed to develop the property, engineers are dovetailing thousands of details which must be worked out to deliver Cerro Bolivar ore to United States blast furnaces. Mining equipment, conveyor belts, a crusher plant, a company town, a railroad, loading docks, and a fleet of giant ore boats must be designed and built.

There are two alternatives for bringing the ore out. One is a railroad running 274 miles due north to a deep-water port at Barcelona; the other is a 93-mile railroad running to the junction of the Caroni and the Orinoco. In the latter case they would have to dredge the Orinoco-Macareo River route so that huge ore boats could come 170 miles up the river.

Dredging the river looks like the cheaper method. The Orinoco is broad, deep, and fairly straight, with few tributaries near the

mouth. That means little silt. The Orinoco delta is dead, no longer building like the Mississippi.

But rivers can be as unpredictable as women. The longer railroad, spanning the Orinoco on a 4-mile bridge and rolling north to deep water, might be more dependable. But it would also be more costly. Aside from the tremendously expensive bridge, building a railroad in Venezuela would cost upward of $200,000 a mile. This decision, involving tens of millions of dollars, is only one of hundreds which must be made before the ore starts flowing.

Other divisions of United States Steel are rushing plans for a new eastern steel mill. It will soon be rising from the flat New Jersey farmland alongside the Delaware River, below Trenton. By the time it is in operation, in 1955, Venezuelan ore is expected to be flowing in ample tonnage to support it easily.

In Venezuela the pioneers of what will some day be a great ore-mining company are rapidly adjusting to tropical life. The company offices are now in a high-ceilinged, tree-shaded old mansion. Surrounding it in the company compound are comfortable, screened, and shuttered brick buildings, both bachelor quarters and family dwellings.

SNAKE SCARES

Even at the temporary advance camp, a third of the way up Cerro Bolivar, the jungle is giving ground grudgingly as civilization moves in. In the early days snake scares were numerous. Boeckmann, living in a flower-surrounded hut farthest up the hill, once found a bushmaster sharing his shower. Another time the wife of a geologist, making a bed, found a brilliant-colored coral snake under the pillow. In the camp garage a mechanic, installing a spare radiator on a jeep, dropped it in panic as a snake poked its head from the top.

In spite of such diversions, the project is moving rapidly ahead. United States Steel is counting on Venezuela for at least 10,000,000 tons of ore a year. It hopes to mine it cheaply enough to compete with other ore as far west as Pittsburgh and Youngstown, perhaps even to the shores of the Great Lakes. It also plans to sell Venezuelan ore to other steel companies.

The Venezuelan Government is anxious to develop its iron-ore resources and has welcomed foreign investment in order to do so. But American steel makers, who use 100,000,000 tons of ore a year, cannot afford to become too dependent on foreign sources. The Venezuelan ore basket, big as it may be, is hardly safe enough or close enough to hold all the eggs of such a vital industry.

Both United States Steel and other steel companies must continue to develop their taconite programs. Eventually, taconites will probably be produced cheaply enough so that they will be extensively used in the Midwest. Promising ore deposits in Labrador are also being studied for development.

Venezuelan ore, however, will make possible a smaller investment in taconite plants. It will also be available in quantity before taconite production reaches substantial levels. And every ton of Venezuelan ore used means one more ton of high-grade Mesabi ore saved for an emergency.

Even though the Government has made no move to set aside some of the remaining Mesabi ores as a war reserve, the steel industry has been thinking along those lines for several years. By the time the Government gets around to taking such action, farsighted planning by the steel makers will have made it possible to do so without crippling the country's steel production and creating a serious industrial crisis.

Crusade for Freedom as Counterpetition to Communist-Inspired Stockholm Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to supplement the investigation which has been made of the reports appearing in the Communist Party organ, the Daily Worker.

As I have previously stated, I would not think of dignifying anything appearing in that paper by including it in the Appendix, except for my hope that by making it available to my colleagues they may find opportunities to urge in their districts the greatest concerted action possible in obtaining signatures to the counterpetition developed by sincere Americans devoted to the cause of a real peace. Since September 1, there have been five articles of this nature appearing in the Daily Worker. The first is a short article reporting upon some organization of individuals in North Carolina. I sincerely hope that the Daily Worker of September 1 is in error in this report and that the persons stated to have formed a State-wide committee in support of the Communist Stockholm petition will take the opportunity of repudiating the report and associating themselves with the crusade for freedom. The article is as follows:

CAROLINIANS FORM GROUP TO BACK PEACE PLEA

North Carolina residents have formed a State-wide committee in support of the world peace appeal, the Peace Information Center learned yesterday. Seven of the 14 on the committee are ministers and one is chairman of the NAACP youth councils of North Carolina.

Mrs. Virginia White, of High Point, was chosen secretary of the committee. The others are C. Roy Swain, a carpenter, of Forsyth County; Mrs. Edna Russell, of Weaverville; the Reverend Frank O'Neil, pastor of the Union Mission Holiness Church, Winston-Salem; Edwin Hjorkman, author, of Asheville; Nathaniel Bond, of Durham, chairman of the NAACP youth councils, W. A. McGirt, Jr., Winston-Salem, and John Myers, graduate student, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

The other ministers are the Reverends J. M. Miller, Rocky Mount; T. E. Bond, Catawba; D. W. Roston, Chapel Hill; G. D. McNeil, Jr., Shaw University; M. G. Brown, and the Reverend and Mrs. E. T. Williams, of Winston-Salem.

The Peace Information Center continues to receive many moving letters from throughout the country, especially from the South. Washington, Ga.; Allerton, Mich.; Harrison, Idaho; Phoenix, Ariz., and Cumberland, Wis., are a sample of the names of towns sending letters of support.

The town of Harrison, Idaho—population 300—sent 36 signatures. A farmer from Cumberland, Wis., asked for "small-size Stockholm appeals so he can use them with letters" or Christmas cards.

A husband and wife of Richmond, Va., wrote that they had signed 56—she 30, and he 26.

Many include dollar bills to help "your splendid work along."

The second is a news story from Paris appearing in the Daily Worker issued for September 4. It is reported to be by Frederic Joliot-Curie, president of the Committee of the World Congress of Defenders of Peace, and carries the headline "Two hundred and seventy-three million, four hundred and seventy thousand, five hundred and sixty-six sign world peace appeal." The article is as follows:

Throughout the world they are talking today about the appeal launched at Stockholm on March 19 last by the Committee of the World Congress of the Defenders of Peace.

This appeal demands the absolute banning of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control to insure the implementation of this ban, and condemns as a war criminal the first government to use such a weapon.

After a world-wide campaign commenced only 3 months ago, and which in some countries is only now beginning, the appeal has attracted up to the present time a total of 273,470,566 signatures. The detailed results are as follows:

Albania	620,000
Algeria	266,000
Argentine	1,000,000
Australia	50,000
Austria	578,578
Belgium	153,060
Bolivia	20,000
Brazil	600,000
Bulgaria	5,801,346
Burma	1,000,000
Cameroons	22,000
Canada	300,000
Chad	16,500
Chile	50,000
China	44,000,000
Colombia	50,000
Costa Rica	4,000
Cuba	400,000
Czechoslovakia	9,500,000
Denmark	100,000
Egypt	12,000
Eire	1,200
Ecuador	20,000
Finland	616,248
France	12,000,000
Germany (West)	2,000,000
(Democratic Republic)	17,046,000
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	790,277
Guinea (French)	10,000
Holland	229,067
Hungary	7,500,000
Iceland	5,000
Iran	25,000
Israel	261,750
Italy	14,631,523
Ivory Coast	50,000
Japan	1,345,000
Korea	5,680,000
Lebanon	56,000
Luxemburg	7,000
Mongolia	686,732
Morocco (French)	19,581
Niger (French)	12,500
Norway	50,000
Philippines	50,000
Poland	18,000,000
Reunion Island	20,000
Rumania	10,046,570
Saar	2,600
Senegal	25,000
Spain (refugees)	284,995
Sudan (French)	30,000
Sweden	250,000
Switzerland	150,000
Syria	60,500

Trieste	50,000
Tunisia	50,000
United States	1,350,000
Upper Volta	50,000
Uruguay	50,000
U. S. S. R.	115,275,000
Venezuela	12,000

To this list should be added countries like Ceylon, Cyprus, Indonesia, Iraq, New Zealand, Pakistan, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, Viet Nam, and others whose campaign results have not yet come to hand.

The campaign as a whole now extends throughout the world and at the present time is being carried on in 75 countries.

When one realizes that in the majority of cases only adult persons are called upon to declare themselves, it may fairly be considered that actual signatures in fact represent some 500,000,000 human beings, or nearly a quarter of the earth's population.

This mass support is made up of people of every country, every opinion, every belief, and kind and condition. We join them in sending our greetings to all those, wherever they may be, who are striving together toward the prohibition of the weapon of aggression and mass destruction, the atomic bomb. We urge them to continue and extend their efforts to achieve this end.

The banning of atomic weapons is the necessary first step to ease international tension; granted this, the peace of the world, which now stands in grave peril, can yet and will be saved.

Mr. Speaker, while it is unfortunate if anything like 1,350,000 Americans have been duped into signing this appeal, I am sure that our press and radio, as well as all organizations in this country, except the Communist Party, will be anxious to do everything they can to counteract any such assembling of signatures of misled Americans by united and effective work in supporting the Crusade for Freedom between now and October 24, when the signatures of those approving the crusade will be placed in the freedom bell in Berlin.

A Willful Little Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when the special privileges and advantages given them by the Wagner law were—at the expense of the public and their own members—misused by a few—a very few—labor leaders, the public became outraged and demanded new labor legislation. The Congress, after long hearings, earnest debate and consideration, wrote the Taft-Hartley Act.

Certain labor leaders, opposed to any change, denounced the T-H Act as a "slave labor" law.

In their efforts to prevent its enactment, they were joined by President Truman who exerted all his political power in an attempt to defeat it in Congress.

But the will of the people, as always when they put their minds to it, prevailed, and the law was placed on the books. But not until the Congress, by an overwhelming vote, was forced to override the President's veto.

Thereafter, though President Truman promised to enforce the law, he has endeavored in more ways than one to sabotage it.

Notwithstanding his efforts and the violent, persistent opposition of a few others, the law has demonstrated its fairness, its efficiency, its workability.

Under it, membership in the unions has increased as have wages. Working hours have been shortened. Under it, according to the president of UAW-CIO, the best contract ever written between labor and management has been negotiated without even the threat of a strike.

Naturally, the Taft-Hartley Act is not perfect, but its imperfections can and will be ironed out by subsequent Congresses.

AROUSED, THE PEOPLE WILL NOT BE DENIED

To that fact the President is singularly blind. The legendary Missouri mule's chief characteristic is stubbornness, but the stubbornness of that mule is mild, compromising, and conciliatory when compared with that of President Truman.

The President prides himself upon loyalty to his friends even when their disloyalty to the Nation's best interests has been demonstrated. That is going just a little too far, even for a President.

THE REDS

The people want no truck with the Communists nor the Communist doctrine. The President cannot be ignorant of that feeling; nevertheless, he sticks by Acheson, who sticks by Hiss, who, throughout his public career, stuck by the Communists' program.

The President, though he apologized to the Marines, has never apologized to the American people for his reference to Stalin as "good old Joe" when he said, "I like old Joe. He's a decent fellow but he's a prisoner of the Politburo."

Notwithstanding the public demand for legislation curbing Red efforts, the President, with the CIO as one of his advisers, bitterly opposed the enactment of the demanded legislation, characterized Republican attempts to oust Communists from Federal positions as a "political 'red herring'."

The President, looking for votes in New York City, yielding to certain labor leaders and left-wingers, refused to consent to the writing of any bill curbing Reds.

With an election coming up, the Members of Congress, even those in the Democratic Party who desired to go along with the President, were forced to write an anti-Red bill. Like the Taft-Hartley Act, it may have its imperfections but those can be ironed out by subsequent Congresses. It is far better than no law at all. Mr. Truman has objected to "Red-curbing" legislation.

Stubborn, as always, and angling, as always, for votes, the President vetoed that bill. His veto was overridden by a vote of 286 to 48 in the House; 57 to 10 in the Senate.

The will of the people cannot, it will not, be denied when they make known their wishes.

The salvation of this country, the preservation of the Republic, depends upon the people. They will get what they want if and when they vote intelligently.

Tuesday, November 7, is the date.

Elect then a Congress—and in 1952 a President—who will think first of your welfare, the security of the Republic.

Articles and Editorial Comment From Various Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask to have unanimous consent to have the following articles inserted in the RECORD:

First. About That "Living Lie"—views of the News-Sentinel, Fort Wayne, Ind.

Second. Time To Liquidate Commitments, by Charles T. Henderson, appearing in Cleveland Plain Dealer, September 21, 1950.

Third. Copy of telegram from Ashland Daily Press, Ashland, Wis., September 22, 1950.

Fourth. Editorial from Washington Post, September 22, 1950, Alas, Poor Clio.

Fifth. Article by Arthur Krock, New York Times, September 21, 1950, A Game Others Can Play and Will.

Sixth. Article by George Dixon, Washington Times-Herald, September 27, 1950, Washington Scene.

Seventh. Article, United States News and World Report, September 29, 1950, West To Open UN Door to Mao—If He Behaves.

Eighth. Article, Washington Daily News, by Charles Lucey, September 27, 1950, Truman Knew He'd Succeed Roosevelt Before Election.

Ninth. Article, Bangor Daily News, George E. Sokolsky, March 21, 1948, These Days.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of September 25, 1950]

ABOUT THAT "LIVING LIE"

Senator JENNER's "living lie" castigation of the new Secretary of Defense shocked many sensitive souls. The language at the time seemed intemperate and not a few of the incomparable Hoosier's admirers thought the choice of words might defeat their purpose, which was to challenge General Marshall's fitness for a high civilian post in the Government. But after Senator JENNER had twice laid his case before Fort Wayne audiences last week, a great many of those who had criticized his language commended his courage.

Senator JENNER is not popular in Washington. This fact in itself is scarcely a damning trait, since popularity and statesmanship are not necessarily synonymous. He is the target of the Drew Pearsons, Alex Campbells and other apologists for an administration bent on giving America away.

Senator JENNER's popularity is not the issue. Nor is the question of whether his bare-knuckle attack on the defense post appointment alienated some votes. After all, Senator JENNER, as he himself puts it, is expendable. What happens to one Senator isn't the point.

The issue is this: Is General Marshall, acknowledged by the Hoosier as a great soldier, a "living lie"? If that is the truth, then the good American will be more concerned by its implications for the future of his country than in the choice of words required to tell the truth.

Twice during his whirlwind visit to Fort Wayne, Senator JENNER said he made the "living lie" remark with his eyes open. Twice he repeated the threat made to him by a prominent Democratic Senator that if he gave that speech on the floor, he would be destroyed. The charge was not the impulse of a moment. Nor was it politics. For if that were the only motive public expression of such a remark would be very bad politics, particularly when it shocked and irritated members of Senator JENNER's party.

Actually, the perspective of time, rather than any of his contemporaries, will be the final arbiter on the accuracy of Senator JENNER's accusation. We don't think, however, there was a soul who heard the fiery Hoosier speak here last Thursday who would doubt his sincerity or convictions. And when a man of Senator JENNER's courage and discernment, with eyes open, speaks out against treachery and conspiracy against his country, his voice cannot be stilled by either the smears of his political enemies or the muffled groans of timid members of his own party.

Let's take another look at the "living lie" tag. That would seem to mean a person who pretends one thing but is really another. For all practical purposes, it could mean a distinguished general deluded, misguided, or even deceived into betraying his country by superiors.

Senator JENNER, on his recent round-the-world trip, stood on the deck of the partly sunken battleship *Arizona* during a memorial service for the dead of Pearl Harbor. Hundreds of bodies lie within that battered hull. How many of those bodies would be there now had General Marshall, then Chief of Staff, warned Pearl Harbor to be prepared for a Japanese attack by telephone rather than through commercial channels, which delayed arrival of the message until after the sneak attack? Considering the gravity of the situation, wasn't it odd and quite abnormal that Pearl Harbor should not have been alerted in the shortest possible time?

With Senator JENNER, many good Americans believe we were pushed into the war with Japan by deliberate provocation of an attack. The Senator quoted ex-Secretary of War Stimson to the effect that Roosevelt, with Marshall and his inner circle, courted war. We have never seen this version denied.

Moreover, General Marshall still doesn't remember where he was on December 6, the day before Pearl Harbor. His wife thinks he was home; but he isn't sure. Most people have vivid recollections of their whereabouts on this tragic occasion.

General Marshall's acceptance of a mission to bring peace in the Chinese civil war can only mean he favored putting Communists in the Nationalist Government, or was merely a tool to those who did, without protest, because that is what he tried to do. We have never read that he rebelled at trying to sell out a World War II ally, China, now on the Soviet side of the fence. General Marshall would not dare to suggest we form a coalition American Government, with the Commies in choice seats. Yet he found it easy to do so to a then free country which today might be an ally instead of a Kremlin satellite. Today, would American boys be dying in Korea had the Truman-Acheson-Marshall team not given the Kremlin an assist?

Senator JENNER is saying that General Marshall's record is contradictory to Mr. Truman's claim that he is now fit to head a department charged with the security of our country. The hypocrisy and double-dealing in Washington should collapse of their own weight and they would, if more of our public servants had the courage of Senator JENNER to expose them.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of September 21, 1950]

TIME TO LIQUIDATE COMMITMENTS

(By Charles T. Henderson)

The secret commitment business of the operatives in Washington has to be liquidated.

To be specific on the meaning of liquidation, it must be stated that it includes notification to all the world that we will no longer recognize secret commitments when they are revealed, as revealed they always have to be eventually, no matter how far their consequences may have proceeded clandestinely.

The Nation's purse strings are the key to that part of the problem, of course. As the next step, and equally as a matter of course, is a careful audit of all commitments now on our books as alleged to be due. Many will be written off entirely, many more will be written down, but the remaining total will come well within our capacity to deliver, and well within the standards of national righteousness.

REPUDIATION

But this spells repudiation? It does, and why not say so? A well-considered repudiation, as the diplomats say, but, as regrettable as it is, a necessary one. If we had had the courage and the character to face the facts at the start, and as they were presented to us, they would not now be piled into the toppling mountain which threatens to destroy us.

When it is gravely stated by an honest and informed, but cautious and orthodox, commentator that the American people have been committed to more war than we have the military strength, even in soldiers, to deliver, the necessity of taking action instantly becomes frightfully apparent. But it was known long before the German phase of our warring was over that we were being led into a position where we would be compelled to fight the world, or try to.

And so it turned out. Arguments and diagnoses and learned twitterings about balancing power alike have no bearing on the fact that we are in a jam, and the two corollary facts, first, that we've got to get ourselves out of the jam, and, second, that we cannot fight our way through it. General Eisenhower's crack—if he really made it—that we can lick the world, if we are unified, was its substance, was a very silly and dangerous one. For there is not unity among Americans and there neither will be nor should be.

TOO MUCH TALK

Preferring to believe that he did not say it, the fact is that the sentiment, wrong and deadly as it is, has marked much of our general talking and thinking. The dear people themselves are not blameless in the present pass, let them blame their leaders as they may. The blame is not pertinent. The only pertinent thing is the jam we are in, and the undertaking to get out of it. Obviously our leaders are quite useless—they are the ones who got us in the fix we are in. Acheson and Truman could be impeached and hanged higher than Haman and we would still be teetering on the edge of the destruction which those two worthies were very far from being alone in creating.

With all of its faults, which are those inherent in any assemblage, our only chance of cutting the Gordian knot which secret commitments and suicidal obligations have tied around our Nation and our people lies with what we call our Congress, and Congress already has the sword with which to cut that knot. All Congress has to do is to swing it, right smack on the appropriations which are always demanded to back up the blunders, or worse, of those doing our international operating.

Feeble as Congress is, there is yet genius in democracy, and Congress is the only place where the light of democracy still burns, dimly to be sure, but with a spark of effectiveness in it. Four or five men in Congress can yet provide the leadership which is all that is lacking. TAFT can provide the character, the intelligence and the patriotism of the Pym and Hampden, who led the English Parliament's revolt against Stuart military tyranny and wrong taxation—for the two are always twins. But TAFT is no Cromwell. Maybe none will be needed in the present parallel.

It is not a fanciful parallel, nor need there be a fanciful application of its principles. An orderly, constitutional committee of the present Congress will do the work with sessions open to the public, and absolutely no privilege of immunity on the old gags "not in the public interest" to tell the truth—as if war were in the public interest. In the meanwhile, not a dollar of public funds to be appropriated for secret use by anybody, especially the President, for any purpose related to war, or peace or anything else, and the only military funds expended to be for service payrolls.

Only by such forcible liquidation of secret commitments and obligations can the perpetual war with which we are now confronted be diverted, or brought within endurable limits. American patience may be yet another insufficient material, quantitatively, for the amount of war that has been bitten off for us to chew.

[Telegram from Ashland (Wis.) Daily Press]

United States Senator WILLIAM JENNER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your General Marshall speech. It makes you one of our great Americans in today's crisis. Letter follows:

Respectfully.

[From the Washington, D. C. Post of September 22, 1950]

ALAS POOR CLIO!

The President preferred to sidestep a question at his press conference yesterday on the concurrence or otherwise of General Marshall in the instructions which he took with him on his mission to China in 1945–46. Mr. Truman says he was a special envoy of the President, and went to China to carry out the President's written instructions. In other words, the general even in his retirement behaved like a good soldier, and the general's disclaimer at the Senate Committee the previous day of any responsibility beyond that thus stands unqualified on the historical record. It will now be added to the Republican indictment of the State Department in the November elections.

It is odd, looking over the Truman statements on China policy and General Marshall's subsequent exposition of that policy, to think of General Marshall as a robot, speaking lines after he had been cranked up. There can be no precedent for it. When a person of General Marshall's eminence is given a mission, the usual thing is to talk over the instructions, so as to find out whether the envoy believes in and approves of his mission. Only in that way can you be sure of a sincere prosecution of the mission. General Marshall's career has hitherto supported the view that this has been his practice. "Give me the facts," he is wont to

say, "and I will make up my own mind." The function of State Department officials in the China matter was to dish up the facts; as hired help they could do no other.

The understanding that this newspaper has hitherto entertained about the Marshall mission was the logical one—that when civil disorder broke out in China the diplomatic experts supplied the briefs on all possible alternatives of American action. One was nonintervention (which would have been our own preference) another was all-out intervention on the side of Chiang Kai-shek, yet another was all-out intervention on the side of the Communists, and the fourth was mediation. These alternatives are said to have been given to General Marshall. He is said to have plumped for mediation. If, in spite of the Truman assurance in 1945 and 1946, he wasn't consulted, and urged mediation on the Chinese without having committed his own beliefs, then the situation is passing strange.

The way that the public has been misled both on the GOP side and on the administration side on China is hard to stomach. The President has avoided the issue before; now he avoids it again. The administration seems ashamed in 1950 to acknowledge what in 1945 was regarded by almost everybody in America as a noble experiment. So the buck is passed to the hired help, and the Republicans are left with more material further to tar and feather the career officials. In sympathizing with them, let us also condole with the Muse of history.

[From the New York Times of September 21, 1950]

IN THE NATION

A GAME OTHERS CAN PLAY, AND WILL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 20.—Organized labor, having clearly failed to persuade the country or a large congressional majority that the legislation which bears the name of Senator TAFT has enslaved the workers and should be replaced by a very slight modification of the Wagner Act, is trying to retire the Senator from public life on the votes he has cast which dealt with foreign policy. That is the best strategy available to organized labor. But the same cannot be said of the administration and its choice of the spokesman who espoused this strategy in a speech at the convention of the American Federation of Labor at Houston, Tex., yesterday.

There are several reasons why this is very vulnerable procedure:

1. The spokesman selected by the administration, W. Averell Harriman, is the Presidential assistant whose task it is to coordinate foreign policy and help thereby to make it more effective. Important to this task is bipartisan support in Congress. Nothing could be better calculated to destroy the basic understanding in this enterprise—that no partisan politics is to be engaged in by any of its principals—than an assault of this type on Senator TAFT by one of the President's chief deputies in that field.

2. There is much fairly to be criticized in votes cast by Mr. TAFT on the foreign-policy proposals of the administration. But to say that, if they had prevailed, "Soviet objectives would have been furthered in the world" invites an impressive tu quoque which can be documented by the foreign-policy record of the administration for several years and by the record of Mr. Harriman himself. In that debate, which Mr. Harriman, with the obvious approval of the President, invited, the testimony of Yalta and Potsdam, and activities and statements by Secretary Acheson and General Marshall with respect to the Far East, will have great weight.

China and Yalta

In this connection two statements made yesterday by General Marshall in reply to questions from Senator JENNER illustrate how effectively critics of the administration's foreign policy can cite instances by which this has "furthered Soviet objectives":

"A. I accepted that commission to China [in 1946] because the President had to have a representative, there was trouble, and a resignation of a delegate, he asked me to go, and I said 'Yes.' Then, while I was in this room for a week undergoing the Pearl Harbor investigation, the policy of the United States was being drawn up in the State Department, and that was issued while I was on the ocean, going over there. The policy, of course, speaks for itself, the message from the President. Once in China my job was to stop the fighting.

"B. I do not think it would have been my position [to 'protest the policies adopted at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam which handed half of the world on a silver platter to Stalin,' the text of this JENNER query]. I was very much engaged in a war at the time and the meetings with the Soviet commanders and staff, and those are not simple affairs, I might say. The political meetings took place at other places with which I was not familiar. Admiral Leahy [President Roosevelt's military adviser] attended practically all the political meetings, but the general agreement, and all, I read largely in the press afterward, so far as that was disclosed."

In at least two of these meetings Mr. Harriman was among the deep insiders.

Other points for counterattack

3. To say, as Mr. Harriman did, that Senator TAFT failed to appreciate the fact that "American leadership is essential to the world" is to say what cannot be demonstrated on the record. This is fundamentally different from a charge that the Senator's views on how that leadership could best be exercised have proved unsound.

4. Not to give credit for sincerity to a public servant whose sincerity has been thoroughly established, while asking full credit for sincerity on the part of those whom he opposed, is poor tactics in any controversy.

5. In singling out Mr. TAFT for attack before an organized labor convention Mr. Harriman obviously was playing politics for a particular audience and, with the blessing of the President, giving organized labor additional assurance that its personal loves and hates, like its social-economic programs, are law to the administration. Only the day before the President had dismissed Robert N. Denham as general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for interpreting the Taft-Hartley Act and his duties under it in ways that organized labor found objectionable.

This may be good politics—though not for an official in Mr. Harriman's position—but the attitude of Congress on labor legislation does not indicate that it is.

There is one interesting personal aspect to the choice of Mr. Harriman to speak at Houston and his enthusiastic acceptance of the mission. He and the Senator are both members of a senior society at Yale which is as famous for its brotherly devotion in collegiate and later life as it is for the grisly symbol of its being. Seldom, if ever, have two members of this close-knit order, bound by secret oaths of enduring fealty, been publicly ranged in a political gouging match. That is the more notable because, when Mr. Harriman was a freshman on the Yale campus in the fall of 1909, the biggest man there, not only because his father was President of the United States, was a senior and future club brother named ROBERT A. TAFT.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Ferald]

WASHINGTON SCENE

(By George Dixon)

I have just received a confidential report from a source so deeply inside the administration inner circle he has claustrophobia. It isn't a pretty story, but I feel you should have it placed before you for your consideration. This insider assures me the facts are as follows:

He declares this thing of putting Gen. George C. Marshall in as Secretary of Defense is a barney to take the Democrats off the hook with the voters.

He says General Marshall is only going to stick on the job until after the November elections.

He says that General Marshall will then be replaced, amid great administration hoopla of returning the national military establishment to civilian control, by the United States High Commissioner of the American occupation zone in German, John J. McCloy.

This insider says the whole gimmick was worked out at the White House before poor Louie Johnson, the President's trusting pal, was given the boot. Poor Louie wasn't in on the plot. He didn't know what hit him, and doesn't yet.

The scheme came to a fruition after the political brains at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue decided poor Louie was too big a burden for a political party to carry in an election year. The brains thought around for someone big enough to still the growling of the electorate.

General Marshall was the outstanding choice. But he is 69 years old and craves nothing more than to spend his days on his farm at Leesburg, Va. When approached he made this very forcibly known.

My source declares that brought the plot to a head. The deal was consummated for the distinguished general to stay in there long enough to appease the voters, then announce that he had found his return to public life too much for his years and strength after all.

This done the White House will make a great thing about taking the national military establishment completely out of politics by appointing McCloy, a Republican.

I suppose McCloy is a Republican—if you can call a fellow who began working for the Democratic administration back in 1940 a Republican. In that time McCloy has had a succession of very good administration-appointed jobs.

This GOP stalwart from Philadelphia left a law practice 10 years ago to become a consultant to his fellow Republican, F. D. R.'s Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson. A short time later McCloy was appointed Assistant Secretary of War.

Among his jobs he handled State Department liaison for the Army. He attended the Casablanca, Cairo, and Potsdam Conferences.

After that he was made president of the World Bank, from which he resigned in 1949 to succeed Gen. Lucius D. Clay as our occupation chief in Germany.

My informant says there's another political angle to restoring the national military establishment to civilian control. It is designed to forestall the Republicans from installing some great military figure, such as Ike Eisenhower, as Secretary of Defense, should the GOP take over in 1952.

One of Washington's legal luminaries, a member of the Army Reserve, wishes very much to avoid being summoned back to active service.

He grudgingly filled in a questionnaire sent him by the Army. When he came to the question: "What languages do you speak?" he answered: "None."

Listed in the Washington telephone directory: "Truman Boyles."

What about?

[From the United States News and World Report]

WEST TO OPEN UN DOOR TO MAO—IF HE BEHAVES

Door to the UN is being left ajar for Chinese Communists. But they won't get in as puppets run by Stalin.

Idea is to let Mao Tse-tung have his say if he stays out of Korea, shows that he doesn't take his orders from Moscow.

It can lead to United States recognition in the end. But the whole thing is touchy business. A misstep can mean war.

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y.—Here is the story of how Communist China is being shown a way into the United Nations, a way of getting much of what it wants without war, as told by delegates to the UN who know what is happening.

Sooner or later, Communist China will be seated at the UN, assuming, of course that the Communist regime behaves itself. If the Chinese Communists send their troops into Korea, if they attack Formosa, then it's all off. They would get war, real war.

The whole affair, as the story is told, is to be handled smoothly and slowly. It is recognized that China policy is a political issue in the United States elections just ahead. The timetable isn't set. Communists will not get China's seat in the UN right away. There will be no "appeasement," no secret deal. But steps are being taken to show Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese Communist leader, that peaceful waiting will pay off better than fighting Russia's wars for Moscow.

Inside the UN, many delegates believe Mao knows that Russia, which pretends to be helping Communist China, is really working in Russia's interest. They feel that, if Russia wanted to get Communist China into the UN, Russia's delegates would go at the thing quite differently.

Mao is pictured as eager to get his delegates into the UN where they can do their own talking. Most UN delegates here feel that the west should have some means of talking directly to the people who run all of mainland China.

The opening step, now being tried, is an effort to find some pretext for inviting Chinese Communists here.

Canada, for example, got the Assembly to approve creation of a special committee to study the question of China's membership. And India is pressing to have this committee invite Chinese Communists to appear before it.

Both the United States and Russia have asked the Assembly to take up the question of what to do about Formosa. There, too, when the matter is referred to committee, the Chinese Communists might be invited to state their claim to the island.

Western idea is to give the Chinese Communists a foot in the door of the UN, where the west can talk directly to Mao. Russia, of course, sees the plan. UN delegates expect Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Vishinsky to do what he can to block it. They also expect Secretary of State Dean Acheson to go slowly on all matters concerning Communist China in an election year in the United States.

Next step, as now planned, will be to talk directly to Chinese Communists if and when they get to the UN as observers or witnesses. Moscow, if these estimates are correct, can't treat Mao like a North Korean Communist. Mao is pictured as strong in his own right, who won't be ordered around to fight wars while Russia sits on the side lines.

After that, as western delegates see it, Mao will have to make up his mind. All the western governments can do is to show him what the UN can offer.

Formosa, for example, now is a UN question. Mao, inside the UN, would have a chance to state his government's claim to the island and, perhaps, get full legal title to Formosa in time. One route to this end proposed by western delegates is to have Formosa placed under a UN trusteeship. As UN delegates see it, Mr. Truman and Secretary Acheson both have paved the way for such a settlement by declaring that the United States does not intend to keep Formosa for itself and wants no special position—that is, military or naval bases—there.

Korea is likely to set the timetable on Mao's entry into the UN. If the United States and UN forces reach the thirty-eighth parallel in about 2 months, western delegates believe, Mao will understand that Russia has lost its gamble there.

UN membership for the Chinese Communists, full membership, as the western delegates see it, may come at the spring meeting of the UN Assembly, if not before. It depends, they say, on whether Mao is willing to wait.

Mao, they admit, may not wait, may get impatient and try to seize Formosa by force or move into the Communist-led war against the French in Indochina. But Mao, they believe, would prefer peace in order to consolidate the Communist hold on China. Aim of United States officials and other delegates here, as it now shapes up, is to open a way for Mao's Communists to be heard in the UN, to make direct contacts with the west, bypassing Moscow, avoiding war.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News]

TRUMAN KNEW HE'D SUCCEED ROOSEVELT BEFORE ELECTION

(By Charles Lucey)

Among Democratic leaders who helped nominate Harry Truman for the Vice Presidency there was a conviction Franklin Roosevelt would not live out his fourth term and that in choosing the Missourian they were really picking a President.

Harry Truman himself apparently thought so long before the people voted in that November of 1944.

That's the story told in Jonathan Daniels' new book, the Man of Independence, published today. Mr. Daniels is the son of the former Navy Secretary and envoy to Mexico, and was himself White House press secretary in the latter Roosevelt days.

"You are not nominating a Vice President of the United States but a President," Mr. Daniels quotes Edwin W. Pauley as telling party leaders before the Chicago Democratic Convention that year.

And in September after Mr. Truman had been named F. D. R.'s running mate, when a friend named Edward McKim told him he would be living in the White House before long, he is quoted as saying:

AFRAID I AM

"Eddie, I'm afraid I am."

Mr. Daniels' Truman story is pegged on the intimate and friendly approach. He gives the Man of Independence more than a shade the better of his judgment most of the way but acknowledges, for example, that he had an impossible case in trying to defend Pendergast politics before the Senate.

The author, editor of the Raleigh News and Observer in Raleigh, N. C., has pulled together his stories of others who have written on past Roosevelt-Truman phases, and has added enough reportorial fact to make his work a contribution to history of the period.

But it isn't just a story of Harry Truman. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, gets an awfully rough handling in this book, and Mr. Truman apparently was glad to help out on it.

QUESTIONS MARSHALL TRIP

The stature of Gen. George C. Marshall as diplomat to China and as Secretaray of State is brought into serious question. And Mr. Daniels cites—and tries to explain with soft words—the amazing conduct of Mr. Roosevelt in seeming to promise the job of 1944 running mate to almost any politician who dropped past his office.

"No sensible friend of Roosevelt will try to make neat, punctilious logic out of Roosevelt's behavior at that convention," Mr. Daniels says. "There will be no easy explanation of his various letters, his apparently vacillating positions. He was tired. The scissors of time had cut his strength * * *."

Of Mr. Truman's adoring devotion to General Marshall, Mr. Daniels writes:

"Sometimes indeed he (Truman) acted when some members of his staff thought that Marshall was being a little stuffy, as if Marshall were his walking equivalent of George Washington and Robert E. Lee.

NOT SO CONFIDENT

"Some others who admired the General's great abilities as a war leader were not so confident of his abilities as a diplomat or foreign minister. As Secretary of State they thought he depended too strictly on the proposals which came up to him in the line of command in a field with which he was less familiar than he had been as a professional soldier."

Admiral William H. Leahy was one not so sure of General Marshall.

"I was present when Marshall was going to China," the admiral told Mr. Daniels. "He said he was going to tell Chiang that he had to get on with the Communists or do without help from us. He said the same thing when he got back. I thought he was wrong then, both times."

Mr. Daniels discloses that "in Marshall, Truman had a Secretary of State whom he trusted sometimes, some of his staff felt, to the point of his own injury."

Jimmy Byrnes is needled through much of the book. Mr. Daniels dates the Truman break with Mr. Byrnes as beginning with the Moscow Conference of December 1945. He thought Mr. Byrnes went too far in accepting Russian positions in regard to Bulgaria and other satellites, and said that "Byrnes lost his nerve in Moscow." Mr. Truman told Mr. Daniels that Mr. Byrnes "got the real riot act" after Moscow and is quoted as saying Mr. Byrnes "failed miserably as Secretary of State."

The fallibility of men's memories is an interesting sidelight of the Daniels chapter—and a most useful one it is—on the maneuvering that saw Henry Wallace kicked out and Mr. Truman dropped into the Vice Presidency. Mr. Daniels is quoting Mr. Pauley, Ed Flynn, George Allen, Sidney Hillman, and many others, and at times is forced as a reporter to note the discrepancies in the tales they tell.

Behind the whole book is a very human study of a quiet, modest, retiring, studious Harry Truman arriving in the Capital as a Senator with his Bess and Margaret at a time when, as he said, "I am the poorest Senator financially in Washington."

The price is $3.57. J. B. Lippincott Co. is the publisher.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of March 20–21, 1948]

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

ALARMS! ALARMS!

The record ought to be kept straight in these days of alarms and excitements. A historical error can never be corrected; it sets up a chain of events which moves in the direction set by the error until it wears itself out, or is diverted by other events or is stopped by force.

Among a free people, those who participated in the errors must be held responsible for them. It may be pleasant for those who built reputations and made political profit by making mistakes to have us forget what they did and said when the going was smooth. However, now that their mistakes are being uncovered, they shout, "Stop Thief!" We have to assume that those who supported Roosevelt's policy at Tehran and Yalta and Truman's policy at Potsdam, and such trivia as Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods are responsible for our present misfortunes. It will avail them nothing, for they face the facts of their own incompetence. There is no longer any cover-up.

Therefore, when Jimmy Byrnes, or George Marshall, or Averill Harriman gets terribly excited about the evils of the Russians, I challenge them to deny the charge that they were accessories before the event, that they condoned in advance the rape of European

civilization by Stalin, that Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, in advance, consented to the despoilation of our allies and the countries we liberated. At Potsdam, President Truman joined in these operations.

Nor, were these men and others to confess their sins, were they to assume moral responsibility for what they did, even if they pleaded ignorance, it would be possible to forgive them while pitying the country that fell into their hands. But when they deliberately reverse themselves and, shouting louder than anyone else, demand a war to correct their errors, we must say to them that if it is another war they managed to get for us, we may have no alternative but to offer our sons as sacrifices, but we want better, more competent, and more truthful managers. We cannot trust those who lied to us.

On February 13, 1945, it was reported that War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes returned to Washington from Yalta and disclosed that President Roosevelt proposed the formula for the solution of the Polish question. Mr. Byrnes did not say that he, Byrnes, opposed that solution nor did he tell us then that other arrangements were made there, even an arrangement making Soviet Russia the successor to Japan's rights and privileges in Manchuria in direct violation of our treaties with China since 1844 and constantly renewed. Mr. Byrnes said nothing about that. Nor did General Marshall or Averell Harriman, or any of the ex-New Deal commentators who are trying to run General Eisenhower on the Democratic ticket as part of a war scare.

On June 15, 1945, General Eisenhower told a press conference in Paris that so far as he is concerned, there is nothing to indicate that cooperation with the Russians is impossible. He said that "peace lies with all the peoples of the world, not just for the moment with some political leader." I never quite knew how the people would produce peace unless they did it through their political leaders in control of their government. The fact is that they have not produced a peace, nor a peace treaty, nor a formula for peace, and they are all again talking about another war as though it were seasonal, like Easter or Christmas.

As for General Eisenhower's belief in our ability to cooperate with the Russians in June 1945, he said that after Yalta and Tehran, and he must have known in his position what was done at those conferences, or perhaps he was as deceived as Mr. Hull seems to have been. At any rate, those who connived at Tehran and Yalta and those who condoned and defended Tehran and Yalta ought not to be believed. They are not to be trusted. Until we get a new and undefiled leadership, there is no need of alarms, excursions, and incitements. If Soviet Russia chooses to make war on us, let her not face those who helped Stalin to deceive the American people.

Prompt Action in Military Defense Assistance Program Is Imperative To Maintain Peace—Delay Could Lead to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I submit herewith a report which I am sending to Hon. CARL VINSON, Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, concerning the Military Defense Assistance Program as I observed it and learned about it on a trip to Europe recently.

REPORT BY LEROY JOHNSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, CALIFORNIA, ON STUDY OF THE MILITARY DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND RELATED MATTERS FOR THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MADE BY VISITING COUNTRIES INVOLVED

Pursuant to the instructions of Chairman CARL VINSON, I proceeded by air to Bremerhaven, Germany, arriving there on July 20, 1950, for the purpose of studying the Military Assistance Program and related military matters. I remained abroad until September 9, when I proceeded, via Army Transport *Rose*, to New York, arriving there September 18, 1950.

MILITARY ADVISORY ASSISTANCE GROUPS (MAAG'S)

During those 2 months most of my investigations were in those countries in western Europe in which we have Military Advisory Assistance Groups (referred to abroad as "MAAGs"). These countries are: the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Italy, and France. I also visited Sweden and Spain to inquire into the situation in these countries, as our relations with them in the near future may well have a significant bearing on our own military posture and potential in Europe and the Mediterranean basin.

Each of these groups (MAAGs) has as members a representative of the Department of State, and a representative of each of the Armed Forces. These men work with their counterparts in the various foreign nations trying to develop the defense needs of each particular country—recommending the relative priorities of the myriad military items required, determining which programs in a particular nation will build its defenses most effectively and at the least cost, analyzing the potential of each country for the manufacture of military equipment, munitions, etc., and assisting in the development of a master defense plan for western Europe by studying out the mission each country should assume in order to assure the greatest success for the master plan.

I was impressed by the high caliber of the men who compose these various groups. They must have been selected with extreme care, not only on the basis of outstanding military record and efficiency but because they also have the talent of friendly association with other people. They are not only military advisors, in their special fields, but they function also as American ambassadors of good will in their dealings with their foreign counterparts. I want to make it clear that these remarks are not confined to our military personnel on these groups. The same fine talents were equally evident in the State Department representation on each group.

Of the numerous fields which these groups explore, of signal importance is the manner by which the military programs in each particular country contribute the most to our own defense effort, when considered as part of the collective defense program of the North Atlantic Treaty organization. It is now painfully evident that each country (the smaller ones in particular) cannot build a balanced modern defense force and have the collective effort of the free nations thus become an integrated, sound, reasonably economical defense organization. Consequently, the present aim is to develop such a military program in Norway, for instance, as will promote the most security not in itself but as an integrated part of the defense effort of the other cooperating countries. The underlying precept is that each of these countries is now incapable of defending itself adequately against aggression, but the group, working together, can assuredly build a balanced defense system capable of defending each and all of these countries. It is hoped that in the future each country will concentrate its efforts on only that part of the defense program it is best capable of strengthening and hence bring the maximum total military strength of all to bear. Thus and only thus, the entire grouping of nations may in time be able to repel any aggression, no matter its source or victim. If an aggressor knows, as the North Atlantic Pact provides, that an attack on any one of these countries will be considered an attack against all, and will result in immediate retaliation from the entire group, then it will be prevented from picking off relatively small and helpless countries one at a time. The urgent need is to bind together this joint defense effort and to get each country equipped and trained for its part of the job in the shortest possible time.

EXPEDITIOUS FURNISHING OF EQUIPMENT AND TRAINING IN ITS USE IS IMPERATIVE

In developing this program it can readily be understood that after having decided what a country should have and can use to the best advantage, the equipment must be provided to implement that decision. But it should also be recognized that an equally important part of the effort is the training of those who are to use the equipment.

Consequently a large training program is going on concurrently with the furnishing of the arms and equipment. The recipient countries provide students to be trained in the use of the equipment. Some are taught in the United States at our various service schools. Some are taught at a school operated by EUCOM. In all parts of the American Zone are schools teaching these foreign students in the use and upkeep of rifles, artillery of various calibers, tanks, vehicles, various types of aircraft, radar, and in the tactical principles in the use of various kinds of equipment, etc. It is a comprehensive program; a program essential in order that the recipients of our aid know how to handle the equipment furnished them as well as to repair and maintain it. The underlying idea in selecting the students is to designate men for this training who, by training and aptitude, are potential teachers. They in turn will train others in their own countries and thus the countries will ultimately have enough trained men to administer their own programs. The results from this effort in training have been good as to quality, but the program is entirely too conservative in size.

Also, although there was money in the 1950 appropriation for a considerable acquisition of material to be sent to these countries, only a very small volume of goods was actually sent. Only from 5 to 10 percent of the total authorization and appropriation has arrived in the form of military goods. I was told that some requisitions have been as long as 6 months in being filled, and yet the goods are readily available. Now that much larger funds have been authorized and appropriated, it is hoped that there will be a far greater expedition in shipments of all requisitioned goods. Time is the most important element in this program. Failure to recognize this and to fill the needs promptly may plunge all of western Europe into disaster and seriously jeopardize our own national security. The time to stop trouble is before it starts, and the MDAP is designed to do exactly that. If the program is carried out promptly we have every reason to believe that the result will be what we anticipate. If the program drags it may be merely a waste of time and money and place us in a very dangerous position. The combined power of these North Atlantic Allies in men, productive capacity, and in military striking power, if properly armed, is tremendous. Delay and inertia in getting this program adequately implemented might provoke the very aggression that we are trying to forestall by this program, thus not only injuring irreparably the very countries we are trying to help but also dangerously imperiling our own security.

ONE ARMY UNDER SINGLE COMMANDER WOULD MAKE MDAP MOST EFFECTIVE

This brings us to another aspect of this problem. It is the proposal made by Mr. Churchill and also by Mr. Schuman of France that the countries involved in the MDAP program have a common army and other defense forces and that these forces be employed as a unit under a unified command. I favor this program enthusiastically as it will bring the maximum strength to this effort. With a unified command over the entire group of forces, with a master defense plan worked out by the combined efforts of all the participants, the most important area of the free world would be in a tremendously improved position to defend itself against attack. Such an organization, equipped with the best quality and adequate volume of modern weapons and auxiliary equipment, need not fear any aggression of the type now so feasible in Europe. This, as I see it, would be the accomplishment of the first phase of the mission of the Atlantic Pact countries in the military field, namely, the neutralization of the present threat of aggression against western Europe and western Germany.

EUROPE IS THE KEY TO SUCCESS OF CONCEPT OF UNIFIED ACTION AGAINST AGGRESSOR

There is one thing that we should keep clearly in mind in the development of this program in Europe. That is that Europe is the key to the success of the entire concept of military aid to our allies and the joint utilization of our military strength and productive capacity. In the group of countries with which we are concerned (I am including Greece, Turkey, and Iran) there are over 260,000,000 people. Moreover, these countries are one of the most mighty industrial areas in the world. Unless the plan of unified defense is made to work in Europe it will be futile to try it elsewhere. The close association of these European countries with the United States, and indirectly with the Western Hemisphere, Australia, and South Africa, would in effect unite for mutual protection all free people of the world and the great majority of the industrial capacity of the free world. Therefore, I urge as forcefully as I can that our Chairman and the committee over which he presides will use its every last ounce of power and influence in seeing that this program is greatly expedited. We cannot toy with the security of the free world or with our own. The quicker the joint action of this group becomes effective, thereby enabling the free world adequately to resist aggression, the safer will our generation be, as well as those to follow. Time and again I was told by members of groups representing other countries that what they want is a definite plan. It was repeatedly told that "if a plan is given us we will see that the part of the plan assigned to our country will be carried out." I cannot attest that these people have the authority to do exactly what they said. Yet I received the firm impression that they were reflecting not only their own viewpoints but those of their political leaders as well. The people I met in these various countries are acutely aware that they are in a dangerous position. However, they also realize that if we are willing to put out the necessary effort to help them get armed rapidly, all countries in Europe, as well as the United States, joined together in a firm determination to resist aggression by joint action and adequately equipped with modern weapons, the feared aggression may not and probably will not come.

JOINT AMERICAN MILITARY ADVISORY GROUP (JAMAG) COORDINATES PROGRAM FOR EUROPEAN ASSISTANCE

The Military Defense Assistance Program is a part of a broader program. The broader program dovetails the efforts of the State and Defense Departments and the European Cooperation Administration. These agencies work together in trying to strengthen our European allies in the economic field so their productive capacity may be enlarged, buttressing the weakened economic fiber of these nations. As this effort succeeds, each country becomes thereby better able to contribute to the common defense system.

In the diplomatic field the effort being made is to achieve a world ruled by law rather than by fear and force as is the case today. Even the free world could not forever maintain peace through the threat of military force. A way to an understanding with those in the world whom we believe are threatening the peace of the world must be found. Otherwise the future is forever to be one of fear and uncertainty for everyone; the end result will surely be war on a global scale, a war that might wreck civilization. America was caught so miserably off base in Korea that we cannot but wonder if the same situation can suddenly arise in Europe.

To coordinate all this effort and make the maximum progress toward peace—which is our real objective—the Joint American Military Advisory Group (JAMAG) has been formed. This Group, headquartered in London, is composed of two major subgroups. One is charged with planning under the North Atlantic Treaty. The other is charged with the Miliary Assistance Planning Advisory Groups. This JAMAG organization and its branches screen the requests of the various MAAGs and keeps them informed of the top-level planning of the whole effort. The JAMAG also encompasses what is done by our diplomats, leading military men in Europe, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the State Department to weld the United States with the United Kingdom and other European nations in a defense plan capable of withstanding any aggression. It has numerous committees aimed at developing a rounded program and performing such essential functions as keeping the Defense Department informed of State Department activities, and vice versa, letting the planning group know what the group that implements the program is doing, and all in all keeps the program moving consistently and in harmony in every respect. Certainly, in an effort of this nature, the most important purpose is to obtain adherence to an over-all program, with as little duplication and confusion as possible.

WESTERN GERMANY SHOULD BE ARMED AND ITS INDUSTRIAL POTENTIAL USED FOR THE PROTECTION OF ITSELF AND WESTERN EUROPE

I gave particularly close attention to this matter. I talked with a great many people about the problem of getting Germany properly armed. Germany has often been referred to as "the key to the economy of Europe." It has major industrial resources; it has the population; its people have the discipline and the ability to produce vast stores of military and industrial goods. Germans have twice proved this ability in two great wars, which have proved devastating to them because they were outnumbered and outgunned. It is foolhardy, in my opinion, not to provide arms for these people in the three western zones of Germany. The Soviets have been arming eastern Germans for a considerable time. They are using the so-called German police as a subterfuge and organizing them into combat units of various types and sizes. In some instances I learned, from authentic sources, that the Soviets are now contemplating the organizing of these groups of so-called police into divisional units.

The Germans have always been accustomed to seeing visible symbols of power that would protect them against foreign aggression. They have always had a large and well-disciplined army. They have always felt that they could look to this group of professional soldiers, airmen, and naval experts to protect their country against any penetration by aggression. Today there is not a single gun in Germany available to any German. They know that should aggression start they will be absolutely helpless. A man high in authority in the American organization in Germany (whose name I cannot reveal) advised me that our people have already learned that many Germans in the western zones are signing up with communistic or semicommunistic groups. They are doing this, I am told, not because of a belief in communism, but as a result of fear that if invasion comes and they are seized by the invading forces, they could point to the fact that previous to the invasion they had been members of Communist groups and therefore should receive decent treatment. Anyone who has been in Germany and France and fought in one of the world wars realizes how sensitive the French are about the arming of the Germans. We cannot ignore this natural feeling. However, I am positive that any arming of the Germans would be of a type which could be easily controlled by the remainder of the allies in the group, so that Germany could not again become the militaristic and belligerent nation she has been in the past. The ideal is that ultimately, once Germany has demonstrated a willingness to live in the family of nations as a peaceful member and once international security is achieved by collective efforts, Germany be admitted to the western nations family. Her period of probation must depend on her own conduct and the progress of the United Nations, but I believe it is generally agreed that ultimately Germany should become a part of the western society of nations. Consequently we must take reasonable steps—and promptly—to arm Germany. We must make Germany capable of arming herself at least in part in order to have the ability of protecting her own citizens and her own territory. This should be merely to supplement the protection to be given by the group in western Europe, which we are trying, by means of the MDAP under consideration, to arm for their own protection.

No reasonable person can afford to ignore the tremendous industrial potential of Germany. Germany had immense industrial plants previous to the war. These have been largely wrecked. Some have been revised, but others should also be. In this great industrial complex can be produced many things useful to the western defense. If there is hesitancy about permitting Germany to manufacture munitions and other war material of value to the armed services, she can assuredly produce many other things that will be collaterally helpful in developing our mutual defense system. Germany should be set about making some of them.

The need for the rebuilding of the German industrial system is evident. The nearsighted and crude concept of reducing Germany to an agricultural nation has been wholly abandoned. Modern nations cannot be wiped out. It has been tried several times in Poland and each time the Polish people finally reemerged as a nation. It is the international hope that the German people have learned from their two mistakes, that they will in the future turn to peaceful pursuits, and that this great nation may ultimately qualify for membership in the United Nations. But in the meantime, I see no harm, and much good, in using the German productive capacity to help develop an organization to maintain the peace of Europe. Some of our American representatives in Germany indicated to me that more and more the Germans are insisting upon the reconstruction of Germany, politically and physically, so she can assume the station of a respected and peaceful member of the family of nations. In assisting her toward that goal, we should permit her to add her mite to the defense effort we are making in western Europe.

One of the problems facing Germany, and especially in Berlin, is the problem of unemployment. In Berlin I noticed an unusually large number of night policemen. Upon inquiring about this, I learned that this was not because of excessive danger of burglary, assault, robbery, or other crimes being committed or contemplated but was a measure initiated by the American group in Berlin to ease the unemployment problem in Berlin. Our effort to build our defense system with German assistance would help this problem also, as well as build up our peace insurance in that explosive area.

SPAIN SHOULD BE WITH US IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DEFENSE SYSTEM FOR WESTERN EUROPE

I visited Spain to gather first-hand information from our military attachés at Madrid and from others. Also, I took the opportunity of talking with most of the members of the Grand Military Staff of Spain. As nearly as I could determine, this organization corresponds closely to the American Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is the group of men who formulate and carry out the military policies of Spain.

Spain is a country with which we should find a way to cooperate, in our effort to build a strong mutual defense system in Europe.

Portugal is in the Atlantic Pact. It has had a dictator for 20 years. We seem to have no difficulty in working with him in developing the MDAP.

We should not let our political antagonisms blind us to such an extent as to prevent Spanish participation in our MDAP for western Europe. When your home is threatened by fire you do not junk the fire extinguisher simply because its manufacturer is not in accord with your politics or morals.

Spain's strategic location is magnificent. It commands the entrance to the Mediterranean. It has the only substantial defense line in Western Europe. The Pyrenees, used as a defense line, permit great results to be achieved by a small army. With this range of mountains in our control, and with the cooperation of the country behind them, we could repel a gigantic attack.

As a military matter, Spain is the most strategic air base in the entire world. Operating from the Iberian Peninsula, the air fleets of any nation can sweep all of Europe except the extreme northerly part. It can cover the entire Mediterranean area, the Near East and Northern Africa. Such planes would be in reach of the greatest industrial potential in the world, excepting North America, and some of the most valuable natural resources of all kinds in the entire world. No area in the world, in the light of present day conditions, is as strategically located from the standpoint of defense as the Iberian Peninsula.

With Spain on our side we could control access to and exit from the Mediterranean. That is of crucial importance, and plainly evident. It would also mean that North Africa would be friendly territory. America learned the great importance of that in the recent war. It is sheer nonsense to turn a cold shoulder to a country of 22,000,000 people who could be so helpful to us, if the military storm should break over Europe.

Few actions of the Congress in recent times could ultimately be so meaningful to American defense and the future of the free world as the recent appropriation on behalf of Spain. The strategic implications are so sweeping, the defense potential so stupendous, that all the free world stood to benefit enormously from this effort to breach the unrealistic moat between western nations and Spain.

And yet, during my visit in Europe, the President announced his intention not to permit the expenditure of these funds on behalf of Spain.

This is a shocking abuse of Presidential authority, even leaving aside the grave effects this unwise move has on western defense efforts. As in the case of Presidential withholding of Air Force funds in the amount of $735,000,000 in the 1950 military budget, and as characterized unanimously by the Committee on Appropriations, this type of action amounts to an item veto, which is an unconstitutional act by the President.

My personal reaction to these repeated and studied acts by the President, contemptuous of the will of the Congress, flippant in approach and derived from the conviction that the President and his minions can construe all national and international problems better than the American people through their representatives in Congress, is that renewed and more determined efforts must be made by the Armed Services Committee and by the Congress generally to recapture the rapidly vanishing congressional powers being so cavalierly usurped by the executive branch.

Cancellation of the aircraft carrier *United States* after thrice being authorized by the Congress; vetoing appropriations of the Congress in an unconstitutional manner; high-handed administration of the defense program of America over the strong protests of the Armed Services Committee; act after act eating away at the fiber of the American Government, taking from the people their influence and control in the decisions of their own Government. How ironic "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people" sounds in the light of these acts contemptuous of the desires of the American Congress.

The Presidential item veto of the Spain appropriation is, in my view, not only unconstitutional but constitutes a terrible disservice to the cause of the Nation's defense in an hour of extreme peril.

It ranks right along with the recent acts of the administration in pulling the pillars from under the Armed Forces in the name of economy while the northern Koreans were girding for their June 25 attack on South Korea.

How long such nearsighted actions, such cavalier mishandling of the Nation's vital problems, can continue without a violent protest from the American people, is an interesting, challenging question.

SWEDEN

Sweden is not in the Atlantic Pact. Its foreign policy is one of neutrality and no one can blame Sweden for adhering to this policy, if she can make it work. Norway, Denmark, and Holland had the same policy, but they learned to their sorrow that ambitious, warring nations no longer pay any attention to neutrality if the neutral country is needed in a military campaign that the great country is waging. However, Sweden is not as necessary in the defense of western Europe as are the other countries in the program. If Sweden were in the group we would be committed to defend her in the event of an attack on her territory. She faces the Baltic and it would be easy for any country to the east or south to make a surprise attack on Sweden such as Germany made on Norway. That would be a hard situation for us to cope with as it might take a terrific number of troops and enormous quantities of equipment to dislodge a well-trained force already in possession of the country. Furthermore, the entrances to Sweden from the south and the east are very difficult for a military expedition, if a strong force should be in control of Sweden.

THE REAL PURPOSE OF THE SOVIETS IN ITS PROGRAM OF PENETRATION AND POTENTIAL AGGRESSION IS TO SUBDUE THE UNITED STATES

In studying our problems for a number of years and listening to witnesses and talking to all kinds of people about it, I have formed one imperishable impression. It is this: The conduct of the Soviets against countries like Greece, Iran, Korea, countries behind the Iron Curtain, Italy, France, etc., are merely incidental steps in their major plan. The Soviets do not necessarily need Italy or Greece to carry out their ultimate plan. However, their purpose is to weaken or absorb certain nations that might be friendly and helpful to the United States in the event of a conflict with the Soviets. The major purpose of the Soviets is to get themselves in a position where they can conquer or neutralize the United States of America. The only reason for their activity in other countries is to lop off possible American friends; to liquidate numbers of people who might be helpful to America in the event of a struggle; to limit, constrict, and reduce the potential striking power and the potential resources which might be at the command of the United States in the event of a conflict with the Soviets. The attack is not made directly; it is made under cover. It is made by political and economic penetration but it is all aimed at the same end, namely, to create a world where the Soviets would be in a position to strike successfully at the most powerful free country in the world, the United States of America.

We should not deceive ourselves about the situation. We are the object of the aims and attentions of the Soviets and to subjugate us is what they believe is their mission in the world. Since we have only about 6 percent of the world's population, it is obvious that the matter of relative manpower is very vital in the struggle of the type that might follow. In the free world in Europe alone, there are roughly 250,000,000 people who would like to see the western form of political and economic life continued and expanded. That is why it is so essential that we develop our defense plan without any hesitation and without delay. Our strength would neutralize the possibility of the accomplishment of the major Soviet mission. In fact, if the status quo could be held for a number of years or decades it is conceivable that trouble within the Soviet areas might be very helpful to those who are now the objects of their envy and hatred. Dictators have no easy situation. The fall of a dictator usually precipitates squabbles and fights and brings about division, indecision, and confusion. People are chafing under dictatorial decrees of the Soviets. It is a well known fact that the armies of Hitler when they marched victoriously into Ukraina were received as liberators. Had it not been for the fact that Hitler was a madman devoid of any objective consideration of the problems before him, the Ukrainians might now be on our side. However, Hitler so insulted them and enraged them that they promptly fell back into the Soviet orbit. That underlying tension is still there. While it is hard to rebel in a police state, the lid may some day blow off. But it takes time to generate the steam necessary to bring about the explosion which will blow the lid off dictatorship and oppression. That is why I am so heartily in favor of joining with these western nations to the full extent of our economic power and our military ability and genius to bring about a closely knit group of countries properly armed, trained and disciplined to be ready for any difficulty which may arise. This might be the deterrent that will give the time lag which will work in favor of freedom and of the United States.

THE TROOPS IN EUCOM ARE WELL TRAINED AND THEIR MORALE IS GOOD

While in Germany I had the pleasure of seeing the First Infantry Division in three different exercises. The first was an anti-aircraft battalion shoot at a place on the Baltic. This battery had a very interesting exercise and it was my privilege to see their equipment and to witness the shooting. By modern standards, their equipment is out of date. This is the kind of equipment that was used in the recent war and now with only 5 years elapsed much more modern

equipment has been developed, particularly, radar equipment.

I saw the engineers of the First Division span the Rhine River with a pontoon bridge. This was an exceptionally interesting exercise. The Navy participated in the exercise. In addition to helping haul the segments of the bridge to the place where they were to be connected, the Navy had a large boat with some heavy anchors. Thus the connected segments of the bridge were held in place while others were being put in, until the entire operation went from shore to shore. The bridge was made in 3 hours less time than any previous effort.

Then I attended the final exercise of the First Division maneuvers. The First Division maneuvers lasted over 1 month and were actual simulated battle conditions, both as to the equipment and the manner in which the men lived. The final exercise was a display of the fire power of the division, and we saw them shoot every kind of a weapon from a 30-caliber machine gun to a 90-millimeter cannon. The exercise was witnessed by a great many foreign observers, as well as a great many of our military leaders in Europe. It was a tremendous spectacle and emphasized the terrific fire power of a modern infantry division. In addition, we had a tank attack, exactly as it is carried out in actual warfare—which was also a tremendous spectacle.

Our old friend, Maj. Gen. John Dahlquist, who proved to be such a fine witness on many of the important bills passed in the Eightieth Congress, is now the Commanding General of this division. The morale of his troops is excellent. The First Infantry Division is battle-worthy. Twice a year they maneuver and they keep themselves in first-class physical shape and are continually developing their marksmanship and other activities which makes them wonderful soldiers. The housekeeping affairs of the division is handled by another unit, so that every man may be trained primarily for combat and be continuously ready for any eventuality. The First Division is one of our best-known divisions. It looks and acts like a worthy successor of the great First Division I knew in 1917 and 1918. It is well-led by a great leader with much battle experience, as well as wide knowledge of the administrative problems of the Army. It is well-staffed by junior and senior officers and has a group of men in the ranks that are the equal of any other unit in the armed services.

I saw a good deal of the Air Forces and they seem to be in fine condition. They are also ready for any eventuality and are kept in continuous readiness. Their commander is Lt. Gen. John K. Cannon, who is an able, resourceful, and experienced Air Force leader.

When I say for any eventuality, it must be understood, of course, that these contingents of our forces are small compared to what would be required if a major conflict should start. We have, really, only a token force but it is in excellent shape and in fine condition, and for its size, unequaled by any similar sized force in the world.

It was my privilege to be briefed by the EUCOM staff officers. The briefing was most interesting and they are likewise alert and ready for any situation. The Commanding General in Europe, Gen. Thomas Handy, is well known to the members of our committee. He is a man with a vast combat experience, as well as great experience in staff and administrative problems in peace and war. General Handy was Deputy Chief of Staff and had other important key positions in the Army. He is a leader of men and knows how to get along with his associates and get the most efficiency out of them. In my opinion, he is doing a splendid job. We are fortunate to have such fine leaders at the head of our various groups in the EUCOM. All they need is some tools to work with and they will produce results in the event that their services are required. I only wish we had more personnel. We simply must have more to be safe. Five to ten divisions more and an equal number from our western European allies would ease the tension a lot.

Appropriations, Second Session, Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, as is customary at the conclusion of a session, I submit a summary of budget estimates and action thereon in the appropriation measures considered and adopted thus far during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. Only four appropriation bills were considered during the entire session, not counting the District of Columbia bill which is not a charge on Federal revenues.

Budget estimates for appropriations totaled $54,321,138,822, which were reduced by $1,893,212,194; amounts enacted totaled $52,427,926,628.

Reductions totaling $40,269,500 were made in estimates for contractual authority and loan authorizations of $2,998,799,500, allowing $2,958,530,000 for these categories of obligational availability. In addition, provision for an over-all cut of $550,000,000 was included in the omnibus appropriation bill, and since this figure was a minimum rather than a fixed sum, total reductions against all items aggregated not less than $2,483,481,694.

There follows a tabulation summarizing the amounts in comparative form:

Comparison of budget estimates, appropriations, and authorizations, 2d sess., 81st Cong.

	Budget estimates	Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), law compared with estimates
APPROPRIATIONS			
Urgent deficiency, 1950	$825,611,600	$739,653,500	−$85,958,100
H. J. Res. 476 [1]	159,810	[1] 153,810	−6,000
Deficiency, 1950	611,500,130	653,761,608	+42,261,478
General Appropriation Act, 1951:			
Ch. I. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	12,000,000	10,800,000	−1,200,000
Ch. II. Legislative	87,820,747	69,290,211	−18,530,536
Ch. III. State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	1,185,612,897	1,065,627,962	−119,984,935
Ch. IV. Treasury-Post Office	2,813,379,100	2,757,846,000	−55,533,100
Ch. V. Labor-Federal Security	2,463,008,500	2,272,428,614	−190,579,886
Ch. VI. Agriculture	810,626,946	773,208,924	−37,418,022
Ch. VII. Interior	674,971,505	620,396,325	−54,575,180
Ch. VIII. Independent offices	8,466,982,724	7,996,140,947	−470,841,777
Ch. IX. Civil functions	834,867,500	687,043,270	−147,824,230
Ch. X. Defense Establishment	13,376,865,000	13,294,299,443	−82,565,557
Ch. XI. Foreign aid	4,855,073,729	4,387,373,729	−467,700,000
Total, general act	35,581,208,648	33,934,455,425	−1,646,753,223
The supplemental, 1951	17,302,658,634	17,099,902,285	−202,756,349
Total, appropriations	54,321,138,822	52,427,926,628	−1,893,212,194
CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS			
Urgent deficiency, 1950	87,650,000	78,885,000	−8,765,000
Deficiency, 1950	15,000,000	35,000,000	+20,000,000
CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS—CON.			
General Appropriation Act, 1951:			
Ch. III. State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	$91,036,500	$62,325,000	−$28,711,500
Ch. V. Labor-Federal Security	161,211,000	154,288,000	−6,923,000
Ch. VII. Interior	44,750,000	36,230,000	−8,520,000
Ch. VIII. Independent offices	578,367,000	531,517,000	−46,850,000
Ch. X. Defense Establishment	1,385,785,000	1,385,785,000	
Total, general act	2,261,149,500	2,170,145,000	−91,004,500
The supplemental, 1951		[2] 57,500,000	+57,500,000
Total, contract authorizations	2,363,799,500	[2] 2,341,530,000	−22,269,500
LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS			
General Appropriation Act, 1951:			
Ch. VI. Agriculture	610,000,000	[3] 536,500,000	−73,500,000
Ch. XI. Foreign aid		[4] 62,500,000	+62,500,000
	610,000,000	599,000,000	−11,000,000
The supplemental, 1951	25,000,000	18,000,000	−7,000,000
Total, loan authorizations	635,000,000	617,000,000	−18,000,000
Total, appropriations, contract authorizations, and loan authorizations	57,319,938,322	55,386,456,628	−1,933,481,694
Over-all cut (general appropriation act)		[5] −550,000,000	[5] −550,000,000
Net total	57,319,938,322	54,836,456,628	−2,483,481,694

[1] For certain contingent expenses of the Senate, as set forth in S. Res. 284.
[2] In addition, indefinite contract authorization for the purchase of 100,000,000 pounds of raw wool for armed services.
[3] In addition, not to exceed $150,000,000 for REA loans available upon certification of need.
[4] Public debt transaction for loan to Spain.
[5] Applies only to items contained in General Appropriation Act, 1951.

Your Congressman Reports to His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Eighty-first Congress is approaching the end of its sessions after two long and difficult years of legislative work. This is a proper time to report to my constituents on some of the major problems which confronted us during the past 2 years. The people of my district are entitled to know how their Representative in Congress served their interests and that of the Nation as a whole. They will have an opportunity to pronounce judgment on my record of service on election day.

During each of my campaigns for election, I fully and fairly made known my views on all major political and economic problems. I made it crystal clear to them what they could expect of me as their Representative, how I would represent them, what I would fight for, and what I would fight against. They elected me by overwhelming majorities, in 1948 by more than 3 to 1. I am very grateful to the people of my district for this outpouring of confidence in me. I believe I have fulfilled every promise made to them. In the few instances when some of my people disagreed with me, time has proved me right. There is but one instance in which some of my supporters still honestly differ with me. There too, I am confident, the future will justify my vote.

For the third time in succession my party—the Democratic Party—has designated me unanimously for another term in Congress. The Liberal Party also is unanimously supporting my candidacy, as it had done twice before.

Labor's League for Political Education, in its congressional scorecard issued for the guidance of American Federation of Labor members and the public generally, has given me a perfect score on 10 selected key issues in Congress, including such matters as the Taft-Hartley Act, rent control, public housing, minimum wages, antitrust laws, social security, and others.

Similarly, the Congress for Industrial Organizations—CIO—published a supplement to the CIO News where the voting record of all Members of Congress was appraised on the basis of 13 selected issues, and I was rated as having voted "right" on every issue.

The magazine, New Republic, in a special supplement containing a progress report on the Eighty-first Congress, gave me a score of 100 percent on 15 major issues, among them the Marshall plan, reciprocal trade, broadening social security, veterans' pension plan, antipoll tax, Brannan farm plan, and others mentioned previously.

More recently, the well-known liberal organization, Americans for Democratic Action, labeled my voting record perfect on what they considered the 15 most important issues. These included some of those already mentioned by the other organizations, as well as Korean aid, FEPC, middle-income housing, point 4 aid to underdeveloped areas, the natural gas bill, health reorganization plan, Defense Production Act, and the Wood-Mundt-Nixon bill.

During the first and second sessions of the Eighty-first Congress over 12,000 pieces of legislation were introduced, including public and private bills and various resolutions. Several hundreds of these reached the floor of the House for action. Those and many others were carefully studied and analyzed by me. I voted at all times in the best interests of the people of the United States and of my district, but never provincially and never contrary to my platform pledges.

My record in Congress is an open book. I modestly, yet proudly, present this record to my constituents and invite them to acquaint themselves with my efforts and accomplishments. I do not pretend to be infallible. Suggestions and constructive criticism will always be welcomed by me.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

During my campaign in 1948, I expressed the following views:

> Peace and democracy at home gain when democracy abroad is healthy. The Marshall plan to rehabilitate Europe strengthens our economy and helps destroy subversive influences. Antidemocratic doctrines must be vigorously combated. We want peace without appeasement.
>
> Strengthen the United Nations. A strong United Nations demands a strong United States of America. Discard the veto power. Establish an international police force to prevent aggression.

In the 2 years that have passed since I stated these views communism has made serious inroads abroad, particularly in Asia, but it was stopped in Europe where countries like Italy, France, Greece, and others were threatened. Thanks to the aid given them through the Marshall plan, the march of communism in Europe was successfully contained. The United States has demonstrated to the world that she desires peace, but that she is not desirous of attaining it through appeasement of communistic efforts at enslavement of the world.

Unfortunately, the situation is different in Asia where open warfare and bloodshed are the order of the day as a result of the invasion of South Korea by the Communists of North Korea, using Russian arms and serving as a spearhead of Russian imperialism in the Far East. If we had had a stronger United Nations, if the UN had discarded the veto which Soviet Russia is utilizing for its own interests and to the detriment of the UN and world peace, if the UN would have had a strong international police force to deal with acts of aggression—it is very likely that the Soviet aggression in Korea would never have been risked and communism would have been stopped in its tracks in Asia as in Europe.

I have supported the Marshall plan during the past 2 years and I shall continue to support it in the future. I shall also continue my efforts to build a strong UN, as I have done in the past. I voted for the Korean-aid bills originally, and more recently supported the bill providing additional funds for military assistance.

On the matter of war, I stated on the floor of the House of Representatives on March 7, 1950, as follows:

> The American people do not want war. I believe the Russian people do not want war either—if only they had the opportunity to speak their mind freely. But if war nevertheless engulfs this world, it will be due to the insatiable lust for power on the part of the present rulers of Soviet Russia.

On June 26, 1950, the day after the brutal and unwarranted attack by the Communists on South Korea, I supported the declaration of the UN Security Council condemning this aggressive act and I lauded President Truman's decision to aid the UN. I said:

> No one can consider it a warlike act for us to carry out our obligations as a member of the United Nations to protect our weaker sisters from brutal, unprovoked aggression. No one in our time has done more than President Harry S. Truman to bring about permanent peace in every part of the world. * * * His action with reference to Korea and the Far East is further proof of his determination to maintain peace. Our country and all the peace-loving peoples of the world will be ever grateful to him for his patience until action could no longer be withheld, and for the speed and forthrightness with which he ordered our Armed Forces to the defense of democracy when no other alternative was possible.

On June 30, 1950, President Truman graciously wrote to me with reference to this subject. He said in part:

> Your assurances will be helpful indeed as we go forward with the steps necessary for the promotion of peace and stability in the world.

PRICE CONTROL

Next to the problem of war, the most immediate threat to our democratic way of life is the spiraling inflationary situation which took on sudden momentum after the outbreak of the conflict in Korea. Prices of food, clothing, and other necessities of life began to soar sky-high, and hoarding once again reared its ugly head. During my campaign in 1948 I said:

> Runaway prices of food, clothing and other necessaries make it harder and harder for you to make ends meet. American family life cannot survive without food, shelter, and clothing which the people can afford.

It would extend my report to undue proportions to cite the many instances in the past 2 years when I spoke up in Congress against high prices and in favor of effective price control and the interests of the consumer. I have appealed for an end to profiteering and for the necessary measures to stop hoarding.

More recently, when Congress was considering the Defense Production Act of 1950 to establish the necessary controls for the present emergency, I supported the establishment of such controls and urged granting the President the necessary powers to control prices, wages, rationing, credits and commodity speculation. On August 2, 1950, I said in the House:

> If we must invoke controls, price controls, wage controls, and other controls we ought to go all out and make them enforceable.

The next day I said:

Price and wage stabilization is intended to eliminate and prevent profiteering, manipulation and speculation, and to protect the consumer, the wage earner, and the investor from undue impairment of their living conditions.

And on August 10, shortly before the House voted on the Defense Production Act, I made a final appeal and issued a warning, as follows:

In a few moments you are going to be called upon to stand up and be counted and have your names recorded permanently in the records of this Congress so that your children and the children who come after them may know who stood up here and said: "Send them over to fight, but keep from them that which they need in order to be able to fight. Regiment the boys into the armed services. Regiment little lobbyless John Q. Consumer back home. But stay away from the untouchables who can pressure us with their powerful lobbies. Exempt the agricultural exploiters, the commodity-exchange manipulators, and the real-estate interests. Control the little man and woman in the home and in their daily activities, but let the money lenders and the money changers and the gamblers run riot."

The time will soon come for you to be recorded; let your conscience be your guide.

RENT CONTROL

Coupled with the problem of rising prices, profiteering and protection of the consumer is the question of rent control. During the campaign in 1948, I said:

We must continue the fight against exorbitant rents. Low-cost housing and slum clearance laws must be enacted.

I have fought consistently for an effective rent control act. I am aware of the great hardships to the people in the large metropolitan areas who are threatened by any relaxation of rent control and I raised my voice in Congress on numerous occasions to bring this matter to the attention of all legislators. Typical of my remarks on this matter are the following:

January 18, 1950:

I think every man, no matter what his politics may be, who comes from any metropolitan community, any large municipality, must stand for an extension of rent control at this time.

March 30, 1950:

There are still millions of families who urgently need the protection which this law (i. e. rent control) affords them, and there are still hundreds of thousands of families who have to live doubled-up because of lack of sufficient housing * * *. In view of the fact that rent has always been a basic factor in the cost of living for many millions of families, and in view of the slow but gradual increase in unemployment in many sections of the country, we should not be too hasty in suspending this means of protection which will unquestionably hurt the lower-income groups very severely. I fear that if we allow the rent control law to lapse, that if we do not renew it for another year, our inaction or refusal to extend its protection to those millions of our citizenry who still need it, may lead to a chain of events which would seriously undermine the economic stability of many areas of the country * * * Let us not encourage economic chaos; let us not contribute to economic instability. Rent control is still a matter of emergency legislation. It is absolutely necessary.

June 13, 1950:

Who wants this continuance of rent control? Is it, as you have been told by some of the opponents of the bill, only the left wing or the Communists or those who think along the same lines? Six of the largest and most influential national veterans' organizations of this country came before our committee and asked that these controls be continued. The CIO and the A. F. of L. asked that these controls be continued.

After a bitter struggle, Congress voted to continue the rent control law until the end of 1950 with a provision for an additional 6-month extension for local municipalities which enact laws therefor.

The Korean war and the resulting emergency, of course, make it imperative that rent control be continued, and strengthened. It will be one of my major tasks to fight for a more stringent rent control law in the next session.

HOUSING

The enactment of housing legislation, including adequate provisions for slum clearance and low-rent housing projects, is of utmost importance. In this matter I supported President Truman and the plank in the 1948 Democratic platform which said:

This Nation is shamed by the failure of the Republican Eightieth Congress to pass the vitally needed general housing legislation as recommended by the President.

Throughout the session of Congress I urged housing legislation for the benefit of low-income groups, including cooperative housing projects. When the executive board of the CIO passed a resolution on February 16, 1950, urging Congress to approve the middle-income housing bill, I had that resolution reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the same day so that all Members of Congress might read it. When the bill came up before the House on March 20, I described to my colleagues the cooperative housing movement in certain western European countries as I had observed it on a mission for the House Committee on Banking and Currency. I said:

The surest way to make a convert to capitalism and to individualism is to give a family a piece of property or an equity in it, no matter how little. Give him the opportunity to call something his own and he will fight to the death the efforts of socialism or communism to take it away.

When some Members wanted to retain certain obnoxious provisions in the housing bill, I frankly stated on March 22:

They say those provisions are not special legislation; they do not take care of special groups. They just take care of big business, the financial fraternity of the country, the big builders. Of course, when we do anything like that we are never catering to special interests. But when you try to take care of the forgotten man who is never forgotten when it comes to taxes, the fellow in the middle-income group who is carrying the tax burden of our Government, you are told we are socialistic, communistic, collectivistic, discriminatory, everything except what it is.

LABOR, SOCIAL SECURITY, AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

During my campaign in 1948, I said:

The aged, the ill, and the unemployed must be cared for. A broad program affords your best protection against depression and the awful hazards of illness and disability. The gains of labor must not be impaired.

My opposition to the Taft-Hartley labor law is a matter of record. My votes against this bill and some of its rigid antilabor amendments have been duly noted by the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods, the CIO, and all patriotic labor unions. I shall continue to work for the removal of its restrictions on labor unions and the laboring masses. At the same time I shall continue to work for sound labor relations during the present emergency and to keep strikes at a minimum in order to maintain production at a high rate.

I have been an ardent supporter of the Social Security Act and worked for its expansion to include 10,000,000 additional people. The expanded act finally went into effect recently thereby substantially increasing benefit payments to many millions of our citizens. Due to the more liberal provisions of the act many who were ineligible before will now be entitled to receive social-security payments. In time, it is hoped, the act will entitle our entire adult population to the benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance when they reach the statutory age. I shall continue to work toward that goal.

In the matter of unemployment, I constantly advocated that the necessary measures be taken to prevent a rise in unemployment. Among such measures, I urged the repeal of wartime excise taxes on a large number of commodities and articles in order to stimulate production and purchasing of such articles on a larger scale. In a statement to the House Ways and Means Committee urging repeal of such taxes, I said:

I am also fearful of the effect this will have in the near future on the employment situation, not only in the industries affected by the excise taxes where already considerable unemployment is being reported, but even in other fields.

Fortunately, at the present time our unemployment figures are among the lowest in our peacetime history. For those who unfortunately must remain on the unemployed lists I wholeheartedly favor maximum payments under unemployment insurance.

TAXES

During my campaign in 1948, I said:

Low income earners should not pay taxes. The first $3,500 of income should be exempt.

Throughout my incumbency of office I have supported the idea of tax exemption for the low-income groups. Notwithstanding the need for higher taxation resulting from the war in Korea and our defense needs, I still believe that the burden of taxation should be taken off the shoulders of the small wage earners and placed upon the high income groups, big business and the big corporations. When I advocated the repeal of excise taxes, I did it primarily because it hurts the small-income people most. The Korean conflict, unfortunately, postponed the possibility of repealing the excise nuisance taxes.

I also earnestly support an excess-profits tax to stave off excessive profiteering on the part of a small group at the expense of the rest of the population. An excess-profits tax at this time would help take the burden off the small taxpayer.

I urged repeatedly that we pay for armaments and defense as we incur the expenses therefor. That means more taxes now.

I voted against adjourning the Congress until we enact an excess-profits tax. I earnestly hope we will do so before the end of the year.

In the matter of excess profits, I said:

One need not be an economist to know that you control profits when you control prices. A primary result of price control is the limitation of profits.

CIVIL RIGHTS

During my campaign in 1948, I said:

Safeguard freedom of opinion and speech. Sustain our traditions of justice and fair trial. Eliminate poll taxes. Abolish discrimination.

I have worked most diligently to safeguard civil rights in this country, notwithstanding the hysteria of the times and the befuddled thinking of conservative forces who are dividing our people at a time when unity is most urgent. As the leading Nation of the free world we should be a model of democracy and should set an example in practicing the principles of tolerance, understanding, and the treatment of minorities in our midst. Abolition of discriminatory practices in employment, in education, in the Armed Forces, in housing, and other phases of our activity will not only safeguard our freedom here, but will help us gain many friends throughout the world for the cause of democracy.

During the term of the Eighty-first Congress, I spoke up on numerous occasions for the maintenance of civil rights. Here are a few such examples:

January 12, 1950:

Never before in world history was there greater need for human understanding, good will, and lasting peace than in the present postwar critical period. * * * False prophets and hatemongers in our own country spread doctrines of bigotry and hatred which serve only to undermine the unity of our people at a time when such unity is urgently needed for our very survival.

January 18, 1950:

I hope that on Monday of next week this House will call up for final action the FEPC bill that has been receiving so much attention throughout the country. At this time I want to direct your attention to the fact that one more step in the right direction to eliminate discrimination in this Nation has been taken by the Army, pursuant to an order issued by Gen. Gordon Gray. He has issued an order which requires that Negro troops be integrated into every branch of the service. * * * Last year I introduced a bill in the House which would attempt to accomplish the same purpose in the National Guard. * * * The enactment of the FEPC law on a national scale will go a long way toward eliminating those very situations which bring about such riots and lynchings, it will be one further step in the accomplishment of true freedom, freedom in the democratic way.

The FEPC bill was finally called up in the House on February 22, 1950, and I voted for it. Although it was stymied in the Senate, I continued to urge final passage of this bill and other civil-rights bills.

I urged home rule for the 900,000 disenfranchised Americans living in our Capital City of Washington.

In continuing the struggle against intolerance, on March 22, 1950, I said:

My view is that wherever bigotry and intolerance of our fellow men is practiced, in any part of our country, it should be exposed. Every effort should be made to eliminate the cancerous growth of hatred and prejudice wherever it shows its ugly head.

When the courts of New York upheld the restrictions limiting the huge housing project of Stuyvesant Town to whites only, I advocated that the United States Supreme Court reverse that decision. I stated as follows:

The effort to reverse that decision has significance which goes beyond the field of housing or even the problem of racial discrimination. Unless the decision is reversed it may set a precedent which in time may prove ominous to our whole American pattern of democratic government.

When reports reached me that segregation and discrimination are gradually and successfully being eliminated at our military bases and camps, I said on August 15, 1950:

At a time when our democratic system is on the defensive the elimination of racial segregation in our Armed Forces is a very encouraging factor. It is the best reply to Communist hypocrisy and double talk. Nations throughout the world cannot fail to realize that as a Nation we stand united, in peace or war. They, likewise, will realize that the rights of minority people and human rights for all are best respected and defended in countries which practice true democracy.

COMMUNISM

During my campaign in 1948, I said:

Fight communism, but not at the expense of Americanism.

I have favored elimination of subversive and disloyal elements from Government service, but I am vigorously opposed to any punishment being meted out to any of our citizens who may have different political views. Thought control is not in the American spirit or tradition. It is the practice of dictatorships, not of democracies.

Discussing the question of democracy versus communism, I said on May 2, 1950:

The late Franklin D. Roosevelt, at a time of national emergency, told the people of this country that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself. Should another emergency arise, the American people will not be afraid to rise to the situation. Our problem is how to avoid that emergency, how to stave off disintegration from within and destruction of our freedom from without.

On another occasion, on May 24, I brought to the attention of Congress the excellent article by David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, published in the magazine Foreign Affairs, in which he discussed the new international labor organization created earlier this year in London and the role of free labor throughout the world as a dynamic force in the struggle against communism. On another occasion, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of a plan by Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers Union, in which he suggested a positive peace offensive to stop Communist aggression by initiating a program of economic and social action to eliminate poverty, human insecurity, and injustice which are the sources of Communist power.

Although I have spoken out against communism on numerous occasions, I was and still am opposed to so-called control bills. I opposed the Mundt-Nixon bill when it first came up 2 years ago, I opposed it when it was revived recently as the so-called Wood bill. I said then and I still say that such bills are bad, they will do us untold harm and will not help us solve the situation.

During my 1948 campaign I frankly told the voters that I had voted against the Mundt-Nixon bill and why. I made perfectly clear that if reelected I would vote against any similar bill.

I would have been duty bound to vote against the Wood-Mundt-Nixon bill this year if it were only as bad as the Mundt-Nixon bill of 1948. As a matter of fact, it was much worse.

The company in which I find myself in opposing this bill is small, but indeed select. It includes our President, Harry S. Truman; our Attorney General, J. Howard McGrath; FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover; our Secretary of Defense, Gen. George C. Marshall; our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson; our Director of Intelligence, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith; Gen. Dwight Eisenhower; Catholic Bishop Bernard Sheil, of the Archdiocese of Chicago; Philip Murray, of the CIO; William Green, of the A. F. of L.; Walter Reuther, of the UAW; David Dubinsky, of the ILGWU; and Jacob Potofsky, of the ACWU. I have no doubt that time will prove us right.

In opposing the bill in the House of Representatives on September 20, I said:

I bow to no man in or out of this Congress in a desire to preserve this country and its good, true—yes, divine principles of democracy. Time is too brief to call again to your attention the arguments that were raised against the Mundt-Nixon bill 2 years ago and then against the present bill a short time ago when we considered it. They are still valid against this bill.

I enumerated some of the dangerous parts of the bill. They were referred to at length by President Truman when he vetoed the bill. The bill is designed to catch votes and headlines but not spies.

As I told the Congress, the alien and sedition laws of 1798 were directed against subversives too. The reported cases, however, show that the only ones convicted and jailed under them were Republicans who opposed legislation espoused by the Federalists—the then majority party. I do not want my party prosecuting Republicans or even Dixiecrats, nor do I ever want to find Democrats in a position to be prosecuted by them—because of political or religious beliefs. Under this very bad law I can be prosecuted for urging its amendment or repeal.

I have and always will be in the forefront of every fight against totalitarianism under every guise and every name. Just as vigorously will I fight for our American principles of democracy.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

During my campaign of 1948, I said:

Stop discrimination against Catholic, Protestant and Jewish displaced persons. We want no Nazis here.

I am happy to report to my constituents that Congress finally passed a more liberal DP bill, minus most of the discriminatory clauses of the old DP Act. The number of DP's eligible to enter the United States has been substantially increased, certain preferences were established for orphans and children, while the eligibility date has been moved forward several years making many thousands of DP's eligible for admission. After 2 long years of struggle, our efforts in this matter finally were successful.

Let me add, that on March 15, 1950, I introduced a bill to provide nonquota immigration status for children coming to this country for adoption by American citizens. At a later date, I called the attention of Congress to the work being done by the International Refugee Organization which is caring for and feeding the DP's in the camps. I urged that sufficient funds be made available to this organization to help it find homes for the remaining DP's and thus finally resolve the DP question.

ISRAEL

During my campaign in 1948, I said:

A free democratic homeland is the hope of the Jewish people. It must not be bartered away by imperialistic powers, intent only upon private gain. Extend de jure recognition. Lift the arms embargo. Grant the loan. Stop aggression.

The picture has vastly changed during these 2 years. Israel is today recognized by nearly all the nations of the world, it is a member of the United Nations, the war on its frontiers has been stopped, the United States has granted it a $100,000,000 loan and has removed the arms embargo. Relations between Israel and the United States are most cordial and friendly, and Israel is supporting our efforts in Korea.

Earlier this year, when the Arab countries were arming at a furious pace and threatening Israel with a "second round," many of us in Congress demanded that this country take steps to prevent a renewal of bloodshed and to protest against British arms shipments to the Arabs. I was among the first to warn of "dire consequences" unless the armament race in the Near East is ended. Beginning in February of this year and succeeding months, I spoke on the matter in the House, I contacted personally high officials in our Government, I went with congressional delegations to Secretary of State Acheson. I exerted every effort in my power to gain active American support to secure the existence of the Jewish state. Finally, on May 25 the three-power declaration was issued whereby the armament race was ended and the nations of the Near East were warned against aggressive acts.

I also spoke out against the internationalization of Jerusalem, for peace between Israel and the Arab states, for economic assistance to Israel to help it stabilize its economy and integrate the hundreds of thousands of new immigrants entering the country. In April, when Israel celebrated the second anniversary of its independence, I organized a "Salute to Israel" on the floor of the House and more than 40 Congressmen participated with addresses and statements of greeting to the Jewish state and its leaders. At the request of the American Zionist Council, which includes all Zionist groups in the United States, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a review prepared by the Council of the accomplishments of Israel in the first 2 years as an independent state.

I was privileged to accompany to the White House, Mr. Benjamin G. Browdy, president of the Zionist Organization of America, on two different occasions and participate in conferences with President Truman concerning Israel, its political and economic problems, and its close ties with the United States.

OTHER ISSUES AND EFFORTS

The issues previously referred to were among the most important ones that came before the Eighty-first Congress. There were others, some of lesser importance from the international standpoint, but all of great significance to large segments of our population. In each such instance I took a stand fearlessly and worked assiduously to enact those ideas which I considered constructive and to oppose those which I considered detrimental. Let me enumerate just a few of these:

I introduced a bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit organizations in the construction of housing for families of moderate income.

I urged loans to needy students to enable them to continue their education over a period of 4 years at the rate of $1,000 per year.

Time and again I brought to the attention of Congress the plight of oppressed minorities all over the world, including that of the Jews in Russia, the true situation concerning Jewish life in that unhappy country, the rise of anti-Semitism there, the refusal to allow Jews to emigrate to Israel, and the extermination of Jewish religious and cultural life there.

On several occasions I protested the revival of anti-Semitism in Germany and the deterioration of democracy there, and our failure to denazify the Germans. On May 23, 1950, I introduced a resolution asking for the appointment of a bipartisan commission to investigate American policy in Germany.

I urged immediate ratification of the Genocide Convention of the United Nations to outlaw mass murder of whole peoples as practiced by the Nazis, and as threatened to be practiced by the Communists.

I protested against the rigged and phony trials of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary and of Cardinal Stepinac in Yugoslavia. I repeatedly urged our State Department to remonstrate with these governments against their incarceration.

I introduced a bill to issue a special postage stamp to honor the memory of Col. David (Mickey) Marcus, the Brooklyn hero who died in the fight for Israel's independence.

I introduced a bill to amend the Tariff Act by stabilizing import duties in order to encourage trade relations with foreign countries.

I supported and voted for the various reorganization plans submitted by President Truman to make the executive departments of our Government more efficient.

I protested vigorously to the House Committee on Post Office against the curtailment of the postal service as false economy and urged the reestablishment of the service and introduced a bill to accomplish that purpose.

I supported the President's point 4 program to aid underdeveloped areas of the world. I spoke up for Americanism, for religious freedom and brotherhood, a helping hand to Italy, unity of Ireland, dissolution of the monopolies in order to aid small business, and many other phases of activity in American life.

In arriving at my conclusion as to how to vote on legislation I always had in mind that veterans who had answered the call of their country and their families were entitled to certain rights and privileges which must always be respected and preserved and my vote has always been cast so as to preserve their best interests.

I am not touching at this time on the numerous efforts in behalf of the many constituents who called upon me for help of one sort or another. In every instance, I did everything I could to help them. The voters of my district have been good to me in permitting me to serve them. I have tried to reciprocate in kind.

CONCLUSION

The United States and all the free people of the world are now in the midst of a world crisis. Unity of purpose is the demand of the hour. The whole world looks to this country for guidance and leadership in the days ahead to make life more secure for ourselves and our children and to bring lasting peace to a tortured mankind that has not known the meaning of real peace for many years. I have great confidence in the American people, in their loyalty to the highest ideals of mankind, in their will to uphold and maintain our democratic way of life. With God's help, we will go forward to a better day.

Defense Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, communism is America's most dangerous enemy. It openly announced its intention to conquer the world, destroy all religion and enslave mankind.

Abroad it is feverishly arming and drilling millions of men, and here at home it is endeavoring to establish fifth columns with the avowed purpose of destroying our Government by force and violence.

Every precaution must be adopted and every safeguard provided to protect the Nation against spies and saboteurs and counteract subversive activities which

endanger our institutions or our form of government.

This is the purpose of the McCarran bill. But, as laudable as is the objective of the bill, it fails utterly in its intention and defeats the very purpose for which it was drawn.

This is the general consensus of practically every metropolitian newspaper in the Nation.

The following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is typical:

CALLING FOR A VETO

With the so-called antisubversive bill before him, President Truman has a magnificent opportunity to tell the Nation what the nature of the Communist threat to security really is. It is time for calm analysis in these days of fear.

Externally, the threat of Soviet imperialism is apparent enough. Internally, however, there is not and never has been direct danger from the few American Communists as a political party. It would be absurd to regard them even as a measurable political force.

The important domestic peril today is the possibility of espionage, sabotage, and actual subversive conspiracy. These are illegal and overt acts. And it is such overt acts, and not the propaganda or ideas of communism, which are menacing. Yet the bill before the President deals less with the real threat of illegal action than with the imaginary threat of ideas which have absolutely no appeal to the American people. Because of this the bill is dangerous, of doubtful constitutionality and largely unworkable.

1. The bill is dangerous because of loose definitions and wide grants of discretionary power. For example, the Attorney General would be permitted to cite "Communist action" groups for registration and special restrictions, upon only the vaguest legal instructions.

Hence it is possible that organizations or individuals not in the least subversive might be penalized or stigmatized. Senator DOUGLAS asserted that a party in power could use the bill to smear dissidents and enforce conformity.

2. The bill represents novel and doubtful concepts of fundamental law. In time of war or insurrection, the Attorney General could intern persons on "reasonable ground" that they might commit espionage. Senator FERGUSON stated that this grants power to "convict a man for his capacity to commit a crime." The Constitution does not provide punishment in anticipation of a crime.

Another section would punish conspiracy to perform any act which would "substantially contribute" to the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship. Under this vague phraseology might not a speech be a contribution toward such an act? The Constitution guarantees any American the right to advocate even extreme changes in government.

3. The bill is virtually unworkable because of its vagueness and because it attempts the impossible. The definitions of Communist groups are open invitations to lengthy court action, and Senator DOUGLAS concluded that it might be 6 to 12 years before any unregistered Communist could be imprisoned.

Aside from this, the bill is based on the assumption that subversive elements would voluntarily step forth and declare themselves. Some Communists might do this, merely as a front, but no spies or saboteurs would do so. Attorney General McGrath believes the measure would drive the most dangerous enemies underground and make the FBI's task more difficult.

What was needed, and what Mr. Truman requested, was a measure strengthening laws dealing with espionage and such overt acts. A few sections of the bill would do this and are thoroughly desirable.

But what the White House finally got was a shotgun wedding of five separate bills, conceived in haste and dedicated to the proposition that Congress had to do something about communism—and do it, apparently, before the November election.

Mr. Truman had already said he would veto one of these five bills. Four had been criticized in Congress as threats to personal freedom, before their sponsors reconsidered and accepted all of them. The result is the most extreme legislation since the abhorrent Sedition Act a century and a half ago.

Congress has the votes to override a veto, and a veto will require courage. President Truman has courage. He also has logic and law on his side. With a veto, he will have an opportunity to tell the citizens that this bill is no way to fight communism. It is a way to damage their liberties.

Similar views are expressed in an editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune:

FIGHTING SUBVERSIVES

The ideal antisubversive law would be easily enforceable. It would scrupulously safeguard the political and personal liberties of our citizens. It would provide every possible protection to the good names of the innocent. It would strike hard and directly at those who might threaten our national security in time of crisis as spies and saboteurs, while still permitting to the great body of our citizens a maximum of freedom of speech, thought, and action.

Such a law will probably never be enacted. But one might have expected something closer to this difficult ideal than the catch-all McCarran bill which the Senate passed and sent to the President Wednesday.

This bill is a disorderly accumulation of many antisubversive formulas. There are parts of it which will unquestionably assist the Government in its war on subversion over a period of time. But other parts can be enforced only with the utmost difficulty, and the bill resorts to such a broad, blunderbuss technique that there will be constant likelihood of hitting individuals, and puncturing freedoms, which should be safely out of range.

The Communist registration sections of the bill offer a conspicuous example of good intentions which may go badly awry when the flinty realities of enforcement are faced. These sections require the registration of all Communists and Communist-front organizations, as well as their officers and financial dealings. Communist organizations are supposed to register their individual members, too, but individuals are liable for self-registration if their organization fails to sign up for them. Penalties for nonregistration run up to a maximum fine of $10,000 and 5 years in prison.

As one Government official remarked, "This will work fine if the Communists cooperate." But if they don't—and their record on noncooperation with the Government is superbly consistent—the stage will be set for a long period of litigation. The machinery for enforcing registration set up by the McCarran bill could be stalled almost interminably by Communist delaying tactics, while the Communists themselves dug more deeply underground.

Likewise in an editorial carried by the Washington Post:

STAMPEDE

Panic and politics—and an irresponsible desire to go home—led the House of Representatives into a stampede late yesterday that overrode not only a presidential veto but a fundamental principle of American life. The President's message on the McCarran bill deserved more conscientious consideration. The exceptional importance he attached to it was attested by his unprecedented action in sending to each Member of Congress a letter which urged that the issue be given sober and searching reflection. This was an appeal which, coming from the President of the United States, no Member of Congress could decently ignore. It deserved the most serious thought. It should have taken debate on the measure out of the mire of politics into which it was plunged during its earlier consideration. It imposed upon the Members of Congress a solemn obligation to review the issue, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans responsible for the safeguarding of the Nation and of the Nation's distinctive and historic values.

The President's message presented, in our judgment, a carefully reasoned and compelling analysis of the McCarran bill. It demonstrated that, on strictly pragmatic grounds, the measure would injure the national security which its sponsors have sought to protect. Every agency of the Government entrusted with the responsibilities of safeguarding the country has informed the President that the bill would seriously impair its operations.

The President showed in detail that the registration provisions of the bill would in practice be wholly ineffective and would produce no information about Communists not already available to the FBI. He showed that so far as Communists are concerned, the bill imposes no penalties not already enforced and that it creates a grave danger that these penalties will be applied to legitimate activities by persons who are loyal citizens. He showed that the attempt to enforce the bill will entail a dissipation of energies needed for more effective internal security precautions.

The McCarran bill has made a tremendous appeal to patriotic Americans because it is anti-Communist in intent and appearance. But it will do no injury to the Communists. It will, as the President observed, "help the Communists in their efforts to create dissension and confusion within our borders." Mr. Truman offered an illuminating analogy to show the ineptness of the bill. "The idea of requiring Communist organizations to divulge information about themselves is a simple and attractive one," he observed. "But it is about as practical as requiring thieves to register with the sheriff."

Most of the message was devoted to demonstrating the disparities between the purposes and the effects of the bill. We are glad, however, that the President chose to lay before Congress the consideration of essential principle which justified his rejection of the measure. He presented as simply as it could be presented the basic American idea with which the McCarran bill is in irreconcilable conflict:

"There is no more fundamental axiom of American freedom than the familiar statement: In a free country, we punish men for the crimes they commit, but never for the opinions they have. And the reason this is so fundamental to freedom is not, as many suppose, that it protects the few unorthodox from suppression by the majority. To permit freedom of expression is primarily for the benefit of the majority, because it protects criticism, and criticism leads to progress."

It is this idea which the House overrode when it voted in such haste last night to reject the President's message.

One of the difficulties which prevented the adoption of a more effective plan of combating communistic subversion in the recently enacted bill was the necessity of harmonizing half a dozen different bills and reconciling the views of numerous able and patriotic Members of the House and Senate who collaborated in the drafting of the bill in the closing days of the session. Time was short and adjournment was pressing and as a result, the bill when finally reported out by the conference committee was a

catch-all and a hodgepodge of hastily assembled sections for which no one author or one committee was responsible.

As the New York Times well said:

As it passed the Senate Tuesday evening, the McCarran antisubversive bill is something of a hodgepodge. On the credit side, it now includes as a last-minute addition the Kilgore detention-center bill, which goes to the heart of the Communist problem. And it retains a few useful technical provisions that would strengthen existing security laws. But the fact that the bill embraces some good features does not alter the more important fact that it would impose infringements on the freedom of thought, speech, press, and political association that Americans have always held dear.

Of course it is necessary to protect our country from the menace of Communist aggression, whether in the form of Russian imperialism or of internal espionage and sabotage. But it has been and still is our belief that the principal features of the McCarran bill, far from achieving this goal, would interfere with it. Its registration provisions would ensnare Federal authorities in interminable litigation, while the Communist Party itself would be blithely going underground or making its appearance under a succession of aliases. Its prohibitory language is so broadly worded that there would be danger of involving in the toils of the law perfectly loyal citizens of leftist or radical or even merely unpopular views. Its immigration sections give vent to the peculiar versions of the know-nothingism that was rejected in this country nearly a century ago. This bill would strike primarily at beliefs; the real danger to our country lies far more in actual or potential espionage or sabotage at the hands of Russian sympathizers who may or may not be members of the Communist Party than in the public expressions of Communist belief, however offensive, mendacious and contemptible such expressions may be.

In this connection the St. Louis Globe-Democrat also said editorially:

UNWISE RED BILL

Attorney General McGrath was not altogether right in assailing the catch-all Red measure as evidence of hysteria. The lopsided majorities rolled up for this legislation in both Houses were politically inspired. Some Congressmen honestly believe in this bill. Others about to go on the stump seem to think American voters despise communism so bitterly they want any kind of blunderbuss statute aimed at Red rooting.

This is not as sound a political thesis as such Congressmen hope. American sentiment overwhelmingly fears and battles Red subversion in the United States. But there are millions of intelligent citizens who either have grave doubts about the McCarran bill compromise or oppose it outright.

A cogent argument can be made that this measure constitutes a bill of attainder, barred by section 9 of the Constitution. An attainder means an extinction of civil rights. The legislation does not specifically outlaw communism, its press, speech, or assembly, but it could be interpreted to abridge these rights and set up a thought-control section of Government.

The act of fomenting communism, Red spying, and overt treachery can be dealt with under present statutes. That has been demonstrated by the courts. The idea of communism or any other idea cannot be banned by statute.

But the plainest defect of this bill is its futility. It would force members of the Communist Party to register; also leaders of Red-front organizations. Registration cannot flush Communists. The most menacing Reds have always worked secretly and law will not change that. Communist Party members can simply tear up membership cards and burn CP records. Prosecution would be next to impossible, and they will go underground, as they have publicly proclaimed.

The registration feature of this law just won't work. The section authorizing internment of Reds in time of war could work extreme hardship and injustice. Besides, the FBI will take care of the spy and saboteur hazard if crisis comes. It has done so effectively before. Other provisions of the bill, however, are excellent and needed to bolster existing treason and espionage acts. For instance, the section extending the statute of limitations on acts of spying and betrayal of national secrets.

The President is faced with a dilemma. The Communist-control measure embraces valuable provisions, but other sections are repugnant, dangerous, and impossible to enforce. The bad features outweigh the good. Mr. Truman should veto this bill, then call for a more realistic act that can strengthen the Government's drive to bare and destroy Red cells festering among us.

Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the effort which our colleagues on the committee have made to provide a workable bill, and it is a particular disappointment that the composite measure falls so far short of the needs of the hour. I have long urged aggressive action to weed out Communists both in business and in Government. I sponsored the resolution in the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress under which we dismissed civil-service employees of the Government suspected of being Communists.

Again in the second session of the Eightieth Congress I introduced House Resolution 500 providing for an investigation to make similar dismissals of any Communist found in the Government service. But the political control of the Congress had changed for that one Congress and the committee refused to report the resolution to the House.

In support of that resolution, I said in the course of debate in the House on March 11, 1948:

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have witnessed within the last 3 years and especially in the last 3 weeks, the destruction of free governments and the subjugation of free people throughout Europe and Asia. In each country it has been an instance of undisguised, unwarranted, and unprovoked aggression, such as can be found only in remotest medieval history.

The pattern followed in the conquest of each of these sovereign states has been identical. First, the foreign aggressors have organized a fifth column on the inside; then they have placed Communists in key positions, and through infiltration have taken over the control of the important administrative offices. Eventually they close in and send all patriots who oppose them to concentration camps or liquidate them before firing squads, or with the assassin's knife. The result is that without a declaration of war, without firing a shot, except in assassination or intimidation, they have subjugated great and prosperous nations and conscripted and sequestered life and property as arbitrarily and as completely as in any ancient despotism.

Now, the feature of this incredible usurpation and devastation which concerns us and which gives rise to apprehension in every civilized country today is that it is all a part of a progressive program. There might have been occasion to think, when they first took over two or three neighboring nations that there was some particular need for the establishment of zones or buffer states which justified their acquisition. But, the deadly and considered method of these rapidly spreading conquests has now become all too evident to leave room for any doubt about their ultimate objective.

All the testimony before our committee corroborates the conclusion that it is a part of a long conceived and carefully planned campaign of world domination, not only of government but of ideologies, of philosophies so alien and so hostile to our institutions and our form of government as to make it impossible for both to exist in the same country. No one can doubt that these series of conquests, the absorption of state after state, have for their eventual purpose the conquest of America.

I do not have to say that the foremost desire of every American citizen, so far as our international relations are concerned, is to avoid a third world war. As a people we would make almost any reasonable sacrifice to establish enduring peace. But here in the third year since the close of the war we are no nearer a treaty guaranteeing the integrity of the nations of the world than we were when Japan capitulated. And as far as we can look into the disturbed and uncertain future there is today no prospect for peace or any agreement of any kind short of armed readiness for any eventuality.

Under these unhappy circumstances and in the light of the tragic experience of a dozen nations which have been destroyed from within, the integrity and loyalty of the employees of our Government becomes our first line of defense. If those employees are not dependable, if disloyalty creeps into the citadel itself we are nearing the beginning of the final crisis. We would then be following precisely the pattern followed in the subjugation of every European and Asiatic state which has been taken over.

There is reason to believe that vast sums of money have been expended and a far-reaching network of espionage has been at work in this country for some time with the purpose of establishing a fifth column which, when the opportune time arrives, will cooperate with disloyal forces on the inside to take over our Government and destroy the very agencies that should protect us. So, any charge, Mr. Chairman, that there is disloyalty among Government employees of the United States, however fantastic it may appear merits our earnest attention. With that in view, I have introduced this resolution.

During every Congress, in which I have served on the majority side of the Committee on Appropriations, including the present Congress, the committee has never failed to report in full the amounts requested by FBI and other Federal agencies charge with the investigation and control of subversive activities.

Accordingly, I voted for the rule to consider the bill and for the bill itself when it passed the House. On the face of the bill it did not promise effective control but I voted for it in the hope that it would be improved in conference.

But, as the President sets out in his veto message, and as corroborated by the overwhelming editorial opinion of the Nation, the bill does not control the Communists. Instead it would help them. In actual operations, the bill secures results exactly the opposite of those intended. It weakens our existing internal security measures and seriously hampers the Federal Bureau of Investigation and our other security agenices. Instead of supplementing the deficiencies of our present laws the bill weakens rather than strengthens them.

The bill has been carefully analyzed by the Department of Justice, of which the FBI is a part, by the Department

of Defense presided over by such men as General Bradley, Admiral Sherman, and General Vandenberg, by the Central Intelligence Agency which is in better position to weigh the effect of such legislation than any other Government agency, and by the Department of Defense now under the direction of General Marshall, one of the ablest and best-loved men in public life today. All these key departments report unanimously against the bill and urge its rejection.

And for good reason. Incredible as it may seem, administration of the bill would require publication of every vital defense installation in the country, the location and the function of our A-bomb plants, our munition factories, our navy yards, and every war production center which an enemy would endeavor to put out of commission, either by saboteurs or by surprise attacks from the air. When my committee visited Oak Ridge, during the last war, we came and went by secret plane in the night and the members of our own families did not know where we had gone. During the war, and since the war, spies have constantly sought to locate and map these installations. And now a bill passes the Congress which provides for the publication of location of every such plant in America. Do you wonder that the President vetoed the bill and that Members, devoted to the suppression of communism, could not vote for it?

The bill also provides for the admission and naturalization of aliens and foreign nationals years before they would be eligible for naturalization under our present laws. Under existing laws applicants must wait 10 years before becoming eligible for citizenship but under this bill, subversive aliens become eligible for naturalization as soon as they withdraw from organizations required to register under the law—which might be the next day.

The bill would seriously handicap the FBI in its control of subversives. Not only would it overburden the Bureau with impossible demands upon its time and resources in the attempted discharge of hopeless duties imposed by the law, but it would require the disclosure of information, and sources of information, of the most vital character. An important official of the FBI told members of the committee the enactment of the law would set the FBI back a decade in its work. And FBI, of course, is the indispensible factor in the control of communism in the United States.

One of the most serious effects of the bill would be its interference with the Federal loyalty program. Under this program we have apprehended and dismissed great numbers of disloyal employees, but under this law, for example, the Attorney General could be enjoined, and his designation of subversive organizations held in suspense, approximately 2 years or more.

Incidentally another weird effect of the bill would be the demand for self-incrimination on the part of Communists required to register, who would thereby be required to acknowledge violation of the Smith Act specifically penalizing participation in efforts to overthrow the Government by force, or membership in organizations advocating such doctrine.

Many other deficiencies in the law could be cited but the fatal defect in the law is the opportunities it affords for interminable delay in the administration of the law.

As one advocate of the measure rather quaintly suggested: "Registration under the law requires cooperation on the part of the Communists." And, as the President pungently observed, "It is about as practical as requiring thieves to register with the sheriff."

They would, of course, refuse to register. As a matter of fact the press reports that Roy M. Wood, chairman of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia, said that neither the party or its members would register under the law. "The Communict Party of the District of Columbia will not register under the fascistic law," he said.

Conservative lawyers estimate—and no advocate of the bill denies—that from 2 to 4 years must elapse before the Supreme Court can pass on even the first case. In the meantime defendants enjoy full liberty, and wide publicity, and will be free to carry out any assignment by alien or local Communist leaders against the peace, property, and security of the Nation. Even the minimum of 2 years, would be ample time in which to put into effect any such campaign of espionage, sabotage, death, and destruction, the McCarran law to the contrary notwithstanding.

Even simpler tactics could stall the law and submerge the FBI hopelessly in its futile efforts to administer the law. Under the routine, subversive organizations are notified to submit the roster of their members. When submitted the FBI sends out a form letter to everyone on the list. If anyone so named denies membership in the organization, the FBI automatically makes an exhaustive investigation to determine the facts. Any subversive organization, directed to submit its roster, could file all the names in the telephone books of the city and bog down the FBI beyond hope of extrication.

And, of course, other recourses would be open to the defendant. Change of name, dissolution and reorganization, and other alternatives would all be available to the subversives in the 2-year legal hide-and-seek period allotted them under the law.

And experience demonstrates that the most dangerous and insidious malefactors are far too clever to affiliate as members of the Communist Party and could not be registered under any interpretation of the law.

The law is utterly ineffective and, as the President has indicated, would obstruct rather than contribute to the defense of the Nation in the apprehension of subversives and the control of communism.

In the hurry and confusion which always attends the last days of a long session there was little time for study of the report hastily reported out of conference, and the Members, relying on mass action on the bill, voted conventionally or in the expectation that the bill would be revised when the House returns.

The Christian Science Monitor explains:

Political expediency reached perhaps the highest point in current congressional history when Congressmen overrode the President's veto of the so-called anti-Communist bill and promptly adjourned until after election day.

There may have been a dozen in the Senate and a score or so in the House who sincerely believed that they were curbing communism by this particular means when they voted for the omnibus bill. But these few believers were a small minority of those who voted in favor of the bill.

Most of those who passed it did so with grave doubts that it actually would reduce communism, with an uncomfortable suspicion that on the contrary it probably would be a publicity asset to communism if it ever were enforced strictly, and with a comforting assumption that it probably never will be enforced strenuously.

In short, the vote reflected not the considered opinion of Congress on how best to curb communism but only the considered opinion of most Congressmen on how best to keep out of trouble on election day. The bill is known in headlines as the anti-Communist bill.

Whether it is an effective anti-Communist bill is beside the point politically. The politician figures he can lose no votes by being for something labeled "anti-Communist," but might well be hurt if he had played this one the other way. The great majority decided to play it politically safe.

That the bill actually will curb communism is extremely doubtful. The most responsible and authoritative opinion possible on this matter is certainly that of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which has an impeccably anti-Communist record, which is the agency of Government most familiar with communism in the United States, and which must attempt to enforce the bill. The FBI did not want it. The FBI thinks that its operations against domestic communism will become more difficult under the new bill than they were before.

Usually the men of Congress pay respectful attention to the views of the FBI. But this was a case where the legislators didn't feel they could act on the merits of the case.

Thus, there is on the statute books a law which the President says will help communism, which the FBI thinks will make it harder to watch and catch Communists, and which most legislators, irrespective of party, think is unworkable.

Incidentally, Congress was in too much of a hurry to get to the hustings to bother to vote any money for enforcement of the new law. Hence not much is likely to be done about it until and unless this omission is repaired.

The Washington Star corroborates in the same vein:

It is just as well that the current congressional campaign can be concluded in less than 6 weeks. In one respect at least it is not a very edifying spectacle. Too many of the candidates are seeking reelection on a claim that does them no credit. The claim is that on the issue of communism they can be just as hysterical, or more so, than their opponents. Democrats, as well as Republicans, that is the appeal they are making to the voters. They are holding up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to prove that they voted for the Mundt-Ferguson-Nixon-McCarran-Wood bill, despite a 5,500-word Presidential veto begging them not to saddle the Government with legislation so unworkable and potentially dangerous.

But the whole atmosphere surrounding the enactment of this 1950 version of an alien and sedition law was one of political panic. The people's leaders were running from the people, in the mistaken belief that the people had become an unruly, unreason-

ing mob and that the only way to appease this mob was to prove that you were just as scared, or even more scared, than the next fellow. That seemed to be the case with quite a number of the Senators and Representatives. In private conversation many admitted their grave misgivings concerning the legislation, but said they didn't dare oppose it, that to do so would mean defeat at the polls.

That's how it was with some of our statesmen. They simply closed their ears to reason and ran. It does not excuse their votes, if they voted in defiance of their own convictions. And many admit that they did.

Living, as our democratic system does, by politics, it is unfortunate that politics so frequently brings out the worst in us. Never has it been more unfortunate than in the present instance.

Here we have a Congress whose Members genuinely and wholeheartedly loathe communism, voting to put themselves in the wrong and the Communists in the right. Possibly, in a saner and more courageous mood following the election they will find ways of undoing some of the damage they have done. On the other hand, the campaign being the sort that it is, they may commit themselves so deeply to their folly that it will be impossible for them to take corrective action.

As suggested by the press of the country in a number of editorials, the remedy is a restudy and a redrafting of the bill when the House returns in November.

Among those submitting this suggestion, the Baltimore Sun says:

NEVERTHELESS, THIS NEW ANTI-RED STATUTE WILL HAVE TO BE REVAMPED

The Congress has now passed the new anti-Communist law over the President's veto. But there are significant details in the ballot that should not be overlooked. The House acted by less than the three hundred-odd affirmative votes by which it normally expresses itself on anti-Communist issues. Some of the best (and, it must be conceded, some of the worst) men in the Senate put up a filibuster that was exhaustive in the precise physical sense.

These are signs that the President's long and eloquently argued veto message had some, if not a conclusive effect. For Mr. Truman really outdid himself in this message. Wise in the legislative process himself, he unerringly laid his stress on the bill's greatest weaknesses—its pot-pourri, grab-bag, catch-all character, and the fact that its multifarious provisions duplicate in a less effective way many sound measures already on the books. And the leading one of these measures, of course, the Smith Act, has yet to be tested for constitutionality. Yet if the Smith Act is upheld the need for the new law will be lessened; while if the Smith Act is rejected, whole sections of the new law will fall by analogy.

The President was particularly telling against that provision of the law that would require a published listing of defense factories. Months of work by enemy spies would be saved by this provision, he insisted. He was again strong in his denunciation of the exclusionary immigration provisions of the law. There is no point in making access to America unduly free to those who would subvert it; but the President made a good case for his point that the present law goes much too far.

On one phase of the measure that has especially troubled libertarians, Mr. Truman was unexpectedly mild—and quite confusing. This is the internment camp provision, which, surprisingly, was sponsored by some of the Senate liberals. No doubt Mr. Truman did not wish to offend them. But when he criticized these provisions largely because they did not authorize suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, the President confused many who felt the maintenance of this old safeguard was to be desired even in emergencies.

A particularly troublesome passage in the veto message deals with the registration provisions of the new act. Here the President used two mutually repugnant arguments which canceled each other out. He said (a) the registration sections would be hard to enforce because of legal technicalities and ultimate appeal to the courts; and he said (b) that the registration provisions strike at civil liberty. But they do not strike if technical safeguards exist and if the courts can intervene; and Mr. Truman gave too little notice to the fact that his Attorney General is already doing by mere administrative fiat, without hearings and without appeal, some of the things the registration sections of the law propose to do by something far closer to due process.

On balance, however, and on the whole, the message was a good one. Certainly it was a brave one. Mr. Truman's vigilance on the Communist issue has not always been lively. For him to stand now against extremism in anti-Communist legislation opens him to charges from extremists which could be damaging in an election year.

It is, indeed, the election year aspects of the matter that will strike citizens hardest. The President's own Senate leader, Mr. LUCAS, probably summarized the prevailing legislative motivation when he stated: "The American people are anxious to have an anti-Communist bill placed on the State books." Just any bill, apparently, the Senator thinks.

But he is wrong. The people want a bill that will work—and work only against subversion without pulling innocent libertarians into the line of fire. The Congress could enact such a bill by amending the present measure in the relative calm and quiet of the postelection session. And possibly, by that time, it would have the guidance of a Supreme Court decision under the Smith Act, authoritatively restating the constitutional principles which must be held to in the general anti-Communist field.

The Washington News also suggests that the bill be taken up for revision when Congress reassembles again:

THE VETO MESSAGE

Only time can tell whether Congress has made the "terrible mistake" which President Truman believes it made by passing the so-called Communist control bill over his veto.

But certainly Congress did not give the veto message the careful consideration which it deserved, and for which Mr. Truman had sent a personal plea to each Member.

It was an exceedingly impressive message. Its tone was temperate. Its statement of the principle that this free country should punish men for crimes they commit, but never for opinions they have, was eloquent. Its explanation of the reasons why the President felt compelled to disapprove the bill, after huge majorities of both parties in both branches of Congress had voted for it, was painstaking and persuasive.

Yet, the adjournment-headed House could hardly wait for its reading clerk to drone through the message before starting its roll-call vote to override the veto.

And, though the Senate went into a long night session, there was little more evidence there of open-minded willingness to discuss the President's arguments on their merits.

Mr. Truman may be mistaken in his opinion—an opinion which, he said, is also held by the Departments of Justice, Defense, and State and the Central Intelligence Agency—that the law which now goes on the statute books will help, not hurt, the Communists.

The dangers which he sees in this legislation—dangers to national security, to America's relations with other friendly nations, to the rights of all citizens—may be less than he believes, or may be nonexistent.

Laws previously enacted may be—and, in this newspaper's opinion, are—less adequate than Mr. Truman thinks to protect the country from "the real dangers of treason, espionage, sabotage, and actions looking to the overthrow of our Government by force and violence."

And, unquestionably, the votes in Congress on this bill reflect a heavily predominant belief among the American people that strong and comprehensive new legislation is needed.

But legislation enacted in such times of stress as these can be, and in other such times has been, too comprehensive and too strong to be wise and safe. The people and their Congress cannot afford to be too sure that Mr. Truman is mistaken.

When Congressmen reassemble again, in November, they should give Mr. Truman's veto message thoughtful attention. And then, in the calmer, postelection light, they should be resolutely prepared to enact such legislation as appears to be needed by the situation as it exists at that time.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, in view of the widely expressed dissatisfaction with the bill, the impracticability of its administration in its present form, and in conformity with the universal demand for an effective defense against communistic and other subversive organizations threatening the peace and security of the Nation, I am introducing the accompanying bill and it is here submitted for study and discussion during the recess of Congress:

A bill to protect the security of the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Domestic Security Act of 1950."

SEC. 2. Section 793 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 793. Gathering, transmitting, or losing defense information

"(a) (1) Whoever, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense with intent or reason to believe that the information is to be used to the injury of the United States, or to the advantage of any foreign nation, goes upon, enters, flies over, or otherwise obtains information concerning any vessel, aircraft, work of defense, navy yard, naval station, submarine base, fueling station, fort, battery, torpedo station, dockyard, canal, railroad, arsenal, camp, factory, mine, telegraph, telephone, wireless, or signal station, building, air force base, office, or other place connected with the national defense, owned or constructed, or in progress of construction by the United States or under the control of the United States, or of any of its officers, departments or agencies, or within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, or any place in which any vessel, aircraft, arms, munitions, or other materials or instruments for use in time of war, including items related to nuclear energy, are being made, prepared, repaired, processed, or stored, or are the subject of research and development under any contract or agreement with the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or with any person on behalf of the United States, or otherwise on behalf of the United States, or any prohibited place so designated by the President by proclamation in time of war or in case of national emergency in which anything for the use of the Army, Navy, or Air Force is being prepared or constructed or stored, information as to which prohibited place the President has determined would be prejudicial to the national defense; or

"(2) Whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, and with like intent or reason to believe, copies, takes, makes, or obtains, or attempts to copy, take, make, or obtain, any sketch,

photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, document, matter, writing, or note of anything connected with the national defense; or

"(3) Whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, receives or obtains or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain from any person, or from any source whatever, any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, matter, or note of anything connected with the national defense, knowing or having reason to believe, at the time he receives or obtains, or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain it, that it has been or will be obtained, taken, made, or disposed of by any person contrary to the provisions of this chapter; or

"(4) Whoever, lawfully having possession of, access to, control over, or being entrusted with any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, matter, or note relating to the national defense, or information relating to the national defense which information the possesor has reason to believe could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation, willfully communicates, delivers, transmits, or causes to be communicated, delivered, or transmitted, or attempts to communicate, deliver, transmit, or cause to be communicated, delivered, or transmitted, the same to any person not entitled to receive it, or willfully retains the same and fails to deliver it on demand to the officer or employee of the United States entitled to receive it; or

"(5) Whoever having unauthorized possession of, access to, or control over any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance matter, or note relating to the national defense, or information relating to the national defense, which information the possessor has reason to believe could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation, willfully communicates, delivers, transmits, or causes to be communicated, delivered, or transmitted, or attempts to communicate, deliver, transmit, or causes to be communicated, delivered, or transmitted, the same to any person not entitled to receive it, or willfully retains the same and fails to deliver it to the officer or employee of the United States entitled to receive it; or

"(6) Whoever, being entrusted with or having lawful possession or control of any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, note, matter, or information relating to the national defense—

"(A) through gross negligence permits the same to be removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of his trust, or to be lost, stolen, abstracted, or destroyed; or

"(B) having knowledge that the same has been illegally removed from the proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of his trust, or loss, or stolen, abstracted, or destroyed,

and fails to make prompt report of such loss, theft, abstraction, or destruction to his superior officer—

"Shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"(b) If two or more persons conspire to violate any of the foregoing provisions of this section, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be subject to the punishment provided for the offense which is the object of such conspiracy.

"(c) No prosecution shall be brought under this section or under section 792 or 794, except upon the express direction of the Attorney General of the United States."

SEC. 3. (a) The analysis of chapter 213 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 3281 of such title, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"3291. Espionage and security of defense information."

(b) Chapter 213 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 3290 the following new section:

"SEC. 3291. Espionage and security of defense information.

"An indictment for any violation of sections 792, 793, 794, 795, 796 or 797 of this title may be found at any time without limitation."

SEC. 4. The act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631; 22 U. S. C., 611–621), entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Strike out the word "and" at the end of section 1 (c) (3), insert the word "and" at the end of section 1 (c) (4), and add the following subsection immediately after section 1 (c) (4):

"(5) any person who has knowledge of, or has received instruction or assignment in, the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or subversive tactics of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party, unless such knowledge, instruction, or assignment has been acquired by reason of civilian, military, or police service with the United States Government, the governments of the several States, their political subdivisions, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the Canal Zone, or the insular possessions, or unless such knowledge has been acquired solely by reason of academic or personal interest not under the supervision of or in preparation for service with the government of a foreign country or a foreign political party or unless, by reason of employment at any time by the Department of Justice or the Central Intelligence Agency, such person has made full written disclosure of such knowledge or instruction to officials within those agencies, such disclosure has been made a matter of record in the files of the agency concerned, and a written determination has been made by the Attorney General or the Director of Central Intelligence that registration would not be in the interest of national security.

"In no event shall the exemptions from registration provided by sections 3 (c), (d), and (e) of this act be available to any person who is an agent of a foreign principal by virtue of this subsection.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of this act, the Attorney General, in his discretion and having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may withdraw from public inspection any registration statement filed by a person who is an agent of a foreign principal by virtue of this subsection."

(b) Add the following subsection immediately after section 8 (d):

"(e) Failure to file any such registration statement or supplements thereto as is required by either section 2 (a) or section 2 (b) shall be considered a continuing offense for as long as such failure exists, notwithstanding any statute of limitation or other statute to the contrary."

SEC. 5. (a) The analysis of chapter 67 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1381 of such title, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1385. Promulgation of security regulations."

(b) Chapter 67, title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 1384 the following new section:

"§ 1385. Promulgation of security regulations.

"(a) Whoever willfully shall violate any such regulation or order as, pursuant to lawful authority, shall be or has been promulgated by the Secretary of Defense and approved by the President of the United States for the protection or security or military or naval aircraft, airports, airport facilities, vessels, harbors, ports, piers, water-front facilities, bases, forts, posts, laboratories, stations, vehicles, equipment, explosives, or other property or places subject to the jurisdiction, administration, or in the custody of the National Military Establishment, or of any department or agency of which said establishment consists, or of any officer or employee of said establishment, department, or agency, relating to fire hazards, fire protection, lighting, machinery, guard service, disrepair, disuse, or other unsatisfactory conditions thereon, or the ingress thereto, or egress or removal of persons therefrom, or otherwise providing for safeguarding the same against destruction, loss, or injury by accident, or by enemy action, sabotage, or other subversive actions, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be liable to a fine of not to exceed $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.

"(b) Every such regulation or order shall be posted in conspicuous or appropriate places.

"(c) In time of war, or national emergency as proclaimed by the President, the provisions of this section may be extended by Presidential proclamation to include such property and places as the President may therein designate in the interest of national security."

SEC. 6. Section 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 890; 57 Stat. 553; 8 U. S. C. 156), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. (a) That the deportation of aliens provided for in this act and all other immigration laws of the United States shall be directed by the Attorney General to the country specified by the alien, if it is willing to accept him into its territory; otherwise such deportation shall be directed by the Attorney General within his discretion and without priority of preference because of their order as herein set forth, either to the country from which such alien last entered the United States; or to the country in which is located the foreign port at which such alien embarked for the United States or for foreign contiguous territory; or to any country in which he resided prior to entering the country from which he entered the United States; or to the country which had sovereignty over the birthplace of the alien at the time of his birth; or to any country of which such an alien is a subject, national, or citizen; or to the country in which he was born; or to the country in which the place of his birth is situated at the time he is ordered deported; or, if deportation to any of the said foregoing places or countries is impracticable, inadvisable, or impossible, then to any country which is willing to accept such alien into its territory. If the United States is at war and the deportation, in accordance with the preceding provisions of this section, of any alien who is deportable under any law of the United States, shall be found by the Attorney General to be impracticable or inconvenient because of enemy occupation of the country when such alien came or wherein is located the foreign port at which he embarked for the United States or because of other reasons connected with the war, such alien may, at the option of the Attorney General, be deported (1) if such alien is a citizen or subject of a country whose recognized government is in exile, to the country wherein is located that government in exile, if that country will permit him to enter its territory; or (2) if such alien is a citizen or

subject of a country whose recognized government is not in exile, then, to a country or any political or territorial subdivision thereof which is proximate to the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject, or with the consent of the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject, to any other country. No alien shall be deported under any provision of this act to any country in which the Attorney General shall find that such alien would be subjected to physical persecution. If deportation proceedings are instituted at any time within 5 years after the entry of the alien, such deportation, including one-half of the entire cost of removal to the port of deportation, shall be at the expense of the contractor, procurer, or other person by whom the alien was unlawfully induced to enter the United States, or, if that cannot be done, then the cost of removal to the port of deportation shall be at the expense of the appropriation for the enforcement of this act, and the deportation from such port shall be at the expense of the owner or owners of such vessels or transportation lines by which such aliens respectively came, or, if that is not practicable, at the expense of the appropriation for the enforcement of this act. If deportation proceedings are instituted later than 5 years after the entry of the alien, or, if the deportation is made by reason of causes arising subsequent to entry, the cost thereof shall be payable from the appropriation for the enforcement of this act. A failure or refusal on the part of the masters, agents, owners, or consignees of vessels to comply with the order of the Attorney General to take on board, guard safely, and transport to the destination specified any alien ordered to be deported under the provisions of this act shall be punished by the imposition of the penalties prescribed in section 18 of this act: *Provided*, That when in the opinion of the Attorney General the mental or physical condition of such alien is such as to require personal care and attendance, the said Attorney General shall when necessary employ a suitable person for that purpose, who shall accompany such alien to his or her final destination, and the expense incident to such service shall be defrayed in the same manner as the expense of deporting the accompanied alien is defrayed. Pending final determination of the deportability of any alien taken into custody under warrant of the Attorney General, such alien may, in the discretion of the Attorney General (1) be continued in custody; or (2) be released under bond in the amount of not less than $500, with security approved by the Attorney General; or (3) be released on conditional parole. It shall be among the conditions of any such bond, or of the terms of release on parole, that the alien shall be produced, or will produce himself, when required to do so for the purpose of defending himself against the charge or charges under which he was taken into custody and any other charges which subsequently are lodged against him, and for deportation if an order for his deportation has been made. When such an order of deportation has been made against any alien, the Attorney General shall have a period of 6 months from the date of such order within which to effect the alien's departure from the United States, during which period, at the Attorney General's discretion, the alien may be detained, released on conditional parole, or upon bond in an amount and specifying such conditions for surrender of the alien to the Immigration and Naturalization Service as may be determined by the Attorney General. If deportation has not been practicable, advisable, or possible, or departure of the alien from the United States has not been effected within 6 months from the date of the order of deportation, the alien shall become subject to further supervision as is authorized hereinafter in this section.

"(b) Any alien, against whom an order of deportation, heretofore or hereafter issued, has been outstanding for more than 6 months shall be subject to supervision under regulations prescribed by the Attorney General. Such regulations shall require any alien subject to supervision (1) to appear from time to time before an officer designated by the Attorney General for identification; (2) to submit, if directed by such designated officer, to medical and psychiatric examination at the expense of the United States; (3) to give to such designated officer information under oath as to his nationality, circumstances, habits, associations, and activities, and such other information whether or not related to the foregoing as the Attorney General may deem fit and proper; and (4) to conform to such reasonable written restrictions on his conduct or activities as are prescribed by the Attorney General in his case. Such regulations shall also require that any alien subject to supervision shall be denied access to any area designated by the Attorney General, if in the opinion of the Attorney General the presence of such alien in such area would endanger the national security.

"(c) Any alien who willfully fails or refuses to comply, and any person who counsels, aids, advises, abets, or encourages any alien not to comply, with any requirement imposed by or pursuant to subsection (b) of this section shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both: *Provided*, That the alien may be released from such imprisonment by the Attorney General if the alien's deportation can be immediately effected at any time during the term of his imprisonment.

"(d) If any alien subject to supervision under subsection (b) of this section is able to depart from the United States, except that he is financially unable to pay his passage, the expense of such passage to the country to which he is destined may be paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of this act, unless such payment is otherwise provided for under this act."

SEC. 7. (a) The President may, during rebellion or invasion, suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, as he may deem necessary in the interest of the public safety, and is hereby authorized, acting through the Attorney General, to apprehend and detain each person as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe will engage in, or will conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage, sabotage, or other activity inimical to the public safety.

(b) Any person detained hereunder shall be released from such emergency detention upon—

(1) the termination of such emergency by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress;

(2) an order of release issued by the Attorney General.

(c) The President is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he shall deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(d) Whenever there shall be in existence an emergency within the meaning of this section, the Attorney General shall transmit bimonthly to the President and to the Congress a report of all action taken pursuant to the powers granted in this section.

SEC. 8. (a) Chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately following section 1506 of such chapter, a new section, to be designated as section 1507, and to read as follows:

"1507. Picketing, parading, or interfering with administration of justice.

"Whoever interferes with, obstructs, or impedes the administration of justice, or attempts to influence any judge, juror, witness, or court officer, in the discharge of his duty by picketing, parading or other activity in or near a building housing a court of the United States, or in or near a building or residence occupied or used by such judge, juror, witness, or court officer, or uses any sound truck or similar device or resorts to any other demonstration in or near any such building or residence, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"Nothing in this section shall interfere with or prevent the exercise by any court of the United States of its power to punish for contempt."

(b) The analysis of such chapter is amended by inserting, immediately after and underneath item 1506, as contained in such analysis, the following new item: "1507. Picketing, parading, or interfering with administration of justice."

SEC. 9. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the employment of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any corporation or other agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) may be terminated by, and in the absolute discretion of, the head of the department, commission, board, or other establishment or agency in which such officer or employee is employed whenever the head of such department or other such entity shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

SEC. 10. Nothing in this act shall be so construed as to alter or modify procedures in connection with determination as to loyalty of employees of the Federal Government under Executive Order 9835, or to interfere with proceedings under such order.

SEC. 11. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 12. The Internal Security Act of 1950, Public Law 831 (81st Cong.), is hereby repealed.

Mr. Speaker, summarizing briefly:

First. The bill eliminates impracticable provisions of Public Law 831 such as the requirement of publication of list of defense production facilities which would supply vital defense information directly to foreign governments.

Second. It eliminates unworkable and unconstitutional features of Public Law 831 as, for example, the registration provision.

Third. It is so drawn as to make its provisions clear, concise, and unequivocable, and readily administered.

Fourth. It provides a workable detention provision which can be invoked when needed and permits suspension of the writ of habeas corpus in accordance with the terms of the Constitution as opposed to the cumbersome, impractical provisions of Public Law 831 which fails to authorize suspension of the writ.

Fifth. It gives the President power to designate areas where security regulations may be enforced in time of war or emergency as requested by the President; authority was not included in Public Law 831.

Sixth. It protects the Federal Bureau of Investigation from the necessity of disclosing confidential sources of data as would be required in the administration of Public Law 831.

Seventh. It interdicts interference with the currently operating and effective loyalty program, whereas Public Law

831 leaves doubt as to whether the loyalty program, which functions under Executive order, can continue, pending determination of issues in the courts.

Eighth. It authorizes the heads of all agencies to dismiss employees without delay or interference of red-tape procedures whenever the security of the Nation requires.

Ninth. It strengthens the law with respect to gathering, transmitting or losing defense information and eliminates the statute of limitations on violations of the laws relating to espionage.

Tenth. It strengthens the current law with respect to registration of foreign agents.

Eleventh. It strengthens the laws providing for promulgation of security regulations and deportation of aliens.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, permit me to include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, summarizing the situation and paying a richly deserved compliment to the President of the United States:

A BIG MAN IN DEFEAT

The McCarran thought-control bill is on the lawbooks and Harry S. Truman stands up a bigger man than ever before in his life.

The President from Independence had everything on his side but the votes in Congress.

Yesterday the Post-Dispatch printed every word of Mr. Truman's veto message. We did so because we wanted each one of our readers to have the opportunity to study it for himself.

We wish that every American could have sat in the visitors' gallery in Congress and heard that courageous paper of state as it came from the White House.

We wish that every citizen could have known before final passage what this law does to him or her.

For we believe—as confidently as we have ever believed anything—that this law would not have passed if our 150,000,000 people knew the extent to which it invades their cherished liberties and how far it goes to endanger their security in a time of national emergency.

Congress has put itself up as knowing more than three Federal departments—Defense, State, and Justice—and the Central Intelligence Agency. All these reported that the McCarran bill would damage our security and make our operations against subversive agents more difficult.

These dangers were set out clearly in the President's veto. One muddled provision is enough to show how little thought many Members of Congress gave to what they voted on.

This is the requirement that the Federal Register print a public list of all defense facilities, war plants, laboratories, and other essential security installations—no matter how secret up to now.

As the President said, this hands vital information to the Communists and to the agents of any possible enemy—and "on a silver platter." Many an officer in the armed services has been severely punished for a breach of security inconsequential compared with this one ordered by Congress.

What we have seen is a gross miscarriage of representative government.

Six weeks before the congressional elections—6 weeks before an application of the principle of self-government, our lawmakers collapse under pressure of hysteria, fear, and partisan politics.

The depressed peoples of Asia and Europe look hopefully to America to demonstrate the purpose and scope and strength of the democratic ideal.

Instead, we stage an exhibition that is thoughtless, frightened, partisan, mean, vindictive, shameful.

It is enough to make Jefferson and Madison and Lincoln rise from their graves to join President Truman in his magnificent appeal for a return to sanity.

Mr. Speaker, the accompanying bill is, of course, tentative. It is submitted as a basis of consideration when Congress returns in November. However, it has been carefully studied and has been prepared in collaboration with authorities familiar with the subject and with legislative procedure.

It is to be hoped it will have the attention of all interested in the effective defense of the Nation in this decisive hour.

Daily Worker Attacks Crusade for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, previously I have reported on a check of recent issues of the Daily Worker with reference to the Communist-inspired Stockholm peace petition. There have been three such articles up to September 20 which I want to call to my colleagues' attention. The first appeared in the issue of September 3 under the headline, "Two million in United States sign A-ban: DuBois hits 'foreign agent' slur." The article is as follows:

America's signature of the world peace appeal passed the 2,000,000 mark last week as the administration pressured the Peace Information Center to register under the provisions of the Foreign Agents Act—an action Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, the peace group head, branded as "fantastic absurdity."

The Peace Information Center—formed last April—has been supplying Americans with materials and facts of various groups working to prevent a third world war and atomic catastrophe. In addition to the world peace appeal to ban the A-bomb, it has supplied similar material from the International Red Cross, the World Council of Churches, and others.

Dr. DuBois declared such attacks have but one purpose: "To intimidate those working for peace, whether in support of the World Peace Appeal, the International Red Cross statement calling for banning atomic weapons, or the teachings of the Prince of Peace Himself."

Dr. DuBois made his statement via trans-Atlantic phone from Paris where he has been traveling. "I can state categorically," he declared, "that there is no basis, in fancy or in fact, for the charge that the Peace Information Center is a representative in any way of a 'foreign principal.'"

The Negro leader—a world-famous anthropologist and historian—emphasized that the peace group he heads is an entirely American organization whose sole objective is to secure peace and to prevent a third world war.

He said the fantastic absurdity of the Justice Department's demand is demonstrated in the failure of the Department even to indicate on whose behalf we are supposed to be acting.

Dr. DuBois declared the Department of Justice action will not erase the 2,000,000 signatures already secured for the world peace appeal.

"I am sure," he said, "that these 2,000,000 signers and countless millions of Americans who hate war will defend the right to speak and work for peace."

The work of this peace group has been supported by many thousands of Americans, including outstanding figures in the scientific, religious, and political world.

Dr. DuBois is the only Negro member of the National Academy of Arts and Letters. He is a world-known savant, with three degrees from Harvard and is a recipient of honorary degrees from five American universities.

One of the most revered men in Negro life, he founded the well-known Negro magazine Crisis and was a director of research for the NAACP from 1910 to 1932 and from 1944 to 1948. He was chairman of the peace information group since its inception.

Another significant development on the peace front occurred this week when President Truman and the mayors of 192 American cities were asked by 70 leading public figures to act as one against those who seek to interfere with the right to petition, speak, or act for peace.

Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, former governor of the Virgin Islands, and Dr. John B. Thompson, dean of the Rockefeller Memorial Chapel, University of Chicago, issued the letter.

The signers said they were Americans who differ among themselves on many issues, including a solution to the problems of world survival presented by the threat of atomic war. But they believed, they wrote, that they would be disloyal if they condoned for one moment the subversion of American democracy manifested in these assaults and arrests of workers for peace.

The signers included 1946 Nobel peace prize winner, Emily Greene Balch; Dean Wilner G. Katz, of the University of Chicago law school; Dr. Kenneth Brown, president of Dennison University; Dr. Linus Pauling, of the California Institute of Technology, former president of the American Chemical Society, who was decorated by President Truman and the French Government for his work on atomic research.

Again, I sincerely hope that all those who are mentioned in that article will be as vigorous in their open and immediate support of the Crusade for Freedom which is now being circulated in this country as they are in their sincere interest in the protection of the right to petition, speak, or act for peace.

The second article appeared on September 5. Its sole significance lies in the fact that the editors of the Daily Worker are obviously concerned about the immediate response of Americans to the Crusade for Freedom. Its despicable smear of fine Americans will be recognized by all of us as the kind of Communist slander and libel which every American must expect whenever he challenges Communist propaganda and lies. I hope that it will be possible for every single Member of Congress to lead off in his district or State in signing the petitions in support of the Crusade for Freedom. The article is entitled "The 'Crusaders' Gang Up on the Stockholm Peace Plea" and is by Art Shields. It is as follows:

One well-known name is missing from the list of sponsors of the committee to fight the Stockholm peace pledge that Gen. Lucius D. Clay is launching this week. The missing sponsor is Ilse Koch, the "Beast of Buchenwald," whom Clay pardoned when she was

doing time for making lamp shades out of human skin. Clay's committee of bankers and war profiteers will have no firmer supporter, however, than the wife of the commandant of the Buchenwald murder camp.

General Clay's group is called the Crusade for Freedom Committee. It is officially directed against the peace petition campaign that is troubling the war profiteers so much. Clay's "crusaders" are circulating a rival petition, asking Americans to fight against "tyranny and aggression." This means communism, explains Clay.

The new war crusade was given a send-off with a radio address by five-star Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower last night.

Big shots on Clay's committee include Lawrence M. Giannini, the president of the $6,000,000,000 Bank of America, the country's biggest bank. This rich crusader is also a big stockholder in the $5,000,000,000 National City Bank, the second biggest bank. Another rich crusader committee leader is Arthur W. Page, a director in the Rockefeller's Chase Bank, the Mellon's Westinghouse Electric Manufacturing Co., and the Morgan's Kennecott Copper Co. All three outfits are war profiteers.

DULLES GUIDING SPIRIT

The crusaders' guiding spirit, however, is Allen W. Dulles, whose anti-Soviet spy activities have been often advertised. Dulles is also the counsel and former director of the Schroder bank, a notorious Anglo-German-American institution, with many Nazi connections. And he is a brother of John Foster Dulles, the liaison man between the Nazis and Wall Street, who incited the war against Korea.

Another enthusiastic crusader is Cardinal Spellman, who broke the New York gravediggers' strike and who seeks to plunge America into war against the Soviet Union.

Another Clay committee member is George N. Craig, national commander of the American Legion, who called for the atom bombing of the Soviet Union in a recent speech.

CAREY IN CRUSADE

Clay's committee is promising millions of signatures. It hopes to get these millions in big industrial plants and churches and schools. Some elements of the clergy and right-wing labor leaders are expected to help.

AFL President William Green, CIO President Philip Murray, and CIO Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey have been added to the committee to line up workers for the war crusade.

The crusade committee, however, is controlled by the war profiteers, not by their labor stooges.

Clay himself is a big Wall Street tycoon. The bankers were highly pleased with the general's services in protecting the Nazis and turning Germany over to the American cartelists when he was head of the American military government. So they gave him three financial posts when he retired.

The general is now chairman of the board of directors of Continental Can Co. This is a $200,000,000 outfit that cashes in on war contracts.

The AMG chief, who freed the Nazi beast, is also a director of the billion-and-a-half-dollar Chemical Bank & Trust Co.

IN AFRICA SLAVE TRADE

The Crusade for Freedom chairman is also exploiting thousands of African copper miners at 40 cents a day and less.

Clay (like James F. Byrnes, former Secretary of State) is a director of the Newmont Mining Corp., with large copper mining interests in the Union of South Africa and Northern Rhodesia.

Any genuine Crusade for Freedom should begin by liberating these terribly oppressed African workers, who are flogged or imprisoned if they won't go into the mines. Flogging and imprisonment are the penalties meted out to African natives who lack the money to pay the Government head tax.

To get this tax money they have to work in the mines.

This African slave trade is also of interest to another top crusade committee member, Frank Altschul. He served for years as a partner of the Wall Street firm of Lazard Freres, which has large South African mining interests.

Crusader Altschul is now president of the powerful General Investors Corp., which handles big deals for Lazard Freres and Lehman Bros. It was set up jointly by the two banking houses.

A dozen other big labor-busting Wall Street executives pass before my eyes as I scan the committee's members and sponsors. One notices, for instance, Lt. Gen. Ira B. Eaker, who doubles as vice president of the strike-breaking Hughes Tool Co., and as chairman of the California division of the crusade committee. It is a mockery to think of such men as devotees of freedom.

But America's working people want peace. And the 336,000,000 plain people throughout the world, who signed the Stockholm peace pledge, are determined that the patrons of Ilse Koch shall not bathe the nations in blood again.

The last article I have seen from the Daily Worker on this subject is in the issue of September 20. It is entitled, "Shop Peace Parley To Discuss China." Previously I have reported on the unanimous action by all American labor organizations in denouncing the Stockholm peace petition and those who seek to bring labor organizations into a position of apparent support of their efforts. This group calling itself the New York Labor Conference for Peace undoubtedly is following the pattern used by others who, without the shadow of authority, have stolen the word "labor" to use for their own malicious purpose. I am sure that American labor organizations, not only deeply resent this, but will do everything in their power to expose it and, further, will encourage the members of their organizations, individually and collectively, to support the Crusade for Freedom and to sign the petitions being circulated in its behalf. The article is as follows:

The New York Labor Conference for Peace, an organization which circulates petitions against the A-bomb and favors mediation of the Korean war, will give major attention to United States relations with China at a shop stewards, and delegates, peace conference Saturday at 1 p. m. at 13 Astor Place.

Trade-unionists from the eastern seaboard and the Middle West will attend the conference, according to Samuel Freedman, chairman of the labor group. A national committee meeting of the Labor Peace Conference is also scheduled for Saturday and Sunday in New York.

The Nehru proposals for mediating the Korean war and seating the People's Republic of China in the UN will be presented to the conference by Shiv K. Shastri, director of the Information Division of the Embassy of India. Shastri was designated to attend the conference by Madame Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Ambassador of India to the United States, Freedom disclosed.

A policy statement on China to be submitted to the conference, warns that a hostile foreign policy toward China can lead to hostilities with China and with those nations on the continent of Asia which, like India, look upon China as the most effective assurance of stability in Asia.

Sharply critical of a policy which places a virtually complete trade embargo on China's 450,000,000 people, the draft statement estimates that if our per capita shipments to China were increased to equal our per capita exports to the Philippines, we would sell China $10,000,000,000 worth of goods annually and add 2,000,000 peacetime jobs at home.

"The Labor Peace Conference has been urging trade-union officials to sign statements for mediation of the Korean war, along the lines of the Nehru proposal," Freedman said yesterday. One such statement, prepared by the New York Labor Conference for Peace, will have more than 500 signatures of trade-union officials by the time of the Saturday conference, he predicted. It is planned to submit these statements to Warren Austin, head of the United States delegation to the UN.

Greece and Korea: Two Victims of Soviet Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I made a trip with the House Foreign Affairs Committee which took me through the country of Greece, and during that time I had the pleasure of meeting a young Greek journalist and author by the name of Stephanos Zotos.

Mr. Zotos is a foreign correspondent of two conservative Greek newspapers, the Hestia and the Embros, both published daily in Athens, Greece, and he is an accredited correspondent to the United Nations here in the United States—since February 1949.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to insert the following article written by Mr. Zotos entitled "Greece and Korea: Two Victims of Soviet Aggression." This article, I think, will be of interest to all Members of Congress.

GREECE AND KOREA: TWO VICTIMS OF SOVIET AGGRESSION

(By Stephanos Zotos)

All war stories have an identical start. A few shots are fired somewhere in the immense arena of international disputes. These shots are intensified or silenced according to circumstances. These circumstances are dictated by the military preparedness or unpreparedness of the nations involved, directly or indirectly, in a conflict.

South Korea is the second victim of an armed aggression carefully prepared and launched by the Kremlin. The first victim was Greece. Since her liberation from the German occupation, in September 1944, Greece has been attacked twice by the Soviet-led Communists.

The main resemblance between the aggressions against Greece and South Korea lies in the fact that they were conceived by Moscow which in both cases used its satellites to achieve its aims of conquest.

The major difference between them is theoretical only. Six years ago when Greece was attacked for the first time, west and east, still allies, were fighting together against Germany. Besides, no collective action could have been taken. The United Nations had not been created yet. When the second attack against Greece occurred

in 1946, the west was not physically and intellectually mature enough to realize the exact nature of the Greek case—at least not at the beginning. Moreover, 4 years ago possibilities of an understanding between east and west existed.

Today they have completely vanished. We aren't talking or thinking in terms of agreement anymore. Instead it is through equations that we are trying to determine our strength and the might of our Communist enemies. The west has reached the point at which it realizes that only force can meet force. Through this new prism imposed upon our thinking and acting by the evolution of events, the aggression against South Korea has appeared to us in a new light.

The treacherous dagger that was thrust into the backs of the Greek and South Korean peoples at different historical moments was, however, exactly the same bloody dagger detached from the Soviet arsenal.

In 1946 some people were inclined to believe the war in Greece derived its roots from internal factors. Today everyone knows that what Moscow terms "internal dissatisfaction" or "an aggression launched by American imperialism" is nothing else but a poor pretext designed to camouflage the real purposes of an action undertaken by Russia itself. An action that is only a part of the long-range program drawn up by the masterminds of the Kremlin.

The first attack against Greece was launched in December 1944. At that time the so-called Greek Liberation Army, which claimed monopoly of the resistance against the German, Italian, and Bulgarian invaders, almost succeeded to take power. Although represented in the first Greek Government of the liberation period, the Greek Communists promoted a full-scale armed revolution. They were finally subdued, thanks to a handful of British who assisted Greek soldiers and police.

This first assault cost Greece considerable misery and devastation. Sixty thousand people were executed, and 20,000 others were taken as hostages into the neighboring iron-curtain countries where the defeated Greek Communists sought and found cordial refuge.

The second incursion came in 1946, ravaging Greece almost 4 years, meeting elimination only a few months ago. During these 4 years the Greek Communist forces were given full military and economic support from Russia's three satellites, Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, the last of which finally ceased supplying aid after an ideological dispute with the Cominform. Had it not been for American grants amounting to $1,000,000,000 in military and economic aid, and for the heroic resistance of the Greek people, Greece would have been today just another satellite of Russia's Red empire.

The casualties and destruction resulting from the second aggression were extremely heavy for a country that had been at war since 1940. The Greek Nation suffered the loss of 30,000 soldiers on the front; 28,000 children abducted by the Communists and still in captivity in the iron-curtain countries; and 2,000 villages destroyed by guerrilla raids. In addition, 750,000 refugees were driven from their homes by the Communist bestiality. Only now are they returning to their former villages where they are trying with precarious means at their disposal to rebuild what the hammer and sickle have erased from Greece's soil.

Both the Greek and Korean questions were referred to the United Nations. The Korean issue was placed before the world organism by the United States in 1947 after American-Russian negotiations in Seoul failed because of Soviet insistence that Korean representatives unsympathetic to the Kremlin should be barred from consultation in the establishment of a Korean Government.

The Greek question was brought to the attention of the United Nations early in January 1946. Ironically, it was first introduced by the Russians, and at the very time their Greek Communist mercenaries were standing alert, ready to cross the Greek border. The question was placed before the UN Security Council by a letter of the Russian delegate which, under article 35 of the Charter, charged the presence of British troops in Greece was a threat to international peace and security. Russia's intention was obvious. Moscow was attempting to eliminate the British presence in Greece so that the task entrusted to the Greek Communists might have better chances to succeed.

The Greek question came again before the Security Council in August 1946, with the Ukrainian representative charging this time that the policy of the Greek Government had produced a situation in the Balkans endangering international peace and security. Of course, neither allegation was sustained by the Security Council.

Meanwhile, the war was on in Greece.

In December 1946, the Greek Government placed its case in the hands of the Security Council. Since that time the Greek problem has been under study in the United Nations under the denomination of "Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece." Two commissions set up at different dates by the Security Council established that the Greek Communist guerrillas were given full support by Russia's satellites. One of these commissions—the "watchdog"—is still in Greece.

An almost similar United Nations commission was established in January 1948, for Korea. It was at work when shooting started in the South Korean capital.

It is worth while to note that until shooting started June 25 on the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea, the United Nations followed an almost identical procedure in the cases of Greece and Korea.

The symptoms which provoked the Security Council's decision to send military assistance to South Korea had prevailed, however, in Greece since 1946. Yet this decision could not have been taken in the case of Greece—although some western diplomats believe it should have been taken—for reasons already explained, and because of Russian presence in the United Nations at the time of the Communist aggression against Greece.

Today we are facing an all-out effort of the United Nations to stop aggression in South Korea. For the first time in its short history, the United Nations has decided to provide military assistance for an attacked country, and this, despite the fact that the victim was not a member of the United Nations. The decision became possible because of the Soviet absence from the Security Council and therefore because of the lack of veto which would have torpedoed any effective resolution.

But there is another fundamental factor that led the United Nations to take such a historical measure.

The international situation is more tense than it was 4 years ago. Today we are closer to the possibility of a world war. A victim of a Communist aggression is more effectively supported than could have been a nation attacked 4 years ago. The world is definitely divided into two adverse camps. The demarcation line has been drawn between freedom and slavery.

The free countries outside the iron curtain are given full support because they belong geographically and militarily to the western alliance. The west cannot afford to repeat mistakes which permitted Germany, before the Second World War, to absorb one country after the other, until there were so many victims and so many prospective targets that world shooting started.

The question now is if there is going to be a third, or perhaps more victims. And if so, which will be the eventual third?

Already alarming reports from the Balkans do not exclude the possibility of a recurrence of what was attempted in the past.

However, the United Nations army is already alerted. It is believed that any new aggression will be faced at least as drastically as the South Korean question was met by the western world.

Since June 25, 1950, Communist activities are not matched with theoretical resolutions only. The western army under the blue banner of freedom and civilization is on its way.

Lee Pressman Lies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I would be less than human if I did not say that it gives me considerable satisfaction to direct the attention of my colleagues to an article written by Dick Reynard in the September 9 issue of the New Leader, entitled "Lee Pressman Lies."

During the course of the 1948 political campaign which he waged against me, some of my neighbors chose to disbelieve the charge that he was the No. 1 Communist of the country. I wonder what they are now saying about his plea of guilty.

The article is as follows:

LEE PRESSMAN LIES—FORMER CIO GENERAL COUNSEL ISN'T TELLING ALL HE KNOWS ABOUT COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES

(By Dick Reynard)

Lee Pressman, one-time adviser to political and labor giants, is a liar. He is a cunning liar.

For, in the past week, he almost convinced four of America's shrewdest newspapermen that he was telling them the truth. He tried separately, in various cities, to give them each the very same story as the exclusive tale of his ideological "break" with the Communist Party.

What he wanted most was to have the country unfold its morning newspapers last Monday, just as he was going on the congressional witness stand, and read in these publications, ostensibly independently, about the virtues of this man. At that moment he would be telling the Capital's assembled newsmen that his high sense of political morality would prevent his disclosing what he knew about the American and international Communist apparatus. Here, indeed, the public would say, was a man of principle.

But this maneuver failed. The newsmen checked with each other. Mr. Pressman made enemies of men who wanted to trust him. Instead, they attacked him.

Lee Pressman got on the witness stand and told the querying Congressmen that no man in CIO had ever asked him if he was a Communist. Since the politically sophisticated world knows that such labor leaders as Walter Reuther would hardly permit a decade to slip by in CIO without protesting Mr. Pressman's loyalty to the party line, Pressman's professing to have been unquizzed on this sensitive subject simply makes a public fool of Philip Murray—if taken as the truth.

However, the truth is that Philip Murray did call Mr. Pressman in no less than 10 or

12 times and ask him directly. The truth is that Philip Murray did call Mr. Pressman and Comrade Juniper, alias Julius Emspak, and Tovarisch Jim Matles, and ask them if they were Communist Party members.

The fact is that Mr. Pressman, frequently with tears in his eyes, energetically denied this each time. The fact is that Philip Murray, not wishing to disrupt his organization, protected this man. And now we hear him go into the national spotlight and deliberately demean the president of the CIO.

Mr. Pressman lies when he says that John L. Lewis never put it to him. The fact is that John L. hated him toward the end of Lewis' presidency of CIO. The fact is that Mr. Lewis has told other labor leaders of this hatred and eventual distrust, and that it was Henry Wallace who recommended that Mr. L. hire Mr. P.—another detail about which Pressman has lied to newspapermen.

Mr. Pressman is a liar of long standing.

For years he told Mr. Murray that his decisions in CIO were intellectually independent.

But he admitted to columnist Victor Riesel that for over 10 years he met secretly with the then Communist Trade Union Commission commissar, Roy Hudson; the Communist Party chairman, William Z. Foster; and the Communist Party secretary and boss, Gene Dennis.

And when Pressman and Murray got into a bitter quarrel over the second-front policies, the lend-lease resolution of the CIO, which virtually came out against lend-lease, and the Marshall plan statement—all of which Mr. Pressman wrote under careful guidance of the party line—Mr. Pressman told his chief client that these were his own objective viewpoints.

Mr. Pressman is autobiographically confused. He gets on the stand and testifies that he quit the Communist Party in 1935. Yet there are those who could, if they would, testify that he was in the party until 1939 and then simply didn't renew his Red card. What difference? Ben Gold has just done that. Does it make him any the less a Stalinist?

Mr. Pressman is chronologically confused. He has said that for 2 years he has been undergoing considerable psychological heartburn over whether to speak or not to speak.

Now that is odd, to say the least.

Until recently he had been handling some legal matters for the Soviet Embassy.

Until recently he was closely associated with Abe Pomerantz' law firm, the legal counsel to Gubitchev, that addict of espionage, international romance, and television.

Until recently he was handling cases for the International Workers Order, an official Communist organization.

Until recently he cooperated with the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, the American Labor Party, the American Round Table on India, the Civil Rights Congress, the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, the International Juridical Association, and other pro-Communist fronts.

Only as recently as 1948 congressional campaign, the entire Communist Scratching and Squalling Society converged on his congressional district and ran for him one of the dirtiest congressional campaigns in history.

Until recently he has refused to talk to the FBI. Now it must be understood that the Bureau never betrays any confidences. It would not even report that he had spoken to it. No one need ever have known. There was no moral issue involved—if, as he said privately to one of the newsmen, he really was "ready to fight for his country." (Which he qualified by saying: "If attacked.") He simply could have told the FBI agents what he knew and all Government agencies would have permitted him to drop into the obscurity he deserves.

He could, for example, have told us the whole story about John Abt, the man who helped create the Cominform's World Federation of Trade Unions, now about to launch world-wide, rolling-strike sabotage of United Nations forces in the Orient.

He could have told us how Abt met with international Communists; how Abt wrote the CIO statement on, oh, what a wonderful democracy Russia was (issued when a CIO group returned from Moscow). He could have told us how Abt ran the CIO Political Action Committee. Or how Abt got passports during the war when only the military and its VIP's could get to London.

He could, for example, tell us all about the Communists' wartime activity, for he was CIO liaison man with the White House then, and frequently made decisions in the name of Phil Murray on matters which Murray never heard of.

You get the point by this time!

This piece has been rough on Mr. Pressman, but no rougher than he was on thousands of others when he was riding high in CIO—for Mr. Pressman was a tough, disciplined party liner.

WHY DID HE LIE?

Yet, Mr. Pressman, who undoubtedly will be quite angered by all this, should realize that he brought it all on himself. There is an insensate arrogance about a man who tries so hard to con so many people who were genuinely eager to help this personable chap, this husky, ex-varsity swimming and wrestling champ. Yet he lied to most of these people, including the few newsmen he saw. Why?

What makes Pressman run? Has he broken? Why did he do what he did?

Well, there are those who believe that he wants the respectability needed to continue in law practice, and continue to represent the little steel-fabricating people he has been advising.

There are those who say he would like to get back into the CIO and has been wooing Phil Murray (which he has).

NEW HISS TRIAL?

There are those who believe that by denying he knew Hiss in the four-man cell—at which they sat around and read books, he would have us believe—he was preparing the ground for a new Hiss trial by introducing testimony contradicting Chambers, thus supplying new evidence.

There are those who say he simply doesn't want to be rounded up with other Commies and their friends if war comes.

And there are those who believe he is simply a part of a not very subtle Communist maneuver to get some back into high places in the CIO.

But there are none that I know of who believe Mr. Pressman has told even 1 percent of what he knows.

So it all seems like such a waste of energy on his part—and ours, too.

Minerals Production and the Public Domain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources, before the annual convention of the American Mining Congress, at Salt Lake City, Utah, August 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Secretary Chapman has asked me to bring you his greetings and best wishes for a successful meeting. He is most anxious to take advantage of every opportunity to meet with the minerals industry so that together we can work out the problems posed for us by the current situation in Korea and elsewhere overseas.

For that reason, Secretary Chapman called the National Minerals Advisory Council into special session in Washington, D. C., earlier this month. In preparation for that session he instructed me to hold preliminary meetings with mining executives in Denver, Boise, and Spokane to get first hand their views on our mutual problems. The National Minerals Advisory Council will meet again this week in Salt Lake City and departmental officials have been invited to attend.

We all know that defense agencies will increase their call on many minerals. Civilian demands alone are already equal to or outrunning our current capacity to produce some of these items. To meet total needs, therefore, we shall have to increase our capacity to produce in these fields.

The Congress, in the Defense Production Act of 1950, is now offering specific aids to the minerals industry to expand its production of essential minerals. Although the bill is not yet available in final form, I think we can review its general outlines, always recognizing that there may be some last-minute changes.

Here are the specific provisions which will help the minerals industry to expand exploration, to speed development of new metallurgical processes, and to increase production from both active and inactive deposits.

First, the Government can make direct loans to private enterprise, and loan guaranties to private banking institutions, for expansion of existing capacity, for development of new capacity, for exploration and mining, and for development of technological processes and production of materials. Loans can be made for defense purposes without regard to the usual limitations governing Federal lending agencies. For instance, loans for exploration could be repaid out of revenues, which would relieve the operator of liability in the event that he did not discover usable deposits.

Second, the Government can make long-term procurement contracts which will guarantee a market to the minerals operator for a reasonable period and at a price adequate to cover the cost of production. This permits paying more than the market price to stimulate immediate production from new or inactive mines. The price can also be adjusted to cover costs of exploration and development in search of new minerals.

Third, the Government, through use of its priorities and allocations authority, can channel steel and other materials to the mining industry and the mining machinery industry for essential work, whether it be exploration, expansion of mining operations, or expansion of processing. The Department of the Interior will probably be designated as a claimant agency to assist the industry in applying for its requirements.

Fourth, the Government may have funds made available under supplementary appropriations to step up its own research, exploration, and development programs. The Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey can widen the search for new deposits, either through direct operations, or by contract with private companies. The Bureau of Mines

can expand its metallurgical experimentation and pilot plant operations; successful processes developed will be available to industry for commercial operations, aided by Government loans and procurement contracts if necessary.

I know that many of the operators here have already begun to review their own programs to see how they can expand production, with or without the help of these new aids in the Defense Production Act. It is vitally important that you set up speedily a schedule of the specific projects you can activate, revive, or initiate for exploration, for new mining developments, for new processing development, for reopening inactive operations, and for expanding present production of essential minerals.

While concentrating on these new methods for expanding minerals production, the Government is continuing its attempts to clear away impediments which the industry tells us are hampering production.

One long-standing problem is the tax structure as it affects mining operations, according to the reports given us by representatives of the minerals industry. We are told that the tax structure inhibits exploration and production of minerals and that it discriminates against the minerals industry in comparison, for example, with the oil industry.

In the interest of the minerals industry, Interior Department has been exploring this problem with Treasury Department officials, who, I am pleased to be able to tell you, are giving sympathetic consideration to the characteristics of the mining industry. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John Graham has, at our request, taken the unusual step of sending one of his tax experts to be on hand at this conference as my adviser. He will sit in with me in your sessions on taxation to learn better your point of view.

The taxation problem, as all of you know, is not a simple one. It will not be easy to solve nor will it be solved in a hurry. Secretary Chapman wants to assure you, however, that we are working on it.

Another impediment which is hindering the minerals industry from expanding production to the utmost is the Federal mining laws, the subject you have asked me to discuss with you today. Discussion of changes in the mining laws has a history equally as long as discussion of changes in the tax structure.

I would like to dispose, frankly, of any misconceptions which may have arisen between us in this history of discussion.

I am very well aware that some quarters of the minerals industry fear that adding a comma or transposing a sentence in the existing mining laws is merely one way of getting the foot in the door in order to change the entire system of mining laws and substitute leasing for patents. Secretary Chapman has authorized me to say that the leasing system is not at issue here. The Department of the Interior is not considering or contemplating any action or legislation which would apply the leasing system to hard-rock mining.

In the last year or so we have reviewed our position with relation to changes in the mining laws. Along with all others who have studied the problems seriously, we believe that the laws could well stand some revision, and that proper revision can remove the impediments the present laws place in the way of legitimate mining operations. But we don't intend to upset the apple cart merely to throw out a few bad apples.

We don't pretend to know the answers or even all the problems connected with revisions of the mining laws. However, numerous discussions with leaders in the mining industry and in other industries have brought to our attention a number of assumptions concerning the mining laws. I am presenting these assumptions to you now, not as conclusions, but merely as bases for further discussion.

First, everyone seems to want the mining laws to be as simple as possible. They should contribute to the finding and producing of minerals on public lands. That means making it easy for minerals producers to operate within the laws.

It is certainly true that the mining laws and accompanying regulations are not simple now. They have made patenting of mining claims both slow and difficult. Industry leaders have objected to the necessity for exactly concurrent posting of notices and advertisements. I have received complaints about so-called nuisance filings on fractional areas adjacent to mining claims and suggestions that these should be subject to patent without discovery.

Conflict between claimants for the same location considerably slows the patenting process. This overlapping of claims for the same land, much of it unintentional, is inevitable when there is no central place for filing all claims. Invariably the only method of settlement is lengthy and expensive court action. Those with mining claims now have no opportunity to file objections if an application is submitted for an oil lease, for instance, on the same land, because the officials granting the oil lease are not aware that the mining claim exists.

Now some of these complications to which there is objection are in our regulations and not in the mining laws. Secretary Chapman has ordered a complete review of these regulations to make sure that we sift out any that are causing us trouble if it can be done. These regulations have been so bulwarked by court decision, however, that we greatly risk our decisions being thrown out of court unless we follow the present rules. For instance, when we have wanted to accept notices of posting and advertising, each running for 60 days but not exactly concurrent, we have been warned that the case would not be upheld by the courts. For that reason some of these regulations in fact can be changed successfully only by changing the laws.

Second, it seems to be generally agreed that the mining laws should be up to date, that they should relate to the facts of mining life today. The mining industry now uses technological processes unknown when the mining laws were first enacted. The industry now operates on a larger and more costly scale than possibly could have been envisaged 75 years ago. Mining claims today are more likely to come in batches than singly because we are looking more and more for minerals that are not exposed on the surface but which can be expected to be found in a zone covering numerous single claims.

Industry leaders have said that the present assessment requirement is something of a joke. Certainly that is a contributing cause to the succession of moratoria. One hundred dollars expended each year on a number of separate claims is often labor and money piddled away. If this money were blocked up in space and time—i. e., if work on one claim could be applied to contiguous and cornering claims, and if work in 1 year could be applied to the few years preceding the following—then it would be easier to show results for the money expended in improvements.

The present mining laws do not reflect the need for geophysical and geological exploration to locate deep-seated minerals. For that purpose the use of fairly large areas for limited periods of time is needed. Mr. Charles Willis, chairman of the public land subcommittee of the National Minerals Advisory Council, says that you need something in the nature of a prospecting permit which can later be developed into a claim after discovery. Instead, we have two cases, for example, from around Silver City, N. Mex., where prospecting by geological and geophysical methods for uranium-bearing ores was hampered by many small claims plastered over the area. As a result, large-scale operation was abandoned.

I understand from industry leaders that the holder of a mining claim wants either to continue development work looking toward production or else to patent it and retain it for further use at another time. The mining laws should facilitate both these objectives. If the miner wants to develop his claim, the law, by its definition of assessments, should allow him to use the most modern methods and give full recognition to his work. On the other hand, if the miner wants to patent his claim, the law should make it possible to do this simply and speedily with a minimum of procedure.

Third, I am told that the mining industry is understandably and properly jealous of the mining laws and is interested in their being used only for the promotion of mining. It is expected that the mining laws will give the full protection for mining originally intended when the laws were passed. It is assumed that the mining laws will provide the miner with all the authority needed for a legitimate mining venture, including all the surface he needs for his operations.

If it is agreed that this is what the mining laws should do, it follows logically that there are some things the mining laws should not do. Certainly the last thing desired is to have the mining laws referred to as the "hot-dog-stand law" or the "gas-station law." Yet that is exactly what it has become in too many places.

Perhaps you know the story—the true story—about the man along the Snake River who established a tourist camp on a gravel bed. He says it is a mining claim, but his income comes from the tourist court. He hasn't been digging or selling any gravel.

In California a man recently sold a garage, a filling station, and a motor court along the main highway. He obtained the land as a mining claim. The very fair price he got when he sold it did not reflect the values of any minerals on the claim, for he had discovered none. The price reflected the thriving tourist business enjoyed by the garage, the filling station, and the motor court.

Our files are full of such examples and I am sure that many of you are familiar with them, too. Mining operators are not responsible for these abuses and misuses in the mining laws. Probably all the operators would second Mr. Willis when he told me, "You should be very much concerned about people filing mining claims in order to use them for hot-dog stands or blocking road rights-of-way; I agree that's wrong."

We in the Department are very much concerned about invalid mining claims. However, these claims don't often come to our attention unless the land is going to be used for a specific purpose. Further, if we don't classify the land and reserve it for another purpose, such as a reservoir site, a military reservation, or a small tract, someone else can file another invalid mining claim as soon as the first one is cleared. We could save the taxpayer some money if the mining laws were changed to make the clearance of invalid claims less cumbersome administratively

Although miners are not responsible for these abuses, the mining industry nonetheless is criticized for the misuses of the mining laws for nonlegitimate purposes. Naturally, people ask how can the mining industry allow its chief legal instrument to be so prostituted.

Fourth, everyone heartily favors the conservation of our natural resources and the

optimum use of our public domain. These resources and this land belong to all of us; we all have a vested interest in seeing it properly used and its benefits fully realized.

Since 1872, when the first mining laws were passed, the area to which they were applied—the public domain of our great West—has changed immeasurably. In the early days the western lands were barren of population. Only the miner, in search of precious metals, was daring enough to enter some of the forbidding mountains and to explore some of the arid plains. In time, however, civilization caught up with him. When he made a strike it paid others to follow him. In time the land which seemed useful only for mining became more valuable for other purposes.

Now we manage our public domain on a multipurpose basis. We want to put it to the best possible uses. This might be mining in some places. In others it might be recreation for a greatly expanded population; in still others it might be grazing; in some places its greatest value is in the timber on the land. Some public domain covers watersheds. There we must protect the soil and forest cover in order to guarantee some municipality's water supply, in order to contribute to flood prevention, and in order to store water for irrigation and electric power.

The uses of the public domain, and the attendant problems, necessarily vary from area to area. Each miner usually knows only the uses and problems common to his own area. For instance, in arid portions of the Southwest, the miner is not concerned with conflicts with timber operators over use of the public domain. In the Northwest, however, timber is one of the prime users of the public domain. The mining laws which are applicable to the entire Nation must take cognizance of these special situations in different regions.

The Department of the Interior, along with the Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service, is charged with managing the public domain for all these purposes. In that connection we are responsible not only to the mining industry, but to the grazing industry, the timber industry, the people who live in the flood plain, the municipalities who are dependent for water, the city dwellers who want outdoor recreation, and many others. These are not separate groups of people. The same person falls into several categories and wants the public domain to be available for several purposes. Even the mining industry is interested in recreation for its members, in the hydroelectric power which comes from sites on the public domain, and in water for mining operations that depends on proper watershed management. All of us have a stake in doing our multipurpose job on the public domain and in doing it well.

When someone misuses the mining laws to obtain title to a piece of the public domain, which is more valuable for some use other than mining, it may well be depriving some other better qualified and more deserving citizen of his rights under other statutes. For instance, under the small-tracts law and the Homestead Act, veterans have preference to available parcels of public domain. This veterans' preference doesn't apply in the mining laws. Thus, if the mining laws are used for what are termed illegitimate purposes, it makes it possible for a nonveteran to get a tract for a home site or camp site to which the veteran is entitled.

The timber operators and the highway departments recent paying toll—they sometimes call it blackmail—to those who intentionally establish mining claims across road rights-of-way, not for the purpose of mining, but so that they must be bought out. A lumber company in the Pacific Northwest said that they were afraid to put out a survey party to locate a new road because they knew they would immediately be faced with a spate of mining claims filed across the road. It is cheaper to buy out these mining claims at an average of $500 apiece, whether they be valid or invalid, than to fight them through the courts. The State highway department in California has reported that mining claims were filed as soon as they surveyed a new road and that they were forced to buy out the claimants.

The same complaint is made by livestock men against those who throw mining claims across water holes.

I am sure you recognize that I am not talking about mining claims filed for mining purposes, where the search for minerals is real. Such legitimate claims and the right to file them must be protected. Likewise, the rights of other groups using the public domain under other laws must also be protected. Some way can and must be found to carry out the intents of all these different laws protecting the public domain and the users thereof.

For grazing, for timber, for recreation, and for all the other uses of public lands, the Congress has passed special legislation giving both the user and the public proper protection. Under the Taylor Grazing Act, for instance, monopoly of a water hole on which the surrounding livestock economy depends is prohibited. Under the O. & C. timber management program, logging is controlled to maintain sustained yield of the forest. Under the small-tract law, only a proper area can be set aside for this purpose and it must bring the Public Treasury a price commensurate with its value for this purpose.

Whenever someone uses a mining claim not for mining, but to obtain timber or to monopolize a water hole, or to obstruct a right-of-way, or to get exclusive control of a recreation site, or to obtain a small tract, he is defeating the expressed intent of the Congress.

Legitimate mining operators—rightly or wrongly—are being criticized for allowing their law to be abused in this fashion.

We are grateful to the many individuals in industry who have given careful study to the mining laws. We are indebted to them for bringing these problems to our attention in a constructive manner.

It is obvious that constructive suggestions are to be found on how the mining laws might be revised for better protection of the mining industry and the public as a whole. They have been submitted by miners, by stockmen, by timber operators, by recreation and wildlife enthusiasts, by city officials, by irrigation farmers, and by many others.

All these groups have claims to the public domain, and therefore something valuable to contribute to discussions on the mining laws. This was demonstrated shortly after last year's mining congress, when representatives of these different groups in the Northwest met for 2 days in Spokane. Mr. Donald Callahan, who is on the program here this morning, participated in that Spokane meeting; I hope he is going to tell you about it.

If we are to spell out the answers on how the mining laws should be revised, serious round-the-table discussions by all the interested parties are needed. Since the problems differ from region to region, these discussions might take place in a series of meetings held in different areas throughout the West.

It would be entirely appropriate for the mining industry, as in effect the custodian of the mining laws, to initiate such meetings. Invitations might go out to organizations representing grazing, lumbering, recreation, forestry, farming, health, and sanitation, and other interests. If the Department of the Interior can help you work out a solution, we shall be pleased to join you.

All the different groups concerned, after sitting around the table together, ought to be able to come up with a proposal which all of us together can take to the Congress next January and ask for its enactment into law.

Democracy in our country has gained steadily in strength and effectiveness, through the interplay of diverse points of view. Conflicts of ideas can develop into a unified course of action which is sounder and stronger than any of the component ideas standing alone. Today as democracy faces another rigorous test, we are presented with a fresh opportunity to prove that collaboration between government and industry can once again equip our country to withstand her enemies.

Stephen E. Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the services of Stephen E. Rice, Senate legislative counsel.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Before we return the Senate will lose the services of the Honorable Stephen E. Rice, who, since World War II, has been Senate legislative counsel.

Nothing I could say would be more complimentary to Captain Rice than his appointment by the President of the United States as judge on the Tax Court of the United States, the unanimous approval by the Senate Finance Committee of his appointment, and his confirmation by the United States Senate without a dissenting vote.

But personally, and as a Member of the Senate who is not a lawyer, I wish to say that I have regarded his work with and for us as outstanding service by a man endowed with fine personal qualities and distinctive native ability who has demonstrated exceptional professional competence.

Judge Rice has served the legislative branch of the Federal Government for the past 17 years, with time out for distinguished naval service during World War II. He has worked with members of all political parties on some of the most complex and controversial legislation ever considered by a legislative body. Yet I know of no Senator in all that time who did not regard him personally with esteem and accept his work and advice with confidence.

We shall miss him in the Senate, but I am sure that he goes to the bench with the best wishes of all of us, and he has my heartiest congratulations.

Although he is a native of Florida, I am pleased that he has adopted Virginia for residence.

As I express my regret at the departure of Steve Rice from the Senate, I think it is appropriate to add we are further indebted to him for the development of an excellent staff and to invite attention to the fact that he has recommended the promotion of Mr. John H. Simms to succeed him as legislative counsel. Mr. Simms also enjoys the confidence of the Senate, and I endorse the recommendation.

The Vanishing American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Vanishing American" which I made before the Kansas City Real Estate Board in Kansas City, Mo., on September 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered, to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, my friends of the Kansas City Real Estate Board, ladies and gentlemen, it's good to be with you again.

I congratulate the members of the Kansas City Real Estate Board on your honest, forthright stand on legislation affecting your business and the property owners you represent. I have observed that you, through your national board, say what you mean and mean what you say. You have the courage to stand up and fight for what you think is right. I salute you for it.

In contrast there is the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. It holds annual meetings once a year and committee meetings at frequent intervals. The members pass resolutions expressing their faith in the American way of life. They shudder at the name of Karl Marx, as they ought to do; they talk economy and promote Government spending, such as the point 4 program.

The Chamber of Commerce carries on large operations in Washington. It has a paid staff there which finds it easier to collaborate with those in power in Government than to carry out the political ideals of most of their dues-paying members.

Members of the Chamber frequently visit Capitol Hill. They urge with great insistence and plausibility that this reorganization plan must be disapproved in the Congress or that Senate or House bill must be defeated—all in the interest of free enterprise.

These big-business men talk freely enough in Washington mostly off the record. Their attitude seems to be "Let's you and him have a big fight." In their own States and districts—with a few notable exceptions—they have no part in political organization and even hesitate to express an opinion publicly on what they call a political matter. When creeping socialism is storming their camp, except for occasional trips to Washington, they lie quietly and peacefully in their tents. While the labor unions have their political-action committees working in the townships, wards, and precincts every day in the year—as they have a perfect right to do—these businessmen avoid political discussions as the plague. Some of them even strut and cackle every time a New Deal bureaucrat comes around.

Naturally Members of Congress understand the situation. Nobody in Washington is fooled—least of all the administration or the Congress. I offer the opinion that the influence of this business organization will continue to decline so long as its members fail to fight openly and aggressively for the principles they profess to believe in, and the same fate awaits any other business group that follows a similar policy of supine indifference.

This reminds me that lately in Washington, some people have had the misfortune to say the wrong thing at the wrong time. Perhaps many of us would do well to follow more closely the example of the late Calvin Coolidge, who once remarked, "I don't recall ever getting into trouble for something I didn't say." This is particularly good advice if the subject involved is the United States Marine Corps.

There is the story of how a famous preacher lost his first job. This minister was born and reared in the moonshine district of eastern Kentucky.

His first sermon was a distinct success. He was invited to dinner at the house of one of the deacons. The blessing was said. Everything went fine for a while. The famous minister years later told what happened. "The deacon said: 'Have some corn, brother Smith,' and I passed my glass instead of my plate."

I. WE SHOULD NOT THROW AWAY SOMETHING THAT HAS SERVED US VERY WELL INDEED

I grew up in Macon, in the northern part of Missouri. I remember when Colonel Blees, who had inherited a fortune from his father in Germany, brought the first automobile to Macon, a Studebaker electric. I remember when Captain F———, who lived on a pension broke his back pulling up a turnip in his garden. It was a pleasant town, on the whole; neither better nor worse I suppose than thousands of other towns like it throughout the length and breadth of the land.

I know from personal observation and experience that the United States is a better place to live in, a better place for grown people, and a better place for children than it was at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Yes, I can remember those good old days of the turn of the century very well indeed, and I say anyone who would trade 1950 for 1900 would trade a Cadillac for a handcar. I say without hesitation that the great mass of Americans lead healthier, fuller, happier, lives than they did 50 years ago. I say this abruptly so that no one will think that I am one of those who casts an undeserved aura of glamour and respectability over the past.

Disraeli said, "I am a radical because I want to eradicate that which is bad; I am a conservative because I want to conserve that which is good."

In the process of change that is going on before our eyes, God permit that we may retain that which is good, and discard that which is bad.

I ask you to consider whether in this process of change, we are not about to commit the folly of throwing away something that has served us very well indeed.

What has made possible these gains in the material well-being of our people? No one will hesitate over the answer. It is due to the mass production and distribution of quantities of useful goods.

What has made this development possible? It is the American system of free enterprise that has grown up under the protection of the Constitution of the United States—the Constitution which you have set aside this day to honor.

Sixty years ago, someone asked James Russell Lowell, United States Minister to the Court of St. James's "Dr. Lowell, how long will the American Republic endure?" Lowell responded, "As long as the ideals of the men who made it continue dominant."

Those who made the Republic were independent, straight-thinking Americans, who valued self-reliance, diligence, and thrift. Above all, they entertained a healthy distrust of too much government. The question I wish to discuss with you today is whether this kind of American shall be allowed to take his place with lo—the poor Indian. Shall we call him a vanishing American?

II. SECURITY CANNOT BE ATTAINED BY A GOVERNMENT FORMULA

Today we find our people turning more and more to government—largely to the Federal Government—for hundreds of different types of assistance. They have been lured by the promises of something for nothing by Washington bureaucrats who, in their lust for power, gladly promise what is not theirs to give. Today, nearly 26,000,000 individuals receive regular Government checks—or almost half as many as the total number of persons employed in this country.

A former Congressman from Illinois tells this story to show that we are becoming less responsible.

A very strait-laced lady of the old school was approached by her maid, who said that she would have to quit. Her employer asked why, and the maid sobbed that she was going to have a baby.

The lady replied sternly, "I do not condone this sort of thing, but neither am I going to condemn you. As a Christian woman I conceive it my duty to help you in your hour of trouble. You keep on working here and when your baby is born I will adopt it. You will be saved from shame."

The lady was as good as her word. But a year later the maid came to her again, saying she would have to quit because she was going to have another baby.

"This is shocking," said the lady. "But I am not going to sit in judgment on you. Nor will I let you be held up to shame. You stay on here and have this second baby and I will adopt it, too."

The next year the maid approached her once more, again saying that she was going to quit.

"Good heavens," cried the lady, "not another baby?"

"No, not this time," the maid replied. "I liked working here when there was just you and the mister. But I ain't going to work for a family that has two children."

There is an old saying: "We never miss the water until the well runs dry."

Well, the truth is, our own well is just about dry. We've continued to prime the pump—prime the pump—and the bucket still comes up full—but our heavy spenders in Washington haven't bothered—or dared—to look into the well to find out how much is left.

We all desire security. But not once in the history of the world has security been attained by a government formula. Security cannot be achieved by the simple method of having the earnings of the people spent, not by themselves, but by a spendthrift bureaucracy.

Once the people surrender their initative to the Government, once they agree to turn over their liberties to Washington in exchange for hand-outs, then we will no longer have the kind of Government on which our Nation was founded.

We have not outgrown the Sermon on the Mount in our spiritual progress. We have not outgrown in our political life the wisdom of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Several years ago, a benevolent citizen of Seattle, Wash., provided in his will a fund, the income from which is used for feeding the ducks on a nearby lake. Each day these ducks receive their hand-outs of grain Now it seems that they have become so satisfied with their social and economic well-being that they have almost lost the power to fly with the wings that God gave them. They sit huddled about in the quiet waters of the lake from one feeding to another waiting for the next distribution of free grain. Frank Holman, of Seattle, a former president of the American Bar Association,

relates this story as a warning that we cannot build a strong and enduring America by turning our citizens into "sitting ducks."

III. DURING WAR OR PEACE, THE DRIVE FOR THE HAND-OUT STATE CONTINUES UNABATED

Nevertheless, a drive has been under way in this country for nearly a fifth of a century for bigger and bigger government by fewer and fewer people, in order to push more and more people around.

The drive did not slacken during the last great war. It moved right ahead, and after the war was over, those who favored the establishment of a hand-out state fought bitterly against eliminating the police-state wartime controls.

Now again—tragically so soon again—we find ourselves engaged in war. Unfortunately, certain controls are necessary in wartime.

But there are those who would use the Korean war—or any other war that may occur, God forbid—as a smokescreen behind which to shelve constitutional government for once and for all, and to erect a socialist government in its stead.

Once that is done, we are well on the road to communism. Let there be no doubt about that. John Strachey, the present British minister of war, has said: "Like all Socialists, I believe that the Socialist society evolves, in time, into the Communist society." Those were the words of the present Socialist Minister of War in Britain.

The British Socialists have not hesitated to go ahead with their plans to socialize what remains of the free economy there, including the iron and steel industry. Under the Marshall plan, the American taxpayer will underwrite the operation.

It is no secret that Government planners in this country are itching to take over the American iron and steel industry. They must not be permitted to use war as an excuse.

IV. KOREAN WAR MUST HAVE PRIORITY, BUT WE SHOULD NOT IGNORE THE THREAT TO OUR INSTITUTIONS FROM WITHIN

First priority must go to matters connected with the Korean war—and God grant that it may be only that. But we must not forget that the fight against totalitarianism is world-wide. It is far from being a strictly military problem—and we are faced with threats from within as well as from without.

V. CONGRESS MUST NOT GIVE PRESIDENT A BLANK CHECK AND A RUBBER STAMP

There are those who, in wartime, say Congress must surrender substantially all of its powers to the President, that is, give him a rubber stamp, a blank check, and all the red ink that he wants.

This is virtually what occurred during World War II. Too many lump sum appropriations were approved with only the slightest notion as to the purposes for which they were to be used. The result, waste, extravagance, graft, and a much larger national debt than would otherwise have resulted.

Even more tragic was the complete surrender by Congress of its functions in the field of foreign affairs to the Chief Executive.

The Constitution provides that: "He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present shall concur."

During World War II, a Chief Executive of the United States entered into far-reaching agreements with representatives of powerful foreign nations, including the Soviet Union, at Teheran and Yalta. His successor entered into equally far-reaching agreements with foreign representatives including Joseph Stalin, at Potsdam.

The calamitous Yalta deal—which sold China down the river to the Reds—was made in secret. The advice of the Senate was not obtained—and apparently not desired. And the world-shaking agreements made at Yalta, as in the case of those made at Tehran, were not ratified by the Senate, or even submitted to it. Today, more than 5 years after the Yalta conference, we still don't know exactly what took place at Yalta.

At Potsdam, in August 1945, the present incumbent of the White House followed the example set by his predecessor. The negotiations at Potsdam were conducted for the most part in secret. The Senate played no part. The agreements made were not submitted to it as required by the Constitution.

Certainly so far as the conduct of foreign relations was concerned, during World War II ours was a Government by men and not by Constitution.

And to use a time-honored phrase, the results speak for themselves. Instead of achieving lasting peace, we find ourselves in greater danger than ever before in history. This is largely the result of Government by guess and intuition instead of by the Constitution.

VI. ARE WE REPEATING OUR MISTAKES OF WORLD WAR II?

Nevertheless, we apparently are reluctant to learn from experience. The outbreak of war in Korea found us making the same tragic mistakes.

As an example of what I mean, consider what occurred when the President ordered our forces into Korea on June 27. As you may recall neither branch of the Congress was consulted. The first the Members of the Senate knew of it was when the President made available on the floor of the Senate a copy of a press release issued from the White House.

I then raised the question on the floor of the Senate as to whether the President had arrogated to himself the power to declare war. The answer was the pretense that our participation in Korea was only a police action. We know differently now. It is war—full-scale, bloody, appalling war.

The Constitution provides: "The Congress shall have power * * * to declare war."

Yet as of this date, 3 months after the President ordered our troops into Korea, the Congress has not passed a resolution recognizing what must be apparent to every citizen—that a state of war exists.

VII. THE ROLE OF THE CONGRESS

I hope that during the months ahead Congress will resume its constitutional functions. There must be no further surrender of them to the White House. You may ask: Just what do you think Congress should do? Specifically, Congress should take these steps:

First, not one dollar should be spared that is necessary to provide the American soldier with every item of equipment he needs. Congress will make those funds available. I shall support the appropriations just as I have supported every appropriation for our national defense since you sent me to Washington. But I shall insist that the Congress exercise its constitutional authority to say how those funds shall be spent.

Second, Congress, and particularly the Senate, should reaffirm its role in the conduct of our foreign relations. There must be no more undeclared wars, no more secret agreements selling our allies down the river. Never again must we permit our diplomats to lose what our fighting men have won.

Finally, the Congress should scrutinize each presidential request for powers to impose controls and regulations. Congress should grant only those necessary to the success of the war. The hand-out state must not be allowed to ride in on the coattails of the god of war.

To talk this way may mean that I am one of the vanishing Americans. If so, I am proud to be a member of the race.

Vishinsky Sees Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal:

VISHINSKY SEES RESULTS

Andrei Y. Vishinsky, Soviet Foreign Minister, is killing two birds with one stone by attending the United Nations General Assembly. He is not only providing direct service for his government in the United Nations but he is also getting first-hand information on the results of Moscow's blunder in calling for the North Korean aggression.

If Vishinsky were back in Moscow he would have to take the reports as cabled and written by him by Russian representatives here. No one knows whether the Soviet Politburo was surprised or not when the United States and the United Nations jumped to the defense of South Korea. A good guess is that a speedy victory was expected without any intervention.

In addition to the intervention, the Korean affair touched off a rearmament program in the United States similar to that launched 10 years ago after Hitler marched into Poland. United States industrial power is one thing the Russians do not underestimate. Vishinsky can read and see the activity in this country that Moscow stirred up.

Boycotting the United Nations was the first blunder made by Moscow. No Russian delegate was present to halt the United Nations from opposing with arms the North Korean aggression. The second blunder was ordering the aggression, and the third blunder was setting the United States defense into action.

While Vishinsky is here he may read of the crushing of the North Korean Army whose fate now seems sealed unless new forces from outside Korea come to the rescue.

Whether Russia will be much concerned about the North Korean defeat remains to be seen. The Korean affair may have been planned as a starter of several attacks which may now be held back.

The Korean war is not yet over. There will be more bloody battles but eventually the North Korean Army will be cut up or captured. Russia will not only have suffered defeat but will have put the United States on guard with a big preparedness program.

Federal Aid to Education Will Be an Investment in the Training of Youth To Solve the Complex Problems of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress I called the attention of

the House to the fact that we had failed to pass legislation providing for Federal aid to education, and urged my colleagues of the House that we pass this legislation before the Eighty-first Congress finished its work.

Now, as the second session of the Eighty-first Congress comes to a close, I regard our failure to pass Federal aid for education legislation as one of the greatest failures of this Congress to respond to an ever growing domestic need.

I sincerely hope that the Eighty-second Congress will make a determined effort to provide aid for our schools, so that the boys and girls from the less wealthy States may have an educational opportunity equal to that of our national average.

We have overcome all obstacles to provide Federal aid to the States, local communities, and individuals, in the fields of housing, hospitals, roads, municipal planning, public health, guarantee of bank deposits, and others.

Yet, to the boys and girls of America in the field of educational opportunity we have failed to respond.

Federal aid to education will mark a great milestone in America's progress. It will be a tangible expression of our belief in our future, of our willingness to sacrifice that our young folks may better prepare themselves to solve the problems of the future, which undoubtedly will grow more complex with each passing year.

Under permission granted, I insert an article from the Monday, January 9, 1950, issue of the New York Times entitled "Statistics of the States on School Teaching and Operating":

STATISTICS OF THE STATES ON SCHOOL TEACHING AND OPERATING

The present status of total teaching staff, emergency teachers, teachers' salaries, range of salaries and operating expenditures for elementary and secondary schools, as reported throughout the Nation is as follows:

	Number of teachers		Number of substandard or emergency teachers		Average salaries		Range of salaries (1949-50)		Operating expenditures for elementary and secondary schools	
	1949-50	1948-49	1949-50	1948-49	1949-50	1948-49	Lowest	Highest	1949-50	1948-49
NEW ENGLAND										
Maine	6,200	6,198	207	494	$2,150	$2,080	$1,000	$4,900	$21,500,000	$21,000,000
New Hampshire	3,055	2,949	379	414	2,750	2,325	1,700	4,200	15,000,000	13,729,222
Vermont	2,602	2,615	536	424	2,332	2,205	1,500	5,600	10,200,000	9,872,178
Massachusetts	24,250	22,223	(1)		3,625	2,700	1,800	5,100	115,566,879	113,300,862
Connecticut	10,887	10,712	475	511	3,405	3,328	2,000	6,000	60,000,000	56,040,525
Rhode Island	3,950	3,816	35	35	3,100	3,095	1,600	6,300		18,496,455
MIDDLE ATLANTIC										
New York	76,250	76,480	3,700	3,633	3,875	3,652	2,000	6,200	525,000,000	500,000,000
New Jersey	27,006	26,121	2,100	1,976	3,460	3,262	2,200	5,600	155,000,000	158,606,084
Pennsylvania	59,560	60,137	2,500	2,643	2,896	2,770	2,000	4,000	294,994,452	253,846,551
Delaware	1,850	1,765	82	105	3,325	2,834	2,400	4,000	9,300,000	8,312,110
District of Columbia	3,307	3,353	408	477	3,793	3,733	2,830	4,830	22,593,935	21,593,157
Maryland	11,504	10,749	1,365	1,274	3,449	3,342	1,100	5,000	55,629,160	54,046,638
SOUTH										
Virginia	20,470	18,032	2,840	3,150	[2] 2,200	2,275	[2] 1,185	[2] 4,500	[2] 70,000,000	66,605,075
West Virginia	16,007	15,700	1,826	3,486	2,330	2,400	1,485	3,600	64,363,418	54,113,359
North Carolina	28,800	24,289	300	699	2,550	2,100	1,080	3,069	103,600,000	87,000,000
South Carolina	17,000	16,159	600	621	1,795	1,721	696	3,048	45,000,000	43,377,047
Tennessee	22,196	20,750	2,934	4,025	2,140	1,790	1,179	2,826	69,650,000	56,000,000
Georgia	24,506	23,595	3,000	4,321	1,990	1,890	1,128	2,200	69,000,000	61,251,862
Alabama	22,000	20,800	2,446	4,955	2,048	1,909	900	4,250	59,771,752	53,898,499
Mississippi	15,950	14,700	800	1,067	1,393	1,287	500	3,200	34,002,575	33,586,826
Arkansas	13,500	12,650	2,500	3,009	1,675	1,600	700	3,960	32,500,000	30,981,066
Louisiana	16,229	15,500	1,487	2,389	2,700	2,400	2,400	3,600		
Kentucky	19,000	18,929	3,800	4,600	1,900	1,880	524	4,300	55,000,000	54,206,000
Florida	17,760	15,266	2,000	2,453	2,832	2,782	2,100	3,600	91,577,916	66,716,175
SOUTHWEST										
Oklahoma	17,900	17,393	2,412	3,489	2,726	2,327	1,500	4,200	70,000,000	59,000,000
Texas	50,250	46,000	2,000	2,250	2,900	2,470	1,834	5,600	275,000,000	217,000,000
New Mexico	[2] 5,300	4,350	157	209		3,678				
Arizona	6,240	4,303	111	351	3,575	3,500	2,100	4,800	31,912,812	28,294,336
MIDWEST										
Ohio	45,299	43,921	3,767	4,400	2,893	2,800	1,500	4,600	206,000,000	205,293,184
Indiana	25,124	24,400	1,103	1,227	3,280	3,096	1,600	6,440	155,000,000	78,256,696
Illinois	45,400	46,647	1,500	2,066	[2] 2,700	2,475			252,248,185	240,236,367
Michigan	35,000	33,500	7,000	7,000	3,550	3,200	3,550	3,550	240,000,000	200,000,000
Wisconsin	20,600	22,000	3,100	3,350	2,625	2,450	1,800	4,650	98,000,000	96,500,000
Minnesota	20,539	20,500	622	892	2,750	2,700	1,000	4,800	105,000,000	96,097,978
Iowa	22,778	22,578	205	969		2,425	1,100	5,300	101,500,000	94,349,244
Missouri	25,000	24,300	2,000	2,360	2,259	2,300	1,150	4,750	195,000,000	187,000,000
North Dakota	6,388	6,481	670	1,371	2,100	1,573	1,150	4,100	23,500,000	19,009,671
South Dakota	7,014	7,469	1,356	1,377	2,100	1,990	1,225	4,200	25,000,000	23,852,762
Nebraska	12,000	12,000	1,460	2,467	2,113	2,065	450	4,000	39,000,000	39,000,000
Kansas	16,800	15,680	250	592	2,475	2,143	2,497	4,200	64,000,000	
ROCKY MOUNTAIN										
Wyoming	2,600	2,600	170	182	2,740	2,552			13,000,000	12,200,000
Colorado	9,000	9,150	1,475	1,500	[2] 2,650	2,480	1,200	4,500	40,000,000	30,618,000
Utah	5,400	4,957	870	1,153	3,100	2,900	2,300	3,900	25,500,000	25,143,000
Nevada	1,241	1,195	7	11	3,058	3,004	2,400	4,740	6,629,640	5,690,678
NORTHWEST										
Montana	4,620	4,780	700	950	2,930	2,779	1,700	4,600	24,000,000	21,598,005
Idaho	4,798	4,590	840	1,000	2,463	2,450	1,800	3,900	21,230,536	20,219,584
FAR WEST										
Washington	16,200	15,400	3,600	4,824	3,300	3,200	2,400	4,600	90,000,000	84,986,541
Oregon	10,500	9,500	1,619	1,467	3,305	3,000	2,100	5,300	64,000,000	56,000,000
California	62,700	53,824	12,500	13,000	3,940	3,740	2,400	6,000	380,000,000	356,000,000
Total United States	942,530	901,006	86,293	105,218	2,886	2,676			[3] 4,524,771,260	[3] 4,032,925,737
Projection for total United States									4,651,663,374	4,194,318,081

[1] No certification in Massachusetts.
[2] Estimate.
[3] Total for 45 States and District of Columbia.

Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of all of the Members of this House to an article which appeared recently in the newspaper, Labor. The article is headed "Register and vote—Big lobbyists gang up on men who stood by people—Propaganda campaign against BUCHANAN illustrates drive to elect reactionary Congress." It follows:

REGISTER AND VOTE—BIG LOBBYISTS "GANG UP" ON MEN WHO STOOD BY PEOPLE—PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN AGAINST BUCHANAN ILLUSTRATES DRIVE TO ELECT REACTIONARY CONGRESS

(By Albert H. Jenkins)

It takes special courage nowadays for a Member of Congress to stand by the people and defy selfish interests. Any Senator or Congressman who does so knows that an unprecedented flood of propaganda will be turned against him the next time he is up for reelection.

For example, take the case of Congressman FRANK BUCHANAN, progressive Pennsylvania Democrat.

Nearly a year ago, the House gave BUCHANAN a mandate as chairman of the Lobby Investigating Committee. That mandate was to uncover the facts about powerful lobby and propaganda organizations, and to recommend ways to make them register with Congress, tell who pays them, how much, and what they do for the money.

BUCHANAN is a courteous gentleman. In his committe hearings, he leaned over backward to be fair. Though some Republican members of the committee were often insulting to him he never lost his temper. Watching how things were going, some of BUCHANAN'S House colleagues thought—at first—that he was being too soft with the hard-boiled lobbyists.

OUT TO CRUCIFY HIM

As the hearings continued, however, it became clear that BUCHANAN was pursuing and revealing the facts without fear or favor. His quiet but persistent methods proved deadly.

The big lobbyists, and the powerful interests back of them, did not like it. They set out to crucify the Pennsylvania Congressman in the election which ends next November 7.

Not all their propaganda guns are firing yet, but here is some of the shooting against BUCHANAN so far—in his home district:

A RIDICULOUS LIE

The Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association mailed to druggists and other small-business men a propaganda "piece" entitled: "BUCHANAN Voted Against Small Business."

That is ridicuously false, as any close observer of Congress knows. Moreover, the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association dominated by big and monoplistic steel corporations—would have loudly applauded BUCHANAN if he really had voted against small business.

A barrage of post cards and other propaganda against BUCHANAN is being sent to the voters of his district by the GOP State and county committees. This propaganda is of the same brand as that used by the power-trust lobby, medical lobby, and real-estate lobby, which are also flooding the mails with vicious lies against BUCHANAN.

The medical lobby is also known as the organized doctors. Its official name is the American Medical Association.

Now this medical lobby is sending to doctors, dentists, nurses, druggists, and others in his district a flood of propaganda against BUCHANAN. Why?

Because the organized doctors fear the Buchanan probe will get around to their huge lobby and propaganda campaign against President Truman's health insurance bill and other measures designed to furnish adequate medical service to the American people at a price they can pay.

RUMELY SEEKS REVENGE

On October 15—about 3 weeks before election day—one of the biggest propaganda guns will open fire against BUCHANAN in his district. This big gun is the so-called Committee for Constitutional Government, headed by Edward A. Rumely.

As labor reported, Rumely repeatedly refused to tell the Buchanan committee where the CCG and other branches of his superlobby get the big money which enables them to carry on their vast and continuous reactionary propaganda campaigns. For thus defying the committee Rumely was cited for contempt of Congress, and may be sent to jail. So Rumely and the wealthy men back of him are out to get revenge on BUCHANAN.

AFTER OTHER CONGRESSMEN

It is no accident that all these and other powerful lobbies ganged up to pour propaganda against BUCHANAN into his district. The House committee's probe revealed close ties between these reactionary lobby organizations, and many ways they work together.

They are out to get many other Members of Congress in addition to BUCHANAN, and to elect a Senate and House which will betray the people.

But the people, and particularly the workers, can keep BUCHANAN and their other friends in Congress—by registering and by voting on November 7.

Senator Lucas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, about daylight Saturday morning, September 23, the majority leader of the Senate, Mr. LUCAS, delivered a notable speech before the Senate. It was able and courageous. He said he intended to vote to override the President's veto of the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill. In giving his reasons, he delivered, in my judgment, one of the best speeches made on either side of this question.

I have been associated for a long time with the majority leader of the Senate; and we have diffcred on many matters of public policy. But disagreeing as I have with many of his votes, I have been impressed with the fact that he has performed his duties as majority leader in an able and honorable fashion. His task has been a difficult one.

The Democratic Members of the Senate have been sharply divided on principles of government, but Senator LUCAS has been fair to all Members. Never have I known him to use his official position to take an unfair advantage of a colleague. Always has he been completely frank in dealing with his associates in the Democratic Party.

Will the Russians Beat Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a recent issue of Liberty magazine carries an article by Mr. Eugene Tillinger entitled "Will the Russians Beat Us"? This article describes the background and personalities of some of the secret figures working under Soviet direcion in the eastern zone of Germany. It should not be a surprise that some of these individuals were prominent in Nazi Germany. I need not stress the dangers inherent in giving power to these Nazis who, under whatever banner, will seek only to serve their own ends and the ends of a militaristic antidemocratic Germany. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL THE RUSSIANS BEAT US?—THE ANSWER MAY WELL LIE IN OUR ABILITY TO FORESTALL THE RUSSO-GERMAN BLOC

(By Eugene Tillinger)

It was on January 30, 1943. Hitler's armies had been decisively beaten at Stalingrad. In a small room of the Red army's advance headquarters, just behind the front lines, six high-ranking German generals and officers awaited their first interrogation. Just taken prisoner, they still wore their white coats and caps over their uniforms. They did not know what their fate would be; they expected the worst. All of them were nervous—except one.

He was a thin, tall man nearly 6 feet 6. His eyes, cold and hard, looked out of a lean, ashen face, whose left side had an involuntary twitch. He was Maj. Gen. Dr. Otto Korfes, known as one of the best brains of the German General Staff.

Soviet Lieutenant Colonel Chuikov began the questioning. Suddenly everyone in the little room, Germans as well as Russians, looked up in startled surprise. For Korfes, gazing straight at Chuikov, was declaring in loud, clear tones: "It is a tragedy of world history that the two greatest men of our times, Hitler and Stalin, who obviously pursue the same goal, are fighting one another, instead of joining forces to fight together against their common enemy, world capitalism."

Almost 8 years have passed since that memorable scene. Today the very same Dr. Otto Korfes has his headquarters in offices in the Orangerie Palace in the heart of the

famous Sans Souci Park in Potsdam, former citadel of German militarism. He is chief of the so-called Central Archive of the Soviet Zone, sponsored and protected by the Russians. Here Hitler's former officers, in close cooperation with the Russians, work on geopolitical and military blueprints for the future Russo-German alliance.

A veil of deep secrecy hangs over this "Central Archive." Only a trusted few secure permission to enter the area. Most of the German officers working there were members of the Free German Committee, founded in Moscow after the German collapse at Stalingrad. This committee—formed of one-time Prussian generals, Nazi officers, and leaders of Hitler's Elite Guard under Soviet sponsorship at the height of the war, was a first step toward Stalin's postwar strategy for Europe.

After Korea, the next place where the Soviets are apt to strike is in Germany. The Communists will try to take over all of Berlin, and then all of Germany. A vital link in this plan is the strange new alliance of ex-Nazis and Communists, a combination of German military and scientific brains with Soviet armed might.

The Soviets launched the Free German Committee among their prisoners of war, to lay the groundwork for converting German militarists to an old idea—the idea of close cooperation between Germany and Russia, an aim that German's Iron Chancelor, Bismarck, first propounded some 70 years ago.

The scheme worked well. Dr. Otto Korfes is not the only high-ranking German officer who has enthusiastically endorsed communism. The role which ex-Nazi militarists now play in the political, economic, and cultural life of Germany's Soziet zone is shown by the following statistics recently revealed by the Neue Zeitung, of Munich, official organ of the United States High Commission in Germany: "Sixty-five percent of all ministers, state secretaries, cabinet heads, police chiefs, mayors, etc., in the province of Mecklenburg are former Nazi officers and members of the Free German Committee. The corresponding figures for Brandenburg are 52 percent; for Saxony, 47 percent; for Thuringia, 39 percent; for Saxony-Anhalt, 61 percent."

The plan does not end here. The so-called people's police, Soviet-equipped and organized along strictly military lines, is the nucleus for a new Red German army. Instead of the swastika, it's now the hammer and sickle. The same goose-step, the same blaring bands, the same floodlights, the same torch parades. All the martial trappings so dear to the German hearts have been given back to them by the Russians.

And who are the chiefs of this Kremlin-inspired so-called people's police? Are they proletarian Communists? Not at all. They are former Nazi officers, Prussian generals, SS leaders, all of them once members of the Moscow Free German Committee, and later indoctrinated in one of the so-called Antifa (anti-Fascist) schools in Soviet Russia. Working quietly for years on this top-secret operation, the Soviets have converted a tremendous number of former Nazi militarists to their cause. They have even permitted them to have their own Soviet-sponsored party in the eastern zone, the National Democratic Party (it might more aptly be called the Red neo-Nazi Party) which has become a rallying point for former Nazis, soldiers of the Wehrmacht, etc. The party's official daily newspaper, the Nationalzeitung, speaks for all former Nazis, who, given the green light, have rallied to the Soviet cause. The chief of the National Democratic Party is none other than Dr. Otto Korfes, who also plays a star role as commander of the people's police. His deputies and colleagues are all graduates of the Antifa Academy at Krasnogorsk; they all have endorsed the Bismarck policy and become key figures in the Soviet pattern.

Who are these ex-Nazis, whom the Russians have entrusted with such high positions in their zone? Why have they stepped out of the shadows to suddenly become powerful figures in Red Germany?

Let's start with Otto Korfes. Long before Hitler came to power, Korfes was one of the leading spirits of the ultrareactionary Stahlhelm. In 1934 he joined the storm troopers, while retaining his righly confidential position in the Potsdam Heeresarchiv, the classic planning office of the German General Staff. He left his desk job to become commander of the Two Hundred and Ninety-fifth Infantry Division and was named a major general by Hitler, who bestowed on him the high distinction of the Knight's Cross.

Taken prisoner at Stalingrad, Korfes immediately made himself a favorite with the Soviets. For the record, it should be noted that Lieutenant Colonel Chuikov, who interrogated Korfes after Stalingrad, is presently supreme Soviet commander in Berlin, working hand in glove with the former Nazi general.

Korfes himself makes no secret of his views. Recently he declared: "What we Germans need is a decision for the east." In a lecture at the Soviet Kulturhaus in Berlin he called Stalin's recent congratulatory message to the Eastern German Republic "a moral alliance between Russia and Germany."

Korfes' right-hand man, Vincenz Mueller, chief of staff of the "People's Police," is a typical Nazi general. He once belonged to the personal staff of Gen. Hans von Schleicher, who was assasinated on Hitler's orders during the purge of June 30, 1934; whereupon Mueller promptly rallied behind the Fuehrer. A fanatical Hitlerite, by the time war broke out Mueller was made chief of staff of the Seventeenth Army Corps. In February 1942 he was responsible for brutal mass executions of thousands of Jews in Poland.

Oddly enough, Mueller's army chauffeur was condemned to 25 years in prison by the Russians after the war because he had driven the general's car when the Germans attacked the Soviet Union. But Mueller himself not only was never apprehended, but enjoys high favor with the Soviet leaders. Utterly devoid of scruples, he is today as devoted to Stalin as he once was to Hitler.

Three other ex-Nazi generals, Arno von Lenski, Martin Lattman, and Bernard Bechler, also belong to the inner circle of the "people's police" high command. Von Lenski, turfman and cavalry officer, looks like a caricature of a monocle-wearing Prussian junkers—ice cold, supercilious, insolent. Like Mueller, and the others, when he graduated from the Antifa Academy at Krasnogorsk he took the Antifa oath: "I, a son of the German people, do hereby swear that I will always be a fighter against fascism and that I am willing at all times to sacrifice myself for this cause. May the German people punish me if I ever be unfaithful to this oath."

Martin Lattman was formerly commander of the Fourteenth Nazi Panzer Division. Martin Lattman, also rabidly anti-Semitic, was one of the early members of the Hitler Party. In a speech he made on joining the Moscow Free German Committee in 1943, he proclaimed: "Officers and soldiers of the German armed forces, save for the German people the men of the Wehrmacht. Save the Wehrmacht for the new Germany as an instrument of peace."

When he spoke these words on Russian soil back in 1942, no one took particular notice, but today they have a directive for all the Nazi generals and officers who are working for the Soviets.

Bernard Bechler was a major general commanding the Twenty-ninth Nazi Motorized Division, and also won a Knight's Cross. He too embraced communism by way of the Free German Committee. He got his reward after the war, when the Russians appointed him Minister of the Interior in Brandenburg. Today, chief of the "people's police" training school in Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, he parrots his master's voice. Recently he told his pupils: "Side by side with the Soviet Army we will drive the Anglo-Americans into a super Dunkerque that will stop their meddling in Germany once and for all."

Of special use to the Russians in the work of attracting former Nazis was Stalin's amazing statement made during the last war, even at a time when Hitler was still winning. On November 6, 1942, during the wartime celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, Stalin declared: "We do not pursue the aim of destroying the entire organized military force in Germany, for every literate person knows that this is not only impossible * * * but also inadvisable from the point of view of the victor."

Thus spoke Stalin in the midst of the war, when the tide of Nazi victories was still running high. And today in the Soviet zone of Germany the former Wehrmacht soldiers are being reminded of those outspoken statements in their favor. Along with the campaign to woo the Nazis, Soviet propaganda now stirs up bitterness against the West. The Germans are told that the Western Allies deliberately bombed German cities during the war to kill German civilians, while the Red Army never used its military against civilians.

The German Communist puppets obediently echo their bosses in the Kremlin. For example, Moscow-trained, Walter Ulrich, chief of the German Communists, gives this big-hearted assurance: "The question of who was a Nazi and who was not a Nazi is no longer open to discussion. At present only one standard counts. Who is a peace-loving person? Who wants a unified Germany? We do not ask what party book he used to carry, or whether or not he belonged to the Hitler party."

The SED, the German Communist Party, in an official decree, states: "We are for cooperation with all German patriots, including the former members of the Nazi Party and the former officers."

Now huge billboards in the main sections of the Soviet zone are emblazoned with this message: "We appeal to all politically persecuted former Nazis to return. Every German who is being politically persecuted in west German capitalist zones should come to us and he will be received as a friend and a brother."

Besides ex-Nazis, noted reactionaries, conservatives and monarchists are now shaking hands with the Kremlin's champions of the proletariat. The most fantastic case is that of Georg Dertinger, foreign minister of the Moscow-engineered eastern German Republic. Nearly every day his name is headlined on the front pages of the German Communist press.

But the Communist press never mentions some interesting facts about Herr Dertinger's past. It forgets that he was an ardent monarchist, a close friend of Franz von Papen and a leading member of the nationalistic Stahlhelm. During the Weimar Republic, Dertinger wrote editorials for the extreme rightist Der Tag. Because of his monarchist activities he was refused membership in the Nazi Party, but he maintained close relations with the Hitler regime. Goebbels even made him editor of a press service which distributed daily hand-outs to foreign newsmen.

The Soviets had good reasons for giving Dertinger such an important post, despite his record. Through his first wife, of the von Derwitz family, he has excellent connections with the most conservative army circles, and thus is able to contact those former general staff members who belong to the pro-Russian wing. Through his second wife, Baroness von Neuenstein, he can reach influential Catholic circles in Bavaria.

"Black-white-red Commies"—from the colors of the flag of Imperial Germany—is the

name the Germans have given to the ex-Nazis and Prussian militarists who are teamed up with Moscow. And, naturally enough, former chiefs of Hitler's dreaded secret police have also become Stalin's pets. Abalbert Baumler, who was once on the staff of Gestapo chief Heydrich, is now chief of the SSD, the Soviet-controlled German Security Police. Another former Gestapo boss, Leo Lange, is now in charge of the infiltration of Communist agents into western Germany. Dr. Carl Clodius, Hitler's top-flight economic adviser and right-hand man of the Third Reich's financial wizard, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, is today economic adviser of the Cominform.

Lenin once said that whoever controls Germany controls Europe and thus the world. Control of Europe may no longer mean control of the world, but the first part of the axiom still stands. This has been a guiding principle of Russian foreign policy. In 1922, after the First World War, the Western World was startled by the announcement of a Russo-German friendship pact. Secretly signed in the small Italian town of Rapallo, near Genoa, the alliance was a bombshell comparable to the Stalin-Hitler Pact of 1939, which ushered in World War II.

As a matter of fact, the Soviet leaders have never made any secret of their true feelings about Germany. A straight line leads from Molotov's blunt statement in October 1939 that "We Russians have always held that a strong Germany is an indispensable condition for a durable peace" to Stalin's congratulatory message to the German people in October 1949, stating that the Germans and the Russians "have the largest potentialities in Europe to complete great actions of world significance."

For their part, the German militarists are realists who have not forgotten that Germany was twice defeated within one generation because Bismarck's successors, Kaiser Wilhelm and Hitler, abandoned the pro-Russian policy. Thus, resurgent German nationalism looks once more toward the east, while the Soviets foster it for their own purposes. Moscow's strategy has given German nationalism a new historic goal, to unify Germany once again with the Kremlin blessing.

What do the Germans expect from the Russians and what have the Russians promised them? This writer is in possession of a document which throws some light on this. It is a letter intercepted by French intelligence, written by an aristocratic German officer from a Soviet indoctrination camp to a relative in Germany. In it the officer significantly refers to the annexation of eastern Prussia and the territories behind the Oder-Neisse line by Soviet Russia and Poland as "unimportant events, if the problem is viewed in its entirety." And he adds:

"What do these new western borders really matter if our being on the side of the Russians opens to us perspectives unparalleled since the days of the ancient Roman Empire? For the historians of the year 2000, the most important historical fact will be that in our time the peoples of the East, led by the Slavs, realizing their historic mission, have installed themselves in those territories which history has reserved for them. The Russians have already advanced their western borders 156 miles, and the same is true of the Poles. Thus it becomes the historic task of the Germans to push our tide of invasion toward the west and to take possession of those territories which history has reserved for us."

In other words, the Prussian militarists and Nazis believe that Germany, allied with Soviet Russia, can achieve what it failed to secure under the Kaiser and under Hitler—lebensraum in the west. This is the price Stalin is willing to pay for the deal. He needs German technical skill, German brains, and German soldiers for his over-all European plans.

The handwriting on the wall is clear. Stalin intends to conclude a third Russo-German pact against the west as soon as all Germany has been reunified under Soviet protection.

The day may not be far off when that new German Red army, the people's police, will march into western Germany with black-white-red flags flying and old military marches playing. Its ex-Prussian generals and ex-Nazi officers will proclaim that they have come to liberate the Germans from the Anglo-American warmongers. Not a single Russian will participate officially and the whole operation will seem to be strictly a German show. But it will be staged, armed, equipped, and blueprinted by the Kremlin.

A Soldier's Hope of a Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by a professional soldier, who does an exemplary job of rationalizing the present anomaly of building up a huge military machine to preserve peace. Like many another American, my heart is heavy that we must engage in this wasteful and unproductive armaments race, but, as General McAuliffe told his audience at Wilmington, to preserve our free society we must mobilize our resources to meet the threat. The text of General McAuliffe's address follows:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. ANTHONY C. MCAULIFFE, CHIEF CHEMICAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WILMINGTON CHAPTER OF THE ARMED FORCES CHEMICAL ASSOCIATION, DU PONT COUNTRY CLUB, WILMINGTON, DEL., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1950

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a distinct pleasure to appear before the Wilmington chapter of the Armed Forces Chemical Association and to discuss with you matters of mutual concern. The Korean situation brings the chemical industry and the Chemical Corps, once again, into a closely knit partnership in fulfillment of our mutual obligations.

The soldier in a fox hole in Korea, the scientist in the laboratory, and the industrialist manufacturing needed weapons and material, are all part of the national defense team. I don't believe that we are being overoptimistic in stating that our joint efforts will eventually drive back the enemy and help to reestablish the sanctity of conference-table agreements.

The decision of our Commander in Chief to commit United States troops in Korea, in execution of our solemn responsibilities under the United Nations Charter, was the result of our belief in the rights of all men to live free lives in a free world. This ideal was the lodestar of our forefathers who asserted its meaning in our Constitution; it is the keystone of our democratic way of life.

In two world conflicts during the past half century, we have committed ourselves to the field of battle in furtherance of this belief. Now once again, we are fighting, in partnership with other members of the United Nations, to help others achieve these objectives.

Now how can we accomplish this mission? How can you men as leaders of the chemical industry assist the Chemical Corps to supply our fighting men with chemical equipment, supplies, and munitions? I will try to clarify this tonight.

I would like to picture, first, the role of Chemical Corps troops on the front lines in Korea and show how some of our weapons are being used; second, the impact of the Korean situation upon the corps from a budgetary viewpoint; third, a brief review of the industrial mobilization program of the Munitions Board and procurement planning within the corps; and finally, how the chemical industry can most effectively fit into the picture.

On the basis of past experience in the recent war and an analysis of combat operations completed to date, we might briefly summarize Chemical Corps front-line activity and its part in the build-up in Korea.

Organic Chemical Corps troops are in action in Korea. Chemical maintenance units are providing front line maintenance service on all items of chemical equipment, including mechanized and portable flame throwers, smoke generators, and decontamination apparatus. A chemical laboratory unit is examining and analyzing captured matériel, supplies, and equipment. Chemical technical intelligence personnel are collecting technical information on types of warfare within the scope of the Chemical Corps mission.

Organic infantry heavy weapons units are supporting combat operations with the well-known 4.2 rifled mortar developed by the Chemical Corps. These mortars are lobbing hot messages over the hills of Korea direct to the Communist aggressors.

We are supplying napalm and incendiary bombs to the Air Force, which is doing an excellent job tactically against the enemy's strategic industrial targets. Colored smoke grenades are being used for ground-to-air signaling.

The Chemical Corps also supplies the Navy with floating oil smoke pots to cover amphibious operations; napalm for fire bombs; and smoke generators for large-scale screening of ship concentrations, port facilities, and dock installations. In addition, the Marine Corps is being supplied with flame throwers.

Although I was not associated with the Chemical Corps during World War II, I would like to assure you that I am familiar with the extent of your assistance. Without it, the corps would have found it impossible to meet the tremendous load placed upon it. Fortunately, we have a fine organization, the Armed Forces Chemical Association, to bring us together, as it is doing tonight, for the discussion of mutual problems and ways of solving them. I know that we will continue these good relationships. As chief of the Chemical Corps, I continue to seek and encourage your advice and assistance. We have a lot of problems to meet during the Korean situation. I know that with your help we can lick them. Many of the Chemical Corps items that I have just mentioned were successfully used on all battle fronts of World War II. Since then, they have been improved by research and development and are now effectively supporting UN action in Korea. But it takes money to accomplish our mission and get the supplies and equipment.

When active Communist aggression broke out in Korea, the annual appropriation bill of the Department of Defense, for fiscal year 1951, was pending before Congress. The over-all budget was based upon keeping defense expenditures at approximately the same level as for fiscal year 1950. Congress has since enacted this annual appropriation, and the Chemical Corps has been allocated $36,300,000 to carry out its normal peacetime functions. Of this, our industrial mobilization program funds are approximately the same as for fiscal year 1950. Our procurement funds amount to approximately $10,000,000. These funds will be used primarily

for meeting normal issue demands of the Regular Army, for service testing small quantities of matériel, and for procurement of standard chemical items in short supply.

With the commitment of a United States task force in Korea, the corps was immediately loaded down with requisitions for critical supplies needed for combat operations. Here in the United States there was a serious depletion of normal issue stocks, such as gas masks, smoke munitions, and training matériel. Further demands were made upon the corps by the expansion of task-force troops in Korea, and by the need for equipping replacement units in the zone of interior. It soon became evident that additional funds would be required to meet these obligations and to replace depleted depot stocks.

In his first message to Congress on the Korean situation, President Truman requested $10,000,000,000 in supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense to support combat operations. A joint resolution of Congress was subsequently enacted from which $31,500,000 has been made available for expanded demands upon the Chemical Corps. Of this sum, over $20,000,000 is required to meet the obligations of the Chemical Corps in supporting the United States task force in Korea. This money will be used principally for the procurement, production, and delivery of chemical supplies and matériel. It will also cover the increased cost of maintenance and operation of active Chemical Corps facilities. These funds will provide for the initial increment of critical items of ammunition and weapons such as fuel for flame throwers, grenades, napalm, smoke pots, and similar chemical supplies.

I wish to assure those of you who have members of your family in the service that we are doing everything possible to supply our troops with the best type of protective equipment and clothing against any eventuality.

Some contracts for these requirements will be placed with large and small manufacturers in the States of Delaware, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Virgina, and West Virginia, which comprise the New York chemical procurement district. Quite naturally you would like to know whether definite commitments can be made on the allocation of these funds through firm contracts with your organizations. For that reason, I would like to make a brief analysis of the industrial-mobilization program of the Department of Defense and the Chemical Corps' procurement-planning program, so that you can get a general idea of our procurement procedures. I hope that some of the questions which arise may be answered in this discussion. I believe that this will be of some assistance to you, for our procurement procedures have been radically changed since World War II.

The major part of our planning, as you know, is based upon procedures established by the industrial-mobilization program of the Munitions Board. This program was established to coordinate and to plan efficiently the industrial-mobilization phase of a national emergency. Basically the plan has been divided into four categories: Maintenance of reserve plants; acquisition and maintenance of essential machine tools and manufacturing equipment difficult to obtain in an emergency; planning studies and industrial-preparedness measures with industry; and planning within the Department of Defense.

One basic aspect of the over-all industrial-mobilization program concerns the allocation of civilian industrial capacity to members of the national defense team on a priority basis. In other words, the procedures established by the Munitions Board are so planned that the responsibility for procurement of specific classes of items will be assigned to a single agency. The Chemical Corps is at present responsible for the procurement of many items of chemical supplies and equipment for all branches of the Department of the Army and, upon request, for the Navy and the Air Force. These procedures, therefore, involve detailed procurement planning between military agencies and industry.

If an emergency is declared by Congress, it is hoped that the Nation's industrial resources will be effectively mobilized without undue loss of time. It is also anticipated that competition, such as existed between the armed services after Pearl Harbor, partly because of prior commitments of industry under the lend-lease program, will be largely eliminated. For instance, procurement representatives of departments of the Armed Forces will not be in your plants outbidding each other for various, and perhaps the same, items. The single-agency procurement also means increased efficiency in developing plans with industry.

Our industrial-preparedness contracts with some of your organizations have already saved considerable "lead" time.

The Chemical Corps' procurement-planning program is based upon requirements for supplies and equipment in execution of the strategic plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The basic consideration of this planning is the troop basis for mobilization.

Our procurement-planning agency at Army Chemical Center (formerly Edgewood), Md., analyzes our requirements on the basis of past experience and detailed studies of industrial facilities. Tentative production schedules are then placed on the corps' six chemical procurement districts, with offices in Boston, New York, Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, and San Francisco. Their mission is to locate potential prime contractors who are qualified to produce desired end items of chemical supplies and equipment. Prime contractors are responsible for locating subcontractors for component parts and raw materials.

Prime contractors will, therefore, be fully responsible for meeting scheduled deliveries of end items. This procedure, I might point out, is a great improvement over that which existed during World War II. Many of you will recall that the Chemical Corps, at that time, was responsible for supply, inspection, and delivery of component parts to end-item manufacturers.

In carrying out our procurement-planning program, the technical procurement districts obtain preliminary allocation of a plant's capacity from the Munitions Board through local armed-services procurement-planning officers, known as ASPPO's. These officers may be members of any technical service or department of the Armed Forces. When further plans are completed between industrial-plant managers and the corps, final allocation plans for end-item production are drawn up. If satisfactory, allocation to the Chemical Corps of a plant's industrial capacity for emergency production is confirmed by the Munitions Board. In exceptional cases, however, where conflicts arise between military departments or where production bottlenecks exist among potential subcontractors, the Munitions Board, rather than local ASPPO's, is the final deciding authority.

It is contemplated, however, that in an emergency these six procurement districts will become active offices authorized to place firm contracts with industry. Some activity in this direction has already been initiated.

The New York chemical-procurement district is planning production schedules at the present time for many items that are procurable in this area. Please contact the commanding officer of this district at 111 East Sixteenth Street, New York 3, N. Y., for information on our procurement plans for these materials.

In this connection, the Department of Defense urgently requests potential manufacturers to contact procurement districts direct and not to waste their time or money in coming to Washington. Our procurement districts have all the necessary information regarding plans for emergency procurement.

Although our workload has increased considerably since the opening of Communist hostilities in Korea, full emergency procurement will not begin until authorized by Congress. I might mention that, in general, the Chemical Corps procurement agency at Army Chemical Center, Maryland, is still the primary center of our procurement functions.

The Department of Defense further requests that all industrialists and potential contractors become familiar with industrial mobilization procedures, which I have attempted to clarify. Munitions Board Manual No. 90–1, known as the Production Allocation Manual, contains these procedures and may be obtained direct from the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

In summing up my discussion this evening, I believe that we are all fully conscious of the implications of Communist aggression in Korea. If we are to have the type of free society for which we are striving, it will be due to the fact that we have mobilized here at home, our military, industrial, political, spiritual, and moral forces to meet the challenge thrown at a free world by a determined and ruthless enemy. In meeting him on the battlefield, we must be prepared to meet strength with strength.

Despite the fact that we are backing up our commitments in Korea and our responsibility toward the United Nations through our military and industrial might, we are always ready to negotiate in appropriate international forums. Our objectives and our determination are clear. We seek to assist in creating situations in which the economic health and political stability of the free world will develop and mature. We have no territorial ambitions. We desire a free world based upon the right and liberty of the individual.

By consolidating our strength and concentrating on the foregoing objectives, we may give Communist imperialism reason to doubt its analysis that the free world will collapse. Eventually this may lead to moderation of the present policy of aggression. We must show that the free world is the world of the future. It has both the resources and the will to resist effectively whatever aggression may confront it. We must be ready and willing at all times to back up our commitments to assist in securing a free world for all members of the society of nations.

Let's Give the Queen of Battles a Better Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, recent reports from the Korean front have, I believe, emphasized the great importance of an adequate Infantry component to our national defense. However, based on my experience as an Infantry battalion commander in World War II, I have long felt that the Infantry both as a branch of our Armed Forces and as individuals deserved a consideration, in several aspects, more commensurate to the tremendous job it is called upon to perform in time of war.

In this connection, I believe that certain measures, within reason, could be taken to improve the individual infantryman's lot which would, simulta-

neously, improve his combat efficiency as well as that of his unit and tend to mitigate somewhat the general impression that the Infantry is the least desirable wartime service.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on this matter which appeared in two installments in the August and September 1950 issues of the National Guard Man entitled "Let's Give the Queen of Battles a Better Break":

LET'S GIVE THE QUEEN OF BATTLES A BETTER BREAK

(By Lt. Col. Peter O. Ward, Office of the Chief of Army Field Forces)

(Pt. I)

The Infantry soldier in World War II shouldered the greatest burden, measured by whatever yardstick one chooses to use. Some of the yardsticks are chances for survival, general living conditions, physical quality of personnel, mental quality of personnel, replacement of personnel, pay, awards, and a few others.

It is my purpose to show that the Infantry suffered the greatest losses both necessarily and unnecessarily in World War II. It is my purpose to show that there are some things that can be done about the doughboys' lot if there is a world war III.

Compared with other components of the Ground Forces, and to the Air Force and the Navy, the Infantry suffers on all counts. By Infantry soldier, I mean company-grade officers and enlisted men of an Infantry regiment in an Infantry division. Armored divisions, Marine divisions, and other similar or special types of units, are in a somewhat different category, not actually on quite the same basis for comparison. For example: Airborne divisions must engage in flight and in very hazardous fighting behind enemy lines, but they receive more pay and are pulled out of the line for regrouping, etc., more often than are Infantry divisions.

One might say: "All right, the Infantry soldier does have a rough time; so what?"

Possibly, many things cannot be changed. There always has to be a place on the battlefield where there is nothing in front of our men but the enemy, and these must be infantrymen. But those infantrymen should be able to expect leaders who are as well qualified, mentally and physically, as are the small unit leaders of the other Ground Forces and the Air Force and the Navy. That was not the case in World War II.

So much has been written on Infantry casualties in World War II that it can be considered almost axiomatic that the Infantry did suffer the highest casualty rate. But the facts are more terrible and dramatic than axioms.

CHANCES FOR SURVIVAL

In the shocking economy of war the chief supply item of the Navy is ships; of the Air Force, aircraft; of the ground army, guns; and of the Infantry, human beings. The casualty lists represent blood and death, agony of mind and body, and broken homes. Unfortunately in war planning, infantrymen must be considered as a supply item.

If you are a veteran, at some time during the war you must have asked yourself: "Will I come back, and in one piece?"

Any combat infantryman who asked himself this question could not have given himself a very reassuring answer. That was because by the law of averages the overwhelming majority of combat infantrymen could look forward to getting killed, wounded, or captured. Not only had the Infantry soldier slim hopes of survival; his morale was affected by knowing it. Is there an infantry regiment that entered combat that did not increase its rear echelon personnel section substantially just to take care of the clerical work necessary to report the casualties? The T/O. & E. did not provide enough personnel for this purpose.

Have you ever been around a battalion aid station during combat? If you have, you know that—with few exceptions—the happiest group of men you ever saw were those who had been only slightly wounded but were being evacuated. There were some who were anxious to get back to their units, but by far the greater number cracked jokes, smiled, and were plainly delighted to get away from the mess up ahead.

Getting down to facts and figures as to casualties, the Third Division lost 33,547 killed in action, wounded in action, or missing in action; the Fourth, 21,205; the Ninth, 22,135; the Thirty-sixth, 26,718; and the Forty-fifth, 27,207. The average for all Infantry divisions engaged in combat was 9,505.

That is about 100 percent of the Infantry of a division when you consider that the strength of an Infantry regiment was about 3,200, and there are only three Infantry regiments in a division, and the average of 9,505 includes the divisions that saw little combat, such as those committed in the spring of 1945.

In the Army as of July 31, 1945, the Ground Forces had suffered 79.8 percent of the casualties, the Air Force (which was then part of the Army) 12.3 percent, and the service troops 7.9 percent. Of the ground arms' casualties, 67.8 percent were in Infantry divisions. Of the Infantry divisions casualties, 94.25 percent were in Infantry regiments.

The exact over-all figures take on an even greater significance. The Infantry, which comprised only 20.5 percent of the total strength overseas, took 70 percent of the total casualties.

Lt. Gen. Lesley J. McNair reported in March 1944 that, although the Infantry overseas thus far constituted but 6 percent of the Army, it had borne 53 percent of the casualties. He advised that these figures be not made public in the spring of 1944. Now the public may be told, for now the effect of those figures on the morale at home is a thing of the past. The report is no longer classified secret, and now there is an opportunity to remedy the conditions that increased the inequalities for the Infantry.

As for the Navy, the submariner provides a good basis for comparison. Commander Charles B. Carroll, a noted submarine skipper of World War II, has stated that the casualty rate among submarine personnel was 18 percent.

There is literally no approach to equality of danger. It is scarcely too much to say that there was a greater difference in danger between the Infantry soldiers and those in the other branches than the difference between those in the other branches and noncombatants in the communication zone.

Those casualty figures are good argument for equality of treatment of the Infantry. What could have been done to give them this equality? More rest is the biggest item; but other important needs are more men with high I. Q., more men better physically qualified, better trained replacements, more awards, and more pay—and more men. Consider these needs in turn.

REST

It is well known that a single drop of water falling on a man's head can be kept on with relentless, unrelieved monotony until, by that alone, the man will be driven raving crazy. With however honest intentions, there has been too much of treating infantrymen as if they were no more affected by unrelieved strain than robots.

Steel rails have to be replaced because it is a fact that after certain periods of strain a steel rail, suddenly and without warning, will crack. Even to the last day of World War II there was an unnecessary amount of handling infantrymen as if they were stronger than steel rails.

It would have saved them physically and mentally if they could have looked forward to a rest period at the end of some definite period of combat. They fought with no end in sight but the end of the war, a hospital ward, a prison camp, or death.

Had there been a definite rotation policy for Infantry troops in combat, the exhaustion rate of infantrymen would have been remedied materially. Something in the way of a rotation system such as the Air Forces had would certainly be possible. And who can calculate the odds in combat between exhausted men and others? There is surely a difference in casualty figures between men fighting under a rotation system and men fighting as if they went to dig a tunnel through a mountain and no man knowing how far to the place where he might rest. There is no way of estimating such comparisons exactly. But in July 1945, the Army Air Force had lost 12.3 percent, the Infantry 70 percent.

Next to rest, it is an absolute necessity that the Infantry get more of the available top-level brains and brawn.

INTELLIGENT QUOTIENT

By comparison with the Navy, the Air Forces and the remainder of the Ground Forces, the Infantry got the very bottom of the stockpile, so far as I. Q. was concerned. This was changed to some extent during the latter part of World War II, but by then it was too late to have any marked effect. Should another war be begun in haste, and the planning repeat these aspects of the recent war, the Infantry again would get more than its share of dangerously low I. Q.'s.

Prospective inductees were permitted to enlist in the Navy. The Navy could reject them; the Army could not. The Navy could pick and choose to a much greater extent than either the Army or the Air Forces.

Before comparing the figures, it should be noted that the combat crews are a very small percentage of the Air Force, yet prior to June 1944, 75 percent of all ground personnel of the Air Force were classes I, II, or III; those scoring 100 or over on the Army General Classification Test (A. G. C. T.) and mechanized aptitude tests given inductees. And within the Ground Forces, personnel whose A. G. C. T. score was 115 or better, and who were otherwise qualified, were plucked from Ground Forces installations and set down in the Army specialized training program.

In 1944, it was found that the Air Forces and the Service Forces had the highest percentage of classes I and II men; the Ground Forces the highest percentage of classes III, IV, and V. Army Air Forces had 59.4 percent of the class I and II personnel, Army Service Forces 37.1 percent, and Army Ground Forces 27.3 percent.

Of the men assigned to Ground Forces, the Infantry got the dregs. One division went into combat with only 2.5 percent class I personnel. And you can make a pretty good guess as to how few of these found their way to rifle companies.

Generally speaking, the Infantry was the least popular branch of the service. And it is reasonable to assume that many of the most ingenious soldiers, with high I. Q., were those most successful in devising ways to stay out of the Infantry.

Also, there were a number of ways in which high I. Q. personnel were diverted from the Infantry into the other branches.

Army Ground Forces Study No. 5 states: "Not all of the high-grade men assigned to the Ground Forces could be retained. Attrition was highest in this type of personnel. Some were lost as officer candidates who elected to try for commissions outside of the ground arms. In an Infantry division in 1942, of 1,200 enlisted men accepted as officer candidates, 800 elected officer training in Quartermaster, Medical Administration, and Finance. Apart from relative danger, these branches were probably preferred

in a belief that they offered opportunities for vocational self-improvement. Election of these branches by enlisted men in the combat ground arms was later forbidden by amendment to the Army regulations."

Throughout the period of mobilization, soldiers of the Ground Forces were free to volunteer for aviation cadet training. If they did not qualify as flight personnel, they were retained by the Air Force for duty with its ground installations.

The Ground Forces had, in addition, to meet its own requirements for officer candidates, service schools, enlisted specialists, parachute volunteers and cadres for new units. After all the picking was done, the Infantry had to "make do" with what was left. Sometimes that wasn't much. It caused Gen. Ben Lear to comment that we were sadly lacking in the necessary material for noncommissioned officers, and that we must pay for this dearly in battle. We did.

The Selective Service System and the classification system were partly to blame. In general, for the Infantry there was no specific vocational preparation in civilian life as there was for the Engineers, Quartermaster Corps, etc. The infantryman's principal occupation is fighting, and (as Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey has put it) that isn't a common civilian occupational specialty. Therefore, in assigning newly inducted men it was necessary to ignore, to a great extent, civilian occupations or to assign to the Infantry men who had no established occupation and therefore were unlikely to be the most desirable human material.

It is an obvious commonplace that men with no definite work are generally men with a definitely low ability to take care of themselves or others. Recent statistics have shown that even morons get along very well in certain types of occupations, and that there are numbers of such morons. One of the jobs they are not fitted for, however, is that of the Infantry noncommissioned officer. But the screening processes sent them to the Infantry by the hundreds, with the even less able who had no definite occupations at all. These men were hazards to many highly intelligent doughboys who fought in the same squads with them.

It might be asked: "Why must the Infantry have people who have a high degree of intelligence? For the type of fighting they do, all we need is a sort of dumb fellow who can hold a gun and stand on the ground. In fact, we don't want a man with too much intelligence, because that type is inclined to be high-strung and will go to pieces under too much stress."

That was a common belief, but nothing could be further from the truth.

The truth is: If you have a man who is brave, strong, and intelligent, you have the ideal infantry soldier. If you have a man who is brave, strong, but stupid, he is going to get a lot of people killed.

People do not grow braver in combat as the war goes on; they are as courageous on the first day of combat as they will ever be. But what does happen is that they grow smarter, learn how to survive—and the higher their I. Q., the quicker they learn.

As a broad general truth, the bright mind that goes all to pieces when faced with danger is a fiction. That has been demonstrated again and again. To choose one specific example, a survey among paratroopers has shown that among those who refused to jump, there is a very high percentage of low I. Q. individuals. If jumping in a parachute is an indication of courage, individuals with a high I. Q. seem to have more courage than their duller comrades. And, at any rate, whatever is indicated by refusing to jump is typical of the low I. Q.

There were many combat soldiers who were brave and strong and who won awards for valor, yet were as dumb as they came. Generally speaking, however, this type got killed, got other people killed, and could not be depended upon. They were erratic. It was the courageous and intelligent type that consistently paid dividends and lived to tell the tale.

Now, what can be done about these things?

Must the Infantry have all class I personnel? No, not that; but a better distribution could be made.

The Air Force did not need men with high I. Q.'s to sweep floors, but it had them in World War II. It had class I men working at jobs that could have been done as well by class V's.

It is reasonable to expect that highly technical requirements of the Navy, Air Force, and other components of the ground arms, must have priority on civilian skills. It appears to me just as reasonable that the infantry, therefore, should have priority on physical and I. Q. qualifications in the proportion that others have priority on civilian skills.

You can teach the section chief of an antiaircraft gun section how to run his section and he will do just about the same thing over and over day after day. You can teach the leader of an Infantry rifle squad certain general rules of thumb and that's about all. It is doubtful if he ever will meet the same set of circumstances twice in a lifetime. His intelligence must control his handling of each situation. His intelligence controls the life or death of the men in his squad.

The Infantry needs more intelligent men than many people are willing to concede. It doesn't take a Napoleon to direct, control, and look out for the destinies of 9 or 10 men, but the squad leader's job has too many responsibilities for a Mortimer Snerd—particularly a Mortimer Snerd under fire.

Thousands of fine, highly intelligent GI's were unnecessarily endangered by being sent to fight side by side with these less responsible men. And millions were endangered, both soldiers and their families 5,000 miles away, because of our relatively small quantity of Infantry.

QUANTITY

The Chief of Staff stated in his report to the Secretary of War at the cessation of hostilities: "It is remarkable how exactly the mobilization plan fitted the requirements for victory. When Admiral Donetz surrendered the German Government every American division was in the operational theaters. All but two had seen action, one had the vital missions of securing the installations in the Hawaiian Islands; the other was an airborne division in SHAFF reserve. To give General Eisenhower the two divisions, already earmarked for future operations in the Pacific, the Eighty-sixth and Ninty-seventh were halted on the west coast in February, rushed across the United States and on to fast ships for Europe. When these troops left the New York port of embarkation there were no combat divisions left in the United States. The formed military forces of the Nation were completely committed overseas to bring about victory in Europe and keep sufficient pressure on Japan so that she could not dig in and stave off final defeat."

And what would have happened had there been 10 or 15 additional divisions?

It is possible that the Battle of the Bulge, with its thousands of killed and wounded, never might have occurred. It is possible that the arrival of more divisions might have ended the war earlier. But it is certain that to misinterpret the closeness of that mobilization economy is to be like a man who has ignored a sign saying "Danger" and gotten across a bridge just as it crashed into a bottomless pit—and who concludes that therefore he can always expect to succeed by walking past signs marked "Danger."

Examine for a moment these statistics. By the middle of 1943 a program had been inaugurated to establish 90 divisions for the Army—a considerable reduction from the original program. Germany's program called for 313, Japan's 120, Italy's 70, Hungary's 23, Rumania's 17, and Bulgaria's 13. The U. S. S. R. had a program for 550; the British, 50; the Chinese, more than 300.

Total mobilization of various nations for the war gave the U. S. S. R. 22,000,000 men; Germany, 17,000,000; the United States, 14,000,000; the British Empire, 12,000,000; and China, 6,000,000.

The Chief of Staff's report continues: "The significance of the facts should be carefully considered. Even with two-thirds of the German Army engaged by Russia, it took every man the Nation saw fit to mobilize to do our part of the job in Europe and at the same time keep the Japanese Army under control in the Pacific. What would have been the result had the Red army been defeated and the British islands invaded, we can only guess. The possibility is rather terrifying."

What would have been the result had we mobilized 10 or even 5 divisions fewer? Or what if we had mobilized exactly as we did but the enemy had mobilized 10 more divisions than they did? Again we can only guess, but it could have meant the difference between defeat and victory. Certainly the war would have been prolonged for some years.

Mobilization of divisions involves timing and a gathering of manpower here briefly described as quantity. This is the business of those who make our strategic plans. It is true that strategic plans must and do change. The original concept was for an invasion of Europe in 1943, so the planners certainly had to consider that in the mobilization of divisions. For future planners, however, this is hindsight that might help: The ground forces were the first to mobilize and the last to be used. No Infantry division, activated in the United States after Pearl Harbor, entered combat until 1944.

The matter of quantity poses important problems. Army Ground Forces Study No. 4, on the mobilization of the ground army, stated, in effect: How much power can the United States, considering all circumstances in its situation, actually deploy overseas on the ground? If the United States with 12,000,000 men in its armed services can produce fewer than 100 divisions, including those in the Marine Corps, this fact must be considered by all concerned in a future global war, and certainly will be considered by any possible enemies.

Our ability to conduct ground operations overseas was limited by a number of factors: National resources needed to control the sea and air, policies of allotting national resources to strategic bombardment and the support of our allies, the need for maintenance of long supply lines and by the effort to provide American soldiers with something corresponding to their normal standard of living. It was the last two factors that accounted in large part for the prodigious growth of overhead and service units. These factors are likely always to be present. The strength of American ground armies always is likely to depend on the degree to which economy in these limiting factors is achieved.

Where did the Army economize when it had to? And economize it did. The Army by the beginning of 1945 was a more economical and leaner organization than in any other year of the war. This is where the Army trimmed off fat: A pool of soldiers on college campuses which was half as large as our entire armored force, comfortable surpluses of aviation cadets, antiaircraft artillery which numbered half as many soldiers as all infantry divisions combined; personnel solely in post-house-keeping duties, and allowances for overstrengths in some tactical units. And where did this fat go? It went to the Infantry, because that was where the critical shortage of manpower existed. But it went

only when that critical shortage was in existence.

In the winter of 1944–45, the Army became frantic for Infantry replacements because too few Infantry divisions had been mobilized and too few replacements had been earmarked for the Infantry. It managed to get these replacements, and they came from the source already mentioned without impairing their efficiency.

REPLACEMENTS

The Infantry never had a satisfactory replacement or reinforcement system. Primarily, the trouble lay in the scarcity of men and the planners' basic mistake in underestimating requirements. It is a rule of thumb that the scarcer supplies are, the more tightly they must be controlled and the farther to the rear they must be held. That is why we could not have overstrengths, divisional replacement companies, and various other similar remedies which have been proposed. The new table of organization and equipment does give every Infantry division its own replacement company, but in the future, the same condition will exist again if the total quantity of Infantry is too small a part of the total fighting forces.

There were mistakes which might be prevented, in the event of world war III. The limited quantity of manpower had a definite bearing on these mistakes. It was reflected in the inadequate training of many replacements who went up to combat units; for example, one who tried to fire a rifle grenade with ball ammunition in the chamber of his rifle, at the cost of an ear—and he was lucky it was only that.

Infantry units received replacements who had been transferred in the grade of technical sergeant, staff sergeant, etc., from the Air Force, antiaircraft units, and so on. Our Infantry platoon sergeants were privates and privates first class. The high-ranking replacements, not properly trained, could not take over their new jobs; they had to be reduced in order to provide ratings for those who were doing the job—hardly fair to the men who were "busted" through no fault of their own.

It was quite usual to receive replacements who were poorly trained, particularly those who were trained in the ETO. As a consequence of such inadequate training these later replacements lacked courage, fighting spirit, and confidence.

In World War II the Army ground forces itself underestimated the correct balance of replacements. Training centers had been designed to fill vacancies in new units being activated in the United States according to the T./O. & E. Unfortunately, men died in numbers that did not balance with the plans on paper. Units in combat must have replacements based on statistics of how men actually die. These point up the need of the infantry.

National policy is another problem to deal with. There were many policies for the employment of all inductees. There was a policy for 18-year-olds; there was a policy for 19-year-olds; and a policy for married men; then a policy for men whose children were conceived before Pearl Harbor and men whose children were conceived after Pearl Harbor. They all caused confusion.

The Chief of Staff reported to the Secretary of War: "Our ground strength was, for the size of our population, proportionately much smaller than that of the other belligerents. On the other hand, it was, in effect, greater than a simple comparison of figures would indicate, for we had set up a system of training individual replacements that would maintain 89 divisions of ground troops and 273 combat air groups at full effective strength, enabling these units to continue in combat for protracted periods. In past wars it had been the accepted practice to organize as many divisions as manpower resources would permit, fight those divisions until casualties had reduced them to bare skeletons, then withdraw them from the line and rebuild them in rear areas. In 1918 the AEF was forced to reduce the strength of divisions and finally to disband newly arrived divisions in France in order to maintain the already limited strength of those engaged in battle. The system we adopted for this involved a flow of individual replacements from training centers to the divisions so they would be constantly at full strength. The Air Forces established a similar flow to replace combat casualties and provide relief crews.

"This system enabled us to pursue tremendous naval and shipping programs, the air-bombardment programs, and unprecedented, almost unbelievable, production and supply programs, and at the same time to gather the strength necessary to deliver the knock-out blows on the ground. There were other advantages. The more divisions an army commander has under his control, the more supporting troops he must maintain, the greater are his traffic and supply problems. If his divisions are fewer in number but maintained at full strength, the power for attack continues and the logistical problems are simplified."

As stated before, the most essential supply item of the Navy is ships; of the Air Force, aircraft, of the ground Army, guns, and of the Infantry, human beings. The system of furnishing Infantry replacements, which I have quoted from the Chief of Staff's report, differed from that of the Air Force in this respect: there were no planned rest periods for the Infantry. The Air Force had a definite rotation policy; the Infantry, let me repeat, (and the rest of the ground Army for that matter—had no rotation policy at all. This single factor alone could have made the infantryman's burden more nearly equal. Regarded as a supply item infantrymen should be conserved, and regarded as a human being, every infantryman should have as complete equality as possible. Even economically it should be remembered that he has a mind, a heart, hopes and fears—and nerves. Human beings give better performmance by far if the psychological factor is considered, as was done for the Air Forces.

The latter's replacements were not tossed in as they were in the Infantry. A combat crew for a bomber had quite a considerable period of orientation; many an Infantry squad got its first daylight look at its newest members when the squad was under enemy fire. It needs no more than a high school French understanding of the words "esprit de corps" to get a fairly good idea of the inequality in that instance. Possibly some of this welding together might be economically managed by timing the rest periods for veteran units with orienting fresh troops. We lack so much as a field manual covering the operation of a replacement system. In practice, high type personnel frequently were withdrawn from the replacement stream by almost every headquarters through which replacements passed. The leftovers went to the Infantry units in the line, and they and everybody else concerned suffered because of it. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link and it is possible for an Infantry squad in a tight place to be as weak as its weakest member in mind and body.

It is fairly obvious that the infantryman, who is expected to live in a fox hole, make long cross-country marches, and close with his enemy in hand-to-hand combat, should be as fit physically as his comrades of the Navy, the Air Force, and the other ground components.

But was he, in World War II? He was not!

(Pt. II)

The physical hardihood of a soldier should be greater in direct ratio to his potential proximity to the battlefield. Lt. Gen. Lesley J. McNair illustrated this point when he stated, "A cook in an Infantry rifle company should not have poor eyes, flat feet, or bad hearing, because he must be able to fire his weapons, be on his feet for long hours, and hear and understand whispered directions in the presence of the enemy. These requirements are not essential in a rear-area installation."

But how many rear-area installations in the other branches had already grabbed such desirable cooks and sent men to the front-line Infantry squads who could not understand directions whether whispered or shouted?

In August 1943 General McNair proposed that a physical test be given for assignments to the Infantry, and that no selectee, unless of unusually good physique, be assigned to the Infantry if he was shorter than 5 feet 6 inches. In November he recommended that the inductees should not normally be assigned to Infantry if they were below 5 feet 9 inches tall.

In November 1943, 12,000 combat soldiers at the AGF Overseas Replacement Depot at Fort Meade, Md., were examined in an effort to obtain a cross section of the situation in the ground forces. They were inferior in height, weight, AGCT grade, and education to the average for the Army as a whole. General McNair produced evidence to show that the average height of infantrymen was 5 feet 7.74 inches, and the average for all inductees was over 5 feet 8 inches.

Army Ground Forces Study No. 5, dated 1946, states: "Physically inferior men accumulated in the Armed Forces in various ways. * * * Although men not meeting current physical standards for general military service were not supposed to be initially assigned to combat units and replacement centers of the Ground Forces, a considerable number were in fact so assigned."

Army Ground Forces Study No. 5 further states: "Having long failed to obtain from the War Department a policy of selective assignment of new inductees to the Infantry, Army Ground Forces on February 20, 1944, dispatched a confidential letter to its subordinate commanders, pointing out that infantry had scarcity value, that it comprised only 11 percent of the troop basis, that it was nevertheless the decisive arm, that it must therefore be scrupulously conserved and that the strongest and healthiest men should be assigned to it." This clearly indicates that infantrymen were not up to the physical standard of other enlisted men.

General McNair amplified his statement on physical fitness and nearness to combat zones with the statement: "It is desired to point out that Air Force combat units are peculiar in the respect that generally only a certain proportion of a combat unit can be considered as actually engaging in close combat. Dependent upon conditions, ground crews and administrative personnel of front-line combat air units may be from 100 to 1,000 miles from the enemy. Such personnel can be more or less assured of regular meal hours, favorable living conditions, and medical attention."

Medical attention is the only one of those item the Infantry could hope for.

MEDICAL SERVICE

The infantryman who was wounded or suffered an accidental injury got all the physical medical care that was possible and the very best that was available, and no praise can be too great for the personnel of battalion-aid stations. But complete medical service covers a good bit of other ground.

What makes a man ill? The following are major contributions: His mind, his physical surroundings, germs, and physical injury.

We can't do much about the infantryman's physical surroundings, and the medical service did all it could to combat disease germs and physical injury.

But how about the mind?

The most casual reader of newspapers and magazines must know that medicine has now proved effects of the mind on the body.

From hypertension to fever blisters it has been established, at more length than this article can include, that distraught minds cause genuine physical ailments. Overwhelming fear or anxiety not only can throw a good mind into a state of unbalance, but a good digestive system into conditions of ill health. Emotional tension can send the blood pressure soaring. During World War II doctors behind the lines found men suffering from unmistakable liver trouble with no other cause than shock. Shock had not made them imagine they had liver trouble. It had given them liver trouble.

All of these ills happened in other branches of the service as well as the Infantry, but it is exhaustion that works like yeast to increase these ills, and it was exhaustion that was forced on the Infantry in the largest doses with least relief.

Preventive psychiatry is the attempt to keep the mind from making the mind or the body (or both) sick, by helping the individual to achieve inner strength. Profound mental poise grows from profound belief in a purpose, combined with the abiding conviction that one is working toward its achievement. Will power to put purpose into practice is strengthened through discipline. Thousands of men needed, and could be given in the future, more of these vital steadying forces.

Quicker and less profound aids to mental stability are a feeling of personal importance (morale), identification with an admired group (esprit de corps), and attachment to a strong personality. Before the words "preventive psychiatry" were heard of, these were in common use every autumn by football coaches from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

The medical service, of course, has in this field only the adviser's role. The medical service and the Infantry failed through no fault of their own, in administering the proper preventive psychiatry. The reasons are an accumulation of many things. The infantryman's intellectual functioning was injured through ignorance because of the inadequate replacement system and scarcity of replacements, which made it necessary to place men in the line who were not properly educated for the task. His emotional balance and his will lacked discipline as a result of inadequate training. This lack was indicated by the higher incidence of straggling and desertion; and, again, combat exhaustion was caused by mental stress and mental stress was inestimably increased by combat without rest. The rifleman seldom had a feeling of personal importance, or that he was one of an admired group, or that he felt attachment to a strong personality in his squad leaders.

All of this did not apply to all outfits at all times, but to paraphrase Lincoln's saying, it did apply to all outfits some of the time and to some outfits all of the time.

Maj. Raymond Sobel, who was on duty with the Thirty-fourth Division during World War II, has written in Combat Psychiatry about "good soldiers" under the name of "Old Sergeant Syndrome" who broke down after prolonged combat stress. He states that the most striking cases occurred among those commissioned and noncommissioned officers who had considerable combat experience. The syndrome, he writes, "occurred in well-motivated, previously efficient soldiers as a result of the chronic and progressive breakdown of their normal defenses against anxiety in long periods of combat. It was seen only in those divisions that had experienced prolonged combat commitments without relief."

Ninety percent of these cases occurred in Infantry soldiers, Major Sobel reports, many of whom had received citations, awards, and medals. Nevertheless, in spite of their efficiency, training, and discipline, "they eventually developed abnormal tremulousness, sweating and a tendency to be the first to get in and the last to get out of a foxhole."

Kipling, in a less precise language, noted the general subject:

"It was not in the open fight
We threw away the sword,
But in the lonely watching
In the darkness by the ford.
The waters lapped, the night-wind blew,
Full-armed the fear was born and grew.
And we were flying ere we knew
From panic in the night."

There are notable examples of the use of preventive psychiatry to good advantage. These were found in the airborne divisions, to some extent in the armored divisions, and in the Air Force. The Air Force probably made the greatest stride in making this type of medical service available to its personnel because it had a rotation policy. Infantry divisions did not; they lacked the means.

Related to the problem of the infantryman's morale is the system of tangible recognition of service, valued by most of humankind.

AWARDS

Did the infantryman get his just share of awards?

Well, infantrymen got 70 percent of the total casualties and 11.6 percent of the total awards. These figures are exclusive of the Purple Heart, hardly a decoration to encourage soldiers to try for.

In World War II, as of January 1, 1946, there were awarded 228 Congressional Medals of Honor, 3,799 Distinguished Service Crosses, 67,957 Silver Stars, 831 Distinuished Service Medals, 122,357 Distinguished Flying Crosses, 10,931 Legion of Merits, 10,905 Soldiers Medals, 323,160 Bronze Stars, and 1,156,615 Air Medals. Exclusive of the Purple Heart the infantry received 11.6 percent, the Air Force 76.2 percent, others 12.2 percent.

The Bronze Star for the Armed Forces was intended to be like the Air Medal for the Air Forces, but was it? Compare the statistics again—323,160 Bronze Stars, versus 1,156,615 Air Medals.

Many persons contend that the Air Forces awarded far too many medals while the Ground Forces kept their awards within reason; I contend the Ground Forces should have awarded more, not the Air Forces fewer. Even when the Combat Infantry Badge is considered, it is not enough. By comparison with the Air Forces it is no more than the various categories of wings that are awarded to bombardiers, navigators, pilots, and others.

The infantry should have had a medal which a man should get just for being subjected to artillery or small-arms fire; just for being present on the battlefield. This is about what the Air Force did—and its morale did not suffer from having too many medals awarded.

These are some interesting figures for comparison as of January 1, 1946. The number of men killed per 100 medals awarded was:

Air Force	2
Medical Department	12
Field Artillery	12
Coast Artillery	28
Engineers	29
Cavalry	36
Infantry	67

As of March 20, 1945, Infantry had received 6.9 percent of the awards, and all others 93.1 percent. The Infantry received 14 medals for each 10 men killed; the Air Force 431. These figures are exclusive of the Purple Heart.

Apart from statistical comparisons, it should be kept in mind that the conditions under which infantrymen received their awards were, generally speaking, far more severe than prevailed for personnel of other arms and services. And many deeds of heroism that were exceptional for other arms and services were, by comparison, a matter of course to the front-line infantryman. Many an infantryman's courageous act was performed without witnesses, or in the presence of witnesses who were killed or wounded before a lull in the action provided the opportunity for a formal report, and the man himself often was killed, too.

The principle illustrated further by the award for battle credit without distinction among units; for example, General Order No. 102, War Department, 1945, gave battle credit to the First Infantry Division, the Thirty-third Machine Records Unit, the One Hundred and Forty-seventh Army Postal Unit, and the Twenty-ninth Infantry Division.

PAY

Close to the question of awards is the award of regular pay for regular service.

In 1943 this was the average annual pay of enlisted men:

Air Forces	[1] $1,152
Ordnance	875
Signal Corps	780
Armored Force	760
Quartermaster	750
Antiaircraft Artillery	730
Field Artillery	730
Engineers	720
Medical	707
Infantry	700

[1] Exclusive of flying pay.

Later, grades and ratings were added which increased the average annual pay for the Infantry to $743, but the ratio remained unequal, as the other branches were increased, also. The point is: Was the infantryman compensated for hazardous duty in proportion to other branches which were so compensated—the airman, the paratrooper, the submariner? The casualties would seem to indicate that he was not. True, the infantryman received $10 extra pay per month if he had earned the Combat Infantry Badge, but this did not make up the difference.

The pay basis is due in part to the fact that in peacetime it is necessary to attract volunteers by paying more money for the more skilled positions, and not the more dangerous. An infantryman's job is not particularly dangerous—until war comes. Then, the higher pay should go to get good men for the more dangerous jobs.

Further pointing up the disparity of pay is this comparison of wartime pay of enlisted men:

Type unit	Average monthly pay	Average monthly pay, including overseas, flying, submarine, and all extra compensation
Infantry rifle company	$92	$120
Combat crew, aircraft	112	201
Submarine	102	153
Parachute rifle company	----------	170

There are many other ways in which the Infantry came off second best, compared with other components. Some were little things, seemingly unimportant, but still, aggravations that made the infantryman feel no better about his lot.

STRAWS ON THE CAMEL'S BACK

In the Navy and the Air Force, one usually had shelter over his head; he was dry, and he got a bath once in a while. His food usually was fresh and hot. In the Air Force, combat crews got special rations. Other branches of the Army, being relatively farther from the front, did better as to material comforts than did the infantryman on the line—the rifleman who thought of the company CP as being "rear echelon"—the man who had the sky for a roof and rocks for his

bed, who ate cold K rations and considered it a treat if he "liberated" a fresh egg.

The infantryman, compared with his comrades, had less opportunity to attend church, to write letters, to see a movie, sleep between sheets, to attend to his personal hygiene in relative comfort, to sleep with his shoes off.

In peace and in war, when there is an undesirable job to be done, it usually is the infantry that gets it. Others often are considered too valuable.

Instead of a plan for Infantry rotation, it might be said there was only a plan for Infantry exhaustion. If a man could just look to some time in the future when he could go home, it helped tremendously, no matter how distant that time might be. But the infantryman could only look forward to getting killed, captured, or wounded.

General Marshall wrote to the head of the Bureau of Public Relations in February 1944, "Men will stand almost anything if their work receives public acknowledgment. They are inclined to glory in its toughness and hazards if what they do is appreciated. There has been so little glamor in infantry work that the public is little aware of the requirements. On the contrary, if you will recall, I was opposed vigorously in the early formation of the Army for my attitude regarding the Infantry soldier and his importance in our war Army. It was to be all tanks and air, maybe a little artillery, with everybody motorized, etc. Now (in February 1944) the picture is being completed in accordance with the fundamental requirements of waging a successful war. The haphazard theorizing is found to be without solid foundation, and the influence of the more glamorous methods of making war is found not to be sufficient for the purpose of successful operation. * * *

"It might well be charged that we have made the mistake of having too much of air and tank and other special weapons and units and too little of the rifleman for whom all these other combat arms must concentrate to get him forward with the least punishment and loss. I don't want to discourage the rifleman and yet I want his role made clear and exalted. I don't want to unduly alarm the families of riflemen and yet it is important that some action be taken."

Let us remember this if there is a world war III.

What can be done about it?

Many things obviously never can be bettered. There always will be a place in war where a man is and there won't be anything in front of him but the enemy; and that man will be in the Infantry. His will be a dirty, nasty job.

But some things can be helped.

The most important item from an infantryman's standpoint is a definite rotation policy. Here is one: Members of Infantry battalions, after a certain number of days in contact with the enemy, should get a certain number of days out of the line. If people in other branches don't like this, let them transfer to the Infantry.

This brings up the question of quantity. The quantity needed must be clearly understood. Train every man basically as an infantryman. To solve this problem we need universal military training now.

Next in importance comes the question of mental quality. As the only acceptable minimum, Infantry must receive mentally qualified personnel, at least in the same ratio as all others.

The Infantry must be given priority on physically qualified personnel.

The system for getting properly trained replacements, physically and mentally fit, to the right place at the right time, must work.

A system for converting Air Force, AAA personnel, and others to Infantry must be planned well in advance and must be clearly understood.

Start initially with young leadership. Battalion commanders shouldn't be over 32, regimental commanders 38, and division commanders 48. That's the way you'll end up.

The infantryman's esprit de corps must be built up. One way is to borrow a leaf from the Marines' or the Air Forces' book and give the infantryman a public relations build-up comparable to that given our comrades of the wild blue yonder.

The Infantry should get a better break financially. Why not give fighting pay for combat zone service to members of arms in which the monthly casualty rate reaches a certain percentage?

Why not give the Infantry a distinctive uniform?

After these things are accomplished for the Infantry, don't make the tragic mistake of pampering. Work the hell out of 'em and particularly during training.

These are practical ways to improve the lot of the infantryman.

Now is the time to do it.

Congress Disregards President Truman's Veto by Big Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has on several occasions lately vetoed legislation passed by both Houses of Congress by almost unanimous votes. On each occasion both Houses of Congress have overridden his veto by tremendous majorities.

What does this mean? It means that hundreds of leading Democrats in the House and Senate have rejected the President's pleas and have indicated that they have no faith in his opinions or in his judgment.

If this would happen in the congress of some of the leading nations of the world it would mean that the President should immediately step down and relinquish his high office.

I should think that he would learn that there are three coordinate branches of the Government and that each of these branches has its duties and responsibilities and that no one branch has the right to usurp the powers of any other branch.

The President's training under Boss Pendergast must have taught him that since the boss of Kansas City controlled the action of the three branches of the municipal government that the President of the United States should be the "big boss" over the three branches of the Federal Government.

Common sense should teach any person that it is for the best interests of our Government that the three branches—the legislative, which is Congress; the judiciary, which is the Supreme Court; and the Executive, which is the President, to work together in harmony if possible.

The Democratic and New Deal friends of President Truman cannot long claim that he is a man of sufficient judgment or common sense to fill the position of President if he continues to issue such statements as he did when he compared the Marine Corps to Stalin and if he continues to put his judgment as to what is the duty of Congress against the judgment of intelligent and patriotic Democrats with long honorable service in Congress.

The President evidently has no appreciation of his responsibility toward the making of our laws. He has no appreciation of his power to use the veto on the work of Congress.

The Constitution gives the President the right to veto any bills passed by Congress and the Congress may override any presidential veto if two-thirds of the Members of both Houses of Congress vote to override his veto.

It was not the intention of those who wrote the Constitution that the President should veto a bill passed by both branches of Congress just because he did not agree with the action of Congress. He should not veto a bill for capricious reasons. He should not veto a measure which has been passed by both branches of Congress acting freely and without any improper influence unless it is clearly an infringement upon the rights and jurisdiction of one of the other branches of the Government or unless it is clearly repugnant to the policies and principles and best interests of the Republic.

The President's actions in his numerous vetoes indicate petty, personal reasons of a little man and not the broad statesmanlike actions of a person worthy to be President of the greatest Nation in the world.

Of course, the President cannot be expected to write all his own state papers himself without the aid of assistants. It is clear that Harry Truman did not write the veto message which was read to Congress yesterday, September 22. This message indicates clearly that it was written by a lawyer well versed in legal verbiage. The language and the arguments suggest to me that one of the Frankfurters might have had a hand in the preparation of this message. At any rate, whoever wrote it must have felt that the bill was anti-Red and that the best way to favor the Reds would be to support the President in his efforts to defeat the bill.

In the list of those who voted to support President Truman in his veto can be seen the names of practically all of those who consistently vote against all legislation that has for its purpose stamping out un-American activities.

The bill that the President vetoed was prepared by stalwart Americans and was supported by stalwart Americans. No Reds or pinks had anything to do with the preparation or passage of the bill that the President vetoed.

The Senate also rejected the President's veto by a tremendous majority. Only 7 Members of the 96 Members of the Senate supported the President. These seven were practically all New Deal Democrats. But, in spite of a filibuster conducted by these seven Senators, the Senate by an overwhelming majority rejected the President's wishes. It is reported that Senator LUCAS, the majority leader of the Senate, refused to follow the President in his request that the Senate vote to sustain his veto.

The President and those who favor his views in the House and in the Senate argued persistently that the proposed legislation should not be passed and that it would finally work out to the advantage of the Communists. These arguments are absolutely unjustified and the proof of this falsity is that practically every Red and pink individual and organization in our country is opposed to the action and is supporting the President's veto. Can it be that these opponents are and have been giving aid and support to those enemies within our gates, who are numbered by the thousands and who all want to undermine the institutions and our great country.

I voted to override the President's veto and am well satisfied with my vote. There is no doubt that the people of the country are patriotic and favor any legislation that curbs the actions of the Communists who are within our country, most of them illegally.

The press of this country is patriotic and the large majority of the newspapers have been very critical of the President and vigorously support the Congress.

The Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, one of the leading newspapers in the country, sets forth its opposition to the President's position in a very positive editorial, which is as follows:

VETO UNMASKS THE REAL TRUMAN

The President's veto of the bill to control Communists at home is a political betrayal of the country's sacrifices in lives and money to fight Communists abroad.

It is a desperate effort to protect those Communists and fellow travelers in his own party who carry on sabotage against American institutions, who undermine American freedoms, who confuse us in social and economic matters and who betray our military secrets.

It is the political pay-off to every Communist and Communist sympathizer from Klaus Fuchs to Alger Hiss and to all the thousands of Reds and Red followers in between who have supported his regime in return for the Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and China appeasements.

The requirements of the bill vetoed by the President are few.

Communists, Communist organizations and Communist-front groups are required to identify themselves to the Department of Justice.

In time of war, the Department of Justice would be empowered to round up and hold, but not in criminal prisons, spies and saboteurs.

It denies Communists jobs on the Federal payroll or in defense plants or public transportation facilities.

It increases the punishment for spies and saboteurs.

The President is given wide discretionary powers in applying the various measures in the bill.

To veto it on the basis that it is dangerous to American liberties echoes the Communist whine against a restriction of constitutional rights whenever a Communist toe is stepped on.

Politically the veto will be taken as a gesture of support to all the fringe radicals in the Truman camp. It will be accepted as the cloak to cover the countless numbers of Communists and fellow travelers suspected of still being active within the administration itself.

The veto was made not for the protection of the American people but of the administration itself which cannot afford politically to allow its fringe of Reds or their hangers-on within the Government to be exposed in their full strength.

It signals again the decision of the President to stand at all costs behind the Acheson-Hiss-Lattimore policy of appeasement for the Chinese Communists who threaten the very area where our own boys are fighting and dying in a war whose purposes are far from clear.

Congress, by its overwhelming vote in favor of the Communist control bill has, on the other hand, accurately reflected the feelings of the American people about Communists. This feeling has come to an explosive head after months of exposures and disclosures by Congressmen themselves who are opposed to the Truman-Acheson foreign policy maneuverings.

This feeling demands that something be done to protect the Nation.

The voters will have a chance to confirm this feeling November 7 when America goes to the polls to elect a new Congress, a Congress which will have a new opportunity to reexamine our foreign policies in the light of every American family's sacrifices. And in the light, too, of the Truman administration's efforts to bring these sacrifices to naught by such political betrayals as this veto.

FEPC and Civil Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an address which I delivered at a large civil-rights rally at Tindley-Temple M. E. Church, Philadelphia, Pa., stressing the need for strong, enforceable FEPC legislation and early enactment of President Truman's civil-rights program:

Ladies and gentlemen, friends, I welcome this opportunity to come before you because I not only believe that it is the duty of every Congressman to report to his people, but also that such occasions as this help create an atmosphere of understanding about the issues before us.

You and I know, in a brief address, one cannot hope to discuss all, or even a small portion, of the enormous number of legislative proposals now under consideration. But there is one great issue with which we all are familiar, and which commands our attention and our active support. I, of course, refer to the need for strong, enforceable FEPC legislation. I say strong because I want to emphasize the fact that some very well-known reactionaries in Government are deliberately attempting to push the enactment of a watered-down bill which is an insult to every intelligent man and woman. These reactionaries give lip service to FEPC, but avoid it like a hot potato in the showdown. I want to stress the necessity of enforceable FEPC legislation because, if legal sanctions are lacking, such legislation isn't worth much more than the paper it's written on. I demand effective FEPC legislation that is acceptable to the great body of people who are in need of it, who look to it as a living symbol of hope which will erase a smudge on our reputation as a freedom-loving people.

Fair-employment-practices legislation has been talked about long enough. It's time to do something about it.

It's time to strengthen and fortify our liberties, not sacrifice them to the whims of selfish reactionaries. It's time to actively support President Truman in his fight to enact a wise and a far-reaching civil-rights program. He can't win the fight alone. He needs your help individually and collectively, just as your United States Senator and Congressman need your help. Talk about FEPC. Have your friends talk about it to their neighbors, and have them all send letters of protest to the reactionary Members of Congress who are constantly obstructing the passage of praiseworthy FEPC legislation.

During my two terms in Congress I considered it an honor and a privilege to introduce legislation designed to contribute to the betterment of human welfare and to support every measure which in any way fostered the expansion of civil rights so that all minority groups may enjoy all of the rights as set forth in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I am profoundly disturbed by the attempts of bigoted persons who cast aspersions on the necessity of FEPC legislation. They were best characterized recently by individuals who sought to endow educational institutions with immense sums of money provided the schools taught white supremacy or denied benefit of the funds to Catholics and Jews. Such actions are intolerable and must be stamped out, otherwise the ideal of human rights and freedom will eventually be lost, as they were in Germany and Italy and as they are denied in the Soviet Union.

The importance of FEPC action on the local level is pointed up by the fact that the commission in Philadelphia handled 294 charges of discrimination between January 1948 and October 1949. It was reported that 254 of these cases were settled and that 40 were still under investigation. Ladies and gentlemen, I do not believe that those figures tell the whole story. Many hundreds of cases go unreported, and I contend that it is therefore logical to conclude that many others are forgotten or hushed up because of machinery that is inadequate to serve the needs of a city the size of Philadelphia. I do not question the good intentions of the local commission, but I am convinced that there is room for vast improvement. Moreover, there still exists a crying need for effective State-wide FEPC legislation. This, too, should be coordinated with national legislation in order that the people of all States would know where they stand.

We need unity on every level of our society if we are to endure as a strong nation. The denial of rights which we profess to hold to be inalienable to any one group is a road block in the path of progress. It helps breed disunity, scorn, and even utter disrespect for our fellow human beings. That certainly is not the way which we, as a whole, can ever hope to reap the fruits of our democratic system of government. Our national welfare and the future of the United States as a leader in the community of nations makes it imperative that we recognize that fact now.

It is estimated that the forthcoming census will reflect a sharp increase in population figures throughout the country, and particularly in urban centers. As our population rises our problems will likewise increase in virtually every field of human activity. It inevitably calls for greater police protection, improved fire-fighting facilities, more playgrounds, more schools, and more homes. I have mentioned these few things because they are highly important in maintaining a high standard of living. When people have the opportunity to enjoy a fair measure of personal security and live up to their responsibilities as citizens, they tend to become more tolerant and understanding of the rights of others. We know from recent history that in times of depression and poverty there is a pronounced upswing in

the direction of intolerance as manifest by an increase in crime and other violations of the law.

Having lived through the most turbulent years in history, we have a pretty good idea of what does, and what does not, contribute to industrial progress and economic security. Unfortunately, however, our forward steps in understanding the needs of the individual as a member of society have not kept pace with our industrial achievements.

During the past 50 years we have come a long way toward recognizing that fact as evidence by liberal legislation enacted by Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and now Harry Truman. But the job is far from completed. There is much that remains to be done in the field of social science. In this respect, the enactment of national FEPC legislation is of paramount importance. I assure you, ladies and gentlemen, I am doing my utmost to see President Truman's civil-rights program voted into law. I consider it a moral obligation to help remove the obstacles which beset minority groups at every turn. I need your help and your active support to do the job. By working together to achieve a common goal we can stem the tide of the die-hard reactionaries who, in my opinion, are making a political football of one of the most important legislative propos: 's in the short, but glorious history of our country and mine.

Ladies and gentlemen, you and I have a deep responsibility to make the most of the golden opportunity exemplified by President Truman's fair-employment-practices bill.

Thank you very much for the privilege of talking to you.

A Book on Mining That Every Western Miner and Prospector Should Have on His Bookshelf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the illustrated book containing the hearings on the Conference on the Revision of United States Mining Laws is now obtainable from the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

This book contains much valuable mining information including compilation of existing mining laws taken from the United States statutes; also the Department of Interior's Manual of Mining Laws with Departmental Rules and Regulations.

Included in the volume is a Forest Service map of the national forest wilderness areas together with a description of the primitive and roadless areas.

The book also contains the prescribed forms for making locations of mining claims on public lands and in the national forests, together with copies of forms for making and filing proof of labor on mining claims, or when the requirements for mine assessment work is suspended by law, there is a form for making an intention to hold mining claims—all of which have been made part of this volume.

This compilation of mining laws and mining forms is intended to be useful as a handbook for citizens who may discover valuable ore veins in isolated and faraway places, which may even be in the mountain fastness of Alaska, and will enable anyone to write on the spot and post notice of mining locations.

That this book is in demand is indicated from a few of the letters received which are inserted herewith:

ARIZONA SMALL MINE
OPERATORS ASSOCIATION,
Phoenix, Ariz., September 21, 1950.
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMPTON: This will acknowledge your letter of September 16.

The copies of the Spokane conference arrived today. I certainly do appreciate getting the copies you sent me. This is going to prove to be a very valuable book. We also appreciate your taking over this hearing and making it a matter of record with Government backing.

This book has a tremendous amount of data in it that is extremely valuable.

Thanking you again, and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely,

CHARLES F. WILLIS,
State Secretary.

MOSCOW, IDAHO, *September 21, 1950.*
The Honorable COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Recently you presented me with a copy of Conference on Revision of United States Mining Law, Serial No. 24. This I greatly appreciated, and even more so now as I am able to well use it in my irrigation and mining law class at the college of law. There are no available textbooks for this course and the students of the course as well as the law library could use a couple dozen copies of this publication as well as any other that you might have in relation to our course. Would greatly be appreciated by all, anything you could do for us in regard to these publications.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE L. LOVELESS,
Student of Law, University of Idaho.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE
AND CIVIL SERVICE,
September 22, 1950.
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMP: I have been very interested in reading the hearings before the House Special Subcommittee on Public Lands on Revision of United States Mining Laws. May I compliment your subcommittee on its zeal in conducting the hearings and compiling this valuable document on the development of our natural resources and the administration of laws relating to the public lands of the United States.

Many Idahoans have asked me to mail copies of this publication to them, and I find that I am unable to comply with all of their requests because the committee's supply is practically exhausted. If you have any copies available for distribution, I shall be happy to receive them. Can you tell me whether it is expected that additional copies will be printed for distribution by Members of Congress?

With warm personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY.
(HENRY DWORSHAK.)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., September 21, 1950.
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: Our supply of committee hearings on Conference on Revision of United States Mining Laws, serial No. 24, is practically exhausted. I am wondering if you could supply us with additional copies of this hearing for distribution to the various libraries throughout the United States.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE E. RAGAN,
Clerk.

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1950.
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: This office has placed on sale to the public, Conference on Revision of United States Mining Laws, and now finds the demand heavy enough to investigate sources of additional copies provided they are needed.

Our purpose at this time is to determine if you or the Committee on Public Lands have a surplus supply that could be released to the Superintendent of Documents and avoid the possible expense of printing additional copies.

Please address your reply for the attention of the Procurement Section.

Sincerely,

ROY B. EASTIN,
Superintendent of Documents.

Democratic Administration Fails To Provide Needed Financial Aid to Flood-Stricken Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress are well aware of my efforts to secure financial assistance and relief to the distressed citizens, as well as financial aid to the townships, counties, villages, and cities in the flood-disaster area of northwestern Minnesota.

It may be recalled that I introduced quite a number of bills and I want to mention them again. They were as follows:

H. R. 8278: To provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the State of Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods.

H. R. 8435: To provide for the authorization for an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads, bridges, and other public facilities in the States of Minnesota and North Dakota, which were destroyed or damaged by floods in the spring of 1950, and for building necessary road dikes and levees and dike and levee protection, and

H. R. 8461: To authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments

in major disasters, and for other purposes.

However, because of the opposition by every Democratic administrative agency and bureaucrat, it was not possible to get favorable action on these bills in the House Committee on Public Works at this time.

There was but little sympathy and cooperation from these agencies, before and during the time hearings were held before the House Committee on Public Works on my bills and similar bills. The agencies and departments even opposed the national disaster bills, introduced by Representative Lemke and myself, namely H. R. 8396 and H. R. 8461. They opposed the very heart of these measures, namely, section 6, which would provide that in any major disaster the President is authorized to make grants of funds to local governments for restoring, reconstructing, or replacing their public facilities "damaged or destroyed in such major disaster. Such grants shall not exceed 50 percent of the estimated cost, as determined by the President, of the restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of such public facilities without enlargement of service capacity or other betterment, excepting that the grant may exceed 50 percent of such estimated cost in the case of a local government with respect to which the President specifically finds and declares that the damage to public facilities resulting from such major disaster is of such magnitude and extent that the fiscal resources of the local government are insufficient to defray 50 percent of such cost: *Provided, however,* That in determining the fiscal resources of the local government consideration shall be given to (1) the extent and probable duration of any impairment of the taxing base and borrowing authority of the local government as a result of the major disaster, (2) the existing or prospective availability of aid from State and other sources, and (3) the eligibility of the particular local government project for Federal financial assistance under other laws. Grants made under this section may be used to enable the recipient thereof to qualify for other Federal financial assistance which is conditioned upon State or local participation in financing the work."

The best part of the measure was taken out.

In my opinion it is time for a change in the Federal agencies and departments and time for a change in leadership, which presently expresses more interest and gives more support for assistance to the people of Africa, Europe, and other parts of the world, even though they are not suffering or handicapped by serious flood disasters or other catastrophes.

The best bill we could get out of the committee was the revised Hagen-Lemke bill, which will provide for some financial aid to financially distressed civil agencies, including townships, villages, counties, cities, and so forth, for the temporary or emergency rehabilitation of roads, bridges, culverts, and so forth. However, in view of the unfriendly attitude of the administration, I am fearful that the distressed townships, counties, villages, and so forth, will get very little consideration under this national emergency disaster program, which now has been passed by both branches of Congress, the Senate only yesterday—Tuesday, September 19. I am presuming, of course, that the President will sign the bill which authorizes but does not provide $5,000,000 for emergency disaster aid. However, the President has over $1,000,000 in his emergency disaster fund which can be used to supply funds for approved applications for aid until the $5,000,000 is actually appropriated by Congress.

I will urge the officials of the townships, villages, counties, cities, and so forth, to immediately make application for assistance, if they feel that they can qualify.

If the law and program is properly administered, some assistance can be secured. If the administrators fail to cooperate, then we should make an immediate effort in the Congress to pass more definite and direct legislation, requiring and directing that financial aid be given to distressed townships, villages, counties, and so forth, in emergency disaster areas.

There will be little opportunity until January to get any new legislation. During the special session, to be called about November 27, excess-profits-tax legislation and a few other matters will be considered. The chairman of the Committee on Public Works in the House has indicated that he will not take up any further legislation of this kind before his committee during the special session of Congress, and the same situation perhaps exists in the Senate.

I am very sorry that the Senate did not improve the Hagen-Lemke disaster bill. It was passed in the House in somewhat of a rush because of the emergency situation in northwestern Minnesota and North Dakota. However, the Senate delayed in taking action on the bill until the last week of the Congress. Having been delayed that long, the measure could not have been improved and amended without endangering passage of the measure, since only a few days of the session remained.

The aid which will come to the townships, villages, counties, cities, and other civil agencies is just a drop in the bucket compared to what they will need. I charge the Democratic administration with complete lack of interest, sympathy, cooperation, and support for the distressed flood-stricken areas of Minnesota and North Dakota.

Even in spite of assurances given to Members of Congress and the public at the time of the flood disaster and immediately thereafter, we again have a situation of too little too late.

It will be our job to continue our efforts and try to get the Democratic leadership to see the error of their ways and to join us in getting much improved and more desirable flood-aid legislation. You can be sure that this will be my purpose and aim as long as I am the Ninth District United States Representative in Congress and if I am returned to the Congress by the vote of the people on November 7.

Senate Bill 784 Failed To Receive Fair Consideration in the House—In Fact, It Never Reached the Floor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, when House Resolution 818, the rule to bring Senate bill 784 before the House for consideration, came up, I was prepared to speak in support of the Senate bill, which was a bill to return $384,256.26 in bond money wrongfully withheld from the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Companies.

Much of the time for debate on the rule to bring the bill to the floor for consideration was consumed by members permitted to speak out of order on issues entirely irrelevant and foreign to the provisions of the bill. The arguments of the opponents of the rule went far afield, and did not deal with the issues in the bill.

A study of report No. 2135, dated May 25, 1950, of the House Judiciary Committee, on S. 784, will readily disclose this. No credence can be given to any of the objections raised, which were unjustified and unjustifiable objections evidently made to confuse and obscure the issues, and prevent a fair and full presentation of the facts concerning the rights of the claimants to the return of the bond money wrongfully withheld by the Maritime Commission.

As the Members of Congress will well recall, this Government agency has recently been abolished by a terse directive of the President, who followed the recommendation of the Hoover Commission. This action was approved by Congress.

S. 784 states in plain language what its purpose is; namely, to return to the depositors "$384,256.26, being the balance of certain sums deposited by 'the companies' as a security." The objectors would make it appear that no such balance exists. They have either allowed themselves to be misled by the groundless contentions of the Maritime Commission, or they are acting as belated spokesmen for the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the contention that this claim is stale is unfounded. This case has had the continued, serious consideration of Congress since 1936. Eight successive congressional committees have analyzed the evidence in the case, and have brought to light the facts and the motivation for the delays. The committees have evidently recognized this deliberate pattern; to wit, the endless procrastination with the apparent objective of tiring the companies and their owner by the endless, time-consuming and expensive legalistic subterfuges which the Maritime Commission has carried on in the name of the Government, and at public expense.

The congressional committees evidently recognized the tactics of the Maritime

Commission; their endeavor to confuse the issues, the fallacy of their contention that sales were involved in the transaction and that the companies had breached the provisions of a sales contract, and the attempt to support this contention by lifting a short sentence out of the context of the testimony, thereby seeking to justify a plea for forfeiture of the funds as liquidated damages. The Maritime Commission failed to support their contention in court. It is evident that the congressional committee became thoroughly aware of the injustice of these delaying tactics.

The House Judiciary Committee in its report on S. 784 dated May 25, 1950, on pages 17 to 19, joins previous congressional committees in emphatically denouncing these unjustifiable attempts to alienate the companies' cash property as liquidated damages.

The companies were forced to go all the way to the Supreme Court in this case, and the Court affirmed the companies' claim that the status of the Government was not that of a sovereign, but merely that of a liquidator of the assets and obligations of the Fleet Corporation—see page 6 of House Report No. 2135.

The claim has not been before Congress since this determination was made.

This is the first time that these claims have been before the House since 1940, and since all the relevant evidence has been assembled. All of the evidence now in the record was not collected or presented when the forerunner bills were vetoed by the late President Roosevelt. In vetoing the previous bills passed by Congress for the relief of these claimants, President Roosevelt was misinformed; his veto was obtained through the assertion of the Maritime Commission that "It decided there had been a sale and refused to return the money." President Roosevelt's Attorney General, after reviewing the facts concluded and so advised Congress that the President's veto was obtained through the aforesaid groundless and invalid contention of the Maritime Commission.

As a result of the Senate's inquiry to the court in 1940, the United States Court of Claims determined in 1946 in its findings of fact, based on unrebutted evidence before the court, that "there were no sales," that "the companies breached no contracts" and that they "did not damage the United States to the extent of $384,256.26, or any part thereof."

S. 784 provides for the return of this $384,256.26. It does not provide for the payment of interest for the time of withholding these private funds.

On April 13, 1950, Hon. Peyton Ford, Assistant to the Attorney General, on behalf of the Department of Justice, reported on S. 784 to the House Judiciary Committee as cited on page 30 of the report—that the Department of Justice has "no further objection to the passage of this bill," and Mr. Ford further pointed out, in the aforesaid report, that—

> I desire also to call the attention of your committee to the fact that the Attorney General while a Member of the Senate reported the bill favorably on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary and actively supported the measure on the floor of the Senate.

On page 34 of the official House report, No. 2135, is an accurate and precise summary of the account concerned. It shows $384,256.26 as the unreturned balance of the companies' cash bond funds, after allowing to the Fleet Corp. and its successor—that is, the Government—all due credits versus offsets. These figures have never changed. As cited on page 22, in his statement in support of S. 784, the Honorable SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, attests as follows:

> There has never been any dispute as to these figures, or any of them.

The unrebutted evidence in this case supports this accounting as correct. The companies have proven to the Court by point-for-point evidence, the errors in any accounting other than that above.

The following excerpt from page 19 of the House Judiciary Committee report is pertinent thereto:

> The attempt by adverse expression of opinions, by negation of the facts, by complete disregard for the evidence in this case, to evolve a "framework of accounts" by retroactive bookkeeping, contrary to all evidence accounts and their status, to thereby just exactly make claim for the confiscation of the $384,256.26 now that the heretofore alleged contention and reasons have been proven as thoroughly invalid, appears unworthy of consideration; it would be the opposite of fair dealing, justice, and equity.

Every objection and every contention contrary to the purpose of S. 784 has been proven invalid, and apparently have been repeated for the sole purpose of beclouding the issue and obscuring the truth.

Such attempts, however, cannot extinguish the public records showing the receipt and the retention of the moneys in question, nor can they change the title and ownership of the moneys; and it is regrettable that such questionable tactics have been used to delay the return of the balance of the companies' cash bond. Unrebutted evidence now of record has proven that the companies fully performed and faithfully carried out the agreements which they had guaranteed by their cash bond.

With the exception of the objections which were suddenly raised on August 22 and August 31, no Member of Congress has heretofore, after a study of the evidence, done otherwise than approve the purposes now provided for by S. 784.

As stated in House Report No. 2135, on page 2:

> It is evident that the published reports of exhaustive investigations by congressional committees have recorded a full exposition of the facts, and have cited their judgment that the funds herein concerned must be returned to the citizen companies as provided for in S. 784.

It is pointedly cited on page 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary report, under the title of "Conclusions," that—

> It is noteworthy that up to this time every Member of Congress has recognized the equity and morality of this demand of the companies for the return of their cash property herein involved. Reference is made to page 1 of Senate Report No. 548, to wit:
>
> "After this case came to the attention of the Congress and was fully investigated by members of the Senate and of the House committees, and reported on to Congress, Congress has consistently endeavored to provide the relief due to these companies, which common sense and justice, honorable and equitable consideration of the facts do require."

Realizing the injustice that has been done these claimants and the equity of their claim, I was prepared and intended to speak in support of the bill. I was surprised at the incomprehensible type of objections voiced by the opponents of the rule on S. 784, in light of the facts available to the objectors in the evidence in the exhaustive reports of the House Judiciary Committee. It is regrettable that the rule was voted down as a result of the misinformation asserted by the objectors, and because the supporters of the measure were given no opportunity to be heard.

There is no justifiable excuse for the objections. The conscience of the objectors ought to urge them to withdraw their objections as a matter of good faith, and out of respect to their fellow Members of the House who were misled by their unwarranted contentions.

S. 784 is justified and proper legislation. The honor of the Government requires that it be enacted into law.

The Republican Record of Promise and Performance for the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, between the closing of the eighty-first session of Congress and the morning of next November 7 when the election booths of the Nation open once again to American voters, the farmers of my district, and of hundreds of other districts throughout the country, are going to do some serious thinking about a number of problems facing them as citizens of our great Republic. They will want to know—and they have a right to know—how I voted and how Republicans generally voted.

First of all, let me say that no one knows better than I, or appreciates more, the magnificent role played by the American farmer in the history of this Nation's progress to world leadership. The well-being of this country's agriculture is the foundation stone of the Republic's strength. Without a healthy and stable farm population there can be no real and lasting stability in America.

Our farmers have not made their major contributions down through the years of war and peace without sacrifice, and I, for one, am deeply appreciative of the unending struggle waged by our men and women of agriculture against the vagaries of nature, against drought, flood, and pests, and against the

sometimes cruel twists of economic fate.

In times of peace the Nation's farm families have toiled long, hard hours to keep America the best-fed nation the world has ever known. But even more impressive have been the American farmers' achievements in time of war when they have been called upon to do the near impossible in wringing from an often reluctant Mother Earth food not only to supply our needs at home but to bolster our allies around the globe with the necessities of life. They have done this with curtailed manpower and in spite of shortages of equipment and materials. And while doing it many have given their sons and brothers to the fighting front.

Now once again the time is drawing near for American citizens to make decisions in the voting booth. These decisions, shaping our destinies, merit a period of careful study of issues by all our people.

One of the issues farmers will think about and discuss with their typically hard-headed approach will be the farm program. They will, I am certain, give careful consideration to past party promises. These American farmers will also, you may be sure, give sober thought to party performances. And they will take a long and careful look at future prospects.

Even a casual check of the records down the years will convince any fair-minded observer that the Republican Party is the traditional friend of the Nation's farm population.

As representative of the Second Congressional District of Indiana I was among those members of the party who supported the soil-conservation program of 1935 and 1936 in the Seventy-fourth Congress. I again voted for the welfare of the American farmer in the Seventy-fifth Congress when a measure providing Federal aid to farmers for soil conservation came before the House.

The Republican Party was quick to recognize the need for emergency action when farmers in many parts of the Nation suffered disastrous crop failures because of adverse weather conditions and hordes of insect pests. Here again I was among those who backed a measure in the Seventy-seventh Congress providing Federal funds for crop-failure relief.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress two major bills concerning agriculture which received Republican support, including mine, were one providing incentive payments and another which continued the Commodity Credit Corporation. On this latter measure it was Republican aid which enabled the bill to pass despite an overriding veto.

Moreover, it is a matter of record that I have consistently supported all general agricultural appropriation bills to come before the House.

But what of more recent legislative history?

Without question our farm friends will compare the records of the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congresses as those records bear on the problems of agriculture.

WHAT WILL THEY FIND?

When the farmers of the Indiana Second Congressional District make that comparison what will they find?

I will tell you what they will find. They will find that solid, enduring farm progress was made under the leadership of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress. As House majority leader of the Eightieth Congress I am proud of Republican accomplishments on behalf of American agriculture.

These farm friends of mine will consider that in the Eightieth Congress they were given the Agricultural Act of 1948—the first permanent farm bill ever written.

As majority leader in the Republican Eightieth Congress, I know it was drafted only after the closest consultation with farmers and leaders of the great farm organizations, including the American Farm Bureau.

They will remember that the Republican Eightieth Congress authorized $800,000,000 in loans for rural electrification—twice as much as any previous Congress, with REA electricity extended to nearly a million farm homes during fiscal 1948 and 1949—again more than double the previous figure for any similar period before World War II.

The farmers of my district will also consider that the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress appropriated more than $500,000,000 for soil-conservation activities on American farms. And another $262,500,000 for soil-conservation payments for 1949.

Not to be overlooked among the beneficial legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress on behalf of the American farmer was an act amending the Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916. This amendment authorized $900,000,000 to be spent during 1950 and 1951 on highways of the Nation, with a major portion earmarked to improve America's vital network of farm-to-market feeder roads.

How does this performance stack up with the pledge in the Republican declaration of principles for 1948?

We said:

We have pledged stability of farm prices during the reconversion and readjustment periods. We will carry out those pledges. We will support sound, permanent proposals to give farmers expanding markets and their fair share of the national income. We reaffirm our long-standing support of soil and water conservation. We shall support measures designed to protect better rural living.

Did the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress keep that pledge? The record speaks eloquently for itself.

PROMISE VERSUS PERFORMANCE

What of the Eighty-first Congress—the Democrat-controlled Congress under a Democrat administration which had promised to be all things to all people?

Now that we are closing the books on the activities of the Eighty-first Congress the farmers in my district can consider that record.

They can, and you may be sure they will, consider how, after fiddling and fussing for months, the Democratic-controlled Eighty-first Congress, in the closing days of the first session, finally rushed through, in desperation, a "new" farm law which, when it becomes operative after 1950, will resemble closely the very Agricultural Act of 1948 passed by the much-maligned Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress.

The farmers in my district will also discover that the Eighty-first Congress could do no more than modify, under impetus of a bipartisan group, the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation, an agency, mind you, that was given its first permanent Federal charter by the Republican Eightieth Congress.

The farmers of America will find, moreover, that the Crop Insurance Act of 1949 is legislation which continues the crop-insurance program on an experimental basis—again as begun in the Eightieth Congress—provisions for gradual expansion of crop insurance to additional counties and containing other modifications of the law pursuant to the new program initiated in 1947.

Farmers comparing the accomplishments of the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses will notice that legislation authorizing the REA to make loans to financial expansion, construction, and operations of rural telephone service was introduced by a large bipartisan group of Republicans and Democrats.

Having thus considered the actions of the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress, citizens in agriculture may fairly ask what happened to the grandiose promises made by the Truman administration. Again the record speaks eloquently, and I do not believe my farm friends will be fooled by this Democratic attempt to put laws given to them by the Eightieth Congress in new wrappings, tied with new ribbon, and passed to them as gifts of the Trumanites.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

Hoosier farmers always look a gift horse in the mouth. In this, I suspect, they are no different from their neighbors in other States.

My friends of the Indiana Second District have been closely scrutinizing a Democratic gift horse, which might better be called vote bait, known as the Brannan plan. They want no part of the spavined critter.

The farmers I know want no part of a scheme spawned by the CIO that would reduce the traditionally free and independent American farmer to a shackled serf chained to a system of socialized agriculture, bedeviled with bureaucratic red tape, and haunted by the fear of heavy punishment for failure to properly fill out a Government form.

They want no part of a Federal law which provides that all farmers must keep such books and records and make such reports as may be required by the Secretary and that if they fail to keep these reports and records they will be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than a year, or both.

They do not want to be dependent for a considerable share of their income upon annual appropriations out of the Federal Treasury which one day might not be appropriated, and which surely, if appropriated, would be in large measure paid by the farmers themselves in increased taxes. That is just what the Brannan plan seeks to do.

They want no part of the Brannan plan and neither do I. Neither did a lot of Democrats of the Eighty-first Congress.

But the farmers of the Nation know only too well that the Socialist-minded planners want it desperately. And they know that the peril of this preposterous, two-faced Janus which makes the false promise of high prices to farmers and low prices to consumers—with the difference presumably coming from thin air—will always be an ominous cloud on the American farm horizon as long as the radicals are in power. The Brannan plan and all that it implies constitutes the future prospects for the American farmer under leadership of the Trumanites.

What, then, do my farmer friends find to consider for the future under Republican leadership?

For the part I was privileged to play in helping to draft the 1950 statement of Republican principles and objectives I am proud to point to these pledges to American agriculture:

A. A program to provide a fair price for the farmer's products in the market place aided by a system of price supports and by protection against the dumping of competitive commodities produced by underpaid foreign labor, to the end that the farmer's standard of living will be in line with the contribution he makes to the national economy.

B. Continue and enlarge programs of research and education, both in production and marketing, with particular attention to cheaper and more effective production, a better and more effective marketing system, especially for perishable commodities, sound cooperative marketing, and the development and expansion of industrial uses for agricultural products and by-products.

C. Continued development and restoration of our soil and water resources through soil conservation and reclamation.

D. Expansion of animal agriculture as a means of reducing surpluses, rebuilding of the soil and providing a better diet for our people.

E. Special encouragement for the development and ownership of family-sized farms, improvement of rural living conditions, and completion of the rural electrification program.

F. Development of export markets for the surplus crops which can be efficiently produced in this country.

Here is a Republican program not master-minded by the CIO but worked out only after long consultation with leaders of our great national farm groups. It is the blueprint for building a prosperous and enduring farm economy based on sound principles, tested and proven by the experience of men who know—men who have wrung their livelihood from the land as sons of agriculture. It offers no fantasies, no double talk, no false promises, no sleight-of-hand, and no economic witchcraft.

It is not a program that is "too good to be true," but one which is geared to reality, reasonable and workable in its many parts.

MEN OF COMMON SENSE

I have faith in the sound common sense of the American farmer. I believe he wants and expects a reasonable return based on the extent of his production efforts. I do not believe he can be taken in by will-o'-the-wisp schemes, of which the Brannan plan is a typically shocking example.

The records of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress and the Democratic-controlled Eighty-first Congress are now on the books for the farmer to examine carefully in the weeks that lie ahead.

On the Republican side of the ledger he will find sane and effective pledges backed by a record of sound performance. On the Truman Democratic sheet he will find held out to him nothing but the dismal specter of the Brannan brainstorm.

My Report to the Railway Employees and Other Workers of the Ninth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, as we all know there has been very little legislation of direct or vital concern to labor, which was considered by this Democratic-controlled Congress.

Of course, the average workingman, railroad employee, or white collar worker is just as much interested in all legislation considered by the Congress as any other citizen. Nevertheless, he is perhaps more especially interested in legislation which would more directly concern him, his job and the welfare of himself and family.

There has been little opportunity in this Congress to vote on so-called labor legislation for the reason that the few bills that were desired by the labor organizations were bottled up in committee and never came out on the floor of the House for consideration or vote.

Therefore, in making this brief report to railway employees and other labor people of the Ninth District, I desire to go back to my record of previous Congresses, following the President's policy, to show to them that I have been friendly to and on the side of the workingman.

My record in behalf of labor speaks for itself. I quote from the official records to show how I voted on legislation which was of special interest and concern to railroad employees and other workers. The record shows the following legislative acts and my vote in behalf of labor in every instance:

Crosser amendments, railway retirement bill, H. R. 1362; House voted July 3, 1946. I voted for labor.

Venue bill, railway suit bill, H. R. 1639, HAGEN'S office in Washington, D. C., was Capitol Hill headquarters for union representatives fighting venue limitations; House voted July 17, 1947. I voted for labor.

Full Employment Act, prolabor legislation, H. R. 4437; House voted February 7, 1946. I voted for labor.

Smith-Connally bill, vicious antilabor bill, S. 796, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 4, 11, and 25, 1943. I voted for labor.

Case bill, antistrike legislation, H. R. 3908; House voted February 7, 1946. I voted for labor.

May-Smith-Arends bill, another antistrike bill, H. R. 3937; House voted December 11, 1945. I voted for labor.

As many labor leaders understand and believe, the vote on the Taft-Hartley bill was not a fair test as to which Members of Congress were friendly to labor.

In the first place, the Taft-Hartley bill does not affect railroad labor. In the second place, the law is not what some union labor leaders represent it to be. Many features operate to the benefit of the workingman and should be retained. On the other hand, a few changes will undoubtedly be made during subsequent sessions of Congress to rectify possible inequities.

An effort was made in this present Congress to improve the Taft-Hartley bill, but administration leaders wanted no improvement in the bill but worked for its complete repeal and the repeal of all labor provisions as set forth in the Taft-Hartley law. Many members of unions did not want all labor laws repealed insofar as the Taft-Hartley provisions are concerned. I felt as they do, improvements could be made in the law and therefore I voted for a measure which would improve the Taft-Hartley law.

As a former railroad employee, myself, and as a farmhand at one time and one who has done a lot of manual labor, I just want to assure the railroad employees and other labor people of my district that I will never vote for legislation which would be contrary to their best interest. I will always work, vote for, and support the welfare of the working people of the Ninth District and Nation.

In closing I want to insert at this point a letter which I have received from the Government Employees' Council, of the American Federation of Labor, expressing appreciation for my interest and support of legislation desired by workers. The letter follows:

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., October 25, 1949.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Member, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: As we turn through the pages of the legislative history of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, we find that Federal and postal employees' working and financial conditions were improved.

Legislation was enacted into law improving the Federal retirement system, the Employees' Compensation Act, salary adjustments for all employees, classification laws were amended, and several other laws enacted improving the service and for the betterment of all Federal and postal employees.

We of the Government Employees' Council of the American Federation of Labor are delighted to express to you our heartfelt thanks for the major part you played in writing the legislative history of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

This is considered a thank-you note and does not require an answer.

With kindest personal regards and every good wish, I am,

Most sincerely,

THOMAS G. WALTERS,
Operations Director.

"In Bad Taste"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial taken from the Daily Times published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., entitled "In Bad Taste":

"IN BAD TASTE"

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, speaking at a public dinner in New York City on Thursday evening, had the courage to speak forthrightly in the presence of the heads of the Soviet delegation to the United Nations on the subject of Soviet concentration camps.

Thereupon, the Soviet's representatives ostentatiously arose and stalked from the room.

While the large majority of the audience, and we believe a preponderance of the American public, applauded the remarks of Governor Dewey, reliable newspaper reporters at the occasion recounted that some American guests at the head table expressed the view, privately, that the Governor's action was in bad taste.

That is more than surprising. It is astounding. And if these guests had even a portion of the courage which actuated Governor Dewey in his plain talk they would have allowed the use of their names instead of making their remarks privately.

In bad taste, indeed!

What about the taste in Korea where the subsidized armies of these same Soviet representatives are murdering in cold blood wounded American prisoners?

It is our firm opinion that we have had entirely too much of this namby-pamby, kidglove treatment of Communists, both foreign and domestic brands. Why not recognize the enemy for what he is, and treat him accordingly?

And while we are at it, let's line up the critics of patriots who speak forthrightly with those in whose behalf they offer these excuses.

For too long we have been calling a spade a garden tool for cultivation. Now let's call it a spade, whether Moscow likes it or not. And let's take off the kid gloves and put on boxing gloves.

McMahon's Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "MCMAHON'S Campaign," published in the Hartford Times of September 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCMAHON'S CAMPAIGN

The man who is being picked both within and outside the State as a likely winner this fall is Senator BRIEN MCMAHON. If the Senator, himself, has any doubts as to his reelection, they did not appear in his opening campaign speech the other night. In fact he made no special appeal for votes. But he gave his listeners an accounting of his activities and record in Congress the past 6 years in an address that for statesmanship, forthrightness, and candor struck a high note in a State campaign badly in need of such a lift.

There was no partisan appeal, no reference to his opponent, Joseph E. Talbot, no catering to special groups, racial, labor, or business. It was a summation of his efforts in behalf of world peace, of defense, of control of the atomic bomb, all of which have already been recognized in the Nation and in other parts of the world as outstanding. This record will stand the closest scrutiny and, the Times believes, entitles him to continue his services in the United States Senate for another 6 years.

As chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senator has become an authority on the peacetime and wartime uses of atomic power. In this field, he is a pioneer as well as an experienced, responsible leader. He has had the opportunity of working closely with the White House, the State and Defense Departments, and all the other units of government into which the variety of national and world problems are channeled for policy and action.

While preferring to work for world disarmament and peace, the Senator said he supported every measure, including Korean defense, that would help prepare us in our conflict with Soviet Russia.

"If I've been wrong, I've been terribly wrong," is a statement that could come only from one whose conscience is clear and who is content to leave the final judgment to the electorate on voting day.

So far, however, Senator MCMAHON'S performance in Washington, both in behalf of the Nation and his State, has been highly creditable and his opponents will have no easy time trying to belittle it. There is no sense in replacing him, especially in these critical days when experience and leadership are a prime need.

Greek Concentration Camps at Makronissos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago when I opposed the Truman doctrine I predicted that the hundreds of millions of American dollars being sent to Greece would not be used to feed the people, restore a stable economy, and institute a democratic government for that country. I warned that it would lead to disaster for the Greek people and arm a reactionary government against its own people.

Three years later we can see the results. The average Greek worker lives in a paper hovel, earns less than 60 cents a day when he is lucky enough to find work, and pays more than a day's wages for a pound of potatoes. The budget of the Greek Government today faces a deficit of billions of drachmas, while scandals about misappropriation of funds by corrupt politicians and generals continue to rock the Nation. One-third of the children of Greece have no schools to go to while American dollars are building airstrips and military roads. Democratic trade-unions have been all but wiped out and government officials replace the elected leaders who have been imprisoned and exiled by the thousands where they have escaped execution.

These are the fruits of the Truman doctrine, which has maintained Greece as a military base, impoverished its people, and maintained hundreds of anti-Fascist fighters in concentration camps in order to terrorize the people. The United States mission in Greece, by countenancing these brutal concentration camps—surpassing even Dachau in atrocities—is making of America a hated symbol of terror.

Our State Department would have us believe that these concentration camps are health resorts for rehabilitation purposes. That is pure "bunk." There is an enormous amount of documentary material that refutes this idea. The Greek-American Committee for the Abolition of Makronissos has made available authentic documents to prove the falsity of the State Department's window-dressing statements.

Some of these documents have been published by the Daily Compass, a New York newspaper, in a series of articles exposing the actual conditions on Makronissos, the largest and most hideous of these death islands. I should like to insert some excerpts from these articles into the RECORD:

Last fall and winter, ships carried to the rocky island of Makronissos, 3 miles off the Greek coast in the Aegean Sea, thousands of inmates of the Greek Government's network of prisons and concentration camps.

Here, according to an act of the Greek Parliament, these Communists and leftists, these captured rebels and persons of dubious loyalty, were to be reeducated. Alexander Diomedes, then premier, told New York Times correspondent C. L. Sulzberger: "We wish again to make them good and useful Greeks. They will be received and treated as people who are lost sheep returning to the flock."

Sulzberger described this, in August 1949, as the "first experiment in mass decommunization."

Now the experiment is over, and the gray rock of Makronissos is again being left to the birds and fishermen. The prisoners are being loaded on ships and taken to Ai-Stratis, Trikkeri, and other islands even smaller and more remote than Makronissos.

The prisoners who are leaving are fewer in number than those who came. Thousands have been reeducated to the satisfaction of the Government; they have been released to their native places on good behavior. Many others have died, their bodies thrown in the sea, and others have been transferred to hospitals or insane asylums on the mainland.

No first-hand survey of the Makronissos experiment is likely to come from the United States mission which is so busily engaged in "rehabilitating" Greece. But pertinent data exist in the form of items in the Athens press, reports by foreign correspondents permitted to visit Makronissos, and letters from prisoners smuggled off the island.

Even a second-hand survey permits conclusions. It indicates that the educators of Makronissos did not spare the rod. It indicates that to purify men's minds they broke men's bodies. The education of Makronissos was education by fire.

The spokesmen of the Liberal and Populist Parties remark with satisfaction on the number of graduates from Makronissos, a barren, gray island baked all day by a blazing sun and swept at night by chill winds. They quote the statements of repentance published almost daily in the press:

"I, John Kourtis, * * * declare that I condemn with disgust the Communist Party, ELAM, ELAS, and EPON, and, in general, all their offshoots, because they have proved that they had as their aim treason, arson, deception, and adventurism."

"I, Nicholas Selimos, * * * dissociate myself from the Communist Party * * * and take as my life's compass the ideals: faith, fatherland, family."

But what arguments were employed by the teachers on Makronissos to convert Selimos to the ideals of faith, fatherland, and family? What facts were marshaled for his benefit—what texts did he study?

Basil Davidson, a former lieutenant colonel in the British Army, who visited Makronissos last December and reported his findings in the New Statesman and Nation, wrote:

"While on Makronissos I could not discover any of the normal apparatus of education. There were no classrooms; the library contained less than 50 books, some of these being duplicates. I was introduced to no educationalists of any degree, even the lowliest."

Last January, A. Venidicoglou, president of the Woodworkers' Union, told a court in Athens:

"Before I signed the statement I had been subjected to almost incessant torture for 59 days on end. Only when I stood a hair's-breadth from death and I realized that I could not hold out any longer did I sign the paper. * * *"

In a letter published June 18 in Democratikos Typos, organ of the anti-Communist Democratic Alliance, George Kustekis, a soldier, wrote:

"Before that tragic dilemma, life or death by torture, I could not do what so many heroes, simple and great, have done. But if, in a moment of weakness under the most brutal pressure, the men of darkness tore a 'recantation' out of my soul, they have not crushed my faith."

From those who, having signed no statements, remain prisoners letters have made their way to the outside world. Toward the end of last year an intellectual, whose name obviously cannot be disclosed, wrote:

"Every few days new groups arrive. All those who are pronounced 'reeducated' are immediately sent to groups organized into companies. Those who resist 'reeducation' are dispatched to the Sixth Company for further indoctrination. * * *

"The second group which came numbered nearly 800, among whom were intellectuals. They were beaten with particular viciousness. Nearly 170 did not sign. * * * One prisoner from the second group committed suicide by severing his veins with a fork. Another tried to swallow a broken spoon and a third slashed his wrists. * * *

"There have been acts of courage which left the Fascist soldiers speechless. When one prisoner was ordered to undress and lie down, all of those present did the same thing in solidarity."

The data contained in such letters come from men who presumably are Communists or leftists. But substantial information is also available from anti-Communist sources.

The newspaper Democratikos Typos reported in March that the Makronissos authorities "have extended their 'reeducation' measures to women as well. Evangelia Skevafilaka Triandafilia Giumkel and Pipsta Marangu have gone mad as a result of torture. * * *"

Mahi, organ of the Socialist Party, the Greek equivalent of the British Labor Party, reported in its issue of April 5:

"Marinos and another man were hurled from a height of 20 feet onto the rocks. Bailas was spitting blood, Kiourdzis vomited blood, and nobody escaped unscathed. Those who could not stand it any more and signed from despair were transported to the convalescents' section. The others were thrown back into the cages of the solitary confinement section where they were left for days without care, food, or water."

On April 14, Mahi reported:

"One exile, whose name we have in our possession, had not only been tortured most brutally, but when he persistently refused to sign, had one of his eyes gouged out. Finally he signed, and read a speech: 'In this miracle-working Lake of Siloam, I have recovered my sight. I was blind, and I have seen the light.'"

In the files of UN Secretary General Trygve Lie is the shabby original of the most detailed description extant of what has taken place on the Aegean island of Makronissos, which since 1947 has served as a reeducation center for Greek political prisoners.

Its author is Manolis Proimakis, himself a prisoner on Makronissos, former member of the Greek Parliament, veteran leader of the Democratic Alliance Party, a non-Communist party of the left.

It was written in secret, dated January 24, and smuggled off the island. Proimakis asked that his name be signed to it and that it be titled, "J'Accuse."

He declares that he has restricted himself to describing the camp guarded by the Second Special Armed Battalion, where 7,000 prisoners were then undergoing reeducation. "All that I relate forms part of my own experience. I have seen these things happening with my own eyes," he writes.

"At nightfall they take us to a deserted place behind the tents of the Eighth Company. There the process known as 'fishing' begins among the new arrivals. Soldiers who have been well rewarded for the part they are to play are sent among us, seeking out men from their own locality, acquaintances, and old men who do not look as if they would have great powers of resistance. * * *

"Those 'fished out' are separated from the crowd and the soldiers describe to them the tortures to which they will be subjected. * * *

"In a state of extreme terror this mass of human misery waits, and, as soon as the soldiers' bugles have given the signal, the next phase of operations begins. It continues till 5 a. m. the following day."

THREATS AND SCREAMS

"It is dark, the soldiers advance on the ranks of the prisoners, they shine their torches on men shivering with cold and sleeplessness, choose from 5 to 10, and lead them to the confession room, one at a time. * * *

"The officers begin their work by bringing intense psychological pressure to bear on the prisoners. Promises and threats are characteristic of this stage, while the victim hears the cries and screams of suffering which shatter the stillness of the night. * * *

"The man subjected to this psychological pressure is alone and at the mercy of his armed jailers. While he awaits his fate he sees some of his comrades carried away on stretchers, others dragged along the ground by two or three men, others with whom he has lived for months, with whom he has discussed a thousand things and whose sanity he could not doubt, he sees mad, driven completely out of their minds and capable only of inarticulate cries. * * *

"Those prisoners who still refuse to sign are taken by military police into ravines where they are subjected to an even more inhuman beating. The soldiers, armed with truncheons and knobby wooden clubs, beat them until a number fall to the ground with broken limbs and try to crawl away moaning with pain. These are then thrown into nearby tents with other prisoners."

SIX HUNDRED REFUSE TO SIGN

"Is it necessary to add that after such treatment a large number of prisoners sign in order to end their sufferings?

"The treatment described above was meted out to those who arrived on Makronissos on December 2, 3, and 5, 1949. The majority of them were elderly, sick, sufferers from TB and ex-officers of the Greek Army. Out of 1,900, 600 were able to stand up to this torture and refused to sign the 'declaration.'

"These 600 men are isolated in the Eighth Company. There they spent the terrible night of December 8, a night of blood and horror.

"At 10 o'clock at night, when all the prisoners were lying down, worn out by the suffering of the past days, they were wakened by wild shouts and a crowd of savages burst upon the recumbent men, pulling them and beating them unmercifully to force them out of their tents. * * *

"As soon as we were all gathered outside, they divided us into groups of 100 and led us to different parts of the camp. There a new questioning took place, even more cruel than the first, at the end of which we were again delivered to our tormentors who, after making us undress completely, beat us savagely all night long. At 5:30 a. m. the groans of hundreds of men rose to heaven.

"At this stage 106 more signatures were obtained. * * *"

The testimony of Proimakis, together with that of scores of others, has made the name of Makronissos a Greek synonym of Dachau. Now the agonies of Makronissos, which have lasted 1,000 days, are drawing to a close. But the torment of its inhabitants is not over; they are merely being transported to smaller and more distant islands of rock, where, perhaps, their voices will not rise above the wind and sea.

SIX GROUPS DESIGNATED

Last October, as a substitute for the decrees of martial law, the Greek Parliament enacted a law designating Makronissos as the national reeducation center, and directing that prisoners be transferred there. A council of five ministers was set up to supervise it.

The law defined six categories of persons subject to arrest and internment on Makronissos:

1. Military personnel "considered dangerous to the security of the armed forces."

2. Anyone "exiled by the security committees as dangerous to public order."

3. Anyone arrested by the military authorities for "having committed suspicious actions" threatening the armed forces, provided that the local security committee concurred.

4. Bandits who are captured or who surrender.

5. Those condemned or awaiting trial and those "in exile for participation in antinational activities."

6. Those "preventively arrested by the Ministry of Public Order or the military authorities."

Persons released from Makronissos as satisfactorily reeducated were to be rearrested if the local security committee determined that they had resumed antinational activities.

UP TO THE POLICE

On October 16, the newspaper Mahi, organ of the Socialist Party, the Greek equivalent of the British Labor Party, commented:

"The categories subject to reeducation on Makronissos include everybody—except those whom reaction does not want out of the way. * * * Everyone is covered, because it is the police who will, in fact, decide, since it is the police files which are behind the security committees."

Two months later, the Ministry of Public Order further clarified the law by officially

defining a "nationalist" as one who has had "no dealings with the police" since 1945 and who voted in the 1946 elections—which were boycotted not only by the Communist-led EAM, but also by the anti-Communist Socialist Party, the Left-Liberals, the Progressive-Republicans, and the Agrarians.

The working of the Makronissos system was illustrated by the elections of March 5, from which the EAM parties were excluded. Makronissos itself was the central issue; the liberal candidates led by Gen. Nicholas Plastiras and the candidates of the Democratic Alliance, a non-Communist organization of the left, campaigned on a platform of amnesty of political prisoners and reconciliation.

Despite official paring of the electorate, liberal and leftist candidates received 415,000 votes, electing 70 deputies to Parliament, whereas the Populist Party, the bulwark of the right, polled only 274,000, or 18 percent of the total—a sharp decline from the 55 percent it received in 1946.

Observers agreed that the electorate repudiated the Government as far as it could; it was prevented from doing so completely by the very system it was seeking to end.

"Martial courts are still operating and people under detention have not been released," the Socialist Party declared in mid-February. "Except in some great cities, the left-wing and democratic masses do not dare to express their political opinions."

Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of the Twenty-first Congressional District, investigated the charges against the Greek Government, however, and reported his findings to a constituent on May 19:

"I find that in the detention camp on Makronissos there are civilian detainees being held under the charge that they are unreliable with respect to their loyalty to the Greek Constitution.

"These civilian detainees are being requested to subscribe to a standard declaration abjuring communism and the guerrilla movement and affirming loyalty to the Greek state—* * *.

"United States investigators, however, state that they have found no evidence of atrocities though there are complaints of mistreatment by those who have not signed the declaration. It is charged that atrocity stories are being circulated as Communist propaganda."

THE OFFICIAL TOURS

Presumably JAVITS and his informants were guided by the reports of correspondents and others who have made tours of inspection of Makronissos under official auspices.

How such visitors were deceived was explained recently by the newspaper Mahi, organ of the Socialist Party, the Greek equivalent of the British Labor Party:

"A twofold effort was made to deceive visitors. First, to keep out of sight all those who should not be seen. Secondly, to compel the rest to speak and act in accordance with the orders of the administration; to assist it, under compulsion, to present to the outside world a 'magic screen' * * *."

One visitor who saw through the magic screen of Makronissos was Basil Davidson, correspondent of the New Statesman and Nation (London) and former lieutenant colonel in the British Army. He wrote:

"In the course of several hours we were shown upward of 20,000 prisoners. I saw young boys undergoing intensive nationalist indoctrination. And I saw, at the other end of the scale of experience, and in living conditions which are a disgrace to Greece, famous leaders of the wartime resistance such as General (Stefanos) Sarafis (commander of ELAS) * * *.

"While on Makronissos I could not discover any of the normal apparatus of education. There were no classrooms; the library contained less than 50 books. * * *

What is this 'reindoctrination'? I kept asking the army officers who escorted me. And for answer they pointed to the ubiquitous Greek flags, bade me listen to the everlasting repetition of the national anthem, talked enthusiastically about the singing and the speeches. That is good enough perhaps for the foreign visitors who normally land on Makronissos. It can obviously convince no one who knows anything of life and politics in Greece."

In its issue of April 21, Mahi suggested that visitors go to the Daphni Mental Asylum, where former inhabitants of Makronissos were being treated:

"The asylum is dirty and overcrowded, and the sight of so many other mental cases and maniacs, with their fits, cries, and screams, the semidarkness of the wards, the filth on the floor and tables, the gray unchanged linen, are not calculated to lead to recovery."

Mr. Speaker, the American Government is now cutting its funds to Greece. Why? Is it in order to force a basic change in the Greek economy, to help the people of Greece achieve stability and security? Quite the contrary. The Truman doctrine now seeks to inflict further punishment on the people of Greece. The Truman doctrinaires demand more arms from Greece, not more bread—they demand less freedom, not more, for the Greek people.

For the fact is that the concentration camps and prisons have not proved an answer to the demands of the Greek people for bread, security, and freedom. The Greek people, despite the armed-camp atmosphere that prevails in this ancient home of liberty, are answering the terror of their government backed by American funds and occupation forces, with growing demands for the abolition of the concentration camps and a general amnesty for political prisoners.

The collapse of the Plastiras government in Greece was brought about when the Greek people, protesting nationally, succeeded in making Plastiras declare his desire for a general amnesty for the 70,000 political prisoners in Greece. In the New York Post of September 3, 1950, William Attwood, its foreign correspondent, wrote:

The fall of Premier Nicholas Plastiras' centrist government came about because it called for a policy of leniency toward former Communist sympathizers and a reduction of the armed forces from 150,000 to 80,000 * * * it promised a reform economy, civil liberties, and social progress * * * it recognized that Makronissos was infamous.

Now note these words:

The United States Government, rather than grant general amnesty, put a new government into power—a new government which is Fascist-minded. * * * Plastiras has been replaced by a less liberal government under Sophocles Venizelos.

This is the verdict of an anti-Communist correspondent. It places the responsibility for reaction in Greece where it belongs—on the American officials in Greece—and behind them the Truman doctrine which is supported by both Democrats and Republicans. The votes that have been cast for the Truman doctrine and its appropriations are now clearly seen to be votes for reactionary governments, for concentration camps, for the deaths of labor leaders and liberal editors, for the impoverishment of the Greek people and the loss of their freedom. These are the fruits of the Truman doctrine. But the Greek people will not eat those fruits—and the American people, when they learn the truth, will repudiate the Truman doctrine.

Tribute to Senator Lucas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to our majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with my colleagues in paying a few words of tribute to our majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

The Senator from Illinois deserves our appreciation for the excellent record he has made as majority leader under trying circumstances. He has shown patience, industry, courage, tolerance, and tact, and under his leadership and his understanding of legislative and parliamentary procedure, the record and the accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress have been outstanding. I join my colleagues in congratulating the majority leader on a job well done.

British Comments on World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is a letter from the distinguished American lyricist and author of such favorites as Oklahoma and South Pacific, Mr. Oscar Hammerstein II, giving some comments by outstanding British parliamentarians on the subject of world government:

WRITERS BOARD FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT,
New York City, September 7, 1950.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JAVITS: When I was in London a few months ago I was invited to talk to a group of the Members of Parliament about the progress of the Federalist movement in the United States. They know that from my association with the Writers Board for World Government I had some information and great interest in the subject. In my informal speech I mentioned the resolutions pending in both the House and the Senate, stressing the strong backing for these bills, both in numbers and in the caliber of the sponsors.

There was much enthusiasm when I finished, and hope was expressed that communication could be started and maintained among the interested legislators in the two countries.

Because of my great concern about the present situation, and because more than ever the events in Korea have proved to me that the only alternative to world law is world war, I am taking the liberty of sending you a few excerpts from a report that was sent to me by Gilbert McAllister, Labor Member of Parliament for Rutherglen. All of the members of Parliament who were present at the meeting on May 25, backed the motion stated in the enclosure.

I trust you will read the news from Great Britain with as much interest as I did.

Sincerely,

OSCAR HAMMERSTEIN II.

Quotation from a letter from Gilbert McAllister to Oscar Hammerstein II:

"Since I saw you I introduced a motion in the House of Commons calling for the amendment of the United Nations constitution to make it an effective world government. This attracted the signatures of over 40 members of Parliament of all parties. They were mainly Labor, but it was supported by Conservatives such as Mr. Isaac Pitman, the head of the great publishing firm; Lord Douglas-Hamilton, brother of the Duke of Hamilton; and Mr. John Tilney. Then, I was able to get in on the Korea debate and make a speech. As a result, Mr. Clement Davies, the leader of the Liberal Party, declared in favor of world government; so did Mr. Anthony Eden."

Text of motion introduced in the House of Commons by 40 members of Parliament on June 28:

"World government: That this House, regarding with deep concern the situation which has developed over Korea, call upon His Majesty's Government to instruct their representatives at the United Nations to move a resolution under article 109, calling for the reform of the United Nations in such a way as to make it an effective world government able to make and maintain world law and thus give to the peoples of the world the freedom from fear which was one of the major aims of the Second World War."

Clement Davies said:

"For many years I have desired a world government. I am perfectly sure we shall never get permanent peace until all of us are prepared to surrender part of our sovereignty and have an international body that will lay down the laws all of us shall obey. That is one great fault of the United Nations organization, that some were put above the law and some below the law. I only wish, and so do my party—who were the only ones who protested against it—that that right of veto had never been inserted. We desire that there should be only one army, the international army, to maintain the law."

Anthony Eden said:

"I am sure myself—I have been sure for many years—that the only alternative to war or international anarchy is the establishment of the rule of law. Efforts have been made to do that in the past. They have failed. I have seen them fail. I have had my share of responsibility in those events. I do not think there is much object to be served in examining those failures, except to try to learn from the mistakes of the past."

Winston Churchill, speaking at a dinner in London on June 28, 1950, said:

"What hope can there be for the future of the world unless there is some form of world government which can make its effort to prevent a renewal of the awful struggle through which we have just passed?"

Tribute to Senator Lucas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to our majority leader.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, for the fight against communism, nothing is more important to success than wise, courageous, unswerving leadership in the legislative chambers where policies are debated and decided. Fortunately for the United States and the cause of freedom, SCOTT LUCAS has supplied that indispensable high caliber of leadership. Senator LUCAS has a keen understanding of our defense problems, our veterans' problems, and our great problem of defeating communism. Both before and since the outbreak of aggression in Korea, SCOTT LUCAS' understanding of our defense needs and his sure-footed, determined leadership in the Senate have contributed enormously to his country's success in turning back the Communist aggressors. The Nation needs more men like SCOTT LUCAS in places of leadership—to lead America's fight against Communist imperialism.

Bill Benton: Idea Man on the Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, pursuant to the general order entered into September 23, I ask leave to insert an article written about me in Coronet magazine in September 1948, long before it ever occurred to me that I would be running for election to the Senate. I insert this article because of the many inquiries that come to me about my record prior to my appointment to the Senate. I cannot of course take credit for all the statements in the article, particularly the more flattering ones, and I insert this particular piece in part because it is the most up-to-date piece about me written before my appointment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL BENTON: IDEA MAN ON THE RUN

(By Arthur Bartlett)

WILLIAM BENTON used to be an advertising man. He was, in fact, so sensationally successful as an advertising man that most people still think of him as such. Which just goes to show how hard it is for a man to live down his past.

When the New York Herald Tribune recently referred to BENTON as a publisher, he was as elated as a teen-ager being addressed as "Mister." For 12 years he has been in the unusual situation of a man struggling to rise above his own success. In the process, he has been an educator, a radio impresario, a film producer, a music dispenser, an economist, a patron of the arts and a publisher.

BENTON has probably stirred more cultural pots to a boil than anyone else in America—and he has also made several million dollars. But he does not consider the money-making important, for he could have done that as a top-flight advertising man.

Part I of the BENTON saga is a fabulous Alger success story. He was the poor boy from the West who came to New York. He was the $25-a-week beginner who skyrocketed to $250,000 a year. He was the young man who started a business on a shoestring 3 months before the 1929 crash—and pushed it to the top while all old and established companies found it difficult to hold their own. Finally, the Alger story has an O. Henry ending.

It came in 1936, when BENTON was still only 36. He had made money—reputedly a million—but bigger and easier earnings lay ahead. He had become one of the great men of advertising while he still had half a lifetime in which to enjoy his commanding position and profit from it. Instead he sold out and retired from the advertising business. It was time, he announced, to start reaching for higher things.

Currently, he is chairman of the board of the Encyclopedia Britannica, of Encyclopedia Britannica Films, and of the Muzak Corp. He is special consultant to Secretary of State Marshall on matters concerning the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which BENTON was largely responsible for vitalizing during a recent term as Assistant Secretary of State.

He is vice chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, a group of long-range planners in the higher brackets of American economic life, which he helped to form. He also has numerous other interests, but none whatsoever in the thriving advertising firm of Benton & Bowles, from which he retired in 1936. From 1937 to 1945 he was vice president of the University of Chicago—a longer time, as he points out, than he spent with Benton & Bowles. Yet, people still insist on thinking of him as an advertising man.

This insistence is not difficult to understand. Now 48 years old and well-groomed, assured and almost professionally affable, BENTON might well be picked by the student of occupational types as an advertising man. Moreover, he is still by nature the archetype of American advertising man—eager, intense, bubbling with ideas, and always under such mental steam pressure that he invariably makes trains with only seconds to spare, and long since stopped using his middle name, BURNETT, because it took too much time to write a middle initial.

Characteristically, BENTON spent his first day as vice president of the University of Chicago in preparing a presentation aimed at selling the Rockefeller Foundation on investing $4,000,000 in an educational-film project which he had dreamed up for the university.

At 11 o'clock that night, with an assistant, BENTON put the finishing touches on the presentation; then was ready to drop into a night club for a bite of supper. (Incidentally, he didn't get the $4,000,000, but he later launched the educational-film project anyway.)

BENTON considers the Ediphone an indispensable tool to record instantly the ideas that are constantly effervescing from his

mind. On his first day as Assistant Secretary of State, he indicated where he wanted one of these instruments placed in his office.

"Oh, we never use Ediphones in the State Department," he was told.

"You do now," said BENTON.

This was only the first of many shocks experienced by the staid old State Department during his hectic sojourn in its hallowed halls. In that job, he was officially in charge of Public Affairs, but even this high-sounding phrase failed to convince people that he was not an advertising man. His task was to sell America to the world, and when he resigned, the New York Times rubbed it in with well-meant praise:

"It needed an advertising man of Mr. BENTON's energy and persistence to tune up and get this new organ going, and to persuade and browbeat a reluctant Congress not to cut the whole overseas program * * * out of the budget."

BENTON is obviously proud of his triumphs as an advertising man, but his friends think he is also secretly embarrassed by them. He is a man who likes to be called BILL, and his urge to associate himself with things on a higher plane than soap and breakfast food, they explain, carries with it no parallel urge to wear a high hat, but comes from a feeling somewhat akin to guilt; for BENTON comes from a long line of poor but high-minded clergymen and educators, and he was the first in his family for generations to devote any time or effort to getting rich.

BENTON was born in Minneapolis in 1900. His father, an ex-minister who had become a college professor, could write three degrees after his name. His mother had been superintendent of schools in Otter Tail County, Minn., when she married Professor Benton. After his death in 1913, she filed a claim on some free land in Montana, and mother and son lived there 4 years, proving up the claim. Thus BENTON is one of those rare men in America today who experienced the pioneer struggles of a homesteader in his youth.

By 1917, the homestead had been secured, and Mrs. Benton, going back to teaching, set her son's feet firmly on the academic path. A good boyish voice helped him get a scholarship at Shattuck School in Faribault, Minn., which had a choir. From there, he went on to Carleton College, also in Minnesota, and then transferred to Yale, where his father and grandfather had preceded him.

Unlike them, he failed to make Phi Beta Kappa; yet as chairman of the board of editors of the Yale Record, he demonstrated his own kind of talent by developing an editorial campaign which boosted the Record's circulation and profits to a new high, meanwhile earning $1,200 for himself.

One of his classmates was Robert M. Hutchins, a serious-minded young man who later was to become president of the University of Chicago. Three years after him, in 1924, was a young man named Chester Bowles, whom BENTON did not know at Yale but who was to become his partner in Benton & Bowles before heading the OPA during World War II.

After BENTON retired from Benton & Bowles, the legend grew that he had vowed, while still a Yale student, to make a million by the time he was 35 and then retire. Today he smiles at this story, but admits that by the time he was graduated in 1921 he was thinking definitely of a big business career.

Upon departing from New Haven, BENTON'S first job was selling cash registers, which he carried from store to store in up-State New York in a truck. His mother, however, was still not reconciled to the idea of his becoming a mere businessman. If he was determined not to be a teacher or preacher, like his forebears, she wrote him in 1922 from St. Louis, where she had become head of a girls' school, he could at least be a lawyer—and she had taken steps to enter him at Harvard Law School.

Until she died in 1942, BENTON was devoted to his mother, and her firm view as to his proper future swayed him—at least temporarily. He took a train and started for Cambridge. But when he reached New York, ambition again overcame his sense of family tradition, and he walked into an advertising agency to apply for a job. He was hired—at $25 a week.

From this point onward, the success story moves rapidly to its unusual ending. He began his climb, while still an obscure novice, by offering to talk at the regular weekly conference of the creative staff. By 1928, having had a constant stream of ideas about everything in the advertising business, he was a junior partner in another firm, making $12,500 a year. Then he met one of the seldom-mentioned hazards in the standard success formula. He stepped too hard on the toes of the president, and was fired.

With the self-assurance of the perfect advertising man, he went back to the first agency for which he had worked and landed a job as general manager of the Chicago office. Within 6 months he was making $25,000 a year.

By this time, BENTON, only 28, was looked on as a 9-day wonder. Devising questionnaires to be submitted to women all over the country as the basis of sales campaigns for household items, he had given the advertising business a new concept of the value of what has now come to be known as product research.

He helped sign up beauty-shop operators all over the world to endorse Palmolive soap, and assembled so many charts, statistics, procedures and plans for a proposed advertising campaign that it took all day for BENTON to explain them to Palmolive executives—and made old-fashioned advertising methods look amateurish.

Chester Bowles, whom BENTON had hired as his assistant at the George Batten agency (later Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn), had also come up fast in the business; and now the two young men decided to form an agency of their own. BENTON was then with Lord & Thomas, whose boss offered him $50,000 a year to stay. He declined. It was the summer of 1929, and America was booming.

Benton & Bowles started on $18,000 capital. Three months later the stock market crashed, and business—including the advertising business—began its long dive. BENTON, however, ignored the depression and went after new business with techniques that made even advertising men marvel. He was not interested in small accounts, he announced. Benton & Bowles would take only accounts with a lot of money to spend. This attitude frightened off many prospects, but it worked with some.

"BILL was always a good salesman with about 10 people out of a hundred," Bowles reminisced recently, "and that is what counts in the advertising business—to knock 1 guy over, even if you lose 10 others."

It is a point of pride with BENTON that the agency took on fewer than 20 clients during the years he was there, yet business kept going up and up. By the time he quit, the firm was doing a business of $18,000,000 gross billings per year, and he was drawing $250,000 a year.

The agency's first account was Certo, and BENTON went to New Jersey and Bowles to Connecticut, to ring doorbells and ask housewives pertinent questions about jelly making. After 4 months, the partners had compiled 533 pages of data, which they used to such good effect that General Foods, which owned Certo, gave them a dozen more products to handle within the next few years.

Benton & Bowles put most of their clients heavily into radio, starting such stars as Fred Allen and Gladys Swarthout on the air. The elaborate hour and half-hour variety shows which the agency pioneered seemed fantastically expensive—until business got used to the idea and other agencies began doing the same thing.

When BENTON suddenly quit the agency after its meteoric rise, his business associates—and competitors—were openmouthed in wonder. In explanation, BENTON said he didn't want to get into a mental rut, and saw no reason to go on merely piling up money.

"I was never interested in yachts, or things like that," he declared.

Whether he had made a round million or not, he had enough so that money no longer seemed urgently important. In the $25-a-week days, he had paid $10 for room rent, and had stretched the remaining $15 so thin that his regular breakfast was a chocolate bar, bought on the way to the office. As he grew more prosperous, he drove the agency so hard that copywriters sometimes muttered about its being a sweatshop. Yet he became more and more liberal with salaries, and thought nothing of sending a secretary abroad when he decided she had been overworked.

Old friends who found the going hard during the depression could always look to him for a stake; and he started his present sizable collection of paintings by his college classmate, Reginald Marsh, by buying them on a picture-a-month basis for a time during the depression.

In the best-seller, The Hucksters, author Frederic Wakeman has his hero express a superbly cocky and contemptuous attitude presumably peculiar to advertising men: "It's only money!" BENTON, although he has always had a keen grasp of finances, displays a measure of this confident unconcern. In fact, his wealth has been considerably enhanced by his lack of hesitancy in writing a check when he has confidence in a man.

Some years ago, a friend decided to go into the shoe-manufacturing business. BENTON put up $5,000 to help him get started. The Joyce Shoe Co. became so successful that BENTON eventually sold out his interest for $125,000.

When the newspaper PM was being started in New York, editor Ralph Ingersoll persuaded BENTON to serve as consultant, and gave him $7,500 in stock as payment. After the paper had been launched, BENTON found himself in disagreement with its policies, and asked that his stock be taken up. Meantime, another friend, Emory Thomason, had asked him to invest in the Chicago Times, which he was trying to build up. BENTON transferred his PM check—amounting, with increment, to $7,825—to the Times, agreeing, as he had with Joyce, that his friend could buy him out whenever he wished. His interest was eventually taken up for $55,000.

Such investments, however, are not purely casual with BENTON. He decided, when he withdrew from Benton & Bowles, to invest in small businesses rather than in the stock corporations. "Big business did not build the wealth of this country," he wrote in a 1944 magazine article. "It was individual, hard-hitting and hard-working men who started small, independent, competitive businesses."

As if to emphasize his break with his past, one of BENTON'S first investments of this sort was in Muzak, a company which pipes recorded music, without advertising, into restaurants and other subscribing institutions. When the company was still in the idea stage, BENTON bought a one-third interest for $30,000. Later he bought another third, and then the rest of it, raising his total investment to $132,500. He has since expanded Muzak into record-making and allied activities, and has been offered more than 20 times what he paid for it.

When he quit the advertising business, BENTON told friends that he didn't know just how he was going to occupy himself, but that he might go into missionary work—a field in which some of his forebears had been active. Instead, his Yale classmate, President Hutchins of the University of Chicago, persuaded

him to join the university as vice president and overseer of public relations.

Promptly, BENTON asked for a comprehensive report on research activities, and when he was handed a sheaf covering about 50 projects, his mind started popping ideas faster even than had his questionnaires about jelly making. Plans for magazine articles, news releases and radio programs came forth in a steady stream.

BENTON'S chief aim was to broaden the university's services as a cultural and educational force in the national community. The making of educational films was one way to achieve the goal, and although the Rockefeller Foundation failed to respond to his $4,000,000 appeal, he arranged the purchase of the Western Electric Co.'s film facilities and also persuaded the Eastman Kodak Co. to donate its collection of classroom films to the university.

BENTON also exploited the radio, receiving a $50,000 grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation to build up the University of Chicago Round Table, in which world-famous authorities tackled political, social, and economic problems. To dramatize research work at the university, he also developed a science program called The Human Adventure, which was so popular with the public that he was able to turn it over to a commercial sponsor and make money for the university, instead of sharing its production cost.

The program managed to interest radio audiences in such unlikely subjects as chlorophyll, cosmic rays, Pavlov, and blood; and a program on the Einstein theory of relativity, of all things, had to be a broadcast by popular demand.

Probably BENTON'S most effective coup in making the university, and himself, a more powerful cultural force was the taking over of the Encyclopedia Britannica. Many years before, when the Britannica had seemed doomed, Julius Rosenwald, the Chicago philanthropist, had bought it as head of Sears, Roebuck & Co. When he offered it to the university the trustees declined. Under new management, it became a paying property, even though Sears had little interest in publishing or academic research.

After Gen. Robert E. Wood took over the direction of Sears, BENTON characteristically reopened the subject of the Britannica with the abrupt query, "Do you think it appropriate that a mail-order house should own the Encyclopedia Britannica? Why don't you give it to the university?"

Wood looked startled, but a few hours later formally offered to do so. The trustees, however, again balked at using university funds for what they considered a risky venture. BENTON, quick as ever with the checkbook, offered to put up an amount said to be $100,000, under a stock deal acceptable to the university. Today BENTON owns all the company's outstanding common stock, and has built the company up so that it now pays the university several times as much every year in royalties as he originally invested in working capital.

The educational-film project was incorporated as a subsidiary, Encyclopedia Britannica Films, into which BENTON put a million dollars of Britannica money. He has also branched out into allied publishing fields, with the result that Britannica has a series of educational picture-story books for children, as well as the Britannica Junior, the Book of the Year, and the Britannica World Atlas. Soon to appear is a 54-volume set, the Great Books of the Western World, on the preparation of which the company has spent $1,400,000.

In 1945, BENTON was appointed Assistant Secretary of State. Since then, he has said that he went to Washington thinking that he was to do a job that everybody wanted done, and found out that hardly anybody was interested. The job involved the liquidation of the old Office of War Information and the Office of Inter-American Affairs, neither of which was popular with economy-minded Congressmen, and the integration of their functions into the State Department.

BENTON had to spend most of his time selling his ideas to Congress and, to some extent, to the State Department itself. When he resigned a year ago, President Truman wrote him a "Dear BILL" letter, saying that he knew "only too well the difficulties and frustrations which you have encountered," and praising him for the "solid foundation" which he had laid.

BENTON was characteristically busy in Washington, using luncheons, cocktails, dinners, and frequently breakfasts as occasions for conferences, and keeping his Ediphone busy far into the night. It came nearer to satisfying his urge to be a high-powered modern missionary, his friends think, than anything else he ever experienced; and many predict that he will soon be back in public service, one way or another.

An indication of his inclinations in this respect took form last March after he left for a 3-month vacation at his winter home near Phoenix, Ariz. Unhesitatingly he abandoned his vacation when he was asked to become chairman of the American delegation to the UN Conference on Freedom of Information, and hastened east to catch a boat for Geneva.

Just how much he would have relaxed, even had he stayed in Arizona, is questionable. His usual routine when sojourning there is to start the day with a swim, then spend most of the rest of it dictating into an Ediphone installed at the edge of the pool.

BENTON has been married since 1928, and has four children, and when his mind is on family affairs, it is the same effervescent mind which has created so many sales ideas. Not long ago, he was visiting the home of a friend where the family cat had just had kittens. "What a wonderful way for children to see nature reproducing herself," he said; and his little black notebook came out of his pocket for a notation: Get a pregnant cat.

The cat acquired by his secretary next day turned out to meet the specifications so thoroughly that it had kittens even before it could be introduced into the BENTON home. "Perhaps I shouldn't have been in quite such a hurry to put the idea across," said BENTON.

It is a habit, however, which the ex-advertising man shows no signs of breaking.

REA, a Great Help To Minnesota Farmers, Should Be Further Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my high honor and privilege to represent a great and thriving agricultural district comprised of the northwestern Minnesota Counties of Becker, Beltrami, Clay, Clearwater, Kittson, Lake of the Woods, Mahnomen, Marshall, Norman, Otter Tail, Pennington, Polk, Red Lake, Roseau, and Wilkin. The world-famous Red River Valley on the United States side of the International Boundary and the Minnesota side of the North Dakota boundary line is wholly within the Ninth Congressional District.

The people of my district and the citizens of Minnesota are truly appreciative of the great benefits and the many advantages and conveniences they have derived from the splendid accomplishments of the Rural Electrification Administration program.

The REA is an agency of the United States Department of Agriculture. It was created on May 11, 1935, by an Executive order of President Roosevelt, under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, approved April 8, 1935.

The Norris-Rayburn bill followed which provided permanent status for the agency and authorized a 10-year lending program upon its approval on May 20, 1936—that legislative action is now known and referred to as the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

The Pace Act was approved by the President on September 21, 1944, and among its several provisions it provided that the lending program be extended indefinitely and that the Congress annually determine the amount of funds the Rural Electrification Administration may lend.

The REA is under the direction of an Administrator who is appointed by the President for a 10-year term, with the advice and consent of the United States Senate. In his official actions he is responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture. The present Secretary is Hon. Charles F. Brannan, of Colorado, who is the author and sponsor of the Brannan plan for agriculture.

The present Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration is the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, of Indiana, who assumed the duties of his office in July of 1945. Mr. Wickard is a conscientious, capable, and efficient Administrator and exceptionally well-qualified by education, training, and experience to discharge the many duties of his office.

In the field of rural electrification, the REA is employed to make loans to qualified borrowers, with preference to nonprofit and cooperative organizations and to public bodies. The loans are made to cover the full cost of constructing power lines and other electric facilities to serve persons in rural areas who are without central station electric service. The loans are repaid over a maximum period of 35 years and bear a 2 percent interest rate.

The REA program involves no grants or subsidies, and it operates no rural electric facilities. The loans approved by the REA are repaid from the operating revenues of the locally owned, locally managed systems it finances. A part of each consumer's monthly payment for electricity is set aside to pay off the Government loans. It therefore follows that in the field of finance the REA serves principally as a banker to local systems and its main functions from an over-all viewpoint are to lend money and give technical advice and counsel where needed in the construction and operation of the borrower's facilities.

Farm electrification in the United States had advanced very slowly during the 53-year period from 1882, when the first central control generating system went into service, to 1935 when the REA was created.

A survey of the REA discloses that a few farms were connected to power lines prior to World War I. During the early twenties there was a short-lived spurt in the field of electrical engineering, which progress was reflected by a small increase in the number of farms served with electricity. However, it is significant that only 10.9 percent of all farms in the United States were receiving central power electric service by 1935 and few power lines had been built beyond the immediate vicinities of cities and towns according to REA statistics.

It was because of this slow rate of progress that farmers and farm organizations presented a solid front in their demands for Government action in the field of rural electrification. The result was the establishment of REA, with a program designed to make electric service available to farm people without electricity.

The establishment of the REA greatly increased the extension of electric service into the rural areas. Between 1935 and July 1, 1949, more than 3,800,000 additional farms had been connected to central power lines by all agencies, both public and private. More than half—about 57 percent—of the farms connected to central station lines since 1935 received electric service from REA-financed systems. The remainder were on lines of other suppliers, many of which were stimulated to greater activity in the rural field by the accomplishments of the REA program.

It has been estimated by REA that 4,582,016 farms, or 78.2 percent of the Nation's total, were electrified by June 30, 1949. There are still approximately 1,275,000 of the Nation's farms, or more than 21 percent, still unelectrified as of that date according to their statistics. In addition, there were hundreds of thousands of rural churches, nonfarm dwellings, schools, crossroads businesses, and other rural establishments without electricity.

Many of these unelectrified units are located in isolated areas, or in areas of relatively low farm income. It therefore follows that one of the most difficult jobs in the rural electrification program remains to be completed. The REA program, however, has succeeded in establishing a pattern which eventually can provide virtually every unserved farm in the country with electric service.

The REA has informed me that as of June 30, 1950, they had approved $2,205,470,314 in loans to 1,070 borrowers. It includes 980 cooperatives, 41 public power districts, 24 other public bodies, and 25 commercial power companies. As of that date the REA had on file or in process of investigation in the field additional loan applications totaling $308,748,500 for new system construction and various line improvements. Most of these applications, I am informed, are for expansion of existing systems financed by the REA.

I have also been informed that some 999 of these REA borrowers had rural electric facilities in operation as of June 30, 1950. The facilities included 1,018,336 miles of line serving more than 3,251,787 farms and other rural consumers in about 2,500 counties of 46 States, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands. This clearly indicates that additional lines are being built more rapidly now than ever before.

Thus far, of all the loans approved by the REA, over 81 percent have been for electric distribution facilities, to borrowers who buy power at wholesale rather than generate it themselves. Generation and transmission loans are made only when borrowers are unable to purchase an adequate supply of power or a saving would result. It has been estimated that approximately 17.5 percent of the rural electrification loans have been for construction of generating plants and transmission lines. Approximately 1 percent of the entire amount of loans have been made to power system operators for relending to their consumers to finance installation of wiring, plumbing, and electrical equipment and appliances.

The rural electric cooperatives do not limit their membership to farmers. It is open to all people in a rural area who can be reached and who want electric service. As of June 30, 1950, the REA had advanced $1,553,887,178 in loans to its borrowers. The REA loan contracts provide that advances are made as the borrowers need the funds with which to pay for construction that is under way or completed. The difference between the amount of loans approved and the amount of funds advanced represents loan funds that are obligated to borrowers. Most of it has been further obligated by the borrowers to pay for materials or contract services and will be advanced as construction proceeds.

As of June 30, 1950, the borrowers had returned to the Government $244,795,307 in principal and interest payments on their REA loans. This included $22,967,195 in payments on principal ahead of schedule. Only $774,458 was reported more than 30 days overdue. Only one REA loan foreclosure has been necessary to date on an operating power system; it was on a loan that had been made to a commercial power company.

The REA has made more than 95 percent of its loans to cooperatives organized under State laws by rural people seeking electric service. These groups, which make up about 92 percent of all REA borrowers, are local independent private business enterprises. They are controlled by their consumer-members through boards of directors elected annually by and from the membership.

The rural electric cooperatives have proved the most effective instruments for carrying out the REA program because of their advantages as a method of making reasonable-cost electric service available to farmers in rural areas. These advantages include:

First. REA-financed cooperatives operated on a nonprofit basis. This enables them to provide electric service at cost to their members.

Second. Directors of REA-financed cooperatives are elected because of their known interest in making electric service available to rural people at reasonable rates. They serve without compensation and keep operating expense at the lowest possible level consistent with good service.

Third. Members of REA-financed cooperatives also are interested in keeping costs at a minimum. For example, they help reduce operating expense by voluntarily reporting potential causes of service interruptions such as tree limbs touching the lines. Most of them read their own meters, and many make out their own bills.

Fourth. Previous experience of farmers with other types of cooperatives helps them to organize and operate rural electric cooperatives on a sound basis with a minimum of effort and expense.

The lines constructed by REA borrowers are built to serve entire areas, including less densely settled sections as well as those of greater population. This is known as area coverage. The test is no longer whether an individual line or section will be self-supporting, but whether the entire system as a whole is feasible. This policy has become increasingly important as the rural electrification job has progressed. Only through area coverage can electric service be extended to many of the more isolated farms, and to groups which are remotely situated in pocketed areas far removed from any established source of power.

In every region in the United States rural electric cooperatives have demonstrated that farm electrification, far from constituting an additional cash drain on low farm incomes, actually brings more business into rural communities. It encourages new local enterprises which come about when low-cost power is available. It stimulates private business, both locally and nationally. Surveys indicate that for every dollar invested in rural power facilities the farmer invests an additional $4.50 in wiring, plumbing, and electrical appliances.

The use of electric power in farm production and processing is constantly expanding. To date about 400 farm uses for electricity have been reported. Electric power on the farm is an economic necessity which can pay its way with handsome profits for the farmer. REA encourages its borrowers to give their consumers guidance as to which uses are the most efficient and the most profitable in these times of power shortage.

In the State of Minnesota, at the time REA was established, only 13,783 farms, or 6.8 percent, were receiving central station electric service. REA estimated that 149,500 farms, or 79.1 percent of all farms in the State, were served by June 30, 1949. An estimated 39,452 farms in the State still were without service.

The first REA loan in Minnesota was approved in September 1935 and the first REA-financed line placed in operation on October 31, 1936, by the Mille Lacs Region Cooperative, of Aitkin.

Up to June 30, 1950, REA had approved $122,092,806 in loans in the State to 54 borrowers, 52 of them cooperatives. The loans will enable these borrowers to finance the construction of 74,233 miles of line and other rural electric facilities to serve 175,332 rural consumers. Some of these facilities already are in operation, and additional lines are being built as rapidly as possible.

By June 30, 1950, REA had advanced $93,174,598 as loans in Minnesota, and

the State's borrowers were operating 65,623 miles of line serving 157,557 farms and other rural consumers.

The average monthly farm consumption on REA-financed lines in Minnesota increased from 86 kilowatt-hours in December 1941, to 225 kilowatt-hours in December 1949. This increase reflects greater use of electrical equipment to save time and labor in performing farm and household tasks to help bring about a more comfortable way of rural living. In the same period the national average went from 61 to 141 kilowatt-hours per farm.

The latest REA debt-service summary, covering all transactions to June 30, 1950, shows that the Minnesota borrowers have paid $16,689,507 in principal and interest on their Government loans.

This includes $1,622,680 paid on principal in advance of the date due. Thirty-four borrowers were ahead on their payments and none were behind.

I was elected to the House of Representatives in November of 1942 and took my seat as a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which convened on January 6, 1943. The REA and its program always has had my wholehearted and active support. The following listing gives the date and the subject of roll calls since my election to Congress which had direct bearing on the REA and its program:

June 23, 1943: Vote on a motion to concur in a Senate amendment to the 1944 Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, to increase REA loan funds from $20,000,000 to $30,000,000. Motion defeated 168 to 193.

May 28, 1947: 1948 Department of Agriculture appropriation bill: Motion to recommit bill with instructions to restore committee cut of $25,000,000 in REA loan funds. Motion defeated 174 to 180.

July 18, 1947: REA appropriation, 1948 Department of Agriculture appropriation bill: Motion to recommit conference report with instructions to increase rural electrification loan funds from $225,000,000 to $250,000,000. Motion defeated 196 to 206.

February 24, 1948: Urgent deficiency appropriation bill 1948: Vote on Representative RANKIN'S amendment to add $300,000,000 for REA loans. Amendment defeated 151 to 181.

April 1, 1948: First deficiency appropriation bill, 1948: Motion of Representative CANNON to recommit with instructions to increase REA loan funds from $75,000,000 to $175,000,000. Motion adopted 199 to 154.

June 16, 1948: Second deficiency appropriation bill, 1948: Vote on motion to recommit bil with instructions to appropriate $450,000 for REA administrative expenses, for fiscal year 1949. Motion defeated 199 to 204.

July 13, 1949: Rural telephone amendment to Rural Electrification Act. Vote on passage of bill. Bill passed 282 to 109.

In every instance I voted for the REA program and for REA members, and the official record shows this.

The following is a list of REA-financed systems in northwestern Minnesota, together with the names of the managers:

Lake Region Cooperative Electric Association, Pelican Rapids, Minn., Albert R. Knutson, manager.

Red River Valley Cooperative Power Association, Halstad, Minn., Gerald A. Thalacker, manager.

Red Lake Electric Cooperative, Inc., Red Lake Falls, Minn., O. J. Overmoen, manager.

Wild Rice Electric Cooperative, Inc., Mahnomen, Minn., Kenneth R. Martin, manager.

North Star Electric Cooperative, Inc., Baudette, Minn., Gordon M. Farel, manager.

P. K. M. Electric Cooperative, Inc., Warren, Minn., Robert A. Graham, manager.

Beltrami Electric Cooperative, Inc., Bemidji, Minn., Earl H. Larson, manager.

Roseau Electric Cooperative, Inc., Roseau, Minn., August A. Bourque, manager.

Border Counties Power Cooperative, Inc., Warroad, Minn., Einar Bergan, manager.

Clearwater-Polk Electric Cooperative, Inc., Bagley, Minn., Onno V. Beaver, manager.

Itsaca-Mantrap Cooperative, Inc., Park Rapids, Minn., Robert W. Wright, manager.

All are doing a splendid job in serving their areas.

The Rural Electrification Administration recently entered another field of service to our rural population upon the approval on October 28, 1949, of the amendment to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, providing for the improvement and expansion of rural telephone service. The rural telephone loan legislation and its program has had my wholehearted and active support because its benefits are much needed in my congressional district. I have long contended that it is more necessary for farmers to have telephones than many of our town and city dwellers. The objective of the telephone loan program is to furnish loans and technical assistance in the rural telephone field similar to that which has been provided for rural electrification. The loans are made to telephone organizations, with preference to existing companies and cooperatives. The Congress provided an initial telephone loan authorization of $25,000,000 and the first REA rural telephone loan was approved February 24, 1950.

The REA has advised me that, according to the 1945 census, only 54.6 percent of farms in Minnesota had telephone service at that time. As of September 15, 1950, REA had received 39 applications for rural telephone loans in Minnesota.

All REA loans are self-liquidating. They bear 2 percent interest and must be amortized over a maximum period of 35 years.

If I am again chosen to represent the Ninth Congressional District as its United States Representative, I will continue to fully support the REA and rural telephone programs in Congress.

It will be a pleasure to be of service to all citizens who may have any inquiry concerning these programs or any other Federal matters.

The Answers To the "Fourteen Unanswered Questions"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, September 8, 1950, my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], placed 14 unanswered questions in the RECORD, claiming that he "could not answer many of them because he had raised similar questions himself but had never been able to get the answers from the administration." Since that time other Republican Congressmen have raised the same 14 unanswered questions in their campaigns.

Even though many of these questions are based on false assumptions, they should not be allowed to hang in the air unanswered. Direct answers to these questions follow:

First. What went with the $95,000,000,000 spent on national defense since World War II?

Answer: Of this amount approximately $42,000,000,000 or 45 percent went to pay for the cost of liquidating World War II. This left $48,000,000,000 or an average of less than $10,000,000,000 a year. During the postwar years there have been unusually heavy costs for maintaining peace in distant lands. Nearly half of our Army has been overseas in occupied countries in Europe and in Asia. Substantial portions of our Navy have been in the Mediterranean helping maintain the peace. We have had to bear the costs of saving Berlin with the airlift. The money needed to pay, feed, and clothe the men in our Armed Forces has cost an average of $5,000,000,000 a year. An average of $3,000,000,000 a year has gone to meet the costs of operating and maintaining the aircraft, ships, tanks, and military installations that go to make up our military strength. Major procurement of aircraft, tanks, and other equipment took $2,250,000,000 a year. Research and development of new weapons took a little more than a half billion dollars a year. The remainder was made up of National Guard and Reserve costs, service-wide and classified projects, pay of retired military personnel, and military public works, including housing.

Second. Why did only $1 out of every seven defense dollars go for combat equipment?

Answer: The answer to the first question above contains the data on how national defense funds were expended. Major procurement—the purchase of hardware, aircraft, ships, tanks, and other weapons—has accounted for approximately 2¼ billion dollars a year, or 18 percent. It is worthy of note that the percentage of the annual total that has gone into major procurement has increased from a low of 6 percent to a high of 19 percent in the fiscal year ended July 1, 1950. It is also worthy of note that 60 percent of the President's recently recommended $10,500,000,000 supplemental budget, approved by the Congress, is for major procurement—hardware.

Third. Why did President Truman limit the Air Force to 48 groups when the Republican Eightieth Congress ordered the Air Force expanded to 70 groups?

Answer: This question contains a false assumption. When the Republican Eightieth Congress ordered 70 groups for the Air Force—and I voted for it—it failed to vote a cent of the necessary funds to expand the Air Force to 70 groups.

The strength of an Air Force group has been greatly increased. It contains far more planes than ever before. For example, the B–29 groups long ago were

expanded from 30 bombers to 65, 20 of which are tankers, thus increasing the range and striking power of a group. In other words, when the term "70-group Air Force" was first coined in 1947, it was the equivalent of what we now have in 35 of our present-day groups. Moreover, the original proposal for a 70-group Air Force called for 412,000 men, and almost exactly that number of men was provided as long ago as July 1949.

In October 1949 the House of Representatives voted to expand the Air Force to 58 groups. The President impounded the $615,000,000 voted for this sudden and unbalanced expansion of the Air Force for these reasons: First, a sudden rise in one branch of the armed services would destroy the balance between Army, Navy, and Air Force necessary to have an effective fighting force. Second, as additional aircraft were delivered, it would be necessary to make provision for additional personnel to man them; no provision was made by the expansion act for adequate ground and maintenance crews, for example.

The President did not reject the amount which was provided for aircraft; the money was merely kept available to be expended in accordance with the capacities of the aircraft industry to produce aircraft.

Fourth. Why, if communism was a menace in Asia, were there only 6 General Pershing tanks, only 30 propellate—tactical—combat planes, only 1 aircraft carrier, and not a single combat marine in the Japanese area when we entered the Korean conflict?

Answer: The figures cited in this question are grossly incorrect. Obviously, the number of troops and weapons in a combat area is classified information which cannot be bandied about. However, I agree with the gentleman that we should have had more combat marines ready and available in that area.

Fifth. Why did President Truman on December 15, 1945, officially announce that unless our ally, China, admitted Communists to its Government China would get no more American aid?

Answer: President Truman made no such announcement. On December 15, 1945, he issued a statement of United States policy toward China. In the course of that statement he said:

> It is the firm belief of this Government that a strong, united, and democratic China is of the utmost importance to the success of [the] United Nations organization and for world peace. A China disorganized and divided either by foreign aggression, such as that undertaken by the Japanese, or by violent internal strife, is an undermining influence to world stability and peace, now and in the future.

The statement said that—

> The Government of the United States believes it essential—
>
> (1) That a cessation of hostilities be arranged between the armies of the National Government and the Chinese Communists and other dissident armed forces for the purpose of completing the return of all China to effective Chinese control, including the immediate evacuation of Japanese forces.
>
> (2) That a national conference of representatives of major political elements be arranged to develop an early solution to the present internal strife—a solution which will bring about the unification of China.

The call for a conference was in support of the proposals already made by the National Government and Chiang Kai-shek regarding a peaceful settlement of the Communist problem and the agreement reached by the National Government and the Communist Party in October 1945 providing for the convening of a political consultative conference to discuss measures looking toward the establishment of a constitutional government. A provisional list of the delegation to the conference had already been published at Chungking on November 27 and on December 31, 1945, the National Government announced that Chiang Kai-shek had decided that the political consultative conference would convene on January 10, 1946.

President Truman's statement also said:

> The United States and other United Nations have recognized the present National Government of the Republic of China as the only legal government in China. It is the proper instrument to achieve the objective of a unified China.

Sixth. Who was best serving America, the administrations which for 50 years defended the open door in China, or the Truman administration, which abandoned China to Soviet exploitation?

Answer: This question contains one false implication and one false statement. It falsely implies that the administrations which for 50 years defended the open door in China were Republican administrations, neglecting to mention the support given China by the Democratic administrations of Cleveland, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It falsely states that the Truman administraion abandoned China to Soviet exploitation. The actual fact, of course, is that the Truman administration took every step possible to support the National Government short of committing American forces to fight the Chinese Communist armies in support of the government of Chiang Kai-shek, which in the course of 3 years lost the support of the people of China and the entire territory of China, despite over $3,500,000,000 worth of economic and military aid from the United States and the military advice of one of the greatest generals the world has ever seen, Gen. George C. Marshall.

Seventh. Why, when Congress had voted $10,500,000 military aid for South Korea 8 months earlier, had South Korea received only $200 worth of Signal Corps wire when the Communists struck June 25?

Answer: As noted above, this oft-repeated charge is absolutely false. The $200 figure was bandied about because some signal equipment was in process of being shipped from San Francisco on the day of the invasion, and a charge of $108 was made against appropriated funds for purposes of taking out and inspecting the equipment. This completely overlooks the vast amounts of weapons and munitions supplied by the United States and actually in the hands of the Koreans.

The military equipment which the American Government had turned over to the Republic of Korea before the Communist attack totaled over $57,000,000. Included in the military equipment turned over to the Republic of Korea were the following items: Over 130,000 small arms, rifles and carbines; over 50,000,000 rounds of ammunition; over 2,000 machine guns; nearly 7,000 pistols; nearly 200 antitank guns; over 700 mortars; 91 big 105-millimeter howitzers; 108,000 shells for these howitzers; over 275,000 rockets, rifle grenades, and hand grenades; nearly 9,000 grenade launchers; armored cars; half-track fighting trucks; nearly 5,000 trucks in which to move troops and equipment; 150 bazookas; over 50,000 mines and demolition blocks; 79 vessels, including mine sweepers, landing craft, and other types of fighting ships; 20 airplanes for military use; equipment for 15,000 men, including rifles, clothing, field tents, and other materials needed by soldiers in the field; and thousands of spare parts and operational material necessary to keep this equipment functioning properly.

Eighth. Whose advice was the administration following when it asked last year for $150,000,000 in economic aid for South Korea? That of its long-time adviser, Owen Lattimore, who said in July 1949 that "The thing to do is let South Korea fall but not to let it look as though we pushed it"—hence the recommendation of a parting grant of $150,000,000.

Answer: This phony question contains three false statements or implications. In the first place, it implies that Owen Lattimore was a major long-time adviser of the administration. This is not true, as three former Secretaries of State and the present Secretary of State have denied in writing.

In the second place, it implies that the administration in asking last year for $150,000,000 in economic aid for South Korea did so on Owen Lattimore's advice. This also is not true. The economic-aid program for the Republic of Korea was based on the advice of Secretary of State Marshall and of Paul Hoffman, the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation program.

In the third place, it implies the purpose of the $150,000,000 request was to "let South Korea fall but not to let it look as though we pushed it." The actual fact, of course, is that the $150,000,000 request was plainly stated to be the first year of a 3-year program intended to place the Republic as nearly as possible on a self-supporting economic basis—hardly a program to let South Korea fall.

Finally, the question fails to mention that the economic-aid program for Korea was killed in the House of Representatives on January 19, 1950, by the Republican Party and by 1 vote, 192 to 191. By this act the Republican Party demonstrated that it did not care to support the Republic of Korea.

Ninth. Why did Secretary of State Acheson virtually invite the Communists to take Korea, Formosa, and the balance of China by announcing January 12, 1950, that they were beyond our defense perimeter?

Answer: The above statement is untrue, and misquotes the January 12, 1950, statement of the Secretary of State. In his Press Club speech of January 12, 1950, Secretary of State Acheson said that the United States itself would defend a line along the Aleutians, Japan, the Ryukyus,

and the Philippines. He further said that should an attack occur in other areas "initial reliance must be on the people attacked to resist it and then upon the commitments of the entire civilized world under the Charter of the United Nations." That is precisely what the Republic of Korea and the United Nations did when the North Korean Communists attacked on June 25, 1950.

Tenth. On what basis did President Truman declare—only 27 days before ordering American troops into Korea—that we were closer to a permanent peace "than anytime in the last 5 years"?

Answer: President Truman made this statement because during the last 5 years under the far-sighted leadership of the Democratic administration, the collective security arrangements of the free world both in the United Nations and in such regional arrangements as the Rio Pact and the Atlantic Pact had created situations of strength in the free world which made it less likely than ever before that any nation should undertake a major war. President Truman did not overlook the isolated armed actions going on in such places as Indochina, Burma, or China. He did not exclude the possibility of limited outbreaks, such as that which has now occurred in Korea. He was referring to the fact that our collective arrangements made aggression more risky than ever before. The correctness of this assumption was strikingly demonstrated by the immediate vigorous action taken by the United Nations to halt the aggression in Korea and thereby to give all potential aggressors notice that aggression against any free nation will be met by the resistance of all free nations.

Eleventh. Which was wiser—the administration's appeasement policy that enabled Russia, in the 5 years after World War II, to extend its domination from 170,000,000 people to 800,000,000 people, or Republican insistence on a firm anti-Communist policy?

Answer: This patently political question has four false statements.

First, it suggests that the administration has been carrying out a policy of appeasement. Nothing is further from the truth. The administration has vigorously and successfully opposed Soviet imperialism by the leadership which it has taken in the development of a strong United Nations, by turning back Soviet aggression in Iran, by declaring the Truman doctrine and helping the legitimate Government of Greece to resist aggression, by helping Turkey to strengthen itself against Russian threats, by preventing the overthrow of Italy and France by communism, by proposing the Marshall plan and thereby saving Europe, by advancing the Rio Pact for collective security and then consolidating the nations of the Americas, by saving Berlin when the U. S. S. R. ruthlessly tried to starve and freeze its people, by proposing the North Atlantic Pact and welding together the North Atlantic community, by successfully mediating peace in Indonesia, by aiding the National Government of China until it collapsed, but even then continuing economic assistance. This policy has been anything but appeasement.

The second false implication is that American policies have enabled Russia to extend its domination in the 5 years after World War II. The fact is that Russian gains in control in Europe since the war have with limited exceptions resulted entirely from the fact that Russian forces overran such countries in the course of fighting against the German armies. In the Far East, the domination which Russia now exercises is the result of her participation in the war against Japan, not of any American policy.

The third false statement is the figure of 800,000,000 people. This evidently includes China. The degree of control which Russia exercises over the Chinese people through the Chinese Communist Government is not because of American policy but because the National Government of China was unable to hold Chinese territory despite its immense military superiority and despite immense aid by the United States.

The fourth and most astounding falsehood is the implication that the Republican Party has insisted on a firm anti-Communist policy. The actual fact is that the Republican Party, despite the efforts of a few enlightened members, has persistently resisted the efforts of the administration to create a firm defense against the spread of communism. As one typical example, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives killed the Korean economic aid bill on January 19, 1950, by a vote of 131 Republicans against it to only 41 Republicans for it. When the administration brought it up again, the Republicans voted to cut it 99 to 36 and the Republicans voted against its passage 91 to 42.

As another example, when the administration's proposal for military assistance to the free countries of the world came before the House of Representatives in August 1949, only 51 Republicans voted for the bill and 94 voted against it. This was after the Republicans had voted by a tremendous majority to cut in half the money authorized under the bill. The bill was saved by 187 Democrats voting for it, with only 28 voting against it. On final passage of the bill after it had returned from the Senate, only 51 Republicans voted for it and 84 voted against it. This was in contrast to 173 Democrats who voted for it and only 24 against it.

The Democratic Party can be proud of its record on these votes and on other measures to contain communism. The Republican Party cannot.

Twelfth. After the Korean Communists are pushed back to the thirty-eighth parallel, then what?

Answer: This is an honest question. It can be answered, I believe, only by Gen. Douglas MacArthur and the United Nations which must decide what action it will take. It is my belief that MacArthur has the authority under the original UN directive to go across the thirty-eighth parallel and, for that matter, had already crossed it when American and Australian planes bombed North Korean installations. It is my hope that there will be no timidity or indecision in the UN because the only way to reunite Korea and carry out the UN order is to cross the parallel, hold elections, and bring the country together under one government.

Thirteenth. What will the administration do in Asia in the future—return to appeasement?

Answer: This question has the false implication that the United States has engaged in a policy of appeasement in Asia. This is, of course, untrue. In China the United States took every action possible to assist the National Government to retain control over China except to commit American troops to fight the more than 2,000,000 Chinese Communist forces. In Indonesia the United States assisted the leaders of the Republic and of the Netherlands to settle their differences and to make it impossible for communism to take advantage of the situation which existed.

In French Indochina the United States is helping France and the Indochinese Governments to resist the local Communist aggression. In Korea the United States was primarily responsible for the establishment of the Republic by the United Nations and when the Republic was attacked by Communist North Korea, it was the administration which took the lead in the United Nations to act immediately and decisively to throw back the aggression. This is hardly a record of appeasement.

Since many sincere people are deeply interested in what the administration will do in Asia in the future, it should be said that our firm, clear policy is the same as that which we had in Europe. We would help to maintain free governments and to prevent the spread of Soviet imperialism and international communism. As President Truman has said:

> We believe in freedom for all of the nations of the Far East. * * * We not only want freedom for the peoples of Asia, but we also want to help them to secure for themselves better health, more food, better clothes and homes, and the chance to live their own lives in peace. The things we want for the people of Asia are the same things we want for the people of the world.

Fourteenth. What hope can there be for peace under this administration?

Answer: This is a loaded question which shows a callous disregard for the deep, sincere desire which the people of the United States have for lasting peace.

The people of the United States know that the threat to peace comes from the ambition of Soviet imperialism and international communism to extend their control over the people of free nations. They will not be misled by false criticism which implies that it is the United States which is disturbing the peace.

The people also know that President Truman and this administration have one great fundamental purpose—the achievement of peace with freedom. All the policies and programs proposed by President Truman had been directed toward that end. The people know that the efforts of the administration are directed toward increasing the strength of free nations everywhere to resist Communist subversion and to make clear to the Soviet Union that aggression will not pay.

The people also know that the Republican Party and the Republican leadership in the Congress has persistently

contrived to frustrate the great measures proposed by the administration to increase the strength of free nations. The people know that the Republican Party and its leaders in the Congress have recklessly tried to create dissension by false charges and loaded questions, such as these, and to destroy the confidence of the American people in their Government. By this means, the Republican Party seeks to destroy the unity and strength of the American people—a unity and strength vitally needed in these difficult times.

What I Have Stood for in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the coming election to all of the people of the Nation, I want to give the people I represent a short report on the policies I have followed while serving in the Congress.

I have insisted on, and voted for economy in Government at all times. I have practiced economy in the operation of my own office at a saving to the Government. I voted and spoke against the increase of congressional salaries, and against the increase of allowances for congressional expense in the operation of congressional offices.

I voted against increasing the President's salary from $75,000 to $100,000 a year, and against giving him a tax-free bonus of $50,000 a year.

I voted against increasing the salaries of 300 top officials in the executive department of Government, with increases ranking from $2,000 to $10,000 a year for each official.

I voted and spoke against giving many unnecessary billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money away, which I felt was wholly unnecessary, to all of the nations of the earth. I voted to give reasonable assistance where it would be to our interest in national defense to foreign countries, but I voted against and spoke against many excessive billions I knew were not needed.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed the Brannan plan and supported the parity formula farm program, but have insisted that such perishable products as potatoes should not have the benefit of price supports.

I have supported appropriations for soil conservation at all times. My reasons can be given by quoting a paragraph from my speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of April 5, 1950, when I said:

Mr. Speaker, I am also interested in the provision with reference to soil conservation. The greatest contribution we can make to the posterity of this country, as well as for the immediate future, is that we try to leave the soil in a better condition than we found it, more fertile and more productive for those who follow after us. If we have done that, then we have really rendered a service to the country not only for the present and the near future, but for the many years to come.

REA

I have supported the extension of the REA and all of the appropriations requested by its Director and the President for the past 8 years I have had the honor to serve in Congress. I want to see it extended as rapidly as possible until light and power is brought to every farm home in the Nation requesting it.

FARM-TO-MARKET ROADS

I helped to write the farm-to-market road bill, and will continue to insist that this program be extended more rapidly in the future than in the past so the farmers may have the benefit of all-weather roads so much needed throughout the Nation and in my congressional district.

SHUMAN COMMENDS VURSELL RECORD

Mr. Speaker, I know of no one whose endorsement of my record in support of the farmers and farm legislation would carry more weight than that of Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association.

I am inserting a letter from Mr. Shuman commending my services which I am sure will be of interest to the farmers of the Twenty-fourth District.

The letter reads as follows:

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., July 19, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VURSELL: In response to your recent letter, I have checked your voting record in the major agricultural issues coming before Congress. I find that on these important issues you voted in accordance with the expressed position of the Illinois Agricultural Association. We certainly appreciate the careful consideration that you have given to the agricultural issues coming before Congress.

The Illinois Agricultural Association has strongly opposed the so-called Brannan plan for subsidizing agriculture. We appreciate the fine support given us on this issue by yourself and other members of the Illinois delegation in Congress.

Very truly yours,
ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
CHARLES B. SHUMAN, *President.*

SOCIALISM

I will continue to oppose the Brannan plan that would rob the farmer of his freedom through governmental regimentation, and would socialize the great agricultural industry of this country.

I have opposed and will continue to oppose socialized medicine which Lenin, the founder of Russian communism, said "is the key to the arch of the socialized state."

It would cost the taxpayers from five to ten billion dollars a year, and the people would receive a lower standard of medical care. I am opposed to socialism in any form, because it is only the first step down the road to communism.

COMMUNISM

For 8 years I have helped to lead the fight against the godless ideology of communism, and to hold back the power of the Communists who would overthrow this Government, destroy the churches, and enslave the people.

I voted for the Mundt-Nixon and McCarran anti-Communist bill which was vetoed by the President, and helped to pass it over the President's veto.

I do not believe in protecting, coddling, and dealing gently with the Communists in this country who seek to overthrow the Government while our fine young American soldiers are fighting and dying to protect southern Koreans from Communist invasion. I think the President making a great mistake in opposing this legislation.

THE LABOR PROBLEM

I voted for the Taft-Hartley bill which sought to bring about a more friendly cooperation between labor and management. It was absolutely necessary, and if it had received the support of the President as he should have supported it, it would have rendered a much greater service to all of the people of the Nation. Even with the opposition of the labor bosses and the President, it has proved its worth to the Nation and has been, at the same time, of great benefit to the honest rank and file of labor.

LABOR BOSS DICTATION

Mr. Speaker, because of my support of this legislation, and because I have refused to be a rubber stamp for the power-drunk labor czars, they have demanded my defeat in this election. They have boasted of the millions of dollars for the past 2 years they have been raising to defeat the Members in Congress who will not take their dictation.

It should frighten the people to know that the labor bosses only need to make a net gain of 14 Members in the House of Representatives, and 6 in the Senate to control both branches of Congress, and thereby the Government.

If they gain this objective, they will most likely give this country a Socialist labor government, probably worse than the Socialist labor government they have in England today.

RUBBER STAMP GOVERNMENT

Mr. Speaker, they are supporting my opponent who, in his announcement to the labor bosses, says: "If I go to Congress, you can write your own ticket."

NO ONE GROUP CONTROLS ME

When this announcement was carried in the Associated Press, I was asked to comment on my position. My answer was "that no single group has ever written my legislative ticket, and no one group ever would so long as I remain in the Congress." That has been my policy in the past, and will be in the future. I will deal fairly with business, labor, and agriculture in approaching legislation, with equal justice to all of these groups, and special privileges to none.

The Democratic farmer, the Republican farmer, the Democratic businessman, and the Republican businessman, and all of the people who have sacrificed and struggled to own a farm or a business, or a home, I feel certain are opposed to any one group having the power to control this Government.

Such control will wreck our American way of life, and destroy our freedom and liberty. The threat of it is before all of the people in this district in this campaign. The great majority of the peo-

ple know I have been right in having the courage to stand up and fight these labor bosses off in their grab for more and more power and control. I feel certain that the farmer who wants to protect his fireside that he, his wife, and family have saved and sacrificed to own, realize this threat facing him in this campaign. If he will rise above politics and get into this fight with me, we can protect his future, and the future of all of our people.

The way to beat this crowd is with votes in the ballot box. I believe the farmers and the small-business men and—yes, many clear thinking laboring men, realize this dangerous threat to the future of our country.

I hope and believe that they will put the protection of their homes and businesses first, and forget politics long enough to urge their friends to go to the polls and join with me in making this fight to protect the interest of all of us, and the American way of life.

There is grave danger ahead. It is time for action now. It is later than we think.

Hon. Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared concerning my own reactions to an event which concerns us—the end of Senator GRAHAM'S current term of office in the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FRANK GRAHAM BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN

One of the associations in this body which I shall always cherish is the one I have enjoyed with the junior Senator from North Carolina, Dr. FRANK GRAHAM. It is sad for me to contemplate returning to a Senate on November 27 which will not include this kindly modest humanitarian.

But, while Dr. GRAHAM'S contributions to the Senate during his year and a half tenure as Senator were always in the finest traditions of American democracy and genuine liberalism, that the role was for him only one of many which he played in the great drama of human progress. The work he has done in both his private and public capacities for the relief of the distress of his fellow men is tremendously impressive. The positions he had held range from president of the North Carolina Conference for Social Service to United States representative on the United Nations Commission which secured peace in Indonesia.

Indeed, his very eagerness to relieve human suffering and to fight human injustice was undoubtedly responsible, in large part, for the fact that he will no longer be a Member of this body.

Thus, his membership on the President's Committee on Civil Rights aroused antagonism on the part of some of his constituents despite the fact that Senator GRAHAM did not personally support all the proposals contained in the civil-rights report. But Senator GRAHAM, although his views are somewhat different from mine in this regard, followed faithfully and unerringly the dictates of his own conscience and the findings of his judgment. He would not compromise. He would not retreat from what he believed was right. That, along with gentle tolerance and full understanding, are the keynotes of FRANK GRAHAM'S character.

There have been many distinguished Members of this body who have honored the Senate of the United States by their presence in its 161 years of existence. We have had Daniel Webster, and Henry Clay, John Calhoun, and many others who each in his way made significant contributions to the development of this Nation. But, as I think of great Senators with whom FRANK GRAHAM'S social philosophy and warm humanitarianism can be more accurately compared, the name of Robert M. La Follette, Oscar Underwood, George Norris, and Robert F. Wagner of my own State, come most easily to mind.

It was in the La Follette-Norris-Underwood-Wagner tradition that FRANK GRAHAM served his State and Nation in the United States Senate during the past 18 months. And I feel certain that this great man will continue to grow in stature and to serve his country and his fellow men.

You and the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a pocket-size booklet titled "You and the Atomic Bomb," prepared through the joint efforts of the New York State Civil Defense Commission, and Time, Inc. In view of the fact that it is the first simplified A-bomb handbook to be released officially, I beileve it to be of sufficient interest to warrant its insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU AND THE ATOMIC BOMB—WHAT TO DO IN CASE OF AN ATOMIC ATTACK

(By New York State Civil Defense Commission, Public Pamphlet No. 1)

FOREWORD

The purpose of this booklet is to help you answer the question, What do I do if an atomic bomb is dropped?

As terrible as the bomb is, it will not spread as much death and destruction as many people believe. Atomic attack will not, as some people think, mean the end of our great cities, our State, or our country.

Certainly we must face the fact that at the immediate scene of an atomic explosion there will be dreadful devastation and thousands of lives will be lost in a heavily populated area. An entire city could be crippled temporarily by one bomb.

There is no complete defense against the atomic bomb, any more than there is against any other weapon of war. But if you are one of those who has said to yourself, "there is no defense against the atomic bomb," the facts, as you will see, are otherwise.

By careful civil defense planning now, and by full understanding on your part of what you can do now and what you should do in time of disaster, the effects of the bomb can be greatly minimized.

In case of attack, the enemy would logically concentrate on areas of dense population and industry. What happens in these areas can affect every citizen in the State. And it is the people of the so-called "safe areas," who must be ready to come to the help of those who might be bombed.

What you should do in time of attack are simple things—but all-important.

They are briefly outlined here.

LUCIUS D. CLAY,
Chairman, New York State Civil Defense Commission.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

We hope that your closest acquaintance with an atomic bomb will be in reading this pamphlet. But if you are to understand what to do if an A-bomb should fall on your city, you must first know what an A-bomb does.

An atomic bomb set off in midair, about 2,000 feet from ground level, is more destructive than either a water or ground burst, so we must consider this kind of attack as the most likely.

Air burst

Here is what happens in an air burst: At the instant of the explosion, a brilliant fireball appears in the sky and quickly grows to about 900 feet in diameter. It could probably be seen for 50 miles in daylight, 200 miles at night. From this fireball, brighter than 100 suns, deadly heat and radiation burst out in all directions. The heat flash is dangerous up to 2 miles, but radiation intensity falls off rapidly after 4,000 feet. In the first second, half of the radiation has already passed. In three seconds heat and most of harmful radiation are over.

Following the heat flash, a tremendous shock wave caused by the expansion of hot gases from the explosion sweeps over the area. Winds of 800 miles per hour accompany the shock wave in its early stages but fall off rapidly in intensity, dropping to 100 miles per hour within a mile and a half. Several seconds later, another wind roars in toward the center of the explosion with about half the force of the out-rushing blast. At the end of 10 seconds, the immediate danger from the explosion itself has passed.

If you are above ground anywhere within three quarters of a mile from the air burst, you will have less than a 50–50 chance of survival. If you are underground within this area, you will have a good chance of coming through, unless you are almost directly under the point where the bomb explodes.

Here are some estimates of how an atomic explosion would damage the area around it:

Within one-half mile: Complete devastation. Little chance of survival if above ground.

From one-half to 1 mile: All buildings, except those of concrete and heavy steel frame, will be gutted or destroyed. The heat flash will be intense, but radiation will be reduced.

From 1 mile to a mile and a half: Most old-style brick and frame buildings will be destroyed. Modern buildings will be seriously damaged. There will be great danger from flying debris. Radiation will no longer be a hazard. The heat flash will still be dangerous, but not lethal.

Hundreds of scattered fires will break out, many of them caused by broken gas mains, oil lines, and tanks, or shorted electric circuits. All utilities will be destroyed or seriously damaged.

At 2 miles: Damage here will almost all be due to blast and secondary fires. Public utilities will be badly damaged. Only moderate burns, if any, will be caused by the heat flash.

At 4 miles: There will still be some blast damage, especially to frame and old-style wooden buildings, and scattered secondary fires. Rubble will block the streets.

Beyond 4 miles: In some instances blast damage might extend to a distance of 6 miles, depending upon the wind, weather, and the terrain. Glass and plaster breakage might occur up to a distance of 8 miles. Utilities might be disrupted from damage in the central blast area.

About a half hour after the explosion a strong wind will blow in toward the center of the damaged area, spreading the fires that have already been started.

Ground and water bursts

While it is likely that an enemy will prefer an air burst because of the greater damage it does, he may deliberately or accidentally explode an atomic bomb on the ground or in a harbor.

In ground or water bursts the effects of the blast, heat, and direct radiation do not extend nearly as far as in an air burst. In the case of a water burst, heat and direct radiation are negligible, and damage from the shock wave does not extend beyond 1 mile.

However, both ground and water bursts have a particular danger of their own which is almost completely lacking in air bursts. The clouds of spray or dust thrown into the air by these bursts become highly radioactive. As they drift with the wind over the surrounding area, they contaminate all objects in their path and poison people who are exposed to them too long.

WHAT TO DO IN AN AIR RAID

A radar network and a force of volunteer airplane spotters is being established to detect a possible enemy attack. If enemy raiders are sighted, air raid sirens will be sounded. But we must also consider the possibility that the enemy will be able to evade our defenses and deliver a bomb before a warning can be sounded.

Sneak attack

In case of a sneak attack there are several things you can do to protect yourself, even though you may not be able to reach shelter.

The blinding flash of the explosion will be your first warning. If you are in the open, immediately fall to the ground face down next to a building wall, if possible, so you will be shielded from falling brick and stones. Close your eyes and cover your face, neck, and arms. This will give you some protection against the deadly radiation and scorching heat.

If you are on the street, dodge into a doorway if it is not more than a step or two away. Stand to one side under the arch of the door. Turn away from the flash and cover your face and other exposed areas of the body.

If you are in the house, crawl under a bed or table or drop behind a sofa or any other large object which can protect you from flying glass. Keep out of line with windows. Cover up.

Air raid warnings

When enemy planes are spotted coming toward your city, the sirens will blow a rising and falling signal for 3 minutes. This is the only warning and means that from the observed direction of flight of the enemy planes, they will soon be in a position to attack your city. The warning will be sounded just as soon as the direction of attack is clear, so that you will have as much time as possible to seek shelter, but will not be alarmed unnecessarily.

An attacking plane may fly over many towns before reaching its target. All these towns will be warned. The air raid warning does not necessarily mean that your city is the target. But remember that the rising and falling signal means trouble is at hand. Take cover.

Unless announced in advance that tests will be held, an air raid warning means business.

When you hear the alert

Know your designated shelter. Get down into it or into the basement, as fast as you can without pushing people around. Take cover, but be sensible. Do not panic.

Blast is most destructive to the upper portion of buildings. If you can't get downstairs, get into the center hall, the core of the structure.

If you cannot get out of your office or apartment in time: Get under a desk or table if possible or lie close to the wall where you are not in line with the windows. Cover your neck, head, and arms with your coat. Close your eyes tightly. These precautions will help protect you from flying glass or debris, as well as the heat and radiation from the explosion.

If you are on the street: Get to the nearest shelter, basement, or subway.

If no air-raid shelter is available, step into the nearest doorway or, better yet, into the lobby of a concrete building. Face away from the street and from windows. Pull your coat over you head or if you are without a coat shield your head with your arms.

If you are driving a car: Park at the curb as quickly as you can. Do not park where you will block a street or a corner. Leave your keys in the car. Get out and seek shelter at once. If you are riding in a taxi or bus, get out and take cover.

If you live in a frame house: Shut off at the source all oil, gas, light, and water. Put out fires. Close all doors and windows. Draw curtains and blinds.

Get into the basement if you have one. Take a flashlight and, if it is winter, a supply of warm clothing. After all fires have been extinguished, close fuel lines and draft doors of coal furnaces or stoves.

Have several buckets of sand and water and a complete first-aid kit handy.

The all clear

When the enemy plane has been shot down or has passed by without attack or has made its attack and departed, the sirens will blow on "All clear," a series of three 1-minute steady blasts.

After an air burst

The immediate effect of the explosion will be over in a few seconds, but before you leave cover look out for falling wreckage. The greatest danger after the attack is from fires set by the heat of the explosion or resulting from broken gas and oil lines and short circuits. Use your head. Don't let yourself get trapped by big fires. But don't run off and let a small fire burn your house down if it can be controlled with a fire extinguisher or sand.

If, because of fire or damage, you must leave the building you are in and there are clouds of dust or spray outside, cover your mouth and nose with your handkerchief. (The dust probably is from the wreckage and may be harmless, but be careful; a ground or water burst may have spread radioactive dirt or fog through the air.)

If you are not in the area of serious damage, stay indoors and close the windows.

Once the enemy raiders are clear of the area, change your clothes the first opportunity. Bathe or shower; scrub hard and use plenty of soap. Be particularly careful to get your hair and fingernails entirely clean.

After a ground or water burst

If you have been officially notified that the explosion was a ground or water burst and you are near the damaged area, do not use any food or drink which has been exposed. It may be contaminated.

As soon as possible after a water or ground burst, specially trained teams with detecting instruments will determine the areas which are seriously contaminated. You will be told if you must leave the area. Bathe and change to uncontaminated clothes.

Against the radioactive fog created by a water burst there is no certain protection, but obviously it is wise to take cover in as well sealed a place as possible, since the fog can seep through broken windows or small cracks. Until you are out of the contaminated area, try to keep your mouth and nostrils covered to avoid inhaling radioactive dust or spray.

Do not pick up objects on your way out of a contaminated area; you will be carrying contamination with you.

RADIATION

You need not worry about lingering radioactivity after an air burst. It is now known that there is much less residual radiation from an atomic air burst than was at first feared.

But a ground or water burst leaves a great amount of deadly radioactivity behind in the spray or dirt that spreads contamination as it falls to earth. Radiation, even if you have absorbed a considerable amount of it, is not always fatal, however.

There is no immediate way of knowing when you have been exposed to radiation during or after the atomic burst. You will not feel anything if radiation hits you. Signs of radiation sickness show up later. How much later depends upon how much radiation you have absorbed.

If you have absorbed a large amount, you will know it within a few hours. The first signs are nausea and shock.

In the first day or two, the shock will be followed by vomiting, diarrhea, and fever. There will be no pain, but you will suffer discomfort, depression, and fatigue.

The symptoms will disappear, then return for 2 or 3 days. In the worst and untreated cases, death follows.

In moderate cases these symptoms will appear only after several days—in some cases 2 or 3 weeks. During this time the mouth and gums will bleed, and there will be internal bleeding. All bleeding, even from small cuts, will be difficult to stop. Loss of appetite and falling hair also may indicate radiation sickness.

Medical attention important

In many cases radiation sickness symptoms disappear entirely for a time. This does not mean you are out of danger. The symptoms may return at a later time.

If you show any signs of radiation sickness or have reason to believe the area you have been in is radioactive, go to a medical station at once.

Conditions after the bombing, however, may not permit you to get proper medical treatment immediately. In this case follow these simple rules until help comes: Keep warm. Get complete rest; stay in bed if possible. Drink warm, nourishing liquids, and eat foods rich in sugar and protein, but do not eat or drink foods or liquids that have been exposed in a contaminated area.

FIRE

You may ask why you need concern yourself with fire when there is a fire department nearby. The answer is that no fire department system, even with the help of its auxiliary services, can deal with the multitude of fires which would result from enemy attack.

If the area in which you live is attacked, the first responsibility for providing fire protection (especially in case your house is set afire) rests directly upon you.

This responsibility involves the provision of the necessary fire-fighting equipment and the knowledge of how to use it.

A single attack may start hundreds of fires, and probably so much water would be used by the fire department that there would be little or no water pressure in homes. Also, any special fire-fighting equipment

which operates by electricity should not be counted on, since power lines may be broken.

But a great deal can be done with individual fire-fighting appliances if they are used properly and promptly. If you act fast, you can help reduce losses from small fires and leave the regular fire departments free to go to work on the big blazes. They will come to your aid as soon as possible.

FIRST AID

First aid, particularly in the case of serious injuries and burns, is delicate work, for experts only. If medical aid is available, it is better to remain calm and let qualified medical people handle the situation. Otherwise you will do more harm than good.

But you might find yourself in a situation where help is not at hand and injuries are such that they need immediate attention.

Burns

If medical aid can possibly be secured, do not touch or treat any severe burn. Remember that infection may reduce chances of recovery by 50 percent. Any handling will increase the danger of infection.

A few simple rules:

1. Exclude air from the burned area with clean gauze, soft, clean cloths, or absorbent cotton, then bandage gently.

2. Unless absolutely necessary, do not remove clothing. If garments must be taken off, cut the cloth around the burn. If material sticks to the flesh, do not remove it. If blisters have formed, they should not be broken or punctured.

3. Dressings may be soaked in a lotion made by stirring baking soda in clean water (about two teaspoonsful to the pint). Keep strips wet by repeatedly pouring the lotion over them. Do not remove the dressings.

4. If pain is unbearable and no medical aid can be secured, smear clean gauze with petroleum jelly (vaseline), and apply to the burned area.

5. Dressings should overlap each other. Overtight bandages may lead to serious injury. The patient should be kept warm; give hot, sweet drinks if he conscious.

Hemorrhage

1. If bleeding is sigiht or there is only a small amount of oozing, it is best to ignore it. Remember, touching or handling a wound will increase the risk of infection. If there has been a ground or water burst, cover the patient with some garment to keep out contaminated water and dirt.

2. Bleeding may be checked by the use of a compress of gauze or cloth held by a moderately tight bandage. A tourniquet should be used only when there is excessive bleeding. A tourniquet or pressure bandage must be loosened momentarily at half-hour intervals to prevent serious damage.

Fractures

1. Do not try to set a broken bone.

2. Do not move the patient unless he is in danger from fire or falling debris.

3. If necessary to move the patient, bind the limb tightly to a pillow, a padded board, or other improvised support. When possible lay the patient on a door or other flat surface before moving him.

4. Keep the patient warm; give hot, sweet drinks if he is conscious.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND YOU

Your New York State Civil Defense Commission, working with the various State departments and local city and county governments, is taking all possible steps to effect immediate mobilization of the State's resources in time of emergency.

Advanced planning is now being completed by the State Commissioners for Public Health, Safety, Police, Public Utilities, Welfare, Housing, Veterans' Affairs, Agriculture and Markets, the Public Service Commission and the National Guard. This work includes the inventorying of manpower, equipment, hospital, housing and welfare facilities; the training of auxiliary police, firemen, air-raid wardens, welfare workers, and State guard and the organization of emergency teams ready to move at once into disaster areas.

Your local city or county civil defense director is responsible for the organization and operation of civil defense where you live. He works in cooperation with the State commission and the State agencies. But the success or failure of the program in your locality will depend largely upon the efficiency of the local organization and the teamwork and spirit of the community.

Here is how you can help:

1. If you have special skills, register at once with your local civil defense office so that you can do your part as the volunteer organization is expanded.

2. Cooperate with the civil defense workers in charge of your block or the building in which you live. Know your local warden.

3. In time of disaster, follow instructions, keep calm, don't try to telephone or drive away in your car.

4. Don't start or repeat rumors, particularly in time of real or threatened emergency. Don't believe everything you hear. Rely only on official information through the press, radio, or your local civil defense organization.

It is estimated that effective civil defense measures can save as many as 50 percent of the lives which might otherwise be lost in time of atomic disaster.

Let us hope that time will never come. Meanwhile, civil defense is everybody's business today, tomorrow, and in the months ahead.

HERE IS A SUMMARY OF THE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS TO REMEMBER IN CASE OF AN ATOMIC ATTACK

What you should do

Keep calm.

If there is time, get to shelter at once.

If no underground shelter is close by, get into the ground floor of a nearby building or even stand in a doorway if nothing better is available.

If you see the bomb flash and there is no cover of any kind within a step or two, drop to the street or gutter, turn away from flash, and close eyes tightly. Cover your head, face, neck, arms, and other exposed areas of the body.

If you are indoors, turn off gas, electricity, water, and oil at first warning and hang drapes over windows. Get into the core of your building and under a desk or table if there isn't time to get to the basement. Lie face downward and out of line with windows. After the burst tie handkerchief over mouth if area is contaminated.

What you should not do

Don't telephone.

Don't turn on water after blast, unless to fight fire.

Don't eat or drink in a contaminated area.

Don't use metal goods in a contaminated zone.

Don't touch things after ground or water burst.

Don't try to drive your car.

Don't get excited or excite others.

HERE ARE SOME THINGS FOR YOU TO DO AND NOT TO DO

What to do

1. Close doors and windows to prevent draft.

2. To force a door, break panel near lock.

3. Crawl, don't walk when in thick smoke.

4. Keep near walls where floors are strongest.

5. Attack fire at closest possible range.

6. Use sand or foam to quench oil fires.

7. Keep buckets of water and sand in the house and be sure extinguishers are filled and in order.

8. When searching a house for fires start at top.

What not to do

1. Don't enter a smoke-filled room alone, except to save a life.

2. Don't enter burning building or room without fire-fighting appliances, except to save life.

3. Don't play water on electric wiring.

If your attic is full of odds and ends get rid of them. They are a fire hazard.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The text of this booklet has been prepared by the public information section, New York State Civil Defense Commission, with the assistance of the commissioners of health and safety, New York State, and the publications of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Civil Defense Department of the British Government, the British Information Services and other authoritative sources.

The New York State Civil Defense Commission gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Time, Inc., for printing and underwriting the first 850,000 copies.

Contents of this booklet are not copyrighted and permission is granted for reproduction.

NEW YORK STATE CIVIL DEFENSE COMMISSION,
THOMAS E. DEWEY, *Governor.*

Activities of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following summary of action taken by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the Eighty-first Congress.

During the Eighty-first Congress, 610 House bills, 36 Senate bills and resolutions, and 44 House resolutions were referred to the committee. Favorable action was taken on 58 House bills and resolutions and 10 Senate bills, of which 55 became law. Two bills are presently pending before the House, three House bills were vetoed, four House bills have passed the House and are pending in the Senate, and four House bills were incorporated in other legislation.

The committee held extensive hearings on the following subjects: First, postal rate revision; second, revision of the Classification Act of 1923; third, improved financial control of the Post Office Department—Hoover Commission recommendation; fourth, recruitment procedures for the competitive civil service—Hoover Commission recommendation; fifth, increases in compensation for heads and assistant heads of executive departments and agencies; sixth, salary increases and other benefits for postal employees; seventh, summary suspension of employees in order to protect the national security; eighth, appointment and promotion of veterans

of World War II in the postal service; ninth, census of housing; tenth, legislation requiring Communist, Fascist, totalitarian, and subversive organizations to identify matter sent by them through the mails; and, eleventh, more liberal benefits for civil-service annuitants.

In addition to the legislative activities of the committee, two subcommittees were appointed to study and investigate personnel practices in the Federal Government.

One subcommittee composed of Mr. KARST, chairman, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. REES, has submitted a report—House Report 2456—concerning certain irregularities in connection with the administration of the Army finance center at St. Louis, Mo. Most of the recommendations of the committee have been adopted by the Department of the Army.

Another subcommittee composed of Mr. WILLIAMS, chairman; Mr. DAVIS of Georgia; Mr. HERLONG; Mr. REES; and Mr. HAGEN, has been studying the problem of employee utilization, overstaffing, and inefficiency in Government personnel operations in order to determine where economies can be made. One of the studies of this subcommittee is contained in House Report 2457 and relates to the activities of the Federal Security Agency. The operations of other departments and agencies have been studied and additional recommendations will be made.

Legislation approved by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the 81st Cong.

HOUSE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY COMMITTEE WHICH BECAME LAW

Public Law No.	Explanation of provisions	House bill No.
9	To provide for the issuance of a 6-cent air-mail postage stamp in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va., in lieu of provision in Public Law 807, 80th Cong., providing for the issuance of a 5-cent air-mail stamp.	H. R. 1432
13	To provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States during the period ending July 5, 1951	H. J. Res. 84
19	To authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md	H. R. 969
29	To provide for eliminating the necessity for reappointment in cases of postmasters whose post offices are advanced from fourth class to a higher class or where post offices of a higher class are relegated to fourth class.	H. R. 253
98	To allow certain employees of the Government separated between Jan. 23, 1942, and Apr. 1, 1948, with less than 20 years' civilian service, to obtain refund of retirement deductions in lieu of annuity at age 62.	H. R. 2020
123	To provide retirement credit for Federal service when, through inadvertence, no deductions were made from the salaries of Federal employees	H. R. 3338
133	To provide for an improvement in the administration of the collection of cotton statistics by requiring the Bureau of the Census to furnish information regarding cotton statistics only to interested parties.	H. R. 3444
158	To provide continuing authority for the Bureau of Census to use other Government employees for field work in connection with the decennial censuses, and providing that during the taking of the next and subsequent decennial censuses enlisted men and officers of the Armed Forces may be appointed and compensated for the enumeration of the personnel of the Armed Forces.	H. R. 3198
160	To grant a retroactive (July 1948) $330 annual pay increase to employees of the Foreign Service and classified employees in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia. These employees were excluded from the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees' Salary Act of 1948.	H. R. 5100
167	To authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.	H. R. 20
180	To provide for the repealing of the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act and the Canal Zone Retirement Act and to bring all employees to whom such acts apply within the terms of the Civil Service Retirement Act.	H. R. 3445
199	To exempt from the Civil Service Retirement Act certain employees of the Library of Congress and the judicial branch of the Government whose employment is temporary or of uncertain duration.	H. R. 3512
206	To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept reimbursement for overtime paid to employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry who prepare virus, serum, toxin, etc.	H. R. 459
214	To clarify laws relating to the compensation of postmasters by providing the Postmaster General with authority to retain fourth class post offices in the salary grade and class to which they were advanced because of "unusual conditions" until the annual adjustment is made at the end of the fiscal year.	H. R. 5168
231	To provide a long-range development program in the Post Office Department for improvement in methods, procedures, equipment and supplies	H. R. 91
233	To provide that Federal employees who are veterans may be granted time off, not to exceed 4 hours in any one day, to participate as active pallbearers or as members of firing squads or guards of honor in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned for burial.	H. R. 2662
235	To provide that the civil-service annuities of certain officers and employees engaged in the enforcement of the criminal laws of the United States shall be computed on the basis of their average basic salaries for any 5 consecutive years of allowable service. Under previous law the basis for computing annuities of such persons is last 5 years of service.	H. R. 3756
257	To provide that automatic promotions for part-time employees in the custodial service of the Post Office Department shall be based on a calendar year rather than on present procedure requiring 2,024 hours of service.	H. R. 1516
267	To provide retirement benefits for certain employees with 25 years of service involuntarily separated from the Federal service between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947.	H. R. 997
277	To grant the Postmaster General additional authority to award star-route contracts for transportation of mail by air where no air-mail service exists and where the airplane is the most practical medium for transporting mail.	H. R. 4498
288	To provide that with respect to the computation of night differential for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, night work shall be defined as any work performed between the hours of 6 p. m. and 6 a. m., and either standard or daylight-saving time shall be used, depending upon whichever time is observed where such night work is performed.	H. R. 3383
290	To provide the Postmaster General with authority to reduce postal rates to 1 cent per pound for braille writers and other appliances for the blind, or parts thereof, which are the property of State governments or subdivisions thereof, and of public libraries or of private agencies for the blind not conducted for private profit, or of blind individuals, under such regulations as he may prescribe.	H. R. 3637
310	To provide for extending survivorship benefits to widowers of employees retiring under the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930 (previous law extends such benefits to widows), and changes the reduction factor in the annuities of the retiring employees from 10 percent to 5 percent on the first $1,500 per annum of such annuities and retains existing law of a 10-percent reduction factor on that portion of the annuities exceeding $1,500.	H. R. 2944
316	To extend pro rata annual- and sick-leave benefits to part-time employees on regular tours of duty covering not less than 5 days in any administrative workweek, and to validate payments previously made to certain part-time employees.	H. R. 2619
320	To provide that in computing annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act for employees paid on a fee basis, the maximum basic salary upon which retirement may be based shall be $10,000 per annum.	H. R. 5465
359	To establish rates of annual compensation for the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and agencies from $14,000 per annum for certain bureau chiefs and board members, to $22,500 per annum for members of the Cabinet.	H. R. 1689
362	To amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.	H. R. 86
425	To provide for granting the Civil Service Commission discretion under the Civil Service Act of 1883 to authorize appointments in the departmental service without regard to the apportionment laws when persons are not available from States whose quotas are not filled. Also, this legislation codifies statutes governing the residence requirements of persons seeking positions in the departmental service.	H. R. 3826
428	To provide employees in the postal field service with (*a*) increase of $120 per year for all employees paid on an annual basis, 2½ cents-per-hour increase for hourly employees and 5-percent increase for fourth-class postmasters; (*b*) 3 longevity grades for all employees (including postmasters and supervisors) not previously entitled to such grades; (*c*) increase in entrance salary for regular employees by $200.	H. R. 4495
429	To provide for the repeal and replacement of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, by revising and simplifying the classifications and pay schedules of 885,000 classified employees, an average $140.50 annual pay increase, and longevity step increases in all of the CPC grades and below grade 11 in the new general schedule. New procedures for allocating positions are provided for the classified Federal service subject to the control and supervision of the Civil Service Commission. A general schedule of 18 grades and a crafts, protective, and custodial schedule of 10 grades replace the present schedules and grades. 3 additional salary ranges are provided above the present ceiling of $10,330 with limitations upon the number of positions in each such grade as follows: 300 in GS–16 ($11,200 to $12,000), 75 in GS–17 ($12,200 to $13,000), and 25 positions in GS–18 ($14,000). A new procedure is established to grant employees promotions or cash awards for contributing to outstanding efficiency and economy in administration.	H. R. 5931
486	To permit claims for payment of postal notes to be filed later than 1 year from month of issue if the original note is presented with the claim	H. R. 6475
492	To remove pay inequities that developed in cases of certain employees in the field service of the Post Office Department who did not receive full credit for military service for pay purposes under the terms of Public Law 577, 79th Cong.	H. R. 4285
500	To provide uniform longevity grades for employees in the postal field service by (*a*) establishing 3 longevity grades for all employees, (*b*) permitting all employees to count all years of service toward such longevity grades, (*c*) permitting employees presently receiving longevity grades to elect to remain under old system of such grades or come under the new system.	H. R. 6553
545	To provide for changing the phrase "legal voting residence" to "legal or voting residence" in the act setting forth requirements for application for civil-service examinations.	H. R. 6552
547	To provide, in the absence of a designated beneficiary, the following order precedence for lump-sum death payments under the civil-service retirement: (1) Beneficiaries designated by the employee, (2) widow or widower, (3) children, (4) parents, (5) executor or administrator, (6) other next of kin.	H. R. 7866
552	To authorize the Postmaster General to detail employees to postal units at armed services camps and to authorize allowances not exceeding $4 per day in lieu of actual expenses. Renews an authority which had expired.	H. R. 5103
562	To provide that the Civil Service Classification Act of 1949 (Public Law 429, 81st Cong.) shall be inapplicable to postal employees of the Canal Zone	H. R. 7888
577	To permit the Postmaster General to renew for 4 years star-route mail contracts with subcontractors at the same rate as the original contract. Permits such renewals with subcontractors who have performed satisfactorily for at least 1 year, and where present contract holder does not want to continue contract.	H. R. 8270
580	To postpone the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in the Selective Service System	H. R. 7889
601	To provide that each civil-service annuitant who retired prior to Apr. 1, 1948, under the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, may retain or accept an increase in his annuity of 25 percent or $300, whichever is lesser, and at the same time designate his surviving spouse to receive ½ of his annuity (but not to exceed $600). Under previous law such annuitants were granted the privilege of accepting one or the other of the above alternatives.	H. R. 4295

Legislation approved by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the 81st Cong.—Continued

Public Law No.	Explanation of provisions	House bill No.
699	To provide the Postmaster General with authority to return to senders marked "Unlawful" all mail addressed to persons, firms, corporations, companies, partnerships, or associations engaged in obtaining remittances of money or property of any kind through the mails in exchange for obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile articles, matters, things, devices, or substances, and to refuse to cash money orders and postal notes in connection therewith.	H. R. 8767
712	To provide improved procedures with respect to the financial control of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes. Carries out recommendations of the Hoover Commission with regard to accounting and auditing.	H. R. 8923
733	To protect the national security of the United States by permitting the suspension or termination of civilian officers and employees in certain sensitive departments and agencies of the Government.	H. R. 7439
767	To direct the Secretary of Commerce to take and publish every fifth year a census of governments, to include data on taxes, tax valuations, receipts, expenditures, indebtedness, employment, etc., of the States, counties, cities, and other governmental units. Removes restriction on use of certain data when compiled from or customarily provided in public records.	H. R. 7265
873	To provide for the administration of performance-rating plans for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes...	H. R. 7824

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY COMMITTEE WHICH BECAME LAW

Public Law No.	Explanation of provisions	Senate bill No.
212	To authorize the Civil Service Commission to extend from 6 months to 1 year the time within which application may be filed for disability annuity.....	S. 1459
269	To permit mothers and widows who acquire veterans preference under the Veterans Preference Act, and then lose such preference by remarriage, to regain such preference after divorce, legal separation, or death of such husband.	S. 974
254	To extend the time within which legislative employees may come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act.....	S. 1977
381	To provide an increase in equipment-maintenance allowances for rural carriers of 1 cent a mile.....	S. 1232
431	To convert village letter-carrier service at second-class post offices to city letter-carrier service.....	S. 1479
432	To provide automatic promotions for temporary employees in the mail equipment shops of the Post Office Department.....	S. 1825
504	To provide for reducing to 15 (was 20) days the period after which undelivered c. o. d. parcels may be returned to the sender. Permits the Postmaster General to direct immediate return of such parcels, if undeliverable.	S. 3117
523	To provide for lump-sum payments for accumulated annual leave and current accrued annual leave for former officers and employees of the Bituminous Coal Commission who were involuntarily separated from the Government service upon the termination of such Commission.	S. 2350
536	To provide that the Postmaster General shall prescribe regulations for forwarding undeliverable as addressed, second-, third-, and fourth-class matter to the sender or the addressee upon payment of postage for such service. The service will be discontinued if postage is not paid. Notice of undeliverability may be given for 5 cents per notice.	S. 3118
609	To provide that first-class mail may be sent free by any member of the Armed Forces serving in Korea or any other theater of operations hereafter designated a combat zone by the President. Effective until June 30, 1951.	S. 3876

BILLS INCORPORATED INTO OTHER LEGISLATION

Bill No.	Explanation of provisions	Action
H. R. 1599	Private bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece, to provide that she shall have an extension of time for filing her application for disability retirement.	S. 1459, which became Public Law 212, applies to this case (see p. 5.)
H. R. 2203	To direct the Bureau of the Census to take a census of housing in each State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Alaska in the year 1950 in conjunction with the decennial census of population.	Incorporated into the Housing Act of 1949, Public Law 171.
H. R. 6603	To provide that custodial and mail equipment shop employees of the postal service may count all time in the postal service for longevity and meritorious salary increases.	Incorporated into Public Law 500 (H. R. 6553, see p. 4).
H. R. 5265	To require Communist, Fascist, totalitarian, and subversive organizations to identify matter sent by them through the mails.	Incorporated into Public Law 831 (H. R. 9490, a bill to protect the internal security of the United States).

BILLS PASSED THE HOUSE AND PENDING IN SENATE

H. R. 2660	To prohibit the parking of vehicles on post office property. This legislation is designed to correct conditions where individuals have blocked access to the post office loading areas by parking motor vehicles on post office property.	Passed House Mar. 7, 1949. Reported in Senate by Public Works Committee on Apr. 1, 1949. On Senate Calendar and objected to 10 times.
H. R. 2945	To provide for the readjustment of postal rates and fees in all classes of mail and special services. It is estimated that this legislation will increase postal revenues by $130,000,000 annually, to offset a portion of the deficit of approximately $500,000,000 for fiscal year 1950. The bill also authorizes the Postmaster General to set rates on the special services.	Passed House Feb. 9, 1950. Pending before Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
H. R. 7185	To provide that in civil-service examinations for the position of apprentice, competition shall be restricted to 5- and 10-point veterans, and that such examinations shall be open to all veterans.	Passed House May 1, 1950. Placed on Senate Calendar May 2, 1950. S. 3050, reported by Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on Apr. 14, 1950, is a similar bill and also pending on the Senate Calendar.
H. R. 8195	To rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services...	Passed House Aug. 16, 1950. Placed on Senate Calendar Aug. 16, 1950. S. 3560, reported by Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on May 10, 1950, is a similar bill and also pending on the Senate Calendar.

BILLS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE AND PENDING BEFORE HOUSE

H. R. 8711	To provide that certain custodial employees transferred from the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration will continue to be paid under the Postal Employees' Classification and Pay Act.	Reported by committee on June 26, 1950. On Consent Calendar, passed over without prejudice.
H. R. 8925	To provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes, carrying out the most important recommendations of the Hoover Commission.	Reported by committee on July 20, 1950. Pending on Union Calendar.

BILLS VETOED

H. R. 87	To grant certain employees in the postal field service credit toward their automatic promotions for all time spent in the military service between Sept. 16, 1940, and June 30, 1946.	Passed House Mar. 8, 1950. Passed Senate June 8, 1950. Vetoed June 23, 1950. Passed House over veto June 26, 1950. Senate sustained veto Aug. 31, 1950.
H. R. 142	To provide that no charge shall be made by the Bureau of the Census for supplying population data to members of the armed services or persons honorably discharged therefrom, or to persons requesting information as proof of age for the purpose of establishing claim to old-age assistance or old-age and survivorship insurance benefits.	Passed House May 16, 1949. Passed Senate July 26, 1949. Vetoed Aug. 9, 1949.
H. J. Res. 461	To provide that South Parkersburg, W. Va., shall be considered as a part of Parkersburg for purposes of the census of 1950.	Passed House June 5, 1950. Passed Senate July 26, 1950. Vetoed Aug. 11, 1950.

Key to Conquest of Reds To Be Found Inside Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I herewith include in my extension of remarks an article written by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen and appearing in the Boston Post of October 1, 1950.

This article is a splendid one and written by one of the great churchmen of the world and one of the outstanding students of world events, particularly of communism. This article is worthy of deep consideration by everyone who believes in God and who values liberty.

This article of Monsignor Sheen's impresses me tremendously with its logic and its power. The contents of Monsignor Sheen's article cannot successfully be challenged.

His pointed suggestion to those officials who direct the Voice of America on the power of the Word of God is in order and should be adopted by them.

It is not only a timely article but is a very practical one.

KEY TO CONQUEST OF REDS TO BE FOUND INSIDE RUSSIA—GANGSTER TACTICS CAN BE BLOCKED BY MAN'S WILL TO SAVE HIS SOUL

(By Fulton J. Sheen)

The most tragic thing in the world is that those who are most violently incensed against the evils of communism have no clear idea of why they are opposed to it. The western world is being armed with guns to attack a faith, without itself having a faith.

Communism in Russia can be conquered, but only in the same way that it conquers—namely, from within. Without firing a single gun, but through winning over a state department employee from one country, a justice official from another, and a general from still another, it has gained mastery of over 800,000,000 people. Never before in the history of the world did any one country gain such power without the use of a bow and arrow or gun powder. Without an army crossing its own frontiers it has mastered much of the globe. The Trojan horse tactics and the fifth column within other countries have been more conquering than any army of the Russians' own could be.

The Western World is now arming against a communism which refuses to bear arms. It is the very essence of Russian communistic tactics not to fight. Russia did not fight to gain the Kuriles at our back door; it did not go to war to gain northern Korea, or even invade South Korea. It did not fight to gain China, nor Lithuania.

Almost every one of its victories were won at a conference table, as the statesmen's cigarette and cigar bowed down to the majestic smoke screen of a dictator's pipe. Communistic Russia will not use its Russian Army so long as there is a living Chinese, or Korean, or Indian. Its technique is exactly the same as that of gang leaders who hire killers to do away with their enemies while they pose as respectable citizens who love to give soup to the poor.

KEY TO THE PROBLEM

The key to the problem of how to deal with communistic Russia is to be found within Russia itself. The most effective victories are won by using the very implements the enemy would use in destroying us. Since communistic Russia would conquer the world by destroying each country from within, so communism in Russia can be conquered from within. In any country there are some elements which are the raw material for a revolution of one kind or another. The immoral, the jaded, the avaricious, and the atheistic naturally gravitate toward a communistic center.

The people of good will, the fathers and mothers who love their children and their God, naturally gravitate to a divine center. Russia has a greater potential for being destroyed from within than has America; there is a greater fifth column in Russia than Russia's fifth column in America. This potential enemy of communism within Russia is the vast majority of the Russian people, who are anxious to throw off the cruel yoke, simply because they are human beings. As the Chinese Communists betray China, and as American Communists betray America, so the Russians can be induced to destroy communism in Russia.

It may be said that the Voice of America is trying to achieve this. The truth is that the Voice of America will never overthrow Russia from within by merely political broadcasts, for politics alone can never fire the souls of men. Why should the Russians endanger their lives to change one form of politics for another? No Russian wants to risk his life in order that his country, too, may have a Tydings committee, but he will risk his life to save his soul.

DANGER OF WARS

Russia must be overcome spiritually before it can be overcome politically. Men will not throw off communistic materialism just in order to enjoy American materialism or the right to buy anything they see in a mailing-house catalog. But they have a thousand reasons for surpassing both kinds of materialism in order to remake their own souls, according to their own lights and according to their great Christian traditions.

America is not in danger of a war with Russia. But it does face a succession of wars with a succession of Russian satellites. As the northern Koreans put little boys with pop guns in the front ranks to protect the soldiers, so Russian Communists will resist "American imperialism" to the last drop of Chinese, Korean, Indian, and Philippine blood. Yet the Koreans are not our enemies, nor are the Chinese: they are our brothers.

American boys would not strike the sister of a boy they were fighting if he held his sister before him. That is what the Russians are doing; holding other nations before them, like women, to protect themselves. Russia never wins a battle—nor does it ever lose a battle. The Koreans lose battles, or the Chinese, but never the Russian Communists. That is why Russia will never be defeated until it is defeated from within. The Voice of America could accomplish this if its directors really believed that most people think seriously about God.

ECA—Old and New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, in keeping with the order entered into in the United States Senate on September 23 I seek the privilege of inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of September 25, 1950, headed "ECA—Old and new," about two of my old friends and old associates in the Committee for Economic Development, and surely two of the finest public servants Washington has seen. One of the finest things about them is their attitude toward each other, and their attitude, as Republicans and yet as loyal subordinates, toward the President. This editorial is as deserving as any of the dozens I have seen occasioned by Mr. Paul Hoffman's resignation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA—OLD AND NEW

The change in the headship of the Economic Cooperation Administration will not alter its direction. Paul G. Hoffman and William C. Foster have been David and Jonathan in running the ECA, with, of recent months, Mr. Hoffman the expositor and Mr. Foster the administrator of that great and ramified agency.

At the start Mr. Hoffman had to create an organization. This he did with signal success. There is a fund of ability in this country for assignments of this sort, but it must be inspired before it can be enlisted. Mr. Hoffman happens to have the gift of inspiration, as his career before he started ECA had testified. As a progressive industrialist, he threw his abundant energies into the setting up of the Committee for Economic Development, which has served to take the Bourbonism out of American industry. He has enlightened ideas on the duty that industry owes to the community and a sense of cooperation with Government. As an employer he knew his workers in terms of coworkers, and is able to distinguish between a personal interest and paternalism. Withal he has a warming nature which breathes confidence and then enthusiasm into his associates and his audiences. No wonder he organized a team of like-minded and hard-working officials in ECA.

The same qualities account for his success in dealing with Congress. Few men have his facility for dissuading or persuading committees of Congress. It seems like an art as he exercises it, but Mr. Hoffman is artless, and he comes by his disarming trait quite naturally. His convictions are part of the explanation. But the power of his appeal comes from the respect he shows for the legislative branch of Government and the obligation he feels toward stewardship.

And what an excellent missioner he has been abroad. The farther east you go, the more the picture of the wickedness of the American capitalist is conjured up. But when Mr. Hoffman appeared among the people of Europe, they saw no forked horns, but a man of faith, with a deep sensitiveness to the fears and hungers of the world's submerged, and with a passionate belief that the free-enterprise system can distribute as well as produce. He must have offset a good deal of Muscovite propaganda of the exploiter grown fat on surplus value by the disproof furnished by his person as well as by his mission.

Mr. Foster has long had the reputation as the best administrator in Washington. He has taken over ECA at a time when the programing is being dovetailed with the post-Korean need for rearmament. In the new context of defense policy the integration of Europe over which both Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Foster have labored of recent months now has a military impetus. Mr. Foster, like Mr. Hoffman, is a Republican. But both of them have shown a single-minded loyalty to their work

which must have been a great satisfaction to the President. With the respect that he has also gained from Congress and the ECA staff, Mr. Foster is assured of a flying start in the titular improvement of his assignment.

Statement by Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, President of the National Lawyers Guild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, president of the National Lawyers Guild, in answer to a recent report of the House Un-American Committee attacking the National Lawyers Guild.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUILD ANSWERS UN-AMERICAN COMMITTEE ATTACK

Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, president of the National Lawyers Guild, issued the following statement in answer to the report of the Un-American Committee:

"The report of the Un-American Committee on the National Lawyers Guild is another typical demonstration of the fantastic standards, methods, and distortions which have earned that committee the disrespect of most thoughtful Americans. The committee's apparent purpose in this report, however, is more far-reaching than the usual one.

"Having contributed greatly to creating a hysteria in our country, under cover of which more and more dissident individuals and groups face prosecution directly or indirectly for their views, the committee now seeks through this report to intimidate or eliminate the only lawyers who have had the courage to defend those at the whipping post. In short, the committee is striking at the constitutional right of one accused to counsel of his own choice, and at the duty of every lawyer under the code of ethics not to reject a client's cause out of fear.

"We are confident, however, that guild members will not be intimidated. They and the guild will continue to fulfill to the best of their ability the special responsibility of the bar, to which Mr. Justice Douglas referred in his Altgeld Memorial address, to help make our civil liberties a vital force in American life.

"The committee recommends that because the guild is affiliated to an international bar association, the views of which the members of the committee disapprove, it should be required to register as a foreign agent. The committee does not refer to a single instance in which the guild has acted as an agent of the international association. The fact is that the guild is bound by no decision or policy of any other organization, and it has never represented or acted as an agent for anyone but its own membership. The guild is no more an agent of the international association with which it is affiliated than the American Bar Association is an agent of the Inter-American Bar Association, or the American Affiliate of International Rotary, the World Council of Churches, or the Catholic Church. Fortunately, under our law, the opinion of the Un-American Committee regarding the international association does not convert an affiliation into an agency.

"The committee's conclusion that the guild is a subversive organization (whatever that means) and should be listed as such by the Attorney General, is based essentially on two points: (1) That the guild and its members have defended the constitutional rights of Communists or alleged Communists, resisting the current hysterical witch hunt and the legislation and investigations which it fosters; and (2) that certain of its policies are somewhat similar to certain policies of the Communist Party.

"The aims of the guild as stated in its constitution include the following: 'To protect and foster our democratic institutions and the civil rights and liberties of all the people.' We have steadfastly adhered to this aim, and we shall continue to do so. We believe that liberty is indivisible, that when any group may be deprived of its constitutional rights, the liberty of us all is imperiled.

"It happens that the Communists are the scapegoat now. The main direction of the present repressive drive, as after the First World War, is against them. It is only for this reason that grave constitutional questions have so often been raised in cases involving actual or alleged Communists. We have presented our views on these questions as a friend of the court, never representing any accused person in any case. We hold that to be the highest responsibility of the bar. We shall not shrink from the fulfillment of that responsibility, however unpopular the individuals who happen to be involved. If that is subversive in America today it is a shameful reflection upon the state of liberty in our land.

"The guild's views on public questions are, and always have been, those of independent, liberal lawyers. It has considered and acted upon such questions strictly according to its view of the merits. It has taken positions in direct conflict with those of the Communist Party, just as with those of the Republican, Democratic, and other parties. This was exemplified most recently by the statement adopted by our national executive board on September 9 on the Korean and related problems. The board said, in part, 'We support the actions of the United Nations in opposing the aggression of North Korea against South Korea. We hope that this action will strengthen the authority and prestige of the United Nations and prove a deterrent to future aggression.'

"The guild is a nonpolitical bar association which supports the policies or personalities of no party. It has not been, and will not be deterred from the free exercise of its judgment, democratically determined, by the similarity between these views in any given case, and the views of any political party.

"It happens that the views of the Communist Party coincide in many instances with the views of most of the labor movement and many church and civic organizations. This is true especially of the area of civil rights and liberties, in which the guild has been most active. Presidents of the United States, in common with the guild and the Communist Party have protested the methods and procedures of the Un-American Committee. Many trade unions and church organizations have opposed universal military training in common with the guild and the Communist Party. Nonintervention in and recognition of China has been urged by many groups, including the Governments of India and Great Britain. Our opposition to diplomatic and economic relations with the Franco government is shared by the vast majority of the members of the United Nations. Undoubtedly the vast majority of the American people would approve our call to the 'United States and the Soviet Union (to) compose their differences in the briefest possible time and lay the ground work for the composing of differences among other nations.' Many other illustrations could be cited.

"To infer control or undue influence from similarity of some views is patently an absurdity. Most of the members of the United Nations vote with the United States on almost every question. Yet, the Un-American Committee would be the last to suggest that the United States controls or exercises an undue influence over these other governments. What is important is that the committee has referred to no policy or act of the guild which is not wholly consistent with the guild's vigorous support for our democratic institutions, and of every effort to further the cause of peace devoutly desired by all Americans.

"Some assertions of the committee deserve specific comment.

"It is said that 'almost without exception, its leading members * * * seek to bring the courts and its procedures into disrepute.' This conclusion is supported only by reference to the conduct of seven guild members in two cases. The guild has 85 members on its national board and many more on its local chapter boards. It has thousands of members handling tens of thousands of cases. Yet, the committee jumps easily to its conclusion. Moreover, while six of the lawyers mentioned were found by the trial judge to have had such a purpose as the committee mentions in their conduct of a single trial, this finding was held by the United States court of appeals to have been made without the hearing and opportunity for defense required by law.

"The guild is attacked for its criticism of the methods and practices of the FBI. The position of the guild is supported by the most extensive factual documentation of its criticisms and request for an investigation. None of this documentation has ever been challenged by anyone.

"The committee refers to 19 guild members who represented witnesses called by the Un-American Committee. Because these witnesses declined to answer certain questions asserting that their answers might incriminate them, the committee concludes that counsel, who advised the witnesses of their constitutional right to refuse such answers, did so under directives from the Communist Party. This conclusion is not supported by reference to a single fact or circumstance except that some witnesses were more ready to answer incriminating questions before consulting counsel than after. No doubt this would be true of all witnesses and all counsel. Moreover it is absurd to charge the guild with the conduct of a few of its members.

"Finally, the committee asserts that 'the dominant forces in the National Lawyers Guild have been composed of known Communists and fellow travelers.' In support of this three guild members are referred to, as to whom testimony was given before the committee that they were members of the Communist Party prior to the time the guild was organized. None of these three were ever active leaders of the guild. Some eight others are referred to as having been affiliated at some time with organizations disapproved of by the Un-American Committee. The dominant forces in the guild have always been the delegates to our annual conventions, chosen by the membership. They are the final determiners of policy. The committee's statement is wholly unfounded.

"The committee, as is so often the case, issued its report without notice to the guild or any hearing."

Record of Hon. Adam C. Powell, Jr., of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on my record in Congress:

SECTION I. SUMMARY OF RECORD PRIOR TO JANUARY 1949

The New York Times on Wednesday, February 4, 1948, in a page 2 article said "the only anti-Jim Crow bill before the Congress was introduced by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., Democrat, of New York, in the last session." This was stated in connection with the Truman Civil Rights Report.

Before President Truman took office, POWELL had authored or co-authored all the legislation which later became the Truman civil-rights program, including the following bills:

Anti-poll-tax, FEPC, antilynching.

Abolition of Jim Crow in interstate transportation.

Abolition of segregation in the Armed Forces.

Civil rights for the District of Columbia.

Franchise for the District of Columbia.

POWELL also wrote, introduced and steered through to enactment the only civil rights law since Reconstruction to be passed by the Congress and Senate (United States Statutes, 79th Cong., 2d sess., No. 60, Pt. I, Public Law 396). It guarantees "equitable distribution" of funds for school lunch program.

POWELL was the only Congressman to fight on the floor of Congress for the inclusion of Negroes in the permanent Air Corps bill and for the inclusion of Negro women in the permanent nursing corps of the Armed Forces and in the WAC permanent corps.

POWELL'S parliamentary maneuver was able to keep the House of Representatives from passing the southern regional Jim Crow college bill. Also, he started and led the fight lasting a solid week, to wipe out segregation in the Armed Forces (80th Cong.).

By a last minute speech in the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress, POWELL convinced the House of Representatives to vote several million dollars for the Virgin Islands.

The only Congressman to lead the fight, and take the issue to the White House so that black citizens of Panama would be given equal treatment with whites in the Panama Canal Zone. (He was sent as a committee of one to Panama to investigate these conditions.)

The only Negro Congressman to urge that the salaries of post office employees and all Federal workers be increased and to raise this issue at the committee hearing.

He chaired the Citizens Committee for the successful strike of Washington, D. C. cafeteria workers against GSI, thus bettering the living conditions of 10,000 Negro workers.

POWELL maintains full time offices in New York and in Washington, handling over 5,000 cases a year through which jobs have been obtained, pensions secured and increased, veterans assisted, and over $20,000 in cash refunded by the Federal Government.

SECTION II. EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The following quotes are from an article in the Pittsburgh Courier of August 3, 1949, entitled "Negroes in the Halls of Congress" written by Lem Graves, Jr.:

"Once in Congress, POWELL became the articulate Congressman-at-large for United States Negroes in general and the vocal advocate of all downtrodden people. * * *

"POWELL has, in the course of his congressional career, authored the usual list of civil rights bills and has been a far more vigorous spokesman of the civil rights cause than have other Negro Congressmen. He has also been interested in labor and is second man on the Democratic totem pole in the House Labor Committee. He gets on the RECORD often with strong speeches and is easily the best showman of the Negro congressional lot.

"But almost obscured behind the glamour is some solid achievement. POWELL shepherded his Naval Academy nominee, Wesley Brown, through 4 years and saw him become the first Negro in history to graduate from that service school. He won the first Negro sponsored legislative victory when his anti-discrimination amendment to the national school lunch act was adopted. He headed a labor subcommittee which favorably reported an FEPC bill in the present Congress and fought vainly to have the House pass this bill. He fought against West Indian restrictions. He helped master-mind the deal which resulted in recommittal of the Wood labor bill after the administration failed to repeal Taft-Hartley. He saved the Virgin Islands Corporation in 1948 when its charter was about to expire. And a few weeks ago, he cleverly maneuvered a protective amendment into the long range housing bill during floor debate in the House only to see his amendment sabotaged in the all-powerful conference committee.

"POWELL'S hard-hitting attacks on the floor of Congress cover a wide range of Negro-interest subjects and practically every State in the Union. The fact that he is the race's Congressman at Large is the source of votes in New York where the political interests of the ghetto melting pot are so diverse."

SECTION III. NEWSPAPER QUOTATIONS

A. Miscellaneous statements

New York Herald Tribune editorial: "Congressman POWELL'S (FEPC) hearing is at the very least doing a good job of education. The statement of the facts now arouses public opinion. * * * We hope they are beginning to see the light" (May 19, 1949).

Roy Wilkins, administrative secretary, NAACP: "Representative POWELL conducted a brilliant campaign in behalf of his bill (FEPC) against overwhelming odds." (Associated Negro Press, March 3, 1950.)

Earl Brown, New York City councilman: "Congressman POWELL performed an efficient job as chairman of a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee. He conducted his hearings with efficiency and dignity. He engineered a recommendation to the entire House Labor Committee to approve a Federal law that would abolish discrimination in employment." (Amsterdam News, June 11, 1949.)

Val Washington, assistant to the chairman of Republican National Committee: "Castigates the weak civil rights record of the Democrats, pointing out that many key committees are chaired by minority-baiting Congressmen. He does pause to praise such as ADAM POWELL." (Chicago Defender, June 11, 1949.)

A. M. Wendell Malliet: "Congressman POWELL is doing a splendid job. He should have the full support of a united Democratic people." (Amsterdam News, June 11, 1949.)

Majorie McKenzie: "Although this was POWELL'S first chairmanship he displayed a capability that won praise even from his political enemies." (Pittsburgh Courier, July 2. 1949.)

Charlie Cherokee: "ADAM POWELL held the floor for a half hour as he took active part in the debate on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law." (Chicago Defender, May 7, 1949.)

Pittsburgh Courier: "Congressman POWELL did a fine job in attempting to guide his bill to a vote, in the longest and most turbulent session of the House in years." (Washington Bureau.)

"Congressman POWELL has courageously conducted himself as an eloquent exponent of justice and equality before the Nation's law making body." (Some Great Men, April 14, 1949.)

"Congressman POWELL covered himself with glory at the close of the Taft-Hartley battle last week. He sat at the leadership table during the entire action and was one of the key quarterbacks of the game against Hartley."

B. Record of service

Segregation in the District of Columbia

New York Herald Tribune, March 3, 1949: "The unsuccessful attempt to drive a civil-rights wedge into Washington's long-standing segregation policies was made by Representative POWELL, Democrat, of New York, when he introduced an amendment to the appropriation bill."

New York Herald Tribune, March 15, 1949: "The defeated amendment of Representative POWELL which attempted to right the grievous wrongs of discrimination by segregation in the city of Washington, D. C., deserves editorial comment."

Washington Post: "Dixiecrats in the House this week teamed up with northern Republicans to defeat Representative POWELL'S amendment to ban segregation in the Nation's Capital by a vote of 106 to 64."

Anti-West Indian Discrimination

New York Herald Tribune, March 1, 1949: (See whole story of fight to take out of Judd bill clause which would have barred immigration of West Indians to the United States. Beginning March 1, and continuing to last days of Congress, POWELL successfully insisted upon elimination of this clause.)

New York Age, April 2, 1949: "New York Age and POWELL upset migration curb."

Amsterdam News May 28, 1949: "Congressman POWELL fought desperately against the Judd bill now pending before the Senate committee."

Kansas City Plaindealer, June 3, 1949: "Congressman POWELL led the speakers' list of the denunciation of the duplicity of leaders in Government."

Pittsburgh Courier, July 30, 1950: "POWELL leads fight against quota system."

Federal Aid to Education

New York Herald Tribune, March 9, 1949: "The House Labor Committee voted today to bar any racial discrimination in Federal aid to schools. In making the change the committee voted 19 to 5 for an amendment by POWELL, of New York."

Interracial Theater in Washington, D. C.

New York Herald Tribune, April 13, 1949: "A bill to direct the administration to lease the old Belasco Theater near the White House to the American National Theater was introduced by Representative POWELL."

Minimum Wage

(See story in all papers. POWELL appointed House conferee to meet with Senate; result: National minimum-wage upped to 75 cents.)

Aid for Panama Workers

Chicago Defender, April 23, 1949: "A bill to extend the benefits of the civil-service retirement to the Panama Canal employees was introduced last Monday by Representative POWELL."

Discrimination in Housing

Washington Post, June 9, 1949: "The House approved 199 to 41 an amendment by POWELL, giving first priority for occupancy of houses to persons removed from their home by slum clearance."

Pittsburgh Courier, July 9, 1949: "A major victory for Negro slum dwellers was won in the House last week when an amendment sponsored by POWELL passed 199 to 41. It may well prove to be one of the most important legislative contributions POWELL will make in his entire career."

Anticommunism

New York Age, April 30, 1949: "In opposing Paul Robeson's statement that American Negroes would not fight against Russia, POWELL said, 'In the hour of crisis we will be loyal to our Nation. In the event of war at any time, against anyone, we will do our part.'"

First Negro Annapolis Graduate

Washington Post, March 21, 1949: "Midshipman Brown appointed 1945 by Representative POWELL, first of his race to be graduated from the United States Naval Academy. Thomas Brandon, June 1950, graduated from West Point."

FEPC Leader

New York Post, March 30, 1949: "The whole field of discrimination in labor will be explored at a public hearing by a new House Labor Committee on FEPC under Representative POWELL. POWELL has been fighting for the naming of such a committee for 3 months."

Herald Tribune, May 11, 1949: "POWELL opens House hearing on FEPC bill—first Negro ever to preside over the drafting of civil-rights legislation in Congress * * * smoothly and quickly he cut off the only flare-up when one of the southern Democrats began a diatribe against the bill."

Washington Post, May 18, 1949: "POWELL, chairman of FEPC Committee, denounced America's railroad unions as 'scab No. 1 against democracy' because they are brotherhoods for whites only."

Amsterdam News, May 21, 1949: "POWELL, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Labor and Education under threat of subpena summoned the presidents of the top railroad brotherhoods before him for hearing."

Fights Segregation in Government Cafeteria

Chicago Defender, Charlie Cherokee: "NAACP Labor Secretary Clarence Mitchell with the aid of the Negro press and ADAM POWELL succeeded in finally ending segregation in Government Printing Office cafeteria."

Fights Segregation in Nation's Capital

Washington Post, May 24, 1950: "On a standing vote of 50–19 the House defeated the Powell amendment to attach an anti-segregation rider to the District appropriation bill."

Fights Segregation in the Armed Forces

Washington Post, May 25, 1950: "The House voted down 107–23 an amendment by Representative POWELL to end all racial segregation in the Armed Forces."

Time To Face Realities—Address by the Chairman, W. Arthur Simpson, at the Republican State Convention, Montpelier, Vt., September 29, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am including as an extension of remarks the speech made by the Honorable Arthur W. Simpson, chairman of the Republican State convention, at Montpelier September 29, 1950:

I am honored by selection to preside over this convention. I am not here to entertain you. I am going to make a few remarks which I hope you will find pertinent to this occasion.

This is a time to face realities and to face them without soft concealment. Thousands of American boys, ill-prepared and ill-equipped, have died or suffered grievous wounds on a far-flung battle front. The development of new areas of combat depend on the whims of our enemies. It cannot be denied that this may simply be a rehearsal for the big parade. We had been lulled into a sense of false security by little men who had crawled into position of great responsibility.

The historian will find in those things happening in the world today a familiar pattern to what has heretofore happened but the implications and impact of this conflict are the greatest in the history of civilization. This is not just another war. We are confronted by world revolution swept by forces of terrible portent because they will determine whether force or reason shall rule the world. The sword of Damocles hangs over this Nation. This is not an overstatement.

Liberty is fighting for its life. We must arm for a generation, both to protect ourselves and to police the world. There can be no compromise with these grim facts. Such a course, and we have no alternative, will be hard and expensive. The maintenance of a great standing Army, a two-ocean Navy, a great Air Force, will tremendously change the whole social and economic fabric of the Nation. It will eventually lower our standard of living. Liberty cannot be saved in its Sunday clothes.

During a time of national peril the Government has been unwilling to strengthen its credit or husband its resources. Inflation is not a threat. It is a reality. Not one single individual can consider himself immune from its consequences. The destruction of the material values built up through many generations of planning, toil, sacrifice, and thrift is a terrible thing. Lenin, the father of communism, declared that the best way to destroy capitalism was to debauch the currency.

We must put iron into our democracy. Democracy creating its own world was hard and grim and poor. Democracy in years of national peril has been rich and soft and quarrelsome. Government has been actuated by selfish political motives. It failed tragically to make peace. It failed dismally to prepare for war. These things are true. At a time to come, at a place not foretold, the life of liberty will be won or lost in an hour of battle and what happens there will have been determined beforehand, by work done in the arsenal, in the shipyard, in the airplane factory, on the tank assembly line, a few man-hours more or less. God grant that the hour will not have been struck too late.

The time is long overdue for us to seriously consider what road we are pursuing in this country. There are only two definite roads. One road is rocky but leads upward toward the summit of permanent stability. It is the road of economy, of balanced budgets, of constitutional government, and of common sense. It is a road which does not appeal to unthinking people, nor to those who have been led to believe that they can get something for nothing, but it is the only road that we can ever take to achieve any semblance of normal and permanent recovery in this country.

The other road is the well-paved road that leads ever downward. It is the road of extravagance, of loose fiscal policies, of bureaucracy, of crackpot schemes, and ideas, and at the end of this road is the mailed fist and the iron heel of a dictator.

The siren song of socialism with its fantastic promises of less work and more pay, guaranteed security, and other vistas of utopia is nothing new. It has been sung periodically since the establishment of civilization. It has brought about the downfall of nations wiser, more prosperous, and longer enduring than ours.

Government has a profound influence on the character of its people. The only progress which is really effective does not depend on the bounty of nature. It depends on the character and energy of man. The building of a great nation is essentially the triumph of character. Our founding fathers laid great stress on the pursuit of happiness. They did not attempt to guarantee it.

There is an increasingly prevalent idea throughout the Nation that the individual should look to government for his security rather than to earn it through work and industry. Man wants government to guarantee him security against all the hazards and vicissitudes of life.

Higher wages, increased comforts and luxury, which are solely the product of free enterprise and of which the people of this Nation possess more than peoples of any other nation in the world, present or past, arouse hunger for more wages with still greater comfort and additional leisure time. Political power and favoritism have given more of these comforts and leisure to some groups than to others. This is no time for higher prices, higher wages, greater profits, shorter hours, larger pensions, and rigid prices for agriculture. They are destroying the moral basis of society. They are increasing the cost of living and contributing to the depreciation of the American dollar. They are dominant factors in the rise in the cost of government and the burden of taxation.

A political power which perpetuates itself by setting class against class, by buying our votes with our own money and by special favors to minority groups, is creating a Frankenstein which will ultimately destroy the Nation. Power corrupts even the best intentioned men. Big government is vastly more dangerous than big business. The tendency is to offer more and more benefits and services for lengthened periods, at less and less (visible) cost to the recipient. Once a nation becomes entangled in the meshes of the welfare state, the party which can promise more welfare to more people has a head start in every election. James F. Byrnes has said: "Let government go unchecked and your children will be forced to pay for the folly of their fathers."

This Nation was not built on the blue skim milk of family and community unconcern. The persons who built this country were impelled by strong ideas, full of family and community responsibility. They were willing to work and save to that end. Had they been filled with the watered-out philosophies too often expressed today by our socialistic planners, the last white man would have long since been chased down the eastern slope of the Alleghenies, in fact it is doubtful if he would have ever crossed the ocean in the first place.

Our society and economy is roughly divided into two groups, one the producing-incentive group, the other the nonproductive group. Today more and more burden is falling on the producing group to support and pay for the nonproducing group. Progressively penalizing producers for the nonproducers is not only heading for trouble, it is heading for universal impoverishment. Our society must strain every effort to find a reverse process to stop the leveling off and dissipation of personal and individual energy and initiative.

This country is suffering from an overdose of selfishness and self-righteousness. Every group wants special consideration. They pool their resources and political

strength to needle more out of Congress. The big moguls heading up the special groups enhance their reputation, measure their strength and increase their powers by the concessions, privileges, favors, and benefits they are able to obtain at the expense of the general public of which they are also an integral part. No one is willing to sacrifice, we cannot even be inconvenienced. Everyone is tarred by the same brush. So we go merrily down the road to inflation, repudiation, and bankruptcy.

No government will work in a land where everyone tries to work the government. When you take away the incentive to produce and the penalty for loafing, you are on the slippery road to ruin. We can take out of our economic system only what we put into it. Government can wave no magic wands, issue no decrees, make no laws which will provide things for a people who do not produce.

The only riches which enable us to eat and drink, to clothe, shelter, and educate ourselves and our families, to provide a measure of security in old age and to enable us to aid the less fortunate are the riches that are created through the skills of men in industry and business or grown through the efforts of men on farms. It is easy to forget how to plow when everyone wants to be a harvester.

The hope of mankind in relief from all forms of tyranny over the mind of man rests in the republican form of government. A hundred generations of struggle and sacrifice stands back of the experiment entrusted to the American people.

Abraham Lincoln concluded an address which is a model for brevity, clarity, and high resolve with these words: "That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Freedom is not from everlasting to everlasting. It is the obligation of each generation to insure that it be perpetually renewed and strengthened. This is our obligation, yours and mine. God helping us, we can do no less.

Crusade for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors of the Crusade for Freedom, I ask leave, under the order entered into in the United States Senate on September 23, to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Hartford (Conn.) Courant which grew out of an excellent speech by Gen. Lucius Clay at the opening of the Freedom Crusade in Hartford on September 26. And may I emphasize in particular the closing sentence of the editorial that "Ideas alone can now win victories that endure," with a suggestion that the Congress has not remotely given adequate consideration to this neglected area in the conduct of our foreign policy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRUSADE FOR FREEDOM

If anybody has first-hand information of the conflict between the Big Lie and the Big Truth, it must be Gen. Lucius D. Clay. He was military governor in Germany in the days of the Berlin airlift. In fact for years General Clay had to contend with the Big Lie in almost every phase of the American cccupation. General Clay was in Hartford last night to open the local Freedom Crusade. That fact alone lifts this cause above the level of just another drive. General Clay knows well today's bitter struggle for the minds of men.

The Crusade for Freedom, in General Clay's own words, "is a program designed to enlist the help of millions of Americans in this job of stepping up our world propaganda campaign." Such a campaign, financed privately, is already under way. Refugees from iron-curtain countries are already broadcasting to their compatriots in the Soviet sphere. An 8-foot, 10-ton Freedom Bell is now being cast in England. It will be installed in the western part of Berlin. The bell, a bronze one, bears five figures representing the five races of mankind passing the torch of freedom. It will be rung, says General Clay, "in the hope that every time it rings it will signify that freedom still lives behind the iron curtain."

Its installation in Berlin is to be attended by representatives of all free nations, and its ringing is to be broadcast throughout the world. Its pealing is expected to be taken up in every community throughout the free countries with the ringing of local church, school, and other community bells.

Do not underestimate either the power of a symbol or the effectiveness of truth spoken by simple people. The "V for victory" became a symbol that long haunted the Nazis. And the letters of American citizens to their relatives in Italy were potent factors in stemming the tide of communism in that country.

Man does not live by bread alone. And even in those countries where bread is a luxury, the hunger for freedom still exists. If this Crusade for Freedom, joined in by all the American people, can establish the Big Truth of liberty and justice in the minds of these captive Europeans, then we shall have won the only kind of victory that is real. There are no longer spoils of war from battles won. Ideas alone can now win victories that endure.

Communists and Socialists in Vermont—We Shall Have a Housecleaning To Rid Ourselves of These Termites, and To Get Rid of the Parasites Who Would Live Off the Body Politic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting as an extension of remarks a verbatim copy of the speech I delivered September 29 before the convention of nominate members of the Vermont Legislature:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Vermonters, appreciative as I am of the generous courtesy extended me and the high privilege which is involved in the opportunity afforded me to address you, let me put you on notice that this is not—God willing, and you all receptively minded—my valedictory. In fact, and you should know it, I have in preparation a speech for delivery on the floor in Congress, eventually to be distributed to all of you, in which I shall undertake to cover many of the things I have undertaken to accomplish during my service in Congress as your sole Representative, thanks for your sufferance, the while. I owe you a debt of gratitude for confidence manifest, immeasurable.

Today, I desire briefly to direct your attention to a few matters that deserve and must have the immediate attention of all loyal Americans, of whatsoever and of all partisan political beliefs there may be, to which matters the Republican Party of construction must pay particular heed because of its responsibility if it would preserve, as is its destiny and as of tradition, our freedom, which is the most precious heritage of America.

CALL FOR LEADERSHIP

Never was the call for leadership so loud or so compelling. Always heretofore in the emergency the Republican Party has been called upon to save the Nation and has saved it. So shall it be. Shall we do less?

The call today is louder and more widespread than ever before. In all humility but with the confidence born of what it has done, the Republican Party should assume the responsibilities of distinguished leadership out of which only can come the restoration and the preservation of the freedoms guaranteed to the people who are the Government and the life of such a democracy as we have lived and as we understand it.

Need I say, my fellow Vermonters, free government is the target of attack over a large part of the world while here at home and even in Vermont are those who would barter freedom for security. We can—we must—have both. That is one burden of responsibility which has to be assumed by the Republican Party.

As a party we must protect our form of government against those who first would destroy it by force, from outside or inside, and secondly against those whose purpose it is to make it the primary function of Government to guarantee support and social security for everybody. Instead of affording everyone an equal opportunity and a maximum freedom consistent with the same freedom for all others. Both groups and all other groups similarly minded are political termites which, unless eradicated or controlled, will topple the temple of freedom, justice, and equality for all, which is democracy defined, and as our founders established it. To prevent such a tragedy is the burden to be borne by the Republican Party. It is a tremendous responsibility. To be called upon to save Democracy is a challenge.

NO SURRENDER OF FREEDOM FOR SOCIALISM

The promises of those who told us we must relinquish some freedom in return for security have proven false again and again. There is no surrender of freedom to be tolerated, against any necessity otherwise.

Heedless of this plain lesson of history millions of Americans have forgotten that freedom and security are inseparable. They have listened to the siren promises of all the little political groups seeking power, paying lip-service to freedom, to those who would have something for nothing at the expense of those of us bound to pay, advocating a series of measures which only in the end are sure to liquidate freedom.

All these minority groups for welfare, for those who pay nothing for it, stem from that same philosophy under which and by reason of which Australia and New Zealand and England find themselves, as we find ourselves, where we are today.

I say to you that history and recent experience of other governments substantiates

my statement that any system of government which offers the same rewards to the man who loafs on the street corner as to the man who works daily, will kill the greatest force that has made this United States of America the country the whole world envies, so let it be.

All these something-for-nothing programs are socialism, pure, simple, and undefiled, whether recognized as such or not. Therefore I am opposed to their continuation. Such philosophy does not fit the America we know, which we seek to protect against their efforts to socialize and destroy this country of ours.

America was built and has grown on the proposition that what the people should have is what they can get for themselves, plus such aid from others as their needs may demand from childhood to old age. To perpetuate that policy is a burden and responsibility which rests upon the Republican Party, as against the giving all to the do-nothings, which is the policy of the New Deal and the Fair Deal and the welfare state.

NO NEW ENGLAND TVA'S

I tell you, and I do not need to tell you, that work is the genius of all accomplishment. We need no more planned economies, governmental, no more rubber dollars, no more socialistic gratuities, no more tax-exempt TVA's, and no more subsidies. Who pays for them? Figure that out. You do in the last analysis. Why should you? Why should socialism set up a group of people in this United States exempt from taxes which you and I pay in order to support it?

HEAR CALVIN COOLIDGE

Think that over. It reduces itself to a situation which confronts the next Legislature of the State of Vermont, if I am correctly advised. "Why," said Calvin Coolidge, "the America which Washington founded does not mean we shall have everything done for us, but that we shall have every opportunity to do everything for ourselves." "Sovereignty," said he, "it is our belief is vested in the individual, and we are going to protect the right of the individual." I may be right and I may be wrong, but that has been my doctrine ever since I went to Congress and my votes are consistent with it and I have made many enemies because of it and I am glad of it.

And to the farmers he said, and when the history of the United States of America is written this man Calvin Coolidge will stand out as one of the protective defenders and as one of the greatest Presidents the United States ever had, "No complicated schemes of relief, no plan for Government fixing of prices, no resort to the Public Treasury will be of any permanent value in establishing agriculture."

This man Coolidge spoke, when he did talk, always whereof he knew what he was talking about. He was for economy and more of it, and for freedom and free enterprise against socialism, fascism, and communism. So I say, as a Coolidge Republican, that it is true that the greatest hoax of this century is the theory that socialism, straight or modified, is the alternative which will save us from communism. In my opinion, socialism is like the Mother Hubbard which would-be Communists put on to cover that which they would undertake to hide. In 7 cases out of 10, if you take off the Socialist nightgown you would find a Communist exposed.

May I say in the words of another: A lot of time has been lost, but thank God we are at last awakening. It is late, but I believe not yet too late. If the Republican Party will mobilize fully and organize effectively the moral, the material, and the military resources of ourselves and of all free peoples under imaginative, courageous, and inspiring leadership, then the tide of tyranny that threatens everything we count precious can be turned back. Only thus can we secure once more for ourselves and our posterity the blessings of liberty.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION

Some 4 years ago I was criticized because I said that Vermont had been infiltrated by Communists. That criticism would not hold as of today for nobody doubts the truth of my statement. Nobody doubts that Vermont was deliberately selected by the Communists as a nest for experimentation. Nobody doubts that Vermont was selected and that Vermonters were chosen as a bunch of guinea pigs on which to experiment. Nobody doubts what they planned to do and did do in our midst. It is a matter of record that they so did do. I had reason to know I was talking the truth when I said what I did and I make no retractions. The evidences of the Communists are today to be found in more places than you would think possible in our colleges and schools. I say this without hysteria, but as a matter of fact and I insist that as a matter of self-protection the State of Vermont should undertake to segregate those who are known to be registered Communists or affiliated or associated Communists or fellow travelers, or sympathetic with any of the above-named groups, who are connected with any of our schools or colleges, or are even in our legislature. We should get rid of them and we will finally as we would of any other itch or aggravation on the body politic of the State of Vermont. They have no place in good old Vermont, and the sooner they get out and rid us of the embarrassment of their presence, or we kick them out, the better. Neither Communists nor hysteria can make much headway in this State of ours, among our people of such fiber and such faith, who are guided by the stars and not by the lights of each passing ship, if and when they know the truth, for the truth shall be told and it shall make us free.

OUR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

I realize that I will be criticized by socialistic sympathizers, Communist stooges, appeasers, and others for referring to these matters today, but I am convinced that some light should be let into some of the dark places here in Vermont. Who knows what textbooks are being used in our schools? Who knows what type of political economy and civics is being taught in our junior colleges and our universities? Nobody as a matter of fact, as Representative MILLER, chairman of a subcommittee of investigation of the House of Representatives, will tell you, because he could get no information from the chairman of the board of education or from the commissioner of education relative to the above matters. He had heard that some alleged communistically inclined textbooks were in use in Vermont. I told him, as shown by a free press survey, they had been so used, but I doubted that they were being so used now. The correspondence he had with Vermont State officials is very interesting reading, to say the least, and our failure to know what is being taught our children reflects no credit on us.

WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

In this connection let me say as did Bernard Baruch:

"Communism in America is not a political philosophy. It is not a political organization. It is not an expression of free thought. In America, it is a criminal conspiracy, inspired and ruled by the Kremlin. * * *

"It is not a matter of red-baiting, or red herrings. It is a question of survival. * * *

"You will find among us those who talk—who prate—of academic freedom, including, they say, absolute freedom to think and to teach. That is a dangerous romanticism, quite opposed to the naked reality.

"In the discussion of academic freedom, I beg you to remember that those who accept the Communist doctrine must accept the Communist discipline. They may not deviate from the line. * * * there is no academic freedom for those who are compelled to take orders from non-American sources, hostile to the spirit of our very existence. * * *

"We must continue our search for treason. That doesn't mean seeing a Communist under every bed, but it does mean the rooting out of organized propaganda, especially in the schools, colleges, and the Government. But always the process must be orderly, ethical, and free from demagoguery."

THE SOCIALISTIC THREAT

But, Mr. Chairman, under cover of all the excitement involved with respect to the Communists, it is creeping socialism which is crawling subversively, doing the work of the termite to undermine the foundations of our Government, State and National, which should give us great concern.

It has been well said that the time is here for all those who believe in America and who want above all to save her to stand up and make their voices heard above the clamor of the minorities who are destroying us.

The capitalist system can operate at its fullest efficiency only when there is a full and free flow of savings into investment—the creation of new capital machinery or the expansion of old. Whatever encourages that stimulates the system. Whatever hampers or checks that, slows it down and ultimately destroys it.

Since 1933 the administrations in power have waged relentless war upon this system, in the first years ignorantly but in its final phases with a definite design to cripple and destroy it. This must come to an end. What this Nation needs above all is men and women who are willing to create jobs. A job is an opportunity to work at a task producing useful wealth or useful services. Every man who starts a little shop to provide work for himself benefits the system. If he provides work for himself and one other, he doubles his useful contribution to the system's energy. If he can make enough profit to save and expand his business to employ 10 and then 100 and then 1,000, he is the most useful type of citizen we have.

Yet he has been pilloried as our greatest criminal and the Government has taken every conceivable measure to prevent him from accumulating those savings which alone make expansion possible. It has held him up to public scorn and hatred. It has taxed away his savings and it has so choked the streams through which savings flow into investment that our system is now wilting away before our very eyes. It is a fact that today, despite the addition of 20,000,000 to our population, the number of people employed in private enterprise upon the business of producing goods and services for the people directly is actually smaller than it was 20 years ago. The rest owe their jobs to Government directly or to the production of war materials or other products for the Government.

STOP SOCIALISTS

Therefore our course must be to stop planning for socialism and begin planning to encourage and revive free private enterprise. There are many defects to be cured—old imperfections and far more destructive new ones. Our system is in an appalling mess now, what with the debt, the confiscatory taxes which draw the blood from its very veins, Government intrusions, and the threats of ultimate extinction that are taking ever more terrifying shape. The task will call for patriotism and courage. But it must not be delayed another day.

It is my belief that we are rushing headlong down the road to collectivism or socialism much in the manner of Great Britain. * * * The free-enterprise system is being dealt savage blows—and if the trend is too long continued, will be destroyed—by (1) excessive Federal spending; (2) excessive taxation; (3) excessive Government regulation; (4) excessive Government competition with private business.

The American people will never knowingly and voluntarily give up their liberties, but the entire trend of Government during the past 15 or more years has been gradually and definitely toward a highly regimented state with personal liberty subordinated to bureaucratic control. Planned economy has been the fashion, and planned economy, in its ultimate form, is collectivism.

PRESIDENTIAL PROPOSALS SOCIALISTIC

The Presidential proposals this year included these:

Authority to control prices, wages, and employment practices; commodity control allocations; extended authority over consumer credit and bank reserve requirements; extended federalized power development through public works; expanded federalized insurance; socialization of agriculture (which turned out to be the Brannan plan); federalized urban redevelopment, housing, and farm housing; federally aided education and socialized medicine, the latter being the most costly and far-reaching Federal program yet proposed. Adoption of a Fair Employment Practices Commission, recommended by the President, would empower the Federal Government to enter every private business and say who should be hired or promoted.

Such proposals, if adopted, would expand nearly 100 different programs already spreading out like tentacles from among the 60 principal Federal departments and agencies which extend Federal administration through financial aids, grants, subsidies, and benefits, payrolls, pensions, payments, and virtually every other form of Government advance and contribution. It is my firm belief—and this is buttressed by history—that the people cannot surrender such vast power without eventually sacrificing basic individual freedoms.

If it is an insult to the intelligence of the American people to say we are on the road to socialism, as the President "cracked" at the Jefferson Day dinner, then the insult is added to the injury already done our intellect by Truman proposals and propaganda.

We have been moving steadily down this primrose path of socialism for some time, but we shall be irrevocably committed to socialism—from which there is no retreat once it is entrenched—if Congress adopts but three more of the President's projects.

A BUSY GROUP OF SOCIALISTS IN VERMONT

In conclusion, may I say, Vermont has a very busy group devoting its time and attention to the furtherance of socialistic programs and schemes under cover subversively, and active, seemingly, for the betterment of all those who, may I say, are willing to take something for nothing. I mean to be understood to say that these leaders, so-called, undertaking to convince Vermonters that what they can get for nothing is what they should have, have convinced a great many people that if by any method they may relieve themselves from a payment of their fair share of taxes by joining any association of whatever name, it is justified by reason of the benefits which they derive. This is a theory which is uneconomic, unpatriotic, and un-American.

ON GUARD

And now, I say to you, as I have said before, and I leave it with you to ponder and to consider, and as a basis upon which you, as the members of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, will act in days to come: We should dedicate our every strength against the gripping curse of communistic larcenists, guard our liberty, while we make sure we turn back those lustful men who would undertake to persuade us to close our eyes while they rob us of the things for which our fathers fought in order that we might have a chance to keep our children free.

"This is an hour to keep * * *
This is an hour to guard, letting no past
Or future moment make the present small.
Nothing except eternity can last,
And we must trust today to live at all."

Comment on Interparliamentary Conference Held in Dublin, Ireland, September 8–11, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I just received from Mr. P. J. Parker, of Dublin, Ireland, telling about the recent Interparliamentary Conference held in the city of Dublin from September 8 through 11, 1950.

Mr. Parker is a successful businessman with long experience in the United States and Canada. He was at one time the general manager of the famous Hudson Bay Stores, of Canada.

I also ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following the aforesaid letter a series of editorials and special articles from Irish newspapers relating to the Interparliamentary Conference.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUBLIN, EIRE, *September 25, 1950.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I had the pleasure of meeting Senator and Mrs. Pepper, Mr. and Mrs. Cooley, Mr. and Mrs. Poage, with other members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Knowing that Senator PEPPER is a very old and trusted friend of yours I arranged a little luncheon for him and for Mrs. Pepper, Mr. and Mrs. Cooley, Mr. and Mrs. Poage, and a few other friends. I endeavored to make their visit to Dublin as enjoyable and memorable as possible.

I am sure you will be very pleased to hear that all of the members attending the Interparliamentary Union Conference publicly stated that the Irish meeting surpassed in organization, efficiency, and hospitality their greatest anticipation. The conference on the whole was a great success. The outstanding figure was Senator PEPPER. His address at a press conference at Leinster House re the Atlantic Pact and unity which they all declared was a masterpiece, in fact, it was by far the highlight of the conference.

To my mind, Senator PEPPER is a statesman of high caliber and well worthy of high office. He was largely responsible for the outstanding success of the Interparliamentary Union Conference.

Now, Senator, I want to offer to you and Senator PEPPER a suggestion that I believe worthy of great consideration. It is as follows: I candidly believe that if you and Senator PEPPER could convince President Truman that the elimination of the border would help to a very great extent to straighten out and fortify the Atlantic Charter and also help to further world peace before a third and last world war engulfs and destroys the present world. It seems to me it should be possible for the President and the British Commonwealth of Nations to see the light in the interest of the human family the world over. I, in my very humble capacity, am unable to understand England. Now, with the backing of the United States she has an opportunity of redeeming herself to some extent from the great crimes committed in the past against helpless nations the world over. I believe it is within your own and Senator PEPPER'S power to start this great crusade, and if accomplished, the names of Senator MURRAY and Senator CLAUDE PEPPER will live forever in the minds of the people of Ireland and of all nations the world over.

America today stands at the very zenith of its power and greatness and may God grant that the men now leading America will not have it said by future generations that she failed in her effort to obtain a world peace.

If the great minds of America follow the teaching of the first great world Moral Crusader she cannot fail.

I often think of the body of scientists sent to St. Helena in order to discover where the genius of Napoleon Bonaparte lay. To most thinking people the British Government should have sent its scientists when he was living and not trouble sending them 50 years after he was in the clay and if it had not been for an Irishman, the Duke of Wellington who beat him at Waterloo, we might have had the United States of Europe which America is hoping to obtain today. The scientist from India professing no particular denomination other than faith in his God made a very brief statement which is as follows:

"What care we for the rise or fall of Kings or Emperors
For in that coffin there lies the greatest of them all.
He fought a hundred glorious battles and half the earth was his
Yet he must cross those yonder stars to know what greatness is."

So must we all, Senator; when the final day comes, kings, queens, warriors, and dictators shall all be judged in accordance with the light which God gave them while on this earth.

I am enclosing for your perusal various articles and editorials from Irish newspapers concerning the Interparliamentary Conference.

In the event President Truman and his associates can in a friendly way solve the problem of partition it will be the means I think of helping to keep democracy alive for all time to come. With America, Great Britain, and the members of the Commonwealth of Nations, including France, Italy, Spain, Belgium, Holland, and Denmark united, they can, I think, prevent world war III.

In conclusion may I ask your indulgence for presuming to offer suggestions to your good self and Senator PEPPER regarding political problems which mean so much to the world. I can only say from my heart if we had a completely united Europe it may be the means of preventing a third world war.

With sincere good wishes for yours and Senator PEPPER'S good health, and happiness, and may God spare both of you to help to accomplish the great peace which the entire world desires regardless of creed or nationality.

Most sincerely yours,

PATSY PARKER,
(P. J. Parker).

[From the Irish Press, Dublin, Ireland, of September 22, 1950]

WHY SIX COUNTIES?

Nothing has annoyed the six-county leaders and Unionist Press so much as the proposal for a plebiscite made by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida. Senator PEPPER is a very distinguished American and an experienced man of affairs. He knows what he is talking about and he understands that partition in Ireland is as fundamental a wrong as partition in Korea, which, as a recent United Nations report on that country says, was the origin of the war now costing so many lives. Senator PEPPER is also a Democrat without inverted commas, that is one old-fashioned enough to believe in the will of the people. To such a man it came quite naturally to suggest that the status of Ireland should be determined by a simple vote of its people. Then, if the national majority did not want unity, there was an end to it; if it did want unity then this disturbing problem would be settled for good.

But the one thing the British in Ireland, and those whose policy they direct, will not have at any cost is an ascertainment of the will of the Irish people. Their reason is no secret. The decision would go against them. Consequently the Unionist Press is very sharp toward Senator PEPPER, even offensive. American aid is one thing, they tell him, but American advice, no! One of the Unionist papers having lectured him on his bad manners adds:

"It does not need the prompting of a foreign country, however friendly, to show the Government at either Westminster or Stormont where its duty lies."

The reaction is so sharp because Senator PEPPER's proposal threatens the democratic facade behind which the six-county government has entrenched itself. The area detached from the rest of Ireland was chosen by Britain solely to provide a majority against unity. That majority is pointed to as if it meant something, whereas it is simply the fulfillment of a British trick. At first it deceived decent democrats but now they are coming to understand why elections always go the same way in this British enclave and they are proposing a real election. The bitter anger the proposal meets is simply because a real election would spoil everything.

Senator PEPPER being merely a "foreigner" (though a very useful foreigner both in war and peace) may not see why, if the national unit is to be broken up, there should not be a four-county election as well as a six-county one. If Derry, Armagh, Tyrone, and Fermanagh were to vote as a bloc they would extricate themselves from their present frustration and leave only two counties to maintain Belfast and to fill Stormont, and even these two counties would not be homogeneous by a long chalk.

The kernel of the partition question is this: Either it represents the will of the people concerned (which is clearly all the nation, since all the nation continually debates it) or, if there is to be a lesser division of the nation for testing purposes, then why not four counties? Both the greater proposal and the lesser the Unionists of the northeast reject with barbed words. Their resentment derives from the fact that the trick could not be played in any other way without defeating the British purpose. It cannot be a national plebiscite for the majority is overwhelming against partition; it cannot be a local plebiscite for the majority would take away most of the partitioned territory.

[From the Irish Independent, Dublin, Ireland, of September 14, 1950]

APPEAL TO DELEGATES

Following is a statement which was issued yesterday by the Anti-Partition Association to all delegates to the Conference of the Interparliamentary Union:

'On behalf of the Irish Antipartition movement, which represents the just demands of the Irish Nation, and in particular on behalf of the Nationalist minority in the six counties, now occupied by Britain, we make the following appeal. The claim of Britain to dismember the ancient Irish Nation is indefensible on either ethical or moral grounds, or under international law. It is based on a treaty which the Irish representatives were coerced to sign under threat of a resumption of the reign of terror perpetrated by Britain through the medium of the Black and Tans and other armed forces of occupation.

"Even in these circumstances, the Irish signatories to the treaty were induced to sign it only by the fraudulent representation of British statesmen that a boundary commission would be set up which would include in the jurisdiction of the Irish Government the various areas, amounting to almost half of the total area of the six counties, where the Nationalists were in the majority. Promises were made by all the leading British statesmen that the boundary commission would be an impartial tribunal and that the dismemberment of the country would be only a temporary phase during which the minority would be protected by proportional representation. All these pledges were flagrantly violated. British statesmen, once the treaty was signed, took every possible step to perpetuate partition.

"At the present time, most of the freedoms which you have striven to implement for your respective peoples have been abrogated in the six-county area, with the consent and connivance—and, in many cases, at the suggestion—of the British Government. Freedom of meeting has been denied to the Nationalist minority. Freedom to choose the employment to which their abilities and qualifications entitle them, has been denied also. The sanctity of the home and of personal freedom has been violated repeatedly, and the whole bulwark on which democracy must rest, universal suffrage, has been destroyed or rendered nugatory by the process of gerrymander.

"We would ask all fair-minded delegates—in the interest of true democracy, which we believe they aspire to serve—to peruse the various pamphlets with which they have been supplied and to lend their assistance to end the intolerable conditions existing in that portion of Ireland now occupied by Britain."

[From the Irish Independent, Dublin, Ireland, of September 14, 1950]

UNITED STATES SENATOR STRESSES UNITY NEED

He thought that a national plebiscite would be a fair way of determining what should be the form of government of this island, said Senator CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat, Florida) at a press conference in Leinster House, Dublin, yesterday.

Senator PEPPER, who was one of the United States delegates to the Interparliamentary Conference, said that it seemed to him that it bore very directly on the interests of the security of both the United States and Britain as well as the security of Ireland itself that there should be unity in Ireland.

Professor Savory and the members of the British delegation to the conference had an informal confidential discussion on partition with Mr. de Valera. The meeting lasted several hours.

Senator PEPPER said that the unhappy problem of partition prevented the unity they desired in the Atlantic community, and he deplored the fact that Ireland was not in the Atlantic Pact.

It was but natural that this strategic island should be in association with other peoples to preserve their common freedom, and the freedom of each particular state. Yet the lack of unity here prevented such a movement, because it was felt in Ireland that the Atlantic Treaty rather tended to assure the integrity of the territory of each particular state and that this might be interpreted as giving an assurance that there would be no change in the boundary situation here in Ireland.

Any weak link in the strength of the Atlantic Pact affected the security of the United States. Today they were facing a danger more insidious than anything in the past. Not only was a certain power greater numerically than any enemy they had had to contend with, and possessed vaster territory than any nation that might be an aggressor, and had great resources, but it had developed some devilish and fiendish capacity to inflame the minds of peoples, and to make them its willing serfs to perpetuate its evil designs. It was not only attacking them externally, but right inside the border of their countries was breaking down defenses, and even breaking down the mental and spiritual resistance of their people.

"We might appropriately remind those who contemplate aggression to remember the Nuremberg and Japanese trials, where heads of states as well as high military and naval personnel were executed in dismal jailyards for aggressive war and crimes against humanity," he said.

FEDERAL PLAN

Senator PEPPER referred to the commendable efforts of the United States Ambassador to Ireland in bringing about two treaties within the past year to promote greater commerce and trade between the two countries.

Asked if he had suggested any concrete way in which the problem of partition could be solved, he said he thought it would be more fitting for the people here in Ireland to work out details, and a suitable technique. Mr. MacBride had suggested a federal plan and this obviously was a system which appealed to Americans seeing that they had the Federal system in operation in the United States.

In reply to a question as to whether it would not be desirable that the United States, in its own interests, should mediate to secure a solution of partition, Senator PEPPER said that he could not speak for the United States Government, but he was sure that if such mediation were desired, the Government of the United States would do anything it could toward healing this painful breach.

He thought, he said in reply to a further question, that a national plebiscite would be a fair way of determining what should be the form of government of this island. He believed in the principle of democratic rule, with the will of the majority prevailing and with, of course, constitutional safeguards for the rights of the minority.

"As long as you keep this partition problem out in the open," he said, "I think you are making some progress toward a solution. I have been encouraged by the candor of the talks before this Conference. I think that the march of present-day events and the pressure that they bring will bring us nearer and nearer to the necessity of healing those several breaches that exist in our Atlantic community. As the pressure of the problem grows more acute it may be that we shall have to move faster."

Asked how he assessed the prospects of international peace at the moment, Senator PEPPER said he believed they were brighter than they had been for some time. That was because they had taken steps to save the peace and because they had shown that they were willing to fight, if necessary, to keep the peace. Whether they had peace or not depended on how the aggressor appraised the unity and strength of the free world.

He expressed the belief that if this country were attacked the United States would give it assistance, but he suggested it would

be better if there could be a solemn engagement such as that existing among the Atlantic Pact countries. He would, he added, like to see Ireland included in the arms aid program, and he knew that many people in his country would like to see it, too.

[From the Evening Herald, Dublin, Ireland, September 13, 1950]

UNITED STATES SENATOR AND PARTITION BARRIER TO ATLANTIC UNITY

The unhappy problem of partition in Ireland prevented, in the Atlantic community, the unity which they all desired, said Senator CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat of Florida), one of the United States delegates to the Interparliamentary Conference, in a press conference at Leinster House, Dublin, today.

"It seems to me," he said, "that it bears very directly on the interests of the security of both the United States and the United Kingdom, as well as, of course, the security of Ireland itself, that there should be unity in Ireland."

He deplored the fact that Ireland was not a member of the Atlantic Pact group. It was but natural that this strategic island should be in association with other peoples to preserve their common freedom, and the freedom of each particular state.

Yet the lack of unity here prevented such a movement, because it was felt in Ireland that the Atlantic Treaty rather tended to assure the integrity of the territory of each particular state and that this might be interpreted as giving an assurance that there would be no change in the boundary situation here in Ireland.

Any weak link in the strength of the Atlantic Pact affected the security of the United States. There was today a greater necessity than ever before for the consolidation of nations to resist aggression and to promote Atlantic community, not only to peace, but also intimately to work together to accomplish those objectives.

"A CERTAIN POWER"

"Today," said Senator PEPPER, "we are facing a danger more insidious than anything we faced in the past. Not only is a certain power greater numerically than any enemy we have had to contend with, and possesses vaster territory than any nation that might be an aggressor, and has great resources, but they have developed some devilish and fiendish capacity to inflame the minds of peoples, and to make them their willing serfs to perpetuate their evil designs. So that they are not only attacking us externally, but right inside the border of our countries are breaking down our defenses, and even breaking down the mental and spiritual resistance of our people.

"We might appropriately remind those who contemplate aggression to remember the Nuremberg and Japanese trials where heads of states, as well as high military and naval personnel were executed in dismal jailyards for aggressive war and crimes against humanity."

FEDERAL PLAN

Senator PEPPER referred to the commendable efforts of the United States Ambassador to Ireland in bringing about two treaties within the past year to promote greater commerce and trade between the two countries.

Asked if he had suggested any concrete way in which the problem of partition could be solved, he said he thought it would be more fitting for the people here in Ireland to work out details and a suitable technique. Mr. MacBride had suggested a federal plan and this, obviously, was a system which appealed to Americans, seeing that they had the Federal system in operation in the United States.

UNITED STATES MEDIATION

In reply to a question as to whether it would not be desirable that the United States, in its own interests, should mediate to secure a solution of partition, Senator PEPPER said that he could not speak for the United States Government, but he was sure that if such mediation were desired the Government of the United States would do anything it could toward healing this "painful breach."

He thought, he said, in reply to a further question, that a national plebiscite would be a fair way of determining what should be the form of government of this island. He believed in the principle of democratic rule, with the will of the majority prevailing and with, of course, constitutional safeguards for the rights of the minority.

"As long as you keep this partition problem out in the open, I think you are making some progress toward solution. I have been encouraged by the candor of the talks before this Conference. I think that the march of present-day events, and the pressure that they bring, will bring us nearer and nearer to the necessity of healing those several breaches that exist in our Atlantic community. As the pressure of the problem grows more acute, it may be that we shall have to move faster."

Asked how he assessed the prospects of international peace at the moment, Senator PEPPER said that he believed they were brighter than they had been for some time. That was because they had taken steps to save the peace, and because they had shown that they were willing to fight if necessary to keep the peace. Whether they had peace or not depended on how the aggressor appraised the unity and strength of the free world.

Resolution by American Carpatho-Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, in keeping with the order entered into in the United States Senate on September 23, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD the attached copy of a resolution adopted by the administration of the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Diocese at a conference of the consistory held in New York City on September 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION OF THE
AMERICAN CARPATHO-RUSSIAN
ORTHODOX GREEK CATHOLIC DIOCESE,
New York, N. Y., September 28, 1950.

RESOLUTION AMONG OTHER MATTERS ON THE AGENDA AT A CONFERENCE OF THE CONSISTORY HELD THIS DAY OF OUR LORD THE 28TH OF SEPTEMBER IN THE YEAR OF 1950

I

Representatives from 23 parishes of American Carpatho-Russians convened at a National Church Congress, July 25 and 26, 1950, in the Fort Pitt Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., and proceeded to establish the Administration of the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Diocese with a governing body named the consistory headed by the Rt. Rev. Andrew Siepecky.

II

Whereas the consistory desires to record this religious entity in the Archives of the Government of the United States of America at Washington, D. C., and to inform President Harry S. Truman, the Congress, the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the entire Nation with the founding of this religious body; that in its administration it shall be completely democratic, and free from all foreign entanglements, persuasions, and anti-American philosophies; and

III

Whereas the consistory is made up solely of either native-born or naturalized citizens of these United States of America representing 15,000 or more church followers, this consistory wishes to declare and assert in the name of all its member adherents, that—

1. We are ever grateful to the founders of the United States Constitution guaranteeing us freedom of religion.

2. We are loyal citizens of this beloved county.

3. We intensely abhor and oppose all that is alien to the spirit of our free American democracy.

Rt. Rev. Andrew Siepecky, St. Clair, Pa.; Rev. Joseph G. Simko, Bridgeport, Conn.; V. Rev. Stephen Varzaly, Rankin, Pa.; V. Rev. Dr. Andrew M. Pankov, Youngstown, Ohio; V. Rev. Dr. Joseph M. Mackov, Perth Amboy, N. J.; Rev. Ivan Ladizinsky, Lansford, Pa.; Rev. George Yankevich, Warren, Ohio; Mr. Michael Mahonec, New York, N. Y.; Mr. John Popp, Bridgeport, Conn.; Mr. Stephen B. Halapin, Bridgeport, Conn.; Prof. Andrew M. Griz, Bridgeport, Conn.; Mr. John Bodrog, Rankin, Pa.; Mr. Joseph Sevachko, Campbell, Ohio; Mr. John Sasala, Perth Amboy, N. J.; Mr. George Bobal, Perth Amboy, N. J.; Mr. George Pcholinsky, Rankin, Pa.; Mr. Peter Rim, Lansford, Pa.

Undesirables in Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Topeka (Kans.) Capital, of September 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL LEGION BACKS SCHOEPPEL ATTACK

Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL apparently is not alone in his fight against communism and Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman.

On the Senate floor recently the Kansas Senator accused Chapman of Communist affiliations and has been a controversial figure ever since.

Meeting in regular session Thursday night Capital Post Legionnaires, after a report from the National Legion Americanism Committee, decided to back SCHOEPPEL. The local Legionnaires headed by Olyn Foard decided to delve into the subject after hearing that a Denver American Legion post had demanded that SCHOEPPEL apologize publicly for his remarks about Chapman.

QUERIES NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Foard wrote to the National Legion headquarters in Indianapolis and Thursday received a letter which he is using as source material.

The letter said Chapman had been known to deal with organizations which have all been declared subversive by accredited Government agencies.

The letter read to the Capital post membership says, "The Dies report of 1940 lists Oscar Chapman as a sponsor for the American League of Peace and Democracy. The 1948 Un-American Activities Report for California shows that Mr. Chapman was a sponsor of the National Council of American Soviet Friendship in 1943. Page 481 of Appendix Part IX of the House Un-American Activities reports show that the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman was a sponsor of the United States-Soviet Friendship rally, and page 1202 lists him as a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship rally held at Madison Square Garden, Monday, November 8, 1943.

"TOASTS RED ARMY

"Page 1604 of the same report lists the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman as sponsor of a dinner celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red army, under the auspices of the magazine, Soviet Russia Today.

"The above-mentioned organizations have all been declared subversive by accredited Government agencies."

The report was received by the local post members with enthusiasm and Foard was appointed as a committee of one to convey the National Americanism Committee report to the Denver Legion Post.

Three Fictions About United States Role in Korea Disproved by Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks with pleasure an article appearing in the Boston Herald of October 1, 1950, written by Hal Clancy, Boston Traveler-Sunday Herald war correspondent and which should be given as wide publicity as possible.

In the closing paragraph of his splendid, constructive article, Mr. Clancy says:

How we will clear up these things, I don't know. But anyone who has spent a night in a fox-hole talking with our soldiers, knows that we must find the way—and the sooner, the better.

The insertion of this article is an effort on my part to cooperate with Mr. Clancy and our officers and men in Korea to correct an erroneous impression created by some sob-sister writers, mostly on the domestic front, and some others who were doing it for sniping political purposes.

Mr. Clancy's article which worried me very much is one of the finest I have ever read.

We can be proud of the record made in Korea by American officers, men and women. In my opinion the battle of Korea will go down in history as one of the great military feats of all time.

I did not for one instant think that our fellow Americans who fought in Korea did not know what they were fighting for. But there are some who did.

The article of Hal Clancy, who is and has been at the front in Korea, is a complete refutation of such an erroneous and unjustifiable impression.

His article presents to the American people the truth.

THREE FICTIONS ABOUT UNITED STATES ROLE IN KOREA DISPROVED BY FACTS

(By Hal Clancy)

SOMEWHERE IN KOREA, September 30.—This war has produced three evil fictions—absolutely unparalleled in American history—which are hurting our troops in the field as much as any enemy bullets or shells.

That this trio of falsities is absurd does not make them less lethal. They have been said and they have not been adequately unsaid.

Stated briefly, they are:

1. That our troops don't understand what they're fighting for.

2. That the American people don't understand.

3. That our soldiers are lacking in aggressiveness.

They are all lies, all of them. Whether they have been inspired by Communist propaganda or the mouthings of the professionally cynical, I don't know. But I do know they are criminal distortions. Something should be done, and promptly, about clearing them up.

Take them one at a time:

1. Our troops do know why they are fighting and what they are fighting for.

In the early, terrible days of the Korean war, some soldiers were quoted as saying they didn't know and didn't care. What answer would you expect if you walked up to a soldier who was bone-weary and still shaken from the horror of recent battle and asked: "Son, do you know what you're fighting for?"

SIZZLING REPLY

Unbelievable as it seems, I heard that question asked in that manner under those conditions very recently. The answer, not printable, was precisely what the questioner deserved.

But I have talked to infantrymen, to the battle-tried combat engineers, the tankers, the fliers, the artillerymen—hundreds of them. Frequently, I have talked to them under fire. And I have talked to the wounded lying in aid stations waiting to be evacuated.

I asked them if they thought the United States was right in supporting the UN and if the UN was right in opposing aggression.

I am still waiting for the first "No" to either question. Most of them said "Yes" in a manner which implied I was crazy to ask.

But, one way or another, every man said "Yes" to both questions.

Beyond that, they know of this fiction and they bitterly resent it. They consider it—as indeed it is—a monumental slur at their intelligence.

The average soldier is not a speech maker. But those with whom I have talked believe, a little angrily, that their actions should be sufficient answer. No one familiar with this war could doubt for a moment that these men have a thorough conviction or righteousness and necessity—though they would never word it that way. They are motivated by more than orders.

CREDIT TO ARMY

The much-maligned and overly criticized Army deserves some credit for this. Its educational program, the brunt of many poor jokes, has been largely responsible for this mental conditioning.

2. Of course, most Americans know why we are fighting and, as evidenced by the extraordinarily spontaneous public support of our action, are ready to see the thing through.

But our soldiers do not believe this—at least there are a very great number of them who do not. Time and again I've been asked:

When are they going to wake up at home and realize that this is a real war we're fighting—and why we're fighting it?

Here is the preposterous contradiction: Some, at home, saying the soldier doesn't know why he fights. Soldiers, in the field, saying civilians don't understand.

Obviously, both understand—very well. If that were all that mattered, there'd be no problem. But it isn't. It is important to our soldiers that positive action be taken to eliminate both doubts. A soldier, it would seem, would enjoy better morale if he were sure he was not regarded as a moron at home. It would also help him if he were sure that America knew why he fought, how hard was the fight, how important the victory.

CIVILIANS ALSO SUFFER

The soldiers don't like making all the sacrifices. They aren't making all of them. Civilians, though to a far lesser degree, are making them also. But it is terribly and pathetically wrong that the soldiers do not know this.

3. Of all the untruths, the hints, and on a few occasions flat statements, that our men lack aggressiveness are worst of all.

Our soldiers need no defense. The record is only too clear.

But they know what has been said and they are deeply resentful.

The fact, of course, is that rarely in the history of American arms have our soldiers performed so gloriously.

The early days in Korea saw American soldiers outnumbered 20 and sometimes 30 to 1. They lacked supplies of all types while the enemy seemed well equipped. They fought tanks with weapons that were almost completely ineffectual. But they fought them. They didn't run.

There were times when one division, which, according to the book, cannot be expected to defend more than a 12-mile front, was spread over almost 40 miles against overwhelming numbers of reds.

Look at the record: Our battalions fought divisions. Our companies held off regiments. Ask any military expert and he will tell you that is impossible, especially when the enemy also held the edge in weapons.

And that's true. It is impossible. But we did it.

ORDERLY RETREAT

When we retreated, we withdrew with amazing order. There was no rout, no panic. Our outnumbered, outgunned, outsupplied troops—fighting day and night against Red troops—made the enemy pay a fantastic price in men and matériel for every yard we gave up.

When, finally, we had retreated as far as we intended to go, we announced we would fight to the death for the ground we held. At that moment, looking at the situation on paper, we seemed to be a hopeless underdog.

But we held.

Now, though still outnumbered, we have the supplies and we are on the move—with an aggressiveness that must strike a deep chill in the hearts of would-be aggressors elsewhere in the world.

It is true that these falsehoods are no longer put into words frequently. But that is not enough. A falsehood does not disappear. It has to be retracted.

EDUCATION NEEDED

A large-scale educational program is needed. Not propaganda, education. We have merely to promote, forcefully, the simple facts that our men do know why they fight, that our people are in the fight, too, and that the soldiers who have fought in Korea have won lasting glory and the salute of decent men, everywhere, for their courage.

How we will clear up these things, I don't know. But anyone who has spent a night in a fox hole talking with our soldiers, knows that we must find the way—and the sooner, the better.

The Human Rights Jefferson Fought For Are Being Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an extraordinary and heartwarming article from the bulletin of the Department of State dated September 25, 1950.

This is a careful, objective, nonpolitical, even somewhat dry account of the slow and small but steady steps we have made in these United States in the year 1949 in spite of the wild hysteria and emotionalism climaxed in the last day of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress by enactment of the miscalled Internal Security Act over the vigorous veto of the President.

To me, steeped as I am in the Jeffersonian principles of human rights and individual dignity, this account is a great comfort; and if the article itself is nonpolitical, there is nothing nonpolitical in my reaction to it.

I am very glad indeed to claim credit for the Democratic Party for these advances in human freedom, won in spite of and not because of the obstructive minority.

In truth, this sober narrative reflects a sad frustration of the magnificent message on civil right enunciated by President Truman in the opening day of this Congress; we have fallen far short of the bright goal set by the President then.

How much less would have been accomplished without the heroic leadership of President Truman I leave, Mr. Speaker, to your own contemplation.

UNITED STATES DEVELOPMENTS IN HUMAN RIGHTS DURING 1949 [1]

Significant statutory and administrative developments concerning human rights in the Federal, State, and local governments in the United States during 1949 are herein presented. It should be borne in mind, however, that these 1949 developments can be understood only when viewed against the total background of assurances of human rights in the United States, including the Federal Constitution, its Bill of Rights and subsequent amendments to the guaranties contained in the various State constitutions, and the vast body of pertinent legislation and court decisions.

In this connection, for example, the United States Supreme Court in 1949 continued its traditional role of expanding and interpreting the many human rights guaranties of the Federal Constitution relating to personal liberty and security. In *Lustig* v. *United States*, the Court applied the doctrine that evidence which has been obtained under an illegal search and seizure participated in by a Federal officer will not be admissible in a Federal court, in spite of the fact that the search and seizure was conducted by State officers to whom this principle has not been applicable (*Wolf* v. *Colorado*).[2]

Elsewhere, the Court amplified for the States the application of the "due process" clause of the fourteenth amendment of the Federal Constitution to assure their affording basic guaranties of criminal justice. In *Watts* v. *Indiana*, in *Turner* v. *Pennsylvania*, in *Harris* v. *South Carolina*, convictions for murders based on confessions which were obtained while holding the accused persons incommunicado for several days without arraignment and without advice as to the prisoners' constitutional rights, were reversed. In *Gibbs* v. *Burke*, the Court held that the accused in a larceny case had been denied a fair trial because he was not represented by counsel during a trial in which hearsay and other improper evidence had been admitted. It was stated by the Court that the primary duty is on the trial judge to determine the accused's need of counsel at arraingment and during trial and to decide in each case whether the need is so great that deprivation of the right works a fundamental unfairness.[3]

GUARANTIES IN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

Three international agreements to which the Government of the United States is a party and which entered into force in 1949 contain clauses protecting human rights.[4]

Article XI of the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States and the Italian Republic, which entered into force on July 26, 1949, provides that the nationals of each contracting Government, individually and collectively, shall be permitted full religious freedom when in the territory of the other Government; that their nationals, or corporations and associations, when in the territory of each other, shall be free to write, report, and gather information for dissemination to the public and shall be free to transmit such information abroad as well as to publish it within the territory of each other.

The occupation statute for western Germany defines the powers retained by the three occupying powers, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States, after the establishment of the Federal Republic of Germany. In this document, which entered into force on September 21, 1949, the three Governments declare their intention of seeing that the German people of the three western zones enjoy th maximum possible self-government. The three Governments also assure to the German people of those zones that the agencies of the occupation will respect the civil rights of every person to be protected against arbitrary arrest, search, or seizure; to be represented by counsel; to be admitted to bail, as circumstances warrant; to communicate with relatives; and to have a fair and prompt trial.[5]

On November 22, 1949, the High Commissioners of the United States, France, and the United Kingdom reached an agreement with the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany which they hope will facilitate the incorporation of Germany "into a peaceful and stable European community of nations." In article V of the protocol of agreements the German Federal Government affirms its resolve, as a freely elected democratic body, "to pursue unreservedly the principles of freedom, tolerance, and humanity, * * * to conduct its affairs according to those principles, * * * to eradicate all traces of nazism from German life and institutions, * * * to liberalize the structure of government, and to exclude authoritarianism."[6]

ACTS OF CONGRESS

The Eighty-first Congress of the United States approved several laws during 1949 that bear upon the social and economic rights now recognized as fundamental.

Housing Act of 1949: This act, which was approved on July 15, 1949, authorizes the provision of low-cost housing units during the next 6 years; provides for a comprehensive program of Federal research designed to relieve underlying technical, economic, and social housing problems; and authorizes financial assistance to farm owners to enable them to construct, improve, or repair farm housing and other farm buildings. Preference for admission to the low-rent housing authorized by this act is given families, otherwise eligible, who are displaced or are about to be displaced by public slum clearance, redevelopment, or low-rent housing projects, with certain veteran-preference features. The Housing Act of 1949 establishes a national housing policy which reads as follows:

"The general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require housing production and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious housing shortage, the elimination of substandard and other inadequate housing through the clearance of slums and blighted areas, and the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living and environment for every American family, thus contributing to the development and redevelopment of communities and to the advancement of the growth, wealth, and security of the Nation."[7]

Fair labor standards amendments of 1949: This legislation, which was signed by the President on October 26, 1949, strengthens the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in the following ways: (1) Increases the statutory minimum wage of all workers in interstate commerce as defined by the act; (2) redefines the term "oppressive child labor" to correct an unintentional error in the 1938 act which permitted a parent to employ a child in his custody under 16 years of age in a hazardous occupation while he could not employ the same child over 16 years of age in the same occupation and makes the employment of "oppressive child labor," as redefined, a direct violation of the act; (3) extends coverage to include certain agricultural handling and processing occupations; and (4) permits the administering authorities to su-

[1] Ambassador Warren R. Austin, United States representative to the United Nations, announced on September 4 transmittal to the Secretary-General, Trygve Lie, of a report on progress in the field of human rights in 1949 in the United States. The material is for use in the United Nations Human Rights Yearbook, which will be available at a later date from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, New York. The Yearbook for 1948 is sold for $6 a copy.

[2] 338 U. S. 74; 338 U. S. 25.

[3] 338 U. S. 49; 338 U. S. 62; 338 U. S. 68; 337 U. S. 773.

[4] Excerpts from the three acts are included in part II, Documents.

[5] Excerpts from the three acts are included in part II, Documents.

[6] Ibid.

[7] 63 Stat. 413.

pervise the payment of, and under appropriate conditions to bring court action to recover, back wages owed to employees under the terms of the law.[8]

Hospital Survey and Construction Amendments of 1949: These amendments were approved on October 25, 1949. They continue and increase Federal financial aid to the States for the construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals. The amendments also authorize grants-in-aid to public and private nonprofit agencies for the study of the development, utilization, and coordination of hospital services, facilities, and resources. This provision is particularly significant as experience under the Public Health Service Act of July 1, 1944, had indicated that although a great many small hospitals were being built, they could not provide a complete service nor could they be staffed in such a way as to handle all types of cases and illnesses. It was apparent that these small hospitals needed to be linked with larger hospitals. The grants-in-aid will make it possible to build up and supplement medical care in rural areas, and will tend to reverse factors which in the past have led to the concentration of medical personnel and facilities in the large cities.[9]

Nineteen hundred forty-nine amendments to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936: Today the increased use of electricity on farms is an important element in improving the standards of living of both the farm and nonfarm population. Legislation enacted on October 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 948), provides for the expansion of telephone services (1) in rural areas, which include cities and villages of 1,500 population or less; and (2) in areas surrounding towns and cities of more than 1,500 population and their suburban residential areas.[10]

FEDERAL REGULATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

In the execution of national laws, the various departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government from time to time issue regulations and instructions. Several directives of this kind were issued during 1949 which strengthen the enjoyment of human rights.

Instructions for carrying out the fair employment program: The President in Executive Order 9980 of July 26, 1948, called for more effective application of the long-established policy of employment in the Federal service on the basis of merit and fitness alone, without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.[11] Instructions issued by the Fair Employment Board of the United States Civil Service Commission, effective March 24, 1949, require each Government department to appoint officers in both their home and field offices who shall have full operating responsibility for carrying out the President's fair-employment objectives. Under these instructions, each department is required to make known the names of these officers to all its employees.

Amendments to National Capital Parks Regulations: The National Park Service of the Department of the Interior amended the National Capital Parks Regulations on May 20, 1949, to prohibit the publicizing of the facilities, accommodations, or any activity conducted in the park area of the National Capital in such a way as to reflect upon or question the acceptability of any person because of his race, creed, color, or national origin. Operators or any employees of any public facility or accommodation, likewise, are prohibited from discriminating by segregation or otherwise against any person in the furnishing of any accommodation, facility, service, or privilege offered to or enjoyed by the general public in the park areas of the city of Washington.

Amended housing credit regulations: Amended regulations issued by the Federal Housing Administration on December 12, 1949, add several new sections to the National Housing Code. Under these new sections, property, the sale or occupancy of which is placed under any racial or religious restriction, is not eligible for new Federal loan guaranties.

Military directive: In Executive Order 9981 of July 26, 1948, the President of the United States proclaimed a policy of equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed service without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. In furtherance of that policy, the Secretary of Defense on April 6, 1949, directed the three branches of the armed services to examine their practices to determine what steps could and should be taken to eliminate racial discrimination in the services, and to submit in writing their detailed proposals. The Air Force's plan received official approval on May 11, the Navy's plan on June 7, and the Army's plan on September 30, 1949. Under the Army's new program, for example, military occupational specialties, formerly closed to Negroes, are now open to all qualified personnel; Negro quotas for selection to attend Army schools are abolished, with selection now made from the best qualified personnel; promotion is administered on single-standard merit basis; and white and colored students attending Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) summer training camps remain together and are trained together. Under the old policy, Negro ROTC students attending such camps were placed in Negro units for their training.[12]

STATE AND TERRITORIAL LEGISLATION

The legislatures of 44 of the 48 States, as well as those of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, met in regular session in 1949. It has not been found practicable to cover every item in the great volume of their legislation that has a bearing upon human rights. Appropriation acts, which are not included in the table, reflect the continuing support given the maintenance of civil rights and such economic and social rights as social security, housing, health, education, and similar activities authorized in legislation of earlier years.

During the year there was considerable controversy regarding the effect of legislation adopted by some State legislatures which applied to teachers and others holding public employment. This legislation related to organizations believed to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, and in some cases called for special oaths of loyalty to the United States Constitution or of nonmembership in such organizations.

Perhaps the most fundamental State and Territorial legislation, from the point of view of human rights, which was enacted during 1949 concerns the elimination of discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin in the fields of employment, education, and public accommodation, and in State militia. Many laws also were adopted which either materially strengthen existing labor laws, or add new features protecting workers. There were a number of enactments which specifically aim at the protection of women and children. Health laws were broadened, primarily to include additional services, such as psychiatric aid.

Discrimination in employment: One of the basic ideals for which the Government of the United States was founded concerns the right of an individual to succeed to the best of his ability.

In *Graham* v. *Brotherhood of Firemen*, the United States Supreme Court reaffirmed a principle already established in the field of collective bargaining in *Steel* v. *L. N. R. Co.*, and in *Tunstall* v. *Brotherhood*, that an exclusive collective bargaining representative for a craft or class of employees has the duty to represent all members who belong to the craft or class of employees without racial discrimination.[13]

In *Lincoln* v. *Northwestern Co.*, and *A. F. of L.* v. *American Sash and Door Co.*, the United States Supreme Court hald valid State laws guaranteeing a person the opportunity to obtain or retain employment whether he is or is not a member of a labor organization. In an opinion concurring in the results reached in these cases, Mr. Justice Frankfurter noted that article 20, clause 2, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, December 11, 1948, declares that, "No one may be compelled to belong to an association." [14]

This ideal has also received considerable impetus in recent years through the passage of what are called "fair employment practices acts."

Prior to 1949, four States—New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut—had adopted such acts, with enforcement provisions. Two other States—Indiana and Wisconsin—had laws providing for voluntary compliance. Four new States—New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington—enacted legislation during 1949 forbidding racial or religious discrimination in employment. Although similar, these laws are not identical in coverage, types of discrimination prohibited, or methods of administration.[15]

New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut enacted measures in 1949 strengthening the antidiscriminatory laws already on their statute books. New York, for example, passed a law in 1949 forbidding questions on place of birth of applicants for civil-service examinations. New Jersey adopted a law combining the provisions of a 1945 antidiscriminatory measure with those of its civil-rights law and placing the administration of both under a single administrative agency, the commission on civil rights.[16]

In addition, California prohibited in 1949 the inclusion of any question relative to an applicant's race or religion in application forms for State employment. Several other States already had such provisions in their laws respecting civil-service employment. Kansas, Nebraska, and Minnesota provided for special commissions to study the problem of discrimination in employment.[17]

Several cities in the United States have enacted fair employment practices acts. One city, Richmond, Calif., adopted such an ordinance in 1949. It prohibits discrimination on account of race, creed, or color in hiring by the city or by its contract and franchise

[8] 63 Stat. 910—1949 and 52 Stat. 1060—1938.

[9] 63 Stat. 898—1949 and 58 Stat. 682—1944.

[10] 63 Stat. 948.

[11] United Nations Yearbook of Human Rights, 1948, pp. 241–2.

[12] Press releases of the National Military Establishment 3–49A, dated Apr. 20, 1949; 35–49A, dated May 11, 1949; and 78–49A, dated June 7, 1949; and press release 256–49 of the Department of Defense, dated Sept. 30, 1949.

[13] 338 U. S. 232; 323 U. S. 192; 323 U. S. 210.

[14] 335 U. S. 525; 335 U. S. 538; 335 U. S. 538, 539, note 5.

[15] New Mexico 1949, ch. 161, p. 366; Oregon 1949, ch. 221, p. 314; Rhode Island 1949, ch. 2181, p. 157; Washington 1949, ch. 183, p. 506. The Oregon Act repealed a previous law which applied only to public employment.

[16] New York 1949, ch. 384, p. 1053; New Jersey 1949, ch. 11, p. 37; Connecticut 1949, ch. 291, p. 262; the Massachusetts 1949 session laws had not been published in time for citation in this yearbook.

[17] California 1949, ch. 1578, p. 2826; Kansas 1949, ch. 289, p. 523. In the case of Minnesota, such a commission had been appointed in 1947. An appropriation made in 1949 continued the life of that commission for the next 2 years.

holders, and carries a fine of $500 or 6 months in jail for violation. The other cities having similar ordinances include Chicago, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, and Phoenix, Ariz. The ordinances of three of these cities—Chicago, Minneapolis, and Philadelphia—apply to private as well as to public employment.

Discrimination in education: Closely allied to the ideal of equal employment opportunities for all is that of equal educational opportunities. The majority of public schools throughout the United States have always been open to all races without distinction. Laws eliminating discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin in education have recently been adopted by several States on which questions have arisen. New York took the lead in this respect by passing a law in 1948 which prohibits racial discrimination in all schools and colleges, private as well as public, except those under religious auspices. Two other States followed the New York example in 1949, but on a less broad basis. The State of Indiana adopted a law abolishing separate schools for white and colored students and progressively eliminating segregation in its public-school system from kindergarten to university.[18] This law becomes fully operative by 1954. A 1949 Wisconsin law prohibits the establishment of separate schools or school departments and forbids the exclusion of any child between the ages of 4 and 20 years from any public school on account of religion, nationality, or color.[19]

The public schools of Oklahoma, like those of Indiana and a number of other States,[20] have been organized and maintained on the principle of providing equal educational opportunities in separate schools for white and colored students. However, in response to a ruling by the United States Supreme Court (*Sipuel* v. *Board of Regents* (322 U. S. 631)) that equal graduate-school facilities must be provided to Negro students and in the same full measure as provided for students of any other color, the State of Oklahoma adopted a law on June 9, 1949, admitting qualified Negro students to its institutions of higher learning serving white students, to pursue such courses of instruction as are not given in the institutions established and maintained for the use of Negro students. This act stipulated that the courses of instruction given to Negroes in the white institutions must be either at separate times or in separate classrooms.[21]

Discrimination in public accommodation: Two States approved legislation during 1949 eliminating racial segregation in housing. They were Connecticut and Wisconsin. The new Connecticut law expands the coverage of previous legislation to include public-housing projects as well as hotels, restaurants, railroads and other public transportation, theaters, motion-picture houses, and recreation parks. It carries a fine or imprisonment, or both, for violation of its provisions. Wisconsin also amended previous legislation by providing that no veteran, otherwise eligible, should be discriminated against for admission to veterans' housing projects because of race, color, creed, or national origin. The State of Florida enacted legislation authorizing the authorities of Miami Beach to prohibit the publication or distribution of literature tending to discriminate against or actually discriminating against any person or any religion, race, or creed in places of public accommodation, resort, or amusement in the city of Miami Beach.[22]

In addition to these laws, other developments occurred in the field of housing which have an important bearing on nondiscrimination. In 1948 the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that State and Federal agencies might not enforce racial or religious restrictions on the ownership of real property, thereby removing the support of law from restrictive housing covenants. In December 1949, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama held unconstitutional racial zoning ordinances of the city of Birmingham, barring Negroes from residing in dwellings in certain sections of the city.

In a court decision, affecting segregation in public accommodations, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia held that the 1949 order of the United States Civil Aeronautics Administrator prohibiting racial segregation at the Washington National Airport became the controlling policy at the airport.[23]

Other housing legislation.—The legislatures of 32 States, and those of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands enacted housing legislation during the calendar year 1949. Most of the legislation amended and enlarged existing laws pertaining to housing authorities, or amended or enacted slum-clearance and redevelopment statutes. The action of the Maine Legislature in enacting the Maine Housing Authorities Act is of particular interest. This act, which is similar to low-rent housing legislation already in effect in other States, provides for the creation of local housing authorities to undertake low-rent housing projects. Thus, Maine became the forty-second State to enact legislation aimed at permitting participation in the federally aided low-rent public-housing program. The legislatures of at least six States—California, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Oregon, and Pennsylvania—provided for housing studies and investigations to ascertain, study, and analyze all facts relating to community redevelopment and housing problems, with particular reference to legislation supplementary to Federal enactments. Other subjects covered by 1949 State housing legislation included greater protection against evictions, student housing, housing aids for veterans, provisions for middle-income housing, and the reconstruction or rehabilitation of dwellings by authorized housing cooperatives for their members.[24]

Discrimination in State militia: Several States followed the example of the Federal Government (see above) in declaring a policy of equality of opportunity and treatment for all in the armed services by outlawing racial discrimination in their National Guards. California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin, as New Jersey had already done, abolished racial segregation, while New York and Pennsylvania passed laws of a more general tenor. The Pennsylvania law, for example, states that "there shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons * * * giving due regard to the powers of the Federal Government which are or may be exercised over all the militia of the Commonwealth and to the time required to effectuate changes without impairing the efficiency or morale of the militia."

Minnesota became the ninth State to abolish racial discrimination in the National Guard. On November 22 1949, the Governor of Minnesota issued a preclamation establishing "equality of opportunity," without segregation, in the Minnesota National Guard (Executive Order C–19).[25]

Progress in labor laws: Noteworthy advances were made during 1949 in State laws regulating workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, protection of women workers and children, and disability compensation.

Each of the 44 States whose legislatures met, and Hawaii, improved their workmen's compensation laws in one or more respects, principally by increasing benefits. For example, 37 States and Hawaii increased benefits for death or some type of disability by raising the maximum weekly payment, extending the number of weeks for such payments, increasing the maximum percentage of wages for computing benefits, or increasing the aggregate maximum amount of benefits permitted. Benefits for death and for all types of disability were increased in 25 of the States and Hawaii. Medical-aid benefits were liberalized in 19 States and Hawaii. Two States, New York and Washington, adopted new disability compensation laws. The 1949 developments in this field also indicate a trend toward fuller coverage of occupational diseases.[26]

Statutory minimum wages for all workers were increased in two States, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and in the Territory of the Virgin Islands.

The outstanding trends in unemployment insurance were laws increasing benefit amounts and decreasing employers' contribution rates. Two States, Texas and Massachusetts, extended the coverage to include respectively governmental workers and maritime workers.[27]

Protective legislation for working women and children included the following: Maine, Tennessee, and Alaska adopted new child-labor laws. Under these laws, a basic minimum age of 16 years, for full-time employment, is established, thus making in all 22 States, in addition to Alaska and Puerto Rico, having this standard. All three of the new acts also improve maximum-hours-of work standards, Tennessee and Alaska setting an 8-hour day, 40-hour week, 5-day week for minors under 18 years of age, while Maine established an 8-hour day, 48-hour week, 6-day week for minors under 16 years of age.

---

[18] Indiana 1949, ch. 186, p. 603; the text of this law will be found in part II, Documents; Wisconsin 1949, ch. 433, p. 403.

[19] See United Nations Yearbook on Human Rights, 1949, p. 244.

[20] Arkansas, Florida, Kentucky, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, Texas.

[21] Oklahoma 1949, table 70, ch. 15, p. 608.

[22] Connecticut 1949, ch. 291, p. 262; Wisconsin 1949, ch. 592, p. 526; Florida 1949, ch. 26026, p. 1455 (2).

[23] *Shelley* v. *Kraemer*, 334 U. S. 1, and *Hurd* v. *Hodge*, 334 U. S. 24; *Monk* v. *Birmingham*, 87 Fed. Supp. 538; *Air Terminal Services* v. *Rentzel*, 81 Fed. Supp. 61.

[24] For example: Alaska 1949, ch. 13 p. 53; Conn. 1949, no. 299 p. 268; Fla. 1949, ch. 25531 p. 1221; Hawaii 1949, Act 379 p. 50; Ill. 1949, no. 672 p. 1550; Maine 1949, ch. 297 p. 243; Md. 1949, ch. 215 p. 579; Minn. 1949, ch. 224 p. 440; Oreg. 1949, ch. 562 p. 907; V. I. 1949, no. 8; Wis. 1949, ch. 390 p. 354.

[25] Calif. 1949, ch. 1578 p. 2826; Conn. 1949, no. 8 p. 14; Fla. 1949, ch. 26026 p. 1455 (2); Ill. 1949, no. 1130 p. 1587; Ind. 1949, ch. 186 p. 603; Kans. 1949, ch. 289 p. 583; N. J. 1949, ch. 1 p. 37; N. Mex. 1949, ch. 161 p. 366; N. Y. 1949, ch. 384 p. 1053; Okla. 1949, table 70, ch. 15 p. 608; Oreg. 1949, ch. 221 p. 314; Pa. 1949, ch. 568 p. 1903; R. I. 1949, ch. 2181 p. 157; S. Dak. 1949, ch. 244 p. 280; Wash. 1949, ch. 183 p. 506; Wis. 1949, ch. 76 p. 104.

[26] For example: Ala. 1949, no. 36 p. 47; Calif. 1949, ch. 107 p. 346; Colo. 1949, ch. 185 p. 522; Del. 1949, ch. 160 p. 385; Hawaii 1949, Acts 110 and 112 p. 15; Idaho 1949, ch. 287 p. 590; Iowa 1949, ch. 60–61 p. 83; N. Mex. 1949, ch. 84 p. 201; N. Y. 1949, ch. 600 p. 1370; N. C. 1949, ch. 399 p. 396; Oreg. 1949, ch. 103 p. 127; P. R. 1949, no. 311 p. 940; R. I. 1949, ch. 2269 p. 369; S. C. 1949, no. 302 p. 564; S. Dak 1949, ch. 443 p. 417; Tex. 1949, ch. 428 p. 797; Wash. 1949, ch. 235 p. 876; Wis. 1949, ch. 142 p. 150.

[27] For example, see also: Alaska 1949, ch. 13 p. 53; Ariz. 1949 ch. 80 p. 158; Ark. 1949, Act 155 p. 493; Colo. 1949, ch. 245 p. 720; Conn. 1949, no. 307 p. 290; Del. 1949, ch. 160 p. 285; Idaho 1949, ch. 144 p. 252; Ill. 1949, no. 1105 p. 887; Kans. 1949, ch. 288 p. 295; Maine 1949, ch. 430 p. 518; P. R. 1949, no. 50 p. 126; R. I. 1949, ch. 2175 p. 38.

These acts provide in addition that special hour regulations shall now apply to employed children under 16 years of age who are attending school as well as working. The Tennessee and Alaska laws prohibit night work for minors under 16. The Maine law eliminates a former night-work prohibition for minors under 16. Three other States—Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin—passed laws in 1949 modifying previous child-labor standards. The Indiana law permits girls of 16 to 17 years of age to work until 9 p. m. instead of formerly to 7 p. m. on 2 evenings a week in stores under vocational-education programs. The Ohio and Wisconsin laws revise former minimum-age standards regulating the employment of minors in certain public exhibitions.[28]

Laws specifically protecting the rights of women workers were of two kinds. Three States—California, Connecticut, and Maine—and the Territory of Alaska, enacted legislation requiring the payment of equal wages to women for comparable work, thereby making 13 jurisdictions having laws abolishing discrimination in wages because of sex. Three States improved the working hours of women. Wider coverage is provided for the restrictions on hours of work for women under Maine law. In Wyoming, female employees in certain occupations requiring continuous standing are given two rest periods of 15 minutes each day. A Tennessee law establishes a maximum 50-hour week for women workers.[29]

Compulsory school attendance: Four States made major changes in their compulsory-school-attendance provisions, namely, Idaho, Michigan, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin. The Idaho law lowers the upper age from 18 to 16 years for required school attendance, but strengthens existing law by eliminating the exceptions under which minors under 16 years of age were formerly excused from school attendance. Under the 1949 law, only children physically or mentally incapacitated may be excused. The Wisconsin law also eliminates the exceptions for children under 16, now permitting only high school graduates to leave school under that age. Michigan eliminated a provision under which formerly children of 14 and 15, whose services were needed for the support of their family or for themselves, might be excused from school to go to work. Under the new Oklahoma law, provision is made that unless minors between the ages of 17 and 18 years are high school graduates, they are required to attend school. The previous provision permitted children of 16 and 17 to be excused from school for employment, if they had completed the first 8 grades of school.

A number of States established new minimum school terms. Georgia and South Dakota extended their school terms to 9 months; North Dakota and Nebraska to 8 months; Delaware from 160 days to 180 days. The North Carolina Legislature repealed previous legislation under which the public schools of Currituck County might be closed in order to allow pupils to pick cotton.[30]

Voting: Two acts relating to voting by employees were adopted during 1949. A Nebraska law permits employees to be absent for 2 hours to vote in any election, instead of only in primary elections. An Arkansas act makes it a misdemeanor to attempt to influence the vote of an employee by discharge or threat of discharge from employment. The State of Tennessee, one of the seven States requiring the payment of a poll tax for voting, enacted legislation in 1949 (1) exempting women and blind persons from the payment of the poll tax; (2) abolishing payment of it as a prerequisite for voting in primary elections for certain political nominations; and (3) limiting the time for the collection of delinquent poll taxes. South Carolina moved in 1949 to submit the issue of a poll tax as a requirement for voting to a general election to be held in 1950 (J. Res. 347). Similar moves on the part of the legislatures of Texas and Virginia were defeated in the November 1949 elections in those States.[31]

[From UN Document E/1826, adopted August 9, 1950]

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT SIXTH SESSION OF COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

"The Economic and Social Council notes that the Commission on Human Rights considers that the draft international Covenant on Human Rights relating to some of the fundamental rights of the individual and to certain essential civil freedoms is the first of the series of covenants and measures to be adopted in order to cover the whole of the universal declaration of human rights; notes further, the decision of the Commission to proceed at its seventh session with the consideration of additional covenants and measures dealing with economic, social, cultural, political, and other categories of human rights, and to consider additional proposed articles included in annex III to its report of the sixth session, together with any other articles which might be further proposed by governments; and approves the decision of the Commission."

"The Economic and Social Council, considering that the Commission on Human Rights, at its sixth session, resolved to begin at once the preparation of the execution of its work program for the year 1951, with a view to assuring to everyone the enjoyment of economic, social, and cultural rights set forth in articles 22 to 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, having noted with interest the report submitted by the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization on regulations concerning economic and social rights in the International Covenant on Human Rights (E/1752 and E/1752/Corr. 1), requests the Secretary-General—

"(a) To transmit to the International Labor Organization the proposals for relevant articles on economic and social rights contained in annex III to the report of the sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights, together with the summary records of the debates in the Commission concerning the inclusion of economic and social rights in the draft covenant or covenants on human rights,[32] so that the said specialized agency may submit to the Secretary-General, before the seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights, a detailed report on what has already been achieved in these fields, what still remains to be achieved and how it might be accomplished;

"(b) To make the necessary arrangements for obtaining any collaboration he may think desirable from the other organs of the United Nations and the other specialized agencies; and

"(c) To submit to the Commission on Human Rights, before its seventh session to be held in 1951, a report on the information and observations thus obtained, together with any documentation he may consider relevant."

"The Economic and Social Council, considering the need for thorough and precise information relating to the prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities, requests the Secretary-General—

"(a) To invite governments, members, and nonmembers of the United Nations (i) to furnish him, as soon as practicable, examples (with appropriate citations, where possible) of legislation, judicial decisions, and other types of action which have been found to be especially useful in that country in preventing discrimination in one or more of the fields covered by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; (ii) to furnish him, as soon as practicable, full information regarding the protection of any minority within their jurisdiction by legislative measures and in the light of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and (iii) to furnish him, in particular, such information as could serve as a basis for defining the term 'minorities.'

"(b) To distribute the information received from government in response to this invitation to the members of the Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities prior to its fourth session."

"The Economic and Social Council believing that education plays a great part in the prevention of discrimination, and that positive and lasting results in preventing discrimination are attainable in educational establishments, affirming its conviction that one of the principal goals of education should be to eliminate all forms of discrimination and to eradicate such prejudices as may lead to the commission of acts of discrimination, emphasizing that considerable assistance in this matter may be given by nongovernmental organizations and private institutions, noting with satisfaction the initiative taken in this field by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the improvement of textbooks and teaching materials, in the conduct of educational seminars, in the training of teaching personnel, and in the preparation of a statement on race from the viewpoint of present scientific knowledge, recommends that member states—

"(a) Adopt measures to be applied in educational establishments designed to eliminate discrimination;

"(b) Distribute the books and pamphlets referred to in subparagraph (b) below as widely as possible among all their peoples; and

"(c) Introduce, insofar as possible, the ideas contained in the books or pamphlets referred to in subparagraph (b) below into their education programs; recommends that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization—

"(a) Give emphasis to such practical educational activities as are likely to eradicate prejudice and discrimination, bearing in mind the opportunities afforded through adult education;

"(b) Undertake, as soon as practicable, preparation and widest possible dissemination of information through suitable books and pamphlets based on scientific knowledge as well as general moral principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

[28] For example: Alaska 1949, ch. 73 p. 189; Ariz. 1949, ch. 74 p. 152; Calif. 1949, ch. 127 p. 359; Colo. 1949, ch. 112 p. 230; Ill. 1949, no. 1061 p. 905; Maine 1949, ch. 290 p. 231; Minn. 1949, ch. 545 p. 950; Pa. 1949, no. 224 p. 847; P. R. 1949, no. 304 p. 1,114; Tenn. 1949, ch. 201 p. 689.

[29] Alaska 1949, ch. 29 p. 80; Calif. 1949, ch. 804 p. 1541; Conn. 1949, no. 287 p. 261; Maine 1949, ch. 262 p. 207; Tenn. 1949, ch. 200 p. 687; Wyo. 1949, ch. 126 p. 206.

[30] For example: Alaska 1949, ch. 32 p. 86; Ark. 1949, Act 67 p. 170; Act 131 p. 285; Act 315 p. 803; Colo. 1949, ch. 153, p. 362; Conn. 1949, no. 271 p. 246; Del. 1949, ch. 76 p. 125; Ga. 1949, no. 333 p. 1406; Hawaii 1949, Act 227 p. 30; Idaho 1949, ch. 120 p. 214; Ind. 1949, ch. 238 p. 789; Maine 1949, ch. 276 p. 214; Mich. 1949, no. 315 p. 666; Minn. 1949, ch. 675, p. 1209; N. H. 1949, ch. 92 p. 81; N. C. 1949, ch. 154 p. 129; N. Dak. 1949, ch. 65 p. 67; ch. 143 p. 166; Okla. 1949, table 70 ch. 1A p. 517; Pa. 1949, no. 280 p. 978; P. R. 1949, no. 55 p. 140; R. I. 1949, ch. 2341 p. 550; Tex. 1949, ch. 334 p. 625; Wis. 1949 ch. 96 p. 122.

[31] For example: Ark. 1949, Act 2482 p. 1350; Calif. 1949, ch. 153 p. 383; Del. 1949, ch. 132 p. 202; Nebr. 1949, ch. 86 p. 231; Tenn. 1949, ch. 62 p. 215; ch. 236 p. 790 Act 164 p. 491; ch. 271 p. 884.

[32] See U. N. docs. E/CN, 4/SR. 184–187.

and designed to expose fallacies of race theories and to combat prejudices which give rise to discrimination."

"The Economic and Social Council, having requested the Secretary-General in its resolution 2/9 (sec. 4, par. (a)) of June 21, 1946,[33] to make arrangements for the compilation and publication of a Yearbook on Law and Usage Relating to Human Rights, having considered the reports of the fifth and sixth sessions of the Commission on Human Rights relating to the question of the yearbook; having considered the Yearbooks on Human Rights for 1946, 1947, and 1948 compiled and published by the Secretary-General; requests the Secretary-General to continue annually the compilation and publication of the Yearbook on Human Rights which, beginning as soon as possible but not later than with the yearbook for 1951, shall be compiled on the following general lines:

"(a) Each volume of the yearbook shall contain a compilation concerning the application, and so far as necessary, the evolution in as many countries as possible of one of the rights or of a group of closely related rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This compilation shall be prepared from information supplied by governments and may include digests of this information prepared by the Secretary-General and shall be documented by reference to legislative enactments and other authoritative sources;

"(b) For this purpose the Secretary-General shall draw up a plan for the consideration of the Commission on Human Rights indicating, for a number of years ahead, which right or group of rights should be treated in each year;

"(c) The yearbook shall continue to record international and national developments concerning human rights which have taken place during the year, and for this purpose shall contain: (i) A report on the work of the United Nations in the field of human rights; (ii) relevant texts or summaries of international instruments in this field, including decisions of international courts and arbitral tribunals; (iii) texts or summaries of or sufficient references to constitutional and statutory provisions which constitute important developments in the field of human rights during the year; (iv) summaries of or sufficient references to decisions of national courts where these decisions constitute important developments in the field of human rights;

"(d) The yearbook shall also include texts or summaries of, or sufficient references to, basic laws on human rights in respect of non-self-governing and trust territories, together with other relevant texts in respect of such territories in the same manner as indicated in paragraph (c) above.

"(e) The yearbook shall include adequate references to the sources of any texts or summaries which appear in it. It shall be produced in a form which is easy to handle and at a moderate price, and the reproduction of constitutional or statutory texts shall be confined within the limits imposed by these requirements; invites governments to supply to the Secretary-General, either directly or through correspondents appointed for this purpose at the request of the Commission on Human Rights, relevant information on the points noted above."

"The Economic and Social Council, (1) having considered in its broad aspects the draft Covenant on Human Rights submitted by the Commission on Human Rights in accordance with General Assembly resolution 217 (III); (2) having noted the valuable work done by the Commission with a view to submitting a draft covenant to the General Assembly; (3) having noted with satisfaction that the draft covenant includes articles relating to implementation; (4) thanking the Commission for the contribution it has already made toward the accomplishment of a task of great importance; (5) having given consideration to the questions of (a) the general adequacy of the first 18 articles; (b) the desirability of including special articles on the application of the covenant to federal states and to non-self-governing and trust territories; (c) the desirability of including articles on economic, social, and cultural rights; and (d) the adequacy of the articles relating to implementation; (6) concluding that further progress on the covenant cannot be made without basic policy decisions on the above matters being taken by the General Assembly; (7) transmits the draft Covenant on Human Rights together with relevant documentation and records of the discussion in the Council, to the General Assembly at its fifth session for consideration with a view to reaching policy decisions on the points mentioned in paragraph (5) above; (8) requests the Commission on Human Rights to consider the draft covenant further, bearing in mind the policy decisions of the General Assembly and the views expressed in the Council at its eleventh session, and to submit a revised draft covenant to the Council at its thirteenth session; (9) requests the Secretary-General to transmit this resolution, together with the records of the debate at the eleventh session of the Council, to member states with a view to obtaining their observations after the fifth session of the General Assembly to be forwarded to the Commission on Human Rights."

[33] See Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, 1st yr., 2d sess., p. 401.

"Ten Days Ago, America, D-Day Dawned in Korea—Over That Embattled Land Roared Bombers in the Most Massive Air Strikes Made Since World War II—They Softened Inchon's Beaches and All Land Approaches to Seoul—B-29's and Giant B-50's Dropped Their 10-Ton Devastating Bombs for the Great Counteroffensive: 'Operation Torch'" (Battle Report, Washington)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 4, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on this eighty-second day of the war, Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, again presents to the Nation, Battle Report, Washington. Nothing that I might say would be complete were I not to avail myself on this occasion to commend the splendid commentaries made in this outstanding teledocumentary by Robert ("Bob") McCormick, one of the National Broadcasting Co.'s ace commentaries well and favorably known to many here in this House. Bob McCormick's style of presentation makes every program of this now nationally famous television series an action program of tremendous interest to the video audience everywhere.

On the occasion of this telecast Dr. Steelman presented Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the United States Air Force; Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force; Ambassador Jessup; and John Foster Dulles, consultant to the Secretary of State.

These gentlemen, as Dr. Steelman so aptly stated, "are helping write the history of our era, and, moreover, every hour of every day they are helping to mold a world in which men can live in peace and security."

As special guests Dr. Steelman also presented Col. Dave C. Schilling and Lt. Col. William D. Ritchie, two of America's leading aces in the Eighth Air Force in World War II. These intrepid flyers are the Air Force officers who flew the F-84 Thunderjets and successfully negotiated the 3,600-mile ocean hop which constituted the first nonstop trans-Atlantic flight ever made by jet-propelled planes—and they made the journey across the ocean in 10 hours and 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize the fact that Secretary Finletter in his address stated that the first task of the Air Force was to defend these United States; second to that he said it was to conduct strategic counterattacks; third, to lend tactical air support and in every manner in all that that operation implies to all branches of our ground troops; and fourth, to transport by air all the men and matériel needful and necessary to the complete functioning of our great war machine in its entirety and in all branches of the service which calls upon the Air Force for that assistance.

In each of these—

Secretary Finletter went on to say—

the Air Force seeks to associate the other armed services with it to the maximum extent possible, for our Defense Establishment is and must be always primarily a force for peace.

From the beginning to the end of Sunday's program, every word spoken was of tremendous interest to the membership of this House and to the American people in general.

I am sure all present will find particular interest in the talk made by Ambassador Philip C. Jessup, in which he commented upon the accomplishments of the meeting between Mr. Bevin, Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Mr. Schuman, Foreign Minister of France, and our own Secretary of State Dean Acheson. These proceedings he summed up in this significant statement:

This week we have made clear to our allies that we mean every word that we have spoken and are anxious to act now to create the strength in Europe which is vital to protect all of us * * * against an attack against any one of us.

Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous import of this Battle Report, Washington to the Americans everywhere, under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks and include therein the seventh of the series of teledocumentary reports made by John R. Steelman, As-

sistant to the President, in collaboration with the National Broadcasting Co.

The telecast was as follows:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. MCCORMICK. As war moves swiftly to a fiery climax in Korea, NBC television calls into focus its cameramen in United Nations—in Inchon on the road to Seoul, and here in the Nation's Capital—to bring you once again your Battle Report, Washington.

Washington—far removed in space from the flaming peninsula dividing the Sea of Japan and the Yellow Sea—but scene of mounting action to back drop the battle of men and guns.

Today, we draw our battle report from men who guide the destiny of our Air Force, and men equally vital on our diplomatic front. But first, we turn to one—familiar by dint of his unique position as the Assistant to the President—with all that concerns us at the Nation's Capital this eighty-second day of war—Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Another week has passed and the fight for peace and freedom continues. On the military front brave men are fighting and dying under appalling conditions. On the diplomatic front, other courageous men are engaged in another struggle to bring the dawn of peace.

And, all over the world men are asking: Why; why cannot nations live in peace; why cannot they cooperate to create a world of plenty?

The answer is obvious. A small group of greedy men with an insatiable lust for power have poisoned the minds of millions. In every place where they can find a foothold they preach the doctrine of hate and destruction. Even their ridiculous claim that they advocate peace is permeated with falsehoods and colored with venom. Ruthlessly they have sent millions to their graves and if they are not stopped, all the world will become a slave camp. The free nations of the world have united against them and are echoing the immortal words that rang through France when the Germans were at the gate of Verdun in World War I, "They shall not pass."

This afternoon you will hear from both the military and the diplomatic fronts. Secretary Finletter and General Vandenberg will tell us how the Air Force is doing its part. Ambassador Jessup and John Foster Dulles, consultant to the Secretary of State, will take us behind the scenes and report to us on the meetings of the General Assembly of the United Nations and the Foreign Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty nations.

These men are helping to write the history of our era and every hour of every day they are helping to mold a world in which men can live in peace and prosperity.

As special guests this afternoon, we have with us Col. David C. Schilling and Lt. Col. William D. Ritchie, of the United States Air Force. These intrepid fliers are the two who flew F–84 jet planes across the Atlantic last Friday. The wrote aviation history and are here now to tell us about it.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Ten days ago, America, D-day dawned in Korea. Out of the mist over that embattled land roared bombers in the most massive air strike since World War II, softening Inchon's beaches and all land approaches to Seoul, B–29's and giant B–50's dropped their 10-ton devastating bombs to give literal meaning to the name selected for this first major United Nations counter offensive: Operation Torch. Behind these bombers that gave such heart and help to the marines storming the Korean shore, our men charged with a larger responsibility: that of maintaining our air power as a force for peace in the world. And here to tell us of some the plans involved in that increasingly vital role is the Secretary of the Air Force himself, Thomas K. Finletter.

Mr. FINLETTER. The Air Force of today has a tremendous responsibility as a member of our defense establishment. It has a tremendous responsibility not only to this Nation, but to the preservation of peace in the world.

In my 5 months as Air Force Secretary, I have become firmly convinced that a strong and well trained Air Force is essential. This is so because the Air Force is an integral part of the over-all Military Establishment, which must be built up, not because of the fight in Korea, but because of the general international situation. Even a successful ending of the Korean war must not give us a false sense of security. Until the basic tensions between the Communists and the free world are greatly reduced, adequate armed strength is an all-compelling need to guarantee survival of the free nations.

Specifically, the Air Force has a major responsibility for four main tasks. These are: first, the defense of the United States; second, the strategic counter-attack; third, tactical air support; and fourth, air transport. In each of these, the Air Force seeks to associate the other services with it to the maximum extent possible.

The present plan for the Air Force is a basic increase from the present 48-group level to 58-group level, with a projection toward 69 groups. Even with the 69 groups we must not become complacent, but must be clearly alert to developing better planes, better weapons, and better trained personnel so to stand ever ready as a deterrent to any aggressor nation and as a force for victory should war still prove unavoidable.

In all of this building of weapons for war I want to emphasize that we are making these preparations in spite of the fact that peace is the primary objective of our Nation. We all hope for the day when military preparations can be safely reduced to a force which will police those of the world who have not yet learned to behave themselves.

We all must understand fully that the objective of this American Defense Establishment, of which the Air Force is an integral part, is to deter war and reduce the chances of it by making clear to those who might think of war that it would be an error to attack us. Our Defense Establishment is, and must be always, primarily a force for peace.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Nothing on earth of the slightest value to the enemy is sacred to a pilot on a strafing mission. One after another as the targets leap into view, the strafing planes "go to town," adding their own specialized talent to the heavier work of their bomber brothers, all for the same purpose, to cripple the enemy and tear his supply line to shreds. By last week, as we threw our Sunday punch, the Communist Koreans had come to have a healthy respect for the deadly facility of the strafers as they now have for every arm of our Air Force. And for this, no little credit goes to the man from whom we hear next.

General VANDENBERG. Mr. Finletter has told you of the world-wide responsibilities of the Air Force. I should like to emphasize that we intend to keep this major responsibility firmly in mind, even though we are now concentrating on the Korean situation.

As the Secretary has said, we feel firmly that a strong Air Force, as a part of a strong Defense Establishment, is a most effective deterrent to war. It is also vital to victory should war occur in spite of our efforts for peace.

The Air Force has inflicted powerful blows against the Communists in Korea. I say this, not because I am Chief of Staff of the Air Force, but because the facts bear me out. From General MacArthur down to the soldiers in the line have come high praises for the effectiveness of the Air Force units which have been operating over Korea. This applies to the units which have operated in close tactical air support, in strategic bombardment, in air transport, and in air rescue service.

In spite of the initial success of the Communists, the United Nations forces were not driven out of Korea. There has been neither another Bataan nor another Dunkerque. Vastly outnumbered troops fought a skillful delaying action and have now turned to the offensive. Our troops have complete freedom from hostile air power. Our bombers have neutralized all significant strategic targets in North Korea. The enemy's main lines of transportation have been cut and then cut again. The enemy's supply movement is almost at a standstill. Since the last days of June, the Communist spearheads have been under vigorous and unremitting attack by our fighter-bombers. All of this has been accomplished by some 88 consecutive days of all-out air support of United Nations forces which have totaled more than 33,000 effective United States Air Force combat sorties.

Effective as the Air Force action in Korea has been, I should like to emphasize again that the Air Force has no delusions about air power doing the job alone. No one in authority in the Air Force has ever said this could be the case. The Air Force is a part of air-land-sea team, of which no one unit is more important than the others.

In addition, I would like to emphasize that air power can never guarantee that enemy planes may not deliver atomic bombs to American cities should war come to this Nation. Just as Germany, at the peak of its air power, was unable to force the turn-back short of the target of a single one of our bomber strikes, we cannot expect to prevent all enemy planes from getting through.

Since this is so, our strategic Air Force must be ready to reinforce the defense by carrying the fight to the enemy.

With the build-up from 58 to 69 groups, which Mr. Finletter has described, we will have an Air Force which will command even greater respect from any aggressor nation who may be watching us. I pledge the efforts of myself and all Air Force personnel to see to it that this Air Force, whatever its strength will be, is as well-trained and as alert to its responsibilities as is humanly possible. I pledge this, both for the preservation of peace and the defense of our Nation should the need come.

Mr. MCCORMICK. While the battle waxes hot in the Pacific (and the Nation fixed attention upon Wolmi, Kimpo, and Seoul), here on the other side of the world men met in critical conference with their eyes on Europe—first, the Big Three ministers in suite 37–A in the Waldorf Astoria in New York, and later, 12 nations representing one-seventh of the world's population. Object, to make forbiddingly stronger that "all for one and one for all" fellowship designed to deter Communist aggression.

Accompanying Secretary Acheson to these conferences was Philip C. Jessup, our Ambassador-at-Large. As these vital meetings recessed, he sat before our NBC television cameras that we might bring you this film report of what has transpired to date. America, Ambassador Jessup.

Mr. JESSUP. The presence in New York of Mr. Bevin, the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom; Mr. Schuman, Foreign Minister of France; and Secretary of State Acheson made possible a meeting of the so-called Big Three—the foreign secretaries of the three states which have occupation troops in western Germany. The many actions which the three ministers took last week reflected their desire to take important further steps in the

process of integrating the Federal Republic of Germany into the community of free nations. These actions mark a new phase in the relations between the occupying powers of Germany. The ministers agreed to grant more authority to the Federal Republic, including more control over its foreign affairs. Provision was also made for the creation of a mobile German police force to increase the internal security of the republic without altering the rights of the occupying force. The ministers agreed to seek the termination of the state of war with Germany. This decision is part of the over-all objective of normalizing relations with the republic and progressively returning Germany to partnership in western Europe.

The 12 members of the North Atlantic Council were also hard at work last week in New York on the problem of preventing war by strengthening the military forces of the free world in Europe. Secretary of State Acheson made a revolutionary proposal which was welcomed by the other ministers to create an integrated army in Europe as soon as possible. This army would be made up of contingents from each of the 12 members of the North Atlantic Treaty organizations. The additional forces which President Truman said on September 9 would be sent to Europe would be the first United States contribution to the new combined army. These American troops, as well as the forces sent by the other treaty states, would be commanded by one man who would have a staff to assist him made up of officers from the states which have contributed forces. The supplying and financing of this new army would be the joint responsibility of all treaty members. The total strength of this integrated force must be equal to the task of keeping Europe free—of forcing any aggressor to ponder long and hard before starting out to conquer Europe.

One of the problems which immediately arises in talking about defense of Europe is how Germany could contribute to this major undertaking. The United States believes that plans for the integrated European force should provide for a contingent from Germany. This definitely does not mean that we would build up a national Germany army or a German General Staff. All agree that this would not serve the best interest of Germany or Europe. The majority of the German people also seem to share this view, but the United States does think that Germans should be allowed to take part in the joint defense of Europe through participation in an integrated force.

The North Atlantic Council discussed these problems this week and then recessed for a few days to give the ministers time to explain the plans to their governments. The ministers, most of whom are now attending the sessions of the United Nations General Assembly in New York, will meet again in a week or so to decide on ways of speeding up the creation of a strong enough military force in Europe to discourage any power from breaking the peace. During the interval Mr. Moch and Mr. Shinwell, the French and British Ministers of Defense, have come to the United States and have talked with Secretary of Defense Marshall and Messrs. Acheson, Bevin, and Schuman.

All of you will be hearing a great deal more about this plan for an integrated defense force in Europe because our contributions to making this force strong and efficient would mean sacrifices for all of us. The United States as well as every treaty member must deny itself many things in order to meet the challenge to free peoples everywhere. We must be ready to do our part as others do theirs.

When the United States signed the North Atlantic Treaty we agreed that our freedom was linked to the freedom of the western European states. This week we have made clear to our allies that we mean every word that we have said and are anxious to act now to create the strength in Europe which is vital to protect all of us against an attack against any one of us.

Mr. McCORMICK. As the talks Ambassador Jessup describes were temporarily halted in New York, and the United Nations happily studied the "miles gained" by its liberating forces in Korea, last Tuesday the General Assembly of the United Nations met again in session. With the arrival of Russia's Andrei Vishinsky to take his place beside television's new Hooper-rating star, Jacob Malik, the world got set for another ride on the "black is white and white is black" merry-go-round. Member of the United States delegation to the General Assembly is John Foster Dulles, consultant to the Secretary of State. Here is a sound-on-film report from Mr. Dulles, made especially for Battle Report, Washington.

Mr. DULLES. The General Assembly of the United Nations is now under way. It is the most important gathering that has been held since San Francisco 5 years ago. This Assembly is going to decide whether the free world can organize enough unity to hold together, or whether it is going to be pulled apart in pieces little by little. Of course, we've got United Nation's action in Korea today to try to save one of the small countries from being overrun by aggression. But it is pretty much an accident that the United Nations is able to act in Korea. It just happened that Russia was boycotting the Security Council when it came up, so that it couldn't veto the Security Council resolution that called on all the members to help in Korea. It also happened that the United States had a considerable amount of military power in nearby Japan because it was an occupying force there. But in the future, we can't let the security of the free world depend upon the coincidence of these lucky chances. We have got to get the United Nations organized so that there will always be somebody on the job, and so that there will always be some force to bring into play at decisive points to withstand aggression. At this Assembly, our delegation of the United States, under the leadership of Secretary of State Acheson, has made a very momentous proposal for accomplishing that organization to creating a standing and an alert world-wide peace patrol with military force to back it up. Under that proposal, the Assembly would have observers at danger points throughout the world so as to keep the United Nations informed as to what is going on and so they can see possible threats of aggression. It would be what you might call the eyes and ears by the United Nations. And then back of that we want to have all of the members bring into being some military strength which can be earmarked for use in united action on behalf of the United Nations, and we want those military forces trained and equipped so that they can consolidate and fight together with standardized equipment.

Now into a different language, etc., so that they can really be an effective whole. If we can do those things that would mean that there wouldn't be any repetition of the Korean affair where the entire burden of the resistance falls almost entirely upon the United States as in the case today. And now, in order to get all of that into action, we've got to some way meet the situation that there might be a veto in the Security Council. So we proposed that the United Nations Assembly should always be ready to meet on 24 hours notice in case a veto in the Security Council prevents the Security Council calling upon the member states there for action. And through that combination we believe we can really consolidate the strength of the free world and deter aggression. We want to have this program which is designed to strengthen the United Nations. It is going to involve cost and effort by all the nations, but security cannot be had cheaply, and no nation is entitled to United Nations protection unless it is prepared to share the burden of common effort. We have heard a lot of talk in this country, and in other countries, about making United Nations strong. Well a lot of those people will now have a chance to work for it. The nations here will have a chance to stand up and be counted as to whether they want security in words or security as a free right, or whether they are really willing to do what it takes.

Mr. McCORMICK. High over the North Atlantic less than 48 hours ago two American pilots, each flying an F-84 Thunderjet, on a 3,600-mile ocean hop in the Air Force's first attempt, were refueled by such new-devised magic as this. Result—the first nonstop trans-Atlantic flight by a jet-propelled plane. Time—from Manston Air Base in England to the United States of America—10 hours and 1 minute. Lt. Col. Bill Ritchie was forced to bail out when he ran out of fuel approaching Labrador. Col. Dave Schilling made it to Limestone, Maine. Both pilots are with me now in their first television appearance since their dramatic, history-making flight. And, to start off, Colonel Schilling, tell us something about this trip. I know it isn't pleasant to sit in one of those things where you can't move your head and you can't bend over. How was it, was it pretty dull, or what?

Colonel SCHILLING. No, we were pretty busy. We had a lot of work to do in navigating. We had enough freedom to move to not make it too uncomfortable. We had very excellent emergency equipment and ventilating eqiupment—suits to keep us cool, and keep down perspiration.

Mr. McCORMICK. So it wasn't really as much torture as we might imagine. Well, now according to the stories I have read, Colonel Ritchie, the reason you had to bail out was because you missed your air tanker and couldn't refuel, was that right?

Colonel RITCHIE. No, I had no trouble making rendezvous with the tanker; I just couldn't accept fuel.

Mr. McCORMICK. What do you mean you couldn't accept—a mechanical problem, or——

Colonel RITCHIE. My refueling equipment was damaged over Iceland.

Mr. McCORMICK. Oh, I see. In other words, you met the tanker, but you just couldn't take the fuel from them.

Colonel RITCHIE. That's right.

Mr. McCORMICK. What sort of refueling device is used on this sort of thing, Colonel Schilling?

Colonel SCHILLING. It is a British probe drogue method. It is a funnel on the end of a hose which has a probe mounted on the front side of the receiver aircraft which grabs in and makes contact.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, does the tanker fly above the plane it is refueling, or below it, or what?

Colonel SCHILLING. No, he flies above and just ahead.

Mr. McCORMICK. And just ahead; well, what sort of a plane is it—a B-29 they use as a tanker?

Colonel SCHILLING. We used a British Lancaster, Lincoln, and a B-29.

Mr. McCORMICK. And you can slow one of those jets down enough so that a B-29 can keep up with it?

Colonel SCHILLING. Oh yes, they will fly just as well slowly as they do at high speeds.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, how did you bail out, Colonel Ritchie? Physically how—did you have one of those ejection seats that bailed you out?

Colonel RITCHIE. Yes, I used ejection too.

Mr. McCORMICK. Oh, you did. And you landed in the water, did you?

Colonel RITCHIE. No, I landed over land in a tree.

Mr. McCORMICK. Oh, well, did you have any sort of protective clothing in case you had landed in the water?

Colonel RITCHIE. Yes. I had this waterproof suit. Fortunately, I didn't have to use it.

Mr. McCORMICK. Yes, we are very happy that you didn't. How long did it take you to refuel?

Colonel RITCHIE. Several minutes—three or four.

Mr. McCORMICK. Just a matter of minutes?

Colonel RITCHIE. Just a matter of minutes.

Mr. McCORMICK. Does the weather affect you?

Colonel RITCHIE. No, because normally at the altitude you refuel, you are above a large percentage of the weather.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, one more thing. Did you have food and water on this plane?

Colonel RITCHIE. Yes, I had fighter rations and water.

Mr. McCORMICK. Did you use them?

Colonel RITCHIE. Yes, we ate them.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, now, what was this trip suppose to prove?

Colonel RITCHIE. Well, the feasibility of inflight refueling and the possibility of moving a large number of fighter aircraft over large distances in a very short period of time.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, you mean the theory is that if this works, you might be able to move a lot of jets across the ocean all at once?

Colonel RITCHIE. We could move as many over in as many hours as it took us to move 16 over in days.

Mr. McCORMICK. Since you didn't quite make it, do you think the test was a success or not?

Colonel RITCHIE. Yes, I do. Particularly our rescue party.

Mr. McCORMICK. You are most grateful for that? Well—so another Air Force first—the first nonstop trans-Atlantic flight by a jet plane. Time: barely over 10 hours.

Thus the Nation, America—as top diplomatic, Air Force, and executive officials have come before our cameras to report to you—moves into the fourteenth and perhaps the most critical week of the war. And the latest headlines that reflect the heightened action—General Vandenberg has just told me that he has had word on his B–50 missing on flight from Goose Bay to Arizona. The wreckage has not actually been sighted, but an RAF Lancaster, 150 miles southwest of Goose Bay has spotted an unknown number of survivors. Rescue work cannot be undertaken immediately.

Letter From Resident of Rome, Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I received today from a resident of Rome.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GANGSTER

Roberto Rossellini: During the Fascist régime, said Rossellini has many times enjoyed the aid and protection of the Ministry of People's Culture. During the war unleashed by the Nazis, while the civilized people fought those barbarians, Rossellini went to parties, turned out Nazi propaganda films; and while the patriots were being tortured by the Nazi beasts, Rossellini enjoyed their protection.

After the liberation Rossellini sought to smother the scandal by directing two films: Rome, the Open City and Paisan. These two works are justly recognized, but [the effort] to hide his sad past has been unsuccessful.

Roberto Rossellini found shelter in an official asylum [for the criminally insane] in Italy in whose wards are sheltered only those who must give account to the law.

Rossellini is like some creeping snake; he has abused the trust of a lady, Ingrid Bergmann, has destroyed a family, has taken an innocent child away from her mother. What was his purpose in doing so? The dirtiest and unmentionable purpose, with the speculation of snatching the splendid fortune of that ingenuous lady.

This man full of vices, who has collaborated with a barbarian Nazi, a drug addict, vicious, unworthy to live in a human community of honest people, must never set foot in a civilized country like America. This vermin enveloped in falsehood, this adventurer, believed to be an honest man only because he succeeded in acquiring fame and riches in the meanest of worlds.

In a following article I shall prove and document everything on the past of Roberto Rossellini, and shall prove that Senator JOHNSON in his speech in the Senate has spoken the whole truth.

I have known Rossellini from when he was 20 years old; I know his whole past; that is why I can declare that he has betrayed, betrayed everybody—a woman, friends, relatives, father, and mother. That is why I inform the American people of the misdeeds of this super gangster.

GUSTAVO GARZIA,
Journalist, Lido di Roma, Italy.

A Congressman Makes Up His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Rodgers Park (Ill.) News of Thursday, September 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST COLUMN

(By Leo A. Lerner)

A CONGRESSMAN MAKES UP HIS MIND

"The wicked spring up like grass * * * but the righteous shall flourish as the palm tree. * * * Growing mighty as a cedar in Lebanon." (Psalms 92.)

This is the story of one man's searching his soul.

When Congressman SIDNEY R. YATES, Democrat, Ninth District, came down with a cold recently. He was sick in bed when the House voted overwhelmingly in favor of the McCarran antisubversive bill. But YATES, a first-term Congressman who has made an excellent record and is well liked by the people in his district, had to return to Congress last week, and he knew that he would have to cast a vote on the acceptance of the Senate-House conference committee report on the McCarran bill.

It was a real dilemma.

Congressman YATES knew in his heart that the bill was not a good bill. As a lawyer he felt that it was unconstitutional, since the bill was drawn in such broad language as to make possible the intimidation and persecution of citizens who are not guilty of any real subversion. He knew that the bill would not hurt the Communists but actually help them, and that its provisions would weaken the security of our country.

YATES knew something else that was even more important, and that is that it was possible under this bill to smash the future of liberalism in America by bringing on a new series of outrages against people guilty of liberal thinking. And he knew that the end of liberal thinking usually means the end of progress itself.

YATES, a sensitive person and a student of history, remembered that at several other times in the history of our country we had passed legislation under hysterical circumstances for which later the country was sorry.

But some practical people in YATES' district, those who wanted to see him return to Congress, advised him to vote in favor of the bill. They reasoned with him like this: "Your opposition is going to try to smear you as a Communist. We all know that you are not a Communist. We know, in fact, that you have always been a good and loyal American, but if you fail to vote for the McCarran bill, you will be singled out and pushed around."

These friends continued, "Sure, we know the bill is no good, a great many of the Congressmen who are voting in favor of the bill know the bill is no good, and yet they are voting for the bill because they feel intimidated. This is an election year, and anybody who fails to follow the so-called popular sentiment is caught in that trap."

Congressman YATES searched for the answer. He asked many of his friends what to do. They were divided.

The idealists said, "You know it is a bad bill, you should not vote for it, and even if you go down to defeat, it is better to vote your own convictions, than to be wrong for political considerations."

The other half said, "You are a useful man in Congress, you are one of the leaders of the northern Democratic liberal bloc. If you vote against the McCarran bill, it might cause you to lose the election. One vote more or less won't make any difference. We think you should compromise with your conscience in order to be able to serve the country and your ideals in the long run."

Up to the very last minute before leaving for Washington last Tuesday, YATES debated the pros and cons of his vote on the McCarran bill. He knew that his Republican opposition in the Ninth Congressional District was going to try to smear him by comparing his votes on various issues with those of Congressman MARCANTONIO.

(This in spite of the fact that the Republican isolationists vote like MARCANTONIO more often than YATES ever did.)

He feared that his vote on this single issue might make a difference to people who could be misled, to people who did not read and would not read the McCarran bill, but who could be told that YATES voted in favor of communism by voting against the bill.

The Congressman spent several sleepless nights.

On the way to Washington on the plane he read a little article in a magazine called Confessions of a Candidate, by Richard L. Neuberger, who was elected to the State senate in the State of Oregon. In this article Neuberger said that the public admires an honest man who votes his convictions and principles more than it does a fence straddler and an opportunist.

But on the other hand, YATES asked himself, what can a little man like himself do

when confronted with the overwhelming decision of the other Congressmen. One of YATES' friends had said to him, "After all, you are not God, you can't put yourself above everybody."

True, he wasn't God, but God is in every man, and every man is in God. God speaks to each man in His own way; each man's sober judgment is a part of the universal scheme.

YATES remembered what another good friend had told him. "Long after this vote, you will have to live with yourself. Vote the way your conscience dictates, don't vote to get votes, vote for the right, and the votes will take care of themselves."

Some time in that starry night high above his beloved America, the land of his birth and his opportunity, the land where he had done so much and given so much, SIDNEY YATES made up his mind.

He decided that he would trust the people of his district. He would stake his future on playing it square.

When the McCarran bill came up for vote on Wednesday, Congresman SIDNEY R. YATES, of the Ninth Congressional District of Illinois, stood up and voted "No" on the McCarran bill. With him were three other Illinois Congressmen, BARRATT O'HARA, ADOLPH SABATH, and WILLIAM L. DAWSON. All of these voted their convictions honestly, in favor of Americanism—the old-fashioned Americanism of Washington, Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln.

The Passing of Dr. Pugh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from September 16 issue of the Chester Times, of Chester, Pa., in which the editor, Alfred G. Hill, pays tribute to the distinguished career of the Reverend Dr. William Barrow Pugh, one of the great spiritual leaders of our country, whose tragic death on September 14 was a great shock to the Christian world.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PASSING OF DR. PUGH

The last picture this writer has of his neighbor, William Barrow Pugh prior to his tragic death late Thursday was that of Dr. Pugh walking about his garden with his third-generation namesake, better known as "Bunkie," age 21 months.

Increasingly in recent months, "Bunkie" and Don, Jr., another grandson of almost the same age, had become a major incentive for Dr. Pugh to hurry home and devote hours to the close study of these first grandchildren.

Earlier there had been the period of delight on the part of Dr. Pugh when he had welcomed two daughters to the Pugh family, the brides of his two sons who married soon after returning from their years on World War II service. And it is needless to say that Dr. Pugh had virtually lived the budding careers of his two lawyer sons. Finally it should be observed that another field of sympathetic interest was in watching his wife plan and develop their beautiful home with its spacious surroundings.

Another revealing thing: Never did this observer see a man who found more apparent pleasure in the little gifts which came home with him, day after day, and week after week.

That may seem a strange contrast from the unsparing grind of Dr. Pugh's professional life both as a spiritual leader and administrative head of the great Presbyterian denomination.

Duty, as Dr. Pugh saw it, took him to all parts of the world. His hours of work were long. They included night work at home. They included association with persons whose names are most familiar in this country and over the world.

Through it all, Dr. Pugh was the same unassuming, forthright, clear-thinking individual as the Reverend Bill Pugh which Chester knew so well for 10 years during which period he was the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Chester.

Dr. Pugh transmitted the common touch in his unvarnished accounts of his experiences afield. How well he knew human nature, yet how completely sympathetic was he to those with whom he came into contact. There was combined in Dr. Pugh the tolerance of the diplomat and the zeal of the crusader.

Dr. Pugh did not spare himself, and the strain of the World War years and those following, had taken their toll. But the viewpoint remained cheerful and confident in the ultimate future. And Dr. Pugh continued to cherish the friendships of earlier years when he was a National Guard chaplain in World War I and even earlier when he was active in baseball and other sports.

It was difficult from this viewpoint to understand how Dr. Pugh could stand up under the exceptional strain which the combination of administrative detail, travel, and public speaking take from a man.

But never did Dr. Pugh indicate his desire for a more leisurely, less responsible routine. It would be hard to imagine Dr. Pugh living with real happiness on an inactive basis.

It is particularly hard to lose such a man at a time when his experience and wisdom are so much needed by a world which can only be saved by the Christian standards which Dr. Pugh preached and lived.

And yet it is glorious to go to another sphere at a time when an individual such as Dr. Pugh is in full fruition of his powers, and with a record such as his to live on everlastingly.—A. G. H.

Home Front Death Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1950

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, last month we all were shocked over the tragedy of the railroad accident in Ohio which caused the death of some 30 American soldiers and the maiming of some 50 others. Not long after that tragedy a frank and thought-provoking editorial concerning such accidents was printed by the Orlando Morning Sentinel which is published in Orlando, Fla., by Martin Andersen, an eminently capable and public-spirited newspaperman.

I feel that this editorial is so timely and so deserving of attention that I ask that it be printed here so that it may be fully considered for any possible legislation or change in policy that may be needed to prevent recurrences of such unnecessary and tragic disasters.

HOME FRONT DEATH TRAP

So they're going to investigate the slaughter of more than 30 American soldiers and the maiming of 50 others in the splintered wreckage of an ancient troop train cut down the middle by a luxury streamliner on a straight-away track in Ohio.

Let the investigators go far enough and high enough to put the finger on officials responsible for hauling American boys off to war in rickety, 70-foot, wooden coaches which long ago earned the apt designation of "cattle cars."

Let it be shown if this is just another cruel result of a loathsome official policy of "let's not disturb the soft life of the voters, boys," while a relatively few young Americans are herded off to fight in mud and blazing sun, some of them to be maimed for life and others to die.

Why in the name of decency and American fair play aren't these boys riding in the stainless steel streamliners with their reinforced construction, their comfy air-conditioning and their crooning radios?

They'll know hell soon enough.

Let them ride off to it at least, in safety, if not in luxury.

Let them ride in modern passenger cars and if there aren't enough for them and for the business as usual, pleasure-as-usual crowd, then let the latter ride in the creaky day coaches of a bygone era which just about everybody except the railroads have grown out of.

And if that means more of those old day coaches on Florida-bound winter tourist trains, then that's what it means.

Any civilian who must travel these days has plenty of other choices for comfortable transportation—by private car, by bus or by plane, also amply luxurious.

The soldiers have no such choice. They travel in what some button-pusher orders out for them. And 80 of them traveled to injury and death in an antique railroad crate which had been automatically stopped twice by broken air hoses and was a helpless sitting duck in the fog for the crack City of St. Louis streamliner which streaked premature tragedy into many families.

Doesn't anybody know we are in a terrible war except the young men taken from their homes and sent to the hell of the battlefield?

Let your officials know that you know it.

Government as Usual During the War—Only an Independent Congress Responsible to the American People Can Change This Shameful Condition—The Final Decision Will Be Made by the American Voters November 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a summary of the situation which I stated before a meeting in Northampton, Mass., with reference to the surplus-food commodities:

Recently President Truman asked the American people to tighten their belts and

to accept cheerfully the sacrifices they would have to make in the days to come.

But he did not then and he has not since pledged any similar sacrifices on the part of the Federal Government.

Since June 25 it has been Government as usual in Washington. It will continue that way unless the American voters put a stop to it on November 7 by electing a Congress which can and will bring an end to the inexcusable waste of public funds and which can and will see to it that the Federal Government concentrates on the war effort and essential civilian services.

It makes no sense at all to take our young men and women from their homes and their families, their civilian jobs, their schools and their colleges and yet permit Federal departments and agencies to continue to carry on their government as usual activities.

It is sheer nonsense to take additional billions of dollars from the hard-earned and prudently-saved money of the American people and yet witness the spectacle of continued indefensible waste of hundreds of millions of those dollars for nonessential activities.

It is economic ignorance to be planning controls over the lives, the wages and salaries, the daily activities of the American people without using ordinary common sense by stopping promptly programs which have no possible relation to the war effort or essential civilian work.

But this will not be done voluntarily by the present administration. It is dedicated to the proposition that it can in the future, as in the past, deceive the American people as to any of the numerous errors it has made and that it must never, under any circumstances, admit a mistake or take any action which could be construed as such an admission.

If one thing is certain in these days of confusion, contradictions, and uncertainties in Washington, it is that the administration wants, is working for and will welcome the election of supine, puppet Congressmen pledged to the support of its entire program, whatever it is now or may become during these vitally important months ahead of all of us.

There are many instances which have been exposed throughout the entire range of governmental activities, but I want to give you one concrete current instance as a prime example of conditions prevailing in Washington.

Many of you know that back in January I urged the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to take constructive action on a bill I filed providing for the disposal of the huge stocks of surplus foods being stored at tremendous cost, with some of it in danger of spoilage.

My suggestions and pleas for action were ignored for months, with one exception, when the President told a news conference that he was filing the messages in the wastebasket.

Then on July 24 Secretary Brannan belatedly came before the House Committee on Agriculture, reversed the position he had taken on March 21, that the bill I had filed on February 2 was administratively not feasible, and he recommended practically the same bill. It passed the House unanimously on August 22.

It languished in the Senate committee with neither the President nor Secretary Brannan doing anything, although we were at war and needed every dollar we could get to speed up the war effort, until September 14 when the President wrote Senator THOMAS, chairman of the Senate committee, and used virtually every argument I had made throughout this period of several months. He pointed out the obvious fact that the Government had gigantic stocks, and he said, as I had repeatedly said, that it made no sense for the Government to store these surpluses which will surely spoil while there are people in this country and overseas who badly need the food. He wrote: "This will not be a costly program. It is no more expensive to ship dried eggs and milk, for example, than to carry them for months on end. We ought to take steps to get these surpluses where they will do some good."

On September 15 the Senate committee reported the House bill favorably and that day it was included in the must legislation before adjournment.

However, during the following 8 days, I could find no evidence whatever, although I talked with a number of Senators who would have known the facts, that either the President or Secretary Brannan lifted a finger to help in the passage of the bill. I sent a telegram to the President September 23, hours before the Senate adjourned, calling his attention to the situation and urging action. I now learn that he did nothing about that except to send the telegram to Secretary Brannan, and I will refer to that shortly.

I know and you know that the administration hoped that the about-face by Secretary Brannan and the letter of the President to Senator THOMAS would give the American public the impression that they were greatly concerned about this waste of public funds and the threat of spoilage of wholesome foods. I know and you know that they counted on the universal concern of all of us about the war in Korea and world conditions to make it almost impossible for anyone to present the facts as to the real lack of interest and the inaction on the part of the administration. Surely it is obvious that the majority leadership in the Senate could and would have brought this nonpartisan bill up for prompt action if they had received any word or request from the President on September 23.

I sent the President another telegram expressing my disappointment as to the adjournment without action, referring to the fact that at least $3,840,000 would be wasted between then and November 27 in continuing this unnecessary storage, and I said: "In the light of Secretary Brannan's testimony as to the threat of spoilage and because of his admission that, under existing law, he would have the power to dispose of any commodities threatened with spoilage, I urge that you order this action to be taken at once. Any failure by him to invoke this law to prevent spoilage will be shocking to the American people."

I have received a letter sent by Mr. Brannan which is not only not responsive but is actually a masterpiece of evasion. It is an obvious attempt to build a record which it is hoped will lull and deceive the public.

On September 15 I had written asking specifically for the exact amount of food threatened with spoilage, as Mr. Brannan had testified before the House committee on July 24. I also had requested the exact location of the storage houses. But nowhere in this letter from Secretary Brannan is there any reference to the amount of spoilage, or threatened spoilage, or to direct action taken under existing law to avoid spoilage or to the exact local locations of these food stocks.

Let me quote this letter to you:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: Reference is made to your letter of September 1, and to your letter to the President of the same date which has been referred to us for consideration. In these communications you pointed out the need for additional legislation to provide for the distribution of perishable commodities and suggested that the matter be called to the attention of the proper parties in the Senate. I also wish to acknowledge your letter of September 15 and two telegrams of September 23 to the President, which have been referred to this Department for consideration.

The situation which you described was brought to the attention of members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by the Department. As you know, on September 14 the President wrote to the Honorable ELMER THOMAS requesting that the Senate committee report favorably on H. R. 9313 to the Senate in time for final action at the current session. This letter is included as appendix A of the Senate report on H. R. 9313, dated September 15.

The Department has always maintained that authority to pay distribution costs to receiving points within States would increase the volume of surplus foods that would be distributed to needy groups. This was included in a report on several bills that were sent to the House Committee on Agriculture on March 21, 1950. On March 30, 1950, Mr. Trigg testified before the House committee concerning changes that would be desirable in section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and on April 27, 1950, at the request of the committee, we forwarded a proposed amended to section 416. On July 24, 25, and 26, we again appeared before the House committee on this matter.

H. R. 9313 contains most of the changes the Department had previously recommended.

We are making every effort to assist State agencies responsible for intrastate distribution of surplus foods to handle maximum possible amounts during the coming year.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

I have received the official report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the month of July. Let me point out that this report is available to the public and the Congress nearly 2 months after the period which it covers. It does seem as though the Department of Agriculture, with 85,464 employees in July of this year, a payroll of $23,261,000, and an appropriation for this fiscal year of $773,208,924, could keep its reports much more current and could answer legitimate questions promptly by referring to the daily records of bills paid for storage of food commodities at different locations.

In any event, I find that in July the Federal Government paid for carrying charges on 17 items of food which could be eaten without processing $1,100,045.30. This is at the rate of more than $35,000 a day. In view of an estimate I received on September 12 as to the amount on hand on September 11 of 9 of these items, it is a certainty that the rate of daily expenditure for unnecessary storage is greatly increased now over July.

From July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950, the amount of this indefensible waste was $38,700,524.29. It is dead certain that it will not be less in this fiscal year unless Congress does something about it. And that will only be by a Congress dedicated to its own responsibilities to the American people, not a subservient rubber stamp of the administration.

The tragedy is in the realization that these hard-earned and prudently saved tax dollars are gone forever and for no useful purpose. Think of what $77,000,000 would mean in terms of guns and ammunition for our fighting forces.

This is all in sharp contrast to the warning the President gave the American housewives when he said: "Every American housewife must not buy more than she needs. She must put off buying whenever she can. If the housewife insists on buying more than

she needs, there will not be enough to go around and prices will go up."

Of course, hoarding is unnecessary and harmful. The President rightly said so. But the contrary is what he permits the Federal Government to do. It is not the American housewives who are hoarders. The biggest hoarder in all history is the Federal Government.

I realize that it is probably impossible to rectify this situation now with Congress recessing—over the protest of a great many Republicans and a number of Democrats—subject only to recall by the President before November 27. However, I shall continue my efforts to develop the facts and to urge action. I want to repeat my appeal to all those who may know of the locations of these stored commodities so that my colleagues and I can try to get these facts. As of July 31, there were 8,779,317 pounds of dried milk, 398,662 pounds of cheese and 668,877 pounds of butter then stored in Massachusetts.

I have written a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture summarizing the situation and asking him to schedule hearings immediately upon the return of Congress to bring out the truth. I wrote: "If there has been no spoilage, that fact will be welcome news. If there has been spoilage by November 27, the full extent of it should be reported to your committee." I have reason to believe that the committee will inquire into the facts.

This case history of casual indifference to the situation which confronts the American people, with a sharply increased tax bill and the possibility of rigid control, is not confined to any one department or to any one agency in one department.

The investigators for the House Appropriations Committee developed two instances of such senseless actions. They found that another branch of the Department had sent one-half of a truck unit to Florida and the other half to Texas in order to prevent another branch within the Department from using it.

This particular branch asked Congress for funds for 63 new automobiles. The Appropriations Committee investigators found that this bureau's Denver office with 35 persons had 217 automobiles of which 194 were unused.

Government records show that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has 11,300 employees for 363,000 Indians—1 Government employee for every 30 Indians.

The Hoover Commission reported that the Federal Government spends $10 to buy and process each 50-cent typewriter ribbon. Yet the Post Office Department in Washington is dragging its heels under the authority given it by Congress to modernize its mangement system.

The height of overlapping, doubling of effort and waste of taxpayers' money is probably reached in the field of Government printing and propaganda. There are 61 separate printing and duplicating plants in Washington, 23 in San Francisco, 25 in Philadelphia, 16 in Chicago, 6 in Kansas City, and 16 in New York, with others scattered all over the country.

It would take the rest of the afternoon and evening to give you a complete catalogue of convincing evidence of this Government-as-usual attitude in Washington. I hope that this brief outline will be sufficient so that you and your friends will do everything in your power to see that this shall not continue. What has been tolerated for 3 months during the Korean fight will be terminated only by an intelligent and determined Congress recognizing its responsibilities to all the American people.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD program No. 34 in my series of broadcasts to the citizens of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 34)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

Congress has now completed setting up the machinery for total mobilization of our Nation's strength to meet the threat of Communist aggression.

We have appropriated approximately $30,000,000,000 to be spent directly for national defense. Other billions have been appropriated, part of which will contribute either directly or indirectly to our defense.

We have given the President authority to draft manpower for the armed services. Under the defense production bill which Congress enacted, the President has the right to fix prices and stabilize wages. He has the power to set up a system of priorities and allocations of critical materials.

He has been given the authority to requisition plants, equipment, and materials needed for national defense. He has been given the power and authority to expand the Nation's industrial productive capacity if needed to meet military requirements.

He has been given the authority to restrict consumer credit and real-estate credit on new construction.

No President in the history of our country has ever been given such complete authority to regulate and direct the economic life of the Nation.

Under our system of government, the President has the duty of administering the laws enacted by Congress. The management of these vast expenditures and far-reaching controls is a tremendous responsibility. Congress does not share in that administrative function. The job is solely in the hands of the President and his administration. In other words, responsibility for the success or failure of the program rests with the President.

I know that the American people hope and pray that the powers that have been granted to the President will be exercised wisely; that he will surround himself with men of outstanding ability and integrity.

We must make sure that the people of the United States get a dollar's worth of defense in return for every dollar that is spent. We must make doubly sure that the defense funds are spent to provide the best and most modern weapons and equipment for our fighting men.

It is my considered opinion that Congress has failed in one respect to meet its responsibility in the present crisis.

Certainly the times call for a drastic reduction of all governmental spending not connected with national defense. In spite of the $30,000,000,000 defense program for this fiscal year, Congress yielded to administration pressure and continued to appropriate billions of dollars for domestic programs which could and should have been curtailed or eliminated. The left-wingers and pinks continued their fight for socialistic experiments that would only regiment our people and undermine our system of government.

Many of us in Congress voted for drastic reductions. Finally we were able to eliminate the expenditure of approximately one-half billion dollars out of a budget of nearly sixty billions. That was a mere "drop in the bucket."

The general appropriation bill, as passed, directed the President to trim $550,000,000 out of the total amount of thirty-six billion one hundred and fifty-three million. He was given the authority to decide where and how the economies were to be effected.

I do not approve of that method. Congress was shirking its responsibility when it "passed the buck" to the President in directing him to trim $500,000,000 out of the overall appropriation.

It was the responsibility of Congress to determine just where the cuts should be made. We should have proceeded to make those cuts.

The total budget for this fiscal year will be nearly $60,000,000,000. Even with the new tax bill, which will raise an additional $4,500,000,000, we will probably run a deficit of at least $15,000,000,000 this year alone.

Such unsound financing must not continue.

Our Republic and our individual freedom cannot survive in the shackles of overwhelming debt. It is, therefore, mandatory for us to pay as much of the cost of defense out of current revenues as is humanly possible.

The President, in his recent radio report to the people, said:

"All of us—whether we are farmers or wage earners or businessmen—must give up some of the things we would ordinarily expect to have for ourselves and our families. The danger the free world faces is so great that we cannot be satisfied with less than all-out effort by everyone."

With that statement I am in full accord. I think it applies to the bureaucrats in Washington as well as the farmer, wage earners, and businessmen. I think every department and bureau, not directly connected with the national defense, should exercise the most stringent economy.

But I have seen nothing here in Washington to indicate a willingness to economize anywhere, on anything. Despite national peril, the administration is committed to the most lavish nondefense domestic spending in its entire history. The appropriations for nondefense domestic spending are almost double what they were only 2 years ago.

It would be encouraging to the people of the United States if they could see an honest effort made to reduce the cost of government on the domestic front. There has never been a time when real economy was so important. Every dollar we spend needlessly is a dollar deposited in the bank account of Joe Stalin.

In another week the taxpayers of the United States will be called upon to pay increased income taxes. The people must make sacrifices in this form and soon will be called upon to make sacrifices in many other ways.

In the preservation of our free Republic sacrifice should be shared by every individual. The President and Members of Congress could set a fine example to the American people.

Each Member of Congress receives an annual tax-exempt allowance of $2,500. The President, by a special act passed during the Eighty-first Congress, was given a tax-exempt allowance of $50,000 a year.

If the American people are called upon to make the necessary sacrifices, then I believe that the President of the United States and

every Member of Congress should favor legislation to make these tax-exempt allowances subject to income tax the same as the income of the average citizen. A few weeks ago I voted to do this very thing but the proposal was defeated.

Extravagance in Government spending and waste of public funds should never be condoned but in a time of national peril it is the height of folly to continue expenditures that would weaken the defense of our freedom.

We have reached a time when the President, the Congress, the bureaucrats in Washington, State government, county government, and local government must all cut nondefense expenditures drastically.

Each one of them has that responsibility and let me say, my fellow Pennsylvanians, that each of you, as individual citizens, shares in that responsibility. You have the duty of demanding that the President, Congress, and all levels of government eliminate all waste and all nonessential services.

That is the only way that we can build up the military forces of America to meet Communist aggression. It is the only way we can escape national bankruptcy and the loss of individual freedom which must inevitably follow.

The American people realize the great danger that confronts us. Everywhere I go I find they are ready and willing to tighten their belts. They are ready and willing to make any sacrifice to preserve the American way of life.

They realize that the recent tax increase is only the beginning. They know that they will be called upon to shoulder heavier tax burdens and to make more sacrifices before we see this crisis through.

But they are looking with great anxiety to Washington for the kind of leadership in which they can have confidence.

They want and should have a hard-hitting team, working in complete harmony. They want men of broad vision directing our plans and policies, men who have been proven in the past, so there will be faith in their ability to meet what lies ahead.

Only 5 years ago the United States had achieved military victory which placed our country at the height of its power. We had the greatest military force in the world. We had industrial production unparalleled in all history. The atom bomb was ours alone.

We had defeated our enemies on every continent and turned once more to the ways of peace. But in the field of world diplomacy we met crushing defeat. In secret conferences and through a policy of appeasement we canceled out all the gains our military leaders had achieved.

Today we find ourselves trying to restore by force the peace of the world that was lost by a blundering leadership which virtually invited aggression and then resorted to arms in a sudden reversal of policy.

The mistakes of the past that have led us into the present crisis must not be repeated.

We must remember that after Communist aggression is crushed in Korea, as assuredly it will be crushed, we cannot count it a complete victory.

The godless enemy of human liberty will still be a powerful force, ready to spring again with all the ruthless brutality that has enslaved one nation after another behind the iron curtain of tyranny.

For our own national security and for the sake of freedom and peace in the world we must maintain our strength at its highest peak.

We must never forget that Soviet Russia regards Korea as a mere testing ground and that the present conflict is only the opening round in further aggression which aims to involve the United States in one war after another against the Communist satellites.

By that process Joe Stalin hopes to sap our military and financial strength, to prepare the way for the destruction of American freedom and thus gain Communist domination over the whole world.

Let us therefore take warning from our experience in Korea. Let us determine that we will never again be caught in the same state of unpreparedness.

While the Communist menace exists in the world we must not let down or divert our preparedness to meet that challenge.

We must be ready to meet force with superior force, with patriotism, sacrifice, and the utmost in military, financial, moral, and spiritual strength.

We must go ahead with complete realization that the cost will be stupendous.

But if American strength and power can avert global war the price will be insignificant compared to the sacrifice which our fighting men are making with such heroism in the bloody slaughter of the Korean battlefields.

Here in Pennsylvania we have already felt the terrible shock of war's tragic cost. I refer to the troop-train disaster which took the lives of 33 members of the One Hundred and Ninth Field Artillery of Pennsylvania's own Twenty-eighth Division.

These fine young men will always be remembered as casualties of war who gave their lives for their country in the same patriotic spirit as their comrades who face the enemy in Korea.

Their families know the real meaning of sacrifice.

While we honor their memory let each and every one of us dedicate our lives in our country's cause and help hasten the day when peace will rule the world, under God, with freedom and justice.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Memorial Launched for University of Michigan Students and Alumni Who Died in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on October 2, thousands of University of Michigan alumni and their friends gathered throughout the Nation to celebrate Atom Day and the launching of the University of Michigan Memorial-Phoenix project. Among the participants, who were joined together by telephonic connections from their various meeting places as well as by a Nation-wide radio broadcast, were Ambassador Warren Austin, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, and Gordon Dean, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The University of Michigan Memorial-Phoenix project is a memorial to the Michigan students and alumni who died in World War II. It will be financed by private subscriptions. It contemplates an exploration into the field of atomic science from the point where the discovery of atomic energy and its military application leave off.

The project seeks to coordinate all the resources of academic life in the direction of obtaining maximum peacetime benefits from atomic energy.

It is apparent that peacetime uses of atomic energy will have untold effects in the fields of architecture, engineering, economics, law, sociology, and so on through the entire range of human knowledge and activity. It is the purpose of the Phoenix project to speed the adaptation in all these fields to the potentialities of atomic energy, and thus to lessen its impact and heighten its benefits to mankind.

I am tremendously enthused by this project, which will cooperate with all related governmental research and activity but which will not rely upon the Government for support. It was my good fortune to be able to participate in the Atom Day program of October 2, in Ann Arbor. I ask to have printed in the Appendix my radio remarks in introducing Ambassador Warren Austin.

There being no objection, the introduction was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The undertaking which brings us together, throughout the Nation, has a noble inspiration. Nothing could possibly be a more fitting memorial than this project which proposes to serve the living in honor of the dead.

It is a project of tremendous scope and meaning, symbolizing much for the future of humanity.

It breathes the air of the future.

It is novel not only in its sweep but in its purpose.

Every past discovery of energy sources has brought tremendous changes, confusion, and accompanying fear. By its explorations into the peacetime uses of atomic energy this project seeks to dispel the fear and helplessness that men feel in the face of the unknown.

The guiding spirit of this project is that where the light of knowledge shines the darkness of fear disappears. It is a spirit of hope and of promise.

Its significance does not stop with its scope or purpose. The means of its realization has equal significance.

This is to be a project established and maintained by private, individual subscriptions—from Michigan alumni giving not alone out of pride and gratitude to their alma mater but out of a sense of individual responsibility for the aims of the project.

In short, this project marks a resurgence of private enterprise in an era which has somehow forgotten what the spirit of private enterprise has meant in the past, to the enlightenment and advancement of mankind.

No one could more appropriately take part on this occasion than the guest I now have the distinction to present, from New York.

Warren Austin, too, is pioneering in fields which still stand in the shadows of uncertainty. But he, too, is engaged in an effort to sweep away those shadows so that men everywhere may live without fear in a new era of peace and progress.

No one who has recently been witness to the historic meetings of the United Nations could have turned away unimpressed by the firm Vermont hand which has so largely guided those sessions through their stormy ways.

It is a hand whose granite strength is drawn first from the person of the man, but also from the principles for which he stands in addressing the world.

I can be pardoned a note of pride in my introduction, for I call him my friend. I

speak, however, in terms of tribute from a grateful nation.

I take great pleasure in introducing Warren Austin, United States Ambassador to the United Nations, speaking from the Hotel Biltmore in New York City.

Address of Rear Adm. Sidney W. Souers at the Graduation Exercises of the FBI National Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the excellent address which was delivered by Rear Adm. Sidney W. Souers at the graduation exercises of the FBI National Academy on September 29, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Director Hoover, distinguished guests, members of the graduating class and friends of the FBI National Academy, it has been my privilege to work for nearly 20 years with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and with the other security and intelligence services of our Nation. It has been an increasing pleasure throughout this period to work with the FBI's distinguished director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, and I am especially pleased to be able to join with him in these graduation exercises of the FBI National Academy.

Since its establishment by Mr. Hoover in 1935, the Academy—like the FBI itself—has made a major contribution to the security and welfare of the United States. The wisdom and foresight displayed in founding this school were amply proved by our magnificent security record during World War II. Thanks largely to the FBI and its National Academy there was not a single major act of enemy-inspired sabotage, and crime was held down to a remarkably low level during that entire period.

Now we are again in a period of grave international tension, for Communist imperialism endangers the peace of the world and threatens our existence as a free nation. The fears and suspicions brought on by Soviet aggression will last for many years and, as public servants, we are acutely concerned over the dangers of espionage and subversion, engendered by that foreign-inspired aggression.

Accordingly, you and your fellow law-enforcement officers face a new period when your contributions will be of major importance in protecting our country. You gentlemen who are graduating are, indeeed, to be congratulated in preparing yourselves for the difficult times ahead.

As President Truman recently stated, "We face most acutely the threat of the Communist movement, international in scope, directed from a central source, and committed to the overthrow of democratic institutions throughout the world." While Mr. Hoover, the FBI, and others concerned with national security fully recognize the gravity of the menace confronting us, I would like to emphasize this morning some aspects of this menace which warrant special attention at this time.

The false, materialistic and godless ideology known as communism advocates and strives to effect a series of violent revolutions, designed to overthrow all non-Communist governments. Its success to date are well known to all, particularly are they well known to the distressed and suffering peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Albania, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and eastern Germany, all of whom have been enslaved by the proponents of this inhuman philosophy.

Just as this enslavement process was facilitated in those countries by Kremlin-directed agents of international communism, so also are Communist agents working in our midst today to bring about similar conditions in the United States.

While there is no possibility that communism will ever have any appeal to large numbers of our people, there are many thousands of party members in this country who comprise the hard core of the American Communist movement and who have sworn allegiance to their Soviet-controlled bosses.

There is no danger that these agents can deliver us into the hands of their masters in the Kremlin, but their very existence is a grave danger to our national security. These conspirators are prepared to serve the Kremlin by committing sabotage, espionage, and subversion whenever they receive orders to do so.

It is against these hard-core Communists that we must direct our efforts. It is against them that President Truman has directed the energetic action that has brought about the prosecution and conviction of many Communist agents as well as the assortment of atomic spies recently brought to account.

To deal with these subversives, strong laws have been on the statute books for some time. The President has from time to time recommended additional internal security legislation as needed. The Congress included most of the President's recommendations in the Internal Security Act of 1950, but the Congress also incorporated therein a number of provisions which were contrary to the President's recommendations.

The President felt impelled to veto the act as passed by the Congress because it contained a number of confused and unworkable provisions. Many of these provisions are so sweeping that they may affect not only the hard-core Communists, tens of thousands of persons who, whether knowingly or not, have at one time or another been associated with questionable organizations. Although passed over his veto, the President has directed the Department of Justice to enforce impartially, judiciously, and vigorously, the provisions of this act to the best of its ability.

It is fortunate that the American people are fully aroused to the sinister evils of communism, but we must watch our step in how we deal with it. The wave of anticommunism which is sweeping the country is not an unmixed blessing. It contains the seeds of danger. Unrestrained and indiscriminate anti-Communist activity can be just as dangerous to American institutions as Communist activity itself.

The problem we have with communism is not a new problem. The issue which communism presents to us as public servants is an old one—as old as the United States itself. The issue is simply this: How, in times of stress and danger, do we maintain the order and security we want without sacrificing personal liberty?

This is a profoundly important issue, and I believe it will help our thinking on the subject if we look back to the early days of our Nation.

Our ancestors fought the war for independence because the British Government was trying to tighten its grip on the Thirteen Colonies. It wanted more order, more security, and more control over the thoughts and acts of the colonists. British taxes, British soldiers, and British royal governors made the colonists so angry they declared their independence, and fought a lonely, bitter war for 5 years. We owe our freedom to this indignation which early Americans felt against the encroachment of government powers—including police powers—on their personal freedom.

When the Revolution ended in victory, the leaders of the Thirteen Colonies were so eager to enjoy their newly won independence that they forgot all about the necessity for a central government to provide order and security. They broke apart into 13 rival, jealous States.

All of us know the story. The Confederation went bankrupt. Riots broke out. Too much liberty proved to be worse than too much security.

Colonial leaders made a new start, drafted a new Constitution, and started a new government. This time, they established a strong central government to provide the order and security they had not had since the Revolution began. But because of their unhappy experience with the British, they were still afraid of a government which might unduly limit personal liberty. They wrote out a Bill of Rights for the new Constitution to safeguard the rights of every citizen.

That Bill of Rights has been the guardian of our personal liberties ever since. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights struck the perfect balance between security on the one hand, and liberty on the other.

Unfortunately for our record as a democracy, however, there have been a few occasions when an excited public opinion has forced the Government to take drastic action completely contrary to the spirit of the Bill of Rights. In 1798, for example, many Americans were alarmed by the excesses of the French Revolution. They were afraid that French agents in this country were endangering our independence.

Under the pressure of public opinion, Congress passed the alien and sedition laws. These laws were intended to protect the country from acts inspired by a radical foreign government, but they were so loosely drawn that they were used to put many law-abiding citizens in jail.

The alien and sedition laws were so contrary to the spirit of the Bill of Rights that a strong reaction set in against them. The anti-French hysteria passed and the offending laws were repealed.

That experience teaches us that we must always be on guard against those who are willing to undermine personal freedom in the name of national security.

I have cited these historical references so that we may all have in mind the fact that, while communism in its present form is a new and serious threat, the problem it raises for us as public officials is a very old one. In our determination to keep communism under control, we must never forget that extreme action on an indiscriminate basis may be as dangerous to our liberties as anything the Communists themselves could ever do in this country. We have no place in our country for vigilante activities.

As a matter of fact, American Communists would like nothing better than a wholesale outbreak of vigilante activities so that they might capitalize on the ensuing confusion. Should such an outbreak occur, I am sure that it would serve only to make martyrs of the Communists. They would take advantage of vigilantism by initiating a compaign of vituperation against all law enforcement.

I would not for a moment underestimate the seriousness of the Communist menace. I know from personal and long experience in dealing with Communist agents how clever and dangerous they can be. But, I am convinced that we are already meeting the challenge of communism in a sober and sensible way. I am convinced that we can control the problem. I am convinced also that there is no need for the American people to give way

to another wave of hysteria like those which have swept our country in the past.

My confidence is based on the soundness of the policies which the Nation is now following in dealing with communism.

We are attacking the Communist menace in three ways.

First, we are building up the strength of the free world. The greatest danger of communism comes from abroad. We hope the Communists will not start a third world war, but the invasion of the Republic of Korea demonstrates that Communist leaders are willing to use open warfare as well as internal subversion to extend their tyrannical control over other countries. Because of that danger, we are doubling the size of our Army, Navy, and Air force, and we are more than doubling our military aid to other free nations. We are building this military strength to convince the Communist leaders that they cannot afford to start another Korean episode.

Our second method of attacking communism is to continue improving our own democracy. We already have the richest, most productive economy the world has ever known, and we enjoy the world's highest standard of living. Americans own 85 percent of the world's automobiles. As a nation, we have more and better food than any other country. We have more schools and more hospitals. We have complete freedom of speech and of religious worship. But it would be foolish to pretend that we are perfect. Some poverty, slums, and misery still exist. These conditions aid the growth of communism, for Communist leaders make glittering promises to the under-privileged, who have no way of knowing that these promises are entirely false.

The best way to curb communism in the United States is to wipe out these conditions upon which it thrives by continuing to improve the health, welfare, and education of our under-privileged. If we maintain this progress in improving our democracy, communism will never have any appeal to the American people.

Our third method of attacking communism is by working, through our intelligence and law enforcement agencies, against those engaged in subversive activities. We must work calmly, without hysteria, and with the aid of a patriotic and fully-informed public.

While we have been building up our military strength and improving our democracy, we have been fully aware of the threat of Communist infiltration in this country. The Government has vigorously attacked Communists wherever and whenever their activities have been a genuine threat. The Government has carried on the fight against subversive activities with every law on the statute books.

No known instance of Communist subversion—or any other kind of subversion—has remained uninvestigated.

The Government has crippled the Politburo of the American Communist Party by prosecuting and convicting 11 of its top-ranking members.

The Government has successfully prosecuted many other persons for crimes related to communism.

The Government has also prosecuted and obtained convictions of a large number of alleged Communists on charges of contempt, for refusing to testify before congressional committees or Federal grand juries.

The Government is now investigating the cases of more than 1,000 citizens to determine whether their citizenship should be revoked on grounds involving subversive activities.

The Government has initiated deportation proceedings against numerous Communists and other subversive aliens.

The Federal employee loyalty program has protected the Government against subversive employees while, at the same time, it has fully protected the rights of each individual employee.

The Government has taken all these steps, and it will continue to act against Communist subversion, remaining always well within the framework of the Bill of Rights.

The Federal Government has been able to carry on its effective work against subversive activities, in large part because of the splendid cooperation it has received from State and local law enforcement officers.

It is obvious that subversive activities know no geographical boundary lines and that they must be dealt with on a Nation-wide basis, through the coordinated efforts of all lay-enforcement agencies. It is for that reason that President Roosevelt in 1939 designated the FBI to take charge of the Federal Government's antisubversive work. At the same time, the President requested that all State and local law-enforcement agencies cooperate and assist the FBI in this important effort.

President Truman has recently repeated this request, suggesting at the same time that all patriotic organizations and individuals report information relating to subversive activities to the FBI. The success of the FBI in keeping Communist activities at a minimum is a measure of the wholehearted cooperation and assistance which it has received in response to these requests from the White House.

Nevertheless, there is a danger that patriotic and public-spirited groups—and even some law-enforcement agencies—may forget that such matters are the responsibility of the Federal Government. The widespread public concern about communism must not result in the enactment by States or localities of unnecessary laws designed to suppress Communist activities regardless of whether or not they are subversive.

Such legislation as this would be ineffective and dangerous, and those who might sponsor it would be forgetting that such legislation is a direct infringement on the Bill of Rights. Breaking down the guaranties of the Bill of Rights in order to get at the Communists is a police-state way of doing business. If the Bill of Rights were to be broken down, all groups—even the most conservative—would be in danger from the arbitrary exercise of governmental powers.

As public servants, we are determined to protect our internal security. But in that determination we must never forget that the purpose of that security is to allow us to enjoy personal liberty.

As law-enforcement officers, you have especially great responsibilities in this regard. You must be vigilant in enforcing the laws which protect our citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights.

All of us who are public servants must do our best to prevent mob violence, and we must cherish and guard zealously the right of all Americans to vote, to speak freely, to worship freely, and to be tried fairly.

As public officials it is our duty to protect the innocent as much as it is to catch the guilty. Justice, and fair play for the weak, or for the victims of prejudice or suspicion, are as important to our democracy as prompt punishment for the guilty.

The public interest—which all of us are sworn to uphold—is not just the interest of our Nation, our State, or our community. It is first and foremost the interest of individual citizens.

It is this concern for the rights and the welfare of each American that distinguishes our democracy from Communist and other totalitarian states. It is this concern for the individual, as well as for our security, which must guide all law-enforcement officers in the United States. And it is this devotion to the rights of our citizens that will insure the ultimate triumph of democracy over communism.

As J. Edgar Hoover has said so well: "Law enforcement in America is inextricably linked with the democratic tradition which has given birth, guidance, and validity to the institutions of this Nation. Previous attacks on western society have been turned back. The challenge of communism, too, can and will be mastered, and in a democratic manner."

Broadcast by Alan Courtney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, recently a Florida radio commentator, Mr. Alan Courtney, broadcast over a Miami station a statement which had originally appeared in the New York Times on August 10, 1950. As the article concisely and effectively stated the crucial situation of the Korean war, I would like to have it reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

The people of the United States, looking on at this war that has begun in Korea, appear to view it with about equal parts of fury, incredulity, confusion, and frustration. It's a war we don't want and have tried in every way to avoid. Two World Wars would seem to be enough. Now we have a third.

But we do have it, and unless we win it we shall lose it—and if we lose it the earth including the United States, will be governed from Moscow. The worst thing we can do at this moment is to take it for granted that we shall win. We can win only if we use our heads and hold nothing back, for the Russians have the jump on us. They are so confident that they hope not to have to fight us at all, but to run us ragged with minor engagements fought by stooges all around their periphery till we are worn out and can put up only guerrilla resistance when taken over.

Part of our confusion and frustration are cause by the fact that we have never been in a war like this one. This is not the first time our forces have been mauled at the beginning, but it is the first time when our enemies looked forward with confidence to the long pull. If we let it go that way, this war may last the rest of our lives, even the lives of those who are young. Russia counts on growing constantly stronger during the next 30 years. If we are harried by minor campaigns all over the world our economy and our morale are going to be subjected to such strains as they have never known. We shall have to put on stringent controls and we are going to have to do without a lot of the things we've been used to if we're to produce the quantities of munitions and train the numbers of men needed for the almost predictable series of emergencies.

The action in Korea shows us what would happen to us in the Pacific if Russia were to send her own forces against us. We could not hold Korea, we could not hold Japan, we could not hold the Philippines, we probably could not hold Alaska, and perhaps not Hawaii. A recent discussion in the House of Commons exposed very frankly what would happen to Europe if Russia decided to march west. Eighty Russian divisions and 4,000 or 5,000 tanks are mobilized and ready. Nothing could stop them before they reached the English Channel. There is only one reason why Russia has not already annexed our Pacific holdings and western Europe. She is afraid that if she makes open war on us we will drop atomic bombs. And we probably would. The world has no other reply to the

enormous military machine Russia is holding over our heads.

There are many honest men who are wondering whether anything we could win by a war would be worth the immense and prolonged sacrifices a war will certainly demand of us. But one steady look at the Politburo makes it obvious to any American that he could not endure existence in that vast concentration camp which is Russia and her satellites. We know democracy is not perfect; it's only a political system which tries to give all its citizens a fair chance under rules of fair play. It's not perfect, but it's the best men have had so far and the Communist slave state is probably the worst. There are conditions under which life is not worth living, and those are the exact conditions now offered by Russia to the rest of the earth. Living in a democracy we are prejudiced against violence and try to avoid trouble when we can, but the men of violence are marching their slaves against us again. We cannot accept what they offer. Weary of war though we are, it's better to fight.

Ultimately we shall win. The atom bomb is still ours and is holding the Russians at their borders. Invention and thought, which are dead in Russia, are very much alive among us, and they will begin to find ways to defeat the massed power of slaves and steel. Every soldier in our armies is a potential leader, every working brain is a potential leader of thought. We shall fight our way out of this trap no matter how long it takes.

But from now on let us make no mistake about it—the war is on, the chips are down. Those among us who defend Russia or communism are enemies of freedom and traitors to the United Nations and the United States. American soldiers are dying in a battle against slavery, against Russia's attempt to enslave mankind. Every man's house will be in a target area before this thing ends whether we like it or not. The United Nations is on our side because Russia is at war with every nation that insists on being free. Fortunately President Truman has seen the Russian danger, and he knows as well as Churchill how boldly and rapidly we must act if we as a nation are to come out of this conflict alive. He will make very heavy demands on us, and very soon. He will have to make them, and we shall have to give everything we have to defend our liberty. Well, let us give it, and let us give ourselves, till Russia, too, has been taught that our free world is more than a match for the world of Genghis Khan.

American Legion National Executive Committee Cites Legionnaire Drew Pearson for His Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from the Drew Pearson broadcast of Sunday, October 8, at which time Mr. Pearson received a citation authorized by the national executive committee of the American Legion and presented by George N. Craig, national commander of the American Legion:

Commander CRAIG. I am delighted to be here and also to welcome fellow Legionnaire Drew Pearson. I only wish all of the folks listening could join us in Los Angeles. To you, Drew, I want to say that millions of Americans have come to admire your achievements as reporter and interpreter of the news, but the great work you have done through people-to-people relations—to make democracy live—is perhaps not so well known.

Last Christmas the American Legion tried a new pitch in that field. We asked boys and girls all over the country each to give one of their own Christmas toys for other children born in lands where Santa Claus is a casualty of war. That was the Tide of Toys—and the good people of the United States, young and old, responded so well that we were able to send 3,000,000 toys to a dozen different countries.

That program never would have started—much less succeeded—without the support and hard work of a man by the name of Drew Pearson. How we feel about your part in the Tide of Toys, Drew, is pretty well summed as in a citation authorized by our national executive committee. I know that Americans everywhere will share with me the privilege of presenting it to you at this time.

It reads as follows:

"In recognition of his bold and diligent efforts since the close of the Second World War to promote reciprocal understanding and good will between the people of the United States and those of western Europe;

"As manifested in particular by the sponsorship and delivery to France and Italy of the Friendship Train of food and clothing which contributed materially to a recession of Communist strength in those countries;

"And more recently by his extraordinary cooperation with the American Legion in the planning and execution of the Tide of Toys;

"The national executive committee of the American Legion commends the Honorable Drew Pearson on behalf of 4,000,000 Legionnaires and auxiliary members consecrated by common sacrifice in war and perpetual service in peace."

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD program No. 35 in the series of broadcasts which I have been making to the citizens of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 35)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you the thirty-fifth in the present series of discussions of happenings in Washington.

Now that the Eighty-first Congress has recessed until November 27, we have an opportunity to examine the record it established in its second session.

We can judge its accomplishments in the light of legislation that was enacted and also on the basis of administration proposals that were rejected.

First it should be remembered that the Eighty-first Congress is under Democratic control with substantial Democratic majorities in both Houses.

Under those circumstances it would be natural to expect that the program advanced by President Truman would have easy sailing.

Yet, on many domestic proposals which would transform the Federal Government into an all-powerful, centralized, socialistic state the administration ran into a blunt "No" from Congress.

It is fortunate for the future of our country that this Democratic Eighty-first Congress said "No" to the President just as decisively as did the Republican Eightieth Congress which preceded it.

In spite of the opposition to President Truman's domestic program there was almost unanimous support for every move planned for the national defense.

The Republicans in Congress joined with the Democrats in putting through every bill designed to strengthen our national defense and to build a barrier against the further spread of communism in western Europe and Asia.

In fact, a majority of the Members of the Eighty-first Congress was ahead of the President in recognizing the dangerous threat of Communist aggression. They appropriated funds and directed the President to establish a 58-group air force. But the President ordered it cut down to 42.

They appropriated millions of dollars to support the Nationalist Government in China and more millions for arms and equipment for the defense of the free Republic of South Korea. But millions of dollars, appropriated for these purposes, were deliberately withheld by order of the President and today we are paying a terrific price for these blundering violations of the will of Congress.

More than $30,0000,000,000 was appropriated for defense purposes for this fiscal year alone.

A defense production bill was enacted giving the President complete power to mobilize and control the Nation's economy during the war emergency.

Laws were enacted authorizing the unlimited expansion of the Military Establishment.

Billions of dollars were appropriated to rearm the friendly nations of western Europe and to strengthen their economic security.

Legislation was enacted, over the President's veto, to erect safeguards against the subversive activities of Communists within our own country.

Many other measures dealing with defense and internal security were passed by Congress on a nonpartisan, nonpolitical basis.

Now let us look at the domestic program recommended by President Truman.

In his campaign speeches the President told the people over and over again that if he were given a Democratic Congress the first order of business would be the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

Then would follow his program for socialized medicine, the Brannan plan for socializing agriculture, and Federal aid to education.

In his message to Congress at the opening of the second session in January President Truman again recommended that program.

This Congress, as I have pointed out, is strongly Democratic. No matter what the Republicans wanted to do, the Democrats had the votes to jam through the entire Truman Fair Deal program.

But Congress would not accept these seemingly attractive, but unsound proposals because they would sweep the country closer and closer toward the rocks of socialism. Yes; toward that all powerful, bureaucratic form of government which is the very essence of state socialism. They are the direct oppo-

site of the American system which elevates the dignity and the freedom of the individual rather than the supremacy of the state.

This was accomplished by the determined opposition of the Republican minority aided by sound Democrats who placed real Americanism above party lines.

Let us consider briefly the proposals which Congress refused to approve.

You remember, of course, that when the Eightieth Congress passed the Taft-Hartley law over Harry Truman's veto, it was denounced by administration spokesmen and some labor leaders as a "slave labor" law.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, this law has been in operation for 3 years and has been invoked by the President himself to meet emergencies which he could not handle otherwise.

Do you see American labor in shackles? Is there a single workingman in the entire country who is oppressed or enslaved by the Taft-Hartley law?

Has the right of labor to organize, to bargain collectively or to strike been taken away?

You know the answer. It is perfectly obvious in the higher wage scales that have been gained by organized labor since the Taft-Hartley law was passed and the new round of wage increases now under way.

Labor organizations today are stronger and richer than ever before and the individual member has greater freedom. The Taft-Hartley law is such a fair law that even this Democratic Congress refused to repeal it.

Let us turn now to some of the purely socialistic proposals—those which pretend to give to the people something for nothing.

Congress refused to approve socialized medicine for the American people. Under that scheme the Government would provide so-called free medical and dental care for all the people. The Government would pay the bill.

At first glance many people would wonder why anyone would oppose such a plan. But most Members of Congress and nearly all of the Nation's doctors and dentists were against it as well as millions of other Americans.

Why was there such strong opposition?

Well, of course the Government would tax the people to get the money to pay the doctors. So it wouldn't be free after all. And it would take an enormous army of payrollers to do the paperwork and keep the books and you would be taxed for that too.

The Government would have complete control over the medical and dental profession. They would all be working for the Government, wasting most of their time in the jungle of bureaucratic red tape.

The free choice of doctors and the personal relationship between physician and patient would be destroyed. The standards of medical practice would be lowered, just as they have been in England.

Next is the Brannan farm plan which this Congress could not stomach. It is a shrewd, insidious thing. It promises guaranteed high prices to the farmer, and at the same time, lower food prices to the consumers. That too sounds like utopia. Do you wonder why Congress said "No" to that?

Let me tell you why.

Under this system, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan admits, the farmer would usually get more for his product than the consumer paid for it. Who would pay the difference? The taxpayer, of course.

The consumer would pay the price of the food on the open market, plus the taxes necessary to cover the difference. But that's not all—the consumer would also be taxed to pay another army of snoopers, inspectors and bookkeepers to administer the program.

How much would this scheme cost? No one—not even Mr. Brannan—has the faintest idea. But the most objectionable feature is that the farmer would be completely robbed of his independence. He would be placed under the most rigid governmental controls and regulation.

In effect, an iron collar would be placed around his neck with a chain reaching to Washington. He would be told what to plant and how much. He, too, like the doctor under socialized medicine, would have to spend much of his time keeping records demanded by Government red tape.

Although Congress rejected this scheme, the administration has not abandoned it. It has never ceased selling the idea to our people as an easy way for the farmer to get higher prices and the consumer to pay less. It is pure socialism, contrary to the traditional freedom of the American farmer.

Federal aid to education is another proposal which seems to be desirable on its face. But that, too, was rejected by Congress because it would eventually give the Federal Government dictatorial power over educational policies which rightfully belong under local control.

Such power in the hands of an unscrupulous administration could be used to regiment the thinking of the youth of America, just as Hitler did in Germany and Stalin is doing today in Soviet Russia.

And again, the people would be taxed to pay for a program which in a few years would cost several billion dollars annually.

There are other proposals in this Fair Deal program.

But I want you to notice that everything in this category has three elements in common.

First, the Government promises something attractive to the people—free.

Second, to get it free, the people must pay heavier taxes.

Third, the Government would step in and clamp new controls over the freedom of the individual and how he earns his livelihood.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, beware of governments that come bearing gifts like that. There is danger ahead when the Government offers something for nothing.

Congress has beaten down a number of these propositions—but it is not the end. The people and Congress must be vigilant that the administration does not place these programs into effect by presenting them as defense measures.

Once the yoke is placed upon our necks it will be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to remove it.

On the credit side it is worthy of mention that a majority of the Republicans and Democrats alike supported legislation to increase social-security benefits and to expand its coverage, to liberalize the admission of displaced persons, and to raise the minimum wage. These were pledged by both political parties.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, let me offer a word of warning. With a Korean victory our people may be inclined to relax. Some may say we ought to water down our rearmament program and coast awhile.

I do hope you will not be misled by such easy, soft thinking. Korea is a tiny corner of the globe. Bloody as it is, what has happened there is not the main event.

Communist Russia has not been weakened. The fire of Russia's ambition for world conquest has not been quenched.

We are rearming ourselves, not against the Koreans, but to defend ourselves against Communist Russia and its satellites. We must not relax. We must prepare to defend freedom against any attack from the Godless forces which seek to enslave the world.

This broadcast brings to a conclusion the present series of my reports to the people of Pennsylvania on happenings in Washington.

At this time I wish to express my deep and sincere appreciation of the many helpful and encouraging letters I have received from all parts of the Commonwealth. Your comments and suggestions have been extremely valuable.

I hope you will continue to write to me. I particularly welcome any criticism or suggestions that will assist in making these broadcasts more interesting or of greater service to the people of Pennsylvania.

I extend my thanks also to the radio stations which have so generously made their facilities available to bring you these reports on the activities of Congress.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I hope to be with you again when Congress returns to Washington.

Thank you again for your attention.

"We Wisconsin Farmers Are Voting Republican—We Know That the Republican Party Has Supported the Wisconsin Dairyman—We're With You, Senator Wiley, in Your Fight for the Dairyman—We're Going To Reelect You Because We Know You Are the Farmer's Friend"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the last month, it has been my pleasure and privilege to visit practically all over wonderful Wisconsin. I have spoken to folks in the cities and in the country, at the street corners and out on the rural routes.

I have visited with farmers working in the fields and meadows and with merchants in the stores. I have talked over the problems which you, the people of Wisconsin face—problems of high prices, the problem of Korea, the problem of communism. I have asked you, the people, your reactions to the 1950 Wisconsin senatorial campaign.

I am tremendously grateful for the magnificent response which has come to me from all over our State as regards my personal campaign for reelection. Wherever I have gone, I have met grand folks who have pledged their complete support to me. They've said, in effect:

WHAT WISCONSIN FARMERS HAVE SAID

"We're with you, Senator WILEY, in your campaign for reelection. We know that you have fought the dairyman's fight in the United States Senate. We know that you have been on the job in Washington working for us, the people back home, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year. We know that you have been working night and day for our cause, that you have the experience and the know-how to help us in the Senate.

"We know that you are a farmer yourself; that for over 34 years you have owned and operated a dairy farm in Barron County, Wis.

"We know that you appreciate the importance of farm cooperatives because your own farm receives its electricity from an REA cooperative and sells its milk to a dairy cooperative.

"We know that it was your bill—the Wiley probutter bill—which was our foremost

weapon against the vicious oleomargarine lobby. We know that it was your bill—the Wiley bill—which was the spearhead of the St. Lawrence seaway fight. We know that bills introduced by our Senator WILEY have always been for the best interest of the family farmer.

"So we're with you and we're urging our friends to be with you in this campaign. We're telling them to be sure to vote on Tuesday, November 7, for Senator ALEX WILEY and for the rest of the fine Republican ticket headed by Walter Kohler, Jr., for governor."

Yes, these are the reactions of the farmers whom I have met and of folks in the cities, too. Many folks have said to me: "Senator, we may not agree with you 100 percent of the time. As a matter of fact, it is difficult for any two people to agree all of the time. But by and large we have agreed with you practically all of the time. By and large we know that you are in the right.

"We know that you are trying to do an honest, conscientious job for all the people and that it is what counts. You're a family man yourself. You've got four children and eight grandchildren. You want to keep America American and so do we."

Mr. President, these are the real sentiments which I have found in Wisconsin. I am not exaggerating them because I want to give an honest report of the convictions of these honest folks.

SENATOR WILEY'S FARM PROGRAM

As I visited these Wisconsin areas, I stated my program for Wisconsin farmers, and here it is:

1. St. Lawrence seaway: I will continue the fight (which I have waged ever since I came to the Senate) for enactment of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway bill.

2. Dairy income: I will continue the fight to assure an adequate income for our 175,000 Badger farmers, for their milk, butter, cheese, for their milk solids and ice cream.

3. Natural foods: I will do everything that is within my power to help increase consumption of body-building natural foods like milk, butter, and cheese rather than allow the synthetic lobby—the cottonseed and peanut-oil groups—to ruin the great dairy industry of America.

4. Cooperatives: I will battle against any effort made in the United States Congress to harm the great cooperative movement. I will fight for continued rural electrification, for adequate rural telephone funds, and for all other procooperative bills.

5. Taxes: I will try to ease the tax load on our citizens insofar as that can be done. In order to do so, I will seek to cut down on Federal waste and extravagance.

6. Health: I will do everything I can to help improve health standards in rural areas. This means more hospitals, more doctors, more health services for the farmer, for his wife and for his youngsters.

7. Education: I will do everything I can to help improve educational facilities in the rural areas.

8. Housing: I will seek to perfect the housing laws now on the statute books under which the farmer receives aid in the repair of his home and in construction of new farm buildings.

9. Preparedness: I will continue to strive for a well-armed, well-prepared America rather than have us helpless and defenseless as we were prior to the Korean attack. To be prepared at home means that we must have a strong, prosperous agriculture.

The farmers of Wisconsin know from my record that these planks in my platform are based not just on what I propose to do, but on what I have been doing ever since I came to Washington. In other words, the Democratic candidates have been making empty promises and never fulfilling them, whereas we Republicans have sought to actually help the farmer—by deeds, not mere words. Actions talk louder than a million words.

Let us recall these facts:

HOW REPUBLICANS HAVE HELPED FARMERS

It was Republican Congresses and Republican administrations which were responsible for—

The United States Department of Agriculture.

The United States Reclamation Bureau.

The United States Forest Service.

The Pure Food and Drug Act.

Federal regulation of oleomargarine.

Conservation of mineral resources.

Pro-cooperative legislation.

The agriculture credit law.

Establishment of the United States Dairy Bureau in the Department of Agriculture.

The Federal Farm Board to help sell farm commodities.

These are the facts of history. This is what the Republican Party has done in the past.

HOW DEMOCRATS STABBED FARMER IN BACK

On the other hand, what have the Democrats done for the farmer except hurt him? What have they done but stab him in the back?

Let us note these facts:

1. It was a Democratic President, a Democratic administration, and a Democratic Department of Agriculture which is responsible for the vicious new oleomargarine law. For 2½ weeks in January 1950 I battled against this law. But at last, after this bitter battle, the crucial Wiley probutter amendment was unfortunately defeated by the Democratic forces by a vote of 47 to 38.

2. It is a Democratic Congress and Democratic committee chairman from the South who are primarily responsible for the defeat of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway bill. This bill, if enacted, would tremendously help improve transportation of farm commodities, make transportation cheaper, easier, and faster.

3. It is a Democratic administration which has tried to lower farm supports. Republican Congressman REID MURRAY of Wisconsin and I have been battling to maintain adequate parity support, particularly for manufactured dairy products. But we have had to fight against the Democratic Secretary of Agriculture every inch of the way in order to help protect our dairymen. Note that point, my friends, against the Democratic Secretary of Agriculture.

RUINOUS STRIKES HAVE INCREASED

4. It is the Democratic Party which has been coddling the labor bosses in the big cities. The Democrats have been prodding and encouraging them to call needless strike after strike. What is the result? The result is that we farmers have had to pay constantly higher prices for the things we buy.

The result is, too, that the workers in the cities have lost countless paychecks through unnecessary strikes and that has cut down on purchasing power for farm goods. Don't forget those strikes, my friends—the railroad strikes, the coal strikes, the phone strikes, the steel strikes, the tractor strikes which paralyzed America, yes, the strikes in production of commercial fertilizer.

5. It is the Democrats, too, who have been coddling the Communists and Socialists for so many years. Every time you pick up a newspaper you see how friends of the Democrats in high office have been exposed as Red traitors.

How can the farmers vote for the Democratic Party which has shown that it is completely soft on the issue of communism? How can the farmers vote for a party which battled against the strong anti-Communist law which we just enacted over the President's veto? Farmers want to keep America American. They won't vote for a party that has coddled traitors.

6. It is the Democrats who have tried to cut the throats of farmers here at home by failing to protect the home market. Just look, for example, at the Wisconsin fur-farming industry. It has been practically bankrupted by the flood of incoming Russian furs. Just a few weeks ago I introduced the Wiley amendment to prevent this dumping of Russian furs on the market.

What happened? The Democrats as usual killed this proposal. Why? Because apparently they prefer the Russian fur farmer to make money while the American fur farmer starves. How then can Wisconsin farmers vote for a party which wants to sacrifice domestic producers for these foreign competitors? How can farmers vote for a party which encourages sales to a country which is helping Korean Reds kill our own boys?

These and other facts prove the point that I am making. The Republican Party is the friend of the Wisconsin farmer and always has been and always will be. But the Democratic Party, on the other hand, has proven itself to be the enemy of the Wisconsin farmer.

HOW DEMOCRATS BROKE THEIR PROMISE TO FARMERS

You will remember that in 1948 the Democrats promised to maintain farm income high. So many farmers unfortunately voted for the Democratic Party.

Well, what happened? As soon as the Democrats were elected to office, as soon as President Truman came into power once again, instead of being stabilized, farm income started to nosedive downward. The price of milk, butter, and cheese skidded. Wisconsin farmers lost tremendous income. Why? Because the Democrats broke their promise as usual. They completely violated their pledge.

The Wisconsin farmer will not forget this betrayal. He will not soon forget that the Democratic Party permitted the cutting of his income, that the Democratic Party passed the vicious oleomargarine law, that the Democratic Party has fought against the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

IT IS TO FARMERS' SELF-INTEREST TO VOTE REPUBLICAN

I know, therefore, that as Tuesday, November 7, approaches, our Wisconsin farmers will remember these facts. Why? Because it is to their own self-interest to do so. I know that I can count on Wisconsin farmers to go to the polls and vote Republican. They have loyally supported me in 1938 and 1944.

They know that they need a man of experience in Washington rather than a complete novice and amateur, who doesn't know his way in the complex affairs of our Nation's Capital. They know that on the farm, as well as in Washington, men of experience are desperately needed, especially in times of crisis.

Let me show you a typical wonderful letter which I've just received from a Badger farm group:

GENESEE DEPOT,
PURE MILK PRODUCTS LOCAL,
Burlington, Wis., September 13, 1950.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chippewa Falls, Wis.

DEAR SENATOR: We, as part of the great dairy industry, wish to thank you for your untiring efforts in our behalf.

We wish to point out to the entire State of Wisconsin that you represented every one of us. Every person in our State shares directly in the milk check the dairyman receives.

Senator WILEY, you have represented us well and we look forward to a continuance of this effort on behalf of our State, in the United States Senate for the next 6 years.

By unanimous vote the secretary was instructed to send this letter expressing our feelings to you.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE F. HAAS,
Secretary.

WISCONSIN'S PRESS ENDORSES SENATOR WILEY

That is but one of countless other gracious letters which I've received.

Now, what does Wisconsin's press think about my efforts for our farm people? Well, let's take a look. Here are a few quotations from Badger papers. They are tremendously heart-warming quotations. Now, folks, I'm not taking any bows. I'm not asking for any pats on the back. But I am sincerely appreciative of these warm, sincere comments in Wisconsin's press—both daily and weekly papers. Here are but a few:

"ALEX WILEY talks the farmers' language, because he knows farm problems from first hand. He fought the farmers' battles for manpower during the war when the farms were being stripped of all hands; he fought to assure foreign markets for farm produce. He fought against OPA rules that were damaging to the Wisconsin cheese industry."—Baldwin (Wis.) Bulletin.

"Senator WILEY—the man who works for his constituents, well known for making the interests of his constituents his first consideration, be it widows, orphans, farmers, small-business men, or veterans—he can be relied upon to do the things asked of him."—Palmyra (Wis.) Enterprise.

"Senator WILEY has proved his worth in the Senate. He serves Wisconsin well. More important, he serves the Nation as a leader in our National Legislature. He should be returned to the Senate."—Janesville (Wis.) Gazette.

"There is probably not a single home in the county that has not heard of the efforts this outstanding Senator has put forth to help the dairy farmers of Wisconsin. He had been a lawyer, businessman, and farmer, having successfully operated a dairy farm for some 30 years * * * in times of crisis we need men of experience in public office, not novices who would take years to find out what government is all about."—Shawano (Wis.) County Journal.

"He works hard. He personally reported out 205 bills last session—more than any other man in the House or Senate."—Washington, D. C., Times-Herald.

"It is well that Senator WILEY has so faithfully discharged the duties of his constituents and his country. Would that we had more people so diligently devoted to our way of life."—Brillion (Wis.) News.

"The necessity of returning Senator WILEY to Washington is as obvious as anything could be. Wisconsin and the Nation need WILEY in the position of leadership to which he has risen.

"The socialistic ventures of Government must be met with men of WILEY'S rank and stature in Washington."—La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune.

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY deserves to be congratulated on his alertness in protecting and advancing the interests of Wisconsin in Washington."—Clintonville (Wis.) Tribune-Gazette.

"We need men in Congress who will fight for dairying, and for that reason we need to send ALEXANDER WILEY back to Washington."—Hillsboro (Wis.) Sentry-Enterprise.

MY HEART AND SOUL ARE IN THIS JOB FOR YOU

These papers know that my heart and soul are in this job—for you our people.

They know that I have been battling against crime, that I have been battling for world peace; that I have been fighting against communism; that I have been seeking to maintain American prosperity rather than to allow us to fall into a depression.

But let the facts speak for themselves. Let Wisconsin farm organizations and farm newspapers tell the story far better than I can.

WHAT FARMERS HAVE WRITTEN ON BEHALF OF THEIR SENATOR

Here, then, are some other quotations from a few of the hundreds and thousands of messages from individual farmers, REA cooperatives, and newspapers that have come to me endorsing my reelection. I say to all of these folks: Thanks a million, friends. I am grateful, deeply grateful to you all.

From a co-op leader in Shawano, Wis.:

"I have just read your open letter to your friends in the cooperative movement and I wish to state that I hope they all read it.

"I am sure that we people in this organization have felt that you have been an outstanding supporter of cooperative legislation and an outstanding friend of all the dairy farmers of Wisconsin."

From an individual farmer on a rural route outside Ashland:

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am a farmer, have been all my life. * * * We think you are doing a good job at Washington. You did the best you could to keep the oleo tax from being repealed and so did our Congressman, but the CIO was too much for farmers to overcome. Wisconsin farmers will feel the blow."

From a farmer on a rural route outside Seymour, Wis.:

"We are a member of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture. And I have followed the daily papers and radio and no one could have done better in the oleo fight than you did and you sure never gave up, and when you return home you can face the people anywhere."

From a cheese marketing leader in Monroe, Wis.:

"I know you can help us as you have done so in the past. You spoke of the Senate passing the oleo bill, which I know was no fault of yours, as you did your part very well, but I think we as producers have neglected to do our part.

"But I hope that you will not be discouraged but will keep up the good work and when election time comes will do all that we can to see that you will continue to be our Senator from Wisconsin."

From a farmers' union official in northern Wisconsin:

"MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In behalf of the Douglas County Farmers Union I want to thank you for supporting the FHA appropriations and for having our recent correspondence entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

From an electric co-op official in Menomonie:

"I am sure you will do all you can to help us as you have always indicated that you are a strong supporter of the REA program.

"Thanks for copy of your statements headed 'WILEY Blasts Democrat Party Betrayal of Wisconsin Farmers.' Let me commend you for your fearless stand and your fine support of the cooperatives."

From a farmer and his wife in Jefferson, Wis.:

"My husband and I both would like to thank you for what you did to fight the oleomargarine bill. The farmer would be lost without someone to help us out like you did. After all, we have to sell our milk and butter or else we won't be able to live very long."

From a leader of a co-op creamery in Cumberland, Wis.:

"I've intended writing you for some time telling you that we appreciate the work you did in the fight against repeal of the yellow oleo law. Although we lost out and the repeal will be a black eye to the Middle West dairy States, you did your part."

CONCLUSION

Well, folks, thanks for your kind attention to this report.

Thanks, too, for your loyal help.

Please don't forget to go to the polls on Tuesday, November 7. Rain or shine, please exercise your great right to vote. Urge your friends and neighbors to do so also.

I earnestly urge you to vote for your country, to vote for your own self-interests.

Yes; vote Republican.

Vote for your senior Senator ALEXANDER WILEY. I urge that in all humility, in all modesty, in all gratitude.

Help me continue my fight in your behalf. My fight against communism, against crime, against corruption, against depression, against war; my fight for the dairy industry, for the St. Lawrence seaway, for peace, for prosperity, for freedom.

Vote for American-thinking Americans, not for Socialists, not for puppets of a few labor big shots who want to push our people around.

Vote for the Republican Party—the friend of freedom, the friend of the farmer, the wage earner, the man in the street.

Vote for the Republican Party which expanded the rural-electrification program in the Eightieth Congress to a greater extent than ever before in American history.

Vote for the Republican Party which was responsible for the first pro-cooperative legislation in our history.

Vote against the smear boys, the hate boys, the alien-minded radicals who want to sabotage this country from within.

Vote Republican.

Thanks to you folks from the bottom of my heart.

Legislative Record of the Second Session, Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the legislative record of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE SECOND SESSION, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The record of the Eighty-first Congress proves again there is a tremendous difference between a Congress with Democratic leadership and a Congress controlled by reactionary Republicans. The Republican leaders of the Eightieth Congress paid little attention to the needs of the American people.

In this Democratic Eighty-first Congress, the people came first.

The people asked for more homes—and the Congress passed a housing bill which set off the greatest building boom in American history.

The people asked for more social security—and the Congress added approximately 10,000,000 Americans to the social-security rolls and doubled the benefits.

The people asked for higher minimum wages—and the Congress lifted the wage floor from 40 to 75 cents an hour.

The people asked for rent control—and the Congress extended rent ceilings on a basis fair to tenants and landlords.

The people asked for the removal of the discriminatory provisions of our displaced persons law—and we liberalized that law.

The people asked for more trade with other countries around the earth—and the Congress restored the reciprocal trade program to the wise policy originally established by Cordell Hull and Franklin Roosevelt.

The people asked for improvements in our farm program—and the Congress passed a bill which gives us a more flexible system of farm

price supports. Reversing the policy of the Eightieth Congress, which had caused many farmers to suffer losses on their surplus crops because no storage bins were available, this Democratic Congress gave the Secretary of Agriculture the necessary funds to build more bins for our huge crops.

The people sought Federal aid to education, and the Senate passed a good bill, but it bogged down in a tragic controversy in the House of Representatives.

The people asked for action to stop the Communists at home and abroad, and the Congress acted by supporting the Federal loyalty program, and tightening all laws against spies and saboteurs.

More funds than ever before were appropriated for the FBI, and J. Edgar Hoover was given authority to hire thousands of new agents to continue his splendid work in protecting America from subversive groups.

There was enacted stringent and far-reaching legislation to control Communists and other subversive persons, requiring Communists to register and authorizing their detention in case of war, invasion, or insurrection.

In foreign affairs, the Congress continued the bipartisan foreign policy with the cooperation of Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG and other Republicans who agreed politics should not determine America's course in dealing with other nations at a time when the world faced a great crisis.

After the North Korean Communists invaded South Korea in one of the most savage, unprovoked attacks in the history of the world, the Congress strongly supported the action of President Truman when, at the call of the United Nations, he ordered American forces to Korea to aid in resisting the aggressors.

The Senate ratified the Atlantic Pact, linking America in a firm alliance with 11 other free nations.

The Senate approved the International Wheat Agreement to open guaranteed markets around the globe for many millions of bushels of American grain.

The Marshall plan was extended on the scale necessary for the continued economic recovery of our friends in western Europe.

The military-assistance program for the free nations was expanded to give the people in those countries the weapons they needed to defend themselves against the aggressive Communists.

In all these great achievements in foreign policy, the Democratic leaders were able to overcome the strenuous opposition of some Republican isolationists who wanted America to turn back from the path of world leadership, to reenter the turtle-shell existence of isolationism which existed in the twenties, and which permitted the rise of Hitler and Mussolini.

Both branches of Congress passed the Defense Production Act, giving the President power to set up priorities, to allocate scarce materials, to stabilize prices and wages, and to take other steps which might be necessary to mobilize our vast resources in the struggle against communism.

The Congress authorized a 70-group Air Force, removed the limitations on the size of our Army, and authorized the President to call the Reserves and the National Guard to active duty. The Selective Service Act was extended to enable the armed services to obtain all the manpower they required for the safety and security of America. The Congress voted allowances to dependents of men taken into military service, so the hardships their families would have to undergo could be substantially alleviated.

Approval was given to a bill to increase taxes on the incomes of corporations and individuals, to raise some of the revenue necessary to meet the costs of defense. The Congress took the first steps toward the creation of an excess-profits tax, to make sure no one would squeeze profits out of our mobilization for the fight to defeat communism.

In the first session of this Congress, Democratic leaders tried hard to repeal the repressive Taft-Hartley Act, because experience had demonstrated this law was not a fair one. The Lucas amendment to remove the injunction provision from the act failed by only one vote.

In both sessions, the Democratic leaders strove to obtain civil-rights legislation desired by millions of Americans. Efforts in the Senate were frustrated when a majority of the Republican Senators failed to back Vice President BARKLEY on a ruling which would have opened the way for consideration of civil rights bills.

This Congress expanded the REA and the soil-conservation programs which have helped our farm families to enjoy greater comfort and prosperity. Both Houses passed a rural telephone bill to make it possible for thousands of farm homes to be linked to our telephone networks. Many of these phones have already been installed in farmhouses across America.

This Congress approved 27 governmental reorganization plans submitted by the President on the basis of the Hoover Commission's proposals. These plans will save American taxpayers billions of dollars in the coming years. They represent the right kind of Government economy—sane and scientific economy, to improve and streamline the Federal services.

This Congress repealed the Federal tax on oleomargarine, making this nutritious product available at lower prices for millions of American families.

Measures for the unification of our Armed Forces were approved. The success of unification was proved under battle conditions in Korea, where the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force worked as one great team to achieve military miracles.

This Congress also established the National Science Foundation, for the purpose of conducting fundamental research in medicine and other fields of knowledge—to keep America in the forefront of world progress.

As the Eighty-first Congress neared the end of its work, the American people reached peaks of power and prosperity they had never attained before.

More than 62,000,000 people had good jobs at good wages.

More than 1,000,000 new homes were placed under construction in 1949 and again in 1950.

The production of new cars approached the rate of more than 7,000,000 cars a year.

The value of goods and services produced by the American people was running at the rate of $270,000,000,000 a year.

In two long and stormy sessions, the Democratic Eighty-first Congress has faced test after test, and responded to each challenge with courage and vision.

The Eighty-first Congress stayed on the job when the going was rough, and despite many obstructions has met most of the basic needs of the American people.

Following is a detailed summary of the major legislation considered by this Congress up to the time of the recess on September 23, 1950:

SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATION, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION (JANUARY 3 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 23, 1950)

Agriculture

House Joint Resolution 398: This resolution as adopted authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to correct certain inequities which have resulted from the application of cotton and peanut acreage allotments for the first time since the war. In some instances adjoining farms of the same size were given greatly different acreage allotments. This resolution authorized an increase in the 1950 national acreage allotments for cotton and peanuts and thereby made available additional acreage to assign to those farmers who, under the operation of the existing law, were assigned inadequate acreages.

This resolution prohibits price supports for the 1951 crop of potatoes unless marketing quotas are in force in respect to such potatoes.

Adopted by Senate February 27, 1950, by a vote of 53 to 24. Conference report adopted by the House March 22, 1950, by a vote of 197 to 156; adopted by the Senate March 23, 1950, by a vote of 37 to 33. (Public Law 471. Approved March 31, 1950.)

Commodity Credit Corporation

H. R. 6567: To increase by $2,000,000,000 the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

This act increases the borrowing authority of Commodity Credit Corporation from $4,750,000,000 to $6,750,000,000. The necessity for the increase is due to the greatly expanded operations of the farm price-support program. The act provides that the conditions under which this country could invoke import fees or quotas on agricultural commodities in order to prevent disruption of domestic farm programs shall be continued in any future international trade agreement.

Passed Senate June 6, 1950, by a vote of 46 to 5. Conference report adopted by the House June 21, 1950, by a vote of 166 to 84; adopted by the Senate June 26, 1950, by a vote of 36 to 35. (Public Law 579. Approved June 28, 1950.)

Rural Rehabilitation

S. 930: To provide for the liquidation of trust funds now held by the Secretary of Agriculture in the name of State Rural Rehabilitation Corporation.

This act provides for the liquidation of trust funds created under transfer agreements between State rural rehabilitation corporations and the Secretary of Agriculture. These corporations were organized in 1934–35 to assist the Federal and State Governments in the administration of funds provided by the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933. The funds would be returned to the State corporations upon application by the corporation. (Public Law 499. Approved May 3, 1950.)

Forest Service

H. R. 5839: This act makes a number of relatively minor changes in the laws relating to the Forest Service which will save the Government money through more effective and efficient use of existing appropriations. These changes include: Setting up advisory boards, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to grant 10-year grazing permits; and earmarking a certain proportion of grazing fees for revegetation, construction of range improvements, control of rodents, and destruction of poisonous plants on the range. (Public Law 478. Approved April 24, 1950.)

Agricultural Commodities—Marketing

H. R. 5511: This act amends the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act of 1930, to increase the license fee from $10 to $15 for commission merchants and dealers in perishable agricultural commodities. This increase will enable the act to again be largely self-supporting. The act has for 20 years aided in suppressing fraudulent and unfair practices in the marketing of fruits and vegetables in interstate or foreign commerce, and its activities have become an integral part of the marketing of fruit and vegetables. It has the unanimous support of both producers and handlers in the fruit and vegetable industry. (Public Law 554. Approved June 15, 1950.)

Rice Marketing Quotas

H. R. 7700: This act provides for a national reserve for adjustments of inadequate

farm-acreage allotments of not more than one-half of 1 percent of the national-acreage allotment for rice in 1950 and not more than 1 percent thereafter. The 1950 reserve will be in addition to the national allotment and cannot exceed 7,965 acres. After 1950, the reserve will be taken out of the national-acreage allotment. The act also exempts nonirrigated rice produced on farms of 3 acres or less and rice produced outside the continental United States from marketing quotas or acreage allotments. (Public Law 561. Approved June 16, 1950.)

Agricultural Loans

S. 2996: This act makes loans available, of the type formerly made by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, to the owners or operators of established farms in any area or region, upon their full personal liability with such security as may be determined by the Secretary. Loans cannot be made: 3 years after the enactment of this bill; in excess of $10,000 to any one borrower; which would increase the total indebtedness of any one borrower beyond $20,000; which would increase the aggregate principal amount of the loans outstanding at any one time to an amount exceeding $2,000,000. (Public Law 665. Approved August 5, 1950.)

Future Farmers of America, Inc.

S. 2868: This act extends the privileges of a congressional charter to the Future Farmers of America. The objects and purposes of the corporation are:

(1) To create, foster, and assist subsidiary chapters composed of students of vocational agriculture in public schools;

(2) To develop character, train for useful citizenship, foster patriotism, develop competent, aggressive rural, and agricultural leadership;

(3) To create and nurture a love of country life by encouraging members to improve the farm home and its surroundings; and

(4) To encourage the practice of thrift. (Public Law 740. Approved August 30, 1950.)

Cooperative Technical Assistance to Forest Landowners

H. R. 7155: This act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest landowners. Previous legislation restricted the forest management services assistance to farms. The nonfarm owners, who own almost as much forest land as farmers, are in equal need of such technical aid. This act will permit assistance to the nonfarm forest owners as well as to processors of forest products, such as sawmill owners. It is also specified that the new program will be carried out by the Secretary of Agriculture in such manner as to encourage the utilization of private consulting foresters. (Public Law 729. Approved August 25, 1950.)

Mineral Reserve Rights

H. R. 4800: This act establishes a nationally sound, equitable, and uniform policy for transferring Government-reserved mineral rights to those farmers who purchased lands prior to 1946 from the Resettlement Administration or the Farm Security Administration. This act will enable those farmers to obtain ownership of all minerals under their lands, and will place them in the same status as farmers who acquired lands after the passage of the 1946 act. The mineral rights are not to be given to the present landowners. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell these rights to the landowners upon receipt of written applications. In areas where it has been determined there is no active mineral development or leasing, a nominal sale price of $1 per application has been established; where there is active mineral development and leasing, the mineral interests will be sold at the fair market value as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture after appropriate appraisals have been made. (Public Law 760. Approved September 6, 1950.)

Soil Conservation Extension

S. 2636: This act extends the soil-conservation and domestic-allotment programs of 1936 for another 2 years. This legislation has enabled the Secretary of Agriculture to develop programs and make payments directly to the farmers for specific purposes. Increased needs for more production have given the farmers a greater incentive for an effective agricultural conservation program. (Public Law 817. Approved September 23, 1950.)

Soil Conservation Amendment

S. 2635: This bill amends the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by providing the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary power to set fair prices for conservation materials to be bought in whole or in part with Federal funds. Prior to the enactment of this amendment by the Senate the setting of fair prices was mandatory and, under this bill, the State committee could provide for the setting of fair prices where circumstances warranted or as an alternative, the credit value of the material or service only would be prescribed. This method would permit the farmer to take advantage of lower prices.

Passed Senate July 26, 1950. Pending in House Agriculture Committee.

Agriculture Program in the Virgin Islands

S. 2809: This bill is designed to provide, on a restricted scale, an agricultural program for the Virgin Islands. One of the foremost industries is agriculture and there are more than 55,000 acres of farm land in the Virgin Islands. This bill would provide assistance to the islands and the farmers, and looks toward the day when, as a result of increased agricultural production, the importation of food will be eliminated and deficit spending for the islands' economy can be substantially reduced or, perhaps, terminated.

Passed Senate July 26, 1950. Pending in House Agriculture Committee.

Appropriations

Public Law	Appropriation	Estimate	Amount approved	Savings
468	Urgent deficiency (first)	$830,911,600	$739,653,500.00	$91,257,100
585	Urgent deficiency (second)	611,500,130	653,761,608.40	
759	OMNIBUS BILL			
	District of Columbia	12,000,000	10,800,000.00	1,200,000
	Legislative	87,820,747	69,180,211.00	18,640,536
	State-Justice (total)	1,185,612,897	1,065,627,962.00	119,984,935
	State	230,077,397	206,062,297.00	24,015,100
	Justice	149,002,800	141,752,000.00	7,250,800
	Commerce	782,419,000	694,384,000.00	88,035,000
	Judiciary	24,113,700	23,429,665.00	684,035
	Treasury-Post Office (total)	2,813,379,100	2,757,846,000.00	55,533,100
	Treasury	577,686,100	550,346,000.00	27,340,100
	Post Office	2,235,693,000	2,207,500,000.00	28,193,000
	Labor-FSA (total)	2,463,008,500	2,272,428,614.00	190,579,886
	Labor	220,014,700	208,573,100.00	11,441,600
	Federal Security	1,636,019,600	1,593,081,090.00	42,938,510
	National Labor Relations Board	8,615,000	8,582,500.00	32,500
	National Mediation Board	1,359,500	1,359,500.00	
	Railroad Retirement	594,000,000	457,832,724.00	136,167,276
	Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	2,999,700	2,999,700.00	
	Agriculture (total)	810,626,946	773,208,924.00	37,418,022
	Research and Marketing	11,102,000	6,000,000.00	5,102,000
	Agricultural economics	6,293,400	5,504,000.00	789,400
	Agricultural Research Administration	76,567,008	73,825,358.00	2,741,650
	Control of forest pests	8,213,500	5,700,000.00	2,513,500
	Forest Service	68,749,300	61,415,000.00	7,334,300
	Flood control	11,700,000	10,315,000.00	1,385,000
	Soil Conservation Service	56,452,100	55,965,175.00	486,925
	Production and Marketing Administration	481,487,000	473,039,000.00	8,448,000
759	OMNIBUS BILL—continued			
	Agriculture—Continued			
	Commodity Exchange	$675,000	$650,000.00	$25,000
	Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	7,450,000	7,204,000.00	246,000
	REA	9,525,000	8,550,000.00	975,000
	Farmers' Home Administration	35,000,000	29,150,000.00	5,850,000
	Farm Credit Administration	592,000	585,000.00	7,000
	Extension Service	28,814,738	28,003,498.00	811,240
	Office of Secretary	2,275,300	2,161,300.00	114,000
	Office of Solicitor	3,070,000	2,562,500.00	507,500
	Foreign Agricultural Relations	623,400	600,000.00	23,400
	Office of Information	1,297,200	1,265,800.00	31,400
	Library	740,000	713,293.00	26,707
	Interior	674,971,505	620,396,325.00	54,575,180
	Independent offices	8,466,982,724	7,996,140,947.00	470,841,777
	Of this amount the VA figures were	6,007,615,000	5,807,685,000.00	199,930,000
	Civil functions	834,867,500	687,043,270.00	147,824,230
	National defense	13,376,865,000	13,294,299,443.00	82,565,557
	Foreign aid (total	4,855,073,729	4,387,373,729.00	467,700,000
	ECA	2,657,700,000	2,250,000,000.00	404,700,000
	Korea	100,000,000	90,000,000.00	10,000,000
	Interntinal Children's Fund	15,000,000	None	15,000,000
	International development (point 4)	26,900,000	26,900,000.00	
	Mutual defense	1,678,023,729	1,678,023,729.00	
	Government and relief in occupied areas	320,000,000	288,000,000.00	32,000,000
	Government in occupied areas in Germany	30,000,000	27,000,000.00	3,000,000
	Aid to Palestine refugees	27,450,000	27,450,000.00	
	Omnibus total	35,581,208,648	33,934,345,425.00	1,646,863,223
	Contract authority	2,261,149,500	2,170,145,000.00	−91,004,500
	Borrowing authority	610,000,000	599,000,000.00	−11,000,000
	Total	38,452,358,148	36,703,490,425.00	−1,748,867,723
	General reduction		−550,000,000.00	−550,000,000
	Net total	38,452,358,148	36,153,490,425.00	2,298,867,723

Approved Sept. 6, 1950.

Supplemental appropriations

Public Law	Appropriation	Estimate	Amount approved	Savings
843	District of Columbia [1]	$2,846,952	$2,122,954	−$723,998
	Legislative	480,910	304,510	−176,400
	State-Justice (total)	116,694,171	90,489,352	−26,204,819
	State	86,405,669	65,330,850	−21,074,819
	Justice	9,980,000	6,000,000	−3,980,000
	Commerce	20,308,502	19,158,502	−1,150,000
	Treasury Post Office (total)	53,647,700	50,306,700	−3,341,000
	Treasury	7,648,700	5,206,700	−2,442,000
	Post Office	45,999,000	45,100,000	−899,000
	Federal Security	185,707,300	136,306,000	−49,401,300
	School construction S. 2317—$25,000,000.			
	Agriculture	26,100,000	100,000	−26,000,000
	Interior	18,845,500	18,932,000	+86,500
	Independent offices	1,201,376,000	1,016,968,670	−184,407,330
	National Science Foundation—$225,000.			
	Civil functions	21,900,000	15,400,000	−6,500,000
	National defense	11,642,906,000	11,736,094,000	+93,188,000
	Foreign aid—mutual defense program	4,000,000,000	4,000,000,000	
	Claims and judgments	$35,001,053	$35,001,053	
	Total appropriations	17,302,658,634	17,099,902,285	−$202,756,349
	Contract authority:			
	FSA—Office of Education: Grants for survey and school construction		25,000,000	
	Department of Air Force: Air engineering development center		32,500,000	
	Total contract		57,500,000	
	Loan authorization: Farmers' Home Administration		18,000,000	
	Total loan and contract authorization		75,500,000	

[1] District of Columbia appropriations not included in totals.

Approved Sept. 27, 1950.

Civil rights

Equality for Women

Senate Joint Resolution 25: To amend the Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women yet safeguard all special legal protection. The resolution must win a two-thirds vote in the House and then be approved by 36 of the 48 States within 7 years to become a part of the Constitution. This article would take effect 1 year after date of ratification.

Senate vote 63 to 19, January 25, 1950. Now pending before a subcommittee of House Judiciary Committee.

Puerto Rico—Government

S. 3336: This act provides that the people of Puerto Rico, through referendum, may call a constitutional convention at which they may form a constitution in accordance with the laws of Puerto Rico. The provisions to be submitted to Congress for its approval and, upon approval by the Congress, the constitution shall become effective in accordance with its terms. (Public Law 600. Approved July 3, 1950.)

Civil Government for Guam

H. R. 7273: This act provides a civil government for the first time in the 52 years since Guam came under the American flag by virtue of the Treaty of Paris at the end of the Spanish-American War in 1898. Up to the present time all the powers of government have been exercised under two Presidential Executive orders, issued by President McKinley in 1898 and by President Truman in 1949. This act permits the people of Guam to govern themselves instead of being governed by the executive branch. It establishes democratic local government for the island under the authority of the Congress, and American citizenship will be conferred upon the approximately 27,000 native Guamanians. A bill of rights is provided; a representative local government formed in the American tradition and an independent judiciary will be created to mete out justice in the true American manner. (Public Law 630. Approved August 1, 1950.)

Fair Employment Practice Commission

H. R. 4453: This bill passed the House on February 23, 1950, and was immediately placed on the Senate Calendar. On October 17, 1949, just 2 days before the close of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported, without recommendation, a similar bill, S. 1728, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

On May 8, 1950, the Senate began consideration on the motion of Senator LUCAS to take up the FEPC bill. Debate on the motion continued until Friday, May 19, when the petition filed by Senator LUCAS to close the debate upon the motion to take up the bill was defeated by a vote of 52 yeas to 32 nays. (Two-thirds majority or 64 votes is required to invoke cloture.)

Again on July 10, 1950, Senator LUCAS made a motion to take up S. 1728 and filed a petition to invoke the cloture rule on that motion. The petition was defeated by a vote of 55 yeas to 33 nays—two-thirds needed to carry. The motion was withdrawn.

Last year an attempt was made to improve the rule for limitation of debate in order to clear the way for legislation in the field of civil rights. Following a 3-weeks debate, the majority of the Republicans joined with other Senators and succeeded in securing Senate approval of an amendment sponsored by the Republican floor leader which requires that two-thirds of the entire Senate membership, or 64, must agree to cut off debate upon any motion to take up a measure. If and when cloture could be obtained upon a motion to take up the measure, it then becomes necessary to obtain the constitutional majority of 64 votes to take up the measure for consideration. It should also be pointed out that on any attempt to change this rule, petition for cloture does not apply on the motion to proceed to the consideration of the changing of the rule.

Antipoll Tax

H. R. 3199: On July 26, 1949, the House voted to remove payment of poll tax as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries. This bill, together with Senate bill 1727, is still pending before a 3-man subcommittee, comprised of Senators STENNIS (Mississippi), WITHERS (Kentucky), and WHERRY (Nebraska), in the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Economic stabilization

H. R. 6743: Amendments to Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and title IV of the National Housing Act.

This act increases the amount of individual accounts that may be insured in savings and loan associations from $5,000 to $10,0000 and provides for an orderly retirement of the capital stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation which is now held by the Secretary of the Treasury. An additional $1,000,000,000 financing is granted the home loan banks, which will materially aid the financing and building of homes. (Public Law 576. Approved June 27, 1950.)

National Rent Control

S. 3181: This act extends rent control until December 31, 1950, and permits cities to continue the controls until June 30, 1951, if they so desire. Controls on permanent accommodations in Chicago transient hotels were retained. Counties were given the right to remove controls before December 31. Cities and towns already have that authority.

Passed Senate 36 to 28, June 12, 1950; passed House 202 to 163. House adopted conference report June 21, 1950, 174 to 166. Senate adopted conference report June 21, 1950, 40 to 24. (Public Law 574. Approved June 23, 1950.)

Abacá Production Act of 1950

S. 3520: During World War II there was a critical shortage of the raw material going into the production of cordage. The Philippine Islands, the principal supplier of Manila fiber, was cut off by the Japanese invasion. It, therefore, became necessary to establish in the Western Hemisphere plantations for the production of abacá (manila fiber). At the present time there are approximately 25,000 acres under cultivation in Central America. This act permits the expansion of acreage for cultivation to approximately 50,000 acres in order that the stockpile of this critical material may be kept at the levels considered necessary for any future emergency. (Public Law 683. Approved August 10, 1950.)

District Rent Control

S. 3776: Rent control in the District of Columbia will be continued through January 31, 1951, and thereafter it may be continued for 5 months upon the passage of a joint resolution by the Congress.

Conference report adopted by the Senate June 29, 1950, by a vote of 45 to 23. (Public Law 592. Approved June 30, 1950.)

National Banks

H. R. 1161: This act provides for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks. It places national banks on a more equal basis with State banks with respect to transferring from one banking system (State or National) to the other, by way of conversion, merger, or consolidation. Heretofore, a State bank could convert into, or consolidate with a national bank by obtaining the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency unless forbidden by the State law in which it is located. A national bank, however, had no statutory right to convert into a State bank, or to consolidate with a State bank under the latter's charter. This act provides such a statutory right without the

approval of the Comptroller of the Currency if under the law of the State in which the national bank is located, a State bank may, without the approval of any State authority, convert into or merge or consolidate with a national bank in accordance with Federal law. (Public Law 706. Approved August 17, 1950.)

Import Controls

S. 3550: Authority to exercise import controls on certain products. This act extends import-control authority over fats, oils, rice, and rice products for a 1-year period from June 30, 1950, and adds certain provisions to the law which are intended to mesh the exercise of authority over import controls with the obligations of the United States as a party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, adopted at the conclusion of the second session of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment executed at Geneva, Switzerland, on October 30, 1947. (Public Law 590, Approved June 30, 1950.)

Federal Deposit Insurance Act

S. 2822: This act increases the maximum insurable deposit from $5,000 to $10,000 on individual accounts in FDIC banks, and reduce assessments under a new refund credit system. This change would increase insurance coverage from 96 percent to 98.4 percent of all accounts in insured banks, and from 44.8 percent to 52.4 percent of total deposits in insured banks. The act also provides for the FDIC to pay back to member banks up to 60 percent of the insurance premiums they pay each year. The act also gives FDIC special examiners the right to inspect member banks which are not under the Federal Reserve System. (Public Law 797. Approved September 22, 1950.)

Federal Reserve Banks

S. 3527: This act extends the authority of the Federal Reserve System to purchase up to $5,000,000,000 worth of obligations from the United States Treasury under the open-market program for 2 years dating from June 30, 1950.

This direct-purchase authority is a useful mechanism whereby the Treasury Department of the Federal Reserve System can coordinate financing requirements of the Treasury with the requirements of the Federal Reserve System in regulating bank reserves in the money market. This authority provides an aid in stabilizing the securities and money markets without which the Treasury would feel obligated to carry larger cash balances, a procedure which would increase interest costs to the Government. (Public Law 589. Approved June 30, 1950.)

Small Business

Senate Resolution 58: This resolution provides a permanent select committee on small business consisting of 13 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate at the beginning of each Congress to make investigations on small-business problems. The present members are: SPARKMAN, MCFARLAND, O'CONOR, LONG, GILLETTE, HUMPHREY, HUNT, BENTON, TOBEY, SALTONSTALL, THYE, HENDRICKSON, and SCHOEPPEL.

Adopted by Senate February 20, 1950, by a vote of 55 to 27.

Business Information

S. 868: This act establishes a clearinghouse in the Department of Commerce for the dissemination of technological information obtained from foreign and domestic sources which would be of value to American industry, particularly small businesses which have limited research facilities and technical staffs, and provide a needed reference source of technical information for the benefit of all American business. (Public Law 776. Approved September 9, 1950.)

Health

Physically Handicapped

S. 4051: This bill provides for an extension of the program for the vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped. Prior to the passage of this bill, the program cared for only about 55,000 persons and each year there are approximately a quarter of a million persons newly disabled who need rehabilitating.

This bill authorizes State agencies to institute new services, and provides Federal grants-in-aid for such services. For the first time, it brings Federal funds to the support of the program for the blind.

Passed Senate September 13, 1950. Pending in House Committee on Education and Labor.

Housing

S. 2246: This act expands and supplements existing Federal housing legislation and serves the following broad purposes:

1. It continues Federal assistance to private housing production but on the basis that will stimulate production at lower cost and larger size to meet the needs for larger families which prior legislation has failed to do.

2. Establishes an orderly and feasible policy for the further use and disposal of federally owned war housing.

3. Makes home loans to veterans more widely effective and more widely available by broadening the base for GI guaranties and by enabling the Government to make such loans if they cannot be obtained from private sources.

4. Makes Federal loans available for housing at educational institutions.

In addition to the above, the act continues other aid currently in effect including FHA insurance on a more liberal basis and other phases of the housing program now in effect. (Public Law 475. Approved April 20, 1950.)

Housing—Military Installations

H. R. 7846: This act amends Public Law 211, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which provided special FHA mortgage insurance and other incentives for the construction by private enterprise of housing on military installations.

The program has been delayed because it was found impractical to operate under the law where the builder or bidder himself is required to submit plans for proposed houses. This act requires the Secretary of Defense to decide on the type housing needed, and then permit the prospective builders to bid competitively on that basis. (Public Law 498. Approved May 2, 1950.)

Slum Clearance

S. 3635: This act enables the governments of Alaska, of Hawaii, of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands to authorize slum clearance, urban redevelopment, and low-rent housing activities and will overcome a number of technical obstacles which have prevented or impeded participation in the Housing Act of 1949. (Public Law 615. Approved July 18, 1950.)

International relations

ECA

H. R. 7797: To amend the ECA Act of 1948, as amended.

This act extends Economic Cooperation Act until June 30, 1951, and authorizes the following funds for economic aid abroad:

ECA (includes $150,000,000 reappropriated funds)	$2,849,100,000
Additional authorization for investment guarantees in ECA	50,000,000
Palestine refugees	27,450,000
Point 4—technical assistance plus $10,000,000 already allocated under Smith-Mundt bill to South and Central America	25,00,000
Korea	$100,000,000
China—reappropriated funds	94,000,000
Children's emergency fund	15,000,000
Total	3,160,550,000

Passed House March 31, 1950, 287 to 86; passed Senate 60 to 8.

House adopted conference report 247 to 88; Senate adopted 47 to 27. (Public Law 535. Approved June 5, 1950.)

Mutual Defense Program

S. 3809: To amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949.

This act extends the mutual defense assistance program and authorizes $1,222,500,000; $1,000,000,000 for North Atlantic Treaty countries, making available to them production equipment as well as machine tools; $131,500,000 for Greece, Turkey, and Iran; $16,000,000 for Korea and Philippines; $75,000,000 for area of China. Additional $250,000,000 worth of surplus materials authorized. President can use up to 10 percent of total provided for in the act for any other country than those mentioned. The President is required to terminate assistance to any country that is not making its full contribution toward defense.

The Congress considered this measure after the outbreak of the war in Korea. Passed Senate June 30, 1950, by a vote of 66 to 0. Passed House 362 to 1. (Public Law 621. Approved July 26, 1950.)

Far Eastern Economic Assistance

S. 2319: This act extends an existing authorization of assistance to areas of China not under Communist forces. Of the $104,000,000 now unobligated, the Administration expects to obligate $10,500,000 of this amount between February 15 and June 30, 1950; authorizes the expenditure of $60,000,000 to aid Korea from February 15 to June 30, 1950, but terminates this aid to Korea should a coalition government be formed including one or more members of the Communist Party or the present government now in control of northern Korea. (Public Law 447. Approved February 14, 1950.)

International Claims Settlement Act

H. R. 4406: This act creates in the Department of State a three-person commission—International Claims Commission of the United States—to handle nationalization claims for nonenemy countries. It establishes the procedures and provides the mechanism to apportion the money received by the United States among the claimants in accordance with the agreement between the United States Government and the Government in Yugoslavia on July 19, 1948. (Public Law 455. Approved March 10, 1950.)

Liberalize the Displaced Persons Act

H. R. 4567: This act changes the cut-off date from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949, and extends the act itself to June 30, 1951; increases the number of admissible aliens from 205,000 to 341,000 displaced persons, 5,000 nonquota war orphans and 54,744 expellees over a 3-year period beginning July 1, 1948; provides funds for transportation; eliminates the requirements that 40 percent of the displaced persons be from the Baltic States and that 30 percent be farmers.

Passed Senate April 5, 1950, by a vote of 58 to 14. (Public Law 555. Approved June 16, 1950.)

Posthumous Decorations

Senate Joint Resolution 166: This resolution, introduced by Senator LUCAS, authorized an appropriate decoration posthumously to crew members of the Navy Privateer who lost their lives in or over the Baltic Sea on April 8, 1950.

Adopted unanimously in both the Senate and House. (Public Law 476. Approved April 24, 1950.)

International Organizations

House Joint Resolution 334: This resolution raises the statutory limitations imposed on the financial contributions of the United States to five international organizations of which the United States is a member. (Public Law 806. Approved September 21, 1950.)

Treaties—Ireland

Executive H, Eighty-first Congress, second session: A treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on January 21, 1950. (Ratified July 6, 1950.)

Niagara River

Executive N, Eighty-first Congress, second session: On August 9, 1950, the Senate ratified the treaty between the United States of America and Canada concerning the uses of the waters of the Niagara River, signed at Washington, February 27, 1950, with the following reservations: "The United States on its part expressly reserves the right to provide by act of Congress for redevelopment, for the public use and benefit, of the United States share of the waters of the Niagara River made available by the provisions of the treaty, and no project for redevelopment of the United States share of such waters shall be undertaken until it be specifically authorized by act of Congress."

Telegraph regulations

Executive J, Eighty-first Congress, second session: On August 9, 1950, the Senate ratified Executive J, the telegraph regulations (Paris revision, 1949) annexed to the international telecommunications convention (Atlantic City, 1947), and the final protocol to those regulations, signed at Paris on August 5, 1949, subject to certain reservations and declarations.

Road traffic

Executive O, Eighty-first Congress, second session: On August 9, 1950, the Senate ratified the convention on road traffic, which was open for signature from September 19 until December 31, 1949, and during that period was signed on behalf of the United States of America and 20 other states, with a related protocol, concerning occupied countries or territories, which was open for signature at the same time as the convention.

Extradition

Executive K, Eightieth Congress, second session: On August 15, 1950, the Senate ratified a treaty of extradition between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa, signed at Washington on December 18, 1947.

Sugar

Executive G, Eighty-first Congress, second session: Protocol dated in London on August 31, 1949, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1949, the international agreement regarding the regulation of the production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937. (Ratified on July 6, 1950.)

Fishing vessels

Executive M, Eighty-first Congress, second session: Convention between the United States and Canada for the extension of port privileges to halibut fishing vessels on the Pacific coasts of the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa on March 24, 1950. (Ratified June 27, 1950.)

Uruguay

Executive D, Eighty-first Congress, second session: The Senate, on August 9, 1950, ratified a treaty of friendship, commerce, and economic development between the United States of America and the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, signed at Montevideo on November 23, 1949.

Iranian Students—Funds

H. R. 5731: This act provides the Comptroller General with the authorization to discharge a fiduciary obligation which the United States has borne since 1925, when it accepted from the Iranian Government a sum of $110,000, to apply as a fund for the education of Iranian students in the United States. Tentative plans in the Department of State call for 24 Iranian students to come to the United States to study at the rate of 8 each year for 3 years, probably in the fields of medicine, public health, and agriculture. (Public Law 861. Approved September 29, 1950.)

Enemy Property

House Joint Resolution 516: This resolution authorizes the President to make agreements with certain foreign governments for the purpose of speeding up the settlement of intergovernmental disagreements as to the disposition of certain properties of the governments, or nationals thereof, with which the United States was at war. (Public Law 857. Approved September 28, 1950.)

National defense and internal security

Defense Production Act of 1950

H. R. 9176: This act, which was prompted by the Communist aggression in Korea, is designed to develop our military and economic strength by preventing any undue strains on our civilian economy and our system of competitive enterprise.

This act grants to the President stand-by and discretionary authority to invoke the following if and when he deems it advisable in the public and national interests.

1. Establish priorities and allocate materials and facilities.
2. Requisition equipment, supplies, materials and facilities.
3. Expand our present productive capacity.
4. Establish price and wage stabilization.
5. Settle labor disputes.
6. Regulate consumer credit and real estate construction.
7. Encourage small-business enterprises.

This act will terminate June 30, 1951—contract authorizations June 30, 1952. (Public Law 774. Approved September 8, 1950.)

Selective Service

H. R. 6826: Extends the Selective Service Act of 1948 for 1 year or until July 9, 1951. This extension continues the President's authority to induct. The President is authorized to order into active military or naval service of the United States for a period of not to exceed 21 consecutive months, with or without their consent, any or all Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States and retired personnel of the Regular Armed Forces. Under the extension the President can either induct first or order in the Reserves and National Guard, but cannot exceed the manpower strength of 2,005,882.

House adopted conference report June 27, 1950, 315 to 4. Senate adopted conference report June 28, 1950, 76 to 0. (Public Law 599. Approved June 30, 1950.)

Extend Enlistments

S. 3937: This act authorizes an extension of enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of not to exceed 12 months, or until July 9, 1951.

The Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps are made up almost entirely of volunteers. These volunteers enlist for a specific period and, unless authorized otherwise by the Congress, when this period of service expires the individuals are entitled to return to a civilian status. The international situation makes it essential that a procedure on extension be authorized by the Congress which permits the President to defer the discharge of these well-trained men to assist in the expansion of our armed services. (Public Law 624. Approved July 27, 1950.)

Armed Forces—Personnel Strength

H. R. 9178: This act suspends the present restrictions on the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces as provided for in the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended in Public Law 599. The suspension of the statutory ceilings which provided for an over-all active-duty strength of 2,005,882, exclusive of 1-year enlistees, will permit an expansion to any strength for which appropriations are authorized. Because of security reasons, it is not possible to report the size to which it is contemplated that the Armed Forces will be enlarged. (Public Law 655. Approved August 3, 1950.)

One-Year Enlistments

S. 4027: This act suspends until July 9, 1951, the provisions of section 4 (g) of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, permitting enlistments for more than 1 year and permitting enlistees to be sent outside the United States.

Passed Senate August 15, 1950; referred to House Armed Services.

Doctor-Dentist Draft

S. 4029: This act is an amendment to Public Law 599, the Selective Service Act of 1943, as amended, and provides for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories to support the expanding forces without requiring the large-scale call to active duty, without their consent, of Reserve officers who have had substantial periods of service in World War II. (Public Law 779. Approved September 9, 1950.)

Servicemen's Family Allowances

S. 4071: The Communist aggression in Korea has prompted an extensive expansion in the Armed Forces. National Guard and reservists are being ordered to active duty and thousands of men are being mobilized under the provisions of the Selective Service Act. It has been a traditional policy of our Government to provide allowances for the dependencies of our Armed Forces during periods of mobilization. This act provides:

Grade	Dependents			Allotment contribution
	1	2	Over 2	
Private	$45	$67.50	$85	$40
Private first class	45	67.50	85	40
Corporal	45	67.50	85	40
Sergeant		67.50	85	60
Staff sergeant		67.50	85	60
Technical sergeant		67.50	85	80
Master sergeant		67.50	85	80

Public Law 771. Approved Sept. 8, 1950.

Free Postage in Specified Areas

S. 3876: This act provides that any first-class letter mail sent by a member of the Armed Forces, while on active duty or in the active service in Korea and such other areas as the President may designate as combat zones or theaters of military operations, to any person in the United States including the Territories and possessions shall be transmitted free of postage. This practice is to be continued through June 30, 1951, unless terminated earlier. (Public Law 609. Approved July 12, 1950.)

Modern Naval Vessels

H. R. 7764: Prior to and during World War II the Navy designed and developed ships of numerous types. During the war the Navy displayed tremendous progress in both equipment and tactics. This progress was high-lighted by the development of the carrier task force which, together with the amphibious forces developed during the period, successfully carried on operations against the enemy. Since the end of hostilities there has been little or no construction or conversion of vessels. This act enables the Navy to initiate a modernization program through the construction of new prototype vessels and the conversion of other vessels. The total new construction authorized is approximately 50,000 tons and the

conversion will cover approximately 200,000 tons of ships. This program is not intended, in any way, to affect the supercarrier program. (Public Law 674. Approved August 8, 1950.)

Ships' Security

S. 3859: This act authorizes the President to establish such measures and issue such rules and regulations to control the anchorage and movement of foreign-flag vessels in waters of the United States when the national security is endangered. The President is also given the power to safeguard against destruction, loss, or injury from sabotage or other subversive elements and permits the United States to put in protective measures short of the declaration of a national emergency. Such protection is extended to the Canal Zone and all territory and water, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. (Public Law 679. Approved August 9, 1950.)

Civil Defense

H. R. 8909: This act establishes an Office of Civil Defense in the District of Columbia, headed by a Director of Civil Defense, to be appointed by and responsible to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The Office will prepare a comprehensive plan for civil defense integrated with the plans of the Federal Government and adjoining States and communities; organize, equip, and train civil defense units; and prepare public information programs. (Public Law 686. Approved August 11, 1950.)

Rubber Act Extension

H. R. 7579: This act provides for the continuation of the present program for 2 years, or until June 30, 1952. The necessity for this extension is due to the increased need for rubber and the fact that our continuing supply of natural rubber is critical. This placed upon Congress the responsibility for guaranteeing an uninterrupted production of ample quantities of synthetic rubber. (Public Law 575. Approved June 24, 1950.)

Tin-Smelting Industry

S. 3666: This act extends for 5 years, or until June 30, 1956, the present authority to maintain a domestic tin-smelting industry in the interest of national security.

The present law, which will remain unchanged, authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (1) to buy, sell, and transport tin, tin ore, and tin concentrates; (2) to improve, develop, maintain, and operate by lease or otherwise the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.; and (3) to finance research in tin smelting and processing. (Public Law 723. Approved August 21, 1950.)

Internal Security Act of 1950

H. R. 9490: The purpose of this act is to protect this Nation against Communist aggression and subversion which might threaten our constitutional liberties. The major features are:

1. The internment of dangerous Reds in time of war, invasion, or insurrection.

2. The strengthening of our espionage and sabotage laws.

3. Barring Reds from Government jobs, from work in defense plants, and from obtaining passports. This provision coincides with the Executive order of the President setting up a Loyalty Board which has the power to remove persons who are disloyal to the Government.

4. Revision of immigration laws making possible exclusion of dangerous aliens and deportation of aliens proven to be subversive.

5. The registration of Communist and Communist-front organizations with certain restrictions applicable to registered organizations and members.

6. Outlawing conspiracies to set up a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States.

7. Outlawing picketing or parading near Federal courts.

Passed Senate September 12, 1950, by a vote of 70 to 7.

Senate adopted conference report by a vote of 51 to 7.

House adopted conference report by a vote of 313 to 20.

Veto overridden in Senate September 23 by a vote 57 to 10.

Veto overridden in House September 22, 1950, by a vote of 286 to 48. (Public Law 831. Approved September 23, 1950.)

Coast Guard

S. 4136: This measure is designed to include the Coast Guard in the provisions of the Selective Service Act, to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the Coast Guard and to order members of the Coast Guard Reserve and retired Coast Guard personnel into active duty for a period not to exceed 21 months.

This legislation will implement the Ships' Security Act regarding the control over the anchorage and movement of foreign-flag vessels in waters of the United States. (Public Law 850. Approved September 27, 1950.)

Air Engineering Development

S. 4118: The purpose of this act is to increase the appropriation authorization for the establishment, initial construction, installation, and equipment of the Air Engineering Development Center from $100,000,000 to $157,500,000.

This center will provide facilities to conduct research and development, including the construction and operation of wind tunnels, and for the development and testing of matériel and equipment essential to national defense. (Public Law 799. Approved September 21, 1950.)

National Defense Facilities Act of 1950

H. R. 8594: This act provides for the construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, and joint utilization of buildings, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States. World War II proved conclusively that a most important part of our military strength lies in a large and well-trained Reserve, including the National Guard. One of the more serious handicaps in developing the Reserve has been the lack of adequate armory facilities. This act will enable the Federal Government, with the combined efforts of the various States, to plan a coordinated and long-range armory construction program for all the civilian components of the Armed Forces, thus strengthening our national defense. (Public Law 783. Approved September 11, 1950.)

Maritime Commission—Liability Insurance

S. 2484: This is stand-by legislation authorizing the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the President, to provide war risk and certain marine and liability insurance for the protection of passengers, crew, vessels, and cargoes when endangered by war conditions or threats of war. (Public Law 763. Approved September 7, 1950.)

Alien Army Enlistments

S. 2269: This act permits the Secretary of the Army, with approval of the Secretary of State, to accept specially qualified aliens abroad for enlistment and reenlistment in the Regular Army. The enlistees must be between the ages of 18 and 35, unmarried, and without dependents. The enlistment period is restricted to not less than 5 years and the number in the program at any one time cannot exceed 2,500. The authority to accept such enlistments and reenlistments terminates June 30, 1953. (Public Law 597. Approved June 30, 1950.)

Military Construction

S. 2440: This act provides construction authorization for specific projects required by the Department of Defense and authorizes the appropriation of funds to carry out these projects at locations in the continental United States and overseas. (Public Law 564. Approved June 17, 1950.)

Aeronautical Research

H. R. 3946: This act will promote national defense and contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics a leave of absence from his regular duties for the purpose of carrying on graduate study or research in institutions of learning. Any leave of absence granted under this act will be without loss of salary or compensation. (Public Law 472. Approved April 11, 1950.)

Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1950

H. R. 5876: This act allows for an increase in the number of Army nurses and adjusts the periods of service necessary for promotion. It is also designed to credit Army nurses with time spent on active duty and with time spent outside the service prior to reenlistment in determining the maximum age limit for enlistment. (Public Law 514. Approved May 16, 1950.)

Women Doctors and Specialists

H. R. 4384. This act permits the Army and the Air Force to secure the services of about 50 additional women physicians and 25 additional women dentists, which will serve to provide a degree of relief for the present shortage of medical, dental, and allied specialist personnel. Qualified women may be appointed in both the Regular and Reserve components of the Army and the Air Force on the same basis as now governs the appointment of qualified men. The Army and the Air Force places them on the same promotion and retirement basis as applies to male officers commissioned in the medical services of the Army and the Air Force.

Passed Senate amended, September 6, 1950. House did not take final action.

Army and Air Force Authorization Act

H. R. 1437: As a result of this act the Air Force will have, for the first time, its own statutory authorization as to its size and composition and procurement program. The Air Force will have an authorized strength not exceeding 70 United States Air Force groups, and such separate United States Air Force squadrons, Reserve groups, and supporting and auxiliary United States Air Force and Reserve units as may be required. (Public Law 604. Approved July 10, 1950.)

Army Organization Act of 1950

H. R. 8198: This act provides a statutory basis for the internal organization of the Army and the Department of the Army. World War II made major changes in Army organization under the First War Powers Act. As postwar demobilization progressed, the wartime organization of the Army was readjusted and certain new laws were enacted which affected the Army such as the National Security Act of 1948, and others. As a result, the organization under which it was functioning, prior to the enactment of this bill, had a precarious statutory basis. This act provides the flexibility in organization necessary to meet developments in the organization of the National Military Establishment. (Public Law 581. Approved June 28, 1950.)

Uniform Code of Military Justice

H. R. 4080: This act provides a single code of justice applicable to all the military departments, i. e., Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard at time of war and peace. It supersedes the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the Disciplinary Laws of the Coast Guard. The code, while based on the Revised Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy, is a consolidation and a complete recodification of the present statutes. It

will provide, for the first time in history, a single law for the administration of military justice in the Armed Forces. (Public Law 506. Approved May 5, 1950.)

Regulation and Control of Air Commerce

S. 3995: This act permits the President, in time of war or when the national security is endangered, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce and the Civil Aeronautics Board to control the flight of United States civil aircraft over the United States. The Secretary of Commerce may establish special airspace identification zones and, after consultation with the Department of Defense and the Civil Aeronautics Board, prohibit or restrict within these zones the flights of aircraft which he cannot effectively identify, locate, and control with available radar and other facilities. (Public Law 778. Approved September 9, 1950.)

Gen. George C. Marshall

H. R. 9646: This legislation authorizes the appointment of General of the Army George C. Marshall to the position of Secretary of Defense. In order to make this appointment, it necessitated amending the National Security Act of 1947 as it prohibits the appointment as Secretary of Defense of any individual who, during the previous 10 years, has served on active duty in one of the regular components of the Armed Forces. This exception is limited to the appointment of General Marshall.

Following a bitter attack on the floor led by the Republicans, the bill passed the Senate by a vote of 47 to 21. (Public Law 788. Approved September 18, 1950.)

Defense Housing

S. 4145: The purpose of this measure is to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Agency to use funds now on hand, from the operation of the temporary war housing under its jurisdiction, to erect housing on or near military installations which have been reactivated since the outbreak of the Korean war.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to organize and subscribe for the capital stock of companies formed for the purpose of acquiring real estate, developing and constructing rental housing necessary for national defense; RFC is also authorized to make and manage loans to any such company for the purpose of financing such project plus the general expenses of the company; upon completion of any such project all right, title, and interest must be transferred to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The total amount of loans to be authorized by RFC must not exceed $100,000,000.

Passed Senate September 15, 1950. Pending in House Banking.

States—Military Forces

S. 4088: The purpose of this legislation is to provide authority, for 2 years following enactment, to the several States, Territories, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone to organize military forces and to provide pay and allowances, travel, arms, ammunition, uniforms, equipment, medical, and other military supplies necessary to enable such forces to execute their internal security missions within or without their respective States and Territories to serve while the National Guard is in active Federal service. (Public Law 849. Approved September 27, 1950.)

Natural resources

Federal Reclamation Projects

H. R. 7220: This act expedites the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects by permitting repayment installment plans as directed by the Secretary of the Interior to become effective in less than 60 days after their submission to congressional committees, when the committees so approve. (Public Law 451. Approved March 3, 1950.)

Flood Control

H. R. 5472: This is a combined omnibus river and harbor and flood-control bill. The last comprehensive river and harbor and flood-control authorizations were passed in 1946. Additional authorizations are now needed to continue the unified basin water resources developments now in progress and to round out basin programs where changing conditions have shown the necessity for extensions or modifications. In addition to the economic stimulation, these programs constitute a backlog of economically justified public improvements which can be placed under construction at rates of speed and sequence of locations as may be most suitable to variations of unemployment. (Public Law 516. Approved May 17, 1950.)

Eklutna Project

H. R. 940: This act authorizes the construction of the Eklutna project near Anchorage, Alaska, and confers upon the Secretary of the Interior the specific authority to construct, operate, and maintain the project. The project will consist of a low dam at Lake Eklutna, a diversion tunnel and penstock, and a power plant with installed capacity of 30,000 kilowatts transmission lines to Anchorage. (Public Law 628. Approved July 31, 1950.)

Fuel Investigation

Senate Resolution 239: On August 15, 1950, the Senate authorized the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete investigation and study of the available fuel reserves of the United States and the present and probable future rates; to formulate a national fuel policy; to study and recommend methods of encouraging developments to assure the availability of adequate fuels; and to report to the Senate not later than January 2, 1951.

Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act

H. R. 8975: The purpose of this measure is to extend the authorization to operate demonstration plants for testing the possibilities of commercial manufacture of synthetic liquid fuels from coal and oil shale to April 5, 1955.

The continuation of the synthetic-fuels research and development program will benefit the Nation by forestalling or alleviating any oil shortage that may result from either inadequate domestic petroleum production or interruption of supplies from overseas which is essential in the national interest. (Public Law 812. Approved September 22, 1950.)

Reclamation Project

H. R. 1920: This act is designed to prevent speculation in lands resulting from construction of the Columbia Basin Project Act which provides for the establishment of farm units and for the disposal of lands held in excess of a farm unit by a landholder. (Public Law 851. Approved September 27, 1950.)

Palisades Dam Project

S. 2195: This act reauthorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project in Idaho, including the northside pumping division of the Minidoka project and appurtenant irrigation facilities such as American Falls Dam, power-generating facilities for furnishing electrical power for irrigation. (Public Law 864. Approved September 30, 1950.)

Reorganization, Government departments and employees

Reorganization Plans Adopted During Eighty-first Congress

Plans 2 through 7 went into effect on August 19, 1949. They are:

No. 2. Transferred the Bureau of Employment Security from Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor.

No. 3. Strengthened top-level organization of the Post Office Department.

No. 4. Transferred National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.

No. 5. Made Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission its chief executive and administrative officer.

No. 6. Made Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission its chief executive and administrative officer.

No. 7. Transferred Public Roads Administration from Federal Works Agency to the Department of Commerce.

No. 8. Unification of armed services already accomplished by enactment of Public Law 216.

Plans 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 went into effect on May 23, 1950:

No. 2. Transferred to the Attorney General the functions and powers of the Justice Department now conferred by law on subordinate officials.

No. 3. Transferred to the Secretary of the Interior the functions and powers now conferred by law on subordinate officials.

No. 5. Transferred to the Secretary of Commerce the functions and powers now conferred by law on subordinate officials.

No. 6. Transferred to the Secretary of Labor the functions and powers now conferred by law on subordinate officials.

No. 8. Placed administrative responsibility of Federal Trade Commission in the Chairman rather than in the members collectively.

No. 9. Placed responsibility for administration of Federal Power Commission in the Chairman rather than in the members collectively.

No. 10. Placed responsibility for administration of Securities and Exchange Commission in the Chairman rather than in the members collectively.

No. 13. Placed responsibility for administration of Civil Aeronautics Board in the Chairman rather than in the members collectively.

No. 14. Transferred enforcement of all labor standards provisions to the Department of Labor.

No. 15. Transferred administration of the Alaska and Virgin Islands public works programs to the Department of Interior from GSA.

No. 16. Transferred the responsibility for financial assistance to public school districts and grants and loans for water pollutions control to FSA from GSA.

No. 17. Transferred the administration for advance planning of non-Federal public works and the management and disposal of certain war public works to Housing and Home Finance Agency from GSA.

No. 18. Transferred building and space management functions of various agencies to the Administrator of General Services.

No. 19. Transferred Employees' Compensation and Employees' Compensation Appeals Board to Department of Labor from FSA.

No. 20. Transferred certain archival and records functions from Secretary of State to the Administrator of General Services.

No. 21. Transferred the functions of the Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce.

Reorganization plans which became effective July 9, 1950:

No. 22. Transferred Federal National Mortgage Association from RFC to Housing and Home Finance Agency.

No. 23. Transferred from RFC to HHFA the lending functions of the Government with respect to the production and distribution of prefabricated houses and components.

No. 25. Transferred the functions of the National Security Resources Board from the

Board to the Chairman of the Board and makes the Board advisory to the Chairman; provides for a Vice Chairman.

Reorganization plan which became effective July 31, 1950: No. 26. Transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury all the functions of the Department, except those of hearing examiners, of the Coast Guard in time of war or when the President so directs, and of the Comptroller of the Currency.

Civil Service Retirement

H. R. 4295: This act amends the Civil Service Retirement Act by providing that any officer or employee who on or before April 1, 1948, had retired on an annuity is entitled to an increase, effective April 1, 1948, or 25 percent, or $300, whichever is the lesser; also provides that if a retired employee did not elect a survivor's annuity, there shall be payable upon his or her death, to his wife or her husband if married before April 1, 1948, an annuity equal to one-half of his or her present annuity but not to exceed $600 per annum during the remainder of the survivor's life. (Public Law 601. Approved July 6, 1950.)

Second-, Third-, and Fourth-Class Mail

S. 3118: The purpose of this act is to modify existing law with regard to second-, third-, and fourth-class mail which is undeliverable by authorizing the Postmaster General to modify the procedures to meet emergencies, thereby promoting better service to the public. This measure authorizes the forwarding or return of second-, third-, and fourth-class matter which is undeliverable as well as perishable goods. (Public Law 536. Approved June 8, 1950.)

Uniform Longevity Grades

H. R. 6553. The purpose of this legislation is to rectify the inequities relating to carriers in the postal field service resulting from the application of Public Law 428, approved on October 28, 1949. It also aids in the establishment of a uniform procedure for determining the eligibility of postal employees for promotion of longevity grades. (Public Law 500. Approved May 3, 1950.)

Providing for a Single Catalog System

House Concurrent Resolution 97: This resolution places the Congress on record as approving a single supply catalog system for all agencies of the Federal Government, both civilian and military, in order that there shall be published and put into use on the earliest practicable date a single supply catalog. During the Second World War there were almost as many catalog systems as there were procurement agencies in the Government which, it has been estimated, cost the Government billions of dollars. It is felt that with this new system not only will there be a financial savings as well as storage and purchase requirements but will also provide a positive system of identification for the procurement of parts should there ever be another war. The Munitions Board will be the central cataloging authority with assistance from General Services Administration.

Budgeting and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950

H. R. 9038: This act provides for modernizing budget and accounting procedures, to supplement the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 advocated by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, under a joint and continuous program designed to bring about improvement of accounting and financial reporting in the Government by the Comptroller General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. (Public Law 784. Approved September 12, 1950.)

Revision of Hatch Act

H. R. 9023: This act is designed to modify the punitive section of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act commonly known as the Hatch Act. The previous law required the removal of Federal employees who violated the Hatch Act. This act provides that any person violating the provisions of the Hatch Act shall be removed immediately from his position; if, however, the Civil Service Commission finds by unanimous vote that the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty shall be imposed by direction of the Commission. It further provides that in no case shall the penalty be less than 90 days' suspension without pay. Upon request, the Commission may reopen and reconsider the record in such case and if by unanimous vote it is found that the acts committed did not warrant removal, an order may be issued revoking the restriction against reemployment, but no such revocation shall become effective until at least 90 days have elapsed since removal. At the end of each fiscal year the Commission shall report to the President for transmittal to Congress the names, addresses, and nature of employment of all persons against whom such action was taken and the penalty imposed.

This act also amends section 612 of title 18, of the United States Code, to provide that persons who willfully publish or distribute mail (except postal employees in the official discharge of their duties), transport or cause to be transported in interstate commerce any card, pamphlet, circular, poster, and so forth, relating to any person who has publicly declared his intention to seek a political office, which does not contain the names of the persons, associations, committees, or corporations responsible for the publications and the names of the officers shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. (Public Law 732. Approved August 25, 1950.)

C. O. D. Parcels

S. 3117: This act reduces the free retention period from 20 to 15 days on c. o. d. parcels; authorizes the Postmaster General to direct the immediate return of c. o. d. parcels which are undeliverable at address given; reduces the personnel service costs resulting from numerous handlings. (Public Law 504. Approved May 5, 1950.)

Travel Expense

H. R. 5951: This act authorizes the payment of per diem and transportation expenses to officers and employees of the Government who become ill, or are injured not due to their own misconduct, while traveling on official business. (Public Law 482. Approved April 26, 1950.)

Civil Service Employees

H. R. 7666: This act amends section 12 (e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide an order of precedence for lump-sum death payments as follows:

(1) to the designated beneficiary or beneficiaries; or

(2) to the widow or widower of such person; or

(3) to the child or children of such person and descendants of deceased children by representation; or

(4) to the parents of such person or their survivors; or

(5) to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such persons; or

(6) to the other next of kin of such person as may be determined by the Civil Service Commission to be entitled under the laws of the domicile of such employee at the time of his death. (Public Law 547. Approved June 14, 1950.)

Post Office Financial Control Act of 1950

H. R. 8923: This act is designed to provide improved procedures with respect to the financial control of the Post Office Department as recommended by the Hoover Commission report. It modernizes and improves the accounting and auditing of the Post Office Department and implements the Department's new budget procedure. (Public Law 712. Approved August 17, 1950.)

Research and education

National Science Foundation

S. 247: This act is designed to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences, through grants of scholarships and graduate fellowships and the interchange of scientific information. World War II revealed our urgent need for an agency of the Government, to function in time of peace as well as war, to promote and foster fundamental research in the sciences which are not likely to be carried on privately because of the size and difficulty of the problems and because of the lack of an immediate commercial value.

The National Science Foundation will initiate and support basic scientific research through contracts or other arrangements and, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, initiate and support scientific research in connection with national defense. It will also serve to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries and will correlate its research programs with other scientific research programs of individuals and public and private groups. Our national health, prosperity, social welfare, and security will be aided materially by such a foundation. (Public Law 507. Approved May 10, 1950.)

Vocational Education Act

S. 493: This act authorizes an annual grant of $40,000 for use in a vocational education program in the Virgin Islands. In the enactment of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, which amended the George-Deen Act of 1936, the Virgin Islands were completely overlooked although grants-in-aid to the several States had been extended to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, the island of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. This discrimination was unjustifiable especially in view of the fact that more than a thousand Virgin Islanders were members of the Armed Forces and many additional thousands were affected by the dislocations produced by the war. (Public Law 462. Approved March 18, 1950.)

School Construction Act

S. 2317: This act authorizes a 3-year program calling for the construction of critically needed school facilities in those school districts overburdened by Federal activities. Twenty-five million dollars has been appropriated for this program of which $3,000,000 will be used for survey purposes, plus $25,000,000 contract authority. (Public Law 815. Approved September 23, 1950.)

School Assistance Act

H. R. 7940: This act complements the School Construction Act, Public Law 815, by authorizing the expenditure of funds for operating-expense purposes in those school districts overburdened by Federal activities. This act authorizes a 4-year program of educational aid to those school districts having large increases in enrollments due to the movement of Federal activities and the corollary movement of Federal employees. (Public Law 874. Approved September 30, 1950.)

Social welfare

Navajo and Hopi Tribes

S. 2734: This act authorizes $88,570,000 for a program rehabilitating the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and for the better utilization of the resources of their reservations. (Public Law 474. Approved April 19, 1950.)

Indian Irrigation Projects

H. R. 8199: This act extends the period of time allowed the irrigation districts of the Flathead Indian irrigation projects to execute

new repayment contracts. (Public Law 528. Approved May 25, 1950.)

Social Security

H. R. 6000: This act extends old-age and survivor insurance coverage to approximately 10,000,000 additional persons, making the total number covered approximately 45,000,000 persons. Among the new groups, included are 5,000,000 nonfarm self-employed excluding professionals such as lawyers and doctors; 900,000 regularly farm-employed workers; 1,000,000 domestic servants employed 24 days and paid $50 by one employer in any calendar quarter; "casual" laborers on the same basis as domestic servants; certain Federal civilian employees not covered by the Federal retirement program; employees of certain publicly owned transit systems; outside salesmen; Americans employed abroad by American concerns; and optional coverage for employees of certain nonprofit organizations. Monthly benefits for approximately 3,000,000 persons now receiving would be increased on the average from $26 a month to more than $48, or more than 85 percent. The lowest benefit groups would be increased more than 100 percent. This act, in accordance with their desires, totally excludes State and local government employees such as policemen, firemen, teachers, and other employees of counties and municipalities since they feel their pension systems are far more beneficial to them than coverage under this act.

The new computing formula would provide 50 percent of the first $100 of average monthly wage, plus 15 percent of the next $200, based on the maximum wage-tax base of $3,600. The minimum benefits would be increased to $25 and the maximum benefits would be increased to $150, but the maximum could not exceed 80 percent of the average monthly wage of the insured. World War II veterans are granted wage credits of $160 a month for time spent in military or naval service between September 16, 1940, and July 24, 1947.

Present payroll taxes of 1½ percent each on workers and employers are continued through 1955. In 1956 the rates will rise to 2 percent and will increase gradually to 3¼ percent by 1970.

Passed House by a vote of 333 to 14. Passed Senate June 20, 1950, by a vote of 81 to 2. (Public Law 734. Approved August 28, 1950.)

Major Disasters

H. R. 8396: This act authorizes $5,000,000 to cover disasters occurring anywhere in the entire country. This legislation provides for an orderly and continuing method of rendering assistance to the States and local governments in alleviating suffering and damage resulting from a major peacetime disaster, in restoring public facilities and in supplementing whatever aid the State or local governments can render themselves. A major disaster is defined as any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe. (Public Law 875. Approved September 30, 1950.)

Taxation

Revenue Act of 1950

H. R. 8920: This act, which is a direct result of the Communist aggression in Korea, increases tax liabilities by approximately $5,000,000,000. The change in withholding rates on individuals becomes effective on October 1, 1950, and the increase in the corporate rate for 1950 is approximately one-half of the rate which will be effective in 1951 and subsequent years. A tax is levied on the investment income of life insurance companies over the last 2 years, 1949 and 1950. The only provisions relating to excise taxes are those which will provide additional revenue. The act tightens up on the operations of tax-exempt charitable trusts and foundations, to prevent them from being used for the benefit of their creators, and from making investments of an unsound nature. Income tax exemptions have been allowed the Armed Forces serving in combat areas—commissioned officers will be allowed not in excess of $200 a month and the income of noncommissioned officers will be excluded from tax.

The Congress has directed the Committees on House Ways and Means and Senate Finance to report a bill raising revenue by levying, collection, and payment of corporate excess profits taxes with retroactive effect to October 1 or July 1, 1950, to the Eighty-first Congress as early as practicable after November 15, 1950, if the Congress is in session. If Congress is not in session, the bill is to be reported as early as practicable during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. (Public Law 814. Approved September 23, 1950.)

Repeal of Oleomargarine Tax

H. R. 2023: This act requires that oleomargarine, when served in eating places, be served in triangular shaped patties; when sold in stores, the external wrapper shall bear the word "Oleomargarine" or "Margarine" in type as large as any letter on the label and shall list all the ingredients; wrapper of internal contents shall also bear the name "Oleomargarine" or "Margarine" in letters 20 points or more high (¼ inch). Federal taxes repealed are:

Colored oleo at retail, 10 cents pound;

Uncolored at retail, one-fourth cent a pound;

Six hundred dollars a year on oleo manufacturers;

Four hundred and eighty dollars a year on wholesalers of colored product;

Two hundred dollars a year on wholesale of uncolored;

Forty-eight dollars a year on each retailer of the colored product;

Six dollars a year on retailers of the uncolored. (Public Law 459. Approved March 16, 1950.)

Distilled Spirits Tax

H. R. 5486: This act modernizes present requirements and procedures for warehousing and tax payment of domestically distilled spirits by providing for the use of tax-stamp machines as an alternative method of paying the tax; provides for the collection of tax on the actual quantity only of distilled spirits which are removed from bond at the time of tax payment; also terminates certain wartime legislation enacted for the purpose of enabling the distillers to manufacture spirits for munitions and industrial purposes. (Public Law 448. Approved February 21, 1950.)

Metal Scrap

H. R. 5327: This act continues until June 30, 1951, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap. The word "scrap" as used in this act shall mean all ferrous and nonferrous materials and articles, of which ferrous or nonferrous metal is the component material of chief value, which are second-hand or waste or refuse, or are obsolete, defective or damaged, and which are suitable only for remanufacture. (Public Law 869. Approved September 30, 1950.)

Foreign-Trade Zones

H. R. 5332: This act amends section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934, relating to the establishment of foreign-trade zones. Under the act of June 18, 1934, manufacturing and exhibiting within a foreign-trade zone was prohibited. This act permits foreign goods to be fabricated, assembled, and displayed in foreign-trade zones—restricted areas near United States ports where products can be stored temporarily without payment of import duties. (Public Law 566. Approved June 17, 1950.)

Estate and Gift Taxes

Hcuse Joint Resolution 480: This resolution extends to July 1, 1951, the period for tax-free release of powers of appointment credited on or before the effective date of the Revenue Act, which was October 21, 1942.

The Revenue Act of 1942 made a number of significant changes in the treatment, under the estate and gift taxes, of property which is subject to a power of appointment created by a person other than the holder of the power. In order to enable holders of previously created powers to adjust their affairs, it was provided that such persons could release their powers within a prescribed period of time without incurring any tax liability. This period has been extended from time to time because of the many difficulties individuals have encountered in making the necessary adjustments. (Public Law 578. Approved June 27, 1950.)

Transportation

S. 2436—Alaskan Airports: This act authorizes an additional $4,000,000 for the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska. (Public Law 454. Approved March 10, 1950.)

S. 456—New District of Columbia Airport: The purpose of this act is to authorize the construction and operation of a second public airport to relieve the congestion at Washington National Airport and to allow for future increases in commercial air traffic here. It has been estimated, conservatively, that by 1955 the air traffic will have increased by 40 percent and it has been determined that the Washington National Airport facilities at present cannot be expanded because of encroachment upon the channel of the Potomac River. To insure a greater degree of safety it has been concluded that an additional airport for the Washington metropolitan area must be constructed. (Public Law 762. Approved September 7, 1950.)

S. 2875—Federal Airport Act of 1946, extension: This act extends for a periods of 5 years the time for appropriating and expending funds to carry out the Federal Airport Act beyond the present termination date of June 30, 1953. The present act authorized a 7-year program, with a top limitation of $520,000,000. This extension did not increase the amount of the authorized appropriation—it simply allows additional time for the completion of the program or until June 30, 1958. (Public Law 846. Approved September 27, 1950.)

S. 3771—Permitting Canadian vessels to transport merchandise and pasengers between Alaskan ports and continental United States for a temporary period: This act extends until June 30, 1951, temporary waivers of laws protecting American-flag shipping in order to provide adequate transportation for three small communities in southeastern Alaska. Since the volume of passenger traffic to and from Skagway and Haines does not permit operation of adequate passenger service to these ports and since Hyder has no passenger or cargo service by American-flag vessels, the only feasible aid for these communities is to permit Canadian vessels to continue calling at these ports. (Public Law 584. Approved June 29, 1950.)

H. R. 5990—Baltimore-Washington Parkway: This act provides for the construction, development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland as a Federal-aid project. The present Baltimore Boulevard is overcrowded to such an extent that accidents occur far more frequently than on the average 4-lane highway. Further widening of this route would be difficult because of the property development that would create rights-of-way problems. The new highway will have divided lanes, limited access, grade-crossing separation, and restricted truck traffic. (Public Law 643. Approved August 3, 1950.)

Federal Aid to Highways

H. R. 7941: This act continues the Federal aid road program which was initiated in

1916 and has been conducted so successfully since its inception.

This act authorizes $1,188,150,000 for Federal aid to highways and other road construction for a 2-year period ending June 30, 1953. This represents a savings of approximately $26,000,000 from the amount recommended by the Senate committee. This aid is to be matched by the various States participating. Following is a breakdown figured on a 1-year basis:

Primary road, secondary, urban	$500,000,000
Forest highways	20,000,000
Forest roads and trails	17,500,000
Alaska-Tongass Forest roads	3,500,000
Park roads and trails	10,000,000
Parkways	13,000,000
Indian roads	6,000,000
Emergency fund	5,000,000
Roads on public domain	5,000,000
Inter-American Highway	4,000,000
Defense Highway Act	10,000,000
Safety conference	75,000
Total	594,075,000

(Public Law 769. Approved September 7, 1950.)

Panama Canal

H. R. 8677: The purpose of this legislation is to improve the organization of the Panama Canal and to establish an equitable and proper base for the collection of tolls. (Public Law 841. Approved September 26, 1950.)

Ship Sales Act

S. 3571: This act continues the authority of the Secretary of Commerce, under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, to sell war-built ships until January 15, 1951; charters on war-built dry-cargo vessels existing on June 30, 1950, may be continued to October 31, 1950; charters on passenger vessels existing on June 30, 1950, may be continued until December 31, 1951, or until expiration thereof by the terms of their provisions; also provides for the continuation to January 15, 1951, the authority of the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to grant waivers of navigation and vessel-inspection laws except in the case of laws regulating employment of aliens or requiring a vessel to have a full crew. (Public Law 591. Approved June 30, 1950.)

Great Lakes Shipping

H. R. 8847: The purpose of this legislation is to develop and maintain package freight and passenger service on the Great Lakes by permitting 10 surplus, war-built, Government vessels to be sold for operation on the Great Lakes on substantially the same basis as vessels can now be purchased under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 for use on the oceans. (Public Law 856. Approved September 28, 1950.)

Veterans

Postal Employees

H. R. 4285: This act amends the act of July 31, 1946, to retroactively advance in grade, time in grade, and compensation, certain postal field employees who are veterans of World War II. This increase in the pay rates of certain substitutes is designed to benefit those who are actually receiving less pay than they otherwise would have received had they been privileged to accept appointments in the field service between May 1, 1940, and October 28, 1943. (Public Law 492. Approved April 29, 1950.)

Veterans—Tuberculosis

H. R. 7440: This act provides that World War II veterans who have active pulmonary tuberculosis develop with a 10 percent or more disability, within 3 years after separation from active service shall be considered as having been incurred or aggravated by active service. (Public Law 573. Approved June 23, 1950.)

Veterans' Patents

H. R. 4692: This act provides for an extension of the life of patents issued to veterans of World War II, on the theory that their service would have in many cases precluded them from exploiting their patents during that period.

This act permits an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, who served for all or a part of the period between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, and to whom had been issued or who has continuously owned since a time prior to September 2, 1945, a patent whose original term had not expired before the latter date, to apply to the Commissioner of Patents for an extension of the term of his patent equal to twice the portion of his military or naval service between the dates of December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945. (Public Law 598. Approved June 30, 1950.)

Veterans—Mothers

S. 3263: This bill, as passed by the Senate, grants preference in Federal employment to the mother of a deceased son or daughter whose life was lost on active duty, or of a son or daughter who is a service-connected permanently and totally disabled ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman, honorably discharged, where the father of the deceased or disabled ex-service man or woman is totally and permanently disabled; or where, if the father is dead, divorced, or separated from the mother of the deceased or disabled ex-service man or woman and the mother has remarried, and the second husband is totally and permanently disabled.

Passed Senate August 8, 1950. House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Veterans—Education

S. 2596: This act clarifies the intent of Congress on the proper interpretation of the GI Bill regarding veterans' educational training benefits. Specifically, it continues the provision of Public Law 266 requiring the disapproval of courses in institutions having been in operation for a period less than a year prior to the date of enrollment unless such enrollment was prior to August 24, 1949. Certain exceptions are provided for to do away with inequities which have been caused in the past. Provision is also made whereby the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration may deny initiation of any course only if he finds (1) that the veteran is not eligible by reason of the July 25, 1951, cut-off date, or (2) that it is not in the same general field as his original educational or occupational objective and that such veteran has already made one change from one general field to another, or (3) that it is precluded by reason of the fact that it has been found to be avocational or recreational in character. (Public Law 610. Approved July 13, 1950.)

Veterans—Conveyances for Certain Disabled Veterans

S. 3768: This act is a 1-year extension of Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, which was the first law giving automobiles to veterans who had lost the use of one or both legs above the ankle. The present law expired on June 30, 1950, and it has been estimated that there are approximately 150 cases remaining for the year of 1950 and about 350 cases for 1951 which cannot be approved without this extension. This act provides the sum of $800,000. The only change made in the law is to permit the veteran to pay the difference in cost of an automobile over and above the $1,600 which was not permitted under the 1950 law. (Public Law 798. Approved September 21, 1950.)

Spanish-American War Veterans

H. R. 6217: This act provides out-patient medical care for approximately 100,000 Spanish-American War veterans in non-service connected diseases or disability cases. (Public Law 791. September 19, 1950.)

A Report to the People of the Third Congressional District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1948 I pledged my efforts to true representation for the people of the Third Congressional District of Illinois. In recognition of my obligations to the people of our district, whom I am honored to represent in the Congress, I should like to report briefly to them on the landmark legislative actions of the Eighty-first Congress.

The world we live in today is beset by an aggressive element, inimical to our traditions and institutions, and seeking only the path to world domination. As Americans we have dedicated ourselves to the pursuit of peace. Our every act and intention has been predicated upon that cherished desire.

A godless state, fostering the materialistic, the Soviet Union today threatens the peace of the world. This communistic octopus has since 1945 absorbed and taken over 7,500,000 square miles of new territory and has subjugated 500,000,000 people to its police-state control. Soviet expansion has wiped from the map Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Seven nations independent before 1939—Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and China—have lost their independence and become satellites of communism.

In this world of unrest the Democratic administration has stood as a bulwark for the preservation of the ideals of freedom and human dignity. The Eighty-first Congress has been in the vanguard of the western bloc striving for peace throughout our world. Public opinion has sought a solution for these international crises; our national affairs have had to be, therefore, necessarily subordinated. Our Federal Budget has been weighted with the demands upon it for the halting of aggressive action from without. Indeed, national problems and expenditures could be easily dealt with if the costs of war were forever removed.

Our insistence upon and support of the United Nations, our timely Marshall plan, and the point-4 program all have aided in turning the tide of communism in Europe. Our foreign policy has been based on the preservation of an orderly community of free nations; to this end we sponsored the United Nations. The Marshall plan was our answer to countries seeking to rebuild on the ashes of a Second World War. Its success has stemmed the flow of communism and rescued Europe from the iron curtain.

President Truman's point-4 program is the challenge to aggressors in underdeveloped backward countries. The Eighty-first Congress has sought to provide these people with the technical and agricultural know-how for improving the standards of their national economies. The United States has thereby placed at the disposal of these nations a means

whereby they may help themselves. The North Atlantic Treaty and military assistance pact for Europe are steps to strengthen and solidify the western bloc against encroachments from the grasping tentacles of communistic influence.

We live in a world of uncertainty; but we have a plan for survival. This plan will enable us to preserve our liberties, freedom, and way of life.

The Korean war has served, despite its sufferings, to cement the nations of the Western World against any further act of aggression. With a love of God and our neighbor, with courage and the ability to face up to realities, we shall succeed in the course we have set for ourselves.

DOMESTIC ISSUES—SOCIAL-SECURITY AMENDMENTS, 1950

One of the outstanding accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress was the passage of the Social Security Act of 1950, extending the benefits of its old-age and survivors benefits program to over 10,000,000 additional persons. The following important changes are recited:

Extension of coverage to self-employed persons other than farmers and certain professional persons.

Coverage of regularly employed domestic workers.

Coverage of State and local government employees not members of retirement systems, through voluntary agreements between the State and the Federal Government, and compulsory coverage of certain employees of certain transit systems taken over by States or local governments after 1936.

A substantial liberalization of the benefit formula for future beneficiaries.

Increase in the wage base for benefit and contribution purposes from $3,000 to $3,600.

A substantial increase in benefits for current beneficiaries, averaging 77½ percent.

Payment of benefits to dependent husbands and widowers of insured women workers.

Liberalization of survivors insurance benefits with respect to insured married women.

Payment of the lump-sum death benefit in all cases of insured deceased workers.

Increase in the benefits for dependent parents and for the first child in a family from 50 to 75 percent of the primary insurance benefit.

Provision of wage credits of $160 for each month of the military service during World War II.

Provisions for Federal grants to the States for the needy permanently and totally disabled.

Inclusion in aid to dependent children of one adult relative in a family, for Federal matching purposes.

Provision for mandatory exemption of $50 earned income for the blind, beginning July 1952.

SUBVERSIVE CONTROL—ANTICOMMUNIST LAW

This legislation—the McCarran Act—requires registration of Communists and subversives. It bars Communists from Federal jobs and tightens restrictions on aliens and immigration. Its provisions assure a round-up of all Communists and other subversive elements in a time of national emergency.

HOUSING

The present war circumstances have necessarily diminished the scope of the housing program; however, the Housing Act of 1950 expands and clarifies the Federal Housing Act. With its increases in the limit on mortgage purchases by the Government, this measure is of distinct aid to the moderate-income families. A liberalized scheduled of financing on FHA rental and cooperative housing will prove a boon to all, particularly our veterans.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Eighty-first Congress liberalized many procedures involving payments for various types of disabilities. In bettering the administration of the GI bill of rights the Congress has eliminated many abuses arising out of providing assistance to veterans for educational purposes.

Congress also enacted laws permitting the payment to veterans of retroactive benefits during hospitalization. A time extension was also enacted for filing in certain cases claiming benefit and compensation. Another prominent action increased from 75 to 100 percent the payment rates for presumed service-connected disabilities. Over $60,000,000,000 has been spent to date on benefits and services for veterans of all of our wars.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Federal aid for hospital construction was extended to 1955. Research and training in the search for cures for rheumatism, arthritis, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and other diseases is concerned in Public Law 692. Another law, Public Law 754, now permits property, surplus to the needs of the Federal Government, to be shared by public health institutions.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY AID

A 2-year program of Federal aid to highway construction has been assured by law with the authorization of $1,188,000,000. This will keep our highway system the best in the world, a pride and artery in peacetime, a necessity in wartime.

DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1950

The number of displaced persons who may be admitted to the United States was raised from 205,000 to 415,744 by action of the Eighty-first Congress. Regular immigration quotas allotted abroad will cover this increase. Every basis for a charge of discrimination has been eliminated. A careful screening by the security agencies of the Government, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration, Defense, and State Departments has been provided.

REORGANIZATION

Congress accepted 27 of the 35 reorganization plans submitted to it by the President. These plans included realinement of functions and streamlining of housekeeping in the vast executive branch of the Government. Further, they provided for the centralization of authority as well as responsibility in the heads of the various departments and agencies. With the elimination of duplicative practices and overlapping functions in the various departments, management experts predict savings of over $1,000,000,000 in the Federal Government, with concomitant increased efficiency and meritorious economy in governmental services. I have supported many reorganization plans (except plan No. 27 for a Department of Health, Education and Security) because of my study of the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, headed by our only living ex-President.

I have taken an unequivocal stand for rebuilding the Labor Department and improving the National Labor Relations Board framework. On the occasion of the reorganization of the Labor Department, I took the following position in directing a statement to the House committee charged with responsibility in this field. I should like to insert that letter at this point:

APRIL 13, 1950.

HON WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Commitee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments,
New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAWSON AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: I am writing to you in support of Reorganization Plan No. 6, which is presently being inquired into by your excellent committee during hearings on House Resolution 522. House Resolution 522 has for its objective the rejection of this meritorious reorganization plan.

Reorganization Plan No. 6 in general would accomplish the vesting in the Secretary of Labor of all functions of all other officers of the Department of Labor and all functions of all agencies and employees of that Department. In this fashion the Secretary will have the necessary authority to go hand in hand with the responsibility he presently is charged with in the conduct of his Department.

In your considerations of this proposal, I should like permission to stress three important factors: (a) This plan is identical to what is proposed for the five other executive departments in Reorganization Plan No. 1 through No. 5; (b) it seeks to carry out the recommendations for improvement of the structure of our governmental departments, carefully arrived at in the studies of Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; (c) it exactly parallels the reorganization of the State and Post Office Departments, recently approved by the Congress, and will result in economy and efficiency through clearer lines of authority and an absence of any division of responsibility.

I urge your support of this proposal of the President, in order to secure the proper foundation and framework for the achievement of the purposes which created this very vital Department.

Respectfully submitted.

NEIL J. LINEHAN,
Member of Congress, Third District, Illinois.

My stand on the National Labor Relations Board, a two-headed agency harboring opposing philosophies, is also a matter of record. The President recently, in removing the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, has taken a very forward step toward curing the internecine strife existing within that agency.

Another landmark measure of the greatest importance to the working peo-

ple was the congressional enactment of the new and revised minimum-wage law increasing the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour. This meritorious law is contained in the Fair Labor Standards Act. Further labor legislation clarified overtime pay provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and outlawed retroactive claims. This raising of the minimum wage was one of the Democratic administration's promises in the 1948 campaign.

AGRICULTURE

The following measures were enacted in this field. A Federal tax on oleomargarine was repealed. The Congress recognized the feasibility of continuing farm-price supports for cotton, wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. The 1950 potato crop support was rendered subject to producers agreement on marketing quotas.

Government extension of control on imports of wheat, oil, rice, and rice products was added until June 30, 1950.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

This law is of intense interest to us all. The Korean war has touched our lives in many respects; our successful pursuit of peace will require many self denials from all of us. This act provides the President with the discretionary powers for imposing rationing controls; it permits the fixing of price and wage ceilings simultaneously; it provides for requisitioning of buildings, equipment, and materials; it contemplates allocation and assignments of priorities; control of consumer credit and credit on new housing is provided for; it further gives the President the power to make or guarantee production loans and ability to set up machinery for settling war labor disputes.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

The existing draft law was by force of this measure, extended to July 9, 1951. Under its provisions the President has the power to call up the National Guard and the Nation's Reserves when he deems such action necessary in the public interest.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATION ACT FOR 1951

This act provides the money for operating the Federal Government during 1950–51. In former times individual acts were passed for each department and every item of Government expenditure. At the urging of management experts, the Commission on Organization, and the public, Congress this year gave trial to a form of appropriation bill where the over-all cost of government was considered in a single package. This method was employed as an improved means for public examination of Government fiscal needs. Thirty-six billion dollars has been allocated for the normal operation of the Government for the current year. The Korean war has necessitated a supplemental budget of an additional $18,000,000,000.

CONCLUSION

I have sought to set out in brief the worth-while record of the Eighty-first Congress. Out of space considerations, only the leading measures of national and international importance have been stressed in my report. The steps that the Congress has taken since January 1949 have been substantial and have immeasurably contributed to the well-being and security of our people. They stand as a vital force in our pursuit of peace. They mark well our national vigilance. The continuance of liberty, justice, and freedom from western Europe to Korea has been the rich harvest of our efforts for true representation.

The Wisconsin Senatorial Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMATION, PLEASE—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT 1950 WISCONSIN SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN

What are some of the basic facts about the 1950 campaign for the Wisconsin senatorship? I am happy to present herewith some of these facts. I hope that they will be of interest to our folks.

If you have any additional questions, please don't hesitate to pass them along to me. I will try to answer your questions as fast as they are put to me and to present the responses completely and frankly as always. I present this report in all humility and hope you will enjoy it. It is based, too, on answers which have appeared in the press—not just on my answers alone:

Question. Just what is involved in the 1950 Wisconsin senatorial election on Tuesday, November 7?

Answer. A 6-year term in the United States Senate, beginning in January 1951.

Question. What are the basic differences between the Republican candidate for United States Senator—Senator ALEX WILEY—and the Democratic candidate?

Answer. (1) The Republican candidate has 12 years of intensive legislative experience in Washington; the Democratic candidate has none—zero—a complete blank.

(2) The Republican candidate is committed to the free-enterprise system; the Democratic candidate supports various socialistic proposals (e. g., socialized medicine, socialized farming) to alter that system.

(3) The Republican candidate—Senator WILEY—is opposed to appeasement of communism; the Democratic candidate has repeatedly recommended in effect coddling of Reds at home and abroad.

These are a few of the basic differences between the two men.

BADGER PAPERS ENDORSE WILEY

Question. Does Wisconsin's press believe Senator WILEY should be reelected?

Answer. Here's the answer. It comes from a few of the dozens of favorable editorials in Badger papers:

"Senator WILEY has proved his worth in the Senate. He serves Wisconsin well. More important, he serves the Nation as a leader in our National Legislature. He should be returned to the Senate." (Janesville (Wis.) Gazette.)

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY deserves to be congratulated on his alertness in protecting and advancing the interests of Wisconsin in Washington." (Clintonville (Wis.) Tribune-Gazette.)

"We need men in Congress who will fight for dairying and for that reason we need to send ALEXANDER WILEY back to Washington." (Hillsboro (Wis.) Sentry-Enterprise.)

"It is well that Senator WILEY has so faithfully discharged the duties of his constituents and his country. Would that we had more people so diligently devoted to our way of life." (Brillion (Wis.) News.)

"The necessity of returning Senator WILEY to Washington is as obvious as anything could be. Wisconsin and the Nation need WILEY in the position of leadership to which he has risen.

"The socialistic ventures of Government must be met with men of WILEY's rank and stature in Washington." (La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune.)

Question. What positions does Senator WILEY hold in Washington?

Answer. The Senator is the highest ranking active Republican member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He is the highest ranking Republican member on the Senate Judiciary Committee. He is a member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee (which has been probing crooked politics in Chicago and elsewhere.)

Question. What do these committee assignments mean?

Answer. Plenty, folks, as any well-informed citizen will tell you. Here's why. Most of Congress' work is done in committees. If a man has unimportant committee assignments he is not, relatively speaking, in a position to do an effective job. On the other hand, Senator WILEY by virtue of his important committee assignments, is in one of the most powerful positions that a Wisconsin man has ever been in to really help his State. In other words, it is a basic fact that in 102 years of Wisconsin statehood, very few if any Wisconsin legislators have ever held as high positions in the United States Senate as Senator WILEY does. Those are plain, undisputed facts.

Question. Well, assuming all of the present indications were to be reversed, what would be the effect if the Democratic candidate were to win insofar as committee assignments were concerned?

Answer. Assuming such a condition, here's what would happen. Wisconsin would go to the bottom of the list insofar as representation by one Senator is concerned. In other words, any new Senator coming into office would be at the bottom of the roll. He would get the least important committee assignments. He would have to remain in Washington for many years before he was given any position of authority and responsibility. In the meanwhile, he would have to learn the legislative ropes. This takes years and years. Why? Because Government in Washington has become a very complex affair.

Question. Let's turn to legislation. How many bills has Senator WILEY introduced in the present Congress?

Answer. Your senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, has introduced over 80 bills in the Congress alone.

Question. What are some of the most important Wiley bills in this Congress?

Answer. The St. Lawrence seaway bill; the bill to assure adequate income for farmers producing milk for manufactured dairy products; legislation to reduce taxes on necessities like cosmetics, baby powders, household drugs, union dues, etc.; proveteran bills; anti-Communist legislation; a bill for improvement of conditions among Wisconsin Indians.

These and literally dozens of other bills have been introduced by your Senator within these last 2 years.

Question. Have many of Senator WILEY's bills been enacted into law?

Answer. Absolutely yes. Senator WILEY's was one of the first proposals that was ultimately enacted into the famous portal-to-portal law.

Several of Senator WILEY's suggestions for anti-Communist legislation have been enacted into law.

The Senator's proposals for a Foreign Relations Advisory Committee have been adopted.

Legislation for a cheese marketing news service which the Senator had proposed have also been adopted into law.

Small-business legislation which he suggested was adopted.

Question. Does Senator WILEY have sufficient background in Wisconsin affairs to merit another term in the United States Senate?

Answer. Well, let the record speak for itself. Here are the facts without embellishment. The Senator has one of the most varied backgrounds of any Wisconsin candidate. He has been an attorney, a small-town banker, owner of a dairy farm for over 34 years. At the start of his career he worked in the sawmills of northern Wisconsin for 15 cents an hour, 11 hours a day. He sold life insurance, books, washed dishes to work his way through college. He graduated from the University of Wisconsin.

Question. Is the Senator a family man?

Answer. Yes. He has a family of four children—all born and raised in Wisconsin—and eight grandchildren.

Question. Does he occupy an important position in foreign policy?

Answer. You can answer that one yourself by looking at these facts. Three times Senator WILEY has represented the United States Government in foreign conferences. Moreover, in Washington, D. C., although President Truman has tried to purge him, it is a fact that the President has called him to the White House to confer with him on many critical occasions. In other words, we see the complete contradiction in the Democrats' position. On the one hand they are trying to purge the Senator, and on the other hand they have consulted with him in Washington in the White House itself on crucial foreign policy matters.

Question. Speaking again of foreign policy, what is the Senator's stand?

Answer. The Senator has supported every last bipartisan foreign policy move to curb the tide of communism. In other words, he has voted for all measures designed to strengthen liberty-loving foreign nations in their opposition to the Red tide.

The Senator has, however, opposed the blundering, bungling policy in the Far East, the policy which lost us China, the policy which brought on the Korean war, with over 20,000 American casualties already. He urged from the very first day of the fighting that the United Nations supply more troops and arms rather than rely on Uncle Sam to do everything and to bear all the sacrifices.

The Senator opposed military unpreparedness. He has fought for adequate arms and equipment for American boys.

He has pointed out that Congress voted every last cent which the President requested—over $50,000,000,000 in 4 years—and yet the Democrats still left us unprepared.

The Senator's primary aim has been to prevent another disastrous world war. He has voiced the prayers in the hearts of all Wisconsin people for peace. As a matter of fact, he has introduced legislation for the establishment of a Cabinet Department of Peace in the United States Government.

SENATOR WILEY'S MOVIE AVAILABLE FOR YOUR CLUB

Question. Does Senator WILEY have close contact with the people of Wisconsin?

Answer. Absolutely. Look, folks, at the record. The Senator has visited Wisconsin as often as he could. Often he has flown back to Washington staying up all night—going without sleep for 30 hours—in order to both fulfill his obligations in Wisconsin and in our Nation's Capitol. He prepares weekly news letters, articles, special bulletins.

He produced a precedent-making motion-picture film with sound entitled "America in Crisis." It is a 16-millimeter, 22-minute educational movie which is now being shown throughout Wisconsin. You can borrow a print of that movie by writing to his Washington office. A reel will be sent out to your organization at any date you specify if it is available.

This film is designed to present some of the basic problems in current American life.

HOW BADGER VOTERS HAVE SUPPORTED SENATORS

Question. Does the Republican Party support Senator WILEY as their candidate?

Answer. Absolutely. The Senator was endorsed unanimously at the Republican convention in Milwaukee in June. In the September 19 primary, Senator WILEY completely swamped his opponent. As a matter of fact, the Senator received more votes than were received by his combined opposition—by all four Democratic candidates for the United States Senate.

TYPE OF INDIVIDUAL OPPOSED TO THE SENATOR

Question. Who are the groups opposed to Senator WILEY?

Answer. The answer to this question is very important to Wisconsin because it is a fact, as newspapers have pointed out, that the very groups which oppose the Senator show how important it is that he be re-elected.

1. He is opposed by a few big city labor bosses (not by the rank and file worker). These bosses oppose him because he has steadily supported sound labor laws. They have opposed him because he refused to take their orders and refused to repeal fair labor legislation. As a matter of fact, they tried so hard to defeat him that they pumped thousands upon thousands of dollars into an opposition candidate in the Democratic primary—a candidate who was completely defeated by their own party. In other words, the rank and file of honest workers did not swallow the line of their dictatorial labor bosses.

2. Another group which does not like Senator WILEY, is the New Deal socialistic group. They want to completely socialize our country whereas Senator WILEY is 100-percent opposed to socialism. That is why they support the Democratic candidate for United States Senator, a candidate who wants socialized farming and socialized medicine, a candidate as radical as is running anywhere in our country.

3. Various underworld influences are also at work against the Senator. Why? Because they know he is fighting for clean government. He is a member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee. He has battled against corruption, against crooked politics, against the combined influence of dope peddlers, white slavers, gunmen, cutthroats. Wisconsin is a clean State, and Senator WILEY intends to keep it clean, to keep out the influence of the Chicago mob which years ago infested Wisconsin.

SENATOR'S PRO-MADISON BILLS

Question. What particular bills has Senator WILEY introduced that are of special interest to Madison, the capital of Wisconsin?

Answer. The best answer to that is shown in the Senator's continuous amendments—practically every year—for the great Forest Products Laboratory at Madison. Look in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and you will find that year after year, it has been Senator WILEY's amendments which have saved this great research institution.

Senator WILEY has also helped Madison by seeking to get the Quartermaster Research Laboratory set up there also. The Senator has, in addition, fought for Wisconsin Central Airlines whose headquarters is at Madison.

If you look again at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will note that time after time, the Senator has spotlighted the great role of the University of Wisconsin. He has pointed out that this famed university of which every Wisconsinite is proud, has been in the forefront of social and scientific progress. Time and again, Senator WILEY has publicly praised in the Senate the great faculty and student body of the university as well as the beautiful city in which it is located.

Question. Can you cite any instances wherein Senator WILEY has been of particular help to the consumer?

Answer. The best illustration of this point came up when the notorious natural-gas-rate-increase bill was being debated in the Senate. This is the unsound bill which was sponsored by leading Democrats. But its aim was to cause an increase in the rates paid by 1,500,000 Wisconsin users of natural gas.

Senator WILEY denounced the bill as inflationary and as a terrible blow to the consumers of the State. He voted against it and moreover urged the President to veto the bill when the Democratic Congress unfortunately passed it. Finally, after a long fight, the President gave into Republican pressure and vetoed the dangerous bill. That shows how Senator WILEY has fought to protect the consumer. Innumerable Wisconsin newspapers applauded the Senator's efforts on this particular issue.

SENATOR WILEY RECEIVED TWO VETERANS' AWARDS

Question. What has the Senator done for Wisconsin veterans?

Answer. Here is the easy answer to that one:

1. The Senator was one of the original cosponsors of the famous GI bill of rights.

2. Through the years, he has introduced legislation endorsed by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and American Veterans of World War II.

3. The Senator was given special awards by both the AMVETS and Disabled American Veterans Foundation.

4. He has introduced a long series of bills for other veteran groups including the Military Order of the Purple Heart and Reserve Officers' Association of the United States.

Question. What sort of work record has Senator WILEY compiled?

Answer. The best answer to that is shown by an editorial carried in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald. This editorial stated:

"Senator WILEY works hard. He personally reported out 205 bills last season, more than any other man in the House or Senate."

Question. What is the basic question that the average voter should ask himself in going to the polls?

Answer. The only real question that counts is this: "Do I want a man of experience like Senator WILEY, who is dedicated to the free-enterprise system, or do I want a man of complete inexperience who is opposed to that free-enterprise system?"

Question. Has Senator WILEY been a friend of the Wisconsin farm industry which is the backbone of Wisconsin's economy?

Answer. Absolutely. His efforts for farmers have been endorsed by the National Grange, by famous magazines like Hoard's Dairyman, by innumerable Wisconsin cooperatives, REA's, and other groups. In fact the Senator is known as a spokesman for the Wisconsin dairy industry in the Halls of Congress.

BILLS IN THE INTEREST OF WOMEN

Question. Has Senator WILEY introduced legislation of particular interest to women?

Answer. Absolutely yes. He is one of the leading cosponsors of the women's equal rights amendment. Moreover, he has been one of the leading fighters for legislation to wipe out nuisance excise taxes on cosmetics, baby powders, and essential drugs that every family uses in its medicine chest.

Question. What has Senator WILEY done for the great conservation movement of Wisconsin?

Answer. He has introduced innumerable pieces of legislation endorsed by the Izaak Walton League and by countless rod and gun clubs. He has been a vigorous supporter of legislation for Federal aid to fish hatcheries and for Federal aid for forest preservation and conservation of our national parks.

HELP GIVEN TO BADGER TOURIST INDUSTRY

Question. What has Senator WILEY done for the great Wisconsin tourist industry which is the second most important industry in the State in furnishing income?

Answer. The Senator has been termed in the press one of Wisconsin's best salesmen in the Nation. Time after time he has focused the attention of our country on Wisconsin as a tourist paradise. The favorable publicity which he has secured for Wisconsin has helped contribute to the economic health of the great tourist industry of the State. This means many more dollars and cents to managers and workers in restaurants, hotels, tourist cabins, gasoline stations, and other service industries.

Question. What does my vote for Senator WILEY mean?

Answer. Your favorable vote means that you believe in:

1. Keeping a man of experience in Washington.

2. Retaining a leader who believes in honest, clean government, who is a sworn enemy of crime and corruption.

3. Supporting a man who wants to conserve your tax funds rather than to spend them irresponsibly.

4. Supporting a man whose integrity has never been questioned even by his opponents.

5. Supporting a man who believes in the people and has faith in the people, who tries to serve the people rather than to take the dictates of any special-interest group.

CONCLUSION

Well, folks, that concludes this "Information, please" quiz. I've tried to present these answers candidly and fairly. I'm not asking for any special credit or pats on the back. All I've sought to do is to report to you honestly and objectively on the facts. I've always sought to do the best I know how, admitting errors when they occur and trying constantly to do a better job for you.

You, the voter, can exercise your own fine judgment and wisdom in making up your mind.

I have faith in your support.

Don't forget, friends, Tuesday, November 7, is a crucial day for Wisconsin.

Not only is the senatorship at stake but the governorship, county, and local officers. I feel that the Republican ticket merits your kind support right down the line—ALEX WILEY, Walter Kohler, Jr., and all our other Republican candidates.

We want to keep Wisconsin free, sound, prosperous—with good government at Madison and strong Republican leadership in Washington.

So, folks, I'll be seeing you at the polls Tuesday, November 7.

Please vote for good government, for peace (rather than 3 Democratic wars in 33 years), for economical, responsible government (rather than Democratic waste and extravagance).

Thanks very much, indeed, folks.

Unfinished Tax Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Unfinished Tax Problems delivered by me over the radio program entitled "Pro and Con" over facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., Friday, October 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ordinarily higher taxes are not a very pleasant subject to talk about because most people don't want to pay more taxes. That is natural, and I don't blame them.

However, today I am particularly glad of the chance to talk about taxes because it is through our taxes that we all must make a concrete contribution toward winning a victory in the Korean fighting and toward strengthening our country.

The brunt of the sacrifice in all wars has always been carried by a comparatively small group—those actually under fire or those at the combat front primarily. That is just as true of the fighting in Korea as of any other war. According to the last tabulation 2,441 young men have been killed in action or died of wounds and about 15,000 others are wounded or missing—perhaps captured—perhaps dead.

Those men have alreay paid a great deal more than taxes. So have the others who have been in the front lines. Even those who have been lucky enough to escape injury so far.

Our job at home is to supply the money and the implements of war for these men to fight with and for our Armed Forces to guard us with after the fighting in Korea comes to an end. That means as a starter higher taxes—perhaps sharply higher taxes.

Many of you know that Congress just passed a tax bill a few days ago. Perhaps you will be interested in some of the provisions. The principal provisions are increases in the rates of taxes on the incomes of both individuals and corporations.

For example, for most people the rate will go up from about 17 percent to 20 percent of your income above exemptions and deductions. That is on the first bracket. On the highest bracket—those with very large incomes—the rate will go up to over 90 percent—more than nine-tenths of the income of those drawing very big salaries.

The tax rate on corporation incomes goes up from 38 percent to 45 percent. In other words all corporations except the very small ones will have to turn over almost half their income to the Federal Government.

I realize that these tax increases, particularly those on the average man with a family to support, may not be easy to pay in some cases. Congress decided to put them on with real reluctance, I can tell you. There was just no other way to begin to raise enough revenue to meet this situation.

Furthermore, I must tell you that these taxes are possibly only the beginning. I wish I could tell you that further tax increases will not be necessary but that is not the case. We want to pay as we go on this rearmament program if we possibly can. World War II was paid for largely by borrowing but that created inflation and a higher cost of living and a very great hardship for millions of people. If the Government can raise enough revenue through taxes to meet its expenses without borrowing, it will be possible to keep prices from going up any further. That is one of the most important reasons for raising taxes.

In practice taxes heavy enough to pay the full cost of rearming curselves and making our country secure would be extremely burdensome. They would be very difficult to pay. It will be a really big problem to find ways and means of raising enough money for the Government to meet this situation without laying an absolutely intolerable burden on taxpayers which means everybody—wage earners, farmers, salaried people, businessmen, everybody. That is a problem that Congress is going to have to tackle as soon as it goes back into session again.

Is there any way by which these extremely heavy taxes can be avoided? I don't know but I can suggest some ideas we might try. For example, we ought to start in immediately in cutting out or slashing to the bone some of the less essential activities of our Government. Taxpayers are going to be forced to cut down their own expenses when more taxes are withheld from their wages and salaries. Many taxpayers are going to have to do without things they really need or postpone plans they have made.

There is no reason on earth why the Federal Government should not do precisely the same thing with some of its functions that are not really essential. Everyone knows that Federal spending for nonessential purposes could be cut down sharply. Even before the fighting in Korea started, the Federal Government was spending five times as much as it did back in 1940 and 1941. There is no possible reason why the Federal Government should expect to continue spending as usual while each individual taxpayer is forced to give up his own plan so that he can give more of his income to the Government.

In my judgment it should be equally possible to cut out four or five billion dollars of Federal spending per year. Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, has proposed budget reduction of about that amount. He is a Democrat and I am a Republican but this matter is far too serious for partisanship. I go along with him 100 percent in his proposal for budget reduction. He and I teamed up to put through the single-package Federal appropriation bill which helped us save over half a billion dollars on this year's budget, and I believe that if economy-minded Republicans and Democrats alike will work together, we can make really big savings in Federal spending.

If we could save $5,000,000,000 in nondefense spending, that $5,000,000,000 would be available for building up our military strength. We will need ever cent we can get.

If we are willing to face up to this problem squarely, it should not be too hard to find places where real savings can be made. We may have to do without new post offices and the like for a while—perhaps for some years. We ought to examine into some of the subsidies paid out by the Federal Government—particularly the hidden subsidies which seem to leak out of every bureau and agency in the Government. Some of those subsidies have been going on far too long as it is, and it is time they put a stop to them. We simply cannot afford such luxuries any longer.

No matter how much we save on these nonessential functions the cost of rearming ourselves is sure to take heavier taxes than we have had in the past. Wars and the munitions of war are terribly expensive. That is why it is all the more important to make every dollar count.

But to return to the subject of taxes again, a number of people have asked me what

Congress did about an excess-profits tax. Many people seem to be under the impression that Congress decided not to levy a tax on excess profits during the late session. That is not quite correct.

During consideration of the tax bill that was just enacted Congress decided fairly definitely that there would be an excess-profits tax and that it would become effective on the same date as the higher individual income taxes or perhaps on an earlier date That decision in general terms was written into the law.

However, we ran into some difficulty in determining exactly how the tax should be levied. The Treasury Department which normally performs the detailed studies as a basis for recommendations on how the tax should be levied informed Congress that it was not in position to recommend the exact form that the excess-profits tax should take. Apparently the Treasury tax experts were caught off balance by this emergency. They had not tried to work out the details or to draft the precise legal language for an excess-profits tax. Both the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, and President Truman definitely recommended to Congress that we wait until the problem had been studied very carefully before deciding exactly what form an excess-profits tax should take.

When these details have been worked out, the excess-profits tax is supposed to be dated back at least to the date on which the individual tax increases go into effect.

An excess-profits tax or war-profits tax is a very complicated type of tax for the Treasury to administer. There are still thousands of cases left over from the excess-profits tax of World War II which have not been settled yet. The reason it is so difficult to apply is that it is not so much a tax as a method of confiscation. The general idea of a war-profits tax is, practically speaking, to confiscate the profits that arise out of war. In other words, it is supposed to take the profits out of war by taxing them into the Treasury of the United States.

That is easier said than done. Although the rates of the World War II excess-profits tax approached 100 percent, there were still somehow some persons who managed to find loopholes in the law or by some other means to make a good deal of money out of the war. We all know that. Furthermore, when you talk about confiscating war profits you want to be sure of just what you are confiscating. Generally you don't want to confiscate normal regular profits. They are taxable at the regular rate of 45 percent as I said before, but they should not be confiscated if they are not war profits. Unless the tax laws are very carefully written we may find that it has been written so as to apply excess-profit rates against companies which are really making only normal average incomes.

That is why both the Treasury and the President urged Congress to wait awhile before working out the exact details of an excess-profits tax law. That is what was done.

Even when an excess-profits tax is put into effect, however, I should warn you that it will not solve all of our tax problems. I am afraid many people have an exaggerated idea of the amount of money that can be brought to the Treasury through an excess-profits tax. An excess-profits tax might possibly raise three or four or five billion dollars a year. It is hard to tell. Even if it does so, however, that will probably not be enough to pay the cost of providing us with the planes, tanks, and guns, and other equipment that we must have in order to be really secure. Even if every dollar of war profits can be taken into the Treasury it is not likely to be enough to pay the cost of rearmament.

That is why it is so absolutely essential to cut back on every unnecessary item of cost in the Federal Government. That is why it may be necessary for Congress to search for additional ways of raising revenue. In levying any such additional taxes I intend to do my best to see that they are levied as fairly as possible so that no one is required to pay more than his share. But I do believe everyone should be willing to pay this share. I believe that is the least we can do to back up the men and boys who are fighting for us in Korea. If all of us understand that I believe we will all be willing to do our part.

A Letter Describing Early-Day Conditions in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues there is inserted herewith a letter describing early-day conditions in northern Idaho:

OCTOBER 9, 1950.

DEAR FRIEND EBY: Your letter of September 23 making an analysis of the plans of storing water on Lake Pend Oreille and generating power through the construction of the Albeni Falls Dam brings to my mind my experiences and observations concerning the Clark Fork River and Lake Pend Oreille since we, the White family, the mother and five children, got off the Northern Pacific train at the new depot built in the lane cut through the tall timber for the railroad's right-of-way July 30, 1890.

There weren't too many people for the White family to see in Clark Fork in those days, nothing much but Chinese coolies wearing a queue under a big umbrella hat, living in little huts in the woods along the railroad, cutting wood to fire the locomotives before coal was discovered at Roslyn in the Cascades. These Chinese, and I think there were over a hundred of them, were cutting wood and shingle bolts for the water-power shingle mills. We found them queer people that couldn't understand or speak English.

I have learned a lot about Lake Pend Oreille and the Clark Fork River since those eventful days when I was a 13-year-old boy. We were living in the railway depot then the very next day after our arrival, the other two kids in town insisted that I go way back in the woods to the foot of Antelope Mountain to see the mine—where there were some log cabins, a tunnel on the hillside, a boxed-in ore chute from the dump down to a log ore bin at the foot of the hill—all idle and vacant. The story was that the foreman got the check for the returns from the first ore shipment that was made that spring (1890) and skipped, leaving the men without any pay. This is now the Lawrence mine on Antelope Mountain.

There were a good many prospectors in Clark Fork in those days, baching in their miners' cabins scattered over the hills and around the valleys working their claims, before Grover Cleveland called a special session of Congress to repeal the Silver Purchase Act, and struck American mining a blow from which it hasn't recovered to this very good day.

Prospectors, sometimes called sourdoughs of that day, were really honest-to-God men; well read, well informed, and bearded, husky individuals.

My father, being a telegraph operator and railway agent in those days before mining consolidations and big properties were the rule, quite often received messages over the wire which some little broker in Spokane would send out to the fellows working claims in the hills, and when the operators would be authorized to find a messenger to take the telegrams up to the claims, in most cases I was the messenger.

I didn't think much of skipping up a steep trail almost to the top of the main range, or climbing the foothills around Clark Fork in those days; and I was very much intrigued by the pluck and determination of those real Americans that hammered away with their single jacks at the steel-defying rock, with drills sharpened with charcoal burned from the neighboring timber. The muck from the headings of their tunnel was trammed out in home-made cars made of boards and wooden wheels with treads covered with rawhide, on tracks made of square poles covered with strap iron.

I watched these sturdy prospectors sinking their shafts by hand to reach the ore and the fortunes they were sure was waiting to be opened in the deeper levels of these veins, hoisting their muck in iron-bound buckets with home-made windlass which they wound up by hand with muscle and brawn in 10-hour shifts.

Then came Grover Cleveland with the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act and a financial depression that did its work. The big mines shut down all over the country and our prospectors scattered to other camps and other occupations. Their tunnels and shafts stand today as a monument to perseverance and hard labor and American ideals that our bureaus here in Washington are endeavoring to extinguish.

But now coming back to the Clark Fork River and Lake Pend Oreille. My father, being a southerner with an appreciation for land values and needing a home, took up a homestead in the woods just off the railroad's right-of-way and in a southern fashion built our house on blocks 2 feet off the ground.

In the year 1894 came the flood, covering our yard and gradually rising until it was necessary for us to take our bedding and cooking utensils and ferry to the higher ground to escape the flood that raised to 18 inches above the floor of our house setting on its 2-foot blocks. Boxcars that came through on trains from Portland showed the high water marks up to the eaves.

Those were stirring and interesting days for the White family at Clark Fork.

The things being said at this late date by the Army engineers and yourself concerning the quality and nature of the land in the Clark Fork Valley could have been said of either the delta of the Rio Grande or the delta of the Colorado River which have been cleared up and put into production and have proved to lie some of the most fertile and productive land on earth. Some of the most fertile land in Idaho lies in the delta of the Clark Fork River above Lake Pend Oreille. My 60 years of observation and experience convinces me of this fact.

This land in the Clark Fork Delta has not been flooded for 20 years until the high waters of 2 years ago.

Canary grass grows a forage higher than your head on the land in the Clark Fork Delta; and besides clover, timothy, and redtop grass grows luxuriantly on the meadows in the Clark Fork Valley and Delta.

Beef cattle come off these meadows in the fall rolling fat. Now what more do you want and where can you find land that is more profitable to own and utilize?

There is another feature of this land that probably you, with your keen observation, may have overlooked. In the autumn when the frost strikes or kills off the crops and grass on the higher farm lands, in the Clark Fork Valley there is a mist or fog which rises from the warm waters of the Clark Fork

River and spreads over these lowlands and keeps off the frost for a period of sometimes from 6 weeks to 2 months later than the frost period in the upper elevations; and the cattle get fat on the late pasture.

Now with respect to the influence of the local utility that is buying Bonneville power for 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour and selling it to the mines at 1¼ cents per kilowatt-hour, it is proposed to ruin the Clark Fork Valley and the low-lying lands around Lake Pend Oreille and the Pend Oreille River by the storage of water and the power to be generated over a dam at Albeni Falls that will doubtless be all bought by the local water power company and turned into its distributing system through the transformer station and transmission lines built at Newport overlooking the site of the proposed new plant, which at the present prices should earn the Spokane company the difference between purchase and selling price of $2,000,000 a year.

Show me a mine in the State of Idaho or anywhere else that would produce $2,000,000 a year income.

Talk about a gold mine, if the power companies can induce the Government to come in and shoulder the expense of paying for the damage to the land and paying for the construction of a plant and deliver the power to it at 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour, what more could our Government do for any business organization anywhere?

It is always a pleasure to receive your letters and pithy comments, and I hope that you and I will live to see the day when the vein structure and ore deposits of the Clark Fork district will be explored at depths and the dreams of the old miners that worked so industriously and persistently in the early nineties will come true.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Sources of Failure of the Veto Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of September 26, 1950, by Arthur Krock.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOURCES OF FAILURE OF THE VETO MESSAGE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 25.—There were a number of reasons why Congress overrode the President's veto of the new Communist control law, and overrode it by far more than the two-thirds majorities required by the Constitution. One was that the constituencies revealed an overwhelming demand for legislation of this nature before Congress recessed, and the bill which emerged from the trading and compromising that is always the price of highly controversial measures was well known to be the only one possible in the time that remained.

But in view of the forcefulness of the veto message and the circumstance that the delaying action by the handful of Senators opposed to the bill assured enough time for the country to read the message before the Senate voted, it is plain that other and worthier considerations influenced the size and personnel of the vote to override and were responsible also for the breach in the administration front represented by some of the overriders. Only this could explain the presence in the prevailing group of the majority leader, Mr. LUCAS; the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. CONNALLY; Senators HILL, MCMAHON, and TYDINGS, who have carried many burdens for the President; and on the Republican side, Senators IVES, SALTONSTALL, and SMITH of Maine.

Among these latter considerations were the following:

1. For many years the executive departments, under two Democratic Presidents, were, to say the least, lax in keeping subversives out of the country and out of the Government, and this has been dramatically demonstrated. The administration fight against H. R. 9490 in the name of protecting civil liberties under the Constitution would have carried more weight if this had not been true.

2. Some of the most violent protests against the bill came from quarters which have kept company with groups that have been sympathetic with Soviet policies and activities in this country, and some came from officeholders who have acquired their places through the support of such groups. This helped to cancel out the sincere and documented objections of patriotic citizens and newspapers concerned over the integrity of the Bill of Rights.

THE FACTUAL DISPUTE

3. But even these considerations do not account for the size of the overriding majority and the identities of some who helped to compose it. That can be traced partly to the fact that the President, in his veto message, stated as incontrovertible truths things which were as firmly controverted by members who helped to write the bill. (The rest of the message was given over to opinions of how the measure would operate, and in matters of opinion there is always the right to differ.)

After the President sent his message Friday, and the delaying action began, Senators in favor of the bill drew up specific challenges of his statements of fact concerning the measure and spread them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The following is a sample of the response of Messrs. FERGUSON and MUNDT, Republicans:

The President says "it would aid potential enemies by requiring the publication of a complete list of vital defense plants, laboratories, and other installations." * * * The fact is, as emphasized in the report of the conferees, that the test to be applied by the Secretary of Defense in publishing any list of facilities is that he "finds and determines that the security of the United States requires the application of the provisions of subsection A of this section." Obviously, then, if publication would be against the interest of national security, as the President claims, the Secretary could make no such designations or postings. It may be added that if the subsection is made inoperative by a failure of the Secretary, for security or other reasons, to designate an establishment as a defense facility and so publish the fact, nothing anywhere in the act modifies the protection afforded those establishments by other provisions of the criminal code, including the espionage and sabotage statutes.

ON "THOUGHT-CONTROL"

Another example:

The President says, "It would put the Government * * * in the thought-control business." Neither any person in the course of the entire debate on this legislation, nor the President in his veto message, has been able to point to a word or phrase in those sections of the bill which the President finds so objectionable, that suggests or implies thought-control. The actual fact is that the legislation of which the President speaks proscribes and punishes only specific, designated overt acts which are clearly defined in the law.

And Senator MCCARRAN, Democrat, in a separate analysis of the veto message, cited the text of the bill against other criticisms which the President classified as facts.

This type of counterattack fortified many who found the force of the veto disturbing. The result was that, for various reasons, only seven Senators were unrecorded on final passage—BENTON, DOWNEY, FLANDERS, GILLETTE, MORSE, PEPPER, and WITHERS; and 77 Senators voted either to override, or were paired in favor, as against 12 who voted, or were paired, to sustain.

Summary of Housing Legislation Enacted by Second Session of Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., September 27, 1950.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCORMACK: At Mr. Foley's request, I am sending to you with this note a brief summary of housing legislation enacted by the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. This, of course, is in addition to the Housing Act of 1949 which was enacted by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress providing for (1) a declaration of national housing policy, (2) Federal assistance to local communities for slum clearance and urban redevelopment projects, (3) Federal assistance to local communities for low-rent public housing for families of low income now living in slums and other inadequate housing, (4) a program of housing research and (5) loans and grants to farmers who otherwise would be unable to obtain credit for housing on reasonable terms within their ability to pay.

Sincerely yours,

B. T. FITZPATRICK,
Deputy Administrator and General Counsel.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF HOUSING LEGISLATION ENACTED INTO LAW IN 1950 (81ST CONG.)

1. HOUSING ACT OF 1950 (PUBLIC LAW 475, APPROVED APRIL 20, 1950)

A. FHA (note greater down payments are now being required as part of inflation control—see item 4)

New FHA Low-Cost Home Program

The Housing Act of 1950 added a new section 8 to the National Housing Act providing a new FHA mortgage-insurance program for low-cost homes in suburban and outlying areas. This program replaces the former class 3 FHA loans. The section 8 authorization is limited to $250,000,000.

FHA Insurance of Modernization and Repair Loans Continued

The FHA title I authorization to insure lenders against losses on home modernization and repair loans was extended to July 1, 1955. A new formula was provided which limits the total amount of such outstanding insured loans to $1,2050,000,000. This amounts to an increase in authorization of approximately $5,000,000.

FHA Title II Home Mortgage Insurance Program Improved

The FHA title II home mortgage insurance authorization was increased by $2,250,000,000 to a total authorization of not more than $9,000,000,000, and the program was revised to stimulate more lower-cost homes of a size adequate for family life.

The section 207 FHA rental-housing mortgage-insurance program was amended to continue the stimulation of rental-housing construction formerly provided by the temporary section 608 rental-housing program. Provisions were added to section 207 requiring certification by the mortgagor that there will be no discrimination in the selection of tenants by reason of the fact that there are children in the families.

FHA Cooperative Housing Mortgage Insurance Liberalized

New provisions were added to the National Housing Act liberalizing the FHA program of mortgage insurance for projects of housing cooperatives. The act required the appointment of a new Assistant Commissioner of FHA to administer cooperative housing mortgage insurance, and to furnish technical advice and assistance to such housing.

Temporary Section 608 FHA Rental-Housing Program

An increase of $500,000,000 in the mortgage insurance authority under section 608 of the National Housing Act was provided in order that applications for section 608 mortgage insurance on rental housing received in the FHA field offices on or before March 1, 1950, might be processed. (Sec. 608 authority was temporary and no more applications can be processed under that section.)

FHA Mortgage Insurance for War-Housing Sales Provided

Section 610 of the National Housing Act was amended to make mortgage insurance in connection with the sale of war housing by the Government or any public-housing agency applicable also to the sale of war housing constructed under Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress.

FHA Insurance of Loans for Manufactured Houses and Large-Scale Site Construction Liberalized

The FHA mortgage insurance authorization was liberalized covering insurance of loans to finance the manufacture of houses and to finance large-scale modernized site construction of housing.

B. GI home-loan guaranty increased—Direct loans to veterans provided

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 was amended by raising the maximum maturity of GI loans from 25 to 30 years; by raising the maximum home-loan guaranty from $4,000, or 50 percent of the loan, to $7,500, or 60 percent of the loan; to require all homes financed by GI home loans to meet construction requirements prescribed by the Veterans' Administration; to abolish combination VA-FHA loans effective December 31, 1950; and to provide for stand-by direct home loans to veterans unable to obtain loans under the terms of the act from private sources.

(NOTE.—Some additional down payments being required under new anti-inflation controls.)

C. Disposal of war and veterans' housing facilitated

The Housing Act of 1950 provided for the disposition of all war and veterans' housing under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and for the transfer of the farm-labor camps under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture to the Public Housing Administration for management and disposal. (Program being reexamined due to Korean situation.)

D. Loans for student and faculty housing authorized

The Housing and Home Finance Administration was authorized to make loans to educational institutions of higher learning for the construction of housing for their students and faculties. To provide funds for the loans the Administrator was authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time obligations for purchase by the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $300,000,000. (Program temporarily suspended due to Korean situation.)

E. Home mortgage secondary market operations implemented

An additional authorization of $250,000,000 was provided to the Federal National Mortgage Association for the purchase of home mortgages. The new section 8 FHA home mortgages were made eligible for purchase by the Federal National Mortgage Association. The Veterans' Administration guaranteed farm-home mortgages were added to the home mortgages exempted from the 50 percent limitation on the amount of eligible mortgages in a lender's portfolio which may be sold to the association.

2. MILITARY HOUSING MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ASSISTED

Public Law 498, approved May 2, 1950, amended title VIII of the National Housing Act, which authorizes FHA mortgage insurance for rental housing at or in areas adjacent to military installations. The amendment permitted the military services to employ architects to draft plans for military housing projects. Upon the basis of these plans and specifications prospective sponsors of projects bid competitively for the privilege of supplying the housing so that the necessity of each prospective sponsor preparing separate plans and specifications is eliminated, thus expediting and encouraging the provision of military housing by private enterprise.

3. ADMINISTRATION OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITY PROGRAMS FURTHER COORDINATED

Three reorganization plans were put into effect which further coordinated the housing and community facilities functions and activities of the Federal Government into the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Reorganization Plan No. 17 (effective May 24, 1950) transferred two programs from the General Services Administration to the Housing and Home Finance Agency: (1) Administration of advances to State and local governments for the planning of public works; and (2) management and disposal of sewers, schools, hospitals, and other community facilities constructed under title II of the Lanham Act, the World War II War Housing Act.

Reorganization Plan No. 22 (effective September 7, 1950) transferred the Federal National Mortgage Association to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Association provides a secondary market for home mortgages insured or guaranteed by Federal Government agencies through the purchase, service, and sale of such mortgages. In addition, it is authorized to make direct loans for housing in Alaska.

Reorganization Plan No. 23 (effective September 7, 1950) transferred from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency the lending functions of the Government with respect to the production and distribution of prefabricated houses and components.

4. HOUSING INFLATION CONTROLS—CONSERVATION OF CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES

The Defense Production Act of 1950, Public Law 774, approved September 8, 1950, authorized the control of real-estate credit in order to conserve materials for defense use and to protect the national economy against inflation. The act provides that regulations may be prescribed governing maximum loan or credit values, minimum down payments, and trade-in values, as well as the amount, form, and time of various payments involving real-estate credit. The President had previously (on July 18, 1950) issued administrative instructions to Government agencies requesting certain curtailments of housing credit extended by them in order to assist in curbing inflation and to conserve materials for national defense purposes. Credit controls on Government-aided housing (old or new houses financed with the aid of FHA, VA, etc.) are to be administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and controls on new construction the financing of which is not aided by Government agencies are to be administered by the Federal Reserve Board in consultation with the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

The act provides for priority and allocation powers which are designed to conserve materials for defense purposes. The hoarding of scarce materials (including building materials) may be prohibited. The first regulation issued under the act by the new National Production Authority designates cement, gypsum board, sheathing, lath, and various iron and steel products as scarce materials. The act will not only assure conservation of materials for defense purposes but, if it becomes necessary, will be used to allocate available materials for the most essential housing purposes, such as housing for military personnel and war workers, and lower cost housing.

5. SAVINGS AND LOAN INDUSTRY STRENGTHENED

Public Law 576, approved June 27, 1950, contained provisions designed to strengthen the savings and loan industry, thus further aiding in the financing of homes and the encouragement of savings.

The act requires lending institutions which are members of Federal home loan banks (principally savings and loan associations) to maintain a certain minimum liquidity. In order to assure a source of funds to savings and loan associations to meet demands upon them for mortgage funds and to meet withdrawal requests by savers and account holders, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase the obligation of Federal home loan banks up to $1,000,000,000. The proceeds of these obligations would be used for advances by the banks to savings and loan associations and other members of the Federal home loan banks.

The insurance protection afforded by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to the accounts of savers in savings and loan associations is increased from $5,000 to $10,000 for each account. It was provided that the increase would go into effect when a corresponding increase had been authorized in the insurance coverage of other banks deposits by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Legislation was approved by the President on September 21 authorizing this increase. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is also authorized by Public Law 576 to borrow from

the Treasury such funds as in the judgment of the Home Loan Bank Board are required for insurance purposes.

The act also accelerates retirement of the Government-owned capital stock in the Federal home loan banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

6. TERRITORIES ENABLED TO UNDERTAKE SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

The Territorial Enabling Act of 1950 enabled the governments of Puerto Rico, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands to authorize public bodies or agencies to undertake slum clearance and urban redevelopment activities. The low-rent public housing enabling statutes of Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii were revised to assist that program in those territories.

7. RENT CONTROL CONTINUED

Public Law 574, approved June 23, 1950, continued rent control until December 31, 1950, except where local governments adopt resolutions requiring the continuance of rent control. In such instances rent control will cease June 30, 1951. The act also provides that rent control shall be terminated in localities where the local governing body adopts a resolution, after public hearing, that the shortage of housing is no longer such as to require rent control in that community.

8. CRIMINAL STATUTE AMENDED TO PROTECT SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Public Law 634, approved August 3, 1950, amended the criminal provisions of the United States Code to include savings and loan associations within the definition of the word "bank" as used in the provisions of the code with respect to bank robbery and incidental crimes.

State Department Regulations Under Displaced Persons Act of 1948 as Amended by the Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Federal Register of September 23, 1950, because of the widespread interest in the Department of State regulations under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended by the act of 1950, and the relative difficulty of obtaining prints of the regulations through other sources:

TITLE 22—FOREIGN RELATIONS

CHAPTER I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Dept. Reg. 108.115]

Part 45—Visas: Documentation of aliens under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended

Visa Regulations

Cross reference: For regulations of the Displaced Persons Commission see 8 CFR parts 700–710, chapter IV (15 F. R. 3864). For regulations of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, see 8 CFR, chapter I, parts 105, 129, and 171 (15 F. R. 4440).

Chapter I, title 22, of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended by the addition of the following new part:

Sec.
45.1 Definitions.
45.2 Classes of applicants under the Displaced Persons Act.
45.3 Applications for visas: Qualifications.
45.4 Preference and priorities.
45.5 Procedure in issuing or refusing visas.
45.6 Exemptions.
45.7 Assurances under section 3 (b) and section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act.
45.8 Good-faith affidavit.
45.9 Disqualification to receive visas.
45.10 Visas: Numerical limitations.
45.11 Quota control.

Authority: Sections 45.1 to 45.11 issued under section 24 (43 Stat. 166), section 37 (54 Stat. 675; 8 U. S. C. 222, 458). (Interpret or apply 62 Stat. 1009–1014, Pub. Law 555, 81st Cong.; 50 U. S. C. App., Sup., 1951–1963.)

Sec. 45.1. Definitions: For the purposes of this part all pertinent terms which are defined in section 42.101 of this chapter shall have the meaning ascribed thereto in section 42.101. As used in this part, the term:

(a) "Displaced Persons Act," means the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, approved June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1009), as amended and extended by Public Law 555, Eighty-first Congress, second session, approved June 16, 1950.

(b) "Commission" means the Displaced Persons Commission established under the Displaced Persons Act.

(c) "Displaced person" shall have the meaning ascribed thereto in section 2 of the Displaced Persons Act.

(d) "Eligible displaced person" shall have the meaning, ascribed thereto in section 2 of the Displaced Persons Act and section 45.2 (a).

(e) "Eligible displaced orphan" shall have the meaning ascribed thereto in section 2 (e) of the Displaced Persons Act and section 45.2 (b).

(f) "Section 2 (f) orphan" shall have the meaning ascribed thereto in section 2 (f) of the Displaced Persons Act and section 45.2 (c) (1).

(g) "German ethnic origin" refers to a person who

(1) Was born in Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Russia, or Yugoslavia or areas which were under the control and domination on June 16, 1950, of any such countries, except those parts of Germany and Austria under military occupation on such date by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

(2) Resided, on January 1, 1949, in the western (American, British, or French) zones of Germany or Austria or western (American, British, or French) sectors of Berlin or Vienna; and

(3) Is a refugee or expellee who is characteristically Germanic, a status which shall be determined upon the basis of the following combination of factors, the presence or absence of any particular one of which shall not in itself be considered as conclusive, but any combination of which may be considered as providing satisfactory evidence of Germanic origin:

(i) Antecedents emigrated from Germany;

(ii) Uses German or any German dialect as the common language of the home or for social communication;

(iii) Resided in the country of birth in an area predominantly populated by persons of Germanic stock or origin who have retained German social characteristics and group homogeneity, as distinguished from the surrounding population;

(iv) Evidences common attributes or social characteristics of the Germanic group in which he resided in the country of birth such as educational institutions attended, church affiliation, social and political associations and affiliations, name, business or commercial practices and associations, and secondary languages or dialects.

(h) "Within the third degree of consanguinity" means lineal and collateral consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law. Lineal consanguinity is the direct line of descent and those within the third degree of such consanguinity include the child, grandchild, great-grandchild, parent, grandparent, and great-grandparent. Collateral consanguinity is the relationship of persons descended from the same common ancestor and those within the third degree of such consanguinity include the brother, sister, nephew, niece, uncle, aunt, first cousin, second cousin, grandnephew, grandniece, great-uncle, great-aunt, child of great-uncle or great-aunt, and child of first cousin.

(i) "Country of last residence," as used in sections 2 (d) and 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act means the country of alien's residence in which he had established his domicile, or in which he had the right to reside permanently and the right to work.

(j) "World War II" shall be considered to have started on September 1, 1939.

(k) "Applicant" means an alien applying for an immigration visa under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act and under the regulations contained in this part.

(l) "Principal applicant" means an applicant for whom an assurance of employment is provided or who confers derivative status on a spouse or minor dependent children.

(m) "Firmly settled," "firmly settled or resettled," or "firmly settled or firmly resettled" as used in sections 2 (c) (1), 3 (b) (3), 3 (b) (4), and 3 (c) (4), of the Displaced Persons Act are considered to be synonymous and shall have the meaning ascribed thereto in the regulations of the Commission (see 8 CFR 702.5 (15 F. R. 3867)): *Provided*, That a former member of the Polish Army as defined in section 3 (b) (3) of the Displaced Persons Act and as classified in section 45.2 (d) (2) who has not applied for British naturalization shall not be considered firmly settled or resettled if he registered for an immigration visa with a United States consular officer in Great Britain prior to June 16, 1950: *And provided further*, That a Greek refugee as defined in section 3 (b) (4) of the Displaced Persons Act and as classified in section 45.2 (d) (3), shall be considered firmly settled or firmly resettled if such refugee returned to his former habitual residence in Greece prior to January 1, 1950, or, if afforded the opportunity to return, he freely chose another place of residence prior to that date.

(n) "Unmarried" means not married at the time of issuance of a visa to the applicant, whether or not previously married.

(o) "Under 21 years of age" means under 21 years of age as of the time of issuance of a visa to the applicant.

(p) "Farm worker" means a person who engages in activities or performs services in his own behalf or as an employee of another person, trust, estate, partnership, corporation, or public agency in connection with farming in any of its branches and, among other things, includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the raising, production, cultivation growing, harvesting, and processing of any agricultural or horticultural commodities including (1) crude gum (oleoresin) from a living tree, and the following products as processed by the original producer of the crude gum (oleoresin) from which derived: Gum spirits of turpentine and gum resin, (2) maple sirup or maple sugar, and (3) mushrooms, the ginning of cotton, the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, management, and slaughtering of livestock, bees, poultry, fur-bearing animals, and wildlife on a farm, the hatching of poultry, and any practices (including any forestry

or lumbering operations) performed by a farmer or on a farm as an incident to, or in conjunction with such farming operations, including planting, handling, drying, packing, freezing, grading, processing (if such service is performed as an incident to ordinary farming operations, or in the case of fruits and vegetables as an incident to the preparation of such fruits and vegetables for market), storing, the preparation for market, delivery to storage or to market or to carriers for transportation to market, and the operation, management, conservation, improvement or maintenance of the farm and the tools and equipment used in connection therewith, and including further the operation or maintenance of ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways used exclusively for supplying and storing water for farming purposes: *Provided, however,* That the foregoing shall not include services performed in connection with commercial canning or commercial freezing or in connection with any agricultural or horticultural commodity after its delivery to a terminal market for processing or distribution for consumption.

(q) "British Isles" and "Great Britain" as used in section 3 (b) (3) of the Displaced Persons Act and in the regulations contained in this part are construed to be synonymous, and shall include England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland.

(r) "Until July 1, 1952" as used in section 2 (f) of the Displaced Persons Act means not later than midnight of June 30, 1952.

(s) "Natives of Greece" as used in section 3 (b) (4) of the Displaced Persons Act means aliens chargeable to the quota of Greece under section 12 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924.

(t) "Nationals of Greece" as used in section 3 (b) (4) means aliens who are citizens of Greece regardless of their place of birth.

(u) "Area or country in Europe" as used in section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act shall include the Azores, the British Isles, the Dodecanese Islands, Iceland, Madeira, Svalbard, and all islands in the Mediterranean under the sovereignty of European countries.

(v) "Department" means the Department of State of the United States of America.

SEC. 45.2. Classes of applicants under the Displaced Persons Act—(a) Eligible displaced persons—(1) IRO displaced persons and refugees: This class shall consist of aliens who (i) are displaced persons or refugees as defined in annex I of the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization and are the concern of such Organization; (ii) on or after September 1, 1939, and on or before January 1, 1949, entered Germany, Austria, or Italy; (iii) on January 1, 1949, were in Italy or the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or in the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria, or who had temporarily absented themselves therefrom for reasons which show special circumstances justifying such absence; and (iv) have not been firmly resettled.

(2) Persecutees—Residents of Germany and Austria: This class shall consist of persons as defined in section 2 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act who (i) resided in Germany or Austria; (ii) were victims of persecution by the Nazi government and were detained in Germany or Austria, or were obliged to flee from and subsequently returned to one of such countries; and (iii) have not been firmly resettled.

(3) Venezia Giulia refugees: This class shall consist of persons as defined in section 2 (g) of the Displaced Persons Act who (i) were residents of Venezia Giulia prior to May 6, 1945; (ii) on or after May 6, 1945, departed from those parts of Venezia Giulia placed under the sovereignty or administration of Yugoslavia under the terms of the treaty of peace with Italy signed at Paris February 10, 1947; (iii) on June 16, 1950, were not de jure Italian citizens; and (v) on July 1, 1947, were in Italy or in the United States-United Kingdom zone of the Free Territory of Trieste, or in the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or in the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria. Not more than 2,000 immigration visas within the total numerical limitations provided in section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act shall be issued to persons entitled to classification under this subparagraph.

(4) Section 2 (a) persecutees: This class shall consist of persons as defined in section 2 (d) of the Displaced Persons Act who (i) have been displaced from the country of their birth, or nationality, or their last residence since January 1, 1946; (ii) fled into Italy or the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria; (iii) cannot return to the country of their birth, nationality, or last residence because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions; and (iv) whose admission into the United States for permanent residence is recommended by or on behalf of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. Not more than 500 immigration visas within the total numerical limitations provided in section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act shall be issued to persons entitled to classification under this subparagraph.

(b) Eligible displaced orphans—(1) Displaced orphans in general: This class shall consist of persons as defined in section 2 (e) of the Displaced Persons Act, exclusive of Greek orphans defined therein, who (i) had not passed their sixteenth birthday anniversary on June 25, 1948; (ii) are orphans because of the death or disappearance of both parents, or who have been abandoned, or deserted by, or separated or lost from, both parents, or who have only one parent due to the death or disappearance of the other and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for any such orphan and agrees to release him for emigration and adoption or guardianship; and (iii) on or before June 16, 1950, were in Italy or in the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria.

(2) Greek orphans: This class shall consist of persons as defined in section 2 (e) of the Displaced Persons Act who (i) are natives of Greece; (ii) had not passed their sixteenth birthday anniversary on June 25, 1948; (iii) are orphans because of the death or disappearance of both parents, or who have been abandoned, or deserted by, or separated or lost from, both parents, or who have only one parent due to the death or disappearance of the other and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for any such displaced person and agrees to release him for emigration and adoption or guardianship; (iv) on or after January 1, 1940, and on or before January 1, 1949, were forcibly removed or forced to flee from their former habitual residences in Greece as a direct result of military operations in Greece by the Nazi Government or by military operations in Greece by the Communist guerrillas, and (v) were residing in Greece on January 1, 1950.

(3) Not more than 5,000 special nonquota immigration visas within the total numerical limitations provided in section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act shall be issued to persons entitled to classification under subparagraphs (1) and (2) of this paragraph.

(c) Other orphans and adopted children—(1) Section 2 (f) orphans: This class shall consist of persons as defined in section 2 (f) of the Displaced Persons Act who (i) are under the age of 10 years at the time of issuance of the visa (ii) prior to June 30, 1950, were residents of Germany, Luxemburg, Austria, Italy, the United States-United Kingdom zone of the Free Territory of Trieste, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Portugal, France, Switzerland, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Greece, or Turkey; (iii) are orphans because of the death or disappearance of both parents, or because of abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or who have only one parent due to the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, the other parent and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for any such orphan and agrees to release him for emigration and adoption or guardianship; and (iv) prior to June 30, 1951, have assurances of proper care submitted to the Commission in their behalf for admission to the United States for permanent residence with a father or mother by adoption, or with a near relative, or with a citizen of the United States, or with an alien admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or who are seeking to enter the United States to come to a public or private agency approved by the Commission. Not more than 5,000 special nonquota immigration visas, in addition to the total numerical limitations provided in section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act, shall be issued until July 1, 1952, to persons entitled to classification under this subparagraph.

(2) Section 12 (c) adopted children: This class shall consist of children as defined in section 12 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act who (i) are chargeable either to the German or Austrian quota under the provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924 or the provisions of section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act; (ii) had not passed their sixteenth birthday anniversary on June 25, 1948; and (iii) prior to May 1, 1949, were legally adopted under the laws of the country in which they resided by American citizens residing abroad temporarily. Such a child, although classifiable as a nonpreference quota immigrant, shall be accorded a top priority in the issuance of a visa notwithstanding the preferences provided by section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 and section 6 of the Displaced Persons Act.

(d) Additional classes: Immigration visas may be issued to the following additional classes pursuant to the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act:

(1) China refugees: This class shall consist of displaced persons and refugees as defined in annex I of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, except Spanish Republicans and other victims of the Falangist regime in Spain, whether enjoying international status as refugees or not, who (i) resided in China as displaced persons or refugees on July 1, 1948, or on June 16, 1950; and (ii) are still in China, or having departed therefrom, have not subsequently proceeded to, been received for, and accepted permanent residence in, any other country. Not more than 4,000 immigration visas within the total numerical limitations provided in section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act shall be issued to persons entitled to classification under this subparagraph.

(2) Polish war veterans in Great Britain: This class shall consist of persons as defined in section 3 (b) (3) of the Displaced Persons Act who (i) were members of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Poland during World War II; (ii) were honorably discharged from such forces; (ii) were residing in the British Isles on June 16, 1950; (iv) have not been firmly settled or resettled; and (v) registered for an immigration visa with a United States consular officer in Great Britain prior to, and were validly registered as of June 16, 1950. Not more than 18,000 immigration visas within the total numerical limitations provided in section 3 (a) of the Displaced

Persons Act shall be issued to persons entitled to classification under this subparagraph.

(3) Greek refugees: This class shall consist of persons as defined in section 3 (b) (4) of the Displaced Persons Act who (i) are natives of Greece; (ii) on or after January 1, 1940, and on or before January 1, 1949, were forcibly removed or forced to flee from their former habitual residence in Greece as a direct result of military operations in Greece by the Nazi government or by military operations in Greece by the Communist guerrillas; and (iii) prior to January 1, 1950, had not been either firmly settled or firmly resettled. Not more than 7,500 immigration visas within the total numerical limitations provided in section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act shall be issued to persons entitled to classification under this subparagraph.

(4) Greek preferentials: This class shall consist of persons who (i) prior to June 30, 1950, were residents and nationals of Greece; (ii) are eligible for admission to the United States as first or second preference quota immigrants, including persons skilled in agriculture, as provided in section 6 (a) (1) of the Immigration Act of 1924; and (iii) prior to June 30, 1951, make application to an American consular officer in Greece for appropriate visas with which to apply for admission to the United States for permanent residence. Not more than 2,500 immigration visas within the total numerical limitations provided in section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act shall be issued to persons entitled to classification under this subparagraph.

(5) Section 3 (c) out-of-zone refugees: This class shall consist of persons as defined in section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act who (i) on or after September 1, 1939, and prior to January 1, 1949, entered an area or country in Europe outside Italy or the American, British, or French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or the American, British, or French zone of either Germany or Austria; (ii) establish that they are persons of European national origin displaced from the country of their birth, nationality, or last residence, as a result of events subsequent to the outbreak of World War II; (iii) are unable to return to any of such countries because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions; and (iv) have not been firmly resettled in any other country. During the period beginning July 1, 1950, and ending June 30, 1954, 50 percent of the nonpreference portion of the immigration quotas as provided in section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 shall be available for the issuance of immigration visas to persons who are entitled to classification under this subparagraph, exclusive of the total numerical limitations provided in section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act.

(6) Persons of German ethnic origin: This class shall consist of persons of German ethnic origin as defined in section 45.1 (g). Not more than 54,744 immigration visas, in addition to the total numerical limitations provided in section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act, and including the visas issued to aliens in this class since June 25, 1948, shall be issued to persons entitled to classification under this subparagraph.

(e) Spouses and minor children: This class shall consist of the spouses and unmarried dependent children under 21 years of age, including adopted children and stepchildren, who intend to accompany, and propose to live with, persons described in paragraphs (a) and (d) of this section.

SEC. 45.3. Application for visas—Qualifications: (a) An applicant shall have the burden of establishing that he is entitled to the specific classification under which he makes application as well as his eligibility to receive a visa under the general immigration laws and regulations. An applicant shall not be issued an immigration visa if the consular officer knows or has reason to believe that such applicant is subject to exclusion from the United States under any provisions of the immigration laws and regulations or (1) is not a displaced person and an eligible displaced person if applying for a visa as such, or (2) is not eligible to receive a visa under any provision of the Displaced Persons Act and the regulations contained in this part.

(b) An applicant who is an eligible displaced person or an eligible displaced orphan for whom assurances have been furnished pursuant to the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act shall not be required to furnish an affidavit, or other evidence, of support. However, if the assurances of employment, housing, or of proper care submitted in behalf of such applicant are deemed by the consular officer to be inadequate for the purposes for which they are submitted, no visa shall be issued to the applicant.

(c) In determining whether an applicant is eligible under the Displaced Persons Act, the certification and report of the Commission, prepared pursuant to section 10 of the Displaced Persons Act, shall be considered by the consular officer as establishing, in the absence of specific knowledge or substantial belief showing ineligibility, that the applicant is eligible under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, except so far as such report relates to the issuance of a visa under the general immigration laws and regulations. Consular officers shall not be required to reopen or review each case de novo in the absence of specific knowledge or substantial belief showing ineligibility under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, as distinguished from the question of eligibility to receive a visa under the general immigration laws and regulations. In the event the consular officer has specific knowledge or substantial belief showing ineligibility under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, an appropriate inquiry shall be instituted to ascertain the facts relative thereto, and, in this connection, the consular officer may interrogate the applicant or any other persons, and may consider any evidence deemed relevant to a determination of the alien's eligibility under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act.

(d) So far as concerns applicants under the provisions of sections 3 (b), 3 (c), and 12 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act who registered with a United States consular officer prior to June 14, 1950, the burden of coming forward to claim eligibility under any of such provisions shall be borne by the applicant, and if such eligibility is established, his priority in the issuance of a visa shall be determined as of his original registration priority.

Sec. 45.4, Preferences and priorities: (a) The preferences and priorities provided within the quotas by the Immigration Act of 1924 and the regulations issued thereunder shall not be applicable in the case of any person receiving an immigration visa pursuant to the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, except as otherwise expressly provided in this section. In lieu thereof, the following preferences, without priority in time of issuance of visas as between such preferences or as between preference or nonpreference cases under the Displaced Persons Act, shall be granted to persons and their family dependents who are the spouses or the unmarried dependent children under 21 years of age, including adopted children and stepchildren of such persons:

(1) Aliens who are farm, household, construction, clothing, and garment workers and other workers needed in the locality in the United States in which such persons propose to reside, or persons possessing special educational, scientific, technological, or professional qualifications.

(2) Persons who are the blood relatives of citizens or lawfully admitted alien residents of the United States, such relationship in either case being within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law.

(3) Within the foregoing preference classes priority in the issuance of visas shall be given to eligible displaced persons who during World War II bore arms against the enemies of the United States or who served honorably in the labor service or guard units of the United States Army, and their family dependents who are the spouses or the unmarried dependent children under 21 years of age, including adopted children and stepchildren.

(b) Notwithstanding the preferences established by paragraph (a) of this section, and the preferences authorized by section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924, top priority in the issuance of immigration visas under the German and Austrian quotas shall be granted to adopted children described in section 45.2 (c) (2). The date of registration for an immigration visa with the United States consular office shall determine the priority among such children in the issuance of visas within the classification. Immigration visas issued pursuant to this paragraph shall be charged to the nonpreference portion of such quotas.

Sec. 45.5. Proceedure in issuing or refusing visas under the Displaced Persons Act: (a) Except as otherwise expressly provided in this part, consular officers shall follow the procedure prescribed in sections 42.317–42.357 of this chapter in issuing immigration visas pursuant to the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act.

(b) Supporting documents required under section 42.327 of this chapter shall be attached to the visa application. Reports required under the provisions of sections 10 and 12 of the Displaced Persons Act with respect to eligible displaced persons and persons of German ethnic origin shall be appended to the visa in such manner as to make them readily available to officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Consular officers shall insist upon presentation of birth certificates if such certificates are reasonably procurable, and in those cases in which the consular officer knows or has reason to believe that the alien was not born in the alleged country of birth, the alien shall be required to present satisfactory evidence of his birthplace. In cases where birth or police certificates are not reasonably available, secondary evidence of birthplace, character references, or other probative evidence may be accepted in lieu thereof.

(c) In the case of any applicant who is determined by the Commission to be eligible under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act and who, for any reason, is refused an immigration visa by a consular officer, a report in writing, approved and signed by the consular officer in charge shall be submitted to the Commission for the purpose of maintaining orderly records, which report shall show the cause for rejection of the applicant and shall contain a reference to the specific provision or provisions of law on which such rejection is based. In any such case the consular officer shall notify the appropriate field representative of the Commission of the action taken.

(d) No quota immigration visa shall be issued under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act or the regulations promulgated pursuant thereto until the visa-issuing officer shall have received an appropriate quota number for such purpose.

(e) Nonquota immigration visas issued within the numerical limitations prescribed in the Displaced Persons Act shall be numbered serially in a common series from which such numbers shall be apportioned by the Department in order to keep the issuances of such visas within the numerical limitations prescribed.

(f) Quota nationality shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 12 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, unless expressly provided otherwise in the Displaced Persons Act. However, section 12 (a) (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924, providing that the accompanying wife under certain conditions may be charged to the quota of her husband, shall not be applicable so far as concerns the Displaced Persons Act, except section 3 (c) thereof. In all such cases the accompanying wife shall be charged to the quota of her nationality. However, section 12 (a) (1) of the Immigration Act of 1924, providing that a minor child accompanied by its alien parent shall be charged to the quota of such parent, shall apply in the case of children accompanying parents under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act.

(g) In the case of an alien applying for an immigration visa pursuant to the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act and of the Immigration Act of 1924, application Forms 256a and 256b shall be revised as follows:

(1) In the space provided in the upper left-hand corner of Form 256a and 256b, a line shall be drawn through the inapplicable words and the statement revised to read: "I claim to be an applicant under the Displaced Persons Act, and my claim is based on the following facts."

(2) In the adjoining space provided below on Form 256a and 256b the statement shall be revised to read: "Available documents required by the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and the Displaced Persons Act are filed herewith and made a part hereof as follows."

(3) The clause at the lower end of the visa application form beginning with the word "Wherefore" shall be revised to read: "Wherefore, I apply for an Immigration Visa pursuant to the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 and the Displaced Persons Act."

(4) On the reverse side of Form 256a and 256b, the blank space opposite the fifth "box" shall be used to show the classification of persons under the Displaced Persons Act, except Greek preferentials as classified in section 45.2 (d) (4) and as to which the usual procedure shall be followed. In this connection, reference shall be made to the specific subsection or subdivision of the Displaced Persons Act under which the applicant is classified followed by a descriptive designation as used to identify the several classes of applicants in section 45.2, for example, "Section 2 (c)—Eligible displaced person," or Section 2 (e)—Eligible displaced orphan," or "Section 2 (g)—Venezia Giulia refugee," or "Section 3 (b) (2)—China Refugee," or "Section 12 (a)—German ethnic origin."

(5) On the reverse side of Form 256a and 256b, the statement directly above the space provided for the signature of the visa-issuing officer shall be revised to read: "The bearer, who is of (citizen or subject) nationality, having been seen and examined, is classified as a (insert descriptive designation used above) and is granted this immigration visa pursuant to the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 and the Displaced Persons Act."

SEC. 45.6. Exemptions—(a) Visa fees: No fee shall be charged for an immigration visa, or application therefor, issued to an eligible displaced person, an eligible displaced orphan, a person of German ethnic origin, or a section 12 (c) adopted child. In all other cases of applicants under the Displaced Persons Act, the issuance of an immigration visa shall be subject to payment of the prescribed fee of $1 for the application and $9 for the visa.

(b) Contract labor and assisted immigration: The excluding provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875–878; 8 U. S. C. 136), relating to contract labor and the payment of an alien's ticket or passage by another, or by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, either directly or indirectly, shall not be applicable to persons whose admission into the United States is authorized under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act: *Provided,* That the benefits of exemption from the contract-labor provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, which are provided by section 3 (b) (5) of the Displaced Persons Act, shall not apply in the case of a person whose application under the Displaced Persons Act is based on the submission of an affidavit or other evidence of support. In lieu thereof, the applicant may submit assurances, as provided in section 45.7 of this part, in order to have the benefits of such exemption.

SEC. 45.7 Assurances under sections 3 (b) and 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act—(a) Assurances in lieu of affidavits of support: In lieu of affidavits of support or other evidence of support, a person authorized to be admitted under sections 3 (b) and 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act may submit to consular officers assurances by a citizen or citizens of the United States in such form as is prescribed in this section, which shall provide that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment, and that such person and the members of his family who shall accompany and who propose to live with him shall not become public charges and will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing. Either form of evidence shall be acceptable and either may be used for different individuals, except that an affidavit of support may be submitted by an alien resident of the United States as well as by a citizen of the United States. The term "citizen or citizens of the United States" shall include (1) domestic corporations, partnerships or other firms having their principal place of business within the United States; and (2) American public or voluntary agencies recognized by the Department for this purpose: *Provided,* That a voluntary agency within the meaning of this part shall be an agency which provides services in connection with the immigration, settlement, or welfare of aliens: *And provided further,* That the officer or member of such corporation, partnership, firm, or agency who executes the assurance in its behalf shall be a citizen of the United States.

(b) Assurance of employment: (1) The assurance that an applicant will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment shall provide such information as may be required to satisfy the responsible consular officer that (i) suitable activities for salary, wages, or other gain are to be made available to the applicant by, through, or on behalf of the individual or agency furnishing the assurance; (ii) the wages or compensation offered are not less than the prevailing rate for like activity in the community where the employment is pursued; (iii) the employment is of a permanent or indefinite nature and will be available at the time of the arrival of the applicant in the United States; and (iv) that no person will be removed from employment because of the activities to be performed by the applicant.

(2) Assurance that an applicant will, as his principal activity, attend regular sessions at a school in the United States and that he will undertake studies appropriate to his age and prior scholastic attainment shall, for the purposes of the Displaced Persons Act, be deemed to be assurance that the applicant will be suitably employed.

(3) If the employment is to be provided by an individual other than the person furnishing the required assurances, a statement in triplicate from the prospective employer, preferably on the business stationery of such employer, shall accompany the assurances, which statement shall contain a specific offer of employment, and shall indicate the place, nature, and anticipated duration, and other pertinent data relative thereto. The original of such statement shall accompany Form 256a; the duplicate thereof shall be attached to Form 256b; and the third copy given to the alien.

(c) Assurance of housing: The assurance that the principal applicant and the members of his family who will accompany him and who propose to live with him will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing shall provide such information as may be required to satisfy the responsible consular officer that (i) adequate housing will be available to the applicants upon arrival in the United States, and (ii) no occupant of such housing will be displaced therefrom in order to accommodate the occupancy of such applicants.

(d) Assurance against becoming a public charge: The assurance against becoming a public charge shall provide such information as may be required to satisfy the responsible consular officer that neither the principal applicant nor any of the members of his family who will accompany him and who propose to live with him will become a public charge.

(e) Assurance of transportation: In the case of an applicant who is ineligible for transportation provided by the International Refugee Organization, or by the Commission, the consular officer shall be satisfied, prior to the issuance of a visa to the applicant, that adequate arrangements will be made for the transportation of such applicant from his place of foreign residence to his destination in the United States, and in support thereof the consular officer may require the submission of such supplemental assurances as he deems necessary.

(f) Forms of assurances: (1) The assurances referred to in paragraphs (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section shall be in such written form as may be prescribed by the Department and, except for the assurances submitted by public agencies or voluntary agencies approved by the Department, shall be sworn to or affirmed before a notary public or other person authorized to administer oaths or affirmations. Assurance forms may be obtained from such public agencies or voluntary agencies or from the Visa Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

(2) The assurance form prescribed for the purpose of this section shall contain the following statement immediately preceding the jurat: "I am furnishing this assurance fully mindful of the provisions of section 15 of the Displaced Persons Act providing that any person or persons who knowingly violate or conspire to violate any provision of such act, except section 9, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $500 or more than $10,000, or shall be imprisoned not less than 2 or more than 10 years, or both."

(g) Adequacy of assurances: If the consular officer is satisfied that the assurances submitted pursuant to the provisions of this section meet the requirements of the Displaced Persons Act and the regulations contained in this part, he may proceed to a further consideration of the applicant's eligibility under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, and his eligibility to receive an immigration visa under the general immigration laws and regulations. If the consular officer is not satisfied that the assurances meet such requirements, he may require the sponsor to provide additional information relative thereto. If such additional information is not submitted within a reasonable time, or if submitted, does not meet the requirements of the Displaced Persons Act and the regulations contained in this part, the consular officer shall discontinue consideration of the application based on such assurances, and shall notify the applicant and the sponsor of his action.

(h) Named and unnamed assurances: Assurances submitted to a consular officer as

provided in this section may be either named assurances (identifying the particular applicant by name), or unnamed assurances (not identifying the applicant by name but requesting admission of an alien having specific skills or other qualifications): *Provided*, That in the case of an applicant under section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act only named assurances may be submitted.

(i) Public agencies and voluntary agencies: For the purpose of this section, public agencies and voluntary agencies shall include only such agencies as are recognized by the Department, and consular officers shall not accept assurances from any agency not so recognized and included in an approved list thereof furnished by the Department. Assurances submitted by public agencies or voluntary agencies shall conform to all the applicable requirements prescribed in this section.

(j) Assurances, section 2, orphans—(1) Greek orphans: Assurances required by subsection (e) of section (2) of the Displaced Persons Act in the case of a Greek orphan shall be submitted to the Commission in accordance with the regulations thereof as contained in 8 CFR, parts 700–710 (15 F. R. 3864). In areas where the operations of the Commission do not extend, such assurances, upon being validated by the Commission, will be forwarded to the appropriate consular office.

(2) Section 2 (f) orphans: The procedure prescribed in subparagraph (1) of this paragraph shall be applicable in the cases of orphans defined in subsection (f) of section (2) of the Displaced Persons Act, except that the assurance required thereunder may be given either by a citizen of the United States or by an alien admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and shall be submitted to the Commission prior to June 30, 1951: *Provided*, That no immigration visa shall be issued subsequent to June 30, 1952, to an orphan defined in subsection (f) of section 2 of the Displaced Persons Act.

Section 45.8. Good-faith affidavit: (a) An applicant applying for an immigration visa under the provisions of section 3 (b) or 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act whose admission is based on the submission of an assurance of suitable employment shall execute a signed statement under oath or affirmation that he accepts and agrees in good faith to abide by the terms of employment provided in such assurances. Consular officers are authorized to administer the required oath or affirmation without fee.

(b) The affidavit provided for in paragraph (a) of this section shall be executed in duplicate in accordance with the terms of a prescribed form to be furnished by the Department. The original of such affidavit shall be attached to visa application Form 256a, and a duplicate copy thereof shall be attached to Form 256b.

Section 45.9. Disqualification to receive visas: (a) No visa shall be issued to any applicant whose admission under the Displaced Persons Act is based on the submission of an assurance of suitable employment unless the applicant shall first execute the good-faith affidavit required by section 6 of the Displaced Persons Act and the regulations contained in this part.

(b) No alien shall be issued a visa of any kind under the general immigration laws and regulations or under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act if the consular officer knows or has reason to believe that the alien has willfully made a misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as an eligible displaced person. In any case involving a reasonable doubt, the consular officer shall communicate with the Department with a view to obtaining an advisory opinion, and shall submit with his communication all the pertinent facts on which such doubt is based.

(c) No applicant shall be issued an immigration visa as an eligible displaced person, as a person of German ethnic origin, or as a section 12 (c) adopted child, in the absence of a written report from the Commission concerning his character, history, and eligibility as required by sections 10 and 12 of the Displaced Persons Act.

(d) No applicant shall be issued an immigration visa if the consular officer knows or has reason to believe that the applicant, subject to the exemptions expressly provided in section 45.6 (b), is excluded from admission to the United States under any of the provisions of the immigration laws and regulations, or if the consular officer knows or has reason to believe that the applicant is not entitled to the specific classification under which he makes application.

(e) No applicant shall be issued an immigration visa if the consular officer knows or has reason to believe that:

(1) The applicant is or has ever been a member of the Communist, Nazi, or Fascist Party or of a political or subversive group of an ideological character similar to that of any of said parties:

(2) The applicant adheres to, advocates, or follows, or has adhered to, advocated, or followed, the principles of any political or economic system or philosophy directed toward both the destruction of free competitive enterprise and the revolutionary overthrow of representative governments;

(3) The applicant is or has been a member of any organization which has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States as a Communist organization;

(4) The applicant is or has been a member of or participated in any movement which is or has been hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States;

(5) The applicant has advocated or assisted in the persecution of any person because of race, religion, or national origin;

(6) The applicant voluntarily bore arms against the United States during World War II. This provision shall apply to aliens who voluntarily bore arms against the United States on the western front, including North Africa and Italy, but shall not apply to aliens, other than German nationals, who were forced against their will to serve in the German armed forces or auxiliary organizations.

(f) No visa shall be issued to an applicant coming within the provisions of sections 3 (b) or 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act in the absence of a thorough security check. An appropriate report thereon shall be placed in the applicant's file.

(g) No immigration visa shall be issued to a person coming within the provisions of section 2 (d) of the Displaced Persons Act and classified as a persecutee in section 45.2 (a) (4) in the absence of an appropriate instruction from the Department.

SEC. 45.10. Numerical limitations on visas: (a) In accordance with the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, a total of 400,744 immigration visas, including visas previously issued under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, may be issued as follows:

(1) Not more than 341,000 to eligible displaced persons and eligible displaced orphans, and certain other classes.

(2) Not more than 54,744 to persons of German ethnic origin and their spouses and children.

(3) Not more than 5,000 to nonquota orphans under 10 years of age.

(b) Within the 341,000 immigration visas authorized by section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act and referred to in paragraph (a) (1) of this section, numerical limitations on the issuance of visas to designated classes shall apply as follows:

(1) Eligible displaced orphans	5,000
(2) China refugees and their spouses and children	4,000
(3) Polish veterans and their spouses and children	18,000
(4) Greek refugees and their spouses and children	7,500
(5) Greek preferentials	2,500
(6) Venezia Giulian refugees and their spouses and children	2,000

(c) In the event that all of the special classes of persons enumerated in paragraph (b) of this section do not receive the total of 39,000 visas authorized for such classes, the unused portion shall be made available to qualified aliens classifiable as eligible displaced persons to the extent of such unused portion but not in excess of 341,000.

(d) The number of immigration visas which may be issued to "out-of-zone" refugees pursuant to the provisions of section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act shall be determined by the current numerical limitations on the quotas of the countries concerned.

(e) All persons receiving visas pursuant to the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act shall be charged to their proper quota on a current-year or a future-year basis, except the 5,000 eligible displaced orphans for whom special nonquota immigration visas are provided by section 3 (b) (1) of the Displaced Persons Act, and the 5,000 orphans under the age of 10 years for whom special nonquota immigration visas are provided by section 2 (f) of that Act, and other applicants who qualify for nonquota status under the general immigration laws.

(f) The number of immigration visas which may be issued to adopted children pursuant to the provisions of section 12 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act, exclusive of those which may be issued to such adopted children who qualify as persons of German ethnic origin, shall be determined by current numerical limitations on the immigration quotas of Germany and Austria.

(g) A quota number used in issuing an immigration visa to a particular applicant shall not be used in the issuance of a visa to any other applicant even though the original recipient thereof fails, for any reason, to use his immigration visa.

(h) A replace visa may be issued to the original applicant under the same number of the same quota, or to a nonquota applicant, during the effective period of the particular provisions of the Displaced Persons Act under which the applicant was classified and was issued his original visa: *Provided*, That in applying therefor the applicant is found to be still qualified to receive a replace visa under the same provisions of the Displaced Persons Act as were originally applicable to his case. If the original visa was allotted from a current quota, no replace visa may be issued subsequent to the quota year in which such original visa was issued.

SEC. 45.11. Quota control: The following rules are prescribed to govern the administration of immigration quotas under the Immigration Act of 1924 as affected by the Displaced Persons Act:

(a) The first 50 percent of the quota of each nationality for each of the fiscal years beginning July 1, 1950, shall be made available for the issuance of immigration visas to qualified applicants of the first-preference quota class specified in section 6 (a) (1) of the Immigration Act of 1924.

(b) The remainder, if any, of the 50 percent of each quota referred to in paragraph (a) of this section shall be made available for the issuance of immigration visas to qualified applicants of the second-preference quota class specified in section 6 (a) (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924.

(c) Any portion of the first 50 percent of each annual quota referred to in paragraph (a) of this section not required for the issuance of immigration visas to qualified applicants entitled to first or second preference under the provisions of sections 6 (a) (1) or 6 (a) (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924, shall be made available to aliens qualifying for nonpreference status under the provi-

sions of section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act and section 6 (a) (3) of the Immigration Act of 1924: *Provided,* That not more than 50 percent of such unrequired portion shall be made available to applicants qualifying under the provisions of section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act.

(d) Twenty-five percent of the quota of each nationality, for each of the fiscal years beginning July 1, 1950, and ending June 30, 1954, shall be made available for the issuance of immigration visas to qualified applicants under all provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, except section 3 (c) thereof, and for persons whose cases are adjusted under section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended, and for persons whose cases are adjusted under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act: *Provided,* That beginning July 1, 1954, as much as 50 percent of any quota may be used in any fiscal year for persons covered by this paragraph.

(e) During the fiscal years beginning July 1, 1950, and ending June 30, 1954, 25 percent of each annual quota, exclusive of the 50 percent (first preference immigrants) referred to in paragraph (a) of this section, and the 25 percent (displaced persons) referred to in paragraph (d) of this section, shall be made available first for the issuance of immigration visas to qualified applicants entitled to preference under the provisions of section 6 (a) (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924, and second to qualified applicants under the provisions of section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act: *Provided,* That not more than 50 percent of the quota numbers not required for issuance to qualified applicants under the provisions of section 6 (a) (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924 shall be made available for issuance to qualified applicants under the provisions of section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act: *Provided further,* That any residue of such 25 percent shall be made available for issuance to qualified applicants entitled to nonpreference status under the provisions of section 6 (a) (3) of the Immigration Act of 1924.

(f) The reduction of a quota as required by the enactment of private acts by the Congress shall operate to reduce that particular portion of each annual quota from which a quota number is most readily available.

This order shall become effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Compliance with the provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 238; U. S. C. 1003) relative to notice of proposed rule making and delayed effective date is unnecessary because the regulations contained in this order involved foreign-affairs functions of the United States.

JAMES E. WEBB,
Acting Secretary of State.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1950.

Recommended, so far as the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 and the Alien Registration Act, 1940, are concerned:

J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Attorney General.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1950.

[F. R. Doc. 50-8366; filed September 22, 1950; 8:52 a. m.]

Philippine Support of United Nations Forces Against Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a recipient of the speech of the Honorable Camilo Osias, a distinguished member of the Philippine Senate and a former colleague of great ability who served with us in this House as Resident Commissioner for his Government, I am impelled to invoke the privilege accorded me and to insert in the RECORD the speech delivered by him on August 7, 1950.

The speech deserves preservation in the RECORD of the Congress of the United States where it will remain available to our people for their perusal and edification. It should serve to convince even the skeptics that despite political differences in the Philippine Islands, there is unity upon the question of Korea and the course pursued by the United States and supported by the United Nations.

It is to be noted that Mr. Osias is a member of the minority party and that he is critical of the Chief Executive, President Elpedio Quirino, and of the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Carlos Romulo, both of whom are my good friends of many years' standing, and to which criticism I do not subscribe.

However, Mr. Speaker, the speech is doubly significant and illustrates the point I desire to call to your attention and to emphasize, which is despite partisan differences and criticism, on the crucial question of Korea there is unqualified support and agreement. In his peroration the Senator from La Union refers to the binding ties between the Governments of the United States and the Philippines which warms the cockles of my heart and proves to me anew and to the world that I have reckoned correctly upon the undying friendship of the Filipinos, who over the half century became wed to the people of the United States and thus by their ties of sentiment, affection, and appreciation are in reality related to us by custom, language, and democracy.

The speech follows:

[Second Congress of the Republic of the Philippines, second special session, begun and held at the city of Manila on Tuesday, the 1st day of August 1950]

Concurrent Resolution 16

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress of the Philippines to render every possible assistance to the United Nations forces in the Korean conflict

Whereas, on June 25, 1950, the armies of North Korea crossed the thirty-eighth parallel and without cause or provocation attacked the Republic of Korea;

Whereas despite the cease-fire directive of the Security Council of the United Nations issued on the day of the aggression, the North Korean armies pressed the attack on South Korea, thereby causing the Security Council to meet again on June 27, 1950, and approve a resolution calling on all members of the United Nations to "furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack";

Whereas it is the duty of the Republic of the Philippines under article 25 of the UN Charter "to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council," a duty which is accentuated by the fact that the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines is the present President of the United Nations General Assembly;

Whereas apart from its obligations under the UN Charter, the Republic of the Philippines should rally enthusiastically to the support of the UN action in Korea because the fate that awaits the Republic of Korea in this crucial contest may well decide the fate of small and militarily weak nations like the Philippines;

Whereas the President of the Philippines, in his special message to Congress, declared that "the Philippine Government has pledged its support to the United Nations effort in Korea to the limit of its available resources": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives of the Philippines concurring), To express, as it does hereby express, the sense of the Congress of the Philippines that the Republic of the Philippines should render every possible assistance to the United Nations effort in the Korean conflict, including the participation of Filipino troops, and to inform, as it does hereby inform, the President of the Philippines of its readiness to adopt such measures as may be necessary and adequate to render such assistance in the shortest possible time.

Adopted August 10, 1950.

SPEECH OF SENATOR CAMILO OSIAS, SENATOR OF THE PHILIPPINES, IN SUPPORT OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16, EXTENDING MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO KOREA AT THE SPECIAL SESSION ON AUGUST 7, 1950

Senator OSIAS. Mr. President, I desire to be recognized on this resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT. The gentleman from La Union has the floor.

Senator OSIAS. Mr. President, the Senate has before it a resolution of national import and of international implications. It is, therefore, important; and as a minority man, I rise to make patent our consistent principle that in matters of great moment there is no need for anyone to appeal to us for unity. We are, as a party, unity in action.

This concurrent resolution calculated to make the Republic of the Philippines render ever possible assistance to the United Nations in suppressing the Korean aggression is a resolution that involves a momentous decision for every member of this august, deliberative body. For the vote that we shall cast, we will be responsible to our conscience, to our people, before the bar of public opinion and before the verdict of history. The collective will of the congress shall reveal the soul of the nation in the face of a severe trial and an impending danger. The resolution calls for calm and deliberate reflection. It will test our stature as representatives of a free and sovereign nation, and our combined judgment will measure our statesmanship. It will likewise serve as a measure whether we are fit as a people to move, live, and have our being in a society of free and civilized nations.

Before I proceed, I express the prayerful hope that neither we nor the generations who will come after us will be called upon again to have to deliberate and vote on a measure so transcendental as this.

Mr. President, our first need is to come out in the clear from the forest of confusion. There is confusion in the United Nations, there has been confusion in Washington, and there is confusion in our own land. So it is necessary that we come out in the clear, as I said, from out of this forest of confusion.

Just now the United Nations are divided. In the Security Council, the powerhouse of the United Nations, prominent members are at loggerheads. Soviet Russia with her Malik and satellites on the one hand, and the United States and the free nations represented in the Council on the other, are expressing contrary opinions. Malik, now the president of the Security Council, has propagandized the world in the name of Soviet Russia that the aggressor nation is the United States, and that those associated with her are also aggressor nations. But the opinion of the world has become clear. There is no blinking the fact that Communist-sponsored North Korea committed a perfidious act of aggression. And in the defense of the ideology of

the United Nations, the United States and those associated with her in this great adventure of freedom are fighting a war of defense to keep alive and make robust the ideals incarnated in the charter of the United Nations organization.

In Washington, too, there has been confusion. At one time America abandoned Nationalist China in the continent. At another time we read President Truman observing the hands-off policy in Formosa. But more recently the happy intelligence came to us that the Commander in Chief of the Republic of America ordered the Seventh Fleet and, subsequently, some other forces to prevent aggression against Formosa and even to defend Formosa.

In our own land we have had confusion worse confounded. At one time President Quirino advocated the Pacific Union and, coming immediately after the organization of the North Atlantic Pact, he then envisaged an anti-Communist alliance. That was reaffirmed when President Quirino had a conversation with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and later supported by Syngman Rhee. But then the political campaign was on. The white paper on China was published in Washington. The aspirant for presidential election went to Washington and after meeting American officials and Ambassador Romulo, he changed front. He turned about face. He came back and no longer talked of anti-Communist organization but of a Southeast Asia union that was non-Communist.

The stand of the Executive had been reversed. Subsequently we had the much-heralded and publicized Baguio Conference and there was neither a southeast Asia union organized nor was there a positive policy announced that would serve as a beacon light in the midst of darkness. More recently the new Secretary of Foreign Affairs was reported as having also reversed himself by abandoning a negative stand and advocating the sending of an armed force to Korea and the President turned it down on the ground that such a step would be a provocative act. The stand of the Executive has been equivocal. His foreign policy, if any, has been effeminate.

Therefore, the Senate does well in the face of this Executive indecision to take the initiative and consider this positive concurrent resolution which envisages not only the kind of assistance that we have so far given or have promised, but more, even the sending of an armed force to the scene of the bloody conflict.

We need some instrumentality like the Congress, because it is the policy-making body to initiate and define a policy, and this is its golden opportunity. It is crystal clear that we are now confronted not with a theory but with a condition. The present posture of world affairs compels us to take sides. Our stand must be unequivocal and firm.

We are drawn into the present conflict for reasons varied and sundry. But the most important is that this has clearly become a struggle between communism and democracy. And because we are wedded to the ideals of democracy, we are on the side of the democratic forces of the world.

It is well known that at one time North Korea was under the regimentation of Russia with her Communist philosophy, and that South Korea was under the sponsorship of the United States with her democratic ideology. The thirty-eighth parallel became the dividing line, but although that seemed to be at first a dividing line that was imaginary more or less, now the cleavage has become broad and deep. The line of demarcation has been thoroughly defined.

Why this crisis in Korea? It is not a spontaneous event that took place with the act of aggression committed by the North Korean forces schooled in the revolutionary technique of communism. Its root, the root of the movement, goes far back. And if I may, I should like to ask the indulgence of the Senate to permit me to invoke a few facts of history the better for our people to make a proper appraisal of the action that the Senate shall take.

It is commonly admitted that Karl Marx is a sort of patron saint of communism. Karl Marx was born in Germany of German-Jewish descent in 1818. He studied in the University of Bonn under the influence of the great German philosopher Hegel, and that being so, he, like many disciples of Germany, came under the influence of Hegelianism. What is this philosophy?

Hegel had an arbitrary and fantastic division of history into four stages: The first stage presenting the drama of the oriental world where civilization began; the second representing the civilization of the Greek States; the third when the Greek world gave way to the Roman world; and the fourth, the Germanic world was to be the climactic expression of civilization developing superlative power and to become dominant over all.

That is why we had Kaiser Wilhelm of the First World War, then Adolf Hitler in World War II advocating that Hegelian philosophy in action with Germany striving to rule the world propelled by the warlike slogan, Deutschland über alles—Germany over all. Marx was born into that epoch. He was reared in its atmosphere. He inherited much of that philosophy and so he became an active advocate of revolutionary socialism. I say revolutionary as distinguished from evolutionary socialism. The great difference between the two is that the latter deleted from its program the principles of class struggle and revolutionary technique. Revolutionary socialism, however, made class struggle and revolution the two important elements in its ideology. So when Karl Marx, together with Engels, devised the Communist Manifesto in 1848, he embodied these ideals and ideas in that document and to that manifesto may be traced much of the belief, creed, dogma, and technique of present-day communism.

In Russia bolshevism under Lenin came into being. Bolshevism may be defined as revolutionary socialism with the revolutionary aspect intensified. And so, Mr. President, I say Marxism is revolutionary socialism. Communism is aggressive Marxism further intensifying the idea of class conflict, revolutionary technique, and for that reason it thrives on confusion and disorder. It makes use of subversion, sabotage, and fifth columnism, and all manner of revolutionary procedures. Comes now Trotsky. After Lenin, Trotsky is eliminated, and Stalin emerges, fresh from World War II about which the people of Russia only know that Russia was responsible for the triumph of the Allies in the last cataclysmic war. They believe that the time has come for them to witness the abolition of all ideologies inimical to communism and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship over the entire world. So, Mr. President, here is a philosophy that cannot but issue in war. There is no peace where communism has sway.

Democracy is our ideal. It is the ideal that impelled the framers of the Constitution of our country to enshrine the principle which renounces war as an instrument of national policy. We love peace and hate war. We believe in arbitration or mediation to settle disputes among nations. We are drawn to the present situation where we have to contend with imperialistic and armed aggression and join our forces with those of defensive peace. We cannot be apathetic, sir, in this fight against bolshevistic communism that is repugnant to the traditions of our people, to the ideals that inform our Constitution, to the sacred tenets of our religion, and to the sublime principles of government republican in form and democratic to the core.

Senator GARCIA. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT. The gentleman may yield if he so desires.

Senator OSIAS. If the gentleman will just allow me to develop one more thesis, I will gladly yield.

Now, the question to answer before our people and our conscience is: Why should the Philippines participate with the United Nations forces in the present conflict?

I answer first, that we must participate to make patent our sincere and loyal devotion to freedom. Unfortunately we have not yet reached the stage when freedom could be said to have been securely established upon the foundations of law and peace. We are called in the midst of this troublesome era to make freedom real and enduring. We must perforce admit that the tree of liberty in our time has yet to be nurtured by the sweat of anguish, by the tears of sorrow, and by the blood of sacrifice.

My second point is that we should participate to implement our commitments with the United Nations. The affixing of the signature of the representative of the Republic to the United Nations Charter was voluntary. We knew whereof we acted when we joined the UN. We cannot remain indifferent to our formal, voluntary, and sacred commitments.

This is not all. We are impelled to act in the direction indicated by the concurrent resolution of the Senate in order to show our sincerity in fulfilling our part of the bargain in the military assistance pact and the military bases agreement entered into by the Republic of the Philippines with the Republic of the United States of America.

It is to be presumed that the United States Government and people will faithfully and adequately carry out their part in the Military Assistance Pact in the training and development of armed forces and "in the performance of those obligations which may devolve upon the Republic of the Philippines under its international agreements" given the mutuality of interest of the two Republics.

We are also impelled to participate actively in this conflict of stopping further aggression to give validity to the value of the plighted word and to uphold the sanctity of treaties. We cannot have world peace, sir, as long as peoples do not return to common decency, common honesty, and common respect for the plighted word. We have to fulfill in all honesty our share in the contractual obligation which we have assumed in treaties to which this Republic is signatory. We must not be found wanting before the verdict of history. Let it not be said of us ever, that we as a people were ready and willing to share in the advantages but we eschewed or shirked the burdens and sacrifices which every solemn compact entails.

And I wish to say a word from the standpoint of enlightened self-interest. Our participation with other free nations in this struggle would give the people of the Philippines a new sense of mission. This new sense of mission will vitalize our unity. It will galvanize the solidarity of our people at home. I wish even our dissidents will heed these words. There is no use to pay lip service to unity unless and until there is an ideology, unless there is a clear sense of mission around which all people irrespective of political affiliation or creed may rally.

Mr. President, I glory in the opportunity to cast my vote in favor of this resolution because the action initiated by Congress will serve as a polestar to the orientation of our future culture and civilization.

The United Nations, sir, has to win this war. It cannot afford to lose it. Korea today; perchance Iran tomorrow; Berlin and then Formosa next. It will be a history from aggression to aggression replete with losses of property valued by the trillions, and lives counted by the millions.

The League of Nations which was the aftermath of the First World War did not succeed because it could not enforce its decisions. The League lacked teeth. The United Nations which is the aftermath of the Second World War must not fail now that it is a body determined to implement is resolutions with action, action commensurate with the gravity of the challenge, action suitable to meet the present aggression, action understandable to communism which no longer contents itself with subversion, sabotage, and fifth columnism only but resorts to armed aggression.

The aggressiveness of violence by communism has to be stopped in its tracks. This cannot be accomplished by apathy or appeasement. It can only be done through active cooperation among like-minded nations committed to freedom and the democratic way of life.

Mr. President, the frontiers of freedom must be extended. The area of freedom must not be permitted to contract. This can be achieved through implementing the decisions of the United Nations organization and its agencies, especially the Security Council.

After due reflection I came to a definite conclusion. I announce that I shall give my support and vote to this resolution, evincing thereby my sense of obligation and responsibility as a citizen of the Republic of the Philippines and as a citizen of the one world that is being fashioned. I believe that every member of this august body will do likewise and I urge, Mr. President, that we all give our vote and support to this concurrent resolution to make this Republic more active in its participation to bolster the United Nations in suppressing the Korean aggression; and this we must do as an evidence of our determination to fight aggression and as an act of faith in humanity's relentless forward march from victory to victory until all nations at last shall in full measure enjoy the blessings of freedom and democracy, of peace and security.

QUESTIONS BY SENATOR GARCIA

Senator GARCIA. Mr. President, I would like to ask a few questions from the gentleman.

The ACTING PRESIDENT. The gentleman may yield if he so desires.

Senator OSIAS. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Bohol.

Senator GARCIA. I take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from La Union for the eloquent and masterly speech he has given in support of the resolution now under consideration. Since the gentleman has evinced mastery of the facts relative to this question I would like to take advantage of the floor of the senate by asking the gentleman from La Union an answer to certain opinions presented in the public hearings of the committee on foreign affairs and the committee on national defense held before this day, to the effect that the question in Korea is a home fight or a civil war between two sectors of one country, and that since we adhere by our constitution to the international law which sanctions nonintervention in a case of a civil war that may happen in a country, basing upon those arguments they have alleged and have continued to allege that the intervention of the Philippines in the Korean affair would be an unwarranted interference in a civil war which properly belongs to the Koreans. I would like to ask the gentleman from La Union to answer this argument.

Senator OSIAS. I do not subscribe to the idea that this is a mere civil war. I already stated that I am drawn to the conclusion that it is an active trial of strength between two ideolcgies, one committed to aggression, the other to peace and to the democratic processes of conciliation and mediation. We are not in error when we follow in the footsteps of fifty-odd nations, over 50 free and civilized nations of the world, that have come out squarely, characterizing the Communist-sponsored invasion of the Republic of Korea as a raw act of aggression menacing the peace and security of the world. I believe further that this is one time when we can do our part as a signatory of the Charter of the United Nations "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small."

Korea in her history and geography demonstrates considerable parallelism with ours. If we do not rally to the cause of freedom and democracy in Korea today, tomorrow, God forbid, we may also fall a prey to the evil designs of aggressor nations. In that eventuality what right have we to expect the cooperation of other free nations of the world? So I cast aside the theory that this is but a home fight, a civil war, that this is a matter for the Koreans only to decide because of the additional fact that Korea as a republic came into being under the sponsorship of the United States with which nation we are bound by ties that brook no breaking and sponsored also by the United Nations organization of which we are a member. That, in brief, would be my answer to the question of the gentleman which I know is a query that does not reflect his opinion but that he is voicing it as an opinion from certain quarters inimical to the stand taken by the United Nations.

Mr. President, if there are no further questions, I ask that we vote on the resolution.

How Low Can They Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, this letter is directed to all justice-loving Americans, but particularly to those living within the Eleventh Congressional District of Ohio:

FELLOW AMERICANS: It is true, but hard to believe, that any group would deliberately jeopardize a person's character in the hope of winning a congressional seat in Congress.

This will give you some idea of how desperately they need seats and the length to which they will go in an effort to elect those pledged to support a program which, if enacted, would in the opinion of millions force national socialism upon the American people.

When they selected Drew Pearson to spread their lying propaganda they revealed the contemptible and cowardly side of their nature.

Some of you will recall the 1944 election when I faced this same unscrupulous outfit. You will recall at that time they tried a sneak smear attack on my integrity which boomeranged when the decent, honest, Christian law-abiding citizens of this district rose up in righteous indignation at such a spectacle.

In 1944 the articles were signed J. E. Moore, secretary, Underwood for Congress Committee, New Lexington, Ohio. That proved to be a fatal error and definitely identified the source of the attack to the voters.

The strategy this time was to have someone else open the sneak attack and thus divert attention from the real source.

Isn't it strange how people revert to type? This J. E. Moore is a typical example. He is the fellow who is evidently having such a jolly good time spending hundreds and hundreds of dollars reproducing in the local papers the lies and insinuations which were undoubtedly given Mr. Pearson to publicize. In this way it was probably felt that attention would not only be diverted from the birthplace of this illegitimate offspring but also from the real and vital issues facing us at this time. It is a typical attack used by some of the more radical left-wing leaders of the CIO-PAC who have again endorsed my opponent just as they did in 1944.

Yes, the voice of Jacob but the hand of Esau is readily heard and seen.

Ninteen hundred and forty-four: J. E. Moore, secretary, my opponent's committee for Congress.

Nineteen hundred and fifty: J. E. Moore, secretary, Eleventh District Taxpayers Committee.

It should just be "tax sufferers committee."

Ever since the primary I had been warned to expect something. When one opposes this combine he knows that anything can happen and usually does. Therefore, I was not too surprised when the Department of Justice received a letter containing wild and unfounded accusations from a fellow identified as a Democratic politician.

I therefore decided that not only should the unfounded accusations contained in this letter be investigated but also that it should be extended to include everyone who had ever been connected with my office.

Let's quote from two letters:

"SEPTEMBER 13, 1950.

"Mr. LOUIS B. NICHOLS,
"Assistant Chief, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. NICHOLS: Will you please let me know if the investigation which your agency was recently authorized to make regarding various and past personnel affiliated with my congressional office has been completed? If it has been completed, will you please give me the date of completion.

"Thanking you for your cooperation, I remain,

"Sincerely yours,
"WALTER E. BREHM,
"Member of Congress."

"UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF JUSTICE,
"FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
"OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
"Washington, D. C., September 13, 1950.

"Hon. WALTER E. BREHM,
"House of Representatives,
"Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to acknowledge your communication of September 13 addressed to Mr. Nichols, wherein you inquire regarding the status of the recent investigation which was conducted by the FBI. * * *

"In response to your specific inquiry, the investigation requested of the FBI was completed * * * under date of August 25, 1950.

"Sincerely yours,
"J. EDGAR HOOVER."

Does Drew Pearson have more information than the FBI?

I realize that they have powerful connections in Washington and that anything could happen just before the election.

I know of nothing else which I can do at this time to prove that these charges are the most despicable and the most maliciously inspired that could possibly be conceived.

I have turned this entire subject over to my attorneys for a possible libel suit.

The lie breaks quicker and travels faster from the starting gate, but truth will even-

tually catch up, take the lead in the stretch, and win the reward.

Therefore, until the final chapter is written I trust that you will continue to keep faith with me.

Most sincerely,

WALTER E. BREHM,
Member of Congress.

Résumé of the Internal Security Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McCARRAN
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a résumé of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RÉSUMÉ OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

(By Hon. PAT MCCARRAN)

FOREWORD

On September 23, 1950, the Congress of the United States passed over the veto of the President, the Internal Security Act of 1950, to protect the United States against Communists and other subversives. In view of the barrage of propaganda which has been directed at this law—by the persons and organizations coming within its purview—there is herein set forth an objective analysis of the principal provisions of this law so that the reader may judge for himself whether or not it constitutes thought control or in any way contravenes the basic rights guaranteed by the Constitution. It is to be noted that the American Bar Association, which numbers among its members the ablest constitutional lawyers in the Nation, adopted a resolution endorsing this law.

The law is entitled the "Internal Security Act of 1950" and consists of two parts, title I and title II, respectively. Title I is known as the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 and title II is known as the Emergency Detention Act of 1950.

TITLE I—THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Registration requirements

Communist-action organizations and the members thereof, and Communist-front organizations and the officers thereof are required to be registered with the Attorney General. This provision is substantially the same as the registration provision of the present law under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and under the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Such organizations are required to file with the Attorney General periodic financial statements and to identify their literature and radio and television programs; and no deduction for Federal income-tax purposes is allowed for contributions to such organizations.

The law does not outlaw the Communist Party or prohibit membership in any organization. The purpose of the registration provision is to force the Communist organizations out into the open.

A Communist-action organization is defined as any organization in the United States (other than a diplomatic representative or mission of a foreign government accredited as such by the Department of State) which (1) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement, and (2) operates primarily to advance the objectives of such world Communist movement.

A Communist-front organization is defined as any organization in the United States (other than a Communist-action organization) which (A) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by a Communist-action organization; and (B) is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist-action organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement.

The term "Communist organization" means a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization.

Procedural safeguards

Whenever the Attorney General finds that an organization or individual has not registered when required to do so, he shall file a petition with a bipartisan board, known as the Subversive Activities Control Board, in which he sets forth the charges. A copy of the petition is served on the organization or individual, and a public hearing is held in which the organization or individual is afforded the right to counsel, to offer evidence and to cross-examine witnesses; and the decision of the Board is subject to review by the courts.

The criminal provisions of the law may be evoked only through the normal judicial processes, including all of the customary rights, such as the right to trial by jury. The law specifically states that it shall not be construed to authorize, require, or establish military or civilian censorship or in any way to limit or infringe upon freedom of the press or of speech as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and no regulation shall be promulgated hereunder having that effect.

Prohibited acts

The following acts are made unlawful:

1. To knowingly combine, conspire, or agree with any person to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, the direction and control of which is to be under the domination or control of, any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual; provided that this shall not apply to the proposal of a constitutional amendment.

2. For an officer or employee of the United States to transmit defense secrets to agents of foreign governments, unless specifically authorized to do so.

3. For agents of foreign governments to obtain defense secrets of the United States unless specifically authorized to do so.

4. For members of Communist organizations to conceal their membership in such organizations when seeking nonelective office or employment under the United States or in any defense facility, or to hold any nonelective office or employment under the United States.

5. For officers or employees of the United States or of any defense facility to knowingly contribute funds or services to Communist organizations.

6. For members of Communist-action organizations to engage in employment in any defense facility.

7. For members of Communist organizations to use a United States passport.

Espionage and sabotage provisions

The espionage and sabotage laws are strengthened by tightening the provisions of the law relating to the obtaining, possession, or transmission of defense secrets, and by broadening the categories of defense facilities subject to security regulations. Moreover, the time within which prosecutions may be brought for the violation of certain espionage and sabotage laws is extended.

Registration of foreign agents

The Foreign Agents Registration Act is amended by requiring the registration with the Department of Justice of certain persons who have been trained by a foreign government in espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage.

Immigration provisions

All aliens whose entry into the United States would endanger the public safety are excludable, and if their presence in the United States endangers the public safety, they are deportable. Aliens who are members of Communist organizations, except certain aliens in diplomatic status, are excludable and deportable. It is to be noted that the Attorney General of the United States testified that an analysis of 4,984 of the more militant members of the Communist Party in the United States showed that 91.4 percent of the total were of foreign stock or were married to persons of foreign stock.

The Attorney General is empowered to place under supervision or in detention aliens who have been found to be deportable, while arrangements are being made to effect their deportation. If the deportation is not effected within 6 months the Attorney General must release the aliens and may place them under supervision. A violation of the terms of supervision is made an offense, subject to normal court trial.

It is made a penal offense for aliens in the criminal, immoral, and subversive classes who are found to be deportable to willfully fail to depart from the United States, subject to normal court trial.

The statistics of the Immigration and Naturalization Service show that there are literally thousands of aliens who have been found to be deportable, but because of certain technicalities in the law, their deportation cannot be effected. Although many of these aliens are in the criminal, immoral, and subversive classes, under the preexisting law, they were free to roam the country at will, without supervision or restraint.

Naturalization provisions

Naturalization is prohibited to (a) members of Communist organizations, except members of Communist-front organizations who esetablish that they were innocent dupes, (b) aliens who are subject to deportation, (c) aliens who cannot read, write, and speak the English language if physically able to do so, and (d) aliens who refuse to bear arms if required to do so by law, unless they establish that they have bona fide religious scruples against bearing arms.

Denaturalization proceedings may be instituted against persons who join Communist organizations within 5 years of their naturalization, except in the case of persons who join Communist-front organizations and who establish that they were innocent dupes.

Prohibiting the picketing of Federal courts

It is made unlawful for anyone, with the intent of interfering with the administration of justice, or with the intent of influencing any judge, juror, witness, or court officer, in the discharge of his duty, to picket or demonstrate in or near a Federal courthouse. This provision was prompted by the mass picketing of Federal courts by Communists and Communist sympathizers in proceedings involving Communists. Pickets have ranged from 300 to 750 and the noise created by loud chanting (and in one instance, by a sound truck) seriously hampered the administration of justice.

TITLE II—THE EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT OF 1950

Declaration of internal security emergency

The President is empowered to proclaim the existence of an internal security emergency in the event of any one of the following:

1. Invasion of the territory of the United States or its possessions;
2. Declaration of war by Congress; or
3. Insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy.

Detention during emergency

During the existence of an internal security emergency the President, acting through the Attorney General, is authorized to detain persons as to whom it is found that there is reasonable ground to believe that such persons probably will engage in, or probably will conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage or of sabotage.

Procedural safeguards

Persons who are apprehended are accorded a prompt preliminary hearing, a review by a bipartisan board, known as the Detention Review Board and may appeal to the courts. They are afforded full opportunity to be represented by counsel and have the right to testify, to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses and to cross-examine adverse witnesses. The act specifically states that it shall not be construed to suspend or to authorize the suspension of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus. It further requires that no person detained under the act shall be confined in company with persons who are confined pursuant to the criminal laws of the United States or of any State, or be required to perform forced labor.

Hon. Chan Gurney, of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement I made in regard to the retirement of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I do not want this session of the Congress to end without my adding my tribute to those of my colleagues who have expressed regret over the coming departure from our midst of the senior Senator from South Dakota, CHAN GURNEY.

Others have spoken of his great contribution to our national defense, but I desire to point out the very real service which he has rendered in the development of the great natural resources of our country as a member of the Appropriations Committee and particularly as chairman of the Civil Functions Subcommittee of that great committee during the Eightieth Congress.

As you know, flood control and navigation are very vital to my State of Louisiana. Senator GURNEY over a long period, and repeatedly, has indicated in very substantial ways his great interest in our problem and has contributed greatly to their solution. He took the time and trouble on more than one occasion to visit with us in Louisiana and learn first-hand our problems and consistently expressed a sympathetic interest in them. He has many friends in Louisiana who I know share my regret in his leaving this body. I am sure that all of them join me in wishing him well in any future endeavor.

Far East Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD various communications from Alfred Kohlberg, of New York City, relative to the Far East situation.

The first of these communications is dated September 19, 1950, and was addressed to the chief editorial writer of various publications.

The second communication, dated August 30, 1950, is addressed to President Harry S. Truman, suggesting a certain procedure in the Far East. It includes a bill of particulars, numbered 1 to 61, outlining the conditions and events leading up to the present situation in the Far East, and a portion of Mr. Kohlberg's testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 10, 1948.

The third communication is a letter addressed to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, dated July 13, 1950; and the fourth is a letter to the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Jr., of New York, dated June 28, 1944, outlining the Far East situation.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALFRED KOHLBERG, INC.,
New York, N. Y., September 19, 1950.

To the CHIEF EDITORIAL WRITER:

If General MacArthur was correct in his semisuppressed statement to the VFW, that Formosa was essential to our entire Pacific defense, and that Korea was not even worthy of mention, strategically, then the enclosed appeal to Governor Dewey should have the careful attention of every Republican.

If the administration is expending American lives and money in strategically unimportant Korea in order to make a deal for the Communist conquest of strategically vital Formosa, the Republican Party has a duty to warn the country before it is too late. The enclosed letter, written Governor Dewey last July, becomes of utmost urgency, as the UN Assembly meets this week.

The Republic of China is still officially our ally in the unsettled war with Japan, and is likewise our ally in the UN police action in Korea, even though we refused her offer of three divisions.

If we now abandon that ally, as we abandoned the Republic of Poland and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, we must be prepared to understand the hesitation on the part of European nations when we urge them to full alliance.

Very sincerely yours,

ALFRED KOHLBERG.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 30, 1950.*

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: President Wilson said: "We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. * * * Honesty and competence require no shield of secrecy."

Believing that you agree with President Wilson, I respectfully suggest that you:

1. Study the attached bill of particulars, gathered from various sources.

2. Reveal to your fellow citizens all the still-secret documents of importance, the names of your advisers and the occasions for such advice, in connection with each of the items enumerated.

3. Replace the above advisers with men whom time has proven sound and authoritative on the dangers of world communism.

Mr. President, the security of the Republic is at issue. The hour is late. I beseech you to rise above business-as-usual, spending-as-usual, bureaucracy-as-usual, and politics-as-usual. I fully realize that the Republican Party has failed sufficiently to protest the sell-out of the free world step by step as it occurred; they have gone along in eastern Europe in the bipartisan appeasement of the Soviet Union, while protesting about China. They must share the blame. Final responsibility, however, is yours.

It will never be too late to adopt a policy aimed at the overthrow of the tyranny that rules from Moscow, so that a free world may again return to the ways of peace with justice. Such a policy should be as publicly proclaimed as is the Communist "program" for the conquest of the world. Americans do not lack courage nor thrive on secret conspiracy. Tell us, I beg you, where we have been, where we are, and where we are going.

Are we going to the thirty-eighth parallel—to the Manchurian border—to the aid of all threatened nations whether they are willing to fight or not—to pamper their own Red fifth columnists or not—or will we go on to the final overthrow of the tyrannical Red slave state that rules from the Kremlin?

Most respectfully yours,

ALFRED KOHLBERG.

(Enclosures: Bill of particulars; statement of June 10, 1948.)

BILL OF PARTICULARS

1. It was widely reported that the candidate for Vice President on the Democratic ticket at the Chicago convention of 1944 was cleared with Sidney Hillman. You were selected. Since then it has been revealed that among Mr. Hillman's advisers were John Abt, C. B. Baldwin, Lee Pressman, and Nathan Witt. If there was any understanding, no matter how inconsequential, it would be a matter of public interest. Recently, the Treasury spent 2 months investigating my affairs for 1946–47. I considered this right and proper. Parents of Americans who will die under your command have a right to ask whether there was an understanding between you and Mr. Hillman, and whether that understanding was reduced to writing. Though Government witnesses have since then identified Messrs. Abt, Pressman, and Witt as Soviet espionage agents, they have not been arrested. Unexplained, it is disturbing.

2. When you became President you were bound by President Roosevelt's military agreements with our allies. Under our constitutional system, territorial, economic, and political agreements could not be binding until confirmed by the Senate. According to the memoirs of Secretary Stettinius, President Roosevelt made this perfectly clear to Prime Minister Churchill and Generalissimo Stalin at Yalta. Therefore, you started with a clean slate, and what has happened since 1945 must be credited to you.

3. When you assumed office you were the Commander in Chief of the greatest Air Force, greatest Navy, and most powerful Army in the history of the world. The military alliance you headed included nations totaling 1,890,000,000 people. Complete and unconditional victory was only 4 months distant.

Of our then military allies only 190,000,000 owed allegiance to the dictatorship in the Kremlin. One billion seven hundred million comprised the population of governments who ruled by consent of their people, expressed in accordance with their traditional forms. On the day of victory the odds in the UN were 8 to 1 against the Communist tyranny.

Today, 830,000,000 people are ruled from the Kremlin; while our military allies are an unknown quantity, if any. The most optimistic estimate would count only the Anzacs, the Chinese Nationalists, western Europe, and the Western Hemisphere as on our side when the chips are down. These nations total 540,000,000 people. On this most optimistic count the odds now favor the Kremlin by 5 to 3.

The responsibility for this disastrous change rests solely on you and your advisers.

This bill of particulars details but a few of the decisive errors that brought us from unconditional victory to almost unconditional danger. After 5 years of vast tribute to ally and defeated enemy alike, we find ourselves fighting alone in Korea, except for the South Koreans, whom you and Secretary Acheson spurned in your joint statements of January 5 last. The offer of three divisions by the Republic of China, which you spurned in the same statement, was rejected by Secretary Acheson July 1.

4. The chain of decisions and events that have brought us to war in Korea, under the most unfavorable circumstances, are fully set forth in a 40-minute speech by Congressman WALTER JUDD, in the House, July 27, 1950.

5. Every official State Department study has found that the Soviet regime was (a) a ruthless tyranny; and (b) not to be trusted to carry out any agreement. Yet on June 10, 1950, in your foreign-policy speech at St. Louis you said: "We had hoped that our wartime ally, the Soviet Union, would join in the efforts of the whole community of nations to build a peaceful world," and "we are closer to world peace now than at any time in the last 3 years."

In making this statement you disregarded the exhaustive official studies of the Communist dictatorship made by your Government. The first of these studies was made and published by Robert Lansing, Secretary of State for Woodrow Wilson, whose heir you are. In his letter of transmittal, dated October 27, 1919, Secretary Lansing said: "The purpose of the Bolsheviks is to subvert the existing principles of government and society the world over, including those countries in which democratic institutions are already established. They have built up a political machine, which by a concentration of power in the hands of a few and by the ruthlessness of its methods, suggests the Asiatic despotism of the early Tsars."

The following year, under President Wilson's last Secretary of State, Bainbridge Colby, another study was made and published. Based on it, Secretary Colby wrote a public letter to the Italian Ambassador stating why we would not recognize the Bolshevik regime in Russia. Dated August 10, 1920, he said: "The responsible leaders of that regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements."

Further studies were made and published under succeeding Secretaries of State, all to the same effect, until 1933, when such reports were sealed, and it became our policy to present Bolshevik Czar Stalin as a benign individual, and the Bolshevik regime as a peace-loving democracy.

State Department personnel, who by years of study, had become authorities on Communist fifth columns throughout the world, and on Communist theory, plans and programs, were exiled to the far corners of the earth, or muzzled.

As recently as May 1, 1950, in a letter authorized by you, the State Department advised me that they had no use at this time for anyone who was informed on Communist theory, program or intentions, or who had been correct in warning you or the Nation of the developing crisis.

6. Charges of Communist activities made against officials have been met with unbelief or ridicule:

Sworn testimony and charges in Congress, involving Alger Hiss, Donald Hiss, Lee Pressman, Harold Glasser, Nathan Witt, John Abt, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, Lauchlin Currie, Noel Field, Duncan Lee, Owen Lattimore, Michael Greenberg, Harry Dexter White, and innumerable others, have resulted only in the trial of Alger Hiss. The charges have been called "red herrings," and high Government officials have disgraced themselves by testifying for the accused, supposedly with your approval or at your request.

Beginning in 1944, when Alger Hiss was put in charge of United States activities in the UN, there has constantly been a strange assortment of persons soft to communism acting as representatives of the United States and as staff members. Small wonder that the UN, created ostensibly to enforce the peace, has been helpless in eastern Europe and in China, and could act in Korea only because of the temporary absence of Russia and our willingness to carry the burden.

More than 5 years ago, I gave the State Department information of Communist activities by certain officials. Previously, and since, I have given the FBI information and leads. According to the Tydings report, these were not even investigated. Were you serious when you asked your fellow citizens to report such information to the FBI, and then drop the matter?

Invariably, the administration seems to have rushed to the defense of the accused, refused access to the files, cleared the accused before hearing, investigated and smeared the accuser.

7. Names of 163 or 313 suspected spies furnished by Canada. No arrests: In 1945, Prime Minister Mackenzie King flew to Washington to present to you a report on the Gouzenko Soviet spy ring. It has been both reported and denied that he handed you a list of 150 such spies in the United States, which list had already been turned over to the FBI by the Royal Canadian police. Cabinet Minister Pearson confirmed that you were given 163 names of Americans connected with one of the Canadians arrested. In any case, not one was arrested, either of that list or of the cases developed by the Un-American Activities Committee. It was reported that the FBI had the evidence, but that the State Department refused to permit the arrests for fear of offending Russia.

8. Delivery of slave laborers and German POW's to Russia: A great mystery surrounds the delivery of 400,000 German POW's by us to the Russians, contrary to the Geneva Convention, to which we adhere. Do we have their names and records? Where are they now that Russia claims to hold no more Germans?

And what substance is there to the stories of hundreds of thousands of Russians returned forcibly to Stalin against their will and against all our humanitarian traditions?

For example, at Nordhausen about 40,000 Russian civilians worked in the enormous underground, air-conditioned V-2 rocket factory. These Russians were forcibly returned to Russia against their will and we then turned over the entire works, unscathed, to the Soviets, on their promise to dismantle and return the machinery to the various countries of manufacture, such as France, Czechoslovakia, and even Cincinnati, Ohio. Did the Russians carry out their promises, or are they still making V-2 rockets there?

9. Who stopped General Eisenhower's march on Berlin?

At that time our Ninth Army was not more than 30 miles from Berlin. With 11,000 combat effectives the Ninth Army held 65,000 German prisoners. Resistance had practically ceased. They could have been in Berlin the next day. Goebbel's sound trucks were notifying the Berliners to surrender to the Americans. The Russians were still 25 miles east of Berlin and didn't arrive until 10 days later. Who ordered our forces to retreat to the Elbe and leave Berlin for the Russians—a decision that has cost us so dearly since?

If General Eisenhower is the Republican and you are the Democratic nominee in 1952, each of you will have to charge that it was the other who issued the order to our victorious armies to back-track, to turn the Berlin sector over to the Russians, and put our necks in a noose there. It is perfectly apparent that the order for retreat was a sudden decision by you or General Eisenhower contrary to the previous orders given the generals rushing on Berlin. Why not now make public the orders then issued, instead of waiting until 1952?

10. Who stopped Georgie Patton 30 miles from Prague? In the Saturday Evening Post of April 17, 1948, Demaree Bess reported that Gen. Georgie Patton (pet hate of the Reds because he was the officer of the day who headed the detail from Fort Myer which dispersed the bonus campers in Washington in 1932) was ordered to halt his conquest of Czechoslovakia and to refuse the German surrender which had already been made by the German general to one of Patton's colonels. The fate of Czechoslovakia was sealed.

11. Why did we then turn the uranium mines over to Russia? Who ordered General Eisenhower, after the German surrender, to withdraw from already occupied western Saxony and Thuringia and turn them over to the Russians?

The area abandoned to the Russians is the industrially most valuable part of the present Soviet-occupied eastern Germany. Together with Jachymov in Czechoslovakia, which General Patton was ordered to evacuate, it contains some of the most valuable uranium deposits in the world. Without Czech-Saxon Erzgebirge, the Soviets would not have been able to produce an atom bomb by 1949. These turn-overs to Russia were ordered at a time when Russia had already broken the Yalta agreements of the previous February in Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, and even in Berlin, and was refusing us access to American POW's behind the Russian lines, some of whom, Counter-intelligence reports, are still held by the Russians.

12. Pro-Russian clique took over State Department in 1944–45: Under oath, before the Un-American Activities Committee August 30, 1948, Mr. Adolf Berle, former Assistant Secretary of State, and then and now chairman of the New Deal Liberal Party of New York State, testified: "In the fall of 1944 there was a difference of opinion in the State Department. * * * I was pressing for a pretty clean-cut showdown" (with the Russians) "then when our position was strongest.

The opposite group in the State Department was largely the men—Mr. Acheson's group, of course, with Mr. Hiss as his principal assistant. * * * I got trimmed in that fight and, as a result, went to Brazil and that ended my diplomatic career." Later, he referred to the Acheson group as the pro-Russian clique.

Mr. Berle could have named numerous others of his group who were forced out so that only the pro-Russian clique remained. The clique then named by Mr. Berle now runs our State Department.

13. The Acheson-Lilienthal Report: In 1946, the State Department presented a public report on the internationalization of the A-bomb. Called the Acheson-Lilienthal Report, it proposed the step-by-step release of all atomic data on the basis of an international agreement, made unenforceable by no restrictions on the veto in the UN Security Council. Fortunately, the Baruch Commission took a more realistic view of our peace-loving Soviet allies and provided for continuing inspection, free of the veto. Russia refused.

Reward for this proposed A-bomb gift to Russia by the Acheson-Lilienthal committee was chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission for Lilienthal, and Secretary of State for Acheson. Just to make it perfect, Philip C. Jessup, who, while still a Columbia professor in 1946, proposed we give the bomb to Russia while throwing our own stockpile in the ocean, was made Ambassador at Large and chief adviser on how to get along with the Russians, and now member of the Security Council, cleared for atomic secrets.

The original Atomic Energy Commission consisted of four men in addition to Chairman Lilienthal. Three of the four, and the first counsel of the Commission, were known as leftist liberals, hardly the qualifications for keeping out Soviet sympathizers and spies.

14. Sharing the A-bomb with Russia: As recently as last September, you again proposed to share the A-bomb with Russia, subject to certain promises. At that time Russia had a 100-percent record of broken promises to us, and to all the world. Do we still intend to trade the A-bomb for Russian promises?

15. H-bomb delay: The newspapers have reported that atom spy Fuchs had information on the H-bomb in 1945. Also, that our AEC is just now discussing a site for H-bomb development. The delay remains unexplained.

16. One of the unexplained puzzles was your proposal to send Justice Vinson to Moscow just before the election of 1948. It is reported that you intended him to be a latter-day Harry Hopkins to again woo Stalin. This idea was abandoned, according to Arthur Krock, only because the election campaign was on. The question arises: What countries was Justice Vinson authorized to sell out for another scrap of paper signed by Joe Stalin?

17. According to the Hoover Report we had the full equipment of 89 divisions at the end of the war. At the time of the report we had left only the equipment of 18 divisions. The larger part of this missing equipment was destroyed in Europe and the Pacific. In the copper trade it is believed that the largest copper deposit in the world is at the bottom of Pacific lagoons, where we dumped it. A very considerable part of the destroyed arms, planes, and ammunition is exactly what we now have to build all over again, both to arm our Atlantic pact allies and for ourselves. Americans who must work and pay for this, and troops at the front inadequately armed, are entitled to know who ordered that destruction.

18. Nine billion dollars spent on equipment since 1946: Having destroyed $35,000,000,000 of United States war equipment in Europe, we have spent something like $50,000,000,000 since 1946 on our Armed Forces. The results are not reassuring. Of this sum, only $9,000,000,000 was spent on new equipment. Whether we do or do not have any atom-bomb defense, or any warning network, either in being or planned, is another item that civilian defense officials have some right to know. Many believe that the Soviet spy network must have furnished this information to Moscow. If they know it, why shouldn't we?

19. Foreign aid wasted without military protection: Since 1945, under your direction, a sum exceeding $36,000,000,000 has been spent on various forms of foreign aid. Of this entire amount, scarcely $1,000,000,000 has been for military supplies or training for our supposed allies in case of war. You have been advised again and again that economic aid, in advance of military protection, was playing the Communist game. The results in Korea, where $440,000,000 of economic aid, and in China, where $1,500,000,000 of economic aid prior to military security was wasted, points up the wisdom of the rejected military advice.

A public statement, supplementing the private advice, was made to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, March 4, 1948, in connection with the proposed Marshall plan for Europe, by Deputy Chief of Staff, Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer. He said: "I have made the statement repeatedly that I do not believe that we should improve conditions politically, economically, or culturally in any area in the world without protecting such areas militarily, as long as there are forces in the world that unquestionably have for a policy the destruction of everything and everyone in opposition to their aggression." Rejection of this warning was cited as the cause of the Korean war by the ECA Director for Korea in the New York Times of July 15, 1950 (p. 3).

20. Marshall plan fattens the calf for slaughter: The Marshall plan was first proposed by Under Secretary Dean Acheson in a speech at Cleveland, Miss., in May 1947. The following month it was proposed by General Marshall at Harvard University. It was intended to include the U. S. S. R. and eastern Europe, as well as western Europe; the Soviet zone finally being left out only because Molotov refused to agree.

What could have better pleased the Kremlin than a $22,000,000,000 expenditure (the original amount) in Europe, to be divided between east and west, with not a single dollar of arms or ammunition? It would help fatten up Europe for the take-over, drive the United States toward bankruptcy and inflation, and force us to pare our own arms budget (as it did). Why Molotov rejected this handout is still a puzzle.

I suggest that you were mistaken last May when the State Department wrote me that you did not need anyone who was well informed on the Soviets.

21. American acquiescence in Red enslavement of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia remains unexplained: It is believed that still unrevealed secret agreements of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam hold these mysteries. Continued secrecy cannot be explained on grounds of American security. It seems high time to get everything out in the open, reveal the errors, or worse, of the past and let the American people see where they've been and what they are headed for.

22. Somebody turned over to Russia the hundreds of Danube barges we held, just before the Danubian Conference met. This was our only trading point. Without it, at the conference, we were treated contemptuously, as could be expected.

23. Tito kills American fliers, War Minister Mikhailovich, and jails Archbishop Stepinac. We reward him. Until the recent erection, by public subscription, of a monument in Arlington Cemetery to the five American fliers shot down over Yugoslavia, their graves were covered with a slab reading: "Killed in airplane crash," which was untrue. Requests by the public committee to inscribe on the monument: "Shot down over Yugoslavia" were refused. For such activities Tito was given the gold store of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, vast UNRRA supplies, a steel mill, and $100,000,000 loan. After which he voted against us on Korea in the Security Council of the UN. No wonder Prime Minister Nehru said we treat our enemies better than our friends.

24. Another Korea has been prepared in western Germany. While the Soviets, contrary to agreements, are building an army in eastern Germany, we keep western Germany disarmed. When the east Germans attack, the situation will be even worse than Korea, for there will be no armed Germans to fight beside our two divisions in Germany and the east Germans should reach the Rhine in days or weeks unless the French and British come in force, as they have failed to do in Korea.

25. The defense effort in western Europe looks like a phony. As long as Italy, Germany, and Spain are excluded, western Europe is strategically incomplete. French and British armaments are woefully weak. Although the Soviets and their satellites have completely violated the disarmament stipulations of the peace treaties with Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, we hold Italy to the six divisions, plus 200 light planes, of the peace treaty; we hold Germany to limited production, even after the vast dismantling which continued until 1948 in our zone and still goes on in the British; we are now preparing for more billions to France, Britain, Belgium, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries without any agreement for them to pull in their belts on welfare handouts, or even to remove the Communist sympathizers from high posts in their governments.

26. State Department pro-Sovietism caused the Berlin airlift. At Potsdam, in July 1945, it was agreed that our forces in Berlin would have a ground and air corridor from west Germany to Berlin. The State Department opposed getting this in writing from the Russians. The Air Force insisted and got the air corridor written in the agreement. The Army submitted. If the Air Force had been as weak as the Army, the Berlin airlift could not have come into existence. If the Army had insisted on its view, the airlift would never have been necessary. The State Department, somehow or other, is always found to be the Soviet's advocate.

27. Late in 1948 the UN met in Paris to attempt to settle the Berlin airlift and blockade. Ambassador Jessup asked the Chinese delegation, which had intended to vote with the United States, not to do so. This top mystery leaves unanswered the question of whom Ambassador Jessup really represented, as General Marshall was Secretary of State at the time.

At about the same time, in a memo to the State Department, Republican John Foster Dulles advised that Berlin be abandoned. Ambassador Jessup concurred. So seriously did the State Department regard this advice that General Clay deemed it advisable to fly to Washington to explain that the abandonment of Berlin in the face of Russian threats would be tantamount to the abandonment of western Europe.

Again in Paris, in 1949, at the meeting arranged by Jessup and Malik, which finally ended the airlift, Jessup fought for acceptance of the Russian terms. Once more Clay had to fight to stop it.

And now Clay is out and Dulles and Jessup are in.

28. The postwar Clay-Sokolovsky agreement providing for the return of Russian Army deserters from our zone of Germany was morally wrong and against American interest. It stopped an incipient anti-Com-

munist movement in the Russian Army, it prevented us gaining valuable information and adherents for world war three, and presented the United States to European anti-Communists as the friend of communism and hence their enemy. This same agreement was forced on General MacArthur in Japan and Korea, where smaller numbers of Russian Army deserters were handed back at the border to be executed.

It is reported that in 1948 emissaries from a Russian armored division in East Germany came to General Clay and offered to march over with full equipment if we would receive them. General Clay was ordered to refuse and to hand the emissaries back to the Russians at the zonal border. Would you now refuse such an offer if made?

29. We were hardly established in Berlin before our zone was the scene of nightly snatches by Russians. When they were caught by our MP's they were brought to command posts. If the Russian was smart enough to charge that the German "snatchee" was wanted for some imagined crime in the east zone, the Russians were permitted to take the German across the boundary. No legal formalities were complied with. This continued for at least 2 years.

30. At the Nuremberg war-crimes trials the Germans were accused of the massacre of 10,000 Polish officers in Katyn Forest. At the demand of the Russians no evidence was introduced, yet at the end of the trials the Germans were not acquitted of this particular charge. Meantime our G–2 collected the evidence of this Katyn massacre. It is still kept secret. A committee headed by former Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane collected evidence and presented it in outline at a press conference in New York. The Voice of America refused to carry the item in its news broadcast on the ground that it might arouse hatred of the Russians in Poland. This is the continuance in 1950 of the appeasement of Russia in Poland, which began at Tehran in 1943 and was made conclusive in 1945, when we abandoned the Yalta agreement for a Polish government jointly formed of the Polish London government-in-exile and the Communists. According to the Harry Hopkins papers, this was a deliberate betrayal, Hopkins saying he had no interest in getting the recognized London Polish government-in-exile into the new Government of Poland. We agreed to accept, instead, the Communist government, plus one of the London Polish leaders with no authority. After the sell-out we prematurely withdrew recognition from the London government and made stateless refugees of the Polish troops who fought beside us at Cassino and elsewhere.

31. Ninety million dollars given Red Poland: After the Polish Communist Government had scornfully rejected America's request for the free elections pledged at Yalta, and refused our Ambassador permission to visit Americans in jail there, Under Secretary Acheson approved a $90,000,000 loan over the protests of Ambassador Lane. Mr. Acheson's law firm acted as the agent of the Polish Government. Part of this money went to arm the dreaded secret police.

32. Dean Acheson discards Kingdom of Yugoslavia in favor of Tito: On December 22, 1945, Dean Acheson, as Acting Secretary, recognized Tito's Yugoslavia in place of our ally and cosigner of the declaration of the UN, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. In the agreement of Yalta it was provided that free elections were to be held. None was. Mr. Acheson's act seems to fall into the definition of a war crime, as defined at Nuremberg.

33. Dean Acheson welcomes the Red Dean of Canterbury:

November 14, 1945, on the platform at Madison Square Garden with the Red Dean of Canterbury and pro-Communists Corliss Lamont, Paul Robeson, Albert Fitzgerald, and former Ambassador Joe E. Davies, Dean Acheson said: "Never in the past has there been any place on the globe where the vital interests of the American and Russian people have clashed or even been antagonistic, and there is no objective reason to suppose that there should now, or in the future, ever be such a place. We understand and agree with them that to have friendly governments along her borders is essential both for the security of the Soviet Union and for the peace of the world."

Whatever one might think of poor little Russia faced by such unfriendly governments as Finland, Greece, Iran, South Korea, etc., Mr. Acheson's plea for friendship must have been heartening to Russia, but what does it reveal about Mr. Acheson?

Some believe that the words "friendly governments" were taken from the text of one of the still secret pacts of Potsdam, which tied our hands in China.

34. Averell Harriman of Yalta in the White House:

Your top adviser on how to push the Communist bigwigs out of the Czar's Kremlin back to the garrets of the European underground, from which they emerged in 1917, is Mr. Averell Harriman. Mr. Harriman has much pushing to do. As our Ambassador in Moscow, during the latter part of the war, he was either the architect, or at least chief draftsman, of our Soviet giveaway program. He it was who prepared the secret Yalta agreement giving the Far East to Russia. He brought this to Yalta and had it agreed to by President Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins in a 15-minute session with Stalin and Molotov, according to Secretary Stettinius. When the British learned of it later, it is reported, Eden urged Churchill to refuse to sign, but he said he couldn't fight both America and Russia, so gave in. I hope Mr. Harriman knows better now, but his education, and the development of his judgment, are too costly in American lives.

35. Other top foreign-policy advisers with small qualifications are:

Under Secretary Webb, with no apparent foreign affairs background; Deputy Under Secretary Rusk, best known as author of a book on the subject of improved curricula for girls' colleges, protégé of Alger Hiss; Philip C. Jessup (friend and witness for Hiss, long-time associate of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, T. A. Bisson, Edward C. Carter, Owen Lattimore, Harriett Lucy Moore, Philip A. Jaffe and Guenther Stein), editor of the China white paper and protagonist of Red China; John Foster Dulles, a gentleman of the highest reputation, whose lack of discernment led him to place Alger Hiss as president of the Carnegie Endowment for Peace, and now has led him to replace Mr. Hiss with Hiss's former top assistant in the State Department; and Wm. T. Stone, protector of Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, overlord of the pinko Voice of America and now State Department member of the new National Psychological Strategy Board in which (New York Times, August 18, 1950) the State Department will be the center of authority.

36. Richard J. H. Johnston, reporting from Korea, quotes a GI at the battle front as saying: "Damned if I know why I'm fighting to save this hellhole." (New York Times, August 13, 1950, p. 1.) The answer, of course, is because your State Department refused arms to the South Koreans for their defense; confining them to small arms suitable only for internal security. This is the same policy followed in China where our GI's may soon be asking the same question about that twenty-times bigger hellhole. There has never been any shortage of Koreans or Chinese to fight on our side.

Mr. President, why have we preferred to use armed Americans unfamiliar with the country and unaccustomed to living under native conditions, instead of giving arms to the anti-Communist native forces? And, why do we still continue that policy?

37. Withdrawal of General Hodge's forces from Korea in 1948–49: Had our occupation of Korea continued, the Americans who landed in Korea last June would have had bases, supplies, and equipment at hand. Hodge's withdrawal and your January 5, 1950, statement were open invitations to the Reds to attack. Your change of attitude June 27th was sound, but we have a right to know who advised you to change. There was no secret about North Korean intentions to attack after we withdrew. It was openly predicted by our military in Japan; and our Korean occupation officers, heading for home last year, some via Europe and some via the Pacific, spread the word everywhere. Just last Sunday night, Ambassador Jessup said we still have no policy in Korea, but will leave it to decision by the 53 nations who voted with us in the UN.

38. MacArthur ordered to favor the Communists: One of the least understandable of the variety of cockeyed orders sent to General MacArthur by the State Department was the order, still in effect, certifying the Communist Party of Japan as one of the democratic parties to receive official encouragement. General MacArthur has been denied authority to act against that party so that, even today, with Korean Communists shooting Americans in the back, General MacArthur cannot take action against Japanese Communists as such.

39. China, key to Asia:

In spite of public warning by leading world statesmen that China held the key to the peace of the world, you have treated that vast and potentially powerful ally as though it were only a useful tidbit to appease the voracious appetite of the Red Czar, whom you hoped would "join in the efforts of the whole community of nations to build a peaceful world."

In 1899, in proclaiming the open-door policy, now sunk without trace, Secretary of State John Hay said: "Whoever understands China * * * has a key to politics for the next 500 years."

Lenin and Stalin both stressed that the turning point in the world revolution would come when China was conquered by communism.

In an address to the Politburo of the American Communist Party, published in part in the Daily Worker of December 2, 1945, W. Z. Foster, party chairman, said: "The war in China is the key to all problems on the international front."

A few days later you sent Gen. George C. Marshall to China to push that country into a coalition with the Communists, which you described, 3 years later, as "the same thing as a Communist government."

Innumerable warnings have pressed in on you, but you seem adamant in your determination, continued even today in your orders to the Seventh Fleet, to throw China to the Russian wolves. Most important of these warnings came from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who, adding to his private warnings, said publicly in March 1948: "I can say, without the slightest hesitation, that a free, independent, peaceful, and friendly China is of profound importance to the peace of the world and to the position of the United States."

40. The key is thrown away: By a series of acts of commission and omission, some of which are detailed below, China was delivered over to Soviet power. Stuart Symington, on July 28, said our greatest shortage was manpower. China is the world's greatest reservoir of manpower. Physically, and intellectually, the equals, or the superiors, of the Koreans, we have seen what they can do when well-trained, well-led, and well-armed. Five hundred million Chinese turned over to Russia tipped the manpower balance in her favor. It is not yet too late, however, 500,000 troops under Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa, and 1,500,000 Nationalist guerrillas now fighting on the mainland, could be armed and trained to reconquer a Communist China, seething with revolt and dissatisfaction.

41. Secretary Acheson's sudden interest in China:

In 1943, Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who had been brought into the Department in 1941, as liaison with Congress, suddenly took a profound interest in China, where he has never been. Beginning that summer, his initials appeared frequently on the blue archive copies of messages to China. These initials show the identity of the person preparing the message, which is itself signed with the name of the Secretary or Acting Secretary, who, however, seldom sees it. Among his China activities was the preparation of General Marshall's instructions, and a message to Ambassador Hurley instructing him to follow Henry Wallace's report on China as policy guide, thenceforth.

The beginning of Mr. Acheson's interest in China coincided with the Soviet break with the Polish Government in April 1943; the secret Lattimore letter to Joseph Barnes, of June 1943; and the Jessup-IPR blast at Chiang Kai-shek and praise of the Chinese Communists as pure democrats and agrarian reformers, in July 1943. When the Soviet line on China changed from pro-Chiang to anti-Chiang, Acheson suddenly became interested.

Mr. Acheson's continuing interest in China was expressed in the embargo on arms to Chiang Kai-shek; the issuance of the White Paper on China, which served the double purpose of denouncing Chiang (though strangely it made no single charge of bad faith against him) and revealing our bad faith to every chancellory in the world. Mr. Acheson's championing of the Hiss brothers, of Harold Glasser, another of the same network, of Lattimore and Jessup and Barnett and Hanson and Service and others may be a tribute to his compassionate regard for sinners fallen into evil ways, but it discredits him as the guardian of our security.

42. Lauchlin Currie countermands the Joint Chiefs of Staff: After VE-day, the Chinese applied for surrendered German arms and ammunition. The Joint Chiefs of Staff approved, sent orders to General Eisenhower and 20,000 rifles actually left a German port for China, via India. The Joint Chiefs order was then countermanded by Presidential order signed by Lauchlin Currie, Administrative Assistant (since named by both Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley). The balance of the vast stores of German armament was then destroyed; by whose orders is unknown.

43. China's reserve ammunition destroyed: At the time of VJ-day, 39 Chinese divisions had been partially, or wholly, equipped with American arms. Ammunition in China was limited, but vast stores, all provided under lend-lease, lay in India awaiting shipment by air over the Hump, or by truck over the Stilwell Road. By somebody's order, all this vast store was destroyed and none recredited to Chinese lend-lease account. The amount destroyed is uncertain, except that smaller caliber ammunition was blown up in dumps in India and larger caliber (amounting to 120,000 tons) was taken to sea and dumped in the Bay of Bengal. In the Indian operation, it is reported, 25 Americans and 125 Indians lost their lives in accidents.

For lack of this ammunition, China's best 39 divisions were never able to undertake continuous field operations against the Communists, but had to husband remaining ammunition for defense of fixed points. This was made certain by an American and British embargo applied against ammunition export licenses to China, from December 1945 until about October 1948.

44. Chinese Reds kill Americans with impunity: Between the Japanese surrender, and VJ-day, small American intelligence forces behind Japanese lines in China were ambushed by Chinese Communists. This continued at intervals after VJ-day, under varying circumstances, until our forces withdrew. No apologies or reparations were ever obtained, and urgent requests from United States commanders in China and from fleet commanders (under whose orders the Marines were acting) failed to bring authority to take punitive action. Even when the Chinese Reds took to beating and jailing our diplomats, in 1949–50, the State Department continued to favor them.

45. State Department circumvented your orders for surplus arms to China: In March 1948 after congressional clamor, surplus arms and ammunition lying in the Pacific islands were ordered made available to China, then desperately short of ammunition for American arms previously supplied. Prior to the issuance of this public order, I am informed, a secret order went to Tokyo to classify as surplus only unserviceable material. When the Chinese arrived, they managed to get a little serviceable ammunition because the officers in charge, having a better sense of reality than the State Department's FLC, let their consciences be their guide in deciding what was unserviceable. Today, with your guaranty to Formosa in effect, there is a shortage of ammunition there. If not promptly remedied, it may cause the fall of Formosa, requiring American landings not necessary if we give the Chinese the wherewithal to fight.

46. The American Navy ordered to run away: Four times the American Navy has been ordered to withdraw from legally entered ports, when faced with Chinese Communist threats. Three such withdrawals occurred in late 1945 (at Dairen, Chefoo, and Hulutao), the fourth at Shanghai in 1949. Why we ran away from the Communists in China when they were weak and then went in to fight them in Korea, when they were strong, is explained by your turn from appeasement to strength, which we all approve. Too bad you didn't act on Churchill's advice in Fulton, Mo., in 1946, while the arms destruction program was still underway and could have been halted, and before Russia had the A-bomb.

47. Henry Wallace wrote our China policy: Ever since the Henry Wallace reports on China, cabled from Kunming and New Delhi in June 1944 and delivered to President Roosevelt in July 1944, the theme song of American policy in China has been the tune of "Chiang must go." Even the recall of General Stilwell was recommended by Mr. Wallace. In 1948, spending 2 days in China, Paul Hoffman wrote and signed a letter to Chiang Kai-shek advising him to resign. He did not mail it, but news of it became common gossip, and Mr. Hoffman told a friend, after his return, he regretted not mailing it. Yet, in all these years, your administration has never dared name a possible successor to Chiang Kai-shek. They knew there was only one possibility, and that his name was Mao Tse-tung, but they never had the courage to say it openly. Why not make the Wallace reports public? In his book, Soviet Asia Mission (1946), Mr. Wallace said: "As we began to talk about details, it became apparent that President Roosevelt had much more than China in mind. He urged me to take Owen Lattimore with me, who, he said, was one of the world's great experts on the problems involving Chinese-Russian relationships."

48. High policy China papers still secret: Last fall, Secretary Acheson wrote two letters, one to the then President Li Tsung-jen of China, and one to Chiang Kai-shek. They are still secret. May we not know why? Also all cables from President Roosevelt to Chiang Kai-shek and vice versa; and the 12 coded messages called for by Ambassador Hurley when before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in November 1945. The Chinese, of course, have these messages; in the Amerasia case, John S. Service revealed he had turned some over to Philip Jaffe. Mr. President, are not the American people entitled to this information?

49. Arms for the Chinese Communists: Proposals were made in 1944 by General Stilwell, Vice President Wallace, and the State Department to arm the Chinese Communists with American arms. Actual implementation of these proposals in 1945 and the proposal to Congress by Under Secretary Acheson in March 1946 to arm both Communists and Nationalists, suggest a complete report on this whole subject.

50. John S. Service's testimony before Senator TYDINGS hinted at a conspiracy.

But the facts did not come out. In April 1945 the State Department proposed that the planned American landings on the China coast be shifted from the sandy beaches of Nationalist-defended Hangchow Bay, far to the north in the Communist area; and that 300,000 Communists be armed and trained by us. The Navy rejected the plan for tactical reasons.

In July General Stilwell, then in command on Okinawa, renewed this plea. Again it was scotched. The Japanese surrender in August ended that plot. Had it succeeded, the conquest of China by the Reds would have been advanced by 2 or 3 years. The Tydings committee covered this up.

51. Suppression of the Wedemeyer report from August 1947 to August 1949: Had the Wedemeyer report been implemented, communism would have lost in China, and there would have been no war in Korea. The continued suppression of the Korean section of the Wedemeyer report may hide another skeleton in the closet. Did Wedemeyer warn you?

52. Why do we fight alone in Korea?

At the very beginning of the Korean fighting the Chinese Nationalists offered three of their eight American-equipped divisions for immediate service in Korea and the ships to transport them. The State Department refused this offer. To date, no other member of the UN has delivered a single unit of ground troops to Korea, though some may be en route. Our boys die there alone. Parents ask why Chinese allies were rejected and also why volunteers at American embassies in every country of western Europe are turned away with a printed notice reading: "The United States Government does not accept the enlistment of foreigners outside the United States." Both may be sound policy, but parents would appreciate an explanation.

Should the balance of the South Korean forces collapse, the refusal of Chinese divisions will leave us fighting a race war in Korea, as now charged in Communist propaganda. White against yellow is a picture that would turn most of the 1,000,000,000 people of East Asia against us.

53. Everywhere, Mr. President, we have sought to make our enemies into friends by treating our friends as enemies. The free governments of Poland and Yugoslavia in exile and the people of those two countries were our friends. We treated them as our enemies and turned them over to communism. The people and Government of the Republic of China were our friends. As General Marshall said, "By a stroke of the pen [the embargo] I disarmed them" and step by step turned that vast "depot" of manpower over to communism. President Quirino, of the Philippines, proposed an anti-Communist Asiatic alliance in July 1949, came to Washington, was told to "lay off," and dropped the idea. Only 4 months ago leaders of your administration proposed a $10,000,000,000-a-year bribe to the Soviets for another piece of paper calling for 50 years of peace on promises of disarmament by Russia and real disarmament by us.

Last year a Republican political leader told me that communism was not a political issue. "It's like VD," he said; "everybody's against it, but nobody wants to talk about it." Re-

cently he told me that the only issue in this campaign was "Korea." I reminded him of what he said last year. "That was right," he said, "but now we've got it."

How true: "Red herring" poultices, "let the dust settle" and "won't turn my back on Alger Hiss" palliatives will no longer serve. Drastic surgery and informed medication by competent doctors are called for. The quacks, who have a record of 100 percent wrong guesses, should go. The bad medical advice you have taken should be discarded. New advisers and new remedies are urgent before the present bleeding drains our strength.

54. It took a genius to lose the cold war: It took hundreds of wrong decisions to reduce you to the necessity of calling for help to challenge a scarcely fifth-rate Soviet satellite. It took scores of wrong decisions to bring about the conquest of one-third the world in the last 5 years, without the shedding of a drop of Russian blood. And, all by a punch-drunk Soviet Union which had seen half its European territory ravaged, 20,000,000 of its sons and daughters slain, and 1,000,000 of its army in revolt at the end of World War II.

It took genius in reverse to lose our war (call it cold, or call it hot) with the Soviets. This is proven by the unbelief 5 years ago that it could possibly happen. It is proven by our postwar offers of aid, at least until Russian rejection of the Marshall plan. It is proven by our still continuing offers to share the atom bomb. Russia claims (correctly) 830,000,000 people behind the iron curtain, yet, also only claims 18,000,000 Communists there. The State Department and Voice of America "pinkos" have been losing the cold war, where the odds are heavily on our side. Now they are getting us into a hot war where the odds are heavily against us. It doesn't take a genius to figure that out.

55. J. Peters, Gerhardt Eisler, Adams (or Adamson), and John Santo were four of Russia's top espionage agents in the United States of America: After this was known to our authorities, Eisler and Adams were permitted to escape, and Peters and Santo were permitted to leave voluntarily. Information, such as we are now obtaining from British spy Fuchs, and American spy Gold, might have been obtained from these four, if jailed here.

56. In your broadcast to the country July 19, you quoted Chief of Staff J. Lawton Collins, as reporting that "our far eastern forces were organized and equipped primarily to perform peaceful occupation duties in Japan."

The Eighth Army, and other forces that occupied Japan, were heavily armed for the campaigns in the Pacific islands; and prepared for the landings on the Chinese and Japanese coasts. If they left all that armor behind, as reported by General Collins, who induced you to permit its destruction? Wouldn't it be useful in Korea? Might it not be useful if the Russians attacked us in Japan?

57. In spite of the killing and wounding, without apology or reparations, of more than 100 Americans by the Chinese Communists; in spite of the beating and jailing of your representatives (our consuls in China), in spite of daily abuse of America and you by the Chinese Communist press and radio, last September 29, Ambassador Philip C. Jessup, in an interview in the Pathfinder magazine, recommended the recognition of Red China. Recently, you appointed him to the Security Council. His is not the advice your countrymen wish to follow.

58. Behind the fantastic insults you stand for almost daily in the UN, State Department fat cats, such as the Washington Post, United States News, Walter Lippmann, and Drew Pearson hint at appeasement of the Chinese and Korean Communists, to restore peace. Parents, whose captured sons had their hands tied and were shot in the face, want punishment, not appeasement, of Communists in Korea and elsewhere.

59. Why do we hesitate to arrest the Axis Sallys and Tokyo Roses of this war? Poison, more sinister than the treason of these American Fascist broadcasters of World War II, is broadcast daily in the Communist Daily Worker, People's World, and Political Affairs and at hands-off-Korea meetings. America is denounced; our sons are accused of wanton slaughter of peaceful Koreans; we are accused as aggressors. To make it complete, you are denounced as a tool of Wall Street. The fulminations of Kim Il Sung, head of the North Korean Government, are printed. Even denunciations of America, lyingly attributed to captured officers by name, are printed. Treason was not condoned in World War II. Why now?

60. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 4, 1950, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, your ardent supporter, said: "American occupation forces were withdrawn from South Korea in July 1949. * * * Again, we miscalculated and failed to understand the menace of the Communist conspiracy." Mr. President, your advisers have failed to understand this menace, at home and abroad, again and again. Of this bad advice Americans have had enough.

61. Why doesn't the FBI trust the State Department?

The reasons for this distrust are apparent to those who have watched the records of hearings before the Un-American Activities Committee, the Tyding committee, and others. One incident is the FBI report in 1946, which was put in chart form by the State Department and introduced in the Senate by Senator MCCARTHY. The story back of this is that the FBI material was turned over to the State Department Office for Visual Presentations. The head of that office was Carl Aldo Marzani, later sentenced to jail as a Communist.

Another instance concerns the file on Nathan Silvermaster (member of Elizabeth Bentley's and Whittaker Chambers' spy rings), who testified that William T. Stone, his superior, showed him the FBI record. Mr. Stone has since been promoted to a high State Department position.

Another was the instance in which this same Silvermaster was cleared by Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson after a derogatory report by G-2. This was supposedly on request of Lauchlin Currie, who saw the file, and who, himself, was later named by both Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley.

In each of these cases the sources of FBI information were revealed to a Communist, who might be expected to report to the Communist Party; thus possibly spoiling FBI sources of information.

From what I hear, the FBI has no more confidence in the State Department than do Americans generally.

62. To close this bill of particulars with a constructive suggestion, I attach a reprint of a portion of my testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee, June 10, 1948. I hope you will find these proposals, in spite of their brevity, worthy of consideration. They are not original, but represent the conclusions of many of the few Americans who may properly be considered authorities on communism. Instead of leaving the initiative with the Soviets, as does the present policy of partial containment, it proposes that we seize the initiative, arm our fighting friends and give men everywhere the opportunity to fight for freedom, if they have the will. Like most worth-while proposals, it starts at home.

If you are not longer committed to the road to disaster we have followed for the last 5 years, I hope you will give it serious consideration.

ALFRED KOHLBERG.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 30, 1950.*

CHINA AID PROGRAM

(Portion of statement of Alfred Kohlberg, New York City)

More than 2½ years ago the last of our enemies in World War II surrendered unconditionally. Never in the history of the Republic had the United States won so complete a victory; all other foreign wars in our history having been settled by peace treaties and not by unconditional surrender. During these 2½ years President Truman, with the assistance of three different Secretaries of State, has so completely lost the peace in Europe, in the Near East, in Korea, in China, and almost everywhere in the Far East, that I find our people turning almost in resignation to the thought of a third world war as a corrective for these errors. Since my return from China and Japan in March, I have been frequently asked, "How did we get into our present mess?" "Is it because of stupidity or was it treason?"

In the past 3 years this Congress has been rushed from one world-saving emergency measure to another. Each, at the time, was guaranteed to win the peace, save the world, and prevent world war III. These were Bretton Woods, $7,000,000,000; UNRRA, $3,500,000,000; UNO, a few million; the British loan, $3,750,000,000; post UNRRA aid, $350,000,000; the peace treaties with Italy and three satellites, Greek-Turkish aid, $400,000,000. I might also mention the $500,000,000 Export-Import Bank loan to China held in front of the Chinese horse like a carrot, while the stick of coalition with the Communists was vigorously applied by General Marshall on the spot. When the stick failed, the $500,000,000 carrot was canceled.

Each of these measures was put through in a frenzy of enthusiasm. Each has failed. It is time now to look this latest horse coldly in the mouth and put some check rein on it so that it does not go dashing off wildly in all directions and end up nowhere, like UNRRA, Bretton Woods, the UN, and so forth, before it.

CONFUSED AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The American public is confused by an apparent policy of stumbling from one step to another, and from one emergency to another, in an unplanned attempt to contain Soviet Communist expansion everywhere in the world. Our armed services are in direct contact with Communist armies in too many places, in Germany, in Austria, in Greece, in Trieste, in Korea, in North China, and on the thin water barriers between Siberia and Alaska and between the Kuriles and Japan. We fear that incidents may result in an unintended war.

Only by turning these points of contact into outposts of unity and confronting the Communist world with a closely knit free world too strong to attack, can peace be preserved. To accomplish this, may I suggest the following steps now. Some of these steps can be written into your appropriation bill, some would need other legislation.

In their memoirs our recent leaders are now telling us that World War II could have been prevented had steps similar to these been taken at any time prior to 1939. The objectives of my proposals are:

One, to prevent world war III by destroying the Soviet fifth column and bringing into being an alliance of free people so overwhelming that world communism will not dare a military decision.

Two, while preventing the present cold war from becoming a shooting war, to destroy world communism from within.

While it is true that the conduct of our foreign relations is the constitutional prerogative of the President, the power of the purse remains with Congress. The signers of the Constitution probably never expected that it would cost $10,000,000 a year to conduct our foreign relations. It is my humble opinion that when the cash is appropriated you assume responsibility for results.

NATURE OF OPPOSITION TO DEMOCRACY

What we face is an ideology plus a force. This ideology promises socialism, economic democracy, miraculous medicine, free education, no more exploitation, racial equality, and every variety of pie in the sky. These ideas are for export only. Behind the iron curtain it delivers poverty, the police state, terror, and slavery.

The force is the Communist International, which includes the ever-expanding Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and musters 450,000,000 subjects and slaves, and millions of spies and agents all over the world.

It will destroy us or we will destroy it.

Force can be destroyed by force, but an ideology cannot be destroyed by force alone. It must be destroyed by a better ideology.

We have that better ideology. It is freedom—political freedom, religious freedom, and economic freedom.

I believe that every one of the steps which I am going to suggest is inevitable; that every one of them will in any case be taken the day after war comes; but that, if taken now or in the very near future, war may be avoided.

Step 1: Congress must declare that world communism has proclaimed the United States its enemy, and itself our enemy. This declaration that Communist hierarchy has officially made a number of times, most particularly in section 1, paragraph 1, of the constitution of the Communist International which proclaims its objectives to be to fight for the establishment of a World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, that is for the conquest of the entire world. In accordance with this declaration, adhering to, giving aid and comfort to world communism would fall under the constitutional definition of treason.

Step 2: Unrestricted trade relations shall be permitted only with nations entering the alliance outlined in step 3. Trade relations with Communist-controlled nations and areas shall be prohibited. Trade relations with other nations and areas shall be controlled so that no materials which may directly or indirectly promote the war potential of the Communist areas may thereby reach such areas.

Step 3: American armed aid in case of attack by armed Communists shall be promised to every nation taking the above action on condition that each such nation agrees to extend armed aid under the same circumstances to each of the others so qualifying. No question of the form of government of nations entering such an alliance, whether free enterprise, democratic, monarchial, dictatorial, socialistic, or otherwise shall be given consideration. When thinking of military alliances, we should remember that Russia signed a treaty of military alliance during the war with Great Britain to run 20 years.

Since the war she has signed treaties of military alliance with the following former allies of ours: Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and France; also with the following enemy nations: Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Finland, all, not long since, described as Fascist beasts. The alliance I envison would be independent of the UN which we would permit to continue in the hope of a happier day in the dim and distant future, at which time it could be reorganized to fit.

Step 4: American economic, charitable, relief, or reconstruction aid shall be permitted only to nations entering the alliance provided for in step 3.

Step 5: Direct military and other aid shall be supplied to dissident elements within the Communist world, exactly in the manner that Russia now supplies such aid to Communist and other dissidents in the free world, as, for example, in China, Korea, Greece, Trieste, Austria, Germany, Italy, Iran, Finland, the Philippines, and elsewhere.

Step 6: Diplomatic relations shall be immediately broken with all nations and areas within the Communist world. Such diplomatic relations in the past were presumed to smooth the course of international relations, but as now practiced by the Communist nations only serve to aggravate such relations. Only last April I returned from Japan where the Soviet Union has several hundred employees in its Tokyo Embassy. A few dozen are engaged in diplomatic work. The balance are busy at espionage, propaganda, agitation, and intrigue.

All these steps can be taken at once. No one of them is warlike, nor does any of them, except the rupture of diplomatic relations, go beyond the steps already taken by the Soviet communism in its cold war on us. Those who think we are now at peace with Russia must consider all these steps to peace; they exactly duplicate Russia's peaceful approaches to us. Those who think we are engaged in a cold war with Russia will applaud retaliation confined to the cold level.

GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY,
Executive Mansion, Albany, N. Y.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: I appeal to you as the titular head of the only loyal opposition party in the United States of America.

Six years ago last month I wrote to my old friend, your then campaign manager, Herbert Brownell. I secured his permission to make my letter, but not his answer, public, and enclose a copy. It is my intention, unless you object, to make this letter public.

Since 1944 the sell-out of China and Poland, predicted in my letter, has become fact. The Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms are long since forgotten.

We had two traditional foreign policies. The open-door policy, dating from 1899, was secretly abandoned at Yalta. The Monroe Doctrine, which President Monroe refused to make a consultative pact in 1823, was turned into just that at Chapultepec in 1945.

When I wrote Herb Brownell in 1944 the United Nations, formed January 1, 1942, was a hard and fast military alliance. The nations in it—our military allies—were the recognized governments for 1,690,000,000 human beings. Of these 190,000,000 were accounted for by the Soviets, whose government had been officially described by Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of State in 1919 as one that "suggests the Asiatic despotism of the early Tsars." The others, accounting for 1,700,000,000 people, were governments that ruled by consent of their people, attested in their several ways.

Today our allies and partial allies (western Europe, this hemisphere, South Korea, the Philippines, and the Anzacs) account for 580,000,000 people. Meantime the Soviets have increased to 830,000,000. Should war come, on a population basis, the odds against us are 8 to 5, whereas in 1944 they were 8 to 1 in our favor.

I trust you will pardon me as an older Republican for saying that under your leadership the Republican Party has been remiss in its duty to the country. It has failed to explain and denounce the combination of treason and incompetence that has brought us to the verge of disaster, now becoming so apparent in the hills and rice paddies of Korea. Your speech of November 23, 1947, on China and Korea was a classic and predicted exactly the very disaster that has now befallen us in both countries. But neither you nor the party carried through.

Korea is only a peninsula jutting out from Manchuria, sold out to the Communist slaveocracy by Messrs. Harriman, Hiss, Hopkins, and Roosevelt at Yalta. Manchuria is only the three northeastern provinces of China, pledged to be restored to the Republic of China (not just China) at Cairo. The step-by-step sell-out of China, so well exposed in its naked infamy in the documents that make up the appendix of the State Department white paper, must be clear to every chancellery in the world who had experts study it, even if we did not. The white paper suppressed Generel Wedemeyer's report on Korea. Was this suppression treason, now being paid for in American lives?

However, I would not write you only to refer to past, though undenounced, treason.

I write because of what I now see ahead, just as I saw the Polish-Chinese double-cross in 1944. What I see is another Tehran, or Yalta or Potsdam (yes; or Munich), this time in the UN. A deal for Russia to order the North Koreans back to the thirty-eighth parallel in return for a Communist China on the Security Council; the cutting off of the armies on Formosa from further ammunition; a few Americans stationed in a ruined South Korea to await the next attack; the UN completely hamstrung by a double veto; and the whole Asian world told once and for all that the United States is a faithless ally and its promises made only to be broken.

I am not imagining this. The pro-Russian clique in the State Department (minus only Alger Hiss, on whom they "have not turned their backs") as described by New Dealer Adolph Berle, still controls our destiny. This coming infamy has been spelled out by their favorite grapevines, the Washington Post, Walter Lippmann, the United States News, and Robert S. Allen. They expect this peace to bring Truman as great an ovation as Munich brought Chamberlain and Daladier. They seem to agree with Hopkins that we are "too damned dumb" to understand.

Furthermore, they have contrived, by refusing to accept Chinese divisions, to present a picture of white imperialism fighting alone in South Korea, Indochina, and Malaya, against native Communist nationalism.

I think your two predecessors as titular heads of our party would concur in the above analysis except, possibly, for the charge of appeasement to come. Now that you have removed yourself from the political race, could you not join with them in a nonpolitical warning to our party and to the country?

President Hoover spoke out above party at the convention in 1948. In spite of the ovation accorded him the party and the country continued asleep. Both are now awakening. For the sake of God, of America, and what is left of the free world, I implore you to speak out now.

Very sincerely,

ALFRED KOHLBERG.

(Copies to President Herbert Hoover, Gov. Alf Landon.)

SPRING LAKE, N. J., *June 28, 1944.*
HON. HERBERT BROWNELL, JR.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR HERB: It is my observation that there are very few citizens whose votes can be changed by arguments based on domestic issues. All who will listen to common sense and reason are already anti-New Deal. The rest have closed their minds and ears and cannot be reached.

However, the vast majority are completely at sea on foreign policy and are completely open to explanation and reason, as they have only the vaguest idea of what it is all about, how this war happened, how we stumbled into it and how to avoid stumbling into a bigger world war III in another generation—possibly almost before World War II is completely over.

Bad as Roosevelt's domestic record is, his foreign record is worse. What saves him is that the Republican record of the past few years is even worse. But Dewey's record is not and he is not bound by the record of Republicans who did not hold national policy making offices—the last Republican record binding him at all is the record of the Harding, Coolidge, Hoover administrations.

Before going to China in 1938, 1939, and 1941, I was told by high State Department officials that the foreign policy of the United States of America was not made by the State Department and not by the President, but by public opinion. Not only is that conception unconstitutional, it was untrue, and in the final analysis it was disproven when the ultimate foreign policy decision—the decision of peace or war—was made not by the State Department, the President, the Congress, or public opinion, but by Mr. Hirohito.

Now in the seventh year of the war in China, the fifth year of the war in Europe and our third year in the war, Roosevelt's only pronouncement (3 weeks ago) is to reestablish the proven failure of the bankrupt League of Nations, practically without change.

Meantime, he has bypassed his Secretary of State to sell out Poland, and maybe France, and maybe China to the U. S. S. R. These deals are not provable now but may be before election. There is circumstantial evidence now. (There may be leaks from China as to Wallace's demands.)

All this only deepens the confusion of the average man. What is needed now is a clear statement of America's interest and then a clear policy to preserve that interest.

Our fundamental interest is clear and simple. It is to prevent the establishment of any superstate anywhere in the world so big and powerful that we would always have to be armed to the teeth in fear of attack by it.

One hundred and twenty years ago President Monroe acted to prevent such a state from developing as our neighbor in this hemisphere. Today such a state anywhere in the world would be nearer to Washington than Mexico was in Monroe's time (in point of time). A Europe under one power, or an Asia under one power, or both under one power, would be a threat so great that we could never return to the normal ways of peace.

An extension of the Monroe Doctrine to the world is called for. The world is relatively smaller today than the Americas were in Monroe's time, and we are bigger, relatively. Furthermore, it is in the Republican tradition—the tradition that warned Spain in Monroe's time and penalized her for criminality in McKinley's; that proclaimed the open door policy in China in McKinley's time and aided in ending Russian aggression in Roosevelt's; that pledged the territorial integrity and independence of China in 1922; and refused to countenance Japanese in Manchuria under Hoover. Furthermore, it would clarify and give substance to the foreign policy plank of the platform adopted in Chicago yesterday.

I have drawn it up roughly in the enclosed "Proclamation." This could be greatly improved in many ways, particularly as I do not have the Monroe Doctrine here with me on my vacation. This, however, represents many years of thinking, study, and travel; and after discussions with a former State Department official and Republican Minister to Hungary 3 years ago was drawn up in a different form at that time. (Copy enclosed.)

In the present form it has been seen by no one but my secretary. If it proves to have any points of interest, I would be glad to discuss it with any of your advisers. I shall be back in New York shortly.

It is many years since Ward and you and I have been together, but I have watched your career and your increasing success with great pleasure.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED KOHLBERG.

Too Slow, Too Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD an editorial, Too Slow, Too Short, that appeared a few days ago in the Washington Daily News. I am in agreement with the argument set forth in this editorial that the United States, even though we have greatly increased our defense expenditures and are now making a greater effort to prepare this Nation for the danger of war, is still not doing enough. I would call particular attention to these statements:

Defense spending will be doubled to a rate of thirty billion a year by next June, the President said, and to a much higher rate the year thereafter.

But next June is 9 months in the future, whereas the danger the free world faces is here and now, and there is every reason to believe that it grows by the hour.

Russia's rulers, we may be sure, are not dilly-dallying. They are forcing their subjects to utmost exertion to maintain and widen their margin of military superiority and, especially, to overcome what we fondly trust is our lead in production and stockpiling of atomic bombs.

America's one chance of winning the fateful race is to get her unexcelled industrial machine to work at top speed on production of planes and tanks and ships and guns and other weapons—not after months or years, but now.

In that is our only hope of deterring Russian aggression and bringing peace to the world. In that is our best hope of survival if we are forced to fight a third world war.

The American people will give what it takes. They cannot be safe or satisfied with less than an all-out effort by their Government.

Mr. President, the time has come when the United States should make an all-out effort to prepare for the danger of war. If we make an all-out effort and we are able to keep the peace, then we can feel sure that the great effort and the expenditures made by this Nation succeeded in giving us peace for many years to come. If we make this enormous effort and we are later forced to fight a war, then we can feel that we did the wise thing and had our Nation in position that it would be able to survive with liberty and freedom. Nevertheless, it is time we understand that the hour is late, the time to be ready is now, not a year from now.

I regret, Mr. President, that this great Nation was not sufficiently alarmed or awakened by the Berlin blockade. Then was the time when we should have been completely on notice that Soviet Russia did not have peaceful intentions. Then was the time when we should have immediately undertaken to see that we would not be outmatched, outproduced, outgunned in a war of survival. Oh, Mr. President, how unfortunate we are that America was not sufficiently awakened or alarmed by the Berlin blockade.

History may record that it was still more unfortunate that the American people again went to sleep at the switch in international affairs within 1 year of the lifting of the Berlin blockade. While Russia was preparing as rapidly as possible the American public was again demanding reduction in defense expenditures, and our Secretary of Defense was making himself popular over the Nation by refusing to spend hundreds of millions of dollars which Congress had appropriated for defense. Let us hope and pray that we have been sufficiently awakened in Korea and that we will profit from the lessons of Korea and the American lives that are being lost there. If this great Nation had undertaken immediate and rapid preparedness for war at the time of the Berlin blockade and had continued it until the present date, we might be reasonably sure we would not be losing the lives of our finest men in Korea today. Let us hope that we will not lose hundreds of thousands of additional lives and possibly the freedom of all America and of the entire world by our failure to wake up to the danger in time.

Now is the time when we must put aside petty differences. Now is the time when we must cease arguing and bickering about differences and mistakes of the past. We must join together in a tremendous effort. I hope that the President and our new Secretary of Defense will lose no time in making clear to the American people the danger that we face and initiate a program of peace through preparedness. The democracies have tried to maintain peace in our time by appeasement, only to fight the most terrible war in all history. We can have peace when we are ready and able to win a victory for freedom. No American would want peace without liberty.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOO SLOW, TOO SHORT

"All of us—whether we are farmers, or wage earners, or businessmen—must give up some of the things we would ordinarily expect to have for ourselves and our families. The danger the free world faces is so great that we cannot be satisfied with less than an all-out effort by everyone."

Those words from President Truman to the American people are profoundly true.

And more surely than ever before, the free world's danger is our own country's imminent danger.

But the only Americans from whom the President thus far has demanded vital sacrifices and all-out effort are the hard-pressed, outnumbered men sent to fight in Korea.

The pay-as-we-go taxes and the other steps taken or proposed toward home-front mobilization, about which Mr. Truman talked Saturday night, are longer steps than he previously has seemed to consider necessary, and in the right direction.

But they still are steps too slow and too short.

If voluntary restraint and limited economic controls could prove effective in halting the disastrous spiral of inflation, as Mr.

Truman hopes, it would be for one reason only.

It would be because Mr. Truman's program of military mobilization and preparedness is inadequate and its strain on the economy would not be severe.

Defense spending will be doubled to a rate of $30,000,000,000 a year by next June, the President said, and to a much higher rate in the year thereafter.

But next June is 9 months in the future, whereas the danger the free world faces is here and now, and there is every reason to believe that it grows by the hour.

That danger will be lessened, Secretary of State Acheson said last night, and there will be a good chance for stability in the world and peace between East and West, when the Western Powers attain military equality with Russia.

This, Mr. Acheson explained, does not mean that the huge Soviet Army must be matched man for man or division for division.

What it does require is that the numerically smaller forces of the Western Powers must be better armed, better trained, and more ingenious than Russia's.

Meanwhile, Mr. Truman has approved proposals for a substantial increase of American troops in western Europe—troops which, if they are to be provided without weakening the war effort in Korea, must be called from civilian life, and trained and equipped.

And, meanwhile, our European allies look to America for increased aid in their own rearmament.

Russia's rulers, we may be sure, are not dilly-dallying. They are forcing their subjects to utmost exertion to maintain and widen their margin of military superiority and, especially, to overcome what we fondly trust is our lead in production and stockpiling of atomic bombs.

America's one chance of winning the fateful race is to get her unexcelled industrial machine to work at top speed on production of planes and tanks and ships and guns and other weapons—not after months or years, but now.

In that is our only hope of deterring Russian aggression and bringing peace to the world. In that is our best hope of survival if we are forced to fight a third world war.

The American people will give what it takes. They cannot be safe or satisfied with less than an all-out effort by their Government.

Pound Conversion Tied to Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a dispatch from the New York Times of September 12, 1950, on the pound conversion being tied to the reserves.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POUND CONVERSION TIED TO RESERVES—BRITISH SAY $6,000,000,000 IN GOLD IS NEEDED FOR FREE EXCHANGE OF STERLING—ESTIMATE OF 1944 TRIPLED—WORLD BANK MEETING IN PARIS SEES HINT OF NEW PRESSURE BY UNITED STATES TO DROP CONTROLS

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

PARIS, September 12.—The British are letting word get around that Britain will need gold and dollar reserves of at least $6,000,000,000 before she can consider making pound sterling fully convertible.

This figure has been quietly suggested by leading British financial journalists, to members of the staff of the International Monetary Fund, and to financial bigwigs from the whole world gathered now in Paris for annual meetings of the fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Six billion dollars is nearly three and a half billion more than Britain has now, about the same amount above what she had when the Marshall plan started, and four billion above what in 1944 was regarded as a necessary minimum reserve for the sterling area. It is, in fact, such a big figure that no responsible financial expert here believes the British have any idea that they will reach it in the foreseeable future.

ANTICIPATE UNITED STATES PRESSURE

What, then, is the point of fixing the financial world's attention on that figure? The general explanation in United States circles here is that the British are anticipating renewed American pressure to drop their system of sterling area exchange and trade controls, the effect of which is to keep countries using or dependent on sterling substantially blocked off from the dollar-using world so far as commercial competition is concerned.

They are anticipating renewed pressure because of the fact that their gold dollar reserves have risen more than a billion dollars since devaluation and are still going up. Britain has indeed been banking more dollars than she has received from Marshall aid.

As their reserves pass all of the old landmarks, American experts say, the British know they will be asked increasingly why they cannot live up to their oft-repeated pledges, both contractual and unilateral, to make the pound again freely convertible currency in world trade. American experts anticipate precisely the same thing. But nobody on the United States side nor among continental experts here believes the British have any intention of making the pound convertible, no matter what pressures are brought to bear, because they now know by experience that in the last analysis the United States always gives in in such an argument.

BRITISH TRIAL BALLOON

The six billion figure is therefore in the nature of an advance patrol for the regiment of arguments the British will muster to prove why convertibility remains impossible under present circumstances. Among these are that although British dollar reserves are rising these reserves are largely mortgaged to other countries in the sterling area. Most of the increase the British avow comes from increased sales and high prices of sterling area raw materials.

The Bank of England gets dollars but Australia, Ceylon, New Zealand, and other sterling area countries get pounds which the British sooner or later have to cash. To cash them in the form of exports from Britain will get harder as the British military effort expands. Therefore Britain must hold reserves against possible claims for dollars and, by the same token, cannot permit this sterling to be freely converted into dollars until reserves reach an almost fabulous level.

Preponderant expert opinion here is that the British will never take the risk of establishing convertibility until the position of the pound as world trading currency is seriously threatened by its being inconvertible into dollars. Because of the large proportion of world trade conducted in pounds, of clever management by the Bank of England and United States aid—particularly through United States contribution to European Payments Union—no such threat has yet appeared.

American Medicine Must Remain Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine speech made by Dr. W. C. Caudill, president of the Virginia Medical Society, at the annual meeting of this organization in Roanoke, Va., on October 9.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends, with this session, we complete a seasonal cycle. In the year that has passed since our last meeting, world events have moved with stunning rapidity. We are just beginning to realize the severity of the sacrifices which the free peoples of the world will be called upon to make during the period ahead.

At this moment, of course, it is difficult to appraise the precise role which will be played by the organized medical profession. Of one thing we are certain, however: If the medical profession of the United States is to render effective service in peace or in war it must remain free. This is no time to bind the hands of the American doctor with the manacles of socialization.

Whatever the extent or the duration of the present crisis, we cannot afford to jeopardize the continued progress of American medical science. It is now high noon in the twentieth century. During the 50 years just passed the medical profession has made astounding advances in all phases of the healing arts. In the field of preventive medicine there has been an enormous dimunition in the diseases and deaths of early life, the acute infectious diseases, and maternal and infant mortality. The American community no longer fears an epidemic of typhoid or diphtheria, or smallpox.

In the field of medical research we have witnessed huge strides in the development of specifics. In the fight against bacteria the medical arsenal is being stocked with new and powerful antibiotics. One by one, the scourges of the human body are submitting to the unrelenting efforts of the medical scientist.

In the field of surgery, we have perfected techniques of almost incredible complexity. The clinical experience afforded by two world wars enabled the medical profession to perform near miracles in the healing of wounds and the restoration of diseased and damaged tissue.

The general practice of medicine is on a higher level than ever before. The family doctor has at his disposal diagnostic and therapeutic aids which increase his effectiveness manyfold. He has available modern and well-equipped hospital facilities, staffed by trained technicians. Opportunities for medical education were never greater, as our accredited schools turn out increasing numbers of graduates each year. In addition, there are expanding opportunities for doctors to undertake graduate work.

All these things are part of the case history of the past half century. I venture to suggest that in no other branch of human endeavor has there been comparable progress. And I venture to suggest, also, that the reason for that progress may be found in the fact that during these past 50 years there has been a strong spirit of freedom and individual initiative in the medical profession.

Progress in medicine, as in other fields, is best nurtured in a free soil.

What shall we say of the next 50 years? While we do not pretend to assay the future, we do know that we are far from the ultimate. We have only begun to be astounded by medical science.

That future, of course, is conditional. It is ours only if we continue to deserve it. It is ours only if we adhere to the principles of freedom which have guided our steps in the past. We shall lose that future if we permit the heady wine of socialism to dull our sensibilities and destroy our initiative.

I intend this as a solemn warning. The insidious processes of socialism are already threatening not only the medical profession, but all of our free institutions. This year 1950 finds our United States standing virtually alone as the last bastion of constitutional freedom in a world bent on embracing various forms of collectivist society. But our own anchors are no longer firm. We, too, are drifting, faster than most of us realize, toward the yawning vortex of the welfare state.

The great labor leader, Samuel Gompers, warned in an address given more than 30 years ago: "I bid you have a care in all these attempts to regulate the personal relations and the normal activities of the citizenship of our country before it be too late. For a mess of pottage, under the pretense of compulsory social insurance, let us not voluntarily surrender the fundamental principles of liberty and freedom."

We must understand that the body politic, like the human body, can be ruined by overmedication. In a class conducted by Sir William Osler, the students were asked how much of a certain drug should be given to a patient. One student promptly answered, "four grains," and none of the other dissented. Sir William continued discussing the case symptoms, and a few minutes later he was interrupted by the same student, who asked permission to change his answer. Sir William gravely consulted his watch and said, "I'm sorry, young man, but your patient has already been dead for 3 minutes."

We see much the same thing happening today in our Nation's economic life. Fuzzy-minded politicians and addle-brained theorists have the idea that because one grain of socialization has proved helpful, four grains will bring us utopia. Because it is necessary for the Government to undertake a few essential services, they feel that the Government should perform more and more services and ultimately attend to all our human wants and needs.

The advocates of government by overdosage are busy with their propaganda. They have introduced numerous schemes to set up a system of compulsory health insurance. They insist that America follow the lead of nations whose health standards are far below our own. We hear the assertion made that medical care is too expensive for the average American family. The prescription for this situation is to establish a vast bureaucratic monster to administer a compulsory health program at a cost estimated variously between ten and twenty billion dollars a year.

The whole thing is a patent nonsense. Why does America need socialized medicine when she leads the world in medical research and scientific development? Why does America need socialized medicine when we have more doctors, dentists, nurses, and hospitals per capita than any other country? Why does America need socialized medicine when American citizens enjoy a long and continually lengthening life span? Why does America need socialized medicine when there are enrolled today in voluntary medical insurance programs more than 70,000,000 people, in addition to the tens of thousands who participate in industrial, fraternal, and labor health programs and private group clinics?

Why indeed? The whole idea is a dismal distortion of logic. It is blandly declared that 325,000 persons die needlessly each year, and the implication is that if their medical care were only turned over to the Government, the figure would be mysteriously reduced to zero. But when we examine the figures, we find that some 40,000 of these deaths are deaths by accident—and no health insurance program I know of has ever been effective against accidental death. Another 100,000 of these deaths are caused by cancer and heart disease—diseases which are the inevitable accompaniment of old age. Communicable diseases account for 120,000 of the deaths. We know that these can be prevented, because we are preventing them in large measure. Through the efforts of the medical profession over the past 50 years illnesses and fatalities from these diseases have been reduced at an astounding rate.

The arguments advanced by the proponents of socialized medicine are so feeble that no informed person can be convinced by them. But there is one argument that the socializers have not yet mentioned. If they wanted to be fair about it, they would call as their No. 1 witness a man named Nikolai Lenin, the father of the police state. "Socialized medicine," said Comrade Lenin, "is the keystone of the arch of the socialistic state."

Here is the crux to the whole issue. Socialized medicine is the entering wedge. It is the decoy. It would be the means of creating a gigantic new army of bureaucrats, replete with regional administrators, inspectors, coordinators, and collectors. It would elevate political hacks to serve as local czars in every city, town, and village in the country. The healing art would degenerate into a political pill mill, with every doctor, dentist, nurse, and technician reduced to the status of a lackey on the public payroll.

The inevitable accompaniment of socialized medicine would be dictatorial control over the life of the individual. Members of the medical and dental professions, of course, would be the first to feel the long arm of Government control. They would be placed in the same position as the doctors and dentists in Great Britain, whose Labor Government has instituted an all-inclusive compulsory health-insurance program. Impartial observers agree that British doctors are so desperately overworked and so burdened with bureaucratic red tape that they are losing all incentive for adequate practice. "Quetopia" is the term that has been applied to the British medical phenomenon. The "something for nothing" philosophy has grasped the British people to such an extent that doctors are forced to waste valuable time dealing with patients whose ills are either imaginary or negligible, while truly deserving patients await their turn.

Yet there are those who would have us destroy the soul of American medicine by following the British example. There are those who would have us adopt an expensive, cumbersome, inefficient, and dictatorial scheme which would jeopardize the high medical standards of the present and the progress which we may expect in the future. There are those who would play fast and loose with the fiscal structure of the United States by instituting a tax levy of from 3 to 10 percent on every pay check up to $4,800 a year, at a time when our national economy demands rigid control over expenditures in order to fulfill our military and diplomatic obligations. There are those who would destroy the sacred personal relationship between doctor and patient and inject the Government as an unwelcome, prying third party.

You and I know who are the chief advocates of political medicine. They are the bureaucrats like Oscar Ewing, of the Federal Security Agency, who see in socialized medicine a means of expanding their power and insuring lush political plums for themselves and their political satellites. They are the powerful and arrogant labor leaders who view socialized medicine as an additional means of control over the vast army of American workers. They are the Communists and their dupes who view socialized medicine as the keystone of the arch of the socialistic state.

We may be thankful that the vast majority of the American people have not fallen prey to the fuzzy thinking of these elements. The front of opposition to socialized medicine is being rapidly expanded to include such influential organizations as the American Legion, the National Grange, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Bar Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Council of Christian Churches, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and numberless other groups and individuals who have the courage to stand up for fundamental Americanism and refuse to be lured by the siren song of socialization.

The stand taken by these organizations gives the lie to any assertion that the American Medical Association constitutes the sole opposition to socialized medicine. The American Medical Association is only one of many organizations which have banded together in this crusade to maintain freedom in American medical practice.

But let it not be assumed that the medical profession is content with a negative approach to the economic aspects of medical practice. The American Medical Association is a pioneer in the development of voluntary prepayment plans. The approach of the AMA to the Nation's medical problems is on the broadest possible scale, embracing mental and physical health, disease prevention, medical treatment as needed, prolongation of life, and research for the advancement of medical science. It includes also a program of nutrition, recreation, prenatal care, child welfare, construction of hospitals and diagnostic centers, and he lth education. Prepaid medical service plans already in operation under the sponsorship of organized medical societies have a membership of 70,000,000, and it is estimated that the number will be increased to 90,000,000, within the next 3 years.

This is ample evidence that America's problems of medical economics are well on the way toward being solved—solved not through any intervention of the politicians, but solved through the efforts and endeavors of the medical profession itself, with the cooperation of various lay organizations, acting under the time-tested principles of American free enterprise.

Ministers to the sick have a reputation which neither time nor calumny can tarnish. Even the caustic skeptic, Voltaire, could find it in his heart to write, "Nothing is more estimable than a physician who, having studied nature from his youth, knows the properties of the human body, the diseases which assail it, the remedic which will benefit, exercises his art with caution, and pays equal attention to the rich and the poor." In like manner, Robert Louis Stevenson wrote that the physician has an opportunity as no other class of men to be the flower of our civilization.

This is an opportunity we do not hold lightly. So long as the doctor remains free, so long as the society he serves enjoys a maximum of liberty, we have the promise that American standards of health will continue to be the highest in the history of the world.

War Goal of Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following very interesting and informative article written by James G. Colbert, of an interview he had with Col. Peter C. Borre, who is in a position to obtain valuable information of Communist intentions and activites here and abroad:

ASSERTS WAR GOAL OF REDS—HUB ATTORNEY REPORTS EUROPE SEES GLOBAL CONFLICT IN 1952—SAYS UNITED STATES GAINS PRESTIGE

(By James G. Colbert)

World war III will be touched off by the spring of 1952.

That is the considered opinion of a former noted Boston attorney and Army airman now practicing international law in Rome, who has been in a position to have his finger on the European pulse.

Attorney Peter C. Borre, home on legal business, declared in an exclusive interview last night that there is unmistakable evidence in Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Switzerland that Soviet Russia is getting ready for all-out war.

While stressing that anyone outside the iron curtain can only hazard a guess as to when the Soviets will plunge the world into war, Borre, veteran of two wars for the United States, in answer to questions, expressed the belief that the fateful move will come within a year and a half.

UNITED STATES GAINS PRESTIGE

He declared that American prestige in Europe has risen markedly as a result of the stand against Russian aggression in Korea, and said that the despair formerly existing on the other side of the Atlantic has been replaced by real hope for the future.

"I was in Frankfurt on June 26, the day of the outbreak of the Korean war, and the effect of the news on the German people was dramatic and electrifying," Borre related. "Not only was it applauded, but the Germans and others who fear the yoke of Moscow were convinced it would bring closer their day of deliverance."

DEPRESSED BY MARCH

He quoted one German diplomat, who had not been in the Nazi fold, as saying: "For the first time we can see the sun on the horizon."

Germany at that time, Borre pointed out, had been badly depressed by the Berlin march, up to then the latest move in the war of nerves, and the consensus of opinion among the German people was that the United States had dismissed the event too lightly.

Until President Truman decided to fight in South Korea, many solid German citizens, not in the leftist movement, had just about despaired of any real stand by the United States and the United Nations against incidents created by Stalin and were beginning to feel it might be the part of wisdom and discretion to deal with Russia rather than risk liquidation, Borre reported.

TENSE IN ITALY

The feeling in Italy, though not as acute as that in Germany, is still very tense because of the power of the Communist Party which still has much to say in Italian governmental affairs," Attorney Borre revealed.

"The fear held by Italians stems more from factors within the borders of their own country than from behind the iron curtain," Borre explained. "It is partly due to the fact that the peace treaty allows Italy only 200,000 soldiers, a hopelessly inadequate number to safeguard against internal incidents and at the same time offer any real border defense."

He said that the Italian troops could not even handle all the Communists in Italy, to say nothing of any attack from without. Strong and widespread opinion exists in Italy today that the nation should be given authority to expand her armed forces in order to be in a better position to combat any Communist aggression, the attorney revealed.

STAND BROUGHT RELIEF

Borre said that it probably is difficult for the people in this country to appreciate the tremendous impact our stand in Korea made upon the impressionable and jittery peoples of Europe.

"The Korean stand taken by President Truman was received with a feeling of extreme relief and is placed alongside his momentous declaration on March 12, 1947, when the so-called Truman doctrine was proclaimed," he asserted.

"Of course, the prestige of the United States suffered somewhat from the early defeats in Korea, but there also was a genuine expression of sympathy for the United States, and there was no question where the vast majority of Italians stood. They were definitely on the side of the United States.

"PAPERS ALLAYED FEARS

"The newspapers of the middle and right did much to allay the fears of ultimate defeat by pointing out repeatedly that America had been taken by surprise and was unprepared but that the same military might which annihilated the Nazi war machine would prove itself in the end.

"Recent events, particularly the establishment of the beachhead at Inchon and the capture of Seoul, not only have dramatized the potent power of the American juggernaut, but have convinced a nervous, uneasy western Europe that at long last the Russian bluff has been called.

"All this has resulted in an upswing in United States prestige and a drop in Soviet esteem," he added.

Some of the keenest minds in Europe believe, however, Borre disclosed, that, following the oriental philosophy, the Russians will provoke further incidents in an effort to avoid loss of face with her European and far-eastern satellites.

REDS LOSING IN ITALY

As an example of the change that has resulted in the thinking of the Italian people, Attorney Borre said he has had friends stop him on the streets of Rome and enthusiastically congratulate the American Government on its wonderful feat.

Communist influence in Italy has waned since the last election held April 18, 1948, Borre reported. He said that has been reflected both in a drop in the actual number of Communists and a lessening of the bravado with which they operate.

"No longer do they dare to try to intimidate the masses," he asserted. "The force of Communist power is felt today, however, in the labor movement dominated by Luigi DiVittorio, president of the Italian Confederation of Labor, who continually agitates and confuses the industrial picture by slowdown methods and work stoppages."

Borre interrupted his chain of thought with the observation that the Italian labor picture is not an easy one for Americans to understand.

FLOOD OF WAR ORDERS

"The Christian Democrats, who only 3 years ago broke away from the confederation due to leftist domination, are making headway by constantly recruiting new members and increasing their numbers. DiVittorio's organization, however, dominates the northern industrial cities of Milan and Turin and by no means can be written off as just a nuisance factor."

He said that the Korean situation has brought a flood of orders for Italian industry for heavy machinery, automobiles, textiles, and war equipment but that Italy also is faced with a shortage of necessary raw materials and a steadily mounting market price which might cause temporary disruption.

"Generally speaking, I find the average Italian workman, despite unceasing Communist agitation, to be the most willing worker in all of Europe," Attorney Borre remarked. "He works long hours, and he does much work of a heavy, laborious nature which is performed by machines in this country.

"HOLY YEAR PILGRIMS HELPED

"He is content with his lot if he manages to earn enough to provide food, clothing, and shelter for his family. The radio and the usual household appliances which are taken for granted in the home of the average American workingman are luxuries the Italian worker cannot afford, while the automobile is a superluxury owned only by persons in the higher income brackets."

Attorney Borre, who himself attracted international attention when he represented Dr. Peter Lindstrom in his divorce suit against Ingrid Bergman, believes that the American pilgrims who flocked into Rome on holy year visits have themselves been goodwill ambassadors who in their own way served to combat Soviet propaganda.

Borre's practice of international law has taken him into the capitals of Europe and has placed him in a position to observe closely the developments, effects, and undercurrent of the cold war, and his opinion that war is likely by the spring of 1952 undoubtedly will be given a great deal of weight in Washington.

GREATEST COMEBACK

Of all the countries in Europe, he said, Italy has made since the end of the war the greatest comeback from the standpoint of reconstruction of war damage. He said that roads and bridges have been rebuilt and that in the port of Naples, for example, the scars of war have been erased, the vast debris of sunken ships and ruined piers removed, and water-front hotels rebuilt.

American tourists who visited Rome this summer will be interested to know that Borre had some criticisms of Italian hotel operators whom he characterized as greedy, in the exorbitant prices they charge. Pointing out that Italy needs the dollars spent by American tourists, he asserted that there is real danger that the hotel keepers will kill the goose that lays the golden eggs unless there is a crackdown on them by the Italian Government.

Barbed-Wire Fence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of October 7, 1950, entitled "Barbed-Wire Fence."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARBED-WIRE FENCE

The barb-studded wires of the fence erected around the United States by the McCarran Act are now threatening to prick friend and foe, the dangerous and the innocuous, without discrimination. During the course of the debate on the measure, its proponents tended, ironically enough, to minimize its impact, while its opponents asserted that it would affect great numbers of aliens friendly, or at least not unfriendly, to the United States. Now that it has to be enforced, the State Department finds itself in desperate straits between the two interpretations. The language of the act affords little help. Indeed, it is language that challenges the intrepidity of lawyers and defies the understanding of laymen. Section 5 (c), for example, declares with characteristic lucidity that:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of the tenth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875; 8 U. S. C. 136), or any other law—(1) the provisions of section 1 (1) and 1 (3) shall be applicable to any alien within the purview of section 3 (1) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 153; 8 U. S. C. 201)," except Ambassadors, public Ministers, etc., ad nauseam.

Well, as accurately as we can figure it out, the act will bar virtually all of the nationals and some of the official representatives of a number of totalitarian countries with which the United States is now collaborating in resistance to the spread of communism. It seems clear, as we pointed out when the McCarran bill was originally introduced and as the President asserted in his veto message, that the definition of "totalitarianism" laid down in the measure includes such countries as Spain, Portugal, Argentina, and Saudi Arabia. Any students or businessmen or tourists from those countries, if they adhere to the regime in power in their homeland, must be excluded. So far as they are concerned, then, we shall be as much an iron-curtain country as the Soviet Union.

In addition, we think there will be serious diplomatic difficulties under the act. Its restrictions do not apply to "career diplomatic and consular officers who have been accredited by a foreign government recognized de jure by the United States and who are accepted by the President or the Secretary of State, and the members of the immediate families of such aliens." But many countries may wish to follow a practice commonly pursued by the United States and send over noncareer representatives for special purposes. None of these would be admissible under the terms of the act. If they are excluded, no doubt their homelands will counter by excluding comparable personnel from this country.

So far as the numerous United Nations organizations are concerned, the act permits admission only of "a designated principal resident representative" of a totalitarian government, "accredited resident members of the staff of such representative, and members of his immediate family." A totalitarian government might reasonably wish to send to the United Nations General Assembly a nonresident representative—Mr. Vishinsky, for example—and the United Nations could scarcely function here if such representatives were excluded by the United States. Moreover, to exclude, as the act appears to do, the families of all members of the staff of a totalitarian representative to the UN would be to impose on them a senseless and altogether unjustifiable hardship.

How the State Department will adjust its regulations under the law to the demands of its sponsors on the one hand and the demands of common sense and international comity on the other remains to be seen. The McCarran Act poses, we think, an impossible problem. Time was when Americans had enough pride in their country and enough faith in the durability of their own institutions to believe that a visit here would make friends and influence people in our behalf. Now we present ourselves to the world as frightened and ashamed. Like Russia, we have transformed ourselves into a hermit state.

Minnesota State Laws Concerning Veterans and Their Dependents—Reported by Harold C. Hagen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Minnesota has many laws granting rights, benefits, and privileges to veterans, their dependents, and their organizations.

Many veterans and their dependents are not fully aware of the rights and benefits to which they are entitled. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include a major portion of the following digest of such important Minnesota laws as compiled by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the United States House of Representatives, revised to January 1, 1950:

Type of law	Résumé	Citation
Bonus	Bonus to veterans of Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition. (Time limitation for benefits expired June 30, 1935.)	Laws 1931, ch. 405, as amended; Laws 1935, chs. 193, 204.
	World War I: Amount: $15 for each month of active service, minimum $50	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 197.31-197.38.
	World War II: Amount: $10 per month for domestic service, maximum $270; $15 per month for foreign service, maximum $400.	Const., art. 20; Laws 1949, ch. 642.
Burial allowances and allied benefits.	Burial: State allowance for burial of indigent veterans. Burial may not be in potter's field. Relatives or comrades of the deceased may be allowed to conduct the funeral. Allowance for a flag for each grave.	Stat. Ann (1945), § 197.20.
	Burial grounds: Power of counties to establish a "soldiers' rest." No charge shall be made for space therein.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 375.36-375.38.
	—— Provision for a burial lot near a State hospital for the insane for burial of certain indigent veterans dying in such hospital or in that vicinity, and of wives or widows of such veterans. Appropriations may be made to the nearest post of the Grand Army of the Republic for care of such burial lot.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 197.50-197.52.
	Grave care and registration: Cities, villages, and towns are required to decorate veterans' graves not otherwise decorated on Memorial Day.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 465.51.
	—— Counties may appropriate funds for the improvement and maintenance of abandoned cemeteries containing the remains of war veterans.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 306.243.
	—— Reports to the commissioner of veterans' affairs of the burial of a veteran shall include the name of the veteran and the location of his grave in the cemetery by lot number.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 306.03.
	Headstones and markers: The commissioner of veterans' affairs shall apply to the Federal Government for a headstone. State allowance for having stone set up, for having a stone furnished other than by the State or Federal Government engraved with the designation of the organization to which the person belonged. A separate State allowance for a headstone is available if the application to the Federal Government is unsuccessful.	Stat. Ann. (1945; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§ 197.21-197.22.
	—— The commissioner of veterans' affairs shall, upon petition, furnish markers for veterans' graves to mark such graves for memorial purposes.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 197.23-197.24.
Civil relief and war emergency provisions.	Acknowledgments of written instruments executed by members of the Armed Forces of the United States, validity.	Stat. Ann. (1945 Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§ 358.27-358.271.
	Affidavit concerning military service status of owner of mortgaged premises upon foreclosure of real-estate mortgage.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 580.15.
	Contracts relating to the purchase of tax-forfeited lands with members of the Armed Forces may not be canceled for nonpayment during military service.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 282.11.
	Evidence of death or other status of persons missing in action	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§ 600.24-600.26.
	Extension of time for commencing certain actions for damages whenever the claimant or his attorney is in the military service of the United States.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 465.091.
	Hunting and fishing privileges to those in military service	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 98.47, Subd. 2.
	Motor-vehicle drivers' licenses continued in effect without renewal until 60 days after discharge from military service. (Repealed, Laws 1947, ch. 479, sec. 3.)	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 171.27.
	Operation of motor vehicle by soldiers and sailors in time of war	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 168.034.
	Powers of attorney granted by persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, effect of death.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§ 507.391-507.394.
	Preservation of rights under a confession of judgment during military service and for 6 months thereafter. Affidavit and payment of real property taxes or exemption from such taxes are required.	Laws 1945, ch. 120.
	Suspension of fiduciary powers during war service	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 501.45.
Civil rights	Absentee registration and voting	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 201.191; Laws 1949, ch. 383 (Coded as §§ 203.15-203.28).
	Exemption of servicemen from payment of fee required of absent voters	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 203.05.
Claims; assistance in obtaining benefits; safekeeping of papers.	Public record certification: Free copies of vital statistics records or certified copies of discharges recorded pursuant to statute, for use in presentation of claims to the U. S. Veterans' Administration or in connection with any veterans' organization or the State department of veterans' affairs.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 197.63.

Type of law	Résumé	Citation
Claims; assistance in obtaining benefits; safekeeping of papers—Con.	Recording of discharges: Certificates of discharge may be recorded in the office of the register of deeds without the payment of any fee.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 386.20–386.22.
	Service officers, etc.: Duties of the commissioner of veterans' affairs in assisting veterans having claims against the United States for pension, bounty, or back pay arising out of or by reason of any war or any Federal military or naval service.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 196.05.
	—— The adjutant general shall act as agent for veterans having claims against the United States for pensions, bounty, or back pay, arising out of or by reason of war or Federal service, and prosecute such claims without charge.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 190.09.
	—— The veterans' service officer shall aid all veterans in securing benefits provided by law on account of military service.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 197.603.
	—— Veterans' referral center shall aid veterans in securing benefits provided by law on account of military service.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 197. 64.
Educational benefits; qualification for the professions and trades.	Certain law-school graduates may be admitted to the bar without examination	Laws 1947, ch. 285.
	Contracts between the State teachers college and the Federal Government for instruction, etc., of veterans.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 136.035, 136.18–136.19.
	Exemption of watchmakers from examination upon application for certificate within 1 year after discharge from military service.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 326.544.
	Limitation on expenditures for tuition of soldiers. Benefits not available to veterans entitled to similar benefits under Federal law.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 197.75.
	Reimbursement of tuition to certain students at the University of Minnesota	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 137.10.
	Renewal of professional licenses and certificates of registration within 6 months after discharge from military service.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 326.55.
	Service credit to veterans of World War I or World War II who are applicants for certificates of registration under the law governing architects, engineers, and surveyors.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 326.10.
Educational opportunities for children of veterans.	Aid to children of deceased veterans of World War II. Amount: $250 maximum per year for each child.	Stat. Ann. (1945; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§ 197.71, 197.75.
	Aid to children of veterans of World War I who died in the service or as a result of such service. Amount: $250 maximum per year for each child. Free tuition in State institutions of secondary or college grade.	Stat. Ann. (1945; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§ 197.09–197.12.
Employment preferences, privileges, etc.	Benefits under the Unemployment Compensation Act	Stat. Ann. (1945; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 268.06.
	Eligibility of certain World War II veterans for employment as State highway patrolmen	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 43.171.
	Inclusion of war service in period of service qualifying for pension from the firemen's relief association in cities of the first class.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 69.47.
	Inclusion of war service in period of service qualifying for pension under the Police Retirement Act in cities of the first class.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 423.012, 423.153.
	Interim legislative commission to study veterans' preference in public employment and civil-service laws of the State.	Laws 1949, ch. 741.
	Leaves of absence for State and municipal officers and employees in the Armed Forces of the United States; reemployment without loss of seniority rights, insurance benefits, etc., upon termination of military service.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 192.26–192.264.
	Preferences in the appointment of a commissioner of veterans' affairs	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 196.02, as amended; Laws 1949, ch. 738, § 20.
	Preference in the appointment of employees in the department of veterans' affairs	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 196.14, 197.76.
	Preference in selecting county service officers	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 197.601.
	Preference in selecting trustees, officers, and employees of the soldiers' home	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 198.06.
	Preference under the State civil service	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 43.30, as amended; Laws 1949, ch. 222.
	Preference to war veterans, their wives or widows, in public departments and on public works in State and local units.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§197.45–197.48, as amended; Laws 1949, ch. 687.
	Retention of position on eligible register of police department during military service	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 419.06.
	Seniority rights of veterans under the State civil service	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 43.23, as amended; Laws 1949, ch. 611.
	The commissioner of veterans' affairs may establish and provide an employment, placement, and advisement service for disabled veterans.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 197.06.
	War-service credit under the employees' retirement law in cities of the first class	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 422.10.
	War-service credit under the law relating to the retirement of probate judges	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §490.12.
	War-service credit under the State Employees' Retirement Act	Stat. Ann. (1945; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§352.01, 352.04, 352.09, 352.11, as amended; Laws 1949, ch. 644.
Exemption from execution, garnishment, etc.	Veteran's pension, bonus, adjusted compensation, allotment or other benefit received from the State or Federal Government exempt from legal process for a period of 1 year after receipt thereof.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 550.38.
	World War II bonus payments exempt from garnishment, attachment, or levy of execution	Laws 1949, ch. 642, § 22.
General extension of benefits	Disabled veterans of all wars and their dependents entitled to same privileges formerly extended to disabled veterans of specific wars.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 196.17.
Guardianship; administration of estates.	Admission to probate of nuncupative will of a soldier dying in active service	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 525.182.
	Provision for notice of a hearing on an account of a guardian to be given the regional office of the Veterans' Administration.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 525.581.
	The commission on veterans' affairs shall act as guardian for minors and incompetent persons receiving moneys from the U. S. Government when no other suitable person will consent to act.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 197.06 (5).
Homes (institutional)	Admission of veterans of any war, their wives, widows, or mothers to the Minnesota Soldiers Home.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 198.01–198.23.
	Use of certain funds for the maintenance of a hobby shop for the inmates of the Soldiers Home.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 198.24.
Hospital benefits	Collection of funds from Federal Government to care for and maintain certain veterans in State hospitals.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 197.01–197.02.
	Commissioner of veterans' affairs directed to investigate treatment accorded veterans confined in public institutions.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 196.05 (15).
	Commitment of incompetent veterans to State or Federal institutions	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 525.753.
	County and city aid in operating rest camps for disabled or needy veterans and their families.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 197.18–197.19.
	Emergency hospitalization from the State soldiers' welfare fund	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 197.03–197.06.
	Provision for a State recreation and recuperation camp for disabled veterans to be known as the Big Island Veterans Camp.	Stat. Ann. (1945; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§ 197.13–197.17.
Housing	Preference to veterans of World War II and the families of such veterans (including the families of those who died in the service), under the Municipal Housing and Redevelopment Act.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An Pocket Part, 1948), § 462.421 (22), as amended; Laws 1949, ch. 505, §§ 462–485.
Land settlement benefits	Cities of the third class may convey to veterans unused lands not needed by the city	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 465.59.
	Purchase of tax-forfeited lands by veterans of World War I or World War II	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§ 282.031–282.037, as amended; Laws 1949, ch. 456.
Loans, contracts of minors, etc.	Removal of minority disability of veterans eligible for benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 48.245.
Medals, certificates, etc.	Awards to officers and enlisted men of the National Guard for service during periods of war and for which no medals or bars are authorized by the Federal Government.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 192.23.
	Provision for the issuance of a "certificate of military service" to Civil War veterans	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 197.39–197.41.
Patriotic holidays	Cities are authorized to expend money for observance of Memorial Day	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 465.50.
	Counties are authorized to expend money for Memorial Day observance	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 375.34–375.35.
Pensions	Any woman unheard of for 20 years who deserted her husband prior to his enlistment in the World War, if he died in the war, is presumed to have predeceased him and his next of kin at time of his death shall receive his war-risk insurance.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 197.49.
	Pensions for Indian war veterans	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 197.42–197.44.

Type of law	Résumé	Citation
Records, relics, etc.	Adjutant general authorized to keep an alphabetical list of Minnesota volunteers in the Civil War, and to compile and maintain individual records of such veterans as well as those who have served in other wars including the First World War and subsequent wars.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 190.13.
	Compilation of individual records of World War II veterans may be authorized by the boards of county commissioners.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 375.383.
	Names of deceased veterans may be inscribed on columns in certain public buildings in a county and city of the first class.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 374.23.
	Preservation of flags and colors carried by Minnesota troops in time of war	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 190.09.
Relief and rehabilitation	Authorizes the soldiers' home board to extend relief outside the home to soldiers' widows, deserted wives, children or parents.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 198.11-198.22.
	State recreation and recuperation camp for disabled veterans to be known as the Big Island Veterans Camp.	Stat. Ann. (1945; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§ 197.13-197.17.
	Use of soldiers' welfare fund to aid veterans and their dependents in securing compensation, hospitalization, or other such benefits and to maintain such persons in an emergency.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 197.03-197.07.
	Veterans' referral center may be established in any city of the second class	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 197.64.
	Village aid to ex-servicemen	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 447.04.
	War veterans' fund created to provide veterans of World War II with the necessities of life and such other needs, including but not limited to tools and equipment for use in trade or business, as may assist in their rehabilitation. Expenditures shall be made by the commissioner of veterans' affairs. Amount: $250 maximum. Benefits shall not continue longer than 5 years after discharge from service.	Stat. Ann. (1945; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§ 197.71-197.77, as amended; Laws 1949, ch. 617.
Tax and license fee exemptions	Gift tax: Gifts to or for the use of veterans' organizations exempt from gift tax	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 292.04.
	Income tax: Abatement of State income tax imposed for the taxable year in which an individual died in active military service during World War II.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 290.65, Subd. 15.
	—— Exemption of first $2,000 received as military compensation from State income tax. Applicable to taxable year 1942 and subsequent taxable years, but not beyond 2 years after cessation of hostilities.	Stat. Ann. (1945; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 290.65.
	—— Exemption of mustering-out payments	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 290.08 (15).
	—— World War II bonus payments exempt from taxation	Laws 1949, ch. 642, § 21.
	Motor vehicle license: Motor vehicle exemption from registration tax during active military service of owner. It may be operated by him while on furlough or leave of absence.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 168.031.
	Peddler's license: Veterans are exempt from the payment of fee	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 197.59.
	Professional and occupational licenses: Exemption from payment of renewal fees during active military service and for 6 months after discharge.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 326.55.
	Property tax: Homestead exemption to members of the Armed Forces of the United States	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 273.13, Subd. 10.
	—— Preservation of status of householder in relation to exemption of personal property during active military service in World War II and for 6 months after discharge.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 272.02.
	—— Protection to persons in the military service owning lands on which time of redemption from delinquent taxes has expired.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 281.273-281.277.
	—— Stay of proceedings for the enforcement of delinquent taxes on real estate during military service. (Effective until May 15, 1945, or for 6 months after the "war is terminated by a treaty of peace proclaimed by the President of the United States.")	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 279.01 (note: Laws 1943, ch. 641).
Transportation, motor vehicle, etc., privileges	Common carrier may provide free transportation to inmates of soldiers' homes	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 218.31.
Veterans' organizations	Corporate rights: Formation of corporations	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 312.01-312.04.
	Insignia: Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations declared a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment for not more than 60 days or a fine not to exceed $50, or both.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 614.35.
	Meeting places, etc: A county or city of the first class may provide a meeting place for veterans' organizations in the city hall or courthouse.	Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), § 374.21.
	—— Quarters in State capitol or other State office building for the Grand Army of the Republic, American Legion, and certain other veterans' organizations.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 197.53-197.58.
	Patriotic holiday observance: County appropriation for observance of Memorial Day through veterans' organizations.	Stat. Ann. (1945), §§ 375.34-375.35.
	Records, relics, etc.: Veterans' headquarters in State capitol to be used for the deposit of records, relics, etc., for safekeeping.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 197.58.
	Relief to veterans, etc.: Appropriations: Minnesota Department, GAR, $900 (1948), $125 (1949); United Spanish War Veterans, $1,000 (1948 and 1949); Disabled American Veterans, $7,500 (1948 and 1949); Veterans of Foreign Wars, $7,500 (1948 and 1949).	Laws 1947, ch. 539, §§ 3-6.
	Tax exemptions: Gifts to or for the use of veterans' organizations are exempt from gift tax	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 292.04.
	Uniforms, etc.: Adjutant general may issue to any camp of the military organization known as the Sons of Veterans, United States of America, and other organizations composed of veterans of any war, arms and accouterments owned by the State and not in use, bond for the safe return of such property to be given by some member of the organization.	Stat. Ann. (1945), § 190.12.
Veterans' service agency	Department of veterans' affairs under supervision and control of the commissioner of veterans' affairs.	Stat. Ann. (1945; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§ 196.01-196.17, as amended; Laws 1949, ch. 739, § 20.
	County service officers	Stat. Ann. (1945; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1948), §§ 197.60-197.607, as amended; Laws 1949, ch. 583.

Bonus Payments for Veterans of World War II

MINNESOTA

Citation: Constitution, article 20 (Laws 1947, ch. 642); Laws 1949, chapter 642.

Authorization: Constitutional amendment, ratified by referendum November 2, 1948. Legislative enactment fixes terms of the bonus.

Application: Must be received by the Commissioner on or before December 31, 1950.

Amount: $10 per month for domestic service, maximum $270; $15 per month for foreign service, maximum $400; beneficiaries entitled to $400 if the veteran died from service-connected causes.

Qualifications: Service in the armed forces between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945. Residence within the State at the time of entering the service and for at least 6 months prior thereto.

Financing: $84,000,000 indebtedness authorized, to pay which the following taxes are imposed: A surtax of 5 percent upon the income of State and National banks, corporations other than banks, upon individuals, estates, and trusts, and an additional tax of $5 is required of all taxpayers. A surtax of 10 percent is imposed on intoxicating liquors and upon fermented malt beverages and an additional tax of 1 percent upon all ore mined and all royalty received. For the purpose of supplying any deficiency in the veterans' compensation fund which is created by the act, provision is made for the levy of an additional tax upon all taxable property when it becomes necessary.

State Laws Relating to Marriages, Divorces, Births, and Deaths

MINNESOTA

Marriages

The clerk of the district court of county in which the woman resides issues license.

The law requires that a record of license be kept.

Divorce

District court of the county where plaintiff resides maintains divorce records (Minnesota Statutes Annotated, sec. 518.09).

State custodian

State registrar of vital statistics, St. Paul, Minn.

Marriages and divorces: No State records kept; address clerk of the district court where marriage or divorce occurred for marriage or divorce records.

Births and deaths: Records begin 1900, apparently complete; indexed for each year since 1908; original records are filed with the division of vital statistics, State board of health. When certified copies of records are needed it is advisable to write the clerk of the court of the county concerned if the birth or death occurred prior to 1908.

Fees

Certified copies of records of births and deaths which occurred after 1908, needed in the presentation of claims to the United States Veterans' Administration, will be furnished without payment of fee (Minnesota Statutes Annotated, sec. 114.69).

Certified copies of marriage or divorce records shall be issued without charge to any veteran as therein defined, the surviving spouse, or next of kin, for use in the presentation of claims to the United States Veterans' Administration (Minnesota Statutes Annotated, sec. 197.63).

Majority

Males and females attain majority at age of 21 years.

Section 185 of the Minnesota Probate Code, effective July 1935 (ch. 72, Laws of Minnesota for 1935), provides: "The word 'minor' means a person under the age of 21 years." Minnesota Statutes Annotated, section 525.60 provides, in part, as follows: "A guardianship of a minor shall terminate upon his death or upon his attainment of legal age. The marriage of a female ward under guardianship as a minor only and not under a juvenile court guardianship shall terminate the guardianship of her person but not of her estate, provided that such guardianship shall not affect her capacity to join with her husband in instruments involving his interest in real estate."

Common-law marriage

Common-law marriages have not been recognized since April 26, 1941 (Minnesota Statutes Annotated, sec. 517.01).

If you veterans have any problem in connection with these State laws, I am sure your county veterans' service officer will be glad to cooperate with you. Furthermore, as your United States Representative in Congress, I will be glad to be of every possible service to you at any time. If you desire to write me, my address is: Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN, 205 Post Office Building, Crookston, Minn. If I am reelected on November 7, my address again will be 1405 New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Resolutions Passed by Thirty-second Annual Department of Nevada American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions numbered 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 10, passed by the Thirty-second Annual Department of Nevada American Legion Convention, dealing respectively with the capacity of the Reno Veterans' Hospital, the Hoover Commission reorganization plan to reorganize the Veterans' Administration, approval of the universal military training program, the control of prices, opposition to the shipment of strategic materials and supplies by the European nations to Soviet Russia or other Communist-dominated countries, and placing before candidates for office the resolutions of the convention.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 2

Reno facility

Whereas the Reno facility of the United States Veterans' Administration has a capacity of 168 beds, although only 125 active beds are available for use at the present time; and

Whereas the congestion caused by waiting lists and delayed cases is rapidly approaching an emergency, thereby compelling local veteran patients to seek hospitalization in private institutions; and

Whereas this emergency is not decreasing, but rather increasing and will continue to do so for many years to come: Be it

Resolved, That this situation be called to the attention of all members of the congressional delegation from Nevada, in Washington, to the end that steps may be taken to bring this situation to the notice of the central office of the United States Veterans' Administration in Washington so that arrangements may be made and funds provided to equip and operate the Reno facility to its fullest capacity; and be it further

Resolved, That the delegates to the Department of Nevada, American Legion Convention, assembled in Ely, Nev., August 10–12, 1950, in passing this resolution urge our department officers to work for the achievement of the ends herein set out.

Resolution 4

Whereas the Hoover Commission reorganization plan suggests measures and legislation that are detrimental to the veteran, and if these recommendations are carried out, they will result in dismemberment of the Veterans' Administration into five separate agencies, with resultant loss of efficient service to the veteran, and with additional expense, confusion, and chaos to the Government; and

Whereas the national commander of the American Legion is calling on all legionnaires to do all possible to prevent this catastrophe to the veterans of America, if the recommendations of that portion of the Hoover Commission report referring to veterans are carried out; and

Whereas other veteran organizations, the DAV, AMVETS, and the VFW have joined with the American Legion in presenting a united front against dismemberment of the Veterans' Administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the delegates to the Thirty-second Annual Convention of the Department of Nevada of the American Legion, That such convention assembled go on record as being unalterably opposed to any legislation or executive acts that will dismember the Veterans' Administration, and we demand of our Representative and Senators in Congress that they will do all in their power to oppose any move that will accomplish this purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Nevada Senators and Representative in Congress, asking them to do all in their power to preserve the Veterans' Administration in its present form, as a one-stop service for efficient and economical service to the veterans of America.

Resolution 7

Whereas the American Legion, Department of Nevada, has heretofore passed a resolution urging the passage of legislation effecting the American Legion universal military training program; and

Whereas the need for such legislation is now, in the light of present world conditions, more critical than ever before: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the American Legion, Department of Nevada Convention, assembled at Ely, Nev., August 10–12, 1950, go on record as favoring immediate passage of universal military training legislation sponsored by the American Legion in accord with bill already presented Congress, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Representative in Congress urging them to do all possible to have this universal military training legislation enacted immediately.

Resolution 8

Whereas prices of foods and commodities have risen at an alarming rate ever since the Communists started the Korean war; and

Whereas this profiteering has led to hysterical buying on the part of many of the Nation's consumers; and

Whereas wages and salaries have not advanced in keeping with this condition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the delegates to the Department of Nevada, American Legion, Convention, assembled at Ely, Nev., August 10–12, 1950, To petition our Congressman and Senators to enact immediate legislation and controls necessary to maintain a balanced economy during a minimum of regimentation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Representative and Senators in Congress and to the national convention of the American Legion to be held in Los Angeles, Calif., in October for adoption by that body.

Resolution 9

Whereas under United Nations Organization mandate, the United States has entered into armed conflict with North Korean Communist forces; and

Whereas such armed conflict will take the lives of American soldiers and demand sacrifice from and result in deprivation of American civilians; and

Whereas the North Korean Communist forces are inspired by and are under the direction of Soviet Russia; and

Whereas any aid or comfort, including the shipment of strategic materials or supplies, given to Soviet Russia or to other Communist-dominated countries is certainly inimical to the interest of all non-Communist nations who hold membership in the United Nations organization, and particularly to the internal security of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the Department of Nevada, American Legion Convention, assembled at Ely, Nev., petition our United States congressional delegation to promote legislation which will effect the immediate cessation of financial or any other aid from the United States to Russia or Communist-dominated countries or to any other nation which directly or indirectly is engaging in the shipment of sales of strategic materials or supplies or is giving either financial or moral aid or comfort to Communist Russia or to any so-called iron-curtain countries. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Nevada congressional delegation and to the national convention of the American Legion.

Resolution 10

Whereas the American Legion as an organization is interested in various matters of State and National legislation; and

Whereas certain resolutions have been approved by that body in favor of or in opposition to certain legislative matters; and

Whereas the American Legion has no effective means of promoting such legislation, nor has the organization taken steps to officially ascertain how candidates for State and national offices stand on the various issues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That all matters of legislation in which the American Legion has expressed interest by way of resolution be taken before all candidates for State and National legislative offices and that each post of the American Legion be specifically advised thereafter of each of said candidates' attitude toward such legislative issues; and be it further

Resolved, That this said resolution be made available to all publicity mediums throughout the State.

The Communist Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Denver Post on Sunday, September 24, 1950, entitled "Good Intentions But Bad Legislation," and also a column entitled "That's That" by columnist Bruce Gustin.

These editorials show the interest not only of a great newspaper, but of the people of Colorado in the legislation recently passed by Congress entitled "The Internal Security Act of 1950." As the days go by we find more and more that level-headed editors and those persons who generally love freedom are becoming aware of the danger of passing hysterical legislation. It is my observation that all types of the press of the country whether Republican, Democratic, or independent, are viewing with deep concern this type of legislation.

I trust that the action of those Members of Congress who opposed the legislation will be appreciated for its value in helping to preserve the time-honored principles of our Constitution.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post of September 24, 1950]

GOOD INTENTIONS BUT BAD LEGISLATION

With the best intentions in the world, Congress has passed, over Mr. Truman's veto, a bill to control Communists which seems to be based in part on hysteria and in part on the mistaken belief that laws can control the minds of men.

Those of us who fear that the bill is unworkable and is more likely to help rather than hinder the world-wide Communist conspiracy only hope that its passage does not mean that we in America are about to begin to play the game of self-protection according to the pattern of the totalitarian states behind the iron curtain.

We hope the passage of the bill does not mean that we have lost any of our faith in democracy or the principle that, if our people are kept informed, they can be relied upon to make the right decisions.

It has been said that the new bill does not outlaw the Communist Party. Whether, in effect, it will do that remains to be seen. It does require the officers of Communists and Communist-front organizations to register with the Government and to reveal the sources of their funds. It requires Communist, but not Communist-front, organizations to list their members.

We are not hopeful that any honest lists of Communist members will be forthcoming. Evidence that Communists for several weeks now have been preparing to go underground to escape the registration provisions of the new law has been reported in the New York Times and elsewhere.

The names of some of the dupes and some of the less important Communist members may be registered, but not the names of the more dangerous Communist leaders. They will resign to form other organizations or use other ruses.

Has our experience with the Voorhis Act taught us nothing? It requires foreign-controlled political parties to register but the Communist Party has not so registered. It seems reasonable to believe that any real effort to enforce and check up on the registration provisions of the new law would require a vast enlargement of the FBI. But the law carries many other provisions.

It makes it a crime for a member of a Communist or Communist-front organization to hold a nonelective Government job although, admittedly, many unsuspecting people, including even some conservative Members of Congress, have been lured into front organizations.

No Communist can hold a job in a defense plant but it also would be a crime for a member of a Communist-front to apply for such a job without disclosing his membership. The far-reaching act contains many other provisions, some highly desirable.

The part of the law relating to the protection of "classified" Government information seems good, but it has been pointed out that under the evidence that was available in the Alger Hiss case a conviction probably could not have been obtained under the new statute although a conviction was possible under a safeguard we already have, the perjury law.

Our Communist-control laws have needed strengthening to give protection against espionage and sabotage, but the law passed by Congress seems to have gone far afield in some respects. We believe that substitute measures supported by Congressman JOHN CARROLL (Democrat), of Denver, and others would have been more practical and effective and less fraught with potential dangers.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post of September 27, 1950]

THAT'S THAT

(Says Bruce Gustin)

Congress went the limit to control communism in this country when it passed the Mundt - Nixon - Ferguson -McCarran-Kilgore bill. It may have gone beyond the limit. There is grave doubt of the constitutionality, effectiveness, and wisdom of some of the measure's most drastic provisions. But with congressional elections in the offing, it is a reasonable assumption that the 312-to-20 vote in the House and the 51-to-7 vote in the Senate fairly represented public sentiment. Members of Congress have an ear to the ground, especially in a campaign year. Most Americans are more interested in stamping out the Red menace than in how this is done.

Two of the 20 votes against the Communist control bill in the House were cast by Congressmen CARROLL and ASPINALL, both Democrats, and both from Colorado. Theirs were the only Colorado votes against the bill. That took a lot of courage. ASPINALL is seeking reelection and CARROLL is running against Senator MILLIKIN, Republican.

In fairness to CARROLL and ASPINALL their votes against the Communist control bill cannot be taken to mean that they are opposed to reasonable, constitutional control of the Red menace. CARROLL introduced a bill calling for arrest and internment of all known Communists in the event of war. He opposed the measure passed as "useless, inadequate, and unconstitutional legislation which gives evidence of fear and indecision, and not courage and confidence.

One of the main and most controversial provisions of the Communist control bill requires registration of all members of Communist and Communist-front organizations. Congress would have been in a far better position to act intelligently on this proposal if it had waited for the United States Supreme Court decision in the case of the 11 Communist leaders who were convicted under the Smith Act. This decision should clear up a lot of questions about how far Congress can go in legislating against communism.

Proposed Federal Employees' Loyalty Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of Senate bill 3213, which may be cited as the Federal Employees' Act of 1950. This bill was introduced on March 8, 1950, by the junior Senator from Nevada and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, where it is now pending.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3213

A bill to provide for removal from, and the prevention of appointment to, offices or positions in the executive branch of the Government of persons who are found to be security risks or disloyal to the United States

Whereas each employee of the Government of the United States is endowed with a measure of trusteeship over the democratic processes which are the spirit and strength of the United States; and

Whereas it is of vital importance that persons employed in the Federal service be of complete and unswerving loyalty to the United States; and

Whereas, although the loyalty of by far the overwhelming majority of all Government employees is beyond question, the presence within the Government service of any disloyal and subversive person constitutes a threat to our security and democratic processes; and

Whereas maximum protection must be afforded the United States against infiltration of disloyal persons or security risks into the ranks of its employees, and equal protection from unfounded accusations of disloyalty must be afforded the loyal employees of the Government: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Federal Employees' Loyalty Act of 1950."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "employee" means any officer or employee in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States, including any officer or employee of a corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States; but does not include (A) the President or Vice President, (B) an officer appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (C) an officer or employee in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or (D) a temporary employee employed not to exceed 180 days in any fiscal year in construction or maintenance work at an hourly rate of pay.

(2) The term "applicant" means any person who is actually being considered by the proper appointing officer for appointment to an office or position in or under the executive branch which would give him the status of an employee.

(3) The term "Commission" means the Civil Service Commission.

(4) The term "Board" means the Loyalty Review Board established by section 3.

(5) The term "Bureau" means the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(6) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, means the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States (Panama Canal Zone).

LOYALTY REVIEW BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created, as an independent establishment in the executive branch, a Loyalty Review Board to be composed of five members versed in loyalty matters appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No individual shall be appointed as a member unless he is a citizen of the United States. Not more than three of the members of the Board shall be members of the same political party. The President shall designate a member as Chairman of the Board.

(b) The term of office of each member shall be 6 years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 4 years, one at the end of 5 years, and one at the end of 6 years, after the date of enactment of this act; (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occuring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (3) upon the expiration of his term of office a member shall continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(c) Any member may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office and for no other cause.

(d) Each member shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per annum. No member shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a member.

(e) The Board is authorized to appoint such investigators, attorneys, and other employees, and to make such expenditures, as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

(f) It shall be the duty of the Board to establish such number of subordinate boards as it may deem necessary to carry out the functions imposed upon such subordinate boards by section 5. Each such subordinate board shall be composed of three members who shall be employees of the Board. The office of each such subordinate board shall be at such place in the United States as may be fixed by the Board.

(g) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Board may exercise its powers at any place in the United States.

INVESTIGATION OF LOYALTY OF EMPLOYEES AND APPLICANTS

SEC. 4. (a) An investigation shall be made, as provided for in this section, of every employee and every applicant to determine whether reasonable grounds exist for the belief that such employee or applicant is disloyal to the United States.

(b) After the date of enactment of this act, no applicant shall be appointed to an office or position in or under the executive branch (except to a position as an employee of the Board) prior to the determination under this act of his loyalty to the United States, unless (1) the appointing officer certifies to the Board that the immediate appointment of such applicant is absolutely required in order to perform a necessary function of the department or agency, and (2) the Board, after conducting such preliminary investigation of such applicant as it may deem necessary, notifies the appointing officer that such appointment has the tentative approval of the Board. Any applicant so appointed and any employee of the Board appointed prior to investigation under this act shall be promptly investigated under this act as an employee.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Commission to conduct preliminary investigations of all employees and applicants, and, in conducting such investigations, the following pertinent sources of information shall be used: Federal Bureau of Investigation files, Civil Service Commission files, military and naval intelligence files, the files of any other appropriate Government investigative or intelligence agency, House Committee on Un-American Activities files, local law-enforcement files at the place of residence and employment of the employee or applicant, including municipal, county, and State law-enforcement files, schools and colleges attended by employee or applicant, former employers of applicant, references given by employee or applicant, and any other appropriate source.

(d) (1) Whenever any derogatory information is developed with respect to the loyalty to the United States of an employee or applicant from any of the sources set forth in subsection (c), the Commission shall immediately terminate its investigation and furnish such information to the Bureau. The Bureau shall conduct a full field-loyalty investigation of such employee or applicant.

(2) Whenever any derogatory information is developed with respect to the conduct or qualification of an employee, other than with respect to his loyalty, from any of the sources set forth in subsection (c), the Commission may take such action as may be necessary to cause the removal of such employee from his office or position. In the event such action is taken, the Bureau shall not conduct an investigation under paragraph (1) with respect to such employee.

(e) If no derogatory information is developed with respect to the loyalty to the United States of an employee or applicant from any of the sources set forth in subsection (c), the Commission shall terminate its investigation and immediately notify the head of the appropriate department or agency that such investigation has disclosed no evidence that reasonable grounds exist for the belief that such employee or applicant is disloyal to the United States.

(f) Upon the completion of each full field-loyalty investigation, the Bureau shall transmit immediately to the Board a full report of the investigation which shall contain all evidence pertaining to the question of the loyalty to the United States of the employee or applicant.

REVIEW OF REPORTS OF INVESTIGATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall distribute each report of investigation transmitted to it by the Bureau in accordance with section 4 (f) to a subordinate board. As soon as practicable, the subordinate board shall review such report and make a preliminary finding upon the evidence furnished by the Bureau with respect to the loyalty to the United States of the employee or applicant under investigation, and transmit such finding to the Board. If such preliminary finding is not adverse to the employee or applicant and is the unanimous decision of the subordinate board, such finding when approved by the Board shall become the final decision of the Board, and the Board shall immediately advise the head of the appropriate department or agency that, in the judgment of the Board, there are no reasonable grounds for the belief that such employee or applicant is disloyal to the United States. If such preliminary finding is not adverse to the employee or applicant, but is not the unanimous finding of the subordinate board, the Board shall conduct such a review of such preliminary finding as it may deem necessary. If after such review the Board agrees with the preliminary finding of the majority of the subordinate board, such finding shall become the final decision of the Board, and the Board shall immediately advise the head of the appropriate department or agency that, in the judgment of the Board, there are no reasonable grounds for the belief that such employee or applicant is disloyal to the United States. If such preliminary finding is adverse, or if the Board agrees with the adverse preliminary finding of the minority member of the subordinate board, the Board shall notify the employee or applicant under investigation in writing of the preliminary finding of the subordinate board, or of the preliminary finding of the Board, as the case may be, together with a factual statement upon which such finding is based, not disclosing, except when in the discretion of the Board, the interest of justice so requires, the source or sources of the information, and advising such employee or applicant that such preliminary finding must be appealed to the Board within 15 days after the date of such notification or it shall become the final decision of the Board: *Provided*, That the preliminary findings of the Board and factual statements furnished the employee or applicant provided for under this section, shall be held as confidential by the Board.

(b) (1) If such adverse preliminary finding is appealed as provided for in subsection (a), the Board shall consider such pertinent evidence as may be submitted to it by the appellant in writing or at a hearing before the Board. Following the appeal, after consideration of all the evidence, the Board shall make a final decision, and, if such decision is not adverse to the employee or applicant under investigation, the Board shall notify such employee or applicant and the head of the appropriate department or agency.

(2) If such adverse preliminary finding is not appealed, or if such final decision under paragraph (1) is adverse, the Board shall notify in writing such employee or applicant of its final adverse decision and shall certify to the head of the appropriate department or agency, that, in the judgment of the Board, it is established by the preponderance of the evidence that such employee or applicant is disloyal to the United States. Such certification shall constitute authority for the discharge of such employee or the rejection of such applicant, as the case may be, and shall be accompanied by the request from the Board that for the reasons set forth in the certification, (A) the services of such employee shall be terminated immediately upon receipt of such certification, or (B) such applicant shall not be employed. Such department or agency shall comply with the instructions in said certificate. As used in the preceding sentence, the term "employee" includes an applicant who is appointed to an office or position after certification, pursuant to this subsection, with respect to his disloyalty.

(c) All findings and decisions of the subordinate boards and of the Board shall be based upon the standard set forth in section 8 (a).

RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 6. The Board is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such rules and regulations, and any amendments thereto, shall be published promptly in the Federal Register, and, among other things, shall provide that all statements presented to the Board by an appellant shall be under oath, and that an appellant shall have the right to be represented by legal counsel, to produce evidence and witnesses, and to furnish affidavits or other written statements of competent persons. Such rules and regulations shall provide that no finding or decision of the Board shall be made except after the concurrence of at least three members of the Board, and that the Board shall maintain a permanent record showing how each member voted upon each finding and decision.

ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES AND PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

SEC. 7. (a) For the purposes of this act, the Board may require by subpena the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Any member may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Board. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Board or any member designated by him, and may be served by any individual designated by such Chairman or member.

(b) Such attendance of witnesses at any designated place of hearing, and the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents at any designated place of hearing, may be required from any place in the United States. Witnesses summoned under this section shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

(c) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any person, the Board may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the investigation or proceeding is being conducted, or where such person resides or carries on business. Such court may issue an order requiring such person to appear before the Board, there to give or produce testimony or books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, or documents, bearing upon the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever such person may be found.

(d) Any person who without just cause fails or refuses to attend and testify or to answer any inquiry or to produce books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, or documents, in obedience to a subpena of the Board, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

STANDARD TO BE USED BY BOARD

SEC. 8. (a) The standard which the Board shall use as the basis for the removal from employment or for the refusal of employment in the executive branch of the Government on grounds relating to loyalty shall be that, in the judgment of the Board, it is established by the evidence that there is a reasonable doubt the employee or applicant investigated is disloyal to the United States.

(b) Activities and associations of an employee or applicant which may be considered by the Board in connection with the determination of disloyalty may include one or more of the following:

(1) Sabotage, espionage, or attempts or preparations therefor, or knowingly associating with spies or saboteurs.

(2) Treason or sedition or advocacy thereof.

(3) Advocacy of revolution by force or violence to alter the constitutional form of government of the United States.

(4) Intentional, unauthorized disclosure to any person, under circumstances which may indicate disloyalty to the United States, of documents or information of a confidential or nonpublic character obtained by the employee making the disclosure as a result of his employment in or under the executive branch of the Government.

(5) Performing or attempting to perform his duties as an employee, or otherwise acting, so as to serve the interests of another government in preference to the interests of the United States.

(6) Membership in, affiliation with, or sympathetic association with, any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons, known to the Board or designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

(c) The Attorney General shall, after full investigation, from time to time have published in the Federal Register a list of the organizations, associations, movements, groups, and combinations of persons designated by him pursuant to paragraph (6) of subsection (b). At the request of the Board, the Attorney General shall submit to the Board the reasons for the inclusion upon any such list of the name of any such organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons, and, upon request, shall promptly advise the Board as to organizations, associations, movements, groups, or combination of persons not designated by him pursuant to paragraph (6) of subsection (b).

REPORTS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 9. Before January 15 of each calendar year commencing after the date of enactment of this act, the Board shall submit to the Congress and the President a report outlining its work during the preceding year, together with any recommendations it may deem advisable with respect to its activities. Such report shall contain a statement with respect to the status or disposition of the cases of those disloyal employees with respect to whom the Board notified the President under section 5 (b).

PRECEDENCE OF INVESTIGATIONS OF, AND ACTIONS WITH RESPECT TO, EMPLOYEES

SEC. 10. In carrying out the provisions of this act, investigations by the Commission and the Bureau, and actions by the subordinate boards and the Board, with respect to employees shall take precedence over investigations by the Commission and the Bureau, and actions by the subordinate boards and the Board, with respect to applicants.

FINGERPRINTS OF EMPLOYEES

SEC. 11. As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this act, the head of each department or agency in the executive branch of the Government shall submit to the Bureau, through the Commission, the name and fingerprints of every employee of such department or agency whose name and fingerprints have not theretofore been submitted by such department or agency, and shall from time to time thereafter submit the names and fingerprints of new employees. Information secured by a search of the Bureau's name and fingerprint files shall be transmitted to the head of each department or agency through the Commission.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 12. There are authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Peace With Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech given by Mrs. Edith S. Sampson, alternate United States representative to the General Assembly, at the meeting of the India League celebrating Gandhi's birthday on October 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE WITH FREEDOM

I feel highly honored to be invited to speak on this occasion in celebration of the birthday of a great world citizen, Mahatma Gandhi. I shall never forget the morning in August 1949, when I stood with the representatives of some 25 American people's organizations to witness a simple ceremony, laying wreaths at Raj Ghat, the hallowed place on the right bank of the Jumna River where Mahatma Gandhi was cremated. Workmen paused in their labors in building the half-finished memorial. I'm sure in their minds as well as ours flashed vivid images of a man who carried on a long and successful struggle for peace and freedom.

That evening I sat in a corner of the garden of Pandit Nehru's residence. The guests were seated in a semicircle around the Prime Minister of India. Mr. Nehru talked of India's problems, as if we had been near neighbors who had dropped in for an evening's chat. And, as always in our meetings in India, the name of Gandhiji came to his lips. The Prime Minister and the workmen alike seemed to look at India and the world through the eyes of Gandhi.

On that occasion Mr. Nehru told us, with humility, that his Government was building and maintaining a military force for the defense and order of the new state. In this, he said, they were not living up to the personal faith of Gandhi in the power of the spirit, unarmed, and unafraid, to overcome evil with good.

Mr. Nehru did not try to make it appear that the grim necessity was the ideal. He recognized the gap between Gandhi's lofty principles and the Government's practice. Mr. Nehru told us very frankly that the "Gandhi way" called for many more millions with real soul-force than his Government could master. This was not an inadequacy in the the Gandhi way; it was an inadequacy in the community's capacity to walk that way.

Realistically Mr. Nehru recognized that a country in the present state of human development could not preserve its freedom without the means of material defense against aggression.

Perhaps mankind will someday reach that high state of maturity Ganhdi achieved and be able to resist domination by the might of the spirit alone. We shall never reach that day if too many men in cowardice exchange their freedom for a peace of capitulation, for the high character required by Gandhi's idea can never be the product of cowardice. It is the highest expression of courage and dignity.

There are three ways to deal with aggression—appeasement, armed resistance, and nonviolent resistance. We Negroes know from sad experience that the brutal will to dominate cannot be appeased by concessions to it. Those who prefer peace above freedom are bound to lose both. Peace with freedom requires a determined and united resistance against each threat of aggression. Gandhi never stood for appeasement. He was the terrible meek who led a movement of real resistance.

Negroes can understand the feelings Pandit Nehru expressed to our group that night in New Delhi because they have had a great deal of experience with all three ways of dealing with the power of evil. Some of us have tried to appease the forces seeking domination over us, and some have even collected their "30 pieces of silver" for their leadership in appeasement. Only a few of us have

learned to rely upon soul force to resist evil, though many of us have had some experience with that method. But I think that practically all of us know that peace without freedom is slavery, and we have given a good account of ourselves in the fight for freedom.

Gandhi often expressed his convictions about self-government — about democracy and voluntary cooperation. He knew that the human spirit needs the chance to struggle for a better life by peaceful means, and that only democracy gives human beings that chance. To get a master off one's neck is only part of the victory over enslavement. The long road up to enlightened, cooperative living takes patient education and self-mastery.

We think of Mahatma Gandhi as the champion of victims of poverty and discrimination. He lived among the lowly people in utter simplicity. He saw their problems from their point of view. He thought of practical plans for improving their way of life—plans for converting wasted hours into the growing of food and making of cloth with their spinning wheels.

When the American Negroes' emancipation came only a few decades ago, we set forth on a new road with many rugged detours and stony side paths. First we had to fight ignorance and backwardness in ourselves. We had to learn to be free men, as a blind man suddenly given sight must learn to see and to understand what he sees.

During these decades we Negroes have learned how to fight for fuller freedom with many new weapons. These are not weapons to fight people, but to fight laws and customs and obstructions in the path of our human rights. We know how difficult it is to expand educational opportunities, and then to pry open vocational opportunities for the educated. We know how hard it is to get hold of the peaceful instruments of democracy, and then to use them with wisdom and skill and devotion for the common good. But we have learned to stand up and fight for our rights with these weapons of democracy—in the courts, at the ballot boxes, through free associations, in the professions and skilled occupations, in the cultural fields and sports.

This is not the occasion to recount the achievements of Negroes. I refer to our struggles here simply to explain why we have perhaps a special understanding of the ideals of Gandhi and the problems of Nehru. I refer to them to emphasize the point that nonviolence is a practical method of struggle in a democracy. And that struggle can be increasingly successful as people learn to use the tools of democracy.

We are acutely aware of the discrimination we must still resist and overcome; but we are also cognizant of the progress we have made. Our struggles have given us self-confidence and self-reliance.

We Negroes know something about the slave system. We know that it delivers a kind of security. We know that slaves never have to worry about unemployment, for example. The masters—and many of them were benevolent—look after the essentials of food, clothing, and shelter. And we also know the cruel marks of dictation, suppression, and the whip. We know what it is like to be forced to say that a lie is the truth. We know how it feels to be helpless in the face of arbitrary authority. It is a part of our folklore.

So we can tell the difference between a slave system and a democracy even though we do not yet share the full benefits of our own democracy. Armed defense of our democracy is to us the defense of the freedoms we have achieved and the rights we use as tools in the struggle for fuller freedom.

We will not exchange a measure of freedom for a precarious peace for ourselves; neither will we participate in the appeasement of an aggressor by failing to resist an encroachment upon the hard-won freedom of others. Thus, Negroes are not easily misled by false slogans to immobilize their spirit of resistance to tyrannies or to break their unity with other freedom-loving peoples around the world.

In Moscow there is an official humor magazine called Crokodil. Many of the cartoons that appear in Crokodil deal with the American Negro. In English, Crokodil is crocodile, which, as everyone knows, is a beast of prey and a symbol of hypocrisy.

The Communist press all over the world sheds crocodile tears for Negroes in its cartoons and stories. For example, in the New York Daily Worker, Korea is pictured as a war of color with such phrases as (and I quote): "Today under the orders of our southern President (meaning President Truman, who is the leader of the civil-rights program) United States planes are bombing and strafing colored people in Korea."

How do American Negroes react to such propaganda? Do the crocodile tears succeed in diverting attention from the crocodile character and his arsenal of teeth for expressing it? Let me read a few sentences from an editorial in this very month's issue of Ebony, one of the largest Negro picture publications. Incidentally, this is not an official organ of the Government or of any group. It is just part of the free, uncensored press of the United States. Here is what the Negro who edits Ebony thinks of the war-of-color Soviet line:

"The Communists are not the first in their attempt to use race and color as an effective propaganda device. During World War II, the Japanese tried the same technique. Their agents played upon Negro nationalism and through a call for solidarity of colored peoples had several fanatic so-called pro-African groups working in their behalf.

"But the vast majority of Negroes saw the war-of-color propaganda for what it was—a flimsy curtain behind which hid the ugly specter of jingoistic Japanese militarism intent upon world conquest along with Hitler. Intelligent Negroes recognized the war as a struggle between two ways of life—democracy and fascism—and they fought for democracy not only abroad but also at home."

With regard to the Korean conflict, the Ebony editorial continues: "By dragging the race angle into the Korean conflict, they are trying to disassociate Negroes from the feelings and attitudes of most Americans toward Communist aggression in Korea. By their war-of-color propaganda, they are crying wolf while making off with the lamb—in this case, Korea."

"There is no doubt that Negroes everywhere," says the editor, "are behind President Truman's move to block Russian aggression by force. Between democracy and communism, the choice for Negroes is clear and obvious. The Negro soldiers of the courageous Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment who won the first American victory of the Korean War by taking Yechon, gave the most dramatic reply to Communist war-of-color propaganda."

It is interesting to note that Soviet propaganda nowhere in the world mentions the fact that American forces fighting under the United Nations flag with forces from other United Nations countries include many colored soldiers.

Those brave soldiers are proud to take their stand in the united resistance against what Nehru called naked aggression.

They are in the front line of a fight against a new imperialism. The freedom and independence of many countries are being defended at this one point.

Indeed, the future of peace is at stake. The historic record of expanding empires clearly shows that only through a united resistance have the empire builders ever been stopped in their march toward war.

God grant us the clarity of vision, the humility and the stubborn determination which characterized the life of Mahatma Gandhi as we unitedly seek peace with freedom.

Encourage Conservation and Development of Mineral Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of Senate bill 3570, a bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes, which I introduced on May 10, 1950, and which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This bill incorporates the provisions of Senate bill 2105 as it passed the Senate on October 6, 1949, and failed of passage in the House on March 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3570

A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Resources Conservation and Development Act."

SEC. 2. (a) It is the policy of the Congress that every effort be made to stimulate exploration for and conservation of strategic and critical metals and minerals and other essential metals and minerals by private enterprise to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the United States, and that every effort be made to encourage the development and maintenance of sources of these metals and minerals within the United States in order to decrease and prevent, wherever possible, a dangerous and costly dependence by the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of such materials. To this end it is the further policy of the Congress that every effort be made to maintain a sound and active mining industry within the United States; to expand exploration for those ores and other mineral substances which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States; and to prevent the discontinuance of mine operations and make the resumption of mine operations possible until national industrial and defense requirements are met for the present and future security and safety of the United States.

(b) In carrying out these policies small mining enterprises shall be encouraged to apply for aid under this act, and for this purpose the Secretary of the Interior shall provide small mining enterprises with full information concerning this act, and shall make special provision for expeditious handling of applications from small mining enterprises.

SEC. 3. To carry out the policy of this act, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter called the Secretary) shall from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of the Treasury or their deputies, determine—

(a) the amount of appropriated money to be allocated to the aid of exploration, on the one hand, and to the aid of conservation, on the other hand;

(b) the amount of appropriated money to be allocated to the aid of exploration for any metal or mineral or group of metals or minerals;

(c) the amount of appropriated money to be allocated to the aid of conservation of any metal or mineral or group of metals or minerals;

(d) the maximum price or the minimum price, or both, which may be paid for the purchase of any metal or mineral for conservation: *Provided*, That adequate allowance shall be made for depletion and depreciation in computing costs of operation or maintenance;

(e) the maximum amount or the minimum amount, or both, which may be paid on account of participation in the costs of maintenance for conservation with respect to any metal or mineral;

(f) the maximum amount or the minimum amount, or both, which may be paid to any producer or class of producers on account of exploration for any metal or mineral or group of metals or minerals, and the ratio which the Government's contribution for exploration shall bear to the contribution of any producer or class of producers for exploration;

(g) the particular metals or minerals or ores thereof and specifications therefor that shall be eligible for aid for conservation;

(h) the particular metals or minerals that shall be eligible for aid for exploration; and

(i) the time limits or dates within which contracts for aid for conservation shall terminate.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, which must be complied with by applicants for contracts under the provisions of this act.

(b) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions under this act.

(c) All rules and regulations issued under the authority contained in this section shall be published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 5. (a) Any producer may file with the Secretary an application for financial aid in carrying out a specified project for exploration or financial aid to conserve a deposit of ores or minerals. An application to conserve may be either for aid by participating in the costs of maintaining the property in stand-by condition or by purchasing all or any part of the metals or minerals resulting from production from such deposit. The application and the project for aid disclosed by the application must conform to the express policy and provisions of this act and with the rules and regulations of the Secretary: *Provided, however*, That simple contracts covering exploration projects shall be awarded upon application to small mines and such contracts shall provide for the payment by the United States of one-half of the total reasonable costs of all tunnels, shafts, winzes, and raises in such a mine if it is determined upon examination that there is a reasonable promise of developing unknown or undeveloped sources of metals or minerals.

(b) The Secretary shall cause qualified mining engineers, geologists, and any other necessary technicians to make examination of and to report on each application, and to certify it to the Secretary either for acceptance, as presented or subject to specified modifications, or for rejection. In the case of a project for exploration, the examining experts shall certify whether the project offers reasonable promise of discovering unknown or undeveloped sources of metals or minerals. In the case of a project for aid to conserve a deposit of ores or minerals, either by participating in the costs of maintaining the property in stand-by condition or by purchasing all or any part of the metals or minerals resulting from production from such deposit, the examining experts, considering economic and practical factors, shall certify whether the project offers reasonable promise of maintaining in stand-by condition or in production, as the case may be, a property the production from which would, in the absence of financial aid by the United States, be discontinued or remain discontinued under such circumstances as to make it probable that for economic or technical reasons such production would not or could not be resumed when needed for the national economy or security.

(c) The Secretary shall either except and approve the application, subject to any modification therein which he may require, or he shall reject it. If the Secretary accepts the application, either in its original or modified form, the terms of the application and acceptance shall be merged in a formal, written contract. Any applicant who is dissatisfied with the decision of the Secretary upon his application may at any time within 30 days after receipt of notice of the decision, unless further time is granted by the Secretary, appeal to the Secretary for reconsideration of such application, and the Secretary, as expeditiously as possible, shall review the entire matter, reconsider his findings thereon, and notify the applicant of his decision.

(d) All metals or minerals purchased under the provisions of this section, or such equivalent quantities thereof as may be permitted by the contract with the producer, shall be delivered by the producer to and shall be received by the Administrator of General Services (hereinafter called the Administrator) at such places and times as may be provided in the contract. The Secretary shall transfer to the Administrator for the performance of his functions hereunder such funds as the Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall determine to be necessary, in addition to any funds appropriated to the General Services Administration, for the proper performance of said functions. The Administrator shall from time to time, and in any event before selling them in the open market, notify the Munitions Board of the inventory of metals or minerals held by him under the provisions of this act and shall continue to hold all metals or minerals received by him under this act until at least 60 days after he has given the Munitions Board notice that they are so held. The Munitions Board may, as long as any such metals or minerals are held by the Administrator, (1) direct the Administrator to transfer any of them to the national security stockpile in accordance with the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended (53 Stat. 811, 60 Stat. 596), or (2) within 60 days after such notice from the Administrator direct to him to hold any such metals or minerals listed in the notice until 60 days after the next succeeding appropriation for purchases for the stockpile has become available. Unless notified by the Munitions Board to either transfer any of such metals or minerals or to continue to hold them as provided in this subsection, the Administrator shall sell them in the open market if and when open-market prices will return to the Government at least the approximate average price paid by the Government for the metals or minerals, and only in such quantities as will not materially depress the market. No metal or mineral shall be transferred into the national security stockpile under the provisions of this act, unless the material has been found to be strategic and critical as provided in the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and meets established specifications as to quality and degree of refinement or processing, and unless such transfer is consistent with the current stockpiling procurement program of the Munition Board. All moneys received by the Administrator from such sales in the open market shall be for deposit in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, and any transfer of metals or minerals to the national security stockpile shall be covered by a transfer of funds from appropriations available for purchases for the stockpile to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury in amounts approximating what the cost of the metals or minerals would have been if purchased in the open market at the time of transfer.

(e) All contracts entered into under the provisions of this section may be entered into without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, or other provisions of law prescribing the manner of making contracts on behalf of the United States.

SEC. 6. As used in this act—

(a) "Exploration" means exploration in the United States for unknown or undeveloped sources of metals or minerals, including undeveloped extensions of known deposits, conducted from the surface or underground, by surface trenching, core or churn drilling, tunnels, raises, winzes, or shafts, including recognized and sound procedures for obtaining pertinent geological information, and including metallurgical research on processes for the production of such metals or minerals.

(b) "Production" means the production of ores or minerals from mines in the United States, or from tailings, dumps, slags, or residues of such mines, which the Secretary determines would, in the absence of financial aid by the United States, be discontinued or remain discontinued under such circumstances with respect to each particular mine as to make it probable that for economic or technical reasons such production would not or could not be resumed when needed for the national economy or security.

(c) "Small mines" means mines or deposits of ores primarily producing or which in the course of conducting an exploration project primarily produce (a) lead, zinc, or copper ores, or ores containing a combination of such metals, the average aggregate monthly production of which does not exceed 100 tons of lead, zinc, and copper metal combined, and (b) manganese, mica, chromite, mercury, and tungsten ores and ores of other minerals and metals the average monthly production of which, by quantity, does not exceed approximately the market value of 100 tons of lead computed and fixed as of the effective date of this act, the quantity limitation for each mineral and metal thereafter to remain unchanged.

(d) "Producer" means any person or persons or legal entity by whom or for whose account and interest exploration, maintenance, or production is to be or is being performed.

(e) "United States," when used in a geographical sense, means the United States and its Territories and possessions.

SEC. 7. This act shall not be construed as superseding or amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 755), as amended.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior not to exceed $60,000,000 in the fiscal year 1951, and thereafter, $30,000,000

annually for the carrying out of the provisions of this act, including payments to producers for exploration, maintenance, and production, and the costs of administration, such funds to remain available until expended.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be granted each year to the Department of the Interior such contractual authority in excess of authorized appropriations as may be necessary to assure the continuity of exploration and mining operations, all contractual obligations incurred thereby to be liquidated with appropriations authorized under paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) The provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section shall expire June 30, 1954, and no contract shall extend beyond such date.

SEC. 9. (a) Each producer shall at all times have access to a complete file of all copies of all calculations and analyses and determinations used as a basis for aid under this act, or modification or denial of his application, and shall be furnished a copy of each such analysis.

(b) The Secretary shall make annual reports to Congress on the operations under this act on April 15, 1951, and February 15 of each succeeding year. Such reports shall include current and summary information detailing the activities and results obtained and anticipated pursuant to this act, and such other pertinent information concerning the administration of this act as will enable the Congress to evaluate its administration and the need for amendments and related legislation.

(c) Advance payments may be made for exploration projects, in such amounts and on such terms as the Secretary deems appropriate, where the producer certifies the need for such advance payments as working capital. Advance payments received by operators shall not be commingled with other funds and shall be subject to post audit.

The Doctors' Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the revolt against the alliance of the American Medical Association with the most reactionary forces in America, with its huckster campaign against medical and public health progress in America, grows daily. It is a revolt not only by the American public, but by decent and honest doctors themselves. In the last few weeks we have seen the deans of American medical schools protest the American Medical Association fight against aid to medical education. We have also seen the American Hospital Association say no to American Medical Association demands that no laymen participate in setting hospital standards. And now we have a protest from an eminent and respected physician, professor of clinical medicine at Harvard University and chief of the medical services at the Massachusetts General Hospital.

I include an article in the current Atlantic Monthly by Dr. James Howard Means, titled "The Doctors' Lobby," which outlines the problem of the honest doctor, how to get medical progress through a new and more enlightened leadership of the American Medical Association:

THE DOCTORS' LOBBY

(By James Howard Means, M. D.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—American Medical Association medical care is for the people, not for the doctors, says James Howard Means, M. D., and skyrocketing costs can be reduced and better service provided by private enterprise only if the American Medical Association—organized medicine—takes a more open-minded and constructive view. Dr. Means is not a Socialist; for the past 27 years he has been professor of clinical medicine at Harvard University and chief of the medical services at the Massachusetts General Hospital.)

I

Medical science has made enormous strides. Are the American people getting the greatest possible benefit from them? Obviously not. The majority cannot afford medical care under the prevailing fee-for-service system, and in many places adequate personnel and facilities are not available. Because of these shortcomings, a rash of medical-care bills broke out in Congress. None of them was passed, and now, with a war on, they will be shelved indefinitely. If Government cannot help at this juncture, it is fair to ask whether initiative can be found elsewhere, and to what extent "organized medicine"—that is to say, the American Medical Association and its State and county societies—can improve the situation.

In December 1948, the legislative body of the American Medical Association—house of delegates is its name—voted to assess all members of the association the sum of $25 in order to raise a political war chest of $3,500,000 to fight socialized medicine. There was some fuzziness as to whether this assessment was to be obligatory or voluntary, although the word is hardly interpretable as "voluntary." There was, however, so much unfavorable comment, both in medical and nonmedical circles, on the expenditure of such a large sum by the doctors, apparently for the sole purpose of preserving the status quo in the matter of medical care, that the association could not quite bring itself to enforce payment. To do so it would have had to expel an embarrassingly large number of prominent members. During the, at times acrimonious, debate which ensued over the assessment, the editor of the association's journal, the voluble Dr. Morris Fishbein, came in for so much adverse criticism that in June 1949 the trustees of the American Medical Association decided to silence him, and subsequently he retired from the editorship.

This conservative attitude of the American Medical Association is of long standing. As far back as 1932 the well-remembered Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, headed by Ray Lyman Wilbur and made up of 50 persons—leading physicians, health officers, dentists, nurses, pharmacists, social scientists, and representatives of the public—rendered a majority report containing recommendations for voluntary prepayment plans which today look quite innocuous. They were not very different from that to which the American Medical Association is now at least giving lip service, but at that time Dr. Fishbein branded this report as incitement to revolution, and the proposed group practice as medical soviets. The American Medical Association does progress, but only in the wake of the steam roller of public opinion.

Directly after the elimination of Dr. Fishbein there was hope that at last the American Medical Association's leadership had felt the force of public opinion sufficiently to adopt a more enlightened policy. The American Medical Association had lost its voice in Dr. Fishbein; it had to find another. In March 1949 it hired the California firm of Whitaker & Baxter as public relations counsel.

This was not the American Medical Association's first experience with public relations counsel. In February 1946, in what appeared to be a forward-looking mood, it engaged the public-relations agency, Raymond Rich Associates, to study the association's public relations and make recommendations for their improvement. This was done, and several reforms were suggested. The house of delegates of the American Medical Association approved the recommendations, and in September 1946 Raymond Rich Associates were retained to carry them out. However, the trustees of the American Medical Association failed to give sufficient authority, and in June 1947 Raymond Rich Associates, which has been described as a firm of unquestioned standing and probity, resigned from the job, stating that their position had become professionally untenable. At a hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate in July 1947, Senator J. Howard McGrath said that the reasons Raymond Rich Associates resigned were, in effect, that the American Medical Association does not honestly represent the doctors of America, and in fact refuses to carry out their instructions. Thus passed t. transient progressive mood on the part of the American Medical Association into its more usual one, of standpatism or reaction.

Whitaker & Baxter have proved to be more to the American Medical Association's liking. This outfit had previously worked for Governor Warren—in fact ran his campaign for governor in 1944. A year later they split with him over his proposal for health legislation, and instead they were retained by the California Medical Association to defeat the measure. After a bitter fight, the measure was killed in committee.

Whitaker & Baxter got off to a fast start, and in a year have built up a propaganda campaign of truly majestic proportions, euphemistically called education. So pleased with the results is the House of Delegates that at the annual convention held last June in San Francisco, Whitaker & Baxter's contract was renewed amidst acclamation. To support the education program, it was voted on December 8, 1949, to levy dues of $25 on all members. In contrast to the previous assessment, payments of dues is mandatory. Members must pay by January 1, 1951, or else they will be fired from the association. It can safely be predicted that a goodly number will refuse, and it will then be very interesting to see what happens. The association will either have to fire these members or lose face.

The line followed to date by the Whitaker & Baxter campaign is the same old Fishbein line, which has evolved approximately as follows: Down with compulsory health insurance—compulsory heath insurance is socialized medicine—socialized medicine is state socialism—state socialism is eternal damnation, and so on. Recently it has been claimed that the emphasis has shifted to the positive side. Instead of merely conducting a crusade against socialized medicine, a positive promotion of voluntary health insurance will be made. In the light of history, which shows that heretofore organized medicine has opposed nearly every such effort, one is entitled to wonder just how ingenuous this change in front is.

The doctors of the land have been deluged with campaign material portraying the horrors of government medicine. They are as-

sured that the voluntary way is the American way—whatever that means. They are importuned to spread the official gospel throughout the community via their patients to the utmost of their ability. Every doctor is invited to make a political pressure outpost of his private office. The personal physicians of politicians are being urged to put the heat on these, their patients, to vote right on medical bills. This last seems no longer necessary, as the bills are dead ducks anyway. A Washington lobby to the same end, of increasing size and cost, is being built up.

The type of campaign material which Whitaker and Baxter are circulating in ever increasing volume is insulting to the intelligence both of the doctors and the people. For the campaign emblem a mediocre Victorian painting was chosen displaying an ill child, or maybe a dead one, a frustrated doctor, and a pair of despairing parents. Its selection well betokens the naïveté and obscurantism of the high command of organized medicine. Under the picture is the slogan "Keep politics out of this picture." Public places have been as thoroughly beplastered with this chestnut as with the advertisements of a popular toothpaste. It is on the same level. Its appeal is purely emotional. A proper legend for this picture would be: "Keep this picture out of medicine. It has nothing to offer. This child is entitled to be in a modern hospital receiving the most up-to-date treatment that medical art and science have to offer, under a prepayment plan its parents can afford."

In connection with the propaganda campaign a book entitled "The Road Ahead," by John T. Flynn, is being distributed widely to doctors and others. Doctors and laymen alike are urged to read it. This reactionary screed tries to show that everything which has happened during the last 60 years in Britain, and to some extent in the United States, is taking us toward socialism. The author's inherent sophistry is manifest when he claims there is no fundamental difference between British and Russian socialism. There is a stupendous difference. British socialism is democratic; in Russia, socialism is a form of absolutism. The essential of a healthy democracy is a strong two-party system. Britain has a very strong two-party system—stronger than ours. Any time the British people do not like their Socialist government they can vote it out. They nearly did so at the last general election. The American Medical Association, on the contrary, although it makes a great point of its democratic nature, does all it can to discourage any formation of a two-party system. What dissenters there are in its ranks, the association does its utmost to muzzle.

II

At the June meeting of the American Medical Association in San Francisco the speaker of the house of delegates, Dr. F. F. Borzell, of Philadelphia, delivered himself as follows: "We have seen, it is true, our warfare against the forces that would destroy us progress favorably in the last year." I suppose this refers to the fate of the medical bills before Congress. "We have won many minor skirmishes and some major battles, but the enemy is not yet annihilated. The evil spirit of Fabian socialism is still riding the stalking horse of communism. It is becoming more and more evident that we are the spearhead of attack that, if successful, will spring the gates wide open to the hordes of statism." The public may well inquire, "What's the shooting all about? Whose medicine is it, anyway?" The enemy which Dr. Borzell identifies with "Fabian socialism is presumably anyone who does not uphold the American Medical Association party line, even the most middle-of-the-road liberal. Certainly there is nothing in Dr. Borzell's bombast to indicate any departure from the old standpat philosophy.

On the same occasion the incoming president of the American Medical Association, Dr. Elmer L. Henderson, a surgeon of Louisville, Ky., spoke in similar vein. In his keynote speech he reiterated a warning not only against socialized medicine but against the entire socialization of the Nation, and claimed that only the doctors, mirabile dictu, can save the people from this misfortune. Physician, heal thy country.

Finally the president-elect, Dr. J. W. Cline, a surgeon of San Francisco, who will succeed Dr. Henderson a year hence, said a vociferous amen to Dr. Henderson's remarks. There will be no deviation from the party line under his leadership either. He enriches the official vocabulary with the terrifying term "coercive statism."

When it comes to coercion, it makes a lot of difference who is being coerced. One resolution passed by the house of delegates would outlaw the system, now in wide use and generally satisfactory, whereby hospitals often place certain of their doctors on salary and collect from patients for their services. This applies particularly to radiologists, anesthetists, and pathologists, and in certain of the teaching hospitals to full-time physicians and surgeons. Of course, American Medical Association law is not the law of the land, and is enforcible only insofar as the American Medical Association can bring pressure to bear through its own or affiliated organizations. "Organizational coercion" we might call it, to match Dr. Cline's "coercive statism."

The methods of coercion open to organized medicine include expulsion from membership, which would cut off, in considerable measure, the doctor's opportunity to keep in touch with his professional brethren—and without such contact the doctor rapidly stagnates intellectually. Also loss of hospital appointments might follow expulsion, which might make it difficult for the doctor to earn a living. It will be interesting to observe how much force will be exerted on the great teaching centers of the country to conform to such resolutions of the house of delegates.

One wonders what may be back of such a resolution. Chiefly, I think, it is organized medicine's inherent distrust and hatred of any element of lay control in matters pertaining to the provision of medical care. The doctor knows best—not only how to treat the patient, but also how the doctor shall be employed and what he shall be paid. No layman can tell him anything about it, or have any voice in the matter. That seems to be the attitude.

Next I should like to mention the opposition raised by the house of delegates to Government aid to medical schools. In the Atlantic for last June, Dr. George B. Darling of Yale outlined convincingly the financial plight in which our medical schools now find themselves. The medical schools are obviously necessary to the production of doctors; so are the teaching hospitals, but unless aid from Government or private sources is forthcoming, some of the schools may have to close, and that would be a national misfortune. Dean George P. Berry of Harvard Medical School has said that rather than let a school close, the Government would take it over and run it; but surely this would be far less desirable than keeping all the schools going under their own steam by timely aid. Yet organized medicine has persistently obstructed legislation which would permit Federal aid to needy schools. Actually, of course, many of our first-rate school are already operated and supported by State governments.

Thus it become clear that organized medicine has no use for any extension of Government participation in the provision of medical care to the American people. It also appears to be against the Government's coming to the aid of medical schools. If Government medicine is inherently bad, and if organized medicine provides no solution, where is the public to look for a solution? The answer is: To agencies other than the American Medical Association and its components.

III

Some promising beginnings have been made. In New York City, for example, under the sponsorship of the late Mayor LaGuardia and with his power behind it, a health insurance plan was started in 1947, in the first instance primarily for city employees, but not operated by government and open to anyone. It provides complete medical care, either at home or in hospital or doctor's office, all for a fixed annual premium of $34 for an individual, and increasing by approximately that amount for each member of a family until a ceiling is reached at $103.68, beyond which no further charge is made, however large the family covered. For persons with incomes of over $5,000 for individuals or $6,500 for families, these premiums are approximately 50 percent greater. Health Insurance Plan makes use of various previously existing first-class hospitals and has recruited its doctors from among the best. The plan does not cover hospital bills when hospitalization is necessary, only doctors' bills; but Health Insurance Plan requires its subscribers to join the Blue Cross and the two plans give complete medical and nearly complete hospital coverage. When it started, the county medical societies of the regions served were invited to send representatives to the medical control board of Health Insurance Plan. Some of them refused to do so, their chief objection being that there was a majority of laymen on the board of directors. Attempts were also made in certain instances to scare doctors away from joining the plan.

The Journal of the American Medical Association also disapproved of Health Insurance Plan editorially. Health Insurance Plan, despite the opposition of organized medicine, is a going and growing concern, and shows how private enterprise can solve the medical care problem when there is a will to do it.

A similar example is furnished by the Permanente Health Plan in California. Set up under the guiding genius of Dr. Sidney R. Garfield, this enterprise is an offspring of the health plans developed for the workers at Grand Coulee Dam before the war and the Kaiser shipbuilding plants during the war. For a premium of $36 for an individual, and $70 for a family of two or more children, and for a charge of $1 for office visits and $2 for home visits, it gives complete coverage for both medical and hospital care. That is to say, it serves the purposes of Health Insurance Plan in New York and Blue Cross combined. It owns its own hospitals, the major one being in Oakland. I have visited this hospital and talked with both doctors and patients therein. The doctors are evidently topnotch and the patients very much pleased with the plan. Nevertheless the county medical societies have resisted it in various ways. For a time they refused membership to Permanente doctors. The Alameda County society, Dr. Garfield tells me, has now admitted all his staff, but not the San Francisco society. Dr. Garfield has also been brought to trial before the disciplinary board of the societies on various charges of unethical behavior, of all but one of which he was acquitted. The one on which he was found guilty was of unduly promoting the health plan. For this he was reprimanded. Nevertheless the Permanente Health Plan is growing and meeting a very real need in the community.

Throughout the country there are other such plans in successful operation: The

Group Health Association in Washington, the Ross-Loos Clinic in Los Angeles, the Labor Health Institute in St. Louis, and others. All voluntary prepayment plans of this type have been greeted by organized medicine with coercive tactics designed to force doctors not to associate with them. In 1943 the Supreme Court of the United States found the American Medical Association and the District of Columbia Medical Society guilty of illegally obstructing the Group Health Association in Washington.

The plans that organized medicine claims to support are of one specific type—namely, those which pay doctors on a fee-for-service basis and permit them to charge patients fees in addition to the amount paid by the insurance plan. In general these plans cover only fees for surgery and obstetrical deliveries in a hospital. A few also pay fees for nonsurgical physicians' services in a hospital, and a very few pay fees for home and office visits and diagnostic services outside a hospital.

While these plans are of some assistance in aiding surgeons and obstetricians to collect their fees, and while they act as a bit of a cushion for the patient facing a big bill for a surgical or obstetrical procedure, they obviously have glaring deficiencies. For one thing, they probably do not cover more than one-sixth of the average family's annual doctor's bill, so that they are hardly more than a token of economic aid.

Yet these inadequate voluntary insurance plans are the only ones which have received the support of organized medicine. If a nonmedical group like a cooperative tries to reach an agreement with doctors to look after its members; if an attempt is made by an insurance plan to set professional standards and to offer its subscribers only the services of physicians thoroughly qualified to perform them; if doctors are paid salaries, retainers, or annual per capita amounts instead of fees for every service, then organized medicine not only gives no encouragement but usually does its best to prevent such plans from being organized or from operating successfully.

In conclusion I submit that in recent years organized medicine has taken on a rapidly expanding political function. In my opinion, this is being exerted in a way which is not in the best interest of the people, for whom, after all, medical service is supplied. Medical care is for the people, not for the doctors. At the present time the provision and financing of medical care in many areas of the country are in an unsatisfactory state. The skyrocketing costs put a rapidly increasing number of people in the medically indigent class. Some way of prepaying for complete medical and hospital care and of lowering their costs through more efficient organization and professional teamwork is urgently needed. Being no Socialist, I should much prefer to have these things accomplished by private enrerprise than by government, but I am certain that if private enterprise fails in this regard, we shall have Government medicine whether we like it or not.

In this emergency I consider that organized medicine has failed dismally. Its public relations are deteriorating. People look upon its motivation with increasing suspicion. It cries now for voluntary health plans, but does little actually to produce them. The record shows that when others have sought to do these things organized medicine has obstructed them. A learned profession has sunk, or been dragged, in its political sphere, to a distressingly low level. Individually the American doctor of medicine is, in most instances, an honest, sincere, and generous person. Certainly he is a hard-working one. When he organizes, however, his collective behavior is, at times, less noble than that which he displays when acting on his own initiative.

If organized medicine would drop its obstructionist tactics, and instead devote its energy and money to the creation of adequate health plans like Health Insurance Plan and Permanente, it would more effectively forestall Government medicine than it will with its present costly propaganda campaign and Washington lobby. What organized medicine needs in serving its political function is a new and more enlightened leadership.

Copper, a Symbol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD my statement before the United States Senate Finance Committee on Copper, a Symbol of Domestic Production and National Security, Tariff or Import Fee, Floor Under Wages and Investments, National Security, Employment, and Taxable Property.

There being no objection the statement was printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE W. MALONE, OF NEVADA, ON COPPER, A SYMBOL OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTION AND NATIONAL SECURITY—TARIFF OR IMPORT FEE—FLOOR UNDER WAGES AND INVESTMENTS—NATIONAL SECURITY—EMPLOYMENT—TAXABLE PROPERTY, BEFORE UNITED STATES SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY 27, 1950

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MALONE, of Nevada, wishes to be heard on this bill. All right, Senator.

LONG-ESTABLISHED PRINCIPLE—NATIONAL SECURITY

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I have requested to appear before your Finance Committee on House Joint Resolution 502 providing for an extension of the free trade on copper for 1 year, because I believe the resolution to be in direct violation of the long-established principle of providing a floor under wages and investments through a tariff or import fee representing the differential in the wage standards of living between this country and the competitive nations. I believe that the passage of House Joint Resolution 502 threatens our national security as well as the employment and taxable property of our own country through discouraging the investment of venture capital.

COPPER A SYMBOL

Mr. Chairman, copper is merely a symbol in this debate, and just happens to be the first American product singled out for removal of all protection to the workers and investors of this particular industry. Thousands of other products have been severely shaken and endangered through the operations of the State Department acting under the authority of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended, under which Congress transferred its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch of the Government. The State Department was given the authority to lower tariffs and import fees up to approximately 75 percent after perfunctory hearings.

Further hearings are scheduled at Torquay, England, in September, with the avowed purpose of further lowering the tariffs and import fees on American products—venture capital is being frightened out of the investment field in these industries and bills are being introduced at this time to provide Government funds to replace the venture investment capital, which we formerly took for granted would be adequate for the growth of business.

The extension of the free-trade provision on copper is simply a trial run. Other industries and products that will be and have been affected in a similar situation include textiles, crockery, glassware, lumber and wood products, petroleum, precision instruments, watches, wool, hides, agricultural products, steel and steel fabricated products, mining products generally—such as tungsten, mercury, manganese, lead, zinc, aluminum, and, in fact, practically all American production except automobiles and the heavy machinery production which the foreign countries are not yet fully equipped to produce. Both tariffs and quotas apply to certain types of cotton.

All of these products are protected by a tariff or import fee, and in no case are needed imports kept out through such protection.

Senator JOHNSON. The extension or the suspension?

Senator MALONE. The extension of the suspension of the tariff on copper, which means the extension of the free-trade provision on that strategic metal.

Senator MARTIN. Senator, when did it expire? Was it July?

Senator MALONE. It expired midnight June 30.

Senator MARTIN. Of this year?

Senator MALONE. Yes.

FLOOR UNDER WAGES AND INVESTMENTS

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the war effort and what a great thing it is to have free trade during a war. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the tariff or import fee principle representing the floor under wages and investments on American products is a national defense measure and applies especially to the strategic and critical minerals and materials produced in this country.

This is in direct conflict with any idea that such a tariff or import fee hinders the war effort.

On the contrary a tariff actually is a national security measure.

IMPORT FEE ESTABLISHES MARKET ON BASIS FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

Mr. Chairman, in normal times an import fee or a tariff as applied to American-produced products establishes a floor under wages and investments and encourages the continuance of venture capital into the business stream of the Nation, both during peace and war times.

In addition such an import fee, which should be flexible, assures the foreign nations a place in the American market on a basis of fair and reasonable competition.

That is all a tariff or import fee has ever been when fairly administered.

There is no question of a high or low tariff. The tariff or flexible import fee, representing the differential of cost of production between this Nation and competitive countries, assures the investor of venture capital in a business, that he will not be destroyed as soon as a supply of the product can be made available from the low-wage living standard countries.

TARIFF ASSURES INVESTORS AND WORKERS THEY WILL NOT BE DESTROYED

The tariff, then, properly administered, preferably on a flexible basis, assures a market in the United States for these foreign nations on a basis of fair and reasonable

competition; and further, Mr. Chairman, it assures the domestic producer that he will not be destroyed while paying the standard American wages. It is not copper alone.

ASSURES FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC PRODUCERS EQUAL MARKET

Mr. Chairman, in peacetime the "fair and reasonable" competitive basis establishes a market for foreign production as well as for production in this country and assures an adequate domestic production for national security, employment, and for the development of taxable property.

"GOING CONCERN" MINING INDUSTRY—STOCKPILE NECESSARY

To secure maximum production of our strategic and critical minerals, such as copper, tungsten, mercury, lead, zinc, aluminum, molybdenum, and vanadium, without which we cannot live in peace or fight in war, it is necessary to have a healthy "going concern" mining industry. Our national security demands an adequate standby stockpile of such minerals and a "going concern" mining industry.

This condition can be attained only through the continuous protection of the labor and capital investments in the business, which can be done only by a tariff or import fee, preferably flexible and adjustable.

WARTIME—NATIONAL SECURITY PARAMOUNT

Instead of the three categories of safety for national security, employment, and the development of taxable property, which is what makes this country go in peacetime, in wartime we are concerned mainly with national security.

The haphazard lowering of the tariffs or import fees on such materials, and most especially abolishing such protection altogether at any time, is an open invitation to an enemy during a period of our Nation's emergency to concentrate on stopping imports entirely.

During World War II the chromite and manganese, for example, necessarily had to come from South Africa, Cuba, South America, and the Philippines. It was estimated at one time that from 75 to 90 percent of the ships leaving South Africa for the United States with such material were destroyed by German submarines. Now, with the snorkel submarine in the hands of the Russians, there is no question that the casualties of shipping from South Africa or South America would be near 100 percent.

IMPOSSIBLE DEPEND UPON IMPORTS IN WARTIME—UP TO 90 PERCENT SHIPPING LOST

Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity of serving with the Senate Military Affairs Committee during World War II as a special consultant, and Senator EDWIN JOHNSON, of Colorado, served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic and Critical Minerals and Materials. We wrote the report on Strategic and Critical Minerals, a copy of which I hold in my hand.

The scarcity of such minerals is coming again in this current emergency just as it did in those days of 1941 to 1945.

In connection with that special work I kept in very close touch with the WPB, the War Production Board, and had the secret information at all times that the shipping casualties were from 70 to 90 percent.

What saved us in those days, Mr. Chairman? The factor that saved us was that until World War II we had had a tariff and import fee on many of these strategic and critical minerals and materials; for example, on tungsten and mercury. I will not go into detail today, but I do expect to debate this vitally important subject fully on the Senate floor, if this committee permits it to get that far.

PRODUCTION—TUNGSTEN, MERCURY—WARTIME INCREASE

On tungsten, for example, the tariff was 50 cents a pound on the tungsten content of ore and concentrates.

That roughly made up the differential of cost in the wage-living standards and other factors between this Nation and the competitive countries, which included principally China and Burma. We know, of course, that China is gone, and Burma is in real danger.

It will be remembered that tungsten and mercury are among our scarcest minerals.

It will also be remembered that our domestic tungsten and mercury mine production became almost sufficient in production within 6 months after imports fell off through the shipping casualties in World War II, because before the war we were producing about 45 percent of the domestic consumption of these indispensable metals, Mr. Chairman.

Tungsten just happens to be something without which you can't make a pound of steel, just as copper is an indispensable war material.

When the State Department lowered the tariff on tungsten from 50 cents to 38 cents per pound of contained tungsten it closed every tungsten mine in the United States—just as the suspension of the copper tariff closed the independent copper mines. Of course, tariffs are not effective during a war because the price goes above the peacetime "fair and reasonable" competitive price, but the tariff is a definite floor under the wages and investments in the business, and investors are assured that their investment is safeguarded following the emergency—there is a floor under the price.

Production can be expanded during the emergency if we already have the trained men and the trained managers. That is the reason we were able to become almost self-sufficient in the production of tungsten and mercury within 6 months following the declaration of war in 1941. If we had not been in the business to that extent, God knows what would have happened in that war, and what will happen in this war if it becomes general is yet to be determined.

WORKERS SCATTER—DIFFICULT TO RESUME PRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, as a result of the State Department's short-sighted, regulated policy the American tungsten miners are scattered. Many of them are not available, and many, no doubt, will be in this war before we wake up and find that we have to have them in the mines.

Mr. Chairman, the same thing is now happening to the employees of the independent copper mines of this Nation.

I remember early in World War II, and Senator JOHNSON will remember, when we were crying on each other's shoulders in the Senate Military Affairs Committee and in the subcommittee of which Senator JOHNSON was chairman, wondering how to get these miners back to work after we suddenly realized that we must expand the domestic tungsten production.

Finally we decided to recommend calling out of the Army 4,000 or 5,000 miners and letting them go back to their jobs, and as long as they kept their jobs they were deferred from Army service and if they quit their jobs, they were drafted back in the Army. And, Mr. Chairman, that is what happened—and it seems we are in a fair way to face that condition once more on account of again following a short-sighted policy. It is almost impossible to start a mining business in a short time. It requires many months to assemble crews and do the necessary exploration. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in peacetime or in wartime the tariffs and import fees must be there as a floor under wages and investments to assure a feasible price below which the price of these minerals is unlikely to go. Then and only then venture capital will be available. I am talking now about minerals, such as copper, tungsten, and mercury, but it applies equally to the textiles, scientific instruments, and many other products. Prices will go above stabilized prices in wartime when you have a tariff and have kept a going-concern mining industry, and have the trained men available because then the wartime price will increase the normal production.

AMERICAN WORKERS VERSUS SWEATSHOP LABOR OF EUROPE, ASIA, AND AFRICA

The necessity is to get venture capital into the mining business in peacetime as well as in wartime and because they know immediately the war is over the price will drop below the feasible level in the absence of the stabilizing tariff or import fee. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of such a stabilizing import fee or tariff the labor in this country is placed in direct competition with the sweatshop labor of Europe, Asia, and Africa. It is simply a matter of paying American wages—the tariff represents the difference.

The situation now, due to the lowering of tariffs by the State Department, is that the tungsten and mercury mines in the United States have closed. The United States miners have scattered. The same is true as applied to the independent copper mines.

Senator BUTLER. May I interrupt the witness, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

COPPER A SYMBOL—OTHER AMERICAN PRODUCTS SAME CATEGORY

Senator BUTLER. You are speaking of tungsten and mercury. Is that covered by this resolution?

Senator MALONE. No; but I am simply citing an example. Copper is a symbol, as has been cited. Copper is only one of the strategic metals.

The pressure has been on copper for some unknown reason. The reason is perhaps not entirely unknown. The President of Chile has joined with the two large companies which control the Chile copper and the larger share of the production in this country, in doing a first-rate lobbying job in the United States Congress.

Senator MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things I am not quite clear on. What is the difference between the cost of production, we will say, of copper in the United States and in foreign countries?

DIFFERENCE IN WAGES, LIVING STANDARDS, AND PRODUCTION COST

Senator MALONE. I would say the difference in cost of production is in the neighborhood of 10 to 12 cents per pound. I could not furnish you the exact information because it is not made public by the operating companies.

Senator MARTIN. What is the difference in cost? Of what is that made?

Senator MALONE. Mostly labor; they pay around $2.40 wages in Chile and about $11.17 a day in the copper mines of America. That is the principal difference.

Senator MARTIN. Another thing, you said it took quite a little time to assemble the personnel to operate a mine. How long would it take to open up a new mine if you had the venture capital to do it with?

REQUIRES TIME TO REPAIR IDLE MINES—ASSEMBLE WORKERS

Senator MALONE. During the war it is almost impossible to open up a new mine because there is a prospecting job to be done first, and then an exploration job, and then the assembling of mining equipment and so

on. It is a 4- or 5-year job even to find a good deposit of minerals.

The chances are against finding it during wartime. It is a continuous job of finding new metal, of prospecting and exploration and development that must go on continuously and which is made possible only by a tariff or an import fee forming a floor under-investments to protect the venture capital and labor interested in the business.

You cannot build a mine like you build a warehouse—it must be a continuous operation.

VENTURE CAPITAL INDISPENSABLE

Senator MARTIN. A copper mine in order to be profitable, I presume, like a coal mine or the production of oil, has to have over a long period of years a relatively substantial market at a profit in order to keep the thing moving along, in order to encourage venture capital to come in.

Senator MALONE. That is entirely correct, Senator Martin. You were in exactly the same position in petroleum production prior to our getting into this war. If the war continues there will be such an increased demand for oil, that of course, again the existing producers will be in good shape, but little exploration will continue in peacetime because there is not a sufficient tariff or import fee on the oil at this time to equalize the cost of imports from the Middle East. Of course, without tariff protection the imports from the Middle East oil fields can close down production from our own oil fields that are furnishing fuel at a considerable distance from the point of production to produce steam power and for other uses. Such imports are coming in at this time. You remember, Senator CONNALLY complained at length about it on the floor, and tried to secure quotas set on imports.

Senator MARTIN. I would like to ask another question, although I don't wish to take too much of your time. Does a copper mine that is shut down deteriorate by reason of water or anything of that kind that almost destroys it? Is there any situation like that? I just do not know.

MICHIGAN MINES—FLOOD—WAGES LOWERED

Senator MALONE. Yes. For an example, there is a situation in Michigan that is described in a brief prepared and submitted by the Governor of Michigan, Mr. G. Mennen Williams, entitled "The Crisis in the Copper Country of Michigan." An excerpt from this brief says:

"During the early summer of 1939 the price of copper fell so low that the Calumet and Hecla Consolidated Copper Co., of Calumet, Mich., could no longer mine its conglomerate workings at a profit. The outlook for improved prices was bleak and the amygdaloid mines were producing at a slight profit, so the company pulled out the pumps in the conglomerate mines and the workings filled with water.

"The water had scarcely filled these mines when the coming of war made copper a critical metal. Our national safety demanded every ounce available. Engineers immediately began a survey of the cost of reopening the conglomerate at Calumet. Their conclusion was that in several years' time the workings could be pumped out and retimbered at a cost of about $20,000,000. Twenty million dollars was a lot of money and the war wouldn't wait several years. Millions of pounds of copper had to stay where it was, and the metal remained on the critical list throughout the war." That, Senator MARTIN, answers your question.

PETROLEUM—COPPER—OTHER AMERICAN PRODUCTS

Mr. Chairman, as long as the oil situation has been brought into the picture, I want to discuss it with a word or two. Petroleum is in exactly the same position as the mining industry and in particular the production of copper; in that the competitive situation in the Middle East is such that you cannot pay the high wages of ten to fifteen dollars a day in the oil fields in this country and compete with the cheap production abroad. The production was recently severely curtailed in the oil-producing States and I think is still curtailed at this time, Senator.

Of course, as I say, the war will bring on an increased demand and luckily it has not been curtailed long enough to stop the exploration there and to scatter the oil workers and destroy the investments. If we had gone on 10 years or 5 years we would be in the same position we are now with regard to tungsten and mercury and, as a matter of fact, copper from independent mines.

AMERICAN-CHILE-INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The question, Mr. Chairman, has been raised that whether we are injuring Chile with the reimposition of the copper tax, it is said that this is a foreign-relations question, a foreign-policy job.

Mr. Chairman, the only possible reduction of imports from Chile through the application of the principle of the flexible import fee or any tariff or import fee such as the 2 cents tax would be by the amount of the increase in domestic production. The 2 cents per pound tax, by the way, is highly inadequate; even the 4 cents which we had in the beginning, probably would not even be adequate, but the State Department has split this tariff in two for no reason whatever, simply in an arbitrary deal made with another country.

EXCHANGE MANIPULATION—IMPORT QUOTAS, ETC.

Of course, we are entirely familiar—I hope the chairman is—with the import quotas and embargoes and manipulation of foreign currencies, with exchange rates and import licenses to keep us from trading with those countries. Chile as a nation practices manipulation of monetary exchanges—and utilizes embargoes, import licenses, and government taxes on imports. Nevertheless, this copper-tax reduction happened. The 2 cents tax on copper will help somewhat, although inadequately, to keep the American independent copper industry alive.

IMPORTS FROM CHILE ONLY AFFECTED BY INCREASED DOMESTIC PRODUCTION

So the only possible chance that any imports would be curtailed at all would be the increased production in this country due to the import fee or tariff. Tariffs or imports fees certainly do not curtail imports; they have nothing whatever to do with it, for only demand determines the amount of imports from Chile or any other source.

CLOSED INDEPENDENT COPPER MINES

When we extended this suspension of the copper tax last year I remember I walked across the floor to the chairman of your committee and said, "We will close the independent copper mines in the United States of America if we do this." The chairman was very reasonable about it. He said, "I would consent to 1 year if others would agree to it," and they did, luckily.

I said, "Well, we will be meeting again, and if what I predict does not happen, we can extend it."

But what I predicted did happen, Mr. Chairman. We closed all but a very few of the independent copper mines in the United States of America, and in those labor had to take a reduction in wages and investors wrote down their investments, and these few mines continued to operate on a smaller scale.

RUSSIAN SNORKEL SUBMARINE COULD DESTROY CHILE COPPER

Mr. Chairman, to the extent that this 2-cent tax would open these independent mines and cause prospecting and exploration and increased production in this country, certainly it would curtail imports from Chile. Mr. Chairman, this is a national security matter, and I want to say again, while I am on this matter of Chilean production, that I hope that the chairman and members of this committee will have looked at the map.

Those deposits are right on tidewater, near the ocean. One snorkel would destroy most of their installations in 48 hours, and we would be without copper. If the enemy did not actually destroy the mine installations, let me warn you that in the last war, as I have already said, shipping was destroyed to the extent of 70 to 90 percent when we tried to get these important minerals and materials from South Africa and from other sources. Mr. Chairman, any possible increase in domestic production would, as I mentioned before, reduce to that extent the imports from Chile, the normal peacetime imports. Now, however, with the war on, both imports and domestic production would be stepped up because of increased price and demand. So, as a matter of fact, in the event of war, we would import more copper than ever before, unless the foreign mines were destroyed.

PRICE LARGELY DETERMINING PRODUCTION

The whole point of mentioning national security is the analogy between the tungsten and the mercury industry during World War II. Those mining industries were not restricted to their normal capacity, like power plants, which cannot readily increase production. At a certain price, they can produce a certain amount of metal. With a raise in price, they can often double and treble their production in ordinary mines. During the war we increased copper production in domestic mines during one year up to 1,100,000 tons.

Senator BUTLER. If we put the price high enough, could we produce enough?

Senator MALONE. An adequate price affects production, naturally, and especially in the independent mines. But to fight a war we must have a "going concern" mining industry plus adequate stockpiles of strategic minerals, depending upon the extent of domestic production.

Senator BUTLER. If we put it up high enough, would we produce enough for your purpose?

TAMPERING WITH THE TARIFF DISCOURAGES VENTURE CAPITAL

Senator MALONE. We would not at this time, but we might if the tariff had not been tampered with. I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that tampering with the tariff is almost as bad as removing it because the tampering shows the threat of possible removal. This Congress, in 1934, transferred its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade by tariffs and import fees, and to regulate the national economy, to the Executive. This, of course, means that the State Department, the way this is set up, has that authority given by the two acts, the first one to make a 50 percent reduction, and the second 50 percent more, which adds up to a maximum of 75 percent. A 75 percent reduction in any tariff or import fee is the same as free trade, because there can be no competition at all with foreign imports unless there is a severe lowering of the standard of living here to meet the standard of living of the competitive country.

So I say to you, Mr. Chairman, with this power over tariffs in the hands of the Secretary of State and with his record showing he does not consider the differential of cost of production between the competitive countries and this country in fixing tariffs and

import fees, you have effectively stopped the flow of venture capital into businesses affected by tariffs, such as the precision instrument, the lumber, mining, glassware, pottery, lumber and wood products business and many other American industries.

The people who are in those industries have to stay there. They have to do the best they can with their investments, but no new venture capital will be available, Mr. Chairman. If this tariff had not been tampered with, if the 4 cents per pound tariff had not been tampered with at all, if Congress had not shown a disposition to interfere with it, venture capital would be flowing into the copper mining business at a great rate. I have a telegram here from a producer in Battle Mountain, Nev.—that is, he was a producer—from the Copper Canyon Mining Co., Robert H. Raring, president, dated July 26. I will read the telegram at this point:

"Respectfully solicit your continued efforts before Senate Finance Committee for restoration of moderate tariff on copper imports. According to official Bureau of Mines statistics, Nevada copper production in May 1950 was only 63 percent of monthly average for year 1940. This downward trend will continue despite world situation until venture capital for new mines is protected against savage market raids of cheap-labor-produced foreign metals. Labor is biggest cost in mining and 2-cent tariff would help equalize position of domestic producers. Production costs of foreign metal well below domestic costs cause of wage differentials, and continued duty-free imports only swell coffers of foreign producers at expense of American workmen, and hamstring efforts to start up new domestic mines. Restoration of tariff need not increase consumer price. Production-cost differential between foreign and domestic metal sufficient to absorb moderate tariff despite any propaganda to contrary. Keystones of our national health are agriculture and mining. Agriculture was never better and mining was never worse. In the interest of self-preservation invoke spirit of Paul Revere to awaken Americans in these mournful times against soft-headed thinking and pink tea diplomacy. Let us look to our own ramparts and man them like Americans.

"Regards.

"COPPER MINING CO.,
"ROBERT H. RARING,
President."

I also would like to insert then a wire from Mr. A. E. Petermann, vice president, Calumet & Hecla Consolidated Copper Co., Calumet, Mich. His comments on differences of cost of production are worth noting:

"Reurtel have asked Oliver Dom Pierre, Senator FERGUSON's secretary, to furnish you with a copy of a brief prepared for Finance Committee hearing. I have mailed copies to Senator GEORGE and all members of the committee, and, in addition, have asked Dom Pierre to file 15 copies with committee.

"Proportion of labor cost to total cost is probably higher in mining than in production of any other commodity. This is so because the raw-material cost is low, being essentially only depletion. Tremendously high standard of living in this country is inevitably due to high wages.

"Foreign producers of metals have same advantages as domestic producers in respect to improved methods, mining equipment, and so forth. In large part these are supplied them by American capital. Therefore, foreign producers, having cheap labor with low living standard, have lower cost than domestic producers.

"Where the basic cost difference is not compensated by high grade ore, or situation permitting cheap production, such as open pits, inevitable result is to place American producer in extremely poor position to compete with foreign producer.

"American producer cannot arrive at wage scale which will compete with African or Chilean. Therefore, except in times of extreme demand American producers must sell at level which means no profit. Since extreme demand is only occasional and temporary, incentive to find and develop new underground mines is lacking. Free trade attitude simply cuts all protection from domestic producer.

"Call your attention to facts that United States copper production has declined from over 1,000,000 tons per year to 840,000 tons per year since end of war. This largely due to unstable price condition and to free imports since April 1947.

"Have no information relative to zinc, lead, or other strategic metals, but am sure same situation exists.

"A. E. PETERMANN."

Mr. Chairman, the manipulation of the tariff, the fear that Congress will manipulate a tariff on the slightest occasion, discourages the very capital that Mr. Raring is talking about, the venture capital to prospect, to explore and to develop new mines. In this vein, I ask permission to enter into the record a table showing the change in the number of mines in operation. It is a sad, sad story, Mr. Chairman.

Gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc lode and placer mines in production, totals by States for selected years

State	1939	1940	1941	1948	1949 [1]
Alaska		[2] 1,142	[2] 855	298	270
Arizona		1,300	989	399	396
California		1,866	1,559	436	408
Colorado		1,130	894	294	274
Idaho		926	855	272	264
Montana		972	937	284	326
Nevada		1,010	877	386	327
New Mexico		343	248	93	83
Oregon		304	244	61	62
South Dakota		92	51	6	3
Utah		212	179	120	99
Texas		6	9	5	3
Washington		171	117	31	33
Wyoming		37	20	3	4
Alabama	1		2		
Georgia	25		18	2	2
New Jersey	3		2	2	2
New York	2		3	3	3
North Carolina	17	58	7		1
Pennsylvania	1		1	1	1
South Carolina	6		7		
Tennessee	8		13	11	13
Virginia	6		4	1	1
Arkansas			32	6	2
Kansas			58	79	70
Illinois			6	23	23
Kentucky			8	14	11
Michigan		416	7 447	11 383	9
Missouri			93	90	60
Oklahoma			120	119	100
Wisconsin			123	41	43
Total		9,985	8,338	3,091	2,893

[1] Estimate.
[2] Including dredges.
Source: Mineral Yearbook and Bureau of Mines.

FIRST PROSPECTS—SMALL MINES—THEN CHANCE FOR BIG MINE

Mr. Chairman, in order to have big mines you first must have small mines. In order to have small mines you first must have prospecting and exploration. Someone has to find these prospects, and there has to be a chance to make money on the time and the money expended.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOES NOT PAY TARIFF—FABRICATED PRODUCTS TO GOVERNMENT NOT AFFECTED

Mr. Chairman, since this free-trade extension has been directly tied to the present war effort, I want to read the facts into the record: That the Government does not pay itself a tariff. If it did pay duties it would make little difference, because it would be putting it from one pocket into the other pocket. But during the war there was an Executive order in effect that no tariff would be paid on Government imports.

Mr. Chairman, it is also said that tariffs paid by private companies increase cost to the Federal Government.

Senator TAFT. Is that order in effect still?

Senator MALONE. That order is still in effect, although modified.

Senator TAFT. I never thought it was valid to begin with, but I know they enforced it. It never seemed to me that the statute on which it was based justified any such order.

Senator JOHNSON. Even if it were not effective and the money was collected over here and would be paid out over there, it is just a bookkeeping proposition.

Senator TAFT. That is why nobody has ever kicked particularly about it. That is not quite true, because, of course, the Government can buy some copper from other people in the products that it buys and on some of the copper it has paid a tariff.

Senator JOHNSON. Only the foreign purchases would be affected. On their domestic purchases the price would be increased.

Senator MALONE. I think it is clear, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, that there would be no money lost if the private producers—the sellers to the Government—paid the tariff, because the cost of the fabricated copper articles, for example, to the Government is only increased by the tariff on the copper content, and the Government would have collected the same amount when it was imported. I also agree with him that it is questionable whether the order upon which duty-free entry is based was legally sound. As the Senator has said, no one kicked about it because it made no difference anyway—it was a bookkeeping operation—from one pocket into another for the Government.

Senator TAFT. It is based on an ancient statute intended to give the United States Navy the power to import ships' supplies

that they buy in foreign countries without paying a tariff on it. It was stretched to cover something that I am sure never was intended.

Senator MALONE. The point I want to make to the distinguished Senator from Ohio is that it makes no difference anyway. The Government would collect the duty and then pay the same amount to the processor in any case. If a private purchaser pays a tariff direct and then sells his goods to the Government, it still is no different. Let me put it this way:

Any articles imported for use in national defense and purchased by the Government are in fact duty free, despite any and all taxes or import fees that may have been paid on them.

For example, if a woolen manufacturer imports raw wool and pays duty on it, this duty is reflected in the price of the woolen uniforms to the Government. The part of the total price which is due to any duty, however, would be offset by the revenue received through the duty. Any tariff on Government-purchased articles would therefore merely represent a bookkeeping transaction, transferring a sum of money from Government expenditure to Government revenue.

In wartime, many war materials like tungsten and manganese, are allocated to arms manufacturers from stockpiles, imports for which were duty-free.

Any arguments, therefore, that tariffs and import fees are a hindrance to war production and national security are fallacious. So it makes no difference anyway, no matter who pays the duty. I want to make that entirely clear. I would very much like to have questions asked now if there is any doubt about it.

Mr. Chairman, the harm is done the industry since, by the very fact that Congress is continually nibbling at the protection of American workers from the low-wage living standard foreign nations, venture capital is effectively stopped.

PROVISION EXEMPTING FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM TARIFF PAYMENTS

Mr. Chairman, an appropriation act for the Navy Department approved June 30, 1914, contained the following provision. This is the provision that the Senator from Ohio referred to.

"The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to make emergency purchases of war material abroad: *Provided*, That when such purchases are made abroad, this material shall be admitted free of duty." (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 568.)

By Executive Order 9177, dated May 30, 1942, the President, under the authority of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, approved December 18, 1941 (Public Law 354, 77th Cong.), extended to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the authority possessed by the Secretary of the Navy under the above-quoted provision of the act of June 30, 1914. Purchases by the United States Maritime Commission were included in the exemption by Executive Order 9495 of October 30, 1944, purchases by the Secretary of Commerce by Executive Order 9768 of August 9, 1946, and purchases by the United States Atomic Energy Commission by Executive Order 9829 dated February 21, 1947.

Mr. Chairman, it is abundantly clear that the tariff has nothing to do with the Government purchases for stockpile or for any purpose whatsoever.

Section 12 of Public Law 413, Eightieth Congress, Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, granted the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force the same authority with respect to the emergency purchases of war materials abroad as the Secretary of the Navy has in respect to such purchases under the above-mentioned act of June 30, 1914.

Mr. Chairman, further, by Executive Order 9903 of November 12, 1947, the President terminated the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to import materials free of duty under Executive Order 9177, and the United States Maritime Commission under Executive Order 9495, and of the Secretary of Commerce under Executive Order 9768. Accordingly, at present only the Secretary of the Treasury and the United States Atomic Energy Commission are authorized to import duty-free emergency purchases of war materials by virtue of Executive order, but the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are granted such authority by law. The authority of the Secretary of the Treasury and the United States Atomic Energy Commission under the Executive order will expire 6 months after the termination of World War II and may be sooner terminated by congressional or Presidential action.

Mr. Chairman, section 502 (d) (6) of Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, provides that any imported materials which the authorized procurement agency shall certify to the Commissioner of Customs to be strategic and critical materials procured under the Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (60 Stat. 596), may be entered free of duty. Under this authority, the Bureau of Federal Supply, General Services Administration, may import duty-free strategic and critical materials for stockpiling purposes.

Under the temporary exemptions from import duties, I go on to say, scrap iron, scrap steel, relaying and rerolling rails, and nonferrous metal scrap were exempt from duty by Public Law 497, Seventy-seventh Congress. Exemption was originally scheduled to run from March 14, 1942, until the termination of the unlimited national emergency, but by Public Law 384, Eightieth Congress, the exemption was made terminable at the close of June 30, 1949. Duties have been assessed on such scrap since July 1, 1949, except for copper scrap, the import tax on which remained under suspension under the copper tax legislation referred to below.

Lead: Public Law 725, Eightieth Congress, provided for the duty-free entry of lead during the period June 20, 1948, to the close of June 30, 1949. This exemption was not extended.

Copper: The import excise tax on copper, including copper scrap, was suspended by Public Law 42, Eightieth Congress, from April 30, 1947, to the close of March 31, 1949. The suspension was extended to the close of June 30, 1950, by Public Law 33, Eighty-first Congress. Since July 1, 1950, the copper tax (reduced from 4 cents per pound to 2 cents per pound in the general agreement on tariffs and trade) has been applied to imports of copper.

I want to make abundantly clear again that, even if the Government did pay the tariff, which they do not, as has been shown, it would be from one pocket into another. The Government simply pays it on the one hand and collects it on the other.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will not go into further detail, but lead and zinc are in exactly the same category as copper. We produce approximately two-thirds to three-fourths of our domestic consumption of copper; in zinc and lead we produce more than half. I will furnish figures for the record. The imports make up the remainder.

Copper production, imports, by years—United States copper supply and domestic consumption, 1925–50

[Average monthly figures in short tons]

Year	Domestic production [1]	Imports [2]	Total supply	Domestic consumption [3]	Domestic production as percent of total supply	Domestic production as percent of domestic consumption	Year	Domestic production [1]	Imports [2]	Total supply	Domestic consumption [3]	Domestic production as percent of total supply	Domestic production as percent of domestic consumption
1925	(4)	26,766	(4)	70,000	(4)	(4)	1938	51,024	20,904	71,928	50,666	71	100
1926	74,830	31,998	106,828	75,833	70	98	1939	67,093	27,712	94,805	66,750	71	100
1927	72,909	29,616	102,525	71,833	71	100	1940	80,137	40,794	120,931	89,160	66	90
1928	80,655	32,342	112,997	82,583	71	98	1941	86,623	62,759	149,382	131,500	58	66
1929	89,498	40,026	129,524	96,666	69	93	1942	97,344	63,611	160,955	126,500	60	77
1930	62,853	33,732	96,585	79,666	65	79	1943	101,292	59,502	160,794	141,750	63	71
1931	44,793	24,198	68,991	54,166	65	83	1944	90,672	65,343	156,015	138,000	58	66
1932	22,807	16,225	39,032	30,666	58	74	1945	72,428	70,978	143,406	121,833	51	59
1933	21,577	11,969	33,546	34,583	64	62	1946	53,510	32,773	86,283	102,583	62	52
1934	23,754	17,754	41,508	38,583	57	62	1947	82,304	34,491	116,795	111,532	70	50
1935	37,902	21,386	59,288	47,833	64	79	1948	80,886	42,271	123,157	116,192	66	77
1936	56,686	15,727	72,413	62,416	78	91	1949	75,670	45,679	121,349	87,769	62	86
1937	77,010	23,044	100,054	71,666	77	100	1950 (January–May)	84,705	49,876	134,581	115,172	63	74

[1] Copper production on a smelter basis. Includes secondary, but excludes foreign ores and concentrates.
[2] Includes ore, matte and regulus; unrefined block, blister, and converter copper in pigs, bars, etc; refined copper in cathodes, ingots, plates, or bars.
[3] 1925–41 is use of copper in the United States by purpose as reported by the American Bureau of Metal Statistics. 1942–50 net domestic consumption as reported by the Copper Association. The consumption figures exclude exports of refined copper and exclude any purchases made for strategic stockpile. Consumption for the years 1945 through 1948 underestimated since they do not include sales of copper for consumption by RFC.
[4] Not available.

Sources: Domestic production and domestic consumption from American Bureau of Metal Statistics. Imports from Department of Commerce.

Zinc

UNITED STATES MINE PRODUCTION AND IMPORTS

[In short tons]

	Production, United States mines [1]	Imports [1]			Percentage of imports		Production, United States mines [1]	Imports [1]			Percentage of imports
		Zinc ore	Slab zinc	Total				Zinc ore	Slab zinc	Total	
1930	595,425	25,887	347	26,234	4.41	1941	749,125	289,213	34,554	323,767	43.22
1931	410,318	779	274	1,053	.25	1942	768,025	368,408	36,352	404,760	52.70
1932	285,231	1,904	311	2,215	.78	1943	744,196	539,049	56,155	595,204	79.98
1933	384,280	2,133	1,941	4,074	1.06	1944	718,642	422,700	63,626	486,326	67.67
1934	438,726	14,277	1,731	16,008	3.65	1945	614,358	381,719	97,116	478,835	77.94
1935	517,903	10,520	4,479	14,999	2.90	1946	574,833	272,051	104,743	376,794	65.55
1936	575,574	172	11,722	11,894	2.07	1947	637,608	297,959	72,388	370,347	58.08
1937	626,362	8,811	39,398	48,209	7.70	1948	629,977	264,218	93,283	357,501	56.75
1938	516,703	18,584	7,486	26,070	5.05	1949	583,882	240,879	126,924	367,803	62.99
1939	583,807	36,099	31,423	67,522	11.57	1950 (January–March)	[2] 141,500	60,132	36,773	96,905	68.48
1940	665,068	180,320	16,468	196,788	29.59						

[1] Based on U. S. Bureau of Mines and Bureau of the Census figures, in short tons.
[2] Estimated.

DUTIES, PRICES, AND PROTECTION

	Duty per pound		Average price, slab zinc, East St. Louis [1]	Percentage of protection			Duty per pound		Average price, slab zinc, East St. Louis [1]	Percentage of protection	
	Zinc ore	Slab zinc		Zinc ore	Slab zinc		Zinc ore	Slab zinc		Zinc ore	Slab zinc
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*				*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*		
1930	1.50	1.75	4.56	32.9	38.4	1941	1.20	1.40	7.47	16.1	18.7
1931	1.50	1.75	3.64	41.2	48.1	1942	1.20	1.40	[2] 8.25	14.5	17.0
1932	1.50	1.75	2.88	52.1	60.8	1943 (Jan. 30)	.75	.87½	[2] 8.25	9.1	10.6
1933	1.50	1.75	4.03	37.2	43.4	1944	.75	.87½	[2] 8.25	9.1	10.6
1934	1.50	1.75	4.16	36.1	42.1	1945	.75	.87½	[2] 8.25	9.1	10.6
1935	1.50	1.75	4.33	34.6	40.4	1946	.75	.87½	8.73	8.6	10.0
1936	1.50	1.75	4.90	30.6	35.7	1947	.75	.87½	10.50	7.1	8.3
1937	1.50	1.75	6.52	23.0	26.8	1948	.75	.87½	13.58	5.5	6.4
1938	1.50	1.75	4.61	32.5	38.0	1949	.75	.87½	12.14	6.2	7.2
1939	1.20	1.40	5.11	23.5	27.4	1950 (May 4)	.75	.87½	11.50	6.5	7.6
1940	1.20	1.40	6.33	19.0	22.1						

[1] Engineering and Mining Journal.
[2] OPA price ceiling. Premium prices not included.

Lead

UNITED STATES MINE PRODUCTION, IMPORTS, EXPORTS

[In short tons]

	United States mine production	Lead imports				Imports, in percent of production	Exports, total		United States mine production	Lead imports				Imports, in percent of production	Exports, total
		In ore	Base bullion	Pigs and scrap	Total					In ore	Base bullion	Pigs and scrap	Total		
1930	558,300	39,400	38,600	200	78,200	14.0	48,300	1941	461,400	82,100	24,700	274,400	381,200	82.6	14,400
1931	404,600	20,900	32,300	----------	53,200	13.1	21,700	1942	496,200	79,400	43,900	369,300	492,500	99.3	1,900
1932	293,000	21,000	13,500	----------	34,500	11.8	23,500	1943	453,300	70,000	4,600	244,500	319,100	70.4	2,000
1933	272,700	6,000	1,600	100	7,700	2.8	22,800	1944	416,900	93,600	----------	226,100	319,700	76.7	15,500
1934	287,300	10,600	2,400	300	13,300	4.6	5,900	1945	390,800	70,000	----------	230,300	300,300	76.8	1,400
1935	331,100	20,000	1,900	2,100	24,000	7.2	7,000	1946	335,500	44,500	100	114,700	159,300	47.5	600
1936	372,900	20,700	300	2,600	23,600	6.3	18,300	1947	384,200	50,800	1,600	175,400	227,800	59.3	1,500
1937	464,900	34,100	1,800	5,000	40,900	8.8	20,100	1948	386,900	64,200	7,400	275,500	347,100	89.7	400
1938	369,700	45,400	15,300	3,200	63,900	17.3	45,900	1949	[1] 404,000	107,400	2,350	289,750	399,500	98.9	1,000
1939	414,000	30,800	48,900	7,100	86,800	21.0	74,400	1950 (January)	[2] 35,000	1,300	1,100	30,600	33,000	94.3	33
1940	457,400	111,300	19,600	151,600	282,500	61.8	23,700	1950 (February)	[2] 36,500	10,400	----------	31,300	41,700	114.3	154

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Estimated.
Source: American Bureau of Metal Statistics and U. S. Bureau of Mines.

TARIFFS, PRICE AND PROTECTION

	Tariff per pound lead in—		Average New York lead price per pound [1]	Percent protection			Tariff per pound lead in—		Average New York lead price per pound [1]	Percent protection	
	Ores	Metal		Ores	Metal		Ores	Metal		Ores	Metal
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*				*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*		
1930	1½	2⅛	5.52	27.2	38.5	1942	1½	2⅛	6.48	23.1	[2] 32.8
1931	1½	2⅛	4.24	35.4	50.1	1943 (January)	¾	1 1/16	[3] 6.50	11.5	[2] 16.3
1932	1½	2⅛	3.18	47.2	66.8	1944	¾	1 1/16	[3] 6.50	11.5	[2] 16.3
1933	1½	2⅛	3.87	38.8	54.9	1945	¾	1 1/16	[3] 6.50	11.5	[2] 16.3
1934	1½	2⅛	3.86	38.9	55.1	1946	¾	1 1/16	8.11	9.3	13.1
1935	1½	2⅛	4.07	36.9	52.2	1947	¾	1 1/16	14.67	5.1	7.2
1936	1½	2⅛	4.71	31.8	45.1	1948—January–June	¾	1 1/16	16.20	4.6	6.6
1937	1½	2⅛	6.01	25.0	35.4	July–December	0	0	19.89	0	0
1938	1½	2⅛	4.74	31.7	44.8	1949—January–June	0	0	17.13	0	0
1939	1½	2⅛	5.05	27.7	42.1	July–December	¾	1 1/16	13.60	5.5	7.8
1940	1½	2⅛	5.18	29.0	41.0	1950—May 1	¾	1 1/16	11.00	6.8	9.7
1941	1½	2⅛	5.79	25.9	[2] 36.7						

[1] Engineering and Mining Journal.
[2] World War II.
[3] OPA fixed price. Government premiums raised these prices greatly.

COPPER—SAME PRINCIPLE AS LEAD AND ZINC

Senator MALONE. It is just as reasonable to suppose that we should take the tariff entirely off lead and zinc as well as copper. As a matter of fact, it has been severely reduced by the State Department, and the domestic companies have been severely injured thereby, as can be seen in the table which I submitted for the record. Lead and zinc are in exactly the same category. The only difference is, we do not have the president of a foreign nation here, as far as I know, lobbying to get the tariffs removed from lead and zinc completely.

MANUFACTURERS WANT "FREE TRADE" ON WHAT THEY BUY—TARIFF ON WHAT THEY SELL

Mr. Chairman, the fabricators of copper products, brass, etc., want to keep the suspension of copper tariffs because they are interested in availability of cheap raw-material supplies, they say. I suppose we are human like every one else; we want to buy anything we have to buy as cheaply as possible and want to sell everything at a profit. The fabricators of brass products which contain between 60- and 90-percent copper have a tariff at anywhere up to 60 percent ad valorem on all their products—and need it to stay in business. I do not hear the brass fabricator people asking for removal of the tariff on their brass-fabricated and manufactured products.

Mr. Chairman, they could not live 60 days without the protection unless a war was on so the Government took all their production at a higher price, because they cannot any more compete with the low wages of the foreign competitive nations in the production of these fabricated products than the copper men can compete with the foreign low-wage labor in the production of copper.

So, Mr. Chairman, in the case of brass products particularly, the rates of duty on manufactured and semimanufactured goods run from 15 percent to 65 percent ad valorem. Any one honestly interested in the welfare of the consumer of copper goods would have to be consistent and advocate also the cutting of tariffs on the brass semimanufactured and manufactured goods. I ask permission at this point to insert a table showing the tariffs on manufacturers of brass.

Rates of duty applicable to manufactures of brass [1]

Tariff par.	Item	Rate of duty	
		Tariff Act of 1930	Current rate
346	Buckles (belt, trouser, waistcoat, shoe, or slipper) and parts:		
	Valued not over 20 cents per 100	5 cents per 100 plus 20 percent	Same.
	Valued over 20 cents, not over 50 cents per 100	10 cents per 100 plus 20 percent	3½ cents per 100 plus 10 percent.
	Valued over 50 cents, not over $1.66⅔ per 100	15 cents per 100 plus 20 percent	5 cents per 100 plus 20 percent.
1527	Earrings, bracelets, and other jewelry:		
	Valued over 20 cents, not over $5 per dozen, pieces or parts	110 percent	55 percent.
	Valued over $5 per dozen, pieces or parts	do	Do.
1527	Watch chains	do	45, 55, or 65 percent.[2]
1541	Musical instruments: Brasswinds, with cup mouthpieces	40 percent	$2 each but not less than 20 percent nor more than 30 percent.
339	Table, household, kitchen, and hospital utensils, and hollow or flatware (jardinieres, flowerpots, bowls, vases, book ends, trays, etc.).	do	15 percent.
397	Slide fasteners:		
	Valued at 4 cents or more each	45 percent	40 percent.
	Valued at less than 4 cents each	do	66 percent.
	Parts	do	Do.
397	Blow torches and incandescent lamps operated by compressed air and kerosene or gasoline	do	25 percent.
397	Manufactures of brass, not elsewhere specified:		
	Trouser and suspender clamps	do	45 percent.
	Perfume and other fancy bottle caps	do	Do.
	Bases for electric-lamp bulbs	do	Do.
	Electric fixtures	do	Do.
	Curtain rings	do	Do.
	Automobile key blanks	do	Do.
	Desk furnishings	do	Do.
	Printers' rules (column markings)	do	Do.
	Hardware	do	Do.
	Plumbing fixtures	do	Do.
	Other familiar, typical, and widely used articles	do	Do.

[1] In addition to duty provided for under Tariff Act of 1930, these articles are taxable under Internal Revenue Code, sec. 3425, which provided for an import excise tax of 1½ cents per pound on any article not otherwise provided for in this section of the code, in which copper is component material of chief value.
[2] Rate depends on value and type of chain.

TIME TO AGREE ON PRINCIPLE—QUIT SHARPSHOOTING

Mr. Chairman, this type of argument has been going on for 75 years—luckily they are not often effective. However, such agreements lend weight to the State Department in its free trade—one economic world program; they play one producer against another, and eventually whip them both. It is a very shortsighted position for the brass fabricators to take.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for all American producers to agree on a principle of the floor under wages and investments based upon the fair and reasonable competition principle, using the flexible import fee method of adjustment of such tariffs.

COPPER TARIFF DOES NOT AFFECT COST TO GOVERNMENT OR FABRICATORS

Mr. Chairman, if the brass fabricators paid directly the 4- or 2- or 5-cent tariff, whatever it should be, and, of course, it should be adjusted according to the differential of cost between this country and the competitive nations, due mostly to the wage and standard of living, instead of just haphazardly lowering such tariffs and import fees with no thought or no rhyme or reason, the Government would get the 4 cents as they paid it. Then when they sold their products to the Government again the Government would pay it back to them and there would be no loss and no gain. It does not make any difference whether the private fabricators buy the copper from the foreign country direct or whether the Government buys it.

PAY AMERICAN WAGES

In the case I have shown, the Government buying directly pays no tariff. As the senior Senator from Ohio suggested, the tariff is a floor under wages and investments. So, as a matter of fact, even in peacetime, if the Government were buying the copper from domestic producers, the tariff simply prevents the price from going below the feasible mining cost. The Government would be paying the standard wages incorporated in the cost of the product, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, instead of trying to hold the price down so the workers have to lower their wages to keep producing. That is the only difference, and I think our Government should be the first to do just that.

COPPER A SYMBOL IN AMERICAN PRODUCTION

Copper is only a symbol in this whole problem of tariffs and import fees. There is not one iota of difference between copper, lead, zinc, and textiles, precision instruments, wood and wood products, petroleum, agricultural products, and scores of other goods produced by American workers. Agricultural products now have a subsidy, of course. If it were not for the subsidy, half of the farmers, maybe two-thirds of them, in the United States would be out of business, or very broke indeed.

FLEXIBLE TARIFF OR IMPORT FEE

I will say right here that if there was a flexible import fee applicable to agricultural products, 85 percent of the agricultural products of the United States of America would not need a subsidy, Mr. Chairman. That is easily demonstrable. I will not do that today, but I do intend to debate this whole subject at some length when and if it comes to the Senate floor. It is exactly the same principle as the petroleum from the State of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. It is the same as the products from every State in the Union. I will be prepared to show that on the Senate floor if this bill gets that far.

DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS NOT AFFECTED

Mr. Chairman, I want to say again that there is little chance of injuring diplomatic relations or international relations with any nation, including Chile. The only possible chance of a reduction in imports from Chile, Mr. Chairman, would be through the increased production in this country brought about by the attracted venture capital investment through the stabilized price—the floor under wages and investments—in exactly the same manner that the ad valorem tariff on brass fabricated products stabilizes the price in that field and we need such assurance especially because of national security.

The tariff is a stabilizer for the price; it would have little or no effect during a war

because so much more copper will be used and so many more textiles, so much more of everything that practically everything anyone can produce can be sold at a profit.

PRODUCTION—PROSPECTS—SMALL MINES—LARGE MINES

Suppose it were peacetime and it did reduce the amount of copper shipped from Chile by the amount of our increased production coming from 50 or 100 new mines and prospects working in this country that might develop a few larger mines. It takes many of these prospects and small mines to have a chance to develop one large mine. The security of this Nation is the most important thing and not to be confused through a consideration of a few pounds of material more or less to be purchased from a foreign nation.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

I want to say to you that the copper tax is a matter of national security. With these 50 to 75 or 100 or 150 new copper mines, a rise in price in an emergency such as this would increase production of copper a substantial amount and even more if the price went up further. This rise would take place if the submarines, the snorkels, destroyed access to those Chilean deposits, which could happen in 48 hours, and if they didn't destroy the mine installations, they could sink, as they did before, the vessels coming from South Africa and South America with the strategic, critical minerals and materials. We know we are in no position to stop the submarines at this point.

So, from a foreign-relations point of view, as I say, the tax will not reduce the imports from Chile now. It has nothing to do with international relations, but if it did reduce it by 50,000 tons or 75,000 tons in the peacetime future, isn't it worth it to have additional national security? The same is true in regard to petroleum and many other products. The Middle East oil was about to shut down many of our wells and would have done it had we had 3, 4, or 5 years more without a war. Is it not worth it to have this copper and petroleum available so that production can be immediately increased if necessary? The United States is all of the protection that Chile has—she should cooperate with us in more national security—not less. We produced up to 1,100,000 tons in 1 year in World War II.

I venture to say, if they destroyed the Chile mine installations and we had kept this tariff on copper at 4 cents a pound and all these mines had remained open, this Nation could be much more secure.

I just read into the record a telegram from Robert Raring, of Battle Mountain, Nev., I have dozens of such briefs and wires which I will read into the record on the Senate floor from many States throughout the Union.

I want to say again that until Congress quits its nibbling at the tariff structure of this country continually, venture capital will continue to back away from business investments. All that tariff ever was was a floor under wages and investments and it encouraged venture capital to go into business, because no matter where the price goes, no matter how great in times of temporary shortage, investors know there is a floor under that investment below which it is not likely to go.

VENTURE CAPITAL

You could not sell a share of independent copper stock in the United States of America today to anyone even if he had $10,000,000 unless he thinks the war is going to last long enough and he might get his investment back, but not in peacetime. The people who have their money in these mines, like Bob Raring, at Battle Mountain, and like the investors in the mine about which the Governor of Michigan writes—they have to do the best they can to get their money out of the mines' continued operation, but no new money will come in. Anybody who is not in the oil business would not enter it if we did not have a tariff on oil.

PETROLEUM IMPORT QUOTAS

The distinguished Senator from Texas tried to get a 5-percent quota on oil which, of course, would have helped, and I voted for it. It is not the right way to do it, but it would have helped the oil business. If you use quotas, if you use subsidies, you are simply manipulating your production and putting into the hands of a bureau the whole business structure of the United States of America.

SUBSIDIES VERSUS TARIFFS

I want to say to you before I close, Mr. Chairman, that the difference between subsidies and tariffs and import fees is a very important one. In a subsidy the Congress appropriates money from the taxpayers of the United States of America every year. There is a continual danger in, for instance, a subsidy to agriculture, because when the payments grow, the people get alarmed and then Congress may not appropriate the subsidy money, and then everybody is broke.

There is no convalescent period. But a tariff is not subject to any bureau; it is not subject to an appropriation every year. It is based on principle. The tariff, of course, should be adjustable, but a tariff that is not adjustable is better than no protection at all. So if you have a tariff it is a matter of principle by law. Therefore, if this principle is followed for several years and there is no interference with the tariff, no interference with the import fees, then venture capital will start back into business because investors know that a law must be changed to change the principle. Committee hearings must be held—it must pass both houses of Congress—and lastly the President must sign it.

Free traders know then that they have to go before a Senate committee, that they have to go on the floor of Congress, that they have to get the signature of the President to bring about a change. The continual manipulation and the continual nibbling at this protection of venture capital, the floor under wages and investments, has severely shaken the economic structure of this country.

I said before the distinguished Senator from Arizona entered the room, that copper is a symbol in this whole field. It is a vital subject and has to be reckoned with. Mr. Chairman, I submit for the record a table showing products affected by the tariff in certain States. And I will not read it all.

PRODUCTS AFFECTED BY THE TARIFF IN SELECTED STATES

It will be noted that each member of the committee has several products affected by the tariff, but on which reductions have been made or will be made, in his State.

Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to enter into the record just a partial list of the products that are in exactly the same category as copper, except that we do not have as yet an open lobby representing the President of a nation where these products are produced, demanding the removal of the tariff. We have what the State Department calls reciprocal trade treaties, made under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. Of course, such trade treaties never were reciprocal, were never intended to be, and do not operate that way, as everyone can see now, for the very simple reason that when foreign nations agree to lower a tariff, they immediately establish quotas and embargoes, and manipulate their currency values, impose a permit system for imports, and defeat our objective from the outset.

"MEMBERS OF THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE—INDUSTRIES INJURED OR FEARING INJURY IN THEIR STATES

"Georgia—Senator GEORGE: Luggage and leather goods, ladies' handbags, corduroy, velveteen, candy, mineral earth pigments, textiles.

"Texas—Senator CONNALLY: Luggage and leather goods, ladies' handbags, lead, candy, bone charcoal, petroleum.

"Virginia—Senator BYRD: Luggage and leather goods, ladies' handbags, corduroy, velveteen, lead, candy, mineral earth pigments, leather fiber.

"Colorado—Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Senator MILLIKIN: Chemical porcelain (scientific apparatus), luggage and leather goods, lead, candy, mushrooms, petroleum.

"Oklahoma—Senator KERR: Lead, candy, petroleum.

"Ohio—Senator TAFT: Dental burrs, luggage and leather goods, ladies' handbags, cocoa mats, fatty acids, crayons and water colors, glassware, leather gloves, braids and twines, chinaware and pottery, magnesite (dolomite), corduroy, cordage and twine, candy, mushrooms, mineral earth pigments, leather fiber.

"Nebraska—Senator BUTLER: Candy, animal glue.

"Illinois—Senator LUCAS: Photoengraving and lithographing equipment, optical instruments, scientific instruments, luggage and leather goods, ladies' handbags, potassium permanganate, fatty acids, crayons and water colors, rubber footwear, cellulose products, watches, glassware, paperboard, cordage and twine, lead, leather gloves, candy, mushrooms, cocoa and chocolate, mineral earth pigments, leather fiber, animal glue, petroleum.

"North Carolina—Senator HOEY: Ladies' handbags, paper—cigarette and Bible, etc.—corduroy, velveteen, candy, carpets, textiles.

"Pennsylvania—Senator MYERS, Senator MARTIN: Dental burrs, whiskies and spirits, luggage and leather goods, lead pencils, ladies' handbags, bone charcoal, crayons and water colors, fur-felt hat bodies, paper—cigarette and Bible, etc.—optical and ophthalmic glass, lace, fatty acids, mineral earth pigments, glassware, chemicals, woolen goods, slide fasteners, cordage and twine, bicycle tires, leather gloves, candy, mushrooms, animal glue, gold leaf and metal foil, water meters, cocoa and chocolate, carpets, petroleum.

"Maine — Senator BREWSTER: Spring clothespins, luggage and leather goods, ladies' handbags, paper and pulp, corduroy, canned fish, leather fiber, carpets, textiles."

CURRENCY MANIPULATION PERMITS, ETC.

I want to say to you just briefly that I do have much information on how foreign nations' currency is manipulated in most of the foreign countries for trade advantage. For example, in Colombia an importer wanted to buy a certain product made in the United States. They gave him the exchange, but what happened? They said he must pay 3½ pesos to the dollar used to purchase the goods in America.

The official exchange is 1.96 pesos to the dollar. So the competing countries, it happened to be that in that case England and Scotland were the chief competitors—so Colombia could give importers from other countries 2 pesos, 2½, or even 3—to the dollar—and the deal was off as far as the Americans were concerned.

That is one way currencies are manipulated through exchange controls. I have gone into some detail on the Senate floor about this manipulation. Of course, we are all familiar with the latest lowering of the pound last year, which had a tremendous effect on trade agreements that had been made before. Even if they were allowed to

be carried out without the quotas and embargoes and manipulations day by day that they exercise, the lowering of the pound would simply nullify every trade agreement that had been made up to that time. It is a form of trade piracy, the effect of which is apparently little understood in this country.

WAGE AND INCOME MANIPULATED

Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to say that there is a well-understood deal in the agreements between the major copper companies and the Chilean Government. I want to give you some detail in regard to this because it is the crux of the wage-living standard of that country. The Chilean Government has four basic exchange rates in relation to the dollar. These are set up so as to provide the Government with maximum dollar balances, even though Chilean importers and exporters often receive far less than the full dollar value of the respective articles.

The official Government rate of 19.37 pesos to the dollar must be used by the large mining companies and to cover costs of operation of the mines in Chile. Each dollar earned only represents 19.37 pesos for them, while at the free rate each dollar is worth 90 pesos. The result is that the Chilean exchange authorities make a profit of 70 pesos on each dollar.

There have been intimations that the duty of 2 or 4 cents would affect the Chilean workers' wage rates and cause labor disturbances, even threats of communism.

It may not be generally known and understood in this country that the amount that the Chilean worker receives for his day's work has little or no relation to the price of copper but is dependent upon the peculiar system of using different exchange values for different purposes.

To show the relation to copper under the present system, if the sale price were 20 cents per pound, a Chilean exporting 5 pounds would receive approximately a dollar. Excluding transportation and marketing costs, the Chilean Government would then take this dollar and give the Chilean copper firm 19 pesos. The Government would thus have made 70 pesos on the transaction.

On the other hand, a Chilean wishing to import something from the United States, for example, a camera film costing $1, would have to take 43 pesos to the Chilean foreign exchange office in order to receive that needed dollar. If he were going to buy some less essential item or were to visit the United States, he would have to spend 90 pesos on the free market to get his dollar. And a Chilean miner only earns approximately 225 pesos a day, or between $2.40 and $3.75 depending on the rate of exchange.

Any reduction of copper exports to the United States could easily be compensated by the Chilean Government by according a more favorable exchange rate to Chilean copper exporters, since the worker does not benefit in any case. The total amount of dollars earned by the Chilean economy would have to be accordingly less.

The second rate of 25 pesos or the export draft rate is limited to use for imports of newsprint. The third rate of 31 pesos to the dollar is used for converting nitrate export proceeds, for most official transactions, and for certain basic imported commodities. The fourth rate of 43 pesos to the dollar is the banking rate or the one used in the exchange derived from industrial and agricultural exports.

In addition to these rates, the Chilean Government has begun the practice of licensing temporary individual export transactions at rates of anywhere from 50 to 100 pesos and connecting them with all imports at the same rate.

The free or curb exchange rate is 90 pesos to the dollar, which rose from 60 in 1948 to 100 pesos to the dollar at the end of 1949, and then fell again to 90 in 1950. The Chilean Government eventually plans to have a fixed rate of 60 to the dollar to cover all transactions, hoping that through devaluation the free rate will also find this level.

Mr. Chairman, further, I want to review briefly the arguments that have been used in this connection. I read the testimony that has been presented in the House hearings, and which has become a part of the Senate hearings, or I understand will become a part. Now I want to take up each of the arguments presented for the tax suspension and answer each one briefly.

First, the political and economic foreign relations, particularly with Chile, would suffer through the reimposition of the copper import tax. I referred to Chilean exchange manipulation just now and shall not explain it again. At present demand for copper, it is unlikely that imports would be reduced below the present level in any case. Any increase in domestic production of copper would not take place immediately, and it would be a moderate increase in any case. The imposition of the tax would, however, produce the effect that any slump in the market would not close down our mines before we reduce the imports from foreign sources, and the peacetime stabilization effect of the tariff on venture capital would be effective at once.

The second argument is that Chile is largely dependent upon copper exports for foreign exchange and revenue. It is more important to preserve the standard of living of our own miners and the national security here than to consider livelihood abroad. Besides, as was pointed out, imports will only be affected through the reimposition of the tax at present demand levels by the relatively small increase in the domestic production.

DOMESTIC PRODUCTION CONTROLLED

Mr. Chairman, third, it is said that the 2-cent copper import tax would immediately be reflected in the selling price of copper and brass products. In the past the differential in cost of foreign and domestic copper has rarely exceeded 1 cent, even when the copper import tax was 4 cents per pound.

In the beginning it is possible that price rises up to 2 cents may take place. However, after a short period of readjustment, it is likely that the domestic copper price will again approach the level of the world price for copper. As I have already said, in part it is a manipulated price, since it is a controlled price.

The production in this country is entirely controlled, since the closing of the independent copper mines, by three major companies, and two of those major companies entirely control the Chilean production, which is the competitive country at the present time. At this point I ask permission to insert a short memorandum on the control of brass fabricators by the major copper producers. It is an interesting document, Mr. Chairman.

"FABRICATORS

"WHAT CONSTITUTES THE FABRICATION INDUSTRY

"The fabricator is the principal customer of the primary copper producer. Here most of the copper is put into semifinished form of sheets, rods, wire, extruded or rolled shapes, etc., which constitute the raw materials for a vast industry of processors of articles for final consumption or of parts for the products of other industries. The stream fans out from about 20 primary copper establishments in the United States to more than 5,000 processors, not including the electrical and machinery manufacturers who use large quantities of copper and copper products.

"There are about 80 companies in the United States generally recognized as important fabricators and users of raw copper, the latter being, for the most part, the large electrical manufacturers such as General Electric, Westinghouse, etc. The more important of the fabricators are owned or controlled by one or the other of the great copper producers, giving them completely integrated operations from the mines to the finished brass and copper products. Thus, for example:

"American Smelting & Refining Co.[1] has interlocking directorate with General Cable Corp. (Kennecott Copper Corp. controls: Chase Brass & Copper Co., Inc., American Electrical Works, now Kennecott Wire & Cable Co. Anaconda Copper Mining Co. controls: American Brass Co., Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. Phelps-Dodge Corp. controls: National Electric Products Corp., Habirshaw Electric Cable Co. Seventy-five to eighty percent of fabricating industry.)

"Each of the fabricators listed above represents the merger or acquisition of various concerns well known in the past as important producers of copper and brass products. The only important fabricators not now controlled by the copper producers are: Bridgeport Brass Co., Scoville Manufacturing Co., Okonite Co. (wire and cable), Muller Brass Co.

"Revere Copper & Brass Co., Inc., has interlocking directorate with American Smelting & Refining Co.

"The brass fabricators controlled by the three major name copper producers produce approximately 75 to 80 percent of all of the brass-fabricated products in this country."

Senator MALONE. I ask permission to put in the RECORD the arguments that have been raised here and in the House to hearings and their refutations.

The CHAIRMAN. You may put those in the RECORD.

"DEMAND EXCEEDS DOMESTIC SUPPLY FOR SOME TIME TO COME

"At present levels of production, and in the light of the present war crisis, it is likely that the demand for copper will remain relatively high for some time to come. The 2-cents-per-pound tax is not designed to keep imports out nor is it designed to increase the price of copper to the domestic user. The tax will merely represent an inadequate floor under wages and a small measure of protection for the domestic copper-mining industry. The tax will fulfill its purpose mainly in the case of a severe drop in copper prices. In that case, the tax will serve as a small price cushion and will make up to a small degree the differential in cost of production between foreign and domestic copper.

"THE TAX WILL REDUCE THE COMPETITIVE POSITION OF COPPER BY USING SUBSTITUTES TO A GREATER DEGREE

"This argument runs counter to the argument that the tax will increase copper prices. To the extent that the copper price will be increased and substitutes will be used in those few fields in which they are feasible, the pressure in copper demand would be taken off and the use of substitutes would thus become a balancing factor on the price of copper and copper products.

"STOCKPILING WOULD BE JEOPARDIZED BY REDUCING THE AVAILABLE SUPPLY OF COPPER

"The reimposition of the tax would have no appreciable effect on the amounts of copper available for either commercial imports or for Government stockpiling. Foreign nations, particularly Chile, are badly in need of dollars and will continue to supply the Amer-

[1] American Smelting & Refining Co. does not produce enough copper for its own account to supply the fabricators in which it is interested so these fabricators must depend in part on purchases of copper in the open market.

Source: Report of the Federal Trade Commission on the Copper Industry, 1947, pp. 54–55.

ican market with copper in order to gain much needed foreign exchange. The availability of copper for stockpiling would not be reduced by the 2-cent-per-pound tax.

"IT IS ARGUED THAT THE DOMESTIC INDUSTRY IS OPERATING AT PEAK PEACETIME PRODUCTION

"Although it is undoubtedly true that the rate of domestic production is high for normal peacetime conditions, it is also true that large numbers of the independent mines are closed, partly due to the price drop in 1949 following the suspension of the tax until June 30, 1950. The added production that can be brought into play by reopening these properties that have been reluctant to do so because of the uncertainty of the copper market has been estimated at 80,000 to 100,000 tons annually. The reason that these mines have refused to open are that in order to undergo the necessary expenses of reopening, a continued high price for copper would have to be assured. The reimposition of the 2-cent tax would represent a small factor, but an important factor, in assuring independent miners a return adequate to justify the expense of pumping water out of the mines and of retimbering the properties. As far as a consistently fair return for copper mining can be assured through the operation of the 2-cent tax, new-venture capital will go into copper mining, and exploration for new deposits will take place and thus assure the Nation a continued supply of copper. Only a healthy and operating industry can undergo the expense of exploration and development, and the 2-cent tax will, to a small degree, assure just that.

"NEW DISCOVERIES OF ORE DEPOSITS ARE NOT MADE AS FAST AS THE DEPLETION OF OLD ONES TAKES PLACE

"The same answer as above applies, plus the following: Coupled with new exploration and exploitation of deposits, there must be research for new technology which will make the use of low-grade deposits economically feasible. This research requires money and a healthy mining industry.

"FURTHER SUSPENSION OF COPPER TAX WOULD REDUCE THE PRICE OF COPPER

"Realizing that the 2 cents per pound tax is only a small part of the cost differential between domestic and foreign production, it is clear that the 2 cents per pound tax cannot completely stabilize copper prices. As was pointed out earlier, the domestic price of copper will probably soon approach the world price and just provide a cushion for extreme fluctuations of the domestic price.

"STOCKPILING COSTS WOULD BE INCREASED

"This was discussed earlier. Stockpiling can be done without payment of tariffs, and any argument that the security of the Nation would be endangered by this 2 cents per pound tax is dangerous and fallacious.

"In the hearings before the House, Mr. Phelps, vice president of Westinghouse Electric Corp., testified that Chile might reduce her exports to the United States by as much as 15 percent, irrespective of any such replacement of imports by increased domestic production.

"What made Mr. Phelps take the figure of 15 percent unless he was informed of such a figure by Chilean interests? Could this be regarded as a form of blackmail?

"INVESTMENT IN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MINING INDUSTRY IS DEPENDENT UPON LONG-RANGE PRICE PICTURE, IRRESPECTIVE OF TARIFFS ON COPPER

"It is undeniably true that the development of copper mines and the prospecting in the industry is guided by the prospective price picture. We cannot argue that 2 cents per pound will guarantee the domestic producer a permanently high price. This low tariff will merely represent a small measure of protection. If we use the same factors today as we used in 1932 for the determination of the tariff necessary to compensate for the differences in the cost of production here and abroad, the copper tariff would have to be in the neighborhood of 8 cents per pound whereas in 1932 it was determined that 4 cents per pound would give domestic production adequate protection. The much more steeply rising costs in this country as compared with foreign production, and the devaluation of foreign currency, has brought about this change in the picture."

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I have a memo here of the effect of the copper tariff and the actual tariffs on copper products and I ask unanimous permission to insert that in the record.

"In talking with various Government agencies I found a general consensus of opinion that the reimposition of the excise tax will be reflected in the prices of semimanufactured goods containing copper. However, on many final copper products the effect will be so small as to be practically negligible, and all press reports that the consumers would suffer through higher prices must be regarded as grossly exaggerated.

"Here is an example of the incidence of the copper tariff on the retail price of an article such as a compact or a lipstick case made of copper or copper alloys: A compact made of brass weighing 2 ounces and assuming a copper content of 60 percent will contain 1.2 ounces of copper. At the present price of 22 cents per pound for copper the value of the actual copper contained in the compact would be worth approximately 1.65 cents. At a retail price of $1.65 for the compact only 1 percent of the retail price would be in payment for the actual copper used. If the tariff on copper were reimposed, the additional cost of 2 cents per pound for the tariff would represent an additional cost for the compact of 0.15 cent (15/100 of a cent), or approximately 0.001 percent of the retail price of the compact. Even assuming a great deal of waste of copper during the process of manufacture, one could hardly say that the increased cost of copper would be a hardship for the consumer.

"In general it must be said that the effect of reimposition of the copper tariff would be least noticeable in those commodities which require a great deal of labor in their production. It is pretty safe to say that the increased cost will be absorbed by the retailer, the jobber, or the manufacturer. However, there are other categories of goods which are heavier in weight and in which the actual copper cost represents a higher percentage of the final price. In housing, for instance, a great deal of copper is used for plumbing, heating, and other installation. If we assume that 250 pounds of copper are used in a house, the increased tax on copper would amount to $5 per house. If we realize that copper is generally only used to any great extent in houses in higher price brackets ($15,000 on up), the increased copper price will represent 0.033 percent of the total cost of a $15,000 house.

"The proponents of the further suspension of the copper tariff argue that any further increase in price may well lead to a further search for and use of a substitute for copper. In addition it is feared that any price slump that may occur in the copper industry will have more severe repercussions if the price is artificially hiked through the reimposition of the copper tariff. It is also argued that after the 1949 recession the copper industry is again working at, or near, capacity and that the reimposition of the tariff will not greatly increase domestic production of copper.

"During the last few years imports of copper have been necessary and it is considered hardly likely that at present consumption rates the tariff will change that picture significantly.

"As it was pointed out earlier, the reimposition of the tariff on copper will have no appreciable effect on the import situation at the present high prices. Should commodities wholesale, however, fall considerably on the world market, domestic copper producers would find themselves producing below the break-even point and copper purchasers would prefer to buy imported copper at lower prices. The 2-cent copper tariff, therefore, only represents a 2-cent per pound margin of safety for the domestic producer. Should world copper prices fall to more than 2 cents below the break-even point of domestic copper mines our copper industries would again largely suspend operations. It must be realized that domestic copper mines vary in their break-even point and that so-called marginal mines can only operate profitably at a high copper price and those would be the first to suspend operation in the case of a price break. The 2 cents per pound tariff would merely represent a 2-cent safety margin protecting the domestic market from excessively competitive imports. In regard to production cost foreign copper is produced at far lower rates than domestic copper and the 2-cent tariff only represents a small part of that difference in cost of production. This is a strong argument for the flexible import fee bill.

"In summing up, we may say that any fear of a significant increase in the price of commodities containing copper is without foundation. On the other hand, at the present condition of the domestic economy, it is doubted that the reimposition of the copper tariff will change the copper supply situation to any great extent. It must be added that in the case of a serious drop in copper price, the 2-cent per pound tariff may represent a small measure of protection for the domestic industry, although that amount of tariff is not enough to compensate for the much lower cost of production of imported copper.

"It has been found impossible to locate exact figures and examples of the effect of the copper tariff on the retail price of certain commodities. There are thousands and thousands of different products containing copper and it is almost impossible to find out what percentage of copper is contained in the products or in their alloys. It has been found, for instance, that in brass plumbing fixtures alone the percentages of contained copper vary from less than 60 percent to more than 90 percent. In the case of lipsticks, it is very difficult to find out how much of the cost of the lipstick must be apportioned to the case and how much to the actual lipstick; furthermore, the case may be made of any number of copper alloys and the actual chemical analysis would be almost impossible to obtain.

"The attached table lists articles which are dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and which are taxable under the copper import excise tax for the copper contained therein. The tax of 2 cents per pound on the copper contained is levied in addition to the regular tariff. Any articles containing copper which are not provided for in paragraphs 316, 380, 381, 387, 1620, 1634, 1657, 1658, and 1659 of the Tariff Act of 1930, are taxable at the rate of 1½ cents per pound of the weight of the article if copper is the component of chief value. Articles which are not composed of copper as chief value, but which contain 4 percent or more of copper, are taxable, in addition to their regular duty, at the rate of 1½ percent ad valorem, or three-eights of a cent per pound, whichever is lower.

"In other words, all articles containing copper, specifically provided for in above paragraphs, are taxable for all copper contained. Other articles are taxed depending on whether they are in chief value of copper, or, if not, whether they contain 4 percent or more of copper. In either case, they are taxed, in addition to the normally applicable duty, on the weight of the article, and not on the copper contained."

Effect of copper tax

(Pars. 316, 380, 381, 387, 1620, 1634, 1657, 1658, 1659 of the Tariff Act of 1930, of which all products containing copper are separately dutiable under sec. 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code)

IRC sec.	Description	Tax rate
3425	Copper-bearing ores and concentrates and articles provided for in pars. 316, 380, 381, 387, 1620, 1634, 1657, 1658, or 1659 of the Tariff Act of 1930:	
	Copper-bearing ores and concentrates	2 cents per pound on copper content.
	If products of Cuba	Free.
	Copper sulfate	2 cents per pound on copper content.
	Other	Do.
	All articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, not provided for heretofore in this section, in which copper (including copper in alloys) is the component material of chief value.	1½ cents per pound.
	All articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, not provided for heretofore in this section, containing 4 percent or more of copper by weight.	1½ percent ad valorem or ⅜ cent per pound, whichever is the lower.

Tariff Act of 1930 par.	Description	Duty	Plus copper tax of 2 cents per pound
316	(a) All wire composed of iron, steel, or other metal not specifically provided for (except gold, silver, platinum, tungsten, or molybdenum).	15 percent ad valorum	
	All flat wires and all steel in strips not thicker than ¼ inch and not exceeding 16 inches in width, whether in long or short lengths, in coils or otherwise, and whether rolled or drawn through dies or rolls, or otherwise produced:		
	Not thicker than 0.01 inch	7½ percent ad valorem	
	Thicker than 0.01 and not thicker than 0.05 inch	10 percent ad valorem	
	Thicker than 0.05 and not thicker than ½ inch	12½ percent ad valorem	
	All wire, iron, steel, or other metal coated by dipping, galvanizing, sherardizing, electrolytic, or any other process with zinc, tin, or other metal:		
	Round iron or steel wire, valued at not above 6 cents per pound	The rate for the wire of which it is made and 0.1 cent per pound additional.	
	Other	The current rate for the wire of which it is made and 0.1 cent per pound additional.	
	Telegraph, telephone, and other wires and cables composed of iron, steel, or other metal (except gold, silver, platinum, tungsten, or molybdenum), covered with or composed in part of cotton, jute, silk, enamel, lacquer, rubber, paper, compound, or other material, with or without metal covering.	17½ percent ad valorem	
	Wire rope	1¼ cents per pound, but not less than 10 percent nor more than 20 percent ad valorem.	
	Wire strand	17½ percent ad valorem	
	Spinning and twisting ring travelers	35 percent ad valorem	
	Wire heddles and heads	25 cents per 1,000 and 30 percent ad valorem	
	(b) Ingots, shot, bars, sheets, wire, or other forms not specifically provided for, or scrap, containing more than 50 percent of tungsten, tungsten carbide, molybdenum carbide, or combinations thereof:		
	Ingots, shot, bars or scrap	30 percent ad valorem	
	Sheets, wire, or other forms	40 percent ad valorem	
380	German silver, or nickel silver, unmanufactured	20 percent ad valorem	
	Nickel silver sheets, strips, rods, and wire	30 percent ad valorem	
381	Copper in rolls, rods, or sheets	1¼ cents per pound	2 cents per pound tax throughout on copper content.
	Copper engravers' plates:		
	Not ground	3½ cents per pound	
	Ground	5½ cents per pound	
	Copper tubes:		
	Seamless	5½ cents per pound	
	Brazed	5½ cents per pound	
	Seamless copper tubing	3½ cents per pound	
	Brass rods, sheet brass, brass plates, bars, and strips	2 cents per pound	
	Muntz or yellow metal sheets, sheathing, bolts, piston rods, and shafting	do	
	Brass tubes:		
	Seamless	do	
	Brazed	6 cents per pound	
	Seamless brass tubing	2 cents per pound	
	Brass angles and channels	6 cents per pound	
	Bronze rods and sheets	2 cents per pound	
	Bronze tubes	do	
387	Phosphor-copper or phosphorus-copper	3 cents per pound	
1620	Bells, broken, and bell metal, broken and fit only to be remanufactured	Free	
1634	Brass, old brass, clippings from brass or Dutch metal, all the foregoing, fit only for remanufacture.	do	
1657	Composition metal of which copper is the component material of chief value, not specifically provided for.	do	
1658	Copper ore		
	Regulus of copper		
	Black or coarse copper		
	Cement copper		
	Old copper, fit only for remanufacture		
	Copper scale		
	Clippings from new copper		
	Copper in plates, bars, ingots, or pigs, not manufactured or specially provided for	Free	
1659	Copper sulfate or blue vitriol		
	Copper acetate and subacetate or verdigris	Free	

SEVENTY TO EIGHTY PERCENT OF THE BRASS FABRICATORS' PRODUCTION CONTROLLED

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in closing that 70 to 80 percent of the fabricated brass production in this country is controlled by the three major mining companies, two of which are adamant that the free trade on copper be extended. On these same brass products containing 70 to 80 percent copper, a tariff or import fee of from a 15 to a 65 percent ad valorem is maintained which is necessary to pay American wages in this country and compete with the low-wage living standards in the competitive country, and to which I, of course, enter no objection. I am for a flexible tariff or import fee to stabilize the price at a competitive level for all products produced in the country.

QUESTION OF BUYING AT A SLAVE WAGE LEVEL

In my opinion we should not try the hold the price of the products that this Government buys from foreign nations down to a slave wage level. In my opinion we would have much better diplomatic relations, much better international relations, if we paid a price for these products that would allow them to pay their labor eventually on a scale comparable to our own instead of putting us in competition with this labor and insisting that we either put our men on relief or force them to work for a lower wage in this country.

And that goes for all the industries that I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, not only copper, because copper is merely a symbol—the tariff or subsidy is the alternative to putting our own men on relief, taking the subsidy money, the relief money out of the Treasury. Let us have an import-fee system so that we equalize the price diferential so they can raise the wage living standards of their workers to our standard, to the extent that we purchase abroad. A good example is the situation in Chile, where copper producers get only 19.37 pesos for each United States dollar earned,

compared with a free market value of 90 pesos for the dollar. No wonder that wages in Chile are so low, when the Government retains most of the foreign exchange earnings.

Mr. Chairman, paying a price to foreign nations comparable to our own standard would be a very much improved method over the one we are using now which is a continual threat of removing what little floor under wages and investments exists.

Whenever the wage living standards reached the American level, no tariff or import fee would be necessary.

THE PURPOSE OF A TARIFF OR IMPORT FEE

The purpose of a tariff or import fee is a floor under wages and investments.

It means that regardless of the fluctuations in price there is a stabilized level below which it should not go, providing such tariff or import fee correctly represents that differential of cost between this Nation and the competitive countries mostly represented by the difference in the wage-living standards.

Whether the domestic production is 60 percent or 100 percent of the domestic consumption, the principle is the same, providing the tariff is based on the principle of "fair and reasonable" competition. A market then is established for foreign nations' goods on the same basis as for the domestic producer—but not at an advantage.

It simply supports the economic structure of our own country on the wage-living standards established by its own citizens. The principle, of course, should be applied to all products and all industries.

My flexible import fee bill, S. 1965, now in Senate Finance Committee, this very committee, provides that the long-experienced Tariff Commission would be turned into the Foreign Trade Authority, since this more nearly represents its work; and that Authority would have the same latitude in the field of adjusting the tariffs and import fees on a basis of "fair and reasonable" competition as the Interstate Commerce Commission was given the responsibility of fixing the freight rates for the carriers on the basis of a "reasonable return" on the investment.

THE "PERIL POINT" VERSUS THE FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE

The much-discussed peril point would simply require the President to write Congress a letter in case the State Department lowered the tariff or import on any United States product below the Tariff Commission's estimate of the point of injury to domestic producers while the flexible import fee is established on principle. If we accept any provision of that nature we are then on record for the principle set out in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended with the exercise of the President's judgment as it benefits abroad, overcoming the damage to industry in this country—and he is already on record that sacrificing an industry here is no reason to stop the indiscriminate handling of our own tariffs and import fees to provide additional imports into this country.

NO CONSIDERATION OF A HIGH OR LOW TARIFF

There would be no consideration of a high or low tariff or import fee, but the flexible import fee would at all times be adjusted to the differential of cost due mostly to the difference in the wage-living standards.

The tariff or import fee would be lowered as the foreign nations' living standards were raised, and when such standards approximated our own then the common objective of free and unrestricted trade would be the almost immediate and automatic result.

The tariff or import tax on copper has, unfortunately, been lowered from 4 cents to 2 cents, which is woefully inadequate, but nevertheless through its permanent restoration, the principle is established and venture capital and the workers in the industry would regain confidence that Congress is again operating upon a principle and not sharpshooting.

I want to thank the chairman and the committee for their kind attention, and I want to say if this comes to the floor I intend to debate it at some considerable length. I think it is time that the people of this country woke up, and I think they are waking up now. I have wires and resolutions from labor organizations, and I would ask permission to include those resolutions and wires that I have in my office, which are relatively few in number, in the record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be done.

(The documents referred to follow:)

"DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY RESOLUTION, NEVADA REPUBLICAN STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, 1950 AND 1952 PLATFORM, NOVEMBER 15, 1949

"The Nevada State Executive Committee passed an official resolution on November 15, 1949, offering the flexible import fee principle as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as amended—and called for the defeat of the International Trade Organization legislation—and for definite conditions on further gift-loans to Europe.

"The resolution:

" 'Whereas the selective free-trade policy adopted by the State Department, based upon the Trade Agreements Act, is removing the floor from under wages and investments—causing unemployment and loss of taxable property; and

" 'Whereas the proposed International Trade Organization, consisting of 58 nations, each with one vote, to which it is suggested that this Nation assign all of its right to adjust tariffs and import fees for the protection of the working men and investments in the United States of America, would complete the job of wrecking our economy; and

" 'Whereas the policy of making up the trade balance deficits of the European nations (16 ECA nations) in cash each year without definite conditions for its utilization is simply reestablishing the century-old feud and rivalries among such nations: Therefore be it

" '*Resolved*, That the Republican State Executive Committee of Nevada hereby adopts and recommends to the National Republican Committee for adoption an American domestic and foreign policy:

" '1. A domestic (national) policy.

" 'A. The flexible import fee principle, based upon fair and reasonable competition, administered by a reorganized experienced Tariff Commission, to be known as the Foreign Trade Authority, in the same manner as the long-established Interstate Commerce Commission adjusts freight rates for the carriers on a basis of the principle laid down by Congress, of a reasonable return on the investments, to be substituted for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended.

" 'Under the flexible import fee principle a market is immediately established for the goods of foreign nations on a basis of fair and reasonable competition with our own—they cannot in good conscience ask for more.

" '2. A foreign (international) policy—as a condition of further aid to Europe.

" 'A. Integrity of private investments.

" 'B. A United States of Europe—including Germany without trade barriers of any kind.

" 'C. Free convertibility of the European currencies in the terms of the dollar.

" 'D. Equal access to the trade of the nations of the world—subject only to the action of such individual nations; be it further

" '*Resolved*, That the so-called bipartisan policy, including the support of the administration's three-part free-trade program has destroyed our traditional floor-under-wages policy and has contributed materially to the defeat of the Republican Party; and that the haphazard lowering of the import fees and tariffs, without regard to the differential of the cost of production due largely to the difference in living standards of this country and the foreign competitive nations, has severely injured the mining, petroleum, agricultural, textiles, pottery, lumber, precision instruments, and many other industries, thereby causing unusual unemployment and loss of taxable property; and that we are, by our own actions, removing the floor under wages and investments in this Nation and in effect transferring American jobs to foreign soil.' "

"EXCERPT FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE THIRTIETH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NEVADA STATE FARM BUREAU, ELY, NEV., DECEMBER 2, 1949

"DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY

" 'Resolution 17

" 'Whereas the selective free-trade policy adopted by the State Department, based upon the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as lowering the American living standards through the lowering of wages and is causing unemployment and a subsequent decline in the demand for agricultural products: Therefore be it

" '*Resolved*, That the Nevada State Farm Bureau adopts and recommends that the American Farm Bureau Federation support a domestic and foreign policy containing the following features:

" 'I. Foreign policy:

" '(a) Protection of private investments in foreign countries.

" '(b) Free convertibility of European currencies in terms of dollars.

" '(c) Consolidation of the European nations into a United States of Europe, and the erasing of all present trade barriers.

" '(d) Equal access to the trade of all nations of the world subject only to the action of the individual nations.

" 'II. National policy:

" '(a) Set up a flexible import fee which would be based upon "fair and reasonable" competition administered by a reorganized, experienced tariff commission in the same manner as the long established Interstate Commerce Commission adjusts freight rates for the carriers on a basis of the principle laid down by Congress, of a reasonable return on the investment. Under a flexible import fee principle, a market is immediately established for the goods of foreign nations on a basis of "fair and reasonable" competition with our own—other nations in good conscience cannot ask for more. By so doing, America's domestic agricultural market would be greatly stabilized and cease to be a dumping ground for world surpluses. We are a land of agricultural abundance striving to maintain a standard of living unparalleled by any other nation in the world; be it further

" '*Resolved*, That the lowering of import fees and tariffs without regard to the differential of the cost of production due largely to the difference in living standards of this Nation and of foreign competitive nations has a demoralizing effect on our agricultural markets as well as those of other industries, thereby causing unemployment and loss of revenue to the American farmer.' "

PIOCHE, NEV., *January 17, 1950.*

Senator G. W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR SIR: By unanimous vote Pioche Union, Local No. 407, CIO, disapprove part 4 plan of the President which includes the International Trade Organization Agreement and urge that you do everything possible to substitute flexible import fee as outlined in your talk at Pioche, Nev., on December 15, 1949.

Yours truly,

THOMAS L. HUTCHINGS,
President, Local No. 407.

"EAST ELY, NEV., *January 19, 1950.*

"Senator MALONE,

"United States Senate Office Building:

"We call your attention to the following resolution adopted by the White Pine County Central Labor Council:

" 'Whereas the selective free trade policy is removing the floor from under American wages and investments, causing unemployment and loss of taxable property; and

" 'Whereas the haphazard lowering of the import fees and tariffs without regard to the differential of the cost of production due largely to the difference in living standards of this country and foreign competitive nations, has severely injured the nonferrous mining industry: Therefore be it

" '*Resolved*, That a telegram be sent to each of our National Senators asking them to do what they can toward correcting this deplorable situation.'

"DOUG HAWKINS,

"President, White Pine County Central Labor Council."

"INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,

"LOCAL LODGE NO. 705,

"Sparks, Nev., September 16, 1949.

"The Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE,

"United States Senator,

"United States Senate,

"Washington, D. C.

"SIR: The legislative committee of Local Lodge, No. 705, International Association of Machinists, Sparks, Nev., reported favorably on the matter of the flexible import fee. Whereupon the membership unanimously instructed the legislative committee to inform you that Local Lodge, No. 705, International Association of Machinists, Sparks, Nev., has gone on record in favor of the flexible import fee.

"The legislative committee wishes to commend the Senator for his hard work and initiative.

"Yours truly,

"SATIRIOS SOUKAROS,

"Chairman, Legislative Committee.

"GEORGE H. SHELTON,

"JOHN L. ROBERTSON,

"Legislative Committee."

"LAS VEGAS, NEV., *January 12, 1950.*

"United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,

"Washington, D. C.:

"Urge you to support a flexible import and export tariff bill for protection of our domestic industries and curtailment of foreign spending.

"PROPERTY OWNERS ASSN., INC., OF CLARK COUNTY, NEV.,

"HELEN E. CRANER, *Secretary."*

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, there never was a consistent "free trader"; in general, you will find that they want "free trade" on the material which they must buy and a tariff or import fee on the product that they must sell. Thus, there is a continual clash between industries, both of which must have the protection on the basis of "fair and reasonable" competition to pay American wages and stay in business.

A shining example is the brass fabricators, largely fronting for the owners of the foreign copper deposits, asking for "free trade" on copper, which makes up 70 to 90 percent of their raw material, while demanding a tariff or import fee of from 15 to 65 percent ad valorem on the brass fabricated products to meet the American wage standard of living. The three large copper producers own or control 75 to 80 percent of the brass fabricators in terms of output.

The workingmen and investors of this country will take things into their own hands when they finally realize that what we are doing is putting direct competition with the $2 labor, the $1-a-day labor, and the sweatshop labor of Europe, Asia, and Africa and other places. We can, however, protect our workers and investors if we take the differential of living standards into consideration through the tariff or import fee.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator MALONE. Thank you.

Coffee

UNDERPAYMENT FOR IMPORTS BASED ON SELECTED PRICE INDEXES

[1926=100]

Year	Import price per pound	BLS Wholesale Index	Underpayment BLS Index	Associated Press Commodity Index	Underpayment Associated Press Index	Consumers Price Index	Underpayment Consumers Price Index	Fair price based on BLS Index increase	Year	Import price per pound	BLS Wholesale Index	Underpayment BLS Index	Associated Press Commodity Index	Underpayment Associated Press Index	Consumers Price Index	Underpayment Consumers Price Index	Fair price based on BLS Index increase
	Cents		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*	*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*	*Cents*
1926	21.6	100.0	None	100.00	None	126.4	None	None	1946	17.2	121.1	8.9	133.68	11.7	139.3	6.6	26.1
1938	6.9	78.6	10.0	68.01	7.8	100.8	10.3	16.9	1947	26.4	152.1	6.0	183.60	13.3	159.2	.8	30.4
1939	6.9	77.1	9.7	68.35	7.9	99.4	10.1	16.6	1948	26.8	165.0	8.8	187.24	13.7	171.2	2.5	35.6
1940	6.2	78.6	10.8	73.27	9.6	100.2	10.9	17.0	1949	31.8	155.0	1.7	159.93	2.8	169.1	[1] 2.9	33.5
1941	7.9	87.3	10.9	86.56	10.8	105.2	10.1	18.8	1950:								
1942	12.0	98.8	9.3	99.04	9.4	116.5	7.9	21.3	First 6 months	41.1	166.1	[1] 5.2	[2] 167.67	[1] 4.9	167.8	[1] 12.4	35.9
1943	12.4	103.1	9.8	106.01	10.5	123.6	8.8	22.2	August				189.00	[1] .4			
1944	12.5	104.0	9.9	107.07	10.7	125.5	8.9	22.4									
1945	12.6	105.8	10.2	109.48	11.1	128.4	9.3	22.8									

[1] Overpayment.
[2] 1950 to date.

NOTE.—Associated Press Index, Sept. 15, 192.77; underpayment, 0.54 cent. Fair price, Associated Press Index, Sept. 15, 41.64 cents.

Coffee: Comparative prices for coffee, imports, and wholesale prices in United States

BUREAU OF LABOR

(Associated Press Index for 35 leading commodities, Aug. 30, 1950: 189.2 percent of 1926 as 100)

[1926=100]

Year	Imports (millions of pounds)	Bureau of Labor Wholesale Index	Import price in cents	Underpayment (cents per pound)	Dollar total (millions)	Year	Imports (millions of pounds)	Bureau of Labor Wholesale Index	Import price in cents	Underpayment (cents per pound)	Dollar total (millions)
1926		100	21.6	None	None	1946	2,475	121.1	17.2	8.9	220.2
1938	1,965	78.6	6.9	10.0	196.5	1947	2,501	152.1	26.4	6.0	150.0
1939	2,043	77.1	6.9	9.7	198.1	1948	2,774	165.0	26.8	8.8	244.1
1940	2,534	78.6	6.2	10.8	273.6	1949	2,993	155.0	31.8	1.7	49.6
1941	1,760	87.3	7.9	10.9	191.8	1950 (first 6 months)	1,071	166.1	[1] 41.1	+.33	
1942	1,801	98.8	12.0	9.3	167.4						
1943	2,568	103.1	12.4	9.8	251.6	Total underpayment, 12 years					2,482.2
1944	2,495	104.0	12.5	9.9	247.0						
1945	2,866	105.8	12.6	10.2	292.3						

[1] The comparative price for coffee first 6 months of 1950 is based on the Associated Press Index for 35 leading commodities instead of the Bureau of Labor Wholesale Index. In spite of the current confusion about coffee prices, a direct comparison with 35 other leading commodities indicates clearly that coffee prices are at approximately the same level as other leading world commodities. Most of the reaction against the price of coffee results from the tremendous underpayment to coffee producers during the period 1938 to 1950.

Copper

UNDERPAYMENT FOR IMPORTS BASED ON SELECTED PRICE INDEXES

[1926=100]

Year	Import price per pound	BLS Wholesale Index	Underpayment BLS Index	Associated Press Commodity Index	Underpayment Associated Press Index	Consumers Price Index	Underpayment Consumers Price Index	Fair price based on BLS Index (increase)	Year	Import price per pound	BLS Wholesale Index	Underpayment BLS Index	Associated Press Commodity Index	Underpayment Associated Press Index	Consumers Price Index	Underpayment Consumers Price Index	Fair price based on BLS Index (increase)
	Cents		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*	*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*	*Cents*
1926	12.6	100.0	None	100.0		126.4	None	12.6	1939	9.6	77.1	0.1	68.35	[1] 1.0	99.4	0.3	9.7
1927	11.8	95.4	12.0			124.0	0.6	12.0	1940	10.0	78.6	[1] .1	73.27	[1] .8	100.2	.0	9.9
1928	12.4	96.7	[1] .4			122.6	[1] .2	12.2	1941	9.9	87.3	1.1	86.56	1.0	105.2	.6	11.0
1929	16.1	95.3	[1] 4.1			122.5	[1] 3.9	12.0	1942	9.9	98.8	2.5	99.04	2.6	116.5	3.3	12.4
1930	13.2	86.4	[1] 2.4			119.4	[1] 1.3	10.9	1943	10.4	103.1	2.5	106.01	2.9	123.6	1.9	13.0
1931	8.5	73.0	.7			108.7	2.3	9.2	1944	10.7	104.0	2.4	107.07	2.7	125.5	1.8	13.1
1932	5.7	64.8	2.4			97.6	4.0	8.2	1945	10.8	105.8	2.5	109.48	3.0	128.4	2.0	13.3
1933	6.2	65.9	2.1			92.4	3.0	8.3	1946	11.7	121.1	3.5	133.68	5.1	139.3	2.2	15.3
1934	7.0	74.9	2.4			95.7	2.5	9.4	1947	18.8	152.1	.3	183.60	4.3	159.2	[1] 2.9	19.2
1935	6.9	80.0	3.1	76.61	2.7	98.1	2.8	10.0	1948	20.2	165.0	.6	187.24	3.4	171.2	[1] 3.1	20.8
1936	8.3	80.8	1.7	78.11	1.5	99.1	1.6	10.2	1949	18.1	155.0	1.4	159.93	2.0	169.1	[1] 2.1	19.5
1937	11.7	86.3	[1] .6	87.77	[1] .6	102.7	[1] 1.5	10.9	1950	[2] 16.1	[3] 160.0	[2] 4.0	[4] 167.67	[2] 5.0	[2] 167.8	.6	20.2
1938	9.2	78.6	.7	68.01	[1] .6	100.8	.8	9.9									

[1] Overpayment.
[2] First 6 months.
[3] Estimated.
[4] 1950 to date.

NOTE.—Sept. 15, Associated Press Index, 192.77, 1.79 cents. Fair price, Associated Press Index, Sept. 15, 24.29 cents. Sept. 14, Kennecott, 22.5 cents; Phelps-Dodge, 22.5 cents; Anaconda, 24.5 cents; and California and Hecla 24.5 cents.

Tin

UNDERPAYMENT FOR IMPORTS BASED ON SELECTED PRICE INDEXES

[1926=100]

Year	Import price per pound	BLS Wholesale Index	Underpayment based on BLS Index	Associated Press Commodity Index	Underpayment based on Associated Press Index	Consumers Price Index	Underpayment based on Consumers Price Index	Fair price based on BLS Index (increase)	Year	Import price per pound	BLS Wholesale Index	Underpayment based on BLS Index	Associated Press Commodity Index	Underpayment based on Associated Press Index	Consumers Price Index	Underpayment based on Consumers Price Index	Fair price based on BLS Index (increase)
	Cents		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*	*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*	*Cents*
1926	60.0	100.0	None	100.00	None	126.4	None	60.0	1944	50.4	104.0	12.0	107.07	14.0	125.5	9.2	63.5
1938	40.3	78.6	6.7	68.01	0.5	100.8	7.5	47.0	1945	48.4	105.8	15.1	109.48	17.3	128.4	12.5	63.5
1939	44.9	77.1	1.3	68.35	[1] 3.9	99.4	2.3	46.2	1946	53.24	121.1	15.1	133.68	26.8	139.3	12.9	72.6
1940	45.8	78.6	1.3	73.27	[1] 1.9	100.2	1.8	47.1	1947	76.5	152.1	14.7	183.60	33.5	159.2	[1] .9	91.2
1941	47.4	87.3	5.0	86.56	4.6	105.2	2.5	52.4	1948	93.7	165.0	5.3	187.24	18.6	171.2	[1] 12.4	99.0
1942	48.9	98.8	10.4	99.04	10.6	116.5	6.4	59.3	1949	99.1	155.0	[1] 5.9	159.93	[1] 5.6	169.1	[1] 18.8	93.0
1943	49.0	103.0	12.8	106.01	14.6	123.6	9.7	61.8	1950				[2] 167.67		[3] 167.8		

[1] Overpayment.
[2] 1950 to date.
[3] First 6 months.

Copra

UNDERPAYMENT FOR IMPORTS BASED ON SELECTED PRICE INDEXES

[1926=100]

Year	Import price per pound	BLS Wholesale Index	Underpayment BLS Index	Associated Press Commodity Index	Underpayment Associated Press Index	Consumers Price Index	Underpayment Consumers Price Index	Fair price based on BLS Index (increase)	Year	Import price per pound	BLS Wholesale Index	Underpayment BLS Index	Associated Press Commodity Index	Underpayment Associated Press Index	Consumers Price Index	Underpayment Consumers Price Index	Fair price based on BLS Index (increase)
	Cents		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*	*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*	*Cents*
1926	5.1	100.0	None	100.00	None	126.4	None	5.1	1944	3.4	104.0	1.9	107.07	2.1	125.5	1.7	5.3
1938	1.8	78.6	2.2	68.01	1.7	100.8	2.3	4.0	1945	3.0	105.8	2.4	109.48	2.6	128.4	2.2	5.4
1939	1.6	77.1	2.3	68.35	1.7	99.4	2.4	3.9	1946	3.8	121.1	2.4	133.68	3.0	139.3	1.8	6.2
1940	1.3	78.6	2.7	73.27	2.4	100.2	2.7	4.0	1947	7.9	152.1	.2	183.60	2.5	159.2	[1] 1.5	7.7
1941	1.7	87.3	2.7	86.56	2.7	105.2	2.5	4.4	1948	12.2	165.0	[1] 3.8	187.24	[1] 2.6	171.2	[1] 5.3	8.4
1942	3.3	98.8	1.7	99.04	1.8	116.5	1.4	5.0	1949	8.0	155.0	[1] .1	159.93	.2	169.1	[1] 1.2	7.9
1943	3.6	103.1	1.6	106.01	1.8	123.6	1.4	5.2	1950				[2] 167.67		[3] 167.8		

[1] Overpayment.
[2] 1950 to date.
[3] First 6 months.

Cocoa

UNDERPAYMENT FOR IMPORTS BASED ON SELECTED PRICE INDEXES

[1926=100]

Year	Import price per pound	BLS Wholesale Index	Underpayment based on BLS Index	Associated Press Commodity Index	Underpayment based on Associated Press Index	Consumers Price Index	Underpayment based on Consumers Price Index	Fair price based on BLS Index (increase)	Year	Import price per pound	BLS Wholesale Index	Underpayment based on BLS Index	Associated Press Commodity Index	Underpayment based on Associated Press Index	Consumers Price Index	Underpayment based on Consumers Price Index	Fair price based on BLS Index (increase)
	Cents		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*	*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*		*Cents*	*Cents*
1926	10.0	100.0	None	100.00	None	126.4	None	10.0	1944	6.7	104.0	3.4	107.07	4.0	125.5	3.2	10.6
1938	4.4	78.6	3.4	68.01	2.4	100.8	3.5	7.8	1945	7.4	105.8	3.2	109.48	3.5	128.4	2.7	10.6
1939	4.2	77.1	3.5	68.35	2.6	99.4	3.7	7.7	1946	9.5	121.1	2.6	133.68	3.9	139.3	1.5	12.1
1940	4.4	78.6	3.4	73.27	2.9	100.2	3.5	7.8	1947	25.4	152.1	[1] 8.9	183.60	[1] 7.0	159.2	[1] 12.8	15.2
1941	5.6	87.3	3.1	86.56	3.1	105.2	2.7	8.7	1948	35.4	165.0	[1] 18.9	187.24	[1] 10.7	171.2	[1] 21.9	16.5
1942	7.7	98.8	2.2	99.04	2.2	116.5	1.5	9.8	1949	19.7	155.0	[1] 4.2	159.93	[1] 3.7	169.1	[1] 6.3	15.5
1943	6.8	103.1	3.5	106.01	3.8	123.6	3.0	10.3	1950				[2] 167.67		[2] 167.8		

[1] Overpayment.
[2] 1950 to date.
[3] First 6 months.

Sodium nitrate

UNDERPAYMENT FOR IMPORTS BASED ON SELECTED PRICE INDEXES

[1926=100]

Year	Import price per ton	BLS Wholesale Index	Underpayment based on BLS Index	Associated Press Commodity Index	Underpayment based on Associated Press Index	Consumers Price Index	Underpayment based on Consumers Price Index	Fair price based on BLS Index (increase)	Year	Import price per ton	BLS Wholesale Index	Underpayment based on BLS Index	Associated Press Commodity Index	Underpayment based on Associated Press Index	Consumers Price Index	Underpayment based on Consumers Price Index	Fair price based on BLS Index (increase)
1926	$46.79	100.0	None	100.00	None	126.4	None	$46.79	1944	$21.84	104.0	$26.83	107.07	$28.6	125.5	$24.6	$48.07
1938	18.59	78.6	$18.18	68.01	$13.2	100.8	$18.7	36.77	1945	21.84	105.8	27.67	109.48	29.4	128.4	25.7	49.51
1939	18.55	77.1	17.45	68.35	13.4	99.4	19.0	36.00	1946	21.59	121.1	34.08	133.68	41.0	139.3	30.0	56.67
1940	18.74	78.6	18.03	73.27	15.5	100.2	18.4	36.77	1947	27.22	152.1	43.96	183.60	58.8	159.2	31.7	71.18
1941	17.80	87.3	23.15	86.56	22.7	105.2	21.2	40.95	1948	32.47	165.0	44.75	187.24	55.2	171.2	30.9	77.22
1942	19.11	98.8	24.02	99.04	27.2	116.5	24.0	45.13	1949	38.49	155.0	34.05	159.93	36.4	169.1	24.0	72.54
1943	19.95	103.1	28.25	106.01	29.6	123.6	25.7	48.20	1950				[1] 167.67		[2] 167.8		

[1] 1950 to date.
[2] First 6 months.

Export-Import Bank operations, Latin America

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Total credits authorized from Feb. 12, 1934, to June 30, 1950	Balances outstanding as of June 30, 1950		Operations during 6 months ended June 30, 1950			Country	Total credits authorized from Feb. 12, 1934, to June 30, 1950	Balances outstanding as of June 30, 1950		Operations during 6 months ended June 30, 1950		
		Undisbursed authorizations	Outstanding loans	Authorized	Disbursed	Repaid			Undisbursed authorizations	Outstanding loans	Authorized	Disbursed	Repaid
Argentina	218,690	125,000	164	[1] 125,000	-------	10	Mexico	156,980	18,803	77,870	[4] 1,287	9,382	9,234
Bolivia	36,998	16,070	18,517	-------	-------	137	Nicaragua	5,235	-------	1,226	-------	-------	295
Brazil	298,390	14,614	100,542	[2] 10,888	4,163	3,904	Panama	6,500	522	1,478	-------	354	-------
Chile	141,631	20,243	76,411	-------	23,411	3,497	Paraguay	7,800	-------	3,704	-------	-------	339
Colombia	67,480	17,961	22,236	[3] 2,200	1,670	1,736	Peru	37,450	-------	284	-------	-------	23
Costa Rica	8,723	-------	6,511	-------	-------	66	Salvador	1,726	-------	910	-------	-------	61
Cuba	90,367	-------	10,236	-------	-------	231	Uruguay	43,726	-------	13,658	-------	206	119
Dominican Republic	3,300	-------	195	-------	-------	159	Venezuela	52,497	7,495	3,630	-------	-------	100
Ecuador	28,917	13,980	11,149	[4] 1,300	522	206	Various	120,483	21,105	-------	1,500	-------	-------
Haiti	17,350	4,000	4,445	-------	-------	493							
Honduras	2,700	-------	-------	-------	-------	323	Total	1,346,943	259,793	353,166	142,175	39,708	21,033

[1] For liquidation of past due dollar obligations to United States commercial creditors both on private and governmental Argentinian account.
[2] For building cement plant, railway equipment, locomotives, and passenger rail cars.
[3] For construction of grain treatment and storage stations.
[4] For construction of municipal water works system for Guayaquil. (An additional credit to an existing loan.)
[5] For purchase of shrimp vessels.

Commodities used in Associated Press index

Commodity:	Weight
Industrials	30.7
Cement	1.8
Hides	2.3
Rubber	2.7
Bituminous coal	3.2
Petroleum	5.3
Steel scrap	6.0
Steel billets	3.6
Turpentine	.6
Linseed oil	.8
Lumber	3.1
Burlap	1.3
Food	17.4
Eggs	2.9
Sugar	2.0
Cocoa	.6
Coffee	2.1
Flour	4.1
Lard	1.7
Butter	4.0
Livestock	13.5
Hogs	7.0
Cattle	3.8
Lambs	2.7
Agriculture	22.1
Corn	4.0
Wheat	7.2
Oats	1.9
Rye	.4
Cotton	8.6
Textiles	10.1
Wool	2.2
Rayon	1.8
Cotton cloth	4.7
Silk	1.4

Commodity:	Weight
Nonferrous metals	6.2
Antimony	.4
Tin	1.0
Zinc	.5
Lead	1.2
Copper	3.1

Base is 1926 average prices.

Source: Wire from Harry T. Montgomery, general business editor, the Associated Press, New York.

U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D. C.—Relative importance of subgroups in wholesale price index year average, 1949

Groups and subgroups:	Percent of all commodities, index
All commodities	100.00
Farm products	19.16
Grains	2.65
Livestock and poultry	6.88
Other farm products	9.63
Foods	20.41
Dairy products	2.18
Cereal products	3.45
Fruits and vegetables	1.33
Meats, poultry, and fish	8.97
Other foods	4.43
Hides and leather products	3.26
Shoes	1.60
Hides and skins	.60
Leather	.76
Other leather products	.30
Textile products	8.16
Clothing	2.11
Cotton goods	2.62
Hosiery and underwear	.68
Rayon and nylon	.45
Silk	.08
Woolen and worsted goods	1.45
Other textiles	.77
Fuel and lighting materials	14.94
Anthracite	1.17
Bituminous coal	4.38
Coke	1.17
Electricity	1.12
Gas	.56
Petroleum and products	6.54
Metals and metal products	15.33
Agricultural implements	.37
Iron and steel	6.83
Motor vehicles	5.93
Nonferrous metals	1.92
Plumbing and heating	.23
Building materials	6.66
Brick and tile	.45
Cement	.44
Lumber	3.21
Paint and paint materials	1.26
Other building materials	1.30
Chemicals and allied products	1.53
Chemicals	.80
Drugs and pharmaceutical materials	.15
Fertilizer materials	.20
Mixed fertilizers	.17
Oils and fats	.21
Housefurnishing goods	2.43
Furnishings	1.33
Furniture	1.10
Miscellaneous	8.12
Automobile tires and tubes	1.34
Cattle feed	.63
Paper and pulp	2.07
Rubber, crude	.26
Other miscellaneous	3.82
Raw materials	31.12
Semimanufactured articles	8.63
Manufactured products	60.25
All commodities other than farm products	80.84
All commodities other than farm products and foods	60.44

CPI items and their relative importance in the major groups and in the total index, December 1948

Items	Percentage distribution of index value factors in December 1948	
	Group total	All items total
Food	100.0	40.6
Cereals and bakery products	13.9	5.6
Meats, poultry, and fish	32.8	13.3
Dairy products	18.8	7.6
Eggs, fresh, dozen	5.8	2.4
Fruits and vegetables	19.6	8.0
Beverages	3.0	1.2
Fats and oils	3.2	1.3
Sugar and sweets, sugar	2.9	1.2
Apparel	100.0	12.4
Wool	25.3	3.1
Cotton	17.6	2.2
Silk, rayon, and nylon	14.6	1.8
Footwear	16.6	2.1
Other garments	3.9	.5
Services (dry cleaning, repairs)	4.5	.5
Rent	100.0	12.5
Fuel, electricity, and refrigeration	100.0	5.1
Housefurnishings	100.0	4.7
Miscellaneous	100.0	24.7
Transportation	27.8	6.9
Medical care	13.1	3.2
Household operation	13.1	3.2
Recreation	19.6	4.8
Personal care	9.9	2.4
Gifts, contributions, and other unallocated items	16.5	4.2

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a condensation of speech given recently by Dr. Johannes U. Hoeber before the Torch Club of Philadelphia. Dr. Hoeber was born in Switzerland, educated at the Universities of Berlin and Heidelberg and the London School of Economics and Political Science. A resident of Philadelphia, he has served on the staff of the city charter committee of the Institute of Local and State Government at the University of Pennsylvania, as director of public relations of the Philadelphia Housing Authority, and as labor representative of the Community Chest. He is now director of the southern area of the Health and Welfare Council, Inc.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

(By Johannes U. Hoeber)

How to finance our Nation's medical bill has been a subject of hot debate for the past 20 years. Today the issue has become much narrower than it appeared to be only a few years ago. From Senator TAFT, of Ohio, to Senator TAYLOR, of Idaho, there is now agreement that some form of Government aid is needed in wide areas to maintain and improve the Nation's health. Medical services for the veterans, financial assistance for the construction of hospitals, grants-in-aid to medical schools, expansion of public-health services are no longer subjects of controversy. The practice of group medicine is no longer opposed by the medical profession, and even the principle of health insurance is now universally accepted.

The controversy has now narrowed down to one single issue: Should health insurance be sponsored by the Government and the extent of its coverage determined by law, or should it be voluntary and left entirely to the free choice of the individual?

If the American people are to make an intelligent choice between these alternatives, two obstacles must be removed which now obscure from the view of the general public the true merits of the case on either side.

The first of these obstacles are the propaganda slogans. This is not the life-and-death struggle between socialism and free enterprise as it is being depicted by the American Medical Association and its allies. Nobody would call our public schools socialist because they are owned and operated by units of government; and our home-building industry certainly continues to regard itself as private enterprise although a large segment of its operations is dependent upon the mortgage guaranties of the Federal Government. The tags of socialism and free enterprise, in this as in other fields, serve only to confuse instead of to identify the issues.

PUBLIC SHOULD BE HEARD

The second obstacle is the failure of the general public to participate in this debate. Voluntary versus Government insurance is not a medical issue. On how to practice medicine, nobody is qualified to speak but the medical expert; but how to pay for medical services is as much, if not more, the concern of the consumer of these services—99.9 percent of our population—as it is that of the 150,000 physicians engaged in the private practice of medicine. To select the best system of health insurance calls for the special knowledge of the economist, the tax expert, the student of government and public administration, the actuary. The voice of the American Medical Association should not carry any more weight in this debate than that of the United Automobile Workers or the American Association of Social Workers.

What, then, are the facts? What is proposed by the advocates of national health

insurance? What is offered by the existing voluntary plans?

Following President Truman's special message on the Nation's health, the National Health Insurance and Public Health Act was introduced into Congress in April 1949. Title VII of this act proposes to expand the social-security system by adding health insurance to the existing old age, survivors' and unemployment insurance. The bill proposes to cover approximately 85 percent of the population including both employees and self-employed persons, and their dependents. Persons covered by insurance would be entitled to medical services by general practitioners and specialists at their homes, in the doctor's office, and in hospitals; to hospital care up to 60 days per year; to laboratory and X-ray services, costly prescribed medicines, eyeglasses, special appliances, and certain amounts of dental services and home nursing. Patients would be free to select the doctor, dentist, and hospital of their own choice; doctors, dentists, and hospitals would be free to join or not to join the insurance system and to accept or reject individual patients. The program would be administered by the States and their subdivisions (counties and municipalities).

Administration at the local level would be put into the hands of local boards appointed in accordance with State law and composed of local citizens, including members of the medical profession. The role of the Federal Government would be limited to the collection of the health-insurance fund for distribution to the States. A Federal board composed of five persons would establish certain general requirements with which State programs would have to conform. Doctors would be paid from the health-insurance fund on a fee-for-service, capitation, or salary basis, depending on what system of payment the participating doctors in each locality would choose for themselves. The program would be financed by a special tax of 3 percent on all incomes up to $4,800 a year. Self-employed persons would pay the full amount themselves; employees would pay 1½ percent themselves; and the other 1½ percent would be paid by their employers.

A large number of voluntary health-insurance plans are now in existence. For purposes of comparison, the combined Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan of the Associated Hospital Service of Philadelphia and the Medical Service Association of Pennsylvania is used as a typical example of the best that voluntary health insurance has to offer.

Maximum benefits under the Blue Cross plan include 30 days of hospitalization for each different ailment requiring admission to a hospital in any one year. Hospital service is provided in the lowest-cost semiprivate room available at the time of admission; it includes all services rendered by salaried employees of the hospital and all drugs in general use. X-ray examination, laboratory examination, etc., are limited to certain maximum amounts. Hospital care for patients suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis or mental or nervous disorders is limited to 10 days. Conditions existing prior to enrollment are not covered during the first 12 months. Maternity benefits are provided up to $75 a year after the subscriber has been enrolled for 12 months.

The medical-surgical plan of the Blue Shield provides surgical services up to $200 a year according to the Blue Shield schedule of surgical payments regardless of whether the surgical operation is performed at home, at the doctor's office, or in a hospital. Medical services are paid hospitalized patients up to 70 days at the rate of $10 for the first, $5 for the second, and $3 for the remaining days. Medical service at the patient's home or the doctor's office are covered up to 21 visits at $3 per visit starting with the fourth visit, if the subscriber is a member of an affiliated employee group and is disabled by illness. Medical treatment for mental, TB, and VD cases is limited to 30 days in a hospital.

Doctors participating in the Blue Shield plan are allowed to make additional charges over and above those paid for by Blue Shield if the annual income of a subscriber with two or more dependents is more than $4,000.

The cost of this combined Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan for a family including husband, wife, and all unmarried children under 19 years of age is $6.10 a month or $73.20 a year.

Disregarding differences in benefits, which will be discussed later, a comparison of the costs of health insurance under the two plans for three different levels of income is shown by the table at the bottom of this page.

No comparison is possible for incomes over $4,000 a year because Blue Shield permits doctors to charge unspecified additional amounts.

As far as benefits are concerned, these are some of the major differences between the two plans:

Blue Cross provides for hospitalization for 30 days for any one ailment; National Health Insurance for 60 days per year. Hospital care for TB or mental patients is limited by Blue Cross to 10 days. Maternity benefits, X-ray examinations, and laboratory examinations are limited by Blue Cross-Blue Shield to hospitalized patients and to certain maximum amounts; they are not limited under National Health Insurance.

Blue Shield does not cover any medical services unless the subscriber is disabled by illness (i. e., required to stay home from work) and does not cover the first three visits at the patient's home or the doctor's office even though the subscriber cannot go to work.

This is probably the most serious shortcoming of the voluntary plans. If the old adage, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" has any validity, voluntary health insurance as offered today contributes nothing to that part of our total medical bill that is most vital from the standpoint of the Nation's health; the cost of preventive medicine. Voluntary insurance as offered today is sickness insurance and not health insurance.

More serious than the gaps in the coverage provided by voluntary plans to the individual subscriber is the failure of these plans to enroll, at least so far, enough subscribers to justify their claim that they can do the whole job. According to the AMA's own figures, only 13,000,000 people, or less than 9 percent of the total population have comprehensive Blue Cross (hospitalization), Blue Shield (medical-surgical), or similar coverage. An additional 21,000,000 have hospitalization and surgical coverage, and 27,000,000 have only Blue Cross (hospitalization) coverage. (At the end of 1949 only 5 percent of the population of Pennsylvania were Blue Shield members).

Moreover, present subscribers are very unevenly distributed geographically and economically. In May 1949, about 60 percent of all Blue Cross policies were held by citizens of six rich industrial States of the East and Midwest. Only 17 percent of Blue Cross members lived in Southern and Western States with 43 percent of the population. Only 3 percent of the rural population were covered.

The members of voluntary insurance plans are the industrial and clerical employees in the East and Midwest. A large share of the credit for enrolling so many of them in recent years belongs to the trade-unions which have won health-insurance benefits through collective bargaining. At the same time, the advances gained by union members in this field are threatening to disturb the competitive equilibrium between the various parts of our economy in the same way in which it has been disturbed by wage differentials in the past and more recently by the spread of private pension funds. If this trend continues, we may some day see the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce retreat from their position against national health insurance just as they have retreated recently from their former opposition against the broadening of social security.

It would be highly desirable if the American people—all of them—could be induced to insure themselves voluntarily against the cost of medical care; but is it realistic to assume that this ideal can ever be reached? Americans have an innate desire to pay for what they get. They despise charity. That is why any system based on the means test will never become law. That is why people risk sickness rather than being charity patients. Are we not expecting too much if we assume that the head of a family who can barely stretch his pay check to cover the cost of food, clothing, and shelter would part voluntarily with $6 a month for health insurance? That the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the American people spend each year more money for liquor, for entertainment, and for other luxuries than they spend for medical care. Is it really socialistic and communistic to help the spirit along by using the democratic process of legislation to give the Nation's health priority over other less vital needs?

Resistance against anything that bears the label of "compulsion" is one of the strongest—and healthiest—traits in our national character. Opponents of national health insurance have used the compulsory feature of the plan as one of the most effective weapons to whip up sentiment against this piece of legislation. Yet compulsion is the very essence of every law imposed on the individual by the community—from the traffic ordinance to the Constitution of the United States. Once it is admitted, as proponents and opponents of the program do, that health is a matter of legitimate national concern, compulsion becomes as appropriate in this field as in the fields of civil rights, education, social security, or the protection of life and property of the individual and the community at home and abroad.

In April 1934, at a time when the American Medical Association was fighting voluntary health insurance as "socialism and communism inciting to revolution," it issued the following statement:

"Without some form of compulsion voluntary insurance fails of its objective of distributing the cost of sickness among large classes of the population with even approximate fairness. The young and healthy will not join and the aged and sickly, if accepted, will raise the cost to a prohibitive point and, if rejected, remove protection from those most in need. Sickness insurance cannot distribute the burden of sickness unless it is compulsory."

We might well rest our case for national health insurance on this statement.

Annual income	Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan		National health insurance			
			Employed		Self-employed	
	Amount	Percent of income	Amount	Percent of income	Amount	Percent of income
$3,000	$73.20	2.4	$45.00	1.5	$90	3
$3,500	73.20	2.1	52.50	1.5	105	3
$4,000	73.20	1.8	60.00	1.5	120	3

Hagen's Long-Range Flood-Control Plan Under Way for Valley Area—Many Projects Started, Others Planned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of greatest importance to my people in Minnesota's Ninth District is the flood problem. Therefore, as the Congress nears adjournment I ask permission to report to them on some of the work I have accomplished and the legislation that I have introduced on their behalf during recent months and years.

This spring one of the greatest disasters in the history of our Nation struck the Red River Valley of the North. Surging floodwaters of the Red River and its tributaries swept over 1,100,000 acres of Minnesota and North Dakota. Another 2,000,000 acres of fertile and productive land were inundated because of inadequate drainage. United States Army engineers, in a report of August 19, said that about $33,000,000 damage was done in the flood.

I returned to my district twice by airplane during the floods. My purpose was twofold—to help out in their hour of need and to get first-hand information that would guide me in working out my relief and reconstruction program of legislation.

On my return to Washington, I immediately began introducing the following bills and resolutions in the Congress:

APRIL 27

H. R. 8264: A bill to provide for the modification of certain recommendations relating to flood control on the Red River of the north and its tributaries, to include the construction of additional flood-control improvements.

H. R. 8265: A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Buffalo River in Minnesota for flood control purposes.

H. R. 8266: A bill to provide for the construction of a flood-control and hydroelectric dam on the Red Lake River about 3 miles west of Red Lake Falls.

H. R. 8278: A bill to provide for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods.

APRIL 28

H. R. 8296: A bill to increase the emergency fund for the President from $1,000,000 to $20,000,000.

MAY 3

H. R. 8341: A bill calling for funds for the reconstruction and repair of roads, bridges, culverts, drainage ditches, and other public facilities destroyed or damaged as a result of the recent floods.

MAY 10

H. R. 8461: A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to States and local governments in major disasters. It authorizes funds to supplement State or local aid in alleviating suffering and damage and for restoring and repairing public facilities. This covers disasters in any part of the Nation and, of course, includes the 1950 Red River Valley floods.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that the bills above—especially those at the top of the list—tie in with the long-range program previously approved by Congress, and designed to get at the very roots of the problem.

My original long-range flood-control program, to a great extent provided in H. R. 6149, which was approved by Congress early in 1948, provides a suitable series of dams, levees, and reservoirs, and other flood projects that will prevent these annual major or even minor flood disasters.

There will be a dam and reservoir about 6 miles southwest of Fergus Falls with a capacity of 14,100 acre-feet of water. This has been approved and construction may get under way this fall or early next spring. This will reduce flood flows in the lower Otter Tail River, and in time of drought increase low-water flows in coordination with the Baldhill Dam and Reservoir and the Red River of the North. Other dams and reservoirs are recommended for several rivers in North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota.

Then the main stem of the Bois de Sioux River will be straightened and cleared; the main channel around Fargo and Moorhead will be cleared and enlarged and deepened with levees 1,800 feet long at Moorhead and about 1 mile long at Fargo. At East Grand Forks there will be channel clearing for 16 miles with deepening and straightening. My long-range plan calls for a levee 6,700 feet long in the southern part of Grand Forks and a levee and flood wall 9,600 feet long in East Grand Forks.

The Wild Rice and Marsh Rivers will be straightened, deepened, and widened. This project is under construction at the present time.

The Sand Hill River Basin will be enlarged shortly, and improvements on other streams tributary to the Red River and Red Lake-Clearwater Rivers carried out in the coming years. One of the important projects scheduled for early action is the Lost River project.

Flood-control projects eventually will be undertaken on the streams in Marshall and Kittson Counties which flow into the Red River of the North.

The Roseau River project has been reopened by my efforts, and a feasible and practical Federal flood-control project is expected.

For 40 years many persons in northwestern Minnesota had attempted to get the money to undertake the Red Lake-Clearwater flood-control project. But it was only in the Eightieth Congress that success finally came—when I led the campaign for Federal funds. The projects are now nearing completion.

In the present Eighty-first Congress, my bill introduced April 27, 1950, calls for construction of a dam on the Red Lake River about 3 miles west of Red Lake Falls at or near the site known as Huot or Cyr Rapids. This dam, and the reservoir it creates, can be used for both flood control and for hydroelectric power. There also are other suitable sites for reservoirs or for power.

Perhaps the legislation of most timely interest to the people of Minnesota's Ninth District at this time, from the list above, is the national disaster bill. Both the late Representative William Lemke, of North Dakota and I had introduced similar measures. After the death of my good friend and colleague, Mr. Lemke, I piloted his disaster bill through the legislative channels as a mark of respect to his memory. This measure became known as the Hagen-Lemke bill—H. R. 8396.

The Hagen-Lemke bill, under certain conditions and limitations, provides $5,000,000 to relieve suffering and repair public facilities after a disaster. It also authorizes the President to coordinate the activities of all Federal agencies in such an emergency.

The Hagen-Lemke disaster bill was approved by the House of Representatives on August 7, 1950. Several times that afternoon I was asked to yield the floor for comments and questions on the bill. These two short quotes are taken from the comments of my colleagues on the floor.

Representative JUDD:

I should like to commend my distinguished colleague from Minnesota on behalf of the other Members from Minnesota and North Dakota for the lead that he has taken and the persistence he has demonstrated in bringing this important matter to a favorable vote today. Naturally he was especially interested this year because the most recent and severe flood was in his district. But he has been a pioneer in the field long before this year's disaster.

Representative ANDRESEN:

I recognize the months that Mr. HAGEN has spent in hard work to try to secure worthwhile legislation to aid in rehabilitating that part of his area so hard hit by floods. No man in Congress has done as much as he has in trying to bring a solution to this problem.

I am also happy to report at this time that my other bills relating to flood reconstruction and control are progressing satisfactorily. Many of them have already received favorable reports from full committees—others favorable reports from subcommittees. And I need not remind my people of Minnesota's Ninth District that world conditions have slowed down action on some of these bills. I am sure that they are aware of the fact that top priority is being given to military and defense measures since the situation in Korea began developing early this summer.

As Mr. JUDD stated in his remarks above, I have long had a prime interest in this flood problem. Through the years that I have been in Washington it has been of greatest concern to me. The countless hours I have labored on the problem, the bulging flood correspondence files in my office, and the many messages of appreciation from both my constituents and colleagues lend proof to that fact.

There is, of course, no such thing as partisan lines when one is working with a problem of such vital importance. My

dealings and extensive correspondence with the White House on flood matters attest to that fact. I regret that anyone in my district, who might talk of partisanship, was not present at our White House conference with President Truman on June 14, 1950. It was left up to me to see who should be included in the conference, since I called it and arranged it. I invited all of the Minnesota and North Dakota Members of the House of Representatives. I also invited Senators THYE and HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senators LANGER and YOUNG, of North Dakota. Governor Youngdahl arrived in the Capital that morning, so I invited him. All of these men accepted the invitation and attended the conference. Senator HUMPHREY, at my request, was spokesman for the group.

Here I wish to quote a portion of an editorial printed in the Crookston (Minn.) Times on May 23, 1950, under the heading of "Careless charges by DFL convention":

It is absurd to speak of Congressman HAGEN as seeking to jump the gun on getting relief for flood victims, and it is sheer political quackery for such a claim to come from the opposition party.

Thus far there has been no word from Senator HUMPHREY regarding any failure on the part of HAROLD HAGEN to live up to promised bipartisan work. As HUMPHREY said in an interview with a Times reporter, "We are working together as a team." None of the members of the team has cast any charges at his teammates. It does not behoove the partisan supporters of HUMPHREY in the ninth district to go so contrary to the path set by their leader.

Let's not start playing politics with flood-control efforts.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this report has given the people of my district a clear picture on flood relief and reconstruction measures. I have been guided in my work on behalf of my people in this flood legislation by these eight words: "The need is great—the cause is just."

Opposing Reduction of Tariff Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of Senate Resolution 355, opposing reduction of tariff rates during the effective period of the Defense Production Act of 1950. This resolution was introduced on September 20, 1950, by the junior Senator from Nevada and referred to the Committee on Finance, where it is now pending.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 355

Whereas American industry is now operating under emergency regulations and controls; and

Whereas it is unfair to American industry and labor to flood this market with foreign competitive items while American industry and labor is engaged in the production for our armed services; and

Whereas the further reduction of tariff rates under the present uncertain conditions causes venture capital to withdraw from the field of investment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that all negotiations and conferences under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which might result in the loss of revenue to the United States Treasury be postponed so long as the Defense Production Act of 1950 is in force and effect.

Bender Says 1950 Congressional Elections Are Key to World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following talk by the Honorable George H. Bender, former Representative at Large from Ohio:

BENDER SAYS 1950 CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS ARE KEY TO WORLD AFFAIRS

George H. Bender, Republican condidate for Congressman at Large, speaking at Warren, Ohio, before the Trumbull County Republican organization on Wednesday, October 4, 1950, declared that the 1950 congressional elections are the key to the entire world situation for the next 4 years. Mr. Bender said:

"The congressional elections of 1950 throughout the Nation are of more than immediate importance. This November our people will be electing one-third of the membership of the Senate as well as the entire House of Representatives. By one of the quirks of fate, most of the Senate seats being contested this year are in the Northern, Middle Western, and Western States. Thirty-two Senate seats are up for election now. Twenty of these are now held by Democrats and 12 by Republicans. If there is to be any change in our Government it will come only if our Congress is changed, and this means a change in the Senate as well as in the House.

"The time to make this change must be in 1950, because 2 years from now the Senators who come up for election will include a majority of Republicans. This is the crucial congressional election for the next 4 years.

"Our entire foreign policy is at stake in the voting on November 7. If we have another rubber-stamp Democratic Congress, it will do everything in its power to conceal deficiencies in our defenses, to minimize the strength of Communist influence in our Government, and to pretend that everything is quiet on the western front when we are sitting on a powder keg.

"The record speaks for itself. Under the present national administration, with its subservient Congress, there has been a consistent effort to play down all of our Government's tragic blunders and incredible errors of judgment. If you were to listen to Democrats in Congress, the Alger Hiss case was nothing, the outright stealing of secret State documents and their publication in a pro-Soviet magazine was just a prank, and the confession of Pressman that he had been a member of a Communist cell when he was working for our Government was not even worth noticing.

"Fortunately there are others in Washington who believe that these episodes are not isolated. There are Republicans who believe that these revelations are closely related to the tragedy of China, to our surrender at Potsdam, and to the chaos which prevails all over the world today.

"We want to do something to clean up this mess. We can start doing it on election day by voting for a Republican Congress."

Universal Military Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of Senate bill 4062 to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes. This bill was introduced on August 17, 1950, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, where it is now pending.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4062

A bill to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Congress declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of training and service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy;

(b) the Congress further declares—

(1) that to provide the common defense for which the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established, every male citizen of the United States and every other male person residing in the United States owes to our country an obligation to undergo training which will fit him to contribute to its protection in time of emergency;

(2) that adequate preparedness will prevent wars against this country and the needless sacrifice of human life; and

(3) that a citizenry trained for defense is the bulwark of democracy and the keystone of preparedness and can best be assured through youth training for national security.

TITLE I—UNIVERSAL TRAINING

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "National Security Training Act of 1951."

SEC. 102. There is hereby established the National Security Training Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall consist of three members, two of whom shall be civilians and one shall be a member of the Armed Forces, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. The Commission shall report directly to the President. The Commission shall cause a seal to be made of such design as the President may approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

SEC. 103. The civilian member of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum, and the Chairman shall receive

compensation at the rate of $16,000 per annum. The military member shall receive the pay and allowances to which he is otherwise entitled by law. The civilian members shall serve for terms of 3 years.

SEC. 104. The Commission shall have an executive director who shall be the principal executive officer thereof. The executive director shall be appointed from civilian life by the Commission and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 per annum. No member of the Commission shall be eligible to serve as executive director. The executive director shall perform such duties in connection with executing the functions of the Commission as the Commission may direct. For this purpose any power, function, or duty of the Commission may, at the direction of the Commission, be exercised or performed by the executive director.

SEC. 105. Subject to the direction of the President, the Commission shall:

(a) Establish such policies and standards as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title and all agencies authorized to carry out any of the purposes of this title shall be governed thereby; and

(b) Provide for ascertaining the manner in which the authorized agencies carry out the functions assigned to them through a system of civilian inspection. No agency conducting training under the terms of this title shall deny to a person being trained the right of access to a member of such inspection system.

SEC. 106. The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such civilian personnel as are necessary for the performance of its functions. Civilian personnel required for the execution of this title may be employed notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946, entitled "Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946" (60 Stat. 216), with respect to the maximum limitation as to the number of civilian employees.

SEC. 107. The Commission may exercise any of its functions through such officials or agencies as it may designate.

SEC. 108. (a) There is hereby created within the Commission a National Security Training Advisory Board which shall consist of a civilian Chairman and not less than 10 nor more than 25 other members appointed by the Chairman of the Commission, three of whom shall be members of the Armed Forces designated by the Secretary of Defense. The chairman and other civilian members of the Board shall serve for such terms as the Commission shall prescribe and shall, while actually serving with the Board, receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Board pursuant to authorization of the Board, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of $10) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their office. The members of the Armed Forces shall receive the pay and allowances to which they are otherwise entitled by law.

(b) The National Security Training Advisory Board shall advise the Commission, with particular attention to the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of universal training, and shall undertake such investigations and studies as requested by the Commission.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS

SEC. 109. There is hereby created the National Security Training Corps of the United States (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"), to be composed of male persons who shall be inducted into it for training as hereinafter provided. Members of the corps shall be organized, administered, and trained by training agencies as provided herein, in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission.

SEC. 110. (a) An individual shall be considered to have been inducted into the corps and to have become a member thereof upon taking and subscribing to the following oath or affirmation:

"As a member of the National Security Training Corps, I, , do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States of America and that I will obey the orders of the officers or other persons appointed over me according to law. So help me God."

(b) A member of the corps shall be subject to rules and regulations pertaining thereto: *Provided*, That he shall be subject to the code of conduct only while assigned to active training duty with the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 111. (a) Service in the corps shall consist of active training duty and inactive training duty. The first day of active training duty shall be the day of induction into the corps. Upon successful completion of basic training as prescribed herein, each member of the corps shall be furnished by the training agency with a certificate of completion of basic training. Such members shall be ordered to inactive training duty by the training agency as of that date and shall remain on inactive training duty while pursuing any alternative program provided by section 125 (c) except the alternative training provided by section 125 (c) (1).

(b) Upon successful completion of an alternative program, the member shall be discharged from the corps and shall be furnished in every case with a certificate of discharge issued by the training agency concerned.

(c) The Commission shall make provision for the types and conditions of discharges to be executed, which shall include: Honorable; general, undesirable; bad conduct; and dishonorable: *Provided*, That members of the corps assigned to military training shall be given a dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge only as provided in the code of conduct: *Provided further*, That members of the corps not assigned to military training shall be given a dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge in those cases where a district court of the United States, the Territories, possessions, or the District of Columbia, or courts of the several States, have sentenced a member to imprisonment for 1 year or more.

SEC. 112. Upon discharge of a member from the corps, he shall not be subject to any further training or service under the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall in any way limit or prohibit the call to active service in the Armed Forces of any person who is a member of a Regular or Reserve component of the Armed Forces: *Provided, further*, That the execution of a bad-conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge shall forfeit any right to credit by the member for time served in training, but shall not prevent the member, upon the recommendation of the training agency concerned, from being reinducted for all or part of the training prescribed herein.

SEC. 113. Each member shall be paid, by the training agency to which he is assigned, a cash allowance during his active training duty at the rate of $30 per month; and under regulations prescribed by the training agency concerned, shall be furnished (1) necessary transportation, including transportation from his home to the place of induction and training and return, (2) quarters and subsistence or a monetary allowance in lieu thereof at a rate not to exceed the rate provided for enlisted members of the Armed Forces, (3) clothing and equipment, (4) hospitalization, surgical, medical, and dental care, and other necessary services and supplies.

SEC. 114. (a) The head of the training agency concerned shall prescribe the uniform for members of the corps in training under his agency and the conditions under which it shall be worn, which uniform shall include distinctive insignia prescribed by the Commission and may include devices to denote grade or rank.

(b) Subject to regulations of the head of the training agency concerned, members may, upon termination of active training duty, be authorized to retain clothing and equipment. Members discharged otherwise than honorably, may be authorized to retain underclothing, toilet articles, and nondistinctive articles of outer clothing and may be furnished such civilian outer clothing as may be necessary.

SEC. 115. (a) Upon the application of a member of the corps in proper form or of any dependent of such member as hereinafter defined, a dependency allowance shall be paid, by the training agency to which he is assigned, to his dependents during the period of active training duty in the corps. The allowance shall be computed from the first day of the month in which an application is made and shall end on the last day of active training duty or on the last day of the month in which notice of termination of or cessation of dependency is received by the disbursing officer making payment of the allowance, whichever date occurs first: *Provided*, That the total number of payments shall not exceed the total number of months actually served on active training duty in the corps by the member thereof. The dependency allowance shall be paid without regard to the pay status of the member while on active training duty: *Provided*, That if a member shall remain absent without leave for a period of 30 days, the allowance may be terminated by the head of the training agency concerned, or officer or person designated by him for that purpose.

(b) A dependent within the meaning of this section is:

(1) A lawful wife including a former wife divorced who has not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed and is still payable.

(2) A child including: (a) a child legally adopted in accordance with the laws of the State, Territory, or country in which the adoption took place; (b) a stepchild if in fact dependent on the member for his or her chief support, including a stepchild who after death of the natural parent or termination of marriage is in fact dependent on the member for his or her chief support; (c) an illegitimate child, but only if the member has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support or has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child, or has acknowledged in writing under oath that he is the father of such child; (d) a child to whom the member stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than 12 months prior to the date of application on behalf of such child: *Provided*, That the dependency of such child be considered to commence at the expiration of such 12-month period.

(3) Parent including a father and mother, grandfather and grandmother, stepfather and stepmother, father and mother through adoption, either of the member or of the spouse, and persons who, for a period of not less than 1 year prior to the member's entry on active training duty stood in loco parentis to the member concerned: *Provided*, That such parent is dependent upon the member for his or her chief support.

(c) The dependency allowance shall be paid without a reduction or charge to the cash allowance of the member in the following amounts:

(1) for one dependent, $50 per month;

(2) for two or more dependents, $65 per month.

(d) The determination of all facts, including the fact of dependency, in the administration of this section shall be made by the local board with whom the member is

registered, and shall not be subject to review in any court or by any accounting officer of the Government. Such local board may at any time on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause reconsider or modify any such determination, and may waive the recovery of any money erroneously paid under this section whenever it finds that such recovery would be against equity and good conscience. The General Accounting Office shall not refuse to allow credit in the accounts of any disbursing officer for any erroneous payment or overpayment made by him in carrying out the provisions of this section unless such erroneous payment or overpayment be determined to have been made as a result of gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States. No recovery shall be made from any person authorizing any erroneous payment under this section unless such payment or overpayment was authorized by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States.

(e) The monthly dependency allowances payable under the provisions of this title shall not be assignable; shall not be subject to the claims of creditors of any person to whom or on behalf of whom they are paid; and shall not be liable to attachment, levy, garnishment, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatsoever.

(f) Whoever shall obtain or aid others to obtain or receive any dependency allowance or payment under this section, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.

(g) Whoever in any claim for dependency allowance or in any document required by this section or by regulations made under this section makes any statement of a material fact, knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

(h) Any person who has been entitled to payment of a dependency allowance under this section and whose entitlement to payment of such allowance has ceased shall, if he thereafter accepts payment of such allowance with the intent to defraud, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(i) No part of any amount paid pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any dependency allowance payable under this section. Any person violating or causing a violation of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000.

SEC. 116. Members of the corps shall, during active training duty, be entitled to the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended. The terms "persons in military service" and "period of military service" in section 101 of the cited act shall be deemed to include members of the corps on active training duty and periods of active training duty.

SEC. 117. In case of the death of a member of the corps during active training duty, the costs of recovery of the body, preparation for burial, including a suitable casket, transportation to the home of the deceased or to a cemetery designated by the deceased's nearest relative or proper authority, interment, transportation of baggage, payment of only the accrued or undisbursed cash allowance owing the trainee at the time of death, and accrued or undisbursed dependency allowance owing his dependents at the time of the trainee's death shall be paid by the training agency to which he was last assigned in the same manner as prescribed by law or regulations in the case of a member of the Armed Forces: *Provided*, That members of the corps shall not, solely by reason of their membership therein, be eligible for burial in a national cemetery.

SEC. 118. (a) If any member of the corps shall suffer illness or injury in line of duty while on active training duty with the corps, or die as the result of such illness or injury, he or his beneficiaries as the case may be shall be entitled to all the benefits, which are prescribed by law for civil employees of the United States who suffer disability or death while in the performance of duty, and the Secretary of Labor shall have jurisdiction in such cases after release of the member from active training duty with the corps, or in the event of his death, and shall perform the same duties with reference thereto as in the case of civil employees of the United States now within his jurisdiction: *Provided*, That employee's compensation shall not be paid concurrently with the cash allowance provided in section 113 of this act.

(b) For the purpose of determining the benefits to which he shall be entitled under this section, the total compensation received by a member under this title in cash and in kind shall be deemed to be $150 per month.

(c) The periods of time within which notice of injury, claims for compensation, or any report or notice of inquiry, claims for compensation, or any report or notice must be made, as provided in the act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742), as amended, shall not begin to run in disability compensation cases until the termination of the member's active training duty in the corps.

(d) All determinations as to line of duty and review of these determinations shall be made by the head of the training agency concerned under applicable regulations of that agency approved by the Commission for such action and shall be conclusive upon the Department of Labor whether made before or after the filing of a claim.

SEC. 119. A member of the corps shall be pecuniarily liable for the loss of and damage to property of the Government and for costs incident to his apprehension and return, including rewards paid, in case of unauthorized absence, and the amount of liability as determined by the training agency may be collected by stoppage against the authorized cash allowance not to exceed $15 in any one month: *Provided*, That the head of the training agency concerned or his designee may remit any such liability in whole or in part.

SEC. 120. (a) Members of the corps, while assigned to active training duty with the Armed Forces of the United States:

(1) shall be considered to be a member "of the military or naval forces of the United States" within the meaning of subsection (c) of section 402 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 812);

(2) shall be considered to be "military personnel" within the meaning of section 1 of the act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 662), and section 1 of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372).

(b) Members of the corps assigned to active training duty under the jurisdiction of departments or agencies of the United States other than the Armed Forces shall be considered to be employees of the Government within the meaning of subsection (b) of section 402 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 812).

(c) The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force and their designees are authorized to exercise with respect to claims of members of the corps, while on active training duty with their respective forces, for damages to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, the respective powers conferred upon the Secretary of War and his designees by the act of May 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 225), and the Secretary of the Navy or his designees by sections 2, 3, and 4 of the act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 662).

SEC. 121. Except as otherwise herein specifically provided, members of the corps shall not, solely by reason of their membership, be entitled to any rights, privileges, gratuities, or benefits provided by law or regulations for personnel or former personnel of the Armed Forces or civilian employees of the Government.

SEC. 122. Nothing contained in this title or any other act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to members of the corps while on active or inactive training duty.

SEC. 123. (a) It shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, cantonment, or training or mobilization place, where training under this act in the National Security Training Corps is being given, as the Commission may determine to be necessary to the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of the National Security Training Corps and as the Commission shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to establish or keep houses of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, or places of entertainment which are public nuisances, or other like facilities detrimental to the health and morals of members of such corps, or to receive or permit to be received for immoral purposes any person into any vehicle, place, structure, or building used for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution within said distance determined by the Commission or to knowingly rent, lease, or permit the use of any property for such purposes. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both.

(b) No person, corporation, partnership, or association or agency shall knowingly sell, give, or in any way supply any intoxicating liquors to any member in the National Security Training Corps on active training duty. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association or agency violating any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 12 months, or both.

SEC. 124. (a) The Commission shall designate Federal departments and agencies as training agencies to formulate and conduct training programs: *Provided*, That military training and such other training as may be assigned by the Commission shall be conducted under the direction and control of the Secretary of Defense by the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, and Department of the Air Force, for members of the corps assigned to the Armed Forces for training.

(b) Training agencies shall have direct responsibility for all training operations and may utilize the services of other agencies with or without reimbursement, including non-Federal agencies and institutions, in the conduct thereof.

(c) Military personnel of the Department of Defense may be detailed for duty with the National Security Training Corps, and when so detailed are authorized in addition to and in excess of the strengths otherwise prescribed for such establishment and section 1222 of the Revised Statutes shall not be applicable to any officer personnel so detailed.

SEC. 125. (a) The period of training provided for under this act shall be for 1 year, or its equivalent in terms of a combination of

basic training and training in one of the alternative programs (options) prescribed in subsection (c) below.

(b) Basic training shall be for the initial 6 months' period beginning with the date of induction into the corps, unless sooner terminated by enlistment in the Regular Establishment of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or at the discretion of the head of the training agency, provided that the period may be extended as follows:

(1) with the consent of the member, for the purpose of furnishing hospitalization, medical, and surgical care for injury or illness incurred in line of duty, or

(2) for the purpose of requiring a member to make good time lost to training for any cause.

(c) The alternative programs to be entered into upon completion of basic training will be as follows, and subject to quotas and standards of qualifications fixed by the head of the appropriate training agencies, with the approval of the Commission, the member may enter the alternative program of his choice:

(1) Additional active training duty with the corps for a period of six consecutive months;

(2) Voluntary enlistment and service in any of the regular services, including the Coast Guard, for such period as may be authorized by law or regulations for each service at the time of such enlistment;

(3) Enlistment and service in the National Guard or Air National Guard or Organized Naval Reserve or Organized Marine Corps Reserve for such period as may be authorized by law provided such term of enlistment is so fixed, otherwise by regulations for each service in effect at the time of such enlistment;

(4) Enlistment and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or the Enlisted Reserve component of the Air Force and assignment to an organized unit for which he is entitled to receive pay for attendance at drills or equivalent duty, for such period as may be authorized by law provided such term of enlistment is so fixed, otherwise by regulations for each service in effect at the time of such enlistment;

(5) Entrance into the service in either the Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academy;

(6) Enrollment and service in the Naval and Marine Corps officer procurement program as provided in subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057, ch. 962);

(7) Enlistment and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or Naval Reserve or the Enlisted Reserve component of the Air Force or Marine Corps Reserve for at least such period as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, and entrance upon a college course, including Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps training and an agreement to accept a Reserve commission in the appropriate service if offered upon completion of the course;

(8) Enlistment and service in the United States Naval Reserve, and entrance into either the United States Merchant Marine Academy or a Navy-accredited State Maritime Academy accompanied by an agreement on the part of the trainee to accept a commission in the Naval Reserve at the completion of the course, if offered;

(9) Enlistment and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or Naval Reserve or Enlisted Reserve component of the Air Force or Marine Corps Reserve for at least such period as the Commission may prescribe, and the pursuance of an approved course of technical or specialist training in such school, college, or university as may be approved by the head of the appropriate training agency, accompanied by an agreement to accept a Reserve commission in the appropriate service if offered upon completion of the course;

(10) Enlistment and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or Volunteer Naval Reserve or Enlisted Reserve component of the Air Force or Volunteer Marine Corps Reserve for a period of 6 years: *Provided,* That during the 6-year period of enlistment such trainee shall be subject to a maximum of 6 months' active duty training, of which not more than 1 month will be required in any 1 year: *Provided further,* That this alternative of 6 years' enlistment in one of the Reserve components named in this option is open only to a trainee who is unable to select any of the preceding alternatives provided in subsections (3) through (9) because they are not available to him in his community, or if available, because their quotas are already filled, or he is otherwise ineligible for reasons over which he has no control;

(11) Such other alternative programs established by the Commission which the Commission shall determine to be of comparable importance to the national security and to constitute an equal obligation on the part of the member: *Provided,* That programs established under this subsection shall be available to those trained in the Armed Forces only within quotas established by the Commission after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, and to those who are not given military training.

SEC. 126. Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission, any member serving in or selected for training in any of the alternative programs provided for above, who is unwilling to enter upon or fails to complete satisfactorily the period of training in the selected alternate program, may be recalled for an additional period of active training duty not to exceed 6 months.

SEC. 127. The Secretary of Defense or the Commission, as appropriate, shall prescribe a system of training credits to be applied in the event of transfer from one alternative program to another.

SEC. 128. The President is authorized to determine the location of such additional permanent or temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge existing installations; to construct, install, and equip; and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances, including the necessary grading and removal, repair, or remodeling of existing structures and installations; and, in order to accomplish the purpose of this title, to acquire lands, and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, and to prosecute construction thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended.

REGISTRATION, SELECTION, AND INDUCTION

SEC. 129. Subject to the policies, standards, and quotas of the Commission, the Selective Service System shall administer all matters in connection with the induction into the corps and the registration, examination, classification, allocation, delivery, and maintenance of records, of men registered under this title, together with such other duties as are assigned by this title.

SEC. 130. The local boards, established pursuant to the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, under rules and regulations promulgated by the Director of Selective Service and approved by the Commission shall have the same powers and duties within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to determination of dependency, inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from induction for or allocation for training under this title, of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards as such local boards have with respect to similar questions or claims arising under the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended.

SEC. 131. The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is authorized to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Director of the Selective Service System in carrying out his functions under this title.

SEC. 132. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every male alien residing in the United States who has declared his intention to become such citizen, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, who is between the ages of 17 and 18 and of every other such male citizen or person upon thereafter attaining the seventeenth anniversary of the date of his birth, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places in such manner, and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and rules and regulations prescribed hereunder: *Provided,* That persons in any category exempted from registration pursuant to the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, shall be exempt from registration hereunder.

SEC. 133. Every person registered under this title who is not subject to induction under any other provision of law and who is not otherwise exempted under the provisions of this title shall, until he attains the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth, be liable for training: *Provided:*

(1) That every male person who is a citizen of the United States and every male declarant alien, who enters the United States at a time subsequent to the period in which he would have been required to train had he not been absent from the United States, shall be liable for training, but no person shall be inducted for training after having attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the date of his birth;

(2) That any registrant under this title who has attained the seventeenth anniversary of the date of his birth and has not attained the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth and who is not liable for induction under the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, may volunteer for induction for training, except that a registrant who has not attained the eighteenth anniversary of the date of his birth must have the prior consent of his parents, or parent having custody of him, guardian, or person standing in loco parentis to him in order to so volunteer;

(3) That any registrant who, on the eighteenth anniversary of the date of his birth is successfully and satisfactorily pursuing a standard course of study, on a full-time basis in a high school or a similar institution of learning shall, if he so requests, be entitled to have his induction or assignment under this title postponed until his graduation therefrom, or until he ceases to pursue satisfactorily such course of study, or until he attains the twentieth anniversay of the date of his birth, whichever occurs first, except that any such registrant whose induction or assignment has been so postponed shall be liable for training until he attains the twenty-sixth anniversary of the date of his birth;

(4) That under rules and regulations promulgated by the Director with the approval of the Commission, there are hereby authorized deferments from training under this title, for extreme hardship, physical or mental disability, or reasons vital to the national interest;

(5) That under policies established by the Director with the approval of the Commission, every registrant shall, prior to induction, be physically and mentally examined,

and the local board shall classify the registrant: *Provided*, That no person shall be inducted for military training unless and until he is acceptable to the Armed Forces for training;

(6) That the President is authorized to postpone or exempt the induction of such groups or number of registrants as are necessary in order to limit inductions to the maximum number which can be trained by training agencies designated by the Commission;

(7) That no registrant under this title shall be liable for training under this title who (a) is now serving or has heretofore served honorably for at least 1 year in any of the Armed Forces of the United States in active Federal service or of the Armed Forces of any nation allied with the United States at any time during World War II; or (b) shall hereafter enter into any of the Armed Forces of the United States on active duty, and complete a minimum of 1 year honorable service therein; or (c) is enlisted and is serving, on the effective date of this title, in any one of the following Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States: (1) The federally recognized National Guard of the United States and Air National Guard of the United States; (2) the Organized Reserve of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard: *Provided*, That in either case failure to complete such current enlistment shall render such person liable to induction and training until he attain the twenty-sixth anniversary of the date of his birth; or (d) on the effective date of this title is a cadet of the United States Military Academy, a midshipman of the United States Naval Academy, a cadet of the United States Coast Guard Academy, a midshipman of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, or of a Navy-accredited State Maritime Academy, a member of the Senior Division Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval aviation college program, so long as he satisfactorily continues in and completes 2 years training therein: *Provided*, That until such time as the President determines that the program has reached full-scale implementation, the Commission may conditionally exempt from induction or conditionally discharge from training any registrant or trainee who has been accepted for admittance to any of the academies or training programs enumerated, in order that such person may enter such academy or training program wherein he shall complete not less than 2 years of training in order to be relieved of liability for induction or further training hereunder. (b) No exception from registration, exemption, deferment, or postponement of induction for training under this title shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

SEC. 134. (a) Subject to such quota limitations and standards of qualification and selection as may be established by the Secretary of Defense to insure a proper balance of trained manpower between the ground, air, and naval arms, each registrant eligible for military training shall be entitled to request and receive training in the service of his choice, and shall be classified therein by his local board. Each registrant found not to be eligible for military training shall, subject to such quota limitations and standards of qualification as may be established by the Commission, be entitled to request and receive training in the nonmilitary training program of his choice, and shall be classified therein by the local board: *Provided*, That any such person claiming exemption from combatant training, because of religious training and belief as defined in section 6 (j) of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, and whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, when inducted or assigned under this title, be required to elect training in such other available training program of his choice as provided herein subject to such quotas and standards as may be established.

(b) Any person claiming exemption from combatant training shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal with the appeal board, the appeal board shall forthwith refer the matter to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice, after appropriate inquiry, shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the person concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board that when the objector is inducted or assigned for training under this act, he be required to elect training as provided in (a) above. If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice together with the record on appeal from the local board, in making its decision. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant training because of religious training and belief as herein defined is sustained, shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

SEC. 135. (a) Every person liable for training under this title, except those whose training shall have been deferred or postponed in accordance with provisions of this title, shall be called, inducted, and delivered by his local board for training with such training agency for which he has been classified by his local board at the time and place as directed by the director: *Provided*, That a volunteer for training under 18 years of age may be delivered for training to which he has been assigned, at the training period next following the date upon which he was accepted as a volunteer, whether or not he has attained the age of 18 years.

(b) The Commission, after consultation with heads of the training agencies concerned, will determine induction schedules and numbers to be inducted pursuant to such schedules.

SEC. 136. No person liable for training under this title shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such training; no substitute as such shall be received or enrolled for training; and no person liable for training hereunder shall be permitted to escape such training or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of his period of training by the payment of money or any valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for his release from such training or liability therefor.

SEC. 137. (a) Each registrant exempted or deferred from training under this title, until he shall have attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, and each trainee for a period of 6 years after completion of the first 6 months of training or until discharged from the corps whichever period of time is greater, shall be required to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in status, including his status in the training program and completion thereof, as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the director, and approved by the Commission.

(b) Each local board shall maintain a register of registrants, which shall contain a current record of the address, occupational, dependency, training and service status, and such other information as may be required for the periods specified in (a) above.

SEC. 138. Funds appropriated to the Selective Service System shall be available in the case of registrants who prior to their induction into the National Security Training Corps suffer illness, injury, or death while acting under orders issued under the provisions of this title, for the payment of actual and reasonable expenses of (1) emergency medical care including hospitalization, and (2) recovery of body, preparation for burial, including suitable casket, transportation to the home of the deceased or to a cemetery designated by his nearest relative or proper authority, and interment, but such burial expenses shall not exeeed $150 in any one case.

SEC. 139. Any person having and exercising any authority under this title, who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical or mental examination, deferment, enrollment, or muster; or any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certification as to his fitness or unfitness or liability or nonliability for training under the provisions of this title, or who otherwise evades or refuses registration, induction, or training or any of the requirements of this title; or any person who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration, induction, or training, or any of the requirements of this title, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way by force or violence with the administration of this title; or any person or persons who conspire to commit one or more of such offenses; or any person selected for training under this title who shall refuse to complete the training as prescribed under this title, shall upon conviction in the district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this title, and such case shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

SEC. 140. (a) Nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 281 and 283), or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this title and the regulations pursuant thereto, as an uncompensated member of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from training because of conscientious objections.

(b) All functions performed under this title shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements of section 3 of such act.

SEC. 141. No individual who has been convicted of any crime not punishable by death, and no individual who has been committed to jail, corrective institution, or institution for juvenile delinquency, shall by reason of such conviction or commitment be relieved from liability for training under this title, but may be trained as directed by the Commission.

SEC. 142. Under rules and regulations promulgated by the heads of the appropriate training agencies, with the approval of the Commission, members of the corps while on active training duty may be granted leaves of absence without loss of cash allowances to which otherwise entitled: *Provided*, That no trainee shall be entitled to any payment in lieu of leave not granted to him prior to release from active training duty.

SEC. 143. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums

to each department or organization performing functions under the provisions of this title as may be necessary to enable it to perform its said functions.

SEC. 144. The Commission shall report semiannually to the Congress all expenditures of appropriations in detail.

SEC. 145. If any provision of titles I, II, or III of the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of said titles, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 146. The Secretary of Defense shall submit recommendations to the President as to the time and rate of implementation of the training program established pursuant to the provisions of this act. The recommendations shall take into consideration the intent of the Congress that operations under this act shall not interfere with the immediate increasing of the components of the Armed Forces to their authorized strength.

TITLE II

CODE OF CONDUCT

SEC. 201. Title: This title shall be known as the Code of Conduct (hereinafter referred to as the "code") for the military training program of the National Security Training Corps.

SEC. 202. Statement of policy: Any act or omission of a trainee, as herein defined, which tends to hinder or impede his training is hereby declared to be contrary to the purposes of title I and this title. The disciplinary punishment of trainees of the military training program as hereinafter provided shall be consistent with the maintenance of discipline.

SEC. 203. All trainees subject to provisions: All trainees, as herein defined, shall, from the time of actual induction and while serving on active training duty, as herein defined, be subject to the provisions of this code.

SEC. 204. Definitions: The following words when used in this code shall be construed in the sense indicated in this section unless the context shows that a different sense is intended:

(a) The word "trainee" shall be deemed to mean a person inducted into the National Security Training Corps and assigned to a component of the Armed Forces for training under the provisions of title I of this act during the period of his active training duty.

(b) The words "active training duty" shall be deemed to mean that period of training commencing with the day of induction into the corps and consisting of the period of basic military training in accordance with title I of this act and ending with the completion or earlier termination of such basic training, and in addition the optional additional military training provided in section 125 (c) (1) of title I.

(c) The word "officer" shall be deemed to mean a commissioned officer.

(d) The words "civil authorities" shall be deemed to mean law-enforcement authorities of the United States and of the Territories and possessions, and authorities of the several States, including political subdivisions thereof, and of the District of Columbia.

(e) The words "commanding officer" shall be deemed to mean an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, who is empowered to exercise command of any detachment or company of trainees, or similar or higher units.

(f) The words "appointing authority" shall be deemed to mean (1) an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, who commands a trainee regiment, or comparable unit; or (2) superior military training authority.

(g) The words "reviewing authority" shall be deemed to mean an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, who is next superior in the chain of command to the commanding officer of the accused as defined in this title and who also is empowered to convene general courts martial.

(h) The words "staff judge advocate" shall be deemed to mean an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, who is a lawyer assigned to a reviewing authority to perform law duties.

(i) The words "superior military training authority" shall be deemed to mean an officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or the Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, superior in the chain of command.

(j) The words "extra duty" shall be deemed to mean additional work or duty of any nature assigned to trainees as punishment.

(k) The term "military law" shall be construed to mean the laws governing the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps of the United States.

SEC. 205. Mode of enforcing discipline: Violations of this code shall be punishable in the discretion of the commanding officer (a) by disciplinary punishment administered by the commanding officer of the accused, unless the accused shall request trial, or (b) by national security training courts. Trainees shall be likewise subject to prosecution in the courts of the United States and of the Territories and possessions and of the District of Columbia for crimes and offenses against the United States, and in the courts of the several States for crimes and offenses against the States or any subdivision thereof.

SEC. 206. Disciplinary punishment by unit commander: A commanding officer of a trainee company or higher command may, for minor violations of this code, impose disciplinary punishments upon trainees of his command without the intervention of a national security training court unless the accused requests trial by that court. Punishment assessed by a commanding officer shall not constitute time lost to training within the meaning of section 278 hereof, and shall operate as a bar to subsequent trial for the same offense.

The disciplinary punishment authorized by this section may include admonition, reprimand, withholding of privileges for not exceeding 1 week, extra duty for not exceeding 1 week, restriction to certain specified limits for not exceeding 1 week, but shall not include forfeiture of cash allowance or confinement under guard. A trainee punished under authority of this section who deems the punishment unjust or disproportionate to the offense may appeal to the next superior military training authority, but may in the meantime be required to undergo the punishment adjudged.

The commanding officer who imposes the punishment, his successor in command, or superior military training authority shall have power to mitigate or remit any unexecuted portion of the punishment.

SEC. 207. National security training court: A national security training court shall be composed of any number of officers of the service to which the trainee is assigned for training, of which three shall be a quorum, one of which three shall be a major or lieutenant commander or above. The senior member of the court shall be the president. One member of the court, if practicable, shall be a lawyer and shall act as a law member of the court. In the event no member of the court is a lawyer, the president thereof shall act as law member. Trials of trainees for violations of trainee discipline hereinafter set forth may be by a national security training court, which shall not include the accuser or the immediate commanding officer of the accused or the investigating officer or a witness for the prosecution or the defense.

SEC. 208. Appointing authority: A national security training court may be appointed by an appointing authority as herein defined.

SEC. 209. Who may serve on national security training courts: All officers of the service to which the trainee is assigned for training shall be competent to serve on a national security training court. When appointing such court, the appointing authority shall detail as members thereof those officers of the command who, in his opinion, are best qualified for such duty by reason of age, training, experience, and judicial temperament. Officers having less than 2 years' service shall not, if it can be avoided without manifest injury to the corps, be appointed as members of a court in excess of minority membership thereof.

SEC. 210. Influencing the court: Any attempt on the part of any member of the Armed Forces to influence, by any unauthorized means, a national security training court or its members, or to admonish, censure, or reprimand the court or its members for any act or omission, is hereby prohibited and shall constitute an offense against military law.

SEC. 211. Appointment of trial counsel and defense counsel: For each national security training court the appointing authority shall appoint a trial counsel and defense counsel, who shall, if practicable, be lawyers: *Provided*, That if the trial counsel is a lawyer, the appointed defense counsel must also be a lawyer. No person who has acted as investigating officer or court member in any case shall act subsequently as trial counsel or, unless expressly requested by the accused, as defense counsel in the same case. No person who has acted for the prosecution shall act subsequently in the same case for the defense, nor shall any person who has acted for the defense act subsequently in the same case for the prosecution.

The accused shall have the right to be represented in his defense by civilian counsel if provided by him, or by military counsel of his own selection if reasonably available or by the duly appointed defense counsel.

SEC. 212. Jurisdiction of national security training courts: A national security training court shall have jurisdiction to try and punish any trainee for any offense made punishable by this code.

SEC. 213. Allowable punishments by a national security training court: The punishments authorized by this code upon conviction of a trainee for any offense herein made punishable shall consist of any of the following punishments and no others: Admonition, reprimand, withholding of privileges for not to exceed 3 months, extra duty for not to exceed 3 months, restriction to certain specified limits with or without extra duty, for not to exceed 3 months, and confinement with or without useful work for not to exceed 3 months, and forfeiture or withholding of one-half of the cash allowance per month, for not to exceed the period of confinement, when a trainee is confined pursuant to sentence of a national security training court, and where specifically authorized, bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge: *Provided*, That admonition, reprimand, or bad conduct discharge, or dishonorable discharge may be included together with or in addition to any of the other punishments allowed under this section.

SEC. 214. Arrest: A trainee charged with an offense may be placed under arrest or in confinement, as circumstances may require, but when charged with a minor offense only, a trainee shall not ordinarily be placed in confinement. Only a commanding officer or superior military training authority or an officer duly designated as his representative shall have power to place a trainee in, or release him from confinement. Any commissioned officer shall have authority to place a trainee in arrest. The arresting officer, the commanding officer of the trainee or superior military training authority shall have authority to release a trainee from arrest.

SEC. 215. Preferring charges: Any person subject to the provisions of titles I and II of this act or military law may prefer charges, which shall be under oath that he has personal knowledge of or has investigated the matters set forth therein and that the same are true in fact to the best of his knowledge and belief. The charges shall be set forth upon a charge sheet and shall be in the form of a charge setting forth the alleged violation, together with a specification. In the event a trainee is placed under arrest or in confinement, charges shall be filed within 48 hours of the time thereof. Otherwise a trainee shall be released from such arrest or confinement unless the commanding officer, acting upon the recommendation of an officer duly designated by the appointing authority to conduct a preliminary hearing or investigation, and who having conducted or begun to conduct such a hearing or investigation at which the trainee is present and informed of the grounds of his confinement recommends that the accused be not released, directs that the arrest or confinement be continued.

SEC. 216. Action by commanding officer: Charges will be filed with the trainee's immediate commanding officer, who will inquire into the facts and circumstances of the case and expeditiously dispose of the matter or without delay forward the charges together with the names of the witnesses and a statement of their prospective testimony with his written recommendations to the appointing authority.

SEC. 217. Forwarding charges; delays; service of charges: Unless the charges are disposed of without trial, the unit commanding officer shall, within 48 hours after accused is arrested or confined, if practicable, forward the charges to the appointing authority. If the same be not practicable, he shall report to superior authority the reason for delay. The unit commanding officer shall cause to be delivered to the accused a copy of the charges.

SEC. 218. Action by appointing authority: The appointing authority, in his discretion, may refer the chargers for trial, order them dismissed, or make such other disposition of them as he sees fit; and no charge will be referred to a court for trial unless it has been found that a thorough and impartial investigation thereof has been made as prescribed herein, that such charge is legally sufficient to allege an offense under this code, and is supported by evidence indicated in the report of investigation.

SEC. 219. Investigation of charges: An investigation of charges shall include inquiries as to the truth of the matter set forth in said charges, form of charges, and what disposition of the case should be made in the interest of justice and discipline. The accused shall be advised of the charges against him and of his right to be represented at such investigation by counsel. Upon his request, he shall be represented by civilian counsel if provided by him, or military counsel of his own selection if such counsel be reasonably available, or by counsel appointed by the appointing authority. At such investigation full opportunity shall be given to the accused to cross-examine witnesses against him if they are available and to present anything he may desire in his own behalf, either in defense or mitigation, and the investigating officer shall examine available witnesses requested by the accused. If the charges are forwarded after such investigation, they shall be accomplished by a statement of the substance of the testimony taken on both sides, and a copy thereof shall be given to the accused.

SEC. 220. Staff judge advocate: Every reviewing authority shall have a staff judge advocate who shall advise the appointing or reviewing authority as to all matters prescribed by this code and shall perform such other duties as may be devolved upon him by law, regulation, or custom of the military, naval, or air services.

SEC. 221. Assistant staff judge advocate: Any assistant staff judge advocate shall be competent to perform any duty devolved by this code or by law, regulations, or the custom of the military, naval, or air services upon the staff judge advocates.

SEC. 222. Action by trial counsel: The trial counsel of the court to which the charges have been referred shall, within 48 hours after receipt thereof, cause to be served upon the accused a copy of the charges upon which trial is to be had. A failure so to serve such charges shall be a ground for a continuance. The trial counsel shall as soon as practicable upon serving the charges upon the accused notify the defense counsel thereof. No trainee shall against his objection be brought to trial before a national security training court within a period of 72 hours subsequent to the service of charges upon him.

SEC. 223. Trial counsel; prosecution: The trial counsel of a national security training court shall prosecute in the name of the United States.

SEC. 224. Oaths: The trial counsel shall administer to the national security training court the following oath or affirmation: "You, , do swear (or affirm) that you will well and truly try and determine, according to the evidence, the matter now before you, and that you will duly administer justice, without partiality, favor, or affection, according to the provisions of the Code of Conduct of the National Security Training Corps, and if any doubt should arise, not explained by the said code, then according to your conscience and the best of your understanding. So help you God?" When the oath or affirmation has been administered to the members of the court, the president of the court shall administer to the trial counsel an oath or affirmation in the following form: "You, , do swear (or affirm) that you will faithfully and impartially perform the duties of a trial counsel?"

All persons who give evidence before the court shall be examined on oath or affirmation administered by the trial counsel in the following form: "You, , swear (or affirm) that the evidence you give in this case shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. So help you God?"

In case of affirmation the closing sentence of adjuration will be omitted.

SEC. 225. Arraignment, pleas, and motions: The accused shall be arraigned, at which time the charges and specifications shall be read to him by the trial counsel. The accused may plead guilty or not guilty. If the accused makes any irregular pleading, or after a plea of guilty sets up matter inconsistent with the plea, or if it appears that he has entered the plea of guilty improvidently or through lack of understanding of its meaning and effect, or if he fails or refuses to plead, a plea of not guilty shall be entered in the record, and the court shall proceed as though he had pleaded not guilty. Prior to so pleading, or at any other time, the accused may make any pertinent motion which the court shall dispose of as justice may require.

SEC. 226. Challenges: Members of a national security training court may be challenged by the accused or trial counsel for cause stated to the court. A majority of the court shall decide the challenges by secret written ballot but challenged members have no vote. Upon a tie vote the challenge shall be sustained. Each accused and the trial counsel shall be entitled to one preemptory challenge.

SEC. 227. Opportunity to obtain witnesses and other evidence: The trial counsel, defense counsel, and the national security training court shall have equal opportunity to obtain witnesses and other evidence in accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe. Process issued in national security training court cases to compel witnesses to appear and testify and to compel the production of other evidence shall be similar to that which courts of the United States having criminal jurisdiction may lawfully issue and shall run to any part of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

SEC. 228. Refusal to appear or testify: (a) Every person not subject to this code who—

(1) has been duly subpenaed to appear as a witness before any national security training court, or before any military or civil officer designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before such court; and

(2) has been duly paid or tendered the fees and mileage of a witness at the rates allowed to witnesses attending the courts of the United States; and

(3) willfully neglects or refuses to appear, or refuses to qualify as a witness or to testify or to produce any evidence which such person may have been legally subpenaed to produce;

shall be deemed guilty of an offense against the United States.

(b) Any person who commits an offense denounced by this article shall be tried on information in a United States district court or in a court of original criminal jurisdiction in any of the Territorial possessions of the United States, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such courts for such purpose. Upon conviction, such persons shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500, or imprisonment for a period not exceeding 6 months, or both.

(c) It shall be the duty of the United States district attorney or the officer prosecuting for the Government in any such court of original criminal jurisdiction, upon the certification of the facts to him by the national security training court, to file an information against and prosecute any person violating this article.

(d) The fees and mileage of witnesses shall be advanced or paid out of the appropriations for the compensation of witnesses.

SEC. 229. Compulsory self-incrimination prohibited: No witness before a national security training court or before any officer, military or civil, designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before a national security training court or before an officer conducting an investigation, shall be compelled to incriminate himself or to answer any question the answer to which may tend to incriminate him or to answer any question not material to the issue when such answer may tend to degrade him.

No statement obtained from any person in violation of this section or through use of coercion, unlawful influence, or unlawful inducement shall be received in evidence against him in a trial by a national security training court.

SEC. 230. Depositions: Depositions may be taken and used as evidence before national security training courts in the same manner as now or hereafter provided for courts martial.

SEC. 231. Former jeopardy: No trainee shall, without his consent, be tried a second time for the same offense, but no proceedings before a national security training court resulting in a conviction shall be considered a trial until the reviewing authority shall have taken final action upon the case. A proceeding which, subsequent to the introduction of evidence but prior to a finding, is dismissed or terminated by the appointing authority or on motion of the prosecution for failure of available evidence or witnesses without any fault of the accused shall be a trial in the sense of this section.

SEC. 232. Limitations as to time: No person subject to this code shall be liable to be

tried and punished by a national security training court for any offense committed more than 1 year before arraignment of such person: *Provided,* That the period of any absence of the accused from the jurisdiction of the United States, and also any period during which by reason of some manifest impediment the accused shall not have been amenable to military justice, shall be excluded in computing the aforesaid period of limitation: *Provided further,* That this section shall not have the effect to authorize the trial or punishment for any crime or offense barred by the provisions of existing law.

SEC. 233. Evidence: Insofar as not otherwise prescribed in this code or by regulations promulgated under authority of titles I and II of this act, the rules of evidence for courts martial shall be applied to national security training courts.

SEC. 234. Rulings on legal questions: The law member shall rule in open court upon all interlocutory questions other than challenges arising during the proceedings: *Provided,* That any such ruling made by the law member upon any interlocutory question other than for a finding of not guilty or the question of accused's sanity, shall be final and shall constitute the ruling of the court; but the law member may at any time consult with the court in closed session before making a ruling, and may change any ruling made at any time during the trial. Unless such ruling be final, if any member objects thereto, the court shall be cleared and closed and the question decided by a majority vote, viva voce, beginning with the junior in rank. A tie vote on a motion for a finding of not guilty or on a motion relating to the question of the accused's sanity shall be a determination against the accused.

SEC. 235. Instructions: Before a vote is taken on the findings, the law member shall, in the presence of the accused and counsel, instruct the court as to the elements of the offense and charge the court—

(1) that the accused must be presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established by legal and competent evidence beyond reasonable doubt;

(2) that in the case being considered, if there is a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the accused, the doubt shall be resolved in favor of the accused and he shall be acquitted;

(3) that if there is a reasonable doubt as to the degree of guilt, the finding must be in a lower degree as to which there is no reasonable doubt; and

(4) that the burden of proof to establish the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt is upon the Government.

SEC. 236. Findings: After both sides have rested and after any argument of counsel, the national security training court shall make its findings as to the guilt or innocence of the accused, which findings it shall announce in open court.

SEC. 237. Findings of guilty: In the event the accused is found guilty, the national security training court shall receive evidence as to the age and service of the accused, together with any evidence of previous convictions by a national security training court or a district court of the United States, the Territories, or possessions or the District of Columbia in accordance with the provisions of section 250 of this code and any other pertinent data submitted by either side, for consideration by the national security training court in fixing the punishment.

SEC. 238. Sentence: The national security training court shall thereupon sentence the accused. The sentence shall be announced in open court.

SEC. 239. Vote on finding and sentences: The findings and sentence shall be determined on secret written ballot by the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present.

SEC. 240. Policy as to sentence: The national security training court shall adjudge a minimum sentence consistent with the maintenance of discipline and shall, if it believes such action consistent with the foregoing policy, recommend to the reviewing authority that he suspend the execution of the sentence in whole or in part.

SEC. 241. Bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge: In the case of a trainee, as defined in this title, a bad conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge shall be effected only pursuant to a sentence of a national security training court. The court upon proof of two previous convictions by courts deriving jurisdiction under the provisions of this code, or if otherwise satisfied from the evidence that the accused is incorrigible, or as an included punishment for any of the offenses denounced by sections 251 to 253, inclusive, of this code, shall have power to adjudge bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge from the National Security Training Corps, in addition to any other punishment authorized by this code. The bad conduct discharge shall be adjudged for an offense or offenses warranting separation under conditions other than honorable as included punishment, but not of nature to warrant dishonorable discharge. The dishonorable discharge shall be adjudged for an offense or offenses warranting dishonorable separation as included punishment. A bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge shall not be adjudged unless a complete record of the proceedings and testimony before the court has been made. A bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge adjudged in such cases shall be effective only when ordered executed by the reviewing authority, after the record of trial has been held legally sufficient to support the sentence and approved by the Judge Advocate General of the service concerned. The holding of the Judge Advocate General shall be final and conclusive.

SEC. 242. Effect of bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge: The execution of a bad conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge shall forfeit any right to credit by the trainee for time served in training, and shall not prevent the trainee, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, as the case may be, in his discretion, being reinducted for all or part of the training prescribed by law.

SEC. 243. Preparation of record of trial: The trial counsel shall prepare the record of trial, which shall include in narrative or other form the testimony of the witnesses. In such cases as he shall deem appropriate, the appointing authority may detail a reporter to record the proceedings of the trial. The trial counsel and the defense counsel shall agree upon the record and the statement of the testimony, and shall authenticate the record in certification of their agreement, and the record shall thereafter be authenticated by the president of the national security training court. In the event of disagreement, the testimony of the witnesses and any other part of the record in dispute shall be stated by the national security training court, whose decision evidenced by the signature of its president shall be final.

SEC. 244. Disposition of record of trial: The record of trial shall be transmitted to the reviewing authority who shall forthwith refer it to his staff judge advocate for consideration and advice. After having been acted upon by the reviewing authority, the record of each trial by a national security training court shall be transmitted to such headquarters as may be prescribed by the head of the training agency concerned.

SEC. 245. Approval by reviewing authority: No sentence of a national security training court shall be carried into execution until it shall have been approved by the reviewing authority and in the case of a sentence involving a bad conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge until the record of trial has been held legally sufficient and approved as provided in section 241. However, a sentence involving withholding of privileges, extra duty, restriction, or confinement shall run from the date of the announcement of the sentence by the national security training court. Neither an acquittal nor a finding of not guilty shall require approval by a reviewing authority and neither shall be disapproved.

SEC. 246. Powers incident to power to approve: The power to approve the sentence shall include the power to approve or disapprove a finding and to approve only so much of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense and to approve or disapprove the whole or any part of the sentence and to order a rehearing: *Provided,* That no rehearing shall be ordered upon any charge or specification upon which the accused has theretofore been acquitted by the national security training court nor shall such court on rehearing have power to increase the sentence originally imposed. The power to approve a sentence shall include power to mitigate or remit the sentence or suspend, for a period not exceeding the period of training, the execution of a sentence or any part thereof but shall not include the power to increase the sentence. The reviewing authority, or his successor in command, or superior military training authority shall have power to vacate the suspension of any sentence, or any part thereof, and order it carried into execution.

SEC. 247. Confinement of trainees: So far as practicable, trainees held in confinement shall not be confined with members of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 248. Surrender of trainee to civil authorities: Any trainee who is accused of a crime or offense punishable by the laws of the United States or the Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia, or of the several States or a subdivision thereof shall be surrendered, upon application duly made, to the civil authorities for trial: *Provided,* That any proceedings, trial, or period of punishment resulting therefrom shall not operate to relieve the trainee from any liability for further training in the corps.

SEC. 249. Return of trainees held by civil authorities: The commanding officer or superior military training authority, when advised that a trainee is held in custody by the civil authorities shall in appropriate cases make application for his return to training control; the trainee unless already tried by the civil court for the offenses with which he was charged by the civil authorities may be brought to trial before a national security training court, or the case shall otherwise be disposed of, in the discretion of the commanding officer or superior military training authority.

SEC. 250. Jurisdiction of the United States courts: The several districts courts of the United States, the Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia shall have concurrent jurisdiction with the national security training courts of the crimes and offenses defined in sections 251 to 253, inclusive.

SEC. 251. Desertion: Any trainee in the military training program who deserts or attempts to desert the National Security Training Corps shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for 2 years, or both.

SEC. 252. Advising or aiding desertion: Any trainee or other person who advises or persuades or knowingly assists a trainee in the military training program to desert the National Security Training Corps, or who harbors a deserter, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for 2 years, or both.

SEC. 253. Escape from confinement: Any trainee who, having been duly placed in

confinement, escapes therefrom shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $1,000 or imprisonment for 6 months, or both.

SEC. 254. Striking or assaulting officers, or other persons in authority: Any trainee who strikes an officer, warrant officer, petty officer, noncommissioned officer, or other person in authority over such trainee, or draws or lifts up any weapon or offers any violence against such person, being in the execution of his office, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for 1 year, or both.

SEC. 255. Collective insubordination: Any trainee or other person subject to the provisions of titles I and II of this act who attempts to create or who begins, incites, causes, instigates, encourages, or joins in any collective insubordination tending to hinder or impede training under these titles shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for 1 year, or both. Collective insubordination within the meaning of titles I and II of this act shall include any concerted action in the nature of a strike, including a sit-down or slow-down strike, or walk-out, picketing or boycott, which tends to hinder or impede training under the provisions of titles I and II of this act.

SEC. 256. Failure to suppress collective insubordination: Any trainee or other person, subject to the provisions of titles I and II of this act, who, being present at any occurrence involving collective insubordination, does not use his utmost endeavor to suppress the same, or knowing or having reason to believe that such collective insubordination is to take place, does not without delay give information thereof to his commanding officer or other competent military authority, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or imprisonment for 6 months, or both.

SEC. 257. Property loss, damage, or wrongful disposition: Any trainee who willfully, or through neglect, suffers to be lost, spoiled, damaged, or wrongfully disposed of, any property furnished for or intended for use under the provisions of law providing for training in the corps shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or imprisonment for 6 months, or both, and may be required to make good the loss or damage, in whole or in part, and when required to make good the loss or damage the amount of the liability determined thereunder may be collected by stoppage against the authorized cash allowance.

SEC. 258. Waste or unlawful disposition of property: Any trainee who sells or unlawfully disposes of or willfully or through neglect injuries or loses any arms, ammunition, accouterments, equipment, clothing, or other property issued for use in accordance with provisions of titles I and II of this act shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or imprisonment for 6 months, or both, and when required to make good the loss or damage, the amount of the liability determined thereunder may be collected by stoppage against the authorized cash allowance.

SEC. 259. Absence without leave: Any trainee who fails to report at the fixed time to the properly appointed place of duty, or goes from the same without proper leave or absents himself from his command, guard, quarters, station, camp, or ship without proper leave, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 260. Disrespect and insubordination: Any trainee who behaves with disrespect or in an insubordinate manner toward an officer, warrant officer, petty officer, noncommissioned officer, or other person having lawful authority over him, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 261. Breach of arrest: Any trainee who, having been lawfully placed under arrest, breaks his arrest before he is set at liberty by proper authority shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 262. Release or escape of prisoners: Any trainee who without proper authority releases a prisoner committed to his charge, or suffers a prisoner committed to his charge to escape, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 263. Drunk or disorderly conduct: Any trainee who shall be found drunk or disorderly in quarters, station, ship, command, or under such circumstances as to bring discredit upon the National Security Training Corps, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 264. Offenses of sentinels: Any trainee posted as a sentinel or watch who is found drunk or sleeping upon his post or leaves his post before he is regularly relieved shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 265. Disobedience of lawful orders: Any trainee who willfully disobeys or fails to obey any lawful command of his superior officer, warrant officer, petty officer, noncommissioned officer, or other person having authority over him in accordance with law, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 266. Assault: Any trainee committing an assault shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 267. Assault and battery: Any trainee committing assault and battery shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 268. Committing a nuisance: Any trainee who shall commit a nuisance shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 269. Carrying a concealed weapon: Any trainee who shall carry a concealed weapon without proper authority shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 270. Discharging a firearm: Any trainee who shall through carelessness or without proper authority discharge a firearm in camp, quarters, station, ship, or command shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 271. False official statement: Any trainee who shall make a false official statement or report shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 272. False swearing: Any trainee who shall swear falsely before a national security training court of any officer thereof or in any investigation, proceedings, or course of justice had under or arising out of this code, or who shall make a false oath to an affidavit, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 273. Indecent exposure: Any trainee who shall indecently expose his person shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 274. Possession of intoxicating liquor: Any trainee having in his possession intoxicating liquor in camp, quarters, station, ship, or command shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 275. Wrongful appropriation: Any trainee who wrongfully takes, obtains, or withholds, by any means whatever, from the possession of the true owner or any other person any money or personal property of the value of $20 or less, with intent to deprive or defraud any person of the use and benefit thereof or to appropriate the same to his own use or the use of any person other than the true owner shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 276. Miscellaneous offenses: Though not mentioned in the preceding sections, all disorders and neglects to the prejudice of good order and trainee discipline, all conduct of a nature to hinder or impede training or to bring discredit upon the National Security Training Corps, of which a trainee may be guilty, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 277. Complaints of wrongs: Any trainee who believes himself wronged by his commanding officer or any other person having authority over him and who, on due application to his commanding officer, is refused redress, may complain to the next higher military training authority, who shall examine into the complaint and take proper measures for redressing the wrongs complained of.

SEC. 278. Making good time lost: Every trainee may be required to make good any time lost to training as a result of his own willful act of neglect, and this shall include time lost in desertion or absence without leave and time lost by a trainee due to restraint prior to trial resulting in conviction or restraint imposed as a result of a sentence by a national security training or civil court.

SEC. 279. President may prescribe rules: The President may, by Executive order, which he may modify from time to time, and which shall be published in the Federal Register, prescribe the procedure, including the rules of evidence and maximum limits of punishment, not exceeding the maximum limits of punishment authorized by this code, in cases before national security training courts: *Provided*, That nothing contrary or inconsistent with this code may be so prescribed.

SEC. 280. Certain sections of code to be read and explained: Sections 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 213, 214, 241, 242, and 250 through 278 of this code shall be read or explained to every trainee at the time of his induction or within 6 days thereafter and shall be read or explained once every 3 months to all trainees.

A Matter of Belt-Tightening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona Tribune, entitled "A Matter of Belt-Tightening":

A MATTER OF BELT-TIGHTENING

On Sunday, new income-tax increases went into effect for most of the wage earners of this country. The immediate need for which this new money is to be used is not to be questioned, for it is earmarked for military defense purposes.

However, we should be dull, indeed, if it did not occur to us, as it must to every taxpayer who thinks for a moment about his costly central government, that if the people in Washington had been a little less free with our money in the last few years, and so eased off the pressure of the wartime taxes, most of which we still bear as the new raise hits us, the new tax increase would not bring our total taxation to the record-breaking peak at which it stands today.

We must have money now to build up our defense establishment. But, while Mr. Truman, and Mr. Snyder and Mr. Oscar Ewing, speak of tightening our belts, they obviously mean our belts, the people's, for they say nothing at all about tightening the Government's belt.

It would seem only the part of common sense that if it becomes necessary now to

expand our spending vastly to protect our Nation, that this emergency financial strain be offset to some extent by reduction of domestic spending.

Yet, never a word about such cuts from any responsible Government official. Always, belt tightening is for the people. The bureaucrats don't want to cut a thin dime off their expenditures.

Notice how cleverly Mr. Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator and one of the Government's chief propagandists, treats the matter of reduction of domestic spending:

"How strong would our foreign policy be if our country were weak, if our people were hungry, if our workers were dissatisfied, if we had millions of unemployed roaming the streets? How would we stop aggression if our people were diseased and discontented? How far would we get if our factories were idle and our industrial plant stagnating?"

This, of course, is exceedingly smart propaganda aimed at anyone who would advocate any cuts in the proposed administration welfare state program, which includes, incidentally, a plan for national-health insurance for which Mr. Ewing was speaking specifically in his address before the Federation of Labor at Houston some time ago.

Mr. Ewing represents here that any reduction in the proposed social-welfare program would be disastrous to America. And, of course, it would be nothing of the kind. Much of that program for which he was speaking so obviously, fortunately has not even been formally proposed in the Congress.

Mr. Ewing infers that unless the Government programs become law, the country will disintegrate.

He infers that unless the administration gets its way, or unless every New Deal or Fair Deal political proposal of the last decade become, or remain, law, America will dissolve in its own weakness.

At the very least, Mr. Ewing seems to assume that every person unconnected with the Government is weak-minded, with too little American initiative to support the country in the way that made it the greatest nation on earth.

His argument, of course, is utterly ridiculous. It merits no serious consideration. For it is merely propaganda, aimed at deception and distortion of the facts. Mr. Ewing wants no curtailment of spending.

Americans concerned for their country's welfare might well ask when the administration is going to cut nonmilitary spending, when is it going to tighten its belt?

S. 3898, Authorizing Flood Survey of Las Vegas Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of Senate bill 3898, to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity. This bill, introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada on July 11, 1950, passed the Senate on July 26, 1950, and was referred to the House Public Works Committee, where it is now pending.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3898

A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas and vicinity, Nev., to be made under direction of the Chief of Engineers, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made for runoff and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on such drainage area, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes.

The Federal Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Federal departments and agencies are now spending about $250,000,000 a year on Government publicity and propaganda to condition public opinion in favor of administration policies and programs.

These combined activities of the Federal bureaus have been described by Members of this House as our most dangerous lobby. Certainly the Federal lobby is the largest and most powerful with which Congress must contend. If all its costs—hidden and direct—could be tabulated, the bill to the taxpayers would be shown to approach $1,000,000,000 a year. At present we can tabulate only the printing expenses, mailing costs, and some editorial salaries, aggregating something more than $200,000,000 a year. But under prevailing accounting methods there is no way of knowing how much in administrative and executive salaries is diverted largely to publicity and propaganda activities in the one-thousand-eight-hundred-odd-administrative units of the Federal establishment.

THE HOOVER COMMISSION STUDY

On September 22, 1950, I presented for the consideration of the House the voluminous task force report prepared for the Hoover Commission on the subject of Government publicity and propaganda. That report carried the story to September 1948. I now present additional material on the same subject which has come to hand since the Hoover Commission completed its work. Members will recall that under Public Law 162 of the Eightieth Congress, approved July 7, 1947, the Hoover Commission was required to submit its reports and terminate its activities by the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress in January 1949. The new material presented herewith has come to light since that time. It forms, in effect, an addendum to the task force report which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 22, 1950, at page A6861.

THE REES SURVEY

The task force report placed the cost of production and distribution of Government intelligence at approximately $100,000,000 a year. Representative E. H. REES, of Kansas, a distinguished member of the House Civil Service Committee, since has conducted an extensive independent investigation in this field, with a view to offering remedial legislation. He estimates the cost of Federal publicity and propaganda to be in excess of $200,000,000 a year—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 21, 1950, page 5525. In debate on the 1951 appropriations bill, Mr. REES said:

The annual cost of Government printing alone; that is, not including original research, writing, typing, editing, reviewing, and checking, is over $50,000,000. Experience of one large Government agency indicates that editing and preparing copy for the printer costs three times as much as the actual printing. On that basis, the cost of Government publishing would run about $200,000,000 annually. This still excludes the cost of research and writing, on which figures are not available.

Representative JOHN TABER, of New York, then cited a budget estimate of $58,000,000 for Government printing for the fiscal year 1951.

Representative REES expressed the conviction, from his own surveys, that much of the Government material was unnecessary, expensive, and to a great extent wasteful.

TREMENDOUS WASTE DOCUMENTED

The Federal Government operates the biggest printing and publishing business in the world.

Mr. REES continued:

The waste involved in its operation is great but incalculable.

There is widespread overlapping in federally owned printing plants and facilities, not only among departments, but within cities throughout the country. There are 61 separate Government printing and duplicating plants in Washington; there are 23 in San Francisco, 25 in Philadelphia, 16 in Chicago, 6 in Kansas City, 6 in Denver, 16 in New York, and so on. The Army and Air Force have 140 printing and duplicating plants, the Navy has 87, Commerce Department has 26, and the Interior Department, 15.

In many cases, as we all know so well, large editions of bureau publications are run off the presses at the Government Printing Office. But there is no public demand for many of these books and pamphlets. On this point, Mr. REES reported:

Tons and tons of undistributed Government publications are sold as waste paper each year, to clear storage space for new publications. In 1947 and 1948 alone, the Government Printing Office condemned more than 10,000,000 copies of publications. How many millions more were condemned by the agencies themselves is not known.

Investigators for the Senate Appropriations Committee found as many as 500,000 copies of some publications on hand, and 200,000 to 300,000 copies of others. All had lain there for several years, untouched and unwanted, taking up valuable storage space.

In one instance, the Interior Department published a 23-volume series on

the Columbia River Basin. The production cost for printing—not including any editorial expense—was $36.06 per set. But when the Department put this series on sale through the Government Printing Office, it was offered at $6.90 per set. Only a few sets moved at this price. Most of the books were given away.

In 1948, the Senate Appropriations Committee requested each department to submit one copy of every publication issued during the fiscal year 1947. Congressman REES checked the results of this survey:

> The committee actually received 83,723 different publications before giving up for lack of room. One bureau was ready to send up a stack of publications, one copy of each, estimated to be 52 feet high. Another bureau would have required seven file cabinets of four drawers each to accommodate one copy of each of its publications for the year.

OFFICIAL PROPAGANDA FOR THE BRANNAN PLAN

Government propaganda for the Brannan plan is a conspicuous current example of Federal lobbying. Systematic mobilization of the Department of Agriculture's field service employees to agitate for the Brannan plan, as one specific and documented instance of Government-financed pressure-group activity, is traced in detail in the 1950 debates of Congress.

On April 3 and 4, 1950, the United States Department of Agriculture's county committeemen of the Production and Marketing Administration in the State of Minnesota, met at St. Paul. The Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan, was scheduled to address the meeting on the second day, April 4. Evidently the managers of the program felt that the county committeemen, by themselves, would not make a sufficient audience for the Secretary. On March 16 a notice was sent at Government expense—the taxpayers' expense, if you please—to all 5,000 community committeemen of the Production and Marketing Administration in Minnesota. This notice was signed by Charles W. Stickney, chairman of the Minnesota PMA committeemen. In effect, the notice directed the 5,000 community committeemen to attend the St. Paul meeting at 2:30 p. m., April 4, to hear the Secretary's speech. The invitation from Chairman Stickney carried this language:

> A travel allowance is being authorized for community committeemen who attend this meeting.

In conclusion, the invitation added:

> We feel that this is an opportunity which you, as committeeman, cannot afford to miss. We strongly urge you to attend this meeting.

On June 20, 1950, the Comptroller General of the United States issued a 300-page report on his investigation of the St. Paul political rally. This report listed the Minnesota community committeemen who turned in expense vouchers for the trip to St. Paul. On average, it cost the Department of Agriculture approximately $40 per head to bring these men into St. Paul for the rally. The detailed expense accounts may be examined in the Comptroller General's report at pages 203–206. Yet the Comptroller General found the expenses of the St. Paul meeting justified under a provision of law permitting travel expenditures when necessary to the successful administration of the program.

Here, then, was an unblushing all-expense, tax-paid mobilization of some 5,000 community committeemen to hear the Secretary of Agriculture make a political speech in support of his own conception of socialized agriculture. It may be questioned whether all American history affords a more flagrant abuse of executive authority, or a bolder dipping into Federal appropriations for bureaucratic propaganda activities supporting the official party line of thought or policy.

Such a propaganda mobilization should come as a danger signal to America. As stated by Prof. E. Pendleton Herring, of the department of government in Harvard University, the question is: "Can one speak of government by consent, when this consent is manufactured by official press agents?" When American public opinion is formed and spread from the very top layers of Government down through the grass roots of the States, then the administration frankly has begun to experiment with the mechanisms of official thought control. That was the system perfected by Hitler in Nazi Germany. It was the system which brought down complete disaster upon Tojo's Japan. It is the system which today enslaves millions in darkest Russia. In this instance, the entire operation was at the direct expense of the American taxpayers. The Comptroller General's report computed the cost of the St. Paul meeting at approximately $200,000. This estimate was based on payments of $8 per day to the community committeemen, plus $9 a day for subsistence on duly authorized travel, plus an allowance of 5 cents a mile to those who drove to St. Paul in their own automobiles. All these funds were diverted illegally from moneys appropriated by Congress for soil conservation programs, not for political activities. Throughout the entire upper Mississippi Valley the St. Paul meeting was headlined in press, radio, and television as the opening gun in the 1950 congressional campaign for the Brannan plan.

One Member of the Senate examined the complete transcript of the St. Paul meeting. He reported—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 11, 1950, page 5051:

> About two-thirds of Secretary Brannan's speech was devoted to promoting the Brannan plan, and the rest of it to condemnation of Allan Kline and the American Farm Bureau, who oppose the Brannan plan.
>
> I have searched diligently through the transcript and can find nowhere that he makes any reference to the subject matter for which the conference of county committeemen was called, namely, the formulating and administration of agricultural programs as authorized by law. * * *
>
> The speeches of both the Secretary and the junior Senator from Minnesota, Senator HUMPHREY, were political from start to finish. Money appropriated to the Department of Agriculture for soil-conservation programs cannot be legally spent in hiring audiences for political purposes.

Of course, there is no law on the books authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to approve vouchers for such political meetings. But neither is there any record that a question ever was raised by the General Accounting Office touching any of the vouchers turned in for this political rally.

Extended debate touching the St. Paul meeting was held in the Senate on April 11, 1950. The debate developed that county committeemen expressed themselves as feeling under compulsion to attend at Government expense.

Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, cited title 18, section 1913, of the United States Code, which forbids diversion of any Federal appropriation to activities calculated to influence legislation. The St. Paul mobilization of the community committeemen of the PMA, he told the Senate, presented "a clear violation of the law."

To date, however, no action has been taken, either by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Justice, to discipline or reprimand any of the officials who arranged the St. Paul political rally.

The Comptroller General's report to Congress revealed that the St. Paul meeting was planned, not on a State-wide basis but rather as a regional conference to reach all the State committeemen for the entire upper Mississippi Valley. In addition to the Minnesota employees of the Department of Agriculture, the PMA State committeemen were invited from Iowa, Wisconsin, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Nebraska, and Illinois. The estimated cost of $200,000 for this meeting did not include expenses incurred by officials attending from Washington; neither did it include the cost of advance arrangements, invitations, publicity, and promotional activities, both in Washington and St. Paul.

The St. Paul meeting was discussed in the House of Representatives on April 21, 1950, in connection with the 1951 appropriation bill. In that debate total traveling expenses of all Government departments and agencies for the fiscal year 1951 was given as $356,000,000. Representative KEATING, of New York, said in this debate:

> Of course, we all know what the Department of Agriculture is doing. It is a public scandal and an open violation of the law. They are running all over the country trying to sell the Brannan plan to the farmers and consumers—all at the taxpayers' expense.

Two days earlier, on April 19, 1950, Senator BYRD, of Virginia, reviewed the St. Paul rally for the Senate, concluding on this note:

> It appears to me that the propaganda machinery of the Federal Government has reached a new low when it uses Government funds for the purpose of hearing the Secretary of Agriculture explain the Brannan plan.

THE GOVERNMENT LOBBY FOR SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

On March 30, 1950, the Buchanan committee investigating lobbying activities—House Resolution 298, Eighty-first Congress, first session—devoted the entire day's hearing to the topic, "The Role of Government Agencies in Influencing Legislation." Frank H. Weitzel, Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, was the principal witness. He

was questioned about the St. Paul farm rally for the Brannan plan, and also about the European tour by Federal Security Administrator Oscar W. Ewing and a selected staff of FSA assistants, between December 1, 1949, and January 17, 1950.

Press and radio comments on Mr. Ewing's trip characterized it as chiefly a propaganda mission designed to laud on a world stage the advance of socialized medicine in Great Britain.

Chairman BUCHANAN asked the General Accounting Office for a report on this trip. The Comptroller General, in turn, asked Mr. Ewing for a statement. Ewing's statement then was transmitted to Congress verbatim. It explained that the mission was an official survey approved in advance by President Truman. The cost of the junket to the American taxpayers was not computed. In transmitting Ewing's statement to Congress the General Accounting Office added: "There is no information readily available to this office which indicates the facts to be other than as reported."

Thus, the Buchanan committee's investigation of Oscar Ewing's mission was, in fact, limited to a whitewash written by Oscar Ewing himself.

Press conferences were held by Mr. Ewing in London, Dublin, Edinburgh, Stockholm, Rome, and Tel Aviv, plus a final round-up and review conference aboard the *La Guardia* in New York Harbor on January 17, 1950.

"I come home with even greater confidence in President Truman's proposal for national health insurance in the United States," was the headline theme of the New York press summary.

Whatever the nominal purposes of this expensive and extravagant mission, the record is clear that it provided, at public expense, a world-wide sounding board for avowed advocates of socialized medicine. No argument, proposal, or suggestion challenging socialized medicine appeared in the press and radio summaries of the Ewing junket. When a committee of Congress demanded a report and accounting on the mission, Mr. Ewing himself was permitted to write his own report to the General Accounting Office, denying all charges of propaganda and lobbying, as had been aired so extensively in the press and radio. There the matter was snuffed out, so far as congressional inquiry was concerned.

This incident is arresting for the light it throws on the propaganda techniques of the Federal Security Administration. It warns Congress that more vigorous and effective methods of legislative inquiry may be required in the future to explore Federal lobbying activities, if the General Accounting Office serves no further purpose than to transmit to Congress the official justifications of the suspected or accused agencies of propaganda.

The propaganda machine of the Federal Security Agency is one of the largest and most expensive in the entire Federal establishment. During the last 10 years it has demonstrated several times that it is beyond the reach of real congressional investigation. It is a law unto itself. Yet it is sustained entirely by the Federal Treasury.

Government propaganda and lobbying do not serve the people. They serve only the greedy interest of the power-grasping bureaucrats. They will destroy representative government, if not restrained.

The Consequence of Our Diplomatic Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, this Nation with a terrible sacrifice of life and treasure has demonstrated its fighting prowess and has been victorious in two great wars of world magnitude, but due to international influences and the failure of our country's diplomats we are assuming the burden of militarism that will alter if not destroy our form of government.

In order that my colleagues may have an expression of my views on militarism and peacetime conscription, there is inserted herewith a letter recently received from the Washington office of the American Legion, with my reply thereto, and a statement of my views on peacetime military training as announced in 1945:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., October 7, 1950.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
United States Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On June 19, 1945, in testimony on proposed universal military training legislation before the Select Committee on Postwar Military Training Policy in the House of Representatives, your organization indicated opposition to passage of such legislation at that time. In the light of recent developments the American Legion is anxious to learn whether or not your organization has changed its position with reference to universal military training.

We would greatly appreciate a brief statement setting forth your present attitude toward universal military training. In the event we do not receive an answer from your organization we will assume that your position remains unchanged from that expressed in your testimony of June 19, 1945, before the Committee on Postwar Military Policy.

Hoping that we will receive your kind cooperation in this matter and thanking you in advance for your courtesy, I remain

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. KELLY,
Assistant Director, National Public Relations Commission.

OCTOBER 14, 1950.

Mr. GEORGE J. KELLY,
Assistant Director, National Public Relations Commission, the American Legion, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KELLY: Answering the inquiry made in your letter of October 7, concerning my position on universal military training, there is enclosed for your files and information a copy of my remarks extended in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 16, 1945. Since that time my views have not much changed on this important subject.

It is my feeling that if our Government had exercised a little diplomacy in dealing with its allies at the close of the war and had seen to it that Russia was given the right of navigation to warm water ports through the Dardenelles and protected in the use of that right by the establishment of a commission to control the Dardenelles, and permitted Russia to participate in the acquisition and utilization of petroleum in the immense oil fields recently discovered in the Near East, which is practically in Russia's back yard, there would be a very different situation in world affairs at this time.

It would seem that your great organization, the American Legion, which has experienced the rigors of war, would give its attention to bringing about universal disarmament and the establishment of permanent peace, rather than devote its tremendous influence to assist in building up military powers throughout the world armed to the teeth. You will find in my statement which is enclosed reference to the experience of France and Germany in building up armaments and in military training, which brough them nothing but despair and destruction.

I for one propose to devote my efforts to securing universal disarmament and the establishment of permanent peace throughout the world.

It is my suggestion that when the members of the American Legion have occasion to sing carols at Christmas time—Peace on Earth Good Will Toward Men, they will mean what they say.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

(Remarks of Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE, of Idaho, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, October 16, 1945)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, of the many issues under the consideration of our Government and the Congress, the proposal to establish universal peacetime military training is a serious threat to the freedom of the American people and our form of government.

Starting from a small beginning, surrounded on every side by potential enemies with a foothold in this country, in Canada on the north, in Louisiana Territory on the west, and in Florida on the south, the plan that provided an army and navy for our defense and protection in those perilous times and which was given us by the founders of this country, has made this Nation preeminent among world powers. Now, after winning the war which extended to every quarter of the globe, with all but our allied nations defeated and helpless for generations to come, we are told we must sacrifice the best years of the education of our youth to adopt the same plan of compulsory military training which was followed by the heretofore strongest military powers in Europe—Germany and France—a plan that saved neither country in the holocaust of war which has just swept over the world.

In this conflict we fought for peace and justice. Now that we have peace let us direct our efforts to achieving amity and fair dealings among all the people of the earth and establishment of a just and enduring peace. The principles of the issue of peacetime military training we are called upon to deal with are ably presented in the following article by Joy E. Morgan, editor, Journal

of the National Education Association, to which I fully subscribe:

"To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

"Lowell Mellett's comparison in the Star of peacetime conscription with required attendance at school, calls for further consideration. He has performed a service in his admirable column by bringing this issue into the open. Let us make a comparison.

"First, take required attendance at school. It applies to young children, not to men at 18 or over who are face to face with getting established in life. School attendance does not take the child out of his home, away from his parents, and away from his community and local church. The school requirement does not insist that the child attend any particular school—he may go to a Catholic school or a Lutheran school or any kind of private school which meets reasonable standards. Whatever school he attends is in charge of persons responsible to the community. Education is guided growth. It does not seek to force the child, but in cooperation with the home and local church and neighborhood to build his natural endowment into the finest possible well-rounded character. The common free school, more than any other institution is close to the people, responsible and responsive to their wishes, and devoted to the ideals of the golden rule and the brotherhood of man.

"HIS VIEW OF CONSCRIPTION

"Second, take conscription. It proposes to go into every home, community, church, and school and by force to take from those homes and communities their mature young men, to put them under military law, in charge of officers not selected by the community and not responsible to it. It proposes to put these young men in charge of an Army hierarchy whose whole outlook, training, experience, and faith are associated with the use of force and the conviction that force and only force can maintain peace. It is proposed to give these young men a training in the art of killing, which, in many cases will destroy the very finest elements of their manhood. It proposes to give them training in 'citizenship,' Army style, which by its very nature is totalitarian and medieval. Every young man is to be exposed to a life which as anyone familiar with such life knows multiplies drinking, gambling, and prostitution.

"In a nutshell the fundamental difference between educational philosophy and military philosophy is this: Education asks, What is right? What is best? and allows wide freedom. The military asks, Who's boss? and Who's strongest? One builds democracy, the other destroys it and always will. The day the United States adopts conscription, if it should do so, which I do not believe it will, would mark the beginning of the end of American democracy and would be a black day in the life of humanity everywhere. Conscription would be a constant threat to our personal rights, political liberties, and representative institutions.

"SEES NO NEED TO HURRY

"This is not a matter that needs to be decided hurriedly. We can afford to wait until the shape of things to come is clearer; until the United Nations Organization is in operation and we can know our obligations under it; until a sincere effort can be made under Representative MARTIN'S bill for a world conference on the limitation of armaments; until plans can be evolved for whatever peacetime program is needed in a form that will not destroy our democracy and produce riots and rebellion, and until the issues can be thoroughly discussed and considered in at least one congressional election.

"Nothing could be more foolish than to try to rush this issue through Congress before Christmas to avoid the next election. The issue should go over into the next congressional election and it will go over unless its proponents drop it. Even the passage of conscription by Congress would not prevent that, but would merely make certain that the question would be an issue in every congressional election until it was repealed. Members of Congress know this. They know that the people will hold them accountable and will not forget. The people will not forget because they will be reminded year after year as families are broken up, men taken from farm, office, store, and community when most needed. They will be reminded when their sons who wish to go to college and prepare for the professions are delayed in their careers. The people will not stand for conscription in the form in which the Army hierarchy is trying to ram it down their throats by methods which reveal all too well how much respect many Army men have for the democratic processes. We are all proud of the part our Army leaders have played in winning the war; we shall have to look to civilians to win the peace.

"JOY E. MORGAN,
"Editor, Journal of the
"National Education Association."

Senate Resolution 230, Authorizing Investigation of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and Michael J. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of Senate Resolution 230 authorizing a full and complete study and investigation of the operation and administration of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and for other purposes. This resolution was introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada on February 17, 1950, and was referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where it is now pending.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 230

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Comerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, in pursuance of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation and administration of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not that Bureau is being operated in accordance with the law, the public interest, and the intent of the Congress.

Such study and investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to, an examination into the qualifications, honesty, competency, efficiency, and loyalty of people employed by the Department of Commerce, and particularly the qualifications, honesty, competency, efficiency, and loyalty of Michael J. Lee, formerly known as Ephraim Zinovi Liberman, Chief of the Far Eastern Division of the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eight-first Congress, (1) to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the commtitee.

"Each Day the Radio From Moscow Pours Forth Its Venom—People All Over the World Are Being Told To Hate the United States and Everything for Which It Stands—We Cannot Relax—Every One of Us Must Realize That Everything We Hold Dear and Sacred Is in Jeopardy"—Dr. John R. Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I need not tell you all that South Korea has now been liberated. The capital city of Seoul, with battle embers still burning, has within the last few hours fallen into the hands of the forces of the United Nations, led by General MacArthur.

It takes no word of mine to tell you all that freedom is not free. The fight that the brave American boys, together with their allies, have made in behalf of Korea did not fail to collect its toll in death and injury. Thousands have already paid the supreme sacrifice for the liberation of that country from the dreaded forces of the Communist atheists, imperialistically inspired; and still the fight is not yet won.

The shooting war in Korea has now raged for more than 100 days and nights, and no man can prudently forecast its end. The interest in that war, although thousands of miles removed, supersedes all other interests of the people in these United States.

Inasmuch as the assistant secretary to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman, has for some time been heading up a series of telecasts entitled "Battle Report—Washington," telling of that conflict, I am again directing these and the talks of other public officials whom he is presenting in this week's program to your attention.

Through this telecast, Americans everywhere are able to appraise the successes on the home as well as on the diplomatic fronts not alone in Korea but throughout the world.

It is in the knowledge that this series of teledocumentaries have proven of inestimable value and interest to our people everywhere that I am again directing this, the eighth Battle Report—Washington to the attention of my colleagues in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I have been given to understand that already, as a result of the splendid teledocumetary of the National Broadcasting Co., innumerable requests have been received by the Department of State from high-school teachers, college and university professors, librarians, and others throughout the country, asking more complete information pertinent to the teledocumentaries being cast by Dr. John Steelman and the representatives previously introduced by him to the video audience of the National Broadcasting Co.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion Dr. Steelman presents the distinguished Secretary of the Department of the Army, Mr. Frank Pace, as well as the Deputy Chief of Staff of the United States Army itself. They will tell us of the work being done by the Armed Forces in the current battle for freedom. Additionally thereto, he is going to bring us on a visit with three great Americans who are now heading up the transportation service of the Nation.

Commissioner Knudson, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, will tell of rail and truck transportation; Admiral Cochran, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, will tell us of the work being done by the American ships carrying men and merchandise to the four corners of the world; Mr. Delos W. Rentzell, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, will detail just how United States civil aviation is serving mankind in its peaceful endeavors.

To quote but a few words of Dr. Steelman:

We still have another opportunity to meet with the Under Secretary of State, Mr. James E. Webb, who, in telling of the activities on the diplomatic front, will point out how, slowly but surely, we are making progress toward building a better world of peace.

Mr. Speaker, it is only in part because of the foregoing that I am asking the unanimous consent of this House to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD Battle Report—Washington telecast over the National Broadcasting Co. on October 1, 1950.

The telecast was as follows:

ROBERT MCCORMICK. As the burning capital city of Seoul is returned to the Republic of Korea, as the liberating UN forces raise a flag of freedom to fly once more above its streets, NBC again points its cameras upon our own Capitol to bring you your eighth Battle Report, Washington.

Washington, separated by thousands of miles of continent and ocean from the men meeting the challenge of communism head on, but vital source of the increasing strength that is spelling their victory.

In this fifteenth and most heartening week of the war, standing by to report to you where we are, where we've been, and where we go from here, are top Washington officials who've lived with the war since it first exploded over the rice paddies of Korea. Our cameras choose first the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

DR. STEELMAN. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. The events of the past week have been encouraging to free people all over the world. However, we must remember that our military success in Korea does not mean that the battle for freedom has been won. Each day the radio from Moscow pours forth its venom. People all over the world are being told to hate the United States and everything for which it stands. We cannot relax. Every one of us must realize that everything we hold dear and sacred is in jeopardy. The only way we can save our way of life is through our own strength in cooperation with our friends of other nations.

This afternoon we have reports from three fronts—the military, the diplomatic, and the domestic. First, we will hear from the distinguished Secretary of the Army, Mr. Frank Pace. Then the Deputy Chief of Staff of the United States Army will tell us of the vital role our Army plays in the battle for freedom.

On the domestic front three prominent Government officials will tell us how the transportation problem is being solved. Transportation, as you well know, is vital not only to the military but to our entire domestic economy. These three men are directing our defense transportation efforts. Commissioner James K. Knudson, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, will tell us about rail and truck transportation. Admiral E. L. Cochrane, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, will tell us how American ships are carrying both men and merchandise to the four corners of the world. Mr. Delos W. Rentzell, the new chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, will tell us how aviation is serving mankind in peaceful ways.

Again this afternoon we have another opportunity to meet with the Under Secretary of State, Mr. James E. Webb. He will tell us about the activities on the diplomatic front, and how slowly but surely we are making progress toward building a world of peace.

MR. MCCORMICK. Today word reaches us that before the sweeping march of UN troops, all organized enemy resistance has virtually ceased in South Korea. What is left of the shattered Red Army has retreated hell-bent behind the doubtful safety of the thirty-eighth parallel where the Allied drive is now halted. Nowhere below that line is the enemy attempting a real stand. And as a fitting climax to all that has gone before, Friday General MacArthur returned the liberated city of Seoul to the grateful Republic of Korea. But there is much unfinished business still on the agenda. To describe what is yet on the books, and to give us a more complete insight on what the Army faced when the Korean conflict erupted—including some hitherto little-known facts—our cameras bring you next the Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace.

FRANK PACE, JR. This afternoon I know I voice the sentiment of a grateful nation when I acknowledged the debt we owe the gallant men who have brought the United Nations campaign against aggression in Korea so close to final victory. We also owe a debt to their families, many of whom have made sacrifices far beyond anything that will be asked of the rest of us in the days ahead.

As we survey the developments of the past three momentous months, there are several things which stand out crystal-clear: one is the swift and unmistakable determination of the American people to help stop aggression wherever and whenever it breaks out. The speed and decisiveness with which the United States along with the other free nations of the world, responded to the challenge in Korea is the hope of peace-seeking people everywhere. It is a warning—it is the world's most powerful deterrent to any new adventures by the forces of aggression.

The willingness of the American people to make whatever sacrifice is required of them so soon after World War II is reassuring to us as a nation and to the world at large, so desperately seeking a way of collective action for peace.

Today we are pouring billions into our defense forces; training camps are being reopened; hundreds of thousands of American youth are being called to the colors; food, clothing, weapons, supplies are being procured in staggering amounts, paid for by us, the American people, who are determined to resist with all our resources, if need be, those who would destroy us.

And I think the last 3 months have given us another demonstration of the excellent caliber of our military personnel, our officers, and our men. We know that in their hands our national security will have the kind of leadership and support that a democracy should expect. The brilliant delaying action in the first 40 days of Korea is a military performance unsurpassed in history. Sometimes out-manned 20 to 1, those holding forces held to the last round, to buy the all-important time to permit us to place effective fighting forces into action. What they suffered and endured is now paying off in victory. The magnificent campaign in Korea, the shoulder-to-shoulder teamwork of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines, along with the other forces of the United Nations, have written a new chapter in the military annals of freedom.

The military conflict in Korea is being settled, but it is imperative that we keep in mind the world-wide situation. At any time, at any place, Communist-inspired aggression may break out again. We must stand guard, ready to execute our responsibilities in Europe, the Far East, and throughout the world.

We are maintaining now the largest peacetime military establishment we have ever had. We in the Army are engaged in vigorous, training programs which General Ridgway will tell you about; we are developing new weapons, improving old ones. Our research in every scientific field continues day and night. The Army, from top to bottom, is vigilant. As pleased and as proud as we are with the Korean victory, the Army is looking ahead. We are not seeking trouble, but we are preparing to help carry out our country's determination to meet aggression wherever it threatens us.

I can assure you this afternoon that your Army is aware of its great responsibilities. It is working diligently and intelligently to help maintain the peace of the world, for you and your family—and for all of us.

MR. MCCORMICK. New names in the news—cities in the north of South Korea rather than the area around Pusan—names like Sibyon, Vijongbu, Wonju—these mark the new advance of our forces—forces hardened for battle by the vigorous training program that preceded their struggle in Korea. Closely concerned with the pre-combat training given our troops is the man who led the Eighty-second Airborne Division in the historical role it played in the North African and Italian campaigns, and himself parachuted with the leading elements of his division into Normandy. The role he plays today—Deputy Chief of Staff for Administration, United States Army. His name—Matthew B. Ridgway. For an inside appraisal of our training program, we turn our camera sights now upon Lieutenant General Ridgway.

General RIDGWAY. This period of our history is critical—critical, not just for days or months—critical not as we have been accustomed to view crises—as situations, however acute, to which by sudden emotional upsurges we can rise, and by sudden bursts of extraordinary energy, surmount. This is not that sort of crisis.

It is not one, which as in the days of our youth as a nation we might confidently expect to conquer, and then to go our way of peaceful living.

It is one of vital import to all living Americans and to their descendants for generations to come, and to every man and woman of every race and creed in whose hearts the love of freedom lives. It is one which may long continue, presenting us through the years, as it presents us in this moment, with problems of decision of as basic and far-reaching a nature as any a free society has yet confronted.

We face great present perils. Yet in the uncertain duration of this period and in our inherent impatience, lies, I think, America's greatest peril of all—the deadly danger that changing tactics may obscure the implacable intent of the Kremlin to attain its unchanging objectives—the destruction of our potential capacity for frustrating its design for world domination.

We should thank God that realization of this has come to most of our leaders, and that it is daily coming to increasing numbers of our people.

We do not know how long we shall be compelled to live as Soviet enemy No. 1, marked for attack by war or subversion at times of his choosing.

We do know now—Korea ripped one mask aside—that there will be no quick and easy solution, no short-cut to our objective.

In our growing national maturity, we begin to see true things at true values; to perceive that the moral transcends the physical by at least three to one.

So it is in every phase of the building of our great and growing Army, and its sister services on sea and in the air.

We need superior numbers and types of weapons as we never needed them before. We can't have them and unlimited luxuries, too. We must choose between differing values.

We need men and women in our ranks. We cannot have them, and an undisturbed economy, too. We must make that choice through the years ahead.

We must have training superior to any we have had before. We shall not have it unless the sterner things of the spirit are placed above the pleasant life; unless hours are longer, efforts are greater, and hazards are accepted in the training of our youths.

In no army on earth are men as well clothed, fed, and paid; as cared for when sick and injured, as in ours. In no other are they better trained and led. We would not have such training, were the moral not recognized as dominating the physical.

As old as man himself is the fear of the unknown, as devastating as fear itself is the sudden surprise appearance of threats the individual never foresaw, and against which in those first moments of mental paralysis he thinks himself defenseless. For every one of such threats in the past, it is entirely possible there will be several in the future. To all of the age-old hazards of battle, science now adds new ones, with increased potentialities for terrorizing the ill-trained fighter, or for paralyzing his mind and hand until it is too late to avert disaster. New forms of old weapons of increased range and destructiveness, new weapons of mass destruction, radiological, biological, and other forms of attack—all new to him—will place him in jeopardy as he has never before been placed.

We seek in our Army training to forestall these evils; to strengthen his spirit as we toughen his body; to teach his leaders to look ahead to the spiritual as well as to the physical dangers which threaten the men they lead, and by precept, example, and ample practice to reduce these dangers to the minimum.

It takes time to accomplish this training; time, and the understanding cooperation of parents and people to the purpose we pursue. It requires a maturity of grasp by the American people of the problem presented, and of the manner by which an unsurpassed corps of officers and noncommissioned officers loyal to every American principle is striving to solve that problem.

The hearts of these men will be no stouter, their courage no greater than the spirit of those who bred and reared them. They cannot alone discharge responsibilities which are equally theirs and those of civilian leadership in every community in everyday life.

They know, as they hope you know, some elemental facts; that weapon superiority will be a vital factor, but that the issue will still rest not with the weapon alone, however marvelous the science of its development and the technique of its manufacture, but with the use made of it by the indomitable heart and unflinching courage of the fighters, in whose virile hands it rests, and in the unfailing support they receive from home.

They see, as they pray you see, that only so can we hope to attain the goal for which we fight—an honorable lasting peace.

Mr. McCORMICK. For every soldier in battle in Korea 5 to 12 tons of equipment had to be moved in. To put men and material where they will do the most good those concerned with the transport of our Nation forged a bridge of trucks, trains, and ships stretching from every war-productive community in the United States clear across the Pacific. Three of the men whose work lay unseen but felt behind the gigantic buildup that permitted us to launch our recent offensive, are now ready to report to you—the people. First the man in charge of our civil air power—which literally "rose" to meet the emergency in the early critical days of the war. He is Delos W. Rentzel, presently chief of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, but this week to become Chairman of our Civil Aeronautics Board—Mr. Rentzel.

DELOS W. RENTZEL. As I speak, somewhere along the borders of the United States the Civil Aeronautics Administration is transmitting the flight plan of a friendly aircraft to the Armed Forces so that it can be identified when it shows up on a radar screen.

This form of cooperation in air defense of the United States is only one of many ways in which civil aviation helps keep the Nation prepared.

Our airlines helped rush men and materials to Korea when the need was most critical, moving about 75 tons a day to the Far East in August.

Our non-air-line aviation groups, who spray and dust crops, patrol pipelines, train pilots, and repair aircraft, have surveyed their resources and have come up with a comprehensive plan for using America's civil air power in the interests of defense.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration network of air navigation aids, traffic control, and communications has been and is being steadily improved with the most advanced electronic devices, to make it increasingly useful as a common system for civil and military use.

Our aircraft manufacturers are stepping up the tempo of production, to keep the United States foremost in the air. Instead of the two-billion-dollar-aircraft program scheduled before the Korean attack, their sights are now set at seven billion.

America's 500,000 civil pilots, her 90,000 civil aircraft, her 300,000 aircraft builders, her 6,400 civil airports—all are prepared for any service the Nation may require of them.

Never forget that 7,000 miles of ocean separate the United States of America from Korea. To tell us something of the tasks involved in meeting that challenge, here is Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board and Administrator of the Maritime Administration.

Vice Adm. EDWARD L. COCHRANE. Indispensable as our railroads, highways, and airlines are when it comes to moving men overseas by the thousands and materials by the tens of thousands of tons, sturdy ships moving on the sea lanes of the world are still indispensable. Behind the GI's and the fighting marines in Korea was a fleet of merchant ships carrying the bullets and the beef which these young Americans and their allies needed for their terrific fight and in their advance to Seoul.

The ships used in the Korean campaign were largely Victories hastily broken out of the laidup fleet and operated by the shipping companies under Navy orders. We put over 130 of these vessels into service as well as some transports and other special types. Additional Victory-type cargo ships are being repaired now so that they will be ready for service if needed.

Upon the request of the Secretary of Defense we are undertaking to complete as troopships four of the six big passenger liners now building. This includes the superliner at Newport News which in her new guise will carry more than 12,000 armed passengers in uniform instead of happy civilians on pleasure bent the service for which she was originally ordered and to which we hope she can soon return.

One very important fact, however, is that by far the greater number of the remaining ships in the laidup fleet are famous 10-knot Liberty ships of the emergency program of World War II. Indispensable as these ships were in the last war they are not good enough to carry vital supplies through the advance areas of another emergency. We need ships which can make at least 20 knots to assure the support of our own men and of our allies with speed and assurance in another emergency.

On Wednesday of this week I asked the shipowners and ship designers to deliver to us in about a month the basic plans of such a vessel. We must be ready to move critical cargoes fast and with security. The new type can do the job.

Mr. McCORMICK. Behind the intricate web of railways, highways, inland waterways and port facilities vital to the defense mobilization of our Nation, is the Interstate Commerce Commission. Here now is Commissioner James K. Knudson, recently appointed to administer our defense transportation.

JAMES K. KNUDSON. My responsibilities in the mobilization effort lie in the field of domestic transportation by railroad, streets and highways, inland waterways, warehousing, storage, and port utilization. Problems may develop in all of these fields and an organization, keeping in mind the taxpayers' best interest, will be set up to cope with them.

A defense-mobilization program of the magnitude now under way will require the transporting of large numbers of persons, great quantities of material, and the proper storage and handling of the Nation's wares in port areas and elsewhere. Heavy demands upon the systems that serve these interests will give rise to programs designed to effectuate your Government's careful planning, but also to preserve the rights of the citizens and maintain our American ideals.

As the national defense program unfolds, shortages and dislocations of equipment, materials, facilities, and manpower are bound to occur. Such shortages will require self-imposed conservation measures by carriers and shippers alike. Some Government controls have already become necessary in the field. Others will no doubt follow.

Our two major problems at the moment have to do with the immediate construction of from 150 to 200,000 new rail freight cars and with the maintenance of a stabilized manpower situation in the transportation community. We are not unmindful of other areas of need, particularly in the field of local transit.

The institution of any controls requires a measure of belt tightening on the part of all of us and a great deal of hard work by your public servants who must have your support

in doing the job as you would want it done and in realizing our common aims of peace and liberty.

Mr. McCORMICK. As the tide turns at last in the Far East, as the victory for which the Nation has prayed is finally in sight, millions of Americans are already breathing sighs of relief—but all too prematurely—for while the dramatic turn of events is cause for rejoicing, it is also pregnant with new dangers looming on the horizon—dangers that confront us all. To sketch these dangers for you, to prepare us for what we may yet expect, we next greet one of our top Federal officials—a man who has known war both on the front lines and far behind the front, doing an equally important job. Ladies and gentlemen, an ex-marine, now your Under Secretary of State—James Webb.

JAMES E. WEBB. I want to talk to you today about the job ahead.

You will remember that when President Truman spoke to the Nation on July 19, he said:

"There are three things we need to do:

"First," said the President, "we need to send more men, equipment and supplies to General MacArthur.

"Second, in view of the world situation, we need to build up our own Army, Navy, and Air Force over and above what is needed in Korea.

"Third, we need to speed up our work with other countries in strengthening our common defenses."

When the President spoke to you on that July evening, hardly more than 10 weeks ago, the immediate prospect was dark and filled with danger. Our men in Korea were fighting with desperate courage, under a United Nations flag to hold a United Nations beachhead.

Tonight, we can say with deep thankfulness that the end of the United Nations police action in Korea—the successful end—is in sight. We can say that the first of the three things we need to do is almost done.

Looking back, it might seem that the victory has been won with remarkable speed and with surprising ease. That conclusion would be wrong. The real burden, the cruel burden, has been borne by our men in Korea. For them the ordeal has been long and hard. To them our deep thankfulness goes in full measure. Now, let's look ahead. And in looking ahead, let's be very clear about what we have to do and why we have to do it.

What we have to do, what we are already doing, is to build up our military strength with all possible speed. At the same time we are working with other countries to build up the collective strength of the free world. And that, too, must be done with all possible speed.

To accomplish these things is not going to be easy. It is not going to be cheap. Every single American is going to feel the effects of this effort in his personal life. Every single American is going to contribute to this effort. That's the way we do things in our democracy. And because the burden and the sacrifice are shared equally and willingly, we will come through this effort stronger and more united. Experience has shown that this is true.

When we come to the why of the matter, I think most Americans have a pretty clear understanding of the danger we face. That danger is not some time off in the future. It is now.

President Truman put his finger on it when he said, "The fact that Communist forces have invaded Korea is a warning that there may be similar acts of aggression in other parts of the world." The free nations must be on their guard, more than ever before, against this kind of sneak attack.

Our purpose, and let's keep this always in mind, is to prevent another sneak attack, like the one in Korea. And the way to do that is to build up such a strong collective defense that Communist leaders will know beyond all doubt, that aggression does not pay.

But we are not thinking only in terms of military defense. We have other and perhaps even stronger resources on which to draw. One of them is the United Nations. In the case of Korea, we saw the United Nations work as it was really intended to work. As Secretary Acheson has repeatedly said, we are determined that from now on it shall have every chance to go on carrying out the purposes of the Charter.

In addition, the free world has great economic resources to help people fight poverty and to strengthen their faith in the free way of life.

And finally, we have the resources of freedom itself. Let's never forget that freedom is the strongest force in the whole world. We have it in our hands. Our greatest hope and desire is to share it with all our fellow men.

Mr. McCORMICK. Thus the Nation, America—as leading Washington officials have come before you to report—moves into another week of war in Korea.

And now we urge you to lend eyes and ears to Dr. Steelman and Under Secretary Webb who have an especially important announcement for you at the receiving end of this battle report.

Dr. STEELMAN. This is a book prepared and just released at the suggestion of President Truman. It is entitled "Our Foreign Policy" and contains a wealth of information on the origins, problems, and goals of that policy. Without doubt, it is the most important publication of its kind since the Korean conflict. Under Secretary Webb has made it possible for you to secure this book at no cost—will you tell them about it, Jim.

Mr. WEBB. Yes, John. To secure your copy of Our Foreign Policy, simply address the Office of Public Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D. C. While there is no charge, as Dr. Steelman pointed out, the supply is unfortunately limited. Again, simply write—a penny postcard will do—the Office of Public Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D. C. We, of the State Department, are happy to make this important report available to you, and hope every thoughtful American will read it.

Mr. McCORMICK. Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another teledocumentary, this, then, against the background of battle-front Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your eighth Battle Report, Washington.

Acheson Campaign To Oust MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a United Press news dispatch which appeared in the Ely Times of September 19, 1950, relative to the Secretary of State's campaign to oust MacArthur.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD EVENTS

(By the United Press)

WASHINGTON.—Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, believes Dean Acheson will be dropped as Secretary of State within 60 days and that Gen. Douglas MacArthur may be ousted as United States commander in the Far East.

In a radio interview MALONE said agitation against Acheson will not die down despite Gen. George C. Marshall's appointment to succeed Louis Johnson as Secretary of Defense. Because of continued public criticism, he said, Acheson, too, will be out.

He said a State Department clique is out to get MacArthur and predicted that its behind-the-scenes propaganda will be stepped up against the Supreme Allied Commander. He added that Mr. Truman would not dare oust MacArthur now because of public opinion.

Address by Dr. Harold W. Dodds, President of Princeton University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address by Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University, delivered at the opening exercises of Princeton University's two hundred and fifth year in the Princeton University Chapel, Sunday, September 17, 1950:

With these exercises Princeton embarks on her two hundred and fifth year devoted to the advancement of knowledge and the education of young men. There is no need to expatiate upon the stresses and strains under which we begin a new academic season. We are truly living in the age of anxiety. Geologists may call it the cenozoic era; but "phenobarbital era" describes it better from a sociological standpoint.

Therefore it seems appropriate on this opening day for me to interrupt my usual habit of talking about matters pertaining peculiarly to Princeton and her educational philosophy, and to give you instead, as briefly as I can, my view of today's world, in which every American, young and old, educated or ignorant, is involved.

Beneath the Nation's strain and anxiety lies an uneasy national conscience. By specific words and actions the United States Government has accepted the responsibility of world leadership in building the United Nations into an effective international government. Yet, the diplomacy of the mightiest and richest people on earth has not been able to prevent resort to war. Whether it can prevent explosion of present hostilities into global war only the future can say.

Yet our collective national mind has been wobbly, uncertain, and divided. Too often the baser features of practical politics, revealed in unsavory maneuvers for personal and party advantage, have tainted the treatment of the gravest issues. Our prestige as a nation, fit to be trusted with the function of world leadership, has diminished since 1945. While paying lip service to the need for military strength, we have seen that strength decline, experts tell us, to a point on June 25, last, substantially under that on Pearl Harbor Day. The total military strength of all the free nations is below that of Russia's, as was made clear last month in the figures announced in Parliament and in the British and French memoranda to our Government.

Our military deterioration has naturally weakened our diplomatic officers in their dealings with an adversary which considers our military weakness but an index of spiritual flabbiness. We have been unfair to our diplomats, for we have compelled them to lead from military weakness rather than from military strength. Neither have their hands included the ace card of an intellectually united and spiritually harmonious America, at a time when our personal and material comforts have been increasing at a most extraordinary rate.

Walter Lippmann's phrase "deficit diplomacy" aptly describes the way in which American commitments abroad increased while our power to meet them declined. Last January, Mr. Acheson defined our "defensive perimeter" in the Far East. Whether or not he excluded Korea is open to argument, but in any case he included more territory than we are militarily able to defend at the moment. Mr. Truman's recent announcement of intention to increase substantially our forces in western Europe merely reminds us of the patent fact that in the last analysis Europe is the critical area in respect to world war or peace.

In the last few years we have heard a great deal about one world. Yet, as thoughtful observers have pointed out, the grim fact is that in several respects we are further from one world than we were in 1914, at the outbreak of World War I. In those old complacent days one could travel throughout two hemispheres without a passport. (My first visit to Europe was possible only by working my way over on a cattle boat. So limited were my resources that had I had to pay the costs of a passport and various visas necessary today, the trip would have been beyond my means.) Then trade, as well as travel was far less restricted; international monetary exchange was freer; intercourse between peoples was easier and friendlier; both commerce and culture were more cosmopolitan than they are today. International intercourse today is between governments rather than between individuals with the consequence that, whether you define war in terms of cold or hot, the restricted intercourse we enjoy today is more warlike than at the opening of the century.

On the other hand, however, it is not all on the grim side; there are some new assets which must be stressed as indications of progress toward world order. In favor of world order today must be listed the credit item of a functioning, if embryonic, world organization, the United Nations. Power imperialism, as western nations used to practice it, has almost passed from the scene. Today more consideration is being given to backward peoples by the more advanced. A greater popular awareness of the horror and stupidity of war has grown up. There is a wide realization (although it is yet far from general) that only new and extreme measures will maintain peace and that there can be peace only with justice. There are grounds to hope that if global hostilities can be postponed for a period, a world order sufficient to meet the requirements of a durable peace can be established.

Now, where does all this leave us? The only way I can answer is to review what I have been preaching for several years. From this point my remarks will be somewhat personal, I fear.

As the end of hostilities approached in 1945, I became increasingly alarmed by a growing expectation that somehow victory would bring automatically a durable peace through the easily and quick organization of a comprehensive world government, which could be established and made to function overnight. In several addresses throughout the country in the interests of a just and durable peace, I pointed out that the basic elements of common consent, of common legal and political experience and habits of thought, which are the foundation of domestic law and popular government within a nation, were still lacking in international relations. As yet, international law is not full-fledged law—it is still in a process of becoming—not merely for the reason that it lacks an international police power to enforce it, but more truly because there does not yet exist among the leading nations of the world the common basis of peaceful habits, popular acquiescence and accepted custom at the international level which underlie the domestic law that we obey without question. Take the Russians, for example. They have had no experience with such democratic practices as free elections or the impartial, judicial settlement of private disputes. Yet, it is these very institutions of democracy, arrived at by years of struggle in our own history, that we correctly consider to be the only rational and enduring basis of a peaceful world order. Therefore, was it to be expected that, no matter how proficient in science and technology, politically backward peoples, unacquainted with the familiar democratic processes of free elections and the judicial settlement of private disputes, would be willing suddenly to entrust their national security to an agent so new and strange as the United Nations? Rather, was it not to be expected that they would naturally adhere to a system they understood, viz, the familiar methods of force, at least for as long as their aims were being successfully attained by force?

But there is more to Russia's behavior than political inexperience with free, representative institutions. Something new has been added to old-fashioned power politics. International communism is a new style in national aggression. Now we are coming to understand that the Communist manifesto meant what it said, and that the gospel of communism is a ruthlessly expansionist doctrine of both domestic and foreign violence—physical, intellectual, and spiritual. Now, after many lessons, although not until international communism under Russia's domination had gained control over one-third of the population of the world, we are piercing the smoke screen of its false social philosophy and perverted ideals of social justice to an understanding of its evil driving power when once it has captured the minds of men.

For these and other reasons, there were, at the end of the war, convincing grounds to anticipate that, as a practical matter, for an interim period at least, the basic deterrent to war would be found in some form of an international balance of power, in which balance Russia and the United States would appear as the chief elements. The unpleasant truth was that, if there was to be peace long enough to enable the United Nations to grow into an effective world government, it would be with the help of balance of power. We who argued thus were not popular among our brethren in educational circles. We were charged with militarism, jingoism, treason to the United Nations, and similar crimes and misdemeanors. Nothing was further from my mind and heart. I want to emphasize that never for a moment did I suggest that balance of power would keep the peace indefinitely. Balance of power has never been a durable agency of peace; its best and only possible service would be as a block on war—long enough for the nations to develop an effective world organization to replace war. I did feel that if America played her part a balance could be achieved which could keep the peace long enough to permit the United Nations to develop into an effective international government.

I have to admit that I underestimated the strength of Russia's resistance to a functioning United Nations, although I cannot but feel that a more courageous military and diplomatic position on our part in the early stages would have influenced her toward more peaceful ways. I realized that the time which balance of power would give for this purpose would be relatively short, but it could be long enough, if the world powers, which alone can support great armaments, were imaginative and zealous for enduring peace. I knew that this line of reasoning placed upon America, as the strongest and therefore the most responsible nation in the world, a rugged twofold task, viz, to maintain a strong military position with a willingness to fight for our way of life if need be, yet at the same time to work incessantly, day and night, for world government as a substitute for war. I realized that these were most difficult—almost contradictory—courses for any nation or any individual to pursue at one and the same time. If we plumped for force alone we were lost; yet, if we neglected force we were equally lost. Military strength alone would not be enough. Balance of power alone could not only result in war eventually, as it always has. But it alone could give us hope of a breathing space sufficient to the development of a wholehearted acceptance and implementation of the ideal of world law under world government.

It is at last clear that there is no present alternative to a substantial strengthening of our military position as the only possible road to peace in the fevered state of the world today. You young people may accuse me, who am past the age for military service, of cold-blooded willingness to sacrifice you to a course of action in which your lives must bear the brunt of disruption and perhaps danger. But, I repeat, I can find no alternative to a larger mobilization of our military resources, although as I shall indicate in a moment, it alone is not enough. I do not venture to suggest what degree of military mobilization will be necessary; no one can now say, least of all an amateur like myself. Later developments will point the way; but from my study in 1947 as a member of the Commission on Universal Military Training, I believe that the President's estimate of approximately 3,000,000 in the Armed Forces is a minimum. Basic to every other consideration (let us never forget) is a full degree of unity and willingness to sacrifice on the part of the millions who will not be called to serve in the Military Establishment proper. I repeat, we must lead from the harmonious combination of military, economic, and spiritual strength; we cannot influence the course of events by being weak in the face of hostile forces that despise weakness.

Despite all I have said, to conclude that another world war is inevitable is rank defeatism. There are reasons to hope that Russia has overextended her front—that she has bitten off more than she can chew; that behind her iron curtain lurk grave internal weaknesses; that she knows that her economy cannot support a war and that the mass of her people are psychologically against it. There is reason to believe that the oligarchy that rules Russia is vulnerable to a campaign of psychological warfare; that behind the iron curtain the dictatorship is less securely entrenched with the masses than we think; which suggests the importance of a more alert compaign of understanding than the feeble efforts undertaken so far. Nor can her rulers be so ignorant and stupid as not to be aware of the overwhelming industrial potential of the United States and the role it would play in global war. There is reason to hope that we can contain Russia, that we can still buy more time, if we are willing now to pay the price in terms of disruption for a period of those pleasant pursuits appropriate to a world at peace.

Let us never forget that power alone will not insure peace; it can only buy us time to develop the foundations of peace. Therefore, what we do now with the time we may buy is all important. If we fail to link to our power a bold and comprehensive program for achieving the peaceful settlement of grave international differences, we shall be committed to an armament race that can have

but one ending, disaster. That disaster will be the greater because we shall descend into it with all the bitterness and self-recrimination of a guilty conscience. Policies more fundamental than have heretofore been advanced must be put forward, not as vague ideals to be adopted at some unnamed future date, but as goals to be achieved soon. It is not time for homeopathic doses. The disease just won't wear itself out.

After long consideration I have joined that school of thought which holds that there is no durable solution short of the mutual and complete disarmament of the nations now comprising the United Nations, and that the time to announce our support of it, as the ultimate solution, is now. I stress the words "mutual" and "complete." I place no trust in unilateral disarmament. Moreover, it must be under an accepted world government empowered to administer the process of disarmament, for efforts heretofore to civilize war or to attain peace by international treaties have always failed. Such methods as Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, the Naval Disarmament Agreement engineered by Charles E. Hughes in 1921, and the Kellogg Pact of 1928 have long since demonstrated their inadequacy. I, therefore, stress the existing organization of the United Nations as the only agency available for undertaking the task in time. I suggest, therefore, that the United Nations turn its attention to the rapid accomplishment of complete disarmament, not merely to the abolition of A-bombs and H-bombs. (May I parenthetically observe that I am here expressing the general philosophy which is most cogently argued in a little book by Grenville Clark, entitled "A Plan for Peace," to be published soon and which I commend to you.)

Realism suggests that the process of universal disarmament must necessarily progress by degrees, beginning with the elimination of the newest and most devastating weapons. The real point is that the accepted goal must be complete disarmament and that, while we are improving our military position to meet the present crisis, America should throw her influence behind disarmament and assert her readiness to lead.

I know that many sincere public officials who have endured prolonged frustration in nerve-wracking negotiations with Russia will reply that, since our good intentions have failed in lesser efforts, they cannot succeed in a more revolutionary and comprehensive program. I agree that our intention to support a broad program of disarmament should not retard for a moment the rapid restoration by the Western World of a favorable power position. But while we are improving our power position as a negative restraint on violence, why should we not also be developing a new positive weapon in the form of a great purpose?

If you object that the proposal that universal and complete disarmament is too bizarre to merit consideration by responsible statesmen, I shall reply in the words of George Washington: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and just can repair; the rest is in the hands of God."

One thing is clear. The peoples of the world do not want war. Increasingly aware, as they are, of the human costs of another one, are there not grounds for hoping that before it is too late they can be aroused to demand a lasting solution? And isn't it better to work and fight in behalf of a permanent solution than a temporary palliative? One thing we can be sure of: that to fight and win a war, no matter how just the cause or complete the victory, brings no enduring peace. To contain Russia is wise and necessary, but alone it lacks the driving force of a profound ideal which carries the promise of the future we all desire. Heretofore, the bold stroke which would arouse the spirit of peoples by penetrating to the deep heart of our fears and dangers has been absent. To reduce the possibility of war Mr. Baruch has wisely urged that America declare her peace terms now. I should go further by including in such terms the extreme proposal of general disarmament as the chief function of the United Nations.

As a practical matter, a national decision by a strong America in favor of disarmament under world government would be good psychological warfare right now. In terms of the vision by which men and nations live or die, such a stand would cleanse our national conscience and renew our awareness of the mission which our strength lays upon us.

Finally, a special word to Princeton students regarding the academic years ahead. The university authorities can be relied upon to keep you informed promptly of developments and programs at Washington affecting your future here. Special agencies have been established for this purpose. Amidst the confusion and rumors that are bound to develop, we shall do our utmost to keep you abreast of matters affecting you; and to advise individuals as to the course they should pursue.

If and as it may become necessary, the university will adjust to your changing needs. We shall retain, however, our faith in the timeless importance of the education for which we stand. For never has the world stood in greater need of liberally educated people, leaders who see beyond the facts and figures of technology and commerce to the nature and aspirations of human beings.

Remember—what you have heard before—that it is men that the world is afraid of, not the forces of nature. It is not atomic energy we fear; it is how men may use that energy. Early man stood in fear and awe of the forces of nature; the tempest, the lightning, storm, and drought. Science has enabled us to conquer our fear of these; but we have acquired in the process a more devastating fear of each other. Princeton has held for more than 200 years to the belief that a well-rounded education provides the elements by which fears of each other can be exercised and human energies released for greater things.

Until you are summoned to other duties, you can continue your course here with a clean conscience if you earnestly pursue your education. It will help equip you to meet later the Nation's, and the world's, greatest problems. Let us keep the coming year as normal as circumstances permit, in certain confidence in the values of the education we believe in. Let us all pull together in the Princeton tradition. With God's help we can and will make it a good year.

I extend to each and every one of you my personal best wishes for a fruitful life on this campus.

I have not pulled any punches. I have frankly given you the pattern of the facts as I see them. Anything less would be eyewash, and an insult to your intelligence. But above all else, do not become cynical and do not fall into despair. The very tensions we are under; our national awareness of danger, exceeding our grasp before World War II, are sound reasons for hope.

British Jet Arouses Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two news dispatches from the New York Times for Tuesday, September 12, and Thursday, September 14, concerning the questions aroused by the British jet.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 12, 1950]

BRITISH JET STIRS QUERIES ON SOVIET—EXPERTS THINK RUSSIANS MAY HAVE BUILT SIMILAR PLANE WITH ENGINES LONDON SENT

LONDON, September 11.—Aviation experts took a long look at Britain's fastest interceptor plane in the world today and said the Soviet Union might have developed one almost as fast from jet engines shipped to Moscow by the Labor government.

The controversy over 50 jet aircraft engines supplied to the Soviet Union 4 years ago came to a head after Britain displayed a powerful twin-engined fighter powered by her most powerful jets at the Farnborough Air Show.

The fighter was a standard Royal Air Force Meteor. The engines were the new Sapphires, billed here as the world's most potent jets—with a single Sapphire developing as much power as all four piston engines in a United States Superfortress. The plane was flown in public for the first time last week.

ROLLS ROYCE ENGINES SENT SOVIET

The engines sent to the Soviet Union were Rolls Royce "Nene" and "Derwent" type jets, a Ministry of Supply official said.

The Sapphires, taken off the secret list only a few weeks ago, were developed largely from information gained flying the Nene and Derwent engines.

"If I didn't know a single thing about jets, and someone gave me 50 to play around with, I'd have a mighty fast plane flying in a very few years," one British expert said.

The Soviet Union, with the aid of expert German engineers taken here after World War II and known to be working on jet development outside Moscow, could have carried out similar experiments, design specialists said.

At least the British engines probably shoved the Soviet Union as much as 10 years ahead ir her development of jet aviation.

FIRST SOVIET JET FLOWN IN 1945

That would be quite a jump for a nation that flew its first jet over Berlin near the war's end. The Russian jet flown in the Battle of Berlin was a patched-together model of a captured German Messerschmitt, western experts believe.

Reliable sources said the decision to send the engines to the Soviet Union, despite substantial objection on the part of British military circles, had been approved on very high level by the Labor government.

The Sapphire could drive a plant at 1,000 miles an hour—if an airframe could be built to stand the stress—experts estimate.

The Meteor, even without a fuselage designed for high subsonic or supersonic flying, approaches the speed of sound with only one of its two Sapphires turned on, reliable sources said.

It reaches 40,000 feet in under 3 minutes.

[From the New York Times of September 14, 1950]

BRITISH HALT EXIT OF JET AIRCRAFT—BAN ON SCARCE WAR MATERIALS COVERS LANDS NOT IN ATLANTIC PACT OR COMMONWEALTH

LONDON, September 13.—Britain has ordered a halt to deliveries of scarce military equipment, including jet aircraft, to countries outside the North Atlantic Pact and the British Commonwealth.

This action had been foreshadowed yesterday by Prime Minister Attlee in the House of Commons.

However, as the Government has not yet promised unequivocally to withhold machine tools from the Soviet Union and its satellites, the Conservative Party moved in Parliament tonight to block such exports.

Winston Churchill and other Conservatives offered a motion in the House of Commons urging the Government "to suspend the export of heavy machine tools and strategic raw materials that would add to the war potential of possible aggressors, or which we or our allies require for our own defense."

That motion will be debated Monday. Meanwhile an undertaking in almost the same terms came from the Government in the House today.

Hugh Gaitskell, Minister of State for Economic Affairs, said that Mr. Attlee had made it perfectly clear that the Government would stop the export of items of equipment, including machine tools required by Britain and her allies. Requisitioning powers would be used if necessary, Mr. Gaitskell added.

ATTLEE PLEDGE RECALLED

He did not say that equipment not needed here would be withheld, although it might be useful, as Mr. Churchill has alleged, for the war industries of Communist countries.

In the House yesterday Mr. Attlee said that action had been, or would be, taken to insure the availability of goods needed for the war effort of Britain and her allies.

On the day before the Government of Egypt, which has been receiving considerable deliveries of British arms and equipment, including jet fighters, was informed of the new British policy. Other governments that have placed arms contracts here, including Argentina, are likewise being informed.

This does not mean that all arms deliveries to countries outside the great alliance necessarily will be halted.

The ban applies only to high priority items—presumably of the type that the North Atlantic Council of Deputies have urged the Atlantic pact countries to produce at the greatest possible rate.

The Ministry of Supply accordingly has been instructed to ask British concerns manufacturing for foreign buyers to postpone deliveries of high priority items indefinitely.

Such items, it would appear, are to be produced only for Britain, her North Atlantic allies, and the Commonwealth countries.

OUTCOME OF SECRET TALKS

OTTAWA, September 13.—Britain's decision to halt the supply of high priority arms to all countries outside the Commonwealth and the North Atlantic Pact group was disclosed here today to be the outcome of a secret North Atlantic Pact conference held recently in Paris.

At this meeting representatives of Canada and the United States called on European members, including Britain, to tighten up against shipment of strategic materials to Communist countries by reclassifying strategic lists to match those used in North America.

Statement of James Dillon, Irish Minister of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, by request, an extract from the remarks of Mr. James Dillon, the Irish Minister of Agriculture, which were made at a meeting organized by the Ancient Order of Hibernians at Glenties, County Donegal, Ireland.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Referring to communism, Mr. Dillon remarked that at the present time no honest man or woman could remain neutral. To pretend neutrality was, in reality, to help the Communists and the sooner that fact was faced and personal decisions were taken in the light of it, the better it would be. The Minister then made this observation: "Would that Ireland had the opportunity of taking her decision on this issue as a united nation. Why cannot those who maintain the crime of partition not see the wicked folly of it before it is too late?"

Mr. Dillon stated that the attack on Korea by the Cominform was the first stage of a conspiracy to destroy freedom and Christian faith all over the world. If America had not been there to challenge that aggression, it would have spread like a prairie fire throughout the whole Orient and by now the Philippines, Formosa, Indochina, Burma, and Malay would have been overrun. This would have led to the destruction of India and Persia, and Europe would have been faced with the choice of becoming the world's battleground or of capitulating. "All this," he said, "had been averted by the heroic resistance of a handful of American soldiers who for the last month had held a heavily equipped army of 250,000 Communists at bay."

Not the Way To Conserve Ores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Reno Evening Gazette of September 8, 1950, relative to the development of the mining industry.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT THE WAY TO CONSERVE ORES

Closing down American metal mines to conserve the reserves of strategic ores is a fallacious theory held by some of the planners in Washington. They would leave the ore in the ground, and meanwhile import metals from foreign sources as long as possible.

This is another case where the theorists talk about things of which they have no practical knowledge. Mines aren't underground storage vaults, Federal treasure hoards of gold at Fort Knox and silver at West Point.

Closed mines must be maintained, and this is an expensive process. Extracting the ore and reducing it to metal cannot be done on a moment's notice, either. It takes complicated and costly equipment to operate a mine and mill, and skilled personnel. At a time when these vital minerals would be needed, there would be a shortage of both men and equipment.

Rather than regard the ore deposits of this country as a supply that can be tapped easily, the Government planners should be concerned with developing new sources to assure an adequate supply for both war and industrial purposes. In two world wars, this country found itself short of many metals. Only when the situation became critical did the Government show any interest, and then it spent money extravagantly in an effort to develop the domestic mines. But as soon as peace returned, the lessons of this short-sighted policy were forgotten, and the efforts of the mining industry to get Federal aid to bolster up the industry were dismissed, and the mining men were accused of trying to claim an undeserved subsidy.

Resolutions on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD three resolutions adopted by the American Federation of Teachers at their national convention held on August 21–25, 1950, in Detroit, Mich.

There being no objection, the resolutions were printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCRIMINATION IN INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION

Whereas segregation and discrimination against citizens of the United States because of race or color is practiced in transportation, under laws of several of the States of the United States; and

Whereas such segregation and discrimination has been shown by recent judicial decisions to be contrary to the letter and spirit of the Constitution of the United States, as far as interstate transportation is concerned; and

Whereas such judicial interpretation, however beneficial it may be in its ultimate effect, is not being implemented by officials of the United States and the several said States with sufficient rapidity under present laws: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Federation of Teachers in convention assembled, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States be petitioned to pass laws preventing segregation and discrimination against citizens of the United States on account of race, color, or national origin, in interstate transportation of all kinds.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL FOR NATION'S CAPITAL

Whereas rights granted to American citizens by the Constitution of the United States are daily violated in the Capital of the Nation; and

Whereas the exclusion of Negro citizens from theaters, moving-picture houses, restaurants, hotels, and other places for amusement, entertainment, and education in the Capital of our Nation has made us appear backward to the rest of the civilized world; and

Whereas such a situation has been and will continue to be exploited by the potential enemies of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Federation of Teachers in convention assembled, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the

United States be respectfully petitioned to pass a civil-rights bill for the District of Columbia resembling civil-rights laws that are now on the statute books of several States of the United States.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE LAW

Whereas there is a prospect of increasing unemployment in our country; and

Whereas such unemployment is likely to be suffered in unusual degree by members of minority racial and religious groups; and

Whereas action by the several States is not likely to be taken in time adequately to deal with this problem; and

Whereas it is highly desirable that the National Government set an example to our country as a whole: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Federation of Teachers in convention assembled, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to enact a fair employment practice law for the States and Territories of the United States, including the District of Columbia.

Peacetime Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the July 1950 issue of the Mining Congress Journal, entitled "Peacetime Battle," which has to do with the mining industry in the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACETIME BATTLE

"Battles are only a sort of public verification of mastery gained during peace," said William James, famed naval historian. As this is written, American fighting men are carrying out United Nations punitive sanctions in Korea. There is risk that this procedure might result in a war that would again engulf the major portion of the world. Since, however, the initiative does not rest with the United Nations nor the United States, none of our professional or amateur prognosticators are doing anything more than making educated guesses.

This activity is a healthy one; every enemy capability should be thoroughly considered in enabling this Nation to seek the right course. Unfortunately for us, there are some most unpleasant facts that must be faced in laying plans for the part we will play when and if the opposition decides to quit heckling and move out in force. No matter where the enemy may strike or in what force, we must be prepared to answer with the measures most likely to result in our victory; delivery to the enemy in quantity of raw materials in fabricated and injurious form. This requires an abundant supply of minerals, the product of a healthy, vigorous mining industry.

Tonnages of those metals essential to the prosecution of a war can only come from a live industry such as could exist in the climate created by adoption of the tax recommendations made by the National Minerals Advisory Council and the American Mining Congress. But a dismal picture is drawn when one examines the results of a recent survey made through the members of a society that embraces most of those technicians who make the decisions as to whether exploration or development of new metal deposits is economically justifiable.

This study, which also inquired into corrective measures, was conducted to determine the relative extent of new development and exploration being carried on today as compared with 1940, and the relative health of the various branches of the industry at both ends of the decade.

The examination revealed that exploration and development in the coal industry had not changed materially, but the general opinion held was that labor troubles and taxes had placed the industry in a far less favorable condition than in 1940.

Since 1940 exploration and development of new iron-ore reserves has increased by 50 percent, but the widespread thought encountered was that, in event of war, the industry would not be in as good shape to produce as it was 10 years ago.

Figures concerning exploration and development for the nonferrous metals indicate a reduction of 74 percent. The consensus of opinion was that, should an emergency arise, the industry would be badly off in comparison to the condition prevailing in 1940.

These figures, together with the considered opinion of the experts, glaringly reveal that but little effort is being made to find new ore reserves. At the same time, many mining companies maintain high production from ore deposits developed with prewar dollars and at prewar costs. This ore is being turned into 1950 depreciated dollars. If an endeavor was made to replace those reserves under present costs and subject to current taxes, it would be almost impossible to show a profit commensurate with the risk.

When we examine into the number of operating underground mines, we find that, in California, the total had declined by 76 percent from 1940 to 1949 and that mining employment has fallen off by 72.3 percent in this last decade. In Utah the number of shipping mines has dropped 89 percent in the same period; Oregon has undergone a 95 percent decline in underground lode mining and Nevada has suffered a 62.7 percent reduction. Although final data are not available on the number of mines producing strategic metals, in the period 1940–49, lode mines producing either copper, lead, zinc, gold, or silver, declined in New Mexico, 53 percent; in Arizona, 67 percent; in Montana, 59 percent; and in Colorado, 43 percent.

What do these figures mean to us? When we weigh them against the exceptionally high World War II submarine sinkings of shiploads of critical materials, and consider the superior underseas fleet that opposes us today—there is food for thought. Domestic mining undergoes a steady downtrend in the face of foreign imports. New reserves are not being found at an adequate rate. Know-how is being lost as important strategic metal mines are forced to cease operations. Have we lost our peacetime battle? It appears most unlikely that we would be able to achieve, as quickly as needed, the output of minerals and metals to sustain a major effort.

This condition would be understandable if it had been brought about by natural exhaustion. Such is not the case. On a course closely duplicating the errors made in the post-World War I era plus a few new and untried mistakes, lack of sound and constructive Government policies has brought the domestic mining industry to its present precarious situation.

Included among the harmful factors are the dead hand of a Federal tax structure that permits insufficient return to justify the risk involved; inadequate depletion allowances and a tariff system too weak to encourage competition with foreign imports.

World events focus attention upon mineral supply. To enable the mining industry to fulfill current requirements and to meet the demands of another emergency, the recommendations of the NMAC and the AMC should be adopted immediately. It is not yet too late to take this step to assure this Nation's continued peacetime mastery.

Chickens Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the October 11, 1950, issue of the New York Times in connection with the McCarran anti-Communist bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICKENS HOME TO ROOST

Of the many silly features of Senator MCCARRAN'S masterpiece, the Internal Security Act of 1950, the immigration provisions are among the silliest. Anyone who had taken the trouble to study them before passage of the law would have foreseen the absurd situations which would inevitably result from this ill-disguised effort to erect an iron curtain around the shores of the United States. In analyzing the bill last August 18, we noted that "it moves our immigration procedures in precisely the wrong direction * * * and could keep out of the United States people of the very type that all of us (except perhaps Mr. MCCARRAN) want to admit." The trouble is that most Members of Congress apparently did not bother to consider the drastic nature of these (or any other) sections of the McCarran Act, but allowed themselves to be swept along in the general tide of frightened approval of anything that could be called anti-Communist.

Under the broad and vague terms of the McCarran law, anyone who at any time has ever been affiliated with the Communist or other totalitarian party of any foreign state is automatically excluded, subject only to the right of the Attorney General to grant temporary admission and to make a detailed report to Congress in each case in which he so acts. Thus Friedrich Gulda, a 20-year-old Austrian pianist, who, at the age of 10, joined the Hitler youth movement because he had to, was barred from entry until the Attorney General granted him leave to remain here for 6 days. Thus Fedora Barbieri, a young Italian mezzo-soprano who 10 years ago attended a school in Italy which was, as one might suppose, run by the Fascists, was barred from admission yesterday. Thus any singer who ever sang under the Nazis must be barred because in order to sing they all automatically had to join one or another Nazi organization. Obviously the problem of admitting formerly active Nazi, Fascist, or Communist artists raises quite another question. Here we are talking about artists of no political background, who are excluded solely because of perfunctory membership in one of the innumerable affiliates of the totalitarian regimes.

At the moment, attention is focused on the artists whom the McCarran Act prevents from contaminating American audiences. But, damaging as this policy will be to our artistic life, the problem is of even deeper

significance. Many intellectual and political leaders who have long since renounced communism or any other antidemocratic philosophy are, especially in western Europe, in the forefront of the struggle to keep the world free. As reaffirmed in the McCarran Act, our policy is to turn thumbs down on them, to say there is no hope of redemption and thereby to alienate men and women who could be among our most effective friends. Our policy, in short, simply does not make sense. Perhaps when Congress reconvenes after the election the law will be modified in conformity with the real interests of a free and democratic United States.

Tariff Cuts Offset by Use of Import Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a news dispatch which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of September 27, 1950, relative to the Torquay, England, conference where 39 nations, including the United States, will enter a bout of tariff cutting.

The United States concessions, through tariff- and import-fee reductions, will be without regard to the differential of the cost of production due to the difference in the wage standard of living between this Nation and the competitive countries, and will further remove the floor under wages and investments.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEM AT TORQUAY: EFFORTS TO SPUR TRADE BY TARIFF CUTS ARE OFFSET BY USE OF IMPORT QUOTAS

(By Warren H. Phillips)

TORQUAY, ENGLAND.—Thirty-nine countries will start a winter-long bout of tariff cutting here tomorrow in the interest of freer world trade—but some of them have slipped aces up their sleeves to keep their own industries from getting hurt.

Delegates from nations carrying on four-fifths of the world's trade have assembled at this one-time smugglers' nest on England's south coast—a "free trading" center of a past century. The negotiations are expected to be on an even larger scale than the two previous postwar rounds of tariff cutting at Geneva, in 1947, and at Annecy, France, last year. The American Government emphasized the importance it attaches to the conference by sending Willard Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State, as head of its delegation. It is the first time a person of his rank has lead the United States group.

UNITED STATES CUTS IMPORT DUTIES

The State Department already has announced it may cut import duties on about 2,500 products, including many that might stir American producers. Among these items are wool, fish, clocks, wines, whisky, paper, textiles, toys, chinaware, rayon, and dairy products.

Yet some other countries figure on having their cake and eating it at the same time. They'll agree to lower their tariff barriers in return for American concessions that will enable their exporters to sell more in the States. But while ready to throw off some trade shackles, they've been forging a few new ones to protect their home industries.

Here's how this double-dealing works:

Since the war, the number of countries applying quantitative import restrictions has swelled until all but 9 out of 86 nations now require import licenses or foreign exchange permits. Governments imposed these quotas and other import barriers with the idea of keeping their people from buying whatever they wanted in the United States and in other countries with whom the particular nation had balance-of-payments difficulties; in other words, to keep purchases in the dollar area, for example, from far outdistancing the number of greenbacks the country could earn by selling its own exports there. Without such restrictions, it is claimed the monetary reserves of many countries would have been rapidly drained dry after the war.

PROTECTING DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

At the same time, however, these import restrictions had the incidental effect of protecting domestic industries from foreign competition. And now trade experts here agree that many countries no longer needing these import curbs to protect their monetary reserves are retaining them chiefly as a protective device for their home industries—to nullify to a large extent the effects of tariff reduction.

One top American delegate gives a hypothetical example: "A factory may not be taking care of as much of the home demand for a particular product as it might if there were less foreign competition," he says. "So quantitative import restrictions are imposed with the idea of cutting down this foreign competition. The reason given is that this helps the balance-of-payments difficulties. It's difficult to decide where you are going to start and stop in applying them."

RELUCTANT TO GIVE UP "Q. R.'S"

Some import barriers erected to protect dwindling postwar monetary reserves afforded absolute protection to certain home industries—foreign products were banned. Now some producer groups and labor groups in these industries are reluctant to give up their sheltered life and face foreign competition. In some cases, it is believed the restrictions have probably influenced the direction of investment; new auto or fishing-tackle production capacity, for example, might have developed where there would not have been a big enough market to justify it if foreign imports had been allowed. These many groups have a vested interest in the maintenance of the quantitative restrictions—called "Q. R.'s" in the economists' jargon—and they're pressuring their governments to keep them.

The general agreement on tariffs and trade, under which the Torquay negotiations are being held, sanctions quantitative restrictions only if imposed to rescue a country from depletion of monetary reserves. The trend toward "Q. R.'s", which will be discussed at Torquay, was reviewed several months ago by a working party appointed by the countries which have signed the general agreement on tariffs and trade. In an 18-page technical report issued this summer, the group flatly declared:

"Some of the restrictions have remained in force after the need for them has passed away, and of the Q. R.'s applied for financial reasons, many have been retained to protect domestic producers against foreign competition."

Delegates here are reluctant to make specific allegations of bad faith against any particular country. "All sorts of other things definitely creep into the picture besides payments troubles," says an American official, "but it's ticklish to argue with a country about what the prime purpose of its Q. R.'s are and which of the effects are incidental."

Nevertheless, the delegates do agree that abuse of these import curbs and their use as a protective device is becoming widespread. "There definitely is a strong and perhaps unavoidable tendency to retain Q. R.'s even after the balance-of-payments troubles have eased," acknowledges an official of the tariff conference's secretariat.

OTHER WAYS TO GAIN ADVANTAGE

Delegates here also agree that some countries are finding other ways to stifle world trade for the sake of their home industries at the same time they are participating in projects such as this one to get it back to normal.

Western Germany, for instance, will be the most important new participant in the Torquay talks. The United States hasn't discussed tariffs with the Germans since 1930. There are a number of important United States imports from Germany on which duties may be cut, including steel specialties, chemicals, toys, optical instruments, and machinery. Most of these categories weren't discussed at the previous two tariff conferences because Germany was a chief supplier and wasn't represented at them.

GERMANY MODERNIZES OLD CODES

But the new West German Government has just modernized its old tariff code and re-evaluated its duties. Trade experts say it's impossible to get an accurate statistical comparison of the new list and the old, but those who have examined the modernized list in detail agree that the rewriting job represents an over-all upward revision.

"This way they'll come to Torquay with something more in their pockets to bargain with," says one official.

Once a country signs the general agreement on tariffs and trade, it is bound not to raise its over-all tariff level. Western Germany is not the only country that made sure to hike its rates just before signing on the dotted line. France reevaluated its tariffs before it joined the Geneva talks in 1947, and Italy did the same before entering the tariff negotiations for the first time last year at Annecy. The general impression among the specialists is that, on an over-all basis, both were upward revisions.

One effect of these reevaluations is to give these countries a bargaining advantage in the tariff negotiations. They can ask tariff cuts from other countries and reduce their own duties proportionately—yet their home industries would not feel the full effect of the reductions when they are compared with the tariff level before the code was rewritten.

REEVALUATION OFFSETS

The reevaluations have yet another effect. France and Italy held their new duties in abeyance until the recent trade liberalization drive in western Europe—in which the Marshall plan nations have already agreed to free 60 percent of the trade among themselves from quantitative import restrictions. Then they put their modernized tariff schedules into effect.

Thus while trade is freed by one method, such as reducing Q. R.'s, these reductions are in some cases met by tariff increases which throttle commerce. These reductions in quantitative restrictions apply only to western European nations. American exporters won't find it any easier to sell abroad than previously. And when tariffs are cut here at Torquay on a basis that will make the cuts applicable to all 39 nations taking part in the talks, some of the effect will be

nullified by maintenance of Q. R.'s by some countries for protective purposes.

The upshot is that in protecting home industries, Europeans have found there are many ways to skin a cat—none of them conducive to free trade and a return to normal international commerce.

Communism and High Prices Are Our Most Serious Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, to my mind the most serious problems that confront us today are the many problems that arise because of the wide infiltration of Communists and their activities into our country, and the next most serious are the mounting prices of all commodities. I shall discuss each of these subjects briefly.

The reason for there being so much communistic activity in our country dates back to the recognition of Russia as a nation by President Roosevelt. President Wilson had refused to recognize Russia and so had Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. One of the first new things done by the New Deal was to take Russia into full fellowship with the United States. That same spirit of giving America away at every opportunity has characterized the New Deal from that time down to now.

By reason of this spirit of laxity on the part of the New Deal we soon found that our immigration laws were being violated on every hand and undesirables by the thousands were finding their way into our country.

Under Madam Perkins, our Secretary of Labor, and many others who shared her views, we soon found many foreigners holding responsible positions in our Government. We also found the Communists in our country becoming more active and more assertive until they were secretly dominating some of our Government departments and activities. They seemed to gravitate most naturally into the State Department and into the Department of Labor. Evidently they got more sympathy and more freedom in these two departments. They became so powerful that we soon found them sitting at the elbow of President Roosevelt at many of the most important international conferences ever held by any officers representing our country. Alger Hiss was Roosevelt's most confidential adviser and if he had not been convicted as a perjurer he would no doubt be Secretary of State now.

Mr. Speaker, the communistic activities of hundreds of these Government employees should have been known to Roosevelt and his crowd. The fact that Roosevelt and his crowd did their utmost to prevent an exposure of these traitors throws the burden of proof upon them.

When Mr. Truman said in 1948, "I like Old Joe—he is a decent fellow," he surely was terribly ignorant of historical facts or he was being flippant as he was when he criticized that great branch of our national defenders known as the United States Marines.

Mr. Speaker, a reasonable amount of political partisanship can be tolerated even from a President. Fair partisanship between political parties is a stimulant just as fair competition is a stimulant to business. But blind stubborn partisanship which fails to be incensed at unpatriotic conduct is carrying partisanship too far.

When the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives was bringing out into the open the facts of the Whittaker Chambers case and the Hiss case and many others, it was improper for President Truman to refer to these activities as a red herring. If he had the patriotic sportsmanship that characterizes the usual American he would have acknowledged his mistakes. He has not done so. As the score now stands Truman still thinks that "Old Joe" is a fine fellow and that Alger Hiss and thousands of other traitors are free Americans and that the Marines are not what we all have claimed for them.

Mr. Speaker, the national situation is too precarious to admit of the injection of politics into our economic activities. The Korean war and the serious threat of war in other directions should cause those in authority to appreciate their responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to say to my constituents and to the world that from my first election to Congress I have been in the front line in opposition to the bringing into our country of undesirable aliens and in favor of deporting all those who favor communism and who agitate against our Government. I am the author of legislation that restricted immigration and restricted the action of suspicious aliens.

Mr. Speaker, the only way this dirty mess can be cleaned out is to elect a Republican Congress and Senate on November 7 and elect a Republican President in 1952.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the other important issue of high prices. I confess that this is also a serious problem and a difficult one to work out. The unwise meddling with the ordinary and natural business methods by the Roosevelt administration brought about many maladjustments that proved difficult to remedy. We will not forget NIRA and WPA, and many others. We will especially remember OPA with its attendant black markets and high-handed business practices. We will remember that it was as a result of the disclosures of the Republican Food Study Committee of which I had the honor of being chairman that President Truman did away with the OPA and although the people are terribly displeased with the present conditions from which such tremendously high prices have come upon us, nobody that I know of wishes a return of OPA.

Mr. Speaker, Congress in the present session passed a law giving tremendous powers to the President over our business activities and especially over prices of food and living commodities. He was also given the power to control the wages that naturally are a part of the price of practically every commodity.

The President will probably take no action with reference to this urgent problem until after the coming election. He should not play politics with serious matters. Action should be taken immediately for the situation is serious and getting more serious every day. It is unfortunate that all these economic loads and maladjustments fall heaviest on the persons who are least able to carry them.

Mr. Speaker, just a short time ago, Mr. Albert Goss, the master of the National Grange, delivered an address that treated in part with the agricultural problems of this time. He discussed profiteering and price controls very intelligently. I am sorry that I cannot elaborate on his views. I can only say that the farmer is much interested in any action the President may take with regard to price fixing. Care must be taken not to disrupt the production of food which is the responsibility of the farmers. Agriculture is our greatest industry. In our last great national depression agriculture was the first to suffer deflation. We must not permit that to happen again for now we not only feed ourselves but much of the world depends upon us for food.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of food production in our country is now a great business. There are many factors that must be considered and these factors must cooperate. Up-to-date farms now must have electric energy. The development of rural electrification has been an interesting topic with the farmers of Ohio. I think Ohio leads or is near the lead in rural electrification, and practically every farm home in Ohio is now supplied with electricity.

I am proud that I had a very important part in forming the Buckeye rural electrification unit which now is one of the largest units in the State. The first meeting in connection with the formation of this unit was held in the courthouse at Gallipolis and I went all the way from Washington to attend it. I attended several other meetings there and have consulted frequently with the directors and management of this big concern. This unit has now expanded until it serves most of the farmers in seven counties. An announcement has been made today by the Rural Electrification Administration that an additional allotment of $475,000 has been made to the Buckeye rural electrification unit. This amount is to be expended in Meigs, Gallia, Lawrence, Jackson, Vinton, and Athens Counties. It is planned to build 146 miles of new lines to serve 515 additional families. The remainder of this allotment is to be used in repairs and maintenance.

I hope that the board of directors and the management of this very large project will give to it their best service and thereby guarantee to these hundreds of patrons good service at reasonable cost.

Mr. Speaker, I leave off as I began by saying that our two most urgent problems are: First, wipe out communism; second, take immediate action to prevent unfair profiteering and exorbitant prices.

Aid to European Industry May Backfire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the Los Angeles Examiner of February 28, 1950, in regard to the possibility of United States aid to European industry backfiring.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES AID TO EUROPE INDUSTRY SHOWING SIGNS OF BACKFIRING

(By J. W. Ward)

Industry in the United States is beginning to feel effects of extraordinary efforts by the Government to stimulate foreign trade by reducing tariffs and financing industries of foreign countries.

So long as European nations were flat on their backs after the end of hostilities, there was no objection in giving them all the help possible, not only to alleviate suffering but to put their industries in position to resume operations.

The Marshall plan was the result of this altruistic policy of the Government. Since its initiation billions of dollars have been poured into the industries of these nations. As a result, production of many goods has attained almost prewar proportions and some of these are entering world markets in competition with American products.

Some businessmen now are beginning to wonder if it is possible that we went, and are going, just a little too far in our efforts to help the suffering peoples of the world and make them self-supporting.

Not only was money in huge amounts given them, but the latest and most improved automatic and labor-saving machines were sent to them and in addition they were given opportunity to learn all we know about mass production, the process which is the basis of the industrial greatness of this country.

Now it is dawning upon Americans that these foreign firms which a few years ago were bankrupt, poorly equipped and badly managed, now have ample finances, the latest and best machinery, and men at their heads who have had the opportunity to study the latest American methods of production.

It is these newly born industries which are entering the world markets to compete with American goods. With equal facilities and a much lower scale of wages, they are dangerous competitors.

Lowering of protective duties under the guise of assisting foreign industry also is coming in for its share of criticism.

At a recent meeting of the Paper and Pulp Association in New York, E. W. Tinker, executive secretary, asserted that further lowering of import tariffs by the United States was potentially harmful to the industry, and could result in numerous "Waltham" failures.

Mr. Tinker stated that the industry is not opposed to increased international trade, but moves to change the tariff structures under which the industry has grown, have caused grave concern.

"Potential effects on employment, payrolls, taxes and dividends," he declared, "was and is a major issue.

"Unless the situation with respect to the paper industry is handled judiciously a multiplicity of instances comparable to the town of Waltham easily could occur."

Burma and Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me from the American Embassy in Rangoon, Burma, in connection with Burma's support of the United Nations in Korea.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Rangoon, Burma, September 15, 1950.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: May I congratulate you on the timeliness of your statement, congratulating Burma on her support for the UN in Korea. As soon as USIS received your text and that of Mrs. BOLTON, copies were made and they were presented by our Ambassador to the Prime Minister, Thakin Nu, so that he had them before the press. Then, in this morning's press, the statements were given great prominence on page 1 in at least two newspapers, the Daily Gazette and the Nation.

The statements arrived at a time when we were running into a little Red-promoted misunderstanding over the ECA agreement. So, coming on top of a press conference that we urged the Burmese Government to have on ECA, your statements just helped that much more to allay suspicions and to lay the groundwork for sound United States policy in this area.

The following incident might interest you. While Parliament was considering the Korean question last week, the assistant to the Attorney General came to the USIS Library to ask for 200 copies of our pamphlet, the United Nations and Korea. He wanted them for distribution to all members of Parliament. He was given the 200 copies of that pamphlet and also 20 copies of the UN Bulletin reprint, Enforcing the Peace in Korea. The day following Parliament's vote to support the United Nations' decision, the same gentleman returned to the library to express the Attorney General's appreciation. He reported that the pamphlets had supplied the arguments which helped beat down the opposition. The Prime Minister was given an overwhelming vote of support, much to the discomfort of our enemies.

My best wishes, believe me, and regards to Senators LODGE and SALTONSTALL and Congressman JOHN HESELTON (from one of their constituents), and to Senators BILL BENTON, KARL MUNDT, and the "V. P." when you see them.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. EDMAN,
Public Affairs Officer.

All Russian Goods To Be Boycotted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a news dispatch which appeared in the New York Times of September 9, 1950, relative to the refusal of the International Longshoremen's Association to unload Russian cargoes in New York City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL RUSSIAN GOODS TO BE BOYCOTTED—DOCKMEN ANNOUNCE DECISION AFTER GOVERNMENT FAILS TO LIST ESSENTIALS

Lacking specific instruction from Government officials, the membership of the International Longshoremen's Association on this coast will make no exceptions in its boycott of Russian cargoes, Joseph P. Ryan, International Longshoremen's Association president, announced yesterday afternoon.

The union had agreed earlier in the week to handle cargo necessary to national defense or civilian economy despite its Russian origin, but asked Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin to advise the union what cargoes would fall into these categories.

Mr. Ryan said the union's Atlantic district council had received no answer to its telegram of Wednesday to Mr. Tobin, and therefore would continue to boycott all Russian cargo.

"It is up to someone in authority in either the Army or Navy to convince us that the cargo is essential to the national defense program before the men will touch it," he said.

The Atlantic district council, Mr. Ryan said, has instructed the longshoremen to handle all cargoes to and from satellite countries until some definite policy can be decided, but he conceded that there was little likelihood of the order being obeyed at present.

The union president reported that a meeting of the council on satellite cargoes was scheduled for Monday afternoon, after a wage review meeting with representatives of the employing stevedores. He expressed the hope that some sort of advice would be forthcoming from Mr. Tobin by that time.

Mr. Ryan declared it was significant that Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer, a member of the President's Cabinet, should issue a statement in Washington on Thursday urging Congress to look into the question of curbing imports from Russia. He said the Secretary's views coincided with the position taken by the union.

The matter of handling Russian and satellite nation cargoes was put before the Atlantic coast district council when it met here Wednesday.

The council supported the men and the New York district council in the ban on

general Russian cargoes, but agreed to the handling of all essential military or civilian goods. The group asked for official designation of cargoes necessary for national defense or civilian economy and deferred action on satellite country goods pending receipt of such information.

We Must Not Be Misled by the Appearance of an Improvement in World Conditions Into Reducing or Slowing Down Our Defense Preparations—We Must Hold to a Consistent Policy Designed To Develop Our Strength and the Strength of the Free World Until the Basic Difficulties Are Removed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been more or less discussion with respect to the manner in which various components of the armed services are being inducted in order to meet this present crisis. It is to be remembered that this action, although now centralized in Korea, could at any moment easily be exploded into full-blown global warfare. I am happy to say that the First District of Alabama, now as in past wars, is more than doing its part in supplying all types of component troops to the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, and marines.

It was my pleasure, on Thursday, September 14, to have as my guests, at a luncheon given in the Speaker's room, some 78 officers and enlisted men, members of the Nine Hundred and Eighty-sixth Petroleum Distribution Company of the United States Engineers. All were reservists, stationed temporarily at Fort Belvoir en route from their little home town of Monroeville, Monroe County, Ala., in my own First District, on their way to Korea.

Seating space in the Speaker's dining room alone precluded my having the entire Alabama congressional delegation present to honor these splendid men. Many were no longer in their teens, and many others had served their country in World War II. A vast number, along with battle ribbons and medals, had received the Purple Heart. It was indeed an inspiring sight to sit, break bread with them—and then realize that here were Americans going to far off Korea in order to fight for the freedom and right of the Koreans to worship God under a representative government just the same as they would fight for those rights in their own homeland in the first district of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, we missed your presence at that luncheon. The table, however, was honored by the presence of the senior Senator from Alabama, the Honorable Lister Hill; Maj. Gen. William E. Hall, director of legislation and liaison, United States Air Force; Brig. Gen. Robert E. L. Eaton, deputy director, Office of Legislative Liaison, OSD; Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, represented by Col. E. Fred Klinke; the Honorable Dewey Short, ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee; as well as the Honorable Leo E. Allen, ranking on the all-powerful Rules Committee of the House. The burden of the talks delivered by these Members of Congress and general officers of our armed services will linger with me and the men of the Nine Hundred and Eighty-sixth Petroleum Distribution Company of the United States Engineers as long as we live.

Mr. Speaker, when one looked out over that assembly it causes one to speculate as to just why our Nation is calling in such numbers upon the reservists of all services, and this question had not been answered to the satisfaction of the Nation's Congress or its peoples until it was answered in Fort Worth, Tex., on Friday, September 29, by the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force.

In Fort Worth, before the Air Reserve Association Convention, Secretary Finletter presented such an exemplary talk that I feel that the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD could not be better employed than to afford the broadest possible dissemination of the text of that memorable address to all Members of the House and of the United States Armed Service Forces.

Mr. Finletter approached the problem which faces the Reserve forces of the armed services by way of friendly counseling rather than the ordinary lofty, detached view that one might expect from those trained under military discipline. It was the full and altogether sympathetic understanding with which he approached the problem that engrossed the minds of Reserves in attendance at the convention.

Mr. Finletter laid the ghosts of rumor and of conjecture by a simple recitation of the conditions which existed as of the very hour at which he spoke. His was an honest evaluation of future actions as they might easily pertain to the reservists already in uniform, as well as to all others awaiting the call to duty.

Recognizing and discussing the two basic problems confronting the members of the Reserve forces of the United States Air Force, Secretary Finletter dealt with each in a forthright manner. Where there was no immediate answer to some singular pertinent question, he honestly acknowledged that fact and even averted any intent of building false hopes in the hearts of his hearers.

In advancing this discussion, Mr. Finletter pointed out that many members of the Reserve forces were being called to duty for a purpose that probably, as he stated, had never entered their minds when they contracted to train in peacetime in order to serve in the case of grave threat to their country.

The United Nations' action in Korea—far remote from their homeland in the strict sense of the word—would not constitute the grave threat to their Nation. However, Mr. Finletter clearly pointed out that while the action thus far was not total mobilization, and therefore caused inconvenience to but a portion of the reservists, still the country has thus far been able to avert all-out war, and is carrying on a policy of doing its utmost to avert such an all-out war.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Finletter's talk on the situation of our Reserve forces, before the Air Force Reserve Association, is just the kind of a talk that this country his learned to expect from Tom Finletter—frank, honest, clear, temporate—it inspires the confidence of all in the ability, understanding, and driving force of the man who now is Secretary of our great Department of the Air, and who has already distinguished himself as one of our greatest and most able public officials.

With these thoughts in mind, I commend this talk to every Member of this Congress, and feel it to be one of the most forthright, sympathetic, and honest expressions on public policy that I have ever heard.

It is because of the foregoing that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include in the RECORD the address of Secretary Finletter before the Air Reserve Association.

That talk is as follows:

I propose this morning to discuss with you openly some of the problems which are facing you and therefore are facing the Air Force.

It is of course redundant for me to speak of the vital importance and the splendid work of the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard up to the present time. It would be futile to review the vital part that the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard played in World War II and the part they have been playing since then. Some idea of the importance of the role of the Air Force Reserve in the pre-Korean structure of the Air Force can be seen from one statistic, namely, that prior to the Korean war there were 35,126 Air Force Reserve officers on full time duty; and that these 35,126 Air Force Reserve officers represented 61.1 percent of the total number of officers in the Air Force. And since Korea these figures have been increased. The initial recall program, calling for approximately 50,000 Air Force Reserve officers and airmen to be brought to active duty, is expected to be completed soon. Included in these figures are the two Air Reserve wings which are already on duty. In addition five Air National Guard groups and two Air Reserve wings have been alerted for recall and soon will be in training.

The Reserves—and I am now referring to both the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard—are an essential element of the Air Force Establishment. But perhaps of more importance to you at this moment than how important you are is the question of certain difficulties which face you and your colleagues of the Air National Guard.

As we see it, there are two main types of problems which concern you. The first is that class of problem which affects those who have been called to active service—that is the four Reserve wings which have been or are being called, the five Air National Guard groups who will soon be on duty, and the numbers of air reservists who were neither on active duty before or who have been called to duty as a result of the Korean war and the basic build-up in the National Military Establishment. Many problems face these officers and men who are on active duty, the main one being no doubt the period for which their services will be required. There are, I realize, many other problems which affect those officers and men who are or will

be on active duty—and these will be discussed during the course of your convention—but I take it that the main one is the length of service.

But secondly there are problems of very great seriousness which are affecting those of you who are in the Air Force Reserve and have not as yet been called, a problem which also affects those units of the Air National Guard who have not been summoned for active duty. These men must be deeply concerned about the uncertainty of their position. This uncertainty not only affects their careers but must be very unsatisfactory in all their business and commercial affairs. I can well see how this uncertainty must interfere in many of the relationships of the reservists with their firms and companies—to say nothing of the greater interference with their personal lives and their family relationships.

Now the Air Force, as well as the Army and Navy, is trying to do something about this question through a coordinated and uniform deferment policy. In the Department of Defense there is a Civilian Components Policy Board currently studying this problem and every effort will be made to establish procedures which are reasonable and equitable. The Air Force is aware of many changes in the status of reservists in the past few years. We know that new skills have been achieved and some old skills have been lost. We also know that same reservists are no longer eligible for military duty because of health or because of critical employment or other responsibilities which take precedence over military service. Criteria for deferment have been established on a uniform basis for the Department of Defense. Machinery to administer the criteria in the three military departments is in operation. Members of the headquarters staff are here with you in this convention and are prepared to discuss all individual problems. General Hoag, who is the Special Assistant to the Chief of Staff, General Vandenberg, for Reserve forces, is here and I understand that he will speak to you on these matters in further detail.

But the main point which I want to make to you this morning is that the Air Force is aware of the difficulties and uncertainties of the position of all reservists.

I regret to say that I do not now have solutions to all of these difficult problems to offer you. I do, however, want to make it clear that we are fully aware in the Air Force of these difficulties and the burdens they place on you—on those who have been called up and those who have not been called up. I want to assure you, too, that we are devoting our most earnest efforts to alleviating this situation, to try to make clear to you just as soon as possible how the problem is developing and what the prospects look like. It is only the gravity of the international scene which has compelled the action which has been taken.

One thing has stood out clearly in our minds as we have looked at this troublesome problem, and that is the cause of it. As we see it, in very broad terms the reservist—and I am using this term to include the Air National Guard and all the Air Force Reserve—voluntarily took membership in their respective Reserves because of a desire to serve their country. These volunteers wished to be in a position to serve rapidly and effectively in case the country should be forced into war. These volunteers, whether they had formerly served in the armed services or not could, if they had so wished have taken no responsibility with respect to the future. They could have gone about their own civilian ways, standing ready to serve their country in the event of war but without any training during the period of peace. Instead of this they determined to fit themselves in time of peace for a possible war, to take time off from civilian pursuits at expense of leisure and possibly of position, in order to prepare themselves to serve their country.

This must be rated as a patriotic act of the highest devotion. These reservists—again using the term in the broad sense—no doubt felt that their peacetime obligation would be limited to training and that they would not be called involuntarily to serve except in the case of a grave threat to their country. Now the situation is that they are being called upon to serve under circumstances which however grave they may be still are less than a full mobilization of the country's total manpower. I submit that this is the root of the difficulty. If the country were in all-out war for survival, these particular problems which are concerning you today would disappear—and of course much greater ones would befall all of us. In short it is the very fact that the country has been able to avert all-out war and is carrying on a policy of doing its utmost to avert such an all-out war which causes a great deal of inconveniences and problems which beset the reservists of today.

Now the answer to this would be provided of course if there were assured peace in the world which would enable this country to have a small military establishment which would not require the service of the Reserve units. But unfortunately this kind of peace has not been possible with the international scene as it is today, and therefore the country has been forced into having a large Defense Establishment in a time such as the present. This Defense Establishment must be large as long as the international scene remains as it is. For unless we do have a military force of the proper size and strength to give it authority, we will lessen the hope that our combined political and military policies may be able to avert war.

The reservists are therefore being called into service or being subjected to the uncertainties of possibly being called into service in a noble cause. The Armed Forces of the country are actually engaged in fighting, and fighting of an extremely serious nature. At the same time our basic military establishment is being built up to give strength to our policies of peace. Anyone who is in the Reserves—whether he be in the actual fighting in Korea, or whether he be in civilian life with the uncertainty of possible call hanging over him—is therefore rendering service of the very greatest importance to his country. For without this reservoir of Reserve strength the United States would not be able to provide a quick build-up of its peacetime force in being. Without the reservists it might not be able to build up this peacetime strength quickly enough to serve the all-important purposes of national security which it is now serving.

Those who may not be called are also serving a need of the country. For the Air Reserve program must go on. The Reserve is such a vital part of the air establishment that our Reserve training program is being intensified and reprogramed in accordance with the new and special needs of the Air Force and the special qualifications of the reservists.

Surely this is about as important a work as anyone in this country could undertake. And if it bears particularly hard upon you, and indeed if it bears somewhat unexpectedly upon you, there is only this one possible consolation. It is that while the work you are now doing is not that which you may have anticipated—for it is not actually engaging in all-out survival war for your country—it is a call to duty of the very highest and indispensable nature. You are in a sense being called upon to pay the price for your patriotism by being in the front of those who wish to serve their country. You are being called on first. It is a position of honor and one for which the country must be always grateful.

Now this I know must be in some ways cold comfort to you, but the point I am trying to make this morning is that the Air Force is aware not only of the importance of your work but of the sacrifices which your work entails.

I want to assure you that your problems keenly concern us. I have said that I do not have adequate solutions for all these difficulties to offer you at this time. But this is not because of any negligence on our part or for any lack of deep concern about your problems. It is because the international situation today is extremely changeable and because of the needs of the Defense Establishment of the United States and therefore of the Air Force are to a certain extent affected by the fluctuations of the international scene. But I must add that until the world conditions which will create a real peace—and not merely the illusion of peace—are established we must keep on with the building up of our Armed Forces without regard to the immediate happenings of the day. We must not be misled by the appearance of an improvement in world conditions into reducing or slowing down our defense preparations. We must hold to a consistent policy designed to develop our strength and the strength of the free world until the basic difficulties are removed.

I cannot assure you that the international situation is going to change for the better in the immediate future. The only thing that I can say is that, we intend to call you only when necessary, to process you with consideration for the problems you face, to keep you only as long as you are really needed, to employ you effectively when you are in the service, and to study earnestly how we can handle your problems fairly and with consideration for your special difficulties.

In addition to the problem of those who must serve at a sacrifice we have also the problem of those Reserves who have been on active duty for a considerable number of years and who wish to continue on active duty. We have never been able to give these men a definite promise as to the number of years they may expect to remain on active duty. During the past year budgetary limitations forced us to relieve some of these men, even though they did not wish to be relieved. Some relinquished their ratings as air crew members because of the same budgetary restrictions. In many cases we are now offering them the opportunity to renew their ratings or to resume their active duty. These uncertainties are not to our liking, and I assure you that the Air Force would not impose them on its personnel except for circumstances beyond its control.

As I have said, we hope to be able to lessen the number and degree of uncertainties which we are forced to impose upon you and we shall press the necessary measures with all possible speed. In the meantime the services of some of you will be required for the defense of the Nation. I know that despite the inconveniences and despite the inevitable uncertainties which may continue for some time, you will find satisfaction and cause for pride in the fact that you have been called upon to make your contribution as citizens and as airmen.

Imports Threaten Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD several

news dispatches concerning the threat to industry by foreign imports.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe of January 8, 1950]

MAYOR CHARGES STATE DEPARTMENT HAS SOLD CITY DOWN THE RIVER—IMPORTS THREATEN TO END GLOUCESTER FISHING FLEET

(By Paul F. Kneeland)

Gloucester has been the biggest fishing port in the Nation ever since 1623, but there's no future in it now, according to the city's new mayor, John J. Burke, Jr. And any week now—perhaps even any day—the Gloucester fishing industry may actually founder or run up on the rocks of bankruptcy.

How come? Fish imported from Canada, Iceland, and Greenland sells for less than Gloucester fish does—it's cheaper to produce because of lower labor costs in those countries. Also, there is no quota on foreign fish and the tariff on it is very light.

So, Burke recommends: (1) A quota on imports; (2) a heavier tariff, and (3) immediate RFC loans to boat owners and processors who have already started hoisting distress signals.

"Right now the industry is in dangerous waters," the mayor warns. "If Washington doesn't answer our S O S immediately, we're sunk.

"No; without immediate relief, I can promise you that half the Gloucester fishing fleet will be tied up at the wharves under a marshal's sale—and with no one to buy."

Incidentally, Burke would suffer personally, too, in the event of such collapse; he's co-owner of 25 fishing vessels, the New England Fillet Co. of Gloucester and the Gloucester Seafoods Corp. He also runs a Gloucester diner and filling station.

"I'm a businessman, not a politician," says Burke, a short, stocky man in his early forties—a member of the class of 1930 at Brown, he was a guard on the football team and looks it.

"My father was a lawyer like myself, and I practiced for a while when I graduated from Harvard Law School and passed the bar in 1933. But being the grandson of a seafaring man, I have always been a fisherman at heart, I guess.

"Frankly, I don't want to sit out my 2-year term and watch Gloucester's mainstay—the fishing industry—give way to heavily subsidized foreign competition."

Commenting on his 5,500-word inaugural address Monday in which he charged that "the Gloucester fishing industry has lost practically all semblance of protection under the present reciprocal-trade agreements," Burke adds:

I WANT A FAST ANSWER

"The State Department has sold Gloucester down the river. I want a mighty fast answer to that one."

First step in this direction will be the organization of a citizens' committee comprising representatives of all phases of the industry—owners, fishermen, machine shops, chandlers, processors, etc.—and a march on the Capitol would result.

Meanwhile, here's how crucial the situation, as Burke points out, is today:

(a) Of Gloucester's $10,000,000 fleet of 150 vessels, only 10 are operating at a profit—the other 140 are in the red.

(b) Ships' supply houses have been extending easy credit terms left and right—otherwise some owners would have been forced to tie up their vessels months ago.

(c) An out-of-work fisherman makes more money while collecting his $25 a week or so State unemployment insurance than he does while on a voyage—the fabulous $200-a-day wages are a thing of World War II times.

(d) There hasn't been a new vessel built in either Maine or Massachusetts shipyards for the past 2 years—an ominous sign.

(e) The cost of producing Port-of-Glouster fish makes it impossible to compete with foreign fish—at the present time, Gloucester fish is being sold below cost in order to get back part of the money invested.

STATE DEPARTMENT "CHOWDER HEADS"

"That one-world theory those chowder heads in the State Department rave about is going to ruin us," Burke continues.

"They claim that, for example, the country which can produce fish at the lowest possible cost should do so.

"All right, Canada can do it and we can't. Why? Because women in Nova Scotia fish-processing plants get 37 cents an hour; here women doing the same job get $1 an hour. The Nova Scotian man's pay in fish-processing plants is 50 cents an hour; here men doing the same job get $1.50 an hour.

"What the State Department overlooks completely in their comparisons is the standard of living. Any school kid knows that the United States has the highest standards of living of any country in the world. The State Department doesn't say anything about that—oh, no! When it comes to us, they're unsympathetic and inconsiderate—ask about our problems and they show about as much life as a barrel of salt cod.

"Are Gloucestermen, their wives and children, supposed to reduce standards of living?" Burke questioned contemptuously, "just so they can compete with the Canadian market?"

Take these differences in per-pound wholesale fish quotations:

	Cents
Canada:	
Redfish	1–1½
Haddock	2–3
United States:	
Redfish	4–5
Haddock	7–9

If a 90-foot, 400-horsepower Gloucester beam trawler goes on an 8-day fishing trip off St. Pierre and the Sable Islands, it must gross at least $5,000. And if the price on fish drops below 7 cents a pound, "Then it's just too bad," Burke interjects. "A beam trawler cannot operate and break even if fish is selling under 7 cents. Look at these Canadian quotations—what can we do about it?"

And Burke elaborates on his (1) quotas, (2) tariff, and (3) RFC solutions:

"(1) Last year, 1949, the United States imported 60,000,000 pounds of frozen fillets; it should be limited this year to a quota of not more than 40,000,000 pounds.

"SOME DIFFERENCE

"(2) Increase the tariff. Recently one of my vessels became disabled and $1,100 of my catch was unloaded in Canada. Canada considered it an import and the tariff was $400. Now, if that had been a Canadian vessel disabled off the United States coast and unloaded here, the tariff would have been $11 on an $1,100 valuation. Some difference, huh?

"(3) RFC loans are vital in order to protect everybody in the industry, everybody from producer to processor. During the last war, the United States gave $30,000,000 worth of fishing vessels and equipment to foreign countries, including 19 beam trawlers worth $250,000 each. How about a little peacetime spending for our benefit for a change?"

Gloucester fisheries have invested a small fortune in a national advertising campaign during the past decade—"fish should be on your diet" was the theme. It went over big and increased the per capita consumption of fish from 3½ pounds yearly (1938) to 13 pounds yearly (1948).

But imports have increased 500 percent since 1946, leaving this sad-to-tell situation in 1949:

Total Gloucester catch, 300,000,000 pounds; fillets made from this catch and frozen, 90,000,000 pounds; total imports of frozen fillets, 60,000,000 pounds.

GLOUCESTER FISH IN FREEZERS

"All the imports were sold," Burke complains, "but there are still 10,000,000 pounds of Gloucester fillets left in the freezers as of this moment. With new imports coming in all the time, it means production will be topping sales, and those 10,000,000 pounds of frozen Gloucester fillets will have to be sold at less than cost."

The big catch—it's about 50 percent of Gloucester's total—is redfish. Next in line are mackerel, codfish, halibut, flounder, pollock, and swordfish. Since the mid-thirties, when frozen fish was introduced, 90 percent of the catch is frozen after filleting; the rest is canned, dried and salted, pickled and smoked.

Recently "trash fish"—unmarketable as food for human consumption—like porgies and parts of fish discarded in the filleting process, have been cooked, pressed, and converted into animal food, oils, and fish solubles.

"But the cent or cent and one-quarter per pound paid for this 'trash fish' doesn't come anywhere near balancing the industry's budget," Burke adds.

"Two-thirds of Gloucester's 25,000 people are employed in the fishing industry. They're not asking for subsidies, although Canadian fisheries, processing plants, and vessel owners get up to 50 percent subsidization. All Gloucester's fishing industry wants is adequate protection for her great production."

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 11, 1950]

CHEAPER FOREIGN GOODS BEGIN TO CUT A SWATH IN DOMESTIC MARKETS—THEY HIT UNITED STATES CHINAWARE, GLOVES, SEWING MACHINES, AND SIMULATED PEARLS—PROTESTS REACH WASHINGTON

(By Edward Bejan)

Makers of a significant scattering of items—from simulated pearls to sewing machines to chinaware—are getting those import jitters once again.

Reason for the latest reoccurance of a well-known prewar ailment: Goods from Japan and Europe are entering the United States market in increasing volume and at prices domestic producers find hard to meet.

Take the Gelmart Knitting Mills, Inc., of Yonkers, N. Y. This firm has cut back its production of wool and cotton gloves 80 percent from a year ago. Gelmart still considers itself lucky, however, because it was able to get a supply of nylon for glove-making. President Arthur Goldsmith explains the switch to the synthetic fabric: "Japan sells cotton string gloves to American jobbers at $5 for a dozen pairs. We have to get $9.75 a dozen, since our labor costs alone amount to $5."

Other glove makers in the same Hudson River town are not so lucky. Reports the Hega Knitting Mills: "We're operating at 25 percent of capacity and our break-even point is 60 percent. And the outlook is worse. We may be forced to close down next year." The Sternwild Knitting Mills, Inc., which usually halted regular output for 30 days around this time of the year for sample-making, says it will be slower resuming operations this year; the company's output before the current shutdown was running 25 to 30 percent below a year ago. The York Glove Mills, also in Yonkers, looks for a 50-percent drop in its 1950 volume.

THEY WERE DIFFERENT

American producers in the postwar era have tended to regard most imported products as different from home-made goods rather than as a competitive threat. They

have in mind such things as Scotch whisky, Irish linen, and Belgian lace. Now, however, many a manufacturer sees foreign wares directly threatening his markets.

Up and down New York's Worth Street, textile hub of the country, merchants are keeping a nervous eye on Japanese cotton-goods quotations. Dealers report some Nipponese-made grey textiles have already entered the United States at prices as much as 35 percent below those for corresponding American wares. One result: Anglo-American textile men are planning to send an exploratory group to Japan to size up the situation.

Wool fabric makers are alarmed at the influx—at lower than domestic prices—of English and Italian merchandise. Better quality imported goods, according to trade reports, are landing duty-paid at $1.50 to $2 a yard below current New York quotations.

Dinnerware manufacturers are more than alarmed: They cite Japanese and German imports as the main factor behind an estimated 25-percent dip in their sales last year below 1948. The Jackson Vitrified China Co., which claims to produce the least expensive chinaware set in the United States, says it is unable to meet Japanese prices.

Reports Philip Distillator, Jackson's president: "A few months ago, Japanese producers trimmed the wholesale price of a typical 12-piece set from about $42 to $30. Our set was $50 then. We were forced to come down to $40, but we can't go any lower."

SEWING-MACHINE HEADS FROM JAPAN

Bulking large in the sewing-machine field are imports of Japanese heads—machines not yet installed in cabinets or equipped with electric motors. A spokesman for big Singer Manufacturing Co. estimates these are coming in by the thousands. One importer reports his sales of heads rose from about $10,000 in 1948 to well over $100,000 last year.

Several American manufacturers and distributors specialized in putting the Nipponese machines in cabinets and outfitting them with motors. Some do their own importing under exclusive contracts with Japanese plants. One of these, Bega Bros. Products Corp., says its sales of the imported machines have increased 200 percent over 1948. Morse Sewing Machine, which imports a unit to retail at $139, claims its current volume is running 25 percent over 1948 and "we sell everything we bring over."

A bargain-hunter can pick up an inexpensive console-type Japanese-make machine today for around $95. In contrast, the cheapest Singer console model retails for $164.50.

Another major Japanese import—simulated, glass-base pearls—is gaining a foothold in American markets. To meet the wholesale price of the imported beads—$1.50 a dozen necklaces in New York—United States makers have been forced to use plastic-base pearls. The catch is that domestic consumers prefer the glass-base pearls which are heavier and fit more snugly.

Some simulated pearl manufacturers, finding it difficult to meet this Japanese competition, are solving the problem by becoming importers. Ditchik Bros., for example, has trimmed its output some 50 percent and is importing merchandise to offset that cutback. Spencer Novelty Manufacturing Co. is now importing 25 percent of the wares it's selling.

BULB COMPETITION

"Killing" is the term used by flower bulb growers to describe competition from Holland. Says Arend Schravendeel of Schravendeel & Segers Sons, Inc.: "We should get $20 a thousand for gladiola bulbs but we have to sell at $9 to $10 to meet the Dutch price. Back in 1947, gladiola bulbs were bringing $45 to $50 a thousand." Mr. Schravendeel has watched his production at Palmyra, N. Y., from 52 acres in 1948 to 15 acres today "and I don't know whether I'm going to be able to keep that much going."

Charges of foreign "dumping" are beginning to reach the Federal Tariff Commission in Washington. Among them: The Northwest Bulb Growers Association says the Dutch sometimes sell narcissus bulbs at a loss in this country to get badly needed dollars. The S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Co., Ransom & Randolph Co., and Lee S. Smith & Son Manufacturing Co. have lodged complaints that German dental burs offered to American buyers at $2.88 a gross are being sold to Brazilians for $3.60. American-made dental burs range from $5.82 to $7.73 a gross.

Several protesting groups are seeking import curbs and higher duties. These include northwestern nut growers, who ask a 50-percent hike in duties, and the Association of Knitted Glove and Mitten Manufacturers, which is pressing for a quota on shipments to this country.

Their chances of getting such restrictions, manufacturers agree, are slim. ECA and other Government officials have long been urging increased imports to close the trade gap; United States overseas purchases still lag far behind shipments abroad.

Lower labor costs are a big factor in foreign manufacturers' successful invasion of American markets. One United States maker of knitted berets, for instance, declares his labor costs are five to eight times those prevailing in France and Czechoslovakia. A manufacturer of wool fabrics puts his labor bill at triple the English level and five times the Italian rate.

Ability of overseas producers to make speedier delivery than before is also aiding the sale of foreign goods. And finally, say importers, merchandise produced abroad has improved considerably in quality during the past year. Harold Wilson, president of the British Board of Trade, mentions that he didn't hear a single complaint about the quality of English wares during a recent trip to United States cities.

[From the New York Times of January 27, 1950]

FELT HAT MAKERS' UNION HIT IMPORTS—CALL UPON TARIFF COMMISSION FOR RELIEF—BANKRUPTCIES, JOB LOSSES CHARGED

Tariff concessions on fur felt hat bodies for women's hats have boosted imports by more than 300 percent, according to a joint statement of labor and management of the hat body industry issued yesterday. The situation warrants a review of the reciprocal trade agreement program as applied to the hat industry, it was said, and the United States Tariff Commission was called upon to act.

An application to the Commission, signed yesterday by Warren Smith, secretary of the Hat Institute, and Max Zaritsky, president of the United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers International Union, outlined the sharp rise in fur felt hat body imports. In 1946 imports resumed the prewar pattern of approximately 5 percent of domestic production.

Following the tariff concessions granted in the Geneva trade agreement of 1947 they rose from 37,000 dozen in 1946 to 112,000 for the first 10 months of 1949.

The latter figure indicates a jump from 5 percent of domestic production to almost 20 percent, the application stated, and has been an important contributory factor to the 36 percent drop in the number of hat industry productive workers since 1937.

According to Hat Institute figures, in 1937 an average of 4,426 workers were employed in the women's hat body segment of the industry. In 1949, the number of workers in this division of the industry fell to 2,810. Figures of actual man-hours worked reveal a parallel decline of 1,500,000 man-hours in the same period. Moreover, effect on the domestic industry has been such that several long-established companies have gone bankrupt and there has been noticeable hardship in certain localities where the hat industry is the economic lifeblood of the community.

The application went on to say that benefits of the tariff concessions to foreign nations were not manifest. The hat industry imports virtually all its raw materials consisting of furs and skins and exports only a negligible quantity of the manufactured product. Increases in imports of hat bodies and finished fur felt hats acts to reduce the import of raw materials, and thus offsets the benefits of the reciprocal international trade program.

In requesting action by the Tariff Commission, the applicants emphasized that both labor and managements were in sympathy with and recognized the need for tariff concessions as a means of fostering world trade. It was pointed out, however, that the threat to its existence which the concessions implied, made it mandatory for the industry to obtain a review.

[From the Wall Street Journal of May 23, 1950]

HATTERS' UNION OFFICIAL WARNS OF TRADE'S RUIN BY UNITED STATES IMPORT POLICY—SAYS IRON CURTAIN NATIONS WITH SLAVE LABOR OUTPUT CAN TURN DANBURY INTO GHOST TOWN

WASHINGTON.—American hat workers cannot compete with iron curtain slave labor and survive, Marx Lewis, general secretary of the AFL United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers, warned here. If imports of competing goods increase or even continue at their present rate, hat-manufacturing towns like Danbury, Conn., "will be reduced to ghost towns," Mr. Lewis prohphesied.

He was here as a member of the executive committee of the National Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Trade Policy.

The committee, representing nearly a score of industries which say they are being unfairly affected by foreign imports, met in closed session to discuss problems raised by America's foreign trade policy.

Also representing the hat industry on the executive committee is David Harshaw, president of the Hat Institute, Inc., and president of the John B. Stetson Co.

Mr. Lewis said Czechoslovak imports are presenting the chief problem to hat manufacturing concerns such as those in Danbury. Imports from this iron curtain country have increased 300 percent since the end of the war, he asserted.

The position of the hat industry is similar to that of the other industries represented in the National Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Trade Policy, he said.

"A billion dollars' worth of imports will not seriously affect the American economy, but if only a few industries, and especially smaller industries, are made to assume a disproportionate share of the burden caused by such imports, then the situation can be ruinous," he said.

It is planned to present the hat industry's problem to a House Labor Subcommittee set up to study the effect imports are having on American labor and employment, Mr. Lewis stated.

The United States Tariff Commission is conducting a preliminary survey of the hat industry's problems.

It has been suggested by some Government spokesmen that hat workers and others simi-

larly affected try training for other types of work, Mr. Lewis said.

"It won't work. Hat workers have been in the industry too long to be retrained for other work," he declared.

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 6, 1950]

STEEL IMPORTERS TAKE BUSINESS FROM UNITED STATES WAREHOUSES BY QUOTING LOWER PRICES

One Eastern steel warehouseman says: "We can't possibly compete with the importers." The latter offer 7 percent to 8 percent lower prices on such products as hot-rolled bars and structurals. That puts their quotations below what the warehouses—the steel industry's retailers—pay the mills for these items.

The incoming steel is shipped from Belgium, Luxemburg, Britain, France, and Germany. Last year's currency devaluations laid the groundwork for the lower import prices.

Imports of semifinished steel, rising rapidly in the late months of 1949 following devaluation, reached 300,000 tons for the year. That was about double the 1948 total.

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 6, 1950]

COLOMBIA TO INCREASE ITS IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES, FINANCE MINISTER SAYS

Colombia expects to increase imports from the United States by 30 percent this year to around $400,000,000, acording to Dr. Herman Jaramillo-Ocampo, Colombian Minister of Finance.

This increase is made possible by higher coffee prices and the dollar savings from restrictions maintained by the country on imports of all but essential goods, Dr. Jaramillo stated.

Dr. Jaramillo has been in Washington representing Colombia at the Economic and Social Conference of the Pan American Union. He will return to Colombia next week.

"Colombia is enjoying a very healthy economic and fiscal situation with bright prospects for the future," he stated. "The metallic reserves of the Bank of the Republic have reached $135,000,000; they were $80,000,000 in April 1949. International payments for commercial operations and for external public debt are up to date."

Dr. Jaramillo listed several steps that Colombia is taking to continue its economic development. He stated that a special banking mission of the Federal Reserve Board will soon leave for Colombia to aid the Government in the formulation of financial policies that will stimulate agricultural and industrial production.

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 24, 1950]

UNITED STATES CHEMICAL INDUSTRY FIGHTS TRUMAN PLAN TO MAKE IMPORTS CHEAPER AND GETS SUPPORT FROM MILITARY MEN

(By W. C. Bryant)

WASHINGTON.—The United States chemical industry is fighting an administration scheme to cut off much of its tariff protection.

Shortly after World War I, Congress granted this industry special tariff treatment. It was intended to encourage domestic production of chemicals like dyes and explosives that used to come from Germany.

Now, the Treasury, with State Department backing, wants a change in these laws. This proposal is part of "the Customs Simplification Act of 1950," a bill President Truman will soon send to Congress for its approval. The measure is supposed to reform customs procedures so importing all sorts of goods—not just chemicals—will be easier and cheaper.

Sections worrying chemical companies mainly affect coal-tar products, a vital segment of the industry. They now include not only dyes and explosives, but also plastics, insecticides, medical supplies, perfumes, and flavors.

WOULD CHANGE TARIFF BASE

Under present tariff law, duties on these imported chemicals are a percentage of the generally higher selling prices of American manufacturers. Duties on most other products are computed on the foreigners' selling prices. The new bill would give the chemical industry new tariff rates on competitive foreign items and apply them to the foreign, rather than domestic, selling prices. Initially, the new rates would be calculated to give about the same protection the industry now gets. But chemical companies see many failings in this change. They suspect it is part of a broader scheme to cut tariffs generally and permit more foreign competition.

A representative of the Monsanto Chemical Co. recalls that when the chemists first heard about the customs bill "the reaction was explosive."

A spokesman for the Manufacturing Chemist Association claims the change would be especially hard on some of the Nation's 46 dye-making outfits. It also would discourage companies from developing new chemicals, he thinks.

The industry is having some success in its battle to let the law stand as it is. The Tariff Commission has sent a "confidential" report to the Budget Bureau finding fault with the "chemical" part of the bill. Military planners, always worried about having enough domestic chemical production in time of war, have told Budget Bureau officials the change might do harm. Chemical men hope the Munitions Board will submit an even stronger report.

BILL HELD UP 2 MONTHS

With such help, they're trying to induce President Truman to delete the controversial sections from the customs bill before it goes to Congress.

Because of doubts the chemical industry has raised, the customs bill has been held up for over 2 months at the Budget Bureau, which supervises all legislation suggested by Federal agencies. This delay means Congress probably won't get around to acting on the bill until next year.

But despite all the optimistic signs, industry people think they'll have a tough time proving they still need special tariff protection to the satisfaction of the State and Treasury Departments.

Officials of these two agencies think the law should be changed for these two reasons:

Under the present scheme, the foreign exporter and the United States importer can't be sure what duty will be levied on a shipment. That's because the duty will depend largely on whether some United States firm is offering a similar chemical for sale when it is imported.

Second, the use of the "American selling price" is contrary to the rules of the proposed International Trade Organization. Though Congress hasn't okayed the ITO charter, it's on President Truman's legislative must list. It aims to improve trading conditions among some 50 countries.

PRESENT LAW HELPS UNITED STATES FIRMS

The chemical industry admits that the present law gives it advantages. It is the only major industry that knows any time it raises its prices, it also automatically makes higher tariff walls for foreign competition.

The law was intended to give advantages to United States producers. It sets up duties as a percentage of the value of the imported goods. In the case of most imports, the value is the foreign price. But whenever any foreign coal-tar product competes with the domestic item, the value is the American's selling price.

For instance, the price of a special dye may be about $1.20 a pound in Switzerland and about $1.50 in this country. If the duty, which is 40 percent, were based on the foreign price, it would be 48 cents, but using the American price makes it 60 cents.

For every dollar that the domestic price goes up, the import wall goes up 40 cents. This may not keep out all foreign competition, but it is more protection than most other industries have.

The law helps the United States companies in another important way, too. Whenever they decide to duplicate a foreign innovation, they know the tariff will go up as soon as they succeed and put a competing, domestic copy on the market.

COAL-TAR PRODUCTS SPECIAL

Even if the foreign chemical isn't competitive, as long as it's a coal-tar product it is subject to special duties. In this case, the duty is based on the United States value, which is the prevailing price at which it sells in this country. Duty on most products is based on the foreign price, which is usually lower.

The customs bill proposes two major changes in the present law. First, the Tariff Commission would list all foreign coal-tar products that would compete with United States chemicals. It would figure out new tariff rates for these items, based on foreign prices. They would be calculated to give domestic firms about the same protection as they now get.

For example, some dyes, now taxed at 40 percent of the American selling price, would have a rate of about 100 percent of the foreign price. A few coal-tar products could even have rates of about 500 percent, experts roughly figured.

Although that still sounds like a lot of protection, United States companies say it isn't enough. For one thing, foreign producers could lower the tariff by cutting their prices. Thus, United States producers would no longer control the tariff wall. There would be no extra protection, either, for new products.

BUDGET BUREAU SUGGESTS COMPROMISE

The second change would be to base duties on noncompetitive items on the foreign price, instead of United States value. The present percentage rate would continue to apply on these chemicals.

To placate the chemists, the Budget Bureau suggested a compromise late last week. It involves having two rates for every coal-tar product: A high one to be used when customs officials think an import is competitive and a low one if it isn't. The Treasury would give 30-day notice before shifting from one rate to the other.

The Treasury may adopt this idea, but few disputants like it. The State Department thinks it might be too effective in keeping out imports. Industry representatives think it might not be effective enough. So the battle goes on.

A few other industries also would be affected by these changes. They produce rubber overshoes, knit gloves, and canned crab meat.

The chemical industry has one other tariff headache. The State Department last week listed a lot of imported chemicals on which it would like to cut the United States duty at a big trade parley to be held in England in September. The companies will get a chance to object to these proposed rate cuts in public hearings to be held next month.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of May 18, 1950]

MARCH UNITED STATES TEXTILE IMPORTS SHOW RISE—COTTON CLOTH DOUBLED SINCE FEBRUARY, RAW JUTE ARRIVALS TRIPLED

WASHINGTON, May 17.—United States imports of textile fibers and manufactures rose in March to $92,100,000 from $86,500,000 in February, and $61,500,000 in March a year ago, the Commerce Department said today.

Imports of cotton cloth nearly doubled from the short month of February to March and were three times greater than March 1949. Arrivals of jute and jute manufactures also showed large gains, with raw jute up over three times.

Imports of woolen fabrics, wool wearing apparel, raw silk, and synthetic yarns also increased over both the previous month and a year ago. Arrivals of carpet wools were below February but above March 1949. Raw cotton imports also fell but were still more than four times larger than March a year ago.

A comparison of imports for the three periods follows:

	February 1950	March 1950	March 1949
COMMODITY			
Cotton, unmanufactured (pounds)	44,950,608	38,305,232	8,472,990
COTTON MANUFACTURES			
Cotton cloth (square yards)	4,282,541	7,480,788	2,411,391
Cotton table damask (pounds)	301,546	505,883	134,278
Cotton table damask (pounds)	301,546	505,883	134,278
Cotton gloves and mittens (dozen pairs)	10,615	25,615	19,258
Embroidered or lace handkerchiefs (number)	2,357,508	2,158,774	1,580,560
Cotton floor coverings (square yards)	366,252	643,734	288,233
JUTE AND MANUFACTURES			
Jute, unmanufactured (tons)	2,804	9,251	11,457
Jute burlap (pounds)	24,595,060	46,981,504	40,480,056
Jute bags or sacks (pounds)	2,940,189	4,764,551	1,521,716
FLAX, HEMP, AND RAMIE, AND MANUFACTURES			
Flax, unmanufactured (tons)	360	274	335
Woven fabrics (pounds)	1,162,738	1,555,972	952,555
Linen handkerchiefs (number)	1,467,015	1,742,124	2,454,309
Linen towels, napkins, and bedclothing (number)	933,608	1,049,678	899,378
OTHER VEGETABLE FIBERS AND MANUFACTURES			
Sisal and henequen (tons)	10,483	13,291	12,376
Manila and abacá fibers (tons)	3,916	4,640	3,581
Kapok (tons)	319	170	170
Total, including other (tons)	15,522	19,240	17,340
Binding twine (pounds)	466,162	2,051,705	488,110
WOOL, UNMANUFACTURED			
Carpet wool, clean content (pounds)	13,928,514	10,297,570	5,379,514
Apparel wool, excluding hair of camel, clean content (pounds)	33,293,944	30,957,669	13,694,751
Total, including other clean content (pounds)	47,912,091	42,091,007	19,519,232
WOOL SEMIMANUFACTURES			
Wool noils (pounds)	1,691,143	1,380,184	1,061,939
Wool yarns (pounds)	154,761	200,927	129,541
WOOL MANUFACTURES			
Worsted, woolen, and mohair fabrics (square yards)	1,103,043	1,282,843	806,510
Wool wearing apparel (pounds)	125,973	159,839	86,706
Carpets and carpeting (square feet)	3,091,997	3,441,614	1,694,090
SILK AND MANUFACTURES			
Raw silk (pounds)	470,159	518,276	368,748
Broad silk fabric, excluding pile fabric (square yards)	4,801,972	1,769,163	3,280,451
SYNTHETIC FIBERS AND MANUFACTURES			
Rayon filaments, not over 30 inches long (in pounds)	4,930,911	6,601,464	1,370,780
Yarns (pounds)	34,343	102,444	56,486

[From the Washington Post of May 23, 1950]

OIL IMPORTS COSTING JOBS, MINERS SAY

Spokesmen for coal miners and operators urged Congress yesterday to curb oil imports, which they said are causing thousands of American workers to lose their jobs.

D. T. Buckley, of the National Coal Association, and Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers, protested at a Senate Labor subcommittee hearing that foreign oil is being dumped in this country at unfair prices.

"The equivalent of a year's work for 50,000 miners in the bituminous coal industry is being destroyed by foreign oil at the current rate of importation," Buckley said.

Kennedy said that 100,000,000 barrels of residual oil—that is, oil used for fuel or industrial purposes—was imported last year and either put 25,000 coal miners out of work or reduced their workweek. He said the oil was marketed "at ridiculously low prices."

Buckley estimated last year's oil imports cost 25,000 miners and 25,000 transport workers their jobs, and said these figures could be doubled in 1950 if the present trend continues.

They testified at the opening of the subcommittee's hearing on a resolution by Senator NEELY (Democrat, West Virginia), to investigate the causes of "increasing unemployment" in the coal, railroad, oil, zinc, lead, and silver industries.

Kennedy said that if the present flow of imported oil increases, "as the prospect seems to indicate, we shall witness a complete disrupting and revamping of our American fuel pattern."

LOSS OF TEXTILE JOBS LAID TO DEVALUATION

NEW YORK, May 22.—American cotton textile men say their export trade has dropped more than $500,000,000 as a result of devaluation of foreign currencies and increased low-cost foreign competition.

This sum, they add, is equivalent to 52,000 American textile jobs and millions of wage dollars.

They compiled the figure in a battle against any further reduction of tariffs, claiming levies already have been slashed at least a third since 1935 and some items have been hit by 75 percent cuts.

The American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York, and the Textile Export Association of the United States joined in preparing the brief for coming tariff hearings.

They have filed a survey of their views with the Committee for Reciprocity Information in Washington. Their testimony will be presented at committee hearings for consideration in tariff negotiations in England in September.

As the textile men prepared their brief, United States Department of Commerce figures showed that exports of cotton cloth from the United States in the first quarter were 120,740,000 square yards, a decline of 57.5 percent from the first quarter of 1949.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce]

APPLE PRODUCERS ASK IMPORT LIMIT—CANADIAN COMPETITION HELD ADVERSE FACTOR ON DOMESTIC PRODUCT

WASHINGTON, June 5.—Apple producers today asked the Government to negotiate a 1,000,000-bushel import limitation on Canadian fresh apple imports when reciprocal trade agreements talks are resumed this fall.

But they left the door open for any other solution Government negotiations might work out to place this country's apple producers on an equal footing with Canadian producers, not only in trade among themselves but in foreign markets.

The quota limitation was proposed to the agricultural panel of the committee for reciprocity information by Frank W. Taylor, secretary of the Northwest Horticultural Council. It was approved by Truman Nold, executive secretary of the National Apple Institute.

MARKETS LOST IN WAR

Samuel Fraser, secretary of the International Apple Association, pushed for worldwide equality for American producers as the only chance for this country to regain war-lost European export markets. He said Europe's efforts to increase its apple output are complicating the situation. C. C. Rathbun, representing the Florida Canners Association, was the only other witness appearing today. He asked the committee to consider binding present tariffs on canned citrus juices. The general reduction on canned lime juice, he said, worked a hardship on the American industry, and any further reduction for any canned citrus juice would be felt here.

Taylor said the Oregon-Washington apple producers are affected most adversely by Canadian competition, and pointed out that apples imported from Canada carry only a 12½-cent-a-bushel duty while those moving from here to Canada must pay about 40 cents.

CANADIAN COSTS LOWER

In contrast, he said, Canadian production costs are about 60 cents a bushel below costs in the Pacific Northwest. This, coupled with a monopoly marketing system in British Columbia, makes it possible for Canada to undersell domestic producers and drive prices well below cost of production.

He said the council reluctantly advised the committee to place a quantitative restriction on Canadian apple imports, but added that exhaustive investigation failed to produce any other method of correcting the situation.

He also warned the committee that apples must be placed on the next supplemental list of commodities under negotiation at the coming trade talks or the United States would be unable to put apples on the agenda.

PRESERVERS OPPOSE CUTS

The New York Preservers' Association, Inc., went on record in opposition to any reduction in import duties on jams and jellies made from tree fruits and on orange marmalade.

While it is true that in the past the percentage of imports of jams, jellies, preserves, and marmalades has been comparatively small, the association brief said, "nevertheless any prospective reduction in the tariff on these items will constitute a serious threat

to the industry, particularly in the New York area."

Most of these imports, the preservers held, coming principally from the United Kingdom, Cuba, and Canada, come into the port of New York, with the greater part of their sale concentrated here. An informal survey locally, the association said, revealed that the larger retail outlets in New York, mostly department stores and supermarkets, are giving considerable display space to imported preserves even exceeding the space devoted to the domestic products, and that very substantial quantities of foreign-made preserves and marmalades are being sold.

[From the New York Times of June 7, 1950]

UNITED STATES POLICY SCORED ON CANDY TARIFF—CHAPMAN TELLS ASSOCIATION PARLEY CLOSING OF DOLLAR GAP IMPERILS INDUSTRY HERE

Sharp criticism of encouraging imports at the expense of home industries was made yesterday by Harry R. Chapman, chairman of the Washington committee of the National Confectioners' Association, at the association's annual meeting in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

"At the insistence of our own Government officials, Britain and other countries have agreed to exclude exports from the United States, while at the same time stepping up the shipment of their products to our markets," he declared. "This is called closing the dollar gap, but at the same time it would distribute poverty to American industries."

Mr. Chapman, who is also chairman of the board of the New England Confectionery Co., Cambridge, Mass., charged that 80,000 American workers in the candy industry alone have been made expendable as a result of this "strange doctrine."

He pointed out that the 40-percent duty on imported candy was reduced to 20 percent in 1939, to 14 percent in 1948, and now discussions are being held to recommend further cuts.

As an example of increased foreign competition, he said that during the first 2 months this year foreign candy imports increased 350 percent, with Czechoslovakia, a Soviet satellite, the second largest shipper. He said that these facts have been reported to the Tariff Commission.

MEAD ISSUES WARNING

James M. Mead, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, emphatically denied at the morning session that trade-practice rules may be used to cover up law violations.

"Should the Commission find any industry attempting such a practice," he said, "I can assure you that the full weight of the Commission's formal corrective powers would be speedily brought to bear against the guilty parties, and the rules for that industry would be rescinded."

The return of penny candy was reported by Philip P. Gott, president of the association. He explained that during the war manufacturers were reluctant to use limited sugar supplies for low-priced candies, but now the increase of young children has high-volume sales possibilities.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of September 14, 1950]

NEW MONTHLY IMPORT HIGHS LOOM IN FALL

(By E. M. Doran)

American imports are continuing the sharp upward climb they began in May. Now all-time monthly highs may be expected this fall.

Leading New York city banks which reported very sharp gains in total of letters of credit issued during July, yesterday indicated further expansion had occurred in August. Sensational gains over August 1949 were reported by some banks.

RISE IN IMPORT CREDITS

While a large volume of American imports is financed on terms other than letters of credit, the latter type of financing is relied on heavily. This reliance is sufficiently large that a sharp increase in the import letters of credit totals normally will be followed by a marked rise in total imports.

Letters of credit in payment for foreign merchandise may be taken out well in advance of shipment or at time of sale. But bankers report most credits are issued when an order is finally placed or when sales are made.

In some instances goods are prepared for shipment after the letter of credit has been established while in other cases goods may be ready for sale at time the credit is issued.

RISE REFLECTED LATER

Increases in imports as reported by the Bureau of Census, United States Department of Commerce, may show up in many cases within 1 to 3 months of when the banks here issue the credits. The large credit totals reported for August may be reflected largely in September and also in October or possibly November.

Import statistics have shown a steady upward trend in the past few months. In July, the last month for which official figures are available, imports passed the $711,000,000 mark. This compared with a 1949 monthly average of around $552,000,000 and with an all-time high of $720,000,000 chalked up in December 1948, when strike-delayed clearances swelled the total.

Leading New York City banks with whom the Journal of Commerce checked yesterday, stated that the values of import letters of credit issued in August showed gains ranging from 15 to 40 percent above July, in which month the total values reported were from 10 to 30 percent above earlier months.

SOME GAINS SPECTACULAR

Spectacular gains over August 1949 were reported in some instances with last August totals as much as 80 percent or more above the values in the preceding year.

The rise over August 1949 is significant also since the influx of Christmas goods which arrive in volume in early fall generally may be expected to swell credits issued in August.

REFLECT SPECIAL FACTORS

Banks with whom the writer checked pointed out that the sensational gains experienced in the value of credits established reflect a number of special factors. For example, heavy buying of foreign soda ash abroad was spurred by strikes here.

In a number of instances importers here are trying to build up inventories to higher levels on account of the unsettled international situation.

Accordingly, they now may be purchasing at a considerably higher rate than they may do in a few months. Further, the high prices for raw materials naturally swell import values.

MAY LEVEL OFF LATER

Factors such as these may mean that the steady upward trend in credits issued will level off later on, it was pointed out. On the other hand, the high totals reported currently as well as for August point to an extremely high level of imports throughout the remainder of the year.

Banks also foresee expansion in coming months of export letters of credit due to relaxation of foreign country import restrictions. This increase will be contingent on United States ability to supply merchandise wanted in midst of accelerating defense efforts.

Every dollar rise in imports, whether gained fortuitously such as in the case of products sold here because of American strikes, or otherwise, expands foreign purchasing power. This, in turn, it is noted, generally makes for further relaxation of import controls abroad and promises to help sustain foreign demand for American goods over the long run.

Poland and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Secretary of Labor, Maurice J. Tobin, over radio station WSPR, in Springfield, Mass. Secretary Tobin spoke on the Justice for Poland radio program. His pertinent and forthright statement of our country's position in opposition to atheistic communism, which has engulfed the freedom-loving people of Poland, is worthy of commendation. It is the prayer of the American people that Poland will soon be free of its bonds of atheistic communism, and that the people will gain the independence which they have so long cherished.

POLAND AND FREEDOM

It is more than 7 months since I spoke on this Justice for Poland program. I talked at that time about the sad plight of trade unions in countries behind the iron curtain.

Events have marched rapidly since then. Communism has grown more violently aggressive, and the forces of freedom have mobilized spiritual and economic strength more powerfully to defend liberty and democracy.

As President Truman has said on July 19 in his message to Congress on Korea:

"The American people are united in their belief in democratic freedom. We are united in detesting Communist slavery.

"We know that the cost of freedom is high. But we are determined to preserve our freedom, no matter what the cost.

"I know that our people are willing to do their part to support our soldiers and sailors and airmen who are fighting in Korea. I know that our fighting men can count on each and every one of you.

"Our country stands before the world as an example of how free men, under God, can build a community of neighbors, working together for the good of all.

"That is the goal we seek not only for ourselves, but for all people. We believe that freedom and peace are essential if men are to live as our Creator intended us to live. It is this faith that has guided us in the past, and it is this faith that will fortify us in the stern days ahead."

We are arising to the height of the ethical challenge of the hour. That challenge calls for a patriotism as big and precious as our country's very survival. I do not doubt that this call will be answered nobly by most Americans. I know it will be so answered by American labor which has always fought, as Samuel Gompers said 26 years ago, to abolish wrong and establish right, for itself and for the children of men everywhere.

For Poland and for the other countries behind the iron curtain, we can offer our prayers and our own example, to help in the fight of the people against communistic dictatorship.

In Poland, for example, the Communist totalitarian repression increases at the expense of the freedom of the working people. I have before me a new edict, a law dated April 19, 1950, Journal of Laws No. 20, which is the latest step of Poland's rulers to oppress the freedom-loving workers of that country.

This law, in its preamble, trumpets the rights of the working class as masters. In its second breath, however, the preamble bodes ill to those who would be so foolhardy as to reduce the effectiveness of the devoted work of their colleagues and hamper the steady increase in prosperity and culture for the working masses by violating work discipline. The law says that every manual or white-collar worker, irrespective of his position and the type of work performed by him, who is employed in a nationalized establishment, institution or office, should be held responsible "in the event of unjustified absenteeism" for violation of work discipline. According to the law, the council of ministers will determine the cases of absence from work which require justification, as well as the procedure with regard to proving justification for absence from work. It may be presumed from this that any worker who was ill and who did not secure the services of an approved physician could not justify his absence. The law goes even further in stating that a person who is absent from work for a part of a day in excess of the limits laid down by the ministers is considered absent for the whole day. This is indeed a far cry from our working standards in which persons are allowed annual vacations and sick leave on their own statements.

In an apparent attempt to soften this decree, the Communist rulers of Poland have decided that any worker, who distinguishes himself by "irreproachable work discipline" for a period of 3 years should be recommended for state decoration and prizes.

Let us look at the penalties in this Communist decree. For the first breach of discipline a worker is given a rebuke with warning or fined the equivalent of 1 day's pay. Should the worker be so rash as to be absent without excuse for 3 days or for a third time in any one calendar year, then the fine jumps to 2 days' pay for each day absent, or a good chance of demotion to lower paid work. Then if a worker should be absent for a period of 4 days in a row or 4 days in any one calendar year, he is subject to court penalty. This court penalty will oblige him to remain at the same job for a period not exceeding 3 months with a cut in pay of 10 to 25 percent. All of these penalties apply in a country where a worker cannot arbitrarily select a day of vacation and have it apply against his annual vacation time. These penalties are imposed in a country where the minimum workweek is 6 days and the minimum workday 8 hours. Such minimums, of course, can well be disregarded if a factory should fail to meet its production quota for the month.

Not to be outdone with severe penalties for workers, the decree also provides punishment for managers if they become lenient in such matters. The law says, "The manager of a work establishment who, intentionally and contrary to the circumstances, considers the absence of a worker as justified or, in spite of the obligation imposed upon him, does not inflict a penalty or does not submit the case to court is liable to imprisonment up to 3 months or a fine up to 150,000 zlotys, or to both of these punishments." The fine is the equivalent of 4½ months' wages. I can well imagine the results of such a law in this country. Yet this is supposed to be an example of production and progress under the Communist domination.

Under such rules and edicts the freedom of individuals has no meaning. Polish workmen will soon realize that the state's view that their sole purpose in life is production, that they will be allowed only enough rest as to enable them to produce more, and that severe and immediate penalties will be imposed if they should entertain the thought of taking a day off for rest or relaxation.

To further the Communist scheme, to build the machines and dig the coal, the people's democracy—that's what the Communist dictatorship is called—has decreed that labor unions shall exist; not representative unions whose purpose is to improve working conditions and raise living standards but organizations of work power which may be assigned goals in the Communist program. The unions do not serve as bargaining agents or grievance committees or even as contract negotiators. No; their single purpose is to provide ability, manpower, and another administrative control on the workers. Yes; a Polish workman is allowed to join the unions. If he doesn't join and make his services available to the production scheme, then he is in trouble. He may join the many millions of liberated people who work as forced labor for the Communists. During my last address to this group, I mentioned the forced-labor camps, and I want to do so again. I do not know the exact number of humans who are kept alive only so long as they are able to work. May God grant us the ability to help those who have become such victims of the Communist system.

This program is named "Justice for Poland." Only under God and free men can there be justice for Poland or for any other country. Although the Polish people continue to find strength and solace in a religion which suffers from constant attack by the government, the Communist regime, based on the shifting sands of materialism, tries its best to change the Polish people, to bend their knee at the Ikon of Sovietism.

The Poles have a long history of Christianity. They believe it and they practice it and they will never accept the state as their God. The people of Poland are still Christians, but their rulers are trying to substitute the state for God.

The new masters of Poland have decided that free religious activity has no place in the Communist scheme of things.

The people, the workers of Poland, have only their faith and friends in this country and the rest of the free world to depend on.

The mask has been stripped from the face of Communist aggression and underneath we find the grim countenance of Soviet imperialism.

This is the time to support the action of the United Nations.

This is the time when free men everywhere must pray and work together to release those who have fallen prey to Communist aggression and Communist repression behind the iron curtain.

Senator McCarthy's Charges Against State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release for March 29, 1950, concerning my statement on Senator MCCARTHY'S charges against the State Department.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The people back home, the honest people who make up this land of ours, are amazed and a little confused at what is going on here in the Halls of Congress.

A United States Senator, Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, indicated he had reason to believe that traitor Alger Hiss was not the only person disloyal to the United States who had access to State Department secret files—that apparently there had been others who were poor security risks—and he asked that a complete study and investigation be made. The Senate authorized the investigation, and a subcommittee was appointed.

The news stories, giving blow-by-blow descriptions of the subcommittee's performance, indicate that an effort has been made to browbeat the Senator who asked for the investigation. The Senate's orders to the committee were "to conduct a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are or have been employed by the Department of State." The Senate, after listening to Senator MCCARTHY, decided an investigation of the State Department should be made, and ordered it. The Senate did not order its committee to investigate Senator MCCARTHY; he is not on trial. In its investigation of the State Department the subcommittee obviously could use Senator MCCARTHY'S information for leads. The Senate's orders to the subcommittee were not to try to whitewash Mr. Acheson's department, but to investigate—to find out if there are or have been persons in that Department who are selling or giving away this Government's secrets.

Naturally, any of those named as Communist sympathizers, or poor security risks, are going to call the charges untrue when appearing before the committee. What counts is the cross-examination. But there is no effective cross-examination.

What kind of an investigation is this?

There's a friendly pat on the back, a "proud of you" murmur, and applause from the audience.

I am reminded that Alger Hiss was applauded when he first appeared before the House Un-American Activities Committee. But the House committee did no whitewashing of traitors, applause or no applause. Had the House Committee on Un-American Activities operated as our Senate subcommittee started out to operate, quite probably traitor Alger Hiss would still be calling the shots on our foreign policies, as he did at Yalta. You will recall that traitor Hiss was the top adviser to a very sick President at Yalta, and it was there that we gave Manchuria, the breadbasket of China, to the Russians. It was largely through that action that China was lost. With that President dead and Hiss convicted, we have no way of knowing at this time what other dangerous commitments were made upon traitor Hiss' promptings.

There was great glee when Miss Dorothy Kenyon, one of those named as a Communist sympathizer, called Senator MCCARTHY a liar, notwithstanding the fact that news articles had connected her name with a long list of front organizations branded as subversive, and notwithstanding the fact that Miss Kenyon's attitude toward the Alger Hiss matter was the same as that of the Communist Daily Worker—that "Alger Hiss is a perfect example of sacrifice to the hysteria created by the Un-American Activities Committee," to use her words.

Miss Kenyon received the kid-glove treatment from the Democratic majority of the committee who, though specifically directed to probe Red infiltration of the State Department, appear more interested in coddling

and protecting persons whose connections give rise to serious doubts about their loyalty.

Ambassador-at-Large Philip C. Jessup seems a little worried now over the reputation of our State Department. Isn't he a little late with this concern? He should have thought of the reputation of the State Department when he, a high official of that Department, started association with persons such as A. A. Heller, Frederick V. Field, Howard Fast, and John Howard Larson. Jessup should have thought of the reputation of the State Department when he sponsored the American Russian Institute, cited by the Attorney General as un-American. He should have thought of this when he became a member of the advisory board of the American Law Students Association, an affiliate of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American Youth Congress, both cited as Communist-front organizations by the Attorney General. He should have thought of this when he became a member of the board of sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, enthusiastically supported by the Communists and cited as subversive.

He should have thought of this when he got mixed up in the Institute of Pacific Relations with some of the same crowd who were running the magazine Amerasia. (You will recall that the offices of Amerasia were raided by the FBI and around 100 files of State, Treasury, Navy, and OSS documents were found—some vital; and you will recall that the case was suddenly hushed up, after one of those involved was fined.) Jessup should have thought of the State Department's reputation when he, as an official of that Department, testified that Alger Hiss' reputation for loyalty, integrity, and veracity "is good." Yes, it would seem Dr. Jessup is a little late with his great concern over the standing of the State Department.

Secretary Acheson himself had a nice word to say for traitor, Alger Hiss.

I, for one, have heard enough and read enough about the cases presented for study by Senator McCarthy to cause me to join in the demand for a thorough investigation—not a whitewash.

No wonder the people are amazed and a little confused: Committee hearing audiences applaud and headlines are made when those accused deny the charges, but an admission by a State Department official that 91 employees of that Department have been dismissed for being homosexuals passes with little excitement. I venture to say no such percentage of degenerates could be found in any other company of human beings. The American people are interested in knowing if others are still there.

The State Department gathers the data, formulates the plans, lays down the techniques, short of war, for foreign policy and the welfare of our country. Our foreign policy has been wrong for years. What part did those homosexuals, obviously subject to blackmail, play in the formulation and conduct of those erroneous policies?

Homosexuality has figured, off stage, in one of our traitorous operations. A great deal of the trouble we are in, internationally, can be laid to the tolerance of that kind of weakness in a service which should be above reproach.

Did homosexuals, bribed or bullied, help plan the ECA program? Did homosexuals decide that America must accept a greater volume of imports from abroad, even at the cost of injury to her own industry and unemployment to her own workingmen?

Mr. Acheson, in his speech about total diplomacy, demands that Americans commit their total resources, making adjustments here at home. The adjustments to which Mr. Acheson refers mean, it is presumed, that if American industries are damaged by his free-trade policy of importing an unprecedented volume of foreign cheap-labor products, we shall have to tax and tax ourselves to vote relief to ourselves. I wonder who it was in the State Department that thought that one up?

Obviously, the State Department needs a housecleaning from top to bottom. All Americans should be grateful to Senator McCarthy for pointing up the existence of a deplorable situation which now must be corrected—and should demand that a thorough investigation be made.

Jewish Festival of Tabernacles Reminds Americans That the "Four Freedoms" Are an Intellectual Heritage of the Old Testament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following synopsis of a stirring sermon recently delivered by my good friend, Rabbi Edward E. Klein, rabbi of the Stephen Wise Free Synagogue, 30 West Sixty-eighth Street, New York. I believe that Rabbi Klein has a message here for all Americans.

Speaking at the Sabbath service of the Stephen Wise Free Synagogue, Rabbi Edward E. Klein pointed out that the Jewish Festival of Tabernacles is a reminder of the importance of the "four freedoms." He said, "Actually there is a close bond between our fathers—who proclaimed three millennia ago that it is immoral and ungodly for man to enslave his fellowman—and the embodiment of the ideal of freedom in the institutions of American democracy. The founding fathers of Judaism proclaimed the dignity and inviolability of the individual; and America's founding fathers took that vision and built it into a government based on the proposition that men are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights.

"Of all the rights most cherished through the years, the right of free speech was most precious. If Moses had not dared to speak out before Pharaoh, the Jewish people would have disappeared in the totalitarian world of old. If the prophets had permitted themselves to be throttled by priests and kings, the Judeo-Christian ideal would never have come into being. Faith in man as the child of God means faith in man's ability to solve his problems through the free give and take of ideas. For this wars were fought, men gave their life's blood, and to this the Government of the United States was dedicated.

"And yet, such are the tensions in this age of the cold war, such is the fear that grips us that in blind hysteria we strike at the foundations of the freedom which is our birthright.

"A so-called anti-Communist bill was recently passed over the stern veto of the President, a bill which the President warns 'can be the greatest danger to freedom of speech, press, and assembly since the alien and sedition laws of 1798.' Among such provisions as those which would set up American concentration camps and immigration barriers that would make the Statue of Liberty a mockery is one requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations. This defines such organizations as those which take positions 'from time to time on matters of policy which do not deviate from the Communist movement.' Think of it. Because the Communists hate Fascist Spain and we hate Fascist Spain, we might be tarred with the same brush. Because they favor rent controls and so do we, we might be suspect.

"Every sincere anti-Communist liberal, every patriot who holds an unpopular opinion, any zealous citizen who walks in the footsteps of Jefferson and Lincoln, might be in jeopardy. Must we resort to double think and double talk to protect our livelihoods and our families?

"I hate communism as thoroughly as do the authors of this bill. For the threat to world peace, communism is guilty. For warring on religion, communism is guilty. For the persecution of Zionists behind the iron curtain, communism is guilty. For spying and sabotage, communism is guilty. But we serve the Communists when out of fear we circumscribe liberties even as do the Russians. The security of the state is indissolubly bound up with the security of the individual. We weaken America when we weaken our liberties.

"Yes; we must legislate against espionage and sabotage and subversive action; but when we legislate against thought, we legislate against America. I like the words of Governor Dewey, 'We should prosecute men for the crimes they have committed, not for the ideas they have.'

"And yet hope must not be surrendered. God be praised, we live in a democracy whose growth and development are in the hands of the people. Mistakes can be rectified. A step back to reaction can be checked by steps forward to progress. We can all speak out even as our President has spoken out. Let us make our wishes known at the ballot box. Let us do our best to influence the climate of opinion around us. Let us not succumb to fear and panic. Let us believe in democracy and work at democratic living with such dedication that our enemies will be discredited and that America become the living inspiration of a struggling world. Let the symbolism of the Sukkoth remind us always of the freedoms which are our birthright as children of the ever-living God."

Bipartisan Foreign Policy Nonexistent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record a press release for April 25, 1950, giving my reasons for feeling the bipartisan foreign policy is nonexistent.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington, D. C., April 26.—"The bipartisan foreign policy, about which we hear so much, does not exist," United States Senator George W. Malone, Republican, Nevada, declared today in addressing his colleagues in the Senate. The Nevada Senator quoted from the Republican Party platform to show that the party's position was diametrically opposite to that of the Acheson-Lattimore-State Department policy which the Democratic Party has adopted.

"No one can be for the principles of the Republican Party and for the Democratic Party foreign policy at the same time," Senator MALONE said, "since the fundamental principles of the two parties are diametrically opposed. Bipartisan foreign policy, like reciprocal trade, is a catch phrase to sell the one-economic-world philosophy to the American people.

"The Executive, through the State Department, is supposed to formulate the foreign policies and then submit them to us for consideration and debate, and approval or rejection. The three branches of government were set up to form a system of 'checks and balances,' and any coalition is against the spirit of the Constitution. As operated now, the foreign policy is handed to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to accept, as is, without dotting an 'i' or crossing a 't'. However, when the State Department is being attacked from all sides for its miserable failure and for the questionable character of some of its officials, past and present, the President and the Secretary of State, and others, made uncomfortable by the disclosures, search frantically to find a way to share the blame; it is then they like the word bipartisan' as they plead, weakly, that those who expose the rottenness are attacking the 'bipartisan foreign policy.'

"The few Republican Senators who go along with the Acheson-Lattimore-State Department foreign policy cannot be said to represent the Republican viewpoint. As set forth in its statement of principles, the Republican Party believes that world trade, an integral part of foreign policy, should be developed on a basis of fair and reasonable competition and that 'products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman and the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to domestic industry.' Republicans then are obviously against free trade.

"On the other hand, the Democrats are committed to the three-part free-trade program as outlined to the Senate Appropriations Committee by the Undersecretary of State, the program which includes the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the ECA, and the International Trade Organization. The Democrats are for free trade—the lowering of tariffs and import fees to the point that competition of low-wage foreign goods and slave-labor products will remove the floor from under wages and investments in the country and reduce the standard of living of American workers. This is the State Department's foreign policy, and I submit that it cannot be bipartisan.

"The two opposing positions of the major parties are clear. A Senator can be on one side or the other; he cannot be on both sides. There cannot be a bipartisan foreign policy without a major change in the accepted platform of one of the major parties."

Who Runs America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New Era, an AFL publication at Reading, Pa.:

WHO RUNS AMERICA?

That's the question propounded by the American Medical Association in its campaign against national health insurance. It's an interesting question which the AMA proceeds to answer in this manner: "Running America is the joint job of 150,000,000 people."

Now up to this point we cannot quarrel with the AMA's statements which appear in their $1,200,000 advertising campaign hitting the Nation this week in newspapers and magazines—and on the radio. The AMA's logic beyond this point grows quite fuzzy and confused, however, and creates the impression that a scared animal produced the advertising copy while riding out a hurricane.

Who really does run America? Well, until the advent of the New Deal back in the Republican depression days, powerful employers with plenty of money to spend on elections, ran America. Our laws from the period prior to 1930 are evidence of this. Representatives in Congress served their masters well—and the masters were that small handful of men who controlled the Nation's greatest corporations, investment trusts, and international cartels.

Workers were emancipated from their industrial shackles in 1933 and during the past 17 years they have been slowly moving toward a more accurate realization of the fact that running America is the joint job of 150,000,000 people. Only in the last two decades have the 150,000,000 Americans begun to use their right to vote. Only in the past 20 years have they awakened to the cruel hoax which the money crowd of America was perpetrating in the name of democracy.

The AMA doesn't really want the common people of America to turn out at the polls en masse and send liberals to Congress. Not at all. If all the working people vote, they eventually will demand better medical care. The average working man or woman is the one who needs it most. And usually they are the ones who cannot afford it.

The logic of the AMA is indeed strange. In the first place, the AMA calls national health insurance socialized medicine. That phrase "socialized medicine" is supposed to conjure up all the evil spirits known to man and thus create a scare atmosphere in which the AMA propaganda can work.

National health insurance is not socialized medicine and the AMA knows darned well it isn't. Doctors would not be compelled to accept patients and patients could choose their doctors. The Government would not tell doctors how to diagnose and treat illness. Workers would contribute to their own medical care through a small weekly payroll deduction of approximately $1 per week per family—just as they now do to provide social security when they reach age 65 and no longer can be gainfully employed.

National health insurance is simply a method of paying for medical care in advance. To date no one has explained how this differs from Blue Cross or Blue Shield. For some strange reason, the AMA does not object when its members are paid by these private agencies. Yet they holler like blazes and cry "socialism" when the Government suggests that we extend social security to cover medical care for all of the people. Don't forget, national health insurance can come into being only by majority action of the Congress of the United States which represents those 150,000,000 Americans the AMA speaks of. And we always were taught that that's democracy.

The AMA, in our opinion, is missing the boat in its advertising campaign. "An American's heritage is the right to learn the facts," says the AMA. We defy anyone to show us anywhere in the AMA ad a single analysis of the national health insurance bill. Instead of discussing the facts, the AMA deals in trick words like "state socialism" and "socialized medicine."

We make no pretenses about crystal ball gazing, but if we were to venture a prediction, it is this: The AMA campangn will send millions of Americans in search of the real facts. And when those Americans get the facts, the AMA is really going to learn who runs America.

Government Offices Need Cleaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release of May 10, 1950, giving my views on the immediate housecleaning need in Government jobs.

There being no objection the remarks were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 10, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, said today in the Senate that there must be an immediate housecleaning of poor security risks in Government jobs, and that it was senseless to try to measure loyalty by degrees, as the administration is doing in differentiating between those classed as disloyal to America and those Government employees classed as poor security risks.

Senator MALONE demanded that action be taken on this bill, S. 3213, for the creation of a Loyalty Review Board as an independent establishment of the Federal Government, the members of which would be approved by the Senate. The Nevada Senator said that the present board, scattered over the world from Hawaii to New York, seldom if ever meet together, that its office staff, as a matter of course, approves the findings of the lower loyalty boards. Poor security risks are still in important Government posts here in Washington, the Senator said, and his bill would be in the interest of security of the Nation.

Continuing, Senator MALONE said: "President Truman is reported to have made a broad statement in a recent speech intended to give the impression that there were no subversives in the Government service. One wonders if the President would not have made the same statement had traitor Alger Hiss—or some of the other subsequently exposed subversives—still been on the Government payroll. As a matter of fact, did not President Truman refer to the congressional investigation of Hiss as a 'red herring' shortly before he was proved to be a traitor.

"Although the President's Loyalty Review Board includes some men of fine character, I regret to say that the Board itself is not above reproach. I am reliably informed, and there is documentary evidence to back it up, that one William Ludwig Ullman, in applying for a Government post, gave the name of Harry W. Blair, lawyer, Tower Building, Washington, D. C., as his personal reference.

Later, Ullman was accused of being a member of the espionage group which conveyed information from the files of the State Department here to agents of the Soviet Union, and when Ullman was subpenaed and asked questions pertaining to these charges he refused to answer on the ground of self-incrimination. Harry W. Blair, who is one of Ullman's sponsors, is a member of the President's Loyalty Review Board.

"There is no denying that the President's Loyalty Review Board has cleared persons subsequently found to be poor security risks. To illustrate: A Mr. Jesse Eppstein, an admitted member of the professional unit of the Communist Party in Seattle, Wash., was cleared by the loyalty review board of the Federal Public Housing Authority and the President's Loyalty Review Board approved that clearance. The man known in the Commerce Department as Michael J. Lee, whose real name is Ephraim Lieberman, who was once refused American citizenship on the ground that he was not attached to principles of Constitution of United States, was cleared and is still Chief of the Far Eastern Division of our Office of International Trade. I am told that William Remington, who admitted to cooperating with Elizabeth T. Bentley, a confessed Soviet spy, was cleared by the present Board and is now in the Department of Commerce, but transferred to a job where it is considered safe to work.

"While thousands of loyal American citizens are out of work, we have the spectacle here in Washington of administration officials going far out of their way to find a place for one they admit is a poor security risk. Mr. C. V. Whitney, on the occasion of his resignation as Under Secretary of Commerce, said it is 'eyewash' to think Government workers classed as poor security risks can simply be transferred to 'less sensitive jobs.'

"The Loyalty Review Board as provided for in my bill would correct the present situation. The American people are interested in loyalty to America of their employees in Washington."

Ghosts in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, pursuant to the general order entered into September 23, I ask leave to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ghosts in Philadelphia" which was published in the September issue of the News Letter of the Supreme Council, Thirty-third Degree, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, for the northern Masonic jurisdiction, United States of America. The article, written by Mr. McIlyar H. Lichliter, editor of the News Letter, presents a graphic picture of Philadelphia in 1776 and the historic events which culminated in the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. It was greatly appreciated by all who attended the annual meeting of the supreme council held in the city of Philadelphia, September 27.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GHOSTS IN PHILADELPHIA

(By McIlyar H. Lichliter)

Philadelphia is one large city in these United States where one may see ghosts. In Boston, they have been driven from Beacon Hill and exorcised from the vicinage of the Old North Church—by whom, we do not here reveal. They still linger in Plymouth and Salem, in Harvard Yard, and in the classic shades of Lexington and Concord. But they throng downtown Philadelphia, especially along Chestnut Street between the Benjamin Franklin Hotel and Independence Hall. The harmless phantoms on their errands glide, with feet that make no sound upon the floor.

Fifty-six in all—a colorful crowd. Men with powdered wigs, knee breeches, silken hose, silver buckles, shirts with lace and ruffles, coats and waistcoats of brilliant hues. There were also the Friends, "the people called Quakers," in sober homespun, dark hair, and broad-brim hats—the most successful business and professional men in town. The leaders of the Colonies have come together to form a Continental Congress and to decide the destiny of a new Nation. They crowded the London Coffee House, at the southwest corner of Front and Market, the City Tavern, on Second Street above Walnut, and available rooms in private homes. They met in various places—the long room of the City Tavern, seating 300, in the State House—and in Carpenter's Hall. Philadelphia: 1774–76. Population 20,000. Three thousand houses. Larger than New York.

John Dickinson, perhaps the most eminent leader, who was to hold the Congress in the hollow of his hands until the tide turned, lived outside the city at his beautiful estate, Fairhill. Wealthy, cultured, a man of unblemished integrity, a scholar in the law, trained in Middle Temple, London, a persuasive speaker and the author of the most influential political pamphlet of the day, Letters From a Farmer in Pennsylvania. There's a dramatic touch. Isaac Norris, whose daughter Mary married John Dickinson, was speaker of the Provincial Assembly for 31 years and chose the inscription for the great bell ordered from London, "Proclaim liberty throughout the land, to all the inhabitants thereof." (Leviticus 25: 10.) He never dreamed what that was to mean.

John Dickinson led the conservatives, opposing separation from Great Britain as valiantly as he resisted British aggression. Was not Massachusetts too precipitous? Why not pay the East India Co. for the tea dumped into the harbor, open the ports, get the ships moving again—and wait? Some of the most powerful friends of the Colonies were in Parliament, he said—and that was true.

John Adams, of Massachusetts, with the strong support of Benjamin Franklin and the Virginians, was the foremost advocate of complete separation from Great Britain. The debate was impassioned, then became quiescent—while the Congress elected Washington as Commander in Chief and tried to finance armed resistance which had already begun. What ghosts there are at Valley Forge. In 1776, the debate flared up again and became bitter. One day, on Chestnut Street, John Adams removed his hat and bowed to John Dickinson, but Dickinson passed him on the street with a face of stone.

The tide turned toward independence. On June 7, 1776, the brilliant Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, moved "That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States." A month of solemn discussion—the story ought to thrill every American heart. These men knew what it would cost, and they were not afraid. At the last—a vote. Delaware proudly recalls how Caesar Rodney rode all night from Dover, Del., 80 miles, through a driving rain, and reached the State House covered with mud and intolerably weary, just in time to cast a decisive vote. That was July 2.

Last scene: John Adams, as great in humility as in wisdom, said to a lanky reddish-haired Virginian—one Thomas Jefferson: "I am obnoxious, suspected, and unpopular. You are much otherwise and you can write better than I." Climb the stairs to a hot second-floor room at Mr. Graf's on Market Street, see Jefferson, desk-board on knee, quill pen in hand, slowly composing the immortal Declaration. Franklin, who like Washington and Jefferson did not care for speeches but was a master of words, sat by him and helped him with certain phrases. On July 4, 1776, the Declaration of Independence witnessed the birth of a new nation. The city was wild with joy, and, as one historian writes, the Liberty Bell "was heard in heaven."

A final word: One sentence cut from Jefferson's draft has a nostalgic touch for the chaotic days in which we live. Speaking of the true Britain and the British people, he had written, "We might have been a great and free people—together." Is it too late?

Unnecessary Fault in Highway Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my May 26, 1950, press release on the unnecessary and stupid fault in one of our transcontinental highway systems.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 26, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, today demanded that immediate action be taken to correct what he called an "unnecessary and stupid fault in one of our transcontinental highway systems." In a strong statement to the Senate Public Works Committee, of which he is a member, Senator MALONE called attention to the 47-mile gap of unimproved road in western Utah which prevents highway No. 6 from extending unbroken 3,000 miles from Provincetown, Mass., to Long Beach, Calif.

After completing his statement before the committee, Senator MALONE said that he believed this Congress will correct the situation, which he referred to as deplorable. "The 47-mile link of unimproved road should not be permitted to interfere with the efficient use of a 3,000 mile transcontinental highway," the Senator said, continuing: "The completion of this link is important to national defense, as highway No. 40 is now the only complete transcontinental highway through the central part of the Nation and in the event of an emergency both routes would be vital."

In Senator MALONE's presentation to the committee, it was developed that in conference with the Federal Director of Public Roads, Thomas H. McDonald, and the Highway Commission of Utah, the Utah commission will set aside 27 percent, or $202,500, of the needed $750,000 for the completion of this link in highway No. 6 when the Federal Government makes available its 73 percent, or $547,500, under the provisions of the Federal Aid Act. It was also developed that if the Federal Government would act immediately, the 47-mile link could be completed by the end of 1951.

Senator MALONE told the committee that although an amendment had been offered to authorize the necessary funds, the amendment may not be necessary, that a way may be found to do the work without passage of the amendment.

Civic organizations in five States, Nebraska, Colorado, Utah, Nevada and California, have been in consultation with Senator MALONE in regard to the completion of the vital link in the transcontinental highway.

Address of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Clarksburg, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, pursuant to the general order entered into September 23, I ask leave to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me at a Republican rally held at Clarksburg, W. Va., October 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to be here tonight because West Virginia is a stronghold of loyalty and patriotic Americanism.

For many years I have derived a great deal of pleasure from my frequent social, business, and political visits to your State. I am grateful for the warm, neighborly welcome I have always received.

I want to assure you also that Pennsylvania is proud of the greatness of West Virginia and its important place in the economic life of the United States. Your vast natural resources, your mineral wealth, your great reserves of coal, your gas and oil production—all form a solid base on which your people have built their splendid cultural and spiritual progress.

Your diversified industries, iron and steel, chemicals, glass, pottery, textiles, leather, and tobacco products, to name but a few, have developed West Virginia into one of the great workshops of the world. They have contributed to the welfare and prosperity of the whole Nation. Your agriculture has become increasingly important, particularly in livestock and livestock products.

Yes—Pennsylvania is proud of the Mountain State—proud of its historic tradition as the home of free men and women who know the meaning of real Americanism. We are proud of West Virginia because your people have given the world an example of love of liberty, loyalty to the Union in the dark days of national crisis, faith in the American Republic and faith in God.

It was upon faith in God and faith in the capacity of a free people to govern themselves that our Nation was established. Firm reliance on the protection of divine providence is solemnly expressed in the immortal charter of American freedom, the Declaration of Independence.

In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 Benjamin Franklin reminded his colleagues that "God governs in the affairs of men" when he proposed that daily prayers be held "imploring the assistance of heaven and its blessings upon our deliberations."

The founding fathers recognized freedom under God as the foundation of all human progress.

The pioneers of our independence sought guidance in the teachings of the Holy Bible. The greatness of the United States reflects the deep religious conviction of our people, their love of God, their ardent desire to live in peace, good will, and tolerance. It reflects their self-reliance, their willingness to work and save, and to create through their own toil and sacrifice a better land and a better life for themselves and their children.

American diplomatic leadership in the world was the product of many generations of honesty and fair dealing with other countries, constant striving for peace, and unselfish zeal for justice and freedom for all people.

Those, in brief outline, are the principles of Americanism. Under our system of government freedom of the individual reached its highest peak in all world history.

My fellow Americans, all of us who love our country, Republicans and Democrats alike, know that the freedoms which have come down to us from the patriotism and the sacrifice of our forefathers are in grave danger.

We all know that we are engaged in a desperate struggle for survival as a free nation.

What has happened during the 5 years since our glorious victory in World War II?

We were then the greatest military power of all time. Our great military leaders and fighting men had placed us at the pinnacle of world affairs. The freedom-loving people of every nation looked to America to lead them in the ways of peace.

But just 5 years later, instead of cultivating the garden of peace, we are again called upon to use force and spill American blood on foreign soil.

We are again engaged in conflict which may destroy even our own freedom.

Who is to blame for the situation that has been brought upon us?

Who has been in power and responsible for our diplomatic policies?

Was the Republican Party? Was the Republican Party represented at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam?

Was the Republican Party consulted about the secret agreements entered into at those conferences?

You know the answers. It was a Democratic President and his Democratic Department of State that sold out one nation after another in Europe and Asia and placed millions of people in bondage behind the iron curtain.

It was the Truman administration that announced to the world that we had abandoned the defense of Korea and Formosa and thus gave the Communists a free ticket to overrun South Korea at will. Then, overnight, without any preparation, without trained men, without adequate equipment, Mr. Truman announced that we were going to defend South Korea.

Were the Republicans consulted in framing the policy that led up to the crisis in Korea? Not a single Republican had a thing to do with it, even though the administration talks about a bipartisan policy. The blundering of the Democratic administration is directly and completely responsible for the situation in which we find ourselves.

And today more than 30,000 American casualties have been announced so far and the list is still growing.

Had the administration leaders taken a strong, firm, determined stand, had they made it known months in advance that the United States would resist aggression, we would not be reading the casualty lists today.

The Truman administration must be held responsible for every life that was sacrificed, for every wounded boy up to this day and the days to come before this conflict ends.

We are all fully aware that the end of the shooting war in Korea will not mean that peace has returned to the world.

Victory in Korea must not erase from our minds the greater danger that we may be plunged into total war to defend our very existence against the threat of world conquest by the Godless forces of communism.

How can we build American strength to meet the crisis into which we have been forced?

We want a United States so powerful that no aggressor nation will dare disturb the peace of the world.

But, first, let us have a clear understanding of what we mean when we say we want a strong America.

America will be strong only if we defend our own individual liberty against the creeping paralysis of socialism and its poisonous promise of an easy way of life at the expense of the Government.

We must remember that unless we preserve our own freedom here at home we will be powerless to bring freedom to any other country in the world.

America will be strong only if we build our spiritual and moral resources in a great mobilization of righteousness.

We must defend America against greed, selfishness, and grasping ambition for personal advantage. With the spirit of God in our hearts, we should clean up all immoral practices in politics, and business, and in national and international affairs.

America will be strong only as we strive to restore solvency to our Nation—to meet the costs of war on a pay-as-you-go basis—and to abandon the policy of reckless and extravagant spending which has already brought us to the brink of national bankruptcy.

America will be strong only if every citizen, in every walk of life, recognizes his individual responsibility for the future of our country and does his full duty in peace and war.

Furthermore, and most important, America will be strong only if those in control of the Government set an example of honesty and morality in the conduct of national and international affairs.

One of the great tragedies of our time is that we have a stupid, blundering administration at Washington that does not trust the people and has established deception as a definite policy.

It is an administration which puts politics above the preservation of the Republic and whose first consideration always is how to get the votes.

It's no wonder that so many patriotic Americans are confused and troubled. No wonder they are asking questions which so far have gone unanswered.

Why did the State Department invite Communist aggression by announcing that Korea and Formosa would not be defended?

Why did the administration ignore the repeated warnings from many sources, including General MacArthur, that the Reds of North Korea were preparing for an invasion across the thirty-eighth parallel in June?

What caused the sudden reversal by the President which sent untrained and inadequately armed soldiers into battle in the early days of the Korean War?

Why did President Truman, on June 1, 3 weeks before the Korean invasion tell the American people and I quote:

"The world is closer to peace now than it has been in the last 5 years."

Why were we deceived regarding our lack of military preparedness?

Why were we lulled into a false sense of security by defense appropriations of $95,000,000,000 in the last 5 years, of which $8,500,000,000 were spent for weapons, planes, tanks, and ships?

Why, at this late date, are the White House and the State Department silent on their reported plan to support the seating of Communist China in the United Nations?

Why? Why? Why?

The questions go on and on.

They echo across the muddy rice paddies and the mountains of Korea, where our boys gave their lives so heroically to win back the losses sustained by a stupid, blundering, tragic policy of weakness and appeasement.

They reecho in the thousands of American homes that are darkened by tragedy as the casualty lists pour in from the blazing battlefront.

What a terrible price to pay because the Democratic leaders failed to understand that Soviet Russia's sole objective is to dominate and enslave the world, including the United States.

The cold, stark, ugly truth is that the party in power at Washington had no policy in the Far East except that which grew out of the shameful black-market deal at Yalta. There the Democratic leadership sold China down the river into the hands of Joe Stalin and his gangster mob.

You will recall that Alger Hiss, friend of Secretary of State Acheson, was one of the keymen in that disastrous departure from the clean traditions of American diplomacy.

The same Alger Hiss was exposed 4 years later as one who passed vital Government secrets to agents of Soviet Russia. Today he is under a prison sentence as the penalty of his disloyalty, even though President Truman called the Hiss case only a red herring.

Never before have the American people faced so serious a crisis with such little confidence in their leaders at Washington.

Freedom in the world is facing its supreme test. The American people are prepared for patriotic and willing sacrifice to build our Nation's defensive strength.

They are prepared to assume a heavier burden of taxation. They are ready to give up many of the things they have enjoyed in order that critical materials may be channeled into war production.

Congress has given the President wide powers to regulate the Nation's economy, to impose price and wage controls, to allocate materials and to restrict credits in order to check inflation.

Republicans in Congress joined with the Democratic majority to confer these powers upon the President as a means of protecting the farmer and the wage earner from the danger of runaway prices and a shrinking dollar.

But the President has virtually ignored the danger. He has failed to act in the face of increasing inflationary pressure that has already sent the price of food, clothing, and all commodities sky-high.

Inflation is no longer a threat. It is here, right now. But Mr. Truman hopes to gain political advantage by postponing rigid controls until after the November election and until the current round of wage increases has run its course.

Keep in mind also that as your cost of living rises the price of every item needed for defense production also jumps upward.

This was explained recently by Mr. John McCone, Under Secretary of the Air Force, when he appeared before the Armed Services Committee of the House.

Mr. McCone stated that rising prices between April and September have reduced the purchasing power of the Air Force by at least $315,000,000. In terms of F-86 jet fighter planes, Mr. McCone said, it means that the Air Force will have to cut down its purchases by 750 planes unless more money is provided.

According to another estimate the $18,000,000,000 appropriated for the Korean emergency will buy only $16,500,000,000 worth of arms and equipment at today's inflated prices.

It would be well for every American to keep in mind that President Truman's failure to halt inflation, after he was given the power to do so, is responsible for a more drastic increase in taxes for defense which must be levied by the next Congress.

When will President Truman and his spendthrift crew realize that world conditions today demand that we cut to the bone every item of domestic spending not connected with national defense?

When will the Washington bureaucrats learn that strength for victory is the only thing that matters now?

When will the Democratic leadership give the people some assurance that the increased taxes they must pay will contribute directly to the preservation of American liberty?

Despite national peril the Truman administration has yielded to every pressure group and is committed to the most extravagant nondefense spending in all our history.

The left-wingers and the pinks continue their fight for visionary socialistic experiments without regard for their cost and fully aware that their schemes would undermine our system of government.

It is shocking in the face of the Korean situation to find Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, a Truman spokesman, demanding that the fight for these fantastic proposals be continued with increased intensity.

Appropriations for nondefense spending in this fiscal year are almost double what they were 2 years ago.

With the staggering cost of building our strength at home and abroad how long can we continue a policy of unrestricted spending without plunging into national bankruptcy?

I say to you that every dollar we spend needlessly is a dollar deposited in the bank account of Joe Stalin.

The most shocking attitude I find in Washington is the utter refusal of any department, agency, board, or commission to come forward and point out one place, one function, or one activity of Government where it would be possible to cut down a single dollar.

This stubborn insistence that no savings can be made, coupled with continuous demands for more and more of the taxpayers' money, is to me a convincing indication of criminal waste and extravagance.

For a period of 18 years, with the exception of 2 years when the Republican Eightieth Congress was in control, the result has been unbalanced budgets and deficit spending on a stupendous scale.

In the last 5 years, during a period of our greatest prosperity, we have gone deeper and deeper into debt to support a system of handouts, subsidies, and so-called grants-in-aid, many of which were simply schemes to buy the people's votes with their own money.

Eighteen years of irresponsible government has transformed the great Democratic Party of Thomas Jefferson into a party comparable to the Socialist Party of England.

What have they given us?

They have given us deficit financing.

They have increased taxes to the highest peacetime level.

They have placed upon the backs of the American people the greatest burden of debt of any country in all history.

They have given us inflation and a debased currency so that the purchasing power of the dollar has been cut in half.

They have given us a deficit defense program which found us unprepared in this critical time, although billions and billions of dollars have been appropriated by Congress for the defense and security of our Nation.

They have given us a deficit program in agriculture by spending billions of dollars to keep food prices up. At the same time, vast quantities of food are bulging the warehouses, filling the caves of the country. There it is spoiling while our Government goes into the open market and spends more millions and millions for butter, eggs, milk, cheese, potatoes, and other agricultural products for our Armed Forces.

They have given us a deficit tariff policy which is destroying many American industries and the jobs of American workers through a system of so-called reciprocal-trade agreements. You in West Virginia know what that is doing to the workers in the glass and pottery industries of your State.

They have given us a deficit policy in foreign relations. They have wiped out the great victory we had in World War II and have lost the peace. Now we are again forced to take up arms to restore peace to the world.

Yes, in past 18 years they have given us a deficit policy in morals and integrity. The actions and utterances of Mr. Truman have stripped the high office of President of much of its dignity. The public no longer regards that office with the same respect that it formerly commanded.

They are attempting to force upon the American people a program of socialized medicine, socialized education, socialized agriculture through the Brannan plan, socialized public housing, and many other programs which would destroy the American system of government and the freedom of the individual. They would substitute a controlled and regimented socialistic state.

Eighteen years of misrule have given us confusion, corruption, and communism. Today we find ourselves in danger on all fronts.

There is only one way that we can restore real American principles. There is only one way that we can get back on the path of real Americanism.

There is only one way that we can get back to solvency and a balanced budget. The Republican Party proved in the Eightieth Congress that the budget can be balanced, not by just talking about it, but by adjusting expenditures to income.

There is only one way that we can drive out the Communist conspirators and their disloyal fellow travelers who have entrenched themselves in the State Department and other branches of Government over the past 18 years.

My fellow Americans, there is only one way that we can rid ourselves of those responsible for the mess we are in and substitute bold, courageous leadership that will restore sanity and solvency to this Republic.

That one way is to go out now and work to elect a Republican Congress and lay the foundation-stone for 1952, when we shall go forward to a great Republican victory.

National Defense and International Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted

in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech which I delivered before the national convention of the American Legion in Los Angeles on October 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNATIONAL POLICY

Commander Craig, Legionnaires, and distinguished guests, the American Legion and the veterans' organizations should furnish the leadership of the Nation in national defense and international policy. The 20,000,000 veterans of this Nation should lead, not follow. The national commandership of the American Legion is second only to the Presidency of the United States.

National defense and foreign policy are part of their training and background. They know what war means.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The American Legion's military preparedness program, including universal military training legislation, has varied little over a period of 30 years, and then only in detail. During that period I held every office in our organization from post adjutant up to and including national vice commander, serving on the national defense and other national committees.

CARRIED FIGHT TO SENATE FLOOR

Today I am speaking to you as an active member, a member who has carried the fight for our national defense program from our committees to the floor of the United States Senate.

STATE DEPARTMENT DOMINATION

I am speaking as a member of the American Legion who has seen our programs given lip service by public officials and then sidetracked, defeated, and nullified by the national administrations—over a 30-year period. I do not like it. I will have no part of the administration's attempts through the State Department to control this organization's thinking and leadership in national defense and international affairs. Respectable to be suspected of being a traitor to your country.

ADMINISTRATION STOPPED ENACTMENT OF UMT AND 70-AIR GROUP

Since entering the Senate in 1947, I have joined in introducing two bills for universal military training, but the President, through administration spokesmen in the Senate, prevented either of the bills being reported, with the flimsy excuse that its passage would interfere with the draft; it would have complemented it and gradually merged it into the universal-military-training program.

On the Senate floor I fought for an adequate preparedness program. Here again the administration opposed the 70-air-group appropriation and other adequate programs.

MURDER—NOT WAR

American Legion officials and the veterans of this Nation have stated their belief that had a universal-military-training program been adopted when S. 66, one of the bills which I cosponsored, was introduced, we would not have suffered the early severe setbacks in Korea, with the accompanying loss of American lives and American prestige among nations. The boys who had to be sent first into battle should have had proper fundamental training and the most modern equipment, and would then have had an even break.

Sending young men into battle without proper training and equipment is not war; it is murder.

The Korean situation might never have arisen in the first place, despite State Department bungling, if we had had a definite foreign policy and an adequate national defense organization, spearheaded by an air corps and a submarine fleet, so that the nations of the world and the American people would know that we could enforce our commitments.

WHAT IS OUR FOREIGN POLICY?

This suggests the question: But what are our commitments? The State Department first denied that we would defend Korea, and then caught everyone, including the American people, off guard by suddenly reversing its former position.

For 3 years I have been pressing the executive branch of our Government, which is charged by the Constitution with fixing foreign policy, to name the nations in Europe, Asia, the South Seas, and Africa whose integrity is important to our ultimate safety. With no established foreign policy, the Russians simply may have been trying us out in Korea.

If our foreign policy is not more clearly designed, these tests will continue. Our foreign policy should be determined and it should be told to the world in clear terms what areas are important to our ultimate safety. Let the administration name them and prepare to meet the issue squarely before the American people and the nations of the world.

CRACKPOT, STUPID IDEAS

Our foreign policy, if one can dignify the conglomeration of crackpot ideas as a policy, is at the root of our troubles.

There is no bipartisan foreign policy. There never has been a bipartisan foreign policy. There has been a Truman-Acheson-Lattimore program, decided upon and settled in every instance before the Republicans of the Senate were even informed as to what was under consideration.

MARSHALL PLAN—ECA—ARMS RUSSIA

Let's look briefly at the so-called foreign policy.

As for Europe, the administration forced the ECA down the throats of our taxpayers. Billions of dollars to Europe with no conditions attached. And for what? The United Nations Secretariat recently reported that notwithstanding the billions of dollars poured into Europe by us, Europe's economic problem is not solved and the solution is not in sight. Our taxpayers' money has accomplished one thing: The renewal of the hundred-year-old feuds among the countries of Europe.

Churchill has recently said that the European Marshall plan countries are less able to defend themselves now than they were 3 years ago.

If money is to be sent to foreign countries it should be loaned to private business within those countries, conditioned upon the protection of private property and investments—not given to the current European governments to perpetuate themselves in power.

It could be loaned to private business through the World Bank on the same terms that the RFC loans money to organizations and individuals in this country in times of stress. We should not give our taxpayers' money outright to any foreign government, nor loan it to foreign private business—on less stringent terms than a veteran can borrow it in this country.

STRENGTHENING THE YOKE OF BONDAGE AND SLAVERY

Our taxpayers' money is being used by the ECA in the Far East and Africa for the vile purpose of strengthening the yoke of bondage and slavery and perpetuating misery among the primitive peoples ruled and worked by imperial overlords through the colonial system—and for arming Russia and the iron-curtain countries for a third world war. The colonial system is dead as Julius Caesar, we cannot preserve it through a third world war.

A high British Government official has said quite frankly that the British needed American money not for use in England but to develop her Far East and African colonies—to be farmed for the benefit of the mother country. In condoning the French misuse of ECA moneys in the Far East and north Africa the United States turns its back on morality and its promise to respect independent nations through the United Nations organization. Far from achieving any of its proclaimed objectives the European recovery plan has served there only to consolidate French economic and political domination in Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, and Indochina.

CONSOLIDATING RUSSIA'S GAINS

The aid which we are sending to ECA countries is finding its way in manufactured and processed products to Russia and her satellite countries and to other areas dominated or controlled by Russia, consolidating her gains in the iron-curtain countries and in China.

The Communist countries are being armed by ECA or Marhall-plan countries through trade treaties. I introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of 96 trade agreements between ECA countries and countries behind the iron curtain, including Russia, made since the close of World War II. Metalworking tools, steel, ball bearings, electrical machinery and apparatus, grain mills, heavy road machinery, farm machinery, and assembled motor vehicles are a few of the many items being sent to Russia's satellite countries from ECA nations.

It is the opinion of informed people that Russia cannot process and manufacture goods fast enough to keep her satellite countries contented, and without our help Russia will fail in her aggression. It is paradoxical that only with our help can Russia hold her allies and hope to defeat us over the years ahead—and we are giving her that help through the Marshall plan or ECA. It is simply a manufacturing-in-transit program.

HELPING RUSSIA AS WE HELPED JAPAN

We helped Russia in the so-called cold war by furnishing her the processed and manufactured goods to consolidate her gains in eastern Europe and in China.

The Japanese planes that destroyed our fleet in Pearl Harbor were made from the steel shipped to Japan through the Golden Gate in San Francisco during the years preceding World War II.

Much of the tanks, guns, and equipment the boys are facing in Korea were made with the tools and materials furnished Russia, the iron-curtain countries, and Communist China by the 16 European countries, and financed by the Marshall plan or ECA. How stupid can we get, and for how long?

NONAGGRESSION PACTS WITH RUSSIA

Both England and France have nonaggression pacts with Russia which read startlingly like the North Atlantic Pact—we should demand the cancellation of these pacts as a condition of further aid of any kind in eastern Europe and in China. We censured ourselves for permitting a shortsighted administration to send scrap iron and oil to Japan before Pearl Harbor but today we are treating the Communists much better; we are seeing to it that they get, not scrap, but finished products. The Marshall-plan countries which we are supporting are sending Russia and her satellites everything they need to wage world war III.

FOREIGN POLICY—STUPID OR WORSE

Now, let us look briefly at our so-called foreign policy in the Far East.

The many unpleasant chapters of American diplomacy in the Far East, of which Korea is the latest but probably not the last, are a direct sequel to the amateurish bungling, which, in retrospect, actually seems to have been designed to make the Communist dominant in Asia. As a matter of fact, John Foster Dulles told a Republican Senators' luncheon that a group in our State Department believed that a dose of communism would be good for Asia. He simply confirmed what we had already suspected.

We would probably never have faced what President Truman calls this threat to the peace of the world at this early date had it not been for the gross blundering by the administration in the field of foreign policy. At Yalta, with the advice of Dean Acheson's friend, Alger Hiss, since labeled a Red traitor, our ailing President bribed Stalin to intervene in the far-eastern war. This was quite unnecessary for, as Mr. Hiss no doubt well knew, Japan was then on its last legs and had already made several unofficial overtures for peace. Thus the way was paved for a Communist base in North Korea.

WRECKING NATIONAL ECONOMY—GIVING AWAY STRATEGIC AREAS

Our administration has deliberately followed a systematic policy since the close of World War II of giving Russia the strategic areas in Asia and Europe, through international conferences at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, and of wrecking our economy through a free-trade program based upon the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. It is a powerful nation indeed that can stand both of these onslaughts at the same time.

ACHESON CONSULTS NO ONE WITH EXPERIENCE

At a closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Acheson was asked whether he had sought the views of General MacArthur on the strategic importance of Formosa. He answered that he was not reporting on MacArthur's views; that he did not necessarily know them. He also said he had not talked to the Joint Chiefs and did not know their views. Three days later Mr. Acheson made the announcement that America's military defense line in the Pacific ran from the Aleutians to the Philippines, including Japan and Okinawa but skipping Korea and Formosa. Undoubtedly Stalin thought he had the nod from Acheson to go ahead. Everything points to that. But Acheson's position on Korea was suddenly reversed, and it may be presumed that he is now apologizing to the Hisses and his other Communist friends.

The President's trip to see MacArthur is fine—but just 5 years late—Chiang is gone, Manchuria is gone; economically and psychologically, we are down in the Pacific.

Our foreign policy has been both casual and improvised. Furthermore, the State Department is unwilling to tell the American people just what commitments have been made.

As a matter of fact, it did not even tell General MacArthur that it had made commitments which might require a Korean campaign. Now, since the stupidity, or deliberate treachery, of the Asia policy makers, Hiss, Lattimore, and Acheson, cannot be denied, the followers of this group have the unmitigated gall to spread the lying whisper that General MacArthur was responsible for the surprise attack on South Korea.

General MacArthur, far from shaping any of the policy, was not even consulted.

WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATION WARNED BY MAC ARTHUR

Is it General MacArthur who determined to withdraw our forces from Korea and leave an ill-equipped constabulary in their place? Is it he who ignored repeated reports of armed raids by Communists across the thirty-eighth parallel, and the urgent warnings from Korean Government officials that heavier attacks were imminent? The answers to these questions are as obvious as the whispered charges against MacArthur are ridiculous.

Now it has since developed that General MacArthur warned the Washington administration 3 months in advance that the South Korean invasion by the Reds was planned for the month of June.

Our State Department had never once consulted either of the two persons best qualified to advise us on our far eastern policy: General MacArthur and Admiral Badger.

The American people pay the penalty in bloodshed and loss of life and in damaged prestige throughout the world—because of stupid incompetence, as well as lack of foresight on the part of our State Department.

ACHESON WHOLLY UNFIT

The handling of the Korean threat is but another instance proving the unfitness of Mr. Acheson for his high position. His administration has been wholly unsatisfactory. It is important that he be removed before other serious blunders are made.

The ideas of the Hisses, the Wadleighs, the Services, and the Lattimores, activated by Acheson, follow a definite pattern. This clique favored giving Manchuria to the Reds at Yalta; they favored the partition of Berlin without any provision for ingress or egress of non-Soviet personnel; they favored communism for China, as disclosed by Dulles; they favored recognition of the Chinese Reds; they favored our sending financial and industrial aid to Russia and those European countries which would arm Russia and consolidate her gains in her satellite nations for world war III.

Evidence of traitorous intent and purpose may be found in the fact that when it was exposed that Britain and other Marshall plan countries were sending Russia war-making materials, not one of this influential clique lifted a finger to stop our money and materials flowing to those countries; in fact, they actually opposed the measure—Senate Joint Resolution 151, the Malone resolution—which would have stopped our indirect arming of Russia. War-making materials are still being sent to Russia, thanks to the Communist lovers in our administration.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Only the most naive or blind could now doubt that Communists have been in policy-making position in the United States Government. Lee Pressman, the fair-haired New Deal official, recently confessed that he and others were Communists while holding Government office and that Communists moved into Washington and took over key positions in the Government in the early days of this administration. It has been exposed that Communists have held key positions in the Department of Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, State, and Justice, in the Treasury, the OSS, Board of Economic Warfare, Air Corps Matérial and Service Division, War Production Board, OPA, WPA, and many other Government offices.

In their attempts to discredit American industry and free enterprise, the smart pinkish members of the administration were serving their Moscow masters well. It is interesting to observe that we have been led step by step into a socialistic government in Washington.

The amazing thing about all this is that Communist associates and sympathizers are permitted to continue in high office and influence the President. Apparently this deplorable situation will not be corrected until the American people themselves correct it at the polls.

SOCIALISTS AND COMMUNISTS OBJECTIVES THE SAME

The ultimate objectives of the Communists and Socialists are the same—government control with the individual owning nothing. The difference is that a Communist will shoot you to gain his objective while a Socialist will spend you into it. A Communist is just an impatient Socialist.

FACE THE ISSUE

Until this country squarely faces its errors in foreign and domestic policy, until it abandons the spend-and-elect theories of welfare statism, until it abandons the "one economic world" Marxist program of free trade—and world distribution of our hard-earned wealth, we will continue to tremble before the threats of a people backward in production and culture.

We need to remind ourselves that our first and foremost task is to keep ourselves strong. The anti-Communist forces of the world that are able and willing to fight are outnumbered. The defense of the free world must be achieved by the quality of training and equipment which can overcome quantity. We are not big enough to overwhelm our opponents by the massing of military power. Since we cannot hope to be bigger, our fate depends on whether we can be better trained and better equipped.

NAME THE AREAS THE INTEGRITY OF WHICH IS IMPORTANT TO OUR SAFETY

The United States of America should immediately establish a definite foreign policy, naming the nations in Europe, Asia, the South Seas, and Africa, if any, whose integrity is important to our ultimate safety, notifying the world that we would consider the attempt of any nation to extend its system of government into those areas as an overt act against the United States. This would be a logical broadening of our Monroe Doctrine, which has served us well for 127 years in the Western Hemisphere.

REAL THREAT FROM WITHIN

Where is the greatest danger—at home or abroad? We have been repeatedly warned that we are in danger from within. Since 1932 there has been a constant war against America, within our gates.

On the home front, the Red plot has been carried on within the administration by a constant attack on American industry. This attack has come through, first, Government regulations so designed as to eliminate venture capital, which made this country great; second, taxes so designed as to eliminate initiative; third, a foreign free trade policy so designed as to curtail domestic production; and, fourth, reckless spending on the part of the Government so designed as to threaten our whole economic structure.

CLEAN UP THE HOME FRONT—SAVE OUR ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

Let us clean up the home front, give assurance to American people that American industries and things American will be protected. Let us once and for all put a stop to the stupid foreign programs which weaken our position abroad and destroy our industries at home. Let's fight for American ideals and for an administration that will uphold them when this war is at an end. The boys on the front have little to fight for unless they can know clearly that they are defending the American way of life. The American Legion must not let them down.

The American Legion and the veterans of this Nation—nearly 20,000,000 strong—can do the job. Let us develop a few leaders who are for America like Churchill is for England. Only then will we have a basis for a sound international cooperation that will make some sense. Let us stop this senseless, stupid apologizing for America and for

Americans who love America, and let us establish a real leadership that the world will be glad to follow, and that conceivably could keep us out of a major conflict for a generation.

Meet Paul Raver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the October 8, 1950, issue of the Sunday Oregonian on Dr. Paul Raver. I commend it especially to those who may have believed the article which appeared some weeks ago in the Reader's Digest. The Digest article contained allegations which were proven false by my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and myself.

It gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to further set the record straight. We of Montana—and the Northwest—owe a great deal to Dr. Raver for his friendliness, his integrity, and his understanding of our problems. The new industries, the new power, and the new spirit of cooperation that is coming into Montana can largely be attributed to the far-seeing vision and intelligent understanding Dr. Raver has shown. He is a public servant in the finest and highest tradition.

The article follows:

MEET PAUL RAVER—SOME CONSIDER HIM COLD PLOTTER, OTHERS TRUE CHRISTIAN

(By Paul Hauser)

Dr. Paul Jerome Raver, a man admired by his pastor as one whose main motivation is the Christian ethic, is regarded in some circles as an octopus with electrical transmission lines for tentacles.

He is not so regarded by those of his opponents in the dialectics of power policy who know him best, although their regard for his sincerity and integrity has not greatly tempered their differences with him.

Dr. Raver, a calm, poised, and deliberate man of 56 who likes to contemplate an idea of a Pacific Northwest industrial empire powered by the Columbia River, is an engineer and an economist who came to run the Federal Government's electrical distribution system in the Pacific Northwest 11 years ago. He had been chairman of the Illinois Commerce Commission and head of the department of public utilities of Northwestern University.

When he came he believed in the worth of public ownership of utilities under proper circumstances and he still does. He also believes the Bonneville Act directs him to give preference in sale of Federal power to publicly owned utilities, and, as he has said many times, he will continue to believe so and do so until Congress changes the Bonneville Act.

He has been called a Socialist, condemned as a plotter on the floor of Congress, and hanged in effigy.

While Raver is known to close associates in the Bonneville Administration as a deeply sensitive man who is hurt by unfair criticism, he resents any attempt to shield him from it. He has shown restraint not usually considered typical of his Scotch-Irish descent in avoiding fruitless personal controversies as result of such attacks. He sometimes writes a hot answering letter, shows it to a few of his office intimates, and then tears it up.

Dr. Raver's pastor and close personal friend, Dr. Myron C. Cole, of the First Christian Church, believes Dr. Raver's strong religious feeling and his regular habit of worship account for his depth of understanding and probably give him the poise and serenity so evident when he is baited.

Known to friends who have fished and played poker with him as a warmly friendly man and a good companion and known to other Bonneville employees as an intensely kind and loyal boss, Dr. Raver sometimes gives strangers an impression of aloof coldness.

Raver's light brown eyes, which gaze levelly from behind inconspicuous spectacles, were once described as cold as a rattlesnake's by an eastern Oregon politician who met him casually.

Whatever his casual judgments, Raver is greatly respected by men who have met and battled with him across a conference table. One of these is Franklin T. Griffith, chairman of the board of the Portland General Electric Co.

"Paul Raver is a man of very high ideals," Mr. Griffith said recently. "He has a job under the Department of the Interior. He entered it with an understanding of the powers and duties of that office with which I was not in accord, but in which he honestly believes. He has tried to carry out his conception of the law under which he was appointed. I do not think he is a Socialist, but on the contrary believe that he has a very firm conviction that free enterprise is the secret of American success. He harmonizes his belief in free enterprise with his belief in the propriety and advantage of public ownership of some utility operations."

In his administration of the Government's $162,000,000 Columbia power distribution system, a job for which he is now paid $12,200 a year, Dr. Raver is a man who, according to his coworkers, is insistent that he be supplied no phony facts.

"He never proceeds on the theory that we are right when a complaint comes in," an assistant said recently. "He says to get the facts. He doesn't want any phony answers to anything."

Dr. Raver has gone so far to get the facts that Bonneville offers a rarity among Government agencies. Its accounts are audited twice—once by the Government and once by a private accounting firm of national stature which specializes in utility accounting. That ended criticism that the agency's bookkeeping was rigged.

Dr. Raver is to the men around him a rare combination of the dreamer and the practical man. He is practical enough to fight to run the agency on a business basis, but can dream of the time when Bonneville again has spare power to sell to attract industries to the Northwest.

"He's a dreamer if there ever was one," said an associate. "He sees the Columbia River," as he has said, "as an oil well that never runs dry." Nothing thrills him more than finding some new industry has come in.

Running the power agency through a war and then through unexpected power shortages provided tough times enough to make Raver's hair get grayer, but neither was the hardest time he had to face. That was in 1947 when he had to discharge 650 people under congressional "economy" orders.

"They were people who lived here, people for whom I had personal affection," he said recently.

Dr. Raver's deep interest in people as people and in their problems is one of the things that come up in almost weekly "coffee and fireplace" sessions of Dr. Raver, Reverend Cole, and their wives.

"We sometimes chew the fat after a meeting 'way into the wee hours of the night," Dr. Cole said, "talking about matters of people and democracy and Christian ethics."

Dr. Raver's church connections are of long standing and deep-rooted in his Nebraska farm background. He first met his wife at a church supper. He was president of the Chicago Disciples Union before he came to Oregon and is now one of the 15 members of the executive committee of the Disciples of Christ international convention.

At home Dr. Raver likes to work with power tools, play the piano (he's a good jazz player in the 1920's idiom) and be a backyard chef on the barbecue grill he recently constructed in what the Ravers call "the back 40" of their Eastmoreland home. He is also a doting grandparent to the children of his two daughters, Mrs. Robert W. Irish, of Portland, and Mrs. Alan H. Jones, of McMinnville.

Mrs. Raver says he's an easy man to cook for. He likes nearly everything but fish—which proves he's a fisherman.

ECA Payments to American Publishers and Movie Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a list of payments made by the Economic Cooperation Administration—ECA—to newspapers, weekly publications, and book companies, subsidizing them in the export of their publications to Europe for propaganda purposes.

Time and Life magazines together received $122,961.21 from April 3, 1948, through August 30, 1950, and Reader's Digest received $123,998.37, and the New York Herald Tribune received $59,975.76 during the same period, and other publications received the amounts listed.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

WASHINGTON, September 7.—The Paris edition of the Herald Tribune has been engaged in a red hot circulation war recently with the overseas airmail edition of the New York Times. The Times has reported its overseas airmail edition has been a sell-out almost from the start.

The biggest subsidy payments made in August by ECA went to the Motion Picture

Exporters Association and to RKO Radio Pictures, Inc., which enlisted the aid of the American taxpayers to show their films in Germany. The association collected $100,000, and RKO got $127,356.

ECA sold Congress on the idea of subsidizing the circulation of American newspapers, magazines, and books, and the showing of American movies in Europe to teach Europeans the American way of life. The subsidy payments were made under investment guaranty contracts signed with ECA, whereby the Marshall plan agency bought from the companies any nonconvertible European currencies collected from their overseas operations.

Total subsidies paid the American publishers and movie producers during August and from April 3, 1948 through August 30, 1950, follow:

	August subsidies	Total through Aug. 30
Time and Life	$3,429.40	$122,961.21
Newsweek	486.66	1,421.66
Reader's Digest	10,580.05	123,998.37
Pocketbooks	11,715.00	46,545.50
New York Herald Tribune	−1,024.24	59,975.76
Motion Picture Exporters Association	100,000.00	314,625.00
Nassau Distributing Co	17,000.06	52,458.81
Princeton University Press	421.91	52,458.81
Crowell-Colliers	2,181.14	4,949.14
Harper & Bros	183.30	1,213.30
Interscience Publishers	82.40	3,009.84
Viking Press	117.90	401.44
Bantam Books	2,773.62	12,947.62
J. Wiley & Sons	$1,750.26	$4,698.26
Keystone Pictures	8,165.48	8,165.48
R-K-O	127,356.12	127,356.12
New American Library		29,621.45
Curtis Publishing Co		14,660.65
Overseas News Agency		3,590.00
Stechert-Hafner		3,158.58
Paul B. Hoeber, Inc		162.00
Alfred A. Knopf		87.00
Harvard University Press		415.00
McGraw-Hill		2,822.00
Yorke Publishing Co		289.00
W. B. Saunders		1,277.00
Silver Burdett Co		32.00
D. Van Nostrand Co		1,370.00
Reinhold Publishing Co		1,136.00

Informational media guaranties issued during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950

Applicant	Media to be distributed	Face amount of guaranties issued					
		Western Germany	Netherlands	Austria	Norway	Italy	Total
A. MAGAZINE PROJECTS							
Harper & Bros. (Franklin Square Agency)	Agreed categories of periodicals, largely technical, of many United States publishers.		$40,000				$40,000
McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc	Technical, industrial, and trade periodicals	$55,000		$5,000			60,000
The Crowell-Collier Publishing Co	Collier's, American Magazine, and Woman's Home Companion	8,000	16,790	2,400		$14,920	42,110
The Curtis Publishing Co	Saturday Evening Post, Ladies' Home Journal, and Holiday	69,688	45,692		$13,970	7,500	136,850
The Reader's Digest Association, Inc	English or German edition or both	54,000	16,520	26,450	10,000	3,670	110,640
Time, Inc	International edition of Life or Time or both	61,850	86,600	12,000	21,900		182,350
Weekly Publications, Inc	International edition of Newsweek	5,000		600			5,600
Subtotal		253,538	205,602	46,450	45,870	26,090	577,550
B. BOOK PROJECTS (Including periodicals in certain cases, as noted)							
Academic Press, Inc	Any books published (scientific and technical)		11,400				11,400
Acme Code Co., Inc	Agreed categories of books, chiefly nonfiction, of many United States publishers; also some periodicals.		15,000				15,000
Alfred A. Knopf, Inc	Any books published	750	2,000				2,750
Architectural Book Publishing Co	List of books specially selected by applicant (architectural)		6,340				6,340
Atlas Publishing Co., Inc	World Markets Directory, World's Waste Trade Directory, World Chemical Directory; also World Markets, a weekly trade newspaper.	5,000					5,000
Bantam Books, Inc	Inexpensive paper-bound editions, specially selected by applicant	25,000	19,800			5,000	49,800
Doubleday & Co., Inc	List of Doubleday and Garden City books specially selected by applicant, and medical books published by the Blakiston Co.		15,000				15,000
Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Inc	Any books published	300	1,350				1,650
D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc	Any books published (chiefly technical)	1,250	6,675	3,500			11,425
Frederick A. Praeger, Inc	Agreed categories of books, chiefly scientific and technical, of many United States publishers; also some periodicals.	60,000					60,000
Gerard E. Haagens	do		5,000				5,000
Grune & Stratton, Inc	Any books published (medical) and 2 medical journals		10,000				10,000
Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc	Any books published	550	1,350				1,900
Harper & Bros	do	2,000	6,675				8,675
Harvard University Press	do	1,000	4,175				5,175
Institute for Research in Biography, Inc	World Biography, a 2-volume reference work	930		542		1,875	3,347
Interscience Publishers, Inc	Any books published (scientific and technical)		27,700				27,700
J. B. Lippincott Co	Any medical books published and 2 medical journals		14,750				14,750
John Wiley & Sons, Inc	Any books published (scientific and technical)		33,650				33,650
Lea & Febiger	Any books published (medical) and 1 medical journal		6,000				6,000
McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc	Any books published (substantially all scientific, technical, and industrial)	26,600	40,000	5,000		20,000	91,600
Museum Books, Inc	Agreed categories of books, chiefly nonfiction, of many United States publishers; also some periodicals.		20,000				20,000
Paul B. Hoeber, Inc	Any books published (medical)	875	2,500	1,500			4,875
Pocket Books, Inc	Inexpensive paper-bound editions, specially selected by applicant	24,000	20,000			12,500	56,500
Prentice-Hall, Inc	Any books published (scientific, technical, industrial, and vocational)		20,000				20,000
Princeton University Press	Any books published	1,250	3,350				4,600
Reinhold Publishing Corp	Any books published (scientific and technical)		13,400				13,400
Silver Burdett Co	Any books published (textbooks)	300					300
The C. V. Mosby Co	Any books published (medical) and 11 medical journals		15,000				15,000
The New American Library of World Literature, Inc.	Inexpensive paper-bound editions, specially selected by applicant	25,000	15,000			16,000	56,000
The Viking Press	Any books published	1,250	2,500				3,750
Van Riemsdyck Book Service, Inc	Agreed categories of books, chiefly scientific and technical, of many United States publishers; also some periodicals.		15,000				15,000
W. B. Saunders Co	Any books published (medical)		16,300				16,300
W. S. Hall & Co	Agreed categories of books, chiefly nonfiction, of many United States publishers, also some periodicals.		35,000				35,000
Year Book Publishers, Inc	Any books published (medical)		12,000				12,000
Subtotal		176,055	416,915	10,542		55,375	658,887
C. MOTION PICTURE PROJECTS							
Motion Picture Export Association (Germany), Inc.	35 feature films approved by Military Government and released prior to Dec. 31, 1949.	636,400					636,400
Eagle Lion Films, Inc	2 feature films	52,485					52,485
Loew's, Inc	9 feature films	321,000					321,000
Paramount Pictures Corp	10 feature films	359,000					359,000
Republic Pictures Corp	7 feature films	254,000					254,000
RKO Radio Pictures, Inc	13 feature films	484,000					484,000
Samuel Goldwyn Productions, Inc	2 feature films	54,925					54,925
Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp	13 feature films	486,000					486,000
Universal Pictures Co., Inc	8 feature films	247,000					247,000
Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc	7 feature films	292,000					292,000
	Recommended for guaranty by ECA Advisory Committee on Motion Picture Guaranties and to be released in calendar year 1950						
Subtotal		3,186,810					3,186,810

Informational media guaranties issued during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950—Continued

Applicant	Media to be distributed	Face amount of guaranties issued					
		Western Germany	Netherlands	Austria	Norway	Italy	Total
D. NEWSPAPER AND RELATED PROJECTS							
Keystone Pictures, Inc.	News photographs	$45,000					$45,000
Overseas News Agency, Inc.	News service in German language	7,840					7,840
The Journal of Commerce Corp.	The Journal of Commerce, Weekly Report on United States Business, and Import Bulletin.	5,500					5,500
Subtotal		58,340					58,340
Total		3,674,743	$622,517	$56,992	$45,870	$81,465	4,481,587

Informational media guaranties issued up to June 30, 1949

Applicant	Media to be distributed	Face amount of guaranties issued (for operating periods of 6 months except where noted)				
		Western Germany	Netherlands	Austria	Norway	Total
A. MAGAZINE PROJECTS						
The Crowell-Collier Publishing Co.	Collier's, American Magazine, and Woman's Home Companion	$36,640				$36,640
The Reader's Digest Association, Inc.	English or German edition or both	181,000	[1] $1,100			182,100
The Yorke Publishing Co., Inc.	American Journal of Surgery, American Journal of Medicine	3,000				3,000
Time, Inc.	International editions of Life or Time or both	[2] 219,800	[1] 10,500	$19,000	[3] $34,700	284,000
Weekly Publications, Inc.	International edition of Newsweek	[2] 41,325				41,325
Subtotal		481,765	11,600	19,000	34,700	547,065
B. BOOK PROJECTS						
Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.	Any books published	9,000				9,000
Bantam Books, Inc.	List of books specially selected by applicant (25-cent reprints)	9,000				9,000
D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc.	Any books published (mainly technical)	28,000				28,000
Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Inc.	Any books published	4,000				4,000
Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc.	do	9,000				9,000
Harper & Bros.	do	28,000				28,000
Harvard University Press	do	11,000				11,000
Nassau Distributing Co., Inc.	List of books specially selected by applicant (mainly scientific and technical)	200,000				200,000
The New American Library of World Literature, Inc.	List of books specially selected by applicant (25-cent and 35-cent reprints)	100,000	[1] 22,500			122,500
Paul B. Hoeber, Inc.	Any books published (medical books)	6,000				6,000
Pocket Books, Inc.	List of books specially selected by applicant (25-cent reprints)	100,000				100,000
Princeton University Press	Any books published	8,000				8,000
Silver Burdett Co.	Any books published (textbooks)	1,200				1,200
Stechert-Hafner, Inc.	Any books published by the Macmillan Co.	40,000				40,000
The Viking Press	Any books published	16,500				16,500
Subtotal		569,700	22,500			592,200
C. MOTION PICTURE PROJECTS						
Bookfilm International Corp.	Prints of Snow White, Fantasia, and 12 Walt Disney short subjects	70,000				70,000
Motion Picture Export Association (Germany), Inc.	Prints of about 52 feature films and about 26 short subjects, as approved by Military Government.	[2] 457,139				457,139
Subtotal		527,139				527,139
D. NEWSPAPER AND NEWS AGENCY PROJECTS						
New York Herald Tribune, Inc.	European edition	[2] 160,000		7,000		167,000
Overseas News Agency, Inc.	News service in German language	23,200				23,200
The Progressive Publishing Association, Inc.	Neue Volkszeitung, a weekly newspaper published in New York	10,400				10,400
Subtotal		193,600		7,000		200,600
Total		1,772,204	34,100	26,000	34,700	1,867,004

[1] Covers operating period of less than 6 months, for technical reasons.
[2] Includes renewal of guaranty for second operating period of 6 months.
[3] Includes renewal of guaranty for second operating period, less than 6 months, for technical reasons.

Acheson Should Resign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a July 19, 1950, press release giving my reasons for asking the resignation of Dean Acheson.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 19, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, today demanded the resignation of Secretary of State Dean Acheson for his stupid bungling in foreign policy which has brought this country to its present plight, and for a complete reorganization of the Department.

Continuing, Senator MALONE said: "We have been led into the Korean War, which will cost us the wealth of lives and material. Having committed ourselves and finding ourselves in this thing, we will make every necessary sacrifice to win. This wholehearted uniting of our efforts to win does not, however, take one iota from the stigma of stupidity on the part of our officials who made it possible for us to get into this predicament.

"The many unpleasant chapters of American diplomacy in the Far East, of which Korea is the latest but probably not the last, are a direct sequel to amateurish bungling, which, in retrospect, actually seems to have been designed to make the Communist dominant in Asia. I am reliably informed that a group in our State Department believed that communism would be good for Asia.

"We would probably never have faced what President Truman calls this 'threat to the peace of the world' had it not been for the gross blundering by the administration in the field of foreign policy. At Yalta, with

the advice of Dean Acheson's friend, one Alger Hiss, since labeled a Red traitor, our ailing President 'bribed' Stalin to intervene in the far eastern war. This was quite unnecessary for, as Mr. Hiss no doubt well knew, Japan was then on its last legs and had already made several unofficial overtures for peace. Thus the way was paved for a Communist base in North Korea.

"Mr. Acheson's recent statement that the United States would not use its veto power in the United Nations to block recognition of the Communists regime in China was a weak-kneed position to take against the advancing aggressor, and was virtually an invitation to the Reds to go further.

"Either the State Department should have clearly abandoned southern Korea or should have done the things necessary to make it clear that an attack on southern Korea would be opposed by us. It did neither. Why? Partly because our foreign policy is both casual and improvised, and partly because the State Department is unwilling to tell the American people just what it has committed them to.

"It is imperative that a stop be put to the State Department's deficit diplomacy. The administration has allowed our commitments to increase while our power to meet them has been allowed to decline.

"Obviously, General MacArthur did not prepare for a Korean campaign because our State Department had never informed him that it had made commitments which might require such a campaign.

"Our State Department never once consulted either of the two persons best qualified to advise us on our far eastern policy: General MacArthur and Admiral Badger.

"Now the American people must pay the penalty in bloodshed and loss of life and in damaged prestige throughout the world because of incompetence as well as lack of foresight on the part of our State Department.

"We went into this shooting war to wage a political fight against the Russians. Today it looks like the shrewd Russians may simply ignore the challenge, neither backing down nor openly fighting. As in Greece and in the Berlin airlift, we may be left to expend our energy while the Russians rest and continue their preparations, with, of course, the help of the Marshall-plan nations which are shipping to Russia, her satellite countries in Europe and Communist China, materials needed to wage war. Through 96 trade treaties between Marshall-plan countries and iron-curtain countries, we are even today arming Russia to wage world war III.

"Perhaps in Korea the Russians were trying to see how far they could go. If our foreign policy is not more clearly designed, these tests will continue. It ought to be determined what this country can do and what it is willing to do, and those things should be told to the world in clear terms. What areas are important to our ultimate safety? What areas are we to defend? Let the administration name them so that everyone will know.

"What is to be our policy regarding the continuation of arming Russia through the Marshall-plan countries? What is to be our policy in regard to one of those nations, England, furnishing petroleum and other war materials to Communist China, some of which has found its way to Korea? What is the Korean war intended to accomplish? What do we do after we have pushed the North Koreans back across the thirty-eighth parallel? Do we intend to garrison all of Korea for the indefinite future? Is the sending of troops to Korea to be regarded as a precedent? If so, of what? Despite our low opinion of the State Department, we find it hard to believe they got into this thing without an idea of what they mean to make of it. They at least owe the soldiers, their wives and parents, and the taxpayers an explanation that so far has not been forthcoming.

"The stupid handling of the Korean threat is but another instance proving the unfitness of Mr. Acheson for his high position. His administration has been wholly unsatisfactory."

Representative Harold C. Hagen Reports on Veterans' Benefits Provided by Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting herewith the following digest of the most important laws enacted for the benefit of our veterans and their dependents during the Eighty-first Congress, first and second sessions:

Laws relating to veterans and their dependents and the Veterans' Administration enacted by the 81st Cong.

Public Law	Subject	Date approved
41	Modifies certain laws to permit qualified officers heretofore or hereafter placed on honorary retired list of Naval or Marine Corps Reserve to receive retirement benefits under Public Law 305, 79th Cong., Feb. 21, 1946, and to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of Naval Reserve, to be effective from Feb. 21, 1946	Apr. 14, 1949
51	Authorizes completion of processing of the visa cases, and immigration into the United States of certain alien fiancés and fiancées of members, or of former members of Armed Forces of United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (Public Law 471, 79th Cong.), as amended, which expired Dec. 31, 1948	Apr. 21, 1949
69	Amends sec. 602 (u), National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as added by sec. 9, Public Law 589, 79th Cong., to make it clear that as to insurance maturing on or after Aug. 1, 1946, in cases where beneficiary could not have elected lump-sum settlement, any accrued installments of insurance not paid to beneficiary during his lifetime be paid to estate of insured rather than estate of beneficiary	May 23, 1949
108	Extends to members of the Reserve components of all branches of the armed services (including National Guard men) who are killed or injured while rendering service or undergoing training under competent orders for short periods of time the same benefits they would receive if serving for periods in excess of 30 days	June 20, 1949
171	Housing Act of 1949: Title III provides preference in occupancy of projected low-rent public housing to the veterans of World Wars I and II, or their families; title V provides preference to veterans of any war, or their families, in the granting of loans for construction or repair of farm homes; and title VI tenders aid to State low-rent or veterans' housing projects	July 15, 1949
194	Amends sec. 1 (B), Public Law 662, 79th Cong., to require payment to a veteran having been hospitalized or cared for by the Veterans' Administration, of benefits discontinued during the period of such hospitalization or care by reason of the limitation in Public Law 662, 79th Cong., which precluded payment to him of such sums where his estate equals or exceeds $1,500. This payment may not be made until after the expiration of 6 months following a finding of competency	Aug. 1, 1949
195	Authorizes retroactive awards of compensation and pension payable by the Veterans' Administration for those persons now on the rolls who were prevented from filing their claims at an earlier date by reason of being interned by a country with which the United States was at war or were otherwise prevented from filing such claims by action of such country. Claims for benefits of this act are required to be filed within 1 year from the date of its enactment	Do.
233	Grants time to employees in the executive branch of the Government who are veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I, or World War II, to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States for burial	Aug. 16, 1949
241	Extends for 2 years existing privileges of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad	Aug. 17, 1949
286	Amends Public Law 702, 80th Cong., which provides special housing assistance to certain disabled veterans, to extend such aid to veterans entitled to compensation under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for permanent and total service-connected disability due to the loss, or loss of use, by reason of amputation, ankylosis, progressive muscular dystrophies, or paralysis, of both lower extremities, such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheel chair	Sept. 7, 1949
314	Provides terminal-leave pay for certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps	Oct. 5, 1949
339	Omnibus Compensation Act: Amends sec. 28, Public Law 141, 73d Cong., to restore full compensation rates to World War I presumptive service-connected cases; amends Veterans Regulation No. 3 (a), as amended, to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; amends subpars. (a) to (j), inclusive, par. II, pt. I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to increase disability compensation rates (total disability: $150) (under Public Law 876, 80th Cong., peacetime service-connected disability is compensated at 80 percent of these increased rates); amends par. IV, pt. I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to increase payments to widows with children; liberalizes requirement for dependency allowances under Public Law 877, 80th Cong.; amends par VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended by adding a proviso to the effect that disease, injury, or death incurred without willful misconduct on the part of the service person shall be deemed to have been incurred in line of duty if the sentence of the court martial did not involve an unremitted dishonorable discharge or if the offense for which convicted by civil court did not involve a felony as defined under the laws of the jurisdiction where the service person was convicted by such civil court. (Prior to this amendment the requirement for line of duty was not met if at the time injury was suffered or disease contracted the veteran was confined under sentence of court martial or civil court.)	Oct. 10, 1949
341	Sec. 5 adds new sec. 7 to United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (Public Law 264, 79th Cong.) to clarify status and procedure re noncombatant assistance furnished by United States in support of United Nations activities which are specifically directed to peaceful settlement of disputes. Armed Forces personnel detailed for such duty to be considered, for all purposes (including pay, allowances, longevity, retirement, and all other perquisites appertaining to personnel of United States Armed Forces), as acting in line of duty	Do.
351	Career Compensation Act of 1949: Provides for pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement, for members of Armed Forces, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, and the Reserve components thereof	Oct. 12, 1949
388	Provides for installation in Arlington Memorial Amphitheater near Washington, D. C., of a carillon in memory of World War II dead	Oct. 25, 1949
436	Increases basic rates of compensation for service-connected disability, based on degree of disability, payable to persons otherwise eligible for disability compensation under World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as restored with limitations by Public Law 141, 73d Cong. ($150 for total disability—temporary or permanent; proportionate ratio for lesser disabilities)	Oct. 29, 1949
473	Authorizes extension of officers' retirement benefits to certain persons who while serving as enlisted men in the Army of the United States during World War II were given battlefield promotions to officer grade and were incapacitated for active service as a result of enemy action	Apr. 17, 1950

Laws relating to veterans and their dependents and the Veterans' Administration enacted by the 81st Cong.—Continued

Public Law	Subject	Date approved
475	Amends National Housing Act, as amended, to liberalize, extend, and expand FHA insurance authority under titles I, II, and VI; to increase the purchasing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association and remove its power to make advance commitments for the purchase of eligible mortgages; to provide for the disposal of war and veterans housing (Lanham Act Housing); to authorize low-interest-rate loans by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to educational institutions to provide housing for their students and faculties; and amends title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended (Public, 346, 78th Cong.), among other things, to extend GI loan benefits to unremarried widows of certain deceased veterans; to extend permissible period of a home loan from 25 to 30 years; to increase amount of guaranty from 50 to 60 percent (but not exceeding $7,500) on loans for purchase of residential property or construction of a home, provided the veteran has not previously availed himself of title III (SRA) benefits; to require conformity with minimum construction requirements prescribed by the Administrator for loans on residential property; to repeal section 505 (a) of the SRA (secondary loan provisions) effective Dec. 31, 1950, or such earlier time as the Administrator may determine: and to provide direct 4 percent loans to veterans under certain conditions	Apr. 20, 1950
479	Amends sec. 5, Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended (Public, 704, 79th Cong.) to extend until June 30, 1951, the time within which to make application for terminal-leave pay	Apr. 26, 1950
492	Amends Public, 577, 79th Cong., relating to benefits for certain World War II veterans who lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of service in armed forces, in order retroactively to advance in grade, time in grade, and compensation certain employees in the postal field service who are veterans of World War II	Apr. 29, 1950
500	Provides uniform longevity promotional grades for the postal field service. Time spent in the military service is allowable service as defined in the act.	May 3, 1950
511	Amends sec. 415, Public, 351, 81st Cong., which provided a period of 6 months after Oct. 1, 1949, during which members of uniformed services who were hospital patients had the right to elect retirement benefits computed under laws in effect on Sept. 30, 1949, to extend the effective date from Apr. 1, 1950, to Dec. 31, 1950	May 10, 1950
521	Authorizes commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to administer oaths required in the procurement of persons for enlistment or appointment in the armed services	May 22, 1950
573	Amends subpar. (c), par. I; pt. I, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, by Public Law 748, 80th Cong., June 24, 1948, to provide a rebuttable presumption of service connection in case of veterans who develop a compensable degree of active pulmonary tuberculosis within 3 years from date of separation from active service	June 23, 1950
574	"Housing and Rent Act of 1950." Amends the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, to extend rent control. Sec. 2 extends to June 30, 1951, the provisions for preference or priority to veterans of World War II with respect to purchase or rental of housing accommodations	Do.
598	Provides for extension of term of patents of persons who served with military or naval forces of the United States during World War II	June 30, 1950
599	"Selective Service Extension Act of 1950": Amends Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public 759, 80th Cong.), as amended, subsec. (b) of sec. 17, to extend termination date thereof from July 9, 1950, to July 9, 1951; and adds sec. 21 which authorizes the President until July 9, 1951, to order any or all members and units of any or all Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States and retired personnel of the Regular Armed Forces to active duty for 21 months within the personnel strengths provided by sec. 2 of the 1948 act	Do.
609	Provides free postage for members of Armed Forces of United States in Korea, and such other combat zones as the President may hereafter designate, until June 30, 1951, unless terminated at an earlier date by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by direction of the President	July 12, 1950
610	"Veterans' education and training amendments of 1950": Amends title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), as amended, to incorporate, with significant modifications, certain provisions which heretofore had been the subject matter of administrative regulations and temporary limitations in appropriation acts, relating to the qualifications of schools and courses offered by schools, the character of courses and the conditions under which they may be pursued by eligible veterans, and the determination of fair and reasonable rates of tuition chargeable by institutions; also includes certain entirely new provisions, notably minimum standards for applications by the States in approving profit schools, and a procedure for recovering overpayments of subsistence allowance from schools failing to make prompt reports of attendance status	July 13, 1950
611	To make amounts properly for deposit into the personal funds of patients and funds due incompetent beneficiaries, administered by the Veterans' Administration, immediately available for disbursement for authorized purposes without covering into the Treasury of the United States to be accomplished by creating special deposit accounts for such funds with the Treasurer of the United States	July 15, 1950
624	Authorizes the President to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of not to exceed 12 months, this authority to expire on July 9, 1951	July 27, 1950
771	Authorizes payment of family allowances to dependents of enlisted members of armed services. Provides GI dependents with $85 to $165 a month * * * 3 lowest grades in Armed Forces contribute $40 per month, with Government adding $45 for 1 dependent, $67.50 for 2 and $85 for more than 2 * * * middle 2 grades pay $60 and 2 top grades allot $80 with $67.50 added for 1 or 2 dependents and $85 for 3 or more * * * payments retroactive to Aug. 1 * * * no allotments for officers	Sept. 8, 1950
791	Provides for out-patient treatment of veterans of Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, and Philippine Insurrection	Sept. 19, 1950
798	Authorizes payments by Veterans' Administration on purchase of automobiles by certain disabled veterans	Sept. 21, 1950

I supported and voted for most all of the above-mentioned measures.

As the Representative in Congress from the Ninth District of Minnesota, it has been my pleasure to have been of official service to thousands of veterans. Any veteran having a problem with a Federal agency who contacts me, always will receive my fullest official aid and cooperation. Besides voting for all meritorious veterans' legislation, I introduced the following bills myself:

H. R. 1216, January 10, 1949: A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

H. R. 2024, January 31, 1949: A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children.

H. R. 4275, April 14, 1949: A bill to extend the status of veterans of World War I to persons enrolled or enlisted and serving on United States Shipping Board vessels during World War I in war zones.

H. R. 4999, June 6, 1949: A bill to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall furnish the children of certain deceased veterans medical, hospital, and domiciliary care.

H. R. 5905, August 5, 1949: A bill to amend Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 so as to grant certain peacetime veterans and their unmarried widows preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed.

H. R. 8324, May 2, 1950: A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide the maximum retirement pay for certain retired enlisted men for the period from July 1, 1942, through June 30, 1946.

H. R. 9679, September 15, 1950: A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to extend the period of presumption of service-connection in the case of pulmonary tuberculosis from 3 to 7 years.

These have not become law, although some provisions have been adopted into legislation which has become law.

I invite veterans to write to me at any time. I am your United States Representative in Congress and your friend. I will be glad to hear from you and I assure you of my fullest cooperation and assistance at any time.

My name and address is Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN, 205 United States Post Office Building, Crookston, Minn.

If I am reelected as your Congressman—United States Representative in Congress—on November 7, my address on and after January 3 again will be 1405 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

The veterans of the Ninth District are fortunate in having a splendid group of county service officers. Veterans can always get good cooperation from these men. They know their job and they are very helpful to veterans and their dependents. The county service officers in the Ninth District are as follows: Ralph Reinhardt, Becker County service officer, Detroit Lakes, Minn.; E. A. Axelson, Beltrami County service officer, Bemidji, Minn.; Leslie Welter, Jr., Clay County service officer, Moorhead, Minn.; F. J. Hanson, Clearwater County service officer, Bagley, Minn.; E. R. Fitzgerald, Kittson County service officer, Hallock, Minn.; Ira L. Brazie, Lake of the Woods County service officer, Baudette, Minn.; Allen W. Benson, Mahnomen County service officer, Mahnomen, Minn.; John W. Sands, Marshall County service officer, Warren, Minn.; Merton Johnson, Norman County service officer, Ada, Minn.; Philip M. Kjaglien, Otter Tail County service officer, Fergus Falls, Minn.; H. B. Rafteseth, Pennington and Red Lake County service officer, Thief River Falls, Minn.; Earl G. Barness, Polk County service officer, Crookston, Minn.; C. R. Turner, Roseau County service officer, Roseau, Minn.; George M. Korbel, Wilkin County service officer, Breckenridge, Minn.

Your Expanded Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the American public must fully realize that one

of the important achievements of this Eighty-first Congress is the passage of the bill, H. R. 6000, expanding and bringing up to date our social-security system. This bill marks substantial progress in the field of social legislation and has long been overdue. A great part of the credit for this progressive legislation is due to the work and long effort of my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], who is going to be the next Governor of the State of New York. There has been Nation-wide interest in the provisions of this new social-security bill ever since we passed it here in the House last October. Now that President Truman has signed the bill and it has become Public Law 734, I feel it might be helpful to my constituents to describe the major changes in our social-security system occasioned by the new law.

MAJOR CHANGES

Briefly summarized, the major changes are:

(a) Larger benefits: The 354,843 New Yorkers receiving social-security payments as of August 31, 1950, will find that in the checks to be mailed out next month their benefits will be, on the average, roughly 75 percent greater than they have been. For those persons who will retire after June 1952, benefits will be twice what they are now, on the average.

(b) Broader coverage: On January 1, 1951, nearly 1,000,000 people in the State of New York who up to now have not been covered by social security, will come under the system. For the first time the nonfarm self-employed—persons owning small businesses such as grocery stores, retail stores, or gas stations—will have the opportunity to earn social-security privileges.

(c) Easier eligibility: In general, it will take less years of social-security "coverage" before you are eligible to draw benefits. Persons who are now 65 or over, and who have had six quarter-years—a year and a half—of social-security "coverage" can and should apply immediately for benefits. Any retired worker, as well as survivors and dependents, will be able to earn $50 a month as against the present limit of $15 without losing their benefit payments.

LARGER BENEFITS

How much larger will benefits be under the new law? Increases in the amount of benefits will go to two main groups: (a) Those who are currently receiving benefits, or who will begin receiving them before 1952; and (b) those who will reach retirement age after June 1952. Let us see how the new bill affects each of these groups.

There are approximately 354,843 people in the State of New York now receiving social-security benefits. In the checks which they will receive early in October—their September payment—they will find that their payments will be, on the average, 77½ percent greater than they have been up to now.

The following table shows the amount of increases for an insured wage earner without any dependents, and for a married couple:

Retired wage earner without dependents		Retired wage earner and wife	
Now	New law	Now	New law
$10	$20.00	$15.00	$30.00
$11	22.00	16.50	33.00
$12	24.00	18.00	36.00
$13	26.00	19.50	39.00
$14	28.00	21.00	42.00
$15	30.00	22.50	45.00
$16	31.70	24.00	47.35
$17	33.20	25.50	49.80
$18	34.50	27.00	51.75
$19	35.70	28.50	53.55
$20	37.00	30.00	56.50
$21	38.50	31.50	57.75
$22	40.20	33.00	60.30
$23	42.20	34.50	63.30
$24	44.50	36.00	66.75
$25	46.50	37.50	69.75
$26	48.30	39.00	72.45
$27	50.00	40.50	75.00
$28	51.50	42.00	77.25
$29	52.80	43.50	79.20
$30	54.00	45.00	81.00
$31	55.10	46.50	82.65
$32	56.20	48.00	84.30
$33	57.20	49.50	85.80
$34	58.20	51.00	87.30
$35	59.20	52.50	88.80
$36	60.20	54.00	90.30
$37	61.20	55.50	91.80
$38	62.20	57.00	93.30
$39	63.10	58.50	94.65
$40	64.00	60.00	96.00
$41	64.90	61.50	97.35
$42	65.80	63.00	98.70
$43	66.70	64.50	100.05
$44	67.60	66.00	101.40
$45	68.50	67.50	102.75
$46	68.50	69.00	102.75

These same increases apply to anyone who retires before June 1952.

The next table contains the amounts of the September checks for widows with two children who are presently receiving social security:

WIDOW WITH TWO CHILDREN

Present benefit: $20; new benefit: $40.
Present benefit: $25; new benefit: $46.
Present benefit: $30; new benefit: $53.
Present benefit: $35; new benefit: $59.
Present benefit: $40; new benefit: $67.
Present benefit: $45; new benefit: $76.
Present benefit: $50; new benefit: $92.
Present benefit: $55; new benefit: $110.
Present benefit: $60; new benefit: $117.
Present benefit: $65; new benefit: $122.
Present benefit: $70; new benefit: $128.
Present benefit: $75; new benefit: $133.

YOU DO NOT HAVE TO APPLY FOR INCREASES

Your increases will be mailed to you automatically. If, however, your increase is not included in your October check, you will receive it very soon thereafter, in full. Please do not write to the Government for information because the more letters that have to be answered, the longer it will take for the program to get fully under way.

If you retire after June 1952, a new formula may be used to compute benefits. This formula will yield approximately twice the amount of benefits now being received. A person can begin to use this new formula just as soon as he has worked for six quarter-years—a full year and a half—under the social-security system after January 1, 1951.

The next table demonstrates in round figures the approximate amount of the benefits, according to this new formula:

Average monthly wage	Single	Married
$50	$25	$38
$100	50	75
$150	58	86
$200	65	98
$250	72	109
$300	80	120

The amount of the minimum primary benefit has been increased from $10 to $25, in most cases, and the maximum family benefit has been increased from $85 to $150. These are sorely needed and long overdue changes when we consider present high living costs.

WHAT NEW PEOPLE WILL BE COVERED?

On January 1, 1951, approximately 1,000,000 people in the State of New York—nearly 10,000,000 in the Nation as a whole—will come under the social-security system for the first time.

THE NONFARM SELF-EMPLOYED

The largest group to be admitted to the system are the nonfarm self-employed, numbering about 580,000 persons in our State. For the first time, the druggist, the grocer, the candy-store man, the gas-station owner, and thousands of other small-business men who are in business for themselves, will be covered by social security, and will be able to draw benefits when they reach the retirement age of 65. This does not include many professional people, such as doctors and lawyers. Industrial home workers, under certain circumstances, would be included.

I should emphasize for the benefit of these small-business men, as well as all those who will now come under the social-security system, it will be much easier for you to become eligible for benefits under the new law. If you are 62 or over on January 1, 1951, and begin your coverage on that date, you will need only a year and a half of coverage in order to begin drawing benefits. This means that you will begin to draw benefits just as soon as you reach the retirement age of 65.

DOMESTIC WORKERS

About 122,500 New York domestic servants and workers in nonfarm homes will join the system beginning January 1, 1950, provided they work 24 days for 1 employer and receive cash wages of at least $50 during each quarterly period.

VOLUNTARY COVERAGE FOR STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

Roughly 99,000 employees of the State, and of cities, towns, or counties in New York State may come under the system if a voluntary agreement is reached between the State and the Federal Government. In order that no existing retirement system will be interfered with, no one covered by a State or city retirement system when the agreement is reached will be covered. Employees of the Federal Government not presently covered by a Federal retirement system will be included.

EMPLOYEES OF NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

Employees of hospitals, churches, schools, and the like will be covered only if the employer agrees to pay his share of the tax contribution and if two-thirds or more of the employees favor social-security coverage. Ministers and members of religious orders will continue to be excluded.

SALESMEN AND TRUCK DRIVERS INCLUDED

All full-time life-insurance salesmen, certain full-time traveling salesmen, other than house-to-house, and many delivery truck drivers who satisfy certain conditions will be covered.

HOW LONG DOES IT TAKE TO QUALIFY?

One of the greatest advantages of the new law is that in the future you will not have to work under the social-security system nearly as long before you can retire and begin to draw security benefits. The retirement age is still age 65 but under the new law you will only have to be in "covered employment"—that is, employment under the social-security system—for half of the time elapsed since January 1, 1951. "Coverage" before that date may be used to fulfil this requirement. The present law requires "coverage" for only half of the time since January 1, 1937. In all cases, at least six quarter-years, or a year and a half, of coverage will be required. Under the old law, 27 quarter-years—nearly 7 full years—of coverage was required for a man or woman now 65 years of age who wanted to retire.

IF YOU ARE AGED 65

Any insured worker who is now 65 or over and who has had six quarter-years—or a full year and a half—of social-security coverage can draw benefits immediately.

Any worker who is 62 or over in January 1951, even if he or she only starts his social-security coverage next year, will be eligible to begin drawing benefits just as soon as he reaches the retirement age of 65, if he has had six quarter-years—a year and a half—of coverage.

THE NEWLY COVERED

Most important to the thousands who will become eligible to join the social-security system next year—it will be possible to begin drawing benefits upon retirement (at age 65) with much less coverage than now.

The next table shows how many quarter-years of coverage you will have to have under the old and new law. Simply look at the figure next to your age on January 1, 1951:

Quarters of coverage required to be fully insured

Age reached in first half of 1951	Present law	New law
76 or over	6	6
75	8	6
74	10	6
73	12	6
72	14	6
71	16	6
70	18	6
69	20	6
68	22	6
67	24	6
66	26	6
65	28	6

Quarters of coverage required to be fully insured—Continued

Age reached in first half of 1951	Present law	New law
64	30	6
63	32	6
62	34	6
61	36	8
60	38	10
59	40	12
58	40	14
57	40	16
56	40	18
55	40	20
50	40	30
45 or under	40	40

DEPENDENTS' AND SURVIVORS' BENEFITS

How much will survivors and dependents receive under the new law? The primary benefit is the payment made to an insured wage earner who has no dependents. Generally speaking, dependents and survivors will receive the same part of the primary benefit as at present. This means that their benefits will also be about 75 percent higher than at present, up until 1952, and double the present levels after that time.

The major changes in survivors' and dependents' benefits are:

(1) A retired worker's wife who is under 65 years of age may receive benefits if she has a child in her care.

(2) The benefit for a dependent parent has been raised to three-quarters of the primary benefit of the wage earner—it is only one-half at the present time.

(3) Lump-sum death payments, though reduced to three times the primary benefit of the wage earner, are now payable to the family of every insured worker. Before now these payments were made only when no other member of the family was entitled to survivors' benefits at the time of the wage earner's death.

(4) Retired workers, survivors, or dependents are permitted to now earn up to $50 a month, as against $14.99 under the present law, without losing their benefit privileges.

I believe that the Congress should soon enact further improvements in our social security, such as including an insurance system for the permanently and totally disabled, and lowering the retirement age to 60, both of which I have long recommended.

In conclusion, let me say that our new social-security law is a great step forward; a step of which I believe the Congress and the people of our great Nation may well be proud.

Legion Demands Reds Be Outlawed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD various news dispatches reporting action taken by the national convention of the American Legion in Los Angeles in connection with outlawing communism and its advocates.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Evening Herald and Express of October 9, 1950]

SENATOR MALONE SAYS UNITED STATES ARMING RUSS THROUGH EUROPE AID

The United States is stupidly arming Russia for a third world war by permitting recipients of Marshall-plan money to send war materials to the Soviets.

That warning was sounded today by United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, who arrived here with his wife for the national convention of the American Legion. The Nevada Senator is scheduled to address the Legionnaires on Wednesday.

"It may not be generally known," he declared, "but it is a fact that 16 Marshall-plan countries have 96 trade treaties with Russia and are supplying the Communists with the sinews of war, including everything from clothespins to steam engines."

RESTRICTIONS URGED

"We should demand that conditions be attached to any further financing of Marshall-plan countries that would forbid these shipments of matériel which eventually will be used against us."

Senator MALONE said there should be an end to the financing of Socialist and Communist governments.

"The United States is making the same mistake it made when it sent steel and oil to Japan in the months preceding Pearl Harbor," he said. "Are we ever going to learn? How stupid can we be?"

The Nevada Senator bitterly assailed France and England for having a 20-year nonaggression pact with Russia, while at the same time being signatories to the Atlantic Pact.

CHOICE DUE

"This," he emphasized, "is a complete contradiction. When the flag is up, France and England will have to make a choice."

MALONE complained that the Truman administration has no foreign policy, and that the time has come for this country to make it clear to the world where we stand, what we are prepared to defend, and get ready to do it.

"We must have universal military training," he said. "If we are ready, there is a good chance that another war can be averted for another generation."

[From the Los Angeles Evening Herald and Express of October 11, 1950]

SENATOR MALONE IN FIERY LEGION MEET TALK SAYS ACHESON MUST GO—CRACKPOT FOREIGN POLICY IDEALS HIT BY NEVADA SOLON

In a fiery speech before the 1950 national convention of the American Legion, United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, demanded immediate removal of Secretary of State Dean Acheson before more stupid mistakes are made.

He charged:

1. That American taxpayers' money is being used to arm Russia for world war III.

2. That the United States foreign policy is a conglomeration of crackpot ideas.

3. Tanks used by the Red Koreans were financed through the Marshall plan by way of trade agreements between Marshall-plan and iron-curtain countries.

4. That there is no bipartisan foreign policy but only a Truman-Acheson-Lattimore program.

MAC ARTHUR LEFT OUT

5. That Acheson never consulted Gen. Douglas MacArthur or any other American military figure before announcing abandonment of Formosa.

6. That Communists in governmental posts are waging a deliberate war at home to destroy the American economic structure.

7. That taxpayers' money is being loaned to foreign private business on less stringent terms than a veteran can borrow it in this country.

8. That our taxpayers money is being used by the ECA in the Far East and Africa for the vile purpose of strengthening the yoke of bondage and slavery and perpetuating misery among the primitive peoples ruled and worked by imperial overlords through the colonial system.

Senator MALONE, a former national vice commander of the American Legion, blamed both the Acheson foreign policy and the failure of Congress to enact universal military training for the Korean War.

HITS TRAINING LACK

"Sending young men into battle without proper training and equipment is not war; it is murder," he said grimly.

Only once did Malone depart from his attack on American foreign policy to warn the Legionnaires that "since 1938 there has been a constant war against America within our gates."

"On the home front," he cried angrily, "the Red plot has been carried on within the administration by a constant attack on American industry.

"This attack has come through, first, Government regulations so designed as to eliminate venture capital which made this country great; second, taxes so designed as to eliminate initiative; a foreign 'free trade' policy so designed as to curtail domestic production; and, fourth, reckless spending on the part of the Government so designed as to threaten our whole economic structure."

HITS ORIENT POLICY

Senator MALONE flayed Acheson bitterly for the Far East policy of the State Department and charged that "undoubtedly, Stalin thought he had the nod from Acheson to go ahead" in Korea.

"Everything points to that," he asserted. "But Acheson's position on Korea was suddenly reversed, and it may be presumed that he is now apologizing to the Hisses and his other Communist friends.

"Our administration has deliberately followed a systematic policy since the close of World War II of giving Russia the strategic areas in Asia and Europe, through international conferences at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, and of wrecking our economy through a free-trade program based on the 1934 Trade Agreement Act. It is a powerful nation, indeed, that can stand both of these onslaughts at the same time."

CONSULTED NO ONE

"At a closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Acheson was asked whether he had sought the views of General MacArthur on the strategic importance of Formosa. He answered that he was not reporting on MacArthur's views, that he did not necessarily know them. He also said he had not talked to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and did not know their views.

"Three days later, Mr. Acheson made the announcement that America's military defense line in the Pacific ran from the Aleutians to the Philippines, including Japan and Okinawa but skipping Korea and Formosa.

"The State Department is unwilling to tell the American people just what commitments have been made.

"As a matter of fact, it did not even tell General MacArthur that it had made commitments which might require a Korean campaign."

WARNED BY MAC ARTHUR

"Now, since the stupidity or deliberate treachery of the Asia policymakers, Hiss, Lattimore, and Acheson, cannot be denied, the followers of this group have the unmitigated gall to spread the lying whisper that General MacArthur was responsible for the surprise attack on South Korea.

"General MacArthur, far from shaping any of the policy, was not even consulted.

"General MacArthur warned the Washington administration 3 months in advance that the South Korean invasion by the Reds was planned for the month of June."

MALONE castigated the administration of the Marshall plan, vigorously declaring that the administration forced it "down the throats of our taxpayers."

"Billions of dollars to Europe with no conditions attached," he cried. "And for what?"

URGES REAL LEADERSHIP

"The United Nations secretariat recently reported that notwithstanding the billions of dollars poured into Europe by us, Europe's economic problem is not solved and the solution is not in sight. Our taxpayers' money has accomplished one thing: The renewal of hundred-year-old feuds among the countries in Europe."

Senator MALONE closed his address with a plea to the veterans to "develop a few leaders who are for America like Churchill is for England."

"Let us stop this senseless, stupid apoligizing for America and for Americans who love America, and let us establish a real leadership that the world will be glad to follow, and that conceivably could keep us out of the major conflict for a generation."

The ouster of Dean Acheson has been demanded by several top-ranking legionnaires including National Commander George N. Craig. The demand will undoubtedly come before the convention for action in one of the reports.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of October 10, 1950]

LEGION DEMANDS REDS BE OUTLAWED—WOULD TRY ALL COMMUNISTS

(By Walter Naughton)

Communism and its advocates, administration bungling which weakened America in the face of open or covert Communist advance—these came under heavy fire at the American Legion convention yesterday.

Delegates applauded and cheered as speakers demanded the immediate ouster of Secretary of State Dean Acheson and energetic enforcement of the new Communist control measure.

They applauded and cheered again as speakers voiced open defiance of Stalin and as Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS warned the Soviet dictator that "if you want war, we will drive you from this earth."

They enthusiastically approved resolutions calling for such action as:

Outlawing of the Communist party in America as an agent of a foreign government, with a constitutional amendment if necessary.

Immediate detention, for reasons of national security, of all known Communist Party members; trial of those who are American citizens as traitors, and those not citizens to be treated as enemy spies.

Many other resolutions followed the same line.

The convention adjourned without hearing or acting upon two important committee reports. One is from the foreign affairs committee, which may present resolutions dealing with Secretary of State Dean Acheson and other individuals and actions concerning international relations. The other is from the national security committee, in whose jurisdiction come such matters as universal military training and national defense. Both will report today.

All three speakers of the day—Congresswoman ROGERS, United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, and United States Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota—launched vigorous attacks upon the administration for—

Its faint-hearted handling of the Communist menace.

Its false economy in cutting down national defense.

Its blindness to the warnings of such leaders as Gen. Douglas MacArthur and the necessity for such measures as universal military training.

MALONE demanded the immediate ouster of Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

Resolutions which were directed toward a stronger America included:

Outlawing not only of the Communist Party but of all subversive and front organizations.

Disbarment of members of the National Lawyers Guild for following the party line.

Continuance of the House Un-American Activities Committee with sufficient appropriations.

Subversive groups to be refused permits to meet in public buildings or hold parades.

ADEQUATE COURSES IN UNITED STATES HISTORY

Adequate courses in American history in high schools and colleges as a prerequisite for graduation.

Removal from office of any public official who tolerates Communist activities within his department.

Redoubling of loyalty checks on Government employees.

Better supervision of immigrants here under special or temporary visas.

Compulsory arbitration of labor disputes during emergencies.

More severe screening of displaced persons permitted to enter the country.

The invoking of economic sanctions upon trade with Russia or her satellites.

CONVENTION CHEERS CONGRESSWOMAN

It was a day of enthusiasm that reached its highest pitch when the delegates, meeting in Shrine Auditorium, rose to their feet to cheer Congresswoman ROGERS as she concluded her dramatic defiance of Stalin.

Her brief speech was given as she accepted the Legion's highest honor, the organization's Distinguished Service Medal, which has been awarded to only 36 persons in 32 years.

Castigating the administration for permitting the Nation to become "weak and unprepared," even after the lesson of two wars, and for putting "politics and office holding" ahead of national defense on the false claim of economy, Mrs. ROGERS declared:

"All of this took place with a cold war in progress which might at any moment break out into a hot war; while Communist Russia was developing the mightiest military machine ever known in the world.

"All of this took place while communism was already on the march and while the threat to America was gaining in intensity by the hour.

"It was because America was unprepared that Hitler started World War II, and because America was weak that Stalin started the Communist drive on South Korea."

CAN'T DEFEAT UNITED STATES BY NAME CALLING

Dramatically directing her words to Stalin, she said:

"By your name calling, your lies, you cannot defeat America. Men who know the value of freedom cannot be propagandized into slavery.

"If it is your desire to have war, you will have to fight America and the other free nations.

"We will drive you from this earth."

It was then that the delegates stood and cheered.

Demanding immediate action to remedy administration blunders, MALONE said:

"American Legion officials have stated their belief that had a universal military training program been adopted we would not have suffered the early severe setbacks in Korea, with the accompanying loss of American lives and American prestige among nations.

"Sending young men into battle without proper training and equipment is not war; it is murder."

ATTACKS LACK OF FOREIGN POLICY

Attacking the lack of definite foreign policy, he said:

"Our foreign policy, if one can dignify the conglomeration of crackpot ideas as a policy, is at the root of our troubles. There is no bipartisan foreign policy. There never has been a bipartisan foreign policy."

Turning to sharp criticism of ECA and the Marshall plan, he declared:

"The aid which we are sending to ECA countries is finding its way in manufactured and processed products to Russia and her satellites and to other areas dominated or controlled by Russia, consolidating her gains in the iron-curtain countries and in China.

"Both England and France have nonaggression pacts with Russia which read startlingly like the Atlantic Pact—we should demand the cancellation of these pacts as a condition of further aid of any kind in eastern Europe and in China."

Declaring that the State Department could not plead ignorance of the danger in Korea, MALONE said:

"It has developed that General MacArthur warned the Washington administration 3 months in advance that the South Korean invasion by the Reds was planned for the month of June."

NEVER CONSULTED SERVICE LEADERS

"Our State Department never once consulted either of the two persons best qualified to advise us on our far eastern policy—General MacArthur and Admiral Badger.

"The handling of the Korean threat is but another instance proving the unfitness of Mr. Acheson for his high position. His administration has been wholly unsatisfactory. It is important that he be removed before other serious blunders are made."

Senator MUNDT told the Legionnaires that he had asked President Truman to appoint to the Subversive Activities Control Board at least one Legion-recommended two-fisted, sturdy American, coupling a realistic knowledge of communism with an active sense of fair play.

"If the President mans this effective new net for catching Communists with a crew that considers communism nothing more than a red herring, we shall never be able to catch and decapitate the great conspiratorial red octopus that is communism," he declared.

"The new Communist control bill," MUNDT said, "does not limit in any way the civil rights of all Americans," but in fact provides a forum in which anyone unjustly accused may clear himself publicly.

Urging more vigorous action against Communists who have insinuated themselves into the Government, MUNDT said that he once asked Jack Peurifoy, then Assistant Secretary of State, in charge of security, how many Communists were employed by the State Department. Peurifoy, he said, said that 205 known Communists or disloyal persons had been discharged.

"If I could be allowed to send 205 loyal, sturdy American Legionnaires into the Politburo in Moscow, I promise you that within 6 months, I would have old Joe Stalin walking around Red Square, waving the American flag and singing Yankee Doodle," he said.

The Legionnaires roared approval.

[From the Los Angeles Times of October 12, 1950]

JAILING OF ALL REDS SOUGHT BY LEGION—OUTLAWING OF PARTY URGED—SENATOR MALONE BLASTS ACHESON

Communism and Secretary of State Dean Acheson were torn to shreds yesterday at the thirty-second annual national convention of the American Legion, as the delegates got down to brass tacks.

Their annual grand parade a thing of the past, the Legionnaires girded themselves militantly against America's Communists and America's foreign policy.

High lights of yesterday's session was a speech by United States Senator MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, who ripped into the Marshall plan, Secretary of State Acheson, and President Truman.

The other outstanding deevlopment of the convention was adoption of the Legion's Americanism committee report in toto.

BACKS RED JAILING

The report called for the jailing of members of the Communist Party and urged Congress to dissolve the party.

The report also demanded that the President and the Chairman of his Loyalty Commission continue their efforts in their work.

Senator MALONE, undoubtedly delivering the most dynamic speech of the convention, declared:

"The Legion's programs over the years have been given lip service by public officials and then were sidetracked, defeated, and nullified by the national administration. I will have no part of the administration's attempts, through the State Department, to control this organization's thinking and leadership in national defense and international affairs."

FOUGHT FOR UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

"Since I entered the Senate in 1947, I have fought for universal military training and an adequate preparedness program. Here again, the administration opposed the 70 air group appropriation and other adequate programs.

"American Legion officials have stated repeatedly their belief that, had a universal military training program been adopted, we would not have suffered the early severe setbacks in Korea with the accompanying loss of American lives and American prestige among nations. The boys who had to be sent into battle first should have had proper fundamental training and the most modern equipment."

CRACKPOT IDEAS

"Sending young men into battle without proper training and equipment is not war—it is murder," the Senator declared.

"The Korean situation might never have arisen in the first place, despite State Department bungling, if we had had a definite foreign policy and an adequate national defense organization, spearheaded by an air corps and a submarine fleet so that the nations of the world and the American people would know that we could enforce our commitments."

Senator MALONE termed the American foreign policy a "conglomeration of crackpot ideas." He said these ideas are the root of America's troubles today.

"There is no bipartisan foreign policy," he said, "and there never has been a bipartisan foreign policy. There has been a Truman-Acheson-Lattimore program, decided upon and settled in every instance before the Republicans of the Senate were even informed as to what was under consideration."

RAPS MARSHALL PLAN

At this juncture of his address Senator MALONE launched into a bitter denunciation of the Marshall plan.

"The administration forced the ECA down the throats of our taxpayers," he began. "Billions of dollars to Europe with no conditions attached. And for what? The United Nations Secretariat recently reported that, notwithstanding the billions of dollars poured into Europe by us, Europe's economic problem is not solved and the solution is not in sight.

"Our taxpayers' money has accomplished one thing—the renewal of 100-year-old feuds among the countries of Europe.

"Churchill has recently said that the European Marshall-plan countries are less able to defend themselves now than they were 3 years ago."

YOKE OF BONDAGE

The speaker told the delegates that ECA money could have been loaned to private business through the World Bank on the same terms that the RFC loans money to organizations and individuals in this country in times of stress.

"We should not give our taxpayers' money outright to any foreign governments, nor loan it to foreign private business on less stringent terms than a veteran can borrow it in this country," the Senator continued.

The speaker charged that American money is being used by the ECA in the Far East and Africa for the purpose of strengthening the "yoke of bondage and slavery and perpetuating misery among the primitive peoples ruled and worked by imperial overlords through the colonial system and for arming Russia and the iron curtain countries for a third world war."

ARMED BY ECA

"The Communist countries are being armed by ECA or Marshall-plan countries through trade treaties," the Senator charged.

"Metalworking tools, steel, ball bearings, electrical machinery and apparatus, grain mills, heavy road machinery, farm machinery, and motor vehicles are a few of the many thousands of items being sent to Russia's satellite countries from ECA nations," he explained.

The Senator said that we are helping Russia for war just as we helped Japan before World War II.

Turning to the Secretary of State, the Senator said:

"At a closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Acheson was asked whether he had sought the views of General MacArthur on the strategic importance of Formosa. He answered that he was not reporting on MacArthur's views, that he did not necessarily know them. He also said he had not talked to the Joint Chiefs and did not know their views.

"Three days later, Acheson made the announcement that America's military defense line in the Pacific ran from the Aleutians to the Philippines, including Japan and Okinawa, but skipping Korea and Formosa. Undoubtedly," the Senator continued, "Stalin thought he had the nod of Acheson to go ahead. Everything points to that. But, Acheson's position on Korea was suddenly reversed and it may be presumed that he is now apologizing to the Hisses and his other Communist friends.

"Now, the President's trip to see MacArthur is fine, but it is 5 years late. We have given away China and Berlin.

"Our foreign policy has been both casual and improvised," the Senator went on. "Furthermore, the State Department is unwilling to tell the American people just what commitments have been made."

NOT EVEN CONSULTED

"As a matter of fact, it did not even tell General MacArthur that it had made com-

mitments which might require a Korean campaign. Now, since the stupidity, or deliberate treachery, of the Asia policy exists, Hiss, Lattimore, and Acheson cannot be denied, the followers of this group have the unmitigated gall to spread the lying whisper that General MacArthur was responsible for the surprise attack on South Korea.

"General MacArthur, far from shaping any of the policy, was not even consulted," the Senator said.

"That handling of the Korean threat is but another instance proving the unfitness of Mr. Acheson for his high position. His administration has been wholly unsatisfactory. It is important that he be removed before other serious blunders are made."

RAPS REDS IN JOBS

The speaker then went into a condemnation of various Communists in Government departments, such as Lee Pressman, and continued:

"Until this country squarely faces its errors in foreign and domestic policy, until it abandons the spend-and-elect theories of welfare statism, until it abandons the one-economic-world Marxist program of free trade—and world distribution of our hard-earned wealth—we will continue to tremble before the threats of a people backward in production and culture.

"We need to remind ourselves that our first and foremost task is to keep ourselves strong. The anti-Communist forces of the world that are able and willing to fight are outnumbered."

WARNS OF DANGER

"The defense of the free world must be achieved by the quality of training and equipment which can overcome quantity. We are not big enough to overwhelm our opponents by the massing of military power. Since we cannot hope to be bigger our fate depends on whether we can be better trained and better equipped."

The Senator called for a housecleaning at home and warned of a real danger on the home front through Communists and Communist-front organizations.

"The American Legion must not let us down," Senator MALONE concluded.

Administration, Not Hoover, Made Reorganization Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, my press release for May 31, 1950, stating why I feel the administration and not the Hoover Commission is the designer of the reorganization plans.

There being no objection the remarks were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 31, 1950.—The administration has deliberately misused the name of our only living former President, Herbert Hoover, in its grab for power, United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, charged today, referring to the reorganization plans which, as Senator MALONE pointed out, were prepared not by the Hoover Commission, but by the administration.

In calling attention to differences between Hoover Commission recommendations and the reorganization plans as submitted by the President, the Nevada Senator made this comment: "The administration has been successful in securing the support of some high-minded people and highly respected organizations only by labeling its reorganization plans 'the Hoover plans' and representing them as measures of efficiency and economy, while as a matter of fact some of them were perversions of Hoover Commission recommendations and obviously were submitted for the one purpose of increasing the power of the Executive."

Continuing, Senator MALONE said:

"We have gone a fearful distance on the road to centralization. It seems to me that we have reached a point where the only sensible yardstick to apply to any new legislation or proposal is this: Does it further centralize power in the Executive? If it does, then this fault is so grievous that it outweighs whatever may be good about it, because centralization of power causes the atrophying of those national traits that made us big, virile, and wealthy as a nation.

"Those of us who have observed close at hand the reckless spending, wanton waste, and hopeless inefficiency in which the Truman administration has reveled were at first surprised when it was reported that the administration favored the Hoover Commission recommendations. Had the administration at long last turned over a new leaf, or on the other hand was this another device to grab more power for the President? After reading some of the reorganization plans, we knew the answer.

"Senator SCOTT LUCAS, the majority leader, in supporting the reorganization plans, all of them, suggested that the Congress should give the President some leeway. We in the Senate have cause to suspect what the words, 'some leeway,' may mean to this administration.

"The Hoover Commission was created by efficiency-conscious and economy-conscious Republicans, in the Eightieth Congress; its report was adulterated by the Democrat administration."

Statement of Foreign Minister Mohammed Salah El-Din Bey, of Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the best way to achieve a sounder basis of international amity is across the council table. That is why we welcome the visits to these shores of leaders of foreign governments.

The statement issued on the occasion of the recent visit here of the Foreign Minister of Egypt, His Excellency Mohammed Salah El-Din Bey, brings a constructive note from the strategically important Middle East.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued on the occasion of his visit to the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE FOREIGN MINISTER OF EGYPT, MOHAMMED SALAH EL-DIN BEY

As this is my first visit to America, I am happy to express my great admiration for the obvious signs of prosperity on all sides which makes this country a leader in the fields of industry, trade, and democratic practices. The original purpose of my visit was to attend the fifth meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations and to emphasize once more the deep interest Egypt has in the cause of peace and the successful cooperation between all nations. But I also have had the great pleasure of meeting several leaders in the political and economic life of the United States, and my interviews with them have been of great interest.

My visit to Washington has given me further insight into the life of this great democracy and has offered me the opportunity of meeting Mr. Acheson, with whom I have had a very frank and friendly exchange of views in matters concerning our two countries. I had also the pleasure of paying a courtesy visit to General Marshall, with whom I have had a very friendly and interesting talk.

I should like to take this opportunity to emphasize the basic principles of Egypt's foreign policy, which are:

1. To complete and safeguard Egyptian independence and implement the unity of Egypt and the Sudan.
2. To live on friendly terms with all nations.
3. To help the world-wide movement to establish peace and security.
4. To play her part, together with other democracies, in bringing about general stability and understanding between the nations.

There is no doubt that Egypt would be better able to play her part in the international field if her own political problems could be successfully resolved. I am here referring to the question of the British occupation of the Suez Canal Zone and the difficulties which still stand in the way of unity between Egypt and the Sudan under the Egyptian Crown. We hoped that these problems might be solved through friendly negotiations, as their solution in Egypt's favor is essential for the sake of stability and peace in the Middle East.

I need not point out the importance of Egypt's strategic position, her economic resources, her plentiful manpower, and her great value as a stabilizing influence, not only in the Middle East, but in the world as a whole. I hope that my present visit to America, and the opportunity it has afforded me in establishing friendly contacts and sympathetic understanding with your public men, will eventually remove all obstacles and help to realize the full cooperation of Egypt as a member of the United Nations in upholding the cause of democracy and peace in this troubled world.

Washington Unconcerned About Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a press and radio release dated July 25, 1950, concerning the fact that Washington seems

unconcerned with the position of the American taxpayer.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 25, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, said today in the Senate that Washington seems unconcerned with the position of the American taxpayer. The Nevada Senator made this statement in a speech in which he pointed out ways to raise the money for the expanded military program without raising taxes.

Senator MALONE said that the only program understood in Washington seems to be: "Spend, spend, spend, save nothing, boost the withholding taxes, boost all the taxes, give no thought to the American taxpayer."

The Senator said that the American taxpayer should not have to bear the burden of building up Europe's peacetime industries and carrying on a domestic peacetime public works program while also carrying the load of a war. He asked, "Are the Members of this body interested in saving any money for the taxpayers in their respective States?"

"In the new budget," Senator MALONE said, "there is an item of $500,000,000 for peacetime public works. In wartime, such works are unnecessary and, in fact, undesirable. Our money and our manhours should be devoted to the war effort. This $500,000,000 should be transferred to the military program."

For a saving of an additional $3,500,000,000, Senator MALONE suggested that 20 percent be cut from the civil government budget. He pointed out that of the total budget of $42,000,000,000 for the new fiscal year, $25,000,000,000 are for national defense, veterans' services and benefits, and interest on the public debt, leaving $17,000,000,000 for the civil government, and he said that this item could easily stand a 20-percent cut, a saving of approximately $3,500,000,000.

Senator MALONE said: "This $3,500,000,000, plus the $500,000,000 for peacetime public works, plus the $3,000,000,000 which can be saved by stopping ECA, a peacetime endeavor, plus the $1,000,000,000 which would be available by combining the military-assistance program with our own military program, makes $8,000,000,000 for the military program. That is a good start, and by following this suggestion of saving we need not now load down our taxpayers with additional burdens."

Extending Free Trade on Copper Plot To Weaken United States Economic Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my press release for July 31, 1950, giving my reasons for saying that the extension of the free trade on copper is part of the conspiracy to weaken the economic structure of the country.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 31, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, charged today that the extension of the free trade on copper is part of the conspiracy to weaken the economic structure of the country. The Nevada Senator referred to his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee against House Joint Resolution 502, which would resuspend the import tax on copper. In that testimony he strenuously objected to the resolution, and he proposes that if the resolution comes to the Senate floor he will debate it at some length.

"Those Red sympathizers in our midst who are plotting against the American system," said Senator MALONE, "are happy to see 70 percent of our mines closed in time of war, as this means a weakening of our productive structure." The tariff or import fee is a national defense measure, applying to practically all products, but especially to the strategic and critical minerals and materials, of which copper is an important part. An import fee has the effect of encouraging venture capital by establishing a floor under wages and investments.

"When the 4-cent tariff on copper was reduced, every independent copper mine in the United States was closed, with the exception of one in the State of Michigan, which had to lower wages and write off investments to meet competition.

"The major copper-producing companies are using the brass fabricators as a front to lobby for free trade on copper, while at the same time manufactured brass products have a tariff up to 65 percent, sufficient to meet American wage standards.

"This is the first time in our history that the head of a foreign nation has come to Washington to lobby for legislation. The President of Chile is to be commended for looking out for the best interests of Chileans. American officials should be equally concerned for the best interests of Americans. A strong America is necessary to win a war.

"Our strongest weapon is productivity, which the enemy is attacking from within. With no import fee to protect American workers and investors, no venture capital will be available to go into business, to go into mining, and no new mineral deposits will be found.

"The excuse used by the free-trade plotters to the effect that an import fee would keep out copper and hurt our war effort is absurd on its face for the simple reason that the Government does not pay tariff, and any such import fee paid the Government by a private manufacturer is charged back to the Government in the product.

"From the evidence and from the attitude of the free-trade proponents, the conclusion is inescapable that this is part of a gigantic scheme designed to undermine the American economic system. Well-meaning folks who favor the free-trade policy are unmindful of the danger to the American workers and to America's national defense, and are being used as dupes by the clever enemies within our own Government."

The November Elections—Mr. Morley Has a Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two editorials from the Catholic Review of Baltimore, Md., for Friday, October 13, 1950. The first is an editorial by J. J. Gilbert entitled "The November Elections" and the second is an editorial entitled "Mr. Morley Has a Point."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NOVEMBER ELECTIONS: IMPORTANT BECAUSE THEY WILL CHARACTERIZE THE NEXT CONGRESS

(By J. J. Gilbert)

It is beginning to become apparent in Washington that the votes which the citizens of the United States cast in the coming November elections will be of a particular importance.

This is so because informed persons believe that the coming winter will be a period of intense political activity, and one in which the people of the United States will be subjected to an impressive barrage of propaganda from both within and without the country. The elections afford the people an opportunity to express definitely the opinions they want represented in Congress. In fact, they will elect all of the House of Representatives and 32 Senators. The complexion of the Congress for the next 2 years will have a heavy bearing upon the outcome of the Presidential election in 1952.

The elections are of particular importance because the Congress that is elected to serve for the next 2 years probably will be called upon to make decisions that will affect the American way of life for many years to come.

Just before the second session of the Eighty-first Congress recessed, it enacted over President Truman's veto a strict antisubversive law which it felt the people wanted. The lawmakers were going back to stand for election before their constituents, and they felt called upon to override the President's opposition. Warning already has been given that a vigorous drive will be made to water down the "Red curb" bill when Congress reconvenes. The people, by their votes, are expected to instruct and encourage their representatives in Congress as to their wishes in this matter.

An impression has been created in some quarters that the antisubversive law has put the Communists in this country on the run. There is nothing to justify this belief. One hears as much propaganda favorable to Red plans as heretofore, whether those who spread the propaganda do so wittingly or not.

The next Congress is likely to have to pass upon the peace that is made in Korea, assuming our success at arms continues there.

President Truman already is claiming that attempts will be made in the next Congress to block the Nation's defense program that he has launched. Part of the President's explanation of this prediction is the fact that after both World War I and World War II, Americans pressed to do away with the draft, to reduce arms expenditures, and cut taxes. He says, too, that it was sought to block preparedness in the current session of Congress.

It seems likely that the defense program will get at least some consideration in the next Congress, because the really heavy tax "bite" has been deferred until after the November voting, and the Secretary of the Treasury has warned that the increases—to be long enduring—will be very heavy.

The next Congress may have to ratify the peace treaty with Japan and make very important decisions as to how much longer we will wait for Russian cooperation before taking other international decisions without her.

The new Congress is going to have to make many more decisions along this and other lines. Many of these measures will tend to centralize power in the Government and edge us toward Federal control. It will be the duty of Congress toward the people to safeguard again against these steps becoming permanent policy.

MR. MORLEY HAS A POINT

Felix Morley, who is best known to the American public as a news analyst, spoke to the Maryland Action Guild last Monday night—and it would be accurate if colloquial to remark that he uttered a mouthful. The former college head, editor and observer, spoke about the bipartisan complexion of the State Department, and remarked that in his opinion, it was just about bipartisan enough to discourage criticism. Or at least, this was the motivation. Certainly if this complexion turned away any wrath, it did not plug up more than a tiny few channels of criticism. But it may have discouraged some otherwise outspoken critics.

Mr. Morley seemed convinced, as do many other Americans on the outside looking in, that Mr. Acheson, with administrative reassurances and impulsions, is steadily working up to an arrangement for permitting if not actively endorsing the United Nations recognition of Communist China. The appeasement pattern evidently has not been torn up in the State Department possibly for two reasons. They are to keep the red Chinese hoping and thus out of Korea, and to go along with Great Britain in the recognition and possibly, but not probably wean them away from Russian domination by emphasizing Russia's proclivity for starting wars with satellites and then letting them bite the dust when they are beaten.

Another of Mr. Morley's nuggets during his address was his admonition to voters. He pointed to the coming November elections as the only means enjoyed by the American citizen to thwart any deals with Communists by voting for candidates committed to battle Communists within and without and to tolerate no compromise with them.

It should be added, perhaps, that, keeping this advice in mind, voters also might do an excellent service to America by electing men who will not stand for paring down the anti-subversive law even during the howling and clamoring from those who must enforce it.

Senate Joint Resolution 151, To Prohibit Financial Aid to Any Foreign Country Engaging in Trade With Russia, Her Satellite Countries, or Any Other Area Dominated or Controlled by Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 151 to prohibit financial aid to any foreign country engaging in trade with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other area dominated or controlled by Russia. This bill was introduced on January 24, 1950, by the junior Senator from Nevada, and was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, where it is now pending.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 151

Joint resolution to prohibit financial aid to any foreign country engaging in trade with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other area dominated or controlled by Russia

Whereas one of the alleged basic purposes of the Marshall plan is the restoration or maintenance in European countries of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence through a joint program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation; and

Whereas Russia and other Communist dominated and controlled countries and areas have refused to participate in such joint program; and

Whereas Communist actions have endangered world peace; and

Whereas certain participating nations under the Marshall plan by trading with Russia and other Communist dominated and controlled countries and areas and through nonaggression pacts and treaties are violating the basic principles of the Marshall plan and are aiding and fostering communism in other areas of the world through furnishing the necessary equipment, machinery, and supplies to consolidate Communist gains in eastern Europe and in Asia; and

Whereas such nations are furnishing Russia and the Communist areas necessary equipment, machinery, and supplies for world war III; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Congress and the basic policy of the Marshall plan and its enabling legislation that assistance to any participating country which fails in any way to meet its obligation to sustain and strengthen the principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence, through cooperating with such Communist nations and areas, should be terminated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That on and after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution no financial aid shall be given by the United States or any agency or officer thereof (whether by loan, grant, lend-lease, or in an, other manner) to any foreign country which engages in trade or commerce on or after such date with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other Communist dominated or controlled area in any other country.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that no moneys shall hereafter be appropriated and no loans shall hereafter be made and no equipment or supplies of any kind shall be furnished to any nation engaging in such trade or commerce or permitting its nationals to do so.

Lack of Training Adds to Combat Losses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Salt Lake Telegram, of August 22, 1950, relative to the danger to untrained soldiers in Korea.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LACK OF TRAINING DOES ADD TO COMBAT LOSSES

Senator MALONE, of Nevada, told the United States Senate the other day that this country is "murdering" American boys by putting them into combat in Korea without adequate training. The Senator said many of the boys being rushed into battle were "green" and that they therefore "had no chance to survive." He was arguing for universal military training, which he said the American Legion and other groups had been advocating for 25 years.

The Senator's language may be a bit too strong, yet there is no question that the inadequately trained soldier is far more apt to stop a bullet than the one who has been carefully prepared to face the emergencies of combat and to take care of himself.

Half-trained troops do make themselves far too conspicuous targets. They do not have the discipline which helps them to fight not only courageously but wisely and shrewdly. While a universal military training program will not guarantee us against war losses, it will keep those losses to a minimum by assuring that green troops will not have to get their training in the hard, and all too often deadly, school of actual combat.

Incidentally, there are no political aspects to Senator MALONE's advocacy of universal training. He is a Republican, but the program has the wholehearted support of President Truman. In fact, the issue of whether or not we should have such training cuts straight across party lines. It is not a partisan question and, of course, any issue involving the lives of our American youth should not be.

Tungsten in Korea—World's Tungsten Supply—Socialization of American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by S. H. Williston, of California, an expert in the tungsten business, outlining tungsten in Korea, the world's tungsten supply, and socialization of American industry.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUNGSTEN IN KOREA

The ECA was able to complete its expenditures of some half million dollars or more on the rejuvenation and rehabilitation of one of the world's largest tungsten mines in South Korea just before the North Koreans captured the property on the first day of the Korean incident. American know-how and American taxpayers' money solved a rather difficult metallurgical problem and had the property going in tiptop shape at the time of the invasion. One thousand tons of concentrates were also available for the Russian war effort upon the capture of the mine. The mine was located less than a score of miles from the thirty-eighth parallel.

THE WORLD'S TUNGSTEN SUPPLY

Prior to the conquest of China by the Communists, Russia's proportion of world tungsten producing capacity was negligible. At the present time Russian-controlled tungsten producing capacity is something close to two-thirds of the world's total, leaving only one-third available for the United States and all of the democratic countries. The United States alone for purely commercial uses normally requires 25 percent of the world's capacity to produce. The democracies of Europe normally take another 25 percent. Normal commercial requirements for

peacetime uses alone are greater than the world's productive capacity under the control of the democratic nations. It is manifestly impossible to get 50 percent of the world's production from 35 percent of the world's capacity to produce.

It is interesting to note that reliable sources of information indicate that Russia is paying China for tungsten in gold, at a price almost twice as high as the United States market.

Just where tungsten for jet engines, tungsten carbide tools and steel alloys is going to come from is difficult to foresee, and what will happen to the program for tungsten carbide cored tank-killer ammunition is even more difficult to foresee.

SOCIALIZATION OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY

In England many industries have been taken over by the British Government and since they usually show losses, the British Government pays the losses. The socialization system in the United States is considerably superior. In any new corporate venture in industrial production the Government tax is some 45 percent of the corporate profits, and then if it is a successful venture, roughly 50 percent of what remains. This adds up to a 72½ percent carried interest in the operation. Since all of the profits are taxed and few of the losses are allowed, I think everyone will agree that a 72½ percent carried interest is far better for the Government than owning the industries outright. It does seem, however, a little selfish of the Treasury to want to add an excess profits tax which would make the Government's carried interest even larger. When proposed renegotiation of raw materials is added to this it would seem that the profit motive has been completely eliminated in a country that in the past has boasted of its ability to produce under the capitalistic system.

While Russia has abandoned the basic Marxist theory of communism and now rewards her producers in accordance with their production, we in America, through our tax policies, seem to have adopted in toto the theory of "from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs." This is translated in Washington bureaucratese as cost plus fixed fee.

Statement of Hon. Herbert Hoover to the American Society of Mechanical Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in critical times like these, the sage advice of former President Herbert Hoover on the exercise of the right of suffrage is worth the attention of every American. Totalitarian governments grow on the apathy of the voter. Inefficiency in government thrives on the failure of voters to go to the polls. Boss governments grow fat and ruthless when voters fail to take an active part in the business of running the country.

Vote, and preserve democracy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of Mr. Herbert Hoover.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a time of many crises. Some of them reach deeper than even war.

The ballot is the foundation of our representative Government where individual rights are cemented as from the Creator and not from the state.

The necessary lubricant of the machinery of such Government is the two-major-party political system where the voter may have a choice of policies and representatives.

Only 66,811,000 persons, registered or otherwise qualified themselves to vote in 1948 out of the 94,072,000 persons over 21 years of age. Of these, only 48,834,000 persons actually voted.

There are over 20,000,000 citizens who either have employment or direct benefits from the Government. With their wives they constitute a potential of over half of the registered voters. They usually vote. They may vote in the interest of the whole people. But a system of checks and balances must be maintained.

If you do not vote, you have no right to complain. But far worse, you have abandoned the whole American system.

At a time of world crises when this country stands as a great bulwark of freedom against the forces of totalitarianism, Americans are in serious danger of losing their priceless heritage of liberty within these shores through the shocking indifference of a substantial portion of our electorate.

The American Society of Mechanical Engineers makes a nonpartisan appeal to its members and to all engineers to perform their first duty as citizens—to vote. The ASME asks the engineer to exercise his civic responsibility with the same devotion with which he discharges the high purposes of his profession. It asks all Americans to vote.

American blood is being shed for freedom overseas. Do not let democracy at home go by default.

British Firms Deal With Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Jonathan Stout, appearing in the New Leader of September 2, 1950, entitled "British Firms Deal With Reds."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH FIRMS DEAL WITH REDS

(By Jonathan Stout)

British businessmen in Hong Kong are making their lushest postwar profits selling railroad and bridge-building equipment to the Chinese Communists, although they know that some of the equipment is going to the North Koreans and the rest is being used by Peking to build up its military transportation system.

Both Washington and London know what is going on, but neither has made a move to halt this lucrative trade with a government whose troops may shortly be fighting openly in Korea against American and British soldiers. The matter remains a hush-hush subject at the State Department, which has not even broached the affair to Downing Street as yet. Inquiries at the Department have encountered only official frowns, and American military heads in the Far East are reported incensed at the Department's failure to take steps to protect the lives of our GI's in Korea.

A few months ago—and, indeed, up to the eve of the North Korean attack, as originally revealed in the New Leader—the State Department was fighting for permission for Peking to obtain railroad equipment from American-occupied Japan and western Germany. This was finally prevented by the Defense Department's spirited protest. Now that the Chinese Communists are procuring the equipment through the British, the State Department is enjoying the final triumph over the Pentagon and is not bestirring itself to take any corrective measures.

This story spotlights only a small part of the fierce struggle now in progress between Defense Secretary Louis Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Acheson. General MacArthur and the ECA are also involved. Acheson is fighting both Johnson and MacArthur, and Johnson is squared off against Acheson and the ECA.

The Defense Department is the one responsible for withholding export licenses for millions of dollars worth of machinery, steel mills, and oil-refining equipment manufactured in this country under ECA authorizations and destined for companies in western Europe which are either wholly Russian-owned or are shipping their output to the Soviet bloc.

The Department has been forced to rely wholly on its own intelligence service in checking on European firms ordering war-potential equipment from American manufacturers under ERP. It has uncovered a network of companies, in Marshall-plan countries, completely owned by the Soviet Government through secret agents and producing exclusively for export to the U. S. S. R. Other firms, though not under Soviet ownership, are under contract to produce only for the Russians. In every such case discovered by the Defense Department, protests by the military have blocked issuance of export licenses. The American manufacturers have already been paid by the ECA, so they stand to lose nothing but the storage charges incurred while they hold the equipment.

The secrecy surrounding the whole situation began to crack last week when it was revealed that a British firm had transshipped to Russia 50 tons of American-produced molybdenum—an alloy used for hardening steel. Another 150 tons of molybdenum scheduled for shipment to the Soviet Union was seized in London and is being held there. United States authorities are investigating whether the British firm in question is one secretly owned by the Soviet Government or merely under contract to the Russians.

The lid was pried a little further off later in the week when Winston Churchill revealed that the head of Craven Bros. in Stockport, Britain's second largest machine-tool firm, had informed me that he had for more than 2 years asked the British Government whether he should fulfill contracts for making machine tools for Soviet Russia, particularly of the class required for the manufacture and repair of tanks, when so many of our own royal ordnance factories are in sore need of renovation for this very purpose.

"The Craven Co.'s head," Churchill said, "told me his highly skilled craftsmen were seriously disturbed at doing work for Soviet Russian satellite Poland, which they feared would weaken our country and strengthen its most likely assailant. They also did not like the presence of Russian Government inspectors under present conditions inside their workshops where a lot of confidential production is also being done for His Majesty's Government."

A spokesman of the British Ministry of Supply commented later, "It is quite true

that several machine-tool manufacturers, including Craven Bros., are fulfilling contracts for Russia."

That is the picture as it obtains today in this country and in western Europe. In the face of these conditions, the efforts of the Defense Department to enforce the embargo against the shipment of war-potential equipment to the Soviet bloc have been described to this reporter as trying to plug the leaks in a sieve.

Defense of States' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a news dispatch which appeared in the Reno Evening Gazette of September 23, 1950, relative to the defense of States' rights by the junior Senator of Nevada.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALONE EXPLAINS HIS STAND ON SLOTS MEASURE

Senate GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, will continue his "vigilance in the Senate on the premise that any State possess the sovereign right to legislate within the framework of Federal Constitution," he reported from Washington today.

Senate MALONE, who completed nearly 12 hours of extended debate Friday, emphasized that contrary to reports of his action on the Senate floor, his stand was on the question of whether or not the Senate should approve a conference report on a bill he said "obviously circumvents the right of a State legislature to pass any legislation that does not contravene the Constitution of the United States, and not on the question of whether or not gambling should be legal."

During his one-man stand, Senator MALONE continually accentuated that he was not a member of the Nevada State Legislature, that it was not his business to interfere with its functions and that he merely abided by the laws of that body which represents the opinions of the people of Nevada.

The Senator stated, "I am trying to protect a State in its authority to carry out the wishes of a majority of its people, and will continue to do so regardless whether it is my State or any other State.

"I am not in any way attempting to interfere with the pressing business before the Senate. At any time I will gladly yield for such business that will speed up the work of the Senate. But, I cannot concede if it will mean the usurping of the sovereign rights of the people of these United States."

The bill under debate would require the legislature of a State, where gambling devices are legal to enact a law exempting that State from the provisions of the bill. Once the State law was enacted such devices could be shipped into the State by the manufacturer. However, the machines could not be shipped back for repairs since all major slot-machine manufacturers are located in Illinois where their use is illegal.

In continuing his stand, Senator MALONE stated "The final result of this law, if approved, will be the nullification of an act of a State's legislature representing the people. The point has been made in the Senate many times on other occasions. And I approve of the position thus taken—that the Federal Government has continued to encroach upon the States over the past years until, if continued, it will eventually absorb the function of a State.

"This development has been accelerated greatly in the past 15 or 20 years, until the right of a State to handle its own business has been severely curtailed. The situation in that respect now is becoming very dangerous."

United States Leads for German Cutlery Import

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a dispatch from the June 26, 1950, issue of the Journal of Commerce concerning the United States leading the foreign markets for west German cutlery.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES LEADS FOREIGN MARKETS FOR WEST GERMAN CUTLERY

SOLINGEN.—The United States is now the leading market for west German exports of cutlery, scissors, razors, penknives, and similar cutting implements, followed by Canada, Switzerland, and Belgium in that order, according to industry observers here.

The industry—which is concentrated almost exclusively in the Solingen area—was able to double its exports in the first quarter of this year to a value of DM 9,930,000 from DM 4,052,000 in the first 3 months of 1949. Total exports last year had a value of DM 20,950,000—which represented a threefold increase on the 1948 figure of DM 6,670,000.

SEVENTY PERCENT OF PREWAR VOLUME

In the terms of value, 1949 shipments reached approximately 70 percent of the prewar level (1938 exports were worth 31,100,000 Reichsmarks); but, in view of the increases in prices during the intervening period, the actual volume of exports during 1949 is estimated to have been equal only to about one-third of prewar. Moreover, exports accounted for about 40 percent of the total production prior to 1939, whereas only 15 to 18 percent are sold on foreign markets at the present time.

Sales to soft-currency countries are still severely handicapped by a reluctance to grant import licenses on a large scale. Scandinavian countries, in particular, which used to be important outlets in prewar days, are issuing licenses very sparingly but Turkey has recently issued import licenses for $150,000. Home market sales have been at low ebb following a seasonal spurt last Christmas.

SPECIALTIES LEAD

Foreign demand is concentrated largely on specialties, with only minor emphasis on staple lines, in which the United States, Britain, and Italy are strong competitors. Absence of import licenses is regarded as the main obstacle to a further rapid expansion of sales.

The relatively favorable development of exports to dollar countries has caused a number of manufacturers to lower their dollar prices with a view to increasing turn-over. The Export Committee of the Solingen Chamber of Commerce and Industry points out that such price reductions should aim primarily at preserving a competitive position and should not be made unnecessarily. Industry circles are of the opinion that German export prices, on the whole, compare well with foreign quotations, though strong competition is being met in cutlery from Belgian, Dutch, and Swiss manufacturers. Argentina and Brazil are also able to supply cutlery of above-average quality, though in different shapes than are being made by German firms.

German exporters are doing a fair volume of business with Central and South America in high-quality razor blades, but are unable to compete with United States producers in the lower price brackets.

Exports of penknives have benefited from an expansion of assortments effected recently by most manufacturers. However, the large range of products now being made has added to costs and prevents rationalization of production. German quotations for penknives are said to be fully competitive with United States, British, and Italian price levels.

Our Flag To Stop Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, recently I received an article written by a lady who lost her son as a result of an illness incurred during and because of his military service. This lady is Mrs. Vivian Boyer Ropes, who is well known as an aviatrix of great ability. Her son's dying wish was that his mother tour the earth in an effort to bring peace and order to our troubled world.

Mrs. Ropes made that trip and I ask that its result be reprinted here in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sure that those who read it will find that it is a most thoughtful and earnest approach to solving—to a degree at least—the difficulties of international relations.

The article follows:

OUR FLAG TO STOP COMMUNISM

SEPTEMBER 14, 1950.

Upon touring the world and talking with people of all countries and in the many contacts made while riding in busses instead of taxicabs, trams, and trains, I have discovered that in many of the small villages, especially in Italy, communism is flourishing and all because they do not know that America has been sending many goods to their country for them.

I traveled through these little villages giving the children candy and the men cigarettes, telling them it was given to them by America. Women with children in their arms with whom I talked and gave candy, were very much surprised, and said it was the first thing they had ever received from America. That immediately started me thinking and asking questions, such as: "Is your husband a Communist?" There were 8 answers of "yes" out of every 10. I wrote the letters "U. S. A." on a piece of paper and asked if they had ever received anything with that stamp on it or did they know what it meant; not one of those questioned knew, including men, women, and children. This reaction prompted me to draw the American flag, putting in all the stars. This I showed them and asked if

they recognized the flag; believe it or not, women, men, and children recognized it and said "Yes, that is the American flag."

The women in that little town told me that they did without food in order to buy pencils and paper so that they could send their children to school. They wanted them to learn very much, so as not to go through the hardships that are caused by ignorance. I felt right then and there that if we Americans would send paper and pencils to those little villages, not with U. S. A. stamped on it, but a picture of the American flag on top of each and every pencil and pad, it would do more to wipe out communism than any form of propaganda we could think of. One of the best ways of wiping out communism, in my opinion, is to start with the children. If a child knows what country is helping it there will be no doubt in its mind when it grows up. And no matter how ignorant or uneducated the people in these countries are, there is one thing that they will always be able to recognize, that is, the good, old American flag. Through the experience of my world tour, including 12 countries in Europe, the only solution for wiping out communism, I find is this:

1. Instead of U. S. A., all materials, regardless of nature, should have the American flag on each and every article, regardless of size.

2. All stamps of American flags should be stamped on the left side or in the same place on each article, so that if there is any dispute of the flag being removed we can easily identify it as having come from the United States by pointing out the scar on each and every article.

3. Every stamp of the American flag should be put on any article going to countries outside the continental United States or any other country to which we send charity.

4. All loans made to any country should be stamped with the American flag, not to make sure the country knows where it came from, but so that in the event the paper is lost or finds its way into the hands of a Communist, whether able to read or not, there would be no doubt of its origin.

5. All articles bought in foreign countries with American loan money, should also be stamped with the American flag, so that there would be no doubt as to who was giving the country the gifts. I say this because much money has been loaned to foreign countries and with that money Communists have bought food for the poor, making them believe that the Communist is the benefactor. This, I feel, is the only way that our articles, and our charity for all will be known throughout the world. Subsequently, there would be no argument as to where it came from, if they could see the American flag.

The American flag is our only solution to wipe out communism, which seems to flourish among the ignorant. I know that I would have been very happy upon numerous occasions, if I would have been able to prove to these many people I talked to, many of whom were Communists, that many of the articles they received were in reality gifts from the United States.

6. The American flag stamped on our goods that have been given to charity, falling into the hands of black-market dealers, would prevent these dealers from selling the articles which were meant as gifts to the poor.

The American flag on any article would immediately inform the people that this was an American gift.

I think it is time that the United States used the flag for more than just a parade, as it will in time be used to save our country. Our flag was made for the people that could not read or write, so whenever our forefathers saw it, they knew it represented their country. Because even they, when our flag was first made could not read the words United States of America, the only thing they understood was the good old American flag.

VIVIAN BOYER ROPES.

Hoffman Proposes $150,000,000,000 for Peace Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the September 21, 1950, Washington Post, on Hoffman's proposal that the United States spend $150,000,000,000 in the fight for peace.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOFFMAN PROPOSES UNITED STATES SPEND $150,000,000,000 IN FIGHT FOR PEACE

(By Sam Stavisky)

A fight for peace, waged with the same vigor that the free world waged war, was proposed yesterday by ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman.

To 15 foreign editors visiting this country under auspices of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Hoffman outlined a five-point program, made up in its essentials of policies already in operation, in varying degrees.

The military phases of this program, he told the group, would cost the American people forty to fifty billion dollars a year for the next 3 years, in order to lift the Nation to an appropriate level of strength. His whole program included steps to:

MUST AUGMENT FORCES

1. Prevent the Kremlin from going to war by amassing sufficient military strength in the United States and the Nations of the free world.

"This is a tough assignment," Hoffman said, "one which the free world cannot readily carry out."

For the United States to do its share on the military front, Hoffman estimated, it would take a military budget of forty to fifty billion dollars for the next 3 years to bring our Nation up to full strength. The other free nations would have to make a proportionate financial sacrifice.

2. Help build up the economic strength of the countries threatened by communism.

"We must give the people in these countries something to live for and something to fight for," Hoffman declared.

3. Strengthen the democratic institutions and processes of the nations of the free world.

4. Hold out hope for the people of Russia and her satellites that they, too, may some day join the free world.

Hoffman estimated that 80 percent of the people in Russia and Communist-dominated countries could be eventually reached on this front.

5. Make the people of the world understand, through "truthful propaganda," that the democratic way of life is the best way of life.

"The Kremlin has outsmarted us and outspent us on the information front," Hoffman said. In France, he said, the Communists spent 15 times as much fighting the Marshall plan as this country did to put it over.

To skeptics who might ask: "Why should Russia wait until the free world gets strong enough to contain the Kremlin?" Hoffman replies there is no certain answer to such a question. He stressed, however, that the free world could have a reasonable hope that Russia would not go to war now or in the near future for several reasons:

1. The United States has better atom bombs and more of them.

2. The Korean war has shown Russia that it can't take western Europe through a coup, but would have to engage in a long, hard war to do so.

3. The Kremlin fears that its troops might become contaminated by western ideas and ways should Russia send its 300 divisions into a general war with the free world.

Hoffman said he had it from reliable authority that "contamination" of Russian troops has been a serious trouble wherever they have come in contact with the free countries.

It is his belief, Hoffman said, that this is the most potent of all reasons as to why Russia would prefer to avoid risking a general war.

The ECA chief also attempted to answer what he called another $64 question on the part of those who would take a skeptical view toward his containment proposal. This view is summed up in the following question: "Assuming the Western World can successfully contain Russia while averting war, what's to be done about Communist Russia's attitude toward the free democracies?"

Hoffman replied to his own question that he doesn't quite know the answer to this one, but that he believes if Russia can be contained long enough, and if the West can keep throwing the Kremlin off balance as it has with the Marshall plan and the United Nations' action on Korea, the people inside Russia will themselves change the government.

So long as the free world contains Russia an eventual split can be expected among the leaders of the Kremlin, Hoffman said, and a revolt can eventually be expected among the people.

"The collapse of the Kremlin rulers will come before the end of the present decade," Hoffman predicted, "if we wage peace on all fronts."

It is not too much to hope for a new Russian Government, a non-Communist government, that can participate in a free world at peace by 1960 he said.

The ECA Administrator emphasized there was nothing official or formal about his proposal. It's something he evolved during 30 days of hospitalization following a recent operation, Hoffman disclosed. He was not permitted to read while he was bedridden, so he dwelt on the possibilities of averting a third world war and attaining peace for the world. He spoke to the journalists at a luncheon in the Carlton Hotel.

Address of Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of

the RECORD a copy of a radio talk I made over Station WTIC on Tuesday evening, October 10, 1950. This is the first of four major addresses which I propose to make over the radio during the coming days of the campaign.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I've chosen radio as the best vehicle for saying the most important things I want to say in this campaign. I want to talk to you in your own homes. My opponent says political campaigns are dull. He has hired the Brooklyn Dodgers band to relieve his tedium. The Republicans seem to be hoping this campaign will be dull enough to keep the voters at home on election day. They count on the apathy—in this year of world crisis—which has so often elected them in Connecticut in so-called off years, when there is no presidential campaign.

If you had been with me in Washington this year I know you'd have discovered that the issues in this campaign are no ordinary issues—but can indeed become a matter of life and death to all of us and to our children. I am therefore going to ask you to stay with me tonight for some straight, serious talk—with no folk dancing and no time for the Whiffenpoofs or Sweet Adeline. In the four major broadcasts I am planning on this station I shall talk about the gravest problem any American generation has ever faced—the problem of whether we can in fact hope to achieve peace of mind and quiet of soul.

The future holds terrifying possibilities of tragedy, but it holds hope, too. Which of the two we achieve will be decided not by blind fate but by the courage and wisdom of our leaders and of the entire American people. Every one of us must sense the fateful nature of the decisions which have to be taken in the next 2 years—war or peace—death or survival—a great forward surge for humanity, or a turning back to reaction and inertia.

Here in Connecticut, for the first time we choose a governor for a 4-year term. The State has a clear choice: whether to move forward under the new and progressive pattern of administration launched by Governor Bowles, or backward to an older era. Our State government affects every one of you—and not only your taxes and housing—but the education of your children and your own comfort and welfare in sickness, unemployment, and old-age. Governor Bowles in his 2 years in office has set an unrivaled record for progress in these areas of State administration. He is the leader of a strong and experienced and capable State ticket. Your choice this November will determine the shape of Connecticut's government for years to come. Here the issue revolves in major degree around the return to office of one man—one of the finest and most public-spirited men I have ever known, Gov. Chester Bowles. Nothing is more disturbing in this campaign than the innuendoes and vicious attacks being leveled at Governor Bowles. I've known him 25 years. They are lies. They remind me only of the stories spread everywhere about President Roosevelt. They are fostered by the same bitter die-hards—then as now—who through prejudice and ignorance oppose the great legislative measures for the welfare of the people.

In the election for national offices—your Senators and Representatives in Congress—the issue is one of principles and of national policies even more than of men. The significant thing is not merely whether Senator MCMAHON and I, and our associates who are Democratic candidates for the House, are to be the spokesmen for Connecticut. The question is also whether the leadership in the Congress of the United States—in this, one of the most critical moments of history—is to remain in experienced hands or to be turned over to a strangely assorted group not remotely equipped to provide the leadership the times require. In foreign affairs, the Republican Party includes powerful Senators and Congressmen who want to return to isolationism, and other vocal men who seem prepared for reckless adventures in the Far East. In domestic affairs many of the Republican Party's most influential figures would like to head the country back to the McKinley era, if they thought they could get away with it—and if they get control then they will say they have a "mandate" to get away with it.

The Senate elections in Connecticut are a prime target for this Republican group. That's why so much money is being poured into the State, from Wall Street and from elsewhere. The Republicans only need seven more seats to control the Senate. They already count on four or five and they figure the two from Connecticut as possibilities. Yes, around these two Connecticut Senate seats may revolve the control of the United States Senate—and United States and world policy.

Up to a year ago I was listed as an Independent. Hard, tough thought—not political partisanship—had led me to support the Democratic candidates in six successive Presidential elections. And believe me it has been hard, independent thought, plus some bitter and eye-opening experiences in Washington with some of the key men who control Republican politics, that led me to this speech tonight and the three to follow.

Let me set forth my personal and political creed as simply as I can, in five points. Basic to those five points is my faith that the good of all—the common good—is a means to the enduring happiness of every individual in society and is superior to the economic interest of any private group, not only in war but in peace as well.

First, I believe in freedom as the way to the common good—and in freedom of speech, of conscience and of religion as the basis of all other freedoms. The greatest threat to the common good today is communism, because it corrupts the common good, and denies that freedom is the way to reach it. If communism prevails throughout the rest of the world we in the United States can quickly find ourselves marching, our freedoms gone, in a Red goose-step, toward a common evil.

Second, I decry the cynicism that operates on the thesis that war can never be banished from the world. I deny the theory of a preventive war, which is justified as a kind of radical surgery—but which might readily kill the alleged doctor along with the alleged patient.

Today we and our friends must build our economic strength to discourage Communist aggression, as well as to serve the common good. We must also build our military strength rapidly, but we must recognize that force is no substitute for the great moral strength of which we must learn to be capable. The free peoples cannot win through this crisis by material means alone. To win the hearts and loyalties of mankind to freedom, we must develop ideas and faith—as a substitute for the sword.

Third, I believe in the economic system chosen by the American community, loosely (often too loosely) called the free enterprise system. This system, when it functions properly, permits the maximum freedom to the individual consistent with the common good. Free enterprise does not mean freedom to exploit, to monopolize or to waste. Essential to a system of free enterprise is a climate where new small and independent businesses can be conceived and born, can grow and prosper.

An economic system based on private enterprise can better serve the common good, not because it enables some men to enrich themselves, but because it develops a high and rapidly rising level of living. It can best insure the American prosperity so vital to world prosperity and to world peace.

Fourth, I believe that the common good must include the protection of those who suffer misfortune. The American people recognize that the adjustments which are inevitable in a changing and developing economy often work hardships on individuals. Through their Federal Government, they have wisely provided in the past, and should continue to provide in the future, a program of social security—for example, unemployment insurance and old-age pensions—for the benefit of those who are unable to work or, if able and willing to work, are for any reason whatever unable to find sufficiently remunerative employment to protect themselves against want. Such individual protection against hazards should be still further extended and as rapidly as practicable.

Fifth, I believe that the common enterprises in which we engage—and the greatest of our common enterprises is Government itself—need not be wasteful, inefficient or unimaginative. When Government suffers from these ailments, it is primarily because the citizens fail in vigilance. With the heavy responsibilities facing America abroad, we must clean up Government waste and inefficiency.

This five-point creed has guided my record in public service for the past 15 years—and the votes I cast in the Senate this past year. Thus I supported the Marshall plan, and added my own proposals for a great Marshall plan of ideas which I shall tell you more about in a later broadcast. Thus I have supported a strong defense establishment, but opposed the idea of a preventive war. Thus I have fought for a better break for small-business men, about which I shall tell you more next week. Thus I have supported the new Social Security Act and added my own plea for protection of mothers with dependent children—which was accepted by the Senate. Thus I led the fight with four speeches on the Senate floor for the Hoover Commission proposals—a largely successful fight to increase the efficiency and economy of our Federal Government.

As your Senator I believe I have been loyal to the creed I have set forth. Often, I'm sure, you won't agree with my individual votes. I'm sure the people of Connecticut will agree with the over-all pattern. Often the issue on a single vote is not clear, measured against my five principles, or in any other way. Often the vote is difficult because the principles are broad and the legislation must be specific.

I hope you will write me care of this station and let me send you material about my 15 years in public service, and notably about my record in the Senate, and contrast this with my opponent's record.

I like to think that my Senate record has been based not only on principle but on courage and independence in the application of principle. Next week I shall give you some examples which bear on this.

I began this talk tonight by stating that the people of Connecticut, in choosing two Senators and six Congressmen next month, may well decide the future course of America. The Congress is dominated by its committee chairmen, who are always members of the majority party. Under the seniority rule, we know right now who would wield the power if the Republicans win control. Do you want Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, to be chairman of the important Committee on Expenditures? Do you want Senator CAIN, who fights the battles of the real-estate lobby, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works? Do you want to put into power a party powerfully influenced by Senator JENNER, who recently described the career of General Marshall as a "living lie"? One of the most powerful men in Congress is the

chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. That would be Representative TABER who called the Marshall plan "operation rathole." Do you want this country and its foreign policy turned over to Senator TAFT and Senator WHERRY? Senator TAFT you know voted against the Atlantic Pact, against military assistance, point 4, and Marshall plan appropriations.

These men sound like a roster of the Chicago Tribune's hall of fame. Are these the men who can lead us toward the peace of mind and quiet of soul we so fervently pray for?

I cannot promise you that we shall achieve peace of mind and quiet of soul in our time, in your generation or mine. Indeed I can promise you little except that I shall fight for your interests as I see them, even when sometimes I think the majority of you may not agree with me.

But even when our own progress is slow, we must continue to work for peace of mind and quiet of soul—in our children's time. That should be our common goal, our common good. Let us rededicate ourselves anew to this great effort.

Barring of Soviet Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD several news dispatches, which appeared recently relative to the barring of trade with the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 28, 1950]

WAR AID TO SOVIET DENIED BY BRITAIN—LABOR MINISTER CONTRADICTS CHURCHILL, BUT COMPANY HEAD SUPPORTS ALLEGATION

LONDON, August 27.—Arthur G. Bottomley, Secretary for Overseas Trade in the British Labor Government, said today that in trading with the Soviet Union, Britain had taken care not to send any commodities that might contribute to the Soviet Union's war potential.

At the same time, however, a British machine tool manufacturer said that his company was producing equipment ordered for the Soviet Union and Poland in 1948 that could easily be converted for making armaments.

Mr. Bottomley's statement was a comment on the allegation made by the Conservative Party leader, Winston Churchill, in a radio broadcast last night that machine tools, particularly of the class required for the manufacture and repair of tanks, were being produced in this country for the Soviet Union.

"In supplying goods to Russia, Britain has been careful to withhold any commodities which come into the category of strategic priority," Mr. Bottomley said.

Mr. Bottomley, who negotiated Britain's trade arrangements with the Soviet Union, both this year and last, added:

"What has happened is that we have had essential supplies from Russia in the shape of grain and timber and in return we have had to make payment."

GRAIN, TIMBER RECEIVED

Last year Britain received 1,000,000 tons of coarse grain from the Soviet Union and 100,000 standards of timber. This year arrangements have been made for the supply of 150,000 standards of timber."

"The goods supplied by Britain [to the Soviet Union], while covering a wide range, have been outside the category of those necessary for building up war potential," Mr. Bottomley said.

This statement seemed at variance with Mr. Churchill's remark last night that the head of Craven Bros'. machine-tool works had been asking the Government for 2 years whether he should fulfill contracts for making machine tools for the Soviet Union, particularly tools of the class required for tank manufacturing and repair.

The head of the company, Mr. Churchill stated, had said that his workmen were disturbed at doing work of that kind for the Soviet Union and Poland and did not like to have Soviet Government inspectors in their workshops.

J. R. Greenwood, chairman and managing director of Craven Bros., supported Mr. Churchill's statement today. Mr. Greenwood stated that his company was about to complete the first of the orders for the Soviet Union, placed from 2½ years to 18 months ago.

"We have been doing business with Russia for 20 years," Mr. Greenwood said. "I have built up that side of our output. I, and the company, want to go on doing the work, but under present conditions we have to ask ourselves, 'Are we doing the right thing?'"

Mr. Greenwood said he had been putting that question to the Government for 2 years, but could "get nowhere."

CAPABLE OF CONVERSION

Mr. Greenwood, who said that the £1,000,000 worth of tools being made in his plant for the Soviet Union and Poland could be converted to arms-manufacturing purposes, suggested that the orders be suspended, not canceled, and the tools retained in this country for Britain's own rearmament program.

Some of the items would be prohibited for export if ordered now, but since the orders were placed in 1948 the Government had ruled that deliveries should be made, he added.

Trade with the Soviet Union and its satellites is governed by "stop lists" of prohibited goods issued by the British Government. One list was issued in 1949 and another last month, but they do not apply to 1948 orders.

As to another part of Mr. Churchill's statement, J. Hulme, senior works convenor at Craven Bros. and a Labor Party member of the Stockport Town Council, said:

"I don't think the men were aware of the Russian orders, but, in any case, they are not likely to be concerned, as they are used to it. Between the two wars it was Russian orders that kept Cravens going."

Mr. Hulme said he understood that there was a Russian inspector at the works 6 weeks to 2 months ago.

Mr. Greenwood said that the Russians were inquiring about 10 days ago when their inspectors might come and see the work now scheduled for completion.

[From the Wall Street Journal of September 6, 1950]

ALLIES SHOULD BAR ALL MACHINE TOOLS FROM RUSSIA, SAYS BERNA—INDUSTRY SPOKESMAN ASSERTS ANY TYPE CAN BE USED FOR WAR WEAPONS PRODUCTION

CLEVELAND.—Any machine tool can be used in armament building and therefore all types, not merely a select list, should be barred from Soviet-dominated countries by England and west Germany, Tell Berna, general manager of the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, declared here.

The reply of Prime Minister Attlee to Winston Churchill that England is not shipping machines of strategic importance to Russian-dominated countries, he said, either reveals an "incredible ignorance" of machine tool users or is a "political cover-up."

"You cannot say that a certain machine is to be used for tractors and therefore will not be used for tanks. All machine tools, of whatever category, have their place in production for war. Recognition of this basic premise is the only sound foundation for the determination of policy regarding sales to Russia and her satellites," said Mr. Berna.

"According to Mr. Attlee," said Mr. Berna, "exports of machine tools 'regarded as of key importance for strategic purposes' were stopped 18 months ago, except in the case of contracts already concluded before that date.

"The fact is that any engineer, for that matter any workman in a metalworking plant, knows that all machine tools, of whatever nature, are used in war production. The withholding of a few types of machines merely gives lip service to the problem. In fact, the types withheld can be built on the machines received."

But aside from these facts, he asked, why are British "shipments of these very machines still continuing on contracts concluded prior to 18 months ago?"

"Two and a half years ago, the United States Government stopped shipments of all types of American machine tools to Russia and satellite nations, even though these machines had been built in fulfillment of contracts concluded before that time," he declared. "Meanwhile, England continues to ship not only quantities of machine tools which Attlee says will not 'damage essential defense needs,' but in addition keeps right on supplying the Russians with machines of the very types which he himself states are 'regarded as of key importance for strategic purposes.'"

This same contradictory policy is also being exhibited in allied-occupied west Germany, Mr. Berna said, where authorities have issued a list of types of machine tools, made in west German plants, which are not permitted to be exported to Soviet countries.

[From the New York Times of September 8, 1950]

UNION GETS BEHIND BAN ON RED GOODS—INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION ATLANTIC COUNCIL REBUFFS TRUMAN AND ASKS ARMY, NAVY, AND TOBIN FOR ADVICE

The 3-week boycott of Russian cargoes by longshoremen here became official yesterday afternoon. The Atlantic District Council of the International Longshoremen's Association, A. F. of L., unanimously approved a resolution barring the handling of such goods, except for commodities "essential to the United States defense or civilian economy."

The action of the council, which convened yesterday morning at 164 Eleventh Avenue to discuss a wage review with employing stevedores, was a rebuff to President Truman, who had said last week that the Government and not the longshoremen would set the foreign policy of this country.

The group qualified its stand somewhat by saying in a telegram to Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin that it would handle such goods as were deemed by the Government to be necessary for defense or civilian economy. It added that the longshoremen must have the assurance of some high Army or Navy officials as to just what the necessary cargoes are.

On Tuesday, Mr. Tobin wired Joseph P. Ryan, union president, expressing appreciation of the patriotic zeal of the union's membership, but pointing out that it was essential that necessary products continue to be landed.

UNION ASKS TOBIN'S ADVICE

The council deferred action on handling goods from Russian satellite countries and asked for further policy information from the Secretary of Labor. It is such cargoes that have caused most of the protests from American businessmen.

Mr. Ryan said he had asked Mr. Tobin for explicit information as to just what policy the United States has framed on exports and imports in full consideration of the problems of national security and national interest. He added the opinion that the council probably would make some decision today or tomorrow.

The council, while deferring its decision on goods from satellite nations, did issue a specific ban against goods aboard the Gdynia America liner *Batory*, due to dock at West Forty-eighth Street late this afternoon.

Mr. Ryan said the longshoremen would handle all passenger baggage and mail, but no more, and that the same practice would hold for the vessel's departure next week.

The Polish liner will again be the object of intensive search by customs agents. Forty men will board the vessel in the lower bay about noon and give her a thorough going-over in line with the Government's port security plan.

The vessel was subjected to a similar search the last time she arrived here.

MUCH CARGO STAYS PUT

Meanwhile, 2,000 cases of Polish hams and nearly 600 tons of miscellaneous cargo from Czechoslovakia remained in the holds of vessels moored at piers 60 and 61 in the North River as longshoremen refused to handle it. Members of Local 791, the same group that instituted the embargo on August 14, they have steadfastly maintained their determination to touch no cargoes from Russia or satellite nations.

James Sullivan, shop steward for the local, said that the hams arrived Friday on the freighter *American Traveler* and the Czechoslovakian goods, largely shoes and glassware, arrived yesterday aboard the *American Judge*. Both vessels are operated by the United States Lines.

Mr. Ryan said the union would prefer to have the Government furnish a list of necessary commodities but, recognizing the difficulty of preparing such a list, it wanted at least advice on the nature of the arriving Russian cargoes.

The ILA president once again defended the spontaneous patriotic action of the longshoremen in refusing to handle the Russian goods. He said the great majority of the men working the docks have seen service in either of the two World Wars and "they don't have to have lessons in patriotism taught to them."

DENIES VFW MERITS CREDIT

He took issue with the Port of New York Longshoremen, post 7095, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which, he said, is claiming credit for having instigated the ban on cargoes from the Soviet Union. Mr. Ryan said the union wanted it understood that the ILA's New York District Council, its Atlantic coast district, and its executive council had approved the action of the men, and he added that these groups, and not any outside organization, would dictate the policies of the union.

Prior to yesterday's 3-hour meeting of the Atlantic District Council, John F. Condon, 33-year-old commander of the VFW post, said that British stevedores would be asked to aid the embargo on Red goods.

Mr. Condon said local longshoremen would distribute mimeographed statements headed, "Don't work for Russia," in the holds of the Cunard liners *Queen Elizabeth* and *Mauretania*, both of which were in port yesterday, and attach them to packages in the vessels' holds.

Mr. Condon was not a delegate to the council and therefore could not attend the meeting.

IMPORTERS PROTEST

Representatives of two importers' groups sought unsuccessfully to attend the meeting to urge that they be permitted to bring in $625,000 worth of merchandise from Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Mitchell Bogaty, of 246 Fifth Avenue, said that eight American concerns for which he is the buyer already have paid down in irrevocable letters of credit approximately $125,000 for Polish-made willow laundry and shopping baskets.

Mr. Bogaty said that orders for $500,000 of such goods had been placed in January and that deliveries had been arriving with each docking of the *Batory*. He said baskets with a wholesale value of $35,000 were due today aboard the Polish ship.

Another protest was made by Max Grossberg, an importer, of 1214 Broadway, and a director of the United States Stone and Bead Importers Association. He said that the group's 60 members probably had $500,000 tied up in letters of credit for the purchase of Czechoslovak rhinestones.

Mr. Grossberg said "They've penalized the importer—the satellite countries have our money and we have no goods."

Informed of the complaints, Mr. Ryan commented that "this might teach them not to do business with Russia and her allies."

[From the Journal of Commerce of September 13, 1950]

FEAR SOVIET STILL GETTING VITAL ITEMS

(By George Cheely)

WASHINGTON, September 12.—United States-produced strategic materials may still be falling into Russian hands, a Commerce Department export control director admitted today.

"We cannot get assurances that controlled goods are not being transshipped to Russia or Soviet-dominated countries," John F. Havener, Assistant Director of the Office of Industry and Commerce, told a House Interstate Commerce Subcommittee.

REPORTS SOME PRODUCTS

Greater cooperation from importing nations is required, he said, and the State Department is making substantial progress after 2 years of attempts to get Atlantic Pact nations to control exports to the Russian bloc.

In reply to questions by Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON (Republican, New Jersey), Havener said he does not believe it wise to block all shipments of strategic commodities pending better controls. Much of this trade is with Atlantic Pact and ECA countries, he said, and is actually a part of our defense program.

Representative CARL HINSHAW (Republican, California) said there is "no cooperation at all between the British and ourselves."

The British, he said, had allowed a firm to offer atomic energy materials to Holland after our Atomic Energy Commission had refused to grant export licenses to Holland for the very important gadgets.

REPETITIONS POSSIBLE

The inquiry was prompted in large part by the fact that at least one molybdenum shipment to Britain was resold to Russia. Havener said that repetitions of this transaction are possible, since we cannot check the end-use of every shipment.

The reputations of the exporter and the importer and the normal requirements of the importing country generally are used as the basis for determining whether transshipment is likely, Havener said.

Export licensing is done according to the comprehensive export schedule, program determinations of the Commerce Secretary's interagency advisory committee, and the strategic rating of the commodity, he added.

CALLED SECRET INFORMATION

Program determinations and strategic ratings are both secret information, he said, but would be shown the subcommittee in closed session.

Under questioning, Havener admitted that "we should have more end-use checks," but said the Department is too short of money and staff. WOLVERTON exploded at this "same old reply," and demanded some action.

WOLVERTON asked if former export control officials William Remington and Michael Lee, under fire for allegedly having concealed Communist affiliations, had a hand in shaping export controls. Havener admitted that both had served at one time in the Office of International Trade, but denied that either had helped set policy.

WOLVERTON also asked for a full report on the *Flying Arrow*, an Isbrandtsen Line vessel that tried unsuccessfully to run the Nationalist Chinese blockade of Red China earlier this year. He said he understood the cargo was petroleum, a controlled item. Havener said he would give the committee the details on Thursday.

HINSHAW called attention to news reports that Russia is stockpiling rubber and demanded to know why rubber V belts were recently taken off the control list. Havener said the advisory committee had decided they were not of sufficient strategic importance.

HINSHAW referred to a trade advertisement that the V belts are used in a new landing gear which enables the B–36 and other large planes to land on soft ground. "I suggest the committee take another look," he concluded.

[From the New York Times of September 19, 1950]

GREEN WOULD BAR ALL SOVIET TRADE—TELLS A. F. OF L. CONVENTION THIS MIGHT AWAKEN RUSSIANS TO SERIOUSNESS OF SITUATION

(By Louis Stark)

HOUSTON, September 18.—William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, today advocated a complete American boycott of trade with the Soviet Union.

In his keynote speech opening the federation's sixty-ninth convention, Mr. Green blamed Russia for the failure of the world to establish international peace and security since the end of World War II.

Recalling the federation's action in asking the Government to stop sending scrap iron to Japan prior to Pearl Harbor, Mr. Green said that labor saw the danger of war at that time before any other group.

The present world situation parallels the events that led up to World War II, Mr. Green told the 700 delegates.

Then he added:

"I am of the opinion that this convention should call upon our Government now to stop buying anything from or selling anything to Russia.

"Stop shipping goods to Russia from America because it will use them for the purpose of preparing for war."

Prolonged applause by the delegates interrupted Mr. Green. When it subsided he said that a trade boycott against Russia would perhaps awaken them to the seriousness of the situation and make a genuine contribution toward the promotion of international peace and security.

PAYS TRIBUTE TO GOMPERS

In the presence of an unusually large delegation of fraternal delegates and visitors from foreign countries, Mr. Green summarized the federation's viewpoint on the outstanding questions of the day.

He opposed a wage freeze at this time, predicted the eventual repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, and pointed to the passage of a liberalized Social Security Act, which he said was drafted by the A. F. of L.

Standing in front of an enormous picture of Samuel Gompers, his predecessor, Mr. Green paid a tribute to the founder and first president of the federation. He referred to the celebration of the centennial of Mr. Gomper's birth, which is now under way, and pledged that the organization would carry out the philosophy espoused by Mr. Gompers.

This observation was a reiteration of his promise on opening the convention that the federation would not "follow byways of ideological experimentation" but would "fight against infiltration by any ideology."

In his summary of the international situation Mr. Green denounced the "lying misrepresentations that have been made by the Soviet Government in which they accuse America of being responsible for this terrible situation in Korea."

CITES RISE IN LIVING COST

Mr. Green dwelt at length on the rise in living costs since last March, and particularly since the Korean invasion on June 25.

"What we are determined to do," he said, "is to fight with all the power that we possess to lift the wage level up so that it is established on a parity with prices before there is any freezing of wages."

The speaker reviewed organized labor's fight against the Taft-Hartley Act, pointing out that its repeal was advocated in the Democratic platform in 1948, and yet some Democrats, particularly southerners, had joined Republicans in opposing repeal.

Mr. Green added that the Democrat who voted against his party platform sacrificed his honor.

Resolutions proposed today and referred to committees called for an increase in the Federal minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour, creation of a foreign affairs training school for labor spokesmen, denunciation of the so-called Stockholm peace petition of a colossal hoax sponsored by Russia, and moderation of tariff policies when they meant unemployment in this country.

President Truman praised the work of the labor press in a message to the annual convention of the International Labor Press of America, now in session. He said that the labor press "can keep American workers aware of their responsibilities in producing the goods and materials needed in the present situation."

"This," he added, "calls for production at full speed and without interruption for the protection of our free institutions and those of liberty-loving peoples the world over."

Providing for the Designation of the Reservoir To Be Formed by the Davis Dam on the Colorado River as Lake Mohave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, Public Law 538, Eighty-first Congress, second session, providing for the designation of the reservoir to be formed by the Davis Dam on the Colorado River at Lake Mohave, passed as a result of the introduction on June 2, 1949, of Senate bill 2117 by the junior Senator from Nevada.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2117

An act to provide for the designation of the reservoir to be formed by the Davis Dam on the Colorado River as Lake Mohave

Be it enacted, etc., That the reservoir to be formed by the impounding of the waters of the Colorado River by the Davis Dam now under construction shall be known and designated on the public records as Lake Mohave.

Approved June 14, 1950.

Industry Opposes Tariff Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Daniel Small, textile editor of the Journal of Commerce, May 23, 1950; a column by George Rothwell Brown, New York Journal-American, June 27, 1950; and several news dispatches concerning industry and the proposed tariff cut.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce of May 23, 1950]

ENTIRE TEXTILE INDUSTRY MUST MAINTAIN FIGHT AGAINST FURTHER TARIFF CUTS

(By Daniel Small)

Representatives of most sections of the textile industry have already filed their briefs with the Committee for Reciprocity Information taking a stand on the Government proposal to negotiate further tariff cuts on many textile items.

These industry spokesmen are unanimous in opposing these further cuts and some have asked for a raise—rather than further reductions—in the textile tariff structure. Any other stand on the part of the textile industry would be extremely surprising. There is no single segment of the textile industry which does not face sharp and dangerous competition from low-wage producers throughout the world.

According to all reports, the textile industry has long been regarded by the State Department as one of the major expendable trades in this country. The fact that so many other countries make textiles and find it easy to expand this industry has always led Government officials to accept the fact that the path of their products into this country should be made easy. The fact that the textile industry is one of the largest employers has apparently meant little. It has been argued that if textile mills are displaced by foreign producers selling here this will mean that more dollars have become available to such producers to buy other United States products, thereby opening up new employment possibilities for unemployed textile workers.

There can be no minimizing the threat of foreign textile producers to the American industry. In a brief presented by the cotton-textile industry, it is pointed out that the export trade has already dropped more than $500,000,000 due to devaluation of foreign currencies and increased low-cost foreign competition. The export trade had become a vital section of the expanded and prosperous textile industry in the postwar period. It helped maintain peak employment. At present, due largely to foreign competition, United States exports of cotton cloth are running at less than a third of the peak period in 1947.

The loss of such export sales is as important as the loss of sales in the home market. Every yard of cloth not sold abroad because of cheap foreign competition comes home to roost in the home market or more likely is not produced at all, thereby reducing sales and employment.

Accompanying the loss of cotton-textile export markets (which will apply to rayon cloth as well) is an ever-growing volume of imports of textiles and textile items into this country. These have been rising steadily, and there is every reason to believe the rise will continue. Lowered tariffs would make such an increase even more certain.

In the wool-textile industry the import threat is always present—mostly from Great Britain. In previous years most imports seem to have been concentrated upon quality goods, but further reductions in tariff, combined with devaluation, will open the way for medium and lower end fabrics. In the next few years the substantial tariff reductions on these goods, which started in 1939, will receive their first full test.

In the cotton- and rayon-goods import picture the threat comes from Japan first, then from England, Germany, Italy, and other nations. These low-wage areas have not yet trained their export guns fully on this market, but may be expected to make ever greater efforts as they fill the needs of their other markets. A definite tendency in recent months has been for manufactured cotton and rayon goods to arrive here. Such items as handkerchiefs, tablecloths, napkins, etc., which require more labor than just the cloth, are more susceptible to arriving here below domestic prices because of the greater labor-cost content.

It is important that the entire textile industry keep up a strong fight against any further cuts in tariff until the present duties have had the full test of a world competitive market. American producers are already suffering from foreign competition—which is just beginning to assume a clear-cut postwar pattern. The welfare of every member of the textile industry is involved in this battle for protection against low-wage foreign competition.

[From the New York Journal-American of June 27, 1950]

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. Va., June 27.—Although West Virginia will choose neither Governor nor United States Senator this year, it is one of the States well worth watching in the November elections, because of the tip-off that may be given here on the importance of the tariff issue in 1952.

In many of the industrial States, as disclosed by their Governors at the recent gathering of State executives at White Sulphur Springs, the impact on American business and American labor of increasing foreign import is reflected as yet only in scattered localities.

But in West Virginia three of the leading industries are in trouble because of the Roosevelt-Hull-Acheson low-tariff policy, which is slowly but surely imperiling the American high standard of living, as the result of an overdose of altruism for the dear foreigner.

These West Virginia victims of free trade are pottery, coal, and glass.

As a result, in all six of the congressional districts the Republican aspirants will line up against the reciprocal trade agreements law.

Thus there is likely to be a significant test in this State of the tariff as a major issue for the Republican Party in the forthcoming Presidential campaign.

West Virginia's important coal industry has been hardest hit perhaps of any basic industry in the country.

It is estimated that there is 15 percent of unemployment in the coal mines, and the State's sales tax has been cut by from 18 to 20 percent.

The competition of oil is really something for the people here to worry about.

An interesting outgrowth of this general situation is the probability that former Democratic Senator Rush D. Holt, now a member of the legislature, will formally change his registration and become the coalition candidate, as a Republican, for the seat in Congress in the Third Congressional District, now represented by CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, Democrat, of Clarksburg.

The district went Democratic in 1948 by nearly 17,000. But the Republicans carried it in 1946 by about 2,500, and Holt believes that conditions this year will duplicate those of 4 years ago, when the Republican Party carried the House of Representatives.

Coal and glass are the two industries in this district which are feeling the baleful effect of the Truman economic and foreign policies.

It will be recalled that young Rush Holt, elected to the Senate in the Roosevelt era at so young an age that he had to wait 6 months before he could qualify as a Senator under the Constitution, turned to be the bad boy of the early New Deal.

He broke with the Roosevelt Administration when he began showing up the waste, extravagance, and crooked politics in the various boondoggling projects initiated by F. D. R. It eventually cost him his seat in the Senate, from which he retired in 1941. Then he came back to West Virginia where, in 1942, he was elected to the legislature as a Republican. He has been there ever since.

What is especially valuable to him today as a prospective coalition candidate for Congress on the tariff issue, is the fact that while in the Senate he twice bucked Roosevelt by voting against the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

If Holt decides to run as a Republican he must act to change his registration by July 1.

Republican chances are also said to be looking up this year in the First Congressional District, generally strongly Democratic but which went Republican in 1946 by about 5,000, and in the fourth, another Democratic district which the Republicans also carried in 1946.

The tariff issue as it develops in West Virginia will be watched closely by politicians of both parties.

[From the Journal of Commerce of May 12, 1950]

EIGHT-MONTH DELAY IN TARIFF INCREASE RULING QUESTIONED—DECISION ON COMPLAINT BY NUT GROWERS MADE AFTER ANNECY PACT

WASHINGTON, May 8.—The United States Tariff Commission denied at the end of the week an application for a tariff increase on the grounds that the item was included in a trade agreement, but it waited almost 8 months for the trade agreement to become effective before it issued its denial.

Four days after the trade agreement was ratified the Commission said it could not increase the tariff because the item was now in a trade agreement.

NUT GROWERS' COMPLAINT

On September 2, 1949, the Northwest Nut Growers, of Dundee, Oreg., filed application with the Commission for an increase in duty on unshelled filbert nuts, citing Section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930. When the application was filed the United States was negotiating a trade agreement with Italy on this product at Annecy.

Section 336 provides that the Commission may increase United States duties on the basis of a comparison between United States and foreign production costs.

But, on the other hand, section 2 (a) of the Trade Agreements Act says that section 336 may not be used when the product in question is already subject to a trade agreement.

On May 4, almost 8 months later and only 4 days after the agreement was signed, the Commission denied and dismissed the application of September 2, stating:

CITED ANNECY PACT

"The application was dismissed because filberts, not shelled, have been included in the Annecy agreement which was concluded under the Trade Agreements Act. Section 2 (a) of that act forbids the application of section 336 to such articles. The concession was negotiated with Italy."

Italy signed the Annecy agreement on April 30, and the President has not yet issued the proclamation without which the agreement cannot become effective.

A similar application from the Northwest Nut Growers, filed January 26, 1949, was dismissed April 8, 1949.

LEAD COMPANIES ASK HIGHER TARIFF—21 FIRMS CITE MINE SHUT-DOWN RESULTING FROM HIGHER IMPORTS

A group of 21 lead companies from Alaska and the United States yesterday asked the United States Tariff Commission to boost lead import duties to prevent further serious injury to domestic producers caused by an unprecedented volume of shipments from abroad.

Organized as the Emergency Lead Committee, the group includes several of the top companies in the industry, including St. Joseph Lead Co., New York; Eagle-Picher Mining & Smelting Co., Joplin, Mo.; United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co., Boston, Mass., and Bunker Hill & Sullivan Mining & Concentrating Co., Kellogg, Idaho.

REPORT MINE SHUT-DOWNS

The committee said in its petition to the Commission that the present emergency lead situation has forced the shut-down of some highly important lead mines in Utah, and is threatening a similar result elsewhere throughout the West and Middle West.

The group named as the principal source of these lead imports Mexico, Canada, Australia, Peru, Germany, and Yugoslavia. It attributed the rise in incoming shipments to reduced tariff levels established in the Mexican agreement of 1943, last year's series of currency devaluations, and the 1948 cut in the value of Mexico peso.

The petition asked, in effect, two increases in the duties on lead ores and metal. The committee urged that the Commission recommend to the President that he cancel the 50 percent reduction in the 1930 rates—1½ cents per pound on lead ores and 2⅛ cents per pound on lead metal—effected in the Mexican trade agreement and, and further increase duties 50 percent over the 1930 level to 2¼ cents on ores and concentrates and $3\frac{3}{16}$ cents for metal and bullion.

CITE INFLATION

The 50 percent advance over 1930 tariff levels, the committee indicated, is required to adjust duties to current, higher price levels, for lead tariffs are fixed on the basis of quantity rather than as a percentage of value.

Lead imports, the group said, reached a peacetime peak in 1949 when they were equivalent to 99 percent of domestic mine production compared with an 11.3 percent proportion in the period 1930–39. Imports in 1949 totaled 399,500 short tons compared with 86,800 in 1939, according to figures presented in the petition.

The companies charged that the record-breaking peacetime flood of lead imports and lower domestic consumption have precipitated a sharp price decline which is causing distress bordering on demoralization in the lead-mining industry.

[From the Journal of Commerce of May 23, 1950]

NFT TO OPPOSE MORE TARIFF CUTS—TEXTILE INDUSTRY MADE EXPENDABLE TO FOREIGN TRADE, BLUNT DECLARES

The philosophy of the State Department that the United States textile industry is expendable in the cause of international trade will be vigorously opposed by the National Federation of Textiles, Inc., the group said in a brief filed with the Tariff Commission protesting further tariff cuts, expected to be negotiated at Torquay, England, this September.

The Federation's executive and tariff committees, through Miss Irene Blunt, secretary of the NFT, announced their disfavor with the inclusion of textile items in each negotiating session, as a bribe to the textile strong countries in building their exports.

"Particularly, the two principal beneficiaries, Japan and Germany, as far as rayon and silk are concerned, will not take part in the conference. The concessions are being made ostensibly for other countries," Miss Blunt said.

"This is what happened before. The concession made to France at Geneva in reducing the rate on finished silks valued at $5 or more a pound reacted almost entirely to Japan's benefit, not to France," Miss Blunt added.

SILK PEOPLE PROTEST

"The effect of that last reduction to 25 percent can be seen in the protests made by the silk-weaving firms of Paterson and eastern Pennsylvania to Government officials in the Army, State Department, the Tariff Commission, and now the Customs. Scarf makers in the United States are facing loss of employment, too, because silk scarfs already hemmed and ready for use are coming in at absurdly low prices, entirely beyond the reach of these employing American sewing workers," Miss Blunt stated.

The NFT is collating information on domestic operations and import values and quantities in readiness for meeting the fabric discussions.

[From the Journal of Commerce of June 2, 1950]

TUNG-OIL GROUP ASKS TARIFF AID

WASHINGTON, June 1.—Tung-oil producers made a bid today for tariff protection for their industry in the interest of national defense when the Government reopens reciprocal trade talks next fall.

But they were told by George B. L. Arner, chairman of the agricultural panel of the committee for reciprocity information, that his group has no authority to recommend tariffs on a commodity that already is on the free list.

W. Wilson Kilby, representing the American Tung Oil Association, warned that if the United States gets into a shooting war, the entire import supply of this strategic material would be shut off overnight. He said tung oil's importance was recognized by Congress in providing a mandatory price-support program for it.

PROTESTS COMMUNIST AID

Thomas Crawford, secretary-treasurer of the Tung Growers Council of America, also asked the committee to see "if there is any way to take tung oil off the free list and give us some protection." He declared it the height of foolhardiness to allow Communist

China to earn dollars through duty-free oil exports to this country.

He pointed out that all competitive drying oils are protected by tariffs and that paints and varnishes which use tung oil receive the same protection.

Ammon Dunton, counsel for the National Fisheries Institute, also pleaded against tariff reductions on fats and oils, pointing to the huge domestic production of 11,600,000,000 pounds in 1949 which forced prices for menhaden fish oils from a high of 22 cents to a low of 4.9 cents a pound in less than 2 years.

Instead, he said the Government should be considering an increase in tariffs to protect this blossoming United States industry. He said fish-oil producers are doomed if tariffs are reduced further.

WARNS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

The State Department's proposal to negotiate tariff reductions this year on a large list of chemicals will endanger national defense and may cause serious losses and unemployment in America's domestic chemical industry, according to William P. Marsh, president of United States Industrial Chemicals, Inc. A brief explaining USI's position, Mr. Marsh said, already has been filed with the committee for reciprocity information.

The company's brief recommends that tariff duties on the following chemicals in particular should be maintained at existing levels: Synthetic resins, acetic acid, acetaldehyde, butyraldehyde, ethylene glycol, acetone, methyl ethyl ketone, amyl alcohol, fusel oil, butyl alcohol, propyl alcohol, ethyl ether, and collodion and other pyroxylin solutions.

CALIFORNIA WINE MEN CHARGE LOWERED TARIFF IS RUINOUS—URGE INDUSTRY MEMBERS TO WRITE CONGRESS, BATTLE AGAINST DECREASING TARIFF PROTECTION—CITE 15-YEAR RECORD TO SUPPORT CHARGES

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., June 1.—Calling upon all phases of the California and national domestic wine industry, the Wine Institute urged adoption of resolutions by associations; letters to Congressmen from individuals, and contacting candidates for political office as methods to battle against elimination of tariff protection for American wine, in the Wine Institute Bulletin to members.

The information contained in the bulletin is part of the campaign that group is waging against proposed tariff cuts on different types of wine.

In discussing previous tariff reductions, the bulletin stated:

TARIFF RECORD

"The tariff record since 1930 is one of repeated and drastic slashes in import duties on most classes of wines and grape products. In the last 15 years United States import duties have been trimmed as follows:

	Percent
Foreign table wines, bottled	68
Foreign table wines, in bulk	40
Foreign sparkling wines valued at not more than $6 per gallon	67
Foreign sparkling wines valued at more than $6 per gallon	75
Foreign Vermouth, bottled	75
Foreign Vermouth, in bulk	50
Foreign brandy	75
Foreign wine vinegar	50
Foreign cream of tartar	25
Foreign tartaric acid	25

"Additional tariff reductions are now officially proposed on most major items listed above, plus dessert wines. Specifically included among the subjects for negotiation in Torquay, England, beginning September 28, 1950, are table and dessert wines; sparkling wines valued at not more than $6 per gallon; argols, tartar and wine lees, containing 90 percent or more of potassium bitartrate; Rochelle salts or potassium-sodium tartrate. Hearings on the proposed reduction already have started in Washington, D. C., and will be continued at intervals until next September.

"The American vineyard industry has been singled out for tariff slashes because it is a specialized farm industry largely concentrated in a few States. Only a few Members of Congress represent grape-growing constituencies."

AMERICAN INDUSTRY HURT

"Approval of the proposed reductions in dessert wine duties, which have not been tampered with in the last 15 years, would turn over the United States dessert wine market to such countries as Spain, Portugal, Argentina, Algeria, and Italy. A few million extra gallons of cheap foreign dessert wine would be enough to break the American market, causing inventory losses of tens of millions of dollars, destroying markets for California and other United States grapes.

"These tariff cuts can be blocked, but only if all members of the grape and wine industry and all of their friends in other branches of agriculture and in allied industries join in fighting this attack on the vineyard industry."

FAVORED TARGETS

"The specialty crops of the United States have been for many years the favorite targets of the low-tariff proponents. For two decades these specialty crops have been sacrificed on the international bargaining table. Western agriculture has suffered the most heavily from tariff cuts, and western agriculture of necessity must take the lead in halting the systematic destruction of its specialized farm industries."

[From the Journal of Commerce of June 6, 1950]

FATS, OILS GROUP FIGHTS TARIFF CUT

WASHINGTON, June 5.—Representatives of fats and oils concerns today branded present tariffs inadequate and protested any reductions that would affect the industry.

In the last normal year, 1938, imports amounted to 30 percent of the national stearic acid consumption, L. B. Platt told the committee for reciprocity information. His firm, Stevenson, Jordan & Harrison, Inc., New York City, represents 11 major fats and oils concerns.

The present tariff of 12½ percent will allow stearic acid imports to displace domestic supply, Platt said. This would be reflected in the tallow market with lower prices to the farmer for livestock and higher prices to the consumer for beef, he added. The lower requirements of soap manufacturers—now concentrating on detergents—will add to this situation, Platt said.

The diversified uses of fatty acids—in plastics, rubber, pharmaceuticals, and explosives—are vital to the national defense, he argued, and must not diminish because of cheap European imports. Lower wages are the chief reason for the lower selling price of imports, Platt said.

I. M. Colbeth, the Baker Castor Oil Co., New York, agreed that tariffs and fats and oils products should not be cut. He pointed out that castor oil is an important industry item, but one that can be easily threatened by cheap imports.

R. D. Parker, president of the Dry Color Manufacturers Association, New York, asked for retention of present duties on inorganic pigments such as sodium bichromate and zinc chromate. C. H. Love, C. K. Williams & Co., Easton, Pa., supported this view, saying that German manufacturers would soon challenge domestic firms for United States trade.

Donald Cole, H. J. Baker & Bros., New York, spoke for continuation of present tariff rates on precipitated chalk. William W. Walker, McAndrews & Forbes Co., New York, and R. T. Goodwin, the J. S. Young Co., Baltimore, urged that tariffs on licorice extracts remain at present levels.

[From the Journal of Commerce of June 9, 1950]

NEW CHEMICALS TARIFF CUTS SEEN PERILING JOBS, RESEARCH

WASHINGTON, June 8.—American and British makers of organic chemicals locked horns today over proposed tariff reductions for imports of intermediates, dyestuffs, and other organic products.

Appearing before the committee for reciprocity information, officials of the Synthetic Organic Chemicals Manufacturing Association definitely opposed any reductions, while representatives of Imperial Chemical Industries, New York, maintained that low-cost imports would do no harm to American industry. The Plastics Materials Manufacturers Association took issue with similar claims the ICI had made earlier in regard to plastics raw materials.

Research and development staffs will be the first to be cut, if tariffs are reduced to allow substantial quantities of basic organic chemicals to be imported, Synthetic Organic Chemicals Association President Sidney Moody declared. Lower costs of imports generally being proportionately lower labor costs, Moody said.

Stewart Hotchkiss, consulting engineer for the association, declared that although supplies have not met demand in Europe, there they will by 1952 and that there will be a world surplus in intermediates in 1953.

QUESTIONS WAGE COMPARISONS

"There is little opportunity to employ labor-saving devices in organics manufacture because of the 'batch' nature of the industry," Moody said. "Labor costs in the United States are from four to six times those in Europe," Hotchkiss reported.

Percy A. Shay, representing ICI, called American tariffs on coal-tar intermediates "the highest anywhere in the world." "The 45 percent ad valorem plus 70 cents a pound duty is a barrier to domestic growth," he said. He attacked comparisons of labor costs, saying that national insurance and other employers' considerations must be added to get a true British labor cost.

Despite present prohibitive tariffs, the relative importance of intermediates and dyestuffs has declined since 1922, William De Gelsey of the ICI told the committee. "Intermediates accounted for only 30 percent of organic output in 1948 compared to 80 percent in 1922," he said.

PRICE DISPARITIES CITED

Association representatives expressed fears that partly finished goods would be imported by ICI and completed here, if import duties are lowered. ICI recently purchased a plant in Rhode Island which might be used for this purpose, but De Gelsey denied that this had prompted the request for a tariff reduction.

ICI's request was attacked by Frank H. Carman, general manager of the Plastics Association. "Acrylic sheets from Britain are selling in New York at 20 percent below American prices despite the present tariff," Carman said.

He backed the position of Rohn & Haas, Philadelphia, and B. F. Goodrich Chemical Co., Cleveland, in insisting that plastics, a strategic war material, should be maintained in full domestic production. "United States production is ample to meet present and potential needs," he added.

LOWER DUTIES ASKED

"Low-priced imports will affect the industry's price structure and employment and research programs," Carman said. A cut in import duties would be unwarranted in the present buyers' market, considering the "ruthlessness of foreign producer," he added.

Lowered duties of germanium oxide were urged by R. H. Lawrence, W. R. Brance & Co., New York, who pointed out that the decrease in domestic zinc production had hurt the output of germanium byproducts. He was the last witness to appear before the chemicals panel, which adjourned to review testimony presented since May 31. Several supplementary briefs are being filed.

[From the Journal of Commerce of June 21, 1950]

WARN PROPOSED TARIFF CUTS WOULD HARM UNITED STATES DISTILLERS

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Proposed tariff reductions on Canadian and Scotch whisky would prove harmful to the domestic distilling industry and United States labor, Joseph F. Haskell, speaking for the United States Distillers Trade Agreements Committee, today told the Interdepartmental Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Speaking at a hearing in connection with the forthcoming trade agreements negotiations with 17 nations to be held at Torquay, England, in September, Mr. Haskell, an official of National Distillers Products Corp., said that current international trade and domestic tax policies post a threat of "breaking the back of a substantial United States industry and sabotaging the job opportunities now enjoyed by approximately 800,000 persons."

OPPOSE FURTHER CUTS

The 22 American distillers on the United States Distillers Trade Agreements Committee previously filed a brief urging there be no further reduction of the import duty on Scotch and Canadian whisky under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; that a reduction granted at Geneva in 1947, lowering the tariff rate from $2.50 per proof gallon to $1.50 per proof gallon, be withdrawn and the former duty reinstated.

The brief also urged that trade barriers imposed against the importation of distilled spirits from the United States be wiped out in countries with which the United States will negotiate reciprocal trade agreements. A further reduction of United States distilled spirits import levies to $1.25 per proof gallon has been proposed as a feature of the Torquay negotiations.

"There is no such thing as trading of United States distilled spirits in Canada, where Government purchasers refuse to buy United States-made whiskies," he said. "In England we are stopped from selling United States distilled spirits. As far as our industry is concerned reciprocal trade is a one-way street."

Haskell declared that reduction of the tariff rate would mean "that for the third time in 11 years Canadian and British whiskies would be benefited." He pointed out that liquor import duties were reduced from $5 to $2.50 per proof gallon in 1939 and from $2.50 to $1.50 in 1948 while the excise rate on domestic distilled spirits was raised from $2 to $9 per proof gallon in the same period.

The tariff reduction proposal, combined with the now-pending Custom Simplification Act and continued wartime tax rate of $9 per proof gallon would "jeopardize the employment of hundreds of thousands of organized labor in the United States whose livelihood depends upon the legalized industry," Haskell said.

SIMPLIFICATION ACT ATTACKED

He also attacked H. R. 8304, the Customs Simplification Act, which, the committee was told, "would benefit the foreign producer to the extent of about $1.20 per gallon in imported whisky through changing the basis of the tax and import duty from the wine (physical) gallon to proof (100 proof) gallon." Haskell claimed this change would cost the United States Treasury $15,000,000 in revenue annually.

The United States Distillers Trade Agreements Committee is composed of the following: Anderson County Distilling Co., Associated Kentucky Distilleries Co., Bernheim Distilling Co., Brown-Forman Distillers Corp., Continental Distilling Co., General Distillers Corp. of Kentucky, Glenmore Distilleries Co., W. A. Haller Corp., Heaven Hill Distilleries, Inc., Hoffman Distilling, Inc., James Distillery, Inc., Kinsey Distilling Corp., Medley Distilling Co., Merchants Distilling Corp., National Distillers Products Corp., Old Charter Distillery Co., Old Joe Distillery Co., James E. Pepper & Co., Stitzel-Weller Distillery, the George T. Stagg Co., United Distillers of America, Waterfill & Frazier Distillery Co., and Willet Distillery Co.

[From the Journal of Commerce of June 21, 1950]

MORE GROUPS HIT TARIFF REDUCTIONS—RAYON, SILK, VELVETEEN, JUTE YARN, ANGORA WOOL PRODUCERS ADD PROTESTS

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Producers of rayon and silk, velveteens, jute yarn, and Angora rabbit wool today added their protests to the textile-industry chorus against further tariff reductions.

Like other branches of the industry, they told the Committee for Reciprocity Information, that competition from cheap foreign labor is a primary reason for maintaining—or raising—present duties.

Today's session winds up textile-industry hearings prior to the international tariff negotiations at Torquay, England, next September.

Recommendations of the interagency CRI will largely determine the scope of the negotiations.

RAYON-SILK GROUP TESTIFIES

The National Federation of Textiles, Inc., representing 98 rayon and silk fabric weavers, accused foreign countries of "hamstring" reciprocal trade agreements by restrictive trade barriers that are more effectual * * * than relatively high duties.

Harvey Wilson, speaking for the federation, told the CRI that "the State Department must recognize sooner or later the fallacy of reciprocity when foreign governments offset lowered duties by manipulation of exchange controls, rigid quotas, barter deals, and the like.

"Rayon and silk fabric manufacturers depend on the domestic, not export, market and to expect them to accept lower United States duties in return for reduced foreign tariffs is like a 'heads I win, tails you lose' proposition," Wilson declared.

SMALL BUSINESS BOOST ASKED

"The executive also challenged the Government to prove its intent to aid small business by refusing to lower duties. The 1947 census of manufactures showed that 88 percent of rayon and related broadwoven fabric establishments employed less than 500 workers," he said.

"Although the present ratio of rayon imports to domestic production is very small, it isn't sensible to wait to be hurt before complaining," Wilson added.

The velveteen industry "cannot exist without tariff protection, and current rates should be raised the full permissible amount," Howard Richmond, of that industry's tariff committee, told the CRI.

VELVETEEN IMPORTS RISE

"Japan can flood the United States market with low-cost velveteens," Richmond declared. "In 1950, total imports—mostly from Italy—will approach 500,000 yards, compared to 110,000 last year," he predicted.

Arguing that current duty of 25 percent is too low, he told the committee that Japan swamped the United States market in the thirties when rates were 62.5 percent.

Joseph C. Mahoney of the Soft Fiber Manufacturers Institute declared that, if duties are reduced, the United States market for jute yarns will be lost to India, while our markets for flax and hemp yarns will be lost to the United Kingdom and the Continent.

Citing India's overwhelming labor-cost advantage. Mahoney told the CRI "that even with the slight protection of present rates, India can sell jute yarns here at a considerable price advantage."

"Any increase in imports of jute yarn and twine will mean a corresponding loss of needed dollar exchange to Pakistan through a decline in raw jute exports to the United States," he asserted.

[From the Journal of Commerce of June 27, 1950]

SPINNERS PROTEST TARIFF-RATE CUT—PRODUCER OF SALE YARN TELLS OF DANGER TO UNITED STATES MILLS IN CRI BRIEF

CHARLOTTE, N. C., June 26.—Manufacturers of carded and combed cotton sales yarns say that a further reduction in tariff rates would encourage a heavy influx of yarns into the United States and would threaten thousands with a destruction of their means of livelihood.

As a device for closing the so-called dollar gap, the State Department will consider tariff negotiations and possible concessions with 23 or more countries in Torquay, England, in September.

The Southern Combed Yarn Spinners Association of Gastonia and the Carded Yarn Association of Charlotte have joined the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute and other trade groups in filing a general brief protesting proposed tariff cuts on textiles.

ADDITIONAL BRIEF FILED

However, a supplementary statement pertaining to cotton sales yarns, presented by E. N. Brower, president of the Rockfish Mebane Yarn Mills, Inc., of Hope Mills, N. C., and a manufacturer of both carded and combed cotton sales yarn, has been filed with the Committee for Reciprocity Information in Washington in behalf of the yarn associations.

The statement points out that many of the approximately 275 yarn plants, mostly small in size, and situated largely in the Southern and Eastern States, are in relatively small communities where the mill payroll is the chief source of income for workers and their families.

For instance, it is estimated that in Gaston County, N. C., the center of the combed sales yarn industry, at least 40,000 people, or two-thirds of the population, get their living directly or indirectly from the steady operation of the mills in that county.

EXCEEDS DOMESTIC NEEDS

The statement points out that the potential production of yarns in this country already exceeds the poundage required by domestic consumers, and that during the past 3 years foreign producers have captured most of the export markets for sales yarn.

This, the statement says, has been due to the fact that the manufacturing costs in other countries are so materially lower than those in the domestic sales yarn industry. It goes on to say:

"The average wages in the United Kingdom are approximately one-third of those of our industry; in France and Italy, one-fourth; and those of Japan and India are about one-tenth.

"As a result, the American exports of cotton yarn have declined from 92,112,000 pounds in 1947 to 26,122,000 pounds in 1949, with a current annual rate of approximately 21,000,000 pounds.

"On the other hand, the imports of cotton yarn, which reached a low during June 1949 of 4,000 pounds, have grown progressively until March 1950, during which 90,000 pounds were imported.

"While the impact of these imports has not as yet been sufficient to cause undue hardship, the rapidity with which they are increasing under existing tariff rates gives cause for great concern to the sales yarn producers.

"While a greater part of the imports has consisted of the finer counts of combed yarns, the displacement of production in the finer mills have caused these mills to shift their production to lower counts of yarn, thereby having the same effect as if the coarser counts had also been imported."

[From the Journal of Commerce of August 30, 1950]

WOOL GROUP URGES CANCELLATION OF TORQUAY MEETING

Secretary of State Dean Acheson yesterday was urged to terminate plans for the tariff cut conference scheduled for Torquay, England, in September in a telegram dispatched from the New York office of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers. The wire requested termination of the plans to reduce further current tariffs at Torquay in September.

"Recent events have underscored the broad public desire for leadership to keep this country strong in face of the forces of aggression," the telegram said. "One source of strength is our industrial organization. It should not be jeopardized nor demoralized by further reductions in our tariffs, which are designed to protect it from foreign low-wage competition.

"The wool textile industry does not desire to be dependent on war orders for its existence," the wire continued. "It does seek, however, to preserve its defense potential by fulfilling the normal requirements of the American market unhampered by competition from low-wage areas, and for this reason we again record our opposition to the Torquay conference."

[From the New York Times of September 15, 1950]

ACTION ON TARIFF TO AFFECT PRICES—EMBROIDERED HANDKERCHIEFS FROM CHINA SEEN ADVANCED 9 TO 11 CENTS AT RETAIL

Price advances on Chinese embroidered handkerchiefs retailing under $1 are due when the higher rates of duty go into effect in the near future as a result of the withdrawal of tariff concessions to China.

Importers said yesterday, however, that no increase is expected in prices of embroidered handkerchiefs already on their shelves or in bonded warehouses.

Handkerchiefs are one of the important items affected in the list of withdrawn tariff concessions issued by the State Department on Wednesday. The tariff rate on typical imports of embroidered handkerchiefs, covering both Chinese and Madeira types, will rise from 2 to 3 cents a unit and from 20 percent to 40 percent ad valorem.

One trade source estimated this will mean a rise in the lowest retail price range from 39 to 50 cents, of the 50-cent item to 59 cents and the 59-cent handkerchief to 65 to 75 cents. It is expected that handkerchiefs retailing at $1 each and more will not be affected in price, due to possible changes in design or construction, to absorb the higher duty.

Trade sources pointed out that the action by the State Department in announcing the withdrawal of tariff concessions represented no change in policy toward trading with Communist China. The point was made that the State Department took the action inasmuch as the Chinese Nationalist Government in Formosa had abrogated the trade agreement with this country on May 5.

It was pointed out that the State Department list does not include withdrawal of all the concessions granted to China. Several countries, which are contracting parties to the general agreement on tariffs and trade, are interested in these items and consultations are being held with the State Department. If these consultations are completed successfully, the present Geneva rate will be continued on such items.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I herewith include in my extension of remarks a copy of a radio address I made last evening over Station WTIC, Hartford, Conn., on the issues of foreign policy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Good evening, friends and neighbors. Last Wednesday, at a meeting in the great Consolidated High School in West Cornwall, I was asked a six-word question—the most important question facing the American people. The question was: What do we do about Russia?

I said I would answer it tonight. I suggest that all candidates discuss this question. It can't be brushed aside by arm waving or slurs or slogans. How do we stop Russia? This is the key question for all of us today. War or peace depends upon it.

The issues of foreign policy are now more important than all our domestic questions combined. They can mean life or death for millions of Americans—freedom or slavery for hundreds of millions of human beings throughout the world.

There has been a revolution in American foreign policy since 1945—a change more profound than has ever been experienced by any victorious great power in so short a time. We have completely reversed our historic policy of "no entangling alliances." We have now decided that, for our own protection, we must resist any aggression that threatens world peace, wherever it may occur. The question now before the voters of Connecticut, as I shall show, is whether to ratify that policy, or repudiate it. This is the question you must decide on November 7. The question for you is nothing less than that.

Symbolic of the great change that has taken place is the action in Korea—an action which would have been unthinkable 10 years ago. In the 3 months since the Korean war began, the United States has led the free world in what may perhaps prove to be the most decisive step in modern history. We have taken the lead in transforming the United Nations from a none-too-polite forum of debate into a mighty force to police the world. In three short months we have lifted the hearts of free peoples everywhere. We have given new hope to mankind for the achievement in our own time of a peaceful and secure world.

The action in Korea is one more step in a series of extraordinary accomplishments which stand out in all the uproar and confusion—yes, and the present deliberate distortion by my opponent—that has befogged the discussion of foreign policy in recent months. These accomplishments, which I shall list very briefly, have required decisions just as bold, and staff work just as brilliant, as that required of any victorious commander in the field. The common front that has now been built up against aggression didn't just happen. (Even in one's own family, where the blood runs thicker than water, a common front doesn't just happen.) No, it has been created step by step through a long, difficult process—often hazardous, and sometimes with set-backs.

In 1945, we began to see that there was to be no pause in the imperialistic drive of the Soviet Union. In 1946, the Soviet threat against Iran and the oil-rich Middle East was checked. In 1947, the Truman doctrine blunted the Russian drive against Turkey and Greece, and 3 years of assistance since then have not only hurled back the threat of military aggression in the eastern Mediterranean but have stimulated economic recovery and long-range democratic advances.

In 1947, also, we developed the Rio Pact, which set up the first machinery for collective action in case of an attack on any American nation. And in the same year, I was able to see the Voice of America programs, for which I had been fighting and for which I was responsible as Assistant Secretary of State, established on a long-term basis.

In 1948, we launched the Marshall plan, known as the European recovery program. Under the inspired leadership of my close friend, Paul G. Hoffman, the ECA has rescued the European Continent from economic chaos and prostration. The fruits of that program, in turning back the tide of communism, are particularly evident in Italy, where I inspected ECA projects last June.

When the Soviets retaliated after the Marshall plan, by trying to blockade Berlin, we instituted the airlift and forced them to back down.

In 1949 came the North Atlantic Treaty—binding us more closely together with the free nations of western Europe. This was followed by the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, which is now developing toward a continental military force in Europe, under unified control.

In this year, 1950, we have the beginnings of the crucial and vital point 4 program, which I shall come back to later.

Throughout this postwar period we have worked unceasingly to strengthen the United Nations and to help establish UN controls of atomic weapons—an area in which my colleague, Senator MCMAHON, has contributed so brilliantly. I was myself privileged to take the lead on behalf of the United States and to play a major part in the creation of one UN agency, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO.

Now, what does this add up to? It is a record of rolling back communism wherever our capabilities permitted. We gave economic and military aid to Nationalist China, in its civil war with the Chinese Communists, but its armies and its popular support disintegrated on the Chinese mainland. We sought to give freedom to Poland and other lands of eastern Europe, but the Soviets tore up every wartime agreement they made. These were defeats, yes. Nothing short of full-scale military intervention by the United States—an effort at least 10 or 20 times the present effort in Korea—would have saved China. And nothing but a full-scale world war III could have driven the Red army out of Poland and off the soil it occupied in Europe at the end of World War II.

Now, how can this election, here in Connecticut, determine whether the United States is to move forward along the general lines of our present creative and dynamic foreign policy—or double back toward isolationism and head-in-the-sand irresponsibility?

There is today in the United States Senate a powerful group of Republicans who have

opposed or sought to weaken nearly every great forward step we have taken. This group includes Senator TAFT, the chairman of the Republican policy committee, and Senator WHERRY, the Republican floor leader. It also includes Senator JENNER, who recently described the career of General Marshall as a living lie. It includes Senator KEM, Senator MALONE, and other bitter-end isolationists. If the Republican Party gains seven Senate seats in this election, these men would control and dominate the Senate. They would thus have the last word in foreign policy. They are watching Connecticut eagerly. They figure they have in the bag five or six of the seven they need—and the two key seats to give them control are here. They know they can control any Republican newcomers to the Senate, through the seniority system.

Therefore, when you vote on November 7, remember you are voting on whether you want to turn over America foreign policy to TAFT, to WHERRY, JENNER, MALONE, KEM, and CAPEHART. As you see, this is no mere State election. You are voting on policies which affect the entire world and which will affect it for decades to come.

Now let us glance at the record of this group on foreign policy. I speak from bitter personal experience; it was Congressman TABER—who would become chairman of the powerful House Appropriations Committee and who not long ago called the Marshall plan operation rat hole—it was Congressman TABER who tried to kill the Voice of America by calling it a racket, and it was Senator TAFT who held up its legal validation for almost 2 years.

In 1947, 16 Republicans, including the present floor leader, Mr. WHERRY, voted against the Greek-Turkish aid bill. The same year 20 Republicans, led by TAFT and WHERRY, voted to reduce foreign aid. Then came the Marshall plan. Senator TAFT mustered 23 Republicans in an effort to cut the authorization by one and three-tenths billions. Senator CAPEHART rounded up 19 to convert the bill into a relief measure and they cut it to $2,000,000,000. Next, the North Atlantic Treaty. Senators WHERRY, TAFT, and WATKINS marshaled 18 Republican votes for a reservation to withhold military assistance from our allies. Twenty-three Republicans voted to cut the appropriation 40 percent, from $500,000,000 to $300,000,000. On final passage of the act, Senators TAFT, WHERRY, and others who dominate the Republican Party, voted against any military assistance to our North Atlantic allies.

In January of this year, when the House defeated the Korean aid bill—the little ECA for Korea—192 to 191—130 Republicans were numbered among the 192.

I think it is now time for me to ask, "Just who has been giving the 'green light' to the Communist aggressors?" In truth and in fact, it is those who have tried to cut ECA, to undermine the Atlantic Pact, and to wipe out or cripple the point 4 program. Can the American people afford to give control of their Congress at this juncture of history to men with the international myopia of JENNER and WHERRY, TAFT and TABER?

Heaven help us if our foreign policy should ever be "Jennerized." Heaven help the defense of our country and the lives of our sons if our military and foreign-aid appropriations are again allowed to be "Taberized."

I shall now answer my questioner in West Cornwall about Russia. This answer is in five parts.

The first way to stop Russia is through the continuation, improvement, and development of the domestic policies initiated by and carried out under the leadership of President Truman over the last 5 years. The first requisite in stopping Russia is that we maintain and develop our economic strength at home. Our economy is now stronger than at any time in our history, with 62,000,000 Americans employed and national income at record levels. Next week I shall devote my broadcast to our domestic problems and opportunities, the broadcast I had originally planned for tonight.

The second way to stop Russia is military strength so overwhelming that even the men of the Kremlin will give heed. All such military forces should be organized and coordinated with a view to carrying out the rule of law in the world under the United Nations flag. The precedent of Korea is the key to the future security of mankind. It is a key that looms big on the pages of history. We must use it to unlock the door to freedom for the suffering peoples of the world.

The gravest danger in this respect lies in projecting the penny-wise pound-foolish attitude that has characterized so many of the Republican leaders in the past—an attitude which, if it prevailed, would ultimately, I believe, be paid for in the lives and blood of our sons.

The third way to stop Russia is through economic assistance to our friends and allies in the free world. Here again, along with the Marshall plan and following it—we must move forward to bring the benefits of our technological age to the world's underdeveloped areas, especially in Asia around the Soviet perimeter. We must help the famished peoples fight the poverty which breeds communism. I favor a greatly expanded point 4 program. The Republicans voted 25 to 8 against passage of the point 4 program. It should be increased at once to a minimum of $100,000,000.

The fourth way to stop Russia is in the extension of human rights. The UN Convention on Genocide must be ratified. The UN declaration on human rights should be implemented. The slave labor conditions in the Soviet Union should be fully exposed and documented by UN action.

However, these four programs, however comprehensive, will not clinch and solidify the world-wide struggle for the survival of free institutions unless we can win the minds and loyalties of mankind to the cause of freedom.

This is our fifth way to stop Russia, and it may become as important as any of the other four. It is in their appeal to men's minds and hearts that the Soviets have made most spectacular gains—with weapons of subversion and propaganda and lies—and with a minimum of cost and outright force. In the Senate I have fought for a great expansion of this phase of an all-embracing foreign policy. Such an expanded program in the war of ideas was vital before Korea. It is even more vital today. I shall tell you why 2 weeks from tonight. If you want my article on this subject in the current Coronet, write me and I'll send it to you.

In Korea, with victory now seemingly assured, a united and peaceful nation must result from the sacrifices of our youth. The authority of the United Nations must be double riveted. Justice must be meted out to the violators of elementary decencies. Aid must be given the Korean people. All this can and should be accomplished under United Nations auspices without any appeasement of or deals with Communist China, over Formosa or any other issue.

The five-point program I have outlined here is geared to the needs of the present world situation. It is consistent with the traditions of our country. It develops out of the spirit and the genius of our people. It partakes of their confidence in their own destiny and their hope for peace and security in a perilous world. And it presents the kind of challenge Connecticut never failed to meet.

State Department Injured 21 Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release for July 12, 1950, dealing with the 21 American industries listed in the Senate as having been seriously injured by the State Department's present foreign trade policy.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 12, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, today in the Senate listed 21 American industries which have been seriously injured by our State Department's present foreign-trade policy. The Nevada Senator offered the list as a sequel to a previously submitted list of victimized industries in 20 States. He emphasized that every State which has any of the 21 industries in the new list will be hit by unemployment.

Senator MALONE said: "The State Department's theory that the more foreign goods sold in this country, the more American dollars there will be in the hands of foreigners with which to buy American goods bypasses one basic question: Inasmuch as the free-trade importation of low-wage and slave-labor products in competition with those of high-living-standard American workers will force more and more American workers out of jobs, how can unemployed Americans buy the foreign products regardless of how cheap they are?"

The 21 American industries listed as the first sufferers are: (1) Crude petroleum and products; (2) aluminum in coils, plates, bars, and rods; (3) gloves and mittens, knitted or crocheted, wool and cotton; (4) fur felt hats and hat bodies; (5) silk piece goods; (6) stencil silk, dyed or colored; (7) knitted wool berets; (8) glassware, blown stemware and artware; (9) paper products; (10) spring clothespins; (11) reeds and cane, wrought and manufactured from rattan; (12) lead ores, lead bullion; (13) zinc; (14) copper; (15) seafood; (16) beef and veal, chilled and frozen; (17) corduroy and velveteen; (18) woolens and worsteds; (19) magnesite; (20) synthetic organic chemicals; (21) textile machinery.

Senator MALONE called on the Senators from the States having these 21 industries to join him "in an honest effort to put a stop to the State Department's foreign trade policy of encouraging importation on a basis which gives foreign industry an unfair advantage over American industry."

Continuing, Senator MALONE said: "There never was a consistent free-trader. He wants free trade on things he must buy and high import fees on things he must sell. A case in point is the position recently taken by certain brass fabricators, who wanted free trade on copper, which they had to buy, and a protective tariff on finished products similar to their finished products.

"We have the spectacle here in the Senate of one distinguished Senator after another going along with the State Department in its free-trade policy except where it concerns a product of his own State. A Senator wants

free trade on everything except, say, oil—his State produces fuel; another seems to like free trade on most everything except clothespins—that Senator's home State produces clothespins. We must establish a general principle applicable to all American production and quit sharpshooting for the benefit of this group or that group and at the expense of the American workers and investors as a whole. If we are to have a fair import fee on one item, let us be fair about all items. Let us try a little basic honesty.

"In fairness to Americans let us fight against the present State Department policy which will remove the floor from under American wages and investments. Once that floor has disappeared, labor will be the first to feel the effects. The workingman, with his house half paid for and with his kids in school, will find himself destitute, forsaken by a Government that deliberately destroyed his opportunity to earn an American living."

State Department Dishonest Concerning Point 4 Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio and press release for August 30, 1950, which charges the State Department with deception and dishonesty in its now revealed expansion plans for the point 4 program.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 30, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, charged the State Department with deception and dishonesty in its now revealed expansion plans for the point 4 program.

Senator MALONE said, "When administration spokesmen were confronted on the Senate floor with estimates that point 4 would cost the United States taxpayers thousands of millions of dollars, they blandly answered that the $45,000,000 request was not preliminary to request for larger sums and that money was to be used in this connection only to send American experts to advise the rulers of underdeveloped countries about projects. They settled for thirty-five million. Yet, word comes now that $85,000,000 of ECA funds are to be spent on the point 4 program.

Point 4 philosophy ignores the precept of common honesty in government. It was inaugurated in an atmosphere of dishonesty, the administration attempting to make it look like a small project which needed to study and but little money.

"The joker is that the measure provides that the private investments necessary for the development projects are to be guaranteed by the United States Government. In other words, losses due to socialization or confiscation of private property in foreign countries, or due to any other cause, are to be passed on to the United States taxpayer. Leading proponents of point 4 say that it is a 50-year program which will cost at least $7,000,000,000 dollars per year, or $350,000,000,000 over the 50-year period. Other estimates run higher.

"Point 4 was never a plan, but a loosely conceived form of global WPA, trotted out as a bold new program, hailed enthusiastically by the do-gooders who think that there is no limit to the taxes which can be taken from the American people and that we should share our taxpayers' money with foreign countries.

"To some of us, it was evident from the first that, despite claims to the contrary, the scheme contemplated the deep gouging of the United States taxpayer. If the foreign countries had national integrity and were to supply their own capital, then why wouldn't they hire their own American experts, as in the past.

"There is great merit in the idea of developing backward areas, and venture capital is abundantly available whenever foreign countries create a favorable investment climate through fair fiscal and monetary policies, demonstrate good will toward foreign enterprises, and establish a record which assures an investor a fair chance on his money.

"The point 4 plan would shift the risk from the willing investor, seeking a profit, to the American taxpayer. The American public should not be expected to make good losses brought about by the lack of integrity on the part of foreign countries.

"Point 4 cannot do the things that are promised in its name without a much deeper drain on the American taxpayers and much severer restrictions on American freedom than the Administration has spelled out. We cannot very well establish and set in motion a program affecting millions of people for 50 years and then suddenly draw back.

"The potential of point 4 should be reviewed carefully before the Government sends experts all over the world bearing promises on which our American workers will have to make good."

"Sold Out" by State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my July 26, 1950, press release on our being "sold out" by the State Department.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 26, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, charged today that we have been "sold out" by our State Department. The Nevada Senator said that the foreign policy of our Government "which got us into this war was part of a deliberately designed plot to advance communism."

Continuing, Senator MALONE said: "The handing over of Asia to the Soviets, the arming of Russia through Marshall-plan countries, the encroachment of socialistic ideas in our legislation here, and the wrecking of American industry were some of the steps in the treacherous plot.

"Undoubtedly, Stalin thought he had the nod from Acheson to go ahead in Asia. Everything points to that. But Acheson's position on Korea was suddenly reversed, and it may be presumed that he is now apologizing to the Hisses and his other Communist friends. Our position in Asia and elsewhere is just what could be expected with the personnel of our State Department what it is.

"On the home front, the Red plot has been carried on within the administration by a constant attack on American industry. This attack has come through (a) Government regulations so designed as to eliminate venture capital, which made this country great; (b) taxes so designed as to eliminate initiative; (c) a foreign 'free trade' policy so designed as to curtail domestic production; and (d) reckless spending on the part of the Government so designed as to threaten our whole economic structure.

"Until this country squarely faces its errors in foreign and domestic policy, which is all one policy, until it abandons the 'spend and elect' theories of welfare-statism, and until its citizens are discouraged from running to Washington for handouts, we will continue to tremble before the threats of a people backward in production and culture. Until that time, the prestige of America will continue to sink as it sank in the face of the Korean affair.

"How far are we now from the mood for reclaiming our national self-respect? Unless there is a complete reversal in Washington's mood, this armed outbreak will be the occasion for more reckless spending, further demands for power, and more of all the same trappings that have accompanied this country to its present plight.

"There will, no doubt, be bigger requests for all sorts of things that can, in some way, be tied to the label 'national defense.' We will not question many of these expenditures. Peace that was so costly won has been thrown away by blunders and stupidities. And with it gone, we must, however sadly, prepare to defend ourselves against the possibility of new onslaughts.

"We do not anticipate that the present administration will curtail its spending on nondefense items. It has shown no love for a balanced budget or a strong currency. Now is the time Congress needs a little backbone to stand up against Government waste and against unlimited powers for the administration—all in the name of saving us.

"We need to remind ourselves that our first and foremost task is to keep ourselves strong. Only with a strong American industry can we win. The anti-Communist forces of the world that are able and willing to fight are outnumbered. The defense of the free world must be achieved by quality which is able to overcome quantity. We are not big enough to overwhelm our opponents by the massing of military power. Since we cannot hope to be bigger, our fate depends on whether we can be better.

"Where is the greatest danger—at home or abroad? We have been repeatedly warned that we are in danger from within. Since 1932 there has been a constant war against America, within our gates.

"The State Department's foreign free-trade policy, through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended, which has been erroneously called reciprocal, has removed the floor from under wages and investments and has stopped the flow of venture capital in a large section of the industrial field. American mines have been closed, and at a time when an adequate stockpile of strategic metals and a going concern mining industry is vitally needed. The so-called escape clause proved to be no escape; a deaf ear has been turned to the American industries which have appealed for relief from the State Department's actions. The so-called peril-point provision is just as much of a snare and delusion; in case of a test, it would mean nothing, because it provides only that, when the peril

point is reached, the President write a letter to Congress. Nothing more.

"Let us clean up the home front, give assurance to American people that American industries and things American will be protected. Let us once and for all put a stop to the foreign policy which weakens our positions abroad and destroys our industries at home. Let's fight for ideals and for an administration that will uphold them when this war is at an end. The boys on the front have little to fight for unless they can know clearly that they are defending the American way of life."

Democratic Administration Foreign Policy Mistakes Led to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this administration's mistakes in its foreign policy program has brought about the present conflict in Korea.

A splendid speech on the subject, which points up the mistakes of the administration, has been prepared for radio delivery by Mrs. Elizabeth Heffelfinger, Republican national committeewoman from Minnesota. This talk will be of interest to readers of the RECORD and Americans everywhere. I submit it for their reading. It follows:

Good afternoon, fellow Americans. The free world is rejoicing today because of the news of the growing success of the United Nations forces in Korea. In the flush of victory we must not let the mistakes of our foreign policy, which led to this war, become obscure. This is not the time for recriminations but along with our joy we must ascertain what went wrong with our thinking and how could we have so grossly misinterpreted the handwriting on the wall. Our past mistakes must make us realize today, more than ever, that we can still win the major battle of war and lose the peace.

In 1923, Lenin wrote: "The outcome of the world struggle will be determined by Russia, India, and China, inasmuch as they constitute the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe." Today Russia and her satellites have some 800,000,000 under her control. We, the free Western World, have the same number of people. The remaining 700,000,000 living between Korea and Iran will tip the balance of the scale.

Why have we lost the confidence of this group? We must understand a few historical episodes. The seizure of Manchuria from China by Japan in 1931 was the first act of aggression which finally culminated in the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. In 1943, at Cairo, in December, we promised China to return Manchuria to her but in 1945 at Yalta, we betrayed that commitment and in secret agreement, invited Russia to take control of the railroads and seaports in Manchuria in return for Russian assistance in our war against Japan.

The sell-out to Russia at Yalta was to shorten the war and save American lives. However, Russia came into the war against Japan only 6 days before the end of the war. For every life saved at Yalta thousands of untrained and unequipped Americans, South Koreans, and United Nations troops have died in Korea today. We cannot sell out moral principles and escape the day of judgment. The Yalta agreement, famous for buying the good will of the strong by sacrificing the weak, will also be remembered for the prominence of those who signed it, including the name of one "red herring"—Alger Hiss.

The Korean war is a direct result of the failure at Yalta to think beyond the military objective. It is thought by many that secret commitments not yet brought to light were made at Yalta which permitted the Russians to take over North Korea, just as they did Berlin and Czechoslovakia. Korea was divided at the thirty-eighth parallel and Russia invited to take over North Korea from the Japanese, despite the declaration of the Cairo conference that one of our aims was the independence of Korea, a pledge renewed at Potsdam in 1945.

The thirty-eighth parallel threw out of line Korea's reasonably balanced economy making survival of either part impossible without outside assistance. Time-consuming negotiations between the Russians and the United States for full freedom of Korea brought no results. When negotiations finally broke down entirely, the Russians were in complete control of North Korea to such an extent that they refused to permit the United Nations commission to come in and conduct a free election. Instead Russia held its own election in 1948 and presented the North Koreans with the usual slate of unopposed Communist candidates. The Russians then announced the withdrawal of their troops, leaving behind, however, a highly trained and well-equipped Communist military force. At the same time the South Koreans, under a United Nations commission conducted elections and a Republic was formed headed by Syngman Rhee. In spite of the fact that the South Korean National Assembly on November 1948 passed a resolution urging United States troops to remain until the Republic was capable of maintaining national security, the United States started withdrawing troops and 6 months later, in June 1949, we had completely withdrawn from Korea, leaving only a small military mission of 300 men who were to train a constabulary of South Koreans for the sole purpose of internal security. This small police force was equipped only with light arms and ammunition received from our surplus supplies and all of it was over 4 years of age.

The North Koreans, during the past 5 years, had become skillful warriors because of the training they had received under the Communists, and because they were joined by Siberian Koreans—Koreans who had fled Japanese control and joined the Russian Army in Siberia. After our troops had been withdrawn from South Korea, President Truman recommended a program of economic aid. Leading Republicans in the House believed that under the present setup South Korea was untenable and that it was futile to pour American goods and machinery into a country which could not defend itself against Communist leaders, who even at that time were commanding North Korean forces in border fighting. The Republicans of the House attempted to amend this economic-aid program so the money could be used for military aid also. The State Department turned thumbs down on a Republican minority report which stated that Soviet troops are in positions of command as well as acting advisers in North Korea and that this development may well mean the launching of a full military drive and unless South Korea is prepared to meet force with comparable force economic assistance cannot of itself insure the safety and integrity of South Korea.

So Korean economic aid bill was finally passed in February 1950, calling for $110,000,000 to be spent during the first 6 months in 1950. However, less than half, or $45,000,000, was actually delivered during that specified important period. Military aid, which should have reached them at the same time to the amount of ten million three hundred thousand, 6 months later, only amounted to $200 worth of barbed wire. Other military material, which was marked rush for South Korea, still had not been sent at the time of the Communist attack this summer. The Communists knew all of this and realized we did not have a policy, or any real convictions about Korea, and that we did not carry through with our commitments. They further realized that we had no convictions about Formosa or Indochina, and they welcomed Secretary of State Acheson's answer to Senator VANDENBERG, when he asked what the administrative policy was. Secretary Acheson answered: "The administrative policy was to wait until the dust settled." The dust has settled on our American youth in Korea. On January 12, President Truman asserted he was against military aid for Formosa. The next day Secretary Acheson announced that the American line of defense was drawn through Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. That statement openly told the Communists that we would not defend Korea or Formosa. Even as late as last June President Truman on his western nonpolitical trip asserted: "The Nation is closer to peace now than at any time during the last 5 years" and Senator CONNALLY, Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, felt that the private military and State Department reports indicate an easing off in the international situation. June 23, Secretary Acheson announced that our policy not to defend Formosa had not been changed. The next day, June 24, the Communists invaded South Korea and on June 27 President Truman did an abrupt about-face and announced that air and sea forces would be sent to the aid of the Republic of Korea and the Seventh Fleet of the United States Navy was proceeding to Formosa to defeat any attempt to storm that last bastion of Nationalist China. The rest of the tragic picture of unpreparedness is known to us.

The late James Forrestal lost his job as Secretary of Defense and later took his life because he knew our military budget was not equal to the commitments our administration had made all over the world. His recommendations and those of Gen. Omar Bradley in 1948 called for eighteen billion as a minimum cost of adequate defense. This was cut to fourteen billion by order of the President, a policy which was popular with the people who had not been told the tragic facts now so apparent to us in the light of present events. Our military weakness and the shortcomings in our preparedness cannot entirely be attributed to the lack of funds. It is the way the funds were administered. Atomic war was placed first to the neglect of ground forces and fighter planes and tanks to protect those ground forces. We did not have enough air transport planes to insure the number of men required for our worldwide commitments. The week the North Koreans struck, the last of our 14 large carrier air groups was being decommissioned. The week we embarked on police action we had only 7 large carriers out of a group of 20 we had had at the end of the war. Half of our 10 divisions were doing occupation duty. Before Pearl Harbor we were making annually 8,500 tanks. These tanks are now obsolete and we were making none in June. By the same token, in 1941 we were making annually 25,000 military aircraft compared to none as of June 1950. We had 2,025,000 men in the armed service in 1941, compared to half that number in June 1950. Our national debt in 1941 was fifty-five billion compared to two hundred and fifty-seven billion now. Our dollar then was worth 90.5, compared to 53.7 in June, and it is even less today.

On June 9, 13, and 20 the Senate Appropriations Committee, in supersecret hearings, heard reports on the Central Intelligence Agency telling of massing of Red troops

and the moving of heavy artillery at the thirty-eighth parallel. The question is now, in view of these intelligence reports, Why was the United States, 4 days later, caught in another Pearl Harbor? The Korean campaign caught the United States in a tight, propaganda trap. It came at the time of a Russian peace crusade—the fallacies of which are apparent to the educated world but not so to the hundreds of millions of uninformed. It was a psychological defeat for us which resounded all over the world and was particularly depressing to those people of western Europe who were depending upon us for leadership.

Have these policies of the present Democratic-controlled administration brought us peace, stability, international security, or rather have they brought us war, inflation, and international chaos? If unity means a continuation of these policies, if disagreement with the administration is tantamount to conspiring with the enemy then we had better reexamine the word unity. The time does not call for politics as usual. If we continue to dissipate our strength in contests with Soviet satellites, we will soon become exhausted economically and militarily and at the same time we will be permitting Russia to build her reserve of economic and military strength to such a degree that in the end she will have the strength.

One-third of the people of the world today are slaves of a Communist dictatorship which recognizes no God. A dictatorship ruthless in its destruction of human liberties and the rights of the individual. A dictatorship dedicated to global war in which Korea is only the first incident. If we, who believe in God, and the dignity of man, are going to rally the free forces of the world to our side, we must persuade them of our sincerity and the integrity of our purpose so that we may form a united bulwark to protect those things which we hold sacred.

These people must in the future have confidence in the forthrightness of America. What can you and I do about it? The freedom of criticism can be reflected in our vote November 7. We can use our voice, our vote, for a change of administration in Washington, for wiser leadership to insure lasting peace—for preparedness against future Communist aggression. We can demand that the United States regain the initiative—establish a program of international inspection and control of atomic activity. We can fight for the amendment to the United Nations' Charter proposed by Senator VANDENBERG in 1948. In place of ineptness we can have power, strength, and integrity.

Hoarding Charge Byproduct of Socialistic Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my press release for September 6, 1950, on the subject of hoarding, which is a byproduct of the socialistic thinking in high places in Washington.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 6, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican of Nevada, charged today that the administration's tirade against American families on the subject of hoarding was a byproduct of the socialistic thinking in high places in Washington.

The Nevada Senator said, "When the President attacks the honest American trait of providing for a rainy day, laying in supplies against a possible emergency, making provision for the future, he is echoing the thoughts of the Communists and left-wingers in our midst who want to set up a welfare state where diligent work, extra effort, individual enterprise, and striving to get ahead will mean nothing, where the shiftless, the improvident, the inconsiderate and the wastrels will be taken care of from the cradle to the grave."

Continuing, Senator MALONE said:

"In the first place, the tirade against provident American housewives for hoarding a few extra pounds of sugar, or something else which is not scarce, comes with ill grace from an administration which is the prize hoarder of all time—192,000,000 pounds of butter, and buying up more at the rate of 9,000,000 pounds a week; 170,000,000 pounds of dried eggs, and buying up more at the rate of 15,000,000 pounds a month; 104,000,000 pounds of cheese, and buying up more at the rate of 15,000,000 pounds a month. The Government has hoarded $50,000,000 worth of dried milk, is buying up potatoes at a rate that will cost the American taxpayers $87,000,000 this year alone—and that is only the beginning of the list. The Government is hoarding all kinds of foodstuff in caves and bulging warehouses and old airplane hangars from Maine to California. And why? To raise the prices of this foodstuff.

"And why does the administration say the housewives should not lay in supplies of food? Because it might raise the prices.

"Unlike the individuals whom it criticizes, the Government hasn't any use for all this food. It is wasting millions of dollars of the people's money, and creating inflation.

In conclusion, Senator MALONE said:

"This is but another illustration of the inconsistency in all economic matters—domestic and foreign—which marks the left-wingers of this administration."

Truman Succumbed to Acheson Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD my press release for September 13, 1950, concerning the succumbing of President Truman to the Lattimore-Acheson influence.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 13, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, charged today that President Truman had succumbed to the Lattimore-Acheson pink influence and that his recent failure to back up General MacArthur was one of several indications of a complete about-face.

In a statement issued from his Washington office, Senator MALONE said: "In the address, which the President asked General MacArthur to withdraw, the General had simply agreed with the President's previously stated position regarding the defense of Formosa against the Reds, but the Communist sympathizers in the State Department sold the President on the idea of crossing up MacArthur. It is another about-face in the President's pitiful attempt to follow conflicting ideas of his advisers, only some of whom are in the Hiss-Service-Acheson clique of Communist associates and sympathizers.

"Of all the President's conglomeration of advisers, the only ones who know what they want and follow an unwavering course are these Communist associates and sympathizers. The ideas of the Hisses, the Wadleighs, the Services, and the Lattimores, activated by Acheson, follow a definite pattern. This clique favored giving Manchuria to the Reds at Yalta; they favored the partition of Berlin without any provision for ingress or egress of non-Soviet personnel; they favored communism for China, as was disclosed by John Foster Dulles; they favored recognition of the Chinese Reds; they favored our sending financial and industrial aid to those European countries which would arm Russia and her satellites for world war III.

"Evidence of traitorous intent and purpose may be observed in the fact that when it was exposed that Britain and other Marshall plan countries were sending Russia war-making materials, not one of this influential clique lifted a finger to stop our money and materials flowing to those countries; in fact, they actually opposed the measure—S. J. Res. 151, the Malone resolution—which would have stopped our indirect arming of Russia. War-making materials are still being sent to Russia, thanks to the Red lovers in our administration.

"Only the most naive or blind could now doubt that Communists have been in policy-making position in the United States Government. Lee Pressman, the fair-haired New Deal official, recently confessed that he and others were Communists while holding Government office and that Communists moved into Washington and took over key positions in the Government in the early days of the New Deal. It has been exposed that Communists have held key positions in the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, State, and Justice, in the Treasury, the OSS, Board of Economic Warfare, Air Corps Material and Service Division, War Production Board, OPA, WPA, and many other Government offices.

"In their attempts to discredit American free enterprise and American industry, the New Deal Reds were serving their Moscow masters well. It is interesting to observe that we have been led step by step into socialism. But the plot appears much more serious. There is considerable evidence that the American people are victims of a gigantic conspiracy conceived by traitors, or ignorant fools, in Government offices in Washington.

"The amazing thing about all this is that Communist associates and sympathizers are permitted to continue in high office and influence the President. Apparently this deplorable situation will not be corrected until the American people themselves correct it."

My Report to the Flood Sufferers of Crookston, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1950

Mr. HAGEN., Mr. Speaker, my home city of Crookston, Minn., this year, was

visited by its worst flood in history. I was born in Crookston in 1901 and have lived in this city all my life. I was seriously disturbed by the floods that visited our city on two different occasions late this spring.

I made two trips by plane out to Crookston and the general flood area in the Red River Valley, to determine firsthand the extent of damage done, and to find out the causes of the flood, and to gain knowledge which would assist me in advancing projects and proposals to prevent these floods in the future. This problem is close to my heart, because many of my own friends and neighbors suffered great losses in the floods. I am determined to do everything I possibly can to assist them, and to work out a program which will prevent these floods again in the future.

It is well known now that I have introduced several measures in Congress, and have secured approval of these by the House Committee on Public Works, and the Congress as a whole, which would, if carried out, prevent these floods or make them less damaging in the future.

My efforts have resulted in a complete resurvey of the whole Red River Valley drainage system, including the Red Lake River, of course, to determine ways and means of preventing serious floods at Crookston.

I have suggested and have asked that particular attention be paid to the following proposals:

First. Construction of reservoir dams at one or more places on the Red Lake River and other rivers to hold back the floodwaters.

Second. The deepening, straightening, and widening of the channel of the Red River of the North between East Grand Forks and Grand Forks and the Canadian boundary in order that the floodwaters be speeded up to their destination to the northward.

Third. The deepening of the channel of the Red Lake River through Crookston and nearby areas.

Fourth. Federal assistance in the planning and construction of dikes at Crookston.

Federal action on this latter provision would take several years, and therefore the people of Crookston are going ahead on their own. It is quite certain now that the public-spirited and civic-minded citizens of Crookston will go ahead without Federal aid and build their own dikes. With this spirit of cooperation shown, we have still further reasons why the Federal Government should give particular attention to the flood problem in this area. The fact that the people of Crookston are not willing to wait for Federal action shows that the problem is a very serious one.

I regret that the administration has decided to withhold funds for some of the projects in the Red River Valley this year. These projects previously authorized by Congress had been given funds for their construction by Congress. These projects will now have to wait until the administration sees fit to advance the money which has been appropriated by the Congress. Otherwise it will be necessary for Congress to act again next year.

It has been a satisfaction to me to have sought and immediately secured the assistance of the United States Army engineers to study possible future flood-control projects for this area. Their services also have been offered to the city of Crookston, as far as technical assistance and advice is concerned.

I would like to insert here a letter I have just received from Col. Leverett G. Yoder, district engineer, Army Corps of Engineers, St. Paul, Minn., on the subject of possible future floods in the Crookston area. The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ENGINEER
ST. PAUL DISTRICT,
St. Paul, Minn., October 13, 1950.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Crookston, Minn.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: This is in reply to your letter of October 9, 1950, in which you request to be advised regarding a statement attributed to one of the engineers of this office to the effect that a flood several feet higher than the recent flood could be or might be expected next year.

Although there is no record or knowledge of such a statement having been made by a representative of this office, it is possible that such a conclusion might have been drawn from a misinterpretation of a discussion pertaining to the maximum probable flood. Theoretically, it is possible for a flood of greater magnitude than the 1950 flood to occur at Crookston under more critical conditions of infiltration losses, heavier snow cover, more rapid rate of snow melt, and greater accompanying rainfall. This office has not attempted to determine the maximum probable flood for the Red Lake River at Crookston so that it is not possible to state whether its occurrence would result in a maximum stage only 1 foot or several feet higher than the maximum stage reached this spring.

A knowledge of the maximum probable flood is desirable as a basis for determining the degree of protection which can be economically provided by levees or other protective measures or as a basis for spillway design in connection with storage reservoirs. Rarely, if ever, is it economically possible to construct levees to such a height that the theoretical maximum flood could be contained.

Preliminary calculations indicate that the 1950 flood at Crookston would have an average frequency of occurrence of about once in 100 years. Stream-flow records at Crookston cover a period of about 50 years so that the conclusions relating to flood frequency are fairly reliable. At the present time this office has no information which would lead to the conclusion that another major flood might be expected next year, nor has it any indication that a greater flood might be expected next year.

Sincerely yours,
LEVERETT G. YODER,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer.

In conclusion, I want to assure my neighbors and friends of Crookston, that they can be sure that their home-town boy, HAROLD C. HAGEN, will always look after their interests and their problems, and that I will do everything within my power to work out a solution to this flood menace which threatens Crookston periodically. My help is pledged to them all in every way possible.

Administration Using War To Cover Socialistic Aims Advance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a September 19, 1950, release charging the Truman administration of trying to advance socialistic aims under cover of the war emergency.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 19, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, today accused the Truman administration of trying to advance socialistic aims under cover of the war emergency, "at the risk of prolonging the war and taking the lives of more American boys." Senator MALONE made this serious accusation in a statement issued by his Washington office.

The Nevada Senator said: "Every economic step taken by the Truman administration has been in the direction of socialism, and now, with the war emergency as an excuse, it takes us the final step. The only kind of controls the administration has ever wanted are those which mean the final and fatal step into the abysmal pit of socialism, from which there seems no turning back. The State Department insists in completing its one economic world program at the Torquay, England, conference, under cover of war, starting on September 28.

"The great strength of our country lies in its productivity. American industrial management has demonstrated its understanding of national problems as well as its ability to outperform the world. Our industrial capacities have been indispensable to victory. We have won two World Wars, not because one Yank can lick six other guys, not because our generals were superior in wit and strategy, not because our arms were more ingenious; we won because the hoarded reserve strength of the American industrial economy provided the weapon that could not be matched. We had an untrammeled production machine that, being free to grow, had grown rich in untapped resources.

"This we would not have had if we had been hamstringing ourselves with Government controls. American productive might has well been termed the arsenal of democracy, and it can best be maintained as such by a minimum of economic controls and Government interference. The United States will not remain the most productive nation on earth if the Government tries to run the mines, the factories, the farms, the stores, and the railroads.

"War requires initiative and imagination. Management for war production has to be flexible and sharp. With the controls which the administration wanted, these things will be lacking and our chances of winning the war speedily will be greatly lessened. With such controls our strength will be dissipated.

"Despite this the administration wanted these controls. There is only one explanation: the left-wingers in the administration to whom the President most often listens are willing to pay this high price in American blood shed to bring on socialism.

"Once the New Dealers get their hands on the economy, which has been their ambition for a generation, they will fight to keep it. Any power given Government administrators is not freely relinquished.

"The clamor for Federal controls over industry did not arise out of fear that industrial production is inadequate, but actually reflected the ambition of certain elements to seize control of the economic life of the Nation at whatever the cost."

Totalitarian, Anti-Semitic Propaganda Spread by Agitators Operating Under Cover of War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, in contemptible contrast to the brave spirit of our soldiers fighting in Korea stands the evil of propaganda being systematically spread about the country by a group of agitators, trouble-makers and hatemongers.

These propagandists include many of the very same men who tried to undermine our democracy in its life-and-death struggle with Hitler and the Axis Powers. Their strategy is to set race against race, and religion against religion. They are heavily financed and dangerous.

The details of this un-American propaganda plot have been well set forth in a release issued by the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, 165 West Forty-sixth Street, New York; an organization which has for the past 17 years specialized in investigating and exposing these enemies of our American institutions.

Under general leave to extend my remarks, I include the release of the Anti-Nazi League:

MOST DANGEROUS WAVE OF ANTI-SEMITISM THREATENED BY PROPAGANDISTS OPERATING UNDER COVER OF KOREAN WAR—LEAGUE ASKS FEDERAL INQUIRY UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Charging existence of a dangerous conspiracy to undermine morale and discourage enlistments in connection with the Korean war, the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League today sought a two-pronged Federal investigation into activities of a number of isolationist, anti-Semitic and formerly pro-Nazi publications and propagandists.

In a complaint to Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, the league requested investigation, under Selective Service Act provisions penalizing conspiracy to discourage enlistments, of the Broom (west coast weekly), Common Sense (New Jersey biweekly), Women's Voice (Chicago biweekly), and a number of other publications and individuals, including the Communist Daily Worker and a German-language newspaper in Chicago.

In a second complaint to Congressman FRANK BUCHANAN, Democrat, Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Committee on Lobbying Activities, the league urged congressional investigation of the same publications, and also of the Washington lobbying activities of Gerald L. K. Smith, Agnes Waters, George W. Armstrong, and others.

Both complaints were signed by Prof. James H. Sheldon, administrative chairman, and Herman Hoffman, chairman of the league's board of directors.

As examples of the kind of agitation complained of, the league cited the following:

"Prospective draftee confused on Jew problem, asks for advice"—full-page headline in the Broom, July 24, 1950. The ensuing article, purporting to answer an inquiry from a prospective draftee identified only as "Frank," puts the entire blame for the Korean war upon the Jews, quoting at length from the notorious Protocols of the Elders of Zion, a propaganda forgery popularized by the Nazis about 15 years ago.

"The Zionists * * * have given word for the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. * * * They are working with the enemy and will retard shipment of supplies and help the Communist forces in any way possible." (Excerpts from article in Common Sense, issue 118 (distributed July 20).) The same issue contains a long article by the Texas multimillionaire propagandist, George W. Armstrong (who admits paying for a considerable part of this propaganda), saying: "Our weakness is that New York Communist Jews control both our industries and labor organizations. * * * We have hybrid Jew Mark Clark as commander in chief of our Army and our Atomic Commission is pro-Jewish."

"Bring home our boys. * * * It is nothing but a mass slaughter and a put-up job. * * * This war is a Jewish conspiracy." (Women's Voice, July 27, 1950.) The same publication (one of the most notorious anti-Semitic publications in the country) also started a "bring home our boys" campaign during World War II, when Hitler's armies were pushing back our first troops landed in Europe.

Gerald L. K. Smith, a ringleader amongst all these agitators, has already held large meetings on the west coast, in an attempt to blame the Korean war on "Jewish influences." Taking obvious advantage of the press hysteria engendered by the atom spy exposures, Smith is again pushing a particularly scurrilous pamphlet called The Jews Have Got the Atom Bomb, plus an accompanying tract, Is Communism Jewish?

Meanwhile, an important part of the German-language press has adopted a similarly bad position. For example, the Chicago Burgerzeitung actually devoted half of its front page to reprinting the notorious letter that Hermann Goering sent to Winston Churchill just before Goering committed suicide, in which Goering insolently declares that future history will show that England and America were wrongly influenced in not having supported the Nazi regime of Adolf Hitler instead of fighting against it.

Without an immediate Federal investigation, the Anti-Nazi League warned, "The country faces the gravest danger today from a Nation-wide conspiracy of nationalists, isolationists, and anti-Semitic agitators, who have combined a new propaganda line, blaming a specific religious minority, the Jews, for (a) getting us involved in Korea through the United Nations, (b) strengthening communism so as to do business with both sides, and (c) stealing atom secrets for the benefit of the enemy—all of which is combined with a general attack along conventional partisan and lobbying lines, upon the entire foreign policy of the present administration."

"The sudden and heavily financed increase in this type of propaganda, reflected by anti-Semitic and former Bundist agitators all over the country indicates the beginning of one of the most dangerous waves of anti-Semitism and other un-American propaganda which has ever swept this continent," the league's complaint concluded.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—For further identification of the publications mentioned above, the Broom, was named in the first wartime sedition conspiracy indictment, and has lately been conducting a campaign to halt the dismantlement of German war industries. Common Sense recently urged appointment of Merwin K. Hart as Attorney General, and has printed a number of articles written by Robert Best, the American who broadcast for Goebbels on Radio Berlin during the war and is now serving a sentence for treason. Women's Voice is one of the most prolific distributing agencies for anti-Semitic literature amongst women's groups, and its office accounts for a large percentage of the distribution of such items as the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, in this country.

State Department Cowardly Blaming MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release of September 26, 1950, stating that the very same State Department officials who made the stupid blunders that invited the Korean war are cowardly attempting to smear General MacArthur by placing the blame on him.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 26, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, charged today that "the very same State Department officials who made the stupid blunders that invited the Korean war are cowardly attempting to smear General MacArthur by placing the blame on him." The serious charge was made in a statement issued by the Nevada Senator's Washington office, which demanded public exposure of "this new trickery on the part of the Communist-loving clique in the State Department."

Continuing, Senator MALONE said: "These left-wingers have been after General MacArthur's scalp for some time because he stood firm against their scheme, first made evident at Yalta, to turn Asia over to the Communists. Now, since the stupidity, or deliberate treachery, of the Asia policy makers, Hiss, Lattimore, and Acheson, cannot be denied, the followers of this group have the unmitigated gall to spread the lying whisper that General MacArthur was responsible for the surprise attack on South Korea.

"The person who was responsible, who made the wrong decisions, who mothered the stupid notions, who put into force the ill-conceived ideas of the Communist lovers, who in fact never deviated from any of their principles, is Mr. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State.

"At a closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Acheson was asked whether he had sought the views of General MacArthur on the strategic importance of Formosa. He answered that he was not reporting on MacArthur's views, that he did not necessarily know them.

"He also said he had not talked to the Joint Chiefs and did not know their views. Three days later, Mr. Acheson made the announcement that America's military defense line in the Pacific ran from the Aleutians to

the Philippines, including Japan and Okinawa but skipping Korea and Formosa.

"General MacArthur, far from shaping any of that policy, was not even consulted.

"Is it General MacArthur who determined to withdraw our forces from Korea and leave an ill-equipped constabulary in their place? Is it he who ignored repeated reports of armed raids by Communists across the thirty-eighth parallel, and the urgent warnings from Korean Government officials that heavier attacks were imminent? The answers to these questions are as obvious as the whispered charges against MacArthur are ridiculous."

Administration Ignoring Lower-Income Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release dated for October 3, 1950, in which I believe that the administration is turning its backs on the low- and middle-income American families.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 3, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, today charged President Truman and the Democratic administration with turning their backs on the low-income and middle-income American families and he offered as evidence the new credit curb on installment buying.

In a statement issued by his Washington office, Senator MALONE said:

"Who is hurt by Mr. Truman's curb on installment buying? Certainly not the wealthy families. They do not need to buy things on the installment plan. The installment-buying plan has been a great blessing to the low-income and middle-income families. It accounts to a great extent for the high standard of living in America, because it brings into the modest homes from coast to coast the things which make better living.

"Had Mr. Truman and his planners had their way in the earlier years of American economy and free enterprise, America today would resemble those miserable European countries where installment buying and other economic advantages are unheard of.

"The President says he must curb the buying power of American families. One of the reasons given for boosting the already high Federal income taxes, you will recall, to siphon off the rise in wages, was to curb buying power and to prevent inflation—raising wages is only another indirect source for increased Federal taxes. I do not think the American people will continue to stand for this kind of subterfuge and interference with their life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

"Mr. Truman has pretended to be the friend of the American worker, but his credit curb on the middle-income group which he has invoked is as bad a stab in the back as the American worker could possibly receive, and it is absolutely unnecessary. Don't let any of the Socialist-minded monetary and credit manipulators tell you the war emergency requires this outrageous step against the people. Other steps can be taken which would make this unnecessary. It has no basis whatsoever in sound national economy.

"The simple fact is the war situation is being used as an excuse for this and other steps toward peacetime regimentation and national socialism. It is part of the softening up process to get us to accept true socialism, which objective is the same as communism, government ownership of property. We have observed the encroachment of socialism, step by step, in our lives but I believe that such affronts as this, to the low-income and middle income American families, will cause the people to awaken to the danger before it is too late."

The Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.—The Report Which Was Never Released

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on Communist propaganda.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE METROPOLITAN BROADCASTING CORP.—THE REPORT WHICH WAS NEVER RELEASED

It is basic in the Soviet Communist conspiracy throughout the world that strenuous efforts have been made by them to infiltrate, influence and control propaganda outlets such as newspapers, radio, and moving pictures—so that their insidious poison may be used to influence the people of the world.

Whenever Communist influence obtains control of any source of information within this country, I firmly believe that such a situation should be exposed because it constitutes a serious menace to the security of this country. The American people are entitled to know the facts pertaining to the Communist conspiracy.

I do not stand alone in voicing these opinions. The danger involved in Communist propaganda has been proven time after time.

The notorious Canadian-Russian espionage case contains numerous facts showing that employees in high places in the Canadian Government were recruited for the Soviet espionage system through study clubs, where the philosophies of Karl Marx and Stalin were taught.

One of the findings of the Royal Commission in Canada which investigated the workings of the Soviet camp in that country, was that Soviet agents were out to find Canadians who were willing to betray their country and to supply agents of a foreign power secret information. The Canadian Government found that many of the public servants implicated in working with the Soviet camp Communist conspiracy were persons with an unusually high degree of education, and many were well regarded by those who worked with the agencies and departments of the public service as persons of marked ability and intelligence.

The Royal Commission also found from overwhelming, positive, conclusive evidence—both from the documents and the testimony—that those traitors within the Canadian Government aided the Soviet Communist conspiracy not for monetary gain but because their minds had been poisoned by a political ideology and by the psychological condition received in Communist-front study groups.

In all of the cases investigated by the Royal Commission in Canada, that commission found that those Government employees who became Soviet spies and traitors were recruited from secret cells and study groups controlled or directly influenced by the Communist Party. The Canadian Government also found that a number of Canadian citizens—some employed in high influential positions—were presumably quite ignorant of the espionage conspiratorial network and were innocent of the implication of such activities.

The Canadian Government in its painstakingly thorough investigation has pointed out in its report that every Communist study group is a potential recruiting base of Russian espionage agents. Incidentally, the Canadian Government delivered to this Government a list of over 150 names of American citizens in high places both within our Government and without—names which were obtained from testimony and documentary proof—who were part of a huge espionage conspiracy within the United States.

Those names and facts were delivered to none other than the President of the United States and thereafter there has been complete silence on the part of those in control of the executive branch of our Government relative to those traitorous Americans whose identities were revealed by the investigation of the Canadian Government in Canada.

Today I intend to reveal facts and documentary proof concerning what is known in Washington as the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., operating under the identification of radio station WQQW. Most of these facts, if not all, have been in possession of the executive branch of the Government, as well as the House Un-American Activities Committee, which has been controlled all of these years by the Democratic majority, with the exception of that period of time during the Eightieth Congress when, under Republican leadership, this committee revealed and successfully caused the prosecution of Alger Hiss.

Why these facts have not been given to the American people is obvious.

The Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. is a corporation, and was granted a conditional license to operate a frequency modulation station in Washington, D. C., by the Federal Communications Commission. The corporation also received a construction permit from the same Commission to erect a standard broadcasting station. The facts concerning this corporation came to the attention of the Democratic-controlled Committee on Un-American Activities as early as 1946.

A detailed report clearly reflects the facts gathered concerning the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. and concerning the type of people controlling this corporation and its policies—but, strangely enough, when the facts had been obtained which involved numerous responsible people in the employ of our Federal Government it was never released. I do not know the exact reasons why, other than the fact that the executive branch of our Government, which has been under the control of the Democratic Party these many years, has consistently, on every hand, used every facility to suppress the exposure of subversives within our Federal Government. I think this is obvious to the American public.

I am not going to go into great detail on the facts because I am now putting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report that should have been filed in 1946, so that the true nature of this propaganda outlet in control of the Communist influence can be taken to the American people.

I intend today to mention merely a few of the significant facts concerning the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. which I feel

should be emphasized. I also will discuss additional facts obtained by me concerning this radio station developed since the unfiled House committee report of 1946.

In 1946, Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. had approximately 75 stockholders. As of December 1948 this radio station had approximately 200 stockholders. Now, on the basis of facts which are contained in this report which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, plus the additional facts developed since 1946 regarding these stockholders, let us analyze the people who actually control and operate this station, as far as its policies are concerned. As you know, persons who are not only stockholders of a corporation but who are also creditors of such corporation and, in addition to this, have official business in connection with such a corporation, wield a tremendous influence upon the activities of the corporation.

For your information, six of the stockholders are the largest creditors of radio station WQQW and are affiliated with the Communist Party in the District of Columbia. They are persons who have contributed substantial financial aid to known and cited Communist-front organizations and have furnished funds directly to the Communist Party as well.

In this group of six is included the president of this corporation, Morris Rodman. His brother, Samuel Rodman, and Samuel's wife, Bella Rodman, were called before the House Un-American Activities Committee in June 1949 and refused to answer pertinent questions on the ground of self-incrimination. In addition to these individuals with known Communist Party affiliations and activities who are stockholders and creditors of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Co., let me further advise that 17 of the remaining stockholders of this corporation who wielded influence over its policies, are also considered to be affiliated with the Communist Party in and around Washington, D. C. In addition to this number, 63 additional stockholders are known to have affiliated themselves with one or more dangerous cited Communist Party front groups.

It will be noted from this unfiled House committee report that a great many of these individuals—both the officers of the corporation as well as the stockholders—have been affiliated actively as officers or members of the notorious Communist Party front organization called the Washington Cooperative Bookshop.

The Washington Cooperative Bookshop, I might point out here, is another one of those insidious, dangerous Karl Marx study group clubs on which the efficient FBI obtained such damaging facts that even former Attorney General Biddle cited this organization as subversive and a Communist-front club.

As I have stated before, the Canadian Government ascertained that these Communist-inspired Karl Marx clubs formed the breeding and recruiting grounds for Soviet agents to carry out the Communist conspiracy and the Washington Cooperative Bookshop organization fits to a "T" the very type of organization found to be so dangerous to the security of the Canadian Government in its investigation of the Soviet espionage activities by Government employees and others in Canada.

In addition to this, it is very interesting to note that this report reflects that 28 individuals who are stockholders and directly connected with the Metropolitan Broadcasting Co. are Government employees—many of them employed in very strategic vital positions. Eight of these twenty-eight are employed in none other than Dean Acheson's organization, the State Department; others are employed in the Treasury Department; others were employed in the Navy Department, Office of Research and Inventions; others are employed in the Internal Revenue, Geological Survey, and Department of the Interior.

It has been expressed by many persons responsible for the security of our country that any Government employee who associates with known Communists, or fellow travelers in any enterprise is presenting his own challenge to the Government which pays his salary.

Let me go into detail about some of the persons involved in this corporation on whom facts reflect the party to be clearly a Soviet espionage agent. That is Mary Jane Keeney.

Mary Jane Keeney was a stockholder of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Co. in 1946 and was a stockholder in 1948.

In a report by the House Un-American Activities Committee dated May 24, 25, and June 9, 1949, there is contained the testimony of Phillip O. Keeney and Mary Jane Keeney, and a statement regarding their background. Relative to the Keeneys, this report quotes FBI reports which were introduced as evidence in the Judith Coplon trial. The pertinent facts of the FBI reports are quoted as follows:

"Confidential Informant T-8 advised on August 20, 1946, that Mary Jane Keeney, who was well known on the east coast for her Communist and espionage activities, stated she desired to get into the ICC (Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions) and would look into the job in New York when she next saw Mrs. Florence March, a vice president of the Congress of American Women and a person whom she knew very well.

"With regard to Kournakoff, Informant T-21, of known reliability, has advised that he is identical with Sergei Nikolayivich Kournakoff, was (with aliases), including Colonel Thomas. According to that informant, Kournakoff is a Russian national who came to the United States as a stateless citizen on October 21, 1921. He became affiliated with the Russky Golos Publishing Corp., and wrote articles for the Daily Worker and the New Masses magazine. He departed the United States at New York City on January 30, 1946, and is believed to be in the U. S. S. R. He was a close associate of Mary Jane and Phillip Olin Keeney, who, according to Confidential Informant T-22, were members of the Communist Party. T-22 is a former member of the Communist Party who has furnished considerable information to this office and who assisted in forming numerous front organizations for the Communist Party.

"Confidential Informant T-1 advised that on March 9, 1946, one Mary Jane Keeney arrived in the United States on the steamship *Mit Victory* at Pier 84, North River, New York City, and was met by Jules Korchein, mentioned hereinbefore, with whom Wasserman was residing at 110 Christopher Street. Mary Jane Keeney was traveling on diplomatic passport No. 418-1, which had been issued at Washington, D. C., on October 22, 1945. Keeney and Korchein were placed under surveillance by Special Agents N. M. Kalmes and the writer, and proceeded to 110 Christopher Street, where they entered the apartment of Wasserman and Korchein. The same informant advised that Keeney was to stay in the apartment and Korchein had made arrangements to leave there and stay in another apartment for the 3 or 4 days Keeney would be in town. On this same date, namely, March 9, 1946, Keeney was placed under surveillance by Special Agents M. M. O'Rourke, J. H. Doyle, and F. J. Nolan, and was observed leaving 110 Christopher Street, New York City. She proceeded to the Murray Hill Restaurant, Park Avenue and Forty-first Street, New York City. At the restaurant, she was joined by an individual, later identified as Joseph Bernstein, suspected of being engaged in Soviet espionage. Keeney was observed passing a manila envelope to Bernstein.

"This same informant advised that on March 11, 1946, Alexander Trachtenberg, secretary-treasurer, International Publishers, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York City, held a conference with Joseph M. Bernstein, the individual mentioned previously as having had dinner with Mary Jane Keeney, and, during this conference, Bernstein advised Trachtenberg that he had seen a friend of his who had been on a Government mission in France, and that she had managed to bring in an important will furnished by a first political deputy who had been shot down by the Germans. Trachtenberg indicated that he had been trying to get this will for over a year and at this time it was agreed that Bernstein would bring the will to Trachtenberg's office on March 13, 1946.

"On March 13, 1946, Special Agents M. M. O'Rourke and F. J. Nolan took up a surveillance of Bernstein and it was established that Bernstein was identical with the individual who dined with Keeney on the Saturday night previous and to whom Keeney had given the manila envelope. At the time this surveillance was taken up, on Monday, March 13, 1946, it was observed that Bernstein had in his possession the manila envelope which was believed to be identical to the one Keeney had given to him. The surveillance on Bernstein was undertaken and ultimately led to the office of Alexander Trachtenberg, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

"Phillip Keeney was formerly a librarian, and was employed as such at the University of Montana, and during the latter months of 1945 and in early 1946 was attached to General MacArthur's staff in Japan, heading the organization of libraries in Japan. In late 1946, he was dismissed from his position by the War Department and he returned to the United States. Mary Jane Keeney was formerly employed by the United States Government on a special economic mission and had gone to Europe in October 1945 with this mission, which she was still with at the time of her arrival in the United States in March 1946. At a later date, Mary Jane Keeney resigned her position with this mission. She is presently employed by the United Nations at Lake Success, N. Y., in the editorial department. The Keeneys have been in close contact with Ursula Wasserman since March 1946 to the present time."

FBI reports, which are set out in detail in the reports before the House Un-American Activities Committee dated May and June 1949, clearly reflect that Mary Jane Keeney is considered by the FBI as being a notorious Communist and espionage agent both within and without the United States; and they clearly show the nature of her activities to be that of a Communist courier or espionage agent.

Mary Jane Keeney and her husband have been reliably identified by Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley as associating with and trafficking with numerous members of the Nathan Gregory Silvermaster Russian espionage groups, the Victor Perlo group, and numerous other persons both on the east and the west coasts who formed part of several Soviet espionage rings within this country. It shows also that the Keeneys were very active in the Washington Cooperative Bookshop.

Phillip Keeney and Mary Jane Keeney appeared before the House Un-American Activities Committee and as the report reflects both Phillip Keeney and Mary Jane Keeney refused to answer numerous questions as to the people they knew, organizations to which they belonged and their activities underground with the usual stock Communist answer of "self-incrimination."

Mary Jane Keeney resigned her job with the State Department and obtained a job with UN upon State Department recommendation.

In a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated June 28, 29, July 6, 12, and 28, 1949, there is included—"Hearings Regarding Communism in the District of

Columbia—Part I." This committee makes the following statement, which I feel is very significant.

"We are frank to state that these espionage agents could not have successfully evaded detection—in fact, they could not have operated without the aid of Communist agents working from outside the Government. This is a pattern which has long been typical of Communist operations throughout the world. It is similar to the practice of using outsiders to aid Communists operating within large industrial plants and is known in Communist jargon as concentration. Such concentration rings have, in the past, been known to render the following services to their fellow conspirators within Government agencies or strategic plants:

"1. To furnish financial aid, in some cases running into large sums.

"2. To handle the mechanics of Communist Party membership, dues payments, distribution of directives, literature, etc.

"3. To establish contact with Communist Party officials.

"4. To transmit Government documents and information to Communist Party officials.

"5. To furnish convenient meeting places.

"6. To furnish convenient mailing addresses and drops.

"It should be noted that although some of the witnesses occupy positions of some standing in the business and social world, they have uniformly refused to answer questions on reported Communist affiliations on the ground of self-incrimination. In other words, they have resorted to the same conspiratorial methods of nondisclosure which have characterized known Communists in their appearance before this committee."

The president of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., Morris Rodman, as well as his brother, Samuel Rodman, and Samuel's wife, Bella Rodman, all have been shown to be members of the Communist Party or affiliated very closely with the party, as well as numerous dangerous Communist-front groups and other Communist activities which are almost notoriously known in Washington, D. C.

The following facts on Bella Rodman are contained in the hearings regarding communism in the District of Columbia:

"This individual, according to her testimony, was born in Warsaw, Poland, in December 1902. She presently resides at 3700 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

"During the course of the committee's investigation of Bella Rodman, it was reported that she was responsible for the sustaining fund of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia and that she had discussed Communist Party financial affairs with Martin Chancey, former Communist organizer in the District of Columbia.

"She was also reported to the committee as having been a member of the Thomas Jefferson Club of the Communist Party, and her husband, Samuel, although not known as a member of the Communist Party, is reported to have made a contribution through her which was to be used for the benefit of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia.

"In reply to questions regarding the Communist associations set forth above, Mrs. Rodman declined to answer on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate her."

The following facts are also set out in that report concerning Samuel Rodman:

"This individual stated during his testimony that he was born February 12, 1898, at Joppa, Palestine, and that he is a naturalized citizen of the United States, having received his naturalization papers in the district court of New Brunswick, N. J., in 1927. He stated that he is the husband of Bella Rodman, who has been mentioned hereinbefore.

"During the course of the investigation concerning Samuel Rodman, conducted by the committee, it was ascertained that he had been the recipient of loans totaling more than $2,000,000, which were to be used in the construction of housing enterprises under permission granted by the Federal Housing Administration. The loans secured by Rodman were granted by various private organizations; however, these loans are insured by the Federal Housing Administration, which is not empowered to conduct investigations of applicants for loans from a security standpoint.

"During the committee's investigation, it was reported that Rodman had been associated with the Friends of the Soviet Union, that he had attended Communist Party meetings of a public nature, that he had made contributions for the benefit of the Communist Party in the District of Columbia, through his wife, and that he had discussed Communist Party affairs with Martin Chancey.

"When asked questions regarding the Communist Party associations mentioned hereinbefore, Mr. Rodman refused to answer on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate him."

The Rodmans have all of the reasons in the world, due to their financial position, to be loyal American citizens; having obtained so much in the way of material wealth under our system of Government. And they have in turn used their money and their efforts in furthering Communist-front causes and Communist Party activities. Their testimony which is reported by the House Un-American Activities Committee for June and July of 1949 contains a pattern of the most insidious type of activities, including their contemptuous type of refusal to answer pertinent questions. The Rodmans are the group which influence so much of the activities and policies of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

Another individual whom I feel I should mention particularly is one of the many State Department employees who were connected with the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.; owning an interest in this company and furthering its aims and its policies. He is P. Bernard Nortman.

In connection with P. Bernard Nortman, I insert as an exhibit contents of the actual files contained in the FBI investigation report in detail relative to activities, associates, and contacts of P. Bernard Nortman.

The FBI reports and surveillances reflect that the FBI considered Nortman certainly to be a Russian espionage agent because their surveillance reflects that Nortman had numerous contacts with Victor Perlo, Mary Jane Keeney, whom I have mentioned, Dr. Abraham Weinstein, and none other than William Walter Remington, all of whom were named as Soviet agents—the William Remington who is now under indictment in connection with his Communist activities. This is the William Remington who was on my list.

FBI surveillance reflects Nortman's Communist activities and suspicious contacts in Washington, D. C., and in New York not only with known Soviet agents but numerous underground Communist Party members in Washington, D. C.

By memorandum from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, to the State Department dated August 23, 1946, it was reflected by actual FBI surveillance that Nortman and William Remington were on an extremely friendly basis and that on September 3, 1946, in addition to contacting William Remington and discussing his job in the Economic Development Section of the State Department, he visited Victor Perlo in the office of Victor Perlo, and Nortman was observed carrying a legal-sized folder of papers into Perlo's office. After conferring with Perlo for approximately 1½ hours, Nortman left his office without such papers and such surveillance clearly indicated Nortman delivered these papers to Victor Perlo.

Victor Perlo, of course, has been named by Government witnesses under oath as being a Soviet espionage agent.

FBI investigation reflects that a reliable confidential informant of the FBI was a member of the Communist Party with P. Bernard Nortman in 1936 in unit "L" of the Harlem section of the Communist Party in New York. Numerous other clear-cut facts, developed by reliable FBI informants, reflect Nortman to have been a member of the Communist Party for a good many years, so when the State Department in June 1947 was furnished with these overwhelming facts by the FBI showing Nortman's membership in the Communist Party, his membership in Communist Party front groups, and his numerous unusual contacts with known Soviet agents, that Department was forced to discharge Nortman; but like so many in that Department they did not turn their back on Nortman. They should have discharged him in such a manner as to prevent further employment in Government service. However, after discharging him in June, his record was revised in November of 1947 which reflects only that he resigned. Nortman continues to be connected as a stockholder wielding influence in the policies of the operation of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

Another person influential in formulating the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. policies and connected with this company as a stockholder is one Selden Menefee.

In a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Seventy-ninth Congress, 1946—which was suppressed and not issued, and pertinent parts of which I am inserting into the RECORD, Menefee is described on page 66 as follows:

"He has been a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, a Communist front, and so described by an Attorney General of the United States.

"In addition to membership in the Washington Committee for Democratic Action and the Washington Book Shop, Mr. Menefee has also signed a statement on behalf of the Communist Party of the United States which pertained to the purge trials in Moscow, Russia, during the year 1938. The authority for the fact that Menefee signed this statement is the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker, for April 28, 1938. This statement is entitled 'Statement by American Progressives on the Moscow Trials.' The Moscow trials were conducted in 1938 and they resulted in the wholesale execution of persons considered enemies of Joseph Stalin.

"This report has mentioned the fact that Menefee's book Assignment U. S. A., was the basis of a radio play conducted by the Writer's War Board in 1944. Two members of the Writers' War Board, Arch Oboler and Carlton E. Morse, were associated with the Writers' Congress in 1943. The Writers' Congress is an outgrowth of the League of American Writers which was described in a magazine entitled 'International Literature,' published in Moscow, Russia, as the first revolutionary writers' congress in a capitalist country."

The facts developed concerning Selden Menefee by the FBI were so aggravated relative to his Communist activities and associations, that during the war he applied to the Civil Service Commission for a rating and such rating was refused because of his Communist Party activities and associations. At the time of his application for such rating, he was preparing to lecture to members of the United States Army overseas and this was refused and blocked through military efforts.

The facts furnished by the House Un-American Activities Committee in its report, reflect that Menefee was connected with the Writers' Congress in 1943, described to be a subversive. In this connection I must point out that Owen Lattimore was also connected

with the Writers' Congress as a speaker before that group in 1943.

Rose Anderson is a creditor of radio station WQQW to the amount of $500 and also holds 30 shares of stock. In the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, dated June 28 through July 28, 1949, in regard to hearings regarding communism in the District of Columbia, the following facts relative to Rose Anderson are set out on page VII:

"This individual was born in Russia, according to her own statement, 58 or 59 years ago. She entered the United States in 1904 as Rose Leifshitz, her maiden name.

"During the course of the testimony she stated that she had been proprietor of the Investment Pharmacy for a period of 22 years. During the course of the investigation conducted by the committee in connection with the Communist activities of Rose Anderson, it was reported that Mrs. Anderson had made large contributions to the Communist Party of the District of Columbia and that she had been a member of the white-collar branch of the Communist Party in 1944. It was also reported that she had been associated in Communist Party activities with Emanuel Levin, Gertrude Hurney, Thomas Hurney, and James Branca.

"It was also reported to the committee during its investigation that Rose Anderson had been a member of the Thomas Jefferson Club of the Communist Party in 1945.

"In reply to all of the questions propounded to her during the course of the hearing regarding Communist Party activities set forth above, Mrs. Anderson declined to answer on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate her."

John Anderson, husband of Rose Anderson, is a creditor of radio station WQQW to the amount of $550, holding 10 shares of stock. The following facts relative to him which are set out in the report on hearings regarding communism in the District of Columbia issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities, reflect the following:

"This individual, during his testimony, stated that he had been born in Sweden on May 3, 1895, and that he is the husband of Rose Anderson, who has been discussed previously herein.

"During the course of the committee's investigation, it was reported that John Anderson was a member of the white-collar branch of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia and that meetings of that branch of the Communist Party had been held in his home. He was also reported to have been associated with James Branca in connection with Communist Party activities in the District of Columbia.

"The files of the Committee on Un-American Activities disclose that John Anderson was the treasurer and a member of the executive board of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, according to a letterhead dated June 4, 1947. The committee has cited this organization as subversive in a special report dated June 16, 1947. The files further indicate that John Anderson was affiliated with the Washington branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy and the Washington Committee for Aid to China, both cited as subversive by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

"He was also listed by the Daily Worker of January 9, 1948, page 10, as the vice president of the Maryland Wallace-for-President Committee.

"In reply to questions propounded to him during the course of the hearing afforded him regarding his membership in the Communist Party of the District of Columbia, Mr. Anderson declined to answer on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate him."

Owen Lattimore and his wife, Eleanor Lattimore, are also stockholders.

The report reflects that since its inception, the Lattimores have alined themselves and actively supported this radio station. As of June 24, 1947, Eleanor Lattimore is a member of the board of directors of this organization.

The House Un-American Activities Committee in 1946 prepared this report which I am inserting into the RECORD for distribution and release. The report you will note furnishes factual background concerning numerous persons connected with the radio station, and it considered Owen Lattimore of sufficient significance to devote a large portion of the report dealing with the personnel of this station to Owen Lattimore, which is quoted as follows:

"STOCKHOLDER OWEN LATTIMORE

"The above-named individual is a stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. Owen Lattimore has been affiliated with the Writers' Congress of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization. This organization is a successor of the Pacific coast branch of the League of American Writers, which has been cited as subversive by former Attorney General Biddle. Also it should be stated that the First Congress of the League of American Writers was described in International Literature, a magazine published in Moscow, Russia, as the first congress of revolutionary writers in a capitalist country.

"Owen Lattimore has also been associated with the Amerasia magazine. The managing editor of this magazine, Philip J. Jaffe, was recently convicted of a violation of the security laws of the United States relating to the 'possession of documents stolen from secret Government files.' The documents in question were stolen by various Government employees and made available to Jaffe, who subsequently, it is alleged, made them available to the American Communist Party. The disposition and handling of the case involving Jaffe by various governmental agencies is the subject of an investigation being conducted by another congressional committee. It is alleged as the basis of the investigation that Jaffe and others involved with him were recipients of special favors by certain governmental agencies. Nevertheless, here we find a stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., who has been associated with a convicted espionage agent in the publication of a Communist Party line magazine.

"Also, it might be stated here that Philip J. Jaffe is a consultant for the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. Kate L. Mitchell, who was implicated with Jaffe in the espionage case, but who was not convicted, however, is also a consultant for the same organization. Selden Menefee, who is a stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., who has been mentioned before in this report, is also a sponsor of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

"This report has pointed out the danger of association between Communists and Government employees because of the opportunities that such association provides for the recruiting of espionage agents. We must therefore consider that the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., has now fallen into the category of a Karl Marx Study Club from which espionage and propaganda agents are recruited. The association of stockholders Menefee and Lattimore with Philip J. Jaffe, a convicted espionage agent, should definitely demonstrate the point. As further evidence of the association of these individuals and the purpose of their association, we need only to point out that the documents involved in the Jaffe espionage case concerned in part the activities of the Chiang Kai-shek government in China. The Amerasia magazine, of which Jaffe is editor, specializes in far-eastern affairs and has been very critical of the Chiang Kai-shek government. Being a Communist Party line publication, the magazine is critical of Chiang Kai-shek and supports the Chinese Communists. One of the documents stolen and turned over to Jaffe contained detailed information concerning the disposition of the troops under Chiang Kai-shek's command, which, of course, is a very valuable document for the Communists to acquire, since Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Communists are now engaged in a civil war. Another document involved was one which described in some detail the entire personal and political background of the Chiang Kai-shek family. This document, of course, was very valuable for the purpose of circulating anti-Chiang Kai-shek propaganda. Some of the other documents involved military secrets of great value, but since they bear no relation to the matter under consideration they will not be discussed here. These documents were found in the possession of Philip Jaffe at the offices of the Amerasia magazine at the time of his arrest by the Federal authorities. Some of these documents apparently were used as the basis of articles condemning the Chiang Kai-shek government and the American State Department's support of Chiang which appeared in Amerasia from time to time.

"Owen J. Lattimore, like Philip J. Jaffee and Kate L. Mitchell, has supported organizations which want to see a communistic government in China."

In 1946 Owen Lattimore, with State Department approval, was busy on an assignment for the executive branch of the Government in Japan advising on reparations during that year.

The House Un-American Activities Committee report which would have given the facts to the American people—the facts to which they are entitled—were suppressed. It was not released. Why?

It is interesting also to note that Eleanor Lattimore and Owen Lattimore listed as their business address as stockholders in this company, 1710 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. At that time it was the identical address of the Washington section of the Institute of Pacific Relations, named as a Communist front and over whose publication Philip Jessup, for some time, had editorial control.

Mrs. Lattimore's phone number was publicly given by that subversive group called the Committee of One Thousand as its official phone.

What is the Committee of One Thousand? The avowed purpose of this committee was to pressure Congress to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Naturally, the Communists and their fellow-travelers desired to abolish this committee or any other effort on the part of Congress to tell the American people the facts concerning the Communist movement in this country.

Not only does examination of the facts from the report in my hand reflect Communist activities and affiliations on the part of those who control and influence this station, but it should be pointed out that this report also reflects that on questions of foreign policy, the Communist Party has utilized the organization called the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts and Sciences, and the National Citizens Political Action Committee. Both such organizations are closely alined with the third subversive organization called the National Committee to Win the Peace.

All of these organizations were created and controlled by the Communist Party to influence through propaganda and otherwise the foreign policy of the United States in favor of Soviet Russia, and all of these organizations are represented among the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

Thus, as the report reads, we find that these three member organizations created by the Communist Party to affect foreign policy now have an outlet for propaganda support-

ing its views on foreign policy through the facilities of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

From these facts it would appear that WQQW is completely under Communist control.

This station should not be confused with WPIK, the Virginia station known as the "Metropolitan Network Station."

I think that anyone reading these reports and the reports which I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can have no doubt as to the nature, aims, and purposes of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES AND PROPAGANDA—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 5, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

METROPOLITAN BROADCASTING CORP.

Foreword

The above-named corporation is incorporated in the District of Columbia and it has been granted a conditional license to operate a frequency modulation station in Washington, D. C. A construction permit for the erection of this station has been granted by the Federal Communications Commission. The corporation has also received a construction permit from the Federal Communications Commission to erect a standard broadcasting station. In summation, therefore, the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. will have control of two radio outlets which will reach the listening audience in Washington, D. C., and vicinity.

The mere letting of broadcast facilities by the Federal Communications Commission, of course, is not a matter of great import to the Committee on Un-American Activities. However, some alarming facts concerning the grant of these stations to the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. have been brought to the committee's attention.

These facts appear of particular interest when it has become apparent that there are two schools of thought in existence in the United States today on the question of foreign policy. One of these schools believes in wholehearted cooperation with the Soviet Government and the division of the world into two spheres of influence, American and Russian. The other school of thought believes in cooperation with all of the world's nations and the retention of what we may call the status quo insofar as the nations of Europe and Asia are concerned. By the status quo we mean the restoration of the right of self-government to every nation that enjoyed this privilege prior to the outbreak of the Second World War. Also this second group believes in free and unbridled trade between all of the nations of the world. The present foreign policy of the United States is supported by the majority of those persons who fall into the category of the second school of thought, or those who believe in the retention of the status quo.

This difference in thought on the question of foreign policy was recently visibly brought to the attention of the American public when a speech made by Henry Wallace on the question of foreign policy resulted in Mr. Wallace's dismissal as Secretary of Commerce from the President's Cabinet. Mr. Wallace's speech was sponsored by the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and the National Citizens Political Action Committee. These two organizations are political organizations, and we find that they are in turn closely alined with an organization called the National Committee To Win the Peace. This third organization, the National Committee To Win the Peace, we find is also opposed to the foreign policy of the United States Government. The National Committee To Win the Peace, the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, and the National Citizens Political Action Committee are represented among the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. Thus we find that three organizations opposing the foreign policy of the United States now have an outlet for propaganda supporting their views on foreign policy through the facilities of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

The Communist Party of the United States, of course, supports the foreign policy of the three organizations mentioned. We also find the Communist Party of the United States represented among the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

In addition to the data briefly set forth hereinbefore it is also of interest to note that there is today in the United States a third-party movement which will undoubtedly come into being in the near future. This third-party movement is also represented indirectly among the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. The third-party movement through the medium indirectly represented among the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. has a direct representation in a west coast radio station which will be discussed in supplemental data appearing in this report. The third-party movement is supported by the followers of the first school of thought on foreign policy mentioned in this report.

The committee also finds that there has been a very close connection between employees of the Federal Communications Commission and the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

Further, the committee also finds that one prospective stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp has openly avowed her belief in Karl Marx philosophy and radicalism in a magazine article which she wrote not too many years ago for a Communist-front publication.

It is of further interest to note that represented among the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. are approximately 10 individuals who have held membership in the Washington Book Shop, a Communist enterprise.

The committee's investigation has also developed the connection of two present employees of Members of Congress with the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. These two Members of Congress are supported by the three organizations which we have mentioned herein, that is to say, the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; the National Citizens Political Action Committee; and the National Committee To Win the Peace, and in this same connection we also find that two former employees of subcommittees of the United States Senate are represented among the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. The committee's investigation reflects that although these individuals indicated they were employees of the Senate in documents submitted to the Federal Communications Commission the committee finds they were actually employees of the Interior and Navy Departments and had been loaned to the senatorial subcommittees. The subcommittees of the Senate for which these two persons worked were headed by two Senators who are also sponsored by the same organizations mentioned hereinbefore.

All in all the committee finds that the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. are a closely knit group of individuals who have identified themselves with numerous Communist-front groups, the Communist Party, and certain political organizations.

Each of the phases of the investigation mentioned hereinbefore will be developed more fully as this report continues under various subheadings.

Stockholders and employees of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. and the Federal Communications Commission

Edward M. Brecher is general manager of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. He is a former employee of the Federal Communications Commission, which has granted broadcasting privileges to the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. Brecher was an employee of the Federal Communications Commission at the time the corporation referred to herein filed its application for the construction permit to erect the frequency-modulation station. The application for this permit was filed with the Federal Communications Commission on October 8, 1945. Brecher did not resign from the Commission until February 11, 1946. The permit for the construction of the frequency-modulation station was granted on August 9, 1946, some time after Brecher's resignation took effect.

The application for the construction of the standard broadcasting station by the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. was filed on March 4, 1946, before the Federal Communications Commission. This was filed approximately 1 month after Mr. Brecher's resignation.

One witness before the committee has testified in executive session that Mr. Brecher has told acquaintances that he engineered the entire matter when it was presented to the Federal Communications Commission. However, the Federal Communications Commission has advised a Member of the House of Representatives that Mr. Brecher did not take part in the processing of the applications filed by the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. with the Federal Communications Commission. In this connection, however, it has been noted by the committee that the testimony taken before the Federal Communications Commission in connection with the applications of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. fails to mention the fact that Mr. Brecher had been an employee of the Federal Communications Commission.

It is interesting to note, however, that Mr. Brecher did testify before the Federal Communications Commission that—

"The majority of the stockholders have been brought in by myself from among friends, associates and friends of friends and associates since February 13. Prior to that time I can only give you hearsay."

This statement makes it fairly clear that all of the persons associated in this enterprise are well known to each other and that in all probability they have the same political views and social philosophy. Clearly from the evidence compiled the group of persons represented in this enterprise belong to the school of thought that believes in further appeasement of Soviet Russia, and the liquidation of the British Empire, as well as the relegation of Great Britain into a secondary power in world affairs. Also some of the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. have demonstrated through their association with known Communists and Communist fellow travelers that they belong in that category of individuals who believe that they can associate with Communists without betraying the country of their birth and in some cases the country that gave them refuge.

Before leaving the subject of employees of the Federal Communications Commission and the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. it is of interest to note that Clark Foreman, one of the stockholders, is president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. Mrs. Virginia Durr, the wife of Commissioner Clifford V. Durr of the Federal Communications Commission, is a vice president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare has been identified as a transmission belt of the Communist Party by none other than Earl Browder, former head of the Communist Party of the United States.

Employees of Members of Congress and the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

H. Richard Seller, one of the stockholders in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., is an employee of Congressman Hugh De Lacy of the State of Washington. Congressman

De Lacy is supported politically by the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and the National Citizens Political Action Committee. Congressman De Lacy was also a sponsor of the National Committee To Win the Peace. As this report has stated these three organizations support the foreign-policy views of Henry A. Wallace which caused the recent rift in the President's Cabinet.

Curtis E. Johnson, another stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., is an employee of Congressman Ned Healy of the State of California. Congressman Healy, like his colleague Congressman De Lacy, is also supported by the three organizations mentioned hereinbefore.

The fact that stockholders in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. are employees of Members of the House of Representatives is not of great import, however, when we consider that fellow travelers of the Communist Party are also stockholders in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. as well as two members of the Communist Party as testified to, in executive session, the fact that employees of Members of Congress are stockholders in the group becomes a matter of interest to the American people.

The committee would also like to bring to the public's attention the fact that two other stockholders in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. have been employees of subcommittees of the United States Senate. One of these stockholders, Bernard LeRoy, is an employee of the United States Navy Department. On the mimeographed list of stockholders presented to the Federal Communications Commission by the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. it is indicated that Mr. LeRoy is an employee of the United States Senate. However, the committee's investigation reflected that Mr. LeRoy was not an employee of the Senate, but was temporarily loaned to a subcommittee of the Senate headed by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of the State of Florida. Senator PEPPER is sponsored politically by the same three organizations which sponsor Congressmen DeLacy and Healy. Senator PEPPER, it should be recalled, was a speaker with Henry A. Wallace on the program sponsored by the National Citizens Political Action Committee and the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions which led to Mr. Wallace's resignation from the Cabinet after much criticism had been leveled at his speech on foreign policy.

Another stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. is one Ann S. Gertler, an employee of the United States Department of the Interior. On the mimeographed list of stockholders in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. submitted to the Federal Communications Commission it is indicated that Miss Gertler is an employee of the United States Senate. The investigation conducted by the committee, however, reflects that Miss Gertler was actually employed by the Interior Department, but had been temporarily loaned to a senatorial subcommittee headed by Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of the State of West Virginia. Senator KILGORE is also sponsored by the National Citizens Political Action Committee and the Independent Citzens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The Communist Party of the United States openly takes credit for the establishment of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, and one Communist Party statement in this regard appears rather significant. This statement by a Communist was:

"We built the Independent Citizens Committee and it has developed into a powerful political weapon."

Here again we have evidences of employees of the legislative bodies of the United States Government associating with known Communists and fellow travelers of the Communist Party of the United States.

Other Government employees and the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

Listed among the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. we find the names of the following governmental employees and their places of employment:

Leonard Ackerman, Internal Revenue.
Robert C. Davenport, Agriculture.
Philip H. Dunaway, State.
Maynard Gertler, State.
Marcus I. Goldman, Geological Survey.
Arthur Goldschmidt, Interior.
Carl P. Green.
Ruth Gruber, Interior.
Albert E. Hussey, Agriculture.
Kelley E. Lowell, commander, United States Naval Reserve, Navy Department, Office of Research and Inventions.
Larry L. Leonard, Treasury.
Harry J. London, Social Security.
Milton Lowenthal, Agriculture.
Just Lunning, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve, State.
Alice R. G. MacLean, State.
David R. Mendelson, Office of Price Administration.
C. Roy Murphy, Agriculture.
P. Bernard Nortman, State (since been allowed to resign).
Forrester Raymond, Agriculture.
Dorothy E. Richardson (Mrs. Dorothy R. Adler), Treasury.
Chet Sinclair, State.
H. Bowen Smith, State.
Pierson Underwood, State.
Gerhard P. Van Arkel (assistant general counsel), National Labor Relations Board.

Here we have 24 individuals, in addition to the 4 we have mentioned previously, employed in various sections of the United States Government, who are stockholders in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. It is to be noted that some of these persons are employed in strategic positions.

The committee feels that any Government employee who associates with known Communist and Communist fellow travelers in any enterprise is presenting his own challenge as to whether he is loyal to the Government which pays his salary.

As will be shown later in this report some of the persons named above have been associated with the Communist enterprise known as the Washington Book Shop, as well as with other Communist-front organizations.

The Committee on Un-American Activities does not challenge the right of Government employees to hold stock in a radio enterprise. The committee does, however, challenge the right of any Government employee, or official for that matter, to become closely connected with any organization that obviously intends to promote another outlet for the philosophy of Karl Marx as so many of the stockholders in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. did when they formed or became associated with the Washington Book Shop. The best illustration of this point insofar as the danger of association between Government employees and Communists is concerned is contained in the report of the Royal Commission of the Canadian Government which investigated the Russian espionage system in Canada recently.

The report of the Royal Commission contains this statement in the chapter entitled "Motivation of Agents":

"Perhaps the most startling single aspect of the entire fifth-column network is the uncanny success with which the Soviet agents were able to find Canadians who were willing to betray their country and to supply to agents of a foreign power secret information to which they had access in the course of their work, despite oaths of allegiance, of office, and of secrecy which they had taken. Many of the public servants implicated in this espionage network were persons with an unusually high degree of education and many were well regarded by those who worked with them in agencies and departments of the public service, as persons of marked ability and intelligence."

The report then states:

"There is no evidence that monetary incentive played an important part in the original motivation of these persons whose ideology was sympathetic to the Communist cause, who agreed to act as espionage agents. On the contrary the evidence is overwhelming both from the documents and the testimony of several such agents themselves that their original motivation was a product of their political ideology and of the psychological conditioning received in the study groups."

The report says that:

"In virtually all cases the agents were recruited from among cells or study groups of secret members or adherents of the Communist Party."

Another paragraph in the report states:

"The inquiry has revealed the names of a number of Canadians, employed in various departments and agencies of the Government, who, while presumably quite ignorant of the espionage network and certainly innocent of implication in such illegal activities, were being subjected to development by the same means for use in the future."

The Canadian report has therefore definitely and upon the basis of factual evidence pointed out that every Communist "study club" is a potential recruiting base of Russian espionage agents through psychological development of its members.

The Government employees who are stockholders in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. and who have been members of the Carl Marx Study Club, known as the Washington Book Shop, have therefore again placed themselves in jeopardy and the Government employing them as well. As this report has stated there are at least two known members of the Communist Party associated with the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

Further, there are at least two persons who are regular contributors to the Communist Party and the wife of one of these is in charge of the sustaining fund maintained by the Communist Party of the District of Columbia.

The Washington Book Shop

The Washington Book Shop also known as the Washington Cooperative Book Shop was so obviously an enterprise of the Communist Party that it would have been impossible for any politically informed persons to walk into it without perceiving its Communist character.

Particular attention is directed to the findings of the Attorney General Mr. Francis Biddle contained in exhibit No. 1 which follows:

"EXHIBIT NO. 1

"MEMORANDUM OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, MR. BIDDLE

"(Strictly confidential)

"WASHINGTON COOPERATIVE BOOK SHOP

"NOTE.—The following statement does not purport to be a complete report on the organization named. It is intended only to acquaint you, without undue burden of detail, with the nature of the evidence which has appeared to warrant an investigation of charges of participation.

"It is assumed that each employee's case will be decided on all the facts presented in the report of the FBI and elicited, where a hearing is ordered, by the board or committee before which the employee is given an opportunity to appear.

"Please note that the statement is marked 'strictly confidential' and is available only for use in administration of the mandate of Public No. 135.

"The Washington Cooperative Book Shop, under the name, the Book Shop Association, was incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1938 for the stated purposes of providing a meeting place for persons interested in literary and cultural activities, providing for the cooperative purchase and resale of literature and works of art for the profit of its members as consumers, maintaining a renting library and ticket service and fostering other activities of a literary, educational, and cultural nature. The association is a nonstock corporation operated on the cooperative plan, with nine trustees elected by the membership, which, according to its announcements, have numbered 1,000. It maintains a book shop and art gallery at 916 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., where literature is sold and meetings and lectures are held.

"Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations, including works on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, reports concerning American Youth Congress, literature of American Peace Mobilization, articles on the Young Communist League, and Communist periodicals, such as New Masses. In this connection the Washington News of May 22, 1941, reported that the Washington delegates to the people's convention of the American Peace Mobilization at New York City in that year were advised that only at the Washington Cooperative Book Shop could they buy literature approved by that organization. Information received from confidential sources indicates that certain of the officers and employees of the book shop, including its manager and executive secretary, have been in close contact with local officials of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia. One member of the association has reported that he received literature, unsolicited, from the Communist Party of the District of Columbia, a circumstance which he attributed only to his membership in the association. In May 1941 Joseph Starobin, one of the editors of New Masses and a teacher at the Communist Party Workers School in New York City, lectured at the book shop, reportedly following the Communist Party line of that day, stressing the invincibility of the Soviet Union and criticizing the Roosevelt administration. A quantity of literature of the type above described was displayed near the entrance of the book shop on that occasion.

"In May 1941, the book shop desired to promote a membership drive and solicited the cooperation of the Cooperative League of the District of Columbia. The league, having received reports that the book shop was Communist controlled, requested it to provide certain information. The information was not furnished and the book shop resigned from the league, stating it was doing so as a result of unfavorable publicity attached to the incident. At about the same time the Washington press carried news items reporting seizure by representatives of the Dies committee of a membership list of the book shop allegedly initialed to indicate those members who were regarded as Stalinists. A meeting of the members of the book shop denied Communist control, and thereafter adopted a resolution disclaiming Communist domination and affirming adherence to the foreign policy of the administration.

"In view of the nature of the enterprise, investigations of charges of participation in the Washington Cooperative Book Shop have been restricted to exclude mere patrons or subscribers and to include only those fairly charged with participation in its administration."

The following letter written by the manager of the Washington Book Shop is also of interest:

"EXHIBIT No. 2

"THE BOOK SHOP

"(A CONSUMER COOPERATIVE, 916 SEVENTEENTH STREET NW., WASHINGTON, D. C.)

"DEAR SIR: You may be interested to know that our Cooperative Book Shop is the only store in Washington carrying a complete stock of the basic works of Mark, Engels, and Lenin, many of them in inexpensive pamphlet editions.

"If you are planning to use any of this material in your courses as assigned or supplementary reading, it will be a convenience to your students and a real service to our book store if you will refer your class to us for books in this field. Below is a list of a few books from our stock in which you and your students might be interested.

"Mark & Engels: Capital, volume I, $1.25; Communist Manifesto, 10 cents; Wage, Labor, and Capital, 10 cents; Value, Price and Profit, 10 cents.

"Lenin: State and Revolution, 10 cents; Imperialism, New Data for, $1.60; Paris Commune, 20 cents.

"Engels: Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, 15 cents; Engels on Capital, $1.25; Anti-Duhring, $2.

"Marx: Critique of Political Economy, $1.25; Civil War in France (Burns edition), $1; Handbook on Marxism, $1.75.

"May we also extend you a cordial invitation to visit our book shop.

"Sincerely yours,

"LAWRENCE HILL, *Manager.*"

The Washington Book Shop Association—affiliated with the District of Columbia Cooperative League

These two exhibits in themselves should convince even the skeptical that the Washington Book Shop was a study club of the type described by the report of the Royal Commission of the Canadian Government which we mentioned in a previous paragraph.

However, the Washington Book Shop itself has furnished additional evidence of the communistic nature of the enterprise through the type of programs it sponsors and the nature of the persons who have appeared on these programs.

For instance, during the year 1943 one Fannina W. Halle, a Russian propagandist, appeared before an audience sponsored by the Washington Book Shop and lectured on the subject, No Weaker Sex in the Soviet Union. Miss Halle is the author of several books containing Soviet propaganda; two of these were entitled "Women in Soviet Russia," and "Women in the Soviet East."

Another individual who appeared before a Washington Book Shop audience in 1943 was Murko Markovich who spoke on the subject, The Truth About Yugoslavia. In his address Markovich condemned General Mihailovich who was recently executed by the present regime in Yugoslavia which is under the control of one Josef Broz, alias Marshal Tito. This individual is a Communist. During the period when Markovich appeared before the Washington Book Shop audience, Tito and Mihailovich were the leaders of two opposing political factions in Yugoslavia. Each faction hoped ultimately that in the event of an Allied victory it would succeed in taking over the reins of government. The Tito faction was supported by the American Communist Party and the Washington Book Shop. The purpose of the American Communist Party was, of course, to secure sympathy and financial assistance for the faction known as the Partisans which was headed by Marshal Tito. In order to achieve this purpose, the American Communist Party set up several front groups in the United States among the persons of Slavic descent. Also the Communist Party furthered this aim by distributing literature among so-called sympathetic intellectual groups such as the Washington Book Shop. It also indirectly sponsored lecturers such as Markovich to appear before these intellectual groups. The purpose of the literature distribution and the sponsoring of lecturers was to condemn Mihailovich and praise the Communist Tito.

The front groups set up among the American Slavs were:

The American Slav Congress,

The United Committee of South Slavic Americans,

The American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, and

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

If one wonders whether these groups were successful in their purpose we need only to resort to our own common knowledge, for Marshal Tito today rules Yugoslavia with an iron hand.

It is apparent that the Washington Book Shop as early as 1943 assisted the American Communists in their scheme to install Tito in Yugoslavia. It is openly admitted by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee that it was the agency which installed Tito in power in Yugoslavia.

Further information concerning the Slavic Communist-front groups in the United States and their relation to the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. will be set forth later in this report.

On April 2, 1943, the Washington Book Shop membership and supporters were entertained by one "Woody" Guthrie. Mr. Guthrie is an entertainer who has been serving the Communists in many enterprises for a number of years. One may wonder why it is necessary to set forth any information concerning a mere singer in any report on communism. However, the American public should be fully aware by now that even music plays a part in the communistic scheme to take over the United States. Revolutionists know that the music of many of our songs as well as the words contained therein play a part in the emotional structure of everyone.

Not only do the Communists realize that revolutionary songs stir the emotions of a propagandized people, but they also realize the fact that entertainers can assist them financially, either through donations from their own funds or through donations of their time and talent. Also the audience listening to the entertainment will very often, if pleased at the performance, willingly donate funds above the price of admission to any enterprise sponsored or propagandized during the course of the performance.

"Woody" Guthrie, or Woodrow Wilson Guthrie, as he is actually named, is at present connected with an organization called Peoples Songs, Inc. This organization is an outgrowth of the organization called the Almanac Singers. The Almanac Singers was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, after an exhaustive study and investigation.

Although Peoples Songs, Inc., has denied that it is an outgrowth of the Communist-front group called the Almanac Singers we need only to examine the records to disprove this denial. For instance, Lee Hays and Peter Seeger are members of the executive committee of Peoples Songs, Inc. These individuals were not only connected with the Almanac Singers, but they wrote some of the songs used by the Almanac Singers for the nefarious purpose of carrying out the musical phase of the Communist Party line. As an illustration the committee cites that phase of the Communist Party line which was followed by the United States Communist Party

during the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact. During the period of this pact the American Communist Party did everything in its power to defeat any preparatory defense measures the United States Government sought to enact such as lend-lease to Britain and the Selective Service Act. One of these fronts, the American Peace Mobilization, even used a song written by Lee Hays and Peter Seeger, of the Almanac Singers, which went like this:

"Oh, Franklin Roosevelt told how the people felt;
We damn near believed what he said;
He said, I hate war and so does Eleanor,
But he won't be safe till everybody's dead."

Thus in the days of lend-lease to Britain, the Selective Service Act, and the Hitler-Stalin pact, Franklin D. Roosevelt was a warmonger. Today, however, to Peoples Songs, Inc., Peter Seeger and Lee Hays, Franklin D. Roosevelt, their one-time enemy, has become their friend. The enmity of Seeger and Hays for Mr. Roosevelt ceased the day Hitler attacked Stalin's Russia. This friendship for the late President insofar as the communistic musical world is concerned has now been immortalized by Peoples Songs, Inc., in the form of a printed statement in the April 1946 issue of Peoples Songs, Inc. This statement is: "One year ago this month, Franklin D. Roosevelt died, and to his memory and the ideals of world peace and freedom for which he fought, the issue is dedicated." Thus, a President of the United States once defamed in song by Seeger and Hays has now been immortalized by them, but only because it suits their present purpose and the purpose of the Communist party of the United States.

Mr. Guthrie's association with the Communist Party is not limited to his appearance before the Washington Book Shop nor to the Peoples Songs, Inc., headed by Seeger and Hays, for the committee finds that as late as June 28, 1946, Mr. Guthrie further assisted the fund-raising technique and propaganda dissemination of the Communist Party by appearing at a communistic gathering in Washington, D. C. This function was called the Memorial Meeting To Honor Sam Banks, Young Communist Leader in Washington and Maryland. The gathering was sponsored by the Sam Banks' Youth Club, Communist Party of the District of Columbia. Speakers on the program were William Taylor, chairman of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia, and Irving Goff, New York State veterans' director of the Communist Party. Mr. Guthrie's association with the function was listed as an entertainer from Peoples Songs, Inc., New York City, N. Y.

From the data set forth herein it is apparent that the Washington Book Shop during the year 1943 even followed the musical phase of the Communist Party line.

Another individual who appeared before a Washington Book Shop audience was Anna Louise Strong, one of the outstanding communistic propaganda writers in the United States. Miss Strong has written a book on every phase of life in Soviet Russia, always from the viewpoint of the pro-Communist. Miss Strong has also written numerous books which were designed to secure sympathy for the puppet communistic regimes set up in European countries after their liberation by the Allies.

Ruth McKenney, who was recently expelled from the Communist Party of the United States because of a difference in views with the controlling powers of the Communist Party, has also appeared before Washington Book Shop members. Ruth McKenney still proclaims her belief in communism, even though she has been expelled from the party.

In this connection and aside from the issue of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. and the Washington Book Shop it is interesting to note that Ruth McKenney and her husband, Richard Bransteen, or Bruce Minton, as he is more popularly known, were expelled from the Communist Party of the United States because they supported the views of Earl Browder deposed head of the Communist Party over those of William Z. Foster present head of the United States Communist Party. This example of the fact that free speech among Communists is not tolerated should not be overlooked.

One other individual whom we should not overlook in this discussion is Howard Fast. This individual has also lectured before the Washington Book Shop. Howard Fast has been a member of the executive board of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. Seventeen of the officers of this Communist-front organization have been cited for contempt because they refused to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities and because they refused to produce documents and records concerning their activities. The organization has steadfastly maintained that it is engaged in relief work, yet Howard Fast, in his book entitled "The Incredible Tito," makes the following statement:

"The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee provided funds and means for Tito's return to Yugoslavia."

In other words, the American public has contributed funds to an organization supposedly engaged in relief work, but the funds were used for the political purpose of installing Tito as dictator of Yugoslavia. The reason why the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee refused to permit an examination of its books and records should now appear quite apparent.

In addition to his work on the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, Howard Fast is also a regular contributor to the Communist publications called the Daily Worker and the New Masses. Howard Fast is an associate editor of this latter publication. Here, again, we have evidence of the communistic connections of the Washington Book Shop and the fact that it was used to disseminate propaganda in favor of a Yugoslavian Communist, Marshal Tito, who has become a stumbling block on the pathway to world peace.

Corliss Lamont, the foremost exponent of communism in the United States, has also lectured before the Washington Book Shop. Lamont has also been cited for contempt by the House of Representatives because his organization refused to produce its books and records for examination by the Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. Lamont has made statements to the effect that communism will come to the entire world in the future. Mr. Lamont has also written a book entitled "You Might Like Socialism." Mr. Lamont is chairman of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, which has consistently issued propaganda in favor of the Soviet. It has never praised the Government of the United States and has taken strong issue with both Great Britain and the United States on matters of foreign policy.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has not been able to examine the records of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, but it does know that the Amtorg Trading Corp., a registered agency of the Soviet Government, has solicited contributions to the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship from various manufacturers in the United States for the purpose of having books published which were supposedly sent to the Soviet Union by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. The committee knows that the minimum possible collection by Amtorg for the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was $22,500.

Mr. Lamont is also a frequent contributor to the publication entitled "Soviet Russia Today." This magazine was in part financed by the Sound View Foundation, a notorious Communist financing organization.

Here again is evidence of the association between the Washington Book Shop and the entire communistic movement in the United States.

Another individual who has appeared before the membership of the Washington Book Shop as a lecturer is Selden Menefee. This individual is a stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. Further information concerning Mr. Menefee will be found later in this report.

Government employees who are stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. and who have held membership in the Washington Book Shop

Among the Government employees who are stockholders in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. and who have held membership in the Washington Book Shop are the following individuals:

Robert C. Davenport, United States Department of Agriculture.

Marcus I. Goldman, United States Geological Survey.

Arthur E. Goldschmidt, United States Department of the Interior.

Ruth Gruber, United States Department of the Interior.

Milton Lowenthal, United States Department of Agriculture.

C. Roy Murphy, United States Department of Agriculture.

With reference to Arthur E. Goldschmidt it should be stated that he has also held membership in the American League for Peace and Democracy which was a notorious Communist-front organization and so cited by a number of investigative agencies. Among these citations appear the following:

1. The American League for Peace and Democracy was a Communist transmission belt originally organized and controlled by the Communist Party, carrying out its instructions as an affiliate of the Communist International in Moscow. (Citation from the New York City Council Committee Investigating the Municipal Civil Service Commission, pt. 2, p. 66.)

2. Cited as an organization in which Communists have controlling influence by the Massachusetts House Committee Report on Un-American Activities, 1938, page 77.

3. Cited as a Communist-front organization by Pennsylvania Commonwealth counsel before the reviewing board of the Philadelphia County Board of Assistance, January 1942.

4. Cited as a Communist front by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, report for 1943, page 91.

5. Established in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism.

"The American League for Peace and Democracy was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International." (Attorney General's citation, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7443.)

6. "Established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (P. 7442 of citation 5 above.)

Citation 6 is particularly important not only with respect to the American League for Peace and Democracy and its purpose to create sympathy for the Soviet foreign policy, but we must remember that this report has disclosed that the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. is alined with interests supporting present-day foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

Through his association with the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., Mr. Goldschmidt has again alined himself with an organization identified with the Communist movement in the United States and an organization supporting the foreign policies of other nations against that of the United States.

Mr. Goldschmidt has also been associated with the Communist front known as the International Labor Defense. This organization is the legal arm of the Communist Party of the United States. It has been cited as a Communist front by Attorney General Francis Biddle, and by several State, Federal, and municipal investigative bodies.

Mr. Goldschmidt has also donated money to the Friends of Spanish Democracy, another Communist front.

Further, Mr. Goldschmidt has also been associated with the National Negro Congress at several of its functions. This organization has been cited by former members and by the Attorney General as a Communist front as well as by several investigative committees of State and Federal Governments.

Mr. Goldschmidt has also subscribed to the New Masses, a Communist publication.

The wife of this individual has also been a member of the Washington Book Shop. She, too, is a stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

With reference to Robert C. Davenport, it should be stated that he has also been a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action as well as the Washington Book Shop. The Washington Committee for Democratic Action has been described as an affiliate of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, another Communist-front organization, by the Attorney General of the United States.

With reference to Marcus I. Goldman, it should be stated that he was a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which was as this report has shown, a Communist-front organization. However, when Mr. Goldman testified before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities he denied that he had held membership in the American League for Peace and Democracy. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, however, to support its charges obtained through a subpena an original questionnaire which had been executed by Mr. Goldman as a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. Goldman also testified before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities that he had contributed $500 toward the defense of one Angelo Herndon, a well-known Communist and a member of the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States, who was arrested and convicted for insurrection in the State of Georgia.

Mr. Goldman testified before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities that he had also contributed $500 to the International Labor Defense which is as this report has indicated the legal arm of the Communist Party of the United States.

In addition to the two contributions mentioned above it should further be noted that Mr. Goldman has also contributed funds to the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, another front and so described by the Attorney General of the United States.

Further, it should also be noted that Mr. Goldman has admitted that he was a subscriber to the New Masses and the Daily Worker, both official publications of the Communist Party of the United States. Also it should be noted that for a number of years Mr. Goldman was the holder of $5,000 worth of bonds of the Soviet Union.

The committee can conceive that these Government employees might possibly have been led into membership in the Washington Book Shop, but the other evidence against them and in particular their present association with the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. seems to indicate that they were well acquainted with the communistic aims of all of the groups mentioned.

It is perhaps fitting to mention here that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, John Edgar Hoover, has recently stated that the time for loyal Americans to stand up and be counted has come.

The Un-American Activities Committee agrees with Mr. Hoover, and it further coincides with his belief that actual Communists and Communist sympathizers can no longer hide under the cloak of liberalism.

Other stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. who have held membership in the Washington Book Shop and/or other Communist-front organizations

Among the other stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. who have held membership in the Washington Book Shop are the following individuals: Carl P. Green, Selden C. Menefee, Samuel J. Rodman, David Wahl, Samuel Lichtenstein, Morris Rodman, Morris Sharnoff, and Mrs. Luke I. Wilson.

With reference to David Wahl it is of interest to note that he has also been an employee of the United States Government. At one time he was employed by the Library of Congress. According to information furnished the old Special Committee on Un-American Activities, David Wahl was the leader of the Communist unit in the Congressional Library.

In addition to his membership in the Washington Book Shop, David Wahl has also been a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which has been described as a Communist front previously in this report.

Morris Sharnoff, whose name is mentioned above, has also in addition to his membership in the Washington Book Shop been a member of the Communist front called the Washington Committee for Democratic Action.

Samuel Lichtenstein has also been a member of the Washington Book Shop and the Washington Committee for Democratic Action.

The wife of one of the individuals whose name appears in this section of the report has been identified by a witness in executive session before the Committee on Un-American Activities as being responsible for the sustaining fund of the Communist Party in the District of Columbia.

Two individuals mentioned in this section of the report are regular contributors to the sustaining fund of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia.

With reference to Selden C. Menefee it should be stated that he has appeared before the Washington Book Shop as a lecturer on certain subjects. He is also the author of a book entitled "Assignment: U. S. A." A radio play based upon this book was adopted by the Writers War Board and presented by the National Broadcasting Corp. on February 22, 1944. This play based on Mr. Menefee's book definitely belittles the Americans of Irish descent and makes some caustic statements concerning them, particularly with regard to the Irish living in Boston. Mr. Menefee's book and the play based on it are not the only mediums through which Menefee has attacked the Irish and the Irish Catholics in the United States. In a newspaper article appearing in a Washington newspaper on June 10, 1943, Menefee attacked the Irish Catholics of Brooklyn, N. Y.

The article was the subject of an open letter written to the editor of the Washington newspaper by the editor of the Baltimore Catholic Review. The open letter is quoted in part as follows:

"In these days above all days when we have a duty to foster unity among all classes. Mr. Selden Menefee, one of your columnists, throws in the torch that might set afire racial antagonisms."

In the book, the play, and the newspaper column mentioned Mr. Menefee indicated that the Irish Catholics were anti-Semitic and he belittles their contribution to the war effort.

Mr. Menefee according to the open letter mentioned above and quoted in part seems to be a master of the art of the Communist strategy of setting one group against another.

Certainly in his association with the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. he has become associated with a group that intends to stir up the Negro population of Washington, for in their testimony before the Federal Communications Commission they openly stated that the Negro is to receive special consideration in their programing. Also it is of interest to note that one stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. was associated with Paul Robeson in the delegation that called upon President Harry S. Truman and threatened the city of Washington, D. C., with a race riot in the event the Federal Government failed to take action to prevent any further lynchings of Negroes.

It is a well-known fact that the Communists in the United States are leading the agitation among the various racial groups in the United States. It appears that those associated with the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. have identical views regarding racial agitation. The record of Selden C. Menefee a stockholder in this corporation seems to bear out this conclusion.

In addition to the information concerning Menefee recorded hereinbefore it is also of interest to note that he has been a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, a Communist front and so described by an Attorney General of the United States.

In addition to membership in the Washington Committee for Democratic Action and the Washington Book Shop, Mr. Menefee has also signed a statement on behalf of the Communist Party of the United States which pertained to the purge trials in Moscow, Russia, during the year 1938. The authority for the fact that Menefee signed this statement is the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker, for April 28, 1938. This statement is entitled "Statement by American Progressives on the Moscow Trials." The Moscow trials were conducted in 1938 and they resulted in the wholesale execution of persons considered enemies of Joseph Stalin.

This report has mentioned the fact that Menefee's book Assignment U. S. A. was the basis of a radio play conducted by the Writers' War Board in 1944. Two members of the Writers' War Board, Arch Oboler and Carlton E. Morse, were associated with the Writers' Congress in 1943. The Writers' Congress is an outgrowth of the League of American Writers which was described in a magazine entitled "International Literature," published in Moscow, Russia, as the first "revolutionary writers' congress in a capitalistic country."

Another individual named above, Mrs. Luke I. Wilson, in addition to her membership in the Washington Book Shop has also been associated with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, described by Earl Browder, former head of the Communist Party in the United States, as a transmission belt for Communist propaganda.

Organizations represented in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. through Stockholder Clark Foreman

Among the other stockholders in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. we find the name of Clark Foreman. This individual is president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. He is a member of the executive committee of the National Citizens Political Action Committee. Mr. Foreman has also been a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action which has been identified as a Communist front by an Attorney General of the United States. Mr. Foreman is also interested in the National Committee To Win the Peace and has also been associated with the schools for political action conducted by the National Citizens Political Action Committee.

In effect therefore the National Citizens Political Action Committee now has a radio outlet in the District of Columbia for its own political propaganda. This fact alone should interest those Members of Congress

who have been nominated in the past and who will be nominated in the future as political opponents of the National Citizens Political Action Committee. The Democratic and Republican Parties have no direct outlets for political propaganda such as has been created under the sponsorship of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

It should also be of interest to note that the efforts of the National Citizens Political Action Committee, to secure outlets for political propaganda through the use of radio broadcasting facilities, has not been confined to the District of Columbia. Efforts in this direction are being made in California at the present time through a group of individuals who have formed a corporation named the Hollywood Community Radio Group which has among its membership at least one known member of the Communist Party and numerous fellow travelers of the Communist Party. It is not known at this writing whether the group will be successful in securing radio outlets in the vicinity of Los Angeles, Calif., but it is not wholly without representation at the present time in the State of California. The National Citizens Political Action Committee is represented in the membership of the Hollywood Community Radio Group. It has a direct representation in Washington, D. C., through the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. and it has an outlet in the State of California at present through Bartley C. Crum who is president of radio station KLAC in Hollywood, Calif. Bartley C. Crum has associated with several Communist-front groups and has recently publicly announced that he favors the formation of a third party group in the United States.

Bartley C. Crum and Clark Foreman are both members of the National Committee To Win the Peace, a so-called liberal organization. Director J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has recently called attention to the fact that Communists in America are hiding under the false cloak of liberalism. Certainly the American liberals or so-called liberals have not divorced themselves from the taint of communism, and have not made any effort to remove the Communists from their so-called liberal organizations. The National Committee To Win the Peace will be discussed later in this report.

Since this report has mentioned the Southern Conference for Human Welfare it seems appropriate that some evidence concerning the communistic character of the organization be set forth in this report. To begin with, Earl Browder, former head of the Communist Party in the United States has testified publicly that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is a transmission belt for communistic propaganda. This statement by a Communist puppet should in itself alone prove to even the gullible that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is being used by the Communists to further their cause and not the cause of those who are ostensibly the recipients of the alleged social work performed by the organization.

However, there is a great deal more evidence concerning the communistic character of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. For instance, one of the theoretical Communist Party organs called the Communist in January 1939, carried an article by Robert Fowler Hall which referred to a speech by Earl Browder. Hall in 1939 was secretary of the Communist Party of Alabama. In discussing the Browder speech Hall said in the article which appeared in the Communist:

"Comrade Browder's remark thus anticipated the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, held in Birmingham, November 2–23. Let us estimate the southern conference in the light of Comrade Browder's remarks at the tenth convention of the Communist Party. In this sense, we can say that the southern conference was a brilliant cofirmation of the line of the Democratic front advanced by Comrade Browder at the tenth convention. Our comrades naturally watched the conference preparations closely and helped wherever possible. Southern State organizations of the Communist Party were represented at the conference by five southern Communist delegates. In strengthening this movement, our party has before it a great task. On this basis, our party can and must proceed to recruit from the progressive ranks many hundreds of members."

This article therefore states in effect that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was formed through a directive issued in a speech by Earl Browder and that the Communists were not only active openly in the first conference of the organization, but were also behind the scenes during the preparations for the conference. Also this article, plainly interpreted, states that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is to be used as a recruiting base by the Communist Party. Plainly, therefore, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is another Karl Marx study club such as we have described hereinbefore.

James W. Ford, a Communist candidate for public office in the years just passed, said in speaking of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and the Southern Negro Youth Conference:

"The Communists, through their pioneering work in the South, may justly claim to have laid the foundation for those great social movements."

This article appeared in the Communist magazine in September 1938. Further proof of the communistic purpose of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is again demonstrated.

Further evidence of the communistic character of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is available to the committee, but in the interest of brevity only the foregoing has been presented.

Clark Foreman, in addition to his association with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., is also active in the affairs of the National Committee To Win the Peace. The National Committee To Win the Peace is opposed to the foreign policy of the United States Government, particularly on the question of Yugoslavia and China. For instance, the Communist publication called the Daily Worker carried a release issued by the National Committee To Win the Peace on August 23, 1946, which stated, "The unwarranted United States ultimatum to Yugoslavia and the ostentatious display of military power in the Mediterranean have put the security of our Nation and the peace of the world in peril." The statement further says "The balance of good will accumulated by the United States during World War II is rapidly being dissipated by the brash acts of our diplomats and military leaders who are talking through their guns." In other words, the National Committee To Win the Peace oppose the United States even when the American State Department finds it necessary to issue an ultimatum to a government that has openly been hostile to the United States, and a government which sanctioned the murder of innocent American fliers. It will be recalled that Marshal Tito, the Moscow puppet in Yugoslavia, ordered the Yugoslav Air Force to shoot down all planes flying over the territory of Yugoslavia which have the insignia of the British and American Air Forces. In following out this order the Yugoslav Air Force shot down an unarmed American transport plane, which resulted in the death of five innocent American soldiers.

Despite the fact that the incident appalled most of us in the United States, the National Committee To Win the Peace placed the entire blame for the incident upon the actions of our diplomatic and military leaders. No blame for the murder of the American soldiers was assessed to Tito by the National Committee To Win the Peace.

The National Committee To Win the Peace has been set up as a front organization by the Communists in order to secure sympathy for Russia's foreign policy in Europe, and for the Russian satellite nations. Many of the persons associated with the National Committee To Win the Peace are also associated with another organization called the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. This latter organization has been set up by the Communists for the purpose of securing sympathy for Russia's foreign policy on far-eastern matters. The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy has a total of 143 directors, consultants, and sponsors. Of these 112 have extensive records of association with Communist-front groups. Some of the persons making up the list of sponsors are known members of the Communist Party. The Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp, is represented in this group through Selden Menefee who has been mentioned previously in this report.

In the interest of brevity all of the associations of stockholder Clark Foreman are not being incorporated herein, but it is believed that the data concerning Foreman which has been included herein is sufficient to show that he has contributed to organizations which have definitely shown that they are communistic in character and in action, and that some of them were actually created by the Communist Party of the United States in order to achieve the realization of certain phases of the Communist Party line.

Stockholder Mary Jane Keeney

Another stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. is Mary Jane Keeney. In a publication called Black and White, volume 1, No. 4, September 1939, there is a story entitled "The Making of a Radical," which was written by Mary Jane Keeney. In the article the author plainly speaks of her conversion to the philosophy of Karl Marx.

There remains very little doubt as to the real purpose of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. For here is a stockholder who has openly expressed her devotion to the philosophy of communism. The purpose of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. is to issue communistic propaganda over the American air waves.

It should also be stated that some years ago the husband of Mary Jane Keeney was discharged from a position as a professor in a university because he propounded communistic theory.

Stockholder Robert Sherman

Another stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. is one Robert Sherman. He has been a member of five Communist-front organizations. Three of these organizations have been cited as Communist fronts by the United States Department of Justice.

Stockholder Martin Robert Rogers

Another stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. is Martin Robert Rogers. This individual is reported to have associated with known Communists in the literary field, and to have furnished several known Communists with employment while he was editor of a magazine called Click, Inc., in order that they could have means of subsistence while they were engaged in Communist Party work.

Stockholder Owen Lattimore

The above-named individual is a stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. Owen Lattimore has been affiliated with the Writers' Congress of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization. This organization is a successor of the Pacific coast branch of the League of American Writers, which has been

cited as subversive by former Attorney General Biddle. Also it should be stated that the first Congress of the League of American Writers was described in International Literature, a magazine published in Moscow, Russia, as the first congress of revolutionary writers in a capitalist country.

Owen Lattimore has also been associated with the Amerasia magazine. The managing editor of this magazine, Philip J. Jaffe, was recently convicted of a violation of the security laws of the United States relating to the possession of documents stolen from secret Government files. The documents in question were stolen by various Government employees and made available to Jaffe, who subsequently, it is alleged, made them available to the American Communist party. The disposition and handling of the case involving Jaffe by various governmental agencies is the subject of an investigation being conducted by another congressional committee. It is alleged as the basis of the investigation that Jaffe and others involved with him were recipients of special favors by certain governmental agencies. Nevertheless, here we find a stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. who has been associated with a convicted espionage agent in the publication of a Communist party line magazine.

Also, it might be stated here that Philip J. Jaffe is a consultant for the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. Kate L. Mitchell, who was implicated with Jaffe in the espionage case, but who was not convicted, however, is also a consultant for the same organization. Selden Menefee, who is a stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., who has been mentioned before in this report, is also a sponsor of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

This report has pointed out the danger of association between Communists and Government employees because of the opportunities that such association provides for the recruiting of espionage agents. We must, therefore, consider that the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. has now fallen into the category of a Karl Marx Study Club from which espionage and propaganda agents are recruited. The association of stockholders Menefee and Lattimore with Philip J. Jaffe, a convicted espionage agent, should definitely demonstrate the point. As further evidence of the association of these individuals and the purpose of their association, we need only to point out that the documents involved in the Jaffe espionage case concerned in part the activities of the Chiang Kai-shek government in China. The Amerasia magazine, of which Jaffe is editor, specializes in far-eastern affairs and has been very critical of the Chiang Kai-shek government. Being a Communist Party line publication, the magazine is critical of Chiang Kai-shek and supports the Chinese Communists. One of the documents stolen and turned over to Jaffe contained detailed information concerning the disposition of the troops under Chiang Kai-shek's command, which, of course, is a very valuable document for the Communists to acquire, since Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Communists are now engaged in a civil war. Another document involved was one which described in some detail the entire personal and political background of the Chiang Kai-shek family. This document, of course, was very valuable for the purpose of circulating anti-Chiang Kai-shek propaganda. Some of the other documents involved military secrets of great value, but since they bear no relation to the matter under consideration they will not be discussed here. These documents were found in the possession of Philip Jaffe at the offices of the Amerasia magazine at the time of his arrest by the Federal authorities. Some of these documents apparently were used as the basis of articles condemning the Chiang Kai-shek government and the American State Department's support of Chiang which appeared in Amerasia from time to time.

Owen J. Lattimore, like Philip J. Jaffe and Kate L. Mitchell, has supported organizations which want to see a communistic government in China.

Selden Menefee, who like Owen J. Lattimore, is a stockholder in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., is now associated with Philip J. Jaffe and Kate L. Mitchell in the functions of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, which organization stands for support of the Soviet Russian policy in the Far East and the communization of China.

It must be recalled that Government employees were used by Philip J. Jaffe to secure confidential documents. The Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. has numerous Government employees associated with it, some of whom hold strategic positions. The possibility of their use as espionage agents by such as Jaffe is a grim reality.

Stockholder Russell M. Shepherd

Another individual who is associated with the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. is Russel M. Shepherd, who functions as director of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the United States War Department. This agency at one time operated under the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission.

Briefly stated, the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service performs the function of receiving and translating radio broadcasts which emanate from foreign sources. While under the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service was the subject of much adverse discussion and publicity. Goodwin Watson, who was at one time an administrative officer of this section of the Federal Communications Commission, was ordered discharged from the Federal payroll after a prolonged investigation by a congressional subcommittee which found that Watson was subversive. Goodwin Watson is now associated with the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

As this report has stated, Selden Menefee, of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., is also a member of this Communist front.

Russell M. Shepherd, director of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, has through his association in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. again brought the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service into disrepute.

General statements regarding the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

1. The Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. was granted licenses by the Federal Communications Commission without any effort being made by the Commission to determine the extent of communistic influence in the corporation.

2. The wife of a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission is vice president of a Communist-front organization of which one of the officers of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. is president.

3. The Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. is an outlet for third-party and communistic propaganda.

4. Two stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp. have been associated with a convicted espionage subject.

5. Known Communists are stockholders in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., as well as contributors to the Communist Party.

6. Numerous Communist-front organizations are represented through the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

7. Numerous Government employees who in some instances hold responsible positions have placed not only themselves in jeopardy but the Government they represent as well, through their association in the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp.

8. A former employee of the Federal Communications Commission is general manager of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., and he has told other persons that he engineered the granting of the licenses by the Commission.

9. Through the interlocking directorates of organizations represented among the stockholders of the Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., it is definitely indicated that the third-party movement is Communist-inspired and Communist-dominated.

10. The Metropolitan Broadcasting Corp., because it is a Karl Marx study club, has presented possibilities that its members through the strategic positions they occupy in the Federal Government will become sources of information for foreign agents.

P. BERNARD NORTMAN

The files of the State Department contained the following information concerning Mr. Nortman:

1. Memorandum to Mr. Peurifoy, through Mr. Robinson, from Mr. Fitch, dated June 16, 1947.

Reference is made to the case of P. Bernard Nortman, who was transferred to the Department from FFA and who is employed as an economist, P-6, in the Division of Investment and Economic Development. The subject has been investigated in connection with Federal employments by the Civil Service Commission, the War Department, and CSA, and all of these investigations with the exception of CSA's were entirely favorable to subject.

It is known that Nortman has been under surveillance by the FBI and that he has been interrogated in his home by agents of that agency. According to the FBI reports furnished to this Department this surveillance has determined that the subject has been in association with Victor Perlo, William Walter Remington, Mary Jane Keeney, and ———, all of whom are subjects in a current investigation of Soviet espionage activities in agencies of this Government. It was also learned during an interview with subject by CSA that he rides in a car pool with V. Frank Coe, who is another subject in the aforementioned investigation.

Specifically, the FBI has reported that Nortman was in contact with Perlo on December 1, 1945, and on September 3, 1946; that he was in contact with Remington on August 19, 1946; that he was in contact with Mrs. Keeney on August 19, 1946, and again on August 22, 1946; and that he was in contact with ——— on March —, 1946.

It is further stated in a recent FBI report that Mrs. Nortman talked on the telephone with Mrs. Keeney on May 27, 1947, and that she asked when Mrs. Keeney was coming to visit them. When interviewed, the subject explained that he had met Perlo and Mrs. Keeney through previous employment and that he had gone to Dr. Weinstein's office for dental work because the latter had a special technique for treating teeth, which Nortman felt would be helpful. He admitted that he was acquainted through his employment with H. Bowen Smith who is another subject in the current FBI investigation of Soviet espionage activities in agencies of the Federal Government.

It is noteworthy that the subject did not mention his association with Remington, a name not mentioned by FBI agents, during their interrogation of him, until asked specifically if he knew Remington. In discussing his relationship with Remington, Nortman stated that he had met him at Columbia University and that he had seen him from time to time since his arrival in Washington, D. C., in 1942. However, subject added that he had not seen Remington since he had been in the Department. This statement may be false as FBI surveillance has revealed that on August 19, 1946, Nortman

was in contact with Remington at which time he discussed his job in the Department.

Confidential informant ——— has alleged that around 1936 both he and the subject were members of unit 1 of the Harlem section of the Communist Party. The informant also alleged that he frequently saw the subject at meetings of the unit; that subject was very active in the unit; and that he may well have been a Communist Party functionary. ——— further charged that subject became associated with another unit of the Communist Party when unit 1 was split in 1937. An attempt was made by CSA to corroborate the above statement through inquiry with confidential and undercover sources in New York, N. Y., but no corroborating evidence could be obtained from the sources contacted. However, it does not appear that any of the informants contacted were members of the unit of the Communist Party of which the subject allegedly was a member.

A confidential informant has advised the FBI that Beatrice Smith, a known former member of the Communist Party in the District of Columbia, had in her possession at one time a list of persons all of whom were believed to be Federal employees. An inquiry was being made about the individuals on this list to determine if they were members of the Communist Party or were desirous of becoming members of the party. Several notations relating to P. Bernard Nortman and his wife were contained on the list.

The CSA investigation disclosed that Nortman has been friendly since his student days at Columbia University with one Moses I. Finkelstein and the subject stated during his interview that he sees Finkelstein when he is in New York, N. Y. Two informants interviewed indicated that the subject had been quite friendly with Finkelstein during 1938 to the 1940 period. The FBI in New York, N. Y., described Finkelstein as a party-liner and a Communist sympathizer, and he has also been reported as being on the speakers' list of the American Peace Mobilization; as being a secretary of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special House Committee on Un-American Activities, and as being the membership chairman of the American-Russian Institute, which has been described as a Communist-front organization by the afore-mentioned House committee. Finkelstein was also charged with being a Communist before the Rapp-Coudert committee by William Canning, but he denied the allegation. It is also significant that Sidney Hook, New York University, stated that in his opinion Finkelstein is a member of the Communist Party, and he further indicated that he would view with suspicion the association of any departmental employee with Finkelstein.

Many individuals were interviewed during the CSA investigation of P. Bernard Nortman, and the majority of them commented favorably with regard to his loyalty to the United States. One informant who worked with the subject in the WPB stated that Nortman had made remarks that he interpreted as pro-Russian. The informant indicated that Nortman regarded the Russian-German nonaggression pact as one of the most brilliant strokes of modern diplomacy and that he belittled the achievements of the United States Army during the war, but at the same time praised in a lavish manner everything concerning the Soviet Government and the Red army. Another informant, who also worked with Nortman at the WPB, stated that he had heard remarks to the effect that Nortman was a Trotskyite. However, the informant could furnish no additional information in this regard.

It may also be of interest that during one of the hearings given to the subject he discussed the Marzani case and indicated that the sentence which might be given was too harsh when compared to the sentence given to one Romney, who was accused of embezzling funds of the House of Representatives. Nortman also seemed to place considerable weight, on the testimony offered on Marzani's behalf by Emile Despres. and it appears that he regarded this testimony as more significant than that offered by the Government in the case.

The subject at times during the various hearings was rather vague in his answers and was not able to recall various groups and organizations whose meetings he might have attended. In view of the allegation that he had been a member of the Communist Party in New York, N. Y., he was particularly questioned regarding his activities during his study and employment at Columbia University. He indicated that he had attended meetings of various groups and had participated in study groups, but the only study group about which he could recall any information was one headed by a person named Lerner, who Nortman described as a dissident Communist.

The investigation did not disclose that the subject has committed any overt acts on behalf of the Communist Party or Communist-front organizations. It should also be pointed out that an evaluation by CSA of some of the writings submitted by the subject has disclosed no Communist slant in them. However, it is believed that the cumulative weight of Nortman's admitted association with subject's in the Gregory case and with Finkelstein, of his alleged membership in the Communist Party, and of the above comments from a coworker at the WPB, is such, that a reasonable doubt as to his loyalty is raised. In view of this it is felt that the subject's continued employment in an agency as sensitive as the Department of State constitutes a security risk and it is recommended that his services be terminated.

2. Communication from the Philadelphia division of the security agency of the State Department addressed to the Chief Special Agent in Washington, D. C., dated June 9, 1947.

Personal attention was given this case at Philadelphia, Pa., on June 9, 1947.

As requested in your letter of June 5, 1947, I interviewed Prof. Simon Kuznets at the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. Professor Kuznets is professor of statistics here.

Professor Kuznets states that the subject, P. Bernard Nortman, worked under his general supervision in the Planning Division of the WPB at Washington, D. C., from the early part of 1943 until about May 1944. He was also Associate Director of the Planning and Statistical Division.

Professor Kuznets states that prior to his employment by WPB, Nortman was employed in the Material Division of the Air Corps at Washington, D. C., under Gen. Bennett Myers and that a man by the name of Silverman was his superior there. Professor Kuznets was not certain that this employment was with the War Department, but knows that the particular division in which Nortman worked supplied material for Wright Field.

3. Communication from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI to Frederick B. Lyon, Director of the Office of Controls, classified personal and confidential and delivered by special messenger. The letter was dated August 2, 1946.

In compliance with your request there follows a summary of information appearing in the files of this Bureau concerning P. Bernard Nortman, an employee of the State Department.

One P. Bernard Nortman attended the City College, New York City, during the period 1930 to 1935 and was on the editorial staff of the college paper known as the Campus.

According to an anonymous letter sent to the special committee investigating Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, dated January 29, 1946, which complained about aliens being retained on the rolls of the State Department while native-born citizens were being discharged, one of the individuals mentioned by the complainant was the case of Frederick M. Mossner of FEA, who was described as a German alien and generally thought to be disloyal. One of his sponsors was mentioned as P. Bernard Nortman, who was instrumental in having his termination notice recalled.

P. Bernard Nortman was the subject of a special inquiry conducted by this Bureau for the State Department in 1946. Copies of investigative reports have been made available to the State Department. It is noted that during this investigation it was determined that Nortman on December 1, 1945, visited Victor Perlo one of the subjects in the Gregory case presently being investigated by this Bureau and about which you have been supplied full information.

In connection with the above visit, a man, woman, and a 3-year-old child, in a 1934 Buick automobile bearing Virginia license tags 112–079 registered in the name of P. Bernard Nortman, 411 Brook Drive, Falls Church, Va., were observed to arrive at the residence of Victor Perlo at approximately 4 p. m., December 1, 1945. These individuals departed at 6:10 p. m.

Investigation in the Gregory case, has developed that Dr. Abraham B. Weinstein, a dentist in New York City, who is a highly suspected espionage agent and a contact of a number of the subjects in the Gregory case, according to reliable sources, has been contacted by P. Bernard Nortman an employee of the Economic Security Control Office of the State Department. Nortman is known to have been in the office of ——— on ———.

In the event further information is developed that Nortman is in contact with any known or suspected Communists or Soviet espionage agents you will immediately be advised.

4. Communication from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI to Frederick B. Lyon, Director of the Office of Controls, classified personal and confidential and delivered by special messenger. The letter was dated August 23, 1946.

Reference is made to my communication to you dated August 2, 1946, which sets out information contained in the files of this Bureau concerning P. Bernard Nortman.

I thought you would be interested in the following pertinent information which has come to the attention of this Bureau since that time.

Through a source regarded as reliable it was learned that on August 20, 1946, William Walter Remington, who you may recall is a subject in the Gregory case and who is an employee of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, was in contact with P. Bernard Nortman at which time Nortman advised that he was now employed in a new position at the State Department, which he described as a very nice job in the Economic Development Section of the State Department. He further advised that in connection with his job he works on loans to foreign countries. It was indicated that Nortman's telephone extension at the State Department is 3839.

5. Communication from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI to Frederick B. Lyon, Director of the Office of Controls, classified personal and confidential and delivered by special messenger. The letter was dated January 30, 1947.

Pursuant to your request, the following supplemental data concerning P. Bernard Nortman, an employee of the State Department, is being made available to you.

You may recall that in previous correspondence you were advised that Nortman and his wife were known to have contacted Victor Perlo, another subject in the Gregory case, on December 1, 1945, and that Nortman is known to have visited the offices of ———— in New York City, prominently mentioned in the Gregory case, on March —, 1946.

On August 19, 1946, Nortman was in contact with William W. Remington, another Gregory case subject and Nortman indicated to Remington that he was then employed in the Economic Security Policy Section, Financial Development Division of the State Department and his position entailed working on loans to foreign countries. Nortman said that his boss was in London working with Lubin, who is attached to a subcommittee of the United Nations Conference. Remington desired to know if Nortman would be interested in accepting a teaching job at a salary of $3,500 for two terms. Nortman declined, stating that due to his financial status he would be unable to accept such an appointment.

On the same date Mary Jane Keeney, former State Department employee and one who is prominently mentioned in the Gregory case, contacted Nortman and inquired as to the whereabouts of H. Bown Smith, a former State Department employee. Keeney and Nortman agreed to meet at a later date. On August 22, 1946, a physical surveillance revealed that Mary Jane Keeney had lunch with Nortman on that date.

On August 28, 1946, a physical surveillance reflected that Nortman had lunch with Alexander Gerschenkron, an employee of the State Department serving on the U. S. S. R. Country Committee. Gereschenkron has been reported to have soft pedaled all problems in which the Soviet Union was involved on the grounds that any strong action would estrange the Soviet Union.

On September 3, 1946, a physical surveillance revealed that Nortman contacted Victor Perlo, previously mentioned, in the latter's office and spent approximately 1½ hours with Perlo. Nortman was observed carrying a legal-sized folder when he entered Perlo's office and when he left the office he was not carrying this folder. After his departure Nortman returned to his office in the State Department.

You will be advised of any further pertinent contacts made by Nortman in connection with his current activities.

6. Civil-service form 57 contained in the file revealed the following information:

Address: 411 Brook Drive, Falls Church, Va.

Legal voting resident: New York.

Place and date of birth: New York City, October 8, 1912.

Employment:

A. July 1944 to—Acting Chief of Industry Section, FEA at a salary of $6,440 per annum. Supervisor Martin T. Bennett, Chief Industry Section.

B. August 1943 to July 1944: Economist, WPB at a salary of $5,600 per annum. Immediate supervisor Melvin Anshen, director research and coordination.

C. December 1942 to August 1943: Senior statistician, $4,600 per annum, in the AAF, War Department. Immediate supervisor Foster Adams, head production specialist.

D. February 1942 to December 1942: Senior business analyst at a salary of from $3,800 to $4,600 per annum in the OPA. Immediate supervisor, W. M. Blaisdell, principal business analyst.

E. September 1939 to February 1942: Instructor in economics at Columbia University, New York. Salary $1,250 per annum. Supervisor Dean R. M. Haig.

F. September 1939 to February 1942: Research assistant in the National Bureau of Economic Research, 1819 Broadway, New York City. Supervisor J. W. Angell. Salary $2,600 per annum.

G. September 1939 to February 1942: Economic adviser, New York City Department of Investments, no pay.

H. March 1937 to September 1937: Director of research, anthracite coal industry, Philadelphia, Pa., salary $3,000 per annum.

I. September 1936 to March 1937: Statistician, national research project, Philadelphia, Pa., Dr. Harry Jerome, director, salary, $1,800 to $3,000 per annum.

J. January to September 1936: Economist, New York area State office at a salary of $1,260 per annum.

K. June 1935 to January 1936: Research assistant, Science Research Council, One Hundred and Sixteenth Street and Broadway, New York City, salary, $1,200 per annum.

Education: Morris High School, Bronx, N. Y.; New York University, New York, N. Y., from 1929 to 1930; City College, New York, N. Y., from 1930 to 1934, B. B. S. degree; Columbia University, New York, N. Y., from 1934 to 1935, master of arts degree.

Languages: Understands and can read French and German.

References: J. W. Angell, Tempo T, Washington, D. C., economist; W. C. Mitchell, 2 Horatio Street, New York City, professor of economics; Martin T. Bennett, 27 Woodmont Road, Alexandria, Va., consultant.

Question No. 26: Do you advocate or have you ever advocated or are you now or have you ever been a member of any organization that advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence? No.

7. Unsigned memorandum from the FBI dated July 11, 1947.

On May 19 and 20, 1947, no contacts of a significant nature were observed to be made by Mr. Nortman.

On May 21, 1947, at 1:05 p. m., Nortman was observed leaving the State Department building with an unknown man and they walked back and forth on Seventeenth Street, NW., between New York Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue for approximately 25 minutes, engaging in continuous conversation. At 1:30 p. m., Nortman returned to his office and the unknown individual entered the State Department building at Twenty-third and E Streets NW., and was observed to enter room 707. It was observed that this room was occupied by the Central European Section, and it is believed that the individual contacted by Nortman was Mr. Arthur Leon Horniker, who occupies a desk in this room.

On May 22 and 23, 1947, no contacts of significance were made by Nortman. The only contacts that he made were with individuals residing in his neighborhood with whom he associated in a car pool.

A highly confidential and reliable source advised that on May 27, 1947, Dorothy Nortman, wife of P. Bernard Nortman, was in contact with Mary Jane Keeney, a former employee of the State Department and a strongly suspected Communist. Mrs. Keeney stated that she had thought about Mrs. Nortman a great deal and had received a message from Mr. Nortman in a roundabout way and therefore did not want to contact Mrs. Nortman. Mrs. Keeney said that her husband had arrived from Japan and that things were "in a state." Mrs. Nortman stated that they had been having their time too. She regarded this remark as "part of the same thing." Mrs. Nortman inquired as to when Mrs. Keeney would come to visit her. Mrs. Keeney inquired if it would be all right for her and her husband to visit the Nortmans. Mrs. Nortman said: "I have decided the devil with them—I mean they are not going to stop us from living." Mrs. Keeney inquired as to whether the thing had been settled. Mrs. Nortman said that it had not been settled and that they don't know what is going to happen, but "they know we know you (Mrs. Keeney) so what is the point in pretending in some way that we don't know." She stated that apparently they are just as objectionable as Mrs. Keeney. Mrs. Keeney said that as a matter of fact anyone that had certain beliefs in the United States was just as objectionable. Mrs. Nortman agreed and said that she didn't believe in turning around and running in the opposite direction "just because they opened their mouths." She stated: "I mean the devil with them, let them do their darndest." Mrs. Keeney admired her "spunk." It was finally decided that Mrs. Keeney should continue to contact the Nortman's and come and visit them.

8. Transcript of hearings.

Date: May 19, 1947 (May 5).

Place: Room 514, 515 Twenty-second Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

Panel: V. C. Wilson, Thomas E. Hoffman, and Carl L. Bock.

Reporter: Elizabeth Wake.

9. Transcript of hearings.

Date: May 19, 1947.

Place: Room 514, 515 Twenty-second Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

Panel: T. E. Hoffman, C. L. Bock, and W. J. Bullock.

Reporter: V. R. Voce.

10. Transcript of hearing.

Date: May 26, 1947.

Place: Room 514, 515 Twenty-second Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

Panel: V. C. Wilson, W. J. Bullock, and T. E. Hoffman.

11. Memorandum to Counsel ACOPS from Hamilton Robinson dated April 1, 1947.

This memorandum enumerates the activities of P. Bernard Nortman. The closing paragraph is as follows:

"In the opinion of the Office of Controls the information contained in the preceding paragraphs raises a reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of the subject to the Government of the United States and as to his security reliability and accordingly it is recommended that his services be terminated."

[From the New York Sun]

SECRET PLANS LAID FOR DRIVE TO ATTACK THOMAS COMMITTEE—GROUP OF 1,000, HEADED BY DR. SHAPLEY, AIMS TO PERSUADE CONGRESS TO ABOLISH INQUIRY—HOLLYWOOD STARS HAVE BIG ROLE

Secret plans have been completed for the formation of a new organization designed to attack the Thomas Committee on Un-American Activities with a Nation-wide high-pressure campaign, it was learned today. Emphasis will be put on persuading Congress to abolish the committee, the plans reveal.

Headed by Dr. Harlow Shapley, Harvard astronomer, the organization is known as the Committee of One Thousand. Its first publicity blast was carried in a full-page newspaper advertisement over the signatures of 20 prominent persons. The committee hopes to avoid the stigma of Communist domination by having some of the original sponsors withdraw into the background after the campaign gets under way next week.

The impetus for the committee came at a meeting in New York in October 1947, of the arts, sciences and professions section of the Progressive Citizens of America. The initial plans were made at a hotel-room conference by Shapley, Hannah Dorner, past executive secretary of the P. C. A.; J. Raymond Walsh, and Howard Mumford Jones, dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, it was learned. At this meeting a list of 1,000 prominent persons was prepared to reactivate the original Committee of One Thousand, formed in 1943 to appeal to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt for special consideration to the Soviet Union in the writing of the peace treaties.

HEADQUARTERS NOW IN CAPITAL

After this meeting Shapley and Miss Dorner set up headquarters of the committee in

a New York hotel room but later it was decided to move the headquarters to Washington, where it is now at 1710 G Street NW.

After its move to Washington the committee's first blast was the full-page newspaper advertisement which called for donations. The advertisement said nothing about a special meeting planned in Washington next Monday to which a number of Congressmen have been invited.

Among those who signed the advertisement were Shapley, Bowen Smith, executive secretary, and William Rose Benet, Henry Seidel Canby, Norman Corwin, Albert Einstin, Olin Downes, Fredric March, Florence Eldridge (Mrs. Fredric March), Marshall Field, Archibald MacLeish, Rexford G. Tugwell, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Dorothy Canfield Fisher and Christian Gauss, all listed as original sponsors.

The meeting in Washington on Monday is supposed to be a spontaneous one. Efforts have been made to persuade one newspaper to write an editorial favorable to the aims of the group and a nationally known columnist is being propositioned to write a column on the Committee of One Thousand before the meeting. At the meeting pressure will be exerted on any Congressman present for passage of the Sabath resolution calling for the dissolution of the Thomas committee. Pressure also will be put on Senator JAMES MURRAY (Democrat, Montana) to introduce a similar resolution in the Senate.

CONGRESS MEMBERS INVOLVED

Bowen Smith, the group's executive secretary, this week was told by Representative SABATH to "line up" with Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS (Democrat, California), Senator CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat, Florida), and Senator GLEN TAYLOR (Democrat, Idaho), representatives of the far-left wing of the Democratic Party. TAYLOR has been mentioned as a possible running mate for Henry Wallace on the third party ticket. At a conference between Shapley and Miss Dorner on January 13 it was decided that Senator WAYNE MORSE (Republican, Oregon), and PEPPER would be asked to introduce bills for the dissolution of the Thomas committee.

It was learned that leaders of the new group held lengthy discussions over the desirability of certain individuals as members of the organization. At one point in a discussion over Tugwell, one of the eventual sponsors, it was stated that Tugwell wanted to be national chairman of the group and therefore was anathema to Shapley.

Robert Kenny, former attorney general of California and attorney for some of the film writers who refused to answer questions on their Communist affiliations, was consulted by Shapley. Hollywood is scheduled to play an important part in the committee's work. Persons sympathetic with the group's aims are sponsoring a stage show Monday to coincide with the committee's meeting in Washington. Asked to participate are such stars as Lucille Ball, Charles Boyer, Fredric March and his wife, Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., Katharine Hepburn, Gregory Peck, Frank Sinatra, Sylvia Sidney, and Cornel Wilde. Groucho Marx's name was stricken from the list, it was learned, when the sponsors decided that the public looked upon him as only a screwball comedian and that the whole committee might be characterized as such because of this.

Other Hollywood figures asked to participate in Monday's show include Edward G. Robinson, Myrna Loy, Eddie Cantor, Deanna Durbin, Franchot Tone, Robert Young, George Sessions, Milton Sterling, Pandro S. Berman, Ben Hecht, and William Wyler.

Two weeks ago after a meeting in New York, a telegram was sent to a number of prominent persons from the Century Club in New York. It was signed by Shapley and asked these public figures to join the Committee of One Thousand in conducting "a dignified educational and legislative campaign calling on all Americans who likewise would safeguard our traditional freedoms to join with us" in eliminating the Thomas committee. Among those to whom the telegram was sent were Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Nelson Rockefeller, Thomas H. Benton, Pearl Buck, Walter Lippmann, Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, Franklin P. Adams, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, E. B. White, Henry Kaiser, Einstein, James L. Fly, Carl Van Doren, Eugene Ormandy, Norman Cousins, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Sinclair Lewis, John Hersey, Sergi Koussevitzky, Arturo Toscanini, Quentin Reynolds, Walter White, Maxwell Anderson, Deems Taylor, Rex Stout, A. F. Whitney, Samuel Seabury, Chester Bowles, Robert Sherwood, Samuel Rosenman, Mark Ethridge, John W. Davis, Philip Murray, and C. C. Burlingham. Also stricken from the list was Dr. Harry Woodburn Chase, chancellor of New York University, because he suspended Prof. Lyman Bradley from the university faculty because of his association with a Red front group.

At a conference between Shapley and Miss Dorner last week it was disclosed that four persons had refused the invitation already. These were Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, former Governor Lehman, Walter Lippmann, and Sergei Koussevitzky.

Facts, Not Fancy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I call upon you, also my colleagues in the Congress, as well as any competent attorney in the country to bear witness to the following.

A voluntary campaign contribution has no connection with "kick-backs" or "payroll padding." Also, no money is paid to any Member of Congress for clerk hire. All of our office help is paid directly by check from the disbursing office. Any money left after taxes is theirs to spend as they choose and it is no one's business but their own.

Over a 3-year period covering two congressional elections, a voluntary contribution of $600 was made to my campaign fund. I listed this money under oath with the Secretary of State as well as with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and I challenge anyone to submit reliable or documentary evidence to prove otherwise.

My opposition is trying in every way possible to convince my people that this is illegal. If it were, then half the people in the United States would be in jail either for giving or receiving a campaign contribution.

I am 58 years old. Only twice in that time has my integrity ever been questioned. Once in the 1944 campaign and now in the 1950 campaign. Both times I faced the same unscrupulous opposition.

The radical left-wing element of the CIO-PAC is spending and contributing thousands of dollars in an effort to gain control of Congress. However, I feel certain that my people are too smart to fall for their lying propaganda. I just wanted you to know the length to which they are going in an effort to take me out of Congress. How much further they will go before election is anyone's guess.

Address of Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered to the Wisconsin Retail Food Dealers Association, Milwaukee, Wis., August 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

At this very moment, ladies and gentlemen, American men are dying in Korea. There is a question of vast importance to those left behind by not only those who die today, but also those who die tomorrow and next year and the year after that. The question is whether those young men are dying because of the incompetence or traitorous acts of those who have been entrusted with power in this Nation or whether they are dying because of the ambitions of the Communist rulers to enslave the world—or because of a combination of the two.

It is no secret that I have repeatedly stated that those young men are dying because of two things: (1) the decision made in the Kremlin that the world must be subjugated to atheistic communism, and (2) because there are today in controlling positions in our Government those who are more loyal to communism than to western civilization.

As you know, my charges in this respect resulted in the appointment of a senatorial committee which was ordered and empowered to make a complete investigation of Communistic infiltration of our State Department. That committee has now announced to the world that its task is completed and that all of those suspected are actually simon pure, loyal Americans. For example, the chairman of that committee, Senator TYDINGS has said, "There is not a single Communist in the State Department and there is no evidence against those charged that they are Communist, pro-Communist or in any way disloyal."

If this is true, then this Nation is in no danger of enslavement for as a great historian once said, if this Nation falls, it will not fall because of enemies from without but rather because of enemies from within. If the report of TYDINGS and MCMAHON is true, then those young men dying in Korea are dying for a really worth-while reason.

If, however, as I have stated, TYDINGS and MCMAHON, who control the committee and who were hand-picked for the job by Senator LUCAS, are two little men—little mentally and little morally—men who could not rise to the occasion and do a great service to this Nation—if, as I have maintained, they have done a dishonest job and were interested in protecting Communists for political reasons, then this Nation is in grave danger and the blood of those young men who are today dying in the hills and valleys of Korea stains not only the hands of the masters of the Kremlin but stains also the hands of those men in this Nation who cannot rise

above politics—who cannot rise to the challenge of the problems of 1950. Yes, staining—if you please—the hands of those who place cheap political considerations before the welfare not only of this Nation but of civilization as a whole.

Now there is no secret about the fact that I have claimed that this committee was controlled by little men—that it was completely ridden with politics—and that the results of its activities would long remain as a blot upon the honor of the Senate and a disgrace to America.

I realize that those of you who agree with me may think it is a vast waste of time to delve into the activities of that committee. However, I am sure you will agree that if I am right and if the results of that committee's work are allowed to stand, that then a tremendous force for evil has been created.

If, on the other hand, I am wrong and the committee is right, then certainly McCARTHY should be stilled.

Therefore, I strongly feel that the work of that committee should be discussed the length and breadth of this land, because it is still not too late to undo the damage which that committee has done this Nation.

Now I realize that it is easy for anyone to make general statements. It is easy for anyone to wave the flag. A vast number of politicians are doing that. Therefore, let's get down to some specific facts. Let's take a few specific cases.

Now as you know, that committee has issued a report pointing out that there is absolutely nothing to the McCarthy charges and that he has "irresponsibly" charged "innocent" people.

As you know, while evidence on 81 cases was given the committee, the names of all except nine were given in private. The committee insisted those nine be given in public. Therefore, the talk of smearing innocent people is necessarily in connection with the nine who were named.

With your permission I would like to give you a very brief résumé of the uncontradicted evidence covering those nine and let you decide whether or not their activities and their background should have been subjected to the spotlight of exposure or should have remained hidden in darkness and secrecy.

First let's take the case of Gustavo Duran. I presented to the committee the complete Army intelligence report showing that he was active in secret Communist operations in Europe and that he was regional head of SIM, a counterpart of the Russian secret police—at first there was the cry of mistaken identity. The State Department said, "Oh, but that is not our Gustavo Duran." I thereupon produced pictures of him in the uniform he wore at the time he was with the secret police and pointed out that that Duran was truly the State Department's own Gustavo, who, incidentally, had been quietly shifted to a higher salaried job in the United Nations. He is another one of the "innocent" people exposed.

Another is Dr. Frederick Schuman, whose job was to lecture and train State Department employees who were to be placed in Communist trouble spots.

He was associated with a vast number of organizations officially listed as fronts for and doing the foul work for the Communist Party. For example, he was a member of the American Council on Soviet Relations, the American Russian Institute, the Civil Rights Congress, the Friends of the Soviet Union, and on and on. He also headed up a campaign committee for Wallace for President.

Do you want this man on your payroll coaching State Department employees who are about to leave for Communist trouble spots?

Another is Haldore Hanson. He was named in testimony under oath by Louis Budenz as a member of the Communist Party. He wrote for Amerasia, a magazine owned by Jaffe, who was also named under oath as a Russian espionage agent and listed by the FBI as a Communist. He was coeditor of a Communist paper in Peiping, China. Hanson wrote a book praising the Communists in China. In this book he admitted that he was arrested with the leaders of the Communist Youth Corps in China. He had this to say of the top Communists in China: "They impressed me as a group or hardheaded, straight-shooting realists."

I hope some of you will get that book and read it. The name of it is Humane Endeavor. Read it and see if you would pick him for a top State Department job.

He is now head of the Technical Project Staff of the Government's point 4 program and is planning the future spending of hundreds of millions of your dollars in various parts of the world.

Here is a man who worked for the Communist editor of a magazine; who praised Communists; who was coeditor of a Communist paper in China; who was named by a Government witness under oath as a member of the Communist Party.

Another is Harlow Shapley. Shapley was chairman of a conference held in New York, March 1949, which President Truman denounced as a tool of Russia and a soundingboard for Communist propaganda. But what does Mr. Acheson do? He rewards Shapley, the chairman of this conference which Truman called a tool of Russia, by giving him an appointment to represent the State Department on a United Nations Commission—paid for, of course largely out of your pockets.

The list of Communist-front organizations to which he belonged is legion.

Then we come to John Stewart Service. Service was arrested by the FBI in connection with the theft of hundreds of secret Government documents. The FBI testified they had microphones in the hotel room of Jaffe, whom they labeled as a Communist when Service visited him. The microphone recording showed that Service discussed military secrets with this Communist while the war was still on. Service admitted having turned over to him classified State Department documents. At the time Service and his five codefendants were arrested, J. Edgar Hoover, according to a Washington paper said, "This is a 100 percent airtight case of espionage." But Service did not go to jail. However, Under Secretary of State Joseph Grew who insisted he be prosecuted, left the Department. Acheson took over and Service was rehired, promoted and put in charge of placing personnel in the Far East area.

The Tydings-McMahon committee said he was a bit indiscreet, but that it was so unfair to expose him.

Another case is that of Judge Kenyon. That case was used as an example of how incompetent was the loyalty board. The State Department loyalty board had the information and the photostats which I had showing that this woman belonged to 28 organizations which were officially labeled as doing the foul work of the Communist Party. Yet the loyalty board never called upon Kenyon to explain.

Also, in a public speech, Kenyon condemned those responsible for exposing Alger Hiss, the Communist traitor and spy.

I am not unmindful of the fact that some of the bleeding hearts shout that this is establishing guilt by association, that the fact that you belong to scores of Communist-front organizations, work with Communists, chum with Communists, travel with Communists means nothing. They forget that people have always been known by the company they keep.

The fact that you gentlemen are members of a retail food dealers' organization should indicate to the normal person that you are interested in food merchandising; if you belong to the Lutheran Young Men's Club, that should normally indicate that you are a Lutheran; if you belong to the Knights of Columbus, it should indicate that you are a Catholic. But the Tydings committee by a tortured process of reasoning concludes that this rule does not even remotely apply for those who belong to Communist-front organizations.

Another case was that of Esther Brunauer, a $10,000-a-year State Department official. She also belonged to a sizable number of organizations named as fronts for the Communist Party. For example, she was chairman of a meeting of the American Friends of the Soviet Union, at which the principal speaker was a well-known Communist and a frequent writer for the official Communist Daily Worker. Brunauer was a signer of the call to the annual meeting of the American Youth Congress which was publicly known to be completely dominated by the Communist Party. She admitted that her husband had Communist connections and had been a member of the Young Communist League.

Here we have a person handling top secret material who not only belonged to Communist-front organizations, but who presided over meetings at which the principal speaker was an extremely well-known Communist and who signs the call for a meeting of a completely Communist dominated and controlled organization and who admits to her husband's former membership in the Young Communist League.

Next we come to Ambassador at Large Philip Jessup. I produced photostatic proof that he was affiliated with not one but five—five organizations which had been officially listed as fronts and doing the work of the Communist Party.

I furnished photostatic proof that he had editorial control of Far Eastern Survey, a publication of an organization officially labeled as a front for the Communist Party. I furnished photostats of checks representing Communist money totaling $6,000 used to support that publication while it was spearheading the Communist Party line. His adviser was Owen Lattimore.

When this was brought to the President's attention, he took action. Ladies and gentlemen, what do you think his action was? It was to give Mr. Jessup top secret clearance to all A- and H-bomb information.

The Tydings committee says "Sure, McCARTHY has proved Jessup chums with Communists; sure, McCARTHY proved that Jessup's publication was supported by Communist money; sure, McCARTHY has proved that Jessup's publication spearheaded the Communist Party line." "But," says the Tydings-McMahon committee, "there is no evidence that Jessup was pro-Communist." "And," says the Tydings-McMahon committee, "McCARTHY should not have given American people these facts about the Ambassador at Large Jessup who helped plan American disaster and Soviet victory in the East."

Finally, let's take the case of Owen Lattimore. Lattimore is that State Department adviser who referred to the Communist victory in China as the opening of limitless horizons of hope. Lattimore is the man who was named under oath as a member of the Communist Party and high in the councils of the party—named as a man whose secret symbol, XL, was on the top secret instructions going out from Communist headquarters. Lattimore is the man who admitted using the Soviet diplomatic pouch to get material to Russia.

Lattimore is the man who boasted that the State Department had been successful in allowing China to fall without letting it appear that we pushed her. Lattimore is the man who said, "Let South Korea fall, but don't let it appear that we pushed her."

Lattimore is the man who, upon Acheson's request, furnished advice to the State Department, advice which followed the Communist Party line on Asia almost down to the last period. This advice was held secret until I made it public.

He admits having roamed Asia with Agnes Smedley, who was named by MacArthur's intelligence as a top Soviet spy, and with Phillip Jaffe, who was named under oath as a Russian espionage agent and who was found guilty in connection with the theft of hundreds of secret, classified Government documents.

He was publicly proclaimed, according to Wallace's book, by a top Soviet official as "the great hope of China."

Do you want this man planning our foreign policy and on your payroll?

Incidentally, the Tydings-McMahon report says there is no evidence whatsoever that this man Lattimore was in any way pro-Communist and then proceeds to damn McCARTHY from hell to breakfast for having exposed Lattimore. Even though he roamed Asia with Agnes Smedley, Jaffe, and Bison and spent months at Communist headquarters in Yenan where he lectured Mao Tse-tung's Communist troops. Despite all this—the Tydings-McMahon committee says, and let me quote, "There is no evidence that he ever knowingly associated with Communists."

I wonder if they didn't know Mao Tse-tung was a Communist?

I have been trying to coax and club the Tydings-McMahon committee into investigating the second and third echelon in the State Department who have been so carefully placed there over a period of years by the Red dean himself. However, rather than discussing them, let us discuss the evidence on Dean Gooderham Acheson—not evidence that any committee has produced on Acheson; not evidence McCARTHY has produced on Acheson; but evidence that Acheson has produced on Acheson.

So that we will more fully understand the urgent necessity of getting rid of him if this Nation is to survive, let me briefly review what have been the prime objectives of the Communist Party since the days of Lenin. Lenin, who is considered one of the greatest brains of the Communist movement, stated that the two initial major aims of the Soviet should be to create a Red Poland which could be used as a dagger in the heart of Europe and a Red China which was a necessary prelude to a Red Pacific.

As Lenin said: "He who controls China controls the world."

Now let's see what part Acheson played in helping the Communists to obtain these two major objectives.

This is the Acheson who helped to mastermind disaster for America and victory for communism in the east—the same Acheson who in 1939 before Hiss did all of his damage at Yalta said, "Don't investigate Hiss; I will vouch for him completely," and who kept him in top jobs and finally put him at the head of the United Nations Convention in San Francisco.

This is the Acheson who sent Hiss to Yalta where Hiss, together with Gromyko drafted the Yalta agreement. This agreement was described by our American Ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, as follows: "As I glanced over the document, I could not believe my eyes. To me, almost every line spoke of a surrender to Stalin."

This is the Acheson who was sponsored by Senator TYDINGS way back in 1933 for Under Secretary of the Treasury, at which time TYDINGS said, "Don't hold it against him because his law firm has represented Communist interests."

This is the Acheson who said, "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss," after Hiss was convicted by a jury of perjury in connection with the delivery of State Department secrets to a man named as an espionage agent.

This is the Acheson who, after his clique engineered the Communist victory in China, said, "A new day has dawned in Asia."

This is the Acheson who notified the world that we would not stand in the way of United Nations' recognition of Communist China.

This is the same Acheson who publicly stated that aid to the anti-Communist forces in China was a "silly venture."

From October 1945 to March 1947 Acheson's law firm was retained by the Communist Government of Poland to obtain a $90,000,000 loan from the United States. The loan was put through and Acheson's firm received a fee of over $50,000, according to Acheson's sworn testimony.

During the time Acheson was Assistant Secretary of State. He admitted in January 1949 that he was charged with sole responsibility of making or refusing that loan.

Fifty million of that ninety million went to equip and arm the Communist army and the dreaded UB—the Communist secret police just then being set up in Poland.

It was Mr. Acheson who placed the guns, the whips, the blacksnakes, and the clubs in the hands of those Communists. It was Mr. Acheson who furnished them with bullets to keep a Christian population under Soviet discipline. It was Mr. Acheson who helped put uniforms on the masters of prostrate Poland.

He did not do those things blindly. He was fully advised as to what the money would be used for. Listen to the words of our Ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, who pleaded with Acheson not to make the loan:

"With the greatest earnestness of which I am capable, I beg the Department not to approve the extension of any credits at this time. When the terroristic activities of the Security Police come to an end, when freedom of the press is restored, and when American citizens are released from Polish prisons—not until then should United States public funds be used to assist the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity."

Lane was on the ground. He knew the facts. He had gone about the country and talked with hundreds of real Polish leaders, who were bitterly opposed to an American loan to the Communist government.

He begged Acheson, in behalf of Poland and liberty, not to make a loan to Communist Poland.

But Acheson coldly turned aside Ambassador Lane's warning. Shortly thereafter, Lane resigned to tell his story in his book, under the very significant title, "I Saw Poland Betrayed." Lane went and Acheson remained. Acheson always remains.

You will recall that the Congress last year voted millions of dollars to furnish necessary planes, tanks, antitank guns, rifles, and ammunition so that the South Koreans might be able to defend themselves. We voted one item of $75,000,000, any part of which could be used in Korea. We voted another item of $10,300,000, all of it to be used to arm South Korea. The President signed those two bills without a word of protest. Democrats and Republicans alike, almost unanimously, voted that money. Then what happened? At that point the State Department crowd stepped in and, ladies and gentlemen, how much of that money do you think was actually spent to arm South Korea? The answer is not one ounce of gunpowder, not a single shot ever found its way to Korea. Out of the $10,300,000 which was appropriated for the defense of South Korea only $200 was spent, and that to load some baling wire.

If that congressional plan to arm South Korea—a plan approved by our military—had not been sabotaged by the State Department the blood of American boys would not be staining the hills and valleys of South Korea today.

The Acheson who made the $50,000,000 loan of your money, ladies and gentlemen, to the Communists in Poland is the same Acheson who kept from the anti-Communist forces in Formosa and in Korea the $35,300,000 appropriation which the Congress voted so that they might fight communism.

Why, ladies and gentlemen, why does the American Secretary of State, the man who is supposed to be fighting against communism, why does he insist upon making loans to Communists in one half of the world while he denies money to the anti-Communist forces in the other half of the world?

Now the question that must arise in your mind is, "Why doesn't the Congress do something about this?" "Why does the Congress stand idly by while a group of Communists, fellow travelers, and their dupes sabotage the efforts of the American people to hold back the aetheistic Communist horde before it hits our shores?" It is truly a good question, gentlemen.

The American people want to know where and how was spent the $90,000,000,000 which the American people gave to make this Nation strong. If that money was wasted, then the American people want to know where, how, why, and by whom.

As you know, the Armed Services Committee is charged with the responsibility of making sure that the money which we appropriate for the arming of this Nation (and of any other nation) is being properly spent. Who do you think is the chairman of that committee? None other than MILLARD TYDINGS—the same TYDINGS who headed the whitewash committee. As chairman of that committee he should be the watchdog of the American people. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee Senator TYDINGS should know where the $90,000,000,000 we spent to make this Nation militarily strong went. As chairman of that committee he should know why only $200 was spent to arm South Korea, out of a total of $85,300,000 which was appropriated for that purpose. As chairman of that committee, he should be the powerful, vigilant watchdog of 152,000,000 American people—truly a great job.

Unfortunately, the man whom the administration placed in charge of that committee, instead of being a bristling, vigilant watchdog is the administration's whimpering lap dog. This is truly a tragic situation.

Today, the same columnists who have always headed the smear brigade against those who would expose Communists and traitors at home, have now wrapped themselves in the American flag and are attempting to convince the American people by some strange, twisted reasoning that the best way to aid our fighting men is to protect the traitors who are responsible for sending our soldiers almost bare-handed against tanks in the mud of the valleys of Korea.

Today, those people who are responsible for disaster for America and success for Russia are screaming to high heaven that if they are exposed, that if a bright light is directed upon their acts that then our unity of effort is endangered.

Now I deeply feel that any American would be faithless to his Nation if he remained silent while men of evil, whose corroded minds have served the Communists, remain in our Government to continue the corruption of the United States. Since the shooting started, we are urged to sit back in silence, to stop our criticism—yes, even to approve the decisions which led us into the traitorous Kremlin trap in Korea.

Certainly it is time for the Congress and for the 152,000,000 normal American people to serve notice that we can best fight a war abroad by disposing of the traitorous filth and the Red vermin which has accumulated at home. It is all part of the same war.

You have as a flaming backdrop to my remarks the facts of the world as you find them today. Communism is no longer a creeping threat to America. It is a racing doom that comes closer to our shore each day.

We have seen the Communist plot thicken in the blood of Poland; we watched it congeal on the corpse of China. Now it stains the streams of Korea. The Korean death trap can be laid at the doors of those men who sabotaged the congressional attempt to send arms to the anti-Communists in China, Formosa, and Korea—men whose shadows hover like vultures over the corpse of China and whose actions rip at the backbone of freedom in America.

There are those who very honestly say, "Oh, we think you are on the right track, McCARTHY, and we like the results you are getting, but we just don't like your methods. You should have done this secretly. You should not have done it in public. You should not have embarrassed the United States before the world."

As you know, the depth that the festering rot had eaten makes it necessary to cut painfully deep.

If American mothers can stand the pain of learning that their sons had their hands bound behind their backs and their faces then blown off by Communist machine guns, because we failed to provide the necessary arms to South Korea, if those mothers can stand that pain, then I am sure the American people can stand the pain of cutting deep enough to remove this cancerous Communist growth.

And in this connection, ladies and gentlemen, remember that those who shed crocodile tears for the families and friends of the Communists and the dupes and stooges of the Kremlin whom I exposed might better shed tears for the 400,000,000 people—400,000,000 of our allies—who were sold into aetheistic communistic slavery because of either the incompetence or the traitorous acts of those still doing our planning. They might better shed their tears for those young men who are today consecrating the hills and valleys of Korea with their blood. They might better shed their tears for the wives and mothers of those young men who have gone so deep into the valley of darkness and despair as a direct result of incompetence or traitorous acts.

Ladies and gentlemen, to those who say McCARTHY you have been too rough, we don't like your methods, let me say—and take my word for this—there is no way on earth that this job can be done delicately or secretly. People have been trying to do this job with kid gloves for many years and have gotten nowhere. Either I had to do a bare-knuckle job or suffer the same defeat that a vast number of well-meaning men have suffered over past years. It has been a bare-knuckle job. As long as I remain in the Senate, it will continue as a bare-knuckle job.

Charles E. Wilson's Philosophy: A Fundamental Guide for Future Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the friendly relations existing between the management and the employees of the General Motors Corp. have been materially strengthened by the forthright and progressive expressions of Mr. C. E. Wilson, president, in a speech delivered at the National Press Club on June 8, 1950. The speech was then followed by a brief period of questions and answers.

Altogether too often big business, as represented by its spokesmen, has been suspected and charged with lack of foresight, blind selfishness, and a total disregard for the welfare of the employee, who while he is at the bottom in the organizational graph, and guided by management, nevertheless produces the profit for himself and for the stockholder. The expressions of Mr. Wilson may well dispel all doubts, at least insofar as this giant industrial enterprise is concerned. This viewpoint indicates the future course to be followed. It assures lasting peace, increased production, and steadier, even larger, profits.

Broad gage leadership of this kind by its example will hasten and stimulate industrial conversion to the idea that management and labor have a common goal, and share responsibility as well as the credit for success. In a most forceful way, Mr. Wilson forged a strong link between General Motors, the corporate body, and its employees, the living potent force which propels and reinforces its own position in the business world.

Mr. Speaker, I could not forego the privilege of preserving in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this historic speech, which follows:

FIVE YEARS OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE

The 5-year agreement between General Motors and the UAW-CIO, promising 5 years of industrial peace in General Motors plants, was concluded on May 23, 1950. Such an agreement, settling all matters for so long a time, is unique and unprecedented, and apparently was so unexpected that many people have asked us what the big story behind it is, wondering how so much ground could be covered so quietly without pressure bargaining, wondering what motivated the parties, perhaps wondering how a big union and a big company could move so far forward so fast.

WHAT IS RIGHT AND FAIR

As a matter of fact, there is quite a story behind this agreement and it goes back far beyond the relatively short period of the recent negotiations. It is the story of building up good, workable relationships with the unions based on reason and experience over a period of years. For our part, we have always kept in mind not what might be expedient from a short-range viewpoint, but what is right and fair for our employees and the corporation now and in the years ahead. The 5-year agreement could not have been reached except for the progress made 2 years ago in adopting a formula for fair wage determination, and if the UAW-CIO had not demonstrated during this 2-year period its sincerity and responsibility in carrying out agreements.

Our thinking behind this agreement is that we want all jobs in General Motors to be good jobs. We want our employees to want to work for General Motors. Only in that way can we continue to make the kind of progress we have made in the past and build quality products for our customers. On this last depends the progress of everyone connected with the business—stockholders, dealers, suppliers, as well as employees and the unions. Customers in particular will gain by this agreement, since customers are the real victims of strikes.

The present agreement, therefore, is based upon experience, logic, and principles rather than on pressure, propaganda, and force. The principles are important and, we believe, can be applied generally. They are:

1. That it is logical, fair, and reasonable to maintain the purchasing power of an hour's work in terms of goods and services the employee must purchase in his daily living. There may be some backward countries where the mass of the people are on a subsistence level and where, as an aftermath of wars or partial crop failures, the standard of living has to be reduced, but this certainly is not the case in our prosperous Nation.

2. That all Americans look forward to improving their condition, and that workmen along with other citizens are entitled to share in the advancing prosperity of the Nation. If workmen are denied any increase in hourly wages and they can look forward only to a better standard of living through reduction of prices, the process for them is terribly slow. And in many cases the products they are producing, especially in the heavy goods industries, are not the ones they are consuming themselves. Workmen will apply themselves better to their work when they can see directly that they are getting somewhere.

3. That the way to advance the Nation's prosperity and achieve higher standards of living for all is through science and technology, taking advantage of better tools, methods, and organization and substituting machines and mechanical power for human backs.

4. That to produce more with the same amount of human effort through technological improvement is a sound economic and social objective that discards the false philosophy of made work, featherbedding, and the erroneous idea that machines take the bread out of the workmen's mouths.

5. That insecurity worries people and that it was reasonable for General Motors to assist employees in acquiring life insurance, sickness and accident benefits, hospitalization, and surgical coverage and pensions to protect them to the degree possible against the individual hazards of life.

6. That cooperation and peace rather than strife and industrial warfare will best promote the prosperity of the employees, the company and all the people and even strengthen the Nation.

THE HIGH LIGHTS OF THE AGREEMENT

A 5-year term expiring May 29, 1955, without reopening by either party for any cause.

A cost-of-living formula by which wages are adjusted each 3 months in line with changes in the Consumer Price Index of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics.

An improvement factor of 4 cents per hour added to all wage rates starting May 29, 1950, and annually thereafter for the period of the agreement.

Recognition by the parties that higher living standards depend upon technological advancements and the cooperative attitude of all parties in such progress.

A sound, funded non-contributory-pension plan integrated with Federal social security.

An insurance package, for which the Corporation pays approximately one-half the cost, covering group life insurance, continuing insurance upon retirement at no further cost to the employee, sickness and accident benefits for all employees, and hospitalization and surgical coverage for the employee's family as well as himself.

Increasing the vacation pay of employees with 15 years' service or more from the 80 hours pay they previously enjoyed to 120 hours.

An additional increase of 5 cents per hour for certain skilled jobs.

Union security which resolves the problem of a union shop in a practical and workable manner.

Retention with little or no change of the main clauses of the previous agreement such

as those dealing with union recognition and responsibility, management's rights and obligations, grievance procedures, seniority, work standards, promotions and transfers, and the impartial umpire. These provisions, tested through years of experience, have been found to be fair and workable. A number of minor changes in contract language were made in other provisions to improve the agreement to the benefit of all parties.

It is well to remember in thinking about union-management agreements that under the laws of our land it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to raise wages, improve insurance plans or grant pension plans without the consent of the union that has bargaining rights. General Motors attempted to put an improved insurance plan into effect January 1, 1948, and was stopped by one of the unions that had bargaining rights in the plants. The National Labor Relations Board cited us for unfair labor practice and got out an injunction to stop the installation of the plan so that it could only be put into effect for salaried people and in certain plants where unions did not object or there were no unions. After the 1948 agreements went into effect, May 29, 1948, this union finally agreed to withdraw its complaint so that the employees would receive the benefit of the plan.

Many people do not realize that unions have such rights and think that the agreements only protect the unions and employees against reductions or decreases. As a result, the impression is created that improvement in wages, working conditions, and benefit plans are brought about year by year only by a union beating an employer over the head. Unfortunately, in collective bargaining one party or the other too often tries to gain an advantage—a bargain, like buying something for less than it is worth in a store. I think the only sound approach to collective bargaining is to work out an agreement that will clarify the rights and responsibilities of the parties and operate to the advantage of all concerned.

A CONSTRUCTIVE AGREEMENT

When we started the negotiations which led to this agreement we frankly discussed what kind of agreement the parties would try for and how we would go about it. Would we try for a pattern agreement for 2 or 3 years with annual reopenings on wages and perhaps other economic considerations, or would we make the effort to settle all matters for a much longer period of time? We said that for the ordinary kind of pattern agreement, obviously we would not try to undercut the economic considerations recently agreed to in the automotive industry. On the other hand, the union and our employes could not expect by ordinary collective bargaining to obtain benefits very much greater than had been obtained recently from other corporations in the industry. However, we said that, based on some of the principles we established 2 years ago, a really constructive agreement of an entirely different kind was possible and we would be willing to do our best to work out such an arrangement. This gave us an unusual opportunity to do the kind of things we thought we would like to do in the next 5 years for our employees, to promote both their welfare and the welfare of our business. This is how the 5-year agreement came about.

NEITHER INFLATIONARY NOR DEFLATIONARY

The cost-of-living formula by which wages are adjusted each 3 months is a continuation of the same principle used in the 1948 agreement, applied in the same way. This provision protects our employees against inflation but in itself is neither inflationary nor deflationary, but follows what other pressures have forced on the national economy. Inflation depends upon money supply, the fiscal policies of our Federal Government, credit policies of banks and finance companies, tariffs and subsidies, lack of production created by wars, strikes, export policies, or partial crop failures, none of which the employees or the Corporation have much to say about.

The annual improvement factor of 4 cents per hour is an increase of 1 cent per hour over the 3 cents provided for in the 1948 agreement. It is approximately 2½ percent of average wages. Many people think it was arrived at based on what we expect or can achieve in General Motors. This is not so. The 2½-percent annual improvement factor is somewhat less than the Nation's manufacturers have been able to achieve on the average in the last 50 years. In addition, in 50 years the standard workweek has been reduced from 60 hours to 40. The standard of living of a nation cannot be raised at the same time a war is being fought, and the census of manufacturers apparently shows little improvement on the whole between 1939 and 1947 due to strikes and union conflict and restriction of work by unions as well as the effect of the war.

The rosy forecasts of the future made by many economists, and may I say some public officials in high places, are based, if there is any hope of their realization, on this same technological improvement. We in General Motors have subscribed to what we think is the average of what the country can do. Of course, we hope to do better ourselves and, in addition to raising real wages, continue our policy of improving our products and reducing our prices. We are certain that small businesses have just as great an opportunity to improve their efficiency and their operations and take advantage of modern knowledge and technology as we have. In many instances they have greater opportunities because they are not quite so far down this road. This applies even to digging ditches, as the improvement in our modern American ditch-digging equipment over the old pick and shovel is enormous.

SHARING THE FRUITS OF TECHNOLOGY

This principle of annual improvement in real wages based on technology we also hold to be neither inflationary nor deflationary. It does share promptly with workmen part of the fruits of technology. Unit costs are not increased since productivity is assumed to increase at least as fast as hourly wages. Therefore, no price increase should result from such wage increases. On the other hand, the purchasing power of a dollar would tend to be stabilized instead of increased, as would be the case if wages were held down and prices reduced and there were no inflationary pressures. Costs of manufactured articles importantly depend on the cost of raw materials as well as labor, and the prices of many raw materials do not fluctuate directly with the labor cost of producing them. Witness the recent increase in non-ferrous-metal prices. Some people have apparently been looking forward to general wage reductions as well as price reductions, which is another way of saying they are looking forward to a deflation.

We believe that full recognition in this agreement by both parties that higher living standards depend upon technological advancements and the cooperative attitude of all parties in such progress is a very significant step ahead in labor-management relations. If there had been recognition of this principle in the agreements between the railroads and their unions, there would have been no strike over the useless second fireman on Diesel locomotives. Our new contract itself says:

"The annual improvement factor provided herein recognizes that a continuing improvement in the standard of living of employees depends upon technological progress, better tools, methods, processes, and equipment, and a cooperative attitude on the part of all parties in such progress. It further recognizes the principle that to produce more with the same amount of human effort is a sound economic and social objective."

The benefits of technology in raising the standard of living of a country can be dissipated through strikes, work restrictions, featherbedding, absenteeism, and an artificially short workweek. Without a clear understanding regarding this matter, we would not have had the courage to promise in advance a yearly increase in real wages.

Both parties completely accept the principle of progress, including the use of machines, mechanical power, and better organization, better working conditions, and better arrangement of the work in order not to waste human effort. If the people of our country really understand this principle and stick to it and are willing to work for the things they would like to have just as they have been willing to do in the past, I have no worries about our country being able to stand the costs of pensions, insurance, and high wages.

PROTECTION AGAINST HAZARDS OF LIFE

Both the insurance package and the pension plan were worked out in order to assist employees in protecting themselves against the individual hazards of life.

All parties recognize that such benefits mean some additional accounted cost, but no one can be sure to what degree these costs will be recovered through less sickness and absenteeism and through better morale and a cooperative attitude on the part of the employees. Many people have held that individual employees should pay for such benefits directly themselves from their wages, but the plan we have worked out will help employees acquire such benefits at probably lower cost than they could do it for themselves. Our plan should mean that practically all employees are covered by these benefit plans. We often forget how hard it is for the average workman to save money for a rainy day or for his old age. We have millions of salesmen abroad in our land trying to entice these same workmen and their wives to spend every last dollar they can get their hands on. It is important that the Nation's workmen should spend for what they need or feel they should have and still have reasonable security. Basically they are the customers as well as the producers who maintain the economy of our Nation. Only 40 percent of our national income is spent for subsistence living. The balance is spent for other things that give us our high American standard of living. The production, sale, and purchase of these other things depend on both the confidence and the ability to buy.

RECOGNITION FOR OLDER EMPLOYEES

Increased vacation pay for employees with 15 years or more service and the paying of one-half of the hospital and surgical coverage for the employee's family as well as himself is an effort to give added recognition to our older and more experienced employees. The additional increase of 5 cents per hour for certain skilled trades carries out this same idea.

UNION SECURITY

The union-security provisions which resolve the issue of the union shop we believe are practical and workable and reasonably carry out the intent of our present labor laws as well as the wishes of the majority of our employees affected. They should enable the union to carry out more effectively its responsibilities under the agreement while at the same time they provide job protection to the minority of our employees who for reasons of their own do not desire membership in the union. In certain labor circles there is considerable discussion over these provisions of our contract as to whether we did or did not grant a union shop. As a practical matter, any employer where unions have bargaining rights in his plants or office has a union shop not by the specific definition of the term but in a broad sense in

that he must deal with the union in regard to wages, hours, and other working conditions including pensions and insurance programs. The important thing is to have the union-security provisions worked out in such a way that they reasonably protect individuals against union purges or the abuse of unionism. In other words, a workman's living cannot be taken away from him because he has gotten into a political tangle with his union.

FAIR TREATMENT FOR ALL

We put a great deal of value as a practical matter on the contract language of the agreement. Many of the important provisions of the contract have been maintained with little or no change for more than 10 years. They are very important from our point of view in maintaining efficiency and order in our plants and avoiding misunderstandings and work stoppages. They provide for the establishment of fair work standards and for fair treatment of employees. They recognize the basic principle that all individuals have a right to a hearing over any grievances they may have regarding their work. I would recommend that those who are interested or who have the practical problem in their own businesses of working out agreements with unions should give at least as much attention to the contract provisions of our agreement as they do to the more dramatic wage and benefit provisions.

We have been receiving many letters regarding this settlement—most of them favorable, a few from people who apparently still want to fight unions and from a few who are honestly questioning whether or not the contract is inflationary. I have one here, from the wife of an employee, which is very short but which says a great deal. I would like to read it to you. Here it is:

"As the wife of one of your employees, I am writing to thank you for the wonderful thing you have done. I am glad you realize men don't want to strike—and that they do have to provide for their families, and that insecurity worries people. My husband said the next day after the good news the men were happy and worked hard and well."

When 2 years ago we first recognized the quarterly cost-of-living adjustment and the annual improvement factor in determining wages, our agreement was promptly criticized by the Mine Workers' Journal and Barron's Weekly. This encouraged us. All of the workmen in our plants understood the wage formula at once and were highly pleased since they understand money as a medium of exchange. Many employers and financial people did not seem to understand the agreement so well. Perhaps they were thinking of money as capital and were wondering what this agreement did to their capital. Many of those who were skeptical of our wage-determination formula 2 years ago decided that it was probably a pretty good plan after they saw how it worked out.

This 5-year agreement was promptly criticized by the Daily Worker and certain financial writers and commentators who dubbed the agreement inflationary and not in the interest of business generally. Some even implied that the contract was not consistent with free enterprise and that it did not assure industrial peace but represented only temporary appeasement. One manufacturer took the trouble to write to a number of people prominent in national business associations. Perhaps without realizing it he took the classical reactionary position that has loaded the guns for the Communists and Socialists regularly.

AN AMERICAN SOLUTION

The problem is to work out an American solution for the relations of labor and industry and not attempt to adopt the philosophy of class conflict from Europe, either from the Communists and Socialists on the one hand or the cartel-thinking, noncompetitive reactionaries on the other. A continuation of shotgun bargaining on the pattern familiar in the coal industry certainly will not contribute to the prosperity of our country or satisfy our people.

Certainly General Motors believes in free enterprise, in producing more and better things for more people and in serving its customers well. It also believes in fair treatment of its employees and holds that this is not in conflict with treating customers right. Any business that expects to show good profits should attempt to earn them through efficiency and progress and not just by collecting a toll. It sometimes seems to me that some people who talk free enterprise intend it for others and are reluctant to face competition themselves. Some even seem to use free enterprise talk as a cloak for a little extra selfishness.

We do not expect this agreement to set a pattern of so many cents per hour or of so many dollars a month in the form of a pension nor in the form of certain insurance benefits intended to improve the health of the worker and his family. It is our hope that this agreement will set a pattern for bargaining based on principles that will insure industrial peace and prosperity and minimize strife and industrial warfare.

Chairman RADFORD E. MOBLEY, JR., president of the National Press Club. Thank you very much, Mr. Wilson. The first question is "How will your agreement affect small business; how can small business meet your terms?"

Mr. WILSON. I have never known a good businessman, whether he was engaged in what we call a small business or in a large one, who took the position that the only way his business could continue prosperous was by paying substandard wages or by operating what we call a sweatshop, or something like that.

Actually, I looked up the record of the wages in the parts companies in the automotive industry for instance. The automotive parts companies have increased their wages since 1940 by a bigger percentage on the average than have the big automobile companies.

Many people are sort of surprised to know that that is so. The smaller companies are less able to stand pressure bargaining than the large companies. They are subject to a double hazard. When the principals get into trouble with strikes their business is shut off.

When they, themselves, are pushed for wage considerations—economic improvements—they face the hazard of their own business and the loss in it, and their principals are likely to be forced to take some of the business away from them. They never get it back—not all of it. Because if you asked somebody else to help you out in an emergency you cannot cut his throat and say, "No, I don't know you," after the thing is over. So you have to redivide the business a little bit. You can see why all those companies are very fearful about precipitating a row—and they have been edged up more in proportion than the big companies.

If I were a small-business man operating a nice little business, I would just love to take this General Motors agreement and put it right into effect right in my business. I would expect to get a fine morale from my people. I would be close enough to them so they would understand what I was up to, and they would try to help me run a good business, and I would not be afraid of the competition at all or of paying good wages to good people. That is my firm belief, and I think I have got the figures to back it up. When some folks say, "Well, how can little business keep up with a thing like this," they are not realistic about it. What did they do with the 18 cents an hour in early 1946?

What did they do to the raise in 1946 to recognize the inflation and paid holidays for workmen, as well as for salaried people, and paid vacations? What did they do about the 11 to 13 cents 2 years ago? What are they going to do about the recent insurance and pension package? They are going to step up to doing reasonably well for their employees, and the better they work it out the more successful their business is going to be.

Chairman MOBLEY. These next three questions involve predictions. I remember, sir, that you are a good prognosticator. When you last talked to us in 1946, we thought the ceiling was falling through the floor with prices. You said, in a general way, that the prices of automobiles will go up before they come down.

You were quite right. Perhaps we should ask you to predict the November elections. We newsmen did not do too well the last time.

These questions say:

1. Is it fair to assume that General Motors is betting that business will be very good during the next 5 years, with General Motors at least, and that costs and prices will continue upward?

2. How many passenger cars do you expect will be produced by the industry in 1950, 1951, and 1952?

3. How high will GM stock go?

Mr. WILSON. On the question of how high General Motors stock will go, it makes me think of an experience I had in Texas a number of years ago. I was asked the same question and I said, "Now you men down here are in the cattle and oil business. You just figure out where you think the price of oil is going and the price of beef, and General Motors stock prices are probably going to move right along with those two things."

Our business is so big that we are going to go along with the prosperity of our country. There is no way that I know of where we can have a marvelously successful business in General Motors and have the business of the country not doing very well.

I just sort of let that price of the stock take care of itself and I worry about things I have something to do about.

On the rest of the question, I do not know what the production is going to be this year. It looks like it would be well over 7,000,000 cars and trucks in the United States. I do have to say this: the shortage of cars in General Motors is worse than it was a year ago or 2 years ago; also, in spite of the fact that we are producing at about a 30 or 35 percent higher rate than we were last year, our dealers actually have fewer cars in their places of business than they had this time last year.

I am personally getting on the fire again from some of my friends because they can't get their Cadillacs delivered. It is really a marvelous business. And it is marvelous because our cars do so much for people and there is so much value in them.

Mr. MOBLEY. That is our commercial. [Laughter.]

Some people question whether the 5-year GM contract holds promise of freedom from strikes by the union that it has been advertised as having.

The basis for this question is a decision in April by the NLRB. In that case NLRB held that a CIO union holding a 2-year contract with the Wilson Packing Co. was free to strike 3 months after signing the contract. The union had a no-strike pledge in its contract and it had filed a 60-day notice required by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Do you think that under this decision to UAW has a license from the NLRB to strike during its 5-year pact with GM?

Mr. WILSON. I am not a lawyer, but I don't think so. Our whole contract projects the good intent and faith of the parties, and I don't know just exactly where I would run

to if General Motors started out to break that agreement. I don't think I would have the face to try to negotiate another one, and I don't think the union boys would either. I think they are going to carry out this agreement and they are going to do it well.

Now, we have always been careful in our union agreements to make sure we understand each other. As a matter of fact, after we worked out this whole thing and stayed up all night, Monday night—these things always have to be settled at night, for some reason or other; I am getting sort of old to stay up all night, but I can still do it and did—but here is what the waiver, as we call it, says. If this doesn't say there are not going to be any strikes in General Motors for 5 years, I don't understand English:

"The parties acknowledge that during the negotiations which resulted in this agreement each had the unlimited right and opportunity to make demands and proposals with respect to any subject or matter not removed by law from the area of collective bargaining, and that the understandings and agreements arrived at by the parties after the exercise of that right and opportunity are set forth in this agreement.

"Therefore, the corporation and the union, for the life of this agreement, each voluntarily and unqualifiedly waives the right, and each agrees that the other shall not be obligated, to bargain collectively with respect to any subject or matter referred to, or covered in this agreement, or with respect to any subject or matter not specifically referred to or covered in this agreement, even though such subjects or matters may not have been within the knowledge or contemplation of either or both of the parties at the time that they negotiated or signed this agreement."

Now, what does that sound like? That is the understanding of the parties, and I am sure the parties are going to try to live up to it independent of what the National Labor Relations Board says.

Mr. MOBLEY. In view of General Motors' success and the general prosperity today, do you believe you were wrong in asking that the 40-hour week be waived after the war?

Mr. WILSON. No, sir. That was the only way we could have avoided a big inflation and an increase in prices. I was a little disappointed that some more people didn't join up and try it. I noticed Mr. Baruch came out for it about a year and a half late, but we had established a high take-home pay and a good standard of living, so far as purchasing power was concerned, for workmen during the war by going from a 40- to a 48-hour week; so if we had taken several years to work back down to the 40-hour week, like we did when we went from 48 hours to 40 before, we would have given management time for these technological improvements I talk about so much. Accordingly, we could have come along year by year and knocked the work week down and not cut the take-home pay and wages of the people.

You couldn't do it with the one big jump of 30 percent. We have committed ourselves to 2½ percent a year and we are going to make it and more, to promote our business. But that 30 percent jump in one flip in the fall of 1945, we couldn't take, and the only thing that could have been done to maintain approximate wages and prices would have been to work longer for a while until we recovered the losses of the war in terms of production—not in terms of money, but in terms of goods and services.

That is the only way it could have been done. It is too bad we didn't try it.

Mr. MOBLEY. We have time for two more questions. This says: To what extent does General Motors benefit from the Marshall plan? Does the corporation have many military orders?

Mr. WILSON. We don't have very much military business. We do feel a responsibility to work along with our Government, our military people, in their defense program.

We know, just as we did 10 years ago, that if this country ever has another war the country is going to need General Motors awfully bad, and we want to be ready to do a good job promptly. So we are working along with those responsible—not to make money out of the military program, but to be ready if we have the terrible job to do.

Mr. MOBLEY. This last question is very brief, only four words: Why these stock split-ups?

Mr. WILSON. I think there are two or three reasons for it. There is a general impression that if the stock doesn't sell at too high a figure in dollars per share, more people will buy—the little people will buy ten shares. We think the present economy of our country calls for the "folks" to put some capital in our enterprises, too, and we would like to see more stockholders in General Motors. That is one of the reasons.

The second reason, perhaps, is it just got to be the style. A lot of other big companies, after 20 years or so, split their shares. You men who are familiar with the financial business can list them for yourselves. We are one of the last ones that got around to it.

The dollars aren't quite the same kind of dollars they were, as you all know, in 1940. We have invested a great deal more money in General Motors to modernize our plant and get good working conditions for the men, and the finest tools that we know how to produce in our country or we know how to think up ourselves as improved ways of doing things.

So we thought it was a good thing to increase the number of shares. There was some argument about it in the family. Some of the men said: "It won't change the real equities of the owners at all." But the psychology of it seemed to favor a stock split.

That is the best I can do with that one. It is a little out of my part of the business, anyway.

Mr. MOBLEY. Mr. Wilson, the National Press Club admires you a great deal. We always appreciate your coming down to talk with us. We want to thank you for coming here today.

Tolerance Essential to a Free Society—Charles E. Wilson Speaks Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, what might properly be termed as a sequel to a previous and farsighted declaration by Mr. C. E. Wilson, president of General Motors, Corp., is herewith submitted for the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Wilson's views further clarify his philosophy as it bears upon human needs and relations in and out of industry.

Mr. Wilson delivered his speech before the National Conference of Christians and Jews held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City, on Tuesday evening, October 3, 1950.

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Baruch, members of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and guests, it is a high honor that has been bestowed upon me this evening. I greatly appreciate both the brotherhood award and the way it was presented.

When the National Conference of Christians and Jews was founded some 22 years ago it stated that its objective is "to promote justice, amity, understanding, and cooperation among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, and to analyze, moderate, and finally eliminate intergroup prejudices which disfigure and distart religious, business, social, and political relations, with a view to the establishment of a social order in which the religious ideals of brotherhood and justice shall become the standards of human relationships."

This objective is a plea for tolerance. But it is also far more than tolerance. Tolerance alone is negative. Your objective is founded on a positive concept of mutual respect, based on the common ethical principles of the Judaeo-Christian tradition, which include among others the following premises:

1. That man is more than a mere animal, in that he has a mind to know the truth and a will to determine his own course of action.
2. That man has sacred rights derived from God.
3. That man also has responsibilities to God and to his fellow men.
4. That all men are brothers before God.
5. That the Ten Commandments are a universal code for all men.

It is from this same ethical tradition that Thomas Jefferson took the basic principles upon which our Government was founded, so brilliantly set forth in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Upon that ethical foundation the founding fathers framed the Constitution of our United States. In the light of this same ethical background they recognized the necessity of restricting the authority of Government in order to protect these basic personal rights. From this flowed the Bill of Rights, the very first article of which stated that—

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of people peacefully to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Great personal freedom from man-made tyranny and great material benefits to all humanity have flowed from these inspired and highly successful efforts to create a free society founded on these religious and ethical principles, thus fulfilling for at least part of the world the hopes and aspirations of all men to be free.

From far-away India comes much the same thinking regarding the basic rights of man. To quote the words of Mahatma Gandhi published in an Indian magazine at about the time of his death:

"Individual freedom alone can make a man voluntarily surrender himself completely to the service of society. If it is wrested from him, he becomes an automaton; and society is ruined. No society can possibly be built on a denial of individual freedom. It is contrary to the very nature of man, and just as a man will not grow horns or a tail so he will not exist as man if he has no mind of his own. In reality even those who do not believe in the liberty of the individual believe in their own."

To my way of thinking, such wisdom, if followed, is a good omen for the new nation of India.

Under these liberal concepts of government great social and economic progress has been made in our western world in the last two

centuries. About 100 years ago other social and economic doctrines were advanced by Karl Marx and others. These doctrines denied in their entirety the ethical foundation of our political and economic system. Marx and Engels, with their doctrine of dialectic materialism, directly challenged our religious institutions and teachings. Their teachings tend to undermine all religions and to substitute communism, or some form of socialism, for religious beliefs. They falsely claim that their philosophy is a liberal philosophy and promise that it will greatly benefit the common man.

In the last 30 years our western civilization has been increasingly challenged by the followers of these collectivist doctrines. Wherever people have adopted collectivism they have lost their individual freedom, and dictatorship has been the result. Not only have they suffered in the loss of their liberty and in spiritual degradation but the promised material benefits have not materialized. In addition, in many cases, the world has witnessed a resurgence of the most savage barbarism. The world is in danger of slipping backward, not just to the horse-and-buggy days but back to the chariots of the Caesars and the elephants of the Hannibals, and I fear back to the pagan disregard of human life and of the dignity of the individual. The fundamental principles of communism are so diametrically opposite to the ethical principles on which our western civilization is based that these Communist dictators promptly attempted to suppress the churches and all religions advocating the rights of the individual. This is forcing our religious organizations, through their leaders, to take a positive position against communism and socialism and all other forms of government that deny the basic inalienable personal rights of men. Religious leaders especially stand to lose not only their property and standard of living but their spiritual integrity as well.

Many times in past centuries whole nations have suffered greatly and much blood has been shed because some religious group demanded complete conformity of whole populations in religious matters and control over their temporal affairs. Conversion by the sword, however, has never been successful. Land areas can be taken by force, but force cannot capture men's minds. Ultimately the pen proves to be mightier than the sword. The fundamental religious principles that people believe must have free expression if those people are to endure.

In speaking of religious tolerance, I would like to make the sharp distinction between tolerance and indifference. I am sure that tolerance, including religious tolerance, is essential to a free society, but I am even more convinced that no free society can continue to exist unless the great majority of its citizens subscribe to ethical principles and a moral code that develops self-respect and self-discipline on the part of individuals and recognition of the individual citizen's basic obligations to others. With this background he will be willing to concede to others the same rights that he wishes to enjoy himself.

The wars and conflicts of the past that arose over religious differences or imperialistic efforts to capture lands and resources are being replaced by conflicts arising from efforts to capture, control, and direct men's minds. In this world-wide conflict between the ideology of collectivism and the philosophy of personal freedom it seems clear to me that all of our religious leaders must take a position in favor of personal freedom and of our western type of civilization, since it is based on the ethical principles that are the very foundation of their religions. The leaders of religious groups have always had a problem of the extent to which their religious responsibilities require them to take positions regarding current social and economic affairs. For religious leaders to take a proper and sound position in the present world conflict without appearing to attempt domination of temporal affairs and without increasing friction between states and nations is difficult, but the issue must be faced. Collectivism, which denies individual freedom, is contrary to the very nature of man, and to force communism on a people requires dictatorship, and the entire population must conform to the will of the dictator lest his rule be weakened as the people realize the truth and the false philosophy on which his rule is based be broken down as the people assert their liberties. In contrast, the republics and democracies of the world are based on respect for the rights of individuals. They tend to be tolerant of the thinking and beliefs of all peoples, even to the point where the interests and aspirations of the liberty-loving majority may be jeopardized by violent minorities dominated by totalitarian beliefs or by individuals who preach communism as a cloak to further their ruthless ambitions. This, too, poses a difficult issue. When does free speech become sedition? How far should free nations go in protecting enemies of freedom in their efforts to destroy freedom itself?

At times, in past centuries, great masses of the people have been subjected to extreme hardships and violence with religion as a front for the ambitions of ruthless leaders. Again today great masses of people are being subjected to hardship and violence to advance the principles of collectivism and to further the ambitions of a few dictators who falsely claim that their actions will result in the greatest good for the greatest number. I am convinced that the peoples of the world want peace, not war. Through the centuries of the recorded history dictators, no matter how they have achieved their power, have been responsible for most of our disastrous wars.

Fortunately or unfortunately, we are all animals as well as human beings, and are subject to the same needs and laws that control the animal kingdom. As animals we must have food, clothing, and shelter, but these things alone will not satisfy our desires as human beings. To keep a people prosperous and happy sound policies must be followed which contribute to both physical and spiritual well-being and to economic and social progress. The Bible recognizes clearly this dual nature of man. In Genesis appears the line, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," but Deuteronomy adds, "Man doth not live by bread alone." The promises made in the name of communism especially appeal to people living in poverty and misery and whose pressing animal needs seem to be more important than their spiritual welfare.

Our modern western society by the use of machinery and mechanical power and specialization of labor has given each of us a great deal more for our labor, but at the same time it has made us increasingly dependent upon one another. As our means of communication and transportation have improved and the world has grown relatively smaller whole nations are becoming more dependent upon one another. As we become more interdependent clearly it is necessary that we become more understanding and more tolerant of one another's problems, for only by effectively working together is it possible for us to maintain our own existence. Today even a farmer, who has traditionally been considered economically the most independent among us, is himself dependent for his very existence upon the smooth functioning of our industrial order. He must have a market for his surplus. He lights his lamps and operates his milking machine with electricity produced by a power company which uses machinery made in Pittsburgh or Schenectady and coal mined in Kentucky or Virginia or oil from Texas. This power comes to him through wires made in Connecticut out of copper from Montana or Utah. He hauls his produce in a truck made in Michigan (or maybe even in South Bend), powered by gasoline from oil out of the Southwest. He pays taxes to help support the Marshall plan. His son may be fighting in Korea. Break the spirit of willing cooperation and existence becomes a very difficult problem, an impossible one for most of us. In our modern western civilization we must have a spirit of tolerance and cooperate with others if we are to maintain our standard of living. And to an even greater degree we must respect one another's view and make real progress in our social and economic relations if we are to preserve our liberties.

It is increasingly clear that our large industrial corporations are not merely economic institutions, but that they have social responsibilities and problems as well—that business decisions and policies must be made and adopted not only in the light of short- and long-term economic factors but also with due recognition of pertinent social values and possible social reactions. We in General Motors believe and hope that we are making an important contribution to the economic progress of our country. We also hope and believe that we are contributing to the stability and social well-being of our thousands of employees and of all those who are affected by our business. Our American industry, with its development of mechanical power, better tools, and better organization of human effort, is making possible material benefits and a standard of living for all people that only kings dreamed about a couple of centuries ago. We believe the actions of our large American industrial organizations are the economic expression of the same fundamental principles that are the basis of our political institutions and our religious beliefs.

The advocates of Government-planned economy and of Socialist and communistic states appeal to envy, prejudice, and greed in the effort to discredit accomplishment and to further their totalitarian ambitions. They attempt to discredit the great accomplishments of our free society by magnifying a few of its weaknesses or defects. They get the people's confidence by promising great improvement in their physical welfare if they will adopt the Communist society. By the time the people find that these promises are not fulfilled they are already trapped. It is too late. They have gone down a one-way street. In terms of the history of the world, our type of free society is relatively young, and I am sure that none of us would take the position that it is perfect and cannot be improved. But on analysis of the facts we have made more progress for more people in less time, both in terms of physical goods produced and consumed and as human beings, than ever was made before in the history of the world.

Our free society, based on the religious concept of individual freedom, has recognized the importance of the individual and his rights and obligations, has given him positive incentives for accomplishment and provided opportunities for all. This has promoted and rewarded the initiative of the millions, thereby producing this great economic and social progress. I am sure that no society, based on state planning from the top or regimentation of all individuals with a resulting curtailment of initiative and opportunity, can produce an equally prosperous and happy society.

In these troublesome times, we must understand and renew our faith in our fundamental beliefs, and make sure that in our efforts to solve the problems of our times and of our daily living we do not adopt policies which violate these fundamental principles.

My special plea tonight is that all of us should work to further social and economic progress based on the common ethical principles of our religions and as expressed in

the Constitution of our country. I am sure that this is the way to combat the false philosophies of communism and state planning, and that only through a clear demonstration of the material and spiritual benefits of our free system can we convert others to it. While I believe we, as well as the people of all other free nations, must at all times be prepared to defend ourselves against invasion, and be willing to help each other when attacked, I do not believe that communism can be vanquished by the sword, that bullets will kill ideas, no matter how wrong these ideas may be. We must vigorously oppose this false philosophy and the dictators who are promoting it but not the people who are being misled by it. Only when the great masses of the people of the world understand the basis of our prosperity and freedom and understand and accept the fundamental truths that we believe, will we have a secure foundation for peace in the world. Efforts of organizations such as yours to establish the brotherhood of man in a free society are certainly making progress in the right direction. Only the truth can keep us free.

Reclamation and Conservation of Water Resources Never Has Been and Should Not Be a Partisan Party Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I read with amazement and disappointment the statement of my colleague Congresswoman HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of September 22, 1950.

I do not believe that reclamation and the conservation of water resources ever has been a partisan party issue. The Reclamation Act of 1902 was passed by a Republican Congress. President Theodore Roosevelt was really the father of the idea. The general policies outlined in that act, with certain additions and improvements, have been recommended and supported by every succeeding President. The differences regarding what should be done in the conservation of waters and in the reclamation of arid areas has never followed party lines. Furthermore, I am firmly convinced that these problems should not follow party lines.

To make reclamation and water conservation a party issue would in my opinion be very damaging to the cause which we are trying to foster.

It is interesting to note for instance that when the Central Valley project began to take shape that the approval of it by the Legislature of California and by the people of California was not gained through the efforts of any of the political parties, as such. It was a nonpartisan effort of a great group of people who saw in the development of the Central Valley project the key to the destiny of California. Many people and numerous groups and interests opposed the project. Nevertheless it was approved by a substantial majority at the polls.

Later during the great depression, when our State turned to the National Government for aid, two of the leading spokesmen for the aid were Republican Congressmen B. W. Gearhart, of Fresno, and Richard J. Welch, of San Francisco. Undoubtedly the entire California delegation participated in the request but the two mentioned above are the only ones who personally have told me of that historic meeting with Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I have been told that when the President was informed of the project and the purpose and nature of it, he wanted to know why they were asking the National Government for aid for a project that concerned itself exclusively with intrastate waters. The streams involved, together with their watersheds, are all within the confines of California. President Roosevelt, according to my informants, pointed out to those present that since no interstate streams were involved, he was in doubt as to the legality of Federal aid to this project. Furthermore, there was no undeveloped public arid land which might be reclaimed by this project as was the case in most of the reclamation projects previous to that time. However, some of those present pointed out to President Roosevelt that the major dam of the project, namely Shasta Dam, would have the effect of regulating the waters of the Sacramento River. The Sacramento River is a navigable stream and has been navigated from time immemorial. It was pointed out that millions of dollars had been spent in trying to control the flow of that stream. It was further pointed out that much Federal money had been spent in an effort to reduce silting and control floods on the Sacramento. The Federal Government having control of and jurisdiction over navigable streams, it was suggested that it was legal for the Federal Government to appropriate money to be used for the development of the Central Valley project. On that fine thread the first aid given was in the amount of $10,000 and was the amount which the President recommended as the initial contribution largely to determine, by investigation, whether or not Federal money could be lawfully spent on the project. It is known by everyone that from that date on Mr. Roosevelt was a stanch supporter of the project and that hundreds of millions of dollars have been appropriated in the development and construction of the project, the completion of which is now in sight.

In an effort to get the committees of Congress to understand the project and to appropriate money for its development, numerous Congressmen have given aid, including Mrs. DOUGLAS and the author of this statement. Differences of opinion as to the various phases of the project have arisen. For instance, Mrs. DOUGLAS and myself have on numerous occasions advocated the construction and ownership by the Government of transmission lines to carry the electricity developed at the power plant below the Shasta Dam. This policy has been violently opposed in the House by members of both parties. For instance, my good friend Jed Johnson, who left Congress some time ago and who was for years chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, did not believe in that principle. I merely mention this to point out that no party can claim that it alone is the friend of reclamation and the development and conservation of our waterways. The statement was made in the extension of my colleague that "because the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress sharply curtailed progress on the Central Valley project, the San Joaquin Valley does not have enough water to supply its ever-increasing demands."

I do not believe that is the correct conclusion nor a correct statement of facts. It is true that the Eightieh Congress gave less money than I personally wished they had appropriated. However, that Congress was trying to balance the budget, and did balance it. It is well known that the budgets of the Truman administration have been unbalanced. This is one of the major reasons why we have the terrible rash of inflation which is punishing every family in America today. No matter if they had given more money, the project would not have been completed as no Congress, irrespective of its political complexion, would have given enough during the period that the Eightieth Congress was in session to have completed the project by this time. It is also well known that the Delta-Mendota canal was not completed as early as it should have been and as a result the Reclamation Bureau was enjoined from diverting water to the south into the Friant-Kern canal. The injunction was granted by a judge who is a Democrat, appointed by a Democratic President. His decision was based on purely legal grounds, without any consideration whatever of party policies.

The effort to assail one party or the other for their deficiencies in reclamation development will not bring the progress to which the projects are entitled. Neither party can claim all the credit nor take all the blame in these matters. For the good of the projects, it is better to have a situation, which by and large has been the situation up to now, where the question is not which party is in control when appropriations are made for their development but what is the merit of any particular project. I hope I will never see the day when a project is considered on the basis of the political affiliation of those who support it and the secret question asked by the committeemen listening to the evidence is, "Are the supporters of the project of our political affiliation?" The only attitude that the committee should take, and I believe this has been their attitude, is what are the merits of the claim being made for any particular project and what amount of money is a reasonable amount to appropriate and which can be best utilized during the coming fiscal year?

Sometimes zealots on both sides of the problem try to enmesh or utilize reclamation projects for political advantage. For instance, when Secretary of Interior Krug made a trip in the fall of 1948 to Arizona and to Vallejo, Calif., to

make an announcement in those particular areas that two certain projects had been approved by him, in my opinion, that was merely done for the purpose of trying to indicate to those areas that the Democratic administration had been kind enough to approve two projects in which those areas were interested, and consequently the voters should express their gratitude by Democratic votes. That trip was a distinct disservice to the reclamation program. The Secretary could have made that announcement in Washington, filed his report, in which he declared the project to be feasible, with the Speaker of the House. It would then be eligible for appropriations. It did not need any trip to the western coast with the personal appearance of the Secretary just before election time to indicate that the project had been found feasible and it was recommended as such by the Secretary of the Interior. That trip was such an obvious political one that I hated to see it be tied to any reclamation project. The statement by Mrs. DOUGLAS is along the same line. For instance she says:

> Today, thanks to renewed progress on the Central Valley project under a Democratic controlled Congress, farmers in the Chow Chilla water district will get the water they need.

Some of the very works that enable them to get this water were built by money appropriated by a Republican Congress. In fact, it is not now certain exactly when the water will be delivered but the contract for its delivery has been signed.

I think that Gov. Earl Warren, of California, has done more than any other single individual, in or out of Congress, to get appropriations for the Central Valley project. He has taken the time to come to Washington from his busy job as Governor of California to plead with the appropriate committees of Congress for aid in the rapid development of our Central Valley project. I know that his presence has had tremendous influence on the committees to whom he has talked. For instance, that great friend of reclamation, Congressman MICHAEL KIRWAN, devoted a great part of his presentation of the Central Valley project items in the appropriation bill for fiscal 1948 to eulogizing the Governor and praising his efforts for coming to Washington to explain the need of California for appropriations in order that the Central Valley project could be rapidly brought to completion. What greater testimony could there be that reclamation and the conservation of our waters is not a political problem—is not a partisan problem—than the testimony of Mr. KIRWAN, who has been our stanch friend in support of money for this project ever since I came to Congress? The members of the subcommittee itself at various times that I have appeared before them—and I have appeared before them at every session of Congress since I have been here—have been divided within the parties. Some members of the Democrats do not believe, like Mr. KIRWAN does, that the transmission lines should be owned by the Reclamation Bureau. On the Republican side we, likewise, have a division of opinion sometimes, some believing that the public should own transmission lines and some being opposed to it; some saying we are emphasizing hydroelectric-power development too much and irrigation too little, and so forth. The net result has been that we have fared rather well considering all the other expenses our Government has had to face during the past few years. I hope that when I go to a committee and discuss the water problems of California, either to get authority for a project or to get money for it, that no member of the committee will look at me and inquire whether I am a Republican or a Democrat. I hope that all he will say is, "What merit is there in the statement that Mr. JOHNSON makes regarding the project involved? Is it sound? Is it feasible? Is it practical and does our fiscal situation permit us to give money to the project at this time?" Is these can be answered in the affirmative, I hope that no member will hesitate to grant my plea, and especially will not consider what my particular party affiliation is.

Communist Infiltration of the Scientific Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The ranks of American scientists have been infiltrated to an alarming degree by the Communist enemies of the United States. This real threat to the Nation's security is a matter which has either been ignored by the Atomic Energy Commission or treated far too lightly by this vital administrative agency of the Government.

It is the same old story of softness toward Communists which has prevailed in the State Department and the Department of Justice these many years.

Klaus Fuchs and Harry Gold are not isolated phenomena in their betrayals of this country's vital scientific secrets. Their cases are a part of a general pattern of Communist infiltration of the scientific profession.

The startling fact is that at least 500 scientists whose biographies are listed in American Men of Science have been openly affiliated with the Communist movement through its deceitful and seditious front organizations. Any scientist who is anybody in the world of science is listed in this authentic reference work.

It may be countered by some apologists for subversion that 500 represents a small and insignificant percentage of the 50,000 scientists whose biographies are given in American Men of Science, but the fact remains that even a 1 percent incidence of disloyalty among scientists may strike at the very heart of our national security. Furthermore, the very eminence of these 500 Communists and fellow travelers among scientists is a shocking phenomenon in American life, and their scientific prominence more than makes up for their relatively small percentage of the whole scientific profession. Included in this list of 500 are some of the "scientific greats" of all time.

What, one may ask, can be the controlling motive which prompts a man of science to betray the country which honors him and his profession and affords him unparalleled opportunity? It is apparent that we must look beyond such base or sordid motives as economic advantage or hatred for the institutions of this country for an answer to that question. The Communists are far too shrewd to attempt any appeal to scientists generally on the basis of pure selfishness or class hatred. It would appear from the record that spurious or misapplied notions of "world brotherhood" and "the internationalism of science" underlie, for the most part, the behavior of those scientists who affiliate with the Communist or the Communist-front movement and, thereby, lend their great prestige to subversion.

Several publishing events of recent days have brought into sharp focus the issue of our national security, as it is affected by the Communist infiltration of the scientific ranks of the United States and as it is met by Government administrative agencies.

First, we have the publication of a book entitled "Security, Loyalty, and Science," by Prof. Walter F. Gellhorn, of Columbia University. This volume, published by the Cornell University Press, is a not-to-subtle effort to hold the very idea of loyalty clearance for atomic scientists up to public scorn and ridicule.

Second, we have several reviews of the Gellhorn book attempting to give it favorable acceptance by the public. It received enthusiastic support from book reviewers of several New York newspapers—the same New York papers, incidentally, which gave such favorable reviews to Owen Lattimore's recent book. In addition to these widely read New York reviews, a national magazine gave considerable publicity to Professor Gellhorn's book a short time ago in an article entitled "Danger: We're Headed for a Russianized America."

Third, we have a series of articles in the New York Journal-American, written by the paper's financial editor, Leslie Gould, under the title "The Story of Senator MACMAHON." This series of articles has disclosed the amazing information that the top employee in the office of the chairman of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was a man whose Communist connections led him to write for the Communist Party's New Masses and to espouse the Communist-inspired and Communist-directed campaign of Henry A. Wallace for the the Presidency in 1948. This man was the late Charles E. Calkins.

These publishing events call for some elaboration of their significance.

I propose to show that Prof. Walter F. Gellhorn was completely disqualified to approach any study of loyalty and security in an impartial frame of mind. Gellhorn's conclusions could hardly be other than self-serving, human nature being what it is, and Gellhorn's prior attitudes having been what they were.

For more than 10 years, Prof. Walter F. Gellhorn has been allergic to all investigations of un-American activities, at the slightest contact with which he breaks out with a rash of words.

Gellhorn was incompetent for the job of examining loyalty and security programs and should have been disqualified on the following grounds:

1. He has a personal stake in finding against the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities;

2. On April 19, 1943, he was subjected to examination as a witness by the congressional committee, which confronted him with evidence of his own Communist-front activities and connections:

3. He has collaborated with known Communists in their enterprises;

4. He has been affiliated with Communist organizations cited as subversive by the congressional committee;

5. On more than one occasion, he has published embittered articles against the congressional committee;

6. He has admitted under oath that he had probably signed an attack on the Congressional committee's record without ever having read or seen any part of it, i. e., the committee's hearings;

7. In at least one instance, he falsified the congressional committee's printed record, and in so doing, contradicted his own sworn testimony;

8. He has written an article in the Harvard Law Review in defense of a notorious Communist-front organization;

9. He has claimed, under oath, complete ignorance of the simplest facts about the American Communist Party; and

10. He has been a well-known enemy of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for a period of more than 10 years.

Almost a year before the publication of Professor Gellhorn's volume; the Communists had formed a favorable impression of it and anticipated that it would be a contribution in the field of political science. The Communists and their fellow travelers know their friends better than these friends know themselves. The November 5, 1949, issue of the New York Teachers News carried an editorial by its Communist editor, Abraham Lederman, which looked forward to the appearance of Professor Gellhorn's book in the following words:

"Of course I cannot venture an opinion as to the validity of the conclusions the study will reach, but I did get the impression, when a Columbia professor participating in the project interviewed me this summer * * * that the results would represent a contribution in the field of political science."

The 10 points which I have cited as disqualifying Professor Gellhorn from writing an impartial book on the questions involved in loyalty and security, can be documented to the hilt.

Gellhorn's general method of trying to discredit loyalty investigations is to cite a few anonymous cases in which absurd questions were allegedly asked by the investigators. Inasmuch as everything is strictly anonymous, you must take Gellhorn's word for it that these questions were asked of some unnamed Government employees or prospective employees by unnamed investigators on unnamed dates at unnamed places. Such is the character of Professor Gellhorn's research.

Professor Gellhorn and the reviewers who have favorably publicized his book reveal a degree of ignorance about the Communist movement which is truly appalling and which, if made the basis of our national policy, would be dangerous in the highest degree. It would require another book to set down the full details of this ignorance (assuming that it is not, in all cases, deliberate distortion). Communist espionage would find its pathway very considerably smoothed if the American people could be frightened by the hobgoblin of totalitarianism into abandoning their insistence that the loyalty of atomic scientists be thoroughly checked before they are given access to secrets which are vital to our national security.

I must limit myself to a single illustration of Gellhorn's ignorance (or was it deliberate misrepresentation) of the facts about Communist organizations in this country. On pages 141–142 of his book, he depicts the American Russian Institute as a very respectable (if not, indeed, conservative) organization and, by clear implication, assails Attorney General Tom Clark for his listing of the American Russian Institute as a Communist organization. While stating several facts about the American Russian Institute (proving that he did some research on the subject), Gellhorn omits the relevant fact that Henry H. Collins is executive director of the organization. Is it possible that Gellhorn did not know this? Or is it possible that he did not know that Henry H. Collins has been named as a member of the Communist espionage cell in the Federal Government which included Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Dean Acheson's law partner, Donald Hiss, John Abt, Nathan Witt, Lee Pressman, and Gregory Silvermaster? Such convenient omissions of fact pervade the book of Professor Gellhorn—convenient in the sense that it serves the interests of the Communist Party at a crucial moment in our national history.

It may have been unintentional, but Gellhorn's book reveals the sloppy thinking of some of the Nation's outstanding educators and scientists.

In May 1949, Fulton Lewis, Jr., revealed that the self-proclaimed Communist Hans Friestadt had been granted a $1,600 fellowship by the Atomic Energy Commission for study at the University of North Carolina. The matter was wholly newsworthy but, despite this obvious fact, Gellhorn writes that a radio sensationalist had reported it. The objective and impartial Columbia University professor refrained from naming Fulton Lewis Jr., but resorted instead to the use of an epithet in identifying this prominent radio broadcaster.

After recording the fact that a radio sensationalist (as he put it) had reported the appointment of Communist Hans Freistadt to a $1,600 fellowship by the Atomic Energy Commission, Professor Gellhorn went on in his usual effort to portray the American people as mad with anti-Communist hysteria—a caricature which is far from the truth but which is parallel to the line of the Communist Party. Among other things, he wrote: "The juxtaposition of 'atom' and 'Communist' stimulated a fervor of response which was undiminished by the sobering facts that the fellowships involved no danger to secrets of any description." Gellhorn overlooks the simple fact that, regardless of his own favorable reaction to subsidizing Communists with taxpayers' money, the American people see no reason whatever for the Atomic Energy Commission to spend the people's money in training avowed enemies of the United States. Would Gellhorn advocate spending taxpayers' money to train avowed Nazis in the field of nuclear fission or in any other field.

Gellhorn cites with approval the incredibly naive argument of Alfred Newton Richards, vice president of the University of Pennsylvania and president of the National Academy of Science, who urged that educating a qualified person, even if a Communist, "will have added one more to the group—now far too small—of those capable of utilizing knowledge of nuclear energy and of its products in the advancement of medicine, biology, agriculture, and, at need, could release for Government classified service another who possessed no disqualifications. The country will have been the gainer by his training." Gellhorn and Richards, in their consummate ignorance of communism, do not seem to understand that every Communist is a potential espionage agent for the Soviet Government, and that every such agent trained at the expense of American taxpayers releases the Soviet plotters from the financial responsibility of training its own agents.

Professor Gellhorn alleges, without quoting him directly, that Detlev W. Bronk, president of Johns Hopkins University and chairman of the National Research Council as well as the patron of Owen Lattimore, echoed the fantastic nonsense of Alfred Newton Richards. It should, of course, be noted that all of Gellhorn's indictments of distinguished scientists and educators are unwitting.

Unwittingly, Professor Gellhorn places the president of Harvard University, Dr. James B. Conant, in a most unfavorable light by quoting him to the effect that "a naive scientist or a philosopher with strong loyalties to the advancement of civilization and the unity of the world" might be a questionable asset for Government service but "extremely valuable to a university." In describing a Communist scientist as one who believes in the "advancement of civilization and the unity of the world," President Conant was quoting the "defense" of the convicted traitor, Alan Nunn May, and other atomic scientists who have betrayed civilization to the red-handed murderers of the Kremlin.

In a totally different category from the writings of Gellhorn and the several reviews to which I have referred is the series of articles by Leslie Gould, entitled "The Story of Senator McMahon."

I have already called attention to Gould's disclosure that Charles E. Calkins, clearly pro-Communist in his connections if not indeed a card-carrying member of the Communist Party, was the top man on the payroll for 3 years of the Senator from Connecticut who is also chairman of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Connecticut Senator's personal appointee as his scientific adviser on atomic energy was none other than Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the Federal Bureau of Standards.

Despite its own regulations, which I shall discuss later, the Atomic Energy Commission has given security clearance to Dr. Condon.

The Communists have made two major organizational efforts to enlist American scientists in fronts, namely, the now-defunct American-Soviet Science Society and the existing American Association of Scientific Workers. About the latter I shall have more to say.

Dr. Edward U. Condon was a member of the executive committee of the American-Soviet Science Society, a front which has been cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General. Condon was not only a member of this organization's executive committee; he was an active solicitor of memberships for the outfit. On April 15, 1946, he personally addressed a letter soliciting members from among the physicists of the entire country.

Condon's fellow officers in the American-Soviet Science Society included the notorious Columbia University Communist, Prof. Bernhard J. Stern.

When the House Committee on Un-American Activities attempted to obtain the loyalty file on Dr. Condon from the Department of Commerce, its efforts were blocked by orders from the White House. There was, however, every reason to believe that Condon's loyalty file contained much damaging and derogatory evidence against him. It is known, for example, that the Army canceled a passport which the State Department had issued Condon to travel to the Soviet Union in 1945, and that the Army took steps to remove Condon from a plane which was bound for Russia.

Condon is now cleared by the Atomic Energy Commission for access to restricted data on atomic energy. We have not heard the last of the Condon case.

The administration of the Atomic Energy Commission with respect to this question of communism calls for a relentless examination which will not be forthcoming from this Truman administration.

There was no lack of warning against what has transpired in the administration of the AEC. When the United States Senate confirmed David Lilienthal as head of the AEC in April 1947, the question of Communist infiltration was thoroughly aired.

Nor has there been any lack of adequate rules to guide the AEC in removing all security risks from the personnel of atomic energy projects.

The official policy of the AEC with respect to security clearance for personnel is clear enough and adequate enough to keep any and all security risks far removed from atomic energy projects which are under the administration of the AEC. All that is needed is a strict adherence to, and application of this official policy.

All personnel connected in any way with atomic-energy projects fall into one or the other of two categories: (1) Those requiring security clearance and (2) those requiring security approval. Individuals who are employed directly by the AEC or who are permitted access to restricted data must receive security clearance. All individuals who are employed by contractors on work not involving access to restricted data must receive what is termed "security approval."

The official policy of the AEC underscores the subversive character of front organizations as no other governmental policy, decision, pronouncement, or verdict has ever underscored it. The AEC has emphatically linked the question of security risks with the question of membership in, identification with, or sympathetic association with organizations which have been designated as subversive by the Attorney General, or with organizations which have been otherwise established as fronts or known to be infiltrated with members of subversive groups.

The pertinent sections of the official AEC policy are worth quoting in full:

Category (A) includes those cases in which there are grounds sufficient to establish a reasonable belief that the individual or his spouse has held membership in or joined any organization which has been declared to be subversive by the Attorney General, provided the individual did not withdraw from such membership when the organization was so identified, or otherwise establish his rejection of its subversive aims; or, prior to the declaration by the Attorney General, participated in the activities of such an organization in a capacity where he should reasonably have had knowledge as to the subversive aims or purposes of the organization.

Category (B) includes those cases in which there are grounds sufficient to establish a reasonable belief that with respect to the individual or his spouse there is—

1. Sympathetic interest in totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or other subversive political ideologies.

2. A sympathetic association established with members of the Communist Party; or with leading members of any organization which has been declared to be subversive by the Attorney General. (Ordinarily this would not include chance or casual meetings, nor contacts limited to normal business or official relations.)

3. Identification with an organization established as a front for otherwise subversive groups or interests when the personal views of the individual are sympathetic to or coincide with subversive lines;

4. Identification with an organization known to be infiltrated with members of subversive groups when there is also information as to other activities of the individual which establishes the probability that he may be a part of or sympathetic to the infiltrating element, or when he has personal views which are sympathetic to or coincide with subversive lines.

The AEC has explained that security clearance, as distinguished from security approval, would ordinarily be denied in both of the categories (A) and (B). On the other hand, security approval, while ordinarily denied in category (A), might be warranted in those types of derogatory information mentioned under category (B).

It is a shocking fact that, in the cases of many of the most eminent atomic scientists in the United States, there is a presumption of security risk, under any strict application of the foregoing principles of the AEC's official policy. Many of them have at one time or another joined organizations which have been declared subversive by the Attorney General, and many more have had sympathetic associations with leading members of organizations designated as subversive by the Attorney General.

One of the most important projects of the Atomic Energy Commission is the Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island.

Atomic scientist, W. A. Higinbotham, is a prominent member of the staff of the Brookhaven National Laboratory. Higinbotham has been chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, an organization heavily infiltrated with Communist fellow travelers. Ironically, the FAS has set up a scientists' loyalty committee, of which Higinbotham is chairman. This committee has among its members such veteran fellow travelers as Prof. Stuart Mudd, of the University of Pennsylvania, and Prof. Oswald Veblen, of the Institute for Advanced Study. Melber Phillips, secretary of the FAS, has an extensive record of fellow-traveling with Communist-front organizations.

Both W. A. Higinbotham and Melber Phillips supported the Win-the-Peace Conference which set up the National Committee To Win the Peace, the latter organization being cited as a Communist-front organization by the Attorney General. (See Daily Worker, March 5, 1946, p. 3.)

The subversive Win-the-Peace Conference was held in Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946. The meetings were held in the auditorium of the Department of Commerce, with the authorization of the Secretary of Commerce, Henry A. Wallace.

Cochairman of the Win-the-Peace Conference was Paul Robeson. Several years ago Robeson publicly expressed his preference for the Soviet Union as his homeland, for himself and his family. One of Robeson's recent anti-American performances took place in Paris in April 1949. At the Paris Congress for World Peace, an out-and-out Communist affair, Robeson declared that the Negroes of the United States would not fight to defend their country against the Soviet Union, a gross libel against the Negro people of America.

The sponsors of the Win-the-Peace Conference, with whom W. A. Higinbotham associated himself, included such notorious Communists and fellow travelers as the following: James E. Allen, Edward K. Barsky, John T. Bernard, Lewis A. Berne, Walter Bernstein, Dorothy Brewster, Harry Bridges, Louis E. Burnham, Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., Hugh DeLacy, Muriel Draper, W. E. B. Dubois, Julius Emspak, Howard Fast, Lion Feuchtwanger, Stephen H. Fritchman, William Gropper, Ralph Gundlach, Langston Hughes, Crockett Johnson, Kenneth Leslie, Albert Maltz, Saul Mills, Grant W. Oakes, Martin Popper, Ferdinand C. Smith, and Bernhard J. Stern.

Lyle Borst, atomic scientist, is also a member of the staff of Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island.

The Daily Worker of February 28, 1949, featured the announcement that Lyle Borst would address the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace. The headline in the newspaper of the Communist Party read as follows: Atom scientist to address peace parley." In lending his name to the Communist gathering which was convened at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, March 25–27, 1949, Lyle Borst performed a distinct service for the enemies of the United States. The Waldorf-Astoria conference was held under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.

The Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities has published a lengthy special report on the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, making it clear beyond the slightest doubt that Communists dominate the organization.

The Waldorf-Astoria meeting commanded the widest attention in the newspapers of the United States. Anti-Communist pickets were in line around the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel throughout the meeting. The speeches made at the gathering were, with a single notable exception, directed against the interests of the United States (the exception being the speech of Norman Cousins).

The panel on natural science at the Waldorf-Astoria meeting, scheduled to be addressed by Lyle Borst, of Brookhaven National Laboratory, was presided over by Philip Morrison, professor of physics at Cornell University.

Prof. Philip Morrison is a nuclear physicist who took part in the design and fabrication of the atomic bomb at Los Alamos Laboratory. (See Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, February 1949, p. 37.)

At the 1949 annual dinner of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship Professor Morrison was one of the principal speakers.

Parenthetically it should be noted that the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship has been listed as a subversive Communist-front organization by the Attorney General of the United States.

In his speech before this subversive group Professor Morrison did two significant things: (1) He hailed the Soviet possession of the atomic bomb as a boon to world peace. The clear implication of his words was that the United States has been the aggressor in the "cold war," and that fear of the Soviet atomic bomb would now make the United States more peacefully inclined. (2) He took occasion in his remarks to this Communist-front gathering, to berate the FBI. This was strictly according to the Communist Party line those days, and it pleased his audience immensely.

In view of Professor Morrison's record of affiliation with subversive organizations it is highly noteworthy that he is a member of the Committee on Secrecy and Clearance of the Federation of American Scientists. (See Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, April 1948, p. 111.)

Early this year the British physicist, Prof. P. M. S. Blackett, published in the United States his book, Fear, War, and the Bomb. Professor Blackett is well known for his pro-Soviet leanings. His book was extensively reviewed in the February 1949 issue of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists. Prof. Edward A. Shils, of the University of Chicago, headed his review "Blackett's Apologia for the Soviet Position." The point to be noted here is that Prof. Philip Morrison's review of Blackett's book in the same publication was highly favorable, even enthusiastic.

Professor Morrison is no casual or accidental fellow traveler. He has been affiliated with the following Communist-front organizations:

1. American sponsoring committee, World Congress for Peace, member. (Program leaflet, April 20–23, 1949.)

2. Committee for Free Political Advocacy, signer. (Daily Worker, February 28, 1949, p. 9.)

3. Committee of One Thousand, signer of open letter. (Daily Worker, January 3, 1949, p. 7.)

4. Denunciation of the Hartley committee, signer. (UE News, January 1, 1949, p. 7.)

5. Educators for Wallace, member. (Pamphlet, October 1948.)

6. National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, speaker at annual dinner, September 1949.

7. National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. (Program, March 25–27, 1949.)

8. National Non-Partisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the Twelve Communist Leaders, member. (Letterhead, September 9, 1949.

9. New York State Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, vice chairman. (Daily Worker, June 11, 1948, p. 2.)

10. Progressive Citizens of America, sponsor. (Program, October 25, 1947.)

11. Teachers' Union, Local 555, of the United Public Workers of America, supporter of Communist Samuel Wallach. (New York Times, November 12, 1948, p. 28.)

My next case is that of Harold C. Urey, professor of chemistry at the University of Chicago—that maverick among our educational institutions headed by the one-time boy prodigy, Robert Maynard Hutchins.

In discussing the record of Professor Urey, it should be borne in mind that the University of Chicago administers the Argonne National Laboratory on behalf of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Argonne National Laboratory is one of our most important atomic energy projects. It would be hard to imagine less-qualified persons than Professor Urey and Chancelor Hutchins for the administration of such a project—that is, from the security standpoint.

Prof. Harold C. Urey has achieved great distinction in the field of chemical science, having been awarded a Nobel prize for his discovery of heavy water. He was one of the leading scientists on the Manhattan project which produced the atomic bomb.

There is a completely fallacious view among us that a man who has achieved great distinction in one field should be listened to with respect whenever he chooses to speak upon all other questions. The obvious truth, of course, is that a scientist in the field of chemistry may be an utter fool in the field of politics and should not receive more attention on the latter subject than an eighth-grade pupil.

Of late, Professor Urey has been sounding off with bitter invectives against the security regulations which the Atomic Energy Commission has adopted and allegedly enforces for guarding the secrets of our atomic developments. Quite recently, Professor Urey declared that he would fire every security officer on all our atomic projects throughout the United States.

Professor Urey's temperament is anything but that of a cool, objective scientist. At times, he is highly emotional, even hysterical in his public speech.

Last December Professor Urey sounded off on the subject of a federal union of the so-called democracies. Such a union would, he declared, be "the first move toward one world." In the same speech, Professor Urey went out of his way to describe the revelations of Major Jordan as "this latest fool thing."

On May 19, 1949, Professor Urey appeared as a witness before a committee of the Illinois Legislature charged with the investigation of subversive activities at the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College. In his testimony, he assailed the Attorney General of the United States for issuing lists of subversive organizations. With emotion bordering on the psychopathic, he declared: "I consider the designation by the Attorney General of organizations as subversive or Communist one of the most dangerous things in American life." Professor Urey's viewpoint on this matter is diametrically opposed to the official viewpoint of the Atomic Energy Commission which holds, in its formal regulations at least, that the Attorney General's designations are useful—not dangerous—in reaching conclusions concerning personnel security risks. Furthermore, Professor Urey defended the granting of Government atomic energy scholarships to Communists, particularly the granting of a scholarship to Hans Freistadt, an avowed member of the Communist Party. "I consider it dangerous," declared Professor Urey heatedly, "to inquire into the political affairs of such students." It will alarm some Americans, at this stage in international relations, to find a professor of the scientific stature of Professor Urey supporting a policy of granting atomic-energy scholarships to Communist students.

In the case of Professor Urey, we find a possible explanation of his denunciation of the Attorney General's lists of subversive organizations. This explanation may lie in the fact that Professor Urey himself has in the past been affiliated with numerous Communist-front organizations, including five which have already been listed as subversive by the Attorney General.

And now this same Professor Urey wants to fire every security officer connected with our atomic energy projects. To him these security officers are just a part of a horrible witch-hunting scheme. It's too bad Professor Urey can't stick to his heavy water and let heavy politics alone. But, on the other hand, he has a right under our free institutions to be a first-rate political ignoramus.

Lest there be any misunderstanding of any kind in what I have said, let me emphasize that I have no information that Harold C. Urey is actually a member of the Communist Party. Like many non-Communists he has frequently collaborated with Communists to the great advantage of the latter.

Communist-front enterprises thrive on the enlistment of just such famous scientists as Urey.

The distressing fact is that Professor Urey talks out of both sides of his mouth. Out of the one side, he denounces the Communist Party unsparingly, as he did in his testimony before the committee of the Illinois State Legislature. Out of the other side, he defends the granting of Government atomic scholarships to avowed Communist Party members, denounces the Attorney General's list of subversive Communist-front organizations, and defends unblushingly his numerous affiliations with Communist fronts.

I come now to the well-nigh incredible account of one of our most prominent scientist's connections with the Communist movement.

This is the story of Prof. Linus Carl Pauling, who since 1931 has held a professorship of chemistry at the California Institute of Technology, and who is now the chairman of the division of chemistry and chemical engineering at the institute.

Pauling has valid claim to the highest academic and scientific distinctions. He was president of the American Chemical Society last year.

Having cited a portion of the academic and scientific record of Professor Pauling, I come now to his record of support for Communist causes.

Pauling was affiliated with the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. Under the auspices of this Communist organization, Linus Pauling protested the deportation of Communist Hans Eisler. Hans Eisler was the Communist musician brother of Gerhart Eisler, both of whom are now out of the United States. Attorney General Tom Clark has listed the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as a subversive Communist front.

During the month of September 1949 the Communists convened in Mexico City a gathering which they called the American Continental Congress of World Peace. Linus Carl Pauling was one of the vice presidents of this Mexico City gathering and also a delegate. (See Daily Worker, July 29, 1949, p. 5.) Associated with Professor Pauling in this subversive enterprise were such fellow-traveling stalwarts as Paul Robeson, Donald Henderson, Stefan Heym, Corliss Lamont, Thomas Mann, Vito Marcantonio, the Right Reverend Arthur W. Moulton, Harlow Shapley, Mary Van Kleeck, Henry A. Wallace, Colston E. Warne, James Waterman Wise, Thomas Woody, the Reverend John B. Thompson, and Gene Weltfish.

Linus Carl Pauling is a sponsor of the Committee for Free Political Advocacy. (See press release, February 11, 1949, and the Daily Worker, February 28, 1949, p. 9.) This is a Communist-front organization devoted to the defense of the 11 Communist Party leaders who have been convicted of conspiring to overthrow the Government.

On September 12, 1949, the Communists and fellow travelers who supported Henry A. Wallace in 1948 tendered their recent presidential candidate a dinner in New York City. Linus Carl Pauling was a sponsor of this affair. VITO MARCANTONIO was the principal speaker at this dinner for Henry A. Wallace. That should be comment enough.

In his biography in Who's Who in America, Linus Pauling inserted the information that he was on the board of directors of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions and that he was the vice-chairman of the Hollywood Chapter of the ICCASP. The ICCASP was the immediate predecessor of the present-day National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. The latter Communist-front organization was the one which held the notorious Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, March 25–27, 1949.

Linus Pauling is now the chairman of the Southern California Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council. This Communist front organization is the west coast regional branch of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, to which reference has been made. It is a provable fact that the great bulk of the Communist contingent in Hollywood is now associated with the Southern California Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council.

Pauling was a fellow of the National Research Council and also the holder of a Guggenheim fellowship. He is now a member of the committee of selection for the Guggenheim fellowships. It has long been known that scores of Guggenheim awards of fellowships have been made to Communists. This is not at all surprising in view of the fact that Linus Carl Pauling is a member of the committee of selection.

In the October 1949 term of the Supreme Court of the United States, a brief of amici curiae was submitted on behalf of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo, Hollywood Communists. Professor Linus Carl Pauling was one of the signers of this brief.

Attesting his prominence among atomic scientists is the fact that Professor Linus Carl Pauling is a member of the board of sponsors of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. (See issue of January 1949.)

Early this year, the largest scientific body in the world held its convention in New York City. I refer to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, often known as the Triple-A S.

As a final example of the Communist infiltration of the ranks of science, I am particularly interested in the fact that the Triple-A S elected Kirtley Fletcher Mather, professor of geology at Harvard University, to serve as its president in 1951. Mather's election is a sorry commentary on the patriotic sensibilities of American scientists. Mather has been known so long and so publicly as a supporter of the Communist-front movement in the United States that even scientists—however remote their ivory towers from political reality—could hardly have remained ignorant of his devotion to the cause of Stalin's fifth column in this country.

I do not mean to accuse the vast majority of these men of science of actually hating America and loving the Soviet Union. The strong probability is that the vast majority of the members of the Triple-A S are unorganized, apathetic, and indifferent to the machinations of a small clique which dominates the organization. Mather's choice cannot be understood on any other hypothesis than such a clique of Communist fellow travelers has great influence in this distinguished body. If this is so, it is time that the rank-and-file members of the Triple-A S got up on their hind legs at the next annual convention and prevented the installation of Professor Mather as the organization's president for 1951.

Kirtley Mather has been affiliated with upwards of 40 Communist-front organizations. Very few men in the academic world have a more flagrant record of supporting the causes of Stalin's fifth column in this country.

At the risk of boring you with a long list of names, I am going to read the organizations with which Professor Mather has been affiliated and which have been listed as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States. Here they are:

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.
American Council on Soviet Relations.
American League for Peace and Democracy.
American League Against War and Fascism.
American Slav Congress.
American Youth for Democracy.
Citizens Committee To Free Earl Browder.
Civil Rights Congress.
Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.
Council for Pan American Democracy.
International Labor Defense.
Jefferson School of Social Science.
Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.
League of American Writers.
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.
Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.
Win-the-Peace Conference.

There you have 18 subversive Communist-front organizations with which Prof. Kirtley F. Mather has been affiliated. Every one of them has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General, which means that every one of them is an enemy of the United States. The Attorney General's listings are based on the most careful and exhaustive investigations by the FBI.

In addition to these 18 subversive organizations listed by the Attorney General, Professor Mather has been affiliated with more than a score of other Communist fronts listed by the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities.

What a record. I repeat that few professors in the whole United States have anything like it or even approaching it.

When the notorious Gerhart Eisler was indicted in February 1947, Professor Mather signed a statement denouncing "the shameful persecution of the German anti-Fascist refugee." The statement was published under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress—one of the most malodorous of the present-day Communist-front organizations.

On April 19, 1949, the China Welfare Appeal was launched at a dinner attended by some 350 persons at the Hotel Roosevelt in New York City. The China Welfare Appeal is the American branch of the China Welfare Fund, whose chairman is Madam Sun Yat-sen, a vice chairman of the new Communist regime in China. There can be no doubt that both the China Welfare Fund and its American affiliate, the China Welfare Appeal, are operated in the exclusive interests of the Chinese Communists. Prof. Kirtley F. Mather is listed as a sponsor of these pro-Communist Chinese outfits. Paul Robeson is an honorary member of the China Welfare Fund. In this period of history when the United States has so much at stake in the Far East, it is shocking that any prominent American should line up on the side of the brutal Chinese Communist regime. It is doubly shocking that such an American should be elevated to the position of top leader of American scientists.

Professor Mather is particularly proud of one of his affiliations with the Communist-front movement. For 5 years he was national president of the American Association of Scientific Workers and wants that fact recorded. The AASW has been listed as subversive by the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities.

Let us look for a moment at the history and significance of the American Association of Scientific Workers. It was organized in 1938 as a part of a world-wide movement to enlist scientists in the cause of world communism. It was no accident that the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers, the British Association of Scientific Workers, and the Australian Association of Scientific Workers came into being within a period of 12 months in 1938 and 1939. Such organizations, bearing almost identical names in widely separated countries, had to have a central inspiration and direction. That central control was the world-wide Communist apparatus. Note carefully how these so-called scientific bodies were geared to Communist espionage as it was revealed in the case of the Canadian spy ring. I am going to read to you now from the Report of the Royal Commission, which was formed for the sole purpose of investigating Soviet espionage in Canada:

"Control by the Communist Party over a broad organization such as the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers could be used in a variety of ways not only for propaganda purposes but eventually as a base for recruiting adherents to that party from among scientists, and in due course, no doubt, for recruiting additional espionage agents in key positions in the national life."

Prof. Raymond Boyer, exposed as a member of the Canadian espionage ring, became the national president of the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers. The convicted Soviet spy, Prof. Alan Nunn May, was a member of the association's executive committee. Other members of the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers who were also members of the Soviet espionage ring included Ned Mazerall and David Shugar. Writing of another man involved in the Soviet espionage ring in Canada, the Report of the Royal Commission reported that he had become a member of the national executive committee of the association charged with maintaining liaison with corresponding organizations in other countries and that there was evidence suggesting that he used this position as a cover in making contacts with members of the staff of the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa.

It is difficult to understand why Professor Mather is so proud of his presidency of the American Association of Scientific Workers. The organization is a branch of the world-wide Communist movement, including the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers, which the record shows was nothing more than an espionage nucleus. Perhaps Professor Mather is completely indifferent to the implications of his affiliation, relying on the apathy of his scientific colleagues to shield him.

The American Association of Scientific Workers is an associate society of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. American scientists would be well advised to arouse themselves to the Communist infiltration of their ranks.

Spending the Nation Into Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has authorized appropriations, contract authorizations and other expenditures, which indicate that the Federal Government is spending the Nation into bankruptcy.

During the second session of the Eighty-first Congress we have appropriated a total of $52,427,926,628.

In addition to the appropriations, the contract authorizations total $2,341,530,000. Permanent appropriations for such things as interest on the public debt, the Federal contribution to the civil-service retirement fund and other continuing obligations of the Government, will, in all probability, raise the total by another $6,000,000,000.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we have appropriated and contemplate the spending of over $60,000,000,000 of Federal money in the next year.

Add to that $60,000,000,000 approximately $20,000,000,000 as the probable expenditures by State and local governments during 1951 and the total burden heaped on the shoulders of the American taxpayers becomes approximately $80,000,000,000 a year.

This means that approximately 35 percent of the national income is going for the expenses of government, with all the waste and hazardous foreign adventures included.

WE MUST CUT DOWN ON FOREIGN AID OR GO BROKE

Mr. Speaker, a large part of the spending in the next year will be for our adventures into the fertile fields of foreign aid, military assistance, and all the other schemes thought up by the economic internationalists to drain away the resources of our country in a global share-the-wealth plan.

The Office of Business Economics in the Department of Commerce reports that since the end of World War II, our net outflow of charity cash, goods, and services to June 30, 1950 amounts to $29,349,000,000. Besides the outflow already

computed to June 30, 1950, there remains available for foreign aid in the form of grants and credits, a total of $14,146,000,000.

We are spending more each year on foreign aid and assistance than the total cost of the Federal Government in any single year up to 1933. The squandermania of the New Deal-Fair Deal party must be stopped by the people or our whole economy is destined for a collapse.

Let's cut out the foreign aid before we go broke. Next year may be too late.

The Kingsley Plan for Medical Manpower Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the Kingsley plan for medical manpower distribution. This proposal, prepared by Dr. D. W. Kingsley, a distinguished physician of Hastings, Nebr., is in my judgment worthy of the most serious consideration by the armed services as a means of conserving the services of our limited supply of doctors, dentists, and other medical personnel during this emergency.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE KINGSLEY PLAN FOR MEDICAL MANPOWER DISTRIBUTION

Medical manpower is one of our most important services for successful completion of any war effort. In time of war it also remains of prime importance to the civil population. In peace or war the same number of physicians will care for the same number of people. Only the conditions and method of service are altered under wartime service. Past experience in two great conflicts has demonstrated a wanton waste of our medical manpower. It is common knowledge that during World War II many eminently qualified physicians were assigned to such nonprofessional tasks as inspecting latrines and kitchens. Others spent long hours in routine office and administrative work which could well have been handled by trained office personnel. Still countless others spent valuable time in sheer idleness because of a lack of immediate need for their professional services. This loss cannot be calculated in dollars and cents nor in human suffering to our citizens. Such reckless waste is a luxury which even a country as fabulous in resources as the United States cannot afford in a time of crisis.

We are now facing a third catastrophic experience which, because of atomic potentialities, threatens to be of greater threat to total destruction. Shall we make the same great mistakes which can well be more costly than our previous ones, or shall we devise more efficient means to conserve our valued possessions? Is it necessary that we continue to waste valuable medical manpower in time of war simply because it has been traditional, or does both the medical profession and the military have greater responsibilities to our people? It is time for us to become more realistic in our planning in the light of modern medical care and modern transportation. It is not necessary that we continue to lavish valuable and unneeded medical service on noncombatant military groups at the expense of the civilian population. It is our patriotic duty to devise a modern plan to conserve our available supply.

It is the recognized duty of the medical profession to provide our people with the best possible medical care whether these people are in uniform defending our country or whether they be civilians engaged in normal pursuits in support of those defenders on the front line of democracy.

The Kingsley plan has been devised to provide sufficient and competent medical care to all Armed Forces based within the continental confines of the United States at a great manpower saving and to still provide the same competent service to the civilian population. Combat troops will retain their present T. O. This plan is respectfully presented through proper channels for consideration. The plan presented is broad in scope. There are many detail problems to be resolved.

Section 1: The medical care services of all Armed Forces bases located within a reasonable transportation distance of a medical center should be operated by the county medical society or other medical groups in that locality. The administrative work should be accomplished by Armed Forces personnel. The medical group operating the professional services may work out a plan of operation among its own members for the covering of the required services. This may mean a rotation of doctors in such a manner that the Armed Forces would be fully covered at all times and at the same time the civilian population will not suffer. Sanitation and other health problems will be assigned to personnel trained for that type of service. Doctors of medicine will devote their full time to caring for the sick.

It may be necessary to vary the method of operation to fit the needs of different bases. In all cases a medical officer assigned by the military shall be the Chief of Staff of the base hospital and the various services may be headed by competent local civilian physicians in the same manner as local civilian hospital units. Military bases located beyond a reasonable distance from a medical center capable of supplying a full complement of medical manpower may be partially staffed by the military from physicians disqualified for combat duty secured under section 2 of this plan. There seems to be no justifiable reason why every military base within the United States, and even some of the foreign bases, cannot be efficiently staffed and operated by civilian physicians and by inducted physicians disqualified for combat duty. It is immediately recognized that units in combat must be staffed by physicians qualified for combat duty and in a ratio at or near the present table of organization. It is as readily recognized that some definite change should be made in the present unrealistic table of organization for base units. The matter of compensation for services rendered could be on the same basis that the Veterans' Administration is using, or on any basis worked out between the Armed Forces and the medical governing bodies.

Section 2: Physical requirements for physicians should be based entirely on their capability to do professional work. A physician with an artificial limb, hernia, or impaired eyesight should not be rejected if he is capable of performing efficient professional services. There should be a place for him to serve his country under some of the suggestions outlined in section 1 of this plan.

Section 3: The Kingsley plan takes cognizance of the fine work and plans already formulated for the order of induction of physicians and heartily endorses the following order of induction as an aid to the plan:

A. Those individuals who received their medical education at the expense of the United States.

B. Those individuals who were in medical school during World War II at their own expense and who were deferred in order that they might complete their education.

C. Those individuals who have not served in either World War I or World War II.

D. Those individuals who have served in World War I and/or World War II. The order of calling these individuals should be in proportion to the time they have already served; i. e., an individual who has served 1 year should be called before the man who has served 2 years, etc.

Section 4—Summary: This plan is respectfully submitted as a workable answer to a serious crisis now facing the United States. Many perplexing problems must be resolved and details refined to furnish a completed vehicle. With this accomplishment the following results may be expected:

A. Fully utilize the professional skills required with a minimum of waste of medical manpower.

B. Provide efficient medical care for based troops and also provide adequate care for the civilian population.

C. Maintain sufficient civilian medical personnel to cope with atomic disaster in the vicinity of military and essential areas.

D. Make available more physicians for tactical military units.

E. Provide a great economic saving in the cost of medical care to the military. (It is estimated that the medical manpower requirements for the military may be lowered by 35 to 50 percent and yet maintain a high quality of service.)

F. Maintain high availability of medical care for the civilian population.

G. Place the responsibility for the health of the Armed Forces and the civilian population squarely upon those who are trained to accept such responsibility.

D. W. KINGSLEY, M. D.

New Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Congressman CLARENCE CANNON is to be commended for his splendid statement which appeared in the Appendix of the RECORD for September 27. To supplement that statement and the editorials which accompanied it, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of newspaper articles and editorials based on the 1 month's experience we have had with the subversive-control bill. They prove that the passage of the bill was a serious error.

There being no objection, the articles in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of September 24, 1950]

NEW ANTI-REDS MEASURE MAY UNDERMINE SECURITY RATHER THAN BOLSTER IT

(By John F. Day)

WASHINGTON, September 23.—Not since the Alien and Sedition Acts has Congress been so willing, not to say anxious, to restrict personal liberties as it was in passing this week the McCarran-Wood-Mundt-Nixon-Ferguson-Lucas catch-all "internal security" bill.

That is the opinion not only of those who voted against the measure, but of a number of those who voted for it.

The Alien and Sedition Acts were a series of four laws enacted in 1798 by a Federalist Congress, designed to insure the defeat of the Jeffersonian Republican Party at the polls. The first three were aimed at denying a vote to alien Frenchmen who favored the Republicans. The fourth made it a high misdemeanor "unlawfully to combine and conspire" in order to oppose legal measures of the Government. Publication of "false or malicious" writing against the Nation, the President, or Congress was prohibited. The Federalists used the law solely to punish Republican editors who dared criticize the Government or the President. Federalists never were accused. The law finally was declared unconstitutional in 1882.

Furthermore, many fear the measure may actually weaken rather than strengthen our security against Communist sabotage and spying.

Then what happened? Why did Congress vote so overwhelmingly for the bill? That is an interesting story.

But first take a look at some of the faults that have been pointed out. Most of them have been overlooked in day-to-day reporting that the measure was essentially a "tough, anti-Communist bill" requiring that Communists and Communist-front organizations register and providing for internment of suspected Communists in event of invasion, insurrection, or a declaration of war.

CHANGES PERMANENT

Here are things the measure would do:

1. Make permanent—rather than for the originally proposed 3-year period—changes in our laws.

2. Require Communist and Communist-front organizations and their members to register with the Government or face heavy criminal penalties. At least three things have been called wrong with this:

First, that one might as well expect burglars to register and declare themselves.

Second, that Communists who refuse to register can fight their cases through the courts for years, and might well end up making martyrs of themselves if the Supreme Court—as many think it will do—eventually declares the law to be unconstitutional.

Third, perfectly innocent organizations which happen to be on the same side as the Communists at any given time may be declared Communist front.

In a final appeal against the bill, Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, declared: "I say that under this measure, anyone who forms any organization for any purpose, anyone who wishes to have intellectual liberty, anyone who does not wish to have conformity of political purpose, anyone who wishes to protect freedom of speech and freedom of the press, had better watch out. For in this measure are words and clauses which * * * could strike down things for which America has stood, for which our country has fought many wars, and for which we are fighting today."

NO CURB ON LISTS

3. Force every FBI undercover agent now working in a Communist or Communist-front organization to disclose his identity. This is one place where it is feared the measure would weaken security.

4. Force any person who registered as a member of a Communist-front organization to declare himself in effect as guilty of conspiring to overthrow the Government.

5. Fail to prevent Communist-controlled organizations turning in false lists of membership, thus requiring innocent people to spend years trying to clear their names.

6. Allow a corrupt Attorney General to refuse ever to clear the names of such innocent persons. Also allow a corrupt Democratic Attorney General to smear Republicans, and vice versa.

7. Make it unlawful for any person knowingly to combine, conspire, or agree with any other person to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment * * * of a totalitarian dictatorship. This is extremely broad terminology which could easily be stretched to the lengths of thought control. "Any act" could be making a soapbox speech or reading a book. One of the sponsors of the bill, Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, said that to admit belief in something was an overt act. And a newspaper which prints a Communist-line speech might substantially contribute to the establishment of a dictatorship.

DEPORTATION PROVIDED

8. Make it unlawful for any Government employee to transmit in any manner or by any means classified information (that which is marked secret, confidential, or restricted) to a representative of any foreign government or member of a Communist or Communist-front organization.

This section does not require that there be intent to harm the United States before a person can be penalized, and it includes friendly as well as unfriendly government representatives.

9. Provide for the deportation of any immigrant who has not been finally naturalized, who participates in any way in the printing or distributing of material advocating or teaching world communism or any other form of totalitarianism. That means that an alien printer or bookseller who has anything to do with Mein Kampf or the writings of Karl Marx can be deported.

10. Literally put a squad of immigration officials trailing every immigrant who steps off a boat in the United States.

11. Bar Communists and members of Communist-front organizations from working for the Government or in Defense Establishments. The trouble with this is that all sensitive projects—whether plants, airports, railroads, utilities, harbor installations, laboratories, or what-not—would have to be listed. This would form a perfect guidebook for spies and saboteurs. This, then, is another place where security would actually be weakened.

A NEW FIRST

12. Empower an Attorney General, under conditions not too difficult to meet, to stifle the emergence of any new political party.

13. In time of war or insurrection, allow the Attorney General to detain any person he has reasonable grounds to suspect may some day engage in espionage or sabotage. This concentration-camp feature was proposed by Senator KILGORE, Democrat, of West Virginia, as a substitute for the McCarran bill. When that move failed, it was put in as an amendment by Senator LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois. In a queer twist, MCCARRAN argued that this section as originally written was too strong. And he removed from it a provision that suspects could be picked up not only in event of war, invasion, or insurrection, but at any time when an emergency was declared. Thus the part of the bill that gave real control over potential saboteurs was weakened.

14. For the first time in American history, make an act not of force or violence, or plainly leading to force of violence, conspiratorial against the Government of the United States.

Now for a little background on how this came about.

To be loudly anti-Communist—the louder the better—has become increasingly popular in recent months. Ever since the Alger Hiss and MCCARTHY episodes, there has been a sort of contest on in Washington to see who can damn the Communists the most vociferously. This, naturally, was intensified by the Korean War.

TREND WAS EVIDENT

Riding this crest of vocal anticommunism, Senators MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, and FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, began pushing vigorously for their Communist control bill. They were assisted in the House by Representatives WOOD, Democrat, of Georgia, and NIXON, Republican, of California, members of the Un-American Activities Committee.

Mindful that this sort of legislation could come to plague a party in future years (the alien and sedition laws destroyed the Federalist Party), President Truman urged Majority Leader LUCAS to keep it off the Senate floor. This LUCAS did for some time. But then MUNDT and FERGUSON began maneuvering to attach their bill as a rider to other legislation. And it was clearly evident that, the congressional state of mind being what it was, they were going to be successful.

Attorney General Howard McGrath realized that LUCAS and other Democrats were going to have a rough time being reelected if they bottled up an "anti-Communist" bill or got one thrown in over their heads. So he pleaded with Truman to offer his own proposals for strengthening the espionage and sabotage laws. This Truman finally did, but too late to stem the tide for the Mundt-Ferguson bill.

Senate Judiciary Chairman MCCARRAN, an antiadministration Democrat, sloughed off the Truman proposals. Instead, he accepted the Mundt-Ferguson measure, and added to it numerous other restrictions, including those on immigration which he failed to get into the Displaced Persons Act.

LUCAS MADE A SHIFT

Up until the very minute of the voting, LUCAS fought the McCarran bill with a vigor and courage that made his colleagues and newspapermen marvel. He was daring to run in Illinois against the "anti-Communist" tide. He sincerely believed the measure violated the Bill of Rights. He denounced it before the American Legion on the eve of final debate.

When the time for voting came, he offered the internment section (essentially the Kilgore bill) as a substitute for the McCarran measure. He got 29 votes. Then, without consulting those who had voted with him, and to their great chagrin, he moved to make his amendment a part of the McCarran measure instead of a substitute for it.

This pulled the rug from under such Senators as KILGORE, DOUGLAS of Illinois, and HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. In order to help out LUCAS and to get the part they had supported, they had to take it all, a bitter draught. Only seven Senators, among them KEFAUVER, stuck it to the bitter end and voted against the catch-all.

But LUCAS was not dismayed at what he had done. His attitude was one of "I guess we showed them who's really against Communists."

OVERRIDING CERTAIN

A similar measure, the Wood-Nixon, had passed the House by a whopping majority. The conferees kept the most drastic parts of both bills. The conference report went sailing through, 51–7, in the Senate, 312–20 in the House.

President Truman had not minced words in saying what he thought of the Mundt-Ferguson bill. And he told a press conference he thought the McCarran measure was worse. His lieutenants on Capitol Hill urged him not to veto, because of the political "heat," but veto he did.

Congressional overriding was a foregone conclusion.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald of September 25, 1950]

A SENATOR WEEPS

The sobbing of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS in the well of the United States Senate Saturday afternoon, after that body had overwhelmingly overridden the Truman veto of the anti-Communist bill was the very symbol of the feeling of men to whom thought control is the most obnoxious of the weapons of dictatorship.

For it is difficult to deny that the provisions of the act which is now the law of the land have within them plain machinery for punishing those who dare oppose, if only with their minds, the course upon which the United States has now or might later set its feet.

And yet, the Illinois Senator, who is one of the most intellectually honest men in government, well knew that whatever else the measure is, it is aimed at a party which not only plays a dirty game but makes up its own rules.

He more than once stated his dilemma on the floor of Congress. Though he stood with President Truman in Saturday's hectic session, he had previously recorded his vote in favor of the McCarran measure when it went to the joint committee. A sign of the grip the measure took on party lines came when another Senator from Illinois, SCOTT LUCAS, Truman's own congressional lieutenant, voted regretfully to override.

Here is the law: The Attorney General of the United States may intern possible spies in wartime, point the finger at any organization he thinks doing Reds' work, act as registrar for Communists and their groups which must declare themselves. Propaganda which is Red but doesn't say so is a crime. So is conspiring to substantially contribute to a United States totalitarian dictatorship or hiring a Communist to work for the Government. Red aliens may be kept out or deported and may not be naturalized. The statute of limitations on espionage is lengthened and certain acts, including those which led to recent strings of arrests for passing on atomic bomb information, are spelled out as spying.

Clearly, an Attorney General who was capricious, and we have been cursed with several, could soon make complete mockery of all civil liberties which, like so many great privileges of this democracy, are often taken too much for granted.

What does it mean to substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship? What is a substantial contribution? What, for that matter, is a totalitarian dictatorship? How easy to say, for example, that a political meeting which cheered loudly a forceful speaker who called an administration too conservative was making such a contribution. We know that while many meetings are held in good faith, many others sparked by Communists are not. The problem, calling for much more than the wisdom of Solomon, is to hit the Reds who have revolution in mind without hitting those who seek change through orderly means.

President Truman thought the second class is left unprotected by the bill he vetoed. The rest of us may only pray that the kind of soul-searching which beset honest Democrats and Republicans alike as to the veto fell will also prevail in the breasts of the men who administer the law. Where civil liberties have died, they have stayed dead a long time.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of September 26, 1950]

ON THE OTHER HAND—CURRENT CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN PRESENTS UNEDIFYING SPECTACLE

(By Lowell Mellett)

It is just as well that the current congressional campaign can be concluded in less than 6 weeks. In one respect at least it is not a very edifying spectacle. Too many of the candidates are seeking reelection on a claim that does them no credit. The claim is that on the issue of communism they can be just as hysterical, or more so, than their opponents. Democrats, as well as Republicans, that is the appeal they are making to the voters. They are holding up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to prove that they voted for the Mundt-Ferguson-Nixon-McCarran-Wood bill, despite a 5,500-word Presidential veto begging them not to saddle the Government with legislation so unworkable and potentially dangerous.

The call these troubled days is for leadership in high places. One of the high places is Congress. Congressmen, Senators and Representatives, should be leaders. Their's the duty to think clearly in the people's behalf when the people themselves show signs of being confused; the duty to stand by their convictions when the mob spirit is abroad. Leaders should lead, not run away.

ATMOSPHERE OF PANIC

But the whole atmosphere surrounding the enactment of this 1950 version of an alien and sedition law was one of political panic. The people's leaders were running from the people, in the mistaken belief that the people had become an unruly, unreasoning mob and that the only way to appease this mob was to prove that you were just as scared, or even more scared, than the next fellow. That seemed to be the case with quite a number of the Senators and Representatives. In private conversation many admitted their grave misgivings concerning the legislation, but said they didn't dare oppose it, that to do so would mean defeat at the polls.

That's how it was with some of our statesmen. They simply closed their ears to reason and ran. Maybe they estimated correctly the popular state of mind in their home States or districts. They are presumed to know their own people. But they could be mistaken. Conceivably the majority of the people have no desire to see the Government strike out blindly in all directions, regardless of the consequences. The average citizen is capable of understanding the simple and compelling reasons that moved the President to veto the bill. Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, has said that his mail was 10 to 1 against the legislation. This may be completely contrary to the experience of other lawmakers, but it does not excuse their votes if they voted in defiance of their own convictions. And many admit that they did.

MAY BE COMMITTED TO FOLLY

Living, as our democratic system does, by politics, it is unfortunate that politics so frequently brings out the worst in us. Never has it been more unfortunate than in the present instance.

Here we have a Congress whose members genuinely and wholeheartedly loathe communism, voting to put themselves in the wrong and the Communists in the right. Possibly, in a saner and more courageous mood following the election, they will find ways of undoing some of the damage they have done. On the other hand, the campaign being the sort that it is, they may commit themselves so deeply to their folly that it will be impossible for them to take corrective action.

Very certainly the Communist Party members, by the very act of resisting the new law, as they announce they will do, can be counted on to arouse a real mob spirit, one that will make any calm thinking almost out of the question. Which may cause the Mundts, Nixons, and McCarrans no regrets, but should sadden the better men in Congress who yielded their convictions to what they considered political necessity.

[From the New York Times of October 2, 1950]

THE ANTI-RED ACT AT WORK

The State Department, as Walter H. Waggoner reported to this newspaper yesterday, is having trouble with the new Internal Security Act. Section 22 of this interesting bit of legislation, as the President said in his veto message, "excludes from our country anyone who advocates any form of totalitarian or one-party government." So now the State Department, as Mr. Waggoner puts it, will apparently have to devise a political spectrum of the governments of the world for the purposes of deciding what governments are totalitarian and what are not. What about Spain? What about Argentina? What about Yugoslavia? What about diplomatic representatives, agents, and staffs from the admittedly Russian-style Communist countries? What about delegates from Red China, who may come here to present whatever case they have on the question of the alleged accidental bombing of their territory or the status of Formosa? What about Communist visitors of the nonconspiratorial sort—if there are such? We used to believe we might weaken any Communist's faith by showing him America. Has our own faith weakened?

Of course the State Department has to carry out the law as well as it can until or unless the Supreme Court says some of it is unconstitutional, or until and unless Congress revises it. Revision on the immigration and other fronts is suggested in the Statement issued yesterday by the 10 Democratic Senators who voted to sustain Mr. Truman's veto. They also make one other suggestion, which in an ironic way supports their opposition to some sections of the act. This is that opponents should take care not to join Communist-sponsored organizations which are urging repeal. Such organizations do exist and are making hay out of the present situation. Pretending to be liberal, they are working for the world's foulest example of illiberalism, as they always do. Now they have something new to talk about—a present handed them on a silver platter by 286 Representatives and 57 Senators.

Liberal opponents of the more foolish and restrictive clauses of this law are no more sympathetic with communism than are the rest of the population. They have a right to point, as the President did, to those sections which help communism instead of hurting it and hurt democracy instead of helping it.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of October 7, 1950]

BARBED-WIRE FENCE

The barb-studded wires of the fence erected around the United States by the McCarran Act are now threatening to prick friend and foe, the dangerous and the innocuous, without discrimination. During the course of

the debate on the measure, its proponents tended, ironically enough, to minimize its impact, while its opponents asserted that it would affect great numbers of aliens friendly, or at least not unfriendly, to the United States. Now that it has to be enforced, the State Department finds itself in desperate straits between the two interpretations. The language of the act affords little help. Indeed, it is language that challenges the intrepidity of lawyers and defies the understanding of laymen. Section 5 (c), for example, declares with characteristic lucidity that—

"Notwithstanding the provisions of the tenth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875; 8 U. S. C., 136), or any other law—(1) the provisions of section 1 (1) and 1 (3) shall be applicable to any alien within the purview of section 3 (1) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 153; 8 U. S. C. 201), except Ambassadors, public ministers," etc., etc., ad nauseam.

Well, as accurately as we can figure it out, the act will bar virtually all of the nationals and some of the official representatives of a number of totalitarian countries with which the United States is now collaborating in resistance to the spread of communism. It seems clear, as we pointed out when the McCarran bill was originally introduced and as the President asserted in his veto message, that the definition of totalitarianism laid down in the measure includes such countries as Spain, Portugal, Argentina, and Saudi Arabia. Any students or businessmen or tourists from those countries, if they adhere to the regime in power in their homeland, must be excluded. So far as they are concerned, then, we shall be as much an iron curtain country as the Soviet Union.

In addition, we think, there will be serious diplomatic difficulties under the act. Its restrictions do not apply to career diplomatic and consular officers who have been accredited by a foreign government recognized de jure by the United States and who are accepted by the President or the Secretary of State, and the members of the immediate families of such aliens. But many countries may wish to follow a practice commonly pursued by the United States and send over noncareer representatives for special purposes. None of these would be admissible under the terms of the act. If they are excluded, no doubt their homelands will counter by excluding comparable personnel from this country.

So far as the numerous United Nations organizations are concerned, the act permits admission only of a designated principal resident representative of a totalitarian government, accredited resident members of the staff of such representative, and members of his immediate family. A totalitarian government might reasonably wish to send to the United Nations General Assembly a nonresident representative—Mr. Vishinsky, for example—and the United Nations could scarcely function here if such representatives were excluded by the United States. Moreover, to exclude, as the act appears to do, the families of all members of the staff of a totalitarian representative to the UN would be to impose on them a senseless and altogether unjustifiable hardship.

How the State Department will adjust its regulations under the law to the demands of its sponsors on the one hand and the demands of common sense and international comity on the other remains to be seen. The McCarran Act poses, we think, an impossible problem. Time was when Americans had enough pride in their country and enough faith in the durability of their own institutions to believe that a visit here would make friends and influence people in our behalf. Now we present ourselves to the world as frightened and ashamed. Like Russia, we have transformed ourselves into a hermit state.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of October 9, 1950]

SUBVERSIVE CURB SEEN BLOW TO WEST GERMANS

(By J. Emlyn Williams)

FRANKFURT.—The new United States antisubversive legislation, which is primarily directed against Communists, may have serious repercussions here, according to officials in the United States branch of the Allied High Commission.

If maintained, the new law may react most unfavorably against the program for reeducating Germany in democracy, may hinder smooth working of plans for extending this country's trade with the United States, and inflict unnecessary hardships upon German wives of occupation personnel.

High Commissioner John J. McCoy is understood to have sent a request to Washington asking for further information and pointing out that strict liberal interpretation of this law could upset arrangements for sending Germans to the United States as part of the reeducation program.

APPLICATION OF MEASURES?

For the security measures which are now to be adopted would ban entry into the United States of any persons who were members of the Nazi Party or its affiliated organizations.

Does this include such organizations as the Hitler Youth and the League of German Girls?

This is one of the questions which must be cleared up. If they are banned, then 90 percent of the Germans over 15 years of age would be affected. Yet, it is from these very same young men and women that American educators over here aim to draw their democratic leaders of tomorrow.

POSSIBILITY OF GREAT HARM

To exclude people who at the time they joined such organizations were hardly able to discriminate for themselves and have since been trained along quite opposite lines is unjust. To exclude people who were members of the labor service, or even of the black shirt and brown shirt organizations would not show much understanding of conditions existing here in Germany after 1933.

Exclusion obviously cannot be made simply on the basis of membership in Nazi organizations. That would simply be introducing the grave mistake of the de-Nazification program of the first 4 years after the war. It would not only alienate the sympathy of the majority of good Germans but also undermine foundations of much valuable pioneering work which has been done here by American and German leaders.

There are today many hundreds of German students in the United States on scholarships and almost as many waiting to go. Presumably none of the former would be sent back. But it would be a serious mistake to reject entry to the latter because of something they did—or were compelled to do—in the earlier abnormal years of the Third Reich and in World War II.

German businessmen also would be affected. They have been encouraged to visit the United States so as to establish trade contacts and exchange commercial ideas. This has been done with a view to increasing the federal republic's foreign trade so that Germans can obtain more dollars and thereby relieve the American taxpayer of part of his burden.

Another class of people intimately concerned in what this new law means is the German wives of American occupation personnel over here. United States citizens who have married Germans and planned to return to the States with their new wives now believe that their wives will not be granted visas.

The United States High Commission officials at the moment are uncertain as to what this new law actually means in practice. For this reason the answer to Mr. McCloy's inquiry is eagerly awaited.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 10, 1950]

SECTION 22

By an application of his discretionary powers, the Attorney General has permitted the entry into this country of the young Austrian musician, Friedrich Gulda, who was technically barred under the terms of the new Security Act. When a child of 10, Gulda had been forced to join a Nazi youth movement; and section 22 of the act denies admission to aliens who have ever been affiliated with a Communist or other totalitarian organization. The exceptional permission is for a period of 6 days only, eliminating a second projected concert; obtaining it involved a bewildering and nerve-wracking delay at Ellis Island. The Government has sensibly announced that it will not press for the strict interpretation of the law which might have justified the holding of Toscanini on his arrival today, despite the noted musician's long opposition to fascism. Thus a bad situation has, for the moment, been dealt with in the best possible way.

Section 22 remains, however, a mischievous and potentially dangerous provision. In his veto message the President pointed out that, under its terms, Spanish businessmen or students would find it impossible to visit these shores, and that admission would be denied to those who had renounced and repudiated communism. Obviously, a law is not sound which relies upon a constant application of discretionary power—particularly when it is considered how many cases may fail to achieve special consideration. Since the act went into effect last Thursday, more than 75 aliens have been taken into custody at Ellis Island. What unjust hardships could be wrought on many of these by a rigid adherence to the letter of the act?

For a variety of reasons, neither the Congress nor the public was in a state to examine with sobriety all the complex provisions of the omnibus anti-Communist bill; and the President had forfeited the confidence which should have made his warnings bear weight. This newspaper pointed out the fallacies of the immigration and naturalization sections, where a host of novel and confusing barriers were added to the existing prohibition against known Communists. Congress is in recess; meanwhile the shortcomings in its work are spelled out. It can have no more pressing task when it returns than to review the results, applying itself to a law that really meets the threat of communism without raising up new problems and inviting new injustices.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of October 11, 1950]

CONFUSION AT THE GATES

American policy on the admission of aliens, especially those from former enemy countries, has been so confused in recent years that we doubt whether the State Department could make it worse. The Department, of course, has been accused of such a design by Michigan's Senator FERGUSON. He says it wants to discredit the new McCarran catch-all antisubversives law.

That law certainly does not make the admission of aliens, on a temporary or long-time basis, any easier. True, the Attorney

General has authority to grant exceptions. But he must explain each such exception to Congress. That means, almost certainly, that there will be few exceptions made. It is easier to rule against a foreigner than to go before a congressional committee—perhaps for weeks of badgering. This shows, in a practical way, that President Truman was right in opposing the law.

Even without the law, however, the record on the admission of aliens is poor. Decisions have been all too arbitrary. The case of Ellen Knauff, the war bride, comes to mind at once. Or that of Josef Krips, the Austrian conductor, who was turned back at Ellis Island even though he had been given a visa in Vienna. Obviously, the gates should not be opened to spies and saboteurs. But they should not be kept closed because of some bureaucrat's unsupported opinion. And, as far as possible, the issue should not be confused by questions about the individual's personal or professional conduct.

Many Americans may not want to attend a concert by a musician who, in their opinion, did not take a sufficiently clear anti-Fascist stand during the war, or who, after the war, was willing to appear in a Moscow music hall. But if such a person has been given a visitor's visa, why not let him in? We can always express our disapproval by staying away.

Any other course on the part of the State Department, the Justice Department, or the immigration authorities at a port of entry can only lead to a long series of arbitrary and confusing precedents, many of which would conflict with American concepts of individual rights. Because it fosters such conflicts, the McCarran law is of the most doubtful constitutionality.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of October 13, 1950]

NEW SECURITY ACT STIRS CONFUSION FOR CAPITAL

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON. — Immigration authorities here are frantically trying to unscramble the bewildering complications of the National Security Act, which has suddenly slammed the immigration door in the face of internationally famed musicians, foreign-born brides of American soldiers, returning immigrants of long United States residence, and has even barred ship captains and pursers from coming ashore for customary port formalities.

Stunned by the sweeping and confusing implications of the law in its initial application, officials estimate that it will cost some $12,000,000 a year to administer it and require the addition of 800 or more persons to the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Total Immigration Service expenditures in 1950 were $32,000,000.

TWOFOLD PROBLEM

Right now the authorities entrusted with the application of this law are tackling the Houdini-like stunt of trying to carry out its provisions and at the same time be practical and humane.

When the captain and purser of a foreign ship were recently barred from coming ashore, under one provision of the act, to attend to regular port business, harassed New York immigation officials appealed to Washington.

"Be sensible," they cried. "These men must get ashore."

Meanwhile, all members of the crew were also bottled up on the ship, with no shore leave.

In the case of the captain and purser, Washington immigration authorities gave permission to bring them ashore under a temporary visitor's visa, granted by the Attorney General in case of a temporary stay up to 6 months.

PROVISIONS OF ACT

In fact, this is the legal device under which the service is slowly relieving the Ellis Island blockade.

But that is not the solution, for here is what immigration authorities are up against:

The act says that among those to be excluded from admission to the United States are "aliens who are members of or affiliated with (1) the Communist Party of the United States; (2) any other totalitarian party of the United States; (3) the Communist Political Association; (4) the Communist or other totalitarian party of any State of the United States, or any foreign state, or of any political or geographical subdivision of any foreign state. * * *"

That includes anyone with present or past connection with any organizations of a totalitarian government.

APPLICATION TO ITALIANS

Such a provision could apply to nearly all Italians, since, until 1943, practically all Italian children belonged to the Fascist youth organizations. As one Italian put it when asked if he had ever been identified with such a group, "But, of course, one had to eat."

State Department brows are furrowed and slightly damp over the question of whether that section of the law could also apply to immigrants from Spain and Argentina.

President Perón is commonly called a dictator. The Justice Department will undoubtedly be confronted with the problem of deciding whether the Perón government and that of Generalissimo Francisco Franco shall be construed as "totalitarian" under the terms of this law.

One case which touched the sympathies of Washington immigration officials was that of an elderly Italian woman who had lived in the United States as an immigrant for many years. Not long ago she was called back to Italy by the illness of one of her children.

Now she is returning to her home in the United States, and because she once was associated with an Italian Fascist youth organization, she had to be stopped at Ellis Island.

She was finally admitted under a temporary visitors' permit, under which she may remain for 6 months.

Foreign-born brides of American soldiers who have been stationed in Italy, Germany, and other countries are also barred from residence under this legislation. These women are now being admitted under a temporary visitor's permit.

REPORT TO CONGRESS

While the act permits the Attorney General at his discretion to issue temporary visitors' permits to persons normally excluded under these regulations, it requires that he give a detailed report to Congress on all persons so admitted.

This poses a real problem. Immigration officials have no time to dig into the past of these people for the purposes of a detailed report.

It was solved this way: When the immigrants are questioned as to past affiliations, the immigration official immediately telephones the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Army Intelligence for a clearance or other report on these individuals.

Whatever these three agencies, or any of them, report is used as basis of the information for the detailed report required under the law.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of October 15, 1950]

ANTI-RED LAW CREATES ALIEN CHAOS

WASHINGTON.—Harassed United States immigration officials struggled to cope with many-tongued confusion Saturday while the State Department sought to spell out regulations for executing the tough new antisubversives law.

The act bars from the United States aliens who have been a member of a Communist, Nazi, or Fascist organization.

ALIENS PILE UP

Aliens detained for a check-up under the statute piled up at Ellis Island, New York, and in Europe thousands of Germans, Italians, and Austrians clamored for clarification of the new American travel restrictions.

Overseas travel agencies reported scores of last-minute cancellations on plane and ship passage to this country. They complained their losses are running into thousands of dollars a day.

Here in Washington, under a massive portrait of President Truman, acting United States Immigration Commissioner A. R. Mackey sat at his desk in a drab, yellow-walled room overlooking the Anacostia River and tried to make order out of chaos.

CALL FOR GUIDANCE

On the desk, a battery of telephones jangled almost constantly, hour after hour, with incoming calls seeking guidance from points of entry on the borders.

Foreign governments vigorously protested the temporary detention of their nationals holding valid travel papers—including such notables as Victor de Sabata, conductor of the famed La Scala Opera in Italy, and Hans Hotter, German baritone, who came to sing at the Metropolitan Opera in New York.

De Sabata was released Friday after a 24-hour detention, but others were held longer while authorities checked whether they ever belonged to a totalitarian group.

On Wednesday the State Department announced a temporary world-wide "freeze" on all passport visas—except in cases where foreigners could prove to United States consular officials abroad they would be accepted on arrival in this country.

The order hit thousands of Europeans headed for the United States.

CHARGE SABOTAGE

Some Members of Congress charged the administration with attempting to sabotage the statute with a too literal enforcement policy. Congress passed the law over President Truman's veto in hectic closing hours of the last session. Now some lawmakers say the administration didn't want the law to work.

Foes of the law replied that it, not the administration, was to blame. They said the only remedy is drastic revision of the law.

Sitting in the center of this hubbub, Mackey declined to be drawn into the public disputes. In between never-ending phone calls, he told newsmen:

"We are trying to administer the law with all the fairness and equity we possibly can."

The week-long furor centered on that section of the new law which prohibits admission of any alien who has ever been a member of any totalitarian movement. That means Nazi and Fascist movements, as well as the Communists—although the much-amended law was originally aimed primarily at Communists.

Actually Attorney General McGrath has exercised his basic authority to grant temporary admissions in scores of special cases during the last week.

Altogether a total of 339 persons were detained up to Friday night. Of these, the Attorney General authorized a release of 170 under special permit, and the Justice Deparment is considering how to deal with the others.

Among those detained, and the new law's provision for their entry are:

Aliens who have lived in this country for at least 10 years and who are returning after a visit to the homeland—special-entry permits, good for 6 months.

IMMIGRANTS WAIT CHECK

New immigrant aliens—detention at the port of entry pending examination by a special board of inquiry.

The Government has not even made a start on another new provision which says that when the United States has ordered an alien deported and his home country won't take him back, there shall be no further immigration here from that country until the deportee is accepted.

Officials say the countries affected by this provision include nations with which the United States has the most cordial relations.

State Department experts, concerned with foreign relations, and Justice Department officials, who administer the law, are continuing a long huddle over next steps.

Meanwhile, with ships and planes arriving hourly at United States borders, many of the Immigration Service's headquarters staff here got notices to stay on the job throughout the week end.

[From the New York Times of October 15, 1950]

LAW TO BAR SUBVERSIVES CAUSE OF MUCH CONFUSION—MANY ALIENS ARRIVING WITH GOOD VISAS FIND THEMSELVES SHUNTED TO ELLIS ISLAND

(By Jay Walz)

WASHINGTON, October 14.—The Ellis Island detention of some 100 incoming aliens this week gave the country a first view of the workings of its new internal security law, and Federal Government enforcement officials a first touch of the headache they were sure would come along.

Whether this initial mass screening operation actually shut out anyone dangerous was not immediately reported, as public attention was focused on the spectacle of a youthful Austrian pianist being held 48 hours, and of even Arturo Toscanini being subjected to a brief interrogation.

On the face of it, the proceedings looked silly and farcial to opponents of the legislation that Congress, just before its pre-election recess, passed over President Truman's veto. Supporters of the law reported the New York enforcement activity simply demonstrated that the administration intended, by overdoing it, to nullify a law it did not want.

NO ALTERNATIVE SEEN

The Justice Department insisted, however, that its Immigration Service had no alternative under the law to the action it took at Ellis Island. Section 22 of the law, officials quote, excludes from admission aliens who are, or have been, members of a Communist or other totalitarian organization.

There is one prospect, noted in Washington, that the congestion at Ellis Island may be relieved in the future. The State Department on Thursday ordered all visas except those of displaced persons withheld until the operation of the statute can be clarified. The Department also will assume eventually the task of screeing would-be incomers at its consulates in foreign lands.

FOREIGN POLICY DILEMMA

But immigration authorities will still be expected to be on guard and double-check on anyone they suspect. The Immigration Service also faces the problem of dealing with a retroactive feature of the law. This applies not only to aliens en route when the statute went into effect, but applies also to those already in this country. Those with totalitarian sympathies must be deported.

The State Department for its part is worrying over its instructions to its consuls abroad because important questions of foreign policy get involved. For example, if the State Department is to deny visas to totalitarians (Communists, or others), it must decide whether to continue to regard as dictatorships certain countries with whom the United States wants to be friends.

Enforcement of a much more controversial part—the Communist registration program—has gained momentum very slowly.

President Truman left for his Pacific rendezvous with General MacArthur without having named the five-member Subversive Activities Control Board, or having indicated when it would be named. This is the body that must rule after open hearings on what organizations are Communist, or fronts, and which, therefore, must register with the Attorney General.

TO PROCEED SLOWLY

The registration program is expected to move very slowly. A Justice Department lawyer said a hearing before the SACB to prove the Communist Party itself was subversive could go far beyond the New York trial of 11 Communist leaders that took 11 months. And, he predicted, until the existence of a Communist action organization (such as the Communist Party) were proved, it would be hard to show the existence of a Communist-front organization.

The Communist control law was passed on September 23, and the 30-day period provided for voluntary registration of Communists and their fronts is nearing an end. So far, none has offered to sign up, and none is expected to sign up. As a matter of fact, the official forms for doing so are still in preparation.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of October 16, 1950]

OUR OWN IRON CURTAIN FALLS WITH A CLANG

Before passage of the McCarran bill, with its hodge-podge of amendments, the United States had the most rigid and vexatious laws against the admission of alien visitors or prospective residents, of any country in the world save Russia and her satellites. Under the new law, we have at one bound reached parity with all the despised national fraternity of bolts and bars.

The degrading effect of the new bill in this one application alone may be seen in the piling up behind bars in Ellis Island of visitors and intending immigrants who had previously been cleared for entry under the old law. Now instructions to United States consuls abroad seem likely to delay indefinitely the arrivals of hundreds of foreigners, businessmen, artists, officials, and plain immigrants for further wearying investigation.

Under terms of the new law, any alien who holds or has held membership in, or been affiliated with, any Communist or other totalitarian organization must be refused admittance. The loose language of the section will mean an endless quibbling on the part of consular officials and would-be visitors, and a further spread of the already highly inconvenient division of authority between the State Department which processes intending visitors in their homelands and the Justice Department which questions them when they arrive here. Ironically the law's application so far has been invoked entirely against Italians and Germans, nearly all of whom must claim at least an affiliation with some totalitarian party in the past 20 years. Since no inhabitants of Communist countries dare apply for admission and no other admitted Communists ever get beyond the preliminary screening, the vast nuisance of this section accomplishes little, indeed, in protecting us from communism. It is likely, however, to put an abrupt stop to the parade of repentant Nazis, former Fascists, and loan-hungry representatives of Franco, most of whom at one time or other have had a cordial welcome from some Congressman or other. But this is not enough to justify it.

Unfortunately it must also abruptly halt the dreams or plans of scores of other decent Europeans who had hoped either to do business with us or maybe just to see how we lived and worked. For whether they have ever been affiliated with totalitarianism or not, and whatever the degree of their affiliation, the burden of proof is on them and the effort in most cases may be too great to justify the prize.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of October 20, 1950]

VISA ANTICS

The State Department, having suspended the issuance of all visas to enter the United States, is now engaged in the hopeless task of framing regulations to fit the McCarran Act. It must choose between making a mockery of the act and making the United States a subject of mockery throughout the civilized world. Apparently it attempted to take the first alternative as a lesser evil, judging from the assertion the other day by a Department spokesman that "a member of the Spanish Falange Party would get a visa as of now provided he is otherwise admissible." But the Department of Justice, demonstrating much more respect for the law, says it will not allow the Falangists to come in.

The McCarran Act explicitly forbids admission, or the granting of a visa, to "aliens who at any time, shall be or shall have been members of * * * the Communist or other totalitarian party of any State of the United States, of any foreign state, or of any political or geographical subdivision of any foreign state." And the act is perfectly plain about the meaning of the term "totalitarian." Here is what it says:

"The terms 'totalitarian dictatorship' and 'totalitarianism' mean and refer to systems of government not representative in fact, characterized by (A) the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial basis, with so close an identity between such party and its policies and the governmental policies of the country in which it exists, that the party and the government constitute an indistinguishable unit, and (B) the forcible suppression of all opposition to such party."

This is a precise description of the Falange Party in Spain. It is the only political party in the country, it is organized on a dictatorial basis, it is indistinguishable from the Government, and it forcibly suppresses all opposition. Therefore no one who has belonged to it or has been affiliated with it at any time, at least during the last decade since it came into power, can properly be admitted to the United States under the terms of the McCarran Act. The same may be said, of course, of anyone who is or was a member of the prevailing party in Portugal or Saudi Arabia or Yugoslavia. The same must be said, indeed, of anyone who was ever affiliated with the Fascist Party in Italy (about 75 percent of the country's present population) or with the Nazi Party in Germany. They are absolutely and unconditionally banned as permanent immigrants and may come in as temporary visitors only in special cases and upon specific authorization by the Attorney General.

No wonder, then, that Italian Ambassador Tarchiani delivered a formal protest to the State Department on Tuesday expressing amazement at the discriminatory character of the Department's interpretation of the McCarran Act. Italians who were only children under the Fascist regime over 5 years ago are being rigidly excluded, although the Italian Fascist Party is no longer in existence, while no objection was made under the Department's interpretation to admittance of present adult members of the existing Falange Party in Spain. Whether considered from the point of view of justice to aliens or of protection for the security of the United States, this is cockeyed nonsense.

But, of course, the whole of the McCarran Act's immigration section is cockeyed nonsense. The State Department, no doubt with

the best will in the world, has merely succeeded in making it slightly more nonsensical. It is not at liberty to exempt any totalitarians—even those dear to the heart of Senator PAT MCCARRAN. It must, like the Department of Justice, enforce this act to the letter until the absurdity of the patently noxious provisions becomes manifest to the Congress that adopted it. Congress alone can amend its own mandate. When it returns next month, it will take heed, we hope, of the sensible resolution passed on October 13 by the executive committee of the British Liberal Party: "The executive committee of the Liberal Party expresses its deep concern at the sudden suspension of visas for the United States arising out of the security law passed by Congress despite the President's veto. Freedom to travel is essential to greater unity between the free peoples, and such arbitrary restrictions upon it strike at the basis of the opposition to totalitarianism."

[From Time Magazine of October 23, 1950]

IMMIGRATION—REVENGE AT ELLIS ISLAND

Under the law some 347 Italian and German opera singers, businessmen, musicians, and plain citizens were snatched off ships and planes arriving last week in New York, and packed off behind the wire fences of Ellis Island. There they were 800 yards from the Statue of Liberty, and a good deal farther from the land they had hopefully come to see. They were among the first victims of the new restrictions on immigration in the Communist-control bill passed by the Congress over Harry Truman's veto. Italy was outraged; western Germany was hurt. Both sent protests to Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

Harry Truman had warned Congress of just such trouble. Congress had ignored him, overridden his veto by humiliating majorities. Now Harry Truman was gleefully proving his point by enforcing the law to the letter.

The letter of the law did not give much choice. It banned any alien who "at any time" had been "affiliated" with any "section, branch, affiliate, or subdivision" of any "totalitarian party." Under Hitler, nearly every youth was forced to join one or another of the Hitler youth organizations; nearly every man who worked for a living had to belong to a Nazi-dominated labor union. In Italy, every school was a Fascist school. Officials estimated that the new law would exclude 90 percent of all Germans, more than half of all Italians. It would bar all repentant Communists, interfere with trade with Yugoslavia, exclude many of the 55,000 German refugees from east Europe, whose admission Congress had just authorized last June.

Republicans cried that Harry Truman was trying to discredit the whole law. The law provided, they pointed out, that the Attorney General might admit aliens temporarily at his own discretion. But the law also specified that he had to make a full report to Congress on each case every time he did so—and no Attorney General was likely to leave himself open to criticism when rigorous enforcement would save him the trouble.

Last week this policy was creating a very satisfactory uproar. As ship after ship steamed into New York harbor, immigration authorities seized one distinguished victim after another. There was Friedrich Gulda, a talented 20-year-old Austrian pianist who had come to give a concert in Carnegie Hall (Gulda had been required to join a Nazi youth group at the age of 10). Famed Conductor Victor de Sabata, who conducted at Tanglewood earlier this year and was coming again as guest conductor for the Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra, had conducted Milan's La Scala Orchestra during the Mussolini regime. A German war bride of Philadelphia, returning from a visit to her mother in Germany, was detained because she had belonged to a Hitler youth organization in her teens. The Metropolitan Opera's mezzo-soprano, Fedora Barbieri, was held (she went to a Fascist school).

The Metropolitan was also worried about one of its star sopranos, Ljuba Welitch. She probably joined the German labor front, observed Director Rudolf Bing sadly. "You either joined or you didn't sing," he explained. Arturo Toscanini was waved in though technically he too was suspicious; during Il Duce's regime, he had led an Italian orchestra, once ran for the Italian Senate with Mussolini on the Socialist ticket in 1919. Obviously the Attorney General felt he could make an exception of Toscanini.

Most visitors were admitted after a couple of days for a temporary stay. At week's end, with 131 aliens still in custody, the State Department stemmed the flood by canceling temporarily all United States visas all over the world. United States consulates were swamped with travelers trying to get a new visa under the new rules; many simply canceled passage. In Europe, the Communist press happily crowed about "American political racism" and referred to Ellis Island as "that well-known concentration camp."

There were other problems still unsettled. In Congress, Nevada's Senator MCCARRAN who sponsored the new immigration rules was the bright, particular friend of Spain's Franco; but weren't Spanish Falangists excluded by the act's language? Obviously they were, and presumably, if any turned up they could be hustled off to Ellis Island. And what of followers of the Dominican Republic's Dictator Trujillo, or of any of the other Latin-American good neighbors who had lived under military juntas and strong-man machines during the recent past?

State was considering making a distinction between nominal and undeniable totalitarian governments. No one had yet grappled with another provision of the law: a requirement that the Attorney General round up and deport all aliens now in the country who cannot qualify under the law. Throwing in the sponge, the Republican New York Herald Tribune admitted sadly: "This newspaper sees no alternative save to grant the President his revenge and insist on amendment of the worst features of the law as soon as the extra session reconvenes."

"Because of Our Strength We Can Hope That the Day of Peace Is Not Far Distant—A Day When Men Can Devote All Their Thoughts and Energy To Building a World Free of Fear and Free of Want"—Dr. John Steelman, Battle Report, Washington

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is the tenth of a series of weekly teledocumentaries spearheaded by John Steelman, assistant to the President over the coaxials and the television network of the National Broadcasting Co. This program, as you well know, is called Battle Report, Washington.

Mr. Speaker, nothing has happened in all the years that I have been a Representative to this Congress that has brought the Federal Government as close to the people of these United States as this series of telecasts now being made by the National Broadcasting Co. Time was when we regarded the radio as a powerful medium for the dissemination of general information, but through the medium of television, as made use of today by the National Broadcasting Co., in cooperation with the assistant to the President, Dr. Steelman, discovery has been made not alone of a new way in which the people will have greater knowledge of their Government, but also of a way in which the Government can be of greater service to its people.

It is a fact that our form of government would not be very effective were it not for the various mediums of communication which we now have and operate under a system of free enterprise.

It is in this manner that a more enlightened and better informed public can choose its representatives for political office at all levels of government—representatives who will, when elected, carry out the desires of their constituencies.

When society possessed only the medium of the newspaper and the magazine, the task of informing the public was indeed a slow one. Radio added tremendous impetus, but now, by virtue of the medium of television, an informed citizenship can not alone see but hear and know their governmental officials almost in person.

As a television program, Battle Report, Washington, is a sort of a pioneer project. Who knows but that the day is not far distant when these programs may seem crude? But they are definitely forward in their approach to our current political economy and truly representative government, and certainly are evoking greater popular interest and appeal at each succeeding presentation.

Mr. Speaker, much of the credit for the marvelous presentations, human interest stories, and popular appeal of Battle Report, Washington, is due to that great friend of many Members of this House, Mr. Ted Ayres, ace producer of the National Broadcasting Co. I know that I express the sentiments of the American people in general, and this House in particular, when I say that Ted Ayres is doing a splendid job and rendering a great service to the American people. The time and effort and skill that he puts forth in building and which is exhibited in this program can only result in a better America and a better government for our children and our children's children.

Mr. Speaker, during the past week the National Broadcasting Co. and its affiliates had a gathering at White Sulphur Springs in West Virginia. Mr. Robert McCormick, one of NBC's ace commentators, attended the convention, and in the course of one of the discussions presented to the gathering of NBC executives the transcript of an interview between himself and Dr. John Steelman. The interview dealt with Dr. Steelman's personal interest and participation in the NBC Sunday television program, Battle Report, Washington.

Because of that timely interview I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues in this House to extend my remarks and include therein this short interview and the ninth Battle Report, Washington,

as projected over the television Sunday last. The interview of Dr. Steelman and the television script were as follows:

Mr. McCORMICK. Now, Mr. Steelman, that you have become so closely associated with television and Battle Report, Washington, won't you tell us about some of your reactions?

Dr. STEELMAN. Well, Bob, when Fred Wile first offered us time for a telecast, most of us knew little about the medium. Our entire knowledge had been acquired at the receiving end of the screen. But since the first program we have learned a lot, and now I feel certain that Battle Report, Washington, is doing a magnificent job in carrying these weekly messages into millions of homes. Through television, millions of persons not only can hear the message but they also can see the man who delivers it. I am confident that this is not alone making the public feel closer to the Federal Government, but is also increasing interest in public affairs.

Mr. McCORMICK. How about the production—does that interest you?

Dr. STEELMAN. Well, until I went into the control room during one of the telecasts I had no idea of what a complex production job it really is. In the studio I had seen you smiling as if no one had a care in the world and the cameras moving from place to place as if by magic. But in the control room I found Ted Ayers barking orders over the telephone almost continuously and meanwhile watching five television screens as well as the clock. But in spite of the tension, the program moves as smoothly as if it were as simple as falling off a log. It is a perfect example of perfect teamwork, with Ted Ayers in the quarterback spot.

Mr. McCORMICK. Dr. Steelman, have you heard about the new technical advances and how television is growing up?

Dr. STEELMAN. Yes, indeed, almost every day someone tells me of a new technical advance in television and I never cease to wonder. The most recent achievement of covering the President's trip to Wake Island seems almost incredible. The fact that these small hand cameras and sound equipment can bring us telecasts even from 20,000 feet in the air, as you did the other night, is something to really stagger the imagination.

You gentleman have earned profound respect for the great progress you are making in television. We are deeply appreciative of your generosity in making your facilities available to Battle Report, Washington, and I thank you. Best of luck at your convention—and look for us next Sunday afternoon.

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 15, 1950

Mr. McCORMICK. As the presidential plane, which left Washington this week to bear Harry Truman to point X, finally completes its rendezvous with General MacArthur at Wake Island, NBC television turns its cameras upon the Nation's capital to bring you some of the facts behind the vital talks that will take place on that Pacific coral reef this eighteenth week of war.

Washington, the city the President left behind on his blank-mile hop across the Pacific to discuss the battle for Korea, Korea where 350,000 United Nations troops are "moving in for the kill."

Yes, by land, by sea, by air the battle wages hotter. And that you may be more fully informed of what is transpiring now, and the outlook for the future, Battle Report speaks to you today through five Washington voices. The first, who will tell you more of the others to follow, the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Four hundred and fifty-eight years ago last Thursday, Christopher Columbus landed in the new world. The doors were opened for the civilization and culture of western Europe to flow into a new land and there to flourish. Fundamental in that civilization and culture was and still is our most precious possession—the rights of the individual. It is our heritage that governments and the men who compose them are servants of the people. People are not the servants of the government. That is tyranny.

Once again that fundamental of western civilization is being attacked. Vicious men, greedy for power, already have enslaved millions and, according to their own statements, are aiming to enslave the world. Their methods are obvious. First, they use promises. If they fail, the next step invariably is bloodshed, imprisonment, or death.

But freemen everywhere have risen up to resist the threat. We are becoming stronger each day—and because of our strngth we can hope that the day of peace is not far distant—a day when men can devote all their thoughts and energies to building a world free of fear and free of want.

This afternoon we will hear from another group of Government officials—the servants of the American people, who are working for the cause of peace in different spheres. The Secretary of the Navy, who faces a gigantic task in our world-wide defense program, will take us behind the scenes in the Pentagon. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget will discuss the fiscal problems of our Government. Our Minister to the Duchy of Luxemburg, who has just returned to Washington for consultation, will give us an intimate picture of life in western Europe, how the people look upon us and how they,too, are working for peace. A fighting major who has just returned from the battlefront will give us a graphic story of what our Armed Forces are doing in Korea.

One gracious lady of exceptional ability and three distinguished men are in the front line of the battle to preserve our freedom. After you have met them and heard their messages, I know you will join with me when I say: You are doing your part—and doing it well.

Mr. McCORMICK. Led by the giant guns of "Mighty Mo"—the famed battleship *Missouri*—this week end, 37 warships showed the Nation and the world what the Navy can do to stall aggression. Along 130 miles of North Korea's shore—practically to the very edge of Manchuria—they let the Reds have it. Big "Mo" alone raining more than 800,000 pounds of hot shells in a searing attack on the iron and steel port of Chongjin. This is but part of the vital work we can expect from our Navy today—operating through its battleships, destroyers, cruisers, carriers. But what of the tasks ahead for the Navy? For the answer to that question, here in our studios our NBC cameramen train their sights upon—Secretary of the Navy, Francis P. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Fundamentally and traditionally, the mission of the United States Navy has been and still is to maintain the freedom of the seas for our fleets both combat and commercial, to deny their use to any enemy, and to keep war away from our shores. In other words the Navy's task is to carry the battle to the shores of the enemy and win wars through combat on sea and land far remote from our own country.

This was not only the mission of the Navy in the past but it is its task at present and its job of the future. The instruments for accomplishing these missions will change just as the sail was outmoded by steam and as in our own day the battleship has been supplanted as the core of the fleet by the airplane carrier.

We learned at Okinawa that a powerful fleet of our types of vessels is essential to victory over a foreign foe even though the enemy has no effective fleet of his own. That lesson has been repeated with much emphasis in the recent Korean incident.

Whatever the Navy's mission may be it is no more or less than the fullest contribution of one element of the national defense team dedicated to maintain our national security. The Army has performed a much more valiant and dangerous maneuver in Korea than most people understand or can comprehend. It will be on the job when the last shot is fired. It will have to stay to maintain peace and to help in the rehabilitation. That is the Army's traditional role in any conflict and it will be the same in any war of the future.

When the Navy's task is to support the Army its task is manifold. The Navy is responsible for the safe transport of our troops overseas. It is the Navy's responsibility to keep our expeditionary forces amply supplied with food, ammunition, medical supplies, and all other equipment that is needed to keep an army moving forward. In Korea as well as anywhere on earth where war rears its ugly head our battleships, carriers, and destroyers will support our ground forces and ground operations with pinpoint gunfire. Not only at Inchon but on the entire perimeter of Korea our warships made coastal highways and railways, troop concentrations and production plants useless to the Communist forces. The Navy is prepared to fulfill that mission in support of the Army wherever water is deep enough for the keels of our combat vessels.

In return, the Army has and will hold the bases and ports of entry our fleets need to command the overseas operations of the national defense team. In Korea the Air Force needed the Navy to transport fighter planes, every drop of aviation gasoline, gallons of oil, airplanes parts, and equipment that that gallant sister service needed in its vital task.

Thus, in the ground operation—and in whatever call to arms the future may bring—the Navy will be a full partner in the national defense team, each part of which is essential to the other two.

The Marine Corps, an essential and integrated part of the Navy, won new battle honors for our flag in the Korean engagements. As specialists in amphibious operations, as masters in the art of close ground combat, as well as excelling in the close air support of our ground troops, the Marine Corps proved itself at Masan and Inchon. Naval aviation, from the grotesque helicopter to the huge sleek neptunes, once again demonstrated in Korea the Navy's ability to carry out its assigned missions.

In all techniques of modern warfare the Navy has demonstrated its readiness. Whether we have enough of the instruments of warfare is a question which is being resolved. In the so-called mothball fleet, consisting of the Navy's reserve warships and lesser craft, we have a pool of resources which can be readily activated for any emergency.

As Admiral Sherman, the Chief of Naval Operations, has informed the Armed Services Committee of Congress our active fleet is in the process of being reinforced by scores of ships from this mothball fleet, after recommissioning and modernization. Carriers which were adequate for the demands of 1945 are being modernized to keep abreast of the advances in the science of war which our research of the last 5 years has produced.

Submarine warfare is one of the Navy's primary missions. This aspect of naval warfare is presently the No. 1 study of the United States Navy and I can assure you that devices are now emerging from the experimental stage which promises to return to antisubmarine warfare the advantages formerly held over surface ships by modern submarines. The results of our research in the modern marvels of electronics and the techniques of their unlimited application truly give us reason for optimism in our thinking.

The day of great surface fleet engagements is probably something of the past. We will probably never hear again about rival floating fortresses slamming away at each other as at Surigao Straits in World War II. There is no potential enemy who has the naval forces to match or even approach ours in types and numbers, nevertheless, we will need all that the Navy can afford to keep afloat, from carriers to landing craft, to

insure the speediest and most effective response to any threat against our security or the peace of the world wherever it may appear on the globe.

With our fleets in the Pacific, the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, the potential spots of eruption are all within relatively few hours of punitive action by our Navy.

Therefore, I say, that the effective protection of American lives, of American territory and of the lives and territory of our allies is the major mission of the United States Navy. The cost of meeting this responsibility may be high in dollars but it will be low in comparison with the value received. The Navy has the capability to fulfill its historical mission of keeping the horrors of war from our own shores. With the Army and the Air Force it is dedicated to defend your liberty and the sacred right of free men to live in happiness and peace in a free world.

Mr. McCORMICK. King Football is with us once again, and with him, the excitement of passing and broken-field running, the frenzied roar of the crowd, the thrill of upsets, but the only upets aren't on the gridiron, America. Behind the men meeting Communist aggression in Korea, behind the mountain of supplies that feed their strength lies another kind of upset, far more important to most of you, believe me, than Purdue's 28 over Notre Dame's 14. Here with a "play-by-play" description of the impact of war in Korea upon the Nation's budget, hence upon every pay envelope in these United States, here is the Nation's "finance quarterback," the Director of the Budget, Fred Lawton.

Mr. LAWTON. The action of the United States in world affairs is a major factor in determining the size of the Federal budget. Events of the past 4 months have amply demonstrated this fact. Since the attack in Korea, we have more than doubled the $14,000,000,000 originally planned for military purposes in this fiscal year. We are going to have to increase the amount still further. By next year, well over half of the budget will be devoted to defense.

These increased military expenditures are going to require a good deal of the manpower and materials we have been using to produce civilian goods. Consequently, it has been necessary to take measures which will help raise our total production and keep our mounting defense spending from causing inflation. The people producing military equipment are getting more dollars in their pay envelopes, but there is no increase in the amount of goods they can buy. These added dollars increase the competition for the available goods and push prices up. Furthermore, unless we can halt inflation, we shall be spending more dollars for defense without getting our money's worth. Our dollars would be going for increased prices rather than for more defense.

So far we have attacked the problems on four fronts:

First, Congress passed the Defense Production Act early in September. Under this act Federal agencies are taking steps to conserve materials, give priority to defense contracts, and stimulate capacity for expansion in critical industries.

Second, steps have been taken to reduce the volume of new credit in both the housing and consumer credit fields. This helps to relieve the upward pressure on prices.

Third, a tight rein was held on nonmilitary expenditures in this year's budget. Since Korea, it has been pulled even tighter. Congress directed the executive branch to cut at least $550,000,000 from the funds it voted in the general appropriation act. Last week I announced the reductions which had been applied to 31 departments and agencies in the 1951 fiscal year. The total amounted to more than $580,000,000. Congress directed that this cut-back should be made without impairing national defense. We have made the saving serve two additional purposes. It will conserve materials and manpower needed for defense, and it will reduce the inflationary effects of lending programs.

Fourth, Congress has passed a tax measure which the President calls the first installment. This is expected to bring in about $4,500,000,000 a year. The best way to support our defense expenditures—and check inflation—is to increase taxes. While taxes hit the pocketbooks of all of us, they divide the cost of the defense program more fairly than inflation, which hurts those with low or fixed incomes the most.

We must spread the burden fairly because our Government expenditures will have to be very high for years to come.

Mr. McCORMICK. Far beyond the thirty-eighth parallel—in some places as much as 100 miles deep—ranges the United Nations fast-rolling military machine. Wonson is ours. And relentlessly our troops are advancing on Pyongyang, the North Korean capital—fresh back from Korea, where he has been with our armed forces virtually from the moment war began, comes our next guest. A combat infantryman in the last war—in this, his job has been to gather the news for our Defense Department. He is prepared to report to us specifically on the cost of war as he has seen it—and also, tell us something of the problems of our war correspondents, who are engaged in perhaps one of the most difficult reportorial assignments in history. Ladies and gentlemen—meet military correspondent Maj. Wes McPherson.

Major McPHERSON. Yes, warfare is an expensive business. And this thing in Korea has been no exception. But that's part of the price we must pay for freedom. It takes lots of guns, ammunition and tanks to take a hill. And in Korea there's an expression: "over the hills, more hills." I've seen the toll that must be paid to win a hill in Korea.

The American people probably pay more in dollars and cents for a battle won than any people in the world. But because they do, the cost in lives is smaller. But I think this is common knowledge to most Americans who have been following the struggle in Korea in their newspapers, on radio and television—following it from the on-the-scene reports obtained by the war correspondents there.

Less familiar, however, has been the story of the correspondents themselves—or the story behind the story. The correspondents in Korea have a higher rate of casualties than in any past conflict. And their ratio of killed to wounded-and-missing has been even greater than among the combat infantrymen—more than 50 percent of all correspondent casualties have been fatal.

The nature of the warfare in Korea and the enemy there has made the area behind the lines almost as dangerous as the front. Actually, it has become well established that the area of greatest danger has not always been on the front line, but frequently between the command posts and the front line. There where infiltrating enemy patrols and snipers often moved 24 hours a day, to travel except in strong groups was almost the kiss of death. The correspondents, because they had to travel fast, had to travel alone. They were seldom able to wait for convoys or organized groups for protection.

Let me cite from my own experience some examples typical of the risks correspondents had to take, not only to get the story, but to bring it back. One day, on the front, below Taegu, several correspondents and I had completed a recording of an action and were ready to return to the air strip at Taegu to take a plane back to Tokyo where I had to make my short-wave broadcast to the States. It was then that we learned that the road over which we had traveled to reach the forward position had been cut by an enemy patrol of unknown size. Some of our troops were attacking to clear the road which was a vital battle supply route. We waited an hour, maybe a little more. The enemy had been driven back into the hills but was still able to deliver fire on the road. Then we could wait no longer; we all had a deadline to make. We jumped in a jeep that was going to make a run for it and almost immediately came under an observation and fire from the enemy in the hills which continued for more than a mile. By some miracle of good fortune none of us were hit. We reached the airfield and I got back to Tokyo and made my broadcast deadline that midnight for our official Department of Defense radio program, Time for Defense.

Another time I joined a group of our own Army Signal Corps, still a motion-picture cameraman, at a forward artillery observation post to record the story of a duel between that observation post and enemy tanks and artillery. To reach that position, which was on a newly captured hill, we had to race down a mile and a half of straight road under direct observation of enemy artillery and tanks. To make our deadlines we had to use the same road going out again. Good fortune was with us and we made it. These are typical examples of the risks that correspondents have run to bridge the gap between people at home and the soldier at the front with the gun. Some made it—but some didn't. Such incidents as I've cited have become a matter of normal daily routine for the correspondents in Korea—men like Hal Boyle, Don Whitehead, your NBC camermen Gene and Charlie Jones, and yes, even a woman too—Marguerite Higgins. So, taking advantage of this opportunity, I'd like to say, "Well done" and "continued good luck" to these representatives of our country's great news gathering organizations. They're part of a fine profession which can be justly proud of the work they've been doing in Korea.

Mr. McCORMICK. Europe—as if reminding us it is still there—flares again. In Austria, where the news features Communist-inspired rioting, in Germany, and in similar tinder-boxes throughout the Continent, the signs of unrest are unmistakable. Let us, then, take our eyes off Korea for a moment and—for a first-hand report on Europe—put them on one of America's best-liked ministers abroad. With Presidential Assistant Dr. Steelman standing by to interview her in your behalf—here, in her first television appearance since her return to this country, is the United States Minister to Luxemburg, Mrs. Pearl Mesta.

Dr. STEELMAN. Madam Minister, it's nice to see you again, and even nicer to have you with us on this program. We will be very glad to hear your reactions on what has been happening in Europe. Specifically, how did the people of Europe take the news of the invasion of South Korea?

Mrs. MESTA. I think the Europeans reacted almost the same as we Americans. They were very disturbed—perhaps more disturbed than we were at home, since they are such a short distance from the Russian zone. However, there was no panic, and everyone was vastly relieved at the prompt action of the United Nations.

Dr. STEELMAN. Has this initial reaction changed in any respect, Madam Minister?

Mrs. MESTA. No, except that opposition to aggression has become firmer than ever. The Europeans realize as we do that a strong stand is the only course to follow in the present situation. I think almost everyone in Europe realizes now that they must make a strenuous effort if the free world is to remain free, and they are prepared to do their part.

Dr. STEELMAN. How do people in Europe feel today about the United Nations?

Mrs. MESTA. There can be no doubt that the prestige of the United Nations has risen immeasurably in Europe since the very prompt and effective United Nations action in Korea. I think that before that there were certain misgivings—some people were prone to look back to the days of the League of Nations and feel that the UN might go

the way of the League. They were afraid that a Russian veto would effectively immobilize the UN were rapid action necessary to settle a crisis in some distant corner of the world. But the way in which the United Nations acted in the Korean invasion and the excellent results obtained, have done a great deal to renew peoples' faith. They have regained their confidence in the United Nations and feel, once again, that there might be some way to find peace through international organization. And I might add they are heartily grateful and thankful to the United States for the way our American boys have fought in Korea.

Dr. STEELMAN. I wonder, Madam Minister, if you could give us some of your reactions about the United States? Sometimes it is difficult for those of us who don't travel to see any marked changes; whereas an observant person coming home after living abroad for sometime can readily see very distinct changes.

Mrs. MESTA. Mr. Steelman, one of the first things I noticed and which, I might say, gave a tug at my heart strings, was a line of young men in Union Station in Washington, under the care of a Marine sergeant, bound for training camp. It is sad to see our young men going back into uniform. I have also felt an air of determination, coupled with a feeling of urgency, when I have discussed recent developments with my friends. They are determined to see this thing through and believe that we must strengthen our defenses as promptly as possible. They feel that the fate of the world hangs upon the forceful action the free nations take during the months ahead and they hope and pray that through effective united action a lasting peace can be secured. I might add a note of caution to what I have just said. I have been asked by several Europeans if the end of the war in Korea would mean that the United States defense effort would be slowed down. Of course, what they were driving at was that if we didn't propose to continue strengthening our defenses they would not continue strengthening theirs. To this, my reply has been that the United States does not intend to slow down. On the contrary, we are going to step up our defense production and they must do likewise.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Thus the Nation, America—as representatives of the Nation on the Army, Navy, and Diplomatic front have come before our cameras to report to you—looks from Washington this mid-October Sunday.

Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another "Teledocumentary"—this, then, against the background of battle-front Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your tenth "Battle Report, Washington."

Summary of Legislation of Committee on Banking and Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith submit a summary of the legislation to date acted upon by the Committee on Banking and Currency during the second session of this the Eighty-first Congress. The legislation affects many phases of our national economy, and after the Korean outbreak the committee devoted its efforts to measures designed to conserve our resources, channel our productive capacity into necessary defense production, and stabilize our economy against inflation in order to promote the national defense and security.

For easy reading and continuity of subject matter, the legislation has been grouped under general headings, and subjects dealing with those general headings are summarized thereunder. For the further convenience of the Members, the public law number and the House report numbers, including conference reports, are listed immediately under the heading of each measure for ready reference to more detailed descriptions and analyses of the matter concerned. For the further information of the Members, I would like to call their attention to the fact that the summary of the committee's activities during the first session of this Congress may be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 16, beginning at page A6790.

All but three of the measures acted upon by the Committee on Banking and Currency have been enacted into law. Of these three, two have passed the House and are pending in the Senate and the other is pending before the House Committee on Rules.

The summary follows:

ECONOMIC MEASURES

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

(Public Law 774; H. Repts. Nos. 2759 and 3042)

This law, which was enacted after the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, provides broad authorities for mobilizing materials for the defense program and for protection of the civilian economy.

The President is authorized to require priority for national defense contracts and to allocate necessary materials and facilities. It is made unlawful to hoard materials designated by the President as scarce materials. Equipment and materials needed for the national defense may be requisitioned by the President and provision is made for payment of just compensation.

The President may authorize Government procurement agencies to guarantee financing institutions against loss on loans made to finance national defense contracts. To expedite production for national defense the President is authorized to make or guarantee loans for expansion of capacity, development of technological processes or production of essential materials. Further encouragement to needed production is contained in procurement authority granted the President to purchase or make commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other raw materials for Government use or resale. Two billion dollars is authorized for the loan and purchase authorities.

To prevent economic disturbances and interferences with effective mobilization of national resources, the President is authorized to undertake price and wage stabilization on a voluntary, selective or over-all control basis. Voluntary control programs approved by the President are exempted from antitrust laws. In the event selective price controls are imposed, wages must be stabilized in the particular industry producing such material or service. Over-all price controls and wage stabilization are required whenever ceilings have been established on a substantial part of all sales at retail and materially affecting the cost of living.

In the settlement of labor disputes affecting national defense, primary reliance is placed upon mediation and conciliation through negotiation and collective-bargaining processes. To this end, the President may initiate voluntary conferences between management, labor, and designated representatives of the Government and the public, and take action agreed upon in such conference.

Authority is granted for regulation of consumer and real-estate construction credit to conserve resources for defense needs and to help control inflation. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is authorized to exercise consumer credit controls and the President is authorized to prescribe regulations preventing excessive or untimely use of real-estate construction credit. He is further authorized to curtail real-estate loans made, insured, or guaranteed by United States Government agencies, but in doing so must preserve the relative credit preferences accorded veterans under existing law.

Provision is made for encouragement of small business enterprises to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of the act through use of advisory committees, full dissemination of information, exemptions when feasible, and expeditious handling of requests, applications, and appeals.

TEXAS CITY TIN SMELTER

(Public Law 723; H. Repts. Nos. 2270 and 2911)

This act provides a 5-year extension (to June 30, 1956) in the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (1) to buy, sell, and transport tin, and tin ore and concentrates; (2) to improve, develop, maintain, and operate by lease or otherwise the Government owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.; and (3) to finance research in tin smelting and processing.

The Texas City Tin Smelter is the only tin smelter in the Western Hemisphere. Its production of this critical material was of major importance to the defense needs of the country in World War II and in the ensuing years. The smelter has facilities to treat the entire Bolivian ore production, which would provide for approximately two-thirds of United States consumption under strict wartime controls. The 5-year extension in authority for operation of this facility will provide needed flexibility in making contracts with foreign countries and producers for ore supplies.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK FOREIGN INVESTMENT GUARANTIES

(H. R. 8083; H. Rept. No. 1960)

Late last year the committee favorably reported H. R. 5594, a bill which would vest in the Export-Import Bank of Washington the power to guarantee United States investments abroad. This was designed to implement a part of the President's point 4 program to assist underdeveloped areas of the world to improve the economic status of their peoples. The proposed guaranty authority would not permit guaranties covering ordinary business risks, but would only relate to losses due to inconvertibility of currencies or losses due to expropriation, confiscation, or seizure by action of public authority. It was felt that protection against these risks peculiar to foreign investment would stimulate the flow of American private capital to the underdeveloped areas of the world.

In this session of Congress, the committee reported a substitute bill, H. R. 8083, which dealt with the same subject matter as the previously reported bill but differed in two particulars in that specific provision was made for the charging of an appropriate fee for guaranties issued and the aggregate amount of such guaranties was limited to $250,000,000 outstanding at any one time. As the bill passed the House, provision was further made requiring that there be in effect between the foreign country and the United States a treaty or agreement adequately protecting nationals of the United

States against discriminatory action by the foreign country.

BANKING, CREDIT, AND FINANCE

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT

(Public Law 797; H. Repts. Nos. 2564 and 3049)

This act increases the insurance coverage on individual deposits in banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from $5,000 to $10,000. It provides a reduction in the cost of deposit insurance to insured banks by making provision for a credit to the banks of a percentage of the net assessment paid each year. This premium-credit formula, while providing for a reduction in the assessments paid by the banks, at the same time adequately protects the FDIC insurance reserves because the premium credit only becomes available when current assessments received by the FDIC are adequate to pay operating expenses and losses. The banks receive a credit of 60 percent of net assessment income and the remaining 40 percent goes into the FDIC insurance reserves.

This act also requires the FDIC to repay to the Treasury prior to July 1, 1951, approximately $80,000,000, which represents simple interest on the capital funds originally advanced to the FDIC by the Treasury and Federal Reserve banks, which capital funds of some $289,000,000 have already been repaid to the Treasury. This act also provides for simplification in the computation of the assessment base, and gives the FDIC under certain conditions the authority to make special examination of all insured banks. The act also contains other amendments of a technical nature designed to strengthen the Federal deposit-insurance law.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS DIRECT-PURCHASE AUTHORITY

(Public Law 589; H. Rept. No. 2359)

This act extends the authority of the 12 Federal Reserve banks to purchase directly from the Treasury Government obligations up to $5,000,000,000. This direct-purchase authority would have expired June 30, 1950, and this act extended the authority for an additional 2 years to June 30, 1952. This authority assists in the management of the Government's finances in such a way as to promote the stability and good health of the Nation's economy rather than subjecting it to periodic strains. Without this authority, the Treasury would have to maintain larger cash balances which would, of course, increase interest costs to the Government.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK SYSTEM AND FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

(Public Law 576; H. Rept. No. 1540)

This act makes several important changes in the operation of the Federal Home Loan Bank System which serves as a permanent reservoir of credit for thrift and home-financing institutions such as savings and loan associations, building and loan associations, cooperative banks, homestead associations, and savings banks. It also makes important changes in the law governing the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation which insures savings accounts in Federal Savings and Loan Associations and those State-chartered institutions which are members of the Corporation.

With respect to the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the act:

1. Provides for acceleration of the retirement of Government-owned capital in the Federal home-loan banks. All such stock will be retired within 3 years.

2. Provides a statutory range of minimum liquidity requirements for members of any Federal home-loan bank.

3. Provides standby Treasury support of the Federal home-loan banks through purchase of their obligations up to an amount of $1,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time. Such Treasury support would only be used in event of an emergency and is similar to Government support provided to other financial agencies of the Government.

With respect to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the act:

1. Increases the maximum insurance of individual accounts in insured savings and loan associations and building and loan associations from $5,000 to $10,000.

2. Provides for an orderly retirement of the Government-owned capital stock of the Corporation.

3. Provides for a reduction in the insurance premium rate from one-eighth to one-twelfth of 1 percent.

4. Authorizes the Corporation to borrow from the Treasury for insurance purposes up to $750,000,000.

The institutions that are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation play an important part in our economy. They promote and encourage thrift and systematic savings, and at the same time meet a most important need in the home financing requirements of their communities.

PUBLIC DEPOSITS IN NATIONAL BANKS

(Public Law 715; H. Rept. No. 2271)

This act would permit national banks to accept and give security for deposits of funds made (1) by agencies or governmental instrumentalities of one or more States or political subdivisions thereof, and (2) by officers, employees, or agents, in their official capacities, of States and political subdivisions or other governmental instrumentalities to the same extent as is authorized in the case of other banking institutions in the State in which the national bank is located. National banks now have the authority to accept deposits and give security therefor in the case of funds deposited by States or political subdivisions thereof, and this act extends such authority in the manner indicated above.

NATIONAL BANKS IN TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

(H. R. 7340; H. Rept. No. 2916)

This bill, H. R. 7340, passed by the House on August 21, 1950, and pending in the Senate, concerns the reserves required to be kept by national banks that are not members of the Federal Reserve System and are located in Alaska and the insular possessions or any part of the United States outside the continental limit of the United States. Under existing law the lawful money reserve requirements of such banks is an amount equal to at least 15 percent of the aggregate amount of the bank's deposits. Three-fifths of such reserve may consist of balances with other national banks, and the other two-fifths must consist of cash in the vault. The bill would reduce the amount of such reserve required to be kept in cash to one-fifth.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK BRANCH BUILDINGS

(S. 3105; H. Rept. No. 2565)

This bill, S. 3105, reported by the Committee on July 14, 1950, and pending before the Committee on Rules would modify the limitations now contained in the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the cost of buildings at branches of the Federal Reserve banks. The bill would authorize the Federal Reserve banks to purchase or construct needed branch buildings without regard to the present statutory cost limitations so long as the aggregate of all costs incurred thereafter for branch-bank buildings did not exceed $10,000,000. The requirements of the several Federal Reserve banks with respect to branch building facilities cannot be met within the limitations of existing law, and the bill would provide the same relief as was provided in the act of July 30, 1947.

HOUSING

HOUSING ACT OF 1950

(Public Law 475; H. Repts. Nos. 1686 and 1893)

This act, which was enacted in April of this year, perfected and expanded Federal Housing legislation in several important respects. It has had an important effect on the extremely high production of housing, which prior to the cut-backs necessitated by the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, promised to give the production of an estimated 1,300,000 housing units this year. Such a level of housing would far have exceeded the production of housing units in any previous year.

Important changes and additions were authorized for the FHA mortgage insurance programs, additional incentives were made available under the GI home program, the purchase authority of the government secondary market for home mortgages was increased, special authorization was made available for housing at educational institutions, and a program was developed for the orderly disposal of government owned war and veteran housing. The principal additions to the existing Federal housing programs are outlined in the following summary.

1. Amendments to the National Housing Act

FHA insurance authority for home modernization and repair loans was extended to July 1, 1955, the authorization was set at $1,250,000,000 and a new and more equitable formula for calculating the insurance was provided.

A new program was provided to meet the particular problems of insurance of mortgages on small homes in suburban and outlying areas with appropriate flexibility in insurance limits to meet the needs in high cost areas. For this program an insurance authorization of $250,000,000 was made.

The FHA insurance authority with respect to sales and rental housing was adjusted to provide incentives for the production of lower-cost housing, particularly units with three and four bedrooms.

A new section 213 was added to title II of the National Housing Act providing more liberal insurance provisions for mortgage loans on cooperative housing projects, particularly those of veteran groups and the administration of the program was placed in the hands of a new Assistant Commissioner of FHA appointed for that specific purpose.

Mortgage insurance authorization for FHA title II, the basic mortgage insurance title of the National Housing Act, was increased by $2,250,000,000 and FHA section 608 rental housing insurance authorization was increased by $500,000,000.

2. Increased secondary market authorization

An additional $250,000,000 authorization was made available to the Federal National Mortgage Association for the purchase of FHA insured and VA guaranteed home loans and further safeguards were established for the exercise of this mortgage purchase authority.

3. Amendments to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

Amendments made to the home loan provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 include (a) extension of maximum maturity from 25 to 30 years, (b) increase in maximum amount of the home loan guaranty from $4,000 or 50 percent of the loan to $7,500 or 60 percent of the loan, (c) provision for the guaranty of farm home loans, (d) home loan benefits for unremarried widows of veterans, (e) preservation of home loan benefits for veterans in certain cases where a veteran loses his GI aided home by action or circumstances over which he has no control, (f) requirement of minimum construction standards and (g) termination of the FHA-VA combination loan authority.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act was further amended by providing $150,000,000 of stand-by authority for direct home loans to veterans in certain cases where financing is not otherwise available.

4. *Housing loans to educational institutions*

Authority was granted the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans, not exceeding 40 years in maturity and at an interest rate of one-fourth of 1 percent over the Federal going rate, to educational institutions for the construction or modernization of housing facilities for students and faculties. An authorization of $300,000,000 was provided for such purposes.

5. *Disposal of Government-owned war and veterans' housing*

A new title VI was added to the Lanham Act providing for the orderly disposition of all war and veterans' housing under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Appropriate safeguards were established to insure best disposition of such units, both permanent and temporary units, and to minimize any hardships incident to the transfer of ownership and control from the Government.

As noted above, since passage of this act the impact of the defense program on materials and manpower has necessitated a cut-back in housing programs and this has been ordered under authority of the Defense Production Act of 1950. Hence it has been necessary to modify and even temporarily suspend the operation of certain of the programs above outlined.

MILITARY RENTAL HOUSING INSURANCE

(Public Law 498; H. Rept. No. 1860)

In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress there was enacted Public Law 211 which authorized FHA mortgage insurance for rental housing constructed by private enterprise to serve the needs of personnel at military reservations. Public Law 498 amended that act primarily with respect to the procedure to be followed by prospective project sponsors. Under the old law, prospective sponsors prepared their own plans and specifications and it proved complicated and time-consuming to select the best sponsor from among the several submitting propositions because each proposition was based on different plans and specifications. The principal amendment made by Public Law 498 changed the procedure so that the armed services could enter into contracts with architects and engineers for the preparation of plans and specifications under arrangements whereby the fees for such services are later assumed by the successful sponsor. This permits a uniform procedure of competitive bidding whereby the award can be made to the lowest responsible bidder. It is providing an important impetus to this type of needed housing construction.

SHANKS VILLAGE HOUSING PROJECT

(Public Law 827; H. Rept. No. 2917)

This act relates only to the Shanks Village housing project located in Rockland County, N. Y. This veterans' temporary housing project, containing 1,500 units, is owned by the Government. Some 4 years ago the Government entered into contracts with Columbia University and the Citizens' Veterans Homes Association of Rockland County whereby the university and the association, in return for the right to refer tenants to the project, assumed certain obligations with respect to possible deficits in the operation of the project by the Government and with respect to ultimate removal of the units. In the past 4 years operation of the project by the Government has produced $475,000 of net income, which has been retained by the Government. This act authorizes and directs the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, upon request of the other respective parties to the above-mentioned contracts, to release them from the contracts. At such time the project will then revert to the same status as other temporary war and veterans' housing remaining under the jurisdiction of the Public Housing Administration and located on land under its control.

RENT CONTROL

HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1950

(Public Law 574; H. Repts. Nos. 2116 and 2285)

This act, enacted prior to the Korean hostilities, continued Federal rent control authority to December 31, 1950, and provided that Federal rent control could be retained in a community until June 30, 1951, if prior to December 31, 1950, and while Federal rent control was still in effect in that community, it declared by resolution of its governing body or by popular referendum that there was need for further continuance of Federal rent control in that community. With respect to local self-determination in the matter of decontrol, such authority was extended to include counties as well as incorporated cities, towns, and villages, and local government determination was made final without need for approval of such action by the governor of the State. The preference or priority afforded veterans of World War II in the purchase or rental of housing accommodations completed after June 30, 1947, was continued for a full year to the close of June 30, 1951.

FARM COMMODITIES

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

(Public Law 579; H. Repts. Nos. 1757 and 2269)

This act increased the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation an additional $2,000,000,000. The previous ceiling on the Corporation's borrowing authority of $4,750,000,000 was set in 1945. The Corporation was created for the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds and fibers, and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, and is the mechanism through which the agricultural price support operations are carried out. Throughout the Corporation's operations the farmers of America are assured of a stable income for their crops, the consumers of America are assured of an adequate supply of foodstuffs, and the economy of the Nation is cushioned against the perils inherent in agricultural production. This act also provides that the conditions under which this country could invoke import fees or quotas on agricultural commodities in order to prevent disruption of domestic farm program shall be continued in any future international trade agreement.

IMPORT CONTROLS

(Public Law 590; H. Rept. No. 2272)

By the terms of this law, import-control authority over fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap, and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products) and rice and rice products was authorized until July 1, 1951, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government. Such authority is desirable to protect farmers' marketing of the oilseed crops and to facilitate the orderly liquidation of surpluses owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

MISCELLANEOUS

RECOINAGE OF SUBSIDIARY SILVER COINS

(Public Law 509; H. Rept. No. 1957)

This act provides that the losses incurred in the recoinage of subsidiary silver coins (10-, 25-, and 50-cent pieces), the wastage incurred in silver coinage, and the cost of distributing silver coins shall be charged to a fund which arises from the coinage of silver bullion into coins of a nominal value exceeding the cost of the bullion. The losses, wastage, and costs referred to above were previously made up by appropriations for the specific purposes enumerated. The act authorizes no expenditures not now authorized but merely permits certain expenses and operations to be chargeable against revenues, rather than be dependent upon annual appropriations.

MEDALS AND PROOF COINS

(Public Law 508; H. Rept. No. 1956)

This act merely provides that the money arising from the manufacture and sale of medals and proof coins shall be reimbursed to the appropriation then current and chargeable for the cost of manufacture and sale of medals and proof coins. Previously the Bureau of the Mint paid for the manufacture of medals and proof coins from funds appropriated for that purpose, but the revenues derived from their sale had to be turned in to the general fund of the Treasury, and could not be used to offset the cost of manufacture. The act merely permits the revenues received to be used to pay the cost of manufacture.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

(Public Law 737; H. Rept. No. 2915)

This act authorizes the conveyance of a stone house and former dock by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the board of trustees of State colleges of the State of Rhode Island to be used by the Narrangansett Marine Biological Laboratory of Rhode Island State colleges for marine research. The site in the authorized transfer involves a little less than 6 acres and the conveyance is conditioned (1) upon the payment to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of an amount equivalent to 50 percent of the appraised value of the property, and (2) that the board of trustees furnish to the Government prior to December 28, 1950, a satisfactory survey of the land involved.

As American Tanks Sweep Victoriously Through Korean Streets, as Crowds of Koreans Having All the Communism That They Can Take, Cheer United Nations Troops as They Break Across the Thirty-eighth Parallel, John Steelman, Assistant to the President, Presents Another "Battle Report—Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I know of no news items which gives me greater knowledge in shorter time or less words about current events than does the teledocumentary broadcast each Sunday afternoon over the National Broadcasting Co. network under the title "Battle Report—Washington."

This, as you have come to know, is the program wherein John Steelman, the Assistant to the President, presents each week—top-flight Federal officials, administrators, and policy makers, who directly report to the American people as to their departmental and personal activities which have to do with current events.

Already, on the series, we have heard and learned a great deal about agriculture, labor, finance, social security, commerce, education, and trade, not alone with respect to the economy of this Nation but to our international economy as well.

We have already heard from many top-flight officials of our armed services—both civil and military. Additionally thereto, a number of GI's from the Navy, Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps, recently returned from the Korean battlefront, have told intimate stories of the successes and achievements as well as some of the reverses and disappointments with which their outfit met in the Korean war. Insofar as I am concerned personally, "Battle Report—Washington" is a Sunday afternoon must.

It is because of the universal interest in this program that I now wish to avail myself of the medium of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and bring to those parts of our Nation which are yet without television the all-important news disseminated over the air and the coaxial cables of the National Broadcasting Co. through "Battle Report—Washington," as telecasted on October 8, 1950.

The telecast was as follows:

ROBERT MCCORMICK. As American tanks sweep victoriously through Korea's streets, as crowds of Koreans—having had all of communism they can take—cheer United Nations troops as they break the thirty-eighth parallel, NBC television invites your attention, so recently trained on the world series, to the far more important struggle for freedom.

Washington—a dot on the east coast of the United States of America, but vital source of strength to the battle to which the arrow points in the Far East, a battle that is fast mounting to a final decision.

Today our cameras isolate Selective Service Director Hershey with a late report on the draft, Labor Secretary Maurice Tobin with the facts on our manpower situation, an ECA official to tell us what's happened to our mission in Korea, an Army observer with some pertinent observations, and three GI's literally "dressed to kill"—but first, let's follow our camera up the driveway to the East Wing of the White House, enter the doors, and visit for a moment with the Assistant to the President—Dr. John Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Another week has passed into history. Once again, through the magic of television, we will meet with Government officials and hear reports on their activities. I wish every man, woman, and child in the world could join with us in these intimate meetings. Especially, I should like to have those behind the iron curtain witness these telecasts. All day long the Kremlin radio stations blare forth messages of hate and incredibly fantastic falsehoods. You, the people of the United States, are pictured as warmongers who are enslaved by greedy monopolists. The Soviet Union is pictured as a paradise on earth.

But because of the cowardice of the men in the Kremlin, none of the enslaved peoples are permitted any other source of information. Never before in history has any despot possessed so much power and so much wealth as the small group which rules the Soviet Union. But still they are not content. They now dictate where a man should live, where he should work and what he wears—they also want to control his thinking—to own his mind as well as his body. That indeed is the epitome of slavery.

I am convinced if the slaves behind the iron curtain could know us as we really are, a peaceful world would result—a world of friends working together to bring happiness and prosperity to all mankind. If they could see these telecasts and come to know the officials of our Government as you do—the mere thought of war would be destroyed.

Today it is my pleasure to present on Battle Report—Washington, the Honorable Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of the Department of Labor, from whom we shall learn not alone of the tremendous contribution that labor is making to our Nation's security and world peace, but particularly as to the manner in which that contribution is being made.

Additionally thereto, we shall have the pleasure of meeting with Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, who will tell us of the problems and the achievements of his administration; Edwin C. Arnold, Director of the Korean Section of ECA; and Capt. Walter Pennio of the United States Army—ex-newspaperman and General MacArthur's former news chief—who has just returned to the States from Korea.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Forward rushes the sweep of UN's victorious troops. Above the thirty-eighth parallel—South Koreans, already 75 miles deep into what was once strictly Red territory. Below the parallel, troops like these—taking prisoners numbered in the scores of thousands. We couldn't help wondering, as perhaps you've wondered, how all this will affect the draft. So we took our cameras down to 1712 G Street, here in Washington, entered the Selective Service headquarters and asked the one man sure to know. Yes, Selective Service Director, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey. Here is General Hershey's answer:

General HERSHEY. The work of the Selective Service System will increase even though we should find a satisfactory solution of the Korean incident. The Selective Service System has before it the target established by the President of the United States as approximately, at least, 3,000,000 men in our Armed Forces. This number of men will require that the Selective Service System reexamine the different sources of manpower from which the number can be drawn. At the present time, the law provides for the responsibility upon those between 19 and 25 years of age. To provide a force of at least 3,000,000 men we will be compelled to use far more of our manpower than we have ever done in the period when we were not at war. I suppose it is well to call our present period a period of tension and then the question comes, how can we best meet the figure of 3,000,000 and disturb all of our manpower the least possible amount in order to permit the ultimate in production. There are many factors that must always be considered. Selective Service at the present time is engaged in filling the call of 170,000 men. These men will be submitted to the Armed Forces in September, October, and November. We do not know as yet what the demand will be by months later on, but it will require that we either increase the age group which does not seem to be the thing to do, or more intensively use those who are in the age bracket 19 to 25. In doing that we must search first of all to increase the acceptability of those that we submit to the Armed Forces; secondly, we must reconsider those who have, now, dependent status, and probably finally we must call on Congress to remove the restriction which now prevails against induction of veterans. If America is to become strong and remain strong, we face the prospect in years ahead of using our young men in the Armed Forces to a much greater degree than we have in recent times. It will mean that the age group between 19 and 25 must bear the larger share of this burden. Perhaps if we are successful as the years go on, we can lessen the time of service, but at the present time the indications are that probably the period of service will have to be increased rather than decreased. It is true that arrangements will have to be made to defer a few of the most important people under 26 years of age, but if we are to meet and maintain the 3,000,000 mark in our manpower, it will mean that practically every person must at some time in his career be ready to give to the greatest country on earth, as a service tax, some 30 months of his life.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Propaganda leaflets rained down upon Korea help to assure our armies of a friendly reception. But the victory itself must be won by men on the battlefield armed with machines born of our production lines at home. General Hershey has told us how many more the draft will siphon out of our manpower stream. Question: How will this affect industry—industry which supplies our guns, planes, tanks? This time we send our cameras through the door of the Department of Labor and find at his desk, prepared to answer these questions—Labor Secretary Maurice Tobin.

Hon. MAURICE J. TOBIN. Today the United Nations are rapidly bringing the fighting in Korea to a successful conclusion. At the same time, we are mobilizing to build a strong force for not only American defense, but for all the free nations which are associated with us in the United Nations.

During the course of the next several months, more than an additional million people will be added to the Armed Forces. By the first of July next year the total manpower of the Army and Navy and Air Corps will amount to approximately 3,000,000. Now all of this has very serious implications for America's economy.

Admittedly, the impact today has not been great, but we should give consideration to the fact that we have practically full employment in the United States at the present time, that for the first time in the history of America, the average weekly wage of factory workers has gone in excess of $60 a week. There are definite occupational shortages in many areas of the country even right now. But there is no over-all shortage of manpower, but this condition will not remain for very long, because as yet, the economy has not felt the full impact of defense production. There are certain occupational shortages in certain States in the country. The Labor Department has already issued a critical list of skills—approximately 80 in number—in which shortages exist at the present time, or in which there will be shortages in the not-too-distant future. The controls that are in effect at the present time are confined to controls in the allocation of materials and controls in installment credit, which are not very stringent, and probably will be made more stringent. In the not-far-distant future, as the program progresses, it will be necessary to invoke additional controls because inevitably we are going to be running into shortages of labor and shortages of plants, shortages in equipment, and last but not least, probably as important as any, real shortages of manpower.

The manpower situation today differs greatly from the situation in 1940. In 1940 we had 8,000,000 unemployed. Today that figure is down to 2,200,000. There were but 45,000,000 people gainfully employed at the start of World War II. There are 62,000,000 people gainfully employed in the United States at the present time.

So you can readily see in the event we must have all-out mobilization, our man-

power situation is going to be a much more serious problem than it was at any time in World War II. Of course, like yourself, I hope, and we all hope, we will not have to have all-out mobilization, but we definitely must be prepared. That is why the Labor Department and the State employment services of the Nation, with their 1,800 national and district offices, are using every act to help in defense production to make certain defense-production goals are met.

We will have to call on people who are not ordinarily in the work force, are not ordinarily seeking employment. It means much greater utilization of women not now in the work force. Many are with skills which they developed during the last war. It means much greater utilization of handicapped people. We should then remember that we have just completed national Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. Employers of labor who had never used handicapped people before learned of the great contribution that the physically handicapped could make to production. I am confident that a great deal of production effort will come from the working people for and by physically handicapped.

In addition, it will be necessary for us to call upon older and retired workers with great skills. We expect to be able to procure approximately 5,000,000 additional workers from these sources. My advice to anyone who is seeking a defense job is to go to his local employment office. First, learn the opportunities that are to be found in your own community. We are attempting in every possible way to eliminate needless migration. Most people desiring to do defense work are able to find opportunities in their own local communities. I would also strongly urge the employers to take advantage of the facilities of the employment service. There are to be found professional skills that will enable them to handle their difficult personnel jobs in the days that lie ahead.

Now it is a tremendous job, in spite of all of us, and, as Americans, everyone of us should pitch in and do our proportionate share. There will be sacrifices, and taxes are bound to be higher. There are certain materials and the like that we will be able to procure today that we may not be able to procure in the days that lie ahead. But all of us working together in this great defense effort can make America so strong that we can contribute to the strengthening of our allies to the point where we will be able, all giving everything that we have to preserve peace in the world.

Mr. McCORMICK. Soldiers on the march here at home, soldiers battling in Korea's summer heat, soldiers in snow-covered terrain, forced to fight cold and ice as well as the enemy—all bring to the Quartermaster Corps the same question that's on your wife's mind today—yes, clothes. And so now—now we give you Battle Report's own style show, a view of what the well-dressed GI is presently wearing in combat and a preview of what he'll be wearing tomorrow, all done—(aside) within the limits of television, of course—somewhat like a very special strip-tease. At the microphone, style-conscious Dave Brinkley.

DAVE BRINKLEY. First on Battle Report's runway, Pfc Carl McInnis from Dothan, Ala., modeling the uniform worn by GI's in Korea today, and fully equipped with M-1 rifle, cartridge belt, and pack. That object attached on the outside is what the Army likes to call his entrenching tool—just the thing for digging foxholes this season.

His uniform is of a cotton fabric, herringbone twill. Outer layer, jacket and trousers, topped by steel helmet.

Under the jacket, a layer of cotton underwear.

Now let's take a look inside his pack. There are his rations, his change of socks, and here is his toilet kit, containing razor, soap, towel, and toothbrush.

And this handy item is called a poncho. That's Army for raincoat.

Now the well-dressed GI you're about to see is Pvt. Peter Stefanchik, of Yonkers, N. Y. He is showing you what they'll be wearing in Korea this coming winter, in fact, part of the outfit will be issued around the middle of this month.

He is dressed in what is known as the wet-cold uniform—designed on the Army's layer principle—outer layer, wind resistant and water repellent, inner clothing of wool materials, which makes the most use of air pockets as insulation.

Let's ask Private Stefanchik to go into his strip tease.

Upper body wear—observe the private's field jacket serving as an outer shell—wind resistant and water repellent. Beneath this another jacket of field pile. This normally is worn in extreme temperatures, and is carried with him at other times.

Under both jackets—a high-neck sweater slipover, which covers a flannel shirt.

Next the undershirt—50 percent wool and 50 percent cotton.

Now if you'll give the private's feet the eye, you'll see the Army's answer to the soldier's age-old problem of trench foot—a waterproof boot, part rubber, inside of which is worn a felt insole and two pairs of wool ski socks. He's given an extra change of socks so he can dry the wet ones against his body next day.

Now the Army's dry-cold uniform, designed to protect our GI's in temperatures where there's always snow on the ground, always below freezing—this apparition is Corp. John W. Lemon, of Pittsburgh.

The overwhite is worn purely for camouflage purposes.

Under that we find his costume varies from the wet-cold only in this way—the outer layer is a parka shell, with a parka lining, and with the hood attached.

Note the hood, if you will—it's provided with an extension that has a fur ruff, with a malleable wire inside so he can adjust it around his face to protect him from snow and wind.

The feet, too, are specially covered—the outer layer consists of muckluk boots—the sole made of very flexible leather * * * and the upper part of canvas. They're not waterproof because they don't need to be where the weather is always below freezing. Inside each boot he wears heavy felt socks, plus two pairs of ski socks, plus a wool cushion, plus two felt insoles.

And that's what the well-dressed GI is wearing this season. The Quartermaster Corps has issued him everything that goes with the finest kind of clothing—except hand-painted neckties.

Mr. McCORMICK. War cuts deeper scars on Korea every day, breeds havoc, havoc that leaves in its wake torn and divided families, starvation, demolished homes, disrupted transportation. Caught in Korea when war erupted was a mission of the Economic Cooperation Administration, sent there to help the new Republic of Korea to get on its economic feet. Since attached to the unified command, they've been doing yeoman service during the fighting, helping to sustain the civilian economy. For a more complete report on how this mission is carrying on in Korea, we focus now upon the Acting Director of the Korean Section of ECA, Edwin G. Arnold.

EDWIN G. ARNOLD. After most of Korea was overrun, obviously, our original program had to be thrown into the discard, at least temporarily. But members of the ECA staff remained in Korea, attached to the unified command, to do everything in their legal power to help maintain the civilian economy and keep the wheels of industry turning 24 hours a day. This was most essential to the UN military action.

The technical men succeeded in boosting textile production in the Pusan area to nearly the total of the whole Republic prior to the war; power experts coaxed diesel, steam, and hydroelectric plants to put out sufficient juice to keep the lights on in the factories, and other ECA experts worked around the clock to help keep urgently needed supplies rolling through the ports and along the rails. Financial experts helped the Korean Government fight inflation. Still others helped coordinate contributions of relief supplies from many United Nations members.

In early September the picture changed again, as rapidly as it had changed with the North Korean onslaught. United Nations forces launched an attack at Inchon, quickly moved on to Seoul, and in a matter of days almost the whole of the southern peninsula was in United Nations' hands. With this, ECA's task doubled, if not trebbled.

Responsibility for civilian relief is now in the hands of the unified command. ECA is now charged with implementing and augmenting the task which was our original objective, to assist and advise the Republic of Korea in organizing and rebuilding its economy.

We know that a lot of damage has been done. Most of Seoul is rubble. The same is true of Taejon, Pohang and a dozen other towns. The power system has been seriously damaged, and transportation and communications equipment wrecked. The civilian population in some urban areas stands close to starvation and, in the months to come, may be faced with death by disease and exposure. Inflation is again a serious threat.

Members of ECA's mission returned to Seoul a few days ago to assist in patching up whatever facilities are left, to assess the damage, and begin the purchase of urgently needed supplies.

Congressional appropriation of funds for Korea for the current fiscal year is $90,000,000. Since the invasion, we have spent more than twenty-one million, including some left over from last year's funds. Of the ninty million for this year more than half will go for the purchase of fertilizer, cotton, rubber, coal, and petroleum products. About thirty million is earmarked for supplies to rehabilitate docks, warehouses, electric-power installations and industrial projects.

Ultimately, the United Nations will carry the burden of the rehabilitation and recovery work, to make Korea a free, independent and virile democracy, with a free and healthy economy.

Meanwhile, ECA will carry on with its original objective of helping a peace-loving people achieve economic stability, free from outside support.

Mr. McCORMICK. As you can see, war is not all "guns and glory." Much of it is nothing more than drudgery, mud, and slime. Yes, the good earth in Korea is hard to take when it's wet. Skilled observers accompany our troops to note their reactions under tough combat conditions, that our Armed Forces may learn whatever lessons are to be learned for future reference. Such eagle-eyed and keen minded observers were in the seige of Taegu, landed with the marines at Inchon, and only yesterday, an old friend who is one of them—an exnewsman and MacArthur's former news chief—just returned Stateside, dropped by to see me at our NBC television offices. For the first-hand observations of a skilled observer—meet combat infantryman, Capt. Walter Pennino.

Is it as bad this time as it was last time around?

Captain PENNINO. Yes, Bob; it's just as bad and it's quite rough out there.

Mr. McCORMICK. Shall we say this is the roughest yet?

Captain PENNINO. I don't think the infantrymen kid themselves about it. I don't think that the combat infantryman hopes for any better break than dust and mud and a hot meal and an occasional shower, and of course, the mail from home. Otherwise, other than that, there is very little he can

do to make himself comfortable. The area of Korea is just not one of those places where you can be clean and comfortable.

Of course, nobody is scrounging around the countryside the way they did in World War II. The things that are available there are just not edible and there is quite a bit of dysentery and the boys don't want any of that. The C and K rations are good enough for them. They have seen what dysentery can do to good men. Of course, you have probably heard about the horrible smells out there. They are just as bad as people say they are and because of these odors the boys can't really develop a real appetite. The odors are caused by the fertilizer which is night soil and the people continue to fertilize their crops much as they have for centuries. What makes matters worse is that the boys not only have to eat near these places and have to smell these odors, they also have to work in it. They have to dig their gun emplacements and their slit trenches and foxholes.

The water situation wasn't much different. It wasn't drinkable. However, there was a lot of it. The engineers operating the water point purifying the water and water points all over the front lines. The bad situation was that you couldn't count on the water point being in the same place that you had seen it yesterday, the reason being that the engineers not only had to operate these large canvas tanks and water-purification units, but they also had to defend them because of the infiltration. The North Korean Communists had a talent for coming in on the flanks and in the rear of artillery batteries and such units as water point.

The village offered little more comfort than the sparse hillside or the stenchy rice fields. Probably the only comfort out of the village was that you had some cover from the rain but, of course, the odors were still with you. This dust they tell you about is a very fine red powder that settles every place—choking dust. The men wore handkerchiefs over their faces and looked pretty much like wild-west bandits.

There may have been rougher, dirtier, more dismal places to fight a war, but it would be sheer folly to tell the gallant men of the Twenty-fourth Division and the Twenty-fifth and First Cavalry Divisions different. For them it is the roughest ever. Of course, it should be. The only relief from the dust was mud if you had a preference for discomfort.

Mr. McCORMICK. Thus the Nation, America—as men working behind the battle in this Nation's Capital have come before our cameras to report to you—thus the Nation stands this ——— day of war. Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another Teledocumentary—this, then, against the background of battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your ninth Battle Report, Washington.

Austrian Restitution Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter of October 4, 1950, which I addressed to the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, together with the reply from the Department of State signed by Ben. H. Brown, Jr., in which letters there is set forth information which I believe will be of interest to Senators concerning the proposals pending in the Austrian Parliament to amend the restitution legislation and the commendable efforts of our Government to point out the undesirable character of these amendments to Austrian leaders.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 4, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
State Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have recently been disappointed to learn that several of the political parties in Austria are introducing and supporting undesirable amendments to the restitution law, and would greatly appreciate learning from you what steps our Government is taking to secure thoughtful reconsideration of these policies by the Austrians and if possible to prevent the enactment of the amendments.

The restitution of looted property, according to my understanding, has been an important point in allied wartime and postwar policy. The principle is also in accord with every civilized concept of justice. Austria has had such a restitution law for sometime, but now, in an apparent bid for the votes of the pardoned "minor Nazis" both the People's Party and the Socialist Party have proposed amendments to the restitution law which would effectively emasculate it.

It is unfortunate that the restitution program has not already been completed by this date, 5½ years after the Nazi defeat. For a friendly country to amend the law so as to reopen past cases and impede pending cases would be even worse.

I am confident you will agree that Austria will prejudice its position before the world if it should finally adopt such amendments, and I hope the representatives of our Government can advise the leaders in Austria that any such course would arouse serious criticism in this country. I shall be grateful for any information which you can send to me on this matter.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 11, 1950.

The Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: The Department refers to your letter of October 4, 1950, regarding your concern over the recent amendments to Austrian restitution legislation introduced into the Austrian Parliament.

You will be interested to know that strong representations to the Austrian Government were made by the legation in Vienna within a few days after the bill to amend restitution legislation was introduced into the Austrian Parliament in July.

The Department shares fully your feeling that amendments to the restitution legislation that would reopen past cases, would be completely contrary to the policy of protecting Nazi persecutees that the United States has constantly emphasized in its negotiation with the Austrian Government.

You may be assured that the Department will be do everything in its power to insure that undesirable amendments to the restitution legislation do not become law.

Sincerely yours,

BEN H. BROWN, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations
(For the Secretary of State).

The Medill Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address by Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, delivered on the Chicago Tribune of the Air, over WGN, WGNB, and the Mutual Broadcasting System, Saturday, October 7, 1950:

The Library of Congress has given to Senator TOBEY, and the latter has published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a letter written by Joseph Medill to Congressman Washburne on January 14, 1863, never before published, suggesting that Vicksburg and Port Hudson should be taken; Arkansas and Texas conquered; Louisiana would fall to the holder of the Mississippi; then the war should be stopped, leaving to the Confederacy the States of North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi to be conquered when convenient, and that Canada should be taken.

Of the seven States which Medill would have let secede, the poverty of the soil of Georgia was well known. Florida was practically a swamp. The other four States were poor in resources.

In my biography of Grant, I pointed out how strong the Southeastern States were with the labyrinth of Virginia to the north, the sand bars off the coast, and the Appalachian Mountains to the west.

Medill considered that all the generals except Grant were either slavery men or incompetent, and he was right. Sherman's biographer, Lloyd Lewis, says that Sherman did not learn his generalship from Grant until after the Vicksburg campaign.

Medill wanted the Army to go on the defensive in Virginia and 40,000 men sent west. This was done later in the year. Medill wanted the garrisons added to the armies in the field. Grant did this when he came into power.

That brings to mind a number of facts that have been recorded, but generally forgotten, and one important fact which I think no historian has ever pointed out. Much as I have written about the Civil War, its significance had not been apparent to me before.

Wars are not started over any one difference * * * nor was the Civil War. The first cause of offense was the tariff that gave New England industries a monopoly in the South. This led to the nullification acts of South Carolina during President Jackson's term and has been a continuing grievance until recently.

The next difference was that the Republicans of the Middle West insisted that slavery should not be admitted into any more territories.

The third cause was the ambition of Charleston to become an important seaport and the fourth was the animosity of the Democratic officeholders, who had been in power in Washington for 60 years. As a matter of fact, it was these two minor causes which brought on the war—the firing upon Fort Sumter and the efforts of the southerners to take the capital, projecting well into slave territory, which led to the Baltimore riots, the capture of Baltimore, the crossing of the Potomac into Virginia, and eventually to the battle of Bull Run.

With the solidarity we have achieved in 87 years, it is difficult to realize how much

the sections of the North were activated by different motives.

Lincoln was the outstanding leader for the preservation of the Union. He said:

"I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. The sooner the national authority can be restored, the nearer the Union will be 'the Union as it was.' If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time save slavery, I do not agree with them. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time destroy slavery, I do not agree with them. My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. What I do about slavery and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union, and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union."

The abolitionists, of whom Medill was one, wished to destroy slavery at all costs. As early as 1862, Lincoln found it necessary to conciliate them by the Emancipation Proclamation. They eventually became the dominant element in the war.

New England was not seriously interested in either abolition of slavery or the preservation of the Union. The New Englanders had been the slave traders until that form of commerce was stopped under the leadership of Jefferson. They had joined England against the United States in the War of 1812, supplying the English armies, which otherwise could not have operated, and refused troops to the national government. Their leaders opposed the purchase of Louisiana and the annexation of Texas in the following incendiary language.

Josiah Quincy said:

"If this bill (for the admission of Orleans Territory as a State) passes, it is my deliberate opinion that it is virtually a dissolution of the Union; that it will free the States from their moral obligation; and, as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, definitely to prepare for a separation—amicably if they can, violently if they must."

John Quincy Adams said:

"Any attempt by act of Congress or by treaty to annex the Republic of Texas to this Union would be an usurpation of power which it would be the right and the duty of the free people of the Union to resist and annul."

Daniel Webster put the mistaken New England view in an argumentative way:

"And he is a bolder reasoner than I, who has satisfied himself that this Government may be extended indefinitely either to the north or to the south, without endangering its stability and its duration. * * *

"It certainly may be very well questioned, with how much of mutual intelligence, and how much of a spirit of conciliation and harmony, those who live on the St. Lawrence and the St. John might be expected ordinarily to unite in the choice of a President, with the inhabitants on the banks of the Rio Grande del Norte and the Colorado. It is evident, at least, that there must be some boundary, or some limits to a republic which is to have a common center."

The Hartford convention would have declared for secession excepting for the existence of the triumphant armies of Jacob Brown and Andrew Jackson.

From the treaty of peace following the Revolutionary War, the West was constantly exercised over the navigation of the Mississippi. Medill was a western man and an abolitionist. He wanted the Southwest in the Union as free States. He cared little about the Southeast, nothing about the protective tariff. The West had wanted the annexation of Canada since 1812, to which the East was indifferent. In arguing that Illinois should join the Union side, Douglas had said:

"We in the northwest of this great valley can never recognize either the propriety or the right of States bordering along the Gulf of Mexico and upon the Atlantic Ocean, or upon the Pacific, to separate from the Union of our forefathers, and establish and erect tax gatherers and custom houses upon our commerce in its passage to the gulf or the ocean. If we recognize the right in one case we give our assent to it in all cases, and if the few States upon the gulf now are to separate themselves from us and erect a barrier across the mouth of that great river, of which the Ohio is a tributary, how long will it be before New York may come to the conclusion that she may set up for herself and levy taxes upon every dollar's worth of goods imported and consumed in the northwest, and taxes upon every bushel of wheat and every pound of pork and beef, or other productions that may be sent from the northwest to the Atlantic in search of a market? The very existence of the people in this great valley depends upon maintaining inviolate and forever that great right secured by the Constitution of freedom of trade, of transit, and of commerce, from the center of the continent to the oceans that surround it. This right can never be surrendered; our very existence depends upon maintaining it."

The significant fact that has eluded historians is that in January 1863, the cause of the Union was at its lowest ebb. McClellan had been beaten in the peninsula. Pope had lost the second battle of Bull Run. Burnside had been defeated at Fredericksburg and had failed in his famous mud march.

In the middle sector, Nashville was the advanced post which had been besieged. Confederate troops had been to Cincinnati, and even into Ohio. Grant had been defeated at Holly Springs and Sherman at Vicksburg.

The trans-Mississippi campaigns did not loom in the public mind. In the main theater, only Grant had achieved even modest success. He had shown none of the genius which he developed six months later at Vicksburg and Lee had not made his fatal invasion of Pennsylvania.

We may wonder what might have happened if Lee had adopted Longstreet's suggestion in May 1863, to leave Lee to hold the line of the Rapidan and Longstreet to take his corps to attack Rosecrans, while Grant was still occupied at Vicksburg. It is not beyond the possibilities that Longstreet would have destroyed Rosecrans and then have forced Grant to raise the siege of Vicksburg * * * for even after Vicksburg and Gettysburg, victory was not in sight. Bragg, reinforced by Longstreet, was to win the almost decisive battle of Chickamauga. After that Medill's suggestions that troops be sent west were carried out. With the help of these troops Grant broke the mountain barrier and Sherman made his great campaign in which he captured Atlanta and turned the Appalachian mountain range. He then, in the fall of 1864, conceived the march to the sea.

At the time of Medill's letter Sherman was completely hopeless of victory and did not think highly of Grant. New York was about to have its draft riots. One county of New York did secede from the Union. Later, Sherman, a westerner from Ohio, was to write to Grant when Grant was made commander in chief:

"Now as to the future: Do not stay in Washington. Halleck is better qualified than you are to stand the buffets of intrigue and policy. Come out West. Take to yourself the whole Mississippi Valley; let us make it dead sure and I tell you the Atlantic slope and Pacific shores will follow its destiny as sure as the limbs of a tree live or die with the main trunk."

And the last paragraph in the same letter:

"For God's sake and for your country's sake, come out of Washington. I foretold to General Halleck, before he left Corinth, the inevitable result to him, and I now exhort you to come out West. Here lies the seat of the coming empire, and from the West, when our task is done, we will make short work of Charleston and Richmond and the impoverished coast of the Atlantic."

And just before Appomattox, Sheridan, who was from Albany, N. Y., felt:

"If I obeyed these instructions and crossed the James and joined Sherman, the army of the Potomac would rest where they are and Sherman, with our assistance, would close the war. If this should happen it would be disastrous to the country, for there would be no balance of power between the East and the West."

In the end all the objects of the northern factions were secured: Vicksburg and Port Hudson were taken; Arkansas was conquered; Texas was isolated and partially occupied.

The army of Vicksburg, joining the armies of the Cumberland and Ohio, with reinforcements from the East, finished the war in North Carolina. The army of the Potomac only penetrated 100 miles from Culpeper to Appomattox.

Slavery was abolished, the Union was preserved, and the New England tariff continued for another 70 years.

Of the quarrels with Canada, that of Indian invasion had disappeared. The others were settled in the treaty concluding the Alabama claims, a clever piece of diplomacy, concealing the fact that the arbitration was only consented to by Great Britain under threat of an invasion of Canada.

Internal Security Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of Members of Congress a statement issued October 1, 1950, by the 10 Senators who supported the President's veto of the Internal Security Act of 1950 and a series of editorials from leading newspapers in all parts of the country commenting upon the passage of the Internal Security Act. The accompanying articles supplement the 10 editorials included in the fine statement of Congressman CLARENCE CANNON in the Appendix to the RECORD, beginning at page A7025.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATORS CHAVEZ, DOUGLAS, GRAHAM, GREEN, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, KILGORE, LEAHY, LEHMAN, AND MURRAY

We, the undersigned Senators, opposed the Mundt-McCarran bill because it would not give adequate security but would seriously endanger freedom. We now hope that when Congress reconvenes in the calmer, post-election atmosphere, it may repeal or drastically modify this unwise law and enact a

positive, effective security program, and we shall continue to work for this objective.

Nevertheless, now that it has become law, we are confident that in the best democratic tradition all Americans will loyally obey this measure. For it was passed by Congress under democratic procedures and represented the judgment of the overwhelming majority of the Members of both Houses. We believe the decision was a mistake but, as believers in democracy, we should bow to the will of the majority.

Secondly, we urge with all the emphasis at our command that under no conditions should loyal and liberal-minded Americans who oppose the act help the Communists or join in organizations with them in their hypocritical attacks against the Mundt-Ferguson-McCarran Act. Communist Party members are a devious and deceitful group, whose primary loyalty is to a foreign power. While they claim full freedom of speech for themselves when they are in a minority, they refuse to accord it to others when they take power. The Communists aim at violent revolution and not peaceful political action or genuine civil liberties. They are under the control of the Russian dictatorship and a large percentage of their members would be ready to spy and to commit acts of sabotage against us when a test of loyalties came.

Yet experience has taught us that they invariably seek to use an issue like the Mundt-Ferguson-McCarran Act for their party purposes. Thus, an act which purports to strike at them will undoubtedly be the occasion for new Communist Party manipulations and appeals. United-front organizations will be set up with the avowed aim of securing the act's repeal. Defense funds will be gathered to protect the martyrs. Citizens generally will be urged to join in these efforts. But the control and benefit as usual will be kept for the party and its ultimate, anti-democratic objectives. And in the long run such maneuvering will boomerang and hurt the whole campaign for the act's repeal.

We should not permit such a dastardly group to represent themselves as the defenders of that freedom which they would destroy. And unsuspecting, decent persons should not be drawn into their trap. Liberal-minded people should not join such Communist-sponsored organizations which are urging repeal of the McCarran bill, attend Communist-sponsored meetings, or sign Communist-sponsored petitions. They should carefully scrutinize organizations which claim to be working for these ends and avoid the slightest association with so-called united fronts with Communists. To isolate and expose the Communists in this and other efforts, the blunderbuss registration provisions of the act are not nearly as effective as the common sense, the experience, and the guidance of those who have been through these battles before.

Finally, we urge all loyal, liberal-minded Americans to develop their own methods and use existing non-Communist and anti-Communist organizations to urge the repeal of the Mundt-Ferguson-McCarran Act and the substitution for it of a measure that will give adequate security with the least impairment of liberty. Even these efforts will be attacked by some persons, just as an attempt was made in the last minutes of the Senate debate to discredit the fight of the President and Members of Congress upholding the veto by associating our sincere efforts against this legislation with the activities of persons of alleged Communist sympathies with whom we had no connection or contact. But those who understand the threat to freedom in this law will not be so easily frightened. While loyally observing the law, they should urge its early repeal or modification by constitutional methods conducted by existing loyal organizations and by new bodies free from Communist domination or influence.

Only so can the real grounds of our objective be made clear. We are not interested in protecting Communists. We are interested in protecting both the security and the freedom of America.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, HARLEY M. KILGORE, ESTES KEFAUVER, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, JAMES MURRAY, FRANK P. GRAHAM, THEODORE F. GREEN, DENNIS CHAVEZ, EDWARD L. LEAHY

OCTOBER 1, 1950.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of September 30, 1950]

REEXAMINE MCCARRAN DELUSION

It has been widely said that the Communist control bill that Congress passed into law over President Truman's veto received only haphazard congressional attention as to content. Almost nobody had read it entirely; a few more had thumbed through parts of it; many had only glanced at it. This seems incredible, for a body of citizens who comprise the legislative branch of the most powerful Government on earth. But we are forced to accept it as true. If the bill had been read and understood by most Congressmen it could not have been adopted. It is a sad thing when hysteria grips the very core of our representative Government, but it clearly happened in this case.

Fortunately, the congressional action is not irrevocable. There will be time, between now and the resumption of Congress in November, for the Members to read the measure and consider what they have written into law. And there will be time upon returning to Washington to repeal the measure, or so drastically amend it as to undo the bulk of the damage. Some sound guidance is provided by the President's veto message, which likewise was evidently not read or listened to with any attentiveness. It is a good message, rooted in practical truth. We do not think the President was speaking politically in this message; he was offering the best judgment of the best minds in Government—in the Justice Department, the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of State—as to why and in what respects the bill is a dangerous one.

It isn't necessary, in the establishment of the measure as dangerous, to go into the relatively abstruse matters of thought control and freedom of speech. Important though it is to keep the national direction straight in these matters, we can understand how confusions can develop about them, even in Congress, where the sound and the fury can throw a block against consecutive, reasonable logic.

There are dangers in the bill that glare out at even the casual reader—dangers that have to do with our physical safety now, not our spiritual welfare in the distant future.

The requirement of the publication of a complete list of vital defense establishments is one such.

TO PUBLISH IS TO HAND IT OVER TO THE RUSSIANS

Any Congressman must know that to publish such a list is equivalent to handing it to the Russians—a detailed blueprint of exactly where we have installed every defense plant, every laboratory, every storage place for matériel. The Russians would give their eye teeth to get hold of such a list. This bill—this measure so widely and loudly hawked as the answer to the Communist menace—would hand it to them, as the President says, on a silver platter.

Even more devastating to our cause is the requirement for the registration of all Communists and officials of front organizations.

In the first place, this clause of the bill misses the whole point of what the American people are trying to do about the Communist menace. The point is not to pillory a lot of pinkos, or parade them before public scorn. The point is to prevent spies and saboteurs from damaging our Nation.

This bill would not only fail directly to trap any genuine spies or saboteurs, who after all would not be silly enough to put their right names or affiliations on any register, but it would gravely jeopardize the chances of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of catching the real culprits. For if the FBI is going to have to run down and keep under surveillance all of the thousands of people who happen at one time or another to have belonged to Communist-controlled organizations, it's going to have little time left over to do the vital work of trailing and rounding up the authentic bad actors.

FBI WOULD HAVE TO TURN ITS FILES INSIDE OUT

Furthermore, the FBI's responsibility for getting the goods on all the people covered by the registration law would automatically require that agency to make convincing showings in court of the guilt of the persons rounded up. The FBI has already shown great reluctance to drag out its confidential files for public perusal—again because you can't make a thing public without also letting Russia in on it. But in the procedure mapped out by the new law the FBI would in all likelihood have to turn its files inside out, day after day. And if the FBI is going to have to bare its records and its sources of information to public view it might as well go out of business. We think there is hardly an American who wouldn't entrust his security to the FBI ten times sooner than to the authors of the current Communist control bill.

We believe, then, that this measure was railroaded through under pressure of a something's-got-to-be-done hysteria which lost track utterly of just what it was that had to be done.

Congress, on resuming its session, should go carefully and methodically into the matter of how to deal with the problem of spies and saboteurs. Admittedly the problem stands this time to be more critical than it has ever been before. We have to have the legal authority and the physical apparatus to head these people off before they can do their wrecking. We have to keep them out of Government, out of places where they can do their damage. But there are ways this can be done effectively, and there are certain clear principles that can guide Congress in reaching a rational plan. One is that you have to use stealth and cunning equivalent to their own—you can't go view-hallooing all over the countryside and expect to find them in their holes when you get there. Another is that the job is one for experts, for professionals. We still think J. Edgar Hoover is the top authority on what needs to be done to get and keep the Communists under control. He ought to be heeded next time. And, finally, it is both reasonable and practical to produce a Communist control measure that embodies a minimum of lost motion and that cleaves as nearly as possible to those principles of democratic thought and procedure by which we have always abided. Considered from these viewpoints, the current measure is an awkward, panic-bred, confusion-ridden first attempt, and should be written off as such at the first opportunity.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of September 26, 1950]

CONGRESS SETS UP SHOP IN THOUGHT CONTROL

It is ironical that what may well turn out to be President Truman's soundest and most positive veto message would be the one most decisively rejected by Congress. This was the case in overwhelming passage of the "anti-subversive" bill. In an intellectual sense the action is kin to physical reprisals

which in war are called atrocities, like those by North Koreans upon prisoners of war.

The action was taken out of a palpable mixture of motives. The very clamor to get at the bill quickly before Congress adjourned for political campaigning was a revelation of intent. It was a concession to and an exploitation of a national mood of uncertainty, fear, and vengeance. A commentary may be found in that of the 10 Senators who voted to support the President's vigorous protest, none is up for re-election save HERBERT LEHMAN, of New York. And as to him, the suggestion that he is risking his political life was openly voiced, a virtual confession that a noxious infection is in the air.

In this haste there was no consideration of obvious truths in the President's veto message. For one, the patchwork bill is likely to prove unworkable, not to speak of its affront to principles of freedom, its invitation to abuse and persecution. None of the overriding majority gave heed to the plain fact that the Justice Department and the FBI are now turned into a great agency for policing words, actions, attitudes, thoughts.

In many ways the bill which was passed, vetoed, and repassed in the hysterical closing hours of Congress goes beyond the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798—and these, it is recalled today to every child in school, bore themselves the stamp of an aberration.

Today's new law sets up a definite instrumentality of search and seizure. The new repression goes beyond the other in its dangers because it is so loose and general in its proscriptions. It could be applied to the ruination of any critic of the Government. It could be applied to the suppression of a new political party, as John F. Day, of the Courier-Journal Washington Bureau, pointed out in the Passing Show of Sunday's newspaper. Mr. Day recited a section of the bill which defines it as unlawful for a person "knowingly to combine, conspire, or agree with any other person to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship." And what sort of act is in mind? It surely must give one pause to read on in his report: "One of the sponsors of the bill, Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, said that to admit belief in something was 'an overt act.'"

Does not one see substance, therefore, in the President's warning that this Government has now been put in the thought-control business?

Already this business is being organized. The Department of Justice starts setting up its enforcement unit. Obedient to Congress though he had fought passage of the bill, Attorney General McGrath says it must necessarily be large and costly. It will also be faced with a task of enormous proportions and inevitable slow motion, what with the interminable process of trials and appeals from court to court. None may expect to see his pet Communist or the officers of the Progressive Party or any other nagging and vociferous liberal behind the bars for years, if ever.

And so we have, as a law, a handy sounding board for expression of rage and hatred for communism. But we do not have a law that will prevent espionage, sabotage, and the operation of clandestine conspirators. It is these that are the danger today, not the ineffectual radicals who already are known to authorities, and whom the new law will but serve to drag laboriously once more into the light. At the same time, though, no other man is safe, by whatever good works and intentions, from being dragged likewise through smears, libels, falsifications. The Government itself is not safe, because the new law tears away the veils of defense security to serve a mad impulse of universal suspicion. A terror is on the land, and this is its mantle.

[From the Commonweal of October 6, 1950]

CONTROLS

Marxist communism is more than idea—it is a set of beliefs incarnated in the Soviet Union. The ideas behind Russian communism and those that move American democracy are strikingly antithetical. So there is all the difference in the world between life in the United States of America and in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

But when the Members of the Eighty-first Congress went back home after their long and tough session on Capitol Hill, the differences between the two countries were not as great as they had been. It would surely be an exaggeration to say that the gentlemen of Congress had doused the lights of American freedom. Yet in their blind anger against the forces of world communism, they did take a step down the road that leads to the totalitarian darkness. And that must be a matter for regret.

Before the Congressmen finally boarded the trains and planes carrying them to their homes in the 48 States, they left behind them, as the law of the land, H. R. 9490, the Internal Security Act of 1950. As President Truman said when he vetoed the act, H. R. 9490, despite the sincere intention to draw up a drastic Communist-control law, is more pro- than anti-Communist.

There is no free exchange of ideas in Soviet Russia. Invariably the heretic is harassed, hounded, and eventually eliminated with cool, cruel efficiency. That is one application of the Leninist philosophy. In the United States, of course, we have a different notion about freedom of thought. We are more afraid of the suppression of ideas than of their public expression.

H. R. 9490 provides in section 22 that we will henceforth exclude from our country anyone who advocates any form of totalitarian government or one-party system—whether he be Russian agent, Yugoslav functionary, Argentine naval officer, Portuguese professor or Spanish Jesuit.

There is no freedom of the press in Russia. Books, magaiznes, newspapers, pamphlets, whatever is critical of the Soviet regime, are ruthlessly suppressed. This too is part and parcel of the system most of us despise.

H. R. 9490 provides that the Attorney General is required to deport aliens in any way associated with publishing or distributing material that expresses belief in the economic or political doctrines of any form of totalitarianism. This includes Marxists of every dispensation, the more ardent Francophiles, the queer little men with their queer little doctrines who inhabit the Columbus circles and bughouse squares of America. A refugee who sells a copy of Das Kapital in a second-hand bookstore is liable to deportation.

The Soviet Government maintains a strict iron curtain around itself and its satellites. It does not believe in freedom of movement. It goes to drastic extremes to protect its citizens from the contagion—and free air—of the outside world.

H. R. 9490 sharply limits the right of the United States Government to admit foreigners on diplomatic business. With the Internal Security Act the Government can no longer offer asylum in this country to foreign diplomats who have repudiated Soviet imperialism and wish to escape reprisals.

These are only a few of the provisions of the act. Those dealing with the control of Communists—which is what the act set out to do—are themselves generally ambiguous, inefficient and, insofar as they jeopardize the rights of innocent men and women who may be the victims of unfounded suspicion, due to vague terminology, are downright dangerous to our national welfare.

H. R. 9490 is an unhappy piece of legislation. In a way, it represents a small victory for the Communists. America will be a little less America while it remains on the books. There will be that much less for all of us to believe in.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times of September 26, 1950]

A MAJOR MISTAKE

Congress and the people of the United States may never know how seriously the McCarran Communist-control bill will give aid and comfort to the very Communists it is supposed to control.

The opening paragraph of President Truman's veto message took away the breath of many sincere Congressmen who had been supporting the bill. The President rejected the bill after consulting with:

The Department of Justice;
The Department of Defense;
The Central Intelligence Agency;
The Department of State.

These are the agencies responsible for the security of our Nation. The Central Intelligence Agency is our espionage division. When that Agency gives an opinion that any piece of legislation will hurt its functioning, the American people should give sober thought to the opinion.

But Congress was in no mood for sober thought. It was politically and emotionally hell-bent to pass some law against Communists.

Here's an example. There are people behind the iron curtain upon whom we must depend for information. From time to time this country gets them out, as refugees, as immigrants, as special cases. The McCarran bill will prevent them from coming here. That will help the Communist cause.

The bill will cut off immigration from some other countries. As the President points out, by excluding persons from totalitarian countries the McCarran bill will prevent all Spanish businessmen and students from coming here.

That is only one aspect, and a relatively minor one, which shows how ill-considered the McCarran bill really was.

Of more importance is the warning by the President that the net effect of the bill will "help the Communists, not hurt them." Already the Communist Party in this country has served notice it will defy the law. The President anticipated that.

He warned that enforcing the feature of the law which requires Communists, Communist organizations, and Communist-front organizations to register may bring a long court fight which could drag out 2 to 4 years.

Even after a final ruling—if it is against the Communist Party—the Communists need only to change the names of their organizations and force the Government to "begin all over again the long, dreary process of investigative, administrative, and judicial proceedings." The energies of the FBI would be wasted and its sources of information dried up.

The President warned that the bill itself represented "a clear and present danger to our institutions." Innocent, non-Communist persons could be harassed by its workings.

There is only one course now left for the Government to protect itself against the hysteria which resulted in the passage of the bill. A quick decision on the bill's constitutionality by the Supreme Court is needed. Unfortunately, the Court cannot toss out the whole bill even if it finds parts of it unconstitutional.

The President's warning that the bill would "so greatly weaken our liberties and give aid and comfort to those who would destroy us" was taken too lightly by Congress. The Supreme Court can consider the bill in a climate less fogged by hysteria. If it is possible for the Attorney General to bring a suit for a declaratory judgment by the high court, he should take immediate action.

[From the New York Times of September 25, 1950]

THE ANTI-COMMUNIST LAW

As expected, the Internal Security Act of 1950 has now been passed by both Houses of Congress over President Truman's veto. There are certain features of this hodgepodge piece of legislation that will genuinely strengthen the internal security of the United States against Communist subversion. Such are the provisions for closing loopholes in the espionage, sabotage, military security and deportation laws, and for summary arrest and detention of probable spies or saboteurs when the President proclaims an emergency. These laudable features of the new law, which propose to do something practical about existing or potential Communist action as distinct from Communist thought, could and should have been enacted as separate legislation.

Instead, they were lumped in with, or tacked on to, other proposals that in our view are unworkable and, in a very real sense, un-American. In its broad prohibitions, its sweeping registration requirements, its narrow-minded immigration and naturalization clauses, the new law represents a long step away from the American tradition of liberty and freedom. We believe in legislation that would prevent the Communists from doing harm to our country, but not in legislation that is self-defeating, diversionary and undiscriminating. President Truman performed an act of genuine courage in vetoing this bill. And so did the handful of Democrats and Republicans who voted against it.

However, the measure is now the law of the land. We think that many of its deficiencies will soon show up in the effort to enforce it. One of the fine features about a democracy is that error can be rectified before it is too late. And so we may hope that some of the more unwise and impractical provisions of this law will in due time be modified by Congress in a moment of calmer thinking and more reasoned reflection.

[From the Springfield (Ohio) Sun of September 28, 1950]

ON THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Apparently Congress wants to make certain that the American people know it is opposed to communism. To prove it, the legislators last week passed what they believe to be an anti-Communist measure, overriding a Presidential veto in the process. However, there are many Americans who feel that the lawmakers in their zeal to neutralize the forces of communism in the United States have instead given aid and comfort to those who would destroy us.

Congressmen claim that the Internal Security Act of 1950 will serve the Government well in keeping tabs on Reds within our borders. They say it will help the executive branch weed undesirable immigrants from the desirable ones and decide questions of citizenship qualifications. This law, according to Congressmen, will do numerous things to strengthen America's internal security.

President Truman, in his veto message to Congress, explains in length why he feels that the net result of the Internal Security Act will be to help the Communist, not hurt them. He points out, almost painstakingly, that there are already laws which give us most of the protection we need from the real dangers of treason, espionage, sabotage, and actions looking to the overthrow of our Government by force or violence. The new legislation, the President declares, hinders the Department of Justice and its Federal Bureau of Investigation, causing these agencies to waste immense amounts of time and energy attempting to carry out its unworkable registration provisions. Moreover, the subversive bill gives Government officials vast powers to harass all of our citizens in the exercise of their right to free speech.

This last point deserves particular attention. Among the major provisions of the Security Act is one requiring the registration of the Communist Party and its individual members, as well as all Red-front organizations. A front organization is defined as "a group of persons * * * permanently or temporarily associated together for joint action" pursuing "from time to time" a policy similar to that of the Communist Party. Thus, to use President Truman's example, a group favoring low-cost housing for sincere humanitarian reasons might be classified as a Communist-front organization, according to the Internal Defense Act.

Congress acted unwisely, to say the least, in passing this act in its present form. The American people may rightfully expect our lawmakers to provide adequate legal defenses against sabotage or espionage by Reds. In protecting our Nation from such activities, however, they must exercise special care in seeing to it that America's traditional liberties are not endangered. Congress has, in its endeavor to isolate the Communist Party, enacted a law which could do great damage to the democratic structure of the United States. The lawmakers should correct their mistake at the earliest possible moment.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution of September 25, 1950]

A SCATTERGUN WHERE A RIFLE IS NEEDED

Most people—even Congressmen—will admit that the problem is to curb Communists and their sympathizers without unduly jeopardizing the liberties of patriotic Americans.

By that standard it is obvious that the Communist control bill which the Congress overwhelmingly passed over the President's veto is badly lacking.

Mr. Truman's objections to the bill were based on the advice of Federal agencies, including the FBI, which will be charged with its enforcement. The House hardly paused to hear the President's long message. The Senate vote came after a protracted filibuster—conducted, incidentally, by the very Senators who customarily heap scorn on southern Senators for filibustering. But that is beside the point here.

Instead of providing a rifle for cutting down real Communists and fellow-travelers—which is what is needed—the Congress-approved act puts a scattergun into the hands of Federal bureaucrats. A great many innocent persons are apt to get hurt by pellets exploding all over the landscape.

The registration and reporting provisions are apt to bring the most trouble. As the President pointed out, real Communists will use every delaying tactic available while a great many patriots will be subjected to embarrassment and injustice.

The law even demands that security be violated. It calls for a Federal register of all Defense Establishments from which Communists would be barred. Thus the Communists are given a public catalog of our most vital defense installations.

As bad as the bill is, it could have been made acceptable with a few amendments. Perhaps Congress can be persuaded to accept such amendments when it reconvenes and before too much damage has been done.

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of October 1, 1950]

IT IS THE LAW

Although he vetoed the 1950 Internal Security Act, popularly known as the anti-Communist law, President Truman and Attorney General McGrath have lost no time in making it clear that the administration will enforce the law to the best of its ability so long as it remains on the statute books.

This is the proper attitude, not only for the administration, but for all citizens as well.

President Truman, other administration officials, Members of Congress, and citizens generally were well within their rights in opposing the passage of the bill. In fact, they had much the best of the argument, though not the necessary votes in Congress. The measure, even, if it should be as effective as its sponsors claim in combating communism, establishes too high a price in the deprivation of rights of innocent people—rights that have made the United States a free country and which have been the proudest boast of all Americans. In addition to that, there is grave doubt of the effectiveness of the law. It is also doubtful if it can be enforced no matter how conscientious the efforts in that direction.

Opponents of the measure will also be well within their rights in seeking its repeal or amendment by the next session of Congress.

But the law is the law. This is a government of laws. It does not lie with any official or any citizen to distinguish between good laws and bad laws. President Truman and Attorney General McGrath have given full recognition to that fact. Others should follow their example.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times of September 3, 1950]

A BAD LAW ON THE BOOKS

There is no point in arguing further about the anti-Red bill President Truman vetoed. The House overwhelmingly and immediately overrode the veto, waiting impatiently till Mr. Truman's message was read, taking no time to weigh his arguments. The Senate seems sure to follow suit.

The law is a bad law, but it is virtually on the books.

The law is a bad law for reasons that the President's veto message ably stated. It is not inconsistent to argue, as he did, that the law would at the same time not hit many Communists but might hit many innocent persons. When shot is scattered guilty persons are frequently unharmed while innocent persons are struck. The effectiveness of the law against the Reds will require proving that the nonregistered accused are Reds; in the trial of Harry Bridges we have a good example of how difficult that can be. The danger of the law to innocent persons lies in the likelihood of false accusation; in the smears of Senator MCCARTHY we have a good example of how great this likelihood is.

The law is virtually on the books for several reasons. The main one undoubtedly is that, as Senator SCOTT LUCAS said last night, the American people want a stiff anti-Red bill, without carefully considering either what is being defended or how best to defend it.

A secondary reason is that the foes of President Truman, within both parties, wanted to put him on the spot. If he signed the bill they could claim they forced him to do so. If he vetoed the bill they could hold his veto against him.

President Truman took the honest and courageous course of vetoing it.

How much will his veto hurt him? There is much for which Mr. Truman should be, has been, and will be justifiably criticized. It will be ironic and unjust indeed if he is damaged seriously by what is undoubtedly a most brave and statesmanlike stand.

But his foes should not judge their success on this point too certain. Harry Truman is the man who started the Greek-Turkish program against communism. He is the man who set up the Federal loyalty program. He is the man whose administration created the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Pact. He is the man who made the decision to battle against communism in Korea. It will not be possible to pin a pro-Red tag on him.

Now the important thing is for the American people to be alert against abuses of this hodgepodge and vague law. One of the first things needed is to set up some

kind of an appeal system within which organizations labeled as Communist-front organizations can defend themselves if they want to.

The processes of democracy are mysterious. When authority is needed the Government can usually find the power even when laws are not on the books. When broad powers are granted that the Government does not want to abuse, frequently it does not do so. Let us hope that this will be the case in the present instance. Maybe the passing of the law will give the American people a kind of emotional purging so that we can get on with the job of guarding against the Reds without destroying the values that the Reds are attacking.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of September 26, 1950]

DANGERS OF THE NEW SECURITY LAW

One law does not change the character of a society, and the new internal security law will not turn America into a police state. Yet we would be inexcusably naive if we did not recognize this measure as bordering dangerously close to totalitarian-type police controls. It places a great deal of our individual freedom at the discretion of the President and his administrative officials.

We have never before been willing to place such wholesale authority in the hands of the executive branch.

An overwhelming majority of the people apparently believes that the threat to our security is so great we must take this risk. This in itself should be a warning to us, lest in our hysteria we further weaken the traditional and constitutional safeguards to our liberty.

We can lose our freedom by majority vote quite as easily—perhaps more easily—than by a minority clique seizing power.

Under the new law the President can declare an emergency in case of an "insurrection within the United States in behalf of a foreign enemy." A panicky President could interpret "insurrection" quite loosely, especially if egged on by a scared public. President Truman once wanted to draft railroad employees into the Army, in order to put down a strike.

In an emergency, any person whom the authorities "have reasonable ground to believe * * * will engage in, or probably conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage or sabotage" can be arrested. Anyone so held is entitled to a hearing within 48 hours, and can appeal to a review board and the courts. What is new about this provision is that the Government can round up people on suspicion only.

But even this so-called concentration-camp power probably is not as dangerous, practically, as the extremely harsh methods set forth for dealing with aliens. The Attorney General is given absolute authority to prevent admission of an alien, without even having to disclose the basis for his ruling. Aliens who are members of any totalitarian party in any foreign country are barred. Even suspected Communist "sympathizers" are barred.

Any alien naturalized after January 1 will have his citizenship revoked, moreover, if he becomes a member of any group which would have disqualified him as a citizen at the time he was naturalized. This means any group classified as a "Communist front." Any alien who has been a member of such a front within the last 10 years must withdraw within 3 months after it is so classified, or he cannot become a citizen.

But what is a "front"? Organizations which are classified as "fronts," and thus required to register with the Attorney General, are designated by a Subversive Activities Control Board of five members appointed by the President.

Organizations and individuals, it is true, can appeal this designation to the Board and to the courts. But many innocent people are bound to be caught in this wide net. And it may take them years to remove the stigma, even if they are exonerated in court.

If we could always count on wise administration, probably none of these new powers would need alarm us greatly. But it takes little imagination to envision almost intolerable harassment under them.

Suppose the Attorney General and the Subversive Control Board should be men of the McCarthy-Schoeppel stripe. It would be possible for such men to conduct a virtual reign of terror, throwing people into prison for failure to register, for making false statements, etc. They could keep the law enforcement agencies and the courts so loaded with work that many real Communists could carry on their espionage unheeded.

That is the danger, of course. We have decided to risk it, in the urgency of the present world situation. But let us not forget that the risk is there.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of October 5, 1950]

SILLY REQUIREMENT IN THE SPY LAW

The new Communist-control law, passed overwhelmingly by Congress over President Truman's veto, requires the manager of a defense plant to post a notice stating that the plant is producing war materials, if the Secretary of Defense directs it.

The purpose of the notice would be to warn Communists and fellow travelers that if they try to get a job in the plant—or actually get one—they are violating the law and can be sent to prison. The law says that Communists and fellow travelers may not work in defense plants, but that workers shall be informed which are defense factories.

If put into practice, this would serve the Communist espionage system admirably. It would furnish spies accurate information on where to look for facts on our military plans. It would enable them to build up an ideal strategic-bombing map for Soviet Russia.

The law does not require an employer to screen his employees. The responsibility for that is properly on the FBI and military counterintelligence. But with thousands of factories beginning defense work, it will be a staggering task for these police agencies to check several million workers.

Of course, most plants producing large war equipment cannot be hidden very well, anyway. But there are many small plants, subcontracting vital parts, which are unknown even to their own workers. If they are unlabeled, spies may never be attracted to them. It is often these small factories, producing key parts, which are the best targets for sabotage

For this reason, Defense Secretary Marshall probably will not require defense-plant managers to put tags on their factories for the convenience of spies. But the provision is in the law and a panicky administration might do it some time in the future.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of September 25, 1950]

THE VETO MESSAGE

Only time can tell whether Congress has made the terrible mistake which President Truman believes it made by passing the so-called Communist-control bill over his veto.

But certainly Congress did not give the veto message the careful consideration which it deserved, and for which Mr. Truman had sent a personal plea to each member.

It was an exceedingly impressive message. Its tone was temperate. Its statement of the principle that this free country should punish men for crimes they commit, but never for opinions they have, was eloquent.

Its explanation of the reasons why the President felt compelled to disapprove the bill after huge majorities of both parties in both branches of Congress had voted for it was painstaking and persuasive.

Yet the adjournment-headed House hardly could wait for its reading clerk to drone through the message before starting its roll-call vote to override the veto.

And though the Senate went into a 24-hour session, there was little more evidence there of open-minded willingness to discuss the President's arguments on their merits.

Mr. Truman may be mistaken in his opinion—an opinion which, he said, also is held by the Departments of Justice, Defense, and State, and the Central Intelligence Agency—that the law which now goes on the statute books will help, not hurt, the Communists.

The dangers which he sees in this legislation—dangers to national security, to America's relations with other friendly nations, to the rights of all citizens—may be less than he believes. Or may be nonexistent.

Laws previously enacted may be—and in this newspaper's opinion are—less adequate than Mr. Truman thinks to protect the country from "the real dangers of treason, espionage, sabotage, and actions looking to the overthrow of our Government by force and violence."

And unquestionably the votes in Congress on this bill reflect a heavily predominant belief among the American people that strong and comprehensive new legislation is needed.

But legislation enacted in such times of stress as these can be, and in other such times has been, too comprehensive and too strong to be wise and safe. The people and their Congress cannot afford to be too sure that Mr. Truman is mistaken.

At the moment, however, Congress has had its way, and its Members are scattering to their homes and their campaigns.

When they assemble again late in November they should give Mr. Truman's veto message the thoughtful attention just denied it in the adjournment rush. And if, in the calmer postelection light, they see that the new law does go perilously too far, they should be resolutely prepared to admit and rectify their errors.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of September 25, 1950]

THE GREATER DANGER

Some sections of the McCarran subversives control bill are unnecessary and dangerous. The overwhelming margins by which Congress repassed this legislation over President Truman's veto—286 to 48 in the House, 57 to 10 in the Senate—are sobering and frightening. Congress seems to be saying to the people, "You do not know what danger confronts you."

Yet, one cannot accept the premise that the Communist international conspiracy; and that alone, motivated Congress to force into the hands of the President powers he did not want to use—police-state methods including concentration camps for suspected citizens in wartime—to protect the Nation against subversives. There were other factors of motivation.

To a considerable extent, this last action of Congress before most of its Representatives and a third of its Senator returned to face the voters, constituted a declaration of its independence from domination by the executive branch. Even the leaders of the administration forces in Congress joined in defying the President. It was a last chance to prove that Congress wears no one's collar.

At the same time Congress was disavowing to the public any responsibility for what Communist infiltration there may be in the Government. Uncertain about what impact the Alger Hiss conviction, the McCarthy charges against the State Department, and other questions of loyalty raised from time

to time, may have made on the public mind, Congress by approving the McCarran bill over the Presidential veto put itself on record. Congress is for democracy and motherhood; it is against communism. A good sound platform.

But we think there is less of hysteria among the people than among many Members of Congress respecting the Communist menace and proper ways to meet it. We do not know very many people who are ready to give up their rights of free thought, free speech and a free press to a Government police system intended to preserve those very rights which have been sacrificed.

The McCarran bill, which could become the most repressive law ever enacted by Congress in the hands of administrators who believe police-state methods are necessary or desirable, represents a grave departure from the moral and political principles on which this free Nation was founded. We do not believe it will survive the adverse reaction of the people, for very long. But it is much more difficult to get rid of a police state than to stop its development in earlier stages.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 30, 1950]

GET RID OF UNWANTED SECTIONS OF THE ANTI-RED BILL

President Truman has taken the proper position in announcing that he will be in no hurry to carry out the provisions of the anti-subversive bill requiring publication of defense plants from which Communists are to be barred.

Such listing would be an open invitation to sabotage of key installations. Senator MCCARRAN, one of the principal sponsors of the bill, has tried to offset criticism by saying that the order for publications is not mandatory. But if that is the case, why have the provision at all? It points again to the hasty and ill-considered fashion in which the bill was tossed together and passed over the President's veto.

Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has submitted a modified bill that could very well be the foundation for a new law.

It would remove the order for public listing of defense plants and would eliminate the most controversial provision, that requiring the registration of Communists and Communist-front organizations. As the Communists intend to challenge this requirement in the courts, it might not become effective, at best, for several years.

Mr. CANNON'S proposed amendment would strengthen the clause in the McCarran bill authorizing the detention of Communists and other subversives in time of war and would protect the FBI from the necessity of disclosing confidential sources of information which the present bill would demand.

It would empower the President to designate areas where security regulations could be enforced; prevent interference with effective loyalty programs; authorize the heads of Government agencies to dismiss employees without delay or interference when national security is involved; extend the statute of limitations for prosecution of violations of espionage laws; and tighten up laws dealing with the deportation of aliens and the registration of foreign agents.

New and improved laws are needed to cope with espionage, sabotage, and Communist activity in this country, but the major terms of the McCarran Act, stumbling, cumbersome and unworkable, would handicap instead of help the Government in this connection.

The unwanted sections of the bill should be weeded out as soon as possible and a practicable measure along the lines mapped out by Congressman CANNON adopted.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of September 27, 1950]

NOW THAT IT'S LAW

The McCarran anti-Communist bill has become the law of the land. Some of it is good law—needed law; some of it is bad law—very bad. It is a pity that these diverse provisions were not submitted in separate bills. But they were all wrapped together in one package.

It is needed law, for instance, to extend the statute of limitations on espionage to 10 years, to define more realistically the crime of divulging Government secrets, and to spell out in law the authority, methods, and safeguards for rounding up and impounding subversives and enemy sympathizers in event of grave emergency.

It is bad law to lead the American people into a false sense of security (into the assumption that dangerous Communists and hired enemy agents will dutifully come forward, register, and stay put), to overburden the FBI with checking up on "front" membership lists and nabbing reluctant registrants when it needs all its resources to track down saboteurs and interstate criminals.

Perhaps most of all, it is bad law to inject into the American system legal concepts and administrative machinery which, in the wrong hands, could effectively smother any kind of reform movement so long as it was still a small minority and unpopular at the moment with the majority.

This last danger has been the most difficult to make clear. And it heightens rather than dims the political courage displayed by a handful of Congressmen and the President in going on record against the bill to say that many conscientious legislators, up for election, felt themselves under irresistible pressure from unquestionably patriotic constituents who simply would not understand a vote against any measure which purported to "get at" the Communists.

Be that as it may. The best way to correct the bad features of a law is to enforce them firmly and honestly along with the good, and we welcome Attorney General J. Howard McGrath's assurance that he will do just that. The Federal courts continue to give evidence that they are forgetting neither the letter nor the spirit of the Bill of Rights. And there are already signs that, after the elections, quite a few in Congress who voted for the McCarran bill may then feel free to support correcting amendments.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of September 29, 1950]

LAW NEEDS CHANGING

American Communists have announced their anticipated defiance of the newly enacted McCarran Control Act, but we advise our readers that no purpose is served in getting angry at that. Normally, when the domestic brand of commies start breathing their revolutionary fire, our own blood pressure rises to an explosive point. But not this time.

Calmer second thought and a little reading of the veto measure ignored at the time the President's action was overridden has already convinced many Members of the Congress that they have made a mistake and put the Government in position of having to enforce a law it regards as unenforceable and is. Nevertheless it must make the costly, diversionary effort from which only the Communists can possibly gain.

The act plays American security agencies right into the commies' hands, for instead of being able to concentrate on Communist spies and saboteurs and on plans for an emergency round-up of Reds, the highly skilled investigative agents used in counter-Communist undertakings will have to be diverted to determining whether or not this or that tenth-rate Red has registered, in prosecuting him if he has not and to doing the thousands and one things the act will require in the investigative field. The irony of the situation is that the real Communist enemies will now go underground and years of investigative work will, in many instances, be undone.

Some of the wiser leaders of the Congress are planning to seek modification of the act when the vacation-minded Congress gets back on the job, and that cannot be too soon.

[From the Washington Post of October 6, 1950]

MCCARRAN REVISION

Nine Democratic Senators who supported the President's veto of the McCarran Act have joined in a statement calling for the repeal or drastic modification of the law when Congress reconvenes at the end of November. It may be taken more or less for granted, judging from the size of the votes by which the President's veto was overridden in the Senate and the House, that outright repeal is out of the question for the present. Modification may reasonably be hoped for, however, in the light of the law's extravagances. Already these extravagances are creating extremely awkward problems which were certainly not foreseen by many of the act's sponsors. The immigration provisions in particular will have to be revised if embarrassing diplomatic difficulties are to be avoided.

It is possible that Congress will be able to take a sober second look at this legislation when it reconvenes. For one thing, the election will be out of the way by then. For another, the excitement stirred up by the Korean war will have somewhat abated. Perhaps Congress will be able 2 months hence to examine the measure dispassionately; to hold hearings on some of its drastic features, drafted and passed with scarcely a semblance of inquiry into their consequences; and to vote on amendments with at least diminished partisanship. It is shocking to reflect that the unprecedented detention provisions and the fanatical immigration restrictions of the act were adopted without any testimony whatever as to their constitutionality and probable effects.

The chief problem in getting some rational revision of the McCarran Act is to provide a rational climate for discussion of it. It must have been concern over this problem that prompted the nine Democratic supporters of the President to warn advocates of repeal against any association with Communist-sponsored attacks on the measure. We have no doubt that Communist-sponsored attacks contributed greatly to enactment of the law; we have little doubt, either, that this was their intended result. For the law undermines American institutions more damagingly than anything the Communists themselves could accomplish. "We are not interested in protecting Communists," the proponents of repeal declared. "We are interested in protecting both the security and the freedom of America."

Analysis of Second Quarter Reports, 1950 Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, an analysis of the quarterly reports filed under the Federal Lobbying Act for the

second quarter for 1950 is now available. Two hundred and twenty organizations reported spending more than $3,000,000 in the 3-month period to influence the passage or defeat of legislation, directly or indirectly. In addition, 746 agents filed reports for that quarter listing more than $1,300,000 in salaries and expenses. The analysis follows:

FILINGS PURSUANT TO THE FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT FOR THE SECOND QUARTER, 1950

Organizations: $4,815,835.51 contributions and $3,174,719.68 expenditures reported.

Of the 704 organizations represented in the above totals, 220 organizations filed reports in their own names. In the case of 484 organizations, it was necessary to obtain the expenditures from the reports filed by their agents. Fifty-two organizations registered during this quarter.

Agents: $1,049,918.62 salaries and $282,131.75 expenditures reported by agents.

Seven hundred and forty-six reports were filed by agents during this quarter.

Seventy-six agents registered during the quarter.

Seven hundred and four organizations are represented by filings.

The salaries and expenditures for agents include amounts taken from organizations reports in instances where the organization filed and gave pertinent data, but the agents did not file.

This analysis is based on reports for the second quarter filed up to and including July 20, 1950. The Clerk's office has indicated that more than 60 reports for the second quarter have been returned to the organizations and individuals filing, because such reports had been prepared on the old A and C forms instead of on the form issued March 31, 1950. The figures given in those reports were not available for inclusion in this analysis.

A number of the organizations and individuals state that the money as received and expended was for all purposes and that none of it was earmarked for legislative purposes.

I Cannot Urge Too Strongly Upon the Businessmen of This Country the Folly of Increasing Prices, nor Upon the Workingmen of This Country the Folly of Demanding Wage Increases, Except as Such Increases Are Necessary To Take Care of Specific Inequities and Particular Situations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce, some months ago paid a visit to our Southland and addressed a great gathering of people in Mobile, Ala.

His was a great address. I shall always remember his talk as one of the most factual, analytical, and discursive talks that I have ever heard. He not alone discussed commerce and trade as they currently affected the United States national economy, but he discussed agriculture, finance, taxation, and the management of public debt in the light of world-wide conditions.

I remember that, at the conclusion of that speech, one of my friends said to me: "Congressman FRANK, there stands a great man, a great American, and certainly one of the greatest public officials that has ever served the people of these United States."

Mr. Speaker, it is almost inconceivable that any man could be as fully informed and so constructively interested in so many facets of the Nation's economy as Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer, a Democrat of whom the Republicans in Congress are frank to call the best Secretary of Commerce that this country ever had.

Mr. Speaker, the September 23 issue of the Saturday Evening Post carried a story written by its Washington editor, Mr. Beverly Smith, entitled "Truman's Most Surprising Adviser." The story is about Secretary Sawyer, who was nominated and assumed his office nearly 30 months ago. There was then no talk of any Korean warfare, and yet, with uncanny foresight, complete discernment and understanding about domestic as well as international affairs, he grappled briskly with such intractable problems as export controls, voluntary allocation of steel, aid for small business, the modernization of transportation laws and statutes, and the need for a reappraisal of our now too-rigid antimonopoly statutes.

Mr. Speaker, in the Scriptures it is written down that "A prophet is not without honor save in his own country," and, true to character, Secretary Sawyer made his first public address before an advertising group in his own home town of Cincinnati, Ohio.

In that speech, he bluntly and frankly declared:

> I took this job because I am convinced that the work of the Department of Commerce is vital to the national welfare. It is vital because its primary function is to help American business, and I believe that the success of American business is essential to the operation of our social, economic, and governmental systems. * * * My chief responsibility is to help business and businessmen—not any one kind or group, but all business groups and interests in all parts of the country.

In the light of what he told that advertising group in Cincinnati, and the great work which he has since accomplished in the administration of his Department along the lines that he then laid down, is it any wonder that President Truman did, at the request of American businessmen everywhere, choose to repose in this great public official all control of materials deemed needful and necessary to secure the Nation's defenses and the peace of the world?

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Sawyer quite recently made still another talk to the Association of National Advertisers. That talk I regard as one of the finest explanations of the complex conditions that confront this country with respect to its national production of civilian and military goods that could possibly come out of the pen or out of the mind of man.

No words of mine could possibly overemphasize the abilities or the capabilities of Secretary Sawyer to handle his present job or any other job within the gift or bestowal either of the President of the United States or of the American people themselves.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Sawyer's choice of his assistants bespeaks, more than words can tell, his wonderful abilities as an executive and as an administrator. In his choice of William Henry Harrison, he has brought back into Washington one of America's recognized top-flight captains of industry to head up and handle the tremendous task of administering the National Production Authority now reposed in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Harrison, NPA Administrator, is certainly no stranger to any of us who sit on either side of the aisle or on both ends of this Capitol. We knew him as president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Co., and later as president of the International Telephone and Telegraph Corp.

We know him best as Maj. Gen. "Bill" Harrison, who distinguished himself by his service as Chief of Procurement and Distribution Division of the United States Army Signal Corps in the Armed Services Forces during World War II.

We shall always remember him as a strict disciplinarian, a good officer, a great administrator, and, above all else, as a splendid gentleman.

The hundreds of us—Members of both Houses and their families, who were in attendance, will never forget the physical evidences we saw the night we were invited to the Pentagon to look upon what had, in part, been achieved by General Harrison through conservation in the procurement of military supplies.

There, stretched out in the main ring or corridor of that great structure—then new to Washington—we saw fragments of metal, plastic, and other organic and inorganic matters, thousands upon thousands of them, that had been brought into production to serve this country more cheaply and better than did other scarce critical and strategic materials and methods that had historically been used in the production of the accoutrements of war.

I well remember the statistics which evidenced the fact that more than a billion and a half dollars had been saved—by his foresight and administration—through the conservation of millions of man-hours of labor, the substitution of one material for another, through standardization of parts, through simplification of design, by way of reclamation, by the use of die castings that obviated expensive machine labor, the welding of stamped parts to replace those parts that had long been machined out of solid metals and at great expense. Additionally thereto were a host of improved methods of platings and inhibitors, together with a veritable catalog of other variations and changes that then promised to make, and since have made, life more economical and better for every man, woman, and child in these United States. He is a worthy assistant to a great man.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to the reading of every Member of this Congress the article written by Beverly Smith, Washington editor of the Saturday Evening Post, around the Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Charles Sawyer, entitled "Truman's Most Surprising Adviser."

At the same time I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues here in this House to extend my remarks and insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the wonderful address of our great Secretary of Commerce on mobilizing for defense, which reads as follows:

My last meeting with the members of this great advertising association was on March 31 of this year when you joined the membership of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, at White Sulphur Springs. Most of us were optimistic about the future; we had successfully weathered a slight recession in 1949 and the economy was again surging upward.

On June 25 the Communist army of North Korea attacked without warning the free people of the Republic of Korea. Following prompt condemnation of this act by the United Nations Security Council, we undertook to implement their decision with men and with weapons. Since then, we have become increasingly aware of the tremendous burdens which have fallen upon government, upon business, and upon our people.

Recently, the news from the battlefront has been encouraging. We are proud of the men who are engaged in this bloody and bitter struggle. However, for those at home pride is not enough—we must give the men at the front our all-out support.

We have two jobs to do: First, to place in the hands of those at the front all the weapons they need to do their job; second, to keep our civilian economy strong. If business can contribute its full share to these two great tasks it will gain for itself a place of high honor.

Two weeks ago the President delegated to various Government agencies powers given to him under the Defense Production Act of 1950. He delegated to the Secretary of Commerce allocation, priority and requisitioning powers over many of the key materials and commodities of our economy. That difficult assignment makes it proper for me to talk with you about the task which lies ahead and the manner in which we propose to use the powers we have received. It is important that the public—and in particular businessmen—be fully informed as to what the Government proposes to do and why.

First, may I say a word as to the President's policy of delegating the control functions to existing agencies. It is clear that the important fact is not the name of the agency but the name of the man in charge. There are some, inexperienced in practical affairs, who believe that the prompt and easy solution to any Government problem is the magnificent gesture of organizing a new agency, giving it a big name and plenty of money, and calling in some celebrity to "run the show." Such an action is justified only when top-level men in government are incompetent.

Furthermore it does not by any means automatically produce the desired result. Occasionally the "big shot" picked out of the air proves a great disappointment. He may be demanding, egotistical, and ineffective.

There are many advantages in utilizing existing agencies. In the first place, there is the prosaic, but important, matter of money. The creation of a new agency is always expensive. As a rule, it is necessary to give special income advantages to those who enter a new agency. We have experienced that in the Commerce Department, where men were lured from their jobs—or at least were tempted—by larger salaries, opportunities for travel, and other advantages not furnished within the existing agencies.

Furthermore it is far more difficult for Congress or the Executive to keep down mushrooming tendencies of a new agency, where one has no precedent to serve as a guide and the claims of necessity are hard to answer. Not only is such a move expensive from the standpoint of dollars but it is expensive from the standpoint of efficient Government operation.

A new agency, of course, draws much of its personnel from outside of Government, and in many cases that personnel is not of the highest quality. Except where superior talents are persuaded to do a job of this sort on the basis of public service, those who come are not too keenly demanded by industry. In other words, the agency gets the people that industry is willing to let go.

However, a large contribution of experience and competence is bound to come from the people who have, over the years, done the job in Government. To the extent that the new agencies recruit their personnel from the existing agencies—which must, in the long run, carry on the functions of Government—the regular agencies are deprived of some of their best men, morale is adversely affected, and efficiency is substantially reduced.

Not only is this procedure expensive but, by and large, a better job can be done by existing Government agencies. They are already organized. They don't need to undertake the desperate hunt for space, for talent, for equipment.

I can illustrate the point with my own experience. As soon as it was indicated that the President would ask for control powers and that at least some of them would come to the Department of Commerce, we began to organize a new unit in the Department, using the experience and talents of those in the Department who had done this same work throughout World War II. The records and many of the personnel of the War Production Board of World War II were transferred to the Department of Commerce some years ago. It was, therefore, a simple matter to put these men at work on a program for meeting the present situation.

In this endeavor I have undertaken to avoid previous mistakes and benefit by experience. To head up the activity it was clear that we should, if possible, get the services of a man of recognized ability, but also one who had been through this work before and would know what he was doing as soon as he took over. With the help of the business advisory council of the Department of Commerce, many of whom spent practically the entire period of World War II in Government work in Washington, we were able to persuade one of the top businessmen in the country—William Henry Harrison—to leave his high position in the business world and undertake the job of Administrator of the National Production Authority in the Department of Commerce. Those who argue that you cannot set up an enterprise of this sort within the existing agencies say that competent and top-level men won't come to take jobs within the existing agency framework. This is, of course, not true, as Mr. Harrison has proved.

We were also able to secure the services of Mr. Manly Fleischmann, who was first assistant to John Lord O'Brian, General Counsel of the WPB during World War II. Mr. Fleischmann has given up a very lucrative law practice in Buffalo and come to Washington at a great sacrifice in personal income to occupy the important post of General Counsel for the NPA.

Now, as to controls. In a war there are two fronts, the battle and the home front. The purpose of the NPA will be to carry on this home-front fight so that the boys at the battle front get the things they need.

The happy period of peace and prosperity which we enjoyed since the close of World War II is, for the time being at least, at an end. There is no advantage in pretending otherwise. Regardless of the outcome of the battle in Korea, we have embarked upon a program which will put critical strains upon our domestic economy. Serious shortages, heavy taxes, and problems of inflation will tax our ingenuity and self-control and strength to the utmost; and this will go on for years.

Those who think that the end of this present emergency will relieve us of concern for the future are victims of self-delusion; those who fear that the imposition of controls will rob us of our liberties are poor appraisers of the quality of liberty, or lack of it, which will be forced upon us if we fail in this undertaking of self-discipline.

The National Production Authority is now under way, but the great bulk of activity, of course, lies ahead of it. We have only begun the task. Our first order was a so-called inventory control, the purpose of which was to prevent unreasonable accumulation of inventories beyond the normal requirements of business.

Other orders will follow shortly. We are making every effort to impose as little hardship as possible upon business, but where it is necessary we will not hesitate to impose it.

In one respect we shall depart from previous practice. There has been some tendency in Government to reject a man who knows a lot about the line of business he is dealing with. In the last war it was not uncommon to assign a man who had spent his whole life in the copper business to an office in charge of wallpaper or plastics. This is bad administration, to say the least. The man who knows most about the copper business and how to conduct it is the man who has been in that business. There are some so suspicious of American businessmen that they feel the use of men who are familiar with a particular business will inevitably bring about crooked favoritism. I do not believe businessmen are any more honest than other people, nor do I believe they are any less honest—nor any less imbued with a sense of public service. I feel that, for the most part, they will come to whatever jobs are given them with a high sense of public duty, and where I find that this is not the case they will be promptly removed and punished.

Furthermore, the whole concept I am discussing is stupid; if a man is dishonest he is as likely to be dishonest in a field other than his own as in a field with which he is familiar; and if he is uninformed as well as dishonest he is certainly more likely to be an easy mark for unscrupulous practitioners.

One of the problems with which we are dealing now, and will continue to deal, is the question of increasing our productive capacity. We must, and we will, see that this is done. It should not be done, however, hysterically or foolishly.

As we discuss this question, it is well to bear in mind certain encouraging facts, as of today. Never in our history have be been so strong, never has our national production been so high, never has the diversity of employment, plant location, and sources of supply been so extensive. Our national production at the moment is running at the rate of over $280,000,000,000 per year, and in the 5 years since 1945 American business has built and added to its productive facilities $115,000,000,000 of new plants and equipment.

In 1940, we were completely dependent upon natural rubber from abroad. Today, we have a synthetic-rubber industry which is being rapidly expanded and which is producing hundreds of thousands of tons of rubber per year.

Today, the domestic and Western Hemisphere reserves of oil are practically unlimited.

Our transportation system has a capacity far greater than prior to World War II. In 1939 to 1941 American-flag vessels in the overseas trade totaled 563. Today, including reserve fleets, we now have more than five times as many ships, with a gross tonnage proportionately greater.

In machine tools, our present production is utilizing only one-half of the available capacity.

We have a vast addition to our plant capacity, and it is much better distributed than in 1940. The shift of population toward the West has been accompanied by a shift in industry locations. It is much easier to operate in the Pacific than it was in 1940 and 1941, as we have already demonstrated in the few short weeks since Korea.

We have thousands of airfields, shipyards, and other facilities available for use whose building in the early forties required a vast number of man hours and tremendous quantities of steel, cement, and other basic materials. These facilities are available to be converted without the drain on critical materials which was required to construct them in 1940, 1941, and 1942.

Furthermore, the most recent statistics given me by the Office of Business Economics in my Department indicate that plans for fixed investment in the second half of 1950 have been adjusted sharply upward, approximating $9,800,000,000, a figure close to the peak reached in the corresponding period of 1948 and 9 percent higher than in the second half of 1949.

Encouraging as these signs are, we are, however, faced—and will be faced—with many grim problems. We already have shortages of critical materials, and there is no reason to believe these shortages will be relieved in the near future. In fact, there is every reason to believe that many of them may grow. The news from Korea at the moment is encouraging; but this is no sham battle in which we are engaged. Those we fight mean business, and it is high time for all of us to realize that we must mean business too. The Communist control imposes rigid and ruthless discipline from the top. The ordinary man is not asked what he wants to do; he is told. To meet the coordinated effort which this type of discipline makes possible, we must be prepared to impose discipline upon ourselves.

It is completely unrealistic to assume that after a brief interval the problems we now face in Korea will be ended and we can go back to "business as usual." The chips are down. The use of this phrase indicates a game or a gamble. When you gamble, you take some chances; but it is our job to lengthen the odds in our favor. We want better than a gambler's chance to make secure the future of America and the future of civilization.

It is about time that all segments of our economy stop thinking about what they can demand and think about what they can give to save themselves and all of us from an unpleasant fate. Not only as groups, but as individuals, this theory must apply. It must apply in connection with prices, wages, and hoarding.

The matter of price and wage controls has not been given to me, and I shall not discuss it in any detail. The President's order sets up an Economic Stabilization Agency which will deal with these problems. I should like, however, to talk briefly about hoarding. We have been given the power to prosecute hoarders, and to requisition the things they are hoarding. These powers will be exercised, and I can pledge you that wrong-doers will be punished. In every situation and in every age there are people who try to profit from the misfortunes of others. There are those who are willing to take advantage of military demands to enrich themselves. We will undertake, as far as possible, to prevent this. We have already issued a so-called inventory order, putting 32 war materials under control. There must be no accumulation of materials beyond what is needed for normal production and stocks of controlled materials are to be held to a practicable minimum working inventory. Failure to observe this order, now in effect, will subject the offender to a heavy fine and imprisonment. Other materials will undoubtedly be added to this list as time goes on.

One fundamental objective of this developing program is, as I said before, to increase the supply of needed materials. We are not satisfied with present supplies, and are acquainting industry with that fact. We want a continually greater supply of every strategic material, so that we will have not only enough, but more than enough, of what we need.

I referred earlier in my talk to the item of steel. The morning when the NPA was set up, and Mr. Harrison sworn in, I held a meeting with the executives of all the top steel companies in the country, talked with them about the program, told them what we wanted, and asked them to tell me specifically at an early date what they were prepared to do in the way of an increase of steel capacity.

It is essential, of course, while pursuing our immediate military objective, to maintain our own economic strength. There are many problems involved, the most menacing of which, in my judgment, is the threat of inflation. By some device, by some method, we must prevent the inflationary spiral from getting out of control. If it isn't done by one method, it must be done by another. As President Truman said after outlining the vicious results of the inflationary spiral, "We must not let these things happen."

There are several ways in which we can fight the battle against inflation. One method calls for a reduction of the amount of dollars in circulation and the spending power of our people. The Federal Reserve Board has already imposed credit controls under the powers recently given them, and has stated publicly that these controls will be made more drastic if they do not produce early and substantial results. The President has repeatedly stated the need for strong credit controls in connection with housing.

Furthermore, we must expect heavy and continued taxation. One sound device for combating inflation is taxation, and it is highly desirable to pay as we go in this great effort in which we are now engaged. We can, therefore, look forward to heavy and continued tax burdens—all of us.

I shall not undertake to discuss the relative value of methods of taxation, but will leave that to the Treasury experts who are responsible for raising revenue.

If these and other similar methods fail—or perhaps even before they fail—it may be necessary to impose controls upon prices and wages. This is an unpleasant and exasperating procedure, but we may have to do it.

The law passed by Congress provides for an Office of Economic Stabilization which will administer these particular controls. I cannot urge too strongly upon the businessmen of this country the folly of increasing prices, nor upon the workingmen of this country the folly of demanding wage increases, except as such increases are necessary to take care of specific inequities and particular situations.

Every time a businessman increases his prices, and every time a labor group asks for increased wages, it adds to the strain. There are undoubtedly some situations where increases in prices and wages are justified—to readjust inequities. Aside from these infrequent situations, price and wage increases should be avoided.

A workingman who gets a 10-percent increase in his wages, with which he must meet a 12-percent increase in the cost of living, is worse off than he was before.

It is idle now to talk about battles between capital and labor in this country. Capital and labor must join forces in the real battle. If that is lost, we all go down together.

I should like to say a word about the small-business man and the employees of the small-business man. It is highly desirable that this important part of our economy be given attention. There are almost 4,000,000 separate business units in these United States, and if a peacetime—or for that matter wartime—effort is to succeed these units must remain active and healthy. This should be the concern of government, and it should also be the concern of management and labor. Great corporations—Nation-wide in scope—and great labor organizations of similar scope—should have in mind the needs of the small-business man and the employees of the small-business man.

During World War II we recognized, belatedly, the need to have the skill and the effort and the brains of smaller business units at the disposal of our defense effort. As far as my part in the enterprise is concerned, I should like to recognize this need at an early, and not a late, stage of our preparation. Furthermore, it is highly desirable to recognize that our effective business units are not confined to manufacturing. There is a tendeny to ignore completely the function played by distribution in our peace and wartime economy. We cannot afford to overlook this part of the business world.

I have told you some unpleasant truths. In my opinion, the American people—all of them—can stand the truth; furthermore, in my opinion, the American people want the truth. If it is unpleasant, they prefer to know it early. There is a certain pleasing sensation which comes from telling people nice things. It is, however, time to forego that sensation and gain some satisfaction from the feeling that we are preparing the American people to base their future upon the solid foundation of reality.

Resolution of Catholic War Veterans, Department of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of the Catholic War Veterans, Department of Maryland.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas many patriotic citizens and organizations strenuously objected to the original appointment of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State; and

Whereas the American public has become increasingly alarmed over his policy of cringing appeasement toward Communist aggression in the Far East; and

Whereas an irate electorate recently rebelled at his championing of a person formally adjudicated a Communist by a court of the United States; and

Whereas his policy of obsequiously surrendering to the outlaw demands of the Communists in Asia has been thoroughly and dramatically repudiated by the President of the United States; and

Whereas the aforesaid complete reversal of the policies he so stubbornly and dangerously advocated have destroyed whatever conceivable use he may have been to our country as a member of the President's Cabinet; and

Whereas, in our considered opinion, recent world developments and the best interests of our beloved country required his prompt removal from office: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Catholic War Veterans, Department of Maryland, in special meeting assembled this 29th day of June 1950, That the President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to request the immediate resignation of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, to the press of Baltimore City, and to the national press services.

Program for a True Pay-as-You-Go Full-Coverage Social-Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23 (legislative day of Friday, September 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, under permission to extend my remarks, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of my program for a pay-as-you-go social-security system.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, there has come to my attention in recent years a deeply disturbing observation. People are saying that we are so far along the road to statism that we cannot possibly turn back, and so we might as well make the best of it. This, of course, is the most malicious nonsense.

If we are on the wrong road—and statism is the antithesis of democracy—then we must reorient ourselves. But we don't have to waste time going back. Far better, we can cut a new trail across country until we reach the right road off which we wandered.

Mr. President, it is because I sincerely believe that the road we are now traveling in regard to social security is leading us away from American ideals and toward ultimate national insecurity and disaster that I am suggesting a fresh approach to the entire problem.

I am proposing a full-coverage pay-as-you-go social-security program which would give more protection to more Americans than the Social Security Act amendments of 1950 and spell security rather than insecurity for our national economy.

The very real danger which lurks in the 1950 amendments is that we will be lulled into a false sense of social security on our home front, while girding ourselves for all-out defense of our American way of life from foreign attack.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall indicate the social, economic, and political pitfalls of our present system, as I see them, before offering you my substitute American Citizens Pension Plan.

SOCIAL INSECURITY

The bad features of our present system fall into three broad categories: (1) Inhumanities, injustices, and undemocratic discriminations; (2) economic unsoundness; and (3) political pressures.

So-called social security has been with us now for 15 years. Back in 1935, weary and discouraged from depression, many believed the promises then made by President Roosevelt that the magic formula of contributory, deferred-payment, social insurance would free us from the fear of poverty in old age. The Nation did not question where this fine scheme came from, nor examine carefully who was in and who was out—but passed the Social Security Act confident that, by virtue of compulsory contributions, it was purchasing, in a dignified manner, adequate retirement pensions. There would be no more poorhouses; no more public charity; no more of the humiliation and grief of the means test. Federal aid to the States for their old-age assistance programs was to be only a temporary expedient while old-age and survivors' insurance was being set up and perfected.

Now, after 15 years and the latest liberalizing amendments, what do we find?

We find a monster two-headed system, half federally administered, half State-administered, arbitrarily dividing the American people into two groups; those considered worthy of receiving old-age and survivors' insurance benefits as a right based on compulsory token contributions, and those considered unworthy, beyond the pale, without OASI rights or benefits.

To this latter group the system says: "If you are in need, declare yourself a pauper, prove you have no assets, no close relatives who might be forced to support you. Open your books. Let a paid social worker snoop around and look under the rug to see that you have nothing hidden. Then as a public ward, after long delay, you will be sent a check made up partly of State and local taxes, partly of Federal taxes. But if you should have the luck to earn a few dollars, you will be cut off and run the risk of losing your place on the list."

Out of our eleven and one-half million men and women over 65 today, only two and one-half million are receiving OASI benefits as a right. This figure includes some, but not all, of those 65 or over taken in by the new law. Of these, about 250,000 have been forced to undergo the means test to qualify for supplementary local public assistance because their OASI benefits are insufficient. Two million eight hundred thousand who have not qualified for OASI (although many of them may have contributed but a few dollars less than required) are on public assistance with all the indignity that that implies. And over 6,000,000 not qualified for OASI and too proud to apply for assistance receive neither the one nor the other. Many of them may be as worthy as those selected for the former and as needy as those subjected to the latter. In addition, according to the Bureau of the Census, the largest single group of these 6,000,000 forgotten old folks are widows who are not working and whose incomes range from $1,000 all the way down to zero.

The present situation is in process of change, since the new law became operative only recently (September 1, 1950). Even when all those now eligible for immediate benefits under the new act are brought onto the benefit lists, however, it is not expected to change this picture materially.

In short, even after the recent liberalizing amendments, out of some eleven and one-half million men and women over 65, we have only around two and one-half million receiving old-age insurance benefits, and the rest—over 9,000,000—receiving public assistance or nothing.

We have only to examine the record to find that in selecting the privileged Americans for OASI the system operates like a lottery, awarding benefits to those lucky enough to acquire "insured status" by working in covered employment the required number of calendar quarters and denying benefits to anyone who falls short by so much as a few dollars. Basically, however, the system discriminates against the young in favor of the old, against men and women who want to continue to work after 65 in favor of those who retire, against women in favor of men, and against the poor in favor of the rich.

As of January 1, 1951, of the estimated 82,000,000 men and women who will have contributed to OASI since the beginning, only around 60,000,000 will have fully insured status. It is true that the 1950 amendments will take in some 500,000 of the present aged and that increased coverage will make it less likely to lose status by going in and out of covered employment. Even so, the system will strike from the rolls anyone whom catastrophe strikes before he has acquired "insured status."

The amendments make it possible for a man of 62 or older to qualify for benefits at the bottom of the ladder, with six quarters and a total contribution of $4.50. For this $4.50 if he retires immediately after six quarters, he may receive a primary benefit of $20 per month for the rest of his days. If his wife is the same age, with the usual life expectancy of 13 years for him and 15 for her, they may net for that original $4.50 investment $4,826. However, a man 62 years old or older, earning $3,600 or over, would do even better. Under the same set of circumstances, he and his wife might expect to receive $17,373 worth of hand-outs from Uncle Sam—and these are conservative estimates. Under particular circumstances such as a greater number of dependents and longer years of life, the windfalls would come much higher.

On the other hand, for today's 20-year-olds, the amendments demand 40 quarters in covered employment to qualify for benefits; and if today's youth stay all their working lives in covered employment, their compulsory contributions (which will rise to 2 percent in 1954 and 3½ percent in 1970) will amount to sufficient to buy a policy from a private company.

Although the amendments do raise the earned income exemption from $15 to $50 per month after 65, there is no ceiling on unearned income and retirement is still at a premium, although our economy needs more, not fewer workers, and it is generally agreed that continued employment rather than retirement is better for the aging individual himself.

Similarly, the amendments ease the discrimination against women by the innovation of dependent husband's benefits. But the system still assumes that a woman needs less to live on than a man, not only when husband and wife are living together, but when she is a widow and alone.

Most grotesque of all is the System's continued discrimination against the "underprivileged." While raising the highest primary benefits to $80 per month, the amendments only raise the lowest benefits to $20 per month—still not enough to live on independently over most of the United States. And, while extending coverage to some of the richest men and women in the country, the new law still excludes some fifteen to twenty million of the gainfully employed, including those most likely to be in need.

Investigation reveals the astounding picture of bank presidents, corporation executives, and Hollywood stars among those receiving OASI benefits as a right—a right for which they have only made compulsory token contributions, remember—while marginal domestic servants, migratory farm labor, share-croppers, and the widow whose deceased husband failed by a few dollars to acquire insured status, must await their turn to prove absolute need before being given public assistance.

Is this security, or is it sand in our eyes?

ECONOMIC INSECURITY

Now let us consider the economic aspects of the present system.

Individual security is only as secure as the economic soundness of the Nation; and there are enough ominous signs that the handouts we are contemplating will, in due time, undermine our entire national economy.

In the first place, OASI is not an insurance at all in the actuarial sense. This is readily understandable when a comparison is made between the total contributions and the windfall benefits of persons retiring during the first 20 years. Even with the rising payroll-tax rate during the maturing years of the system, benefits far outstrip what the employee's contribution or tax would purchase actuarially. This means that other people must pay the actuarial margin of error. Not only is the employers' part of the tax passed on to the consumers in higher prices, but the forfeiture of some contributors add to the windfall of others.

In addition, there is the question of what happens to the payroll taxes collected. Obviously the money cannot be kept safe and sound in a sock. It must, under law, be invested in Government obligations. The Government promptly spends the money, pays interest to itself from the taxpayers' pockets on the slips of paper in the Treasury and then, when these OASI IOU's fall due, must either float new bond issues or tax the people again to get the cash to pay the benefits.

But by far the most dangerous element in the economics of the liberalized law is the rising cost of the dual old age and survivors insurance public-assistance system. OASI deferred payments increase precipitously as greater numbers retire on a high-benefit scale. And, if past performance is any indication of future trends, political pressures will continue to multiply the millions of Federal grants-in-aid for State and local public assistance.

Dr. H. G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, in his preface to the Cost and Financing of Social Security by Lewis Meriam and Karl T. Schlotterbeck, declares:

"The old age and survivors insurance system in its present form involves constantly mounting costs over a 50-year period. Great confusion has been engendered in the public mind because of the assumption that these costs can be gradually provided for through the application of ordinary insurance principles. That is, it is widely believed that the social-security taxes now being paid furnish the resources from which the future benefits may be paid. The fact is that a practically universal governmental system cannot successfully apply the actuarial legal reserve devices of private, voluntary insurance systems. As the present system operates, no real reserve funds with which to meet future requirements are accumulated. The benefits will have to be paid out of future taxes.

"The future demands upon the Government for benefit payments—to be paid out of future taxes—will be so great that it appears to us essential that they be given full consideration now before the commitments are made. The demand for cash for benefits must be studied in the light of other governmental cash requirements for national defense, foreign relations, veterans' benefits, interest on the public debt, and all other activities of Government."

The authors conclude with a recommendation for a true pay-as-you-go system under which persons now in need will have those needs met from current revenues.

POLITICAL INSECURITY

Now, Mr. President, let us stop for a moment to inquire how we managed to develop a system of ostensible security which in fact endangers our national well-being.

In my opinion, Mr. President, this has happened without our knowing it for three reasons:

1. Social insurance is a foreign concept, started by the German chancellor, Otto von Bismarck, in the 1880's to buy off democracy in his time. The idea of insurance was a political trick to raise revenue while fooling the people into believing in their right to state-guaranteed assistance. It was a poor substitute for that opportunity which was opening before the peoples of the western powers. But it worked in the rigidly class-conscious German society, to keep the masses subservient to the Crown, to the Weimar Republic, and finally to Adolph Hitler.

Grafted on to the American scene, the old age insurance benefit formula, determined by the payroll tax (despite some minor differences) could not but create class prejudice and work hardships here as abroad.

A windfall Federal hand-out to an American bank president at 65 affords him no more dignity than a needs-tested public assistance check does a poor widow.

2. The fact that OASI excluded so many classes of our population and the Federal Government guaranteed open-end grants-in-aid to the States to help them with their assistance programs was an invitation to local politicians to promise free Federal money to their constituents. Thus the fantastic mushroom growth of the State old age assistance programs.

3. The public in general has been kept in ignorance both of the foreign origin of OASI and of the political and economic implications of the dual social security system, while more, bigger, and better persons was the hue and cry of many voters as well as vote-getters from coast to coast.

However, Mr. President, I do not believe that the people of this country would be so stupid or unpatriotic as to undermine our national economy for short-term personal gain—if they realized what they were doing, if they were told the truth. Certainly the mess we are in is not the social security the people thought they were voting for.

Last year former President Hoover wrote to Chairman DOUGHTON, of the Ways and Means Committee, as follows:

"The real and urgent problem is the need group. It is not solved now, nor can it be solved for many years, by the Federal insurance system, even if that system can be made to work efficiently."

After recommending that an independent research body be established to analyze other possible systems, Mr. Hoover concluded:

"A careful inquiry might disclose an entirely different system which would avoid the huge costs of administration and duplication, which would substitute some other form of taxation, more simple and more direct for its support, and which would give more positive security to the aged than this complicated system."

Mr. President, during more than 3 months of public hearings and many weeks of executive session, the Senate Finance Committee labored to report out social security amendments that would be fair and just to all Americans. However, we found that it was impossible to devise an old-age social insurance formula to make the present aged eligible for benefits or to cover those most likely to be in need—such as marginal domestics, migratory farm labor, and share croppers. It was impossible because old-age social insurance was designed for the wage earner, not for the population as a whole.

I strongly suspect that the majority of the Finance Committee is not only unhappy concerning the conglomerate amendments which now have become law, but, for reasons of justice and considerations of economy, would favor an honest pay-as-you-go social security system. This is proven by the proposed committee resolution to set up a subcommittee specifically instructed to study pay-as-you-go.

It became apparent during the hearings that the opponents of the present system fall into three principal groups: (1) Those who would like to see a pay-as-you-go plan adopted, but who cling to the idea of contributions; (2) those who want a pay-as-you-go, low, flat-rate floor of protection for all citizens without a means test; (3) those who believe with the Brookings Institution in pay-as-you-go protection for the aged but on the basis of some kind of a means test, as the only system economically sound.

The proposal which I am about to outline is an attempt to follow Mr. Hoover's recommendations and to incorporate in one universal-eligibility, pay-as-you-go, contributory social security program, the best features of the various points of view. That is: (1) Equal protection for all under the law; (2) freedom from the means test; (3) universal contribution; and (4) economic soundness; pay-as-you-go, go-as-you-pay on an income-tax, income-supplement basis, for all aged persons and dependent children whose income or means of support drops below a given minimum.

AMERICAN CITIZENS PENSION PLAN

In a nutshell, my program, after wiping the slate clean of the fallacious foreign concept of social insurance under which selected classes make token contributions toward annuity rights, would recognize the right of every American citizen to protection, on the fire-insurance principle, in case of need in old age. It would provide pensions on a mathematical sliding scale, without a means test and without discrimination, in amounts to supplement inadequacies of income. The important problem of old-age protection would thus be solved in a manner that would neither bankrupt the Nation nor humiliate the recipients.

Here is the plan in broad outline predicated upon the asumption that a top-flight commission be appointed to work out details and to follow up the provisions affecting the aged in principle also for dependent children:

I. Pension provisions: Create a new social security system as a substitute for the indefensible dual OASI-public assistance provisions of the present act, under which:

A. Every American citizen aged 65 and over would have the right to a citizen's pension, according to the following conditions:

1. Every individual over 65 whose estimation of income for the year ahead (as currently required for income tax purposes) was $600 or less, would receive a citizens pension of, for example, $50 a month—the exact amount to be determined. This would provide every aged couple $100 per month.

2. Every individual 65 and over whose estimation of income for the year ahead was more than $600, would receive a citizen's pension reduced by $1 a month for every $50 more of annual income.

3. Every individual 65 and over whose estimation of income for the year ahead was $2,450 or more would receive no citizen's pension.

B. Revised declarations of estimated income could be made throughout the year. Following the end of a calendar year, the amount of overpayment or underpayment of an individual's pension would be determined and any necessary adjustments would be consolidated with other necessary income tax adjustments.

II. Financing: Support the new system by a tax on every citizen whose net taxable income exceeds some such small amount as $600 a year. Thus, substantially every individual would during some period of his life be contributing toward his ultimate protection.

A. The rate of the supporting tax would be redetermined from time to time solely on the basis of the necessary costs for financing the system. This would constitute checks and balances between the means of the contributors and the desires of the recipients.

B. The initial rate of the supporting tax, according to the proposed schedule, would probably be around 5 percent and in any event would be limited to the first $3,000 of individual income. This 5 percent would be only in part additional because:

1. The existing payroll tax would not be levied.

2. In the long run the local taxes required to support the assistance programs would be escaped.

3. The initial tax would be accompanied by a reduction of about 2½ percent in the regular income-tax rates on the first $3,000 of individual income, in recognition of the fact that the new system is at once relieving the Federal Government of substantially over a billion dollars a year in grants-in-aid.

4. On the other hand, the $600 personal income-tax exemption for individuals 65 and over might be abolished.

III. Transition: An important task of the special commission would be the equitable disposition of the present OASI fund.

Suggestion:

A. Refund to contributors in the form of bonds.

B. Used fund for first year's operation of new system.

C. Hold fund intact and use interest as a cushion for recession periods when incomes drop.

ADVANTAGES

Such a program as here envisioned would have very definite advantages over the present system from the point of view of administration, the national economy, and the best interests of the American people individually.

American tradition: It would be American as opposed to our present copy of European class legislation. It would be just, democratic, nondiscriminatory. It would play no favorites; offer no special privileges. It would match the equal opportunity of our American way of life with equal protection against loss of income in old age. It would assure every American, the richest as well as the poorest, that if catastrophe should strike, he or she would be adequately provided for, by right, in a wholly dignified manner. At the same time, it would put the burden of responsibility on the individual to work and to save. Also, it would put responsibility on the individual whom catastrophe did strike to make an honest declaration of his income for the year ahead—just as now he is expected to make an honest income tax return—and so he would determine his own citizen's pensior. In other words, responsibility would be returned to the individual for his own welfare.

National economy: My proposed program would be economically sound. It would cost far less than the present system while providing protection for the entire population instead of selective groups thereof. Mr. George Immerwahr, former Chief Actuary for OASI, a distinguished authority in this field, has supplied a preliminary cost study in which he concludes with the conservative statement that the adoption of my proposal in substitution for the present social-security system "would produce an ultimate saving of $5,000,000,000 a year." Mr. Immerwahr's estimate of course takes into consideration a vastly simplified administration and greatly reduced bureaucratic expenses. Since it would not undermine the national economy, it would offer every American far greater assurance of security.

General public reaction: My proposal to abolish the means test would have a direct, immediate appeal for the approximately 3,000,000 present public assistance recipients—not to mention any who might have to undergo the test in the foreseeable future.

My proposal to bring in the present aged would affect over 6,000,000 who now are receiving nothing, in addition to those 3,000,000 now on assistance.

My proposal for universal eligibility would effect fifteen to twenty million farmers, sharecroppers, migratory farm labor, and marginal domestic servants.

My proposal to pay pensions on a graduated, income-loss basis would give more in pensions to greater numbers.

Organized labor would gain right on down the line. It is true my proposal would reduce the over-all pensions of those few retired workers who hold a 25-year record of service with companies having no offset clause in their collective bargaining pension contracts. However, it would give more to the vast majority of workers who are employed by small business and who change jobs every few years.

Farmers would approve my proposal as a guaranty of their traditional independence rather than in any way interfering with it. Rural areas generally would be emancipated from the oppression of public assistance.

State governments would be relieved of a large share of their present financial outlay for public assistance. State funds would thus be freed for other necessary local developments or for tax reductions.

The advantages of my program for the individual American, for important groups of Americans, and for the country as a whole, it seems to me, Mr. President, add up to an impressive total.

The 3,000,000 aged on public assistance, the 6,000,000 present aged on neither OASI nor public assistance, plus the fifteen to twenty million of the gainfully employed who remain uncovered by the Social Security Act amendments of 1950, amount to more than 25,000,000 Americans who would be benefited by the adoption of my program.

Add to this the advantage to be won by the members of organized labor and by the farm population on top of the financial relief to State treasuries—and who have we left against it? Those OASI compulsory contributors who might—but then might not—land a windfall. They are the only ones who would lose. And even they would gain surer protection in case of need by contributing to a sounder national economy.

It has been said by proponents of the present system that the American people, all of whom would be taxed (or would contribute) for American citizens pensions and aid to dependent children would not consider it fair not to receive their money back in case they were frugal or lucky and able to save for more than a $3,000 a year income after 65.

I don't believe it. The American people consider it perfectly fair to buy fire insurance and expect only to get their money back in case the house burns down. But far more important, the American people who gladly contribute to the rehabilitation of war-devastated Europe and the building up of backward areas all over the world, I am sure feel strong enough to support those of their own aged and dependent children who have for whatever reason found themselves in the position of having to draw on their insurance policies.

Mr. President, I offer my full-eligibility, contributory, pay-as-you-go social-security program to indicate the way we may reach the American road off which we wandered. Only on the American road can be hope to continue to live the American way and adequately defend ourselves from enemies within and without.

The Need of a United America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important statement made by my colleague, Senator Frank P. Graham, who retires today from the Senate. This statement is entitled "The Need of a United America."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED OF A UNITED AMERICA CONFRONTED WITH THE THREAT OF TOTALITARIAN TYRANNY AND GLOBAL WAR

INTRODUCTION

As the first of those Senators of the Eighty-first Congress to leave the Senate, under the terms of my appointment to succeed the lately lamented and distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina, the Honorable J. M. Broughton, until my distinguished successor, the Honorable WILLIS SMITH, is qualified, I wish, for all those who will soon leave, to express our good wishes to my successor and their successors in the high opportunity at a critical time in human history for service to our country and the world. To name these colleagues who will soon depart from these Halls, the majority leader, the majority whip, the chairmen of three of the most important Senate committees and a former chairman, and six other able members of important committees, representatives of both parties, all able, eminent, and patriotic Americans, to name them would be to entitle a significant chapter in the recent history of the Senate.

APPRECIATION OF WORK OF COLLEAGUES IN EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

I have a sense of the precious treasures of comradeship and of workmanship, even for a brief period in a beginning way, in being numbered with these and other colleagues in this Congress which enacted such vital legislation as: further provision in aid of the economic recovery of free nations; ratification of the Atlantic Pact; the military assistance program against potential aggression; the reciprocal-trade agreements; asylum for the persons displaced by the war; the reorganization of the Government in line with the Hoover report; the housing program for veterans and people of low income; the 75 cents minimum wage; the extension of social security; the conservation, reclamation, and development programs; the flood control and power programs; the agricultural parity price support, agricultural extension, research and vocational education, rural electrification and telephones; the national scientific research program; more adequate provision for military, naval, air, and atomic power; selective service, economic controls, and more adequate mobilization of the Nation for defense against aggression; and other vital acts for the security and welfare of the people. Much remains to be done.

THE VICE PRESIDENT THE BEARER OF GOOD WISHES TO NEWCOMERS AND VETERANS

Mr. President, we who leave look to you, who perennially remain, we trust, in health and happiness, at a more ample time and in a more adequate way, to interpret your and our good wishes to both the newcomers and the veterans who will now carry on the traditions and opportunities of the United States Senate. Yours are the special qualifications for such an interpretation. For us all you are "Mr. Senate." You are a product of both the House and the Senate and a byproduct of the highest traditions of these two historically American institutions which come from both the States and the people. You are the only Member elected by the people of all the 48 States. By inheritance you are a blend of colonial America and the pioneer West, whose forebears followed the trails of Daniel Boone from North Carolina into old Kentucky, a composite of the old South and the new, out there where the West first began and the risen South now beckons to the historic North and the great far West as the triple hope of a greater America.

In your composite Americanism, Mr. President, with recent beautiful reenforcements from Missouri, itself the middle quintessence and herself the very efflorescence of Americanism, you can speak for us all. In your own folklore you speak for us all, whether in the chair or in the cloakroom, by the clock or by the calendar. Long may you preside, Mr. President, with your fair firmness and gracious courtesy, youthful wit, and ancient wisdom, and the experienced skill of the old master. Unlike Old Man River, you do say something, in fact many things in many places, yet in your deep and moving ways, you just keep rolling along. Wherever you tell the stories of politics, history, and life, the people gather together to hearken to your eloquence even though, on occasion in off years, they may vote the other way and then expectantly wait for you to return undismayed for another day. Senators come and Senators go but you, Mr. President, just keep rolling along. Long may you preside, long may you roll along, by sea and air, road and rail, over hill and dale. Long may you wave from coast to coast in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

In your inimitable way, Mr. President, at later times more ample for your historic background, congressional experience, humane insight, and composite Americanism, we pray you to say our good wishes and interpret to all those who carry on with their devoted work the hopes of the people in the United States Senate, which, by constitutional provisions, modern history, and global circumstance, has become the most strategic deliberative body in the world.

CLOSE RANK AS AMERICANS

In your spirit, Mr. President, after the primaries, as members of political parties, we mainly closed ranks as Democrats or as Republicans. After the general election, in like spirit as citizens of our beloved country in a world threatening to human freedom, we must now close ranks as Americans. We must stand united on the shores of a continent fronting on the two great oceans which connect all the continents under skies which reach unbroken around the earth. Beyond those shore lines it is imperative in self-defense that we close ranks as a free people with all the free peoples of the earth confronted with us by the threat of totalitarian tyranny and global war. This totalitarian dictatorship of the Soviet Union would use the continents, the oceans, and the skies, and, by the ways of subversion, doubts, and confusions, would use the destructive divisions within free nations and among free nations, for the subjugation of all the peoples of the earth.

THE HOPE OF THE PEOPLE FOR PEACE

At the shore lines by closing ranks as Americans and beyond the shore lines by standing united with all free peoples, we will make it unmistakably clear, and thereby give pause to the dictators, that we will, in a great American tradition, defend freedom against aggression to the uttermost with our lives, our fortunes, and our most sacred honor. Yet, Mr. President, we must make it no less clear to the great Russian people and to all people, as far as we can get the word through to the people, that we hold on with prayerful hope, in our own imperfect and yet ever aspiring ways, for closing the global ranks as human beings with the will to continue the struggle toward one world of freedom, justice, disarmament, and peace under law for all the peoples of the earth.

With the surrenders of the Axis Powers and the ratifications of the Charter of the United Nations by 51 nations, there came to the generation, which had suffered the deaths, sorrows, destruction, and miseries of two world wars and one world depression, the hope at last for the organization of freedom, justice, and peace in the world. The cooperation of the allied nations which had won the war against fascism, nazism, and imperialism would now, it was hoped, be carried over into the cooperation of the United Nations which would win the moral equivalent of a war in the conquest of hunger, fear, injustice, and war itself. The cause for which scores of millions had died, lived on in the hopes and prayers of hundreds of millions of people. At long last peace could be organized on earth. In this hope there was comfort for the families of the soldiers and sailors dead in strange lands and in far waters around the earth. Now at last as a memorial to heroic youth and as an answer to the prayers of the mothers of men the nations would organize the freedom and peace of the world.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE U. S. S. R.

The answer to the prayers and hopes of the people was mainly in the keeping of the two nations—the United States and the Soviet Union—which survived with the vast potentials of their productive and military power. Would the disillusionments of war, resulting too much in the loss of the objectives for which the war was fought, cause the United States to withdraw from organized international cooperation? Would the illusions of isolation again cause us to lose the peace for which the isolation was attempted? Would confusion of minds and the wavering of purpose between national isolation and international participation, set the world stage for the drift into a third world war? Would the Soviet dictatorship become, as asserted, a transition to freedom, democracy, and peace or become a fixation for tyranny, aggression, and expanding power? Would the Soviet Union return to the policies of subversion, sabotage, liquidation, and subjugation or turn to the policy of participation in an international organization for cooperation and peace?

Once before in this generation the hopes of the people were lifted high for freedom and peace across the earth. After the First World War the United States of America took the leadership in the organization of the nations for peace. In the postwar reaction the United States renounced the League of Nations, attempted to withdraw in isolation, erected trade barriers with the highest tariff walls, and failed the hopes of the people of the world. In the Second World War the United States, to help win the war, shared her resources and her gigantic production with all the Allied nations. American foods, goods, planes, tanks, trucks, and ships streamed across the seas for the succor of the people and the armed forces of Britain, Russia, China, and associated nations on three continents. Lend-lease during the war, interim aid and UNRRA at the close of the war, and later the Marshall plan, regional pacts, technical assistance, and bold bipartisan international leadership, made it clear that the United States was all out for international cooperation and placed its high faith in the United Nations as the chief hope of peace in the world.

The Soviet Union, instead of carrying on the international cooperation which won the war, withdrew behind the iron curtain and more completely cut off the Russian people from the knowledge and intercourse of the non-Communist world. With delays, vetoes, walkouts, withdrawals, violations of the Charter of the United Nations, and obstructions of the procedures of international cooperation, the Soviet Union has damaged the foundations of the United Nations and has failed the humane hopes of mankind.

The United States and the Soviet Union, in cooperation with other nations in the United Nations, could answer the prayers and fulfill the hopes of the people for peace. If both chose to obstruct the procedures of the United Nations, the third world war would be inevitable. The intransigence, the subversions and aggressions of the Soviet Union have thrown upon the United States the main responsibility of preserving the life of the United Nations and the freedom of peoples, and of preventing both a third world war and the establishment of the totalitarian dictatorship of one world police state. The United States of America, by the leadership of free peoples in the United Nations, seeks to prevent the establishment of a world police state without a third world war and seeks to prevent a third world war without surrender to the threat of a world police state. The people of the United States have made it clear that they will, if necessary, fight a third world war to prevent the world dominion of the totalitarian police state.

AMERICA MUST BE STRONG

To carry the burdens of world leadership and to seek to prevent the awful catastrophes of either a world dictatorship or another world war or both, the United States, in self defense and for the survival of free peoples, must be strong. America must become stronger in the most modern military, naval, and air power; in atomic and cosmic science; in research on all the farthest frontiers of knowledge for every emergency of national defense and for every need of human freedom. America must be increasingly strong in the conservation, development, and wiser coordination of our natural, scientific, agricultural, industrial, financial, social, cultural, human, and spiritual resources for the crucial strains ahead. America must be stronger in the reorganization of the Government for economy and efficiency; in an abundant production which can for the long run balance the budget and pay off the debt without the destruction of the essential values of the public welfare, without bringing on a depression, and without surrendering the world to the Communist dictatorship. America must be more deeply resourced in her humane heritage historically great but with promises yet unfulfilled. America must grow stronger in the freedom of enterprise not as the privilege of monopoly of a few but with its equal opportunities open to all within the wide boundaries of the public welfare for that gigantic production, upon whose liberated energies and dynamic power of the organized cooperation of labor and management so largely depend the independence of America and the cooperative self recovery and self determination of peoples. America must be stronger in policies for agricultural equity; good health, preventive medicine, and programs for more adequate hospitals, medical care, and research; minimum wages and social security; in the self-organization of workers and equality in collective bargaining; in fairer and more intelligent interfaith, interracial, industrial, and other intergroup relations as part of the vigor, variety, and promise of American life. America must become thus stronger in democratic morale with a supreme concern for the freedom of the mind, the human dignity and spiritual autonomy of the individual, with a lawful regard for the will of the majority, and a joyous zest in the unresting adventure of fulfilling the American dream of the equal freedom and welfare of all people.

Through the higher knowledge and more general power of free and creative minds, through the more gigantic production of a dynamic economy, and through high democratic morale springing voluntarily from fairer human relations, America will be in the most powerful moral, economic, and military position at the most critical time for the cooperative leadership of the free peoples of the earth. For our own sake and as part of the moral power of American leadership, we must confess some failures and frustrations in our continuous struggle upward toward the fulfillment of the American dream for a freer and fairer society.

REMINDER OF THE REVELATIONS OF THE DEPRESSION

We need to recall that the depression revealed that we were far short of the fulfillment of the American dream, made cruelly clear in the failures and frustration of our democracy and of human society in general. Democracy had provided equality of suffrage but not equality of opportunity; the freedom to worship but not the opportunity to work; the freedom of assembly and the right of collective petition but not the freedom of the self-organization of workers and the equality of collective bargaining; corporate privilege, but not agricultural parity; and political liberty but not social security against the hazards of modern society.

The democracies, in general, with their dominant position, and America, in particular, with its unparalleled possession of the resources of abundance, presented to the world the disillusionments of the insecurity of peace in a world of armaments, poverty of farmers in a world in need of food, child labor and sweatshops in the midst of unemployment, loss of farms and homes in a society largely based on them, poverty and dependence of men and women after lives of faithful work, injustice to Negroes and to other racial and religious minorities, oligarchic corporate manipulation of stockholders, regimentation of workers, and wide misinformation of consumers, the use of the historic documents of human freedom in behalf of economic power over the freedom of human beings, vast unemployment in the midst of universal need, hunger amid plenty, and disillusionment and despair in a world of youth and opportunity. The political liberties and social drift of a more static society were found tragically insufficient to meet the vast economic changes, the financial crises, and the deep human needs of our dynamic modern society.

The American genius for enterprise, invention, and adjustment preserved the old Bill of Rights and added a new charter of freedom and equality for industrial workers and farmers; and of security for bankers, depositors, investors, the unemployed, and the old; of conservation and development of soils, forests, rivers, and power; and proposed a program of Federal aid to the States for the schools under State and local control for more equal educational opportunity for all the children in all the States.

SOME PERSISTING FRUSTRATION OF HOPES

Our people have become more aware of the moral implications of the remaining discriminations against racial and religious minority groups; of the barriers of sentiment and pressure against the organization of workers in some communities and against agricultural cooperative societies in others; inadequate housing, the shortage of doctors, nurses, and hospital beds; the prices rising disproportionately to the increase in incomes; the costs of hospital and medical care beyond the reach of millions of people; a few uneconomic anomalies in the agricultural program; the wastage of soils, forests, minerals, and water resources; huge expenditures for luxuries above the funds provided for the necessities of education and welfare; dictatorships in a few cities, corporations, and unions; slums, crimes, and rackets; the break-up of homes; youthful deliquency; the manipulation by financial power of the prejudices, fears and hates of the people against the interests of the people; the scourge of disease, drink, depressions, and wars recurring in many lands.

Too much is the consideration of the pecuniary interest placed above the scientific, technological and even the industrial; and the industrial exalted above the human and spiritual. Too many are the tendencies to value success as the standard of ethics; license as self expression; size and speed as progress; headlines as information; statistics as knowledge; mere compilation as research, and digests as culture; the humanities and the fine arts as frills; science as philosophy and materialism as religion. Yet in no land more than in America is the struggle more vigorous, various, and unyielding for a realization of the hopes in the minds and hearts of the men and women who crossed the uncharted seas and the unblazed wilderness toward the fulfillment of the American dream of equal freedom and justice for all.

THIS IS AMERICA OF OUR FAITH AND HOPE

In spiritual faith and the American dream, America is being made safe for democracy without vulgarity, differences without hate, and excellence without arrogance; where men become brothers in the sight of God and in the human heart; where opportunities of the children in homes and schools are the chief concern of present progress and the chief hope of a nobler society; where enduring progress in human relations is made through religion, education, and voluntary cooperation in the minds and hearts of the people; and where the struggle for the fulfillment of our historic Americanism is the best answer to fascism and communism in the present global struggle against totalitarian tyranny for freedom and peace in the world.

In this America of our struggles and our hopes, the least of these our brethren has the freedom to struggle for freedom; where the integrity of simple people is beyond price and the daily toil of millions is above pomp and power; where the answer to error is not terror, the respect for the past is not reaction, and the hope of the future is not revolution; where the majority is without tyranny, the minority without fear, and all people have hope. This is our faith. This is America. God bless America.

THE PEOPLE OF AMERICA STILL LOOK WITH HOPE TO THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE WHO ALSO HAVE THEIR DREAM OF FREEDOM AND PEACE

Every people have the land of their dreams, whether it be the eastern lands of the sunrise, the promised land of the Hebrews, the Greek Commonwealth of the oath of the Athenian youth, the eternal city, the city of God, the mecca of the pilgrimage, La Belle France, the British Commonwealth, the fatherland, the motherland, the American Republic, or the Russia of Tolstoian hopes. The free energies of the human spirit spring eternal in the hopes of the people who will make over their states and institutions in the image of their dreams. The Russian people whose hope of freedom and peace have been betrayed by the absolute power of the dictatorship of the Soviet Union cannot permanently be held in isolation and subjection behind the iron curtain which seeks to hide the prison wall of the police state. Despite the tyranny of the czars and the dictators, the Russian people have their own great tradition of the love of their country, lands, homes, churches, forests, their spacious views, the far reaches of the steppes, rivers, mountains, their folklore, songs, literature, and art. The peasants reveal the strength of religion, toil, patience, suffering, shrewdness, love of the land and open country, sense of home and hope. Russia is a land of mighty contrasts and high aloofness of the rulers from the people. The vast land and the robust people give to observers the impression of the potentials for mighty undertakings and a great future. The Russian people have their mighty rivers and stalwart boatmen, vast plains, their villages, and self-reliant peasants, their cattle, sturdy cowboys, and valiant horsemen nonpareil. They have through the generations had their heroic struggles for freedom and unity.

The American people have had much in common with the Russian people in their search for freedom and unity across vast land masses and in the need for expansion between the eastern and western seas and to the southern waters. Differences are cited, not as a matter of superiority or inferiority, but as a basis of better understanding. Some of the differences between the two peoples come from the differences in historic orientation, from the fact that the people of Russia missed and the people of America inherited the legacies of the Roman Empire, Catholic scholasticism, the pervasive influence of the large number of universities founded in Western Europe in the later Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the Reformation, the commercial revolution, the main currents of the scientific revolution, and the philosophic enlightenment, the English tradition of liberty, parliamentary government, the common law, the Bill of Rights, the American Revolution and Constitution, the French Revolution, the industrial revolution, the rise of the middle class, a strong labor movement, a vigorous woman's movement, universal education, universal suffrage and the more dynamic modern currents of freedom and democracy.

These western and American legacies and influences were assimilated and carried on through former centuries and recent generations. The Soviet dictatorship has, with some vital liberations from the czarist despotism and with the energies and hopes released by revolution, sought in one generation to make over the government, the ideology, the economy and the society of 200,000,000 people. The dictators have, with indomitable drive but ruthless cruelty, sought to force and bend the Russian people to their totalitarian will for world dominion. Dictatorship feeds on tyranny, and totalitarian power on more total power. The relaxing of the tyranny of expanding power, the dictators fear, would mean the overthrow of the dictatorship by the people.

The dictatorship demands more regimentation, espionage, exile, imprisonment, and enforced bondage, a more rigorous iron curtain, more false propaganda about plots and wars against the Russian people, and more subversion, infiltration, liquidation, subjugation and exploitation of other peoples for the domination of the world by the expanding power of the totalitarian police state. The Russian people and their satellites are the victims and the means of this dictatorship.

The American people and other free peoples still yearn for peace with the Russian people and all people. The Government of the United States has gone far in seeking cooperation and peace. In every honorable way the United States, in cooperation with the free nations in the United Nations, is doing its utmost to avoid a war with both Russia and Communist China. The United States which, for more than half a century, has had a decisive part in saving the territorial integrity and independence of China against Russian and imperialist power, spent billions in aid to China against Japanese aggression while the Soviet Union stood mainly on the sidelines. Yet, by the propaganda line of the Soviet Union, which has stripped Manchuria and would exploit the Chinese people for Soviet totalitarian power, the United States is pictured as the enemy of the Chinese people, intent upon imperialism and war against China. A war with Communist China would be the mighty prelude to the third world war which, on top of two world wars, would, with atomic power and all the other high potentials of modern warfare, wreck the accumulated civilization of our age.

The democratic people recognize that totalitarian power is now in the hands of the dictatorship of the Soviet Government with all the technological facilities and political power of the police state. As witnesses to

the resurgent power and the unconquerable aspiration of the human spirit for a freer and better world, the people of the free world still have faith in the dreams and hopes which we suspect are deep in the minds and hearts of millions of the Russian people. Exile, bondage, and death are still the price of their aspiration and struggles. The epic defense of Stalingrad came not from and not for the dictatorship but from and for the soil, the plains, rivers, the towns and the villages, homes, the people and the soul of Russia that beat back one dictatorship and will some day beat down their own.

The Russians are experiencing the cruel realization that the revolution which was to liberate the workers and free the dissenters, has exiled, imprisoned, or forced into bondage more millions of workers and dissenters than were ever held in slavery at any time in human history. The revolution which was to end imperialism and exploitation has set up a most despotic empire, and exploited scores of millions of nonparty members in Russia and the satellite nations. The revolution which raised the hopes of the Russian people for justice, freedom, and peace is today the chief cause of the world-wide fear of tyranny and war. The Soviet Union, with many different peoples and some 2,000 Negroes has, to its credit, little or no race problem. The revolution, which was to end all forms of discrimination and segregation, discriminates against scores of millions of nonparty people, holds in enforced bondage millions of nonconformists, and segregates 200,000,000 people behind the iron curtain from the rest of the world. The Russian people have had their dreams, which will yet live again to make them free to join the other peoples of the earth in their struggles and hopes for freedom and peace.

MUST GET THE STORY OF THE AMERICAN DREAM AND OF HUMAN FREEDOM TO THE PEOPLES OF RUSSIA, ASIA, AND THE WORLD

With some 700,000,000 people in the world wavering between the dictators' false promises of security and the slower ways of democracy, the United States must be strong in free association with the peoples in this hemisphere in the treaty of the Americas, with the peoples of France and the British Commonwealth heroically tested in two world wars, with the peoples of the Western European and the North Atlantic community in the Atlantic Pact, in the hopes of the Pacific-Asian conference of the independent people of the East, but most important of all, through a stronger United Nations.

To make known the resolute commitment of the United States to its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and to gird the loins of the United Nations with the power of the moral opinion of mankind girdling the globe, the free nations must get the facts and meaning of the great story of the hopes for freedom and peace of the American people and all free peoples through to the people of Russia, China, India, and to all other peoples, east and west. For example, let us recapitulate again and again in leaflets, pamphlets, books, press releases, and on the air waves around the earth the comparison of the American and Soviet Government policies regarding: (1) The free institutions of the people; (2) self-determination of peoples; (3) discrimination against dissenters and underprivileged groups; (4) aid for the self-recovery of nations; (5) international agreements and the unification of Germany and Korea; (6) international information and understanding; (7) atomic power; and (8) the procedures and purposes of the United Nations.

1. The United States has fostered and the Soviet Union has crushed the freedom of the mind, the press, the schools, the colleges, and universities; the right of assembly and petition; the independence of legislatures and courts; and the free self-organizations of the people. The Fascist and Communist dictators have written in the blood and sufferings of heroic men and women the list of those autonomous and free institutions of the people, without the subjugation of which, tyranny could not have become totalitarian power. This honor roll of freedom includes, we wish to emphasize, the churches, the press, the universities, parliaments, corporations, labor unions, cooperative societies, and other free civic, professional and fraternal organizations, as expressions of the enterprise and freedom of the human spirit, all of which have written heroic chapters in the history of liberty.

2. The United States liberated the Philippines, stood firm in diplomatic, democratic, and moral support for the independence of Indonesia, Iran, Israeli, Korea, and other small nations; rejoiced in and has respect for the independence and internal security of Egypt, the Arab States, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, and sympathizes with the aspiration of all people for self-determination.

The Soviet Union swallowed up Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; and without free elections but with force or the threats of force, subversion, infiltration, and liquidation, dominates Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Albania, Czechoslovakia, East Germany and what is left of North Korea.

3. The United States has guaranteed to dissenters the civil liberties and to underprivileged groups the freedom to struggle for more freedom. With racial prejudice springing from consciousness of kind and with its degree an index of the three main factors, namely, numbers, visible differences, and economic competition, more millions of Negro people, largely concentrated in the South, have made more progress in the United States in the last 85 years than any like number of people in any like period of history. Men and women of good will of both races are working through religion and education for either substantially equal and separate, or, if not equal, the same facilities in accordance with the laws of the State and the decisions of the United States Supreme Court; for private and public, local, State, and Federal cooperation for the prevention of even one lynching by a mob in the South or by a gang in the North, and for the voluntary cooperation of management, labor, and public facilities for the optimum use of the available competent manpower for national defense and maximum production; for the abolition of the poll tax; and for the development of the sense of the human dignity and human brotherhood of all people in fulfillment of our American dream and our religious faith.

4. The United States has supported and generously aided, while the Soviet Union has opposed and has attempted, by misrepresentation and sabotage, to block the self-recovery of nations. Instead of the timely aid of the Marshall plan and the long-run aid of technical assistance, the Soviet Union has siphoned off most vital materials and ruthlessly exploited the satellite peoples for her own dominion and power.

5. The United States has sought patiently and faithfully to fulfill international agreements. The Soviet Union has blocked the fulfillment and has broken the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. The United States has stood for, and the Soviet Union has blocked, free elections for a democratic unification of Germany and Korea. The United States with Britain and France, in order to save the people from the alternative choice between slow starvation or surrender to tyranny, carried through the hazardous Berlin airlift with an efficiency and courage worthy of the brave German people of West Berlin. The United States in and with the United Nations, in fulfillment of international obligations at a most critical time and at the risk of immediate disaster and an ultimate world war, chose to defend with military, naval, and air forces the little Republic of South Korea against the aggression of Communist-dominated North Korea.

6. The United States has in the main promoted and the Soviet Union has in the main sought to block the free exchange of information and knowledge, the mobility of people, and the cultural interchange and international understanding between the peoples of the world. The people of the United States are seeking, within bounds of security against subversion, espionage, and sabotage, to remove any unnecessary barriers to a sound program of humane international exchange and understanding of peoples. One of the barriers to the freedom and peace of nations is the iron curtain which the Soviet Union dropped over the minds of the Russian people in an already darkening world.

7. The United States, when it had the monopoly of atomic power, supported and the Soviet Union vetoed the program of the United Nations for the control and inspection of the sources and use of atomic power. This offer of the United States to give up its then monopoly of the most powerful weapon of national defense for international control and humane use is without precedent in history. The rejection by the Soviet Union is one of the most awful setbacks to peace and international cooperation for a more productive and more noble society in our time.

8. No less tragic than the policies of the Soviet Union regarding civil liberties, the free self-organization of people in behalf of deep human needs, the national independence and self-determination of peoples, the aid for the self-recovery of stricken peoples, the breaking of agreements, the blocking of the unification of Germany and Korea, the iron curtain and atomic power, are the policies of the Soviet Union in the United Nations. As already emphasized in this statement, this is the chief source of the frustration of the people's hopes for freedom and peace in our time.

Short of the self-liberation of the Russian people, the present surviving hope is in the United Nations supported by the United States and the free peoples of both hemispheres.

THE HERITAGE, RESPONSIBILITY, AND OPPORTUNITY OF THE UNITED STATES

The United States and the free peoples have, through the United Nations, come into the responsibility of world leadership in the midst of one of the greatest crises in human history. The American people, with a great bipartisan leadership, are ready for this hour by their heritage, their struggles, their resources, and the commitments of their hopes. The first Americans, selected on the basis of initiative, daring enterprise, and the will to get away from the despotism of kings, the authority of bishops, and the stratification of society, crossed an uncharted ocean and confronted an untrailed wilderness with their courage and their faith in themselves and their destiny. Facing west to the wilderness with axes, muskets, Bibles, and chartered liberty in their hands and history, and with the self-reliant individualism of the ever-moving frontier, they crossed mountains, rivers, prairies, plains, deserts, and mountains again to another sea. They fought the Revolution for their own freedom, a civil war which freed the Negro slaves, fought two world wars, and will fight another for human freedom. They cleared the forests, tilled the soils, exploited its mines and resources, built churches, schools, factories, roads, canals, railways, airlines, libraries, hospitals, cities, and States, making America to the pattern

of their relentless wills and to the image of their dreams.

To them the union of States is an example for the union of nations. The Federal principle which gave the balance of freedom and law for local, State, and national functions of autonomy and power can, for any union of States and any commonwealth of nations, provide in a far more limited yet adequate way the basis for all the United Nations of the world.

Facing the two great oceans, strategic between the east and west, heir of all the races and regions, colors and creeds of mankind, possessor of mighty natural, military, economic, scientific, cultural, and spiritual resources, decisive factor in two world wars, guardian of the heritage and hope of human liberty, and maker of the American dream for the equal freedom and opportunity of all, the people of the United States, in the providence of God, have come into the leadership of the free peoples of the earth in a time for greatness. In this crisis America has measured high under a great and still unbroken bipartisan leadership in crucial decisions, upon which, up to now, have depended the freedom of peoples and the peace of the world.

SOME GREAT DECISIONS

Confronted with the designs to lock Turkey and Greece behind the iron curtain, the Truman doctrine with quick courage shielded their freedom and independence from destruction. Challenged by the threats of starvation, subversion, and the sabotage of the recovery of Italy, France, all western Europe, and other struggling peoples, the Marshall plan, with timely and generous aid to all stricken peoples, saved hundreds of millions of people from the threats of hunger and tyranny. Faced with the Berlin blockade, the answer was given in the high hazards of the Berlin airlift. The negotiated and achieved freedom of Israeli was accorded recognition as an independent nation. Confronted at a crucial time both with the designs of Dutch imperialists to bypass the United Nations and eliminate the Republic of Indonesia and with a Moscow-inspired resistance of Communists to the balanced Republican leadership, the answer was a firm stand for the continued good offices of the United Nations and the inclusion of the republic in the new United States of Indonesia to prevent the Dutch domination of the United States of Indonesia and to guarantee the self-determination of the Indonesian people.

On top of it all there came in Korea the challenge, which tested the moral foundations of the United Nations, the courage of little nations, and the resolute will of American leadership for the awful risks of the responsibility of instant decision. The United Nations, supported by the decision of the American President, decided to meet the challenge and risk the possible military disaster of a Dunkerque to avoid the certain moral disaster of a Munich—one of the great decisions in the history of human liberty. The local struggle of arms in Korea is a part of the global struggle for freedom in our time. The boundaries and foundations of the freedom and integrity of the little Republic of South Korea were widened to include the spiritual horizons and deepened to test the moral foundations of the free world. The raising of the flag of the United Nations in Korea has the historic meaning that hereafter the standard of freedom will be raised by the United Nations in fulfillment of the commitments of its charter against unlawful aggression, however vast, powerful, and unbroken be the land mass back of the aggressor, and however secret be the timetable of the dictator.

Other great decisions include the adoption of the Atlantic Pact by the Atlantic nations with the hope of some day including western Germany as the basis for the unification of all Germany; the adoption, by an overwhelming vote of the General Assembly of the United Nations, of the uniting-for-peace proposals to avoid the destruction of the purposes of the United Nations by the Soviet Union; and the decision to include Japan as soon as possible in the community of nations.

NO ISOLATION IN MODERN DYNAMIC INTERDEPENDENT WORLD

These historic decisions emphasize the fact that no place on this earth can be isolated from the air above, the seas around, or the continents beyond. The mariner's compass, the discovery of America, the rounding of Africa, the circumnavigation of the globe, and the commercial resolution have included all the oceans, continents, islands, and seas, their people and resources in one commercially interdependent world. The steam, electric, gas, and oil power engines as the motive force of the factories, farms, trains, ships, automobiles, and plants of the industrial revolution and its gigantic mass production have made the earth one industrially interdependent world. The actualities of the uranium bomb and the potentialities of the hydrogen bomb fatefully tie together all the peoples of the earth for self-destruction or for abundant production and human enterprises.

The great mechanical framework of roads, rivers, steel rails, copper wires, pipe lines, ocean lanes, high-tension power lines across continents, and cable underseas, has been flung around the earth. Made dynamic by steam engines, dynamos, turbo-generators, internal combustion and Diesel engines, variously resourced in coal, water, gas, and oil as the sources of industrial power, this mechanical framework holds up the economic structure of the modern world and catches up wars and depressions anywhere and involves human beings everywhere.

NEED FOR STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS

To charge this mighty structure now with atomic power and later with cosmic power, makes necessary the strengthening of the United Nations. The high potentials of the nationalistic and dynamic structure of the modern world requires amendments to the charter of the United Nations. Preparations should be made looking toward an international conference of nations to provide for: (1) an international police force responsible to the United Nations; (2) universal disarmament; (3) the inspection and control of atomic power; (4) the original jurisdiction of the World Court over crimes of individuals against the Charter of the United Nations, with the attendant protection of an international bill of rights; and (5) the widening of the responsibilities of the Assembly of the United Nations regarding the causes and prevention of war and the maintenance of peace under law. Part of the preparation for this conference should be the education and mustering of the moral opinion of mankind so that no government would wish or dare to block its purposes in answering the humane hopes of the peoples.

The bipartisan foreign policy, to be further strengthened by the early return of the eminent senior Senator from Michigan, a casualty of the valiant front line of heavy and devoted labors, for the distinguished partnership in international policy, is essential to the effectively united stand of America confronted by the threats of world dictatorship and global war. We of America stand in the great tradition of the struggle for freedom, justice, and peace from 1776 to this hour. The Congress stands on the high tradition of the Fulbright, Connally, and Vandenburg resolutions, fundamental to our bipartisan foreign policy in support of the United Nations and the freedom and peace of nations. Other resolutions, in various forms by Thomas and Douglas, Taylor, Sparkman, Kefauver, McMahon, Ferguson, and Benton, capped by the Tobey resolution, sponsored by Hill, Morse, and others, look in common to the strengthening of the United Nations.

We need always to emphasize that the international economic framework which girdles the globe with its dynamic power for weal or woe, and the international political structure of the United Nations organized to include all the nations of the earth for cooperation and peace, need the international spiritual communion, humane good will and love of people in the minds and hearts of the people who will, in spite of dictators, imperialists and militarists, yet find effective ways to make come true their hopes for freedom and peace. The idea and teaching of Jesus that we are all children of one God and brothers of all men, long rejected as unrealistic, has become, in the atomic age, the most practical and necessary idea of them all for the people and under God, who "made of one blood all the nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth."

May I again express the wish and the challenge that our America, in her rendezvous with destiny, will not fail the hopes of the people for freedom and peace. Rather may she rise in a great bipartisan leadership to the responsibility of her power and the opportunity for her greatness to stop aggression, save freedom, strengthen the United Nations and lead the peoples of the earth in the great adventure of creative cooperation toward one world neighborhood of human brotherhood and peace on earth in God's good time.

Radio Address of Solomon Rosenbaum, Esq., of Fitchburg, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent radio speech by a very talented and distinguished young lawyer and warm friend of mine, Attorney Solomon Rosenbaum, of Fitchburg, Mass.

Many mutual friends have asked me to seek permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and I am pleased to do so even though I fear that my valued and able friend, Mr. Rosenbaum, has been altogether too kind and generous in his references to me. Most assuredly, I am very grateful for his inspiring confidence and the fine friendship I enjoy with him and his distinguished family.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am greatly honored by this opportunity to address you, my friends, neighbors, and fellow Americans, in support of the renomination, to the distinguished office of Representative of the Third Massachusetts District in the Congress of the United States, of that eminent citizen and brilliant statesman, the Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

It is my pleasure to speak to you in my capacity as a long-time resident of this district, who takes pride in its progress, as a business and professional man active in its economic and civic life, as a citizen who has a genuine interest in the well-being of the people of our district as well as of our State

and Nation, and as an American who sincerely believes that the selection of a proper representative, by a people who are, and intend to remain, free, is a matter of the utmost importance, and, as such, I can honestly say to you that we, in this Third District, are most fortunate in having had Congressman PHILBIN as our spokesman in Washington, for no truer or finer representative of the best interests of his constituents could possibly be found anywhere, and it is in that spirit that I wholeheartedly and unequivocally urge every one of you to go to the polls on Tuesday, September 19, and to vote to renominate Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Congressman PHILBIN is amply well qualified by education, experience, and progressive attitude on matters of public interest for this high office and he has justly earned the right to renomination and reelection on the basis of his proven record of outstanding accomplishments, his long and fruitful years in public service, and his sound, liberal, and forthright approach to every problem.

During the 8 years he has already served all the people of this district in our Federal House of Representatives, Congressman PHILBIN has carved out an indestructible monument of public service, resplendent with the piercing light of positive achievements. The manner of his discharge of his duties as the peoples' representative has been most intelligent, courageous, and patriotic, and in thorough fulfillment of the fondest hopes and the highest expectations of the people who chose him as their advocate.

The glowing record of Congressman PHILBIN's many accomplishments conclusively demonstrates that in his services at our Nation's Capital, he has been one of the most aggressive, forceful, hard-working, and conscientious legislators that Massachusetts has sent there in many a decade. In fact, it is a record that is most remarkable both for its quality as well as for its extent. It is a record worthy of the highest praise and it manifests his preeminent competence and his devotion to duty and to the best interests of our district and our country.

The official records of the Government of the United States confirm Congressman PHILBIN's allout support of an impregnable national defense program; his sponsorship of legislation benefiting our beloved and deserving veterans and servicemen, as well as their families and dependents; his efforts to secure international cooperation and the strengthening of the defenses of the free democracies; his implacable determination to resist communism and totalitarianism both at home and abroad; the protection and advancement of the hard-won rights of labor; the simplification and equitable distribution of the burden of taxation; his sincere interest in the problems of every segment of our population, including the wage earner, the farmer, the shopkeeper, the merchant, and the consumer; providing security for the aged and the infirm and help for the underprivileged and the handicapped; his relentless opposition to unbridled bureaucracy, waste, and red tape; his championship of justice and civil liberties for all the people in our country; and the fostering of the American form of free government and the American system of free enterprise.

Significant honor has been brought to our district by Congressman PHILBIN's appointment to the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, a committee of the highest importance in our National Legislature, and a preferment which testifies to his recognition by his fellow Congressmen as a statesman of unusual ability and attainment.

Congressman PHILBIN was the first Member of Congress to introduce legislation providing for the establishment of a 70-group air force, warning the Nation as early as March 1948 that Russian aggression necessitated immediate air supremacy for our country. He is now chairman of the congressional Subcommittee on the Production and Procurement of Tanks, and the proficiency of his efforts in that respect is best attested by the fact that our Armed Forces now have tank superiority in Korea and are thereby able to maintain our positions against numerically superior enemy troops.

Long the outspoken foe of communism, Congressman PHILBIN has striven to defend our basic American institutions and the free democratic way of life, which our founding fathers so wisely ordained and which our brave sons, brothers, and husbands are now preserving at the risk and sacrifice of life and limb. Time and time again, Congressman PHILBIN has warned the Nation of the growing menace of communism, urging a strong America to combat the baneful influence of radical infiltration and to meet all possible threats against our national security.

Sprung from humble, hard-working people himself, Congressman PHILBIN has always been the faithful friend of labor, and his service to the cause of the workingman has been endorsed not only by virtually every labor organization but also by the overwhelming majority of the rank and file of grateful and appreciative workers throughout this district. Congressman PHILBIN's deep sympathy for the plight of those who toil and suffer is exceeded only by his zeal in moving vigorously to assist them.

In addition to his sound and faultless record in these matters of national and international importance, Congressman PHILBIN has given most generously and freely of his time, efforts, energies, and talents to each and every one of his constituents who has ever sought assistance, and by his many benevolent deeds, in behalf of the downtrodden, the helpless, the sick, the needy, and the unbefriended. He has shown that a warm and comforting spirit of humane kindness and heartfelt consideration for his fellow man pervades his every word and action.

I can, of my own knowledge, personally vouch for this attention by Congressman PHILBIN to those deserving help and assistance, and I have observed, with pleasure and approbation, the careful, painstaking, kindly and thorough cooperation and effort he has extended, and the prompt and eminently satisfactory results he has attained.

In the critical times that now exist and in the troubled days that lie ahead, it will be to our own very decided advantage to continue to reap the benefits of Congressman PHILBIN's long and faithful experience. This is certainly no time to lightly cast that accumulated experience aside. Congressman PHILBIN has been tested and tried, during war and peace, in the fires of actual service, and has been found sterling and true. His vigorous mind, his familiarity with the mechanics of government, his mastery of practical "know-how," and his wise counsel and sound judgment are needed today even more than ever before to successfully cope with and solve the confounding and perplexing problems of this emergency era.

In making your choice of candidates, I ask you to please bear in mind the fact that Congressman PHILBIN has been in Washington for 16 years; that he has a very wide acquaintance among Government officials; that he knows his way around. He is thoroughly familiar with the intricacies and the procedures of the various bureaus, commissions, and administrative agencies. He knows how to cut through red tape. As a result he is in an excellent position to take care of your problems quickly and effectively, whenever the occasion may arise. Congressman PHILBIN's ability to serve your needs may prove most important to you. Let us not deprive ourselves of this advantage—we may have serious need of it sooner than we think.

In order that we in this Third District may continue to enjoy the best of representation in Congress, in order that we may be assured of experienced service, and to the end that real democracy may find its finest and truest expression on the American scene, I earnestly appeal to all of you to go to the polls tomorrow, Tuesday, September 19—to take your relatives, friends, and neighbors with you—and to make sure that all of you vote for and renominate the Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN as our representative in Congress.

I thank you, and good evening.

Our "Mothball" Fleet Has Proved Its Worth in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by Mr. John G. Norris, reporter for the Washington Post, and which appeared in that newspaper on Sunday, November 19, 1950. It merits the attention of the House Members and it should be well worth the few minutes it will take to read this informative and detailed story of the United States Navy "mothball" fleet program.

Mr. Norris' article follows:

OUR "MOTHBALL" FLEET HAS PROVED ITS WORTH IN WAR

(By John G. Norris)

NEWPORT NEWS, VA.—America's "mothball" fleet program—a much-questioned postwar experiment—has passed its first test with full credit, if not with flying colors.

In the past 5 months of mobilization, more than 200 ships have been hauled out of "cold storage." Another 300 are being readied for sea. On the basis of performance to date, it is clear that the warships and merchantmen still are in good shape after their 5-year layup.

And, in cases where speed of mobilization was vital—a key point in the program—the ships were ready sooner than most everyone, including the Communist high command, expected.

When we went into Korea, logistics chiefs said they needed 250 additional merchant vessels in the Pacific. The American merchant marine and foreign fleets could provide less than 100 of them. The other 152 were hauled out of mothballs.

Fighter planes had to be rushed to the Far East. Divisions at home were alerted for Korea. Pacific Fleet commanders called for more fighting ships. So aircraft carriers, troop transports, and other warships were hurriedly pulled out of the reserve fleet.

IT PAID OFF

The record was not 100 percent perfect. No major combatant ships in mothballs were readied in time for the major operations around Korea. But the big turning point of the war—the Inchon invasion—was made possible by planes, men, and supplies hauled across the Pacific in demothballed ships. It

caught the Red leaders flatfooted, confident that our counteroffensive could not be mounted so soon. It is safe to say that the program paid off.

Important lessons were learned in the process. Both Navy and Maritime Administration officials discovered and are correcting some flaws in their highly different ship-preservation methods and mobilization plans. This can be very helpful in a future total mobilization.

One byproduct has been a comparative evaluation of the Navy and maritime systems—the first really made. A Navy board, to the surprise of many, found considerable merit in the cheaper, make-do techniques of the merchant sailors. They may adopt some, to the advantage of American taxpayers.

The United States has a lot of money invested in laidup ships—a cool $28,000,000,000 at today's replacement costs. We spent about $500,000,000 dollars on the vessels during the past 5 years. Now that the mothball program has been tested, the Washington Post felt it was a good time for stock taking.

THE BACKGROUND

How successful was the mothball-fleet concept? What happened to the ships while in "cold storage"? Which techniques worked and which didn't? What lessons were learned during the Korean test which will help during another emergency?

To get the answers, the Washington Post interviewed Navy and Maritime Administration chiefs, studied the available files and records, and made field trips to the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, the Norfolk base, the James River reserve fleet, and the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. yard here.

Just to draw in the background, after VJ-day the United States found itself with the greatest naval and merchant armada the world had ever seen—some 14,000 seagoing ships. Obviously only a fraction of them could be operated in peacetime, and there was much scratching of official heads about what to do with the rest.

Some were ordered scrapped, and others were earmarked for foreign sale. There remained more than 5,000 vessels—too valuable to get rid off, too costly to keep in service. The decision was made to lay the rest of them "away in mothballs," as someone then put it, ready for a future emergency.

Two plans for maintaining the laidup ships were approved. The Navy scheme, developed by Capt. H. Gordon Donald, now retired and living in Washington, called for readying the vessels for instant service and "putting them away in a zipper bag."

Donald's rather expensive method contrasted sharply with what the Navy had done with its surplus warships after two prior wars. The steam-propelled iron ships built during the Civil War were tied up and left to rot, while conservative admirals, with limited funds for buying coal, kept wooden sailing vessels in service.

Following World War I, we stripped down our laidup vessels, daubed red paint and preservative over them and hoped for the best. Out of this "red-lead fleet" came the 100 destroyers traded to Britain for Atlantic bases, and many another ship fighting the U-boats in the crucial early years of World War II.

It took a lot of doing to get such ships ready for combat. Donald's zipper-bag concept, on the other hand, envisaged complete overhauls before mothballing, keeping the vessels in top shape while laid up, and arrival of Naval Reserve crews 5 days after mobilization to activate and take them to sea.

It was a beautiful plan, but it was not carried out fully. Demobilization intervened, and "bring Johnny home" took overriding precedent. Only 40 percent of the ships were overhauled before mothballing. Too often, even the decommissioning job was rushed and incomplete. In some cases records and blueprints were lost, and routine maintenance and repairs were neglected.

Reserve fleet crewmen, however, did the best they could. The layup process was complicated and expensive. Airtight cocoons—nicknamed igloos—were built over gun turrets. Similar shrouding was placed over topside vitals. Hull, decks, and superstructure were scraped and painted.

Below decks a novel experiment was tried. Machines containing a dessicant and blowers were installed and dry air approximating the humidity of the Arizona Desert was piped through the ships' fire mains. Almost everything below—spare parts, bedding, instruments, complicated fire-control, radio and radar equipment, electric wiring, even such things as pianos—was left in place. A special preservative was used on the engines and boilers.

Then the interior of the ship, plus gun turrets, was sealed up. Officers and men of the reserve fleet made regular inspections of the vessels to assure that the dehumidification machines were operating, seals were intact and moisture conditions were right. Maintenance of the decks, hulls, and superstructure went on.

It was far more costly in both trained manpower and money than anything ever attempted before. From VJ-day through last June the Reserve Navy spent about $450,000,000 on its reserve fleet. About 1,000 officers and 15,000 enlisted men are assigned to maintain the laidup ships.

The cost, and particularly the diversion of highly skilled manpower from the active fleet, let the entire program in for criticism both from within and without the Navy. Extremists attacked it as a huge boondoggle, and the fleet was a white elephant. Many naval officers felt we should keep more ships in active service and simply tie up the rest. The ships were rapidly getting obsolete anyway, some argued, and were a "psychological block" to the building of new ships.

Under the Johnson economy program, the 5-year overhaul plan was stopped and repair money was cut. But fleet maintenance men argued eloquently the need for "keeping up insurance premiums," and the curtailed program kept going.

Contrasting with the Navy reserve-fleet plan was Capt. Ernest Gorman's Maritime Commission program, under which a larger number of ships has been maintained at one tenth the Navy cost. Maritime reserve-fleet spending for the past 5 years totals $45,000,000.

The methods employed are far different. Instead of being tied to docks at Navy yards, merchantmen are moored in large numbers at remote anchorages.

When laid up, the ships first are stripped of all perishables and semiperishables—bedding, canvas, rope, etc., are stored ashore. The cargo-handling equipment is removed and put in the hold, water lines are drained, and the electrical equipment is cleaned and varnished. One boiler is filled with preservative oil which is pumped through all machinery and pipes.

Then decks, superstructure, and the hulls above the water line are blasted with high-pressure fire hoses. This removes most of the old paint and rust, and a heavy coating of oil and red oxide is sprayed on. It looks like red paint, but dries completely only after many months. The coating not only prevents further rust; it loosens the old paint and scale, which can be removed almost entirely by a second blasting.

This water-pressure method, many times cheaper than the conventional chip-and-paint technique employed on Navy ships, is a Maritime Commission innovation. It's not as thorough as the Navy system, but it preserves the ships.

Of course, the whole approach and objective of the Navy and Maritime Administration systems is different. "We're trying to preserve some old trucks and tractors," said one Maritime official. "The Navy is keeping a fleet of limousines in a condition of near readiness."

When the Korean war started, the Navy had 2,125 ships in the mothball fleet—more than three times those in the active fleet. The laidup vessels included 83 aircraft carriers, 15 battleships, 58 cruisers, 198 destroyers, and 98 submarines. It would cost $22,000,000,000 to replace them today.

Sixty-two of the vessels have been activated, according to an announcement 6 weeks ago, and 296 others will be demothballed by next summer to strengthen the active fleet. About $375,000,000 is expected to be spent in readying them for service, including modernization of electronics, antisubmarine gear, etc.

Late in June there were 2,277 freighters, tankers, old passenger ships, and miscellaneous types in the maritime reserve fleet, worth about $6,000,000,000 at today's building costs. Twenty million dollars was spent in fitting out 152 of the best of them.

Thus, for an outlay of about $600,000,000—the total spending on the mothball fleet to date, plus reactivation costs—the United States is getting 510 ships it would have to pay $3,600,000,000 for now. And the great bulk of the reserve fleets is still untouched.

Most important, the Nation is getting the warships and merchantmen into service in periods ranging from 10 days to 12 months. It would take up to 3 years to build many of them, at great dislocation of the rest of the defense effort and civilian economy because of the huge quantities of steel and other scarce materials involved.

This was the pay-off on the mothball experiment. Here are some instances of the lessons learned in the process:

1. The Navy's elaborate below-decks dehumidification process proved almost 100 percent successful. The machinery and electrical systems on recommissioned ships seem as good as ever—though how they'll stand up under rugged service remains to be seen. Guns and elaborate fire-control mechanism on some vessels reactivated at Philadelphia proved to be better than those on many ships in service.

2. Topside, the story was different. Five years of research failed to produce anything that would beat the elements except constant and painstaking maintenance. Ready ammunition boxes, ladders, radar—everything that could be detached—were moved below in the dry interior. Insulated wiring held up, but not connections and fuse boxes. The Navy moved them below and plugged up the wire ends.

Wooden carrier decks took a beating. A plan to cover them with fabric covers and tar was a failure. An answer finally was found: List the ship so the deck will drain, and slap on three coats of house paint.

Chipping and painting seemed the only way to preserve the exposed hulls and superstructure, though the Navy is now giving careful study to the maritime water-blasting plan. And a commercial firm in Florida has a promising method of blasting with wet sand.

3. Hull deterioration also went on underwater. Periodic drydocking has been necessary, except in the reserve fleet at Green Cove Springs, Fla., where the black swamp water acts as a preservative. Navy chiefs also are much interested in a novel Maritime Administration method of stopping bottom corrosion.

Under this cathodic-protection system, strings of magnesium bars are hung over the

sides of ships. The two dissimilar metals—magnesium and the steel in the hulls—become a wet cell battery in the salt or brackish water and the electric current prevents corrosion and pitting of the hull. While successful, and costing less than one-quarter of the expense of drydocking and painting, the system does not do anything about barnacles.

4. By a combination of circumstances, the merchantmen for the most part were gotten to sea faster than the warships. The maritime plan calls for all reactivation being done by commercial shipyards. As things worked out, the yards were able to drydock, clean up, repaint and repair the 152 vessels without straining in 2 to 3 weeks, and crews for them were available around union headquarters in major ports.

Navy mobilization plans provide for a crew of Reserve officers and men to report 5 days after M-day and activate the ship under direction of experts permanently assigned to the reserve fleet. Under the partial mobilization procedure of the current emergency, crews did not report until considerably later. Reserve-fleet personnel did the bulk of the demothballing.

5. The maritime reserve fleet received an unexpected outside evaluation last summer. When Assistant Navy Secretary John T. Koehler became acting chief of the Maritime Administration last May after its reorganization, he was aware of a widely held opinion that the merchantmen were rotting away. Not a nickel had been appropriated by Congress for drydocking and overhauling the ships, and the daubedup craft certainly didn't look a bit smart or shipshape. Maritime officials assured him the ships were all right.

To get an independent opinion, Koehler arranged for the Navy Board of Inspection and Survey to go over the maritime reserve fleets. Its report, submitted September 14, found the ships on which the layingup process had been completed to be in satisfactory condition.

This view was borne out by ship repair chiefs of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. here. The yard did most of the reactivation of the merchantmen from the nearby James River reserve fleet. After 5 years in storage, the vessels were in comparable shape to ships putting in for overhaul after a couple of years at sea, they said.

The Navy board also had words of praise for the Maritime Administration, noting that the preservation job has been accomplished with a very small expenditure of funds and manpower.

A trip to the James River reserve fleet provides convincing evidence of this and proof of the old saw about necessity being the mother of invention. Capt. John J. Fallon, commander, and Capt. Allan Hoffman, fleet captain, both naval reservists who skippered attack transports during the war, have made a virtue of poverty and improvisation.

Their greatest triumph is a "jet propelled" water monitor used to blast scale and old paint off ships' hulls. A tower was installed on an old barge and a standard firehose mounted. It can clean one side of a hull in a day. The neatest part of the trick is propulsion of the barge. All the helmsman does is turn and depress the hose. The jet effect skims the craft along.

6. Both Navy and Maritime officials agree on one thing—you only get out of mothballs what you put in. Most instances of machinery and parts replacement could be traced to defects not remedied when the ships were laid up. Warships put in reserve in 1948 were in far better shape than those hurriedly decommissioned in 1945.

7. Both Navy and Maritime officials say more maintenance funds are needed. Vice Admiral Edward L. Cochrane, United States Navy (retired), new head of the Maritime Administration, wants to make repairs on 300 to 400 of his ships. Heretofore, only money for preservation has been spent, but Congress last session voted $18,000,000 for repair of about 100 of them.

Cochrane says also that we should build more new merchantmen—tankers and fast cargo ships. We've got freighters "running out of our ears," he concedes, but most of them are slow Liberties, sitting ducks to modern Russian submarines. If we get new craft, some of the Liberties should be scrapped, he believes.

Navy fleet maintenance officers want to triple current spending on the mothball fleet and boost reserve fleet crews by at least one-third. They say that the plan to completely overhaul laidup ships every 5 years—abandoned during the Johnson economy program of last year—should be revived.

But top officials are going a bit slow. They want to evaluate thoroughly the Maritime Administration methods and other experimental techniques under study by the Navy Bureau of Ships.

Annual Reunion of the Cormier Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the recent annual reunion of the Cormier family, which was held in New Bedford, Mass.

I am especially impressed by the strong stand which this resolution takes against communism and in favor of a strong foreign policy.

This family admirably promotes the ideals of Franco-American unity and exemplifies the best traditions of that indeed proud heritage.

Its membership is Nation-wide, and there is no group in the country which represents more faithfully absolute loyalty and devotion to fundamental American principles.

I am very happy to note that my own intimate and valued friend, J. Alfred Cormier, of Uxbridge, Mass., is a zealous leader of this group.

Whereas for more than a century the Cormier family has been pledged to the welfare and development of the American Commonwealth;

Whereas many of its members have played a prominent part in the civic, political, military, and religious affairs of this country while fostering and promoting policies and measures conducive to a better understanding among peoples, as well as to the prestige and good name of the American Nation abroad;

Whereas these wise domestic and foreign policies of the United States are being seriously threatened by subversive activities of Communist agents, operating both within the boundaries of the United States and without; and

Whereas these Communists agents are known to be inspired and directed from Moscow by the Soviet Government or its representatives, whether official or secret: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by members of the said Cormier family, assembled in the city of New Bedford, Mass., on the 30th day of September in the year of our Lord 1950 and originating from several States from Maine to Louisiana, That a strong stand be taken and an energetic declaration be expressed against all brands of communism and all methods of communistic activities anywhere in the world, but specifically here in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That since communism is hostile to all the basic interests of these United States, the duly elected Representatives in Congress of the several States in which members of the aforesaid Cormier family have established their residence be urged to press, with all due vigor, legislation and other means designed to thwart the concerted efforts of communism, whether in the United States or its Territories, or abroad, and specifically to put a definitive stop to the insatiable imperialism of the Soviet Government, and the secretary of the Cormier family is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the aforementioned Representatives in Congress.

EMERY J. CORMIER,
Executive Secretary.
J. ALFRED CORMIER,
President of the Supreme Council.
FRANCOIS CORMIER,
Executive President.

Surplus Dairy Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following inspiring address by Stanley Andrews, Director of Foreign Agricultural Relations, United States Department of Agriculture, before the thirty-fourth annual convention of the National Milk Producers Federation at Minneapolis, November 14, on the subject The International Situation and Its Impact on Agriculture:

The subject assigned me may well be divided into two parts—the effect of the international situation on agriculture in postwar 1945 to about the middle of 1950, and the situation as it affects farmers and their business since the Korean episode and the steppedup remobilization and rearmament program visualized at the present time.

At the close of the shooting war in 1945 we found a world pretty much blasted to bits. On top of that there was a deliberate policy on the part of the allies to so conduct the occupation of Germany and Japan that they could never again, through force of arms, become serious threats to world peace.

Economies geared to war had to be regeared to peace; those in the Armed Forces had to get back to peaceful pursuits. Literally millions of people had been uprooted and displaced by the fighting. They had to get back to some sort of a niche in the world community. Industrial production for peaceful purposes was at near zero except in the United States. Agricultural production in Europe, especially, and to some degree in the Orient, was down by 25 to 30 percent. The population of the world had increased, however, even during war. There were nearly 200,000,000 more mouths to feed than existed 10 years before.

A good part of the industry of the world had to turn to the United States for its machine tools, its raw materials, and some of its consumer goods. This kept the American industrial machine which had been built up on war production in high gear for peace. We did not have that 10,000,000 unemployed about which some of the more pessimistic had been talking.

In agriculture, the American abundance which had rolled from American farms during the war continued to roll out, to keep millions of people from literally starving to death. Few of those people or the countries of their nationality could pay for the food and clothing and raw materials and machine tools. So, America went into an extensive and far-reaching program of assisting nations and their peoples to get back on their feet economically. United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was the first important step in that direction. Though this effort was a United Nations program and involved many nations, more than one-half of the money spent was contributed by the United States. This was followed by loans to Britain, military aid to Turkey and Greece, special aid to Italy and Austria, and, later, the European recovery program. Thus, on top of a war costing about $350,000,000,000 which caused expansion and development and earnings and living standards to go far beyond anything we ever had in this country and above the dreams of most countries of the world, we have actually given away in aid in one form or another around $42,500,000,000. Most of those dollars eventually came back to the United States in turn for food and goods and materials which this country supplied. How could we fail to prosper in a money sense with such expansion and such prodigious production? How could a group of cooperatives or businesses of almost any kind fail to grow and become prosperous with the greatest industrial activity in our history going ahead with wages, earnings, and living standards at an all-time high? So, in the past 5 years we have shipped abroad on the average of about 15,000,000 tons of food products each year. This has been wheat, corn, cotton, oilseeds, lard, dairy products, and some meat. That has kept our farm plant operating at a pretty good clip. It has helped keep prices up and, in at least some of the basic crops, kept surpluses from piling up beyond manageable proportions. Another significant thing about this abundance at home and strong market abroad is the fact that the world had to have American food and raw materials to survive the past 5 years. The iron curtain, whether or not we like to admit it, not only cut off the movement of people, ideas, and goods between the Russian sphere and the western nations, it also closed off a great volume of food products and raw materials which Europe and some of the far-eastern nations had to have to survive. The choice was between dealing with the Far East on Russian terms or finding foods and materials elsewhere, and the United States was about the only nation with anything to spare. Thus we have had a marked increase in exports of all kinds, and particularly food products.

To be specific, compared with the 1934–39 period, our exports of basic commodities line up about as follows:

Wheat and wheat flour of domestic grain:	
Average, fiscal years 1934–35, 1938–39 ---------bushels--	45, 120, 000
Average, fiscal years 1945–46, 1949–50 ---------bushels--	390, 225, 000
Cotton:	
Average, crop years 1934–35, 1938–39----------bales--	5, 296, 000
Average, crop years 1945–46, 1949–50----------bales--	4, 065, 000
Tobacco:	
Average, calendar years 1935–39---------pounds--	420, 797, 000
Average, calendar years 1945–49 ---------pounds--	504, 549, 000
Fats, oils, and oilseeds:	
Average, calendar years 1935–39 ---------pounds--	286, 000, 000
Average, calendar years 1945–49 ---------pounds--	1, 094, 000, 000

The weak note in all that is, of course, the fact that about 60 to 70 percent of those exports in the past 5 years were paid with money which we have taken from the United States Treasury to give to various countries to buy our products.

With European agricultural production catching up, with industrial production recovering to where it was beginning to press for markets, and with a reduction in ECA and military funds, there was evidence 5 months ago that farm prices were headed for some decline. The dollar gap, which had ranged from about seven billion in 1946 to a little under four billion last year, was still narrowing largely through reduction in our exports. Therefore, most of the experts and forecasters were predicting a pretty sharp slump all along the line in October of this year.

Then came the Korea explosion and we once more began to fight and rearm. Though the Korean episode seems well on the way to a successful conclusion, the fact that Russia, which could have stopped the North Koreans on an instant's notice, was willing to risk the possibility of an all-out war means that this country will have to get ready for an all-out war as possibly the best assurance that Russia will not risk it again.

We are in a war boom again—prices have shot up, employment is rising, and Mars again devours the goods which war requires. There will be some pinches in scarce materials and if we move toward the announced objective of about 3,000,000 men under arms and fully equipped with new weapons, if we continue the military aid promised western Europe, the next few years will likely have the appearance of a near-war mobilization.

Europe will not be able to produce the war materials to rearm and at the same time produce the industrial goods and other materials to sell in the world market and thereby close the dollar gap with their own means. The demands of our own mobilization will place a strain on our own and other Allied resources. Indeed, our own prodigious buying of industrial and raw materials such as wool, rubber, minerals of all kinds, and some finished steel has actually given this country an import balance of about $68,000,000 in the month of August—something which has not happened in more than 10 years.

Now, as representatives of a group of cooperatives dealing with milk products, you are no doubt interested in where milk, butter, and cheese stand in the picture, and, like a lot of the rest of us, you no doubt are scanning the horizon to see what the future may hold.

I'm sure I need not recount to this audience the war record of the dairy industry. With shortage of help, shortage of feed, and with about every other handicap, you poured to the armed forces all over the world an endless and almost limitless stream of dairy products. The people at home, of course, had to be cut back in their quite natural and normal desire for milk, cheese, and butter products. So effective was this cut-back that during the war, with high wages and great industrial activity which in the past had always meant increased consumption of these products, we actually ate less than 11 pounds of butter per capita in some of the war years against a 1939 average of about 17 pounds. Even counting the increased consumption of oleomargarine, the two accounted for only 14.3 pounds per capita per year against a prewar average of 19.6 pounds per capita per year.

Right or wrong, we had a right to expect that, once the war ended and rationing was lifted, with the continued high level of industrial and commercial activity, with increased population, butter consumption would increase sharply with ample supplies again available. The reverse has been true. Butter consumption per capita has declined to 10.5 pounds per person, although we are utilizing more milk in the form of fresh milk and cream than before the war. On top of that, dairy-cow population is averaging about 1,000,000 head below the prewar average.

Import and export of butter, in the traditional sense, have always been negligible factors so far as domestic production and consumption were concerned. We have been normally a net butter exporter.

The industry, viewed from the standpoint of its statistical position, looks pretty sad. The Government, stepping in with its support programs to stabilize the industry, finds itself with large amounts of all dairy products and an important part of the market for butter, dried milk, and cheese.

This is not only an intolerable situation for the Government; it is a situation which, if not corrected in some way, may eventually have more serious effects on the industry. I know that most of you are familiar with the figures on Government stocks, but maybe it is worth while to look at them again as they were on November 3. Here they are: Butter, 149,000,000 pounds; nonfat dry milk solids, 290,000,000 pounds; cheese, 43,000,000 pounds. While undoubtedly the present high rate of industrial activity, and perhaps some decline in production will change that picture for 1951, the very presence of this huge pile of food in the hands of the Government, the very existence of nearly 10,000,000 more consumers in this country compared with 1939 are surely challenges that an alert, aggressive industry should not ignore.

Far be it from me, a mere bureaucrat, to try to tell this important group what is good for their industry. But I submit that no industry was ever developed very far by being bailed out by the Government every year. With 150,000,000 customers, with a product which is not only good and palatable but good for us, what has become of American salesmanship when we limp along eating 10 pounds of butter per year against an earlier period when, under far less attractive economic conditions, we consumed 17 pounds per person? We cannot say that oleomargarine has taken our markets because the per capita increase of that product will not offset the decline of our utilization of butter.

We reiterate—the present domestic situation is a challenge to the dairy industry of this country to set about correcting its own ills. There is no other market on earth equal to the American market in volume and ability to absorb usable products.

No other group of people on earth has so wide a choice of what to do with its income. For 80 percent of the people of the earth outside the United States, the question of what they spend their money income for is academic. It is usually already spent before they get it in the form of food, clothing, housing, and medical services. But in America there are about 125,000,000 people who can make a choice every morning whether they will buy a gadget, a new dress, take in a show, save for a bond or a vacation, eat butter or do without it; it's merely a matter of choice with them. That is at once a challenge and an opportunity for the dairy industry. The dairy surplus problem will never

be solved by seeking some foreign market or by dumping for relief purposes because most people of the world can't even afford the luxury of eating butter given to them. We have the solution of our dairy problems in our own hands and in our own country.

Yeshiva University's Charter Day Celebration—Proceedings of Dinner Commemorating Elevation of Institution to University Status on Sunday, November 12, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the proceedings commemorating the Charter Day celebration of Yeshiva University at the Hotel Astor in New York City on Sunday, November 12, 1950. During the course of those proceedings I made the following brief remarks:

This is indeed a unique celebration. Jews the world over have been known as the people of the book. No matter in what surroundings they found themselves, no matter how destitute they were, no matter that even their sacred scrolls were taken from them and burned, learning and teaching remained their most important endeavor. Food for the body might be lacking but food for the spirit was always there.

The more oppressive the persecution, the more destructive the crusades against them, the stronger they clung to the tenets of the one God and the all-embracing concept of true brotherly love.

It was to be expected that when the new state of Israel was brought into being that education would have an important part in the new government's program. It was less to be expected, however, that that program would be one that would require by law that all children, Arab and Jew alike, must attend school and must acquire an education.

More surprising perhaps to the Christian world was the fact that with money and materials so scarce because of the supreme effort being made to accommodate the tremendous influx of new immigrants, that the state nevertheless found the wherewithal to supply that education for the children at government expense.

Reflection upon those matters causes us to wonder why it took so long for the Jews of America to establish a school of learning in this country of university status. The delay in accomplishing that worthy goal could hardly be attributed to an aversion to establishing a university under religious auspices, because in this country there was repeated precedent therefor; most of the larger and best known universities of our country were establishd by religious groups.

For reasons unknown, the Jews have been most backward in bringing into being and sustaining and maintaining and expanding Yeshiva University, the first of its kind to be organized under Jewish auspices. For a long time Jews were fearful that the establishment of the new State of Israel would give rise to new outbreaks of anti-Semitism. The contrary is true.

Today the Jew travels the world over, holding his head high, respected both for his religious affiliation and for his loyalty to the country which he claims as his own, whether it be the United States of America, Israel, or any of the other great democracies of the world. The same must be made true, too, as to institutions of education.

We must continue to preach that it is un-American and undemocratic for any institution of learning anywhere in the world to exclude a student otherwise qualified because of his race, creed, or place of origin.

On the other hand, the strongest preachment on the subject is the establishment and maintenance of a Yeshiva university where boys and girls are readily acceptable upon meeting the scholastic requirements. When the Jewish boys and girls of America have a university which will accept them, the other universities instead of closing their doors to them will soon be inviting them.

The furtherance of the purposes of Yeshiva University will destroy the alleged exclusiveness of those institutions which still maintain a quota system.

Too few people today know the story of Yeshiva University and fewer yet support it financially. All those present tonight should assume the obligation of spreading the story about Yeshiva University and bringing to its support, ever increasing numbers of Americans, who can and will give spiritual and monetary aid.

I commend to you those beautiful words from the Book of Proverbs, chapter XXIX, of our Torah: "The man who loveth wisdom causeth his Father to rejoice."

Mr. Speaker, the toastmaster of the evening was Max J. Etra, president of Yeshiva University Synagogue Councils, of which Mr. Max Halpert is the director. In presenting Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, he made the following remarks:

With humility and reverence I have the honor to present the distinguished head of Yeshiva University. Trained in the great religious academies of eastern Europe, product of Brown and Harvard Universities, Dr. Belkin is the symbol of the synthesis of Jewish learning and general knowledge which is the goal of our university. Foremost Talmudic scholar of our day and simultaneously master of Hellenistic literature, he is the guiding genius of our great educational enterprise. The glory and prestige that our university has achieved are the result of his vision, sacrifice, and consecration.

Ladies and gentlemen, the president of the Yeshiva University, Dr. Samuel Belkin.

Dr. Belkin, on behalf of the university presented its annual award to the Honorable William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. In that connection Dr. Belkin said:

Every title which a man bears symbolizes certain attainments of that particular individual. If a man is a physician we know that he dedicates his life to the curing of the sick. If one is a lawyer, we understand that he devotes his time to the defense of his clients. If one is a judge, we realize that he renders legal decisions. The same is true of titles of books particularly in the nonfiction field. The title reflects the content of the book. I was, therefore, always puzzled by the title of one of the Biblical books.

I could understand why the first book is called Genesis, because it deals with the creation of the universe; with the genesis of the human race. It teaches us the lesson that all of us stem from the same source; that all of us were created in the image of God. Exodus, because the book narrates the story of the flight of the Jewish people from ancient Egypt, from slavery and degradation. It tells us that God is revealed to us not in metaphysical speculation but in human experiences in the concept of liberty and freedom—"I am the Lord thy God, who has taken thee out of the land of Egypt." The Book of Leviticus, because the book contains the laws pertaining to the priests and Levites. The Book of Numbers, because it relates the life of the Jewish people in the Wilderness; to the numbers of the families and tribes. The Book of Deuteronomy because it is a deutero-nomos: a repetition of the laws—a digest of the laws which are found in previous books. The Book of Joshua because it tells of the life of the servant and successor to Moses; his struggles and his victories. But I could never understand the title of the Book of Judges. I expected to find in this particular book many references to legal decisions, to court procedure. I expected to find recorded disputes between man and man, between family and family, tribe and tribe, province and province, and the final decision rendered by the highest court in ancient Israel. We must remember that there were courts in ancient Palestine similar in structure to the courts of the United States.

We are told that there were lower courts, and higher courts, courts of appeals, and a supreme court the highest court in the land which was called the Sanhedrin, and which had its permanent abode in ancient Jerusalem. But none of the institutions is mentioned in the Book of Judges. In fact, with the exception o fthe Pentateuch hardly any legal material is to be found in the entire Bible. I, therefore, wonder why the book is called the Book of Judges. For the book merely relates rather the conflicts and wars between the ancient Israelites and the Philistines; between the Hebrews and the Canaanites, but no reference is made to laws, judgments and courts.

Then I thought that this title teaches us a very profound lesson. True enough it is of utmost importance that a judge, and particularly a judge who sits in the highest court should be a master of jurisprudence. He should be thoroughly versed in the Constitution of the land. He should know legal procedures, and in a sense be a genius in his chosen field. But there is something even more important than the knowledge of the law itself as a prerequisite for a judge in the highest court, and that is the personality of the judge. The willingness to champion the cause of justice, and those ancient judges who fought for monotheism, for a spiritual system of values, for moral discipline, and for the proclamation that there shall be one law for the native and the stranger, and opposed the paganism and materialism of the Philistines and the Canaanites, were the proper men to be judges.

My friends, we are privileged tonight to have with us one of the greatest men in our contemporary American democracy. I could speak of his many intellectual qualities. We all know that Justice Douglas possesses one of the most brilliant legal minds in the United States. I have heard some distinguished jurists say that Justice Douglas is the rightful successor to men like the late Justices Brandeis, Cardozo, Stone, and many others of the same type. I could speak of Justice Douglas as a great academician, for he has served with great distinction as professor in outstanding universities on this continent. I could speak of Justice Douglas as the literary genius, for whoever has read his recent book, his own autobiography, could easily see that had the Justice devoted his life to the field of English literature, he would have made one of the greatest contributions to the field of English letters. The fact that he is interested in reading biographies of forgotten great men shows the humaneness of the man—and I may say in a

figurative sense that he loves to climb mountains, often reaches the top, but never looks down on anyone.

But I, as one, would say that the greatest tribute which we may pay to Justice Douglas is that he has always been a crusader for human rights and a champion of liberty, human dignity, and the preservation of our American democracy.

God once asked an ancient judge what wish I could give thee, and that man answered, a wise and understanding heart. A great man is one who possesses a wise mind and a wise heart, and that is one of the greatest qualities of the Justice whom we are honoring here tonight.

May I say that in a sense Yeshiva University endeavors to accomplish this synthesis—a wise heart and a wise mind. Yeshiva University is a full-fledged university. It is accredited by the highest academic agencies in the United States. It offers the courses and degrees as any ancient seat of learning in our American democracy. We also offer accredited courses in the premedical field, and we hope in the course of time we shall also establish a medical school. But, if one should ask us for the raison d'être of our institution, I would say that we endeavor to create a synthesis between secular learning and divine wisdom, between knowledge and moral discipline, between a wise mind and a wise heart, and while we may use a different method, and different application, nonetheless, we aim to achieve the same end, namely, that through our religious heritage and concept of the divine law, we may create a more spiritual personality.

I, therefore, consider it a privilege to confer upon Justice Douglas the Morris Morgenstern award, and may I say that when we address him as Mr. Justice we do not merely apply the technical term for a Judge who sits in the highest court, but we firmly believe that in his own life, and in his own personality he symbolizes the concept of justice—and as a symbol of our high regard for you, Mr. Justice, I hand you this award.

To which Mr. Justice Douglas responded as follows:

I appreciate the honor which you have conferred upon me. I cherish it, as the late Harlan F. Stone and the late Frank Murphy, of the Supreme Court of the United States, cherished the like honor you bestowed on them. Much of their lives was given to the defense of liberty and the protection of civil rights of the citizens of the Nation. They and Yeshiva University had much in common.

Yeshiva University has a devotion to learning which is possible of realization only in a democracy. It takes patience and tolerance to pursue truth wherever it may lead. The full measure of civil liberties is realized only when government, the community, and those who sponsor an institution allow unrestrained inquiry and sanction full academic freedom in practice as well as theory. This university is a part of the front line concerned not with military matters but with the vastly more important problems of the mind and spirit. Men of learning, men of faith, men devoted to the ideals of freedom—these men rather than those trained in the military tradition are the real security of a nation. They are the ones who keep alive the spirit of independence, who translate the democratic ideal into the lives of every man.

Yeshiva University, though comparatively young, has already made a deep impression upon the cultural and educational life of the community. It has gathered together students from all parts of the Nation and based its program on the belief that the ancient faith forms a solid ground work for the development of American culture and American traditions. The sons of Yeshiva have shown through their activities, both in the pulpit and elsewhere, that religious training and religious outlook upon life are of inestimable aid in advancing the causes of liberty and humanity to which we Americans are dedicated.

There is a deep well of learning from which all spiritual strength is derived. By thought and deed man can achieve spiritual realization and come to be like God. There are men of this faith throughout the world.

We can reach the peoples of the earth only through spokesmen who have that perspective and understanding. It will be the great tragedy of this hour if we let the military be our spokesman. The military mind knows only how to destroy. We need to do a vastly more difficult task. We need to create tolerance, understanding, good will in the world. We need to show the people of the earth the warm and generous heart of America. It is foolhardy to do it by recklessly throwing away our wealth and squandering our fortunes. They need sympathy and understanding, not money. There are revolutions in the world which need management and direction. Revolution is a great heritage of American life. Millions of the people of the earth are trying to do today for themselves and their children what our forefathers did for us in 1776. It will be shameful if when the history of the period is written America is credited with suppressing these struggles, with alining itself on the world scene with reaction, tyranny, and oppression.

Within the past year, I have had the opportunity of visiting the new democracies in Israel and India. I saw exhilarating efforts of hard-pressed people to fulfill their national aspirations and to establish their own cultural and spiritual development. There are important differences between the type of democratic government which grows and flourishes in Israel and India and that with which we are familiar. But they are as deeply devoted to tolerance for minorities, to religious and academic freedom, to the elimination of discriminations of all kinds—race, sex, creed, color—as we are. There are many things we can learn from them. The least we can do is to give them sympathetic understanding, encouragement, and good will.

It is because this institution is a symbol of tolerance for minorities and of respect for their rights that I am happy to receive the honor which you have conferred upon me. I know that in doing so you are not honoring a man but the institution to which I belong; that in this manner you are indicating your devotion to the Constitution of the United States and to the principles on which it is based.

Prompt Senate Enactment of Antimerger Bill Vital to Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2734, a bill designed to plug a loophole in existing antitrust law by prohibiting the acquisition by one firm of the corporate assets of another where the effect of such merger may be substantially to lessen competition overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives on August 15, 1949. The bill, which merely codifies the original intent of the Clayton Act by preventing the elimination of competition through acquisition of corporate assets as well as of corporate stock, should now be promptly considered by the Senate.

Since as far back as 1927 the Congress has been forewarned of the existence of this loophole in its antitrust fabric and the potential dangers to the economy which might arise therefrom through persistent plaints of the Federal Trade Commission. The Temporary National Economic Committee, consisting of the most prominent Members of Congress, which spent several years closely examining the Nation's economic structure, recommended in 1941 that section 7 of the Clayton Act be amended to prohibit continual circumventing of Congress' original intent in passage of the act.

In his state of the Union message delivered to the Congress on January 4, 1950, the President of the United States, Mr. Truman, urged upon Congress the importance of this legislation when he stated:

> We must curb monopoly and provide aids to independent business so that it may have the credit and capital to compete in a system of free enterprise. I recommend that the Congress complete action at this session on the pending bill to close the loopholes in the Clayton Act which now permit monopolistic mergers.

The importance of enacting this law cannot be overemphasized. Already, according to reports of the Federal Trade Commission, controls of our basic and strategic industries are falling into fewer and fewer hands. In the field of primary aluminum, only three companies exist. Three companies likewise control 95 percent of the tin-can and tinware industry, 88 percent of the copper industry, 72 percent of the distilled-liquor industry, and over 70 percent of the rubber-tire industry.

Similarly, entire segments of industries are being wiped out through preemption of their fields by large companies. In the steel industry, for instance, the magazine Iron Age depicted the demise of the barrel and drum business in the following words:

> A few weeks ago the purchase of the Bennet Manufacturing Co., Chicago, by the United States Steel Corp. pretty well completed the capture of the entire barrel and drum business by major steel producers. Some 87 percent of the business, representing about 435,500 tons of steel consumption yearly, has been corralled by the mills.

Independent fabricators in various industries are similarly finding it increasingly difficult to remain in business because of the forward integration into finishing processes by the large producers of raw materials. The shortages of resources caused by the emergency period will, if not offset by this legislation, compound damage wrought by large-scale integration.

With these facts in mind and with a long-term mobilization program in prospect which, unless carefully scrutinized, will further tendencies toward economic concentration, it is most urgent that this bill be enacted into law while opportunity still exists. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate has already recommended to that body that this bill be enacted into law—Senate Report No. 1775, Eighty-first Congress, second session. There remains now only for the full Senate to consider this bill, which

has the approval of the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Justice, the House of Representatives, and the President of the United States. The Senate must act before it is too late.

Apportioning Seats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the outstanding living authority on the question of congressional reapportionment is Dr. Walter F. Willcox, of Ithaca, N. Y., who has made a lifetime study of the subject and prepared an article which was published in the New York Times on November 19, 1950, and which I include herewith:

APPORTIONING SEATS—METHODS FOR GREATER EQUALITY IN HOUSE REPRESENTATION PROPOSED

(The writer of the following letter is professor emeritus of economics and statistics at Cornell University. He has served in an advisory capacity to the Federal Government and is the author of Introduction to the Vital Statistics of the United States, 1900–1930.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Analysis of the recently published census figures suggests that a political struggle over methods of apportionment may start this winter like the one which took so much time in Congress nearly 10 years ago.

Then the Democratic majority voted to adopt a novel method which gave seat 435 to Arkansas in preference to the method used after previous censuses which would have transferred it to Michigan. Now it may be in the interest of the Democratic Party to return to the method discarded 10 years ago, because to do so would transfer seat 435 from Kansas to California.

If such a struggle as I foresee should arise next winter, the technical arguments outlined below will reinforce rather than oppose the political ones.

TRANSFERABLE SEATS

Methods of apportionment are of three types, two extreme and a group of intermediate ones. Both of those now under discussion belong to the intermediate group. The results of different methods differ only in the number and distribution of what may be called transferable seats.

If the States are divided into two groups—one with a population larger, the other with a population smaller, than the average—one extreme method gives all transferable seats to the group of large States, the other gives them all to the group of small States, while methods belonging to the intermediate class divide them about equally between the two groups. The number of such transferable seats after the first census was only 2; 30 years later it was 9. Now it is 17.

Under the 1950 figures the present method of equal proportions gives 9. The displaced method of major fractions would give 8 of these 17 seats to the group of small States.

Two questions seem likely to arise. With the first—namely, which method gives results advantageous to the party in power—I have no concern. With the second—which method best carries out the mandate of the Constitution that "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers"—I am deeply concerned.

INTENT OF FOUNDERS

Discussions in the Constitutional Convention in 1787 and in Congress since then through 150 years seem to indicate that the intent of those who wrote the Constitution was that, while in the Senate each State should count as one, in the House each resident or each 1,000,000 residents should have as nearly as possible the same number of Representatives, whether the 1,000,000 reside in large States or small. The converse of this proposition is that the average population per district in the two groups of large and of small States should be as nearly equal as possible.

Accepting this as the intent of the Constitution and of Congress, I lay down two propositions:

The method which makes the average population per district of the two groups of large and small States most nearly equal is the best.

The method which makes the average number of Representatives per 1,000,000 people, whether living in large States or in small, most nearly equal is the best.

These two propositions are merely different aspects of the same argument. One form of it, however, that about the size of districts, may appeal more to the average Congressman, and the other form about the equality of representation more to the average citizen.

In 8 of the 17 censuses the results of the 2 methods differ; in 9 they agree. In each of the eight cases of difference there is less difference between the average district population of the two groups of large and small States under the method of major fractions than there is under the method of equal proportions. The sum of the eight differences under the method of major fractions is less than one-half of the sum under the method of equal proportions.

AVERAGE DIFFERENCE

If the other method of comparing the approach to equality in the groups of large and small States is used, it appears that in each of the eight cases the average difference in the number of Representatives per 1,000,000 people is greater under the method of equal proportions than it is under the method of major fractions and that the total of the eight differences under the present method is twice as great as it is under the discarded method.

In the 8 cases in which the results of apportionment by the 2 methods which have differed, 10 seats were involved, 3 by the 1920 figures, 1 in each of the 7 other cases. The method of major fractions would have given seats to the following large States: California, Iowa, Michigan, New York (2), North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia (2), which the method of equal proportions would have transferred to the following small States: Arkansas, Kansas, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, Rhode Island (2), Vermont (3).

WALTER F. WILLCOX.
ITHACA, N. Y., *November 14, 1950.*

Separation of Air Mail Subsidy Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to refer briefly to H. R. 9184, which has a rule and which could come before the House soon for debate and vote.

This is one bill reported overwhelmingly by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce designed simply to bring the cost above a fair return for carrying air mail into the open so that the American people can have the facts and the Congress can appropriate based on these facts.

The committee report is No. 3041.

In the Appendix of the RECORD of September 18, page A6631, I outlined certain major points of importance for the consideration of this legislation.

I now wish to include copies of two telegrams I received with reference to the problem involved:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *September 19, 1950.*
The Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The people of the Nation are entitled to know how much of their money is being spent for carrying the mails and how much is for subsidies. Therefore, the Reorganization Commission specifically recommended "that the amounts of these subsidies should be paid to the Post Office by open appropriation from tax funds and not imposed upon the Post Office or the mail users in this hidden manner." I strongly urge that this Congress enact legislation to effect this recommendation of the Reorganization Commission.

HERBERT HOOVER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *September 21, 1950.*
The Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives:

I agree with Former President Hoover who in a recent telegram to Members of Congress said, "The people of the Nation are entitled to know how much of their money is being spent for carrying the mails and how much is for subsidies," separation of air mail subsidies was a major recommendation of the Hoover Commission and is effectively carried out in the provisions of H. R. 9184. You have done good work in seeing that those provisions are included.

ROBERT L. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

I hope this will make readily available for all my colleagues material which will be useful to them. The great savings which would follow the enactment of this bill into law will certainly be welcomed by the American people in view of the burdens placed upon them now and likely to be increased soon.

Draft of Resolution of the Washington, D. C., Chapter, University of Missouri Alumni Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution

adopted by the Washington, D. C., Chapter of the University of Missouri Alumni Association:

Whereas the Washington Chapter of the University of Missouri Alumni Association, assembled in plenary session at the Lee House in Washington, D. C., for a buffet breakfast brunch, at high noon Sunday, November 19, 1950, in order to effectively decide for all time the controverted merits—there being no demerits—to various county claims to curing and producing the best hams in Missouri, it already being established as fact that Missouri produces the Nation's finest hams; and

Whereas the Audrain County ham contributed by Mitchell White, editor and publisher of the Mexico Ledger, and longtime adviser and counselor for numerous and diverse university, county, and State causes, has exceptional merit in taste, flavor, and obvious artistry employed in its preparation; and

Whereas the incomparable Boone County ham sent air express by Robert E. Lee Hill, secretary, Missouri Bankers Association, long noted internationally as the university alumni secretary and No. 1 supporter and enthusiast for all university causes, possesses supreme individuality and succulency; and

Whereas the ham contributed for Callaway County by a most illustrious and successful son, Paul Truitt, of Callaway County and Millersburg, outstandingly upholds the immortal name and claims of kingdom of Callaway aspirations to the title of best producers of Missouri ham; and

Whereas the Lincoln County ham sent direct from his home by the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, loyal university alumnus and distinguished dean of the Missouri congressional delegation who has been elected by his constituents to the House of Representatives in 15 successive victories of landslide or near landslide proportions, and whose perennial position as chairman of the powerful House Appropriations Committee has long established him without peer as a judge of values, whether of hams or of dollars, and earns for his transmittal comment the contest ham is the best he has produced this year on his Elsberry farm immediate substantiation, corroboration, and confirmation by competent and critical fellow alumni; and

Whereas the assemblage deeply regrets inability of the Honorable H. J. Blanton, of Paris, many years a tireless university curator, and many, many years revered editor and publisher of the Monroe County Appeal, to supply a much anticipated ham entry in the contest from his capital of democracy (with big and little D) because "farmers who cure hams the old Virginia way have gotten rich under New Deal and Fair Deal administrations and instead of selling hams now eat them," per his attached letter of regret; and

Whereas the entire occasion has been made more enjoyable and the ham delicacies the more delectable because of the delicious Crimes Golden and Red Scarlet Pike County apples sent especially by the Stark Bros., in Louisiana; and

Whereas a most appropriate Missouri products touch for a Mizzou alumni rally was supplied in souvenir superplastics by the A. P. Green Fire Brick Co., a superlative supporter of university causes and an employer of many outstanding alumni technical and scientific specialists whose refractories products have combined with Audrain ham to give Mexico world renown; and

Whereas the Lee House displayed and exhibited typical Missouri hospitality in leaving no detail unturned to assure complete success of the occasion, especially in the person of Manager Ed Sheehe, whose talents reflect the Missouri influences of his successful regime as manager of the Missouri Hotel in Jefferson City, and likewise in the person of his good right bower, Roger Jacobson, and specifically in the serving of an authentic Washington version of such an important menu item as the Little Dixie Hot Biscuits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the unanimous decision of the judging and resolutions committee, in which the chapter enthusiastically concurs, after exhaustive tasting, sampling, eating, comparative research and analysis, that all the entered contest hams are of such uniformly supreme flavor and excellence as to permit no other award under the evidence than a merited and deserved tie for first place; and be it further

Resolved, That all Missouri hams, properly cured in the dense smoke of hickory chips, are backed, favored, supported, and endorsed against challenging Virginia hams, Maryland hams, Kentucky hams, and hams throughout the world in competition any place and at any time, for money, marbles, or chalk; and be it finally

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be struck and forwarded to all those who contributed to the success of this historic research and fact-finding event, as a unique, distinctive, and historic first in the National Capital, at the Seat of Government, where history on many subjects of much lesser significance is constantly being made.

Judging and resolutions committee: C. Herschel Schooley, President; Katherine Helm, Secretary; John L. Graves, Treasurer; C. P. LeMire, Chairman; Roy E. Miller; Dr. W. D. Curtis; Dr. James S. William; L. T. (Tex) Easley.

Belated Discovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an interesting editorial from the November 24 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

BELATED DISCOVERY

Signs increase that most of the Members of Congress who swept the McCarran Communist control bill over a Presidential veto did so more from fear that any vote against any anti-Red measure would be distorted by their opponents and misunderstood by their constituents than from approval or even understanding of all that bill contained.

The weekly magazine Counterattack, which had battled consistently for the McCarran bill and for its predecessors, now urges its subscribers to write their Congressmen and Senators in support of revising the law in certain respects.

The act as it stands, says Counterattack, could be used to proscribe labor unions as well as the Communist Party. The definition of subversive organizations should, therefore, be amended to prevent this. (In unscrupulous hands, the law could be interpreted also to proscribe any minority movement inconvenient to the majority in power.)

Likewise, says Counterattack, barring from the United States any alien who "at any time" has been associated with Communist or other totalitarian organizations has already worked injustices. And it recommends this provision be changed to recognize the fact that people can wake up and recant.

The official listing of vital defense facilities should be made discretionary instead of mandatory, the magazine adds, so as not to provide enemy agents with gratuitous information.

Counterattack is right. Congress should make these revisions as soon as possible—as this newspaper has been urging ever since passage of the law.

But Counterattack's explanation of how such egregious defects got into the law bears examination. The law, says the magazine, is an "experimental venture in legislation," and effective methods of combating communism can be found only by trial and error.

True—in part. However, these particular defects and these particular perils were held up and exposed by a few courageous Congressmen, by the President in his veto message, and by an alert press in plenty of time to have permitted correction before, not after, the McCarran bill became law.

Men of Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an interesting broadcast by Mr. George E. Sokolsky presented over the American Broadcasting Co. stations on Sunday, November 5, as follows:

On Tuesday we shall go to the polls to vote. Some will vote for personalities, for a friend or a neighbor, for someone who has charm or is a lodge member or is photographed kissing anybody who is available for a photograph. Some will vote for men because the A. F. of L. or the CIO recommends them, or against them for the same reason.

Some will vote for candidates because they are Republicans, others because they are Democrats.

None of these reasons interest me even slightly. The times are too serious. I cannot think of an American boy fighting in the chill mountains of Korea without saying to myself:

"Brother, I shall vote to protest against the waste and loss of your young years. I shall, first of all, vote against the men of Yalta, against the politicians and statesmen and bureaucrats who have lied to us with consistency, who have tricked and fooled us, and upon whose souls must be the blood of Americans, spilled in this avertible war."

For 2 years now on this broadcast, and since 1943 in my newspaper column, I have warned the American people to distrust their own Government regarding far-eastern questions. It has been a most unpleasant task. Nobody really enjoys denouncing the judgments and decisions of the President of the United States and his Secretary of State; nobody enjoys attacking such a personality as Gen. George Marshall.

Yet it had to be done; and had our Government listened to those of us who really knew the Far East, we should not today be fighting the armies of Soviet China in Korea, and perhaps soon enough in French Indochina and India.

How could Dean Acheson possibly have favored the admission of Soviet China into the United Nations? The Communists of China are no new group; they were organized in 1920. Everything about them has been placed in the files of the State Department since 1920. I know of reports that were filed in those years; I prepared some of them for American consular and military officers. In his position, the Secretary of State cannot plead ignorance. It is his business to know.

Yet, under orders from President Truman and Dean Acheson, the American delegates to the United Nations long ago announced that while they would not vote to admit Soviet China, they would not use the veto to keep those satellites of Stalin out, and that they would abide by the majority vote.

So what happens? Dean Acheson is betrayed by Soviet China which goes into the Korean war and kills Americans. And now they say that the United Nations will declare Soviet China an aggressor for her military and imperialistic role in Korea, Tibet, and French Indochina. But what is true today was true a year ago, 5 years ago, 30 years ago. Communist China has been a member of the Third International, in its various forms, since the Baku Congress in 1920.

For this alone, I shall vote against any candidate for any public office who has supported the far-eastern policy of Roosevelt, Truman, Alger Hiss, Dean Acheson, and Owen Lattimore.

That will be my first consideration in this election because Americans are dying in Korea.

Now, I would like to know this. Why was the Wedemeyer report on China suppressed for 2 years and the Wedemeyer report on Korea suppressed up to this very moment?

I say here, categorically, that had the Wedemeyer report on China and Korea been accepted by the United States in 1947, this war in Korea could not have taken place in 1950.

I am not saying that I have read the Wedemeyer report on Korea. Nevertheless, I am going to repeat, categorically, that General Wedemeyer in 1947, warned of the dangers in Korea and set forth a program for safeguarding our situation. That report has been suppressed.

Who ordered it suppressed? Why is it that General Wedemeyer, a great authority on far-eastern matters, and a great general, sits in the Presidio in California twiddling his thumbs, while a far-eastern war is going on? Is it because he told the truth?

Until the entire Wedemeyer story is out in the open for all Americans to see, I shall vote against any man who condones the betrayal of the American people in the interest of party politics.

I want to know something more. Gen. Douglas MacArthur has regarded Formosa as of the utmost strategic importance. He has risked the displeasure of the President by making a public demonstration of his feelings about Formosa. Also, Douglas MacArthur reported on the perils in Korea, although that area had been excluded from MacArthur's sphere.

Why did the President and Dean Acheson write off Korea? Why did they withdraw our troops from South Korea? Why did they fail to train and equip the South Korean Army? Why did they not know that Soviet Russia was arming and training the North Korean Army? Why have we been flirting with the Chinese Communists as recently as a few weeks ago, when they were then actually in Korea and they were then actually in French Indochina?

Who is responsible for the untruthful smearing of President Syngman Rhee of Korea? Is it not remarkable that the smearers are repeating against Rhee what they said about Chiang Kai-shek? He is corrupt. His entourage is corrupt. Is corruption to be limited to Kansas City, Mo.?

These are questions that should be asked in the Senate and House of Representatives. Some of them were asked there in the last session.

I shall vote against any man, of whatever party, who has supported the Acheson-Hiss-Lattimore far-eastern policy.

Now, I want to go into another matter. You will recall that Senator MILLARD TYDINGS was appointed to head a commitee to investigate the infiltration of Communists into the State Department. Associated with him was Senator BRIEN MCMAHON and Senator THEODORE GREEN. There was also a minority of two Republicans consisting of Senators LODGE and HICKENLOOPER.

That Tydings committee never made a proper investigation. I know and say now that Senator TYDINGS knew the truth. I say that his counsel, Edward Morgan, knew the truth. Morgan discussed the work of the committee with me at its inception and his conversation made me enthusiastic that at last a fine job was going to be done. That job died on the vine. TYDINGS, who started like a lion, ended like a crooner. MCMAHON, who likes to play safe, scuttled off into oblivion on that committee.

It ended up in a smear of Senator JOE MCCARTHY and a whitewash of Owen Lattimore and the State Department.

Now, what I want to know is who called off Senator TYDINGS? Who sealed Edward Morgan's lips? Who scared BRIEN MCMAHON?

I want to know why these men failed to protect their country, so that now, because of mistaken policies and school-boyish absurdities in the State Department, our sons are being killed by Chinese Communists in Korea.

No use talking the fancy language of high diplomacy and great statesmanship. We need the truth now and election day is the time for Americans to show that they mean to have the truth.

There is only one way to get the truth and that is to vote out of office everybody who supported the Tydings-McMahon report. We should get rid of them now.

During the end of last week, we probably lost 1,000 of our boys. I don't know how many. Up to October 27, our casualties amount to 27,610 with 4,401 dead.

And last week was one of the worst in this war.

That means a lot to me and I am sure it does to you. And it could have been averted beginning with the Tehran Conference in November 1943, and through the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences. It could have been averted had we not sent Generals Stilwell and Marshall to China to help the Chinese Communists. It could have been averted had we not withheld support from Chiang Kai-shek. It could have been averted had we not drawn the line at the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea. It could have been averted had we listened to Generals MacArthur and Wedemeyer.

That is the issue in this election as I see it—and I shall vote accordingly.

In 1926, I wrote the following for the China yearbook of that year:

"The Communist Party and Communist youth are organizations which came into existence largely through young people of China being converted to communism through the reading of Communist literature and through education in Communist schools in Irkutsk, Moscow, Leningrad, and other Russian cities. These Chinese are more closely affiliated with the Third International than with the Soviet government and their activities are not always identical with the activities of the Soviet representatives in China."

That was written 24 years ago, in the course of a day's work.

But the State Department only discovered the facts of life last week when the Manchurian armies openly appeared in Korea.

Europe or Asia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article from the Christian Science Monitor for November 24, entitled "Europe or Asia?—One Answer Is Steel." I think anyone reading this article will certainly see the wisdom of continuing our assistance to the nations of Western Europe.

EUROPE OR ASIA?—ONE ANSWER IS STEEL

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—The biggest military prize in the world today is the steel production of Europe. It as simple as 2 plus 2 equals 4. Yet in the discussion of the relative importance of Europe and Asia to the United States the equation is frequently forgotten.

With Western Europe's steel on America's side Russia's long-term victory in direct combat is virtually impossible. But if this steel were integrated into Soviet strength the position of the United States would be perilous indeed.

There is no similar steel stake in Asia. Asia's vast potential for the time is manpower. But who will make the guns, the tanks, the locomotives, the machines to equip Asia's potential soldiers? For generations to come the center of such production will not be in Asia (outside of Japan) but in North America, in Western Europe, and in Russia itself.

The simple statistics tell the story better than a volume could do. They show the awful danger threatening the United States if Russia should grab Western Europe. They explain the cold shiver that went through many American military men at the question of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, Can Europe be defended? If Europe's steel production and potential cannot be defended and if this means that it will ultimately go to Russia, then the situation is gloomy indeed. If only for its own preservation, America needs to defend Western Europe.

Here are some comparative figures of steel capacity for 1949 expressed in metric tons (the figure on short tons would be larger):

United States and Canada, 94,000,000.

Western Europe, 60,000,000.

U. S. S. R. and satellites, 27,000,000(?).

If the Soviet conquered Western Europe and took over its steel capacity then its output would be about equal to North America's. Omitting the United Kingdom (with 16,500,000-ton capacity) the Soviet would still boost its controlled production to about 70,000,000 tons if it took over the balance of Europe.

Look for the contrast at the Pacific. Biggest steel capacity there is Japan's, with 7,000,000 metric tons. Australia and India have about the same, around 1,500,000 each. Communists have taken over China but its steel capacity is only about 100,000 tons, while Manchuria has about the same amount. Korea had about 75,000 tons.

Here is the military argument for defending Western Europe. Reduced to statistics like these it seems almost too simple to be worth stressing. The Soviet is steel-poor. It has added a little to its own estimated 21,200,000 tons capacity by taking over four satellite nations: the Czechs with 2,800,000; Poland, 2,200,000; Hungary, 800,000; and Rumania, 300,000. But it is no match on this basis for the outside world. Steel is what Russia needs. Germany has an estimated 1949 capacity of 17,000,000 tons; France, 10,000,000; the Saar, 2,700,000.

It is folly to ask, Why should the United States defend Europe? It is folly because physical capacity for waging war is still based on steel. Russia can't get steel in Asia.

Greater Lawrence Joint Board, Textile Workers Union of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address of George L. P. Weaver, a national CIO official now on leave of absence as special assistant to W Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, at the annual banquet of the Greater Lawrence Joint Board, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, November 12, 1950.

Mr. Weaver was born May 18, 1912, in Pittsburgh, Pa. He received his education in the Dayton, Ohio, schools, the YMCA, college in Chicago, Ill., and Columbia University.

While a member of Local 1000, UTSE-CIO, he was appointed an international representative of the union. In 1944 the convention of UTSE created two assistants to the international president, and Mr. Weaver was appointed to one of these posts, in charge of the Washington office. He was named to the union's general executive board in 1946. Mr. Weaver has served as director of the Committee To Abolish Discrimination since it was established by the CIO in 1942. He is assistant to the secretary-treasurer of the CIO, James E. Carey, and a member of the general executive board of the United Transport Service Employees, CIO.

It is with hesitation and humility that I accept your kind invitation this evening. My association with the National Security Resources Board is of such brief period—and my ignorance so profound—that at the outset, I must extend an apology for my audacity. However, the opportunity to participate in the annual banquet of the Greater Lawrence Joint Board of Textile Workers resolve my doubts.

For the last 8 years it has been my privilege to serve you on the national staff of the CIO. During these years, I have had the opportunity of working with a man, whom I deem it a pleasure to consider my friend and counselor, and whom you have honored in each one of your conventions by electing him your general president, Emile Rieve.

Tonight we are breaking bread together in thanks for surviving another war. This is the time that we pause as an organization and take stock of the events of the past year. Since June, our country, in association with the United Nations, has been in military combat and the events in Korea, though tragic in many respects and to many people, have nevertheless made an invaluable contribution to the future security of the United States. They have given us one more chance to face up to the necessities for survival. They have underscored a simple truth; namely, if we do not first attain, and then maintain, adequate strength, there is sure to be another war, and America is sure to lose. In this new world society, all the old rules have been changed. Wars are no longer declared; the art of diplomacy has been reduced to invective; and the world has so shrunk that oceans no longer offer a means of defense.

In the two previous wars, the United States literally had a period of years in which to mobilize; and the scope and volume of our production finally turned the tide. Today, we cannot bank on having a period of years in which to mobilize our resources. This becomes an important calculation to consider—it is no longer a theoretical matter.

In the middle thirties the most important question for civilization was "What are the Nazis doing?" so today the most important question, one which affects a major part of national and individual thinking and effort, is "What are the Russians doing?" Believing that to be true, Mr. W. Stuart Symington, then Secretary of the Air Force, but now Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, set out to find out from ourselves and our allies as much of this answer as possible; and, as a result, in February presented the following six points in a talk at Baylor University:

"This we know. Those who reiterate America must be destroyed now have:

"1. A ground army greater in numbers than the combined armies of the United States and its allies;

"2. An air force whose strength in nearly all categories is now the largest in the world and growing relatively larger month by month;

"3. The world's largest submarine fleet; and an intensive submarine development and construction program."

Here are three facts which every American should know, because this is the world in which we live:

"1. Behind the iron curtain there has been an atomic explosion.

"2. Behind that curtain is the air equipment capable of delivering a surprise atomic attack against any part of the United States.

"3. We have no sure defense against such an attack."

For the first time in the history of this country, a foreign government has the capacity to attack our home soil tonight—has the weapons and the means to deliver those weapons; and the danger will grow unless we realistically evaluate these grim facts of the last 12 months. This is no theoretical matter to us, and as the military strength of Russia increases, it is certainly no theoretical matter to the United Nations troops in Korea. We cannot underrate the production potentials of this aggressor, as we review our triumphs of production during the last two wars. We can no longer think of the sweep of territory behind the iron curtain as a place where peasants scratch the earth with a stick. It is a vast land, rich with untold resources. There is an immense industrial machine behind that iron curtain; and we now know that the greatest share of its production goes into implements of war, and into more industrial capacity which, in turn, will be used for still more implements of war. That industrial capacity is producing weapons. Unskilled peasants didn't make the tanks that swept over the United Nations forces in Korea.

When you count resources, add in people. In Europe behind the iron curtain there is a population of 270,000,000, and the Communist or Communist-controlled people of the world now total over 800,000,000 people. In terms of sheer output it takes a lot of motors to match that many people.

Whatever we think of the methods used to develop the economic potential behind the iron curtain, we must be realistic in facing up to the result, a wedge of immense force that can now be driven whenever a calculating aggressor chooses to drive it, and theirs is the choice of where and when.

In wartime we ask our civilians to reduce their scale of living in order to release materials and labor for military supply. But the millions of people behind the iron curtain who have never had metal toys to give to their children, or pressure cookers to put on a porcelain range, or enough to cook in any kind of pot, have nothing to give up. What they did without, when they did not have the means, they do without now. For their consumers there is little; for industrial development looking to production of war goods there is much.

The leaders of Communist imperialism not only have great military forces at their command, they have demonstrated a willingness to use these forces in open and naked aggression, in spite of the united opposition of all the free nations. Under these circumstances, the free nations have no alternative but to build up the military strength needed to support the rule of law in the world. Only in this way can we hope to maintain that which is decent, that which is good, and that which is just in our society.

According to President Truman, in order to do our part in building up our military strength and the military strength of the free nations throughout the world, we must more than double our defense efforts. We must increase our rate of spending for defense purposes from $15,000,000,000 to more than $30,000,000,000 by next June.

In the years after that we shall probably have to spend much more than $30,000,000,000. We must be prepared to maintain a very strong defense program for many years to come.

To do this job we must meet and solve three hard, tough problems:

First, we must produce the materials and equipment needed for defense.

Second, we must raise the money to pay the cost of our increased defense efforts.

Third, we must prevent inflation.

To meet these demands we must expand total production. This means, as Mr. Truman has said, harder work and longer hours for everybody. It means utilizing more women in industry, older people—it means we no longer can afford the luxury of discrimination because of race, color, or creed in our employment patterns in American industry. Practically everyone warm and walking is working today—but not at their highest capacity. We must realize the highest productive capacity from each and every worker.

It means that businessmen must expand productive facilities, develop new techniques, and increase efficiency in every way possible. It means enlarging our capacity to produce basic materials such as steel, aluminum, and copper. Until this expansion can meet all our needs, some civilian goods will have to give way for the production of military goods. This is the challenge to our economy for the next few years.

The Defense Production Act of 1950 is one of the prime tools to accomplish this task. This law will enable Government to provide special capital to create this expansion. It will enable Government to make sure that defense orders have top priority—to make allocations of critical materials in short supply—to prevent the hoarding of raw materials essential to defense. It will also enable

the Government to cut down the production of nonessential civilian goods that use up critical materials.

The administration of these and other powers will be coordinated by the Chairman of the NSRB, Mr. W. Stuart Symington. In addition, the National Security Resources Board is an advisory board to the President. It is a board which recommends the essential coordination between civilian and industrial mobilization potential and military potential; or it might be said that it recommends, in emergency, the allocation of all types of resources except military resources, and then monitors the coordination of those resources in accordance with the Defense Production Act of 1950. It is not an operating agency, but a planning and coordinating agency. In furtherance of these objectives the Board resolves interagency issues, prescribes policy and program directives, obtains reports and information on the status of work in the various operating agencies and advises the President on the progress of the program. The Board under the chairmanship of Mr. Symington, is made up of the Cabinet Secretaries, except the Postmaster General and the Attorney General. The new Economic Stabilizer, Mr. Alan Valentine, and the Assistant to the President, W. Averell Harriman, also meet with the Board.

In World War II the policy of the Textile Workers and the CIO was complete cooperation with our Government. In cooperation with the War Labor Board, the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission, labor became a vital part of the great national drive for superior military equipment. Along with the courage of our fighting forces, American working forces and American managers brought victory through the miracle of their production.

Labor knew then for what it was fighting, and labor knows now why it is of supreme importance to first make the defense of this country strong, and then keep it strong. Emile Rieve, as chairman of the CIO economic policy committee, is manifesting this conviction daily in his wise leadership of this most important economic arm of the CIO.

Labor understands the necessity for the Marshall plan and has supported it in a most practical manner. It has assigned dozens of its best personnel to full-time duties with the Economic Cooperation Administration. It has sent many of its top officials to Europe to give encouragement and guidance to the leaders of democratic labor movements. It has raised and contributed millions of dollars in direct assistance to democratic peoples abroad. Through the organization of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, all major sections of the American trade-union movement have established a friendly and working relationship with the free-trade unions of the world.

Labor, better than any other group in our society, understands the character, or better, the lack of character of our enemies—for labor has come to grips in a practical manner with the spokesman of red reaction, and has democratically defeated their obvious purpose of destroying free trade—unionism—at every opportunity. Labor knows only too well that free-trade unions and communism are incompatible. It knows that wherever the Communists have gained power, free-trade unions have been destroyed, and their leaders jailed or murdered. In place of the independent democratic unions, in Russia a new type of political company union has been created—a tool of the police state. Such a concept is a far cry from the freedom and independence of the labor movement in America.

We have demonstrated time and again, the enormous resources and vitality of our free society. In World War II we astonished the world and ourselves by our vast production without sacrificing any of our basic liberties. Since then, our rate of growth has exceeded our most optimistic expectations.

Today, spurred by a greater menace than we have ever faced, we must surpass every previous record. I am certain that we, as a people, working together, can build the strength needed to establish a just and durable peace. I am convinced that labor, as always in the past, is prepared to pull its full share of this load.

Taxing Excess Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial published in the New Orleans States of November 24, 1950, as follows:

TAXING EXCESS PROFITS

In theory, a hefty tax on excess profits sounds fair and flawless. A doctrine universally approved is that no one should be allowed to make a profit out of war, because profits for some, and death, grief, terrible suffering and privation for others, just doesn't make sense.

In practice, the recapture of a big share of excessive profits in taxes, say 75 to 85 percent, is something else. Some of the tax authorities in Washington are reminding us of the difficulties. And some among these approve in theory a stiff tax on this portion of corporate income.

When the tax is steep, the corporation earning a big profit will find ways of spending it in preference to paying it over to the Government. That is human nature. Taxes are not relished any more by the corporate fat cats than they are by the scrawny wage-earner who sees a bite taken out of his pay envelope.

Therefore, steep taxes on excess profits means excessive spending to beat the tax collector; that in turn means inflationary pressure on prices and on wages. Corporations will resort to illogical expenditures, will voluntarily increase wages and increase other costs, merely to cut down the tax bill, even if the revenue is direly needed for the prosecution of a war for the preservation of the profit-and-loss system.

The logical way it seems to us is, first to place rigid controls on prices and wages; next to restrict inflationary spending; and then levy the lug on the excess profits. But few would want to adopt such extreme measures as the national economy and the military demands now stand.

Aid to Medical Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association continues its stubborn opposition to Federal aid to medical colleges. It pretends that only a handful of those it chooses to call radicals favor this legislation. Actually there is widespread support among people of varying degrees of political thought and from all walks of life in support of this legislation.

I am inserting an editorial from the Orangeburg (S. C.) Times and Democrat, which gives the views of the Honorable James F. Byrnes on the need for more doctors. The moment anyone talks about training more doctors, particularly with the use of Federal funds, the AMA always hollers "socialized medicine."

No one in America wants socialized medicine, but if the present leadership of the AMA continues its opposition to even such mild reforms as aid to medical colleges, we may wind up with socialized medicine in spite of ourselves. It is high time the doctors came forward with some constructive support.

BYRNES SAYS WE NEED MORE DOCTORS

Governor-elect James F. Byrnes, speaking in Charleston recently, told the board of trustees of the Medical College of the State of South Carolina that he has been fighting socialized medicine all his life, but he warned that "if the doctors do not get their own house in order, and if we don't train enough doctors so that competition exists among doctors, then the fight against socialized medicine may be lost."

We quote Mr. Byrnes, in using the term "socialized medicine." Nobody has yet defined what constitutes socialized medicine and what does not. It is something of an epithet that has been bandied around the Nation to frighten the people of this country and to preserve the present economic fortune of the medical profession.

Mr. Byrnes calls attention to the lack of doctors in rural areas and the custom of young doctors to move into small towns. The obvious fact is that doctors, like other Americans, are locating where financial returns are greatest. This is an entirely human procedure which subjects no young doctor to criticism. If financial remunerations are insufficient to attract doctors to rural areas, then society, acting through its government, must do something to subsidize doctors in such areas.

We were interested in the statement of Dr. Kenneth M. Lynch, president of the medical college, who admits that "an obstructionist" attitude has existed in the past about the number of medical students being trained. Our only inference from this statement is that the doctor is conscious of a deliberate effort to limit the number of doctors and medical experts in the country. He asserts, however, that the board of trustees are in favor of training as many students as possible.

Gov. J. Strom Thurmond, ex-officio chairman of the board, said that "it is sad that hundreds of students every year who want to enter the medical college cannot because of a lack of facilities for training." Some two hundred men are turned down by the college each year for this reason and the Governor admits that "it hurts my soul and I think something ought to be done about it."

Governor-elect Byrnes warned the doctors that they have "a great deal to do to put their own house in order." He adds that "if the doctors don't get competition" they are going to run into trouble and suggests that "the medical association, or somebody, ought to do something about the situation."

We have little comment to make upon the above declarations, which seem to speak for themselves. We admit, however, that we

have not swallowed the propaganda put out by the American Medical Association which has sought to persuade the people of this country that any effort to provide adequate care for the population of this country will be socialized medicine.

The doctors of the country have rendered a great service to the people of the nation in the field of medical research and treatment. They are experts in this line and we think that sensible people should follow their advice in connection with medical matters.

This observation does not apply, however, to the economic problem of paying for medical services. Upon this subject, the doctors know no more than anybody else. Moreover, the people of the Nation have the right to provide, by public funds, adequate medical treatment for that percentage of the population that is unable to secure adequate medical care.

Of course, nobody pretends that every man, woman, and child in the United States receives the benefit of modern medical science and adequate medical attention. In fact, very few people do.

Memorandum to Our United States Senators and Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, controls on commodities and wages is one of the most serious concerns of the American people. Under the 1950 control legislation, ceiling prices cannot be invoked on commodities without also applying the same to wages. The recommendations of the Arkansas Wholesale Grocers' Association generally appear to be plausible, reasonable, and profitable. It was unequivocally the intention of both Houses of Congress that price controls and wage controls should be tied together. According to the association's statement, it has been rumored that a loophole is being sought by officials of the Government to impose controls on commodities and permit the price of labor to go uncontrolled. When this legislation was before the House, great care was made to leave no doubt in the minds of anyone that both prices and labor should be controlled alike.

I know of no action that could be taken at this time that would be as inflationary, detrimental and calamitous to the public interest than to permit wages to advance and at the same time hold the price of commodities down.

The officials charged with the responsibility of administering the control program should be interested in protecting the American economy and not in building up a mammoth agency to continue to harass the citizen with controls after the emergency is over. When the emergency is ended, controls, too, should end.

Only those who believe in, and subscribe to, the American system of free enterprise should be called upon to administer the Defense Act of 1950. The full text of the recommendations drafted by Mr. William L. Humphries, secretary-treasurer of the Arkansas Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., in Little Rock, Ark., is as follows:

MEMORANDUM TO OUR UNITED STATES SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN FROM ARKANSAS IN ORDER THAT THEY MAY HAVE THE BENEFIT OF THE THINKING OF MEMBERS OF THE FOOD INDUSTRY ON IMPORTANT LEGISLATION WITH WHICH THEY WILL BE CONFRONTED

1. The members of the food industry of Arkansas fully endorse the program of full military preparedness due to the present world situation.

2. The industry, however, realizes the placing of a military preparedness program on top of our normal economy will create an overabundance of buying power coupled with an inflationary trend and will, in addition, create a serious dislocation of a normal distribution of merchandise.

3. The Arkansas Wholesale Grocers' Association is for workable wage and price controls at all levels.

4. We are normally against controls. We believe in the freedom of the people and are against Government regimentation in any form. We recognize, however, that because of the present emergency we will have to give up temporarily some of our liberties. The demand on our manpower and material resources may be so great as to require controls for an equitable distribution of merchandise, and to halt the advancing wage and price spiral that threatens destruction.

5. We are told by competent observers of the Washington scene that the Administration is seeking a loophole in the Defense Act of 1950 in order to circumvent the tying of price controls with wage controls. The members of the food industry in Arkansas know that in order to have price control we must have wage control. We believe the intent of Congress to tie the two together should be strictly followed.

6. We oppose any controls that will not work. We believe the taxpayer will rebel at supporting control agencies if they do not have a workable control. If we have to have controls we must have controls that will cover everyone. We believe the people will support this type of controls and this type only.

7. Since food is a primary requisite for a healthy nation and more of the consuming money is spent for food than any other item we, as members of the Arkansas food industry, feel that we are particularly concerned with the Government's efforts to allocate and price control our American business life. We seek classification of the food industry through the wholesale level as essential to the war effort.

8. In the light of our experiences during the controls of World War II we have certain ideas as to controls which we feel should be given a sincere study by those responsible for authorizing the controls and for their creation.

9. We believe that roll-backs are impossible without accompanying subsidies. We unalterably oppose both roll-backs and subsidies.

10. We believe that the Government wasted much manpower during World War II due to the multiplicity of control authorities.

11. We believe that simple controls not dominated by lawyers will be most successful.

12. We believe that quick redress from inequities is a prime necessity for effective controls. We believe that members of the various industries subject to control with a practical knowledge of the particular industry can best administer the controls and can correct inequities most quickly.

13. We believe that controls should not dislocate the normal distribution of merchandise. It takes practical experience to fully understand what is normal to a particular industry.

14. We believe that in most instances a ceiling price on the manufacturer with a percentage mark-up for the various distributors is the most practical method of controls. This method is not practical for the restaurant industry. The restaurant industry asks that in the event their material and wage cost are increased that they be permitted to increase their selling prices in the same proportion.

15. We believe that controls which are unpopular or unworkable will result in a tremendous black market and a breakdown of law and order.

16. It is our position that the bureaus handling controls should be staffed by men who believe in a free economy and are willing to surrender their authority at the earliest possible moment after they have served their purpose.

17. We believe that patriotic members of the various industries will willingly serve to make controls workable and acceptable to the American people if given a proper part in the control program. We particularly stress that members of the industry should have a strong voice on policy and procedure, as well as the actual writing of the control orders.

18. We wish to emphasize some of the more objectionable features of controls used in World War II which should not be permitted to occur under any new controls.

19. Controversial language: Control regulations should be written in plain language so that the average citizen can understand them. OPA employed a great number of lawyers to interpret its regulations for OPA officials. We cannot expect a merchant to correctly interpret regulations written in legal phrasing.

20. Rulings which are enforced retroactive: Merchants should not be liable for actions made in good faith prior to interpretations and rulings by the control boards.

21. Kangaroo courts: The American government is a government of checks and balances. The control agencies should not make the rules, interpret the rules and prosecute and judge. This is against American democracy.

22. Intent: The intent of a merchant who has infringed under any new control laws should have great weight in judging his case. Many errors occur under bureaucratic control when the intent of the seller is to abide by all regulations. We wish to emphasize that intent should be given great consideration.

23. Enforcement: We believe that much effort in the past was wasted in enforcing trivial violations. We believe in strict and good enforcement aimed primarily at the willful big black and gray market operators. If the large black and gray operators are permitted to operate without stern measures, many legitimate operators will be forced out of business.

24. In conclusion, we wish to state that we are willing to make any necessary sacrifices to place our Government in a sound position. In turn, we ask that the Government refrain from using the present emergency to advance its social program—operate on a balanced budget—eliminate unnecessary stock-piling of labor, and, when the emergency is over eliminate all controls and shackles that are contrary to the American system as soon as possible.

WILLIAM L. HUMPHRIES,
Secretary-Treasurer, Arkansas Wholesale Grocers' Association.
LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *November 17, 1950.*

The People Express an Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Allegan Gazette of November 2, published at Allegan, Mich., comes an editorial written by Leo W. Hoffman, which conscientiously stated some of the issues on which the people expressed an opinion. The editorial is as follows:

IN OUR OPINION A VOTE FOR FREEDOM

Next Tuesday, November 7, you will have the opportunity to help perpetuate freedom in America.

Your vote can be as potent a weapon in this battle for freedom as any muzzle-loader carried by your forefathers.

Your vote, this year, and in the next few elections, may well determine America's destiny.

Any vote cast for a Democratic candidate is a vote for an evil and corrupt clique—and any failure to vote is an admission that you don't care what happens to your native land.

For 20 years the Democratic Party has been in control.

Prior to 1930 Democrats were traditionally loyal to America. The party was respected as an American institution, and radicals, labor bosses, and crooks had no voice in its councils.

In 20 years the character of this party has changed. Communists, like Alger Hiss and Lee Pressman, have acted as Presidential advisers. Sidney Hillman, recognized as the leader of virtually all radical elements, was strong enough to dictate the nomination as Vice President of Harry Truman. Labor bosses have written our labor laws, approved by a rubber-stamp Congress. Communists have gained positions of trust in the Government, and spies have had a free hand in the theft of military secrets. And who dictated our Asiatic foreign policy?

Roosevelt became an easy mark for Harvard graduates foisted on him by Justice Frankfurter, and it is now history that many were Communists. Such men had more influence than real Democrats. Men like Glass and BYRD of Virginia, Garner of Texas, Hull of Tennessee, Byrnes of North Carolina, and Smith and Farley of New York were repudiated and labeled "turncoats" and "isolationists."

The advice of Henry Wallace, Sidney Hillman, Lee Pressman, Alger Hiss, Owen Lattimore, Rex Tugwell, and Dean Acheson was preferred.

Prior to these fateful 20 years Soviet Russia had gone without diplomatic recognition from four Presidents. Knowing the Communists for what they were, they harkened to the words of Lenin: "As long as capitalism and socialism remain we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung either over Soviet Russia or over world capitalism. * * * We will have to use any ruses, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful methods, concealment, and veiling of the truth."

Those were the words of Lenin, and Russia's rulers have remained faithful to them—practicing murder, imprisonment, starvation, torture, blackmail, bribery and robbery to stifle opposition and destroy free governments throughout the world.

This was the Russia given diplomatic recognition by Roosevelt.

From then on, Communist influence increased everywhere. During and after the war, our Democratic leaders permitted Russia to gain control over all the Baltic countries, all Eastern Europe and all of China.

The Democratic Party became so corrupt it permitted Roosevelt to "barter" the lives of millions of Germans, Poles, Austrians, Slavs and Chinese. And the "four freedoms" became a hollow mockery.

Because of such policies—often determined by Communists—and contrary to the advice of old-time loyal Democrats, America today faces the choice of fighting a war of survival or allowing Red Russia to control the world.

What is the reason of 20 years of radical Democratic control?

What has the period brought us?

A 50-cent dollar and the possibility that, in another 20 years, it won't buy a pack of cigarettes or a candy bar.

Establishment of Russia as the most powerful government on earth.

A public debt of $250,000,000,000.

Destruction of the character of American people with cradle-to-grave benefits.

Taxes so high that most of us now work 4 months out of every year for the Government.

And it has also brought us to the very brink of extinction.

It is time to turn out of office those who, intentionally or through ignorance, have advanced the Communist cause. It is time to evict the Democrats, for they no longer have control of their own party.

What do you value most: Freedom for yourself and your children, or a temporary government handout that won't stretch to cover groceries?

Make your answer known next Tuesday.

Hon. Earl C. Michener

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of this session it is well that we pause in our deliberations to do honor to a number of distinguished Members of this House, whose service herein will terminate at the close of the session.

Naturally, one is peculiarly drawn to those with whom he has served in committee. For 12 years it has been my honor and pleasure to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary, and firm indeed have been the enduring friendships that I have formed with certain of the members.

I refer particularly to our able and distinguished colleague, EARL CORY MICHENER, who has so well represented the Second District of Michigan for the past 32 years with the exception of the 2 years of the Seventy-third Congress.

At the moment, there are only eight Members who have served longer in the House than he.

In that period he advanced to the chairmanship of the Committee on the Judiciary in the Eightieth Congress, and most exceptionally did he perform the duties of that high office. His record as committee chairman is one in which he can take justifiable pride.

Endowed with a splendid mind, enriched by a fine education, both in the liberal arts and the study of the law, and steeled by the experiences of the Spanish-American War, he entered in the House in the Sixty-sixth Congress, well equipped and amply prepared to carry out the difficult duties which were ahead. How well he performed those duties we can all attest.

Always kind, considerate, and helpful, many a Member is richer in service by reason of his thoughtfulness and kindly interest.

We who have known him intimately will treasure the memory of an able lawyer, a distinguished legislator, a patriotic American who unselfishly lived up to his highest ideals and leaves behind him a record that all may emulate and rejoice in the fact that he served his district, State, and Nation so well.

Farewell, good friend, and may your closing days be filled with precious memories of the good that you have done for your fellow man and for your beloved country.

Congress Must Find What We're Buying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following stimulating and timely article by George Minot from the Boston Sunday Herald of November 26:

CONGRESS MUST FIND WHAT WE'RE BUYING—GERMANS WON'T REARM, BRITISH WANT TO SPEND LESS, FRENCH RESIGNED

(By George Minot)

Secretary Acheson couldn't have made a more asinine remark had he really tried than he did when he hit at Republican "reexaminists." These persons—and he was sneering particularly at Senator TAFT—he likened to a farmer who pulls up his crops to see if they were growing. He added that he couldn't see any difference between this crowd and the old isolationists.

Notwithstanding this little lesson from the Secretary for whose hide Republicans and Democrats alike are howling and will probably get after the first of the year, there is a great deal in our foreign policy that must be reexamined—and quickly, too.

This little lame-duck session of Congress that gets under way tomorrow will have as its initial task the voting of from five to ten billion dollars more in taxes. Its Members must also make sure that they and the taxpayers know where the money goes.

Congress must find out what we are buying with our money. We have spent around $20,000,000,000 in Europe since the end of the war. In spite of Mr. Acheson, we should lose no time in reexamining what has happened to it. What have we got in return for it, if anything?

NOTHING DONE ABOUT REARMING EUROPE

It was more than a year and a half ago that 12 nations signed the North Atlantic Pact and agreed that "an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or America shall be considered an attack against them all." Since then there has been a lot of talk, but little action, about the rearming of Europe.

Herbert Hoover told the Nation in a notable speech that military authorities had agreed Stalin could put 175 mobilized combat divisions on the European front within 90 days—that the potential enemy has 30,000 tanks, thousands of planes and the atom bomb—that the iron curtain states have large armies poised for action.

Mr. Hoover went on: "In contrast we are told that the European nations now in the North Atlantic Alliance do not have available to Europe more than 30 active combat divisions, with some air and naval power, with which to meet this horde from behind the iron curtain."

In the face of this, our European friends have been asking that we send additional American troops over there to protect them. They are demanding more money to build up their own budgets, military and otherwise. They have shown few if any signs of wanting to help themselves. If there have been any political resolutions to stand firm against the spread of communism it isn't evident over here.

FEELING IN FRANCE

The feeling in France is difficult to describe and even more difficult to understand. Perhaps because around 30 percent of continental Frenchmen are Communists, another war is almost taken for granted. Correspondents there report nobody seems concerned over that probability.

Instead, the French seem far more concerned over the possibility of Germans rearming than they do in building up their own army to fight communism. Even the most radical of the global do-gooders cannot deny the necessity of reexamining the European situation and finding out what has happened to the money we have already sent and whether it is necessary to send more. Or whether the stand of Mr. Hoover is not correct: "We should say, and at once, that we shall provide no more money until a definitely unified and sufficient European army is in sight."

There can't be any effective defense of Europe unless both France and Germany participate. The former is in the doldrums and the latter, by the overwhelming victory of the Socialists in last week's election shows it is opposed to rearmament as presently planned.

It is very late, and if defense armies are to be effective they must be formed now. A little while ago everybody had assumed the German people would jump to arms to protect themselves. Now it is obvious they won't. France still is fighting against any German participation in Europe's defense, and still is not interested in raising a larger army of its own.

You certainly can't reexamine that double talk soon enough.

Our founding fathers provided that the National House of Representatives be completely turned over every 2 years and a third of the Senate at the same time. That was so they could reexamine freshly what was going on. The lame-duck legislators should not merely think of adjourning for the holidays without doing some real work.

FEELING IN BRITAIN

They should look into the hesitancy that has gripped Britain. Last summer the British agreed to spend around $10,000,000,000 on their defense set-up in the next 3 years as a part of the common effort. Now the top Socialists who are running the country think the sum is too big.

They think it might overstrain Britain's domestic economy. They are afraid new sacrifices might make Britishers vote the wrong way, and the labor government hasn't much of a margin. They are wondering if the United States can't carry a bigger percentage of the load.

The British situation is one that TAFT specifically wants to look into freshly—and only a man like Acheson would sneer at the necessity of reexamining "all our policies and all our programs," not only to guard the interests of the American taxpayer but to protect our lives.

Acheson since has protested that his original remarks were misinterpreted, but his explanation had a hollow ring. Arthur Krock in the New York Times last Thursday came to the conclusion that the Secretary believes "reexamination" is all right if it meets his own limited definition. He believes, Krock continued, it is all right for the President and himself to reverse foreign policies, as they have done. But the Secretary believes it is all wrong, and another form of "isolationism," if Congress reexamines policies to decide, in the light of events and results, whether they should be fundamentally revised or reversed.

After the election the professed liberals voiced fear that the "isolationists" were back in the saddle and tears ran down their cheeks in fear that our "bipartisan" foreign policy might be endangered, another phony fear.

NOTHING BIPARTISAN

Since the illness of Senator VANDENBERG there has been nothing bipartisan about our foreign policy. Republicans simply were asked to approve a program after the global planners had thought it up.

There is considerable evidence that with the first of the year we are to have real bipartisanship, which means, in the words of Senator FERGUSON, VANDENBERG's colleague in Michigan, "constructive cooperation in formulation of policy as well as in its execution."

In this coming session you will see TAFT and VANDENBERG working closely together, if the latter's health permits him to work at all.

And you will see both demanding that future programs be submitted to Congress for examination before commitments are made to foreign governments. That will require a change in attitude from Secretary Acheson, if he is around.

REAL LEADERSHIP

We had real bipartisanship during the Republican Eightieth Congress, when VANDENBERG and Secretary Byrnes worked closely together.

It was during that Congress—the one so often attacked by Mr. Truman—that all our big foreign policies were formulated. That Republican Congress first approved the Marshall plan. It first adopted the Greek-Turkish aid program. It voted the Vandenberg resolution that was the idea behind the entire North Atlantic Pact.

The Democrats would tell you that all those countries abroad that are looking for our help—and that are so careful not to overstrain themselves—fear the United States is likely to lapse back into isolationism. That is nonsense.

Republicans ought to stop criticizing old policies of Secretary Acheson and President Truman and get behind the wheel in formulating new ones. But there is no reason why they shouldn't reexamine the whole foreign set-up in the meantime. If they got any mandate in the last election it was to do just that.

Food for Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copies of letters I have sent to Secretary of State Acheson:

NOVEMBER 27, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On November 18 I wrote to you with reference to the request by Yugoslavia for $105,000,000 worth of food to relieve drought conditions there and urged an immediate and full investigation of the possibility of using some of the hundreds of millions of Government-owned surplus food commodities for that purpose.

I have received no acknowledgment of or reply to that letter.

Since then the Department of Agriculture has published the reports of its holdings of food as of September 30. The facts contained in the report reemphasize the vital importance of such an investigation in fairness to the American taxpayers who are paying increased taxes and who face even larger increases of taxation.

In the six kinds of edible foods I mentioned—butter, cheese, dried eggs and milk, edible dried beans and peas—the cost to the taxpayers increased $29,233,958.94 to $432,524,915.71.

The carrying charges had jumped in 1 month $2,598,759.87 to $5,949,788.

The six items by no means exhaust the possibilities of wholesome foods held in storage in huge quantities at indefensible waste of the taxpayers' earnings and savings.

Let me mention a few others:

	Amount	Lost
	Pounds	
Rice	464, 387, 000	$2, 476, 278. 87
Turkeys	3, 905, 821	1, 671, 213. 25
Mexican canned meat	64, 466, 487	15, 524, 878. 95

I cannot believe that your failure to acknowledge my letter of the 18th means that you propose to ignore this possibility or that you are indifferent to the best interests of the American people upon whom the Federal Government has placed so heavy a burden of taxation. But, in view of the current reports as to the executive department's plans and operations in this matter of furnishing food to Yugoslavia, I submit that action upon this suggestion is imperatively needed.

I enclose a copy of my letter of the 18th.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. HESELTON.

NOVEMBER 18, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand from press reports that Yugoslavia has requested approximately $105,000,000 worth of food to relieve drought conditions there. You have been quoted as saying that you would have to go to Congress for funds to carry out any such program.

May I call your attention to the fact that as of August 31 the Department of Agriculture had in storage 1,833,550,826 pounds of six kinds of edible foods—butter, cheese, dried eggs and milk, edible dried beans and peas—at a cost to the taxpayers of $403,290,956.77. The carrying charges on the storage of these food commodities had reached the staggering sum of $3,351,028.13 and is continuing at an unknown rate.

The Department of Agriculture has hoarded away millions more pounds of other food commodities which are doing no one any good, running the risk of spoilage and costing the taxpayers totally indefensible sums of hard-earned dollars.

I urge that you order an immediate and full investigation as to how much of these surplus foods can be transferred to any program you are developing to aid Yugoslavia. I am certain that you will agree with me that the overburdened taxpayers are entitled to this much consideration in connection with any recommendation you submit to Congress when it reconvenes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. HESELTON.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by the Marine News of New York, published in the Washington Post of August 25, 1950, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS

To the EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON POST:

The editorial, Rivers-Harbors Forever, in your August 6 issue, has just come to our attention.

We do not presume the judgment to pass on the Nation's needs with respect to electric power, flood control, and upstream river development. We do feel qualified to publicize the value of harbor and channel improvements. We disagree wholly with your statement, when applied to such improvements, that there has been utterly no selectivity in the congressional approach to the bill. Procedure leading to authorization sometimes lasts for years. More than half of the proposed projects are finally disapproved.

A waterway system, like railways and highways, requires some continuous expansion and development when integration for maximum benefits and economical use is the constant goal. Maintenance also is necessary.

On March 29 we began publishing some educational articles in your paper and others titled "Know Your Waterways." The subhead of the March article is "The pork-barrel myth." We suggest that you read it; it deals largely with selectivity. Subhead of an article published on August 1 is "Only 6 percent of a total." This 6 percent, or only some $46,000,000, is the amount included for new work on coast and Great Lakes harbors and channels in the $731,546,000 total reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee in chapter IX of the general appropriation bill, 1951, for rivers and harbors and flood control, not for rivers and harbors only, as the editorial states.

Unawareness of their indispensability is responsible for much of the hostile criticism of harbor and channel improvements. A great part of America's commerce and all of its defense is vitally linked to waterways.

MARINE NEWS,
GEORGE H. PALMER,
President and Publisher.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

The Mandate of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial dated November 10, 1950, taken from the Tidings, the official weekly newspaper of the archdiocese of Los Angeles. In my opinion this is one of the best editorials I have seen analyzing the recent election results. I commend it for your reading:

THE MANDATE OF THE PEOPLE

America girds itself with new resolution and strength. Over the land, up from the grass roots, in the reserves of common sense of the body politic has surged the unmistakable rebuke to a clamorous cabal, whose strident mouthings over the past decade prevailed, in the councils of a great political party, over the call of Christian conscience and the voice of the American past. There is no other meaning to be garnered from the sweep of the election returns.

This cabal attached itself as a parasite to the Democratic Party at the moment of its greatest opportunity. It was in a time of uneasiness, with the Nation in the throes of economic depression writhing in the shackles it had forged, that the noisy group deflected by artful propaganda the steady gaze of our leaders from the wellsprings of strength and focused attention on a monstrous evil which hitherto we had scorned. It is a long, sad story, but we read it well today to our sorrow.

This is what the electorate remembered: a government brashly encouraging the genius of technicians of free enterprise to perfect the industrial might of an enemy, which despite protestations of friendship, was vowed to our destruction; our professors heralding the excellence of this tyranny over our vaunted freedom, our journals of opinion coloring the news to gloss over Communist excesses, our statesmen and diplomats in undignified social contact, squadering the faith and freedom of Christian men over half the world for a mess of Soviet pottage, a collective lunacy aided and abetted by agencies in Washington which lulled the people into deepening aparity and failed to discern the web that was slowly being spun around us.

This was the political mood of the moment: The conscience of the people was troubled anew with the perfidy to our friends at Yalta, at Tehran and Potsdam. The deception of the State Department that the Chinese Communists were merely agrarian reformers rankled again with the news that 60,000 volunteeers had momentarily turned the tide of freedom in North Korea.

Remembered, too, was the vacant stare, the glib assurance, the outraged hurt, the careless dismissal of well-founded suspicions of Communist infiltration in the higher echelons of government, and Senator TYDINGS has his reward for underestimating the intelligence of the American people. And always and everywhere was the mounting concern that the State Department had rescued little from the debacle, surely not its self-respect, and only awaited a friendly Soviet word or gesture to be off again in the mad whirl.

This is the mandate of the American people to the new Congress: no matter what promises of amendment of way, no matter what avowals of friendship, no matter what overtures for understanding, no matter Litvinov's platoon of peace, no matter even years of profession of fidelity, we shall never again be fooled into acceptance of something evil, that must of necessity, of its very nature, focus all its thinking upon evil and pattern all its action toward evil, something dedicated by its philosophy to the evil of denial of God, to the rejection of man's God-given rights, and the destruction of our beloved America and the freedom-loving nations of the world.

It is because Mrs. DOUGLAS could not disown the words she spoke at Columbia University on January 14, 1946, and elsewhere and at other times, that with the assurance of peace Soviet Russia "will become the great world citizen she is capable of being," it is because up until recently she viewed this evil thing with steady sympathy and tolerance, that she along with Mr. Roosevelt have been relegated by the voters of California to political oblivion.

The Collapse of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Sturgis Journal, published at Sturgis, Mich., by Mark P. Haines, permit me to quote an editorial which might well be given consideration by the administration:

THE COLLAPSE OF POSTAL SERVICE

The service rendered by the United States Post Office Department seems to have all but collapsed.

Is there any excuse for the deplorable condition into which this Government-operated business has degenerated?

Recently the Journal had occasion to order some supplies from a firm in New York City. It took 10 days from the time this shipment left New York until it was delivered in Sturgis. The old stage coaches would have done almost as well.

Is it possible that the Post Office Department is staging a deliberate slow-down in order to force bigger appropriations out of Congress?

The fault does not seem to be so much in local post office personnel as it does in the railway mail service. Air mail seems to function with great efficiency, but there is something decidedly wrong with ground transportation facilities.

Congress may be impelled to look into this in the near future. Suspicion that postal service could be markedly better with the funds actually appropriated by Congress is becoming widespread.

As has been remarked the discontinuance of directory service in post offices, except on special delivery and registered mail, is ridiculous in view of the fact that as many as 10

postal employees may handle a piece of mail being returned to the sender because the Postmaster General in Washington pleads lack of funds for one employee to consult a city directory.

Printers' Ink magazine remarks that "Selective Service wrote to a young waiter in the Advertising Club of New York ordering him to show up on September 12 for a discussion about possibly military service." He received the official notice 5 days late, on September 17. "While he was worrying about what to do," the magazine reports, "an FBI man appeared, asked him how come and wasn't at all convinced by his story about the delayed summons." Fortunately the frightened 21-year-old was able to recover the envelope with a New York September 17 postmark. "Yet," Printers' Ink remarks, "when people holler about Postmaster General Donaldson's ruthless reduction of postal service they are accused of picking on him."

Reduction of home deliveries of mail to one a day may be justifiable. Few, if any, householders are complaining seriously about that. But, on the whole, postal service is becoming unreliable and it is the duty of the Postmaster General to prove that the funds are insufficient or see to it that service is improved.

"Not snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night," is inscribed on the main post office in New York City, "stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." High postal service morale reflected in good service to the public is an old tradition.

Reluctantly many Americans are beginning to wonder whether good service is being sacrificed now to generate a public revolt against what appears to be relatively modest postal economy voted by Congress.

"No Place for Small Business," Symington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that many units of small industry, or small business throughout this country are now suffering and many more will suffer as a result of the defense program.

In the hope that some of this economic difficulty may be eliminated, I am presenting for the RECORD some observations made by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business:

"NO PLACE FOR SMALL BUSINESS," SYMINGTON

All indications are that direction of the business end of the Nation's war mobilization program is being turned over more and more to giant enterprise.

At best, so the signs are, small business is very much in danger of being shoved into a distant, relatively inconsequential back seat.

This is the opinion of many competent Washington observers long familiar with the inner workings of Government.

The tip-off, they say, came recently when W. Stuart Symington, National Security Resources Board chairman, appointed members of his Committee on Economic Mobilization.

The function of this committee is to consult with Mr. Symington and NSRB on all policies drawn to gear our Nation, and every segment of it, to the defense task ahead.

To this committee, as representatives of the whole business fraternity, Mr. Symington appointed men from the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Committee for Economic Development.

Neither NAM nor the chamber have ever fought for any proposal not promising at least equal benefits for both large and small business, and they have always sided with big business when its interests conflicted with small business. The CED has steered a more moderate course. But it hasn't even gone out on a limb for small business.

When asked by the Senate Small Business Committee why he had failed to appoint an actual small-business-organization man on his committee to represent small business, Mr. Symington said:

1. "I believe that the business members of our committee from the Council for Economic Development, Chamber of Commerce, and National Association of Manufacturers provide representation for small business appropriate to the problems of the committee."

2. "Since the Committee on Mobilization Policy will deal only with the broad mobilization problems affecting the major segments of the national economy, it is important that the membership be representative of those large groups."

In short, small business is definitely secondary as far as the Nation's top war mobilizer is concerned.

All this in face of the Eightieth Congress' Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, requiring that small business be given equal representation with big business, labor, and agriculture, in all departments and agencies. All this in fact of the Eighty-first Congress' Defense Production Act of 1950, requiring that small business be given fair representation on all advisory committees appointed for the purpose of consultation "in the formulation of rules, regulations, or orders" issued under the act.

But, Mr. Symington says generously, he is very agreeable to the appointment of actual small business representatives to advisory committees in the next lower ranking defense agencies, such as in the National Production Authority and the Office of Economic Stabilizer.

In other words, small business may have a voice in deciding whether the execution is to be accomplished by hanging, electrocution, or the gas chamber. But it may say nothing about the decision to execute.

Continuing Waste in Time of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following analysis of the surplus-food operations through September 30.

It is incredible that with this country at war any Federal agency would continue its indifferent attitude toward the waste of the American taxpayers' money. But an examination of the September report as to the inventory cost and purchases in the Department of Agriculture's food-hoarding program establishes that fact.

The following are the figures given in the Commodity Credit Corporation report of September 30 as to only six such items:

	Cost of inventory June 30	Purchases through Sept. 30	Total
Butter	$99,452,285.99	$26,410,075.73	$125,862,361.72
Cheese	19,706,623.64	19,376,995.68	39,083,619.32
Dried milk	45,718,460.06	13,490,314.97	59,208,775.03
Dried eggs	103,290,365.96	21,007,762.80	124,298,128.76
Dried beans	79,689,881.33	1,187,055.97	80,876,937.30
Dried peas	3,191,320.56	3,773.02	3,195,093.58
Total			432,524,915.71

The losses on these six items as stated in the report were:

Butter	$9,089,759.79
Cheese	2,592,011,06
Dried milk	6,405,485.01
Dried eggs	7,180,362.22
Dried peas	195,249.01
Dried beans	1,435,861.18
Total	26,898,728,27

Beyond that the Department paid out just to hoard these foods in warehouses between June 30 and September 30 the following:

Butter	$1,259,783,65
Cheese	850,499.44
Dried milk	1,353,300.45
Dried eggs	746,734.91
Dried peas	264,156.72
Dried beans	1,475,312.83
Total	5,949,788.00

These facts constitute an indictment of the executive head of any such agency. They convict Secretary Brannan of extravagent mismanagement and inexcusable disregard of the best interests of the American people. He should resign and the President should appoint some qualified person to head the Department who would cooperate with Congress in working out promptly a sound agricultural program. In any event, I hope that the House Committee on Agriculture will schedule immediate hearings to examine the full facts as to these surplus foods and to recommend the changes that are so obviously and desperately needed.

Needed: Labor Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which ap-

peared in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I think the editorial really hits the nail on the head. For years in my own district I have felt that I had the support of the rank and file of labor. Conversations with members of unions, when the Taft-Hartley Act was a hot issue, assured me that a majority of the workers resented the tactics used by their leaders. Election results proved that the workingmen were not accepting the dictates of their leaders.

This year's election, especially the Ohio landslide for Senator TAFT, is a mandate to the labor leaders to alert themselves to a new and constructive program. All Americans are facing tremendous responsibilities. It means the cooperation of all the segments of our economy. Let us face the facts and cut out all petty selfish interests.

The editorial follows:

NEEDED: LABOR STATESMANSHIP

The anti-Taft-Hartley Act propaganda of the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the resolution passed at its national convention last week pledging continuance of the fight to repeal the law would be merely ludicrous if they did not betray such poverty of labor leadership. There were not enough industrialists determined to destroy labor unions in Ohio to give Senator TAFT his 430,000 plurality. The votes that reelected him were obviously from a cross-section of the population, including workers and union members. This was true in other election day upsets. If the labor leaders will really read the election returns they will recognize the futility of a campaign to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act.

Despite the mumbo-jumbo which labor spokesmen have mouthed since passage of the law, its terms and the protections it offers to the workers are beginning to be understood and appreciated by the rank and file in the labor unions. A constructive labor leadership would come forward now with a program for remedying those parts of the law which such friendly critics as Senators IVES and DOUGLAS agree should be amended. Above all, they would suggest a better solution for national emergency strikes than is provided in the law. The latter becomes especially important as inflationary pressures increase and we move into an accelerated national defense program.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and circulars:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Indianapolis, Ind., November 20, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: A permanent plan of military training is inevitable. Will it be the Old World method of conscription or the democratic plan of universal military training?

There are suggestions in the press and over the radio that a permanent draft (conscription) called universal military service designed to take the place of the present draft and of UMT is being advocated. This is causing considerable confusion in the minds of our people. This new idea of a permanent draft (conscription) should be carefully considered in light of the opinions of our military and civilian leaders.

Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, in August 1944, issued a directive which contained the "General principles of national military policy to govern preparations of postwar plans." Remember World War II had not then ended. He outlined plans through which the manpower of the Nation might be developed.

General Eisenhower, while Chief of Staff, on April 24, 1946, in Circular 119, outlined the General Principles Governing Preparation of Postwar Plans. He directed attention to General Marshall's ideas as expressed in Circular 347, above mentioned, and quoted several paragraphs therefrom, for the purpose of emphasis.

The relevant portions of these two official statements are enclosed in your folder.

The expressions of these two great Americans have been the basis of the Legion's program on universal military training. On behalf of the 3,000,000 members of the Legion, I urge that your actions be guided by this thinking.

Sincerely,

ERLE COCKE, Jr.,
National Commander.

(Circular No. 119)

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington 25, D. C., April 24, 1946.

(Effective until October 24, 1947, unless sooner rescinded or superseded)

ORGANIZATION AND TRAINING

GENERAL PRINCIPLES GOVERNING PREPARATION OF POSTWAR PLANS

3. Fundamental structure of a sound Military Establishment: There are certain trends in warfare which have developed to the extent that they may properly be accepted as existing factors. The knowledge now available to all nations has provided practicable solutions for reducing the efficacy of distance, weather, and geographical features as military obstacles. This fact has created a capability for sudden attack that cannot be safely ignored in military planning. The fearfully destructive power of the most modern missiles, the economic capabilities to produce them by even the small nations, and the practicability of employing them against targets hundreds of miles distant without the progressive advance of large masses of sea and land forces have made it possible for any country possessed of scientific resources and ruthless purposes to inflict devastating blows against the most powerful nations. Since such missiles can be discharged from small, well concealed, and widely dispersed installations, it is probable that their effectiveness will continue practically unimpaired until ground forces have worked their way forward and seized or destroyed stockpiles, productive capacity, and the launching sites. These developments, together with the current ineffectiveness of the passive defense, indicate the importance of having the necessary strength in being to counter successfully a sneak attack and immediately act to wrest from the aggressor that initiative of action so decisive at the outbreak of hostilities. The ever multiplying complexities of the world's economy increase the probability that any war of the future will eventually extend to global proportions. To insure the readiness of reinforcements as required by a developing world war and of replacements for the heavy casualties to be expected in modern conflict, it is necessary to maintain a large reserve over and above the forces constituting strength in being. Such a reserve may be maintained in varying degrees of organization and training so long as there is assurance that its organizations and individuals would become progressively available as required. As a guide in all planning, it will be considered as essential that the fundamental structure of the Military Establishment include:

(a) Forces constituting strength in being: Forces of adequate size and composition to constitute in actuality strength in being.

(b) The reserve: A reserve of organizations and individuals so organized and trained that they would become progressively available as needed to meet the requirements of an expanding war.

4. Types of military organizations: The two general types of military organizations through which the manpower of a nation may be developed are discussed in section III, War Department Circular 347, 1944. The discussion sets forth in unmistakable language the official views of the War Department on the subject. In the first type of military organization, such as previously existed in Germany and Japan, the men of a nation are conscripted into the army for service in the lower grades. The function of the common citizen is ordinarily to be a private soldier or, at most, a noncommissioned officer in war. "Under such a system only the brawn of a people is prepared for war, there being no adequate provision for developing the latent military leadership and genius of the people as a whole. It, therefore, has no place among the institutions of a modern democratic state based upon the conception of a government by the people." Paragraph 2 (b) (3) of the cited section directs that "the basis for all plans for a postwar peace establishment" will be the second type of military organization:

"Based upon the conception of a professional peace establishment (no larger than necessary to meet normal peacetime requirements) to be reinforced in time of emergency by organized units drawn from a citizen army reserve, effectively organized for this purpose in time of peace, with full opportunity for competent citizen soldiers to acquire practical experience through temporary active service and to rise by successive steps to any rank for which they can definitely qualify; and with specific facilities for such practical experience, qualification, and advancement definitely organized as essential and predominating characteristics of the peace establishment."

The foregoing directive is repeated for purposes of emphasis. It is further directed that all officers familiarize themselves with the complete text of section III, War Department Circular 347, 1944.

By order of the Secretary of War:
Official:

EDWARD F. WITSELL,
Major General, The Adjutant General.
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
Chief of Staff.

(Circular No. 347)

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., August 25, 1944.

III. Military establishment. 1. Preliminary assumptions: (a) It is assumed that for some time after the defeat of the Axis Powers the United States will maintain such temporary military forces, in cooperation with its Allies, as may be necessary in order to lay the foundations for a peaceful world order. The plans for a permanent peace establishment, referred to in this circular, relate to a later period when the future world order can be envisaged.

(b) It is also assumed, for purposes of planning, that the Congress will enact (as

the essential foundation of an effective national military organization) that every able-bodied young American shall be trained to defend his country; and that for a reasonable period after his training (unless he volunteers for service in the Regular Establishment of the Armed Forces) he shall be incorporated in a reserve all, or any necessary part of which, shall be subject to active military duty in the event of an emergency requiring reinforcement of the Regular Army.

2. Types of military organization: There are two types of military organization through which the manpower of a nation may be developed.

(a) (1) One of these is the standing-army type. In this type, the men of the nation are drawn into the Army to serve in the lower grades. The function of the common citizen is ordinarily to be a private soldier or, at most, a noncommissioned officer in war. Reserve officers are drawn from the better-educated classes but are generally employed in the lower grades and in subordinate capacities. Under this system, leadership in war and the control of military preparations and policy in peacetime are concentrated largely and necessarily in a special class or caste of professional soldiers.

(2) This is the system of Germany and Japan. It produces highly efficient armies. But it is open to serious political objections. In a nation maintaining such a system, intelligent opinion as to military policy (and the international political policy associated therewith) is concentrated in a special class. Under such a system, the people themselves are competent to exert only a limited intelligent influence on the issues of war and peace. Under such a system only the brawn of a people is prepared for war, there being no adequate provision for developing the latent military leadership and genius of the people as a whole. It therefore has no place among the institutions of a modern democratic state based upon the conception of government by the people.

(b) (1) The second type of military institution through which the national manpower can be developed is based upon the conception of a professional peace establishment (no larger than necessary to meet normal peacetime requirements) to be reinforced in time of emergency by organized units drawn from a citizen army reserve, effectively organized for this purpose in time of peace; with full opportunity for competent citizen soldiers to acquire practical experience through temporary active service and to rise by successive steps to any rank for which they can definitely qualify; and with specific facilities for such practical experience, qualification, and advancement definitely organized as essential and predominating characteristics of the peace establishment.

(2) An army of this type has, among others, the following advantages:

(a) First. While, as in all effective military systems, the efficiency of this system depends primarily upon expert professional control, its leadership is not exclusively concentrated in a professional soldier class. All citizen soldiers after their initial training are encouraged to develop their capacity for leadership to such an extent as may be consistent with their abilities, their tastes, and their civil obligations.

(b) Second. As a great majority of the leaders of the war army are included in the civil population in time of peace, an intelligent and widespread public opinion is provided as the basis for the determination of all public questions relating to military affairs.

(c) Third. As with a properly organized citizen army reserve, no officers or men need be maintained in the regular army to perform duties which can be performed effectively and in time by reserve officers and reservists, the dimensions and cost of the peace establishment, under such a system, are necessarily reduced to a determinable minimum.

(d) And finally, as all our great wars have been fought in the main by citizen armies, the proposal for an organized citizen army reserve in time of peace is merely a proposal for perfecting a traditional national institution to meet modern requirements which no longer permit extemporization after the outbreak of war. This is the type of army which President Washington proposed to the First Congress as one of the essential foundations of the new American Republic. This is the type of army which, in the absence of effective peacetime organization, had to be extemporized to meet our needs in World War I and World War II.

(3) Details of military organization change with changes in weapons, modes of transportation, and international relations. But the type of our military institutions was determined in the beginning by the form of our Government and has not changed since Washington's administration. It will therefore be made the basis for all plans for a postwar peace establishment.

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

ROBERT H. DUNLOP,
Brigadier General,
Acting The Adjutant General.

Hammer-and-Sickle Banner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following splendid editorial entitled "Merchants of Misery," which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., November 12, 1950:

MERCHANTS OF MISERY

The distinguished British historian, Arnold Toynbee, whose researches into the ebb and flow of civilizations provided a new if controversial approach to the ultimate fate of our present civilization, observed recently that the denunciations by communism of the faults of the western world may arouse the nations of the west to cure their own social ills.

If one approaches this viewpoint with a firm conviction that in any clash between the moral strength of our Christian civilization of the west and the moral bankruptcy of Communist totalitarianism the west would surely be victorious, Mr. Toynbee's observation begins to make sense.

The merchants of misery in Moscow have a genius for denunciation. They denounce for the purpose of distracting attention from the economic, moral, and intellectual squalor they have brought about in the lands and among the people they have brought under their sway.

The merchants of misery have not wrought a utopia in the Soviet Union. They have merely created a distant mirage toward which the enslaved people strain, dumbly submissive to the tyranny which promises much but produces nothing but misery and death.

There are social ills in the Western World, but the ills are not as grievous, nor the symptoms as alarming as those afflicting the body politic of nations serving under the hammer and sickle banner. The best proof that the Western World will have none of the nostrums prescribed by communism has been offered during the past 5 years.

Five years ago there was abysmal distress in Europe. On such distress the merchants of misery fatten and gather power. But, given the choice between blind acceptance of communism's tainted specifics, and a chance to work and strive as never before, Europe chose to work the poison out of its system.

Social and economic ills are cured only by long, drastic, and painful treatments. We started the cure back in 1775 and have been taking our medicine ever since. Thanks to the founding fathers who instituted the course of treatment the patient feels very much better, thank you.

No false flush of health deludes us. We know a couple of operations are indicated to rid ourselves of inward poisons. No amputation of our freedom, as advised by the Moscow merchants of misery, will be tolerated.

When we are denounced by communism with charges that we do not practice what we preach, the rejoinder is quite simple. If the Soviet Union would just try our treatment for social and economic ills for a year or two a remarkable improvement would be felt by the people of the Soviet Union.

Their vision would improve 100 percent. They would be able to see the merchants of misery in all their quackery. Even a few draughts of freedom would banish the mass delusion that Stalin is the be-all and end-all of existence.

In fact, with an immense continent crammed with undeveloped natural resources, with fertile lands, with physical toughness which has made it possible for the Russian people to endure maddening repression, a few draughts of freedom would give them a standard of living which would banish forever their feeling of inferiority.

The Western World did not need the denunciations of communism to realize that it had social and economic ills in need of curative treatment. Our realization of that goes back to Magna Carta and progresses through our Declaration of Independence and the four freedoms.

Internal Security Act—1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, Milwaukee is proud to have an outstanding independent newspaper—the Milwaukee Journal. This paper recently ran a series of 10 editorials dealing with the Internal Security Act. These editorials present such a penetrating analysis of this much-discussed act that I think it valuable to bring all of them to the attention of our colleagues. I will present them in numerical order. No. 1 in the series, from the October 24 issue of the Milwaukee Journal, follows:

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT—1

(This is the first of several editorials discussing the Internal Security Act of 1950, the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill.)

Over a Presidential veto Congress passed into law the Internal Security Act of 1950—a catch-all measure intended primarily to curb activities of the Communist Party.

Supporters of the act called it vital to American security. Those who opposed the law, other than the Communists, believe that it adds little to our security, but that it does threaten some of our fundamental liberties and traditions.

It is this bill which has prodded the administration into new action to deport any known alien Communist. Some of them were ordered deported years ago, but were allowed to stay, apparently because they were useful to the FBI in its surveillance of Communist activities. These persons could have been deported under previous statutes.

The persuading argument for the bill was that it was "anti-Communist." Coming when the Nation was stirred up as never before by the threat of communism and when politicians were burning with preelection fever, this argument was enough. Many Congressmen admittedly voted for it because they did not want to go before their constituents without being able to say that Congress had done something about the Communists.

The anti-Communist feeling is understandable. Communism, here and abroad, has proved a major obstacle to peace and our way of life. Most Americans would agree that every constitutional means should be used to fight communism. But there is such a thing as carrying security to the point where it infringes on liberty and wrecks the very traditions on which our freedoms rest.

The President believes that the new Security Act will create conditions for Communists to revel in. Certainly the earliest effects of the new law indicate basis for that fear.

The Ellis Island immigration station already is in a mess. On the island are hundreds of vistors awaiting permission to enter our country—permission they had been granted before the new law was enacted. They are held, some of them, because Hitler Germany made them join Nazi youth groups as children. They are held because once they supported Mussolini. They are held because their home country is in the hands of totalitarian rulers—perhaps rulers they despise.

In this country are wives and husbands of Americans who face the fear of deportation because they, too, once belonged involuntarily to totalitarian organizations. There are groups worried because their objectives—for public housing, against the Marshall plan, for civil liberties, etc.—are similar objectives the Communists have or pretend to have. Under the law programs similar to Communist programs are basis for being labeled a Communist front.

Possibilities of violating the new law are endless. It is possible to give a man 10 years in jail for revealing relatively unimportant information to a representative of a foreign government, even a friendly government. An alien working for any ordinary book store or publishing firm could be deported if that store or company sold or published books on totalitarian forms of government—such as Das Kapital or Mein Kampf—standard in most any book store.

The law, however, is not all bad. Some of its provisions are worthy and should be kept on the lawbooks; some even strengthened.

Congress will reconvene on November 27. Members of Congress will be free of election haste. They should take a fresh look at this law they have enacted and redraft it. The Journal and most of the Nation's other leading newspapers feel that the law is bad. The Journal will, on succeeding days, discuss why the law is dangerous to the whole American tradition of freedom.

The Internal Security Act—2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to present the second of a series of editorials from the Milwaukee Journal on the Internal Security Act. The following editorial appeared on October 25:

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT—2

(This is the second of several editorials discussing the Internal Security Act of 1950, the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill.)

What President Truman has called the most "simple and attractive" idea in the Internal Security Act of 1950 is the provision that all Communist-action organizations be required to register and list their members with the Attorney General.

As a solution to "catching" all Communists it's like the system of catching birds by putting salt on their tails. It is, as the President said in his veto message, "about as practical as requiring thieves to register with the sheriff."

The registration plan raises two questions. First, is it desirable? Second, is it workable? A study of the law and its ramifications supports the conclusion that the answer in both instances is "No."

Admittedly, if we could get a central register of all Communists—those already known and those unknown—it would facilitate the job of keeping an eye on them. The same thing would be true if we could get a register of all bank robbers, known and unknown. But nobody would be so naive as to believe that the Communists would all register, any more than bank robbers would.

Under the law, Monday was the deadline for Communist organizations and their members to register. Not a single one did.

The most dangerous Communists are those who are not known to the authorities and may not even be enrolled members of the American Communist Party. Certainly they will not register and open themselves to prosecution under the Smith Act or other laws which would bring more severe punishment than conviction of failure to register could bring.

But registration is undesirable in itself—from the standpoint of our own security. It would drive the Communist Party underground. It would force the FBI and other agencies to divulge sources of information about Communists in the process of proving them Communists, in the effort to make them register.

Open existence of the Communist Party advertises to all Americans its allegiance to the Soviet Union and its incompatibility with American life. Underground, most Communists would be unknown and much more difficult to keep an eye on.

This is not simply a matter of our opinion. The undesirability of registration is testified to by the Department of Justice, by the Central Intelligence Agency, by the Department of Defense, by the Department of State, and by our various intelligence experts.

Registration could give us no information we do not have about known Communists. It would, on the other hand, require our law-enforcement and counterintelligence agencies to waste time, effort, and money to force known Communists to register. It would force these agencies to reveal their sources of information. It would destroy them as effective counterintelligence agencies.

Wake the Watchman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of November 26, 1950:

WAKE THE WATCHMAN

The most important and most immediate job before Congress today, more important than the war existing and the wars in prospect, is putting some life and force into the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

For the first time in its history, this absolutely vital institution has gone to sleep on its job, and at a moment when the national safety is in extreme danger, not from abroad so much as from within.

The reason the committee has gone to sleep is that it is now, also for the first time in its history, subservient to the executive departments which have so long hid the Communists and fought the committee.

For evidence, compare the volume entitled "Hearings Regarding Communism in the United States Government: Part 2," that record committee proceedings of August 28 and 31, and September 1 and 15, 1950, with the records of comparable inquiries any year from the committee's origin in 1938 down to 1949 when the present membership took over.

The witnesses who appeared before the committee in these latest hearings need no explaining. They were: Lee Pressman, Abraham George Silverman, Nathan Witt, Charles Kramer, John J. Abt, and Max Lowenthal. This handsome galaxy represents the very distilled essence of inside knowledge on matters that can help the people of this Republic understand why we are now wondering where Stalin is going to hit us next.

At least one, Max Lowenthal, is an intimate friend of President Truman, regularly in and out of side entrances at the White House.

Perhaps that accounts—of course, it does—for the arrogant assurance with which Lowenthal spit in the committee's eye when he was finally brought before it for a few feeble questions.

What also accounts for the arrogance of Lee Pressman? Here is a New Deal golden boy, one of the inside insiders, a master of action not only within our Government but also within the CIO.

For almost 20 years it has been common knowledge that Pressman was a Communist and obvious that his great influence had served communism.

SEE THE RECORD

On August 28, 1950, Pressman appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The inside story of how he happened to be there has not yet been dug out in full but this much can be stated with assurance. He did not come as a result of driving demand by committee chairman JOHN S. WOOD, Democrat, of Georgia, or WOOD's ranking Democratic associate, FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, or—note

well—Representative MORGAN M. MOULDER, Democrat, of Missouri.

As for his performance after he got there, the best evidence is the record itself, extremely instructive reading for anybody who wants to see the United States survive its entanglements with communism. In brief it was Representative RICHARD NIXON, now California's new Republican Senator, who carried the ball. With NIXON gone, from the committee, who is going to do the job now?

In respect to Lowenthal, a question quite reasonably might be asked: "Why was this friend of the President called?" Another question could be added: "Why not?" Lowenthal is an extremely shrewd and observing operator with many years' Washington experience.

He could hardly have spent his time here in the circles that he has, without being a potential source of important knowledge. Yet his testimony clearly shows how little help he gave the committee, just as it shows how feebly the committee pressed him for help.

In fact, nobody can read the Lowenthal record without seeing plainly that something was going on at the time which never came to the surface.

Well, the time for subterranean wrestling is over.

There is no middle ground. Either you have a driving urge to cleanse this country of communism or there is a reason why not.

COMMITTEE HAS TURNED TIMID

The House Committee on Un-American Activities was formed in 1938 under the compulsion of a driving urge to save this country from subversive forces of all kinds. It has done the greatest service of any congressional committee in this Nation's history, and all the way uphill against resistance from the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Never, until the Eighty-first Congress could it be judged to have slacked at its work. But it is an obvious thing to all who have known the committee from its beginning, that today it is gone soft, timid, and afraid to fight. Let's hope that in this coming Eighty-second Congress an aggressive and fact-finding Committee on Un-American Activities will develop. Such a force is essential to the U. S. A.

Profits in Surplus Peanuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter I sent to Secretary Brannan. As of this time, I have received no reply:

NOVEMBER 21, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have had a brief opportunity to examine the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of September 30.

I think you will recall that the report for the month of August showed that 14,467,115 pounds of shelled peanuts had been bought for $2,174,067.50, had then been sold for $1,267,607.40 at an expense to the taxpayers of $906,417.84.

In the face of that experience, I now find that in September an additional 11,881,566 pounds of these peanuts were purchased for $1,261,635.69, were then sold for $1,213,408.17 and the taxpayers lost an additional $48,227.51 thereby.

This tragic waste of $954,645.35 is bad enough when the Federal Government is taking so much of the hard-earned and frugally saved money of the American people It is even worse with proposals now pending before Congress for additional taxation.

It is difficult for me to reconcile these reported facts with the position that has been taken by you and the Department that there is no authority for the disposition of the constantly increasing hoarding of such commodities as butter, cheese, dried milk, eggs, beans and peas.

In any event, it seems clear that some individual or individuals must have benefited substantially by the purchases and sales involved in these particular transactions. I request that you furnish me as soon as possible with full information as to the persons who sold these peanuts to the Department and the persons to whom those peanuts were resold by the Department.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. HESELTON.

Armistice Day, November 11, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of the address I delivered on Armistice Day, November 11, 1950, at Lawrence, Mass., at the exercises held on the Common under the auspices of Lawrence Post No. 15, the American Legion:

The last roar of the guns died away, and all was quiet along the 800-mile line of torture that was called the western front.

Men crawled up from the mud of the trenches, leaned on their rifles, and listened to a stillness they had not known for 4 years. Somewhere a bird dared to sing, and then the men broke into cheers.

That was France on November 11, 1918.

The blast and flame and agony of war had ended, and men could walk upright again without hate or fear.

There was peace on earth and men rejoiced.

And when the news reached Lawrence the schools closed. Stores and factories were emptied as people poured into the streets singing and celebrating.

Informal parades started up in a dozen places and covered the city during a day and night of jubilation. Thousands of flags swarmed through the city carried by people who marched and shouted. Teams and automobiles were crowded with people, many of whom had never met before that day, but felt the need of getting together in spontaneous comradeship. At times there were more men, women, and children in the parades than on the sidewalks. It was a day of exultation that stands out in history. Nothing before or since could compare with the outpouring of human happiness that flooded our city on that first Armistice Day.

It danced and sang to victory in the war to end all wars.

And most of mankind shared in this greatest of all triumphs.

That was in November 1918.

During the fat years and the lean years, during Novembers of peace and Novembers of tension, we have met to commemorate the anniversary of that supremely happy and hopeful day of 32 years ago.

We did so in 1945, after the end of another global conflict more terrible than the first. Our casualties had been heavier and our faith in man's ability to win lasting peace had been shaken. Our hopes had soared in June of 1945 when the United Nations was born. Then came the atomic bomb to clinch our victory and, at the same time, fill us with dread concerning the future in which such destructive power might be turned against us. We recalled the old League of Nations and how it had failed because small and shallow men in our own Government had refused to support it.

With those forebodings in mind, we could not give way to unrestrained joy on Armistice Day of 1945.

Today, in 1950, we meet in an atmosphere that mocks those wonderful expectations of that first Armistice Day.

The guns are growling again on the other side of the world. Again, because shortsighted men had insisted that we economize in the wrong place, our young soldiers were thrown into the breach, few in number, ill-trained, and without the equipment needed. After a series of heart-breaking defeats, they were strengthened, went over to the attack and swept through almost to a complete victory.

But reinforcements from China, ordered in by Red Russia, have stiffened the enemy defenses. Our troops face the bitter prospect of prolonged action in the below-zero weather and rugged terrain of northern Korea.

And we at home have an uncomfortable feeling as we pick up our newspaper each night for fear that we will see more names of home-town boys listed as dead, wounded, or missing in action.

We pray that the near victory in that far-away land will be consummated quickly so that the suffering will be over and our boys can enjoy the warmth and glow and the "peace on earth, good will toward men" that should permeate the world this Christmastide. Even now we are sending the choice gifts and the cheerful letters to our men and women overseas, hoping that they will be able to relish them in the garrison life that will prevail in Germany and in Korea.

But we have our misgivings.

The Communist conspiracy against the free world goes on. Sometimes it applies pressure directly, as in the blockade of Berlin, which was an attempt to force us out by stopping all land- and water-borne transport. That failed because of the difficult but successful air lift that we engineered. Much to the Russian's surprise, but at considerable cost, both human and material, we were able to supply the isolated western zones of Berlin by plane. This accomplishment raised our prestige throughout the world.

Now the Reds try to mask their moves by operating through other nations that they control.

Take the case of France, for instance.

That nation, because of its position, must be the keystone of any western defense system. Yet the Communists make up the largest single political party among the various factions. They play up France's traditional fear of Germany, thereby making it difficult to incorporate even smaller German units in the combined military defense that is planned for Western Europe. Communists are found in the schools, on the police force, in the Government, are employed on atomic-energy projects, and even hold high posts in the Armed Forces.

Five and one-half million Frenchmen in that nation whose population is less than one-third of ours voted Communist in 1947. How they would sap France's will to fight

in the event of war with Russia is a question of real concern.

I could point to unreliable factors in other nations who should be on our side if it comes to a show-down. I merely cite this instance as an example of the weighty problems that face our President, his Secretaries of State and Defense.

Not to mention the headaches of a friendly French Government that wants to cooperate with us in every way without losing the confidence and support of its own people.

There are other nations like France where most of the people have a genuine trust in and affection for us as we have for them. But they have very serious problems of their own. And they have little or no say in the policies of their governments.

The self-appointed leaders of Red China have sent troops into Northern Korea to oppose our men who are fighting under the authority of the United Nations.

Some diplomats and generals profess the belief that the Reds want to protect the dams and generators which the Japs built on the Korean side of the Yalu River to supply power for the vital industries in Chinese Manchuria.

I hope that this alone is the basis for Chinese intervention as UN forces approach the Yalu River boundary.

If it is so, the UN could give guaranties that such installations would be saved and the flow of power continued to Chinese industries. In that case, large-scale fighting in Korea would soon be over, and the Chinese Communist divisions would be recalled to their homeland.

If not, then this is the beginning of a long-range plan to tie down some American military forces in Korea, multiplied by incidents elsewhere that will cause us to thin out our strength all over the world.

Both in stockpile and in rate of production, the United States has a definite A-bomb advantage over Russia. While Stalin might give the signal for the withdrawal of Red Chinese soldiers from Korea in return for certain concessions, it is clear that communism is preparing for an eventual attack upon our Nation. If we could be conquered, then the rest of the world would fall under the hammer and sickle with scarcely a protest. But the Reds must first wear us down by causing us to expend our economic power in many different directions, drawn into small wars provoked by the Kremlin that do not involve the Russian armies.

When our human and industrial resources have been weakened, Russia will strike swiftly and with overwhelming force.

It may take years before this happens, but the blueprint for conquest, in spite of every attempt at secrecy, is known to exist by every competent observer.

These are the plans of communism designed for our destruction.

Although failing to conquer Korea by a whisker, the Russians overplayed their hand. The United States woke up with a jolt, and just in time.

Appeasement will not satisfy the Communists just as it could not compromise with the Nazis.

Generals MacArthur and Chenault, both of whom have lived in the Far East for many years and know the workings of the oriental mind, have given us fair warning.

Missionary work for democracy or handouts from the United States do not impress the oriental, and we must remember that a part of Russia is located in the Far East.

What they call "face" is all-important.

The prestige of power is the language they understand.

That is why the sudden and bold decision of the United Nations, encouraged and led by the United States, to resist aggression in Korea made all Asia sit up and take notice. The follow-through in terms of hard fighting that is leading to military success dealt Russia a stunning psychological blow. For everyone knows that the Kremlin planned, directed, and supplied the attack on South Korea from its position behind the scenes.

This did more to strengthen the UN and upset the Red timetable for conquest than any other decision we have made since the end of World War II.

There can be no let-down in that resolute and realistic policy.

The United States is beginning to build up its Armed Forces. It is helping other free nations to do the same.

Whether these and other measures yet to be employed under the Charter of the UN and for the purpose of making the UN strong enough to maintain the peace, whether they will succeed before the Communists attack on all fronts, is the question that history will answer.

We can help to shape that answer for the benefit of mankind.

The American Legion knows what must be done.

It is calling upon every American to help in every possible way.

Only as soldiers, farmers, industrial workers, or civilian defense volunteers, and by united and persistent effort, can we save and perpetuate the peace that is in such present peril.

Armistice Day, 1950, is a time for sober reckoning and solemn dedication.

The road ahead is long and there are many dangers along the way. But you and I and millions of freemen and women must travel it with faith and courage to reach the lasting armistice, that we must win.

Point 4, Au Jus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter by former Ambassador Joseph C. Grew. It appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, November 20, 1950.

The work of our American missionaries, whether they be educators, physicians, nurses, agriculturalists, engineers, or Christian evangelists cannot be overlooked. Per square inch, they have created more good will for America than all of the money we have expended through either political or diplomatic channels.

Almost without exception they are supported by private gifts and donations from the common purse of the United States.

Any expansion of appropriations for political purposes abroad by our Nation should be viewed in the exact and clear light of what it may mean to these privately endowed activities and institutions.

It seems to me that two questions, particularly, should be answered:

First. Will our political activities abroad diminish or distress them?

Second. Will our rising tax rate here at home dry up the source of their support?

We should remember that there is no "gravy" here—just a palatable American program, doing real good, au jus.

The letter follows:

CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY IN JAPAN

More and more, and with each day's developments, the phrase "the Far East" becomes a misnomer. We cannot brush off such matters as the terms of the Japanese peace treaty, or the reconstruction of Korea, or the threat of militant communism in China as problems which are of no lasting concern to us. No matter how much some may wish to do so, we cannot withdraw.

It is important that this fact be faced, and its implications understood. Our concern must be as to how we can adjust to the relatively new concept that all men are, in a manner of speaking, our neighbors.

In any consideration of the problems of the Far East, Japan is the key. In the prewar years Japan was to Asia approximately what Great Britain is to Europe. Once a measure of peace is restored, it is likely that Japan will resume its old place as Asia's major mercantile nation. But can we anticipate that Japan will become the chief source of spiritual and intellectual power in the Asian area, as Britain was in the Western World?

Through the allied occupation our Government has done all that was possible to indoctrinate the Japanese in the ways of democracy. But inevitably the force of compulsion that is inherent in the word "occupation" is diminishing. We must depend more and more on the voluntary agencies which are at work in Japan.

One of the major voluntary programs already undertaken in Japan is the building at Mitaka of the International Christian University which is being sponsored jointly by about 20 of the principal Protestant denominations of the United States and Canada. The university proposes to build around a small model college of liberal arts a series of first-rate graduate schools, each of which will train leaders for service in a special field where such leadership is sorely needed in Japan and elsewhere in Asia.

The university definitely will not be another missionary enterprise, set up primarily to convert the Japanese to Christianity. It will maintain the highest academic standards and at the same time seek to implant in the students' minds the philosophy that true democracy must be built on Christian principles and based on a high moral code.

Initially the three graduate schools will try to meet the great challenges that now exist in education, social work, and public administration. The faculty of the university will be drawn from the ablest scholars of the east and west. Its students, who probably will be drawn largely from Japan, will be carefully selected.

Asia faces a heavy task and a grave responsibility in rebuilding its society along democratic lines. Those who have studied the problem at length believe that the International Christian University is the answer. The Japanese believe with us that it is their great hope, and have given substantially toward its founding.

Now the American people are being called on to contribute $10,000,000 over a 2-year period to provide buildings, equipment, and a modest endowment. No contribution to any cause will bring a greater immediate return, or a more lasting benefit to Christendom and democracy.

JOSEPH C. GREW.

Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by J. A. Swisher:

IOWA

(By J. A. Swisher)

If I could write as poets do
And make the words ring clear and true;
If I could sing as poets sing
And make the notes of music ring;
If I could travel far and wide
And have with me a trusty guide,
I would not seek climes far away.
I still would live in Iowa.

Oh, sometimes when the cold winds blow
I'd go down south a month or so.
Sometimes when things here fairly bake
I'd spend a week up at the lake,
And sometimes when I thought it best
I'd take a little trip out west.
But as for living, day by day,
My friends, just give me Iowa.

In Iowa the corn grows tall
It yields a harvest every fall.
In golden fields, oats, wheat, and rye
Are bumper crops by mid-July.
But Iowa has culture, too,
With schools and churches, not a few.
With boys and girls she, too, is blest
Of all that's good, she has the best.

If I could write as poets do
I'd write each day a verse or two
About the grandeur of the West
And of the State that I love best.
Then when my evening prayers were said
And I had started off to bed,
I'd pause a moment just to say:
"Thank God for good old Iowa."

Fifth Annual Meeting of International Monetary Fund and International Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report to members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the fifth annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 10, 1950.

REPORT TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON THE FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND THE INTERNATIONAL BANK

I. The fifth annual meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was held in Paris at the new building of the Bank of France from September 6 through September 14, 1950. The United States delegation for this meeting was headed by the Secretary of the Treasury in his capacity as the United States Governor. The delegation included the Under Secretary of State in his capacity as Alternate United States Governor; the United States executive directors of the fund and bank; representatives of the executive agencies composing the National Advisory Council; and the undersigned members of this committee who served as advisers at the request of the United States Governor. The chairman and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency were also designated as members of the delegation. The chairman was unable to attend all the meetings because Senate business delayed his arrival, but was present at many meetings and presided at the session on the final day.

The other member countries of the fund and bank were represented by their governors, or alternate governors, who were generally finance ministers of heads of central banks in their respective countries. The meetings thus provided an excellent opportunity for the exchange of views and the discussion of matters of common interest in international finance and investment on the part of the governors and their advisers. These conversations were of considerable value to the members of this committee who were present at Paris.

In advance of these meetings careful preparations were made by the National Advisory Council and the agencies represented on it, as well as by the secretariat and staffs of the fund and bank. This careful preparation contributed to the smooth and efficient, and as a whole, harmonious proceedings of the conference. The United States position on the various matters of fund and bank business had been studied and prepared in Washington in accordance with the directives of the National Advisory Council. The general tenor of the United States position is, of course, familiar to the members of this committee from the reports submitted to the Congress by the National Advisory Council. The council's "Second Special Report to the President and to the Congress on the Operations and Policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (81st Cong., 2d sess., H. Doc. No. 611, May 31, 1950)" analyzes the basic problems confronting the fund and bank and reports fully on the policy which the United States has pursued in these institutions over the last few years. The positions taken by the United States delegation at the fifth annual meeting were based on the policies set forth in that report.

The day-to-day business of the fund and the bank is transacted by their respective boards of executive directors and staffs. The meetings of the Board of Governors, therefore, are concerned with the more general problems of the policies of these institutions than with the day-to-day operations. The meetings thus provided an opportunity for the Governors to discuss these issues in the formal and informal meetings and to raise questions with the administrations of these institutions in the course of the discussions centering about the annual reports of the bank and fund to their respective Boards of Governors. Some of the issues as they arose in the course of the meetings are reported here for the information of the committee.

II. CHINESE REPRESENTATION IN THE FUND AND THE BANK

At the opening session of the Boards of Governors Czechoslovakia introduced a resolution which called for the replacement of the Governor representing the Government of China recognized by the United States by a representative of the so-called Central Peoples Government of China. The United States strongly opposed this resolution and was supported by a substantial majority of the voting power of the bank and fund with only a few governments supporting the Czechoslovakian resolution, and a number of others abstaining. It may be noted also that Czechoslovakia subsequently abstained from participation in the election of executive directors of the bank and of the fund, and so will not be represented on the executive boards during the next 2 years.

III. THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The special problems of the International Monetary Fund were discussed in plenary sessions of the Board of Governors of the Fund, and in a number of special committees composed of Governors from various countries, or their deputies. The United States participated in all of these meetings.

The Managing Director of the fund in his speech presenting the Annual Report noted that the Korean crisis, which broke out after the fund's report had been completed and the necessity for rearmament under present world conditions, have greatly affected the world financial situation. The resulting danger of inflation makes the problem of attaining international monetary stability more difficult. He expressed the willingness of the fund to do all in its power to aid international stability and to continue its work in international financial cooperation, which would strengthen the solidarity of the free nations. He emphasized that one of the basic tasks of the present period is to stabilize and preserve the purchasing power of all currencies, and that governments should pursue policies in accord with the fund's objectives, despite the conditions prevailing. He also noted that the exchange rate adjustments of September 1949, approved by the International Monetary Fund, have been amply justified by subsequent events. International price and exchange relationships resulting from the devaluations are more in harmony with actual conditions, and would make possible better operation of the price mechanism, internally and externally, and so would enable international competition to resume to a greater degree its traditional role as the mechanism for directing international trade. He concluded that the fund has shown its effectiveness in the course of the last few years, and that it stood ready to give its full support to its member nations in carrying out desirable monetary and exchange policies in the future.

The articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund provided for the use of its resources by member countries under appropriate conditions to meet temporary balance-of-payments deficits. The problem of determining the conditions under which these resources may appropriately be used in accordance with the articles has confronted the fund from the beginning of its operations. The executive directors of the fund have adopted a policy of scrutinizing individual requests for currencies so as to determine whether or not the particular request represents a foreign exchange requirement arising out of a genuinely temporary balance-of-payments deficit, and that the proposed drawing is consistent with the objectives of the fund. Any drawings from the fund are presumed to be for a short period and are expected to be repurchased from the fund within a reasonable period of time. In the light of the situation prevailing over the last few years, currency purchases have been moderate.

The prospective termination of the European recovery program and the improvement in the international financial position of the European countries, and indirectly of other countries, largely resulting from that program, have again brought to the fore the question of policy with respect to the fund's sales of currencies. Several governors argued that it would now be desirable for the fund to formulate more precise general cri-

teria to determine the eligibility of member countries to purchase foreign exchange from the fund.

The United States position with regard to the use of the fund's resources as advanced at this meeting of the Board of Governors and previously at the meetings of the Board of Executive Directors, as well as the reports of the National Advisory Council, has favored a cautious approach to the use of the fund's resources, particularly since up to the present time the demand for the fund's resources has been principally a demand for the fund's holdings of dollars. Because the supply of dollars available to the fund is practically limited to the United States subscription to the fund—$2,750,000,000—the United States position has favored conservative use of the fund's exchange holdings in view of the generally great demand for dollars in the postwar period. This would conserve the fund's dollar resources for genuine monetary stabilization operations. As a result of the discussions at the Board of Governors, the executive directors were requested to give further and intensified study to the problem. The members of this committee present in Paris participated in the discussion of these policies in the delegation and are in accord with the position taken by the United States representatives.

The fund's first annual report on exchange restrictions and the portions of the Fund's annual report dealing with this question were given considerable attention during the annual meeting of the Board of Governors. Members of the Board commented favorably on the accuracy and adequacy of the fund's reports and expressed the hope of their countries that it would be possible at some future date to remove some or all of the present restrictions on international current transactions. They stressed, however, the peculiar difficulties with which countries were faced in this period of postwar transition and the particular difficulties of the underdeveloped countries which needed foreign exchange to assist in their economic development far in excess of their current earnings of foreign exchange. While agreeing with the objectives of the fund, they stressed the persistence of conditions affecting their particular countries, or the world as a whole, which they believed justified or necessitated the retention of exchange restrictions by law or administrative action.

It was recognized in the discussion that it would be scarcely feasible for the member countries to eliminate exchange restrictions immediately or completely under existing circumstances. But it is the view of the United States that probably in some instances controls have been retained beyond the period when circumstances required their imposition, and that a system of exchange controls may frequently lead to the perpetuation of conditions which militate against their removal by building up vested interests or directing the economies of the member countries in such ways as makes it difficult for them to operate on a multilateral-trade basis without considerable dislocation of their economic life. For this reason the United States at this meeting continued to urge the member countries to direct their policies along the lines contemplated by the fund agreement and to use all possible efforts to eliminate restrictions as soon as feasible and as completely as is consistent with the economic stability of the member countries.

At the fourth annual meeting of the fund held in Washington in 1949, the Board of Governors, after discussion of a proposal made by the South African Governor, adopted a resolution directing the executive directors to make a study of the fund's gold policy under which the member governments had been requested to take action to eliminate transactions in gold at premium prices by their nationals or by their fiscal agencies. In the course of the year the executive directors submitted a report, which came out strongly against any general revision of the price of gold and which reaffirmed the position taken by the fund previously that the member governments should not engage in, or permit their nationals to engage in, premium gold transactions.

At the fifth annual meeting, when the subject of gold was considered by a special committee, these issues were again raised but in less extensive form. There was no strong argument for the upward revaluation of the price of gold and United States determination to maintain the present gold value of the dollar was accepted without question. A few of the governors, however, did not agree with the Fund's policy on premium gold transactions. The "Report of the Executive Board of the International Monetary Fund on External Transactions in Gold at Premium Prices" was, however, accepted without dissent by the approval of the annual report in which it was included.

Among other actions taken by the Board of Governors were: The acceptance of the report of the auditors; approval of the budget; acceptance of the report of the executive directors; and the election of executive directors by those governors not representing countries which have the privilige of appointing of their own directors. There was no controversy nor any extended discussion about these matters.

IV. THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The president of the International Bank, in presenting its annual report to the board of governors, called attention to the need for economic development in the underdeveloped countries, despite unfavorable conditions resulting from the Korean crisis. He argued that an improvement in the standards of living of the peoples of Asia and other underdeveloped areas was necessary to maintain peace and political stability. He pointed out the substantial progress which the bank had made during the first 4 years of its operations, a period during which it had made loans of almost a billion dollars to 17 countries. He indicated that the bank would continue the expansion of its loan program.

He also mentioned the favorable reception on the security markets of the bank's bonds, and the relatively favorable terms at which these bonds could be sold. As a result of the sound credit position of the bank, it was possible to reduce loan charges. He argued in favor of having a larger number of the members consent to the use of their capital subscription to the bank so as to increase its lending capacity. He pointed out that the bank had established sound lending standards in its operations, which would not only assure reasonable prospects of repayment, but would assist in the most rational development of the member countries. He called upon the member countries contemplating borrowing from the bank to give greater attention to the formulation of balanced development programs which would be within their capacity to service foreign debts, and which would make effective use of their resources without undue strain on the domestic economy. To this end he advocated the adoption of better fiscal policies. He concluded that "with the cooperation of our members, we can aid, I believe, in creating confidence and the kind of economic environment which will encourage productive investment, both local and foreign, private and public." He pledged the bank to play its part despite the trouble and disturbances of the present world.

The major part of the bank's meetings were devoted to a discussion of the bank's report and informal discussions of the bank's policies. In these discussions the president and members of the bank's staff invited questions and criticism on the part of the Governors, and explained the underlying reasons for the bank's policies.

As a whole, the Governors present expressed their satisfaction with the bank's lending policy and its achievements up to the present time. The Governors differed somewhat in the emphasis they gave to various aspects of bank policy, but there was evident a general agreement with the main policies of the bank. Thus, the representatives of the underdeveloped countries, as might well have been expected, strongly argued the case for a rapid expansion of the bank's lending activities in these areas. While they recognized many of the difficulties which the bank has stressed in negotiating loans quickly and successfully, they stressed the importance of quick action in this direction as an aid toward building up the standards of living of these countries which, it was argued, would give greater assurance of political stability and the maintenance of free institutions. The president of the bank gave assurances that the political conditions on the Asiatic Continent would not check the bank's lending for development purposes there, if appropriate agreements could be reached for making sound loans, and if the funds could be used economically and efficiently. In this connection both the officers of the bank and the representatives of the underdeveloped countries stressed the great value of the technical assistance programs of the bank and of the United Nations as means of assisting these countries to formulate sound development programs. In general there was agreement that the bank's missions to member countries, whether or not a loan was in immediate prospect, had been helpful to these countries and had given them much needed technical advice on the engineering and economic aspects of their programs, as well as more general matters of economic and financial policy.

A second matter of interest to the Governors was the problem of securing local currency to finance local costs of projects whose foreign exchange costs are met from International Bank loans. Some of the members stressed the difficulties which exist in their own countries and countries similarly situated in raising local currency to finance these costs and argued that the International Bank should provide larger amounts of local currency so as to avoid inflationary pressures on the country. This would facilitate more rapid economic development than would be possible if reliance had to be placed upon local sources to provide the local currency requirements either from locally floated loans, by taxation, or otherwise.

In this connection the bank pointed out that it might be unwise for countries which had a limited capacity to service debt to incur foreign exchange obligations to meet local currency costs. The bank emphasized that it believed that many of the underdeveloped countries had an inadequate appreciation of the degree to which local currency costs could be financed by voluntary flotation of loans in the country concerned. Thus, the interesting case of El Salvador was cited in which the bank had provided technical assistance to the borrowing country to enable it to float a bond issue on its own markets to provide the local currency needed to carry out a hydroelectric project whose foreign exchange costs are being financed by the bank. The bank pointed out that it was willing to consider individual cases on their merits, and that in accordance with the articles of agreement it would, under appropriate circumstances, finance local currency costs, and that it was willing to lend its technical assistance to countries to enable them to finance these local currency requirements from their own resources without increasing foreign exchange obligations.

The bank's management has also at various times stressed the importance of member countries giving their consent to the use

of their capital subscriptions to the bank so as to broaden the character of the bank's loans, which have up to the present time been financed predominantly from the United States subscription to the bank. The permission of the member is required before the bank may use the capital subscribed by it. The United States has given the bank permission to use the entire amount subscribed, and some other countries have permitted limited use of their subscriptions. The bank has advocated more general permission so as to increase its resources and thus enable it to hasten the process of economic development. A number of the countries expressed their hope of being able to grant this permission at some time in the future, but explained that they were unable to do so at the present time in the light of their balance-of-payments position.

The United States has recognized that some countries are not in a position to permit extensive capital exports, particularly while they are in receipt of special assistance from the United States Government to meet their balance-of-payments deficits. It has supported the bank's position, however, as being ultimately the desirable objective in which the funds made available to the bank by the member countries should actually be used for loans and not merely to constitute, as at present, a potential source of funds in the future. It is recognized that this policy cannot be changed at once and that a number of years must elapse before the bank can fully carry out operations on the scale originally contemplated by the use of the currencies contributed by many of the member countries.

As in the case of the fund, the Board of Governors also approved the audit report, accepted the report of the bank, and carried out an election of executive directors for the next 2 years.

V. CONCLUSION

The members of your committee who were part of the United States delegation wish to record their satisfaction with this meeting of the Governors of the fund and the bank. They are satisfied that the Governors representing the majority of the countries of the fund and the bank support the policies which the United States has favored. They were impressed by the harmonious atmosphere which prevailed at the meetings and the frank discussion of matters of policy on the part of the Governors and of the officers of the two international institutions. They believe that both institutions have made considerable progress toward the achievement of their objectives, and that continued United States support of these institutions and their policies is in accord with the interests and policies of the United States. They have found these meetings helpful in adding to their understanding of international financial policies and problems, and have appreciated the opportunity of meeting with representatives of the other member governments. They believe their experience at these meetings will prove helpful to the work of this committee.

Your committee was also greatly impressed with the policies and the excellent management of the bank, a manifestation of which being the refusal by the Governors to liberalize credit terms and the good work that the bank has carried on in such an imaginative direction as assisting in the establishment of a domestic capital market in El Salvador. Without departing from strict banking principles, they have nevertheless done things that no private bank can do and they are fulfilling very ably the function that was in the minds of those who set it up at Bretton Woods.

The confidence of the people of the world is evidenced by the fact that it has sold its securities in the American market at practically the prevailing rate of direct government obligations and the same has been true in Switzerland.

We can readily appreciate after attending the meeting that so far it has been difficult to make as great a headway with the fund as they have with the bank.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
RALPH E. FLANDERS.

Reexamination of Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the script of a radio interview broadcast nationally last week, between myself and Bert Andrews, Pulitzer prize winner and chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Andrews' interview followed a question that has assumed great proportions following the recent elections, as by and large it reflected considerable dissatisfaction with our foreign policies. That question is, What is meant by a reexamination of foreign policy?

In my answers to Mr. Andrews' questions I sought to express as frankly as I could my views on that subject.

Summarized briefly, they are as follows:

First, our future foreign policy requires a realistic view of world conditions, as they actually are, and plain speaking on them. We cannot afford to be deluded by any hazy ideals or double-talk about world cooperation.

Second, our foreign policy must be tested by results. Are our policies attaining the objectives of peace, security, harmony, and stability in world affairs, based on principle, which should be our common aim? Further, are the sacrifices we are willing to make to achieve results in proportion to the results themselves, or will those sacrifices engulf us to the end that none of our objectives are attainable?

Third, reexamination means that any policy failing the test of promised results should then be reappraised for possible redirection and greater results.

The sum total of such reexamination is to make our leadership in world affairs more effective. By no means does it mean making it less effective, by withdrawing into some sort of shell of our own making. In stating my views I honestly felt I was expressing the opinion of a great many of my fellow citizens, on the basis of my talks with them during the congressional recess. In the course of my discussion with Mr. Andrews I stated that I would like to have our listeners write me, to give me their reactions.

The interested response I have received to date makes me feel that I should supplement that request. To reach people who did not hear the radio broadcast, I intend to have this interview printed and sent to as many people in the State of Michigan as is possible. To them I repeat my request, that they write me at the Senate Office Building, Washington, so that I may have their reaction after reading this discussion, and the benefit of their guidance.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. This is Bert Andrews, reporting by transcription from Washington.

One of the topics of greatest interest in Washington right now is whether there is going to be a congressional reexamination of the foreign policy of President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson. With me tonight is Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, one of the Republicans who has strong feelings on the subject. As we all know, the fuss about the foreign policy was heightened when Senator TAFT, of Ohio, said he thought there should be a reexamination. Then Secretary Acheson—in a speech which many observers regarded as being slightly ill-timed, in view of the Republican gains in Senate and House, sort of taunted the "re-examinists." He took the view that foreign policy was what he and President Truman said it was—and that it was silly to re-examine matters that had already been decided. But many in Congress—Democrats as well as Republicans—have a different view, and things may start popping when the lame duck session of Congress meets on Monday. Tell me, Senator FERGUSON, do you think Senator TAFT or Secretary Acheson is right on this reexamining issue?

Senator FERGUSON. There isn't any doubt in my mind, Mr. Andrews, that the remarks of Senator TAFT represent the opinion of Republicans as well as many of the Democrats and independent voters. When a policy has been unsuccessful, it demands immediate reexamination. The people back home have spoken their opinion about our foreign policy. They do not approve of the present foreign policy, for it was the issue in the Senate campaigns, in all of the States—and most of the States turned their back on Secretary Acheson, the man who wouldn't turn his back on Alger Hiss.

Mr. ANDREWS. Then, Senator FERGUSON, you really regard the outcome of the elections in the key States as repudiation of many of the steps that have been taken by the President and Secretary Acheson.

Senator FERGUSON. Emphatically yes. If you will consider the States of California, Colorado, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania—and don't forget Maryland—you can appreciate what public opinion is at the present time. Secretary Acheson's foreign policy was at issue. If he had been running for any office in any State, he would have gone down to defeat, and he would have realized the real opposition to his views.

Mr. ANDREWS. So you don't agree, Senator FERGUSON, with the Secretary's statement, made just after the election, that he had no reason to be concerned with the election results—that his job was above politics.

Senator FERGUSON. In this country, Mr. Andrews, nothing is above politics—if you are using the term in the sense that I think you are. For what is politics, and what is an election? An election gives the people of the United States the opportunity to say what they think—and the officeholders should abide by it. You know the old saying, the Supreme Court follows the election returns. Well, I say that the President and the Secretary of State are no better than the Supreme Court. They ought to follow the election returns, and I think that in this case they'll have to do that.

Mr. ANDREWS. Well, what do you think will happen if they don't follow the election returns, Senator FERGUSON?

Senator FERGUSON. Let me emphasize, Mr. Andrews, that it is not only the Republicans

who are dissatisfied with the way our international relations have been run. Many Democrats—more than President Truman and Secretary Acheson would like to know about—feel exactly the same way. If they persist in their stubborn refusal to follow the opinion of the people, I think the people will speak up in 1952 at the polls, and speak in such a strong voice that there won't be any doubt in the world as to how they feel.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do I understand you to mean, Senator FERGUSON, that you are going on record now as predicting a Republican victory in 1952?

Senator FERGUSON. I certainly am. The people have indicated what they think about both the foreign and domestic policies of the Truman administration. In my mind, the results of the November 7 election showed only the beginning of a trend. I think the trend will increase in the next couple of years and will result in the Truman administration being swept out of office. After all, Mr. Andrews, you can fool only so many people for only so many years. And the years are running out on the Truman type of fooling.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let's go back to this matter of congressional reexamination of our foreign policy, Senator FERGUSON. Just what can the Congress do about it, granting that the people have had their say and want a change?

Senator FERGUSON. The President can do and does do many things without the knowledge of Congress He acts as the Chief Executive and many times—after he has acted—it is too late for the Congress even to debate the wisdom of what he has done. Congress can only act in its authorizations of appropriations to implement a policy. But reexaminations of these policies will allow Congress to determine whether or not they should be implemented, and whether they should appropriate the money—and how much—to carry out the policies.

Mr. ANDREWS. Are you suggesting, Senator FERGUSON, that the "lame duck" session—or the Eighty-second Congress which will meet on January 3—may tighten the purse strings as a method of getting a real voice in foreign policy?

Senator FERGUSON. I firmly believe that that is just what will happen, Mr. Andrews. In recent years, the Executive has practically eliminated the right of Congress to speak through the ratification of treaties. He has made what are known as executive agreements, where Congress has not even been consulted as to their terms.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have any particular examples in mind?

Senator FERGUSON. The one that stands out today more than any other relates to the division of Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel. That agreement, which was responsible for the present war in Korea, was made without Congress at any time having had an opportunity of saying whether the agreement was a wise one or not. Certainly the events have proved that it was not wise, and that our Chief Executives can make mistakes. In this case they made—as the late Fiorello LaGuardia would have put it—a beaut.

Mr. ANDREWS. You were saying, Senator FERGUSON, that Congress might tighten up on foreign spending as a means of regaining its voice on foreign policy. Do you have any particular appropriations in mind?

Senator FERGUSON. This is the way I look at it, Mr. Andrews. We have spent as a Nation some $42,000,000,000 to help other countries. Program after program has been initiated by the executive branch of the Truman administration. Each program was supposed to accomplish our aims, to implement our foreign policy, and to bring about peace. But what happened? All we did was to appropriate money without getting an agreement as to what other countries would do. Some of these countries just don't see eye to eye with us on the conditions that will bring about real peace in the world. Their socialistic philosophies are opposed to our capitalistic philosophy, and we don't find real cooperation from them. Sometimes I think, Mr. Andrews, that all we are doing by providing these handouts is to weaken our own system and tear down our philosophy.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have any evidence on that, Senator FERGUSON?

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Andrews, let me read to you from a news story from Rome in your own newspaper. I clipped it out yesterday. Barrett McGurn, your Rome correspondent, says that Italy is making little progress in rearming. I would like to quote this paragraph, "Italy has been waiting for specific orders for weapons and similar supplies from other western countries but the latter, in turn—to a large extent—have given indications that they are waiting first to see how much the United States will supply to them free of charge." Let me repeat those last three words—"free of charge."

Mr. ANDREWS. Well, your point then, Senator FERGUSON, if we can put it in a crass, materialistic sort of way, is that you don't think we're getting our money's worth out of some of these arrangements.

Senator FERGUSON. Suppose I illustrate it by talking about the Atlantic Pact, Mr. Andrews. That was supposed to assure us of a common defense. The program and plan were supposed to be made in advance of the spending of the money. Because Congress insisted on putting that provision in the plan, we find this story in your paper to be true. And we don't find agreements to implement the Atlantic Pact as Congress thought it would be implemented.

Mr. ANDREWS. Of course you know, Senator FERGUSON, that such remarks are sure to make some critics attack you as an isolationist. Do you consider yourself to be an isolationist?

Senator FERGUSON. I certainly am not, Mr. Andrews. To me, to be a real internationalist you have to think of your own nation and the other nations so that you may accomplish something for the good of all rather than just weaken the economic and political standing of your own Nation.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you think we are weakening our stand, Senator FERGUSON?

Senator FERGUSON. We are certainly in danger of doing that. But let me pursue my thoughts on the subject a little further. A true internationalist has to be a realist. He must work to bring about a better world in fact and not just on the fancy charts of the State Department. The test should be—will this, in fact, bring about a real world peace. Sometimes I think that the give-away boys at the State Department are thinking more about their pretty charts and their precious jobs than they are about the overriding question—will our program bring peace.

Mr. ANDREWS. I don't think Secretary Acheson is going to love you for that remark, Senator FERGUSON.

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Andrews, it isn't a question of what Mr. Acheson and I think of each other. It's a question of accomplishing the aims of the American people in actually bringing about peace in the world. I think the American people want blunt language used in the present situation. I think they are tired of diplomatic double talk and of these proposals to spend and spend and spend without first finding out what we and the other nations are going to get out of the spending in a concrete way. We in Congress must speak out and be frank in all our discussions.

I've tried to be brutally frank in my answers this evening, and I'll say right here and now that I believe I am expressing the opinions of the vast majority of the people in my State of Michigan and in the Nation. If the people of Michigan or of the Nation don't agree with me, I'd like to hear from them. They can reach me with a letter or postcard sent to the Senate Office Building.

Mr. ANDREWS. I'll tell you what I'll do, Senator FERGUSON, I'll drop around in a week or so and see what your mail does show. It ought to be interesting.

Senator FERGUSON. The point is, Mr. Andrews, that we in Congress try to keep an open mind on these problems. And that—I am sorry to say—is more than the State Department and the President try to do, judging from the way they go after anyone who has the temerity to dispute anything they say. That's why I've been criticized for wanting to reexamine some of their programs and why I've been called a reexaminist.

Address by Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., in Reply to Mr. Andrei Vishinsky, Soviet Delegate

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, during the session of the Political and Security Committee of the United Nations General Assembly at Lake Success, N. Y., the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in his capacity as a United States delegate, made a reply to the slander which the Soviet delegate, Mr. Andrei Vishinsky, had been heaping upon the United States. I consider Senator LODGE as admirably suited for the all-important assignment he accepted and the country is fortunate in having a proven statesman of such worth and dependability at this difficult post. Apparently Senator LODGE found the weak place in the Soviet armor and left the Soviet delegate without a reply. According to the Associated Press correspondent, Mr. Vishinsky's face flushed red. This speech appears to have been such an effective way to deal with the Soviets that I ask unanimous consent to have this verbatim report of it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., UNITED STATES DELEGATE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, IN THE POLITICAL AND SECURITY COMMITTEE

I realize that the hour is getting late, and I shall not detain the committee very long. I do want to say at the outset that this is the first time that I have ever served as a representative to the United Nations, and I want, first of all, to say how honored I am to be serving here in this assemblage of distinguished men from all over the world. Perhaps because this is my first time, my impressions may be typical of those of the everyday citizen. It is certainly as an everyday citizen and not as an expert that I speak.

Of course, you can understand that during the past years I have read carefully the accounts of previous sessions, and I expected, therefore, when I came here to hear my country accused of being a capitalist-dominated, crude, and illegal gang of warmongers.

But to expect to hear these things and to have read them in print is one thing, and actually to sit here and hear these things said is a very different thing.

I have spent substantially all of my life in the United States. I have traveled some. I have been overseas during the war, but for 25 years I have been active in journalism and in American politics, and all I can say is that the things I have heard said here today and during the last few days about the United States are just completely belied by my own experience.

Let me give examples of a few statements which struck me. I heard the representative of the Soviet Union (Mr. Vishinsky) say—this was 3 or 4 days ago—that he wants peace and understanding with the United States. But when you think, if only for 1 minute, of the insults which he saw fit to heap on the United States and the way in which he impugns and questions our motives, you cannot honestly believe that his speech was the speech of a man who really wanted peace. No one who really wants peace with someone else begins by insulting him.

Then he said—and I think I am quoting him accurately—that "force is the foundation of the American foreign policy." Yet he knows perfectly well that the United States at the end of hostilities in 1945 not merely demobilized but actually disintegrated its armed forces—and you all know that—thereby, incidentally, facilitating the territorial expansion of the Soviet Union, which is without precedent in all our human history. That is just as clear as the blue in the United Nations flag.

He spoke today of the use of Japanese troops in Korea, which I sincerely believe to be without any foundation whatever. I do not think he can produce proof of it.

Then I heard the representative of the Soviet Union and his colleague from Poland—Mr. Wierblowski—speak with a lump in their collective throats of the horror of the atomic bomb—which is certainly very true and very real—without ever uttering a word about the horrors of being stuck in the stomach with a bayonet or of being shot by a rifle bullet, or by an artillery shell, or of being overrun by a tank. I heard not a word about the horrors of drowning because your ship had been torpedoed by a submarine. Not even a syllable was uttered about the terrors of the concentration camp and the unspeakable slavery of a police state.

I also heard some interesting figures about the United States preparedness effort. We have a saying in the United States that there are lies and lies and statistics, and you can prove almost anything you want to by figures. If you want to take United States appropriations for military purposes as a percentage of the Federal budget, you can make it look very big. I think that if you take the percentage which the United States preparedness effort is of the per capita income of the everyday citizen, which is what he lives by, I think you will find that that is a much smaller percentage than is the case in the Soviet Union. I am quoting from memory now, but I think I could prove it accurately and will be glad to do so later: that about 5 percent of the per capita income of United States citizens goes into military expenses, and I think the corresponding figure is about 14 percent in the case of the Soviet Union.

But let us forget about those statistics because they are not what matters when one considers military affairs. What matters of course is not the dollars or the rubles; it is the military power. And everyone in this room knows that even if this preparedness effort that the free nations are engaged in attains its maximum potential way beyond what is planned—that even then it could never have any offensive capabilities against the Soviet Union. Every child knows that.

I heard the Soviet Union representative say that the Berlin railway strike of May and June 1949 was inspired by the United States. I understand that this strike was inspired by nobody other than the 16,000 strikers themselves who had a legitimate wage grievance. They were workers who lived in the western sector of Berlin but who were paid in East German marks. This currency was no good to them in west Berlin, and they asked to have their wages paid to them in west Berlin marks. The Berlin railway system, as you know, is controlled from the Soviet sector of the city. From what I am told, the Soviet Union authorities refused this demand of the workers, and the workers went out on strike. I do not suppose it is surprising that those who come from countries which do not permit workers to strike should blame the United States for starting a legitimate wage dispute. The fact is that the strike was eventually settled on the basis of a United States formula which guaranteed the workers payment in West German marks. That is just as illustration of what I have in mind by accuracy.

Then, I heard both the Soviet Union and the Polish representative speak of America as monopolistic, when actually, one of the great basic economic facts about America—and that is something which you can all verify for yourselves—is that it is a competitive country in which monopoly is actually against the law. If I were to choose one word with which to describe our American economy, I would use "competitive" rather than "capitalistic." I do not deny that occasionally Americans, like all human beings, do not seek to prevent competition; but in this country, when you try to prevent competition you know you are doing something illegal and will be punished if caught.

Now I know that we in the United States are not perfect. Perhaps I can tell the representatives of the Soviet Union and Poland things that are right in the United States and more things that are wrong than they know about. But in this country we are working all the time to improve conditions, and I know we have made progress.

I have cited just a few examples of some of the statements which have been made in this committee. The men who made these statements appear to be normal men who obviously must know that these particular statements to which I have just referred are absurd. It would be easy and perhaps natural, therefore, for me to dismiss these speeches as merely a cynical and insincere collection of deliberate lies. But I do not do that.

The strange thing is that I think the spokesmen of the Soviet Union and Poland and the Ukrainian S. S. R. (Mr. Boranofsky) actually believe parts of that strange grab bag of news clippings about the United States, from which they quote so constantly. I saw the Polish representative waving a copy of an American magazine here a few days ago which contained an article which happened to suit the argument that he was making at that time. He did so with an expression of triumph on his face. I think his sensation of triumph was genuine and real for the simple reason that he does not understand what it is like to live in a country where there is free speech. If that magazine had appeared in his country, I suppose its statements would have had the consent of the Government. But in our country the magazine simply represents the editor's opinion, and most Americans take full advantage of the privilege of disagreeing with the editor. In fact, the editor very often disagrees with the owner and the man who wrote the article disagrees with the editor and the reader disagrees with the man who wrote the article.

That is the way it is over here. We are a talkative people. We talk all the time. Perhaps we talk too much for our own good. But to pick out something which someone has said in Tampa, Fla., or out in Iowa, or anywhere else, and to say that that represents the United States of America is just fanciful.

I think that some of you representatives from the Soviet Union and Poland and the Ukrainian S. S. R. really believe that we are monopolistic. You believe it because you come from the world's greatest monopoly, and you just cannot imagine anything else. You also have a Politburo in which power is concentrated in just a dozen men, and you just cannot believe that power is so diffused in this country as it actually is. I believe that the ridiculous fairy tales about domination springs from the simple fact that you live in a dominated society and therefore cannot conceive of a society which is not dominated by somebody. You keep looking around all the time to see who is dominating this country. Well, there is no one.

You have made me wonder—and I say this in all sincerity—during the last few days whether you are not really frightened. Maybe you are frightened of us. Maybe you are frightened of the plain people in your own country. But I know that a frightened man can be dangerous. I am sorry there is fright, and I hope and believe that the time will come when fear will disappear, and that that time will not be far off.

I read recently in former Prime Minister Churchill's memoirs that when Mr. Molotov came to stay at Mr. Churchill's official residence during the war he had a pistol beside his bed at all times. Well, there is a certain amount of fear in all countries and in most individuals; but in many nations which are represented here—notably those nations composed of people who value their freedom—fear is not the prime motive of those who hold responsible positions.

Obviously the policies which you advocate here would be very bad for the world if it should happen to adopt them. But I cannot see how, in the long run, these policies will help the people in your own countries. The people of your countries need friends; every man needs friends. They need friends in the outside world, just as the people of our country and of all countries need friends. Now, I have been here since September 18, and I have talked with many earnest, idealistic, and sincere men and women—some of them in this room—who represent many different countries and who would sincerely like to have an efficient working arrangement with the Russian people. But you have rebuffed them; you have turned them down; you have made it impossible for people who would like to do so to cooperate with you. Your policies are certainly unpredictable, and there may be some tactical advantage in that fact, but I cannot think that the alienation of friends throughout the world is intelligent.

You may be here as members of the United Nations in a purely cynical spirit, so that you can destroy it from within and thus promote your own form of world government. I get the extraordinary impression, however, of a mixture of the conspiratorial and the childish.

As to whether all this helps your own ruling class, I cannot judge.

I believe it is unquestionably bad for the long-range interests of the everyday men, women, and children of the Soviet Union, Poland, and other countries which are now in similar circumstances.

I am confident that the condition which exists in the world is not going to last much longer, because the people of the free world whom you have finally aroused will, in a completely peaceful and orderly way, and within a very few years, create a quiet and peaceful world in which disputes will be settled by negotiation and other peaceful methods set forth in the Charter, rather than by the threat or use of force. I think that time is coming.

We hope the day will come when the oppression of religion in the Soviet Union will stop; when the creative energies of that bril-

liant and gifted Russian people will be released: when the Russian people will be able to mingle freely with people of other lands; and when the people of the rest of Europe will no longer live in terror of the Red army.

My advice is: Stop being afraid.

There has been some talk here of the great powers versus the small powers. We Americans are not a great power in the sense that we like power or that we have sought it. We are essentially little people whose ancestors came here from countries where they had been oppressed, so that they could get away from power politics and live quiet lives of their own. We are becoming powerful, but we are not going to use that power as some others have used it in the past. We will use it, with the other peace-loving nations, to create permanent peace, and, whether the dictators like it or not, that will be a blessing to all of suffering humanity, both in and out of the free world.

Statement by Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, Before the United Nations Committee on Complaint of India Regarding Discrimination Against Indians by South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], United States delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, before Committee I, on the complaint of India on discrimination against Indians by South Africa.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

We confront here in this committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations a complaint that persons are being discriminated against because of race and color.

The American position on this question was basic to the very birth of our Republic and is completely clear today.

It is found in the Declaration of Independence which proclaims that "All men are created equal."

It is clearly expressed in our Constitution which gives us the thundering mandate "to establish justice" and which says that no person, regardless of whether he is a citizen, shall be deprived of life or liberty without due process of law.

It lays at the heart of the issue for which we fought a 4-year civil war of unprecedented—and perhaps unequaled—bloodshed and suffering.

The wiping out of discrimination and the enactment of civil rights has been one of the most dynamic purposes of American society, which we have continued to pursue since the Civil War.

It is solemnly announced as a prime objective by both of our great political parties.

No one knows the race or the color of the unknown soldier who is buried in our national cemetery at Arlington. And everyone knows his sacrifice.

Of course, no nation and no people are perfect either as regards discrimination or any other social evil. Americans are not perfect. Possibly the Republic of India, is not perfect insofar as discrimination is concerned. But we Americans, to use the words which Mrs. Pandit applied to her own country, "work unceasingly to end discrimination in every form." The regrettable fact that there is still some discrimination in the United States or in India certainly does not debar us from saying that we deplore discrimination, wherever it may be practiced. Our American system contains a principle of correction. In our country racial discrimination has no future. The truth is that we have hitched our wagon to a star. We have not reached the star, but we move toward it.

This is not just a self-serving view. The people in the United States who are most closely affected—the colored people themselves—attest to the fact that while we have not gone far enough or fast enough, we have made great strides ahead. No less an authority than Mr. Roy Wilkins, administrator of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, stated on June 20 of this year, in Boston, Mass., "The people of America are responding. The tide is going our way. It is no longer fashionable to believe in inequality, or to be unconcerned about it. There have been changes—some of them revolutionary—in great organized bodies of citizens, in scores of organizations, and in hundreds of communities. The idea has caught on. The people are moving toward equality of opportunity."

We hope that our friends in South Africa, whose sons are now fighting heroically for the United Nations in Korea, will move with us in that same direction.

I am not going into the legal and technical questions concerning whatever actual and concrete powers the United Nations may possess in a matter of this kind and will not challenge in detail the well-expressed argument of the delegation of the Union of South Africa on these aspects. It does seem clear, as a matter of common sense, that discrimination on grounds of race and color are contrary to the spirit of the Charter, and that there is certainly nothing in the Charter which prohibits or discourages the United Nations from making a declaration of sentiment on such a subject. Indeed, the contrary could be cogently argued. It seems equally clear that common sense also indicates that the wiping out of discrimination cannot be effectively imposed by force from without, and that the best chance for progress lies in moving the hearts of men.

The United States delegation hopes that progress will be made and that it will be sure and steady. We will welcome all reports of progress from whatever part of the world they may come—from the United States, from the Union of South Africa, and from India, or elsewhere.

Whatever the legal flaws of any pending proposal may be, this is not essentially a legal question. It is a burning question which goes to the fundamentals of man's humanity to man. It is a spiritual question on which massive statements have been made in many of the world's great religions.

We are men of many faiths here. For us who are Christians, St. Paul said: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." In the Bible, the Book of Leviticus tells us: "But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself."

For you who are Buddhists, there is the declaration, "All men are equal."

For you who are Hindus the Bhagavad Gita says: "Those whose minds are thus set on equality have even here overcome their being. God is pure, and is the same in all. Therefore, they are established in God."

For you who are Jews it is written in your ancient books: "The heathen is thy neighbor, thy brother; to wrong him is to sin."

For you who are Moslems the Koran quotes God as saying: "We have divided you into tribes and nations for greater facility of intercourse and recognition among you; the most honored among you in the sight of God is the one who leads the most righteous life." The Prophet says: "Men are all equal like the fingers of a hand," and "You are all descended from Adam, and Adam was created out of clay."

Mr. President, these are voices to which the United Nations cannot turn a deaf ear.

I understand that representatives of all three parties have expressed their earnest desire to find a peaceful way.

The United States delegation favors the initiative by the delegation of Brazil, supported by the delegations of Bolivia, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. As the distinguished delegate from Brazil pointed out in submitting his resolution, it is our concern to employ all our diligence and resources to bring about a permanent and satisfactory solution to this matter.

If we are to give real meaning to our obligations under the Charter, we must continue to encourage the parties to thresh out their differences in the light of the broad aims of the Charter, and to hope that with patience and understanding those persons, whether Indian, Pakistani, or South African, who have direct responsibilities for these matters will respond to the initiative of the Assembly in the same spirit which prompted it.

Address by National Commander of the American Legion Before Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, at the annual Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce appreciation luncheon, at Indianapolis, Ind., on November 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans this annual luncheon given by the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce to the leaders of the American Legion is always a happy occasion. It is founded on the great American virtues of friendliness and good fellowship. These are qualities desperately needed in our troubled world today.

It takes friendship to produce good fellowship. It takes good fellowship to make a good neighborhood. It takes good neighborhoods to make a good Nation. It takes good nations to make a good world.

Our common objective here today is to make the whole world a good neighborhood. In that cause all of us here are earnestly united. We all want human freedom enshrined in enduring peace.

But we are living in a world that has been split in two by evil forces—the forces of

hatred, of greed and of lust for power—as represented by the sinister philosophy of communism whose chief apostle is Soviet Russia. The ruthless men behind this pagan doctrine of communism believe only in force. They consider good will and friendliness only as signs of weakness to be taken advantage of. By their own pronouncements they have declared that any means justify their ends and thus have removed all basis of integrity and trust in which free men of good will could achieve an area of peaceful understanding with them.

What I am about to say here today may come as a shock to some of you. My purpose is to shock you. My talk here can serve no better purpose than to wake up all the people. Do not consider the American Legion militaristic or me as an alarmist. Remember that we of the American Legion have a right to be more realistic. We know war at first hand. This gives us a clearer perspective of things as they really are. In talking about war and danger of war we do not concern ourselves with impractical idealism or wishful thinking. We deal with real conditions.

There are certain grim facts which every American must recognize today as the ABC's of American survival.

Soviet Russia is our deadly enemy.

Soviet Russia is also the deadly enemy of human freedom everywhere.

Soviet Russia is pursuing a master plan for world conquest.

The war lords of Soviet Russia are using communism only as a tool of world enslavement. It is the most effective tool ever used by any dictator because it is the most versatile tool ever invented. It can be made to mean so many different things to so many different classes and masses. That is why communism has been so successful in creating red fifth columns everywhere. But we must never forget that the driving urge behind communism is Russian imperialism.

Finally, every American must realize that the United Nations cannot save us from the perils of communism. But a strong America can save the United Nations.

Only a strong America—which means an America safe to be with—can serve as the international rallying point for free men and women everywhere in a united and a successful resistance to expanding world communism.

This, my fellow-Americans, is the logic behind the American Legion's 1951 peace through strength program.

In fighting for American strength for peace by compulsion—and that is the only way in which we can make sure of peace—the American Legion asks:

1. Enactment by Congress without further delay of a universal military training law as the manpower framework of a modern American defense establishment plus immediate total mobilization of our Armed Forces to a full war footing. We need the full draft to meet our immediate peril. We need UMT for the long pull as the most effective and least costly system of maintaining necessary national preparedness. The American Legion believes we are on the brink of world war III. We believe that only our immediate total mobilization will discourage Communist leaders from starting a total war.

2. Strengthening of our own internal security through the strict enforcement of the new Communist-control law to the end of at least immobilizing every Communist beachhead in the United States. If we are going to have to fight Soviet Russia, we don't want to be faced at the same time with the necessity of fighting a vicious red fifth column at home.

3. Curtailment or elimination of every possible public and private nonessential expenditure.

From now on national security must have first call upon our national wealth. Our Government must take the lead in drastic reductions in all non-defense costs. Our people must follow the Government's lead.

American dollars must become fighting dollars. They will have no business for a long time to come, jingling as spare cash in individual pockets.

We can never shrink from the cost of the defense of our freedom, however stupendous it may be. The only alternative is life upon our bended knees as slaves of an alien dictator.

It is part of Soviet Russia's master plan to increase the cost of our defense to ruinous proportions in the hope we will spend ourselves into disaster. Joe Stalin is counting on our economic bankruptcy. He believes fondly this is the surest and safest way of destroying America without the firing of one Russian gun by a Russian soldier.

This is a threat which can only be met by American willingness to undergo unprecedented individual and collective sacrifices. The American way of life has always been luxurious. We shall have to settle for an American way of life that can remain free only if it becomes frugal.

This is the rugged path that stretches ahead of all of us. We are facing record taxes, increasing Government controls, and growing civilian shortages. There is no relief in sight. If we escape total war in the immediate future, we shall face years of continuing international tensions and recurring national emergencies. We cannot pass this sternest of all tests of our patriotism on a basis of politics as usual, business as usual, pleasure as usual, and spending as usual. All of us must return to the old-fashioned American virtues of hard work, thrift, and sacrifice. We must not tolerate shirkers in our midst.

There are, I am sorry to say, not only shirkers in America today but actually men who call themselves Americans and yet who for a "fast buck" are willing to sell out our country.

I am referring to merchants, brokers, exporters and shippers who are trading with our enemies. They consider it clever to find loopholes in our laws and in our export license regulations to carry on commerce with Communist nations. These men may be within the law but they are traitors to America. They should be dealt with as enemies.

These renegade Americans are supplying Red China with copper, steel, oil, armor plate, machine tools, scrap, and other supplies which help build up Communist war machines. They are helping to load the guns with which American soldiers are being killed.

Government officials who connive with these blackguards or whose stupidity permits this criminal trading are guilty of diplomatic murder. Their excuse is, "Are we at war with China?" Such officials are morally bankrupt, intellectually deficient, and patriotically degraded. They should be instantly dismissed and branded for life as unfit for any public office.

The devious subterfuges by which these shipments are made to Chinese Communists and the manner in which bureaucratic knaves condone this trading were exposed in recent newspaper articles. Every loyal American should protest this arming of our enemies to his Senator and to his Congressman in strongest terms. Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland, is opening closed committee hearings on this trading with Red China in Washington today.

This unscrupulous trading with Red China is particularly perfidious at this time. We are living in fateful hours. Red China has intervened in North Korea. The Kremlin gang's most fervent desire is to embroil us in a large-scale war with Red China. We have nothing to gain in such a war. Russia has everything to gain. We cannot match China's manpower. China is not our real enemy. Soviet Russia is. An all-out war with China can only bleed us to the point where the big Red army of Soviet Russia can flatten us like a steam roller. We could kill millions of Chinese and drop A-bombs on Chinese cities. The net result would be that we would only weaken China to make her more amenable to Moscow direction, lose countless precious American lives, spend hundreds of billions of dollars, and deplete our stock of atomic weapons. In the end, if we did win such a war, what would the victory profit us? We'd still have Soviet Russia to deal with.

Red China is only a symptom of world disease. No responsible surgeon would dare endanger the life of a critically ill patient by trying to cure the symptoms. No responsible businessman would attempt to solve a serious financial problem by quarreling with his chamber of commerce.

The intelligent approach to any problem, and particularly to the problem of survival, is to determine the exact cause of the problem and deal with the cause.

The time for that resolute and drastic action has come.

The sooner we serve notice on Soviet Russia that we will not fight any more satellites which she elects to "sick" on us but shall hold Moscow responsible for any further aggression and use all of our strength to destroy the breeding place of world trouble the better off we will be.

It is useless to make threats unless we can carry them out.

But this is a threat which our survival demands. We must build our strength to make such a threat good. That demands immediate mobilization of our Armed Forces to full war strength, immediate enactment of UMT, a tough policy toward all Communists and traitors at home, and a full realization and patriotic willingness to bear the burden of sacrifice which this "operation survival" requires.

We must condition ourselves for the most savage period in all of our history. But how many of us have given serious thought to the twilight which is descending on our American way of life? How many of you businessmen have discussed this at lunch, instead of business as usual? How many of our civic, fraternal, professional, business, labor, and other groups have pondered the immediate perils that beset us all? How many of us have made our opinions known to our Members of Congress?

Let's make it clear to the world that we are united on a resolute program of peace through strength.

America is a nation of free Americans. Here the individual counts. We are living in a land of the free because it has always been the home of the brave.

We can keep it that way, all of us together, with God's help. We can do it because the most important part of the word "American" always has been found in the last four letters, which spell "I can."

German Rearmament—What Do the Germans Really Think?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended article from the November 19, 1950, edition of This Week reveals the necessity for proceeding with wisdom and discretion on the question of rearming Germany within the framework of a western European defense force. The

author, William L. Shirer, is one of our best known and most experienced correspondents and commentators:

WHAT DO THE GERMANS REALLY THINK?

(By William L. Shirer)

Over the free world's continuing concern about the problem of rearming Western Germany hangs a cloud of questions. Will the Germans be dependable partners in the struggle with the east? Are their hearts really with the west? Have they finally shed their allegiance to nazism? How do they feel about having a new German army?

Summed up, the question comes to this: What do the Germans really think?

Recently, I spent hours on end, day after day, probing the minds of Germans in Berlin and the Rhineland, and I confess that I came away not only exhausted but confused. Fortunately, we do not have to depend on the findings of one observer, or even a handful of observers, to get a picture of what postwar Germans are thinking.

For 5 years the American Government has had a team of public-opinion experts exploring the minds of the German people. Set up in 1945 as the Opinion Surveys Branch, Information Services Division of Military Government, and later, when civilian rule supplanted the military, as the Reactions Analysis Staff, Office of Public Affairs, under the High Commissioner for Germany, this group has conducted over 100 full-scale public-opinion surveys in the United States zone. The method has been interviews by a staff of 120 trained Germans supervised by 4 American professional pollsters.

Public opinion polls, as we learned from the sad experience of Messrs. Gallup and Roper in the last Presidential election, may not be an infallible basis for predicting how people will vote. But we are concerned in Germany with what people think. To determine this, scientifically designed polls covering all strata of the population have, I believe, a good deal of validity. Careful study of the surveys made in Germany over the 5 years reveals some interesting answers to our questions about a people whose government has instigated two World Wars in the lifetime of every American over 35, and the people whom now we are courting—not without certain misgivings from some of our western allies.

The most important question put to the German people by our pollsters concerned their attitude toward nazism. Did they think national socialism was a bad idea, or a good idea badly carried out? A majority of all classes, our surveyors found, firmly believe that nazism was a good idea, but badly carried out. Moreover, this majority has been growing as the Germans have had time to think the matter over. Whereas from December 1945 to November 1947, 52 percent considered Hitlerism a good idea, today 59 percent see it in that light. Conversely, the first 3 years after the war 38 percent were definitely of the opinion that nazism was a bad idea. Today only 30 percent think it was bad.

FACTS WE SHOULD NOT IGNORE

The official report of the Reactions Analysis Staff concludes rather sorrowfully: "The fact that a majority of United States zone Germans are still unaware of, or choose to avoid analysing, the intrinsic character of national socialism should not be ignored."

Not to be ignored, too, is the German attitude toward democracy and freedom, those two glories of western civilization which we Americans are willing to fight for. In three visits I have made to Germany since the end of the war I could not find much interest in democracy. When our pollsters asked the people, "Do you believe that the Germans today could actually govern themselves democratically?" less than half answered in the affirmative. A third took an outright negative view, and the rest said they had no opinion one way or the other.

"Clearly," commented our surveyors, "a large proportion of United States zone Germans lack confidence in their ability to manage their affairs in a democratic way."

From my observations I would add that they lacked not only confidence but interest. And indeed this was borne out in another survey made by the analysis staff.

POLITICS? WHO CARES!

The question asked was, "Are you yourself interested in political affairs, or do you prefer to leave that to others?" More than 60 percent were quite content to leave politics to others.

What about freedom, which we of the west hold so dear? Freedom of speech, of the press, of religion, of elections?

Hitler took these freedoms away from the Germans and in return offered economic security. My own on-the-spot observations were that the Germans did not mind this exchange too much. I always hoped that my findings were wrong. So I was interested in the answer the Germans gave to the following questions:

"Which of these types of government would you personally choose as better:

"1. A government which offers the people economic security and the possibility of a good income?

"2. A government which guarantees free elections, freedom of speech, free press, and religious freedom?"

AN ARBITRARY CHOICE

Six out of ten Germans answered they would prefer economic security to civil liberties. The choice admittedly was somewhat arbitrary. But when the same question was put to Americans an overwhelming majority said they wanted basic freedoms rather than comfortable incomes.

Asked which rights they would give up in return for economic security, most Germans indicated they would relinquish first the freedom to vote for the political party of their choice; next the freedom to read what they pleased.

It would seem, then, that our present fight for freedom in a world whose liberties are threatened by the Communist tyranny does not arouse quite the same fire in German hearts as it does in ours.

It is not that communism holds any attraction for the Germans. In a free election even the Germans in the east would reject the Communist ticket by 10 to 1. But not having tasted much freedom in their lives or, one might add, in their long history, the Germans do not covet it as dearly as Englishmen or Americans, whose experience has been of another kind.

SUPER-RACISM DECLINES

What about anti-Semitism in Germany? Did it die with Hitler? One question the American poll takers have frequently asked of Germans is: "Do you think some races are inferior to others?"

Since there are virtually no Negroes in Germany, no Red Indians or Asiatics, it is a fair surmise that most people answering the question had the Jews in mind. In 1948, 43 percent thought some races were inferior, and 46 percent thought they were not.

Today, however, only 34 percent subscribe to the theory of racial superiority. More than half—56 percent—say they do not.

Our polls have also delved into the question of war guilt. The querry: "What do you really believe was mainly responsible for the last war—Germany, other countries, or particular circumstances?"

In 1947 only a relatively small minority—26 percent—admitted to any German responsibility. The majority—55 percent—blamed the war on particular circumstances.

Since 1947 there has been some awakening on this subject. Today 37 percent—still a minority, to be sure, but a sizable one—admit Germany's responsibility for the war.

"STAB-IN-BACK" THEORY

As to why Germany was defeated, 38 percent of all Germans, according to one of our surveys, believe it was because of treachery. Whether this state of mind will eventually lead to a general belief in a "stab-in-the-back" theory, such as Hitler exploited so successfully after the First World War, remains to be seen.

At the beginning of this article I posed the question: "Are the hearts of the Germans really with the west?"

We ought never to forget that frequently in history the Germans have allied themselves with the east and with Russia—twice between the wars with Soviet Russia. Stalin has suggested that a new Russo-German alliance might dominate the world. A. J. P. Taylor, the British historian and authority on Germany, argued recently that "whosoever builds up the military power of Germany is presenting Russia with an ally."

DOUBTFUL "NO OPINIONS"

Our polls, however, indicate that the German people favor lining up with the west. Six out of 10 Germans say they are for a union of west European states. Only a handful are flatly against it, though it is significant that nearly 40 percent have no opinion.

As for the Atlantic Pact, 6 out of 10 Germans at least have heard of it, and of these three-fourths believe Germany should participate in it.

A clear majority (63 percent in the United States zone, 90 percent in western Berlin, and 76 percent in Bremen) favored German participation in a western European defensive army within the Atlantic Pact. Forty-five percent opposed an independent German army, 43 percent favored it.

This is a fairly healthy sign, it seems to me, considering what we have experienced from German militarism in the past.

The youths of Germany, who would have to do the fighting, were, to judge from talks I had with young men, much less enthusiastic about any kind of army than their elders. This was borne out by recent polls at Munich University and at Erlangen University.

WANT TO BE SOLDIERS?

"Suppose Germany had an army again—would you want to become a soldier?"

Ninety-six percent of the students at Munich and 91 percent at Erlangen replied "No." Some 70 percent of the students were war veterans; they had had enough.

The pollsters' peep into the postwar German mind reveals a people who: (1) Have not shed their leanings toward nazism; (2) do not care much about the freedoms we Americans are fighting for; (3) scarcely share our confidence in the democratic way of life; (4) do not believe Germany responsible for the last war; (5) are inclined to throw in their lot with the west, though their youth would prefer to let others do the fighting.

"Know your enemy!" the Greek philosophers used to proclaim. Perhaps it is wise to know your friends, too. To know them may spare us later disillusionment, as we found to our sorrow in the case of one of our gallant allies in the late war.

The Long Island Rail Tragedies

REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

wish to amplify and add to the brief comment I made yesterday on the floor of the House when calling the attention of my colleagues to the stark disaster twise striking at travelers of the Long Island Rail Road which serves my constituency.

As many of you know, on November 22, a few hours before the advent of Thanksgiving Day, 77 persons died in Kew Gardens when two trains plowed into each other, and earlier, on February 17 of this year, 33 lives were lost at Rockville Center because a veteran engineer ran through a stop signal. Besides the terrible toll taken by death, both crashes shocked and pitifully injured hundreds of persons. Both caused great financial loss in rolling stock and damage suits to a company already bankrupt and seemingly unable to furnish to its 3,000,000 users the safe and expeditious service requisite to the greatest and fastest-growing commuter area in the Nation.

The catastrophes occurred within 9 months of each other—the second before the courts had had time to review the claims of those bereft and maimed by the first. The disaster in February outraged the people of my constituency when they learned it could have been prevented by an automatic tripper device halting the train made runaway by what its tragedy-weighted engineer, when charged with manslaughter, described as his "blacking out."

The three bodies to which my county of Suffolk had a right to appeal—the Congress, the State legislature, and its board of supervisors—moved concertedly for constructive relief. Attempt was made to attack the problem from two angles. Watchfulness against the ever-present shortcomings of the individual on one hand, and on the other hand provision for perfecting mechanical safeguards. Toward that end, after long consultation with me, Assemblyman Elisha T. Barrett, of the second assembly district of Suffolk County, introduced a bill into the New York State Legislature, and I offered House Resolution 508 here in the Federal Congress. Both bill and resolution were formally endorsed unanimously by the Suffolk County Board of Supervisors.

The Albany measure, introduced in the assembly on March 7, sought to amend the State statute in relation to the authority of its public service commission to make rules and regulations concerning the operating personnel of railroads. It provided:

> At least twice in each year the commission shall review the records of all operating personnel of railroads subject to their jurisdiction and shall also establish rules and regulations requiring periodic physical examinations of all persons whose duties are such as to render them responsible for public safety. Any person whose record of violations of company or commission rules or whose physical condition is such that his continued employment would jeopardize public safety may be suspended or dismissed upon order of the commission after a hearing before the commission, or a member or duly authorized officer thereof, at which such person shall have a fair opportunity to be heard and may be represented by counsel. In any case, where an order of dismissal may be made pursuant to the provisions of this section against a person who is eligible for retirement, an order directing and compelling retirement may be made in lieu thereof.

Both the senate and the assembly at Albany disregarded the strenuous opposition of railroad union lobbyists and passed the bill, but this life-saving measure was killed by the veto of Governor Dewey. It must be small consolation to the families of the dead, maimed, and injured that the Governor felt that the bill "would produce waste and unnecessary cost," particularly since the bill was designed to guard against the very element which, according to him, was probably the cause of this latest accident—human failure.

Although long ago the legislature created a powerful public service commission delegating to that somewhat sluggish body powers comprehensive in scope, session after session it meticulously perfects the State motor vehicle law until it is now a detailed blueprint governing the every movement of passenger car and truck. Or, as was pointed out by the bill's introducer in urging Governor Dewey to affix his signature:

> Our vehicle and traffic law confers upon the commissioner of motor vehicles the power and the duty to suspend or revoke a driver's license whenever the operator is involved in an accident causing personal injury. It provides for mandatory revocation when an operator is found in serious violation of the law three times within a period of 18 months. Revocation is mandatory under our law in cases of intoxication. The law even provides for suspension and revocation in cases involving property damage where financial responsibility cannot be shown. Under the general business law we suspend or revoke a barber's license if he is found with dirty finger nails or fails to wash his hands between service to two customers. * * *
>
> If the situation were not so serious it would, to my mind, be ludicrous to argue that on the one hand the State should and does, exercise these rights in connection with the use of automobiles and can exercise no rights whatever in the case of an engineer or motorman driving a train on which as many as a thousand or more people are riding.

While the hope of relief within New York State ended with Governor Dewey's veto, there remained still before the Congress my own resolution, introduced on March 13, requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to review and assure safety devices on the Long Island Rail Road. Nothing has been done to implement it, although I believe since the tragic wreck of last Wednesday, November 22, the Interstate Commerce Commission has moved into New York to make inquiry into the wreck's causes, and further, the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House has also evidenced concern.

While I am understandably glad to learn that the Commission and Committee are now at work, I am most anxious that their findings be not a mere cataloging of horror but that they become part and parcel of constructive action to avert future disasters. To that end I hope to introduce a new resolution asking that the complete disaster findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission, lest they go the way of bureaucracy, be reported to this House so that it may be certain its legislative mandate in creating titles 43–50 of the United States Code is being carried out in conformity with the intent of the Congress.

The frightfulness of the two accidents occurring on the Long Island Rail Road has pointed up the operating inadequacies of the road itself. For time long past I have been reviewing the complexities of this problem in my own mind and have made some study of the possibility of the creation by the State legislature of a functioning agency, perhaps one modeled after that of Cleveland, Chicago, or Detroit, or one that would function along the lines of the Boston metropolitan transportation district with proportioned taxes paid by the five counties traversed by the road. It is my belief—and I throw it out only for studious consideration and not as a final conviction—that the Boston type of operation might be the more suitable. Corollary to this, it occurs to me that the New York Port Authority, a farsighted and sound body established by the legislature for the express purpose of getting people in and out of New York City, might expand its field of usefulness to include operation of the Long Island Rail Road, either directly or collaterally in an advisory capacity.

Inasmuch as Mayor Vincent R. Impelletteri, of the city of New York, is vitally interested in the problems presented by the Long Island Railroad, which pours hundreds of thousands of commuters in and out of Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Queens daily, I have laid my thought before him as the executive officer of three of the five great counties concerned, communicating with him under date of November 24, as follows:

> MY DEAR MR. MAYOR: The fact the Long Island Rail Road serves many governmental units has to date made it the headache of all and the responsibility of none. So long as the road could operate successfully as the venture of private capital, there was reason for the public's latent hope that some day, somehow, the railroad would improve. Since, however, the company has functioned under section 77B of the bankruptcy act sin- 3 March 19, 1949, and there is no apparent rush of private investors to purchase it, it would appear that eventually it will be encumbent upon the municipalities interested to review at least the problem of the road's continuance.
>
> It is my belief that there should be created a metropolitan transportation district, with power to levy taxes apportioned county-wise upon use. Inasmuch as the Long Island is geared principally as a vehicle for getting people in and out of New York City, the New York Port Authority, created for that very purpose, might be directed to study the feasibility of expanding its field of usefulness to include operation of the road, either directly or collaterally in an advisory capacity.
>
> Legislation fashioned perhaps along the lines of the Boston metropolitan transportation district might offer a workable solution for a worsening condition in traffic that cannot but adversely affect your two great counties of Kings and Queens as well as the counties of Nassau and Suffolk, to say nothing of creating a frightening situation where the very lives of the travelling public may continue in jeopardy because of management necessarily more limited in scope.

The conveyance of your opinion as mayor to me in this matter would be very much valued, particularly at this time when we are so shocked by Wednesday's disaster.

Faithfully yours,

W. KINGSLAND MACY.

Whatever solution is developed for the traffic problem involved in the continuance of the Long Island Rail Road, the first and foremost of the needs of the travelling public on Long Island is safety. To that end we must work tirelessly and concertedly.

Some Thoughts on United Nations Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with United Nations Day, which we celebrated on October 24, 1950, the thoughts of most people throughout the world turned to problems of peace and security now and in the future. While many of us think of such matters hopefully, few among us bother to put our thoughts down on paper. One of those who did is A. D. Whiteside, president of Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., the noted mercantile agency of New York, and the result was a most stimulating letter containing thought-provoking ideas. His letter follows:

GENTLEMEN: I have just come home from bass fishing on a small lake in Sudbury, Vt., where I have been going for years.

This year everything there seemed to be as it had always been, particularly at daybreak when the water was as usual glassy smooth under a gently drifting mist with only an occasional ripple where shiners surfaced over the weeds.

There is something about being alone in the early morning on a small, secluded lake surrounded by hills and dense woods which creates a sense of security and peace—something which made it unreal to think that the permanence we had always felt about our future could be in imminent and terrible danger with no apparent assurance of security for years to come.

While I was there I thought of all that I knew about which had happened since the First World War. And I came to the conviction that if we as a Nation profit by our past experience under war conditions and plan without fear or confusion, we will find, possibly without war, the way to even greater security and contentment for all people in the future than we have ever thought possible in the past.

For at the present time, only one nation in the world stands in the way.

Only Russia shuts the world out, and only our moral and military strength can save the free peoples until they are strong enough to defend themselves, or until the United Nations is functioning fully and able to enforce international justice and world peace.

We have learned from bitter experience in two world wars that we cannot win peace through military victories, and we know now, what we did not understand before, that we could never have won permanent peace until the people of all the nations on earth had become free to determine their own form of government and to enact their own laws recognizing the rights of minorities.

As it is now we can fight if we must for an ideal—for a world of free people working through a world organization dedicated to and able to maintain permanent peace and justice—not as conditions were when a League of Nations was conceived in a world of materialism and balances of power as in the past—not to punish an aggressor—or merely to defeat Russia.

Those two World Wars may not have been futile for they have brought about a world situation which makes it possible to realize that ideal and ultimate aim of civilization. With that purpose clearly and convincingly conveyed to all people, we will accept the sacrifices we must endure to make all people free, and to insure ourselves and the generations to come against another war or domination by Russia or any other nation in the future.

It is possible to win this struggle for world freedom without war.

For we are not opposed by inspired, clear thinking, farsighted men, by overwhelming economic or military strength or by a philosophy of life which will spread throughout the world unless supported by force or by our own failure to meet the issues before the entire world.

The men of the Kremlin may have already made irrevocable mistakes.

They have been constantly predicting an economic collapse in this country since 1946, and have calculated heavily upon that collapse to result in widespread unemployment and disorders, to be followed by cuts in our assistance to other free nations and reductions in our military program.

They have probably made a far greater blunder in instigating the Korean aggression. It may prove to have been an irreparable mistake, just as the Kaiser was defeated because he ordered unrestricted submarine warfare which forced us into World War I, and as Hitler was because he invaded and devastated Russia and encouraged Japan to attack us at Pearl Harbor.

The Russians unquestionably expected, by selecting small divided Korea for the first satellite move, that either we would not fight or if we did fight, be compelled to carry on a long-drawn-out affair which would result in our losing face in all Eurasia and in shaking the confidence of the western nations.

Our immediate defense of South Korea followed by our swift and brilliant, strategic counterattacks within 90 days after the invasion, have had the reverse effect on both the east and west, and undoubtedly have lowered the prestige of Russia and greatly added to our own throughout the world.

But far and away the most serious adverse result to Russia from the North Korean attack has been the effect on the people of the United States. Since the end of the last war until that attack, we had been apathetic toward our defense program, and we may have been on the verge of an inflationary rise followed by a reaction which could have influenced us to delay making adequate military preparations.

Those blunders of Stalin, or the Soviet Politburo or both, have convinced the world that Russian leadership is far from infallible, for they may have prematurely exposed their intentions and their pattern of tactics to the entire world.

Now that Soviet objectives are clearly understood, in self-interest we are compelled to assume the responsibility of joining others in protecting the rest of the free world from aggression, for we cannot indefinitely exist alone against a world dominated by Russia.

And as our military power is absolutely dependent upon our economic and productive strength, the soundness of our nonmilitary or civilian economy must be maintained irrespective of the length of time the Russian menace lasts.

With this imperative need of maintaining a sound economy, we must exert our ingenuity and resourcefulness to superimpose as much of the military programs as possible upon the civilian economy until our total productive capacity, material supply, and labor force is expanded to meet our combined requirements, for in the final analysis our civilian economy must support our entire military program, our Government expenditures of every nature both here and abroad and continue to maintain adequate civilian living standards.

Somehow I cannot believe that an all-out war with Russia is inevitable.

Before that could happen, we will have voiced to the people of the world, clearly and comprehensibly, the fundamental issues irrevocably separating us and all free nations from the Kremlin with its expressed attitude toward other nations.

When we make them, our statements should be comparable in simplicity and in spiritual values with our own Declaration of Independence and the Charter of the United Nations, and be directed specifically to each of our basic differences with Russian intentions as expressed through the Politburo in terms understandable to people in every walk of life.

Every principle enunciated in either document should be translated as to its effect upon the daily life of every person and every nation.

We have fought two wars to end war for all time, and now we are confronted with the threat of a war far more terrible than in the past, but if we are forced to fight again, we will not fight for a visionary or utopian ideal but a reality, and we will fight with the moral and tangible support of most of an organization, now in being, of most of 60 nations against which Russia now stands alone among her satellites.

Since 1776, to every American the Stars and Stripes have symbolized the destiny of the Nation. From 1950 on, to the people of the world, the United Nations flag will symbolize the destiny of all nations, as the flag of each member of the United Nations bears equal value with the flag of every other nation large or small.

It would seem at the moment that this generation will see what was a utopian dream of the past come true—universal disarmament, predicated upon free contact and communication between the people of all nations.

It is not unreasonable to believe that in the not distant future all nations, joined through the United Nations, will live in a period of unending peace based upon international justice. And every flag of every nation will be a symbol of progress toward a type of world civilization which up to this time could not have been sensibly visualized.

It may be that the date of the North Korean aggression will prove, in retrospect, to have been the turning point in the present world crisis.

Sincerely yours,

A. D. WHITESIDE,
President.

National Education Program on Behalf of the Congress of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD information

relative to a national educational program on behalf of the Congress of the United States and the work of its Members.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 27, 1950.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: You will agree that ours will be a stronger Nation if there is better understanding of our Congress and our Government. We have undertaken an educational project that will try to assist you in your work as a Member, and will create a better public appreciation of our Congress.

A group of veteran newsmen who have observed Congress in action for many years have pooled their ideas on how to help our legislators. The result is formation of the Committee for Congress, to sponsor a national study program on Congress, in schools, churches, colleges, clubs, factories, wherever people assemble who are interested in the national welfare.

The primary medium through which the Committee for Congress will work is Your Congress Magazine, a copy of which is enclosed with our compliments. Future issues will carry more articles but this copy outlines the present project on the cover pages.

Various segments of American leadership have indicated their willingness to head up this worthy endeavor. We have assurances of financial support. We will, of course, need your encouragement and moral support, and your active participation whenever possible. Would you kindly comment on this undertaking so that we can use your remarks as the basis for, or part of articles, in forthcoming issues.

Yours truly,

HAL J. MILLER,
Editor, Your Congress Magazine;
Executive Director, The Committee for Congress, Sponsor of the National Congress Study Council.

COMMITTEE FOR CONGRESS LAUNCHES NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM—YOUR CONGRESS MAGAZINE IS DEDICATED TO CREATING A WIDER APPRECIATION AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE VITAL WORK OF THE CONGRESS AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Your Congress Magazine is the keystone of a new and much-needed educational and public relations program sponsored by the Committee for Congress, founded by veteran observers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives. This program will seek to strengthen and sustain our democratic, representative republican form of government.

COMMITTEE FOR CONGRESS

Founding members of the Committee for Congress are: Joseph Young, newspaperman and author; Duncan Aikman, author; Maj. Gen. Henry J. Reilly, former editor of the Army and Navy Journal; William A. Eddy, businessman; Russell McFarland, magazine writer; Homer Joseph Dodge, newspaperman and publicist; Felix Cotton, nationally known correspondent; Walter Green, newspaperman; and the publishers of Your Congress magazine, Hal J. Miller and Virginia E. Miller.

The permanent membership of the Committee for Congress will comprise leading representatives of all segments of the American economy.

It is a true but somewhat disconcerting fact that as our Nation faces the greatest crisis in its history, our people are actually apathetic about Congress and its work.

This indifference is one of the greatest problems confronting our country today. We must protect this greatest bulwark of our American system of government with a permanent, sustained, and carefully planned educational and public relations program.

The ignorance that prevails about our Congress and Government is appalling. Our schools and colleges teach civics, yet these teachings are not always reflected in an alert, informed electorate that understands Congress and our Government.

AWARENESS LACKING

The press, radio, and television do good jobs in their fields, yet the number of people who vote in proportion to the number of eligible voters shows that our citizens lack an awareness of the compelling, personal importance of understanding Congress and its work.

Because of this situation, a committee for Congress has been formed by a group of veteran observers of our congressional system, who believe that one of our national weaknesses is the failure of many Americans to understand their Congress, its Members, and how they can make a direct contribution to the success of its deliberations and enactments.

The Committee for Congress has launched a Nation-wide educational and public relations program for our Congress that is designed to bring home to every American the realization that our representative, democratic, republican form of government is the best in the world.

While our troops are engaging the enemy on foreign battle fronts, our citizens must oppose insidious enemies of democracy, ignorance of and apathy toward our Congress and Government, with the twin weapons of education and sound public relations techniques.

CONGRESS STUDY COUNCIL

The committee for Congress has sponsored the formation of the National Congress Study Council, which will endeavor to set up individual study groups throughout the land, in schools, colleges, women's clubs, service clubs, business and labor groups, community and social groups, and for men and women in the Armed Forces, at home and on foreign battlefronts.

Your Congress magazine and the study program will also be available to industrial firms for employee education.

One medium through which the committee for Congress and the National Congress Study Council will work to achieve better understanding of our legislative processes is Your Congress magazine. This is a brand-new, independent publication, patterned after the 30-year-old Pictorial Directory of Congress. In addition, radio, television, and motion pictures will be used in this educational work.

The publishers of Your Congress magazine have offered to donate the publication to any foundation or qualified educational organization that would finance or carry through this project on a nonpartisan, public-service basis.

NEGLECTED STEPCHILD

Strangely enough, our Congress is a neglected stepchild in the field of philanthropic, educational enterprises set up to aid humanity. Millions are spent on great inspirational projects aimed at explaining the democratic system, without getting down to cases and telling the American child and adult how he himself has the answer to his own fate through his Congress and his Government.

The Committee for Congress proposes to fill this gap in what is being done to inform and educate our people about our most sacred institution, the Congress and the American governmental system.

NEED IS RECOGNIZED

Congressmen, educators, newspapermen, workingmen, housewives, students, and other citizens have stressed the need for a wider and better working knowledge of Congress.

True, there are fine organizations working in different ways to make democracy work. The League of Women Voters is a notable example. The national political parties do their share, within the limitations of political partisanship. Business, labor, agriculture, and other groups present their viewpoints.

Our leaders in Congress have done commendable work. The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN has performed a great service to the Nation by publishing his question and answer book on Congress. Senators KEFAUVER, MONRONEY, and WILEY, and some of our great political economists have recommended congressional reforms.

TO AID REFORMS

The plans of the Committee for Congress, when implemented, can help to put into effect some of these vitally needed reforms.

Your Congress magazine will be expanded to include biographical data as well as the pictures of all Senators and Representatives. There will be photographs of Cabinet and Supreme Court members, heads of agencies and departments, committees of Congress in order of seniority. The written text will include articles explaining how bills are introduced and passed, how committees work, what Congress is doing, and what legislation is coming up.

UNDERSTANDABLE TO ALL

Editorial content will be written clearly and graphically to be understood by plain citizens and students. The relationship of Congress to everyday problems and experiences of people will be stressed, such as the prices of food and clothing, the part of the family in the defense program, and so on.

The former Pictorial Directory of Congress had a limited audience, as it was largely distributed to Members of Congress and legislative and governmental officials and employees. This function has been taken over by a pocket-sized booklet being produced by the Joint Committee on Printing of the House and Senate. Some 8,000 copies are being printed, which will take away the primary, basic market served formerly by the Pictorial Directory of Congress.

While this is a clear case of a Government-sponsored publication supplanting a privately produced medium, the Nation will benefit as Your Congress magazine becomes a national instrument for interpreting Congress and government to the American people.

Your Congress magazine will be published monthly, bimonthly, or quarterly as needs warrant.

We will continue publication of the Pictorial Directory of Congress, and are proceeding with plans to publish the larger Book of Congress.

COMPLETELY NONPARTISAN

Your Congress magazine will continue as a completely nonpartisan, independent publication, devoted to the service of the American people.

Stating the issue in business terms, the Committee for Congress believes that being a member of the board of directors of the greatest corporation on earth, the United States of America, through membership in the United States Senate or House, is a sacred trust.

Or in the language of the trade-unionist, there is no greater honor than to represent the greatest union of free peoples the world has known.

A SACRED TRUST

The Committee for Congress believes that its program will help every American to recognize his responsibility to understand and support and guide our Congress in its work, and to help Members of our great Senate and House of Representatives to honor that sacred trust.

Mr. Young, acting vice chairman of the committee, stated: "A better understanding of Congress and Government by our own people is essential to the future of America."

He suggested use of this slogan: "Strengthen our democracy with better understanding of our Congress and Government."

If you, or your organization, wishes to know more about this worth-while endeavor to arouse a greater national interest in our Congress and Government, please communicate with the Committee for Congress, sponsor of the National Congress Study Council, 1060 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C., Metropolitan 2214.

New Mexico's Report to the President's Water Policy Resources Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Mr. Robert McKinney, chairman of the New Mexico Economic Development Commission and the New Mexico Water Resources Development Board. This statement was made by Mr. McKinney on October 13, 1950, in presenting New Mexico's report to the President's Water Resources Policy Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT MCKINNEY, CHAIRMAN, NEW MEXICO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION AND NEW MEXICO WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BOARD

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 13, 1950.*

To the Honorable Chairman and Members of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission:

This statement has been prepared for New Mexico, in accordance with the request of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, by the New Mexico Economic Development Commission and Water Resources Development Board, which welcome the opportunity to express the views and recommendations of New Mexico concerning Federal Government participation in an over-all program directed toward the full development and proper use of the Nation's water resources.

New Mexico agrees that confused attitudes, inconsistent policies, and the resulting accumulation of unsolved problems regarding national water-resources development call for a thorough review of the situation at this point, and most certainly the various matters raised in your questionnaire demand our serious consideration.

Especially in need of review, New Mexico feels, are the economic criteria used to determine who pays how much for what on a Federal project. For example, using surplus revenues from hydroelectric power development to help finance irrigation projects might not be considered a good idea by everyone. Not that New Mexico would recommend any radical departure from the present practice—at least, without some suitable alternative policy. We do not overlook the fact that in New Mexico, as well as in other Western States, many irrigation projects would simply die without outside assistance. But how do we determine the extent of that assistance? And under what conditions is such assistance justifiable?

Let us take a concrete example: An irrigation project is set up by prospective irrigators specifically for irrigation purposes. However, if a community (or a State, or a nation) derives incidental benefits from that project—fish and wildlife, recreation, sediment and salinity control, flood control, navigation, and so forth—why should that community (or State, or nation, as the case may be) not bear its share of the project's cost? Why should the irrigators carry the financial burden alone?

As a specific instance of this sort, the Alamogordo Dam and Reservoir, a part of the Carlsbad irrigation project, were constructed primarily for irrigation purposes. Yet, the reservoir provides some flood and sediment contol for the community; it forms a lake which has provided pleasure for fishermen and other recreation-seekers; but these incidental beneficiaries enjoy their gains at the sole expense of the irrigators, and at no cost whatever to themselves.

It is New Mexico's view that all beneficiaries of any type of water development project should be assessed an equitable portion of the total costs. Thus, the assistance would be rendered by those who themselves are being assisted—a fair arrangement all the way around. And it would, of course, be important that policies for such assessments contain an absolute minimum of inconsistencies.

New Mexico is happy to report that it has not experienced any serious difficulty in operating within the 160-acre limitation, as has been the case in some other States. However, as a matter of policy, we feel that any restrictive limitation defeats its own purpose if it is made so inflexible as to hold back desirable developments.

New Mexico unequivocally favors a coordinated Federal-State inquiry into all water-resource development possibilities. New Mexico wants a plan that will utilize our limited water supply to the State's greatest advantage. And although New Mexico sees the need for the development of plans on a comprehensive basin-wide basis, it believes that the need for many individual projects is too pressing to await the maturity of such basin-wide plans.

In a State where the water supply has not been increasing in proportion to population growth, we have considered it necessary to initiate rather extensive water-resource studies and the Economic Development Commission and Water Resources Development Board have assumed leadership in speeding the formulation of a State-wide water plan based on these studies. However, EDC has been something of a lone wolf by necessity, not by choice. It earnestly solicits the cooperation of interested Federal agencies, State water-use organizations, and local interests, with a view to further study and eventual completion of a long-range plan for the fullest development and most efficient use of the State's resources. Anyone even slightly familiar with New Mexico's economic situation will realize that the State's future growth and prosperity—and, in some cases, even the bare maintenance of present conditions—depends largely upon the crucial matter of water-resource control.

The steady increase in New Mexico's population has been above the national average ratio, and there is every indication that this trend will continue. Per capita income has also increased in the last 10 years, but it is still below the national average. Population pressures on the one hand, and the desire for an improved standard of living on the other, require an enormous increase in economic activity within the State. In order to raise the per capita income to the national average level, the total income payment to individuals would have to be increased about 50 percent.

The safe limits of agricultural production by dry farming and by irrigated farming as supplied by presently developed supplies of irrigation water, have already been reached or exceeded. In New Mexico mining cannot be expected to provide much opportunity for increased employment. Much of our future growth must be achieved through increased manufacturing, through the processing of agricultural and mineral products, and through expanded trade—particularly the tourist and resort trade, since the State's climate, scenery, and historical background are among its principal resources. An increase in the Federal activities connected with atomic energy and national security (e. g., Los Alamos, Sandia, White Sands) would provide additional employment for a time, but this should not be relied upon as a permanent gain.

All our growth possibilities are dependent upon additional water supplies and their most efficient use; for irrigation, for municipal and industrial needs, for flood control, for hydroelectric development, for fish and wildlife, for recreation, etc. Closely allied problems are watershed management, erosion controls, and more efficient farmland use.

Surface waters are available for new development in the basins of the San Juan River, some of the tributaries of the Canadian River below Conchas Dam, and to a lesser extent along the Cimarron River. In the Canadian River Basin above Conchas Dam and in all other New Mexico river basins, additional water developments will be possible only by using every available means of cutting down water waste, or by importing water from other basins. The only substantial source of water by transfer is from the San Juan River to the Rio Grande.

New Mexico uses a considerable amount of ground water, obtained from artesian or pumped wells. Until the total safe yield of the ground-water supplies are better known, it would be unwise to plan on any other premise except that the withdrawals of underground water are equaling or exceeding the recharge.

A considerable quantity of water—amounting to as much as 50,000 acre-feet in the Pecos River Basin and 200,000 acre-feet in the Rio Grande Basin—can probably be salvaged by channeling or bypassing the reservoir delta areas, controlling or eliminating salt cedars and other water-consuming plants, and constructing whatever drainage works are necessary. Storage of floodwaters will permit more efficient use of water now lost to us during flood periods, but under present conditions in most of the basins of New Mexico, prior appropriations or interstate compacts preclude such floodwater storage. The largest quantity of water can be made available through full utilization of the San Juan River under the terms of the Upper Colorado River Basin pact. The waters of this stream can and should be used to increase agricultural developments by both white and Indian farmers in the San Juan Basin, but it is essential that a reasonable portion of the San Juan flow be exported into the Rio Grande Basin, to meet the urgent requirements for water to supplement the insufficient amounts now available for irrigation; to provide supplies for municipal and industrial needs; to develop power on the Rio Grande and its tributaries; to replace water which will be consumed in any soil-erosion prevention or revegetation measures in the Rio Grande watershed; and to permit, through exchange, the transfer of water to the Canadian and Pecos River Basins.

In supplementing the supply for irrigation the requirements of small projects must be given first consideration. Throughout the north-central portion of the State there are any number of small communities irrigated by simple community ditches. In such communities, characterized by very small holdings and low-income subsistence farming, population pressures have forced the extension of the water supply to the last acre of land that can be served with traditional irrigation practices. A considerable portion of our fine native population is thus being pauperized or forced to migrate from homesteads

which have been in their families for centuries.

Aside from the social and economic problems which occur in low-income groups, our small communities are faced with physical problems in natural-resource control which are simply too great to overcome. In making desperate efforts to meet their minimum subsistence needs, people have often overgrazed, overused their timber, or indulged in other unwise land practices. As a result, streamflow characteristics have changed, and areas that once had a sufficient irrigation supply from perennial flows now suffer damaging floods, followed by midsummer water shortages. Floods repeatedly destroy the small-ditch temporary diversion dams, and each time more labor, time, and materials are required to replace them. Some land has had to be abandoned. Our next State legislature will be asked to establish a State forestry organization for better supervision of State lands.

It is certain that no currently existing State or Federal agency has a plan that will adequately deal with this land problem. The small communities cannot pay back loans; they cannot comply with the provisions of either the reclamation laws or the water-facilities program. It seems to us that, in order to conserve our land and water resources, the State will have to provide funds for small-projects programs that will improve the community-ditch system. In helping the small communities we will help ourselves.

One reason for lack of a more definite program for the fullest development of the water resources of New Mexico is that we simply do not know enough about the available water supplies in many basins, nor do we have sufficient data on precipitation, evaporation, sedimentation, stream flow, ground-water use, recharge, etc. Under EDC's guidance, representatives of State and Federal agencies are now preparing a long-range program for obtaining just this information.

Before we can really say with any degree of definiteness just what opportunities do exist for further economic development, studies must be made of population growth, mineral resources, agricultural and industrial potentialities, recreational needs, etc. EDC is now in process of compiling an almanac and guide to New Mexico resources which will contain precisely this sort of information.

We are glad to say that State and Federal agencies, operating under present laws and policy procedures, have accomplished much excellent work in the development of the water resources of the West. We urge, however, that laws and policies which lack clarity be clarified; and, in cases where conflicting policies hamper actual building, that these conflicts be immediately resolved, either by agreement among the agencies involved, or by executive or legislative action.

We strongly urge completion of the following specific water development projects:

AUTHORIZED PROJECTS

Fort Sumner project: This project would provide for the irrigation of 6,500 acres of land. Construction is now well underway.

Middle Rio Grande project: This project would stabilize the water supply of 98,000 acres of land, and would provide drainage, flood control, channel improvement, water salvage, and reorganization of district finances. Construction of one of the flood-control dams has been started.

Vermejo project: This project would provide for the rehabilitation of 7,200 acres of presently irrigated land and would furnish a small amount of flood control.

PROJECTS UNDER STUDY

Water-salvage measures in the Pecos River Basin: This project would salvage, for beneficial use in New Mexico and Texas, water now lost in the McMillan Reservoir delta by transpiration and evaporation. It provides for development of recreation, fish, and wildlife.

Navajo Reservoir: This reservoir, formerly called the Martinez Reservoir, would provide reregulation of the flows of the San Juan River and make them available for use within the State. Hydroelectric power would be developed and the dam would be the point of diversion for the Shiprock and South San Juan projects.

San Juan-Chama project: The San Juan-Chama project offers the greatest opportunity for the economic betterment of the north central section of New Mexico. It would furnish water for municipal and industrial purposes, hydroelectric power, fish and wildlife development, and recreation. It is the only assured means by which water can be obtained to supplement the inadequate supplies now available to the many small community ditch systems throughout the north central portion of the State. Some of the water would be used to replace that required for watershed conservation measures throughout the Rio Grande Basin.

San Juan Basin project: The Hammond shiprock, South San Juan, and Animas-La Plata projects are located in the San Juan Basin and are interrelated. They should be developed as quickly as possible in order to utilize the remainder of New Mexico's allocation of water under the upper Colorado River compact.

Flood control on Rio Hondo: A plan for flood control on the Rio Hondo in the vicinity of Roswell is in the process of preparation. Such a plan is vitally needed.

Flood control on the Pecos River and Rio Grande Basin watersheds: Flood-control reports by the United States Department of Agriculture are near completion for both the Pecos River and the Rio Grande watersheds. Programs for run-off and water-flow retardation and for soil-erosion prevention are vitally needed in both watersheds.

CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT

This project for the development of municipal water for cities in the Texas Panhandle has been the subject of disagreement among members of New Mexico's delegation in Congress. Consequently, a useful purpose would be served by our conveying to your body the views of the various State and Federal officials in New Mexico most conversant with the project, including the Governor and the State engineer. We recommend the proposed Canadian River project as not adverse to New Mexico, provided that construction be not begun unless and until a Canadian River compact be negotiated and ratified by New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma, and consented to by the Federal Congress; and further provided that the project be constructed and operated in accordance with such compact. We believe that development of the West can best be furthered by cooperation between all Western States, and believe no useful purpose would be served by our preventing the cities of the Panhandle from working out with the Federal Government the preliminary plans for the Canadian River project.

At this point I submit to your honorable body a report on the water resources of New Mexico, which I believe is one of the most, if not the most, outstanding presentations of this nature obtainable on any of the United States. It was prepared for the New Mexico Economic Development Commission, under contract, by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior under the direction of Wesley R. Nelson, Assistant Commissioner. Completed only last month, September 1950, the data in this encyclopedia of all that is now known of the water resources of New Mexico should be of great usefulness to the President's Water Resources Policy Commission.

In conclusion, I should like to summarize the additional studies we believe necessary in order to give us full and accurate knowledge of the water resources of New Mexico and their most efficient application to the agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other requirements of our people:

Study: Water requirements for watershed conservation and flood-control measures.

To be prepared by: Bureau of Land Management Soil Conservation Service, and Forest Service.

Study: Water requirements for potential mineral-processing plants.

To be prepared by: Bureau of Mines, Geological Survey, University of New Mexico, and New Mexico School of Mines.

Study: Water requirements for potential processing plants for agricultural products.

To be prepared by: New Mexico Agricultural and Mechanics College, Bureau of Reclamation, and Bureau of Animal Industry.

Study: Water requirements for potential forest-products processing plants.

To be prepared by: Forest Service, University of New Mexico, and New Mexico Agricultural and Mechanics College.

Study: Estimates of future population growth.

To be prepared by: University of New Mexico.

Study: Influence of watershed conservation practices on run-off.

To be prepared by: Bureau of Land Management, Geological Survey, Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, and New Mexico Agricultural and Mechanics College.

Study: Additional precipitation and evaporation stations.

To be prepared by: Weather Bureau.

Study: Additional snow-survey courses.

To be prepared by: Weather Bureau, Soil Conservation Service, and Bureau of Reclamation.

Study: Additional stream-gaging records.

To be prepared by: Geological Survey.

Study: Additional stream-quality records.

To be prepared by: Geological Survey.

Study: Additional sedimentation records.

To be prepared by: Geological Survey.

Study: Complete coverage of the State in ground-water investigations.

To be prepared by: Geological Survey.

Study: Complete State coverage by cadastral surveys.

To be prepared by: Bureau of Land Management.

Study: Complete coverage of the State by geological mapping.

To be prepared by: Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines.

Study: Complete coverage of the State by topographic mapping.

To be prepared by: Geological Survey.

Study: Inventory and completion of aerial photographs covering entire State.

To be prepared by: Economic Development Commission and interested Federal and State agencies.

Respectfully submitted for the State of New Mexico.

ROBERT MCKINNEY,
Chairman, New Mexico Economic Development Commission and Water Resources Development Board.

SANTE FE, N. MEX., *October 13, 1950.*

To the Honorable Chairman and Members of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission:

New Mexico's report and recommendations to your honorable body have been prepared, at my request, by the Water Resources Development Board of the New Mexico Economic Development Commission. Mr. Robert McKinney, chairman of these two agencies, will discuss the economic and social potentials of our semiarid State in relation to our limited water resources and will outline our plans for future growth by better utilization and further development of our surface and subsurface waters.

In the preparation of this program New Mexico gratefully acknowledges the collaboration of the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Department of the Interior and the cooperation of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Geological Survey, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Mines, and the National Park Service.

New Mexico is proud of the contribution of its scientists in the fields of cloud physus, artificial precipitation and the application of geophysical methods to the location of new underground supplies.

Dr. E. G. Workman, president of the New Mexico School of Mines and vice chairman of the Water Resources Development Board, will report to your body on recent activity in these fields in New Mexico.

In conclusion, Mr. McKinney will present the preliminary draft of a proposed bill for Federal regulation of activities aimed at the inducement of precipitation by artificial methods.

Great as is our need for moisture in New Mexico, we are aware that in our State or adjoining States, indiscriminate cloud-seeding activities may often result in excessive and damaging rainfall, as well as in the diminution or prevention of rainfall. In New Mexico we are considering the establishment of State controls over these activities, but in the view of the inter-State nature of the problem, we respectfully urge your body to lead in the development of a national policy.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. MABRY,
Governor.

Reexamining Mr. Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Reexamining Mr. Acheson," written by William Henry Chamberlin, and published in the Wall Street Journal of November 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

REEXAMINING MR. ACHESON—HIS RECORD OF SO FREQUENTLY CHANGING HIS OWN BELIEFS SUGGESTS EXAMINING HIS QUALIFICATION FOR JOB

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Secretary Acheson must have forgotten an old proverb about glass houses and stones when he recently struck out against critics who wish to reexamine American foreign policy.

Mr. Acheson's own record as a reexaminer is second to that of no man in public life today. He would not turn his back on Alger Hiss. But he has turned his back on so many ideas and assumptions which he once espoused that the ordinary citizen may be pardoned for feeling a trifle giddy at the spectacle of so many gyrations.

Mr. Acheson has been prominently identified with shaping the course of American diplomacy for many years as Assistant Secretary of State in the Roosevelt administration and Under Secretary, and more recently, Secretary of State in the Truman Cabinet. During his period of service virtually every major assumption of American foreign policy was not only reexamined but drastically changed.

HOW ABOUT APPEASEMENT?

What remains today of Roosevelt's assumption that Stalin could be charmed and appeased into becoming a cooperative do-gooder in the cause of world peace? Are we thinking any longer in terms of keeping Germany perpetually disarmed? How about the idea that China under Chiang Kai-shek would be a stable, friendly power and a pillar of post-war stability in the Orient?

It is doubtful whether any country at any time has backtracked so fast from so many dead-end roads as the United States has done during the last few years. And Dean Acheson has been pretty much at the steering wheel both in taking dead-end roads and in trying to back out of them. There is nothing to indicate that he raised any warning voice against the policy of appeasing Stalin which prevailed at the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam Conferences. There is considerable evidence to the contrary.

Some time ago one of Mr. Acheson's colleagues in the State Department during the war, Mr. A. A. Berle, testified that in the fall of 1944 there had been a difference of opinion in the Department.

"I felt that the Russians were not going to be sympathetic and cooperative," said Mr. Berle. "I was pressing for a pretty clean show-down when our position was strongest. The opposite group in the State Department was largely the men—Mr. Acheson's group, of course—with Mr. Hiss as a principal assistant in the matter. * * * I got trimmed in that fight and, as a result, went to Brazil and that ended my diplomatic career."

A PLATFORM APPEARANCE

As late as November 1945 Mr. Acheson appeared on the platform with such familiar ornaments of Communist-front gatherings as Paul Robeson and the Red Dean of Canterbury under the auspices of an organization which has been placed on the Attorney General's subversive list, the Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Mr. Acheson assured a sympathetic audience that there was no reason to suppose that the vital interests of the American and Russian peoples would clash and endorsed the idea of friendly governments along the Soviet frontiers.

Judging from Mr. Acheson's more recent pronouncements on the subject of American-Soviet relations, he has engaged in a good deal of reexamination of this subject since he was willing to lend State Department prestige to the harangues of the Dean of Canterbury and Paul Robeson.

With the active participation of Mr. Acheson's friend, Alger Hiss, the Charter of the United Nations was worked out at Dumbarton Oaks and finally ratified at San Francisco in the summer of 1945. A key point in this Charter was the requirement of unanimity among the great powers, including the Soviet Union, before the organization could be committed to enforcement action.

The Assembly of the United Nations has just recently accepted a project, proposed by Mr. Acheson, which transfers the right to authorize enforcement action, under certain circumstances, from the Security Council, where the great power veto operates, to the Assembly, where it does not. Reexamination would seem rather too mild a word for this change. Repudiation would be more accurate.

SO OFTEN ON TWO SIDES

Mr. Acheson has been for and against German rearmament, for and against crippling restrictions on the German and Japanese economies, for and against the Chiang Kai-shek regime in China, for and against the support of South Korea. He has been so often on two sides of so many questions that perhaps what is needed is not so much reexamination as examination of just what his policies of the present moment really are.

On the question of Formosa it is difficult to keep account of the shifts and zigzags of the foreign policy for which, over a period of more than a year, Mr. Acheson has been the responsible spokesman. A State Department bulletin of June 3, 1945, states that, with the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position as does Formosa. But in a secret memorandum which was communicated to American diplomatic representatives abroad late in 1949 it was intimated that Formosa was of no strategic value.

At that time Mr. Acheson publicly took the position that Formosa was part of China, and that there should be no American interference with what seemed to be the course of nature—a successful Communist invasion of this last stronghold of Chiang Kia-shek's regime. But within 6 months there was another reversal; American naval and air power was committed to the defense of Formosa. Apparently the disposition of the island was regarded as a matter of some strategic concern. At least that is what General MacArthur believes.

In view of his own numerous reexaminations, Mr. Acheson might be more tolerant of those who wish to take a closer look at present-day American policies and their implications, and in view of the Secretary's numerous shifts of attitude and the curious contrast between his apparent softness toward pro-Communist infiltration in his own Department and his fulminations against communism abroad, it is not surprising that there should be a substantial current of public opinion calling for a reexamination of Mr. Acheson's qualifications for the office which he holds.

Address of Ambassador James G. McDonald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, 1950, Hon. James G. McDonald, United States Ambassador to Israel, delivered a brief but interesting address at the opening of the 1950 campaign of the Brooklyn division of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York. The campaign was opened at a dinner in honor of Mr. Max Abrams, a long-time and outstanding leader in city-wide communal endeavors. The entire community paid tribute to him that evening for his untiring efforts in the field of philanthropy.

Ambassador McDonald was in the United States at the time for consultations and has since returned to resume his post in Israel, which he has held for the past 2 years. His comments on Israel are of more than passing interest. The text of Ambassador McDonald's address at the Waldorf-Astoria on October 10, 1950, is as follows:

Hon. Jacob H. Livingston, Mr. Emil Baar, Mr. Harry Zeitz, Justice Edward Lazansky, and my dear friends, this, my only public address during my home leave, is being made because I could not refuse the request of my friend, Max Abelman to whom I owe so much, nor decline to share in your tribute to my friend, Max Abrams. Moreover, as a former Brooklynite, my old borough loyalty is compelling.

You will not, I know, expect me to discuss any controversial aspects of the situation

within Israel or of its relations to its neighbors. I am still in office and have been asked by the President and the Secretary of State to return to my post late this month on the expiration of my leave. Under these circumstances I trust that you will not be too disappointed if my brief remarks are lacking in sensational disclosures.

In my work in Israel during the past more than 2 years I have had the inestimable advantage of the personal interest of President Truman and the unstinting cooperation and support of the Department of State. Whatever fears some of my friends may have had that I, not being a career foreign officer, might have been disadvantaged, have been proved to be wholly groundless. I could not have asked for more support than has been given me by all of those in Washington with whom I have had to deal. Indeed, from the very beginning of my mission, it was evident that the Department in full accord with the President was determined to strengthen my hands. Illustrative of this spirit was the appointment as my first counselor and right-hand man of Charles H. Knox, a brilliant Foreign Service officer. His ability was matched by his charm and complete loyalty. Under his helpful guidance I learned much sooner than would otherwise have been possible the mechanics of my job both in relation to the Government to which I was accredited and to the officials at home. Always I shall be grateful to the Department for thus simplifying my initiation into practical diplomacy. And during the ensuing 2 years Washington has been invariably sympathetic and understanding in its attitude toward my colleagues and me in Israel.

My first impressions of Israel have been strengthened as I have watched with intense interest its achievements during its first critical formative months—its existence heroically defended, its statehood brilliantly vindicated, a workable government improvised out of near chaos and then firmly established by democratic processes, the ingathering of more than 400,000 of the homeless, together with the preparation of plans, now far advanced, for welcoming during 1951, 1952, and 1953 hundreds of thousands more. And to all these accomplishments has been added an encouraging start toward laying the basis for peace with its neighbors. Those initial gains have gone beyond the expectations of even the most optimistic among Israel's friends abroad. Only in Israel itself were these achievements confidently expected. Only there was there a common conviction that, despite the seemingly insuperable obstacles, a new state would emerge with the capacity to meet its obligations at home and abroad and thus fulfill the millennial hopes of millions of Jews.

I am happy to add that I was among those confident ones. There in the midst of this vibrant people, in daily contact with their able and devoted leaders, I would have been blind not to see that Israel has indeed a rendezvous with destiny—the destiny foreseen by the prophets. As Isaiah exclaimed: "I will bring thy seed from the east and gather thee from the west, I will say to the north give up, and to the south 'keep not back'; bring my sons from far and my daughters from the ends of the earth." As I have watched at Haifa, Lydda, or Tel Aviv the arrival of refugees, many of them wholly inadmissible to other countries because of physical defects or age, I thought of Jeremiah's words: "Behold I will bring them from the north country and gather them from the coasts of the earth, and with them the blind and the lame, the woman with child, and her that travaileth with child together."

But the prophets foresaw in Israel reborn more than a home for the outcasts; they foresaw Israel as a center of spiritual and moral leadership, a center from which would radiate blessings of peace and progress. Israel's leaders today intend their state to be not just one more small political unit concerned only with its own security and advancement. They foresee Israel as a center from which the gifts of modern science and technics, modern agriculture and industry, modern medicine and public health, will be available to all Israel's neighbors. They foresee Israel not as a rival but as an ally of its neighbors in the common struggle against poverty and disease.

In proportion as Israel achieves this goal of mutually advantageous cooperation with its neighbors, the world will come to see through the new Jewish state that the age-old prejudices against the Jews are meaningless. Jews in Israel will increasingly demonstrate that as a people they have capacities comparable with the most advanced peoples of the west, and that, given the opportunity, they cannot only rebuild their national life but through it give rich gifts to our common humanity.

And not the least of these gifts will be to bring to more and more millions of non-Jews in the United States and elsewhere the conviction that anti-Semitism is as outmoded as witchcraft. Israel will not only make more secure the future of your children; it will also help to save us other Americans from the grievous sin of group prejudice. Israel will thus help us all, Jews and Christians, to be better Americans.

My pleasant special duty tonight is to express on your behalf and on that of the whole Jewish community of our greatest and most progressive borough warmest thanks for the untiring and brilliant leadership in the Brooklyn Jewish Federation of Max Abrams. He would not wish nor is it necessary for me to extoll to this audience in detail his creative work. Indefatigably he has utilized his excellent capacity for organization and his gift for inspiring others to make the Brooklyn Federation an example to the other boroughs and to the whole country. Never has he sat on the side-lines and limited himself to cheering on his workers in the field. Nor has he ever been satisfied to take the honors and to permit his fellows to bear the brunt of the hard job of following up in their offices and in their homes those who had not responded to less personal appeals. In every respect he has been an effective leader.

Max Abrams' devotion to the harsh task of finding the means to alleviate human suffering and to restore men, women, and children to health and happiness amply explains your decision to present to him this token of your esteem and of your love. It is for me a great honor to be given the privilege of handing it to him in your name. May this beautiful silver tray be not only for him but for his children and his children's children a precious remembrance of the role of mercy which he has so generously played and which has so justifiably won for him the gratitude of his people and of his city.

Need for an Emancipation Proclamation for the Russian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 29 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, in this critical hour in world history, I think that all of us in Congress could well pause and read an article by William I. Nichols entitled "Needed Now: An Emancipation Proclamation for the Russian People," appearing in the October 1, 1950, issue of This Week.

It is with that thought that I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED NOW: AN EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION FOR THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE

(By William I. Nichols, editor of This Week magazine)

HERE IS A WAY TO WIN THE SOVIET MASSES AS AMERICA'S MOST IMPORTANT ALLY

It was a refugee from Riga who first suggested the program outlined on these pages. Tall, gaunt, intense, he stood before his barracks in a West German displaced persons camp and looked out toward the Communist east. It was as if he could still see the home, job, and life from which he had just escaped.

"Listen," he said, "there's no doubt about it now. We're headed for a world showdown. In the process, your country is now in a frantic scramble to line up foreign friends and allies.

"Only sometimes I think you're being too frantic. With all your Marshall plans and your Atlantic Unions, you're overlooking the most important ally of all."

"Which is?" I asked.

He looked at me intently, and said, "The Russian people."

Since then I have talked to scores of refugees with first-hand knowledge of conditions inside Soviet Russia. The plan they propose is a fateful challenge to the leaders of both United States political parties. If developed and put in action, it could, literally, turn the vast Soviet population into democracy's most important ally.

Viewed overall, that may seem a hopeless prospect. Since the fall of China, Soviet Russia and her satellites control one-fifth of the earth's land mass. The 800,000,000 people under Stalin's rule represent close to a third of the world's population. In many ways it is a sinister and threatening power bloc lined up against us.

But look more closely and you see sharp cracks in the structure. Of the grand total, only about 200,000,000, or 25 percent, represent the original prewar U. S. S. R. The others are restless satellites.

And even the hard core has soft spots—plenty of them. Only about one-half, or 100,000,000 people, are Great Russians, that is, the historic Russian nation which is centered on Moscow. The balance is a weird and often hostile mixture of over 100 subject races and nations, eager to be free.

Again, this is not the whole story. Also cleaving through the Soviet population is a deep social split. At the top is a small ruling class, less than 5 percent, which has life-and-death power over the others. What that means to the subject 95 percent is by now an old, old story which needs no repetition here. It is the sickening story of MVD torture chambers, of Siberian slave-labor camps, of confiscated property, subhuman living standards, stifled churches, broken families.

Talk to anyone who has suffered under Soviet tyranny and you soon discover that there is a ground swell of bitterness, hatred, and latent revolt throughout the Soviet world.

In fact, it is this potential disloyalty of the Soviet masses which is the greatest soft spot in Stalin's empire. Last time, it almost cost him the war. In June 1941, when the Nazi armies invaded Russia, hundreds of thousands of Soviet soldiers threw down their arms and surrendered. It has now been fully documented that the civilian population in the Ukraine and other areas met the German invaders with open arms. It was only the

brutal stupidity of the Nazis which finally turned this welcome into bitter hatred.

Since World War II the Kremlin has never forgotten the ominous lesson of such revolts. Hence, the almost hysterical efforts to nail down safety valves and keep the population in check—through police terror, the drug of local propaganda, and, most important of all, iron-curtain separation from explosive contacts with the outside world. It is certainly not an exaggeration to say that Stalin fears an eruption of his own people as much as he does the atom bomb. It happened in World War II and it could happen again.

"WHY DON'T YOU TALK TO THEM?"

It is against this background that most Soviet refugees view United States policy toward Russia today. To us in America, the Russian problem may seem just an area on the map, compact and coherent, a neat X in a political equation. But to them it represents a seething ferment of millions of human beings oppressed, repressed, thwarted, and persecuted in every normal aspect of human life. And so they say again and again:

"Why doesn't America speak to them? Why don't you break through and touch the hearts of these men and women?"

Such comments became doubly passionate during the recent Washington debates on an expanded program for the State Department's Voice of America program. Newspapers were full of proposals for more appropriations, for new broadcasting towers to outshout the Soviet's 100 jamming stations, even for the manufacture and distribution of special $2 short-wave listening sets which were to be smuggled across the borders.

"All that is well enough," the exiles said. "Of course, you need the means of speaking. But it's even more important to have something to say. In any war, hot or cold, there is no substitute for ideas and ideals."

Too often, they say, our broadcasts to the Soviet are nothing but rosy descriptions of United States life which become tantalizing fairy tales to imprisoned Russians. Or they are lofty essays on "freedom" and "democracy"—words which mean little to minds deadened by propaganda.

THEY WANT POSITIVE STATEMENTS

It is in contrast to such unrealistic messages that they cite Woodrow Wilson's 14 points or the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." Both were cases where the eloquent, purposeful statement of peace aims, during war, helped mobilize the energies of men and bring converts to democracy.

An even sharper example was supplied during our own War Between the States. In that conflict the aims were to establish human liberty and a peaceful, lasting Federal Union. It was to achieve those aims that early in the war Abraham Lincoln issued his famous Emancipation Proclamation.

From one point of view, that proclamation was "just a statement." But history shows that it electrified the imagination of all those who loved liberty, and was indeed a mighty factor in restoring peace, freedom, and a lasting Union.

The proposal now, in this time of "undeclared war," is for a new emancipation proclamation, to be voiced by the highest leaders of America, and aimed squarely at the Soviet population. Its purpose is to hold out clear hope of what their world would be like following the overthrow of Stalin's regime.

"It is a simple and fundamental truth," an ex-Soviet official told me, "that Stalin can never be overthrown without the active help of his own people. For psychological reasons that help must be enlisted right now before coming conflicts fan the heat of wartime passions."

To any technical objections as to the "diplomatic propriety" of such a program, ex-Soviets have a ready answer: On November 16, 1933, the Soviet Union made a specific agreement with the United States in which the pledge was given that there would be no attempt by the Russian Government to foster Communist organizations or individuals inside the United States. We all know how well that promise has been kept in the past 17 years. It was only No. 1 in a long series of broken pledges.

FOUR RULES WE MUST FOLLOW

In discussing such a program, the men and women who know Soviet psychology set up certain very specific requirements:

1. The proclamation must be an official declaration coming (like the Monroe Doctrine, the Emancipation Proclamation, or the Fourteen Points) from the responsible head or heads of state.

2. The proclamation must be addressed primarily to the rank and file—the 95 percent who are the subject people. As for the ruling 5 percent—the Communists and their immediate followers—there is always the chance of creating division. Some can be converted; others, like the Nazis before them, will feel that their destinies are wrapped up in the survival of the regime. They must either win or go down with it in flames.

3. All proposals must be clearly labeled as subject to the will of the Russian people as expressed in free and honest elections. There must be nothing to suggest a program which is being imposed or decreed by a would-be conquering power. Soviet people have had enough decrees in the last 30 years.

4. The statement of peace aims must be simple, clear, and understandable, and well within the experience of the Soviet masses. At no point can there be any big, vague, windy pronouncements about freedom, democracy, or the rights of man. Among all mass audiences a concrete statement is always more powerful than an abstract one. But in the Soviet world there is an added consideration. One of Lenin's first, and deadliest, rules was to "confuse vocabularies." Thus, after thirty-odd years of Bolshevik propaganda, the freedom words have lost all meaning. All we have left to work with are the simple, concrete picture words—the names of objects and things and actions which are part of everybody's everyday life.

BUILD AN IMAGE OF FREEDOM

The problem, then, is to find the right picture words to reconstruct an image of freedom in minds which have been dulled and distorted by a generation of propaganda.

The seven points given here are a first approach to the problem. Each stands for one of the basic freedoms in our free, democratic way of life. But each point is expressed in words which also apply to the daily lives of Soviet subjects, and are understandable in terms of their own experience. As an added test of concreteness, only those points were chosen which could be translated directly into pictures, as shown here. Thus the proclamation is adapted not only to broadcasting but to printing on thin rice-paper sheets, easily concealed and smuggled across frontiers by anti-Soviet underground workers. This procedure was employed often and successfully during World War II. Another method, recently tested, would be to send leaflets over the border by small free balloons.

The whole problem is best summed up in this comment from one Soviet refugee:

"Technically," he writes, "we know that your broadcasts are getting through. Of course there's always the jamming. And besides that, only a few non-Communists have both the receiving sets and the courage to listen in. But even a few is enough. In any sealed-in society, really important news always goes like lightning over the grapevine. And hundreds of escaped Russians like myself are ready to go underground and across borders, to help spread the word.

"But you must have something to say. Russians will not risk their lives to listen to broadcasts that only talk of freedom in remote and general terms."

Here then is the question—and a fateful one—for the American people. Will our western world produce some great leader now, as it has in every crisis of the past, to speak the words of freedom in such a way that they will echo round the world and stir the hearts of men? Today the words and the idioms and the method of transmission may differ from the past—but the inner meaning remains the same.

When will such a leader—or group of leaders—step forward?

The need today is greater than ever.

This time our job is to smash through the iron curtain and give the Soviet people, in words and symbols which they can understand, America's great, time-tested and ever-thrilling message. It is the message of malice toward none and charity for all, of government of, by, and for the people, and, under God, a new birth of freedom—around the world.

SEVEN POINTS IN A NEW EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION FOR THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE

1. "You can travel where you please." Today Soviet citizens can't cross frontiers. Even inside Russia they are chained to local communities. Sometimes people of a whole area, like the Crimea, are uprooted and transported forever to distant locations. Families are broken up and sent to faraway provinces. Free citizens could travel, or stay home, as they pleased.

2. "You can buy more things." Soviet living standards are pitifully low. The reasons: Production of war matériel, plus Communist incompetence in making and distributing consumer goods. Russian soldiers who saw western Europe, or used United States lend-lease goods, dream of the day they can buy foreign products, and when their own factories will work for them.

3. "You can own your own land." The desire to own property is a basic human instinct, frustrated by the Communist regime. Reports indicate Soviet food supply is threatened because 40,000,000 peasants balk at working solely for the state on collective farms. Factory workers have no incentive to produce except fear. "Freedom to own" is a magic slogan.

4. "Your churches will be open." Suppression of religion was one of Lenin's first aims. Churches were turned into granaries or antireligious museums. Except for a puppet state church, religion has been driven underground. But memories of the church are still strong, particularly among the older people. Freedom to worship God retains a powerful appeal for them.

5. "No more slave-labor camps." The dread of slave labor hangs over every Soviet home. Estimates of the number doomed to killing labor in MVD terror camps range from 12,000,000 to 15,000,000. The strongest appeal of any new Emancipation Proclamation should be to those suffering—or whose relatives are suffering—from this barbarous form of slavery.

6. "Your nation will be free." Even excluding satellite states, the U. S. S. R. is not one nation but a collection of over 100 restless races and nations. These nations should be free, and their citizens allowed to choose their own leaders in free elections. The subject people will welcome independence, either as separate nations or within regional federations.

7. "World peace through UN." No one has more reason to dread war than the Russians who saw their country torn to shreds in World War II. Above all, any appeal should make clear that, without Stalin, their newly constituted governments, freely elected, would share in an era of world-wide peace and security, within the framework of the United Nations.

Campaign Address by Hon. Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 29 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] on October 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Oklahomans, on November 7, you will choose many of your State and national leaders for the years just ahead. You not only choose between candidates, you choose between political parties.

The only hope of the Republicans is to find or to create division among the Democrats. Otherwise, they have no hope of victory.

The Democrats want to do more for the people. The Republicans want the people to do something to the Democrats.

I pay tribute to each of our nominees on the State and national tickets.

Johnston Murray is a native Oklahoman. He has worked successfully as a farmer, as a laborer, as an educator, and a lawyer. By ability and experience, he is amply qualified to make a great governor for all the people of Oklahoma.

MIKE MONRONEY, likewise, is a native Oklahoman. He also is a product of Oklahoma schools. He also has been a successful businessman, and MIKE MONRONEY has had 12 years of outstanding and successful service in the Congress of the United States. He will make a great United States Senator.

The Republicans have chosen as their nominee for governor one whom I have previously referred to as the oldest and coldest reactionary I know.

I was astounded a few weeks ago when, in a radio speech, I heard J. O. Ferguson make the following statement: "I have the viewpoint of the men and women who have seen Oklahoma fall from her greatness to where we are the poor relation of the other 47 States."

Now, isn't that ridiculous? Oklahoma is the envy of the Nation and the pride of her 2,300,000 citizens. Aunt Eller in the world-famed musical show Oklahoma, expressed my sentiments to a "t." She said, "We don't claim to be no better than anybody else, but we dern sure 'air' jest as good."

A few days ago, I was reminded of just how wrong Jo Ferguson was when he thus slandered Oklahoma. An Oklahoma farm boy, Walter Cummings of Freedom, was elected national president of the Future Farmers of America. Mary Ellen Ash, Oklahoma A. & M. College senior from Muskogee, was chosen queen of the American Royal Livestock Show at Kansas City. A group of Oklahoma farm boys and girls made almost a clean sweep of victories and honors at the same American Royal show. The livestock judging team from Oklahoma A. & M. beat out all competition, including Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, and others for the first prize in the intercollegiate judging contest.

In California, Mrs. Hope Reed, of Vinita, was chosen as national president of the American Legion Auxiliary.

On the other side of the continent, in Washington, D. C., an Oklahoma banker, Elmer Harber from Shawnee and Seminole was drafted by the President of the United States to become the directing head of the RFC, the greatest multibillion dollar banking business in the world. And then, an amazing Oklahoma University football team, already acknowledged to be at least the third best in the Nation, defeated the Texas Longhorns before 75,000 roaring fans in the Cotton Bowl at Dallas.

During the brief period in which these historic events were happening, an even more notable occurrence took place. The junior Senator from Oklahoma became the grandfather of a 7 pound 11 ounce boy.

Does anyone believe that these wonderful things could happen in a State that is the poor relation of all the other 47 States? I want to say that any Oklahoman who thinks this is downright ignorant, and anyone who says it is outrageously impertinent.

Now, my friends, the Republicans also have a nominee for the United States Senate. I must say, however, they haven't had him very long. For a while, the Democrats thought they had him. But the hand was quicker than the eye—and one day, between sundown and sunup, Bill got away. I quote his own words from the Tulsa World of Sunday, October 15: "I want your support. I don't care if you are a Republican or a Democrat. I have been both."

Frankly, I doubt that Bill Alexander is either a Republican or a Democrat. I know that no man can be both.

Of course, being on both sides of a question is no new experience for Bill. I have heard of those who wanted to dance every set. I have heard of those who wanted to run with the foxes and hunt with the hounds.

Bill tries 'em all, with equal ease and equal failure.

He was an original advocate of world federation. He made speeches for it for 1½ years. He has now been against it for nearly 3 months.

When I first knew him, he was an ardent dry. He then became a militant advocate of repeal. At last reports, he is both.

Here is a statement he has made dozens of times, quote: "The blundering inefficient Defense Department has spent more money in the last 4 years for travel than for new military equipment." Now, every eighth grade school child in Oklahoma knows better than that. The record shows less than $889,000,000 spent for all the travel of all our fighting forces since the end of World War II. The same record shows nearly $9,000,000,000 spent for new military equipment. This proves that Bill was speaking either from ignorance or something worse.

About 10 days ago somebody put out the rumor that Senator THOMAS would take a walk in this campaign. Anyone who knew ELMER THOMAS knew better. Anyone who was even curious could have found out better. But Bill, in his characteristic irresponsible impetuosity, issued a flamboyant statement, claiming the world with a fence around it. He said, "MONRONEY has been unmasked by a man who sat in the same Congress with him for 12 years—a man of his own political allegiance—Senator ELMER THOMAS." Senator THOMAS promptly and completely repudiated Alexander's false claim.

The truth is that his primary opponent, the Reverend George T. Balch, has taken the mask off of Alexander. In a blistering radio speech, Balch said, "This candidate (Alexander) may say he is a Simon-pure, dyed-in-the-wool Republican. That I deny. He is not a Republican. He is not a Democrat." Continuing, the Reverend Balch declared, "He is an out-and-out, hand-made, boss-bought mugwump, politically. He has treated the regularly elected Republican Party officials as if they were dirt under his feet."

Actually, my friends, it wasn't necessary for Alexander's primary opponent thus to unmask him. He dropped the mask from his own face when he changed from a Democratic candidate to a Republican candidate.

Now, Bill says the United States Senate needs one man who will stand up and say, "I am a Christian." Actually, my friends, more than 80 Members of the Senate are members of the church. Every Senate session is opened with a prayer, first, of thanksgiving, and, second, for continued divine guidance. Almost all Members are Christians, Bill, but they are too humble to make their Christianity a national issue.

Now, actually, folks, Bill wouldn't like it in the Senate nearly as well as he thinks he would. He would do all right as an out-and-out missionary. He would not be bad at holding a revival for any who would listen. But Bill would be greatly disappointed when he learned how few Senators listen to other Senators talk. And he would be positively heartbroken when he found that under no circumstances would he be permitted to take up a collection.

Of course, Bill has taken up collections at all his political meetings. He puts on a great show. He makes the people laugh, then he makes 'em cry, and then he makes them pay. He tells them he has to have more than their votes to win.

Now, most candidates would be glad to settle for votes. Bill asks for dollars, too. He tells each new group about the ones who gave him money at previous meetings. He refers to kind old women and to what he calls horny-handed farmers who press dollar bills into his hand.

My friends, there are no horny-handed farmers in Oklahoma. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party changed all that. And I haven't seen an old woman since I started to run for office 10 years ago.

This brings me to the most important part of this speech or any other speech. November 7 is not the nominee's day. It is the party's day. It is not the candidates' day. It is the people's day.

Many remember and none should ever forget the 12 long years when we hardened under Harding, cooled under Coolidge, and hungered under Hoover. If there are those whose hearts yearn for the boom-and-bust, the privation and want, the hunger and despair of those days, they should vote for the Republicans, because we were rescued from all that by Democratic national administrations, and the Democratic Party is pledged to prevent its ever recurring. If you, my fellow Oklahomans, want to keep the abundant prosperity and the impregnable national strength and security which we now have, then you should vote for the Democratic nominees.

We know that we have won two World Wars under Democratic leadership. We know that we are winning the present world-wide struggle against the powers of darkness under Democratic leadership. We know that our Nation has been rebuilt. We know that we have marched up out of the valley of gloom and depression. We know today that our farmers and our workers are the most prosperous they have ever been. We know that American business which thrives or suffers, in direct relation to the purchasing power of farmers and workers, enjoys today the most abundant prosperity it has ever known.

The Democratic Party believes in keeping all the security and all the progress we have made. We are pledged to their constant improvement. We are resolved to work always for the betterment of all the people.

To all of you who rejoice in the great prosperity of our people at home; to all of you who approve our invincible military strength that insures our security among the nations of the world; we ask your support. We ask that you join us on November 7 in rolling up an overwhelming Democratic victory.

Wisconsin Editorial Comment on November Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, November 29 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it has been exceedingly gratifying to read the very fine editorial expressions which have appeared in Wisconsin newspapers following the November 7 election. I am humbly grateful for the many gracious comments which have appeared regarding the endorsement which I was personally given at the polls.

I was particularly interested in reading the editorial analysis which appeared on the subject of the exact meaning of the election, not so much in terms of personalities who won or lost, but in terms of exactly what our people decided on the basis of the issues. Their opinion of the basic issues of our times was, of course, the most decisive factor in the election.

I believe that certain editorial comments which have appeared in various Wisconsin papers will be of interest to folks in other States as an index of grassroots opinion in the Badger State. I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from the following newspapers: From the Vilas County News Review of November 9, 1950; from the Wisconsin State Journal of November 8; from the Oshkosh Northwestern of the same date; and from the Wausau Record-Herald, also of the same date.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Vilas County (Wis.) News Review of November 9, 1950]

GOD BLESS AMERICA

This is a great country, and never greater than on election day.

Nowhere in the world can the people go to the polls and say what they think, except right here on the North American Continent.

This writer has always had great faith in the people. The people are patient. There seems to be no limit to their patience. They endure and endure, until one wonders if they will ever protest.

Suddenly, one day they go to the polls. They speak with a might and an authority that cannot be denied. When it is over, definite things have happened.

In some cases, men are smashed. The public, patient too long, finally strikes a mighty blow. It annihilates. It bruises and batters. Sometimes the bruising and battering is so terrific the politician never recovers. Sometimes he gives up public life. Sometimes, when necessary, he is brought to justice for his misdeeds.

Let us never forget that the Democrats wanted this election. They wanted it so badly they were willing to spend plenty of money to get it. In some States, as Ohio, they brought in their top publicists, their top publicity men, their outstanding orators, the virtual cream of the crop. These were rushed in and turned their high-price talent on, then rushed out and a new corps was rushed in.

In some cases, as in Wisconsin, a captain of the Pendergast machine, the smartest political machine in the country, the machine that has for its motto "feed 'em and vote 'em," was brought in. In other places the Veep, the genial, champion story-teller, BARKLEY, himself, went to the rescue with a number of talks.

All this was because the Democrats wanted an endorsement of their policies which have resulted in the Korean war, in high prices, in confusion and extravagance and in the wasting of good food. They wanted an endorsement of socialized medicine, which would put the politician in your doctor's office and the ward heeler in your hospitals, and the Spence bill. They wanted approval of leaving the Communists in high places.

The people listened. That, vast conglomerate force of doctors and lawyers and housewives and teamsters and clerks and engineers and ditch diggers that make up the people endured the bombardment, then didn't give approval.

In State after State the people expressed their dissatisfaction, their disgust, their fear, and their righteous indignation.

Oh, it's a great, mighty, wonderful thing to see the people, at last, make up their minds. It is an awe-inspiring thing to see them go to the polls and let it be known that they demand a change in policies.

The ballot box, more than anything else, has made America great. A strong and intelligent and capable people expressing their wishes without fear or favor, in control of their own destinies, is what has made America great. The patience of these strong people, their endurance and their tolerance is mighty, too, but it runs out.

It ran out November 7. The people took over, unswayed and unmoved by high-price spell-binding and expensive letters, posters, advertisements, and the costly experience of publicity agents who are versed in knowing how to sway people. The people had made up their minds over the months when the Korean war started and when the casualty lists came in. They went to the polls and they administered a stern and relentless rebuke to the men they felt responsible. They warned others that they would tolerate no more bungling.

This is a great country, and never greater than on November 7.

God bless America, and keep her safe.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis., of November 8, 1950]

THE MEANING OF KOHLER AND WILEY

The election of Republicans, Walter Kohler as Governor, and ALEXANDER WILEY as United States Senator, and the defeat of their down-the-line Fair Deal opponents provides Wisconsin political philosophers with food for thought.

Mr. Kohler's victory is, certainly, a vindication of and vote of confidence in the Republican Party that has given this State excellent, clean government for more than a decade.

His victory was a repudiation of the Madison-controlled-and-directed Wisconsin Democratic Party, which sought to bring the questionable blessings of deficit spending and autocratic government to the State.

The Wiley victory points to many things:

Wisconsin citizens want men in Washington who will vote to curb the power of Federal Government. Wisconsin citizens want to decide—themselves—how the dollars they earn will be spent.

And this is most important: Wisconsin citizens want men in Washington who will have the courage, honest intention, and willingness to expose and drive from high places the Communists and fellow travelers who have wormed their way into positions of power and influence.

[From the Oshkosh (Wis.) Northwestern of November 8, 1950]

WILEY RETURNED AS UNITED STATES SENATOR

Riding on the strong Republican tide that swept Wisconsin's rural counties in Tuesday's election, United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, won in the bitterly contested race in which Attorney General Thomas E. Fairchild, of Verona, Democrat, was his opponent.

WILEY took a large early lead in the vote battle, particularly in the rural areas, and Fairchild was unable to overcome that advantage gained in the farm counties, even in the late returns from Milwaukee and other industrial points regarded as Democratic strongholds.

Oshkosh and Winnebago County voters gave WILEY a splendid endorsement, compared with the totals made by his political foe, Fairchild.

The Wiley victory was an important factor in the Nation's congressional contests, in which the Republicans slaughtered the Democratic leadership, but apparently fell short of seizing control of the Eighty-second Congress.

Evidently the majority of the voters had decided emphatically that they were tired of what the Democratic administration has been doing to them and wanted a change.

One of the biggest upsets, affecting organized labor's effort to wipe out the Taft-Hartley labor-control law, was in Ohio, where Senator ROBERT A. TAFT was reelected, defeating his Democratic opponent, Joseph T. Ferguson, who was backed by a Truman-labor coalition that spent a huge amount of money and conducted an intensive campaign in the hope of ending TAFT'S brilliant career in the Senate.

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Record-Herald of November 8, 1950]

MUCH TO CHEER ABOUT

The voters of Wisconsin reaffirmed their confidence in the kind of government—good government—they have been getting under the Republican administrations at Madison by decisively electing a full slate of GOP State officers in Tuesday's election.

And they expressed their displeasure over the type of government offered by the Democratic administration at Washington by returning United States Senator WILEY to office and increasing the Republican representation in the House of Representatives from 8 seats to 9 out of the State's 10 seats.

The Republican gains were substantial enough, we believe, to give the party reason to eye the 1952 elections with confidence, but not spectacular enough to give them the fatal overconfidence of 1948.

Chinese Reds Enjoying United States Luxuries While Our Soldiers Are Dying In Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, November 29 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very

thought-provoking article entitled "Chinese Reds Enjoying United States Luxuries While Our Soldiers Are Dying in Korea," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Evening Star of November 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD—CHINESE REDS ENJOYING UNITED STATES LUXURIES WHILE OUR SOLDIERS ARE DYING IN KOREA

(By Constantine Brown)

At the very time when officials of the Chinese Communist Government are enjoying the luxuries of the Waldorf Astoria in New York, American soldiers are being killed in North Korea by Chinese Communist troops.

Our men are not there as representatives of the United States Government. They represent the same United Nations which is receiving with utmost courtesy and smiles the spokesmen of the so-called Peiping government.

What would the American people have said if in 1942 a batch of Hitlerites had arrived in New York or Washington, not to discuss peace but to accuse the American Government of such "crimes" as giving help to Britain and invading North Africa

INTERNATIONAL TERRITORY

Technically the situation is not the same. Lake Success is international territory because it houses the United Nations. New York by implication, has somewhat the same status, inasmuch as it offers accommodation for those who attend sessions of the United Nations regularly or on special invitation.

The Chinese Communists are not here to discuss ways and means of halting the Korean holocaust. They have come for the specific purpose of accusing the American Government of "intervening" in Formosa. If they allow themselves to be drawn into any discussion of Korea, it will be only to denounce the "crimes" of General MacArthur and the American soldiers under his command.

The nine-man delegation was taken in hand, as soon as it set foot on American territory, by the representative of China's bosses, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Jacob Malik, who awaited them at Idlewild Airport. He is making doubly sure that the Chinese do not change a comma in the instructions drawn for them by the Kremlin.

Mr. Malik, however, has permitted some representatives of Britain and India—two countries which have recognized the Chinese People's Republic—to talk to the new mandarins. These, together with the French, Yugoslavs, and some others, are scraping and bowing in the hope of winning the favor of the Russian dictators' newest Charlie McCarthys.

COST IN AMERICAN LIVES

The Chinese Communists made their charges of American intervention in Formosa last summer, before their divisions actively entered the battle against the UN forces in Korea. There might have been some reasonable grounds for permitting these men to come to America at that time to press their trumped-up charges against our Government. But since that time not only the UN supreme commander in Korea, but also the representatives of his command, have confirmed the fact that the Chinese Communists have thrown a large force into a fight to prevent the unification and pacification of Korea. The intervention of these troops has cost America alone nearly 1,000 lives and at least three times as many other casualties.

The Peiping delegation is not here to discuss how to stop the bloodshed in Korea. Their only purpose is to discuss the crimes of the imperialistic warmongering American Government. The Peiping delegates are on American territory—where they are enjoying the protection, courtesies, and services of Americans, some of whom may have had sons or other relatives killed in Korea—to blast us and not to talk peace.

The wishful-thinking British and Indian diplomats whisper in the ears of American delegates at the UN that if we leave matters to them they may be able to obtain some compromise in Asia. They still advocate firmly the Russian thesis that Peiping's stooges should be given the seat held at present by the Nationalists at Lake Success.

A situation far more dangerous than the 1938 Munich agreement will threaten us if our diplomats plunge headlong into the compromise which some of our allies now are preparing at Lake Success.

German Youth

EXTFNSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, at the present juncture of the critical situation in Germany which will determine whether Germany will or will not take its part in the defense of freedom of western Europe, the appended editorial from yesterday's New York Times on German youth should be of the deepest interest to every Member:

GERMAN YOUTH

A disquieting feature of the current parliamentary elections in Bavaria is the political apathy revealed among young Germans. As Jack Raymond reported in this newspaper, many young people are cynically distrustful of politics and politicians. Apparently they feel helpless to influence the course of events by political action.

This attitude is not surprising. Unlike their older compatriots, these young men and women have experienced little except Hitlerism and the horrors of war. Five years of Allied and German efforts at reorientation have not succeeded in filling the vacuum left by the collapse of the Reich with an understanding of the workings and meaning of democracy. The tremendous task of physical reconstruction used up much of the mental and material resources which might have been employed in efforts to show German youth that it has a stake in the democratic way of life. Again, disclosures of aberrations such as former Nazis being permitted to teach in German schools are not calculated to imbue young people with an ardent faith in western liberalism. Yet it is precisely the schools on which the reorientation program depends most heavily.

The lesson of this sidelight of the Bavarian elections should spur Allied and German authorities, teachers and youth workers in their effort to develop the potential of German youth in the constructive cause of freedom. History has shown that there is no richer, easier prey for the would-be dictator than a youth drifting without aim and ideal. It is a danger neither the Germans nor the rest of the Western World at large can afford to ignore.

Address by Hon. Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina, Before National Association of Real Estate Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 30 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me on November 14, 1950, before the forty-third annual convention of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, at Miami Beach, Fla.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAL ESTATE AND GOVERNMENT

I have often had the occasion, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, to welcome the very able representatives of your organization when they appeared before our committee to testify on housing legislation. Today I am grateful for the opportunity to return those visits and to renew pleasant associations.

Real estate is your business, and I certainly cannot hope to tell you anything about that subject which you don't already know. Since, however, we share common aims and face common problems, I think it would give you who build our homes a better understanding and appreciation of the role Government plays in helping you carry out your job if I explain briefly how the Banking and Currency Committee came to deal with housing legislation, our accomplishments, and our objectives.

The provision of adequate homes for all of our people has long presented a number of very difficult problems. At the root of these problems was the simple fact that a house, unlike other products of our very efficient system of production and distribution, could not readily be mass-produced, and neatly packaged, and shipped hundreds of miles. A house, even a simple one, is necessarily an expensive product, and one which very few people can purchase except on credit. In a free-enterprise system housing problems therefore resolve themselves in large part into questions of finance and of credit. It is for this reason that the Committee on Banking and Currency, both in the House and in the Senate, have been entrusted with jurisdiction over housing.

On a number of occasions within our own generation, housing problems have reached a point which made it necessary and inevitable that Federal action be taken. During the depression in the early 1930's hundreds of thousands of American families faced the loss of their homes through mortgage foreclosure. This threat carried with it the further threat of insolvency to banks, insurance companies, and other lending institutions, and of ruin to their depositors and policyholders and shareholders. Our entire social and economic structure was then in danger of serious and lasting harm. The part which Federal legislation played in meeting this crisis forms the background against which more recent legislation must be viewed in order to be understood.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation—the HOLC—which was authorized by the Congress in 1933, made it possible for about 1,000,000 families to have their homes

from mortgage foreclosure. This temporary agency also saved thousands of lending institutions from bankruptcy.

It was the HOLC that popularized the single, long-term, low-interest-rate mortgage. Many of you here, of course, remember that at one time two or three separate mortgages were customarily placed on even a small home. These mortgages generally expired in about 5 or 6 years and often sooner. Legal and recording fees contributed materially to the cost of housing when first, second, and third mortgages were periodically renewed. In addition, interest rates were high, especially on second and third mortgages. The HOLC, along with the FHA which was authorized in 1934, were largely responsible for eliminating this cumbersome and expensive system for financing residential real estate.

The mortgage insurance guaranties of the FHA brought a steady flow of credit into the home-construction field. The operations of the Home Loan Bank Board and its regional home loan bank system served the same purpose, as did the insurance operations of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Incidentally just before the end of this session our committee reported and the Congress enacted legislation which permits the FSLIC to insure share accounts in an amount up to $10,000 each, instead of $5,000 as was formerly the case.

These various Federal programs all take the form of financial aids. These measures have greatly strengthened our private lending institutions and have enabled the residential construction industry to maintain a high level of production. This in turn has contributed to the profits and prosperity not only of lenders and builders but also of real-estate brokers and appraisers and managers. It has also made it possible for bank depositors, shareholders in savings and loan associations, and other investors to receive a fair return on safe and sound investments. All these results are very desirable, but none of them, and I wish to emphasize this, represents the primary reason why the Congress and the Government is concerned with residential real-estate financing or residential construction.

The major reason and the only justification for Federal housing legislation is the ultimate aim which the Government shares with the real-estate industry to provide decent housing for all our people. In the final analysis, the FHA, the Home Loan Bank Board, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation have justified their existence by the fact that they have helped to bring more and better housing within the reach of more American families, including those of low and moderate income. By itself the real-estate industry did not and could not hope to provide the opportunity of a decent home for all our citizens.

Let me give you a few illustrations. One problem which clearly could not be met through normal financial aids to private industry was the problem of housing for defense workers and military personnel during and immediately prior to World War II. Starting in 1940, there occurred vast migrations of families to industrial and other military centers. Lack of housing at that time represented a serious threat to the production of the tools of war. In order to encourage the greatest amount of construction by private builders through private financing, title VI of the National Housing Act was enacted, making FHA mortgage insurance available to private lenders and builders on more flexible and advantageous terms. This title was particularly effective in providing urgently needed rental housing through private financing. However, in remote areas and in other areas where the housing needs were thought to be temporary and where private industry could not undertake the job, the Government resorted to direct Federal financing. Even here, however, the actual construction was, of course, done by private builders.

Then there was the problem of our returning veterans and their inability to find a place to live. Many of our boys had given up their homes on entering military service. Very few had any opportunity during their war service to compete for existing homes then available at lower prices and rents. In recognition of these facts and of the severe postwar housing shortage, the Congress made special financing aids available to veterans wishing to purchase or build homes. The FHA title VI program was extended to veterans on the same terms as it had before served war workers, and the GI bill of rights provided for the home-loan guaranty program of the Veterans' Administration.

The health and welfare of our people, the status of family life, and the very structure of our communities are affected by any widespread failure to provide decent homes within the financial reach of our people. These are the considerations which help to shape legislative aids which are designed to meet consumer needs. However, there has been a consistent policy in all of our legislation to channel Federal aids through private financing to the very fullest extent possible.

Public housing, upon which some of you and I have sincerely differed, was resorted to as a means of meeting a real and a very desperate need, and one which was not being met, and which, according to the best and most expert evidence presented to our committee, could not be met by private enterprise. But even this program is carried on for the most part by private enterprise. No one can deny that the real-estate industry has benefited greatly from the Government's activity in the field of housing and home financing, even from the very programs it opposed.

Members of the House and Senate are not and cannot be expected to be experts on many of the questions they must legislate on, but they are experts on democracy and determining what is in the best interests of the majority of our people. Be assured, therefore, and have faith in our decisions, especially when we finally make up our minds on a controversial subject. You can be sure that we are convinced after exhaustive investigations and hearing all sides that we, a majority of your Congress, are only adding strength to and enhancing our system of competitive private enterprise.

It is not necessary for me to detail our record of housing achievement these last few years. You helped to make it possible. But it could never have been made were it not for the financial aids provided by the FHA, the Veterans' Administration, the Home Loan Bank Board, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Indeed, since the end of World War II, almost half of the dwellings started have been insured or guaranteed by either the FHA or the Veterans' Administration, and many of the others have been aided less directly by credit made available through the Home Loan Bank System. In June and July of this year, for instance, 35 percent of all the privately financed housing units started were insured by the FHA and 13 percent were guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. Thus 48 percent of all private residential construction during these 2 months received major Federal financial aid. This 48 percent figure is not unusual. Rather, it is typical of the period since World War II.

In spite of the headway we have made in meeting our housing needs and in spite of the prosperous conditions prevailing in the real-estate industry you will be confronted by the challenge of fulfilling a huge housing need for many years to come. In 1940 our population was about 131,700,000. Today our population is about 150,500,000. The percentage increase is over 14 percent. The number of our dwelling units has increased from about 37,300,000 in 1940 to about 46,150,000 at the present time. This is a percentage increase of about 24 percent. In the meantime, however, the number of our households has increased by about 25 percent and our per-capita income, even after allowing for higher cost of living, has increased by about 80 percent. Thus the economic demand for housing has increased more rapidly than the supply. Furthermore these figures do not take into account the need to replace the many substandard units which are a blot upon our local communities and which a Nation as rich and as powerful as we are ought not to tolerate.

With building starts for 9 months of this year estimated at 1,105,000 we were really beginning to catch up on some of the backlog of housing demand when unfortunately the international situation took the unhappy turn it did. We could not, and cannot even now, although the military and international outlook is much brighter than it was a couple of months ago, permit current civilian demand to siphon away the materials and products needed for defense purposes, nor could we afford to allow prices to skyrocket and unstable economic conditions to develop.

Thus, the construction industry being the key industry it is, in peacetime or wartime, was naturally one of the first industries to feel the effects of our shift to a semiwar economy. It would not be fair to the home buyer, the real-estate industry, or to our citizens generally to allow the economic forces resulting from the international and military situation to have full and free play. A severe cutback in the record-breaking level of home production was not a pleasant thing to aim for. Yet, it is necessary if our defense effort is not to suffer. It is necessary also from a housing viewpoint, since the economic demand for new housing cannot long survive inflation in the cost of construction materials.

I am convinced that the need for reducing construction was proven beyond dispute. The only real problem remaining was how to devise credit regulations which would balance essential civilian needs against essential defense needs, and which would result in a fair apportionment of the necessary sacrifices among all those in need of housing, including veterans and their families and low-income and moderate-income families.

The Government has taken a major step in its attempt to solve this difficult problem. However, no one can fully evaluate the many factors involved, nor foresee the many new developments which arise. Therefore, it now remains for all of us to watch closely for the actual effects of the recent credit restrictions under changing conditions. I know that your industry, as well as the Housing Agency and the Federal Reserve Board, are doing just that. I am sure, also, that the credit controls will be modified from time to time on the basis of actual experience, in order to enable the housing industry to make the greatest possible contribution to our civilian and defense needs.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards and the whole real-estate industry has a tremendous responsibility in the period immediately ahead. Controls by themselves cannot do the job. We need the cooperation, above all, of industry. If we don't have it in this key industry where else can we expect it, and imagine, if you will, the consequences.

If you as an industry and we as a Nation make the small sacrifices that are required

in the months ahead, your industry and our Nation can look ahead with assurance to a peace and prosperity the like of which you hesitate to dream of, but for which I feel confident we shall continue to work and pray.

The Strength of Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 30 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Close Ranks," published in the Boston Herald of November 17, 1950. This is an excellent editorial in the present emergency situation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOSE RANKS

Where is the strength of America? We are planning an army of 3,000,000 men. But Russia plans 12,000,000. We have the atom bomb. But so probably has Russia. We have allies. But so has Russia, allies with limitless manpower like China. We have amazing productive capacities. But Korea has shown us that Russia, too, can build formidable tanks and effective jet fighting planes. We have right and justice on our side. But the Russians hold the mastery of the technique of the big lie, to make the bad look good.

Where is our strength? How do we stand against the greatest adversary in all history? Do we even know the peril we are in?

Our strength must lie in an aroused unity, in a consciousness of the danger and in a mighty determination to meet it with all the force we have.

Somehow we haven't achieved that concentrated purpose. We do not even show signs of achieving it.

It is true that the crisis has come gradually. There has been no Pearl Harbor to stir the national consciousness. Instead we have passed from one grave incident to another only a little graver, and we could easily become engaged in a full scale war with China without realizing it.

But by this time the diabolical purpose of the Kremlin is certain. The real test of strength may come soon or late, but come it will.

In the meantime America must close its ranks. It must attain the same unity, the same fixed purpose that it would have if the armies of the two worlds were totally engaged. There must be a patriotic willingness to defer those domestic issues that divide and weaken us. The telephone strike that drags on over a difference of less than 4 cents an hour is a fantastic contrast to the bitter fighting in Korea and the uncertainty ahead. This is no time for the kind of politics that seeks the selfish advantage of one class or one group. The rivalry of business with business or union with union or management with union must be subordinated to the national security. No one wins if America loses.

The American people need to be alerted. They need to know that 4,798 Americans dead in Korea are not the end of the sacrifice that must be made. They need from Washington a true report on the state of the Nation. They need to have what we spoke of in our editorial from Washington yesterday, great targets to shoot at, bold objectives to reach, the call to close our ranks.

The Situation Confronting Us in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 30 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the leading article in the current issue of the national weekly news magazine, Pathfinder, is a most thoughtful discussion of the fateful situation momentarily confronting us in Asia. It is timely, but inasmuch as it was written several days ago, it may well have the virtue of a more calm viewpoint than is possible in the light of developments during the past 48 hours. Therefore, I think it is worthy of consideration by Members of the Senate, and for this reason I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO WORLD WAR IN ASIA—WHY UNITED STATES STRATEGY PREFERS A "DEAL" WITH RED CHINA TO PLAYING RUSSIA'S GAME

"So far as the United States is concerned," said the President last Thursday, "I wish to state unequivocally that because of our deep devotion to the cause of world peace and our long-standing friendship for the people of China, we will take every honorable step to prevent any extension of the hostilities in the Far East."

Upon these 51 words the balance between peace and a possible world war III teetered sickeningly this week. If a nine-man delegation from Red China to the UN will accept Harry Truman's words in good faith—and open the way to "honorable" steps—then the Korean war can soon end. If, however, Gen. Wu Hsiu-chuan and his Moscow-schooled delegates degrade their case at Lake Success to vituperative harangues, then the war will drag along interminably.

Of that, President Truman, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were certain. But that was about all they were certain of on the eve of the conversations.

It was unpleasant to admit, but the United States was at war with China, if not with Soviet Russia itself.

Though the war was still limited to the Korean-Manchurian border area, they didn't know how long it would remain localized there.

Though they had plenty of theories, they didn't know why China had entered the war in the first place.

WELCOME TO AMERICA

Yet out of this dismal fog of ignorance, firm hopes of ultimate peace continued to grow. It is cheering that the Chinese delegation is coming to UN to talk—even though they come by way of Moscow. For more than a month prior to the delegates' departure from Peking, the United States had worked—sometimes through the Security Council, sometimes through Sardar K. M. Panikkar, Indian representative at Peking—to bring about these talks. If Wu Hsiu-chuan will talk—and talk about more than the United States Seventh Fleet in Formosan waters—these are the points around which the conversations will revolve, and the probable United States answers:

Question. What assurance have the Chinese that the United States does not have imperialistic designs on Manchuria?

Answer. The United States will refer to its role as a member of UN and state emphatically that its sole purpose in Korea is to establish peace in a free country. It will state just as emphatically that it does not have, and never had, any intention of crossing the Manchurian border.

Question. What guaranty do the Chinese have that the United States does not intend to seize giant hydroelectric plants along the border, built mainly by the Japanese, and turn them over to a United States-dominated Korea?

Answer. The United States will promise Manchuria continued Yalu River power rights. Doubtful ownership of any plant will be a matter for whatever commission the UN designates for the job.

Question. When peace comes to Korea, what share will the Chinese have in the reestablishment of a free Korean government?

Answer. The United States recognizes the fact that China should have some voice in the government of postwar Korea—from the standpoint of geography if no other. If the UN decides that China should have a seat in whatever commission is set up to supervise the creation of a new government, the United States will not object. However, the United States will oppose any move to establish a partisan control of a segmented Korea, such as was tried in the setting up of quadpartite zones in occupied Germany.

Question. Does the United States intend to support Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa?

Answer. The United States will insist that Formosa be neutralized as long as the Korean war continues. The United States does not care if Chiang stays in Formosa or gets out. The United States will support any government the Formosans adopt for themselves—so long as that government is freely chosen and not the product of external influences from Communist China—or any other nation.

Question. Does the United States oppose the admission of Red China to the UN?

Answer. More than a month ago United States Security Council Delegate Warren Austin said the United States would not veto a UN membership for Red China if other Council members voted approval. This week the United States will repeat this stand. (As a matter of fact, the State Department regards recognition of Red China and its admittance to UN only as a convenience, not an honor to China. Inasmuch as Communist control of China is a fait accompli—and since none of the United States allies in the west oppose recognition of China—State officials see no real reason for delay. However, from a negotiating viewpoint, it is good sense to hold out as long as possible.)

Question. If China were admitted to the UN and recognized by the United States, would the United States extend to China the same advantages of trade, point IV aid, and possible ECA help as it does to other nations?

Answer. To this the United States would give a limited "Yes." The hitch would be a Chinese guaranty that United States goods sent to China would not leak to Russia. (The United States expects that the guaranty would be given but not lived up to.

So, to match duplicity with duplicity, whenever any question arose the United States would apologize, say the limited quantities of the product make trading impossible and glibly point to the fact that we even withhold some goods from Britain.)

These demands and responses are based on the assumption that Red China entered the war primarily to improve its bargaining position. If, however, China's entry is the first step in an effort to involve the United States in a long, exhausting war, another answer will be given by this Nation's spokesmen:

The United States will not be enticed into a war with China at the expense of losing every gain it has made in Western Europe.

If the Chinese should turn loose the estimated 300,000 troops just behind the Manchurian border, hoping to drive the United Nations forces completely out of Korea or lure them into China, current strategy provides that:

1. Gen. Douglas MacArthur's forces will drop back into North Korea, establish a line at some arbitrarily selected point, possibly the fortieth parallel.

2. The United States will not quit in Korea until the peace is won, provided that peace can be won with the 7 American divisions and 12 Korean divisions MacArthur has now. (The Joint Chiefs of Staff has told MacArthur definitely that he can get no more.)

If this week's talks fail, President Truman may have to make this unpopular disclosure perhaps to Congress when it reconvenes on November 27. Bad as it will be for the thousands of wives and mothers who have lost husbands and sons in what then will appear as a fool's errand, every circumstance seemed to dictate that he could do nothing else.

His generals and his diplomats—and the President himself—have not budged 1 inch from their earlier conviction that if the showdown must come between Russia and the United States, it will come where the United States wants it and where it is best able to meet it: in Western Europe.

For the first time since the end of World War II, the State Department, the Defense Department, and the White House are in complete agreement on major policy matters.

They are convinced that the United States cannot fight in every part of the globe without destroying the strength needed to maintain its own security. If it is patently impossible to hold the line everywhere, it is only common sense to hold it among nations who in turn can befriend the United States, and who now are at least sympathetic toward the goals of freedom the United States seeks.

As Gen. Omar N. Bradley stated it in Atlanta, Ga., last week, "The means of Communist aggression are unlimited. * * * The means open to freemen are limited to worthy ones."

The United States cannot use Soviet techniques of international banditry, nor can it suppress free nations by totalitarian methods of conquest. It must fight with what it has—free people, free industry, and respect in the world family of nations. And its fight must necessarily be limited to the weapons it has.

This doesn't mean that the United States will fight an aggressive war on one hand and appease on the other. Nor does it mean that the United States will meekly take every slap in the face or stab in the back Russia chooses to make. It simply means that this Nation will struggle for peace—and for time—so long as national honor isn't jeopardized in the struggle.

Should that time come, Russia will get slapped and knifed in turn. But at a spot where she is most vulnerable.

Attack on the FBI—Book by Max Lowenthal, Reviewed by Walter Trohan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an article appearing in Human Events November 22, 1950, on the book recently published by Max Lowenthal entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation." This book is an attack on the FBI. Walter Trohan, of the Chicago Tribune, reviews the book, and his statement follows:

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, BY MAX LOWENTHAL, REVIEWED BY WALTER TROHAN

By mysterious design, best known to the author and publisher, copies of this book sprouted on the desks of Members of Congress and Federal jurists on the heels of a letter from a Sloane official stating "this unbiased and profoundly conservative approach" would lead to some startling conclusions on the FBI. The dust jacket hails Lowenthal as "a conservative in the most profound sense" and asserts he does not "color his material, editorialize, or draw conclusions."

Now, because the book adds up to an attack on the FBI, which can be expected to be a standard reference for years, it is fitting that these claims to conservatism and objectivity be examined. It is altogether proper and conservative to fret over the possibility that a Federal police force can grow into an arm of terror in a police state. When such fears parallel Moscow radio attacks on the FBI and writings of notorious Communist-fronters, one can ask, "Who's conservative now?"

Mr. Lowenthal is a wealthy New York lawyer, who has been weaving in and out of Washington in various capacities for 30 years. The most detailed biography of Harry S. Truman to date, The Man of Independence, identifies him as the man who weaned the President from the realistic thinking of Pendergastism to the rarefied liberalism of the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis. Last September, Lowenthal acknowledged varying degrees of intimate acquaintance with 22 known Communists, Red spies, and notorious fellow travelers, including Alger Hiss, John J. Abt, Charles Kramer, and Lee Pressman, who is even now seeking to identify himself with conservatism. Lowenthal told the House Un-American Activities Committee: "The number of people I didn't know were members of the Communist Party is something that makes my hair stand on end." So much for the new conservatism.

And now to objectivity. The jacket claims that for every quote questioning the practices or efficiency of the FBI, Lowenthal quotes the FBI reply or replies of FBI defenders, "including, of course, J. Edgar Hoover." This reviewer learned that not one question was addressed to Hoover or the FBI by Lowenthal, and it is difficult, if not well-nigh impossible, to find a kind word for that FBI in the book. However, it reeks with criticism, most carefully traced to source in the most elaborate set of source notes in many a year, and these are most carefully edited to fit the slant against the FBI.

Much is made of an investigation of the FBI by Robert H. Jackson when the Supreme Court Justice was Attorney General. Not one word is included from his report, which emphasized the fact that the acts of every FBI agent are subject to examination by defense lawyers. Jackson said that if civil liberties are "in danger in this country, it is not by the FBI," and reported that with a record of 96-percent convictions in cases brought by the FBI "not one case has been reversed by an appellate court because of 'third degree' or other improper treatment of defendants." Among many other editings against the FBI there is a quotation of an attack by former Senator Carl Hatch, but no mention of a virtual retraction 2 days later. Thus, kind words for the FBI die under the Lowenthal scissors.

Lowenthal belabors the FBI as a menace to freedom of speech and freedom of thought. At the same time he criticizes the FBI for not being efficient enough, holding that the atomic-spy case and the case of his friend Hiss should have broken sooner. In his brief, which is heavy reading, he cites a gamut of cases from Sacco-Vanzetti and the World War raids of A. Mitchell Palmer to the Judy Coplon affair as offering evidence against J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI today.

The verdict of this reviewer on Lowenthal is not guilty of conservatism and guilty of objectivity against the FBI.

Tragedy in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, November 30 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Tragedy in the Far East," written by Walter Winchell and published in the Washington Post of November 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

TRAGEDY IN THE FAR EAST

The failure of peace-loving nations to detect the manifold symptoms of war until it becomes an international contagion is one of history's supreme tragedies. Ironically, communities have learned to quarantine scarlet fever, but counties have neglected a far more disastrous epidemic called war. If the democracies had disinfected nazism when it was merely a rash in Munich beer halls, the lives of 40,000,000 people might have been saved.

During the 1920's when every throw of the dice on Wall Street turned up seven; when prohibition served as the theme of the Nation's leading controversy; when we thought the hip-flask was the most perilous threat to the Nation's youth—Communist Russia already succeeded in infiltrating China on the political, financial and intellectual fronts. The velvet-gloved aggression against China was under the direction of the Comintern. And this operation was masterminded by a Communist leader who was then almost unknown—Joseph Stalin. * * * Some Americans, who were born during the 1920's, are soldiers today being killed by Chinese Communists.

Washington is now discovering what it should have known three decades ago. Never were so many fooled for so long. The Communist master plan in Asia was based on involving the United States in a catastrophic struggle with China. This was made known with fiery clarity during September 1920, when Grigor Zinoviev, chairman of the Third International, proclaimed: "The real revolution will blaze up only when 800,000,000 people who live in Asia unite with us, when we see hundreds of millions of people in revolt. Now we must kindle a holy war against British, French, and American capitalist."

Lenin dispatched agents to organize the Chinese Communist Party over 30 years ago. While renouncing aggressive intentions and giving assurances of amity, the Comintern in 1919 set up a school in Shanghai for the study of Communist strategy. Since Communists, like rodents, operate in the crevices, this school was the initial Red crevice which later split China wide open.

One of the agents who established the school attained influence within the Chinese Government and managed to have a Chinese leader appointed as director of the government's vital propaganda committee. That chief is now the dictator of China—Mao Tse-tung.

The devilish candor of Chinese Communists and their Russian cohorts is as incredible as the gullibility of Washington. In January 1923, China's Reds gathered in Canton and publicly announced: "The Communist Party of China under the guidance and with the aid of the Comintern succeeded in drafting a concrete political and tactical line." The ideological allegiance of Chinese Communists never wavered. During 1944 a book written by Mao Tse-tung was published by the Communist Party in the United States. It included this: 'The world now depends on communism for its salvation and so does China." The Communists later withdrew this book from sale here.

But as late as 1946 the Truman administration believed it could bring peace to China by effecting a conciliation between the Reds and Nationalists via a coalition government. Its vision of amity turned out to be just another mirage. That diplomatic blunder could be mildly described as naïveté—and truthfully described as ignorance.

Despite the 30-year open alliance between China's Reds and the Soviet Union—proof of this alliance was still considered news in the United States on November 21, 1948. On that day the New York Times offered reams of evidence in an effort to prove the close and definite connection between Red China and Russia. The Times added: "The Chinese leaders make no attempt to conceal the identity of interests with the Soviet Union. The overwhelming evidence, therefore, is that the Chinese Communists are pursuing policies identical in aims with the policies of Moscow." That scoop must have raised guffaws in the Kremlin.

The streets of Canton were stained with blood in 1927 when Communist-inspired riots exploded. Yet the isolationist mentality in the United States was so rigid at that time, most editors here either buried the news or ignored it.

The evidence is mountainous that Red China is merely a Russian satellite. Furthermore, the State Department's secret files show that the Department knew it as early as 1945. But it plowed through its own intelligence warnings like a Long Island Railroad engineer opening the throttle through a red light. The Wedemeyer report is still a state secret, but its contents are not. It foretold the Far East catastrophe to the opening rifle shot. The State Department's white paper on China will live in history—as the greatest outright fraud the State Department ever tried to perpetrate on the American public. But the administration is about to reverse itself on that, too. The Nation is so close to war that even Acheson is considering calling on Chiang Kai-shek for aid in Korea.

It takes a split second to pull the trigger which signals the start of armed strife. But the first shot on the battlefield is always preceded by years of ignorance, hypocrisy, and skulduggery in the diplomatic field. War itself is not inevitable. It is the impact of countless blunders during peacetime which produces a war's inevitability. The price of our past diplomatic mistakes is now being paid with the lives of Americans in Korea. Communism is on the march from Indonesia to Indochina; from the Malay Archipelago to the Philippines. If communism conquers Asia—it will have enslaved over half or the world's population.

Publisher M. Cowles (Look, Flair, Quick and newspapers in Des Moines and Minneapolis) at the Saints and Sinners event the other day spoke about newsmen who failed to recognize the Red menace: "Too many of us," he admitted, "were fooled. Too many were fools. Too many have realized too late. Only a few spoke out early."

Thanks for the ad.

It's Your Congress Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, with the feeling in mind that any publication which tends to diffuse accurately information concerning the National Congress, its membership and procedures, is something to be desired very much, and believing that I express the opinion of the Members of the House when I state that each one of us was personally gratified to receive upon our return to Congress from the recent recess the December 1950 issue of Your Congress magazine, I am pleased to have inserted under my name the following letter from the editor of the magazine in which letter Mr. Miller expresses the hopes and plans of his organization in the preparation and use of future issues of this publication:

WASHINGTON, *November 29, 1950.*

Mr. BERTRAM M. GROSS,
Executive Secretary,
Council of Economic Advisers,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GROSS: I was pleased to receive your inquiry through Miss Cantor today about the Committee for Congress and the Congress Study Council.

This project, as outlined in the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is the culmination of almost 2 years' study of the best use to make of the Pictorial Directory of Congress, 30-year-old picture book of the Members of Congress which Mrs. Miller and I own.

A year ago September, Mrs. Miller had the honor of presenting a special White House edition of the Pictorial Directory of Congress to President Truman at the White House when she outlined some of our plans.

In the past, the Pictorial Directory has been used at the beginning of each session as an identification book for Members and officials. This function is now being supplanted by an officially published booklet. The secondary market has been the sale of the directory to Members with their pictures or biographical data specially imprinted.

I am a writer and editor by profession but I have had an intensive and extensive experience in the field of professional public relations. I wrote a course outline on public relations and taught the first course on the subject used in the distributive education program.

This combined journalistic, public relations, and educational background naturally gravitated me to a search for the best means of utilizing the Pictorial Directory. I believe we have found it in the committee for Congress and the study council program.

One of my closest advisers and confidants on this project, although his name is not publicly identified with it, is one of our greatest authorities on Congress and its Members. The other members of our founding committee are virtually all established newspapermen or correspondents listed in the Congressional Directory.

From my research I know there is a definite need for the program we have launched. One of the great foundations may sponsor the project.

Meantime, however, Mrs. Miller and I are carrying the load of laying the groundwork for the program, revamping the pictorial directory for the Eighty-second Congress, preparing the 1952 edition of Your Congress Magazine.

We have offered to present the publication to a foundation or nonpartisan organization or group that will carry through this program, and make a down-to-earth, practical and realistic method of learning about Congress and its Members available to every school and college student, every factory worker, every union member, housewife, clubwoman, teen-ager.

There are the broader implications, such as the need for keeping Congress strong and alert, so that it will hold its own with the Executive or the bureaucracy in the effort to keep our democratic Republic free and representative. However, we are basically interested in letting every man, woman, and child in the Nation know that they have a direct personal interest and stake in Congress and its Members and what they do and how they do their job.

I could cite numerous authorities to prove that this is a vital need for such an educational and public-relations program. I think, perhaps, one of the most convincing pieces of evidence, was a letter received in today's mail, which reached me about the same time as the telephone call from your office.

The letter is from Alta M. Leach, executive secretary in the office of the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Member of Congress for the Fourth District of Colorado, a member of the important House Public Lands Committee. I have her permission to quote it to you in its entirety and to publicize it. The letter follows:

NOVEMBER 28, 1950.

DEAR MR. MILLER: I noted with interest your letter addressed to the Members of Congress dated November 7, in which you refer to the educational project, now under way, which will acquaint our public with the legislative machinery.

Upon returning to the State during this last campaign, it was absolutely appalling to note the large number of individuals who are thoroughly unacquainted with the operations of Congress and the many citizens who do not even know the names of their Representatives and Senators.

Although the press makes a valiant effort to inform the public, apparently the newspaper reader often turns to the sports page, society page, or cartoon strip, rather than absorb articles pertaining to Capitol Hill.

I think you will be doing a great service in sponsoring a national study program in schools, colleges, clubs, factories, and other assemblies. Good government can be attained only when we have a well-informed electorate.

Sincerely,

ALTA M. LEACH.

I can assure you, Mr. Gross, that the receipt of this letter, entirely unsolicited as it was, was a source of great inspiration to us.

At this stage of development of the combined educational and public-relations project for Congress and its Members, we are similarly grateful for the interest shown by individuals or organizations.

This is not a personal project, but an activity in which the whole Nation must participate if it is to be successful.

One of our initial objectives is to place in the hands of every Senator and Representative quantities of Your Congress magazine and related publications for distribution to schools, colleges, and other interested groups. We are developing material for radio and television use. We already have motion-picture films available for immediate use, as Mr. Allan Dibble, of the March of Time, has offered the use of the March of Time Forum films, The Life of a Congressman and The Congress, to the program.

Our feet are solidly on the ground in this endeavor. We have planned long and carefully and know that we are on the right track.

It's worth while, this attempt to expand the knowledge of and personal participation in the Congress and our Government, of every citizen. It's especially important at this time in history, when our free system is faced off directly with the fight-to-the-finish challenge of totalitarianism.

The writer or others of our founding committee will be happy to discuss the program with you in person at your convenience.

Yours truly,

HAL. J. MILLER,
Editor, Your Congress Magazine,
Executive Director, Committee
for Congress, Sponsor of Na-
tional Congress Study Councils.

Economic Aid for the Philippine Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, in reading the Washington Post of November 25, 1950, my attention was directed to conditions presently existing in the administration of the government of the Republic of the Philippines.

In view of these existing conditions, I recommend that the Eighty-second Congress carefuly scrutinize any legislation brought before it to continue economic aid to the Philippine Islands.

I also highly recommend that Members of the Eighty-second Congress do not hesitate to make a thorough and sweeping investigation of the conditions set forth in the editorial of the above mentioned issue of the Washington Post.

Our national economy is now undergoing drastic changes to meet the demands of an adequate defense program to protect ourselves against the growing threat of communism, communistic influences and aggression. We must protect our economy from any government which seeks our aid, only to misuse and waste the funds which we need so badly for ourselves.

Our national security rests heavily on our ability to wisely handle our money.

We cannot afford to support any government which insists on ignoring and, apparently, even supporting the conditions such as now exist in the Philippine Islands.

I charge that it is the duty of the Eighty-second Congress to be especially arduous in weeding out legislation granting economic aid to countries diametrically opposed to those principles which we hold in such high regard and for which we are even now sacrificing the lives of our young men in Korea.

For the information of those Members of the Eighty-first Congress who may have overlooked the above mentioned article, the entire text of this editorial follows:

PHILIPPINE AGREEMENT

Thanks largely to ECA Administrator William C. Foster, a good start appears to have been made toward carrying out the Bell report on the Philippines. In his conferences with President Quirino, Mr. Foster encountered stiff resistance to that all-important, even basic, provisions in the Bell report that further American aid be conditioned upon "supervision and direction" by an American mission. Filipino officials had a good deal to say about the islands being a free and sovereign power; all they needed from the United States was another substantial handout. But Mr. Foster made it unmistakably clear that the Santa Claus role is out. If further aid is to be recommended to Congress, it must be on a partnership basis involving all the strict accounting that is applied to ECA funds.

The agreement that was finally signed commits the Philippine Government to three important steps: (1) It undertakes to collect an additional 250,000,000 pesos in tax revenue, an increase of about 80 percent. (2) It agrees to pass a minimum-wage law, which the Bell mission found to be important because of the pitifully low standard of living prevailing among some groups of Filipinos. (3) The Philippine Legislature must pass a general resolution accepting the other recommendations of the Bell report. In return President Truman will ask Congress for economic aid for the Philippines, to be administered through the ECA, the top figure being $250,000,000, presumably to be applied over a period of years. With the Quirino regime still reeking with corruption and law enforcement at a low ebb, the program is admittedly a gamble. Most Americans would no doubt prefer to do nothing in support of the Quirino regime were it not for the danger that inaction might lead to a Communist coup. The Philippines is in a special category in American consideration.

The test will come, of course, in the steps that President Quirino takes to carry out his agreement. These steps must amount to something more than paper compliance. As to taxes, for example, it is said that no additional revenue would be needed if the present tax laws were enforced. But evasion and outright flouting of the tax laws is prevalent, and there are charges that the President himself is one of the evaders. Even where corruption has been exposed beyond question, Mr. Quirino has failed to prosecute the crooks and in some instances to sever their official connections. More and more Filipinos are asking whether he is afraid that a genuine housecleaning would expose himself. So confidence in the Manila regime continues to sink, the disorderly elements gain strength, and the democratic experiment in the Philippines moves closer toward a potential blow-up. If American aid is to be useful in these circumstances, it will certainly have to be administered with a firm hand.

Armistice Day, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at Spartanburg, S. C., on Armistice Day, November 11, 1950:

We are gathered here today to observe the thirty-second anniversary of the armistice of 1918 which ended the first great world conflict. While it is of great importance that we fittingly observe that armistice, it is vastly more important that we commemorate the supreme sacrifice of our sacred dead in both World Wars and that of our sons who have given and still are giving their lives for the cause of freedom, justice, and integrity in Korea. We the living, who today stand here at this mid-point of the twentieth century, have the opportunity to rededicate and reconsecrate our lives to the cause of freedom and democracy in honoring the sacred dead of these three great conflicts.

Thirty-two years ago this morning, many thousands of men climbed out of the long trench lines that stretched almost without interruption across northern France to the English Channel. Some of these men belonged to advancing divisions which had broken a 4-year deadlock, had crossed the blasted and blackened areas of No Man's Land and come at last into the clear. Others were members of an army in retreat which had seen victory snatched from its grasp in 1914 and again in 1918. But even among the defeated there was some hope. An armistice is itself a form of victory for the scarred and weary soldier. On the ruins of the old imperial ambitions, a new and better world surely would be erected.

For many years after 1918 the Western World took it for granted that in this war to end all wars the sacrifice of our blood and treasure had won an enduring peace. During the 1920's a wave of pacifism swept our country. We in our adolescence thought that by removing all signs of war we could eliminate war itself. We scrapped our battleships, reduced our military forces to a mere skeleton, and depended upon a policy of isolationism to insure peace.

We know now that the world of 1918 and 1919 had hoped too much and planned too little, had been noble in its aspirations, but weak and indecisive in its deeds. We know it because of the holocaust that swept over the world in all its fury only 21 years after that first Armistice Day and, in December 1941, dragged down our own country into the maelstrom of conflict amidst the shattered bodies of our sons and the sunken ships of our Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor.

Standing among the debris of our shattered hopes and unfulfilled dreams during the bleak, gloomy days of late 1941 and early 1942, this great Nation rose in a few months from its position of almost total unpreparedness to that of the greatest military power the world has ever seen. We repeated upon a tremendous scale during the Second

World War what we had previously done during the First World War. We accomplished a production miracle the like of which only freemen are capable. Once again our military victory over the Axis Powers was complete, absolute, and unqualified on land, on the sea, and in the air.

The monetary cost of victory to the United States cannot be calculated accurately for either of these World Wars. One estimate for the second war has been set at $300,000,000,000. This is right as far as it goes. Tremendous quantities of material were consumed in the furnace of war. In time this loss could have been replaced. Work and wealth build and produce the necessities of peace as well as of war. But the lives of our sons can never be replaced. The sacred dead of all our country's wars are the real cost we have paid for victory.

In spite of this sacrifice, today there is no peace. The uneasy truce of the past 5 years was broken last June 25 when South Korea was invaded by a Russian-trained, Russian-equipped army of North Korean Communists. As in 1917 and 1941, we were not prepared for the crisis as far as planes, ships, tanks, and guns are concerned. We had dissipated the magnificent military strength of 1944 and 1945 by an almost foolhardy demobilization and disarmament of our Armed Forces. We had done it against not only the advice of some of our leaders; we had done it against their pleading as well.

Let me quote part of a speech made on October 29, 1945, at the New York Herald Tribune Forum in New York City by General of the Army George C. Marshall, at that time time Chief of Staff, United States Army.

General Marshall's warning was this:

"We are still strong today, but we won't be so a few months hence, unless we take very positive and definite measures to give some degree of permanence to the strength for which we just spent so much of human life and money to develop.

"We are currently engaged in the demobilization of our wartime forces at the fastest possible rate. * * *

"It is certain * * * that the Military Establishment cannot hope to insure the safety of the United States very much longer at the present rate of demobiliaztion unless some permanent peacetime program is established and at an early date.

"For the moment, in a widespread emotional crisis of the American people, demobilization has become, in effect, disintegration, not only of the Armed Forces but apparently of all conception of world responsibility and what it demands of us. If we are to nourish the infant United Nations organization and thus establish some possibility of a future decent world order, definite measures must be taken immediately to determine at least the basic principles for our postwar military policy. I have never felt so certain of anything in my life."

It is needless to say that General Marshall's warning went unheeded—needless but not useless. Each succeeding world crisis in which our Nation becomes involved grants us less and less time to prepare ourselves to meet that crisis. Our period of grace has shrunk from years in the First World War to months in the Second, and finally to weeks in the present Korean conflict. We must reconcile our intense desire to follow the pursuits of peace with the demands of the world beyond our shores. I think it was Thomas Jefferson who said: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." That is true today as far as it goes, but as long as our Nation must face communism across the iron curtain, we must alter Jefferson's statement to "Eternal vigilance and preparedness are the price of liberty." Let us recognize this situation as a fact, accept it as a fact, and reconcile ourselves to the fact. Military strength is a necessity in the world of today. Our continued existence as a free people depends upon it. It is true that our arms have again won a magnificent victory, this time in Korea, for which we all thank God, but fighting still goes on. Our sons are still giving their lives. If peace again comes to Korea, Russian puppets in Indochina, India, Iran, or Germany may be ordered into action by their masters in the Kremlin.

A second situation which the American people must accept, whether or not they want to accept it, is the position of the United States as the leader of the free world. Our only alternative is isolation and gradual suffocation if not actual conquest by communism. For the foreseeable future America's sons will be on the perimeters of the world defending our way of life. It cannot be otherwise. Again I say, let us recognize this situation as a fact, accept it as a fact, and reconcile ourselves to the fact. Never again will the peace-loving nations stand idly by and let aggression envelop whole peoples. Never again will we wait until all the forces and resources of what is left of a free world have to be mobilized in a life and death struggle for survival. Korea has proved this to the world if it has done nothing else.

In this war, as in the last, the real struggle is not tank against tank, nor plane against plane, or yet man against man. The real struggle is idea against idea, philosophy of government against philosophy of government, freedom against slavery. We are fighting for the preservation of our democratic way of life just as much today as we were between 1941 and 1945. Victory can come only through the unity of our people and through sacrifice not only on the part of our military personnel but on the part of every American.

Six years ago today an Armistice Day address was delivered at Columbia by a gentleman who lives here in your city, the Governor-elect of the State of South Carolina. I would like to end these few thoughts today with a quotation from that address which is as pertinent in 1950 as it was in 1944:

"Let us on this Armistice Day dedicate ourselves anew to the great tasks remaining before us. Let us pledge to those who made the supreme sacrifice in the last war and those who are making the supreme sacrifice in this war, that their sacrifices shall not have been made in vain and that with God's help, we shall banish the scourge of war from this earth."

My Defense of My Friend Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation

REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, there appeared recently a book by Max Lowenthal entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation." This is a lengthy volume and from a casual observation its pretense could easily be mistaken as an objective and authoritative compilation on the mission of the FBI and to the unsuspecting and uninformed it could very easily be one of the most expensive booby traps ever contrived by the human intelligence to subtly undermine the most indispensable, effective, honorable, and honored department of our Government—an organization which, during its 42 years of existence, has won fame and respect in every town, hamlet, home, and fireside throughout the length and breadth of this Nation. Its Director, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, towers today above any man on the Federal payroll. He has more influence and prestige in both branches of the Congress than any servant who ever took an oath of office to defend our institutions and the philosophy of our democratic form of government.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, my distinguished friend and former agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I received a copy of this book written by Max Lowenthal. It was on my desk when I returned to Washington last Monday. I questioned my staff and asked them if they had ordered it. They informed me they had not, and I know for certain I did not order the book. It apparently was sent to me by the publishers, probably at the request of the author, Max Lowenthal.

I was quoted in this book, I believe on page 442, in a speech I made on the floor of the House in May 1950. In that speech I criticized the Department of Justice and the Attorney General for failure to prosecute some known espionage agents which I happened to have investigated during the time I served with the FBI.

The author, of course, is a very clever lawyer. He is a great artist at twisting the facts. He quoted me in order to get his point across that I was criticizing the Federal Bureau of Investigation and J. Edgar Hoover, my former boss, which is very far from the truth. I had no intention of criticizing Mr. Hoover or any of the staff or members of the FBI.

As a matter of fact, we all know that Mr. Hoover and the FBI have nothing to do with prosecution except to recommend prosecution of known espionage cases. The criticism that Mr. Lowenthal makes of the FBI in this respect is, therefore, very false. It is an undeserved criticism entirely and I resent it.

I sent this book back to the publishers and suggested to them that they obtain the autograph of Max Lowenthal and send it on to Uncle Joe Stalin in Moscow because he would appreciate it a whole lot more than I would.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, my answer to this attack on Mr. Hoover will be a resolution to provide for a special congressional medal for Mr. Hoover. I expect to introduce this resolution in the latter days of the present Congress or early in the new Congress. It will be a resolution to confer a special congressional medal upon Mr. Hoover in recognition of the outstanding work that he has done to suppress communism, and otherwise better the conditions of this country.

It is an outrage that an American who has carried the flag as Mr. Hoover has

carried it should be smeared as was done by this pinko, and alleged to be Communist, Max Lowenthal.

Mr. RIVERS. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that no man in this Nation has done more for the Nation under so many obstacles.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This Max Lowenthal is said to be a Communist. That this book smearing the FBI is nothing but Communist propaganda. If you have any doubt about that, check up on his record.

J. Edgar Hoover is one of the great men of this Nation. If the Congress of the United States had followed the suggestions I have been making for years and made the FBI an independent agency and relieved J. Edgar Hoover of the embarrassment that he now suffers as a result of those who try to tell him what he may investigate and what he may not, if the Congress would make the FBI, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, an independent agency J. Edgar Hoover could be worth more to us today than any other man alive in letting us know what is going on throughout the world. But he cannot do it with Communists like this abusing him and that little group down there in the Department of Justice trying to stultify him and prevent him from carrying out the duties of his exalted position.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, of all the multitudinous Federal agencies we have, I can think of none other that has the highest degree of respect than does the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I speak particularly of the little people, the man in the street, out in the hinterland. I have seen a copy of the book to which the gentleman is now addressing himself. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary I am personally acquainted with the great work being done under the direction of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. I want to commend the gentleman for the time he has taken and the study he has given in his analysis of this fraudulent book.

The Max Lowenthal smear book on the FBI convicts itself when it is considered along with the known public record of the FBI. The publishers claim:

> This book has been written in the interest of national security.

This is a fraudulent misrepresentation unless the publisher, William Sloane Associates, was thinking of the national security of some country other than the United States. If the author wanted to be objective, as is falsely claimed for him by the publishers, then he would have gone to the FBI and seen its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, and told him like a man exactly what he feared.

The public press, however, states he did not contact the FBI. Yet the author is represented as a lover of civil liberties. One who truly champions civil liberties is first of all honest and seeks to do justice. The mere fact that the author did not call upon the FBI to state its side of the case establishes beyond a peradventure of doubt that he was interested only in smearing the FBI.

Beyond that the author does not even quote the public record. Let me be specific and prove my point. I was intrigued by one reference in the book. On page 320 the author says:

> FBI practices were summed up in March 1940 by a Senate committee.

A review of the report of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce accompanying Senate Resolution 224, does not even contain the name of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. On page 5 of this report, in reciting the abuses referred to in Lowenthal's book, each sentence is preceded by the words "some police" did this and that. Nowhere does it say the FBI committed the abuses.

Lowenthal's book admits that while the report did not "specifically state that its charges were directed against the Bureau, Chairman Burton K. Wheeler, in a press interview, acknowledged that the report was, in fact, aimed at that police unit." The author then cites several newspaper clippings as his source. I checked on only one—the New York Daily News, March 13, 1940—and here is how former Senator Wheeler is quoted:

> "I am opposed to wire tapping, whether by the Treasury, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Interior Department, or private agencies," Wheeler told reporters. "If the FBI has done any tapping, it will certainly be investigated."

This report of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce was issued as a result of a resolution introduced by Senator THEODORE GREEN, of Rhode Island—Senate Resolution 224—and, apparently as a result of press inquiries, Senator GREEN issued a statement which appeared in the New York Journal-American on March 14, 1940, under the headline "'Wire-tap smear'—fails, brings Hoover praise." I have secured the full text of Senator GREEN's statement dated March 13, 1940, which clearly and categorically sets forth the ideas of Senator GREEN and that the resolution was not directed at the FBI. I offer the full statement for inclusion in the RECORD. However, in concluding his statement, Senator GREEN said:

> As a matter of fact, this investigation into wire-tapping practices was partly the result of evidence uncovered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in my State.

No where in Lowenthal's book do I find this statement. If he were honestly telling the story of the FBI, surely he would have been objective. But maybe there is another reason. The very cover of his book states he was employed by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce from 1935 to 1942. Is it possible that this same Lowenthal was the author of this report? Surely if the report were directed at the FBI as Lowenthal says it was, then there would have been a further record. But there is not. The subcommittee appointed to make the investigation, instead of investigating the FBI, did exactly what Senator GREEN in his statement of March 13, 1940, said it would—it investigated a wire-tapping situation in Rhode Island which the present Attorney General, J. Howard McGrath, then a United States attorney, and the FBI investigated. This one instance and these facts prove the dishonesty of the book and its publisher's claims.

One other item on the same page 320 attracted my attention. Lowenthal referred to the Spanish Loyalist cases in Detroit and says Attorney General Jackson "sent an investigator of his own to inquire into the facts; the latter reported that the FBI agents had engaged in conduct which might constitute a violation of the Constitution." I have learned that the investigator is now Federal Judge Henry Schweinhaut. His lengthy report was relased to the press by the then Attorney General, now Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson, who also released a letter to the late Senator George W. Norris to the press. But Lowenthal does not quote this letter in his book, because it would not support his smear upon the FBI. In this letter, the then Attorney General said:

> I am of course anxious, as you are, that in law enforcement we do no violence to our traditional civil liberties. I am convinced that if those liberties are generally endangered in this country it is not by the FBI.

If the rest of the book is as one-sided and inaccurate and conveys the false impressions which the two items do on page 320, then the publisher and the author are entitled to an award for the book of the year containing the most errors and the greatest smear. In fact, I am sure that they will be heartily commended by bloody Joe Stalin as the Communist Party could not have done a more effective job.

STATEMENT OF THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, OF RHODE ISLAND, MARCH 13, 1940

My attention has been called to news articles which have appeared in some newspapers in which it is alleged that I was asked whether the Senate resolution with respect to the investigation of wire tapping was directed at Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I replied that the investigation was not aimed at anyone in particular, but at the practice of wire tapping in general.

No remarks of mine in answer to this question justify the inference that my resolution was directed at the Federal Bureau of Investigation or Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, its Director. I have the greatest feeling of regard for Mr. Hoover, for the splendid work that he has done in law enforcement, and for the efficient and excellent organization he has built up. I admire the splendid accomplishments of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in meeting the great crime menace of 1933 and 1934 and the subsequent fine results which the activities of the Bureau have given to the country generally. As a matter of fact, this investigation into wire-tapping practices was partly the result of evidence uncovered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in my State.

Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NORRIS: I am asking Henry Schweinhaut to deliver to you the report upon his inquiry into the complaints about the arrests in the Detroit cases. He,

having personally interviewed the defendants, agents, and witnesses, will be able to give you any detailed information you may desire.

There is always a wide difference of opinion over methods of law enforcement agencies. Under any view of the matter, wide discretion must be left to officers in the field. They must act in the face of opposition and perhaps danger, and without opportunity for calm deliberation. That the agents in Detroit acted within their instructions, and exercised their discretion in good faith, seems clear to me. Under such circumstances they are entitled to my support.

I am of course anxious, as you are, that in lew enforcement we do no violence to our traditional civil liberties. I am convinced that if those liberties are generally endangered in this country it is not by the FBI.

In weighing the general attitude of the Bureau, it is important to bear in mind that every agent acts under the prohability that his conduct will be examined by shrewd lawyers for defendants, every confession may be challenged, and every act exposed in open court. The Bureau is thus under continuous and hostile examination.

Under this severe test of cases investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and prosecuted as a result of its investigations, convictions are had in 96 percent. In the years since Mr. Hoover became head of the Bureau not one case has been reversed by an appellate court because of third degree or other improper treatment of defendants. These, to me, are very impressive facts, not only by themselves but in comparison with any law enforcing body anywhere.

In an agency as large as the Federal Bureau of Investigation errors of judgment and of overzeal will from time to time occur, and criticism is helpful both to the Director and to the Attorney General in avoiding repetition. But I am confident that the more the operations of the Bureau are explored the more it will appear that its vigorous and effective work for law enforcement is conducted with a fundamental purpose to observe the rights of defendants.

Yours very truly

ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Attorney General.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, my reason for defending this organization is because I believe I owe it to the FBI to say a word in its behalf. I formerly worked for 4 years in the Department of Justice. I was not a member of the FBI but in my capacity as an attorney in that Department, I had access to the agents of this organization and their investigations were the bases quite frequently of our courses of action. I, therefore, had a long opportunity to appraise the value of what Edgar Hoover does and that for which his organization stands. I need no one to speak for me or to tell me of the FBI. I know that I can speak with authority and from experience.

I take the floor today for one purpose and that is to ask questions why one Max Lowenthal should, at this time, write a book berating Edgar Hoover and his honored institution. I further ask the question of who is paying the freight for the distribution of this book to every Member of Congress, United States attorneys, Federal judges, newspaper columnists, newspaper editors, college professors, radio commentators, and countless others holding State and local positions of authority and many philanthropic organizations. In short, it was sent to anyone who could in anywise mold or color public opinion. I do not believe the record of William Sloan & Co. is such that its philanthropies, if it has any, would permit it to make such a widespread gratis distribution. I am, therefore, constrained to say or to feel that the expense for this colossal distribution is paid for by others who do not appear on the surface.

I ask another question, What earthly good under the sun can inure to the American people either individually or collectively from this publication? What earthly good can the undermining of the FBI do at a time when the Congress has passed a subversive and anti-Communist piece of legislation which the Attorney General has at least been persuaded to, in somewise, implement pursuant to his sacred oath, despite his opposition to it. I further ask the question, How in the name of heavens can this thing help America at a time when communism is not only running rampant with its underground highways but is enjoying significant victories against the United Nations and America on the battlefields of Korea? Mr. Speaker, I believe the answer to my queries is obvious. This book can only give aid and comfort to one Joe Stalin and the puppets who are now dancing on his marionette stages throughout the world.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that V. Minayev who wrote in the New Times, Moscow, under date of February 15, 1950, entitled "J. Edgar Hoover and His G-Men" has rejoiced with his complimentary copy of this edition which I assume the Communist Party paid for and sent to him. I am sure that likewise Y. Borisov is also happy with the same article he wrote in the New Times under a similar date. His article was "The Growth of the Peace Movement."

J. EDGAR HOOVER AND HIS G-MEN

(By V. Minayev)

J. Edgar Hoover has been Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for already a quarter of a century. He is the factual head of the entire police espionage system of the United States, and is perhaps the only important American Government official who has remained uninterruptedly in one post for so long, and in such a ticklish post as that.

In 1917, after having been admitted to the bar, Hoover decided to chance his luck in the Department of Justice. Two years later he was appointed special assistant to the Attorney General.

One of his biographers sheds light on the reasons for his rapid advancement:

"While engaged in legal work, he acquired some valuable experience in counterespionage in connection with World War I, which was then in progress."

What this counterespionage work was is no secret. From 1917 to 1919 Hoover was a special agent in the Department of Justice Bureau of Investigation, which specialized in combating progressive trends. When, in 1918, the Bureau was instructed to take measures against the marked spread of radicalism, Hoover's activities attracted the attention of his superiors. He personally directed the raids on the homes and premises of individuals and organizations suspected of radical views.

Hoover was appointed special assistant to a man who contributed one of the most gloomy and bloody pages to the history of the United States—A. Mitchell Palmer, a police tyrant who was fond of calling himself the Fighting Quaker. It was Palmer who engineered the anti-Red drive of 1919–20.

In his day Palmer gained notoriety as the police dictator of America. But the chief and direct organizer of the violence and lawlessness against progressive leaders was young J. Edgar Hoover.

Napoleon referred to the famous spy Schulmeister as a man of destiny. This was Wall Street's opinion of Edgar Hoover. At the age of 26, his career was assured. He was appointed Assistant Director of the Bureau of Investigation, and very soon after was made its Director, it having by then been renamed the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or FBI.

The special agents of the FBI are known as G-men, which is short for "Government men." It is Hoover who was responsible for the appearance of the G-men in the United States. His first measure as Director of the FBI was to purge its staff. Gradually the old and very heterogeneous personnel of the Bureau, both as regards age and detective experience, was replaced by young men of a definite type, the kind usually employed by gaming dens and saloons as bouncers.

The G-men are instructed in the technicalities of man-hunting in special schools maintained by the FBI in Washington and other centers, as well as at the National Police Academy. Some of them are tutored in such arts and sciences as public speaking, psychology, and sociology. These are the men who are specially trained to fight the labor movement.

In addition to his special training as a spy, every G-man is expected to master the various arts of physical assault and the handling of every type of modern personal weapon. The American Gestapo-men are taught how to attack strikers and are initiated into the gentle arts of secret manslaughter, terrorism, and intimidation. Instruction in methods of search, detection, and apprehension holds an important place in the training of a G-man.

The special agent is the central figure in the FBI. Enormous attention is paid to his training, the fundamental purpose of which is to turn him into a man hunter and manslaughtering automaton. His guiding maxim must be the one laid down by Ignatius Loyola for the members of the Jesuit Order: he is expected to be "as obedient as a corpse."

Hoover saw to it that his thugs were given the broadest powers, or, rather, enjoyed unlimited opportunity for the commission of violence. In the thirties Congress enacted legislation considerably enlarging the powers of the FBI and its special agents. They were given permission to effect arrests and to use arms at discretion. Hoover also saw to it that his G-men were well remunerated—the special agents start with a salary of $3,200 per annum, plus operational expenses, and are guaranteed a pension after a definite length of service.

Hoover's outfit is a ramified one. Frederick L. Collins says in his book, The FBI in Peace and War, that the number of special agents on the staff of the FBI and its local branches increased from 851 in 1939 to 4,600 in 1943.

After the war the number of G-men continued rapidly to increase. It has been stated in the American press that in 1946 the FBI had 14,300 special agents.

But in addition to the special agents on its staff, the FBI has a number of agents who do not figure on its rolls. They are known as friends of the FBI, and their recruitment is organized on a wide scale throughout the country. They constitute a reserve from which G-men are drawn.

With Hoover's appearance in the FBI, the system of registration, investigation, and identification of Reds was thoroughly reorganized. He perfected and standardized it.

The bulky files and multiplicity of filing cabinets were replaced by a card-index system and mechanical methods of analysis.

In 1919 and 1920 Hoover card-indexed 500,000 Americans suspected of radicalism and dangerous thoughts. This was the first big measure in this broadly conceived program for putting the fight against progress on scientific lines. Much later the New Republic wrote in this connection:

"In that dark period Hoover compiled a list of half a million persons suspected as dangerous because of the ultra-radicalism of their economic or political beliefs or activities. The equivalent of 1 person out of every 60 families in the United States was on the list. * * * Hoover beat Heinrich Himmler by 14 years."

Hundreds of thousands of names were added every year to Hoover's files, which are known as the national security index. Before the outbreak of World War II Hoover set himself the task of keeping a secret tab on every progressive-minded American without exception. Several million names were entered in the black list. In order to reassure public opinion, Hoover had the rumor spread that the purpose of his card index was to keep a check on Fascist agents in the United States. Actually, his detective activities continued to be directed as heretofore against progressive elements.

Since the war Hoover has developed political spying to monstrous limits. Envy of Himmler's laurels gives Hoover and his masters no rest. We know that the Nazi superspy set himself the aim of not only tabbing every disaffected German, but of keeping a record of every adult inhabitant in general.

Hoover also took great pains to perfect a system of identification which is a component part of the national security index. It was he that initiated the fingerprinting of every American listed in the index. He set up a civil section of the FBI fingerprint files. Before the war the national fingerprint records already contained fingerprints of 11,000,000 Americans.

Hoover exploited the prewar and war situation for the furtherance of his program. A full-blast campaign was started to get Americans to register their fingerprints voluntarily. It was made compulsory for certain categories of citizens—Government servants, members of the Armed Forces, employees of plants working on military contracts, and persons coming under the Alien Registration Act.

On December 1, 1949, Hoover's files contained approximately 113,000,000 fingerprints. The FBI has a register of practically every adult inhabitant of the United States and is drawing up detailed individual records. The national security index and the national fingerprint records are used as weapons against the working class and the democratic movement.

We know that in America government institutions and politicians are no less addicted to self-advertisement than commercial and industrial firms. J. Edgar Hoover makes wide use of publicity. He lavishly supplies the American press with sensational stories about the work of his Bureau. Numerous books glorifying the FBI were published in the United States during the war and since. They are often furnished with a preface by Hoover himself.

The purpose of Hoover's publicity is to delude public opinion regarding the true functions of his police system. When you read the books of Floherty, Collins, or Riess or Hoover's own articles, it is quite apparent that the aim of their authors is to depict the FBI as America's salvation.

Hoover's agents feed the public with trashy detective literature designed to convince the American that both before and during the war America's counterespionage service was prompt in detecting and effectively checking the activities of Japanese and German spies. But it is well known that the FBI's inactivity allowed German and Japanese spies to operate with impunity in the United States. Hoover endeavors, by distorting facts, to persuade the American that United States national security in 1940 and 1941 was watertight, and that he, the all-seeing Hoover, and his special agents were fully up to their job.

The object of Hoover and his underlings in spreading this legend is to instill the belief that now, too, after the war, the FBI is faithfully and honestly protecting the interests of the American people. The fact of the matter is that in these postwar years Hoover and his Bureau have been engaged in a foul and despicable work on a tremendous scale, the purpose of which is to prepare the rear for a piratical aggressive war. The FBI is actually the central operations staff of the rabid campaign against everything progressive in America. Planting stool pigeons in progressive organizations, frame-ups, blackmail—all these are the common everyday weapons of the FBI.

Hoover extended his activities into foreign countries as well. In the years 1937–39 the FBI set up an espionage and sabotage network in Latin America which thrust its tentacles into every department of the government service, into political parties, and into the economies of the countries concerned. It is with the help of Hoover's agents that coups d'état, provocation, and sedition are engineered in the Latin-American countries.

Since the close of 1945, in connection with the law coordinating Federal intelligence activities abroad, the functions of Hoover's Bureau in foreign countries have been considerably curtailed. In 1947, the FBI disbanded the undercover system which it had created during the war in Latin America to counteract Japanese and German espionage. But Hoover retained the right to maintain an inspection system in each of the Latin American countries. Its function is to assist the local police in combating the labor and democratic movements. Hoover's G-men thus play the role of organizers and instructors in political detection in the Latin American countries under the tutelage of American imperialism.

The FBI is now entrusted with the job of organizing the security service (in plain words, espionage) in United States diplomatic and other missions abroad.

Apparently, the question is now being mooted of turning the FBI into an independent ministry of police. Rabble-raising Congressman RANKIN, while still a member of the Un-American Activities Committee, suggested that the FBI be taken out of the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice and made an independent government body with the right to report directly to Congress.

Measures of this kind aim at centralizing internal security and eliminating the competition between the various departments and agencies operating in this field. Hoover, who is always quick to advertise his bureau, is working hard to have all the threads concentrated in its hands. He is eager to become America's police dictator.

There is another fact worth mentioning. A United Press message from Washington in the middle of May 1949, stated that President Truman had ordered the organization of an Interdepartmental Committee on Internal Security to coordinate the work of the Federal bodies engaged in investigating subversive activity. Preparing as they are for aggressive war, America's ruling circles want to be sure of having a reliable rear, purged, with the aid of the police machine, of progressive elements.

Present-day America is police-ridden and detective-ridden. No other country is so infested with sleuths as the United States; no other people are so subjected to all-pervading prying and spying as the Americans. The monopolies have created a police state in the full meaning of the term.

Hoover's widely ramified system of snooping and informing is creating an atmosphere of terror in the United States. By boosting the almighty power of the FBI and the superlative talents of its agents, Hoover is trying to intimidate the ordinary American. The object of his spying system is to suppress all independent thinking and to make the people a pliable and submissive instrument of the imperialist ventures the American monopolies are plotting in their bid for world domination. Hoover and his machine are diligently working to create an atmosphere of fear and terror in the United States and in this they are being assisted by the monopoly-owned press and radio.

Hoover draws widely on the experience of the Nazi spying and terrorist system. But he fails to draw the chief and paramount lesson from this experience, namely, that the efforts of the Hitler-Himmler gang ended in complete and disastrous failure. Hoover's G-men are powerless to stifle the aspirations of the American masses for peace and progress.

GROWTH OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

(Review of the Journal In Defense of Peace)

(By Y. Borisov)

The permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress daily receives letters and telegrams from all parts of the world reporting the progress of the day-to-day struggle of the common people against the imperialist preparations for a new war. The scale and character of the struggle is graphically reflected in the monthly review, In Defense of Peace, published by decision of the World Congress in French, English, and Spanish. The six issues that have appeared since August 1949 mirror the progress made by the peace organization and show how the movement has gained in strength and scope. Among the journal's contributors are distinguished public leaders and noted scientists, artists, and writers of diverse countries. In its pages are to be found letters from workers and farmers, from women and young people in all parts of the world.

The journal draws general lessons from the rich experience of the peace struggle in various countries; it supports every new effective type of action and tries to make it as widely known as possible. Written in a militant and assertive spirit, the articles are an inspiration to the partisans of peace, adding vigor to their fight against the warmongers and imbuing them with unshakable confidence in the triumph of their just cause, the safeguarding of the peace and security of nations.

The journal calls for a determined struggle to stop the armaments drive in the United States and the Marshallized countries, to secure the immediate banning of the atomic weapon and the cessation of the imperialist cold war and reprisals against advocates of peace. It gives detailed information on the activities of the peace movement in the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, where the fight for peace is inseparable from the fight of the working people for the fulfillment of the national-economic plans and for socialism.

"The peoples of the Soviet Union," says the review, "have the happiness to see that their most cherished wish is one of the prime concerns of their government; the U. S. S. R.—and no one will venture to deny this—has always demanded, within the framework of its proposals to reduce armaments and conclude a pact of peace by the great powers, that the atomic bomb be banned and that atomic science be placed at the service of humanity."

The January issue contains a special article on the significance of the international Stalin peace prizes, instituted by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. in connection with J. V. Stalin's seventieth birthday.

"What an encouragement this is to all the fighters in the great battle of life against the forces of destruction and death. The institution of the international Stalin prizes is one more striking proof of the peaceable aspirations of the Soviet state, which ever since its inception has fought indefatigably for world-wide peace."

As late as November 20, 1950, there appeared an article written in Moscow and directed in English to North America entitled "Every United States Citizen Understudy at FBI." A commentary by Pablov entitled "Thought Control in the United States" is very significant.

Look, Mr. Speaker and America, what comforting words this book gives to these people to whom I have just referred. Sad indeed, significant indeed.

In addition to these, Mr. Speaker, I next call to testify on behalf of the terrific damage this book can do to the FBI articles appearing in the New York Herald Tribune. I am sure that everybody knows the New York Herald Tribune is not given to going off half-cocked. Under date of November 23, which, Mr. Speaker, as you know, was Thanksgiving Day, the above-mentioned paper wrote an editorial entitled "Smearing the FBI." It is significant indeed of the import of this book's insidious attack.

This editorial is as follows:

SMEARING THE FBI

Had the FBI been made the victim of an ordinary smear artist, the results would have been deplorable enough. The attack made by Max Lowenthal in his newly published book, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, is, however—by reason of its method and circumstances—particularly obnoxious. This lengthy volume, with its outward pretense to authoritativeness and objectivity, could easily be mistaken for a factual guide to the course of the FBI during its 42 years of existence. It is only when the text has been examined that the author's manner and aims become clear. Mr. Lowenthal has strung together an exhausting series of quotations from public records—inconclusive, tendentious and frequently out of context, designed to have the cumulative result of implying that the FBI has been ineffectual, prejudiced, concerned chiefly with notoriety for itself, and careless of the civil liberties of the citizens. The book's publication occurs at a time when the FBI's activities against Communist infiltration require—as, indeed, they merit, an unhesitating public confidence, and the whole venture of made the more disturbing by suggestions of White House encouragement.

What is the truth? The FBI under J. Edgar Hoover has been a vigilant and highly effective agency in the fields of crime over which it has jurisdiction. In the more pervasive and general assignment which the Communist conspiracy cast upon it, the FBI has been as alert as it has been fruitful in results. Throughout there has been a sharp awareness on the part of the Director of the need for a Federal policing agency to work within the rigid lines laid down by the Constitution, and within the frame of values of a free, liberty-loving people. The American Civil Liberties Union last summer wrote to Mr. Hoover congratulating him on the "fine balance" he had maintained in dealing with "the serious and intricate problem of national security in relation to civil liberties." This judgment finds no place in the pages of Mr. Lowenthal's book, but it is one that will be echoed by every impartial observer who has watched national police agencies in other countries ride roughshod over individual rights.

Americans have every reason to be proud of the FBI and thankful for the record of the man who for more than 25 years has shaped and directed its activities. It would be nothing less than a calamity if, at this crucial moment in the Nation's life, the insinuations and distortions of the Lowenthal book were to undermine Mr. Hoover's position or to cast doubt upon his work.

Again, Mr. Speaker, under date of November 22, Bert Andrews, pretty fair and respectable commentator, writing in the same paper, had this to say:

BOOK ATTACKING RECORD OF FBI BY TRUMAN FRIEND STIRS DISPUTE—MAX LOWENTHAL'S VOLUME IS EXPECTED TO RALLY J. EDGAR HOOVER'S FRIENDS IN CONGRESS

(By Bert Andrews)

WASHINGTON, November 21.—A book written by a close friend of President Truman—a book which many believe was done with the hope of destroying J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—is having many effects that are just about opposite to those designed by the author, Max Lowenthal.

The situation as it shapes up today can be disclosed on the basis of considerable research, concrete and circumstantial evidence, the application of logic and the study of another volume by another friend of President Truman, who might well say by now: "Protect me from book-writing friends!"

The situation resulting from the publication of Mr. Lowenthal's The Federal Bureau of Investigation by William Sloane Associates is this:

1. Mr. Lowenthal's book comes as a last bit of evidence which justifies bringing into the open a matter that many observers in Washington have known about for a long time. That is that President Truman has little use for Mr. Hoover and probably would have had his Attorney General oust him long since if he wasn't fully aware that a majority of the Congress would rise up in wrathful protest.

2. The volume has brought Mr. Lowenthal under prompt counterattack from congressional friends of the FBI, and this, of course, hasn't displeased the FBI. The congressional friends have brought out that Mr. Lowenthal knew Alger Hiss, convicted of perjury on charges growing out of his relationship with Whittaker Chambers, one-time courier for the Russians. The congressional friends have brought out, too, that Mr. Lowenthal associated with Lee Pressman and a long list of others who either turned out to be Communists or denied it on the ground that an admission might incriminate them.

3. The Lowenthal onslaught on Mr. Hoover is bound to bring Mr. Hoover's friends on Capitol Hill to his defense when the lame-duck session convenes on November 27 and when the Eighty-second Congress takes over on January 3 after the lame ducks limp out.

ON LOWENTHAL'S SIDE

On Mr. Lowenthal's side there are these points:

1. The critics of the FBI are hailing it a masterful presentation of the views they have always held.

2. It will be widely read and, if read alone, might well convince a reader that the FBI was a Gestapo or was trying to be one.

3. One reason it will be widely read is that more free copies have been distributed in Washington than are usually sent out. Three copies were sent to the Washington Bureau of the New York Herald Tribune, for example, where usually publishers send only one.

President Truman and his aids in the White House may—and probably will—deny that he has any intention of chopping the Hoover head off. (And nothing in this article, incidentally, is meant to suggest that the President has read or approves of the Lowenthal book.)

DANIELS BOOK CITED

However, the research supplies such point-by-point logic as the following, and supporting quotations will follow:

A. There has been talk for years that President Truman's dislike for Mr. Hoover dates back to the time the FBI took part in the investigation that led to the downfall of the late Thomas J. Pendergast, the President's original political sponsor.

B. There has been talk also that the dislike has increased over the years.

C. Jonathan Daniels, former White House adviser, in "The Man of Independence," emphasized that President Truman and Mr. Lowenthal have long been friends.

D. Mr. Daniels gave reporters the impression that President Truman had read his book in manuscript and approved of all of it.

E. This would mean that President Truman approved of the passages extolling Mr. Lowenthal and telling of their friendship.

F. Mr. Lowenthal in his book has a couple of examples of what seems to be inside dope on President Truman's feeling toward Mr. Hoover, as, for example, his statement that the President twice rejected suggestions—once in 1950 and once some years earlier—that Mr. Hoover be made the over-all head of a superintelligence agency including the FBI and the Central Intelligence Agency.

1949 PRESS CONFERENCE

G. At one press conference in June 1949, President Truman was asked if Mr. Hoover had his confidence. He replied that Mr. Hoover had done a good job. A reporter said: "You said last week that all these investigations just amounted to a lot of headline hunting. Does that include Hoover?" The President told the reporter he could assay that situation as well as the President could. He was asked if he conferred with Mr. Hoover from time to time. He replied that Mr. Hoover makes reports to him from time to time and that he conferred with him through the Attorney General.

H. Nevertheless, it is known that the President hasn't called Mr. Hoover in in a long time for a conference. This is in decided contrast to the actions of his predecessor, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, who consulted frequently with Mr. Hoover.

So, it seems:

That President Truman doesn't like Mr. Hoover and would like to see him out.

That Mr. Lowenthal certainly doesn't like Mr. Hoover and would like ditto.

The circumstantial evidence can be found in Daniels' book telling how Mr. Hoover arrived in Kansas City on April 4, 1939, how Mr. Pendergast was indicted on April 7 on insurance fraud charges, and how President Truman reacted with the words:

"Pendergast has been my friend when I needed it, I am not one to desert a ship when it starts to go down."

There is another passage—showing what a good hater President Truman can be—which observes that President Truman refused to reappoint the district attorney, Maurice Milligan, after he became President in 1945.

But the most interesting passages, in the light of the Lowenthal book, are the Daniels' discussions of the Truman-Lowenthal friendship.

Some of them follow:

Page 284 tells how a self-effacing but ubiquitous man named Max Lowenthal worked in 1936 for a Senate subcommitee investigating railroad finances and how Senator Truman became chairman of the subcommittee just as hearings about the Missouri Pacific came up.

Mr. Daniels writes:

"Max Lowenthal and other members of the staff of the subcommittee were a little disturbed about this unexpected coincidence of a Missouri railroad and a Missouri Senator. They pointed to Truman that some of the things which would come out in the investigation might embarrass him at home.

" 'No,' Truman told them. He would not be embarrassed.

" 'Then,' said Lowenthal, 'some of the lawyers told Truman that some of the exhibits were pretty hot stuff and it would be possible to just put them into the record without bringing them out in the hearing.'

" 'No,' Truman told them. 'Treat this just as you would any other hearing.'

"The messages and telephone calls, telegrams and letters began pouring in from Missouri asking him, first: to stop the hearings on the Missouri Pacific and, second: to go easy on it.

"LIKE ANY OTHER HEARING

" 'Treat this like any other hearing,' Truman told them again. Lowenthal, who had had the image of the Pendergast office boy in his mind when Truman had assumed the chairmanship, was impressed. He began to watch this Senator from Missouri. Unnoticed then, his methods in investigation were the same which made his Truman committee later so effective in the war effort. He combined the politician's ease with the public servant's determination.

" 'There were not half a dozen Senators then who would have withstood the pressure he took,' Lowenthal said.

"Casually one day, but with the secret feeling of a man offering a well-earned accolade, Lowenthal suggested to Truman that he would like to take him to see his friend Justice Louis D. Brandeis. Brandeis was over 80 then and had become, with Oliver Wendell Holmes, one of the two great judges of the American liberal tradition. Brandeis' California Street apartment had become a Washington institution when Lowenthal invited Truman to go with him there. Truman regarded him very seriously.

" 'I'm not used to meeting people like that,' he said.

"It was true. Most of his growth and studying had been free from great intellectual companionship, as his voracious reading as a small-town boy had been largely self-directed.

"After his first meeting with Brandeis, he went often to California Street, almost every other week, to the open houses which the Justice held for his selected friends."

FRIENDSHIP CONTINUES

The Truman-Lowenthal friendship continued over the years.

Mr. Daniels writes of 1944:

"His new stature as chairman of the Truman committee suggested him to some as a solution to them. His friend Lowenthal had been one of those strongly urging him to run for the Vice Presidency. And on one of the last Sundays before the convention in Chicago he called Truman's secretary, Bill Boyle, about it.

"Lowenthal went up to the Senate Office Building to see Truman. They talked in the Sunday quietness of that huge building.

"Truman said he had talked it over with the Mrs. and had decided not to be a candidate. Also, he had a daughter and the White House was no place for children.

"That statement suggests that there was a time before the convention when Truman was thinking and thinking hard about the nomination. The statement Lowenthal remembers about the child and the White House emphasizes the current political calculation that the Democratic Vice Presidential nominee that year would probably become President of the United States.

" 'He drove me home,' Lowenthal said. 'We stopped at his apartment on Irving Street to get his bags, then he dropped me at my house in Chevy Chase.'

"Somewhere along the way Truman told Lowenthal that he was too poor to think about running. And he used an earthy American expression about the lack of both a pot and a window. Lowenthal was still arguing, reluctant to agree, when he got out of the car at his own house."

The Daniels' description of the Truman-Lowenthal friendship is cited at length because of a passage in Mr. Lowenthal's book, in which he says President Truman twice rejected the suggestions that Mr. Hoover be made the top, over-all head of espionage and counterespionage.

This was not general knowledge at the times Mr. Lowenthal lists.

This reporter has learned that the suggestions came from the Military Establishment and that President Truman would have none of them. Mr. Lowenthal, after noting that Congress voted Mr. Hoover a salary raise and praised him, goes on to say:

"There are some indications, however, that the views * * * are not universally held by Americans interested in effective counterespionage. President Truman, when he set up the CIA (Central Intelligence Agency) as a new espionage and counterespionage organization, disregarded suggestions that Mr. Hoover himself should become the head of any such super-intelligence organization. In 1950, when the President made a new appointment to the post, he again disregarded the suggestions that Mr. Hoover be promoted to that position. Indeed, when the President created the CIA, he went further and withdrew from the FBI the authority it had possessed for 7 years in counterespionage work throughout Central and South America."

LAW ENFORCEMENT REPORT

Mr. Lowenthal makes much of the fact that a Senate committee of which Mr. Truman was a member issued a report on law enforcement which while specifically stating that its charges were directed against the FBI, acknowledged that it was aimed at "that police unit."

Mr. Lowenthal a number of times uses quotes of President Truman to criticize quotes of Mr. Hoover, as for example:

"In May 1950, Mr. Hoover described the Communists as the most dangerous and one of the most powerful forces in the United States.

"But some informed authorities believe otherwise today, as in the past. In 1950, President Truman gave his opinion, 'we know that the greatest threat to us does not come from the Communists in this country. Communism has little appeal for people who are healthy, well educated, prosperous, and free. The fact of the matter is—because of the measures we are taking—the internal security of the United States is not seriously threatened by the Communists in this country.' "

To sum up the Lowenthal-FBI feud:

Mr. Lowenthal has started quite a free-for-all.

The FBI, while officially making no comment, is fighting back through its friends on Capitol Hill. One example of this came when Congressmen circulated a House Committee on Un-American Activities report of testimony taken from Mr. Lowenthal on September 15. The committee showed much interest in Mr. Lowenthal's associations with many men who have been labeled as Communists or fellow travelers by witnesses before the committee.

LOWENTHAL TESTIMONY

Mr. Lowenthal showed much interest in pointing out that he had done extensive work for the Government and in stating:

"In the course of 38 years I have met tens of thousands of people, and worked with them, too. I have dealt with many organizations. I think if you take it in proportion to the sum total of what I have been engaged in, all these questions, even if the answer was 'yes,' to them, wouldn't amount to a hill of beans in proportion."

One Washington opinion of the Lowenthal book was voiced by Rex Collier, in the Evening Star. It noted that the publisher, William Sloane Associates, Inc., of New York, said the book with its "unbased and profoundly conservative approach" would lead "to some startling conclusions." Mr. Collier said: "One conclusion of this reviewer is that this is the most nonobjective object or book on the FBI ever published."

John Keats, in the Washington Daily News, noted that no one can ever do an inside job on the working of the FBI, because the FBI won't yield the necessary information.

Mr. Keats added:

"No evil can come from the public's critical examination of the country's Federal police, if it is done thoughtfully and objectively. This book starts the discussion. This country has been singularly free from activities of secret police. The time is probably now to find out whether it needs more or less of this commodity, and how to check its activities in terms of our budget as well as our political philosophy."

All in all, it's quite a "rhubarb."

In the Washington Star, under date of November 20, Rex Collier had an article entitled "The FBI: How 'Objective' Can You Get?" It reads as follows:

THE FBI—HOW OBJECTIVE CAN YOU GET?

(By Rex Collier)

An interesting book is off the press today. The author is Max Lowenthal—his subject, the FBI. It is, I say, an interesting book. But it is not a good one.

The title of the book is printed plainly on the cover: "The Federal Bureau of Investigation." However, the contents of this so-called objective volume are apt to have the average reader quite confused. He will find it hard to believe that Mr. Lowenthal really was writing about the FBI, that has its headquarters at Ninth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue—the agency that has gained so much fame for its war on gangsters, spies, and saboteurs.

This is a different, a strange FBI that Lawyer Lowenthal, a long-time critic of the Bureau, describes: "This unbiased and profoundly conservative approach" to the FBI, says the publisher, William Sloane Associates, Inc., of New York, "will lead to some startling conclusions." One conclusion of this reviewer is that this is the most nonobjective objective book on the FBI ever published.

In his search for material Mr. Lowenthal has dug into FBI history as far back as 1917. He has come up with considerable dirt, for in those early days the Bureau's record was far from clean. The first 27 chapters of the book are based on things that happened in the old Bureau of Investigation before J. Edgar Hoover became its Director. Mr. Lowenthal is still indignant over the radical raids staged by A. Mitchell Palmer over 30 years ago. The Bureau of Investigation, as it then was known, was headed by William J. Flynn. The young Mr. Hoover, just out of George Washington University Law School, was a special assistant to the Attorney General. By a process of "guilt by association," the book gives the impression that

Mr. Hoover almost single-handedly planned, organized, and directed the raids. This, of course, is nonsense.

As a matter of fact, these much-criticized raids were thoroughly investigated by the Senate Judiciary Committee without damage to Mr. Hoover's reputation. Mr. Hoover himself repeatedly has criticized the witch-hunt methods used in the forays. And perhaps the best evidence of Mr. Hoover's innocence of blame was his selection afterward by Attorney General Harlan Stone (later Chief Justice of the Supreme Court) to subject the Bureau to a sweeping reorganization.

The late Mr. Stone was one of the first persons publicly to denounce the Palmer raids. He would hardly have chosen Mr. Hoover to clean house if he had believed him in any degree responsible for the Bureau's tactics.

As one goes on through suceeding chapters, it becomes evident that Mr. Lowenthal has been busy with his shears for many years. In no other way could he conceivably have collected all the newspaper and magazine clippings critical of Mr. Hoover and the FBI included in this veritable scrapbook. Apparently nothing of derogatory import that has been printed about the FBI since World War I has escaped his eye. In his own objective way, he has included virtually nothing that could be considered laudatory.

Thus, he devotes considerable space to criticism by the late Senator Norris of an FBI roundup in Detroit of persons indicted for recruiting men for armed services abroad, viz, the Spanish Loyalist cause. Not to be found in the book, however, is a letter to Senator Norris from Robert H. Jackson, now a Supreme Court Justice and then the Attorney General, stating that a careful investigation had shown that the agents in Detroit acted within their instructions and exercised their discretion in good faith. Mr. Jackson added: "I am, of course, anxious, as you are, that in law enforcement we do no violence to our traditional civil liberties. I am convinced that if those liberties are generally endangered in this country, it is not by the FBI."

Mr. Lowenthal indicates his disapproval of FBI activities in white slavery, automobile theft, bank robbery, and kidnaping cases. He does not explain how the agency can avoid handling these cases in view of the acts of Congress requiring the Bureau to do so. He cites the FBI's publication, Uniform Crime Reports, as providing proof that crime is on the increase in this country, despite the FBI. He neglects to point out that the crimes reported in this periodic bulletin are "offenses reported by police," hence purely local crimes over which the FBI has no jurisdiction. He might have added (but did not) that white slavery, kidnaping, and bank robbery were brought under control only after Congress projected the Bureau into those fields. And spies, too, have developed a healthy respect for the Bureau.

Under the heading "Investigation of beliefs," Mr. Lowenthal rehashes all that has been said in opposition to the President's loyalty program, quoting liberally from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, newspapers, and other sources. But no mention is made of the fact that the fears of "witch-hunt hysteria" expressed by most of the program's early opponents have failed to materialize. He takes cracks at the Bureau's wire tappers, its informers within the Communist Party, its secret files, and nearly everything else connected with the Bureau's policies and activities.

There is a lot more of this sort of "unbiased and profoundly conservative approach" to an appraisal of the FBI, but the foregoing gives a general idea of what purchasers of the book ($4.50) may expect. Certainly this is not the kind of constructive criticism which Attorney General Jackson had in mind when he wrote Senator Norris: "In an agency as large as the FBI errors of judgment and of overzeal will from time to time occur, and criticism is helpful both to the Director and to the Attorney General in avoiding repetition. But I am confident that the more the operations of the Bureau are explored, the more it will appear that its vigorous and effective work for law enforcement is conducted with a fundamental purpose to observe the rights of defendants."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like further to insert for the edification of the Congress and American people articles by Walter Winchell, a fairly well-known commentator, and Fulton Lewis, another well-known commentator, on this book by Lowenthal. Is it not strange, Mr. Speaker, that we should find Walter Winchell and Fulton Lewis in the same bed on this subject. I say it is not strange, Mr. Speaker, because both of these men have fought for the rights of individuals and have defended the institutions of this Nation.

I will say this for these gentlemen: I have differed on many occasions with Mr. Winchell and on many occasions with Mr. Fulton Lewis, but I do not believe it can be said of them that they are afraid to propound and defend their positions. They have been consistent in defending the institutions of which the FBI has been in favor, and they have upheld the hand of J. Edgar Hoover. It is not funny or unusual that they should come to the aid of that great organization and the great leader who towers so high in this Nation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

The articles I have referred to are as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of November 24, 1950]

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

MEN, MOTIVES AND MORAL

Two publications of national interest appeared this week. The first was a so-called objective study of the FBI by Max Lowenthal, which to this writer is nothing more nor less than a vicious one-sided attack on J. Edgar Hoover. The other publication is the official record of the testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, of Lee Pressman, Nathan Witt, Charles Kramer, John J. Abt, and the same Max Lowenthal. Pressman admitted he had been a Communist and named Abt, Kramer, and Witt as members of his commy cell. Witt, Abt, and Kramer declined to testify on the constitutional grounds that it would tend to incriminate and degrade them. Lowenthal, whose testimony appears last, admitted he knew all four men, plus Alger Hiss, but denied he was a Communist.

Lowenthal's book relies heavily on selected statements about the FBI, many in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The cover jacket states the book is objective. However, it fails to note that Lowenthal himself has been vigorously attacked in these words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 1, 1950: "His skill and technique are unparalleled. He does his work, lusts and thrives on obscurity. He knows he could never accomplish what he has in the open. Americans do not like his ilk, and once his shroud of mystery is penetrated, he knows his usefulness is at an end. Doors that once opened to him will be closed because no good American would care to be contaminated by his known presence. I have named this man in passing before. Today I bring him into the open and introduce Max Lowenthal. Like the Communist Party whose cause he has served so well, he operates on two levels. One is seemingly respectable; the other completely underground."

Obviously, if Max Lowenthal believes the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is part of an objective study of J. Edgar Hoover, the jacket of his book—to be objective—ought to set forth what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains about Max Lowenthal.

Congressman DONDERO further stated: "Lowenthal's record is one of attack on any American institution which stands 4-square for the American way of life. He has attacked railroads, banks, and the thoroughly fine American institution of B'nai B'rith as 'bourgeois organization.' Even the cause of liberalism has felt his vengeance." * * * If the FBI is also considered an American institution, then Lowenthal has spared no names, however hallowed, in his attack. Cleverly, he does not make the charges himself. Following is a sample of his devious technique on the memory of President Theodore Roosevelt. Lowenthal says: "Newspaper articles appear, disclosing the fact that dossiers had been assembled for President Theodore Roosevelt containing information about the personal affairs of various Congressmen active in the campaign to investigate the Federal detectives. News accounts conveyed the President's intention to publicize this collection, if the congressional investigation of Federal secret police were carried to the lengths of provoking him."

To this writer, that is an objectionable—and not an objective charge—that President Theodore Roosevelt was a criminal blackmailer. It comes, it must be objectively noted, from Max Lowenthal, whose own loyalty to his country has been challenged on the floor of Congress. It should also be objectively noted that even Theodore Roosevelt's bitterest opponents called him a great American.

For the FBI to be an enduring and growing conspiracy since 1908 the Attorneys General of the United States must have been part of it. At any rate, Lowenthal lists them at the beginning of his book. By any objective standard, they are an honor roll of the American bar. Republicans and Democrafts, Protestants and Catholic, rich and poor, conservative and liberal, they are a cross section of some of the most distinguished names in American history.

Five of them, for example, went to the United States Supreme Court. Most Americans will be revolted by an inference that conservative Republican George Wickersham, conservative southern Democrat James McReynolds, New England's great Harlan Stone, and Michigan's Frank Murphy as Attorneys General, either didn't know what was going on or were part of the same expanding conspiracy. The records show, for instance, that Supreme Court Justice Frank Murphy, practically the American apostle of civil rights—fought as Attorney General for a double budget for the FBI. To this writer, Max Lowenthal's book virtually and idiotically charges that all these great Americans remained quiescent or actively helped the growth of a great conspiracy against the American people.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may throw some light on the reasons Lowenthal wrote the book. At least Congressman DONDERO's opinion deserves mention. From the RECORD of September 1, 1950: "In the thirties, Lowenthal concentrated upon weakening our internal security by aiding an all-out Communist attack against the Federal Bureau of Investigation in 1940. Lowenthal sent out anonymous memorandums, smearing the FBI, which fact can be attested to by many Washington newsmen, hoping to head off the FBI in its fight to protect our shores against the menace of communism and fascism at a time when the Nazis and Communists were

allies. Lowenthal has worked diligently and deviously, but always relentlessly, to destroy the effectiveness of the FBI in its efforts to protect our country from the emissaries of godless communism. He has always realized the FBI is the one agency he could not penetrate or intimidate. He has long known it was one agency which blocked his efforts to completely undermine our internal security."

So, along with 7 Presidents and 15 Attorneys General of the United States, J. Edgar Hoover must consider himself as accused by inference of either allowing, permitting or furthering the growth of the FBI at the expense of the liberties of the American people. Objective history appears to be strongly on the side of the statesmen, and not Max Lowenthal.

It is probable that all Congressmen do not share Congressman DONDERO's drastic opinion that no good American would care to be contaminated by Lowenthal's known presence. But a certain typical, very dry American skepticism of Lowenthal appears from the record of his testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee. The testimony: Mr. Lowenthal: "The number of people that I didn't know were members of the Communist Party is something that sometimes makes my hair stand on end." Mr. RUSSELL: "Ours, too."

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of November 20, 1950]

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

President Truman has a close personal friend and adviser who is credited with great influence in and around the White House. In fact, Jonathan Daniels, in his recent book, The Man of Independence, described this Presidential intimate as having influenced Mr. Truman's liberal thinking more than any other American.

The man is Max Lowenthal, and his intimacy with the President is reason enough to take a look at him. But there is another reason, just as good, which we can work on today.

Lowenthal has written a book about the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It reveals a life-long concentration of distaste for the FBI that has, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 1, 1950, cropped out a time or two prior to this recent writing effort.

In the 1930's, the record reveals, Lowenthal directed another attack against the Bureau; in 1940, the same record discloses, he sent out to Washington newsmen an anonymous memorandum "smearing" the FBI.

Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO (Republican), of Michigan, regards Lowenthal as a man of mystery, and as a man dedicated to "clever, diabolical scheming to undermine our national security." He so characterized him on the floor of the House.

A graduate of Harvard University, Lowenthal is a close friend of Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurther, the character witness for Alger Hiss. He also has been trotting around with a number of others with interesting records, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reveals.

Lowenthal was a member of the national committee of the Communist-dominated International Jurisdictional Association, along with Lee Pressman, who recently admitted Communist Party membership.

In the same organization, he also was associated with such persons as the late Joseph Brodsky, former attorney for the Communist Party; Shad Polier, a friend of Alger Hiss; Nathan Witt, named by Pressman as another former Communist; Abraham Isserman, who was cited for contempt during the New York trial of the 11 Communist leaders; and similarly assorted characters.

He was a member of the National Lawyers Guild, which recently was labeled Communist controlled by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Even more recently he was a backstage manager of the fight to prevent passage of the McCarran-Mundt-Nixon law.

He also was listed as one of the endorsers of the conference of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, cited by the Attorney General as subversive.

Among Lowenthal's other friends is Carol Weiss King, consistent spokesman for and defender of Reds headed for jail. She once was a law clerk in Lowenthal's office. He also on various occasions has worked in close conjunction with Thomas I. Emerson, Yale law school professor and president of the National Lawyers Guild; Abe Fortas, a friend of Owen Lattimore; and Charles Kramer and David Wahl, both of whom have been accused of having been Communists.

Lowenthal has had some other interesting characters working around him at one time or another. One of the most noted is George Wheeler, the turn-coat citizen who not long ago denounced the United States and fled to Communist Germany, where he issued communiques castigating America.

Wheeler was one of Lowenthal's assistants in Germany when the latter was assigned there as an advisor to Gen. Lucius Clay.

Mr. Truman's pet advisor has another friend, Al Bernstein, an official of the United Public Workers of America. DONDERO, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, says that Bernstein is known to be a secret member of the Communist Party. Bernstein worked for Lowenthal at one time.

Few people have ever seen Lowenthal's picture, although in fairness it should be pointed out that he doesn't skulk down alleys when traveling between New York and Washington.

He has just never been in the limelight for one reason or another, and is seldom seen at Washington cocktail parties.

He was born in Minneapolis, Minn., and after graduation from Harvard law school had a series of jobs in law offices in New York before migrating to Washington in 1917.

Just what point there is in Lowenthal's dislike for the FBI is a bit moot at the moment. His book is not a blood-and-thunder recital of FBI cases, but a dull documentation instead.

It is heavy going, the type that usually winds up in libraries on the reference book shelves.

Maybe that is just where he wants it to go; then it will be a source of information for the young minds of America.

[From the New York Journal-American of November 22, 1950]

WASHINGTON REPORT

THE SIMILARITIES BETWEEN TWO BOOKS

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, November 22.—There is a remarkable similarity between two recent books attacking the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The most recent, written by the President's adviser on liberal thinking, Max Lowenthal, has numerous passages containing source material that has appeared in an earlier book by Albert E. Kahn.

In the past day or so we have taken a good look at Lowenthal, so let's examine Kahn's background.

Offhand, Kahn has been cited as being a member of seven organizations, characterized as subversive by Government agencies, more organizations labeled as Communist fronts than are worth counting, and has opposed the jailing of the 11 Communist Party leaders convicted of attempting to overthrow the Government by force and violence.

He is on record as demanding the release of Leon Josephson, a notorious Soviet lover and jailbird, who got there for sassing the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Kahn's latest errand on behalf of the Communist Party was with the World Peace Conference. He was elected to the permanent committee of this Kremlin adjunct in Paris, where he told the assembled Soviet lovers that American clergymen were solidly behind them.

Lowenthal's book was published by the William Sloane Associates, Inc. On the cover the author is described as a conservative in the most profound sense, which runs counter to another Presidential intimate, Jonathan Daniels. Daniels describes Lowenthal as the man more responsible for Mr. Truman's liberal thinking than any other American.

Nobody would ever suspect Kahn of being a conservative. So let's compare him to the publisher's version of one.

On page 8 and elsewhere in Kahn's book, High Treason—the Plot Against the People, he quotes from the report of the Inter-Church World Government which was critical of the Department of Justice roundup of Communists in 1920.

Lowenthal, in his first 250 pages, does likewise.

On pages 11 and 16, Kahn blames FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover for the roundup of Reds, and goes into critical detail regarding the Department of Justice General Intelligence Division. Lowenthal devotes chapters on end to this ancient situation.

Kahn, on page 18 of his book, quotes FBI Director Hoover regarding the roundup of the Reds. On page 173, Lowenthal uses almost an identical quote.

Another almost identical quotation appears in Kahn's book on page 18, Lowenthal's on page 238.

On page 20, Kahn goes into detail in accusing agents of acting as "inquisitors" in the trials of the Communists. Lowenthal, on page 217, blasts the FBI on the same count and almost in the same language.

Both Kahn and Lowenthal discuss a jail in Hartford, Conn., and a Federal building in Detroit, Mich. In Kahn's book the references are on pages 20, 21, and 22. In Lowenthal's, on pages 201 and 208.

Deer Island, where one Communist committed suicide and one was adjudged insane, is mentioned in both books in exact detail. Lowenthal gets around to it on page 207, Kahn on page 23.

William Sloane Associates, Inc., make a point of the fact that Lowenthal quotes FBI's defenders in his book, "including, of course, J. Edgar Hoover." That sounds fine and dandy. But Lowenthal has yet to talk to Hoover, visit the FBI, or request research data from the Bureau. I know. I asked the FBI if they had ever seen anybody resembling Lowenthal around the place. A Bureau spokesman said "No."

[From the New York Journal-American of November 21, 1950]

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, November 21.—Max Lowenthal, one of President Truman's ace instructors in liberal thinking, considers the Federal Bureau of Investigation a waste of taxpayers' money and a detriment to the welfare of the United States of America.

In his new book on the FBI, Lowenthal expresses these views in chapter after chapter, and in one instance goes back 30 years to gripe about J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI.

In 1920 the Justice Department ordered a round-up of Communist and other illegal aliens in the United States for the purpose of instituting deportation proceedings. This

event, known as the Palmer raids, is described in detail in a book by Louis F. Post. Lowenthal quotes at length from the Post opus and in the process virtually blames Hoover for the whole thing.

One thing of interest to note here is that Hoover was then in his twenties and was doing administrative work in the Justice Department. The FBI was only a gleam in his eye at that time. In addition, Hoover had nothing to do with ordering the Palmer raids, and Post, the one historian who did know the story, never even listed Hoover's name in the index of his book. But Lowenthal cites the arrests as another example of how, in his opinion, the FBI and Hoover are a threat to our liberties.

The Lowenthal book is published by William Sloane Associates, Inc., of New York. On the flyleaf of the cover Lowenthal is described as a conservative who does not editorialize or draw conclusions carelessly.

Lowenthal's career is sprinkled with associates who are anything but conservative. As for conclusions, he blames the FBI for running a police state, and then immediately bawls out Hoover for not catching enough atom spies.

On the record, Hoover's agents followed a spy trail that was 4 years old in order to haul into court the Americans who worked with Klaus Fuchs. Fuchs would never have happened if the British Secret Service had been on the ball. As it was, the FBI and Canadian agents handed the first tip on Fuchs to the British.

Scoffing at FBI detection methods, Lowenthal indicates that the only reason G-men ever broke a pre-Pearl Harbor spy ring was that a German agent had the bad luck to be involved in a traffic accident in New York.

The truth of the matter is that German agents in the Ludwig ring had been under FBI surveillance for months. The first tip came to the FBI not as a result of the traffic accident, but via a British censor who intercepted a letter that did not read right. He turned it over to the FBI and it was put through the wringer. Invisible ink writing, calling for data on shipments to England, set the FBI counterespionage experts in operation.

All of this is a matter of record in the court where the Germans were convicted, but Lowenthal missed it in his research.

Lowenthal quotes former Senator Carl Hatch, Democrat, of New Mexico, to bolster his argument that the FBI, as it now operates, is a threat to our welfare. He quotes Hatch as saying:

"Granting everything I say about the ability with which Mr. Hoover has conducted the FBI, every one of us knows that it is a very great power he now exercises. Senators would further broaden that arbitrary power—giving control to the police just as the people of Czechoslovakia did in their poor country."

What he could have added, but did not, is another Hatch quote:

"I want, again, as I did the other day, to commend Mr. Hoover himself for the attitude he has taken on this and other matters, and for his very efficient administration of the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Lowenthal accuses the FBI of lying to a Federal judge about wire tapping in the Coplon case. This should be news to the judge. The facts on record are that on January 20, 1950, the Federal judge presiding in the case stated publicly that the FBI had independent proof of the spying activities of Judith Coplon and her Soviet playmate which had not been obtained by wire taps.

The fact is, also, that it is legal to tap wires when the Attorney General orders it done. The only restriction is that the evidence obtained must not be used in court.

In this, as a further testimonial to the integrity of Edgar Hoover, Mr. Speaker, I insert lastly an excerpt from an article by Morris L. Ernst entitled "Why I No Longer Fear the FBI":

WHY I NO LONGER FEAR THE FBI

(By Morris L. Ernst)

I still remember my start of surprise when I read in the paper one morning in 1939 that J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, had asked the United States Attorney General not to endorse a law that would legalize a free use of wire tapping. Why was Mr. Hoover opposing a law which would make his own work much easier? His own words, published soon afterward, gave me the answer: "I do not wish to be the head of an organization of potential blackmailers."

I had been hearing criticisms that the FBI was made up of witch-hunters hounding loyal citizens out of their jobs on the flimsiest sort of rumor; that they tapped telephone wires indiscriminately, learning everybody's private business.

Ever since I read that newspaper item I have been studying the FBI. I would like to record here what I have learned.

As a liberal with a long record of aggressive fighting for the preservation of personal liberties, I am inclined to view all law-enforcement officers with a wary eye. And not without reason: too many times they break the law in the performance of their duties.

I grew up in New York where there was often a wanton disregard for the rights and dignity of human beings. Large numbers of newcomers to American freedom let the cops bulldoze them. In their native lands they had been used to police brutalities, and in their new home they did not know that the laws protected them.

Such disregard of individual rights, expanded on a national scale, seemed to me a positive danger, for national police have almost invariably abused their power. It was therefore utterly confounding to me to discover that our Federal police agency was doing its work with a fervid insistence on respecting the rights and privileges of individuals.

When a skeptical person like myself reads that of all the trials in which the FBI was involved last year 97 percent ended in convictions, he is likely to have cynical reservations, and when he learns that 94 percent of the convictions were based on pleas of guilty, he is bound to ask: "How were these confessions obtained?"

Nazi and Communist courts have taught us that a plea of guilty may prove nothing more than that a man's will can be broken. One rarely hears such charges against the FBI. In our courts of appeal—where accusations are heard of unfair treatment and violations of constitutional rights — the charge is almost never raised against the FBI.

However, I did not rely on this indication alone, nor even on my study of case reports. I wrote articles in which I asked readers to send me any evidence they might have that the FBI had violated a person's constitutional rights. My scoreboard shows a remarkable absence of such accusations. On the contrary, all the evidence indicates that the FBI as a matter of unvarying policy has played fair with criminals and suspects.

This record is of profound importance because events in recent years have brought the FBI into quasi-political problems. Here the danger to personal liberties could easily become acute. The necessity for inquiring into political activities and associations is a new thing in our country. We began this Nation with a great gamble in our hearts—the conviction that, if all opposing viewpoints were allowed free expression, truth in the end would win out.

The progress of our country has so far justified our forefathers' faith in the potency of truth. But in the last 20 years a new enemy—and a complex problem—has arisen to confuse us. New political movements, by underhanded methods, seek to bypass the honest competition of ideas. We face an invisible underground where Fascists and Communists work furtively and zealously against our freedom and our ideas of decency.

Something had to be done about that, and the FBI had to do it. What was its task? To bring the facts up from underground so that all the people can know what is being plotted.

It is natural that loyalty investigations should give us qualms. We shudder to authorize wire tapping and other forms of spying. But they seem necessary if we are to preserve our freedom. They have been forced upon us by the underground.

I am unwilling to ignore the danger of the Communist movement in the United States just because the Reds seem few in number. I saw my friend Jan Masaryk, Czechoslovakia's democratic Foreign Minister, in Prague not long before he came to his end. I know intimately the story of Quisling. I know how helpless democratic forces can be, if they do not protect their people against the secret discipline, the abominably careful scheming of totalitarian minorities.

The Communists could never win an election in the United States. They do not expect to do so. The Communist program, like the Ku Klux Klan, can grow only by stealth in dark cellars. J. Edgar Hoover was right when he stood firmly against a plan to outlaw the Communist Party when the first public outcry was made against the Communists. Why drive more of them underground? All that such an act could ever outlaw would be a name. The next day the same revolutionists would turn up under a new title.

Until Congress is wise enough to pass laws which force open operation of all mass movements, we shall have to protect ourselves against secretly organized attack. We can bring all subversive outfits into the open by requiring all mass movements to report to the Government the essential facts about themselves—the names of all their officials, the money they take in, and from whom it comes, and how it is spent.

I suggest that the McCarran bill recently passed by Congress will not work because the Communists will either put their organizations underground or abandon them to start other organizations for the same purposes under other names.

The requirement to disclose essential facts is no invasion of privacy. The President's Committee on Civil Rights unanimously recommended that such laws be passed; represented on the committee are members of the A. F. of L., the CIO, and various minority groups. No decent organization hesitates to identify itself; why should any other kind of organization be protected?

Even without such laws, the FBI has handled delicate problems well. On Pearl Harbor Day the Bureau was able to advise the Attorney General of the basis for authorizing the arrest of some 16,000 persons. A few of the 16,000 became my clients. I defended them before hearing boards and was able to help free some of them. In every case there were fair hearings, with every consideration being shown to the defense.

And although I was the lawyer for certain acquitted suspects, I must admit that Mr. Hoover had a justification in picking up my clients; there was cause for suspicion, and no injustice was done.

One Jewish refugee was picked up because she had entertained one of Hitler's most potent underground spies. But it was easy for me to produce conclusive evidence that my client did not know her guest was a Nazi. She was set free—but the authorities had been right to bring her in for questioning.

Largely as a result of the trials of Judith Coplon and Valentin Gubitchev, there has been publicity and much argument about listening in, but both sides seem to overlook the real purpose of FBI wire tapping and its actual extent.

One of the greatest liberals said in 1941: "I do not believe it [wire tapping] should be used to prevent domestic crimes, with possibly one exception—kidnaping and extortion in the Federal sense. There is, however, one field in which, given the conditions in the world today, wire tapping is very much in the public interest. This Nation is arming for national defense. It is the duty of our people to take every step to protect themselves. I have no compunction in saying that wire tapping should be used against those persons, not citizens of the United States, and those few citizens who are traitors to their country, who today are engaged in espionage or sabotage against the United States."

This statement was made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. In fact he established the policy which has since been adhered to by the Attorneys General. Note, however, that FBI agents never undertake wire tapping on their own authority; permission must first be obtained from the Attorney General. Furthermore, wire-tapping evidence cannot be used in Federal courts. Its only value to the FBI is in opening up leads for inquiry.

The loyalty-investigation program has created a misconception about the FBI's function. Every American should understand that the FBI does not try Government employees. It merely serves various Government bodies as a reporting agency. When a reporting agency has the power to edit, it can make anyone appear a devil or a hero. But the FBI does not edit. It gathers the facts about a Federal employee and turns over its findings to the head of the department. And that is all it does, or can do, except that it frequently is able to save a suspect in his job when rumor is doing its best to get him fired. J Edgar Hoover cannot fire a single person. His reports do not even contain recommendations. The FBI turns in all the evidence it finds—including unverified tips, rumors, gossip—everything. It adds comments and evaluation of their accuracy, and there its responsibility ends. It is up to the heads of administrative agencies to act.

It would be folly to ignore rumors, or even anonymous messages; an unsigned note was instrumental in sending the notorious General Myers[1] to prison. Ditto for thousands of less spectacular examples. To abandon that policy would be to assign to Hoover's assistants the duty, and the power, to screen the reports. I should be very much disturbed if police agents were permitted to withhold evidence on their judgment of its value. Far better the present system: the complete reports go to the responsible official; everything is in the dossier, with a careful comment on each item, whether it is a fact, probability, or rumor.

In my study of the FBI it soon became clear that lies were being spread against it. For example, it has been said and printed repeatedly that agents in loyalty investigations demand to know whether a suspect reads certain magazines of leftist tinge. This charge is a lie. Whenever he hears of the statement being made, Hoover calls for the facts—and invariably everybody backs down. They heard it somewhere, they can't remember where. Directives to FBI agents specifically forbid such questions, unless the reading matter is published by the Communist Party.

Of course, some agents may blunder or offend. When that happens, write J. Edgar Hoover. He will see your complaint and it will be gone into thoroughly. I have personally checked about 100 such complaints and I have yet to find one piece of evidence of improper questioning by agents.

The real difficulty in loyalty investigations is that there is almost no way of proving that a person is a Communist. The suspect, if a party member, would deny it. Communist doctrine holds that it is right and proper to lie and cheat. This fact makes new techniques necessary. Yet, in spite of alarms and outcries, nothing oppressive has been done.

It surprised me to learn that of 2,873,180 employees whose records were examined by the FBI all but 12,825 were promptly cleared. This minority being further investigated, only 230 employees were finally dismissed. In 163 cases the employees appealed and were given their jobs back. One significant factor must be noted—1,474 resigned before their cases came up. Actually, the FBI is now being criticized for not having found as many subversives as it should have.

A real "smear" campaign has been carried on against Hoover's work. Those who feared the Bureau—as I once did—will be glad to know the facts. The FBI is unique in the history of national police. It has a magnificent record of respect for individual freedom. It invites documented complaints against its agents. It has zealously tried to prevent itself from violating the democratic process.

Among liberals I am by no means alone in this opinion. A while ago Roger Baldwin, formerly director of the American Civil Liberties Union, wrote to J. Edgar Hoover:

"It seems to me that your Bureau has accomplished an exceedingly difficult task with rare judicial sense."

For me, that sums up the record.

It is also interesting to note what that distinguished Washington columnist, George Dixon, has to say about his research in an effort to find out who is paying for the distribution of this masterpiece of libel. I enclose George Dixon's excerpt:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of November 29, 1950]

WASHINGTON SCENE

(By George Dixon)

A strange little creature, with an even stranger history of associations and affiliations, has written a 559-page book attacking the FBI.

This peculiar little fellow, Max Lowenthal, is described on the jacket as "a lawyer with a long and distinguished record in both private practice and Government service."

He is distinguished all right in that he has the distinction of having been summoned before the House Committee on Un-American Activities with such distinctive you-know-whats as Nathan Witt, Lee Pressman, Charles Kramer, John J. Abt, and company.

But I couldn't find anybody around the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of which he writes so exhaustively, who would admit knowing him.

Director J. Edgar Hoover said he could recall only having met him casually a couple of times. Associate Director Clyde Tolson said he couldn't remember having met Lowenthal at all.

Now this book, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, is a tiresome and tedious thing. It seems to drag on endlessly with so-called documentation; debates in Senate and House; transcripts of long and soporific hearings; reports of congressional committees, and long-winded letters.

After a while you get the impression that every letter this little character ever received from anybody with a name has been worked into the volume.

The book is vicious in its attack on the FBI, but I don't think it was ever intended for general public consumption. It is too dreary for that. The average reader couldn't keep awake long enough to get anything out of it.

The fact that official Washington has been flooded with free copies of this volume would also seem to call for some explanation. With few exceptions, every Member of the House and Senate—435 Representatives, 96 Senators—has received a free copy as well as nearly all the top administration bureaucrats and most of the Federal judges.

The book retails for $4.50, which would seem to make this free list a pretty expensive operation. I phoned the publishers, William Sloane Associates, in New York, and was connected with a Miss Eleanor Nichols, who said she was in charge of publicity.

But when I asked who was putting up the money to flood Washington with free copies she said, "Hold the line," and passed me up to a fellow who said he was Norman Hood, vice president in charge of promotion.

Mr. Hood admitted that 1,100 free copies had been sent out, but insisted this wasn't out of line.

"The books only cost us $1 each to print (so the profit on a book is $3.50 yet?—I'm in the wrong racket: Dixon) which means a cost to us of only $1,100," said vice president in charge of promotion Hood. "That is really nothing in these days of high promotion costs."

I asked Hood who was paying for this free distribution.

"We are," he insisted.

"Let's get this definite now," I said. "No outside interest organization or group is putting up any money?"

"No. We are defraying it all."

Unless William Sloane Associates are in the publishing business for their health I can't see how they can justify such costly promotion for a 559-page book that will not appeal to the general reader.

Well, there's one consolation for J. Edgar Hoover. He doesn't have to worry about the book making any wide impression upon the American public because few people who have to work for a living will be able to find the time to read it.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I include what another distinguished American has to say about this man and for the RECORD I insert an article by George Sokolsky as it appeared in the Times-Herald, November 30, 1950. He gives a little light on one Max Lowenthal. I want the American people to have a little squint at this, Mr. Speaker, as it may help them arrive at a proper conclusion on what lies behind the sudden arrival of Lowenthal's piercing penmanship.

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Most of my colleagues have written about Max Lowenthal's book on J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. Apparently they have read the book, but I must plead that I had other business on hand.

Anybody can be negative about such a job as J. Edgar Hoover does. Did Hoover catch the fellows who stole the ballot boxes in the Kansas City, Mo., election? No. He did not.

Was Harry Truman in Kansas City when the safe containing the ballot boxes was blown up? Yes, he was there. So.

That kind of argument can lead to nothing. A police department is to be judged

[1] Maj. Gen. Bennett E. Myers, former Air Force purchasing officer, convicted of inducing a former business associate to lie under oath about irregular war contracts in which Meyers was involved.

by its general record, by the honesty and efficiency of its employees, and by its own adherence to the law.

The most provable criticism of the FBI is that while it collected evidence to convict spies, traitors, Communists, and their fellow-travelers, its accomplishments in this field have, on the whole, been unsatisfactory because on orders from the State Department and the Department of Justice, spies were not to be arrested.

In the evidence of Larry Kerley before the McCarran committee, the evidence shows that the FBI had Arthur Alexandrovich Adams, one of the worst spies Soviet Russia ever sent to this country, but the State Department safeguarded him from arrest.

In 1917, Lowenthal went on a secret foreign mission. This is what he says on the subject (in appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities—Ed.):

"It was a confidential mission that I don't care to go into. It was only for a short time, and I never discuss that kind of government work with anybody."

You would imagine that in 1917 this secret mission was so terrific that it could only have been to Lenin or Trotzky or somebody like that, although I was in Petrograd in those days, and do not recall Lowenthal, whose mission must have been too important even for history.

Max Lowenthal has held innumerable jobs with various branches of the Government from 1912 almost up to date. Some of them were of this character, to use his own words:

"In 1942 or 1943 there was some kind of problem, it is not quite clear in my mind; there was a war commission, I don't remember its name; it was headed by Mr. McNutt.

"Mr. WHEELER. Paul McNutt?

"Mr. LOWENTHAL. Yes, Paul McNutt. I was sworn to assist them for a very temporary period on something or other, trying to straighten out some difficulties among some men who were not part of the Government.

"Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't remember these things too definitely, and anything any records would show that would correct me, I would accept those corrections.

"Toward the end of 1943 or early 1944 I left that work. During all that period and since that period I have been consulted informally by various people in the Government, but so far as I can recollect at this moment, I don't think ever in any official capacity. There might be some, and I would be very glad to have those noted for the record."

It is a little difficult to believe that Mr. Lowenthal cannot remember what he did for Paul McNutt. It was not so long ago nor could it have been very important. Mr. Lowenthal's lapse of memory at this point is, to say the least, fascinating.

Mr. Lowenthal was asked who had recommended him for employment by the War Department. This is his reply:

"I couldn't say for certain. I was asked by a group of organizations whether I would permit my name to be submitted for recommendation by General Clay, and I agreed."

What are those organizations? He must know, but he does not say. No names of organizations. No names of individuals. It all hangs in the vacuum of secrecy and mystery.

Some of the pages of this hearing would interest a psychologist, who might write a doctor of philosophy thesis about them. Here is a man who started his career as secretary to Judge Julian Mack, a jurist of distinction who would not take on a dope.

He goes through years of Government service and is associated with Senator Burton K. Wheeler on the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate.

Wheeler is an extraordinarily shrewd man. He would not hire a forgetful Jane. Yet, time after time, Mr. Lowenthal cannot remember dates, names, facts which no ordinary man could forget.

It is difficult to help wondering how a man, who forgets so much so easily, could remember so much about the FBI.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, my colleagues, when you read these articles which I have inserted you will find that it is not profitable for Americans to slander J. Edgar Hoover. The legions of his friends will not be asleep when their vigilance is needed. The legions of friends of the FBI will not be silent when his organization is attacked from the rear. The FBI, Mr. Speaker, is too busy with its mission to take cognizance of the forces who are trying to undermine its work. I do not know Lowenthal from Adam's house cat. I do not propose to make any effort to meet him, but for the information of the House, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the distinguished and great American, the Honorable GEORGE DONDERO, delivered on this very floor under date of September 1, 1950, entitled "A Man of Mystery." Mr. DONDERO sheds a little light on who Max Lowenthal is. It will be very handy and my article will be very compact for those who want to read about one Max Lowenthal and to refresh your memory of one J. Edgar Hoover.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 1, 1950]

A MAN OF MYSTERY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss a man of mystery this afternoon and for the first time take off the mask behind which he has been hiding for years and even avoiding service from the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The sharp pen and penetrating insight of a Washington editorial writer has caused Washington officialdom to pause and wonder when he asked in an editorial, "Who is this man?" The writer then goes on to describe him:

"He places these agents of destruction in our Government agencies. He can put his tribe in when our loyal citizens cannot get jobs. He can move his pawns up the scale to better paying and more sensitive jobs. Why? Not so they can get more money, but because they can spy more effectively.

"A man who is not unknown at the White House. Otherwise, he would not have the power or the knowledge to do the job he is doing.

"And now is the time to go after him. It will be a tremendous job. It will mean steping on the toes of some very, very high Government officials, and when he is caught the revelation will be a bigger shock to this Nation than the exposé of Benedict Arnold.

"It must be done. The Nation can take it. But it cannot win the war of survival with Russia if this man is allowed to continue his clever, diabolical scheme to undermine our national security."

Never has this man been more aptly described. Over the years I have acquired item after item of information. I still do not know the full story because he is a man of mystery. He works through others. He has reached pinnacles of great power. A recommendation from him was tantamount to success. There are few men in official Washington today who have dared to stand up against him.

I do not recall having seen his picture in print in recent years, but the Washington press corps knows his name well, so do the Communists and so do those who have taken a stand against Communists.

His skill and technique are unparalleled. He does his work, lusts and thrives on obscurity. He knows that he could never accomplish what he has in the open. Americans do not like his ilk and once his shroud of mystery is penetrated he knows his usefulness is at an end. Doors that once opened to him will be closed because no good American would care to be contaminated by his known presence.

I have named this man in passing before. Today I bring him into the open and introduce Max Lowenthal.

Like the Communist Party, whose cause he has served so well, he operates on two levels. One is seemingly respectable; the other completely underground.

He is native born. His name does not appear in Who's Who. To secure even a sketch of his biography has been a task.

Born in Minneapolis in 1888, he attended the University of Minnesota, graduating with a bachelor of arts degree in 1909. Then like many other parlor pinks, fellow travelers, Communists, and convicted perjurers, he attended Harvard Law School, graduating in 1912. In those early days he came under the influence of another man who through the years has manipulated the Charlie McCarthys in Government office. There is a striking kinship between the master, Justice Felix Frankfurter, and the pupil, Max Lowenthal. And as is so often the case, the pupil rises to outdo the master.

Following his Harvard days, he served as a secretary to Judge Julian M. Mack in New York, and then infiltrated the highly respectable law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft. After a few years he founded his own firm of Lowenthal, Szold & Brandwen.

Later he secured an appointment as assistant secretary of the President's Mediation Board in 1917, in 1918 he was in the War Department, in 1920 he was an assistant secretary to the President's Industrial Conference. Then he secured the appointment as executive secretary for the Wickersham Commission on Law Enforcement, but when he found he could not run it he resigned in a huff. Later he became research director of the Banking and Currency Commission. In 1935 he was appointed to the staff of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, also becoming affiliated with the Board of Economic Warfare.

By pulling strings he acquired the title of adviser on disposal of Jewish property to Gen. Lucius Clay, head of our military government in Germany. Within a matter of weeks he was known as the general counsel to General Clay and had as an assistant George Shaw Wheeler, the American traitor, Communist, and renegade who shocked all America when he denounced the land of his birth and asked Communist-controlled Czechoslovakia for asylum. I exposed him several years ago on the floor of this House.

Within a matter of weeks a change occurred in Germany. The usually accurate Human Events of September 25, 1946, reported, "It may be mere coincidence, but since Mr. Lowenthal's appointment General Clay has permitted leaders of the Soviet-sponsored SED (Socialist Workers Party) to address mass meetings in the American zone of occupation." This was the opening which the Russians were awaiting because it gave them the opportunity to sponsor a Communist Party under our protection. A few weeks later the commentator, Walter Winchell, warned on his Sunday night program that as a result of Lowenthal's activities a rife had occurred between the American and British zones.

Lowenthal's influence began to mount in the early thirties. As his influence grew, so

did its effect. Men he had selected and nursed became more powerful.

Lowenthal acquired some semblance of respectability, but what of the other side? The evidence of his unswerving loyalty to Soviet Russia is clear and unequivocal. In the early twenties, the Russian-American Industrial Corp. was formed in New York City to aid and assist in developing the resources of Russia. Large sums of American capital were raised to finance Russian industry. The head of this Communist subsidiary was the late Sidney Hillman, who later became disillusioned and turned on communism, but his one-time general counsel, Max Lowenthal, still follows the party line. There is an interesting sidelight. The California authorities raided the office of the Russian-American Industrial Corp. in September of 1922 and seized their books, records, and a list of members of Friends of Soviet Russia in Los Angeles. Several persons were indicted for violating the California Securities Act; however, the indictments were later dismissed. Behind the scenes powerful forces went to work. Prof. Felix Frankfurter, of Harvard University, started a chain of letters to his former students who were members of the bar, asking, as a personal favor to him, for them to look after the interests of the defendants.

Lowenthal also lent his prestige to other groups. He was reported to be one of the endorsers of the Conference of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born in 1940, an organization listed as subversive by the Attorney General. He was a member of the left-wing National Lawyers Guild. He was a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association with Lee Pressman, who once defied a congressional committee. He admitted his Communist affiliation this week. Lowenthal also was associated in this organization, cited as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, with the late Joseph R. Brodsky, the attorney of the Communist Party; Shad Polier, friend of Alger Hiss; Nathan Witt, an accused Communist; Edward Lamb, a left-wing newspaper and radio-station operator; Abraham J. Isserman, who was cited for contempt by Judge Medina in the New York Communist trial, along with others of a dubious background. The activities of the International Juridical Association incidentally at one time were carried on in the offices of Carol King, the well-known lawyer for Communists. Some other well-known members of the International Juridical Association are Lowenthal's friend, Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, Yale Law School and president of the National Lawyers Guild; Ruth Weyand, discharged attorney from the National Labor Relations Board; and Abe Fortas, of Lattimore fame.

Carol Weiss King, who has probably represented more Communists than any other lawyer in America, once was a law clerk in Lowenthal's office, where she was well grounded and trained for her later years.

Lowenthal has always found time for his extracurricular pursuits of aiding and abetting Communists. For example, he has been given the credit for the offensive launched against the House Un-American Activities Committee in the Hollywood hearings. Lowenthal was conveniently in Washington in October 1947, and naturally was extremely cautious in working behind the scenes with David Wahl, Charles Kramer, Bartley Crum, and others. At the time, word leaked out of the Council of the Hollywood Unfriendly Witnesses that Lowenthal had urged an attack upon the individual members of the committee in order that the Congressmen could be removed. In fact, Lowenthal told the Hollywood group and its lawyers to charge that the Congressmen on the committee should be removed. Everyone will remember the Hollywood Committee of One Thousand who flew to Washington to defend the Communists—that was also Lowenthal's idea.

In the thirties Lowenthal concentrated upon weakening our internal security by aiding an all-out Communist attack against the Federal Bureau of Investigation in 1940.

Lowenthal sent out anonymous memorandums smearing the FBI, which fact can be attested to by many Washington newsmen, hoping to head off the FBI in its fight to protect our shores against the menace of communism and fascism at a time when the Nazis and Communists were allies. Lowenthal has worked diligently and deviously, but always relentlessly, to destroy the effectiveness of the FBI in its efforts to protect our country from the emissaries of godless communism. He has always realized the FBI is the one agency he could not penetrate or intimidate. He has long known it was the one agency which blocked his efforts to completely undermine our internal security.

Lowenthal's record is one of attack on any American institution which stands foursquare for the American way of life. He has attacked railroads, banks, and that thoroughly fine American institution of B'nai B'rith as a "bourgeois organization." Even the cause of liberalism has felt his vengeance. For example, in 1939, when that great liberal and denouncer of communism, William O. Douglas, was elevated to the Supreme Court, Lowenthal got busy trying to organize opposition because he feared Douglas would some day become the heir apparent to F. D. R., and should this happen communism would have a stalwart foe.

His friends boast of Lowenthal's authoring Presidential veto messages and even more recently of his master-minding the ill-advised move to thwart the enactment of antisubversive legislation at a time when members of both political parties in Congress and throughout the country have united as one to secure a law which would make America safer in its hour of trial and crisis. The Federal Communications Commission, under James Lawrence Fly, was not untouched by the tentacles of Lowenthal's influence.

The influence for evil of this man of mystery can best be gaged by viewing a few of his intimates:

Al Bernstein, director of negotiations, United Public Workers of America, a union so left-wing and Communist-directed that it was expelled from the CIO several months ago: At one time Bernstein worked for Lowenthal and has been a contact of his for years. Bernstein is known to have been a secret member of the Communist Party work, with his chief, Abe Flaxer, in Washington.

Bjorne Yngvare Halling, Sausalito, Calif., secretary-treasurer of the old California CIO council, which was expelled from the CIO because of its Red tinge, has a long record of Communist activities. According to the Communist paper, the People's World, for October 19, 1949, Halling protested the trial of the Communist leaders in New York. Halling's secretary was Sadie Sokolove, member of the executive committee of the Communist Party and wife of Martin Chancey, one-time head of the Communist Party in Washington. But does this have any connection with Max Lowenthal? Halling sought political support to have Max Lowenthal placed in charge of certain phases of the investigation of civil-service employees because his friend, Lee Pressman, told him to do it.

Allan Rosenberg, another of Max Lowenthal's fair-haired boys, had a phenomenal rise in the Government service. In concert with John Abt, long an undercover Communist and agent, he was one of those who figured prominently in the 1947 New York grand-jury investigation of spy activities in Washington, where, because of technicalities in the espionage laws, prosecution could not be had. Rosenberg was charged with furnishing information to a confessed Soviet agent. Lowenthal and Wahl saw to it that Rosenberg's advance in the Foreign Economic Administration was rapid.

David R. Wahl was a protégé of Max Lowenthal in the Foreign Economic Administration. The files of the Civil Service Commission and the Committee on Un-American Activities reveal him as one whose loyalty has been questioned several times and also one with powerful forces who came to his aid. In fact, in 1944 the Civil Service Commission ruled Wahl unfit for Government service. Then his friends in the Foreign Economic Administration went to work and urged his reconsideration as eligible. Wahl has long been a legman for the Communist Party in Washington.

The Lowenthal influence in one case alone more than documents his activities and reveals his true colors. One of Lowenthal's assistants in the Board of Economic Warfare was George Shaw Wheeler. Wheeler had previously served in Government agencies such as the National Labor Board, the Department of Labor, and the State Department. He also was investigated several times because of his reported affiliations with the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, the American League for Peace and Democracy, the Washington Bookshop, and the American Peace Mobilization, all of which have been ruled by the Attorney Generl to be subversive organizations.

The files of the Civil Service Commission contain testimony that he was a member of the Communist Party, and if made public, they would reveal that the Civil Service Commission found Wheeler was ineligible for Government service because of his Communist activities. Then, a pressure campaign developed that had all the earmarks of a Lowenthal manipulation. In no time at all, the Civil Service Commission reversed its position and Wheeler was cleared. When Lowenthal was appointed to go to Germany on General Clay's staff, he took as his first assistant none other than George Shaw Wheeler. Soon after Wheeler's arrival in Germany, he established contacts with the German Communist Party. The Army finally dropped him on November 1, 1947. Wheeler, by his acts and words, has proven the correctness of the early Civil Service action insisting Wheeler was a Communist. I hope our Government has taken steps to record Wheeler's disavowal of his citizenship and forever will bar him from our shores.

But Lowenthal is back, living in New York but spending much of his time in Washington; his influence still a menace to the best interests of America. I have no doubt we shall hear further either from him or his stooges and when we do, it will be because of some sinister act, designed either to protect Communists, infiltrate further into our Government, or to undermine our internal security.

Every person still in the Government who has had a Lowenthal endorsement, should be identified and their loyalty determined but not by the standards that freed George Shaw Wheeler.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say this to you, my colleagues, freedom of speech and press is a great and priceless possession. It is unfortunate when this freedom leads men to doing the things which Lowenthal has either consciously or unconsciously done in his book. Only in this Nation can such successfully be done. I neither have the time, money nor inclination, much less the ability, to write in the subtle manner of Lowenthal. I do not have the power of distribution which he possesses,

but, Mr. Speaker, I want the archives of the Congress of the United States to know what I and the rest of my colleagues who resent this book have had to say in defense of J. Edgar Hoover's organization. I want the only free press in the world, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with its tremendous circulation, to tell the nation of this book and I want the nation itself to come to the defense of Edgar Hoover and the institution which he has, more than anyone else, protected against the termites who have infested our citadels. We want to stamp out forever in this Nation the vermin that shall undermine the Senate and school and citadel and shrine—the worm of fraud and all the crawling progeny of these—the vermin that shall honeycomb the halls and towers of state in unsuspecting hours.

Mr. Speaker, saving America is everybody's job. Giving aid and comfort to our enemies at home and abroad should be anybody's shame.

That is all I have to say about Lowenthal, Mr. Speaker. I ask permission to insert various articles as a part of my statement here this morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of November 20, 1950]

CIVIL LIBERTIES CHAMPION POINTS OUT FBI RECORD OF RESPECT FOR FREEDOM—VICIOUS BOOK CALLED RED AID

(By Frederick Woltman)

WASHINGTON, November 20.—Congressmen, Federal judges, and others here have been receiving advance copies of a 559-page book aimed at picturing the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover as incompetent, a menace to civil liberties and a virtual Gestapo.

The volume, published today by William Sloane Associates of New York City, is entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation."

ASSAILED BY ERNST

Its author, Max Lowenthal, is a New York attorney who has held numerous Federal posts in the past and has been waging a one-man battle against the FBI for more than a decade.

In New York City, meanwhile, the book was excoriated today as vicious and thoroughly unfair by one of the Nation's foremost authorities on civil liberties. He is Morris L. Ernst, counsel to the American Civil Liberties Union.

"It will give great aid and comfort to the Communist Party," Mr. Ernst said.

According to Sloane Associates, Mr. Lowenthal has been collecting material for the book for 15 years and he documents it with care.

A spokesman for the FBI said today the author never had consulted the Bureau, either for basic information or for its answer to the many attacks quoted to discredit the FBI.

A brief section on the Amerasia case of the stolen Government documents gives the impression that FBI mishandling spoiled the prosecution. It neglects to mention the Tydings Senate subcommittee finding that the FBI handled the investigation with an efficiency and thoroughness in keeping with the best traditions of that agency."

Another section blames the FBI for letting the convicted German Communist, Gerhart Eisler, slip through its hands and escape on the steamship *Batory* to Soviet Germany. Actually, Eisler was free on bail at the time and the FBI had no responsibility for watching him.

QUOTED ATTACKS

When the *Batory* returned, says the book, FBI agents accorded its crew and passengers what one newspaper described as totalitarian-state methods of blustering intimidation and police persecution. Actually, naturalization agents, not FBI agents, conducted the shipboard questioning.

A large part of the book consists of quotations from an endless variety of sources—Senate committee testimony, speeches, newspaper clippings, etc.—attacking the FBI. The author also quotes at length from defenders of the FBI and Mr. Hoover himself.

"What makes the book so biased and one-sided," says Mr. Ernst, "is that Lowenthal picks the quotes that bolster his side and makes no appraisal of whether they are scurrilous or factual."

PALMER RAIDS

"It would be a great misfortune, in my opinion, if libraries bought this book as an authority on the FBI."

Nearly two-thirds of the book goes back 30 years or more. Much of it deals with the Palmer raids and excesses of 1919–20, which the author tries to hang on the present FBI director.

Mr. Hoover has long since denied responsibility for the raids and said he disapproved of them at the time.

In a chapter, Investigation of Beliefs, Mr. Lowenthal sets out to discredit the FBI's long-term program of dealing with Communist subversives and the Red underground. He tosses it off as "tracking down persons and organizations whose views it (the FBI) fears."

The problem of the Communist menace is passed by. Indeed, neither Communist nor Communist Party is even listed in the index.

Last July 26 Mr. Hoover declared: "The FBI is interested in receiving facts; we are not interested in what a person thinks but in what he does which undermines our internal security. * * * Hysteria, witch hunts, and vigilantes weaken internal security."

The American Civil Liberties Union wrote the FBI chief expressing thanks "for the fine balance which you are showing in statements dealing with the serious and intricate problem of national security in relation to civil liberties."

That appraisal appears nowhere in the Lowenthal book.

SMEAR CAMPAIGN

Mr. Ernst, in an article, Why I No Longer Fear the FBI, which will be published in the December issue of the Reader's Digest, will say:

"A real smear campaign has been carried on against Hoover's work. * * * The FBI is unique in the history of national police. It has a magnificent record of respect for individual freedom. It invites documented complaints against its agents. It has zealously tried to prevent itself from violating the democratic process."

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of November 27, 1950]

LOWENTHAL BOOK BLASTING FBI REFLECTS A PEEVE LIKE TRUMAN'S

The relationship between Max Lowenthal's attack on the FBI and Philip Murray's keynote speech at the CIO convention denouncing McCarthyism is purely coincidental. Lowenthal's book and the CIO convention speech have one thing in common. Both reflect a partisan defense of the present Administration and both approaches are based on superficial liberalism that bode no good for the republic.

Mr. Murray's harangue, defending Dean Acheson, was a red herring which was meant to take some of the sting out of the black-eye that the labor groups got in the recent election. It was an effort to divert attention from CIO political failure. It was at the same time a pretty definite indication that the CIO intends to go on making the same mistakes in the future.

It was not McCarthyism that swept the Republican candidates into office in November. It was a public protest against present administration policies, particularly in regard to communism here and abroad and a resentment against the crude way in which the labor groups tried to ram their own platforms down the throats of the electorate.

The Lowenthal book is the first post-election shot fired to lay low one of the pet peeves of Mr. Truman. It is common knowledge that Lowenthal and the President are buddies. It is likewise known that the author of the book has been questioned by a congressional committee on his association with Communist personalities.

Edgar Hoover gets in Mr. Truman's hair more than any Government official in Washington. The Director of the FBI is sincerely convinced that the Communist movement is a real threat to our American security. Harry Truman does not believe that.

The Communists have carried on a persistent campaign of diatribe and vilification against Hoover and the FBI. This organization is the one agency in the country that has stymied the Stalinists at every turn. Without the evidence of the FBI counter-agents in the Commie Party, the conviction of the 11 Red leaders could never have been attained. The stooges of the Kremlin want to discredit Hoover, destroy the FBI, and be relieved of any effective check on their own actions more than anything else.

For political reasons President Truman would like to depose Mr. Hoover, but to date he has not been able to do so. The storm of protest in Congress and among the public would be overwhelming.

Truman has no sympathy for the Communists. We are convinced of that. He is and has been, however, a very mistaken man in his judgment of the menace. The President is as much concerned for the security of the Nation, most likely more concerned, than any ordinary citizen. But he is also a stubborn man and would like to reduce his dislike of Edgar Hoover to action and remove him. We do not know whether or not Mr. Truman previewed the anti-FBI book, as it is reported he did the volume written by Jonathan Daniels. It can be easily assumed that he is not displeased with Lowenthal's effort to smear Hoover and the FBI.

These two incidents, a speech by Philip Murray and the publication of a book reflecting the administration's opposition to a Government agency are separate and isolated events. Both, however, reveal a certain mental attitude toward the Communist issue which has been characteristic of the present administration and its most avid supporters. It is evident that they look upon the late election returns as merely the result of an off-year protest. We believe they are wrong. Public sentiment has shifted and crystallized on this subject of communism and political death awaits the politician who has not yet recognized the turn in the tide.

EVERY UNITED STATES CITIZEN UNDER STUDY BY FBI

(Moscow, in English to North America, November 20, 1950)

(Commentary by Pavlov: "Thought Control in the United States")

One of the distinguishing features of a Fascist state is the liquidation of civil liberties and the establishment of police control over thought. It was that way in Fascist Italy under Mussolini, and things were the same in Nazi Germany under Hitler. Today these abominable characteristics of a police state are appearing openly in the United States.

Control over the thoughts of the United States people is the primary duty of Hoover and his G–men. Making use of the dregs of * * * declassed elements, the FBI has flooded the United States with thousands of paid informers, spies, and provocateurs who persecute honest citizens. On the pages of paper you will often come across Hoover's boastful statement that the FBI has such a huge dossier of material that every American is the subject of study. There are fingerprints for every single one of the cases in the FBI's files.

How many persons are included in these files may be judged from the fact that on Hoover's own admission the number of fingerprints is over 113,000,000. It is interesting to note that 93,000,000 of the fingerprints are those of people who have never committed any crime. The object of the work of the FBI is to create an atmosphere of fear and suspicion in the United States. The widespread practice of tapping telephone wires gives the FBI additional material which is used to compromise people who, for some reason or another, are undesirable to Hoover.

Harold Ickes, using the words of the late Judge Oliver Holmes, called this practice of the FBI a "dirty business." The well-known progressive writer, Howard Fast, said in his recent letter to the editor of the Daily Compass that it has become the customary thing today for the honest and innocent United States people to be thrown into prison.

HOOLIGANS SPREAD SPY MANIA

You listeners probably know of cases where people were accused of disloyalty and were dismissed from their jobs on the insistence of the FBI. Not one of them was able to clear himself and to restore his good name. These people did not even know who was accusing them and what their so-called crime was.

Hoover's Fascist hooligans are spreading a spy mania. They are trying to intimidate the United States people and to close their mouths. By means of police spying and provocation they seek to break the will of the United States people to fight for peace and their rights and are trying to turn the people into docile tools of the imperialists whose tasks it is to unleash a new world war. Fascism and war cannot be separated.

Alongside the colossal expenditures for preparing a new war and for the arms drive, the ruling circles of the United States are appropriating huge sums for the fascistization of the state apparatus. More than $100,000,000 of the taxpayers' money is used every year to maintain the secret service. The Morgans, Rockefellers, and du Ponts need fascism in order to force the United States people to serve without a murmur as cannon fodder for their criminal adventurous policy.

Throughout the United States there is a growing movement of protest against Fascist despotism. The United States people have no desire to be docile tools in the hands of the Fascist warmongers.

[From the Daily News, Washington (D. C.), of November 24, 1950]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 23.—An accepted article of political faith among all elected officials in this Capital is that one certain way to invite election damnation is to say anything against motherhood, the United States Marines, or J. Edgar Hoover.

Truman, before the election, let fly with a pettish crack at the marines and promptly made his penitential pilgrimage to Canossa by way of visiting a Marine Corps convention to confess the error of his way and ask forgiveness.

Now we have an outright critical survey of J. Edgar Hoover and his FBI. The attack was written by an individual authoritatively reported to be the person who persuaded one-time Senator Harry Truman, of Missouri, to seek the vice-presidential candidacy in 1944. The volume was originally scheduled for publication last September but was held up until after the November 7 elections.

PROVIDES DEADLY AMMUNITION

More importantly, it is the best-documented indictment on the existence of a Federal police in the Republic of the United States (going all the way from Theodore Roosevelt to the present) that has ever been compiled. Advance copies were placed on the desks of every Member of Congress, all members of the Federal judiciary, all Washington reporters and all important administration officials, within the last fortnight.

This hasn't happened before. It suggests that distribution of deadly ammunition at the moment is part of Truman political logistics, designed to blast J. Edgar Hoover and his FBI from their entrenched post of popular esteem.

The book we're talking about is the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by Max Lowenthal. (New York: William Sloane Associates, Inc.; 559 pp.; $4.50.)

A CAREFUL, SKILLED INDICTMENT

We'll go along with the author in his preface and his publishers on their dust-jacket blurb that every statement is correctly documented and that he's done a swell job of research.

We'll grant that Lowenthal does not color his material, editorialize, or draw conclusions. We'll admit as truth that the author is a conservative in the most profound sense.

But when they say that this heavy tome is unbiased and purely objective, we'll say it's about as unbiased and objective as a carefully drawn indictment handed down by a smart grand jury guided by a skilled prosecutor.

This book will hurt Hoover and the FBI. It will give Hoover's every foe in Congress easy access, thanks to the expert and authentic references for every statement, to an anti-FBI ammunition dump.

But it's unfair. Lowenthal has certainly made the evils of the Department of Justice investigation force live after them. And he's interred the FBI good with the bones of gangsters he doesn't mention.

RACKETS OF TWENTIES FORGOTTEN

It is all right, as a matter of erudite source dredging, to recall the bonehead (and worse) activities of the old Department of Justice Bureau of Investigation in the days of Woodrow Wilson's jittery Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer or Warren Harding's thieving and cynical Harry Daugherty. Those were the days when the two William J.'s—Flynn under Palmer and Burns under Daugherty—headed up the Bureau. But why blame, by inference, Hoover of today for the sins of his predecessors?

Where Lowenthal is unfair is that he doesn't bear down on the fact that J. Edgar Hoover only got into action during the kidnaping and gang-killing racket of the late twenties. Until Hopalong Cassidy galloped onto the national scene, it was the G-man, and top G-man Hoover in particular, who captured and held the imagination of Americans coming of age—and incidentally their parents.

NO. 1 FEAT: PREVENTION OF SABOTAGE

After all, there was such a thing as the kidnaping of the Lindbergh baby and the capture and conviction of a Hauptmann. Down in the Department of Justice museum today more visitors want to look at the bullet-creased straw hat that John Dillinger wore the night the G-men got him in Chicago than at any other relic in the Capital of the United States with the exception of the Declaration of Independence. And there are still in the memory such names as Pretty Boy Floyd, Karpis, Lepke, and the rest of the killers of the bloody era.

WE'RE SAFE SO LONG AS IT'S HOOVER

And space might be found to note—so long as 600 pages of type are used—that there was no sabotage here in the United States during World War II—and this was Hoover's No. 1 job.

With that off the chest, this writer will proceed to march out on some very shaky ground and probably get bogged down in an intellectual swamp. We thoroughly agree with Lowenthal's fundamental premise that any Federal police, operating with the power, secrecy, and millions of the FBI, is a potential danger to the citizens of the Republic. So long as Hoover is running it, we feel safe. We can think of 50 persons who, if they ever got Hoover's present job, would start raising unshirted hell. The FBI, in our opinion, is like a revolver. If you or a pal has it, OK, but if an opposite number has it and you or your pal is unarmed, then you can expect to sweat.

Because this volume is going to touch off a battle in the next Congress which will be exciting, important, and reach into the lives of every citizen, we'll have more to say about it.

[From Human Events of November 22, 1950]

BOOK EVENTS

(The Federal Bureau of Investigation, by Max Lowenthal. New York: William Sloane Associates, Inc. $4.50. Reviewed by Walter Trohan)

By mysterious design, best known to the author and publisher, copies of this book sprouted on the desks of Members of Congress and Federal jurists on the heels of a letter from a Sloane official stating "this unbiased and profoundly conservative approach" would lead to some startling conclusions on the FBI. The dust jacket hails Lowenthal as a conservative in the most profound sense and asserts he does not color his material, editorials, or draw conclusions.

Now, because the book adds up to an attack on the FBI, which can be expected to be a standard reference for years, it is fitting that these claims to conservatism and objectivity be examined. It is altogether proper and conservative to fret over the possibility that a Federal police force can grow into an arm of terror in a police state. When such fears parallel Moscow radio attacks on the FBI and writings of notorious Communist fronters, one can ask: "Who's conservative now?"

Mr. Lowenthal is a wealthy New York lawyer, who has been weaving in and out of Washington in various capacities for 30 years. The most detailed biography of Harry S. Truman to date, The Man of Independence, identifies him as the man who weaned the President from the realistic thinking of Pendergastism to the rarefied liberalism of the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis. Last September Lowenthal acknowledged varying degrees of intimate acquaintance with 22 known Communists, Red spies, and notorious fellow travelers, including Alger Hiss, John J. Abt, Charles Kramer, and Lee Pressman, who is even now seeking to identify himself with conservatism. Lowenthal told the House Un-American Activities Committee: "The number of people I didn't know were members of the Communist Party is something that makes my hair stand on end." So much for the new conservatism.

And now to objectivity. The jacket claims that for every quote questioning the practices or efficiency of the FBI, Lowenthal quotes the FBI reply or replies of FBI defenders, including, of course, J. Edgar Hoover. This reviewer learned that not one question

was addressed to Hoover or the FBI by Lowenthal. And it is difficult, if not well nigh impossible, to find a kind word for the FBI in the book. However, it reeks with criticism, most carefully traced to source in the most elaborate set of source notes in many a year. And these are most carefully edited to fit the slant against the FBI.

Much is made of an investigation of the FBI by Robert H. Jackson when the Supreme Court Justice was Attorney General. Not one word is included from his report, which emphasized the fact that the acts of every FBI agent are subject to examination by defense lawyers. Jackson said that if civil liberties are in danger in this country, it is not by the FBI, and reported that with a record of 96 percent convictions in cases brought by the FBI not one case has been reversed by an appellate court because of third degree or other improper treatment of defendants. Among many other editings against the FBI there is a quotation of an attack by former Senator Carl Hatch, but no mention of a virtual retraction 2 days later. Thus kind words for the FBI die under the Lowenthal scissors.

Lowenthal belabors the FBI as a menace to freedom of speech and freedom of thought. At the same time he criticizes the FBI for not being efficient enough, holding that the atomic spy case and the case of his friend Hiss should have broken sooner. In his brief, which is heavy reading, he cites a gamut of cases from Sacco-Vanzetti and the world war raids of A. Mitchell Palmer to the Judy Coplon affair as offering evidence against J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI today.

The verdict of this reviewer on Lowenthal is "not guilty" of conservatism and "guilty" of objectivity against the FBI.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. I compliment the distinguished gentleman for the fine dissertation he has made on the record of Max Lowenthal in this book. However, I am fearful lest our explanation of the fraud in which he was engaged when he wrote this book may further enrich his pocketbook by the sale of books. So I would like at this time to ask the American public to place a boycott against the book, Federal Bureau of Investigation, by Max Lowenthal. This gentleman has had his snout at the trough of the New Deal bureaucracy too long now, and I would regret very much to see him further enriched by the sale of this book.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I gladly yield to my distinguished colleague on the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to take this occasion to compliment my distinguished colleague on the Armed Services Committee for this very delightful and appropriate treatise on this subject. I think it is of great value to the country to have at this time.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman. May I say to the gentleman I know of no more tireless and indefatigable student of government or more patriotic gentleman than my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California, Hon. CLYDE DOYLE.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has expired.

Air Power in the Korean War—United States Must Plan Strategy on Possibility of Total War as Well as Limited Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in the autumn issue of the Sperryscope, a quarterly magazine published by the Sperry Corp., there is an interesting article on Air Power and the Korean War, by Lt. Gen. Idwal H. Edwards, USAF.

I call the attention of this Congress to General Edwards' article because it is a clear statement of the role which American air power has played in the Korean conflict, by a leading Air Force general who is now Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations.

There has been considerable uninformed criticism of the Air Force in the Korean War, especially as to the capacity of the jet F–80 aircraft as contrasted with slower conventional fighters. Most of such criticism has been based on a misconception of the tactical support mission, and ignorance of the peculiar conditions of the Korean conflict. Suggestions that the Air Force should reduce its emphasis on the advancement of the air warfare are suggestions that we as a Nation court disaster. In a larger Air Force than we have permitted to be built since demobilization began in 1945, more specialization could be permitted in aircraft. In the Air Force we now have, the jet F–80 is a more versatile and effective plane than the slower F–51 of World War II.

Far more dangerous—but equally uninformed—is the criticism of the nature of the Air Force we have maintained, indeed of the defense establishments we need to carry out our basic strategy. As General Edwards succinctly states:

> We must plan our strategy to take cognizance of the possibility of total war as well as of limited aggression of the sort which took place in Korea.

General Edwards puts first things first. He asserts as the primary aviation need of the United States an Air Force in being which is capable of defending our country against air attack. We must, it is true, have strategic air and tactical air, just as we must have an Army and a Navy, forward bases and sea communications. Likewise we must continue with our program of research and development, if we are to retain superiority over other nations with greater military budgets than ours.

General Edwards sums up:

> Funds recently appropriated in accordance with the President's recommendation for increased military appropriations should permit the building of a force capable of carrying its assigned mission. Budget requirements determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, approved by the Joint Secretaries, accepted by the Secretary of Defense and forwarded to the President were the basis for the fund increases recently approved by Congress. These funds will help us greatly to expand and to improve the Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, General Edwards has summed up very well the situation affecting our Air Force, both past and present. His summary is a dignified answer to uninformed and reckless critics.

Let us therefore stop criticizing the Air Force for not doing what we never gave it funds to do with. The record of our Air Force in Korea is an excellent one, that requires no apology. General MacArthur himself has stated:

> The contribution of the Far East Air Forces in the Korean conflict has been magnificent. They have performed their mission beyond all expectations.

Let us lend our efforts now to building up the Air Force to the strength required by our involvement in Korea, our commitments in Europe and elsewhere, to the maintenance of the strategic air force, and above all, to the maintenance of an air force adequate to meet and defeat any air attack made against the continental United States.

General Edwards has served in the air branch of the Armed Forces continuous-since 1918, when, as a second lieutenant in the United States Army, he transferred to the Air Service.

At the outbreak of World War II, he was in command of Randolph Field, Texas. During hostilties, he served, on two occasions, as Assistant Chief of Staff for Training on the War Department General Staff, and also as Chief of Staff of the European Theater of Operations in 1943. He was Deputy Commander of the Army Air Forces in the Mediterranean during 1944 and 1945.

At the end of the war, General Edwards was appointed Commanding General of the United States Air Forces in Europe and, in August 1947, became Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, Headquarters, USAF, in Washington. His current assignment is Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations.

The article, Air Power in the Korean War, is as follows:

AIR POWER IN THE KOREAN WAR

(By Lt. Gen. Idwal H. Edwards, U. S. Air Force, Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations)

Those of us who are primarily concerned with aviation will be interested in learning details of the role which American air power played in the Korean conflict.

When the aggression began the Air Force planes in Japan, stationed there on a basis of occupation requirements, were a mixture of jet interceptors of the F–80 type, light bombers of the B–26 type, and fighter bombers, also F–80's.

The F–80 is not the ultimate as an interceptor or as a fighter bomber, but it has proved itself in both categories as an effective weapon. All objective reports from Korea support the fact that this conclusion, based upon peacetime tests, has been fully confirmed by the greater test of the war. The F–80's fought, suffered heavy combat damage, and returned to fight some more. Their range was extended by improvising large wing tanks so that they could remain

in the battle area for a substantial period of time to fight close to the ground where the highest consumption of fuel takes place.

The Communist Yak piston-engine planes, used early in the battle, were driven from the air and then were destroyed on the ground. In fact, the United Nations had, from the beginning, total air superiority.

Because of the completeness of the air superiority assured by our jet fighters, we were able to use some older types of aircraft readily available in storage. The World War II piston-engine F–51 and the twin Mustang F–82 also played important roles in ground attack as fighter bombers at night as well as day. Navy and Marine piston-engine planes, too, added to the effectiveness of close support.

The medium bombers, the B–29's, joined in the land battle. At the outset we had two-thirds of a group of B–29's on Guam that were rapidly moved to Okinawa. This force was agumented by additional groups of B–29's which carried out the fundamental strategic purpose of denying the Communist aggressor his sources of supply. These B–29's were even brought into the tactical effort and on many occasions bombed concentrations of troops, bridges, and other military targets in the battle area.

There was some uninformed criticism relative to the capacity of the jet F–80's as contrasted with slower conventional fighters, such as the World War II F–51's, but this criticism was based on a misconception of the tactical support mission. It was suggested that the F–80 is so fast that it could not remain long over the battle and that it could not hit its target as well as the slower F–51. Such a suggestion implies that the Air Force should reduce its emphasis on the advancement of the art of air warfare and return to the slower piston-engine planes of World War II. Any such policy would be disastrous.

The first task of an air force is to seek and maintain air superiority, and this can be done only by having airplanes better and more skillfully used than are the enemy's. The task of tactical air support is to destroy targets. It is not to fly slow or fast or to hover, but is solely to destroy which it can do best in an atmosphere free of enemy opposition. But in tactical warfare only the modern jets can achieve this necessary air superiority. The slower piston-engine planes of World War II against enemy jets would fare no better than did the Yaks against our F–80's. If the enemy had used jet planes to contest our superiority, we would soon have found out the importance of our jets in unmistakable terms.

This does not mean that there must not be specialization in the types of planes with which the Air Force must be equipped—especially in the tactical field. Even though planes are adaptable and can be used for purposes other than their primary mission, the kind of Air Force we need will have to be equipped with specialized planes. Some of these will be designed for all-weather interception, others for close support, others for deeper-in attack bombing and strafing, and others for night and bad weather support missions. The characteristics needed for each of these functions, of course, varies. There may well be, with an Air Force of sufficient size to permit such degree of specialization, a role for slower planes for some purposes. But any suggestion that the jet will not be heavily relied on in the future is incorrect. To deny this is to deny progress.

Equally incorrect would be a misunderstanding of the specialized events of the Korean aggression, and ideas—based on such a misunderstanding—as to the nature of the defense establishment we need to carry out our basic strategy. We must plan our strategy to take cognizance of the possibility of total war as well as of limited aggression of the sort which took place in Korea.

The United States must have in being an Air Force which is capable of defending our country against air attack. We must build up and improve our defense control and warning devices, our installations, and our intercepting forces which will, to the greatest extent possible, blunt any air attack made against the continental United States.

We must likewise have in being an Air Force of unmistakable power which will destroy the enemy's capacity to fight in the event that he makes the mistake of starting an aggressive war against our free world. This means we must maintain a strategic Air Force that is unmistakably good. We must waste no resource; we must spare no effort to see to it that this strategic force constitutes a defensive countermeasure of such violence that it will make it clear to anyone who thinks of attacking us—or the society of which we are a part—that this would be a most mistaken thing to do.

Finally, we must maintain the lines of sea communications as free as possible from enemy attack and strengthen the defense of the free world based on the North Atlantic Treaty arrangements. But this is a political matter as well as a military matter. It requires determination to defend our common society, even at the cost of heavy sacrifice.

In recognizing the tasks confronting our Air Force, we understand that there are many things which have to be done to strengthen our air arm. We must build those installations, acquire the equipment, and train our personnel and units to a skill which will make our Air Force capable, within the limits of the present science, of carrying out its task. Funds recently appropriated in accordance with the President's recommendation for increased military appropriations should permit such a capability force. Budget requirements determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, approved by the Joint Secretaries, accepted by the Secretary of Defense, and forwarded to the President were the basis for the fund increases recently approved by Congress. These funds will help us greatly to expand and to improve the Air Force.

But in addition to building up such an Air Force in being we must also search out and continue to search out every possible deficiency in our air establishment—in our bases, our installations, and our planes, and in the training of the men, and everything else that goes to make up an Air Force. Our Nation, and indeed all of the free world, longs for the time when that free world has the power in being sufficient to guarantee peace and security in this air age.

J. Edgar Hoover Versus Max Lowenthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the recent book of Max Lowenthal, which purports to be an objective study of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, goes to great lengths to place the blame for the excesses in the so-called Red raids of 1919–20 upon J. Edgar Hoover, who was appointed Director of the FBI by the late Harlan Fiske Stone, who was among the first to raise his voice in protest against the manner in which the raids were carried out.

A real authority of that period and those instances was the late Louis Post, who served as Assistant Secretary of Labor during that period. In recounting the events of the time in a book, The Deportations Delirious of Nineteen-Twenty, Mr. Post nowhere singles Mr. Hoover out for censure. In fact, Mr. Hoover's name does not even appear in the index to this book. The following revealing statement appears on page 49, which clearly singles tne late William J. Flynn out as the one responsible for the activities of the then Bureau of Investigation:

Although Congress did not at once make as large an appropriation as the Attorney General asked for, it made one in June and another in December which aggregated more. With these funds at command the private detective whom the Attorney General had already selected to manage the esoteric activities of the Red crusade—his name being William J. Flynn—a man whom at an appropriations hearing he described as "the greatest anarchist-expert in the United States," one who "knows all the men of that class" and "can pretty nearly call them by name," turned the Department of Justice into an agency for stimulating the popular delirium which the postal bombs of the preceding May and the explosions of June had generated.

Later these incidents were investigated by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee and they failed to fix responsibility for these events upon Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

There is another source of information which sheds light upon Mr. Hoover's role in those days. I am sure that this source during that period was not prejudiced on Mr. Hoover's behalf as he was one of Boston's outstanding attorneys who represented many of the aliens arrested. I refer to the late Morris Katzeff, who was assisted in his defense of the aliens by Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Prof. Zachariah Chaffee. On June 11, 1940, Mr. Katzeff wrote me in detail regarding Mr. Hoover's role in the Mitchell Palmer raids.

Mr. Hoover, who served as a special assistant to the Attorney General from 1919 until he was transferred to the Bureau of Investigation in 1921, had no connection with the raids. His role was to handle for the Department of Justice the legal proceedings which followed.

I herewith submit portions of the letter of Mr. Katzeff:

BOSTON, MASS., *June 11, 1940.*

Congressman CELLER,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: * * * I wish to say that I have personal, first-hand knowledge of the part that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover played in the so-called New England raids upon alleged Communists in 1920. I was counsel for some of them immediately after January 2, 1920, and before many days were over, I was retained by a committee that called itself New England Defense Conference, to represent 433 men and women who were held at various police stations and other concentration places, and who were eventually herded together at Deer Island at Boston Harbor.

I represented them all through the preliminary hearings at the island conducted by immigration inspectors, assisted by agents of the Department of Justice, and these hearings lasted for about 5 months.

I was personally present at all of these hearings, after they were allowed to have

counsel. I had numerous conferences during these months with local immigration authorities at Boston, Mr. Skeffington and his assistant, Mr. Sullivan, as well as with the Department of Justice agents in charge of these cases in New England. I had several conferences with the then Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wilson, and still many more, with the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Louis F. Post.

At several of these conferences Mr. J. Edgar Hoover was present, but I never received the impression that he was the man who gave instructions to the local, New England and Boston Department of Justice agents or immigration inspectors.

Mr. Louis F. Post in his little book entitled "The Deportation Delirium of 1920," tells at great length of the outrages perpetrated by the agents of the Department of Justice, under the guidance and inspiration of the then Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer.

At the conclusions of the hearings at Deer Island I filed several petitions in the Federal District Court for the District of Massachusetts for writs of habeas corpus, and the hearings held before Mr. Justice Anderson of the local appellate division consumed, I believe, about 20 to 25 full court days.

At these hearings I was assisted by Mr. Lawrence Brooks, of the Massachusetts bar, now a judge of a district court hereabouts, and I had the invaluable assistance of Zachariah Chaffee, professor of law at Harvard Law School, as well as by Prof. Felix Frankfurter, now Justice of the United States Supreme Court, both of whom appeared as amici curiae.

During the time very interesting disclosures were made concerning the conduct of the Department of Justice in the organizing and executing of these raids.

We obtained and read into the record at that trial the original instructions given by the Department of Justice at Washington to the local Department of Justice agents, and it appears unmistakably that these orders were issued by one Burke who was then the chief of some department, and who was Mr. Hoover's chief at the time.

I was fortunate to be able to find among old papers in my office an original copy of the typewritten opinion of Judge Anderson, from which I enclose for your information copies of these instructions.

I spoke to Mr. Hoover once or twice at Washington in 1920 about the manner in which the raids were carried out, the utter lawlessness of the entire transactions, and I did recall distinctly that he deplored these conditions as much as did counsel for the defense.

Since there are so few persons who were intimately connected with the case who could speak of it with any degree of personal knowledge, I feel it my duty to send this letter to you for such use as you can make of it.

The cases are reported in the Federal Reports and are entitled *William T. Colyer* v. *Henry J. Skeffington, Morris Katzeff* v. *Henry J. Skeffington,* and more cases of *Morris Katzeff* v. *Henry J. Skeffington.*

The voluminous records of the evidence taken in trial, I believe, were turned over some time after the case was disposed of, to Mr. Post, who on one of his visits to Boston called on me and asked for them in order to enable him to write the book mentioned above.

I will appreciate it if you will either make copies of these instructions or return the same to me at some later date.

I am,

Respectfully yours,

MORRIS KATZEFF.

Military Strength Cannot Be Maintained Without a Reservoir of Trained Manpower Available for Service—Message of Secretary of Defense Marshall to the American Legion Stating the Urgent Need for Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, shortly before Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall welcomed the members of the NATO defense committee at their meeting in Washington, he sent a message to the American Legion convention that was held in Los Angeles the week of October the 8th. I do not pretend to know all that Secretary Marshall had in mind when he prepared his challenging message to the American Legion. I can well believe, however, that he was anticipating the scheduled meeting with foreign defense ministers, and his own obligation as Secretary of Defense of the greatest and strongest Nation in the North Atlantic Treaty organization. His primary task would be to prove to the leaders of other countries that the United States is prepared to make its full contribution to the collective forces that will be required to implement the recommendations of the NATO defense committee meeting.

In his message to the American Legion Secretary Marshall stressed, therefore, continuing need for the support the Legion has always given to the preparedness measures of the Department of Defense, and specifically for the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal training.

In the world today, Secretary Marshall warned, military strength is the one factor that supports our foreign policy and that prevents war. It is also the surest way to hasten victory when war breaks out, as war broke in Korea 5 months ago.

Military strength cannot be maintained without a reservoir of trained manpower available for service. General Marshall maintained this as Chief of Staff. Secretary of State Marshall asserted this before the Armed Services Committee. And Secretary of Defense Marshall has now repeated this. Are we to ignore, then, the advice and earnest plea of the man to whom we have given more honors and more varied responsibilities than any other man in our time? Or are we going to be impressed by his sincerity and consistency, by his experience and his wisdom, and take heed of his warning: "It must be done."

Mr. Speaker, the American Legion was impressed by the words of Secretary of Defense Marshall, and retained in its platform a strong endorsement of the principle of universal military training.

Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of this Congress, before it comes to the end of its session, to heed the words of Secretary Marshall and find the means, in spite of present and immediate requirements, for initiating a system of universal military training to give us that reservoir of trained manpower so essential to our future defense and to the requirements of our participation in the NATO program.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD Secretary Marshall's summary of his position, and earnest plea for a strong United States:

To the American Legion Convention at Los Angeles:

I regret that I am unable to be present in person to express to you the appreciation of the Department of Defense for the loyal support the Legion has always given to the preparedness measures and to urge your wholehearted efforts to give this country the strength it needs in the critical future we now face.

In the past, our military successes have invariably been received with an excess of optimism and an immediate reaction to reduce our Armed Forces or limit their further development. This was the case to a greater or lesser degree following almost every success we had in the last war, beginning with the victory in Tunisia. The immediate reaction to the Korean campaign seems to indicate repetition of this unfortunate habit of ours. But this time, with your most active help, I hope, we must not give away to the heavy pressures to relax our vigilance or emasculate our strength.

In the world today, I am sorry to say, military strength seems the most essential factor in the support of our foreign policy and of difficult negotiations, and it seems for the moment to be the best means to prevent war—also the surest way to hasten victory if war should befall us.

To maintain a strong military posture through the years immediately ahead and at the same time not to wreck our economy, it is mandatory that we create and maintain a reservoir of trained manpower available for service. In other words, we must have some system of universal military training. I will not go into the arguments in this message. You already know them well, I am sure, but they never have been more impressive to me than they are today, and I am certain they will be tomorrow.

In March 1948, as Secretary of State, I said before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate:

"I see no possible way financially to maintain a reasonable military posture except on the foundation of universal military training. The consideration of this subject has been confused by discussion of amounts, requirements, administration and various conflicting beliefs. The clear-cut issue is whether or not this country will stand before the world for at least the next 5 or 10 years in a position appropriate to its leadership in furthering the perpetuation of free governments, and avoiding their transition into police states."

In my final report as Chief of Staff in September 1945, I made a special and earnest plea for the immediate adoption of a system of universal military training. Last June we found ourselves of a sudden in a situation in Korea where the issue of trained manpower was of momentous importance. Now that that particular crisis seems moderated to some degree, I hope that the American people will recognize this urgent need and adopt it as a national policy. Just how we can best join the present imperative requirement for selective-service action with the initiation of some system for universal military training I am not now prepared to say. But one way or another, it must be done. Past proposals

will undoubtedly have to be materially altered to meet the serious situation into which we have gotten ourselves by past failures to act in time. But I hope, with your help, that we can manage this time to overcome the vigorous opposition of small minorities that have dominated the decision in the past, and finally do what, in my opinion, is so much to the vital interest of the American people, not to mention the world at large.

That Peace May Come—An Original Poem by Loraine Huntington Miller, of Long Beach, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in my home city of Long Beach, Calif., at the much-publicized and emphasized observance of United Nations Day at the ceremony which was held on the front steps of the city hall there was read the following original poem by the author, Loraine Huntington Miller:

THAT PEACE MAY COME
(By Loraine Huntington Miller)

Can deadly bombs of hydrogen
Create good will among all men?
Or planes that race the stars in flight
Bring peace more lasting than a night?
The spark that lifts us nearer God—
That makes us more than earthly clod—
That questing flame may well consume
The earth and all sons of her womb,
Unless we use it as the Lord
Planned when from the animal horde
He set man apart by giving him scul,
That by love he might control—
Not by man-made weapons hurled,
But by love—control the world.

Let us employ that inner force
By contact with its mighty source.
Let us as a nation pray;
At the beginning of each day
Let church bells ring at 8 o'clock
From timber line to salty dock—
Wet from the spread-out fishing seine—
From Florida to rocky Maine,
From Boston to the Golden Gate,
Ring, sweet bells, purge us of hate.

Ring, carillon, in Gothic tower,
While in the misty morning hour
Bell buoys answer from the sea,
And birds praise God in every tree.

Ring out, bell cast by Paul Revere,
Above New England church austere,
Above a clock tower, quaint and square,
Where strikes the hour for this our prayer.

Ring, mission bells, from adobe wall,
Waking dim aisles that recall
The feet of Serra as he trod
The suffering paths that led to God.

Ring, bells in graceful, pointed spire,
Designed by Wren, and rising higher
Than feathery elm and silver birch
That weave lace shadows on the church.

Ring, bells for college girls and beaus,
In old brick chapels, weathered rose.
Ring, bells, while we, the Nation, pray:
"In God we trust. Guide us each day.
Give us the power to know the right
And make of it our pilot light.
Let each of us strive hard for peace
Within our hearts and never cease.
For we alone can conquer hate
In home and town and sovereign State,
As we, the Nation's people, are,
So is our flag, each stripe and star.

"And give us leaders, strong and true,
Who know no other God than You,
Send straight, sure men in our great need.
Who humbly pray and proudly lead;

"May we and they, in faith's rebirth,
Inspire the peoples of the earth
To trust the God in every man,
And seek with us a better plan
To live together as a whole—
Each a part of infinite soul.

"O heed this prayer, O Lord. Amen."

While church bells ring, each morn again,
At 8 o'clock, across this land,
From valleys green to desert sand,
Let our Nation bow in prayer
That peace may come for all to share.

Mr. Speaker, it was so cordially received and is such a timely and inspiring interpretation that I feel honored to be permitted to have it called to the attention of you, Mr. Speaker, and also my distinguished colleagues in this great Congress. It has been my pleasure to know the author for many years and, on the occasion of this poem being read in public on United Nations Day, she explained to me that, while she was a firm believer in preparedness and adequate military strength as deterrents to war, she also felt the real end of wars for mankind forever must come through spiritual means.

Stop Chinese Communists in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

Congressman BRYSON,
Congressman from South Carolina,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please use your influence and ability for General MacArthur to be given authority to use everything at his disposal to stop the Chinese Communists that are killing our precious boys, and do not allow Britain to bring us into any kind of a so-called agreement with the Chinese Communists and Russian Communists, as there is no truth in them. Last but not least, the Chinese Communists have no right to be heard by the United Nations.

EARL P. PAULK,
State Superintendent of the Churches of God of North Carolina, Charlotte, N. C.

NOVEMBER 30, 1950.

Mr. EARL P. PAULK,
State Superintendent,
The Churches of God of North Carolina, Charlotte, N. C.:

Reurtel. Christian civilization was never subjected to a more severe test than now. The hour is at hand when every known force, including atomic bomb, should be promptly utilized to preserve the last remnant of freedom. I have and shall continue to do my utmost in this important day.

JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Member of Congress.

West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.'s Tree Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on November 9, 1950, a distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK, delivered a timely and significant address on the occasion of the dedication of the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.'s tree farm in Berkeley County, S. C. He paid well deserved tribute to a distinguished group—a group which is doing something to conserve one of our most vital natural resources—the tree—and a group which is such an indispensable asset to our national economy and defense. To those members of this fine group, responsible for such a visionary project, I too want to add my humble congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of our distinguished Senator, as follows:

The Democratic administration under President Roosevelt took over the direction of the governmental efforts in 1932. Among the important moves that he made from his active mind and understanding heart, was the directive through the Forestry Service of the National Government. This encouraged farmers and other land owners to plant trees and put their lands into tree crops.

The CCC camps were organized at this time. These served the double purpose of employment of young men, the development of new forests, and protection of the existing standing timber. Therefore, it is a fact that great emphasis was given to the development and conseravtion of this great national resource by the Federal Government.

It is a remarkable and happy fact that along the Atlantic seaboard from Wilmington, N. C., to Savannah, Ga., trees can grow to commercial size in less time than in any other known area in the world. Here in South Carolina mention should certainly be made of the outstanding contribution to the Nation-wide forestry development by the late F. A. Silcox. As you know he was a native of Charleston who was appointed Chief Forester of the United States.

It was as a member of the Public Works Administration that many problems of reforestation, soil conservation, and soil erosion were brought to the board's attention and they constructively aided in all of the problems submitted to it in this field of responsibility. When the resources of the pulpwood supply in South Carolina were fully realized, the important necessity for the landowner was a nearby market which would enable the seller to obtain a profitable f. o. b. price for his product. When I was mayor of Charleston the West Virginia Paper & Pulp Co. were seeking a site near Charleston to locate a plant. Pulp mills require a tremendous amount of water and their needs were greater than the existing water supply which the city of Charleston could furnish. The city of Charleston, realizing the far-reaching benefits to be derived from the establishment of a large manufacturing plant in this area contracted for the construction of the Edisto tunnel which assured an ample supply of good water indefinitely. This expenditure by the city of Charleston represented an investment of $1,000,000 or more.

I greatly appreciate the cooperation I received as a member of the Public Works Administration from the West Virginia Paper & Pulp Co., the International Paper Co., and others. The function of the Federal Government should be to assist individuals and corporations, when necessary, to maintain the free-enterprise system. Private enterprise in South Carolina, both individual and corporate, has shown initiative and vision and the reasons for today's ceremonies is another evidence of intelligent planning.

In South Carolina timber is one of the big-four crops, ranking second only to cotton in annual value. It stands well above tobacco and corn in total cash value.

South Carolina's forests produce raw materials worth $122,000,000 a year; the processing of wood adds over $150,000,000; 35,000 people are employed full time in South Carolina's forest industries. At least 100,000 others depend on forest industries for a major part of their living. The $372,000,000 forest industry of South Carolina ranks second only to textile in economic importance.

Nearly 12,000,000 acres in South Carolina are forest land. That is more than 60 percent of the State's entire area. The forests of the State are divided among more than 100,000 owners (108,170 individuals and firms). There are only a few large holdings. Many owners have woodlands of 20, 30, or 40 acres; the average holding among smaller owners is 70 acres.

Since 1936 the number of sawmills in the State has doubled. Production of wood pulp has jumped from 100 tons a day to more than 2,000 tons a day. The products of the forests are in greater demand today.

But South Carolina must meet a heavier demand for timber products with less timber than was growing on the land a decade ago. According to the forest survey conducted by the Southeastern Forest Experiment Station in cooperation with the State commission of forestry, the total volume of all sound trees in South Carolina declined 5 percent from 1936 to 1947. Pine, which provides the bulk of the timber products, declined 8 percent.

In saw timber (timber of the sizes and kinds suitable for lumber) the decline was 10 percent. Pine saw timber decreased 12 percent. On the southern coastal plain the decline in saw timber was 25 percent.

This decline in timber volume took place in spite of a 12-percent increase in the acreage of forest land. From 1936 to 1947 the area of commercial forest land increased 1,200,000,000 acres. Most of this increase was due to worn-out cropland being abandoned.

Nearly 5,000,000 acres—two-fifths of the forest land—is poorly stocked. Although South Carolina's industries depend mainly on pine, hardwoods are replacing pines on many areas. In the Sand Hill area some 400,000 acres of pineland has gone over to scrub oak. State-wide, the average quality of timber is declining. The average tree in 1946 contained 15 percent less net board-foot volume than the average tree in 1938. Cull trees have increased in number. One-fifth of the trees now growing in South Carolina are culls.

Nation-wide, the story is much the same. Of the country's 461,000,000 acres of commercial forest land, 75,000,000 is virtually idle. Although the Eastern and Southern States have three-fourths of the commercial forest land, one-third of all our saw-timber is now concentrated on 6 percent of the forest land in the Pacific Northwest. The quality and size of the timber have deteriorated over large areas.

Timber is being cut from the forests faster than it is growing. It is reported that more than half of all timber cutting in the United States is poor or destructive.

Although the United States is one of the leading Nations in forest area and in kinds of useful timber, we have since the war imported more lumber and wood pulp than we have exported. That means we are consuming more forest products than we produce.

But there is indeed a world shortage of timber, especially of the softwoods used for construction lumber. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reports that about two-thirds of the world's forests receive neither care nor protection. In the face of ever-mounting needs for wood, the world's forests are steadily diminishing.

If South Carolina is to benefit from its large area of forest land in more jobs, more resources to return taxes, and more general income for all, that forest land must be made to provide the necessary basic timber supplies permanently and continuously. A permanently prosperous industry and an expanding economy for South Carolina or for the Nation cannot be built upon diminishing resources.

Forest growth in South Carolina and elsewhere in the Nation must be built up and kept up.

Forest land can be managed so that it will grow and yield successive crops of good timber. The average yearly growth rate can be increased and the quality of the growing stock can be improved through good forestry.

The tract of land we are dedicating today is to be devoted to such continuous production. The company that owns this land is to be commended for its progressiveness and foresight in pledging this land to forestry.

Good forestry should be applied on millions and millions more acres, all over the country. Every possible public and private aid and encouragement should be given to the extension of good forestry practice. The Federal Government, the States, the forest industries, and the individual forest owners should unite in aggressive action to build up our forest resources and see that they are wisely managed.

Forest resources are needed—for more than lumber and paper. One of the greatest values of forests concerns the control of water. Much of our Nation suffers from soil erosion and floods and sedimentation. Good forest growth affords excellent protection against such losses. It increases the ability of the soil to take in and store water. By maintaining good forest conditions we can assure ourselves not only of good timber but also better control over runoff, lessened soil erosion, lessened silting up of stream channels and of reservoirs, and greater recharge of valuable underground fresh water supplies.

The world today requires that we make and keep ourselves strong. Forest resources are among the essential elements of our national strength.

The Soviet Union, by the way, seems to be well aware of the importance of the forest resources. The recent 5-year plan for the development of forestry is reported to provide for the planting and cultivation of trees on an area exceeding the entire forest area of the British Isles. The volume of timber production was planned to attain by 1950 a 59-percent increase over 1940. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at present maintains 12 forestry institutes, 15 special forestry research institutions, and many scores of experimental stations and laboratories in all parts of the country.

In this country we have plenty of good, potentially productive forest land, probably enough, if we put it to work and handle it wisely, to meet our timber needs permanently and abundantly.

The dedication of this 340,000 acres today is a good step in the right direction. But good forestry practice must be applied to nearly a thousand million times that much land if our forest resources are to be built up as they should be.

Charles H. Flory, State forester of South Carolina, has said that with the application of improved forest practices it is entirely possible that the annual rate of growth in South Carolina's forests could be increased from the present average of 100 board feet per acre per year to 300 or even 400 board feet. Nation-wide, the average annual timber growth per acre probably could be at least doubled.

In the interest of our national security, and to meet the growing needs of an expanding economy, we should take the necessary steps, promptly and aggressively, to do so.

Debts, Deficits, and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, and an address by Hon. Herbert Hoover to the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce:

JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
November 12, 1950.

Representative BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BEN: Thanks a lot for the letter you sent way back last May 27 regarding the talk Herbert Hoover made complimenting the Jaycees for their work on operation efficiency, the program urging adoption of the Hoover Commission findings.

In that letter you refer to the possibility of inserting this talk in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think this is an excellent suggestion and I know the Jaycees throughout the country would appreciate it very much.

Enclosed is a copy of the recording, which was broadcast over 31 stations from Maine to California.

Also enclosed is a copy of the talk Mr. Hoover later made before the junior chamber national convention. Perhaps it could also be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MATTOX,
Member, Junior Chamber of Commerce, Shenandoah, Iowa.

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDING BY HERBERT HOOVER, MARCH 24, 1950

Gentlemen of the junior chamber of commerce, the junior chambers are doing a valiant job in creating public interest in the reports of the Commission on Reorganization of the Government. You have put a vitality into this crusade that only youth can do. It is a crusade for intelligent reduction in the huge cost of government. It is a crusade to clear the track for competency in the multitude of Federal activities. It is a nonpartisan crusade. It is a job for citizenship rather than partisanship.

There are byproducts of this crusade just as important as winning these reforms themselves. It is a great public educational campaign on the processes, the meanings, the dangers, and the values of government. You're giving a great lesson in civics and good government.

In a larger sense this is a crusade to make democracy work. There is much apprehension that it may fail. Many believe that bureaucracy has got so big that it cannot be controlled.

Now you may have confidence you're making progress. The two reforms of the unification of the armed services and general services of the Government are already enacted. The unification of the armed services already resulted in great savings. The

general services, by consolidating buying, building controls, etc., are already in action with important savings and increased efficiency. A number of other minor reforms have been perfected.

The Commission proposed many more reforms of great importance that have not yet been enacted. There is naturally opposition. There are some Government agencies who hesitate to give up their vested habits and their vested interests and the cuts in the number of their employees. They are steadfastly for reform in all the other departments.

And there are pressure groups who support the objecting bureaucracies and who, I regret to say, misrepresent and distort the Commission's recommendations. To clear up these misrepresentations and carry the debate straight to the people is the great mission that you have undertaken. And this is no academic discussion. You're dealing with matters that concern every cottage in the land. You're engaged in a great national service, and you're doing it well.

DEBTS, DEFICITS, AND TAXES

(Address by Herbert Hoover before the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Chicago, Ill., June 16, 1950)

It is a pleasure to address the Junior Chamber of Commerce. We owe to you a debt for the support you have given to reorganizing the executive machinery of the Government. There are even more reasons for public appreciation of your organization.

You have asked me to speak on the relation of Government expenditures, deficits, and taxes to jobs and to national life.

Today we are blessed with some kind of prosperity. Whatever kind it is, we all want stability without inflation. We want a system that finds jobs for 1,000,000 new workers each year.

DEFICITS IN GENERAL

In 1932 I did the suffering from an unbalanced budget. The reverberations of a European panic had pulled the tax revenues out from under us, and we were compelled to make large recoverable loans to support our credit structure. Outside these subsequently recovered loans our modest deficit was about $1,000,000,000. In the midst of this grief, Mr. Roosevelt, in denouncing our deficit, made an uncomfortable remark to the effect that, too often, liberal governments have been wrecked on the rock of deficits. However, we only heard this remark once.

About this time, Lord John Maynard Keynes came up with his new intoxicant of deficit spending in years of unemployment. It had a good political flavor. Having got the habit, we keep drinking in times of presumed prosperity. With the exception of 2 years in the Eightieth Congress, we have had deficits and increasing debt for all 17 years since Keynes helped us out.

The consoling answer of the inebriated is that there is really no such thing as Government debt. They say, "We owe it to ourselves." Any government which follows this will-o'-wisp will sometime break its neck over the precipice of inflation. Some have already done so.

DEFICITS IN PROSPECT

We cannot appraise these questions without using facts, figures, and the word "billions." But, to be sure the billions I mention are free of political bias, I use only those from Democratic Senators.

Senator HARRY BYRD says that if we include all Federal expenditures, both in and outside of the President's formal budget, they will amount to about $44,000,000,000 for the present fiscal year, with a deficit of about $5,000,000,000. Our State and local expenditures amount to about $15,000,000,000. That would be around $60,000,000,000 of various current government expenditures.

Beyond this Senator MCCLELLAN calculates that, if all the recommended Federal legislation is passed, it will increase the annual Federal expenditures by $20,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 more. Even without this phantasmagoria of a promised land, the Federal deficit will probably be greater next year, and there are also powerful urgings to State and municipal governments for increased expenditures.

THE FIVE QUESTIONS

Five questions arise about all this:

1. Who pays these taxes?
2. Can taxes be sufficiently increased to meet these deficits?
3. Will deficits not lead to more inflation?
4. Can expenses be reduced?
5. What stands in the way of reductions?

It is these five questions, plus the activities of the different breeds of collectivists, which plague the American people today.

WHO PAYS THE TAXES?

"Who pays the taxes?" Here we enter a land of twilights and illusions. We can illuminate it somewhat if we divide the taxpayers into the sheep and the goats. The sheep are the families who have a gross income of less than $7,000 a year before taxes. The goats are those who have a gross income of more than $7,000 a year. Various studies show that almost 80 percent of governmental revenues come from the sheep. It also shows that each sheep family on the average pays about $1,400 a year in taxes and deductions. Therefore even the $7,000 top figure for the sheep is not $7,000.

CAN TAXES BE INCREASED TO MEET THESE DEFICITS?

I suppose taxes could be increased until the whole population can no longer buy enough food or clothes. The real question is how far our people can be taxed and still have jobs and a decent standard of living. We can apply four tests as to whether the patient can stand any more tax mixtures.

First. Because of the average $1,400 annual taxes on the sheep families, a large number of them are already prevented from reaching the standard which the Labor Department insists is desirable.

Second. But how about the goats who have gross incomes of more than $7,000 a year? The answer is easy. If the Government confiscated their entire personal incomes, it would not pay the present Federal deficit—and that does not include Senator MCCLELLAN'S phantasmagoria of a promised land.

Third. One of the illusions of our times is that corporation taxes come from the stockholders. Sometime the American people will realize that corporation taxes are passed on to the customers, who are the sheep. Otherwise the corporations would in the end go bankrupt.

Therefore, any substantial increase in taxes must come by shearing more from the sheep.

Fourth, It is my belief that even present taxes are so draining the savings of the people into the Government as to undermine new jobs for the future. It is possible to calculate the present Government take as theoretically over 60 percent of the people's savings after deducting the cost of a possible decent standard of living. With Senator MCCLELLAN'S phantasmagoria the Government take would be over 80 percent.

The fact that taxes have already definitely shrunken venture and equity capital for small business would seem to be proved when the Government proposes to furnish such capital. Never before, in 165 years, did small business depend on Government.

That is also proof that the Government is becoming more and more the source of capital and credit. To which the Socialists applaud.

Big business can finance itself by borrowing money, especially while the Government is inflating credit. But big business only employs about 25 percent of the working population.

The answer to the question, "Can our economy stand substantially more taxes and still make substantial progress?" is just simply "No," unless you believe a collectivist state is progress.

WILL DEFICITS LEAD TO MORE INFLATION?

Financing Government deficits by borrowing, if continued long enough, has only one end—inflation. That has been proved by a dozen nations.

We ourselves have already decreased the purchasing value of the dollar by about 50 percent, and we are still creeping along that road. The 5-cent telephone call and the 5-cent fare have already gone, and the 5-cent candy bar has shrunk. A new round of inflation is now appearing in direct or indirect wage and salary increases and rising commodity prices.

If we keep on this road, we are certain to reach the President's ideal of $4,000 a year to every family. But it will not have $4,000 purchasing power.

To this question of further Government borrowing to meet deficits, my answer is that it is the road to disaster for every cottage in the land.

CAN WE REDUCE EXPENSES?

The next question, "Can we reduce expenses?" To that, the answer is "Yes."

The first move in that direction is to stop Senator MCCLELLAN'S phantasmagoria in its tracks. That is easy if we take a holiday in new Government services until the deficit is overcome. No doubt many things the Government can provide are desirable. Most every family would like to add desirable things to its living. But getting them by borrowing money is the way the old homestead was lost. Most families shy off that method. And the Government should be even more shy, or it will come to a bad end.

The second and most simple device to reduce expenses is for Congress to cut proposed expenditures to the very bones of necessity; also to suspend the sport of log-rolling and pork barrels.

We are generally told that these enormous Government expenditures and deficits are mainly the inheritances of the war and cannot be helped. It is true that of the present budget of $44,000,000,000, about $32,000,000,000 go to pay interest on the debt, veterans, national defense, and subsidies to other countries to keep them comfortable in the cold war. Those items have been increased 15 percent in the last 3 years.

To get some look at expenditures not created by the wars, and to avoid any partisan flavor, we may start from a Democratic fiscal year of 17 years ago. This nonwar part of the Government has increased expenditures 400 percent in 17 years and 50 percent in the last 3 years. No amount of claims that the purchasing value of the dollar has decreased or that the population has increased can explain these increases.

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The third way to reduce expenses is the more efficient organization and the cutting out of waste in Government on the lines proposed by the Reorganization Commission.

Through the cooperation of the administration, the Congress, the Citizens Committee, and such organizations as yours, we have already made substantial progress in these reforms of the executive branch of the Government.

The major accomplishments are:

Unification of the Armed Forces;

Reorganization of the State Department;

Unification of the General Services;

Reorganization of the Government merchant marine.

They represent big money. In addition, a number of minor reforms have been accepted.

MAJOR REFORMS STILL TO DO

We still have many major reforms to accomplish. They include our proposals:

To reorganize the whole civil service into an honest-to-goodness career service based on merit with justice and encouragement in promotion. The experienced chairman of our task force unhesitatingly stated we could save 10 percent of the Federal payroll. That would be a little item of $600,000,000.

To put the budgeting and accounting of the Government on a business basis. There would be many savings possible if the Government could see itself in the mirror of an adequate accounting system.

To organize the post office into a modern business concern, with management free from politics. With this reform and some increase in rates to special commercial users, I believe its deficit of half a billion could be overcome.

To reorganize the structure of the Departments of Treasury, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Interior, and Housing so that each of them has, cheek by jowl, the agencies devoted to a related major purpose. That would fix responsibility for policies, create checks and balances, eliminate overlaps, competition, and waste inevitable in activities now scattered all over the Government. The chairman of only one of those task forces said that $300,000,000 could be saved by that one unification.

Unify the Government Hospital Services so as to save four or five hundred million dollars of unnecessary construction now authorized; at the same time to provide better medical service and better preparedness for war.

And there are scores of other reforms which are pointed at greater efficiency for less money.

These recommendations were founded upon 2 years of study by 18 task forces comprised of independent leading men and women of experience whose reports, recommendations, and reasons are open to everybody.

These reforms are in the lap of the gods in Washington and the pressure groups at home.

WHAT STANDS IN THE WAY OF REDUCTION OF EXPENDITURES?

The next question is, What stands in the way of these reforms and reductions?

Over 25 years ago, I served on a Commission of Reorganization of the Executive Branch. I saw those reforms go to their doom. At that time I attended their burial with the following remarks:

"* * * Practically every single item has met with opposition from some vested official, or it has disturbed some vested habit, and offended some organized minority. It has aroused the paid propagandists. All of them are in favor of every item of reorganization except that which affects the activity in which they are specially interested. In the aggregate, these directors of vested habits and propaganda surround Congress with a confusing fog of opposition. Meanwhile, the inchoate voice of the public gets nowhere but to swear."

But we are doing better this time than 25 years ago, as we had little public or congressional support at that time.

Among our public supporters, your organization has given its fine energies to educating the misguided lay members of obstructing pressure groups.

I may take a parable from Dr. Flemming. A Boy Scoutmaster was calling the roll of his troop as to what good deed each had performed during the week. All passed except four. The scoutmaster told the four to go at once and come back in the afternoon, each with a good deed to report. When they returned, the first replied that he had helped a lady across the street. The second, third, and fourth made the same reply. The suspicious scoutmaster inquired if this was all about the same lady. The first boy replied, "Yes, sir. She ought to have crossed but she refused to go. It took all four of us to get her over."

PROBLEMS DEEPER IN REORGANIZATION

But the problems which face us in fiscal questions are deeper in American life than reorganization of the executive departments.

We need to make an appraisal of some of the forces which produce these dangers from expenditures, deficits, inflation, and drainage of savings into the Government.

It is possible to denounce public officials for all these dangers and ills. But do not overlook the fact that public officials get elected because they satisfy their constituents. Among their constituencies are the special groups who want something from the Treasury. Many of them are on guard to protect their members from losing established privilege. They all wear the clothing of public interest. They are active in electing their man while the other citizen sleeps.

We bitterly fought special privilege in business. This idea of special privilege in groups is a more modern development.

There are probably 200,000 voluntary associations in the United States of some kind or another, most of which give voice for or against something of public importance. Except for the collectivists, they are one of the essential foundation piers under the American system of life. They perform millions of services in developing public understanding and public action. They also serve the country by neutralizing each other before the congressional committees.

The number of associations interested in increasing or preventing the decrease in Government expenditures is very small, probably not 50 of much consequence, but they are a powerful minority.

Nor do all these pressures come from the voluntary associations. The municipalities press the State governments and the State governments the Federal Government.

If such an unexpected thing were to happen as all these groups keeping their hands off expenditure questions and these reforms in government for 12 months, both in Washington and in the election districts, the Congress would do a great job not only in decreasing expenses but in the common interest of the Nation.

MORALS AS WELL AS ECONOMIES

There is something else involved in all this problem.

Out of the war, as from all wars, the Nation has had a spell of moral and spiritual sickness. It has been a period of great cynicism. With the lowered moral resistance of this period, unfair burdens have been placed on the people by particular groups. Too frequently do we hear a repetition of the excuse, "They got theirs; we will get ours," or Franklin's remark about "God helps those who help themselves."

But if Ben were alive today he would say, "Freemen were not created by drives of pressure groups on the Public Treasury."

CONCLUSION

Nations must inevitably suffer from their mistakes. But their survival depends upon their will, their courage, and their moral and spiritual fiber. If these qualities live, unbalanced budgets and ideological disputes can be but a passing froth on the surface. The rise of American civilization was out of a people of such qualities. It has been sick but it is not in its decline and fall. All around us we see signs of moral and spiritual strength in the oncoming youth.

There is a difficult word I could use here—atavism—that is, the latent qualities which we inherit from our ancestors. They are coming back. Such organizations as yours are their expression. In you lie our hopes and our confidence.

Senator Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, and the Preparedness Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have carefully followed the work of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON are very proud of his accomplishments as Chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee which is a part of the Senate Armed Services Committee. His subcommittee has been interested in obtaining facts about our defense program and when by extensive hearings it is determined that some Government agency or official has made some error, the committee's only concern is to see these faults corrected and to avoid similar ones in the future.

Senator JOHNSON's preparedness subcommittee has demonstrated in many ways that it is after the facts and not the newspaper headlines. In several instances, I understand, some Government agencies or officials had been dragging their feet on some part of the defense program when they learned that this subcommittee was looking into their activity or lack of activity and this very fact has resulted in appropriate action being taken.

Mr. Speaker, it is the leadership demonstrated by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON and his subcommittee which will result in our Nation becoming militarily prepared and able to defend itself against Communist aggression.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram entitled "Senator LYNDON JOHNSON: Man of Vision":

SENATOR LYNDON JOHNSON: MAN OF VISION

Pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are replete with evidence that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas is a man of far greater than average foresight.

Since the trouble in Korea began, touching off our accelerated defense program, there have been many persons, in Congress and out, claiming to have known all along that our position was vulnerable. Some of these claims doubtless are justified; others are of questionable validity.

But there can be no question that Senator JOHNSON foresaw a long time ago that our defenses were weak. While the average American was pleading for curtailed Federal spending and reduced taxation, LYNDON JOHNSON, first as a Member of the House and later as a Member of the Senate, was pleading with his colleagues in Congress for greater military strength for America as the surest way of stopping Communist aggression and preventing war with Russia.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a much-maligned publication, but it is a complete and accurate report of the proceedings in the House and Senate. What our Representatives and Senators say in debates on the floor of either House is taken down by stenographers and printed in the RECORD, making a permanent and indisputable record of each word uttered and each vote cast by every Member of Congress. Here are some excerpts from Mr. JOHNSON'S speeches in Washington, as reported in the RECORD.

In the House on May 7, 1947, during debate on the bill to provide military and economic assistance to Greece and Turkey: "The one thing a bully understands is force, and the one thing he fears is courage. Human experience teaches me that if I let a bully of my community make me travel back streets to avoid a fight, I merely postpone the evil day. If Russia is not willing to stop, then now is the time for us to decide whether we will meet her, and meet her now."

On March 15, 1948, making an appeal for a 70-group air force, Mr. JOHNSON declared that "our air forces, including naval aviation, are today equipped largely with obsolete planes."

"How short is our memory," he said in conclusion. "How soon we forget. To make us less forgetful, somewhere there should be a tablet of enduring bronze and on it inscribed two columns of names in everlasting letters. Above one column would read the inscription: Here are the names of those who refused to prepare. Here are the names of those who voted to send our Army home. Here are the men who were frightened by our attempts to build a navy. That would be the heading of the first column. And on the other side would be eight short words: Here are the names of those who died."

In a radio address over a group of Texas stations on March 25, 1948, reported in full in the RECORD of March 29: "Russia today has more than 4,000,000 men in her army. America has 540,000. Russia is building 8,000 to 12,000 planes a year. America is building 1,800. Russia is spending $20,000,000,000 a year to make herself invincible. We are spending between $10,000,000,000 and $11,000,000,000. We are 322,000 men short of minimum peacetime needs. Some of our finest citizens say that in our atomic air age we won't need any foot-soldier army. I wish I could believe what they say."

In a speech to the House on March 31, 1948, during debate on the Rubber Act of 1948: "I do not feel that I can associate myself with this legislation which, in essence, is an order to the President of the United States requiring him to speed disposal of the Government's rubber properties, which I think are essential to the Nation's security."

On the following day Mr. JOHNSON told his colleagues that "the Red hands of communism are reaching out for the throat of freedom around the globe—in Europe, in China, in South America, and even in our land. What blunder was it that pushed us into two world wars? It was the blunder of doing too little too late."

On April 12, 1948, in another plea for "a strong Air Force—the strongest in the world," Mr. JOHNSON remarked that "the roar of airplane engines is more impressive than the guarded words of diplomacy."

In a statement issued to the press on February 13 of this year Senator JOHNSON declared: "If a guided-missile warfare should begin within the next 2 or 3 years, we, at our present rate, would be very feeble participants. For push-button war we have neither the push nor the button."

"Shall we gamble with security?" Senator JOHNSON asked the Senate on March 28 of this year. "The prudent man, instead of regarding the figures of our military men as excessive," he said, "would regard them as an underestimate."

The foresight which Senator JOHNSON demonstrated he possesses is a fortunate thing for the country. He is using it to good advantage in his new position as chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The Korean war started on June 25, and the Johnson committee was created the latter part of July. Within a month the group, among other things, stopped the sale of four synthetic rubber plants which had been declared surplus before the Korean crisis and apparently had been forgotten by military planners. It also ended the disposal of aircraft parts at one Air Force base where there was evidence that similar parts were being bought elsewhere at higher prices.

In the present crisis America sorely needs men of Senator JOHNSON's ability, energy, and vision. Texas may well take pride in the fact that it is helping to meet that need.

Losing a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following editorial from the Washington News which should be read not only by Members of Congress but also by members of the staff of the State Department:

LOSING A WAR

We are in one hell of a mess.

The United States is at war with world-wide communism, headed up in the Kremlin.

Our troops are fighting under the banner of the United Nations. But most other members of the world organization have given them only moral and token support, and much of it has been given grudgingly and then neutralized by back-seat driving.

And even that support may be withdrawn at any time.

American intervention against Red aggression in Korea was widely applauded as a brave stroke for world order. But when Red China moved to the support of the Korean Communists, the ardor of some of our fair-weather friends began to cool.

Now we are threatened by a new form of isolationism—one which may leave us standing alone against the Russian tide.

It's bad enough to be at war without dependable allies. It's even worse to be at war under leadership which refuses to see in that war anything but a "police action." Five thousand Americans have been killed in this war. How many more must die before our Government can be forced to face up to the ugly and dangerous realities of the situation?

Secretary of State Acheson told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday behind closed doors that everyone knew "damned well" that Moscow was behind the Chinese Communist intervention. Which everybody does. The Russian tanks and jet planes used against our troops left no doubt of that.

But, after admitting that Russia was behind the war her puppets are waging against us in Korea, what did Mr. Acheson propose to do about it? Nothing. For the time being, at least, he said, the United States would not hold Russia accountable.

That attitude is one of the reasons why we are in this mess.

The Chinese Communists invaded Korea on October 20.

The State Department first ignored the attack. Then Mr. Acheson joined the British foreign office in trying to buy them off.

Failing in that, President Truman personally held out the olive branch.

When that gesture was rebuffed, the United Nations rolled out the red carpet and virtually suspended business so that the Chinese Reds could send a delegation to Lake Success to attack the United States for the invasion of Formosa.

Even with 200,000 Chinese Communist troops attacking our forces on the Korean front, our Government, although charging the Chinese Reds with aggression, was not prepared to ask the United Nations to support that charge. It asked only for a UN resolution calling on the Chinese Reds to withdraw to their own side of the Yalu River—the very thing Mr. Acheson has been begging them to do since October 20.

This Nation cannot win a war under that kind of pussyfooting leadership. The men fighting in Korea can have nothing but contempt for it.

Red China is guilty of unprovoked aggression and should be so branded by the United Nations.

This is a made-in-Moscow war and Russia should be told by the United Nations to stop it, under penalty of expulsion from the UN if she fails.

The timid souls in the State Department will contend that we could not win support for such a demand.

Very well. We can put ourselves on record and we can find out what other nations we can depend on as this war continues. We are losing the war now because our vacillation has encouraged a drift toward appeasement that is rapidly becoming a rout.

If the United Nations cannot deal with Russia as determinedly as it did with North Korea, then the organization should be abandoned until the one-world idea has firm support instead of mere lip service.

Meanwhile, if the United Nations will not support the American troops fighting under its banner in Korea, our troops have no business being there. They should be withdrawn and held ready for the real show-down with the real culprit in this situation—Soviet Russia.

Regulation W

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from Michigan and while mingling among my friends and constituents I received many protests about so-called regulation W. In fact, I met with several groups of constituents, all of whom were injuriously affected by this regulation as now being administered.

I am in receipt of a resolution passed by the Lenawee County Automobile Dealers' Association, which conveys the position of the folks back home with whom I have conferred. This resolution does not ask for the abandonment of the regulation in toto but does urge that the time limit in which a purchaser may pay for an automobile be extended from 15 months to 21 months. This is not an unreasonable request and I hope that those in authority will give favorable consideration to it.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas regulation W as presently administered is working a great hardship on automobile dealers, their employees, people generally requiring automobile transportation in connection with their employment, and the public in general; and

Whereas this organization is interested in the national defense and is willing and anxious to do that which is in the public interest; and

Whereas practical experience and a study of the situation convinces our group that said regulation W is too rigid and because of this rigidity will destroy its purpose: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting that the Congress should immediately reconsider and make more flexible said regulation to the end that the over-all time in which a purchaser may pay for an automobile be extended to at least 21 months; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to United States Senators ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG and HOMER FERGUSON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., and Representative EARL C. MICHENER and GEORGE MEADER, Congressman-elect, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Award of Posthumous Medal of Honor to Al Jolson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House that on November 27, 1950, I introduced H. R. 9766 authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to Al Jolson, beloved entertainer and friend of three generations of Americans. It seems to me eminently fitting that Congress should bestow the highest honor at its command upon one who in the course of a long and colorful career upon the American stage gave wholesome pleasure to countless thousands. He was essentially a minstrel in the grand tradition. Every country has its folklore and its folksongs. Our foremost living dramatic critic once remarked, "I care not who writes the laws of a country so long as I may listen to its songs."

In Al Jolson was to be found a type of authentic genius which reflects the popular humor of the era and at the same time something of the yearning, the wistfulness, of the little man, the very humble citizen, who would fain reach out to a world of poetry and melody which he senses but to which he knows he can never attain save by the help of others. Stephen C. Foster, of course, is the most towering figure in the history of American minstrelsy but Al Jolson has his place, too. The beloved black-faced singer of the famous mammy song upon which millions of his countrymen hung year after year between tears and laughter; the world-famous central figure of The Jazz Singer which practically created the era of the talking picture, was a very important figure, indeed, in keeping up the morale of our troops throughout the last war.

After Pearl Harbor, Jolson immediately volunteered for war service. He toured every war front singing the old songs Mammy and Sonny Boy which, as had been the case with their fathers before them, he found to be the favorites with our troops from Alaska to the Southwest Pacific, from England to north Africa and from India to Brazil. While he appeared under the banner of the United Service Organizations he went out of his way to give independent performances to any post that could produce an audience of two people, always paying his own expenses. He was in Sicily soon after the first invasion barges.

Then came Korea. Once more the gallant old trouper responded to the call of duty. Flying halfway across the world the brave old minstrel gave 44 performances in 11 days. It was too much. His valiant heart could not stand the strain. He flew back to this country and died in San Francisco on October 23. He died as surely and as truly in defense of his country as any soldier in the front line.

So, as I said at the beginning, it seems to me fitting and proper that Congress should pay its lasting tribute to a true and noble patriot who will be forever enshrined in the history of the American stage and screen.

Address of Leon H. Keyserling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at the closing session of the National Planning Conference for Israel and Jewish Rehabilitation, Sunday, October 29, Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, discussed certain economic phases and conditions in the United States in 1950. I am sure many of my colleagues will find his views extremely interesting at this time. His address was as follows:

I am particularly glad that this is called a planning conference, because despite the aspersions that are sometimes cast upon the idea of planning, despite the idea that some people seem to think that the word "planning" is something for the totalitarians but not for the free people, I always like to recall that the really simple definition of "planning" is the one thing that separates most of all, the civilized man from the savage or the barbarian. The main difference between the civilized man and the barbarian is that the barbarian lives from day to day, and the civilized man has ideals and hopes and aspirations and plans for the future. That is the central difference between society and the dark days before there was organized society.

So I am very glad that the accent of this meeting is upon planning, upon the idea that however things may be today—and part of the picture day is good, and part bad—that we are concerning ourselves mostly with looking toward the future, that we are concerning ourselves mostly not with the idea that the future will represent simply the unraveling of circumstances beyond our control under some immutable laws, but rather that, broadly speaking, the future will be what we make it, that it will be, above all, what it is made by free men and women all over the world, using the instruments of freedom not for irresponsibility but for planning, for setting goals, high goals, ever-increasing goals, and seeking always to work together to achieve them.

For that reason I am glad, as I have observed in the press and elsewhere, that this conference is concentrating upon long-range planning, upon recognition that there is nothing magical about the day or the month or even the year, and that while none of us can see too far ahead in these parlous times, and while none of us can see a century ahead, we must look at least 3 or 4 or 5 or 10 years ahead to get our bearings and to be able to make our plans large enough and imaginative enough and realistic enough.

I do not think there is a conflict between being imaginative and being realistic. I think they are the two most closely wedded together things in the world.

We must look far ahead enough in this planning conference to realize that we must make big plans and long-range plans and have confidence that the future will give us the chance and the opportunity to carry them out.

I will, I suppose, despite my declarations to the contrary, have to say a few things about conditions in the United States, because, rightly or wrongly, that is one of the reasons why I was asked to be here with you today; and, while I want to say a few things mostly about economic conditions in the United States as a foundation for our thinking about the problems of Israel and other problems, perhaps I ought to say a word first and be even more presumptuous, to say something about the general international situation, not because that is my particular field, but because that is a field in which there are no specialists, because that is the field of everybody, because that is the field upon which we must all rivet our thinking if we are going to have an understanding of the underlying conditions underneath all of our economic problems.

Stated most simply, the new programs, economic in character, upon which the United States is now embarking, are not based upon the inevitability of a world war III. On the contrary, they are plans directed toward working our way, maybe slowly and painfully, but working our way, nonetheless, toward more assuring conditions of peace.

But while in that sense they are idealistic plans, they are also realistic plans, and that illustrates the close connection between the two. They are realistic plans based upon the experience which shows that we cannot have peace simply by hoping for it, that we cannot have peace simply by neglecting real problems, that we cannot have peace through appeasement or weakness but only through a build-up of the strength of the free peoples of the world to the point where they will be in a better position to act with firmness, to act with courage and resolution.

That is the road to peace.

I submit, without having the time to document it in the short time that I have to talk here, that all of the experience within the recollection of everybody within this room shows that the history of this century has indicated that that is the surest road that we can travel toward peace, and, in any event, it is the only road which a free people can choose to travel, because there is no alternative, neither the alternative of closing our eyes and falling asleep about the difficulties confronting us nor the alternative of thinking that we can settle them quickly and more securely by traveling the road to war.

We must travel that moderate, middle ground, trying surely and securely and substantially but gradually to build up our defense effort, in which we must work with the other free peoples of the world.

That has very important consequences for the American economy, and because it has important consequences for the American economy, it has important consequences for any thinking about the relationship between the people of this country and what they can afford to do with respect to assistance in the problems of Israel.

Some of you may recall that in 1949, at Atlantic City, at a time when many people in this country were concerned, when some were throwing up their hands about economic conditions on the ground that there was some softening of the economic situation, I appeared before you at the height or depth of the 1949 recession and said that not only in the long run but also in the short run, the economic prospects of the United States were very good, not only very good but better than they had ever been before—not only very good but prospectively better even than they had been in 1948, which was the all-time peak year up to that time.

I was not surprised that there were some who looked upon that with a raising of the eyebrows; perhaps there were some who even thought—very wrongly—that as somebody within the structure of Government dealing with economics, it was my job to go around the country beating up signs of optimism when none existed.

But by the middle of 1950, even before there was any effect upon the economy resulting from the quickening of defense activity following the outbreak in Korea, in the middle of 1950, even before then, it must have been very clear to everybody that that was the condition of the American economy, that the economy was not only stronger and more prosperous but also more stable than it had ever been before World War II, that the speed of the recovery from the modest recession of 1949 had been quick and reassuring and that by the middle of 1950, in terms of employment, in terms of levels of business activity, in terms of national income, in terms of any of the measurements that we might use, we had reached new peaks, peaks not only incomparably greater than any before the war, but greater than those reached in 1948; and if we had not had the change in the international situation, it would have become by then perfectly apparent that the law of the American economy was the law of growth, that the economy would not, could not be stabilized by standing still, and that in each succeeding year we were going to make new records of economic prosperity, of national income and of general economic well-being; because we have a growing population, because we have a limitless technological skill, limitless resources, because we have, with all its blemishes and defects, the best general economic system and I think also perhaps the best political system that the mind of man has yet put into application on a large scale, although there are defects, and we are going ahead from year to year doing better and better.

Under those circumstances, it seemed absolutely inconceivable to me and still seems absolutely inconceivable to me that any economist, inside or outside of the Government, should have the temerity to stand up here and try to make a case for whether or to what extent or how we can afford to continue responsibilities already assumed and responsibilities becoming larger because the problems are larger.

The only kind of argument that can be relevant to that question would be on the part of those who say, "Haven't we done so much in the past for so long a period of time that we must look forward to a cessation in the near future?" And I say to you in all sincerity that anybody who says that seems to me to be neglecting the first law of life, and first law of history, which is that there is no end to problems; there is no end to responsibility.

The only question is whether we have reached the end of our capacity to live up to our responsibilities. And if we have reached the end of our capacity to live up to our responsibilities, then we are indeed in a shabby state and would be creating a sore spectacle before the free peoples all over the world, a spectacle on the part of the greatest, the richest, the most powerful Nation of peoples in the world, not only now but in the outlook for the future.

The effect of the defense program, since it is a substantial but gradual build-up in the cause of peace, is going to have a substantial effect upon our economy. It is going to make it necessary for us to pay higher taxes; it is going to make it necessary for us to—I don't like to use the words "do without" because whenever I use the words "do without" I again think vividly of the contrast between our condition and that of peoples anywhere else in the world, that when we talk about doing without a narrow fringe of luxuries which people in other countries have not even begun to dream of having or enjoying.

Although we may have to pay somewhat higher taxes—in fact will have to pay somewhat higher taxes—and will have to do without some of this narrow fringe of luxuries that anywhere else in the great world are unknown, nevertheless the power and strength of the American economy are such that I believe that after that increasing burden is borne, and as it helps us to work our way to a more pacific situation, we will have more left over for other purposes year by year than we have had in 1948 or in 1949 or in 1950.

What I mean to say in another way is that the increasing productive power of our economy and its expansion in the years ahead will be able to absorb the increasing defense burden which we are assuming in the interest of ourselves no less than of others, and will leave over enough for us to enjoy standards of business activity, standards of living which by any prewar tests in our own country—and certainly by any test of comparison with any other nation in the world—are so high and will continue to be so high that the test will be not what we can do but whether we are awake to what we must do.

Just to give you one example of that—and then I am nearly through—since I talked with this group or part of this group in Atlantic City a year ago the national output on a yearly basis, the national production, that is, the measure of the creation of our wealth in the United States, is well over $20,000,000,000 a year higher in annual rate than it was when I last talked with some of you.

Just think of it: Within the space of a year or less than a year we have increased our annual national income, we have increased our annual production of goods and services by one-third of our total national income in an average year and by many times the total wealth or the total national income of most other countries in the world.

When we think about that, and when we think that that is merely the result of a normal and steady rate of economic progress in the United States, which will be repeated again and again in the years ahead, I do not see how we can look to figures for any test as to whether we shall be able to bear larger responsibilities than we have in the past. It is simply a measure of how we face those responsibilities.

As I understand the situation with respect to Israel, Israel is moving economically into a situation where it is gradually transforming from a country engaged in rescue and relief to a country engaged in the upbuilding of its economic strength and resources.

Now, that is a broad generalization, and it is not 100 percent accurate, because there is still need for rescue and relief, and there will continue to be, and many great economic efforts toward economic strength and building up have already been accomplished, as some of the other speakers have indicated much better than I can, but, broadly speaking, something is occurring which is tremendously heartening, something which is tremendously inspiring, that within a period of time which is very short in the annals of history, within a period of time which is immensely short, even compared to the history of the United States—and we think of ourselves as a young country—this new nation of Israel is gradually moving from a relief and rescue operation to an operation where it is concentrating upon problems of economic development, upon problems of making itself self-supporting, upon problems of becoming stronger and stronger, so that it can carry more and more of the responsibilities which it itself is assuming.

Now that is all very well and all very good, if we don't allow it to mislead us, if we don't allow it to mislead us in the belief that because Israel is attempting to stand on its own feet—and I am sure will—we should not be misled into believing that because it is standing on its own feet it can stand alone.

No nation in the world, no free nation in the world in these times can stand alone. The United States is standing on its own feet, but the United States of America cannot for a moment stand alone in these times, and if anybody in this country thinks that we can, if anybody in this country thinks that we do not need help—not precisely the same kind of help, but help nevertheless—from the other free peoples of the world, the kind of help that every partner gives to every other partner, although some may be senior partners and some may be junior partners, he is terribly mistaken.

When they are all standing and working together, they must be mutually helpful, and anybody who thinks that we do not need that help has a fundamental misconception of our problems here in the United States.

By the same token, if we here in the United States cannot stand alone, certainly none of the junior partners in the sense of being younger, in the sense of being smaller, in the sense of being weaker—and I do not mean that in any critical or invidious sense; I am simply describing the conditions—certainly they, standing on their own feet, cannot be asked to stand alone; and therefore our responsibilities in the United States, for a continuation—even if all circumstances change—of help to those countries, to help them stand on their own feet, is becoming even more imperative today than it ever was before; and that help, I suppose, will take two forms: that help will take the form of the kind of aid which has been granted in large measure in the past and also will begin more and more to take the form of investment, begin more and more to take the form of participation, not in a rescue and relief operation, but participation in that more heartening in some ways, more promising for the future, effort to build up the economic strength of the State of Israel.

In that effort I am sure that American Jews, and others, I hope, too, but primarily American Jews, realizing the economic conditions in this country, over here, realizing the largeness of the problems of the future, realizing that all must stand together, will find that that opportunity for that kind of participation—and I like the word "participation" better than "aid"—will find the opportunity for that kind of participation even more stimulating, even more challenging than the opportunity which has existed over the last few years for participation in an operation more in the nature of rescue and relief.

And as we go ahead with that, let me say, in conclusion, that I think that the greatest contribution our thinking through the centuries has made to the progress of the world has not been primarily in the area of economics, has not even been primarily in the

political area, but has been primarily in the moral area, has been primarily in the realization that, no matter what state of development civilization happens to be in at any particular time, the final solvent of its problems, whether military, defense, economic, or political, is moral leadership, a sense of righteousness.

Never in the history of the world, and certainly never within the history of this country nor in the memory of anybody within this room, was the crucial importance of moral leadership so acute as it is at this time, when the free nations of the world are seeking to protect themselves and to win their way through in the face of a mess which I happen to think is greater than any that we have faced at any time in the past.

And it is because we, as inheritors of the Jewish tradition, can take particular pride in that aspect of moral leadership, and because we can realize that as citizens of the United States we are participating in a national endeavor directed toward primarily the execution and embodiment of that moral leadership which must be transformed into economic action, into political action, into material action to be effective, that it seems to me that there is no way by which we can so fully demonstrate what this is all about, of our acute realization of our historical role in this process, as by continuing on an increasing scale, the increasing scale which our resources make feasible and which must be matched only by our realization of our ability to do so, on an increasing scale, as American Jews, proceed both with the rescue and relief operation and with the new and potentially more important economic development and strengthening operation on the fullest scale to which our sense of responsibility can carry us, because wherever we may be carried by our sense of responsibility there can be no question in the minds of sensible and realistic men and women that we in the United States have the material ability to meet whatever goals our moral judgment may lead us to set.

Still Up to the Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Times of November 17, 1950:

STILL UP TO THE DOCTORS

The American Medical Association set aside and presumably spent $1,100,000 this election year on an advertising campaign calculated to deliver a knockout blow to the Truman program for compulsory health insurance.

Doctors as individuals, and their wives, were active in many State contests, seeking to defeat candidates they considered friendly to socialized medicine. This found them working mostly for Republicans against Democrats, since the health-insurance plan is an administration project.

The Republican gains at the polls last week undoubtedly afford considerable satisfaction to the organized doctors. In at least two contests where they waged an intensive fight, the candidates they supported won, and in dozens of others they contributed materially.

Net result is that, along with other Truman domestic programs, compulsory health insurance is likely to be a lost cause in the Eighty-second Congress.

Nevertheless, a timely warning to the medicos came this week from one of their profession. Dr. Hamilton W. McKay of Charlotte, N. C., retiring president of the Southern Medical Association, addressing a St. Louis meeting of the organization, spoke sharply to his colleagues.

He warned them that if they did not clean their own house they would lose their professional freedom in this country. Too many doctors are bunglers in their relations with patients and with their communities, he added. And:

"If the people cannot convince themselves that organized medicine is taking vigorous steps to correct its own shortcomings, they will insist that the initiative for action be transferred to other hands."

Doctors have done a sorry job of self-discipline, Dr. McKay charged. Once a practioner got his license and joined a county medical society he was practically fixed for life, even though he might overcharge, neglect his patients, and ignore the art of human relations.

"Our competence," he concluded, "is being weighed against the American standard of competence in other professions. Our charges are being weighed against the budgetary demands of other services which are essential to life in America."

Dr. McKay's advice is sound and sensible. This newspaper has opposed the Truman health-insurance plan—but not without repeatedly urging the doctors themselves to take the lead in correcting conditions that prompt support for that plan.

They would be fatuously shortsighted to sit back now under the illusion that they made decisive and permanent political gains in the recent election.

Colton Union High School, Colton, Calif., Wins Freedom Foundation Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, at Valley Forge, Pa., on October 28, 1950, Colton Union High School, Colton, Calif., was awarded the Freedom Foundation's highest award for its work in furthering the American way of life. This award consisted of a beautiful gold medal encased in plastic and a library of books and other educational materials dealing with the American heritage.

Representing Colton Union High School in receiving this award were the district superintendent, a teacher and a student, whose expense-paid trip from California to Valley Forge for the ceremony was a part of the award from the Foundation.

Freedom Foundation was organized in the spring of 1949, as a nonpolitical, nonsectarian, nonprofit group, set up to encourage others to speak up for freedom.

Schools throughout the nation were invited last spring to submit materials used in the curriculum and student life. In selecting schools for the award, judgment was based on the philosophy on which the foundation is chartered: "To create and build an understanding of the spirit and philosophy of the Constitution and Bill of Rights and of our bundle of indivisible political and economic freedoms inherent in them." "To inspire love of freedom and to support the spiritual unity born of the belief that man is a dignified human being, created in the image of his Maker, and by the fact possessor of certain inalienable rights."

Young people in Colton Union High School are offered a wide diversity of courses and co-curricular activities created to train them for effective living in America. To promote intercultural unity as part of the pattern of freedom and the American heritage, Spanish courses are taught by Mexican-American teachers. These Spanish-speaking Americans, through personal and academic leadership in the classroom and through a large and effective organizaton, the Mexican Youth club, are constantly working to build a somewhat confused racial minority into responsible citizens in our democracy. Courses and organizations for homemakers are built on the principle that sound homes are the arsenals of free government. Here young women are learning that to create homes in which American heritage can be preserved and passed on is woman's greatest destiny.

For four weeks each year every major department of the school works together on an intensive study of the Constitution of the United States. Every student writes and delivers an essay on the Constitution. An all-school contest from which winners may go to county, State, and national contests is held and awards are presented by the American Legion. While this is a national contest, few schools realize 100 percent student participation as does Colton Union High School.

Social studies and history classes emphasize the basic principle of democracy, that good government can be achieved only by the active participation of an informed citizenry. Understanding of the past is stressed as a tool of enlightenment and guide for the future.

Student service clubs, an active student governing body, athletic programs where sportsmanship as well as competition is stressed, music festivals, public speaking and dramatics activities, a system of counseling and guidance, and participation in an interschool student congress are a few of the student experiences that prepare the Colton boys and girls for democratic living. A series of vocational trips for seniors are also arranged to afford an opportunity for each pupil to see the worker at work under regular working conditions. By means of this visit to the plant or office the boys or girls are acquainted with the job opportunities and the opportunity of the job within the local area. They learn at first hand what qualifications and training are necessary for the job.

In spite of agencies seeking to completely eliminate moral and religious teaching from the curriculum of the public school—the program of Colton Union High School operates on the principle that belief in God, as the fundamental principle of freedom, must continue to be taught, as it is found in our great songs, great documents, our currency and the lives of the founding

fathers. By helping students to apply the principles of moral standards to their problems of daily living, the school seeks to guide young people in orienting themselves to adult standards of right and wrong. School discipline is based on a merit system which offers an opportunity to earn awards through desirable citizenship. Student concern with group conduct is stimulated by privileges and penalties which have been set up. Any conduct unworthy of a good school citizen results in the loss of merits. A fair hearing by impartial student and faculty representatives is given to those who feel that justice is not done. Through the actual life situation of having to earn privileges and assume responsibility for his own action, each student, we believe, achieves a realistic understanding of adult behavior.

In every phase of the school's activities, youth in Colton Union High School have opportunity to learn about democracy and the American way of life and to function as young American citizens. In addition to the traditional three r's, this school maintains that young people need to know and to practice respect, responsibility, and reason.

Last Call To Improve on Excess Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal:

LAST CALL TO IMPROVE ON EXCESS PROFITS

It is interesting to see American businessmen protesting against a specific form of taxation but entirely willing to accept higher Federal taxes. That was the message carried to Washington last week by Louisvillians Thomas Graham and George Eggers. They went up to tell the House Ways and Means Committee what they thought was wrong with the proposed return to an excess-profits tax. But, as Graham put it, "industry realizes it must pay the cost of the present national emergency."

This approach deserves plenty of attention from Congress. The "lame duck" session knows it must adopt a stiffer tax program, but it will not hurt to wait long enough to consider what American business thinks about the excess-profits tax. It would be the easiest tax to put on the books, since it simply returns to a method followed in World War II. There is grave doubts, however, whether it would be the easiest tax to administer, or the fairest or most efficient.

The Louisville businessmen rounded up the arguments against the excess-profits levy. It is inflationary, since it fosters loose spending by corporations that would rather throw the money around than pass it on to the tax collector. It is inflexible, in that it requires the adoption of a base period which may be fair to some industries and unfair to others. It is, above all, destructive to small business and to new business. It is not merely an emotional matter to protect the new and smaller enterprises. America needs a constantly expanding industry in order to meet the Soviet challenge to our strength. Our economy can't stay healthy if new businesses can't spring up and prosper.

Graham and Eggers spoke for the Louisville Chamber of Commerce and for American business groups in general. Their points were well taken. The only weakness to the American business position is the lack of an adequate tax program to propose as a substitute for the excess-profits tax. The time is short. If the business world can act quickly and decisively, it may still save the day.

Bureau of Mines Research May Save Millions on Manganese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bureau of Mines at its ferro-alloy research branch at Redding, Calif., is conducting research on manganese requirements for steel which may aid the stockpiling program for manganese immensely.

In the manufacture of steel about 14 pounds of manganese is used to produce 1 ton of steel ingots. This country is producing approximately 100,000,000 tons of steel a year at the present time. This means that about 700,000 tons of manganese is used yearly for the production of steel. Most of the manganese used in steel making is imported, there being very little domestic production. Up until a year or two ago most of the Nation's manganese requirements were imported from Russia. Recently our shipments from Russia have been greatly curtailed so it has been necessary to obtain our manganese supplies elsewhere. Manganese, being so important in steel making is a strategic material so stockpiling is necessary in order that we have sufficient material on hand in case of war.

Manganese is used in steels for three purposes all independent of one another:

First. Manganese is used to react with the iron oxide present in molten steel. The manganese oxide formed is principally removed with the slag.

Second. Manganese is used to combine with the sulfur always present in steel to improve the hot forging and rolling characteristics.

Third. Manganese is used as an alloying element to produce steels that are used for such items as crusher plates, railroad frogs, dredge buckets, and dipper teeth where resistance to abrasion is required.

In peacetime less than 5,000,000 tons of manganese steel are marketed per year and during World War II only about 15,000,000 tons were used. Other alloying elements might be substituted to produce such steels.

For use in deoxidizing steels, other elements which are available from domestic sources, such as aluminum or silicon, may be used.

This leaves the one necessary use of manganese that of controlling the sulfur present in the steel. There appears to be no correlation between the amount of manganese used and the concentration of sulfur in the steel. It is known that steel containing a small amount of sulfur will require less manganese than a steel containing, say, 0.05 percent sulfur.

Metallurgists consider that the sulfur in steel is originally combined with the iron and is in the form of iron sulfide. When the molten metal solidifies, the iron sulfide separates from the solidifying iron and forms thin films of iron sulfide on the grains of iron. When such material is hot forged or rolled these thin films form planes of weakness and the metal breaks apart.

The addition of manganese to steel reduces the "hot shortness" or "red shortness," thereby enabling the metal to be hot-worked. Manganese is outstanding in its power to combine with sulfur. It generally forms as separate globules which have a much less adverse effect on the hot working properties of steel. No other element appears to possess this unique property of preventing "hot shortness."

The purpose of the experiments being carried out at the United States Bureau of Mines laboratory at Redding are to determine just how much manganese will be required for a steel with a known sulfur content. Such experiments are of necessity long and tedious and are beyond the scope of the problems solved by steel companies. The problem is of vital national interest. In order to carry out the tests quantitatively the starting materials must be uniform composition.

I understand that at Redding the starting metal is practically pure iron, with an analysis of less than 0.001 percent phosphorus, manganese, and silicon. As the carbon content would probably effect some of the physical constants of the steels produced, I understand that the experiments are being conducted on material whose carbon content is between 0.20 and 0.30 percent.

I recently visited the laboratory and saw some of the preliminary work being carried out on steels containing no manganese but on which the technicians had varied the sulfur content. A unique method has been devised for testing the hot working characteristics of the steels which have been made in the plant. Rods are twisted at a uniform rate at several temperatures. I saw rods containing 0.002 percent sulfur which broke after about 50 turns and rods containing 0.015 percent sulfur which broke after only three or four turns. The experimenters told me that they were unable to forge manganese-free steels that contained more than 0.015 percent sulfur. I was informed that steels will be made containing varying amounts of sulfur and also varying amounts of manganese. With additions of manganese the sulfur content of the steel may be raised several times above 0.015 percent and still be hot worked.

When this problem is completed it will be possible to determine exactly the manganese requirements for a steel of any sulfur content. If the Bureau of Mines tests indicate that the amount of manganese additions may be lowered to

the point where only 6 or 7 pounds will be required for each ton of steel, a stockpile of manganese that would last for 5 years would be extended to 10 years or more, or a 5-year stockpile of manganese would require one-half or less shipping space. The completion of this one problem alone should increase our self-sufficiency enormously.

The Story of the Plot To Communize America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article from the Detroit Free Press of October 23, 1950:

THE RED RUSSIAN CONSPIRACY—THE STORY OF THE PLOT TO COMMUNIZE AMERICA

This is a brief outline of the long struggle against communism in America.

Sixteen years ago, Dr. William A. Wirt, superintendent of schools in Gary, Ind., and a widely respected educator, wrote a letter stating that he had learned from unidentified brain trusters of what was on foot. He quoted them:

"We believe we have Mr. Roosevelt in the middle of a swift stream and that the current is so strong he cannot turn back or escape from it. We believe we can keep Mr. Roosevelt there until we are ready to supplant him with a Stalin. We all think Mr. Roosevelt is only the Kerensky of this revolution."

The reading of this letter to a congressional committee and its subsequent publication caused a tremendous sensation.

A special House committee of three Democrats and two Republicans summoned Dr. Wirt to prove his statements.

Wirt told of one dinner party at which were several Government employees and the Washington correspondent of Tass.

All were called before the committee.

All ridiculed Wirt as Hiss ridiculed all his accusers.

Congressman J. J. O'Connor, Democrat, New York, threw the gallery into a gale of laughter by asking one of the ladies if she had ever planted a Red flag on the Capitol. She paused, as if trying to recall past events, and then replied that she could not recollect ever having done so.

The man toward whom Dr. Wirt pointed the finger of accusation most directly was Rexford G. Tugwell, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

All attempts by the Republican minority to get Tugwell and other suspected brain trusters before the committees were blocked as was done by TYDINGS in the Amerasia case.

Wirt was a fool, an alarmist, a troublemaker, a red-herring trickster.

That was in 1934.

Thus early was the pattern of concealment set. Thus early, too, was the atmosphere of public opinion so poisoned by subtle Communist propaganda that millions of Americans were ready to believe the worst of Wirt and all others who were to follow.

Two years later George N. Peek quit the Department of Agriculture and wrote a book in which he stated that he had attended numerous parties given Rexford G. Tugwell, at which this fair-haired boy of the Roosevelt entourage openly boasted of how they were planning to make America into a Socialist state.

Whittaker Chambers' accusation of Alger Hiss led to the uncovering of one plot to which Wirt had called attention.

The central figure in it was Harold Ware, a son of Ella Reeve Bloor, whom the Communists have canonized as "Mother" Bloor.

Ware was ordered by Moscow to set up Communist cells in various Government departments.

Ware's prize find was Lee Pressman.

Pressman was assistant counsel for the AAA in the Department of Agriculture from 1933 to 1935. He became the dynamo of Washington Cell No. 1 of the Communist Party, which also included John Abt, Nathan Witt, Charles Kramer, Alger Hiss, and others.

Cells were also formed in the State, Treasury, War, Labor, Commerce, and other departments.

When the Nye investigation opened, Hiss became counsel of the committee.

This gave Hiss a chance not only to assassinate characters, and stir up dissension in this country, but also to get his hands on a lot of defense information for Moscow.

John Abt and Charles Kramer, two other members of the cell, became counsel and investigator, respectively, of the La Follette committee.

Pressman was one of the principal authors of the Wagner labor law, which put Red union leaders above and beyond the laws of the United States.

The second step was to have Nathan Witt appointed general counsel of the NLRB, which administered the Wagner Act.

The third step was for Pressman to become general counsel for the CIO in 1936. He was known as Phil Murray's "brain."

The inside story of the plot might never have been known if in 1948 the Un-American Activities Committee of the Eightieth Congress had not listened to Whittaker Chambers' confession.

Chambers' exposure of Alger Hiss' activities as a Soviet spy in the State Department appeared to most uninformed Americans as grotesque and impossible as Dr. Wirt's story had seemed 14 years before.

The day Hiss appeared before the committee to defend himself President Truman snapped the lock on the files that would have aided his conviction.

Then Mr. Truman denounced the committee's investigations as a "red herring."

The statute of limitations had interposed to save Hiss from prosecution for transmitting Government secrets to a Soviet espionage ring.

A Federal Grand Jury indicted him, though, for lying in connectoin with the charge.

Yet even then the administration tried to shield him by delaying the trial until it could be brought before a judge sneaked on to the bench by Truman against the protests of the five bar associations. The jury disagreed.

At the second trial Hiss was convicted, and sentenced to 5 years in prison.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson still stands by him.

The administration had done its best to cover up for Hiss and had been beaten by an indignant Congress, an aroused public opinion, and an honest judge.

The same Congress, following public sentiment, enacted the Taft-Hartley law, which restored the balance in labor-management relations that Lee Pressman's Wagner Act had destroyed.

Also, it denied the services of the NLRB to unions whose officers did not file affidavits that they were not Communists.

President Truman vetoed the bill in a wild and incoherent message believed to have been written for him by Pressman. Then he went on the air and attacked the bill in an even more violent speech, also said to have been written by Pressman.

What alarmed Pressman about the Taft-Hartley law was that it killed his racket.

With the Communist invasion of Korea under way, and public opinion in this country aroused, Pressman got scared.

He resigned from the American Labor Party.

Then he appeared before the Un-American Activities Committee and testified August 28, that in 1934, while in the AAA, he had joined the Communist party.

Caught in the toils of Whittaker Chambers' testimony in 1948, Pressman went on to identify, as fellow members of his Washington cell, John Abt, Nathan Witt, and Charles Kramer.

Abt, Kramer, and Witt, as well as Pressman himself, had been cited before the House committee in August 1948, and had stood on their constitutional rights.

Two years later, facing the possibility of a stretch behind a barbed-wire fence, Pressman "sang."

Now let's go back to 1934.

That was the year Pressman joined the Communist Party with Alger Hiss and many others.

That, too, was the year when Dr. Wirt sounded his warning.

The same pattern of cover-up and concealment has been pursued by the administration ever since.

The Amerasia espionage case of 1945, involving 1,700 Government documents found in possession of a Communist-front outfit in New York, was hushed up, then was whitewashed by a Democratic Congressional committee in 1946 and again by the Tydings committee this year.

The refusal by President Truman to open pertinent files in Senator TYDING'S trial, not of Senator MCCARTHY'S charges of communism in the State Department, but of Senator MCCARTHY himself, followed the precedent of obstructing justice he set in 1948 in the Hiss investigation.

The McCarthy charges remain unproved, and undisapproved, for the simple reason that the administration has the evidence and will not produce it in court.

The McCarran anti-Red law is not perfect, and probably no Representative or Senator who voted for it thought it perfect. It needs many changes.

They passed it and repassed it over President Truman's veto because of his consistent record in blocking efforts to expose the Communist plot in this country and to protect the Nation from it.

The herd of Communists agents that have come to light would still be working underground if a bipartisan Congress had not lifted the stone under which they were crawling in their treasonable slime and held them up for the Nation to look at.

At the polls on November 7, the American people, if they know where internal security lies, will send to Washington another Congress that will kick in more doors and drag out what is hiding behind them.

The last chapter in the story begun by Dr. Wirt in 1934 has not been written yet.

Reverend Father James Leo McGovern, S. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the career of the Reverend Father James Leo McGovern, S. J., of Boston, Mass., as a

priest-instructor in colleges and high schools for 50 years, in honor of whom his many friends, both clerical and secular, recently paid him, and properly so, great honor. In recognition of his achievements as a revered leader of youth in spirit and mind, I take pleasure in submitting, for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following poem by his lifetime friend, James Patrick McGovern, of the District of Columbia bar:

FIFTY YEARS A TEACHER

(By James Patrick McGovern)

Fifty years a teacher of our youth!
What dedicated heart and steadfast mind
Can serve so faithfully the love of truth
With beauty and with holiness entwined?
Your students, sons and daughters, rise
As leaders with the lore you taught the soul,
Champions of the freedoms which we prize,
Crusaders whom in God's ranks you enroll.
How many minds you lit with wisdom's rays,
How many hearts you warmed with hope and peace,
In countless crises and in myriad ways,
Which in futurity will find release.
What nobler mortal mission can there be
Than Christ-like teaching half a century?

Hon. Sam Hobbs, of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, when at the opening of the session, 435 Members are brought together, many for the first time, curious indeed are the reactions and sensations. Then when committee assignments have been made and Members come in close contact with their fellow committee members these feelings are intensified. So after 12 years' service on the Committee on the Judiciary we come to the parting of the ways with our good and true friend SAM HOBBS, of the Fourth District of Alabama, who voluntarily retires at the close of this session.

Personally, I shall always remember SAM HOBBS, with the most affectionate feeling. From the very inception of our association, he has been a guide, counselor, and friend, and no man could be a more devoted friend than he.

Blessed with a kindly spirit, an unfailing sense of humor, a great reserve of good common sense, and an intense desire to be of help, no man has served his State, the Nation and his fellow man with greater honor and distinction than has SAM HOBBS.

The law has been his first love and zealously has he applied himself to its study and application of its principles to the manifold requirements of our modern life. Today, upon the statute books of our country there are many laws, which bear the handiwork and reveal the deep erudition of this very able and distinguished man.

His departure from these Halls will be sadly missed. First elected to the Seventy-fifth Congress he has served continuously in this body since that time.

A forceful debater, well grounded in his knowledge of the facts and the law, he was indeed a formidable opponent and one worthy of the best steel of any man. Yet he was always kindly, gracious, and considerate. Never did he resort to any cheap tricks, and the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are replete with his splendid contributions.

One of the wisest counselors in committee, he was particularly able in the drafting of intricate legislation. And in the writing of reports he had no superior. Some of the finest reports that have ever come out of the Committee on the Judiciary have been the handiwork of this truly able man. He will be sorely missed.

So in bidding farewell, to this old and good friend, I do so, with a deep sense of personal loss. I shall miss his kindly presence, his wise suggestions, his helpful admonitions, and above and beyond all this, the gentle spirit of a splendid Christian gentleman and true patriot.

The Workingman Is Waking Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, throughout the United States certain labor leaders have, during recent years, in my humble opinion, gone far afield in their attempt to dictate to Members of Congress how they should vote and for whom they should vote. Time and again in my public utterances and written statements I have pointed out that the rank and file members of the unions, in a great many instances, exercised their own judgment and voted just as they pleased and without being influenced by the labor leaders.

I am reliably informed that the arrangements between the Democratic Party and the labor bosses did not work as they planned, indicating the labor leaders were not able to deliver the votes of individual members and their families. Apparently 14 labor-backed candidates for the United States Senate were beaten. The CIO-PAC campaigns, especially in Ohio, Colorado, California, and Illinois, just did not get anywhere in their extraordinary effort to stigmatize Republican candidates and to make rank-and-file union members believe that their salvation rested in the election of only Democratic candidates. There were 16 Republican governors up for reelection and these men were victorious and Republican governors were elected in six other States. The outcome in Michigan has not yet been positively decided.

The independence on the part of union members is as it should be. If the day ever comes when organized labor, as such, as represented by the two great labor unions—the CIO and the A. F. of L.—take the position that their only chance for fair and decent treatment is through the activity and protection extended by a certain and specific and single political party—whether Democratic or Republican—that will be a sad day for organized labor, and for all of our citizens generally. Our type of government just does not operate in any such manner. It has never so operated and let us pray that it never will.

For the benefit of those who are interested in this general subject, I submit for the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, November 28, 1950:

CATCHING ON

The CIO public utility workers have made a great discovery. It is that a man is better off, more independent and nearer his own boss when he is working for a private employer, than when he is on the Government payroll.

Consequently, they are now leading the fight against a Government monopoly of electric power.

Last week in Chicago the politicians in charge of the CIO's resolutions committee had a hard time sitting on the utility workers' proposal that the whole CIO condemn the use of taxpayers' money to push that monopoly. The CIO politicians, who work hand in glove with the Federal monopolists here in Washington, may as well face the fact that they are fighting a losing battle.

The workingman is waking up. He is coming out from under the ether. He is catching on.

Under the management of the union politicians, the workingman has been led right up to the trap of Government ownership for all the means of production and distribution, a state of things sometimes called socialism, fascism, or communism, and all the time meaning bad news for the independent working citizen.

Now the public utility workers, struggling to escape, demand of other workers, "How would you like to have your jobs taken over by the Government?"

LABOR GOES REPUBLICAN

Which calls to mind some remarks made a few days ago by Representative GEORGE H. BENDER, Republican of Ohio. Mr. BENDER, who is a six-term Member of the House and chairman of the Cuyahoga County, Ohio, Republican organization, said:

"Organized labor has been boycotting the Republican Party during recent years in the mistaken belief that the Republican Party is hostile to the interests of the working people of our country.

"It is evident from the results of the election that the rank and file of labor organizations do not share this view. Obviously, large numbers of working men and women voted for Republican candidates and were in part responsible for our election.

"I have asked repeatedly that responsible labor leaders participate in the work of the Republican Party in Cuyahoga County. Our organization has invited them to serve as members of our executive committee and with our advisory committees. * * * I hope that the leaders of organized labor will accept this invitation to be represented within the Republican Party."

Mr. BENDER's invitation is wise as it is generous. It comes after an election which small minds might take as an occasion for vindictive pursuit of beaten opposition. The election mentioned is, of course, that of Senator TAFT. Never in the history of current times, so far as we can recall, has there ever been a more open and plainly decisive contest than the senatorial race in Ohio.

Mr. TAFT won it with the largest vote ever cast for Senator in Ohio's history.

Now he is back in Congress for another term with a record indorsement from the rank and file of Ohio's labor, given against the pressure of union politicians.

Mr. BENDER could take advantage of that to start revolts within the unions. He does not. He merely invites all union leaders to come on in, meet the Republicans and see what they have to offer.

THE IDEA OF LIBERTY

What is that? It is an idea of government which speaks—and acts—to keep the citizen free and independent. If you want an example of it, ask the CIO public utility workers. They know.

Is it a good idea? It is if you believe in government as a servant of the people, and if you are opposed to the principle of making people servants of the government. The idea can be expressed after all, in just one word—liberty.

The rank and file of labor has caught onto it and so goes Republican. How soon will the union leadership catch up with the rank and file?

Graduation Address by James A. Farrell, Jr., New York State Maritime College, Fort Schuyler, Bronx, N. Y., Wednesday, September 27, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address, delivered by Mr. James A. Farrell, Jr., at the graduation ceremonies at the New York State Maritime College, Fort Schuyler, Bronx, N. Y., on Wednesday, September 27, 1950:

Admiral Leary, Fleet Admiral Halsey, trustees and faculty, members, parents, and friends of the graduates, gentlemen of the class of 1950, my heartiest congratulations go to each and every member of this distinguished class, in equal share to those whose technical and academic achievements vary from the least to the greatest, in equal share to the prize winners and those whose degrees and tickets were hardest won. You are the end product of a great tradition and a great school—a school which over the long years has trained and developed outstanding leaders in American merchant shipping, outstanding men in peace and war, men who have made their mark at sea and on shore. You have joined a fraternity of alumni of which you may be proud, and which I know is proud to welcome you.

It is my own observation that among American nautical colleges or academies, New York State most nearly approaches the essential balance between form and substance; between the military and civilian approach; between the curricula and extracurricula; between theory and practice. Over the years, it has been my privilege to associate with merchant officers of many nationalities and varied backgrounds; but, in the zest for continued study, in zeal for professional advancement, and in pride of cloth, none excel your predecessors. This is a heritage of immense and lasting worth.

You, gentlemen, are about to exchange a life of order lived in historic, familiar, and solid surroundings for a life in a disordered world, to be lived in an atmosphere of blind uncertainty and in a future unpredictable as to peace or war, beneath impending doom of atom and hydrogen, the scientists' modern and shameful sword of Damocles. If you are not confused, you stand alone above the rest of us. If the complexities are not awesome, your adjustment is extraordinary, and yet it is sure that you will not be overcome by the disillusion inherent in our present situation.

Disillusion is dispelled by hope, and hope is the flower of the seed which is faith. All seamen have faith or gain it—faith in a supernatural control of forces beyond other control, and faith in their fellow men. It is impossible to despair, no matter what the odds, no matter what the danger, when one has had the stars to guide him through the long night watch to the golden dawn, or has experienced the climatic stilling of the tempestuous sea and the gentling of the raging wind just as the ship was all but overwhelmed. To have been a member of a ship's company among men of every color, race, and creed, men of many origins, is to learn that more men are good than evil, and that the forces of good in the end prevail. So, while we know that the making or avoiding war is man decided, even so a just war must be justly won. So also must we believe that the horrendous forces of fission are as safe in the hands of the law-abiding as is armament, and as dangerous in the hands of the lawbreakers as are smaller and better-known weapons. The problem is of degree, intensity, and morality and not alone that of so-called scientific advance.

One cannot, of course, rationalize away the danger of the present conflicts. The conflict is hot in Korea, warm throughout the Pacific perimeter, and no longer cold in Europe. But war is not inevitable. If the Western World speaks out, if our strength is greatly developed and made absolutely clear to the aggressors, and if social justice, individual freedom, and free enterprise are practiced in the west while being fostered in the east, I am convinced peace is assured. In the interim, your daily life and desired occupations may be interrupted. You may be called upon to take your place alongside other seamen in combat fleet and supply train. That your service and special training can be of immeasurable service has been demonstrated twice in one generation and evaluated as of first importance, equal to any, by General Eisenhower, Admiral King, and Winston Churchill.

But, it is not so much the matter of war and war service that is of paramount interest to you and me. Rather, it is the hoped for peacetime service of the American Merchant Navy and the individual part you, as graduates of this fine school may take in it.

That I am convinced there can and should be a bright future in American flag shipping must be obvious by my own active participation in the industry, both as a part of management and as an investor. That such a future is assured is by no means certain. In spite of a cyclical United States history of over 100 years as a sea power, in spite of the cruel and unnecessary lessons of two world wars, in spite of the advance of this country from the position of international debtor to international creditor, and in direct contradistinction to the pledge and purpose of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the period January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950, marked a steady decline in American participation in world trade. That it did not take place sooner was due to a short-lived shortage of ships in the merchant fleets of the other major maritime powers. That the decline has been temporarily arrested is due entirely to the current need to support our Armed Forces in Korea, Japan, and western Europe.

The causes of the decline are manifold, the panacea not yet discovered. Among the causes still existing are, overtonnaging of trades, and the world-wide dollar shortage. Overtonnaging would have been tempered by a more judicious disposal to overseas buyers of surplus American tonnage. The dollar shortage could have been ameliorated by an extension of ECA funds and shipping controls to colonial governments and a more ardent prosecution of the Federal stockpiling program. Overtonnaging (at least as far as dry cargo liners are concerned) can still be met by an international shipping congress convened among the maritime nations, in which both government and shipowners can participate. At such a congress, the extremely unsatisfactory problem of flag discrimination, stemming from intense nationalism, can be discussed in the light of the United States tradition of nondiscrimination and freedom of the seas and ports.

However, the most important need of the American merchant marine today, and the one most vital to its future, is the continuous, day-to-day, prompt and full implementation of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, by the Federal Maritime Board and the Federal maritime authority.

Under the recently adopted Presidential Reorganization Plan No. 21, the executive branch responsible to the people and to Congress for the promotion and development of a merchant marine was placed with the Secretary of Commerce and revitalized. A Chairman and two Commissioners of outstanding ability and integrity, in whom all interests concerned, the taxpayer, the Government, labor and management have implicit confidence, have been appointed.

It remains to be seen if, as I firmly believe will happen, the newly manned Federal Maritime Board can and will forthwith take a strong hold of its own staff to see that: That which has to be done is done daily; the obligations respecting contracts and determinations are fulfilled and on time; that the work of the Commission is not hamstrung by other agencies; and, in particular, that the policies and appropriations of Congress be not diluted by the influence of other departments whose responsibilities may be many, but do not include the welfare of the American Merchant Marine. You, gentlemen, are directly concerned and should be alive to the necessity of prompt and complete implementation of congressionally determined policy respecting shipping legislation. If by delay and dilution the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is made ineffectual, then your peacetime livelihood is at stake, our peacetime commerce is threatened and our national security imperiled.

It could be that a few individuals employed in staff positions by certain important Government bureaus prefer to have our commerce move in foreign ships or in Government-owned ships. But irrespective of individual opinions, our Congress has spoken long and loud and clearly.

As to your own part when you ship, may I recommend that your study continue and that your technical skill be further developed. In particular, I suggest that you devote your best talents to the care and supervision of cargo, and the maintenance of the vessels in which you serve and their machinery and equipment. Were I asked to compare the prewar merchant officer with his postwar counterpart, I would say that the prewar man was deficient in theory and strong in practical application, while the postwar man has radically reversed the combination. Perhaps your group and generation will bring both necessities into better balance.

It is conceded that no subject is quite as delicate as labor-management relations, and were I more discreet, I should avoid touching thereon. I do, however, have some non-controversial thoughts which may be of some assistance. Due in large measure to my great respect for seafaring men as profes-

sionals of the highest caliber, labor unions as we know them have never seemed to me to be adequate representatives of licensed personnel. But, be that as it may, the law so recognizes unions and you will be importuned to join them and managers are required under certain conditions to recognize unions as your representatives. Accordingly, it seems to me of the greatest importance that where unions can and may represent you, all of you, should take a most active interest in union policy making and elections in order to guarantee that those who do bargain on your behalf are first qualified to do so, qualified in national and educational background, and do in fact represent the men at sea as fully as the men on the beach and that unions not be permitted to alienate the sympathies and understandings that are sine qua non between companies and their own seagoing licensed personnel.

Perhaps from my opening words you may have inferred a note of sympathy towards a group of your age and occupation advancing into a new and troubled era. Such an inference of pessimism is neither intended nor warranted. What I was really disguising was great envy. At your age and with your training and attainment I should like to advance with you upon man's common enemy, the days ahead, so sure am I of your successful future. Congratulations.

Address of Secretary John W. Snyder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at the recent National Planning Conference for Israel and Jewish Rehabilitation, held in Washington during October 27–29, and attended by some 1,200 Jewish leaders from all parts of the country, Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder delivered a significant address on Friday, October 27, the opening of the conference. He said:

I feel greatly honored at the invitation to join you today at the beginning of this National Planning Conference for Israel and Jewish Rehabilitation. I am happy to add my personal good wishes to the welcome which has been accorded the distinguished representatives of the Government of Israel who are with us today.

The large number of organizations and individuals who have come together from all parts of our own country for this conference are evidence of the encouragement which every true American is anxious to render the cause of democracy and freedom in other lands. To every American, the new state of Israel has been an inspiring example of the achievements which can be realized through the pioneering efforts of a free people determined to forge a strong nation.

Israel is one of the newest nations to join the freedom-loving peoples of the world. But from the earliest days of their history, its people have stood for moral and spiritual strength. They have stood for the dignity and freedom of the individual. And of equal importance, their leaders have stressed the responsibilities which each individual must accept if he is to be worthy of membership in a free society.

These are the ideals which have been the hope of men everywhere in their long struggle to break the bonds of tyranny and dictatorship. These are the ideals which inspire the peace-loving peoples of today in their joint battle to preserve the peace and to promote friendly relations between all nations.

For hundreds of years the democratic nations of the world have struggled, each in its own way, to preserve freedom and to achieve strength through the voluntary, cooperative efforts of individual citizens. In our country, and elsewhere in the world, it has been successfully demonstrated that an economy which provides ever-increasing benefits to the common man can be achieved without autocracy. It can be achieved through the individual efforts of a free citizenry, united in faith, in will, and in determination to promote the welfare of all.

The events of this year, however, have demonstrated a further truth. They have made it clear to all of us that responsibility for the common good must be a governing principle of international relations as well as the guiding light of domestic policies. As President Truman stated on October 24, the idea of an association of nations able to keep the peace has lived as a dream in the minds and hearts of men for many years. But it is only since the founding of the United Nations in 1945, and particularly since the decisive action taken by the United Nations in June of this year, that this dream has made a significant advance toward reality.

Through its membership in the United Nations, the State of Israel, which came into being as an independent nation only a little over 2 years ago, has already played a significant part in the struggle of the free world against aggression. In a cable on July 2 to the Secretary General of the United Nations, the Foreign Minister of Israel pledged full support to the Security Council in its efforts to restore peace in Korea. This pledge was immediately followed by the tangible offer of such things as medical services and supplies for the forces of the United Nations engaged in Korea.

Israel has undertaken a vigorous program in support of individual freedom and peaceful progress. The plans for irrigation, for afforestation, for swamp drainage, for soil improvement, for agricultural development, for schools and highways and transportation facilities, for the encouragement of settlements in areas formerly considered barren—all of these things recall to Americans our own pioneering days. Every American has watched with great interest as the new State of Israel has tackled and begun to surmount its tremendous economic problems. All of us have been impressed by the progress which has already been made toward the rehabilitation and advancement of their country.

Possibly the most inspiring thing about the rehabilitation program is the high goal which has been set for individual, community, and national effort. The leaders of Israel have taken up the challenge of proving that in the East, as in the West, ever-increasing benefits for the common man can be combined with political freedom and the protection of human rights. Despite tremendous problems, internal and external, Israel has been able to record important progress in strengthening its economy during the short period of its independent life.

To take only one example of a problem which had to be met, and met quickly: The inflow of homeless people from other lands has resulted in a population increase of 50 percent in the space of about 2 years. This would be comparable to increasing our own population by 75,000,000 in a similar period of time—and increasing it, moreover, through immigration, with all of its attendant problems of adjustment and assimilation.

Quite aside from these special difficulties, the mere increase in production needed to keep pace with the unprecedented population growth posed a tremendous problem. It is not surprising that Israel, in this short period, has been unable to win completely its race with time. But it has made great steps forward.

I am told that agricultural output, on the average, has risen 50 percent in the current farm year as compared with 1947–48. The number of cattle has increased by one-third; poultry numbers and the number of eggs produced have more than doubled; and milk production in 1950 is greater by almost one-fifth than it was 2 years ago. The area devoted to vegetable cultivation is twice as great this year as it was in 1948, and the acreage on which cereals are grown has increased by more than 175 percent during the same period.

These gains reflect in part the heroic efforts of individual settlers, groups of settlers, and the Government of Israel to develop water resources in areas which have been neglected and barren for many hundreds of years. The record of irrigation and water development during the resettlement period is in itself one of the most dramatic chapters in the modern history of the Middle East. Each year, further progress is recorded and new areas are transformed from desert land into productive soil. Each year, Israel moves further toward a food output which will provide a large share of its own needs and at the same time produce a surplus of agricultural specialties for export. This goal is of particular importance, of course, in view of the need for finding ways of solving the present urgent trade problems.

While the agricultural gains of recent years have been outstanding, industry, also, has been forging ahead. The rate of increase has been slowed down by the need to import raw materials and a large part of the necessary machinery. But factory output has nevertheless registered a steady advance. Industrial production, according to recent reports, has increased by more than 20 percent in the past 2 years.

This record of progress in agriculture and industry is particularly noteworthy in view of the complex and difficult problems which Israel has had to face during this period. The very fact that domestic output of needed commodities has been steadily increasing has had a stabilizing effect on the economy of the new nation. The citizens of Israel have confidence that their growing national production will effectively safeguard the economic integrity of their state. And we who have watched the achievements which have been made to date can share in that confidence.

When we turn our attention from the urgent problems of the present and look toward the future, the opportunities which lie ahead of Israel appear almost limitless. If firm and lasting peace can be achieved—in the area of world politics and in the smaller orbit of the Middle East itself—this strong, young nation can play an important role in the advancement of the entire area of which it is a part. With further intensive development of its exceptional mineral resources, its potentialities for specialized agriculture, its sea and air routes to other lands, and above all, its abundant supply of human skills and human resources, Israel can look forward to a secure and prosperous future.

In the troubled world of today this may seem like a distant dream. But the progressive and forward-looking leaders of Israel have already evidenced their determination to build up the economic strength of their own country. They have shown their will to promote the larger goal of greater peace and greater prosperity within the family of nations. They have evidenced their faith in the economic future of the region which embraces their homeland—an area already rich beyond measure in its heritage of cultural and spiritual values.

But for Israel, as for every other nation in the world today, the opportunities of the future wait on our ability to achieve a lasting peace. We have learned that we

must work unceasingly for peace. We must be prepared at all times to defend it. But we must meanwhile never relax our faith that arms may some day be supplanted by peaceful negotiation. It is only then, as President Truman has said, that men in every land can devote the full measure of their inventiveness, their energies, and their resources to creative effort. It is only then that the nations of the world can join together in fufilling the great vision of the Promised Land for all men—a land of plenty, and a land at peace.

Remarks of Secretary of Defense Marshall at the Graveside of General Pershing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, among the many solemn and noble words spoken on Armistice Day 1950 none served better to recall the inception of our annual commemoration of our military dead than those of Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall at the graveside of Gen. John Joseph Pershing; who won the armistice we once thought insured a lasting peace.

Ties of friendship bound General Pershing and General Marshall. Their association and their friendship dated from the days before World War I, and continued through World War II. Standing at the graveside of the general he had once served as aide, General Marshall typified the millions of Americans who have fought for our country in two catastrophic World Wars; but he typifies also the spirit of self-sacrifice that patriotic and freedom-loving Americans must continue to maintain and devote to the cause of security and peace. George C. Marshall, honorably retired from active military service, has been the President's Special Ambassador to China, Secretary of State, chairman of the American Red Cross, and is now Secretary of Defense.

General Marshall is also General Pershing's successor as Chairman of the Battle Monuments Commission. In that capacity, he spoke of the work of the Commission in caring for the overseas resting places of deceased veterans, and of the memorials being erected to commemorate their heroism and their sacrifice. General Marshall's reference to the men who have died in Korea, was a solemn and a sad reference to the fact that war has not yet been outlawed, and other sacrifices will yet be required to insure our national security and the liberties which are our inalienable rights.

In facing the dark future, we should be heartened by the example of General Pershing himself. "General Pershing," said General Marshall, "left a lasting impression on our Army and also on our people. He was a great soldier, without evasions, cool and determined in time of crisis and capable of tremendous power of command and control."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Secretary Marshall's solemn reminder of the task our Nation faces.

Secretary Marshall's remarks follow:

This ceremony this morning is of deep personal significance to me because I was closely associated with General Pershing when he commanded the First Army during the San Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne battles. Later, after the cessation of hostilities, I became his aide and served him for 4 years.

When I returned to Washington in the summer of 1938 to become Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army and later Chief of Staff, I saw the general frequently; as a rule, regularly about once a week, and talked over the critical world situation or the progress of hostilities in which for a time we were not engaged.

General Pershing left a lasting impression on our Army and also on our people. He was a great soldier, without evasions, cool and determined in every crisis and capable of tremendous powers of command and control.

On his death I succeeded him as Chairman of the Battle Monuments Commission. He devoted the last 20 years of his life almost exclusively to the direction of the work of that organization in establishing our national military cemeteries abroad.

As Chairman of the Battle Monuments Commission, I am concerned with the final resting places of our deceased veterans in sacred plots of ground all over the world. There are 22 such cemeteries overseas, and in each we have erected, or are in process of erecting, a beautiful chapel containing a permanent graphic record in stone, bronze, and mosaics of the achievements of the American forces who fought in these regions. Memorial references are included for those tens of thousands of missing or unidentified dead to whom the tragedies of war denied a known and honored burial. Their names will be inscribed on the walls for all to read.

These memorials will serve to remind the peoples of Europe, Africa, and the Far East that American men fought, bled, and died side by side with their own sons to make life more abundant for all of us.

These chapel tributes to the heroism and sacrifices of our men and women are national in character and therefore far more enduring than any individual could provide. They are the product of the finest work of the most noted architects, sculptors, artists, and landscape authorities in this country. As a Nation we are entrusted with the honor of perpetuating these shrines and keeping them always beautiful.

Each year official representatives of our Government and of the governments of the friendly countries in whose lands our men served and died, visit these cemeteries. Thousands of visitors from home and abroad also visit the cemeteries, especially during the summer months. These visits will be in increasing numbers when all the splendid structures and plantings are completed.

Armistice Day this year has for us unusual significance. Earlier occasions were marked by special homage to those who gave their lives in the First World War, and later to the fallen in the recent world conflict. November 11 this year we are also doing honor to 4,000 or more of our men who recently gave their lives in Korea, and today at this very moment other names are surely being added to this list of sacrifices in our behalf.

Each of these casualties represents a precious life, precious to the individual and precious to his family and friends. We can do nothing to restore life to these men, but we can keep faith with them, remembering and honoring their sacrifices and doing our very best to support the ideals they courageously represented. They will not be forgotten. Their Government will see that their last resting place is kept beautiful and peaceful, and a reminder to all peoples that we believe in the dignity of the individual and stand ready to make any sacrifice in defense of his inalienable rights.

Panama Celebrates Its Forty-seventh Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on November 3, 1950, the Republic of Panama, amidst traditional Isthmian ceremonies, celebrated the forty-seventh anniversary of the birth of that nation, the independence of which was proclaimed on November 3, 1903.

As the attainment of independence by Panama was an essential chapter in the history of the Panama Canal, the forty-seventh year of independence takes on added significance because of the enactment of Public Law 841, Eighty-first Congress, approved by President Truman on September 26, 1950.

This law, which creates a Canal Zone government and the Panama Canal Company to replace the existing predominantly military organization, is—in large measure—the fulfillment of a historical cycle. It is by far the most important act of Congress concerning the Canal since the Panama Canal Act of 1912. Based, as it is, upon treaty relationships between the Republic of Panama and the United States in what is a unique diplomatic set-up affecting the affairs of the Canal Zone, it is especially fitting that the forty-seventh anniversary of Panama's independence be more widely recognized.

To that end, I am extending my remarks to include the following editorial published in the Panama Star and Herald of November 3, 1950:

ON OUR FORTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

Today the Republic of Panama reaches another milestone in its national life; today we celebrate the success which attended the efforts of the Panamanians of 1903 to reestablish the independence of the Isthmus and confirm the existence of a Panamanian nationality.

On November 3, 1903, at 5 p. m., the young manhood of this Isthmian capital literally poured down Central Avenue from Santa Ana Plaza and down what is today Avenue "A" on their way to the Plaza de Arms, now known as Plaza de Francia, there to acquire the necessary arms with which to uphold the independence of the Isthmus proclaimed by the leaders of Isthmian public opinion, and to make a supreme effort to recover the political independence which the Panamanian of 1821 effectively secured from Spain on November 28 of that far away year.

The movement for independence was spurred by events in Colombia which threatened the possibility of the interoceanic canal being built at Panama. The Panamanians acted to challenge Colombia's right to continue the sacrifice of the centuries-old wish of the Panamanian people that a waterway between the two oceans, across the American continent, should be built here at Panama.

In the face of Colombia's rejection of the Hay-Herran Treaty, virtually sealing the doom of the Isthmian transit, the Panamanian people reasserted their right to self-determination and resumed the direction of their own destinies. And Panama had every right to independence, because in 1821 she shook off, unaided by any of the other nas-

cent American nations, the yoke of Spanish colonial misrule.

The forty-seventh year of independence finds us still struggling, still trying to establish our economic independence which we acknowledge is a vital part of our national independence as a whole. Economic independence is just as important as political independence for any nation, big or small.

That is why, on this day of such great significance in our national life it is proper that we also devote a few moments to mediation on the responsibilities that rest on our collective shoulders for the future growth and prosperity of our nation.

What is our record, briefly?

The opinions of a vociferous few notwithstanding, our Nation has earned—and still is earning—respect for itself abroad, despite its sometimes difficult dealings with its powerful neighbor, the United States. In that field our country stands alone because no other nation in the world has had to cope with the unique problems that our privileged geographical position has created.

In our internal political life the road still is long. There still is too much petty politics. We are still too prone to settle our family quarrels by force or by skulduggery, and we cast aside constitutions with too much ease and too little regret. We have yet to learn to respect the other man's opinion and to grant to others the sincerity and the good faith that we proclaim for ourselves.

But we have done very little, almost nothing, to achieve self-support. It is not that it cannot be done. It is simply that we have not tried as diligently as we could. We, particularly some of our present generation, have just begun to think about it. Restless voices have pierced the wilderness. But we have yet to grasp the fundamental fact that this independence from want cannot be achieved overnight by one generation; that it is an unending task for this and for all the generations to come.

Beyond our terminal cities which live off the Canal and such transient tourist trade as may develop, we have done little to develop our rich interior—that vast portion of our country we forget through the year except on the occasions of patron saints' festivals or when the vacation season rolls around. Yet, it is in that unexploited land, its virgin forests, and its up-to-now primitively tilled fields, that the Nation's real independence—its economic independence—lies.

The challenge is there. May the succeeding anniversaries of our independence find our Nation moving along the road to independence in the fullest meaning of the word. But it must be a continuing action, not subject to the vagaries of politics and its enervating spoils system. To achieve this progress we must strive ever to have the right man in the right job, and not try to fit around pegs in square holes.

Hawaii's Voting Record Among Best in Country—Territory's People Alert to Responsibilities of American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I present herewith an excerpt from a letter by Urban Allen, member of the editorial staff of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, containing an analysis of the voting record of Hawaii's citizens as compared with those of the States.

The excerpt from the letter follows:

In the November 5, 1950, issue of the Detroit Free Press, Publisher John S. Knight wrote a very forceful editorial on the number of Americans who are not exercising their right of franchise.

He published a table, State by State, showing how each voted in the 1946 off-year election. The best record was made by Montana, where 64 percent of persons of voting age cast their ballots. Only 10 of the 48 States were able to muster a majority of eligible voters at the polls.

Hawaii has long been proud of its voting record. We regularly have more than 80 percent of our registered voters take part in our elections, and in some counties the figure goes to 90 percent or higher.

However, registered vote and persons eligible to vote are two different things, so I asked the Bureau of Statistics of our Territorial government to give me an estimate of the number of people in Hawaii who are eligible to vote.

They reported the number as 187,558. For our general election this year we had 141,319 registered voters. This is 75.3 percent of the estimated number of eligible voters.

(I might say that many recent arrivals from the mainland have not transferred their registrations from their home States. If Hawaii were granted statehood, they undoubtedly would reregister here, as most of them retain mainland registrations, when they can, to be able to vote in Presidential elections.)

But, back to our statistics. Of our 141,319 registered voters, 118,704 actually voted, Territorial percentage of better than 80, and a percentage of voters to persons eligible of 63.3 (just seven-tenths of 1 percentage point behind the Montana turnout of 1946).

When I look at the turnout of such great States as Ohio (44), California (36), Iowa (35), and Maine (31), I am more than ever proud of our record here.

South Carolina reported only 26,000 out of 992,000 eligible voters going to the polls, a percentage of 3. Mississippi did better, 4 percent; Louisiana had 7; Georgia and Texas 8; Tennessee 11; Alabama 12; Florida 13; and Arkansas 14.

I was happy to note that Wyoming, where I enjoyed a pleasant visit in 1946, is well up among the leaders, with a 48-percent turnout in 1946, but still not quite up to Hawaii's record.

Of course, these statistics do not prove that the quality of democracy is better here than it is on the mainland, but they do show, I think, that we, by and large, take our government a great deal more seriously than the average mainlander. What is more, I think we take a greater personal interest in it, not only at election time, but throughout the year.

Why Not Be Consistent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, while the President is asking that Congress saddle on to the necks of the landlords the subsidizing of millions of tenants throughout this country, he is at the same time sanctioning the subsidizing of a small group of potato growers at a rate far in excess of last year. The tragedy is that the landlords are the only segment of our population who are to do the subsidizing. The Government does it in all other cases. Why? Because there are few votes among the landlords. I am not appealing in behalf of the landlords as much as I am on the basis of equal justice. If it is necessary that the tenants be subsidized, the Government should take the load. Personally, I think we should stop a lot of this subsidizing.

I am inserting this article out of the Washington Post which in itself should sicken you on potato subsidies and make you realize what a travesty it is to ask the small home owner to subsidize someone who, in all likelihood, is making more money than the small home owner is.

The article follows:

TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND BUSHELS—UNITED STATES DOUBLES RATE OF SPUD DESTRUCTION

(By John Ball)

So far this year the Agriculture Department has destroyed enough potatoes to meet the normal needs of the inhabitants of 16 States for a year.

Bureau of Agriculture Economics figures show that Americans each eat about 105 pounds of potatoes a year. About 26,700,000 bushels of potatoes were destroyed under the Government farm price support program up to November 15, enough to feed all the people for a year in Oregon, Nebraska, Colorado, Maine (the biggest potato State), the District of Columbia, Rhode Island, Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, South Dakota, North Dakota (another big potato State), Montana, Idaho (the home of the big potato), New Hampshire, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, and Nevada, with some left over for Kansas.

The potato destruction this year is running at a rate more than twice that of a year ago, Agriculture Department figures show. Up to November 15, 26,700,000 bushels had been dumped. A year ago on November 15, only 10,700,000 bushels had been thrown away.

Although the net cost per bushel to Uncle Sam is less than half last year's cost, the total crop cost is running far ahead. Until November 15 the cost this year was about $20,000,000, with the unit cost going up. The price Uncle Sam is paying under the support program has recently jumped from around 70 to 80 cents a bushel. Last year it was approximately $1.40—it varies in different areas, and the total had reached about 15 million bucks.

The whole program last year was $83,798,000. That's a lot of money in anybody's bank account, but it was small potatoes compared with the 24 million plus the 1948 crop cost.

It develops, too, that that wasn't the total cost of the 1948 program, big as it is. Agriculture Department potato men last week were trying to get some alcohol makers to take a lot of potato starch, made by the Government out of surplus Maine potatoes that year, that Uncle Sam still has on his hands.

This month's Commodity Credit Corporation's catalog, listing the surplus commodities CCC has for sale, shows about 6,100,000 pounds of potato starch in storage since 1948, somewhere in the Boston area.

Reports from Boston indicate that the Boston area is an Army warehouse there, but Army officers won't give out any details about the hoard of potato starch, declaring it is to be a military secret.

CCC is offering the starch for sale at two prices. For export the price is $5.10 per 100

pounds, freight at shipside, Boston. For domestic users, the price listed is $4.50 per 100 pounds, f. o. b. Maine shipping points.

Domestic distillers, in spite of the dangerous shortage of alcohol, have turned down the offer. First they are afraid the starch may be deteriorated due to its long storage, and second, the price is too high to make alcohol. It takes 13 pounds of starch to make a gallon of alcohol. At that price for starch, a gallon of alcohol would cost around 65 cents, without any other expenses—and that is more than alcohol will bring, even when sold to the Government.

The story behind the starch stored at Boston is interesting in itself. In 1948 there was a potato shortage in central Europe, but it wasn't feasible to ship whole spuds there. So the Army got a brilliant idea to ship potato starch and flour. They used 30,000,000 bushels of potatoes and made 347,000,000 pounds of flour and a few million pounds of starch for Germany. But the Germans didn't like it. It wasn't cooked. The potato flour they make is cooked. What was left of the potato flour was distributed domestically, and the starch stored in Boston.

The Agriculture Department would like to get rid of that potato starch stored in Boston. Then, maybe, they can forget about the 1948 potato scandal.

Anna Mary Robertson Moses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

HOOSICK FALLS, N. Y., *October 15, 1950.*
The Honorable WILLIAM T. BYRNE,
Representative, Thirty-second Congressional District,
Loudonville, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BYRNE: On October 3, 1950, the enclosed resolution was presented at the Lions Club dinner in Cambridge, N. Y. It received the approbation of such other local organizations as the Hoosick Falls American Legion and Kiwanis Club. The Parent-Teacher Association of Hoosick Falls, N. Y., received State and National sanction from the National Congress of Parents and Teachers prior to presenting this resolution publicly. Mrs. John E. Hayes, national president of the P.-T. A., wired us her approval, and the State congress of the P.-T. A. approved the resolution at the convention of the State congress of the Parent-Teacher Association held at Rochester, N. Y., October 2 and 3, 1950.

We, of course, would like to have this resolution included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and hope that you can see fit to do this. Will you let us know your action upon this request? In the event of the resolution being included within the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will you kindly have forwarded to us a copy of the minutes devoted particularly to this?

Very truly yours,
THE HOOSICK FALLS, N. Y.,
PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATION,
(Mrs.) MABEL T. HART.

Whereas Anna Mary Robertson Moses, of Eagle Bridge, N. Y., living within the boundaries of Hoosick Falls, N. Y., public school district No. 1, and her children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren have been and are attending school in this district; and

Whereas Anna Mary Robertson Moses has attained international fame in the world of art and is serving as a daily inspiration to young and old alike; and

Whereas Anna Mary Robertson Moses, through her untiring activities, has become known the world over as Grandma Moses.

Therefore, we, the members of the Parent-Teacher Association of Hoosick Falls, N. Y., public school district No. 1, having ascertained from both the National and State Congress of Parents and Teachers that this resolution is well within the policy of the organization, hereby resolve that Anna Mary Robertson Moses be named and appointed as Grandmother of the Year for the whole United States, and that a copy of this resolution be given to the Honorable DEAN P. TAYLOR and the Honorable WILLIAM T. BYRNE for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"That Harmony of Purpose Which Is Essential to Our Security in the Years To Come"—Remarks of Secretary of Defense Marshall at the Unveiling of a Monument Erected in Arlington Cemetery in Recognition of the Outstanding Services Rendered by Sir John Dill to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, November 1, in the Arlington National Cemetery, Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall spoke at the unveiling of a monument to Field Marshal Sir John Dill, who was the senior British representative on the Combined Chiefs of Staff at the time of his death, November 4, 1944. It was to the dedication of this monument, I may remind this House, that President Truman was going when two misguided fanatics made the shameful attempt on his life. The name of Sir John is familiar to many Members of Congress. Shortly after his death the Seventy-eighth Congress passed the joint resolution that recognized the burial of a foreign national in Arlington, and the outstanding services rendered by Sir John Dill to the vital cause of British-American military cooperation and to the United Nations.

In words as felicitous as any it has been my privilege to hear, Secretary Marshall spoke of the man who was his friend and intimate associate during most of the World War II years. He quoted the tribute of President Roosevelt on the day after Sir John's death: "Sir John made an enduring contribution toward the victorious conclusion of the war and also to that harmony of purpose which is essential to our security in the years to come."

Mr. Speaker, harmony of purpose existed and, thank God, continues to exist between our Nation and the nation of Sir John Dill. Harmony of purpose must bind together the countries in the North Atlantic community and the members of the United Nations. Harmony of purpose must bind together the Members of this Congress, and all who have at heart the security of the United States.

The monument of Sir John Dill is a monument to the spirit of cooperation that is as essential as the spirit of sacrifice to the winning of victory. American friends have made this monument possible because they appreciate that the things Sir John stood for were things that were good for America. Collective security under the North Atlantic pact represents an extension of Sir John's ideals.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks by Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall at the unveiling of the monument to his friend.

The remarks are as follows:

Here before us in Arlington Cemetery, among our hallowed dead lies buried a great Englishman, Field Marshal Sir John Dill. He was my friend, I am proud to say, and he was my intimate associate throughout most of the war years, commencing with the historic meeting at Argentia in Newfoundland, in August 1941.

He gave his life in the service of his own country and of this country and for the hopes of all free peoples. On the morning following his death, President Roosevelt, in making a posthumous award of the Distinguished Service Medal, characterized his services in part, in these words, "Sir John Dill made an enduring contribution toward the victorious conclusion of the war and also to that harmony of purpose which is essential to our security in the years to come." It was these last words referring to "that harmony of purpose which is essential to our security in the years to come" that moved a group of the American leaders in this war, Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King, General of the Army Henry H. Arnold, myself, and others to undertake the erection of a memorial to Sir John. But more especially we wished to commemorate down through the years and in a manner that would meet the eye of thousands of Americans, the vast importance of that harmony of purpose between Great Britain and the United States which is so essential to our security and the peace of the world in the years to come.

The Congress of the United States established a precedent in passing a joint resolution recognizing the burial of Sir John in this national cemetery and the outstanding services rendered by him to the United Nations.

For those who did not have the good fortune to know Field Marshal Sir John Dill and for those who did not have the rare opportunity of working with him, I wish to say here today that in my opinion, and I know in the opinion of others intimately associated with the conduct of the war, his influence was greater than that of probably any other individual in welding together the military forces of our two countries. It was this complete accord that more than any other single factor gave us the victory in Europe.

I have never known a man whose high character shone so clearly in the honest directness of his every action. He was an inspiration to all of us in those trying days, and I think it is peculiarly fitting that this memorial to his memory should stand prominently at this crossroads where the avenues bearing the names of Roosevelt and Grant converge. It is especially fitting that the road to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier should pass within a few feet of this statue,

for it will enable the thousands upon thousands of Americans who annually visit this shrine to pause for a moment and read the resolution of the Congress and the citation of President Roosevelt in testimony of a great service rendered our two countries and its importance to us in the future.

Captain Cal-y-Mayor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following news release by Lester Healey, of the California Electric Power Co.:

BISHOP, CALIF.—California's three-year-old rainbirds may be flying south any day now. Their destination is Mexico, because Mexico is badly in need of additional water.

Five years ago the United States allocated by law 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually from the Colorado River for Mexico. To put this water to its utmost beneficial use, our good neighbors to the south have constructed the Moreles Dam on the lower Colorado, making available water for the development of thousands of additional acres of agricultural land in a rapidly growing, newly developed area.

The ever-increasing population with the demands for land development, and the luxuries that electric energy can provide, surrounds the problem of obtaining more water to be put to beneficial human use.

An American public utility, California Electric Power Co., which has served sections of Mexico with electrical energy for the past 25 years, has opened the "good neighbor" door and a new hope for additional Mexican water.

At a recent power conference in Mexico City, Gilbert C. Delvaille, vice president and general manager of Industrial Electrica Mexicana, S. A., Mexicali, B. C., hearing of Mexico's water plight, mentioned casually to the Mexican power commissioners that the California Electric Power Co. had been increasing its water needs "with a P–38."

Briefly, Delvaille told the commissioners of the company's 3 years of successful cloud nucleation in the High Sierra of California, where California Electric operates a large network of power plants.

Mexico City, the commissioners reflected, has a similar power plant set-up, including Ixtapantonogo and Santa Barbara plants, and the Tingambato, construction on which starts next January. These comprise the Sistema Hidro-helectric Miguel Aleman. The mountains that tower above these reservoirs are 15,000 feet in elevation, making the watershed similar to the 14,000-foot range of Bishop's High Sierra where the American power company's experimental program has been so successful.

An immediate invitation was extended, by President Albert Cage of the California public utility, to Mexico to study the cloud-seeding and "rain-making process."

Mr. Cage explained that for the past 2 winter seasons, his company's P–38 has been engaged in dry ice bombardment of reluctant cloud formations over the towering Sierra peaks, and has successfully pinpointed "bonus" snowstorms in a 5- by 20-mile area of the Bishop Creek watershed.

During the winter months this dry-ice artificial nucleation of High Sierra clouds, has netted an annual estimated bonus precipitation of approximately 6,500 acre-feet, capable of generating 14,300,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity annually, Mr. Cage related.

Alejandro Paez Uriquidi, director of the Commission Federal De Electricidad of Mexico, took immediate steps that his country might learn the full process of artificial cloud nucleation. He has assigned one of his country's top air force pilots and engineering men to handle the task.

First Capt. Julio Cal-y-Mayor of Mexico City, who learned his air force training in the United States during World War II, is now at Bishop (California) working with Robert Symons, California Electric's areologist and pilot.

Capt. Julio Cal-y-Mayor is honored with his new assignment. He was a pilot in Squadron 201 of the Mexican Air Force during World War II, taking his training at Pocatello, Idaho; Majors Field, Tex.; St. Petersburg, Fla.; and North Island, Calif. He flew with a squadron of 32 pilots and a total crew of 300 in fighting for the Allies in the South Pacific. His squadron flew 14 bombing and strafing missions in the Philippines, Formosa, and other South Pacific areas. Recently General Kinney of the United States Air Force, with Secretary of Defense Gilberto R. Limon of Mexico, appeared in Mexico City and decorated the captain and others with the American Air Medal, which he wears with pride among other decorations.

Captain Cal-y-Mayor knows personally of Mexico's deficiency in water and power. He has lived under power-rationed conditions, and has seen lakes and reservoirs on the west side of the Sierra Madre Range recede tremendously in past years. Industrial Mexico needs more power, and in some areas the past year, Mexican hydro plants operating from 7,000 to 14,000 feet elevations have received only a few days of rain. There are plenty of clouds in the mountain ranges, but they don't produce rain.

This was the same situation that confronted California Electric Power Co. in 1947 when a succession of dry years cut operations in the Bishop Creek plants to 65 percent. Stuart Cundiff, California Electric Power Co. engineer, who had been following the work of Dr. Vincent J. Schaefer and Dr. Irving Langmuir, General Electric scientists, who had developed the dry ice seeding technique in 1946, was put in charge of plans for the artificial snowfall program. Mr. Cundiff had noticed that the alto-stratus and cumulo-stratus clouds, typical in the high Sierras, would roll over the 13,000- to 14,000-foot peaks to be dissipated over the Owens Valley. They literally disappeared into the atmosphere without leaving any precipitation. If these clouds could be made to produce rain and snow, more water would be available to operate the five powerhouses operating in tandem at different elevations in the Bishop Creek area. And these five plants furnish 75 percent of all hydro generation of the company's northern Sierra system.

Symons was picked to do the actual flying and seeding. He had been an experienced pilot in the high Sierra since 1928; has held four United States and world glider records; and had served as flight commander of the United States glider training program at Wickenburg, Ariz. His intimate knowledge of thermal conditions in the high Sierras was to play a large part in the successful pin-pointing of storms in the Bishop watershed.

Actual flights began in the winter months of the 1947–48 season. At first, both the dry ice and silver iodide methods of artificial nucleation were considered. The latter was discarded, however, because it had to be released below the cloud formation, and since most of the time the clouds actually encompassed the peaks, the silver iodide method was not practical.

A BT–13 was the first plane test, and then an AT–6. Both proved unsatisfactory because of their ceiling limitations. A ceiling above 30,000 feet was needed as some clouds were more than 15,000 feet from top to bottom hovering over a mountain range with a 13,000-foot crest average. To meet these specifications the company purchased a P–38 which has operated efficiently under all weather conditions.

Successful nucleation flights require specific cloud formations, and during the 1948–49 season 21 flights were made.

"To release snow it is necessary to work on a supercooled cloud where the temperature is below 32 degrees Fahrenheit," Pilot Symons explained.

"Then just the right amount of dry ice chopped to the proper size is needed. Most of the seeding takes place above the clouds, although sometimes we fly through them. Clouds averaging 3,000 feet or under in thickness are seeded with dry ice the size of rice grains. Larger clouds require pieces ground to the size of a human thumb," he revealed.

The dry ice used in a seeding operation varies in size depending upon the thickness of the cloud; however, the amount used will average approximately one-half pound per mile of seeding.

When the dry ice hits the supercooled cloud it changes the water droplets to ice crystals as it passes them. As the ice crystal has a lower vapor pressure it attracts other water droplets which adhere and when heavy enough, drop as snowflakes. This process releases energy in the form of heat which creates a tremendous suction that draws in moisture from the atmosphere, thus setting off a process of chain reaction. This accounts for the phenomena of seemingly peaceful cloud formations being transformed in a matter of 30 minutes into a seething storm mass. If too much dry ice is introduced, however, it changes all of the water droplets into tiny ice crystals and the cloud is dissipated.

Elvyn C. Pye and Charles S. Patterson, in charge of the United States Weather Bureau at Bishop, have furnished meterological information and the full cooperation of their office during the entire project. Ferguson Hall, Assistant Chief of Staff of the United States Weather Bureau of Washington, D. C., spent weeks at Bishop making detailed maps, records, and diagrams of the seeding operations.

Records of the California Electric Power Co. which go back 40 years, were used to evaluate the effectiveness of the cloud nucleation program. With the aid of this extensive statistical data, each April many company engineers are able to correlate actual snow measurements at lower elevations, and estimate with amazing accuracy what the runoff precipitation will be from the snow pack in the inaccesible back country in the Bishop Basin. At the end of flight operations in April 1948, the estimate was made but the actual runoff showed an approximate 14 percent increase due to the additional "bonus" snow dropped at the high elevations. In 1949, a cold winter with very little moisture, the runoff was 12 percent over the spring estimate.

Translated in terms of electrical consumption, the 1948–49 cloud-seeding bonus of approximately 6,500 acre-feet can generate enough power to supply all the domestic and industrial needs of a city of 50,000 persons for 3 months annually.

In the case of the Bishop Creek operation, all of the water becomes the property of the city of Los Angeles, and makes a 265-mile trip in a giant aqueduct to the United States fourth largest city.

"Our experiments have convinced us that pin-point nucleation of clouds is not only possible, but it is economically profitable," Engineer Cundiff declared in summing up the results of 2 years' experiments.

"We have obtained sizable snowfalls from clouds that would have disappeared in thin air. We believe we have the method to add to the permanent snow pack reservoir that will permit full-scale operations throughout the year, even during dry year cycles.

"During the past 2 years we have commercially pioneered a method of operation that might aid these other similar areas to add to their water supply in years ahead," Cundiff concluded.

And that is specifically what Captain Cal-y-Mayor plans to find out. He will grind dry ice on an improved machine, designed to accelerate effectiveness of the nucleation. He will train in the latest type electrically heated flying suit, complete with heated shoes, oxygen masks and other equipment needed to fly at elevations of from 25,000 to 35,000 feet. He will photograph from the plane snow markers, a new method for measuring snow by pictures, rather than the old method that took two men 5 days to make the check. Now a plane gathers the data on a 35-minute run.

All of this aerial activity and inter-communication is wire recorded for accurate record.

He will study new hydrographic installations, including telephone equipment known as "telemark" that automatically takes water level readings of reservoirs, and opens and closes valves to regulate the flow of water into power plant intakes.

All of this information will go to a special congressional subcommittee appointed by Congressman HARRY R. SHEPPARD, chairman of the California delegation on cloud-seeding and headed by THOMAS WERDEL, Republican, of Bakersfield, Calif.; and CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of Red Bluff, Calif. A constant flow of reports will be forwarded to President Miguel Aleman of Mexico, through Power Commissioner Paez, and the Mexican consul in San Bernardino.

Captain Cal-y-Mayor's job will be to return to Mexico and train a staff to seed clouds in specific areas. If the Mexican experiments prove successful, Mexico can look forward to further industrial progress.

Captain Cal-y-Mayor is finding out that a little snow from cloud seeding has tremendous results. In the Bishop watershed one-tenth of an inch of water over the watershed is capable of producing 925,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity by running it through the six power plants. Near Mexico City the same results can be obtained if California's rainbirds of the High Sierra prove successful instructors.

Another Bureaucratic Power Grab?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a warning against a contemplated power grab by the Department of the Interior:

[From the Los Angeles Times of November 22, 1950]

ANOTHER BUREAUCRATIC POWER GRAB?

Secret efforts of the Department of the Interior to revolutionize the mining laws of the United States, as disclosed by the Times last Sunday, emphasize again the lengths to which this power-hungry bureaucracy will go to increase its grip upon the Nation's resources.

PROPOSED CHANGES

The proposed changes in the mining laws, it is declared by mining authorities, would cripple prospecting and small mining operations so seriously that the search for uranium and other vital war minerals would be virtually ended.

Plans for the sweeping changes in the law were contained in an Interior Department document marked: "Confidential—neither this memorandum nor the information it contains is to be made available to the public."

Why?

Many persons are genuinely puzzled why Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman's Department would attempt such a move, so obviously detrimental to the best interests of the country.

Only one answer seems possible. This is that a Federal bureau, once embarked upon a quest for power, is unable to stop. It moves ever forward, grasping, conniving, scheming, pulling strings, planning new conquests. It seeks to perpetuate itself.

Many ominous signs and portents have indicated the ravenous course of the Department of the Interior in this direction under the last three Secretaries—Harold Ickes, Julius Krug, and Oscar Chapman.

ATTACK ON WEST

They have moved, successively, to gain control over the essential elements in the daily lives of the people of the United States, and particularly in the phenomenally growing West.

These elements are water, electrical power, oil, land, and minerals.

By clever appeals, they have gone far along the road to the accomplishment of their purpose. They have pitted class against class, arrayed the poor against the well-to-do, and promised great rewards to their satellites.

Secretary Ickes started the overt acts about 1936 by junking the essential spirit of the Reclamation Act of 1902, and embarking upon a "Share the Wealth" program backed up by all the resources of his Department. Then there began the taking over of the internal resources of States—such as the water, electrical power, and oil of California. The enormous wastefulness of the California Central Valley project under Federal control has been one of the bitter fruits of the Interior policy—as the farmers who pay the bill are beginning to discover.

Even now the battle is going on over the efforts of the Department to seize the electrical power resources of the Central Valley. This effort of the Interior schemers was aided and abetted by Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, who now has been so thoroughly repudiated by California's awakening voters.

And now comes the devious mining maneuver.

CLEVER WORDING

The Interior Department seeks, through cleverly worded amendments, to destroy prospecting and small mining, which have been the twin bases upon which America's discovery of vitally needed uranium and other A-bomb and defense-weapon minerals have depended.

Disclosure of this latest scheme should result immediately in action by Congress to thwart any such proposals from becoming reality. The Interior Department's use of such seemingly innocent means as the Taylor Grazing Act in its attempt to gain domination over mining activities illustrates the lengths to which it will go. It works, deviously and in the dark, to worm forward toward the goal—more power.

Western Senators, now that they have been informed of what is going on by The Times' disclosure of the mining-law maneuver, can work to prevent destruction of this important aspect of national life. The West, indeed, should become ever more vigilant to protect its people and its resources from the onerous raids of the Washington "planners."

What Patrick Henry Said 175 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Evening Star the words of a great American were printed. They were uttered by Patrick Henry in another day of crisis. As aptly stated in the Star, those words may find an echo in the thoughts of many Americans today. The only deletions made referred to the specific situation then pertaining between Britain and her North American colonies. The speech was delivered at the Richmond convention on March 23, 1775.

WHAT PATRICK HENRY SAID 175 YEARS AGO

Mr. President, it is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth, and listen to the song of that siren, till she transforms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men, engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation?

For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth—to know the worst and to provide for it. I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past. * * *

I ask gentlemen, sir, what means this martial array, if its purpose be not to force us to submission? Can gentlemen assign any other possible motive for it? * * *

And what have we to oppose to them? Shall we try argument? Sir, we have been trying that for the last 10 years. Have we anything new to offer upon the subject? Nothing. We have held the subject up in every light of which it is capable; but it has all been in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and humble supplication? What terms shall we find which have not been already exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, sir, deceive ourselves longer.

Sir, we have done everything that could be done to avert the storm which is now coming on. * * * Our petitions have been slighted; our remonstrances have produced additional violence and insult; our supplications have been disregarded and we have been spurned with contempt. * * *

In vain, after these things, may we indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation. There is no longer any room for hope. If we wish to be free; if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending; if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon, until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained, we must fight. I repeat it, sir, we must fight. An appeal to arms and to the God of hosts is all that is left us.

They tell us, sir, that we are weak; unable to cope with so formidable an adversary.

But when shall we be stronger? Will it be the next week or the next year? * * * Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot?

Sir, we are not weak, if we make a proper use of those means which the God of nature hath placed in our power. Three millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us.

Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave.

Besides, sir, we have no election. If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat, but in submission and slavery. Our chains are forged. * * * The war is inevitable—and let it come. I repeat it, sir, let it come.

It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry, peace, peace—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun. The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms. Our brethren are already in the field. Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God.

I know not what course others may take. But as for me, give me liberty or give me death.

If Crooks, Cutthroats, and Communists Had Their Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the crooks, cutthroats and Communists here and abroad had their way, then not only the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but also every law enforcement agency in our land worthy of the name, would either be abolished or corrupted.

As one who has known that great American, J. Edgar Hoover, personally, for the past 12 years, and having closely followed the activities and good works of the FBI in stopping sabotage in times of war and in bringing to the bar of justice thousands upon thousands of criminals of every stripe, it is alarming to me, as I am sure it is to every American worthy of the protection guaranteed by the laws of our land, to read the rantings of the smear artist Mr. Max Lowenthal against the FBI, while that great organization fights to protect even his inalienable rights to be at liberty in this free land of ours.

Now is the appointed time for every loyal American to come to the aid of clean, decent government and true Americanism by everlasting and wholehearted support of the FBI and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, as a well financed, well organized band of crooks, cutthroats and Communists right here within our own shores, as well as abroad, are this minute doing all in their power to destroy the Federal Bureau of Investigation which has done so much for America—and for every law-abiding and patriotic citizen in our land. The FBI must not be destroyed or even hindered in the slightest in the doing of its good work.

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of United States Air Forces, Warns That America Must Not Be Deluded Into Fighting a Preventive War or Deceived by Russia's Efforts To Involve Us in Wars of Limited Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on November 17, last, Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, delivered a most thought-provoking address before the members of the National Association of Radio News Directors in convention at Chicago. Those who were so unfortunate as not to hear General Vandenberg's bold denunciation of warmongers, accompanied by his assertion of faith in the strength of American democracy, will be doubly unfortunate if they miss reading his remarks. General Vandenberg asserted his belief in the doctrine of peace through diplomacy and power. He insisted that this is not an easy way which spares neither trial nor tension, but insists that this is the only way that offers freemen a rational hope of survival.

During these days, Mr. Speaker, when we hear speeches and remarks on every hand regarding preventive wars, limited wars, and wars of aggression, as well as talk of the inevitable war, I think it is appropriate that we should remind ourselves that there is only one kind of war, namely, destructive war—such that saps our strength, despoils the youth, and endangers the democracy of nations who engage in it.

I commend the reading of this address by General Vandenberg to the Members of the Congress and, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include General Vandenberg's challenging address.

The address is as follows:

If we would reject the reprehensible proposition that America can avert a war of annihilation only by pulling the trigger first, we must do more than cry out against so absurd and desperate a delusion. For this delusion is the product of hopeless resignation to the prospect of inevitable war. To demolish it we must first destroy this myth of unavoidable conflict. We must reassure the American people that power can be employed to prevent war. We must hold out a rational hope for peace through strength and resolution.

Impatience, inconstancy, and cynicism, these are the enemies of hope. And the most perilous of them is cynicism. For it is difficult to believe that war can be averted through early or foreseeable agreement. To obtain peace through agreement, nations must live in the same moral order. Each must acknowledge truth and good faith as the rudiments of human conduct.

When a nation employs the deliberate lie as an instrumentality of statecraft, it rejects this moral order. And having rejected it, such a nation becomes incapable of respecing the sanctity of agreement. However fervidly we may press for peace through agreement, so extravagant a hope will be an illusory one until international communism proves its willingness to abide by first principles of human conduct.

Yet to admit that agreement is unlikely in this present-day world, we need not submit to the cynical assumption that the only alternative left us is inevitable war.

Midway between those extremities of illusion and despair, there exists a middle way. It is the way to an armed peace through diplomacy and power. And admittedly it cannot promise immediate peace through agreement, but it may hold off conflict until those nations whose ambitions imperil the world accept a moral order in which differences can be peaceably resolved.

This way of diplomacy and power can spare us neither trial nor tension. For it is a way of interminable struggle that will demand realism and risk-taking. But it is the only way left to a free people between the distant alternative of agreement and the near alternative of war.

Diplomacy and power can offer free men a rational hope for survival. It will tax them, however, not only in resolution but in resources as well. For to prevail with power and diplomacy against the Communist world we must outpoint its lies with truth and challenge its threat of aggression with a superior military force, and we must banish subversion by helping free peoples banish the cesspools in which it spawns.

No more formidable a task has ever confronted the American people. No more fearful a judgment has ever awaited them should they fail.

The power problem of America, however, is unique in a world strained under the burden of rearmament. For our test shall come not in the creation of power; in this we know our capabilities. Our most difficult task lies in the employment of power—in the wisdom, the courage, and shrewdness with which we use it to benefit the lives of free men.

For if we are to use power not only to safeguard ourselves but to safeguard freedom and minimize the danger of eventual war, then we must exercise power with such boldness that we weaken the purposes of our enemies; exercise power with such foresight that we strengthen the resolve of our friends; exercise power with such judiciousness that we do not squander our resources; exercise power with such prudence that we do not derange our political life; exercise power with such strength that no enemy shall miscalculate our resolution; exercise power with such constancy that our friends need never doubt us.

The task is made more difficult by our traditional aversion to power politics in the world. For we have blinked the fact that nations must struggle for existence.

As a result, too many Americans have draped the world in a chintzy illusion of brotherhood, believing that nations can outlaw struggle over a friendly cup of tea.

Even more unrealistic are the outraged who while not denying that this struggle exists would have us isolate ourselves from it. So fearful are they that the world might despoil us, they would forbid us associate with it.

Though antagonistic to each other, these positions are equally ingenuous. Neither has faced up to the facts of life. Both have created timidity and confusion in the minds

of the American people. And as a consequence we have shrunk from the use of power not because we abhor—but primarily because we have never known how, when, and where to employ it.

It was in 1946 that the United States declared it could no more abstain from the world struggle in peacetime than it could ignore it in war. With this new doctrine we blocked for the first time a rival power with power to initiate a new spirit of resistance in the free world.

Within 4 years we have not only reconstructed the free world's will to resist, but we have also forewarned aggressors as never before that armed invasion will be combated with force, that military adventurers shall hereafter trespass in peril of their own lives.

These successes, however, do not justify the assumption that we have made aggression unlikely. For the most effective deterrent to aggression today is the threat of retaliation.

And yet if we would deter an aggressor, it is not enough that we threaten him with retaliatory attack. Instead we must also deny him his immediate obpectives upon the ground. For the achievement of those objectives would provide him with additional resources, which might warrant his taking the risk of war even in the face of retaliation.

Nowhere is this more likely than in Europe. For there a vast industrial treasure offers so remunerative an objective that an aggressor might willingly risk extensive destruction at home to secure it.

It is in Western Europe that Communist imperialism must ultimately resolve the decision as to whether it shall seek expansion through conquest or whether it shall seek accommodation with the free world. For Western Europe alone holds the balance of power that could spare communism defeat in a world conflict.

Knowing this, the Communists have conspired to distract the American people from their priority commitment of power to the defenses of free Europe. And to circumvent the superiority of American resources, they have endeavored to panic us like wet hens into a strategy of exhaustion. They would have us flit from alternate crisis to crisis, between the east and west.

But however devious these tactics of distraction may be, we shall not be diverted from Europe. For Europe is the theater of decision. Communist successes elsewhere might weaken the free world. Communist successes in Europe could destroy it.

While the United States can underwrite the preliminary costs of Western European defenses, it cannot by itself permanently endow the security of the non-Communist world. For although the European will to resist can be fortified by military aid, it cannot be purchased by American dollars. However liberally we contribute to the common defense, whatever our commitment of troops, in the last analysis Western Europe shall be defended primarily by the Western Europeans.

Any nation that would claim the right to pool its defenses must demonstrate its good faith by sharing fairly to the limit of its resources in the common defense. For if a people merit freedom, they will spend generously to preserve it.

In time of danger there is no limit to what a nation can safely spend for its preservation. Crisis, however, is not license to extravagance in defense. For if the United States is to maintain long-term military power, then it must assume a position it can support not for a year or two, but even for a decade or more. Although the issue shall always be one of what is needed for defense rather than what we can afford, we dare never forget that the health of our Nation is the prime military asset of the free world.

Because power is no more effective than the use to which power is put, the money we spend is no more important than the strategy with which we employ it.

In devising a strategy that would dispel the likelihood of inevitable war, we must accomplish three primary missions:

The first is to challenge the enemy's sources of strength that he will not risk unlimited war for fear of annihilation.

The second is to deny him easy opportunity for conquest by strengthening the defense of free nations.

And the third is to contain his satellite attacks without recourse to the strategic arms that might transmute those second-class wars into first-class conflicts.

In view of the wide range of these missions, it is apparent that no one single element of power can provide the miracle deterrent to total war by accomplishing all three missions.

Yet in strategic air power we do have for the first time a weapon capable of accomplishing the first of these missions—cracking an enemy's will to resist by striking at his home sources of strength. Nevertheless, it does not follow that air bombing alone could deter an enemy bent on the plunder of Western Europe's resources.

For to defeat an enemy by crushing his home sources of supply, it is essential that we prevent him from acquiring new ones. Unless Western Europe is adequately defended, an enemy might overrun its industrial plant and readily supplant its own logistical sources by those acquired through conquest. Thus were an aggressor to occupy the nations of Western Europe, it would have circumvented the decisiveness of strategic air power in the war.

For that reason, the decisiveness of strategic air power is peculiarly dependent upon the ability of ground armies to withstand an aggressor and limit him to his own home sources of supply. And since those ground forces are dependent upon the Navy for their logistical support, air power becomes no less dependent upon sea power than are the Allied land forces in Europe.

By the same token both are dependent upon strategic air power. For however speedily we recreate Atlantic community land strength and its supporting sea power, we shall never mobilize manpower to withstand Communist aggression unless air power can demolish the enemy's logistical sources and limit his armies to what they might have accumulated in stockpiles. Thus if the western world would deter Soviet aggression, it must not only build up the land and sea strength of the North Atlantic community, but must also offset the superiority of Soviet land strength with a comparable superiority in strategic air power.

On June 25 we were confronted by the threat and tactic of satellite aggression. By this risky resort to limited war, the Communist entente would engage us in attritional warfare with conventional weapons while averting retaliation against its heartland sources of strength. To aid the United Nations in quelling limited aggression of this type, we must maintain a mobile striking force of sufficient power in all three arms so as to avoid the necessity of expanding limited into a total conflict.

Just as a prolonged period of trial and tension is preferable to even a limited war, so are limited wars vastly preferable to the prospect of unlimited conflict.

If cynicism be the most insidious enemy of a people who would avert war, then inconstancy cannot be far behind.

For the way to peace through diplomacy and power offers no easy turn-offs to the timid except into disaster.

It is too long a path to be traveled by the impatient whose resolution must be recharged with the passing of each fiscal year.

It is too hard a path to be traveled by the faint-hearted who despair and who are as easily deceived by phony mirages of peace.

It is too steep a path to be traveled by those who value their comfort more than they value their freedom.

More than anything else our allies fear we lack the constancy to follow this path. They fear inconstancy may impair our resolution and cause us to default on our commitments. For they are not certain we have yet sensed the gravity of this struggle for survival.

But while our allies have feared inconstancy, the Soviet has banked upon it.

For they have sought to deceive the world into believing that Americans are incapable of resolution, incapable of the sacrifice such resolution shall require if we are to contest its claims to the future.

This danger of irresolution, however, lies more with us whose responsibility it is to inform the American people than with the people themselves.

For if the people are honestly informed of the tasks and dangers they face, they will respond with resolution. And if assured that power wisely employed may spare them eventual war, they will exert the effort, endure the sacrifice, and provide the power required.

But if we would panic them with exaggerated reports of Communist military strength, confuse them by doubling our requirements in hopes of securing half, lead them blindfolded step by step for fear blunt truths may shock them, then they may hesitate when boldness is needed for lack of confidence and understanding.

As never before this is a time for honesty and faith in the American people; a time for hard truths, a time for clear facts, a time for plain talk on what power will cost.

Given these, they shall willingly do what is needed.

Puerto Ricans Residing in Hawaii Denounce Revolutionary Activities in Native Land, Assert Loyalty to United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herewith an article from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of November 6, 1950, and an editorial from the same newspaper of November 8, 1950. The article follows:

LOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES—TERRITORY OF HAWAII PUERTO RICANS DENOUNCE ACTS IN ISLAND AND AT CAPITAL

On behalf of the Puerto Ricans in Hawaii the heads of their four largest organizations on Sunday spoke out in full loyalty to the United States.

Their statement was caused by the recent uprising in Puerto Rico, soon followed by the attempt made by two Puerto Ricans to assassinate President Truman.

The following statement, addressed to the editor of the Star-Bulletin, was drafted and approved Sunday by the Puerto Rican leaders:

"We, the undersigned, wish to inform the people of the Territory of Hawaii and elsewhere that the Puerto Rican people of the Territory of Hawaii do not sympathize with the recent Communist inspired revolt in Puerto Rico and the attempted assassination of President Truman.

"The Puerto Rican people in Hawaii are loyal Americans and will continue to be so."

The statement was signed by the following:

Antone C. Martin, president, Puerto Rican Independent Association of Hawaii, Inc.

Augustine Montiho, president of Puerto Rican Civic Association of Hawaii, Inc.

Manuel C. Elisary, president, Puerto Rican Athletic Association of Hawaii.

Manuel F. Vegas, president, Puerto Rican Musicians Association of Hawaii, Inc.

The editorial follows:

THEY'RE LOYAL, COOPERATIVE, PROGRESSIVE

Timely action has been taken by the Puerto Ricans of Hawaii to declare their complete loyalty to the United States.

Four chief Puerto Rican organizations have joined in a declaration of this loyalty and of abhorrence for the recent uprising in Puerto Rico and particularly for the attempt to assassinate the President.

These groups are the Puerto Rican Independent Association of Hawaii, Inc.; Puerto Rican Civic Association of Hawaii, Inc.; Puerto Rican Athletic Association of Hawaii; Puerto Rican Musicians Association of Hawaii, Inc.

Jointly these organizations represent virtually all of the immigrant Puerto Ricans and the Americans of Puerto Rican ancestry, a group of some 10,000.

This message deserves and will get special attention in Washington, D. C.

Delegate FARRINGTON will carry with him to Washington this week end the news that the Puerto Ricans of Hawaii have no sympathy for the recent uprising in Puerto Rico, and completely repudiate any connection with any plot or intrigue aimed at the internal security of Puerto Rico or of the United States.

Members of the Puerto Rican community are justifiably proud of the fact that, when the Subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee conducted its public hearings here last spring, not one person of Puerto Rican ancestry was brought before that committee as a suspect.

The lively appreciation of and active pride in their status as residents and citizens of the United States is one of the outstanding characteristics of the Puerto Ricans in Hawaii.

Economically, culturally, and socially, the Puerto Ricans have made and are making rapid and steady progress. Through the schools, the playfields, the churches, and the libraries and other institutions, the Puerto Ricans of Hawaii are merging into the general body of progressive, cooperative, energetic, and useful citizenry.

Their instant revulsion against the Communist-inspired uprising in Puerto Rico, and the fanatical (and probably also Communist-inspired) attempt to kill the President, is not only commendable in itself—it is fine reassurance that the Puerto Ricans in Hawaii are proving their value as loyal citizens of the United States and happy in that loyalty.

South in Control of Next Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the following editorial from the Southwest Citizen of Lake Charles, La.:

SOUTH IN CONTROL OF NEXT CONGRESS

If Mr. Truman expects to get any more of his Fair Deal programs enacted into law, his last chance for at least 2 years will begin tomorrow, when the "lame duck" Congress meets.

In January he'll have to deal with a new Congress over which his supporters will have only nominal control. And in the driver's seat will be the southern Democrats who will hold the balance of power.

However, there lies here a responsibility to the Nation as a whole that must be shouldered seriously. For with its veto power, the South will in effect be legislating for the whole country. The record of next January's Eighty-second Congress will be a severe test of our fair-mindedness, our political honesty, our statesmanship. There is a chance here to show the Nation in this atomic age what kind of government it would have if the capital were in Richmond instead of Washington.

Western Civilization Has Conquered Its Fear of Communism but the Struggle May Only Have Begun—Remarks of Secretary of Defense Marshall to the Defense Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—Requirement for Collective Forces as a Practical Means of Mutual Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of Congress, there was held in Washington a conference of international importance. Representatives of 12 independent and democratic nations, signatories to the North Atlantic Treaty, met to consider what forces should be included in the supernational army that will be required if the defense of the North Atlantic nations is to be implemented. They discussed both the contribution of forces to be made now and long-range requirements, and they reached an agreement that is important to the future of democracy and the survival of our western civilization.

The meeting of the Defense Committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was opened by the Honorable George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense. No man alive today could so well have filled the role of host, keynoter, and leader as Secretary Marshall. One time Chief of Staff of our Army, one time Secretary of State, and now Secretary of Defense, General Marshall has already assumed in the history of our Nation a role comparable to that of General Washington. His name, through his suggestion of the European Recovery Program, has become, like the name of Washington, a token of hope and promise to all lovers of democracy and peace.

In remarks distinguished by their clarity and their directness Secretary Marshall set the tone of the meeting, and presented the foreign defense ministers with a challenge they could not ignore. "I hope," he said, "that the year that has passed will go down into history as the one in which western civilization conquered its fear of communism." Neither economic recovery in Europe nor military victory in Korea is so important as this conquest of fear everywhere. Just as the airlift supply of Berlin inflicted a humiliating defeat on Russia in 1949 so the successful action of democratic armies, acting under United Nations Security Council mandate against aggression in Korea, inflicted a shameful defeat on the very principle of communism in 1950. Concerted action against the North Koreans was an assertion of our determination to remain united against every act of aggression that threatens democracy and peace.

In our own country, the vigorous and successful direction of our contribution to the joint effort gave the lie to all the absurd and prejudiced charges of Communist sympathy on the part of our Government, and specifically of the State Department. Such charges, diverting our attention from the main task of combating communism where communism has greatest chance of success, had threatened to reduce our zeal in pursuing the objectives of the European recovery program, of the United Nations, and of the North Atlantic Treaty organization. But that danger, too, is passed. We have been awakened to the danger that is real, and put away the childish tendency to suppose every bush a bear.

We know now what the danger is, and we have confidence with which to face it. That confidence, however, must not be dissipated. Secretary Marshall warned:

> We must complete a plan that will make it perfectly clear to all the peoples we represent, and also to any who plot against us, that we are organizing, training, and equipping forces that can successfully resist aggression in any form.

The blueprint for mutual defense considered at the Washington meeting will be implemented by recommendations that will make the signatory nations stronger to meet present and immediate threats. Such recommendations should also produce action more quickly than it has done in the past. Those recommendations, of course, will be deliberated by the legislative bodies to which, under democratic process, the delegates to the Washington meeting will report them. But parliaments of other nations will certainly be impressed, in their deliberations, by the actions our own country and our Congress have already initiated. As Secretary Marshall outlined them:

> We are increasing our own defense budget. We are adding to our armed forces. We are producing weapons and distributing them in constantly increasing quantities to the armed forces of (other North Atlantic Pact) countries.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, now nearing the end of its existence, can take great pride in the fact that it has made so great a contribution to the common defense of the free nations that border the North Atlantic Ocean. As the eyes of the world, in Secretary Marshall's phrase, focused upon the Washington meeting, they must have observed what we have done, and what we are doing, and appreciated what, under the inspiration of our leadership, other free nations are now determined to do.

Plans have been made that can quickly and effectively be translated into military strength, and that strength, overcoming the last vestiges of fear, will effectively meet, and repel, the Communist challenge and the threat to peace.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of Secretary Marshall's words that were at the same time an expression of courage and of faith, and a challenge to the foreign delegates to support us in our defense of democracy.

The address by Secretary Marshall is as follows:

On behalf of the United States Government, I extend to the members of this Defense Committee of our North Atlantic community of nations a warm welcome. A year has passed since the first meeting of the Defense Ministers here in Washington. It has been a year of significant progress toward security and peace, to the attainment of which the nations we represent have pledged their political, economic, and human resources.

I hope that the year that has passed will go down into history as the one in which western civilization conquered its fear of communism. Economic recovery and increased military strength have given us greater courage to resist the Communist challenge. Victory in Korea is impressive evidence that the determined efforts of United Nations will have the backing of powerful military, naval, and air forces to defend the peace of the world.

The added confidence we now have gained must not be dissipated. We must not sink into an attitude of complacency or overconfidence, for the struggle may only have begun. That is why this meeting of ours at this time is so important. This is the time that we must complete a plan that will make it perfectly clear to all the peoples we represent, and also to any who plot against us, that we are organizing, training, and equipping forces that can successfully resist aggression in any form. We must adopt mutual defense plans that will exploit the full military potential that we possess among all of our 12 nations. We must develop plans in such a way that they not only are consistent with our principles and our traditions but are realistic in the appreciation of the present critical situation. We must face facts without prejudice. We must now work together as a team and back our promises with positive actions.

For my own country, I can say that we are wholeheartedly supporting a program for our mutual defense. We are increasing our own defense budget. We are adding to our Armed Forces. We are producing weapons and distributing them in constantly increasing quantities to the armed forces of your countries. But this treaty of ours is mutual in character. Each of us must contribute to the common defense in accordance with our respective capabilities.

What has been done so far, good as it may be, is far from enough. The potential collective force of the United Nations was not enough to deter the aggressors in Korea. The actual collective forces of the North Atlantic States may not be enough to deter aggression in our North Atlantic area and definitely is not enough to resist attack without serious and critical initial losses. That gap in military strength we must now close as quickly as possible. Out of this meeting should come definite recommendations that not only will make us stronger to meet the present threats but to do so more quickly than past procedure would indicate.

The processes of our governments among all of us are democratic, we must have time for deliberation and discussion of our national policies. We have had a year now in which to make our position clear to each other and to our respective peoples. We have passed through the creative phase of establishing the North Atlantic community. All of our peoples appear fully determined to accept the principle of mutual defense and to work together for its success. Now today they are entitled to a bill of particulars from us.

In the next few weeks I will be called upon as Secretary of Defense of the United States to appear before our American Congress to defend the expenditures of vast sums of money for our mutual aid and to ask for a continuation of many of the constructive steps we already have undertaken. I imagine every one of you under our respective democratic processes faces a similar challenge. We must convince our legislative bodies and the millions they represent that we have actually developed practical means of mutual defense and that each of us is contributing fairly and fully to the common cause. We will have to prove that our plan can be put in successful operation and that it merits the wholehearted support by our peoples and our governments.

The eyes of the whole world I imagine are focused upon this meeting today. Our citizens are eager to ascertain what forces are to be raised, how, and when, and what every nation under the North Atlantic Pact will contribute. They are clearly entitled to such information. Therefore, let us make an effort to give it to them clearly and unmistakably; and then let us go about the business of translating our plans into military strength quickly and effectively. That appears to me to be the primary mission of this conference.

Fourscore and Seven Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times magazine section for November 19, 1950:

FOURSCORE AND SEVEN YEARS AGO—THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS, WHICH LOOKED BACK TO 1776, FORESHADOWED THE STRUGGLE WHICH CONTINUES IN 1950

(By R. L. Duffus)

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Today it is exactly fourscore and seven years since Abraham Lincoln made "a few appropriate remarks" at the dedication of a cemetery for the Union dead who had fallen in the Battle of Gettysburg. The man who was expected to be the principal speaker was Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, a justly renowned orator. President Lincoln had received and accepted a form invitation precisely like those sent to scores of other dignitaries. It was not until November 2, after his acceptance, that he was asked to speak—as, indeed, the President of the United States had to be asked if he were present at all.

Lincoln had read Everett's address, which was prepared and sent to him—and to all important newspapers—well in advance. Mr. Lincoln had no desire to compete with that imposing, scholarly, and eloquent document. He had to be brief and it was his instinct to be simple. He knew his words would be read by those whose sons or lovers or brothers had died at Gettysburg and on other battlefields and he must have hoped they would be read by the many thousands in the North who had begun to doubt if these sacrifices, this pain, this grief, were not too great a price to pay.

Mr. Lincoln turned back to the birth of the Republic, much as we today turn back to the Gettysburg Address. He took a noble five-word phrase from the Declaration. Are men equal in intelligence or in goodness? He did not say they were. They are equal in their rights. They have an equal claim to liberty.

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

We now know that the Confederacy was doomed by those July days of 1863 which saw Pickett's charge repulsed at Gettysburg and the Stars and Stripes flying again over Vicksburg. But Lincoln could not be sure. The Confederate General Bragg had come within an ace of crushing Rosecrans at Chickamauga in September. There were 16,000 Union dead, wounded, and missing in that battle. In the spring of 1864 Grant was to lose 55,000 men in his advance from the Rapidan to the James.

When Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg, the war could still have been lost by military disaster, by political defeat, by compromise. Lincoln had to find words to stir the faltering spirit of the North. He had to find words to stir the peoples of Britain and France, so that their Governments would not dare take action against the Union.

Perhaps a Nation so conceived and so dedicated could not long endure. That thought would come to him in the sleepless hours of the night.

"We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who gave their lives that that Nation might live."

The Gettysburg battlefield in November 1863, was no well-tended park, where visitors might spend a few mildly melancholy hours. It was a place of thinly hidden horror. The armies had moved away without burying their dead. The civilian authorities had done what they could. Some of the original graves were too shallow. The vultures circled on slow and heavy wings. The Peach Orchard, the Big and Little Round Tops' Culp's Hill—the squeamish who did not wish to be too realistically reminded of what it costs to be and remain free had better not visit those places.

"It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract."

The Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States was humble when he considered the private soldier in the ranks. More than that, it was his purpose to make a symbol of that soldier—a man who may have been drafted or who may have enlisted for the $300 blood money by which another man had bought exemption from the draft.

The drafted men, the $300 volunteers, were not of the quality of those who had joined in the rising of the North after Sumter fell. But Mr. Lincoln seemed to be saying that all those who stood their ground in the face of the enemy belonged to a democracy of honor. The wilderness battles, the final fighting around Richmond, were to testify to that faith. In time of great stress, in such encounters as the Battle above the Clouds, men's souls were purified,

Death was the final great companionship of the free. The living could not enter there. They could only be reverent in its presence.

Other fields, ahead in the black shadows, had still to be consecrated. Again the cannon would thunder, again the rifle fire break out in the woods, the color sergeant would fall and another take up the flag, the wounded might think no freedom worth their agony, there would be weeping in many a home. Lincoln was perhaps weary of words. In the presence of this multitude of the living, he was closer to the unspeaking dead.

"The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here."

Lincoln believed this. He told Ward Lamon, "That speech won't scour * * * The people are disappointed." But there was immediate praise, some of it in the press, as well as the usual sneers and jeers. Everett wrote Lincoln he wished he could flatter himself he had come "as near the central idea of the occasion in 2 hours as you did in 2 minutes."

More than one reporter took down the words, for neither Lincoln nor his secretaries had thought it worth while to have spare copies for the newspapers. The man from the New York Times did this. Writing, probably in long hand, he spoiled some of the best phrases but the full speech, as he got it, was published in this paper on November 20. Everett's followed it.

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced."

There was plenty of unfinished work. Defeatism, pacifism, even treason were vociferous in such Northern States as New York, Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio. Nearly a year was to pass and still Lincoln wouldn't know before election day 1864, how he stood with his fellow citizens and with destiny; he wasn't sure of victory of any kind.

He went on in the voice that many long remembered, high pitched, not the big boom that you might have expected from so tall a man. There are no more beautiful cadences in the whole of English prose.

"It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Sandburg tells us how he went back to a big lunch and reception at the Wills home, attended patriotic services in the Presbyterian Church, and rode home to Washington lying down in the drawing room of his car with a wet towel laid across his eyes and forehead. There is no sense of triumph in these details. He was, and his photographs show it, weary to the depths of his soul.

But he had said the words and they were immortal. They were armies with banners. They were artillery. They fought for the North in every subsequent battle. The new birth of freedom came, though not as he desired it, not with the magnanimity, the pity for the defeated enemies who were to be enemies no more, that if he had lived he would surely have striven for.

Now the Gettysburg address is fourscore and seven years behind us and the voice of Lincoln has been silent for five and eighty years. He stood at Gettysburg at the halfway point of the Republic's progress from the Declaration to the dedication of our own and other nations to stand against aggression in Korea.

The cause for which the men who fell at Gettysburg gave the last full measure of devotion has not been lost, nor has it won its final victory. Liberty is still threatened, it is still not certain that nations dedicated to it can long survive; there is ground far away in a strange land newly hallowed by the brave men, living and dead, who struggled there; anxious humanity still yearns for a new birth of freedom; government of the people, by the people, for the people is not a gift from heaven but must be defended anew from generation to generation.

But the voice of Lincoln, in these few remarks, speaks to the whole world. This is what we like to think democracy means, what freedom means. Time and new inventions and the sweep of history, war, and sorrow and despair, hopes broken on the wheel of dark events, the challenge of a new slavery and a new conspiracy against mankind—these have changed no basic principle.

Fourscore and seven years from now the battle may not even yet be finally won. But the cause will live and the words of Abraham Lincoln will be still remembered.

Air Power Is Truly Peace Power—"Air Power Is Everything Within Our Nation That Has To Do With the Air; It Includes Our Aviation Production Line, Air Education, Commercial Transport, Private Flying, Maintenance Facilities, and Research Laboratories as Well as All Branches of the Military Establishment for Air" (From American Legion National Convention Resolution on Aeronautics)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, there is no group of citizens upon which the Congress places greater reliance, nor whose studied findings merit greater consideration by the Congress of these United States, than do those of our veteran organizations. I need not point out to you, sir, that when the American veteran speaks, the Congress of the United States lends an attentive ear.

Mr. Speaker, that is as it should be, for the American veteran merits that confidence. No nation in this world can point to any citizen group that is more loyal, disinterested, and altogether concerned with the patriotic, ethical, cultural, or moral well-being of their country than the group of veterans that comprise the American Legion; and it is not, therefore, any happenstance that, when the Legion speaks—it speaks with a mighty voice. True to its constitution, however, it does so only on matters that have to do with the peace, well-being, and the security of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I remember one of America's top flight military leaders, a man who had spent his entire life in the United States Army, saying on one occasion. "Frank, within the rank and file of the American Legion will be found some of the most brilliant-minded military strategists in the whole world, and, while their conventions might present a sort of carnival appearance, the fact remains that anyone in attendance upon their committees will rapidly see that here are men—all of them experts in the matters whereof they speak."

Mr. Speaker, my son, James Robert—"Bob"—last week handed me a copy of the resolutions adopted by the 1950 American Legion Convention recently held at Los Angeles. In doing so, he remarked, "Dad, these resolutions are in accord with the very things you have been saying for the last 2 years. I remember that in several of your speeches you said that the men who work in the aviation production lines were just as much a part of the air power of the United States as were the men who flew the B–29's or the B–36's," and now comes the American Legion resolutions, stating that "air power is everything within the Nation that has to do with the air"; that "it includes air education, commercial transport, private flying, maintenance facilities, research laboratories, and the Military Establishment for Air."

It is well for the country that such activities as the Legion carries on are part and parcel of their group activities because out of their fact findings comes to us here in these United States some of the most fundamental military concepts.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is now and has for several years been on the fringe of all-out global warfare. More than ever I am convinced that the only thing which has contained the Russians to date and prevented them from outright and direct attack has been our possession of a stockpile of atom bombs and our unquestioned ability to deliver them by air—with precision and with dispatch.

It is because of these things that I am so concerned every time I hear some word spoken that would tend to disrupt the splendid work that has been done by the United States Air Force and the Navy air arm, not alone in the skirmish that has engaged us at such a terrific cost of life in Korea, but in achieving supremacy in the air.

Inasmuch as I have heard rumors that attempt might be made to again, if not amend the National Security Act with respect to the Air Force, to congressionally establish some new form of organization, I was happy to learn that the Legion, in anticipation of that move, recommended "that the present structure of the Air Force be maintained without change."

It was only after years of study and debate covering the last quarter of a century—subsequent to the adoption of the Reorganization Act and the consolidation of the Armed Services Committee, that the Congress, in its wisdom, finally adopted what we now have come to know as the National Security Act. It was under this act that the Department of the Air Force was established as a separate unit.

Just a few short months ago and upon the suggestion of Louis Johnson, the act

was amended. At that time, the operation of the act as a whole was made a subject of extended study. Inasmuch as the Congress did not at that time see fit to change the present organization of the Air Force, it should certainly not now and within a few months, by ill-conceived legislation, force that great branch of our armed services into an altogether new type of structure and responsibilities. Prudence dictates that no changes be effected until such time has elapsed as might enable us to learn exactly what it is that should be done in order to obtain the maximum air defense at a minimum of cost to the American taxpayers.

I am of one mind with the resolution of the Legion—there should be no organic change made with respect to the Air Force until we have had time to study the development of that new branch of our armed services as it has been laid down, and certainly there should be no more organizational legislation than was provided in the National Security Act of 1947, and amended as recently as a year ago.

It is because of these facts that I was pleased to see the following paragraph among the resolutions adopted by the aeronautics committee of the Legion, and indorsed by its national convention:

The current appropriations for the Air Force and naval aviation are for immediate needs. There is yet to be established, by legislation, a succession of 5-year programs, reviewable yearly, for research, development, and procurement of aircraft for the Air Force and the naval air arm for the purpose of maintaining a rapidly expandable production industry, and we renew our recommendation made in 1949 that such a program be established by the Congress at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not undertake, in the time which I have allotted to myself, to discuss at great length the time it takes to build an airplane from the drafting board to the time that it is rolling off a production line. I have heard it variously estimated as requiring from 5 to 7 years, and heaven knows that time is running out on us. All of these facts are well understood by the American Legion, and it is because of that understanding that that organization steadfastly adheres to its recommendations for a consistent long-term program of aircraft procurement sufficient in size to provide an economical and stable aircraft aviation industry, efficiently operated to the end that the United States Air Force, as well as the Navy air arm, will be equipped at the earliest possible moment with modern combat planes of the latest design and type.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally disposed to feel there still exists a great deal of misunderstanding with respect to the size of our current defense effort expressed by the 70-group air force and its supporting units, as recommended not alone by the President's Aviation Policy Commission, but by our own Joint Congressional Air Policy Board and as legislated and authorized by the Congress in the Army and Air Force Authorization Act of 1949.

It is to be remembered at all times that even now our Air Force is not being built to a size that will put America on a wartime footing. What we in Congress have done to date looks merely to building a peacetime air power program which would provide an adequate base for expansion in the event of war. That is what the Congressional Aviation Board recommended, and that is what the Presidential Air Policy Commission reported to this Congress should be done some 4 years ago.

What we have recently authorized and made appropriations to build, as of this hour, is an Air Force sufficient merely to—

A. Withstand an initial blow intended to cripple these United States.

B. Form the basis for a strong territorial defense.

C. Provide effective retaliation but not a sustained defensive action.

To my manner of thought and in this hour of peril, that is not enough.

What America must accomplish with all dispatch is to both achieve and maintain unquestioned supremacy in the air.

Mr. Speaker, knowing that air power is truly peace power, under unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks, I include the aeronautic resolution passed by the American Legion at its Thirty-second National Convention held in Los Angeles, together with the statement of policy agreed upon by their aeronautic committee, and which was adopted.

The resolution reads as follows:

We reaffirm our declaration of policy contained in a 1949 report of this committee and in the bulletin of the American Legion entitled "The Fifties—Decade of Air Decision," as follows:

Air power is everything within the nation that has to do with air. It includes air education, commercial transport, private flying, maintenance facilites, research laboratories, and the military establishment for air. No nation that merely has airplanes in the hands of its professionals can be said truly to possess air power. A nation must also understand air power and its significance.

The job of the American Legion is to develop that statesmanship of the air within our own ranks. We must recognize that without a healthy aircraft manufacturing industry, a financially stable air transportation industry, and a genuine research program, military aviation cannot be supported.

The current appropriations for the Air Force and naval aviation are for immediate needs. There is yet to be established, by legislation, a succession of 5-year programs, reviewable yearly, for research, development, and procurement of aircraft for the Air Force and the naval air arm for the purpose of maintaining a rapidly expandable production industry, and we renew our recommendation made in 1949 that such a program be established by the Congress at the earliest practicable date.

We note with approval that the Congress has enacted legislation to develop prototype cargo and transport aircraft, primarily for commercial use, but suitable for military use in the event of emergency, to be administered by the Secretary of Commerce in conjunction with the Air Force, in line with our recommendation of 1949.

In the interest of both civil and military aviation, we recommend that the Civil Aeronautics Administration and other appropriate agencies of the Government be given adequate funds to continue and complete research and development in the field of all-weather flying devices.

We recognize that in the interest of military effectiveness, the Air Force must maintain complete control, jurisdiction, and command of all its present components and to that end we recommend that the present structure of the Air Force be maintained without change.

We have heretofore recommended that the Air Force and the Naval Air Arm be expanded in accordance with the principal recommendations of the President's Air Policy Commission and the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board, and we record with satisfaction that considerable progress has been made toward the attainment of those objectives. We recommend that the goals set by those boards be further revised and the program be adjusted to meet the present and reasonably foreseeable world conditions.

We renew our recommendation that the appropriate agencies of the Government explore fully and establish an adequate program for military, naval, and commercial airships under our flag.

We recommend to the national membership committee of the American Legion that it establish effective liaison with the Air Force in order to aid the Air Force in its recruitment program.

(The above statement of policy was agreed upon by your aeronautics committee and was adopted.)

Resolution No. 54 was consolidated with resolution No. 694, which was approved and reads as follows:

"Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled in Los Angeles, Calif., October 9–12, 1950, recommend that a United States Air Academy be established."

(Resolution No. 439, referred to the standing committee.)

(Resolution No. 180, rejected.)

The Negro, Misled in "Rights" Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the following article from the Daily World of Opelousas, La.:

OTHERS SAY

The following is reprinted from the October 22 issue of the Telegram, a weekly newspaper published in Washington, D. C., by Davis Lee, a Negro. Time magazine recently, in an article about Lee, gave the newspaper's circulation at 110,000. A previous article by Lee was widely reprinted in newspapers, including this one.

"THE NEGRO, MISLED IN 'RIGHTS' FIGHT

"(By Davis Lee, publisher)

"The more I travel, listen, and observe, the more convinced I become that the Negro has been grossly misled in this matter of integration and civil rights.

"It appears to me that the first things should come first, and that our economic well-being is of greater significance than the privilege or right to attend a white school or to associate with white people on an equal basis provided by Supreme Court decisions and pressure legislation.

"As a Negro, and an American, I naturally want to see my race enjoy every right, privilege, and opportunity enjoyed by any other American, but I am opposed to any type of

agitation designed to deprive the other fellow of a right to be associated with his own kind exclusively, if he so desires. I would like to reserve such a right for myself and definitely would not like it encroached upon by a Supreme Court edict or any other kind of interference.

"The right granted to one or two Negroes in Virginia or some other Southern State to enter a State graduate school is of no benefit to the millions of our people who are in need of the bare necessities of life, and when the fortunately situated members of the race conduct campaigns of agitation for selfish gain the needy masses suffer."

NOR WHITES EITHER

"While the South does not provide ample or adequate modern school facilities for Negroes everywhere, neither does it provide completely modern facilities for white schools, because the money is not available for such a vast undertaking. However, rapid progress has been made, and in Montgomery, Ala., and several other communities the Negro schools far exceed the white schools in modernization and physical appearance. Neither do the majority of southern Negroes nor the majority of the whites approve of the present program to disrupt a custom which has served both races well down through the years and contributed so much to the Negro's economic security.

"Just what would be the future educational status of the Negro in the South if the legislatures of all of the Southern States would enact legislation withdrawing State financial support from all schools of higher learning, starting at the high-school level? Not only is this possible but if it should come to pass, the Negro would be unable to finance his own educational program. Negro-financed educational programs have been a failure in the past and nothing miraculous has happened which would cause a normal person to assume that the future holds any better prospect.

"Years ago southern Negro educators made annual pilgrimages to the North to raise funds for the support of their schools and this practice continued until northern philanthropists found out that the Negro educators were the beneficiaries instead of the schools. The AME Church, the Baptists, the Presbyterians, and some other minor denominations have been active in the field of Negro education, but their achievements have been nothing to write home about. Not only that, but every year charges have flown thick and fast anent the misappropriations of school funds. The operation of Negro schools has not only produced some of the Nation's juiciest scandals but is a damaging reflection of the Negro's integrity and his ability to operate and finance an educational program."

WHITE DOLLARS

"No race or nationality in this Nation has excelled or equaled the Negro in educational attainment and achievement, but this educational opportunity was not only created by white dollars but has been financed by white people throughout the Nation. It is an unfortunate fact, that Negroes contribute very little to their own community well-being and improvement and this fact should be taken into account by these agitators before they initiate their program for demands in the field of education.

"Instead of spending thousands of dollars to finance unnecessary court fights for privileges which will cost the race millions in lost valuable friendships and racial good will, our leaders should go into the Negro ghettoes and force the local grocer to carry prime meats and sell to our people grade A products which will make us healthy.

"I lived in Newark, N. J., one of the supposedly liberal cities, and it is impossible to find prime beef or grade A cuts of any kind of meat in the Negro sections of the city. This situation is true throughout the United States. Grocers in Negro communities carry the most inferior brands.

"Go into any Negro community and the meat market windows are filled with cheap, inferior smoked and salt meats. Some of it was put through some curing process after it had gone bad.

"It is no wonder that the death rate is so high among Negroes. When one considers the food situation plus inadequate housing, it is a wonder that the death rate is not higher.

"It appears to me that our leaders should direct their efforts toward correcting these abuses which are undermining our very existence. And these abuses are not practiced against us by white people alone; our own people are just as bad.

"Negro restaurants buy the cheapest food, and charge the highest price. Last week on a tour of five States I was not able to get a decent cup of coffee. Some of the coffee sold to me looked like mud and tasted worse.

"It is very apparent to me that the Negro leaders of this Nation have a distorted sense of real values. They appear to be more interested in breaking down racial barriers and conducting their campaigns of agitation, in spreading hate, than in spending their energies and money toward the attainment of a better way of life."

IMPRESSED BY SOUTH

"I was in Atlanta last week and was greatly impressed by the large number of outstanding and progressive Negro businesses. Atlanta is strictly a segregated city. I was in several New England cities this week where there is not supposed to be any segregation, and I found not one creditable Negro business.

"The only owned and operated Negro radio station is not in New York, but in Atlanta. Segregation has not only given the Negro in the South an opportunity to carve his industrial and economic destiny, but it has forced him to the fore as the most substantial and economically secure Negro in the world.

"The Negro in New York, Newark, and other supposedly liberal centers may enjoy the privilege to eat where he pleases or go to any theater or public place of amusement, but a Negro can't get a license to operate a liquor package store, and there are any number of fields that he can't enter business in other eastern and northern cities. But this is not true in the South; a Negro can enter any kind of business he wishes and southern whites will even lend the money. Some of the largest contractors in the South are Negroes.

"Northern Negro dollars spent to force southern white universities to admit Negroes will certainly not contribute anything toward continued good race relations in the South, and race relations were definitely on the improve until all of these school suits started.

"I find more race prejudice in the East than I have found in Georgia or Mississippi. Two weeks ago 10 tourist camps refused to rent me a cabin just outside of Pittsburgh, and Pennsylvania is one of the first States to enact a civil-rights law.

"If the NAACP is really interested in correcting a real evil in the school situation, then it should direct its efforts toward the schools in Harrisburg, the capital of Pennsylvania, which is a little closer than the nearest southern school target.

"The American race situation has not only taken on added alarming proportions but has developed into a serious problem which could explode and create a national crisis. Instead of trying to find peace in Korea and in other foreign lands, our leaders, both white and colored, should try to find a panacea for these racial ills and establish peace at home before advocating it abroad. We are not in a position to teach the other fellow how to establish unity in his bailiwick when we don't have it in our own."

Woodrow Wilson and His Clients

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial by Norman Cousins entitled "Woodrow Wilson and His Clients," which appeared in the September 23 issue of the Saturday Review of Literature.

The recollection of Wilson's part in the continuing crusade for a world of law and order is appropriate, I think, as free men face what would seem to be their last grim chance to achieve that ideal.

The editorial follows:

WOODROW WILSON AND HIS CLIENTS

Monday, September 25, is the thirty-first anniversary of one of the saddest and most costly days in American history. It was on that day that Woodrow Wilson made his last public speech. He was fighting to win over the American people to the cause of the League of Nations, for he was convinced that the war just ended would become merely the opening episode of a continuing tragedy if the nations failed to establish world law. And the biggest test was right here in America. Public opinion was slow in seeing the connection between world peace and world law. Traditionally, too, the American people had been accustomed to waiting for a problem to come to a boil before doing anything about it. Wilson's case rested on the need to anticipate crisis as the best means of crushing it.

Imagine the unutterable anguish of the man who had managed to convince millions of people all over the world of this, only to return home to find that leaders of the opposing political party had been capitalizing on the desire of Americans to forget about the war, forget about Europe, forget about involvements. And the campaign against the League was succeeding. Hence Wilson's decision to carry the fight for peace to the people. It was to be a tour that would attempt to crack open the isolationist heartland. The compressed schedule called for about 100 speeches before audiences in almost every State stretching from Ohio to the west coast—all in a few short weeks.

The best account of that trip—Wilson's last public trip—is to be found in a compelling and evocative book, Woodrow Wilson as I Know Him, by Joseph P. Tumulty, his confidant and friend who served as private secretary for 11 years. The book appeared in 1921 and is now out of print, but it is hoped that the publishers can be persuaded to bring out a new edition, for what it has to say is even more timely today than it was a generation ago.

Tumulty wrote that the small group around Wilson resisted the idea of the trip as soon as it became known. The President had returned from Europe showing the effects of his exertions. He was suffering from violent headaches and was easily fatigued. When an attempt was made to postpone the trip, Wilson would have none of it. He told Tumulty that he knew he was "at the end of my tether," but insisted that a desperate effort had to be made to win over the American people in time.

"If the treaty should be defeated," he said, "God only knows what would happen to the world as a result of it. In the presence of the great tragedy which now faces

people everywhere, no decent man can count his own personal fortunes in the reckoning."

Tumulty suggested a compromise. Set aside 1 week in the tour for a rest at a quiet place in the Grand Canyon. Even this the President rejected. "This is a business trip, pure and simple," he insisted, "and the itinerary must not include a vacation of any kind."

The trip got under way. As it progressed, Wilson seemed somehow to find a magical second wind that enabled him to speak three, four, or even five times a day, seven days a week. Tumulty and the President's staff marveled at his ability to mask his fatigue while talking. Never had they heard him more eloquent or more convincing. Many of the talks were extemporaneous but they all reflected Wilson's great talent for clarity and precision of thought and expression.

And Wilson's message was getting across. It was hard work but you could see the people responding to the call for sanity and the need to put decency to work in dealings among nations. There were hopes in the President's party that the encouraging early reactions would reach a crescendo by the time the tour ended. When the President spoke at Pueblo on September 25 he was more impassioned and effective than ever. It was a longer talk than usual, and it almost seemed that Wilson realized it might be his last. As he spoke the audience was deeply moved by what he said but they were also moved by his frail appearance. It was easy to see that something was wrong; his face clearly showed the effects of the constant strain not only of the trip but of his labors overseas for the League.

He began his Pueblo talk by saying that he had come to speak in behalf of his clients. Those clients, he said, were the next generation. He wanted to be sure that the measures would be taken here and now that would make it unnecessary for that next generation to be sent on another war errand. He spoke of the hundreds of American mothers who came up to grasp his hand during his trip—mothers whose sons had been killed in France. They had said, many of them, "God bless you, Mr. President."

"Why, my fellow citizens," he asked, "should they pray God to bless me? I advised the Congress of the United States to create the situation that led to the death of their sons. I ordered their sons overseas. I consented to their sons being put in the most difficult parts of the battle line, where death was certain, as in the impenetrable difficulties of the Argonne forest. Why should they weep upon my hand and call down the blessings of God upon me? They do so because they believe that their boys died for something that vastly transcends any of the immediate and palpable objects of the war. They believe that wrapped up with the liberty of the world is the continuous protection of that liberty by the concerted powers of all the civilized world.

"These men were crusaders. They were going forth to prove the might of justice and right, and all the world accepted them as crusaders. Their achievement has made all the world believe in America as it believes in no other nation in the modern world."

The President spoke of his visit to a hillside near Paris, at the cemetery of Suresnes, where American soldiers were buried. He then referred to the many men in Congress and public life who were now opposing the creation of a world society which, if all nations joined in giving it real authority, might be able to crush the causes of war, and he said he hoped these men might have been with him to see those graves.

"I wish," he said, "that they could feel the moral obligation that rests upon us not to go back on those boys, but to see the thing through, to see it through to the end, and make good the redemption of the world. For nothing less depends upon this decision, nothing less than the liberation and salvation of the world.

"Now that the mists of this great question have cleared away, I believe that men will see the trust eye to eye and face to face. There is one thing that the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and that is the truth of justice and of liberty and of peace. We have accepted that truth and we are going to be led by it, and it is going to lead us, and through us the world, out into pastures of quietness and peace such as the world never dreamed of before."

As the President spoke, Tumulty looked around and could see the impact of his words. Hard-boiled newspapermen who had sat dry-eyed through the previous speeches were now visibly moved. He looked at Mrs. Wilson and saw tears in her eyes. The thousands of people in the large amphitheater were responding to moral leadership.

But the tour was never completed. Late that night, the night of the Pueblo speech, Dr. Grayson, the President's physician, summoned Tumulty. The President was seriously ill. His left side was paralyzed. One side of his face was limp and expressionless. His left arm and left leg failed to respond to stimulus. The searing headaches that were an old story throughout the tour now held the President's mind in a steel-like grip.

The western trip was over. Woodrow Wilson had fought and lost.

For at least 15 years Americans gave little thought to this defeat. All during the twenties and into the thirties it was fashionable to view Wilson kindly but somewhat skeptically. He was a great idealist, we said patronizingly, a great idealist who never realized we lived in a practical world. The word "impractical" became his epitaph.

But during the Second World War and, indeed, in the years immediately preceding the war the realization grew that Wilson was perhaps the most practical man of his time, for he had addressed himself to the basic needs of America and the world both. He spoke of ideals, certainly, for he believed that ideals were our natural assets and, in time of emergency, our finest weapons. Our failure to act on those ideals in time resulted in countless thousands of Woodrow Wilson's "clients" going on another war errand.

And what about Woodrow Wilson's ideals today? There is a United Nations, and the United States has accepted the responsibilities of membership. But is the United States exercising the type of leadership in the United Nations that can yet achieve world law? There are signs that we are, as in Korea. But there are also signs that the United States is still hypnotized by the false slogans of sovereignty, still willing to shelter the fallacy that world law can operate without compulsory obligations and commitments. We are reluctant to talk about the ideal of world citizenship, though it could be the most effective salient there is against Russian ideology. When we talk about ideals we mumble them somewhat incoherently, as though they are uncomfortable on our lips.

When Wilson spoke ideals he was not self-conscious, he did not stammer, he was not apologetic. He was representing the strength of America as he understood it and as history had confirmed it. We do not honor his memory unless we also honor his convictions. At the heart of those convictions was the belief that vision—vision with spaciousness and moral grandeur—is not only the solvent of potential danger but the natural setting for a human community at peace.

Address by Attorney General of the United States at Midcentury Homecoming Convocation of Western Maryland College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 1 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on November 18, 1950, Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, and formerly a distinguished member of the United States Senate, delivered an address before the midcentury homecoming convocation of Western Maryland College, at Westminster, Md., which truly deserves to be brought to the attention of all the people of the country.

The occasion furnished an auspicious setting for the trenchant remarks of the chief legal officer of the United States. Western Maryland College, in its many years of service to the people of Maryland and of the entire area, has made a contribution to the progress of our people and to the advancement of culture and enlightenment which is everywhere apparent in the splendid group of alumni, many of them now occupying prominent positions in the professions, in business and industry, and in public affairs. Hon. F. Murray Benson, chairman of the board of the college, and an outstanding attorney of Maryland, presided.

In his address Attorney General McGrath reviewed the changes in the economic, political, and social fields which have occurred during the half century just coming to a close and rightly singled out dictatorships in general and communism in particular as the most menacing of all the many problems facing the world today.

It was an address that invites the most thorough attention and consideration of all who had the pleasure to hear it or who will be privileged to read it.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Ensor, Senator O'CONOR, distinguished guests, members of the board of trustees, alumni, students, and friends of Western Maryland College, I deem it a great honor to be here with you this morning and participate in your observance of an occasion, unusual and extraordinary—your midcentury and home-coming convocation—even though I am here in a pinch-hitting role. I regret that illness has prevented you from hearing the distinguished Vice President of the United States, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY, who had eagerly looked forward to this visit with you, but who, on his physician's orders, is unable to do so. In all frankness, and with a deep and sincere sense of humility, I can never hope to match his forensic ability, his oratorical flawlessness

and his bottomless source of wit and wisdom. I know you all join me in wishing him a very speedy and complete recovery.

It is fitting and proper that in the midst of a century which, judging by its first half, will be recorded in the annals of mankind as the most momentous in history, we pause at a meeting of this sort to examine and evaluate the events of the past half century, to assess the state of our civilization of today, to take inventory of all our values, and to endeavor to plan for the next 50 years. I am particularly impressed by your characterization of this gathering as a convocation as well as a homecoming. The term "convocation" owes its origin to the ancient assemblies of the clergy of the Church of England and later to all ecclesiastical councils. While a college homecoming is a happy event in the life of an alumnus, in enabling him to return to his alma mater, to revisit the scenes of a happy youth, to renew old acquaintances, to reminisce in joyful experiences, enrich memories, and renew allegiance to a beloved institution, a convocation connotes a serious tone to an assemblage. The state of world affairs necessitates sober reflection at any gathering these days.

As we reflect upon the 50 years which now have fleeted, we know that we have witnessed during those years the most revolutionary changes in economic, political, and social phases of human endeavor. The technological and mechanical progress of the past half century has far surpassed all that has been achieved in this respect throughout the centuries before 1900. Only by a proper comprehension of this phenomenon will we be able to evaluate our present stake in civilization and plan for the world of the future. You are all familiar with the enormous advances made in the sciences, in the arts, in the fields of medicine, transportation, and communication.

These mechanical and technological advancements have resulted in creating a complex and most confusing civilization. The entire universe has become one small neighborhood. But alas, we have not kept pace morally and spiritually. We have not as yet learned to live as close neighbors. We have made little, if any, progress in the vital field of human relationship. That is why our world of today is a welter of confusion and of fear. That is why we are living in a very critical epoch, which sees our democratic way of life in very grave danger of being completely destroyed. These are seething days in the lives of all. The earth has been contracted by the discoveries of man, but his power to control it has correspondingly been contracted.

Communism in its true essence is a real menace and danger to our institutions. There are over 2,000,000,000 people in the world, and over one-third—700,000,000—are enslaved by the self-made masters of a brutal totalitarian regime. Moreover, the reckless and irresponsible threat of atomic power and its secrets have added to our tension and fear of these diabolic enemies of freedom. This hour is a crucial hour in world history. We are living through a period when dangerous and powerful forces seek to test the enduring power of democracy as a form of government.

We have watched with growing alarm the series of events which have brought much of the world under the domination of these ruthless dictatorships. The present world crisis must be viewed in its true light—a threat of the most serious character to the democratic way of life as we know and cherish it.

World events have hurled our beloved country into a position of world leadership. Our responsibility in this respect is no longer confined to one continent. Enslaved humanity everywhere looks upon us as the citadel of all human liberties—their only beacon of hope. We must not and shall not fail. We have throughout our history met many threats and challenges to our liberties, and we must be prepared now to meet the most serious of all.

The danger we are now facing will require greater sacrifices than ever were demanded of us. It is not enough to gird ourselves with weapons of war and defense. It will not suffice to make our country an arsenal of weapons for democracy. It must also become the arsenal of things moral and spiritual, the weapons by which we shall be enabled to chart the tortuous road to world peace and universal brotherhood. We must provide, strengthen, and maintain the institutions which will train and educate the leaders who will be able to disseminate these moral and spiritual forces which alone can serve as catalytic agents in forging and molding our democratic system into an indestructible tower of freedom, good will, and justice.

Our hopes of avoiding disaster are in our ability to mobilize to the utmost our skill in the political and ideological fields, as well as the economic and military. We shall win only if we succeed in inculcating in ourselves the basic principles upon which our Nation was founded and which are responsible for its greatness. We shall be successful in establishing a just and merciful society if we can educate our people to discriminate between the true and the false, the genuine and the spurious. We must, in short, continue to strive for a high standard of education.

We must realize that whatever conflict exists is not primarily one between Russia and the United States, or between east and west, or between communism and capitalism as economic systems, as is so commonly said. It is far deeper than any of these. It is a conflict between two totally different philosophies of government. One believes that man's problems can only be solved from the top down; the other believes that most problems can best be solved from the bottom up. One puts its primary faith in a few supposed supermen—leaders—at the top; the other puts its primary faith in the good sense, resourcefulness, and capabilities of ordinary people, who are masters in their own houses and are able to choose their own representatives in genuinely free elections.

In reality, it is a conflict between two wholly different philosophies of life—two different concepts as to the nature of man; which means two different concepts as to the nature of God, and the nature of the universe in which we live.

To be victorious in this conflict we need a strong and deep faith in the indestructibility of our institutions and a renewed dedication to its principles. What our Nation and the world must have, if they are to be saved, is what Lincoln prayed for at Gettysburg—"Under God, a new birth of freedom"—a new understanding of that priceless privilege.

Moreover, to comprehend and thus be able to solve the complex and difficult problems facing us today, even in our own economic, social, and political world, we need increased knowledge. We must understand these difficulties and we must be equipped to think through their solutions. That is why our institution of learning assumes such importance today. The kind of intellectual training our youth receives today will determine the nature of our course in the life to come. That will resolve whether the world will remain free or slave.

We must have more of our men and women trained to think and lead. We must multiply the number of our men and women in public and private life, who have been disciplined to think for themselves clearly. That is why the American college, and especially the independent private college, plays so cogent a part in our plans for our march to freedom.

Such institutions are best able to instill in our youth the true essence of democracy, namely, that it is a personal way of life and a system of social and political organization; that it is a positive and not a negative philosophy; that it is a way of life that is of real worth and satisfaction; that it represents the sum total of ideals which must find expression in the lives of all human beings; that only through its processes can we achieve enlightened government.

Such institutions are best qualified to supply the trained leadership we need so sorely in this war of survival. The 600 small private colleges are best equipped to produce such qualified leaders. These leaders must be thoroughly educated in their responsibilities, and colleges like western Maryland have done so in the past and will, with your unstinted help and cooperation, continue to do so on a greater scale.

America needs today a generation of pioneers—American youth equipped and trained in such colleges as yours and mine, to explore and develop new frontiers of better human relationships, a more enduring world peace, a happier and safer world order.

It will be the function of our schools and colleges to serve as vehicles for the transmission of the recognized moral values which are basic to the maintenance of our civilization. While educators may differ as to the methods, the common objectives of all institutions of learning must be the reinforcement of ethical standards in the traits of honesty, integrity, and loyalty of our society. But our schools and colleges necessarily must also teach the methods by which a democracy can be maintained.

Since a democracy is based on truth, it is the function of the academic world to lead in the dissemination of truth so that the world will know what the daily world events signify. The sacred flame of freedom which is now in danger of being extinguished will continue to burn only so long as the academic world will steadfastly uphold its position as trustee of all those true values which mankind recognizes as the component elements of a real democracy. All educators and all institutions of learning must join hands in the endeavor to see to it that freedom shall not perish from this earth. There are too many citadels of ignorance on this earth, and like all citadels they cannot be taken by a frontal assault; they can only be taken by long-seige operations. The college tradition is a symbol of unity of civilization because truth is universal.

Daniel C. Gilman, the first president of Johns Hopkins University, summed up his conception of an ideal university—that it should function for "the advancement of learning, the conservation of knowledge, the development of talent, the promotion of spirituality, the cultivation of literature, the elevation of professional standards and the maintenance of repose." Every true university and college should serve those purposes.

I submit that the small private independent college is best equipped to enable a student to fulfill these purposes within its institutional environment. Within the precincts of a small college, it is easier for the average student to acquire those traits which enable him to benefit most from such an institution. Smallness is an advantage in the production of leadership because smallness tends to induce greater individual participation. In fact, individual interests initiating action in all matters that relate

to man's contact with his fellow men generally seem to vary in inverse ratio to the numbers involved. This evident truth is manifest on an examination of the activities and thinking in small towns, small organizations, and small colleges.

The importance of the small private, independent college in our educational process cannot be overemphasized. It is surprising, but nevertheless true, that the larger percentage of the men and women listed in Who's Who attended small, independent colleges, rather than large universities. In a small college members of the faculty, who have such a profound influence on the student body and who in many instances often mold the personality of the student, are better able to maintain contact with their students as individuals and thus are able to discover and develop qualities that would remain hidden if those students were members of a huge student body. In small colleges, it is almost impossible for any student to remain aloof and apart from his fellow student body. There is greater opportunity for him or her to participate in the activities of the college, to make more intimate friendships, and thus derive greater benefit from his college education, curricular and extracurricular. No wonder we who have attended small colleges re-echo the immortal words of Daniel Webster, uttered in the Supreme Court of the United States when, in his closing argument in the Dartmouth College case, he said: "It is, sir, as I have said, a small college, and yet there are those who love it."

I say we, because I, too, was fortunate in obtaining my college education in a small private independent institution, Providence College. I know from my personal experience of the influence and the real nature of the training afforded by such institutions. Like Western Maryland College, my college was also affiliated with one of the great Christian churches, and while not the same denomination as Western Maryland, it basically, as a church-related college, stressed in its curriculum the moral concepts of life.

After all, university and college education in this country traces its origin to religious influences. Harvard University, the first college founded in this country in 1636, was founded for the purpose of training men in the clergy. That is true in the case of many other of the great universities and colleges of this country.

If we are to survive the ordeal of the present and future, our citizens must not only be able to think for themselves, but must blend their thoughts with the exercise of a moral idealism more elevated than any held by past generations. Sheer shrewdness will not be enough; it must be transformed by philosophic and religious insight into genuine moral responsibility. The two distinct capacities of the human mind—informed intelligence and moral seriousness—must blend into one powerful urge toward a national and international amity that will make us brothers the world over.

That function can best be performed by the small private independent denominational college. The denominational college teaches that there is more to education than the acquisition of a mere knowledge of facts and things. Education there cultivates a sense of right and wrong, of virtue and vice. It provides for all its recipients acknowledged principles of conduct, the secure habit of a good life based upon correct teaching and consistent example. It teaches just compliance with divine will. Moral facts are not ignored but are combined and commingled with every phase of human knowledge. It places high and above knowledge of facts, a love for God's moral law, a profound reverence and respect for those age-old sound and solid principles of complete and wholesome living that from time immemorial have been the mainstay of a decent life in every age and generation.

Such a school is Western Maryland College. From all I have heard, read and know about your institution, it has since its founding by the Methodist denomination in 1867 fulfilled the expectations of its founders and has served to provide the elements of a sound college education. It was the first coeducational institution south of the Mason and Dixon's line. It has for many years been a recognized leader in training teachers for the high schools of the great Free State of Maryland. It is also significant that it has had an active ROTC infantry unit since 1919 and thus has contributed its share toward the supply of military officers so necessary to the defense of our country. Indeed, in proportion to its numbers, Western Maryland College had more officers in the last World War than any other institution of learning.

In this connection, it is worth noting that though denominational in character, its doors have been open to all regardless of race, color, or creed. As a matter of fact, as I have been reliably informed, the numbers of non-Methodist students exceed those of Methodist affiliation. As in most other denominational schools I know of, there is not a breath of discrimination or favoritism because of religious affiliation. I myself was privileged to receive my legal education at Boston University, also first founded in 1867, as a Methodist school of theology. Throughout my years of attendance there, I was never made to feel that my church affiliations put me in a different category of treatment. I was an equal of all in every respect.

That is why colleges like Western Maryland should receive the unstinted support of all its alumni and friends. Inflationary costs have made it difficult for small institutions of this type to maintain their high standards. Your program to be launched today for the increase of your endowment to one and one-half million to improve facilities of this great school will, I am sure, receive your enthusiastic support. As a public official and servant, I feel duty-bound to exhort you to give generously to this institution because in my humble opinion the greatest beneficiary of an independent college like yours is the general public.

I salute you and wish you every success in your campaign. As the century rolls round, may this college grow in influence and in satisfaction to the people who support it. As you gather here today, and rededicate yourselves to the noble ideals for which this institution was founded, resolve to make every effort to the end that those ideals can be maintained for many years to come. With the passage of time, you will develop a deep and intense feeling of gratitude to this little college which you will endeavor to repay throughout your entire life. You will discover that the more you try to give yourself to your college, the more you will find yourself in its debt.

In a sense, we are all today pioneers, building a structure and erecting the heart of a new civilization which will lay the foundation for a greater new age. We Americans have the vision, the skill, the courage, and the faith to make it so. With God's help, we shall do it.

The Significance of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, December 1 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on the 15th of October, which was Layman's Sunday, I delivered an address entitled "The Significance of Korea" at Calvary Episcopal Church, Gramercy Park, New York.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, as it becomes clear that our forces under the United Nations have the power to defeat the Communist aggressors in Korea, it becomes vitally important that we apply ourselves to the question: "What is the significance of the Korean episode?"

This is not merely a military question, nor is it a question confined to any one area of the world. It is a world-wide question involving not only military problems but also, and equally, political problems, psychological problems, and moral probems.

By saying this I do not in any way minimize the crucial importance of the military considerations involved in the battle for Korea and in our whole world position. We must face the fact that our military defenses around the world, in the face of possible new "Koreas" elsewhere, are dangerously thin. They must be built up with all possible speed.

But we must not allow ourselves to become completely preoccupied with battles and weapons. Military preparations and military victories, by themselves, cannot secure either peace or freedom. There is another kind of preparation we must make, and another kind of victory we must win, if our struggle against aggression in Korea is to have any meaning at all. We must prepare, and we must carry through to a victorious conclusion, a political and psychological program for all the world—a program worthy of our heritage of freedom and morality.

Our great need is not for a war program, but for a peace program.

The vital importance of spelling out this peace program becomes obvious if we ask ourselves this simple question: "What are we fighting for in Korea?" We cannot shrug off this question with the answer that we are fighting for our lives, for mere survival, or for peace. We could have life, survival, and peace—of a sort—merely by yielding meekly to Communist aggression. Such a peace would be the peace of a world-wide Communist prison. Any American would rather die than live in it.

Therefore it is our duty to set forth a program making plain to ourselves and to all the world what kind of life and what kind of peace we insist on. Only such a program can give a convincing and inspiring answer to the persistent questions in the minds of war-weary people everywhere: "Why should we join with you? Why should we risk our lives? Why should we fight communism? What stake have we in this struggle of yours?"

The program we develop must be such that any man of good will who sees it, anywhere in the world, will immediately recognize that our struggle is also his struggle, that he can have no hesitation whatever in throwing in his lot with us and not with communism. If this is to be so, it must be founded on a central principle which (1) is true to our national character and traditions; (2) has a powerful meaning for human beings everywhere; and (3) is the spiritual challenge to the appeal of the Communists.

I know of only one such principle. It breathes through the entire political and spiritual history of our great western civilization. It expresses the deepest longings of human beings in Europe, in Asia, in the Americas, everywhere in the world. It has been ruthlessly violated and obliterated wherever communism has come to power.

It is nothing less than the eternal message of human freedom under God.

So I suggest that this message of freedom must be made the message of America to the world. This thought is so inevitable, so apparently obvious, that it seems amazing that we have not yet carried it into effect. I think the reason is partly that we ourselves, living in an atmosphere of freedom, have tended to take it for granted. We have not realized what a tremendously powerful force this idea of freedom can be in the lives of other peoples who have not possessed it as we have, and who yet have enough knowledge of it to make them aspire to be free. But whatever the reason may be, our voice in the world has not even begun to speak clearly enough or powerfully enough on this magnificent theme.

As a result, we have allowed other impressions of American life and American policy to grow up in foreign countries—impressions which would astonish us who have lived all our lives in America, and which do not do us credit. Here are some of them:

1. America is the land of materialism. It is dominated by big business and Wall Street. Its people are fabulously wealthy and care nothing for the things of the spirit. They look down on other peoples who are poor.

2. America is the land of crime and gangsters and mob violence.

3. America is the land of the white man, the friend of European imperialists. Its people believe in the enslavement or exploitation of colored races.

4. America is planning to launch a great war against Russia and wants to use the little peoples of the world as cannon fodder in this war.

Most of these impressions have been built up by the ruthless Communist propaganda, but some of them are partly of our own making. To counteract them, Americans, both at home and abroad, must show in their personal conduct a clearer devotion to the cause of freedom for all human beings. But this by itself is not enough.

Freedom must also be the very backbone of American foreign policies throughout the world. As I see it, the main points of our policy flowing from this idea of freedom must be:

1. The peaceful achievement of independence, self-government, and unity for all peoples. This applies equally to peoples now in a state of colonial dependency and to peoples held under the brutal sway of Russian Communist tyranny.

2. Long-range international programs, carried out primarily through the United Nations, for the economic development of backward areas and their liberation from poverty, disease, and ignorance.

3. Continued unqualified support for the United Nations as a force for peace, and determined efforts to strengthen it for that role and to admit all free and independent nations to membership in it.

4. The building up of our military strength and the military strength of the free nations, in order to make it clear to the Russians and their satellites, including Communist China, that if they touch off a full-scale war they will bring utter destruction upon themselves. For this purpose we should urge early establishment of a powerful and mobile United Nations police force.

5. Constantly repeated proof, by both word and deed, that we in the United States have faith in the possibility of avoiding another world war; that we will never launch such a war ourselves; that we believe in peace and are building for peace.

Having set forth these great aims, we can then implement them in a definite peace program for Korea, and thus clearly tell our people and the world not only what we are fighting against in Korea—that is clear enough—but what we are fighting for.

Our program for Korea can be clear and simple. It must provide for surrender and disarming of the Communist forces; abolition of the Communist puppet regime; unification of the whole country; free nationwide elections, supervised by the United Nations, to establish the authority of the Republic of Korea on a basis of free self-government throughout Korean territory; United Nations aid to repair the ravages of war; a UN security force to guard Korea from further invasion or subversion; and admission of Korea to membership in the United Nations.

If the United Nations, with American support, can achieve this much for Korea, we will have established a pattern for action later in other areas, ultimately in China and in all the other unhappy areas which have fallen under Soviet control. The elements of such a pattern would be United Nations action for independence and self-government, for relief and rehabilitation where necessary, and for physical security against aggression. The spirit of such a pattern would be the spirit which animates our entire foreign policy—the spirit of human freedom.

Our action for Korea, following the military defeat of the Communists there, can be the beginning of a great new era of American and United Nations statesmanship. The cost and the risks of following such a program will be great, not only for ourselves but for other peoples who are with us in this struggle. That is why it is so vitally important that we make clear our unswerving devotion to a cause whose fulfillment will be worth the cost and worth the risks—the cause of freedom for all humanity under God.

This sacred cause is woven into the entire fabric of our western heritage. It is the only goal for which we can fairly ask the peoples of the whole world to risk their lives. I know from personal observation how all the peoples of Asia are yearning to achieve a condition of freedom in which they can live their lives in dignity and self-respect. If we are to win the great moral struggle with atheistic communism, the mortal enemy of freedom everywhere, it is up to us to bring this message of freedom to the whole world.

That is why I have greeted with such great enthusiasm the Crusade for Freedom movement which is being launched in this country under the leadership of General Eisenhower, Gen. Lucius Clay, former Ambassador Joseph Clark Grew, and other leading Americans. This crusade was effectively presented in this and other pulpits throughout the country last Sunday.

I hope also that our own Government's Voice of America program, whose mission is to inform the peoples of the world, will seize this challenge and make itself an ever more powerful Voice of Freedom, to bring our great message to all the spiritually hungry peoples of the world.

Let me sum up, then, briefly my own position in this important matter of our American foreign policy:

I have nothing but praise for the bipartisan cooperation in our Congress that brought about the constructive accomplishments of the Marshall plan and the collective security program of the Atlantic Pact. On the other hand, I am and have been a severe critic of the lack of policy of the administration in the Far East and the tragic mistakes that have led to the conquest of China by Russia's subversive underground methods of infiltration.

While I am wholeheartedly supporting the Marshall plan and the military assistance program in western Europe, I am convinced that mere military preparedness and economic rehabilitation are not enough at this time when the critical battle is for the minds of men and women. I shall continue vigorously to support the program of the so-called Voice of America and the battle to present to the other nations of the world the spiritual values of our western tradition. I will also support wholeheartedly the program to assist the backward nations of the world to get on their own feet economically, to meet the problems of starvation and human suffering, and to find their place in the family of nations. These are the constructive roads to peace that must be emphasized as equally important with the measure for collective security.

But if this program is to succeed there can be no compromise or half-way measures. I am unalterably opposed to the recognition of the Russian-controlled Chinese Communist Government in China and to the admission of the Chinese Communists to the UN. The Korean crisis has awakened us to the dangers in the world situation and has shown us the method by which Russia, using her satellites, is trying to conquer the world. Russia must be told in no uncertain terms that we understand now the dangers of her insidious propaganda, and that we through the UN propose to halt once and for all the further spread of communistic poison.

Let there be no compromise with the issue before the world. That issue is clearly the struggle between materialistic, atheistic totalitarianism as represented by the Communist movement, and freedom under God—the spiritual heritage of our western tradition. If we can succeed as bearers of this great message, we may well turn this century of destruction and despair into a century of hope and fulfillment.

This is the challenge to men and women of good will throughout the world.

This is the very special challenge to the Church of Christ.

Importance of Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 1 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Importance of Propaganda," written by Frederick C. McKee, chairman of the Committee on National Affairs, which appeared in the Washington Post on the 19th of November.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORTANCE OF PROPAGANDA

The importance of propaganda in any war, hot or cold, cannot be overemphasized. "There are only two powers in the world: the sword and the spirit," said Napoleon. "In the long run, the sword is always defeated by the spirit."

This is emphatically the case in the present world-wide conflict between the forces of democracy and those of totalitarianism. It is a war of ideas as well as explosives, and its objective is to convince the underprivileged of the earth that they should embrace either democracy or communism. Guns can halt the physical advance of Communist-led soldiers, they can never halt the march of an idea, however erroneous.

In this war the side which uses words most effectively will triumph if the words are implemented by constructive action. The Russians know this; their appropriation for

propaganda is greater than for any other item except armament. Since 1917 they have fought their major battles for the spread of neo-Marxism not with bombs but with words, not with guns but with verbal butter.

On our side we have been slow and reluctant to accept propaganda as a respectable and indispensable weapon; propaganda has long been a bad word in our vocabulary. Even today, as our State Department admits, we spend less in this field each year than does General Motors for its public relations. And because of an instinctive aversion to the employment of propaganda in world politics, we have neglected to train ourselves in its use.

The result? Up to now we have been losing the war of words. We have been placed, and kept, almost continuously on the defensive. A war cannot be won by defensive tactics alone.

Our selling campaign for the democratic concept has largely failed to reach its audience, partly for lack of funds, partly for lack of a grand strategy and the expert personnel to implement it. With all respect for their earnestness, those charged with operating our propaganda machine have not displayed a sufficient comprehension of the European and Asian mentalities. There is reason to believe that much of our barrage of words goes far over the heads of the depressed masses and bounces off the hard skulls of their masters.

We are the world's acknowledged leaders at selling gadgets, but we are laggard in selling democracy, perhaps because we are not ourselves entirely clear about the sales arguments for the product. To an intellectual, democracy means human rights and fundamental freedoms—free elections, free speech, and the like. But to an Asiatic who has never known civil liberties and whose greatest concern is keeping body and soul together, such talk is meaningless. He wants to know which system is going to keep him fed and clothed and housed and bring about an improvement in his condition. His requirements are fundamental: our propaganda to him must be equally basic. To win the underprivileged masses to the ways of freemen and in so doing to pull the fangs of totalitarianism, requires the application of the best brains backed by sufficient money.

What is specifically indicated is a new Government department or other agency of Cabinet stature, responsible directly to the President, as is the Economic Cooperation Administration, and closely coordinating its activities with the State Department. Its purpose should be to conduct an effective and amply financed world-wide propaganda campaign. It should be the sole governmental agency in this field. It should have teams of genuine experts and native talent in the sensitive political centers of the world shock troops who are familiar with the enemy's spiritual terrain and his methods of warfare, and who know what words will be most effective in winning away his support among the underprivileged. It should be represented by a full-time attaché in every American legation and embassy. It should supervise directly such material as publications, films, radio, etc., transmitted abroad by our Government. It should be headed by a man of unquestioned intellectual integrity and supreme intellectual capacity in the field of public relations, supported by the best staff obtainable without recourse to stuffed shirts or journalistic lame ducks.

The only way to win a war is to fight it; the only way to win a war of words is to produce and disseminate more and better words. We cannot lick communism by wishful thinking.

FREDERICK C. MCKEE,
Chairman, Committee on National Affairs.

NEW YORK.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 1 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated November 28, 1950, which I have received from Mr. Louis George Feldmann, department commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Pennsylvania, on the subject of universal military training.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: For three consecutive decades, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Pennsylvania, have implored the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would provide universal military training, and through it, make available the necessary manpower to meet any national emergency that might arise, including full-scale war.

In July of this year, we again urged the Congress to adopt universal military training as a national defense policy.

In 30 years, the Congress has done nothing to make possible universal military training.

Today, the Department of Pennsylvania, Veterans of Foreign Wars wants you to consider with the utmost seriousness and without reservation whatever, and to take the solemn, probably final grave word of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, that "we are facing a new war."

It is not necessary for me to remind you of the countless and perhaps needless casualties the United States has again suffered in Korea, in a so-called "police action," that in reality is a war, simply because we were again unprepared in manpower to fulfill our obligations in that bleak country thousands of miles from the homes and hearths and loved ones of our youth fighting an apparent losing battle against overwhelming manpower odds.

It should not be necessary for me to remind you of your constitutional duty to defend to the utmost our Nation.

But, it does seem necessary, in view of what inevitably lies in the future, for me to solemnly remind you that we need enormous reserves of trained manpower to militarily protect ourselves from Soviet Russia's determination to destroy us.

So long as we remain weak in manpower, Communists everywhere can destroy us by gradual depletion of our resources, or by direct war. Choice of either is now theirs.

It is already past the time when Members of the Congress should have removed their heads from the sands and faced boldly as statesmen, not as politicians, the evident facts of our impending danger.

The Department of Pennsylvania of the Veterans of Foreign Wars no longer implores you to immediately provide a system of universal military training. We now demand that our Pennsylvania delegation in the Congress stop playing with national defense and our security and heed the word of General MacArthur that "we are facing a new war."

We suggest that all other proposed legislation be laid aside and adoption of universal military training be made the No. 1 priority at this short session of Congress, to make certain our Nation is secure from aggression and possible destruction.

Without security in terms of trained manpower, it eventually may not be necessary for you to enact taxes or pass lesser important legislation before doomsday actually arrives.

We have already wasted 30 years toying with universal military training plans. Our highest military leaders are of the opinion no more precious time must be wasted.

We ask you to confer with the leaders of your party. We want you to decide now on the measure best suited to meet our current and future manpower needs, then confer with leaders and members of your opposition, and between you finally agree upon a satisfactory bill that will give us universal military training within the quickest possible time.

Sincerely,
LOUIS GEORGE FELDMANN,
Department Commander.

Federal Judge J. Waties Waring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 1 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in one of the outstanding small newspapers in my home State of South Carolina. It is my belief that this editorial is extremely well written and should be drawn to the attention of people everywhere in this country so that they may know what we in South Carolina are having to endure as the result of the unprecedented action of a Federal judge who has sought to use his high office as a sounding board to express his antagonistic attitude toward the good citizens of South Carolina.

In my opinion, this man should not be allowed to wear the cloak of the high and esteemed office of Federal judge 1 day longer. No man of his caliber could render an unbiased decision in any case affecting the people of my State.

I desire to highly commend the Chester Reporter and its editor, James F. Tindall, for a job well done, and I hope that articles of this kind will serve as a good warning to the President of the United States that this judge is a danger to South Carolina and the Nation as a whole, and that he should be replaced without further delay.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE WARING

Judge Waring last week again revealed that he cannot by the slightest stretch of imagination be called a fair and impartial man, capable of thinking clearly and arriving at a just decision.

The case did not attract Nation-wide attention as has some of his past actions, but we think it one of the strongest cases against the judgment of the judge since his antag-

onistic attitude against the citizens of South Carolina began.

Briefly, this is what occurred. A rumor began in Summerville, near Charleston, that the judge had bought a home there and was planning on moving to the resort village. The publisher of the paper there, Jack Button, began investigating, finally placing a personal call to the judge.

The Federal judge, instead of acting like a rational man and stating that there was nothing to the rumor, launched into a tirade against Summerville, newspapermen in general in South Carolina, law enforcement in the State and in general against the citizens of the State. He acted like an untrained child in a tantrum, screaming and babbling into the telephone.

Judge Waring told Mr. Button that the rumor was a "lie, probably started by the Klan." He further said go ahead and publish it, as all newspaper men in the State published lies about him all the time. He further accused Mr. Button as being a member of the Klan, without even knowing the man and with no justification of such a statement whatsoever.

The judge proved by his vile attack and screaming conversation that he is not fit to sit on the bench, judging actions of others and making decisions on matters concerning the actions of citizens of this country.

First, the judge is very much uninformed and is making no attempt to become informed. If he would take the trouble to investigate the matter he would find that Mr. Button definitely is not a member of the Klan. The fact of the matter is that the newspaper publisher is one of the leaders in the lower part of the State in fighting the Klan. And the judge has had an opportunity to learn about this matter, as Mr. Button has personally mailed him a number of copies of his newspaper containing editorials denouncing the Klan.

Judge Waring was again wrong when he assailed the general field of newspapermen in the State as being companions of the Klan and guilty of telling lies on him.

The judge hit at an entire field of men who are constantly striving to search out the truth and get it before the public. The judge's claim that all the newspapermen in the State publish lies about him is untrue and definitely not a statement of a man with the capability of studying out a matter and making a just decision. We believe that the average newspaperman in the State is entirely unconcerned about the judge and his private life. However, they are concerned about a man of his capability sitting on the Federal bench.

We further believe that not a single newspaperman in the State holds against Judge Waring his decision in court giving the Negroes the right to vote in the State. Such a decision was inevitable and was bound to come sooner or later. The judge handed down the only decision he could and we believe that the average newspaperman in the State realizes this.

We admit that there has been a great deal written in the newspapers in this State and surrounding States about actions of the judge and his wife. But in practically every instance the stories came as the result of either he or his wife making statements to the press.

We personally know of three different instances when either the judge, his wife, or his secretary made long distance telephone calls to a newspaperman in North Carolina, giving this man stories of their actions. The bigoted judge or his wife in each instance instigated the publicity, which was faithfully written up as a true report on facts given this newspaperman.

Further, Judge Waring in each instance stated that he was giving the story to the North Carolina newspaperman instead of to a South Carolinian, saying that there were no enlightened citizens of the Palmetto State. If the judge had been the least bit smart he would have checked on this North Carolina citizen. He has lived in North Carolina only a few years. He was born and reared in South Carolina, attended a South Carolina school, and is a member of one of the oldest families in South Carolina. In short, the foolish judge was talking all the time to a decadent citizen of South Carolina.

We believe that Judge Waring, by his actions last week, proved definitely that his thoughts are governed by his emotions and not his mind. His statements and blanket denunciations of the South Carolina press definitely were not those of a rational man anxious to be just and trust. To our way of thinking a judge should make an attempt to see the entire picture of each and every situation. He should carefully investigate, weigh each detail carefully, and then try to reach a just conclusion.

He should not jump at every opportunity he has to castigate a group as a whole, denouncing everyone and not just those guilty of his alleged "lies" in the press. In short, the actions of Judge Waring convince us that he is not capable of making just decisions on the bench. Instead, any man ruled by his emotions and unbridled temper is liable at any time to do unrepairable damage while sitting in judgment of his fellowman. His eyes have been blinded by his rages and his actions are being governed by his foolish tirades against his fellow citizens of South Carolina.

The Threatened Destruction of Western Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 1 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Greatest Peril for United States," written by Hanson W. Baldwin, military expert for the New York Times, and published in the December 1, 1950, issue of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATEST PERIL FOR UNITED STATES—WESTERN CIVILIZATION FACES DESTRUCTION IF THREAT FROM EAST IS NOT MET BOLDLY

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The United States faces today the greatest danger in our history. Military, economic, or political destruction of western civilization and of our American way of life are definite possibilities if the danger from the east is not met boldly, imaginatively, and with united effort.

These conclusions are inescapable to this correspondent, who has just returned from thousands of miles of traveling to Korea, Japan, Formosa, Hong Kong, and French Indochina. The danger existed long before the recent Chinese Communist offensive in Korea; it has simply become more acute in the past few days. Americans in the Orient who were cognizant of the carefully planned strategy of the Chinese Reds of the close liaison that exists between Moscow and Peiping and of the immense military power of Red China backed by Russia have been amazed in recent weeks not only by the mistaken estimates in Tokyo but by the wishful thinking and unrealistic patter of some of the discussions in Washington and at Lake Success. To our troops in Korea fighting in some of the most terrible country in the world against the overwhelming manpower of the Orient the United States seemed to be living in a kind of "never never land."

Yet, the unparalleled danger of which Secretary of State Acheson has, at length, warned has existed in the Orient ever since United States troops were committed to the war in Korea. That danger increased as soon as we crossed the thirty-eighth parallel and grew when Gen. Douglas MacArthur—altering prior plans—sent our troops toward the Manchurian frontier north of the Sinanju-Song-jin line along which it had been expected we would hold our advance. Ever since the middle of August, when Chinese divisions crossed the Yalu, we have been at war with Red China. Thus today we are involved in precisely the type of war which we can never win, a land struggle on the Asiatic continent in a theater where no decision is possible against the hordes of Asia. The mistakes that brought us to this present crisis were numerous and major; some of them date back to World War II; others—particularly errors in intelligence and in judgment—have occurred during the past summer and fall.

NATION MUST BE UNITED

But this is no time to recapitulate errors; to err is human, and today the danger is too great to carp and criticize. There must be a united America, and we must face the situation as it is today and try to devise a strategy that will extricate us from our present completely untenable position in Asia.

To formulate wise policies we must first rid ourselves of certain basic misconceptions which still crowd our thoughts. The first and most important fact that must be understood is that the Chinese Communist government is Communist and not merely a new type of agrarian reformer. It is closely and intimately linked to Moscow; certainly during the present crisis the foreign policy of Stalin and Mao can be considered to be identical. Nor, in this observer's opinion, would any policy of recognition or appeasement have altered this relationship, at least for the immediate future. Over a long-term period it is possible, though by no means certain, that a kind of Chinese "Titoism" might develop. But no such schism could have been expected in time to alter the course of history in the future. The British policy of recognition of Peiping has gotten them nothing except some millions of profits in Hong Kong.

Today one inexorable fact dominates the development of history in the Orient; Mao and Stalin are playing as a team. Well before the Inchon landing the present Chinese Communist strategy in Korea and in French Indochina was carefully charted by Chinese and Russian leaders at a meeting in Peiping. The Russians promised, and have given, their support in arms, equipment, and advisers. Some Russian political and military advisers have even been present from time to time in Indochina and Czechoslovak arms plants are helping to supply the Communist followers of Ho Chi Minh in Indochina. Manchuria, and in that part of Siberia close to Korea, Russian forces have been mobilized and Russian equipment and help have greatly strengthened the Chinese Red armies.

AIMS OPEN TO QUESTION

What quid pro quo has been promised to China in return for her intervention in Korea and her help to Ho Chi Minh in Indochina is one of the great question marks of the Orient—possibly the inclusion of Korea and French Indochina in the Chinese zone of influence. The immediate objective of the Chinese Communist intervention in

Korea is also open to some question, but at the very least the enemy clearly plans to keep up fighting there indefinitely and the force of his present drive indicates he may have even greater ambitions—the destruction of the United Nations forces in Korea and our expulsion from the peninsula. And it is as true today as it was when we intervened in Korea in July that the Chinese Communists by sheer overwhelming weight of manpower can push us out of Korea any time they are willing to commit enough men to pay the price in lives—a cheap commodidity in the Orient.

The immediate objective in French Indochina is much the same as it is in Korea—to keep the French bleeding, to nibble off frontier posts, first the salient at Moncay, and later to overrun the whole rich rice area of the Red River delta with the key French towns of Hanoi and Haiphong. But the long-term objective in both these theaters—as in all other parts of the world—is clear and immutable; it is the conquest of the world by communism.

The second basic fact that must be faced if we are to emerge from our "never never land" of wishful thinking is that the modern Chinese Communist soldier is a good soldier—far different from the impressed, underfed Nationalist troops our officers tried to train during World War II. The Chinese Red Army is not the equal of western armies, man for man, in firepower or equipment, but it more than makes up for material deficiencies in numbers. The time for looking down our noses at the Chinese soldier has passed.

Hon. James W. Wadsworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, when one has served in public life, almost continuously, since 1904 and then voluntarily retires after 18 years of service in the House of Representatives, the question may well be asked, What manner of man was this?

After graduating from Yale in 1898, JAMES W. WADSWORTH enlisted as a private, Battery A, Pennsylvania Field Artillery, and served in Puerto Rico. Then for a brief period he engaged in livestock and general farming.

First, elected member of the New York Assembly he served for 6 years in that body, five of those years as speaker of the assembly. For 12 years he served in the Senate of the United States, and on March 4, 1933, he began his service in this House. When he departs from our midst at the close of this session, only nine Members will remain who entered the House at the same time with him. And out of the 435 Members of that day only 36 remain.

Such are the mutations of time and circumstances. Mr. Speaker, no man has served with greater honor and distinction in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States than has the Honorable JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York.

Full of days, riches, and honors, he retires to the quietude of domestic life, far removed from the anxieties, perplexities, and confusions of our modern public life and service.

To extol his virtues and achievements would be to paint the lily. His fame is secure in the record he has made. He leaves to his colleagues a memory of glorious achievement and to his fellowcitizens of this great Republic he bequeaths a heritage of splendid patriotism, of deep devotion to duty, of intense effort in behalf of the betterment of our country, and an inspiration to all Americans who desire to serve, protect, and defend our form of constitutional government. His like will not soon pass this way again.

Therefore, in paying tribute to the worth, achievements, and character of this splendid American we honor ourselves as well as our colleague. For we here testify to all the world and say in deep sincerity that "Here is a man." A man of whom America can be proud.

A man who served his country upon the battlefield in defense of its liberties, who presided over the deliberations of his own State assembly, who for 12 years performed the duties of United States Senator with fidelity and dispatch, and who, for the past 18 years has faithfully promoted the interests and welfare of the people of the United States in his capacity as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Well done, good and faithful servant, and may peace, contentment, and happiness attend the closing years of your useful life.

Operation of Golf Courses in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL T. WAGNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion in the press and in committees of the Congress regarding the operation of golf courses in the District of Columbia. These courses, now operated at a profit to the Government, have received frequent commendation from golf course operators elsewhere. From the day the present operator took over the courses to the present moment the records show the taxpayers have never paid a single cent for the operation of the local courses. Practically all the municipal courses operated by the various cities throughout the country are losing money, yet charge a higher fee than prevails here. The records also show that the present private operator of the District courses furnished most of the capital for the completion of the golf courses here and was repaid from earnings of the courses.

I have no interest in who operates golf courses anywhere, but I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the thought that it might be well to examine the entire recreation program here before disposing of the services of a man who is actually turning some profits into the Federal Government through the operation of the public golf courses. I was amazed to learn that the agreement between Mr. S. G. Leoffler, the operator of the courses, and the Government provides that while the Government gets most of the profit the operator must pay all losses when and if they should occur.

For the present it might be best if those interested in a change of operation of the courses devote their time to the establishment of a USO or some other form of diversion for our Armed Forces visitors and thus allow the work-burdened Members of the Congress to devote their full efforts to the important tasks before it.

I submit for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter on the subject of golf from one of the greatest authorities in the world on golf, Herb Graffis, editor of Golfdom:

Mr. HARRY T. THOMPSON,
Assistant Superintendent, United States Department of the Interior, National Capital Parks,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: My observation of the public golf courses in Washington, D. C., area, is that the operation compares very favorably with most other metropolitan district golf operations.

The adverse soil and climatic conditions plus some original construction defects make the standard of Washington public course turf better, I believe, than could be normally expected unless there could be spent an amount that would involve a considerable raise in rates or a dip into the department budget.

Considering the rates that have prevailed in the Washington operation, I have my doubts that any private or political operator could have improved on the present situation and offhand I would have difficulty in naming even a few who might have equaled this performance.

It is fairly often the case that public-golf operations are self-supporting when the golfers by persistent protest manage to secure operation based on legitimate business balance of income and expense instead of political expediency.

In view of the public's increasing demand of public course facilities closely comparable with those of private clubs, but their reluctance to pay for the standard desired, the public course operators are due for plenty of headaches. Furthermore, as the number of golfers is steadily increasing and the younger people cannot afford private clubs, it's a sure thing that public officials' responsibility is that of providing facilities that are a bargain at the price.

According to my observation around the country, the Washington job has been well done.

Sincerely yours,
GOLFDOM,
HERB GRAFFIS, *Editor.*

Shipments to Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, December 1 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in order that Senators may be kept in-

formed of developments in the matter, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shipments to Red China," from the New York Times of November 27, 1950.

The question of policies regarding trade with such an avowed enemy as Communist China at the present time is one which transcends normal questions of trade policies and procedures. Judging from messages received, our people throughout the country cannot understand why our country should have supplied essentials of war to an enemy which is threatening our very existence.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPMENTS TO RED CHINA

The Department of Commerce has announced a meeting tomorrow with traders, bankers, and shippers at its regional office here in New York to discuss closer control of shipments of strategic materials to Communist China through United States ports. Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland, hearing of this move, commented: "The Federal officials are now moving in the right direction; my only regret is that they did not act some time ago." A vast majority of Americans, we suspect, will be inclined to agree with the Senator.

Senator O'CONOR and his subcommittee have been doing a thorough job in investigating shipments to Red China. They have uncovered a number of cases that are nothing short of scandalous and have succeeded in preventing some shipments and transshipments. From the beginning of the investigation, however, the Department of Commerce has consistently defended its own laxity and usually, by inference, accused the Senator of exaggerating the gravity of the situation.

The Maryland legislator has now compiled a record of what he calls "huge" shipments of scrap rubber, steel, and oil to Communist China from west coast ports and from Japan that have gone forward since the start of hostilities in Korea. Full details of these shipments will now be laid before Defense Secretary Marshall with a request that he consider the possible dangers involved.

This request seems reasonable, to say the least. Active Chinese Communist intervention in the Korean hostilities, again critical with a renewed counter-thrust at the United Nations forces, make the supply of strategic materials to Peiping completely indefensible. The families of soldiers who have been killed or wounded by materials supplied by or through the United States will not take kindly to the suggestion that these shipments are of little importance.

The arguments that we must keep the trade door with Peiping open and that our common carriers have a right to carry what they please where they please are not valid in the face of the present situation. The Chinese Communist regime has made itself the enemy of the United Nations. Members of the United Nations have been called upon, in that organization's resolution, to refrain from giving any assistance to the enemy. At the time of the resolution the enemy was specifically North Korea. The Soviet Union did not see fit to comply with this resolution and the Chinese Communists have shown their contempt for the United Nations by open defiance.

Under those conditions the United States, as a loyal member of the United Nations, cannot do less than to see to it that all the loopholes in the strategic trade with Red China are plugged. This must be done now, and not after our casualty toll has become even more grievous. The actions that have been taken, as Senator O'CONOR has pointed out, have thus far been too little and too late. The executive offices will be well advised to stiffen their attitude and implement the policy that honor and prudence alike require.

The Internal Security Act—4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to present the fourth of a series of editorials from the Milwaukee Journal on the Internal Security Act. The following editorial appeared on October 27:

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT—4

(This is the fourth of several editorials discussing the Internal Security Act of 1950, the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill.)

The registration requirement of the Internal Security Act of 1950 offers the Communists a diabolical weapon for sowing distrust, consternation, and disunity throughout our Government and Nation.

The law requires Communist action groups to register and to list all their members with the Attorney General.

What would happen if, as Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, has speculated, the Communists registered a group and listed as members their opponents in government, in liberal groups throughout the country—men who have been victimized in Communist smears, people whose effective voice against communism might be discredited by any such false listing?

It would be a simple thing for Communists who openly quit the party to avoid registration—as some leaders of the fur workers' union have under the Taft-Hartley law—to testify that these falsely listed persons were Communists. It would be a simple thing for them to testify that they had met these people in cell meetings, that they had received information from them, that they had known them as Communists.

The security law, of course, provides penalties for false registration. But the penalties would be hard to impose. They could be fought through the courts for years, working untold hardship on those who were falsely registered. And for a Communist the penalties would be well worth risking in return for the havoc that false registration could create.

In a day when Communist smears have been all too common, an innocent person might have an almost impossible task disproving false charges of communism. The Attorney General has the duty to publish the names of registered persons after 30 days. If a person falsely registered could not disprove the charge within 30 days his name would be made public before he even had a hearing before the Subversive Controls Board. A reputation and a man's value as a Government official or employee could be ruined for all time by such registration, even though he could later prove in court that he was not a Communist.

The law could open the door for smears by Communists that could have serious results for hundreds of Americans, and for our Government.

To say that the Communists would not do such a thing would be to disregard the fact that Communists have proved themselves capable of anything. The mere fact that the law makes such an action possible points to the undesirability of the law as it stands.

The Communists have proved masters at creating division among their enemies. The new security law provides them with a perfect tool with which to cause confusion and to discredit those enemies.

Message From Methodist Commission on World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, December 1 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received an important spiritual document from Rev. Charles F. Voss, Jr., executive secretary of the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, headquartered at 740 Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. This document is a message to Methodists in all lands which was adopted by the Commission on World Peace in its latest annual session in Chicago on November 16 and 17.

I believe that men and women of good will, no matter what their religious faith, will be profoundly interested in and stimulated by the message. Certainly we need more of the spiritual emphasis which is so abundant in this document, particularly now that we find ourselves so deep in a crisis at the edge of war. We may not agree with all of the contents of the message—I, for one, strongly question several parts and conclusions—but I commend the underlying effort of church leaders and laymen to find a solution of our problems through applied Christianity.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of the Methodist Commission's controversial but significant statement, and that it be followed by a list of the membership of this distinguished commission which cooperates with the World Council of Churches and the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

There being no objection, the message and list were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE TO METHODISTS IN ALL LANDS, ADOPTED BY THE COMMISSION ON WORLD PEACE OF THE METHODIST CHURCH IN ANNUAL SESSION, CHICAGO, ILL., NOVEMBER 16–17, 1950

The millions of members of the Methodist Church live in many different lands, but we are parts of one universal Christian household of faith. Together we must seek to discover and interpret the will of one God for all men and help to make the kingdoms of this world become the united nations of our Lord.

As Christians we must keep before the public mind in all nations the fact that the application of Christ's Gospel will bring a new day, a new humanity more skilled to work together, and a new world in which men will have land and labor and liberty of speech and action. Christianity is the antidote to atheism.

In highest loyalty to his own country, each Methodist holds responsibility for doing his best to save all nations from destructive war. To encourage international peace and understanding—

We must emphasize the Gospel of Christ as the hope of personal and international peace. The disorder of the world results from man's misdoing for which Christianity has the cure.

We must forsake the worship of jingoist national gods and worship the universal God of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We must show our good will by helping feed the world's hungry people. Surplus food in our nations can be shared with other more needy people to the good of all.

We must keep open the lines of communication between peoples. The hysteria of fear must not lead us to close our gates or our minds against the people from other lands.

We must help displaced persons to find homes and a new opportunity.

We must pray for one another in Christian love and by personal witness seek to build up a spirit of mutual trust and determined action for peace through world brotherhood.

WAR IS NOT INEVITABLE

We reaffirm the conviction, stated not only by church pronouncements but also by President Truman in his recent address before the United Nations, that war is not inevitable. The worst thing that could happen in the present crisis among the nations would be for a nation or nations to surrender to fear and launch a so-called preventive war. We rejoice that responsible statesmen recognize this fact, and we call on our people to support this stand by holding steady in good will and faith.

PEACE IS NOT INEVITABLE

Yet neither is peace inevitable, and its cost is patient, continuous effort at international cooperation. Our best political hope of peace lies in the United Nations. We rejoice in its increased prestige and influence. There is emerging from it a larger vision of the total interests of mankind. In spite of obstacles, freedom of presentation and discussion still abides in its Assembly and Councils. Long before it took action to resist aggression in Korea it had proved its usefulness for peacemaking in such troubled areas as Palestine, Kashmir, and Indonesia, and had taken large steps forward through its universal declaration of human rights, and the work of such agencies as UNESCO, the World Health Organization, and the Food and Agriculture Organization. It has created a center in which the official leaders of international affairs in 60 nations can meet for the presentation, analysis, and discussion of problematical issues, and it provides the political structure through which peace can come to the world. Furthermore, both the actual efficacy and the possibility of strengthening the United Nations have been demonstrated in several crucial areas.

KEEP THE UNITED NATIONS UNITED

In spite of tensions within the United Nations, we believe that it must be kept united. We reject the proposal frequently made that the world should be split politically, as it now is ideologically, into two blocs. Regardless of the difficulties which may be encountered in arriving at agreements or in securing unanimity, the United Nations should be maintained for all nations. We believe that nations which have made application for admission—Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, Mongolian People's Republic, Jordan, Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Austria, Finland, Ceylon, Korea, Nepal, and Spain—should be at once admitted.

KOREA

The United Nations, by an overwhelming vote, determined to support the use of armed forces in Korea against what it deemed to be aggression. We counsel our people in all nations to urge their respective governments to support policies which keep the use of armed action at a minimum, if it cannot be abolished altogether. Without condoning the unjustifiable nature of the attack by Communist forces which has precipitated the tragic situation in Korea, we believe it to be part of a long sequence of events in which self-interest rather than international concern has governed the policies of nations. Among these are commitments made at Yalta, the artificial division of Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel, equivocation in foreign policy, and an attitude among western nations which has had too little concern for the economic health and security of the hungry peoples of the Orient.

We believe that adequate and immediate measures should be taken for the relief of the Korean people, now tragically suffering as victims of the cold war between great powers, and that there should be large expenditures of both public and private funds for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of this shattered country. After the fighting ceases, a unified Korea should be assured of her independence, with such interim aid or protection from the United Nations as may be required for restoration to full national status.

THE PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA

No decisions are more crucial and imminent than whether the United States should recognize the Communist government of China (the Peoples Republic of China) and whether this Communist government should represent China in the United Nations. We believe that our governments in the question of recognition, and that the United Nations in the question of admission, should listen sincerely and cooperatively to the counsel of China's neighbor nations in Asia. We believe it to be possible without approving the Communist regime in China to recognize it as the de facto government of that country. The refusal to recognize this government is an evasion of existing fact and can only be conducive to further tension rather than peace.

DISARMAMENT THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS IMPERATIVE

As an effective means of allaying fear and disarming suspicion, we urge leaders in all nations to explore the possibilities of large-scale disarmament through the United Nations. We heartily commend the proposal of the President of the United States that in planning disarmament, weapons of every character, atomic, hydrogen, conventional—will desirably be considered together. In this connection, the United Nations might profitably reexamine the details of procedures, including inspection, whereby effective supervision can be practicably administered. Details, while not of negligible importance, should not be permitted to prevent or too long defer the achievement of decisions on major steps.

Military victory under conditions that would obtain in world war III could have little meaning. The outcome of atomic war is unpredictable, except that all participants will suffer tragic losses. The possibility of a satisfactory plan of disarmament exists and must constantly be explored. Reversion to barbarism is the alternative to effective effort to this end.

WORLD COOPERATION IS NEEDED

Discovery of and agreement upon some plan of large-scale disarmament would demonstrate the possibility of cooperation in many directions, would awaken hope in the hearts of men everywhere, would encourage the conclusion of peace treaties with the nations defeated in World War II, would release capital and industrial production to devote their resources to improving living conditions of humanity on a world scale.

COLD WAR ISSUES SHOULD BE RESOLVED

Paralleling the proposal that any plan of disarmament must cover weapons of every character, we plead for an inclusion of an approach to the issues involved in the so-called cold war. Piecemeal handling of these issues has tended to increase irritation. We feel that the time is ripe for the major nations through top-level representatives to confer on all issues that are now subjects of tension, including peace treaties. Only so can the smaller nations be emancipated from fears not of their making and enabled to make their fullest contribution to world recovery and a vitalized United Nations.

CHRISTIAN ATTITUDES AND LOYALTIES NEEDED

Christians of all nations should learn to speak in the attitudes and purposes of Christianity even when they are speaking to and of persons of other languages, of other economic systems, of other ideologies or conceptions of life. If all the Christians in the world would do this now, there would be released attitudes of determination to find the way to cooperate in peace. There would be, in fact and practice, a growing and developing world fellowship of Christians whose influence would be felt in every land on the earth. There are still many millions of Christians in Russia. They belong chiefly to the Russian Orthodox Church. They are not materialists for they believe that the eternal spirit, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the ultimate reality. Churches and cathedrals are open and people worship in them and traditional scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are used, and the hymns of the Eastern Church are sung. We should make every effort to communicate with these people and send a message of Christian fellowship and good will.

In these critical days we should refuse to be suppressed by reactionary forces operating on the basis of ignorance, prejudice, or chauvinistic patriotism, which would restrict the outlook and attitudes of Christians who cannot be nationalistic but must be universal in their outlook and appeal. Certainly no church is in a better position than the Methodist Church operating as it does in many nations with cooperation through the Federal Council and the World Council of Churches to do effectively "the things which belong unto peace." Our hope is in God and in Him is our trust.

Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church: Rev. Charles F. Boss, Jr., executive secretary; Rev. Ralph W. Sockman, chairman; Mrs. Frank L. Wright, vice chairman; Rev. Willard E. Stanton, recording secretary; Rev. Albert C. Hoover, treasurer; Rev. John W. Haywood, field secretary; Rev. Carl D. Soule, secretary for district and subdistrict conferences; Mr. Herman Will, Jr., administrative assistant.

Members of the Commission: Mr. August Aamodt, Fargo, N. Dak.; Rev. Earle A. Baker, Cedar Falls, Iowa; Rev. Albert E. Barnett, Atlanta, Ga.; Rev. Harold A. Bosley, Evanston, Ill.; Bishop Charles W. Brashares, Des Moines, Iowa; Rev. C. Maxwell Brown, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Rev. George W. Carter, New Orleans, La.; Mrs. George Glenn, Hutchinson, Kans.; Miss Georgia Harkness, Berkeley, Calif.; Rev. Edmund Heinsohn, Austin, Tex.; Mr. E. P. Hocking; Janesville, Wis.; Mr. V. W. Hodges, Atlanta, Ga.; Mr. Harry N. Holmes, Ridgefield, Conn.; Bishop Gerald H. Kennedy, Portland, Oreg.; Bishop Paul E. Martin, Little Rock, Ark.; Mr. James McGiffin, Honolulu, T. H.; Miss Shirley Jean Reece, Huntington

Park, Calif.; Bishop Alexander P. Shaw, Baltimore, Md.; Bishop Roy H. Short, Jacksonville, Fla.; Mr. Frank D. Slutz, Dayton, Ohio; Rev. Ralph W. Sockman, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Francis A. Stanger, Jr., Cedarville, N. J.; Rev. Willard E. Stanton, Wenatchee, Wash.; Rev. Guy C. Tetirick, McAlester, Okla.; Mr. V. L. Wharton, Jackson, Miss.; Bishop Lloyd C. Wicke, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mrs. Frank L. Wright, St. Louis, Mo.

Advisory members: Rev. Eugene L. Smith, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Earl R. Brown, New York, N. Y.; Miss Thelma Stevens, New York, N. Y.; Rev. John O. Gross, Nashville, Tenn.; Rev. J. Q. Schisler, Nashville, Tenn.; Rev. C. A. Bowen, Nashville, Tenn.; Rev. Harry F. Denman, Nashville, Tenn; Mr. Chilton G. Bennett, Chicago, Ill.

Pegler's Column Censored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article and editorial from the New York Post of November 14, 1950:

PEGLER'S COLUMN CENSORED—THE MAN HOPES ASSASSINS "TAUGHT TRUMAN LESSON"

A column by Westbrook Pegler in which he voiced "hope" that the attempt to assassinate the President would "be a lesson to Truman" and ridiculed expressions of shock over the episode has been suppressed by King Features Syndicate, the Post learned today.

The column had been distributed for publication last Tuesday, it was learned, but was ordered "killed" by the syndicate on the eve of its scheduled appearance.

As far as can be learned none of the newspapers which publish Pegler violated the "kill" order. The text of the column as it was transmitted to Pegler's outlets throughout the country has just been obtained, however, by this newspaper.

In the column Pegler angrily challenged editorial writers who said the Nation was shocked by the armed assault on Blair House. He wrote:

"I hope this (the attack) will be a lesson to Truman and the anonymous, eye-rolling disembodied hypocrites of the editorial page who have been croaking that the Nation will view this dastardly resort to anarchy with shock and horror.

"If it takes this to remind us that no President is a holy person, the cost is great but the result is worth it. * * *

"I wasn't shocked, I wasn't horrified, and I believe that most of those who said and wrote that they were, were liars."

Ward Green, chief editorial executive of the syndicate, queried about the column at his office at 235 East Forty-fifth Street, refused to comment.

"I have nothing to say about it," he said.

Efforts to reach Pegler were fruitless. Messages were left at the Park Lane Hotel, where he is staying temporarily, and at the feature syndicate office, but the columnist did not respond.

In the suppressed column, Pegler dispar:ged "all this emotion over an absurdly nondangerous and futile attempt on the life of a man who happens to be President."

He said he deplored what he called "the stupid attack on the policemen guarding the house where President Truman lives," but "nowhere near as much" as he condemned attacks by "union goons of Truman adherents" on the wives of nonstrikers in a Butte, Mont., labor dispute.

He said he believed the policies of the Truman administration had produced anarchy in the United States of America and added:

"Any man who throws in with traitors and gorillas against the loyal, law-abiding people of the United States is asking for the same kind of treatment and is getting off easy when his guards take the rap."

While urging the assassination of Joseph Stalin, Pegler denied that he favors assassination of President Truman at the present stage.

"As to Harry S. Truman, at the present stage of the game, I am willing to settle for the impudence, the scare, and the reminder of the scene at Blair House," Pegler wrote.

He took the view that the President is "no more important and sacred to me than any other citizen" and asserted that Americans were "able to keep our shirts on" in the face of other violences allegedly instigated by unions. He said Mr. Truman "isn't a good President" and "shirks his constitutional duty * * * to strike down lawlessness."

Much of the remainder of the column was devoted to the reaffirmation of the theme that the President brought the attack on himself by failing to curb union-made anarchy.

O SOLE MIO

Pegler concluded with a sharp critique of Margaret Truman's singing. He said most of her audiences were composed of unwilling listeners blackjacked into attendance by local Democratic organizations.

Although Pegler's column has been excluded from his New York outlet on previous occasions, this is believed to be the first time that a "kill" was ordered by the syndicate on a Nation-wide scale. The Journal-American last omitted his column on August 3 when he urged the United States to admit that we were beaten in Korea and to pull out as fast as we could.

W. PEGLER'S PURPLE PASSION

As unofficial guardians of the Pegler documents we naturally resent any break in the continuity of his works. Thus, when his essay failed to appear in its usual place in the Journal-American last Tuesday (November 7), an investigation was promptly begun. The findings are described on page 3 of today's edition.

The inquiry was not easy; on this occasion Peg was not merely dropped from the Journal-American but "killed" as they say in our trade, by order of his syndicate after the explosive words had been transmitted to all his outlets. To the best of our knowledge Pegler's indiscretion did not see the light of day anywhere. It would have been utterly lost to posterity if our diligent researchers had not produced a copy of the missing manuscript. To the gallant citizen (who prefers to remain anonymous) who finally furnished us with the text of the suppressed script go the thanks of all true Pegler scholars; future historians are similarly indebted to him.

The manuscript, described in our news columns, speaks for itself. The issue remains: Should the column have been killed? Peg's managers may justly claim that this was a kind of journalistic mercy killing; they probably felt they had to choose between the life of the column and the survival of the author. But as opponents of censorship we question the decision. Surely Pegler's readers have the right to glimpse the full fury of his mind; let them judge the whole man, not a carefully screened, sissified version of the real thing. Long recognized as one of the great character assassins of our time, Peg was becoming a bore in that role; his views on more direct methods of assassination break the monotony and reveal the life-and-death passion that lurks behind his rhetoric.

Admittedly, to quote his own words, Peg doesn't urge the assassination of Mr. Truman at the present stage of the game. At this moment he is willing to settle for the impudence, the scare, and the reminder of the scene at Blair House. The President must be grateful for this reprieve; but let there be no doubt that Peg believes the attempt was exactly what Mr. Truman deserved. In the columnist's immortal words: "I wasn't shocked, I wasn't horrified, and I believe that most of those who wrote that they were, were liars." Read it and weep for the man who said it.

Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Marquette Tribune, edited by students of the College of Journalism at Marquette University, carried an excellent editorial in its October 5 issue on the internal security bill. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HYSTERIA

The Red-control law, discussed elsewhere in this week's Tribune, climaxes a wave of anti-Communist activity within the United States that has been aptly termed a period of hysteria.

By enacting the bill into law, Congress, opposed only by the valiant little band led by Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, has weakened our genuine anti-Communist defenses and opened the way for the infringement of some of our most precious personal liberties.

That the law will weaken our present protective machinery is attested by none other than the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency. That it endangers basic liberties is apparent from the wide provisions of the bill dealing with Red-front groups.

Under a reactionary administration, these provisions could be applied to any group that the interests in power care to call leftist. In the past few years that term has been applied by powerful forces in the forefront of political activity to every union and to every individual liberal daring to criticize the faults of our capitalistic system.

During the past 3 months especially the words "Communist" and "Socialist" have been hurled with abandon by all sorts of committees and groups who have chosen to set themselves up as judges of their countrymen's loyalty and political behavior. Guilt by accusation and guilt by association have come dangerously close to replacing the conviction that a man is innocent until proved guilty by a jury of his peers.

Thanks to the efforts of these anti-Communist groups, American citizens have been summarily deprived of their means of obtaining a livelihood without the slightest chance to defend themselves. In 30 years of agitation the Communists in this country have never been able to achieve a result like that.

The Red-control law, as it stands now, and the witch-hunting committees have demonstrated more pointedly than ever before that the real internal danger to our way of life comes, not from Communist saboteurs but from forces which claim to be fighting communism. The hysteria which swings blindly at communism is in danger of destroying the very structure of democracy.

The Crisis in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, December 1 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial entitled "A Matter of Life and Death," published in the Washington Evening Star of December 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

A MATTER OF LIFE AND DEATH

The stark and simple meaning of the crisis in which we find ourselves today is that our life hangs in the balance—our life as a free nation and the lives of millions of us as individuals.

Mr. Truman has spoken of the serious crisis and Mr. Acheson has talked of a situation of unparalleled danger. These words carry their ominous connotation, but they are not adequate to convey to the people of this country the enormity of their danger. There is a feeling, though perhaps not shared by Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson, that we should be careful not to alarm the people. Of course, the people should not be unduly alarmed. But the people will never acquire that understanding of the danger, that sense of dedication to the task of preparing to meet it, for which our leaders keep calling unless they are given all of the facts that can be made public within the limitations imposed by security considerations.

The people have not been given all of these facts.

One fact not generally known is that there are responsible men in Washington, men whose official position is such that their opinions are entitled to consideration, who believe that this country, as of today, would have no better than an even chance to win an all-out war with Russia. They also believe that time is working against us—that Russian military production is geared up to a point at which they will grow relatively stronger while we grow relatively weaker. Given the opportunity, at some point, with a maximum effort, we would overtake them. But that will not happen soon, and meanwhile, in the opinion of these men our chances of winning a war will diminish.

It should be emphasized that this is merely an opinion. But if it is a correct opinion, it has a most profound bearing on the policies which this Government is pursuing and for which the unswerving support of the people is solicited.

These policies have been stated in various ways. Mr. Truman summed them up yesterday in these words: (1) We shall continue to work in the United Nations for concerted action to halt this aggression in Korea. (2) We shall intensify our efforts to help other free nations strengthen their defenses in order to meet the threat of aggression elsewhere. (3) We shall rapidly increase our own military strength.

The essence of this policy is that everything possible should be done to avoid war, while doing what we can to prepare for the worse if total war should come.

Along with this is the point of view of those who feel that time and opportunity are slipping away from us. They do not advance their point of view as an argument for a so-called preventive war. They merely set forth what they believe to be the facts, which may be summed up as follows: As of this time, we have a great superiority in atomic weapons and, again as of this time, we are capable of using those weapons against any enemy. The Russians do not now have a large store of atomic bombs, but they will acquire them. They do have planes capable of carrying atom bombs to our cities, and, at best, we would not be able to prevent more than one-fourth of their planes from getting through to their targets in a surprise attack.

One may regard these as facts or only as opinions which deserve consideration. The important point is that they add up to a body of information that should be put before the American people. The people are entitled to know just how great the danger is—not in generalities but in terms that are as specific as possible. The Star does not believe that anything is to be gained by withholding information of this kind. It is the lives of the people that are at stake in this business, and they should be shown the grim picture, not from one point of view, but from all responsible points of view. If the Government wants the support of the American people, a support imbued with a sense of urgency, it should see to it that the people are given a maximum, not a minimum, of information concerning the really great danger in which all of us find ourselves.

Texas Capitol of Missouri Doomed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit the following Associated Press item:

MARSHALL, TEX., November 25.—The last landmark here of a strange page in Confederate and midwestern history soon may be wiped out in the name of progress.

The relic is the building which once housed the Missouri government-in-exile during the Civil War. The owner says he'll raze the structure unless he can sell it soon. An apartment house would be erected.

Only recently another landmark of the period—the Missouri Governor's mansion—was torn down.

WEATHERED BUILDING

The capitol building is an unpretentious one-story frame dwelling. It is badly weathered.

There are a number of conflicting stories about selection of Marshall as the Missouri government's seat. The most widely accepted is this:

Missouri Gov. Claiborne F. Jackson and Lt. Gov. Thomas C. Reynolds fled Missouri in 1861 just ahead of Federal troops. They carried the State seal with them.

They first set up their government-in-exile in Camden, Ark., and later in Arkadelphia. Still later they moved to Little Rock.

CLAIBORNE DIES

In late 1862 or early 1863, Governor Claiborne died, and Reynolds succeeded in the office. Reynolds moved to Marshall when Federal troops pushed into the Arkansas area. He remained in Marshall, conducting such business as he could, until Gen. Robert E. Lee surrendered, and the war ended.

Because Missouri had remained in the Union and had chosen a new Governor sympathetic to the Union cause, the official acts of Governors Claiborne and Reynolds later were declared void.

Just before the Governor's mansion was torn down, an attempt was made to preserve it as a historical monument, but the attempt failed.

So Long as the American Legion Annually Elects Men Like Erle Cocke, Jr., and Thus Rebuilds New Bone and Sinew Into Its Mighty Forces, Neither the American Legion, the American Dream of Justice and of Right, nor the American Way of Life Will Ever, Ever Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, always fortunate in the selection of its national chiefs, the American Legion, this year, picked Erle Cocke, Jr.—a colorful, vigorous young leader, whose dramatic war record, as General Marshall so aptly inferred, was second to none.

During Erle Cocke's spectacular battlefield experiences in World War II, he was stabbed by a Gestapo agent, shot by an old woman sniper, hit in the head by a stray bullet, and finally was "executed" by the Nazis in 1945—but lived to tell the story.

Cocke was later lined up by his enraged German captors before a firing squad and mowed down with machine guns. Made a prisoner of war three times, he not alone managed to make his escape but, during his third escape, was responsible for the capture by the French of 592 German soldiers.

When the Germans captured him for the fourth time, decision was made that they put an end to his escapades—and for all time.

A firing squad riddled Cocke in the stomach and lungs. A Nazi officer gave him the coup de grâce with a pistol shot in the back. But Cocke was a tough soldier, and he refused to die.

Villagers who returned hours after the shooting found Cocke still alive. They hid and nursed him for 48 hours until allied troops reached the area. Cocke spent the next 14 months in 27 different hospitals, underwent 17 operations—and made an amazing recovery.

For his extraordinary gallantry in action with Maj. Gen. A. C. (Nuts) McAuliffe's forces, Cocke, then a captain, was awarded the Silver Star, the Purple Heart with three clusters, the Bronze

Star with clusters, and the French Croix de Guerre. He also holds other decorations and citations. He returned from active military service with the rank of major.

In 1946, after his discharge from the Army, he went to the Harvard Business School, where he received his master of business administration degree. At the University of Georgia, he was active in extracurricular activities—was president of the Phi Kappa Literary Society and student manager of athletics.

Following the completion of his college schooling, Cocke became associated with a food-processing company at Dawson which specialized in manufacturing peanut butter. Later, he became executive director of the Agricultural and Industrial Development Board of Georgia. Subsequently, he was retained as general industrial agent of the Central of Georgia Railway Co., and more recently, he becomes assistant to the president of the Delta Air Lines. He also operates a 1,200-acre farm at Dawson, where he raises peanuts and blooded cattle.

So long as the American Legion annually elects men like Erle Cocke, Jr., and thus rebuilds new bone and sinew into its mighty forces, neither the American Legion—the American dream of justice and of right—nor the American way of life will ever, ever die.

I make no overstatement when I say that that great organization has never elected, as national commander, a more self-effacing and patriotic or greater American, or as much of a direct actionist, than Erle Cocke, Jr., a 29-year-old Georgia farmer and stock raiser, businessman and transportation executive, from the little village of Dawson, boasting of a population of 319 persons—and Erle Cocks, Jr.

On Friday, a week ago, Dawson, Ga., held a great homecoming for its beloved first citizen, to commemorate his elevation to that high office. Among the tremendous group of distinguished visitors in attendance on that occasion was the Honorable George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense.

In presenting Erle Cocke, Jr., to those assembled at Dawson, General Marshall stated, in part:

I have a very pleasant duty to perform this afternoon. Maybe it will seem to some of you rather peculiar for me to introduce to you your own most outstanding citizen. But there are matters concerning him that I may realize more clearly than you do.

You know, I need not tell you, that he is a young man of great promise, a clean, fine young man of exceptional character, the very best type for our countrymen to put forward in these very critical days. His war record is familiar to all of you. To a certain extent, it sets him apart from the vast majority of veterans—sets him apart today because of what and how he suffered in the war and what his attitude is at this critical moment regarding the defense of western Europe against the threat of Soviet Russia. He, more than any of us and more than all but a very few, has reason to hate and despise the Nazi regime of Germany. And yet he sinks his personal feelings in recognizing not only the gravity of the present crisis but the compelling necessity it imposes of allowing Germany, we hope a new Germany, we pray a genuinely democratic Germany, to contribute to the defense of western Europe.

That he stands in front of the Legion in demanding action on urgently needed defense measures is to be expected. But that he does it in sober and thoughtful terms is of even greater importance.

I must not take more of your time with serious observations. This is a day of celebration, a day when you can rejoice that in her most generous mood Georgia has presented to the country a great citizen. Your little community of his friends can take some of the credit, which largely belongs to his mother, for contributing to a character which is of the finest gold, the highest quality a man can possess.

Mr. Speaker, with that kind of mettle annually rebuilt into the very bone and sinew of the American Legion, neither the Legion nor the American way of life will ever, ever die.

Later in the evening, and subsequent to Commander Cocke's homecoming at Dawson, the State of Georgia tendered its beloved son, as well as the Honorable Secretary of Defense, a dinner at Fort Benning.

I shall always regard the few hundred words spoken by Gen. George Marshall on that occasion as one of the very great pronouncements of our time. He pointed out clearly, tersely, and lucidly, the history of the national defenses of this country in the last 30 years. He told of the fact that it appeared that cur defenses were most weak when we most felt their need, and of the practical emasculation of all defense activities during the twenties and the thirties, but of its marvelous resurrection in 1939.

No one single word that he uttered was a rebuke to anyone. Rather, it was the military evaluation of a great soldier—a great American—and a great man, submitting his own personal observations and a historic résumé of the actualities of life.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all of my colleagues might avail themselves of this splendid pronouncement—and which is so worthy of consideration by all—made by the Honorable George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense, I am extending my remarks and including the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

General Marshall's talk was as follows:

It is both natural and a happy circumstance that we have come to Fort Benning today to express our affection for Erle Cocke and our faith in his leadership as National Commander of the American Legion.

It is very natural because Fort Benning is the home of the Infantry School and Erle Cocke one of its most distinguished graduates. It was the battle performance of company officers like him that gave this school its great reputation.

Not merely as Secretary of Defense, but as a doughboy of long standing and one-time director of this infantry school, I have a personal pride in Erle Cocke and in the quality of leadership he displayed in combat I predict for him an unusually successful administration as national commander of the American Legion.

This meeting is fortuitous because it gives me the opportunity to make some observations on our military history, which I hope the national commander of the Legion and his people will take to heart.

The history of national defense in this country has been a succession of feasts and famines, that have followed each other in demoralizing sequence. For a Nation that prides itself on its logic, business precocity, and its practical common sense, we have given the world quite an opposite impression of these qualities when it came to the matter of national defense. Speaking frankly, I fear that we have given a demonstration somewhat of emotional instability.

Consider the history of national defense in your own lifetime, particularly in the lifetime of those of you who are veterans of the First World War. There was the unpreparedness of 1916, the magnificent Army and Navy of 1917–18, the demobilization of 1919, the attempt to set up an enduring system of national defense in 1920, followed quickly by its emasculation in the twenties and thirties, the sudden resurrection in 1939, the rise to world preeminence in the Second World War, and an almost violent dip to a new low in the midst of a dangerous world. The drastic demobilization that followed the cessation of hostilities in 1945 is now succeeded by a long swing of the pendulum back to the demand for the immediate build-up of great strength.

It is always when our national defense is weakest that we most feel its need. I recall in 1947, as Secretary of State, when our country urgently needed military strength to support our international responsibilities, I found that my position was supported by but one and one-third infantry divisions in this country available for duty. Yet, as some of you may recall, I was being urged from many sides to pour it on the Soviets and give them hell.

Despite the failings I have just referred to in our swings toward stronger national defense, we have hung up amazing records in making up for lost time. Our great resources, our varied and abundant skills, and our dynamic spirit once geared into action accomplished miracles. But always the cost was great, much of which could have been avoided with a little prudent foresight. And always the aftermath of the battle was followed by recriminations, investigations, and demands for accounting—an accounting for precious lives that might have been saved, for money and resources that might have been used to better advantage, for waste that might have been avoided. And always there has been a drive to find scapegoats to shoulder the blame. The basic error, however, has always been with the American people themselves. The fault has been their refusal to sanction an enduring posture of defense that would discourage aggression, and if war came, would reduce the casualties, the sacrifices, the excessive costs, and the needless waste.

This alternate cycle of strength and weakness in national defense must stop. No longer can we count upon years or even months in which to prepare after the war is on. In Korea for the first time we were called upon to fight the first day. That will certainly be the case thereafter. At best we are to face a period of tension of long duration. We must grow stronger to defend ourselves against the risk of aggression wherever it may develop.

We must work, and hope, and not merely pray that we can avoid another world war. Our people are ready to give our Armed Forces what they need. They will sacrifice. They will produce. They will give us the men and munitions we need. They will probably break many new speed records.

But what then? What will happen after this immediate crisis passes and we are involved in a long and less spectacular tension? Will we again lapse into weakness, an invitation to trouble, or will we read the warning of history and set up a system of defense consistent with our democratic ideals, a system which will give us enduring security in peace and the immediately available potential strength we need for war if war becomes necessary?

I know which of these alternatives Erle Cocke will favor. I am confident that the American Legion will line up solidly behind him. Let us, therefore, take the time now

and make the effort during his administration to set up an enduring system of national defense, a system that will not collapse at every change of wind and temperature, a system that will keep us prepared for any emergency, yet will not sap the economic strength which is of maximum importance to the democratic people of the entire world.

Peace Talks Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL J. WELCH
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of Tuesday, November 28, 1950:

PEACE TALKS IMPERATIVE

Gen. Douglas MacArthur has stated cryptically that the war is out of hand since Red China's intervention. The tangled skein of human events in Asia must be settled on the diplomatic level. The fight has gone beyond war. The Red Chinese delegates are in the United Nations building and a truce on the battlefield should be proclaimed at once while the United Nations authorities discuss and arrive at a workable amnesty for the errors of all concerned in that Far East theater.

Let's forget about saving face. Let's forget about the ethical theory of who is right and who is wrong. Let's get down to the basic factor of saving the lives of those Yanks and their United Nations buddies who are being fed mercilessly into a machine of carnage.

Do you, as a pedestrian, deliberately hurl yourself at an oncoming automobile? Not unless you plan suicide. Do you, as a driver, deliberately hurl yourself at a fast-rolling train? Not unless you plan suicide. And yet we are subjecting our troops to this very act when we issue the order for a handful of infantrymen to march up a road into certain death awaiting them by a massed and heavily armed enemy fresh from its home supply base.

Why shouldn't these stalwart young Americans cry out in bewilderment about our Nation's tardiness in matching the might of a determined foe of unlimited manpower? Why shouldn't these soldiers, many away from their mothers for the very first time, cry out in consternation and ask why we fail to hurl the atomic bomb? Possessing the one weapon that could halt a moving mass of indestructible enemy we continue to issue the order for these intrepid young men to step up and be murdered.

The showdown is here. Our general himself states that the situation is beyond the ability of our men to meet it. Pea-shooters can't knock out Stalin tanks. A dozen men can't vanquish hundreds of men. It is the atom bomb or diplomatic conversations. We have rejected the former. Let's get busy on the latter. In the meanwhile call back the men from the fighting area.

During the few moments you spent reading this, American boys were being slaughtered on the icy stretches of Asia. They never will breathe again. But others will breathe if we stop the debacle at once. There is no choice. Face be forgotten and the lives of young men remembered. Let the diplomats attend to their stern assignment without delay.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on legislation to extend the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 in the RECORD of July 18, 1950, incident to the Korean crisis, I quoted from two great European students of world affairs: Alexis de Tocqueville and Lord Palmerston. These two, writing in 1835 and 1853, respectively, clearly foresaw the trends toward events which in recent years we have witnessed and in which we are now participating. Commodore M. C. Perry, writing in 1856, as recorded in my extension of remarks in the RECORD of July 19, 1950, likewise foresaw these events with even greater precision.

Though the basic ideas of their predictions remain, the technique of their execution has been considerably developed since those times. An important contribution on this subject by Rear Adm. Bern Anderson, United States Navy, retired, was published in the November 1950 issue of the United States Naval Institute Proceedings, entitled "Russia's New Kind of War."

The article carries the following biographical sketch of its author:

A graduate of the Naval Academy in the class of 1921, Admiral Anderson retired from active duty in June, having completed 20 years of commissioned service, and is now doing graduate work in history at Harvard University. During his long and varied naval career, he served with the Asiatic fleet at the time of the Chino-Japanese crisis, participated in various operations of World War II, and, prior to retirement, was head of the Department of Strategy and Tactics at the Naval War College, Newport, R. I.

As this paper contains much that has not been appreciated by the people of our Nation as it should be I am including its full text, with the recommendation that it be read by every Member of Congress:

RUSSIA'S NEW KIND OF WAR

(By Rear Adm. Bern Anderson, U. S. Navy (retired))

I

War, according to dictionary definition, is "the state or fact of exerting violence or force against another; now only against a state or other politically organized body; especially, a contest by force between two or more nations or states carried on for any purpose; armed conflict of sovereign powers; declared and open hostilities."

Should anyone prefer some other definition to this one, it will surely contain the thoughts that war is an openly recognized and formally declared state of relationships between nations and that it is characterized by the use of armed force.

The use of war for settling international differences has given rise during the past two centuries to a large but rather loose body of rules called international law. The purposes underlying the development of these rules have been to regulate the actual conduct of hostilities between armed forces, to afford protection to private citizens and property in belligerent areas, and to establish the duties and rights of neutrals.

It is obvious today that international law as it has been developed up to the present time has failed to keep the conduct of war within controllable bounds. Why should this be so? There can be no simple answer, but it is helpful in understanding the question to trace some of the trends in the conduct of war in recent history.

The invention of the steam engine and the beginning of the machine age about a century and a half ago opened a limitless field for the exercise of man's ingenuity. Before that event the horse was his strongest source of power, and his travel over the earth's surface was limited to the speed and capacity of the horse. At sea he was at the mercy of the winds. With the steam engine he was able to harness and convert to his service—power. By the beginning of the twentieth century the development of power sources included electricity and the internal-combustion engine, with all of which man was able to produce increasingly complex instruments and machines to serve his desires. The machine age transformed large areas of the world from an agrarian to an industrial economy and produced a spiraling complexity in human life that today shows no signs of abating. What we live in is an endless cycle of new products, new uses, and new requirements for services, constantly relieving man of the need for physical labor but making him more and more dependent upon the machine.

Could all of this remarkable development have taken place without being reflected in the weapons of war? Even if an affirmative answer could be supported, it is obvious that that spiraling trend has been paralleled. Along with more complex and more powerful weapons came requirements for more men to operate them; in turn larger armies and navies, and now air forces.

By 1914, as World War I was soon to demonstrate, this spiral had expanded so much that the waging of war on a major scale required what we have come to know as national mobilization. To use, operate, and supply the powerful armies and navies that had been built up, natural resources and industry had to be brought into the chain of the military effort. That war required a huge expenditure of resources and materials with two major results. First was the tremendous economic cost of conducting war, not only for the actual materials expended, but also in the disruption of the normal economies of the various nations by the diversion of industrial capacity to munitions production. Secondly was the devastation and destruction of real property in the path of military operations. These effects raised a serious question: Can the expenditure of material and manpower resources now required for the conduct of war be balanced by the possible gains to be expected?

World War I is an appropriate starting point for a closer examination of the trends with which we live today. There are four major developments of the First World War that had a deep impact and significance upon the conduct of future warfare.

The first and more obvious development was that of the employment of the airplane as a vehicle of war. Apart from its military value, the use of bombing aircraft in that war opened a new field in international law. After the war, commissions tried to evolve a code for aerial warfare, comparable in scope to the Hague conventions for land and naval warfare. While such a code was produced in the early '30s, it was never ratified by any of the major powers.

The second major development was the use of the submarine on a large scale against enemy commerce. Its use against merchant shipping, and its successes, had significant results. Whole sections of international law

as it then existed, such as visit and search, and the safeguarding of passengers and crew before sinking a prize, became obsolescent, since the submarine was unable to observe them. Here also in the postwar period efforts were made to control and even outlaw the use of submarines, but again international agreement could not be reached.

The third major development of World War I was that of the self-propelled vehicle, symbolized by the tank. This brought to land warfare a combination of mobility, protection through armor, and fire power. With the tank, land operations assumed a new character of speed, flexibility, and power that could not have been attained without the tank or some similar vehicle.

The fourth development that had a significant influence on the conduct of warfare was that of radio and rapid communications. The ability to communicate widely and rapidly reduced the elements of time and space materially for the fighting forces. It also provided the medium for introducing the widespread use of a nonviolent weapon, psychological warfare. Radio communications were especially influential in changing the conduct of naval operations. At last there was the means for quickly disseminating intelligence to commanders at sea, for coordinating the movements of forces not in sight contact, and for initiating changes in plans without delay.

Possibly poison gas should also be listed as a major development of World War I. Certainly it was a spectacular one, and it further complicated the problems of securing international agreement regulating the conduct of war. Although not used in World War II, it was possessed by all belligerents, and from its potentialities we have seen suggested the possible development of comparable weapons such as radiological and bacteriological concentrations.

In the years immediately following World War I, spurred by the terrific economic cost and destruction caused by that war, a number of international efforts to limit and control the conduct of war were undertaken. The League of Nations, the naval limitation of armaments agreements, the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and the conventions seeking to codify rules regulating the use of aircraft and submarines are examples. None of these was even moderately successful, even though each aimed at the desirable goal of preventing or curtailing the huge costs of another war. Possibly they failed because, consciously or otherwise, they were deisgned largely to preserve ninteenth century standards without realizing fully the impact of twentieth century developments. Hampered not only by involved technical questions, they were attempted during the renaissance of the dictatorship type of government, first in Russia, then in Italy, and finally in Germany and Japan.

II

It is sometimes said that the next war is fought with the weapons developed in the last war. Or, in a more cynical vein, that we spend our time between wars trying to figure out how to fight the last one better. In September 1939 the world was startled by the speed and thoroughness with which Hitler's armies conquered and crushed the Poles. In doing this Hitler unveiled a technique which soon came to be known as the blitzkrieg. But the blitzkrieg was more than just a new technique; it was Hitler's solution to the problem of how to fight a war without prohibitive costs in manpower and resources.

The blitzkrieg was a coordinated aerial and mechanized ground attack which possessed the qualities of heavy fire power, great mobility, and concentration. By means of highly developed rapid communications the movements and operations of several mechanized columns and their supporting aircraft could be coordinated. Thus, by the ingenious combination of three of the major developments of World War I, the Germans created a fighting team of tremendous power and capabilities. The basic idea may not have been entirely new, for Ghengis Khan produced something with comparable capabilities for his time. But the blitzkrieg as such could not have been developed as it was without first having the mechanized vehicle and tank, and rapid communications.

With the overrunning of the Low Countries and France, this technique appeared to be all but invincible. It remained for the Russians, trading space for time, to resist the blitzkrieg successfully. In doing this the Russians also revealed the basic weakness in Hitler's strategy. Counting upon the blitzkrieg to achieve his objectives in a short war, he was unprepared with an alternative or for a long campaign when the blitzkrieg did not succeed.

In Norway Hitler produced another new technique in warfare, something in the order of a modern adaptation of the Trojan Horse, the fifth column. This same device was a material factor in the quick defeat of France.

World War II was also the testing ground for still another new form of warfare—strategic aerial bombardment. For the first time the enemy's production sources could be brought under direct attack, without first dealing with the defending surface forces. In part it sought to gain to a greater degree a result comparable to the older naval blockade: to check or choke off the enemy's supplies. That its contribution to the over-all effort was significant is well recognized, but of greater significance was that the uniformed man was no longer the only active participant in war and battle. To some degree the entire population, and especially the munitions worker, had become an active member of the fighting team. Large scale aerial bombardment adds greatly to the total destruction of physical property, and to the general economic cost of war.

The airplane also took a leading part in naval warfare, with the carrier providing the mobile base. One result of this general employment of aircraft in warfare has been to erase the importance of the former natural barrier and boundary between land and sea warfare, the shore line.

The one great development of World War II, that dwarfs all others in significance, was the atomic bomb. Introduced too late for its full capabilities and limitations to be demonstrated, there has been a wide range of speculation and discussion since the war of what might be its effect in the future. Certainly its destructive power so greatly exceeds that of any earlier man-made weapon that it is necessary to consider most fully and carefully the implications of its possible future use. Its widespread use in war could conceivably produce so much devastation and destruction that the economic structure of the world could not recover from its paralyzing effects for generations, if at all.

We have become so accustomed to extensive destruction of property as a byproduct of war that there is a growing tendency to use destruction as a measure of accomplishment in war. This is the reverse of the ideas which the formulators of international law in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries tried to codify. While all of the developments of the Machine Age have contributed to the breaking down of the objectives of international law, the airplane must accept a large share of the credit.

This apparently inevitable trend presents us with a problem whose solution will require the coolest and most penetrating thought. Does this growing tendency to measure results in warfare in terms of destruction point to a conclusion that the nations of the world can no longer afford to use warfare, as it has been developed, as a means of enforcing national or state policy?

What this trend means is that the total war of today involves the whole nation, for any place that can be reached by aircraft might well be in the active theater of military operations. Increased mechanization in all fields of warfare also contributes to this general expansion of the theaters of active operations. If continued, war of the future will place even greater demands on the sources and processing of materials, and tend to erase more and more the distinction that once existed between the civilian and the man in uniform.

This trend is the root of our problem. For, returning to our question, it suggests that the destructiveness of future war will increase, much as it has in the past. Is the world faced with an insolvable dilemma then, or is there some alternative? Assuming that our future efforts to eliminate or control war as the means for settling international disputes will be no more successful than they have in the past, is there a way in which wars can be fought without paying the tremendous price that we have had to pay in recent wars?

As has already been pointed out, Hitler produced one answer in the blitzkrieg. In the long run, however, it was the use or overuse of this very technique that brought on the devastation of World War II. But even before Hitler had conceived of his answer to this question, there had appeared in the world a new philosophy and a new form of warfare. While we have seen it at work for 30 years, it has only been since it has made great gains in the postwar period that the rest of the world has begun to realize how sinister, dangerous, and new it really is. There are many reasons for this, but one of the chief ones is that it has approached the subject of warfare in its own way, quite different from our conventional ideas on the subject.

The present alinement of the world into two hostile coalitions becomes something totally new when we examine the guiding force that is the root of this alinement. To get at the meaning of this force we must examine carefully the origin and nature of communism.

III

Though superficially resembling the Axis coalition of World War II, the present Communist world is quite different in structure. Each of the Axis members was an independent state within the framework of nations that make up the world, with each retaining full sovereignty within the system. Rome and Tokyo, for example, did not look to Berlin for leadership. The Axis was a loosely knit coalition of convenience, and its members distrusted each other to a high degree. Even during the conduct of the war Axis military collaboration was scanty.

The Communist bloc, on the other hand, while now composed of nations, looks to a central body for guidance. Moscow is the heart of this system and daily events indicate all too clearly that the so-called satellites are subject to its will. The leaders of this system are devoted to a doctrine which rejects the idea of independent nations and transcends national boundaries. Its openly stated objective is to bring the entire world into its system and under its control.

If so, how is this to be accomplished? For the answer to this we must attempt to fathom a philosophy and system of thinking that is quite different from any that has guided the development of what we call the Western World.

Communism and its basic philosophy was founded by Karl Marx in the middle of the nineteenth century. The philosophy itself is called "dialectic materialism"; the "dialectic" in this case being a system of logic developed by Hegel, and the "materialism" being derived from Marx's contention that history is determined and life regulated by economic conditions and developments

rather than social or political ones. It produces a system of thought processes peculiarly characteristic of the philosophy, and one very convenient to its disciples, for with it one can rationalize almost any point of view that he chooses.

Communist literature stresses the so-called "contradictions" of capitalism. Marx argued that wars were inevitable under the capitalist system, since that system required periodic wars in order to preserve itself. This is claimed to be a key "contradiction" of capitalism. But dialectic materialism cannot recognize, aparently, the actual contradiction in Marx's assertion that the increased use of machinery in industry could only lead to increased enslavement and lowered standard of living of the working class. While it can show that real democracy cannot exist under the capitalist system, it can prove, to its own satisfaction, that 99.9 percent of the eligible voters, casting an affirmative vote for a single slate of candidates in an election, is an example of the purest form of "democracy."

Strange and illogical as this system may appear to most of us, Marx's doctrines attracted a number of disciples, among the early ones being a group of Russian Bolsheviks. Communism and the Communist Party were illegal in Czarist Russia, and the Bolsheviks were of necessity a clandestine group, with some of them in Russia, some in exile. Forced to work underground, they became highly skilled and trained conspirators. By engineering disturbances within Russia, such as the revolution of 1905, they created dissension, attracted recruits, and became a well-organized and close-knit group.

Their real opportunity came with the collapse of the Czarist regime in 1917. For several months after the Czar's abdication various groups in Russia tried to form a Socialist government, but they were improvised groups and weak in organization and experience. The leader of the Bolsheviks, Lenin, was in exile in Switzerland when the collapse occurred, and it was not until his return to Russia that the Bolsheviks began openly to take part in the effort to form a government. The strongest weapon they had at the time was a fully developed program. By October 1917, Russian calendar, they had gained sufficient support to seize and thereafter hold the government. Many of the present-day leaders of Soviet Russia, including Stalin, were members of this original group.

The current philosophy of the Communist Party is the interpretation of Marx by Lenin and Stalin, the familiar "Leninist-Stalinist" line of Marxism. Lenin had an extremely agile mind and he was a copious writer. Much of his writing was devoted to rationalizing his interpretation of Marx, and of showing how earlier interpreters had failed to perceive Marx's true meaning.

Differences of opinion over Marx's works, even among the faithful, were easy to develop, for he tried to cover the whole range of human experience. Much of his text, as a result, is vague and capable of almost any desired interpretation. The fact that Communist writers could differ so widely is a good illustration of the flexibility of dialectic materialism as a philosophy. Even in the realistic battle for power that followed Lenin's death, and which led eventually to the assassination of Trotzky, the basis for the differences was the proper interpretation of Lenin's ideas. The same has been true in the periodic purges that have taken place since, including the dispute with Tito. It is essential to realize, in trying to understand the actions and statements of Communists, the firm grip which this philosophy has upon them. It is this fanaticism which sometimes causes communism to be likened to a religion, although it is completely antireligious in character.

The basic line of communism is found in Stalin's book, Problems of Leninism, containing many of his essays, speeches, and reports to the central committee, from 1924 to 1939. There is no indication that the events of World War II have caused any material change in this doctrine. Several editions of this work have been published in English in Moscow, and the book is readily available in the United States. Studied closely, Problems of Leninism gives us a clear picture of the nature, objectives, and methods of communism. The quotations which follow are taken mainly from the first part of the 1947 reprint of the eleventh edition—some 1924 lectures entitled "Foundations of Leninism."

Stalin defines Leninism as "Marxism of the era of imperialism, and of the proletarian revolution. * * * Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the proletariat in particular." The proletariat in this ideology refers to the masses of the underprivileged and the working class. Everyone else, with certain exceptions in the intellectual field, falls into the bourgeois, capitalist, or imperialist class, mortal enemies of the proletariat.

"Imperialism is the omnipotence of the monopolist trusts and syndicates, of the banks and financial oligarchy, in the industrial countries. In the fight against this omnipotence, the customary methods of the working class—trade unions and cooperative organizations, parliamentary parties, and the parliamentary struggle—have proved to be totally inadequate."

This, he asserts, is the first contradiction between labor and capital. Seeking to improve the conditions of the working class through such means as labor unions, and laws enacted through normal legislative processes, have failed. Another means of achieving this goal must be found.

Other contradictions cited by Stalin are that wars among imperialist powers have become inevitable, and that the exploitation of vast colonial areas and peoples by the imperialist powers has created a proletariat in these areas.

In the modern world: "In other words, imperialism has brought it about, not only that revolution has become a practical inevitability, but also that favorable conditions have been created for a direct onslaught upon the citadels of capitalism." Further, "The proletarian revolution, its movement, its scope, and its achievements acquire flesh and blood only through the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Quoting Lenin, Stalin says that "The dictatorship of the proletariat is a most determined and most ruthless war waged by the new class against a more powerful enemy, the bourgeoisie, whose resistance is increased tenfold by its overthrow; that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a persistent struggle—bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative—against the forces and traditions of the old society."

A more forthright statement of the nature of this revolution would be hard to imagine. It should be carefully noted that it is directed against all of the old society, and that its weapons are not only military, but also economic, educational, and administrative forces.

"It need hardly be proved," points out Stalin, "that there is not the slightest possibility of carrying out these tasks in a short period, of doing all of this in a few years. Therefore * * * the transition from capitalism to communism must not be regarded as a fleeting period of superrevolutionary acts and decrees, but as an entire historical era, replete with civil wars and external conflicts, with persistent organizational work and economic construction, with advances and retreats, victories and defeats."

He develops that this revolution is not merely a change in personalities in the government, or a change of cabinet, but rather it is an entirely new system, which will arise on the ruins of the old bourgeois state. This means: "Briefly, the dictatorship of the proletariat is the rule—unrestricted by law and based on force—of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a rule enjoying the sympathy and support of the laboring and exploited masses."

From this Stalin draws two conclusions:

"First, * * * the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be 'complete" democracy, democracy for all, for the rich as well as for the poor; the dictatorship of the proletariat 'must be a state that is democratic in a new way—for the proletarians and propertyless in general—and dictatorial in a new way—against the bourgeoisie.' "

"Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, democracy is proletarian democracy, the democracy of the exploited majority, based upon the restriction of the rights of the exploiting minority and directed against this minority."

Does not this definition of democracy go far to explain the difficulties that have arisen in the world since the close of the war when the establishment of a "democratic" government in Germany, for example, has been under discussion?

Stalin's second conclusion, from the nature of the proletarian revolution, was that: "The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot arise as the result of the peaceful development of bourgeois society and of bourgeois democracy; it can arise only as the result of the smashing of the bourgeois state machine, the bourgeois army, the bourgeois bureaucratic machine, the bourgeois police."

"In other words, the law of violent proletarian revolution, the law of the smashing of the bourgeois state machine as a preliminary condition for such a revolution, is an inevitable law of the revolutionary movement in the imperialist countries of the world."

Although not brought out directly in the above quotations, there is a sharp distinction between imperialist wars and the proletarian revolution. That is why Communist leaders can say, in what to them may be good faith, that the Communist world and the Western World can collaborate without resort to war—imperialist war, that is, something quiet different and distinct from the proletarian revolution.

The organization required to accomplish the substitution of proletarian for bourgeois democracy is the Soviets. This is "* * * the most internationalist of all State organizations in class society, for, since it destroys every kind of national oppression and rests on the collaboration of the laboring masses of the various nationalities, it facilitates * * * the amalgamation of these masses into a single state union."

In using the term "Soviet" here Stalin is speaking of the revolution as a whole, not alone of Russia. The single state union refers to eventually bringing the entire world into this system.

"The Soviet power, by combining the legislative and executive functions in a single state organization and replacing territorial electoral constituencies by industrial units, factories, and mills, thereby directly links the workers * * * with the apparatus of state administration."

Here we see the industrial unit replacing the geographical unit as the basis for political organization. This emphasizes the eventual goal of eliminating nations as the components of the world system.

This revolution is to be carried out by the application of the strategy and tactics of Leninism. For these terms also we must look for different definitions and meanings.

"Strategy is the determination of the direction of the main blow of the proletariat at a given stage of the revolution, the elaboration of a corresponding plan for the disposition of the revolutionary forces (the main

and secondary reserves), the fight to carry out this plan throughout the given stage of the revolution."

Reserves, as used here, do not refer to reserves of military forces, as we might normally think of the term. These "reserves" are defined as proletarians in neighboring countries, dissident colonial elements, wars between imperialist countries, and such similar conditions as might be turned to the advantage of the revolution.

"Tactics," on the other hand, "are the determination of the line of conduct of the proletariat in the comparatively short period of the flow or ebb of the movement, of the rise or decline of the revolution, the fight to carry out this line by means of replacing old forms of struggle and organization by new ones, old slogans by new ones, by combining these forms, etc."

"Tactics deal with the forms of struggle and the forms of organization of the proletariat, with their changes and combinations. During a given stage of the revolution tactics may change several times, depending upon the flow or ebb, the rise or decline, of the revolution."

From this we can see that tactics is concerned with the employment of all types of forces, covert as well as overt. All of these forces are to be used to the end of supporting the strategic plan, whether at any instant the revolution be advancing or retreating.

This leads us to the role of the Communist Party in this revolution. Stalin points out that an army at war needs a general staff unless it courts certain defeat. Equally the proletariat needs a general staff if it is to survive. "The working class without a revolutionary party is an army without a general staff. The party is the general staff of the proletariat."

In developing this thought further Stalin shows that the party is not only the vanguard of the proletariat, it is also a part of that class, the organized part of that class, the leader of the class.

"But the party is not merely the sum of party organizations. The party at the same time represents a single system of these organizations, their formal amalgamation into a single whole, with higher and lower leading bodies, with the subordination of the minority to the majority, with practical decisions binding on all members of the party. Without these conditions the party cannot be a single organized whole capable of exercising systematic and organized leadership in the struggle of the working class."

Here the idea of the general staff of the revolution is expanded a step further. The party is organized into echelons, leading to a directing head at the top. Also, there is no geographical limit to the scope of the party and its activities. "Communist Party, United States of America," for example, does not mean a separate political group in the United States. The United States of America here is simply a geographical designation for a subdivision of the larger body of the whole party.

"But the party is not the only organization of the working class. The proletariat has also a number of other organizations without which it cannot properly wage the struggle against capital: trade unions, cooperative societies, factory and works organizations, parliamentary groups, nonparty women's associations, the press, cultural and educational organizations, youth leagues, revolutionary fighting organizations (in time of open revolutionary action), Soviets of deputies as the form of state organization (if the proletariat is in power), etc. The overwhelming majority of these organizations are nonparty, and only a certain part of them adhere directly to the party, or represent its offshoots."

With such a diversity of supporting nonparty organizations to be directed, the need for central leadership is recognized. Obviously the party, the general staff, is the only organization capable of exercising this leadership.

"That is why Lenin says that the party is 'the highest form of proletarian class organization,' whose political leadership must extend to every other form of organization of the proletariat."

"That is why the opportunist theory of the 'independence' and 'neutrality' of the nonparty organizations, which breeds independent members of parliament and journalists isolated from the party, narrow-minded trade unionists and cooperative society officials grown smug and philistine, is wholly incompatible with the theory and practice of Leninism."

A further characteristic of this party is that of the iron discipline which exists within the party. This does not exclude differences of opinion or discussion within party circles, for those are considered necessary and to be expected. "But after a contest has been closed, after criticism has been exhausted and a decision has been arrived at, unity of will and unity of action of all party members are the necessary conditions without which neither party unity nor iron discipline in the party is conceivable."

Still another characteristic of the Communist Party concerns the tolerance of factions within the party. According to Stalin: "the parties of the Communist International, which base their activities on the task of achieving the dictatorshp of the proletariat, cannot afford to be 'liberal' or to permit freedoms of factions.

"Hence Lenin's demand for the 'complete elimination of all factionalism,' and the 'immediate dissolution of all groups, without exception, that had been formed on the basis of various platforms,' on pain of 'unconditional and immediate expulsion from the party'."

If we substitute "Cominform" for "Communist International" in the above quotation, we get an idea of the significance of the current differences between Tito and the Cominform.

Finally, Stalin stresses: "The party becomes strong by purging itself of opportunist elements."

In his Report on the Work of the Central Committee to the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU, in March 1939, Stalin reported that there were 1,874,488 party members represented at the Seventeenth Congress (1934). After reviewing the incidents and purges of the intervening years, he stated: "The number of party members represented at this, the Eighteenth Congress, is about 1,600,000, which is 270,000 less than were represented at the Seventeenth Congress. But there is nothing bad in that. On the contrary, it is all to the good, for the party strengthens itself by clearing its ranks of dross." Boasting in this way of purging at least 270,000 of the faithful is an indication of the strength of the iron discipline that exists in the party and of its ruthless use of the purge.

The above quotations from Problems of Leninism make it clear that the Communist Party is far from being a political party in the sense that we know political parties in the United States. It is international, or rather nationless in character, it is organized along military lines with echelons comparable to military command within the party, it is ruled by a ruthless internal discipline, and the party determines who its members shall be. It is a self-perpetuating group, which, in the final analysis, is responsible to no one but itself. Of course, Stalin points out that as the revolution is completed, and there are no longer social classes in the world, then states will wither and disappear, and so also will the party wither and disappear. Is it reasonable to assume, however, that there will no longer be the need for management or direction for socialized agriculture, manufactures, or transportation? For the Soviets?

From the above it seems obvious that the Communist Party is more military than political in nature and organization, but with some fundamental differences from that which we usually think of as military organizations. The scope of its operations goes far beyond the organized armed forces, which are only one element of the forces which it directs. All of these forces, including the governmental machinery of the Soviet, are not a part of the party but, by and large, merely instruments of the party. In addition to the overt employment of the armed forces, it uses economic, educational, and administrative forces to achieve its aims. These are largely the covert forces of the revolution, using the weapons of propaganda, the fifth column, creating civil disturbances, engineering riots, seizing power in labor unions, sabotage, and other forms of subversion. If we think of this as another solution to the problem of how to fight and win a war without prohibitive costs, its potentialities certainly cannot be minimized.

IV

Should communism continue to spread and gradually engulf the world, what might be the effect on that world as we now know it?

The threat is made by a small but highly organized group whose avowed intention is to obliterate completely the institutions of our civilization as we know them and to replace them with a system of its own design. In this new system there would be no personal liberties, no individual enterprise, no choice of political franchise, and no harboring of divergent political opinion. Most of all, since all forms of administration would be under the control of this self-perpetuating group, there would be little possibility of changing the system.

The ultimate stateless world envisaged by the Communists would eliminate national sovereignties and the independent states that now make up the family of nations. Our present institutions for the conduct of international relations, trade and commerce, the exchange of cultural ideas and objects, and the developments of science, would all be replaced by a centrally regulated system reaching into every facet of human life. It would be directed by a self-selected group who are and would be accountable to none but itself. "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," said Marx. Who determines what each man's ability is? Who determines what his needs are? The answer seems obvious—only the party.

Stalin's view of the role of the Communist Party as the general staff of the proletarian revolution means that the party has borrowed a military institution and adapted its methods to include the direction of all of the affairs of mankind. It is proclaimed to be the all-knowing, all-powerful, agent or trustee of the proletariat, untouchable, and not subject to external criticism or challenge. But, so long as any systems exist in the world which are alien to this one, they are enemies of communism and are targets for ultimate destruction. As Stalin has pointed out, this revolution is an entire historical era, involving victories and defeats, advances and retreats, consolidations, and compromises.

Communist literature stresses the strategical and tactical use of the retreat, the compromise, and reform programs. In each case, while a retreat or compromise might appear on the surface to be a concession to capitalism, actually such a retreat or compromise will be so engineered that ultimately it will be converted to a weapon of the revolution against capitalism. That is why there is little chance of serious efforts on the part of the Communist world to get along with the other democratic world. That is why advocates of some form of superstate in which

the Communist states would form a cooperating part cannot hope to be successful. What is really being asked for here is that Communists should abandon their whole basic philosophy. With the power and territory that the Communist Party has achieved in the world since 1917, could anyone believe that it would now voluntarily abandon such a program?

Since the forces and weapons of communism include all possible kinds, overt and covert, under the direction of its party or general staff, our fundamental beliefs concerning international law and relations are not only challenged but must be critically reviewed. Our belief that a treaty of peace is binding, or that a declaration of war is a prerequisite to hostilities, for example, needs reexamination. We should keep in mind that it is a fundamental strategy of communism that any agreement or compromise with its enemy is made with the reservation that eventually it will be used as a weapon against that enemy.

The very basis of the proletarian revolution is that it is a continuing struggle, waged unceasingly until the complete destruction of capitalism is accomplished. Under such conditions, and with communism having such strength in the world as it does, there can no longer be a condition of peace in the sense that we normally think of the term. Even though open hostilities do not exist this revolution is being prosecuted actively all of the time. The nature of the movement is such that it denies that peace, as we know it, can exist in the world. Peace, to the Communist, can only mean complete acceptance of and subservience to his system.

How, then, does the institution that we call war fit into this new situation? As Stalin emphasizes, violence is but one form of this revolutionary struggle. In terms of economic effort, of manpower, or of treasure, it is certainly the most expensive way of settling international disputes. Does it not seem reasonable that this method will be avoided when other weapons in the Communist arsenal produce progressively favorable results? By creating an organization which requires its membership to place itself above all geographical or national considerations, with sole loyalty to that organization, and by developing and using such weapons as creating riots and internal strife, propaganda, and subversion, the Communists have produced a system which is really new in this world. It is, it should be repeated, a system which adapts the principles of military command, discipline, organization, and strategy and tactics, to the direction of all human affairs.

Under this system the use of armed forces to gain its ends will be governed by carefully calculated studies seeking to determine if the use of armed force is, in fact, the best way to achieve the desired objective. Alternatively these same studies will determine if the same result can be obtained by other means, perhaps requiring more time, but at less cost. If armed force is selected, its use, and the rules for its use, will be determined upon the basis of how it will best serve the purposes of the revolution.

Leaders of the Soviet Union often refer to their armed forces as defensive forces, maintained to protect their domain from imperialist attack. This could be so, and if so, the covert weapons at their disposal might well be their chief offensive weapons. In this connection it is well to recall that Chinese, Czech, and Polish nationals, but Communists first, engineered the coups that resulted in the present regimes in their countries.

When we consider all of the implications of this system, we might well ask ourselves if we had better not reexamine our understanding of the term "war." With the conventional forms of warfare, the use of armed forces fighting with the recognized weapons of warfare, we are probably as well informed as any. With the use of economic, educational, administrative, and psychological forces, mobilized and directed to achieve the same results as war, we have much to learn. Collectively, such weapons, skillfully directed, could be more destructive, over a period of time, than any of the weapons of conventional warfare.

Since these weapons are being used against us at all times they are actually a new form of warfare for which no conventions or rules of international conduct exist. Viewed in this light, the cold war, of which we read and hear so much, has new meaning. If we accept what appear to be clearly stated lines of strategy and tactics, the cold war is but one form of a greater war which is constantly being waged, regardless of whether or not the Armed Forces take an active part.

If we recognize clearly the nature of the situation which faces us, our own program for combatting it can be built on firm foundations. Today our civilization and its institutions are facing a challenge not of their own choosing, and initially it gives the initiative to the opposition. To the Communist, by his own rules, this attack can only result eventually in the complete destruction of our form of civilization, and its replacement by the Communist system. With wisdom this challenge can be met.

As a main step in meeting the challenge then, let us realize that the definition of war, as quoted earlier, is no longer adequate. Rather, for a large part of the world, war is the proletarian revolution which, in Lenin's words, "is a most determined and most ruthless war waged by the new class against a more powerful cnemy, the bourgeoisie"; and that that war "is a persistent struggle—bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative—against the forces and traditions of the old society."

Whether we like it or not, that is the kind of war that we must face, and be prepared for.

Abetting Doctor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to again call the attention of the House to the selfish and short-sighted attitude of the American Medical Association in its opposition to aid for medical colleges. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Toledo Blade:

ABETTING DOCTOR SHORTAGE

By a 9 to 8 margin, the House Commerce Committee has voted to shelve a 5-year program to provide $250,000,000 in Federal funds for the expansion of training facilities for doctors, dentists, and nurses, and to assist students. It is an indefensible decision in the light of the possibility that another major war may create a heavy military demand for men and women trained in these professions.

Behind the measure's defeat lurks the familiar shadow of the American Medical Association, which opposed it on the grounds that the supply of doctors already is adequate to the Nation's needs.

That was a questionable conclusion when the bill was first introduced some months ago. It's sheer nonsense when the potential need for medical personnel is considered.

There has long been a suspicion that the AMA is engaged in a conspiracy to limit the number of practicing physicians. One bit of evidence to confirm that suspicion was the arbitrary attitude taken by most affiliated medical societies toward granting licenses to European refugees. Another was the strict quota system imposed on existing medical schools, limiting the number of students they might enroll. If these weren't enough to establish the case against the AMA, its attitude toward Federal aid to enlarge training facilities should be the clincher.

Congress Must Direct Course Unless Truman Drops Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal of November 29, 1950:

CONGRESS MUST DIRECT COURSE UNLESS TRUMAN DROPS ACHESON

Whatever may have been the plans of the present Eighty-first Congress to side-step any important action during its final days, the abruptly changed situation in Korea demands undivided attention right now.

General MacArthur's sudden turn from an expression of confidence in victory of the United Nations forces before Christmas, to a warning that this is an entirely new war, gives emphasis to the long-held impression that the Korean fighting is merely incidental to the Moscow-inspired grand plan for eventual Communist domination of all Asia, then Europe, and finally the Western Hemisphere, with the United States as the richest prize of all.

Hope for defeat of this grandiose objective lies in development of strength within the United Nations (free from Russian obstruction) to either bring about a negotiated peace or to build sufficient military power to win a third world war.

As in Korea, however, chief burden of defense against Communist aggression rests upon the United States, and it is the extent to which other friendly nations have been encouraged to depend upon this country for leadership and for armament, manpower, and supplies of all sorts, that poses problems with which the present national administration seems totally unable to cope.

Judged by the record of the past few years, no confidence can be placed in the decisions of either President Truman or Secretary of State Dean Acheson in meeting such a situation as now exists, and, regrettable as it is, Mr. Truman has stubbornly refused to call to his aid some of the competent advisers who would have been helpful in formulating a definite foreign policy which might have prevented much of the present turmoil in the Far East and been beneficial in easing the tension in Europe, where the threat of further Communist aggression hangs heavily over the still independent nations.

It is pointless to stress, at this time, the fumbling that has been done by President Truman and his "crony" advisers since the end of World War II, but what is to be done from now on is vitally important to all Americans and to the people of many other countries.

Let us hope—and pray—that voices raised in Congress, even during this brief session, will be of such vigor and earnestness as to steer the ship of state out of the dangerous waters which now threaten its engulfment, and that President Truman can be made to see his need for advice by men who are above political motivation and who have broad knowledge of national and world affairs.

The slaughter of thousands of young Americans in Korea, with other thousands of wounded GI's doomed to lives of suffering, and the ghastly potentialities of another world conflict, present a situation which demands use of the best brains that have been developed in this country—and men who possess such brains would undoubtely respond willingly to the President's appeal for advice in this hour of national peril.

The Internal Security Act—6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to present the sixth of a series of editorials from the Milwaukee Journal on the Internal Security Act. The following editorial appeared on October 30:

THE NTERNAL SECURITY ACT—6

(This is the sixth of a series of editorials discussing the Internal Security Act of 1950, the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill.)

One of the faulty provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 must have saboteurs waiting in happy anticipation.

It directs the Secretary of Defense to list and publish all defense facilities. This, in the words of President Truman's veto message, will hand to saboteurs on a silver platter information for which they "would be willing to spend years of effort seeking to find out."

Under the bill the list to be prepared and published by the Secretary of Defense—and posted in the facilities listed—will include everything from shipyards to now secret atomic energy laboratories, from defense plants to supersecret uranium mines. The purpose of the list will be to indicate where Communists and others dangerous to our Government cannot work.

Supporters of the bill claim that the Secretary of Defense has discretion under the law and need not list facilities he considers too secret for public knowledge. That argument makes the law all the more ridiculous. The supersecret plants, then, will not be barred from hiring Communists under the new law. This gives us the weird situation in which top secret facilities are not given protection from job seeking Communists, while less vital plants are given such protection.

The fact is that we already have ample means of keeping security risks from working in vital defense plants—particularly our laboratories and on supersecret production. The new law adds nothing to security and provides a readily accessible directory to our important defense facilities.

The law, as one Congressman put it, will be "providing a handbook for every enemy in the country * * * telling him where to go to commit sabotage."

Hubert E. Howard, former chairman of the Munitions Board, attacked this section of the law some time ago. It will, he said, be a threat to national security. There's no doubt about it.

The Secretary of Defense, in addition to being directed to provide a list of our defense facilities for any use anyone wants to put it, is put between the devil and the sea by the law. Section 18 provides a fine of $10,000 and a 10-year prison sentence for anyone who gathers, transmits, or loses defense information. Listing of defense plants is certainly defense information of the most vital kind.

The conflicting provisions of the law look as if Congress is directing the Secretary of Defense to get himself jailed.

Opportunity and Responsibility of the Eighty-second Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Eighty-second Congress is maneuvering into position. This so-called "lame duck" session gives an opportunity to form lines for what is to occur after next January 3. If you believe in the two-party system; if you believe in representative government; if you believe that the leaders in the two parties should work closely together when the Nation faces great emergencies, then you should be able to have hope and take courage at this present moment.

Neither major party has a comfortable working majority. Neither party can just go off in a room alone and draft plans for the country, take them to the floor of House and Senate and enact those plans into law. Whatever is done, must be done through the cooperation of the two leaderships heading the two parties—what is done must be done cooperatively.

Going back to our belief in a two-party system and the proposition that both parties should work closely together when the Nation faces great peril, we come now to the proposition that the leadership of the two parties in the Eighty-second Congress substantially qualifies as the conservative wing of the two parties. Many of the so-called and recognized radicals were eliminated in the last election—primary and general. A weeding-out process occurred and I personally am thankful for what happened in this respect, but do regret the perfectly horrible international mess we now have in our lap.

Radical legislation, in my humble opinion, will not be approved during the coming 2 years. Even if Mr. Truman does recommend such and aggressively promotes such, my guess is it will fail of passage. Mr. Truman could be successful in having a bill introduced; but to get it through the two Houses would be something entirely different. Neither party can on its own, proceed to get radical legislation approved.

The big job ahead is to digest and deal with, as best we can, the radical legislation already on the statute books; to get financed the commitments—internal and external—already approved: To find out the perimeter of the direct international commitments which we must finance, first, with money; second, with materials; third, with manpower; to put such checks on those who are making these commitments as will enable us to take stock of what has already been committed, and all before other far-reaching promises have been made by us.

Secretary of State Acheson has sarcastically complained about the "reexaminists" and has shown just a wee bit too much of his arrogance toward congressional leaders and the people.

Unfortunately, too many of the Secretary's proposals have never been closely and critically examined in the first instance. It is not so much a case of the reexaminists as it is of having some one take a genuine look at the proposition before it is completely swallowed by the Congress through being authorized and appropriated.

The State Department of this Government has been substantially "in the saddle" now for many years—probably too many. It has grown accustomed to "saying the word" and the Congress authorized and appropriated the billions. This has gone on and on until now the billionitis has taken hold—a very firm hold—on our living. And what has all this brought us? The radical wing of English socialism is now ready to fight us.

The Federal Government and States should ration themselves. Do not rely on the efficacy of fiscal and credit controls only. Government's demand for goods and services is just as effective as that of individual citizens. Federal and State Governments can do without many things now being bought and used and these demands plus those of the citizen, exceeds supply and naturally inflation is inevitable. We cannot long consume more than we produce and for us to try to do such a thing only adds to the swollen river of inflation: Dams erected by the Treasury and Federal Reserve, and the efforts of the price and wage fixers will be washed out. Plants and men are not working full capacity. Hours should be extended to at least 45 hours per week, without extended pay—giving the worker more dollars and the people more goods, and both effects would protect the worker from inflation, and provide a higher standard of living.

Literally millions of our people are now caught in the net of destructive inflation: The buying power of your savings and current earnings grows less each day. Government-dictated low interest rates prevail; Federal debt expands; deficits become permanent policy of Government; buying power of all the savings of all the people diminishes. This is inflation. How much more of it do we want? Count your dollars—then measure their buying power.

The United Nations Organization now faces a supreme test. Acheson's State Department has committed us across the face of the earth. Socialist England continues to appease Red China. If our State Department is to further "go along" with Red Russia and China and

their British supporters, then we, who believe in a two-party system must consolidate our strength and leadership and protect the United States from further disintegration. This is the opportunity and responsibility of the present leadership of the new Congress.

The Internal Security Act—3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to present the third of a series of editorials from the Milwaukee Journal on the Internal Security Act. The following editorial appeared on October 26:

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT—3

(This is the third of several editorials discussing the Internal Security Act of 1950, the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill.)

Law enforcement and intelligence experts contend that the requirement of the internal security act of 1950 that all Communists be required to register is undesirable. Even if we assume that they are mistaken, there is grave doubt that the law can be made to work.

The purpose of the law is to tag all Communists as "unclean" as a warning to all Americans. It's the old plan of "belling the cat." What method does the law provide for doing the "belling"? It provides a rather futile and endless game of tag in which the quarry, when he's about to be caught, suddenly disappears into thin air.

Despite the law, not one Communist or Communist organization had registered up to the deadline last Monday. The Attorney General now becomes "it." He is charged with going before the subversive activities control board—an agency appointed a few days ago by the President—with evidence, witnesses, and proof that persons he knows to be Communist are Communists in fact.

Assume the Attorney General proves his case to the Board. The persons named can carry the decision to the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. If the court upholds the Board ruling, the case can be appealed to the Supreme Court.

There are an estimated 55,000 Communists in the United States. Under the law the Attorney General will have to start action against all who are known if they do not register. The administrative job of handling those thousands of cases will bury the Board in an impossible job.

The National Labor Relations Board has only one or two thousand cases before it in a year. In 1949 the Board reported it was taking 464 days, or more than 15 months, to make a decision in an average case. With 25 to 50 times as many cases—and more difficult legal evidence to assess—the Subversives Control Board would undoubtedly have a much longer average.

Appeals to the court of appeals take from 6½ to 40 months, with an average of 17½ months. The Supreme Court takes longer. Swamped as they will be by the Communist cases, the courts can hardly maintain their present records.

Altogether this adds up to more than 4 years for an average labor case carried through the Board and the courts. With their known ability to use legal instruments of delay the Communists can certainly run each case well beyond the 4-year average.

Certainly if the Communists constitute a clear and present danger to the Nation's security we cannot afford to wait that long to put them behind bars.

And what of the day that the organization is found to be Communist and ordered by the highest court to register? If it operates like Communist groups in the past, it will be found to have dissolved into thin air long since. Its membership will be found in an innocuous looking new organization long before the final determination by the courts. Then the legal machinery will have to be put into gear again—with the same result.

The law in this respect—and many expert lawyers have testified to it—is unworkable, cumbersome, and ridiculous. It can no more curb the Communist menace than a Communist can openly thumb his nose at Stalin.

How Close Is Socialism in America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has called to my attention a newspaper clipping which purportedly quoted from a public-assistance report issued by the Federal Security Agency. The clipping inferred that language in that report indicated the desirability of the "socialized state."

To satisfy myself, I obtained a copy of the report in question and found that the language contained in one sentence could have no other construction placed upon it. I quote as follows:

Social-security and public-assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure.

The Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, Oscar Ewing, is a controversial figure in Government who has often denied allegations that he has propagandized for socialistic measures. Mr. Oscar Ewing is the person who would administer any national health plan adopted by the Congress. Perhaps the language included in this report points up the reluctance of Congress to authorize a sweeping and bureaucratic health plan which would be under the guidance of the Federal Security Administrator.

I append a copy of the letter I have addressed to Mr. Ewing requesting an explanation of the language used in the report.

NOVEMBER 30, 1950.

Hon. OSCAR EWING,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EWING: There has recently come to my attention Public Assistance Report No. 8, entitled "Common Human Needs." The report is intended as "an interpretation for staff in public assistance agencies" and, as such, has undoubtedly been given wide distribution throughout local and state social agencies.

Both the foreword and the introduction of this booklet give credence to the fact that the report is an authorized project of the Federal Security Agency, which had been closely scrutinized by responsible persons in the Administration.

Upon reading the report in its entirety I was astounded to note on page 57 under the chapter entitled "Adulthood and Old Age," the following sentence: "Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure."

To the best of my knowledge the citizens of America do not envisage the establishment of a "socialized state" nor do they desire it. In any event, I deem it improper for an administrative agency of the Government to disseminate material which would indicate that the socialization of America is a natural sequence to the establishment of a social-security program. It is clearly understood that the Congress which authorized a social-security program, and following Congresses which adopted liberalizing amendments, had no such intention.

I am deeply disturbed by the implications of the quoted language from an official document issued through your agency, and would appreciate receiving a report as to the origin and intention of the excerpt.

Very truly yours,

JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress.

The Internal Security Act—7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to present the seventh of a series of editorials from the Milwaukee Journal on the internal security act. The following editorial appeared on October 31:

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT—7

(This is the seventh of a series of editorials discussing the Internal Security Act of 1950, the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill.)

Experience is bearing out the prediction of the Attorney General, of immigration authorities and of the State Department that the Internal Security Act of 1950 would throw an iron curtain around the United States.

The vague and broad provisions of the bill automatically bar from the United States anyone who was ever affiliated with the Communist or other totalitarian party of any foreign government. The ban is subject only to the right of the Attorney General to give special permission for temporary entry. Each case must be taken up with the Attorney General individually. Each exempted case and his action must be reported by him in detail to Congress.

What has happened? Ellis Island is filled with foreign visitors awaiting the Attorney General's decision on whether they are to be admitted. The State Department has been forced to order all of its officials all over the world to suspend passport visas and recheck them to make sure people who plan to visit here never were affiliated with a totalitarian party.

What does affiliation mean? It meant, for Friedrich Guida, 20-year-old Austrian pianist, membership in the Hitler youth movement when he was 10 years of age.

Guida, like every other German youngster, had to belong to the movement to go to school. That was his only participation in nazism. Yet he was barred from entry and was able to keep a Carnegie Hall concert engagement only because the Attorney General rushed approval for a 6-day stay.

It meant for Mrs. Fedora Barbieri, 25, an Italian opera singer, attendance at a Fascist school in Italy—and all schools were Fascist in Italy under Mussolini.

It means that anyone who ever sang for the Communists, the Nazis, the Fascists, cannot come here and sing because to perform under those regimes it was necessary to belong to government-controlled organizations or unions.

It means that scientists, educators, writers and others who lived under totalitarian governments cannot bring their genius to us. President Truman, in his foreign policy speech in San Francisco, called upon Russia to lift the iron curtain and permit the free exchange of information and ideas. That has always been the American way. But it is no longer the American way under the internal security act.

Now we have our own iron curtain—and it will plague us until Congress amends the law that created it.

Differences on Far Eastern Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, here is news which should interest every citizen of the United States. In Newsweek's November 27 issue appears the following:

The Korean war began paying its fattest dividends to Russia last week. Unity on Korea between the United States and its chief western allies threatened to founder on the issue of policy toward Red China. The arrival this week at the UN of a Chinese Communist delegation may provoke the showdown.

Worse still, differences on far eastern policy showed some signs of threatening western unity in the Atlantic world. This was demonstrated by an illuminating incident in London last week.

This incident was tied in with the old effort by the British Labor Party's left wing to impose its policies on the government. Its international significance was thereby discounted but it did show disturbing underlying currents. It occurred when four American correspondents were told categorically by sources within the British Cabinet that because of alarm over the far eastern situation and the rearmament race in Europe, the Socialist government would renounce any further American military aid and henceforth arm only within its own means.

This information was cabled to Newsweek by its London bureau. Newsweek instructed its Washington bureau to check with the State Department. The news caused consternation in the Department and a cable was immediately dispatched to the United States Embassy in London. The Embassy was greatly concerned since it was aware of a growing British stress on partnership in financing Atlantic rearmament.

Embassy officials got in touch with the British Government and obtained an official denial that any decision had been taken to renounce American military assistance. The Embassy informed the State Department this week end that the denial could be taken in good faith. But it underlined the seriousness of the left wing effort to impose its policy. Monday London officially announced the denial.

This extreme attitude on rearmament mainly reflected policies of the left wing of the Labor Party, headed by Health Minister Aneurin Bevan. But concern over far eastern policy reached from extreme right to extreme left. The weekly Tribune, the organ of Bevan and his followers, charged General MacArthur had defied instructions from the UN and the United States in ordering advances to the Manchurian border. The staunchly conservative London Daily Mail editorialized on the terrible danger of another world war developing in Korea, and it regretted MacArthur's branding Chinese intervention as international lawlessness. The Daily Mail yearned for the blessing of a buffer state covering the Manchurian frontier. In the House of Commons, Winston Churchill asked that the Government constantly bear in mind the great importance of not becoming too much pinned down in China.

From Lord Salisbury, once chief assistant to Anthony Eden in the Foreign Office and now Conservative leader in the House of Lords, came a warning the British considered deeply significant. Salisbury feared the UN forces in Korea had, if anything, advanced too far. He thought we should in no circumstances attack beyond the Manchurian border. He advocated leaving a small area in North Korea unoccupied by United Nations forces. Then Salisbury recommended that "another effort * * * be made * * * to reach a settlement, or at least some sort of modus vivendi, with Russia."

How could the United States avoid a headlong collision with its chief allies? The State Department, under increasing fire from the victorious Republicans, would probably find it politically impossible to go as far as the British wanted in making a deal with the Chinese Reds. For the moment, therefore, United States diplomacy walked softly. A United Nations debate on Formosa was postponed at American request. President Truman officially assured the Chinese "that we have never at any time entertained any intention to carry hostilities into China." Secretary of State Acheson stressed that everything possible must be done to disabuse the Chinese of the idea that the United States had any ulterior designs on Manchuria.

The Chinese replied to the President and the Secretary with the usual vituperation that America had lied and smashed her way across the world to Chinese territory and into it. But at Lake Success Communist sources carefully circulated a story that the Chinese Communists' delegation was bringing with it terms to settle the Far Eastern crisis. These terms involved creation of a buffer zone in North Korea and the end of American recognition of and aid to Chiang Kai-shek. At the same time the Chinese were supposed to be planning to pour more and more thousands of volunteers into Korea to convince the United States that it either had to make a settlement or face endless war.

But the stakes at Lake Success had become higher than even settlement of the Korean War. The West faced the greatest test of its solidarity against Communist force and Communist wiles since the end of the Second World War.

Mr. Speaker, indications are that Truman and Acheson are now striving hard to resolve the catastrophic blunder of Korea to suit the Socialist Government of Great Britain. If they do not succeed in this, will England come in on our side or will she turn her back on us?

What more than this is needed to cause the United States to pull up in Europe?

The Internal Security Act--5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to present the fifth of a series of editorials from the Milwaukee Journal on the Internal Security Act. The following editorial appeared on October 28:

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT—5

(This is the fifth of a series of editorials discussing the Internal Security Act of 1950, the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill.)

Under a witch-hunting subversives control board and Attorney General, or a board and Attorney General without a high sense of civil liberties, the Internal Security Act of 1950 could become the vehicle for calling almost any group in America a Communist front.

Communist fronts, under the law, are required to register with the Attorney General and, when registered, to inform the public in all of their radio, publication, or other propaganda that they are Communist organizations.

What are the tests for a Communist front under the law? The tests are these: The extent to which Communists control an organization, the extent to which Communists contribute to its financial support, the extent to which it furthers activities of Communist action groups, and—now this is the source of danger—the extent to which its policy stands coincide with Communist policy.

In the opinion of such men as Senator PAUL DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois), Senator ESTES KEFAUVER (Democrat, Tennessee), and Senator HERBERT LEHMAN (Democrat, New York), an unscrupulous attorney general could brand as a Communist front any organization that opposed the Marshall plan, ECA, the North Atlantic Pact, arms aid to Europe, and prewar aid to Korea. The Communists oppose all these things. Some of these things are opposed by various American groups—including some conservative segments of the Republican Party. Would that make these groups in the Republican Party Communist fronts?

Many labor and other groups continually fight for civil liberties, FEPC, public housing, minimum wages—all of which the Communists seize upon in their pretended interest in the workingman. These civil-rights ideas are communistic to a good many Southern Senators. Many of the proposed welfare programs argued in Washington—the Brannan plan, health insurance, and others—are branded as communistic and steps toward totalitarian government by conservative opponents. Would that make segments of the Democratic Party Communist fronts?

It's possible. Certainly stranger and just as ridiculous interpretations of law were used by the Federalists when the alien and sedition act was law. They convicted Republicans who had done nothing more than oppose Federalist legislation. Certainly some of the Red-hunt activities of the Attorney General after World War I were just as great perversions of the law.

It is not enough to state, as supporters of the new law contend, that such interpretations are not the intent of the law. They are possible under the law. To have them

happen—no matter whether later court decisions right false interpretations or not—would bring irreparable injury to innocent people.

This whole business of proving an organization a Communist front by legal processes poses an impossible task. It involves proving what men think. How can such an illusive thing be proved when it is difficult in criminal courts of law to prove such relatively concrete things as what men did?

The possibility of being branded as a Communist front would be a further deterrent to liberty. It would tend to make individuals and groups fearful of expressing any ideas—in any instance—that could be interpreted to parallel Communist propaganda. It would bring timidity of expression and thought to a nation which was founded on imaginative and courageous expression and thought.

Flathead Lake Will Not Be Raised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the first week in November, while I was in Montana, I heard rumors to the effect that a plan was on foot to raise the level of Flathead Lake. On Monday, November 6, in a radio address, I made the following statement:

In the last few days I have been receiving word from Kalispell that the rumors going around in the Flathead are that if the Democrats are elected—I suppose that means me—that Flathead Lake will be raised 50 feet. This is an outrageous falsehood because the people in the Flathead know the fight we had to save the lake in 1943; know that the Hungry Horse is assurance and insurance that the lake will not be tampered with again; know that I have stated repeatedly that I would never allow such a thing to happen under any circumstances. I have never lied to the people of Montana and when I give you an assurance you can depend on the fact that I am telling you the truth. Flathead Lake will not be tampered with. I repeat, Flathead Lake will not be tampered with.

On Wednesday, November 8, I came across some more information to the effect that statements had been published as follows:

But don't think that operation Raise-Flathead-Lake is forgotten.

And again:

But Saturday afternoon, a group of public-spirited citizens came to us with concrete evidence. Evidence, which in our opinion proves, there is a movement afoot to raise Flathead Lake. Some of these citizens are Democrats, some Republicans. But the evidence they presented is strong and powerful. Here is the evidence:

1. About 2 years ago the Bonneville Power Administration surveyed, purchased the land for and built the power transmission line through the lower valley (this line shown on map above by solid line). Look at this line and it will show you it follows the shortest, straightest path from Somers to Hungry Horse Dam.

2. But a Bonneville Power Administration engineering crew has for the past several days been surveying a relocation of the power line along the high ground skirting the foothills west of Kalispell. (Shown on the map above by the broken lines.)

3. The local head of the Bonneville office said late yesterday afternoon the new path for the relocated power line would be 5 miles longer than the lower valley route.

Bonneville engineers estimate the cost of the new line at $80,000 per mile, which increases the cost over the lower valley line some $400,000. But this is only the beginning of the extra cost.

The Bonneville office said it has not included the cost of any of the land necessary for the new foothills route. This means a strip of land at least 18 miles long and 250 feet wide must be purchased. And what else? Bonneville must buy all the houses, farm buildings and businesses, etc., lying in the path of the new high-ground route.

And again:

Why is Bonneville abandoning its existing water-level route through the Lower Valley?

Why if this was a good route 2 years ago after a careful survey is it no longer satisfactory?

Why is Bonneville willing to spend a fortune in order to get its new line on higher ground along the foothills?

Why? Because the Government planners know something that we don't know. They may know that the raising of Flathead Lake is in the picture for the immediate future.

And again:

And facts they are. Ask Victor Guest. Ask H. G. Ferguson. Ask Harold Hebert. Ask Ray Lincoln. Ask Eddie Nordtome. Ask Dan Highland. Ask Harry Ross. Ask S. Redmond. Ask them if Bonneville's engineers have not been busy as bees surveying the new high-ground route.

Don't take our word for it. Drive out and see where this line is going, talk to these men and learn for yourselves why some of them came into the Inter Lake worried about their property and businesses and asked for help.

Immediately on my return to Washington, I contacted the Bonneville Power Administration—brought these remarks to their attention and told them I wanted a definite answer to the questions raised. On November 14 I received a copy of a message which was sent by Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of Bonneville Power Administration, to Mr. J. J. Mangan, area manager at Kalispell, Mont., which reads as follows:

Please inform any persons interested in or doubtful about the matter that the Bonneville Power Administration has no plans for raising the storage level of Flathead Lake.

The Bonneville Power Administration knows of no such plans by any Government agency, either within the Department of the Interior or without it. Since 1943, when such a proposal first came to the Bonneville Power Administration's attention, we have been opposed to raising the level of Flathead Lake.

On November 27 I received a letter from Dr. Paul J. Raver, which states in no uncertain terms that the proposed new route of the Bonneville Power Administration is not a part of a plan to revive the long-defunct proposals to raise the level of Flathead Lake and that such an assertion is without any foundation whatever. I am indeed sorry that false statements concerning the raising of Flathead Lake have been circulated in Flathead County and elsewhere throughout the State of Montana. I am stating for the record on the basis of the information sent to me, that Bonneville Power Administration has no plans to raise the storage level of Flathead Lake; that the Bonneville Power Administration knows of no such plans by any Government agency either within the Department of Interior or without it; and that since 1943 when such a proposal first came to the Bonneville Power Administration's attention, it—the Bonneville Power Administration—has been opposed to raising the level of Flathead Lake.

I wish to state also for the RECORD on the basis of information sent to me by Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, that "the recent statements in the Kalispell press that the proposed new route is part of a plan to revive the long-defunct proposals to raise the level of Flathead Lake are without any foundation." I wish to state also in my own behalf that one of the reasons for the Mansfield Act, Public Law 329, Seventy-eighth Congress, H. R. 3570, to authorize the construction of Hungry Horse Dam, was to give assurances that Flathead Lake would not be tampered with again and to furnish insurance that such a catastrophe would never face the people of Montana in the future.

I want to state that under no circumstances, as far as I am concerned, will Flathead Lake ever be tampered with again. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am inserting at this point in my remarks, a letter dated November 24, 1950, from Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, to me and also a memorandum from the Bonneville Power Administration designers to its chief engineer, Mr. Schultz, describing the line-location problem near Kalispell and detailing the factors behind its decision and the savings which will accrue to the Government and its customers through the change in routing:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION,
Portland, Oreg., November 24, 1950.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: This letter replies to your recent request for detailed information regarding the Administration's activities is surviving a new right-of-way for the authorized Hot Springs-Hungry Horse 230-kilovolt transmission line in the vicinity of Kalispell.

As you know, we already operate a 115-kilovolt transmission line from Kerr Dam to Hungry Horse which was placed in service about 3 years ago. The right-of-way for this line roughly parallels the southwest shore of Flathead Lake, crosses the Flathead River below Kalispell, and continues up the east side of the river into the Hungry Horse dam site.

At the time this 115-kilovolt line was constructed, we were aware that additional transmission capacity between Hungry Horse and the remainder of the system would be needed by the time Hungry Horse generation was ready to be placed on the line. Accordingly, easements for the initial 115-kilovolt line include provison for an additional line on the same right-of-way, and they were negotiated and purchased on that basis.

At the time the above right-of-way was acquired, the potential hazards of heavy spring runoffs and the meandering course of the Flathead River were carefully considered by our engineers. Based on discus-

sions with local people and examination of aerial maps and existing topography, they concluded that erosion and scouring conditions had probably stabilized. Subsequent encroachments of the river during high-water periods, notably in the spring of 1948, again raised questions as to construction of a high-capacity circuit paralleling the 115-kilovolt line. This additional line, of course, will have to be of heavy 230-kilovolt construction, since it will become the principal means of integrating the Hungry Horse plant with the rest of the region.

During the process of acquiring detailed field data for designing and constructing the Hot Springs-Hungry Horse 230-kilovolt line, the Flathead River route was again investigated. A thorough examination of the field conditions by our top design engineers led to their recommendation that the additional circuit be relocated on land free from the hazards of high water. They advised also that an additional $174,000 would be required, if the original right-of-way were used, for more massive and permanent foundations and structures in the portions which are subject to further encroachment by the river. Obviously, there could be no guarantee that even this additional expenditure would obviate prolonged interruption of Hungry Horse output under adverse high-water conditions. It was therefore decided to investigate alternative locations.

The route finally selected and approved runs to the west of Kalispell. In spite of an additional length of approximately 6 miles the cost of the 230-kilovolt line in the new location will be $66,000 less than locating it parallel to the 115-kilovolt line on the present right-of-way. About the time this decision was reached, we were advised that the Harvey Machine Co. was planning to locate its new plant near Kalispell. As events have turned out, the new location reduces the cost of facilities necessary to serve this new plant by $250,000 or more.

While the Federal Government does not route its lines solely and specifically for the purpose of saving money for its industrial customers, we are interested in providing for the best over-all method of service. Considering the nature of the times we live in, it is obviously important to save materials and expense to both the customer and the Government wherever this dual purpose can be achieved.

Attached you will find a map which compares the location of the present circuit with the alternative right-of-way for the new circuit. You will also find a memorandum from our designers to our Chief Engineer, Mr. Schultz, describing the line-location problem near Kalispell and detailing the factors behind our decision and the savings which will accrue to the Government and its customers through the change in routing.

You will also find a copy of the policy statement which I recently forwarded to Mr. Mangan, our manager at Kalispell, for public use in that area. Needless to say, the recent statements in the Kalispell press that the proposed new route is part of a plan to revive the long-defunct proposals to raise the level of Flathead Lake are without any foundation whatever. The problem of river encroachments is not a new one with us, and this particular situation was handled as a straightforward engineering problem.

I also understand there have been intimations that the proposed new route may damage agricultural lands and improvements thereon. You will understand, of course, that these manifestations are normal in any growing area where land values may be on the rise, either actually or potentially. As a matter of fact, we have rarely found it necessary to acquire and remove buildings from our rights-of-way, and then only in congested locations. It is our practice to acquire easements only for transmission-line locations, and to encourage the use of the land under the lines for crops. As you can see, this long-standing policy benefits not only the farmer but results in considerable savings to the Government by reducing initial land costs and subsequent expenditures for reclearing and maintenance of rights-of-way.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL J. RAVER,
Administrator.

OCTOBER 10, 1950.

CHIEF ENGINEER,

Branch of Design and Construction, Hungry Horse-Hot Springs Line, Work Order 374-01, Proposed Kalispell Relocation:

In line with decisions reached in your office on Friday, September 22, we are proceeding to survey the new 230-kilovolt Hungry Horse line so that it leaves the route of the 115-kilovolt line at a point east of Columbia Falls, crosses the Flathead River immediately southwest of Columbia Falls, thence westerly and southerly to the immediate vicinity of the Harvey aluminum plant site, thence southwesterly to a point a short distance west of the Kalispell west city limits, thence southerly to a junction with the route of the 115-kilovolt line where it leaves the west side of the valley south of Kalispell and goes over the hills. From this point, the line will parallel the 115-kilovolt line on the existing right-of-way to a point near Elmo, where it will diverge on the new right-of-way and proceed to Hot Springs.

The length of the new location, from the point where it leaves the 115-kilovolt line till it returns again is about 26½ miles. This compares with a length of 20 miles for the corresponding section, had it been decided to parallel the 115-kilovolt line.

The purpose of this memorandum is to record the factors which resulted in the decision to select the slightly longer route.

About 11 miles of 115-kilovolt-line location east and southeast of Kalispell lie in a low valley area where the river has many times changed its course in the past years, as shown by marshes, sloughs, and abandoned water courses.

At the time the 115-kilovolt line was surveyed, it was located east of the city primarily to obtain the shortest route. The river problem was not overlooked, however. A crossing was found where the banks were relatively high and where evidence seemed to indicate that the channel course had been fairly stable. It does not appear that we could better this location by any other route on the east side of Kalispell. Nevertheless, several factors cause us concern. The river crossing lies at the downstream end of a bend in the river, and a field check shows that the river bank on the south side has cut back toward the wood pole crossing structure about 60 feet, as compared to its position at the time the original survey was made. Scouring is even worse slightly upstream where the bank has cut back very close to the county road. On the north side of the river, the banks are much lower and covered during floodwaters. Some concern is also felt about a bend in the river a short distance upstream, which comes within a few hundred feet of our right-of-way, and where we fear that the river might cut a new channel across the low ground adjacent to and on our right-of-way during a flood.

Mr. Farr has estimated that special construction, including a number of concrete footings, will be necessary in the 4-mile section including the river crossing, and that high steel crossing towers will be necessary so that they can be placed at a greater distance from the present river bank. Even with these precautions, he feels that there would remain a definite hazard in the event of floods or river-channel changes.

In the area immediately north of our 115-kilovolt Kalispell substation, there is another section of several miles crossing low ground which includes an old river channel and flood area. An estimate was also made of the cost of providing special footings through this area, but it was found cheaper to cross the 115-kilovolt line twice and locate the 230-kilovolt in this section on the east or opposite side of the north-south county road.

COST COMPARISON

A transmission design section estimate has been made for the 20-mile section starting at the angle point east of Columbia Falls and continuing to the edge of the valley south of Kalispell, including the relocation just mentioned north of the substation. This cost is $942,000 or an average cost of $47,100 per mile, as compared to an over-all average of $38,370 per mile in the last previous estimate for the total future Hungry Horse-Hot Springs line.

It is hard to evaluate with certainty the hazard caused by the river to a location east of town. Consideration has been given to the regulating effect of Hungry Horse Dam which could have decreased the 1948 flood flow from 102,000 to 64,000 second-feet at the peak, and would have decreased the river stage at Columbia Falls by 4.3 feet. Other figures of interest are the average of the annual peaks of record of 60,000 second-feet and the over-all average stream flow of 8,500 second-feet. Some savings under the estimated figure could doubtless be made by taking a greater calculated risk. On the other hand, expenditure of the entire amount will not eliminate all the risk.

In addition to this location, the location described in the first paragraph was investigated in the field. This 26½-mile section is estimated to cost $875,700 or $33,400 per mile, as compared with an over-all average figure of $38,370 per mile for the entire Hungry Horse-Hot Springs line.

RELATION TO LIBBY DAM

In addition to cost and safety, the location west of Kalispell has incidental advantages (which it is hard to evaluate exactly at this time). Lying farther to the west, it is in a convenient location for possible future intertie with lines from Libby.

SURVEY AND DESIGN

There will be some increase in design and survey workload, the latter being increased by an estimated four party-months. The energization date should not be affected.

ALUMINUM PLANT

Location west of the river will also save the Harvey Co. a considerable investment in the permanent 230-kilovolt loop line from our old right-of-way to their plant. Had the line been located east of the river, it had been proposed that the Harvey Co. would build a loop to their plant with sectionalizing and bypass disconnecting switches at the point of take-off. A preliminary estimate of their cost for this was $250,000. This figure, however, was based on the assumption that steel crossing towers would not be necessary at the Flathead River crossing. A subsequent field check raised doubts as to whether wood pole crossings would be safe under flood conditions, and we would have recommended that the company use steel towers on the east bank of the Flathead River at the center of the island between the Flathead River and Gooderich Bayou, and on the high ground west of Gooderich Bayou, making two spans of approximately 2,200 feet in length on each circuit supported by steel structures. This would have increased their cost considerably above the $250,000 estimate.

With the selection of the new locations, some means will be necessary to provide initial service from our 115-kilovolt line. The most satisfactory from our standpoint would be a single temporary tap line of 115-kilovolt construction from a point on our 115-kilovolt line directly east of the aluminum plant. For the short time this would be in service, the company might be willing to

risk an all-wood pole 115-kilovolt line of relatively light construction. Another alternate would be to attempt to speed up the Columbia Falls-Harvey section of the 230-kilovolt line using wood poles and spar arms, so it could be used for initial 115-kilovolt service. However, this would be a change from the original line design which contemplated light steel for higher dependability and better ultimate economy. Unless we hear otherwise from your office, we will assume that the Harvey Co. will provide a temporary 115-kilovolt line.

RICHARD F. STEVENS,
Assistant Chief, Branch of Design and Construction.

American Policy in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, December 1 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Wisdom Can Win," written by Erwin D. Canham, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of November 29, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WISDOM CAN WIN

(By Erwin D. Canham)

Mankind faces the gravest crisis since the end of the Second World War. United Nations forces led by the United States are involved in war with some 200,000 troops of Communist China. Unless some kind of agreement can be reached with the Chinese Communist Government, it is apparent that the UN forces in Korea will have to be heavily reinforced, and will face a long and terribly difficult campaign. While this is happening in Asia, it is feared that the Soviet Union would have a free hand in Europe, which is ill-prepared to defend itself against aggression.

Meantime, at Lake Success the American Government has solemnly accused Communist China of open and notorious aggression and has called for a Security Council vote condemning this aggression and demanding that it cease. Red China's delegate at the UN, former Gen. Wu Hsiu-chuan refused in his first speech to reply to these charges and instead merely lashed out in Soviet-like invective against the United States.

The violent nature of Mr. Wu's speech may have driven some UN members back to support of the United States. Some of them had been wavering. Some of them felt it was rash for General MacArthur to launch an offensive just as the Chinese Reds were arriving for talks at the UN. Others have believed the UN forces should not have gone all the way to the Yalu River. They think the Chinese never would have entered the war if their own frontier had not been touched and—in their view—threatened. And still other UN members were against pressing the fight north of the thirty-eighth parallel. They believe we could have restored the independence of South Korea without running the risk of large-scale war with China.

These criticisms of American policy have been rumbling in the Western European capitals, and in India and the Middle East. And so, while the UN may ultimately condemn Chinese intervention in Korea, it is still very dubious whether the UN will authorize military action against Manchuria, as General MacArthur implies should be done. There still remain many who hope the Chinese would accept a neutralized border.

A whole series of portentous questions face the United States and the UN.

The immediate problem is to stabilize the situation on the front. We could not hope to negotiate with the Chinese or anybody else while we are on the run. More extensive forces from other UN members may well be demanded. But if the European members face the danger of aggression, it is hard to see how they could spare many troops. And the fighting in Indochina as well as the unrest in Malaya is making severe demands on French and British troops in Asia.

In any event, stabilization of the front in Korea will depend on the forces on the spot. One expert likens the situation to the second day of the Battle of the Bulge in Europe. Then General Eisenhower had enough reserves to turn the tide. Has General MacArthur enough reserves or other advantages to hold the line? That is the immediate question.

The next question, closely related, is whether General MacArthur should be authorized to carry the war to Manchuria. This is a problem of immense difficulty. The Chinese have carried the war to General MacArthur—they are using Manchuria as privileged sanctuary. But to attack them there would certainly bring on full-scale war with Communist China, which is a vast quicksand of military involvement. As long as there is hope of negotiation, it is certain many UN members would oppose carrying the war to Manchuria.

It is well for the wise citizen not to be swept into panic. It is well to remember that the Chinese carefully refrained from intervening in the conflict until their own frontier had been reached. Perhaps if we stabilize a line back from the frontier the possibility of negotiations would be much brighter. Thus, in a few days or weeks, the outlook might change again as sharply as it has changed in recent days.

The great need is to do everything necessary but nothing rash or foolish. Above all, the door should never be closed to diplomatic discussions of the problem. Such discussions can be fruitful, it is true, only when they proceed from positions of strength. But it is important not to underestimate our own basic strength.

It is still most reasonable to assume that the Soviet Union is quite satisfied with its present progress without precipitating a world war. And the Chinese, once they are satisfied about their frontier, have really no motive of their own for attacking UN forces. They have plenty of problems in the internal development of their country.

Formosa remains a problem. Some American Senators are urging utmost aid to Chiang Kai-shek, which is the same as advocating an all-out declaration of war on the countless millions of Communist China. But wisdom can solve this problem, too.

We should not fall victims to our own violent language, and assume that a world war is inevitable. A world war, as we all know, would be a catastrophe, and there are many ways of preventing it. One way—the best way—is for all of us to do our thinking and acting as citizens to prevent our Nation and the UN from taking a wrong or reckless step in this crisis.

We are teetering on the edge of wide-scale war with China. But—despite the attacks in Korea—such a war can still be limited and reduced and prevented. That can happen if fuel is not poured on the flames by heedless and ill-informed action.

We in the free world know that our intentions toward the totalitarian states are not aggressive. All we want is the right for people to determine their own destiny and ultimately to improve their own conditions. We have learned from experience that this can best be done under a system which puts man first and the state second. We have learned that freedom can grow in a society where God is worshipped and His law is respected. We want to give all mankind a chance to learn by experience that these things are true.

This is our true peace program, but we have failed to convey it adequately to other nations—above all to the Chinese, with whom we have so long been linked by friendship. The ill consequences of our breach with the Chinese—as well as of our many mistakes in the Far East during the last decade—are now coming home to roost. But since our motives are genuinely in the interest of the people of Asia, we can still persist in the task of awakening them—and ourselves—to the folly of a general war.

Library of Congress Interprets Gettysburg Address for Congressman Doyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln was a Member of the thirtieth session of the United States Congress and served as a Member of this House of Representatives, of which you and I are privileged to be Members, from March 4, 1847, to March 3, 1849. The first session of the Thirtieth Congress extended from December 6, 1847, to August 14, 1848, and the second session extended from December 4, 1848, to March 3, 1849.

On November 19, 1863, this same Abraham Lincoln on the Gettysburg battlefield delivered those words commonly designated as the Gettysburg Speech or the Gettysburg Address.

For many years, in connection with the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, I have had printed and distributed freely many copies of these immortal words by this "citizen of the ages."

I know you, my colleagues, will appreciate this interpretation of the Gettysburg Address as prepared for me at my request by the Library of Congress as much as I do:

CONTEMPORARY INTERPRETATION OF THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

It is now fourscore and 7 years ago that Abraham Lincoln stood by the gravesides of the Gettysburg battlefields, and spoke those few lines beginning "Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." On that autumn day the great President spoke for but 2 or 3 minutes; the main address of the occasion was given by someone else, who took 2 hours. The President's voice was low, and it is said that only the first 15 rows of the audience could hear him—although they were not actually in rows, because everyone was standing. He himself referred very modestly to his own utterance as compared to the deeds of "the brave men, living and dead, who fought here." "The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here."

And yet, in the long reaches of time, it may turn out just the other way. The battle

of Gettysburg, pivotal as it is in our history, tends more and more to become just one of the "battles of long ago," the memory of which grows dim as each generation comes further away from the event itself. This has not been the fate of the words which Lincoln said there. They have been caught up in the mind and heart of the Nation. They have been reprinted tens of thousands of times. Every school boy cons them by heart. Their echoes are reflected in 10,000 utterances. It is one of the major single utterances of our history and it is hard to believe that the world will ever forget them. They express the soul of the Nation.

In this year 1950, fourscore and seven years later, they have a new appositeness. The cycle has turned again, and we are once more in a crisis not unlike that of 1863, but on a global plane, and not on just a domestic one. These words spoken so long ago are opportune now.

To Lincoln, this Nation was a nation dedicated to freedom. This, in his prophetic mind, was its grandest characteristic. He quoted Jefferson's phrase that "all men are created equal." Here, on this continent, was conceived a government that should be "of the people, by the people, for the people."

The great question of that day was, can such a nation, built on such principles, "conceived in liberty," long endure?

Never from that time until now has the answer seemed more dubious. Freedom is under attack, not only in our own but in every country in the world which has any measure of such freedom. Can freedom endure against the massed forces of communism, or will governments of the people, by the people, for the people, perish from the earth after all?

A still earlier utterance of Lincoln's might apply with still more literal exactness to our crisis today. In a message to a special session of Congress on July 4, 1861, Lincoln used these words:

"And this issue embraces more than the fate of these United States. It presents to the whole family of man the question whether a constitutional republic or democracy—a government of the people by the same people—can or cannot maintain its * * * integrity against its domestic foes. It presents the question whether discontented individuals * * * can * * * break up their government, and thus practically put an end to free government upon the earth. It forces us to ask: 'Is there, in all republics, this inherent and fatal weakness?' * * * This is essentially a people's contest. On the side of the Union it is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form and substance of government whose leading objective is to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all; to afford all an unfettered start, and a fair chance in the race for life."

Are these words anything else than a living description of the struggle which is going on in Korea, and which has already been lost for freedom in Czechoslovakia and Poland and Hungary and many another country, including for that matter Russia itself? Are they not a living description of the disaster we face if, in the world struggle which is now going on, all the still-free world shall be lost, including the United States?

To Abraham Lincoln, freedom is worth the cost of struggle, whatever the cost may be. In the language of his greatest biographer, Carl Sandburg, "He had stood that day, the world's foremost spokesman of popular government, saying that democracy was yet worth fighting for. * * * His cadences sang the ancient song that where there is freedom men have fought and sacrificed for it, and that freedom is worth men's dying for."

Today we have "brave men, living and dead" fighting that struggle in Korea. By tomorrow it may be elsewhere as well. The whole world may be engulfed, and the United States in the heart of it, in a vast civil war of humanity. It is for us to take from the honored dead of Korea increased devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. Speaker, as it is always appropriate to print and reprint, read and reread, and quote and requote the immortal words of this great American who once worked in the Halls of Congress as we are doing, I give you the Gettysburg Address:

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth. (November 19, 1863.)

I have frequently advocated that this majestic oration should well be a special memory assignment for the school children of our Nation, for certainly its enduring words are universally rated as the masterpiece of the English language. This is substantiated by the fact that at the University of Oxford many years ago Lord Curzon included both the Gettysburg Address and Lincoln's second inaugural address as first and second places in the English language.

It is my great pleasure and inspiration to have been president of the Abraham Lincoln Club at my home city of Long Beach, Calif., for several years. I am also a member of the Board of Governors of the Lincoln Club of the District of Columbia.

There are similar Lincoln groups all over the various sections of our great Nation which are dedicated to the preservation and dissemination of knowledge respecting the history and biography of Abraham Lincoln. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I feel, therefore, that it is my privilege to respectively, but vigorously, urge that every Member of this Congress and those who read this do everything in their power to see to it that a larger number of Lincoln groups be organized in the United States.

For the information of any who may be interested in undertaking this appropriate act, I am very sure that the Lincoln Club of the District of Columbia, the president of which is Bert Sheldon, 4824 Forty-third Place NW., Washington, D. C., would be very pleased to freely furnish information and advice and outlines of the bylaws which, no doubt, would be very helpful to groups desiring them.

The Internal Security Act—8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to present the eighth of a series of editorials from the Milwaukee Journal on the Internal Security Act. The following editorial appeared on November 1:

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT—8

(This is the eighth of a series of editorials discussing the Internal Security Act of 1950, the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill.)

While the headlines have been captured in the last several weeks by the singers and other prominent people barred from entry to the United States by the new Internal Security Act of 1950, the real heartaches are being created for many ordinary, everyday people.

Andrew E. Eskelinen, of Houghton, Mich., is a typical case. He told his story to Senator VANDENBERG (Republican, Michigan) in a letter reprinted in the Journal the other day.

Eskelinen fought in Europe in the American Army in World War II. After the war he met a German girl. He stayed on as a civilian employee in the occupation. Five years later, July 1, 1950, he married the girl—Amalie Binzer. He wants to take her to Michigan, where he runs a business he inherited from his father. But Amalie, it turns out, is a security risk under the new security law. She was never a member of the Nazi Party but she was a member of two groups affiliated with the Nazi Party—a girls' club and a labor union. As a German under Hitler's government she had to belong to both. Under the new law she cannot join her husband in his Michigan home.

Ridiculous? Of course. But the same kind of case is being repeated hundreds of times over under the new security law. People are finding their plans to bring relatives from Germany, Poland, Italy—any country affiliated with a totalitarian government—canceled by a law which was rushed into passage without adequate study.

Aliens already here—as wives, relatives, or friends of Americans—similarly face hardship under the bill. If they ever were affiliated with a totalitarian government—even by mere existence under it—they are subject to deportation.

Members of Congress are already feeling the wrath of anguished and astonished victims of the law and their relatives. They will hear more as the law continues to take effect.

On Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor the plaque on the Statue of Liberty proclaims words that every school child has been taught to reverence:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

These are beautiful words, and they have meant greatness for America. But they must be getting some cynical glances from across the short stretch of water that separates Bedloe's from Ellis Island, the immigration station.

A man barred as a dangerous alien because Hitler made him join a youth group before he was 10 years of age must think that the "lamp beside the golden door" has gone out.

Aid to Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the President has asked Congress to authorize funds for relief for Yugoslavia, which is presently suffering from extreme drought which has destroyed the crops and seriously endangered the lives of thousands of persons.

The argument is advanced that we as a Nation should help Tito by sending food since, if the famine becomes too severe, the peasants and city dwellers may revolt and overthrow his government. On the theory that half a loaf is better than none, we are asked to send aid to Tito, since, if his regime falls, a pro-Russian hierarchy will, in all probability, take its place.

There may be much merit to this contention. The immediate extension of relief may be disclosed by the hearings to be definitely in the long-range interest of our country. The suggestion should be thoroughly explored as a matter of urgency. No doubt Tito is potentially more useful and friendly to us than a Moscow-controlled puppet.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think we should recognize additional political facts of life when we approach this problem of sending aid.

Tito is an absolute dictator, and as such, controls his government with a firm hand.

Therefore, I am of the strong opinion that we should couple any grant of aid to his government and people, designed to assure his continuation in office, with the strongest possible representations regarding our concern over and disapproval of many of the steps heretofore taken by his totalitarian regime.

He can go far toward dispelling unfavorable reaction in this country to the necessarily repugnant proposition of helping to build up one dictator in order to weaken another. The Yugoslav Government should at once demonstrate its willingness to make amends for past mistakes by immediately releasing from prison Cardinal Aloysius Stepinac, formerly primate of that country, and by returning the rest of the children whom the Yugoslav Communists under Tito kidnaped from Greece.

Cardinal Stepinac was tried in September 1946 and on October 11 of that year he was sentenced to 16 years imprisonment at hard labor. Certainly religious people all over the world abhor the brutal treatment and unfair trial granted to the primate.

Early in 1949, outraged by the Stepinac incident and the closely ensuing life imprisonment sentence meted out to Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Communist regime in pursuance of its studied and distorted campaign of religious persecution, several Members introduced concurrent resolutions declaring it the sense of Congress that these violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms should be submitted by the United States to the United Nations. We have never been able to secure a hearing on these resolutions.

Now that we have some method of influencing Tito's decision in this matter, we should urge in the strongest possible terms that the primate should be released or, at the very least, that the Yugoslav Government should be required to justify its action in this matter before the United Nations.

Furthermore, at the time hearings are held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the proposed bill to extend economic aid to Yugoslavia an opportunity should be given the proponents of these resolutions of protest to present their case on behalf of these men of God whose only sin appears to have been to adhere to and proclaim their faith under an atheistic regime.

Furthermore, principles of simple international justice dictate that one quid pro quo for the extension of aid to Yugoslavia should be the release of the remainder of the 11,000 children abducted from Greek parents. It will be a long and heartbreaking task for the Red Cross to accomplish, and only if its workers receive prompt and real assistance from Yugoslavia can the present pitiable situation of these children be remedied.

Finally, we are holding in storage vast quantities of edible and nourishing foods at an ever-increasing cost to the taxpayers which might very well be sent to Yugoslavia's starving population.

To the maximum extent possible, we should utilize this practical and sensible solution for meeting this problem, since now more than ever our staggering commitments all over the world demand financial prudence.

This is not intended to be a plea for adverse action on the suggestion that economic aid be extended to Yugoslavia, but rather for a realistic appraisal of all the factors which should enter into our determination and a thorough and sincere canvass of all proposals which may be advanced for terms and conditions to be attached to such aid either by way of legislation or diplomatic negotiation.

International Law and Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 4 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and intelligent article entitled "International Law and Fisheries," written by Mr. Edward W. Allen, one of the eminent authorities in my State. The article relates to the import of the proposed Japanese treaty on international law and international fisheries.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND FISHERIES
(By Edward W. Allen)

Many people, including, I regret to say, some lawyers who should know better, joke about there being no such thing as international law. To be sure, some of its attributes differ from those of municipal law, and defects certainly are apparent. Nevertheless, it does exist and, despite shortcomings, it does respond to a definite need in world relationships, both moral and practical. It was one of the regrettable features of the San Francisco meeting at which the United Nations Charter was formulated that the emphasis was placed on international politics instead of international law.

Perhaps our present troubles are partly due to disregard of principles of justice as fundamental to world peace and happiness. Donations and the squandering of billions of dollars to buy allies and friendships have proved to be futile substitutes.

Instead, therefore, of deriding international law, it behooves those who desire a peaceful world to acquaint themselves with its progress and possibilities as well as with its defects and to use their abilities to eliminate the deficiencies. Some of these deficiencies are due to the way in which international law developed. It is the combined result of customs, conflicts, force, reason, diplomacy, and the aspirations as well as the selfishness of human beings. Withal, it is an ever changing mixture of the practical with the altruistic and should never be permitted to become static.

So we find that in the days following the discovery of America, Spain, Portugal, and England were asserting nationalistic title to huge ocean areas, attempting to shut off each other and all other European nations from most of the world. However, it was not so much these world-circling contentions as it was contests over the herring fisheries of the North Sea which were particularly responsible for stimulating Hugo Grotius and other great legal writers of the seventeenth century to expound their theories as to ocean waters. And it is nothing to their discredit that they espoused views favorable to their own nationals.

Eventually, politicians and diplomats came to favor the idea that a nation should own so much, but only so much, of the ocean adjacent to its coast as it could defend from the shore. This was sometimes expressed as the range of cannon or 3 miles. Thus was born the so-called "3-mile rule." During the last century and a half, it became strongly advocated by the big-navy nations because it held to a minimum the waters from which

their fishery and other vessels might be subjected to regulation or exclusion.

It should also be noted that ocean fishery conservation is really a very modern concept, for until recently it was pretty generally believed that such fisheries were inexhaustible.

Nevertheless, there has always been strong opposition to the 3-mile limitation. In spite of certain dogmatic assertions to the contrary, it is open to argument whether there has been such general world acceptance of this particular distance as would justify its being termed an established principle of international law.

Complementary to the idea of a nationality owned marginal sea, whether 3, 4, or 10 miles in width, has been the concept that in the open waters beyond, there can be no national ownership but that the nationals of any country may fish there without limitation.

Here again, however, it is unwise to be dogmatic, for two reasons: First, because there is substantial precedent for the view that, although a nation may have no ownership in the ocean waters beyond its marginal belt, it may, nevertheless, have special interests which it is entitled to protect beyond that belt; and second, because, as previously indicated, international law is always in a state of flux, it is based upon practicalities as well as theories, and when it becomes apparent that an absolutely enormous natural food reservoir can either be maintained in continuous production or can be ruinously curtailed, sensible people will be found to devise ways and means for protecting the supply.

Let us, therefore, not be too discouraged by the pessimistic pronouncements of Government officials or college professors who have no comprehension of the factual situation or of the food and industrial potentialities of the sea. Instead, let us view briefly what has been accomplished and what appear to be some of the possibilities.

We find it has been conclusively demonstrated in the case of salmon, halibut, whales, and fur seals that it is possible to rehabilitate the depleted stocks of such ocean fish and marine mammals.

We also find that this has been accomplished in some cases by the action of a single coastal nation; in some cases by bilateral or multilateral treaties whereby each nation separately agrees to restrict its own nationals; and in some cases, notably that of the Pacific coast halibut and the Sockeye salmon, by joint international management.

But, the theorists say, there are antique principles of international law which will legally permit of the complete frustration of these noble examples of conservation. The best answer is that these are examples of success and that the few attempts to violate these efforts have themselves been failures. I refer particularly to the British-Norwegian threat to disregard the International Fisheries Commission regulation of our north Pacific halibut and the actual invasion by the Japanese of the Bristol Bay red salmon fishery.

Each failure in attempting to apply an obsolete principle to such a current situation tends to invalidate the principle itself and to establish the validity of the new system of accomplishment.

And so we find a Presidential fishery proclamation of September 28, 1945, which deserves some attention, even if the Government departments which were charged with its implementation have failed to respond. The basic concept is that some coastal fisheries should only be fished to a limited extent, which I believe biologists refer to as the optimum, otherwise the future supply will be depleted. If, therefore, a fishery is being so fished, no additional food supply will result but, on the contrary, a valuable food supply will be decreased, if additional fishing is permitted. Hence, where nationals of one or more nations have developed such a fishery to its optimum or beyond, it is an unjustifiable economic waste to permit nationals of other countries to invade such a fishery.

On the other hand, where a coastal fishery has not been fully developed, so that it is not being fished to its optimum, then there is no justification for the coastal nation to object to nationals of other countries entering the fishery, providing always that they remain outside of territorial waters.

The proclamation asserted that this country was willing to apply these principles upon a reciprocal basis.

It has been stated that international law is a mixture of the practical and the altruistic. Perhaps it is simpler and better to say that, generally speaking, international law is an attempt to apply common sense to international relations—to be just and reasonable but not to be silly or gullible.

In this light we may approach the most imminent international situation which confronts the fishing industry of the Pacific coast—the matter of a Japanese fishery treaty. What is the situation and how can it be handled in conformity with international law?

It is well known that there are two types of philosophy in this country, both inside and outside of Government circles. There are those who believe that it is neither isolationistic, unreasonable, or immoral to maintain the integrity of American industry so that this country will really be able to give the world at large sound and effective leadership. Then there is the Henry Wallace type of philosophy which apparently conceives that the way to create a happy world is to sacrifice American industry to foreigners.

This latter type of thinking was well illustrated by the immaculate young man who said that it would be "ungentlemanly" to negotiate a fishery treaty with Japan until the Japanese were in position to refuse to do so.

The practical situation is that the Canadian and United States fisheries of this coast, sardines, herring, coastal tuna, halibut, salmon and others, are being fished to their optimum or more by the fishermen of these two countries; that the intrusion of Japanese fishermen into these fisheries would not increase production on a continuous year-to-year basis; that for their fishermen to come clear across the Pacific Ocean would only be possible because of their low standards of living and would, therefore, necessarily tend to reduce the standards of living of our own fishermen; that they already have a greater fish poundage production out of their own coastal fisheries than we have from ours; that our prewar experience was that Japanese fishery operations were destructive and inconsistent with sound fishery conservation; that the Japanese could substantially increase their own coastal fishery production if they would apply proper conservation measures; and that, if they should come over and deplete our coastal fisheries, it would probably result in our own fishermen going across the ocean to raid the Japanese coasts, a reciprocity of the type that no one wants.

The legal situation is that peace treaties historically have dealt with many subjects other than a mere paper peace; that Japan itself in its two peace treaties with Russia of 1905 and 1925 specifically incorporated fishery provisions; that there is nothing in international law to prevent any two (or more) nations from making treaties restricting fishing by their own nationals and vessels; that there is nothing in international law to prevent Japan from entering into a perfectly simple yet effective and reciprocal treaty that, until otherwise agreed, its fishing vessels will stay out of the coastal fisheries of Canada and the United States and, in turn, these two countries will keep their fishing vessels out of Japanese coastal fisheries; that this can readly be done and should be done as a part of the peace treaty or at the same time.

If the leading fishery nations bordering the Pacific Ocean take timely steps to avoid disputes in that most fertile field for conflict, coastal fisheries, other fields can be investigated with more deliberation and some treaty procedure can be evolved for dealing with the noncoastal fisheries as research may, from time to time, indicate necessity.

It is announced in the press that a Japanese peace treaty is imminent. If, as indicated, international law permits inclusion of provisions such as have been discussed, there is perhaps nothing better that could be done to create that international good will across the Pacific that is desired by the citizens of Japan as well as by those of Canada and the United States. International law can and should facilitate such sound diplomacy.

To neglect this opportunity is to court trouble and to threaten the future peace of the Pacific. International law can be misused to obstruct progress, but it can also be developed to keep abreast of world conditions and to promote world peace.

Let Us Remember Who the Culprit Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 4 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I feel certain that I speak for every Senator and every Member of the House of Representatives at this moment when I say that all of us seek only to be helpful, to be calm, to set an example for the rest of our citizens in this dark hour. None among us wishes to do anything or say anything to complicate the task of our Nation's leaders. None among us wishes to jump to hasty conclusions based on limited information. Each of us would desire only to contribute something of value to the strengthening of our Nation in both the physical and the moral sense.

It is evident to me, as it must be to all my colleagues, that many among our people are deeply fearful, greatly disturbed, and, above all, desperately confused.

Of supreme importance at this time, it seems to me, is the need to keep our minds on the source and origin of our present troubles. We must aim at the real target, not at the decoys that have been set afloat by our enemies. The enemy of America is not its own Government. The enemy of America is not its own President or any member of his Cabinet. The enemy of America is not any of its military chiefs at home or overseas. The enemy of America is not

one or another or any of its allies. No; Mr. President, the enemy of America is to be found in the Kremlin, the capital of the Soviet Empire, the source of our agony in Korea, and the origin of the aggressions that menace the world. Let us, by all means and at all times, aim our attention and our anger at the real target: the Communist rulers of Soviet Russia.

I ask unanimous consent that the leading editorial of the Des Moines Register of the issue of November 30 on the Korean situation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

LET US REMEMBER WHO THE CULPRIT IS

It is only human nature for us to let our bitterest prejudices flare up for a moment, when trouble breaks upon us unexpectedly and we are desperate with apprehension and fear. So no doubt there will now be another swell of recrimination against some of our military leaders, Government officials, diplomatic agents, and Congress itself, because of the reverses in Korea.

But when we pull our consciences and our patriotism together again, as shortly we will, the sober and honest citizen will recognize that the events which harass America throughout the world are not of our making. Unquestionably our statesmen have made mistakes. They are human. They have not had any divine foreknowledge about what was in the Russian or Chinese or any other mind.

Neither, incidentally, has anybody else had such divine foreknowledge—including the critics of everything that the Nation has done. Their most violent accusations are almost invariably based upon hindsight. Whether they would have been wiser than someone else if they themselves had been responsible for making the necessary decisions—that is a proper question.

Of course, in the case of each decision there were alternatives. Another leader or group of leaders might have chosen other alternatives. But whether, even though they had chosen other ones, their decisions would have turned out to be utopian, or even better—that, also, is a proper question. It is always easy to argue, after it is too late, that some particular alternative would have been the right one, since history by now will not permit either proof or disproof.

If we have learned any lesson at all from the last year or two, it should be that no one can predict the course of Communist schemery and that honor and good faith are indispensable weapons of democracy despite their short-term risks.

Let us illustrate with the situation that confronts us at this very moment:

What, actually, are the intentions of Red China? Who is wise enough to foresee? Shall we hurl ourselves into a desperate, all-our war at this moment—or shall we play for time and pray for a less horrible prospect than that?

Why do not those who, 6 months or a year from now, will be pointing out all of the tragic blunders of today's decisions—why do not they tell us now how to solve the situation with a quick snap of the fingers?

The answer is that there is no such solution available to mortal minds. We are compelled to make best guesses.

And even the best guesses as to Communist strategy are only good relatively, because Communist strategy will continue to shift in order to make our decisions as erroneous and impotent as possible. It will seek to circumvent and nullify our course of behavior as rapidly as we adopt it.

It is fairly simple now to go back to 1948 and see what we should have done, if the Communist world were going to follow the course that it has followed. The trouble is that if we had taken some other tack, the Communist course, too, would have swerved to a new, unforeseeable, but equally threatening channel.

This is not said with any thought of domestic political considerations at all. The Register happens to have felt for a long time that the National Government would be strengthened by new political forces bringing new vitality to it. But that new force, if it had come into power, would have been faced with substantially the same problems. The long-term goals of Communist strategy are not importantly affected by the eddies of political currents in the United States.

The conflict that confronts the free world today far transcends national partisan lines. It confronts us as a Nation of homogenous people with common ideals and a common stake. And neither of our major parties has more of inner courage, of loyalty to these ideals, or of patriotism than the other.

It is a stupid waste of our energies to carp and snipe at our own nationally elected and legally appointed leaders, when our very world is drenched with the gasoline of violence and anarchy and about to be set aflame. Whatever its human limitations, our Government was democratically chosen and it is filled with men passionately devoted to their responsibilities to the people of the Nation and of the world. It is not they who ordered the Russian delegates to sabotage the United Nations. It is not they who armed the North Koreans. It is not they who hurled half a million Chinese against our boys in Korea.

So let us all open our eyes and see the crisis in its true form. It may take all the sobriety and courage and clarity of mind that we can muster, before it is ended.

The National Science Foundation Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 4 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a list of the suggested appointees to the National Science Foundation Board and a résumé of the biographies of the members chosen to handle this important work, and what they have done in the field of science education in this country.

I merely wish to point out that the suggested names are the names of great and eminent Americans. I think they are responding to this job almost as to a call to duty, in order that America may keep ahead of the rest of the world, not only in scientific achievement for our own welfare, but in scientific military achievement.

There being no objection, the résumé and list of appointees were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTEES TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BOARD

Many of my colleagues will recall the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

The Senate will soon be called upon to act on the confirmation of the Presidential appointees to the 24-member Board, who will mold the policy of the Foundation.

Too often we criticize, and so infrequently we praise, that it is important that the Members of the Senate study with care the noteworthy appointees that the President has selected for the National Science Foundation Board. It is most interesting to see that 16 States are represented.

I quote from the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 in reference to the appointees:

"NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

"SEC. 4. (a) The Board shall consist of 24 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and of the Director ex officio, and shall exercise the authority granted to the Foundation by this act. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be eminent in the fields of the basic sciences, medical science, engineering, agriculture, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, the Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

"(b) The term of office of each voting member of the Board shall be 6 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, 8 at the end of 2 years, 8 at the end of 4 years, and 8 at the end of 6 years, after the date of enactment of this act. Any person who has been a member of the Board for twelve consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the 2-year period following the expiration of such twelfth year.

"(c) The President shall call the first meeting of the Board, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a chairman and a vice chairman.

"(d) The Board shall meet annually on the first Monday in December and at such other times as the Chairman may determine, but he shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the members so request in writing. A majority of the voting members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last-known address of record not less than 15 days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

"(e) The first Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board shall be elected by the Board to serve until the first Monday in December next succeeding the date of election at which time a Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected for a term of 2 years. Thereafter such election shall take place at the annual meeting occurring at the end of each such term. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice-chairmanship, the Board shall elect a member to fill such vacancy.

"DIRECTOR OF THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 5. (a) There shall be a Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board may make recommendations to the President with respect to the appointment of the Director, and the Director shall not be appointed until the Board has had an opportunity to make such recommendations. He shall serve as a nonvoting ex officio member of the Board. In addition thereto he shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum and shall serve for a term of 6 years unless sooner removed by the President.

"(b) In addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in him by this act, the Director shall, in accordance with the policies established by the Board, exercise the powers granted by sections 10 and 11 of this act, together with such other powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Board; but no final action shall be taken by the Director in the exercise of any power granted by section 10 or 11 (c) unless in each instance the Board has reviewed and approved the action proposed to be taken."

The 24 Board members of the National Science Foundation, appointed by President Truman to make national policy for scientific research and education and administer Government grants, are representative of all sections of the Nation and the broad fields of science, engineering, and industry.

Among the membership are seven university presidents, heads of two big foundations, 11 deans, department heads, or professors of colleges, and two industrial presidents. Sixteen States and the District of Columbia are represented on the board of 24.

Professionally, the board includes four biologists, four chemists, four educators, two engineers, one geologist, two industrialists, one mathematician, three medical scientists, and three physicists.

Two women are on the board and one of them, Dr. Cori, is the only Nobel prize winner in the group. The board includes two Negroes, one a chemist and the other a college president.

The outstanding record of the appointees is of interest to every Member of the Senate. A résumé of their biographies follows:

ALABAMA

Patrick Henry Yancey,

Born Tampa, Fla., October 20, 1896. Educated in parochial and public schools of Tampa. Entered novitiate of Society of Jesus, Macon, Ga., 1912; St. Stanislaus' College, Macon, Ga., 1912–16; Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash. (A. B. 1918; A. M. 1919). Instructor in biology, Spring Hill College, 1919–23. Colegio de S. Francisco Javier, Ona (Burgos), Spain, and Laboratorio Biologico De Sarria (Barcelona), Spain, 1923–25. Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md., 1925–27. Ordained priest June 14, 1926. St. Stanislaus' Novitiate, Cleveland, Ohio, 1927–28. St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., and Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Mass., 1928–31 (Ph. D. effects of high centrifugal force on unicellular organisms). Professor of biology and head of the department, Spring Hill College, Mobile, Ala., 1931–—. Member of many scientific associations.

CALIFORNIA

A. Lee DuBridge

Was born September 21, 1901. He received the A. B. and Sc. D. degrees from Cornell College (Iowa); A. M. and Ph. D. degrees from the University of Wisconsin; Sc. D. degree from Wesleylan University and the Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute. He served as assistant in physics and instructor at the University of Wisconsin; assistant professor and associate professor of physics at Washington University; professor of physics and dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at the University of Rochester. He has been president of California Institue of Technology since 1946. Dr. DuBridge was an investigator with the National Defense Research Committee, and director of the Radiation Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1940–45. He is a member of numerous societies and associations.

Dr. Donald H. McLaughlin

President of Homestake Mining Co., and vice president of Cerro de Pasco Copper Corp. Dr. McLaughlin was for many years professor of mining and geology at Harvard University and dean of the Mining School at the University of California. President of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, 1950. Active at present in the work of various agencies in Washington, including the National Security Resources Board.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Robert Percy Barnes

Born in Washington, D. C., 1898. After graduating from high school, he studied at Amherst College, receiving his A. B. degree in chemistry. In his senior year at Amherst, he won a Phi Beta Kappa key and was made assistant in chemistry. He then entered the graduate school of Harvard University and became a brilliant student in organic chemistry. After receiving the M. A. degree in 1930, he continued graduate work in chemistry at Harvard and received the Ph. D. degree in 1933.

Dr. Barnes has done extensive research on diketones. He is author and coauthor of 20 or more research papers in leading scientifice journals.

Dr. Barnes is presently head, department of chemistry, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

INDIANA

Andrey A. Potter

Executive director, Patent Planning Commission; dean of engineering, Purdue University; past president American Society for Engineering Education; past president, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers; American Engineering Council. Chairman, Committee on Science Legislation, Engineers Council for Professional Development.

James A. Reyniers

Age 42, director, bacteriology laboratories, Notre Dame University. Member Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs. High distinction in field of bacteriological research. Testified on several occasions in support of national science legislation.

LOUISIANA

Joseph C. Morris

Age 48. Received Ph. D. from Princeton. Head of physics department at Tulane and vice president of the university. Member of National Research Council and active on National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel.

MARYLAND

Detlev Wulf Bronk

Was born in New York City on August 13, 1897, and studied at Swarthmore and the University of Pennsylvania, receiving M. S. (1922) and Ph. D. (1926) degrees from the University of Michigan.

He was Johnson professor of biophysics and director of the Eldridge Reeves Johnson Foundation for Medical Physics at the University of Pennsylvania from 1929 to January 1, 1949, when he became president of the Johns Hopkins University.

During World War II he was coordinator of research, Air Surgeon's Office, Army Air Forces, and Chief of the Division of Aviation Medicine, Committee on Medical Research of OSRD, receiving the award for exceptional civilian service in 1946. He is a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and of the advisory committee on biology and medicine of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Since 1946 he has been active as Chairman of the National Research Council and is now Vice Chairman of UNESCO.

MASSACHUSETTS

James Bryant Conant

Was born on March 26, 1893, at Dorchester, Mass. Harvard University conferred upon him the A. B. degree in 1913 and Ph. D. in 1916. In the same year he was appointed instructor in chemistry at Harvard, becoming professor of chemistry in 1927 and chairman of the department in 1931. Two years later he was elected twenty-third president of the university and continues to hold that office.

From 1941 to 1946 he was Chairman of the National Defense Research Committee. He is a member of the advisory committee of the Atomic Energy Commission; Chairman of the American Council on Education; and past president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Edward L. Moreland

Partner, Jackson & Moreland, engineers, 31 St. James Street, Boston, Mass. Widely known administrator of engineering activities. Served as head of department of electrical engineering, dean of engineering and executive vice president of M. I. T. national defense research committee, 1942–46. Expert consultant, Office of Secretary of War, 1945, assigned to GHQ Army Forces, Pacific, Philippines, and Japan.

MINNESOTA

Elvin C. Stakman

Born May 17, 1885. He received B. A., M. A., and Ph. D. degrees from the University of Minnesota, and honorary doctor of natural sciences, University of Halle (Germany). He has been at the University of Minnesota since 1909 and has held the position of chief, Division of Plant Pathology and Botany since 1940. He has been pathologist and agent, United States Department of Agriculture since 1919; United States Department of Agriculture national defense leader of rubber expedition to South America, 1940. He was guest professor at the University of Halle, 1930–31. Member, American Plant Pathologists War Emergency Board, 1918; chairman, War Emergency Committee, 1942–43. Foreign member, Swedish Royal Academy. President, American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1949. Dr. Stakman was a member of the 1948 scientific advisory mission to Japan named by the National Academy.

MISSOURI

Gerti Theresa Cori

Biochemist, born in Prague, Austria, August 15, 1896, the daughter of Otto and Martha (Neustadt) Radnitz.

Education: Graduate of Realgymnasium of Tetschen, Czechoslovakia, 1914; M. D., German University of Prague Medical School; 1920, Sc. D., Boston University, 1948, Smith College, 1949.

Married August 5, 1920, to Carl F. Cori; have one son.

Came to the United States in 1922; naturalized in 1928.

Employment: Assistant, Children's Hospital in Vienna, 1920–22; assistant biochemist, State Institute for Study of Malignant Diseases, Buffalo, 1922–31; Research Associate, Washington University Medical School, 1931–47; and professor of biological chemistry since 1947.

Awards: Midwest award, American Chemical Society, 1946; Garvan medal, 1948; Squibb award in endocrinology, 1947; Nobel prize in medicine and physiology, 1947.

Member: National Academy of Science, American Philosophical Society, American Society of Biological Chemists, American Society of Pharmacists, American Chemical Society, Sigma Zi.

Conductor of research in carbohydrate metabolism and enzymes.

Office: Washington University Medical School, St. Louis.

Frederick A. Middlebush

Age 60. President of the University of Missouri. Member, European Conference, Professors of International Law and Relations, 1926; member, board of trustees, the Carnegie Foundation since 1936; vice chairman, Navy Civilian Advisory Committee, 1946; member, American Political Science Association, American Society International Law, American Association of University Professors, National Committee on Liberal Arts Colleges, Executive Committee Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, Citizens' Committee on Reorganization of Federal Government, Academic Advisory Board United States Marine Academy, Committee on Organization Executive Branch of Government (1948), Board of Visitors Naval Academy (1946–48), Panel of Political Scientists of American Political Science Association (1946). Vice president National Association State Universities (1943). Contributor special articles and reviews to professional journals.

NEW MEXICO

Sophie D. Aberle

Education: Stanford University, A. B. 1923, M. A., 1925, Ph. D., 1927. Alexander Brown Coxe fellow, 1930. Yale University School of Medicine, M. D., 1930. Sterling fellow, Yale University Medical School, 1930–31.

Experience: Assistant in histology, embryology, and neurology, Stanford University, 1924–26. Instructor in anthropology, Institute of Human Relations, Yale, 1927–28. Instructor in Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 1930–34. Associate research, Carnegie Institution, 1934–35. Superintendent Pueblo Indians, Bureau of Indian Affairs, United States Department of Interior, 1935–44. Division Medical Science National Research Council, 1944–49. Special research director, University of New Mexico, 1949–.

Societies: A. A. A. S. American Medical Association; fellow, Society Research Child Development; fellow, Anthropological Association; Association of Anatomists. Research in anthropology: Endocrinology.

NEW JERSEY

Harold Marston Morse

Born March 24, 1892. He received A. B. and Sc. D. degrees from Colby College; A. M. and Ph. D. degrees from Harvard, the latter in 1917; and Dr. (honoris causa), Paris, 1946.

After graduation, Dr. Morse taught at Cornell, Brown, and Harvard Universities. He has been professor of mathematics at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J., since 1935. He was consultant, Office of Chief of Ordnance, United States Army; Coast and Geodetic Survey; and National Defense Research Committee. He served as private, United States Army, 1918–19; second lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps research, 1919–24; chairman, war preparations committee, American Mathematical Society and Mathematical Association of America, 1940–42. He is a contributor to various mathematical periodicals and a member of United States and foreign scientific societies.

NEW YORK

Chester I. Barnard

Age 64. President, Rockefeller Foundation; president, General Education Board; former president, New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.; served on Lilienthal Board of Consultants to Secretary of State on international control of atomic energy; Presidential Special Commission on Integration of Medical Sciences in Government, 1946; fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences A. A. A. S.

Charles Dollard

Age 43. President, Carnegie Corp, of New York; trustee, Bennington College; member, University of Wisconsin Foundation; director, American Council on Race Relation.

Robert F. Loeb

Was born March 14, 1895. He was educated at the Horace Mann School, New York, and at the University of Chicago. He received his M. D. degree from Harvard.

Dr. Loeb has been connected with Presbyterian Hospital and College of Physicians and Surgeons (Columbia University) since 1921, as Lambert professor of medicine from 1942 to 1947, becoming Bard professor of medical services in 1947. He was chairman of the Board for Coordination of Malarial Study, Washington, D. C., and also of the Medical Board of Review, United States Atomic Energy Commission, in 1947. He is a member of numerous scientific societies.

Charles Edward Wilson

Home address: 7 Hampton Road, Scarsdale, N. Y.

Office address: 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Born: New York, N. Y., November 18, 1886.

Education: Educated public schools of New York City.

Experience: 1899: Began in shipping department, Sprague Works, General Electric Co., New York City, and served successively in accounting, production, engineering, manufacturing, and marketing departments; manager, merchandise department and vice president, 1930–37. 1937–39: Executive vice president. Since 1940: President since January 1; chairman of board, General Electric Supply Corp.; director, General Electric Co., International General Electric Co., Guaranty Trust Co. of New York. 1942–44: Executive vice chairman, WPB.

Organizations: Clubs: Scarsdale Country; Mohawk (Schenectady); Links (New York).

Remarks: Baptist.

NORTH CAROLINA

Dr. Paul M. Gross

Dean, Duke University Graduate School, and president and board of directors of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies.

TENNESSEE

Dr. O. W. Hyman

Born December 21, 1890. Graduated from University of North Carolina, 1910; Ph. D., Princeton University, 1921; LL. D., Southwestern College, Memphis, Tenn., 1938. In 1921 was professor of histology and embryology and business manager of University's medical units in Memphis. In 1925 appointed dean of the medical school, and in 1948 appointed vice president medical units, University of Tennessee. Has national reputation as an educator in the field of medicine and its allied sciences.

WEST VIRGINIA

John W. Davis

Address: West Virginia State College, Institute, W. Va.

Born: February 11, 1888; Milledgeville, Ga.

Education: Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., and University of Chicago.

Degrees: A. B., Morehouse College, 1911; A. M., Morehouse College, 1920; D. Litt., State College, Orangeburg, S. C., 1931; and LL. D., Wilberforce University, 1939; Howard University, 1940.

Outline of career: Teacher at Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., 1911–15. Registrar, 1914–17; executive secretary Twelfth Street Branch, Y. M. C. A., Washington, D. C., 1917–19; president of West Virginia State College, Institute, W. Va., since, 1919. National Advisory Committee on Education, 1929–31; member Commission on Institutions of Higher Learning of North Central Association of Colleges, 1936 to date.

Author of Land-Grant Colleges for Negroes, 1934; Problems in the Collegiate Education of Negroes, 1937; Minority Report, National Advisory Committee on Education (with R. R. Motion and M. W. Johnson), 1932; Wilberforce University as a Cause, 1939.

WISCONSIN

B. Fred Edwin

Was born March 22, 1887. He received his B. S. and M. S. degrees from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and his Ph. D. degree from the University of Gottingen.

He is now president of the University of Wisconsin, and has worked and taught at the University of Wisconsin, serving as professor of bacteriology, dean of the graduate school and of the College of Agriculture, and director of the Agricultural Experiment Station. During World War II, he was Technical Program Director of the War Research Service. This service was recognized by the award of a medal for merit.

WYOMING

George D. Humphrey

Age 53. President, University of Wyoming. Long record of experience in educational administration. Active in land-grant college movement.

Mr. President, having been identified with this legislation for the past 4 years, it is my sincere hope that the Senate will expedite the appointment of these outstanding men and women.

The National Science Foundation must get on with its task. The hour is already too late.

National Education Program for Study of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 4 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, upon our return to Congress from the recent recess, Members of the Senate were gratified to find upon their desks copies of Your Congress magazine, outlining the formation of the committee for Congress by a group of outstanding correspondents, to sponsor Congress Study Councils in schools, colleges, and other groups and assemblages.

It seems to me that the thought motivating this program is a very fine one, and should result in much benefit in acquainting the country with the work of the Congress and the responsibilities resting upon its membership.

Any program which tends to create a better understanding of the national Congress, its membership, and its work is very much to be desired.

I therefore ask that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD correspondence I have had with the editor of

Your Congress magazine which emphasizes the woeful lack in our school and college curricula of studies on even the basic functions of our Congress, a shortcoming which the Committee for Congress proposes to correct.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 1, 1950.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Further to our letter to you of November 27 outlining plans of the Committee for Congress, composed of a group of practical, working newspapermen, to sponsor a national-education program for Congress and its Members.

We are receiving offers of cooperation in this program from many people. Of course, the committee is hopeful that every Member of the Senate and House of Representatives will consent to serve as ex officio members of the committee. We will be highly gratified if they will take active roles in the program.

The educational project will endeavor to set up special-study groups in schools, colleges, women's clubs, service clubs, unions, factory groups, and in other assemblages. A special study kit will be supplied by the committee, along with current information about Congress and its members in Your Congress Magazine.

We would welcome additional inquiries on the program at the Committee for Congress, 1060 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C., ME-2214.

The attached letters shed additional light on the educational program, particularly emphasizing the woeful lack of study material on Congress in our schools and colleges. We would appreciate their insertion in the RECORD.

HAL. J. MILLER,
Editor, Your Congress Magazine, Executive Director, Committee for Congress, Sponsor of Congress Study Councils.

NOVEMBER 29, 1950.

Mr. HAL J. MILLER,
Executive Director,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: In this morning's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I read with great interest your letter to Senator WILEY concerning the formation of the Committee for Congress and the publication of Your Congress magazine.

The sentiments expressed coincide so closely with my own views and philosophy that I am prompted to write to you for additional information. This problem of "educating democracy's citizens" in the operation of their Congress and Government has been one of my chief concerns as an undergraduate and now as a graduate student in political science here at the American University in Washington.

As you so ably point out, our civics and political science courses fall far short of their real objectives. I, too, am appalled by the apathy and lack of understanding of even the basic functions of our Congress.

Recognition of the need for materials for better education along these lines has led me to produce two works dealing with the legislative process. Both were published by the American University Press.

For your information and examination I am enclosing a copy of the most recent of these, entitled "Operation: Congress." Since its publication last month it has already been accepted for use as a supplemental text in several high schools, for use in civics courses, and by a number of colleges and universities.

Contributing to the final draft were such outstanding authorities in the field as Dr. W. Brooke Graves, of the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress; Dr. Paul F. Douglass, president of American University; Prof. M. Lloyd M. Short, of the University of Minnesota; and Prof. Stephen K. Bailey, of Wesleyan University.

It has occurred to me that your committee might be interested in the use of these booklets in your study programs or that you might wish to discuss printing rights of a modified version of Operation: Congress in Your Congress magazine. I note that you plan an article along these lines.

Past use of your fine publication, Pictorial Directory of Congress, assures me of the high quality of performance in your new publication, and I am certain that the important undertaking of the Committee for Congress, under your guidances, will be a success. Perhaps my interest and experience would qualify me to take a more active part in the work of your committee. I would welcome an opportunity to help advance, in any way, the worth-while objectives of your organization.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM G. PHILLIPS.

THE COMMITTEE FOR CONGRESS,
December 1, 1950.

Mr. WILLIAM G. PHILLIPS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PHILLIPS: The members of the Committee for Congress were highly gratified to receive your letter of November 29 with its generous offer of the use of your excellent published material on Congress in our National Congress Study Council program. As the program progresses, we will certainly avail ourselves of this offer, as well as of your generous offer to be of personal assistance to the committee.

We were especially interested in your observation that our civics and political science courses fall far short of their real objectives and your comment that you are appalled by the apathy and lack of understanding of even the basic functions of our Congress.

This is corroboration of our own findings that there is widespread lack of understanding of our most cherished institution in the political sphere, our Congress. It is precisely that appalling situation that the Committee for Congress will endeavor to correct.

We were pleased to receive a copy of your publication Operation: Congress, and we will ascertain how it and your services can be worked into the program.

Yours sincerely,
HAL. J. MILLER,
Editor, Your Congress Magazine; Executive Director, Committee for Congress; Sponsor of National Congress Study Councils.

How To Manage Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Catholic Review, published at Baltimore, Md., on Friday, December 1, 1950, the following editorial by the Reverend James M. Gillis, C. S. P., under the unusual heading of "Sursum corda":

Someone has asked whether the famine in Yugoslavia is a biblical one, an act of God, or whether it has been wholly or partially caused by an economic system that simply will not work. In either case our sense of humanity and our religion compel us to come to the aid of the starving Yugoslavs. It will not do to say "charity begins at home," and let it go at that. Still worse would it be to say "they made their own bed; let them lie on it." If "they" means the people, they didn't make their own bed, any more than those who were placed on the bed of the tyrant Procrustes and stretched or shortened to fit it.

We may, some of us, be called isolationists * * * but we never were isolationists from humanity. Furthermore, a nation that can afford to send $70,000,000,000 to Russia can afford $105,000,000 worth of goods to Yugoslavia.

However, though we must be charitable, we need not be reckless or stupid or careless of consequences. It would be crazy for us to send food to Tito and let him distribute it as a reward to those who accept his regime with docility while withholding it from those who venture to show their dislike for communism. He will do just that if we let him, for he is an unprincipled tyrant and a pitiless murderer. It would be suicidal of us to promote his tyranny while saving his people from starvation.

In New York City * * * it is claimed that there was a public servant who used to bestow bounty upon the poor—many of them as ignorant as they were poor—but in the giving he conveyed the idea that what he gave came from him and not from the city or from Uncle Sam. We must not let Tito pull a stunt like that. So let us keep well in mind that the Yugoslav dictator is now and will always be what he was when he came to power: a bandit, a killer, a trickster, and that he is first, last, and always a Communist. It was Communist collectivization that made the present catastrophe or aggravated it.

The drought may have been an act of God but starvation was there before the drought. Constantin Fotitch, former Yugoslav Ambassador to the United States, writes in Human Events for November 8: "In order to buy capital equipment and raw materials from the west, Tito (after the split with the cominform) recklessly exported food with the result that all the reserves of the country were depleted. Long before the drought people had been reduced to near-starvation rations. The standard of living of the Yugoslav citizens was sacrificed to the Marxian goddess, industrialization, and of all the countries in the Balkans, Yugoslavia now pictures the most miserable picture."

And—

"In order to break the resistance of the peasants—who constitute 75 percent of the population and are one of the greatest obstacles to the consolidation of communism—the regime is imposing the policy of collectivization of the land. By all kinds of pressure it forces the farmers into the kolkhozes, and the secret police carries out the orders for the compulsory surrender of the crops with utmost brutality. The result is the passive resistance of the stubbornly independent farmers who refuse to become the slaves of the regime. Tito himself has admitted that in 1949 there was 11 percent more of uncultivated arable land than in 1939."

It reminds us of the condition in the Russian Ukraine in 1932–33 when some six to ten million peasants were deliberately starved by Stalin because of what Fotitch calls a megalomanic 5-year plan. The Yugoslav people are now in the same danger and largely for the same reason. We may, for the moment, relieve their hunger but it would be short-sighted of us to make no stipulation about the system that caused the hunger.

Tito claims to have 32 divisions; that is some 450,000 men under arms. He explains that this huge army is a necessity because of the threat of his one-time partner in

crime, Stalin. If so, Tito should be reminded that we are now fighting Stalin in Korea, and that we could use 10 or 12 or more of those divisions. With 200,000 of his soldiers absent in Korea, the problem of feeding them would be solved—as usual—by us. Tito has thrown out some hints that he would fight the Chinese Reds. He is probably lying—Communists always lie—but we could at least call his bluff.

Fotitch continues: "In a speech in Zagreb on October 29, Tito boastfully claimed: 'I can openly state that the United States Government has set no conditions,' and then turned his wrath against the reactionaries at home and abroad who have 'started a campaign urging Americans to impose on him harsh conditions because the Belgrade regime was now trapped in a corner.'"

We need not impose harsh conditions but the least we can do when we hand out food to the Yugoslavs is to let them know that, thank God, we Americans are able to help them because we are not at the mercy of a dictator and of a murderous and suicidal economic system. * * * We had better not let Tito think that we are an easy mark. As a mere starter and as one token of good will he might release Archbishop Stepinac outright. Suppose we suggest it to him, and see what happens. But in any event we must not let the people starve.

The following newspaper item from the Catholic Review, published at Baltimore, Md., on Friday, December 1, 1950, throws light upon what is going on in Yugoslavia as far as the persecution of Catholic religious are concerned:

CZECH PRELATE, EIGHT PRIESTS FACING PRISON—NEW TRIALS RIGGED ON SPY CLAIM—BISHOP ZELA'S OWN CLERGY FORCED TO HELP PROSECUTION

Fresh evidence that communism, whether Moscow-dominated or not, is the implacable foe of religion is had in the latest news on the relentless persecution of religion in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

In the former, according to word allowed to come across borders closed to free, factual reporting, dispatches tell of a Communist-rigged trial of Catholic prelates and priests which recalls the hearings accorded Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, imprisoned Primate of Hungary, and Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac of Zagreb, Yugoslavia. The Prague regime is a Kremlin puppet.

From Yugoslavia, which is Communist but at odds with Moscow, comes a report of stepped-up arrests of seminarians and seminary professors, obviously designed to strike at the priesthood at its source.

The Tito regime reportedly arrested three of six top officials of the Catholic seminary at Zagreb, the largest in that country. It had arrested 14 students there 3 months ago.

In Czechoslovakia, nine churchmen, including one bishop, were placed on trial by the Prague regime. It became the second major proceeding against officials of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia within a few months. In April of this year 10 prominent Czechoslovak leaders of religious communities were sentenced to terms of from 2 years to life for alleged antistate activities.

The Czechoslovak churchmen were charged with treason, espionage, spreading subversive propaganda, and helping persons flee the country.

On trial were: Bishop Stanislav Zela, auxiliary and vicar general of the Olomouc archdiocese; Abbot Jan Opasek, of the Benedictine monastery at Brevnov; and Abbot Stanislav Jarolimek, of the Premonstratensian monastery at Strahov.

MANY HELD IN DURESS

Also Msgr. Otekar Svec, former consultant at the papal nunciature in Prague; Josef Cihak, archdeacon of the metropolitan chapter at Prague's St. Vitus Cathedral; and Jan Boukal, first secretary to Archbishop Josef Beran, of Prague; and the Reverends Jaroslav Kulac, head of the missionary federation of priests; Antonin Mandl, director of the church's suppressed Catholic action; and Vaclav Mrtvy, Salesian priest who had been employed at the papal nunciature in Prague.

The three clergymen arrested by the Tito regime were described as the Reverends Josip Salac, spiritual director of the upper classes at the Zagreb seminary; Angelko Juric, S. J., spiritual director for the lower classes; and a Father Talan, vice rector at the seminary.

There was no exact information given on how long the Czech prelates and priests had been held under arrest before the trial began. However, it was definitely known that one of the accused, Monsignor Svec, had been under arrest since October 1949. At the time of his arrest he had not fully recovered from sufferings under the Nazis as a prisoner for 3 years at Dachau. Bishop Zela had been reported arrested last August.

PRESS GIVEN COPIES

Representatives of the western press were reportedly given copies of the indictment against the churchmen and passes to the courtroom a half hour before the trial was due to begin. They were forbidden to take along interpreters and informed that official interpretation would be provided over earphones in English, French, and Russian.

Following the well-known pattern of iron-curtain trials, the defendants confessed guilt or partial guilt as the trial progressed at Prague's Pancrac Prison.

The prisoners were reportedly questioned by a seven-man court and three prosecutors. There was no indication that the accused were given the privilege of a defense attorney.

The line of questioning pursued by the prosecutors sought to involve the country's two archbishops, Archbishops Beran and Josef Matocha, of Olomouc, in criminal activities.

PICTURED AS SPY

Archbishop Beran was pictured as having drawn up espionage reports and forwarded them to the Vatican. Archbishop Matocha was described in the testimony as having defied the church laws on instructions from the Vatican. Neither of the prelates are defendants in the trial.

One Czech exile listening to Prague broadcasts of the trial stated he got the impression that what the indictment meant by an espionage report was any pastoral letter or report to the Holy See on the spiritual affairs of the church.

Comments from church papers in Rome stated that an analysis of the proceedings and charges showed the defendants were essentially tried for the crime of being Catholics, and that the trial was not of the defendants but of the Catholic Church.

Reports from the prison trial chamber pictured Bishop Zela pleading guilty in part to charges of treason and espionage. He was said to have apologized and stated he was deeply sorry.

Monsignor Boukal, Archbishop Beran's secretary, reportedly pleaded guilty to the charges and testified that he had drawn up political reports for both Archbishop Beran and the papal nunciature in Prague.

CITES SECRET LETTERS

Monsignor Cihak, head of the St. Vitus Cathedral chapter, was also reported to have pleaded guilty. He is said to have testified that he delivered secret letters for Archbishop Beran containing espionage reports. Monsignor Cihak was reported to have appeared thin and stoop-shouldered, making a meek confession of guilt and apologizing for his mistake.

It was noted that these confessions strikingly parallel those at other Red trials, from Stalin's Moscow purge trials of the 1930's to the many farcical trials of churchmen—Catholic and non-Catholic—in Soviet-satellite countries since the war.

The indictment released by the Czech Ministry of Information states that the espionage was directed by the papal nunciature in Prague; the church's Catholic Action was transformed into a widely ramified conspiratorial network for subversive and espionage activities; the defendants conducted the activities of terrorist groups, and many millions of funds were embezzled from the priests' health service for subversive ends.

No official reason was reported for the arrest of the three Yugoslav priests. But it was believed to have grown out of the previous arrest of 14 students at the seminary. Charges against these student were reportedly based on discovery of a rifle and anti-Tito leaflets in possession of two students. The leaflets were said to have borne the stamp "U," an identification mark that was used by the Ustachi, pro-Nazi Croatian organization that functioned during World War II.

One secular news dispatch indicated that the arrest of the priests stripped the Tito regime of its usual propaganda excuse that it was merely acting to crush a conspiracy. The dispatch stated:

"Persons acquainted with these developments said that the arrests have lost the character of a move by the Yugoslav Communist Government to crush an alleged conspiracy. They said the three officials held are innocent and that their arrest represents a new and important step in Marshal Tito's conflict with the Catholic Church."

From the foregoing, I believe we can say truthfully that the least we should do before giving any aid whatsoever to Tito is to endeavor to have him practice freedom of religion in his land and give to all peoples who have dedicated their lives to God that fair and proper treatment which their high and unselfish calling merits.

What better time is there than now to drive home this request as a must?

Any distribution of food supplies should be made in Yugoslavia by one of our international welfare agencies in well-marked packages stating that the United States of America is the donor.

Europe Is Our First Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, there is no need to dwell at length on the gravity of the present world crisis. It seems to me at this time that our greatest need is for rationality, deliberation, and courage. The courage we need is often harder to muster than what it takes to face guns in wartime. We need the courage to hold to those fundamental world policies which have made our country a force for peace for so many generations.

I would like to call to the attention of the House an excellent statement on the major problem before us; it is an article by Prof. Nathaniel Peffer, of Colum-

bia University, entitled "In the Long Run Europe Is Our First Front":

IN THE LONG RUN EUROPE IS OUR FIRST FRONT—TO LOSE ASIA TO THE SOVIET WOULD BE SERIOUS, BUT TO LOSE ALL EUROPE COULD PROVE FATAL

(By Nathaniel Peffer)

If Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Franklin, and others of the Founding Fathers of the Republic were to revisit the earth to survey the progress of what they had wrought, they would no doubt be startled by skyscrapers, airplanes, telephones, and radio. But what would puzzle them most would be what on earth had brought it about that the Republic they had founded along a narrow fringe of the Atlantic seaboard should, in seven generations, have come to pledge its life, its fortunes, and its honor on the concerns of the continent on the other side of the Pacific.

If it were on the concerns of Europe, they might regret it, believing, as they did, that the Union's safety lay in detachment from external politics, but they would understand, since they regarded themselves as Englishmen and therefore Europeans. But why Asia? That they could not understand.

It is a question that must sometimes puzzle contemporary Americans, too. For one of the main preoccupations of this country in this generation has been the politics of the Far East, and it was actually because of the Japanese invasion of China and not because of the Nazis' conquest of nearly all Europe that America was brought into the last war. Still more, America has been torn within for a decade, part of it looking westward to Asia, part of it looking eastward to Europe—very much like Russia since the eighteenth century.

This was most dramatically in evidence after Pearl Harbor, when there was a sharp controversy, not always in the open, over the strategy of the war, the issue being whether to concentrate first on Germany or first on Japan. Owing to the firmness of President Roosevelt and General Marshall, the decision was in favor of defeating Germany first, but there was bitterness both within the fighting services and without.

Now there is a "cold war," and the controversy has been revived. Again the issue is: Shall this country concentrate its efforts on Asia or on Europe? Russia threatens in both. Where shall we try to check it first? There is an immediate contingency, and as long as the Chinese and North Koreans, or both, are threatening, America has no choice and cannot withdraw. But, in the long run, broader considerations enter and, for the long-run, decisions should be made on those considerations.

Now, however, the issue is political as well as military, and therefore more productive of rancor. It is political both externally and internally; externally, in that, by diplomatic pressure, economic measures and the establishment of strong points we are engaged in almost every part of the world; internally, in that the most acrid controversy in domestic politics now turns on what the present administration in Washington has or has not done in the Far East.

One thing has to be said. The controversy now raging is not always waged on the merits of the issue. It is clear that a great deal of the partisanship of all-out efforts for Asia is a disguised or oblique isolationism. Many of those who would let France go to save Formosa do not care so much about either as they do about letting the rest of the world "stew in its own juice." The solicitude for Chiang Kai-shek and Bao Dai can be a symbolic expression of resentment of the aberration of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt and influential leaders in the Atlantic seaboard. It is, in many cases, sometimes unconsciously, sometimes sincerely, a rationale for regression.

How has it come about? Why the preoccupation with Asia and how far is it justified? The question is not new, even if never before so urgent as now. It has been mounting toward fixity since the beginning of this century and principally it concerns China. It arises out of what has become an increasingly firm resolve to permit no great power to have control over that country.

In the first years of the century, the opposition was directed against Russia, which, then as now, had outposts in Manchuria and was manifesting aspirations to expand from there down into China proper. There were sharp diplomatic brushes between Washington and St. Petersburg, though with more decorum in vocabulary than can be found at Lake Success now.

This ended when Japan disposed of Russia in the war of 1904–1905 and was succeeded by the same situation between the United States and Japan over the same places and for the same reasons. Japan had supplanted Russia in Manchuria and was manifesting the same unmistakable desire to take all of China. This ended only with the ceremonies on the U. S. S. *Missouri* on September 2, 1945.

Among students of American foreign policy, there has never been agreement on why America has staked so much on the preservation of China's independence; outwardly, so much more than it has on the fate of any single European country. The reasons are mixed, as in all politics, but, originally, the main reason appears to have been more economic than anything else.

It is true that trade with China constituted a negligible fraction of American foreign trade, but the lure of what would come when China would be fully opened to foreign commerce and fully developed has exercised a fascination for almost a hundred years. This has changed now. The chief consideration is no longer economic but strategic. It has to do with American security. The hope of gain has given way to fear—fear of the danger that would be created by a Russia extending from Berlin to the Pacific. To that must be added ideological fear—fear of an all-powerful Russia that is also Communist.

Russia in Asia is even more difficult to explain. All the conventional motivations of foreign policy do not seem to fit except as an explanation after the fact. Clearly, the motive cannot be economic, since Russia is still relatively unindustrialized, underpopulated and rich in resources. It cannot be the need for security, since Russia proper never has been menaced by the weak nations and tribes of Asia. There is, rather, something elemental in Russia's eastward expansion, something geological, something glacial, moving slowly but relentlessly. At any rate, Russia was moving eastward across Asia as early as 300 years ago. By the middle of the nineteenth century it was in full course, and before the end of the century had arrived at the shores of the Pacific. Now, it appears to be solidly entrenched and still advancing. But even now it is impossible to say with assurance whether it moves as an empire in the classical sense, in a way Peter the Great would have approved, or as the vehicle of social revolution carrying Marxism to the Eastern World. Whatever the motives may be on both sides, the position is clear. Russia expands in Asia and America seeks to stop it. At the same time, Russia expands in Europe and America (as well as western Europe) seeks to stop it there too. But where shall America direct its major effort—to Europe or Asia? As in 1942, it has not enough power to attempt both simultaneously without being ineffective in both. Which shall it subordinate?

There is only one logical approach to the question. If the ultimate choice were forced in the immediate future by acts or events beyond our control, which of the two could be lost without jeodardizing America's continued existence as a Nation? Could we survive more easily, or, at least, be in less danger, if all Europe fell to Russia, or if all Asia fell to Russia?

Suppose, for example, Asia were lost. Just what would be the consequence to America? Economically, it would be unfortunate, but in future potentiality rather than present reality. It would restrict future opportunity, but not inflict at once a penalty that would be reflected in the American economy. At the worst, not all trade would cease. There was trade with Soviet Russia even before American recognition in 1933. The economic loss, in other words, would be relative rather than absolute.

Strategically, the consequences would be much more serious. Europe would become politically, as well as geographically, a peninsula. The whole Eurasian land mass, with the exception of India and Pakistan at least for a time, would be at Russia's disposal, for political, economic and military purposes. There would be created the largest political unit the world has known. But would it be for a long time the most formidable in terms of actual threat to highly organized and technically efficient societies such as those of western Europe and North America?

Let it be assumed that the whole of China's power is Russia's to use—an assumption not yet warranted in the long run. China has numbers, no doubt. It could provide an army of tens of millions. But as yet Chinese troops have been trained for old-fashioned, small-arms warfare and guerilla resistance only. They were effective against the demoralized, incompetently led armies of Chiang Kai-shek and for slow attrition of small Japanese units, but they would be of doubtful use against a modern army unless superiority of numbers were so overwhelming as to smother it by sheer mass. The North Koreans, it must be remembered, were dispersed in 3 weeks, despite their Russian tanks, when the American forces arrived in comparable numbers.

Aside from manpower, the accession of China, even if it were without reservation, would add little to Russian strength in the near future. China is yet without any real industry. It cannot make a tank or a heavy gun or even a jeep, let alone jet planes. It has only the most rudimentary beginning of industrialization and cannot accelerate the process very much, since it lacks both capital and technical personnel. It will be all the Communist regime can do to keep the country's head above water without a forced pace in industralization. Even if Russia has the capacity to industrialize China and thus provide it with powerful arament, which is doubtful in any period short of decades, there is no assurance that it would do so. Why should it want a really powerful country on its outermost boundaries, next to some of its most important new industrial centers? What guaranty has it that a strong China would always be at its disposal or even friendly? Despite the presumed ideological affiinity, there is no reason to assume that Russia has an excessive trust in China or vice versa, most of all vice versa.

Suppose, too, that Russia were entrenched on the Pacific shore of Asia by virtue of controlling China. How much difference would that make? It is on the Pacific shore of Asia now at Vladivostok, which is closer to San Francisco or Detroit than Shanghai. It is still closer at Kamchatka, opposite the Aleutian Islands, from which it could attack American cities much more easily than from China bases.

All this is to say that Russian possession of all Asia would be serious but not fatal, at least for a long time, long enough, for Europe to be strengthened and its military and economic potential to be integrated with America's.

But if Europe were lost to Russia? Then there would be economic consequences indeed. A large and important segment of America's export trade would be cut off—automobiles, farm machinery, business machines, machine tools, grains, meat, tobacco, and cotton. All would remain to glut the home market. Further, the billions lent to European countries during the war and afterward through ECA would have to be written off. America, no doubt, could make the required adjustments, but the blow would be a crippling one.

More grave would be the strategic consequences. For then Russia would have the whole world, except America, which would stand as an island in a vast militarist-Communist sea, Asia could go Communist and Europe remain unaffected, but if Europe became Communist, Asia would fall into line almost automatically. It would see the handwriting on the wall. Certainly, no part of it would have enough confidence in America to risk alining itself with the United States.

Physically, America would be under direct threat. Russia would have at its disposal not only European manpower but Europe's industrial establishment and its advanced technological development, both in plant and personnel. This last might be the greatest lift to Russia from European conquest. Moreover, it would have convenient and easy jumping-off places for attack on America.

Ireland, the United Kingdom, the Iberian Peninsula, Greenland, Iceland, the Azores, North Africa, and Dakar—all are springboards. Then America would really be surrounded. It would have to become an armed camp, standing unremittingly on guard, all other considerations in American society—education, health, welfare—subordinated to the military. That alone would constitute defeat, would negate the promise of American destiny.

There is something else, more intangible, but no less compelling. The prospect of all western Europe coming under the brutish, atavistic regimen of Russian monolithic totalitarianism is not easily tolerable. Everything slowly grown and formed since the Renaissance, since the Dark Ages even, would be nullified. Western culture would be truncated. The west, after all, has developed slowly, in traditions and institutions of representative, responsible government and guarantees of equality under the law administered in channels of justice openly conducted.

It is not pleasant to think of Scandinavians, Hollanders, Frenchmen, and Englishmen going to bed at night wondering whether the 2 a. m. knock on the door will come and, if it comes, being dragged off and dropped somewhere into oblivion, their wives and children never knowing where they were or whether they were dead or alive, their kindest fate that of being hauled off to some Arctic slave camp. It is not pleasant to think of a Churchill confessing before the microphone at a trial after being held incommunicado for months; or an Attlee or a Herriot or a Bertrand Russell or an André Gide—confessing to anything and everything and then being dragged off to be shot as even common criminals are no longer shot.

It is not pleasant to think of a British physicist or a French philosopher standing up at a public hearing, renouncing all his previous beliefs in the light of the pronouncements of great Stalin, father and protector of England and France, light of the world, inventor of fire and the wheel, architect of the Parthenon, author of Hamlet, painter of the Sistine Chapel, composer of the Ninth Symphony, discoverer of electricity. It is not pleasant to think of all Europeans cowering in terror all their living moments, forever turning their heads to see who was listening, fearful always of the informer, not knowing whether their own children would report on them.

Then, surely, night would settle on Europe and there would be an end of all that has given western civilization its dignity.

Consciously to elect this in order to save Formosa and Indochina and Burma—that requires a resoluteness not easily come by, except as the last, the uttermost price of survival. And that it is not. On any fair examination of the issue on its merits we are not yet at that point. We can save ourselves and the world if we hold Europe, though we lose Asia. We can lose the world and ourselves if we lose Europe, though we hold Asia.

It is much as it was in 1942. We cannot come fully to the defense of both continents. A choice as to priority must be made in order to be successful in both in the end. Now as then, the claim of Europe is greater. We shall stand or fall in Europe.

Blundering Diplomacy—Keeping the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the American people will pay an awful price in life and property because of blundering and inexcusable foreign policy and Democratic administrations since 1933. Now we find them precipitating this action into a global war from which there appears no present escape. Mr. George Sokolsky, writing in the Times-Herald today, points out eight grievous errors in foreign policy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including his article:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

The wise man, when he faces a crisis in his life, steps back and asks himself, "What have I done?" He reexamines his life; he seeks out his faults; but most of all, he probes for a way to cut his losses, to reverse his processes and to straighten himself out.

Only fools blame the environment, the times, the breaks, luck. No one gets very far in life by sulking and scheming. Only an imbecile devotes himself to covering up mistakes by new lies, until his structure collapses on his head. A lie has a curious way of fighting to the surface.

What is true of individuals is true of nations. The crisis appears. At that moment, a nation either blindly and stiffneckedly pursues the course which produced the crisis, or its best minds devote themselves to a reexamination of conduct with a view to rechanneling its attitudes.

Since 1939, it is apparent, beyond doubt, that great errors have been made by the leaders of our Nation. These errors need to be reexamined, not to blame the living or the dead, but to safeguard the future. I shall here list only a few demonstrable errors:

1. Our association with Soviet Russia in the war without prior stipulations as to peace terms. It is suggested that there was no time to work out a full peace program. That is a cover-up. There was ample time to outline the general terms of our participation.

2. The lend-lease agreements gave not ample protections to the United States. Lend-lease to a large degree won the war for Soviet Russia. We contributed $11,000,000,000 to the upbuilding of Soviet Russia's industrial and military strength. Peacetime industrial equipment should not have been provided.

3. Tehran (November 1943) represents the abnegation of American control of American decisions in foreign affairs. At Tehran the United States gave Soviet Russia, then weak, a blank check in Europe and Asia.

4. Tehran belied the Cairo declaration made about 5 days earlier. Both the Cairo declaration and the report on the Tehran conference were issued simultaneously on December 1, 1943. But on that date the Cairo declaration had already been nullified by Tehran. Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin on that date established a historic lie. For that our blood is being shed in Korea.

5. Roosevelt should not have gone to Yalta, because he was a dying man. He lacked the physical or moral strength to meet the challenge of empire.

6. During the war years we were in association with Soviet Russia as an ally, but it was never necessary to accept Communists. It was the Charley-good-fellow attitude that made it possible for Americans and aliens who were serving as Russian agents to infiltrate our Government in high positions.

The existence of the Harold Ware cell was known to President Roosevelt in 1939. He never acted. In fact, such agencies as the FBI were forbidden to arrest known and effective Russian spies.

7. It was a grievous error to make it impossible for the atomic energy authorities to dismiss suspects without proof. A man had no rights to work there. It was a privilege, to be withdrawn at will.

Furthermore, Acheson was one of a body that agreed to write a report. He was only a writer in this respect. The report on the future of the use of atomic energy should have been a closely guarded secret, otherwise we lost bargaining power.

The so-called Acheson-Lilienthal report was issued and publicized under shameful circumstances. When Baruch assumed the job of negotiation at the United Nations, he was plagued by this report.

8. The abandonment and betrayal of Chiang Kai-shek by the State Department from 1944, when he was still fighting, to this moment, when he is still offering to fight, is one of the most grievous errors in all history.

It was designed originally by Soviet Russia and carried out by Russian agents in the State Department, among whom the most publicized is Alger Hiss. A vast and untruthful campaign to justify this treason to America was conducted by the State Department.

After Soviet Russia had won a complete victory in China, Great Britain accepted the role of appeaser which the American State Department imitated. That policy produced the Korean War.

Freedom of Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Broadcasters recently inaugurated a contest for stu-

dents entitled "The Voice of Democracy" and requested me to prepare a statement on freedom of religion for use by the contestants. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the statement which I submitted in response to this request. The statement follows:

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

(By BROOKS HAYS)

No study of the meaning of democracy would be adequate without an emphasis upon freedom of worship. The constitutional guarantee that this privilege shall not be invaded is so much a part of our lives that we seldom stop to think of the conditions which produced it. Too often we think in negative terms. Perhaps we gained an impression from textbooks that the framers of the Constitution merely concluded that, since the idea of a state-controlled church had not worked well in the old world or in the Colonies, we would have none of that concept in the new Federal Government. To be sure, the policy of our Nation is definite on the point that we will not have an official religion. Separation of church and state is one of our distinctive contributions to the science of government.

But the first amendment to the Constitution says something else about the place of religious faith in American life. Here are its words: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." In stressing the free exercise of faith, Thomas Jefferson, the author of this amendment, so richly endowed with spiritual insight, was thinking not in governmental terms but rather of the individual citizen, his right to spiritual growth and his privilege of religious expression which should not be impaired.

In prohibiting a tax-supported church, the Constitution represents a break with the past; but it represents, also, the hopes and the dreams of the past for complete freedom for the human spirit.

It was a daring thing that our forefathers did, this assertion that the new Government should not control the patterns of worship and religious belief. The wise men who designed the Constitution were determined that the tremendous power of organized religion should never be used to inhibit the individual in relation to his Creator.

The first amendment to the Constitution is, therefore, one of the most significant instruments in history. There are two facets, and both must be viewed with understanding. First, the framers had a distrust of man; they recognized his frailty, and this applied not only to politicians and military men who had misused power, it applied even to the ministers. No man, according to this philosophy, could be trusted with power over the minds of his fellow man. But, again, the first amendment represents something besides distrust of man. Its positive aspect explains the reverence we have for it. It reveals a high opinion of man as God's creation. It encourages individual faith.

In granting full freedom of worship the authors revealed a faith that men would not abuse the privilege, that social stability would not be lost in the renunciation of control over religious forms. The Constitution reflects a faith that individual judgments in the supremely important issues of human life and destiny would not have a destructive impact. The authors dared to trust the individual in this vital realm of life.

Thus, it should be clear that our democratic ideal of religious freedom is not in disparagement of religion. Our governmental foundations are essentially spiritual. George Washington spoke for the young nation when he said in his Farewell Address that decency and morality in public life are not possible without the inspiration of religion. It is the American policy, however, to let the citizen seek an outlet for this divinely given right in ways that appeal to him so that each man worships God according to the dictates of his own conscience. And, again, as proof of our daring spirit in granting full freedom, we allow each to reserve to himself the privilege of not worshiping at all if he chooses not to do so. The resources of a positive faith recognized by the Constitution will save the Nation from any theoretical damage by those of infirm faith; they, too, must be protected.

It is an experiment, this American plan, but 161 years have proved its wisdom. We, the succeeding generations of Americans who have benefited by the cherished tradition, are sure that upon such a foundation of freedom and reverence for the individual the Republic will endure.

Still Reluctant To Draw From Oriental Manpower Pool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Evening Star of December 3, 1950:

UNITED STATES STILL RELUCTANT TO DRAW FROM ORIENTAL MANPOWER POOL—CHIANG'S NATIONALIST ARMY AND JAPAN'S MILITARY POTENTIAL ARE KEPT SIDE-LINED

(By Constantine Brown)

As in the days between September 1939 and Pearl Harbor, there is a strong tendency on the part of Government officials to focus the minds of the American people on Europe. The sad truth is that we are at war in the Far East and that is the theater of decision, not Europe. Early victory in Asia is possible only through the intelligent use of all available manpower we have in that area—including the Chinese Nationalists and Japanese.

For the present there is not the slightest indication that such moves are contemplated by the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon. Delicate international implications, they say, prevent such steps.

In World War II political exigencies made it necessary that we defeat Hitler first. That strategy, right or wrong, is now history. But lest we be deluded by pleading Oxford accents, let's study the problem in the light of the situation today.

SOVIET INTENTIONS CLEAR

At present, Russia is our deadly foe. Although in 1941 we had two enemies, separated by the vast Eurasian land mass, today that land mass is our enemy. Russia fronts on both oceans, just as the Axis did. In contrast with the German-Japanese link, Russia has but a single objective. She operates on interior lines while the Axis operated on far more difficult extended exterior lines.

The Kremlin has made a careful study of the Japanese mistakes and while she has adopted many of the old Tokyo ideas to inflame the oriental mind—Asia for the Asiatics, Down With the Colonial Power, and hatred of the foreigner—she has been far more astute in making these policies stick.

Russia now also is reaping the harvest of the defeats of the American, British, and French Armies at the hands of an oriental power—Japan—in 1942. The American victories in 1944 and 1945, when Japan was forced to accept unconditional surrender, are obscured, insofar as Asiatic peoples are concerned, by the lack of proper propaganda exploitation.

The abandonment of the Chinese Nationalists by the American Government in 1946 and the victory of the Soviet-supported Chinese Communists has created the impression throughout Asia that the western powers are doomed and a semi-Asiatic power has risen. This feeling was cleverly exploited by the Russians in the struggle they were preparing against the United States. Russia now has clearly indicated that she means to conquer, hold, govern, and exploit the areas which the Japanese merely occupied.

There is no guesswork in this connection. All we have to do is look at the developments of the last 5 months. It has been definitely and officially established that the North Korean attack was prepared and ordered in Moscow. So long as we were suffering defeat at the hands of the North Korean armies the Russians and their Chinese satellites did not intervene, except by sending war materials to the Korean Communists from Manchuria and Siberia.

DIPLOMATS SEEK EXCUSES

After the North Koreans were pulverized the Kremlin ordered the Chinese Communists to enter the battle. At least 150,000 Red Chinese troops are fighting us today in the subzero weather of the Korean mountains. Another force estimated at between 300,000 and 400,000 regular troops are near the Yalu River or at Mukden, ready to bolster the Communists.

Our diplomats are trying to find excuses for the action of the Peiping rulers. Some say they want to prevent the hydroelectric plants near the Manchurian border from falling into our hands. Others seem to believe that the military operations of the Chinese in Korea are intended as a diplomatic blackjack to force the entrance of the Peiping puppets into the United Nations.

Neither version seems to check with the actual facts. The Indian Ambassador at Peiping assured the Chinese rulers as far back as last August that Manchuria would not suffer in the least if the Korean Peninsula were unified as the United Nations intends that it be. These assurances were repeated officially and unofficially to the Russians at Lake Success and New York. The most far-reaching guarantees were to be given the Chinese to that effect.

The story that the Peiping Government had to make a demonstration of power in order to force open the United Nations doors is prepcsterous. Moscow and Peiping had assurances from New Delhi, London, and Paris that these powers would press the issue. Our own State Department, while opposed nominally to the replacement of the Nationalists by the Communists, had decided not to use the veto on this matter.

This was stated and repeated frequently by the highest officials, from Secretary Acheson down. There could be no doubt in the minds of the Chinese and their Soviet masters that the needed majority to place them in the United Nations was available, if they were really as anxious as they made out to put the Peiping regime in the organization. Hence, neither of the theories advanced by our diplomats to explain the entry of the Chinese Communists Fourth and Seventh Field Armies into the Korean War holds water.

The real reason is disclosed in the Tokyo military evaluation that the Russians are taking the final steps in their over-all plan to secure completely the Eurasian land mass as a base of operations against the western American defense line.

JAPAN "TRUE OBJECTIVE"

Without engaging their own military resources in any way, the Russians are doing their utmost now to expel the Americans, the British, the French, and all other vestiges of western influence from the mainland of eastern Asia.

The war of the Viet Minh Communists against the French in Indochina is proceeding according to plan and it is highly doubtful that the French will be able to resist Ho Chi Minh's drives unless the west accepts the Red challenge in Asia and fights back with everything it has available.

The fate of Thailand and Burma, and eventually India, will be sealed the day the Sino-Soviet combination succeeds in gaining all its objectives in Indochina.

General MacArthur and his staff are said to be convinced that Japan and not Korea is the true objective of the Chinese-Russian forces. But before undertaking such a major operation, without risk, they must first inflict the heaviest possible losses on the American forces, which are supposed to defend that vital bastion of western defense. If this requires a demonstration of force in Europe in the near future, we can be sure that Russia will make it.

The most important handicap the western nations are experiencing now is the lack of manpower. Our mobilization is partial and slow. That of our western allies is nonexistent.

But there is a solid block of manpower available in the Far East. The Nationalists in Formosa have at least 500,000 well-trained men who, if modestly supplied with necessary modern weapons, can be of vital assistance to the western cause. Japan has a potential of 1,500,000 men ready to fight, if provided with the needed weapons.

We still have time to arm the Japanese and to supply American equipment to a Japanese army which not only will be willing but anxious to fight the Russians and the Chinese Communists. But that would not be nice, diplomatically speaking.

Address by Hon. Athanasios Politis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, last evening I was privileged to attend the annual banquet of Worthington Chapter, No. 30, Order of Ahepa, held at the Emerson Hotel in Baltimore, at which Mr. Nicholas J. Nestor was toastmaster.

We were privileged to hear an address by the Honorable Athanasios Politis, Greek Ambassador to the United States, and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the address in the RECORD.

The address follows:

I am delighted to be with you this evening. It is always a pleasure for me to spend an evening with the Ahepa family, and I am especially gratified to have been asked to come to Baltimore to share your festivities on this occasion.

Each contact that I have with Greek-American organizations is an invigorating experience—a source of new strength with which to carry on my work here.

It seems that fate has brought me many interesting trips around your vast country as a sort of compensation for my years of immobility in Moscow. There it was possible to move about only in a very restricted area. It was inconceivable that I could have met with an organization of Greeks, as I am doing tonight, even if such organizations were permitted to exist. You can be sure that the Greeks living in Russia would give anything to be able to form an organization such as yours. But, of course, you know that the word "freedom" is a word with a different meaning in the Russian vocabulary.

On the contrary, here in the United States, from the first days of my arrival, you have given me much pleasure by inviting me to your gatherings. You have allowed me to share your experiences. You have permitted me to observe your progress, and you have provided me with many opportunities to see how energetic and pretty the younger generation is. Of course, you will understand that when I say "pretty" I am not referring to the Sons of Pericles. Naturally, I mean the young ladies.

Wherever I have been—in Miami, Detroit, Philadelphia, New York, Cleveland, Washington, and here in Baltimore, I have been impressed by their beauty—and more by their charm.

I would also like to tell you that I am very much impressed by the beautiful way in which those of the younger generation in America dance our Greek dances. They dance them ever so much better than we do at home. In Greece, perhaps only Queen Frederika dances them even better.

You must come to Greece, all of you, and show us how to dance our own Greek dances. You must show us the grace and charm which I have seen young Greek-Americans display at all of the gatherings I have attended.

I pray that the world will remain at peace so that you may be able to come to Greece in 1951—the year that has been proclaimed homecoming year for Greeks all over the world. For some of you it will be a happy and joyous reunion with the families and friends you left when you came to the new world many years ago. For the rest of you, it will be a wonderful experience, I know, to visit the land of your fathers—to visit the land where civilization began.

Greece will greet you with open arms. Even 10 years of bitter war and hardship have not killed the open, kindly spirit of welcome that has made Greek hospitality an international byword.

You will see for yourselves that this brave country has attacked her monumental tasks with courage and fortitude and with American assistance has traveled far along the road of economic recovery.

Of course, there are problems which have not been completely resolved. One of these is the resettlement of all the refugees, tragic victims of over 10 years of war, in their villages. Above all, the Greek never loses his love for that bit of land where he was born. Our people in Greece are happy only when they are home—and home is where they were born—where they and their fathers before them tilled the soil. But when many of our people go home they find their towns, their villages and their homes in desolation and ruins—the handiwork of communism, the brutal revenge of the bandits and pillagers who could not break the Greek spirit.

You will see at first hand the wonderful work that has been done by the Greek organizations which sprang up to help those in need. You will meet those who will tell you about the work of the Friends of the Village, the magnificent organization which has helped to rehabilitate hundreds of towns and villages by arranging for their adoption by more prosperous centers that were not hit as hard by the war.

You will hear of the organization founded under the sponsorship of the King and Queen which took on the job of directing relief to the stricken areas. Cooking utensils, blankets, used clothing, woolens and hundreds of other items are being sent—items of little or no value to those who have them, but priceless to those who do not.

Many of the refugees are displaced persons in every sense of the word. Their towns leveled to the ground by Communist terrorists, their farms and homes destroyed, their possessions stolen, they have nothing to return to.

But there is new hope for many of them now. With the passage of the 1950 amendment to the Displaced Persons Act, people who lost everything in their struggle against Communist imperialism can now come to the United States and start new life in a country offering opportunities unmatched anywhere else in the world.

But these displaced persons wishing to come to the United States must be sponsored. For many of them it will be virtually impossible to obtain passage money and to pay for other incidental expenses. They must all be assured of jobs and shelter in the United States in order to qualify under the act.

This will not be too difficult for those who have relatives or friends in the United States ready to sponsor them. But what of the displaced person who has neither relatives nor friends here?

Again the Ahepa has stepped into the breach to add its powerful strength to the efforts of other Greek-American organizations and the churches. With its designation by the State Department as a certified voluntary agency, the Ahepa has undertaken to assume the responsibility of organizing this enormous and complicated task. In doing this, the Ahepa is once again displaying the great humanitarianism which has been a characteristic of this great organization since its birth in Atlanta, Ga., over a quarter of a century ago.

But to carry out this important responsibility, sponsors must be found who are willing to help their compatriots in this great time of need. There should be no qualified displaced person unable to find a sponsor. The members of the Ahepa, and Greek-Americans in general, have always shown that they are inspired by that great humanity which is common to the American and Greek Nations. I know that they will rise again to the occasion and help their people in this special problem so that the maximum number of persons will be enabled to reach the United States.

I hope, as I have already said, that there will be peace and that we will be able to proceed with those tasks that face us—the tasks of the peace-loving nations. But, as we all know, the international situation has entered into a period of crisis. To meet this crisis we must put our combined strength behind the flag of the united free world and take a stand for those principles we hold so dear. If we keep ourselves in readiness, if we hold to our resolve, we can and we shall weather the storm.

The Greek people have given proof of their refusal to bow down to totalitarianism. They gave proof with their victory over Communist aggression—the first victory against the new Communist imperialism. They gave additional proof by sending troops and aircraft to the United Nations in Korea—this from a nation still binding its wounds from its own battle against communism. If further proof was needed, it is to be found in Premier Venizelos' declaration that "Greece unreservedly stands at the side of the United States in the struggle of the free nations of the world."

America is more than the arsenal of democracy. It is the bastion of liberty and the hope of the freedom-loving people of the world.

I salute you as Greek-Americans, for you have both the Greek and the American resolution, and the strength that comes from that powerful combination.

You have a double love for freedom and a double understanding of the meaning of today's world struggle. Your contribution to the moral preparedness of your Nation for the momentous days that lie ahead will be important, for the strength of a nation lies in the strength of its people.

As ranking citizens of this great democratic America, your role will be significant, and your faith will help her to an inevitable triumph.

Dean Acheson's Speech Is Convincing Proof That We Need a New, Vigorous Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Dean Acheson's recent radio report confirms the belief that I expressed last September that he should be fired now as Secretary of State. I thought I was hearing a high-school student in a speech before his graduation class. In fact, it was not as good as many I have heard. Then I thought I was hearing a speech in the House of Lords with the accent, but without the wisdom.

Acheson did not tell the American people one single thing that we do not already know.

It seems that Acheson is just waking up to the fact that communism is a threat to this Nation. We all know that. He did not think so when he sought to defend Alger Hiss. Acheson said that Communist Red China has committed an overt act in Korea. We all know that. It was Acheson, however, who agreed to withhold the veto of the United States to admitting Red China to the United Nations.

Acheson said we will fight to defend our freedom and independence. We have always done that and are doing it now in Korea.

Why did he not think of that when the State Department overruled the Defense Department by removing our Armed Forces from Korea before war broke out there in June? Was he thinking of protecting our freedom and independence when he said Korea was outside our perimeter of defense in the Pacific and thereby inviting Russia and North Korea to attack South Korea and put us on the defensive? Was he thinking of protecting our freedom and independence when he refused further aid to the Chinese Nationalist Government, and abandoned China to the Communists?

Acheson's speech indicated more deals with the Russian Communists on the immoral basis of Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and Moscow conferences through which we now find ourselves as a nation subject to the whim and caprice of Russia.

He revealed a complete lack of any policy to meet the crucial situation we are in today.

It was a complete waste of time to listen to Acheson stumble over simple words which showed a lack of conviction of what he was saying.

I am more convinced than ever that what this Nation needs badly—and right now—is a new Secretary of State.

Irresponsible Charges Against Secretary Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND W. KARST
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time for the purpose of making a most serious brief statement. We have just gone through an election in this country and the people have been privileged to exercise their democratic rights in a manner which stands out as a beacon light for free peoples throughout the world.

If this had been an ordinary campaign I would not feel called upon to make any further comment. But it has not been an ordinary campaign and these are not ordinary times. Thousands of our fellow citizens are removed from their homes and their families. Many have already died. Many more have been wounded. The Nation is making great sacrifices of men and materials on battlefields thousands of miles from our shores.

In the heat of the campaign I believe that too many men have forgotten themselves in an effort to gather a few more votes. All of us know that in a political campaign many things are said which are afterward regretted. Sometimes what is said is colored by a desire to be elected. Ordinarily the country could take these things in their stride.

But in this campaign some have gone too far, I believe, in playing on the fears and the prejudices and the insecurities of millions of our people for the sake of attracting votes. They have maligned and insulted; they have come dangerously close to degrading our elections, in their series of irresponsible charges hurled at Secretary of State Dean Acheson. It is high time they were answered and the charges stopped.

Dean Acheson has been made the victim of everything that is bad, and his name has been used to epitomize all the mistakes which have been made. Altogether too much politics has been played with our foreign policy and it will be very costly to the Nation unless it is stopped.

Mr. Speaker, in normal times we can afford to indulge ourselves to our heart's content. But what man in this Chamber will say these are normal times? I say that irresponsible politics, played today with our foreign policy, is actually being played with the lives and the future of countless thousands of our young men and their families.

Second guessing and grandstand managing are among the great American sports. But this is no game we are playing and the results are much more serious than a run or two for one team or another. Many believed that we could live in this world alone, and separated from the rest of mankind without regard for what takes place or what goes on in different parts of the world. We now know that this cannot be done. But many of us are accusing Secretary of State Dean Acheson of not doing the very things we refused to permit him to do. The time has come to call a halt to this second guessing and grandstand managing.

On the diplomatic front we must close our ranks and present a united front to the outside world. This does not mean that our Government or our State Department should be free from criticism or close supervision. No one could advocate that. It does mean that we will have to be above petty politics—above using our foreign policy to catch a few votes. It does mean an end to irresponsible charges and irresponsible action. It does mean a full realization of the seriousness of the hour and of our actions.

Successful foreign policy today, Mr. Speaker, may be the means of saving thousands of lives—it may even involve the future of our Nation. Victories on the diplomatic front may mean more than the capturing of thousands of prisoners or the conquering of vast areas of enemy territory which we do not want anyway.

Dean Acheson has already won many victories on the diplomatic front as history will eventually prove. He will win many more if we do not destroy him.

It would be a great tragedy, Mr. Speaker, if we did not recognize our obligation to ourselves and the world, if we did not find united effort and approach in our foreign policy and our diplomatic relations with other nations.

I appeal to all to joint in a constructive effort to uphold the hands of our President and our Secretary of State. I urge them to help us show the world that we can stand together in a democracy and that we can abandon politics in our foreign affairs. The challenge of world communism will be met by unity, not dissension; by statesmanship, not petty politics; by forthrightness and constructive action, not by confusion and misrepresentation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe too many of us have made a tragic mistake in not fighting aggressively in defense of our foreign policy and our Secretary of State. Any charges which are false, distorted, malicious and designed to mislead should be answered and the people informed of the actual state of affairs.

I wish to read an editorial on this point which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal of Friday, November 17, and to make it part of the RECORD. I commend it to all of my colleagues in the House as well as all our citizens throughout the Nation.

DEAN ACHESON IS HIS PARTY'S GREAT ASSET—DEMOCRATS SHOULD UPHOLD TRUMAN'S FINEST APPOINTMENT AND REALIZE THE WORTH OF HIS SECRETARY OF STATE

"Before us lies the opportunity for action which can save the hope of peace, security, well-being, and justice for generations to come. Before us also lies the opportunity for drift, for irresolution, for effort feebly made. In this direction is disaster. The choice is ours. It will be made whether we act or whether we do not act."

These words, which were addressed to the United Nations General Assembly on September 20, apply with equal if not greater force to the Eighty-second Congress of the United States. They were spoken by the man for whom a minority of this Congress professes a loud and angry contempt, Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

Some of the crudest and most degrading issues of our preelection battle were fought around the personality and conduct of Mr. Acheson. The sources which carried this type of campaign to victory were not slow to claim that their election represented a decision by the people that "Acheson must go." With appalling irresponsibility they have laid the whole burden and blame of a world torn apart on the shoulders of one man.

No one man and no one nation can solve the problems of the world or stop in its tracks the terrible and simple impulse toward independence, human and national, that this complex century has set in motion. Politicians who bewail "the loss of China" or who demand that we, single-handed, "stem the tide in Asia" are men for the most part ignorant of the lessons of history and the clamorous power behind that Wilsonian phrase, "the self-determination of peoples."

It is perhaps Mr. Acheson's misfortune that in dealing with little men he has not often enough concerned himself with the limits of their mental horizons. For the first time in a decade this country is blessed with a Secretary of State who can see our times and our destiny with the perspective of history. Undoubtedly the Department of State has made mistakes in seeking the perilous path to peace. But at least its viewpoint has had breadth and depth, has encompassed something of the grandeur of the American destiny, has kept in mind the goodness and simplicity that mark the best and truest of our national hopes.

"We speak for people," Mr. Acheson told the General Assembly, "whose deep concern is whether the children are well or sick, whether there is enough food, whether the roof leaks, whether there will be peace * * * a moral peace, so that the spirit of man may be free, and the barriers between the hearts and minds of men may drop away and leave men free to unite in brotherhood."

Thus was the American vision nobly detailed for the world, by an American spokesman at a time when President Truman's political foes were yapping at the heels of their Communist bogies. And what did President Truman's political friends say of the man and his message? It would be pleasant to recall that at least one Democratic office-seeker campaigned on the theory that in Dean Acheson the Democratic Party had its noblest asset. To our knowledge, and we should be happy to stand corrected, not one campaigner spoke of Dean Acheson as the asset he is. Not one pointed out the solid achievements of our foreign policy in five terrible years. Not one defended the man and his works against a backwash of spite and untruth. Not one Democrat seems to have reminded us that China has never been ours, to lose or gain; that the Marshall plan, sparked by Dean Acheson and bearing the name of his friend, former chief and present colleague, is perhaps the greatest example of generous self-interest the world has ever seen; that the Atlantic Pact, the decision to aid Korea, the hopeful beginning toward help for Asian independence, are all the products of a State Department which can see the world in the round.

Not only did these wavering and apologetic Democrats who all but lost their congressional majority fail to boast of these things; those of them who did win through are now holding angry and anxious debates about whether Mr. Acheson must be sacrificed in the interests of harmony. The country and the Democratic Party are fortunate in the fact that the party head is both more courageous and more stubborn than his followers. It is time for Mr. Truman to ask his party, and those Republicans still screaming shrilly for Acheson's head, what sort of cringing eunuch would satisfy them as the voice of this country's foreign policy. Apparently he should be a man who never in his life has expressed an independent opinion and who never in his life expects to say more than a submissive "Yes, sir," to the watchdog of a congressional committee. Dean Acheson of course is not that man, and we cannot believe that the average American, who voted this year out of a sense of frustration and concern only dimly expressed, wants that kind of man. It is our hope that President Truman will stand firmly behind the best appointment he ever made and trust to time and the slow maturing of events to justify him in the eyes of the Nation and the world. Hard as his role will be for the next 2 years, it will be a tragedy of great magnitude if Dean Acheson is forced, or persuaded, or permitted, to retire.

What an Outfit To Run a War!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my considered judgment that grave and ominous problems are looming up on the far-eastern horizon. It would appear from the reports that are available that the situation has extended beyond that of a critical stage.

Judging the situation by the scores of letters that have recently reached my desk, there is every indication that the American people are beginning to rebel against our present diplomatic and United Nations policies that prevail in the war sector in Korea. Practically all of the letters from my constituents request that immediate action be taken to remove Secretary Acheson. The citizens who write to me appear not to be impressed with labeling the activities in the Far East as a "police action." Their comments are entirely to the contrary and indicate that they believe we are engaged in a fighting and not an imaginary war. Their letters further demonstrate that they do not propose to entrust to Secretary Acheson and his followers any longer the gigantic task of prosecuting the Korean war. Because of this public clamor it is evident to me that the people of America are beginning to manifest their convictions in no uncertain terms.

As a further illustration of the protests to the leadership to whose hands have been committed the task of mastering the war in Korea, I call attention to an editorial in the Chicago Daily Tribune under date of December 1, 1950, entitled "What an Outfit to Run a War!" Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial, which follows:

WHAT AN OUTFIT TO RUN A WAR!

The proceedings before the United Nations Security Council at Lake Success present the unwonted spectacle of the United States in all its majesty being run up the street by a single Chinese Communist. We are charged with "unlawful and criminal" aggression against Formosa, where we have a military mission of 44 officers and enlisted men. Gen. Wu Hsiu-chuan, who makes the charge, adds that it is inadmissible to argue the very real Chinese Communist aggression in Korea.

We aren't used to being run up the street by spokesmen for China, and we might make a better stand except that the job is entrusted to Warren R. Austin, a former Republican Senator from Vermont, who, with John Foster Dulles, a former Republican Senator from New York, has been enlisted as the mouthpiece of Mr. Truman's administration.

The accounts state that Austin read his piece in a voice so faltering that there was a question in the minds of the audience whether he'd be able to get through the script. Even in debate we have to depend upon a weak need, when the least we could expect is a strong, firm voice breathing conviction.

Austin is an outrider of the Truman official family, but he's typical of the collection of fumblers Mr. Truman has recruited to serve as his Cabinet and close advisers at a time when the Nation staggers in the grip of colossal forces.

There's General Marshall, the Secretary of Defense, a figure whose veracity was found wanting when he was asked to account for his strange behavior during the Pearl Harbor crisis. That was almost 9 years ago. Now Marshall's memory is deteriorating. He can't remember the names of the new collection of generals around the Pentagon. When he attempted to refer to the Korean war the other day he found himself discussing "the war in Puerto Rico."

We've got Charlie Brannan, the Secretary of Agriculture, a genius at storing eggs in caves, painting potatoes blue, and figuring how the farmer can sell dear while the consumer buys cheap. He'll handle the production of food if we get in a war.

We've got Maurice Tobin as Secretary of Labor, the fellow who'll be charged with mobilizing manpower. Just in case Tobin will be preoccupied with his usual duties of humoring the bosses of the CIO and A. F. of L. for political purposes, Marshall has enlisted another manpower expert, Anna Rosenberg. She's the one who proposed a reorientation course for the soldiers before letting them return to civilian society after the last war.

We've got Snyder, the fiscal expert, and Sawyer, in Commerce, who are dangerous not because they are vicious but because they aren't too bright. We've got Postmaster General Donaldson, fitted by his civilian experience to reduce mail deliveries to the boys in the foxholes to one mail call every 6 months. We've got Oscar Chapman in Interior, whose dream of converting central Arizona into a lake can now be pushed as "essential to the war effort." We've got Attorney General McGrath, who about a week ago finally got around to expressing a vague suspicion in a brief that Communists are agents of Soviet Russia. Sharp fellow, that.

Of course, we've got Acheson and we've got Truman, but description would be redundant. We've got Averill Harriman as second-string thinker for Truman, which conveys all anybody needs to know about Harriman. As Secretary of the Army, there's

Frank Pace, who got so used to running deficits while presiding over the Budget Bureau, that running up a new war debt to dwarf the old will be duck soup. And in the Navy there's Francis Matthews, who didn't think the war was coming soon enough and urged the Nation to hasten it by launching a preventive attack.

Never in a period of crisis has the country been in the hands of such a crew of nonentities. If we can survive them, we can survive anything that the Kremlin can throw at us.

Isolationism, If—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following editorial which appeared in the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal on December 2, 1950:

ISOLATIONISM, IF—

The time has come, the Journal is convinced, for the United States of America to inform the governments of all the free nations of the world that it expects them to do their duty in resisting the aggressors if another major war results. This ought to be done promptly with nothing spared in the way of the strongest, severest, sternest language Washington can use. The Journal believes it not only is timely but that the circumstances in various foreign diplomatic and military fields wholly justify it. It also believes that in so informing the chanceleries of the world that we expect them to line up with us if we must fight it out with the Communist nations that we should provide a penalty that would be imposed upon them if they were laggard.

The Journal for many years has believed in internationalism. It long ago was convinced that it was our business what happened elsewhere in the world. It felt that, the world having grown smaller, so to speak, because of swift means of communication and transportation, certain natural barriers of protection we formerly enjoyed had disappeared. Neither the Atlantic Ocean nor the Pacific is a protection for us now. Nor is the North Pole region with its vast ice and snow wastes a barrier between us and air attack from a powerful enemy.

The United Nations idea was and still is one of the finest things for world order the mind of man has conceived. In unity there is strength, and it takes power today to preserve peace in the world. We went into that Organization in good faith. We have tried hard to contribute to its success as a world peace agency. We signed the Charter because we believed in it and put our hopes in this world organization. And if the free nations of the world today went along with us in peace or war, whichever it may be, we Americans still would make our contribution to mankind's betterment and progress. But let the free nations of the world keep this in mind: They must stand with us in all their strength of spirit and physical power, fighting beside us, sacrificing as we do, expending as we do, else they will suffer the penalty we most certainly should impose.

The penalty? That is easy. Simply tell every government that still is free that America is willing to do her best in their interest if they keep step with her. And then tell them that if they don't, if they try to wriggle out, if they shirk their plain duty, if they decide to let Uncle Sam do this job of fighting by himself, they will suffer the penalty of our withdrawing from the whole stinking mess and let them shift for themselves. Yes, by all means, let us return to isolationism if they fail to do their part and then build such defenses with our science and industrial power as will cause all the rest of the world to hesitate before attacking us. We're willing to do our share of the spending and the fighting; we're not willing to fight another world war alone.

Should We Drop the A-Bomb on China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much hullabaloo lately on the part of Monday morning drug store and coffee shop quarterbacks about using the A-bomb on the Chinese Reds.

A certain Nebraska newspaper which is easily the most reactionary publication west of the Chicago Tribune, in an added effort to harry President Harry, have been endeavoring to get a contribution from me for the military I presume, as to whether or not we should at this time make use of the A-bomb in China, all of which made me feel like the colored man in Texas who was asked by his rich, white employer if he could change a $20 bill for him and replied, "No, sir, Mister, but thanks for the compliment."

I have always observed that a public servant gets into trouble when he tries to do more than his job calls for, therefore, I for one shall let President Truman do the exclusive acting and talking on the matter of using the A-bomb on the Chinese Communists.

If I had the power to recommend, I would not recommend dropping an atomic bomb on the Chinese or any other Russian satellite, but would place it some more appropriate and vulnerable place on the theory that one cannot destroy a rat by blowing off his whiskers, or his ear or ears, or his tail or one or more of his feet.

Confidentially though, if the A-bomb is to be used I know some mouthy, witless, reactionary persons in and about the city of Washington, plus a few alleged commentators, doctors, and that certain old Omaha newspaper, who for the good of our country should be parachuted first into the area where the A-bomb is to be dropped so that they too could get the full benefit of the A-bomb for the aid and comfort which they have given, inadvertently perhaps, and are still giving communism by their senseless, unjust, and un-American action and criticism of our President, his aides, and the administration generally, which lie and smear techniques weaken our prestige abroad and spread confusion, discord, and fear at home and make them mentally hand and glove marchers with the Communists.

Because of the conduct of daft, evil, and witless persons who have cried out their scarewords, our whole Nation has been put in a state of unnecessary general alarm.

When I was back in Nebraska before the last election I was appalled to find out that in clubs, lodges, churches, convents, and places where good people are supposed to hold forth that these educated but misguided dupes thought that their worse enemies were the President of the United States and his Cabinet and the administration, bipartisan and otherwise. These people actually thought that their own country and its Government were their worse enemies.

It is startling how history repeats itself. Protégés of those who were given the choice between a savior and a rogue and took the rogue, were there ready to make the age-old mistake all over again. Instead of believing people of good will, they were prepared to believe reactionary rogues, aye thieves.

Now this same badger-faced ilk, in a great crisis like the present, want to impeach the President. It is lucky for them that Andrew Jackson and his Winchester rifle is not in the White House so that mountain justice could be meted out promptly to them.

How could these men lay any claim to patriotism and thus give aid and comfort to the Communist enemy?

What are these extreme right wingers thinking about to so cripple our Nation now?

I guess they just have muscles in their head instead of real patriotic American brains.

Appointment of Anna M. Rosenberg Should Be Rejected

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 1, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, by all means, the other body should refuse the confirmation of the appointment of Anna M. Rosenberg as Assistant Secretary of National Defense in charge of our manpower.

The American people are aroused and indignant that this exalted position, one of the most powerful in the world, should be turned over to a foreign-born individual whose record for association with Communist organizations shows that she is unfit to occupy a place of such responsibility. Besides, Mr. Speaker, we have plenty of Americans whose patriotism is unquestioned to fill these positions.

We shoud follow the advice of George Washington and put only Americans on guard.

This Anna M. Rosenberg is referred to four different times in the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, known as appendix 9.

That record shows that Anna Rosenberg was a member of the John Reed Clubs, and that she signed a protest against the alleged anti-Communist propaganda as did appear in the New York Times of May 9, 1930.

The record shows that—

The John Reed Clubs were Communist-front organizations named in honor of John Reed, one of the earliest Communist leaders in the United States. John Reed died in Russia shortly after the Bolshevik revolution and his ashes were interred in the Kremlin in Moscow.

The John Reed Clubs were out-and-out Communist organizations which preceded the contemporary Communist-front organizations which cater to so-called Liberals.

In the May 19, 1930, issue of the New York Times, the following person affiliated with the John Reed Clubs signed a protest against alleged anti-Communist propaganda—

This is followed by the list of signers, one of whom was Anna Rosenberg.

Witnesses now living, I understand, will testify that this is the same Anna Rosenberg who has been appointed to this important position with our Department of National Defense.

She also signed a petition for a consumers' national federation which Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party, when he was a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1939, identified as a transmission belt. A transmission belt, in Communist nomenclature, is an organization through which the Communist Party extends its influence and ideology to groups that are broader than the party itself.

She signed that petition "Anna M. Rosenberg."

I understand that certain Government files giving these facts on this Anna M. Rosenberg are available, and that there are living witnesses who can testify to her activities in connection with these Communist-front organizations.

Mr. Speaker, while our boys are dying by the thousands in foreign fields, I submit that it is no time to put any questionable character, especially a foreign-born character, in a position of this importance.

I hope the Members of the other body will refuse her confirmation.

American Federation of Labor Opposes Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the American Federation of Labor has strongly opposed the proposed $708,000,000 Central Arizona project, now before the House Committee on Public Lands.

The great voice of the A. F. of L.'s 8,000,000 members was heard in denunciation of the Central Arizona project at their recent national convention, held in Houston, Tex.

On September 22, 1950, the delegates to the convention unanimously adopted Resolution No. 29, which not only condemns the fantastic project but instructs the officers of the A. F. of L. to oppose adoption of S. 75, the Central Arizona project legislation.

The complete resolution, as passed by the A .F. of L. convention, follows:

Resolution No. 29, Central Arizona Project

Whereas a bill which provides for the proposed Central Arizona project is now before Congress; and

Whereas the Central Arizona project, under the guise of reclamation is designed to provide irrigation at exorbitant cost for a relatively small acreage of land to grow common field crops; and

Whereas data supplied by Secretary of the Interior, Oscar L. Chapman, reveals that the Arizona project will cost American taxpayers $2,075,729,000 for interest alone; and

Whereas to supply irrigation through the Central Arizona project would require 1,500,000,000 kilowatt hours of hydroelectric power annually to lift irrigation water to a height of 1,000 feet and carry it over 300 miles in an expensive canal; and

Whereas construction cost for irrigation features alone is estimated to be over $1,800 an acre; and

Whereas the field crops anticipated through irrigation provided by the Central Arizona project are the same crops which are now in surplus and are being subsidized by the United States Government; and

Whereas the exorbitant cost of construction and operation of the Central Arizona project will not add to the national welfare, but will create additional taxes through an increase in surplus crops which must be subsidized by the United States Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the sixty-ninth convention of the American Federation of Labor convening on the 18th of September 1950, in Houston, Tex., instruct the officers to oppose the of the American Federation of Labor convenate an unjustifiable heavy tax burden for a project that will not enhance the Nation's economy.

Price Controls

REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, released yesterday, shows that the Consumers Price Index has just reached a new all-time high of 174.8, an increase of six-tenths percent over September 15, and 2.7 percent over June 15. This figure breaks through the previous high of August and September 1948, which was 174.5. When the House passed the Defense Production Act earlier in the year, there was great ardor for price controls and the coalition of the minority and the majority insisted that the President must be given these powers. Many eloquent speeches were made about the spiraling cost of living and how dangerous it was to our strength in respect of remobilization—military, economic, and spiritual. This new high in the Consumers Price Index, the grave situation in Korea, and the heightened tension between the United States and the Soviet Union underlining the need for even greater efforts in respect of remobilization demand nothing less than utilization by the President of his powers to impose price controls on items basic to the cost of living.

Should the President desire wage stabilization to accompany price controls, then it must be recognized that an immediate wage freeze would also freeze into law fundamental inequities which exist for most clerical, office, and similar workers whose salaries have lagged behind the cost of living, and also for industrial workers in certain areas and industries. This should not stop the invoking of price-control powers, however; but the President should call a high-level collective-bargaining conference of the leading trade union organizations—CIO, A. F. of L., International Association of Machinists, railroad brotherhoods, and other independent unions—and the leading employer organizations, together with public representatives to agree upon a formula which will enable these wages and salaries which have lagged behind the cost of living to catch up conditioned upon the imposition of price controls on basic cost-of-living items. In this way, the objectives of stopping the inflationary spiral can be attained without the injustice of an across-the-board wage freeze. It is also important to note that rent control is an essential element in this program and hence I strongly favor the 90-day extension of Federal rent control.

Mr. Speaker, there is no time for government as usual any more than there is for business as usual. The same Congress which demanded the President be given these powers should now demand that they be exercised. The American people expect of us the same degree of activity and diligence in this crisis as they do of our troops in Korea.

Woman's Club of Hollywood Demands Removal of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State by President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the removal of Secretary of State Dean Acheson from office immediately is the demand of the American people. It is the ultimatum of Americans everywhere who are today appalled at Acheson's gross stupidity in the handling of our foreign affairs, at his deliberate disregard of the obvious objectives of the world Communist movement instigated and directed from the Kremlin in Moscow, at his personal defense of suspected Communists or pro-Communists in the State Department.

No longer do the American people have any confidence in the leadership, patriotism, and loyalty of the State De-

partment under Mr. Acheson. Unless Acheson is removed from office, that confidence will not be restored, and in the face of the present critical situation in Asia, we must have competent national leadership now under which the American people can unite and work for the preservation of our Nation and our ultimate victory.

The following resolution was recently adopted by the Woman's Club of Hollywood, and was sent to me by Mrs. C. Arthur Williams, president of the club, whose letter is also included. This resolution demanding the removal of Secretary of State Acheson is typical of the action being taken by many civic and patriotic organizations who believe his removal is necessary in the interest of our national defense and unity. I submit it for the attention of the Members of Congress.

WOMAN'S CLUB OF HOLLYWOOD,
Hollywood, Calif., November 30, 1950.

Congressman GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCDONOUGH: Enclosed is a copy of the resolution which was sent to President Harry S. Truman, in regard to the removal of Dean Acheson from the office of Secretary of State, and urging his prompt action.

The resolution was unanimously adopted by the board of directors of the Woman's Club of Hollywood and thereafter unanimously approved by the club membership at a regular meeting held on November 29, 1950.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. C. ARTHUR WILLIAMS,
President, Woman's Club of Hollywood.

Whereas the philosophy of communism is now threatening the entire free world, and particularly we find that the United States is in serious and mortal danger through the gradual and steady growth of communism, directed from the Kremlin in Moscow; and

Whereas it appears that the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities has reported that there are approximately 20,000,000 Communists in the world today, or that about 1 in every 115 persons in the world is a Communist; and

Whereas according to the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover before the said committee: "In 1917, when the Communists overthrew the Russian Government, there was 1 Communist for every 2,277 persons in Russia, nevertheless there are in the United States today 1 Communist for every 1,814 persons in this country"; and

Whereas under the leadership and direction of the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, our policy of foreign diplomacy has blundered and floundered not only in the Far East, the Pacific, and the Atlantic, but throughout the world; and

Whereas it is now readily apparent that the American people have lost confidence in the leadership, patriotism, and loyalty of the State Department under Mr. Acheson to such an extent that the State Department now holds a reputation of the lowest esteem; and

Whereas congressional investigations, coupled with public utterances on the part of Secretary of State Acheson, have demonstrated beyond the shadow of doubt that a system of slipshop methods, inexcusable laxity in the screening of State Department personnel, together with his public support of a convicted perjurer, Alger Hiss, has further lowered Mr. Acheson in the esteem of people, both at home and abroad; and

Whereas the Department of State under the direction of Mr. Acheson suppressed the General Wedemyer report, whose recommendations, had they been accepted and followed, could and would have pervented the Communists' conquest in China, and such oppression resulted in the abandonment and betrayal of China to communism; and

Whereas it is readily apparent that the State Department under his leadership has ceased to think American; and

Whereas Secretary of State Acheson's policy in the Far East and more particularly as respecting Korea could well have resulted in one of the greatest debacles in all American history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Woman's Club of Hollywood, condemn the policy of the State Department under Mr. Acheson for its failure to deal adequately with the grim and bloody advance of communism throughout the world. This tragic failure, together with the presence in the Department of State itself of men and women well known to possess communistic leanings and perhaps even Communist Party membership, has seriously and dangerously undermined the confidence of the American people in the ability of the present administration to deal with the dangers that confront us. We consider Mr. Acheson's further incumbency a distinct and dangerous menace to the future happiness and welfare of this country.

We therefore demand that the President of the United States note without delay the clear lack of esteem and confidence of the people of the United States toward Secretary of State Acheson and that he promptly take the necessary steps to discharge Mr. Acheson from that responsible position.

We further demand that he take all necessary action to insure the prompt dismissal and removal from the Department of State of any and all disloyal officials or employees. It is our belief that unless such action is taken the wholehearted confidence of the American people and the faith of peoples abroad will not be restored; be it further

Resolved by the Woman's Club of Hollywood, That should the President of the United States fail to promptly cause Mr. Acheson's removal as Secretary of State, then and in that event, we call upon the Congress of the United States to take such action as lies within its power to remove Secretary of State Dean Acheson from his high office.

National Council of the Republic of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following communication:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE
REPUBLIC OF POLAND,
London, November 22, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Representative from Massachusetts, United States Congress, United States of America.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: I wish to express to you on behalf of the National Council of the Republic of Poland in exile my profound gratitude for the fine speech which you delivered in the House of Representatives on September 1, 1950, on the eleventh anniversary of the invasion of Poland by her enemies, in which you stressed that as the result of the Soviet machinations "Poland exists as a state of the Soviet Union, governed by puppets who dance to the tune played by their Communist masters."

I am also sincerely appreciative that you saw fit to expose that true nature of the Communist pattern of aggression with its lies, duplicity, brutality, and utter disregard for law and international obligations. You have rightly said that the "Poles have the faith and the patience to outlast their conquerors."

Let me also share your view that the "Communists, like Hitler before them, cannot be trusted, for—as you rightly say—"they have made a science of treason." Your effort to unmask the Communist intrigues all over the world should be an eyeopener for all those who still believe that an "understanding" with Soviet Russia is either possible or desirable.

To conclude, I was much gratified to read in your speech that the "Poles have many friends in the United States, which is the last rallying point for the cause of liberty" and that "it is timely to face up to it and prepare to resist and push forward in every way against communism, which is sworn enemy of all that the American people cherish." This courageous warning will not, I hope, remain unheeded.

At the same time I wish to express my most sincere congratulations on your recent reelection for the fifth time to the Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

Yours very sincerely,
T. FILIPOWICZ,
Chairman, Formerly Ambassador of Poland in United States of America.

The Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address as president which I delivered at the fifteenth annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, New Orleans, La., Thursday, November 30, 1950, to wit:

THE VALLEY

The association is dedicated to the flood-control improvement of the lower Mississippi River and to the protection of the lower Mississippi Valley. We delight to speak of it as "The Valley." The waters from the Rockies and the Alleghenies as well as from the Great Lakes on the north, meet at Cairo and from Cairo to the Gulf of Mexico the Mississippi River traverses the alluvial basin, the product of its own torrential floods in ages past, and the valley of its own making, comprising 30,000 square miles, or about 19,000,000 acres of the most fertile land in the United States or in the world.

The Mississippi River and its tributaries drain an area of 1,240,000 square miles, extending from western New York to western and northern Montana, embracing 41 percent of the area of the United States, exclusive of Alaska, and including all or portions of 21 States of the Union and about 20,000 square miles in Canada, comprising parts of two provinces. It provides more drainage and contributes more to navigation than any other river in the United States. The Mississippi Valley is the second largest valley in the world, the Amazon Valley only being larger. It is larger in extent than the whole of Europe, exclusive of Russia, Norway, and Sweden. In its northern stretches the Mississippi River is picturesque and its waters

are clear. In the lower stretches monumental levees have been constructed in the alluvial valley and the waters are muddy.

As one of the world's greatest rivers, the Mississippi is most interesting. None wields more influence upon the country through which it flows. It is the breadbasket and the storehouse of the Nation. As has been well said, "As a dwelling place for civilized man, it is by far the first upon the globe." Ole Man River starts to rolling at the Twin Cities, and it just keeps rolling along to the Gulf where it discharges 3 times as much water as the St. Lawrence, 25 times as much water as the Rhine, and 338 times as much water as the Thames. With the Missouri, it is the longest river in the world. In some places the Mississippi is the most crooked river in the world. In one section the distance as the crow flies is 675 miles, but as the river flows it is 1,300 miles.

The flood-control project of the Mississippi River and its tributaries is the most gigantic ever adopted by any nation. The improvement of the river and the protection of the valley were never more important than today. As the valley grows so will the Nation grow. Progress is rolling through the valley today as new industries are being established, and agricultural production is being increased. The opportunity with soil, oil, and rivers is unparalleled. The eyes of the Nation are turned toward the valley today. Progress rolls just as Ole Man River rolls in the Mississippi Valley.

IMPORTANCE

The rise and fall of civilizations through the centuries have been largely determined by the conservation and the utilization of the bounties of nature. The misuse of land is a warning that the resources of nature are not inexhaustible, and that once lost, it is difficult to replace.

The United States is determined in the programs for reforestation, soil conservation, flood control, and river and harbor improvements to profit by the experiences of other countries. An inescapable conclusion from the study of the past is that the problems of soil erosion and overpopulation go hand in hand.

There is today a connection between the peasant revolt in Italy and soil erosion, for the lands of Sicily are constantly eroded as overpopulation obtains. The Carthagenians used elephants when they invaded Sicily. The people of Sicily used a scorched-earth policy against the elephants of Hannibal. They burned the forests. For 2,000 years forests have been burned. The problem of erosion is tremendous. There is overpopulation in Sicily today.

STREAMS

Nothing in nature is more interesting to me than streams and lakes. They appeal to poets. They are the inspiration of artists. They are useful to the historian. They are the delight of sportsmen. They invite lovers. They are attractive to the writers of fiction as well as verse. They appeal to the engineer as he dreams of building and ministering unto man.

Above the streams and lakes are the sources of both; there are the brooks, there are the forests that have aptly been termed the cradles of rivers. Walking by the side of the still waters of lakes appeals to me, and nothing is more delightful than to roam through the green pastures of valleys. As I linger along streams, my thoughts as I have dreamed for years always turn to the improvement of rivers and to the protection of valleys. Nothing intrigues me more than the journey of the raindrop to the sea. Nothing appeals to me more than beautiful streams over the hills and far away.

PROGRESS

The flood-control works and the river and harbor improvements of the United States surpass those of this or any other country or any other age. No nation has ever made more or comparable progress in production and construction generally, and particularly in the construction of flood-control works than the United States.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The Corps of Engineers was organized by George Washington and it has functioned in river and harbor improvements authorized by Congress since 1824.

No agency of the Government has ever wrought better. George Washington was a great administrator. He provided for the construction of nonmilitary works by them. They are the servants of the Congress, the elected representatives of the people. No engineers are better trained. They are prepared to meet the challenges of peace as well as war, of emergency, and of disaster. They respond where there is an explosion such as occurred at Texas City some time ago. They are on the job when cities, States, and regions are snow-bound. They respond to rehabilitation from hurricanes and storms along the Gulf and the ocean where disaster strikes and where emergency calls. They serve the American people in rain, and in sunshine, in prosperity, and in adversity. They should be encouraged. The civil functions of the Corps of Engineers must be preserved and stengthened. They are the outstanding flood-control engineers of the world.

SOUND POLICY

The rivers of the country are the property of the people and they should be improved for the benefit of the people. The flood control is a national problem. The foundation of the policy is built upon the solid rock of a sound policy that benefits must, in all improvements, exceed the cost.

COOPERATION AND AUTHORITIES

The advocates of authorities or administrations in river valleys to supplant and replace the Corps of Engineers erroneously assert that there is no cooperation between the Corps of Engineers and other agencies of the Government. The argument is fallacious. The Corps of Engineers are cooperating with the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri Valley. They are cooperating with the Bureau of Reclamation in the Columbia Valley. In the flood of 1950 it was demonstrated beyond a doubt that there was cooperation between the Corps of Engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Government agencies, like individuals as they grow old, become more sensible. The Tennessee Valley Authority is primarily a power project. Flood-control is incidental. But in practically all the other valleys of the United States flood-control is fundamental. Congress has rejected Authorities for the Missouri Valley and for the Columbia Valley. When Government agencies fail to cooperate, the remedy is not to establish a new and untried agency but to provide that cooperation must obtain.

RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1950 AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1950

I am glad to report that since the last annual meeting of this association, Congress has passed the River and Harbor Act of 1950 authorizing projects at an estimated cost of $204,253,150, and has passed the Flood Control Act of 1950 authorizing projects at the estimated cost of $1,250,000,000, with an additional $200,000,000 which is the same amount in the act to the Corps of Engineers to the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri Valley. Congress has thus passed the largest authorizations for rivers and harbors and for flood-control in the history of the Republic. Of primary importance to the association is the fact that in the Flood Control Act of 1950, authorizations for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries are increased by more than $200,000,000. The acts of 1950 are not only the largest but they are the most comprehensive and complete acts ever passed by the Congress.

The advocates of flood-control and rivers and harbors must not rest upon their laurels. I do not underestimate the cooperation and assistance of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association and of the other organizations along the Gulf, in the Mississippi Valley, along the Missouri Valley, along the Atlantic seaboard and along the Lakes as well as in the Pacific northwest and in the Pacific southwest, when I say that after all, the final responsibility for the passage of flood control legislation is with the Senators and Representatives. The association can assist but the real responsibility, I repeat for emphasis, is with the representatives of the people. The association can aid and assist. They can encourage and furnish facts, but the final credit, as well as the responsibility, for authorizations is with the Senators and Representatives. I emphasize, also, that members of this association and similar organizations in the United States should encourage Senators and Representatives to seek assignments on the Committees of Public Works in the Senate and in the House. I know of no greater opportunity for helpful and constructive service than familiarity with the problems of rivers and valleys and service on the appropriate committees of Congress.

APPROPRIATIONS

Authorizations are important, but appropriations are still more important.

For the current fiscal year of 1951, Congress appropriated the largest amounts for flood control generally, and for rivers and habors, ever appropiated. The total for general flood control is $383,408,250; for rivers and harbors $198,811,500. It is fair to say that for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries the amount is $66,422,400, whereas the amount for the fiscal year of 1950 was $67,000,000, but I repeat, the aggregate of rivers, harbors and flood control appropriations is the largest ever made.

THE KEY

I have spoken of cooperation between the engineers and other agencies of the Government. There has been no finer cooperation than that which has obtained for appropriations among the Senators and Representatives of the lower Mississippi Valley. Each State has two Senators. The basis of population determines the number of Representatives. The key to continued adequate appropriations for flood control and rivers and harbors is the enthusiastic and constructive advocacy of the elected representatives of the people of the lower valley. I sound the note that should mark the continued cooperation between the States composing this organization, for the Senators and Representatives of any one cannot obtain authorizations or appropriations for that State without the aid and assistance of the Senators and Representatives from the other States.

The executive officer of this association, like the executive officer of similar organizations, should keep in contact with the Senators and Representatives from the lower Mississippi Valley. He should be able to furnish them with information, and he should be qualified to aid and assist them in making contacts and in securing support for the improvements of the valley.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

There have been authorized some 1,300 river and harbor projects in the United States and Territories. They provide for 28,000 miles of improved waterways, 490 locks and dams, and 270 harbors. The vast inland-waterway, coastal and Great Lakes, networks are without a peer. An all-time record high total of 791,541,717 tons of water-borne traffic was reached in 1948, which is more than double the tonnage of 15 years ago. There

are many more harbors to be constructed and waterways to be improved.

FLOOD CONTROL

Some 1,000 projects for flood control have been authorized; and as I recall at the close of the 1948 fiscal year 56 dam and reservoir projects and 170 local protection projects had been constructed. Many other projects have been and many more should be authorized for construction.

ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH

Engineering and research have made possible the improvement of our rivers, the spanning of our rivers, the reclamation of our deserts, the construction of transcontinental highways, the building of transcontinental railways, the harnessing of mighty waterfalls, and the bringing of pure water through mountains, under gorges, and across lands to supply the teeming millions of cities. With the advance in engineering discoveries, science, and invention, there is the opportunity for free America to extend and maintain the highest standard of living ever attained by man.

WAR OR PEACE

President Harry S. Truman stated, about the 1st of June, we were nearer to peace than we had been since the Japanese surrendered on August 14, 1945. The President had done his best to promote peace. Congress had appropriated since the cessation of hostilities, some $48,000,000,000, directly and indirectly, for defense and to promote peace.

When World War II ended, we had the best and the most airplanes in the world; we had the greatest fighting Army in all human history, with more guns and tanks; we had the greatest Navy. As a democracy, however, we ran true to form. The people demanded demobilization. Russia wrecked one peace conference after the other. The Chief of Staff announced, when the President said we were closer to peace than we had ever been, that we were prepared to whip the world. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson reassured the American people when he said that we were unconquerable.

KOREAN INVASION

On the morning of June 25, 1950, like a stroke of lightning cut of the clear sky, North Korea invaded South Korea. The President immediately announced that he had directed the defense of South Korea and the protection of Formosa. His announcement caught the ear and received the approval of the Nation. The future of the United Nations was at stake. The settlement of international disputes by peaceful methods or by force was the issue. The President not only caught the ear of the Nation and brought renewed hope to the free nations of the world, but his prompt and bold announcement that he had directed General Douglas MacArthur to defend South Korea was generally approved by the American people, The President, however, stated that this was a police action. I think the reaction and approval of the Nation were largely based upon the President's statement that this was a police action.

This is no time for criminations and recriminations. Mistakes have been made. We must profit by these mistakes. Those who were responsible must be held accountable. There is nothing for the people of the United States to do except support the prosecution of the Korean War. There was nothing else for the President to do except to aid Korea. We had tried appeasement at Munich. We tried it in Czechoslovakia. We tried it in the First World War.

RUSSIA

We now know that Russia was behind the Communists of North Korea. Arms and tanks and equipment had been furnished. Every day reveals the hand of Russia. By war in Korea, next by war in Iran or Yugoslavia, or some other satellite nation, Russia, without actually fighting but aiding, encouraging, and furnishing guns and cannon, hopes to cripple the United States so that in the event of world war III, the United States will be weak.

Communism is on the march. It must be stopped. The Kremlin recognizes no power save force. A strong America is essential to world peace.

The best aid America can render Europe or Asia is to show the benefits of freedom and demonstrate that the American way of life will promote the welfare of all people.

WARNING

I must utter a warning. We have aided Europe. We have aided China. The conflict between communism and democracy is a contest between ideals. It is a war for men's minds. Guns and cannon cannot destroy ideals. The military thinks of war. The Marshall plan was needed but the military alone cannot conquer communism. The Marshall plan alone cannot overcome communism. This must be supplemented by spiritual plans; the United States can reach the oppressed people of the earth better through spokesmen who understand the needs of humanity rather than by the military who know only how to kill.

No nation has the right to ask the United States for help unless that nation is willing to sacrifice to the limit. People who are not willing to fight are not entitled to our aid. Allies who can be bought with dollars will not fight for freedom.

We must meet force with force, but we are not a military nation. We must show the world that we are not such a nation. We must not saddle ourselves with debts that we cannot pay. Overexpansion, unbridled inflation would please Joe Stalin but it would impoverish us. If we tax our vitality now and prevent the use of our resources as they may be needed, America will be weak instead of strong.

We must help under the Atlantic Pact, but our former allies in Europe must understand that we cannot permanently underwrite their security. They must fight communism with their own money and with their own lives if they expect America to aid them.

While we must be prepared for war, there are other ways to overcome communism. The germs that bred communism must be eliminated. Poverty, inability to acquire a home, or to acquire land must be eliminated in all the world. We must be just. We must demonstrate that we are our brother's keeper. America must not only be prepared for war but the best way to prevent world war III is a strong and a sound America.

The strength of our country does not lie in any one weapon. The strength of America lies in the faith, spirit, the courage, and the intelligence of the people.

Arms alone and furnishing guns and tanks to other nations will not win their friendship. The contest between communism and democracy is for the control of the minds of men. We must demonstrate that the average man in the governments that we aid and assist has a better chance under a free government than under a totalitarian government. We cannot afford to continue the support of corrupt governments whether these governments are in Europe, in China, or in the Philippines.

WHY WE FIGHT

We know why we fight in Korea. Jefferson was right when he wrote: "The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants." We fight to prevent world war III.

AMERICA MUST NOT FALL

One of the most significant stories that came out of the last World War was an incident that occurred in those heart-breaking days of June 1940, when the French troops were crushed and fleeing before the Germans. A young French officer pressing southward came to the cottage of an old peasant who had been his father's friend and comrade-in-arms years before. He paused for a few minutes from his headlong flight, and in conversation with this old friend of his father he said to him: "Tell me what has happened to my country that she now has been broken and conquered. You, with my father, fought for France in the days of her glory. What is the meaning of this, her downfall?" The old peasant promptly replied: "My young friend, I can tell you the secret of France's collapse. In the days of our generation, when your father and I fought in the legions of France, the dominant spirit and only question in the breasts of Frenchmen everywhere was, 'What can I do for France? What can I give to my country?' while in your generation you and your fellows have been thinking only in terms of 'What can I get out of France? What can France be made to do for me?'"

France collapsed long before her armies went to pieces. France collapsed from within when her sons began to think only in terms of what they could get from her.

May the fate of France never be the fate of America. Let us rededicate and reconsecrate ourselves today to the support of America. America must not fall or fail.

"Operation Rain Barrel"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted me, I include in my remarks the speech by Dr. Allen Burkhardt, superintendent of schools and president of the Junior College of Norfolk, Nebr.:

Mr. Chairman and friends, I have a newspaper clipping in my hand which has to do with Farmer and Mrs. Orr and their rain barrel. It seems as though Farmer Orr and his wife keep 250 chickens. Last May, Farmer Orr, who is past 70 years of age, decided to rig up an automatic waterer. He did this by taking an ordinary rain barrel; setting it up on some supports with one end resting on the stump of a tree. He ran a pipe from it down to a trough, and with a little gadget, he automatically controlled the flow of water so that the chickens would always have water to drink. He and Mrs. Orr filled the barrel with water from Piney Creek. He then took half of another rain barrel and put it over the top of the first barrel in order to keep the leaves and trash out.

That was last May. From that day to this, neither Farmer Orr nor Mrs. Orr nor anybody else has ever added a drop of water to that rain barrel. Strangely enough, the level of the water remains constant. There's no connection between the barrel and any source of water. The chickens drink 3 gallons of water every day without lowering the water level. The neighbors have heard about the never-emptying rain barrel and have stood watch 48 hours at a stretch. Twenty thousand people have come to see the never-emptying barrels that can give out 3 gallons of water a day and never change its water level.

Farmer Orr is sick now and has been in bed for a couple of months. When asked how he explains the strange phenomenon of the never-emptying rain barrel, he says, "I can't understand it." Mrs. Orr says that "It might be an act of God."

A bank down in Florida recently published an advertisement which told the following story: In the city of St. Augustine great flocks of sea gulls are starving amid plenty. The fishing is still good, but the gulls don't know how to fish. They don't know how to fish because for generations they have depended upon the shrimp fleet to toss them scraps from the nets. The fishermen for many years have thrown scraps of shrimp from the nets to these flocks of sea gulls. The sea gulls grew fat and comfortable. They didn't have to work for a living. Their children grew up amid ease and plenty and they grew fat and comfortable. They didn't have to work, either. The fourth or fifth generation of sea gulls have come along now. They were doing fine as long as the fishermen threw them scraps to eat. The unexpected happened, however, when the fishermen moved from St. Augustine to a neighboring town. The sea gulls remained. Now they are starving to death because their parents had never taught them how to work; neither had society. They starve amid plenty. The sea is full of fish, but they don't know how to get them. They are gullible gulls. They fell for "ham and eggs without work."

A few years back Ernest Hemingway published a book which he called For Whom the Bell Tolls. In that book are these words which were taken from an essay written 350 years ago by the poet, John Donne. These are the words: "No man is an iland, intire of it selfe; every man is a peece of the continent, a part of the maine; if a clod bee washed away by the sea, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a promontorie were, as well as if a mannor of thy friends or of thine owne were; any mans death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankinde; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

About 250 B. C., a Roman general by the name of Quintus Fabius made a name for himself by defeating the Carthaginian general, Hannibal. Hannibal had a much superior force of men and equipment, but he was no match for Fabius because Fabius practiced what was then a rather new strategy. He avoided meeting Hannibal head-on. He knew that he would be defeated in direct combat, so he used tactics of striking one sector today, inflicting damage, retreating, striking again in a different place a few days later, retreating, never staying to fight long, but always accomplishing something, always harassing the enemy, demoralizing them, convincing them that he was much stronger than he really was. This Fabian approach, this Fabian method of fighting won Quintus Fabius the victory. George Washington is sometimes called the American Fabius because he, too, avoided direct conflict with the British and fought a sector at a time and then retreated, never was captured, never was engaged in a battle with the entire British force, and he won the American Revolution.

I would like to have you remember these little illustrations or incidents and would like to have you fit them with what I have to say in the balance of this talk.

I have been reading history lately and I have found some interesting facts. I have found that revolutions in various countries of the world have occurred almost uniformly when certain conditions were found. Certain circumstances had to prevail in a country, it seemed, before a revolution could take place. In reading about various important revolutionary movements, I find that in order for a revolutionary attempt to be assured of success, there must be rather widespread discontent in the country involved. The people must be angry or discontented about something important. Then the Revolutionaries have a chance to put across their ideas.

I find that one of the chief causes of discontent and one of the common elements that was present in these various countries before revolution took place was that the monetary system was greatly disrupted and disturbed. Wild inflation, it seems, has been present in most countries where serious revolution has occurred. For instance, just prior to the French Revolution, which took place about the time of the American Revolution, the French monetary system was destroyed through wild inflation. In Germany, wild inflation preceded the Hitlerian revolt. Hitler rose to power in a country which had no monetary system worthy of the name; when a piece of paper could have printed upon it the words "one million marks" and yet would not buy a postage stamp. The Reds in China secured a foothold at a time when prices had gone out of bounds, when there was wild or run-away inflation throughout China. People were discontented; business was confused. Italy was a fit subject for Mussolini because of disturbed economic conditions and because of wild inflation. The first aim of the Bolsheviks just prior to their taking over the Russian Government was to inflate away the currency. Lenin one time remarked that "the best way to conquer the United States is to let them spend themselves to destruction and to cause inflation and a disturbed and chaotic economic condition."

We have the makings in America today of wild or run-away inflation. We have a national debt that is almost beyond our ability to comprehend. We have wild spending in Government circles. We have rain-barrel financing. Those controlling Government spending appear to either have the confused outlook of Farmer Orr or the blind faith of Mrs. Orr because they spend more than they receive.

I find another thing to be true as I read history, and that is that almost always violent or physical revolutions occur only after an ideological revolution has taken place. Revolutions are born in the minds of men. They are fostered in the printed word. I should like to point out today that we in America have been undergoing an ideological revolution for nearly 20 years; that certain socialistic forces have been at work in America for nearly 20 years, and an ideological war relating to social problems and economic problems and governmental affairs has been taking place. I should like to point out, too, that Socialists in America and in Great Britain have been using the Fabian approach. They have even avoided the use of the word "socialism." They have called themselves by other names. They have hidden behind the term "liberal," behind labor, behind the welfare state, behind the fair deal. They have used every word except the true one—"socialism."

Great Britain today is one of the most socialistic countries in the world. United States is not far behind. There are those who think the United States has caught up with Great Britain. Now about 65 years ago the Fabian Society was formed in Great Britain. The Fabian Society was devoted to the idea of spreading the teachings of Karl Marx by using the tactics of Quintus Fabius; by gaining ground a little at a time, and they have done just that thing.

Great Britain has been a very powerful country throughout the centuries. No enemy has been able to cross the English Channel successfully. Hitler was not able to do it, neither was Napoleon. But a soft-spoken man by the name of Marx has crossed it, not only has he crossed it, but he has conquered England. About 100 years ago Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto and much other socialistic material. A few enthusiastic followers began to preach his gospel. The Fabian Socialists have worked hard at preaching the gospel of socialism and they have derided capitalism. They have been so successful that we have a whole nation of people so accustomed to socialism that it is an accepted thing.

Sir Stafford Cripps was the leader, the intellectual leader, of the Labor Party until his resignation a few weeks ago. Sir Stafford Cripps was Chancellor of the Exchequer, a very popular and powerful man in Great Britain. Every time he would get up to present his budget message, the members of the Parliament would cheer, that is, those on his side of the aslie would cheer. A year ago last spring, however, something strange happened. He stood up to present his budgetary message, and as he told of the accomplishments of the Labor Party, cheers came from his side of the House. Suddenly, however, the cheers died down on that side and frowns came across the faces of his followers. Almost simultaneously cheers began to come from the Conservative side of the House and here is why this strange thing took place.

Sir Stafford Cripps had come to that point in his budgetary message, after talking about the necessary expenditures in order to carry on the welfare state, where he said, "And now I must report that the time has finally arrived when we must pay for these benefits ourselves. We can no longer soak the rich because the rich are no longer with us. They have been taxed out of existence." That was not popular talk. It precipitated a crisis within his party and within the nation and Sir Stafford resigned the other day. The papers said he resigned because of ill health.

We have no Fabian Society in the United States, as such, but we certainly have been using the tactics of the Fabian Society in attempting to indoctrinate the citizenry of America relative to socialism. I should like to point out that in America today we have a whole generation, as a matter of fact, more than one generation of young people who have never known anything except a philosophy of spending, of deficit financing, of rain-barrel operation, and of security. We have been trying to make a bunch of "gullible gulls" of our people for nearly two decades by preaching to them and by trying to convince them both by example and precept that security is more important than individual enterprise. That it is more important to have ham and eggs at 65, regardless of how you get them, whether you earn them or not, than it is to work hard while you are young. We have been trying to deprive them of the pleasure of work throughout all of these years. We have been trying to convince them that work is not an important element in success. We have done that by not practicing any thrift ourselves. We have done that by permitting our Government to spend and to spend and to spend regardless of the amount of money that comes in. We have countenanced deficit financing in America, rain-barrel financing.

We have deprived our young people of a certain amount of happiness which is their just due. It seems to me as though happiness can only be had when we do things for other people and when we accomplish things for ourselves and others. It appears to me that everybody in order to be happy must feel significant or important. Nobody can feel significant or important if he is told from youth on that he must depend upon a benevolent and a charitable government to take care of him in his old age; when he is taught that retirement is the thing to look forward to rather than accomplishment.

Young people used to come to my office asking me about the advantages of certain occupations and professions. They wanted to know about the work; they wanted to know about what they could expect in the way of promotion and salary and what the future held for them. Today they come to my office and ask some of the same questions, but almost invariably before they leave, and sometimes very early in the conference, they say, "What is the retirement system?" If there isn't a very good retirement system and if it doesn't come at a very

young age, many of them lose interest. These young people should be indoctrinated with the idea that real security can come to a person only when that person possesses confidence in himself; only when he feels self-reliant to the extent that he feels certain he can provide for his own retirement and that of his family. He should know that the dole is not security, but rather the most demoralizing type of insecurity.

I wonder when, in America, we've gotten to the point where we think we can retire all the workers at the age of 50 and still have a productive country. I wonder when, in America, it has become necessary to apologize for the capitalistic system. I wonder why we have to apologize or why we have to shun the use of the word "capitalism," when the capitalistic type of economy in America is one of the things that has made America great; it is one of the things that has helped make America productive. We are the strongest and most productive nation in the world, and we have operated consistently under the capitalistic system, yet we go around afraid to use the word "capitalism." We seem to be afraid to preach to our young people that capitalism is a good thing. We are even afraid to preach to each other that capitalism is a good thing.

Maybe we don't really believe that capitalism is good in America. Maybe we staunch rugged individualists in Nebraska don't really believe what we say. Maybe we are in favor of socialism. Maybe we want socialized medicine. Maybe we want deficit financing. Maybe we want continued subsidies. Maybe our Nebraska farmers want to get themselves in the same shape the British farmer is in today. Ninety-nine percent of the farmers in Great Britain, according to authorities, now operate under the Government-subsidy program. They don't have to operate under that program, it is an optional proposition, but they can't make a living in Great Britain operating a farm unless they do operate under the government plan. And it's gone so far today in Great Britain that if you operate under the Government plan and you don't farm the way the Government thinks you ought to farm, or the way the politicians think, they can walk into your house, sell your land, and put you off the farm. They'll sell your farm at a price determined by themselves and turn the farm over to somebody else to run.

The same thing is true in some other countries in the world today. The politicians can do those things. You say, "No, not the politicians, the government." Well, the politicians are the ones that do it because the politicians are the government. Who operates the Government in America if not a group of politicians? They have to be politicians in order to get into office. They have to be politicians to stay in office. They can be either good or bad politicians, but the point remains that politicians run the Government.

Maybe we in Nebraska want that because we haven't done much to prevent it. You see, in Nebraska we think we should stop spending money, we think we should do away with deficit financing. That is, we think we should except where Nebraska is affected. It's all right to cut out a canal in the State of Maine or Florida or cut out a project in New Mexico or California, but don't go touching any projects in Nebraska. Don't take away any money from our airport, don't close the Kearney base, or the Hastings depot; if you do we'll send delegations of people, even rugged individualists, to Washington to plead for the reopening of these projects. There seems to be a question as to how much we really believe in what we say. Maybe we have become gullible gulls.

"Never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee." Are the bells tolling for us in America today? Are we aware of the fact that we are no longer walking down the road to socialism, but that we are walking down the road of socialism? Are we aware that we are being conquerred by Socialists who are employing and who have been employing for many years the Fabian approach? Knowing these things, do we care? Are we willing to sacrifice our boys and men in Korea in an attempt to stop the spread of communism in the world and then sit supinely by and see the first cousin of the Communist conquer here at home?

I sincerely hope that we citizens of America are smart enough to see what is happening to us and then having seen that, we will gird ourselves for battle. I hope we become so imbued with love for our form of government and our way of life that we will go forth throughout the land preaching the benefits of democracy. Preaching, too, if you please, the benefits of the capitalistic type of society. We must work carefully and assiduously in an attempt to bring the light to people of all ages—even using the Fabian approach—to the end, that our people will some day again be free and truly secure.

Then perhaps the day will come when a tired and weary, but happy mankind will gather in green pastures, even beside still waters for rest and nourishment. There they shall hear, not the tolling, but rather the chiming of the bells. They shall then ask not for whom the bell tolls, but rather—for whom does a new day dawn? Then shall they hear the answer come back to them clear and strong—"A new day dawns for thee—a new day dawns for all."

A Judge Favors Revolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News of November 25, 1950:

A JUDGE FAVORS REVOLUTIONS

"There are revolutions in the world which need management and direction. Revolution is the great heritage of American life."

The above quotation comes from a recent address by Justice William O. Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court. The Justice pointed out that millions of the peoples of the earth are trying to do today for themselves and children what our forefathers did for us in 1776. "It will be shameful if, when the history of the period is written, America is credited with suppressing these struggles, with alining itself on the world scene with reaction, tyranny, and oppression."

We are not sure that we can identify the "millions" of peoples in the world trying to do what this country accomplished in 1776. If the Justice refers to efforts of people in various parts of the world to overthrow their present governments, he seems to suggest that the United States should cooperate with the revolutionists.

We are not quite sure we understand just where there is danger of this country's "alining itself" with reaction, tyranny, and oppression. The Justice suggests that the natives of eastern countries think of freedom in terms of ridding themselves of slavery and includes land reform in areas where the land is largely held by a few. Admitting that in these areas there is no such thing as a free election, the jurist said that the people do not need money so much as ideas and backing reforms. He winds up his address by suggesting that "America should get behind a program of social reforms."

This is, of course, a considerable order of business. It certainly applies to the situation in China, in India, and probably applies to Spain, Italy, and the eastern countries of Europe. Just how the United States can carry out the recommendations of the jurist is something of a puzzle because it is perfectly obvious that this country cannot guarantee or obtain "freedom, peace, stability, and security" for the entire world.

No Communist Is Trustworthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, communism cannot be trusted whether it be Communist aggression from the Kremlin or Communist promises from an independent Communist government.

Some of our administration leaders attempt to draw a line of distinction between communism as practiced in Yugoslavia under Tito and communism as it is practiced by Soviet Russia. The entire theory of communism is based on the belief that free enterprise must be destroyed, and the government must assume ownership of all property, and that only when all nations in the world agree to government by communistic methods will the Communist aim be achieved.

Aid to Tito in Yugoslavia is aid to communism. It must be recognized as such by the Congress when a request is submitted for further aid to Tito.

No Communist is truthworthy, and the Congress should give careful consideration to any request for aid to Communist Tito. The following article from a recent issue of Pathfinder, by Felix Morley, reviews the Yugoslavian situation and is worthy of your attention:

NO COMMUNIST IS TRUSTWORTHY

(By Felix Morley)

In his speech at San Francisco, returning from the conference with General MacArthur on Wake Island, President Truman drew a fine distinction between communism as an economic doctrine and communism as a political arm of Russian imperialism.

Close readers of the speech noted that Mr. Truman nowhere criticized communism as such, although he sharply denounced the international Communist movement, Communist aggression and Communist imperialism.

This attempt to separate the economic and political aspects of communism has the greater significance because it is also found in the booklet Our Foreign Policy, published by the Department of State and widely circulated before the November 7 election.

In this official publication it is suggested that socialism as an economic doctrine does not necessarily destroy individual freedom. The booklet says: "The deepening division between the Soviet-dominated bloc and the free world is not * * * a conflict between capitalism and communism."

Here the State Department disagrees with Lenin, the great hero of Soviet Russia, who

told his people 30 years ago that: "As long as capitalism and socialism remain we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph; a funeral requiem will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

It is the hope of the Department of State that a wedge can be driven between "national" and "international" communism. That hope is the basis of our friendly policy toward Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia. That hope explains Secretary Acheson's apparent belief that we can recognize Red China and permit its entry into the UN.

An argument heard frequently in Washington is that the Chinese Communist leaders are not really convinced Marxists. Mao Tse-tung, the argument runs, could be developed into a Chinese Tito.

Because that argument is so prevalent, the viewpoint of Constantin Fotitch, the former Yugoslav Ambassador to the United States, acquires particular importance. Fotitch says that communism itself is the enemy, and that those who try to distinguish between Tito communism and Kremlin communism are fooling themselves.

Fotitch is perhaps prejudiced, for he opposed the Tito regime with all his great ability, and would be clapped in jail if he returned to Yugoslavia. But he knows that country, and it would be wise not to discount his conviction that Tito would never be a reliable ally against Soviet Russia.

Yugoslav is now trying to secure upward of $500,000,000 from this country, to meet a food crisis for which the Tito regime blames a drought. Fotitch tells me that the real cause is Communist policies, which have been so confiscatory that many farmers have ceased tilling the soil.

If the former Ambassador is right, or even half right, it could be a stupid and costly error to pour money into Tito's country on the assumption that this is containing communism.

The entire theory of communism is based on the belief that free enterprise itself is evil, that governments everywhere should be taken over by those who aim to destroy private property; that when this is done all Socialist governments will live in peace.

As long as Tito and Mao Tse-tung call themselves Communists their actual or potential deviation from Moscow will be of secondary importance. We deceive ourselves if we think Yugoslav, Chinese, or American Communists are trustworthy because they sometimes criticize Moscow.

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Washington Times-Herald of December 4, 1950:

TRUMAN SHOULD GET OUT

General MacArthur says that we are in an undeclared war with China. Mr. Truman brought this about in the name of 151,000,000 Americans when he bought himself a war in Korea by executive fiat, in disregard of the Constitution. Now we find ourselves booby-trapped by the hordes of Communist China.

If this can be described as policy, it was policy working under a blindfold. The country is committed to a wholly useless war from which it can gain nothing. The special sin of Truman is that whatever we now do is bound to be wrong. We can't beat the Chinese with what we have. No American can acquiesce in the abandonment of 175,000 of the Nation's boys who are Truman's hostages to fate. And what about the wounded and prisoners left behind?

Very little could improve this terrible predicament but there would be some consolation and some reason for hope if the country could be relieved of the author of its misfortunes. No man has ever done as much wrong to his country as Truman—not Buchanan, who was passive in the face of impending dissolution of the Union, not Wilson, who embarked upon the fatal course of global war, not even Franklin Roosevelt, who represented the all-time low up to now.

Truman doesn't know where he's been or where he is heading. If he expects to find out through consultation with Prime Minister Attlee, he is laboring under another delusion. Nothing productive can be expected from this tête-à-tête of third-raters.

Truman should resign. Under the law of Presidential succession, we will be stuck with old Alben Barkley, the ancient Romeo and baby kisser, but, though he is no genius, the country could stomach him more easily than the dishonest nincompoop in the White House, who long ago lost his rudder.

WHAT DID YOU EXPECT?

The British are knocking themselves out trying to avoid getting entangled in a major war with China or the Communists world empire. We can't blame them too severly. Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson have got us into this jam, and the British, having seen the appalling result, are saying, "Thanks, no. We have a previous engagement."

This attitude, however, puts a considerable strain on the fiction that the dirty work in Asia is a United Nations war and that "collective security" is in process of being attained.

IT'S ONLY PRETENSE

When Sir Gladwyn Jebb was called upon for a few well-chosen remarks before the UN Security Council, he studiously refrained from any mention of aggression by the Chinese Communists, contenting himself with a routine denunciation of North Korean aggression. This showed a high talent for disregarding the obvious staring one in the face.

Yet it has been a consistent pretense that anything that the United States did Korea involved 52 other nations equally, as this was a United Nations war approved by that many non-Communist states, and our forces were there merely as UN agents. When it comes to laying it on the line, however, everybody else takes a walk.

There is no reason why this should come as any surprise, for Britain has made it abundantly clear that it will honor international commitments only as long as they are in the British national interest. Everybody had proof of that last June, when the executive committee of the ·uling Labor Party turned thumbs down on the Schuman plan for pooling western European iron and steel resources.

The party pronouncement rejected any merging of Britain's politics or economics with other countries.

A UN WAR, BUT WHO FIGHTS?

If there were any surviving doubts about Britain's position, they were set to rest in the proceedings of the council of Europe's consultative assembly in Paris just before the Chinese Communists launched their Korean offensive. The idea of a European federation with supra-national authority was abandoned there in deference to the clearly expressed refusal of England to have any part of such an arrangement.

There is not the slightest reason to believe that Britain would make an exception of the United Nations and depart from its established policy of holding aloof from supranational authorities denying England the power of independent decision in its own interest.

Last May, at Madison, Wis., Mr. Truman said that the sole course before the United States was to "move forward * * * in cooperation with other free countries * * *."

"Isolationism," he said, "is no alternative. Isolationism is only a counsel of despair. Isolationism would bring on another war, and it would be a war in which we might stand alone against the rest of the world."

We have the war, and for all practical purposes we are standing alone, and isolationism certainly did not bring it on. Internationalism brought it on, but the other countries that have wished the doctrine on us are not sharing the results and responsibilities.

Scroll for Courage Heartening Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper editorial which appeared on November 14, 1950, in the Los Angeles Daily News:

SCROLL FOR COURAGE HEARTENING EXAMPLE

A few evenings ago approximately 700 citizens, representing almost every racial and religious group in the community and a considerable variance in political thinking, met at dinner to honor Councilman Edward R. Roybal.

These citizens signed a scroll conveying their compliments to the councilman and listened to talks by a half dozen or so prominent citizens. The quality in Roybal which brought him that testimonial was his courage. Intellectual courage and honesty are virtually synonymous, and Roybal certainly has displayed them.

Although it was Roybal's refusal to vote for an ordinance requiring Communists to register that precipitated the action, it was not that alone that brought him praise. Certainly those who organized and spoke at the dinner are not Communists nor sympathetic with them. Neither is Roybal. In fact he despises communism.

It was the way the councilman conducted himself—what he gave as his reasons for opposing the ordinance that brought such spontaneous acclaim from the community. Here, said the people who honored him, is a man who has convictions and is not afraid to express them in public and against great opposition and at great risk to his political future.

Roybal is a devoutly religious man and he believes that it is an important part of his Christianity to fight for the rights of the people. This, of course, is not a belief confined to the Christian religion or any other. Judge Isaac Pacht, who spoke at the dinner on behalf of some 300,000 Jews in this community, expressed a similar sentiment.

Rt. Rev. Thomas J. O'Dwyer a noted Catholic clergyman, was among the speakers.

What the meeting pointed up to many of those who attended it was that here is the answer to the technique of the Senator McCarthys. It is so easy to blame somebody. When the hue and cry start any hoodlum can join in the outcry and hound the accused. It requires neither courage nor intelligence to call names.

It has been amply demonstrated that the antidote for name calling is not more name calling. That puts accusers and attacked on the same level. The answer to name calling is for people to arise and pay homage and tribute to good public officials who show bravery before they can be attacked by the smear artists.

There is no question but that Councilman Roybal would have come in for criticism by some who are chauvinistic, or worse, in their attitude. He may yet suffer. But he is less likely to suffer because the individuals who delight to smear are usually a little on the timid side if they do not feel they have public opinion with them and they are even more timid where they are sure it is against them.

Consequently the moral importance of honoring a courageous councilman was not just that it bolstered one honest public official in his forthright attitude which is good, but that it sets a precedent which it would pay us to follow in America.

Besides, those who blame are obligated also to praise when praise is due.

Sometimes we think Americans need a refresher course in the fine art of honorable mention.—L. E. C.

The Election Didn't Kill Socialism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greenfield (Ind.) Daily Reporter of November 24, 1950:

THE ELECTION DIDN'T KILL SOCIALISM IN AMERICA

As time passes since the November elections, many people are striving to inventory and assess what the results of that voting mean as a reflection of the thinking of a majority of the people and any changes thereof which may have occurred.

Naturally, many of these conclusions are far-fetched as more time and subsequent expressions of public will are likely to prove.

It is our feeling that the result expressed public anxiety and discontent, as well as uncertainty with the future, rather than any considerable swing to conservatism after a record-breaking period in which majority public sentiment has been even more liberal in its trend to the left.

We think, also, that many of the substantial exponents of "things as they are," and opponents of some of the fairly radical proposals of the present national administration, became desperate in their opposition, convinced somehow that the 1950 elections might be their last chance in self defense. Therefore, they busied themselves, shook off the carping, pointless apathy which has marked their political activities for more than a decade, exerted their influence in an organized manner, recruited a heavy vote from their side of the argument and enjoyed a measure of success.

If this be true, if the medical profession, the conservative farmers, the various types of religious leaders who had become concerned with the materialistic trend, and the regular loyal opposition really beshook themselves into vigorous action, the surprising thing to us is that the results were not more startling than they were.

True, the total popular vote assessed something like 52 percent Republican and 48 percent Democratic, which could be interpreted as a majority in protest against things as they are. But, because of the quirks of distribution, the objectors failed to capture a majority of either national legislative body; and in the House, which is the best direct reflection of the public will, still are considerably in the minority.

Just the same, we can already detect the beginnings of complacency among the elements which so tardily reactivated themselves politically; a sort of we-killed-the-bear attitude, as if their battle was won and over, once and for all.

That is emphatically not the case. The fight against "big government" against increasing paternalism, against the gradual domination of the individual and domination of local governments, municipal, county, and State by an all-powerful centralized power has just begun.

If some of the results of the last election can be interpreted as an awakening of the people generally to the situation, and we are not at all sure that it can, then, at best, this is victory only in a skirmish.

State medicine, the so-called Brannan plan or any kindred agricultural scheme, rabid internationalism with its tremendous cost and continuous embroilment in war, the general principle of subsidy and its companion, Federal control of production and individual initiative, Federal domination of schools, of welfare and charity, and the ever, ever increasing costs, bureaucracy, inefficiency, waste, the bribing of great sections of the electorate with funds directly from the public treasury, and the ever-mounting taxes, taxes, taxes; these things are not dead. Nor are they even permanently defeated.

These matters have been dignified by being publicly discussed as feasible. They have been made issues in an election. Therefore, the process of rationalizing them in the public mind has begun. We are being conditioned to ultimate acceptance. The advocates of such are too deeply entrenched in positions of influence to give up now. There are still too many Americans who are gullible, who think there is a pot of gold at the end of every rainbow; who have been taught that Uncle Sam knows best; who have fallen for the sophistry of "you take the handout, let them pay for it" and still don't realize that "them" is really "us;" who fail to realize the long-term dangers which lie in unthinking docility.

If you mean it then, the battle has just begun. Perpetual vigilance is the price of continued freedom.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution approved by the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This resolution was passed on November 18, 1950:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, IN REGARD TO VETERANS' HOUSING

NOVEMBER 18, 1950.

The national legislative committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, views with grave concern the action of the executive branch of October 12, 1950, in applying strict credit controls curbs on the veterans' home loan program.

Due to the necessity for diverting essential materials to an expanded defense effort, and to hold the line against inflationary pressure stimulated by increased defense spending, it was necessary, the committee concedes, to apply certain controls on housing credit. However, the executive branch disregarded certain principles in applying these credit controls and toward this the Veterans of Foreign Wars must take strong exception.

First, the preferences accorded veterans under existing law were given only token consideration, notwithstanding the specific language of the Defense Production Act that such veterans preferences be preserved. In the opinion of the committee the veteran whose annual earnings are in the $2,500 to $4,000 range is for all practical purposes excluded from the housing market. Here, where the housing need was the greatest, was permitted to fall the greater burden of the credit-control program. This, in the opinion of the committee, constitutes a tragic blunder.

Secondly, if 850,000 housing starts is the target for 1951, and the committee believes that the home credit controls will result in little more than half that number, then the great majority of such homes should be channeled into the low and middle price ranges with the veterans obtaining preference in the acquisition of this housing. To provide otherwise constitutes a breach of faith of the men who fought World War II while a grateful Congress in 1944 fashioned the veteran home loan program of the GI bill of rights.

It is also unfortunate that at this time, when many World War II veterans are facing recall to active service and perhaps combat duty against Communist aggressors, that these same veterans must witness or even experience a denial of a veterans' benefit.

The executive branch also erred in not attempting to accomplish the objectives of the Defense Production Act by first curtailing nonessential commercial construction and high- and luxury-priced homes. Instead, the burden was permitted to fall principally on the low and middle income group in which group the veterans of World War II largely fall. This disregard of a veterans benefit by the executive branch must be rectified without delay.

The national legislative committee therefore calls upon the President of the United States to issue instructions immediately to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to amend the October 12 home credit regulations so that a veteran may obtain a home costing $10,000 or less without the necessity of making a down payment.

Approved by the national legislative committee, November 18, 1950.

Polish United Societies of Chelsea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of my address at the annual Pulaski Day parade and commemoration exercises at the Pulaski monument, Chelsea, Mass., on Sunday, October 15, 1950:

Men are fighting and dying at this very hour.

Four thousand young Americans, so young that they still seem like children to the parents who brought them into this world just 18, 20, or 22 years ago, have paid the highest price for the manhood that came to them so suddenly and so far from home.

They sleep in eternal rest, and each day more comrades join them in the bivouac of the dead.

The people of Chelsea know, for some of your sons are numbered among the dead, the wounded, and the missing, in the fight for freedom that the United States, in the name of the United Nations, is winning in Korea.

They did not put aside the happy and productive work of peacetime and take up arms to defend their homes, their cities, or their Nation.

Why did they have to travel half way around the earth to defend a people they scarcely knew?

Casimir Pulaski, one of the great men of history, knew the answer to that a long time ago.

One hundred and seventy-one years have passed since the Polish nobleman made a far more difficult journey to help Americans win their independence. This week we commemorate his great vision, his military genius, and the supreme sacrifice which he made on the altar of our freedom.

Pulaski knew that the God-given right to liberty can never be divided by the barriers of geography, language, or creed. It belongs to all men of good will, whatever their origin.

It was a long way, measured in months of travel from Warsaw, Poland, to Savannah, Ga., in 1779. It is still a great distance from Chelsea, Mass., to Seoul, Korea, in 1950, but a soldier can leave here and be there in a few days of interrupted flying.

Korea, its people and its problems, are much closer than we think to the everyday life that is lived in Chelsea, as science and invention make us realize that we cannot confine ourselves to the sense of community we feel in our city, State, or Nation. Another relationship, that of the world-neighborhood, is calling upon us to devise a system that will protect all nations and all men from the new form of slavery that threatens the earth.

In other days, men could escape from tyranny because no oppressor had the means to turn this whole planet into a jail.

But now there is no hiding place left.

The instruments of science can reach everywhere.

In the control of evil men, these blessings can become a curse.

If we are to be free, we can no longer run away.

The thoughtless person who says that what happens in Korea, or Berlin, or Indochina, or Washington is no concern of his is making a terrible mistake. It could be fatal if such ignorance spreads.

We are celebrating Pulaski Day not because it gives us the passing joy of seeing a colorful parade. We have not come here in idle curiosity to consider for a moment a name that meant so much to us in our school days, and then put it aside until we revive its memory again on this day in 1951.

History has no meaning and no lessons for us if we treat it lightly.

Pulaski was a man before he was a general.

The outward trappings of uniform and fame are nothing compared with his faith, his belief, and his actions.

He became great because he was so right, in a way that extended far into the future, to the present and even beyond. Pulaski is alive today because his passionate devotion to human rights and human freedoms is what this world needs above all now, if it is not to lose, what he helped to win.

The victories of yesterday can become the defeats of today forfeited by indifference and neglect.

Pulaski's bones have turned to dust, but his spirit marches on in the minds and hearts of men and women who are alive to the dangers and responsibilities of 1950. Old injustices are corrected. New ones appear. Tyrants soften their unsuspecting victims by thought control before they bear down physically. Vigilance as the protector of our liberties must be exercised in all the dimensions of human experience. Words and deeds are no longer reliable in themselves. We must always look for the hidden meanings to save ourselves from being deceived.

Pulaski believed in the right of all men to be free.

That is why he helped us.

That is why we, in the name of the United Nations, are helping the Koreans.

Our men are demonstrating that courage, as ever, is an indispensable quality of a free man's faith.

But to it we must add intelligence.

The mental alertness that knows what we are fighting for, and the clear thinking that seems through the clever lies of enemy propaganda, so that we will not be confused or taken in by half-truths or rumors.

General Pulaski was a man who did his own thinking. He did not depend on others to do it for him.

He was a leader among the sturdy and self-reliant men who won the American Revolution. They and their discendants, together with the new sons and daughters who fled Europe to find the freedom of opportunity here, have built a nation that helps others as well as itself. And this was accomplished by people first, with Government assisting in a secondary role.

The American experiment, stressing individual worth, has exceeded even the fondest hopes of the founding fathers.

We are not going to abandon this good thing for the empty promises of communism. We know that under our free system, every person has a chance to improve himself, even while he helps others as a member of the greatest production team in history.

We also know that our liberty, with the material abundance which is proof of its vitality, cannot survive in a world where all other peoples have been reduced to slavery. We are helping our war-weakened friends to recover their self-reliance. In cooperation with them, we shall bring order to this world, based on a world constitution guided by reason, justice, and faith in God.

The Western World looks to us for leadership, not only in material things, but in the spirit that made them possible.

We demonstrated this positive leadership in Korea and took the ball away from the Communists.

To continue we must have allies rather than dependents.

Weaker democracies will become strong, and those now in captivity will regain their independence, if we do not slacken in our purpose.

The trend toward concentration of power in the hands of the few must be reversed. In government and in industry, we must strive to keep close to the citizen and the worker. Freedom has a hollow ring when a person cannot see or speak to his representative in government or to his employer in business.

That self-reliance which we find in the example of Pulaski, and Americans like him, will disappear from our way of life unless we decentralize as much as possible, permitting people to have a genuine feeling of paricipation in the events which affect their lives.

If Pulaski were living in our times, I cannot imagine him feeling so insignificant concerning his government that he would not even bother to vote. I cannot visualize him as taking some small job at the age of 25 and staying in that one groove for the rest of his life in return for job-security. It is impossible to imagine him as a person who would say: "Let George do it" to every problem outside of his family and his work.

To him, life was not just a span of years along which he could coast with as much comfort and as little annoyance as he could manage.

It was much, much more than that.

He did not live for himself alone, but to win the freedom under which hundreds of millions of people would find greater fulfillment in the generations that followed.

It is a strange but inspiring parallel of history that two countries so far apart—Poland and America—should have been so alike in their early desire for freedom and in the vigor with which they have fought for it on every front down through the years.

It has created a kinship between our two peoples that will never die.

Encouraged by the memory of Pulaski, Poland will regain her independence. No one can predict just when, but of this we can be sure. The United States will be a leader among those who will bring about the liberation of Pulaski's homeland.

We offer prayerful thanks to the memory of a great soldier in a great cause.

Because of him and his fellow-revolutionists, we in these blessed United States are free.

We promise that we shall carry on the good work until the people of Poland and all other enslaved nations can live as human beings again.

When that day comes, Pulaski's victory will be complete.

Who Failed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Herald Tribune carries a very timely discussion of the present emergency in Korea written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop. I offer it for the perusal of my colleagues, not as carping criticism but as the basis for constructive action to prevent a recurrence of this type of catastrophe:

WHO FAILED?

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Every American, in and out of public life, is asking who is responsible for the disastrous intelligence failure which has now led to military disaster in Korea. The answer is simple. The whole responsibility belongs to Gen: Douglas MacArthur's own intelligence organization, headed by one of the little circle of high staff officers who have been with MacArthur since Bataan, Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby.

This would not be so, if General MacArthur were subject to normal rules. In a normal war theater, agent nets and other machinery for gathering and processing intelligence belong to the national intelligence organization, the CIA. In a normal theater, by the same token, the theater G–2 is primarily responsible for military interpretation of the intelligence thus obtained, and has only the most limited responsibility for intelligence collection.

Even during the Second World War, however, when this pattern was becoming established in other theaters, General MacArthur showed sharp dislike for it. Indeed, he actually banned the CIA's wartime predecessor, the Office of Strategic Services, from op-

erating in his Pacific theater. Postwar, he continued to maintain the same ban until this spring, when the CIA was at last permitted to get its toe in the door. Even then, moreover, the unusual concession was demanded and granted, that the local representatives of the CIA should be placed under the operational control of General Willoughby, as theater G–2.

TROUBLE AFTER INCHON

This arrangement remained in force after the Korean war broke out, until after the Inchon landing operation. The bold and brilliant stroke at Inchon was the best possible proof that a great military commander like MacArthur can work real miracles with good intelligence. Inchon would hardly have been possible without solid detailed information about the weakness of the enemy defenses, and MacArthur himself congratulated the CIA representatives on their part in securing this information.

For some occult reason, however, trouble followed almost at once. Not very long after the Inchon landing, the arrangement made in the spring was suddenly upset. The old ban on the CIA was again enforced.

The whole task of gathering and processing intelligence, as well as interpreting the intelligence for the theater commander and for Washington, once more reverted to General Willoughby's organization, where the entire responsibility still remains.

Rather transparent attempts are now being made to suggest that the intelligence thus provided was not really so bad after all. It is hinted, in one breath, that our plans in Korea only miscarried because of the interdict on air operations beyond the Chinese border (which General MacArthur, of course, knew all about long before he gave the recent order to attack). In the next breath, it is also stated that the true intention of the "Home by Christmas" offensive was only to blunt an expected Chinese onslaught. This is demonstrable nonsense.

MAC ARTHUR'S BELIEF

As early as late September General MacArthur had been positively convinced that the Chinese would not intervene in Korea. At Wake Island, he expressed this conviction most forcibly to the President, only a few days before the Chinese crossed the border. The sudden appearance of Chinese troops in combat in October very evidently took our divisions in Korea wholly by surprise. And even thereafter, the authorities in Tokyo clearly believed that the Chinese intervention was essentially unimportant, inspiring many stories about the small numbers of Chinese troops in Korea and their demoralization by American fire power.

Finally, no general in his senses would have hurled our thin lines of men, with a great gap in the center, against an enemy whom he did not confidently regard as weak and on the run. General MacArthur must, he can only, have ordered the "home by Christmas" offensive on the basis of an estimate of enemy capabilities and intentions so grossly false that over 200,000 Chinese troops were somehow lost in the shuffle. He must, he can only, have been perfectly sincere in saying that he hoped to "end the war for all practical purposes." It is a dreadful thing that General MacArthur thus walked into a huge, well-laid trap. But it is more just to our most eminent American soldier to admit this frankly, than to try to pretend that he got into the trap of his own volition.

In short, the horror that confronts us proves the converse of a rule already given. Just as a great commander can work miracles with good intelligence, so even the greatest commander cannot overcome bad intelligence. Since the bad intelligence emanated from General MacArthur's own headquarters, this may displease those who like to believe that he has attained a sort of divine perfection. But facts are facts nonetheless, and they must be faced.

Puerto Rican Radicals in Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, following the Nationalist disorders in Puerto Rico recently and the attempt on the life of President Truman by two of their numbers, Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín made a speech in which he expressed the deep feeling of the majority of his people against these criminal disorders.

Radicals in this country have seized this opportunity created by their fellow travelers in Puerto Rico to launch new blasts against our form of government, all based on false or distorted facts.

It was my privilege to sponsor a bill in Congress which permitted the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own governor for the first time in 1948. Political rights there are fully guaranteed. Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States.

In justice to the sane-thinking citizens of Puerto Rico, I believe the facts set forth by Gov. Muñoz Marín are worthy of our consideration, and I herewith present the speech which he made:

GOV. LUIS MUÑOZ MARIN'S SPEECH, NOVEMBER 1, 1950

The people of Puerto Rico are profoundly indignant at the attempt made at Blair House, in which two Puerto Rican nationalists were involved. We would feel ashamed of calling ourselves Puerto Ricans, if it were not for the fact that the Nationalist gangsters are less than 500 in number, among the more than 2,000,000 decent, democracy-loving American citizens that make up our community. We have a genuine admiration and affection for President Truman, not only because of his leadership in these troubled times of the world, but in a more intimate sense, because of his constant, fair-minded, generous attitude in helping Puerto Rico to help itself. We are deeply relieved that this criminal attempt was as futile as the violence that we have experienced from the same source and under the same guidance in Puerto Rico during the last 2 days. This crime confirms my conviction of the connection of these mad, grotesque, and futile Nationalist violence makers in Puerto Rico with communistic propaganda strategy all over the world.

The Nationalists started violence and assassination last Monday in Puerto Rico. Twenty-seven people were killed and about 90 wounded. In numbers, they are an insignificant group favoring the independence of Puerto Rico. The issue in Puerto Rico is not between colonialism and independence. We are not a colony of the United States. We are citizens of the United States and our island is associated on a basis of freedom with the United States. We are members of the independence of the United States.

The last time the Nationalist Party risked the hazard of democracy by going to the polls was in 1932. At that time they managed to get only 5,000 votes out of 400,000 votes cast. Since then, they have expressed the conviction that votes and democracy are not important. I am Governor of Puerto Rico by a majority of 390,000 votes out of a total of 640,000, but my opponents, who polled the other 250,000, are 100 percent with me in condemning this dastardly attempt on President Truman's life and all the criminal works of this Communist-prompted lunacy. The Nationalists have no political power. They have no votes and they hate votes. Votes to them are as repugnant as holy water to the devil. As decent Christians, as militant members of the democratic world, all Puerto Rico tonight is filled with wrath and indignation.

I have just talked to President Truman on the telephone and I expressed to him the joy of our people that the criminal attack was warded off. I am happy to say that the President answered me that the facts are clearly understood.

In the name of the people of Puerto Rico, I wish also to convey our grief to the family of the guard who lost his life at Blair House today.

As sensational as these developments have been they have had little effect on the economy of the island. This is revealed in a letter I have received from the Sugar Producers Association which follows:

ASOCIACIÓN DE PRODUCTORES
DE AZÚCAR DE PUERTO RICO,
San Juan, P. R., November 29, 1950.

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are certainly aware of the recent events in Puerto Rico: uprise in the Insular Prison, rioting and street shooting.

You are also aware of the fact that two individuals in Washington made an attempt to shoot President Truman. Two days before, a similar attempt against Gov. Muñoz Marín also failed. The uprising, the rioting, and the criminal attempts against both President Truman and Governor Muñoz Marín have had general condemnation in the island.

Since you may have been given a distorted version of the events in Puerto Rico, it may be appropriate for us to explain some facts. We are doing that herein:

The government of Puerto Rico is genuinely democratic; a government elected by the people with their votes at a democratic election with political rights fully guaranteed to all. Because of these circumstances, the citizens of Puerto Rico, who are at the same time citizens of the United States, enjoy the benefits of freedom as do the citizens of all democratic countries.

The unfortunate events of the last few days are the work of misled fanatics of an ill-assorted group of irresponsible individuals, moved by a misconception of ideals. Their kind is limited to a minority of 500 to 1,000 individuals out of a population of over 2,000,000 peaceful, law-abiding citizens. Many of them have already paid with their lives for their mistaken ideal of liberty.

Commerce and industry have not suffered in the least as a consequence of these acts. There has been no interruption of trade. Factories have continued their normal operations. Banks have not closed their doors. The life of the community has not been altered except in the few places where the riots occurred. Puerto Rico is today going about its business as if nothing had happened. And we feel that this is the best indication that the sudden disorders caused were promptly and effectively controlled by the government.

In justice to all Puerto Ricans, it has been our earnest desire to convey to you a true picture of the situation, and we sincerely request your cooperation in passing on the information to your friends and associates hoping that by so doing you will be rendering a valuable service to a people who under no circumstances should have thrust upon them the indignity of the acts of irresponsible individuals.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. GARCÍA MÉNDEZ,
Executive Vice President.

Address of Hon. A. O. Stanley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an eloquent and thought-provoking address delivered by Hon. A. O. Stanley, chairman of the United States section, International Joint Commission and for many years a Member of the United States Senate, before the Rotary Club at Philadelphia, Pa., November 15, 1950:

The ages present no scene so fraught with pathos or tragedy as that of the most opulent, prosperous, and puissant nation on this earth seeking nothing for itself and endeavoring only, perhaps in vain, to preserve that peace of the world against a single insolent and arrogant aggressor.

While sages, jurists, and statesmen in a war-weary world are exhausting all the resources of international council and conciliation to avert the impending catastrophe, our youth gird themselves for war and mothers weep and pray.

Is it humanly possible to substitute the rule of reason for the arbitraments of the sword?

How can international differences be submitted to some form of judicial determination, can any leagues, alliances or any other concert of peace-loving peoples save a devastated and ravaged world from a last dismal resort to organized murder known as world war?

In the abhorred event of the recurrence of international conflict nothing is obviously so essential as international solidarity on this hemisphere.

Above all, there should be between Canada and the United States the most cordial and complete cooperation, yea, more than cooperation, complete integration of all our powers, resources, equipment, and manpower for the common defense. Happily both countries keenly alive to the exigency of the hour are laboring earnestly and efficiently toward the immediate attainment of that end. It is generally assumed by the man in the street that this cordial and cooperative spirit now so manifest between these great and friendly neighbors always existed simply because it should have existed. It is a fact nevertheless that nothing could have been further from the truth. Prior to the organization of the International Joint Commission, under the so-called Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909, and other similar measures, looking to the just and peaceful settlement of differences between these two countries, no such feeling existed.

Until 1912, when the International Joint Commission was formed, interminable disputes accompanied almost every effort to establish the approximately 3,000 miles of boundary extending from Passamaquoddy Bay to the Strait of Juan de Fuca. On more than one occasion border controversy brought the two countries to the verge of armed conflict.

Battleships poised for action at the mouth of the Columbia River; a United States Senator calling for 30,000 to 40,000 rifles beyond the Rocky Mountains; the British Premier declaring in Parliament that "England knows her rights and dares to maintain them"; and "54-40 or fight" was a party slogan in a Presidential campaign in the United States.

This background of hostility had its genesis in the American Revolution. A numerous and powerful minority, having resisted through the conflict any resort to arms or separation from the mother country, at its close, estimated at more than 100,000 were forced into exile. Sailing for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick or crossing Lake Huron and the Niagara River to people in the uninhabited wilds of Ontario and, unfortunately, carrying with them the bitter memories of 8 years of savage civil warfare, passed on to their children and their children's children the bitter story of confiscation, persecution, and exile. For more than a century this unfortunate atmosphere of suspicion and hostility was prevalent especially in the maritime provinces. All efforts to adjust the boundary were productive of more or less acrimonious disputes. The Webster-Ashburton treaty fixing the boundary between Maine and New Brunswick was negotiated only after 50 years of wrangling and threats of war by both sides. And as late as 1903, in the controversy over the Alaskan boundary, Canada protested against the award, alleging that Great Britain in cultivating the friendship of the United States had sacrificed the best interests of the Dominion Government.

Following the Alaskan boundary dispute, it became more and more apparent that the peace, prosperity, and happiness of both countries depended upon the maintenance of a more friendly relation between these two great countries and in ultimately securing, if humanly possible, their close and cordial cooperation. Both Governments were seeking a more flexible and more direct means of adjusting the differences constantly arising between the two countries.

Happily that delicate and difficult task was assigned to the two men, who, in all the world, probably were best qualified to discharge it—the then United States Secretary, Elihu Root, whom Theodore Roosevelt regarded as the wisest man he ever knew, and the erudite James Bryce, British Ambassador to the United States and dean of the diplomatic corps. After years of study their arduous efforts at last resulted in the Boundary Waters Treaty whose prime purpose was "to prevent disputes regarding the use of boundary waters, and to settle all questions involving the rights, obligations, or interests of either Nation in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other along their common frontier, and to make provision for the adjustment and settlement of all such questions."

The treaty provided for the establishment and maintenance of an International Joint Commission composed of six members to carry out those objectives.

Without precedent in the history of international relations, this unique body is clothed with varied and plenary powers—administrative, investigative, arbitral, and judicial. In fact, it can exercise some form of jurisdiction over all "matters of difference involving the rights, obligations, or interests of the United States or of the Dominion of Canada either in relation to each other or their respective inhabitants."

Few courts, national or international, have ever been called upon to exercise jurisdiction over a wider domain, a greater number of inhabitants, or more vast interests. And no such court from the days of Henry of Navarre has been more successful in the discharge of its grave and difficult duties than this International Joint Commission.

International differences of course multiplied with the progress and development of the two countries. The ever-increasing use of boundary waters for purposes of power and irrigation produced trouble spots all along the 3,000 miles of boundary.

As stated by Elihu Root, one of the authors of the Treaty, it was the result of three years of negotiations "upon a great and increasing number of vexatious questions and controversies then pending for solution between two countries. There was the question of the diversion of water at Niagara Falls, the diversion of the waters of the St. Mary and Milk Rivers; the proposed change of the levels of Lake Champlain, the utilization of the border lakes from North Lake to the Lake of the Woods, and the effect of a change of levels in that vast watershed upon riparian property—industrial development and fisheries and wildlife in the whole region."

"With all these and many other questions," says Mr. Root, "we have undertaken in this treaty to treat matters in a little broader way."

In fact, the Commission created by this treaty is unique in the extent, the number, and character of powers conferred upon it.

As stated by Mr. Chako in a recent history of this Commission:

"Since the Hague Convention in 1899, nations have concluded numerous agreements among themselves which provided for investigations—agencies to elucidate the facts or the laws involved in disputes arising among them. * * *

"But not one single Commission in this entire galaxy is clothed with that aggregate of powers which is delegated to the International Joint Commission.

"It is to a certain extent, an administrative agency like the Commission on the Rhine and the Danube; it acts as a court in protecting water rights in boundary streams, it is a Commission of inquiry and conciliation, and last but not least, an arbitral tribunal, a miniature Hague Court under article X. The vast scope and variety of its duties and powers is apparent in the provisions of article IX that:

"The high contracting parties further agree that any other questions or matters of difference arising between them involving the rights, obligations, or interests of either in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other, along the common frontier between the United States and the Dominion of Canada shall be referred from time to time to the International Joint Commission, etc."

Some idea of the extent of authority and jurisdiction hitherto exercised by one or the other of the two Governments was abrogated and vested in this great Commission, as evidenced by the fact that this body now exercises some form of supervision or control over all changes of level, diversion, uses, or pollution of all boundary waters or of streams crossing the boundary. In this category fall the Great Lakes, whose waterborne traffic is the wonder of the world.

"A steam shovel," remarks Michael Costello, "at an iron mine in Minnesota scooped up 20 tons of iron ore at a single bite and dropped it into a railroad dump car. Seven days later and 1,000 miles away a Pittsburgh mill was making that ore into steel."

In 8 months the freight carried over this waterway exceeds the total annual tonnage of all our Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf ports combined, and nowhere else in the world is it carried at greater speed or less cost. During the First World War, Lord George pertinently observed, "Coal is life." At that time the statement contained much truth, since the bulk of all our commercial and industrial activities were then dependent upon steam. This is no longer the case—modern life is literally "wired" in every essential phase; by electricity homes are lighted and heated; trains are driven and the wheels and looms of mills and factories whirl and buzz in response to this silent but irresistible force.

Now in the bulk this electrical energy is derived from falling water, and the greater part of these lakes and streams which furnish this hydroelectric power which cross or form the international boundary, and con-

sequently under the terms of the treaty, fall to a greater or lesser extent under the supervision or control of this International Joint Commission.

To illustrate, at the direction of the two Governments, we have for several years been engaged in a most interesting study of the great Columbia River and its tributaries. It is as amazing as true that approximately 40 percent of the hydroelectric power of this continent, developed or potential, is derived from this single river system.

Some years since Professor Magnusson, in a series of exhaustive studies of the Columbia and other transboundary streams, declared that a river system is in a way like a living organism. In its proper development you cannot bisect it by an imaginary boundary line without irreparable injury and loss to the parts thus arbitrarily separated.

In the economic and efficient utilization of the illimitable national resources of these great waterways forming or crossing the boundary they must necessarily be treated as one system, absolutely without regard to any local interest or imaginary line.

The great structures in these streams essential to meeting the agricultural and industrial needs of both countries necessarily supersede or supplement one another. The effects of a great dam on one side of the border may and often does directly or indirectly affect similar structures on the other. For that reason the efficient and economical development of both countries demands that such works should be as they are constructed by the concurrent action of both countries through the services of the International Joint Commission.

To illustrate the close interrelation of such structures in boundary and transboundary waters, we are now considering the probable construction of the Libby Dam. This great structure located on the upper reaches of the Kootenay River in Montana to a height of approximately 400 feet and impounding 6,570,000 million acre-feet, is capable of generating 620,000 kilowatts of electrical energy. The flow of this stream derived as it is from the glaciers and ice fields of the far north, is highly seasonal, consisting in the main of the floods and freshets caused by the melting of the ice and snow fields in the early spring. These surplus waters from time immemorial have flowed unused from the frozen heights and plateaus of our Rocky Mountains to the sea, of little or no use to man or beast, and in their destructive course flooding towns and villages and devastating the richest agricultural lands in Idaho and British Columbia.

This one structure will change the whole picture in both countries. This dam will impound all the flood waters of the Upper Kootenay and will forever save harmless from formerly recurrent floods, the surpassingly fertile flats of the Kootenay and all the dwellers therein. These waters thus captured will then pass in controlled stages down the stream through the penstocks of six great installations in Canada on the west arm of the Kootenay, structures producing the bulk of the installed hydroelectric power of the whole Dominion, adding to the volume and value of the present installed capacity of 400,250 horsepower, with an annual average output of 282,521 kilowatt-hours. Rolling on these once dreaded and desolating flood waters, will return to the United States and to the great forebay of the Grand Coulee Dam, the mightiest structure of its kind on the face of the earth, firming and enriching its huge capacity of electrical energy and lending further aid to the future irrigation of more than a million acres of fertile and now semiarid lands, thence on down the course of the mighty river to the sea, it will perform a similar service for the great dams at Rock Island and Bonneville.

This Libby Dam project is but a part, and a small part, of the enlightened and cooperative effort of these great and friendly neighbors in a joint and comprehensive development of the illimitable natural resources of their boundary and transboundary waters under the wise guidance and direction of the International Joint Commission.

We are now considering ways and means for a further utilization of the potential hydroelectric power of Niagara Falls without detriment to the beauties of that natural wonder. Our skilled experts and engineers have just demonstrated that it is physically possible and probably practicable to harness and put to beneficial use the illimitable force of the ocean's high tides in Passamaquoddy Bay, and having once before approved, to again investigate, and I trust recommend, the enormous hydroelectric power patented in the international section of the St. Lawrence River where by the erection of a single structure we can readily develop a plant of 2,200,000 horsepower with an average output of 12,600,000 kilowatt-hours. Half of the installed capacity will be on the United States side and half on the Canadian side of the international boundary. Each country would get 6,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year.

What an example we set to the hostile, snarling, and suspicious nations of the Old World. Here we have learned that our future happiness and prosperity lies in cooperation, not aggression. In a wise and broad-minded program of mutual aid in sharing and not by impeding or preventing prosperity of our neighbors, this program, so admirable in time of peace, is absolutely essential to our survival in time of war. In the presence of the pending threat, we may well exclaim with wise old Ben Franklin, "We must hang together or we shall hang separately."

I devoutly rejoice that today, in all our preparations for mutual defense, we are as one nation, in absolute accord in the pooling and allocating of our national resources, the quality and character of munitions, arms, and armament. In the event of that awful and evil hour, Canada and these United States shall stand as one man in resources, in armament, equipment, in an invincible and unconquerable purpose, for a high cause, "to suffer, resist, fight, and, if need be, to die." And well we may, for I am firmly convinced that in the event of attack we shall alike feel the impact of the same blow and at the same time.

No great and free nation ever was or ever will be dominated by air power alone. Airplanes and atomic bombs may devastate but they can never subdue our countries. In the nature of things we can never be taken, can never be subjugated without the physical presence of an irresistible army. No such force threatens, of course, save from Russia, and Russia can never in the face of our superior Navy transport such a body of troops across the Atlantic.

If ever Stalin comes, he must come over the top of the world and across the 52 miles of water separating Alaska from Siberia. Billy Mitchell, the prophet, the apostle and the martyr of air power, first crucified and then canonized by his repentant countrymen, was right, dead right, when he declared that Alaska was the key to our national defense. "With Alaska as a base," said he, "America could dominate the entire world."

Of course if Russian troops landed in Alaska they would have to pass through Canada to reach their arch enemy, the United States. Happily Canada understands this as well as we do. Rejoice as we may in our unexampled facility in the smelting and fabrication of iron and steel and in the assurance of a superior weight of armament and the certainty of an inexhaustible supply, in the last analysis I rest my abiding faith not in armaments but in men, not in the gun—however good that may be—but in the man behind the gun. Not for one instant do I question the imminence of the peril or the might and malignity of this sinister adversary. Whenever and wherever that iron curtain falls it drops like a pall upon all that makes life worth the living; behind it is utter darkness, extinguishing the last ray of hope for any form of liberty, political, industrial, economic, or spiritual.

Russia's recent and rapid acquisitions of people and countries whether by the unsuspecting generosity of her former allies or by her own cunning falsehood and chicanery, has no peer and parallel in the history of this world. In 10 short years, since 1940, Russia has added to her Communist holdings 4,000,000 square miles of territory with a population of 647,000,000. After the First World War, Russia dominated less than 8 percent of the world's population; now more than one-third of all the peoples of this world have been brought to a greater or lesser extent under her evil and debasing dominion and over more than one-fifth of this good earth's surface floats the baleful ensign of the hammer and sickle. With an area exceeding 8,500,000 square miles and a population of over 210,000,000 people, all other empires, ancient or modern, pale before it.

"When Rome sat on her seven hills, and
From her throne of beauty ruled the world"

in the zenith of her power in the golden age of Trajan and the Antonines, Gibbon tells us that the whole Roman Empire "did not greatly exceed 2,000 miles in breadth or 3,000 in length with a population roughly estimated at 120,000,000," which, at that time observes the same great historian, "formed the most numerous society that has ever been united under the same system of government."

This dark and ominous shadow of universal servitude and oppression has a pink penumbra that to my mind is more insidious and in many respects more menacing to free government than out and out communism. It is the diluted form of this devilish thing that most I fear. They tell us that confiscation is tolerable if taken in broken doses. A comparatively harmless form of this social disease—socialism—resembles communism as varioloid resembles smallpox. The political heresies of Carl Marx and LaSalle have at least a certain consistency. This plan for the nationalization of the property of one class for the benefit of another is as inconsistent as it is absurd. To arbitrarily take property not plainly impressed with a public use simply on account of its amount or extent, differs only in degree from the nationalization of all property and inevitably leads to it.

This pernicious paternalism in one form or another, this modified communism dubbed collectivism, socialism or what not, has to a degree undermined the original concept of personal right and personal liberty, the courage, the resourcefulness, and the rugged individualism of an elder and better day in the old world. Men leaning upon governmental aid, the hungry supplicants for some form of Federal handout, are seldom prompt or determined in resisting the insidious encroachment of that same government upon personal rights and personal liberties.

Again in the old world all personal and property rights were originally property and concessions rung from the crown by entreaty or by force. In this new world, men derive their inherent rights and liberties not from governments but from God.

Bancroft observes that the divine doctrine that all men are endowed by their Creator with the "unalienable" right to life, liberty, and property, was older than the Declaration

of Independence. Jefferson expressed the same idea in a somewhat different phraseology when he wrote "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

But to the practical continentals the right to property was as sacred and as unalienable as liberty or life itself. John Stuart Mill has vividly expressed this concept of the essence of any form of free government in the statement that—

"Whatever theory we adopt respecting the foundation of the social union and under whatever political institutions we live, there is a circle around every individual human being, which no government, be it that of one, of a few, of the many, ought to be permitted to overstep; there is a part of the life of every person who has come to years of discretion within which the individuality of that person ought to reign uncontrolled either by any other individual or by the public collectively."

It was to preserve forever inviolate these unalienable rights, the right to live their own lives and to express their own opinions, religious or political, and to own and control their own property, that the Puritans and Pilgrims fled to New England and to the fertile fields of Virginia, the one to set up an altar and the other to establish a house where each would be dependent only upon the fruitfulness of the seasons and the goodness of God. Governments with them, by them created, were always the servants not the masters of the people.

Their holdings, torn from the wilderness and the savage, purchased by their valor and their toil, were as much an inherent part of their "unalienable rights" as freedom of speech and religion.

The greatest and most erudite of all English statesmen at the time of the Revolution called attention of the House of Commons to this clear conception of their right and their familiarity with all the guaranties of the English Constitution greater perhaps than even Englishmen themselves. To know the very weight and fineness of their liberties and the great legislator and jurist who warned a blinded king and his stubborn monsters that no matter what the cost, they would never surrender to them. Said Burke:

"In other countries the people judge of an ill principle in government only by an actual grievance; here they anticipate the evil and judge of the pressure of the grievance by the badness of the principle. They augur misgovernment at a distance and snuff the approach of tyranny in every tainted breeze."

At the time of the Revolution, the colonists all were in complete agreement as to the fundamentals of free government and as to existing grievances, they differed only in the method of redressing them. The royalists, the Tories, hoped for relief by ultimate concessions from the Crown; the Revolutionists, impatient of further aggressions, bade defiance to King and Parliament and flew to arms. The thousands of exiled royalists who subsequently peopled Canada carried with them the same simple and sublime concept of personal liberty and political freedom as the rugged individualists in the Colonies. These opinions have not changed in the passing years. In Ontario, in Nova Scotia, as in New York and New England, in our western States and Provinces, in Montana and the Dakotas, in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, in Vancouver and Seattle, there is in this Western World but one way of life. Stronger than any unity in armament or in arms, is this eternal unity of the spirit.

Alike in social customs, laws, and institutions, forever one in our invincible purpose never to desert or surrender our inestimable and common heritage, we in the Western World are prepared, if need be, to turn a face of flint to the ruthless hordes who threaten us with an unendurable servitude and oppression. As one man, as one people, in arms, in armament, and in spirit, we are prepared to resist to the last gun and the last man.

In the inspiring words of Winston Churchill, as one people we will fight upon the beaches, in the cities, in the fields, and in the hills, we will never surrender. Regardless of what may happen in other countries or other lands, here on the shores of the Western World freedom has set her eternal Ebenezer, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

The American Way of Life as Seen by an Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the December 1950 issue of the magazine Progressive, there is published an article by Robert M. Hutchins, the chancelor of the University of Chicago, which is timely and thought provoking. In view of the recent passage of the antisubversive bill, the thoughts expressed by Mr. Hutchins take on special significance. This world-renowned educator calmly discusses the meaning of the American way of life and the role of education in these troubled and tense days. He warns that we must retain our sense of perspective and proportion, that we must recapture our national sanity and courage.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT ARE WE AFRAID OF?
(By Robert M. Hutchins)

We hear on every side that the American way of life is in danger. I think it is. I also think that many of those who talk the loudest about the dangers to the American way of life have no idea what it is and consequently no idea what the dangers are that it is in.

You would suppose, to listen to these people, that the American way of life consisted in unanimous tribal self-adoration. Down with criticism; down with protests; down with unpopular opinions; down with independent thought. Yet the history and tradition of our country make it perfectly plain that the essence of the American way of life is its hospitality to criticism, protest, unpopular opinions, and independent thought. A few dates like 1630, 1776, and 1848 are enough to remind us of the motives and attitudes of our ancestors. The great American virtue was courage.

We ought to be afraid of some things. We ought to be afraid of being stupid and unjust. We are told that we must be afraid of Russia, yet we are busily engaged in adopting the most stupid and unjust of the ideas prevalent in Russia, and are doing so in the name of Americanism.

The worst Russian ideas are the police state, the abolition of freedom of speech, thought, and association, and the notion that the individual exists for the state. These ideas are the basis of the cleavage between east and west.

Yet every day in this country men and women are being deprived of their livelihood, or at least their reputation, by unsubstantiated charges. These charges are then treated as facts in further charges against their relatives or associates. We do not throw people into jail because they are alleged to differ with the official dogma. We throw them out of work and do our best to create the impression that they are subversive and hence dangerous not only to the state but also to everybody who comes near them.

The result is that every public servant must try to remember every tea party his wife has gone to in the past 10 years and endeavor to recall what representatives of which foreign powers she may have met on these occasions.

A professor cannot take a position on any public question without looking into the background of everybody who may be taking the same position on the same question. If he finds that any person who is taking the same position on this question has been charged with taking an unpopular position on another question, the professor had better not take any position on this question, or he may be haled before some committee to explain himself.

Is this the American way of life? The great American word is freedom, and in particular, freedom of thought, speech, and assembly. Asserting the dignity of man, and of every man, America has proclaimed and protected the freedom to differ. Each man is supposed to think for himself. The sum of the thoughts of all is the wisdom of the community. Difference, disagreement, discussion decided by democratic processes are required to bring out the best in the citizens. America has grown strong on criticism. It would be quite as consistent with the American way of life to offer prizes for the most penetrating criticism of our country as it would be to offer prizes to those who have done the best job of advertising it.

The heart of Americanism is independent thought. The cloak-and-stiletto work that is now going on will not merely mean that many persons will suffer for acts that they did not commit, or for acts that were legal when committed, or for no acts at all. Far worse is the end result, which will be that critics, even of the mildest sort, will be frightened into silence. Stupidity and injustice will go unchallenged because no one will dare to speak against them.

To persecute people into conformity by the nonlegal methods popular today is little better than doing it by purges and pogroms. The dreadful unanimity of tribal self-adoration was characteristic of the Nazi state. It is sedulously fostered in Russia. It is to the last degree un-American.

II

American education has not been constructed on such un-American principles. In general, the practice has been to give the student the facts, to try to help him learn to think, and to urge him to reach his own conclusions. It is not surprising that the heart of American education is the same as that of Americanism: it is independent thought.

American education has not tried to produce indoctrinated automatons, but individuals who can think, and who will think always for themselves. The basic principle of American Government, and one that accounts for the importance of education in this country, is that if the citizens learn to think and if they will think for themselves, the Republic is secure. The basic principle of the Russian dictatorship is that the people cannot think or cannot be trusted to think for themselves.

The American doctrine rests on the proposition that it is the individual in himself that counts. It is not who his father was, or how much money he has, or what his color or creed is, or what party he belongs to, or who his friends are, but who and what is he? So the test of a teacher is hardly a question on which lay bodies, or even administrators or trustees, would wish to pass with-

out the advice of persons professionally competent in the teacher's field.

If we apply any test other than competence in determining the qualifications of teachers, we shall find that pressures and prejudice will determine them. In 1928 it was said that Al Smith could not be President because he would be subservient to a foreign power, and today in many places, and if not today it may happen tomorrow, anti-Catholic or anti-Jewish compaigns may mean that teachers who belong to those churches will not be able to practice their profession.

Teachers may be expected to obey the law of the land. But it is still permissible, I hope, to ask whether a law is wise. To discriminate against teachers, to act as though they were all disloyal, and to put them under special legal disabilities seems injudicious if we want able, independent men to go into the teaching profession.

The assumption appears to be that American education is full of Reds, an assumption that is the precise reverse of the truth. All the excitement of the last few years, all the hearings, investigations, and publicity releases, have not turned up more than four or five Communist professors, even though membership in that party has been perfectly legal up to now. To require oaths of loyalty from all because of the eccentricity of an infinitesimal minority is an unnecessary and derogatory act. And, of course, it will not effect any useful purpose, for teachers who are disloyal will certainly be dishonest.

The way to fight ideas is to show that you have better ideas. No idea is any good unless it is good in a crisis. You demonstrate the failure of your ideas if, when the crisis comes, you abandon them or lose faith in them or get confused about them to the point of forgetting what they are.

The American idea is freedom. Freedom necessarily implies that the status quo may come under the criticism of those who think it can be improved. The American idea is that the state exists for its citizens and that change in society must occur to meet their developing needs.

The whole theory of our form government is a theory of peaceful change. Many of the changes that Marx and Engels demand in the Communist Manifesto have taken place in this country, and they have taken place without communism, without dictatorship, and without revolution, thus disproving, incidentally, one of the central theses of Marx and Engels, that such things cannot be accomplished without communism, dictatorship, and revolution.

These reflections on the Communist Manifesto lead me to say that labeling some thing or some man Communist because Communists happen to favor it or agree with him, that easy process by which one disposes of different views of applying a dirty name to them, involves the negation of thought of any kind. If it had been applied consistently in American history it would have deprived us of some ideas and some men that we are proud to think characteristically American. For example, the Communist Manifesto demands free education for all. Are we therefore to recant, and renounce the American doctrine of free education for all?

And what would the FBI say of Thomas Jefferson, who calmly remarked in his first inaugural, "If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this Union, or change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed, as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it"?

Jefferson was not in favor of revolution; he was serene in the face of talk of it because he had confidence in our people, in our institutions, in democracy, and in the value, power, and results of independent thought.

We are now in the midst of a cold war. We must protect ourselves against external enemies, their representatives in this country, and any citizens who may be conspiring to overthrow or betray the Government. But the statute books are already filled with laws directed to these ends. It has never been shown that there are so many spies or traitors in this country, or that the external danger is so great and imminent that we have to divert the entire attention of our people into one great repressive preoccupation, into one great counterrevolution in which the freedoms of our citizens must be thrown overboard as too burdensome for the floundering ship of state to carry.

It is useful to remember that Jefferson spoke in 1801, when our Constitution was 12 years old, and when the infant Republic was in dreadful danger from deep divisions within and from the wars that were raging between the great powers. If he was right in speaking in such a way at such a time, we cannot be far wrong if now, when America is the most powerful Nation on earth, we seek to recapture some of his sanity and courage.

How is the educated man to show the fruits of his education in times like these? He must do it by showing that he can and will think for himself. He must keep his head, and use it. He must never push other people around, nor acquiesce when he sees it done. He must struggle to retain the perspective and the sense of proportion that his studies have given him and decline to be carried away by waves of hysteria. He must be prepared to pay the penalty of unpopularity. He must hold fast to his faith in freedom. He must insist that freedom is the chief glory of mankind and that to repress it is in effect to repress the human spirit.

VFW National Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following five-point program of top priority objectives of the current VFW national program as established by the VFW National Legislative Committee, November 17 to 18, 1950:

FIVE-POINT PROGRAM OF TOP PRIORITY OBJECTIVES OF THE CURRENT VFW NATIONAL PROGRAM AS ESTABLISHED BY THE VFW NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE NOVEMBER 17–18, 1950

1. National security and foreign affairs:

(a) Adoption of a universal military training program.

(b) To create an Air Force of not less than 70 air groups, and to authorize expansion of the Naval and Marine Corps air arms.

(c) To fix the peacetime strength of the Marine Corps at a minimum of four divisions, each division to consist of nine war-strength battalions with supporting elements, and each division to have one aviation wing as its supporting tactical air arm.

(d) To oppose any form of world government involving loss of our national sovereignty.

(e) Continued support of the United Nations.

2. Americanism:

(a) Unswerving loyalty and devotion to the American flag; opposition to the persistent display of United Nations flag or foreign flags on a superior or equal basis with the American flag, and advocating an intensive, widespread program of allegiance to and respect for the American flag, and the study of American history.

(b) To outlaw the Communist Party in the United States.

(c) Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

3. Housing:

(a) Easement of the credit restrictions placed on GI housing, to the extent that no down payment on houses costing $10,000 or less will be required, so as to conform with the protection intended under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

(b) Opposition to transfer of the VA Home Loan Guaranty Division to any other Government agency.

(c) To channel the majority of residential construction into the veterans home-loan program.

4. Employment and civil service:

(a) To provide for the creation of a self-liquidating Veterans' Employment and National Development Corporation, for the purpose of creating jobs and economic opportunities through broad lending powers and technical service to self-liquidating projects and businesses that will agree to employ veterans and to qualified veterans themselves.

(b) To amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 so as to strengthen veterans' reemployment rights.

(c) To oppose that part of the Hoover Commission's recommendations which affects veterans' preference in Government service, and all legislation which would weaken existing laws relating to veterans' preference.

(d) To strengthen the Veterans' Preference Act by deleting from section 14 the clause "except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service" and insert in lieu thereof, "except for delinquency, misconduct, or inefficiency."

5. Veterans' benefits:

(a) Extension to veterans of the Korean campaign, and subsequent campaigns of like nature, all veterans' benefits granted to World War II veterans.

(b) Twenty-five percent increase in disability compensation and pension rates applicable to World Wars I and II veterans and their dependents.

(c) To provide a uniform pension program for World Wars I and II veterans based on attained age or non-service-connected disability as follows:

Upon being rated 60-percent disabled	$60
Upon being rated permanently and totally disabled	90
Upon reaching the age of 65 years	90
Where an aide or attendant is required	120

(d) To urge the United States Senate, Eighty-first Congress, to pass the pension bill, H. R. 4617.

(e) Extension to widows and children of World War II veterans, on the same basis, the pensions now payable to dependents of World War I veterans.

(f) To increase the income limitation for determining eligibility for non-service-connected disability or death pension to $2,000 for a veteran or widow without dependents, and $3,000 for a veteran or widow with dependents.

(g) To urge the United States Senate, Eighty-first Congress, to pass H. R. 5965, providing for the construction of 16,000 hospital beds; and seek legislation to provide additional hospitals, staff and facilities so that every mentally ill veteran may obtain immediate hospitalization and treatment.

(h) To oppose any plan, such as a United Medical Administration, which would take from the immediate control and jurisdiction of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs any of the functions which have to do with the care and treatment of veterans.

(i) To oppose the formation of a Veterans Insurance Corporation as recommended by the Hoover Commission.

(j) To seek corrective amendments to the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended.

(k) To endorse the principle of free insurance or indemnification in the amount of $10,000, without premium payments or red tape, for death occurring in active service, and for those whose service-connected disabilities make it impossible for them to obtain commercial life insurance.

(l) To provide an equitable adjusted service compensation for veterans of World War II of $3 per day for home service (maximum $3,500), and $4 per day for overseas service (maximum ($4,500), plus an additional $500 for a wound or wounds received in combat.

Hamstrung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona Tribune of December 2, 1950:

HAMSTRUNG

From some sources come criticism of General MacArthur for the Chinese Communist attack. Probably, if the full story were known, it would reveal MacArthur as the most politically hamstrung military commander in history.

For weeks, he has been saying he should have authority from the United Nations to bomb concentrations of Chinese troops across the border in Manchuria. But, his orders from Mr. Truman, and from the United Nations, forbid any American or United Nations plane to cross into Chinese territory.

Thus, under cover of this protection, the Chinese massed 300,000 men, and, although the Yalu River bridges were bombed out, they stalled and fooled the Americans by withdrawing small forces, sending back prisoners, and the like, anything to gain time until the river froze solid enough for those massed troops to cross.

A few days ago, that occurred, and nearly a half million Chinese Reds poured across unhindered to slaughter the boys of the American Eighth Army.

The President should not stand for that. He should show enough consideration for American boys to withdraw those forces immediately unless the United Nations gives consent for MacArthur to mass-bomb the Chinese wherever he may find them, in China, in Manchuria, or in Korea.

As it is, our boys must stand and fight endless Chinese Reds, as they emerge from frozen Manchuria. With a free hand MacArthur could turn loose terrific destruction upon those Chinese slaves of Stalin. He would not even need the atomic bomb.

Most expert opinion says the atomic bomb would be of little value in that region because of the broken terrain and scattered troops.

Our use of the atomic bomb probably would serve only to provide Russia with the right excuse to hand one to the Chinese and tell them to hit New York or Seattle with it.

Mr. Truman Friday asked for a vast outlay of funds to build for victory in Korea and to prepare for possible attack in other parts of the world.

When is the President going to prepare the United States for defense against attack?

Upon General Bradley's advice, he left our own country bare of defenses to send troops into Korea, where they have been led into one trap after another while UN delegates have wasted time and bickered over the most trifling technicalities.

Russia has tremendous military power, concentrated power. She is reported to have at least six full armies backed by 1,500 war planes in eastern Germany.

How many more armies and planes she has in Russia is mere conjecture, but estimates run up to 10,000 war planes including good jets, and 15,000,000 trained men.

Backward Russia! Backward China! So some Americans say, and express contempt. But, no matter how backward in other ways they may be, a nation armed to the teeth with modern weapons, into which it has put all its wealth and effort, can be a hundred times more deadly than a great and rich nation concerned with taking its ease, and in seeking more security for its people.

From Frankfurt Thursday came a news report from a reporter who has been interviewing the German people, and the people of western Europe. They do not want war, and are not interested in taking sides in it.

They are afraid of Russian might, poised at their frontiers. Their military men are convinced Russia could overrun western Europe almost at will, in a matter of days.

Europe has no will to resist Russia.

In China, our ground forces can be ground to pieces, as we commit them piecemeal.

Had Mr. Truman had sound military advice last June, and had he not permitted Louis Johnson to scuttle the Navy and cripple our fighter forces, we might have handled the Korean conflict with only aerial and naval forces, not committing ground troops, which, now one must admit, would have been the sensible thing to do, as hindsight shows.

Now, in view of this confused world situation, Mr. Truman surely will forget the temptation hung before him by Russia to indulge in little wars and instead, concentrate our efforts in building a mighty America, a powerful fortress unwilling to have its strength drained off as Moscow wills.

Labor Day Address of Hon. Horace W. Harper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT CROSSER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by the Honorable Horace W. Harper, member of the Railroad Retirement Board, at Altoona, Pa., on September 4, 1950:

Mr. Chairman and friends, Labor Day is a good occasion to boast about labor's achievements on the one hand, and to point to the many tasks still to be achieved, on the other. I cannot, of course, speak of all the gains that labor made in the past and to outline a goal for all future achievements. I can, however, do so by limiting myself to one topic, which is of interest to railroad workers, and that is the Railroad Retirement Act.

This act was born out of a great conflict between the standard railway labor unions, on the one hand, and the carriers, on the other. This conflict began around 1931 and ended in victory for labor when the Railroad Retirement Act of 1934 was enacted. Labor's victory in Congress, however, was lost when the carriers got a victory in the courts. The first Railroad Retirement Act was declared unconstitutional in 1935. Labor tried again and secured the enactment of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935. The carriers tried for another victory in the courts, but this act withstood the test. Later the carriers and labor agreed on the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, which has been amended a number of times, the major amendments having been enacted in 1946.

There was general agreement in 1946, and until recently, that the railroad retirement system was the best in the world—was much superior to any system that afforded workers security in old age. During the last year, however, there have been a good many free pension systems established in various industries; and, recently, the President of the United States signed the bill, H. R. 6000, which provided substantial increases in benefits under the Social Security Act. These events naturally raise the question whether the Railroad Retirement Act is still better than the Social Security Act.

There have always been enemies of railroad labor who wanted to see the railroad retirement system scrapped. They invariably referred to railroad employees as the aristocracy of labor, receiving preferred treatment over all others, particularly in social insurance, and were very jealous of the higher benefits railroad employees received under the Railroad Retirement Act. It is these critics who are now stumping the country and are misrepresenting to railroad labor that the railroad retirement system is inferior to the social security system. But this is not the case. Even with the new benefits provided under H. R. 60, railroad employees still fare better than employees covered under the Social Security Act. I have not had sufficient time to analyze H. R. 6000 in complete detail but I do know that—

1. Employees covered under H. R. 6000 still lack the protection afforded under the Railroad Retirement Act in cases of disability. Let us take the case of two men aged 30 years, one in the railroad industry and the other in some other industry. Each entered service at the age of 20, and both were in a serious automobile accident so that each is totally and permanently disabled for all regular employment.

At age 30, therefore, the railroad man would be entitled to an annuity of at least $36 and as much as $48 a month for the rest of his life, while the man in the other industry, if he is only covered by the Social Security Act, even under H. R. 6000, will get no benefits whatever for 35 years, that is, until he attains the age of 65. In other words, the railroad man will get benefits for 35 years at the rate of as much as $48 a month while the nonrailroad man will get nothing during those 35 years. I would like those who keep pointing to the higher tax rates under the railroad retirement system to tell me whether the benefits for 35 years which the railroad man will receive are worth 10 times, 20 times, or 100 times the higher tax rate which the railroad man paid for 10 years?

In the same example, if the two men were now 40 years of age and each had 20 years of service, and were each disabled only for work in his regular occupation, the railroad man would start getting benefits at age 40, and could get at least $60 and as much as $96 a month for life, while the nonrailroad man would get nothing for 25 years. Here again I would like those who criticize the higher taxes under our system to tell me whether a maximum of $96 a month for 25 years is worth 10 times, 20 times, or 100 times the higher tax rate which the railroad man paid for 20 years.

2. The maximum an employee can receive under H. R. 6000 on an average wage of $300 a month, even on as much as 40 years of service, is $80. This amount is $3 less than the present average under the Railroad Retirement Act. The maximum under the

Railroad Retirement Act on the basis of 40 years of service will be $192 instead of $80.

3. Under H. R. 6000, a man with 40 years of service and an average of $300 will get no more than a man with 10 years of service and an average of $300—each will get $80 maximum. Under the Railroad Retirement Act, however, the 30 years of additional service are given due recognition. It is true that on the basis of 10 years of service, the maximum under the Railroad Retirement Act is now only $48; but it is also true that the number of employees retiring after 10 years of service is extremely small, except for disability, which H. R. 6000 doesn't cover. By far the greatest majority of workers spend all their lives in industry. Yet the extra years of service, wages, and taxes do not add up to a greater monthly benefit under H. R. 6000, while they do so decidedly under the Railroad Retirement Act.

4. The maximum for a man and his wife under H. R. 6000 is $120, but only if both are age 65. The maximum for a man alone under the Railroad Retirement Act in $144, regardless of whether he has a wife or how old she is.

5. At the present time, the maximum under the Railroad Retirement Act is $144, while H. R. 6000 provides a maximum, for a family, of $150. However, in order for an individual covered under H. R. 6000 to receive the $150 maximum, he would have to have a wife and a child under age 18, or two children under age 18. Most men of 65, of course, don't have children less than 18 years old. On the other hand, the railroad employee's present maximum of $144 is not subject to any conditions as to wife or child. He gets that amount for himself as a matter of right.

6. The railroad retirement system guarantees that no tax payment by the employee will ever be forfeited. That is, if the sum of all benefits paid to an employee during his lifetime, or to his survivors after his death, or to both, amounts to less than the total of the taxes he has paid during his lifetime (plus a slight amount of interest) the difference will be paid to someone the employee designated, or to certain of his surviving relatives, or to his estate. In other words, the guaranty is that there will always be paid out more in benefits than the employee paid in taxes. There is no such guaranty provision in H. R. 6000.

7. There is no forfeiture of service under the Railroad Retirement Act; a railroad worker never loses credit for his service no matter how little or how scattered it may be; while forfeiture of insured status, that is, forfeiture of service has always been a feature of the Social Security Act, and is still possible even under H. R. 6000. Eventually, the forfeiture under H. R. 6000 could be as much as 9 years and 9 months of service and the wages therefor. As I said before, however, railroad employees suffer no forfeitures of service or compensation under the Railroad Retirement Act.

8. Credit for service before the passage of the act was provided for in all three Railroad Retirement Acts; the Railroad Retirement Act of 1934, 1935, and 1937. I do not have to tell you, gentlemen, that substantially all of the retirement annuities payable under the Railroad Retirement Act now are based to a large extent on service rendered before 1937. Such services will continue to be credited at least until the year 1967. Yet, it is well known that under the Social Security Act, service before 1937 is not counted under any circumstances.

I do not mean to simply that H. R. 6000 is not a great improvement on the existing benefits under the Social Security Act. In fact, I consider its enactment a great victory for labor. It is certainly the clearest proof that Congress no longer looks upon adequate protection against the hazards of old age, unemployment, and death, as socialism. Such protection is now as American as, for example, workmen's compensation, which some 35 years ago was also called socialism. Judging by the overwhelming congressional support of the Social Security Act liberalization, it is safe to say that even the great majority of the die-hards have learned their lesson—even they will now admit that it is more American to enable our aged workers to enjoy the serenity of old age in their own homes rather than at the poorhouses. What is more, our old-age protection is not a philanthropic hand-out, but security which we purchased with our own money in the form of tax deductions from our salaries, and which we can enjoy with the utmost self-respect. This, in my opinion, is the true American way to provide for the aged and disabled workers. There is certainly no difference between buying our protection from a commercial insurance company and buying it under the terms of a Federal act. Both are self-respecting, except that we get more for our money under the Federal act than we would from the private insurance company; and to try to get more for one's money is a good old American custom.

The purpose of my comparison was merely to show that with all the improvements under the Social Security Act the Railroad Retirement Act is still a better retirement system. Railroad employees have many more advantages under the Railroad Retirement Act than other employees have under the Social Security Act. I am not suggesting that we should be satisfied with things as they are. Of course not. We all know that our formula for computing annuities was established some 13 years ago when the value of the dollar was nearly twice that of today—when the annuity had some reasonable relationship to the prevailing wages and provided a decent sense of security. Since then the cost of living has risen tremendously and wages have risen considerably so that by now, even with the 20-percent increase we secured in 1948, the ratio of annuities to wages is much lower than it should be, and the annuity is far from adequate to enable us to quote with the high cost of living.

Of course, the big obstacle to an increase in benefits is the matter of cost. In 1948, we were able to increase benefits without increasing taxes because the taxable yearly payroll in the railroad industry proved to be far in excess of what was estimated when the 1946 amendments were considered. When these amendments were first proposeod, the Railroad Retirement Board's estimate was that the average future taxable railroad payroll would be about $3,500,000,000 a year. The railroads estimated it would be about $2,500,000,000 a year; while an actuary consulted by a congressional committee estimated it would be about $2,750,000,000. By 1948, it was clear that all three estimates were wrong, although the Board's estimate was less so than the other two. The railroad payroll was $4,600,000,000 for the fiscal year 1946, $4,700,000,000 for 1947, and $4,900,000,000 for 1948. Of course, it could not be assumed that the payroll would always be this high, but there was enough basis for revising the old estimate as to what the future average taxable railroad payroll would be; and after a careful study, it was estimated that it would be $4,300,000,000. On such basis, an increase of 20 percent in retirement annuities and pensions, without an increase in taxes, was warranted because the existing tax rate, being on a larger annual payroll, would necessarily result in previously unexpected income, sufficient to cover the additional cost.

It is true that we have in our reserve about $2,000,000,000, but many people have misunderstood the meaning of this reserve—they considered it to be a surplus. I am sure I don't have to tell you that there is a substantive difference between a reserve and a surplus. If the $2,000,000,000 were a surplus, we could use it for anything, including increasing benefits. But this is not the case. That money is reserved for future use. When our railroad retirement system was established, the standard railway labor unions insisted on putting it on a sound financial basis. There was, of course, a very good reason for this. None of us, I am sure, has forgotten the unfortunate experiences with the railroads' private pension systems which the railroads established and maintained on a pay-as-you-go basis; they had no reserves to meet future contingencies. The result was that during the depression in the early 1930's, most of the railroads just didn't have enough money to pay their pension obligations. By obligations I mean moral as distinguished from legal obligations because, as you will recall, those pensions were voluntarily set up by employers without contributions from employees; and the employers looked upon these pensions as gratuities or gifts which they could give or withhold. The legal authority to compel them to live up to their promises was very questionable, to say the least. Because there was no reserve set aside to meet contingencies, most of these pensions were reduced, during the depression of the early 1930's, all the way from 10 to 50 percent. This was certainly not a happy situation for those already on the pension rolls, and a much less happy situation for those not yet pensioned. The latter certainly had very little to look forward to. It was for this reason, among others, that the standard railway labor unions insisted on your railroad retirement system being set up on an actuarial-reserve basis. In simple language, this means that for a number of years when the system is young and benefit payments are low, the revenues from the tax rates will be sufficient not only to pay the current benefits but also to lay aside a considerable sum in a reserve to earn interest at 3 percent from investment in Government bonds. Later, the time will come when the benefit payments will be substantially in the same amount as the income from taxes. Finally, a time will come when benefit payments will be larger than the income from taxes. By that time, however, it is expected that the reserve will be large enough so that the interest on it will be sufficient to make up the difference between the benefit payments on the one hand and the tax revenues on the other. By then we shall have reached what the actuaries call maturity, and our system will be safe indefinitely.

We are, of course, planning to increase benefits, but under the present method of financing we can't increase benefits without increasing taxes; and we definitely don't want to increase taxes. At first blush, the problem looks insoluble, but it looks so only to those who do not know, or have forgotten the ingenuity of the leadership of the standard railway labor unions. Time and again they were confronted with even greater problems and they managed to come out on top, and I am confident that they will do so again. In 1933–34, when they were confronted with serious opposition in the halls of Congress in their effort to secure the enactment of the Railroad Retirement Act, who would have believed that they would succeed? But they did. When, in the following year the Supreme Court of the United States declared the 1934 act unconstitutional, who would have believed that they weren't licked? The 1935 and 1937 acts are living exhibits of their success. Again, when in the years 1944–45 they sought the enactment of the amendments, which were finally enacted in 1946, there were many who were skeptical about their success. Need I add any more evidence of their will to succeed, and of their success, once they are fighting for a just cause? Therefore, gentlemen, I submit that the past record of the railroad labor chiefs is more than ample to warrant our confidence in them that they will find some way out of

the present dilemma. And I assure you that the way out will not mean giving up our independence from the Social Security System.

I am hopeful that during the next 5 months or so, a definite plan will be worked out with the aid of the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER, the dean of the House of Representatives and the father of the Railroad Retirement Act, so that early next year a bill to increase benefits will be introduced in Congress.

In mentioning BOB CROSSER I must tell you that I was shocked recently when I was told of an editorial in the Progress, of Clearfield, Pa., under date of August 8, 1950, which held Mr. CROSSER responsible for the failure of an amendment in this session of Congress to increase benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. Anyone who knows BOB CROSSER and his interest in the welfare of railroad workers would know that there is absolutely NO basis for this statement. It is true enough that Mr. CROSSER did not himself introduce any bill during this session of Congress to increase benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, and it is also true that, as chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, he scheduled no hearings on any such bills introduced by other Members of Congress. But this was not because he was not interested in securing an increase in benefits. The contrary is very true. He has been thinking about it very seriously. But it is easy enough to introduce bills providing for an increase in benefits and let someone else worry about where the money will come from. That, gentlemen, is the difference between Congressman CROSSER and some other Congressmen. When Mr. CROSSER finally introduces a bill to increase benefits you will have the assurance that the bill will have been thought through carefully not only with regard to the increase in benefits but also as to financing these increases without increasing your taxes. This has not been the case with regard to the many bills introduced during this and the last session by other Congressmen.

It is true enough that their bills provided increases in benefits one way or another, but not one of them contained a single provision as to where the money would come from. Any of those bills would have required an increase in taxes; and that is what we want to avoid. For anyone to accuse Mr. CROSSER now of lack of interest in you because he refused to hold hearings on any of these bills, is nothing less than an attempt to pull the wool over your eyes. Did Mr. CROSSER'S accusers tell you that the bills proposed to increase your benefits made no provision whatsoever for the financing of them? Or that these bills all left this important question to Mr. CROSSER to figure out, and that was the reason he did not hold hearings on such bills? Yes, gentlemen, it is easy enough to introduce bills. It costs a Congressman nothing to do so. As a matter of fact, he can get such a bill drafted by the House Legislative Counsel, or, as a Congressman, he has the privilege of calling on any Government agency for technical assistance in getting the bill in shape, and even thereafter everything is done for him. The Government Printing Office prints copies of the bill free of charge and in large numbers. The Congressman can get as many copies as he wants free of charge. Then he can and does mail large numbers of this bill under his franking privilege, free of charge, to all of his constituents saying, "See what I have done for you." Yes; all that is easy enough—it costs nothing and helps on election day. But that is not the way Mr. CROSSER does things. He waits a long time before he introduces a bill in your behalf. But when he does, something comes of it. It was his bills that ultimately became the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and all the important amendments to both acts. This was so because they were all thought out carefully, as it should be. Now, gentlemen, BOB CROSSER does not need me to defend him. His record speaks for itself—so much so, that, in my opinion, anyone who said about him the things stated in that editorial has not been open and aboveboard with you.

In conclusion, I plead for your cooperation and patience with regard to amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. As I said before, I think we will have a bill in Congress early next year—a bill which I am sure will be introduced by Congressman CROSSER—a bill which will have been carefully thought out both as to increases in benefits and the method of financing benefits without taxing you any more. But bear in mind, gentlemen, that the problem is not a simple one, and that the bill will have the backing of the chiefs of the standard railway labor unions. You know, and I know, that these chiefs have never failed us before, and I am confident that they will not fail us now.

The Honorable Oscar R. Ewing's Address at Pioneer Women's Silver Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Pioneer Women, the women's labor Zionist organization of America, recently celebrated the silver jubilee anniversary of its founding. Established in 1925, the organization has sponsored health, education, and youth projects in Israel. It has built homes and vocational training centers for immigrant women, and institutions and nurseries to care for orphaned children. Pioneer Women numbers between 40,000 and 50,000 women in this country. It participates in various cultural and social welfare activities, and keeps its membership informed on world events and the struggle of the free world against all forms of totalitarianism.

The Honorable Oscar R. Ewing, United States Federal Security Administrator, was the principal speaker at the silver jubilee celebration of Pioneer Women at the Mayflower Hotel, November 19. Guests of honor were two women leaders from Israel, Beba Idelson, a member of the Israel Parliament, and Mrs. Elisheva Eshkol, a leader of the Israel labor federation Histadrut.

Mrs. Murray Frank, chairman of the silver jubilee committee of the organization, presided. The program was opened by Mrs. Morris Golden, president of the Washington Council of Pioneer Women. Greetings were extended by Moshe A. Tov, member of the Israel delegation to the United Nations; and Mrs. Eva Berg, of New York, one of the national officers, and a founder of Pioneer Women.

In introducing Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Frank told the audience of more than 600 members and guests:

It is my distinct honor to introduce at this time a very distinguished American and one of the leading personalities in the administration in Washington. In addition to his successful legal career, Mr. Ewing has made an outstanding career for himself in the last 10 years in public service.

Just 3 years ago at this time, he was appointed United States Federal Security Administrator. He has acquired a great name and a great reputation in this office and has shown himself to be an able and outstanding administrator. He is one of the most ardent friends of the state of Israel and visited it earlier this year as a special emissary of President Truman.

It gives me great pleasure to present the Honorable Oscar Ross Ewing.

The text of Mr. Ewing's address follows:

I am very glad to be here with you tonight. The story of Labor Zionism, in which the Pioneer Women have played so useful and energetic a role, is very familiar to me. I have had the privilege, not only of seeing how hard and well you work here in the United States, but also—and even more important—of seeing the fruits of your labors in Israel itself.

I visited Israel in the first days of this year. I was there only a short time. Yet the impact of that visit makes the memory of what I saw just as fresh as if I had been there last week. I saw the cities—the ancient city of Jerusalem and the new metropolis of Tel Aviv—and the farms—the collective settlements beyond Tiberias and the orange groves along the coast. I saw the feverish building everywhere, the factories, the hospitals, the homes, the farm houses. Above all, I saw the spirit of the people of Israel. That may sound to you like a figure of speech, for you cannot in reality see the spirit of a people—yet in Israel it is very close to visible; it is evident in every action of a nation building for the future, a nation confident that it will overcome the huge difficulties that confront it, a nation firm in the ways of freedom and democracy.

As Pioneer Women, you have a right to be proud in your share in having made Israel a reality—and of your share, today, in making Israel healthy and strong. I hope some day that each one of you will be able to go over there and see for yourself what the Jews of Israel have done with the help they have received from you. As I understand it, your organization was founded when an appeal came, many years ago, for a few hundred dollars to dig a new well. Out of that appeal burst a mighty movement of Jewish women in America, women who were none the less Americans because they were keenly interested in the upbuilding of Palestine and the ultimate creation of a Jewish state there. Today the state exists. It is a historical fact; indeed, a political fact of the first water. For, in the world-wide conflict of ideologies, every piece of land where there are people who believe in freedom and self-government, who refuse to give in to the blandishments of the totalitarians, who are ready to stand up and fight for their self-respect and their future—every such piece of land is a vital redoubt of the free world.

But it is not enough for a nation to have courage and determination. It is not enough for a government to be founded on the principles of parliamentary democracy.

Today we have learned the hard way that no nation is strong unless its people are strong—unless they are healthy, and adequately fed and clothed and housed, with a decent opportunity to improve their standard of living continuously. That is true of our own country; and I earnestly hope that some of our new leglislators will not need to learn it all over again when they deal with the pressing need for social progress here in the United States. But it is especially true of a land like Israel, where a very large proportion of the population comes from countries which had, at some time in the past, standards of living higher than those of Israel itself; and where another great group

of the population has immigrated from areas where standards of living are virtually nonexistent. In the new Jewish melting-pot, where intellectual and unskilled worker, western European and Yemenite, concentration camp alumnus and proud young Israel-born boys and girls, must all learn to live together—in this new melting-pot, there is the pressing need to establish a sound, healthy, firm economy.

There is only one way to build such an economy, and that is to help mold a sound, healthy, courageous people. That is why the work of the pioneer women is so important. Like good pioneers in the classical sense of the word, you have led the way. You have helped make it possible to prepare the land for the newcomers. You have helped improve health conditions. You have worried about water supplies. Today you are creating day nurseries, women's hostels, and vocational courses for women and girls. And now, in your second quarter-century, you have taken upon yourselves the building of a new youth village and agricultural school on the road to the desert that must bloom if Israel is to prosper.

I suppose many people see in what you are doing the evidence of your sentimental desire to make this land a refuge for oppressed Jews from many parts of the world. But I think you are doing something even more fundamental than that. You, and the Zionist organizations which have worked with you, are giving the world a very real example of how to tackle the universal problems of under-development, how to meet the need for raising living standards, how to lead the way to a better life for peoples everywhere.

The friends of Israel have been carrying on their own voluntary point 4 program for Palestine for a quarter of a century and more. And, when you examine the basic approach, you will see that there is really no difference in purpose between what you are doing and what the United States as a Nation is undertaking for underdeveloped areas in various parts of the world.

The Government of Israel, and the friends of Israel in this country, are vitally interested in building up the services that will improve the health, the education, and the welfare of the people of Israel.

That is precisely what the Government of the United States is interested in, not simply for the people of Israel but also for all the peoples of all friendly nations on earth. This is a basic tenet of our foreign policy—not simply because we have humanitarian motives—but out of sheer self-interest, because we know that the spirit of freedom and resistance to tyranny thrives only when people have something worth living for. A long life, a happy life, a contented life, a flowering culture, an assurance of opportunity for the young; these are things worth living for. And these can be brought about only through a concerted attack on low living standards wherever they occur, at home and abroad.

That is why President Truman's point 4 program, and the technical assistance programs of the United Nations, have so great an appeal for most of the nations of the world.

Low productivity, ignorance, disease, and poverty go together. They are the four horsemen of defeatism, of disaster, of communism. In large parts of the world the working capacity of the population is kept down by incapacitating endemic diseases, by poor nutrition, by illiteracy, by lack of skills. Through the point 4 program, and the United Nations technical assistance activities, we hope to attack these evils.

The Federal Security Agency, as one of the participating organizations in carrying out the point 4 program, is prepared to provide technical assistance in the fields where we have most to offer, at the request of the Department of State. This assistance will include projects to control and eradicate endemic diseases which interfere with economic productivity; projects to improve basic sanitation; projects to develop and strengthen public-health services. In education, our projects will be concerned particularly with expanding and improving facilities for education, including adult education and vocational education. When I was in Israel early this year I made the preliminary arrangements for an American educational mission to help solve the special educational problems there. A few weeks ago, Dr. Earl J. McGrath, our Commissioner of Education, followed up on these conversations with a special visit to Israel, and next year we expect to send a larger mission to continue this work.

Basic education, in all lands, must help people, not only to learn to read and write, but also to deal with all the problems of everyday living, raising food, and maintaining minimum standards of sanitation and hygiene. These are tremendously important; and so are projects to develop other types of community services to improve welfare.

In all these fields, in cooperation with the Department of State, we are prepared to supply experts to advise with governments on strengthening their services and to carry out demonstration projects on the spot. We will help train personnel who will return to their home countries to organize and administer these new programs. Depending on the local situations and the desires of the governments concerned, American personnel may assist in strengthening training facilities in foreign countries. In some cases, grants will be provided for training in educational institutions and agencies in this country. These people, trained in the United States, can go back and train others at home, giving real leadership in the mobilization of brains for the improvement of man's lot.

Now, it is perfectly obvious that technical assistance of this kind must go hand in hand with work to increase food production and to develop other economic resources. The Federal Security Agency naturally will work closely on these problems with the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and other parts of the Government. And we will try to adapt each project so that it will best fit the economic, the social, and the cultural needs of each country—and, of course, so that it will be in keeping with the kind of help which the government of each country most wants.

A few weeks ago, Secretary Acheson said, "The peace the world wants must be free from want, a peace in which neighbors help each other, and together build a better life." We can only achieve the peace the world wants through the exchange of experience and ideas in improving health, increasing literacy, and helping people deal better with their own economic and social problems. The Government of the United States, through the point-4 program, is committed to such a program. It is part of our whole new pattern of American thinking on foreign policy, which envisages a new and expanding partnership among the friendly nations of the world, building a better life and thereby strengthening ourselves against the enemies of freedom.

As members of the Pioneer Women, you have a natural interest in the special problems of Israel. That little country has many problems to solve—problems that would terrify the faint of heart and the weak of will. You and I know that the people of Israel have the heart, the will, and the brains to meet these problems head-on and to lick them.

But the people of Israel need help. They need help of a magnitude which this Government has not yet provided. The need for that help continues. So the people of Israel turn to you, as free-thinking and free-moving Americans, to provide as much help as you can through your voluntary drives to support peace and progress in Israel. They look to you to carry your share of the American program for bettering the lives of our friends abroad. When you carry on your activities as members of the Pioneer Women, therefore, you are extending the program of the Government of the United States; and you are acting in the finest traditions, in the noblest spirit of the American people.

With the help of all of us, and most of all by virtue of their will to survive and prosper, the people of Israel will bring to fruition on the shores of the Mediterranean a great country, a rich new life, a proud culture in a proud tradition, and a mighty bastion in the fortress of freedom. May these people, and all of us, enjoy the blessings which come from the lips of every man and woman and child who greets you in Israel: "Shalom!"—peace, peace to the people of Israel, peace to the whole Middle East, peace throughout the world, just and lasting and founded on freedom, peace to all men of good will, Moslem and Jew and Christian, peace on earth.

Give the GI a Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., Dec. 2, 1950:

GIVE THE GI A BREAK

We've learned that American casualties in Korea are unusually high when measured against the total size of our forces there. But most of us realize that, given the number of our troops at the outbreak of war, there's very little that could have been done about it. In other words, we just didn't have enough men under arms at any stage to provide adequate relief for United States soldiers fighting at the front.

This isn't the place to go again into the reasons for that inadequacy. Presumably if we got into a major war with Russia or anybody else, we'd have more ample manpower for reserve use.

Every American ought certainly to hope, however, that when reserves are available they are employed with greater concern for the welfare and effectiveness of the individual fighting man than was shown in World War II.

In the big way the United States had something like 100 divisions in being. Of these, 64 saw battle action. In case you may not have realized what happens to men who do the actual fighting, consider these figures from an instructor at the Army Command and General Staff School in Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

Eighteen of the sixty-four fighting divisions had greater total casualties than they had men in the beginning. Five suffered casualties of 176 percent—they were in effect almost wiped out twice over.

The figures indicate that on the average half a division's strength was gone after 50 days of combat. Give them 150 days in the front lines and they were down to 18 percent. After 300 days, nearly a year, only 3 out of every 100 soldiers in the original outfit was still fighting.

In 85 to 100 days up front, infantry regiments will suffer total casualties equal to their starting strength.

Said an Army report: "Under present policy no man is removed from combat until he has become worthless. The infantryman considers this a bitter injustice."

The command school instructor, Lt. Col. U. P. Williams, believes combat infantrymen deserve frequent rest periods. He says: "Important manpower savings can be achieved only by having each man believe that an honorable extended period of relief from combat awaits him. The rotation of individuals from the front line to less dangerous duty * * * offers the only practicable method of providing relief."

This officer is talking sense. We all know that the mud-caked, water-soaked GI is the backbone of the Army. If his welfare in the field is not made a prime goal, how can we expect him to do a consistently good job of fighting for us who are comfortably lodged at home?

Accept Military Help of Chinese National Government in Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am not a military strategist and realize we have very able military leaders who I know are giving earnest thought to the serious military condition that has developed in Korea and the Far East.

Like thousands of other American citizens, I have given thought to our present serious situation in Korea, trying to reason out what changes or moves we might make in our military plans in the Far East to relieve the very desperate situation confronting our soldiers in Korea and for the welfare of our people.

I have come to some definite conclusions which I feel it is my duty as a Member of the Congress to offer to this body, our military leaders, and the State Department. I believe the suggestions I offer to relieve our military situation in the Far East add up to just sound common-sense reasoning. These suggestions represent my own thoughts, and I make them for whatever value they may have, if any.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that our military situation has reached the very critical stage in the Far East where we should change our war plans at once in that area.

I believe the time has arrived for a new military approach and that an effective approach is available at this very moment.

The Chinese people, for over a half century, have been the friends, and later the allies of the American people. The continuing of their friendship can be a tremendous asset in the future, and vital to the peace of the world. If we make open war against China, we will lose that asset. If we win such a war, after years of sacrifice and struggle at a tremendous cost, the population is so great and the territory so expansive, we could not afford to occupy China and give leadership or rehabilitation to the people.

The Nationalist Government, when Korea was invaded, offered to furnish 35,000 of her best Chinese troops and trained fighters now on the island of Formosa.

Our military leaders should consider the shortage of American troops because of the more serious situation which has developed, and the great number of American lives that can be saved by the acceptance of the offer of the Nationalist Government to throw its forces into the fight. We know by experience we can expect very little help from other countries, members of the United Nations. That offer was rejected by the United States and the United Nations on the theory that it would invite an all-out war with China if we attack Manchuria.

Later events have proved that position to be erroneous by reason of the fact that over 200,000 Chinese Communists from Manchuria have crossed the border and are attacking United States and United Nations forces in a war of aggression in Korea.

This action on their part opens the way for the acceptance of Chiang Kai-shek's offer again made only a few days ago to enter the war with all of his available resources.

Mr. Speaker, this presents the opportunity to now accept the help of Chiang Kai-shek and lays the foundation for a new plan of military action which I suggest as follows:

Accept at once all of the available power and force Chiang Kai-shek is able to deliver. Let him cross into the mainland of China in full force with an appeal to the Chinese people to join with him and the United Nations, to increase and consolidate their military power and effort in organizing a force to move north against the Chinese Communists. Such an appeal should instill a revolutionary fighting spirit in the Chinese people bringing millions of them to his support.

When Chiang Kai-shek moves in with his military force we should assure the Chinese people that we will furnish them with all the food that is necessary and available, placing upon Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese people the obligation to furnish the military power.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing the millions of Chinese most need and desire is food. Given the assurance of food and the renewal of our support and friendship the Chinese people can be set upon a crusade to reestablish the Government of China and drive out the Communists, a revolution that would overthrow the Communist control and the Communist ideology of their Government.

We should assure the people that when the Communists are driven out and the Chinese Government is reestablished we shall continue to help with food and finances to rehabilitate a Chinese Government of freedom for all of the people.

This action could bring about a complete revolution now before it is too late, of the Chinese people against northern communism and would doubtless cause thousands of Chinese Communists to desert who are fighting today because they were promised land and food which they have failed to receive.

This, in my judgment, offers an opportunity to regain freedom for 400,000,000 people and a stanch ally in the Far East who was sold into communism through a series of blunders of the executive department throughout the past few years.

Such a plan if adopted and successful would free China of communism without the loss of the lives of any American soldiers. It would permit us to use our present forces in Korea, holding the line there. It would compel the Chinese Communist government to fight a war on two fronts that should spell certain defeat.

With this diversion, causing them to fight a war on two fronts it would permit us to limit our military commitments in the Far East, and to furnish much greater military power for Western Europe so much needed, where we could threaten the very heart of Russian imperialism. Such action now would increase the morale of Western European nations.

Millions of Chinese people who have always been our friends are hungry and starving. By giving a southern Chinese army some military equipment, food for their soldiers and the Chinese people, such action should stimulate a military revolution that would sweep the Chinese menace out of all of China. We have vast stores of surplus food. Food will go far toward helping win such a war against communism.

I believe it would save us billions of dollars and countless lives of American soldiers if we adopt such a plan rather than continue to follow the present policy of the administration which can bankrupt our Government financially and never achieve the victory sought.

The administration plan to date has failed miserably. It has shaken the confidence of our European allies, threatens to wreck the United Nations, has brought fear and gloom to the American people, and to the freedom-loving people of the world.

This plan, I believe, will give us the relief we need, will recover the prestige we have lost, and will make it possible us to draw a much greater force and power into the redevelopment of a strong military force in Western Europe, so much desired now by the free governments of Western Europe and for the future peace of the world.

It could relieve the Indochina situation, releasing for action on the European western front large numbers of French soldiers now tied down in the Indochina area.

Economic Development of Underdeveloped Countries: Report of the Economic and Social Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, December 5 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as a representative of the United States in the United Nations Assembly, my colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr.

SPARKMAN] made an address in Committee No. 2 on the Economic Development of Underdeveloped Countries: Report of the Economic and Social Council, on October 19, 1950. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, before entering upon the discussion of the problem of financing economic development, I wish to say a word concerning the accomplishment of the Economic and Social Council at its eleventh session in Geneva. I am sure that it is unnecessary for me to reiterate what has been stated by representatives of the United States on other occasions, namely, that my Government looks upon the Economic and Social Council as the basic instrument for bringing into being throughout the world those conditions of human well-being that are essential to the maintenance of permanent peace. I think that the active part played by our delegation at Geneva provides sufficient evidence of our deep interest in and concern for the affairs of the Economic and Social Council. Further evidence of the faith and confidence that my Government has in the Economic and Social Council is to be found in the remarks of our Secretary of State at the opening of the plenary of the assembly, particularly in his recommendation that the task of developing a program for the rehabilitation of Korea should be given to the Economic and Social Council.

During the closing days of the last session our permanent representative to the Economic and Social Council stated that in the years to come that session may be looked upon as an historic event. The results of its work in the fields of economic development and full employment may prove to be the beginning of a new era in human welfare and happiness.

In referring to the work of the Economic and Social Council, Mr. Chairman, I wish also to pay tribute to the leadership of its president, Ambassador Santa Cruz, whose skillful guidance and patient understanding played so great a part in making the tenth and eleventh sessions such a success.

I mention these things here at this time because my delegation has not felt it necessary to impose upon the time of the joint sessions of committees 2 and 3 by commenting on the underlying work of the Economic and Social Council. The United States delegation was one of the sponsors of the resolution creating the ad hoc committee to study the work of the council. When this body has the results of the work of the ad hoc committee before it, we propose to discuss in detail the problem of ECOSOC's work and organization.

Mr. President, the item now being considered by this committee is, in the opinion of my Government, essential to the attainment of the fundamental purposes of the United Nations Charter. Since the delegation of Poland has attempted to mislead this committee with regard to the attitude of my Government to this question of economic development, I think it necessary to quote a few basic paragraphs from the speech of President Truman which first proposed the now famous point 4 program. This is the speech which has constituted one of the basic directives under which my Government has operated over the past 2 years in its efforts to speed and facilitate the economic development of the underdeveloped countries:

"Our aim should be to help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens.

"We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. Their contributions will be warmly welcomed. This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies wherever practicable. It must be a worldwide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom.

"With the cooperation of business, private capital, agriculture, and labor in this country, this program can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living.

"New economic developments must be devised and controlled to benefit the peoples of the areas in which they are established. Guaranties to the investor must be balanced by guaranties in the interest of the people whose resources and whose labor go into these developments.

"The old imperialism—exploitation for foreign profit—has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair dealing."

I think, Mr. President, that there is no need for me to say more. This is the policy of my Government.

I would like, Mr. President, to address myself to the general topic of economic development, and to reserve the right to comment on the specific resolutions which have been introduced when you submit them to this committee for specific discussion.

The problem of economic development has been at the forefront of the discussions and debates in ECOSOC and in this committee from the beginning of their existence. Those who have been present at these debates are cognizant of the great effort and the great amount of time that has been devoted to arriving at a common agreement on the basic elements of this fundamental problem. The principles that should guide our activity in this field were developed at the early sessions of the Subcommission on Economic Development and of the Economic and Employment Commission. Their achievements were followed by the action of the third session of the Assembly providing for a limited technical assistance—an action which was later amplified by the expanded program of technical assistance which came into existence less than 5 months ago.

It is gratifying to my delegation to note that the technical-assistance program has had the approval not only of so many of the member states of the United Nations but also of eight nonmember states, all of whom have undertaken to bear a share of the cost of carrying on the program. It is also gratifying that 52 countries have contributed to this significant and constructive United Nations venture. Equally important and worthy of emphasis is the large number of requests for technical assistance that have been received by the Technical Assistance Board. To date, more than 40 such requests have been received. They vary all the way from requests for assistance for the control of leprosy and for reorganizing the structure and operations of local governments to requests for advice by a national development bank for planning agricultural development. These are evidences of the realization by those countries seeking accelerated economic development of the part that the technical-assistance program can play in assessing their resources and potentialities and in formulating plans for the economic development these countries are so actively striving to achieve. The progress of the technical-assistance program during its formative period is a source of tremendous satisfaction to my Government.

The resolution of ECOSOC now before us is in a sense a distillation as well as an amplification of the work of the fourth session of the Subcommission on Economic Development, certain phases of the experts' report on full employment, studies prepared by a group of experts convened by the Secretary-General, and the fourth session of the Economic and Employment Commission. The resolution was built on foundations that represent months of work on the part of many exceedingly able government representatives as well as of independent experts in the field of financing economic development. It is the most comprehensive approach to the problem that has ever been formulated. The importance of its recommendations justifies our reviewing them at this point.

First, the resolution emphasizes the desirability of forming development banks, with the participation of domestic banks and local industrial enterprises, as instruments for attracting and channeling foreign investment into essential projects. It is well to note that several such institutions are now in the process of formation in countries that have been in negotiation with the International Bank.

Second, emphasis is placed on the need for establishing conditions to encourage foreign private capital to take part in desirable developmental undertakings, either by direct investment or by investment in bonds of governments or of private or public corporations. As a supplementary measure, in the same connection, the resolution recommends that the more developed countries seek to encourage their nationals to invest their private capital in countries seeking to accelerate their economic development.

Third, in order to increase the lending power of the International Bank and reduce as far as possible the difficulties created by exchange shortages, the resolution suggests that more of the developed countries permit the International Bank to use increasing amounts of their 18-percent subscriptions and place the bank's bonds on their financial markets.

Fourth, it recommends that the more developed countries progressively extend the principle of untied lending of governmentally controlled or guaranteed foreign loans.

Fifth, the resolution emphasizes the indirect effects of non-self-liquidating projects such as transport, communications, housing, and public health upon national productivity and national income. The record of the eleventh session of ECOSOC is replete with references to so-called economic and social overhead projects which are essential to a coordinated development program and to the need for international financing for such projects.

As I have listened to the debate in this committee, I have been conscious of a tendency to overlook the fact that lending institutions have been giving more and more attention to the part that nonself-liquidating projects must play in economic development. I need merely cite the case of the United States Export-Import Bank which has for some time been making loans for highway construction, irrigation, low-cost housing, and similar types of projects. And, let us not forget that the International Bank has also made loans for irrigation, flood control, and similar types of projects. It has recently made several loans on other types of nonself-liquidating projects, such as roads, which should contribute greatly to the productivity of the borrower.

Sixth, since development projects may give rise to the need for importing consumer goods which are not related to the construction of the project itself, because of the shift of labor from agriculture to construction activities or because of the additional labor incomes created from employment on development projects, the resolution recommends that in making international loans lending institutions give appropriate consideration to the foreign exchange requirements for such consumer goods, as well as to the foreign costs of the materials directly required by the project itself. It is gratifying to note that the International Bank, in its fifth annual report, considers this matter at some length and gives promise of a more flexible approach to this problem in the future.

Seventh, particular emphasis is placed in the resolution on the importance of countries seeking to accelerate their economic development to formulate integrated development programs and prepare them for presentation to the International Bank in a manner which will facilitate the bank's operations. It is in this connection that the technical assistance program should be especially helpful to many countries. It should be of particular aid in preparing projects for submission to the International Bank which will contain the basic economic and technical data that are essential to the determination of their feasibility and to the justification of their financing.

To avoid waste, etc., may I, in passing, call attention to the fact that a training course in the economic appraisal of development projects is under way, at this very moment, at Lahore, Pakistan. This course, attended by some 50 Government officials, is a technical assistance project. It is being sponsored by the United Nations, the Government of Pakistan, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East is a part of this venture. The purpose of this technical assistance project is to train the officials of the countries in this region, both members of the FAO and of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, some 14 in number, as well as the officials of non-self-governing territories to prepare development projects and appraise their economic feasibility, so that they will be in a more suitable form for consideration by governmental and international financing institutions.

Eighth, the ECOSOC resolution recommends that the organizations furnishing credits for economic development give consideration to means whereby the funds they loan can be used to carry out integrated programs, that is, coordinated development projects in different branches of the borrower's economy.

Ninth, it is recommended that the interest and amortization terms of development loans made by governmental and inter-governmental institutions should be at rates which will place the smallest feasible burden on the foreign exchange available to countries seeking such loans, consistent with the maintenance of these institutions as self-supporting entities.

These are the highlights of the resolution now before us. I have reviewed them, briefly, because they cover virtually every aspect of the problem of financing which has in the past been the concern of those who have taken part in the discussions on economic development. (They recognize the important part that private investment has to play in this field and the responsibility of governments seeking foreign investment to establish conditions for encouraging such private investment. They also point to the part that the more developed countries can play in stimulating private capital to go into the areas that require economic development.)

I need not reemphasize the importance that the Government of the United States attaches to the place that private investment should and can play in economic development. (My Government has recommended to our Congress legislation which, through adjustments in our tax structure, should stimulate our private investors to invest greater sums abroad. There is also recommended legislation which will provide machinery for insuring, up to certain limits, the convertibility into dollars, of earnings which cannot be repatriated because of foreign exchange shortages.) Consideration is also being given to using this same machinery for insuring investors against certain other nonbusiness risks as may be attendant upon investment abroad. My government is also particularly interested in bringing about arrangements through treaties of friendship and commerce and economic development, which will encourage and expedite a greater flow of American private capital into countries seeking to accelerate their economic development, either by way of direct investment or by way of investment in the securities of governments or in securities of private and public corporations.

Despite the recent hesitation on the part of private investors to send their capital abroad we should not fail to take note of the fact that large sums are still available for investment in areas where conditions are conducive to private participation. One need only look across the border to Canada where very significant amounts of private long-term investment have been flowing during the past year. Private American capital to the extent of almost a quarter of a billion dollars has been committed within recent months to a single project.

My delegation was particularly impressed by the statement of the distinguished delegates from Mexico and Colombia in which they depicted the progress that their countries have been able to make by mobilizing their own domestic resources. The suggestion made by the delegate of Mexico to the Economic Commission for Latin America for an investigation into the factors influencing the demand for and supply of capital should, in our opinion, receive careful consideration.

I wonder how many people appreciate the significance of the war in Korea on the international investment picture.

It is possible that the long-range effect of the Korean War will be beneficial to the international flow of private capital. As time goes on investors are bound to realize that the United Nations—united and strong nations with a will for peace—have become a very powerful influence for political stability and economic growth. (This new influence, we believe, will become a part of the working consciousness of private businessmen, traders, and investors. It is only now beginning to operate. Its full force is yet to come.)

All of this does not mean, Mr. President, that there is not also a compelling need for governmental lending for economic development purposes. My Government in the course of the past 5 years has made available over $28,000,000,000 in the form of loans and grants to individual countries. It has paid in $635,000,000 of its subscription to the International Bank, and has made itself liable up to $3,175,000,000. It has contributed $74,000,000 to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund, $30,000,000 to the United Nation Relief for Palestine Refugees, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency in the Middle East, and $237,000,000 to IRO. No government which has such a record as this can be looked upon as not appreciating the need for Government financing of the needs and the economic development of other peoples.

The United States delegation places great weight on the constructive suggestions of the Economic and Social Council concerning governmental and intergovernmental lending institutions. Because of their importance it might be well to review the status of such institutions, as of this moment.

Since July 1, 1945, the United States Export-Import Bank has made loans for economic development in excess of $1,000,000,000. More than 70 percent of this amount has been for development loans to Latin-American and Asiatic countries. These loans were for development projects such as the generation and distribution of electric power, agricultural activities, the production of metals and minerals, highway construction, flood control, and other developmental work. During the past 3 months, some $212,000,000 were loaned to various countries in these same areas. A significant number of these loans have been based on the recognition of the need for general economic development as envisaged by the resolution of the Economic and Social Council. In other words, the Export-Import Bank has extended lines of credit to borrowing countries, and has thereby provided a firm basis for the coordinated planning of their economic development.

As the outstanding loans of the Export-Import Bank are repaid, the funds received can be reloaned, thus automatically providing the bank with additional lending power for suitable additional development projects. However, the rate at which the present resources of the Export-Import Bank are now being committed indicates the need for increasing its resources. It is therefore the intention of my Government to seek an increase in the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank.

The Government of the United States has viewed with considerable favor the current trend in the activities of the International Bank. The outstanding loans of the bank, as of this date, amount to almost a billion dollars—$972,000,000, to be exact. Of this amount, approximately 40 percent represents loans to countries that are seriously in need of economic development. Almost all of these development loans were made within the past 2 years.

The increasing concentration by the bank on economic development has been accompanied by a heightened awareness on its part of its responsibility to go out to its members and to assist them in assessing their needs and possibilities. Thus, the bank has developed a pattern of consultation and mission, of technical assistance in short, that should measurably increase both the volume of its development loans and effectiveness of the part it plays in the economic development of its members.

From the very beginning of its activities, the bank has had the authority to loan out the entire paid-in capital share of the United States Government. Moreover, the United States' contribution to the bank's capital can be used without any restriction as to where it is to be spent. To aid the bank in the flotation of its securities the United States Congress has enacted legislation authorizing National banks and State banks, which are members of the Federal Reserve System, to deal in and underwrite obligations of the bank. As a result of this legislation the market for the bank's obligations in the United States has been greatly broadened. The bank has borrowed from American investors the amounts that it has felt that it could lend within a reasonably short period of time. There is no doubt but that it will be able to borrow on very favorable terms such additional sums as it may reasonably be expected to require for lending purposes for a considerable period ahead.

I should like to point out that the amount the bank can still borrow in the private market, against the guaranty of the United States subscription, is approximately $2,250,000,000. To this amount should be added such sums as are being made available to it in the currencies of other countries. It is with satisfaction that we note the increasing amounts of the 18 percent contributions that have become available to the bank during the past year. It is also gratifying to know that the bank has been assured of increased loanable resources through the use of additional 18 percent subscriptions in the future, and to hear that France has now made possible the

sale of the bank's bonds in the French capital market.

My Government has looked with particular approval upon the broadening scope of the loans made by the International Bank. The recent road loan to Ethiopia is fresh evidence of the bank's recognition of undertakings, which though not self-liquidating, involve a contribution to productivity and to increased national income. The purpose of the loan is to improve the highways of Ethiopia. Not only will improved roads facilitate internal and external trade by expediting deliveries and cutting down the present inordinately high transportation costs, but, as the bank has pointed out, by making government service more easily accessible to outlying communities, these improvements should also be conducive to bringing improvements in health, education, and governmental administration.

Similarly, the loan to the new Ethiopian Development Bank evidences the interest of the bank in aiding general economic development. This loan will make available to Ethiopia the foreign exchange necessary for the purchase of imported agricultural and industrial equipment. It will provide capital to finance the replacement of obsolete machinery, as well as for the purchase of additional equipment needed to bring existing plants to higher levels of efficiency.

In effect, the International Bank is providing a general line of credit to the Ethiopian Development Bank. The capital stock will be subscribed by the Ethiopian Government in local currency. The credit extended by the International Bank will permit the financing of many private projects, any one of which in itself might be too small to warrant bringing before the bank as an individual project. By the same token the arrangement eliminates the need for a separate government guaranty for each project to be financed. Although small, this undertaking by the bank sets a pattern which, on a wider basis, should both encourage the participation of local capital, and provide large amounts of foreign capital for a wide variety of undertakings in serving general developmental needs.

This experimentation by the bank with new techniques, the wide geographic distribution of its loans, the progressive enlargement of its technical assistance activities, the broader scope of the projects it finances, the promise of greater flexibility with regard to financing local currency costs, are all factors which should expedite and increase economic development. It is the hope of the United States delegation that as the bank becomes more familiar with the needs and capacities of its members, the tempo of its operations will increase and the bank's resources will be expeditiously devoted to the financing of as many development projects as can be economically and efficiently undertaken by borrowing countries.

The Economic and Social Council was fully conscious of the difficulties faced by certain borrowers in servicing foreign loans. Consequently, it undertook to further the collection of the information needed to measure the capacity of countries seeking accelerated economic development to service the required investment of foreign capital. It has recommended that the International Monetary Fund collect and analyze the data showing the proportion of foreign exchange receipts that are now being devoted to servicing foreign investment, as compared with the experience of more developed countries in the earlier stages of their development. It has also recommended that the Fund look into the question of administrative measures that can be used to provide for servicing such investment in times of exchange stringency. This analysis by the Fund will throw light on the extent to which countries in need of foreign funds for development can carry the burden of servicing such investment from abroad. It should bring into focus the extent to which the problem of foreign financing can be met by existing institutions and by current methods of financing. It should enable us realistically to assess those aspects of the problem of foreign financing which have been stressed before this committee by the distinguished representatives of Pakistan, the United Kingdom, Australia and other countries.

My delegation is aware of the fact that there are many projects that require financing which cannot be provided for under present circumstances. I can assure you that we will give careful consideration to the many stimulating ideas and suggestions that have been presented by the distinguished delegates from countries that are at this moment at grips with the problem before us.

And let it not be assumed that the endorsement of the resolution of the Economic and Social Council on Financing Economic Development by this committee will in any way lessen the interest of the Council or its members in this vital problem. To stimulate further progress in this field the Economic and Social Council increased the size of the Economic and Employment Commission to 18. To reemphasize the importance of economic development and to assure its continued consideration, the Economic and Social Council added the word "Development" to the name of the Commission and has instructed it to place the problem of financing economic development on the agenda of at least one of its sessions each year. Thus, provision has been made for this item to appear on the agenda of the Economic and Social Council each year and hence, automatically to be brought to the attention of the General Assembly each year.

Now let me look back for a moment, Mr. President, to compare and evaluate what has been done. We have ended a period of intensive preparation. We have begun a period of progress. In perspective, our work together should lay a sound basis for the confidence of the world—the confidence of those who conduct the trade and business and production of the world.

In all the centuries of search for better things, has any international group—public or private—ever sat together, as the United Nations has, analyzed problems, and then gone to work together to tackle those problems directly? Here, for the first time, mankind has brought together and analyzed his collective experience in economic growth. As a result he has fashioned certain tools which he knows have great usefulness. I refer first to technical assistance—a bad technical name for a program of immense importance. It comprises a whole mental and scientific tool kit of great diversity which can be applied to remedy many different problems. With it, we no longer leave to merest chance the discovery of our economic problems and our economic opportunities. Factories, roads, and ports and dams are being built with the support of skills and technique drawn from many countries. We know that at relatively little cost farmers can be taught to grow more rice and healthier cattle and we have set about to do it. We are internationally organized, for the first time, to do these things on a growing scale.

We have also pooled our financial experience. Never before have the nations together accumulated such a mass of expert data and analysis on which to base their international policies relating to economic growth.

Mr. President, the place that economic development holds in the thinking of the present generation represents a new and important departure in social thinking. In the past, the early stages of economic development have, in too many instances, been a rather painful process. The current approach to the problem is based on the idea that economic development should fit in with modern concepts of social betterment, and with an accompanying rise in the standards of living of the general population. It is this concept that underlies the interest of the Government of the United States in the economic development of other countries. It is this concept that underlay President Truman's statement that:

"New economic development must be devised and controlled to benefit the peoples of the areas in which they are established. Guarantees to the investor must be balanced by guarantees in the interest of the people whose resources and whose labor go into these developments."

My Government is of the conviction that a basic step to a smoothly working international order is the improvement of the living conditions of that vast portion of the world's population who have neither adequate food, housing, nor medical care. It is of the conviction, also, that to attain such improvement requires balanced development programs which include the development of factories, power, transportation, and health, as well as modern agricultural development. It is within our capacity, both as a United Nations, and as individual member countries, to help these people help themselves to secure a better life.

This cannot be attained by mere exhortation or the shedding of crocodile tears. If these hundreds of millions of people are to be benefited it will require more than sponsorship by those who boast of their great industrial expansion, boast of the continuous increase in their national income, question the motive of any country that attempts to help these people help themselves to a better life—and then refuse, or, perhaps, conveniently forget to bear any portion of the cost of carrying out such undertakings.

Mr. President, I should like to refer the members of this committee to the record of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics whose distinguished representative has just expressed so great a concern for the welfare of those who are in need of economic development. I submit that if they look at those economic and social activities of the United Nations which were established to benefit mankind they will find a most interesting record. Mr. President, one time a very learned man in this country wrote, "What you do speaks so loudly I cannot hear what you say." I hope the members of this committee will keep that wise saying in mind as they consider that record which will show:

1. The International Children's Emergency Fund: The U. S. S. R. contribution was zero.

2. The Palestine Refugee Organization: The U. S. S. R. contributed nothing.

3. The International Relief Organization: The U. S. S. R. made no contribution.

4. The special account for the expanded program of technical assistance: The U. S. S. R. did not contribute a single red ruble. In fact, it is worthy of note that the U. S. S. R. delegation attempted only yesterday in committee 5 to cut in half the appropriation in the United Nations budget for the technical assistance administration of the United Nations Secretariat.

5. The U. S. S. R. failed to pay its assessments to the World Health Organization, an agency which has contributed so much to the welfare of men, women, and children everywhere.

6. As to the International Bank, which was created to help finance economic development and in whose formation the U. S. S. R.

participated at Bretton Woods, the U. S. S. R. has not contributed a single cent.

Again, I say to my colleague from the U. S. S. R., "What you do speaks so loudly I cannot hear what you say."

The Economic and Social Council is now engaged in the formulation of a plan to rehabilitate Korea from the ravages of aggression. The combined effort of the United Nations in this venture will furnish practical proof of what collective effort can accomplish in assisting peoples to improve their own conditions of life.

The United States of America believes that the one great objective of the United Nations is lasting peace for all the world.

Today no such condition prevails. There are wars and threats of war. We still have aggression and threats of aggression.

The United Nations was founded on the assumption that there would be genuine disarmament backed by effective measures of control and inspection which would permit governments and peoples to rid themselves of the economic burden of maintaining armaments. This has been blocked by the refusal of a small group of countries to accept such measures.

Because there is no assurance of lasting peace among the nations of the world and because there is as yet no effective system for disarmament, many governments, including my own, feel the absolute necessity of using huge amounts of their resources for defense against aggression. For this purpose the American people have tightened their belts and have voluntarily increased their tax rates. American tax rates now run up to a maximum of 80 percent.

Despite this drain on our economy, my Government will do everything it can during the coming months to expedite the availability for economic development of such materials and equipment that can possibly be spared without seriously interfering with the preparation of the defenses of the free democracies.

Many centuries ago there came to us from the east the voice of a man, simple in his way of life but wise in his teachings. He told of the day when men "shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

We in the United States, he said, still cling to the hope given in that prophecy. Above all things we desire peace—world peace—lasting peace, and the world-wide prosperity and progress which that peace will make possible. Prosperity, in turn, will be an assurance of the continuation of peace.

We look to the day when all nations will agree to a plan of universal disarmament with adequate control, inspection, and enforcement. When that happy day comes and we can all take from our shoulders these heavy armament burdens, then we of the United States of America feel that we and many other member nations will be in a position to join in a real widespread program of development, the need for which has been so eloquently stated by so many of the delegates to this General Assembly. We look forward to all freedom-loving democratic countries associating together in applying these resources which they will save through disarming, to the building up of the areas whose need has been so well described to this committee. The sooner certain countries free the world from the fear of aggression the sooner will my country be in a position to fulfill its determination to carry out this great program.

Paraphrasing Isaiah's great prophecy, then we can truly beat our tanks into dynamos and our guns into machines and factories for industrial and economic development throughout the world, for "we shall not have to learn war any more."

In the meantime, Mr. President, it is the intention of my Government to continue to lend its weight through private investment, the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank, the technical-assistance program, and the specialized agencies to the furtherance and expansion of economic development.

The Military Situation in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following two articles which appeared in the New Leader under dates of November 20 and November 27, 1950, in the hope that it will clarify our thinking with reference to the military situation in Asia. The articles follow:

WHY RED CHINA INTERVENED—THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS' ROLE IN THE KOREAN WAR WAS DECIDED UPON LAST FEBRUARY—IN MOSCOW

(By David J. Dallin)

Communist China's intervention in the Korean war is now a fact. Contrary to prevailing opinion, however, the decision to intervene was not made in recent weeks as American forces approached the border of Manchuria. It would be the gravest folly for the United States to base its policy on this assumption.

The long-range plans for the conquest of Korea were actually laid as long ago as January and February 1950. In mid-December, immediately after the creation of the Peiping government, Mao Tse-tung arrived in Moscow accompanied by a large retinue and was shortly joined by his premier, Chou En-lai. The Moscow negotiations, which lasted for 2 months, resulted in one public treaty (a Sino-Soviet alliance ostensibly directed against any revival of Japanese aggression) and a number of secret agreements.

The essentially aggressive character of the Moscow-Peiping combination was apparent from the fact that the Russians were granted continued use of Chinese military bases for another 3 years. The clear implication was that, at the end of that time, Japan would no longer constitute a menace to China. Presumably, either the Japanese Communist Party would emulate its continental Asian brethren and take Japan into the Soviet camp; or military means would have to be applied by the Moscow-Peiping axis—or a combination of both would be required. At all events, the Communist victory in China was obviously regarded not as a decisive event in itself, but rather as an interim stage in a vast campaign which can end only when Japan is forced to join the Asian Cominform.

The first step in the achievement of this goal was the projected conquest of South Korea. By a logical division of assignments, Moscow was to supply the necessary arms and other equipment, while Peiping furnished battle-hardened Korean veterans of the Chinese civil war.

A complicating factor, however, was the possible American reaction. The most likely eventuality appeared to be that Washington would adopt a hands-off policy; in that case, the Korean Communist army would be able to crush its opponents and occupy the entire peninsula without outside help. On the other hand, to guard against a possible American decision to resist the attack, it was necessary to hold 1,000,000 Chinese troops in Manchuria in readiness to be thrown into the breach.

The Moscow conference ended in the middle of February; early in March, the first Korean contingents started to cross into North Korea from Manchuria. A number of prisoners taken by the United Nations forces have confirmed this significant time relation. Others have reported that the invasion of South Korea was originally slated for the last week in April, but had to be postponed for 2 months.

The postponement of the attack until June 25 and most of the difficulties encountered by the Korean and Chinese Communists in the fighting so far are attributable to one characteristic aspect of the far eastern war: the fact that the troops of both Mao and Korean puppet leader Kim Il-sung must be equipped up to 90 percent by the U. S. S. R. This contrasts sharply with the situation of the eastern European satellites, which are able to supply much of their own military matériel and one of which Czechoslavakia, is even superior to the Soviet Union in industrial power.

Although a few arms plants have been hastily erected in Manchuria and Korea, almost everything from bayonets and revolvers to machine guns and tanks has had to be supplied by the senior partner in Moscow. Before the armies could be set in motion, huge stockpiles had to be amassed from supplies shipped either by way of the overloaded trans-Siberian railroad or by the sea route from Odessa and Leningrad all the way around the Asian continent to Vladivostok and Dairen. (The industry of the Soviet Far East is able to supply very little.) To make matters worse, with the Far East rapidly developing into the pivotal area of world politics, considerable quantities of supplies had to be diverted to the Soviet forces in that region, so that they could be prepared for any eventuality. As a result, the preliminary phase of the conquest of Korea proved far more difficult and protracted than anticipated.

Once the drive was launched on June 25, the assumption that America would not weigh decisively in the balance seemed on the way to realization. Although United States troops were ordered into the battle, they were apparently too little and too late to check the invaders and the North Koreans appeared well able to finish the job without Chinese aid.

But then, after two and a half months of retreat and defeat, the UN forces staged the landing at Inchon and the reoccupation of Seoul. This bold stroke resulted in the destruction of 60 percent of the Korean Communist army and the rapid overrunning of most of North Korea. The Chinese Communists were now faced with the alternatives of either fighting on alone or remaining on the sidelines.

A new appraisal of the situation was necessary. Early in October Moscow decided against moving for a peaceful solution. The first indication that the war was to continue came on October 12, with the publication in large print in Moscow newspapers of an exchange of messages between Stalin and Kim Il-sung. Kim expressed the gratitude of the Korean people for the Soviet help, to which Stalin replied: "I wish the Korean people, which is heroically defending the independence of its country, a successful completion of its protracted struggle for a united, independent, democratic Korea." The Soviet dictator would never have jeopardized his

personal prestige by sending congratulations to a doomed satellite regime. His telegram clearly signified that new forces were to be thrown into the Korean conflict.

The very next day Kim promised the Korean people that "decisive blows will be dealt the enemy" and "the armed interventionists as well as their servants will be destroyed on our soil." He called on the people and army "to defend to the last every inch of our soil."

Within another fortnight considerable Chinese Communist forces were across the border and taking part in the fighting. Despite some initial successes, however, the position of these Chinese troops is essentially a precarious one. With the Korean Army nearly gone, Chinese cities wide open to aerial bombardment, and arms and equipment still arriving at a slow rate, China has no chance of winning a war against the United States in Korea. The dilemma that faces the Kremlin is, therefore, quite simple: unless the Soviet Union enters the war directly the Chinese will be badly beaten.

This is the real meaning of the confusion that has reigned in the Korean war theater since the first engagements between Chinese and United Nations troops. If Stalin does not intervene directly and in force, the Chinese are doomed to defeat, whether they commit 100,000 troops or 500,000. The United States will have the support of a sizable Chinese Nationalist Army from Formosa as well as the other UN forces; American aviation will continue to control the skies, and UN ground forces will have the advantage of superior arms.

Although they may inflict heavy losses on our armies, the defeat of the Chinese Communists will be an even greater disaster for the Communist cause than the North Korean debacle. It will shatter the Stalin-Mao alliance and imperil the key Sino-Soviet stronghold of Manchuria. Furthermore, the conquest of Japan, the No. 1 objective of Communist policy in the Orient at the present time, will recede into the realm of idle fancy.

This situation can be retrieved only by Russian entry into the far-eastern war as a full-fledged participant. And that would mean world war III.

STALIN ALSO HAS TO MAKE THE CHOICE: ASIA OR EUROPE?—WHICH THEATER OF OPERATIONS WILL PAY OFF BEST? THE QUESTION IS KEEPING KREMLIN LIGHTS BURNING

(By David J. Dallin)

The recent elections constituted a clear popular mandate to Congress to pay more attention henceforth to the Far East and to correct the grave mistakes of recent years in America's Asian policy. This national decision was an exceedingly wise one—wiser, in fact, than the average voter realized.

The same issue that confronts the Government and people of the United States—East or West, Asia or Europe?—exists as well for the Kremlin, just as it did for the Tsars whenever they were seized by the itch to move across established frontiers and expand into foreign lands. Of course, Stalin has never recognized any intrinsic necessity for making this choice; up to 1948 he was advancing simultaneously in Europe and in Asia. In the last 2 years, however, fundamental developments have taken place.

In Europe, Stalin has found himself forced to retreat in Berlin and Greece, and to acquiesce in the emergence of an independent Communist regime in Yugoslavia. In Asia, on the other hand, a series of signal triumphs have carried Soviet influence deep into China, Malaya, Burma, and Indochina. Logically, therefore, the Far East is today a more attractive locale than Europe for a Communist offensive.

At present, Stalin's forces in Europe are lying in ambush—an ambush from which they may spring at any moment, depending on the vigor with which the west rearms. In Asia, however, they are already attacking with constantly mounting intensity. The United States Government long failed to recognize the symptoms in this shift of emphasis. Now the grave events in Korea have driven home the shortcomings of past American policy and sharply outlined our future course.

The Korean Communists, fighting alone, have suffered defeat and been forced to call upon a stronger ally. Communist China will meet the same fate at the hands of the United Nations forces, and it, too, will have to cry for help. At this juncture, will the Soviet Union acknowledge the defeat of communism in Asia, with all that implies? Or will it stake all on a mighty gamble and launch the third world war? Or, alternatively—and this is more in keeping with Stalin's personality and the tactics of Stalinism—will it try to operate with "volunteers" for whose actions Moscow will disclaim any direct responsibility?

If the decision is for war, the question will arise once again: East or west, Asia or Europe? Even in an open war, with every frontier ablaze, it will be impossible for the belligerents to conduct operations with equal intensity in every part of the world. Great strategic decisions will be necessary as to which theater shall receive top priority. What blueprints are lying in General Staff headquarters in Moscow no one can say. However, it is by no means too soon—if anything, it is late in the day—for this country to train its sights upon the issues which may assume a tragic immediacy in the not-too-distant future.

Within the larger framework of the U. S. S. R., the Soviet Far East has its own special strengths and weaknesses. Primary among the latter—and most obvious—is the enormous distance separating the eastern region from Russia's European heart. With the outbreak of war, the Siberian and Manchurian railroads will be disrupted by enemy aviation, and sea transport will be made impossible. The only means of communication remaining between Moscow and the eastern war theater will be an ineffectual airlift. Thus, to all intents and purposes, the Soviet far east will be isolated and obliged to wage war chiefly with its own resources.

Alerted to these difficulties by the border conflicts with Japan in the 1930's, the Kremlin has sought to develop the east at a furious pace. New cities sprang up, new industries were created, and the population was increased through compulsory migration. An army, at times estimated at almost a million men, was stationed in the region, with large stores of war material. Nevertheless, in time of war enemy aviation, striking from Japanese bases, will be able to wreak swift destruction upon Russia's only four major cities in the Far East, together with their industries. Soviet air power will retaliate with raids on Japan, but this will not alter the outcome of a war in which Japan will necessarily play only a minor role.

On the credit side, the Soviet Far East possesses one great advantage: If Moscow decides on direct intervention, more than enough troops will be available to eject all the western forces now in Korea. Against 200,000 UN troops, the Soviet-Chinese-Korean Axis will be able to throw in a million, of which half will be well-equipped Russians. The victory, to be sure, will be only a temporary, inconclusive one. But even the lure of a temporary triumph, of humiliating the American "imperialist invaders" and hurling them into the sea, will be tremendously tempting to Stalin and his Asian satraps.

In analyzing the possibility of a Soviet attack in Asia, an additional factor must also be taken into account: the traditional attitude of the Russian people toward far eastern questions.

To the Russians, the Far East has always been a remote, little-known region. Although for 60 years a goal of Russian imperialist expansion, neither Korea nor Manchuria has ever aroused particularly warm feelings among the people or any spontaneous longing for their annexation.

Fifty-five years ago, Russia fought a war against Japan, in which Korea and Manchuria were the stakes. No war in Russia's history ever evoked less patriotic enthusiasm. Defeatism was rampant not only among the left-wing parties but even in circles close to the Government; the people at large were indifferent. The war finally ended in a Russian defeat and had as a direct consequence the emergence of a powerful revolutionary movement which ultimately overturned the Czarist regime.

Much the same thing occurred when the Soviet Union joined the Allied war against Japan in August 1945. In marked contrast to the patriotic fever that had gripped it in the last 2 years of the war with Germany, the Russian people greeted the intervention against Japan with notable coolness. The army obeyed orders, of course, but who can tell what might have happened had Japan not surrendered a scant 6 days after Moscow's declaration of war?

The outbreak of war in Europe means, almost automatically, a major role for Germany, with all that implies. Like most people in Western Europe, millions of Russians view with apprehension any revival of German military might. Poignant memories of recent date make anti-German feeling still a significant psychological factor, whereas anti-Japanese sentiment hardly exists.

To the extent that the outcome of a future war depends on the mood of the Russian people, the Far East is clearly the least favorable theater of war for the Soviet government. The average Russian will not respond to appeals and slogans centering upon Korea and Manchuria, and the inevitable military set-backs might well have dire consequences.

The part of wisdom from the Kremlin's point of view is to swallow its humiliation in Korea with the best possible grace and thereby cut its losses. Should it decide instead to risk all in order to restore the luster to its fading prestige, however, a chain reaction may well result whose last link will spell disaster for the Soviet dictatorship.

A Tax Program To Support the Policy of Containment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the present national administration on the drastic need for additional revenue to meet our preparedness program without forcing us to resort to fantastic deficit financing, but the need for revenue extends far beyond the prospective yield from present revenue laws and the proposed excess-profits tax. I was terribly disappointed when

the hearings started on November 15 to learn that the majority side of the Committee on Ways and Means refused to accept testimony of witnesses who had prepared outstanding articles covering the whole field of potential revenue. Many of these statements are deserving of careful study by every Member of Congress, but they do not appear even in the appendix of the hearings to help us maintain a comprehensive view of the tax field while we have this bill before us.

One of the best statements presented to the committee but the admission of which was refused by the committee, was offered by Dr. Arthur Smithies, professor of economics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., appearing for a group of faculty members from Harvard business school, law school, and the department of economics. I am including this study in my remarks so that each Member of Congress can read it. It follows:

A TAX PROGRAM TO SUPPORT THE POLICY OF CONTAINMENT

THE OBJECTIVES OF TAX POLICY

The success of United States foreign and military policy will depend heavily upon the willingness and ability of the people of this country to sustain the program over a long period of time, should that be necessary. In Mr. Harriman's vivid metaphor, this is not a sprint but a 4-mile race. In comparison, preparation for the last war can be regarded as a sprint, and the economic measures that carried the country through it will not necessarily be appropriate at the present time. In particular, for a sustained effort we cannot hope to rely as heavily as we did then on a comprehensive system of direct controls to secure the resources necessary for the defense program and at the same time avoid inflation. Although the control system during the last war worked better than many had expected, we feel reasonably confident that, had it been continued much longer, the United States economy would have been exposed to the well-known weaknesses of a policy of suppressed inflation.

This time, we must rely much more heavily than before on tax policy and credit policy; direct controls must be applied on a strictly selective basis and must not be permitted to grow into a general control system through lack of an adequate financial policy. In order to avoid the need for undue reliance on direct controls, every effort should be made to approach as nearly as possible a balanced budget during the current emergency.

We are assuming that the total expenditures of the Federal Government, despite all feasible reductions in nonmilitary expenditures, will amount to about 25 percent of the national product. Such an estimate is obviously subject to constant readjustment in the light of rapidly changing circumstances, and we are of course aware that the tax program outlined below will have to be revised to take account of these changes. But even now we are faced with an inflationary situation despite the fact that very little of the planned additions to defense expenditures has already been made and that the Federal budget is currently substantially balanced on a cash basis. Consequently, with the certainty of rapidly rising defense expenditures and large Federal deficits in the near future, we favor early action to gear the tax objectives of the Nation to the requirements of an economy in which the Federal Government will absorb about 25 percent of the national product. In view of the inflationary pressures already existing and the length of time required to put large tax increases into effect, we believe that the following tax proposals should be enacted as rapidly as the legislative process will permit. With all factors taken into account, the risk of passing unduly prompt and severe tax increases seems much less than that of following a policy of "too little and too late."

In this memorandum we deal only with tax policy, but we must emphasize that a tax program alone, however well-conceived and however severe is not enough. An easy credit policy, for instance, can offset many of the beneficial effects of the tax program; and if powerful organized groups—in agriculture, business, and labor—refuse to accept the view that they must deny themselves gains that may be within their reach, and must accept sacrifices in the national interest, a tax program will be fruitless.

Although the tax program must be severe, it is more likely to deprive the American people of the gains in consumption standards they might have enjoyed rather than to impose sharp reductions in living standards. Provided the economy can expand at the rate it has sustained over the past few years, a defense program of the size we assume may be expected to permit a steady increase in consumption standards. On the other hand, if productivity does not increase, mounting pressure for higher consumption standards in the various sectors of the economy is likely to endanger the defense program itself.

As we have indicated, the tax measures that are adopted now should not be devised as short-term emergency expedients, but should provide a basis for the tax structure of the indefinite future. It is therefore essential that the tax structure as a whole should conform to our standards of fairness as among various classes of taxpayers, should be effective in controlling inflation, and should preserve in so far as possible, the incentives to both labor and management to work hard and maintain maximum efficiency.

I. THE CORPORATION INCOME TAX AND EXCESS PROFITS TAX

The above objectives require that at least $5,000,000,000 of additional tax revenues, beyond those provided by the Revenue Act of 1950, be raised from increased taxes on corporate profits. Such an increase would bring the effective tax rate on aggregate corporate profits to a substantially higher level than at any time during World War II. And even with profits before taxes one-third higher than such profits from 1947–49, this higher effective tax rate would leave net profits after taxes somewhat lower than the average net profits after taxes in this recent period. Increases of this severity are nevertheless necessary if corporations and stockholders are to bear their share of the burden of increased defense expenditures.

An additional $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 could be obtained by raising the present corporate income tax rate from 45 percent to 60 percent or by levying an excess profits tax designed to yield the same amount of net additional revenue. As between these alternatives we believe that: the income tax rate on corporate earnings in excess of $25,000 should be increased from 45 percent to 60 percent.

This recommendation stems from our conviction that an excess profits tax would have more serious disadvantages, if adopted for an indefinite period in a semimobilized economy, than would an increase in the corporate income tax. The most important disadvantage of an excess profits tax is that it would inevitably place a greater penalty on new businesses and growing businesses than on their entrenched competitors and on expanding industries as compared with declining industries. Also, efficiency would be penalized and inefficiency, in effect, subsidized.

Under an excess profits tax new and growing businesses typically would have relatively low base period earnings, or none at all, and frequently would possess only small amounts of invested capital. Consequently, most of their earnings would be subject to the excess-profits-tax rates. In contrast, established companies, most of which have had large earnings in the years 1947–49, and many of which are heavily capitalized and hence would be eligible for a large invested capital credit, would be exempt from the excess profits tax on a sizable fraction of their earnings. Thus an excess profits tax inevitably tends to strengthen entrenched corporations by placing what amounts to a freeze on the economy and, even more seriously, to restrict severely the vitalizing contributions of new and growing businesses to the economy. These defects of an excess profits tax obviously are far more serious in their implications in a semimobilized economy for an indefinite period than in a relatively brief all-out war.

The second major disadvantage of a high excess profits tax is that it encourages waste and extravagance. The extent to which padded expense accounts, wasteful production methods, inflated cost structures, and other unnecessary expenditures were stimulated by the 85 percent rate of World War II, is too well known to require comment. These effects, too, would be potentially much more serious in a long-continued period of semimobilization than in an all-out war; the restraining influence of intense patriotic zeal and rigid controls would offer less protection now than under more extreme conditions.

In deciding whether an excess-profits tax would constitute sound policy now, as it did in World War II, differences other than the duration of the emergency need to be noted. In general terms, a strong case can be made for an excess-profits tax only if a reasonably clear and equitable distinction can be drawn between excess profits and normal profits. Such a distinction, difficult at best, would be essentially impossible to make in an equitable manner under current circumstances. The earnings of many companies in the years 1947–49, for example, would not serve as a reliable basis for the distinction because they were swollen by deferred consumer demands and were otherwise distorted by the inflationary aftermath of the last war. Similarly, the numerous difficulties and highly arbitrary character of definitions of invested capital makes reliance on this approach at least as erratic and unfair as the use of 1947–49 earnings as a means of distinguishing between normal and excess profits.

For all these reasons, plus the very difficult administrative problems posed by an excess-profits tax, we prefer straightforward increases in the corporate income tax to an excess-profits tax. To avoid any misunderstanding, this preference has nothing to do with the amount of additional taxes which should be raised at this time from corporations, but simply with the way in which the increase should be allocated among corporations.

Despite our opposition to an excess-profits tax, we recognize that unjustified profits will be made both on Government contracts and on private transactions in the process of transition to a semimobilized economy. We sympathize with the objectives of those who wish to tax away a large part of these profits through an excess-profits tax. We believe, however, that unreasonable profits on Government contracts can best be handled by direct renegotiation of these contracts, similar to the World War II procedure. As for the remaining unjustified profits, our frank opinion is that it will be better to live with those that will not be removed by a 60-percent income tax than to attempt to deal with them by means of an excess-profits tax. When the practical problems of attempting to devise such a tax are examined,

we believe it becomes clear that the tax would be indiscriminate in its impact and would not effectively single out unjustified and undesirable profits for special taxation. On the contrary, its most severe impact, as we have already pointed out, would be on the profits of new businesses and of growing businesses—generally speaking, the most socially desirable type of profits.

If, nevertheless, an excess-profits tax is deemed necessary, we believe it should be limited in duration to the build-up phase of the current military expansion and that it should be carefully designed to minimize the adverse effects which we have noted. In this connection, it is important that:

1. The excess-profits-tax rate should not be so high as to destroy incentives to efficient operations. If necessary, we should prefer to have the excess-profits tax cut into pre-emergency earnings rather than to have a very high tax rate imposed. In general, the difference between the income-tax rate and the excess-profits tax rate should be as small as feasible.

2. The taxpayer should be given the option between an invested capital credit and a base-period earnings credit. The arbitrary character of both of these credits is so great under present circumstances that unreasonable hardships would be imposed if either were applied separately.

3. Corporations should be permitted to retain sufficient earnings to be able to provide for the needed development of the economy. This objective can best be achieved by enacting a ceiling provision similar in construction to that of World War II. Such a provision would be of little or no value to the large, entrenched companies but it would be of great help to new businesses and relatively small, rapidly growing enterprises. A ceiling provision limiting the maximum effective rate of the combined excess-profits and corporate-income taxes on the taxpayer's total net income to say, 65 percent, would also eliminate to a large degree the need for detailed relief of provisions and would avoid the essentially insoluble administrative problems posed by such provisions as sections 721 and 722 of the World War II tax.

II. THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

The rates of the individual income tax should be increased to their World War II levels, or slightly higher, but exemptions should not be lowered and the split income provision should be retained. An additional credit should be provided to ease the impact of these rate increases on unmarried individuals with dependents since these individuals do not benefit from the "split income" provision.

In view of the central place which the individual income tax should occupy in a well-designed tax structure, we recommend that these tax rates be increased to at least their World War II levels. The beginning rate might, in fact be raised to, say, 25 percent rather than to the wartime level of 23 percent. In this event, commensurate increases should be made in the other income-tax brackets. In a long-continued period short of total war, the widespread desire for steeply progressive individual income taxes must be balanced against the adverse incentive effects of high income tax rates. At all income levels it is important to preserve insofar as possible the mobility of labor, the incentive to work hard, and the willingness of investors to provide risk capital. To the extent that take-home pay and net income after taxes are reduced by heavy income taxes, these incentives are weakened.

We do not recommend a reduction in exemptions since, after allowing for the change in the purchasing power of the dollar, the existing exemption of $600 is lower in real terms than was the wartime exemption of $500. By the same token, however, the wartime rate structure, which is fixed in dollars and not adjusted for changes in the value of the dollar, is steeper now than during the war. This fact needs to be borne in mind in appraising the extent to which individual income-tax rates can be increased without impairing incentives.

We believe that the split-income provision, especially if it were to be supplemented by a larger credit for unmarried heads of families, provides a fairer allocation of the tax burden among taxpayers than would any feasible alternative. Consequently, we recommend that this provision be retained and be so supplemented.

Given the anticipated level of Federal expenditures, these increases in the corporate and personal-income taxes, severe though they are, will not yield more than about half the additional revenue needed to approach a balanced budget and to hold the inflationary pressures within reasonable bounds. Short of total war, however, we believe that the increases in the corporate and personal income taxes which we have recommended are about as severe as are consistent with the long-run welfare of the economy. Consequently we face the necessity of recommending that additional revenue be raised from other sources.

III. EXCISE TAXES

(a) Excise taxes that are fixed in dollars, notably those on liquor and tobacco should be substantially increased.

These taxes have remained fixed since 1942 during a period when the general price level has greatly increased; and other excise taxes that are levied on an ad valorem basis have increased correspondingly in dollar amounts. With the greatly increased need for revenue, we therefore feel that it is fair to make substantial increases in the taxes on these commodities.

(b) Heavy manufacturers' excise taxes should be levied on consumers' goods produced by those industries that are major users of the major commodities that will be in short supply as a result of the defense program. Such products include passenger automobiles, household appliances, radio equipment, rubber products, etc. These taxes would take the place of all existing excise taxes on such commodities.

We believe that such taxes constitute one of the most important features of an adequate program. They would be especially effective in removing illegitimate profits arising from the scarcities created by the defense program. On the basis of experience since the war, we may suppose that manufacturers of these commodities will charge far less than the market will bear. This leaves the way open for the gray marketeer, and neither persuasion nor compulsion can close it effectively. Excise taxes go to the root of the trouble by reducing the potential profits from the gray market.

While these taxes would also have to be paid by those consumers who deal in the regular markets, they would apply to durable goods whose purchase can be deferred. Consumers could, in effect, save at least part of the tax by making more intensive use of their existing equipment. Or they could divert their funds to purchases of goods that are not in short supply or to savings. In either event the tax will serve its purpose of relieving pressure on the critical items. In fact, one of the more important advantages of this tax would be that it might avoid the need for allocation controls in some instances. And even where those controls could not be avoided the tax would reduce the pressure on the control system.

(c) Existing ad valorem taxes on other commodities should be increased in line with the excise tax structure that emerges from the foregoing recommendations. However, no change should be made in the present transportation tax.

In our view certain luxury taxes should be increased at the present time. Our opposition to an increase in the transportation tax stems from our belief that the productivity of the country depends heavily on relatively cheap transportation, especially at a time when large shifts in the location of productive resources may be necessary.

IV. ELIMINATION OF MAJOR LOOPHOLES REMAINING IN THE TAX STRUCTURE

In view of the urgent need for increased revenues over a considerable period of time and for a fair distribution of the increased tax burden, we should undertake promptly the task of eliminating the major existing loopholes in the tax structure. We therefore favor measures such as the full taxation of future issues of presently tax-exempt securities; gradual reduction in the excessive allowances now granted through percentage depletion; removal of the present opportunities of avoiding income tax by accumulation of large capital sums of life insurance, and of avoiding the impact of the estate tax through such measures as the use of life interests. The capital gains tax structure should be generally reviewed in the light of the above proposals for general tax increases, and the estate and gift tax structures should also be examined.

V. GENERAL SALES TAX

Further tax revenues that are needed to finance the defense program should be obtained by levying a tax on retail sales.

The measures here recommended, other than the sales tax, can be expected to yield some twelve or thirteen billions of dollars at the 1950 income level. Despite the recent tax increases of four or five billions of dollars provided by the 1950 act, several more billions are likely to be required. We do not believe these billions can safely be raised from existing sources of taxation. We therefore see no alternative to a new tax on a broad base.

A Federal tax on retail sales appears to be the most feasible addition to our existing tax structure. Under present circumstances a sales tax would have significant advantages which at least partially offset the regressive characteristics of the tax. It is, for example, much less subject to evasion by such groups as farmers, small businessmen, and professional people whose income is often not completely reported. The importance of this evasion problem is of course accentuated as income tax rates are increased. The income of some classes of income recipients, mainly labor and white-collar workers, under withholding procedures is fully subjected to the income tax while that of the above groups often escapes the full income tax under the self-assessed system.

A sales tax also would have less restrictive incentive effects than further increases in the income tax and would, to some degree, tend to stimulate saving. Moreover, if food, rent, and perhaps some other necessities were exempted from the sales tax, the most burdensome regressive features of the tax would be substantially mitigated. In our opinion, such a sales tax would be preferable to a reduction in the exemptions of the individual income tax.

These considerations are not advanced to indicate that a sales tax is positively desirable but rather that—after large increases have been made in all other major sources of revenue—it may well be the least undesirable source of raising the further needed revenues.

An alternative to a sales tax would be a flat-rate tax on disposable incomes, i. e., on incomes after deducting the regular income tax. However, as we have noted, the sales

tax leaves less room for evasion than the income tax and exempts savings from taxation. Individuals can help finance the defense program by increasing their saving as well as by paying additional taxes.

In conclusion, we realize that the tax system we propose is more severe than any in our history; but we are in a better position to bear it than ever before and the alternatives to it are inflation, a fully controlled economy, or dangerous curtailment of the defense program.

J. KEITH BUTTERS.
WILLIAM FELLNER.
JOHN LINTNER.
DAN THROOP SMITH.
ARTHUR SMITHIES.
STANLEY S. SURREY.

NOVEMBER 6, 1950.

What Can We Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the following editorial which appeared in the November 29 edition of the Daily Clintonian, edited and published by George Carey, of Clinton, Ind. The editorial follows:

WHAT CAN WE DO?

Rome was complacent when the barbarians began nibbling at the outposts of her far-flung empire. It was business as usual in Rome, the usual waste and inefficiency in government, the usual corruption in high places, the usual bread and circuses for the masses of the people who had been taught to look to the government for a living and to shun work as fit only for whatever the Latin word for suckers may have been.

There was nothing to worry about, for was not Rome the master of the world? Had not the Roman army set an all-time record for consecutive victories? Were not Roman arms and brains and resources superior to any in the world? What were a few low-browed, mongoloid barbarians to worry about, anyway?

There was nothing to worry about when the outlying provinces were lost, for Rome had too much territory anyway. A sort of hysterical frenzy of pleasure-seeking swept Rome. Never had the country been gayer, the parties wilder, the government more inefficient or the spending freer.

Nothing was going to happen to Rome for Rome was the greatest country in the world. Rome refused to wake up; it tried to buy peace and then it was too late. The barbarians moved in and the iron curtain of the dark ages settled over the splendor that the civilized world had known for a thousand years.

Historians see an ominous parallel between the events of the declining days of the Roman empire and the situation in which this Nation finds itself today. It is no use to point them out, for they speak for themselves.

There is no use to delude ourselves any longer. This Nation is at the crossroads. Only by strong and immediate action can it hope to stay the forces pushing our civilization into another dark age.

We dare not vacillate and wander any longer in our foreign policy. We dare not continue on a day-to-day basis in our world associations. We must decide where we are going and get started.

Russia knows exactly where she is headed. Unhampered by such capitalistic handicaps as truths, honor, and decency, she has embarked on a program of world domination using every device that atheistic brutality combined with oriental cunning can encompass. She recognizes no rules; she refuses to live by any. We must recognize this.

Today this Nation is playing Russia's game by bleeding itself white in blood and dollars fighting a war of Russia's planning to save a decadent race from a fate they seem to ardently desire. We are living up to rules Russia scorns; recognizing a border that to her is nonexistent.

The pattern is all too plain. Russia will fight us in Korea to the last Korean, then to the last Chinaman, then to the last Russian if necessary. The pattern is set. Any fool can see it and we are fools if we fail to see it.

Yes, we in America love peace. We will do anything for peace. Will we commit national suicide in the vain pursuit of peace? It is later than you think.

Will we go merrily to hell as Rome went or will we finally wake up and fight with the desperation of men facing doom.

What can we do? We can—

1. Notify Red China that, unless her "volunteers" are recalled from Korea within 24 hours we shall consider that a state of war exists and that our first act will be the atomic bombing of her largest cities.

2. Notify Russia of our action and inform her that we shall consider the appearance of the first Russian "volunteer" or advisor inside China as a declaration of war calling for the atomic bombing of Moscow and Leningrad.

3. Notify our "allies" in the United Nations that we do not consider votes of confidence, a willingness to accept our money and the sending of a few small vessels to cruise in Korean waters as sufficient aid in the first united effort to enforce peace on earth.

4. Notify the member nations of the United Nations that unless they immediately proceed to give all-out aid to the Korean war in soldiers, aircraft, guns, and their own carefully guarded treasure, we shall withdraw our armies not only from Korea but from Europe as well.

We can inform the world that we love peace but not at the expense of trying to save a world too decadent to save. We can make one more supreme effort to save those who seemingly will not save themselves, then we can, if necessary, withdraw within our own shores and prepare for the coming onslaught without first having exhausted our blood and gold by cooperating with Russia's plans as if they were our own.

Of course Russia will use the atomic bomb on New York and Chicago if she decides it is worth more than having Moscow bombed. Of course we shall find ourselves in the most terrible war in history if Russia wants to go to war. Of course we may suffer defeat in the end and wind up dead or slaves of an oriental despotism that is heir to the ideals of Genkhis Khan. But by taking the decisive stand now, and by this means only, do we have a chance to escape with our civilization intact. Any other course is suicide.

We have tried cooperation; we have tried reason; we have tried to buy peace; we have tried appeasement. Everything has failed except calling the Russian bluff. We must accept the supreme gamble or the barbarians will soon be at the gates of Rome.

Address of Charles H. Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation dinner, of which His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman was chairman, was held in New York City at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel on October 19, 1950. The opening address on that momentous occasion was delivered by one of New York's distinguished sons, Charles H. Silver. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. Silver's address. Mr. Silver's address follows:

My friends, we are gathered here this evening to pay our annual tribute to one of the most beloved Americans of our time. Our dinner this year takes on unusual significance. It is being held at a time when the freedom of men is threatened by the dark forces of those states which would engulf all mankind.

Yet we need not despair. We honor the memory of a man who poured out his very life and fine abilities for the men, women, and children of a great democracy. And tonight we know that on the blood-soaked battlefields of Korea, together with our sister democracies in the United Nations, we are driving back the cruel Red hordes and saying to them in effect: "We shall not permit you to pierce the heart of democracy with the poisoned spear of your godless philosophy."

What are we fighting to preserve? Is it an economic theory, a system of government, a way of living, human dignity? I would say that it was all of these and even more; but above all we are engaged in a struggle to preserve the freedom of the individual and to keep him from being thrown into a pit of terror and slavery.

Millions of words have been written on communism and the misery and bloodshed which it has already caused in various parts of the world. Commentators in the press and on the radio, not only in this country but in other democratic nations, have described with great clarity and intelligence the aims and objectives of communism. That is all to the good.

But it seems to me, my friends, that the reason for our dislike of communism has been compressed in a few simple and stirring words by one who gave his life for democracy.

He understood thoroughly what we are fighting for and he spoke his mind, not to a large audience or through the medium of a newspaper, but in a poignant and eloquent letter which he wrote to his two little daughters in Philadelphia. He was Pvt. John J. McCormick and his letter came from Korea. It reached Mary McCormick, his wife, 3 days after a telegram from the Defense Department advised her that he had been killed in action on August 10. This is what he said in his heartbreaking letter which Mrs. McCormick read to the little girls:

"I want you both to know that I would be with you if I could; but there are a lot of bad men in the world and if they were allowed to do what they wanted to do, little girls like you wouldn't be allowed to go to church on Sunday or be able to go to the school you wanted to.

"So I have to help fight these men to keep them from coming where you and I live. It

might take a long while and Daddy will have to go to help God in Heaven, and if I do I always want you to be good to Mummie because she is the best Mummie in the whole world."

My friends, there you have the answer. It is the answer, I imagine, that Al Smith would have given, that Lincoln would have given that every American leader and statesman would have given. And if you are asked what we are doing in Korea or in any other part of the world where freedom is being threatened just quote the words of that young man who gave his life for democracy. None can give a better answer, none can speak with greater sincerity. In that final letter to his children this young man told with simple honesty and conviction what is meant by the American way of life; and his words came from his heart.

And so in opening the proceedings at this dinner, I should like to leave with you one other thought before presenting the distinguished and eloquent speakers from whom we are to hear presently.

We who are gathered in this great banquet hall, men and women in all walks, of all faiths and creeds, are united, I am sure, in our loyalty to our country. Loyalty was one of the strong qualities of Al Smith—loyalty to America and its institutions and his friends. We are blessed with great natural resources; our standard of life is of the highest in all the world; we have food and clothing in great abundance.

We who cannot actively participate in the military phases of our defense program must accept the challenge that faces us in the area of moral and financial support. We know that we have no alternative but to be prepared to meet any threat that may be hurled against us. Building an adequate armed defense will call for heavy financial burdens on us. Each of us will have to pay his share.

I have heard some speak of sacrifices. But have we a right to use the word "sacrifice"? What we are asked to give are mere dollars and cents; how puny, how insignificant that is compared with what that young man who wrote to his children and the thousands like him that have given their last measure of devotion to the sacred cause of liberty. It is they who are making the sacrifices—the supreme sacrifices—with their bodies and their souls; it is they who carry the torch of freedom on the field of battle; it is they who have died and shall die so that democracy may remain on the face of the earth.

As I said a few moments ago our dinner has unusual significance because of the world situation this year. It is significant for another and very important reason. We have opened the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Wing to St. Vincent's Hospital, an institution sponsored by Catholics whose doors are always open to the sick and ailing and helpless of the Protestant and Jewish faiths.

That is also one of the symbols of democracy. There are no barriers of race or creed in our beloved country; those who seek aid in St. Vincent's Hospital are not asked to what political party they belong or in what church they worship.

Democracy in this country and indeed through many parts of the world is now on the march. The path which it travels can have no turning. It leads straight to human decency and love of fellow men. We Americans will not falter for we know in our hearts that democracy will live so long as men cherish the ideals of our founding fathers; Communists and communism have challenged us and we have given our answer. They cannot mistake it.

And when the forces of democracy have triumphed we shall stretch out our hands in friendly greeting to the peoples throughout the world who have thrown off the yoke of their masters. We shall not speak of military victories nor will we gloat over our triumph. For it will be a victory of truth and justice; instead of being written in letters of blood it will be written in lofty and inspiring words and phrases from the hearts and minds of peace-loving men.

Land Reform and Farm Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, December 5 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on October 31, 1950, my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], United States delegate to the Assembly of the United Nations, made an address in Committee No. 2 regarding United States proposals for land reform and farm development. It is a most excellent address, one which received much favorable comment throughout the country, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, first, speaking for the United States of American delegation, let me express our great pleasure in the interest that has been manifested in this whole subject as indicated by the original resolution and by the various amendments that have been presented by the respective delegations.

Land reform is a matter in which the United States of America has long been interested as has been demonstrated by the programs that it has initiated within our own boundaries.

In one of the opening speeches of the General Assembly, our Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, made this statement, which I should like to quote: "As an example of the kind of need to which we must put our efforts, I would like to speak of the problem of the use and ownership of land, a source of misery and suffering to millions. In many parts of the world, especially in Asia, nations have been seeking to achieve a better distribution of land ownership. Leaders in India and Pakistan, for example, are keenly aware of this problem and are taking steps to deal with it effectively. In Japan, as the result of land reform programs, 3,000,000 farmers—well over half of all the farmers in Japan—have acquired land. In the Republic of Korea, where previously there had been twice as many tenants as owners of land, a redistribution of farmlands had, by the time of the invasion, changed this ratio so that those who owned land outnumbered those who held their land in tenancy. Plans scheduled for this summer would have made farm owners of 90 percent of the farm families."

Still later, President Truman in his speech at San Francisco called attention to this same problem and stated in his speech as follows: "We know that the peoples have problems of social injustice to solve. They want their farmers to own their lands and enjoy the fruits of their toil. That is one of great national principles. We believe in the family-sized farm. That is the basis of our agriculture and has strongly influenced our form of government."

More recently, a member of our delegation, speaking before Committee 4 of this General Assembly regarding land problems in trust territories called attention to this same problem and emphasized our desire to see an adequate program of land reform worked out. I should like to quote briefly from the statement made by the Honorable John Sherman Cooper, a member of our delegation, formerly a member of the United States Senate: "Control of soil erosion, proper methods of soil conservation, water control, improved seeds and tools, the the use of modern techniques to halt the depletion of soils, the establishment when feasible of forestry reserves, are practical and reasonably speedy measures to make the land fruitful in production and able to satisfy the needs of the inhabitants."

I make those quotations in order to show that this matter of land reform is not a matter of new thought with the Government of the United States and with the people of the United States.

I should like to make just one other quotation from the recently released recommendation made by Daniel W. Bell, with reference to the economy of the Philippines as set out in the New York Times of Sunday, October 29. I should like to quote just one paragraph from that report dealing with this land problem and the agricultural problem generally in the Philippines: "That agricultural production be improved by applying known methods of increasing the yield from all basic crops; that the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources be adequately supplied with funds and the Agricultural Extension Service be expanded; that the Agricultural College at Los Banos be rehabilitated and the central experiment station located there, with other stations at appropriate places throughout the country; that rural banks be established to provide production credit for small farmers; that the opening of new lands for settlement and homesteads be expedited and the clearance of land titles promptly assured; that a program of land redistribution be undertaken through the purchase of large estates for resale to small farmers and that measures be undertaken to provide tenants with reasonable security on their land and an equitable share of the crops they produce."

Mr. Chairman, when this resolution was first presented to this committee, the United States delegation proposed certain recommendations, certain amendments. Those amendments are included in the draft proposal that is before us. I should like to call your attention to them individually.

First, we ask that a study be made in cooperation with the Food and Agriculture Organization. We ask that the report not be required for the thirteenth session of the council, but that it be made at the fourteenth session instead. We simply feel that there is not adequate time for a worthwhile study and report to be made by the time the thirtenth session will be held, but that an adequate study could be made and a very worth while report be given by the time of the fourteenth session.

Then we propose some amendments to the substance of the resolution by adding in subparagraph (b) the words "and to promote rural cooperatives for the benefit of the small farmers."

In subparagraph (c) to add the words "and the development of small-scale indigenous enterprises for the processing of agricultural products."

In subparagraph (e) by adding at the beginning of it "the promotion of family owned and operated farms and of * * *."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few remarks about each of those amendments going to the substance of this proposal. And again, Mr. Chairman, I want to draw

rather heavily upon the experience that we have had in the United States of America relating to the very things that we are seeking to bring out in this proposal.

First, let me take up our proposal to promote rural cooperatives for the benefit of small farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I can speak with a degree of experience and self-interest on this matter because it happens that I myself am a farmer and have been all of my life, and I know something from first-hand experience of the problems of the farmer and of the small farmer. I am a small farmer.

I have been a Member of the United States Congress for the last 14 years, 10 years of that time having been spent in the House of Representatives and the last 4 years in the United States Senate. I have had a part in the enactment of much of the legislation that has brought about, or has initiated at least, those programs of land and agricultural reforms in the United States.

If I may be pardoned for another personal reference, I may say that the first speech that I ever had the privilege of making as a Member of the United States Congress was in favor of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Purchase Act, which set up for the first time a program in the United States making it possible for governmental help to farm tenants to become farm owners.

Mr. Chairman, may I interpolate here that something has been said in connection with the discussion of this resolution about the use of the term "peasant"? "Peasant" is a term that is not used in the United States. I suppose that the meaning which is generally accepted where the term "peasant" is used, might correspond in the United States to the term "farm tenant" or small individual farmer. They probably mean the same thing.

The purpose of this Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Purchase Act was to make it possible for more people to become owners of their own individual family-sized, family-operated, family-supporting farms.

Mr. Chairman, I think it will be of interest to this committee that bill passed the Congress of the United States by a rather narrow margin. Many people were doubtful as to the efficacy of such a program. Many people, many Members of Congress opposed it because of the littleness with which it was proposed to initiate the program.

Under the plan, as it came before us, it was proposed to appropriate $10,000,000 a year to be used in long-term, low-rate-of-interest loans to worthy farm tenants to purchase farms. There are 3,000 farm counties in the United States. Someone quickly pointed out that the sum of $10,000,000 would permit the purchase of only one farm per rural county and that there was little hope of getting anywhere on such a meager beginning and therefore it was not worth starting.

Mr. Chairman, I have often thought of that experience in connection with programs that are proposed before this committee. I know oftentimes we would prefer to go into a program on a much bigger scale than we feel able to start at the time, and so it was with the farm-tenant-purchase program in the United States. Many of us would have preferred to go into it on a much bigger scale, and some, as I say, opposed our going into it at all because we were going into it on such a small scale.

However, Mr. Chairman, that program proved itself by its own operation. The appropriations were increased until during certain years we would lend out as much as $50,000,000 a year for the purchase of farms.

I should like to call the attention of this committee to what has happened in the United States with reference to landownership during the nearly 14 years that that act has been in operation.

According to the 1935 census, 42 percent of the land operators of the United States were tenants. They did not own their own farms. They were tenants paying rent. They were sharecroppers or they were working for a part of the crop. In my own State of Alabama the percentage of tenants was much higher—64½ percent; in other words, only 1 out of 3 of the farm operators in my State of Alabama in 1935 actually owned the land that he tilled.

The distinguished delegate from Poland, a few days ago, in talking about this, made some reference to landownership and he referred to the States of Alabama and South Carolina. Because he mentioned South Carolina, I think you may be interested to know that the tenancy there in 1935 was 62.2 percent.

The last complete agricultural census that we had of the United States—the 1950 census not being ready—was in 1946. At that time the national percentage of farm tenancy had been reduced to 31.7 percent. In the State of Alabama it had been reduced to 49 percent. In the State of South Carolina it had been reduced to 54 percent. We believe and estimates have been made that during the last 5 years that have ensued there has been a still further reduction of some 5 percent, and that today the farm tenancy in the United States will be about 26 percent, Alabama about 44 percent, and South Carolina about 49 percent.

I do not claim that all of that reduction in farm tenancy has been brought about by reason of the Farm Tenant Purchase Act, which I described to you, but I do mean that it gave the impetus to the program that has made it possible for us to have that substantial reduction in farm tenancy and a similar increase in farm ownership in the United States during the past 14 years.

In the United States we believe strongly in farm ownership, individual farm ownership. We believe that the land that a man and his family works and on which they make a living ought to belong to him and to his family. It is that objective toward which we have been working during the last many years, and it is that same kind of a program or a similar program that we envisage may very well be encouraged by this General Assembly and by this committee, and might very well be undertaken in many parts of the world. That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, that we wholeheartedly support this kind of a program, and that is the reason we ask for the amendment that would particularly provide for helping small farmers, individual farmers, to own and operate the land out of which they and their family make a living.

Mr. Chairman, there are many facts and figures that I should like to give you in regard to this program and many other programs, but I will not transgress on the time of the committee.

However, I do want to mention the rural cooperatives for the benefit of small farmers. We have a rural cooperative program in the United States that has been in existence now for a good many years.

Before I go to that subject and away from the farm ownership I would like to bring in just one other item, because I think this may very well apply to some of the other countries of the world. The United States, of course, is of vast domain, and up until comparatively recent years a great part of it belonged to the public Government. Our Government started as early as 1862 a homesteading program whereby our people were encouraged to settle on the land that belonged to the public domain and for a nominal fee to be able to convert that land into a farm for their own ownership.

Now, Mr. Chairman, turning to the question of rural cooperatives, with Government assistance in their organizing there are today some 10,000 purchasing and marketing farm cooperatives with a membership of 6,384,000 members. Some of these, of course, represent duplications, because we actually do not have that many farmer owners or farmers in the United States. Some of them belong to several different cooperatives. We have 1,850 farmer-mutual fire-insurance groups with 3,500,000 members and $18,000,000,000 in insurance policies. Twenty different cooperative groups have founded hospitals for their membership.

We have a large number of cooperative telephone organizations. And just during this past Congress the United States Government provided an assistance program for all rural cooperatives that would organize for the purpose of installing and operating their own telephone systems.

Back some 15 years ago, the United States Government, through its Congress, wrote into law a provision to lend assistance to farmers who would organize themselves into cooperative groups for the purpose of extending the benefits of electric power to their communities. That has been one of the most successful programs that we have had. And it never would have been started, Mr. Chairman, certainly not on any such scale as it has been carried forward, had it not been for this kind of a program being underwritten by the Government itself. Today, 86 percent of all of the farms in the United States are electrified. It started out, Mr. Chairman, usually with a line being run into a community, individual homes tying into the line and giving electric lights to their homes. Then there came the electric range and the electric refrigerator, electric washing machine. Lights went into the barns and into the outbuildings of the farmers and then there came various farm machinery.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, the statement has often been made that through encouraging an agricultural program an industrial program is stymied or certainly is discouraged. I think the very figures that I have cited with reference to the progress of the rural electric cooperative program in the United States belies that statement, because when the farmer gets electric power into his farm, he buys this equipment. He buys the radio. He buys the electric iron. He buys the electric range. He buys the electric refrigerator and the washing machine. He buys the various farm machinery that he uses about his barn and throughout his farm. It has proven one of the greatest stimuli that there could possibly be for further industrial development in this country.

These are programs that go hand in hand. We in the United States have seen the truth of that statement and when we lay the emphasis that we do upon the development of agricultural programs and upon the development of assistance to farm cooperatives such as this, we recognize that it is not something to displace industrial development but it is something to add to and to encourage industrial development.

Mr. Chairman, in my own State of Alabama, when the rural cooperative program was started, some 5 percent of the farms were electrified. Today that figure is 85 percent. In the United States as a whole only about 10 percent of the farms were electrified. Today that figure is more than 86 percent. And with the blessings that have come to the farm family in extending electrification to their homes, there has also come one of the greatest boons to industry in the production of the various machinery and equipment and attachments that electrification has called for.

Mr. Chairman, we have sponsored many other cooperatives in the United States, cooperatives to enable farmers to do their own marketing, cooperatives that would enable farmers to produce their own crops—farmers that perhaps were not able through no fault of their own to finance the operation of their crops—through a bank, or through some merchant, or through some other lending agency.

Mr. Chairman, I grew up on a farm. I have seen these changes take place in the United States. My father was not a farm owner. He was a farm tenant and I grew up as a farm tenant. I later became a farm owner, a small farm owner. I can well recall the days when farmers in order to be able to get advances with which to make their crops would have to pay an enormous rate of interest—10, 12, 15 percent. They had to take all of the hazards of agriculture without any assurance that when the harvest season came around there would be an adequate price for what they produced.

Our Government over the last several years—well, within my memory—has taken steps to give to the farmers of this country assurance, protection, support, the means to help themselves through the organization of these various cooperatives. The Government subscribed originally to all of the stock in these cooperatives but provided for a gradual retirement of that stock and in many sections of the country today and in many of the various cooperatives that have been organized, all of that stock has been retired so that the farmers themselves now own their cooperatives outright.

The program has worked here. We believe that it can be made to work elsewhere.

We have also proposed an amendment for the development of small indigenous enterprises for the processing of agricultural products. I do not know what the conditions may be in other countries, but I do know that in the United States of America one of the greatest difficulties that a farmer used to run up against, and to a great extent even today it is a problem, was the processing of products, making them ready for market, making it possible to hold them until a market is ready to receive the products. Left to his own resources, he was helpless. The banking structure of our country was not set up in such a way as to provide adequately for him. The Government, through its various programs, through the cooperatives, and through loans and through methods of financing has given every encouragement to the development of these small farm factories, if you may call them such, indigenous to that particular area, for use in helping the farmer to process his own agricultural products and to make them ready to market and to enable him to hold them until a suitable time came for marketing.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that this program can be made to work. We have seen it work here. I would not leave the impression for anything that we have reached a point of perfection in this country. That is not so—far from it. We still have a long way to go. But we have been pleased with the start that has been made. We have been pleased with the progress that has been made and we believe that the sooner a similar start is made by the UN working in concert, the greater, the faster will be the economic development of many parts of the world from which all of us will profit.

I should like to say just a word about the various amendments—not in criticism of any of them. As I said in the beginning, our delegation is pleased that so great an interest has been manifested as is shown by the introduction of these various amendments. It may very well be that there is good in all of them. It may very well be that a better resolution could be obtained by trying to work out a combination of all of them.

It is not my purpose to propose it now, but I should like to offer the suggestion for the consideration of the committee as we proceed in this debate that at the proper time all of the proposals be referred to a drafting committee for the purpose of working out the very best resolution that we could possibly work out here for doing the job that we all want done.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Sesquicentennial of the Establishment of the Territorial Government of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, December 5 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Mr. Elmer Davis on the occasion of the opening of the Library of Congress exhibition commemorating the sesquicentennial of the establishment of the territorial government of Indiana, on November 30, 1950, in the Coolidge auditorium in the Library of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have no doubt that some of you feel that there was something a little inappropriate in the selection of a speaker for this evening who left Indiana 40 years ago, and has had only infrequent and casual contacts with the State since then; and also one who did not come from the region which has become generally known as the classical and typical Indiana, the up-State flat lands. I came from the river counties, which for many years past have been incorporated in the life and culture of the State—thanks to the automobile; but which had not been so incorporated in my day, when the automobile was still a rich man's toy, and there were no roads for it to run on anyway.

In those days the river counties were something separate and peculiar; they had little contact with the classic Hoosier culture upState, they belonged rather to the river culture, which from Pittsburgh and St. Paul down to New Orleans was pretty much all one piece, a culture which even in the days of the railroad was long dominated by the steamboat. The flavor of life in the river counties in those days was much more the flavor of Kentucky than of Indiana; and in my corner of the State we were still further denationalized; we were part of the tri-State metropolitan complex of Cincinnati; and to everybody but the politicians Cincinnati, not Indianapolis, was the center of interest.

Yet when you survey the history of Indiana, as State and as Territory, for the past century and a half, it is clear that the river counties were an essential and typical part of it, however they differed from what later became the stereotype. We were after all the first of Indiana, since the first settlers either came across the river from Kentucky or down the river from Pennsylvania; we were building stately homes and reading the classics when up-State Indiana still consisted mostly of swamps, inhabited chiefly by water moccasins and malarial mosquitos. That up-State life—at least as far up-State as Decatur County—was later depicted by a river-county novelist, Edward Eggleston, in a book which was never popular among his fellow citizens. And for some reason; for while the Hoosier Schoolmaster was true as of the time he remembered, it was no longer true as of the time the book was published. By that time upState had caught up with the river counties; and was presently to go far beyond them, in wealth, self-advertisement, and self-satisfaction.

Yet in those earliest days the river counties had established some traditions to which the whole State has been loyal. In politics, for instance. The Congressman from my district, in Andrew Jackson's day, was Amos Lane—a violent anti-Jacksonian; and it has been reported by those who heard him that when he was denouncing his enemies on the stump, the gritting and grinding of his teeth could be heard 50 yards away. I doubt if that record has been improved on by any of our present congressional delegation. The river counties set the Hoosier literary tradition; and it goes back beyond Edgar Eggleston or even Julia Dumont. My home town, Aurora, was founded by the first Indiana novelist, Jesse Lynch Holman. It is true that his novel, The Errors of Education, was not the first Indiana novel; he wrote it while he was still living in Lexington or Frankfort, Ky., before he came across the river. But Aurora, if it was not the place where The Errors of Education was written, has a more melancholy distinction; it was the place where the first Indiana novel was destroyed. In later life Judge Holman became convinced that his youthful work might have a deleterious effect on the morals of young people, so he tried to buy up the whole edition, and very nearly succeeded. It was probably not too difficult a task, since the book, like the stock of certain family corporations, seems to have been closely held. At any rate he seems to have got hold of all but two copies and according to tradition he burned them in the public square of Aurora—now Mary Stratton Park, named for his daughter. It was the first and so far the only book-burning in Indiana; I hope it will be the last.

Well, up-State eventually passed the river counties; yet we went on leading our own lives until the automobile finally reunited the State. What that life was like down on the river, 50 years ago, has lately been set down in a novel called Ring In the New, by Laura Buchanan Harris, who came from Rising Sun; it is river-bank stuff but a great deal of it is thoroughly recognizable as a picture of small-town life anywhere in Indiana, or indeed in the Middle West, at the turn of the century. It is incidentally about the best picture that has ever been done of life in the river counties; since our ablest novelist, David Graham Phillips, while he was an accurate and perspicacious reporter of Fifth Avenue and Wall Street, fell down badly in his one attempt to give a picture of life in Madison and at DePauw. So much for the river counties up till the time I left; but since then, with good roads and the cars that ride on them making the State all one piece, we have been incorporated into the general picture that Indiana presents to the world.

That is a remarkable picture—such a clear and familiar picture as perhaps no other State in the Union has ever presented. The picture written down in some of Tarkington's novels, some of Nicholson's essays, some of McCutcheon's cartoons, some of Ade's fables; and above all in practically all of Riley's poems—that is Indiana as it has shown itself to the world. It is an attractive picture; what is more, it is a coherent and credible picture. It was substantially true, for its time and place; but it dealt with only a part of Indiana—though the larger and wealthier part, the up-State flatlands; and more important, it covers hardly more than a quarter of the commonwealth's existence as State and territory—roughly, the 40 years following the Civil War. A picture of an essentially rural culture, though punctuated by and focused on the county seats; a world of stovepipe hats and base-burner stoves, where people got around by horse and buggy and by spring wagon, unless they had to go so far that they took the accommodation train. A centripetal, introspective culture; pretty well satisfied with itself, but with better reason for self-satisfaction than most, a world with no aspiration to the loftier heights—except in such very irregular products as Theodore Dreiser and Eugene Debs,

both of them men whose reach exceeded their grasp; but which also, in those days, managed to avoid the depths as well. A culture which was satisfied to turn out, as perhaps its most typical product put it, more first-rate second-rate men than any other State in the country.

But that was only a part of Indiana, in place and time; and the great merit of this exhibition which is opened here tonight is to remind us of the immense variety that has actually existed, over a century and a half, in a State whose stereotype is so familiar. You see here more of old Vincennes, and of the earlier French explorations, than Maurice Thompson ever told you. You see more of the early Utopian pioneers at New Harmony—men whom every Hoosier is taught to reverence but whom no present-day Hoosier would ever dream of imitating. Father Rapp's utopia was celibate; and the taste for celibacy had disappeared from Indiana long before Dr. Kinsey's day. Robert Dale Owen is a hero because he has been dead a long time; if he lived in Indiana today he would probably be ridden out of town on a rail as a Communist agitator. Yet you see here records of those men and of many others, men of the river counties and of the lake counties as well as of the great interior; and you realize that in a State whose typical picture is so familiar, and so attractive, there were nevertheless at sundry times and in divers places many other things that were also Indiana.

That stereotyped picture drawn from Riley's poems and the Gentleman from Indiana and McCutcheon's Indian-summer cartoon—that picture was already beginning to be out of date in my day; and you can perhaps date its decline and fall by one of the best things George Ade ever wrote—I Knew Him When. Many of you perhaps know it; originally a speech at the dinner of the Indiana Society of Chicago in 1910, it was later republished as a booklet. What makes it a classic is that it is the complete history of every small-town boy, in any age, who made good in the big city; but over and beyond that you can read in it that Indiana was already changing. The brief age of the interurbans marked the beginning of the change; Indiana was ceasing to the rural, it was becoming industrialized. Not only Indianapolis—which my father could remember as a clean white city, heated by the gas from Muncie, but which is clean and white no longer—but even the county seats, most of them, have become industrial towns with industrial problems, to which the old Hoosier credo offered no answer. I pass over the brief reign of the Klan, though I should like to believe that the spirit that made the Klan possible is as dead as the paraphernalia of hoods and sheets; but other problems came up with the new age and Indiana, like the rest of the country, is still trying to find the answer.

What that change has meant—one of the things it has meant—I saw dramatized on election night of 1938, when I dropped in on some of my friends at the Democratic State headquarters. The fall of 1938, to anybody who lived in the East, was chiefly memorable for two events—the Connecticut hurricane, which my family and I had survived by the skin of our teeth; and the Munich crisis, which the world survived by the skin of its teeth, but with a pretty clear indication that it would not survive the next one. But Indiana in November was pretty much concentrated on one thing—would or would not Fred Van Nuys be reelected to the Senate. At Democratic headquarters that night they thought he was safely in, till strange and incredible news came from Lake County; instead of the 18,000 majority that had been expected out of the steel mills and oil refineries they had got only 6,000. Nobody could figure that one out, that night; not till some days later did they find the answer. The Democratic leaders in Lake County were all Poles; but a large percentage of the voters were Czechs; and they had voted Republican in Indiana because they disapproved of the attitude of the Polish Government in the Munich crisis. That was the sort of thing Tom Taggart never had to worry about.

Yet even that night, there was proof that Indiana had not entirely changed. Men were going around Democratic headquarters with downcast eyes and darkened facts, till all at once everybody brightened up. Word had come that the returns from Vigo County would be delayed. They were delayed for 2 or 3 days; and when they came in, by happy coincidence, they were just enough to put Fred Van Nuys over. So I went away feeling that even in this world which had so vastly changed, and not for the better, Indiana in some ways was still itself.

Indeed there had been proof of that 18 months before—in the spring of 1937, when the great wave of strikes—organizing strikes, steel strikes in particular—spread through the Middle West. There was bitterness and violence on both sides; plants were occupied by sit-down strikers; other strikers were shot down—retail shootings in Ohio and Michigan, wholesale shootings in Chicago. There were steel strikes in Indiana too; and Cliff Townsend who was then Governor settled them peaceably within 3 days—without violence, without bloodshed; and unfortunately without national publicity. The metropolitan newspapers in those days were not interested in the peaceful settlement of industrial disputes; all they cared about was brickbats and blood. But it was a demonstration that even in the new industrial age, the Hoosier temperament was disinclined to go to extremes.

Whether that temperament is a virtue or a fault has been much debated—the cult of the first-rate second-rate man, the avoidance of extremes, whether of virtue and wisdom or of vice and folly. The argument has perhaps little point any more since it has come loose at one end; Indiana may still produce no saints and heroes, but the recent return to the news of Mr. D. C. Stephenson is a reminder that we no longer avoid the other extreme. Yet we did produce one man—the late Wendell Willkie—who was not afraid to go out on a limb for the things he believed in; who was not afraid even of that thing which Hoosiers of his generation and mine, and of the generation before us, were taught to fear above everything else; he was not afraid of being laughed at. He was a prophet not without honor, save in his own country; but it is still to be seen whether he will have a successor. Hoosiers no longer laugh as much as they used to; and they seldom laugh at the right people.

The old tight, introspective, satisfied Hoosier culture, which never aspired to the heights but never descended to the depths—which cultivated, about as well as any society has ever cultivated it, the doctrine of moderation in all things, of the golden mean—that is gone. It had no answer to the problems of a new age—an age in which not only Indianapolis and Fort Wayne, but Newcastle and Clinton, are industrial cities; in which at one time almost the largest city south of Indianapolis was Camp Atterbury, with half its population consisting of soldiers from other States, and the other half of Italian prisoners of war. An age in which Madison could be selected as the subject of a motion picture to be shown all over the world, illustrating not the homogeneity of middle western culture, but the harmony in which a population could live though its ancestors were of many nationalities. Not Gary, not South Bend; but Madison. For better or worse, the world had broken into Indiana; and Indiana had broken out into the world. An age in which I saw the Paris Opera House, which I had known well in other circumstances and in earlier years, filled with American soldiers, listening to other American soldiers performing the works of Hoagy Carmichael from Bloomington and Cole Porter from Peru.

The Indiana of tradition could handle the simpler problems of its day; but the problems of this new age take more thinking. We older people, who grew up in the harmonious, satisfied, and satisfying Hoosier tradition of the past—I grew up in it, too, when I went to college up-State—we who must now do the best we can with the vast and amorphous problems of a new age—we were perhaps better prepared for that ordeal than we knew. Some of you are old enough to have been raised, as I was, on the Cook and Cropsey arithmetic; which we used to regard as about the most exasperating textbook ever compiled. Its problems were of a tricky complexity never met with in the real life of those days; though I suppose income-tax consultants and Treasury accountants would find nothing unusual in them now. At any rate, it was some consolation to the pupil who struggled with them to know that the answers were written down in the back of the book; and over 50 years I can still remember the cold horror that came over me, the feeling that I had been cheated, betrayed, sold down the river, when I discovered that many of those answers were wrong.

But time brings reappraisals; as the years passed I gradually recognized that this was actually perhaps the most valuable textbook that I ever studied; that Mr. Cook and Miss Cropsey had been educating us, far more profoundly than we could have realized at the time. For what they were teaching us was that there are no answers in the back of the book—no trustworthy answers, anyway; that a man who tells you he knows the answer may be right, by lucky guess—or may be horribly and catastrophically wrong, either by mischance or by intention; that you have got to work out the problem and get the answer by yourself. You may get the wrong one, but it is your business to check it—to prove it, as we used to say, by working the problem backwards; you may find the answer beyond you for the moment but you have got to reach the best approximation that you can. In that search, and in the skepticism about any offer of a guaranteed short cut to the answer—in that is the beginning of wisdom.

Federal Judgeships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 5 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking editorial entitled "Federal Judgeships," from the Newark Evening News of yesterday. This editorial has great bearing upon pending and future judicial appointments and comes to us as sound advice and counsel.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS

On senior Judge Fake's retirement soon, President Truman will have the filling of another vacancy on the Federal district court bench in New Jersey in addition to

the one to which he has just nominated United States District Attorney Modarelli. The latter's confirmation would, with Judge Fake's retirement, leave the New Jersey Federal bench composed of four Democrats and one Republican.

Taking his previous district-court appointments as a criterion, the chances are that President Truman will name a Democrat to the sixth judgeship. But on the plea for a more bipartisan judiciary, Republican leaders in the State will seek to have a Republican named, with their choice centered on County Judge Hartshorne, who has a long and honorable record as a member of the New Jersey judiciary.

It is noteworthy that in the last 17 years only 8 or 10 out of 200 Federal judges appointed are Republicans. Recently President Gallagher of the American Bar Association charged that a virtual spoils system controls these appointments. Yet the regrettable development is not peculiar to the Roosevelt-Truman administrations. Republican Presidents back to the days of Benjamin Harrison have been as partisan as Democratic Presidents in naming Federal judges.

The likelihood, therefore, of Judge Hartshorne or any Republican being named is remote, regardless of qualifications, unless Republicans in the next Congress, with their stronger bargaining position, are able to force the administration to modify its position. In any event, the argument for a better political balance in the Federal judiciary is sound in principle and never more important than in these times as the Federal courts are called upon to adjudicate complex social and economic problems arising from the extension of Federal powers.

Get Out of Korea or Fight China—These Are the Two Bitter Alternatives America Must Face in the Next Few Days With the Rest of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., November 30, 1950, entitled "Get Out of Korea or Fight China," which I think will be worth the time of all the membership of this body to read, inasmuch as the issue is clearly stated. The above-mentioned article follows:

Let's take a good, hard look at our position in Korea. We suddenly find ourselves face to face with a fateful decision. It is worth while to ask what course the Soviets would prefer to have us take at this turning point, and the answer is quite obvious. The Soviets would like to see us launch an all-out war against Communist China.

Nothing would fit so well into the Russian pattern of world conquest. They know we could send bombers over Chinese cities and destroy hundreds of thousands of lives. They know we would probably be forced to use the atom bomb. They know as well that we would have to tie up our major resources in the Far East for an indefinite period to fight a war against a people who have been our traditional friends, and against the greatest mass of manpower in the world. They know it would be almost impossible to attain decisive victory against such a foe. In striving for it we would be bound to alienate the other teeming millions of Asiatics. Best of all from the Kremlin point of view, we would leave western Europe open to a Soviet sweep to the Atlantic.

How can we avoid delighting the Kremlin by fighting China? Certainly we cannot let Chinese Communists continue to slaughter our troops in Korea, mounting their fierce offensive from what General MacArthur calls the "privileged sanctuary" of Manchuria. If this fight goes on, we will have to attack the sanctuary. That can only lead to an all-out conflict with China, while Stalin laughs up his sleeve.

How can we escape from this terrible dilemma? The only chance seems to lie, as MacArthur has indicated, in a political settlement quickly negotiated at Lake Success. We must look carefuly to see what such a solution would require. The Chinese Red delegates have indicated, in an insulting and unreasonable fashion as possible, the terms on which they would be willing to settle. They are following: admission of Communist China to the UN; withdrawal of "American Forces" from Formosa, and our Seventh Fleet from the neighboring waters; and withdrawal of all American and other foreign troops from Korea.

Here is where we Americans need to take a tight grip on our blood pressure. We are not used to being blackmailed or pushed around or presented with an ultimatum. Our impulse is to spit in the eye of the fellow who tries these tactics. The point we must remember, however, is that if we let ourselves go and indulge in the luxury of a fight with the Communist stooges from Peiping, we leave the real Communist enemies from Moscow free to cut the world out from under us.

So let's take as calm a look as possible at the Chinese terms. This newspaper has already advocated the eventual recognition of Red China and its admission to the UN, though not under the ugly pressure of today.

The Red government, much as we dislike it, apparently represents the will of the great majority of China's population. As to Formosa, our UN representatives have already stated that we have no forces there except for 44 military attachés at our Embassy, President Truman declared months ago that the Seventh Fleet would be withdrawn as soon as the Korean conflict was settled. This brings the issue squarely back to Korea.

It is unthinkable for us to pull out of Korea and abandon the other UN forces there. We would have to act according to a program adopted by the UN, providing for evacuation of all UN troops, presumably including the South Korean Army. Korea would be left to the mercy of the Communists. Our effort there would have to be written off as a sacrifice play, like the British landing in Greece during World War II, which was doomed to military failure, but which competent authorities agree was a necessary evil.

The thought of getting out of Korea is terribly bitter medicine to Americans. But look at the alternatives. If we stay on and fight the sort of "limited" war now in progress, allowing the Chinese Communists to slug us with impunity from behind the Manchurian border, we are in the gravest danger of being driven into the sea. General MacArthur, recently so optimistic, has virtually admitted that probability. If we strike back against the Chinese in Manchuria, we are involved in a full war with China, the perfect situation for Stalin. If we move out of Korea, we risk a serious loss of prestige in the Orient and over the world, something America has never had to accept.

These are the bitter alternatives. The last is made a little more acceptable by the fact that we may operate as part of a force which the UN decides to remove from Korea, for the plain purpose of avoiding a much larger and more deadly war. Perhaps our diplomats at Lake Success can win some better terms for a Korean compromise. But we had better prepare ourselves for a settlement that may hurt American pride worse than anything since the burning of the Capitol in 1814. We cannot conduct our foreign affairs in a moment of such danger on considerations of national pride. National safety, national survival are the only issues worth considering.

Those considerations call for an immediate all-out effort to prepare for war. If we pocket our pride in Asia, it should only be for the purpose of throwing all the strength we can muster into western Europe. If we must fight, we had better fight the real enemy on his home grounds in Russia, not a straw man in the endless wastes of China. We may still avoid the really hot war, if we move with enough swiftness and determination. America has no lack of fighting hearts. We must have cool heads to chart the hardest course in our history.

Shipment of War Materials to Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted by the Rotary Club of Atlanta, Ill., on November 29, whereby the members express their resentment over the shipments of materials to Red China. They ask that this be immediately stopped, and they also ask that those who have been responsible for permitting such shipments to be made be publicly called to accountability.

It is my information that the Rotary Club of Lincoln, Ill., unanimously adopted an identical resolution, as has the Kiwanis Club of Lincoln, Ill.

I am inserting this resolution in the RECORD as it demonstrates the extent to which the American people are justly aroused over this situation. They are alarmed and shocked. They have every reason to be. I share their feeling of resentment, and I personally intend to do everything within my power as an individual Member of Congress to correct this appalling practice of allowing those who are killing our boys to have materials from us.

It is a sad commentary on our national leadership to have allowed, over the past 2 years or more, materials from the United States to help build up the Communist China war machine. During these last 2 years many Members of Congress, including myself, have called attention to the fact that Communist China constituted an enemy to our way of life and a military threat to our security. Many of us urged, time and again, that these shipments of materials to Communist China be stopped. But little or nothing has been done about it.

I wish the record to show that I join with the people of my district in expressing our resentment over these shipments

and in insisting that this be stopped, not next month, or next week, but immediately. The resolution follows:

Whereas press reports and radio announcers have publicized the fact that war materials have been shipped from United States ports to Red China in recent weeks and after it became apparent that Red China's troops were assisting North Koreans in fighting against our American troops; and

Whereas boys from our neighborhood are now fighting with the South Korean Army and the United States Government is drafting more boys from our neighborhood and county to become part of the Nation's army and possibly to be victims of the war weapons or ammunition to be made from the war materials being shipped from the United States to Red China or other Russian-dominated countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Atlanta Rotary Club, located at Atlanta, Ill., That we resent the fact that the Government permits such shipments to be made; that we resent that the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States have not yet publicly called to accountability those responsible for permitting such shipments to be made; that we feel that the lives and welfare of our sturdy American boys are of far more value than the profits any merchant may make upon such shipments of war materials, and we feel that the President and Congress should act without delay better to protect our American boys; and that a copy of this resolution shall be sent immediately by the secretary of this organization to our President and to each Senator from this State and to our Congressman and to our Senator-elect.

Passed and unanimously adopted, November 29, 1950.

Dean A. Hoblot, President; J. M. Douch, Secretary; Dr. W. M. Spaits; Richard B. Brown, Jr.; Ray E. Thompson; Howard E. Hienonymous; J. Harold Roger; Barrett F. Rogers; Arthur Applegate; Paul M. Ball; Murrel Miller; A. E. Adams; Paul A. Schmidt; Darrell W. Rankin; D. J. Webber; H. D. Gilbert; William H. Turner; Rev. E. F. Barber; George B. Stubblefield; R. Lynn Ijanos; Arthur L. Starkey; Ben H. Stubblefield; Gordon D. Quiram; J. M. Dowdy; Roy Colaw; Neil Rice; Mervin Loy.

Our Questionable Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith three editorials which appeared in the Press and Standard, one of the distinguished weekly newspapers of this Nation, printed in Walterboro, S. C.

I consider the contents of these editorials to be the most accurate reflections of what the man on the street is thinking today. I believe that the American people are far ahead of the Administration on our present, questionable foreign policy. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the time will come when this country will awaken to the need of a reappraisal of our present, unprofitable program in our dealings with our so-called friends. Events of this very day demonstrate beyond the peradventure of a doubt that neither the so-called United Nations nor the prospective beneficiaries of the arms-aid program are willing to lend us effective assistance in Korea. Today America is bearing her cross practically alone despite the astronomically staggering contributions we have made to world peace in human misery and American dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the enclosed editorials are true, they are timely, and they reflect the thinking of a majority of our patriotic Americans. The above-mentioned editorials follow:

WILL THE UN LIVE UP TO ITS RESPONSIBILITY?

If the United Nations, a body whose concept is based on the belief that civilized mankind had reached the stage of development where he saw the wisdom of settling his differences by reason rather than by brute strength, does not within the next 48 hours take immediate steps to require the withdrawal of Chinese Communist forces from North Korea, then that body will go the way of the old League of Nations.

This is the test.

We feel that our country has been foolish in the way in which it has poured money into other European nations in the belief that that would buy friendship, would secure for us the cooperation and freely given military aid which we might need in any trouble.

We say that our present trouble in Korea can be traced back to pre-World War II days when England refused to aid us in our efforts to drive from Manchuria the Japanese when they first invaded this country.

England's recent recognition of the Chinese communistic government has also aided in giving this Nation the added feeling that she could do as she pleased in Korea.

American soldiers are dying in Korea while Nero fiddles and Rome burns.

Our people have lost confidence in their President, in the present Secretary of State; it has been through their lack of grasp of world conditions; of their inability to bargain, rather than give outright—money, goods—from this country to others, that we find ourselves carrying the major portion of the war in Korea, a war which is foolishly believed by many to be a United Nations conflict.

Where are the fighting troops of other nations (members of the UN) in this war? Why are we forced to carry the major part of the fighting?

Why didn't the UN already have completed a policy of what could, and would, be sanctioned if matters turned out as they have?

Why should these questions have to be decided after things happen?

TAKE CARE OF OUR OWN FIRST

We urge that our Government do at least two things. One is to reduce drastically the free flow of money being spent on countries of Europe.

The other is to take this money and spend it in our country to make us as strong as possible to defend our shores from attack, and to mount an attack anywhere at any time, if necessary.

Our school teachers are underpaid; our school buildings to take care of our students is causing many not to have the opportunity of equal education. Let's spend our people's money here. Not in foreign lands.

Why recognize Spain, or lend money to this government which is a dictatorship, and in which freedom of religion does not exist? Why lend money and send food to Yugoslavia?

Can't our political leaders see that we are wasting our strength? That we are depleting our resources? That our present policy is lacking in common sense?

Why isn't the proven fact taken under consideration that other nations are using us, and will not aid us unless it will be to their advantage to do so?

YOU CAN'T BUY IT

When will our Government learn the hard, but true fact, that we can't buy friendship? That we can't force our democratic form of government on any other nation? We at one time were very noble. We aided Japan. She used much we sent her to fight us. We aided Russia in World War II to fight Germany by lend-lease.

She is now at odds with us, instigating the Chinese Communists to fight us; we sent aid to China, her Government is now fighting us; we aided Germany after World War I, rebuilt her, loaned her money, the same for Italy, they fought us.

When will we learn to keep our powder dry, and place our trust in God, not in bought friendship?

Why must we have a mania for "do-good-ing" over the world?

The FBI and a Critic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Moley, from Newsweek of December 4, 1950. It follows:

THE FBI AND A CRITIC

(By Raymond Moley)

I begin this piece on a personal note for no purpose of self-praise but because it will help to make a point which involves a grave matter of national security. Seventeen years ago when I left active Government service, President Roosevelt asked me to make for him a study of Federal laws and their administration relating to racketeering and kidnapping. He placed this responsibility upon me because prior to 1932 I had devoted 12 years to the observation and study of the administration of the criminal law in various States, including New York, while he and his predecessor, Alfred E. Smith, were in the office of governor. Those studies are recorded in three of my books and in 20 or more extensive surveys and reports.

In pursuing the investigation directed by the President, I not only acquainted myself intimately with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but at the request of Hatton Sumners, then the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, sorted out from a batch of bills, prepared by the Department of Justice and dealing with Federal criminal-law administration, the ones which seemed appropriate for action by Congress. In making these selections, Mr. Sumners and I were keenly actuated not only by a desire to prevent any unsafe encroachment of Federal police powers upon the rights and responsibilities of the States and local governments but upon the rights of individuals under the law.

Mr. Max Lowenthal, on the flyleaf of his currently controversial book on the FBI, has overgenerously offered me a certain distinction, by saying that I was the first of the Americans to look deeply into the problems

of police and criminal-law administration. This is a great overstatement, for I was neither the first, nor the best, nor the last. However, in the light of this friendly gesture, I find it embarrassing to record reluctantly that I regret the general tone and inadequacies of Mr. Lowenthal's book. It is an indictment rather than a survey, a lawyer's brief rather than a judicious summing up of the history, services, and value of the FBI.

With respect to the current controversy concerning Mr. Lowenthal himself, his motives in writing this book, his past associations, and his influence with President Truman, I am not here concerned. Nor am I concerned with doing a detailed review of the book. That is adequately done elsewhere in this magazine (see p. 84).

What is really important is the status of the FBI itself, the confidence of the public in its efficiency and integrity, and the importance that anyone who can speak with some authority, as I can, should say, as I do, that it is by all odds the most competent police and investigative agency that this country has ever seen.

To blame, even by implication, J. Edgar Hoover or the present Bureau for the Palmer excesses of 1920 is no more fair than it would be to accuse President Truman of the sins of Tom Pendergast. In the one case Mr. Hoover was a clerk in the FBI, Mr. Truman a minor machine member.

What is important is that during and after the recent war, despite vastly greater internal dangers and responsibilities, there has been no repetition of the Palmer activities. Also important is the fact that for 26 years Mr. Hoover has served under and had the support of a long series of Attorneys General, some of whom had as great a passion for justice and fairness as has Mr. Lowenthal. Also greatly important are unmentioned achievements such as the virtual elimination of kidnaping, the suppression of espionage and sabotage in the war, the successful prosecution of the 11 Communists, Coplon, and Hiss.

When Roosevelt became President there were powerful political forces which were determined to oust Mr. Hoover and put in his place a chief more amenable to political influences. I happened to be in the middle of that fight, and I heard all of the criticisms, most of which, incidentally, are repeated by Mr. Lowenthal. The President and Attorney General Cummings decided for Mr. Hoover, and for that decision every American should be thankful.

Excess-Profits-Tax Bill of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, when Congress recessed in October, Republican leaders in the House took the position that an excess-profits-tax bill should be adopted before final adjournment of the Eighty-first Congress. I hold to that view and believe that it is the duty of the Congress to adopt such legislation at this time.

Some action must be taken to halt inflation, some action must be taken to bring in additional revenue, and certainly action must be taken to remove excess profits from the war effort.

Our boys are fighting a terrible war in Korea. We must back them with our moral and our financial might to insure that the final victory will be ours.

One step in this direction is the enactment of an excess-profits tax. But I maintain that the bill before the House today is not the bill to do the job.

The administration forces have rammed through a bill which is unsound, discriminatory, and in fact one that will increase inflation. The majority of the witnesses who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, in the brief time they were allowed to testify, were highly critical of this excess-profits bill, and most of them held that it was a confiscatory measure.

The Secretary of the Treasury is cool toward this bill, and that is understandable, because it is indicated that the measure was drawn up by the CIO, and the President rammed it through in the face of opposition from his Treasury Secretary and his Internal Revenue Commissioner.

The administration's excess-profits bill is unfair and unjust because it does not allow sufficient or proper relief or protection for small and new corporations. Our experiences of the recent global war prove that the small and newborn companies are essential to full and all-out production. Furthermore, the administration's bill will retard and hold back the expansion of industry. It is another example of the Truman tax program and follows cut the President's gospel of advocating tax legislation which is not based on sound or equitable foundations.

The Republicans offer the House an excess-profits-tax bill based on common sense, fairness, and sound judgment which will siphon off excess profits resulting from stimulated war production which will not be inflationary and will be fair to all.

In addition to this, the Republican tax measure would raise hundreds of millions of dollars more than the administration's bill. It would gather in the definite war profits and would treat all production, big and small, on a more fair and equitable basis.

Congress must be vigilant to see that there are no undue profits developing from war production.

The Real Case Against Ilse Koch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a feature story by Victor Lasky, staff writer of the New York World-Telegram and Sun, which appeared in this newspaper on November 25, 1950. This article gives us the true case against Ilse Koch, whose proven depravities as the wife of the Nazi commandant of the notorious Buchenwald concentration camp shocked the world. The above-mentioned story follows:

TWO HUNDRED TO LINK ILSE KOCH, TATTOO COLLECTOR, TO MURDER AND LUST—RETRIAL OF SADISTIC WIFE OF BUCHENWALD CAMP BOSS WILL CITE TORTURES, KILLINGS

(By Victor Lasky)

Ilse Koch, whose proven depravities as the wife of the Nazi commandant of the notorious Buchenwald concentration camp shocked the world, goes on trial again Monday in a German court.

And the World-Telegram and Sun can disclose exclusively today the gist of what the German Government intends to prove against the once arrogant, now humble, woman whose case has become an international cause célèbre.

MURDER, LUST, LOOT

More than 200 witnesses will be called by the Bavarian prosecutor, Dr. Johann Ilkow, in an effort to prove conclusively that the notorious Ilse had dedicated her life to murder, lust, and loot.

More than 70 of these witnesses will be called to testify that she actually had ordered tattooed men killed and skinned. Evidence will be produced to show how she used the tattooed skin—as well as dried shrunken heads—to make lampshades and ash trays.

If Dr. Ilkow succeeds in proving that she had a sadistic penchant for geegaws made of human skin, he will have accomplished what United States war crimes prosecutors failed to do.

CLAY'S ROLE RECALLED

For Gen. Lucius D. Clay, then American military governor in Germany, commuted her life sentence to 4 years when he decided that the charges were not satisfactorily proved.

Frau Koch had insisted that none of the charges was true. She testified that she was a good SS wife whose sole interest was her home and children. She said she knew nothing of her husband's business.

General Clay disputed her version of her 7-year reign at Buchenwald. Making clear he had no sympathy whatsoever for that vile woman, he declared that the major charges against her were based on hearsay, not factual evidence.

NO CONVINCING EVIDENCE

"There was no convincing evidence," General Clay stated, "that she selected inmates for extermination in order to secure tattooed skin or that she possessed any articles made of human skin."

News of the commutation aroused Nationwide protests. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, terming it arbitrary and unwarranted, called for a full and complete investigation.

Dr. Robert S. Marcus, New York director of the World Jewish Congress, an organization which led the fight for a new trial, declared:

"Failure to implement the sentence will weaken the hands of our democratic friends and those who believe that a democratic Germany is essential for the preservation of world peace."

SENATE INVESTIGATION

"We must show the Germans that we are determined to punish those who are guilty of crimes against humanity, if we are ever to stop the rising tide of nationalism, militarism, and anti-Semitism now rampant in their country."

The Congress, representing Jewish organizations in 56 countries, finally succeeded in spurring a Senate investigation.

The Senate subcommittee headed by Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, described Frau Koch as a person of widespread infamy for whom 4 years was not just

punishment. The Ferguson group demanded a new trial.

FORMER PRISONERS TESTIFY

General Clay thereupon requested German authorities to determine whether the evidence called for a new trial. Dr. Ilkow conducted an 18-month investigation which took him to the United States where he obtained numerous depositions from former Buchenwald inmates.

On the basis of Dr. Ilkow's findings, Frau Koch was arrested by German police as soon as she was freed from an American military prison in October 1949. Last May, she was indicted on charges of having incited to murder on 45 occasions and of having attempted to incite 135 killings.

The question of double jeopardy is bound to come up in the early stages of the trial. Dr. Alfred Seidl, the defense counsel who has represented Rudolf Hess and other Nazi war criminals, will argue that no person may be tried twice for the same crime.

But Dr. Ilkow will argue that she is not being tried for the same crime. Under the new indictment Frau Koch has been accused of crimes against German nationals, he will state. She originally was charged with crimes against non-Germans.

"Crimes and offenses which Germans committed against Germans are no violation of the laws of war; they do not violate international law but the German penal law," Dr. Ilkow will claim.

If the court upholds Dr. Ilkow he will call numerous witnesses to establish anew Frau Koch's complete depravity.

Born in Dresden 44 years ago, Frau Koch met her husband, Karl Koch, in 1934, when he was an SS officer in that city. Their marriage, a Wagnerian spectacle, took place at night in the open. The light was provided by torches carried by SS officers. Her husband, a friend of Adolf Hitler, was given command of Buchenwald in 1937.

THE REAL COMMANDANT

Before long she established herself as the real commandant in the eyes of not only the terrified inmates but the SS guards, Dr. Ilkow will charge.

Her presence was feared by the guards, who knew she would report the slightest infraction to her husband.

"The SS guards, knowing she was the real commandant, eagerly complied with her every whim," Dr. Ilkow will state. "The slightest hint on her part was sufficient to make any SS officer commit any crime."

SEX-CRAZED WOMAN

Dr. Ilkow will picture Frau Koch as a "sex-crazed" woman who liked to strut around Buchenwald in riding clothes, snapping a whip and shouting obscenities constantly.

She would take particular delight in permitting inmates to gaze at her buxom sweatered figure and then having them whipped as the price for having looked.

In all, 201 witnesses will be called. They will include writers, professors, Catholic priests, Protestant ministers, German parliamentary and police officials, and others who had the misfortune of having made her acquaintance at Buchenwald.

INSTITUTE PROCEDURE

The highlight of the trial will come, however, when Dr. Ilkow begins presenting the tattoo-skin evidence. He will describe the operations of the pathological institute founded at Buchenwald in 1941.

"The names of all tattooed inmates were reported to the institute," Dr. Ilkow will say. "They then were photographed and examined by doctors.

"Those whose tattoos were found usable were murdered by injections. The bodies were then prepared for skinning. The skins were tanned and made transparent. There is no doubt on the basis of the evidence that the skins were used to make lampshades and other objects."

CHOOSY ABOUT DESIGNS

Frau Koch's participation in this macabre work will be detailed by witnesses, five of whom will testify that she visited the institute regularly to examine the photographs of tattooed inmates. Those whose designs she liked would disappear quickly.

"When it became known that Ilse Koch was interested in tattooed inmates, they were warned by the 'illegal' camp leaders to be fully clothed in their presence," Dr. Ilkow will state.

The former inmates will testify that one summer day Frau Koch, passing a laborers' unit, noticed two inmates with attractive tattoos on their chests. She asked them for their numbers, which she marked down in the big red book she always carried. The next day they disappeared.

SIMILAR INCIDENTS

Dozens of similar incidents will be cited, Dr. Ilkow will say.

Dr. Ilkow will charge that the murders were carried out by Dr. Waldeman Hoven who "did everything Ilse Koch wanted him to do." Dr. Hoven, who has since been executed as a war criminal, was one of Ilse's many lovers.

SHE USED THE WHIP

Her dalliances, even with inmates, will also be spread on the record.

Another accusation against her will be that she personally whipped inmates. Witnesses will testify that she beat them with a riding whip. Several will show scars they still carry from the dreadful whippings, performed under the eyes of SS guards.

Her denials that she had even been an onlooker at the beatings of prisoners will be contested by other witnesses who will swear that either they or other inmates had been beaten unmercifully in her presence as they lay naked on a "whipping table."

"Witnesses will also testify that when inmates were beaten into unconsciousness she would hysterically goad the SS men on into finishing them off," Dr. Ilkow will charge.

But even if Frau Koch is found guilty of all the new charges, the worst punishment she can receive is life imprisonment. Under a new German law, the death penalty is outlawed.

Even in prison she has managed to gratify her lust. While in the American prison she told astonished officials: "I am pregnant." An investigation led to the discovery that a fellow prisoner had tunneled his way to her cell.

Excess-Profits-Tax Bill of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in this period of national emergency everyone must do his share. American soldiers today are laying down their lives in Korea. By this excess-profits-tax legislation we insist that others lay down their dollars to help defray cost of military preparedness.

The ordinary peacetime objections to excess-profits-tax legislation have no place in this debate. These are no ordinary times. We are in a war situation. Let us face up to it. It is called a cold war, but it is getting hotter every day with the Chinese Communists' intervention in North Korea.

The President has called upon the Congress for new huge expenditures. Outlays for military and atomic-energy programs for the present fiscal year will approach $50,000,000,000, more than the total national budget for all Government expenditures in the postwar years. The gross national product of the economy is being turned out at a rate approaching $300,000,000,000 a year. With so large a portion of this output going for military purposes, dangers of inflation are self-evident. The excess-profits tax will not only remove some of this inflationary pressure, but it will yield a portion of the revenues necessary to pay for the defense program. The tax is based upon this principle of equity: Those who receive the greatest profits from the defense boom should pay back to the Government a portion of those profits above an average for the past few years.

Corporation profits are running high and running ahead of everything else. During 1950 corporate profits will reach the unprecedented level of $37,000,000,000 before taxes, or $3,000,000,000 above the peak year of 1948. The present excess-profits-tax bill will be collected from less than a quarter of all corporations. Those are the corporations that get the defense business. Small corporations for the most part will come within the credit exemptions provided in the bill.

During my campaign for reelection I told people in my district that excess-profits legislation was one of the first issues to be dealt with when the Congress reconvened. I wish to commend the Committee on Ways and Means for its diligence in reporting out H. R. 9827. This bill will not provide all the taxes we need. It is not easy to administer. Like all tax bills, it will create some inequities, but in view of less desirable alternatives and in the face of national emergency, it should be enacted without delay.

The people of this country are prepared to sacrifice. They insist, rightly, that the burdens be distributed fairly. It is our responsibility in Congress to do what must be done to make America strong and to ready our defenses against communism.

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 5 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Hon. Herbert Hoover on the Korean war, broadcast on October 19, 1950, as published in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

This is a good time briefly to appraise our international situation and our foreign policies. After that appraisal I shall offer some suggestions.

If we take a broad retrospective view of American foreign policies over the years after 1933, we will find one outstanding feature. All that time American statesmanship became lost when it came to the borders of communism. And the consequences of our wanderings still crowd in upon us.

We first entered this swamp of lost statesmanship when we recognized the Communist government in 1933. Four Presidents and five Secretaries of State—Democrats and Republicans alike—had refused to invite Communist representatives into this American home of free men.

Those Americans knew that all Communists carried germs of conspiracy intended to turn America into a police state, to destroy all religious faiths, to overthrow the freedom of men and the independence of nations.

If you need any reminders of what they did to our hospitality, read again the repentant Communist confessions, the congressional exposure, the pleas of self-incrimination and the conviction of traitors in our courts.

These carriers of evil germs penetrated into high places of Government. They influenced national policies at the highest levels.

RESULTS OF RUSSIAN PACTS

I will not dwell at length upon our successive wanderings into these sinister borders of communism. However, I may mention our tacit alliance with Soviet Russia in June 1941, while Dictator Stalin and Hitler engaged in war of mutual exhaustion.

Many of us protested that such an alliance would spread communism over the earth. Beyond this, in the words of a profound student, Hanson Baldwin, "The great opportunity of the democracies for establishing a stable peace came on June 22, 1941, when Germany invaded Russia, but we muffed it."

I could recall the step-by-step acquiescences and appeasements of Soviet Russia after we entered the war. They were punctuated by agreements made in Moscow in October 1943; Tehran, 1 month later; Yalta, in February 1945; and Potsdam, in August that same year.

In net result we abandoned the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the freedoms of men. In the end, we acquiesced in actual Russian annexation of about 40,000,000 free people in northern Europe.

We acquiesced in her development of the governments of over 500,000,000 people of 13 nations behind the iron curtain in Europe and in Asia. Every stage of our relations saw compromises and defeats of American ideals and purposes.

LEGACY FROM LENIN

Due to the valor of our soldiers and the energies of our industries, we won military victory in the war.

But we lost the peace trying to appease the Communists.

We have constantly ignored Lenin's teachings which have been publicly known for 30 years. He said:

"As long as capitalism and socialism remain we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism.

"We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, concealment and veiling of the truth."

Every year Stalin vows his loyalties to Lenin's teachings. All these 17 years have confirmed these malignant policies.

If you want more evidence that these are the principles of Soviet Russia, just remember that within 12 years they have violated 36 solemn agreements with other nations.

They have vetoed efforts toward peace in the United Nations 45 times. They engineered the attack on Korea. And every day they engage in defamation of the American people.

There is a stern lesson for the American people from these 17 years of experience.

Every American who has tried to deal with them has come away with his face and hands smeared with red tar.

Every time our Government has attempted to cooperate with them, we become involved in a morass of lost statesmanship.

APPRAISALS OF SITUATION

The immediate problem which now confronts us is: How can we reorganize our instrumentalities for peace so as to give the world renewed hope? How can we secure peace—even an uneasy peace?

Before I make some suggestions, we must coldly appraise the world situation in which we find ourselves.

1. Our great hope is the United Nations. For 5 years with the one exception of the Korean action when the Russians were away on a blackmail strike, they have paralyzed that organization.

2. Nothing will stop Communist military aggression except an effective organized phalanx of the non-Communist world which will freeze the ambitions of the Kremlin.

3. We are told by many military authorities that Stalin could put 175 mobilized combat divisions on the European front within 90 days. We are told they have 30,000 tanks, thousands of planes, and the atom bomb.

We are told they have large reserve forces. We are told that the iron-curtain states have large armies poised for action. We are told they have huge forces in north Asia equipped by Russia.

In contrast we are told that the European nations now in the North Atlantic alliance do not have available to Europe more than 30 active combat divisions with some air and naval power, with which to meet this horde from behind the iron curtain. We are told that south Asia has but little military strength to oppose the Communists.

COMPARISON OF RESOURCES

4. The industrial potential of the United States can be overpowering in the long run. But Stalin, now having also the industrial power of the iron curtain states, can arbitrarily concentrate it on preparedness.

Western Europe with a larger population than the United States has as large or greater industrial power than that of Stalin. It is being little occupied in preparedness. It could be quickly mobilized and could constitute a doubly overwhelming balance of industrial power.

5. We must realize, and the world must realize, that 160,000,000 Americans cannot alone maintain the safety of the world against 800,000,000 Communists on the fronts of both Europe and Asia.

Nor can we out of our resources and manpower, contribute more than a minority part in such a phalanx of force.

6. We are told by the civilians and military leaders of our Government that we stand in the greatest of perils. We have inaugurated an immense military program.

The consequences of this program to our economic life are already evident. Under it taxes will take a greater portion of our national income than that taken by most non-Communist countries in Europe.

Already we are in the midst of a disastrous wave of inflation from its pressures. We must defer many needed improvements.

We can stand this for possibly 2 or 3 years pending a genuine rally by the non-Communist world to their full part in defense. But we must in time have relief from a large part of that burden.

We cannot carry the load for long without fulfilling Stalin's hopes of bleeding us economically to impotence.

KEYS TO MILITARY DEFENSE

7. There are three sources from which real military defense must come.

First. The European nations in the North American Alliance.

Second. The other non-Communist nations who are members of the United Nations, such as Canada, Latin America, the Middle East, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and some of the smaller South Asian countries.

Third. And there is the United States.

We will successfully clean up the Korean aggression under General MacArthur's brilliant generalship and teach a lesson.

However, our greatest danger point to all western civilization is Western Europe. It is obvious, with the threats in Asia, that the United States can supply only a minor part of this huge European deficiency even with our present program.

The time has come, therefore, to speak frankly what is in the mind of many Americans today. And I speak not only as one who has witnessed two world wars, but with substantial military advice.

We know that the European nations now in the North Atlantic Pact—with American aid—have reached a greater industrial productivity than they had before either World War I or World War II.

They have larger populations and more manpower than in those wars. In both those two wars, these peoples put in the field in 90 days more than 140 equipped and trained combat divisions in addition to naval and air forces.

BILLIONS FOR RESISTANCE

When the fabulous expenditures of various loans, together with the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Pact were laid before the American people, certain results were promised.

It was emphasized that besides economic and social objectives these gigantic sums would build the European nations into a united military defense against aggression upon western civilization. It was represented as the American first line of defense.

We consented to these sacrifices primarily on this promise. It has been costly. Outside of lend-lease during the war, we have spent since the war ended in gifts and loans (which are also bound to be gifts) almost $20,000,000,000 in Europe on this faith.

We have not begrudged these huge sacrifices. But the result has been deeply disappointing to a growing body of Americans.

Competent observers are daily raising the serious question as to whether these nations, outside of Britain, have the will to fight, or even the will to preparedness. The actions and statements of their own leaders give little evidence of any real determination.

MOBILIZING OF FREE NATIONS

Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter is a specific agreement as to mobilization of effective military and economic forces from every member to stop aggression. It provides in detail for its organization and command.

For 5 years the Russians have thwarted any practical realization of that agreement.

I am glad to see the recent proposals for the better mobilization of military strength by the members of the United Nations to stop aggression. That was also a step in the right direction.

However, we must face reality. The United States ultimately must have relief from a considerable part of our present burdens. No patrols or token forces will present so grim a visage to Moscow as would choke their military ambitions.

We need strong medicine in the shape of large and definite armies both from European members of the North Atlantic Pact and from the other non-Communist members of the United Nations.

METHOD OF ACTION PROPOSED

To get action, either the potency and organization of the United Nations under chapter VII should be so restored, notwithstanding Russian obstruction, as to take over a real job, or, alternatively, we should enlarge the North Atlantic Alliance into a world alliance which could in this fashion execute chapter VII of the Charter.

We should, in either case, ask all nations who want to stop Russian aggression once and for all to join and to specify what they will join with and when.

We should say at once that the United States, with all its resources, cannot long endure the present drain on our economy. And if that fails, the world goes into night.

But if we do not find real military action of powerful strength in Western Europe; if there is no definite and effective mobilization of the other members of the United Nations so as to take up the major burden of their own defenses, then we had better reconsider our whole relation to the problem.

In that event, we had better quit talking and paying, and consider holding the Atlantic Ocean with Britain (if they wish) as one frontier, and the Pacific Ocean with an armed Japan and other islands as the other frontier.

LOOKING FOR PEACE

Let there be no misunderstandings.

I am conveying no military secrets to the Kremlin. They are able to read the open books of the democracies from our congressional debates and our press, even if they have no other intelligence service.

I am giving no aid to Stalin by stimulating defense against him.

I am not talking of any such thing as attack or a preventive war. I abhor the thought of it.

What I propose is such defense as prevents attack upon us.

I advise no retreat from the Communist front. I vastly prefer a consolidated front in full strength rather than being forced to reform our lines by failure of other nations.

What we want is real peace. But if we cannot have that, at least we want an uneasy peace within the economic burdens which the United States can bear.

Our hope must be that the Russian people will sometime in perhaps the long future, throw off this evil regime as they did that of the czars.

Then real peace could come, because the mass of the Russian people themselves are a peaceful people. With faith in God that, I believe, will sometime be the outcome.

CHURCHILL'S VIEWS QUOTED

In confirmation, I need only to quote Winston Churchill who stated, in a public address, a few weeks ago:

"Imposing conferences have been held between military chiefs and experts, and a pretentious facade has been displayed by the governments responsible for our safety.

"In fact, however, apart from the establishment of an American bomber base in England, nothing has been done to give any effective protection to our people from being subjugated or destroyed by the Russian Communist Armies with their masses of armor and aircraft.

"I and others have given what warnings we could, but, as in the past, they fell on unheeding ears, or were used to sustain the false accusation of warmongering."

Mr. Churchill seemed to think Europe had only 2 years in which to arm.

Our American officials in the recent Conference of Foreign Ministers again urged the necessity of a unified European defense army embracing German components. That proposal has again been defeated or delayed.

AN ANSWER TO EUROPE

All this situation has come as a great shock to thinking Americans. These failures raise serious questions.

Are we being misled as to the seriousness of this situation? Have these nations such convincing evidence of the Kremlin's good intentions that they are not interested in defense?

Has Karl Marx paralyzed the will of nations for independence? Do they expect the United States and Britain to carry the whole load in case of attack?

The time has come when the American people should speak out in much stronger tones than the diplomatic phrases of conference halls.

We should be willing to aid, but if Western Europe wants defense from the Communist tide they must do most of it themselves, and do it fast.

Someone proposed that we at once increase our forces in Europe to 10 combat divisions. That would be only a slaughter of American boys unless many times that number were standing by their sides.

We should say, and at once, that we shall provide no more money until a definitely unified and sufficient European army is in sight. And, further, that 10 American divisions will not be landed until then.

Nor is such an army in Europe, even with American forces, alone sufficient to dull Kremlin ambitions in both Europe and Asia.

RESHAPING UNITED NATIONS

Five months ago, and again three months ago, I urged that the United Nations be so reorganized as to permit the mobilization of the non-Communist world on military, economic, and moral bases to meet these aggressions.

I suggested this could never happen with the Communist constantly making the United Nations impotent. I gave ample reasons.

The official reception of that idea was hostile. The press reception was sympathetic or favorable.

Every day since that statement was made has proved its validity. And the validity of that proposal was doubly proved 3 months ago, when, for the first time in all its history, due to the absence of the Communist, the United Nations has shown what real leadership could accomplish.

I have been gratified by the recognition of the validity of my suggestion by the proposals of a change in the rules of the United Nations by which Russian obstruction within that organization might be defeated.

People Will Respond to Need if Given Truth, Strong Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the good people of the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan, like others throughout the country, are terribly disturbed about our involvments in the affairs of other countries. A very fine editorial, in the form of a letter to Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, has been published in the Saginaw News, Saginaw, Mich.

The facts and questions presented in the letter are so much to the point in the light of current developments I submit the statement for the Appendix of the RECORD so that many more people of Michigan may have the opportunity to study the observations which the editor has presented:

PEOPLE WILL RESPOND TO NEED IF GIVEN TRUTH, STRONG LEADERS

UNITED STATES SENATOR HOMER FERGUSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The people of the Saginaw Valley (and the same probably is true all over the country) are deeply and sorely troubled. They don't want war. They don't want to see any more of their young men sent off to meet death on a foreign battlefield. Yet they recognize that tragedy more overwhelming than war will result if America fails to meet the challenge.

One great fear dominates the people in this vital industrial area. It is a fear that America will too long be denied the leadership that is needed to guide us through the valley of the shadow of death to the sunshine of peace that can be ours if the forces of communism are confronted with a unified America working and ready to fight if necessary under leaders in whom the people can have confidence.

Can you not launch a petition calling upon Mr. Truman to place the responsibility for our foreign program—diplomatic and military—on the shoulders of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower or some other national figure equal to him in stature?

This newspaper, soon after the Korean War broke out June 25, urged that such action be taken. But all that Mr. Truman did was to remove Defense Secretary Johnson and replace him with Gen. George C. Marshall, whom all America respects but whose health does not make it possible for him to perform now for his country the glorious service he contributed during World War II. He will do all that he can but he needs effective help—and he can't get that from the men in whose hands this Nation's destiny now rests.

The blunders in judgment, the reversals of position and the unforgivable disregard of public opinion of which Secretary of State Acheson and others of Mr. Truman's coterie have been guilty would long ago have removed these men from command in any private industry.

With the Nation's very survival at stake, a housecleaning and establishment of responsible and capable leadership can no longer be delayed. We must have at the helm a man whose patriotism is so great that he will move ahead without regard for personal or political consequences.

There is evidence that Secretary Acheson was keenly aware of the dangers mounting in the Far East. But in the face of Mr. Truman's "everything is going to be fine" utterances, Mr. Acheson held his tongue and permitted the Nation to drift into the near catastrophe which now confronts us. That failure to speak out, frankly and publicly, when he was convinced personally of the President's ill-founded optimism was, in our opinion, grave weakness and a disservice to the Nation.

America has come to another crossroads. The challenge being offered by Moscow through the Chinese Communists finds us still thoroughly unprepared—even though we have had warning after warning.

The outbreak of war in Korea should have been recognized by the administration—as it was recognized by so many of us here at home—as a signal for all-out preparedness.

It was not so recognized, and the people were not given all the facts. Complacency and bungling went right on.

The Pentagon is currently planning and working toward a military force of no less than 5,000,000 men—perhaps two or three times that number—but the administration tells the people the goal is only 2 or 3 million. It is afraid the people would not understand.

Mr. Truman orders our Navy to neutralize Formosa and Chiang Kai-shek to refrain from

attacking the Chinese mainland, but he does not tell the American people that this makes it possible for the Chinese Communists to move their armies away from that sector and up into Korea.

The administration places some pilot orders for naval torpedoes with an Ohio firm that makes automobile radiator cores—despite protests from that firm, which has had no experience with torpedoes, and from the firm which produced huge volumes of torpedoes during World War II and still has the know-how and much of the necessary equipment.

The administration, having seen heroic American forces win against great odds in South Korea, orders General MacArthur to move his men north across the thirty-eighth parallel in the full knowledge that this may precipitate a counterattack by the Chinese Communists—but has made no effective preparation for meeting that assault which now is upon us.

The administration pins much of its strategy on the hope that military assistance in the Far East will be given us by other members of the United Nations—but without getting advance assurances of the amount and timing of such assistance, which in most instances has now failed to materialize in anything but token degree.

The administration has permitted a hostile government (Red China) to commit an unquestionable act of war against us but refuses to recognize the act for what it is and to retaliate with all the weapons at our disposal.

The administration's record from Potsdam to the Yalu River has been one of unceasing errors in judgment. No wonder that the Communist world considers us weak and ready for conquest.

Unless all is to be lost the time for drastic action is here.

First, the American people must be given the full truth—by a man who they will know is speaking the full truth when he talks to them.

Then, and only then, will the people be ready to respond to such an appeal to prepare for the worst, as that which Secretary Acheson voiced so belatedly Wednesday night.

Whether the atomic bomb should now be used against the Red Chinese this newspaper does not profess to know. But we are convinced that no time should be lost in developing our military power to its greatest possible efficiency.

Events of the recent months have demonstrated that we can expect little actual help from any allies other than possibly Canada and Australasia.

This Nation must develop a fighting potential at least as great as that which it tossed aside when World War II subsided. Our need may even be much greater.

We believe the American people can be convinced that a fighting force of perhaps 15,000,000 men and women is needed to effectively put down the forces of anti-God which are creeping across the earth.

We believe the people who are not called for military service can be convinced that they will need to work 12 or more hours a day to produce the materials the fighting forces will need.

We believe the people can be convinced that the economic as well as military disaster which threatens is so great that taxes should be heavy enough to take from everyone on the home front—whether he works on an assembly line or in the front office—all the extra pay which he would receive for his extra war effort.

We believe the people can be convinced of all these things—but only when the helm of our ship of state has been placed in capable hands.

We hope you and like-minded men in Congress can do something quickly to bring about the changes that are needed.

God and the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, December 3, 1950, I received a letter postmarked Memphis, Tenn., from Rev. Charles Granville Hamilton, rector of St. Paul's Church in Corinth, Miss., containing a newspaper review of a speech which he made to the congregation of the Collegeside Congregational Church, Memphis State College, Memphis, Tenn., and a copy of the speech itself, both of which I believe are well worth reading.

The review of the speech published in the Trades and Labor News was as follows:

EPISCOPAL RECTOR DENOUNCES THE "ECONOMIC ROYALISTS" IN A SERMON AT COLLEGESIDE CHURCH

It was rather refreshing to hear that an Episcopal pastor last Sunday denounced from the pulpit of the Collegeside Congregational Church those whom he designated as the very evident group of "reactionary, economic royalists in the United States who are willing to betray their own country for the profit motive."

The Reverend Charles Granville Hamilton, rector of St. Paul's Church in Corinth, Miss., attacked the false religious leaders, the John T. Flynns and Edward Rumelys and Merwin Harts who tremble before progress, who shiver at the thought of better living conditions for all.

The subject of his sermon was God and the welfare state and based on the parable of Solomon and Rehoboam in the Bible. The Collegeside Congregational Church borders the campus of Peabody College and in past years has been noted for the down-to-earth sermons that have been delivered there by both the pastor, and visiting ministers.

He made it clear that his attack was aimed at the conservative element of the Republican Party. The men he called by name—Flynn, Rumely, and Hart—are affiliated with GOP policymakers and campaign strategists.

"We still have with us the Rehoboams and their ilk," Hamilton said. Like Rehoboam "after the New Deal of Solomon," "second rate self-starters, demagogues political and ecclesiastical, have come to the front with foolish dreams of turning back the clock of history.

"They are those who brought about, in their greed and stupidity, the tragic Hoover depression; they are those who helped finance the rise of the Nazi terror in their insane hatred of democracy; they are those who fought a war on labor while most of us were fighting the Nazi and the Japanese.

"We also have false religious leaders among us," Hamilton said.

"Hitler was helped into power by some men in pulpits who called the peaceful democratic Germany of the 1920's socialistic."

Referring to Flynn's book, Hamilton quoted "what his (Flynn's) own church says about the book."

" 'This is the most emotional, illogical, inaccurate, and probably even libelous book, which we have ever been foolish enough to purchase. He (Flynn) does a great disservice by indiscriminately fastening the label "socialistic" on a lot of organizations and programs which have yet to become "radical"—as the social encyclicals, for example. He concentrates his fire on the Federal Council and never so much as mentions the word Catholic. Perhaps he realized that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to persuade his readers that Pope Pius XI was a Socialist.' "

The quotation was taken from a statement by the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Turning to the Welfare State, Hamilton said, "Our Government is meant as a welfare state. It exists for the welfare of the people. God created a welfare state in Eden. He recreated it in the wilderness and He projected it into the promised land. Read the laws of Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, with their concern for the the labor, the learning, the security, and the welfare of all people.

Hamilton said the forces of reaction, represented by Flynn and others, oppose all that Jesus taught. He said these forces have been denounced by members of their own political party—Republicans like Charles Taft, Henry Luce, Eric Johnston, John Foster Dulles, Mrs. Thomas Lamont, and Robert Patterson.

"Rehoboam's modern disciples also have their shields of brass to substitute for shields of gold. They talk about 'economy,' but the 'wasteful spending' they yodel about is spending for homes and health, on schools and highways, and against totalitarian enemies. They speak of the 'American way,' by which they mean, not the path the American people have chosen for 20 years, but the long-gone days of reaction and hunger. They speak of 'free enterprise' when they mean the right of great monopolies to destroy the free enterprise of the small-business man. Those who yell loudest for 'States' rights' are well oiled from beyond State lines, and not with Confederate money."

"The trick of all totalitarianism is to oppose democracy and to confuse it with socialism. The Communist technique today is to divide and conquer by such charges. All who try to undermine confidence in our Government are aiding Stalin. There is nothing Moscow loves to publish more than the words of our Rehoboams and Jeroboams."

Reverend Hamilton is a former religious radio commentator and taught political science at Vanderbilt University last year.

He is the author of several books of sermons and history and is now working on his doctor of philosphy degree at Vanderbilt. He has four degrees and has studied in 14 colleges and universities.

The speech itself was as follows:

GOD AND THE WELFARE STATE: THE AMERICAN ROAD TO THE LIFE ABUNDANT

(By Charles Granville Hamilton)

"So the king did not listen to the people." (II Chronicles 10: 15.)

There are still economic royalists who refuse to listen to the voice of the people, and to the voice of God.

After the wisdom of Solomon came the foolishness of Rehoboam. After the prosperity of Solomon came the disaster of Rehoboam. After the New Deal of Solomon came the reaction of Rehoboam. Second-rate self-starters, demagogs political and ecclesiastical, came to the front with foolish dreams of turning back the clock of history. They were foolish leaders, like the grafters of free-booting free enterprise of the days of Grant and of Harding, like the isolationists of the 1920's and the 1940's, like the 1930 American admirers of Hitler, like the French 200 families who preferred Hitler to social reform enough to betray their own country for the profit motive, like the Japanese who thought they could win a war by treachery, like some of the self-styled leaders who today offer us their services at a price—to save us from our Government and way of life.

Rehoboam was a spoiled and stupid half-wit, and he surrounded himself with his own type. Reared in the lap of luxury, a

spoiled brat who had never done a lick of work, he felt that the laboring people were means ordained by God that his small set of snobs might enjoy life. When labor leaders asked for more rights and less hours, he put them off while he asked advice.

The old advisers of Solomon, who had led in the New Deal which had made Israel a major nation, warned Rehoboam that labor was the strength of his government, and they urged him to grant these reasonable requests. But not so the middle-aged morons with whom Rehoboam lounged in well-stocked clubs. These were no bright young men; the Scripture says that Rehoboam was 41 years old, and his fellow bourbons were of his age. They wanted to get tough with labor. They urged him to put labor in its place. Their language betrays evidence of alcoholic exhilaration. So Rehoboam proposed the first Taft-Hartley law. He rejected the New Deal advisers of his father who had brought prosperity and peace. He sneared in the best bourbon accents, "My father used whips on you, but I will whip you with scorpions."

This stupid hate-labor policy brought its usual results. He lost eleven-twelfths of his people. Of course, in almost any society, labor constitutes 90 percent of the public. Rehoboam tried to break their strike with force, but it did not work. So ended the united nation for which Saul, David, and Solomon had labored, fought, and planned—all because one mediocre mentality wanted to return to the days of labor exploitation.

Rehoboam also weakened his country in the international realm. God abandoned him, because he had abandoned God when he tried to oppress the people of God. Out of the pillared pagan temples of Egyptian enterprise came a Pharaoh and an army, and Rehoboam went under the iron curtain of Egypt. The shields of gold which symbolized the strength of Solomon were taken down to the gaudy temples of Egypt. Rehoboam replaced them with shields of brass, a pretense which fooled few.

We still have with us the Rehoboams and their ilk. They are those who brought about, in their greed and stupidity, the tragic Hoover depression; they are those who helped finance the rise of the Nazi terror in their insane hatred of democracy; they are those who fought a war on labor while most of us were fighting the Nazis and the Japanese. The descendants of Rehoboam are those who tremble before progress, who shiver at the thought of better living conditions for all, who faint at the mention of the name of the President whom Americans chose more often than any other, who shout "socialism" when they hear of anything their grandfather did not know, whose guilty consciences lead them to get tough with others, because they are weak in themselves.

Rehoboam was surrounded by John T. Flynns and Edward Rumeleys and Merwin Harts. We still have archisolationists, psychopaths frustrated in their desires for Federal appointments, smearers of all whom the American people have found nobler than those who scorn them, ignoramuses who think that Tennessee, which has been under the banner of democracy since it began as the State of Franklin, was "bribed by TVA to support democracy," and who have the insanity to shriek that "we attacked the peaceful Japanese at Pearl Harbor," at the moment when such were writing for Japanese money. Like the sadistic pals of Rehoboam, they play Simon Legree, whipping the American people with scorpions of falsehood. They are not above smearing the churches of America with their poisoned pens. They take the word of a Presbyterian parson who was expelled from the church for good reason and use it to libel most of the Protestants in the country. Among 50 leading laymen who accused them of deliberately lying about the Federal Council are such "radicals" as Charles Taft, Henry Luce, Eric Johnston, Mrs. Dwight Morrow, Mrs. Thomas Lamont, Harper Sibley, Robert Patterson, Cleveland Dodge, John Foster Dulles. This is not a partisan matter, for every name in this list is a leading Republican who cannot stay silent while irresponsible smears are spread. Listen to what his own church, in the words of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, says about the book which has taken the place of the Bible for these rabble rousers of the rich:

"This is the most emotional, illogical, inaccurate, and probably even libelous book which we have ever been foolish enough to purchase. He does a great disservice by indiscriminately fastening the label 'socialistic' on a lot of organizations and programs which have yet to become radical—as the social encyclicals, for example. He concentrates his fire on the Federal council and never so much as mentions the word 'Catholic.' Perhaps he realized that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to persuade his readers that Pope Pius XI was a Socialist."

Other Rehoboam pals include men who have been declared to be Fascists by the American Legion and others who accepted millions of dollars of German money to use against us even while we were at war, and who went to the penitentiary for this treason. These are the men who prate about the Constitution and the American way and who delude lesser minds into smearing their intellectual betters who believe in democracy.

Rehoboam's modern disciples also have their shields of brass to substitute for shields of gold. They talk of economy, but the wasteful spending they yodel about is spending for homes and health, on schools and highways, and against totalitarian enemies. They speak of the American way, by which they mean not the path the American people have chosen for 20 years but the the long-gone days of reaction and hunger. They speak of free enterprise when they mean the right of great monopolies to destroy the free enterprise of the small-business man. Those who yell the loudest for States' rights are often well-oiled from beyond State lines, and not with Confederate money. Frank Owsley, one of the South's great historians, pointed out that the tombstone of the Confederate South should have on it "Died of States' rights," because it was traitors hiding behind that phrase who sabotaged their people's cause. Some of those who howl longest about States' rights manage consistently to take the side of the distilleries in other States over the laws of their own States. They take the sides of alien corporations against their own citizens; they accept retainers from foreign corporations to raise taxes on their own citizens; and they surrender the natural resources of their States to contemporary carpetbaggers while they sob ostentatiously over States' rights. Rehoboam's friends pour out propaganda by the carload—with sometimes not a fact in a carload—while they lament the propaganda of the Government which has not one administration weekly magazine in the Nation and not many daily papers. All these shields of gold have become sounding brass.

There is another evil character in this Bible story. His name is Jeroboam. He was a false religious leader. He substituted the worship of the golden calf for the worship of God. He just added the little letter "l" to turn God into gold. He is one of those men who regarded the ministry of God as a way of profit and prestige. He bore false witness against his neighbors and against his own people. He sought to arouse latent isolationism and he slandered opponents at home and abroad. Our contemporary Jeroboams also lash with scorpions of falsehood, the second-hand snakes they borrow from books, and, though they sanctimoniously swear that they do not profit from it, it is obvious that they do not get poorer by so doing.

Our Jeroboams can solemnly mouth ignorance and error about our British neighbors, even though they may post on their churches that they are British rather than American. They call compensation for injured workers, the 8-hour day, and Government payment of election expenses socialism, in their ignorance that these came into the United States under Andrew Jackson. They smear the Liberal Party, which has the support of most Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, and Presbyterians in that land. They ignore the forged Zinoviev letter by which the Tories won an election on charges of communism. They blame the Labor Party, which was not in power, for the Tory policy of Baldwin and Chamberlain which appeased Hitler and which failed to prepare for war. They rant that the English people are worse off than they were during the war, which is palpably untrue. They forget that Britain still has rich men left, that 80 percent of industry, including such business as ships, planes, autos, chemicals, textiles, and all trade is still in private hands. They fail to note that the Tory Party in its recent campaign promised not to change any of these social gains, or that Britain has made more gains in recovery than any other nation in Europe.

The Jeroboams have no scruples against slandering our own country and our own people. It is deliberate and malicious misrepresentation to say that the Government, the American people have chosen for two decades is a Socialist government which decided to change the American system, to tax and spend, to browbeat and bludgeon men into doing the will of the Government. It is appealing to avarice and vindictiveness to charge that class consciousness has been aroused by avarice and vindictiveness. The Jeroboams prey on appeals to snobbery, class feeling, spite and avarice, and any student of psychology can understand why they attack in others what their consciences condemn in themselves. They are so sure these bad qualities are confined to the masses—by which they mean those common people who heard Jesus gladly. They disclose their political naïveté by imagining that a political party could be bought for $500,000; they should learn that some corporations spend that much in one senatorial race. They are also naive enough to state that in our early days as a Government each community built and controlled its own schools and churches They demonstrate that they feel wiser than Jesus by serving both God and mammon. They denounced any taxation based on ability to pay, even though endorsed by all great Americans of the past regardless of party. They sneer at do-gooders, because they know that they are doing good. They have cut out of their Bibles that love of money is the root of all evil. They can look unmoved at drab and dingy slums and congratulate the greed that prevents their rebuilding.

The combined ignorance and falsehood of our Jeroboams is shown in their charges against Americans for Democratic Action. To call it as American as Stalin is to talk like Stalin. Walter Reuther has been shot twice, because of his opposition to communism—which will never be true of our Jeroboams; David Dubinsky and Justice Felix Frankfurter, long-time fighters against totalitarianism, are smeared because of religious prejudice—a lovely spectacle for men preaching, presumably, from a Jewish volume; while the people of Illinois, a literate wealthy State, are insulted, because they have an intelligent leader in university and in government like PAUL DOUGLAS. A $64 prize for ignorance should be awarded to anyone who would include John L. Lewis in the ADA, with which he has never been connected, and who would identify him with

the party which he has opposed in 9 out of 10 elections. When the Jeroboams rave of "increasing race and class consciousness" and of "setting section against section," it might be interesting to ask: "Who paid for the literature of racial hatred in the last election, and in previous elections? What groups have played on religious hatred for a generation? Who financed the efforts to arouse sectionalism in an insanity of fear, to stop democracy? Are these the men to whom we are to turn, the apostles of blind bigotry and of pseudo-sectionalism? Have our Jeroboams never read St. John: 'If any man say, I love God and hateth his brother, he is a liar?'"

Our Jeroboams show their ignorance of American government when they prate of the millions spent by Presidents. Under the American system, no President spends a penny of our money; Congress must appropriate every cent that is spent; and we have certainly not had "socialist" Congresses. No man who has spent most of his life in the South would be likely to sneer at the present government which is led by southerners—as Vice President, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, to say nothing of a President of Confederate ancestry, Secretary of the Treasury—these are our neighbors, and have lived in the South all their lives, unlike some of their critics. And three-fourths of the money these southerners have led Congress in spending has been spent to stop Nazis and Communists. Would our Jeroboams prefer totalitarianism?

Our Jeroboams fail to understand that when we buy our autos from Michigan, our plows from Illinois, and our dresses from New York, only a national system of taxation can fairly return some of our money that has strayed from home. They are also ignorant enough not to know that Maine potatoes are subsidized by their friends, and they fail to realize that the farmer is just beginning to get the aid from the Government which business has had for 160 years. The Jeroboams do not stop from blasphemy, parodying the beloved Twenty-third Psalm with cheap partisan claptrap. They wish for an H-bomb, because they have managed to miss all bombs. They can self-righteously thank God that they are not like other men and can ask God to save America through them—it should be "from them." The old temptation of Satan in the garden is repeated by the Jeroboams, "You shall be as Gods." Hitler was helped into power by some men in pulpits who called the peaceful democratic Germany of the 1920's socialistic. They got their reward.

Listen to what my good friend Hodding Carter, another Mississippi Episcopalian, has to say about such preaching—and you might recall that Hodding Carter supported Governor Dewey in the last election:

"By unhappy coincidence I have read during Easter week a widely publicized sermon which in a good many ways strays as far from the philosophy of the Man whose resurrection the Christian world celebrates as it does from the political and economic realities of our world. If he means that these long-ago English achievements were dangerous and undemocratic, he is talking poppycock. What he is saying is that the freemen of the Socialist countries of Europe who live defiantly under the very guns of Soviet Russia are no better than the Red enemy against whom they stand allied with us. Were the Socialist Norwegian enemies of the liberties of men, those Scandinavian fighters who died while we in America prattled? Are the Socialist Swedes such enemies? Are social planners, as such, enemies of the people—Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson? The H-bomb statement may make a big hit in some quarters, but not among those who have seen nations almost die under bombs, not among those who have seen war-crushed nations rise again in the only way they could, through government-directed action for which no private alternative existed. It is sad that such words should be spoken on a sabbath or any other day. It is sadder and more dangerous to American solidarity that its divisive message should gain such wide distribution. And it is saddest of all to recall how long ago it was that a Man moaned a broken-hearted prayer from a cross, asking His Father to forgive those who knew not what they did."

The American way is not the way of Rehoboam and Jeroboam; it is neither the road to ruin proposed by those who hateth the men who do the work of the world, not the road to the idolatry of the golden calf set up by the proselyters of privilege and plunder. The American way is the way of the God-fearing men and women who came to Jamestown and Plymouth and St. Augustine and New Amsterdam and Biloxi. It is the cry of that immortal human document which proclaims that all men are created equal and are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Jeroboams who do not believe in any kind of equality are obviously not American in spirit; they should be investigated for un-American activities. Those who did not grow up in the American way of life do not always understand it, and anyone who engraves on a public building that he is not from the United States may not know enough to criticize the United States.

We choose our own officials, and we change them when they do not suit us. We are the Government. In seven of the last 10 presidential elections, in most of the past 40 years, we have chosen the way which critics call socialistic. The American people know better. Our Government is meant as a welfare state. It exists for the welfare of the people. The Confederation, our first free Government, used the word and purpose of welfare. The Constitution repeats the word and the purpose. It was Gov. Thomas E. Dewey who said that.

"Anyone who thinks that an attack on the fundamental idea of security and welfare appeals to the people generally is living in the Middle Ages. Everybody wants welfare and security in one form or another. I have never met anyone who did not want welfare and security."

In the past decade not one further phase of American life has been socialized. We have had socialized public schools since the days of Andrew Jackson. We have had a socialized Army and Navy since we rejected mercenary Hessians in 1776. We have had a socialized postoffice since the time of Benjamin Franklin. TVA is not new; those not brought up in the American way of life may fail to realize that 40 years ago most towns owned their own electric power. We have more free enterprise than we have ever had, right now. We have more private businesses, more successful businesses, more income for all, more corporation profits, even more rich people, more crops, more jobs, more buildings, more roads, better health, more education.

The American people are not afraid of words. Just because Chicken-Little felt an acorn fall on his head, we do not believe the sky is falling. The American people chose Thomas Jefferson though he was charged with being a "Red, atheist, Socialist, French radical," and though the Rev. Timothy Dwight warned his upper-crust congregation that the election of Jefferson would close all churches and dissolve all marriages. But the sage of Monticello gave us enlarged lands, honest government, social welfare, and liberty. Rev. Horace Binney told Philadelphians that the Constitution and free elections would disappear if Andrew Jackson was elected. Jackson was accused of wanting "to share all property, to enslave free labor, and to destroy churches." Instead there came wider democracy and more education through the hero who sleeps at the Hermitage. Some clergymen accused Woodrow Wilson of socialism and dictatorship. Yet through that scholar in politics, that Christian in government, came Federal aid for schools and roads, and farms, protection for labor and banks and honest businessmen, and a vision of world peace we still cherish. Socialism, communism, dictatorship, and grass growing in city streets were charges as to what Franklin D. Roosevelt would bring. It was openly charged in 1936 that that was the last election we would have. Instead we not only have more income for labor and farmer and business, but even more profits for railroads, power companies, insurance companies, banks, and great corporations. We also got social security, more rights for those who work on farm or in factory, and the strength to win the worst of wars. Today the words have not even changed; the same charges made against Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and Roosevelt are parrotted by the Rehoboams and the Jeroboams. The trick of all totalitarians is to oppose democracy and confuse it with socialism. The Communist technique today is to divide and conquer by such charges. All who try to undermine confidence in our Government are aiding Stalin. There is nothing Moscow loves to publish more than the words of our Rehoboams and Jeroboams.

The biblical way, like the American way, is not the way of labor-baiting Rehoboams or profit-seeking Jeroboams. God has no other purpose in human government than that it is for the welfare of all. "The earth hath He given to mankind. The profit of the earth is for all." This is the purpose of creation.

God created a welfare state in Eden. He recreated in the wilderness, and He projected it into the Promised Land. Read the laws of Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, with their concern for the labor, the learning, the security, the welfare of all the people. The democracy in the desert and in the land of promise was for the welfare of all. The revolution of David against the economic royalists brought in a welfare state, which the wisdom of Solomon continued. The divided nation only flourished when it was for the welfare of the people. The last line in the historical books of the Old Testament praises one who sought the welfare of his people in government.

Psalmist and proverb writer extolled the state where there was abundance for all. Isaiah insists that God is primarily interested in justice to the poor and needy, and he pictures the welfare state that is to come. Jeremiah defines faith in these terms: "He defended the cause of the poor and needy; was not this to know Me, saith the Lord?" Amos saw justice as a mighty torrent sweeping away human exploitation, and Micah foresaw the time when every man should sit under his own vine and fig tree, with none to disturb his social security. Zechariah saw holiness in all the life of a welfare state, from the pensions of the old to the playgrounds of the children. Malachi reminded men of their common brotherhood under one Father of justice.

The Jesus who drove the money changers out of the temple was not in the ministry for prestige and profit. He came preaching good news to the poor. Blessed were the poor, and lost was Dives for ignoring the need of social justice. Jesus' final test of judgment was, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these my brethren." Christ came to bring the more abundant life and He included in that realm the daily bread as well as the food of the spirit.

Naturally, the early church narrated in Acts was a complete welfare state in itself. St. Paul urged the Corinthians that there be an equality. St. James announced that the poor were God's chosen people. In the pages of the New Testament there are only two

bitter opponents of the welfare state—Judas and Ananias. And the Bible closes with a picture of a world welfare state, a redeemed city in which men will bring all the wealth and glory of the nations, and God Himself will dwell among them. Dare we be wiser than God?

Almost 20 years ago Franz Werfel was booed off a lecture platform in East Prussia, because he told students that their real problem lay in a choice, not between right and left, but between above and below. He had to leave the hall under the protection of the police because of this. Today most of those students are dead soldiers of the swastika; for them he was correct. The choice for us, also, is not between right and left. It is between above and below. The choice is between good and evil, unselfishness and selfishness, character or littleness, welfare or ill fare. It is what goes on in our hearts and minds which makes our decision for below, or for above, in the fateful future which faces us. Shall we follow Rehoboam and Jeroboam, or Jeremiah and Jesus?

"O God of earth and altar,
Bow down and hear our cry,
Our earthly rulers falter,
Our people drift and die;
The walls of gold entomb us,
The swords of scorn divide,
Take not Thy thunder from us,
But take away our pride.

"From all that terror teaches,
From lies of tongue and pen,
From all the easy speeches
That comfort cruel men,
From sale and profanation
Of honor and the sword,
From sleep and from damnation,
Deliver us, good Lord.

"Tie in a living tether
The priest and prince and thrall,
Bind all our lives together,
Smite us and save us all;
In ire and exultation,
Aflame with faith and free,
Lift up a living nation,
A single sword to Thee."

Support the President

REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, during these days of terrible stress and strain, when the whole country is upside down, so to speak, and we are all worried sick, I want to commend to the House an editorial that was written by Hon. Jesse Jones, of Houston, Tex., appearing in the Houston Chronicle of yesterday. It is the finest thing I have ever read. The title of it is "Support the President." Read it. Every man, woman, and child in this Nation ought to read this editorial. It is filled with good common horse sense. We are all in this horrible thing alike.

The editorial is as follows:

SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT

The people of the United States must accept the fact that the danger to our freedom and our safety is as great today as ever in our history.

We have not been shocked by any such overt act as the blowing up of the *Maine*, the sinking of the *Lusitania*, the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

Yet there is today more reason for united patriotism than any of those happenings brought forth. There is no visible line at this moment between peace and war. We can avoid the horrors of a third world-wide conflict only by some circumstance, as yet not known, which we may live to call miraculous.

In this grave crisis Americans must close ranks and rally around the President.

It is easy to criticize and bring recriminations against those who in one way or another may have permitted the situation to deteriorate to the dangerous point it has reached.

But now is not the time for assessing blame. That can wait until we have worked out of the mess in which we find ourselves. Unless we can find a way, ruin faces us and generations to come.

Our problem is to find a course midway between appeasement and total war, if possible.

No one is willing to continue appeasement of the Communists because it is realized only too well that appeasement, once started, will never end until everything has been turned over to them or we turn in desperation with our backs to the wall. Then we would have war and have it under less favorable conditions than if it came today.

No one is willing to advocate action which will bring immediate war on a global scale. We remember the horrors of the recent war too vividly. The fighting in Korea, which has already cost us 31,000 casualties, is a small sample of what would come with a world-wide conflict.

To find a middle course and steer it steadily calls for the combined intelligence of the whole country.

President Truman must depend on the advisers that surround him. Admittedly, some of them are far from what the situation demands. But a negative position of criticizing what they do gets us nowhere. If the citizens in whom the country has confidence come forward and offer their advice in a constructive manner, we believe the President will accept it and accept it gratefully.

The President is the executive head of the Nation. He is also something of a national symbol, around which the Nation must rally in time of danger.

The man in the White House no longer represents either the majority or the minority of the people in the United States. He speaks for each and every one of the 150,000,000 inhabitants of this country.

His words and his deeds will influence the future course of the world, for he must make the decisions now which will cast their sunshine or shadow upon us all for generations.

No one has the authority to supplant the President of the United States in such a crisis. None but he can advocate a course of action to meet the present dangers. What would you do if you were the President of the United States?

It is not sufficient to recommended one step. What would you do to meet the countless considerations which the President of the United States has to take into account?

Would you discard all hope of peace while there existed even the slightest glimmer of hope for such an eventuality?

Would you commit all your forces in Asia to let Europe shift for itself?

Would you abandon the effort to maintain the solidarity of world opinion which flamed against the agressors in Korea on June 25?

Would you limit the money needed for more active preparations to meet the threat of war in order to keep the tax rates down?

Would you restrict the use of critical materials or let business as usual absorb these commodities as it sees fit?

Would you do nothing to halt inflation through credit curbs?

Would you call for an army of 2,000,000, of 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 men?

If you can answer a single one of these questions without inner qualification and without shuddering at the responsibility which your action would entail, you may have a right to do something other than fall in step behind the Commander in Chief.

Since no one can, it is the universal duty of every loyal American to close ranks, abandon partisanship and embrace as his or her patriotic duty, all-out defense of the country and all-out support of the President of the United States.

It is Harry S. Truman whom fate has chosen to head this country in this time of extreme crisis.

We all should give him every help. And we should pray for divine guidance as he makes decisions affecting all Americans and all the world.

The best that is in us all, spirtually and intellectually, is called for.

We cannot do less than offer all. We must show as much patriotism at home as our sons are showing on the bloody fields of Korea. And we must show it today. Tomorrow may be too late.

Resolutions to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting herewith resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the United Farmers of Minnesota, which was held at Wanamingo, Minn., on November 25, 1950:

To the Congress of the United States of America and to the Executive Department:

We, the United Farmers of Minnesota, Inc., assembled in the third State convention at Wanamingo, Minn., November 25, 1950, submit the following resolutions:

"We resolve that—

"1. There shall be no trade barriers between areas within the United States for quality farm products produced in any section of this country, when such products meet the requirements of Federal law.

"Such action is vital to the future welfare of Midwest dairy farmers who are now stopped from selling milk and cream in 36 large consuming areas under the Milk Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and because of local and State regulations.

"We propose the adoption of a national sanitary standard for milk and other dairy products as established by the United States Public Health Service to supersede local and State regulations.

"2. Prices on competitive imports of farm products shall be established at a cost of production of those same products raised domestically. The present program under the reciprocal trade agreements can break the domestic price structure, destroy support programs, and work great injury to American agriculture, labor, and industry.

"3. Cost of production floor prices ir the market place for agricultural products shall be determined by Federal statute and enforced under a two-price system, the farmer to take a loss on any surplus domestically produced that is exported and not needed for American consumption.

"4. Section 117 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code shall be interpreted by the Commis-

sioner of Internal Revenue to abide by the decisions of the courts as in the case of R. W. Albright, of Kenyon, Minn., wherein the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals held that the Commissioner's interpretation of section 117 (j) was 'contrary to the plain language of 117 (j) and to the intent that Congress expressed in it.' We propose that Congress adopt the Thye amendment under the Revenue Act of 1950 to clarify this situation.

"We claim that farm animals kept for draft, dairy, or breeding purposes are long-term capital assets and income from the sale of such assets shall be only 50 percent taxable, just as other long-term capital gains are 50 percent taxable.

"5. Proposals for socialized medicine, socialized Federal housing, and socialized education be rejected.

"6. The Department of Agriculture be made entirely independent from any organization representing farmers.

"7. The Brannan farm plan be rejected.

"8. Congress appoint a special committee to study the health and economic phases of present methods of fertilizer manufacture, investigate the monopolistic control of the phosphate market, and explore the possibilities of using surplus organic materials as fertilizers, thus adding new humus to the soil and aiding the work of soil bacteria.

"We claim that continued use of certain chemical fertilizers are harming the soil as well as impairing the health of the Nation.

"9. Highly skilled, irreplaceable farm laborers shall be given more consideration to prevent them from being called into the draft. Farm labor shortages are already serious and floaters and poor farm hands cannot be used under present-day highly skilled farming methods."

Political Post Mortem—Series I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily speaking political as well as other post mortems are not only disagreeable but are very uninteresting except to those who have a primary interest in the belated operation.

In the present instance however, I feel that I am justified in calling attention to the type of a campaign which I made in my unsuccessful attempt to be reelected, because of the misinformation going the rounds in Nebraska to the effect that it was not a constructive one but was a sort of a knock-down and drag-out affair.

In any event doctors sometimes find post mortems necessary and informative and I see no reason why legislators cannot profit from same, particularly when it might disclose the pernicious influences which are now and have been stalking the land.

The following speech was delivered over radio station WOW on October 6, 1950:

Good evening ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience. I come to you tonight by transcription to open my radio campaign for reelection to the House of Representatives, a position to which you so generously elected me 2 years ago.

I need your help very badly again because frenzied greed and selfishness is hot on my political trail. As your Congressman, I worked for my salary alone. I worked diligently in the interests of the people and the question now is, Will the people in return support me? I hope so.

I come to you tonight without apologies for my doings or my record for the past 2 years in Congress. I believe that record is as good as that of any other Congressman who was a member of the Eighty-first Congress. I kept my promises to the people as all of you well know.

You are my bosses—the only bosses I recognize, because it was through your votes that I was elected.

The record shows that I have tried in every way possible to benefit all of the people of the Second Congressional District. I attended sessions of Congress faithfully. I received more than 12,000 letters from constituents during my nearly 2 years in office. The requests were varied.

I believe I can safely say that very few of these people failed to have their requests granted. I secured positions, some of them rather high positions in the Government, for a number of persons. I aided business institutions of my district in securing loans from the RFC and in other ways, including the getting of Government contracts for the sale of their products. Altogether I would say that more than a thousand citizens of the Second District were benefited financially by my aid in these matters. And never once did I ask the politics of those making these requests. You can readily see that this sort of a course of action entails a lot of hard work—work efficiently performed by my entirely Nebraska staff of workers, all of whom worked in my Washington office.

I was delighted when Speaker SAM RAYBURN and the Democratic leadership named me as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, which is so important to our midwestern territory.

In passing may I remind you that I am the only Democratic Congressman elected to the Eighty-first Congress in the House of Representatives from six States—Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Kansas, and Nebraska—and I have tried during the past 2 years to carry out the wishes of persons in those States who felt that they could not rely upon their Republican Members to accomplish their objectives.

On the floor of the House, I devoted all of my energies on behalf of the people, big and little. I fought for the interests of labor, of the farmer, of the veterans, of decent business, and of the common people generally. For this I have been rather severely criticized by certain cliques in the higher stratas of business and society, but, as I said in the beginning, I have no apologies to make for my record. I will not change my stand in one iota if I am returned to Washington for the Eighty-second Congress.

I want to talk to you now about some of the things which I think are issues during the coming campaign and which I will talk at length about in future broadcasts.

1. The winning of the present Korean conflict with neatness and dispatch.

2. The complete preparedness for the perhaps dark days to come including aid, within our means, to other countries combatting communism or any other subversivism.

3. The crushing and stamping out in this country and in all of her possessions, after proper proof has been made, of all un-American left and right winger organizations, whether they be Communist or Fascist, or any other kindred conspiracies to commit treason, all of which groups equally intend to overthrow or materially alter or change and eventually destroy our country and its splendid form of government.

4. In proper cases after due proof has been made, the deportation of all foreign-born Communists, Fascists and other subversives, and the speedy imprisonment of native-born Communists, Fascists and other subversives, with a view to rehabilitating them, mentally and morally.

5. The practicing of the most rigid economy in national, State, county and city government, consistent with the apparent or seeming necessity and needs of the times.

6. The repeal of the odious, slave labor, Taft-Hartley law and all other unjust, oppressive and labor-enslaving national, State and municipal legislation.

7. The same fair and just laws for labor as well as for capital, both of whom make up our country's great and proper two-horse hitch. This team must pull the burdensome load together, and not seesaw back and forth. They can and will make our great country greater if both are treated with dignity, fairness and equality, legislatively and otherwise.

8. Fair and adequate national minimum wage, social security and voluntary insurance, and other health programs.

9. The upbuilding and protecting in the United States of a just and proper free enterprise system, instead of the outlaw Jesse James, Jack Dalton, Billy the Kid, Doc Middleton, Dillinger, and other desperado types of free enterprise systems, sponsored by certain reactionary Republicans and Democrats who have crawled and crept with their greedy and selfish ideas intact, into the managerial chairs of business executives. This type has no real voice or any control in the Democratic Party but seems presently as for the past many years, to have a strangle hold, a headlock, a body scissors, a toehold, and a tramp-hitch on the once great party of Abraham Lincoln. My friends, we must shake these antisocial minds loose from business, big and little, and from the medical, and every other profession.

10. The phony 21-year-old scare word campaign, which seems to have flourished instead of fizzled out, during the most prosperous and productive years our Nation and its people have ever known: That equality age when the citizen was able to leap from the alley to the boulevard in almost one financial bound, and if he so willed it, and many did, he could bring along with him all of the tastes, manners, and instincts of the alley.

11. The phantom socialized-medicine scare conceived by certain reactionary, greedy, and selfish groups and persons and spearheaded into action by certain of the Don Quixote and Squire Sancho Panza types of bad-medicine men who in this enlightened day and age, as unsolicited interlopers, are out to fight nonexistent legislative enemies and are out to avenge nonexistent wrongs. The old genuine Don and his hapless Squire, as I recall, at least, did fight realities, to wit: A windmill and two clouds of dust stirred up by passing flocks of sheep, but these poor benighted medicos are phantom fighters. There is no socialized medicine bill pending in Congress. Compulsory health insurance—I favor voluntary health insurance—is not socialized medicine. I am against socialized medicine and have said so on all occasions, yet they say I am for it. These men surely appear to me to be pathological or psychopathic falsifiers. They surely could not do what they are doing and realize what they are doing—or could they?

12. Civil-rights legislation should be passed. Our Constitution contemplates, along with a government of freedom, equality to all persons, regardless of race, color, or creed, reactionary Republicans and Democrats to the contrary notwithstanding.

13. The United States Constitution guarantees freedom of speech and press, and it must be preserved, but freedom should not be interpreted to mean license. We need not only a free press but also a fair press

and, if necessary, Congress should pass legislation to insure a fair press to the people of our Nation.

14. Our whole economy is geared to agriculture and an adequate farm-price-support program and other helpful protective legislation relating to agriculture should be passed and maintained by the Congress. Never again should farmers be imposed upon and pillaged by scheming fellows who live and wax fat by farming the farmers.

15. An adequate public-housing program should be fostered and maintained in the interests of the less fortunate people of the community.

16. Price- and rent-control laws should be on the statute books for immediate use against upward-creeping or run-away prices.

17. The aged and the helpless must receive better care or higher contributions.

18. The veteran who has carried the burdens of the war should not be a forgotten man. We cannot permit a hero to be degenerated into an itinerant merchant or a beggar. No skimping economy should apply to a veteran.

19. Congressmen should work for their salaries alone and not be permitted to make side money, which in some instances is interpreted by the citizenry as a bribe in disguise.

20. Congressman should not be permitted to farm out their franking privileges to any individual or concern, as has been done previously.

21. Congressmen should not be permitted to have sleepers on their payroll. In this connection I will briefly say that my present opponent carried Attorney Victor Spittler on his payroll for years as a clerk at a handsome salary, and Mr. Spittler drew pay right up to the time I took office, which included the first few days of January 1949, and all the while Attorney Spittler practiced law actively in Omaha, Nebr., without let or hindrance.

22. When Congressmen are beaten for office they should not give away all of their Government's farm books and bulletins allotted to the congressional district and leave the new Congressman high and dry. Constituents, my opponent did this to you and to me. He sent all of the Government publications on hand to two House Members and one Member of the other body. One of these House Members was from Iowa. He left the book and bulletin shelves as bare for me as old Mother Hubbard's proverbial cupboard. I had to borrow and beg publications to fill your orders from big-city Congressmen until July 1, 1949, when I received a new fiscal-year allotment.

On next Friday at this hour I will again appear over WOW and discuss some of the foregoing matters and particularly the issue of the health of America. I will tell you something of the operations of the American Medical Association, which has built up the biggest slush fund in all history to fight those who favor more medical colleges for America, more hospitals, more doctors, lower doctor bills, and a means of bringing the health of this country up to a point so that never again will 50 percent of your youth be rejected for military service because of health and disabilities.

Thanks, ladies and gentlemen, for listening.

Why Not Try to Save Asia and the Pacific?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, some distinguished citizens think we should keep the only friends of liberty we have in China to help us. They cannot understand either why proffered help is refused. They write to the editor of the New York Times as follows:

NEW YORK, *December 3, 1950.*

There is no longer even a vestige of excuse for not permitting American planes to bomb Chinese Communist concentrations and supply sources in the privileged sanctuary of Manchuria. Every day, every hour, every minute in which this prohibition is kept in effect means the loss of American lives.

Nor is there any longer a vestige of excuse for refusing the proffered help of Chiang Kai-shek, who could land thousands of trained Chinese troops in Korea, while we could help him to supply his guerrilla forces in Communist China and bomb whatever concentrations of Chinese Communists remain opposite Formosa. Thus we could get relief immediately in Korea and open a second front in China.

No Congressman or Senator of either party ought to discuss any other issue or Presidential recommendation whatever until he has first demanded that either these two steps be taken or that the administration officials who refuse to take them resign immediately.

John Chamberlain, Benjamin Gitlow, Charles Yale Harrison, Henry Hazlitt, Suzanne La Follette, Eugene Lyons, J. B. Matthews, Patsy Ruth Miller, George E. Sokolsky, Ralph De Toledano, Lee Tracy.

Jurors Unshaken in Verdict Sacco and Vanzetti Guilty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD W. NICHOLSON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sunday Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass, for November 12, 1950:

JURORS UNSHAKEN IN VERDICT SACCO AND VANZETTI GUILTY—PAIR'S POLITICAL BELIEFS HAD NO BEARING ON DECISION, SAY SEVEN, UNSWAYED 29-YEAR PROPAGANDA BARRAGE

(By Edward B. Simmons)

One day, 29 years ago this fall, Walter H. Ripley, of Quincy, former chief of police and fire departments of that city, left his home for work. Two days past his seventieth birthday, he was foreman of Quincy's water meter repair division.

Mr. Ripley seemed thoughtful that morning. Halfway down the path from his front door to the sidewalk, he stopped suddenly. A big, solid man, with drooping handlebar mustaches like those of William Howard Taft, then Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Ripley put down his lunch box and coffee bottle and returned to the house.

"Snip, oh, Snip," he called. "I forgot to say good-by. I can't leave without a kiss good-by. You know that." He was addressing his wife, to whom he had been married 47 years, and the mother of their three children.

Surprised, for her husband was not usually so demonstrative, Mrs. Ripley embraced him before he went out again, an interlude which she never was to regret.

WORKERS FIND BODY

That afternoon, investigating because he had not made his usual inspection tour, fellow workers of Walter Ripley found his body near his workbench. He was dead, the victim of what apparently was a heart attack.

Unusual police activity immediately got under way. The Norfolk County district attorney's office was contacted. The Ripley lunch box and coffee bottle were impounded for chemical analysis, and the body was given to the custody of the medical examiner for a postmortem. A police guard was established around the Ripley home.

Such precaution in the death of an ordinary citizen would seem unusual now. They were considered routine in the case of Walter Ripley. For, 3 months earlier, as foreman of the Sacco-Vanzetti jury, he had announced to a waiting world that the defendants had been found guilty of murder.

Thus it was, on October 10, 1921, a few weeks later, the most famous murder trial in United States history and one that echoed and re-echoed around the world, exacted its first toll. Investigation disclosed Mr. Ripley had not been poisoned, as suspected, and that he had died of natural causes. But the strain of serving on the jury at an advanced age was held almost certainly a contributing factor.

In spite of the finding in Mr. Ripley's death, authorities had no reason to criticize themselves. In October 1921, 6 years before the two defendants expiated the crime for which they were convicted, turbulence over Sacco and Vanzetti was such that common sense assumed violence had caused the jury foreman's death so soon after the trial.

Ripley was the first member of that famous tribunal to die. He did not, of course, experience the full tempest of propaganda that has swept this Nation, and other continents, intermittently since the tremendous drama in which he was a participant. He escaped also most of the calumny that has been heaped upon those who had anything to do with the conviction of the two men.

TRIAL CAUSED FUROR

"The Sacco-Vanzetti case? Why bring that up?" some may ask. "Everybody has heard of that case," they say. "Two persons by those names were accused of something, there was considerable furor over their trial and they finally died for something. Was it for liberty of speech, or was it murder, can't remember which?"

That vague, and mistaken, impression is one good reason for looking again at the case. Another is that the brochures, books, radio addresses, plays, poems, magazine and newspaper articles and manifestos in their behalf never have waited for the excuse of an anniversary. With glacial imponderability, this outpouring has swept aside fact, constantly creating a more false foundation for later commentaries to start.

Thus, it is almost impossible for today's reader to find out what was perhaps the most significant—in the jury's mind—piece of evidence against Sacco and Vanzetti. The two best-known books on the case, both sympathetic to the defendants, ignore or do not mention this evidence, though a Supreme Court Justice wrote one and a Harvard Law School professor the other.

Most important reason for discussing anew the Sacco-Vanzetti case, however, is that the most authentic and qualified source of information never has been tapped—until now. That source is the one into which time made its first inroad with the death of Walter Ripley—the jury.

Where better to find an answer to the claim that Sacco and Vanzetti were convicted in a hysterically anti-radical period of United States history of a crime they did not commit? Who else survives who heard every syllable of evidence, sized up every witness and can say what evidence counted most in reaching the verdict?

The answer would seem to be obvious. Yet in all the years since the trial, none of the

so-called experts, be they columnists, authors, or rostrum "liberals," none ever took the trouble to inquire into the jury. Until the Standard-Times traced down these jurors and recorded their opinion, they never had been consulted since Sacco and Vanzetti were executed.

SEVEN JURORS INTERVIEWED

There was no way of knowing how many jurors had followed Ripley in death in the 29 years. It was necessary to begin with the actual court records of names and addresses as listed in 1921. But within 2 weeks an almost complete check of the jury had been obtained. Three others were found to have died, and seven of the eight remaining were interviewed. The twelfth member could not be located.

Here is what the seven known survivors of the Sacco-Vanzetti jury told the Standard-Times about their memorable verdict:

The verdict of guilty was in accordance with the evidence, was a just verdict, and they would vote the same way today.

The trial judge was eminently fair, indicated no inkling of prejudice, if he had any, to the jury, and his memory has been inexcusably sullied by defenders of Sacco and Vanzetti.

The so-called radicalism of the defendants played absolutely no part in the verdict. In fact, the jury is astounded still at the charge to the contrary, and amazed the trial ever became a world-wide cause celebre on that basis.

From children of the four jurors known to be dead, it was learned that their juror-parents shared the sentiments of the survivors.

It can be stated, then, that at least 10 jurors, having heard the evidence, seen the witnesses and lived through fanfare since the trial, had no reason to regret their decision and encountered no evidence that would persuade them the trial and verdict of Sacco and Vanzetti was anything but just. Ripley died too soon after the trial to be included in this category and, as pointed out, the other juror, if he is living, cannot be located.

KILLING RECALLED

This fall marked the thirtieth anniversary of the indictment of Nicolo Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti for double murder. They were accused of killing two shoe company personnel in a South Braintree Street the afternoon of April 15, 1920. The victims, Frederick A. Parmenter, paymaster, and Allessandro Berardelli, his guard, were shot down while walking the short distance between two factories of the Slater & Morrill Shoe Co.

The office from which they had departed was on the west side of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad tracks, near the South Braintree Depot and Pearl Street grade crossing. Their destination was on the east side of the grade crossing.

Near the second factory, two men who had been leaning against a fence in front of Rice & Hutchins Co., a factory which once had employed Sacco, sprang into action. A fusillade downed Berardelli, and Parmenter, who began to run across the street, was shot twice in the back. The guard died almost instantly, while Parmenter lingered a few hours unconscious in a hospital.

The two bandits grabbed pay boxes containing $15,776 and climbed into a curtained auto which drew up. The car, containing, it is generally believed, five men, then made off toward West Bridgewater, pausing at a crossing to force the watchman by pistol threat to raise the crossing gate. Two days later the auto was recovered in a section known as Manley Woods, Bridgewater.

On the night of May 5, 1920, Sacco and Vanzetti were arrested in a streetcar bound from West Bridgewater to Brockton. Both carried loaded revolvers. Sacco had a Colt 0.32 caliber, containing 9 cartridges, and had 23 spare bullets in his hip pocket. Vanzetti had a loaded 0.38-caliber revolver and had four shotgun shells in a pocket.

Circumstances of the arrest assumed great importance in the trial. A West Bridgewater garage owner, Simon Johnson, of Elm Square, had been directed by police to report any foreigners calling for an auto stored in Johnson's garage April 19 by an Italian named Boda. Police suspected the car may have had a connection with the South Braintree shootings.

POLICE NOTIFIED

The evening of May 5, Boda, another Italian, Sacco and Vanzetti, called for the car. Johnson engaged the men in conversation, advising them not to take the auto because its 1919 license plates were out of date. Meanwhile, his wife slipped next door and telephoned police. While returning, she testified at the trial, Sacco and Vanzetti, then apart from the others, observed her. They conferred with Boda and the other Italian, and all four left quickly, Boda and the fourth man going on a motorcycle.

Police arrived shortly afterward and one patrolman boarded the streetcar nearer Brockton from West Bridgewater and made the arrests. At police headquarters both Sacco and Vanzetti lied about why they were in Bridgewater, where they had obtained the guns, acquaintance with Boda, acquaintance with each other, and in several other respects. There was no disputing both men lied on arrest; defense conceded this at the trial but said they were afraid of becoming involved with the law as radicals.

The pair were held in jail until their trial began a little more than a year later. Meanwhile, Vanzetti was tried for an earlier attempted holdup in Plymouth and convicted, but serving of sentence was deferred until the outcome of the trial on the South Braintree murders. They were indicted Sept. 28, 1920, for the murder of Parmenter and Berardelli; trial began May 31, 1921; they were found guilty July 14, 1921, sentenced April 9, 1927, and electrocuted August 23, 1927.

Within days after the arrest, their cause was espoused by radicals in New York, where Vanzetti had visited after the crime he was accused of committing and before his arrest. A defense committee headed by Italian workers was formed, magazine and newspaper articles began to appear, and biographies of the two men were printed. The campaign centered, at this point, in Plymouth and surrounding communities. Halls were hired and appeals were made for funds.

Sympathizers played up arrests being made by the United States Attorney General's Office in a campaign against radicals. Some were being deported. Though there had been no special drive in Massachusetts, the New York group pointed to the fact that the body of one arrested radical had been found on the street, 14 floors below where he had been questioned by Federal agents. Persecution, cruelty, and witch-hunting were alleged.

DEBATED IN ITALY

Worldwide repercussions had not yet boomed in full salvo before the trial, but Sacco and Vanzetti were publicized enough for the Italian Chamber of Deputies to make them the subject of debate in January 1921. Already it was a question not of their guilt but of their beliefs. Their Italian birth, broken English speech, and workingman status were stirred in a cauldron from which poured denunciation of the United States, its people, its judicial system, and its traditions.

Gradually there emerged a conception of Sacco and Vanzetti as two shining white knights being crucified for their views. As this monstrous distortion took shape, sympathizers became even sketchier with fact and more vehement on propaganda. By the time of the trial many sincere and earnest organizations had been persuaded to the opinion that Sacco and Vanzetti could not possibly receive fair treatment in the court.

As already pointed out, the worst of the propaganda mill and demonstrations did not come until after the trial. But there was sufficient beforehand to raise the question how much actually seeped into the residents of Norfolk County, from whom the jury would be drawn.

Examination of contemporary newspapers indicates most had the good sense to play down contemporary reaction until after the trial. At any rate, the United States of 1920 was not so radio and news-conscious as now, and there is no reason to doubt that propaganda for Sacco and Vanzetti seems much more formidable as summed up today, than it did 30 years ago.

Already, however, sympathizers had succeeded in one respect. The fanfare disturbed many Norfolk Countians and discouraged them from any desire to serve on the jury. From the first 500 talesmen questioned for jury service, only seven were selected. Judge Webster Thayer, presiding, ordered deputies to round up an additional 200 persons.

At the end of 4 days the jury was completed, its membership satisfactory to the District Attorney Frederick G. Katzmann, and the chief defense counsel, Fred R. Moore, of San Francisco.

JURY CHOSEN CAREFULLY

No jury in Massachusetts history was more carefully chosen. Moore was a veteran defender of known radicals, had participated in the trial of Mooney and Billings for the San Francisco Preparedness Day bombing a few years before. Judge Thayer was vigilant in his questioning of talesmen; neither Moore nor Katzmann had any protests over the final seating except the defense thought it should have had more time to study the background of the five jurors chosen from the extra list of 200.

Thus, Sacco and Vanzetti were tried by a jury which represented the winnowing of 642 residents of Norfolk County. Were they unprejudiced, capable, sound men, neither too high nor too low on the social scale for the task that was theirs? A sure method of finding out, is to talk to them, something no person writing about the Sacco-Vanzetti case ever took the trouble to do until the Standard Times traced them this fall.

The jury, and their occupations at the time of the trial, were, besides Ripley, Frank R. Waugh, of Quincy, machinist; John F. Dever, of Brookline, clothing salesman; John E. Ganley, of Avon, grocer; Wallace R. Hersey, of Weymouth, real-estate dealer; Frank D. Marden, of Weymouth, mason; Lewis McHardy, of Milton, mill operative; Seaward B. Parker, of Quincy, machinist; Harry E. King, of Millis, shoe worker; Alfred L. Atwood, of Norwood, real estate; George A. Gerard, of Stoughton, lastmaker and commercial photographer, and J. Frank McNamara, of Stoughton, farmer.

Ripley, who would be 99 were he alive, was the oldest, and Dever, then 28, was the youngest. Six earned a livelihood with their hands. None was wealthy. All but Waugh were accounted for in the Standard-Times survey. He moved from Quincy to Connecticut in 1922, a year after the trial, and his whereabouts could not be learned.

Besides Ripley, death has taken McHardy, Hersey, and McNamara. Of the seven others, five are living in the same communities, if not the same homes, in which they resided at the time of the trial. Dever now is residing in Worcester and Marden in Medfield. All but Dever have been or are husbands and parents.

There are then at least seven persons available to the Sacco-Vanzetti student who heard all the evidence, observed the reactions of

the witnesses and defendants, and estimated their character, passed judgment on prosecution and defense methods, and for seven full weeks sat but a few feet from the controversial presiding jurist, Judge Thayer. In addition, the families of four other jurors can provide first-hand evidence on what those jurors thought of the celebrated trial.

Is it not remarkable that none of the so-called experts on the case has consulted this jury or sought to measure the qualifications of the members?

AUTHORS NEVER MET JURORS

In 1949 Author Philip Duffield Stong wrote in the Aspirin Age of the Sacco-Vanzetti case. His comment on the jury: "A dozen Yankees who had decided on the guilt of the accused before they took their seats."

According to the surviving jurors, Stong is a liar. Before making his incredibly sweeping statement did Stong take the trouble to meet any of the jurors? He did not.

Does the Sacco-Vanzetti jury fit the condemnation of it by Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter? The latter, in 1921 a Harvard Law School professor, long was articulate in the Sacco-Vanzetti cause. He has written magazine articles alleging a miscarriage of justice by the jury, and also a book. In the Atlantic of March 1927 he had this to say:

"In view of the temper of the times, the nature of the accusation, the opinions of the accused, the tactics of the prosecution, and the conduct of the judge, no wonder the men of Norfolk convicted Sacco and Vanzetti."

In his book, Case of Sacco and Vanzetti, Frankfurter wrote there was no wonder the jury voted for conviction, with its "solidarity against the alien, the indignation against the two draft dodgers." They had been inflamed by a "riot of political passion and patriotic sentiment," he wrote.

Justice Frankfurter is, more than anybody else, responsible for the widely accepted belief Sacco and Vanzetti were convicted as radicals, not murderers. He never met or talked to the jurors he said were unfit. He has never tried to.

RECENT BOOK FOLLOWS LINE

Latest book published on the case, the Legacy of Sacco and Vanzetti, by Harvard Law School Prof. Edmund M. Morgan and G. Louis Joughin, teacher at New York's New School for Social Research, declares there was a "heavy accumulation of proof that the majority of Americans in 1921 were not well suited for service on a jury trying social undesirables."

Proof of the validity of such a statement would depend on the character of the Sacco-Vanzetti jury. Did the authors of the Legacy ever call upon any single member of the jury to see whether their blanket repudiation could be substantiated in the particular case they wrote so hotly about? No juror ever met either author or the Legacy.

The law-school professor and the sociology teacher refer to the jury as "weak," with it "inevitable that the quality of the verdict should be tainted. A sick society makes sick decisions. The men of Norfolk constituted a jury whose ideals were cognate with their verdict."

Strong words, which neither author, nor any of their predecessor-sympathizers ever made the slightest effort to check for authenticity. They damned the jurymen and let it go at that.

Let us turn to the jury, for evidence of whether they were weak, passion-inflamed, and mind-made up before and during the trial.

ASTOUNDING MEMORY

Most articulate survivor of the tribunal is Mr. Dever. His memory is astounding. Perhaps the fact he became a lawyer after the trial served to impress the details of the case in his mind. Nevertheless, his ability to carry on a narrative account of what transpired, never pausing over a name no matter how obscure, is extraordinary. Mr. Dever's recollections are so fluid, the listener is returned 29 years to the hot June days in the courtroom.

The only knowledge the interviewer had of juror Dever before meeting him was based on writer Upton Sinclair's reference to him as "a Beacon Street blue blood." Sinclair's book in behalf of Sacco and Vanzetti, need it be said, declared the jury was incapable of deciding the guilt of persons of such lowly estate as the defendants.

"Are you a Beacon Street blue blood?" Dever was asked. His broad mouth stretched into a smile, then to laughter until he was red-faced. His warm blue eyes melted. He was sitting on the edge of a bed in his lodging-house room. One foot was bandaged. He has been in and out of veterans' hospitals with traumatic arthritis caused by a World War I injury when a gun carriage ran over him. Barely able to hobble about, unmarried with no close relations in this area, his ability to practice law or otherwise gainfully employ himself has been greatly hindered by his foot injury.

He ran his left hand back through his brushed-back gray hair.

"You know, a friend told me about that description. I'm as blue-blooded a Beacon Street resident as anybody can be who was born in the Italian section of Barre, Vt., grew up in Dorchester, stopped schooling at the eighth grade, lost his father at 11, his mother at 5, and went to work at 15.

"That description of Sinclair's is typical, I suppose. He took one look at my address and decided the whole jury, me especially, was a bunch of stand-pat New Englanders out to convict a couple of foreigners.

"Actually my Beacon Street address was a boarding house. I was working in Filene's having just come back from Army service."

DEFENDANTS' MAN

"Funny thing, too. I was a defendants' man. I say that in all honesty and sincerity. I was a defendants' man all the way through the trial. I don't mean I was determined to vote for their innocence regardless, but I was going to find them not guilty unless the facts proved otherwise to my definite satisfaction.

"You are the first person formally to ask me anything about the trial. And I'll tell you something I don't think anybody knows.

"When we first left the courtroom for deliberations, I had the feeling that most everybody felt Sacco and Vanzetti were guilty. But I clung to the theory I began the trial with, that we should give them every opportunity. So I suggested, after a brief spell, that we have an informal ballot, nothing binding, just something to get a sample of opinion. My hope was that the ballot would inspire a thorough review of what we had heard and seen.

"Well, that informal ballot was 10-2 for conviction with me one of the two. And just what I hoped would transpire did. We started discussing things, reviewed the very important evidence about the bullets and everybody had a chance to speak his piece.

"There never was any argument, though. We just were convinced Sacco and Vanzetti had done what the prosecution had charged them with."

How about the enduring charge that the defendants' radicalism was the basis for the finding of guilt by the jury?

"That had nothing whatsoever to do with it," Mr. Dever replied. "Absolutely nothing. The question never came up. I think every juror will tell you that.

"The only thing we considered in the jury room was whether the defendants were guilty as charged by the prosecution in the indictments, or, as I would have expressed it before becoming a lawyer, whether Sacco and Vanzetti did what they were accused of or whether they did not."

RADICALISM TALK ABSURD

"I can repeat it over and over again. That talk of radicalism is absurd. Radicalism had nothing whatsoever to do with it."

As he talked memorable events of the trial fell into line under the powers of Mr. Dever's memory. He recalled outstanding examples of evidence presented against the two men, and described at length the remarkable testimony and evidence on the rarity of the bullets found in Sacco's loaded gun, matched only by a bullet taken from Berardelli's heart.

But before continuing with Mr. Dever, it may be well to look in other jurors' memories.

It took courage to be on the Sacco-Vanzetti jury and considering the way it has been abused since, it requires courage to admit now having been a member. Even Mr. Dever, though unmarried, with a sister in California his nearest blood relation, was inclined to be cautious, not because he was afraid to state his convictions, but because he has no desire for publicity or to stir anew the controversy.

For Juror Ganley, a small spry man, the memory of the discomfort attendant on that jury service are still fresh. He was willing to recall his opinion of the case, but, as to publishing his picture, that was something else.

"I'm sorry, young man," he said, stopping for a moment while helping Mrs. Ganley hang out the laundry behind their comfortable home in Avon. "I would like to help. I would not mind having my picture taken, myself."

TAKING NO CHANCES

"But I have to think of my children. I have two fine sons and a wonderful daughter. I would not want to hurt them or their families, or cause them any discomfort with their neighbors or their daily lives. Of course, I don't mean any harm could come of being connected with the case. That is not it. But you understand Mrs. Ganley's attitude, don't you? And I agree. Better to take no chances."

Mr. Ganley, these many years later, still recalls the armed guard established around his home while he was living in Dedham Courthouse as a member of the jury, and again in 1927, when execution date for the convicted men drew near.

"It was pretty hard on my wife. The children were young at the time."

Mr. Ganley was operating a grocery next door to his home when he was called. Now semiretired, he is no longer in business, though active as chief assessor of the town of Avon.

"I was impressed by one aspect of the trial especially," he recalled. "That was that Judge Thayer was absolutely fearless and absolutely on the level. He was trying to do his job thoroughly and not leaning either way.

"At the final showdown, when the jury was reaching its verdict, there were no objectors. It was 'guilty.' Nobody had to put up an argument at all. Every member of the jury thought they were guilty.

"The more I've seen and heard, even after the trial, the more I am convinced they were guilty."

Identification testimony made a strong impression on Mr. Ganley at the trial. He recalled that of Reed, the Medfield railroad-crossing tender, who, the juror said, "was given two bawlouts by somebody in the bandit auto for having the gates down," and got "two good looks" at some of the occupants. He identified Vanzetti as an occupant.

TESTIMONY STILL FRESH

Also comparatively fresh in Mr. Ganley's memory was the testimony of Bostock, a machinist, who said he passed two swarthy foreigners of Italian extraction leaning on the Rice and Hutchins fence a moment before the shooting, and the testimony of Mary Splaine, who was at work nearby, and identified Sacco as one of the killers. She saw

the shooting from a window 60 feet from the scene.

"It was an entirely just verdict," summed up Mr. Ganley.

Juror King, very much alive at 64, had something in common with Sacco. Both were shoe workers.

Mr. King was setting a hen when the constable called on him and announced he was wanted for possible jury service at Dedham, the original venire panel of 500 having been exhausted. He was the eighth juror selected, first from the special roundup panel.

Testimony on the bullets stands out in Mr. King's recollection of the evidence. He remembers also his impression that Judge Thayer was "very fair. Every day he cautioned us to remember these men are innocent until proved guilty. He told us to keep our minds open. Repeatedly, repeatedly, he emphasized fairness.

"Anybody who says Sacco and Vanzetti were convicted because they were radicals and not on the evidence is all wet. Propaganda about their being radicals and being framed on the charges did not reach me before the trial. I was just a man in the street, minding my own business.

"As jurors, such talk did not concern us. We felt the defense put the radical element in the trial to hide the issue of murder. During the whole trial, the defense was conducted on the basis of the defendants' being persecuted radicals. It must have consumed at least half of the time.

"My associations with the jury were very fine. They were a bunch of fine men, none of them vindictive."

NOT ON CONSCIENCE

"My conscience never has troubled me. I had to come back to my job, working with other shoemakers in the factory. Most of them were Italians and knew Sacco when he lived in Milford. But my fellow workers never questioned the verdict or insinuated it was anything but justified.

"Sacco and Vanzetti were given every consideration."

Mr. King continued to work in the factory until July 1922, when he was appointed postmaster of Millis. When the Democratic Party took over the national administration, he lost that position and returned to the shoe factory. Today he is welfare agent for Millis. Mrs. King died in 1946, a married daughter died last spring and another married daughter and her family now reside with him.

All in all, Mr. King feels the Sacco-Vanzetti experience was costly for him. Diabetes caused the death of his daughter, but he has it on medical advice that worry and stress at home from the trial and 2 months of armed guards may have brought on the disease which eventually took her life.

More reticent about commenting on the trial than any of the other jurors, George A. Gerard of Stoughton says his memory is none too good. He thinks the verdict was entirely fair but that the "case is best forgotten.

"The outstanding thing about that trial was the judge. You can quote me on that. The fairest judge I ever saw or heard of.

"Who are these people who keep bringing up the case and complaining about the verdict? If they say the country was witch-hunting those days it must have escaped me. I don't remember all the radical talk. I always thought it was propaganda only."

NOT BITTER

"Am I bitter about it? Oh, no, not a bit of it. Such things happen every day, trials like that. Heavens no, I am not bitter. I just think the trial is best forgotten. Being on that jury did not affect my life, though it was a new experience for me. I suppose a murder trial is an everyday affair over the Nation, though. That's the way I look at it."

An unusual characteristic about the Sacco-Vanzetti jury, disclosed in the Standard-Times search, was that in almost 30 years only three have moved from their immediate communities. Waugh, of course, was last reported in Connecticut, Dever temporarily is residing in Worcester, and the other is Frank Marden. He waited until he was well over 70 before going from Weymouth to Medfield.

At 84, Mr. Marden and his wife are making their home with a married daughter on a farm. He still has the thick shock of white hair which he had, prematurely, at the time of the trial. A kindly man, he seeks no credit for the jury service he rendered when so many other citizens of Norfolk County were unwilling. Until he retired, he worked with his hands for a living, at masonry.

His clearest impression from the trial is "the outstanding fairness of Judge Thayer. He was fair to the other side, too, fair all around." He also recalls "the fairness of Mr. Katzmann. He didn't seem to be trying to put anything over on the defense."

Considering the evidence, Mr. Marden was impressed by identification witnesses, particularly Pelser (whose testimony is discussed by Juror Dever later), and the bullet testimony. He made the observation all trial witnesses were not in agreement, but added, "In the case of life and death of a man I think people will testify as best they can.

"I never have had a bit of reason to think the trial was anything but fair. I don't think we jurors thought of the defendants in any way except as two persons accused of murder."

JURY OF ONE MIND

"The jury got along fine. I remember that when we went out we had a smoke, talked about something else for a few minutes and gradually brought up the subject. Every one was of the same mind, the same opinion, that Sacco and Vanzetti were guilty."

Mr. and Mrs. Marden have been married 57 years. They never had been separated, before or since, as when he went to the courthouse, a jury venireman, and did not return for 7 weeks.

"Someone came back for his shaving mug and that was the last I saw of my husband for a long time, though one day I went to the trial," Mrs. Marden said. She was nervous then, what with the usual guard sitting in an auto every day outside their Weymouth home, but gradually Sacco and Vanzetti have paled into the distance. Of all the jurors' wives, she was the least apprehensive about having her husband finally heard on what he thought of the verdict.

At 73, Juror Seaward Parker, of Quincy, is still rarin' to go, and, in a good-natured way, somewhat miffed that his machine tool company thought his 38 years with the firm deserved him a pension.

"I'm tired and too old to work, retired at last," laughed Mr. Parker, who with his wife, had just returned from an active summer of outdoor work in Maine.

LAST JUROR PICKED

The last juror chosen, he thought it a "very fair trial by a good judge and heard by a good bunch of fellows. There never was a nicer crowd of men than that jury.

"I can't understand why the trial went around the world. They talk of Reds being involved in it, somehow. There never was a mention of Red in the courtroom or among the jury. I've been in hopes lots of times they would forget that trial, but it looks as if those so-called sympathizers will forever be bringing it up. I never could see where the idea of prejudice was picked up.

"Why should we want to pick up two Reds and try to convict them of murder? We did not know if they were Reds and we did not care.

"To my mind, and I really think this, the judge tried to help the defendants. He was square with us, too."

Recalling the evidence that impressed him most, Mr. Parker said, "The bullets, of course. That testimony and evidence on it sticks in your mind. You can't depend on the witnesses. But the bullets, there was no getting around that evidence."

The trial did not affect his life, said Mr. Parker. But, with Mrs. Parker, the most casual observer could see that Sacco and Vanzetti case turbulence had left its mark. She constantly cautioned her husband against too-free discussion and, in the end, prevailed upon him not to permit publication of his picture. Like Mrs. Ganley, she is not afraid—but. The couple have two married children with families.

POPULAR WITH COLLEAGUES

Alfred Atwood, of Norwood, must have been popular with his colleagues on the jury. Several made the query, "Have you seen Atwood yet?" or put in some other reference to the lean New Englander. At the time of the trial, Mr. Atwood just had returned from a Maine vacation, had not even unpacked, when a constable served a jury summons on him. He was among the extra panel of 175.

When interviewed, Mr. Atwood again had just returned from a Maine summer, at the same vacation place.

"I am absolutely satisfied no jury ever would find Sacco and Vanzetti innocent," he declared. "They might get a disagreement, but little possibility of that.

"I always thought it might have been a good idea to give them another trial in the years before sentence was carried out. The verdict of two juries would be more convincing, I believed. There was no doubt in my mind a second jury would have found them guilty like the first.

"I had no difficulty in my own mind arriving at a verdict."

Outstanding evidence in his mind was that of the old-fashioned type of Winchester bullets, one of which was found in Berardelli's body and duplicates which were found on Sacco when he was arrested. Sacco's manner also was recalled by Mr. Atwood, who at 64 is vigorous physically. He thought Sacco's attitude when asked to try on the cap found at the scene was peculiar, it being the juror's opinion the defendant was determined not to put on the cap in normal fashion, because he kept pulling it down virtually over his ears.

"Of course, both sides made a mess of some witnesses. To my mind it shows what was going on, the pressure I mean, for winning the case. But this we learned later. Never did there come to the knowledge or eyes of the jury any of the out-of-court pressure about the defendants being radicals."

MORE PRAISE FOR JUDGE

"I never saw things so well balanced as they were by that judge. If Katzmann made a point, Thayer would lean over backward to find something to balance it for the defense. If there was anything against those two fellows, he would do all in his power to compensate for their side.

"He never showed any bias to us. We never knew he had been the presiding judge at Bridgewater (when Vanzetti was tried for a holdup attempt in Plymouth). He never showed any favoritism. If I remember anything with absolute clarity, it was the judge's fairness."

Mr. Atwood recalled the jury was not too tense or over-concentrated on the trial when it was off duty. He recalled jury hijinks at the beach, while fishing and in the cramped quarters at Dedham, 12 men sleeping in cots in the same room. One night, he recounted, the jurors partly disassembled the sheriff's bed, so that when that august official retired there was a tremendous crash and much searching for a culprit.

Service on the jury, he feels, caused him later tribulations. Besides selling property, he felt responsible for helping some of those

who purchased from him. He lent money freely and paid interest on mortgages for many. One man took advantage of him. Unwilling to go to court, fearing there would be hue and cry about a Sacco-Vanzetti juror's stony heart, Mr. Atwood settled for virtually nothing.

The 1929 depression, following closely execution of the defendants, found him saddled with many unpaid loans. Rather than collect, he went into debt by more than $50,000. Last year by saving earnings as a glove factory employee, he finished paying off that $50,000, which had been a moral obligation only.

"I am pretty proud of that," he said. He is now employed at the Whitinsville Machine Works, in Whitinsville, returning to his married daughter's home in Norwood on weekends.

"I still feel they had a fair trial," he said nostalgically. "The mistake was in letting litigations drag on so long afterward."

JUROR'S HOME BOMBED

Undoubtedly the heaviest burden for having taken on that jury service fell to the lot of Lewis McHardy, of East Milton. Mr. McHardy died May 1, 1947, aged 83, almost exactly 20 years after his home was demolished by a bomb by radical Sacco and Vanzetti sympathizers, none of whom was apprehended.

His son, John McHardy, who lives in a new home, built on the site by popular subscription of Milton residents, said his father never had any regrets about the verdict.

"My father was a straight shooter. He never liked to talk about the trial and avoided mentioning it. He had taken a juror's oath and felt it binding until his death. He was as honest as any man could be, and as good.

"He discussed few details with his children. He greatly admired Judge Thayer, though, and stood up for him whenever the occasion demanded. He always was fond of the other jurors and said he had had a happy time with them, despite being locked up so long.

"I never heard him express an opinion about any influence radicalism had in connection with the trial. There wasn't much talk about on that subject during the period. That came afterward. We didn't hear about radicals until those who wanted Sacco and Vanzetti to be martyrs went to work.

"It was always kind of hard for our family, that trial. We received notes and crank letters, and finally our house was blown up. After that trouble at home, father was even more determined to forget the trial.

"I don't know why they picked out our house. I suppose it was because at that time there was no other building within 200 yards and many trees and bushes afforded the perpetrators adequate concealment."

FINDS PHOTO OF JURY

Charles H. McNamara, son of J. Frank McNamara, almost predicted a call from somebody about the Sacco and Vanzetti trial. Only 2 days before, while moving from the old homestead to a new house down the street in the farm country around Stoughton, the son's wife came across a photograph of the jury taken while on a fishing junket.

Mr. McNamara left seven children, five boys and two girls, of whom three are now dead. Like his son, Charles, after him and his father before, the Stoughton juror operated a dairy. He died September 23, 1931, aged 74, firm in his belief, the son said, that the verdict was called for by the evidence.

"I remember the period of the trial well," the son recalled. "I was filling silos with corn, just as I am these days. I remember thinking an army of persons wishing us harm could have hidden in the fields of corn around the house.

"The policeman on guard made so many tours of the barn he beat down a path around it. We were, however, not half as afraid as we should have been, realizing, as we do now, what a tempest was raised by the trial and all the excitement afterward."

Wallace Hersey was 81 when he died August 13, 1924. As with other Sacco-Vanzetti jurors who have passed on, the family was pleased no connection with the trial was mentioned in his obituary. The jury has been so neglected in discussion of the Sacco-Vanzetti verdict that most community records on its members have been lost, but the Herseys' children made no reference to their father's trial connection at his death.

"He thought they had a square deal," said Miss Mary E. Hersey, a daughter.

"He thought it was a civic duty to accept jury service, but he was glad to forget that case the last few years. Their sympathizers made it so hard for everybody."

That comment was all the daughter would make. Like nearly every woman directly or indirectly related to the jury members, she was loath to take even the slightest chance of incurring anew the wrath of sympathizers for the two murderers.

KIN DISTURBED

It is, indeed, remarkable how the jury service disturbed women kinfolk of the members. Surviving also in the Hersey family are the juror's widow and another daughter, married. The juror was worried over their safety and a police detail long patroled the home. Mrs. Hersey will not discuss the case, even to this day.

George W. Ripley, of Braintree, son of juror Walter Ripley, recalls how uneasy his mother was over having a police patrol at the family home. Younger members of the family tried to intercept threatening letters, but some reached Mrs. Ripley and heightened her distress.

"The judge told my father he did not have to serve, even after he had been accepted, because of his age," George Ripley, a retired machinist, said. "But he went ahead with it, and that was that."

Probably it was the apprehension of the womenfolk which prevented the Sacco-Vanzetti jury ever from meeting after the trial. They admired one another greatly; their friendliness was cemented by the long weeks together and the common abuse they suffered. But never since the trial have the jurors made any attempt to pick up the threads of the early acquaintanceship.

ONE GOOD END

Lamentable as it is that such conditions can be created in carrying out a civic duty, failure of the Sacco-Vanzetti jurors to meet in the three decades elapsing since their close association, served at least one good end. For their recollections of the trial are still strictly their own, free from any influence of a colleague's memory.

Of course, Juror Dever has no need of having his memory refreshed. He went down the list of evidence as if he had a memorandum on the bureau beside his bed—which he did not.

He was particularly emphatic that radicalism has no place in the jury's considerations.

"For that matter, as far as I know, the prosecution never offered any evidence they were Communists or slackers," he said. "But when Sacco and Vanzetti were arrested they lied as to what they were doing with loaded guns. They gave conflicting stories, afterward proved untrue. There was no argument about that. The defense admitted they lied.

"In Massachusetts, actions and behavior at the time of arrest may be used to indicate consciousness of guilt. When the prosecution sought to emphasize Sacco and Vanzetti's confusion on arrest as consciousness of guilt, the defense, not the prosecution, introduced the fact that they were radicals and slackers and feared arrest."

PERMITTED TO CROSS-EXAMINE

"Thereupon, Judge Thayer permitted Katzmann to cross-examine in an effort to show Sacco and Vanzetti were not real radicals or Communists as they stated in defense of the consciousness of guilt charge.

"All of which means, that if I say I could not have stolen a bicycle at Second and Elm Streets because I was stealing a bicycle at Sixth and Elm Streets, I have to be able to prove I was stealing that bike. If they used radicalism as evidence they were not guilty, they had to prove they were radicals."

And what about Judge Thayer, Mr. Dever? His conduct of the case has been the bullseye for every piece of literature ever printed condemning the trial.

"The judge was A–1. He never in any way, shape, or manner let us know what his views were. Thayer may have had an opinion. He may have expressed it outside of court. But he didn't indicate his preference to the jury. I say that quite frankly.

"I am amused that much of the criticism comes from domains where the judge can say to the jury, 'The evidence, I think, clearly shows guilt. Bring in a verdict of guilty.' The judge can make that kind of a charge in Britain's courts and in the Federal courts in this country, of which Justice Frankfurter is a member.

"You know I've got a good memory," went on Mr. Dever, obviously enjoying an opportunity to talk of the trial he remembered so well and about which he had so long been silent."

QUOTES JUDGE'S CHARGE

"I remember part of Judge Thayer's charge to us, before we went out." And he began to quote, without, as later checking disclosed, missing a word:

" 'I beseech you not to allow the fact that the defendants are Italians to influence or prejudice you in the least degree. They are entitled to the same rights and consideration as though their ancestors came over on the Mayflower.' "

(The next paragraph of the judge's charge continued that theme: "In the administration of our laws there is and should be no distinction between parties. Under our law, all classes of society, the poor and the rich, the learned and the ignorant, the most powerful citizen as well as the humblest, the believer as well as the unbeliever, the radical as well as the conservative, the foreign-born as well as the native-born, are entitled to and should receive the same rights, privileges, and consideration as the logic of law, reason, and sound judgment, justice, and common sense demand.")

"As I say, I was a defendants' man," Mr. Dever continued, "and if the judge was prejudiced against the men he did not give any indication to us.

"I remember in Barre, my birthplace, there was a wonderful statue to Robert Burns of pure marble from the quarries there. It was carved by an Italian. I was brought up near that statue and I acquired a respect for anyone who could create a marvelous work of art like that with his hands. I admired Italians then, I did during the trial and still do. It is nonsense to say we were prejudiced against Sacco and Vanzetti because they were Italian immigrants."

Mr. Dever, his bad foot paining him, lay down as he continued his narrative.

RECALLS SUMMONS

"I remember after receiving a summons for jury service that I went to Dedham on a Monday, returned to Filene's and worked Tuesday and finally went to Dedham to stay on Wednesday. While waiting in an anteroom to be called into court for questioning about jury service, I was told by a newspaperman, 'You'll never be selected for the Sacco-Vanzetti jury.'

"Well, I wasn't exactly sorry at his opinion, but I asked why."

"'Those buttons you are wearing,' he said."

"I had forgotten. I was wearing an American Legion button and a Knights of Columbus pin. Come to think of it, I thought, you won't get by with those, Dever. Of course I realized that with Sacco and Vanzetti reported to be draft-dodgers and radicals, their lawyers would not want a veteran and a Catholic on the jury.

"That wasn't the way it turned out. When I went in, Judge Thayer asked me five questions—whether I was related to the defendants, knew them, had read papers and preformed any opinions, and so on. I responded in the negative to each question, but I did not expect to be approved. I could see the defense counsel, the McInerney brothers, Jerry and Tommy, both of whom I knew well later, and Callahan (William J. Callahan) and Fred Moore looking at me and then examining a book, which, I suppose, contained my life history.

"Then Thayer said, 'The court stands indifferent,' which, of course, meant he did not care one way or the other whether I was acceptable. Katzmann said he would accept me and then Moore announced I was acceptable to both defendants.

"I was surprised."

PANEL EXHAUSTED

"Well, that was Wednesday, I remember. Thursday, they ran out of veniremen and Thayer sent the sheriffs out for more. Finally, while we who had been chosen were sleeping Friday night, the sheriff came in and roused us. It was 1:25 Saturday morning. We pulled on some clothes, went into the courtroom and were sworn in, the last man just having been selected. He was Seaward Parker of Weymouth, I think it was. (Wrong, Mr. Dever, Parker was indeed, twelfth juror but his home was in Quincy.)

"We got Saturday off, I believe. Monday we went for a tour of the scenes of the holdup, place where the getaway car was found—Manley Woods, the auto belonged to a man named Murphy, I recall—and then the trial got under way."

Mr. Dever was asked what evidence he considered to have been most important in the jury's vote of guilt.

"Just as I told Governor Fuller a few years later, there was no single piece of evidence that determined the verdict, I would say. Various pieces fitted into chains of evidence, which, to my mind, not having a weak link, were pretty strong.

"Let me give a couple of examples. For instance, the testimony about Sacco and Boda's car. We know that on May 5 Sacco and Vanzetti were at the Johnson's place. Mrs. Johnson testified she came downstairs in answer to a knock, found Boda and told him she would call her husband. She went upstairs and spoke to him, and while he came down to carry on the conversation she went next door, about 60 yards I think it was, to telephone from the home of people named Bartlett.

"I have a good memory. I haven't discussed this case for years, but all these names come back to me.

"While she was returning home, she said, she saw Sacco and Vanzetti observe her, and they went to where Boda and her husband still were talking, and drew Boda aside. Immediately, she testified, they left. And as you know, they were arrested on the trolley going toward Brockton."

SURE OF IDENTITY

"Now I'm getting to the point. The conductor of that streetcar was named Cox (wrong, Mr. Dever, it was Cole). He testified it was the second time that pair had been on his car at night within a short period. The other time was the night of April 14 or 15, he could not be positive which. He was sure of the identification, though. He was asked why he was so positive.

"'I operate a country trolley,' he answered. 'I know everybody who gets on and off in the country. I particularly remember the defendants because one of them I thought reminded me of a friend and the other was a total stranger. You know everybody on a country route, but I didn't know them.'

"Well, that was pretty reliable testimony, and it seemed reasonable. If you had listened to Cox (Cole) you would have believed him. After all, that is the jury's job, to size up a witness. And he made a good impression.

"The point is this: The prosecution was contending that Boda's car probably had been used to take the murderers from Manley Woods, where the getaway car was abandoned, to the area of Boda's Bridgewater home. And here were Sacco and Vanzetti positively identified by a reliable witness as boarding a trolley in the Bridgewater area either the night before or night after the crime, and a few days later they reappear in that area with Boda.

"Another example of related evidence was the testimony on rarity of the bullets. It was most unusual, in that it was the defense which introduced the evidence.

"Definitely established was the fact a .32-caliber Winchester bullet killed Berardelli. The prosecution's ballistics expert, Van Amburgh, said he thought the bullet had been fired from the Colt .32 found on Sacco when arrested. Another prosecution ballistics witness, Captain Proctor, said he thought it was 'consistent' with having been fired from the Sacco pistol. Both men had fired Winchester bullets from the Sacco pistol to compare markings."

EXPERTS DISAGREE

"Then the defense ballistics expert, Burns, testified he did not think the fatal bullet had been fired from Sacco's gun. He gave reasons. Burns made a good impression. He was a man of fine appearance, apparently reliable and sincere.

"District Attorney Katzmann asked Burns why he had not used Winchester bullets in his tests with Sacco's gun. Burns replied he had not been able to obtain any bullets like the fatal one because it was of a rare old-fashioned type.

"'The bullets I used were, however, more nearly approximate the fatal one than the newer Winchester bullets used by the prosecution's witnesses,' Burns told the court.

"'Did you make a thorough effort to find matching Winchester bullets for your test?' Burns was asked.

"'I tried all over New England with no success.'

"And then Burns looked down from the witness stand at a man sitting nearby," Dever continued, "and added, 'I even contacted my colleague, Mr. Fitzgerald here, of the Remington company, and he was unable to obtain any for me from the company's stocks. Mr. Fitzgerald will back up my statement.'

"Fitzgerald did support Burns' statement," said Dever. "Those old bullets were unobtainable on the market.

"But do you know who had some of them? When Sacco was arrested, he was carrying 23, I believe it was, extra bullets, and some were the identical, old-fashioned, unobtainable Winchester .32-caliber bullets, exact duplicates of the one which killed Berardelli.

"Call that circumstantial evidence, if you will. But in many cases, circumstantial evidence is better than direct evidence. More people are convicted of crimes they did not commit on the basis of so-called direct evidence than are by circumstantial."

CREDIBILITY QUESTIONED

Dever declared he, like others on the jury, was well aware some ballistics testimony, particularly that of Proctor, was open to question because of contradictions. Credibility of other witnesses, who claimed to have seen Sacco and Vanzetti at the scene of the murders, also was suspect because of their manner and personal background, he said.

"Trial post mortems make a great deal of these things. They assume the jury found for guilt on the basis of such weak testimony. In my opinion, we have juries in order that members can assess the true importance of such testimony and not give it the false weight it might assume if submitted in writing. We did not place much credence in poor witnesses. Just like any reasonable persons would, we tried to evaluate all aspects.

"You know I was just out of the Army and I was pretty familiar with a Colt pistol. I remember Proctor was asked if he could disassemble one and he replied he could not. As a juror, that made an impression on me. I suspected he did not know as much about guns as the prosecution claimed. If those who believe Sacco and Vanzetti did not have a fair trial are interested, I can tell them right now: Sacco and Vanzetti were not convicted on a basis of Proctor's evidence." Critics have assailed Proctor's testimony since the trial.

In Mr. Dever's opinion, pro-Sacco and Vanzetti literature often has distorted what the jury actually heard in attempting to try the case in newspapers and periodicals afterward. He cited the testimony of a witness for the prosecution.

"Remember Louis Pelser's testimony?" he asked, as usual reaching into memory instantly and correctly. "Pelser was wearing a blue serge suit, even though it was summer, and perspiring heavily, as he testified.

"He said he had been at work in a shoe factory overlooking the scene of the murders and heard a shot. He looked out the window. He remembered the window had been half open, and that they had not been able to free that particular window for some days."

TELLS OF SHOOTING

"Pelser said he saw a man with a gun bending over another man who was kneeling in the street. He saw the armed man shoot the other man. Then Pelser said the armed man looked up at him, flourished his gun. Pelser testified he ducked, but looked up again in time to see and jot down the robbers' auto license number as it sped away.

"Pelser was asked could he identify the man who did the shooting. He said yes. He was asked whether that man was in the courtroom. He said yes. He was asked if he could point him out. He said yes. And he pointed to Sacco.

"Then defense attorneys took over Pelser and the witness admitted that before the trial he had said, in the presence of his father and mother, a member of the prosecution staff, and a stenographer, while being questioned in his home, that he could not identify the man he saw doing the shooting.

"'How can you come in court now and testify completely to the opposite of what you said then? You are lying now, are you not?, a defense attorney shouted at him.

"'No,' said Pelser, and I am paraphrasing his testimony as I remember it," Dever continued. "'No, I am not lying. I did not want to be a witness in this case. I did not want to get involved. I did not tell the truth when I first was questioned in order to avoid being entangled. But they brought me in, anyway, and now that I am under oath and here on this witness stand I will tell the truth.

"'I have never told the actual story of what I saw before.'

"You know," continued the juror, easing his foot onto the bed, "it was obvious to me Pelser's identification testimony was a surprise to the prosecution. Katzmann was not even questioning him. His assistant, Harold Williams (now a Superior Court judge), was, I believe."

PROSECUTION SURPRISED

"Pelser's intended value to the prosecution, in their estimation, judging from the emphasis of their questions, had been to establish the time and to show how the license identification was obtained. When he went further and identified Sacco, the prosecution appeared to be very much surprised.

"In my estimation, Pelser seemed to be telling the truth.

"Of course, there has to be faulty evidence. If there were not, it would be impossible for one side to win. Faulty evidence is to be expected in any trial. The jury is there to pick it out. Our whole system of jurisprudence would be wasteful and wrong if the printed word was the basis alone for arriving at a verdict. Yet, that is what the post-trial writers expect to accomplish. And they select their evidence and what they will print of it, at that.

"The jury has been condemned by persons who point out Vanzetti had a lot of witnesses who testified he was in Plymouth selling eels the day of the murders.

"I remember one of those witnesses. Judged on appearance, he probably was the most effective. He seemed to be a pretty good fellow. Funny, I can't remember his name. Anyway he said he saw Vanzetti in Plymouth that day, and that he remembered the day especially because he, the witness, was fixing his boat.

"No matter how hard the prosecution tried, they could not shake his testimony. He was convinced it was April 15, he had seen Vanzetti and he had a memory-jogging factor, the boat repair, to make the impression strong in his mind.

"Katzmann had about given up. In fact, as I recall it, he was on his way back to his seat, when he turned to the witness, an Italian like the others who appeared for Vanzetti, and asked 'Are you sure, positively sure, it was April 15 that you saw the defendant in Plymouth?'

" 'Well, I was not too positive myself,' replied the witness, 'but I remember coming up on the train with a defense lawyer and we agreed it ought to be April 15.' "

BOOKS OMIT STATEMENT

"It is irritating," said Dever, "but the books by Sacco and Vanzetti sympathizers leave out that last statement, when talking about this positive witness for Vanzetti.

"No wonder many people think the jury was daffy. How could they think anything else when they get only half the picture? The defense has tried the case in the newspapers. The prosecution, naturally, cannot. The result is, the public simply has been overwhelmed by the defense evidence and little of that which prompted the jury to reach a verdict of guilty ever is made known."

After the trial Mr. Dever resumed work at Filene's. At night he studied law, and in 1926 passed the bar exams. He remained with Filene's, however, until 1933, becoming head of their employees arbitration board. He then joined the State division of employment security, remaining there when it was taken over by the Federal Government in World War II.

The Sacco-Vanzetti jury's service was not closed with the trial. For the next 6 years its members and their families had to endure vilification in written comments and threat from the more radical of the condemned men's supporters. Agitation carried to every corner of the globe.

In Habana, an American General was threatened. Dutch radicals protested. Communist mass meetings in Brussels adopted resolutions. In Czechoslovakia new trial resolutions were approved. American Legations in Sofia, Buenos Aires, Lisbon, and Tokyo received bombing threats. The Paris Embassy was bombed. Algerians, Chinese, South Africans, and Russians demanded Sacco and Vanzetti be freed.

Milan was the scene of many demonstrations. The Swiss labor movement sent a petition signed by 156,000 persons. Governor Fuller, by 1927, had received 17,000 first-class-postage letters.

COMMUNIST TIRADES

In this maelstrom, the Communist press was the vortex. Its tirades knew no bounds. It advocated further legalities and probably was a leading contributor to the more than $360,000 fund that was raised by defense committees. What other sums were obtained in the name of Sacco and Vanzetti and put to purely radical use cannot be estimated, but fund-raising totals are obscure in the record.

In this period, the jury was dismissed as an incompetent, prejudiced, vindictive group of witch hunters. Judge Thayer received the worst of the epithets. His life history was explored; any chance remark he may have made, whether while playing golf in this State or paying the bellhop, in a hotel in Spain, that might be construed as anti-democratic and distorted and played up in "liberal" and left-wing brochures, articles and speeches.

By 1927, sympathizers of Sacco and Vanzetti attained an objective. So great had been the torrent of criticism that many level-headed persons who normally might have permitted the law to take its course were persuaded to doubt fairness of the trial. The crescendo clamoring for a new trial became immense.

Three times motions for a new trial were argued before Judge Thayer; each time they were denied. Twice the defense went to the State supreme court on complaints that Judge Thayer was not correct in denying admission of so-called new evidence. The high court upheld the jurist.

Sacco was in and out of the insane asylum, while Vanzetti's sanity was questioned. A convicted murderer from New Bedford, Celestine Medeiros, confessed in the death house to being involved in the East Braintree hold-up and killings and said Sacco and Vanzetti were not implicated. His account was checked and thrown out as false.

"For a year or more after the trial we were being called by the Governor or some other authority determining whether there was possibility of error," juror Parker said. "The Governor desired to give them every break he could."

ADVISORY BOARD NAMED

In 1927, Governor Fuller appointed an advisory board of President Lowell of Harvard, President Stratton of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Judge Robert A. Grant. This group called in the jury members separately.

"Is there anything about this whole case that bothers you?" Mr. Dever recalled he was asked after reviewing the trial with the group. "Is there anything that makes you doubt the verdict was not just, on thinking it over?"

Governor Fuller summoned jury members singly for his own review of the case. Mr. Dever said he was questioned, with his acquiescence, in the presence of a stenographer. Then the Governor took him aside, out of earshot of everybody else, the juror recalled, put his arm on his shoulder and asked if there was any matter Dever would like to get off his chest about the trial.

The Governor also asked what part of the evidence Dever thought the most conclusive. Mr. Dever said he replied there was no particular thing alone, but groups of related evidence, which taken in conjunction, made a verdict of guilty the only possible one and the just one.

The Governor's advisory board had three questions to answer:

Was the trial fairly conducted?

Was evidence discovered after the trial of such importance a new trial was warranted?

Are members of the board convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that Sacco and Vanzetti were guilty of the murders?

Having read 7,000 pages of testimony and talked to 102 witnesses and the jury, the board found in the affirmative on the first and third questions and in the negative on the second, all by unanimous votes. Their report was made public August 6.

APPEALS TO 14 JUSTICES

April 9, 1927, Sacco and Vanzetti were sentenced to die the week of July 10. In the next 17 days, appeals were taken to 14 justices in four courts. Judge Broadhurst in Suffolk County refused a stay; Chief Justice Walter P. Hall, of the Superior Court, refused to appoint a new judge to hear a new trial motion; Judge George A. Sanderson, of State supreme court, refused a habeas corpus writ; Judge Oliver Wendell Holmes, of State supreme court, refused a habeas corpus, and Judge George W. Anderson, of the United States district court, refused a habeas corpus.

The full bench of the State supreme court heard exceptions to Judge Thayer's denial of a new trial, and denied the exceptions. Then Judge Hall refused a stay of exceution. Judge James M. Morton, Jr., of United States district court, refused a habeas corpus. Judge Holmes refused a stay and an order of notice on a writ of certiorari.

Then the defendants' counsel went to the United States Supreme Court. First Justice Brandeis refused a stay, then Justice Stone, and finally, Chief Justice Taft declined to return to the United States from Canada to take any action.

Final appeal was to Judge James A. Lowell of the United States district court and, again, to Judge Anderson on August 22. The next day Sacco and Vanzetti were electrocuted, while 800 police armed with machine-guns, gas bombs, and high-pressure hoses stood guard around the prison.

The controversy has continued, however, in book, poem, play, magazine, and occasional newspaper article. Justice Frankfurter remains silent, but his lead is being followed by a group including Philip Murray of the CIO, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, of the CIO Auto Workers, Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, and Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger, of Harvard. They sponsored a "manifesto" in 1947 and are attempting to have a memorial bas-relief to Sacco and Vanzetti set up in Boston Common.

NEW BOOK TYPICAL

Typical of the literature is "The Legacy of Sacco and Vanzetti," previously mentioned. In 595 pages, packed with legal references, Professor Morgan and Mr. Joughin present what Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., also a Harvard professor, calls a cogent evaluation of the legal and sociological aspects.

As demonstrated in the interviews, a majority of the Sacco-Vanzetti jury survivors consider the rarity of the bullets found on Sacco and in Berardelli's body extremely significant. Perhaps this was the most damning of all factors involved.

The cogent evaluation of Professor Morgan and Mr. Joughin does not even mention this extraordinary evidence in its lengthy examination of the data presented against Sacco and Vanzetti.

Justice Frankfurter, who orated loudest and longest against the verdict, does not allude to the bullet evidence in the Case of Sacco and Vanzetti, his book on the trial.

By such omission is strength given the allegation that Sacco and Vanzetti were not convicted on the murder evidence. By such omissions is the jury's fitness placed in a false light.

A later era recognized the grave threat to democratic processes that the fact distorted, or omitted, can be. It is no compliment to American justice and fair play that for these many years the Sacco-Vanzetti jury has been damned in books written without even

knowledge of whether its members were alive or dead to respond.

Time continues, of course, its inexorable inroad on the small band of courageous citizens who fulfilled a basic responsibility of citizenship—jury service.

The years have not brought any member riches, but they have brought strengthened conviction that the verdict was in complete accord with the consciences and the evidence—and that it was just.

NO COMMENT

"I have never commented publicy on the Sacco-Vanzetti case and have no intention of doing so now," said Frederick G. Katzmann, of Hyde Park, who as Norfolk County District Attorney in 1921, headed the prosecution staff in the celebrated murder trial. Mr. Katzmann is president of a savings bank and still practices law.

"GUILTY!" SAYS ELWIN HAUVER, COURT STENOGRAPHER AT TRIAL

There was no doubt in the mind of a New Bedford resident who heard every word of testimony in the Sacco-Vanzetti trial that the two defendants were guilty of murder. Elwin H. Hauver, of 427 Bedford Street, has had nearly a half-century's experience in listening to murder trials and recording the proceedings. He was one of two official court stenographers at the Dedham trial in June and July 1921.

"You can't put it too strongly, my belief in the justice of the verdict and guilt of the men and the fairness of the trial," said Mr. Hauver, who retired this year as official stenographer for the Bristol County Superior Court.

"Of course, I've seen a lot of murder trials, and other trials in forty-odd years and I think I'm in a position to be a pretty good judge. At the time of the Sacco-Venzetti trial there was not a single person I ran across in the courtroom who thought they were innocent. With one exception," he added smiling, "a newspaperman."

Of Judge Webster Thayer, who has been accused of prejudice by Sacco-Vanzetti sympathizers, Mr. Hauver declared, "There was no question about his fairness. There was no question about his courage, either. He was not afraid of man or the devil."

In his opinion the so-called radicalism of the defendants played no part in influencing the verdict of guilty. Most of the sensational emphasis on this came after the trial, he believes. Encouragement for later generations to think the pair were not convicted on the evidence has come from books like Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter's, Mr. Hauver said.

Frankfurter's book condemning the verdict, The Case of Sacco and Vanzetti, "distorted the facts," the New Bedford man feels.

"We, the other stenographer and I, heard every word said, we heard every consultation between judge and counsel and prosecution. There was not a single word relating to that trial involving the court we did not hear. And in my mind there was no question that Sacco and Vanzetti were guilty as charged."

Mr. Hauver's experience with murder cases began in 1903 when he was attached to the Boston Police Department.

Manhattanville Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth being held here in Washington this week focusses attention on the Manhattanville Center, located in my district, described by the New York Times as a potent force for combating juvenile delinquency and encouraging good citizenship in an overcrowded section of Manhattan. Members will be interested in the appended editorial from the November 29 New York Times which deals with the outstanding work of this center. It follows:

MANHATTANVILLE CENTER

A potent force for combating juvenile delinquency and encouraging good citizenship in a tragically underpivileged area of the city is the Manhattanville Neighborhood Center, at 514 West One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Street. Here 45,000 persons are living in badly overcrowded housing. Roughly one-third of the residents of the region are Negroes, one-third are Puerto Ricans, and the remaining third comprises 22 nationalities. All of these human beings are squeezed into an area of about 50 city blocks.

Like all enterprises of its kind, the center requires generous contributions from its friends to enable it to carry on. If adequate funds are received, the center hopes to develop a leisure-time program for aged persons, to cultivate more constructive and more social attitudes among juvenile gangs, to keep younger children from being attracted by gangs, to formulate an effective adult-education program, and to carry out extensive physical repairs to the center itself.

Last summer, with the cooperation of Columbia University Teachers College, representatives of the center visited 3,679 dwelling units in the area in a laudable project to redesign and redevelop the community. The results of the study are now being tabulated. Donations from friends will make more constructive surveys of this kind possible. Checks should be sent to the Manhattanville Center Business Office, at 2852 Broadway, New York 27.

A Clean Fulfillment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Manila Bulletin of Saturday, October 14, 1950:

A CLEAN FULFILLMENT

The 5-year task of the War Damage Commission is drawing to a close. The commissioners have completed and sent to President Truman their final report on the public property rehabilitation phase of their work, which is the most visible and tangible of all the things that have been done for the people of the Philippines under the Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

The full scope of restoration is impressive. It often escapes the notice of people who live here because the process has been necessarily gradual. The impact of surprise is apparent in the faces and the remarks of people who leave the country and return to note the progress made in removing the horrible scars of war.

The payment of war damage money to individuals and private entities used up most of the sums allotted to the Philippines for rehabilitation. The sum available for restoring public buildings and properties of the government was ₱110,500,000. Schools got most of it, with national government buildings, hospitals, and dispensaries, provincial and municipal buildings, irrigation projects and waterworks and government corporations sharing in that order.

The Philippine Government at the same time has spent since 1945 an estimated ₱80,000,000 of its money on rehabilitation of public properties. Much of this has gone into construction of roads and bridges, the cost of which was shared half and half between the United States and Philippine Governments. This has led to the erroneous impression that all public restoration work was so shared. Except in a few cases where work on necessary projects had already been started, or under other special arrangements, the cost of restoring public buildings was wholly paid for out of war damage funds from the United States.

The commission's report to the President is factually complete, ably presented and well edited, with illustrations, but it modestly fails to bring forward one notable fact which should not go unmentioned. With all the huge expenditure of money involved, no breath of scandal has touched the operation. There must have been minor defections, mistakes and failures, but none were important enough to come to public notice. There has been a clean fulfillment of public trust.

The American commissioners and staff people are getting ready to leave their jobs and go home. Most of them, including Commissioners Frank Waring and John O'Donnell, will have left by the end of next month. It is quite possible that other Americans will be sent here by their Government to implement the recommendations of the Bell mission's report. In our opinion the best qualified Americans for that work would be Commissioners Waring and O'Donnell. Could they be induced to stay?

British Commonwealth Colombo Plan For Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, one of the essential elements in our fight against the Communist totalitarian drive to capture the free world is economic reconstruction and development. This is the best way to give the millions of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Europe something to fight for.

The appended editorial on the Colombo plan of the British Commonwealth nations is based upon their considerable experience in the Far East and is an indication of the magnitude of the effort required to do the job which needs to be done. It is significant that on the basis of an expenditure of over $5,000,000,000 only modest improvements are hoped for in standards of living, and yet the decisive victory over communism is undoubtedly to be based upon the effort to raise standards of living. The New York Times editorial of November 29, 1950, follows:

THE COLOMBO PLAN

One of the greatest adventures in aid for underdeveloped areas was officially launched yesterday by the seven countries of the British Commonwealth. It is the "Colombo

Plan for Cooperative Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia." Here is a practical, hard-headed, realistic approach to a vital problem in an area of the globe that contains 570,000,000 people and, among other things, exports just about all the world's jute and rubber and two-thirds of the world's tin.

It is hardly necessary at this moment to point out the value of a plan that can lessen or help to defeat the menace of communism in southeast Asia. The economic front is as important in the long run as the military and political fronts. Hunger is the Communist's best ally, and hunger is the normal state in southeast Asia. So the plan rightly aims at food more than anything, and in that connection at providing the technical advice and training to make increases in agricultural production. An idea of the tremendous urgency of the problem can be gained from the fact that in 20 years, at the present rate of population increase, there will be 150,000,000 more mouths to feed in the area. In other words, just to maintain the present miserably low standard of living, production must be increased enough to feed that many more people.

Each region in the plan has specified what it needs and what it can do to help itself. The Commonwealth countries are pledged to provide as much of the remainder as they can. Whatever happens, that much will be done in the next 6 years. Beyond that, the success or failure of the plan will depend upon American aid. In principle, the Colombo plan does just what we believe should be done—the improvement of underdeveloped areas through a maximum of self-help. This is a sort of Commonwealth point 4. Our own point 4 program is not big enough. The French and Dutch have their own problems in southeast Asia. Either we help or the Colombo plan will remain restricted to a scope too small to be decisive. Since it conforms to our policies and aims, the presumption is that Washington will cooperate as much as it can.

The Negro Is Being Misled on Integration and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, Davis Lee, Negro publisher of the Newark (N. J.) Telegram, has written some very interesting editorials for his publication. I am of the opinion that leadership such as represented by this writer will accomplish a great deal more for Negroes than radical proposals offered by those who would use race prejudice to exploit the Negro race for their own benefit.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a recent editorial written by Lee, which represents sound thinking and the most reasonable attitude presented by any leader of the Negro race:

The more I travel, listen, and observe, the more convinced I become that the Negro has been grossly misled in this matter of integration and civil rights.

It appears to me that the first things should come first, and that our economic well-being is of greater significance than the privilege or right to attend a white school or to associate with white people on an equal social basis provided by Supreme Court decisions and pressure legislation.

As a Negro and an American, I naturally want to see my race enjoy every right, privilege, and opportunity enjoyed by any other American, but I am opposed to any type of agitation designed to deprive the other fellow of a right to be associated with his own kind exclusively, if he so desires. I would like to reserve such a right for myself and definitely would not want it encroached upon by a Supreme Court edict or any other kind of interference.

The right granted to one or two Negroes in Virginia or some other Southern State to enter a State graduate school is of no benefit to the millions of our people who are in need of the bare necessities of life, and when the fortunately situated members of the race conduct such campaigns of agitation for selfish gain the needy masses suffer.

While the South does not provide ample or adequate modern school facilities for Negroes everywhere, neither does it provide completely modern facilities for white schools, because the money is not available for such a vast undertaking. However, rapid progress has been made and in Montgomery, Ala., and several other communities the Negro schools far exceed the white schools in modernization and physical appearance. Neither do the majority of southern Negroes nor the majority of the whites approve of the present program to disrupt a custom which has served both races well down through the years and contributed so much to the Negro's economic security.

Just what would be the future educational status of the Negro in the South if the legislatures of all of the Southern States would enact legislation withdrawing State financial support from all schools of higher learning, starting at the high-school level? Not only is this possible, but if it should come to pass, the Negro would be unable to finance his own educational program. Negro financed educational programs have been a failure in the past and nothing miraculous has happened which would cause a normal person to assume that the future holds any better prospect.

Years ago southern Negro educators made annual pilgrimages to the North to raise funds for the support of their schools and this practice continued until northern philanthropists found out that the Negro educators were the beneficiaries instead of the schools. The AME Church, the Baptists, the Presbyterians, and some other minor denominations have been active in the field of Negro education, but their achievements have been nothing to write home about. Not only that, but every year charges have flown thick and fast anent the misappropriations of school funds. The operation of Negro schools has not only produced some of the Nation's juiciest scandals but is a damaging reflection of the Negro's integrity and his ability to operate and finance an educational program.

No race or nationality in this Nation has excelled or equaled the Negro in educational attainment and achievement, but this educational opportunity was not only created by white dollars but has been financed by white people throughout the Nation. It is an unfortunate fact, that Negroes contribute very little to their own community well-being and improvement and this fact should be taken into account by these agitators before they initiate their program for demands in the field of education.

Instead of spending thousands of dollars to finance unnecessary court fights for privileges which will cost the race millions in lost valuable friendships and racial good will, our leaders should go into the Negro ghettoes and force the local grocer to carry prime meats and sell to our people grade A products which will make us healthy.

I live in Newark, N. J., one of the supposedly liberal cities, and it is impossible to find prime beef or grade A cuts of any kind of meat in the Negro sections of the city. This situation is true throughout the United States. Grocers in Negro communities carry the most inferior brands.

Go into any Negro community, and the meat-market windows are filled with cheap, inferior smoked and salt meats. Some of it was put through some curing process after it had gone bad.

It is no wonder that the death rate is so high among Negroes. When one considers the food situation plus inadequate housing, it is a wonder that the death rate is not higher.

It appears to me that our leaders should direct their efforts toward correcting these abuses which are undermining our very existence. And these abuses are not practiced against us by white people alone; our own people are just as bad.

Negro restaurants buy the cheapest food and charge the highest price. Last week, on a tour of five States, I was not able to get a decent cup of coffee. Some of the coffee sold to me looked like mud and tasted worse.

It is very apparent to me that the Negro leaders of this Nation have a distorted sense of real values. They appear to be more interested in breaking down racial barriers and conducting expensive campaigns of agitation in spreading hate than in directing their efforts, energies, and money toward the attainment of the intangible essentials of life.

I was in Atlanta last week and was greatly impressed by the large number of outstanding and progressive Negro businesses. Atlanta is strictly a segregated city. I was in several New England cities this week where there is not supposed to be any segregation, and I found not one creditable Negro business.

The only owned and operated Negro radio station is not in New York, but in Atlanta. Segregation has not only given the Negro in the South an opportunity to carve out his industrial and economic destiny, but it has forced him to the fore as the most substantial and economically secure Negro in the world.

The Negro in New York, Newark, and other supposedly liberal centers may enjoy the privilege to eat where he pleases or go to any theater or public place of amusement, but a Negro can't get a license in Newark to operate a liquor package store, and there are any number of fields that he can't enter business in other eastern and northern cities. But this is not true in the South, a Negro can enter any kind of business he wishes and southern whites will even lend the money. Some of the largest contractors in the South are Negroes.

Northern Negro dollars spent to force southern white universities to admit Negroes will certainly not contribute anything toward continued good race relations in the South, and race relations were definitely on the improve until all of these school suits started.

I find more race prejudice in the East than I have found in Georgia or Mississippi. Two weeks ago 10 tourist camps refused to rent me a cabin just outside of Pittsburgh, and Pennsylvania is one of the first States to enact a civil-rights law.

If the NAACP is really interested in correcting a real evil in the school situation then it should direct its efforts toward the schools in Harrisburg, the capital of Pennsylvania, which is a little closer than the nearest southern school target.

The American race situation has not only taken on added alarming proportions but has developed into a serious problem which could explode and create a national crisis. Instead of trying to find peace in Korea and in other foreign lands our leaders, both white and colored, should try to find a panacea for these racial ills and establish peace at home

before advocating it abroad. We are not in a position to teach the other fellow how to establish unity in his bailiwick when we don't have it in our own.

Congress and Its Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, a group of Washington correspondents has launched a worthy effort to add to public knowledge of the work of Congress and its Members, and under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter received from Hal J. Miller, editor, Your Congress magazine:

COMMITTEE FOR CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., December 2, 1950.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: There has been a unanimous expression of approval of the proposal of our Committee for Congress to broaden the knowledge of Congress and its work through a national educational program.

We have received many suggestions for study subjects and articles for Your Congress magazine, and in order to keep all Members of the House and Senate fully informed on this activity, it has been suggested that the editorial content of the publication should be described in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In fact, it is our intention to conduct all business of the Committee for Congress in a virtual "goldfish bowl." While it is felt that such an educational program will accomplish most if it operates as an unfettered citizen project, free to carry on its work, unhampered by official restrictions, it is recognized that the Members themselves must have a voice in what is said about Congress.

Our founding committee of veteran newspaper observers of our legislative system has been assured that leading representative citizens will be pleased to serve on the permanent Committee for Congress and assist it in various ways.

The Committee for Congress is being incorporated as a nonprofit corporation in the District of Columbia.

Distinguished Members of the House and Senate who have indicated their approval of efforts to strengthen our democracy through the proposed study plan are being asked to serve as an advisory committee. Close liaison will be maintained with all official congressional sources so that accurate reports on the work of Congress can be printed.

The magazine will publish pictures of all Members, committees, and Hill officials. Articles will be checked carefully for authenticity and a strictly nonpartisan policy will be maintained in the distribution of educational or informational material, either in Your Congress magazine or in publications of the committee.

In addition to factual, down-to-earth articles explaining how Congress and its committees function, how bills are introduced, how legislation is worked out in conference, and so on, there will be numerous features in the magazine of general reader interest.

An important feature will be a question-and-answer column in which the queries of students and readers can be answered authoritatively. Members of the House and Senate will be asked to write articles. Veteran Members or former Members will compare Congress today with its work in times gone by. There will be personality sketches of our great congressional personalities, the Borahs, the Cannons, the LaFollettes, the Websters, the Clarks, the Norrisses, and others. Duties of various Hill officials will be explained.

There will be a summary of legislation before Congress, of legislation enacted, and of legislation slated for consideration.

An important feature will be the Congress Study Council and its plans for utilization of study material in schols, colleges, unions, employee groups, service clubs, women's clubs, and other assemblages.

It has also been proposed that we have a department for young readers, which might be used to carry pictures of children and young friends of Members of the Senate and House with brief articles about them or written by them.

In addition to educational uses of the publication, the committee for Congress will endeavor to correct a bad public relations situation resulting from the fact that when some citizens visit the Capitol they find few Members on the Senate or House floor.

This leaves the impression that Members do not take time to attend the sessions, when actually they may be busy in committee, meeting constituents or handling correspondence in their own offices.

By having Your Congress magazine available to all visitors to the Capitol, either through the guide service, or at the newspaper stands, it will be possible to explain how Congress does its business, and that it is not always necessary for all Members to be on the floor at one time.

The committee's principal channel of education will be Your Congress magazine, but we will use radio, television, motion pictures, speakers, special events, and other media. Members of Congress or their designated representatives can serve as study discussion leaders if time and the occasions warrant.

The educational project will be financed by public subscription and the sale of published materials. The great educational foundations and noted philanthropists have been asked to consider sponsoring the entire program on a long-range basis, as it is acknowledged to be of prime importance to widen a knowledge of our Congress and Government if we are to sustain this free, democratic, representative, republican system. A program that is dedicated entirely to the defense and support and improvement of our congressional system is certainly deserving of some practical assistance from the Congress itself and its Members.

The following letter represents the views of a private citizen about the value of this project.

Respectfully yours,

HAL. J. MILLER,
Editor, Your Congress Magazine, Executive Director, Committee for Congress, Sponsor of Congress Study Councils, Washington, D. C.

Is the Loss of Asia Very Near?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the danger to America is the greatest in our history. MacArthur fought the possibility of drifting into a war in Korea, to be fought by us. He urged, even begged support for Chiang and the Nationalist forces, the only friends we have in China. Their manpower was very great; ours, small. They held off Japan 7 years.

Congressman JUDD in the House urged this over and over again. He pointed out that going to war in Korea, after losing the mainland of China to communism, was like trying to salvage the little finger after abandoning the palm of the hand. Militarily, the terrain of Korea was the worst that could be selected.

So a major military disaster to our own utterly inadequate forces stares us in the face. All this time Secretary of State Dean Acheson has stopped and sabotaged the 500,000 well-trained Chinese soldiers on Formosa from attacking the Communists we fight. An estimated million guerrillas are on the mainland of China. They ask not for gifts to their economy; no gifts of our men for their battle. Instead, Acheson and our President deny them even the right to buy munitions from us. Our warships stop them from landing on the mainland to help fight the very Communists that shoot our pitiful little forces in the back.

In spite of this incredible slap in the face, Wellington Koo only a few days ago renewed China's offer of 40,000 troops. They are equipped and ready. Their own ships are also ready to transport them to the fight.

The numbers and equipment of the Communists in North Korea were concealed from us by our State Department. Just so it has misrepresented the numbers and equipment of the Chinese Communists on the Korean border. So sure was it that the Chinese Communists would not attack, it reported that our boys would be home for Christmas. The war would soon be over. Now its minions falsely charge MacArthur with making such reports. They want to make him ridiculous and destroy him just as they did Chiang Kai-shek and just as they do Syngman Rhee. The reason and the alternative is Russia and communism, agrarian reform, and so forth, and so forth.

If Chiang's forces could only be allowed to attack the flank of the Communists. That might well occupy half the Communist forces now in Korea and save us from the disaster threatening us. They are the only relief in sight for our dying, freezing, and fleeing men. Acheson's refusal to accept their offer and ship munitions to them a few years ago makes the charge of conspiracy within our own Government to deliver Asia and the Pacific to the Communists, the only reasonable explanation. If we have no friends willing to fight in China then the whole Korean adventure made no sense from the start.

Our delegates at the UN are instructed to meet with Chinese Communists on the Communists' terms. Their charge is "Americans are aggressors" in Asia. How can our delegates do it? Especially Republican delegates? They should resign before such humiliation. They have even given up the veto right to stop negotiations, headed by the British, looking toward the recognition of Communist China's right to be called respectable and fit to sit in the family of nations.

These are real Communists; as rough and tough liquidators of their opposition as the Russian Communists themselves.

Oh, where, oh, where are the Lattimores now, who deceived us into treating them as "agrarian reformers" not like other Communists?

MacArthur made crystal clear to the Veterans of Foreign Wars meeting in Chicago in August the disaster that threatens the United States at this hour. His statement was squelched and the information in it concealed from us by our President. Nevertheless the substance of part of it is as follows:

1. The abandonment of Formosa would create a base for enemy action at the very center of our defensive perimeter.

2. Our enemy would be 150 miles closer to our present defensive areas of Okinawa and the Philippines than any other point in continental Asia.

3. In Formosa there is at present concentrated operational air and naval bases potentially greater than any concentration on the Asiatic mainland between the Yellow Sea and Singapore.

4. Formosa is like an unsinkable aircraft carrier and submarine tender, capable of offensive strategy endangering Okinawa and the Philippines. The Japanese made such use of Formosa.

5. The abandonment of China to the Communists, including Formosa, makes our position in the Pacific untenable.

6. It means the moving of any future battle area 5,000 miles eastward to the coast of the American continent—our own home shores.

7. That will completely expose our friends in the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, Indonesia, Japan, and other areas, such as Alaska, the Aleutians and Hawaii. To use the language of MacArthur, it exposes them "to the lustful thrusts of those who stand for slavery against liberty, for atheism against God."

Were we to win World War II and then be betrayed to lose 5 years later world war III even now raging? Why did we enter this war without the deliberation and consent of Congress? Has Pearl Harbor been reenacted even more subtly? It is terrifying.

Think of it, now three Republicans—Austin, Lodge, and Dulles—are being shoved out in front of the stage at the UN to accede to the demands of Russia, the abandonment to it of Asia and the Pacific. Our attention is being diverted from this central criminal tragedy by the byplay of the war ending in Korea. Surely these great Americans will seize at this last moment available to them, the opportunity to reverse the plot and make triumphant the will of the forces of liberty to stand against communism.

There is but one possibility left of avoiding the spread of the third world war. The friendly forces still left in China, according to our best authorities, could with the material we could furnish them destroy their own Communist forces. If they are allowed to try, world war III might not develop further. Russia might not be able to fight a world war on two fronts. She must divide and conquer, as Hitler advised. She must win Asia, now that the war has started there, before she can attack Europe and the rest of the world.

The free Chinese, fighting the Chinese Communists, furnish us the only reasonable and honorable relief in sight. Let them join the UN forces with the Americans and the handful of British. That would be an honest "police action." It would unite the forces of freedom and make us all allies in a common cause against the spread of slavery around the world.

The Future of Coffee in the American Economic Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 6 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address I delivered on December 5, 1950, at Boca Raton, Fla., before the National Coffee Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to be with you on this occasion, the annual meeting of your organization. As I look around me at the beautiful Boca Raton Club, with the majestic Atlantic Ocean just a few yards away, it gives me a glow of pride in being an American. We are not here to express or confirm our patriotism, but I cannot help remarking at the outset that we might all glance about us and thank God that we are living in an era and under a government that permits us to gather here and express our opinions on whatever subjects we might choose, without fear of reprisals.

I hope that my remarks may be of some value to you in assembling your portion of the great jigsaw puzzle that is our agricultural and national economy. The subject of coffee is one high in my interest. As most of you know, I was born and reared in the State of Louisiana, which is the focal point for trade with the coffee-producing countries to the south of us. The city of New Orleans is and has been one of our Nation's most important ports. It is recognized as the gateway to the Americas to the south of it, and to the great valleys of the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers to the north of it. New Orleans ranks second on the list of our Nation's seaports in the number of bags of coffee handled annually. Last year, 711,000,000 pounds of coffee or about one-fourth of our total coffee imports passed through that city's port facilities. Accordingly, I feel that my State and I have a vested interest in your business. If you prosper and the coffee business goes well, Louisiana will benefit along with most of you, and I might add in a lighter vein that southern Louisiana looks to the coffee business for yet another reason. South Louisiana is often referred to as the "Sugar Bowl" of the Nation, and I might say that our people would like to see at least one spoonful of Louisiana sugar in each one of your multitudinous cups of coffee.

I shall more or less arbitrarily divide my remarks this morning into three parts, but first, let me beg that you do not treat me like a certain Democratic Senator who died and descended into the lower regions. On his arrival, after he had shaken hands with the old devil himself, he assumed control of all of the infernal regions. Several of the older inmates began to resent this dictation from a newcomer. He started issuing orders: "Stoke those fires; sharpen those pitchforks; torture those souls a little longer." Finally, a committee of the older residents called upon him and demanded to know by what authority he had assumed control over the whole of Hades. "You act as though you own this place," snarled the committee chairman. "I do," answered the Senator. "And where did you get it?" demanded a voice from the rear. "Well," retorted the Senator, "didn't the voters give me hell in the 1950 election?"

As I started to mention, I would like to talk this morning about three things. First, I shall tell you a little about the so-called Gillette coffee report and its effect on coffee economies here and abroad. Second, I shall touch upon the role of the coffee industry in inter-American relations, and third, I would like to mention the future of coffee in the American economic picture.

I presume that all of you are already more or less familiar with the sum and substance of the Senate Agriculture Subcommittee's preliminary report on coffee, which was released as a subcommittee print late last spring. It has caused considerable furor throughout the Western Hemisphere, particularly in Brazil and Colombia. One might say it was a brisk bit of tempest in the coffee pot. This report was put out by a special subcommittee of the Senate's Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, after hearings. I might add that although I am a member of the Agriculture, Committee, I was not on the subcommittee.

Let me give you a little background on the coffee report. The United States Senate adopted in April 1949 a resolution which provided that in view of the ascending prices of agricultural commodities within our country, an investigation should be made to determine who, if anyone, was reaping unreasonable and exorbitant profits. A subcommittee known as the Gillette subcommittee of the Senate agriculture group undertook to hold hearings on, and account for, price spreads of various agricultural commodities—the difference or spread, that is, between the price paid to the farmer and the cost to the American consumer in his market or grocery store. Food prices were going up. Who was getting the benefit? Coffee was one of the commodities investigated and hearings were held a year ago, in order to determine who was getting the lion's share of the large discrepancy in price between producer and consumer. The result of these hearings was, of course, the widely publicized subcommittee print, the original coffee report. I had no prior knowledge of what had been adduced at the hearings, or what would be printed in the report, and I assure you that the document came as much of a surprise to me as it must have to all of you. I read it carefully after the furor arose in the coffee industry, in our own State Department, and at the Washington embassies of coffee-growing countries.

The chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee designated me to head another subcommittee which was to review and, in our discretion, to revise the report. In short, I was an innocent, projected into the center of the controversy, in the role of moderator. I am not here to either damn or defend the coffee report, nor even to explain it, and certainly not to apologize for it. In my own mind, I do not feel that it needs any apology because I know what it is. It is not an expression of foreign policy promulgated by a policy-making agency of our Government. It is only a report to a Senate committee, or in the last analysis, an opinion of a very small group of investigators in the United States Senate. It was not, and should never have been construed as an official slap at our friends and neighbors to the south.

It is indeed most regrettable that the coffee report received the publicity and notoriety that it did. Unfortunately, the time of its publication coincided with some elections

being held in South America. It became therefore a political springboard for anti-American interests, who sought to represent it as an official statement of our Government. It was because of this that the coffee report assumed international proportions all out of reason to what it was, and is—the result of hearings held by a reporting subgroup of a congressional committee. The opinion has been expressed that the findings and recommendations of the original report should have been suppressed and kept completely from the public. I feel that such star chamber proceedings are inimical to our American concept of freedom of speech. A further effort was made to have the original report killed in committee. This, too, I opposed, as I believe that once the die was cast and the report released, we should carry through and in full committee either affirm or deny the report's validity. And that is exactly what we have done.

The result of my subcommittee's revision I am sure you are all also familiar with. I assure you, it was no easy job to reconcile the different and frequently conflicting interests and apparently contradictory statements. I hope that the revision aided somewhat in calming the troubled waters of inter-American relations.

Meanwhile, some relaxation and clarification of the coffee situation has come with time. The events in Korea occupy much of our attention. The over-all cost of living and of food has continued to climb but coffee is no longer a pacemaker in the upward procession. Coffee is off the fire, so to speak.

And we have more light on the new crop that we all worried so much about. In earlier months we were faced with claims and counterclaims on the size of the crop, particularly the main crop in Brazil. The experts, if any there be, disagreed. Some said there was plenty; others pointed to drought in Brazil, floods in Guatemala and to unsettled conditions in Colombia. Our Department of Commerce saw no immediate shortage. But we know now that the 1950 crop was a short one, that the rising prices of futures did in some degree correctly forecast the emerging situation. In early September 1950 our United States Department of Agriculture estimated preliminarily that the five Latin American countries which supply most of our imports would have about 10 percent less coffee for export during 1950–51 than in the previous year.

A more recent and more comprehensive report by the United States Department of Agriculture (Foreign Crops and Markets, November 20, 1950) indicates that world coffee production in 1950–51 is forecast at about 2 percent below the 1949–50 output. The total crop is estimated at 36,766,000 bags of 132 pounds each as compared with 37,486,000 bags in the previous year, 38,926,000 bags in 1948–49 and a prewar average of 41,600,000 bags.

There is, as there should be, considerable coffee usage in the producing countries. The forecast for exportable production in 1950–51 is 28,445,000 bags as compared with 29,035,000 in 1949–50, 30,485,000 in 1948–49 and a much larger prewar average of 35,017,000 bags.

The crop in Brazil of 17,800,000 bags is significantly lower than the 19,250,000 bags of last year and much lower than the 25,350,000 bags average prewar. The Colombian crop of 5,740,000 bags is only slightly less than last year and substantially more than the 4,452,000 bags average of 1935–39. Guatemala actually came out with 50,000 bags more than in the previous year.

The Asian crop is up by about 200,000 bags as compared with last year but nevertheless produced little more than half as much as prewar.

You very probably have heard something of increasing production in Africa. You are likely to hear still more of it in years ahead. The facts seem to substantiate the rumors. The 1950–51 African crop is forecast at 4,671,000 bags, substantially more than the 4,176,000 of 1949–50 and a large increase over the 2,602,000 bags average of prewar.

There is also the matter of decline in consumption. Apparently there has been some decline, due in part, at least, to higher prices, in producing countries. Some think that consumption in the United States of America may have declined something like 5 percent since mid–1949. I can only report that the statistics which I have here of United States imports of coffee by months for all of 1949 and through August 1950 are not entirely conclusive, because imports expanded sharply after trouble broke out in Korea. Nevertheless, through June 1950, imports were substantially below the corresponding months of the previous year.

United States imports of coffee, by month, 1949–50

Month	1949	1950
	Pounds	*Pounds*
January	278, 728, 094	272, 868, 447
February	219, 767, 480	207, 525, 414
March	274, 642, 108	174, 138, 243
April	234, 881, 134	149, 292, 581
May	194, 039, 704	138, 351, 377
June	221, 673, 168	128, 871, 780
July	222, 276, 419	277, 026, 447
August	211, 290, 488	238, 175, 635
September	254, 958, 824	
October	244, 348, 804	
November	264, 556, 841	
December	295, 826, 588	
Total	2, 916, 989, 580	

It also seems probable that western Europe may have been using less coffee during early 1950 than a year previous. Data at hand show that ECA authorized between April 3, 1948 through June 30, 1950, a total of $16,600,000 for coffee procurement but only $300,000 of that total was authorized April 1 to June 30, 1950.

All of this suggests that the supply is somewhat tight and consumer resistance substantial. Expansion in consumption of some competing drinks appears to be in the cards. This, I might add, seems to indicate the need for more effective cooperation between the coffee producer and the coffee consumer.

Few of you know better than I the need for maintaining cooperation within the nations of South and Central America. They need us, and we need them. If we are to maintain any degree of hemispheric solidarity, we must extend the hand of friendship to our neighbors to the South. For too long, the "Gringoes," with their dollar diplomacy, exploited Latin American markets. I feel certain that a tremendous underlying factor in our present relations with our southern neighbors is the fact that most of them are keenly aware of the pseudo-colonial status into which they were pushed in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Memories are long, but world events move on and require new solutions.

It is just lately that the tide has started to turn and that relative prosperity has appeared before the eyes of our South and Central American friends. During World War II, mainly as a result of an export boom and the nonavailability of imports, the Latin American countries accumulated large reserves of gold and foreign exchange. A large part of this, shortly after the close of the war, went into the replenishment of consumer goods inventories and the expansion of plant facilities. In the first half of this year alone, Latin American republics exported nearly three and one-half billion dollars in goods and services. Conversely, their importations amounted to over $3,000,000,000—a large portion of which came from the United States. More than a quarter of our total exports have gone to Latin America this year. Also during the first quarter of 1950, a record-breaking 39 percent of our country's general merchandise imports came from South and Central America.

To me, even more significant is the confidence that American businessmen have placed in the governments of Latin America. In 1946 the United States private investment capital in South America totaled $59,000,000. Last year this had increased over eightfold; American businesses had invested $481,000,000 worth with our southern neighbors. It is my private opinion that perhaps the largest single reason for this tremendous expansion of American confidence and investments in Latin America is that the countries to the south of us may represent the one underdeveloped area sufficiently removed from the threat of aggression, to attract sizable amounts of United States private capital. I say "sufficiently removed from the threat of aggression", but let me pause a moment. In these unhappy times of measuring every step we take and judging our every move on the basis of the ever-present threat of communism, we cannot blind ourselves to the fact that South America offers a tempting field for the operation of the Communist Party. It would be folly for us, ostrich-like, to stick our heads into the sand and blithely assume that the Communists have no interest in the vast resources of the southern Americas, or that they are not interested in fishing in troubled waters wherever there may be poverty and unrest.

Not only economically but also militarily we should, we must, have the wholehearted cooperation of Latin America, and what to me is more important, the Latin Americans must know that they can count on the cooperation of the United States. Nor must anyone forget that inter-American relations must be based upon mutuality. The benefits flow both ways, as they should, to us and to Latin America. It is only on a basis of mutuality that we can build a solid economic and military bulwark against communism. We all recognize that the United States has certain common interests with Central and South America. If a stronger bond can be forged among the nations of the Western Hemisphere, they will prosper and their defense against oppression will be strengthened. But it must be borne in mind that in order to draw of its benefits, all must contribute to its preservation and development.

As members of the coffee-importing business you are all familiar with the necessity for the maintenance of amicable relations with Latin America. You know that the stress and strain of intrahemispheric difficulties is reflected not only in the availability and price of the product you handle but also in a degree of over-all cooperation that you may expect from our neighboring republics. The picture, however, is broader even than that. The growing dependence of the United States upon other countries in the Western Hemisphere is daily more apparent to you as representatives of what is probably the oldest large-scale importing enterprise in the Americas. You will become increasingly important in inter-American affairs. You are tacit emissaries to the countries of the south. The relations between the United States and those countries will depend in a large measure upon your business and social acumen. We must face facts—from day to day our contacts in South America and in Central America must be strengthened; good will must be fostered, and we must embark upon an era of unparalleled good feeling and fellowship with our neighbors and friends in Latin America.

I say we must, and the need becomes more obvious as the world situation shows less and less sign of improvement. The United States consumes roughly 65 percent of the coffee produced in Central and South America, while the coffee-producing countries are dependent on us for a substantial portion of

their economy. Today we are awakening to the fact that the coffee-producing and other South American countries possess raw materials completely indispensable to the development and defense of this hemisphere. I need only mention tin, copper, antimony, platinum, and many others. It is not, of course, my purpose here today to discuss the strategic aspect of our economy, although that subject would, I am certain, arouse your further interest as to the absolute necessity for the friendly relationships that should continue to exist among all of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

Let me put it this way, it is not only economically advisable that we cultivate the good will of the South and Central American Republics; it has become a military necessity if we are to continue any form of military production. Therefore, I say to you that your business relations with the coffee-producing countries and others in Latin America is a vital one. Our country and the Latin-American republics are coming to realize the urgent need we have for one another. You are all ambassadors without portfolio. I trust you will maintain the high standard of friendship for our southern neighbors that we all now realize is necessary to our joint well-being.

To return now to our specific concern here—coffee and the coffee business: The authors of the original coffee report have been widely denounced for criticizing the method of certain South and Central American countries employed to control the production and marketing of coffe, while we ourselves have a comprehensive government program of agricultural controls. The answer, however, is obvious; our Secretary of Agriculture is directed by statute, to sell all price-supported crops when the market for them has reached parity figures. We have stored the storables. Although we have gathered and stored tremendous surpluses of many commodities, these will automatically be released on the market when the price reaches or exceeds parity. In that way, our Government protects the farmers from ruinous prices, and also protects consumers against runaway prices in short-crop years.

I would be the last person to attempt to tell our southern neighbors how to run their farm economy. I think, however, they might well profit by the experience—by the bitter experience, some people say, of our own Government. I am utterly convinced that the only way an agricultural economy can avoid the boom and bust cycle is by sound planning. I do not care whether this planning is done by the farmers, or their cooperatives, or the Government, so long as it is carried out in a democratic manner, and so long as the farmer is permitted a voice in its execution and a fair return for what he produces. We all remember the disastrous low prices of the 1930's. You will all recall, too, the 7-cent coffee of 1940, and the stories of Brazilian locomotives burning coffee instead of coal—even of surplus coffee being dumped at sea. In all some 78,000,000 bags of surplus Brazilian coffee are reported to have been destroyed between 1931 and 1944. Tree planting has been sharply reduced. I don't think any of us want to go back to those days, but I feel that we would all welcome a greater degree of stabilization in the coffee industry. With the depletion of reserve coffee stocks over the last several years, you do not now have a cushion that those large reserves insured. Dry weather or frost can desolate the coffee crop, with a far more direct reflection now on world prices. Instability is not a good way to hold valued markets.

I am sure we would all like to avoid the high prices of short years and the glut of over-production seasons. We in America have, of course, no control over the production and marketing of world coffee. We can only speculate—and I use the word advisedly—and unobtrusively recommend from the basis of our own farm experience with other crops. The rest is up to the coffee-growing countries themselves. I will say only, that if coffee continues in short supply, with attendant high prices, its production in other areas, in Africa, in Asia, and perhaps in the Indies will be simulated considerably and meanwhile, the market for it may decline significantly in spite of population increases.

When the Eighty-second Congress convenes next month, I hope to be the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. I know you are all interested to learn what, if any, recommendations the committee may make to the Senate regarding the coffee industry. At this point, I know only one which will affect your business. Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, who, incidentally, was defeated and will not be back in January, and Senator GILLETTE, who will be back, have introduced bills in the Senate which will permit the inclusion of coffee in the definition of the word "commodity" as used in the Commodity Exchange Act. According to Senator GILLETTE'S bill, coffee will be subject to the Commodity Exchange Act but there will be no further substantial amendment of the act. On the other hand, Senator THOMAS' bill will not only add coffee and other agricultural products to the "commodity" definition subject to supervision, but will also permit the Secretary of Agriculture to establish by regulation a minimum margin to be required and maintained in connection with the purchase or sale of commodity futures. If this bill of Senator THOMAS should be passed, your coffee transactions on the various exchanges will be regulated by the Agriculture Department.

I am opposed to Senator THOMAS' bill and will vote against it, as I believe that American market transactions have not been of such a nature as to require the imposition of these margin controls. Unless this bill is voted on before January—and I might say that the possibility of its being brought up is most remote—it will have to be reintroduced by another Senator in the Eighty-second Congress. You have my assurance that unless a material change occurs in marketing practices, I shall refuse to support any legislation that will permit bureaucratic control of your coffee market. My advice is that you yourselves make every effort to remove the causes that give rise to agitation for controls.

Incidentally, I should like to call your attention to one significant development which seems to have been stimulated by the ill-framed coffee report. You will perhaps recall that there was severe criticism of the restrictive type of contract employed in the coffee futures market. The Wall Street Journal of August 23, 1950, reported the following:

"Following the initial Gillette report on coffee, the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange in June took under consideration the recommendation for a universal type of coffee futures contract.

"A contract along those lines known as contract V was adopted by the exchange membership on August 15 and in which trading will start September 5.

"On the same date, trading in a new modified form of S contract covering will begin. Eventually it will replace S contract covering higher grade coffees after outstanding old contracts have been liquidated. The exchange D contract, covering lower quality coffees, already is in process of liquidation."

I am happy to congratulate any of you who may have had any part in setting your own house in order. Such self-policing and responsiveness to criticism is very important in the democratic process, especially in a business which is peculiarly subject to public misunderstanding and which would like to escape further bureaucratic control.

I know of no other plans afoot by the Government to regulate your business. Most of you know that I am opposed to Government controls per se and that I feel that the government governs best that governs least. Since I was elected to the Senate in 1936, I have served 14 years on the Committee on Agriculture. It is to me the nearest and dearest part of my work as a United States Senator. It will always be. I promise you, as members of a business devoted to the handling of an agriculture commodity, that your interests are my interests, and that I shall leave no stone unturned to help America maintain its place as the greatest agriculture Nation in the world.

I leave you reluctantly, because I have so enjoyed my brief visit here. I feel that your business and your work is of tremendous importance in the industry and commerce of our country. It is more than that. Your enterprise and your relations with our friends and neighbors in the other Americas constitute the cement with which we will build a united wall against inroads by foes which would destroy our democratic way of life.

Sound Reclamation Development—Address by Hon. Guy Cordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 6 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, among a number of splendid addresses delivered at Spokane, Wash., recently, before the National Reclamation Association, there was one by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] which should be made available to all Members of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is a most interesting and valuable statement covering sound reclamation development.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUND RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT

(By GUY CORDON)

Mr. Chairman, I need not say to you, who are gathered here today, that it is a real pleasure for me to have this opportunity to discuss with you ways and means whereby the productive values of the West may be realized to the fullest degree. The end we seek, while geographically sectional, is national in benefit.

The National Reclamation Association is a living exponent of the pioneering spirit which led the stalwarts of old away from security and easy living westward to new fields of adventure and trial. Great of heart, self-reliant, and contemptuous of danger, they sought naught but the opportunity to carve for themselves a future in the unknown. Cooperation in those far days was a necessity. It had the added value of

building friendships. It was a voluntary sharing of danger, of labor, of accomplishment. This association has followed those footsteps.

In the early years of the century men of vision saw in the mind's eye a blossoming in the desert, a fruitfulness and plenty where then was only sage brush, the whirling sand devils, and the distant mirage.

Small in original compass but daring in concept, the reclamation program was one of cooperative effort. The basic mutual effort was between the Government, as the loaning and constructing agency on the one hand, and the settler, the water user on the other.

It was but natural that those who pioneered the settlement and development of the early reclamation projects and those who came with the services necessary to a civilized community should themselves band together to study and to solve the problems incident to this great new adventure in agriculture. And so the National Reclamation Association was born. I am not complimenting you, but stating only a simple and well-known truth, when I say that without your help the West would not be what it is today.

The problems which faced you in your infancy look simple to us today. They were far from simple then. The problems which face you today were unthought of then. I undertake to say that tomorrow's problems are equally veiled in tomorrow's mist, so far as we can project our thinking today.

We have, however, problems enough as of now to keep us reasonably well occupied.

To some of those problems I shall address myself at this meeting. Permit me to say at the outset that if I can be of any help, however slight, in the formulation and execution of a sound policy to meet the present pressing problems of reclamation in the West I shall be most gratified, and, I hasten to add, equally surprised.

It has been my experience that a clear understanding of the nature of a problem is an indispensable condition precedent to a logical search for a solution.

Our problem arises from the well-known fact that there is little, if any, remaining arid, potentially irrigable land left in the West, which can be reclaimed at a cost within the ability of the land user to repay.

As I understand the history of reclamation, the original concept embraced the basic proposition that no land was subject to reclamation which could not be reasonably expected itself to produce sufficiently to repay the principal cost of its subjugation to tillage. It is well to remember, however, that there was provided, even in the earliest legislation, that some nonreimbursable assistance—which I shall term subsidy, because that is what it is—should be given by the Government if the program was to have a fair chance of success. Initially, this nonrecompensable assistance was the rental value of the Federal funds advanced—forgiveness of the interest component, if you please.

It well may be that the happy condition of the Federal Treasury in those days had something to do with the decision.

It is equally possible, if not probable, that the fact that the original Reclamation Act provided for a reclamation fund to be created solely from receipts arising from the sale and disposal of public lands in the affected States, had a bearing upon the matter.

Whatever the possibilities or probabilities, the original act did not contemplate the payment of rental or interest on the moneys appropriated from the reclamation fund for reclamation purposes. That is precedent, and vitally important to us today in the reclamation States.

Let us keep in mind, that the reclamation fund was designed as a revolving fund, that all receipts from reclamation projects of whatever nature, were part of this special fund and were subject to appropriation only for reclamation purposes.

The provisions for these accretions to the reclamation fund are emphasized in importance by section 5 of the Townsites and Power Development Act (act, April 16, 1906, ch. 1631, 34 Stat. 116), providing for the payment into the fund of receipts from the sale of surplus power generated as an incident to the irrigation of lands under the Reclamation Act. This section has increased in importance as projects have increased in size and multiplicity of uses.

I commend the provisions of the abovementioned section 5 to the particular attention of this association in its further study of the present problems of reclamation.

Now let us get into the meat of this subject matter.

A condition precedent to any reclamation program in the field of agriculture must be a need for the additional agricultural production. If the need be immediate, in the near or in the distant future, the program should be geared to the time factor.

This statement may seem abstract to some, even silly to others. It represents stark reality to me.

In the coming years we are going to be faced with objections to reclamation development predicated squarely upon the claim that we do not need additional agricultural production, that even now we produce too much. Recent heavy surpluses in a few crops, notably the potato crop of the last couple of years, have focused attention upon this particular phase of our problem.

Much of the criticism I hear, and which undoubtedly you have heard, is ill-advised and based upon fragmentary information rather than that full view essential to sound judgment. Nevertheless, the criticisms do obtain.

The critics are becoming more articulate as a result of the very fact of the increasingly high costs of reclamation development—the ever-widening breech between the costs of reclaiming an acre of arid land and the amount that the user of that acre can afford to pay for the reclamation necessary to give that acre its value.

I urge that this association give more than passing attention to this phase of our problem.

Having demonstrated need for additional agricultural production, we face another precedent problem that must have consideration and legislative determination. That problem may be stated as a question: What is the maximum amount which, in consideration of the direct and indirect benefits accruing therefrom, we are justified in investing to reclaim an acre of arid land? Irrespective of whether the cost of the reclamation is or is not reimbursable, in whole or in part, this is a question of sound economy, a straight problem of value received for investment made.

I know that I am not alone in this view.

Various agencies of the Government interested in our natural resources, particularly in the field of agriculture, have given much thought to this phase of our problem. I am sure this association has done likewise. It definitely is a field for legislative inquiry. I am of the opinion that a legislative yardstick should be evolved to guide the administrative agencies in this most important determination.

Of this I am sure—and the recent debates on the floor of the United States Senate, with respect to the Columbia Basin account amendment to the omnibus public-works bill, make it abundantly clear—that there has been an awakening in various other parts of the United States to the importance of this phase of our problem. In my considered judgment, if the West is to have the support of the southern and eastern sections of the United States, which it has enjoyed in the past, it is necessary that we face this question openly and cooperatively, and determine it legislatively.

At first blush, one might be pardoned for holding the view that the maximum amount which can logically be invested in such reclamation is measured by the maximum amount that the user of the land can afford to pay—the original concept, as I have earlier stated.

A little further consideration of the matter will, however, indicate the fallacy of that view. A simple method of demonstrating this fallacy is to compare the amount of money received by the grower for his agricultural produce with the price therefor paid by the ultimate consumer. All of the intervening service charges relate back to, and are wholly dependent upon, the irrigated acre which produced the crop. Without going further into this aspect of the problem, I only suggest that here, at least, is the beginning of our yardstick.

Once we have determined the maximum sum which the Nation can afford to invest in reclaiming an acre of arid land, then and only then, arises the question of whether and the extent to which that cost shall, and can, be met by the user of the watered land, and the resulting question of who shall pay the difference between that total cost and the land user's payment.

There is the $64 question. Who shall repay the difference between total cost and the amount repaid by the land user or, as is usually said, the full amount within the ability of the water user to repay.

I have posed the question. I give you my answer to it.

In my opinion, repayment should not be made. Excess over land user repayment should be a nonreimbursable expenditure.

That difference is represented, in my humble opinion, in the added values accruing through the myriad of services which are created by, and are wholly dependent upon, the production from the irrigated land in question. The identity of the beneficiaries of those services cannot be determined; the value of those services, however, can. The values built upon the crop produced from that irrigated acre are as fluid as is the commerce of the United States. The sum total of benefits, direct and indirect, accrue to the economy of the Nation. Therefore, in logic and in equity, that difference in cost should be paid by the Nation.

There is a wealth of precedence for the position I take. Let me cite a few.

The rivers, canals, and harbors of the Nation have been improved and are maintained from the Federal Treasury. There is no reimbursement; the users of the waterways pay nothing for the transportation arteries into which tens of millions of dollars have been poured. That is, of course, plain subsidy. It is justified on the ground that cheaper transportation by water is a national asset. Parenthetically, I remark that production from arid lands is, at least, equally a national asset. I believe I can make a case in favor of its being a greater national asset.

A second, and even more illuminating precedent, is found in the Flood Control Act, which is in effect reclamation with reverse English. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by the Federal Government to protect people, farm lands, homes, and industries from the ravages of flood waters. No portion of the funds so paid is reimbursable, or ever has been. This is based on the proposition that safety from flood damage makes for a greater national prosperity.

Under the law, a flood-control project is justifiable when the total amount of damage prevented within the life of the project, capitalized at 2 percent, I believe, is equal to, or in excess of, the capital expenditure and operation costs, capitalized at a like rate of interest. Here, again the outlay is subsidy. I could give other instances.

In my opinion, the difference between the total cost of our reclamation project of today and the total amount within the ability of the water user to repay is likewise subsidy. Why anyone would cringe from the word as applied to reclamation, or deny the fact, which is indisputable, I am unable to understand. If ever a case has been made, or can be made, to justify nonreimbursable Federal expenditure, it has been made, and can be made, for the program of reclaiming the arid lands of the West. This is adding to the national wealth, contributing to production, making for agricultural strength and independence. It is in the American tradition of individual initiative; it promotes individual independence.

In my considered opinion, we should, and if we can have unanimity of effort in the reclamation States, we can write nonreimbursability of excess of capital costs over ability of water users to repay into the reclamation law.

I am well aware that there are many able students of reclamation, well versed in the mechanics of Federal legislation, who doubt that, as a practical proposition, such a provision can be enacted.

I am not unalterably committed to my view. I have been wrong before; I may be now. Here and elsewhere in conferences I shall present and assert my position. If a better solution can be found I shall join in the effort for its adoption.

I do not include among the alternatives, however, the so-called interest component provisions of the recent O'Mahoney or Magnuson—depending upon who is speaking—amendment to the public works bill in the recently concluded session of the Congress.

I am unalterably opposed to those provisions as they are spelled out in that amendment.

Upon careful and close analysis I find them fantastic beyond belief. Their vice is not in what they disclose but in what they conceal.

There is simply not the time available to us for that analysis, which alone can penetrate the legalistic jargon and reveal the concealed sophistry. I attempted to analyze these provisions in the debate on the amendment in the Senate. I spent over 4 hours on the Senate floor and then did not fully cover the subject. Much of the pertinent supporting proof was inserted in the form of tables. Because of the lack of time these tables were not orally examined in detail, nor their precise application identified and explained.

For those who desire to pursue the subject, I suggest that the debates are available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, copies of which are found in most, if not all, of our public libraries, chambers of commerce, etc. Specifically, the debates began on page 4970 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 10 with a discussion by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, of the provisions of a bill which he had drafted and which he offered, entitled the "Interstate Water and Power Project Act of 1950." The ensuing debate, while not directly on the Columbia Basin account amendment, did include some observations with reference to it.

The debate having specifically to do with the amendment begins on page 5022 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 11 and appears on various pages thereafter up to and including page 5190 on April 14, all, of course, in the current year. Thereafter, certain amendments were offered in an attempt to salvage the reclamation aspects of the amendment. The action taken, together with the comments, appears in succeeding pages.

For those who may be interested in my own analyses, they may be found on page 5122, April 13, and up to and including page 5144, and beginning again on page 5165, April 14, and concluding on page 5175.

If the directors of this association feel that the material contained in the debates, pro and con, can be of value in the further study of reclamation problems, I shall be happy to have reprints made, with extraneous material deleted, for such distribution as may be determined.

My repudiation of the interest component provisions of the amendment does not go to the establishment of a sound accounting system for Columbia Basin power and reclamation projects. Neither does it go to objection to crediting to the nonreimbursable reclamation costs a reasonable portion of receipts from power projects if that should be advisable. Such an accounting procedure may well include prospective receipts so long as the inclusion is definite as to the percentage and time and certainty of the receipts. Any such accounting operation should be subject to audit from independent sources, as is the Bonneville account today.

I have had delivered to me a copy of a proposed bill on the over-all subject of the Columbia Basin account. I have not as yet had an opportunity to study the proposal so I am not in position to comment upon it. I assure you that this proposed bill will have my earnest consideration at the earliest possible moment. I hope that I may be favored with the views of those who have studied its contents. The future of reclamation is too vital to the West not to have the deep and constant study and attention of us all.

While we are on the subject of alternatives, let us have in mind that the term "the ability of the water user to repay" really should be "the ability of the water user to repay in 40 years." This repayment period has been in the law from the beginning. In many minds it has assumed a sanctity it does not, in fact, possess. Other installment-payment periods of principal account in the governmental field, as well as in private industry, have been liberalized during these last 48 years, time and time again. Liberalization under the reclamation law may well be in order. If the water user can afford to pay $100 in 40 years, he can afford to pay $200 in 80 years, and so on. The same user may not pay all the bill, but the production of the land will. If criticism be raised as to the additional length of time taken, answer is found in the fact that in like public works of like public value within like periods of time no payment is made.

That other suggestions have been presented, and will be in the future, I have not the slightest doubt. I realize, however, that with respect to our program time is of the essence. Let us suggest, confer, and agree without more delay. Let us frame and present to the Eighty-second Congress that type of legislation which we can all support and all defend. Let it have the virtues of all good legislation: clarity that all may understand; certainty, so that solicitors' opinions may not torture in interpretation; and lastly, command, so that administrative agencies may know the extent of and the limitations upon the powers and responsibilities created.

If we have problems, potentialities, and hopes, so have they in other regions of our country. We are part of a great adventure in building America. The part is less than the whole. Let us get help by giving it, let us retain confidence by deserving it. These are the signposts on the road to our place in the sun.

Water Supply Assured for Rensselaer County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 6 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article appearing in the Times-Union of Albany, N. Y., on October 5, 1950. This article reveals in interesting detail the benefits which the water-resources investigations of the United State Geological Survey extend to the citizens of every State. The joint Federal-New York State report described in the article is the latest result of a series of continuing studies designed to prevent or to lessen the disastrous effects of future water famines in my State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER SUPPLY ASSURED FOR RENSSELAER COUNTY

(By Bill Breisky)

Rensselaer County readers who encountered the story were somewhat pleased, but not duly impressed with the glittering generalization of a Washington reporter who said recently that "artificial rainmakers, such as those employed by New York City, will be unnecessary in Troy, Rensselaer, or of Rensselaer County for some time to come."

The reporter was referring in somewhat glazed terms to a recently completed study of Rensselaer County water resources made by R. V. Cushman of the United States Geological Survey, conducted with the State Water Power and Control Commission.

Methods and results of the study were discussed in the story, but no mention was made of the important question:

"What does this report mean to the home owners, the industrialists, the farmers, and the businessmen of Rensselaer County?"

This is a story well worth telling, for with a small staff and a few thousand dollars, Federal and State scientists have joined forces to bring to Rensselaer County a permanent study that probably will pay for itself every year over again. Reports also have been published on similar studies in Albany, Montgomery, and Schoharie Counties, but the Rensselaer County report is the most recent one.

The push that got the surveys started came before the war when some wells in the Brooklyn area that had been pumped below sea level were ruined when sea water filled them. Hydrologists of the Geological Survey made plans for a comprehensive cooperative survey to be conducted with the State Water Power and Control Commission that would make greater use of water resources in the Empire State. The war halted the project, but focused a beam on work to begin in the Albany metropolitan area soon after the end of hostilities.

The scientists desired to determine the quality and quantity of water in the State. The study was detailed and completed. It discussed the geologic history, and stratigraphy of bedrock formations and the overlying glacial deposits.

More practically, the scientists were looking for positive facts that would enable residents and prospective builders to determine: How deep the average well level, what type of a pump they can use to best advantage, what their water yield will be in gallons per minute, what water temperature they may expect during the changing seasons, their best and cheapest sources of water supply, and how they may increase water supply and water power at home or in business.

The scientists were seeking basic information; they did not attempt an engineering job for any particular party. Their discoveries already have been utilized by a large number of persons and groups that had varying needs and requirements.

Preliminary planning for public water supplies in Berlin, Hampton Manor, and several other communities already has been aided by the study.

Consulting engineers have referred to it often in planning detailed installations.

Industrial firms desiring to locate in the county or which needed additions to their present supply found the study invaluable. Now they may determine, among other things, how much air conditioning will cost them, what likelihood there is of ever being flooded and whether the municipal-water supply would be more expensive than their own water supply.

Farmers have found many dollar-saving tips in the building of ponds and digging wells at the most advantageous site.

Home owners and builders outside the municipal water system have avoided the notorious problems of Mr. Blanding in deciding where to get their water.

Well contractors, well drillers, and pump manufacturers found out how close to the surface water occurs in different areas and whether there will be a greater need for shallow-well pumps or for deep-well pumps.

Assistance in the study was offered from many quarters. Testings were made under direction of Geological Survey district geologist M. L. Brashars and district engineer Arthur W. Harrington. From their office in Albany's Federal building, Holbert W. Fear headed the surface-water study while Erwin S. Asselstine directed the ground-water investigations.

Contributing agencies included the State department of health, which analyzed water samples, Rensselaer County Health Association, State museum, State department of commerce, United States Weather Bureau, and many water-district superintendents and well drillers.

The study shows the present water supply to be adequate and that flood waters, if properly utilized, could in some areas more than double the present supply if necessary. Most important of all, the Cushman report provides a permanent record that will be a permanent boon to the growth of Renssalaer County and the entire State.

Reclamation Bureau Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 6 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have issued covering Reclamation Bureau policy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BUTLER SAYS CONGRESS SHOULD REVIEW FEDERAL RECLAMATION POLICY AT NEXT SESSION

Senator HUGH BUTLER, Republican, Nebraska, said today that rising costs of construction seriously hamper the development of economically feasible irrigation and power projects in the West and that this condition, as well as recent policies of the Bureau of Reclamation, require that Congress fully examine the Federal reclamation policy at its next session.

Speaking as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which, among other matters, has charge of irrigation, reclamation, and public-lands legislation, Senator BUTLER said present Reclamation Bureau policies regard the western irrigation farmer as an object of Federal charity. This attitude, he added, has provided an excuse for the Bureau to impose burdensome contracts on newly formed irrigation districts which give the Federal Government a virtual monopoly over the land and water resources of the West.

"On multiple purpose projects there are many benefits to be derived," Senator BUTLER explained. "These include electric power, irrigation and municipal water supplies, flood control, fish and wildlife benefits, and, in some instances, navigation.

"The major part of the wealth to be created by these projects will come from agriculture; and yet the farmer is the only beneficiary the Bureau attempts to control completely. Unless present Washington policies are changed, the farmer on Federal reclamation projects will have to labor under a tremendous burden of restrictions and regulations."

The Senator said he has seen the Bureau of Reclamation attempt to take control of both land and water resources in Nebraska under the guise of contracts with newly formed irrigation districts.

"Because construction costs have more than doubled since some projects were authorized, water users cannot repay the same proportion of the Federal investment in the normal period of 40 to 50 years," Senator BUTLER said. "On these grounds the farmers are requested to contract for water with the Federal Government acting in the capacity of a public utility. This type of contract is an evasion of both Federal and State laws inasmuch as water rights, according to Bureau testimony before a congressional committee, would not vest in any lands served nor in any municipalities which received project water. However, should the Bureau repudiate this position, it doubtless will still attempt to use utility type contracts instead of repayment contracts, since the Bureau's objective is to continue control of the land and water resources in perpetuity.

"The exercise of patronage and paternalism to the end that local autonomy will be destroyed seems to be the immediate objective of the personnel now in control of the particular bureau to which we have entrusted our development of reclamation. This policy is now being carried on in the name of planning the development of western resources. The provisions for repayment of construction costs by water users should be amended so that it will be clear that only repayment contracts can be entered into, and that these contracts will be definite as to time, the amounts repayable, and the rules and regulations under which farmers are to operate."

"Let no one believe that the western farmer, rancher, or metropolitan water user places so-called cheap power and water rates above freedom of enterprise and ultimate ownership and partnership in the projects we are building. But a condition exists respecting present costs, that provides a made-to-order argument for the bureaucrats. To put the United States into the business of selling water requires that State irrigation codes be ignored and State laws be reinterpreted.

"The use of a utility contract as a vehicle to extend the power of a Federal bureau, and to maintain such power in perpetuity, has, in fact, been attempted in Nebraska and in California. I have concluded that the laws defining project feasibility, repayment, allocations, and contracts must be carefully studied and clarified. My committee will give these matters first priority in the coming session.

"The determination of the period of repayment by water users has been considered a prerogative of the Congress. Our present difficulties on several large authorized projects arise from the fact that Congress was not fully advised as to the water users' ability to repay their share of construction costs within 40 years. Without consulting Congress the Bureau of Reclamation took advantage of a little-known provision in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, under which the Bureau makes itself a public utility to serve in perpetuity as a purveyor of water. The farmer, under that system, ceases to be an owner and becomes a tenant with no hope of completing repayment of his construction charges. When the Bureau becomes a public utility in perpetuity, the farmer becomes a tenant in perpetuity."

The Senator concluded, "All authorized reclamation projects whose financial feasibilities have been affected by increases in construction costs due to the war or other causes, should receive special consideration by the Congress. The matter of repayment should be reviewed in the light of Federal expenditures for flood control, navigation, and rivers and harbors, the costs of which are not reimbursable by local interests. It is my belief that a reasonable repayment by water users should be required. Water users, however, should not be considered as debtors to the Nation for long or indefinite periods determinable only by the Secretary of the Interior and the Reclamation Bureau which seek new wards upon which to practice a philosophy of questionable origin. The problems I have mentioned indicate that we will need the best advice possible, with special emphasis on agricultural benefits, if we expect to bring order from the confusion which has become so evident in recent years, and which is a direct result of conflicting provisions in the reclamation laws."

A Formula for Action in Today's Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 6 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me and a condensation of an editorial which appeared in the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FORMULA FOR ACTION IN TODAY'S CRISIS

Mr. President, America is today demanding leadership to give the vast potential strength and capacity of our great Nation force and

direction in these days of crisis. Drift and policies of "letting the dust settle" have brought us squarely to the serious crisis which we now confront. Continued reliance upon haphazard hopes and belated reactions to moves by the Russian-directed Communists of the world can bring only chaos and confusion out of the already disheartening and darkened situation.

Today, this country needs a constructive plan of action. We need a positive American foreign and military policy. Each new day brings hope that the President will remove from office those responsible for their failures and frustrations of our prevailing policies and appoint in their places the most outstanding leaders in America, regardless of political party or personal favoritism. We need a National Cabinet comprised of genuine and acknowledged national leaders to meet this national crisis.

Indicative of the country's thinking is the following telegram just received from one of the Midwest's leading editors, Robert D. Lusk, of Huron, S. Dak., editor and publisher of the Daily Plainsman. This telegram is pregnant with food for thought and summarizes incompletely a lead editorial which the Daily Plainsman will carry in today's editions.

Mr. Lusk's suggestions are neither all-inclusive nor in final form but they do indicate courses of action far better than continued drift. They are preferable by far to permitting foreign heads of state to write our American course of action. They provide realistic suggestions for meeting the real problems of this dark day and hour. They are submitted for the consideration of the Senate and the country in the hope other Americans in and out of public life will come up with practical, detailed proposals for constructive action.

We are drifting toward disaster and it is a simple rule of physics that drift invariable leads only in the one direction—downward. Let us find the leaders and the resolution to develop and implement an American course of action which will prevent this crisis from degenerating into a chaotic rout of freemen and the principles of freedom which have made our country great.

HURON, S. DAK., *December 5, 1950.*

Senator KARL MUNDT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In the absence of anything else, here is something to kick around:

1. In order that essential confidence in Government might be restored at the earliest possible moment, a sweeping Cabinet change must take place, with the establishment of a National Cabinet with extraordinary powers and including in it the leading men of the country, regardless of party.

2. The above Cabinet change must include the appointment of a new Secretary of State with powers to remove any or all personnel in the Department without cause and without appeal.

3. Because the United States has a substantial portion of its fighting force involved in Korea, this country must immediately ask the United Nations that handicaps to its fighting an overwhelming and unexpected force be removed. These must include freedom in the use of weapons, in the selection of military targets, and enlistment of support. If such handicaps not removed by overwhelming or unanimous action, the United States will withdraw its armies from Korea as soon as its field commanders find their position untenable.

4. The United States will make the impregnability of the North and South American continents and their approaches from internal and external attack its first and prime effort and will proceed with utmost speed to accomplish this end.

5. The United States will welcome the cooperation, within or without the United Nations, of all free governments and freemen to weld themselves into an alliance to preserve and expand on this world the area of freemen and free governments. It will assist such nations to its utmost capacity after the requirements of America's bastion have been met.

6. The National Cabinet, acting as such, will be empowered at all times to enter into negotiations with recognized Communist governments leading toward establishment of world peace, but only if such peaceful settlement shall include freedom of commerce, trade, and the exchange of information between free and Communist lands and shall include an implementation of the elimination of the mutual danger of attack both by military and seditious forces.

BOB LUSK,
Editor, the Daily Plainsman.

Flag of the Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 6 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a poem entitled "Flag of the Free," by John A. Hofstead, an immigrant boy of 50 years ago, who has a profound appreciation and love for America.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLAG OF THE FREE

(By John A. Hofstead)

Up from the heart and the hope of creation,
Up from the depths of the soil and the sea,
Up from the soul and the surge of our Nation,
Rose and ascended the flag of the free—

Up from the bottom, the bedrock, the boulders,
Up from the toil and the toll of frontiers,
Up from America's makers and molders,
Up from their dreams and their hopes and their fears—

Up from the blood that was shed in our battles,
Up from the groans of the grueling grind,
Up from the souls of the slaves that were chattels,
Up from the prayers in the hearts of mankind!

Flag of the free, like the stars in the heavens,
Shed on us ever your luster and light,
Letting no masters nor leaders nor leavens
Cast on us shadows or darkness or night.

Flag of the free, let no taint nor dictator
Sink your bright stars in the sea's undertow;
Let no usurper, subverter, or traitor
Hoist in our homeland the flag of a foe!

Flag of the free, let no pall and no pallor
Cloak you nor cloud you, nor pale your bright hue;
Let but devotion, with virtue and valor,
Steep you, and keep you our Red, White, and Blue!

Flag of the free, may your folds ever flutter
Freedom and friendship and peace to impart;
Aye, as you whip in the breeze, may you utter
Hopes shining on in humanity's heart!

Flag of the free, remain floating and flying
Streaming and dreaming on land and on sea,
Lighting and leading and waving and vying,
Symbol and signal of souls that are free.

Flag of the free, may you shield us, and shift us
Onward and forward, and upward withal,
Blend us and bless us and lead us and lift us,
Draped in your folds, when life's curtain shall fall.

Four Ship Cargoes for Red China Halted by United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the reports coming from the Government that shipments of war materials from this country to China have ceased, still the racket continues. With ECA goods being shipped from our supposed allies across the line of the iron curtain to be transshipped to Red China, all of these shipments are contributing to the horrible slaughter of our boys. The releases to the press over a period of time indicating that there has been a shutdown of these shipments may allay the indignation of the people, but it does not establish the fact that this racket has stopped.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, December 6, 1950, which indicates that at least four shipped cargoes for Red China were halted. So far so good. But the ships that have already sailed and those that will continue to be smuggled are not reported to the public. The article follows:

FOUR SHIP CARGOES FOR RED CHINA HALTED BY UNITED STATES—22 TONS OF STEEL ON ONE OF THE VESSELS ORDERED TO UNLOAD ON WEST COAST

SAN FRANCISCO, December 5.—In a general crackdown on shipments for Communist China, the United States Government ordered four ships at west-coast docks today to unload steel and other cargo.

Most important of the shipments was 22 tons of Belgian-made silicon steel bound for Tientsin, China, aboard the Norwegian motorship *Igadi*.

Paul Leake, United States Customs Collector, said the steel would have to be removed before the ship, scheduled to sail from Oakland, Calif., last night, could depart.

Balfour, Guthrie & Co., agents for the *Igadi*, said it would take 4 days at a cost of $15,000 to remove the steel since it was in the bottom of the hold. The agents offered to post a $25,000 bond guaranteeing that the steel would be returned to San Francisco after the ship unloaded other cargo in China.

But the Government rejected the proposal. "These are not ordinary times," Mr. Leake said. "We must take every legal precaution to protect this country."

The silicon steel sheets can be used for armor plate. They first were shipped to New York, then loaded aboard the *Igadi*.

Another Norwegian ship, the *Greta Maersk*, was forced to unload cargo at San Francisco,

and a third, the *Chastine Maersk*, at Richmond, Calif.

The agent for these two ships, the Fred Olsen Line, said unloading of 45 tons of general nonmilitary goods would be completed today. The Government objected to these shipments because they had not been licensed. Shipping officials, unaware of the Government's new bans, loaded freight for Hong Kong as late as Saturday.

The fourth ship was the steamship *American Mail*, loaded with 4 tons of slashed automobile tires last week before the embargo was put into effect. Howard McGowan ordered the shipment, also bound for Hong Kong, unloaded before the ship could sail.

The tires were believed to be destined for transshipment to Communist China where the Reds would cut them up and use them for shoes.

Exporters said the Government ruling virtually will shut off all Hong Kong bound cargoes during the next 30 days until the Government sets up its licensing procedure. San Francisco normally does about $2,000,000 worth of business with the British crown colony each month.

Shipping men said the Government's action will work a hardship on them but they generally agreed with its principles.

What Policy Can Americans Now Agree Upon That Has the Best Chance of Saving This Country?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, every American—and especially each Member of Congress—is deeply concerned in finding some successful way to prevent destruction coming to this country and preventing a devastating world war III from overtaking our people.

In the recent congressional elections held in the United States, each of the major parties showed almost equal strength, there being approximately only 1 percent difference between them. If our major parties cannot agree upon American policy at this time, then our great country will have disunity and lose half of its strength, that may cause us all to lose our precious liberties.

Terrible mistakes have been made in the past in our foreign policy, but America and the Republican Party, of which I am a member, must look to the future.

The time has come when we, as a party, need to offer our combined constructive strength to our country.

The Democratic Party and the present administration should set up a truly bipartisan foreign policy that covers all the Pacific areas, as well as Europe, and they should in good faith invite wholehearted participation in this bipartisan foreign policy upon the part of the Republican leaders of this Nation.

It is all right and proper, that prior to our great American elections we should deal in politics, and every man should speak his piece and vote and work as he believes, but the time for politics as usual, and business as usual, has passed in America. If we are to meet and overcome the terrible forces of destruction that are striking at the very heart of America, we will have to have a unified country and we will have to have the combined, best intelligence of members of both of the great political parties in this Nation, which is now possibly in its darkest hour in its history.

Joseph Malik, representing communistic Russia in the United Nations, has clearly demonstrated that Russia does not want peace and that she is driving toward a world-wide war. Russia is proceeding on false propaganda and trying to embitter the world against America.

On more than 40 occasions Russia has blocked world-wide peace by the exercise of the veto. The delegation from Red China which is now participating in the hearings in the United Nations, spent several days in Moscow before coming to New York.

Instead of offering some solution toward the Korean War, the delegation from Red China blasted America, accused her of all sorts of aggression, and said that the hundreds of millions of Chinese people intended to drive America and the United Nations out of the Pacific, and, instead of it being a peace overture, it was very close to a declaration of war against the United States.

With these deadly and powerful enemies that dominate more than one-third of the peoples of the world arrayed against us, determined to accomplish our destruction if possible, it is time that every good American should forget politics and join in a true bipartisan policy and lay plans to save liberty and justice and Christianity.

The forces of the United Nations fighting in Korea are made up of about 90 percent American boys and 10 percent of our allied nations.

At the present time, since the Red Chinese hordes have entered the war, equipped with Russian weapons, our forces are now outnumbered at least 6 to 1 and great additional armies are marching out of China and Manchuria toward the Korean border with such overwhelming force that we will soon be outnumbered 10 or 20 to 1 in Korea.

Early decisions are being pressed for in the United Nations. China and Russia are delaying proceedings in the United Nations every way they can. But even if a favorable resolution is agreed upon and passed, over the objections of Russia and China and their satellites, everybody knows that Russia and China will pay no attention to it and that they will not withdraw their armies from Korea until they get ready, unless they are stopped by force.

In the recent arguments, pro and con, concerning the question of dropping the atomic bomb in Korea, it appears that our present administration and the military leaders have agreed not to do so at this time.

Every day that the present situation continues, means the loss of several hundred precious American lives.

For America and her leaders in both parties to solve these pressing questions, we should all try to place ourselves in the position of American parents who have sons fighting in Korea against these terrible and dangerous odds.

The greatest force that is quickly available to oppose the Red Armies in Korea are the well-equipped and well-trained Chinese Nationalist soldiers now on Formosa. There are from 300,000 to 500,000 of these soldiers that could almost immediately be made available, and they have already, through their leaders, requested permission to enter Korea and China to engage the Communist forces in battle.

When their offer was first made, it was turned down by the United Nations, temporarily, upon the ground that if the Nationalist Chinese Army entered the war in Korea, it may cause the Red Chinese Communist Army in China to enter the war in Korea. Well, the Red Chinese Communist Army has already entered the Korean War. There is nothing to be lost now by accepting the offer of the Nationalist Chinese Army to fight on behalf of liberty and freedom.

In addition to this, almost 50 percent of the Chinese people, in my opinion, will quickly rally to the cause of the Nationalist Army, if they can have any hope of ultimate success.

America is better equipped than any other country in the world to mass-produce weapons of war. It will be far better for the American people to make a large contribution of war implements, and not use up so much of our most precious asset, the young men of this country.

Russia has been smart enough to use the manpower of other nations to do her fighting up to now. Why can America not be smart enough to use an army of possibly half a million Chinese Nationalists, by equipping them with the proper arms?

It is perfectly plain that Russia's plan of operations is to overrun Korea and drive the United Nations forces out of Korea.

They next intend to overrun and take Formosa, and then immediately, it will be their plan and design to overrun and conquer Japan.

It is apparent that they intend to conquer and dominate and control all of the land masses of Asia, including India, and the Pacific Islands, if they are not stopped. If they are permitted to conquer and dominate all of Asia, they will immediately become a much greater and more menacing power of destruction to the rest of the world, including the United States.

An army of a million and a half of well trained Japanese soldiers could be raised, that would be anxious and willing to fight the Russian and Red Chinese Armies. It may be said that to use the manpower of a conquered nation such as Japan, would not be in keeping with some of the treaties and agreements in regard to such subjects.

America has been too soft too long. She will, of course, never do a dishonest thing, but extreme measures must be resorted to now.

It is perfectly possible, and indeed probable, that the United Nations, or we ourselves, could take sensible steps

immediately to create a combined fighting force of 2,000,000 men from Japan and Nationalist China. And there is a distinct possibility that in the future China may yield if necessary many more millions that would fight on our side in this struggle.

Nationalist China is a member of the United Nations. There is no longer any reason why their forces should not join the United Nations in Korea and the Pacific region. Furthermore, guerrillas in the mainland of China who are in sympathy with Nationalist China are now battling Chinese Reds and have captured a number of important cities and towns. If a large portion of the Nationalist Army were to be immediately transported and landed on the mainland of China, it would be an opportune time to strike back at the Chinese Reds and would do more to stop their march into Korea than anything else.

Then, our country should devote its entire national economy for the next several years for an all-out preparation for total war.

We should mobilize radios, television, the press, and advertising agencies, movies and all media of information—and we excel the world in this line—into a propaganda agency of power and effectiveness never before seen in this world, to carry the Voice of America and the great imperishable truths of liberty and justice and equality for all, to every corner of the earth.

To do this, we should enlist the best talent in America from all walks of life and from both major parties. Our propaganda should be true and it should be adaptable so that it could be understood by all peoples everywhere.

We should reexamine the friendship and intentions of all of our allies and let them know that we intend to resist communism everywhere, and let them make their decision as to whether or not they will stand up against communism with us. If they will stand up, assist these countries to rearm against communism; if they will not, discard them and center our strength where it will count.

Continue to take every opportunity to negotiate a peace, if possible, and never close the door on any effort that looks toward peace, and support all efforts of the United Nations in trying to accomplish world-wide peace, but at the same time prepare and rearm to take care of ourselves.

When our all-out war effort produces a sufficient amount of armed strength to guarantee that we can crush communism and establish liberty and Christianity all over the world, notify Russia that any other step toward aggression or making war on any other nation, will be met by this country blasting Russia off the globe, and that we will not engage in making war against Russian satellites but against Russia herself.

It is my belief that the above program is the best hope we have for world peace, and if world peace is impossible, it is the best hope we have to survival and to perpetuate the liberties and freedoms for which America stands.

Congress Should Quickly O. K. New Shipbuilding Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions I have spoken on the floor of this House pointing out the importance of having an adequate merchant marine. The present emergency in Korea has demonstrated the need for such and justifies the statements that I have so frequently made that it is of prime importance that we have a merchant marine commensurate with the needs of our Nation both in times of peace and war.

I include as a part of my remarks under the unanimous consent granted, an editorial entitled "Congress Should Quickly O. K. New Shipbuilding Program," appearing in the Courier-Post, Camden, N. J., issue of Monday, December 4, 1950. This editorial clearly sets forth the importance of proceeding with the new shipbuilding program at the earliest possible day. It reads as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD QUICKLY O. K. NEW SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

An important step toward modernizing and revitalizing the American merchant marine and stimulating the American shipbuilding industry has just been taken by President Truman.

The President has asked Congress to give the Maritime Administration authority to start construction of a number of fast, new, dry cargo vessels before the end of the current fiscal year next July 1.

The money is already available. In the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1950 Congress authorized the expenditure of $132,000,000 for passenger ship construction, which is not considered as feasible or as imperative under present conditions as the building of fast freighters.

Mr. Truman now has asked that Congress make a simple change in the wording of the act, and permit the expenditure of $126,000,000 of this money on new cargo vessels. It is something that should not require prolonged discussion or debate, something that Congress could do at once regardless of the other weighty business confronting the present lame duck session.

Although the President in his request gave no hint as to the number or types of cargo carriers planned, the facts are well enough known in maritime circles. The $126,000,000 would permit construction of about 14 or 15 ships under plans that were completed some time ago by the Maritime Administration, which is in position to ask bids on them within a month, according to Vice Admiral Edward L. Cochrane, its head.

The projected vessels would be of 12,500 tons, with a speed of 20 knots. This speed is vastly superior to the 9 to 11 knots of the wartime Liberty vessels or the 15 to 17 knots of the Victory ships, both types which are outmoded and obsolete because of new submarine developments, yet constitute the vast bulk of our active and inactive merchant fleets.

Designs for the new vessels provide for their conversion into troop transports carrying 3,000 men each if emergency requires, just as the American President liners being built at Camden's New York Shipyard have been modified for the same purpose. It is expected that the new ships could be the prototypes for a much larger number which would be desperately needed in a third world war and would still be invaluable as cargo carriers in peacetime trade.

Admiral Cochrane and shipping men generally have been quick to express themselves as highly pleased over the President's decision to back construction of the new fast freighters.

The decision is so wise from every point of view that it will be most surprising if Congress does not give its speedy agreement and allow this urgent shipbuilding program to get under way at once.

Who Is Fooling Who(m)?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Iron Age dated November 30, 1950, entitled "Who's Fooling Who?" It follows:

WHO'S FOOLING WHO?

The star-chamber clambake on the excess-profits tax should scare the daylights out of us. The question isn't how much should we raise by taxes. It isn't even how we shall do it.

The catch is—how far we are going in this country to fool the people with fancy words? We have gone quite a way. We have welfare, gracious living, babies cry for television, freedom for labor, freedom for business, planned economy, security, and other words that leave a nice cozy feeling—so we think.

A lot of these high-sounding sugar pills cover some pretty bitter stuff. They taste good going down but sooner or later their deadening effects will strike home.

Business has not tried to dodge its responsibility on defense taxes. Industrial groups have used a lot of gray matter drawing up fair, logical, and anti-inflationary plans for taxes.

Does this mean anything to the administration or its yes-men? Of course it doesn't. They want a tax that will bring in just what business wants—but with a big difference.

The administration is holding out for a defense tax with an excess-profits label. That would give the people the idea that profits will be excessive. It suggests that business does not want to foot its share of the bill.

The excess-profits tax submitted by the administration is evil in itself. It limits initiative; it is sugar-coated but bitter in its probable effects. It is even loosely drawn and runs counter to its intended purpose—to fight inflation and prevent windfall profits.

Plans submitted by business and other organizations look at the problem sanely. They will raise just as much revenue. No one will get rich out of the defense program. But that is beside the point.

Debate has been limited. People have been insulted. Democratic ideals are being flouted. That is serious. It is as serious as defense itself. If we deny our people free

expression—one of the things we hope to defend—we are as bad as the Russians.

Who is fooling who(m)? Let's find out—and soon.

TOM C. CAMPBELL,
Editor.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by David Lawrence and one by George Rothwell Brown about the deplorable situation in which we now find ourselves due to the ineptitude of our foreign policy.

The articles follow:

WILL MR. TRUMAN REEXAMINE?

(By David Lawrence)

The Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, by his ironical criticism of those Republicans who want to reexamine our foreign policy, unwittingly gave momentum to the cause of reexamination itself.

Mr. Acheson said he didn't, of course, object to the kind of reexamination which goes on constantly before committees of Congress to explain policies, but he did object to pulling up the crop by its roots just to take a look at how it has grown. He charged that the latter is the true purpose of the so-called isolationist.

But Mr. Acheson completely misunderstands the temper of the country. He has revived a waning isolationism. He has failed to grasp the meaning of the large protest vote at the recent congressional election.

Reexamination is an unpartisan term. It doesn't necessarily mean repudiation of past policies or basic principles. But it does mean reconsideration to see if we are getting anywhere and if a modification will achieve the desired goals.

The present foreign policy, which has guided this country since 1947, has been based on certain assumptions. These assumptions were actually written into the laws which both parties in Congress supported and for which billions have since been appropriated.

America launched the Marshall plan and established the Economic Cooperation Administration on the assumption that we would get economic unity in Europe. We haven't gotten it.

America launched the military assistance program and the North Atlantic Treaty and established a mechanism for carrying out their objectives on the assumption, written into the law, that we would get an integrated military force in Europe. We haven't gotten it.

Is it possible that when we planted the present crop of dollars, expecting to get the white chrysanthemums of peace and unity, we actually furnished seeds that now bring us the weeds of selfishness and discord and even a craven defeatism on the part of governments supposedly allied with us?

Certainly it's time to reexamine policies and to do it with a realism which seems to have departed suddenly from the minds of some of the leaders of European governments.

If Europe does not intend to use our billions constructively, both on the economic and the military sides, how long will it be before we will breed a more and more powerful brand of "isolationism" in America and revert to the go-it-alone policy of the 1920's? Will not the voters listen to the cry that our billions should preferably be used to build up our own Army, Navy, and Air Force and that we should be done with European vacillation and "left wing" softness, of which there seems to be just now such an outcropping, particularly, in Great Britain?

Such a turn of affairs would be tragic indeed. Maybe some of this is our fault. Maybe our world leadership is not persuasive.

Secretary Acheson has a tremendous responsibility. He cannot maintain the principles of any policy by ridiculing those who wish conscientiously to reexamine our relations with Europe and the Far East.

The Chinese Communists recently chewed up a regiment of American boys. Do we now reward the Chinese Communists with a seat in the United Nations? Does international crime pay after all? Do the Moscow Communists go scot free?

What is the meaning of the drive for appeasement in the Far East, sponsored by Britain, which is sweeping Europe today on the mistaken theory perhaps that, if the Far East is written off with another Munich, there will be more American money for Europe?

The appeasement road is the road to war.

The League of Nations, led by Great Britain, took that road in 1931 when Japan invaded Manchuria and United States protests went unheeded. Then, in 1935, came Mussolini's aggression in Ethiopia.

In 1936, the League of Nations dilly-dallied and Hitler marched into the Rhineland. Firmness would have turned him back.

In 1938, Great Britain and France appeased Hitler at Munich. Then came Nazi aggression in Czechoslovakia, in Austria and finally in Poland.

Today a plan to appease Soviet Russia and Communist China is being hatched in the United Nations. What will Secretary of State Acheson do about it?

Certainly it is time for reexamination. If we can't get better policies, maybe we will have to get better men to make them.

President Truman and the Democratic Party are truly responsible—not just Secretary Acheson, an appointed officer. Must we wait for November 1952 to put into effect by a larger protest vote the mandate of November 1950?

Let Farmer Truman reexamine his crops. Let him be sure that we have not sown the wind that "shall reap the whirlwind."

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

Prime Minister Attlee's visit in Washington, at one of the most momentous turning points in modern history—found President Truman confronted by a dilemma somewhat resembling that which threatens the Socialist-Labor Government in London.

It should be borne in mind in this connection that any agreement which the President may see fit to make with Mr. Attlee, if an agreement in this crisis, acceptable to American public opinion, is possible, will be made with a British Government which may be out of power in a matter of weeks.

In London the Socialist-Labor Government's majority in the House of Commons has been barely maintained at a shaky five.

In all recent bye-elections the Labor Government's margin of victory in virtually every case has been critically reduced.

In Washington, on his part, Mr. Attlee found the President of the United States, under the Constitution the officer charged with initiating all foreign policy, about to be confronted less than a month hence by a Senate in which the majority of the Truman Socialist-Labor government has been reduced to two.

Mr. Attlee has also discovered by this time that President Truman not only has a majority of but two in the Senate, but that it is a mere paper majority, and that actually he is the minority President of a minority party.

Both of these politicians are shaky, and they know it.

It also became evident as the President and the British Premier began their historic conferences, that any hopes which the Truman administration may have entertained that the bloody debacle in Korea, one of the worst military defeats in American annals, would have solidified a bi-partisan movement in Congress, had gone glimmering.

The headlines which Mr. Attlee read in his Washington newspaper told of renewed attacks in Congress on Secretary Dean Acheson.

Instead of diminishing, the demands for the removal of the Secretary of State increased on Capitol Hill to a steady drumfire.

But it was clear that the pressure on the President for the removal of Mr. Acheson would not end there even if he yielded to it.

At both Senate and House there is grim, tight-lipped resentment over the belated announcement by the Commerce Department that it had tightened the regulations governing the shipment of strategic materials to Communist China, to Soviet Russia, and the iron-curtain countries—an action properly denounced by Senator KNOWLAND, of California, as 2 years too late.

It will be recalled in this connection that at the time Senator MCCARTHY was firing his opening guns at the "crimson clique" in Mr. Acheson's State Department, the House Appropriations Committee turned up, in its hearings, evidence of a considerable number of fellow travelers in the Commerce Department.

Some of these had been removed. The current disclosures by Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland, of large shipments of important war materials to Communist China, through British Hong Kong principally, have intensified sentiment hostile to the administration at both ends of the Capitol.

Who in the Commerce and State Departments have been responsible for these policies, which have supplied to the Red armies of China vital war materials now no doubt being used to murder our soldiers in the frozen wastes of Korea?

Mr. Attlee doubtless discovered that the attacks on the Truman Cabinet were spreading from the State Department to other branches of the executive departments.

Meanwhile the British Prime Minister must be bearing in mind the fact that in a comparatively short time the new Congress will be considering an appropriation bill, containing proposed grants of financial aid to Great Britain.

There will be many embarrassing questions asked next year as these bills come up for consideration.

They will involve the revealed shipment of British strategic materials to Soviet Russia, and the fact that British socialism, financed with American tax money, is slowing down the British armament effort, notably in the perilous reduction in the output of British coal.

Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MONROE M. REDDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a petition signed by a large

number of citizens of my county, reading as follows:

We are taking this means of conveying our feelings to you about the Korean situation and also about the situation in our State Department, even to our President. We appeal to you to go to Congress and demand action immediately. If you want to continue to hold the love and respect of North Carolinians who have voted and supported you, you will demand action on the floor of Congress. Withdraw our troops at once or declare all-out war on the Chinese Reds at once.

The people of North Carolina are fed up with talk and speeches and conferences. We want action before our boys are entirely slaughtered at the hands of the Chinese Reds. This situation calls for immediate action, not next week or next year. Let's bring our boys back in one piece instead of in a box. Let's call our Nation in repentance to God.

It is apparent that the people of Henderson County, N. C., like a great majority of the people of America, are distressed and disappointed at our mistakes in Korea.

My view is that we should never have permitted our troops to enter Korea and that we should get out now as speedily as possible. Of course, it is preferable if we can reach an agreement with the Chinese, based upon reason and justice for all concerned, but regardless of any agreement we are not militarily in a position to stay in Korea and should evacuate at the earliest practical date.

It is not alone a question of whether we wish to get out. The hordes of Chinese that are murdering our soldiers are so overwhelming in number that they are forcing us out and if they continue this onslaught our military strength is not sufficient to cope with the situation. The distance is too far from our homeland and the supply lines are too long when we consider the fact that the Chinese are fighting in their back yard.

The first great mistake made was in the announcement of Dean Acheson that Korea was not necessary in the defense of our outer perimeter. This was an invitation for the North Koreans to make the invasion that soon followed. It was a statement of our foreign policy to the world that we would not defend South Korea. It was our policy up until the time of the invasion of South Korea. We did an about face immediately after the invasion and this, too, was another great mistake.

Dean Acheson seems to be rather gifted in saying the wrong thing at the wrong time and this has helped to bring our State Department in disrepute before the American people. His usefulness has reached an end. The confidence of the American people in him to serve in this high capacity has long since been lost. He owes it to the American people to vacate the office and let it be turned over to someone who can maintain public confidence.

There are those who say we should stay in Korea to save face. I think we should begin to save the lives of the American boys who are dying in vain in that part of the world where America's foreign policy has collapsed. They are not fighting for democracy. They are not fighting an enemy who has attacked territory necessary to our national defense. They were not sent there by Congress, who is vested with sole constitutional authority to make a declaration of war. Congress has not been asked to take this step. Congress has been circumvented by those who knew such action would not be taken at the hands of the Representatives of the American people. Our soldiers are fighting in Korea because of the action of the United Nations in making an order to that effect in support of the announcement of the President of the United States reversing our foreign policy again.

The United Nations has become a great debating society. Its members argue and debate while Americans die because of an order this organization has issued.

We cannot finance or fight the battles of all the nations of the world and I contend that unless our forces are withdrawn from Korea at an early date, it is the duty of Congress to take action to see that they are withdrawn. I am unwilling to remain silent any longer. The time has come for Congress to assert its constitutional duty and authority, and those who fail to make their voices heard on this all important subject shall be called to answer before their constituents at the polls ere the final chapter of this great tragedy is written.

Struggle in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent issue of the Boston Post, Boston, Mass. It follows:

PEACE HAS NO PRICE

After five momentous years Prime Minister Clement Attlee of Great Britain has asked for a consultation with President Truman on the questions arising out of the Korean War. It is to be hoped that the face-to-face talks will strengthen the determination of the western democracies not to do business with the Soviet Union—but there are serious doubts.

The struggle in Korea is not solely the concern of the United States. It is an issue which a majority of the United Nations must determine. Thus far the United States has provided most of the troops, spent most of the money, and suffered most of the casualties. These has been no carping at this circumstance, nor has the United States shown any evidence of faintheartedness.

Together the United States and Great Britain possess mastery of the sea, and qualitative mastery of the air, however deficient they may be in land forces to meet the Communist hordes. With the atom bomb British-American mastery of the air provides the strongest and most persuasive argument against Soviet aggressions. But such arguments will not prevail if one or another of the great western powers shows an inclination to make a deal with the Russians.

Must Britain learn all over again that there can be no more Munichs, that you can't make a deal with dictatorships? While the Soviet Union has been engaged during the past 5 years in an abusive campaign against the United States, it has been glaringly apparent that the Russians were cozening the Socialist government of Britain, striving to drive a wedge.

There isn't any question of whether Britain is a junior or senior partner in the coalition. The real question is whether Britain, France, and the nations in the North Atlantic Pact will stand firm with the United States, which, during the momentous 5 years since Prime Minister Attlee last visited this country, poured billions into Europe to make it possible for the western democracies to be equal partners in an alliance to guarantee peace.

British recognition of Communist China was expediency, and we are paying the price of that expediency today. If Prime Minister Attlee proposes another bargain with the Soviet Union it is certain that little time can be bought. A firm, resolute stand now will serve notice that the western democracies will make no deals, and the Soviet Union may halt its headlong rush into an aggressive war.

The utter irresponsibility of the Chinese Communists with their bellicose assertion that threats do not frighten anyone should convince the nations of the west that any price paid for peace on any terms with Red China is too exorbitant. If the price exacted by the servant is too high, what of the price that will be set by the master? Only firmness, resolution, courage, and integrity can cope with such barbarous blackmail.

Peace is something that has no price. It is secured only by the readiness of nations to hand together and face a common threat to their peace. Prime Minister Attlee must know how pathetic is the memory of Neville Chamberlain waving his little scrap of paper and crying that he had purchased "peace in our time." All that such deals can buy is the certainty of war.

Our Bankrupt Chinese Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by S. Eugene Allen from the Oregon Labor Press of December 1, 1950. It follows:

OUR BANKRUPT CHINESE POLICY

(By S. Eugene Allen)

Shall it be war or peace?

That question hangs delicately in the balance. And upon its answer depends everything.

That is why it seems appropriate to consider China.

For almost a century prior to 1940 the United States had but two fixed and unchanging principles of foreign policy. One of these was the Monroe Doctrine. The other was the open door in China. In other matters our policy was flexible and adaptable. In these two matters it was fixed.

As a result of our policy toward China Americans came to have a warm and high regard for the Chinese and they, in turn, regarded America as their best friend.

The policy of the open door in China was not an emotional one. It was a practical one—a realistic one. We simply knew we could sleep better at night if China, the great Asiatic power was our friend. The policy we pursued involved no interference with

the Chinese Government. We were not concerned whether she was ruled by an Emperor, an Empress Dowager, a boy king, or by a band of would-be Democrats.

How then did we come—in one short decade from 1940 to 1950—to so incredibly and so unhappily destroy all that we had built since the open door was established in 1844?

Read the following:

"The entire Communist political thesis could be reduced to a single paragraph: If you take a peasant who has been swindled, beaten, and kicked about for all his waking days and whose father has transmitted to him an emotion of bitterness reaching back for generations—if you take such a peasant, treat him like a man, ask his opinion, let him vote for a local government, let him organize his own police and gendarmes, decide on his own taxes, and vote himself a reduction in rent and interest—if you do all that, the peasant becomes a man who has something to fight for, and he will fight to preserve it against any enemy, Japanese or Chinese. If in addition you present the peasant with an army and a government that helps him harvest, teach him to read and write, and fight off the Japanese who raped his wife and tortured his mother, he develops a loyalty to the army and the government and to the party that controls them. He votes for that party, thinks the way that party wants him to think, and in many cases becomes an active participant."

The above paragraph is from the book Thunder Out of China. It was written by Theodore H. White and Annalee Jacoby. It was widely distributed in 1946 by the Book-of-the-Month Club. Neither Mr. White nor Miss Jacoby are Communists nor Communist sympathizers.

But this one paragraph sums up so well the whole cause of our utter failure in China.

It represents the opinion of most of the architects of statecraft during the past decade. It states, naively and utterly without guile, the conviction that the Communists are good people, agrarian reformers, and the bringers of a better life for downtrodden peoples. This view was officially supported by the United States Department of State. The many missions that were sent to China during the decade were all based on this assumption and were instructed to make certain as could be that the Communists were brought into the Chinese Government and made responsible for Chinese administration.

And so it was that in a single decade America destroyed all she had so painstakingly builded in a previous 96 years.

Our policy ceased to be one of friendship for China. It became one of interference within China.

Is it not incredible that we turned our back on the Nationalist Government of China which was the legally constituted government and which was friendly to America and sought to befriend the Communist revolutionary forces of Mao Tse-tung who were seeking to overthrow the legally constituted government of China and who were unfriendly to us?

Yet that was our policy. Today it comes to fruition.

There is no apology offered for Chiang Kai-shek. He was a stiff-necked despot. His government was corrupt. Most of the bitter criticism against his regime is valid.

Granted all this, upon what basis could our national administration choose to compound the evil by support of the revolutionary Communist drive to destroy the national government of China?

Chinese governments have always been corrupt. Communist governments are even worse.

Our stake in China was to keep her as a friend. But our studied policy for the past decade made her an enemy, and an enemy directed by Moscow at that.

In brief sketch this is what happened:

The Japanese ruthlessly invaded China in 1937. As a result of this invasion, American sympathies turned quickly to the side of our Chinese friends. China was hailed as a brave nation who rose heroically to resist barbaric aggression.

Chiang Kai-shek was a hero, not only to China but to America. There were China relief dinners. There developed an almost emotional attachment of American opinion to the Nationalist Government and Chiang. Preachers even implored divine intervention for the Chinese in their struggle. Even the Communists thought Chiang was a great figure.

(Russia has always feared Japan. Russia's interest lay in keeping Japanese aggression occupied in China, thus lifting fears of Japanese designs against Russia.)

With the outbreak of World War II, the Burma Road was closed by the British. Stalin and Hitler were bedfellows. Communists were no longer interested in bolstering Chinese resistance to aggression, for the war was no threat to her, she thought.

The Chinese Communists at this point began their revolution. They began to fight the Nationalist Government of China at the very time China's life was threatened by the foreign aggression of Japan.

In 1941 President Roosevelt sent son James and Owen Lattimore and Lauchlin Currie on special mission to China. They were disappointed because Chiang flatly refused to believe that the Communist revolutionaries were simple do-gooders and "agrarian reformers." They sought to induce Chiang to take them into his government.

Chiang refused even upon their urging.

Relations between the United States and China became strained.

On December 7, 1941, America was attacked by Japan. We were now allies with China, and immediately our hostility to our ally China became almost as emotional as our friendship for China had previously been.

General Stilwell went to China as Chiang's chief of staff. He constantly urged Chiang to accept the Communists into the Government. Finally, Chiang became so enraged with him that President Roosevelt recalled him.

Gen. Claire Chennault organized on a voluntary basis the famous Flying Tigers. This courageous band fought the Japanese invasion all along the China coast and kept out of Chinese politics.

A long wait was in store for poor China in her hour of peril. We simply hadn't enough matériel to give them much. A little was flown in over the Burma hump. At the Casablanca meeting the policy was still for China to wait. It had to be. But while we were unable to give China much aid or military support during these years, we gave her a great deal of advice. Most of it was to urge them to invite the Communists into the government. Giving a foreign power advice when they need matériel is an unrewarding method of conducting foreign relations.

One of the advisers sent by President Roosevelt during this period was Wendell Willkie. He came back and reported that the great reservoir of good will the Chinese had for the United States was leaking rapidly away.

Meanwhile journalists, week-end visitors, and others began to systematically undercut and scorn Chiang—still the legal head of China—and encourage the Communist rebels. Most of this activity was well meant. The new China hands took the Communists at their word that they were simply agrarian reformers seeking to right the ancient wrongs of Chinese landlordism.

By 1944 a real crisis had arrived. And by this time the Office of War Information, an official propaganda agency of the United States, was openly supporting the Communist revolutionaries and attacking the National Government of China and Chiang Kai-shek.

Then Henry Wallace was dispatched by President Roosevelt to see what he could do. It taxes the imagination to speculate on what he was doing. At this juncture Russia and Japan entered into a nonaggression pact. This meant that perhaps a million Japanese soldiers were freed to ravage China from outside while the Communist revolutionaries destroyed her from within.

Dismayed, President Roosevelt sent Patrick Hurley to China as Ambassador. After trying vainly to bring some order out of the mess that had been created, Hurley came home in disgust and said the career diplomats in the State Department were destroying any effective work for China.

In 1945 there was wide agreement in the State Department that China needed a Mao Tse-tung and not Chiang Kai-shek. And the final blow at decent relations with China was struck in February at the secret Yalta conference. This amazing agreement pulled Russia into the Asiatic war where she wasn't needed and couldn't do much; gave Russia Outer Mongolia; gave Russia control of the Manchurian railway; gave Russia control of the port of Dairen and the naval base at Port Arthur. It finally included the requirement that Chiang negotiate an agreement acceptable to Russia on all these points.

Hope was now all gone for a united China. The Russians began arming the Communists with Japanese military supplies. The situation simply deteriorated beyond repair.

Gen. George Marshall was dispatched to China by President Truman. He tried to save the situation. He failed only because it was beyond saving. He came home bitter about the affair.

The war was now over. We were anxious to get the boys home. The Communists pushed full-scale civil war. They won it.

The rest is recent history only too well known.

So in one decade we made a fearsome enemy out of what had been a fast friend. The Communists proved once more—as they always have—that they are Communists.

War or peace? The answer hangs delicately in the balance.

Youth Speaks Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, with our young people lies our hope for building a stronger Nation and a better world. That they are aware not only of the opportunities afforded by our American way of life, but also of the responsibilities of citizenship which its continuance entails, is evident from the outstanding essays which are the products of the pens of three Rochester, N. Y., high-school students who were selected as the authors of the prize-winning speeches delivered in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the junior chamber of commerce of that city. With pride in the achievements of these young citizens, I have requested leave to include their challenging and inspiring contributions in this permament RECORD. They are as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Douglas K. Ahern)

My name is Douglas Ahern, or, just Doug. It isn't a real common name like Dick Brown or Bill Jones. It's just a name. The boy

behind it, however, I can assure you, is as average and common as a hot dog on a picnic. Now, like the majority of my fellow men, I have stage fright if it becomes necessary to speak in front of a group of people so, it follows, that I must have a pretty good reason for speaking now. I have.

A while ago I was asked to speak on behalf of a very famous lady at a great trial. A trial that frightened me with the gigantic significance of its outcome. It is not a new trial. As a matter of fact, it has been dragging on for hundreds of years. Now, however, it is a critical period in its development. When I was asked to speak for her, I accepted immediately. Not because I liked the idea of speaking, or that my few words would have any affect on the outcome, because they undoubtedly won't, but because she has done so incredibly much for me that I have a debt to her I never could possibly pay. Nevertheless, I must make an attempt.

It is my turn, very shortly, to speak at this trial and I thought perhaps you would like to hear me. You know, of course, that he, who governs our lives, the judge, has been on our side from the beginning. It is the jury we must convince. There are still many skeptical persons on it. You understand that it is not my friend herself who is on trial, but rather what she has created. Ah, there is my name. I am to speak for her now. Excuse me, please.

My Lord God, and you members of the jury, citizens of the world. You have on trial here democracy. It is a question whether you are going to accept or reject its ideals. You also, whether you know it or not, have its creator, liberty, on trial. No, don't correct me, for you must see, or I must make you see, that if you have democracy on trial, you have liberty on trial.

Part of the text statement of the Constitution of the United States of America says that, "We, the people of the United States, in order to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." This Constitution is as yet the most perfect recording of democracy obtained. If this democracy, under the Constitution, does secure the "blessings of liberty for the people," it is self-evident that liberty is on trial with democracy and that those who oppose democracy prefer oppression to liberty.

Now the question is, Does this democracy, under the Constitution, secure the blessings of liberty for the people?

On paper, in the Constitution there is an impressive array of liberties. To name a few, there is the freedom of speech, religion, and press, the right to assembly, the right to keep and bear arms, the guaranty of trial by jury, the right to free elections, and even an amendment saying that just because it was impossible to name all our liberties it didn't mean we don't have them. Ah, yes; I can read on your faces what you are thinking. You're thinking that from experience you know that all that is on paper is not a reality.

Well, let's take a look at the citizens of the United States and see how they feel about their country, its Government, and its democracy. You see an industrious but fun-loving people who have one of the highest standards of living in the world. You see great roaring cities with factories shooting rolling masses of black smoke skyward and quiet small towns with broad tree-shaded streets. You see endless plains tilled to perfection by the pride of ownership.

Move up closer. There's the gang down at the corner drug store. There's a political candidate making a sweating attempt to gain the favor of the people over his opponents because it is the people who elect him. What's that over there? Ha, some irate motorist blistering the seat of the local government for not fixing the hole in the pavement he's warned them about. The people love their Government very much, from what I can see. They must, for right now they are dying on the battlefield to keep it. It wasn't too long ago that their ancestors died to make it and its wonderful Constitution, and, although I am still too young, in the future I, too, should be glad and proud to give my life for it, for you see it is my country, too, and the people are free.

Well, what about it, citizens of the world? Do you want liberty or oppression? If democracy is on trial, so is liberty. As for me, if I can't have liberty, I shall at least die fighting for it. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I speak for democracy and its mother, liberty.

Thank you.

I Speak for Democracy

(By Anny Werman)

Democracy is a great symphony, written in the key of the individual and the time signature of all history.

The first movement is the greatness of democracy. Sometimes this greatness is slow, and sometimes it is fast, but it is always tremendous. It is so tremendous that no one can ever hear all of it. It is so important that it is often ignored. It is always present, but not always recognized. Often the greatness is hard to understand; more often it is misunderstood and misinterpreted. Confined only to slogans, it changes to littleness. The extent of this greatness is infinite and is lost in our daily language. This first movement is our goal and our inspiration. Greatness always has some portion of the divine.

The second movement is the sadness of democracy. The themes of this are war and hurt and failure. Death and half-deaths are here; the war that did not prevent a reign of terror; the war that overthrew the czar, but did not bring freedom; the war that did not make the world safe for democracy. Hurt is here: the sobs of a little Negro boy, the first time that he finds out that he is different; the screams that rang from the gas chambers around the world. And failure is also here: the failure of people who do not vote, the failure of people to whom freedom means the right to be selfish. Duties are often commonplace and dull. Responsibility is rarely easy or pleasant. But they both are part of democracy. Death and hurt and failure. The sadness is a long movement.

The third movement is the kindness of democracy. This is the blood bank that receives more than its quota. This is the story of the home-town boy who makes good: the William Allen White's, the Eddie Cantor's, the Andrew Carnegie's. This is a GI soldier giving his food to a Korean orphan. This is the American people sending thousands of dollars to one little girl who has polio. This kindness has become part of us. It is the goodness that forms the strength of democracy. We must have the greatness because it puts everything in its right proportion. We must have the sadness, because it is the price of everything important. But the kindness, the gayness, the goodness are firm and eternal. These are the best defenses democracy has against any of its enemies. These are the forces that keep democracy alive.

The fourth movement is the future of democracy. This is a triumphant march. The darkness of uncertainty is lighted by the knowledge of the past. Democracy has no need to be afraid; it has a right to be proud. It has survived the dark ages, Bonaparte, and Hitler. Dictators are forced upon people; they disappear. Democracy is part of mankind's dream; it remains. It has changed and formed itself into the mold made by each generation. It has bent before the wind of hate, and has not broken. It is a dynamic, ever-moving force. Democracy will live as long as there are people who believe. Our symphony will continue, played by men's hands and hearts and blood. The symphony of democracy is the voice of democracy.

I Speak for Democracy

(By David E. Bilhorn)

In this critical period in the history of man, when our way of life and system of government are being so severely tested, it is imperative that each one of us knows for what we stand and to what end we are striving. We must know this in order to help those peoples who are struggling within themselves, not knowing what to believe—trying to decide upon the merits of American democracy. We must not only know what we believe but act on those beliefs. Today, a democratic world will be gained only through conscientious effort, and all-out cooperation on the part of each person. No matter how many rules and laws there are in a game, it cannot be played without the players.

Here in America we have brought democracy a long way on its road to perfection. We have made it a social and governing system "of the people, by the people, and for the people." We are free to think, speak and act as long as we respect other people's rights. It is here where democracy succeeds or fails, and I am proud to be in America where this sense of respect for others is omnipresent. We are free only when we are responsible.

To live in America, under this social and governing system, is a great privilege. Since we are surrounded by all its joys and comforts, we are often amazed when people who come to this land of ours for the first time are so thrilled and awed at the things we consider everyday occurrences; going to a baseball game, eating popcorn, and driving leisurely through the country on a Sunday afternoon. The staccato voice of a pneumatic drill tearing up a pavement, making way for improved roads; the resounding blows of a lumberman felling a tree; the clear-cut hammerings of a carpenter building a new house; the shrill factory whistles announcing lunchtime, the happy laughter of many children. This is America to the ear. The fragrance of new-mown hay, the smell of a loaf of freshly baked bread, the aroma of coffee on a chilly morning, the scent of a wood-fire in the fall air—America like a whiff of perfume floating over a dreary world. The high majestic mountains, the picture of a brown, orange, yellow, and scarlet valley in the fall; the endless fields of wheat, hay, and corn; the skyscrapers stretching eagerly to the sky; the golden sunset on a silvery lake—America, a nation rich in progress, spread as an unfolding panorama before the world.

But democracy in America is not enough. It must spread to other countries, rolling away the fog that has settled over them. Democracy is what every man craves, but few are able to posssess. Why should democracy be a world force? Why do we want to establish a democratic government for all the world? Do we wish to gain power, and profit financially by it? No. Then why? In the first place, we know the freedom we possess in America and we want others to share it. It is absurd for any man who can think for himself to say that he would rather be a slave than a free man in a democracy. Deep down in every man's heart is the desire to work for himself, to try to throw off the shackles that hold him in poverty. Democracy does not promise that everyone should become rich, it gives a man a chance and a choice. A man works for himself and his fellowmen. Democracy is like a jig-saw puzzle, each piece complementing the other to make the composite whole.

In the second place, a democracy is governed by the people. Because of this, competition thrives and the people may enjoy the fruits of their labor. Through repre-

sentation and election they put in governmental positions the men of their choice. These men in turn are their mouthpieces, for through them speaks the voice of the people.

And, in the third place, democracy is the only form of government in the world today which recognizes and protects the sacredness of the individual. What could be more important than this? It is the whole basis of our great Hebrew-Christian tradition. It is what the Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights were designed to protect. Revolutions in France and the American Colonies were fought to establish this fundamental ideal, and one of the main reasons for our entering the world wars was to protect this principle—this idea which is the basis of true democracy.

Democracy is our American heritage, and we are ready to stand up, fight, and die for this precious gift that we cherish. That is why I am proud to be an American youth—to be able to serve my country—to defy any man to take away my freedom—to stand up, and speak for Democracy.

If He Won't Quit, Fire Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, for a long time letters have been received by Members of Congress which have been most critical of Secretary of State Dean Acheson. Especially has this been true since the Alger Hiss statement was made by him.

I am firm in my conviction that Dean Acheson should not have been appointed originally as Secretary of State. There is an abundance of well-fitted and superbly well-qualified men who are available for such an appointment. I feel that it was a mistake when Mr. Acheson was confirmed for this position. If the matter of his approval was up for consideration at this time, I am doubtful that he would be confirmed.

In the crisis with which our country is confronted, full and complete unity of purpose and action is essential. I know of no better way to bring about a unanimity of feeling than for the Secretary of State to submit his early resignation.

Why do I say this? The No. 2 man in authority in the executive branch of our Government should possess the attributes of full and complete confidence, admiration, and respect of the Nation. He falls far short. It cannot be successfully asserted that Dean Acheson holds and merits the full confidence of the American people. The citizens would want and have a right to demand that a person selected for any place of high trust and responsibility should have no question mark upon him.

There is a question mark upon any man who would support and defend a convicted traitor.

The Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of December 1, 1950, carried an editorial regarding Secretary of State Acheson which is in my opinion most worthy of full consideration by this body. The full text of the editorial follows:

IF HE WON'T QUIT, FIRE HIM

Need for national unity there is in face of the worst crisis in the history of modern civilization, but it won't be achieved at a price of keeping Dean Acheson on the job as Secretary of State. The administration and the Congress will make a fatal mistake if they attempt to use the present extremity as an excuse to protect him. He has got to go and with him the entire coterie of State Department "planners" responsible for the pro-Communist Asiatic policy which invited Red aggression in the Orient. If he won't quit, he should be fired, and if President Truman won't do it, the Congress can force it through the simple expedient of adopting a nonconfidence resolution.

The country has taken enough chances on the possibility of Acheson et al. having a change of heart, and the cost for chance taking is about as horrible as could be imagined. In that black hour when the American people first began to realize the extent of the Korean debacle they had a right to expect from their Secretary of State a clear expository as to what had happened and what, so far as his Department is concerned, would be done about. What they got in his Wednesday night radio address was so unrelated to the real crisis that he left them more bewildered than they were before he started his insipid delineation of what he calls "strategy of freedom." It must have given the Red delegations at the United Nations and the Kremlin's puppeteers a belly laugh.

There can be no unity where confidence is lacking, and there can be no confidence in the State Department as it is currently constituted. The Korean War started in June. We don't have to remind our readers where it is today. During the intervening months Acheson et al. have had almost free rein with their policy making, their appeasement efforts, and their "don't make Russia mad" strategy. This costly experiment has been in American lives, and the experimenters have forfeited the right to public respect.

President Truman is entitled to his personal loyalties and his too-blind friendships, but he has no right to inflict them on the American people and by so doing gamble with a nation's survival.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 6 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article on the war in Korea written by Homer Bigart, and published in today's New York Herald Tribune. It is a very interesting article and I believe it should be read by all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE FRONTS IN KOREA—BIGART SURVEYS SITUATION AS EIGHTH ARMY CONTINUES ITS GREAT RETREAT; CRITICIZES STRATEGIC DECISIONS

(By Homer Bigart)

SEOUL, December 5.—The full impact of defeat—the worst licking American arms have suffered since Bataan—has not yet been felt by the great bulk of American troops in Korea. The retreating soldiers are too weary and too preoccupied with immediate concerns to think of the consequences of this disaster.

Those who participated in the great retreat, those who are moving southward tonight on dusty, crowded roads to new positions in a series of desperate rear-guard actions, have no time to brood over the grim prospect for tomorrow. In this situation a man asks only to stay alive. He becomes a hoarder of days, and each sunrise is lovelier than the last.

Later, when the drug of fatigue has worn off and the fear of imminent death has subsided, there will be bitterness. Already some of the thoughtful officers are beginning to question the sanity of recent military decisions which may not have caused, but which certainly accelerated, this crisis. The most questionable decision of the last few weeks was General of the Army Douglas MacArthur's abortive offensive, which the enemy quickly turned into a defeat.

Before the offensive was launched it was noted by observers that any attempt to push beyond the neck of the Korean Peninsula would be unsound, even if the Chinese Communists withdrew. To fan out a small force along the rugged fastness of a 700-mile frontier with Red China and the Soviet Union simply made no sense. It was an invitation to disaster. Any frontier with a Communist power is exceedingly difficult to seal. That was learned by the American military mission to Greece.

Adequate vigilance of the lengthy frontier would have required a force many times that which the United Nations threw into the Korean campaign. Had our commands all reached the border, we would have been obliged to disperse our forces in small garrisons at isolated points. There would necessarily be unguarded gaps through which "volunteers" from China could cross and recross the frontier at will, exposing the garrisons to the constant threat of annihilation.

Yet, despite the certainty of border incidents that would compel the United Nations troops to remain in Korea indefinitely, General MacArthur's headquarters did nothing to discourage the belief that practically every one would be home by Christmas.

General MacArthur's chief of intelligence, Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, said last Friday that he knew there were 10 Chinese Communist corps either in Korea or on the Manchurian side of the Yalu River when the "home by Christmas" offensive was launched on November 24. Presumably General Willoughby passed this intelligence on to General MacArthur.

If SCAP (Supreme Command, Allied Powers) knew all this, why was Maj. Gen. Edward M. Almond's Tenth Corps given the green light to go traipsing up into the far reaches of northeastern Korea, leaving behind an attractive vacuum between it and Lt. Gen. Walton H. Walker's Eighth Army on the other side of the peninsula? Instead of buttoning up with General Walker, General Almond seems to have been fighting an independent war of his own.

It did not require any deep thinking by the Chinese Communist commanders to strike their heaviest blow down the center of the peninsula. The right flank of the Eighth Army was open and inviting. It was the sort of situation that the Chinese Reds, skilled in the Soviet technique of wide-sweeping envelopment, knew how to exploit. The Chinese counteroffensive quickly accomplished the dual result of caving in the Eighth Army's flank and isolating General Almond's corps. To escape envelopment, the Eighth Army was forced to fall back rapidly, with its flank still ragged and sloppy.

Meanwhile the Tenth Corps faces the imminent prospect of a Dunkerque. Nor is the situation much better with the Eighth Army. For although General Walker's troops escaped entrapment north of Pyongyang, thanks mainly to the skillfully conducted withdrawal by the First Corps, under Maj. Gen. Frank W. Milburn, they are no longer capable of regaining the initiative from the overwhelming Chinese Communist forces, and they eventually may be obliged to pull back into a defensive beachhead perimeter.

The over-all strategic picture is even more depressing. Two-thirds of the existing trained professional troops of the United States Army are pinned down in a part of the world where little damage can be inflicted on the arch enemy—the Soviet Union. This is not a place where the west can achieve victory.

A unit commander, noting that the Chinese Communists had won with virtually no artillery, no armor and no air power, said: "We've got to choose our own battleground, where superior weapons can be effective. We should avoid fighting in this sort of terrain against any enemy that has a great reserve of manpower. We can't hurt Russia here."

President Truman Addresses Fifth White House Youth Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, on December 5, the President of the United States very appropriately took time from his busy duties to go to the meeting of the Fifth White House Youth Conference. There were gathered approximately 6,000 delegates from all over this great Nation. The fact that the attendance at this conference for these several days is large, is, in my judgment, sufficient proof that the people of our Nation are increasingly aware of the importance of children and youth to the domestic security and best interests of the freedom of the world.

This appropriate address by the President of our great Nation speaks for itself. It follows:

TEXT OF TRUMAN ADDRESS TO YOUTH CONFERENCE

(Following is the text of the address by President Truman delivered at the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth in the National Guard Armory today:)

As we meet here today, the serious crisis in world affairs overshadows all that we do. This country of ours, together with other members of the United Nations, is engaged in a critical struggle to uphold the values of peace and justice and freedom.

We are struggling to preserve our own liberty as a Nation. More than that, we are striving, in cooperation with the other free nations, to uphold the basic values of freedom—of peace based on justice—which are essential for the progress of mankind.

As we engage in that struggle, we must preserve the elements of our American way of life that are the basic source of our strength. That is the purpose of this Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth. You are seeking ways to help our children and young people become mentally and morally stronger, and to make them better citizens. I think you should press right ahead with that work, because it is more important now than ever.

NATION BEHIND FORCES

Our thoughts and prayers are with our young men who are fighting in Korea. They are engaged in a battle against tremendous odds. The full effort of the united people of this country is behind them. All of us are aware of the grave risk of general conflict which has been deliberately caused by the Chinese Communist leaders. Their action greatly changes the immediate situation with which we are confronted. It does not change our fundamental purpose to work for the cause of a just and peaceful world.

No matter how the immediate situation may develop, we must remember that the fighting in Korea is but one part of the tremendous struggle of our time—the struggle between freedom and Communist imperialism. This struggle engages all our national life, all our institutions, all our resources. For the effort of the evil forces of Communism to reach out and dominate the world confronts our Nation and our civilization with the greatest challenge in our history.

I believe the single most important thing our young people will need to meet this critical challenge in the years ahead is moral strength—strength of character. And I know that the work of this conference will be of tremendous assistance in the urgent task of helping our young people achieve the strength of character they will need.

MUST UNDERSTAND THREAT

If we are to give our children the training that will enable them to hold fast to the right course in these dangerous times, we must clearly understand the nature of the crisis. We must understand the nature of the threat created by international communism.

In the first place, it is obviously a military threat. The Communist-dominated countries are maintaining large military forces—far larger than they could possibly need for peaceful purposes. And they have shown by their actions in Korea that they will not hesitate to use these forces in armed aggression whenever it suits their evil purposes.

Because of this military threat, we must strengthen our military defenses. We are now engaged in a great program of rearmament. This will change the lives of our young people. A great many of them will have to devote some part of their lives to service in our Armed Forces or other defense activities. In no other way can we insure our survival as a Nation.

OBJECTIVE OUTLINED

Our objective is not simply to build up our own Armed Forces. Our objective is rather to help build up the collective strength of the free nations—the nations which share the ideals and aspirations of free men.

As a matter of defense, we need the combined resources and the common determination of the free world to meet the military threat of communism.

But our problem is more than a military matter. Our problem and our objective is to build a world order based on freedom and justice. We have worked with the free nations to lay the foundations of such a world order in the United Nations, and we must remain firm in our commitment to the United Nations. That is the only way out of an endless circle of force and retaliation, violence and war—which will carry the human race back to the dark ages if it is not stopped. And this is a point that we must make sure our children and young people understand.

MORAL, SPIRITUAL DANGERS

The threat of communism has other aspects than the military aspect. In some ways, the moral and spiritual dangers that flow from communism are a more serious threat to freedom than its military power.

The ideology of communism is a challenge to all the values of our society and our way of life. Some people are most concerned about the Communist threat to our economic system. But, serious as this is, it is only one of the many problems that communism raises.

Communism attacks our basic values, our belief in God, our belief in the dignity of man and the value of human life, our belief in justice and freedom. It attacks the institutions that are based on these values. It attacks our churches, our guarantees of civil liberty, our courts, our democratic form of government. Communism claims that all these things are merely tools of self-interest and greed—that they are weapons used by one class to oppress another.

ATTEMPT TO POISON MINDS

We who live in this country know, from our own experience, how false this attack of communism is. But there are many people in other parts of the world who have suffered injustice, or who have been oppressed, or who stagger under burdens of poverty or disease, to whom the false doctrines of communism have an appeal. And every time our American institutions fail to live up to their high purposes, every time they fail in the proper adminstration of justice, the forces of communism are aided in their attempt to poison the minds of men everywhere.

Our teachers—and all others who deal with our young people—should place uppermost the need for making our young people understand our free institutions and the values on which they rest. We must fight against the moral cynicism—the materialistic view of life—on which communism feeds. We must teach the objectives that lie behind our institutions, and the duty of all our citizens to make those institutions work more perfectly. Nothing is more important than this. And nothing this conference can do will have a greater effect on the world struggle against communism than spelling out the ways in which our young people can better understand our democratic institutions, and why we must fight, when necessary, to defend them.

AID TO DEMOCRACY

These White House conferences have done a great deal, over the years, to make our people and our Government conscious of our social problems, as they affect children, and to help solve those problems. These conferences have made our democracy work better—have aided it to carry out its promise of a better life for all.

In this fifth conference of this White House series, you are carrying on that great tradition. This year you are mainly concerned with the mental and moral health of our children. And that is exactly what you should be concerned with at this time.

I do not claim to be an expert in these things, and I know that I am addressing a conference of experts, but I think there are certain fundamental factors in the development of the American character. The basis of mental and moral strength for our children lies in spiritual things. It lies first of all in the home. And next, it lies in the religious and moral influences which are brought to bear on the children.

NEED RELIGIOUS TRAINING

If children have a good home—a home in which they are loved and understood—and if they have good teachers in the first few grades of school, I believe they are well started on the way toward being useful and honorable citizens. And I do not think I am being old-fashioned when I say that they ought to have religious training when they are young, and that they will be happier for it and better for it the rest of their lives.

In the days ahead, there will be many cases in which we will have to make special efforts to see that children get a fair chance at the right kind of start in life. For as our defense effort is increased, special problems will be created by the disruption of the lives of many families.

When the White House conference was held in 1940, the nature of the defense problems which lay ahead was not very clear to those who participated. But in the years that followed, we found that the defense program created many problems of migration, divided families, working mothers, inadequate housing at defense centers and military camps, lack of community services, and of facilities for education and child welfare.

EXPERIENCE FRESH IN MIND

Today we know much more about these problems, and our recent experience in trying to solve them is fresh in our minds. I know that the work of this conference will give us some important guide lines as to how we can handle these matters best. Our defense effort is all important, but we must do everything we can to see that it does not handicap the lives of children who are affected by it. The delegates to this conference can help us do a better job this time in meeting our defense problems. That is a vital part of the work of helping to make a healthier and happier life for all our children in the years ahead.

We must remember, in all that we do at this conference and afterward, that we cannot insulate our children from the uncertainties of the world in which we live or from the impact of the problems which confront us all. What we can do—and what we must do—is to equip them to meet these problems, to do their part in the total effort, and to build up those inner resources of character which are the main strength of the American people.

Individual self-reliance and independence of spirit are the greatest sources of strength in our democracy. They mark the difference between free countries and dictatorships.

WEAKNESS OF DICTATORSHIPS

The great weakness of dictatorships is that they enslave the minds and the characters of the people they rule. And the effects of this enslavement are most serious in the case of children.

I have been told by people who worked in Germany immediately after the last war that the young people in that country were physically among the healthiest in Europe. But they had been enslaved, mentally and morally, by the dictatorship, and when those controls were destroyed—when they were put on their own—they just didn't know what to do.

Brought up under dictatorial rule, they were unable to take care of themselves after the dictatorship had fallen. It takes time to correct this. The same weakness is characteristic of the Communist dictatorships where the children are just as much slaves of the state as they were under the Nazis.

BELIEF IN SELF-RELIANCE

Our form of society is strong exactly where dictatorships are weak. We believe in self-reliant individuals. That is the goal of our system of education and training—and that is the goal of this conference.

I know that this conference will make important findings concerning the ways we must adopt to meet this goal. I know that its labors will have value for years to come. The country looks to you for guidance, for help, and for inspiration. You have a great role to play in holding up the torch of freedom which this Nation has sworn to uphold, and which with God's help we will uphold.

Voters Repudiate Acheson and Communist Sympathizers—Demand a Policy Which Will Protect the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial which was recently carried in the Allegan Gazette, a weekly newspaper published by Leo W. Hoffman at Allegan, Mich.

The editorial from the Gazette follows:

REEXAMINE MR. ACHESON

Subsequent to the election, Senator TAFT suggested that the American foreign policy ought to be reexamined.

Replying to this reasonable suggestion, Secretary of State Acheson called Senator TAFT a "reexaminationist" and compared his suggestion with "a farmer pulling up his crops to see if there as anything wrong with the roots," implying thereby that Senator TAFT was being very foolish to assume that any useful purpose could be served by "reviewing and examining our foreign policy."

This man Acheson is willing on the one hand to publicly express his trust and confidence in Alger Hiss the convicted perjurer whose influence and advice is directly responsible for the expansion of Communist influence all over the world, resulting in the loss of many of our men in Korea and billions of dollars, and at the same time not only refuses to act on the suggestion of Senator TAFT but attempts to belittle and smear him as being too ignorant to know anything about foreign policy.

At this point we would like to call Acheson's attention to the fact that it is the people of this Nation who are paying the price of his foreign policy in blood and work. The people of this Nation have a stake in this game of diplomacy called "foreign policy." We wish to remind Mr. Acheson that neither he nor Alger Hiss were ever elected to any position of Government trust and that just recently Senator TAFT was elected to a seat in the Senate by a majority of more than 400,000 votes.

We also wish to remind our Secretary of State that even TAFT's enemies admit he is a man of integrity and intelligence in public office, a man who is willing to confess from day to day that he may be wrong but who will approach any problem with an open mind desiring to do only what he thinks is best for his country.

When we think of our young men being killed and murdered in Korea, when we think of our boys being required to spend 2 years of their lives in the Army; when we think of the billions of dollars that we have spent in Western Europe in military and economic aid in order to persuade people there from becoming Communists; when we remember that Acheson and his colleagues refused to help the Chinese Government against the Communists and that he and his clique were wrong, oh, so wrong, in believing that the Chinese Communists were merely "gentle agrarians"; when we think of the billions of dollars that Western Europe and the undeveloped parts of the world are asking from us; when we think of the high taxes we will have to pay to support this foreign policy and the many hours of extra work that will be required of us to pay these taxes; when we think of the value of the dollar going down and down; when we think of the stupid, idiotic blunders that you and your New Deal predecessors have made, we think that it is time our elected Representatives in Congress give some consideration to our foreign policy, examine it and re-examine it, to see if this country is getting anywhere.

Our advice to you, Mr. Acheson, is to listen to Senator TAFT and his brother Senators without mental reservations of superiority in your mind. Examine your own record and acknowledge your mistakes of the past. If you had any common sense, which we consider the basic qualification for any office, you would realize that you couldn't be elected to any office in this Nation even if you were opposed by Joe Ferguson running on stickers.

Forget your fancy mustache, your striped trousers, your friendship with Alger Hiss, your fancy ideas of what is good for the world; bear in mind that it is your duty to do what is best for the people of this Nation and get down to work.

You have spent billions of dollars underwriting Socialist Great Britain, billions more in France and Italy, and yet we read that every third man in France and Italy is still a Communist. You don't want to build up an army of Japanese and Germans to oppose the Communists, yet you insist that American boys protect the Germans and the Japanese against the Communists.

It is about time someone in our Government accepted the truth. That is you can't always buy support for this country with money. It is about time we looked ahead and formed a foreign policy in the best interest of this country. Count noses around the world and form some opinion as to who is with us and who is against us and you can't count on the people you have to buy. The Hessians weren't worth much to the British in the Revolutionary War and the French and Italian Communists and their associates won't be worth much to us in the coming war with Russia.

MacArthur's Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 6 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "MacArthur's Disaster," published in today's New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR'S DISASTER

Chinese Communist forces, according to subsequent information, began crossing the Yalu in mid-October, when the United Nations troops, having secured the big naval base of Wonsan, were just beginning their drive on Pyongyang. General MacArthur paid no attention to this development until 2 weeks later, when the Eighth Army's rapid advance to the Yalu was suddenly unhinged by a Chinese Communist attack on the right and rear, forcing an abrupt withdrawal and regrouping along the Chongchon River line. There was then a dramatic communiqué; the war, it said, had virtually been won when the Communists "committed one of the most offensive acts of international lawlessness of historic record" by moving "alien" elements across the Yalu backed by a large concentration "of possible reinforcing divisions with adequate supply" in the "sanctuary" of Manchuria. "A possible trap was

thereby surreptitiously laid," the communiqué continued, "calculated to encompass the destruction of the UN forces," but was evaded by the skillful defensive maneuvering of Gen. Walton Walker "in order to avert any possibility of a great military reverse."

Just 19 days later General MacArthur walked directly into the trap he had described, with a confident communique in which this appreciation of November 6 seemed totally forgotten. His air forces, he said, had "successfully interdicted the enemy lines of support"; the Tenth Corps in the northeast had "reached a commanding enveloping position" and the Eighth Army was moving forward that day in a "general assault" which if successful should "for all practical purposes end the war." Issuing this announcement, General MacArthur went back to Tokyo. Two days later the trap was sprung in a repetition of the maneuver which should have warned MacArthur in early November; one of the greatest military reverses in the history of American arms has duly followed; tremendous strategic retreats have been enforced on the UN armies and the whole position in the peninsula has been desperately imperiled.

Once again, however, prompt and skillful maneuvering, presumably by General Walker, has so far averted total catastrophe; and the black pessimism which appears to have engulfed Washington is not as yet sustained by anything allowed to come out through the field dispatches. It is true that the MacArthur headquarters, obviously in dire need to excuse a colossal military blunder, has now "estimated" that 1,000,000 Chinese troops are either in Korea or on the way. But on the record of the last 3 weeks, it is impossible to put any confidence in such figures; and it is becoming increasingly difficult to put confidence in the military capacity of a headquarters which has so gravely compounded blunder by confusion of facts and intelligence.

The Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Lawton Collins, is in Korea in an obvious effort to find out what has really happened. Washington's gloom has prepared the country for an enforced evacuation of the peninsula. It has not made it remotely clear how armies of well over 100,000 men, still retaining every modern weapon and full power of maneuver, could in a week be so completely overwhelmed even by superior masses of foot troops, as to see no alternative but evacuation. British criticisms of MacArthur's alleged political irresponsibility have seemed to this newspaper unjust, but a general who fails in the military field can scarcely expect to retain the confidence of the country. Until General Collins' findings are available one has a feeling that all judgment of the military position should be suspended; General MacArthur, at least can no longer be accepted as the final authority on the military actualities. We must be ready for the worst but we still do not know how bad in fact it may be.

Counsel for the Minority—Report on the Tydings Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 6 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the October 20, 1950, issue of the Freeman, a magazine published in New York, there is an article on the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee's investigation of disloyal personnel in the Department of State.

The article was written by Mr. Robert Morris, who was counsel to the minority subcommittee members.

In view of the position Mr. Morris held, and in view of the importance of the subject matter, I ask unanimous consent for insertion of Mr. Morris' article in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article comes within the rule, and involves no extra expense.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

COUNSEL FOR THE MINORITY—A REPORT ON THE TYDINGS INVESTIGATION

(By Robert Morris)

In April of this year, on the recommendation of Senators HICKENLOOPER and LODGE, minority members of the Tydings subcommittee, I was appointed their minority counsel. This subcommittee had been set up by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to determine whether or not persons disloyal to the United States were or ever had been employed by the State Department. It had been sparked by Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S charges that such disloyal persons were still in the Department.

The subcommittee began its work under distressing circumstances. In less than a decade the Soviet Union had expanded from 160,000,000 people to a mighty empire embracing almost a billion. Soviet expansion had been accomplished under circumstances reflecting either great incompetence on our part or downright subversion in top places. From the absorption of the Baltic countries through Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and right down to China, at the very times when resistance should have been strongest, figures high in our Government, with tortuous reasoning and bland sophistry, had advocated appeasement. The intensity of these blandishments seemed to have been highest at the time any particular country was being absorbed.

When the Soviet Empire had swallowed its victim, our Government experts would denounce communism in the abstract, then help pave the way for the next act of Soviet aggression. Alger Hiss, once high in our State Department and an architect of our foreign policy, had been convicted. The first in a long list of atomic spies were beginning to be uncovered. George Wheeler, who had been high in our denazification work in Germany, had taken off his mask and gone behind the iron curtain. Rumors were rampant, and suspicions were running high.

Now an arm of the Soviet Empire was ready to start war in Korea. The country currently being absorbed by the Soviet Union was China. Anti-Communist China still held a seat in the Security Council of the United Nations, had an army of 500,000 on Formosa, and a tremendous guerrilla force on the continent that was impeding the Sovietization of China. Chiang Kai-shek was presented as an emigre reactionary, and the Chinese Communists as democrats and liberals who should have our support lest, as Owen Lattimore suggested, they gravitate toward the Soviet Union. People high in the State Department wanted these full-fledged members of the Soviet International recognized and admitted to the United Nations.

Senator MCCARTHY, chafing at this turn of events, had brought certain anonymous charges that at least 81 (and there was a great conflict in figures) State Department employees were Communists or followers of the Communist Party line. When forced by the majority on the subcommittee to name names, he identified about eight. The charge in almost all cases was that the persons were "pro-Communist," and nothing more. However, he called one man "a top Soviet agent." A well-known radio commentator identified this man as Owen Lattimore.

Such was the situation when I first took part in the hearings in Washington. The flow of events, stirred by Senator MCCARTHY, determined that the first witness should be Louis F. Budenz, former editor of the Daily Worker and former member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, who had not only abjured communism but had proved his sincerity by aiding the Government in the prosecution of the 11 Communist leaders. Budenz' testimony had initiated the Gerhardt Eisler proceedings; he had been the principal witness against John Santo, the Hungarian Communist; had aided the Government in seven other important cases. He had devotedly given many hours a week to the Federal Bureau of Investigation without ever having been shown in error. He had been vouched for by John McGohey, who was the prosecutor of the 11 top Communists at Foley Square and by President Cavanaugh of Notre Dame University, where he had taught after he first left the Communist Party.

Budenz testified to four instances that supported his conclusion that Owen Lattimore was a Communist agent. Lattimore had been a well-known expert on the Far East; an employee of the State Department on the Pauley Mission to Japan; a consultant to the Secretary of State. Though not on the State Department payroll, he had also held such high quasi-State Department assignments as political adviser to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, recommended by the President of the United States at a critical time in our history (December 7, 1941); political adviser to Henry Wallace on his mission to Siberia and China; head of a United Nations mission to Afghanistan; director of the Pacific Division of the Office of War Information during World War II.

Probably the strongest of the four instances was Budenz' testimony that in 1944 when he was editor of the Daily Worker, Jack Stachel, director of Communist propaganda, had warned him (and the warning was repeated by the party chairman, William Z. Foster) that Lattimore was doing important and secret work in the party and that Budenz should strive to conceal Lattimore's party affiliation in the Communist press. This was not a loose example of hearsay. Communist leaders do not talk lightly or with gossip aforethought under such circumstances.

Budenz cited three other such incidents and in addition asserted that in the secret listing and reference to high party members in the minutes of the National Committee Lattimore was always referred to as "X" and "XL" for purposes of concealment.

The reaction to this testimony was curious. When Budenz stated that he had evidence on other State Department employees and other individuals who had a role in shaping our far eastern policy, he was at once taken off the public stand and next heard in secret session. Barred from this next session were not only myself, though I was counsel in effect to Senators HICKENLOOPER and LODGE, but Senator MCCARTHY, on whom Senator TYDINGS and the whole Democratic administration put the burden to prove the charges. Furthermore Senator TYDINGS, until Senator MCCARTHY protested vehemently, allowed Lattimore and his attorney to remain. At this session Budenz named a present point 4 program State Department official, Haldore Hansen, and a State Department consultant, Lawrence K. Rossinger, as members of the Communist Party. He also listed as members of the Communist Party a long series of "experts" on the Far East that readers would do well to learn by securing from the Foreign Relations Committee a copy of the testimony of the proceedings.

The attitude of the Tydings subcommittee and the Democratic administration toward

Budenz's testimony was shameful. The cross-examination of Budenz was hostile, intense, and wearing. It was done by the general counsel, Senator GREEN, and by Abe Fortas, Lattimore's counsel, who acted through the general counsel. A high point in calumny was reached when Lattimore introduced into evidence a sealed copy of the transcript of the Santo deportation proceedings at which Budenz had been the principal Government witness. It included a record of what the Communists through their attorney, Harry Sacher, had thrown at Budenz in that hearing. The immigration authorities, sensing its vileness, had decreed that only one copy be made, a fact that was verified in writing by the district director of immigration in New York, who asserted that this one copy had been given to Sacher in the event he had to use it on appeal. Santo never appealed; he voluntarily went behind the iron curtain. But Lattimore received (obviously from Sacher) that one copy of the transcript.

Then, surprisingly, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico, revealed its contents on the Senate floor, even though it was sealed and the contents were never made known to Senators HICKENLOOPER and LODGE or myself. Senator TYDINGS, as chairman of the subcommittee, and Senator LUCAS, as Democratic floor leader, officially joined CHAVEZ in this attack. It was but one of many instances pointing to a secret liaison between the Communists, Lattimore, the subcommittee, and the Democratic administration. What was the purpose of this attack on Budenz and what was its effect? From where I operated in lining up a list of witnesses, mostly ex-Communists who were able to confirm the Budenz testimony about the point at issue, it served notice on such people that if they came forward and testified against a Communist in Government, they would be smeared and reviled on the Senate floor. Every ex-Communist has something to hide, and every one of the witnesses wilted in the face of it. It was a shrewd and effective move by Senator TYDINGS.

Despite this threat of pillory, there were witnesses who to the very end were willing to come forward. Senator HICKENLOOPER put on the record the fact that we had a list of 25 to 30 witnesses who would testify on vital points in the investigation. Eugene Lyons, writing in the New Leader, has brought out what Alexander Barmine, formerly a brigadier general in Soviet intelligence, would have testified about Lattimore. But Senator TYDINGS steadfastly refused to call these witnesses and reproved me for suggesting that their testimony was important and that they should be heard. Senator MCCARTHY, on whom the whole burden of proof was thrust, was attacked in the vituperative majority report.

Freda Utley, who had been called to analyze Lattimore's writings, got along well enough with the committee until she commenced to draw the parallel between Lattimore's ideas and the Communist Party line. She was thereafter rudely treated and subjected to long interrogation on her personal income and many details unrelated to the inquiry.

The only other witness of importance to be called was Frank B. Bielaski, a high official of the Office of Strategic Services. Because his testimony offered concrete and irrefutable proof that thousands of highly classified Government documents were being systematically stolen, photostated and photographed by a ring operating within the Government, it was made secretly and in camera. Documents when apprehended clearly showed that a ring still in the Department of State was linked in a conspiracy to vilify and undermine Chiang Kai-shek and the accredited Chinese Government and to exalt and strengthen the Chinese Communists. This was the real significance of the Amerasia case, which had never been investigated in spite of insistent minority pressure.

The secondary aspect of the Amerasia case, in my opinion, revolved about who was able to connive so successfully that Government employees who had turned over secret documents to the magazine, could go completely free. Philip J. Jaffe, Amerasia's wealthy editor, had been fined an insignificant amount. Even though the Justice Department and Senator TYDINGS labeled the documents teacup gossip, they contained such items as a highly confidential forecast of the Japanese war, giving secret strategic plans, the location of American submarines and the United States postwar treatment of the Japanese Emperor; the entire counterintelligence plan of naval intelligence; a top secret for eyes only message (the highest military classification I know) from President Roosevelt to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek; future military plans of the United States; future battle plans, attack routes of the Chinese Army against the Chinese Communists; many of Angus Ward's confidential reports on the situation within the Soviet Union (and they were almost the only realistic and non pro-Communist State Department records in the Amerasia papers) and many other documents so highly important that if you read of them in a dime thriller you would call them fantastic.

The subcommittee's rejoinder to this secret testimony was to call, many of them publicly, a long list of apologists for the Government's failure to prosecute. The more they testified, the more implausible and disgraceful the case appeared. In short, the crucially significant Amerasia case was never seriously investigated. Owen Lattimore was one of the original editors of Amerasia.

Senator MCCARTHY tried in vain to get the committee to look into 81 other cases. A Federal grand jury meanwhile had indicted William Remington, 1 of the 81. Senator MCCARTHY read on the Senate floor a classified Government report, anonymously as was his practice, on a present State Department employee, Edward George Posniak, whom a special agent of the FBI, who had infiltrated the Communist Party, had met and known in the Communist movement. To those who have worked in intelligence this is the most direct evidence you can expect to get. Yet Posniak, another of Senator MCCARTHY's 81 cases, was cleared by the Democratic members of the subcommittee.

In the case of John S. Service, who has just been cleared again by the State Department, the FBI testified that while he was under their surveillance they had had a microphone installed in Philip Jaffe's hotel room, and had made a record of Service saying to Jaffe, "What I said about the military plans is of course very secret." Even though the FBI showed that Jaffe was in constant liaison with the Soviet Embassy, Earl Browder, and Chinese Communist leaders, Service's explanation that he had been briefing a reputable newspaperman was accepted by the subcommittee. Senator LODGE pointed out very logically that it is not the practice of State Department officials to search out newspapermen in clandestine session and transmit secret military plans. As if this weren't enough, we introduced into the record Service's writings which invariably had praised the Chinese Communists and vilified Chiang and those Chinese leaders who were trying to hold off the Sovietization of their country. We also showed that he had a long list of associations with people whom various congressional committees had shown to be Communists and Soviet agents. And yet, when Senator MCCARTHY just called him pro-Communist, Service was one of our highest Foreign Service officials in India.

In connection with one of the present deputies to the administration of the ECA, Theodore Geiger, once a State Department employee, I sought in vain to present several witnesses who were prepared to testify (one had testified before the Rapp-Coudert legislative committee in New York in 1941) that they were in the same Communist unit as this high official. Although Geiger handles secret material today, the chairman flatly asserted that we could not waste our afternoon going into this case.

But by far the most serious delinquency of the subcommittee was its steadfast refusal to look into the nature of the Institute of Pacific Relations. It was serious because Budenz had testified (and others were prepared to do so) that this very influential organization during a particularly strategic period had been controlled by the Communists. Its executive secretary was Frederick Vanderbilt Field, who was later to become a foreign editor of the Daily Worker and who recently registered as an agent for the Chinese Communists. Its nominating committee, which reflects the real control, had Field, Lattimore, and Harriett L. Moore as three out of four members. Budenz stated that he had met Miss Moore as a Communist.

The leaders of the Institute of Pacific Relations at that time are now leaders in shaping our far eastern policy. Closely associated with the institute until 1946 was Philip C. Jessup, Ambassador at Large, whom the President sent on an official mission to Asia this year, and who has been almost top man in handling our far eastern negotiations. In fairness to Dr. Jessup, as well as to those countless millions who are uneasy about our far eastern policy, the subcommittee should have determined to what extent, if any, the Communists who controlled the institute were able to influence Dr. Jessup and other leaders.

Such were only a few of the facts uncovered by the hearings. They are disturbing enough. But when we are at war with the very force that may now be subverting our State Department, it seems shameful that an opportunity to explore once and for all, thoroughly and with sincerity, the underlying facts, should have been neglected and even thwarted. The Tydings subcommittee did not do its job. The FBI can collect the facts, but someone has to bring them out.

Acheson and the State Department Prepared the Way for the Present Disaster in Korea

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith the broadcast made by radio commentator Fulton Lewis, Jr., on Tuesday evening, November 28, 1950:

Well, this is black Tuesday, indeed, so far as the Korean situation is concerned and with developments tumbling over themselves we'll have to postpone continuation of the school textbook discussion, I'm afraid, for tonight at least.

The break-through by the Chinese Communist armies along the North Korean military front, is still completely unrepaired tonight, and hordes of Chinese Communist troops are pouring through, virtually unchallenged except on their flanks, in a threatened disaster which could, admittedly, trap the entire United Nations force in

Korea. Officials here admit that the situation is extremely serious, if not actually critical. Two South Korean divisions at the center of the line have disintegrated to such an extent that they apparently have vanished in thin air. The whole picture is so fluid and so changing that even the field commanders there on the scene apparently do not know what is going on. Orders have gone out to hold existing lines at all costs, but no one knows at any given hour what the next hour may bring. And here in Washington there is grave tension, deep indignation and a universal demand for immediate and effective action without the slightest prospect of any such action coming.

As of this morning, President Truman apparently was completely uninformed on the whole business. A White House spokesman said that whatever action the State Department takes will be with the knowledge and approval of the President. Later in the day he did call a meeting of his security advisory council, together with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and conferred with them for an hour and 15 minutes.

For General MacArthur and the men who face the grim realities of possible annihilation in the frozen mountain areas of North Korea, something more effective than talk is necessary. There has been talk for a long time. The business of running a military action from the debating tables of the United Nations organization already has reaped its whirlwind, and it's a whirlwind of death, tragedy, and despair.

In administration circles, embarrassed politicians tried to maneuver the blame to the shoulders of General MacArthur, for the reported statement about the men in Korea getting home for Christmas. The Army's Public Relations Chief, Gen. Floyd Parks, said he does not believe General MacArthur made the statement. It will be noted that in none of the dispatches was the item in quotation marks.

My good colleague Raymond Henle, of the Three Star Extra news program, did a more specific and constructive job of reporting on that subject by sending General MacArthur a cablegram, asking the specific question: Did he make such a statement? He read over his program a few moments ago the following telegram, received in reply:

"In reply to question contained in your cable of November 28, apparently greatly exaggerated statements have been attributed to some informal comment passed between my field commanders and myself in a jocular vein, expressive of the universal hope for an early termination of hostilities. The evident physical impossibility of fulfillment of the statement attributed to me should be its own best refutation. At no time have I ever attempted to predict the course or termination of this or any other military campaign. Signed, MacArthur."

Secretary of State Dean Acheson, grim, as well he might be because he sowed the seeds for this bitter harvest, went before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this morning and this afternoon in closed sessions, for a report on the whole evil picture in Europe as well as the Far East.

The chairman of that committee is Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, 73-year-old choreman of the State Department in general and Secretary Acheson in particular in the Senate. He had little to tell newsmen about what went on when the session was over, but from other members of the committee, I learned the following:

Mr. Acheson, to use the words of one Senator, was nervous as a cat on a tin roof. He was asked what General MacArthur was referring to in his statement of this morning, when he said that conduct of the "new war" would require further instructions and authority from the United Nations organization.

He said the State Department is looking into that and making a study of it.

It was suggested that it could only mean one of several things; for one, additional authority for the United Nations forces to carry strategic bombing to the Chinese Communists in Manchuria and attack supply and troops concentrations and transportation lines; is that what it meant?

Mr. Acheson said possibly it is. That such a possibility is being discussed by the Department.

Did it mean, perhaps, an authorization for the Nationalist armies of Chiang Kai-shek to be permitted to carry an attack to the mainland of China, and thus create a diversionary action which would give us an ally in the Far East? Or could it mean a suggestion along the same lines with some other Nationalist leader?

Those, said Mr. Acheson, were military matters which are being considered and discussed in the proper circles.

In fact, everything was being discussed. There was no new information or decision on anything—although the clear implication of the White House statement this morning was that Mr. Acheson was the person who would make decisions, with the knowledge and approval of the President. Apparently, the only positive statement Mr. Acheson was willing to make was that he knows "damn well" that Russia is the real force behind the Chinese Communist aggression. He has found that out. That is not the song that he and his State Department advisers have been singing in the past. For 9 years they have been telling themselves, you, the American people, and the world at large that there was no connection between the Chinese Communists and the Russian Communists; that these were just innocent peasants, not real Communists at all; this was just an agrarian reform. He and his little coterie of pink intellectuals spent years in building State Department policy and American public opinion to support the theory that these were the leaders of China whom we should support.

Mr. Acheson helped build up and defend the pro-Communists whom Gen. Patrick J. Hurley sent home from China, for being just that. He wrote the instructions for special Ambassador George C. Marshall, and sent Marshall to China to try to force Chiang Kai-shek to take the Communists into his government on a fifty-fifty basis. He sent out the memorandum to foreign service officers all over the world, to begin to prepare and condition diplomatic minds for us to let Formosa go to the Chinese Communists by default. He and his young men forbade the American military mission to South Korea to do anything more than train the South Koreans to be defensive policemen, the avowed reason for that being that they might possibly attack the North Korean Communists. For that reason they could not be trained in the use of tanks, airplanes, heavy artillery, or even in any form of offensive military tactics.

He and his group insisted that the United Nations forces be held up at the thirty-eighth parallel for more than a week until the United Nations could, at its leisure, grant General MacArthur official authority to go beyond that point—a fact that gave the North Koreans an opportunity to regroup their forces, and provide new and costly resistance when the authority finally came.

All of those things are matters of actual record—not hearsay, not rumor; but record. And it is he and his advisers who dictate, at this minute, that the American forces must not fight the war as it has to be fought—with the bombing of strategic targets behind the enemy lines to paralyze their supplies and their reserves. That must be done by the United Nations organization, and the United Nations organization was busy today, listening to the 9 delegates from the Communist Government of China parroting the charges of the Kremlin that we are guilty of aggression in Formosa. Those delegates refused to answer any questions about Korea; and by way of assisting them, the Soviet representatives there on the security council spent the entire day in clear filibustering tactics, delaying in every way, any showdown on a resoluion to demand that the Chinese Communists withdraw their armies from North Korea. Even when the vote comes, it will be vetoed by Soviet Russia, and then must go—in the processes of Mr. Acheson's polite diplomacy—to the General Assembly in the hope that the General Assembly will override the veto. Even then, General MacArthur has no authority. Even then, all that happens is that the demand is put up to the Chinese Communist Government. It may be days before there is any answer. If an answer comes, the whole routine has to be gone through all over again in order to get passage of the authorization—and that, when every hour, every minute, counts for 100,000 American boys in the icy mountains of North Korea.

Now, prepare for a shock. From San Francisco today, 12 American mothers of marines who are fighting it out with death in Korea, sent a telegram to President Truman. It was not an appeal to get their sons home. Nothing so selfish—or so human as that. This telegram—listen carefully—was to protest against the loading of 750 tons of rubber tires on the docks of San Franciso for delivery to the Communist government of China to transport further misery and possibly death to the boys they brought into the world, nursed, cared for, and raised to manhood.

Even as this disaster is stalking our blood on the other side of the world, the provisions of this Washington Government—as administered by Mr. Acheson and his aides, with the consent and approval of Mr. Truman—is permitting the loading of a ship with 750 tons of tires for the murderers of a godless and ruthless gang of international murderers who, as of tonight, are being represented by nine of their kind, as we argue with them at Lake Success.

Reporters of the San Francisco Examiner, to whom I talked a short while ago, say the customs officials there insisted that before the tires could be loaded, they must be slashed across the tread with a knife. That makes them eligible for shipment. The reporters informed me that they had seen the tires and there was no evidence, to them, that they had been made unusable.

Furthermore, it develops that this is only part of the tire shipment. There are several hundred more tons waiting shipment on the piers of the Facific Transport Lines, they reported.

In Congress there is persistent talk that if President Truman does not act immediately to get rid of Mr. Acheson and everyone in the Department responsible for the present tragic situation, Congress itself will act.

The most probable action seems to be a resolution of "No confidence" in the Secretary of State and his present administration of that Department. Demands for some such action already are beginning to creep in on individual Members of the Senate, and for that matter, probably are beginning to reach the White House—demands that the President clean up the State Department at once.

As those demands grow, so will grow the solution of the present debacle. As public opinion mounts up, demanding at long last that there be a cleanup of the State Department—that the little gang of pro-Communists there, who have been protected and coddled and defended and covered up, be swept out from top to bottom—then will grow the flames that will produce the action by Congress, or perhaps, some action by Mr. Truman. Dismissal of Mr. Acheson is, of course, no solution at all. His successor would be merely the same prisoner of the

same forces that have brought us to the present disaster. It must be a complete cleanout.

They said, these men who still sit in control and push the buttons that have brought tragedy and despair and death—they said, these were just peasants—just agrarian reformers. These had no connection with Soviet Russia; just agrarians. Well, Mr. Acheson's agrarians in China are doing some planting today. They are planting American boys.

Address by Hon. Edna F. Kelly, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on October 21, 1950, at the St. George Hotel in Brooklyn, N. Y., the Ancient Order of Hibernians for the first time in its history held its annual dinner in honor of a woman, my distinguished colleague the Honorable EDNA F. KELLY. It was a grand and deserved tribute to Brooklyn's first Congresswoman, who has made her mark as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, permit me to include my colleague's learned and interesting speech before more than 1,000 people who were assembled to pay tribute to her. It follows:

Mr. Chairman, Very Reverend Monsignor McGowen, Father Curran, officers of Ancient Order of Hibernians, members and friends before giving voice to any other expressions this evening, I must tell you, and from the bottom of my heart, how appreciative I am of the great distinction conferred upon me by the ancient order, not only in inviting me to break bread with you, but principally in choosing me as the first woman ever to be accorded the privilege of addressing you at this historical annual function. I want to thank the previous speakers, including the good fathers, for their kind words. I only hope and pray that I can live up to their tributes.

Please bear with me for following the written word. This method insures that I will not detain you beyond your endurance, and gives little sufferance to possible misunderstanding.

While I am keenly aware of the fact that the ancient order must have stretched its charity in selecting me for this tribute, I confess to feeling that it is high time some such honor was paid to us women, for, after all, we have played a part in the foundation of the order and the steady replenishment of its membership, at least in the natal stages. It is wholly and solely in this representative capacity and mood that I have assumed the courage to come forward before you this evening, to share the prominence of this dais with the distinguished persons on it. The honor is unique in that my name will be forever associated with it in the annals of the order; and, to that extent, I am truly personally grateful.

That I stand here graced with the name of Kelly is a privilege I owe to my widowhood. I bear it before you tonight, and ever in my heart in serene and happy memory of a great and a good man, a credit to his Irish ancestry, and an American of Americans. How proud my motherhood that through it I pass on to my son and daughter, not only the name of Kelly, but also the image and likeness of a father who added his personal luster to the name. Had I not the name of Kelly, the name of Flannery, which is my birthright, would bring back in sweet memory the gentle saint, that lover of God and of all his nature, who was my father. Nor would my mother, who is so proud and delighted because of my presence here, want me to omit that she is a McCarthy of the McCarthys, of Bandon, and linked to many more of the grand old folk of Cork and Mayo.

But, of what shall I speak to you tonight that is more germane to our immediate interests in the celebration of such an evening as this? Shall I iterate the path of Irish history and call to mind the Kings of Tara's Hall, or Brian Boru and the Battle of Clontarf? Shall we talk of the book of Kells, the cells of the monks, and the learning of the scholars of old? A prayerful tribute could be paid to the memory of Patrick, Bridget, Malachy, and many more. All this could we do. Or shall we dwell upon the sweetness of the land of Ireland, the brilliance of her emerald cloak, the stark beauty of the isles, the sad splendor of the gloaming upon her evening hills, the lilt of her gay little rivers and the peaceful stillness of her lakes, the rugged coasts, and the ever-sounding seas about her? Or listen to her poets, her philosophers, her scholars, her men and women of wit and charm, her bards and her minstrels? Or tell anew the myths and the fancies, the tales and the come-all-ye's, the annals of olden times, and rhapsodies of the blind walkers of the roads? Or glory in the tenacity which preserved the faith of our fathers, the holiness of martyred priest and nun, or saint, and humble laborer? And might we not join in spirit with the pilgrims wending their way to Mellray and Knock and Croagh Patrick?

How wonderful even to mention these things, and how compelling is the desire to ponder upon them. But I perceive my lack of talent for giving them their true and worthiest expression. My safest course is to tell you that I possess these beloved thoughts. They are part of my being, as they are part of yours. How better our lives, how nobler our natures, for cherishing them. Thank God we have them.

Let us not think for a moment that our riches are those of memory only. The treasury of Ireland has been indeed heavily drawn upon for the endowment of western civilization. It will never be forgotten that when darkness engulfed the minds and hearts of men, and the lamps of learning were blown out by the fierce winds of barbarian invasion and shattered by ignorance, the only light, besides the beacon of the holy faith, that the eyes of man could see and finally take bearings by was the single strong flame which was nourished and kept aline on that little green isle set in the vastness of the ocean waters. So powerful was this flame, and zealous its monastic guardians, that no assault could cause it to flicker or sink, and it burns today in every achievement of the Western World that is good and true and beautiful, and it casts its challenging brilliance even upon the far-flung steppes and tundras of Russia; its warmth is felt in a body politic shuddering in terror of the cold clammy rigor of spiritual death. And it will burn forever, because it was fed with the oil of truth and kindled with the breath of belief in God, His justice, His wisdom, His mercy, and His love.

His Holiness may be without battalions in arms, but he has the imperishable faith, hope, and zeal of his sons and daughters.

Now, since my reference to the papal armaments is an obvious allusion to the contemptuous utterance of the Red dictator, let me say here that the boasted monolith of atheistic communism, now seen as a base for Stalinist imperialism, is naught but fast-splintering shale or rotting sandstone. The true, the only, the eternal monolith is the rock called Peter. Stalin knows it; the whole Politburo knows it; every Soviet mouthpiece knows it; for its solidity and changelessness they hate and fear it. Pray God, the Russian people, under Our Lady, may again come to know its eternal truth.

There is one promise that cannot be written off with the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb, or any other destructive force or agent conceivable by human ingenuity, and that is the promise: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My word shall not pass away." If Stalin can liquidate that promise, let us concede him the victory here and now, and set about being the subhuman zombies he seeks to reduce us all to for the service of his power-lust and for the maintenance of his new classes of Soviet princelings. But he can never banish that promise, because it was made by the Creator and the Creator is ever greater than the thing created.

What other thoughts and concerns have we in common, we who find ourselves together tonight at a Hibernian feast? We could dwell upon the priceless substantial contributions that the Irish have brought to these shores of our beloved America and the part they have played in every field of endeavor which has been for the development and permanence of this great Nation. Irish names come to mind from every decade of our history and from every quarter of the land—and from every bit of hallowed ground, far-flung throughout the world, wherein rest the bodies of our heroic American dead. Here may I not pause to ask, and I am the mother of a son of military age and of a daughter who loves him, what American mother or sister of Irish blood, knowing what the Irish owe to this country and have in its security, has failed to say to son or brother, "Go forth to battle with your shield, and come back with it, or upon it"?

We are Americans, first, last, and always. This is our own, our native land. Our loyalty to it has never been questioned. The Nation and the world know where we stand—and we stand there immovable.

As a Member of Congress, my first consideration and my desire is the good of my country, above all other things, having in mind the dictates of my conscience and the wishes of my constituents. As a human being, and preeminently as an American, it is also my desire that truth and justice shall prevail among all men everywhere, that their rights and dignity be respected as a divine imperative, that they have the greatest freedom possible to establish the seeds of good that are within them. These desires, I grant you, struggle for realization in a most complex and disordered world society. Morally and spiritually, I will continue true to them to the best of my ability before God. Intellectually and practically, I recognize my limitations in the face of the vast array of problems that are thrust before me and every other Member of Congress, problems complicated by the wishes of those who would have us decide in favor of this or that side of a question, often on the basis of an intense ex parte interest or partisan affinity. The internal affairs of the Commonwealth of Australia are not the proper subject of inquiry by our Government in the ordinary course of events. If the people of Portugal want or will tolerate a corporative form of state, that is their concern. If England favors constitutional monarchy, that is the Englishman's free choice. It is no business of ours, in fact or theory, to foist our notions of self-rule upon any other nation. While we, as Americans, Americans with a tradition of freedom postered and magnified by our Irish antecedents, would like to see all the people of Ireland free and united in one nation indivisible, such as our own,

we have no right to prescribe or direct that economy for them. Nor does international law warrant our intruding. But let no one attempt to persuade us not to work and pray for the unification of Ireland, for that is our individual right as free members of a free community. In keeping with my rights, and because of my personal view of the matter, I gave evidence of my stand on the Irish partition situation by standing up in the House of Representatives on March 29, 1950, on a division vote, and casting my vote in favor of the Fogarty amendment, which was adopted, with 99 for and 66 against; then on March 31, 1950, again on a division vote, I was one of the 60 for the same amendment—against 220—when it was defeated.

Now, coming to the latter end of my remarks, and I cordially thank you for the indulgence with which you have heard me until this point, I would like to state that never in the history of the world have men and women of good will so earnestly and so pitifully sought for a sound basis of universal peace. It is a striking fact that in an era of awful physical violence and threats of worse violence to come, the hearts and minds of mankind have leaned with anxiety and the stirrings of hope toward solutions in the moral order, the order of thought and ideas, as opposed to the law of the jungle. Certainly, there will be no peace of any universality until men advance beyond practical moral considerations into the spiritual order of adjustment. It is only in spiritual ordering of their affairs and their lives that men can come to acknowledge, in humility and fraternity, the final sanction of their actions, namely, the will of God. With a widespread spiritual awakening, the terrors that best us all now will perish. Then the whole world, made free to enter upon an era of peace and charity, will do that which will put to shame the glories of the Renaissance and the other great ages of history.

We know that for the accomplishment of His greatest works, God has chosen the weak things of the world. In the great census of humanity, the Irish have been but few; they have been and are numerically weak. But they have, in the historical sum, a moral and a spiritual grandeur and effectiveness that is far out of proportion to their mere numbers. The impression they have made upon western civilization is a major mark. Indeed, they have helped shape the very mold of that civilization. It is devoutly to be hoped and prayed that their moral and spiritual grandeur and effectiveness will continue to be felt in the shaping of the destiny of mankind. The Irish race are a mystical people, and a people of prayer; let us pray for a rule of holiness.

We are a people of action; let us act in the defense of our beliefs, chiefly by the continued example of our good works in public and in private. We are a loyal people; let us never lessen our loyalty to the faith of our fathers and to this great country which we love so dearly as to die for it. Let us do all we can to hasten the day when peace once more walks the ways of this world and holds us all close in a bond of understanding and brotherly love.

Government by Millionaires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article written by John T. Flynn, author of The Road Ahead, for the magazine Common Sense, issue of March 2, 1933. Mr. Flynn's article follows:

GOVERNMENT BY MILLIONAIRES

(By John T. Flynn)

Pious little merchants and bankers' clerks are praying that there will be no extra session of Congress. Politicians, they lament loudly, are undermining public confidence and the way to set recovery going is to get the politicians to be quiet. Such persons ought to be reminded that the crew which scuttled this ship was made up, not of politicians, but of millionaire businessmen.

Herbert Hoover makes ready to go out of office. It may have escaped the attention of many people that his going marks the culmination of an era. He was the first real millionaire businessman to be President of the United States.

When he entered the White House that ominous event marked the climax of a phenomenon which was set in motion 36 years ago when William McKinley became President. When Mark Hanna entered the United States Senate it came to be known as the millionaires' club. When Herbert Hoover entered the White House the process which made the Senate a millionaires' club was completed. This could be called a millionaires' government.

WHY BRIBE NOW?

Before McKinley's time this Government was controlled wholly by the politicians. They were, for the most part, a pretty bad lot. But they drew their commissions from the people and were compelled to pay some measure of tribute to their masters. The Government was, in fact, under this crew of politicians, an independent entity. Businessmen could deal with the Government. But they did not own it. They have, of course, always dealt with it. But their chief instrument was the bribe.

The United States Bank under Jackson corrupted Congressmen and Cabinet officers, just as the Goulds and Vanderbilts and Cookes and others corrupted them at a later day and as John D. Archbold, for instance, in the days of Roosevelt (Theodore) and McKinley, systematically bought Senators and Congressmen and judges and legislators and aldermen in dozen lots. But the medium of control was bribery and direct corruption. It is not necessary to bribe now. Business has taken over directly the management of our affairs. It was not necessary to bribe Andy Mellon to launch an attack on our income-tax and inheritance-tax laws. You do not have to hand money to the Hurleys and Millses and Adamses in order to enable them to see the point of view of big business.

Up to Hoover's day our Presidents with all their shortcomings were drawn from what might be called the political class and always from professional men. Coolidge was a lawyer, Harding was an editor, Wilson was a teacher, Taft was a statesman and judge, Roosevelt was a professional statesman and so on through Cleveland and Garfield and Hayes. When Hoover assumed the purple, the process which began under McKinley and which had slowly brought the Cabinet, the Senate, the diplomatic service, and the powerful commissions of the Government into the direct hands of wealthy businessmen, ended with putting a millionaire promoter into the White House.

WEALTH IN THE SADDLE

For 10 years Andrew Mellon, one of the five richest men in America, ruled the finances of the country with an iron hand in the interest of his class. When he left, the job was committed to the multimillionaire representative of the banking and power interests of New York, Ogden Mills.

It is worthy of note that had death not removed him, it was a partner of J. Pierpont Morgan, millionaire Dwight Morrow, who loomed as the most formidable rival of millionaire Herbert Hoover for the Presidency.

The diplomatic service has, of course, always been well sprinkled with rich men and the cubs of rich men. The price of a smart foreign legation has always been a fat campaign contribution and an income sufficient to pay for its frills. But for many years other Presidents were able to find wealthy men who pretended to some measure of scholarship or culture to fill these posts. The advent of Coolidge and Hoover, however, brought us envoys of the ninety-million Charlie Dawes type. In France we have the millionaire banker, newspaper owner, and advertising man, Walter E. Edge. In Germany it is the financier and public utility man, Frederic M. Sackett; while, succeeding Dawes in England there is the futile and fading Andrew Mellon who moves now to the final chapter of his deflated public career.

John W. Garrett, millionaire partner in the banking firm of Garrett & Sons, represents our opulent but floundering democracy at the court of Mussolini; while Irwin B. Laughlin, one-time treasurer of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Co., functions for us in Spain, succeeding there the late Alexander Moore, millionaire Pittsburgh newspaper publisher.

MILLIONAIRES ABROAD

At home, as assistant to the millionaire Stimson, we have William C. Castle, scion of a wealthy Hawaiian family, which made its fortune in pineapples, steamships, and other concessions. Before Stimson there was the regime of Joseph Clark Grew, now minister to Turkey, and related by marriage to the Morgan family. He, with Leland Harrison and Robert Wilson, ruled the diplomatic service. Wilson is the son of the rich Chicago shirt manufacturer. Harrison is a member of a wealthy New York family and now Wilson is in Switzerland and Harrison is in Sweden. There were, of course, Dwight Morrow of the Morgan outfit in Mexico; Henry P. Fletcher before Morrow and Robert Wood Bliss, son of the manufacturer of Castoria. All this moves merrily forward in spite of the explosion in the House some years ago when Representative Edwards, of Georgia, exposed the fact that promotions were systematically going to rich men and the sons of rich men in the diplomatic service.

This story could be extended indefinitely. But one further comment remains to be offered. The motion got into currency somehow that because a man had successfully gathered a great volume of dollars as a railroad manager or utility magnate or corportion promoter or Wall Street stock gambler he knew the deep mysteries of social life—what makes society function, what makes our industries move and what makes them stop, the economic processes of distribution and finance. Henry L. Mencken, in an obvious allusion, once said that statesmanship was supposed to be a branch of engineering. It was also supposed to be a byproduct of salesmanship or banking or of that even more delightful branch of business called inheriting. It was imagined that because Hoover could run a mine in China and sell its stock in London he knew how to govern wisely an almost alien people in America. Mr. Hoover was pretty well sold on this idea himself. So whenever he had a job which called for expert handling he promptly summoned around himself the most eminent grain dealers, investment bankers, automobile manufacturers, and oil magnates he could find.

When the world crashed around his ears in October 1929, he needed a rescue crew. Had there been an epidemic of some formidable and unknown disease, spreading pestilence and death, he would have summoned

about him experts in disease—scientists in medicine and public hygiene. When a great economic disaster shocked the Nation, spreading around not death but unemployment and hunger, you might suppose that he would have summoned around him the best economic and sociological brains in the country. Instead he hailed a flock of some 50 millionaires. He summoned not the doctors but the germ carriers.

RECONSTRUCTION BY MILLIONAIRES

When a farm problem needed attention he gathered about him a wealthy manufacturer of threshing machines, whose chief interest was selling more machines to farmers to further bankrupt them. The Federal Reserve Board he put under the care of the millionaire Eugene Meyer, former Wall Street investment banker—also a germ carrier. The notion that the banks ought to be regulated in any other interest than that of the bankers never seemed to have occurred to him.

When the declining Nation needed reconstruction Mr. Hoover summoned the great violin player, Charles Dawes, who had been fiddling for a number of years while his bank was burning down. He named the millionaire Texas real-estate operator, Jesse Jones, the millionaire power magnate and Chase Bank director, Harvey C. Couch, and some other millionaires to reconstruct the country; a job they have carried forward in precisely the manner you would expect such men to do it, by passing out hundreds of millions of dollars to favored banks and over $250,000,000 to pay interest and principal on railroad bonds. Why not? That's what reconstruction means to these gentlemen.

And now comes Mr. Roosevelt (Franklin D.). He can do one thing to begin with. Why not try, just as an experiment, some plain, educated, honest men, whose success has been in other fields than the amassing of money? It might work.

Speech by George J. Spatuzza, Supreme Venerable of the Order Sons of Italy in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to the membership of the House of Representatives and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following splendid speech which I had the privilege to listen to at the Columbus Day banquet at the Paxton Hotel, Omaha, Nebr., on October 8, 1950, which banquet was given by the lodges of the Order Sons of Italy in America, of Omaha, Nebr.:

I am happy to be here, in this most progressive and beautiful city of Omaha, and join with the members of the State of Nebraska of the Order Sons of Italy in America in this magnificent symposium to commemorate one of the greatest events in the history of mankind—the discovery of this Western Hemisphere by the greatest admiral of all times, Christopher Columbus.

October 12 of every year is, and by right should be, a happy day, not only for us, Americans of Italian origin, not only for every man, woman, and child dwelling beneath the skies of this grand and glorious country of ours, not only for the inhabitants of this Western Hemisphere, but for all the people, of every race and of every creed, of every country and of every clime in the whole universe, for on that day, 458 years ago, through the discovery of the New World, the whole history of mankind was altered and civilization found its greatest avenue for its onward march.

On every October 12, we should pause and think of the trials and tribulations that Columbus had to endure prior to August the 3d of the year 1492, when in the early dawn of that Friday morning, he set sail from the town of Palos on a voyage that was destined to give posterity a new world.

We should also reflect upon the trials and tribulations endured by him during the voyage—the fears of his mariners—not because of lack of courage, but because of their plunge into:

"A world of waves, a sea without a shore
Trackless and vast and wild."

Mocked day after day with signs of land that neared not. And though threatened with death unless he turned back, he held steadfast in his belief to reach his goal, and in tones of authority commanded these marines to: "sail on, sail on."

Imagine, therefore, the joy of the men on the *Nina*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria*, when in the early hours of that Friday morning of October 12 of the year 1942, Roderico De Triana sounded the alarm that he had sighted land.

Imagine the feeling, when at the break of dawn of that day, this great admiral surrounded by his men stepped on the shore of a vast island and with tears in his eyes kissed the soil, gave thanks to God, and took possession of the land for the crown of Castile and named the island San Salvador.

He returned to Barcelona in March of 1493 to be received in regal splendor by Queen Isabella, who had pledged her jewels to finance Columbus in this great enterprise.

His succeeding voyages led to the discovery of the mainland of South America, the northern coast of Honduras, and other parts of the New World.

Ingratitude and jealousy, however, follow geat men of achievements, and Columbus was no exception.

Many were the aspersions and slanderous charges made against him by his enemies, who succeeded in having him sent home in chains on his third voyage; but the sight of Columbus in chains, however, aroused a feeling of indignation among the people and particularly his friends, who successfully defended his cause, and he again set out in 1502 on a fourth voyage, and after countless adventures, he returned to Spain in 1504—but the death of Queen Isabella destroyed his last hope of being reinstated in his dignities, and he died in poverty in the city of Valladolid on the 30th day of May 1506, without any knowledge that he had discovered a new world.

But, the acts and deeds of great men do not die with them, but live on forever, and soon comes the realization that their achievements have been of great service to mankind. It was not until this Western Continent became the seat of a high civilization that the significance of his discovery began to be realized and reflected to the glory of which Columbus had been denied during his lifetime.

Little did Columbus think, nor could he have imagined, that in this great Western Hemisphere, discovered by him, would one day arise a country which would be a refuge for the people of all nations, who believed in freedom from suppression, in freedom of speech and in freedom of worship, and that it would become a great melting pot of all peoples, who would in time be called upon to give aid and assistance to the whole world.

For indeed, not long after his discovery, we visualize the arrival of the *Mayflower* at Plymouth Rock and the landings of the Pilgrims who had fled the oppression and tyranny of their government to plant the seed from which a new country was to be born, destined to become the land of freedom and opportunity for all and the greatest Nation on earth.

Without Columbus' discovery, we might not have had such a landing and thereafter no Boston Tea Party, no Lexington, no Concord, no Bunker Hill, no Declaration of Independence, no independence acquired through the loss of the precious blood of the heroes of the Revolutionary War, no United States, no Stars and Stripes under which symbol our heroic men and women fought, bled, and died in World War I and in World War II so that democracy may survive—yes, no country that destiny has assigned the role of benefactor to the nations of the Old World—our great United States of America.

Yes; to this great son of Italy the world justly pays tribute.

I congratulate you, therefore, brothers and sisters, for gathering as you are gathered, to pay tribute to this illustrious man, oftentimes called the first citizen of the world, and I congratulate our entire membership, for this evening, and throughout this month, in every city, town, and village throughout America, where the thousands upon thousands of our members reside, like celebrations, under the auspices of the Order Sons of Italy in America, are being held and will be held, all of which is in response to a duty which history imposes on us, and in obedience to the laws of our order, which command us so to do.

Speaking about our order, let me congratulate you, brothers and sisters from Omaha, for all that you have done and continue to do for the triumph of the ideals of the Order Sons of Italy in America.

You have done marvelous work. You have preached the gospel of our order—gospel of truth, of brotherhood, of humanity, of democracy and Americanism — so effectively that, as a consequence, you have, during these past 3 years, increased in numerical strength to such an extent as to win the admiration of your brother members throughout the country.

More than that, through your efforts, our order has become an important factor in the life of our people residing in Nebraska, and has contributed to the welfare of your State and its citizenry, and your work, together with the work of our members throughout the land, has contributed immensely to the advancement of our great country.

Indeed, you have responded generously to all the undertakings of our order, the accomplishment of which undertakings have served the interests of our country, as well as the interest of other countries of free people. For this you have been highly praised by your Government and by the governments of other free countries; have helped to alleviate the suffering of mankind here and abroad, for which you have earned the everlasting gratitude on the part of those aided; and have served the cause of democracy and the cause of world peace as to justly deserve the admiration of all freedom- and peace-loving people.

I am confident that you will keep up your good work because you, like all other Sons of Italy in America, firmly believe that by serving your order you can better serve the cause of our people; you can pave the way for a better future for our children, the men and women of the morrow; and you can better serve the interests of the greatest country on earth, your country and my country, the United States of America.

Yes; you will continue on because you firmly believe that by serving our order, the order will become stronger and stronger, for more links will be added to our chain of brotherhood, all of which will give us more faith and confidence to undertake and accomplish greater things and matters redounding to the glory of our common heritage.

You will continue on, because you firmly believe that such accomplishments will constitute a rich legacy for our children to inherit and to enjoy, and that such a legacy will serve to inspire them to be of greater service to mankind.

You will continue on, because in unison with your brother members throughout the country, you firmly believe, and justly so, that the more extensive our order becomes, the more adherents to the true principles of brotherhood and the more disciples of patriotism will we have, because the temple of our order is but a citadel of fraternity by and through which we gain inspiration, hope, and faith to work for a better world in which human solidarity will become ever stronger, and it is also a rendezvous of pure Americanism, where democracy is preached, our American way of life is cherished and preserved, all of which contributes to peace on earth and good will to all men.

In the continuation of this magnificent work, it is a matter of joy and pride for you to know that you have the good will of all classes of people, of every race and of every creed, and of whatever station in life, except, of course, of one class, and one class only, and of the people of that class, to your everlasting credit, you and all our members have earned their displeasure and may say their hatred. That class consists of those who profess to be the protectors of man's freedoms but who, in truth and in fact, are trying to enslave mankind; of those who profess belief in democratic ideals but who, in truth and in fact, are working to destroy democracy and substitute it with mankind's most dangerous enemy—communism.

Of this we are mighty proud. Proud because in our thirst to serve the cause of mankind and freedom, the cause of liberty and world peace, we are determined to continue to combat this monstrous evil until it is completely wiped off the face of the earth.

And on this grand occasion, we who love freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of religion, and all other freedoms justly belonging to man reaffirm our pledge to spare no time and no efforts to help in the work for its extermination.

And in this fight we beseech our 10,000,000 Americans of Italian origin to continue in their role as militant crusaders. This I know they will do, because like you and me, they are all peace-loving people.

And we beseech the rest of the American citizenry to continue in their opposition of this dangerous philosophy. Let us always be vigilant and alert to the end that no Communist or fellow traveler penetrate any of the departments of our Government, because we want our Government to continue as conceived by the founders of this Republic of ours, a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Communism has been and is on the march of further conquests. Rest assured that it will not stop in its march to conquer people and countries unless a determined and united effort is made by all freedom-loving people not only to arrest its march but arrest it so that it will cease, once and for all, to be a threat to democracy. Unless this is done, we shall witness the complete enslavement of mankind. God forbid such.

And so, this evening, we reiterate again our stand that we are solidly behind the United Nations in its present struggle in the Korean situation; that we are behind our country in her effort in that struggle; that we are behind the President of the United States, and commend him for his wisdom in having taken immediate action to oppose with force of arms the unjust and brutal aggression of the free people of South Korea by the enemies of mankind. In this just cause we pledge our order's manpower and resources for the achievement of victory.

After all, we did not fight in the last war—a war in which millions of lives by the warring nations were sacrificed, millions of people made homeless, billions of our Nation's—as well as other nations'—wealth expended, a war which saw the march of civilization come to a halt, merely to enslave mankind. We fought so that nations could be free from aggression; we fought so that you and I and the rest of the world could be secure in our freedoms, and we will continue in the service of the cause until such a time as we have fully realized them.

I want to take this opportunity to report to you that during the past 3 years we have made great strides. In the first 2 of these 3 years we increased our membership considerably, and the fruits of our labor for the past year indicate that the biennium of 1949–51 will exceed all expectations in this respect. I am happy to tell you that the State of Nebraska has contributed to a good extent in this enrollment of new members. For this contribution I thank you from the very depth of my heart.

I thank you also for your contribution in all the undertakings of our order during these past 3 years. Whether we succeeded or not in all of these undertakings, it suffices to say that our efforts are indelibly written in the history of our order—are to be found in the archives of the United Nations and registered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of our country. When our generations to come will scan these records, they will find how vigorously their fathers and forefathers strove to make this world a better world in which to live.

Indeed, we strove hard to secure Italy's admission to the United Nations, but for the stubbornness of one nation, we failed, but the time will come when Italy will sit in that most important body, for she belongs there.

We strove hard to secure modifications in the terms of the peace treaty with Italy, because we considered and still regard some of the terms of that treaty to be unfair and unjust, but for the stubbornness of one nation we failed.

In that fight, we were rewarded by the comments of President Truman, who said, "Certain of the terms of the peace treaty are not in accordance with our desire," and then added, "within the framework of the United Nations it should be possible to secure such changes in the treaty as may be required by the light of future experience." Well, I believe the experience gained in these past few years has enlightened our country as well as other free countries to make the just changes, but, of course, we will have to ask Russia if she has been likewise enlightened.

We strove hard to secure the return, or in the alternative, the trusteeship to Italy of her African colonies so as to relieve Italy of her surplus population, but we failed, except in a very, very small part. I suppose Italy's 47,000,000 people must, in the opinion of world statesmen and politicians, continue to be cooped up in an area approximately the size of the State of New Mexico. Maybe Russia and some other nation can enlighten us on the subject.

But our work was not ineffective in all of our undertakings. Indeed, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD furnishes ample proof of our efforts in the passage of the Marshall plan, the purpose of which is to aid the European nations devastated by the last war in their economic recovery; the interim program which was to aid France, Austria, and Italy before the operation of the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, and the inclusion of Italy in said pact to prevent the free nations from aggression, and all other legislation necessary for the defense and security of our beloved country, and last but not least, we contributed immensely to the defeat of communism in the Italian elections of 1948.

During these past 3 years we have made and are now making every effort to secure changes in the immigration laws. We consider these laws too restrictive, inhumane, and discriminatory. We cannot, for instance, see why Italy should be allowed an annual quota of 5,801, and other countries larger quotas. What offense Italy has committed to deserve such treatment, I know not. I do know, however, that Italy's sons, who were blessed with the privilege of entering our shores, and their children, have contributed immensely to the development and progress of this country; that in every field of human endeavor they have brought their just contributions, and in many fields they have actually become the leaders.

I cannot see the reason, for instance, why an American citizen, who found himself in Italy either as a visitor or on business, at the outbreak of the last war and was unable to return and thereafter forced to join the Italian army, or to vote under threat of imprisonment, death, bodily harm or starvation by having his ration card taken away from him should have his citizenship canceled and denied the right to return to the country to which he pledged allegiance.

There are so many defects and unjust provisions in the present laws that time does not permit me to detail them.

We have caused several bills to be presented, which, if passed, would relieve the situation, true, to a small degree, but if passed, would give us an inkling as to what more we could expect. All of these bills are awaiting action, and we hope that action will be taken soon. We shall continue in our efforts in this matter until just, decent, and humane legislation is enacted. This is a must on our program.

Another must on our program, which at present I consider the most important, is the completion of the drive to raise $1,000,000 for the erection of the Cassino Memorial Orphanage, at Cassino, Italy. This orphanage, when completed, dedicated to the memory of the American soldiers who fought, bled, and died for the cause of democracy, in the last World War, and to take care of children made orphans through that war, will serve to remind the living generations, as well as all future generations, that whenever and wherever world peace is threatened, liberty-loving people from everywhere will fight for its preservation; a reminder that people living in a democracy are interested in the well-being of all the people throughout the earth, and for our order, it shall be a reminder to our children and their children who are to come to serve its cause that fraternity, as defined in our ritual, must be strictly adhered to and religiously practiced at all times.

I deeply appreciate what you have thus far done in this behalf. I beseech you, however, to redouble your efforts so that this humanitarian undertaking may be brought to a speedy conclusion. This I know you will do. You will, because I know of no instance where the Sons of Italy in Nebraska failed to respond, and generously, to any of the undertakings of our order.

Shortly I shall leave your city. I shall take along with me an everlasting remembrance of this occasion. I leave with you my assurance of profound satisfaction for your magnificent work. Indeed, I shall always be thankful to your Supreme Deputy, my good friend Pisasale, for the work which he has done on behalf of our order. Under his guidance you have made immense progress, and you are destined to greater achievements. My sincere thanks to the president of the executive council of Nebraska, brother Joseph Vacanti. My gratitude goes also to the venerables and officers of the various lodges who have spared, and spare, no time or efforts in the discharge of the duties entrusted to them. My admiration goes to all the Sons of

Italy of this great State for their deep love and devotion for the ideals of our order, for the success of which they have worked incessantly and continue to do so.

With your work and the work of the rest of the Sons of Italy throughout the Nation, and with the guidance of Almighty God, which guidance, we shall always beseech, we cannot but march on to greater accomplishments.

The Permanent Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article from the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, December 5.

I have been on the campus of the American University at Beirut and can attest to the truth of Miss Thompson's observations. I have also visited on the campus of Roberts College on the Dardenelles and know from personal knowledge of the tremendous influence of those institutions, supported by American funds, in foreign countries.

It makes but little difference from what source or creed or denomination the support of these institutions comes from here in America. It is still great.

Last week it was my privilege to use the Appendix of the RECORD to point up some of the values in a letter which former Ambassador Joseph C. Grew had written to the Evening Star. It appeared on November 20, 1950.

Mr. Grew was writing about the International Christian University at Mitaka in Japan. At that time I pointed out the great value of these American missionary enterprises. It was my intention to use the word "missionary" perhaps in a broader sense than merely the "evangelical." At that time I posed two questions regarding the future of these great enterprises:

First. Will our political activities abroad diminish or distress them?

Second. Will our rising tax rate here at home dry up the source of their support?

I believe that these two questions should become a part and parcel of our American thinking.

The article referred to follows:

ON THE RECORD—CONQUERORS THROUGHOUT ALL HISTORY HAVE SOUGHT CONTROL OF MIDDLE EAST

(By Dorothy Thompson)

DAMASCUS, SYRIA.—The Middle East is that part of the Orient closest to Europe and the West. It includes the eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea where the Dardanelles connects this otherwise Russian lake with the Mediterranean, and the Aegean Sea which Turkey shares with Greece; Syria and the hinterlands of Iraq and Iran, the latter being the only non-Soviet state on the Caspian; Lebanon, of which Israel is but a pendant backed by Jordan; Egypt, and the peninsula of Saudi Arabia.

With the exception of Turkey, Iran, and Israel, all this world is Arab. With the exception of Israel all is Moslem.

This Middle East is the crossways of the world as indicated by the signs that successive conquerors have left behind them. Visible from the Mediterranean seafront campus of the American University of Beirut is a cleft in the Lebanon Mountain which rises above the sparkling bay. Through this have come wave after wave of conquerors beginning with the Assyrians in the days of Nebuchadnezzar. Through it came the legions of Caesar.

SOUGHT BY EVERY CONQUEROR

Every European and eastern conqueror down to Mussolini and Hitler who ever endeavored to extend his domain sought the eastern Mediterranean. Whenever European nations fought each other, each tried to make an alliance with the Middle East or its dominant power—for centuries the Ottoman Empire—and conversely the defense of Europe against central Asia has demanded, and still demands, a friendly Middle East, for in the hands of a power hostile to Europe the latter would be menaced from Greece to Gibraltar.

Economically the Middle East is essential as a complement to western Europe. Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia are sources of almost all the oil that turns the wheels of Europe which has none in its own lands. middle eastern oil is the nearest, richest, cheapest and, for foreseeable time, in inexhaustible supply. Europe and the Middle East are natural complementary traders, sharing as they do the common water highway of the Mediiterranean. By proximity and/or industrial development western Europe and America are best equipped to furnish the machinery for Middle Eastern industrial development.

INTELLECTUALS NOT NEGLIGIBLE

This should, furthermore, be aided by the cultural ties which have been developing for a full generation regardless of political difficulties. In every society that is undergoing evolutionary or revolutionary change, the determinant class is the intellectuals. Relatively small though this class is in the Middle East, only one generation elapsed since four centuries of Ottoman oppression, it is not negligible. The action that the Arab world consists of illiterate Bedouins, feudal landlords, and oppressed sharecroppers is a childish oversimplification.

In Syria, for example, about 1 in 300 of the population have had a university education, and these are the fermenting source in society. They are doctors, lawyers, teachers, journalists, engineers. Almost without exception, these speak one of two western languages, English or French. Wherever one goes one meets graduates of the American University of Beirut (established in 1891), the Sorbonne, the London School of Economics, Columbia, Harvard, and even the University of Iowa.

The educated Arab of this generation is intensely politically conscious, and he knows a great deal more about the west than the west knows about his world.

The Arab world owes its modern existence, for better or worse, to the revolt during World War I, in which it mobilized on the side of the west to throw off the yoke of Turkish despotism, when the Arab briefly became the hero of the Lawrence of Arabia legend.

Therefore, at the end of the First World War, when this generation of the Middle East was infant, all the breaks were with the West. Today they are not. The mind of the Middle East, like that of the Far East, is at best dubious, at worst disillusioned and bitter toward the west. This much any visitor will discover in a very short time. And it seems essential for us to try to understand why.

It Was False for Anyone To Assert That I Was Ever for Socialism, Socialized Medicine, or Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I now wish to call attention to the following talk which I made over radio station KOIL, Omaha, Nebr., on October 16, 1950:

I want to repeat again to the voters generally, and particularly to those fair and decent persons who are a part of the so-called Healing Arts Committee, and to their good wives, families, and friends, that I am now and have been always against socialism, fascism, and communism, and every other un-American ism; that I am now and have been always against socialized medicine; that there is no bill pending in either the Senate or the House of Representatives creating socialism or socialized medicine; that the reactionary Republican-Democrat, bad insurance-company-inspired campaign issue of socialism and socialized medicine is a deliberate political snare, a deliberate fraud, and deceit. These reactionaries are fighting nonexistent enemies and attempting to right nonexisting wrongs. It is a phantom fight to distract the attention of the voters from the superisolationism of my opponent's bad record in Congress as far as the farmers, labor, the veterans, and honorable business, big and little, is concerned. They seek to draw your attention away from the sleepers which were on my opponent's congressional payroll, and the fact that he gave the farmers bulletins and other Government books allotted to the Second Congressional District, to other Congressmen, one of whom is an Iowan and also to a Member of the other body; that many times he voted and paired his votes with chronic dissenters who sometimes followed closely the Moscow pattern. They don't want you to think about the strange legislative conduct of my opponent, because it cannot merit approval upon close inspection and study.

I am now and have always been against compulsory health insurance, and am in favor of a voluntary plan, which like social security would not close the field entirely to private insurance companies, but permit them to exist and prosper as well.

Do not pay any attention to people who lie about me and say that I am for socialism, socialized medicine, and compulsory health insurance. I am not for them and never was for them. And if anyone, including the Omaha World-Herald and the old bellwethers of the healing arts committee, says that I am now or ever was for socialism, or socialized medicine, or compulsory health insurance, it is a deliberate, monstrous, and unmitigated lie, and perhaps also a violation of the eighth commandment: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

I cannot understand the perverted, antisocial minds of people who would keep on insisting that that which I have emphatically denied repeatedly and often is a fact. Like communistic, morally dirty old Joe Stalin who is afflicted with leprosy of the mind, they continue to lie, and lie, and lie, and say I am for socialism, socialized medicine, and compulsory health insurance. Who do you suppose the evil person is who has practiced mass hypnotism upon this unholy

horde in and out of the alleged healing arts committee?

In the past they have tried my patience sorely and to stop them I have slashed them in discourses in and out of the Congress with saber cuts of Saxon speech but like North Koreans the waves of lies come and come and come. Perhaps mass pocketbook hypnotism must have been practiced upon them by ignoble insurance companies, because no human could singly be guilty of such distortions of the truth.

The questions are asked often these days:

(a) "What did Congressman O'SULLIVAN ever do in the first instance to infuriate certain of the reactionary Republican-Democrat prima donna medical men, and throw them into such a tail spin of ridiculous hysteria?"

(b) "What made certain of these medical men wax so wroth that they have dug up their money-filled tomato cans, disturbed the secret hiding places of their dollars, opened up their money vaults with a Santa Claus clatter, and are spending their money hoards now in an effort to defeat Congressman O'SULLIVAN and buy a reactionary Republican victory for the Middle West?"

I shall answer these questions and all others of a similar nature by saying that up to the time certain of the reactionary insurance inspired Republican-Democratic doctors spoke out against me, that I had done them nothing but good. However, since they have done so, I have belabored them good and plenty.

When you press them for a reason why they took up their political cudgels against me, they say that before the last election I promised them that I was against socialized medicine. That is true, I was then and am now, and have been always against socialized medicine.

They claim further that after I was elected that I double-crossed them, and that is not true.

Fortunately I have all the original correspondence which passed between the representatives of the Omaha doctors and myself. In order to prove positively that I am right in my contentions, and that they are as wrong as wrong can be, I now ask your indulgence to burden you further so that you may actually hear these letters and papers read and then be in a position to make up your own mind from the proof I offer as to which side is right in this most unfair and unnecessary verbal medical bombardment.

During the latter part of September 1948, one of my doctor friends gave me the following letter which he had received and suggested that I answer same.

DOUGLAS COUNTY REPUBLICAN HEADQUARTERS,
Omaha, Nebr., September 23, 1948.

DEAR DOCTOR: I wish we all could have the privilege of chatting with our Congressman, Howard Buffett, about the pending legislation in Washington to provide Federal aid to medicine.

He is convinced that aid means control and the ultimate socialization of our profession, and has repeatedly voiced his opposition on the floor of the House.

I think that the least we doctors can do between now and November 2 is to give Buffett our all-out support for reelection in the critical fight he is facing.

Our industrialized Second Congressional District is the Democrats' only hope of breaking Nebraska's solid Republican representation in Washington. For that reason, they are pouring most of their money and left-wing agitation into Omaha to knock Buffett off.

With this concentrated opposition, Howard is frank to admit that he needs all the help he can get. If you have taken your stand on socialized medicine, then you have already cast your vote for him. See that your family, your friends, your nurses do, too.

But Buffett needs money as well as your vote. And he needs the money now. Without adequate funds for literature, radio time, etc., he can't hope to meet his opponent on an equal basis, for Howard is being outspent many times to one.

Write your check today, won't you? I think we owe it to the man who is doing our fighting in Washington.

Many thanks.

EARL C. SAGE, M. D.
HERBERT H. DAVIS, M. D.
ROY W. FOUTS, M. D.
J. D. MCCARTHY, M. D.

I hope you noted that this letter was a Republican appeal for funds for my opponent written by old rock-ribbed Republicans out of the Omaha Republican headquarters.

I hope that you realized for perhaps the first time in your life that the dictionary was being Buffettized so that aid and control would mean the same thing. Can you visualize such nonsense? If you aided your father or mother, your brother or sister, your mother-in-law or your father-in-law, your relatives, or your wife's relatives, your country, your State, your city, your church, your minister, your teacher, your policeman, your neighbor, or any other worthy or unworthy cause, that under Buffettism would mean that you controlled them. Isn't that just pathetic nonsense? Did you note that line "Howard is being cut-spent many times to one." Our filed expenditures show that this was not true, and that Howard was the "money bag kid" in the last election.

On my legal stationery I made the following reply to Dr. Sage's letter and sent a copy to every doctor in the district, as well as to other interested persons.

OPEN LETTER TO THE MEMEERS OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION OF THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, COMPRISING WASHINGTON, DOUGLAS, SARPY, CASS, AND OTOE COUNTIES

OMAHA, NEBR., *October 20, 1948.*

DEAR DOCTOR: On stationery carrying the heading "Douglas County Republican Headquarters, 415 W. O. W. Building, Omaha, Nebr., telephone HA 8604," and signed personally by Dr. Earl C. Sage, and bearing also the typewritten signatures of Drs. Earl C. Sage, Herbert H. Davis, Roy W. Fouts, and J. D. McCarthy, an appeal was made to you to support my opponent Howard Buffett personally and financially, on Mr. Buffett's claim that the "pending legislation in Washington to provide Federal aid to medicine" does not mean what it says but means "control" and the ultimate socialization of our profession.

It would appear to me that Congress meant what it said and not what Mr. Buffett surmises.

I have never been for socialized medicine as this letter seems to infer. Our family has produced doctors, journalists, lawyers, teachers, and other worthwhile really good American people. My sister, the late Margaret J. O'Sullivan, was a medical graduate from Nebraska University and also earned bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees from Nebraska University before she studied medicine. She practiced medicine in Omaha from the time of her graduation until death.

Two of my wife's brothers are doctors, they being Dr. Frank T. Lovely, of Omaha, Nebr., and Dr. James Lovely, who practices in San Jose, Calif.

If you elect me as your Congressman you will have a Representative you can rely upon and whom you may also, I am sure, be proud of.

Yours very truly,
EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN.

All was quiet on the medical front after my letter was sent out. However, many doctors worked like termites to defeat me and elect my opponent. They were wan and startled when I was elected, and hied back grimly to their practices.

On January 1, 1949, I went to Washington, D. C., and took up my congressional duties. One day in September 1949, I received through the mail at my Washington office, a very splendid pamphlet entitled "Why We Need National Health Insurance," and knowing that the doctors, hospitals, dentists, druggists, nurses, educators, and others would be vitally interested in this subject I thought that it was my duty to pass this pamphlet on to them so that they could keep up to date on Federal aid to medicine and allied professions.

I telephoned the publisher as to whether or not these pamphlets would be furnished in quantities for free distribution. The answer was no, that a charge of $15 a thousand would have to be made for them, if I desired them in quantities, but a few of them would be furnished free. I bought 5,000 of them for $75 and paid for them out of my own pocket. I bought and paid for personally, 5,000 sheets of paper and 5,000 envelopes. I composed a letter of transmittal and I paid to have the 5,000 letters mimeographed. As this effort of mine was related to pending legislation and was congressional business, I could and did mail them postage free.

The letter was as follows:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1949.

DEAR CONSTITUENT: I know that you are very much interested in the question as to whether or not we should have national health insurance, and I am therefore taking the liberty of sending to you herewith for your perusal and study a pamphlet which shows the need for the President's health program, and provides a brief description of how it would operate if it became law.

I believe that it contains much information which will be of value to you in keeping posted on this proposed legislation and will present to you the basic answers to some of the current misinformation on national health insurance which has been sent throughout the country and to you and me in letters, newspaper articles, and pamphlets which contain distorted attacks on the President's health program, which attacks emanated from interested and purely selfish sources who claimed wrongfully that if this law was passed it would be socialized medicine.

I have some decided notions on this matter which are favorable to the President's health program, and which were arrived at after what I thought was a fair and impartial survey and study of all phases of this important question.

Trusting that you will take the time to read this pamphlet, and hoping it will throw "light" instead of "heat" on this very controversial matter, I remain

Yours very truly,
EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN.

The wording on this pamphlet illustrated by pictures, was as follows:

"WHY WE NEED NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE—CAN YOU AFFORD MEDICAL CARE?

"Four out of five people need financial help to meet serious illness. This means 117,000,000 people cannot afford the full measure of needed medical care." (Citing as authority for this statement The Nation's Health, by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, September 1948.)

"If your family's income is less than $5,000 yearly, this means you." (Based on data from AMA's bureau of medical economics, 1939, and Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index, June 15, 1948.)

"Nearly 80 percent of all American families had incomes below $5,000 in 1947." (President's Economic Report of January 1949.)

"WILL SICKNESS STRIKE YOU?

"As an average American, your chances this year are: 1 out of 3 of being sick once; 1 out of 7 of being sick twice; 1 out of 20 of being sick three times." Citing of the Commission on the Costs of Medical Care, Publication No. 27, 1933.)

"Many more suffer from unrecognized illness. Chronic disability or physical impairment blights 25,000,000 lives today." (Citing the Nation's Health by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator September 1948.)

"At least 8,000,000 people—1 out of 18—are laid up by sickness or injury in any 24-hour period. About half of these will remain disabled for 6 months or more." (Based on Senate subcommittee rept. No. 5, of July 1946.)

"PREMATURE DEATH STRIKES HOW MANY?

"One million three hundred and ninety-five thousand six hundred and seventeen Americans died in 1946. One out of two was under 65. Five thousand one hundred and fifty-three mothers died in childbirth. One hundred and eleven thousand and sixty-three infants died before reaching their first birthday." (Citing U. S. Public Health Service, National Office of Vital Statistics Report, Vol. 28, No. 1 of September 13, 1948.)

"DO MATERNITY DEATH RATES VARY BY STATES?

"Yes; greatly. In 1946, for example: 9 to 10 mothers died per 10,000 live births in five best States—Connecticut, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, South Dakota. Twenty-six to thirty-one mothers died per 10,000 live births in five worst States—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina." (From U. S. Public Health Service, November 1949.)

"DO INFANT DEATH RATES VARY?

"Yes; greatly. Twenty-seven to twenty-nine babies died per 1,000 live births in five best States—Arkansas, Connecticut, New Jersey, Oregon, Utah. Forty-one to seventy-eight babies died in their first year in the five worst States—Arizona, Maine, New Mexico, South Carolina, and Texas." (Citing U. S. Public Health Service, November 1948.)

"HOW MANY DOCTORS?

"Approximately 152,000 physicians are in active private practice. Of this number, 34,000 are specialists. On the average, there is 1 active doctor in private practice for every 950 Americans." (From the Journal of the American Medical Association of May 21, 1949.)

"Ratio in 12 best States is 667 patients per physician." (From the Nation's Health, by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, September 1948.)

"ARE M. D.'S EVENLY DISTRIBUTED BY STATES?

"They are not evenly distributed in response to population or need. One active M. D. per 437 to 636 persons in these States: District of Columbia, Massachusetts, New York, Colorado. One active M. D. per 1,502 to 1,606 persons in 4 worst States: Alabama, Mississippi, New Mexico, South Caroline." (From United States Public Health Service.)

"HOW ARE M. D.'S LOCATED WITHIN A STATE?

"Cities have more than their share. Some cities have 1 M. D. per 500 persons. Rural areas are underdoctored. Three hundred and thirty counties—10 percent of all United States counties—had less than 1 active M. D. per 3,000 persons. Seventy-five counties had no active M. D." (From the Bureau of Information, American Medical Association, 1947.)

"ARE THERE ENOUGH HOSPITALS?

"The United States had 6,335 hospitals of all kinds, with 1,423,520 beds, in 1948. There were 4,589 hospitals for general service with 576,459 beds. Judged by minimum accepted standard of 4½ general hospital beds per 1,000 population, only 14 counties in every 100 meet the minimum standard; 4 counties out of 10 have no acceptable general hospital; 15,000,000 Americans live in such counties." (From the Journal of American Medical Association of August 14, 1948.)

"ARE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES ADEQUATE?

"No; they are grossly inadequate. One county out of three has no full-time public-health department. Forty million people live in these counties without adequate public-health services." (From the President's message to Congress, November 19, 1946.)

"There should be 1 public-health nurse per 6,500 persons." (From the Nation's Health, by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, September 1948.)

"There were only 22,605 such nurses in 1948—1 to 63,700 persons." (From the Federal Security Agency, Public Health Service.)

"WHAT DOES ILL HEALTH COST US?

"Sickness and disability cost 1,500,000,000 days of production annually. Medical and health costs alone come to $8,500,000,000 annually. Short-term illness knocks the average worker off his job 6 days a year. Nearly 3,000,000 potential workers are incapacitated by total disability. Their productive power is lost to American economy. Estimated total cost of ill health, including lost wages and lost production, comes to $27,000,000,000 each year." (From the Nation's Health, by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, September 1948.)

"NATIONAL SECURITY

"Over 40 percent of America's young men were unable to pass wartime draft standards. One out of six rejectees had remediable or preventable illnesses or defects." (From the Senate subcommittee Report No. 5, 79th Cong., July 1946.)

How do health funds compare?

Commodity	Amount	Percent of National income, 1947	Percent of personal income less taxes, 1947
Medical care, insurance, supplies	$6,507,000,000*	3.2	3.7
Alcoholic drinks	9,640,000,000	4.8	5.6
Tobacco	3,880,000,000	1.9	2.2
Jewelry and repairs	1,496,000,000	.7	.9

*This figure does not include an additional 1.9 billions spent for medical care by Federal, State, and local governments (from National Income Number, Survey of Current Business, Department of Commerce, July 1948).

"WHAT IS SPENT ON MEDICAL RESEARCH?

"The Federal Government spends about $28,000,000 annually for research and development in medical and allied sciences. By contrast, one Federal agency alone spent $30,000,000 for research in plant and animal diseases. Business spends about $450,000,000 a year on industrial research." (From the Report of President's Scientific Research Board, Vol. V. October 18, 1947 and Vol. 1, August 27, 1947: Budget of United States for year ending June 30, 1948.)

"HOW MANY HAVE HEALTH INSURANCE?

"Twenty seven million have doctors' services in a hospital plus hospitalization. Twenty seven million more have hospitalization insurance only. Three million five hundred thousand have comprehensive protection including preventive medicine. Ninety six million Americans have no health insurance protection at all." From the Committee on Research in Medical Economics Report, March 1949.)

"ARE VOLUNTARY PLANS COMPLETE?

"No. Most voluntary health insurance plans do not offer complete protection against sickness costs. Voluntary health insurance plans paid less than 10 percent of Nation's medical bills in 1947. Here is the breakdown:

"Hospitalizations plans: Blue Cross, pay only 21 percent of average family's medical bill.

"Hospitalization and doctor's service in hospital: Blue Cross and Blue Shield—only 35 percent of average family's medical bill. Few AMA approved plans offer all these: Preventive medicine; innoculation; pre- and post-natal care; eyeglasses; medical care at patient's home or doctor's office; periodic check-ups." (From the Committee on Research in Medical Economics Report, March 1949.)

"WHY DO WE NEED NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE?

"Any one may be hit by sickness without warning. Costs may run from a few dollars to hundreds or thousands. No one can predict the size of his sickness bills next year. Therefore, everybody—except the wealthy—needs health insurance. It spreads and spaces the costs of medical care. It is the tested insurance principle of pooling resources to meet a common risk.

"WHAT WOULD NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE COST YOU?

"Under national health insurance, your family would pay less on the average than you formerly spent for medical care."

Annual earnings	Average present medical expenses	Your 1½ percent of national health insurance premium (other half be paid by employer)
$1,000	$40	$15.00
$1,500	50	22.50
$3,000	90	45.00
$4,800	144	72.00

Now what on earth was wrong or offensive about that letter or pamphlet? To a fair person, it would be appreciated, would it not?

In a few days out popped the reactionary doctors like shepherd dogs out of a brush patch. Instead of appreciating my efforts to keep them informed at my own trouble and expense, with brains headed for bankruptcy, they ranted and raged at me. I received the most insulting, bitter, and denunciatory letters from certain doctors claiming that I was wasting the taxpayers' money on these pamphlets, printed letters, and envelopes, when I paid for them personally and abusing me for sending this matter free, through the mails, charging me with fooling them into voting for me and then doublecrossing them. Of course before election—they did not know it however—I checked every doctor in my district and the great majority of them being unyielding reactionary Republicans, voted for Mr. Buffett. The strange thing was that upon making a check of my preelection survey every one of these outraged M. D.'s had voted against me according to my records. I knew from that that this whole hubbub was an insurance-minded, reactionary Republican scheme. You see they knew that I was making a splendid legislative record in Congress and they had to start to build fires under me.

I answered some of the less vitriolic letters and filed the other unmannerly blasts away for safekeeping.

Good-by and thanks for listening, ladies and gentlemen.

Everybody's Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of December 4, 1950:

EVERYBODY'S EMERGENCY

The President has given encouraging signs of restoring bipartisanship in the formulation and direction of foreign policy. The Korean emergency at last has impressed him with the doleful fact that playing the score by ear solo is not enough in this time of crisis. Hence, he has conferred with the leaders of both parties in Congress and has laid his cards on the table. We trust this arrangement will not be altered. The moratorium on politics as usual in foreign policy is a must.

But still another moratorium is needed. This relates to America's economic problem, pointed up by Mr. Truman's request last Friday for an $18,000,000,000 increase in appropriations for national defense. This will bring, if granted by Congress as they doubtless will be, the security appropriations to $42,000,000,000 for the year ending next June 30. In view of what is happening around the world this may be a conservative estimate of defense needs.

Whatever the sum, it is staggering and it means that taxes will go higher and higher. Why? Because ever if a compromise with Red China and Russia is reached in Korea, the war will not end there. Communist technique will be to force a break-through elsewhere—in Indochina, Malaya, Iran, west Europe.

Our foreign policy demands that we meet Red aggression wherever it projects itself, and this policy must be underwritten by the military strength required to make it effective. And military strength costs money, billions of it. The cold war to date has cost America upward of $100,000,000,000.

Those billions cannot be conjured out of thin air. They are extracted from the American people, through taxation in whatever form it may be imposed. The corollary of stupendous spending for defense must be careful scrutiny of how it is spent—how the people can get the most for the huge expenditures voted by Congress.

Already the cost of the Korean venture is excessively high because the Federal Government, in purchasing the matériel required to fight there, is buying on an inflated market. Under Secretary for Air McCone has said that price increases from April to last September alone weakened the Air Force's purchasing power by the equivalent of 750 F–86 jet fighter planes, largely because the cost hikes in essential materials had risen between $315,000,000 and $360,000,000 up to that date.

There is another consideration. The President has called for unity in the face of an emergency. Well and good. But Mr. Truman has yet to recognize that a united effort to win a victory over the Communists in Korea or any other place, requires more than a mere agreement on foreign policy. He is not yet willing to relinquish his fight for congressional enactment of his Fair Deal program, a domestic program that not only has no tie-in with an all-out war effort but actually retards it. Only the other day he said he would insist that Congress put into law all the panaceas he champions, and this despite Fair Deal repudiation at the polls last month.

He is still echoing the Roosevelt chant of "soak the rich." He is still insisting that the major taxes for defense must come from big business. He would impose suffocating excess-profits taxes on corporations, in naive defiance of economic laws which prove that at this time they will not return as much revenue to the Government as would a more practical system proposed by the corporations themselves.

Big business is not trying to dodge its fair share of the defense load. It is willing to pay up to the hilt, but it justly inquires how it can meet the administration demands for more and more production, for expanded plant facilities and yet struggle under the stifling imposts and restrictions requested by the administration.

The inconsistency of the President is that in time of emergency he calls on industry to come to the country's rescue, yet relaxes not a whit in his efforts to pillory business even to the extent of labeling it unpatriotic.

He is still carping about the infamous Taft-Hartley law, still telling organized labor to get what it can in higher wages while the getting is good, still following the line of arraying class against class. Management can pay the higher freight out of profits, he says almost flippantly. Again in defiance of the economic facts which relate to industry's inability to do the gigantic job it is expected to do if it is crippled by excessive taxation and dishonestly assailed as a cruel monopoly which would enslave the people.

The President wants an all-out war effort. Granted he is right. Then let him make it all-out for everybody. Business will help carry the load and its share is the largest. But let this be an all-out effort straight across the board. Let's forget Fair Deal frills. Let's cut nonmilitary spending to the bone, but give the armed services everything they need to stop Russia. Russia's blueprint which envisages the world collapse of capitalism is clear. As this newspaper has said so many times, the collapse of the American economic structure into bankruptcy is its long objective. America must keep this structure sound and strong if it is to survive. That is another must.

For heaven's sake, Mr. President, use some common sense in assessing the economic facts of life. This emergency applies to everybody—and we mean everybody.

Has the Marshall Plan Made Friends or Enemies for U. S. A.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the latest edition of the United States News reports the following trade deals between Russia and European countries who have been receiving billions of American dollars through the Marshall plan to recover and rehabilitate their economy following World War II:

It's just as well to know what Russia and her satellites have been up to in the last few weeks. Here's the progress they've made in trade deals:

The British have been offered and will buy 800,000 tons of Russian grain. This makes sense from the British standpoint, since otherwise dollars might have to be laid out for such grain. Payment is in sterling that can be used by the Russians to buy wool, tin, rubber in the British Empire.

The French have been offered and will buy Russian anthracite. This reestablishes a prewar source for the French and doesn't cost dollars. British coal shortage makes this kind of deal necessary.

The Dutch, Danes, Norwegians, Swedes, and French are having Russian grain dangled before their eyes. Half a million tons is involved. What the Russians will ask in return is not yet known.

The Belgians have just made an interesting deal with the Russians. They will get 125,000 tons of wheat, 45,000 tons of manganese, 60,000 tons of phosphates, and 550 automobiles in return for 64,000 tons of steel products and 18,000 tons of copper, zinc, and other nonferrous metals. This at a time when metals generally are running short in much of western Europe.

The Swedes have just signed a new trade deal with Poland. They have to have more Polish coal, as British exports drop. Sweden gets Polish coal, food, and chemicals, in return for shipping iron ore, steel, machinery, and pulp to Poland.

This, mind you, is the roster of trade deals worked out just in recent weeks—the weeks since Chinese intervention in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, this is appalling with the United States engaged in a war in Korea against Russian dominated North Korea and Red China.

Apparently our American dollars have not made us many friends or loyal allies in western Europe.

I have said it before and I say it again—we cannot buy friendship or allies with dollars.

"Hard Thought Needs To Be Given as to How the United States Can Best Attain the Defense Force It Needs; Assuredly, the Air Force, the Main Striking Arm and the Country's Protector Against Air Assault, Demands a Substantial Build-Up"—Washington (D. C.) Post Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have, on a number of occasions, implored this House to recognize the fact that the national defense and security of these United States would primarily rest upon our ability to achieve supremacy in the air.

It was altogether because of the role that military air power had achieved in World War II that we in this body gave autonomy to and established the United States Air Force as a Department of Government.

I have on more than one occasion stated that the people of this country are not fearful of finding our seaport cities subject to bombardment by a practically nonexistent Russian Navy. Moreover, in

the absence of naval transports neither are they fearful of Russian tanks rumbling down United States Federal highways, spearheading an attack by Russian infantry.

What America fears is the death and destruction which can be expected to be dropped out of the bowels of Russian bombers flying over the great metropolitan areas of these United States.

The eyes and the ears of American men and women everywhere today are glued to their television sets, the headlines in the news, and to their radios. Their hearts are torn at what is already happening, or is likely to happen to our boys in Korea; they study the hourly news as it emanates from both the White House and from the United Nation's meetings at Lake Success.

It is because of these things that I am asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a very timely editorial taken from the Washington Post of Tuesday, December 5, headed "What Kind of Defense?"

There is no question but what the Post editorial faces the real problems that confront us in making demand that "some hard thought be given to the manner in which the $18,000,000,000"—which this House is asked to vote for defense—"is going to be spent."

The Post gives top priority for all spending to air power in general, and to "strategic weapons of air in particular." Radar and radar warnings are considered next in importance. Industrial capacity, manpower, the tactical use of atomic explosion," and "the more extensive use of women" are among the means of better national defense discussed in this most sensible analysis of conditions that confront the Nation today.

That my colleagues may have the benefit of reading this most timely expression of sentiment, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Post editorial reads as follows:

WHAT KIND OF DEFENSE?

In the light of the President's request for $18,000,000,000 more for defense, some hard thought needs to be given as to how the United States can best attain the defense force it needs. Assuredly the Air Force, as the main striking arm and the country's protector against air assault, demands a substantial build-up. If worst comes to worst and we must use the atom bomb as a strategic weapon, then we must have the equipment to deliver it. We also need more fighters to prevent, insofar as possible, enemy air attack on the United States, as well as a real radar warning system.

But, aside from the existing strategic bombing force, this is talking in futures; for Air Force expansion will be limited by industrial capacity. Moreover, there is often a tendency to assume that if the United States has the power to deliver the atom bomb it has the ability automatically to conclude a war. This does not necessarily follow. The Red Army, for example, is the Russians' most formidable weapon as respects western Europe, and it is for the most part well armed and equipped. Strategic bombing might seriously disrupt it, but probably could not destroy it.

Manpower is the element in which the United States and its allies are the weakest. New weapons, superior firepower, tactical use of atomic explosives all would help make up for a deficiency in manpower—although as respects tanks, at least, the Russians seem to be ahead of us. The proposed 60-division defense of western Europe is designed to hold the Russians at the Elbe, and operate from there. But this is a hope for the future.

Whatever kind of expansion takes place, it is apparent that the United States is going to have to make much better use of its military manpower than it has so far. When general mobilization comes, then some of the problems would be solved. Short of general mobilization, the Armed Forces will have to straighten out and toughen their haphazard attitude about Reserves, and they will have to find some way of making use of the superfluity of high ranking Reserve officers. They will have to make much more extensive use of women, especially in headquarters jobs. And Congress will have to tighten draft standards by changing physical requirements and age limits and by providing for the draft of younger veterans.

Beyond this the Armed Forces ought to put all their weight behind a plan for universal service coupled with the present selective service. In the immediate future such a plan would produce no more men. But over the long pull it would be the fairest and most comprehensive way of meeting military manpower needs.

California State Legislature Adopts Resolution Commending One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the United States Marine Corps recently received the singular honor of a special commendation from the State of California when a resolution was adopted by both the California Assembly and Senate commending the corps "for their courage, bravery, coordination, cooperation with other branches of the Armed Forces, and in short, the fulfillment of their motto 'Semper Fidelis.'"

The United States Marine Corps has demonstrated again and again on the field of battle the tremendous striking power developed by their branch of the armed services, and through excellent coordination have achieved maximum effects in cooperation with the Army, Navy, and Air Forces. Since the first historic landing of the marines on the Bahamas during the Revolutionary War, the Marine Corps has offered faithful and courageous service to the defense of the United States. The corps has well earned the respect and affection of all Americans, and the action taken by the California State Legislature is one more expression of the people's gratitude for the loyal service of our marines.

The following is the resolution as passed by the California Legislature:

Senate Joint Resolution 1

Joint resolution relative to the United States Marines

Whereas the United States Marine Corps was originally organized on November 10, 1775, when the Second Continental Congress of the United States authorized two battalions of marines for the new Navy; and

Whereas since the first historic landing of the marines on the Bahamas during the Revolutionary War the Marine Corps has devoted 175 years of faithful and courageous service to the defense of the United States; and

Whereas during World War I the United States Marine Corps valiantly distinguished itself serving with the Army during the battles of Belleau Wood, Aisne-Marne, St. Mihiel, Blanc Mont, and Meuse-Argonne; and

Whereas this generation should never forget the role of the United States marines in World War II, nor could it forget the United States marines' part in the courageous defenses of Wake Island, Midway, and Corregidor, nor the heroism of the United States marines in the battles of Guadalcanal, Bougainville, Tarawa, Saipan, Guam, Tinian, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa, to name but a few; and

Whereas the United States marines throughout their history have shown excellent coordination in using their tremendous striking power for the maximum effects, and have shown excellent cooperation with the Army and Navy forces in keeping wars on foreign shores and away from our homeland; and

Whereas the United States marines at present are again demonstrating to the world their bravery and power in their attacks on Inchon and Seoul in South Korea; and

Whereas the multitude of American boys and young men, among them many thousands of Californians, who have volunteered and are serving, and who are now volunteering for service with the United States marines are to be highly commended on joining the marines, our first line of defense, and the outfit first to face the enemy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby highly and heartily commends the United States marines for their courage, bravery, coordination, cooperation with other branches of the Armed Forces, and in short, the fulfillment of their motto "semper fidelis"; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Poland: The Test Case of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio address recently delivered by Mr. Eugene Lyons on the Justice for Poland radio program. Mr. Lyons is the well-known roving editor of Reader's Digest and these programs are sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress:

Ladies and gentlemen, recently I saw a first-rate movie, GI Joe, based on the career of that remarkable war correspondent, Ernie Pyle. Maybe some of you have seen it, too. The story, you will recall, is set in Italy, and

its main action unfolds in the long, bitter struggle around Cassino.

The picture, naturally, deals with the ordeal of the American soldiers involved. But, watching it, I couldn't help remembering that this area was also the scene of great suffering and great glory for tens of thousands of Polish soldiers. It was here that the second Polish army corps, better known as the Anders Army, not only distinguished itself for courage but scored the decisive victory of the whole Italian campaign.

Ever since the beginning of 1943, allied armies—American, British, Indian, New Zealand—had been storming the German Gustav line at Cassino, which blocked the road to Rome. Their every offensive had been hurled back with fearful losses. In the last days of March the Allies had battered a path to within 300 yards of Monastery Hill, the pivotal fortress of the Gustav line, only to be forced to retreat under murderous fire.

Then, on May 12, the Anders Army went into action against that hill. The battle was brutal, bloody, seemingly hopeless. "A savage, animal struggle," one reporter called it. The Poles scaled the heights under a hail of German shells. They hauled antitank guns up steep crags in the night hours. Even seriously wounded men and officers continued to fight, and when they ran out of ammunition they gathered up the grenades left by the enemy.

After 7 days of this, on the 18th of May, the Polish flag was raised over Monastery Hill. It was the telltale breach in the Gustav line, enabling the British and American forces to move forward on the road to the Eternal City.

The British commander, General Alexander, proclaimed: "This is a proud day for Poland, and I salute the Polish flag which now flies proudly over the monastery fortress." General Mark Clark, the American commander, was no less enthusiastic in his eulogies.

Polish forces, of course, had fought on every major front of the war. They had left their quota of dead on the battlefields of France and Norway and North Africa. Polish airmen had been among the so few who had saved so many in the Battle of Britain. Polish vessels had taken part in vital operations in the Atlantic, the Arctic, and the Mediterranean.

But it took the Italian campaign to rouse the world to a sharp awareness of the Polish contribution to the common cause. A war correspondent on the scene summed up the Cassino victory in these words: "The Poles had flung themselves against apparently impregnable positions—and had taken them."

What has been the reward of these sons of Poland for their sacrifices and heroism? No self-respecting American can face that question with an easy conscience.

When the victory over Germany was finally won, the survivors among the other Allies returned to their free homes. Books were written and films were made to celebrate their experience. But what of their Polish comrades-in-arms? These, alas, had no free home to return to. At the very moment they were storming Mount Cassino, American and British statesmen were bartering the liberties and the territories of the Polish people—like so much merchandise—in a cynical game of appeasement of the Bolsheviks.

In recognition of the great Cassino victory, the King of England conferred a high decoration upon General Anders: The Order of the Bath. But at the war's end Stalin and his gang conferred a different kind of title upon General Anders. In their Nuremberg indictment they called him a "war criminal." And today General Anders, one of the great leaders and heroes of the entire war, is an exile, while the country he fought for is writhing under the iron heel of Red imperialism.

And over 100,000 of the brave men who served under his command—in Italy, in France, in the skies over Europe—are likewise wanderers on the face of the earth. They had won their war—and lost their country.

This simple, tragic, terrifying truth stands as an indictment of democratic statesmanship.

Of all the forces making up the great coalition against Hitler's Germany, the Polish were by all odds the most remarkable. When the Second Polish Corps was fighting in Italy, a New York Times dispatch described it as "perhaps the greatest jailbreakers' club in history." He was referring to the fact that most of its ranks and officers had escaped from prisons and concentration camps in Germany, from Nazi-held Poland, from internment camps in Rumania and Hungary. Nearly all the rest had served time in Soviet prisons and forced-labor camps during the 2 years of the Hitler-Stalin alliance.

For other soldiers, the great adventure of war had begun when they enlisted or were conscripted. But nearly all the Polish warriors had been through great adventures before they reached recruitment centers. They had to risk their lives for the chance to fight before risking them again on the battle fronts.

There were no conscripts among them. Singly and in tiny groups they had stolen across Nazi-occupied territories, through forests, over mountains, across hostile frontiers in order to join Polish contingents in the Middle East or France, later in North Africa or Italy. Tens of thousands of them had trekked from Siberia and arctic wildernesses—ragged and starved and fevered—to reach Polish training centers east of the Volga, only to be driven forth again by the Kremlin's whim to Iran.

But however round about their route, though it took them thousands of miles from their native land, these men believed they were fighting their way back to a liberated Poland. In this illusion they were encouraged by solemn commitments by all allied statesmen. But their simple faith was cruelly betrayed. In the end, after 6 years of superb action on all fronts, half their country was swallowed outright by the Soviet Union, the other half was subjected to a ruthless Soviet-controlled puppet regime.

Poland, in the summer of 1939, could have bought a reprieve from devastation at the price of dishonor. It could have submitted to Hitler's diktat, as Austria and Czechoslovakia had done. Instead she chose to resist and become the first victim of a blitzkreig.

Attacked without warning, overwhelmingly outnumbered and outgunned, Poland yet fought gallantly for 30 days—in the seventeenth of which the Red Army struck from the rear, grabbing its half of the mangled nation. A lonely, hopeless resistance it was.

Seven months later came the turn of France. That country, by contrast, was fully mobilized and deployed, shielded by its Maginot line, supported by 10 British divisions, familiar with the nature of a blitzkreig at Poland's expense. Yet mighty France succumbed in only 36 days. Thus the world was able to grasp how truly magnificent had been Poland's resistance.

The country lay in ruins, but it was by no means finished. The German invaders were condemned to struggle without let-up against an underground home army of some 350,000. And Hitler was destined to encounter fierce, fanatic Polish adversaries wherever he turned—first in Norway and France, then in every important land, sea, and air campaign except the Russian. In Russia, Stalin had rejected every offer of the Poles to take part on the eastern fronts.

Even before the end of formal hostilities inside Poland, General Sikorski was shaping up a Polish Army out of fugitive remnants of his beaten nation and from Polish volunteers living abroad. Polish airmen and units of the Polish Navy managed to escape and join Allied forces.

Like every American GI, like every British Tommy, the Polish fighters battled in the first place for the security and independence of his native land. But blundering politicians robbed them of the fruits of their victory. The grave of every Pole who died for the Allied cause is a silent accusation. The ordeal of every freedom-loving Pole now enduring totalitarian despotism at home, or the hardships of exile outside, is a living accusation.

On June 8, 1946, 13 months after the surrender of Germany, there was a magnificent victory parade through the streets of London. Flags of all the nations that had made the surrender possible were on display. Yet there was a rift within the lute. The marchers themselves, and millions throughout the world, were guiltily aware of an absent guest. For the victorious armies of Poland were not represented.

Though they had fought as gallantly as any of the other Allies, though they had helped save the very city in which the parade was being staged, they were now denied their rightful place in the victory march. Why? Because the British Government did not wish to offend our "democratic, freedom-loving" ally in Moscow.

It was a cruel insult, and symbolic of the confusions, the stupidities, the moral bankruptcy which have crowded the world to the brink of a third world war. Time has not healed the wound of conscience represented by the betrayal of Poland. In America, as in all other countries, there are those who remember and they are determined to keep the memory fresh.

During the war it was often said that Poland is the test case of democracy. For those who fought side by side with the Polish armies-in-exile, that is still the test. They will not consider the war against totalitarian enslavement won until Poland is free.

"If the Policy of Russian Containment Has Failed, What Alternative Is Now Left?—The Atom Bomb and the Long-Range Bomber Are Certainly the Most Effective and Perhaps the Only Useful Weapons We Would Have at Our Disposal in a Full-Scale War If It Should Come in the Near Future"—Washington (D. C.) Star Editorial

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the long years I have served in this body the editorial columns of the Washington Star have never failed to contribute substantially to a more complete understanding of almost any question which has come before Congress.

With last week's press, the commentators, and the air waves vibrant with news of world conditions, the Washington Star of Wednesday last carried one of the most thought-provoking, comprehensive, analytical, and informative discussions

with respect to current happenings in Korea, at Lake Success, and elsewhere, that has yet come to my observation.

This particular article traced the history of our country from that memorable day upon which Patrick Henry made his famous address to the Virginia Assembly. In this, he warned his fellow members against the inclination of men to indulge in illusions of hope, and, in doing so, challenged his colleagues to tell how they could gather strength by irresolution of action.

Mr. Speaker, I recall but few editorials, upon any subject whatever, that were more thoroughly thought provoking and constructive than the editorial "Gentlemen May Cry Peace, Peace," as published in the Star of Wednesday, November 29, a day of dark despair. I believe it will be recorded as one of the most momentous days in the history of our Nation.

It will long be remembered as the day upon which, while hundreds of thousands of Chinese Reds were assaulting the United Nations' lines in North Korea, Andre Vishinsky was crying out his denunciation of the United States as an aggressor Nation. Concomitant with these actions, representatives of the Red Chinese were being received at Lake Success in a veritable bower of American roses and other blooms. Altogether, it completed as ghastly a word picture as one could paint of history in this modern day.

Mr. Speaker, I have been telling my colleagues in this House, for 2 years past, that "American air power is world-peace power."

I have repeatedly pointed out that the only thing that has contained the Russians, and has long kept them from openly attacking these United States, was the power of the Strategic Air Command of the United States Air Forces to deliver the atom bomb anywhere on this earth.

Now, when I say, "deliver the atom bomb," I do not mean to deliver it from an air base located somewhere in Europe, which air field could be quickly dominated and easily destroyed by the attack of the powerful air forces which we know the Russians now have.

Neither do I mean that we should depend upon delivery of the bomb from some so-called carrier or "floating air base," that upon discovery, would be sought out and bombed to the bottom of the ocean under the might of Russian bomber air attack.

My theory, from the very time it became evident that we would be called to defend our country, was to effect that defense with land-based military aircraft, which, leaving our own air fields here in these United States, would deliver a payload of atom bombs, and which aircraft, while scattering confusion, death, and destruction, over the Soviet Union, would at the same time, destroy Russia's power to make effective war upon us here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this country will some day recognize the debt that it owes to the foresight of Louis Johnson, Stu Symington, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, and all others of that little band of harrassed but patriotic public officials, who had the courage and the guts to stand up and, in the face of bitterest opposition, to perfect their plans and actually accomplish the building of a land-based fleet of United States Air Force B–36's—long-range intercontinental bombers—ships that can take off from our airfields here in the United States and, in nonstop flight, carry to the very heart of Moscow the one thing in the world that now makes the Kremlin tremble.

I well remember the aspersions, the castigations, the spreading of the "ugly rumors" here in the cloak rooms in this Capitol but a few months ago; but God bless those stalwart Americans who had the courage and the intestinal fortitude, in the interests of our national defense, to withstand the odium of vicious slander and build the United States Air Force B–36's, which, thank God, are now ready to defend this country in its hour of need.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the editor of the Washington Star upon that splendid article. Every Member of both Houses of the Congress, regardless of their party, should acquaint themselves with the subject covered by the Star editorial, which reads as follows:

GENTLEMEN MAY CRY, PEACE, PEACE

One hundred and seventy-five years have rolled by since Patrick Henry made his famous address to the Richmond Assembly—since he chided the gentlemen who were crying peace when there was no peace; since he warned against the inclination of man to indulge in the illusions of hope; since he asked whether we shall gather strength by irresolution and inaction. Throughout those years millions of men have given up their lives for the freedoms and liberties which Patrick Henry so ably championed. And yet, despite all of the sacrifices, despite all of mankind's material advances since 1775, the remaining citadels of freedom and liberty in the world are threatened as they have never been threatened before.

Patrick Henry was trying to arouse his fellow men, to prod them into throwing off the shackles of the mind so they would be able to see and understand the real nature of the crisis which had already begun to engulf them. We need something of the same thing today. We need to take another look at the assumptions and the hopes upon which our course of action has been based. We need to ask ourselves whether we have lapsed into a state of mind where the longing for peace and the dread of war have combined to blind us to the fact that in the larger sense there is no peace. We need to face up to the fact that we will drift into certain disaster unless we are willing to make decisions, perhaps painful decisions, and then act intelligently upon them.

What is one to think of the fantastic spectacle in the United Nations where the Chinese Communists, with blood on their hands, stand in the role of accuser and Russia's Mr. Malik puts the United States in the defendant's box? Not until yesterday, and then at the last possible moment, did our delegate, Mr. Austin, revise his prepared speech to bring a complaint of aggression against the Chinese. What is the rationale of this topsy-turvy business? It was the United Nations which decreed the use of armed force against the North Korean aggressors. Does anyone believe that the UN can serve the interests of peace, or of security, by seeking a place to hide from this new and uglier fact of Chinese aggression?

In his earlier remarks to the General Assembly's political committee, Mr. Dulles, representing this country, devoted most of his effort to a review of the occasions upon which the United States has demonstrated its good will toward China. He spoke of the bond which this record has forged between the people of China and the people of the United States—a bond "that the Soviet Government is now trying, and I am convinced fruitlessly, to break." At the moment that Mr. Dulles was speaking a Chinese Communist army of 200,000 men was smashing through the front of the UN forces in Korea—an assault which General MacArthur describes as an "entirely new war." Is it possible to square Mr. Dulles' hopeful words with the fact of what the Chinese are doing? Can we have peace with the Chinese people by closing our diplomatic eyes when their leaders wage open war against us?

If there is one clear fact which emerges from all this business, it is the fact that we are at war—now. It is not a final, all-out war, but it is war nevertheless. And it is a war which has taught certain lessons and which raises still other questions.

We should be asking ourselves whether our policy of containment has not been tried and found wanting. That policy was based on the assumption that the Communists, and the Russian Communists in particular, would continue to expand unless checked by a show of force, but that they would not expand at the risk of war. The thought was that the Russians could be held in check, or contained, by interposing against them our own military forces, or the forces of allies that had become economically and militarily strong. To say the least, that assumption has become an exceedingly dubious one, if for no other reason than that the containing military forces simply do not exist.

But if the policy of containment has failed, what alternatives are left?

One possibility is a political settlement in Asia which would enable us to break off the war. This, no doubt, is being carefully explored. But we should not build false hopes. It is unlikely that a settlement can be made which will not leave the Communists as masters of Asia, and if we voluntarily accept such a settlement we must expect to pay the price in loss of prestige and potential allies throughout the world. If we reject such a settlement we might be forced to get out of Asia as best we can. If that should happen the minimum penalty would be the loss of everything we have been fighting for there.

Another possibility is that we may accept what comes in Korea, and go on from there. But where will we go and how will we get there?

If the decision should be to fight and not to retreat, we must face the question of whom we are to fight, and where and how.

Such a decision as this could be expected to result only in total war. We would be at war with Russia, and with all of the satellites that Russia could bring into the battle. Considering the enormous superiority in manpower that the enemy would have—and manpower of excellent fighting qualities if one may judge from our experience in Korea—could we hope to fight on the ground anywhere in Asia or Europe? Would a war of land armies spell disaster for us?

Could we fight and in any sense win such a war with air power? The atom bomb and the long-range bomber are certainly the most effective and perhaps the only useful weapons we would have at our disposal in a full-scale war if it should come in the near future. What is the state of our thinking with respect to these weapons and their possible use?

A commission of eminent men, headed by Bishop Angus Dun, of Washington, has taken the position, in a report to the Federal Council of Churches, that we would be justified in using the atom bomb or any comparable weapon only after it has been used by an enemy.

This position, of course, was taken on moral grounds. But we should also consider its

military implications. Suppose that this kind of thinking should prevail and that we should find ourselves at war with Russia. Where and how would we fight? Would we send an American army across 3,000 miles of ocean and attempt to fight the Russians and their satellites in Europe? If so, what is one to think of the hundreds of thousands, probably millions, of American soldiers who would be sent to their deaths in that operation? And how would we get at the real centers of Russian military power deep in the Soviet heartland? Have we forgotten the fate which overtook the German army that Hitler sent marching into Russia? Is there really any valid reason, moral or otherwise, why we must wait until the Russians have blasted our industrial centers before we blast theirs? Has anyone a moral right to insist that our hands remain tied until untold numbers of American civilians have been killed and maimed by the enemy?

Certainly all of these are questions that the American people should be thinking about, and thinking very seriously about, today. It is much easier, of course, to ask questions than it is to know what the answers should be. No layman has the competency to make the decisions that are pressing in upon us. Still, the decisions will have to be made; we cannot escape them. And that force which we speak of as public opinion will play its part.

This being so, there is compelling need for a public opinion which rests on facts as the people are best able to ascertain the facts. We have moved too close to the edge of disaster to accept decisions that are shaped by the cry for peace when there is no peace. We should admit to ourselves that any decisions will be hard decisions. There is nothing left to us except a choice among evils. If this seems to be a repelling outlook, let us remember that it is true, and true in a very literal sense, that we have come to the point where our survival depends upon our ability and our willingness to make decisions that are hard to make, and to act upon them with determinition once they have been made. If we let ourselves be borne along irresolutely by the current of events, we shall certainly be carried to total disaster.

Irish-Jewish Amity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following summary of an address made by the Minister for External Affairs of Ireland, made in November 1950, in Dublin, Ireland, is quite interesting:

"There is nothing I would deplore more than any tendency to arouse sectarian bitterness toward any group in our midst who held religious views different from those of the majority of the people," said the Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Sean MacBride, when he addressed a meeting of the Jewish Discussion Club in Dublin last week.

"This becomes even more despicable if it is done under the cloak of religion, and is little short of prostituting the true meaning and purpose of religious faith."

He was convinced there were no people in the world more sincerely and genuinely attached to the principles of civil and religious liberty than the Irish people North and South. The Irish Constitution specifically recognized the existence of religions other than that professed by the majority of the people.

Unfortunately, religious antagonisms and prejudices were used in an effort to maintain the conquest of the country. These antagonisms and prejudices were foreign to the nature of the Irish people. One of the worst evils of Partition lay in the fact that its continuance depended upon the maintenance of religious intolerance.

"Speaking, I think, for the vast majority of our people," said Mr. MacBride, "I can say we will always guarantee absolutely fair play and equality of treatment to religious minorities within our shores. For these reasons I am sure that this government, or any other Irish Government, will always be prepared, by means of constitutional guarantees or otherwise, to meet fears which may have been created in the minds of a section of our fellow countrymen in the six counties."

Unfortunately, sectarianism and intolerance still operated in the partitioned area of Ireland to deprive those who aspired to the territorial unity of the island, of their political and economic rights.

The more violent and obvious weapons, such as pogroms, had been avoided in recent years, but in various indirect ways, such as gerrymandering, discrimination in the allocation of houses and discrimination in employment, the Nationalist population of the six counties was subjected to constant pressure.

One of the worst effects of intolerance and sectarianism was that it inevitably tended to breed counter-sectarianism. That was one of the dangers against which they had to guard. He thought they had been successful so far in avoiding any tendency to victimize any section of the minority in the 26 counties.

LOYALTY OF JEWISH COMMUNITY

"The Jewish community," said Mr. MacBride, "has always cooperated loyally with the national aspirations of the Irish Nation and as such deserves the thanks and appreciation of the Irish people. I hope that we, too, have always, on our side, shown fair play, understanding and tolerance to the members of the Jewish community in relation to their problems and aspirations.

"One of your former illustrious Chief Rabbis, Rev. A. Gudansky, often paid tribute to the fairness and religious tolerance of the Irish and pointed to the fact that, unlike many other nations, the Irish people might justly take pride in the fact that not a drop of innocent Jewish blood had ever been shed on the soil of Ireland. We are grateful for that fact, and we take pride in it."

Mr. MacBride underlined the points of similarity between the history and trials of the Jewish people and of the Irish race and pointed out that Jewish and Irish people living in other lands, while good citizens of the countries of their adoption, had maintained a deeprooted attachment to their own religion and to the ideals of the people from which they sprang.

Program for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that the United States is presently facing and is involved in the most serious situation in which our country has ever found itself. There is nothing accidental about Soviet imperialism forcing aggression upon and by Red China, just as there is nothing accidental about the aggressions of Soviet imperialism in Europe. Geigor Zinoviev, chairman of the Third International, is quoted as having said in 1920:

> The real revolution will blaze up only when 800,000,000 people who live in Asia unite with us, when we see hundreds of millions of people in revolt. Now we must kindle a holy war against British, French, and American capitalists.

The subjugation of the people of Asia for the benefit of the Soviet empire has been in progress for decades. The situation requires prompt and all-out action, not only for the benefit of others but for our own survival.

I believe that our manpower requirements are now closer to 10,000,000 men in the armed services than the 3,000,000 which were once mentioned. I believe that we must have universal military service without deferments for education and other matters of that kind. Many other things must be done to strengthen our Armed Forces; but I wish now to address myself chiefly to matters not purely domestic. I suggest that we do the following:

First. Issue an ultimatum to Red China to cease firing within 24 hours and remove all of its troops to the Manchurian border within 10 days, failing which, ports, munitions factories, troop concentrations, and all other military targets will be bombed with any appropriate bomb—including the atomic bomb—wherever those targets may be located in China.

Second. Give munitions and combat matériel to Nationalist Chinese guerrillas, who have been estimated to be about a million in number. But no American troops should be sent into China.

Third. Accept the offer by Nationalist China to send troops to Korea and to the mainland of China to engage in combat with the aggressor, Red China.

Fourth. Give financial aid to Yugoslavia in its present famine condition as long as it would seem to prevent a Soviet-sponsored revolution.

Fifth. Continue, but greatly diminish, Marshal-plan aid to virtually recovered Europe.

Sixth. Continue military aid to our allies but restrict such aid to those who firmly agree to assist, by fixed quotas, in putting down aggression.

Seventh. Supplement the present collaborative UN police forces by UN police-authority troops under direction of the General Assembly, UN-financed, manned by volunteers or draftees of any country, including the smaller nations and Japan and Germany. As soon as possible, Japanese and German armies should be established.

Eighth. Intervene with dynamic diplomacy in Red-threatened areas. For example, the existing government in Burma, mainly in the control of the plainsmen, should be encouraged to give more consideration to the Karen and the Mon, whom I believe to be interested in an independent Burma and not in the

Soviet imperialistic desires, but who presently are so little considered that the presence of Communist troops in northern Burma and the presence of munitions in south China endanger the area very greatly.

I also believe that we should exert every effort to assist countries in bringing about land reforms. Here in America we have experienced monopolistic tendencies in management and in labor and have handled each by appropriate laws. We have never had a land reform problem of any magnitude. I believe that many countries in the world have neither management nor labor monopoly problems but have only experienced land monopoly problems. Solutions should be forthcoming in this field by taxation procedures or by other appropriate means. We should encourage European nations to agree on and effect such plans as the Schumann plan for pooling their steel and coal interests and plans to eliminate trade barriers and bring about currency convertibility, step up their production, and enforce their tax collections. Foreign nations should also be requested to assist more fully in furnishing troops and in stockpiling essential materials when they have received so much from the United States in the way of financial help.

I believe that America and the UN have followed a course of high principle and right action. I believe that good ultimately triumphs over evil and that we will win in the end; but that we must think, work and act promptly, and decisively in the present emergency. Nothing that I have said is meant to imply that I believe that peace may not yet be achieved without war against Russia. The answer to that is in the hands of imperialists in control of Russia and its satellites. So long as they act as they are now doing our chief hope lies in the rightness of our position and the armed strength of America. We have little time.

Health Insurance

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to an article in this week's Sunday Star by Jessie Fant Evans, one of the outstanding newswomen in Washington. It is an account of the findings of Dr. Elizabeth Webb Wilson, internationally known woman actuary and author of a recent book on compulsory health insurance.

That the House may be informed, I am including the article with my remarks.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of December 3, 1950]

WOMAN GETS FIRST-HAND DATA ON MEDICINE IN ENGLAND

(By Jessie Fant Evans)

Challenging statements in regard to the British socialized medicine program are made by Dr. Elizabeth Webb Wilson, internationally known woman actuary and author of a recent book on compulsory health insurance. Dr. Wilson, a former resident of this city, is here for a series of economic conferences. She holds a Ph. D. from Radcliffe College, wears a Phi Beta Kappa key, and won her A. B. and M. A. degrees at George Washington University, as well as the GWU alumni achievement award.

She says: "The British compulsory, socialized medicine program is costing three times what the Government anticipated it would. Both doctors and patients are at the mercy of regulation by bureaucrats. For instance, a physician in Great Britain cannot now move his office into the next block, take on an assistant, or go on an extended vacation unless his petition to do so is approved by the local council, representing the Ministry of Health."

She also quotes Lord Horder, the King's physician, as saying, "The progress of British medicine has been set back 100 years by the National Health Service."

MADE SECOND SURVEY

Dr. Wilson attended the centenary of the British Institute of Actuaries in London in 1948 and was the only woman granted the privilege of speaking before it. She subsequently made an intensive 3-month study of the socialized medicine program. She recently returned from another 3 months follow-up survey of how it is working.

"I have never been so intensively occupied in my life," Dr. Wilson told me. "I visited high and low in my efforts to get accurate answers to four questions: (1) What is happening to the economy of the country because of the service? (2) How are the inevitable controls acting on the liberties of physicians and patients? (3) How is it affecting the quality of medical care? (4) What do people think of it?"

With regard to the first two questions, she stated: "Britain is spending between 4 and 5 percent of her national income for the service. This is more than 10 percent of the taxes she collects. Workers pay only a small part through payroll deductions. The rest comes from income and sales tax collections." She quoted Sir Hubert Henderson, British economist, to the effect that "expenditures for the National Health Service are peculiarly inflationary."

COST EXCEEDS ESTIMATES

According to Dr. Wilson, before the service started, its advocates expected it would cost about £152,000,000. In its third year £464,000,000 have been appropriated and possibly the estimate may be exceeded. She pointed out that this is not a complete accounting since there has been no hospital expansion although there are 90,000 in London waiting hospitalization. She also claims there are no new nurses' homes, although there are 40,000 nurses needed, many of whom could be secured if housing were available.

"Inevitably, when the bill is presented, it will be higher than the £500,000,000 set as the danger line by Dr. Ff. Rogers, British medical economist," she stated.

"Naturally," Dr. Wilson continued, "the pressure from the exchequer for economy is resulting in more and more controls. Already doctors, dentists, and pharmacists are regimented by the fact that Minister of Health Bevan is to all intents and purposes the only employer of their professional skill. As such he has cut remuneration of the dentists and pharmacists to less than was promised before the service began. The general practitioners too, are contending Mr. Bevan has never paid them their due. The result is that both English family doctors and Scottish pharmacists are threatening to leave the service."

She called attention to the threat last October of the British Medical Association to pull 19,000 doctors out of the Labor Government's free medical treatment program, unless their pay raise is significant.

With the Ministry of Health owning 96 percent of the hospitals, specialists are chained to their posts as definitely as if shackles were visible, she quoted from the Martin report.

"GROCERY STORE" MEDICINE

In answer to question 3 her examples are the hurried prescription as a palliative instead of a cure, the cursory examinations, the patients' demands for specific drugs—"grocery store medicine," the doctors call it.

In conclusion she summed up her reply to her fourth question to this effect: "I interviewed 300 people whose opinions I did not know in advance. A majority were from the lower-income groups. Much to my surprise I found that three out of four did not like the service. They criticized the quality of care and resented its cost to their government and thus to them in taxes."

In pursuit of information she visited a factory in Birmingham which turns out small household appliances. Here, she talked with each worker. "Then," she said, "I sat in a doctor's surgery, or office, as we would call it, situated in a factory district. He saw 90 patients in 3 hours, some of whom had to wait more than 2 hours for about 2 minutes of his time. I talked to hairdressers, station porters, waitresses, people, in queues before restaurants and in crowds awaiting a glimpse of Winnie (Winston Churchill) and the news of Princess Anne's birth."

Dr. Wilson was a guest at the Queen's garden party. She had tea and dinner with the Prime Minister and Mrs. Attlee and their family at Checquers and she was the first woman to have luncheon in the offices of the Friends' Provident and Century Insurance Co., of which J. Douglas Pringle, one of Britain's prominent industrialists is president. Lady Frank's father, Mr. Tanner, is chairman of the board. She sat between these two distinguished gentlemen.

Free Child's Armor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth is meeting this week in Washington. More than 5,000 delegates representing parents, social, medical, and other professional groups, schools, churches, civic bodies of all types, and other community leaders working in behalf of children are meeting with similar groups from all other States. Their purpose at this Conference is to share their thinking and opinions on how we can develop in children the spiritual, emotional, and mental qualities that are essential to individual happiness and to responsible citizenship. They will consider what physical, economic, and social conditions are deemed necessary to achieve this objective.

The results of this meeting, therefore, will be reflected for years to come in the programs for children which are developed by citizens in States and localities throughout the country. I should like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial about this Conference. It is

from the Washington Post for December 4. The editorial follows:

FREE CHILD'S ARMOR

The timing is perfect for the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth which opened yesterday. For the conference in its accent on the emotional and spiritual aspects of the child's development is reaffirming the Nation's faith in the worth of the individual. It is saying: We Americans, despite the great peril we now face from the latest upsurge of barbarian forces, will not develop our children merely as cannon fodder, robots, Spartans, or even physically healthy animals. More than ever we will try to give them the inner stability that free human beings need.

The physical is not being forgotten—how could it be when four out of five children live in families with income less than $3,000 a year?—but the main objective of the 5,000 citizens attending is to find out how their communities can best help the American child to develop a healthy personality. For we are at last realizing that this is not only the best insurance against the warped mind that breeds the fanatic, the hatemonger, the tyrant, but is also the genesis of the responsible citizen upon whom the survival of free democratic government depends.

Even before world tensions grew so acute, those preparing for this fifth White House conference recognized that the way of the midcentury child would be hard. Social and technological change gave him a great test of adaptation. It was foreseen, also, that he would be shadowed by world uncertainty and confusion. Now it looks as if his way might be even more dangerous. For, in the world of this decade, for which the conference will set this Nation's major goals for children, the free child finds himself greatly outnumbered by the hordes of the regimented. As he grows up he will find himself one of a relatively small brigade that must uphold mental enlightenment and human freedom against ruthless primitive masses seeking the slavery of the spirit. To do this he must be given the "strength of ten" through his emotional stability, maturity, self-discipline and creativeness.

It is the aim of the present conference to gather together what we know today about the development of healthy personality in children and to put that knowledge to work through homes, schools, churches, community agencies. In doing that it is contributing the most valuable future defense to America.

The Lawyer in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a portion of the speech made by Rear Adm. G. L. Russell, United States Navy, before the student body of Vanderbilt Law School on November 16, 1950. Admiral Russell discussed the Navy's part in the new military justice bill passed in this session of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAWYER IN UNIFORM

Dean Forrester, members of the faculty, students of Vanderbilt University, ladies and gentlemen: What, you ask me, does a lawyer in uniform do? I'll answer that to the best of my ability, but confine the description to the lawyer in the Navy, with the observation that lawyers in the Army and Air Force have a somewhat different status, and that while their duties are the same in some respects, they do not match all the way along the line.

For convenience, and I hope for clarity, law work in the Navy under my cognizance may be divided into two categories. The first, representing about one quarter of the total, is court-martial work. The other category takes in everything else except procurement, which is not under my cognizance, and which is handled entirely by civilian attorneys in time of peace. Time does not permit of more than a cursory discussion of the non-court-martial work but I will try to tell you something about it.

As you must know, there is a great number of statutes relating to the Navy and the Navy Department, some of which apply equally to the Army and the Air Force. Obviously, some one must advise the Secretary of the Navy, on what amounts to a daily interpretation basis, as to what he must do, what he may do, and what he may not do, legally, to administer his department in accordance with the law. Some of the opinions given him are not too difficult to prepare, others require considerable research. In spite of all efforts to draft laws that will be unambiguous and need no construction, we are constantly called upon to construe not only statutes, but regulations issued under the authority of statutes. Questions of pay and allowances, promotion and retirement are most frequent, but there are hundreds of others. For example, I had occasion last winter to go into the question of the power of appointment and removal vested in the President.

Since the enactment of the Federal Tort Claims Act our work on claims has increased tremendously, both in volume and importance. If a Navy plane crashes into a house, or collides with a nonmilitary plane, we get the claim. If a plane scares a farmer's turkeys, or his foxes, or his mink, we get the claim. If a Navy vehicle is involved in an accident, we get that, too. We have authority to settle these claims up to $1,000 but we do not participate in litigation beyond doing the so-called spade work for the Department of Justice.

The handling of legislation is another extremely important activity. We draft and report upon bills, coordinate them within the Navy Department, then with the Army and Air Force and the Secretary of Defense. Once that is done—and I might add that it is frequently more difficult to get a measure out of the Pentagon Building than it is to get it through Congress—it must be cleared by the Bureau of the Budget. It then goes to the Congress and when and if it is heard we furnish the witnesses and whatever information is requested. If enacted, it comes back through the Bureau of the Budget for recommendation as to Presidential action. This work is most interesting, and as I say, very important. It's quite a job to follow it all and keep all hands posted as to what happens and when. I might add that we have found WAVES very adept at keeping track of the day-to-day congressional matters of interest to the Navy Department, partly, no doubt, because women just love to be news gatherers.

In 1944 the Secretary of the Navy was by statute given authority to settle admiralty claims up to $1,000,000, and I believe I am correct that he is the only Government official except the Attorney General with authority to settle an affirmative claim. As a consequence, we do a rather large admiralty business, but as in the case of other claims, turn them over to the Department of Justice when they reach the litigation stage. The settlement authority referred to has worked unbelievably well. The great majority of claims are in fact settled to the satisfaction of all concerned, and there is a resulting saving to the taxpayer who is thereby spared the expenses of litigation. In addition a claimant does not have to wait forever to collect a just claim.

International law, covering everything from leased-base agreements to POW rules and agreements; tax law, which brings us in contact with nearly all State authorities and not a few Federal agencies; habeas corpus proceedings; questions of geographic jurisdiction; patent infringement suits; delivery of men to civil authorities and liaison with the Department of Justice are some of the other activities. Not the least work, I might add, comes in the well known administrative job of personnel planning and detailing.

Now for court-martial work, which a great many people think is all we do, and about which nearly every one has an opinion, usually violent. You will recall my remarks about the complexities of military service, and what it takes to put together, command, and support an efficient fighting organization. And bear in mind that a military organization adequate to win a war a few generations back would be not much larger than a good sized task force today. It should not be a newly discovered feature or aspect of military operations, and I don't say that it is; but it is true that we have come to realize more clearly than ever before, that the morale of an organization, which is so vital to its success, can be and will be high or low according to the quality and accuracy of the administration of justice by the responsible officers in that organization.

Here is something that has not changed, that is, no one has invented anything that makes simple justice any different today than it ever was. Human nature, I think, was pretty much the same in the days of Caesar, and of Charlemagne, and of George Washington, and Napoleon, and Sam Houston, as it is now. A square deal is still a square deal. The goal is very simple, indeed. The ways and means to attain that goal are not so easy to come by, particularly when people are under pressure. Besides, as a Congressman told me a couple of years ago, dealings in human relationships—like the law—cannot be reduced to an exact science. As it goes without saying that we can't please everyone all the time, and as we too are subject to the human frailties that sometimes lead us into error, we won't be right all the time. The best we can hope for is a good batting average.

At this point I should like to philosophize a bit more. Justice and discipline are two different things. Discipline may, but by no means must, include punishment. Discipline is the result of training, which if successful, produces the officer and men who not only carry out orders properly, but give them intelligently. In a sense, discipline has broken down when punishment becomes necessary. Also, law and justice are not synonymous, and there has been many a law school story highlighting the difference. When, then, once we are clear on the matter of definitions, is the objective?

There has been some considerable confusion of thought, I believe, with respect to courts martial as a method of trial and punishment, particularly when attempts are made to compare them to our civil courts.

One reason for this confusion, I believe, is the failure to appreciate what a system of justice in a military organization is designed to do. As I have said, it is primarily to make that organization a more effective fighting unit, whereas the criminal statutes and our criminal courts are set up for a different purpose, namely, to protect society. Moreover, we in the service try our best to keep the standards of conduct as high as possible, within reason. Times without number the welfare and perhaps the lives of a man's shipmates depend on what he does. Any comparison between courts martial and the criminal courts is therefore likely to lead to erroneous conclusions. For example, the charge has been made that because the percentage of acquittals and reversals is lower for courts martial, our courts martial are arbitrary. That by no means follows—it may even mean that pretrial investigation has been more thorough.

In any event, it was decided in 1948, following a series of surveys, boards, and committees, to modernize our systems of military justice, and while we were about it, draw up a code of uniform application to the three services. It so happens that two of the individuals who were instrumental in framing and enacting this code are right here in Tennessee, and one of them is at this very law school. Professor Morgan, as many of your know, was the author of the code, and spent some 8 or 10 months in collaboration with representatives of the three military departments and the Secretary of Defense while it was in preparation. It may well be that Professor Morgan feels that he accomplished something in spite of all the advice he received—I believe I can state without fear of contradiction that it is no easy job to referee any argument between the Armed Services.

The other individual from this State was Senator KEFAUVER, who was chairman of the Senate subcommittee to which the bill was referred. Such a bill, representing as it did, after several generations, practically a new constitution governing the conduct and specifying the rights of personnel of the armed services, required the undivided attention of top flight lawyers in the Congress, and it certainly received it in both House and Senate. Senator KEFAUVER's contribution was tremendously important, and he and his subcommittee—congressional committees and their work are frequently underestimated, I believe—gave the measure the careful and objective study it deserved.

When I was invited to come here I was told that while the subject matter of the code will be discussed here at some future date, I need not avoid all reference to it. I should be less than honest if I were to say I subscribe to everything in it, and for that matter I doubt if anyone considers it perfect, and the law itself calls for annual recommendations looking to its improvement, after it becomes effective next May.

The other day, in a conversation about the code, an attorney remarked to me that the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps had been in existence for some 150 years, and wouldn't you think some of the troublesome problems presented would have long since been settled—well, yes, I would; but the Supreme Court is still construing the Constitution, and besides, there was a widespread feeling that service personnel could do with a few more guarantees and safeguards for their protection. That, in a nutshell, is the basis and philosophy of the new code.

To quite a considerable degree, the safeguards in the code consist of requirements that the more important cases be tried by qualified lawyers, and I use the word "tried" advisedly. Every man will be entitled to a full-fledged lawyer for his counsel, and there will be another doing the prosecuting. In addition, still another will sit as a nonvoting member of the court and his duties will approximate those of a trial judge. Then when the record is reviewed in the first instance, a lawyer must have a hand in it, and finally, when it is transmitted to Washington, three more lawyers, set up about the same as an appellate court, go over it. The last word on most cases, so far as their legality is concerned, is to be lodged in a court of military appeals, to be composed of three civilian judges on the same level as the Federal circuit courts of appeal.

There are a few who are not satisfied yet, in that the new code does not completely divest a military commander of all connection with courts-martial, and they argue that so long as he has anything to do with them, there will be abuses of power. As an alternative, these few would have the commander prefer the charges and let what would correspond to a separate judiciary handle everything from there. In my judgment that would go much too far, and much farther than is necessary.

To give you some idea of how this code is being received in the fleet, I should like to read you a couple of paragraphs from a letter issued by the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Fleet, Admiral W. M. Fechteler, on November 6, just 10 days ago. I think it bodes well for the new code.

"The Commander in Chief desires that officers and men of the United States Atlantic Fleet regard this new code as a work of progress rather than as an instrument tending to impede and confuse the disciplinary process by the introduction of technicalities and undue restraints on those in command. Certain basic principles must be clearly understood and kept in mind. In civil life, criminal law seeks to protect society from the depredations of its irresponsible members without prejudice to fundamental individual rights by hasty, ill-considered, star-chamber action. In military life, military law must not only attain these ends but must do more. The primary objective of the military services is to win wars, not just fight them. Therefore, military law must not only restrain individuals for the protection of military society but must be an instrument which will assist in attaining the requirement that all members of the service march in a prescribed order. For this reason, certain acts which are considered inalienable rights in civil society are offenses in military society. For instance, the act of "telling off the boss." This is an inalienable right of the American civilian but in the military service it may well constitute an offense punishable by courts-martial. In civil life, if a man does not like his job he can quit it. Such action in the military service would be desertion. Likewise, in civil life if a group of people decide they do not like working conditions and walk off jointly, that is a strike. In the military service it is mutiny.

"Discipline is considered to be that attribute of a military organization which enables it to function in a coordinated manner under different circumstances. Many factors contribute to the building of a well-disciplined organization. One of the instruments for achieving and maintaining a high state of discipline is military law. It is further considered that those in the military service primarily responsible for discipline are those in command. It is a primary command function. For this reason all the factors contributing to the attainment of a high state of discipline should be controlled by and exercised by those in command with intelligent understanding. To do so requires a thorough knowledge of the tools available to do the job."

Considering the requirements of the code for lawyers, and the needs of the service occasioned thereby, every Navy lawyer will have to be thoroughly grounded in court-martial law and procedure. At present not quite all of them are, but they will be in due course, before they are assigned duty that would include that type of work.

Navy lawyers in uniform fall into three categories. There are about 50 who are unrestricted line officers (like myself) and eligible to command at sea or on shore. These officers studied law, obtained a degree, and were admitted to the bar as naval officers, just as others go in for engineering, or ordnance, or some other postgraduate work. Then there are some 240 who are law specialists. They also are line officers, but of a restricted type, and their duties are primarily, but not necessarily exclusively, in law work. The rest are Reserve officers on active duty and their number will depend on the size of the Navy as determined by the Congress to be necessary for the maintenance of our world position.

I believe most Reserve officers are familiar with the procedure being followed in their call to active duty. If not, I shall be glad to answer any questions. As to the law specialist group, we have authority to commission as lieutenants (junior grade) a limited number of law-school graduates each year—this year we are taking in 14—on a career basis. I am not here on a recruiting trip, but if anyone is interested, the basic requirements are a degree from an accredited law school, membership in the bar of a Federal court, or the highest court of a State or Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia, and age between 21 and 32.

There are, of course, a great many features of the Navy lawyers' life and duties that I could not cover this morning. I suppose also that there is a great deal more to be said about the armed services, their proper place in our national economy and way of life, and the difficulties involved in finding the right answer to the various problems with which we as a nation are faced. If however, we can see the forest through the trees, it seems clear enough that lawyers, individually and collectively, can and should make a direct contribution to our national defense. There is very definitely a place for them that can be filled by no other group of men. If what I have said this morning has helped you in your thinking, or has even stimulated your thinking, the trip to Nashville, which, as I said, has been most pleasant and enjoyable, will have been worth while.

Address of Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., Archbishop of Boston, on Thursday evening, August 3, at the Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass.:

I have already wished you ten thousand times ten thousand welcomes. I renew those greetings in measure overflowing. No visitors are more welcome than the Hibernians. None should feel more at home in our city. People frequently refer to Boston in terms of its so-called Irish-American complexion and character. Sometimes they intend the

description as a compliment. Whether they do or not, we always take it as one.

In any case, the most far-traveled among you must by now feel at home in Boston.

"The heart of staid Massachusetts
The home of the pike and the cod,
Where some still spring from the Pilgrims
But most of us come from the Sod!"

Tonight's dinner is really a going-away party. Many of you will now be leaving Boston to return to your several homes. Tomorrow I leave on Holy Year Pilgrimage to Rome. By this time tomorrow night I shall be on the high seas.

Ocean travel is undoubtedly a great thing, but I must confess that I share Mr. Dooley's opinion of it. Some of you must remember Mr. Dooley's famous conversation with Mr. Hennessy on the subject. It is worth recalling:

"Don't ye make a mistake. A boat's a boat. That's all it is. Annything ye can get at sea ye can get betther on land. A millyonaire is made as comfortable on an ocean liner as a longshoreman on earth, an' ye can play that comparison all th' way down to th' sterrage. Whin I read about this here floatin' palace, I says to mesilf: 'I'll add a little money, and go acrost in Oryental luxury.' Whin I got aboord th' decks were crowded with happy people worryin' about their baggage an' wondherin' already whether th' inspector in New York wud get on to th' false bottom iv th' thrunks. I give th' old an' enfeebled English gintleman that carried me satchel a piece iv silver. He touched his cap to me an' says 'Cue', 'tis th' English f'r 'I thank ye kindly' in Irish. He carried me bag downstairs in th' ship. We kept goin' down an' down till we touched bottom, thin we rambled through long lanes neatly decorated with steel girders till we come to a dent in th' keel. That was me boodoor. At last, part iv it was. There were two handsome berths in it, an' I had th' top wan. Th' lower wan was already occypied be a gintleman that had started to feel onaisy on th' way down fr'm London, an' was now prepared f'r th' worst. I left him to his grief, an' wint up on th' roof iv th' ship.

"It was a gay scene, f'r th' boat had started. Long rows iv ladies were stretched on invalid chairs, with shawls over thim, pretindin' to read, an' takin' deep smells at little green bottles. Three or four hundherd men had begun to walk around th' ship with their hands folded behind thim. A poker game between four rale poker players an' a man that didn' know th' game, but had sharp fingernails, was already started in th' smokin'-room. About that time I begun to have a quare sinsation. I haven't been able to find out yet what it was. I must ask Dock O'Leary. I wasn't sea-sick, mind ye. I'm a good sailor. But I had a funny feelin' in me forehead between me eyes. It wasn't a headache exactly, but a kind iv a sthrange sinsation like I used to have whin I was a boy, an' thried to look cross-eyed. I suppose it was th' strong light. I didn't have anny aversion to food. Not at all. But somehow I didn't like th' smell iv food. It was disagreeable to me, and' it seemed to make th' place in me head worse. Sivral times I wint to th' dinin'-room intindin' to jine th' jovyal comp'ny there, but quit at th' dure. It was very sthrange. I don't know how to account f'r it. Very few people were sea-sick on th' v'yage, but sivral hundherd who were injyin' paddlin' a spoon in a cup iv beef-tea on deck spoke iv havin' th' same sinsation. I didn't speak iv it to th' ship's doctor. I'd as lave carry me ailments to a harness-maker as to a ship's doctor. But there it was, an' fr'm me pint iv view it was th' most important ivint iv th' passage. * * * An' there ye ar're. A boat's a boat aven whin it looks like a hotel. But it's wondherful, annyhow. Whin ye come to think iv it, 'tis wondherful that anny man cud cross th' Atlantic in annything. Th' Atlantic Ocean is a fine body iv wather, but it's a body iv wather just th' same. It wasn't intinded to be thravelled on. Ye cud put ye'er foot through it annywhere. It's sloppy going' at best. Th' on'y time a human being can float in it is afther he's dead."

"Well, it's all very well, but f'r me th' dhry land," said Mr. Hennessy. "Will ye iver cross th' ocean again?"

"Not," said Mr. Dooley, "till they asphalt it an' run th' boats on throlleys."

However, I am leaving tomorrow. I ask you to think of me when I get the quare sinsation.

Much more seriously, I beg your prayers and I promise you my own. Let our prayers for one another be the favorite prayer of the Irish—the rosary. We are planning while on board ship to recite the rosary together every day, just as we have been doing here in Boston by radio for many months, just as the families of Ireland have been doing from time immemorial. The rosary has become the national prayer of the Irish. It is a prayer beloved by the sons and daughters of every land, but it is particularly associated with Ireland and the Irish, with Irish homes and Irish mothers.

There have been many poems about the place of the rosary in the spiritual life of our people. Everyone knows the beautiful verses entitled "The Trimmins on the Rosary." The other day I found some other verses entitled "An Irish Mother's Rosary."

"I bless myself and I kiss the cross, and the holy creed I tell;
And the Pat'rs and Aves trip off my tongue, for it's me that knows them well,
Sure it's many a day these same old beads I told in the same old way—
I got them my first communion morn, and that's 70 years today.
'Twas the joyful mysteries then I liked, and I said them joyfully.
When our Lord was only a child Himself at His blessed mother's knee.
Ochone! But it's many and many a year I've turned from the joyful deeds,
And I cry on the sorrowful mysteries with the tears as big as my beads.
For my beautiful boy with the fever went and himself soon after died.
Do you wonder I think of the mysteries that end with the Crucified?
For it's then, as I'm telling each blessed bead, a-kneeling beside my bed,
We two women, God's mother and me, have many a talk of our dead.
And that's why I'm liking the beads that tell of her pains and her darling son's;
Sure it's plenty of time I'll be having in heaven to think of the Glorious One."

So let our beads during this month, while so many of us are on pilgrimage, be said for one another; joyful, sorrowful, and glorious mysteries, let them unite us all in the communion of saints with Jesus and Mary and Joseph, the Holy Family so beloved by the Hibernians.

While I am speaking of prayers, there is another plea that I would like to make to this convention. Last spring at the annual dinner meeting of our Eire Society, a Boston group which has done so much to serve the cultural interests of the Irish everywhere, I spoke of Blessed Oliver Plunket. My remarks were taken up by the Irish press and apparently reproduced wherever there are Irishmen in the world, which means in every corner of the globe. I was particularly pleased to receive a message from the venerable and beloved primate of all Ireland, the archbishop of Armagh, who told me that my few words concerning Blessed Plunket had increased the hope that the eventual canonization of the great Irish martyr may be the sooner.

I certainly rejoice if such be the case. The archbishop asked me to renew whenever appropriate the plea I made to the Eire Society. I gladly do so at this time.

Last fall we went to Ireland on a great "come back to Erin" pilgrimage. We visited many beloved spots in the isle of saints and scholars, but none more profoundly moved me than did the modest shrine in great St. Peter's Church, Drogheda, where the head of Blessed Oliver Plunket is preserved for veneration.

It is surprising to reflect on how little people outside Ireland appear to appreciate the tremendous stature and historic significance of this great archbishop, patriot, and personality. It would, I think, be most appropriate if the Hibernians would interest itself in the cause of Blessed Plunket.

My purpose in suggesting such a reawakened interest is not to recall the injustices of the past nor otherwise to inflame partisan or political sentiments in the present. Quite the contrary. It is no longer necessary to rehearse the travesty of justice which was his trial; nor the incredible barbarities which accompanied his execution.

My purpose would rather be to present Blessed Oliver Plunket as an outstanding example of what the true Christian should be at all times and as a symbol of the spirit in which the true Irishman seeks the interests of his nation.

As a Christian, Blessed Plunket was kindly and considerate. He was humble in his great learning. He was assiduous in the fulfillment of the duties of his state in life. He was filled with a holy peace and he saw all events of life in a completely spiritual perspective. Few men in history have accepted injustice and even a brutally unjust death with such magnificent dignity and devout resignation.

He was a martyr for his faith. So far as we may use the word, he was also a martyr for Ireland. But his love for Ireland, it must be noted, did not make him the enemy of any other land. On the contrary, Blessed Plunket exemplifies the truly Catholic spirit in which differences between nations must always be resolved no matter what the previous history of injustice or of bitterness on either side.

We in America who have Irish blood in our veins, Irish hearts in our bosoms, whose Christian souls are in bodies with Irish nerves and Irish temperaments, have also much to learn from the Irish example of Blessed Oliver Plunket. We have a lesson to learn from him concerning the spirit of resolute, intrepid, blended faith and charity with which we must help America meet her obligations in the international community. The spirit of Blessed Plunket impels us to meditate soberly and prayerfully the wise words with which our Holy Father, the Pope, last week renewed his plea for peaceful methods of settling international disputes so long as such methods are humanly possible.

In the spirit of Blessed Plunket, we shall continue to abhor war even when it is forced upon us. We shall continue to ask that the arts of peace be employed in the effort to restore or establish order. But we shall not be cowards if traitors at home or abroad compel us instead to practice the science of war. If we be forced to wage war, it will not be war for the sake of the violence which is the Red's objective. It will be war in accordance with the patient principle which alone inspires the Christian when finally he takes up his arms: We go to war, as St. Augustine said, for the sake of peace, to preserve it where it still survives, to restore it where it has been destroyed.

So, too, we Americans of Irish descent should be guided by the spirit of Blessed Plunket in the sympathetic interest we naturally take in the affairs of old Ireland across the sea.

There has never been any question of our dividing civic loyalty between our American fatherland and the motherland of our people. The ties which unite us with Ireland are sentimental and dominantly spiritual. They are entirely consistent with unqualified

American patriotism. Our interest in Irish affairs is the interest of kinsmen in the fortunes of their physical and spiritual relatives. It is on the level of affections and prayers, not the level of politics, intrigue, or sabotage. There is no resemblance, for example, between it and the interest of bundists in the military aspirations of their fatherland. It certainly bears no resemblance whatsoever to the treacherous interest of American fellow-travelers, parlor pinks, and like disloyalists in the affairs of the Soviet. These ladies and gentlemen appear, at least as they reveal themselves in their disloyalty trials or espionage cases, to be thoroughly emancipated from any spiritual values such as constitute the chief tie between the Irish throughout the world and old Ireland. One finds in them scant trace of the sentiment or the poetry which ties hearts like yours to the land of your ancestors.

The love of our people for Hibernia has prompted them to greater, not lesser, service to America. Only in song has Ireland ever asked her sons and daughters to come back to Erin. In reality, she has always encouraged them to take their places in the communities which gave them place, retaining for Ireland only the affection of pious hearts and the gratitude of prayerful children.

Forty years ago an American writer of our own country as an example of this Irish quality of strengthening with God's grace the land which gives them shelter said: "This vast continent affords a most striking proof of what religion means to the Irish people. Count the colleges, schools, academies, hospitals, and asylums of charity that have sprung up as if by magic all over the land, and tell me is there anything that speaks more eloquently to the heart than the faith that inspired such unselfish devotion. Religion as a name is useless; it is only precious for what it enables us to be and to do. It is religion that has made the Irish people what they are. It has made them just toward others, lovers of order and progress, firm in the support of just authority, the courageous in resistance to lawless tyranny. No State can thrive without such virtuous citizens, and no country can be hopelessly lost that has the happiness of possessing them."

What Ireland's inspiration has brought into American national life, it once brought into the universal life of Christendom. Every scholar knows the part that the land of our fathers played in the Dark Ages, when once before the unity of Europe had crumbled under the attack of barbarians and the new glorius unity that was medieval Christendom was being forged by Christian apostles, so many of them Irish by birth. It may well be that once again holy Ireland is destined to play a civilizing and spiritualizing role in our divided and distraught international community, a role like to that which she played centuries ago.

In this connection I recall a prophetic word uttered with regard to the Irish people. Nearly 300 years ago a papal nuncio sent to Ireland by the Pope wrote back to Rome these words: "Ireland may yet become an outwork of the faith to Europe and its herald to America." Ladies and gentlemen, you are living in days which have seen this phophecy on the verge of fulfillment. Ireland has become an outwork of the faith to Europe, has been and is its herald to America. The Irish people, wherever they may be, are the champions of Christianity in a world menaced by Asiatic communism; they are foremost among those who, in the Old World and the New, are unswervingly committed to the traditions of Western civilization and Catholic Christianity which once gave origin, meaning, and purpose to our democracy and which can once again guarantee democracy's survival.

The enemies of faith and freedom, of democracy and Christianity, well know the devotion of the Irish people to the basic principles of western civilization. That explains their desire to embarrass Ireland whenever possible, to keep Ireland out of the councils of the world, to veto her admittance to international organizations. By such action Ireland's critics pay tribute to her integrity and reveal the malice of their own designs. By their action they confirm our conviction that Ireland, today as of yore, is the champion of light against darkness, of the things of the spirit against those of the flesh.

It seems profoundly significant, as well as bitterly ironic, that we should have read in the newspapers the other day an announcement concerning a group of volunteers from the Republic of Ireland, a republic excluded from the United Nations, who expressed their desire to fight by the side of American troops under the American flag, the United Nations or any flag in beating back the Red raiders on Korea—while the same newspapers reported to us the devices and dodges by which nations high in the councils of the United Nations still seek to avoid their responsibility in helping overcome the violence instigated by the Red regime whose representative is to preside over the deliberations of the United Nations Council this month—and whose representatives consistently and successfully object to the admittance into the United Nations of a genuine democracy, a duly constituted republic and a Christian nation like Ireland.

There is no point in attempting to understand the hypocrisy which debars Ireland from her proper place in the international community. I reaffirm my long-standing conviction that such action bears witness both to Ireland's integrity and to the fraudulent purposes of nations which unite in outlawing the Irish Republic, while making common cause with the Red regimes in Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, and the Soviet Republic subject to Moscow. The exclusion of Ireland from international organization is a fraud, a fraud which, as events are proving, will redound enormously to Ireland's good name.

So, too, our sympathetic interest in the fate of our kinsmen impels us to brand as a further fraud the reasons alleged for the continued partition of Ireland. The reasons offered are familiar. I need not rehearse them. Their wording changes according as the hypocrites who profit from the division shift their line to meet the exposure of their fraudulence.

No one will ever be able to understand why Americans, whose President gave the highest and most authoritative expression to the principal of national self-determination, should be so slow to speak up in behalf of Ireland's national self-determination. No one will ever be able to understand why Americans, who talk so much about the necessity for religious tolerance, should espouse in effect the cause of the Orangemen who hold religious tolerance in unconcealed contempt, as against the cause of the Irish whose undeniable record of religious tolerance is by all odds the fairest record of any nation in our day, our own not excepted. There is no Irish Catholic equivalent of the Ku Klux Klan, not even in reprisal. There is no Irish equivalent of the Orangemen nor of organizations like Protestants and Others United.

Last week I read in a news magazine a report filed by a group of Protestant ministers concerning what they were pleased to call violations of religious freedom in carefully selected areas of the world. I later read that some of their own leaders, lay and clerical, had repudiated the report for the specious phony that it is. But, nonetheless, it is typical of the kind of talk heard whenever one asks why a world so sensitive to discrimination elsewhere is so silent concerning the unparalleled discrimination by which an Irish minority in Ulster is virtually disenfranchised, while the overwhelming majority of the Irish people are denied self-determination of their own nation by the Orange minority in the six counties.

The fraudulent report of the ministers speaks of Ireland as one place where religious liberty is allegedly denied. For one wild moment it looked as if a truthful phrase had blossomed by chance in their report and that the ministers were referring to Northern Ireland, where religious persecution, coupled with economic and social discrimination on a strictly religious basis, has been and is the normal state of affairs.

But no. Come to find out, the report referred to the Irish Republic—and the Protestant government in Ulster was given a clean bill of health.

Seumas MacManus said the final word on this hypocrisy over 30 years ago when he wrote: "While such an idea as a Catholic mayor for Protestant Derry and Protestant Belfast is laughably absurd, such Catholic cities as Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Kilkenny, often honor Protestant citizens by making them their first magistrates. And while the idea of a Catholic Member of Parliament sitting for any of the Protestant counties of the northeast is ludicrously laughable, purely Catholic counties in both north and south frequently elect Protestants to represent them in Parliament.

"And finally, and above all, be it remembered that almost every man whom the Irish Catholics chose as their national leader from the days of Robert Emmet to the days of Charles Stewart Parnell, has been Protestant.

"There is bigotry in Ireland—bigotry of the most intolerant, most rampant type—but it is almost entirely confined to non-Catholics of the Brito-Irish part of the population."

The recent report of the ministers reminds us again of the old couplet:

"Forgiveness to the injured doth belong,
They ne'er forgive who do the wrong."

The other arguments advanced in favor of partition are equally fraudulent. Only a hypocrite would present them; only a fool would believe them. This is so much the case that I cannot believe partition can endure unless hypocrisy and folly are forever to gain the day. When common sense, common decency, and the voice of Christian conscience are again heard in international affairs, sheer logic will put an end to the farce of partition. No violent words need be spoken; no rebel shot need be fired; no involved diplomatic formulas need be devised or invoked.

That is why the defenders of partition are the only ones who are talking wildly these days. Our kinsmen, the Irish, are presenting the case against partition with reasoned dignity and Christian calm. The railing, the rudeness, and the vulgarity are all on the other side. Witness the bad-mannered, ill-considered attack of the Christian Science Monitor, for example, on the pronouncement here in Boston and elsewhere of His Excellency, the recently appointed Ambassador of Ireland to the United States. The Monitor departed from its customary pose of impartial objectivity in an attempt to render absurd the statesmanlike declaration of Mr. Hearn concerning the determination of the Irish people to achieve their national unity and their determination to achieve it without violence.

"National unity is the chief aim of the Irish people," the Ambassador said, "The whole soil of Ireland is the property and domain of the whole Irish people of today.

"Those who will tell you it is a complicated problem and plead for a division are as false as the woman who wanted to solve the problem of ownership of a little child in King Solomon's day by cutting it into two pieces.

"We want unity, but we also want peace. We are determined to achieve unity without a civil war."

That is statesmanlike talk. What is more important, it is also sensible talk. Their

kinsmen in American and the lovers of justice everywhere will wish the Irish every blessing in their effort to fulfill the legitimate aspirations of their nation within the framework of a policy inspired by a love for peace and a determination to preserve it.

So, I express the hope of you all that our generation will see Ireland one day united. The end of partition will bring a breath of hope to enslaved nations everywhere. The moral resistance to partition already sustains such hope: They who struggle for freedom are already free.

We who love America are naturally interested in the land which taught our people how and why and with what passion we must love this land of liberty. We who know the joy of living in a united nation—one nation under God, one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all—are under a special obligation to be sympathetic with the aspirations of old Ireland.

God bless America. Erin go Bragh. God bless Ireland.

Telegram From Relatives of Soldiers in First Marine Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, knowing the deep and heartfelt concern felt by relatives of men in the First Marine Division as they battle bitter cold and a ruthless enemy to free themselves from entrapment, I wish to insert the following telegram, which reveals that mothers, fathers, and wives of these men are praying for their deliverance and for divine guidance for those of us who occupy positions of responsibility in connection with our military effort in Korea. It is a touching message, quite unlike any other I have ever received. It should point out to everyone the importance of making Christian petition on behalf of our valiant soldiers. The telegram follows:

SAVANNAH, GA., *December 6, 1950.*
Hon. PRINCE H. PRESTON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Please deliver this telegram personally to President Truman. Prayerfully, our hearts bleeding by reason of the plight of our boys in Korea, we have assembled to ask God's protection for our boys and God's direction for you as you seek means to protect our boys' lives and to guarantee the priceless God-given gifts for which they have been mobilized. Following signatures are parents and relatives of First Marine Division:

Mr. and Mrs. Albert Galkin, Mr. and Mrs. Irving Alpern, Mrs. R. C. Walsh, Mr. and Mrs. I. J. Ryan, Sr., Mrs. Marie H. Rimes, Miss Cornelia Hattrich, Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Lawhon, Mr. and Mrs. M. R. Gandy, Mrs. Lawrence R. Kellerman, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Roberts, Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Bell, Mrs. Inez Hall, Mrs. William A. Hall, Mrs. James D. Hall, Mrs. Carolyn Richardson, Mrs. John E. McCrary, Mrs. Sally Stahl, Mrs. Robert Lee Weldy, Mrs. R. C. Weldy, Sr., Mrs. E. M. Howell, Mrs. John K. Stacy, Mrs. Charles G. Laird, Mrs. Julian O'Neal, J. W. O'Neal, Mrs. Ruth Jerrell, Mrs. Miles M. Pinckney, Sr., Mr. and Mrs. George H. Vickery, Jr., Mrs. Jacob E. Sullivan, Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Nelson, Mrs. E. D. Jenkins, Mrs. A. S. Davis, Mr. and Mrs. Milton Braun, Mr. and Mrs. H. E. Sikes, Patty Russell, Mrs. B. L. Jernigan, Jr., Mrs. Mae McCall, Mrs. H. S. Veno, Mrs. C. W. McCall, Jr., Mrs. David F. Clark, Mrs. B. L. Jernigan, Sr., Mr. and Mrs. L. B. Norton, Ann and J. Waring Horning, Mrs. G. A. Sullivan, Mr. and Mrs. William S. Vining, Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey P. Henderson, Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Faulk, Sr., Mrs. L. Rovolis, Lawrence Williams, Mary C. Williams, Mrs. Margaret Mullinix, Miss Ruth M. Peters, Charles W. McCall, Jr., Betty Rose Mason, Mrs. Gladys Heath, Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Baggs, Mr. and Mrs. John W. Norris.

Amending the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, last April I spoke at length on the floor of this House about the need then for continued Federal rent control. If it was needed then, as I believe it was, it is obviously most critically needed now.

In the all-out defense effort which we must make, increased taxes and controls will exact great sacrifices of this Nation's citizens. As in the past, they will bear these sacrifices gladly. But, surely, those millions now under Federal rent control have a right to expect that they will be guarded against excessive rent increases and possible eviction from their homes.

Already they are feeling a heavy burden. The October 15 consumer's index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics showed that the cost of living for the average family was 174.8 percent of the 1935–39 average, 31 percent higher than at the end of price control in June 1946 and an all-time high.

In my own State of Massachusetts an overwhelming majority of the voters in the last election, through a referendum, indicated their desire to have Federal rent control continued through next June. And, of course, in accord with the present Rent Control Act, they will be so protected, as will the others who have acted affirmatively on the matter.

I do think, however, that the seven-thousand-odd communities with a population over one thousand in the Nation which have not as yet acted on the question must be given the same protection.

It is imperative that this House pass the rent-control-extension measure now before us.

Furthermore, unless conditions improve a great deal, I, for one, will fight for a further extension of rent control in the next Congress.

The Korean Catastrophe and the Way Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it was my privilege on Tuesday night to attend the annual dinner of the American Municipal Congress, held in the city of Washington, and to hear on that occasion an address by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I do not recall ever having heard a clearer and more understandable expression of the events leading up to and existing in the present confused state of world affairs, nor have I ever listened to a more inspiring and eloquent declaration of certain fundamental ideas and ideals, upon which I am convinced the destiny of this great Nation rests in this most trying hour. With the same fine sense of values and with the same frankness, sincerity, and courage that he has come to personify in this body, the Senator from Illinois, in this splendid address, won increased admiration and respect from those who were privileged to hear it—a fact that was attested by the universal and extended ovation that was accorded him at the conclusion of his remarks on that occasion.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD; and I commend it to the careful attention of every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mayor Newton and friends, it is especially pleasant to have the opportunity of thinking out loud before a group of mayors and councilmen and city officials because one of the most thrilling experiences of my life was when I had the opportunity of serving as alderman in the city of Chicago. There was only one experience equally thrilling and that was when I had the honor of being a private in the Marine Corps. The two experiences were very similar, I can assure you.

I am certainly not an adequate substitute for Mr. Acheson, and I certainly do not know what the State Department's line is in the present situation, and like my colleagues, I speak only for myself, but I do want to discuss with you as best I may the extraordinarily grave situation in which we find ourselves in Korea.

We have just suffered the most crushing military defeat in the history of the United States. Our Korean allies, who have fought bravely by our side since June, have been largely broken by the attack of the Chinese Communists; our Eighth Army, which has been in the west of Korea, has been forced to retreat and is now moving southward in apparently an orderly withdrawal, but nevertheless doing so after a very bruising defeat; our Tenth Corps, consisting of my old division, the First Marine Division, and the magnificent Seventh Army Division, are surrounded by Chinese Communists, and while

they have regrouped themselves, are trying to fight themselves out from a very severe trap. It is probably the most severe military defeat which our armies have suffered in the whole history of this country.

This military defeat is, of course, forcing people to think over the question of what we should do next in Korea and what we should do elsewhere. There are those abroad and some at home who say that we should make terms with Communist China and that we should seek an agreement by which we would be able to evacuate our troops from Korea in safety. I hasten to say that this is not my point of view, but it is held by many and is being advanced by some. There are those who believe that we should stay and fight it out to the best of our ability, and there are those who favor some intermediate solution.

Now I read an editorial in a leading American paper 2 days ago which implied that during this period of crisis Americans should keep still, should wait to have the decisions made by the President, the Secretary of State, and the party leaders in conjunction with the British and with some advice from the French, and that we should go along with whatever decision is made, but that we should not discuss it too much while the crucial decisions are under way. This seems to me to be in error. Democracy was not intended merely to deal with unimportant issues. If there is anything to the principles of democracy, and we naturally believe there is a great deal, they should apply to important issues, to crucial issues when the life of a nation is at stake and not merely be reserved for minor affairs.

Of course those who discuss these national issues should do so in a temperate fashion, with guarded speech, and with no intent to promote disunity, but rather with the intent to promote greater national unity. It is in that spirit that I shall at least try to speak, but I shall try to speak frankly and to the point.

THE RECORD SINCE 1945

This catastrophe which has happened to us in Korea is not an isolated act. It is the culmination of a long series of acts by Russia during the last 5½ years and is thoroughly consistent with the whole process of history during that period. I have no intention of recounting the history of these last 5½ years, but I shall very briefly contrast American policy with Russian policy so that the public at least may draw its conclusions as to which side has the preponderance of merit.

We disarmed from a strength of 13,000,000 men to 1,500,000, and at the outbreak of the Korean attack we did not have more than 12 bobtail divisions. Russia probably did not cut its total force by more than half and now has from 175 to 200 divisions which even with their smaller tables of organization amount to from 130 to 145 American divisions.

We offered to share with the entire world the great secret of atomic energy which our scientists had discovered. We offered to put our stock of atomic bombs into a world pool to be denatured and to surrender our secrets to an international authority which would henceforth use atomic energy for the purposes of peace, provided only that two conditions were met: First, that there should not be merely a verbal pledge on the part of the nations to refrain from the production of atomic bombs, but that there should be an adequate system of international inspection under which international authorities could inspect the facilities of every country to determine whether or not this pledge was being observed. The acid test of our sincerity was that we were willing to permit Russian members of the international commission to inspect our facilities on condition that American members of the international commission could inspect Russian facilities. The proposed plan provided also that if this international commission found one of the nations to be violating its agreement not to make atomic bombs, that nation, when hauled before the Security Council of the United Nations, was not to have the power of veto—that the accused in the dock should not be permitted to serve at the same time as a judge on the bench.

This was the acid test of sincerity, and it was a test which America was willing to meet, but which Russia refused to meet. Russia behaved, indeed, as though it preferred to have both countries possess the atomic bomb rather than for neither country to possess it, apparently believing that we would be prevented from using the atomic bomb in a surprise attack both by our Constitution, which gives to Congress the power to declare war, and by our humanitarianism, which would prevent an attack in the absence of a declaration of war. But Russia as a police state would not be inhibited by either constitutional or humanitarian scruples.

We have sought through the United Nations to create a pooled force which would resist aggression wherever it manifested itself. We knew that the United Nations in this phase of its work could operate only if the great powers agreed. But Russia has used the veto power even prior to the Korean crisis no less than 44 times and has prevented the Security Council from being an agency to deter aggression.

We had hoped that the new world order would be one organized not merely to prevent war but one also organized to enhance the arts of peace. And so we have been largely instrumental in building up the cluster of affiliated organizations—the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the organization which goes by the rather mouth-filling term of United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and other international orgnizations—and we have loyally supported these bodies. Russia has refused to join any one of them.

We have sought to negotiate peace treaties for Italy, for Austria, for Germany, and for Japan. After nearly 2 years of wrangling we were successful in getting a peace treaty with Italy, but Russia has prevented a peace treaty from being negotiated for Austria, for Germany, and for Japan. It refused to join in the pledge of Secretary Byrnes for first a 20-year and then a 40-year joint occupation of a united Germany which would have enabled the German people to live together and at the same time offered Russia protection from the fear of German attack which at that time she felt was real.

We have stripped ourselves of our colonial empire by freeing the Philippines, and we had given up the Platt amendment, which gave us the right to intervene in Cuba. But Russia, in violation of the terms of the Yalta Agreement, did not permit free elections in Poland, in Bulgaria, or in Rumania, and applied covert military pressure upon Hungary and Czechoslovakia; so that, while the transferences of power in those countries were ostensibly legal, they were nevertheless conducted under the threat of force.

We offered, in one of the greatest demonstrations of generosity in the history of the world, to spend our economic resources for the reconstruction of all Europe, eastern and central Europe as well as western. Russia refused to come in herself, which was her right; she refused to permit her satellites to join. She has carried on a campaign of vitriolic denunciation in western Europe which has almost amounted to direct sabotage, and she has unloosed the full barrage of propaganda against America, against American intentions, against American actions.

In a number of cases she has tried out the world will to resist by open military acts of aggression—such as keeping her troops in Persia in 1946 in violation of a previous pledge, threatening Turkey in the summer and fall of that year, in the border warfare which she conducted against Greece in 1946 and 1947, and in the suspension of land transportation to Berlin in 1948. The interesting thing is that in each and every one of these cases of aggression the powers of the world rallied with sufficient force to compel Russia to back down. It was as though each year Russia were trying the will to resist of the democratic nations and each time when she found that the democratic nations could work together Russia ceded ground.

I submit, therefore, that, while America may have had faults in its foreign policy since 1945, on the whole our policy has been one of extraordinary generosity in which we have spent nearly $30,000,000,000 for other peoples. It has been an extraordinary attempt to work with other countries for the benefit of world peace. While it may be possible to find some good features in Russian foreign policy since that time—although I confess I have not been able to find them—the distinction between us is sharp and clear, and our consciences should on the whole be easy and steady. Our record has been a good record, and, if trouble comes, there will not be much opportunity for us to question our motives or for the world to point the finger of scorn.

THE KOREAN SITUATION

You all know the Korean situation: A division of that territory at the thirty-eighth parallel, with Russia receiving the surrender of Japanese troops above that parallel, and the United States receiving the surrender below. In the pamphlet issued by the State Department on the Korean situation it was stated that the choice of the thirty-eighth parallel was purely accidental. This may be so, although I am somewhat struck with the fact that it was at precisely the thirty-eighth parallel that the Russian and Japanese division of Korea existed prior to the Russo-Japanese War of 1904.

North of the thirty-eighth parallel Russia organized a police state as it has organized police states in all of its satellite countries, a state in which only one party was permitted, in which political opponents were arrested without warrant and sentenced to imprisonment without a trial, a state in which the all-too-familiar and all-too-terrible aspects of terror as an organized force were wielded by the government.

South of the thirty-eighth parallel we organized a democratic state with freedom of speech, opposing and conflicting political parties, the opportunity of all men to speak their minds. We gladly welcomed the commission from the United Nations which asked for an election, we allowed this election to take place, and we gladly surrendered power to the government which was elected. We took extraordinary precautions to see that the police force or incipient army which we set up for South Korea should not be put in a position where it could attack North Korea. We equipped this army with small arms, machine guns, and artillery up to perhaps 90 millimeters. But we did not give them airplanes, and we did not give them tanks, because we were afraid that if these were given the South Korean Army might start trouble by invading North Korea.

Russia, of course, refused even to permit the commission from the United Nations to enter the territory north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

Then came the attack on the 25th of June. We have been proceeding on the diplomatic fiction that this was an attack by North Koreans, but we know, of course, that it was

conducted with Russian consent, with Russian direction, and at least down to the divisional level that there were Russian staff officers who were assisting.

The decision that we made 2 days later to come to the aid of South Korea was made without much public discussion.

At this juncture when things have apparently turned out so badly and when whispers are being bruited about that we should not have intervened, I think it is proper to ask ourselves what would have happened had we not done so.

In the first place Korea would have been quickly overrun, but that would have been only the beginning. Almost immediately the Communists would have started at the north of the Malay Peninsula and would have worked down into Indochina. Indochina would have fallen, and then communism, under Chinese direction, would have moved down the entire Malay Peninsula, because there are underground Communist movements in most of these countries, and the Malay Peninsula would quickly have gone Communist. With India subjected to Communist pressure at the north from Tibet and Communist influence from the east in Indochina, India, too, would have gone, and in the space perhaps of a comparatively few months, certainly not more than a year or two, all of Asia would have passed under Communist control.

But the effects would not have been confined to Asia. It would have been said by the peoples of Europe that when communism attacked, the free nations of the world did not defend. The doubters, the tremblers, those whose lives were not firmly rooted in principle would have gone over to Russia. Russian prestige would have risen. Western Germany would have lost any will to resist and would have moved rather quickly into the Communist orbit. The French will to resist, which at best has been at least somewhat wavering, would have weakened, and, while conjecture is perhaps idle, it would seem to me that western and continental Europe would in a comparatively short period of time have gone Communist.

Would Russia have been appeased by our failure to intervene? The record of Russia since 1945 and the record of its fellow police states in the thirties indicate that a police state is not appeased by other nations yielding to it. Its appetite is only increased, its rapacity is heightened, its power is strengthened, its contempt for those who yield becomes still deeper.

So I submit that we should have no regrets at having intervened in Korea. We did the only honorable thing, throwing in our force to defend people who without provocation were being attacked, and we did it, at least 99 44/100 percent of the way, through the United Nations.

You may say that our first commitment of naval and air forces was in conformity with the resolution of the day before, on Sunday. Certainly our commitment of ground troops 2 days later was in conformity with the decision of the Security Council that no nation should help the aggressors in North Korea and that all members should come to the aid of South Korea. We have borne our share of the battle with honor and restraint; we have committed a large portion of our armed strength, probably indeed the majority of our armed strength. We have taken heavy casualties, at least 6,000 men killed, over 20,000 wounded. We can be proud of the way in which we have spent our blood and our resources to defend the peace of the world.

It is not for an American to criticize the decisions of other countries, and no one wishes to say anything at this hour to reflect on other nations or to disparage what they have done. But I think it is the feeling of all of us that it would have been far better if the other great powers of the world, which had joined in the Security Council resolution to come to the aid of the nation which was attacked, had made more adequate contributions in men. The peace of the world cannot be upheld by one nation alone. The United Nations can only serve if it is the expression of a combined will and determination.

Then, after misfortunes crowned with a brilliant strategic move, we came back up to the thirty-eighth parallel. It has been intimated that we made another mistake here; that we should have stopped and not gone beyond the thirty-eighth parallel. Let's examine that contention.

Suppose we had done so, what would have happened? The North Korean Army would have reformed its combat divisions north of the thirty-eighth parallel and would have been a continuous threat to our troops south of that parallel. The purpose of a police force is to break the organized will of your opponent—that is the purpose of combat—and had we stopped that organized will would not have been broken and the threat would always have remained. So I submit that we acted properly in going north and, of course, we acted in conformity with the decision of the United Nations expressed by vote of the Assembly.

It was decided that we should go ahead, but we truthfully assured the Chinese that we had no intention of pursuing the North Koreans north of the Yalu River. We had no intentions upon Chinese territory. Our only purpose was to unify Korea so that the Korean people could decide what kind of a government they wanted and so that aggression would not conquer. We gave a pledge through the United Nations that we would not destroy the power stations on the southern bank of the Yalu River which furnished power both to Korea itself and to Manchuria.

Then we found in these last 10 days that Chinese Communists, whose aid hitherto had been covert, were now sending their troops across the river and committing their half a million to a million men in an organized drive against us and against our allies.

Let there be no mistake about this: This could not have been done without Russian consent or without Russian direction. These Chinese troops, as the North Korean troops had been, were equipped, trained, and drilled by the Russians, and were fighting with Russian supplies.

WHAT SHALL WE DO?

Now, as I say, we have suffered this crushing and humiliating defeat, and this defeat has touched off currents of defeatism in this country and waves of defeatism abroad.

It is said by some, "Let's evacuate our men; if we cannot evacuate them under gunfire, let us make terms with the Chinese so that we can bring them off." That, at least, seemed to be the spirit of the United Press dispatches as of Sunday from Great Britain and France, although that sentiment may have changed in the last 2 days.

It is being said in those countries, and it is also being said to some degree in this country, that we do not have enough troops to defend both Korea and Asia on the one hand and Western Europe upon the other, and that therefore we should choose between them; Western Europe with the 50,000,000 tons of steel which can be produced there and the industrial resources of Western Europe are more important to us than Asia, and therefore we should withdraw our troops from Korea and transfer them to Europe and try to protect the Atlantic Pact nations.

Now let us examine this point of view. Let us ask ourselves what it would involve, what would happen if we were to seek, as these defeatists urge us to seek, an agreement with Communist China which would permit our troops to be brought out in safety.

The Chinese Communists told us before we were defeated what their terms were. They laid down their terms in very direct language before we suffered this military defeat. We can be certain that their terms would not be any less stringent now than they were then, that in all probability they would be more stringent. Those terms were very directly stated: That we should abandon Korea, that we should turn over Formosa to the Chinese Communists, that we should permit the entrance of Communist China into the United Nations with a seat on the Security Council.

Put that would be merely the first consequence of any such agreement as this. Almost immediately upon the signing of any such agreement there would be the fall of Indochina which is having a hard time to keep out of Communist hands anyway, and then, as I have said, communism would go over the entire Malay Peninsula in the space of weeks and 125,000,000 to 150,000,000 Malayans would go under Communist direction, including the new, the struggling, the hopeful Republic of Indonesia. India could not hold out, and we would have at least a billion Asiatics, brown and yellow people, added to the 600,000,000 now under Communist domination. Two-thirds of the population of the world would be under Russian control.

But what would happen to Europe also? Proponents of this doctrine seem to think that our position in Europe would still be as strong. We remember the wave of defeatism which swept over the world after Munich. Believe me, the wave of defeatism after any such agreement as this would be far more demoralizing and far more terrible. Western Germany has been reluctant to arm because it did not know whether it would be defended and because it did not know whether there would be a will to resist on the part of the so-called democracies. The sentiment in Germany has varied almost directly with the progress of our armies in Korea, being proresistance when we were winning in Korea, being antiresistance or indifferent to resistance as we were losing in Korea. The abandonment of Korea under these terms would send millions, perhaps tens of millions, of West Germans into the hands of the Communists.

Can you believe that this dry rot would stop in Germany? All of Europe would feel it, France and England alike. The French have been somewhat shaky on this matter; they would become shakier still. This huge and crushing defeat would demoralize those who believe in effective resistance to aggression, and it would make France, Italy, Belgium, and Holland rather ripe plums for the Communists to take. Sturdy Britain would, of course, resist longer, but Britain is extraordinarily vulnerable to the threats of rocket attack and guided missiles from the continent and could perhaps be forced into at least neutrality once the continent of Europe was occupied by the Communists.

In my judgment abandonment of Korea under these conditions would not only mean the speedy loss of all Asia; it would also mean the loss of Europe as well. And I would like to ask—and I say this delicately because one does not wish to inflame the situation—I would like to ask whether there would be a hearty disposition on the part of the American people, after having lost heavily in Korea, then to commit their strength to the continent of Europe where a dubious fate would await our armies? Would there be much popular support for a program of supporting Western Europe with arms and troops if we had been compelled to knuckle under and sign an agreement to get out of Korea at the point of a gun? I think this position would be particularly weakened if our allies were those who urged us to get out because they thought that the risk was too great.

I know that it is easy for anyone in the Statler Hotel after a comfortable dinner to lay down a program of resistance. I think I know something of the feelings of soldiers under fire, and I think I have some concern for the lives of our men who are fighting in Korea. It so happens, as I have said, that one of the divisions which is trapped is my

old division, the division with which I had the honor to fight and serve, a division which includes large numbers of my personal friends, both in enlisted and officer ranks. But I think I know also what the sentiment of all true fighting men is—that resistance is better than dishonor and that no military situation is hopeless as long as there is the determination to hold on.

We have suffered a disaster, yes, but while I do not read the military dispatches from the front, it would seem to me that the situation is not hopeless. Our Eighth Army is still intact and is apparently retreating in good form and can regroup itself north of Seoul at about the old thirty-eighth parallel. We are all praying that the Tenth Corps, consisting of the Seventh Division and the First Marine Division, can fight their way out; and if they can—I think I know something of the spirit of those men—they, too, will not want to be evacuated by ship, but they will want to take their place in a new position east of the Eighth Army.

Now we come to the possible use of the troops of the Chinese Nationalists. There have been many who have urged in the past that we should have used these troops. There are close to 600,000 on Formosa, and Chiang Kai-shek has offered something over 30,000.

For some time I admit that I was not certain in my own mind whether or not these troops should be used. I did not urge their use. I was somewhat afraid that if they were used their use would be represented as an act of war against the Chinese people, that the Chinese Communists would be able to stir up the sentiment of their people against us, and so I was one who kept his mouth shut with a good deal of uncertainty when these proposals were made. But I am uncertain no longer. We are in a desperate struggle. We need every bit of aid that we can get. The troops of Chiang Kai-shek are anti-Communist. In my judgment, we should use them, and use them as speedily as possible.

Now I know it will be said, "Yes; but he is not a decent ally." Well, I have been somewhat scrupulous on this question of allies. I was 1 of 14 Senators who voted against the loan to Franco Spain. I have had doubts about aid given to Tito. I have not wished to deal with any dictators, whether of the left or right, but all the time I have thought of an experience I had in Chicago, and I hope you will forgive me when I relate it.

Members of my party—I will not say which party—were making out a county slate one time many years ago, and, strangely enough, I was called in to consult on the making up of this slate. I was called out of the room for a telephone message. When I came back I found a certain man had been put on the ticket. I did not like him, I did not think he was a good candidate, and I rushed up to the chairman of the county committee and I said, "George, why did you put that fellow on the ticket? Don't you know he is a son-of-a-gun?" The chairman looked at me a moment and said, "Yes; he is a son-of-a-gun, but he is our son-of-a-gun."

Sometimes things get as primitive as that, and if you wait until you have perfect allies in this world, as all of you who are mayors and councilmen know, you will be very lonely.

So this is a confession on my part. I am ready to take my allies now where I can find them. It would be very rough medicine, like the sulphur and molasses my mother used to give me for a spring cleaning out, but I am ready to take Franco and I am ready to take Tito. I don't like it, but we are in a struggle for survival, and during our last struggle we took Joe Stalin as an ally. Well, surely Chiang and Franco and Tito, while they may not be candidates for a ladies' sewing circle, are not any worse than Joe. So I am ready to take Chiang, and I would like to see us get his troops into Korea very quickly.

Now, Senators have a way of popping off and creating international incidents by what they say. Someone once said that a Senator is a man who should have a clothespin attached to his upper and lower lip to keep him from talking. I hope our British and our French friends will not misunderstand me—and they are our friends, may I say—but we would welcome a larger contribution from them.

When I say that we would welcome that, I know that they have heavy burdens to bear—the French have a war in Indochina, the British have a war in Malaya, they are still recovering from having borne the brunt of the attack in World War II, and their governmental expenses are great—but I submit that the maintenance of peace is their affair as well as ours and, without embittering the situation, contributions from them would be extremely welcome.

Now I want to say something that is in no sense a threat. I have no desire to make a threat. I have no power to make a threat, and I hope it won't be construed as a threat. I should like to ask our British and French friends in all friendliness, how can they expect American lives to be poured out in their defense if they will not help us to defend Korea? In particular, cannot the British join us in a blockade of Communist China instead of allowing Hong Kong to be used as a funnel through which supplies are being poured into China to our loss? The British people, noble in their desires, do not want a small group of powerful traders to profit temporarily from this trade if it strengthens, as it does, those who are attacking our armies and who are waging an aggressive war.

We have one weapon of our own, the atom bomb—a terrible weapon, one which we shrink from using, one which we have refrained from using, one which is not particularly adapted to this type of warfare because from a military standpoint it is most effective against closely concentrated industrial targets and not upon diffused armies in the field, one which will have difficulties in its application because in battle the attackers and the defenders are frequently so close together that if you apply it to your opponents you also apply it to yourselves. But I submit—once you make the moral decision that you will resist force with force, once you make that decision, once you decide that nations in order to preserve freedom must use the weapons of the flesh to oppose other weapons of the flesh—that the atom bomb at least in its military use against opposing military forces is not generally different from any other type of force. It is merely force carried to its last and terrible conclusion. It is no more immoral to kill an opposing soldier—and I emphasize soldier—with an atom bomb than it is to kill him with a rifle or a hand grenade or a machine gun or a 155-millimeter shell.

I submit, therefore, that if it is militarily possible to do so and if we have no other effective weapons, we should not be restrained in our use of the atom bomb against the opposing military forces, although I bar from this the use of the A-bomb against civilian units in Manchuria both because of humanitarianism and because of my belief that if it were so used it would in all likelihood set the peoples of Asia against us. But I see no reason, if the situation is militarily desperate and if the atom bomb can be used against the opposing military forces without appreciably hurting our own troops, why we should refrain from its use. General Collins is doubtful of its value, but within these limited objectives I do not believe we should refuse to employ it.

Then we get to the question of what to do with Russia. We have turned the other cheek many times, but on acts of aggression we have turned it twice. We have pretended that the attack by North Korea against South Korea was purely an action of North Korea. We have pretended that the action of Communist China was purely an action by Communist China and was not an action by Russia. We know that both of these assumptions have been false, but we made them diplomatically in order to reduce the danger of a general war.

It does credit to our restraint; it does credit, I think, to our diplomacy. There is an incident from Jules Verne's Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea which is very appropriate here. I believe Mr. Stassen used this analogy in a speech in August, but since I had used it a month before, I hope you will forgive me if I again recall this story of Jules Verne which many of us read as children.

You remember that the deep sea diver in this scientific novel of Jules Verne's was at the bottom of the ocean when he was attacked by an octopus which reached out one tentacle to sweep him in. The diver chopped that tentacle off with a sharp sword. Then the octopus reached out another tentacle and the diver then chopped that off. Then another tentacle reached up and the diver decided that these movements of the tentacles were not independent but proceeded from a decision on the part of a central nervous system, and so instead of chopping off the third tentacle he thrust with his sword at the eye of the octopus.

Now as Christians we all should hold, to a large degree at least, to the teachings of Jesus in His Sermon on the Mount when he told us to turn the other cheek. This is a principle which if we have the strength of character to apply it is capable of great use on the part of one individual to another. I think the happiest moments in the lives of many of us have been when we have been able to transform enemies into friends by just such actions as that.

This principle has also great application on the part of one liberal state to another liberal state where peoples can speak to peoples, but it is relatively ineffective when applied by a liberal state to a police state because a police state does not permit you to make an appeal to the conscience of its subjects.

I have come to the conclusion, and I confess it is a largely non-Christian conclusion, that there is a limit to the number of times we should turn our cheek. We have turned it once, we have turned it twice, but I go on the old American slogan of "three strikes and you're out." I have come to the conclusion that the next aggressive movement by a satellite should be regarded by us as an act of war and that we should then unleash such power as we have directly upon Russia itself.

What I am saying is this: that the cause is not hopeless in Korea; that resistance on the part of brave men is fundamental. I believe the soldiers in the field would have us believe that bravery and courage can transform difficult situations into victorious situations. Courage is a military element, but courage is needed even more by a civilian population. We should reach our decision without bravado, without flag-waving, without denunciatory language, but with a determination that we shall continue to resist and that we will not make any deal under which we evacuate Korea.

Now if we resist it is of course possible that we may still be defeated and that we may be compelled to try to withdraw our troops from Korea by ship, but if that should happen let it be an honorable withdrawal, a withdrawal under gun fire, not a withdrawal purchased by ignominious surrender.

This is a decision which should be taken by the civilian population with full recognition of the dangers and the hardships. In my judgment, it is the only one which gives honor and which gives any chance for ultimate safety. But it must be supported with full vigor and it must be accompanied by almost complete and speedy rearmament.

I don't know whether the figures are classified, but I would not imagine that our strength now is greatly in excess of the million and a half that we had in June. While I'm not a military expert I submit that we

must now really go to work and become as strong as possible in the shortest time. We need at least 4,000,000 men in our Ground Forces with at least 50 divisions, of which I hope at least 4 or 5 will be Marine divisions. In the Navy and Air Force, we shall need at least one and one-half million to two million more, making a total of 6,000,000 men under arms—or four to four and one-half million more under arms than we had last June.

If we employ the ratio of one and one-half to two civilian workers in war industries to every man in uniform, we come up with a total of seven to eight million more needed in war industries, or a total conversion of from 11,000,000 to 13,000,000 persons. Since we have virtually no unemployment upon which to draw, this will mean diversion of civilian industries to war industries. This will require the added expenditure of at least $40,000,000,000 more a year for military purposes than is in the budget for 1950–51. The total budget for war purposes which we will need will be close to $55,000,000,000, and even with the economies which we should make in the civilian budget the total Federal budget will be slightly over $80,000,000,000 or about 30 percent of total national income.

It will require a rigid program of taxation if we are to head off inflation. And I hope we will not be driven to the easy expedient of trying to borrow from banks because that will merely mean the creation of checkbook money which will send up prices and cause inflation and cause the burdens of the war to be borne by those least able to bear them. I hope we can have restraint and determination enough to see that we tax adequately or if we do borrow that the borrowings are made out of savings from current income rather than by checkbook money. It means, in short, that we must go on a war economy speedily and without delay.

You say these conditions are hard. They are very hard. They are not made of our choice; they have been forced upon us. Our choice is whether we will meet these conditions—whether we will meet the threat of aggression with determination—or whether we will weakly and supinely acquiesce. If we acquiesce, in my judgment western civilization, political democracy, and humanitarianism as we know it are doomed. The price of survival is effort and sacrifice of the most intense kind.

Mr. Newton, this has been a very somber speech but it has been somber only because of the conditions, only because I have tried, however imperfectly, to speak honestly about the dangers which are ahead.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Friday night, December 1, it was my pleasure to participate in a radio interview over Station WRC of the National Broadcasting Co. on the regular Forum Pro and Con. The theme of the program was United States foreign policy. I ask that the extemporaneous comments which I made on the program, as well as the questions put to me by Mr. Leif Eid, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF RADIO PROGRAM

Mr. EID. Pro and Con this week was transcribed in the Radio Gallery of the United States Senate, with Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, Wisconsin) in the absence of Senator VANDENBERG as the top-ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Thus, Senator WILEY is in a position to speak from studied experience on the broad aspects of our foreign policy. Senator WILEY, do you feel, as many do, that foreign policy played a large part in the elections?

Senator WILEY. Well, Leif, you know this is no time to indulge in merely picking up things out of the past. We are faced with such tremendous challenges now that the only real question is: Where do we go from here? I think, however, that from my campaigning throughout my own State, I can say that some of the mistakes that were made by the executive branch did play a part in the election.

In other words, my constituency were very much concerned with: Where do we go from here; and whether or not in the past we had made such mistakes that they precipitated us into the present affray. I think basically that we have got to consider the present-day problem and not spend too much time on the past, except that we must profit from those mistakes.

Mr. EID. Well, Senator, with the elections over, do you feel there is more chance of bipartisanship in foreign policy—bipartisanship that will work effectively?

Senator WILEY. Of course, as you said in your opening statement, whenever America faces a crisis, or whenever we have gotten into war, we lay aside the small things and we focus our attention upon the real problem. The real problem is the preservation of America and any man who has eyes to see with and ears to hear with, as the Good Book says, must realize that that problem is the only pertinent and the only big problem, and it requires all our attention and all our vision and all our judgment and our faith.

MISTAKES OF THE PAST

Mr. EID. Well, Senator WILEY, just a moment ago you spoke of mistakes of the past. Do you feel that our present crisis is traceable to any specific mistakes in the past?

Senator WILEY. Yes; I think that in the past we have been so naive in dealing with this Russian situation—and I don't say this critically—I say it simply factually that I feel that now at long last this Korean situation has opened the eyes of those in government who should have had their eyes opened before. Certainly Korea today, with its challenge, was due in large part that we thought, as Roosevelt said, he could deal with the Russians.

Think of Berlin. Just think of Berlin. There we were so naive that we took a part of Berlin and didn't have brains enough to take even a cow path to it. As a result, came the cost of $600,000,000 in the airlift. There are a number of other instances that could be quoted. But, again I say, let us not forget the past, but let us neither center our attention upon the past. Let us learn from our mistakes and now meet the present challenge head on.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

Mr. EID. Well, Senator, aside from past errors, what is your estimate of the present situation and the steps we should take to meet it?

Senator WILEY. Well, I spoke on the Senate floor just about 15 minutes ago on what I thought was imperatively necessary. I am not a military man, but I feel that we have not utilized those forces that we should to penetrate the Russian segment. I am talking, of course, about psychological warfare about which much has been said. I spoke on it at length today.

But I am speaking also about something else. In China today, we know that there are dissident elements there that are quite large. We should get them into action, fighting the Communists. And in Russia today there are 190,000,000 people you must know that are not Communists at heart. Practically every family, as a Washington professor said recently, has either someone who has been liquidated or someone who was in concentration camp. That provides rich soil where we can plant a seed of ferment that might well eventually overturn Russia and solve the problem far better than our going into a great world war.

Mr. EID. Senator WILEY, do you have any ideas about how to reach these people?

Senator WILEY. Yes; of course. If you have read the recent article in the Readers Digest by this professor, he tells you definitely how to do that. It is in the November issue. But I might say, paraphrasing the answer, that 2 years ago about now, while I was in Bermuda representing this Goverment as the head of a Committee to the Empire Parliamentary Conference I called to attention of the British how they could penetrate. Just think of the whole coast—the whole great mass of Russian Siberia. Think of the fact that there are over 70 different nationalities there with their different desires, and think of the purges. And you have the White Russians all over the world that, if utilized, would also penetrate. Recently people have gone all through Russia and come back and made reports. There is even a book published on dissent inside Russia, and that is the thing we have utterly failed in capitalizing upon. We have been like children—just children—in this great political world of ours.

EUROPEAN CRISIS

Mr. EID. Well, Senator, right now we have our eyes focused on Korea and the rest of Asia. But Secretary Acheson said only recently that the real danger—the real danger area—is western Europe. Do you agree with that statement?

Senator WILEY. Why the whole world is a danger area. But, of course, the Secretary's conclusion, I think, is correct. In other words, what we are really fighting for in this so-called cold war is a coalition of freedom-thinking people. So, the question is whether or not the people in Europe for whom we have done so much and for whom we have spent since the war some $30,000,000,000, whether or not their morale or backbone is still strong so that in case of a world conflict they would not lay down as France did and as Belgium did in World War II, or whether they would join us in seeking to stem the overflowing of Europe.

There isn't any question but that tomorrow with the armed forces that Russia has, that it could take Europe in a very short time, and if that were done, then the Russians would have all the manufacturing plants in Europe. That is the thing that would give them the supplement that they of course need, and if they had that, then America would be facing the Russians alone and the contest would be on for our very existence.

Mr. EID. Well, Senator WILEY, with the Republicans in this Congress—this next Congress which begins in January—with Republicans having more power, what is your estimate of the probable fate of Leave Your Foreign Policies in Congress?

EFFECT ON UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Senator WILEY. Well, you know you cannot look around the corner of tomorrow. It all depends upon changing conditions. We have under the ECA program done a grand job, but now we have gone into a military program. But insofar as our own country is concerned, we, after all, cannot kill the goose that lays the golden egg, even in going ahead in our peacetime program. The thing has to

be evaluated in accordance with the changing circumstances as they exist at the time you evaluate them. I think everyone realizes that the crisis is great and whatever is necessary to do must be done. The whole thing is how many cookies there are in the cookie jar to pass around.

Mr. EID. You mean we have only a limited number of cookies?

Senator WILEY. Well, America's barrel right now is sufficiently cut down so that our problem, as I said on the floor today, is immediately to get into a tax program that will provide results—sufficient revenue—and get into a military program that will provide results and get into a position so that we do not further devaluate our dollar. We dare not ruin our own domestic economy.

Mr. EID. Well, Senator, is that the way you would define, say, reexamination?

REEXAMINATION

Senator WILEY. Reexamination I would define this way by using an example. I remember when the question came up last year about ECA aid, I voted for the authorization. But when I did that I said that it was not a definite commitment for the appropriation because when the time for the appropriation came up, the circumstances might have changed, and they did change. England today is getting more dollars out of trade; in fact, it is said that England may be in a position even to make a payment on her debt. All those circumstances that come up, that evolve out of world trade and world problems, have to be taken into consideration at the time you are actually seeking the solution of the problem.

RELATIONS WITH COMMUNISM

Mr. EID. Well, Senator, there is another statement in that State Department booklet called Our Foreign Policy. It goes this way: "Our present world conflict is not between communism and capitalism. Most Americans, while they dislike Communist ideas and methods, concede the right of any nation to live under a Communist system if a majority of its people freely choose that system." Do you agree with that?

Senator WILEY. No; I don't agree with that, for the simple reason you can't simply use terms that way. The fight is between ourselves and the leaders of Russia, who represent present-day communism. As we interpret communism today under Marx, it means in substance that there is alleged to be no God; that the state is all-powerful; that the subjects have no rights; that there is no such thing as freedom of speech and freedom of press, and all those things; whereas our people here enjoy the American way which some call capitalism. I prefer to say that capitalism is a part of the American way. It holds the opposite position that the state is the servant; that there is a God who works in the hearts of men and in nations and that a man's right to work is his, and the right to accumulate property is his, and the right to will it, etc. Those two concepts are entirely separate. Now, in my belief they are two ideas which are in conflict for the conquest of the world, and I care not whether you call it capitalism or the American way, or whether you say it is communism. To me the Russian way is the present-day interpretation of communism, and that is the greatest danger to the liberty-loving people of earth.

SO-CALLED ISOLATIONISM

Mr. EID. The State Department also says that isolationism has practically disappeared in this country. Do you agree with that, Senator WILEY?

Senator WILEY. Well, an ancient philosopher said you have got to define your terms. I don't think in one sense that we ever had the limited definition of isolationism. We gladly traded with the world, for example. We felt, however, it was good policy not to stick our nose into everyone else's—other people's—business.

Now, how this world conflict turns out will determine whether or not there is a resurgence in one direction or another. If the people of the earth—the free peoples—are smart enough, have guidance enough from Almighty God, so that we can contain the movement of the Russian Government, and the Russian people can become free, then we can say definitely that there will be impetus toward unity among the nations of the earth. If, however, on the other hand, a third world war brings us no more than World Wars I and II have—well, you will see a resurgence in other direction.

CONCLUSION

Thank you, Senator. Ladies and gentlemen, Pro and Con has just presented Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, in a transcribed interview on our foreign policy. Senator WILEY is at present the ranking Republican on the highly important meetings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This interview came to you from the Radio Gallery of the United States Senate, and now this is Leif Eid in Washington. Pro and Con will be heard again next week at this same time.

Song for Al Jolson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a wonderful eulogy of Al Jolson, by Walter Winchell, which appeared in the Wednesday, October 25, 1950, issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SONG FOR AL JOLSON

(By Walter Winchell)

They are eulogizing Al Jolson as a great entertainer. As a titan of show business he stood alone, but he was gifted with more than superb singing artistry—he was a great man. To say that Rembrandt was a fine artist and Beethoven a fine composer merely describes the superficial qualities of their technical brilliance. Their genius stemmed from the ability to capture deep emotions and convey them to others. Expressing universal feelings which find a home in the hearts of millions is the source of their immortality. For similar reasons, Jolson is no less immortal.

Al has gone the way of all mortals, but the joy he poured into the world is a living thing.

The truth is the Jolson story does not end with his fabulous success as an entertainer. It begins there. For the Jolson saga epitomizes the American story in the grand tradition. Out of such biographies is woven the fabric of the American legend, and out of such legends is derived the inspiration for generations yet unborn.

Al reached these blessed shores as a young immigrant of penniless parents. He received much from this Nation and contributed more. Yet Jolson believed he was in debt to America and never ceased paying. His gratitude for the opportunity a free Nation presented was as boundless as his love for the country that made liberty a reality. Always acting like a fine American was Jolson's finest performance.

Throughout his career he refused to spare himself. He made his life as much a tribute to this country as the tribute this country is now paying him.

He was the first to entertain troops in World War II, contracted malaria and lost a lung. Then in his upper sixties—he was again the first to offer his singing gifts for bringing solace to the wounded and weary in Korea.

Today we know the exertion of his journey to Korea took a greater toll of his strength than perhaps even he realized. But he considered it his duty as an American to be there, and that was all that mattered to him.

Jolson passed away in a San Francisco hotel. Yet he was as much a battle casualty as any American soldier who has fallen on the rocky slopes of Korea. A star for more than 40 years, he earned his most glorious star rating at the end—a gold star.

It is the measure of Jolson as an American that having his name in lights on the main streets of America was not as thrilling to him as igniting a spark in the hearts of American soldiers battling in some far corner of the globe.

The essential tenderness of the American spirit frequently results in deeper devotion to a great minstrel than a great statesman. For we know a nation is not only judged by the record of its political leaders but also by its songs. Perhaps that is because our entertainers represent as much of a national ideal as the Bill of Rights—namely, the pursuit of happiness.

Americans are aware that statesmen and entertainers are both lighting a candle in the darkness of a tragic civilization. Which explains why the passing of a man who could translate the joyous national spirit into lovely melodies has drawn people into a mourning desolation cushioned with the inner satisfaction of knowing that one man's life has been so nobly fulfilled.

The nobility of Jolson's intentions and his achievements as a public figure and private citizen provide a source of comfort for decent men everywhere. There can be no finer memorial.

He phoned me from Korea to say the reason he was rushing home was to find out if he paid our glorious country enough taxes.

The grief is profound because it is personal. Each of us feels we have lost a friend—and Al's friend was any person acquainted with his stirring voice. Wherever Jolson is right now, we're certain he is enjoying the world-wide salutes. Al was too much of a realist to be impressed by maudlin words, but as an honest showman he was always thrilled by mass affection. He truly loved the public that loved him. Their applause was the bread of his life, and he could play upon the heartstrings of an audience like a Stradivarius.

Jolson's career was not all sunshine and blue skies. After tasting the fragrance of acclaim—he was temporarily numbed by the cold hand of oblivion. That he was able to rise to greater heights after toppling was as much a tribute to his talents as to his fighting heart. Al was a champion in the finest sense of the word. A man could scale the heights with natural gifts, but it takes the most potent moral stamina to rise again after stumbling.

His remarkable comeback was the test of Jolson as a man, and he came through with flying technicolors.

It staggers the imagination to conceive that Jolson is dead. He was a man of vitality. His enthusiasm bubbled and gushed and flowed like a torrent. Until his final days Al's exuberance with almost childlike in its intensity. The way he walked, the way he talked, and the way he sang reflected

his throbbing spirit. He loved to live and laugh and love.

In the final analysis, and especially in the case of Jolson, death is only a physical thing. Thanks to the miracle of modern electronics, generations will thrill to the haunting Anniversary Song, the peppery Toot, Toot, Tootsie, the rousing California, Here I Come, the tender April Showers, and the unforgettable Mammy.

Jolson's most essential living quality was his glorious voice—and it will never be stilled. His heritage is not monetary. He left bright love songs for youth, flowing memories to older folks, and a record of Americanism that will never lose its gleam.

Yes, they are singing Jolson's praises, but no praise is as beautiful as his singing. Another star is in the heavens. Strike up the band! Gabriel, blow your horn! Play the celestial harp! Jolson sings again, and how the angels must be applauding—for this magical troubadour is now performing on another stage.

Angels, you ain't heard nuttin' yet.

Mrs. Al Jolson, just on the long-distance phone, requested that flowers be omitted and the money intended for them be turned over to your local American Heart Association.

Britain Becomes a Creditor Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am offering for inclusion in the RECORD an article which appeared in the November 23, 1950, Paris edition of the London Daily Mail entitled "Britain Becomes a Creditor Power." Its author is Richard Denman, who writes for the Economist, a publication widely credited as authoritative on matters of British economics.

In summary, Mr. Denman's article shows an improvement during the past 2 years in the British balance of trade, and in their foreign capital investments. It also points out that, while some of the favorable trade balance is reflected in accounts due other parties within the sterling bloc, there is, nevertheless, substantial improvement. In essence, it seems that Mr. Denman's writings support the validity of reexamination of our foreign lending programs, and support the fact that legislators can and should take an objective look at our foreign-aid policies.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN BECOMES A CREDITOR POWER

(By Richard Denman)

As a world creditor power Britain has been sliding back sadly over the past three decades. Two world wars fought within a single generation (and fought for considerable periods on a strict cash basis in respect of purchase from allies) have encroached heavily on the overseas investments that had been accumulated by thrifty generations of forebears. A growing and, within reason, desirable concern for social security and economic stability at home have raised standards of consumption and left smaller surpluses available for investment overseas.

Heavy taxation, the concomitant of war and of the welfare state, has gone far to demolish the capacity to save and to stem the flow of private investment from which British capital exports have in the past been fed.

At the end of the war the disordered state of the British balance of payments suggested that Britain's days as an exporter of capital were over. In fact, Britain had perforce to become a large importer of capital—in 1946 to the tune of £348,000,000, in 1947 of £558,000,000.

The position has, however, been changing significantly in the last few months. Even in 1946 and 1947 it should be noted that within the context of an over-all deficit in the balance of payments, and while therefore under compulsion to borrow, Britain could and did make certain investments abroad. It was borrowing with one hand and lending with the other.

BACK IN THE LEAD

A position has now been reached in which Britain is again running overseas surpluses that have brought it back to the forefront of capital exporting nations. In the first half of 1950 the surplus achieved on current balance of payments amounted to £52,000,000 and this, allowing for the grants received by the United Kingdom from the United States and the amount put to reserve, allowed the investments to increase by the modest figure of £16,000,000.

The position in subsequent months has improved by leaps and bounds. We have recently had the October overseas trade figures which make it possible to project balance of payments estimates over the first 4 months of the second half of 1950. In this period imports amounted to £857,000,000 and total exports to £777,000,000, giving a visible deficit of £80,000,000.

As they appear in the trade returns these figures are misleading because exports are valued at the moment at which they are put on board ship in this country, while imports include the cost of insurance and freight costs which are mainly paid to British companies and which should not therefore be regarded as a debit item in the balance of payments. It is normal to make an allowance of about 11 percent for this item of freight and insurance. Deducting this from the import total the visible trade account no longer shows a deficit but a surplus of £14,000,000.

INVISIBLE EARNINGS

This still leaves completely out of account the invisible earnings such as investment interest, profits of banking and insurance companies abroad and last, but by no means least, the profits on overseas trading operations of British oil companies which, in the first half of 1950, brought in a net surplus of £160,000,000.

Assuming that the surplus on these items has been no greater—and there is strong reason to believe that it has grown with the rise in commodity prices—it would appear that in the 4 months July to October 1950 the balance of payments of the United Kingdom showed a surplus of around £150,000,000, or at a rate of £360,000,000 a year.

Allowing for the continued improvement in invisible items it would be reasonable to say that the balance of payments is now running at a quite remarkable figure of £400,000,000 a year surplus. This is almost up to the standard Britain used to maintain in the heyday of its role as an exporter of capital—allowing that is, for changes in the value of money.

In the light of the figures which have recently been published showing the United Kingdom surplus with other members of the European Payments Union, these estimates of the over-all balance of payments do not strike any incongruous note. In October alone Britain's surplus with the European Payments Union amounted to £80,000,000. This was met as to £5,000,000 by the use of existing sterling resources by other member nations, but even so this left the net surplus at the very striking figure of £75,000,000.

WORLD'S BANKER STILL

In the July-September quarter the comparable surplus accumulated by Britain amounted to £28,500,000, so that a cumulative credit of £103,500,000 had in fact been built up by Britain over the 4 months period with the countries of western Europe alone.

Much of this surplus is attributable to the exports of the rest of the sterling area to the countries in question. But it should be noted that it is Britain which takes the burden of the surplus. Australia, for example, is duly paid in sterling for the wool she exports to France or Germany and while, on the one hand, Britain is accumulating a credit with EPU as a result of these operations, it may also see the sterling balances held in London on Australian account increasing by a corresponding amount.

This is a typical instance of the way in which London still acts as banker to the world. The surpluses which Britain has built up with the European countries have now more than absorbed the initial debit, equivalent to $150,000,000, with which the United Kingdom was saddled at the outset of its membership of EPU, and in addition has allowed Britain to build up a credit position equivalent to $140,600,000 with EPU.

One reservation has already been made about this good showing, namely, the extent to which the rest of the sterling area has contributed to it. Another concerns the tendency for hot money to come to Britain from Europe.

NEED FOR CAUTION

It is probable that all payments for sterling imports into Europe have recently been made "on the nail," whereas many payments due from the sterling area to Europe have been postponed in anticipation of an up-valuation of sterling. However false this premise may be, the operations based on it contributed an element of impermanence and artificiality to the surplus which the sterling area has been able to build with Europe in this period.

There is, therefore, some need to tread cautiously in allowing this improvement to lead to a considerable relaxation of import controls or to a generous expansion in overseas investments. What should be done is to use a substantial part of the surplus as an accumulation to reserves. That is in fact what is being done.

An immense field of development lies open for British capital. There are great plans of development in Africa and in south and southeast Asia. Much of this will have to be undertaken on official account and it is to be hoped, in this context, that the expensive lesson learnt in the east African agricultural development schemes will have been taken to heart.

Mining development in South Africa is still waiting for more British capital. The oil companies have in hand an immense development program, most of which will involve overseas expenditure. There is plenty of work to do for any surplus in its balance of payments which Britain can accumulate for investment abroad.

The danger is not that there will be too little to do but that we may attempt too much and by overinvestment give a further push to that vicious circle of inflation which has the economy of the whole world well and truly in its grip.

The Need for Decision in the War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article setting forth the necessity for a decision in the war in Korea, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of November 29, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENTLEMEN MAY CRY, PEACE, PEACE

One hundred and seventy-five years have rolled by since Patrick Henry made his famous address to the Richmond Assembly—since he chided the gentlemen who were crying peace when there was no peace; since he warned against the inclination of man to indulge in the illusions of hope; since he asked whether we shall gather strength by irresolution and inaction. Throughout those years millions of men have given up their lives for the freedoms and liberties which Patrick Henry so ably championed. And yet, despite all of the sacrifices, despite all of mankind's material advances since 1775, the remaining citadels of freedom and liberty in the world are threatened as they have never been threatened before.

Patrick Henry was trying to arouse his fellow men, to prod them into throwing off the shackles of the mind so they would be able to see and understand the real nature of the crisis which had already begun to engulf them. We need something of the same thing today. We need to take another look at the assumptions and the hopes upon which our course of action has been based. We need to ask ourselves whether we have lapsed into a state of mind where the longing for peace and the dread of war have combined to blind us to the fact that in the larger sense there is no peace. We need to face up to the fact that we will drift into certain disaster unless we are willing to make decisions, perhaps painful decisions, and then act intelligently upon them.

What is one to think of the fantastic spectacle in the United Nations where the Chinese Communists, with blood on their hands, stand in the role of accuser and Russia's Mr. Malik puts the United States in the defendant's box? Not until yesterday, and then at the last possible moment, did our delegate, Mr. Austin, revise his prepared speech to bring a complaint of aggression against the Chinese. What is the rationale of this topsy-turvy business? It was the United Nations which decreed the use of armed force against the North Korean aggressors. Does anyone believe that the UN can serve the interests of peace, or of security, by seeking a place to hide from this new and uglier fact of Chinese aggression?

In his earlier remarks to the General Assembly's political committee, Mr. Dulles, representing this country, devoted most of his effort to a review of the occasions upon which the United States has demonstrated its good will toward China. He spoke of the bond which this record has forged between the people of China and the people of the United States—a bond "that the Soviet Government is now trying, and I am convinced fruitlessly, to break." At the moment that Mr. Dulles was speaking a Chinese Communist army of 200,000 men was smashing through the front of the UN forces in Korea—an assault which General MacArthur describes as an "entirely new war." Is it possible to square Mr. Dulles' hopeful words with the fact of what the Chinese are doing? Can we have peace with the Chinese people by closing our diplomatic eyes when their leaders wage open war against us?

If there is one clear fact which emerges from all this busines, it is the fact that we are at war, now. It is not a final, all-out war, but it is war nevertheless. And it is a war which has taught certain lessons and which raises still other questions.

We should be asking ourselves whether our policy of containment has not been tried, and found wanting. That policy was based on the assumption that the Communists, and the Russian Communists, in particular, would continue to expand unless checked by a show of force, but that they would not expand at the risk of war. The thought was that the Russians could be held in check, or contained, by interposing against them our own military forces, or the forces of allies that had become economically and militarily strong. To say the least, that assumption has become an exceedingly dubious one, if for no other reason than that the containing military forces simply do not exist.

But if the policy of containment has failed, what alternatives are left?

One possibility is a political settlement in Asia which would enable us to break off the war. This, no doubt, is being carefully explored. But we should not build false hopes. It is unlikely that a settlement can be made which will not leave the Communists as masters of Asia, and if we voluntarily accept such a settlement we must expect to pay the price in loss of prestige and potential allies throughout the world. If we reject such a settlement we might be forced to get out of Asia as best we can. If that should happen the minimum penalty would be the loss of everything we have been fighting for there.

Another possibility is that we may accept what comes in Korea, and go on from there. But where will we go and how will we get there?

If the decision should be to fight and not to retreat, we must face the question of whom we are to fight, and where and how.

Such a decision as this could be expected to result only in total war. We would be at war with Russia, and with all of the satellites that Russia could bring into the battle. Considering the enormous superiority in manpower that the enemy would have—and manpower of excellent fighting qualities if one may judge from our experience in Korea—could we hope to fight on the ground anywhere in Asia or Europe? Would a war of land armies spell disaster for us?

Could we fight and in any sense win such a war with air power? The atom bomb and the long-range bomber are certainly the most effective and perhaps the only useful weapons we would have at our disposal in a full-scale war if it should come in the near future. What is the state of our thinking with respect to these weapons and their possible use?

A commission of eminent men, headed by Bishop Angus Dun, of Washington, has taken the position, in a report to the Federal Council of Churches, that we would be justified in using the atom bomb or any comparable weapon only after it has been used by an enemy.

This position, of course, was taken on moral grounds. But we should also consider its military implications. Suppose that this kind of thinking should prevail and that we should find ourselves at war with Russia. Where and how would we fight? Would we send an American army across 3,000 miles of ocean and attempt to fight the Russians and their satellites in Europe? If so, what is one to think of the hundreds of thousands, probably millions, of American soldiers who would be sent to their deaths in that operation? And how would we get at the real centers of Russian military power deep in the Soviet heartland? Have we forgotten the fate which overtook the German army that Hitler sent marching into Russia? Is there really any valid reason, moral or otherwise, why we must wait until the Russians have blasted our industrial centers before we blast theirs? Has anyone a moral right to insist that our hands remain tied until untold numbers of American civilians have been killed and maimed by the enemy?

Certainly all of these are questions that the American people should be thinking about, and thinking very seriously about, today. It is much easier, of course, to ask questions than it is to know what the answers should be. No layman has the competency to make the decisions that are pressing in upon us. Still, the decisions will have to be made; we cannot escape them. And that force which we speak of as public opinion will play its part.

This being so, there is compelling need for a public opinion which rests on facts as the people are best able to ascertain the facts. We have moved too close to the edge of disaster to accept decisions that are shaped by the cry for peace when there is no peace. We should admit to ourselves that any decisions will be hard decisions. There is nothing left to us except a choice among evils. If this seems to be a repelling outlook, let us remember that it is true, and true in a very literal sense, that we have come to the point where our survival depends upon our ability and our willingness to make decisions that are hard to make, and to act upon them with determination once they have been made. If we let ourselves be borne along irresolutely by the current of events, we shall certainly be carried to total disaster.

The Folly of Our Bipartisan Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, recently a 21-year-old student of the University of Arizona, Charles J. Farrington, Jr., of Tucson, Ariz., who is studying for the ministry of the Episcopal Church, prepared a paper for an English theme entitled "The Folly of Our Bipartisan Foreign Policy." The paper was well prepared and contains much food for thought. It also indicates a growing interest among the young people of the country in our foreign affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that the paper be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOLLY OF OUR BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

The Republican Party has a job to do. That job is to chart a course for American foreign policy that will synchronize with the fundamental economic and political necessities of this Nation. The primary obligation of government, in all instances, is to safeguard the rights of its citizens. The greatest contribution which the United States can make to the peace and freedom of the world is the development of its own material and

spiritual resources to a height of efficiency that no enemy can possibly overcome. A vigilant and stable American Republic can do more to inspire the liberties of the world than any other source of confidence. It is on this premise that the Republican Party must fulfill its responsibility to the American people.

The present Democratic administration has shown little inclination toward such an objective. Instead, it has consistently sacrificed the interests of the United States in order to perpetuate international esteem for itself. It has made appeasement its watchword and meddlesome world saving its principal industry. And its policies have been dictated, for the most part, by neither the wishes and hopes of the American people nor the practical wisdom of their elected representatives, but, rather, by a disreputable assortment of starry-eyed visionaries in the State Department who are more concerned with promoting the cultural assimilation of heathen tribes at the far corners of the earth than with the preservation of the rights and dignities of free men. It is this present Democratic administration which was repudiated by the voters in the election last November, thus making way for the capable, sincere, and courageous leadership which the Republican Party has the sufficiency to provide.

In assuming this obligation, however, the GOP must rectify certain erroneous assumptions in its own philosophy. It must, of course, equip itself with a foreign policy program that is both dynamic and practical; it cannot succeed merely because of the tragic failures of the Democrats. Neither, though, should the Republican Party regard all of its own views as right and those of the Democrats as all wrong. A party in control of a Government for 18 years has opportunities to do many good things as well as many bad things, though it is the established tendency of administrations too long in power to become corrupt and frayed in their thinking and to do the bad things too often. For such a reason men are dying in Korea today. The Republican Party will be more adequate to its task if it avoids rigidity of opinion and extremism of any sort.

Probably the greatest aid to future constructive government by Republicans will be found in a release from the shackles of so-called bipartisanship. This is a lofty propaganda term which describes the idea of government by coalition or government without challenge. It was conceived during the 1944 election campaign through the combined wishes of the two presidential candidates and, ostensibly, the Department of State. It implies equal party representation in the formation of administrative and legislative policies, in the present instance those having to do with foreign affairs. For purposes of presenting a unified front to the rest of the world it is an attractive ideal, though such a shallow display is not the true end of our Government. In another sense, bipartisanship contradicts the basic intention of the two-party system, which is that the government of the majority party shall be strengthened by a system of checks and balances emanating from the opposition and challenge of the minority. The whole history of this Nation, in matters both foreign and domestic, reflects the merit of government sustained by argument, persuasion, and compromise. The fact that it negates such a democratic procedure renders bipartisanship wholly inadvisable. Furthermore, it does not work.

Even though it was apparently more of a hindrance than a help to them during the 1944 presidential campaign, Republicans continued to pursue bipartisanship in foreign policies in the desperate hope that, after all, such mutual effort would afford a surer way to peace in the world. The full extent of their miscalculation is not yet understood, but there is a rumbling of awareness in Republican ranks which cannot fail soon to comprehend the enormity of the bipartisan hoax. The light of reality is penetrating a fateful illusion. The whole effect of bipartisanship in foreign affairs has been to give the Republican Party a share of the blame for Democratic mistakes, and thus to weaken the prestige of the GOP in all phases of legislative and administrative planning. While such prominent Republicans as Governor Dewey, Senator Vandenberg, Harold Stassen, John Foster Dulles, and Representative Charles A. Eaton have actively advocated bipartisan foreign policy, their influence on this Government's decisions has been largely nominal, and actual Republican participation, in most cases, has been limited to public sponsorship or endorsement of the administration's proposals by these and other of the party's leaders. Bipartisanship is "me-too-ism" of the worst kind, and it has, on the whole, produced a rather shameful display of gullibility on the part of otherwise reliable statesmen. It is devoutly to be hoped that Republicans will soon realize that the kind of bipartisanship the Democratic administration practices can eventually frustrate all efforts for a just and honorable foreign policy, and will surely reduce the Republican Party in both its stature and its purpose.

In spite of claims by both parties, there was no bipartisanship in the election campaign of 1944. At the time plans were under way for the proposed United Nations organization, and the Dumbarton Oaks Conference was in progress. President Roosevelt had every reason to welcome the request of his Republican opponent, Thomas E. Dewey, for information and consultation regarding the problems of world peace, since the effect of such cooperation was to be the elimination of foreign policy as an issue in the campaign. This was, in fact, a stroke of salvation for the third-term Roosevelt administration inasmuch as the bipartisan symbol suggested blanket Republican approval of Democratic foreign policies, past and present. Governor Dewey, scrupulously careful not to criticize the administration for its failures and errors, was vigorous in his support of the proposed world peace organization. There is considerable justification for the claim that if he had not so well respected the terms of this pseudo-alliance, and, instead, had exposed the shocking facts of existing foreign relations to the voters, he might have been elected President in spite of the classic bipartisan plea of the Democrats that we should not change horses in the middle of the stream. That the Republican candidate did not risk such an exposé certainly demonstrates his high-principled patriotism during time of war, but subsequent events in the international field give no indication that bipartisan attitudes have actually deterred the course of catastrophe.

There was no bipartisanship at the Yalta Conference in 1945, where a physically sick and mentally deteriorated President made disastrous commitments regarding Asiatic policy, the consequences of which are not even now fully apparent. Nor was it a bipartisan spirit which refused to turn its back on a convicted Communist spy, formerly of high rank in the Government service. No bipartisan policy complacently witnessed the conquest of Nationalist China by Communist terrorism, defining it as only "the rise of simple peasants" in an agrarian reform. And it was not the voice of bipartisanship which advised that we let Korea fall, but not let it look like we pushed it. It was not a bipartisan team which whitewashed a congressional investigation of subversives in the State Department; it was a former Democratic United States Senator, seeking desperately to protect his party from the humiliation of its own unethical adventures and associations. Neither were they bipartisan candidates who were elected to Congress last November by an electorate outraged over the conduct of foreign affairs; they were Republican candidates who spoke out in defense of America and her people, and against the appeasement and pampering of Communists. Yet the present Democratic administration seeks to brand as immoral or isolationist anyone cautious enough and practical enough to be moved by this disgraceful record of too many years of too many blunders in United States foreign policy.

The folly of our bipartisan foreign policy has been demonstrated time and time again. Bipartisanship is a myth, a convenient device for those who cannot bear alone the consequences of their own failures. It is contrary to every precept of this Republic. And it does not work.

Once the Republican Party divests itself of its tendency to acquiesce or politely assent to the theories of the majority party, it can move forward freely and confidently toward the goals of the American heritage. Such objectives have been gradually and deliberately abandoned during the past 18 years of government by fashion and fancy. They must be restored to the consciousness of free men everywhere. The Republican Party must begin now to apply the principles of firmness, consistency, and justice to all policies affecting the lives and happiness of the citizens of the United States. It must build for America a foreign policy that will promote liberty and peace in the world without reducing the standards and opportunities of this Nation. It must have faith in its own ability to rescue America from the verge of economic, political, social, and spiritual disaster. The Republican Party must not, indeed it dare not, fail the Republic.

Tough Turkey—Middle-East Watchdog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is not the first time I have had occasion to make some verbal references to our ally, Turkey. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Tough Turkey—Middle-East Watchdog," written by L. Edgar Prina, and published in today's Washington Evening Star. I shall read but one sentence, however, because we have so few occasions in these days on which we take considerable comfort and pleasure in the expenditure of some of our relief money abroad. I read the concluding paragraph of the article:

> When the American taxpayer contemplates the aid-money spent since World War II, he probably will come up with the verdict of most of our military experts: Where have the dollars been spent more wisely or to better advantage than in Turkey, guardian of the Middle East.

I simply want to add that I think we may take a great deal of comfort from the stanch support which Turkey has given to us in this present difficulty.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

TOUGH TURKEY—MIDDLE EAST WATCHDOG

(By L. Edgar Prina)

The heroic demonstration of fighting prowess by the 5,000-man Turkish brigade in Korea has afforded the peoples of the free

world this comforting thought: There are 375,000 more like them in the army at home.

And should the Soviet Union make an aggressive move toward the Dardanelles, the Suez, or the Near East, the Turks probably could put nearly 2,000,000 trained men in uniform, thanks to universal military training.

That the tough, hard-bitten Turkish soldier is a first-class fighting man may come as a pleasant surprise to many Americans, but not so to the Turks. An official of the Turkish Embassy here, commenting on reports describing the exploits of his countrymen in Korea, said:

"Give us a piece of territory to defend, and—depend on it—we'll defend it to the end. We Turks haven't had a chance to show what we can do as soldiers since we drove out the invading Greek and Allied armies in the early twenties."

The hand-picked Turkish brigade in Korea is a self-supporting, reinforced unit—a sort of souped-up regimental combat team. It has its own artillery and communications. It carries a replacement pool, medical organization, postal, and mess staffs.

Even men of the housekeeping units have got into the fight. The Embassy spokesman said that many of the cooks demanded to be allowed to go up front, contending they were soldiers first and cooks second. They got permission.

These fighting cooks were with other elements of the brigade cut off by the Chinese Reds last week. Low on ammunition, the Turks fixed bayonets and charged. When the action was completed 200 Reds lay dead and 200 others had been taken prisoner.

An American unit fought its way up to the Turks, providing an escape route. But the Turkish commander, Brigadier General Yazicki, declined to flee the trap. "We are killing too many Chinese," he said.

The Turks finally broke out, carrying their wounded on their backs, after fighting a courageous rear-guard action to aid retreating Eighth Army troops. About 500 of them were killed.

The Turkish armed forces, which have been unified for 15 years, are commanded by Gen. Nuri Yamut. He has more power, relatively, than General Bradley, Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Yamut has the final say. Serving under him are Gen. Kurtdjebe Noyan, Army chief; Admiral Sadik Altindjan of the Navy, and Gen. Muzasser Goksenim of the Air Force.

Universal military training has been in effect in Turkey for many years. Men between the ages of 21 and 23 are required to serve for 18 months. Those who have had high school education or less are put in the noncommissioned ranks. College graduates are given officer training, but normally they can advance only to company grade rank.

The professional officer corps, up to the rank of general, are trained at the military college. Generals and admirals attend the staff college. Turkey keeps the officer corps large enough, even in peacetime, to meet the needs of full mobilization.

Before our joint military mission for aid to Turkey began functioning under the Truman doctrine in 1947, Turkey never had a cadre of noncommissioned officers—the backbone of our armed services. Now, however, careers have been opened up for such men in the Turkish forces.

That isn't the only way the Turks have benefited from American aid. More than $1,800,000,000 has gone to Turkey and Greece in the last 3 years in the form of Truman doctrine, ECA, and mutual defense assistance program grants. With this money, modern equipment and training have been provided. Standardization of weapons is under way, and a network of military roads is being constructed. The 650-member military mission is training Turks to train Turks.

Acting on the recommendation of American experts, the Turks actually have cut down the size of their standing army from the 500,000-man force it maintained in 1947. Today they have a compact, hard-hitting machine of 22–25 divisions of about 15,000 men each.

In September, the Turkish armed forces held what has been officially described as extremely successful large-scale military maneuvers. Tanks, planes, and ships participated.

The Turks say that theirs is not purely a defensive force, and point out that they could, in the event of a Russian attack in Western Europe, smash at the Soviet flank.

Turkey has been negotiating a mutual defense pact with Greece which, when consummated, may later include Italy and Yugoslavia. Such a line-up would put a very sizable force on Russia's flank.

Turkey's chief strength lies not alone in its 2,000,000 bayonets, but in the unity of its 20,500,000 citizens. Since it broke with the past in 1923, under Ataturk, it has embraced western ideals and democratic principles. Its firmness in the face of heavy Soviet pressure has earned it a high place in the ranks of the free nations.

When the American taxpayer contemplates the aid money spent since World War II, he probably will come up with the verdict of most of our military experts: Nowhere have the dollars been spent more wisely or to better advantage than in Turkey, guardian of the Middle East.

An Appraisal of Our Position Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address delivered by John S. Knight, editor and publisher of the Miami Herald and other leading daily papers. I particularly mention the Miami Herald for the reason this is one of the outstanding papers of the State of Florida. This address was made before the Chicago Better Business Bureau at Chicago, Ill.

I think the address is most timely for it is a true appraisal of our position today in the world.

Mr. Knight, who is one of the outstanding thinkers of our Nation, has placed his hand on the pulse of the times and I commend this address to the people of our Nation in these trying, serious, and critical times.

I was fortunate in hearing this address over the radio and was so impressed with it that I thought it should be placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the readers thereof to get the benefit of this excellent address. The address follows:

AN APPRAISAL OF OUR POSITION TODAY

It is indeed a very great privilege to address the Chicago Better Business Bureau, which, like the 90 other better business bureaus in the United States and Canada, is dedicated to the principle of responsibility and self-regulation.

Your general purpose, as I understand it, is "to promote integrity and create confidence in advertising, selling, and all other phases of business."

This is all important because the American mass producing, mass selling and mass distribution economy rests upon consumer faith.

Your slogan: Public confidence counts most, exemplifies what might be called the public service of private business.

Your example of self-discipline in business illustrates what can be done in normal times without the doubtful benefit of Government edicts or bureaucratic rulings.

I commend you for your initiative, vision, and sense of social responsibility.

These are characteristics of which the American businessman has every right to feel justly proud.

They give vitality to a system of free competition and add strength to an economic structure which, despite its imperfections, has not only supported the world but still stands firm and erect under the mounting burdens which it is called upon to carry.

I address you as an ordinary citizen who is gravely concerned, as all of us must be, over today's discouraging news from Korea and the present position of the United States in world and domestic affairs.

We, if I may presume to speak for those of similar persuasion, are not thinking as the blind followers of any political party, as burning internationalists or smug isolationists, or as the disciples of any social or economic group.

We are interested, primarily, in a rededication to the principles and moral attributes which carved this Nation out of a wilderness and built it progressively into a position of world leadership, judged by any standard you may care to select.

But it is not my purpose to declaim upon the blessings which we possess nor to dwell upon the virtues of other generations which are always magnified with the passage of time.

It is rather to make an appraisal of the present day world factors which are determining, not only the direction in which this country is headed, but also the fate of civilization.

In any analysis, whether it be of your business or the gargantuan task of assessing the ills of the universe, it is essential that we take account of the factors and decisions of the past.

Although some deny it, it is my belief that our present international difficulties were born out of Franklin D. Roosevelt's firm conviction that he could handle the Russians.

The validity of Roosevelt's assumption is debatable since he died at a most crucial stage of the war.

The record, however, shows that concessions he and Churchill made to the Russians at Tehran and Yalta are responsible in no small degree for the plight of the world today.

The Balkans, excepting Greece, were entrusted to the tender mercies of Premier Stalin. The deal which brought Russia into the war against Japan 6 days before the Emperor's capitulation may have been thought militarily expedient at the time but it proved to be a tragic blunder.

The decision to let the Russians take Berlin led to the impossible arrangement which gave the Russian military commander absolute authority in that area, save for the isolated zones occupied by the Americans, British, and French.

Russia later used this authority to impose a blockade which was eventually broken by the Berlin airlift after months of effort and at a staggering cost.

Had Roosevelt lived, perhaps a better relationship would have been developed with the Russians but because of his faith in them and Stalin's realization at Potsdam that he was dealing with less able men than Roosevelt and Churchill, our efforts for world peace have been blocked at every turn.

In my humble judgment, we have failed also to use the normal procedures of diplomacy to find possible areas of agreement between ourselves and the Kremlin.

When Stalin in February of 1949 indicated that he was ready to open peace discussions with President Truman, that overture was curtly dismissed by Secretary of State Dean Acheson as Russian propaganda.

Russian demands on the United Nations are countered by American threats; vituperation is met with acrimony.

Now, when the President very properly gives assurances that we want no conflict with the Moscow-dominated Chinese Reds, his expression of good faith is ignored by the Chinese Communist leaders and their masters in the Kremlin.

Can it be that our boasting of long-range bombers which can demolish industrial Russia, the angry threats of our diplomats, and loose talk of a preventive war have made us the prisoners of our own propaganda?

Last spring and early summer I revisited England and France and made a short though profitable and enlightening visit to Berlin and Western Germany.

I had not been in England since 1944, the year of the V-bomb and the Normandy invasion. The change was striking. The people had lost that drawn, tired look and seemed to be in excellent spirits despite the many things about which they might justly complain.

Outwardly, things looked good. The surface impression was that come what may, these rugged, stout-hearted Britishers would, through sheer determination, face up to any problem that might lie ahead.

On the economic side, the British have taken full advantage of Marshall-plan assistance.

In England the Marshall plan is well understood. It has been adequately publicized and every factory wall holds posters which explain to the British worker exactly what the Marshall plan is, how it works, and what it means to them individually.

Moreover, the British production-for-export drive have been a conspicuous success because of the patient willingness of the British people to deprive themselves of consumer goods in order to stabilize and improve their economy.

As a result the so-called dollar gap is virtually closed and it is the considered opinion of many British businessmen and economists that no further help of the kind represented by the Marshall plan is now required.

On the debit side of the ledger stands the British Socialist Government.

Through the over-accentuation of welfare and cradle-to-the-grave security schemes, plus the punitive taxation needed to pay for them, it has destroyed incentive and virtually dried up risk capital.

At the present time, nearly 40 percent of the British budget goes to health and welfare, a larger percentage than is used to pay for past wars and military defense.

While the Government's health program is enjoying considerable popularity, the cost of state medicine is far exceeding the original estimates.

By and large, the nationalization of industry and confiscatory taxation have been the prime factors in retarding competitive enterprise, although traditionally the British lean to cartels and the allocation of markets and production.

On the political front, the Socialist government holds a narrow margin over the Conservatives in Parliament but the Laborites have managed to win all decisive issues, including the recent decision to proceed with nationalization of the highly efficient steel industry.

For the Conservatives, Winston Churchill is still the tireless, dogged, persistent, and brilliant leader of the opposition with Anthony Eden as his chief deputy. The younger Conservatives complain that Churchill stands in the way of their advancement, but actually none of them is more than a pale imitation of the old warrior himself.

The Socialists, led by the scholarly Clem Attlee, are a heterogeneous lot who quarrel furiously within their inner councils but manage a sort of unity on party measures.

"Nye" Beven, most radical of the cabinet ministers, has a consuming ambition to become prime minister. It is no exaggeration to say that he is by far the most dangerous man in England, and his influence within the Labor Party is steadily growing.

Naive Americans who sometimes look upon Britain's socialism as "toothless" should remember that of the major industries; the coal mines, the railways, long-distance trucking, gas, electricity, communications, airways, and the Bank of England are already state owned.

They should learn from Labor's victory on the steel issue that while the Socialists sometimes hesitate, they never quit, even in days of great national peril.

There is some evidence, however, to indicate that the people of Great Britain are not as enamored of state socialism as they were in the beginning.

Recent by-elections have given Labor candidates narrower margins and the workingman is finding that government ownership has not solved all of his difficulties.

At this time, it is not too rash to predict that the Conservatives have an outside chance in the next election. However, the hour is so late that even a Conservative victory would mean that the measures which have been enacted under the pressure of war and a Labor government would largely remain as a permanent part of British life.

Two nations could not be more dissimilar in their way of life, general outlook, and basic integrity than Great Britain and France.

No matter what views one may hold of Britain's Socialist Government, the fact remains that the British by pursuing a definite plan of action, have made tremendous strides toward getting their financial house in order.

The French, on the other hand, with their wonderful agriculture, industrial facilities, and natural resources are living in a fantastic state of unreality.

The people do not talk of war. The government in power which today attempted to resign when the National Assembly demanded the trial of the Defense Minister for alleged misconduct is fashioned from an uneasy coalition of political leaders who seem less concerned with the national welfare than with their own prestige and position.

Evasion of taxes in France has developed through the years into a fine art and it is estimated that at least $1 out of every $4 assessed escapes the tax gatherer.

France's budget has been out of balance for so many years that it is no longer a leading subject of discussion.

Politically, France has six major groups and any number of fringe movements which are constantly shifting in their alinements and loyalties.

Of these six, the Communists have the largest representation in the National Assembly with approximately 175 votes out of 618.

Agricultural and industrial production in France exceeds prewar levels but pay is kept low in order to protect the least efficient producers.

The French have had a dollar problem similar to that of the British but they have not done nearly so well in the export field.

One of France's financial problems stems from the cost of maintaining five divisions of troops in Indochina. This charge about equals what France is now receiving from the United States in Marshall plan aid.

France is suffering from a lack of strong and intelligent leadership.

Labor unions are honeycombed with communism.

Business and industrial leaders lack the sense of social responsibility which we have come to expect of them in this country.

Men prominent in the political life of France are, with rare exceptions, vacillating and self-serving.

They waste critical hours, days, and months debating the subject of rearming Western Germany when time is of the essence in setting up proper defense for Western Europe.

The Schuman plan for the integration of the British, French, and German coal and steel industries is the only demonstration of leadership shown by France since the end of World War II.

The French people are not nearly as aware of Marshall plan aid as the British, the Belgians, or the Dutch because they have never been adequately informed.

It is the frequently expressed view that the Marshall plan has stopped the spread of communism in France. I would agree that the pumping of ECA billions into the blood stream of the French economy has retarded the force of the Communist movement but the hard core of communism still remains.

French factories and business enterprises are doing well under the stimulation of American dollars, but the average workman in a French automobile plant makes about 27 cents an hour.

You can't kill communism that way.

The big question mark in the minds of United States and British military planners is whether the French will fight in case of war with Russia.

As I said previously, individual Frenchmen do not care to talk of war. One influential Paris newspaper even advocates France remaining as a neutral zone in the event of hostilities.

There is a strong feeling in France, springing from the tragic experience of three invasions within 70 years, that occupation is better than destruction.

Will the French fight? If you believe what people say, the answer must be a qualified "No."

However, it is my impression that if and when the Atlantic Pact nations place an integrated force of 40 to 60 divisions into Western Europe, the French attitude may undergo a change. But no one can predict how the French will react to tonight's war headlines.

Before leaving the United States, I had planned to be on hand when the Communist-led East German youth organization held its rally in Berlin on May 28.

As you are well aware, there is no guaranteed access to Berlin by road or train. The trusting Americans failed to obtain written commitments from the Russians when the European Advisory Commission was negotiating the plan of occupancy.

So Berlin is today a tiny island in a Russian sea, with east Berlin held by the Communists and west Berlin by the Americans, British, and French.

The first vivid impression of Berlin is the appalling destruction wrought by bombing and artillery fire. As a basis of comparison, I should say that Berlin suffered 100 times the damage that was visited upon London.

While industrial recovery in Western Germany has been rapid, west Berlin is definitely a depression area. There are 300,000 unemployed who manage to eke out an existence picking up rubble. This project is financed with ECA funds.

The Communist-sponsored youth rally, in which about 500,000 youngsters between the ages of 9 and 25 participated, was a convincing demonstration of Russian ability to organize and influence impressionable minds.

As the paraders marched by, with their bands, anticapitalistic banners, pictures of Communist leaders throughout the world,

and shouting "Americans go home, Americans go home," one could only conclude that here is the Hitler emotional appeal all over again, with a new set of slogans and blue shirts in place of brown.

The citizens of West Berlin have never wavered in the face of these Communistic demonstrations. As Gen. Maxwell Taylor, our military commandant in Berlin, says, "They have met every test."

We have a very special responsibility in Berlin because we are trustees for a couple of million people who are standing firm against the Russians.

From American High Commissioner John McCloy in Frankfurt, I learned how difficult it is to stimulate interest in a workable democracy; also that even then the problem of rearming Germany was a paramount issue.

Still, it seemed obvious that fate would decree that Germany be rearmed despite the denials of Secretary of State Acheson that our policy against rearmament would be changed.

My final impression of Western Germany was that people are working and making very real progress under a different and trying set of conditions.

But like the French, they are not yet in any mood to fight the Russians.

Thus far, I have talked exclusively about Europe, first, because I have been there recently and, secondly, because in the long range scheme of things, the economic stability and military potential of Western Europe will determine whether we are to continue to live peacefully as free Americans, or forced to expend our blood and resources in global conflict.

A superficial appraisal of Western Europe could lead to some tragically erroneous conclusions. This has been a banner year in agriculture; industrial production in some instances exceeds prewar levels; tourist business is excellent.

But nowhere, except in Great Britain, did I find much evidence that in the event of all out war with Russia we would have many stout-heated allies by our side.

The disappointing response to the United Nations call for help in Korea correctly reflects the attitude of our allies in the North Atlantic Pact.

To be sure, they have suffered much, their economic problems are difficult, their leadership, wavering and often incompetent.

But I was appalled by their unrealistic and almost fatalistic outlook.

Both in France and Italy, the monied class—and there is a great deal of wealth in both countries—lack social consciousness.

Workers are underpaid with resultant low productivity per man. Business and industry fail to supply inspired leadership. It's every man for himself and the only united front I discovered was the phalanx of opposition to the tax collector.

Under these conditions, no amount of Marshall plan money will ever succeed permanently in eradicating communism. French businessmen have said to me that many of the people who vote Communist are not really Communists at all but actually only protesters against the government in power.

I received this information with considerable skepticism since I recalled the day when General Stilwell told me on Okinawa in 1945 that the Chinese opposing the Nationalist government were not really Communists but only agrarian reformers.

There is no sound reason, however, why the French could not be a strong and prosperous nation. But years of moral decay aided by a venal press, political expediency, and the failure to produce able, conscientious and enlightened leadership have consigned her to the role of a fifth-rate power.

On the military side, I saw nothing in Europe which could prevent a Russian blitz from reaching the Atlantic coast within a matter of weeks.

That realization is the crux of the discussions which continue between the foreign ministers. Sixty or more trained divisions must ultimately be put into the European theater if Europe, and the United States, are to have any semblance of security from the Russian threat.

It is also my studied opinion, after a series of conferences with military leaders, that our major effort must be concentrated in Europe.

Yet, the plan for an integrated European army, including troops from Western Germany, has suffered one delay after another.

There has been disagreement on standards for weapons; Europe wants the United States to send her more troops to prove that we mean business; we want Europe to show the will to defend herself by making the sacrifices that are needed for more arms and bigger armies.

There have been months of stalling by the French on the question of rearming Germany, months in which I suspect France has capitalized upon her traditional fear of the Germans to get the additional aid she wants from the United States.

But the time is here to move ahead with a skillfully designed plan of action. Neither we, nor Europe, can continue to drag our feet, nor to underestimate Russian military and scientific development.

There is a calculated risk in this rearmament. One, that we might provoke an attack, and, two, that our economy may be wrecked in the process.

But, in the light of the challenge which confronts us, it is a risk that must be taken.

In Korea, we made the initial mistake of underestimating the enemy's strength. It was thought that air and naval units plus two American divisions engaged in so-called police action could do the job.

But the Koreans turned out to be surprisingly well-armed and well trained. Rather than being simple North Korean peasants, they were highly specialized, well disciplined elite forces. Their job was to overrun Korea quickly and be available for deployment elsewhere in Asia when needed.

While I believe that we have no choice other than to rebuild our military establishment for all possible eventualities, that does not mean that we must resign ourselves to the inevitability of war.

President Truman is to be commended for his address to the United Nations, the most statesmanlike of his career, in which he challenged the world, and Russia in particular, to drop the cant and sophistry of mere peace talk for a specific plan of universal disarmament.

We should also avoid the temptation to threaten a preventive war.

Talk of this kind is grist for the Soviet propaganda mill. It gives Russia the chance to point out that United States talks about peace but really wants war.

It also ignores the fact that, at this time, we have neither the arms nor the men to make good such ill-considered threats.

Finally, it bows to the idea that a full-blown war is inevitable; that we had better finish it while we can.

I submit there are better ways to work for the peace of the world than by launching an attack to stop war.

May I warn the unthinking optimists in this country that a budget of $62,000,000,000 and the rebuilding of our military strength to more than 3,000,000 men will strain the American economic system as it has never been tested before.

I make this observation, because unlike World War II, there is no foreseeable end to the period in which we must tool up for war, endure shortages because of inadequate stockpiling and maintain a going half-peace, half-war economy at the same time.

The days ahead will impose special responsibilities on all of us; responsibilities and obligations that we cannot blithely assign to the men in uniform and the heads of our Government.

I have tremendous faith in the common sense of the American public. Contrary to the view of Secretary of State Dean Acheson in opposition to reexamination of our policies, our citizens clearly indicated at the recent election that they are deeply concerned over the course we are taking.

In effect, they demand a reaudit of the Government's domestic and foreign policies. It was a victory, not for the Republican high command, but for balance and moderation.

So let us all be reexaminists, or at least proceed to examine and determine whether or not the United States can—

Rebuild its military strength to wartime size;

Rearm and equip the military forces that will be needed in Europe;

Extend the Marshall plan;

Adopt the Gray report and the point-4 program for sharing our wealth with the rest of the world;

Continue to assume primary responsibility for what is sometimes ludicrously called United Nations action in Korea and, at the same time, keep our national debt from reaching stratospheric proportions;

Hold the line against runaway inflation;

Stave off creeping socialism and remain solvent.

Circumstances dictate the strengthening of our national defenses.

The menacing Russian threat also compels us to push ahead with the creation of formidable military strength in Europe.

But this is no time to undertake to save China from the Communists; to make military commitments in Indochina and other parts of the world which are impossible of fulfillment; to embrace the socialistic schemes which are costing Great Britain 40 percent of her national budget; to spend billions in a futile attempt to stamp out world poverty; to finance the underdeveloped areas of the earth; to bankrupt the United States and lose the struggle to Moscow without a single Russian soldier having been sent into battle.

No, this is the point at which the reexamination of our resources and potentials dictates that first things must come first—and the highest priorities must go to national defense and national solvency.

Even with the billions that have gone to Europe in the way of gift loans and Marshall plan assistance, the French have the third largest Communist Party of any nation; 15 percent of the French Army is Communist; the British are weaseling on a firm settlement in Korea; Europe is reported jolted by the United States elections; United Nations fighting representation, apart from that furnished by the United States, is negligible; Italy has 4,000,000 unemployed, a "paper" army and a larger Communist Party than France.

These facts are anything but encouraging but they should warn us against the folly of placing too much dependence upon Allies to whom capitulation to the enemy may appear to be a lesser evil than making Europe a battleground for world war III.

This is the hour when the United States, as never before, needs unselfish and patriotic leadership from Government, industry, business, and labor.

We need a war-profits tax that will help pay the bill but not a politically concocted monstrosity that unjustly penalizes young and growing industries.

Still the witch hunters are already howling about war profiteers and "money hogs."

The businessman has long been the "whipping boy" of the unscrupulous politician, the Communist, the long-haired Socialist and the reckless labor czar.

Yet who can say with any semblance of truth that as a class, the industrialist or

businessman is any less patriotic than politicians, labor leaders, professional people or even newspaper editors?

However, in this fateful crisis, you businessmen stand challenged with the rest of us to demonstrate that as the grim realities unfold, your one overriding consideration must be that no personal sacrifice is too great to insure the preservation of the great land in which we live.

General MacArthur said a few days ago that the Korean war was in its final phase.

But, even as he gave assurances that we would begin to withdraw troops before Christmas, the Chinese Communists launched a full-scale attack and dealt crushing reverses to the American and South Korean forces.

As the representatives of Red China appear before the United Nations to charge the United States with aggression in Formosa, we are perilously near world war III.

While we sit here tonight in comfort and security, let it never be forgotten that 30,000 of our men in uniform have shed their blood in stinking, freezing, vermin-infested Korea.

Each of us, therefore, in our limited way, must strive to lift his patriotism to the same high level of devotion to God and country.

Artificial Cloud Nucleation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call the attention of the House to House Joint Resolution 550, which I introduced on December 6, 1950, "To create a joint congressional committee to study and investigate cloud nucleation," which resolution has been referred to the House Committee on Rules for consideration.

The proposed joint committee, which would be composed of Members of both the House and Senate, would function on the same national basis as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The purpose of this resolution, which is national in scope, has been the result of a thorough study on this subject by recognized scientific and meteorological authorities throughout the country.

Much time and study has been consumed on this subject by several of our outstanding universities and laboratories of the General Electric Co. at Schenectady, N. Y. I, myself, have spent considerable time and study on the subject as chairman of a subcommittee of the California congressional delegation, which subcommittee was created to thoroughly review the possibilities and control of cloud nucleation.

Mr. Speaker, scientific study of this subject has proven that there is no longer any room to doubt that artificial nucleation, under proper atmosphere conditions, can be used to increase precipitation in the form of either rain or snowpack. There is also reason to believe that such artificial nucleation can cause the opposite effect—that is, if improperly done, it can cause a lessening of precipitation.

In connection with this subject, it should be remembered a storm generated by artificial nucleation will spread and continue until dissipated under natural conditions. Under such circumstances, such storms intended for one watershed where flood control facilities are available, or no flood threat exists, may spread to other watersheds, where damage is not only possible, but probable. This condition is a very serious matter for California, where unlicensed and improperly trained people are reputed to be experimenting with and selling their services to artificially nucleate clouds.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose and intent of this resolution is to obtain the greatest benefit for the most people, particularly in those areas where it is deemed necessary and can be controlled successfully, without the intervention of amateurs or others who might attempt this operation for their individual needs or gain, regardless of the rights of others who might otherwise suffer property loss or damage through these uncontrolled efforts.

Even if competent scientists are agreed that under the proper weather conditions, artificial nucleation can provide benefits to dry areas, they are also agreed that improper or ill-advised nucleation can do damage.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that a study by the proposed joint committee would demonstrate that a Government agency of qualified meteorologists is now necessary to determine when and in what areas artificial cloud nucleation should be done, and what the qualifications should be of persons performing this work. The present floods in California demonstrate the dangers that exist in early snowfalls and warm rains, and what damage could result from a fast spring run-off where an artificially heavy snowpack existed without flood control facilities. Such studies may well demonstrate that we have a large increase in hydroelectric power capacity from existing plants without any increase in capital investment, and they will undoubtedly demonstrate that future investments in flood control and reclamation facilities should be decided upon after advice from competent meteorologists in connection with artificial nucleation.

Mr. Speaker, I am also convinced cloud nucleation is important to many Government agencies, such as the Forest Service, Army Engineers, Weather Bureau, Reclamation Bureau, and the Army, Navy, and Air Corps. Such services would require men of different training than in any other agency that now exists.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the present installations in the Tenth District of California—the Naval Ordnance Test Station at Inyokern, China Lake, and the Edwards Air Force Base at Muroc Dry Lake, which have been developed in the belief that the watersheds emptying into such dry lakes historically have little water in them. Meteorologists might well decide that artificial nucleation in the Southern Sierras could easily generate storms that would continue for the short distance from the crest of the Sierras to the watersheds of China Lake and Muroc Lake.

The recent California floods have demonstrated that present conditions require the earliest possible completion of flood-control facilities on the Kings, Kern, Kaweah, and Tule Rivers, and I will make that request at the earliest possible time after the Eighty-second Congress convenes. The development of homes on small ranches in those areas threatened with flood by the streams mentioned above demands completion of these flood-control projects in the public interest. To successfully operate cloud nucleation, it is essential that we have the proper flood-control facilities to adequately handle the precipitation which would necessarily follow.

I would like to remind Members of the House that the great Central Valley project of California is now pumping an estimated 2,000,000 acre-feet of water from the underground beyond that which is presently being replaced by nature, and that my studies on this subject convince me that competent scientists believe that more water is available by artificial nucleation in the Sierra Nevada Mountains than the deficiency I have mentioned. This, of course, is a benefit that should be developed for the public welfare in California. It is a benefit that is believed to be available to other watersheds, such as the Colorado River, where the amount of water is deficient.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, may I further remind you and the Members of the House that this subject presents an opportunity to do something of great public benefit in arid regions of our country, and may possibly benefit areas regularly plagued with hail and lightning storms. Inasmuch as cloud nucleation is presently being carried on by private individuals, the threat of private and public damage presently exists. The threat of damage in the Tenth District of California, where people with limited means are developing their new homes on river low lands, in reliance upon authorized flood-control projects, is very real and must be given immediate attention, even in these days when we are all working day and night in an effort to solve and finance our national defense problems.

Acheson Must Go and Our House Cleaned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, since the Russian Revolution in 1917 many writers have warned us that the Soviet Union was set on a course of world conquest. Now all of us have become aware that we are locked in a death struggle with the Communists. It is a fight for survival. It is not a conflict of ideologies—Russian imperialism is on the march, communism is but a cloak for her aggression. The conflict will resolve the issue of whether men will live free or slave. It will decide whether mankind must submit to the Communist dictatorship of the Kremlin.

The idea of Eurasian conquest has flashed on the screen of time for centuries and centuries. Periodically, hordes swept over Eastern Europe to loot, rape, and subjugate the peoples of the then civilized world. It was so with Genghis Khan whose armies came from the east in a move of world conquest.

These forces conquered and held much of the area which is now Russia. In fact, they moved through the area where Stalin was born. It has been said that Stalin feels himself to be the reincarnated Genghis Khan. Be this or not, it is worth while to compare the efforts of these two.

Genghis Khan first started his campaign in northern Asia, conquering Manchuria, northern China, and then the plains of western Asia. He then moved through southern Asia, conquering the Turks and thence into what is now Russia. The pressing of his invasion was disturbed by revolt in China against his rule. It took nearly 10 years to quell the uprisings in China, but once controlled he devoted himself to the subjugation of the area which today is under Russian domination. Thus Russia was linked to Asia politically, as today Asia is in large measure linked to the Soviet Union.

Turning now to the present situation, it is obvious that Stalin and his henchmen are bent on world conquest. This fact should have been clear for years by the writings of the Communist leaders just as Mein Kampf made clear the aims of Adolph Hitler. However, our eyes are now open. What we seek to stop is aggression, communism is a secondary factor. It is an aggression which has as its aim world domination with the seat of world government in the Kremlin.

The "fifth column" is a subtle technique which has found modern use in the conduct of wars. It was used by Hitler, and brought to a fine temper by the Soviets. There is an additional factor to be considered in the Soviet approach. It has been called various things. It has been said to be the war for the minds of men. Others see it as a propaganda approach which makes things seem to be what they are not; such as calling the militant force of the Chinese Reds an agrarian reform group. These and many other refinements are to be seen in the present methods of the Soviet Union.

One factor has operated in favor of Stalin and his Soviet cohorts which never worked in the somewhat cruder days of Genghis Khan. Stalin won at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam with mere talk large areas of the world's surface. These easy acquisitions of territory were the result of diplomatic bungling by those who state with high purpose to represent the interest of all the free peoples of the world. We can point to the influence of the Soviet Union in the Balkans, Manchuria, East Germany, North Korea, and the Kurile Islands.

After the organization of the Red Chinese Army of agrarians the Soviets maneuvered these puppets against Chiang and his forces. The thrust was well conceived and executed, and was assisted notably by our own Government. In October of 1946 the policy of this country was stated to be as follows when the question of turning over to China some of our surplus merchant vessels was under consideration:

> It is the desire of the United States Government that these commercial-type vessels be destined for a united and democratic China under a coalition government. It is, therefore, understood by the Chinese Government that, if it appears to be in the best interests of the United States, the latter may discontinue the transfer of these vessels.

In the early days the Greeks attempted by alliance to solidify the Western World against the onslaught of pagan masses just as we today have attempted to stem the tide of communism by the North Atlantic Treaty. We have said for over 3 years that our mission was to stop the spread of communism in the world but actually we have aided the spread of communism in the Orient.

The only place where we are actively carrying out counter measures against communism in Asia is in Korea and this came about only after we had said to the world that we would not defend Korea. The only remaining threat to communism in the Orient are the forces of Chiang. Up until the movement of the Seventh Fleet into the waters around Formosa, a considerable part of the Chinese Red army was occupied on the continent adjacent to Formosa. By our action we shut off any affirmative move by Chiang, and we freed this force of Chinese Reds to take up arms elsewhere. The Communist forces thus relieved may be found on Korean battlefields today. It has been said that about 300,000 troops were moved from the Foochow-Canton area, given winter equipment and specially trained by Russian officers for the Korean war.

During much of the postwar period, Dean Acheson has been a part in the formulation of policies which now are shown to be wrong. No one questions his loyalty, high purpose, and scholarly intellect, but he is not a realist—and the time has come for us to be realistic. His policy of the "strategy of freedom" bears scrutiny. Obviously, this plan did not contemplate freedom for Korea, for by his words before we were committed to Korea he stated that we would not interfere. It certainly was not contemplated to help Chiang.

Therefore, we might say that the "strategy of freedom" concept contemplated the abandonment of Asia to communism. What were we to get in return for such an abandonment? A temporary peace in Europe? Such a trade might be acceptable to Britain and France. The socialistic trends of these countries are completely evident. Socialism is the Red twin of communism. Thus, such a trade might be acceptable to our allies, but for us and our avowed purpose of carrying forward the strategy of freedom it would seem that we come out of such a transaction with a spavined nag.

Obviously, any such policy which is influenced by allies who are not dedicated to the same brand of freedom which we espouse is no policy at all. If we are to continue this crusade for world freedom, we must assume leadership, and not be deterred or distracted by weak would-be appeaser nations. We must set a straight course and follow it.

To assume leadership requires strength, and we are a strong nation. Despite our obvious and latent strength, we often present a picture of confusion to the leaders of our would-be allies. This has been made more confusing by the actions of our State Department, which has been guilty of serious inconsistencies and unity-sapping actions. Our strength is to be found in our people; it is evident from our resources and industrial capacity; it is shown in our ability to transcend party lines and join in unified action against the common enemy.

Now is the time for regrouping, preparation, and long-term planning. It is the time for preparation for the all-out counter offensive against the forces of aggression and slavery. We must have a fresh start. We must have men who will not compromise with principle. Dean Acheson must go, and we must have a reconstituted State Department, just as we must have men to bear arms to fight the cause of right. We must not allow the helpers and advisers to remain on the job in the State Department who have permitted the "boss" to allow us to be swindled.

Let us unify all our forces. Let us make known to the men on the battlefields that every effort here is directed against the same foe with whom they are tirelessly fighting. With strong trust in the Almighty, in the same earnest conviction that freedom was ordained by God for all men and nations, we must prepare ourselves for the sacrifices necessary to pay for a world of truly united nations—nations united by a genuine devotion to the cause of God-given freedom.

Trading With Enemy Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the President and the Secretary of State should make an immediate decision on the policy we will pursue relative to trade with the countries we have been helping through ECA and who in turn are trading with Russia and her satellite countries. On page 818 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 24, 1950, will be found a list of 95 trade treaties which have been made by the 16 ECA nations with Russia and other iron curtain countries.

Mr. Speaker, this very day eight ships are on the high seas headed for Hong Kong, and other ports of China. These ships, according to their cargo logs, are carrying huge amounts of medicine, oil, and other strategic war materials. Most of this is being traded through British channels. These ships should not be permitted to unload at Chinese ports.

The President should order the Seventh Fleet to stop these merchant ships and either send them to a neutral port or return to the United States where their cargoes of strategic war materials can be unloaded and kept from Communist China.

Mr. Speaker, this is the ninth anniversary of Pearl Harbor. This country followed the foolish idea of shipping oil and scrap iron to Japan right up to the day of its attack on Pearl Harbor. Just how foolish can the leaders of this administration be? Have they forgotten Pearl Harbor? Is history repeating itself? The scrap iron and oil sent to Japan helped to kill many American boys. The battleship *Arizona*, with its several hundred American boys, would never be resting at the bottom of the ocean near Hawaii, if this country had refused to trade with Japan.

Great Britain has shipped more than $100,000,000 worth of materials into the Soviet Union. They include ball bearings, steel, drill presses, locomotives, and other materials that could be turned into implements of war. Other nations have been doing the same thing only in lesser degree. Many other materials shipped to the iron curtain countries have been helpful in building up their economy and war potential.

Before the recess I complained, on numerous occasions, about imports from Communist China and about exports to it. Large amounts of eggs, fish, and other products have been received from there. Papers recently reported and showed pictures of huge amounts of tires, still usable in the war effort, being sent to Red China. Copper and sheet metals have gone there in large amounts. While the Department of Commerce, on December 4, announced that no more licenses for such materials would be issued, one wonders why this action was not taken long ago. There seems to be little doubt that some unscrupulous traders will find ways of carrying on active trade with Communist countries unless the Departments of State, Commerce, and the whole administration exercises the utmost diligence.

The United States, at the end of World War II, was the strongest Nation in the world. We have gradually and progressively grown weaker because we have bled ourselves to assist other nations. These ECA nations in turn have made themselves and Russia stronger through trade of materials we sent our supposed friends under ECA agreements, in spite of the understanding we had that they would not ship strategic war materials into Russia and her satellites. Because of this understanding Congress turned down an amendment that would have explicitly prohibited such trade.

If this country is to fight communism it should not be done with half-way measures. Certainly, trading with the Communist countries and keeping them fat is not the way to destroy communism. Since the end of World War II we have continued to build it up abroad through our aid to many nations. Now we are prepared to fight it with the atomic bomb. It is time the Truman administration takes a positive stand on trade with communistic nations. The American people are entitled to know the facts. It has not been frank in telling the Congress or the people about trade agreements between ECA nations and the countries behind the iron curtain.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill, now under consideration in the House, would continue existing rent-control legislation for a period of 3 months after December 31, 1950, the date upon which it is due to expire.

I am of the opinion that at this time there should be an extension, either for the 3 months provided for in the House bill, or 2 months at least, as provided for in the Senate bill. There are two reasons that primarily incline me to this opinion. First, we are now confronted with an extremely serious situation growing out of the Korean incident. It may or may not expand to include a far wider area of conflict. If the latter should result, and I certainly hope it does not, it would in all probability make necessary a full mobilization of all national resources. This might make necessary additional controls in many segments of our economy. Therefore, it seems to me it would be wise to keep the present rent-control legislation in existence for the time suggested until future developments make more certain the conditions that will prevail. In the second place it seems to me particularly proper that in view of the fact that a new Congress is to come into being on January 3 next, that the subject should be left in a position that will enable it to take up consideration of the subject in the light of possible future developments. To continue the present law for another 2 or 3 months would not do any appreciable harm to the interests that are demanding complete abolition of rent controls. To do so will make it possible for a full examination of the whole matter in the light of rapidly moving world events, and by a body which represents the latest expression of the will of the people as reflected by the results of the last election.

With further reference to the views I have expressed, I include as part of my remarks, an editorial appearing in the Courier-Post newspaper, of Camden, N. J., issue of Wednesday, December 6, 1950, reading as follows:

MOST COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES TO CONTINUE RENT CONTROL

Twenty-two Camden County municipalities have acted to extend Federal rent controls until June 30, 1951, while 15 have not, according to a survey made by Emil J. McCall, local rent expediter.

Unless renewed by the current lame-duck session of Congress, Federal rent controls will expire December 31 except for those municipalities whose governing bodies approve the 6-month extension.

Where no such action is taken landlords will not be under legal restriction as to the size of rents they can charge after that date.

Camden and Gloucester cities are two of the county's municipalities that have already enacted resolutions continuing rent controls.

On the other hand, some of the other larger municipalities in the county have taken no action, including Pennsauken, Delaware, and Haddon Townships, Audubon, Haddonfield, and Mount Ephraim.

The complete list of municipalities which have voted rent control continuation is as follows:

Camden, Barrington, Bellmawr, Berlin Township, Chesilhurst, Collingswood, Gibbsboro, Gloucester City, Haddon Heights, Hi-Nella, Laurel Springs, Lawnside, Lindenwold, Magnolia, Oaklyn, Pine Hill, Runnemede, Somerdale, Stratford, Voorhees Township, Winslow Township, and Woodlynne.

The municipalities which have taken no action, in addition to the six listed above, are:

Audubon Park, Berlin Borough, Brooklawn, Clementon, Gloucester Township, Merchantville, Pine Valley, Tavistock, and Waterford.

According to McCall, some of the municipalities which have not yet voted to extend controls may do so before the December 31 deadline.

Throughout the Nation the pattern of action for or against continued controls is mixed, just as it is in Camden County. In a general way the larger cities and municipalities are more likely to be found on the side of rent control and the smaller ones against it, but there are many exceptions to the rule on both sides.

Here in Camden County the stand of the various municipalities may to some extent reflect the percentage of home ownership as compared with the number of rented homes, with localities where homes are largely owner-occupied seeing no need for controls. But, as a glance at the list of municipalities in the two categories shows, this rule also has exceptions.

It may be that the present session of Congress will render the whole question of municipal action on rent controls academic for the time being.

Washington reports indicate a strong possibility that Congress may enact a temporary extension throughout the country of 2 months or thereabouts. This would leave it up to the incoming Eighty-second Congress, after it convenes early in January, to take up the issue afresh and decide whether, in view of the war crisis, to enact an entirely new national rent-control law.

A Balance of Power for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, A Balance of Power for Peace, remarks of F. Eberstadt at a meeting jointly sponsored by the World Affairs Council of Seattle and the University of Washington on October 16, 1950:

At the outset I want to thank President Allen for the privilege of being here and also to thank all of you for honoring me with your presence.

I accepted President Allen's invitation with the greatest pleasure—for several reasons. In the first place, I wanted to remove the serious handicap under which I have labored all my life in never having visited this wonderful place. I was curious as to whether Seattle really was as beautiful, and its inhabitants as agreeable, as Dr. Allen and many others claimed.

Furthermore, I welcomed the opportunity to pay a return visit to President Allen. He attended every meeting, with possibly one exception, of our Hoover Commission Task Force on National Security. This required about 26 transcontinental flights in 5 months, a distance equal to about three times around the globe at the Equator. Committee organizers, take notice. You'll never find a more conscientious committee member than Dr. Allen. It seemed a pretty good business proposition for me to be able to repay 3,000-mile visits on the basis of 1 for 26.

The most compelling reason for my acceptance, however, was the opportunity to talk frankly with you, as one citizen with another, about some of the problems bothering all of us—west and east alike; to take stock, as it were, of where we are and how we got there, and, against this background, to consider whether we still have a chance to achieve a decent, self-respecting, and reasonably durable peace.

Twice in something more than a score of years we have won great military victories at tremendous cost in life and property, only to have the goals for which we fought—and which victory actually brought within our grasp—elude us as we listened "with credulity to the whispers of fancy and pursued with eagerness the phantom of hope."

We are confused and concerned.

Our confusion is all the greater because no people ever faced up to the tragedies of war or shouldered its crushing burdens more unselfishly. We coveted no territory but our own. We sought dominion over no people but ourselves. We desired no material advantage from friend or foe. Our only objectives were to put a stop to brutality and aggression; to assure peace and tranquillity in the world so that people might live in security and contentment under governments of their own selection. For the accomplishment of these worthy aims we gave without stint—of life, of work, of property.

We won the war. Yet none of these goals has been attained. There is no peace in the world. There is no tranquillity. There is no security. Far from assuring greater blessings to others, we are in grave danger of ourselves losing some of those that we have long cherished.

No wonder that we are confused and concerned.

What then has gone so wrong? How is it that a deeply peace-loving people should have so brilliantly mastered the art of winning wars and have failed so disastrously in the art of making peace? This question indicates its own answer. It is not our soldiers who have failed but our statesmen.

It is easy to blame the whole tragic business on Russia. Without doubt the men in the Kremlin are largely responsible for our predicament. But Russia's intransigeance is only part of the story. We ourselves, I believe, bear a very real share of the responsibility for the present situation because, though inspired by the noblest ideals, we have failed to come to grips with the practical realities of power and more specifically, to use an old phrase, with the realities of the balance of power. We ignored, or disregarded, one of the hard facts of international life, namely that, in the absence of overwhelming predominance of one nation (as existed under the Roman Empire, and as presently exists in the Western Hemisphere), or of a world organization capable of laying down the rules and of determining and enforcing justice and law and order among nations, a reasonable balance of power amongst the nations is, has been and always will be, essential to the maintenance of peace. To have destroyed that balance before an adequate substitute had been created was to invite aggression and possibly war. That is exactly what we did, and, in my opinion, that is the main reason why we are where we are.

Heartsick from the terrible tragedies and destruction of two World Wars, "determined," as the United Nations Charter puts it, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war," we nobly resolved that it should never happen again. We were disgusted at the past; we longed for something new—something better—for the future. Associating the balance of power with the past, we wanted no part of it. We regarded it as synonymous with "power politics" and we wanted to be rid of that also, and so we approached the postwar problems on a level of high but rather vague idealism, guided by our hopes for the world as it ought to be. The Russians approached them on a less elevated but more hard-boiled and practical level, guided by their knowledge of the world as it is.

It may not be irrelevant to point out that in both World Wars the captains of our ship of state were men probably more concerned with making history than with following its lessons.

The phrase "balance of power" is an old one and to many an unpleasant one. It connotes the kind of "power politics" which we have been brought up to think of as wholly evil. Yet it is impossible to have such power as this country now possesses without deploying it in one way or another. Furthermore, it is impossible to create huge vacuums in the world by the destruction of great nations without having other forces—often worse ones—rush in to fill them. In and of itself, the maintenance of an adequate balance of power may not be the noblest of goals, but it is a means which statesmen have used, and used effectively, over the years in the cause of peace, and on the record it has proved itself a better instrument to that end than most of the eight-hundred-odd peace plans which have been proposed and tried since the Achaean League.

Maintenance of a balance of power between nations, so as to prevent any one of them from threatening or dominating the rest, was a principle familiar to the ancients, both as theorists and practical statesmen. It was practiced in medieval and in modern Europe. It received recognition in the early formulation of international law. It was the justifications for the coalitions against Louis XIV and Napoleon. National upheavals, changing the map of Europe, obscured its application during part of the nineteenth century, but toward the end of the century it emerged again in a series of alliances and counteralliances whose object was to preserve peace. The disrespect in which the phrase "balance of power" is held in this country has sometimes been ascribed to an interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine whereby the United States exercised a special influence in the Western Hemisphere. The Latin-American countries may have a different understanding of the balance of power than we have and warmer feeling toward it.

For this device perfection has never been claimed; nor do I claim it now. It does not guarantee that absolute assurance against war that is desired by utopians. It recognizes the human race for what it is and takes note of the potentialities and limitations of mankind. It assumes that in the unfolding of time there will arise ambitious and unscrupulous rulers who, opportunity being offered, will embark on aggression and conquest. It was to restrain such men that a balance of power was deemed necessary. As to the relative merits of this mechanism versus a really effective world organization, I offer no argument. I do affirm, however, that since no such effective international authority existed the balance of power should not have been destroyed.

II

At any rate, my thesis tonight is that it is in the interest of this country, and of all other peace- and freedom-loving countries, to restore the balance among nations that was so improvidently destroyed. In support of this thesis, permit me to propose a simple question. Suppose that as the war drew to a close, we had offered Mr. Stalin whatever he wanted. What would he have been likely to request?

I submit that his answer would have been about as follows:

1. Destruction of Germany, so that they might communize that state and achieve their objectives in Western Europe and in the Balkans where for years the Germans and British had blocked them.

2. Destruction of Japan, so that they might achieve their aims in the Far East, which for years the Japanese had blocked.

3. Demobilization of our own powerful Military Establishment lest we raise effective objections to the course which they intended to pursue in very practical terms which they understand and respect.

4. Disclosure of the secret of the atom bomb in circumstances where they could build up a stockpile of bombs while we were foreclosed from doing so.

I hope you will not regard my outline of Stalin's presumable requests as evidence of a close personal intimacy between us, and that my Americanism will not be subject to sinister imputations by the admission on my part that my views as to what Stalin might have wanted are based in part on reading some of his writings.

Well, with childish faith and quite unmindful of the consequences, we granted Mr. Stalin three out of four of these requests. We destroyed Germany and thus opened up that country and its former sphere of influence to Russian infiltration in Western Europe and in the Balkans. We destroyed Japan and thus opened up that part of the world to Russia's aggressive designs. We demobilized our powerful military establishment. One request, however, we have not granted. To the lasting credit of that great and patriotic American, Bernard M. Baruch, we did not hand the Russians the atom bomb on a silver platter.

In a word, by destroying states essential to it, we destroyed the balance of power upon two continents, actions which were highly favorable to the imperialistic intention of Russian communism. To the cool-headed and skillful manipulations of our calculating former ally, we innocently responded in exactly the way they wanted us to. Thus, we have been euchered into a position from which only clear thinking, wise judgment, and prompt and forceful action can extricate us, short of a third and catastrophic war.

We were right, of course, in defeating Germany and Japan and in destroying Hitler and his Nazis and the Japanese war lords. Under vicious and unscrupulous leadership, they had embarked on ruthless conquest, threatening our own national security. Our mistake is not in defeating Germany and Japan, but in reducing them to a condition of complete impotence. These two nations, in the west and in the east, respectively, had for years constituted effective barriers to the imperialistic advances of Russia. When their restraining influences on Russian ambitions were removed, we were faced with the alternatives either of sitting idly by and accepting Russian exploitation of these areas, or of offsetting by our own economic and military resources the Russian pressure to fill the vacuum created by the destruction of Germany and Japan.

Why and how we abandoned all ideas of negotiating peace and embarked on the

course of total destruction of Germany and Japan will some day prove a fascinating chapter in history that I can only touch upon here. The fateful decision seems to have been made rather casually at the 1943 Casablanca Conference where the doctrine of "unconditional surrender" was first announced. Whatever the merits of that doctrine as a military slogan, it had far-reaching consequences on the peace. To Germany we administer this dangerous prescription in full strength. Japan received a diluted dose.

In retrospect, it is amazing that the British should ever have agreed to it no matter how great the American pressure was. For, over the centuries Britain had lived by the balance of power and had waged wars to maintain it. Moreover, Britain—Mr. Churchill's advocacy of attacking the "soft underbelly of Europe" showed—must have been aware of the Russian danger long before the war was over.

In the Far East our resolve to destroy Japan—and to invite Russia in at the kill after we ourselves had the situation well in hand—was even more amazing and just as disastrous.

We were, no doubt, influenced to a considerable degree by our hopes and faith in the United Nations as a restraining force on future aggression. We failed to realize that the United Nations could be effective only on the historically doubtful assumption that all of its veto-equipped members would sincerely cooperate in, and carry out, the noble purposes set forth in the Charter, or if there were a balance of power among the major member nations sufficient to discourage adventures of aggression or conquest irrespective of any exercise of the veto.

The most momentous fact of the political world of today is that the Russian Empire now possesses such power and position that it cannot as matters now stand be adversely affected by any possible coalition of European or Asiatic nations. This power and position are not wholly of Russia's own creation. Furthermore, they are relative, not absolute. They came to Russia largely as a result of the destruction of her formerly powerful neighbors. They will remain with her as long as those states remain prostrate and will be shorn from her when those states are restored to strength.

I submit to you that in the destruction of Germany and Japan and in the headlong demobilization of our Military Establishment, we upset the balance of power to such an extent that unless it can be restored promptly and effectively, war with Russia is likely. However, I also take the liberty of suggesting that, in my opinion, it can be restored if we act promptly and effectively. And, that if and when it is, war with Russia is unlikely. To restore a balance of power in time to forestall war with Russia will, however, require vigorous and courageous action, action going to the heart and core of the problem.

III

How, then, restore the balance of power? What can we do to raise our presently depressed side of the scale?

Well, we can continue trying to do so through our own resources, supplemented by those of the British Commonwealth and the nations of Western Europe, while keeping Germany and Japan in an enfeebled condition. That is a pretty big contract in any circumstances. To accomplish it from another continent thousands of miles away vastly multiplies the difficulties. It involves the hazard that the Germans and Japs, despairing of regaining national dignity, might come to view us as oppressors and turn into the Russian orbit. In any case, successful or unsucessful, such a course would impose upon us a long and staggering economic and military burden. While the views of the British Commonwealth and of the nations of Western Europe appear to be in harmony with our own, their practical and material contributions toward halting Russian aggression have necessarily been moderate.

Assisted by large loans and grants from this country, there has been considerable economic recovery in Western Europe. Whether this recovery has reached the point where these nations can immediately devote substantial sums to rearmament is open to question. Furthermore, while their inclination to resist Russian aggression seems quite clear, it is equally clear that the firmness of their resolve to do so will depend to a considerable extent on their conviction as to their chances of success. We must not forget that the prospect looks a bit different when viewed down the muzzle of a Russian gun than it does from 3,000 miles away. Thus, any policy which deprives us and the other nations determined to resist Russian aggression of the support of the Germans and Japanese, or which would turn them toward Russia, would seem to lay upon us an unwise and unnecessarily heavy burden.

A better approach to the problem seems to me to lie in a simple reversal of what, certainly in the light of hindsight, look like rather serious mistakes. This would involve (1) restoring our own military power to a point which we can, as, indeed, we will have to, carry for a long term of years without crushing our economy; (2) aiding in the restoration of the military power of our allies, and (3) bringing Germany and Japan back into the family of nations as counterweights in the balance against Russian aggression. This, it seems to me, is a more possible and more hopeful course.

We should plan the restoration of military power not on the supposition that, in the pattern of medieval chivalry, Russia will offer us the choice of weapons, but on the very opposite theory, that she will fight us where and in the manner that we are least prepared for. Our Korean experience has been instructive along these lines. Faith in successful push-button war is no longer so strong as it was in some quarters.

In step with our own rearmament should be the rearmament of the other North Atlantic Pact nations, and of those nations whose security in the Far East is also in jeopardy.

Prompt rearmament is essential not only against the contingency of open and all-out war with Russia, but as a measure of precaution—an insurance policy, so to speak—against obstructive measures that Russia might take or stimulate during the highly critical period pending the restoration of Germany and Japan to positions where they can protect their own national security and their legitimate interests, burdens which at the present time, as occupying forces, we are obligated to carry.

Doubts have been expressed as to the willingness of our people to continue to bear for long the high cost of a large military establishment. Such doubts are justified if our rearmament is to be based on scareheads and emergencies, alternating with assurances that peace is near at hand. But such doubts are not justified if our people become convinced that such rearmament is a fundamental element in a clear, sound, and strong foreign policy that has a reasonable chance of succeeding.

It is encouraging to note that at last we seem to be recognizing the facts of international life and to have started on a course aimed at restoring a balance of power. If our course remains steadfast, it will be confidence-inspiring. We have begun to rebuild our own military establishment. We are, perhaps the right word to use is "exhorting," the North Atlantic Pact Nations to shoulder their necessary and appropriate military burdens, aided by substantial contributions from us. We seem even to be drifting toward peace with Germany and Japan. An abortive start toward a peace treaty with Japan was made 3 years ago. It floundered on the reefs of procedural difficulties and apparently remained stuck fast there ever since. On September 15 President Truman stated publicly that he had "authorized the Department of State to initiate informal discussions as to future procedure." This subject was also mentioned in the President's report on his meeting General MacArthur. In the same statement, President Truman said that "we have pressed the U. S. S. R. for an Austrian treaty and we are exploring the possibilities of ending the state of war with Germany." A few days later, the Big Three foreign ministers, after conference amongst themselves and with the representatives of the 12 North Atlantic Pact Nations announced certain concessions to Western Germany.

All that is a start in the right direction. But it is only a start. Germany and Japan in my judgment should not simply be granted concessions, that smacks of trading against the Russians. They should be made into going concerns. If we have in fact adopted the policy of making peace with Germany and Japan, we should make that fact clear to our people and to the world, and we should focus on it—not drift but drive toward it—without wasting too much precious time exploring possibilities or fussing with procedure difficulties. The urgency is great and the time is short. If we are to make peace with Germany and Japan, let's do so promptly and magnanimously, with a view to making these former enemies our friends.

I would like to distinguish clearly between a program which looks toward rearming Germany and Japan on the basis of opportunism and expediency, and the program which I suggest—which is to restore these two nations to positions of responsibility and respectability in the family of nations. The former is a makeshift on the purely military level. The latter is a long-term political program for peace.

Consider the effects of so doing—not soon, not in the distant future, but now, tomorrow. The Russians, who have thus far called the tune on the international stage, would immediately be thrown completely on the defensive. By a single play, we would have trumped the false propaganda which Russia so assiduously has been putting out in Europe and Asia. But more: The Russian bear would discover that the primary forces which contained him in the past were again in being, both in the west and in the east. If then he continued to disturb the peace, he would be faced with the possibility of a two-front war—the age-old nightmare of every Russian statesman and marshal.

The way to make peace is to get busy and make peace—a real peace, not a pussy-footing, weasel word, technical peace under which Germany and Japan are to maintain feeble military establisments disguised as so-called police forces which we falsely hope will do our bidding and fight our battles for us. That would be taking a leaf from Russia's book and attempting to reduce them to the status of satellites. It would fool no one but ourselves. Everybody knows that cops armed with tanks instead of nightsticks are intended for other purposes than maintaining internal order. We cannot expect to treat the manhood of Germany and Japan as pools for the recruitment of great foreign legions in the service of our own political objectives.

Does anyone imagine that either the Germans or the Japanese, under such an arrangement, would be dependable or effective soldiers? Does anyone seriously believe that under any arrangement the Germans and Japanese will fight our battles for us? Certainly not. But they will fight to defend their own homelands and their own

national security and their own interests. To the extent that these are in harmony with our objectives in restraining Russia, they constitute an effective counterweight to the present serious imbalance.

Is it likely that the Korean incident would have occurred if Japan had been restored to a strong and independent condition? How long would the Russian sword hanging over the head of western Europe continue to dangle if Germany were on her feet? These potent and industrious people could, if restored to full nationhood, take off our shoulders a large measure of the political, economic, and military burdens that we are carrying and, as things now stand, will have to continue to carry indefinitely.

The peace that I suggest with Germany and Japan is a real and true peace; a peace which will restore these nations, under decent and enlightened leadership, to positions of equality in the family of nations; a peace under which these strong and productive peoples—70,000,000 Germans and 80,000,000 Japanese—can regain their own self-respect and the respect of the peace-loving nations of the world; a peace under which they will be promptly admitted to full membership in the United Nations and given seats on the Security Council. In my opinion, once Germany and Japan have been so restored, the Russians will recognize the futility and danger to them of their present tactics. Then, and then only, will we be able to make a tolerable and enduring peace.

IV

Finally, let us consider certain specifications of the peace which I propose. First of all, we should see that Germany is firmly tied into the other nations of western Europe and becomes a full partner in the North Atlantic Pact. The importance of this point cannot be overemphasized. We must not permit Germany again to get into a position where she can play the west and east against each other as a preliminary to attacking one after the other. The Schuman plan offers real assurance in this direction. The most effective way to prevent Germany from making another attack against western Europe is to consolidate her heavy industry in the Ruhr with that of Belgium, France, and Luxemburg under an autonomous authority controlled by the nations of western Europe.

In the peace treaties with Germany and Japan we can embody appropriate protective provisions to which they must adhere. For example, we can put limitations on the size and nature of their armed forces. We can call for periodic reports and can reserve the right of inspection to ourselves or to the United Nations. If, then, we and the other members of the United Nations continue to see that these provisions are lived up to, we can greatly minimize such risks as are involved.

During the transition period, while Germany and Japan are recovering to the point where they can protect themselves and their own interests, we should and in fact will have to maintain strong forces in those two countries—ironically enough, not essentially to punish or control a former enemy, but to restrain a former ally. However, just as soon as Germany and Japan are able to protect their own security and to take care of their own affairs, we should withdraw our troops, retaining only such military forces and establishments as in the interest of mutual security are freely and voluntarily accorded us.

I fully appreciate that there are risks—and great risks—in a restoration of Germany and Japan. A restored Germany, particularly in the enfeebled condition of the present European nations, might obtain that ascendancy which the Kaiser and Hitler sought in vain. In the disturbed conditions of the Far East, a restored Japan might again embark on a career of conquest. We can thoroughly understand the fears of the western European and the far eastern nations along these lines. However, we are not at the moment sitting pretty with an opportunity to make a simple choice between a risky course on the one hand and one that involves no risk on the other. We have to choose among courses all of which are risky. "When constabulary duty's to be done, the policeman's lot is not a happy one." The alternatives may be tough and dangerous, but at our peril, we must make the right choice. It is a question of balancing risks, or, to use a phrase recently current "calculating" them.

Yet, it is important to note that the new balance of power here proposed differs radically from anything in the past because the United States, now being ready to shoulder its obligations in the matter of maintaining world peace, would openly and actively be part of it. That will make a great difference. It has often been pointed out that had Germany in 1914 known that both Britain and the United States would actively enter the war against her, she would not have embarked on her adventure. It cannot be doubted that our own isolationism of the twenties and thirties, including both our disarmament and our ill-fated neutrality legislation, powerfully affected the calculations of both Hitler and Japan. The fact that the United States is now irrevocably committed in world affairs will, in my judgment, have a profound deterrent effect on both Germany and Japan in the future. Remaining strong ourselves, we can afford to have strong allies.

If we restore Germany and Japan, we must do so with our eyes open to the risks involved, but firmly determined that we will not again, as we did before, permit them to build up their military power for aggression and be prepared, if need arises, to tip the scales against them.

With a fairly even balance of power in the world, maintenance of peace will require neither unduly onerous economic nor military burdens on our part. We might only need to learn and practice the international art of winning friends and influencing people, a field in which our activities to date have not been conspicuously successful.

V

I recognize that in order to make such a peace with Germany and Japan the wish is not the deed. The process is fraught with difficulties and complications. Even if I knew all the solutions, which I don't, time would prevent their recital. I do not, however, consider these problems either as so difficult or so vital as to deter us from pressing ahead vigorously. We should bear in mind that however formidable these "procedural difficulties" may loom at the moment, if war with Russia were to break out, they would instantly become entirely academic.

The question naturally arises as to what effect such a program as I have suggested would have on the United Nations and on our relations with that organization. We were its main sponsor and have been its main supporter. In spite of many disillusionments it remains a principal depository of our hopes for world peace. Thus we most certainly should not lightly adopt a course which would be injurious to the United Nations or would prejudice its present usefulness and future prospects. The course that I have suggested would not have that effect, in my opinion—quite the opposite. I have not proposed and do not propose that we commit ourselves to restoring a balance of power amongst the nations as a substitute for the United Nations. On the contrary, I believe that we should continue to support the United Nations in every possible way. In line with that policy the restoration of a reasonable balance of power in the world, including the admission of Germany and Japan as full partners in the United Nations with seats on the Security Council, would constitute the greatest practical step forward that could be taken toward strengthening the United Nations and making it a powerful and effective instrument for the maintenance of peace.

The United Nations, like the League of Nations before it, is an expression of the longing of mankind for a new and better and more effective means for maintaining world peace. I yield to no one in the depth and sincerity of my hopes and longing that it may succeed. But I submit to you that practical progress toward its noble objectives is more likely to be achieved by supporting these high purposes with the proved experience of the past. And so, as we hopefully continue the long and difficult struggle to transform the world from what it is to what we think it ought to be, our efforts will be more real, more practical, more effective, if we ground them on the firm foundations of past experience.

In making these suggestions, I am not forgetful of the tremendous debt that we owe to hundreds of thousands of our boys who made the supreme sacrifice to defeat Germany and Japan; nor of the many other millions who died or suffered tortures even worse than death at the brutal hands of the Nazis and Japanese. But I doubt that it would be their wish that we follow policies of revenge and vindictiveness which would sentence to death other millions of young people and end in the destruction of all that they regarded as sacred. They who were the greatest victims of intolerance would, I think, if they could speak, be the strongest advocates of tolerance.

Many I know will object to the course that I have suggested, but none more vigorously than the Russians. The timid among us will assert that such action would force Russia's hand and might provoke her to open war. I doubt it. Russia's response wherever we have taken strong measures and most notably in Korea, does not support this conclusion. The scared will say "Let us attack them first" in what has been called a defensive war. I doubt that we will ever do that. We cannot base our course vis-à-vis Russia on timidity or on fright. Nor can we solve our problems by appeasement, or by threats or by oratory or by exchanges of letters or in present circumstances, by personal conferences with "good old Joe." What we need is clear, forceful, and consistent policy and action based on a sound estimate of the situation. President Truman's firm and realistic decisions in the early stages of the Korean aggression were pitched in the right way.

Above all we cannot achieve lasting peace by continuing to live in a kind of rosy or should I say "Reddish" idealistic haze. We must come to grips with the stern realities of power, harnessing it firmly to the cause of justice and world peace.

I do not claim that if we take the steps that I have suggested we will immediately transform the world into a place where, free from care, we can live happily ever afterward. I do claim, however, that by taking the course proposed, we can create world conditions where, with eternal, intelligent, and courageous vigilance, we can, as a practical matter, win and preserve a just and lasting peace, a peace which will bring in its wake those material and intangible blessings which alone make life worth living.

I have attempted to state my views clearly, and I assure you, they have been stated modestly, for I know very well that, in these matters, there is room for wide differences of opinion among patriotic and well-informed people. Nobody knows all the answers. Even though many of you may not agree with me, I am grateful for the courteous attention that all of you have given to my remarks, and thank you for it.

Further Political Activities of the Doctors of the Second Congressional District of Nebraska, Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, some time after I received the barrage of letters from the doctors as indicated in yesterday's insertion, growing out of my mailing 5,000 pamphlets explaining President Truman's health plan to doctors and other interested parties in my district, I began to receive resolutions from civic and other groups, all of which followed a definite pattern and showed by comparison that they originated from the same source. These resolutions followed this pattern:

Whereas the American family has received the finest quality of medical care available in any country in the world, developed under our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has caused a decline in national health and deterioration of medical standards and facilities, to the detriment of family welfare; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has taken away the family's right to choosing its own family physicians; and

Whereas invasion of family privacy and violation of the sanctity of the patient-physician relationship have proved to be one of the most objectionable features of compulsory health insurance, wherever tried; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would result immediately in a tax of 3 percent on the income of the American workingman, rising within a few years to 6 percent and higher, creating a new tax burden which would reduce household budgets and bring down family standards of living; and

Whereas Government control of medical services, by gradually undermining free enterprise and establishing heavy new tax burdens and unprecedented national deficits, would threaten national bankruptcy and encourage the spread of socialism, which would endanger the rights of our children to the individual freedoms which have been the American heritage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

I made the following answers to these resolutions:

Your resolution was received by me and I wish to advise you that I have always been of the thought that socialized medicine should never find a place in our Government setup. But socialized medicine and national health insurance are two different things, as the slightest investigation will disclose.

It seems to me that the medical profession has been grossly deceived by some interests or some sources and have refused to investigate or learn the difference between socialized medicine and national health insurance.

There are at least three national health insurance bills pending in the Congress now which are compulsory in nature. Having had some disastrous life-insurance experience personally, as far as loading up on insurance was concerned, I can see the danger of compulsory health insurance to many well-meaning persons.

I think that we need some sort of national health insurance if private insurance companies cannot do the job, but any such insurance should be voluntary, and by that I mean that the individual should be accorded the right to say whether he wants the insurance or not and to choose his doctor and the doctor should have the right to accept or reject the patient.

There are many people who would not want national health insurance such as persons who already have adequate insurance of their own choosing with private insurance concerns, persons who work for railroads and other large business institutions, as well as certain public and quasi-public businesses and of course all veterans have a hospital, medical, and dental plan already and it would be of no use to compel these veterans who are employed to take out national health insurance. In other words, I do not believe in loading up people who do not need it with health or accident insurance whether it be Government insurance or private insurance.

Insofar as the foregoing is in agreement with your resolution you can rely upon what I said in this letter and that I shall conduct myself accordingly, notwithstanding.

I came back to Omaha, Nebr., in December 1949, and found the reactionary Republican-Democratic doctors fairly fraunching with rage. I offered to go before the local medical society and explain my stand and talk with them, but they refused to hear me. I talked to the bellwether medical doctors on the streets and over the telephone but to no avail. Finally, Dr. Joseph F. Cross, a fledgling doctor, suggested to certain doctors to let me talk to them and have everybody loaded up with questions, and confuse and confound me, but one of the old Republican wiseacres said, "Oh, don't do that. That O'SULLIVAN is too smart—too experienced. He will answer all your questions and put you to shame. Don't let him appear at all. Keep him away," and I was kept away.

Finally the Omaha dentists, through a friend of mine, consented to let me speak before them and I did so. They had a court reporter take down all I said. I wish I could read that speech to you. Dr. Dailey erroneously introduced me by saying that I would speak for 30 minutes to the dot in favor of socialized medicine, even though I had told him and everyone else I was against socialized medicine. When I arose to address the gathering I roundly repudiated the subject which Dr. Dailey had foisted upon me. I told them I was against and not for socialized medicine and compulsory health insurance; that I favored voluntary health insurance. I answered every one of their questions. They listened to me gravely and in great dignity; they retired to deliberate upon a nonexistent issue.

The mental mountain labored far into the night and brought forth the following intellectual mouse:

OMAHA DISTRICT DENTAL SOCIETY,
Omaha, Nebr., December 7, 1949.

The Omaha District Society had the Honorable EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, Second Nebraska District Congressman, as the speaker for their regular monthly meeting held at the Fontenelle Hotel, Tuesday, December 6, 1949.

The announced topic of Mr. O'SULLIVAN was Why I Am Still as I Always Was, Against Socialized Medicine and for President Truman's National Health Program.

After the address the society decided that the speaker had failed to prove that President Truman's health program was anything except socialized medicine under a different name and adopted the following resolution unanimously:

"Resolution

"Whereas the American and medical profession have established the world's highest standards of dental and medical care resulting in the healthiest major Nation on earth; and

"Whereas the private practice system has been the great factor in establishing that record; and

"Whereas the proposed bill S. 1679, H. R. 4312, and H. R. 4313 which is President Truman's national health program is socialized dentistry and medicine under a different name; be it

"*Resolved*, That the Omaha District Dental Society, a component of the Nebraska State Dental Association and the American Dental Association, hereby request the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance.

"EDMUND J. DAILEY, D. D. S.,
"President.
"ARLO M. DUNN, D. D. S.,
"Secretary."

In a last desperate effort to bring order out of chaos and truth out of falsehood to those who have eyes and see not, who have ears and hear not, who have brains and think not, and whose voices akin to those who brought the sentence of death on the Nazarene, I sent this letter:

OMAHA, NEBR., *December 13, 1949.*
OMAHA DISTRICT DENTAL SOCIETY,
Omaha, Nebr.
(Attention: Edmund J. Dailey, D. D. S., president.)

DEAR DR. DAILEY: I am very sorry that your organization erroneously persists in assuming that President Truman's national health program is socialized medicine under a different name, when it is not any such thing, but who am I to criticize you, if you want to join the reactionary Republican doctors and in good old Mother Goose fashion, thrust your fists against the the posts and still insist you see the ghosts.

The President's program, you must remember, embraces much more than health insurance which your group, like the medical men, have overlooked in the grand assault to appropriate the whole health-insurance field for Blue Cross and Blue Shield, which puts the medical men and the profession in a sort of a medical business for sure, to the financial detriment of private insurance companies and those who believe that medicine is a profession and not a business.

I, as you know, am not against these organizations even though they go far afield in a real socializing endeavor, and in order to protect all proper health-insurance companies, believe that any national health insurance should be on a voluntary basis, i. e., the practitioner should have the right to select his patient, the patient to select the practitioner, and the insured to take or refuse the insurance.

In conclusion, I say that it takes all kinds of people to make a world and we must take the bitter with the sweet and the unreasonable with the reasonable and the selfish with the unselfish, I guess.

With kindest regards, I remain,
EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN.

As an aside, I say man may protect himself adequately against every male-factor in the world except one, and that is a liar, because he does not know what a liar is going to say or do.

I will conclude by saying again, Do not let these insurance-guided reactionary

doctors fool you and remember I was always against socialism, socialized medicine, and compulsory health insurance and was always for voluntary health insurance and think, talk, and act in accordance with the American way which is the best way.

You know the rest, I am sure. For months now the insurance-guided, reactionary Republican-Democratic bellwethers of medicine have been cruising about the Second Congressional District much like a bad accident looking for some place to happen and repeating the falsehood, O'SULLIVAN is for socialism, socialized medicine, and compulsory health insurance and they know full well that that is false.

Will you people please correct the wrong impressions about me which these M. D.'s and others are making? Will you help me to refute these lies?

Good-by and thanks for listening, ladies and gentlemen.

Labor Editor Says Election Revolt Against Union Brass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Portland Oregonian of Friday, November 17, 1950:

"Senator ROBERT TAFT'S record victory in Ohio and the defeat of labor candidates elsewhere was a revolt of the rank and file against its leadership—a leadership suffering from self-hypnosis," S. Eugene Allen, editor of Oregon Labor Press, said in a two-column analysis of this month's election returns in the current issue of his paper.

Allen charged the "high brass" of the labor unions with fatal mistakes in reading election returns and in strategy which, instead of making votes, turned labor against the program of the high command.

He charged that leadership abandoned the traditional nonpartisan position of labor and went hook, line, and sinker into the Democratic Party and the results were a smashing victory for Taft and utter rout for labor.

Declaring the American trade-unionist is not in anyone's pocket, Allen asserted the high command made the mistake of assuming working people would follow the political leadership of the A. F. of L. and CIO and the independent unions just because they believe in union organization and collective bargaining.

He said, "Working people belong to labor unions for economic reasons, not for political reasons. They pay business agents and other officers to represent them in collective bargaining, not to give out political advice."

1948 CALLED FARM VOTE

"Chief of the fatal mistakes made by the high command of labor were," he said:

"1. The assumption that Truman's 1948 victory was a labor victory." Allen said it was a farm-vote victory.

2. The assumption that the Truman victory gave labor a mandate for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law. He pointed out labor refused against the advice of such real statesmen as WAYNE MORSE and PAUL DOUGLAS to agree to amendments to the law which would ameliorate some of the drastic provisions of the act.

3. The assumption that working people would follow political leadership of the high brass of the unions.

4. The assumption that there is "class consciousness" among working people. He said working people are now the American middle class.

LABOR'S WORST BEATING

He pointed out that never in history has labor made a greater fight than in Ohio, "nor have they been so badly beaten" and labor was humiliated.

"It is simply impossible in Ohio—or in any other industrial State—for a majority such as Senator TAFT received to be gained without votes of labor unionists," he said.

Labor's campaign was not based primarily on the issues (of which there were a great plenty) but was one of shameless name calling and flinging of dead cats. The members of labor unions resented it. They voted for TAFT.

"Hereafter," said Allen, "labor should learn some lessons." He recommended:

"Read the election returns properly. Don't think a farm vote represents a labor victory. Don't assume a single issue is a winner in a complex national election. Don't back a candidate of little merit merely to oppose some one. Remember that labor's vote isn't in anyone's pocket and that valid issues and not dead cats win votes. Avoid like the plague entangling alliances with any political party. Clean our own house so we have nothing for apology. Grow up."

Let Us Have Right Kind and Number of Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Hugh Gallagher, president of the Propeller Club of the United States, which appeared in the November issue of the Propeller Club News:

LET US HAVE RIGHT KIND AND NUMBER OF SHIPS

(By Hugh Gallagher, president, Propeller Club of the United States)

Practically my whole life has been directed toward the building of a strong American merchant marine and, as president of the National Propeller Club, it is my intention to direct the energies of this fine organization toward that goal. I hope every member will consider himself a minute man who is always on guard and willing to act on matters which will accomplish desired results.

We have been resting on our oars since the end of World War II, complacently regarding our huge laid-up fleet as money in the bank to be used in an emergency. And what has happened? In the Korean situation we found only a few of these ships were of the type that could get into service quickly enough to save us from disaster. We had insufficient troop ships and fast cargo ships to do the job. We had even to charter some foreign ships. Had we been opposed by enemy submarines and atomic bombs, our small forces could not have held out as gallantly as they did and the Inchon landing could not have been accomplished.

We must remedy this, without delay. Fortunately, there are some in Washington who are trying to get a fast-cargo-ship program started. Vice Adm. Edward L. Cochrane, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, has taken the lead in pushing this program. Every member of the Propeller Club should back him up to the hilt. Let us not worry too much about whether such a ship will be adaptable to all peacetime trade uses. It is more important that it be fast enough to get there, capable of carrying a good load, and able to outrun submarines. We also need troop ships which can transport our men to any spot on the globe—fast. Little is gained by troop carriers advancing at 30 knots if they are not followed closely by cargo ships with supplies, ammunition, and fuel.

The industry associations have been working on legislation which will help to overcome some of these deficiencies, because it will afford private enterprise an opportunity to build ships that are both useful for trade and which can be used in an emergency. But why hasn't this legislation been passed? Must we go through a Dunkerque before we are shocked into doing what is so obviously sensible? Every member must become active in urging his congressional representatives to give close attention to the vital role our merchant marine plays in the defense of freedom.

We must be alert and active against those who urge that foreign shipping should carry more of our commerce because it will improve their dollar position. This is a fallacious position and is not a truly American viewpoint. We must regard such advocates as enemies of a strong American merchant marine. Our export tonnage has, in a large measure, been in Government-financed cargoes, and it is only right that 50 percent of them be transported in United States ships. If American ships are not entitled to a fair share of that tonnage, then the American farmer, manufacturer, worker, and all involved should forego participation. There is no reason why American shipping should be singled out to close the dollar gap.

All members must take this problem to heart. Don't write off the alleged do-gooders in high places, who subtly argue against the American merchant marine. They are active and many. They don't seem to understand that, if we should need ships to save our lives and our freedom, we could not depend on foreign ships to do the job for us. The last war proved, on the contrary, that foreign nations had to turn to the United States to get shipping needed to win the war.

We can only be sure of American ships. Let us have the right kind and the right number ready for the job that may be ahead.

Trends in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, long before the war began in Korea, and at a time when the administration and our people were primarily concerned with a domestic legislative program, in anticipation that a lasting and enduring peace could be achieved, I expressed grave concern on the floor of the Senate and in other public addresses regarding certain trends in our Government, and apprehensions regarding the legislative program sponsored by the administration.

I undertook to evaluate that program primarily on the basis of our ability to support it if it should be enacted into law, and also the risk it would involve to sound fiscal policies and the solvency of our Government.

The last time, Mr. President, that I discussed these problems at a public forum was at the Arkansas Bar Association in Hot Springs, Ark., on May 13, 1950. Subsequently I received a letter from a young jurist and distinguished citizen of my State, Judge Thomas F. Butt, of Fayetteville, Ark., commenting upon the address I delivered at the bar association meeting, in which he expressed views and made comments that should in my opinion engage the serious thought of every citizen of our country, and particularly of the youth among our citizenship, upon whom will rest grave responsiblities as they come into maturity and assume the obligations that citizenship in our democracy entail.

For the information of my colleagues, and in the hope that Judge Butt's letter may be read by many others, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I further ask, Mr. President, that immediately following the letter of Judge Butt, to which I have referred, the address I delivered at the bar association in Arkansas, May 13, 1950, also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter from Judge Butt and the address by Senator MCCLELLAN were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., *October 31, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Not being from your section of the State, and having met you but a few times, and then only casually, it is probable that you would have no reason to identify or remember me. For purposes of recognition, I believe that you do know my father, F. O. Butt, of Eureka Springs, and knew my late brother, John K. Butt.

I have had the pleasure of hearing you speak on several occasions in the past, but the purpose of this letter is to congratulate you on your splendid speech given to the Arkansas Bar Association last May. That convention was the first I have missed, and only recently did I read your address in the Arkansas Law Review.

Of course, one likes or dislikes a given talk in direct proportion to the degree the talk happens to gibe with one's own opinions; but without becoming prolix, let me say that I agree wholeheartedly with what you had to say. Frankly, I am gravely concerned about the democratic future of this country, and I am not speaking politically. I honestly, and regretfully believe that your and my generation, and our children, will never again experience and enjoy the full fruition of traditional American freedom of the individual that you experienced as a younger man, and that I caught glimpses of as I was growing to maturity. I am gravely concerned that the American people, by their own default, are letting their individual liberties slip away, and that they have become so accustomed to holding their hands out to Washington, that they now demand the paternal care of the central government as a right, and not as a matter of temporary emergency relief. The increasing costs of Government can, or course, be laid in part to the tremendous financial burdens of World War II, and I was struck by your assertion that of the projected $9,000,000,000 increase in fiscal 1950, only about two billion was for defense and related items, the balance being for purely domestic items bearing on the national economy, and the Federal Government's growing suzerainty over the individual citizen's private affairs.

Let me tell you of a striking, and in my opinion, terrible thing that I witnessed about a year ago. Here in Fayetteville, the annual C of C dinner attracted some 700 people. During the course of the speaker's remarks, he asked: "In 1775, what was the watchword of the young American people" The answer came from all over the banquet hall: "Liberty-freedom." Then the speaker asked: 'What is today's watchword?" and again came the answer: "Security, security."

The terrible thing about it, as I see it, is that we as a people, and as individuals, are, by our demand for security, surrendering, I fear, forever, the basic freedoms and liberties without which, inevitably, there can never be real security. And I think this is so, primarily, because our Federal Government has embarked upon, and is assiduously pursuing, a course of governmental philosophy, implemented by legislation, that is leading, and must lead, straight to socialism, and worse. I read, the other day, of a wonderful thing. Perhaps you saw it, too. A man in California had sent his check for $652 to the Oklahoma Welfare Department, explaining that it was to repay the amount spent by Oklahoma for the care of the man's mother, at a time when he was sick and unable to do so. Having regained his physical welfare and earning power, he was repaying that welfare agency. This, to me, is the true American spirit; the notion that each of us, primarily, is responsible for himself and his people, and that such is not a charge of government. Of course, as a great Man said: "The poor we have always with us," and, of course, they must be cared for, by private means if possible, if not, then by public institutions. But this is not to say, in my opinion, that the average citizen, able to earn a living, should in any event look to government for his ultimate care and support. To my mind, the growing burden of taxes, made necessary to effectuate programs of public welfare on a grand and national scale, will inevitably lead to a diminution of the individual's incentive to work and earn a living. On this premise, if correct, it is only a matter of time until the American genius of production and creation of wealth will have been drastically reduced, which will in turn require a greater percentage of total earnings to be allocated to taxes to maintain government services.

It seems to me to be imperative that we try to operate our Government somewhere near a cash basis, and stop this pyramiding of agencies and expenses which create new and expanded agencies and expenses. The Brannan farm plan is but one of many programs that are completely illusory, in that the price paid across the grocery counter may be apparently less, but when you and I add to that price the tax-financed parity support, we are not getting a bargain, and neither is the farmer. In the field of industrial earnings, a vicious spiral is and has been in effect. No one wants to deny labor, little or big, organized or not, a fair wage for his work. But a raise in dollar wages does not necessarily mean a rise in real wages. As cost of Government and Government services increases, taxes must go up, commodity prices rise, and there is another round of wage increases, followed by another round of price rises generally, and so on and on.

What must be done, small though it may be, is to put a stop to nonessential Government spending and Government services. The phantom of something-for-nothing involved in Federal grants and allocations, all of which must be supported by taxes, is an ultimately ruinous thing. I highly commend your insistence that all programs of legislation proposed by the administration be carefully scrutinized to determine not only its probable cost, but its necessity and propriety in itself. I wish you good fortune in your legislative efforts to this end, and hope you will have the doughty assistance of other like-minded legislators.

Sincerely,

THOMAS F. BUTT.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN L. MCCLELLAN

Thank you, President Warner, distinguished guests, members of the Arkansas Bar Association, and ladies and gentlemen, I was very much honored and pleased when I received your invitation to give this address, and happy when I knew it would be possible for me to accept and have the pleasure of again attending a bar association meeting of my home State. The opportunity to break away for a day from my arduous official responsibilities and from the administrative and legislative battlefields in our National Capital was most welcome indeed.

As I flew down to Arkansas yesterday, in contemplation of this visit with you, my thoughts turned back to earlier days of my professional life when I was privileged to be present at more of the meetings of your association than I have had the opportunity to attend since I entered upon a public career. I have missed these associations and have regretted my inability to be with you and to actively participate in your deliberations and enjoy the fellowship of my friends among the legal profession.

On my way here, I was given to reminiscing and mediating upon some of the momentous events that have ocurred and changes that have taken place since I first had the honor of representing this, the Sixth Congressional District, in the National Congress. I tried to evaluate and make some appraisal of their significance and the impact they have had upon our country, our form of government, our liberties, and how they are influencing our destiny as a nation and as a people.

When I entered Congress 16 years ago, we were in the midst of the greatest economic depression our Nation ever experienced. That was followed or overtaken by a Second World War—the most horrible and devastating military conflict the world has ever known. Along with our Allies we emerged victorious, but the victory has not yet brought to us and to the world the peace, economic stability, and security that we desired and must ultimately achieve if our freedom and way of life are to be preserved. The full fruits of victory have not materialized.

Our efforts toward an enduring peace, economic security, and stability throughout the world have been met up to now, and are meeting, with effective opposition and resistance from the same character of evil forces, of aggression and militarism that plunged this world into World War II. Those events and world conditions have placed upon this Nation of ours and upon our people a tremendous responsibility not only of leadership but of economic power and strength to try to combat and repel the march of these aggressors and try to hold the line against the spread of an evil ideology that, if it conquers, will mean the loss to us of our way of life, of all we have cherished and lived for throughout the years of our existence as a Nation. We cannot shirk that responsibility. America must meet it. I am concerned, however, about how we shall meet it. I am not immediately apprehensive of war. I do not think Russia intends to start a war immediately. I am fully cognizant, however, of the tense situation that exists and do know that some unforeseen and unexpected event could again plunge us into a war much more quickly than now expected.

My humble opinion is—my judgment could be in error—that Russia has a program of pressure, of threats, of intimidation and

coercion to keep us in a state of confusion and to cause us, if we will, to weaken our democracy and to wreck our economic system so that we will not be equipped, fortified, or have the strength left to meet the final test if and when a third world war comes.

This challenge must be met, and the major responsibility for leadership, power, and strength to fight and repel this world danger has, by force of circumstances, been thrust upon our own people and our own Government by reason of the preeminent position we occupy in world affairs. We shall not, we must not, shirk this responsibility, but we must recognize that there are limitations to our economic strength and our industrial might and power, and if we are to be equal to the task that confronts us in the present "cold war" or in another shooting war, if one should come, it is imperative that we do not dissipate our strength and power by weakening our democracy and wrecking our economy before the final test shall come. For that reason I believe—and I insist—that it is vitally necessary that we proceed with future governmental, domestic programs, and services in the light of world conditions and the tremendous responsibilities and economic obligations that they have imposed upon us.

My great concern is that, confronted with these world obligations and this condition, our Government is being placed under a terrific economic strain because of obligations that have already been imposed upon us, and by reason of the necessity of our trying to maintain and help rehabilitate other nations and other peoples who do believe in and want to retain their freedom. So I have become concerned about our domestic policies here at home.

Many things in our domestic program are desirable; many things we may hope for and anticipate and work for that we would like to have. But I believe we have got to gear, so to speak, the fiscal policies of this Government and our legislative program and domestic enterprise to world conditions and not let our present desires dominate us in these policies.

So I want to talk to you about trends in government. You will not agree possibly with all I have to say. I am going to give you some facts that are indisputable, facts that are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that have not been challenged. Then, I shall give you my conclusions. As I say, you do not have to agree with me, but, feeling as I do, convinced as I am about these trends in government, I would be failing in my duty as a public servant; I would not be worthy of the position I hold if I did not, in view of the position I occupy, talk to you about them frankly and honestly.

I agree that as a Nation we are strong and powerful, but I do not indulge the assumption that our Government has unlimited resources and that its economy or productive capacity are sufficient to permit and sustain domestic programs or fiscal policies that require or compel heavy deficit spending from year to year and that will continuously plunge our Nation deeper and deeper into debt.

Therefore, I believe we need to stop, take a look at, and weigh carefully the growth of our Government and trends in government that jeopardize our national solvency.

BIG GOVERNMENT

In terms of power, programs, and functions, we have witnessed a phenomenal growth in the Federal Government during the past two decades. The Government is now by far bigger, and is spending much more, than ever before in the peacetime history of our Republic. The enormous expansions that have taken place in that brief period of time are astounding and difficult of description.

Big Government, which in the past has been ardently advocated and sought by some, and equally opposed and feared by many others, is no longer a mere scare word of fantasy or figment of political speech. It has become a firmly-established and well-entrenched reality.

PROOF OF GROWTH

For proof, we have only to make comparisons and cite the record.

Today there are in departments, boards, commissions, bureaus, corporations, and other establishments, some 1,800 components of the Federal Government, whereas, in 1930 there were less than 450—an increase of 400 percent. Twenty years ago we had less than 600,000 Federal employees. Today the number is two million.

In 1930 our national debt was $16,000,000,000, or about $130 per capita. Now, 20 years later, the Federal debt is $256,000,000,000, or about $1,700 per capita, and it is presently increasing at a rate in excess of $5,000,000,000 annually. That is shown by anticipated deficits for the present fiscal year of 1950 and for the next, 1951.

Federal taxes (revenue receipts) are now nine and one-quarter times greater than they were in 1930, while expenditures—the operating cost of the Federal Government in 1950—will be thirteen times greater than it was in 1930. And Federal expenditures are not now declining, as we had hoped they would be. They are still rising.

In fiscal 1948, our Government spent in round numbers $34,000,000,000. This year, 1950, Federal expenditures will exceed $43,000,000,000—an increase during the past 2 years of more than $9,000,000,000. But little, if any, of this increase is attributable to foreign spending, and only two and one-half billion out of the nine billion represents additional cost of national defense. About $6,000,000,000 of that increase is for various domestic programs and services that are wholly unrelated to foreign aid and national defense.

One striking example of rapid growth, which is common among many agencies of government, is found in the Department of Agriculture. In 1932 it cost only $220,000,000 to operate this Department. At that time it had only 27,000 employees. Now the Department has 86,000 employees and it is currently costing $2,500,000,000 per year to operate it. Similar growth and increase in costs are present in the Departments of Justice, Interior, and Commerce.

We must add to these a multiplicity of new agencies that have been created and functions that have been established, all of which are requiring the expenditure of many millions of dollars for their support and maintenance.

These significant facts indicate not only that the cost of government is rapidly mounting, but, more, they indicate that rising costs have already attained a momentum that will be most difficult to check or control.

Whether this state of affairs has been thrust upon us wholly by circumstances beyond our control, or if this development has occurred partly as the result of our own carelessness and indifference, it is evident that big government is now upon us, for better or for worse—and I regret that I am compelled to say, in my judgment, it is here to stay. I see no escape from it.

I should like to feel, and should like to be able to give to you and to the American people some assurance that the Federal Government is now full grown—that it has matured—and that we might reasonably expect future annual budgets to be reduced or, at least, held somewhere near present levels. But present trends manifestly are not at all in the direction of curtailment of expenditures nor toward the decentralization of concentrated power in the executive branch of the Government.

HOW GOVERNMENT GROWS

Yes, I know we hear a lot of talk about balancing the budget, about retrenching, and cutting down Federal expenditures. But talk and more talk simply in the mood of wishful thinking without taking practicable and affirmative action will not get the job done.

There is much more involved in checking or preventing rising cost of Government than a mere meat-ax operation in cutting appropriations. Appropriations are based upon and follow legislative authorizations. Authorization statutes in most instances create both moral and legal obligations that later have to be honored and paid by the Government.

New laws and more laws expanding existing governmental services and programs, or establishing new ones, correspondingly increase and multiply the budgetary obligations that the Congress and the Federal Government are called upon to appropriate for each succeeding year. So, what's happening—and this is too often lost sight of not only by the public and the average citizen, but by the Congress as well—is that each year when we have the appropriation bills under consideration we find that at preceding sessions we have passed laws raising salaries, creating new boards, agencies, or commissions with new services to be rendered, or providing for the expansion of existing services and functions. Thus we face pay day on the moral and legal obligations that attached when the authorization laws were passed.

And that is how government grows. Those are some of the reasons why cost of operations is increasing, why deficits continue and become larger, and why demands for higher taxes persist.

PRESIDENT'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Under our system the President not only submits to the Congress an appropriation or expenditure budget, but he also submits a legislative program. Bills that are now pending to carry out legislative recommendations contained in the President's annual message and other messages to the Congress, present a disturbing prospect of the continued rapid expansion and growth of Federal power with correspondingly increasing cost of operations.

I cannot enumerate and comment upon all those measures, but I shall refer to some of them. At my direction the staff of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am chairman, in consultation with other Government authorities, recently made an analysis of the estimated cost of some 15 measures now pending in the Congress to carry out the President's legislative program. It was ascertained by this analysis that if these 15 measures should be enacted into law, they will increase the annual cost of the Federal Government by $25,000,000,000 when they get into full operation.

Among the more prominent and important of these measures is one to establish a compulsory national health insurance program at an estimated cost of $7,000,000,000 a year. Another bill is for the expansion of social security, both in coverage and in amounts of benefits to be paid. This fully extended social-security program as recommended will cost $6,000,000,000 a year. A third measure is popularly known as the Brannan farm plan and it will cost another $6,000,000,000 annually. Universal miilitary training will cost at least $3,000,000,000. And another bill for housing and public works will cost $1,400,000,000 annually. These five measures alone, if enacted into law, will add more than twenty-three billion dollars each year to the Federal Governments expenditures, and the other 10 of the 15 measures are by no means all of the present legislative program. But in terms of cost the fifteen represent the major part of it.

These estimates of cost do not represent my own personal opinion. They were not taken out of thin air, nor were they arbitrarily arrived at. They were determined

after a careful review of statistics submitted, and opinions expressed, by competent witnesses of both the proponents and opponents who have testified on these bills before congressional committees to which they were referred. These figures represent neither the highest nor the lowest of approximate cost testified to, but are generally conservative and range closer to the lowest than they do to the highest estimate submitted to the committees.

When addressing the Senate on February 22, this year, I had inserted as a part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the table prepared by the staff of the Expenditures Committee showing these estimates of cost of each of these measures if enacted into law, and they totaled more than twenty-five billion dollars. Three months have now elapsed and the accuracy of these estimates of costs, so far as I know, has not yet been challenged from any source, and certainly by no one holding any responsible position in our Government. The truth is that instead of the twenty-five billion being an exaggeration it is definitely an understatement.

To illustrate, if we compare the cost of the socialized-medicine program with that of Great Britain, based on the population of the two countries and a comparative wage scale and standard of living, the compulsory national health program that is proposed, instead of costing $7,000,000,000, will cost between twelve and fourteen billion dollars annually. If I should say that the cost of all these programs would amount to $35,000,000,000 annually when they are in full operation, that still would not be an exaggeration.

Now let's see what this program will mean. Of course, we are not going to pay for it. It just means more deficit spending. But if we are going to pay for it and support it on a pay-as-we-go basis, let's look at it. I don't think we can go on indefinitely spending $5,000,000,000 a year more than we take in without having disastrous inflation. I am not afraid of a depression unless we have inflation. I don't think we will have a depression unless it is preceded by inflation, and increased deficit spending is a long step toward inflation in time of peace. I am not saying the budget can definitely be balanced this year, but I am saying if it is ever to be balanced again in your lifetime and mine, we must quit passing more and more laws that have to be financed and serviced out of the earnings of the American people.

COST—IN TERMS OF TAXES

Twenty-five billion dollars additional annual expenditures by the Federal Government, if we are to support these new and expanded programs on a pay-as-we-go basis, will require additional taxes of $166 per year for every man, woman, and child in America. The $25,000,000,000 added to our present $43,000,000,000 budget will raise the Federal expenditures to above $65,000,000,000. This huge total of Government cost would impose a tax burden of $433 per capita on the American people to support the Federal Government on a pay-as-we-go basis.

So far as I know and can ascertain, only one other nation today among the free peoples of the world has a tax obligation in comparison, and that is Great Britain. And it is well known that under their system and that kind of a tax burden the people of England have sunk to an austerity standard of living, and in that unhappy circumstance they can only support and keep afloat their present government and economy by gratuities of a billion dollars a year or more from the American taxpayers.

Do you want this program enacted into law? If we collect the taxes to pay for it as we go along, together with our State, county, and municipal taxes, and on the basis of the present national income, it means 40 cents out of every dollar of the wages, of the salaries, and of the incomes of the people of America—2 days out of each 5-day week. There is the fellow, of course, who says, "I don't pay that tax. You are going to get that out of the rich man." That is one of the biggest jobs we have today, to get over to the laboring man and farmer the unfortunate but indisputable truth that he is the man who pays taxes. Make no mistake about it. Taxes come from profits—and profits have to come from goods and services. It is the consumer who pays not only the cost of goods and the cost of services but he pays over and above that cost an amount sufficient to pay these taxes and provide a profit to the man who operates a business or who is selling services. Too often the fact is overlooked that it is the consumer who pays.

Now, I have no quarrel with all of this proposed legislation. I think some of it may be good. It may be making a substantial and proper approach even to some worth-while goal. I am not complaining about that. I am against some of it. I am going to oppose it and fight it, but I am not against all of the programs or all social gains we might be able to make if and when we can afford them. But I want to point this out: That the common prudence exercised by you and me in our private affairs and in our business affairs, with respect to living within our incomes, does not now prevail in Washington and is not now being practiced in the fiscal policies of this Nation. How often have you and I had desires, maybe needs, actual needs, for some things we could not immediately afford? What you and I do in our private affairs and in business life is simply exercise that common-sense restraint and defer the acquisition of those things until such time as our incomes will permit or we can afford them and know we will be able to pay for them. Looking back through history, any other government that has not operated that way has ultimately failed. Can we defy history? Can we defy the laws of economics and get away with it? To do so is a dangerous gamble.

COMPULSORY HEALTH BILL

I do not quarrel with the purpose and general objectives of all of the 15 measures to which I have referred. Some of them may well have merit and offer an approach to worth-while goals whenever our fiscal status improves to where we will be justified in taking on the additional responsibilities and financial obligations they will incur. But to three of the bills I am unalterably opposed. They are the proposed compulsory national health insurance bill, the Brannan farm plan, and the fair employment practices bill. These measures would, I believe, concentrate unprecedented powers—social, economic, and political—in the Central Government in Washington.

The compulsory national health insurance and the fair employment practices proposals are destructive of our traditional American freedom and constitute a flagrant encroachment upon those personal liberties that are vouchsafed to all citizens by the Federal Constitution—the fundamental law of our land. The right to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness will be, to a material degree, regimented into a bureaucratic straitjacket if these measures should be enacted into law.

In my opinion the proposed "compulsory" national health program means "political medicine" dispensed by a medical profession that will be circumscribed, dominated, and controlled by administrative orders, edicts, and decrees out of Washington. Such a program will provide no panacea for the health of the American people.

The title "health insurance" is an attractive and persuasive "window dressing." This label gives it a flattering appeal to many, but it is equally deceptive. The plan is a snare and a delusion, and the very essence of the whole scheme involves power politics, trafficking in human misery and suffering. I do not believe that governmental red tape and the doctor's professional adhesive tape will mix successfully. The red tape will soon rise to the top just like oil does on water. It will dominate and that will mean a regimented medical profession and a deterioration in the quality of medical services.

I am unwilling to discard our present American system where both doctors and patients have enjoyed freedom of choice and action. This system has given to the American people a quality of service and standard of health that are unexcelled anywhere in the world. Let's keep it and not exchange it for a system that will deny freedom of choice in the exercise of the inherent right of a human being to act independently and of his own free will in the all-important matter and duty of the preservation of the life of himself and that of his family.

BRANNAN FARM PLAN

The Brannan farm plan is designed to have the Federal Government assume and pay annually out of general taxation a multiple-billion-dollar subsidy on the food bill of the American people, under a dubious claim that it will materially reduce the cost of living. While it may have the immediate effect of reducing the retail cost of food commodities, the tax obligation to pay the difference out of the Federal Treasury, plus the tremendous cost of administration, along with the other losses that will be sustained as a result of its destruction of a competitive market for farm products, will greatly exceed any benefits or savings that will be passed on to consumers.

If this law passes, there will be no responsibility on the farmer to try to get the highest price in the market when he sells his wheat, corn, potatoes, and other produce, nor for the market to compete for his product. This law will obligate the Government to pay out of the Federal Treasury the difference between the established parity price and what the farmer gets for his products in the prevailing market price.

FEPC

The Fair Employment Practices Commission bill, which is now the pending business in the Senate, and which is being debated at considerable length, is vicious in the extreme; and basically this proposal is objectionable, if not reprehensible, from any standpoint. However, without regard to the issue of race, religion, color, or creed, it violates and would destroy one of the most basic liberties that we enjoy—the right to own, possess, and control property. He who by his labor, thrift, ingenuity, and investment of his capital creates a business, owns that business under the fundamental law of our land. If that business so established makes available jobs for others, the Federal Government or some bureaucrat in Washington certainly does not own or have a right to control or dispose of that job any more than the Government or some bureaucrat in Washington owns or has the right to control and dispose of the business out of which the job arises.

This bill, aside from the other contemptible aspects of it, which I shall not take time to discuss, is tantamount to the taking of private property—not for public use but for private use and enjoyment—without paying just compensation therefor. The bill should be defeated, and in my opinion—at least it is my hope—in this present battle we of the opposition will again emerge victorious and thus postpone the evil day when such iniquitous legislation shall, if ever, be enacted into law.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

Indications of other trends and efforts to centralize power can be found in other bills now pending. In passing, I should like to refer to the Employment Act of 1946, which established the Council of Economic Advisers to the President. As originally introduced in the United States Senate and as reported to the Senate by the committee, this bill contained a provision that in effect guaranteed to everyone able to work "useful re-

munerative, regular, and full time employment." In other words, this provision, which had considerable support in the Congress at that time, undertook to have the Federal Government guarantee everyone a job. A majority of the Senate, however, opposed the provision, and that part of the bill did not become law.

PLANNED ECONOMY

There is another bill now pending in the Congress, H. R. 2756, known as the Spence bill, that will give you a further idea of what the economic planners in Washington would do to this country if the Congress did not vigilantly guard over the liberties of the American people and our free enterprise system. This bill is known as the Economic Stability Act of 1949. I shall not attempt to give you a complete analysis of it, but only a brief summary of the tremendous power it attempts to create and vest in the economic planners and rulers in the national Capital. This bill might more appropriately be named "The Planned Economy Act." For all practical purposes it would constitute the President of the United States the "supreme planner" for the whole national economy.

This bill would give the President of the United States the power to decide how much of any essential commodity, such as steel, coal, lumber, grains, or most any other product, is to be produced, and power to make up a national production budget accordingly. Under this bill the President can then decide whether this production should be done by private enterprise, and, if so, to then compel consultation between management, labor, farmers, and the Government to carry out such production programs as the President may establish. If the President decides that private industry cannot or will not expand its capacity to meet the President's production goals, he may construct Government plants and factories in any given industry or production field and then contract with private persons to operate these facilities or he may create Government-owned corporations to do so. This bill would give the President the authority, which he recently demanded, to permit the Government to go into the steel business. It would also give him the authority to put the Government in the coal business, in the mining business, or into most any other industrial, productive enterprise.

It would give him the further authority to establish voluntary priority for materials after consultation with industry. If the voluntary procedure did not work, he would then have the authority to set up compulsory priorities and allocation of materials. That would mean that the private manufacturer would first have to get permission from the President before he could secure raw materials, with the President having the right to decide in what order and in what quantities the manufacturer would get the materials. This would vest in the President of the United States, or in some bureau head under his direction, the very power of life and death over every industrial free-enterprise business in the land. It would give him the further power to regulate imports and exports, as was done during the war. It would give him the power to establish maximum prices on materials or facilities if he thinks them necessary. Once that power was exercised, no private business concern could raise its prices without giving to the President 60 days' notice and then the President could refuse it permission to do so.

True, this bill has not yet passed. I hope it never shall. But make no mistake about it, it is the dream and hope of a group of economic planners now in Washington that this bill may become law, so that they can really bask in the power of a planned economy.

We cherish the relationship between the individual citizen and the state under our system of government, wherein the Government is the servant and not the master. We must keep it that way. The power and final authority must ever be reposed in the people themselves. Our past faith in those righteous principles has been abundantly rewarded. It has been crowned with a success and preeminence that is now an envied heritage which it is our obligation and responsibility to perpetuate for the glory of civilization and the benefit of all mankind.

Our national tree, now nearly 2 centuries old, has grown to be a mighty oak in the forest of nations. It towers above all others with its great branches of advantage and superiority, climbing and reaching toward the heavens. All other trees in the forest suffer by comparison. Ours is rooted in the soil of liberty and human freedom. If we sever the roots from the tree, the branches will wither away, the trunk will decay, and the tree itself will surely die.

Government, as we know, has become wasteful. Our staggering national debt appears to be perpetual. We are already taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities, and in our comforts, in our labors, and in our amusements. The Congress is now asked to increase taxes, to take more of the earnings of the American people away from them under the pretense of caring for them. Higher taxes and more spending will bring neither prosperity nor security. They will impose burdens a free people cannot carry, and the result will be subservience and servitued of the individual to the rulers of the state.

Let us never forget that a Government-planned economy means a Government-controlled economy, and a Government-controlled economy means nationalization of industry, the death of free enterprise.

TRENDS IN GOVERNMENT

(a) Trends in government today are definitely toward bigger but not better government.

(b) Trends are in the direction of more and more spending, with an annual budget of from 65 to 70 billion dollars within the next 5 to 10 years.

(c) Present trends indicate continuous and larger deficits that will pyramid the national debt to $300,000,000,000 or more by 1960.

(d) Trends of the present, unless checked or reversed, will compel higher and higher taxes until we, like England, will be taking 40 cents for Federal taxes out of every dollar earned by the American people.

(e) The trend in Washington too frequently now is to base vital policy decisions on political considerations. The test too often seems to be, Will it win or help win an election? and not whether it is wise, sound in principle, and good for the country.

(f) Trends are in the direction of a super central government in Washington, D. C., toward a master government that will assume the full authority and responsibility for both the planning and controlling of the whole national economy, and for the direction and supervision of many of the daily, social, political, and economic activities of all the people.

WHAT FORM OF GOVERNMENT

You ask, What form of government will that be; communism, fascism, nazism, socialism, or liberalism? You may name it. Your label is as good as mine. Whatever the name, the traditional American liberty and freedom of our sacred heritage will be changed and will not be the same as that bequeathed to us by the blood, wisdom, and sacrifices of our founding fathers.

Can Congress stop these trends? you ask. Yes; the Congress can and should. I cannot promise you that it will. In my opinion, it will only do so if the American people become awakened to the real dangers of a super state where the government becomes the master and the people its servants.

If we in America turn to the left and forsake the righteous principles of personal liberty and freedom and substitute therefor the iniquitous philosophy of state paternalism, we shall not escape just retribution.

The American people, I am sure, do not want to give up their liberty. They will not do so knowingly, but by complacency, indifference, and lack of vigilance in meeting their responsibility as citizens of this great Nation they can lose their freedom. It is not a job alone for the Congress to do. The responsibilities of citizenship that rest upon each individual must be enlisted and mobilized to meet this challenge, and this challenge is of such gravity and magnitude that it demands the most and best in every patriotic American citizen.

If we are to repel this insidious assault against the cornerstone of our Republic, the right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, both we who are Members of Congress and the John Does and the Richard Roes—who are the average citizens of this Nation—must place principle above politics, and patriotism above party, and fight with all our might and strength to save and preserve the America we love.

There is nothing Russia would rather see than the weakening of our economy so that when the final test comes, the system of our Government would be changed and she might not ever have to fire a gun.

Let's wait. Let's hesitate and meditate before we plunge this Nation deeper and deeper into debt. We have no moral right to do it. We have the right, of course, to spend in times of emergency but I am going to close with this thought. Let me quote some sound advice: "If a nation is living within its income, its credit is good. If in some crisis it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms but if, like the spendthrift, it throws discretion to the wind, extends its taxing up to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy." Who said that? Franklin Delano Roosevelt. What are we doing today? We have to stand firm. We have no right to set up a standard of living here in this country of governmental services, however desirable they may be, that we cannot support and pass on the obligation to our children and grandchildren. It is our obligation to live—as President Roosevelt said—to live within our income, to practice thrift, to make some sacrifices in this hour of stress and strain, when everything is uncertain, when we do not know what threat or danger will be thrust upon us tomorrow. Thank you.

Throughout History No Nation Has Ever Tried To Be Strong in More Than One Medium and Succeeded—Our Survival as a Nation Demands That We Concentrate on Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have before me an editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star on "The Role of Strategic Air." Besides its general excellence, this thoughtful editorial

has the merit of commenting on an indication of an American tendency to confuse an issue. The editorial begins:

As a result of complaints growing out of the Korean war, there has been some danger that second things might be put first in our thinking about the purpose and the use of air power.

In the face of the threat of a general war, we dare not lose sight of the fact that tactical support of the ground forces in Korea has been a second thing for our air power, and that the first thing—that must be kept first—is the air defense of the United States.

The editorial goes on to quote the unusually well informed and astute Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, on the combat functions of the Air Force, and the importance of strategic air, which is both a deterrent to aggressors and a retaliatory force in the event of attack. As Mr. Finletter puts it:

The strategic air arm is indispensable to our safety and to the safety of our friends and allies.

The editorial ends:

Ideally, a defense force should be a perfectly balanced force. But the fact that the demands of all branches of services cannot be fully satisfied does not mean that the weapon which offers the best hope for peace, and, failing that, for success in war, should be made to suffer. To do that would be the height of folly.

A more extended development of this thought occurs in a second piece I would call to the attention of this House. It is an article from the November 17 edition of the Christian Science Monitor by its distinguished Paris correspondent, Mr. Volney D. Hurd. The real question of the current international situation, said Mr. Hurd, narrows down to whether Washington has considered that Russia might put enough force behind the Communist action in Korea to push the United Nations army into the sea. If Russia does that, Mr. Hurd asked, have steps been taken for meeting the threat to our security?

These steps—

Wrote Mr. Hurd—

are commonly regarded as nothing less than a strong long-range strategic air force of such size that it would notify Russia of American ability not merely to drop a few atom bombs on Russia, but to keep up a sustained bombing attack on that nation for 5 years if necessary.

Throughout history, no nation has ever tried to be strong in more than one medium and succeeded. England, strong at sea, put its money and manpower into navies instead of huge armies. Germany built huge armies as did France, but both had to keep their navies down in order to do so.

Today, with the addition of air power, a modern nation is confronted with having to sustain two forces.

Mr. Speaker, if America is to win a major war, we will have to do it principally as a result of our superior achievements in the air. We have heard a great deal about the lessons of the Korean war proving that we need huge ground and naval forces. I think the events of the past few days have proved that we can accomplish very little against the masses of manpower that could be thrown against our own boys on the ground.

We must go back and face again the fact that we can depend only on our technical and scientific superiority, and this technical and scientific superiority is most effective in the air.

This is the point of the editorial I submit, as well as of the article. But the article with its analysis of what might happen in Korea, is particularly illuminating because it was written before our recent set-backs in Korea proved the point of the article, and Mr. Hurd's qualification as a military prophet.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial and the article which I commend to my colleagues.

The matters are as follows:

[From the Washington Star of October 28, 1950]

THE ROLE OF STRATEGIC AIR

As a result of complaints growing out of the Korean war, there has been some danger that second things might be put first in our thinking about the purpose and the uses of air power.

The principal complaint has been that the ground forces had neither the right kind nor enough tactical air support. It is undoubtedly true that the pinch of budget limitations during the past few years has been felt more painfully by tactical air than by the strategic arm. If we are going to have to fight ground actions, as in Korea, this will have to be remedied, for tactical air, designed to give close support to ground troops, is indispensable in modern ground warfare. This should never be done, however, at the expense of strategic air—the long-range bombers capable of striking at the heart of any potential or actual enemy.

In his recent talk at the Herald Tribune Forum, the Secretary of the Air Force, Thomas K. Finletter, dealt at some length with this question.

The Air Force, he said, has three first priority combat functions. The first of these is the air defense of the United States—to do what can be done to prevent enemy bombers from reaching their targets in this country. Mr. Finletter did not elaborate on this point, but no one believes that defense can be wholly successful. Some of the bombers, perhaps most of them, would get through.

The second function is that of tactical air support, which, Mr. Finletter said, is an extremely important phase of the Air Force job. His greatest emphasis was laid on the point, however, that, while it is necessary to put more effort and more money into defense and tactical air, this "must never be at the expense of strategic air."

Behind this lies the fundamental thought that our basic objective must be to prevent a major war. Manifestly, nothing should be neglected that would insure our success if, in spite of everything, we are forced into war. But no rational person would deny that it is infinitely preferable to prevent war if that can be done.

It is here that strategic air offers the greatest hope. Deploring what he called the misunderstanding of the high importance of the long-range bomber, the Air Force Secretary declared: "As long as the nations stay heavily armed the strategic air attack—our ability to strike with great atomic power at the very centers of an aggressor nation—will be the greatest force for peace in the whole Western World. If we hadn't had this force we might well be in a world war by now. The strategic air arm is indispensable to our safety and to the safety of our friends and allies."

It is hard to see how there can be any valid disagreement with that point of view. Ideally, a defense force should be a perfectly balanced force. But the fact that the demands of all branches of all services cannot be fully satisfied does not mean that the weapon which offers the best hope for peace, and, failing that, for success in war, should be made to suffer. To do that would be the height of folly.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of November 17, 1950]

"ABRASIVE" ROLE OF CHINA COMMUNISTS EYED IN KREMLIN PLANNING

(By Volney D. Hurd)

PARIS.—Russia and its satellites today constitute a vast grindstone. Can the west afford to waste its bar of steel in a futile push against this mass of abrasive? Or is the answer, rather, to smash the bearing on which it turns?

This is the hard decision confronting the United Nations as the Chinese Communist delegation comes to Lake Success to discuss Formosa and to block UN efforts to discuss Korea.

The great question is whether Moscow, despite its championing of Communist China's case before the UN, really wants it to become a member.

In the UN, Communist China would have to play a more discreet role and would be open to contamination by western influences, from which Mao Tze-tung and his crowd have been isolated. Kept out of the UN, Communist China would have to turn to Moscow as its sponsor, protector, and idea source.

TACTLESSNESS SEEN

This would keep huge China under Moscow's thumb, a very practical point in Moscow's perpetuation of its power, and permit the Kremlin to use the vast mass of China to wear down the west.

Communist China's conduct so far, from the maltreatment of American consuls and cool treatment of British recognition to the invasion of Tibet at just this moment, is widely regarded as indicating either stupidity or tactlessness, which is contrary to the Chinese character, or direction by Moscow.

In fact, the very conduct of the Chinese Communist troops in Korea would suggest them as serving as barometers of an internal struggle between pro-Chinese and pro-Russian elements.

Their sudden appearance, quick successes, and then equally sudden vanishing into thin air without pressing home their advantage, make no sense militarily.

PULL AND HAUL

The reappearance of large numbers now building up indicates that they may go into action again. That this might represent the pull and haul between a Mao seeking to hold his pro-Chinese position and dissident elements conditioned and inserted into his organization by Moscow, must be considered as a possibility.

The long Chinese tradition of war lords, of powerful generals building up their own armies and then acting virtually independent of the government, would provide perfect opportunities for the Russians. They could find generals whom they counted on for their own, build the main Communist armies around them, and then encourage these armies to act as though on their own, although really following Moscow's orders.

Mao would be confronted with an accomplished fact, and would have to disown these armies or play along with the policy they forced as a means of saving face. If the best trained and equipped Chinese Communist armies had been made possible only by Russian aid and with Russian picked generals, Mao would be the prisoner of his own revolt and forced to play the puppet.

FURTHER INVASION?

These factors are important because they bring the Korean situation down to the possibility that Communist armies may well continue to invade North Korea even without this being the will of Mao, who should know better.

In that case, if Communist China is kept out of the UN, Mao's lone chance of contact with the west is cut, and he must continue in his present role.

With all the talk of more "periphery wars," the fact is that Korea itself as the point of contact between the west's bar of steel and the Communist grindstone, might do a pretty good job without further conflicts.

The cost to the west, particularly the United States, in matériél, men, and money has been huge for such a small side-issue campaign, and the fact is that it has been an utterly unrealistic one, so far as meeting with a genuine modern force is concerned.

LACK OF AIR POWER

The reason is that the Koreans have never had any air power to speak of, and still have not. The UN's military success has been made possible by this fact. And even with this huge advantage, it was touch and go until the extremely hazardous Inchon operation resolved that phase of the conflict.

But suppose that Russia had placed part of its present large air force at the disposal of the North Koreans? The patched-up efforts to get American planes into action, their impossible practical operation from Japan, which was saved only by carrier-based planes at first, plus other short-range planes when some airdromes had been retaken, shows how poorly disposed were UN forces.

A first-class Russian air attack would have produced a very different situation, as Americans can remember from the Pacific battles when the Japanese still had a lot of planes. Until the Japanese air force was cut down, little could be done.

SUPPLY LINES OPEN

It is questionable if carrier commanders could have assumed the responsibility of pushing their craft so close to the shore if a strong Soviet air force had been operating. As to the UN supply lines which remained in unmolested operations, it would have been a different story if Russian planes and submarines had made concentrated attacks on them.

Moscow, by resorting to its often-used expedient of twisting words and terms, could put into action a large part of the Soviet air force, along with Chinese Communist land armies, with no danger of involving Russia itself.

Military equipment and planes could be "lent" as the United States did to its allies in the last war, and as Russia and Germany did with the Spanish elements during that civil war. The pilots could be "volunteers." And, in this case, the Russians could even point to American volunteer fighter pilots of the Flying Tigers, who served China against the Japanese before Pearl Harbor.

WHAT OF LOSSES?

Thus, thousands of Soviet planes and pilots could operate with Communist Chinese land armies without Moscow's being involved, except through the losses caused. But, considering the Soviet Union's present mass production of planes and pilots, it would not need to mind as long as the effort paid off in victories.

The same holds true of volunteer Communist Chinese armies. Out of a nation of 450,000,000 people, 1,000,000 volunteers would not be excessive in present terms of reference.

The picture which then comes up is of Russia acting as the operator of the grindstone, always keeping just enough abrasive material coming along to insure a maximum consumption of the steel bar, without quite pushing it away or ever letting it really gain any headway.

On the long-range basis of Russian thinking, such time-controlled warfare would be logical. The fact is that, at such a distance from America, the chance of offsetting combined Communist land and air might must be rated almost nil for the United States.

THE REAL QUESTION

The question, then, is whether the west is ready to take the real decision, which is to strike at the bearings of that grindstone, Moscow, and so bring the unhappy process to an end.

And the west might have to face that decision without any choice, if the master operator in the Kremlin finally decided to put a lot of abrasive into Korea and push the UN Army into the sea.

The real question narrows down to whether this basic potential expectancy has been considered by Washington and whether steps have been taken for meeting it.

These steps are commonly regarded as nothing less than a strong long-range strategic air force of such size that it would notify Russia of American ability not merely to drop a few atom bombs on Russia, but to keep up a sustained bombing attack on that nation for 5 years if necessary.

Throughout history, no nation has ever tried to be strong in more than one medium and succeeded. England, strong at sea, put its money and manpower into navies instead of huge armies. Germany built huge armies as did France, but both had to keep their navies down in order to do so.

Today, with the addition of air power, a modern nation is confronted with having to sustain two forces.

This is a huge problem. If a power tries to be strong in three, then all history and common sense indicate it is in for disaster either at home, in what it does to the national economy, or abroad, or both.

WHAT OF AIR POWER?

The key point of the Lenin theory is that America must be made to go broke, and then world domination comes to the Kremlin. One of the best ways to hasten this, according to many authorities, would be a huge three-way military effort.

Further, as soon as one starts drafting men to build up the necessary armies, the manpower to produce and operate the complicated technical machines of a long-range strategical air force would begin to disappear.

It is asserted today that, if the United States were pushed out of Asia by Russo-Chinese communism and forced to try to attack the bearing of the grindstone, it frankly has not the air power to do it. The United States could not count on bases near the Asiatic continent and would have to operate from American bases with B–36's.

But the United States is said to have nowhere near enough of these ships, nor their counterparts, which would have to be designed in order to constitute a modern air task force, with different ships playing different roles as the art now dictates.

DELIVERY OF A-BOMBS

And the atom bomb is no better than the ability to deliver it and to sustain such deliveries until such time as the enemy is weak enough to be ready to surrender, as was Japan.

The United States is considered to be far from prepared to do that today.

That the land armies in Europe now in building could ever hope to hold out alone against Russia, unless the latter was threatened by some such superior air power, must also be written off, as it is by the military experts. It is a force which has been planned as a holding auxiliary, for use only until real power can move in.

Alexander de Seversky in his new book, Survival by Air Power, has amplified the issue of such a striking force and its needs. This is a thought-provoking book which may help the general public realize the new military problems, just as his earlier work, Victory Through Air Power, alerted Americans to the importance of air power in the last war.

An Honest Count Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an editorial published shortly after election day, November 7, 1950, in the Allegan Gazette, by Leo W. Hoffman, at Allegan, Mich., makes interesting reading. It is printed herewith.

ELECTION SHOWS NEED FOR CHANGE

The morning after the election in 1948 metropolitan papers in Michigan reported that Dewey had beat Truman in this State by a small majority. Shortly thereafter it was discovered that more than 30 Wayne County Democrat strongholds had failed to report their straight ballots and a recheck of these ballots gave the election to Truman. An investigation was made by Federal agents but no report was ever published and nothing was done.

On November 8, the day after the 1950 election, papers reported that Kelly was elected governor of Michigan by more than 6,000 votes. But wait, again it appeared that 25 Detroit Democrat precincts had (by mistake, of course) failed to report and count their straight ballots, and a check of these ballots gave Williams a lead of 1,100.

Just how 25 different election boards could all fail to count and report their straight ballots taxes our credulity to the breaking point. Just how this mistake could occur in the 1948 election and then be repeated in the 1950 election forces us to conclude that some group in Detroit is responsible for deliberately withholding the straight ballots for a specific purpose. Any election board, if dishonest, could stuff a ballot box with straight tickets, could substitute ballots, and thus win a close election. It is quite in line with what is happening throughout this Nation. It could be done by the CIO, by Democratic city machines, or a gambling syndicate, or by a combination of all three.

For many years past crooked big city political machines have worked with gamblers. For many years, CIO goons have, under the protection of Democrats, flouted the law.

Individuals responsible for the destruction of property, for beating up individual workers, for conducting the numbers racket, are quite capable of rigging an election.

The Republican Party has asked for a recount and it has a wonderful opportunity for performing a public service for the people of the State of Michigan. No one party or organization should control any election board anywhere. Laws should be passed and enforced to protect the ballot box.

In our opinion, votes in the ballot box are a lot more important than money in the bank. If the results of an election can be changed by theft, forgery, or stupid blunders then there is not much sense in holding an election.

Not too long ago, ballot boxes in a congressional election in Missouri were stolen after recount had been demanded. Truman killed the subsequent investigation. The new type of Democrat who has controlled the

party hasn't shown much interest in preserving the integrity of the individual to vote according to his own desire.

Not too long ago, the new Democrat used the baseball bat as one means of persuasion within its own party ranks. The new Democrat has bribed the voter with the taxpayer's money. The new Democrat has unlawfully assessed the union worker for contributions. It appears that the new Democrat is quite capable of stealing an election.

Regardless of the outcome, we hope and trust that the Republican Party will not only conduct a thorough and honest recount but will follow through so the people of this State in the future will have confidence in the ballot box.

Seedbeds of Socialism: No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a most thought-provoking article entitled "Seedbeds of Socialism," which appeared in the December issue of the Nation's Business, and which was written by Mr. Junius B. Wood. Mr. Wood most effectively points out in this article the danger of the administration's program to socialize American agriculture.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

SEEDBEDS OF SOCIALISM: NO. 3—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(By Junius B. Wood)

THROUGH A STEADY FLOW OF RULES AND REGULATIONS, THE FARMER IS BEING DRIVEN DOWN THE ROAD TO A FORM OF SOCIALIZED AGRICULTURE REMINISCENT OF THE SOVIET—HERE'S HOW IT IS BEING DONE

Ambitious dictators and rulers through the ages have learned that their power never will be secure until the farmers—they call them peasants—are controlled.

In rich and highly industrialized United States, a socialized state, with each individual regimented and Washington dictating and controlling his livelihood, never will be perfected until the farmer is brought into line. That is the condition toward which the Department of Agriculture has been headed for 17 years. Its officials may deny such ambitions, but the facts give the answer.

Figures do not show the farmer's dominant role in the Nation's economic, social, and political stability. The farm population is less than one-fifth of our total and produces only 8 percent of the net national income. But, like the human heart, it is the most vital part of the body politic. Unless heart and agriculture function smoothly, all else stops.

The farmer produces the food, the first essential for life. Without it, the individual dies and a nation wastes away. The farmer by nature and environment is a self-reliant individualist. He adjusts his crops to local climate and soil and depends on his own judgment to meet nature's changes or to determine his methods or hours of work. Convincing him that he should accept push-button control from Washington is a tough job, but agriculture is progressing in that direction.

Many were still hailing the Russian revolution as an altruistic achievement for the common man when the Agriculture Department, in 1933, started conditioning the farmer for the controls that had developed in the Soviet Union. The revolution which the Communist Party, or Bolsheviki, later took over and labeled with their name, had been started by the peasants. While their sons were away at war and authorities otherwise occupied, peasants booted out their landlords and divided the acres. Without the peasants, czardom collapsed and what was called the "workers, peasants, and soldiers republic" followed. Today the soldiers rule the country while the workers and peasants obey—a natural evolution that may be a warning for us.

After the appointment of Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Agriculture in 1933, the Department, which in the 44 years since its creation under President Grover Cleveland in 1889 had accomplished marvels in improving agriculture through advice and assistance to the farmer, experiments, and new crops, started telling the farmer what he must do. Names and faces have changed since then and the Soviet Union has lost its roseate popularity, but the Department, with programs modified to suit the times, has continued steadily toward a socialized agriculture under Government control.

The Department's substantial services to the farmer have continued. If Washington actually becomes the big boss farmer of the Nation, the farms will be good ones. That is more than the Soviet Union can show after its years of regimentation.

In the early years of the Wallace tenure, the councils of Harold Ware were heeded in the Department until his death in 1935. Ware was an outstanding farmer, also a charter member of the American Communist Party. His mother, Ella Reeve Bloor, a dynamic little woman known as "Mother Bloor," was famous as a labor agitator. Ware was invited to Russia by Lenin and spent 10 years introducing mechanized farming and establishing immense collective farms. He returned, to be idolized by his clique as a past master of farming fact and theory.

Lee Pressman, who recently informed a congressional committee that he was a Communist at that time, and Alger Hiss, even better known, were assistant general counsels of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, now known as the production and Marketing Administration. Pressman stated that Nathan Witt, John J. Abt, and Charles Kramer, known to some as Charles Krevitsky, were Communist comrades in the Department.

C. B. (Beanie) Baldwin was a power in the Farm Resettlement Administration, which later became the Farm Security Administration and now is the Farmers Home Administration. He rose to Assistant Secretary and, after leaving the Department, was an assistant chairman of the CIO's Political Action Committee. He managed the Wallace Presidential campaign in 1948 and continued as national secretary of the Progressive Citizens of America when Wallace ditched his party after the Red invasion of Korea.

Charles F. Brannan, Secretary since June 2, 1948, got his first taste of farming in 1935, when Secretary Wallace appointed him an assistant solicitor in the Denver FSA office. Before that he had practiced law for 6 years. He and Arthur M. Hyde, Secretary under President Herbert Hoover, are the only ones without practical farm experience among 14 who have held the office. Secretary Brannan also is the conspicuous survivor among the up-and-coming young men of the Wallace days.

Also active in a department which proclaims itself the loving friend and helper of the farmer was John Franklin Carter, later well known as a columnist and commentator under the name "Jay Franklin." He was director of information for Rexford Guy Tugwell who, as Under Secretary, was second only to Wallace. Carter qualified as an agriculturist, of sorts, through a book, What We Are About To Receive, which he wrote in 1932, 2 years before he joined the Department.

"The farmer has arrogated to himself all virtue and all knowledge," Carter wrote. "He has planted prohibition in our vitals, he has voted against progress, against civilization, against the city, against science, against art. He has made and unmade Presidents in the image of Main Street. He has exhausted our soil as he will exhaust our Treasury if given half a chance. He is the great obstacle to human progress, the great threat to political stability. Sooner or later we shall discover * * * that the landed proprietor, the kulak, is simply so much mud on the path of progress and must be swept aside if society is to advance.

"The farmer is a bad winner and a rotten loser and deserves about as much sympathy as any other man who feels that it is the Government's duty to pay him for being kind enough to exist."

Carter left the Department to become a ghost writer for the administration, but the socialization of agriculture, begun in the years when he was expressing a frank opinion of the American farmer and in the years of the farmer's deepest trouble, still goes on.

The Soviet steps, as shown in their present program in occupied countries are: (1) Oust the original landowners; (2) divide the acres among tenants and party followers; (3) force the new owners into a government collective farm.

As most farmers already own their land, we can skip the first step in the Soviet agricultural pattern and not hang American kulaks on their own apple trees or march their families into exile to get acres for the toiling peasants.

Though forcible police methods cannot be applied in the United States, our Department of Agriculture cherished a similar though gentler program, certainly as late as 1941. In that year, Director Baldwin, expounded to his Farm Security Administration workers in Columbus, Ohio, a plan for redividing the country's farm land into small family-type holdings.

Under this plan, the right of public domain would be granted the Government "as a means of securing the subdivision of large landholdings into family-type farms." Instead of being dragged out of his home, the landowner would be served with a court order in the American way—less brutal but just as effective. Also, under this plan, the Government would not dispose of any land which it now owns and would acquire as much more as possible. These Federal tracts could be converted into Government farms. These would grow bigger while destroying the big independent farmer. The advance into the third step with the family-type farms, new and old, consolidated into collective farms—we'd call them cooperatives—would be easy. In the end, the Government would be the only farmer.

As Wallace and his group disappeared from the Department, this drastic program for making over the rustic face of America faded out, but only to return in new dress and ornaments. Secretary Brannan's formula for trimming down the big farm is more adroit, less abrupt. In the meantime, Federal controls over the farmer's planting, harvesting and marketing increase with each passing season.

The Supreme Court has upheld the Government's right "to regulate and control that which it subsidizes." For the farmer, that means Federal controls go hand in hand with price support for a crop or commodity. The Secretary of Agriculture with a staff of some

105,000 State, county, and community committeemen in farm areas, is the supreme arbiter. Before World War II, each State's three to five committeemen were elected by the farmers. They are now appointed by the Secretary. As they control 10 percent of a State's allotment, elected county and community committeemen are dependent—another tightening of Government control.

How such controls and regulation of farms are inseparable from support of crop prices or unending debate over percentages and payments is the diverting smokescreen behind which the farmer is goose-stepped into socialized agriculture. Price support now means that the Government will finance a crop at a price not exceeding 90 percent of parity, parity being computed on the farm cost of living for specified previous years. Congress decides that certain crops will be supported. The Secretary can add others, fixes the parity percentage and imposes the controls. Controls in the price-support program—they have no relation to controls in soil conservation and other programs—are in four classes with many variations for particular crops or conditions.

The financing, purchases or loans, is done by the Commodity Credit Corporation, second only in size to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation among half a hundred Government corporations. CCC has an authorized borrowing power of $6,750,000,000 to carry out price support.

Acreage allotments, stating how many acres a farmer may plant, are the most used control. An allotment may be a hardship or a blessing, taking or giving acres. An allotment may be more valuable than the land itself. Real-estate dealers and land speculators as well as farmers are applicants in seasons of Government distribution.

In North Carolina, with its burley tobacco fields, an allotment is rated at $1,000 an acre. The speculator who receives one can thank the Government for a quick profit. It is not as easy for the farmer who puts the land to use and must accept the controls that go with it. The tobacco allotment may be for a trifing part of a farmer's total acreage, but he must obey Department rules for soil conservation and other practices for all other crops. The Government becomes his farm manager.

When a surplus threatens, the Secretary can cut allotments for a commodity. An allotment is to a farm, not to an individual. So the fun starts. In burley tobacco, for instance, the law does not permit reducing an existing allotment below nine-tenths of an acre. Farmers, each his own "barnyard lawyer," foresee a coming cut. Wives, children, and relatives are rallied and each is given legal title to a fraction of the old homestead and its total allotment. A family combination of ten is sure of 9 acres. One North Carolina county had 850 burley allotments in 1938; 2,400 in 1950.

This year, Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH polled the Brannan committeemen who distributed the latest cotton acreage allotments in Texas. Bell and Van Zandt Counties reported that about one-tenth of their applicants were genuine farmers, the others wanting an allotment to add to the sale of rental value of the land. In Newton and Angelina Counties, some allotments were only one-tenth of an acre, while in Hill County, one-third of those receiving less than 5 acres quit growing cotton and one-tenth of those who lost out quit farming.

"I was allowed two and two-tenths acres for cotton," a farmer wrote. "I kept off WPA and lived hard in 'Hoover days' but only 2.2 acres out of my 30 forced me on the soup line. I'm too old now to get a job and didn't go to school long enough to get a 'position' and my rheumatism's too bad to dig ditches with a pick and shovel."

"If this farm program were put on a sane and sensible plan without the fiddling, dillydallying, measuring, and all the silly stuff telling a farmer how much of each crop he is allowed to plant, it could be handled with one-fourth the number of helpers and save millions," wrote another, adding a hope that the "whole program will be junked" unless quickly improved.

Though few may see a finished picture of the Department's drive toward complete socialization of agriculture, more and more farmers complain as their acres are put under increased Government controls. Price support gives the farmer a satisfying sense of security while its controls destroy his right to manage his own farm. As he looks at the national picture, he sees a Government building up surpluses whose weight, unless absorbed by wars or other disaster, will swamp him with controls.

The farmer also realizes that payments depend on changing sessions of Congress and the discretion of a Secretary of Agriculture. He sees himself a pawn of politics as Government power spreads over his livelihood. The Secretary of Agriculture can manipulate price supports by deciding when to buy or not to buy. Suspension of buying before the last two national elections—soybeans, corn, and grain storage were involved—which are said to have profited speculators and cost farmers millions, were interpreted by Congressmen as a warning to the farmer that his vote also is under control.

One farmer or several hundred cannot speak for the 5,970,000. Their farm organizations can. The National Farm Bureau Federation (1,435,000 members) and the National Grange (850,000 members) are for a flexible price-support program based on supply and demand and are opposed to the Brannan plan. The Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union (450,000 members) supports the Agricultural Department program in all weather.

The farmer chafes at the shackles which price supports put on his freedom but accepts other controls as fair and necessary. Farming is big business with $105,000,000,000 invested in realty, crops, livestock, and machinery and $22,000,000,000 more in cash and banks. The Government, like private institutions, makes loans to buy farms, stock, and seeds and to improve property. It writes crop insurance and makes direct payments to farmers who follow a soil conservation program. Like any other creditor, the Department enforces approved farming methods, fertilizer, contour plowing, terracing, drainage, livestock, inoculation, insecticides, and crop rotation.

The Department conducts experimental farms, its experts roam the world collecting animals and plants, and it is the Nation's most prolific publisher.

Thus, while the Department wins good will through constructive assistance and advice, the program to regiment agriculture moves steadily forward. In hillbilly slang, the taxpayer and farmer "Ain't seen nothin' yet." Secretary Brannan now carries the torch of the former Wallace group to socialize the farmers.

His Brannan plan outlines what may lie ahead for the farmer, consumer, and taxpayer. Introduced by Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma, it sleeps in committee but is not dead. If it becomes law, government control of every farmer will be absolute—what he plants, how he farms, even how he must spend a goodly portion of his cash income. Fifteen of the bill's 86 pages enumerate penalties on farmers and more pages are bad news for dealers. If the farmer does not keep books and make reports, he can be fined $500. If he makes a false report—even veteran bookkeepers make mistakes—the fine may be $1,000 and a year in jail.

In distinction from the present price-support program, the Brannan program is called production payments or income supports. The farmer will sell a crop on a competitive market for whatever it will bring. The consumer will buy it at the same low price with additional costs for distribution and handling. The Government then gives the farmer a check for the difference between what he received and 100 percent of the parity price for the crop, not 90 percent as at present. Parity would be the average for the first 10 of the preceding 12 years.

The Secretary has not said how much this plan will cost but others estimate from $5,000,000,000 to $12,000,000,000 in added taxes. The consumer will pay his share of taxes from his portion of fictitious savings and the farmer will pay his from his fictitious profits the Government taking back its presents from both and loading the farmer with controls to keep him from producing too much.

Farmers, good businessmen, already see loopholes as in the potato program. One native son took as an illustration two farmers on opposite sides of a road who raise a few hogs for home consumption, not for market. It could apply to other supplies for farm consumption. Instead of feeding his hogs what is raised on his own farm, each farmer drives across the road and buys his forage from his neighbor at the market price. The Government pays the seller the difference between what he got and the income support price. The pig eats the feed and the farmer has it, too. That is, he has the cash equivalent.

The plan has new controls to eliminate the American kulak. Putting the big farmer out of business has vote appeal though experience in other countries proves it uneconomic. Mexico tried it. Thousands of newly established little farmers raised only enough for their families. Russia tried it and the big collective farm was the solution with government, instead of an individual, as the operator.

The Brannan plan replaces the proposed public domain seizures with cash register tests. At first, income support was to be limited to $20,000 of a farm's receipts. A farmer would trim his acres to that income. This was replaced by a "comparative unit" computation of income which also seems headed for discard. In all plans, as in present price support, the farmer is hobbled with controls that balk rational supply and demand.

The value of 10 bushels of corn is the unit in the new Brannan currency. A farmer receives income support for not more than 1,800 units. If corn is $1.35 a bushel, he would get support for 18,000 bushels, or up to $24,300. With wheat at $2, it would be 12,500 bushels, and so on for other crops and livestock but not more than $24,300 for all crops on one farm. The Secretary would designate the crops and acreage of each.

The farmer has no assurance that this will continue. When the national treasury starts scraping bottom, Congress will cut the billions for income support. The 1,800 units will shrink to a smaller number per farm. The efficient or so-called big farmer who has been producing at low cost up to the 1,800 limit is trimmed while the small farmer who never got to 1,800 units is not helped.

Secretary Brannan says his plan will provide income support for 98 percent of America's farms. The two percent out in the cold included the big farms and ranches, which each year produce many times two percent of our farm wealth.

Farm statistics, like others, can give a distorted picture. The Census Bureau rates the average yearly income of one sixth of American farms at $17,500; another sixth at $7,500; one-third at $1,600, and a final third, or 2,000,000, at less than $500. The Bureau defines three cultivated acres or a piece of land returning $250 a year as a farm. Thousands of such "farms," politically lumped to show the sad state of the farmer, are garden patches where city workers or retired plutocrats putter around for the fun of it.

Merits, methods, costs and operations of any national farm program are important, but back of all these is the drive toward state socialism where the Government will be the only farmer and the farmer of today a mere worker in his former fields. The farmer already has marched a goodly distance down the regimented road which leads to complete socialization of agriculture. It is not too late to halt and decide whether he or the Government is to boss his own acres.

Rules put on the farmer

Basic controls which the farmer must accept to obtain price support under the law of Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, and Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, as amended by the act of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico:

1. Marketing quotas: Specifying the quantity each grower may sell. In 1950, these were in effect only on tobacco, peanuts, and upland cotton. A farmer who sells more than his quota is fined under a complicated schedule of percentage deductions from receipts, differing for each commodity. The Secretary can proclaim a quota for any commodity but it does not become effective until approved by two-thirds of the voters at a referendum in the producing area.

2. Acreage allotments: Limiting the area a farmer may plant, as when the Secretary fears a crop will exceed domestic and export demands plus 15 to 30 percent storage allowance. Allotments are on all storage crops and the Secretary has proclaimed them and marketing practices on many others. The usual penalty for excess planting is forfeiture of 50 percent of the support price. A pin hooker (tobacco argot for bootlegger) who has not paid the penalty is liable to $1,000 fine or 1 year in jail. Excess acreage for one crop may not deprive a farmer of support for other crops. If the owner of several farms exceeds his allotment for tobacco or potatoes on one, he forfeits support for that crop on all farms. If he violates it on wheat or other basic crops, he does not lose support for his other farms within the total allotment.

3. Marketing agreements: The voluntary contracts between one farmer or a group and the Secretary for specified areas and commodities. They are exempt from the antitrust laws.

4. Marketing orders: A rigid form of agreement where the Secretary enforces an order which fixes prices, quality, quantity, and where the commodity may be sold. Milk orders are in effect in some 35 city areas and others apply to certain fruits, nuts, soybeans, hops, and honey. The Secretary can start civil action against a violator for either an injunction or civil damages or criminal action for a $50 to $500 fine for each day's violation.

Shall Our Goverment Be Destroyed by the Courts?—The Judith Coplon Case

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if I can regain my equilibrium after listening to the gentleman from New York, Mr. CELLER, protest against anybody stirring while, as he says we are "plunging over Niagara" under Mr. Acheson, if I can regain my equilibrium, sufficiently, I should like to call attention to one of the most disturbing decisions of which I have ever read.

Thomas Jefferson said that if this Government were ever destroyed, it would be destroyed by the courts. I wonder if we aren't approaching that catastrophe.

A circuit court of appeals in New York on yesterday reversed the case of Judith Coplon, not on the ground that she was not guilty of treason, but because she was not arrested under a warrant.

If George Washington had caught Benedict Arnold at West Point, as he came very near doing, and Arnold could have got before this court, it would probably have turned Benedict loose on the ground that he was not arrested under a warrant.

Judith Coplon was convicted of treason, stealing and selling Government secrets to a country that she knew was an enemy of this country, yet this court, while admitting her guilt, reversed the case on the ground that she was not arrested under a warrant.

I can almost hear Joe Stalin laughing over that decision.

We may have to invoke the power of impeachment in order to stop certain courts from attempting to wreck our Government by such decisions.

If some of our courts continue to disregard the Constitution and to change our form of government and our American way of life by judicial fiat, and Congress sits quietly by and lets them get away with it then—

God save the country!

The Internal Security Act—9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to present the ninth of a series of editorials from the Milwaukee Journal on the Internal Security Act. The following editorial appeared on November 3:

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT—9

(This is the ninth of a series of editorials discussing the Internal Security Act of 1950, the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill.)

America has profited greatly from men and women who slipped out of Communist controlled and other totalitarian governments and sought refuge in this country.

We have received from them invaluable information, scientific data, all of the things for which spies risk their necks.

Under the Internal Security Act of 1950 these men and women are branded as dangerous to our security. They cannot come here, or stay here, without special and temporary dispensation of the Attorney General.

What does this mean, for example, to one of the Poles who quit this Communist nation's United Nations delegation and asked refuge here? Does it mean deportation to Poland, where death or worse awaits him? Are we going to break the traditional promise of political haven for men who have fled totalitarian governments? Are we going to say to these refugees who want our help, "Go on home and get shot?"

Under the new law, that's exactly what we say. We make no provision for people who can help us if we help them. We make no provision for the age-old American right of a man to change his mind. Our law says now "once a Communist (or any other totalitarian 'ist'), always a Communist." We make no provision for a youth to get a break if he has ever, no matter how young, been affiliated with a totalitarian regime.

We are, in effect, alienating the very men and women of other nations who might prove to be our most valuable friends. This is absurd, it's against American tradition, it's against common sense. It should be remedied as soon as Congress meets.

The McCarran law, in addition to working hardship on people and breaking our traditions, creates great difficulties in our relationships with foreign governments. Spain and Argentina, for instance, are certainly totalitarian governments. Under the law, their nationals cannot visit us on business, pleasure or anything else.

Many nations send experts with their diplomatic missions or conference missions who do not have diplomatic status and serve only as civilian advisers. Under the McCarran law the attorney general has to bar them, or submit them to the embarrassment and delay of special action in order to grant them temporary visiting permits if they come from nations that are or were totalitarian.

Here is a law that was passed without thought, because of a commendable desire to do something to cope with the insidious Communists. Here is a law that not only destroys American tradition but makes it hard for us to pose as the world's friend. Here is a law that needs rewriting as soon as Congress can get the job done.

Gorgeous Telecolor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call the attention of the House to the following editorial printed in yesterday's Washington News. This editorial presents quite clearly the current situation prevailing in the color television field, resulting from what I consider to be precipitate action by the Federal Communications Commission. I hope the FCC will reconsider its recent action and allow additional time for development in this field, especially in view of the almost certain curtailment of production in the TV industry due to our war and defense needs.

GORGEOUS TELECOLOR

We went down to the National Broadcasting Co.'s studies at Fourteenth and New York Avenue yesterday with Fred Othman to watch RCA's color television. His story about it is on the page opposite.

No doubt you've been reading about the row over color television. Particularly if you're a television owner, or if you're selling television sets, because the kind of color broadcasting which is permitted by the Federal Communications Commission definitely hits you right in the pants pocket.

FCC, led by Wayne Coy, decided to O. K. Columbia Broadcasting System's color technique. This calls for that motor-driven pinwheel arrangement you've heard about.

It also would "degrade," as the trade calls it, the black and white you receive on your current set. Also, you'd have to spend more money on your present set in order to get even the inferior black and white broadcast. And still a lot more money for another color set or converter, if you wanted color.

Comes now the RCA with a demonstration which makes the FCC position either dishonest or silly.

There is no third choice of adjectives.

RCA has been trying to tell FCC about its progress in making a set in which the tube would do all the work, without a mechanical pinwheel, and which would not hurt black and white broadcasting.

RCA didn't invite FCC to its demonstration yesterday. Checking on that, we discovered FCC had been invited several months ago to come and take a look at it, and had refused. Said the matter was closed. How do you like that?

Anyway, take our word for it, the RCA color broadcast was swell. It didn't interfere with black and white, which was shown on a screen right beside the color set. That is to say, in video language, the color broadcast was "compatible" with the 10,000,000 sets now in existence. So your present set, under the RCA color broadcast system, would still be good and useful.

If FCC will change its position to conform with realities, your black and white set will receive broadcasts undiminished in clarity. Sets presently on store shelves will not be suddenly obsolete. You'll buy color if, as and when it is available, and you want it .

This will be some time in the future, because of the war situation. The FCC refused to withhold its recent decision, even though military considerations might delay production of color video. It said the public needed color television (the pinwheel kind) right away. It's haste, to some folks, was unseemly.

At any rate, relay is now a fact; just as real as RCA's new color tube. And the military crisis, which will dip heavily into electronics production capacity gives the FCC an out. That is, if the FCC has enough sense or intellectual integrity to take it.

Since defense needs are going to delay all color television in any case, the FCC should use this time to restudy and rectify its present questionable position.

The Internal Security Act—10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to present the tenth and final editorial of a series from the Milwaukee Journal on the Internal Security Act. The following editorial appeared on November 4:

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT—10

(This is the last of a series of 10 editorials discussing the Internal Security Act of 1950. the so-called McCarran anti-Communist bill.)

For all of its many dangerous and contradictory provisions, the Internal Security Act of 1950 is not all bad. There are in it several provisions that need to be on our law books, either in their present or in modified form.

At least four sections of the bill, which makes improvements to our internal security laws, encompass suggestions made by the president as the result of experience of the FBI and other security agencies which disclosed deficiencies in present laws.

In general these provisions tighten the controls and penalties for transmission of defense and other vital information to foreign powers or to anyone who might use them against the interests of the Nation.

Five sections of the law make minor changes in the naturalization laws that have no particular significance. They do not, however, add appreciably to the Nation's security but neither do they make any changes worth arguing about.

One section of the law makes it a crime to try to influence a court or jury by picketing or other public demonstrations. As the President pointed out, "the courts already have considerable power to punish such actions" but the new law does add another weapon to fight such actions.

The entire second section of the new law, which grants the Government the right to seize and detain persons who might commit sabotage or espionage in time of invasion, war or insurrection, is a power the Government should have. This section, however, should be made stronger. In its present form it does not suspend habeas corpus, and so would enable persons seized to gain freedom through the courts. To be effective in time of real danger habeas corpus would have to be suspended.

These sections listed above have a place in our security laws. They deserve to be retained in more or less their present form. If Congress rescinds the internal security act of 1950, or removes its "silly" provisions, it should re-enact or retain these beneficial provisions.

As for the rest of the law, it is a dangerous hodgepodge that ought to be blotted from the law books. Many experts believe that the courts will do just that. Congress, however, should not wait for the courts. We have, in this country, legal provisions for our security that require only a little tightening up here and there to give us every protection we need. These laws that existed before the new act give us security while retaining our liberty and our traditions of freedom.

We should not allow ourselves to be stampeded into so much "security" that we destroy the liberty we want to secure. The internal security act of 1950 resulted from a stampeding Congress. The Congress should waste no time in calming down after the elections and repairing the damage it has done.

Financial Aid to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, the struggle for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine and the successful culmination of that struggle which resulted in the creation of the State of Israel, has always been a source of deep interest to me and many millions of Americans who admired this great effort on the part of the Jewish people.

On numerous occasions, I did everything in my power to be helpful in this great cause of the revival of a people and the rebirth of a nation on its ancient soil, and I shall continue to be helpful also in the future.

In the 2½ years of its existence as an independent state, Israel has admitted over a half-million homeless and persecuted Jews from all parts of the world. Israel still continues to receive and absorb this unprecedented flow of immigrants and is doing its utmost, in the face of economic strain and financial difficulties, to give these people food and shelter and to guide them into productive channels.

Despite the fact that Israel is in a state of great economic stress as a result of this huge immigration, many immigrants are coming from countries which have imposed a limited time period for emigration, so that if they do not leave now they may never have the opportunity to join their kinfolk in Israel—nevertheless the country continues to grow and develop in a truly democratic spirit. American democracy and the American way of life are well understood and admired there. The United States has gained a true and genuine friend in the people of Israel. It is hoped that in the not too distant future, when final peace will have been established between Israel and its Arab neighbors, the experiences of democratic Israel will influence and inspire its neighbors in the direction of freedom and democracy, as we understand them in this country.

In the meantime, however, we must help solidify Israel as a democratic state, stabilize its economy and set it on the road of economic independence and self-sufficiency. This can be accomplished through American economic and financial aid to which Israel is entitled as a democratic state. By its record of accomplishment and its conduct in supporting our aims in the United Nations, Israel deserves to receive such aid from the funds established by the United States in support of democratic nations throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is my view that our Government extend to Israel special consideration and immediate financial help to aid our ally in the Near East. The people of Israel constitute an enterprising and industrious population, undaunted by economic difficulties. They do not want a hand-out, they desire help in the form of a substantial grant-in-aid from this country which will enable them to purchase the necessary machinery and other means of production to help them attain economic stability.

The United States has assumed a great responsibility in the last few years—the preservation of democracy in the world. In order to achieve this task, we undertook a program of financial assistance to those countries which made a serious effort to maintain democracy and the democratic way of life. Certainly, during its brief period of existence as an independent state, Israel has shown that it is deserving of such assistance.

I firmly believe that in order to buttress and bolster the cause of democracy in the Near East, and in the world as a whole, Israel should receive financial

support from the resources at the disposal of our Government for such purposes. In so doing, we shall be complying with the wishes of the American people. I call upon my colleagues in Congress to urge and support the effort to grant immediate aid to Israel, so that it may cope with its present economic burdens and have the opportunity to build a sound economy on a democratic basis.

There's Nothing Wrong With the Air Force Except There's Not Enough of It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the news that is coming in today from Korea is very serious indeed. In the face of it, we must end our disagreements, quit our bickerings, and stop our sniping at domestic adversaries. The need of the day is unity—on the national level.

A month ago, when things were going better for us in Korea, and there was talk of an early end of the war, a number of people took advantage of the improving situation in Korea to do considerable sniping at home. The special target of some effective sniping was the United States Air Force.

I say effective, because as a result of the sniping there is an approaching congressional investigation of tactical air power, and many people have been given the impression that the United States Air Force failed to do its job in Korea. While the battle is still going on, "lessons" are being drawn from the operation. In short, a distorted picture is being given the American people of air action in Korea, and to that extent the people are being misled.

Mr. Speaker, the truth about our Air Force in Korea is that it has done a magnificent job, a job that has won the highest praise from Army and Army privates. The only thing wrong about our Air Force in Korea is that there hasn't been enough of it—and not enough Army, Navy, or Marine Corps either. Congress never made the appropriations to buy enough defense, and enough military power for offense too. But that brings up questions I do not want to discuss today.

Today I want to call the attention of this House to two articles which have appeared in the past few weeks, both by reputable commentators, that throw some light on the sources of the criticism that has been directed against the Air Force, and reveal the unjustness of it. It will be to our advantage to read these articles carefully, and to remember the essential facts that both point out.

Korea is not a full-scale war—at least not yet—and we should not draw wrong conclusions from it. But as the threat of action directed against the United States itself grows greater we should be very thankful that we have an Air Force prepared to make a retaliatory attack on the source from which aggression against us would come.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it is the duty of this Congress to examine all possible explanations of why the Air Force is being criticized before we start accepting the criticism simply because it is being repeated so often in certain circles, by certain people. We not only owe it to the Air Force and to the men who are doing the fighting. We owe it to ourselves, and to the general cause of unification which must be served, if we are to survive this period of crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Bob Considine that appeared in the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of October 27, 1950, and an article by Bob Sibley that appeared in the Boston Herald of November 12, 1950.

These articles are as follows:

[From the Philadelphia, (Pa.) Inquirer of October 27, 1950]

AIR FORCE FACES FIGHT IN CONGRESS

(By Bob Considine)

WASHINGTON, October 23.—When Congress returns to Washington this winter the Air Force will be called upon to defend a dramatic arm of its service which should need no defense—the ability of its men and machines to support ground forces.

All through the Korean War there has been an undercurrent of semimalicious needling of the Air Force's job of fending for the Korean troops when the odds were heavily against them, and clearing a path for them when they were able finally to advance.

It will be charged by carefully briefed or ruggedly ignorant members of the committee concerned that the Air Force failed dismally, as compared to the Marine air arm's tactical support of its leathernecks. Inferentially, or openly, it will be said that the Air Force must revise its training and perhaps its jet-purchasing program, or yield some of its hard-wor sovereignty as a service.

If the customary defense tactics prevail, a handful of the highest-ranking Air Force generals—good men all—will be brought to the congressional hot seat and questioned sharply. The inevitable and tragic occasional mistakes made by our airmen, which cost a few lives, will be reviewed tartly—and for a damaging day or two the casual newspaper reader and radio listener will gain the impression that the Air Force killed more of our GI's than it saved.

Then, in all probability, the thing will blow over. But the scars will remain and the general cause of unification will not have been served.

It would not be wise nor even possible to deprive Congress of its ancient right to heckle the military, and serve as watchdog over military appropriations. For this country's basic tradition remains civilian rather than militaristic. But it doesn't necessarily follow that all members of all congressional committees are automatically expert in the military fields they probe. Some have been sold a bill of goods by other interests, some are just dopes.

What amounted to a secret smear campaign against the Air Force jets will be reaired at the congressional hearing. It will be said that this type of machine, without which we would lose a modern air war, was preposterously unsuited for tactical support. It was too fast.

The inference here would seem to be that we go back to obsolescent propeller-driven types of craft. Some Air Force officers fear that in the confusion it will be forgotten that if Russia had sent in its jets in support of the North Korean cause, no American propeller-driven plane could have operated in Korea and if we had no jets of our own the land forces then most certainly would have been pushed into the sea. And with not only a shocking loss of life, but an all but irreparable loss of face.

Trouble with congressional needling of all services is that the committees usually call only the generals and admirals. Most of these witnesses were not near the front and must substitute tedious facts and figures for graphic testimony.

In the case of the impending blast against the Air Force's grossly libeled ability to attune its gait to that of the inching progress of the gallant infantry, the Congress should hear from officers and men who fought in Korea and are alive today only because outside Taegu when a grimy marine and Army air arms turned in a superb job—one that gave beleaguered men on the ground below their only excuse to cheer.

The touching gratitude of ground troops for the work of the airmen was to be seen on all sides in Korea. Maybe it was best summed up one day at a First Cavalry regimental command post outside of Taegu when a grimy major touched the sleeve of Gen. George Stratemyer as he walked by and said, with emotion, "Sir, I don't know where the hell we'd be today if it wasn't for you guys."

Congress should hear from a few fellows like that, rather than from Air Force generals who, placed on the defensive, will be forced to give a negative form of defense.

Whether the impending probe was inspired by military elements still disgruntled by the form which unification took remains to be seen. We trust not. But there was and is glory enough for all arms serving in Korea. To create a bickering aftermath of such glory is to profane the memory of men who made unification work in the hardest way of all—by giving their lives.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of November 12, 1950]

NEW SNIPING DRIVE AIMED AT AIR FORCE—WILL STRESS DEFICIENCIES IN KOREA—REAL BLAME RESTS ON WHITE HOUSE

(By Bob Sibley)

A new campaign of sniping at the Air Force is just about ready to get under way. In fact, some portions of it have started already.

One of the chief themes will go something like this: That the Air Force neglected tactical, or ground support, aviation because it was so busy building up strategic air power—long-range bombing planes built around the B-36 Consolidated bomber.

This new sniping drive may become as bitter, if not more so, than the recent whoop and holler concerning the B-36, which critics scorned, and the canceled 65,000-ton flush-deck supercarrier which the Navy and friends of the Navy said was badly needed.

GRAIN OF TRUTH

In this sniping program, which will seek to blame the Air Force for the pushing around the Army got in the first stages of the Korean War, there will be just enough element of truth to make the criticism sound plausible as lessons of Korea are cited.

The truth is that there wasn't enough United States tactical aviation—in the right place or anywhere. But there wasn't enough of anything. There wasn't enough ground support aviation because the appropriations never came through to buy it, and the White House, not the Air Force, can take the bulk of that responsibility.

Who said 48 air groups were enough, at a time when more qualified authorities were saying 70 groups would be the bare minimum necessary for self-preservation in these times; and that even 70 would not be enough to win a war? President Truman said that.

Well, the lack of appropriations sufficient to create an adequate air force posed a terrible decision for air commanders. The decision was this: That since we couldn't have everything, we'd have to make sure our long-range, Sunday punch was the best ever. And that punch was and is strategic air power which can reach deep into distant continents. For big-type trouble, if it comes.

WORDS OF FINLETTER

Weeks after the Korea action started, with all its setbacks, the Air Force still contended:

"This strategic Air Force must be unmistakably good. No effort must be spared to see to it that this strategic Air Force constitutes a defensive countermeasure of such violence that it will make clear to anyone who thinks of attacking us or the society of which we are a part that it will be a most mistaken thing to do. * * *

"It is a curious thing this preparation is in the interests of peace, but that is the way it is. The more violent the potentiality of our air arm, the greater is the hope that it will never be used."

The words are those of Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force.

Well qualified testimony on why air power got a slow start in Korea comes from an aviation writer on the scene who says:

"There is not the slightest reason to apologize for the air show in Korea. On the contrary, our air units have done a magnificent job with what they had."

HOPELESS EFFORT

"Memories can play tricks, and while we remember the power of this once great force, we are all too likely to forget what has happened in the past 5 years while a handful of crusaders have hammered away at Congress, at the administration, and at the public, in a hopeless effort to prevent our Air Force from being rendered impotent.

"We forget the sudden demobilization, the great rush to get the boys home, the deactivation of so many groups that we were left without even a token defensive force.

"We forget planes we deliberately junked, hundreds we pickled, thousands of tons of radio, radar, and construction equipment we bulldozed into the sea on Guam and Okinawa, because we didn't have the men around to look after it.

"We forget the warnings of Finletter and Symington and a few others who kept telling the Nation we were going to find ourselves caught short.

Well, it happened in Korea, and a little sooner than we thought. We didn't win a 3-day battle there because we simply didn't have the planes and equipment necessary to win a war. They weren't in Korea. They weren't in Japan.

PHONY CONCLUSIONS

So now come the snipers seeking to find fault with the Air Force for not having used men and equipment the Air Force didn't have, and citing to a considerable extent some phony conclusions from lessons learned in Korea.

We'll have to watch out for those lesson conclusions. Some of them seem to argue that we shouldn't go forward, shouldn't make progress, and shouldn't learn anything new.

Take, for instance, the usually astute Hanson W. Baldwin of the New York Times, already deep in the Korea lessons business. He recently remarked that at Inchon and off the mud flats and rock-bound coast of Korea the test of battle has supported the Navy's concepts of war.

Baldwin, who just happens to be an Annapolis graduate, also said sea power made victory possible and proved to be the key to success.

This is like saying the ignition system is the key to a successful automobile ride and failing to mention the gasoline, oil, and four wheels. How about the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

The case was framed a good deal better by the Herald Tribune's Gill Robb Wilson, who warned, with deep sincerity:

"Don't learn fallacious lessons from this highly unusual operation (Korea) that would be applied erroneously and disastrously in any planning for a major conflict. * * *

"All of these so-called lessons, if applied to the military's planning for an all-out war, could well bring on disaster rather than success. * * *

"Our principal lesson is not to draw wrong conclusions from the Korean War because of the absence of aggressive hostile air."

Helping Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that a movement has been launched to assist the work of Congress through an educational program for American citizens, sponsored by the Committee for Congress using Your Congress magazine to introduce a course of study on the specific functions, duties, and responsibilities of Congress and its Members into schools, colleges, and various adult groups. In my opinion, there is vital need of just such a program. It is to be hoped that the newsmen back of this project are given all possible assistance and cooperation. I am pleased to comply with the request to insert in the RECORD the following letter from a resident of the National Capital area pointing out the need of action to strengthen Congress and improve its influence and effectiveness:

NOVEMBER 28, 1950.

Mr. HAL J. MILLER,
Executive Director,
Committee for Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: I can think of no project that is more practical in these perilous days, than your committee's proposal to try to awaken, through educational processes, a better appreciation and understanding of our Congress and the work of its Members. The Congress is the keystone of our republican form of government. On it, our representative democratic system will stand or fall. We must let every American know that he is a part of, and has a personal stake in, the work of our Congress.

There is great need for understanding Congress as more and more of the prerogatives of Congress are being handed over to the United Nations. And, of course, we must always have a strong Congress, to prevent inroads on its responsibilities and rights by the Executive. Whether we have a strong or weak President we must always have a strong Congress. It is to be hoped that the program of the Committee for Congress is such as to help strengthen and support our congressional system.

The committee can do real work of the individual Members of the House and Senate. Congressmen are often criticized, unjustifiably and unmercifully, and that is bound to leave its imprint on the public mind. This has tended to create an entirely incorrect view of the men and women who are honored with election to the House of Representatives or the Senate. I doubt if you would find a more able and more honorable assemblage of Americans.

Far too seldom are Congressmen given credit for the good work that they do. There is a tendency to stress so-called shortcomings. And all too often, when a Congressman has risked his own political future for a cause that is not popular in some quarters, he is not given so much as a thank you by the people he assisted.

I am pleased to see the formation of the Committee for Congress, and to note that the people behind it are all practical students and observers of the Washington scene. Now it is up to our national leaders to throw their interests and support and influence and means back of the program.

I hope that your Congress study materials introduced in the study courses are a means of offsetting some of the definitely socialistic and almost communistic trend of material reported to be in some of the textbooks in use.

With good wishes,

EDWARD T. MCGRATH.

SILVER SPRING, MD.

The Dying Eagle Turned His Head and Saw That the Arrow Piercing His Heart Was Feathered From His Own Wing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which appeared in the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald under date of December 5, 1950, raises a very pertinent point for serious consideration; that is, Has not the time come to look after the people of the United States of America?

There is a point, however, which I wish to stress at this time, and that is that vast quantities of war goods under the Marshall plan have been moving steadily behind the iron curtain to Red China. Moreover, some of the industries which we have rehabilitated, even to the erection of new buildings, are producing essential war materials for the benefit of Russia and Red China.

It has now been brought to light that we are furnishing direct from the United States the instruments of death to Russia and Red China with which to murder our boys. It is disclosed also that the United States Department of Commerce has been remiss in its duty in not stopping these shipments to our enemies, which is simply a repetition of what the administration did when it armed Japan, and let her kill thousands of our boys with instruments of war which were furnished to her as a result of the inept leadership of the Democratic administration.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting the above-mentioned editorial in today's RECORD:

ANY MORE NEEDED?

Did you notice that story in this newspaper the other day relative to the improvement

that has taken place in the countries of Western Europe, as a result of the operation of the Marshall plan?

If you didn't, here are a few of its high lights:

Europe's factories now are producing more of nearly everything than ever before in history.

The official report of the European recovery program organization states that industrial production in those countries benefiting from the Marshall plan aid during the second quarter of the present year—apparently the last quarter for which statistics have been tabulated—was at a postwar peak, averaging 24 percent higher than in 1938.

And 1938, remember, was not a postwar year at all, but a prewar year. That's a trickly little sentence that might mislead many people.

"Moreover," says this official report, "output in June, which was 127 percent greater than before-the-war output, was the highest for any month on record."

"New postwar highs," the report continues, "were achieved by Austria, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Sweden."

The article stated that European nations planned to increase steel production under the Marshall plan to a level 29 percent, higher than before World War II; but that actual steel output has topped that level in recent months in key nations.

For instance, Britain's steel factories are producing almost 30 percent more steel than before the war, while the annual production in Sweden has jumped from 276,000 tons on the eve of World War II to 344,000 tons at present.

As to general industrial production, the output of the combined industries in Marshall plan countries on an annual basis is 27 percent higher than in 1938.

But that was the average.

West Germany showed a spectacular jump of 90 percent, despite all her war damage, while Greece had an increase of 100 percent, and Austria 200 percent.

In other words, most of these countries seem to be doing not only an excellent business, but a far greater one than they enjoyed in the years before World War II.

The American people will be highly gratified to realize that their sacrifices—for they have been sacrifices—have done so much to pull the countries of Western Europe out of their economic stagnation following the termination of the war.

But they can be forgiven for wondering whether the time has not arrived when most of these countries are perfectly able to operate under their own power.

The administration in Washington apparently is mapping out a program to continue economic aid to Europe for at least another 5 years.

Whether the President and his associates could secure enactment of the necessary legislation to provide for such continued aid, as a result of the new complexion of the Congress consequent upon the November elections, is problematical.

For matters are not going any too well with us. We, in case it may have been forgotten, badily need aid in Korea. We may need aid in several other directions before we emerge successfully from the situation in which we now find ourselves embroiled.

The expenditures that we will be compelled to make for defense purposes during the next few years will be tremendous; and as our leaders in Washington have emphasized in recent days, the course of international events cannot be divined.

The time would seem to have arrived when not only nonessential expenditures in our own country should be eliminated, but financial commitments for the aid of other nations, other than for defense purposes, should be reduced to a minimum if not cut out altogether.

Christian Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on Sunday, November 12, I had the privilege of hearing a sermon at the Bethlehem chapel of the Episcopal Cathedral here in Washington which impressed me greatly. The preacher was one of the canons of the cathedral, Luther D. Miller, chaplain, major general, United States Army, retired. I ask unanimous consent to have the patriotic words of Chaplain Miller printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Yesterday we celebrated Armistice Day. On such national occasions we display the flag of our country, hold devout communion with our departed comrades, and brag a bit over the fact that we are Americans.

And we should be proud of our country, but we should never forget that back of it are the blood and the life of many patriots. The sacrifice that produced American freedom was sown on blood-stained battlefields from Lexington to Appomattox, to Flanders, to north Africa, Italy, Germany, and the islands of the Pacific. We should see the struggles and the triumphs and realize that every foot of the way has been bought by toil and suffering and sacrifice.

To be devoted to the best spiritual traditions of one's own land, to be glad about them, to be proud of them, to rejoice in them, to want to live up to them, to want to fight and defend them, that is not militarism—that is Christian patriotism. A great dream was born in America and Lincoln's government of the people, by the people, and for the people not only shall not perish from the earth but, continuing, shall in nobler fashion than ever in the past, hold the torch for all the world.

Democracy has come to be what it is because our citizens refused to let her down. Too many tears and too much suffering have gone into the making of our democracy to walk out on it. Whether our system of government and the American way of life will rise or fall, whether it will continue or be crushed will entirely depend upon the number of people who are willing to defend, willing to protect, and willing to sacrifice for it.

In this world anything which deserves to be called progress appears to be impossible except by way of sacrifice and by the way of the cross. The cross does something to the human heart which nothing else appears to do; it rebukes its selfishness; it shames its cowardice and it appeals successfully to its latent capacity for goodness. It is when men strive in sweat and blood and tears for the realization of a true ideal that they develop their deepest insights into the meaning of life and their mightiest faith in the existence of God.

To some, war may be the worst of evils, but to the Christian there is one thing worse—the failure to resist evil, the compromise with unrighteousness, and the unwillingness to die that justice and liberty may live.

Democracy is being challenged again in the world today. We must be prepared to defend this heritage, this trust that our forefathers and our comrades gave their last full measure of devotion. We must defend those beautiful things which few nations of the world can boast of having: The Constitution, religious freedom, free speech, public schools, and an equal opportunity for all. We must establish the necessary barriers behind which free men and women can live.

In one of the great battles of long ago a color sergeant rushed way ahead of the regiment into a most dangerous and advanced position and planted the colors. The commanding officer shouted: "Bring back the colors," but the old sergeant made history when he shouted: "Bring up the army." That is the spirit that is needed today. Oh, for men of that stamp to climb high up on the mountainside of human progress and cry to those below: "Bring up the army of American citizenship, bring up the purity of America's institutions, bring up the standard of manhood and womanhood, bring up everything and everybody that stands for God and home and native land.

The world needs as never before men and women who will render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's. The world needs as never before men and women whose hearts are aflame with the Holy Spirit that stirs and moves them with a sacrificial love to give to our Nation an undivided allegiance. Only such patriotism, exemplified in the lives of every individual citizen of this country can make America a great Nation whose past glories shall be surpassed only by the grandeur of its future.

In these trying, anxious days may every American lift this prayer:

God bless our native land,
Firm may she ever stand
Thru storm and night.
When the wild tempests rave,
Ruler of wind and wave,
Do thou our country save
By thy great might.

For her our prayers shall rise
To God above the skies,
On him we wait;
Thou who art ever nigh,
Guarding with watchful eye,
To thee aloud we cry,
God save the state.

The Men the Reds Hate Most

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the Men the Reds Hate Most, a condensation by the Reader's Digest of an article which appeared in the October issue of the American Legion Magazine:

THE MEN THE REDS HATE MOST

(Condensed from the American Legion Magazine)

(By Eugene Lyons)

(Badgered by public criticism and abuse, the Committee on Un-American Activities remains the one effective enterprise in exposing the Kremlin's agents, spies, and stooges in our midst)

Ever since its launching in 1938, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been the object of systematic, reckless, ferocious attack by Communists and self-styled

"liberals." A Congressman who accepts a place on the committee knows that he is staking his name and peace of mind. "It is the penalty of service on the committee to be reviled and blasphemed by persons and groups sympathetic to the aims of the Soviet Union." Representative Richard B. Vail told the House on April 1, 1948. He spoke from ample personal experience.

Plenty of Americans with no special love for the Kremlin have helped along in the organized assault. In January 1949, for instance, 313 "educators, writers, scientists, artists, and clergymen"—to quote the Daily Worker's proud inventory —signed a demand that the committee be abolished. Most of them were blithely unaware that they were stooging for Communists and fellow-travelers with a vested interest in frustrating any investigation of subversion and espionage. They objected to the committee's methods; those who rounded up the signatures were scared of the committee's objectives.

Unhappily, Communist smears have an immense resonance. Ordinary folk fear to speak out for the committee, knowing that epithets like "reactionary" and "Fascist" will be their reward for candor. For a professing liberal, even of the anti-Communist brand, the acme of moral heroism is to admit publicly that he approves the committee's work.

Yet there is no charge leveled at the Un-American Activities Committee that cannot be directed with equal justice against most other legislative probes. The Walsh Committee, when it exposed the Teapot Dome scandal, was accused of headline-hunting and unfair tactics. So were the La Follette Committee, of which the pro-Communist John Abt was counsel; the Nye Committee, of which Alger Hiss was counsel; the Truman Committee when it looked into war-industry frauds; the recent committee digging into the 5 percenters' racket.

The list could be extended for pages. In every case innocent suspects were hauled into the limelight, as is inevitable in any genuine investigation. The function of a legislative committee, however, is not judicial but fact-finding; it can neither convict nor punish anyone. Its exemption from the rules of court procedure has been established practice from the beginning. An article by Felix Frankfurter, published in 1924 in the New Republic and entitled "Hands Off the Investigations," declared: "The power of investigation should be left untrammeled, and the methods and forms of each investigation should be left for the determination of Congress and its committees, as each situation arises."

The right of Congress to investigate any area of the Nation's life is of the essence of democratic government. The committee's bitterest critics concede that. Why, then, has the Un-American Activities Committee been singled out for unlimited excoriation and defiance? There are many answers:

1. This committee has dared intrude on the cozy secrecies and anonymities of a powerful element in American society: the Communists and their conscious or deluded allies—a group that has disciplined spokesmen and confused sympathizers deployed throughout the American press, radio, schools, and pulpits.

2. The committee has been obliged to educate public opinion as it went along. Americans understand familiar corruptions and cheer those who expose them. They are just learning to comprehend the far more serious subversive corruptions of this totalitarian era. They can grasp the implications of a Costello or an Erickson in the witness chair but are baffled when the accused is a high public official, a movie writer, or a college professor.

3. The committee has labored under the serious disadvantages of the unbridled hostility of the Administration. Repeatedly its inquiries were discounted in advance by two Presidents as "red herrings." The kind of help normally available to legislative groups from the executive branch, and especially the Department of Justice, has often been barred to this committee. Consequently it has had to operate—always on a modest budget—with its own limited research, investigating and legal staffs.

4. Because it has been wrestling with a vast and many-sided conspiracy, the committee has contended with fanatics and with expert liars. Its witnesses have often been hostile and unscrupulous, trained in prevarication and double talk, coached by able but disloyal lawyers, backed by the resources of a well-heeled movement here and a great power abroad.

Considering these piled-up handicaps, the committee has done a remarkably effective job. While its career has naturally been marked by errors, false starts and indiscretions, it will stand comparison with any congressional undertaking of that scope.

The most vital contribution of the committee has been in terms of public education. The very concepts of a false-front organization, a transmission belt, an innocents' club, a fellow-traveler, were unkown to the average American when the committee started its work 12 years ago. Today they are part of the mental equipment of the American people. As a result, we are better prepared to identify and combat those disruptive forces which have robbed one nation after another of freedom and independence.

The array of recent convictions—the 11 Communist Party chiefs, Alger Hiss, Harry Bridges, Gerhart Eisler, Leon Josephson, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee—would have been impossible without the amassment of vital data by this committee.

Whatever the Supreme Court may decide on the constitutionality of the Smith Act under which they were prosecuted, it will not change the findings of fact in the case of the 11 top Communists. Their so-called party has finally been identified as a branch office of a world-wide plot to overthrow democratic governments, our own included, by force and violence. The months-long trial translated into evidence—under the rigid safeguards of judicial process—testimony painstakingly accumulated by the committee.

A San Francisco jury's verdict that Harry Bridges perjured himself in stating that he had never been a Communist simply confirmed what had been spread on the committee record for years. The indictment of William Remington of the Commerce Department for perjury in denying Communist affiliation is the direct outgrowth of testimoney given to the committee by Elizabeth Bentley. At the time this was written his trial had not been held. The proceedings which rid our country of the Eisler brothers, Gerhart and Hanns, of J. Peters and other foreign agents, had their genesis in committee hearings of Louis Budenz, former editor of the Daily Worker. Miss Bentley and Whittaker Chambers, alike, had made desperate efforts to interest other Government agencies in their fearful secrets before the Un-American Activities Committee took them in hand.

As a result of the committee's activities, the very executive officials who cried "red herring" have been constrained to act. The Federal loyalty program, which admittedly has swept hundreds of subversives out of the Government was forced upon the executive branch by public opinion reacting to the disclosures of the Un-American Activities Committee. The Department of Justice, whose officials often sought to disparage the committee's work, has used its findings as the basis for an official listing of subversive organizations. There is no branch of the Government, including all its intelligence services, which does not turn confidently to the huge committee files and cross-index for information.

The most impressive aspect of the record, when we realize that a great conspiracy is involved, is how few mistakes the committee has made in naming names and labeling organizations. The "liberal" press raged hysterically back in 1941 when Dr. J. B. Matthews, for the committee, gave the Department of Justice a list of 1,124 names of alleged pro-Communists on the Federal payroll. The rage was echoed by a large portion of the non-Communist press and radio. By now, several hundred of those named have been identified as subversive or have admitted the charge by resigning under fire.

Organized labor owes a particular debt to the committee. Memory is short. Reading today about the expulsion of Communists from certain unions, who remembers that the committee was attacked unmercifully when it first alerted us to the Red infiltration of unions? Not one of the unions or labor leaders exposed by the committee from 1938 to date has been falsely accused.

The committee began its work with an examination of Fritz Kuhn, leader of the German-American Bund; in due time this outfit and others in the brown constellation were exposed and neutralized. In the initial 10 years, incidentally, fully one-quarter of the committee's time was devoted to probes into Nazi, Fascist and racist groupings. But the people who bemoan our lost liberties when Communists are investigated apparently saw no violation of civil rights, no vile political motivation, when witnesses were asked whether they ever belonged to the bund, the klan, the silver shirts.

In its first year the committee took testimony from and about Earl Browder, William Weiner and Nicholas Dozenberg which ultimately led to their conviction for passport frauds. More important, it uncovered the methods of the passport mills. Two Fascist leaders on the west coast, after their activities were exposed, fled the country. The first of many disclosures of Communist entrenchment in the CIO were spread on the record.

In the second year the silver shirts dissolved under committee fire and the German-American Bund was forced to make public its foreign control and Nazi aims. Communist fraud in election petitions in many States was so well documented that more than 50 convictions followed.

In 1941 the committee unmasked the chief Red front of the Stalin-Hitler pact period, the American Peace Mobilization. It also showed up a long series of Communist-fomented strikes in munitions industries—in effect sabotage of the Allied war effort under Muscovite instructions.

As the committee's own education progressed and its facilities improved, dozens of leagues, congresses, and committees under liberal titles were unmasked as Communist stooge outfits. The committee smoked out Communist cells on atomic projects and spotlighted weaknesses in atomic-security machinery. It must be credited also with the only effective job yet done in tracing the espionage ramifications of the Soviet-satellite legations and the Soviet Embassy itself.

One of the main purposes of any congressional inquiry, of course, is to provide the factual basis for legislation. The recommendations for tighter laws on espionage recently made by the Department of Justice and enacted by Congress stemmed largely from the committee's work.

At every turn in this long and wearing effort the committee was vilified, smeared, mocked. The nature of the committee's work naturally has made its hearings highly newsworthy. But the very papers and radio chains which jam the committee room with

reporters, microphones, and cameras assail committee members as publicity hounds.

As was to be expected, the probe of Communist infiltration of the motion-picture industry probably marked the peak of sensationalism. One critic who found the spectacle highly distasteful declaimed about "ham acting, screaming and shouting, parades of stars, chartered planes of glamor, klieg lights." He failed to note that it was the Communists who deliberately staged the spectacle, chartered the planes, organized the parades, and did the screaming.

While there are also honest, misguided critics of the committee, the rock-bottom fact is that the slanderous campaign against it is led and fed by Communists and fellow travelers. For Americans at large, reason dictates a simple three-point attitude: (1) Praise for the committee's useful achievements; (2) blame for its faults and fumbles; (3) continuing encouragement for its general aims.

The committee is far from perfect—what Government body is flawless?—but it has been for 12 years and remains today the one successful enterprise in exposing Stalin's agents, spies, and dupes in our midst.

The World's Hope and Last Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking editorial entitled "The World's Hope and Last Chance," written by Mr. E. J. Melton, editor of the Cooper County Record of Boonville, Mo., published in the Cooper County Record for November 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD'S HOPE AND LAST CHANCE

When our fathers were taking lands from the Indians, who retaliated with pillage, torture, and murder, there were no qualms about advantage with firearms over arrows. Had there been, we would not be here today.

Since man first lengthened his reach with a stone ax, survival has hinged on advantages. Protectors never have hesitated to use new-found power—the jawbone of an ass, gunpowder, dynamite, TNT. The notable exception was desisting from gas in World War II, since each side had tasted it, and knew the other could retaliate.

The first time powder and lead slaughtered archers there was no world condemnation of the victor, but a scramble for the bandwagon.

Asiatics today have advantage in numbers, a short supply line, and unified resentment of the West. Super weapons are our only superiority. We cannot return to complete isolation because the world has shrunk, yet it is too big for the United States to conquer with conventional weapons and token aid from other free countries.

If we are liquidated in Asia, or withdraw, or are long embroiled, Russia can march in Germany and through Western Europe. When Japan was brought suddenly to her knees with mass deaths, hundreds of thousands of lives were saved, and perhaps half of those were American. We know, too, that if Russia could match us with weapons she would have used them.

Three West German states in free elections have registered hostility to our regime. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars trying to help a former foe. But those Germans fear fighting with us against Russia and a homeland again ravaged. They prefer to save their property and lose their liberty. We cannot change people who are not ready to change.

Most of the world is ready for nothing American beyond loans and grants. And where we fight and conquer we assume new responsibilities and expense.

This attitude of other peoples is understandable. Winston Churchill at Fulton suggested a single sovereignty for the English-speaking world, and a chill settled on the audience. We would fight from street to street and house to house an invader in war. The conquered dislike their masters, no matter how benign, and blame them for whatever evils befall.

We cannot force primitive minds to accept western ways and it is folly to hope the quivering common clay of the Orient will beat in tidal waves in vain against the finely molded vessels of American manhood, buttressed only by conventional weapons. The Korean emergency is but the first of a series of Red-inspired upheavals calculated to exhaust us militarily and economically. We need to plan far ahead. So the bomb.

Reduce it to your boy, your purse. Is not one of ours worth much more than many heathen who are unwilling to accept truth as we see it? The prayerful Puritan thought so. He used every advantage—superior weapons, know-how, better organization. And when Braddock failed to be realistic his defeat became a rout.

We need to be practical. We should recognize and publicly admit that we find much of the world unwilling to accept the American cure-all—gifts and loans coupled with more expense to us for unwanted rule—and that we propose no further imperialism, no more gifts, and that unless the enemy withdraws we will use every super-weapon wherever it is practical. Then, if the foe ignores the threat, hit him with everything we have.

In this darkening night this course seems the only gleam from the Christmas star. It might save many American lives into which parents and country have poured vast investments in loving care and education such as no other generation anywhere ever before received. The ensuing devastation and death would confound and confuse the enemy, rob him of the initiative, and be a lesson far more searing than that of gas in World War I. We are fighting an undeclared war almost alone and can't afford to waste time. Peace through fear might in time develop into peace through growing understanding.

Then the world would yield her increase, want would retreat, and man's energies could be released for exalting the race.

Failing to take this bold step, we may sacrifice the chance of peace to growing chaos. Russia and China have a mutual assistance pact. If we stop the Chinese Red with American flesh and bone instead of awesome bombs, Russia may throw in her conserved forces. And India, now walking a tight wire, may be expected to line up against our ebbing strength and growing confusion.

We have few friends. Nearly all resent our wealth, our easy life. The rich relative in brotherhood of man never gives enough—even unto bleeding his taxpayers to anemia. Our few loyal friends are feeble from war, political experiments, or internal strife. Their effectiveness would diminish with our reverses but might wax if the tide runs with us. We saw that before and after the MacArthur amphibious landings in Korea.

We are as alone as the Puritans after departure of the Mayflower. We have the know-how to produce abundantly the sinews of war but we cannot match Asia in manpower. Can we outwit her leadership? Our early settlers outwitted and outfought the wily, fanatical and more numerous Indians, and eventually brought oil riches to remnants of that vanishing race that would never have unlocked those natural resources.

Diplomacy in a democracy is molded by the articulate people themselves. At this late hour let each citizen write to Representatives in Congress, to the Commander in Chief, to the military, to United Nations officials. Put on pressure for the bomb. This is a fight for existence. Don't belittle your influence—use it. It is a magnificent bequeathal that must be exercised to be preserved.

This task is more important than today's bread; it means tomorrow's all. Ask God's help. And remember: God helps them who help themselves.

Which Will It Be, Peace or War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent article from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., Monday, December 4, 1950:

NO TIME FOR PANIC

Said General Wu, representative of the Chinese Communists, to Ambassador Warren R. Austin, "I must tell you, your threats do not frighten anyone." He wasn't entirely right, because the panic which is coursing through Great Britain and Europe as a result of the Korean crisis shows pretty definitely that General Wu was speaking only for China, and maybe Russia. No one will deny that it is perfectly allowable to be frightened in the face of what lies ahead. And you can bet there is even some slight fear back of the deadpan diplomacy which the Russians and Chinese are so adept at practicing. As far as this particular talent is concerned, the democratic world should take a leaf from their bloody book. Hysteria isn't going to help a bit.

European nations which are directly in the path of the Soviet juggernaut are understandably anxious, but this anxiety should not be allowed to deteriorate into blubbering terror. Right along, ever since the UN launched its defense of freedom in Korea, there has been evidence that some of our partners in the enterprise have felt only a mild enthusiasm for it. But they were ready to yield to American insistence that it was a crossroads issue so long as their own resources were not too extensively committed. Now that there is reason to believe that there was basis in fact for the American viewpoint, now that it is becoming increasingly clear that Korea is not a local infection but a manifestation of systemic disease, now that heroic therapy may possibly have to be resorted to, the all-out concern of Europe contrasts sharply with the token encouragement the United States got in the beginning.

Great Britain's Mr. Attlee wants the fullest prior consultation before any decision is made to use the A-bomb and has projected himself across the Atlantic to argue his case in person. This is all right, but it is somehow incompatible with the calm dignity

which should possess the democratic chancelleries in times of crises. It is this negative sort of approach that Moscow and Peiping, and all aggressors, wax fat on. Vishinsky winks and nudges Malik and says: "Look at old Attlee. Losing his nerve."

And France, which has made no noticeable progress toward settlement, through negotiation or any other means, of the trouble in French Indochina, has adopted a resolution urging the United Nations to negotiate with the Chinese for a buffer zone between Korea and Manchuria.

Western Germany, which is most directly exposed to the menace of Soviet power and which is displaying marked disinterest in proposals that it be rearmed to help neutralize that menace, is praying that some miracle (other than the A-bomb, that is) will persuade the Chinese to call off their dogs.

All of us in this country most certainly hope that the wishes of Europe will be realized and that there will be no war. But all of us also know that nothing effective will be accomplished in an atmosphere of fluttering helplessness.

An Analysis of President Truman's National Health Insurance and Public Health Act—Part 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the fourth talk which I made during my last campaign and which related to the need of some overall national health insurance and public health program and also contained a rather detailed anlysis of the three comprehensive bills which are now pending in the Congress.

I delivered this talk over radio station WOW, October 13, 1950. The same was as follows:

President Truman's National Health Insurance and Public Health Act, as introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, is contained in three bills, to-wit—S. 1679, H. R. 4312, and H. R. 4313.

This legislation was introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives on April 25, 1949, following the President's special health message to Congress on April 22, 1949, in which he said, in part, the following: "We need more widespread use of modern methods of paying for medical care through prepaid insurance. * * * Health insurance will mean that proper medical care will be economically accessible to everyone covered by it, in the country as well as in the city, as a right and not as a medical dole."

The Senate sponsors of S. 1679, were Senator THOMAS, Democrat, of Utah, and seven other liberal Democratic Senators. Congressmen DINGLE, of Michigan, and BIEMILLER, of Wisconsin, sponsored companion bills in the House of Representatives.

The magazine, Consumer's Reports, for October 1950, calls attention to the fact "that in addition to the three national health insurance bills, there have been seven other bills before the Eighty-first Congress to provide more extensive medical care—Senator TAFT's bill, which would allot $300,000,000 a year to the States for the care of the medically indigent; the Hill bill, giving the medically indigent free membership in voluntary hospitalization plans; and an elaborate measure authored by Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, for the development of comprehensive voluntary insurance plans."

All three of these aforementioned bills are comprehensive pieces of legislation. The first three, National Health Insurance and Public Health Acts, recognize as stated by a trustworthy legislative analyst, the need for:

1. More doctors, dentists, nurses, hospital administrators, and allied personnel.
2. Research necessary to discover the causes, cures, and prevention of diseases that take a heavy toll of life and productivity.
3. More hospitals and health centers.
4. Personnel and facilities, including clinics and ambulance services, in rural and other shortage areas.
5. More State and local public-health services.
6. More services for maternal and child health care and services for crippled children.
7. A program assuring everyone of a means with which to pay for the health and medical care necessary to make and keep them well.

They propose to meet these needs by providing:

1. Funds for increasing the enrollment in schools of medicine, dentistry, dental hygiene, nursing, public health, and sanitary engineering; for expanding the facilities of such schools; and for providing scholarships and maintenance funds to deserving students in these fields.
2. The establishment of research institutes in the fields of poliomyelitis, diabetes, arthritis, rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, and epilepsy, and other diseases that take a heavy toll of life and productivity.
3. Additional funds for the construction of hospitals, health centers, clinics, and group practice facilities under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.
4. Special funds ($35,000,000) to aid rural and other shortage areas in getting and maintaining personnel, hospitals, clinics, group-practice facilities, mobile clinics and ambulance services, and funds to establish and operate demonstration farm-health cooperatives in selected areas.
5. Additional funds for the extension of State public-health services and for the establishment and extension of local public-health departments wherever needed.
6. Additional funds to carry on programs for maternal and child-health care and for services to crippled children.
7. The establishment of a national program of health insurance enabling everyone to pay for needed health and medical-care services.

More specifically, each title of the bill provides as follows:

Title I. Federal aid to medical education: Provides authorization of Federal aid for the education and training of physicians, dentists, dental hygienists, nurses, sanitary engineers, hospital administrators, and other health personnel. Aid is for the expansion and improvement of existing professional schools; the construction and equipment of new schools; the maintenance of schools through grants for each student up to an average past enrollment and incentives to increase enrollment through much larger grants for each student beyond the average past enrollment; scholarships awarded through the States, including students' tuition and expenses and a substantial sum toward students' maintenance.

Funds to help meet costs and to encourage increased enrollments will go to—

Medical schools: $300 per student (based on average enrollment over the period June 1947–49) and, in addition, $1,700 per student added to that average.

Dental schools: $250 and $1,300.

Schools of dental hygiene: $150 and $800.

Schools of nursing: $200 and $1,200 where room, board, textbooks, etc., are not provided; $200 for first-year students, $150 for second-year students, and $50 for third-year students in schools where these are provided.

Schools of public health: $350 and $2,400.

Schools of engineering: $200 and $1,200 for students seeking degrees in sanitary engineering.

The administration of this title is under the Public Health Service with a special advisory council. A section giving aid to the training of practical nurse is administered by the Federal Commissioner of Education.

Title II. Aid to medical research: Authorized the establishment of additional institutes in the National Institute of Health, under the United States Public Health Service especially for poliomyelitis, diabetes, arthritis and rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy and epilepsy, and other diseases or groups of diseases. The Surgeon General is empowered to establish one or more additional institutes, and to terminate or combine institutes from time to time as may be required. Special advisory councils in each technical field are authorized.

Title III. Liberalization of Hospital Survey and Construction Act: This title (a) doubles the length of the program now authorized, extending it until 1957; (b) authorizes doubling the annual appropriation from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000; (c) liberalizes the grants-in-aid so that the poorer States may obtain up to two-thirds Federal contribution instead of only a flat one-third as at present; (d) permits grants to clinics and other facilities for group medical and dental practice, not at present authorized; and (e) authorized a special appropriation for studies and demonstrations in the local and regional coordination of hospital facilities.

Title IV. Part A. Special aid for rural and other shortage areas: Through an authorized annual appropriation of $35,000,000 for 4 years, rural and other areas short of personnel and facilities could obtain help to meet a variety of needs, e. g.: (a) Grants or loans guaranteeing income to doctors, dentists, and others who would practice in such an area; (b) aid toward the travel costs of these persons and their families to encourage their establishment in such areas; (c) mobile clinics; ambulance service in connection with hospitals inside or outside the area; (d) loans to supplement inadequate local funds for construction under the hospital construction title; (e) grants for the maintenance of hospitals, group practice units, health center and clinics; (f) grants and loans for construction and equipment of group practice units and of diagnostic and treatment clinics.

These aids to rural and other shortage areas are to be administered by the National Health Insurance Board. This Board may deal directly with the local areas until a State plan has been approved under the national health insurance title. Thereafter, the operations will be part of the State plan.

Part B. Assistance to farmers' experimental health cooperatives: From authorized appropriations of $10,000, for the first year and $15,000 for each of four succeeding years, aid may be furnished to rural cooperative organizations established to provide medical services in areas which are in need of such services and in which surveys indicate that such cooperatives may be practical. Aid may be through (a) technical assistance for surveying needs and for organizing the cooperative and (b) toward the facilities and maintenance of the cooperative during its initial years. Not more than 50 projects, nor more than 2 in any State may receive such aid. This program is to be administered by the Public Health Service in consultation with the Department of Agriculture.

Title V. Aid to States for State and local public health work: This title broadens and

liberalized the existing grant-in-aid system under the Public Health Service, with the aim of extending local public health units where needed and of expanding and improving special health services under health departments.

Title VI. Aid to States for maternal, child health, and crippled children's services: Provides similar expanded grants-in-aid for these functions through the Children's Bureau and funds for the Children's Bureau to carry on research in child life.

Title VII. National health insurance: This title provides, just as the health insurance titles of S. 5 (81st Cong.) and S. 1320 (80th Cong.), the following:

1. A system of health insurance, national in scope and covering approximately 85 percent of the population. This includes employees, self-employed persons, and the dependents of all such persons.

2. Persons eligible for benefits would be entitled to medical and dental service from general practitioners and specialists, home nursing care, hospital care, laboratory service, X-rays, expensive prescribed medicines, eyeglasses, and special appliances.

3. Free choice of doctor and dentist by the patient is guaarnteed, as well as the right to change one's choice.

4. Every qualified doctor, dentist, nurse, and hospital is guaranteed the right to participate or not and to accept or reject patients. These guaranties apply to organized groups of practitioners, clinics, consumer cooperatives, and similar health service plans, as well as to individuals. Every hospital that participates is guaranteed freedom from governmental supervision or control.

5. Payments to doctors from the fund can be made on a fee-for-service basis (as at present), on a capitation basis (so much for each person who has chosen a particular doctor), or on a salary basis—the decision will be made for each local area by the doctors practicing in that area; but should individuals or groups of doctors in the area prefer a method different from that chosen by the majority, this, too, is permissible.

6. Provision is made for grass-roots administration of the program. In each local area administration would be carried out with the help and participation of local citizens, including members of the medical profession. Each State is given the right to administer the system through its own State agency and to divide the State into local areas. The State plan must meet certain general requirements stated in the bill. At the Federal level, administration is under a 5-man board, assisted by an advisory council of lay and professional people.

7. State and local agencies responsible for the subsistence and health care of needy persons (persons having insufficient earnings to contribute to the health insurance funds) may provide medical services for these persons by paying into the health insurance fund on their behalf. (The administration's public assistance legislation now before the House Ways and Means Committee provides Federal aid to the States to finance this.)

All of these Democratic and Republican health measures aid but do not attempt to control in the slightest degree medical practice or practitioners. They are not socialism or socialized medicine by the widest stretch of the imagination.

However, I am now and have been always against socialism, socialized medicine, and compulsory health insurance, and, even though there is no congressional legislation now pending in the Congress, seeking to set up socialism or socialized medicine, I am against any such proposed changes in our form of government; and if there was only one vote cast in the House of Representatives against socialism and socialized medicine, it would be my vote.

I have been consistently opposed also to compulsory health insurance, not because some people seem to think it is a trend toward socialized medicine but because in many instances it would be an unnecesary insurance duplication and would also in other instances be unfair to private insurance companies.

It would be an unnecessary insurance duplication, in my opinion, as far as the following groups are concerned: the veterans of World Wars I and II, the railroad workers, the packinghouse workers, the metropolitan utilities workers, the Omaha public power district workers, and also other workers having a worthwhile company health program for workers.

It would be unfair also to private insurance companies by taking away from them, perhaps, insured persons holding policies of insurance in the Blue Cross and Blue Shield, and policy holders in other insurance companies, fraternal and otherwise, who have satisfactory health and accident insurance coverage already.

I am and have been against compulsory health insurance and a supporter of a voluntary health insurance plan, erroneous statements to the contrary notwithstanding. If here must be a Federal voluntary health insurance plan to take care of those who might be regarded as too great a risk for private insurance companies to service, made it a voluntary and not a compulsory matter.

I also believe that in the cases last mentioned, voluntary insurance payment by the worker and his employer should not be 2 percent of a maximum salary of $4,800 but perhaps 2 percent of a total not to exceed $3,000 to $3,600 in salary, so as to give private insurance companies a chance to continue in business after such a worker has become health insurance conscious.

From the hearings before the congressional committee, no insurance company objected to such a plan and I believe that even the American Medical Association might favor such a plan.

I also think that every other fair-minded person will support voluntary health insurance and oppose all changes of our Government to a socialistic one, and will also oppose socialized medicine and compulsory health insurance.

Thanks for listening, ladies and gentlemen.

Thy Will Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting and thoughtful article from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, December 6, 1950:

IN ALL THY WAYS

Two courses lie open before the American people. In this hour of crisis they can continue to struggle confusedly for a way out of defeat and dilemma. They can continue to guess at the aims of aggressors and make the same kind of human calculations which have repeatedly failed them. They can continue in the tendency of mortal minds to swing from unfounded hope to unfounded gloom.

Or they can choose a better way. They can turn wholeheartedly to God for guidance. They can go forward with the calm assurance that comes with willingness to rely on His omnipotence. They can demonstrate the insight and foresight which come with even a partial understanding of mind's omniscience. They can purify their own purpose and prove once more that a purpose steadfastly based on principle carries its own protection and progress.

If we read the thought of the Nation correctly, it is today riper than ever before for a concerted and definite move along the second course. The shock of events has prepared it for prayer. Confused, dismayed, frightened, their own devices exhausted, millions are recognizing the need for a higher wisdom. They have gained the first requisite for effective prayer—humility.

In such an attitude the people are readier genuinely to follow Solomon's counsel in proverbs: "In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths." Prayer in this spirit does not attempt to instruct the Almighty. It does not beseech the all-loving Father to make a special dispensation for certain favored ones. It recognizes that His purpose is already wholly good, irresistibly right and seeks to aline the petitioner with that purpose—"Thy will be done."

Prayer is essentially an individual affair. It does not require forms of words or crowds of people. Nor is it something in which one can or should engage only on special occasions. Millions undoubtedly are already praying daily, as the Chief Executive has said he is.

But in the present situation there would be value in a more definite move to turn the whole Nation toward spiritual communion with the one God, each seeking in his own way to open his thought and his hands to the divine help that is ever available. On that level the American people can reach a foundational unity prerequisite to any conciliation of partisan or personal strife. In that spirit we urge the President to call the Nation to a day of prayer.

Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in voting for H. R. 9763, I do not thereby indicate deviation from my general opposition to controls. I believe it was Thomas Jefferson who said "that country is governed best which is governed least." Sooner or later, we are bound to come to the conclusion that at least for normal times we already have too many laws, restrictions, and regulations. We are undeniably at this time in the greatest crisis of all history. Even the wisest scarcely know how to turn and what to do. There are, of course, those who are properly denominated rent hogs. Thank God they are in the minority. It is manifestly unfair to discourage and penalize the ownership of property by permanently restricting incomes therefrom. It is unjust and inequitable to control or restrict one segment of our citizens or property holders and allow the vast majority of others to go without restrictions. In my particular section of the country, there is no special need for rent control. Our local govern-

ment agencies have already acted under the law providing for decontrol. The present time, however, justifies harsher and more rigid restrictions than normally we would agree to.

This Congress has already empowered the President to impose controls on prices and incomes or wages. He ought to have long since acted on this important matter. With the hope that the short extension provided for in this resolution will induce the President to immediately impose across-the-board controls, I am voting for the measure. Surely the President and his advisers cannot mistake the signs of the times. A wayfarer ought to know that controls are past due. Let us hope that world conditions will soon be such that we may release ourselves from all controls.

Lessons of the Air War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, there is no more progressive and patriotic group of Americans than the members of the American Legion. Veterans of two world wars, they are men and women who put service to country above everything else, and are deeply concerned with guaranteeing the security of this country, and keeping the United States free from the dangers, the sacrifices, and the destruction of another world war.

The important aeronautics committee of the American Legion is now publishing the Legion Air Review, as part of their Nation-wide air-power program. This monthly publication is expressive of the broad, objective point of view characteristic of the Legion in all its services to the Nation. It beats the drum for no branch of the armed forces, no type of aircraft, no aircraft company, no particular aviation activity. It covers all phases of aviation, and air activities. As a result, the pamphlet has a value that would be lacking in a similar pamphlet published by an organization of less exalted purpose than that of the American Legion.

Mr. Speaker, in the December issue of the Legion Air Review, which has just reached my office, I find an editorial worthy of consideration by every Member of this Congress, and by all other thoughtful citizens. In the face of reverses in Korea, and of a future that may call for the use of air power to an extent scarcely presaged even by World War II, it is important that we keep clearly in mind the lessons of the air war in Korea.

Lt. Gen. G. E. Stratemeyer, Commander of the Far Eastern Air Forces, has said, "Nothing in the Korean War changes the basic fact that air superiority must be won before ground and sea forces can move freely in modern war." The editorial reminds us "It must be remembered that winning a war is a job for ground, sea and air forces combined, and undoubtedly always will be." There is no contradiction between the two statements, nor need there be any disagreement or misunderstanding between any patriotic Americans devoted to the best interests of their country, if, instead of drawing fallacious conclusions from the Korean War, they will understand the action in Korea for what it is—and understand the many air war lessons which we will need to understand if we ever become involved in war with a first rate air power.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert in the Congressional record the editorial from the Legion Air Review on Significant Lessons of the Air War in Korea.

The editorial is as follows:

SIGNIFICANT LESSONS OF THE AIR WAR IN KOREA

There have been criticism and much misunderstanding of the role of air power in the Korean War. Some of the fallacious conclusions of parlor strategists appear to be widely shared and should be corrected before they become deep rooted.

Particularly in the early phases of the war there were some who maintained that air power was over-rated because it failed to stop the steady advances of the North Korean ground troops, although there was little or no enemy opposition in the air to hamper us. Later there was widespread argument that our jet planes were too fast and couldn't stay over the target areas long enough to do an effective job. And it was argued that the strategic air power concept could not halt the advance of the North Korean armies. These specious lines of reasoning have been refuted repeatedly as the war wore on.

In the first place it must be remembered that winning a war is a job for ground, sea, and air forces combined, and undoubtedly always will be. But in the early days of Korea, when the Communists were advancing relentlessly, the United Nations had only a comparative handful of well-trained and equipped ground troops—hardly one adequate battalion for every division mobilized by the enemy. No amount of airplanes could halt such overwhelming numbers of troops. But our fighters and bombers did slow them, liquidate thousands of enemy soldiers, and rip supply lines to shreds. Early in August Maj. Gen. Hobart R. Gay, veteran First Cavalry commander, said eloquently: "Without air support we simply would have been pushed into the water a month ago."

As to the concept of strategic bombing, the operations in Korea have been of a highly unusual nature. In a matter of days our medium bombers had run out of strategic targets of any importance, since the enemy's sources of supply were in a neutral country. It would be folly to use the Korean situation as a model for planning military operations. In an enemy country that has vast industrial and supply potentials to back up its armies, the picture would be entirely different and strategic bombing of these sources would be the first essential.

In Korea the F-80 jets proved they could provide ground support and also defend themselves. Said a Marine air group commander, "The jet can survive in the air and that's the first requirement for a fighter plane." Slower F-51 and F-4U piston-engine fighters provided good ground support, but no matter how good that support potential is, it has no value if enemy planes can knock it out of the skies—as would certainly be the case in conflict with a first-rate military power. The famed German Stuka was a terrific ground support fighter until it met air opposition.

Korea was the first proving ground for the jets. It taught us that we must build jets with greater range than the F-80, and must equip them with more firepower. It taught us that we must develop means of carrying on effective tactical operations at night as well as by day. It emphasized the extreme necessity for careful ground-air coordination and liaison and the need for adequate communications equipment of all types. It taught us many air war lessons which we will need if we ever go up against a first-rate air power. But most of all it taught us that we must continue to develop the concepts of both strategic and tactical warfare and the jet-powered aircraft to fulfill them.

Our Merchant Marine for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, those of us, in Congress and outside, who believe that a well-considered, long-range program, of rehabilitation and maintenance in the merchant marine and shipbuilding field is necessary for the progress of the Nation in peacetime and its security in emergency are greatly concerned over recommendations contained in the Foreign Economic Report recently presented under the direction of Mr. Gordon Gray.

I have before me an editorial from the Los Angeles Times of Saturday, November 25, 1950, entitled "Our Merchant Marine for Defense," which presents very forcefully some of the arguments in opposition to the recommendations of the Foreign Economic Report. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MERCHANT MARINE FOR DEFENSE

All the barometers indicate rough sailing for those sections of Gordon Gray's foreign economic report dealing with the United States merchant marine. The CIO, AFL, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, National Federation of American Shipping and Shipbuilders Council of America have joined in harmonious chorus to denounce the Gray recommendations.

SCOPE OF GRAY REPORT

President Truman, in a cagey preface, did not buy the report of his former Secretary of the Army outright but subscribed only to his statement of basic objectives, which boils down to the assertion that the nations of the world are economically interdependent. Gray's assignment was to find ways of closing the "dollar gap" in foreign commerce in anticipation of the day when ECA ends and countries which have been propped up by American aid have to walk alone.

It has long been known that one of the best ways foreign nations can earn dollars is to sell shipping services to the United States. Since the United States maritime unions enforce wages and working conditions

far above those of any competing merchant marine, foreign-flag ships can almost always underbid American shippers in an open market.

SUBSIDIES APPROVED

But public policy in the United States has been to subsidize American shipping, by direct subsidies in some cases and by preferential legislation in others. This is justified as a national defense measure and also, in the language of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as necessary for the development of (United States) foreign and domestic commerce. Since the humiliating spectacle of a train of foreign colliers following our great white fleet around the world in 1907–9, a large segment of American opinion has demanded that an adequate United States merchant marine be maintained to make us independent of foreign shipping for our essential trade.

This attitude inspired the congressional provisions that cargoes for the Army and Navy be hauled exclusively in American bottoms and that at least 50 percent of ECA or other Government-financed cargoes be transported in American-flag ships. The Gray report takes exception to this policy, urging that direct subsidies be substituted for preferential restriction of competition and only to the extent required for national defense.

Foreign maritime nations, the report argues, should be allowed to earn needed United States dollars by furnishing shipping services over and above those provided by the minimum merchant fleet we must maintain as insurance. The Gray report does not, however, attempt to fix this figure.

The trouble is that it cannot be fixed. Neither Mr. Gray, nor any other man or committee, can say exactly how much merchant marine we may need to meet a war emergency. It depends on many factors—how many places we have to fight; how far away they are; how successful the enemy may be in destroying our shipping; how quickly we can begin launching new ships on an assembly-line basis.

A REMOTE PROSPECT

There are good arguments on both sides of the question of subsidizing merchant shipping. The United States is not alone in the practice; most nations give their own flag vessels even greater preference. The Gray report wishes somewhat wistfully that this might be outlawed by international agreement, but in the present state of affairs this prospect seems remote.

In the meantime about the best that can be said is that any peacetime merchant marine is bound to be hopelessly inadequate for war purposes. It is not a question of cutting down the present subsidized United States shipping industry to size and letting foreigners take what's left. It is more pertinent to ask whether, even with our mothballed reserve, we have enough ships to weather the initial shock of total war. We came too close to losing the last battle of the Atlantic for much comfort.

Mr. Gray proposes that the shipping of friendly free nations be pooled for mutual defense purposes. This is fine and dandy and so long as we and our allies control the sea lanes with superior naval power we can be fairly certain that foreign shipping will work for us in war. But even this pool is far from enough by the experience of World War II.

From 1949 to 1945 we were allied with the principal sea powers of the world and they furnished for our use about 700,000 tons of shipping. But we furnished for their use over 5,000,000 tons of American shipping and then we just barely got by.

The Development of Our Inter-American Policy Under Secretary Acheson's Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I spoke yesterday very briefly about the accomplishments of Secretary of State Dean Acheson in welding together the strength of the American Hemisphere. I would like to add a few words to what I said. I do this to try to bring in focus one of the many valuable achievements of Dean Acheson in strengthening the free world at a time when his virulent detractors are trying to drag him down with the most distorted charges.

The past several years have seen a development of inter-American relations to the point where today the solidarity of the hemisphere is greater than ever before in history. This solidarity is demonstrated most importantly in the United Nations, where on every significant issue the 21 American nations, under United States leadership, stand as one in their opposition to Communist designs. Such unity of purpose and policy among so many nations is unprecedented even in the history of inter-American affairs. It has not been achieved by accident. It has been achieved by a diplomacy that has created confidence in the leadership of the United States, based on a full appreciation of what this country stands for and what is at stake in the fight against communism.

The importance of inter-American solidarity in the United Nations is self-evident. The developments of the last couple of years in our inter-American relations have, however, a more far-reaching importance. The fact that the machinery of the inter-American system has been developed to the point where it goes far to insure the peace and security of the entire hemisphere gives the United States an assurance that the hemisphere provides a secure base for the development of its policy overseas. In other words, the United States need not be preoccupied with fears of troubles in its home hemisphere at a time when it is required to give its attention to the grave dangers facing it in Europe and Asia. Especially since the conclusion of the inter-American mutual-defense treaty at Rio de Janeiro in 1947, the inter-American system has shown amazing effectiveness in maintaining peace among its members and relieving the tensions that might otherwise lead to disruptions of inter-American solidarity. Specific examples are the resolution of difficulties between Costa Rica and Nicaragua, and again between the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Cuba, and several Central American states. Today every one of the American Republics has taken positive action to ratify the Rio Treaty, and all are loyal members of the Organization of American States. The inter-American system has earned the increasing confidence of its members. The developments that have brought this about have in large measure been manifestations of United States leadership under the administration of Secretary Acheson.

There is one more aspect of strength in the Western Hemisphere and a very important one which should be stressed. The American states, in strengthening their common determination over the past 2 years, have taken increasingly aggressive and effective action to control and eliminate communism inside their borders. In 1947 the Communist parties of Latin American had a probable total membership of 360,000. By 1950 this membership has been cut to little more than 200,000. The United States can now give its maximum attention to dealing with the dangers of communism in the east and west with confidence that the danger from the south is receding and under control.

All these achievements of solidarity and strength among the nations of our hemisphere did not come about by accident or by their own accord. They came about through skillful diplomacy continuously exercised and the highly successful Latin-American policy under the administration of Secretary Acheson.

A Question for Defense To Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook of December 5, 1950:

A QUESTION FOR DEFENSE TO ANSWER

In the last week millions of Americans must have wondered why it would not be possible to stop the Chinese invaders of North Korea by dropping a string of atomic bombs across the narrow waist of the peninsula. Unless the effects of an atomic explosion in contaminating large areas have been greatly exaggerated, such a use of A-bombs should halt the supply of the big Chinese armies, regardless of how many of the invaders were killed.

Equally important, this use would be a purely defensive one, which would give Russia no excuse for entering the war, much less for bombing European cities. Of course, the Russians and the Chinese Reds would broadcast huge lies about it, but they have already done their utmost to inflame the Chinese masses against us, and they could hardly afford to frighten their own people by falsely accusing us of killing millions of Asiatic civilians.

If we used the bomb defensively to seal off northern Korea, Russia would be no

more and no less likely to attack Europe than she is already. So it would seem that the governing consideration should be whether such a use of the A-bomb would be effective in checking the Chinese Reds and in saving the lives of UN troops in Korea.

That question can only be answered by our top military authorities. And it is not impertinent for civilians to request an answer in view of the extremely critical military situation in Korea threatening the loss of half of our available ground army. The United States and the free nations of the world cannot afford to suffer a Dunkerque in Korea.

The narrow waist of the Korean peninsula would seem to offer an ideal testing ground for such tactical use of the A-bomb. The territory which would be blasted and made radioactive for weeks would not have to be much larger than that sector of the British front in 1918 which the Germans contaminated so thoroughly by mustard-gas bombardment that it had to be evacuated. Atomic radioactivity should be much more effective than mustard gas in stopping an army which depends on masses of men moving by night, as does the Chinese. Its use would be relatively humane and the moral effect on the Chinese of a series of atomic-bomb explosions should be considerable.

We think this question has sufficient urgency in the minds of millions of Americans to warrant a statement on the subject from the United States Defense Department. If such tactical use of the bomb is not being considered, let the Department tell the American people why.

Too Low an Estimate of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks I am including an editorial from the Paris Appeal, one of the outstanding weekly papers of the Nation signalized recently by a picture of the Appeal plant drawn by Norman Rockwell and published in the Saturday Evening Post.

Jack Blanton, the editor, writes a column for the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and publishes a column in his own paper noted for its wit, frankness, common sense, and unregenerated Jeffersonian democracy.

The following editorial is characteristic and mingles the bitter with the sweet and I commend it not only to the Members of the Congress but to their constituencies as well:

TOO LOW AN ESTIMATE OF POLITICS

There is to much loose talk about depravity in politics. Like this: "If he isn't a crook now, he will be very soon after he gets into office," which remark was made by a man in Paris while a candidate for United States Senator was speaking during the recent campaign. This is but a sample of things people say when talking about politics in this country. A stranger would think our Congress and legislatures were composed of thieves and plunderers of the lowest type. While it is true, of course, that Congressmen and legislators are not measuring up to old-time standards of patriotism and ability, the fact remains that an overwhelming majority of them are above reproach so far as common honesty is concerned. As for the general run of officeholders, the ones with whom we come in contact in our post offices and courthouses are fair samples of the whole. They most always are valuable in church and community, men whose credit is good in bank and store.

In destroying the confidence of young people in everybody who engages in politics we destroy confidence in our form of government. It is a Government of parties, and parties must have offices and patronage of other sorts in order to survive. Besides, how could a party enact its principles and policies into laws without electing men to law-making bodies? Instead of denouncing politics as a crooked game, and officeholders as men unworthy of confidence, a better policy would be to improve the type of men we elect to make our laws. While the average Congressman, Senator, and State legislator is an honest man, not many of them are outstanding for ability. Most of them should be replaced with men who rise above present levels.

UN Politicians Pass the Buck—Second-Guessing MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission to insert in the RECORD this article by Parker La Moore printed in the Washington Daily News on December 7. It certainly hits the bull's-eye. The above-mentioned article follows:

UN POLITICIANS PASS THE BUCK—SECOND-GUESSING MACARTHUR
(By Parker La Moore)

Ever since he became commander of the United Nations forces in Korea, Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been under general instructions to use his own judgment in carrying out his mission.

Nevertheless he has been denounced for exceeding his authority whenever his decisions have been subject to second-guessing.

Usually these were instances in which he was compelled to act because the politicians in the UN had passed the buck to him by withholding specific instructions.

Typical of this was the issue of the thirty-eighth parallel.

Under the initial UN resolution under which he was acting, General MacArthur was to "furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area."

When the question of crossing the thirty-eighth parallel was raised, President Truman took the position that this should be decided by the UN.

However, a majority of the delegations to the UN ducked the question by contending—always off the record—that they had been operating on the theory that General MacArthur had had the right all along to send his forces across the parallel.

Even when India's opposition to this assumption forced a more formal treatment of the issue, the UN balked at using the words "thirty-eighth parallel." Instead, it adopted a resolution that "all appropriate steps be taken to insure conditions of stability throughout Korea * * * including the holding of elections * * * for the establishment of a united, independent, and democratic government" in which "all sections and representative bodies of the population of Korea, South and North" would be invited to cooperate.

Then a special representative of UN was sent to Tokio to confer with General MacArthur concerning the government of newly won areas in North Korea.

A similar situation developed when the intervention of the Chinese Communists confronted the diplomats at Lake Success with another tough decision.

As early as September 2 General MacArthur reported the possible recruitment of Manchurian Koreans to reinforce the Red forces. Sixteen days later he estimated that between 40,000 and 60,000 troops trained in Red China had been released for service in the Korean campaign.

Finally, on November 6, General MacArthur announced that though the armies of North Korea had been decisively destroyed, he was confronted by a new enemy, which had invaded Korea from the privileged sanctuary of the adjacent Manchurian border. Pointing out the limits of his present mission, he obviously expected new instructions.

This crisis introduced the period of appeasement.

President Truman, in a public statement, assured the Chinese Reds that the United States would respect China's territorial integrity and urged their forces to withdraw from Korea. Britain made a similar plea, in a formal note to the Peiping government. Both powers made unofficial overtures to the Reds through the Indian Ambassador at Peiping, the details of which have not been revealed.

The UN invited the Chinese Reds to send a delegation to Lake Success to present their charges of aggression in Formosa against the United States.

Throughout this period the Chinese Communist troops were at war with the UN forces. By late November General MacArthur's intelligence reported a concentration of 500,000 troops on the Manchurian border. But the diplomats at Lake Success still refused to believe that Red China wanted open war.

Under standing orders to establish peace throughout Korea, General MacArthur faced the dilemma of digging in for the winter in the bleak Korean hills, or pushing on toward the border and trying to complete his task. He chose to march—and met a disastrous defeat at the hands of an enemy which outnumbered his forces by two or three to one.

When, at the beginning of his end-the-war offensive, General MacArthur told one of his field commanders he hoped to get the boys home for Christmas, he was indulging in optimism which events did not sustain.

But who can say that the Reds would not have moved against him if he had chosen to sit down and wait?

Acheson and the Snipers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, for many years the San Francisco Chronicle

has been recognized as the leading organ of the Republican Party in Northern California. In view of the violent attacks which have been made recently upon Secretary of State Acheson by so many Republican newspapers throughout the Nation, the following editorial entitled "Acheson and the Snipers," which was published in the Chronicle of Saturday, December 2, is a noteworthy expression of opinion from a distinguished Republican source. The editorial follows:

ACHESON AND THE SNIPERS

Secretary Acheson undertook, in his Cleveland speech, to relate the current crisis in Korea with the entire world situation in which America finds itself. We think he did it rather well—not spectacularly, but competently. It was, furthermore, the sort of thing a Secretary of State ought to do. He is peculiarly charged with keeping foreign affairs in perspective, and a little perspective at this time can be used to advantage by the American people.

The speech hardly made a hit with the Acheson critics, however. They came down on him tooth and nail, charged him furiously with being calm in a time when calmness is intolerable, and renewed the singsong demand that he be fired.

We're getting a little tired of that refrain. When an able man is doing an earnest and competent job in a difficult situation, and the fate of all of us depends upon how well he does the job, we favor letting him see it through. We have seen too often in history this situation: A calm and competent man of vision puts his case before a people. But the people are befuddled by hysteria and hysteria-mongers, and throw him out.

Secretary Acheson is doing such a job in such a situation. We don't happen to agree with his boss politically, but there can be only one President and one Secretary of State at a time, and while he's there he's representing all of us, Democrats, Republicans, Prohibitionists, and everyone else. If he loses it will be just as expensive for us as though we had put him there personally. So we want to give Acheson the leeway he needs. We don't want him loaded down with needless handicaps that are going to prevent him from serving us to the best of his ability.

He is currently being overburdened with that kind of handicap. We would estimate that the trouble he gets at the hands of Vishinsky and Stalin and Mao Tse-tung doesn't slow him down half so much as the trouble he gets from the Americans who keep bleating, "Throw him out, throw him out."

What has he done or failed to do to merit this kind of vicious carping? What's the bill of particulars against him?

The old China policy grudge is still the only thing the critics really hold against him. The Communists won in China, Chiang Kai-shek was whipped, and Acheson got the blame. All the weaknesses of Chiang's regime, the corruption that surrounded him, the eagerness with which his own forces deserted by the milions to the enemy camp—all that is forgotten or ignored. Acheson single-handedly defeated Chiang and turned China over to the Communists. That's the gist of the critics' argument, and Acheson has been built up as the great symbol of the failure of American foreign policy.

We don't go along with that.

We don't think, in the first place, that American foreign policy has failed—yet. Certainly, we could have done better in China, if we could have availed ourselves of second sight. But Acheson didn't have it, and neither did his critics. And we don't go along with the smug Monday-morning quarterbacking when, as now, there's far more pressing work ahead.

Acheson has done a distinguished overall job as Secretary of State. He has plugged patiently and ably for European strength and unity and won a fair degree of success there. He rose splendidly in the Korean crisis. He has championed the United Nations while turning back the Russian effort to convert it to an instrument of Soviet will. It was Acheson who came up with the answer to the Russian veto in the Security Council, and cleared the way for authority to be transferred to the veto-free Assembly, where it now resides. That was a stroke of master statesmanship, managing as it did to save the United Nations and enhance its authority. And now he has outlined a policy of long-range strategy that aims at rearing the maximum strength and unity by free nations while holding to the minimum the likelihood of world war III.

We doubt that Acheson could satisfy his tormentors by any move short of resigning, but if he undertook to follow their counsel on foreign policy we should have real cause for alarm. What they want, judging from the tenor of their criticism, is for the United States to sever all bonds with the United Nations, defy the friendly world, and set out along our solitary way to whip the Communist empire.

We think Acheson's program, though admittedly more complicated, makes far more sense, and we support him in his effort to work it out under circumstances that grow more trying by the hour.

Northeast Pacific Fishery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Fisheries Conference recently adopted a resolution relative to the desirability of having included a provision in any peace treaty signed with Japan stipulating that the Japanese fishermen be excluded from the fisheries of the Northeast Pacific Ocean, a recommendation in which I wholeheartedly concur. Under leave to extend my remarks, an editorial appearing in the December 4, 1950, issue of the Fairbanks, Alaska, Daily News-Miner on this subject is set forth below:

FISHING AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Fairbanks is a good many miles from the famous fishing grounds of Alaska but what's going on in Washington, D. C., should be of intense interest to every citizen of the Territory.

We in Fairbanks will be directly affected if the State Department doesn't get busy and realize that the economy of Alaska depends upon the ability of Americans to catch and process fish products in Territorial waters.

And yet there are people in the State Department who at this very moment are talking about a treaty with Japan that would not include a definite settlement of the fishery question. In other words, they would leave the matter wide open for a later settlement at an indefinite time.

This is causing a great deal of furor in Alaska where we can remember back a few years before the war when Japanese fishing vessels sailed into our fisheries and caught the salmon headed for Alaska spawning streams. That situation ended only because of the heated protests that almost resulted in an earlier war.

Now the Japanese are staying away from our salmon because General MacArthur is running the show and has set definite limitations on their activities. Once a treaty is signed, those limitations go out the window.

The Pacific Fisheries Conference, made up of representatives of all branches of the fishing industry from Alaska to the Mexican border are practical men. At their meeting in Seattle recently they left no doubt in anyone's mind about how they feel.

After the meeting, Congressmen, Secretaries of State, Defense, and Interior and other officials received telegrams notifying them that the conference is united in demanding that the Japanese stick to their fisheries and we'll stick to ours.

More specifically, the conference demanded that the State Department settle the issue at the same time the treaty with Japan is signed.

You don't have to be an expert in international affairs to know that the best time to get anything settled is at the time contracts are signed. A wife seeking alimony doesn't wait to argue her case a month after the divorce papers have been signed. An automobile buyer doesn't wait several months after he has made the final payments and then try to get a set of seat covers.

In this case, we're not asking for anything that isn't rightfully ours. These fisheries were developed by us and belong to us. All we're asking is for a reciprocal provision in the treaty.

This treaty would keep Japanese out of American fisheries and Americans out of Japanese fisheries.

The miles between Fairbanks and Alaska's fishing banks in no way lessen our intense interest in this matter. We should let it be known that all Alaska is united in its demand for action.

Misquoted History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on Tuesday, December 5, 1950, entitled "Misquoted History." It follows:

MISQUOTED HISTORY

Addressing the United Nations political and security committee recently, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Y. Vishinsky made an unhappy historical selection in illustrating his claim that "hatred being stirred by the ruling circles of the United States against the democratic forces of the Chinese people is not something new."

Vishinsky chose to refer to the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, during which the United States played a part in the suppression of the people's revolt in China.

It is a matter of history that United States forces were used in China to protect Americans there. The Boxers, a loose translation for the Chinese guerrilla bands committed to destroy all foreigners, had made wholesale onslaught against all Christians. Scores of Roman Catholic and Protestant missionaries and thousands of Chinese Christians were done to death at the hands of the insurgent bands.

It is important that only a fractional part of the people participated in the persecution of the foreigners. The disorders were con-

fined largely to northeastern China, led by fanatics. American action during the uprising could not have made them hate the foreigners more, for they already hated them enough to kill.

After the Boxer uprising, China was laid open to aggression by foreign powers. True, the hands of neither the United States, Great Britain nor Japan are clean on that score, but it is a matter of history that Russia was there grabbing territory with both hands. It took, in fact, the Anglo-Japanese alliance of 1902 to force Russia to desist. Russia was building a Manchuria for her approaching war against Japan and, although she lost that war, she never has relinquished her political grasp on that often-fought-over area.

It is to the United States' credit that she claimed only rights to some treaty ports, which were relinquished in 1943. And she also returned her share of the indemnity exacted from China to aid in educating of the Chinese.

Vishinsky's reference is ill-chosen, in the light of the history books of the rest of the world. His mistake, probably, was in believing a Russian history book.

Depletion of Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Paul A. Johnson, secretary of the Iowa State Watershed Association:

America had the most wealth of natural resources that any nation ever had. Forests, fertile soil, climate, fisheries, minerals in such abundance that Europe and Asia were poor by comparison. These made her a place to which our fathers came seeking the opportunity that was offered them. America became great and strong in a very short period of time. A land of opportunity under a free people's government.

Loss of these resources is fast making us a have not nation. Mines and oil wells may be exhausted. Even then we have, if we can keep it, our soil, the source of food, of clothing, of shelter. Are we keeping it? "Jesus told a parable of the men to whom the talents were distributed. One wasted them, one made no use of them at all, one managed his so that they were useful and increased. What has America done with the soil resources a bountiful God gave to us?"

There are rugged individualists who are farmers. They are not all lumbermen, oil men or mine owners or builders of monopolies. In the United States as a whole we have had some 160,000,000 acres of what was once farm land destroyed. The total of farm and grazing land ruined is given as 275,000,000 acres. There has been a loss of fertile top soil from Iowa farms since they were first plowed of 30,000,000,000 tons.

How much is 30,000,000,000 tons? An acre inch of soil weighs between 130 and 140 tons. A big truck might carry 10 tons of soil. If my figures are correct a line of trucks necessary to haul back all of our top soil that has gone from Iowa's fields would go around the earth about a thousand times.

One farmer said to me once and I will always remember it, "What can a county agent tell me? I have worn out three farms already." He was a real rugged individualist.

During a spring flood in Crawford County it was found, after careful checking, that the amount of top soil swept off the farms and carried down the Boyer and its tributaries in 4 hours would cover 1,660 acres of land to the depth of 12 inches.

When the Mississippi River is in flood a 40-acre farm is carried down to the Delta every minute. Twenty-four hundred acres per hour. No wonder the total loss of fertile soil is more than that of eight States the size of Iowa. Is this our cooperative American way of life?

When the battle of New Orleans was fought in 1812, that city was a port on the Gulf of Mexico. Now ships ride high above the city down a silt filled, diked channel, to reach the Gulf over 160 miles away, through a delta built up from eroded topsoil, a lot of it from Iowa.

Dean Herb Kildee spoke at a celebration in Mississippi a few years ago. The president of the chamber of commerce, in introducing him said, "Dean Kildee you are standing on 50 feet of black Iowa topsoil. You should feel right at home. The dean said it came so close to the truth that it wasn't even funny.

Why this enormous loss of Iowa's greatest resource? It can be summed up by the statement "Too many farmers are of the rugged individualist type. They neither cooperate with God or their neighbors in the saving and the building up of what God gave to them. As a result gullies (land cancers) are devouring our fields."

Iowa was the State most blessed with black soil, one-fourth of the grade A soil of the Nation was once within her borders. My good friend Fay Murray, former secretary of agriculture of Iowa, tells this in one of his poems entitled "Iowa, Past and Future":

"Iowa, I love the name,
Sweet to boyish lips it came
Magic name for prairies wide
A fertile fragrant countryside,
Iowa, I love it still,
All my being knows its thrill
Pregnant place of growing corn
Feeding place of men unborn.
Oft I wonder as I sit
What the future holds for it
After centuries, ten or twenty,
Will it still mean Land of Plenty?"

Will it? As Iowa goes, as to her soil, so goes the Nation?

This story of soil destruction is not the American way of life. It is not cooperation. It is that old story of me and mine, my son John and his. Not I and my neighbor working together. It is a lack of concern or interest in the other fellow. This is the spirit that breeds wars, creates race hatreds, and leads to suffering and destruction.

God said, "The world is mine, and the fullness thereof." God gave it to man to use, to make fruitful, to feed him, to make an abundance of the good things of life and of happiness.

Man has created a place where some have too much and many have too little. Our American way of life can exist only in a land of opportunity, where there is a better future for folks to secure for themselves. Where justice and equal rights for all are assured because the people are the state.

Our ancestors came from a war-torn Europe seeking opportunity for homes and happiness where resources were abundant. They worked together and built a great Nation. A place where the sick and unfortunate were cared for because there was an abundance for all. A country where folks could live up to the teaching of the golden rule and, not merely recite it in church or Sunday school. A country where the living Christ could rule, for all races, for all creeds, for all folks rich or poor; fortunate or unfortunate. A country where children could have homes where the spirit of cooperation could prevail, where love could rule, where service above self could be taught.

That is what we believe is America, our American way of life, an ideal worth fighting and dying for if needed. Other parents, whose sons gave their lives, feel as I do. They gave their all in the belief that America needed their sacrifice so that it could continue as a land of opportunity, of cooperation, a Christian land, in which the words "do unto others" and "inasmuch as you do to the least of these, you do it unto Me" means the freedom they fought and died for. Can we remember these men and their sacrifice?

In the hurry of everyday life, shall we forget? We can humbly ask the giver of all good things that we may see more clearly what He would have us do and have us be. Then America, our country, shall continue to be that country in which God, not selfish men, shall direct and govern and the teachings of His Son, our Christ, shall continue to be the American way of life, our individual way of thinking.

Proposed Changes in the Administrative Set-Up of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters regarding the proposed changes in the administrative setup of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation:

SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
OF NEW ENGLAND, INC.,
Boston, Mass., December 4, 1950.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: There is enclosed a copy of a communication addressed this date to President Truman relating to the proposed changes in the administrative setup of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

We call your attention to the following:

1. The Boston loan agency is the fifth largest of the existing 31 branches of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

2. We would suggest inquiry by your office as to whether the contribution by the production facilities of the New England area toward the over-all economies with their present and prospective financial needs is one that should be handicapped by transferring local authority out of this area.

You undoubtedly well know that the attitude of this association is that Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not meet the essential need of smaller business for long-term and equity financing and that the need of smaller business is for a capital bank or similar body. Until such time, however, as the capital-bank plan becomes a reality, it is essential that the facilities of RFC should continue to be available to provide fullest assistance to New England business in the most efficient and economical manner.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been of definite assistance to New England. We feel that you, too, would want nothing helpful to this area to be moved from it. The proposed action is to become operative December 15, 1950. Those interested in this

issue request that a public hearing be granted before any such action be taken. We hope that you see fit to promote this request.

Very truly yours,

JOHN D. MALOY,
Executive Secretary.

SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND, INC.,
Boston, Mass., December 4, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We address you regarding a recent release in the local press heralding certain projected plans for what would appear to be radical changes in the existing administrative setup of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and which, according to current press and radio comment, will result in the virtual liquidation of the Boston loan agency of the RFC as at present constituted and operated.

At the outset may we observe that the members of this association are, and for sometime have been, sturdy advocates of any measures looking toward more efficient and economical operation of our Government, at both the State and National levels, as is evidenced by the series of weekly broadcasts which the association has sponsored in this area for the past 3 years.

It is to be noted that we use the expression "efficient and economical," and to us these two qualifications are inextricably interwoven. It is a truism that observance to economy alone at the expense of efficiency produces neither economy nor efficiency. Further, it would seem reasonable to assume that any appraisal of the value of the RFC as a Government instrumentality should be measured in ratio to the extent to which its operation conforms to the basic requirements of "convenience and necessity," and we entertain grave doubts as to whether the proposed reorganization plans will conduce to observance to those fundamental requisites.

The entire economy of the New England area is virtually rooted in the soil of small business. The number of so-called industrial giants in this area in relation to total number country-wide is relatively small. The membership of this association is spread throughout the six New England States and one of our foremost association objectives has been the promotion of those measures that would conduce to easier credit requirements, even to the point of advocating the creation of facilities that would permit of the making of capital loans and equity financing.

These objectives have been the subject of repeated conferences in Washington, over the past 2 years, between representatives of this association and the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the New England area. It has been repeatedly pointed out that, by virtue of the existing tax structure, plus the lack of easy and convenient credit facilities, the average small business is effectually frozen and denied the opportunity for growth and expansion, and the consequent increase in employment capacity.

It, therefore, becomes understandable, that the operations of the RFC have been a matter of great interest and concern to our membership, and, in this connection, the association has maintained a close liaison between its board of directors and the Boston RFC loan agency for sometime past. By virtue of the information which we derive through this medium, we are extremely dubious as to whether the changes suggested by the RFC directors in the presumed interest of "economies, balanced operations, and increased efficiency," and to become operative December 15, 1950, will conduce to any one of those three objectives and for the following reasons:

Item 1: The present Boston loan agency administers to the needs of the six New England States and is the only existing agency of the RFC country-wide that embraces that many States.

Comment: The present personnel of the Boston agency numbers 102 and according to current local press comment, this number will be reduced to 13. In addition, the plans of the directors contemplate the centralization of "all fiscal and personnel matters, all loan administration, and all official files and records in the regional loan agency," which it is proposed will be located in New York City. In addition to the six New England States, it is proposed that the New York City office will supervise four other States, plus the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

How, in the name of common sense, can it be successfully argued that the removal of the base of operations with all vital records to a point more than 200 miles from the center of the scene of action, can result in either economy or efficiency? Particularly does this become questionable when it is considered that a very substantial percent of the loans in number in the New England area are in the small brackets where the borrower can afford no high priced advisory talent in the fields of accounting, taxation, and research, and, as a consequence, of which the personnel of the Boston loan agency are not mere perfunctory examiners, appraisers, and reviewers, but rather of necessity, become in the nature of advisers to many small-business enterprises.

The value of this service is evidenced by the fact that there are those applications which are withdrawn after the RFC examiners and appraisers have reviewed the situation and as a consequence of their efforts and analysis, the needs of the borrower have been accommodated through normal facilities at local banking levels.

Item II: Within the limitations imposed on it by law, the Boston loan agency according to our information is being operated in a generally satisfactory manner and we understand without substantial, if any, expense to the taxpayers.

Comment: Under the present management, since April 1949 the operating expense of the Boston loan agency has been sharply curtailed with respect to personnel, rent, and other administrative costs, and this, during a period when the number of applications presented, the number of loans approved, and the outstanding loan balance, were progressively on the increase (see item III).

In addition, by virtue of a most unusual and, if we may say so, a somewhat unbusinesslike method of calculating reserves, it would seem that this area is the subject of unfair discrimination. The requirement as established by the Controller, provided for an immediate reserve of 3.3 percent of the amount disbursed, beginning June 30, 1948, and up to July 1, 1950, on the latter date the reserve requirement was reduced to 2.8 percent.

There can be no quarrel with the setting up of a reasonable reserve, but the one inexplicable aspect of the system from our point of view, as businessmen, lies in the fact that after a reserve of 3.3 percent has been set aside against a given loan disbursement, it remains as a reserve against that disbursement even after the loan is completely liquidated and paid off.

This doesn't seem to make sense. On the other hand, we are possessed of a complete awareness that the RFC is a Federal agency and that the possibility is ever imminent, that the losses in one or more of its present 31 branches, may exceed the reserves applicable to the disbursements of those one or more branches—hence the necessity for the establishment of reserves on a national level basis becomes obviously essential. We submit, however, that a privately operated national concern would maintain and would give wide distribution to statistical data disclosing the results by branches, if only for the purpose of specifically pointing out to the management of all branches, what might be regarded as a yardstick from the viewpoint of efficient operation, and for the further and highly desirable purpose of stimulating the natural and human competitive urge to the end that the highest possible measure of operating efficiency be the prime objective.

We introduce this subject because it is our belief that on the basis of an unprejudiced analysis, the Boston loan agency will rank high. We have no authenticated figures, but it is the considered opinion of our contact with the local RFC office that the reserve established June 30, 1948, plus cumulative reserves on disbursements subsequent to that date, at the rates earlier mentioned, would produce an aggregate sum substantially in excess of all losses sustained by the local office since the beginning of the lending program in 1934, and of those aggregate reserves, a sizable percent is a reflection of the reserves chargeable against disbursements that have been completely liquidated.

We have seen no figures as to a comparative analysis with regard to the 31 branches of the RFC; neither have we seen any figures on a comparative basis with regard to the adequacy of reserves on those loans authorized by the Washington office, either from direct application to Washington, or on appeal to Washington following negative action by the advisory committees of the present regional agencies. If such figures are available, we would like to have access to them, and in passing, may we say that this is one of the many phases of this situation which should be explored before precipitate action is taken on the proposed administrative changes.

Item III: Within the limitations imposed on it by law, the Boston loan agency is making what we believe to be an intelligent effort to meet the progressively increasing requirements of the New England economy.

Comment: The present management assumed office in April 1949. Despite the operating economies referred to in item II, the business of the local agency has substantially increased as to the number of applications, loans approved, and total outstanding dollar volume. As of April 30, 1949, there were 118 loans outstanding, involving $5,846,000. As of September 30, 1950, there were 220 loans outstanding, involving $20,469,000.

Certainly, the suggestion that a regional area office be liquidated, which in 17 months has multiplied its service to the area by fourfold, does not seem to be a reflection of what would normally be regarded as sound business judgment. Certainly, no efficient privately operated business would contemplate the curtailment of its local service facilities to its customers in the face of such a trend.

Certainly, it cannot be successfully argued that there is any likelihood of a lesser demand on the Boston loan agency in the period that lies ahead. We have, in New England, a greater concentration of small factories and shops equipped for precision work and a greater number of skilled workers in these crafts, than anywhere else in this Nation. These are the shops, the factories, and the workers that are going to be called upon, as they have been before, to contribute much to the pending preparedness program incident to the international crisis which presently confronts us. Obviously, the demands for financing in many instances, what will be regarded as capital financing, will increase in direct proportion to our appropriations for defense.

From this particular aspect of this situation, we are constrained to observe that the action of the RFC Directors is another classic example of that too frequent tendency on the part of governmental agencies to act as completely independent entities, without public hearing for the benefit of those most vitally affected, without regard to the effect of proposed action on the operations of government as a whole, and we re-

gret to say, without adequate consideration to the interests of all the people who, in the finality, constitute the Government.

There are many other points we could make in support of our contention that this situation should be the subject of reexamination as a matter of policy, and that there be a postponement of the announced intention of the Directors of the RFC that the proposed changes become operative December 15, 1950.

May we point out to you what we regard as two basic principles:

1. The moneys expended by the RFC in connection with its loan activities and for administrative cost incident thereto are the moneys of the taxpayers.

2. The New England area represented by this association certainly contributes its proportionate share to the general tax structure from which the expenditures of the RFC are derived.

Having in mind these two basic facts, may we very respectfully suggest, but in a manner not at all lacking in firmness, that those whose interests are most vitally affected should have an opportunity to make themselves heard with regard to any suggested radical departure from the existing modus operandi or at least should be considered and consulted as to suggested changes in advance of their becoming operative.

At this critical juncture in our history, it is obvious that the share of the responsibility to be assumed by the New England economy, with regard to the future of our Nation, will be a heavy one. We submit that the principle of orderly planning dictate that we be permitted to express our views with regard to these proposed changes, to the end that New England industry be guaranteed that no unnecessary obstacle is created that will militate against its efficiency in the discharge of that responsibility.

Accordingly, we request that the RFC be required to publish a complete text of the proposed changes, and that a public hearing be held with regard thereto, either by the Directors of the RFC or by the appropriate congressional committee. Pending such hearings, we request that the proposed changes to be effective December 15, 1950, be postponed.

It is our considered judgment that the procedure we suggest is consistent with democratic processes as we understand them.

In closing, may we repeat that this association is militantly in favor of economy. We are disturbed primarily at the suggestion that the local autonomy with regard to existing authority to approve and grant loans be impeded, restricted, or abolished to the sacrifice of prompt consideration and action on matters involving the steadily growing needs of New England business.

Respectfully,

HOWARD D. WILLIAMS,
President.

National Grange Opposes Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD in order to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress a resolution adopted by the National Grange at its eighty-fourth annual session in Minneapolis, Minn., November 15 to 25, 1950.

I also call attention to excerpts from a letter from the legislative counsel of the Grange, on this same subject. Writing to a member of the Public Lands Committee, Mr. J. T. Sanders of the National Grange said:

In view of the burdens imposed on the Nation's economy by the growing international crisis, the economic unsoundness of this proposal, and the fact that it would add over $2,000,000,000 to the Nation's tax burden, it is clear to us that the project would be contrary to every principle for which the National Grange stands. We therefore urge you, as a member of the Public Lands Committee, to vote against a favorable report on S. 75, the central Arizona project.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE, OPPOSING ARIZONA PROJECT BILL, ADOPTED AT THE EIGHTY-FOURTH ANNUAL SESSION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., NOVEMEER 15 TO 25, 1950

Whereas a bill is now before the Congress which, if passed, will authorize the central Arizona project; and

Whereas the proponents of the bill admit that it is designed to rescue about 226,000 acres of land where the underground supply of water is being or has been voluntarily overdrawn; and

Whereas the construction costs of the irrigation features designed to serve the rescued land will amount to more than $1,800 per acre, with little, if any, of the cost being repaid by the landowners; and

Whereas Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, has officially stated to Congress that the central Arizona project will cost the American taxpayers over $2,000,000,000 for interest alone, which will not be repaid; and

Whereas the central Arizona project can be built and operated only if the established principles of economic feasibility as set forth in the national reclamation laws are grossly violated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Grange does hereby oppose the passage of this legislation and urges its defeat.

Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, at the recent sixth annual conference of the Alaska Moose Association the members at the conference adopted a resolution adding their voice to the thousands and thousands of other Americans who advocate statehood for Alaska. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to present that resolution here:

RESOLUTION ON STATEHOOD OF THE SIXTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ALASKA MOOSE ASSOCIATION, PALMER, ALASKA, SEPTEMBER 23, 1950

Be it resolved, That inasmuch as the present international situation is making our Territory a target for the eyes of the world in both a political and a military sense, and inasmuch as the people of Alaska have demonstrated that they are capable of living up to the obligations of citizenship which statehood will entail; therefore, this sixth annual conference of the Alaska Moose Association favors immediate statehood for Alaska and urges each and every member in each member lodge to assist in achieving this objective.

Approved by the convention, September 23, 1950.

Distribution: President of the United States, Secretary of the Interior, Delegate to Congress, Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress, President of the United States Senate, speaker of the house and president of the senate of the Alaska Legislature, Governor of Alaska, supreme governor of the Moose lodge at Moosehart.

L. E. EVANS,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

No Friends for the Lender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, in connection with our foreign giveaway program, I have long argued that it is human nature, generally speaking, that those who are under obligations to you financially or otherwise are at best inclined to avoid you and at the worst to become your enemy. This unfortunate human weakness applies to our international relations, as has been well pointed out in a recent editorial in the Vineland Times-Journal entitled as above. I think it is worthy to be included in the official record of our proceedings. It follows:

NO FRIENDS FOR THE LENDER

(By Ben Leuchter)

On the wall of a gasoline station's office or a small candy shop one often sees a printed sign which says in these or similar words:

"Let's stay friends. Please pay cash."

It's axiomatic in the business world that the retailer who demands cash payment on his sales retains the friendship of his customers. Only when he begins to extend credit does he make enemies, for some customers, having been tendered the credit (which is the same as an interest-free loan), resent attempts by the seller to obtain payment for his merchandise or service rendered.

That strange trait in human nature which motivates people to bite off the hand that fed them is as evident in international relations as in the retail business world. For more years than many Americans care to remember, Uncle Sam has been the world's lender, seeking to further his own prosperity by helping other nations to arm, wage war, and rehabilitate themselves. He has been even more than a lender, for the funds advanced were loans in name only. Part of the time, repayment of the loan was not expected either by the lender or the borrower.

Verbal and monetary thanks have been received by Uncle Sam for his generosity, until the objects of his philanthropy felt economically able to lose conveniently a portion of their memory. Particularly true has this been since the end of the Second World War, which ushered in one-way flow of money and material eastward across the Atlantic Ocean in a volume and spirit never known in the world's history. Great Britain and France, ravaged physically and starved financially after being America's allies in two wars, pleaded pitifully for aid in restoring their strength. The two great powers of Europe minus any power but that in their vocal chords, lapped up every drop and morsel of American aid, and as their digestive organs were given more use, so were their vocal organs—only more so. Until the present day

the process continues, reaching a culmination in these last weeks in which Uncle Sam is threatened with loss of military support if he follows actions not meeting the approval of those great powers, England and France.

That is the galling background attending Prime Minister Attlee's trip to Washington to confer with the President.

Not that Mr. Attlee is personally to blame, as he has been pictured as a "moderate" attempting to contain the pack of idealistic jackals in his own Labor Party who have grown politically fat experimenting with social panaceas paid for by Uncle Sam. The brazen ingratitude of Great Britain has been exceeded only by that of that land of corruption and indolence across the English Channel. France, which is spending on the indochina rebellion the exact amount of money she receives from the United States in Marshall-plan aid, wiggles her fingers at Uncle Sam and whips up the courage to declare she will not assist her American friend if he should drop the atomic bomb and become involved in an official all-out war with Communist China.

Yet, American indignation at the attitude of her alleged allies must be bridled by the realization that somehow what Mr. Attlee is telling Mr. Truman may make sense. The Prime Minister probably is arguing that if America allows her entire war effort to be sucked into the Asiatic theater, Europe will be left defenseless 'neath the feet of the Russian Bear. He is asking America to seek some "honorable" diplomatic settlement of the Korean War, but he has not publicly stated what he means by "honorable." With Red China now holding the whip and cracking it for everything it's worth, it is difficult for the United States to make any settlement that does not smack of appeasement.

The Communists and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission to insert in the RECORD this column by Walter Winchell in the Washington Post of December 7:

THE COMMUNISTS AND YOU

(By Walter Winchell)

Our armies are fighting with their backs to the wall in Korea, not against defeat, but against annihilation. Militarily and diplomatically we are suffering one of the worst disasters in our history. The Nation's leaders, reversing their statements of only a few weeks ago, now tell us we are fighting for survival. The situation is far too critical to be solved by finding a scapegoat. What the Nation wants is a cold analysis of why we are losing and how we can win.

Before you know where you are going, you must know where you have been. In 1945 we thought we were on the brink of a new and peaceful world. F. D. R. staked all on the good faith of his allies and like his old chief, Woodrow Wilson, he nobly and magnificently failed. In the belief that the loss of 15,000,000 of its people was enough to make any nation sick of war, F. D. R. was prepared to give Russia every assurance that it would not happen again. By quieting Russia's fears, F. D. R. thought he was laying the foundation of permanent peace. But F. D. R. and Stalin weren't playing the same game; Stalin was playing power politics; and from a power politics viewpoint he was taking all tricks. In his mind, Stalin knew the territories he was acquiring were not defensive areas for Russia but staging areas for future offensives of the Red army.

Stalin's first problem was to neutralize the greatest military force in Europe. That was Russia's ancient foe, Germany. While Germany was half occupied by him, obviously it couldn't fight at all, and if there were a fight with the west, Germany and not the Ukraine would be the battleground. That is why he continues to occupy Germany and why there will be no peace treaty reuniting it as a sovereign nation.

His traditional enemy in the east, Japan, was knocked out. Further, he had gotten Manchuria and the Kurile islands as bases from which to keep Japan flat on her back. Thus, the only important force he faced was that of the United States. His diplomatic objective, therefore, was to get the United States to knock itself out, and he succeeded to an incredible degree. We brought the boys home, as he built up more and more divisions to war strength. The last 5 years tell the story: As we receded they advanced.

In power politics the final question is much like a small boy's challenge: "What are you going to do about it?" As we continued our demobilization, and Russia built her armies and air force to an all-time strength, we could do less and less; and she could do more and more about it. She took 13 countries and 600,000,000 people under her dominion, and is still going. At the same time she got us to remove even the last vestige of resistance in the east—the Nationalist Government of China. Power, like water, follows the line of least resistance. Since no Far East nation has nearly the power of any European country, the Soviets are exploiting the vast break-through in Asia. Power goes until it is stopped, and there is nothing of any major resistance left on the Asiatic mainland.

Thus the real question is: "What do we do about it?" The first paragraph in any military manual will give you the grim and simple answer: Assume the worst and do the best you can with what you've got. The truth is we can't do very much about it right now. But a man in a raging sea has no choice but to swim. Our program is now dictated by the same inexorable logic of events. Here it is:

We haven't nearly enough arms and until we do we can't do anything. Accordingly we must again turn our country into the "arsenal of democracy" and teach our men how to use the new weapons. This means war priorities, price control, rationing, and universal military training.

By treaty and policy we have decided to arm the Atlantic alliance. This is a double gamble. The six Red field armies poised on the iron curtain are capable of smashing to the Atlantic coast. It is unreasonable to suppose they are going to sit there indefinitely watching western Europe forging the weapons to defeat them. The Red Army will probably blitzkrieg in overwhelming attack to the west, when it moves, so that it can capture Europe's Marshall-plan factories without destroying them, and thus use them against us.

Assuming the worst, as sound military caution dictates, we must consider that Europe may well be overrun and Great Britain neutralized by rockets, submarines, and air raids. Thus, even as we rearm Europe, an underground should be prepared to function in that emergency and demolition squads trained and ready in case we must yield the territory. Thereafter we and Canada will have to carry the fight, with very little help from South America.

Our choice in Asia is even more limited. Our current Far East policy is changed now to a salvage operation. No agreement with Red China will be kept by it; the President has 52 broken Communist treaties on his desk. The further fact is that the Korean campaign is only part of a continuing general Asiatic conquest now in progress. Tibet we will not defend, and Indochina we cannot defend against the Red Chinese forces when released from action in Korea. That means, at will, the Communists can sweep down to Singapore as easily as the Japanese did.

In the Communist pattern they are seeking to extend the area of their victory by a proposed peace treaty. If we accept their peace terms, it will give them equal rights with MacArthur in Japan, wipe out Chiang Kai-shek, and permit them to purchase the goods they so sorely need in America.

We have lost a campaign, but by deluding ourselves that they will keep any peace treaties we can lose the global war. Appeasement in Korea will be more tragic in results than appeasement at Munich. We will cut our own throats if we admit Red China to the United Nations. From the moral standpoint, for which we say we are fighting, it would be as disastrous as the acceptance of Mussolini's rape of Ethiopia. A bank robber, though successful, is still shunned by a self-respecting community.

We have now been officially told we are fighting for survival. That means we must use all the help we can get from wherever we can get it. It is the first rule of survival that common enemies make natural allies. Our natural allies are the imprisoned countries, and they should be used. With almost suicidal blindness, up to this time, our intelligence has been forbidden to arm the underground resistance movements. That policy should be reversed today.

Our country no longer has the slightest choice. There is only one way. We have gambled that there would be peace—and lost a war. Our last chance is to rush preparation for a global war—and hope to save our country.

Is England a Helpful Ally or Are We Just Pulling Her Chestnuts Out of the Fire?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, light on the question carried in the caption above may be gleaned from an editorial of the Chicago Tribune of December 6, printed herewith:

ATTLEE AND COMPANY

Prime Minister Attlee was sped on his way to Washington with a mighty outpouring of censure for America from British politicians and the press. The English ally views us with suspicion and dislike, and is at no pains to conceal it. When the military situation in Korea could not have been worse, Mr. Attlee's minister of defense, Emanuel Shinwell, and his minister of war, John Strachey, showed their mettle.

Did these responsible ministers of our valiant ally take energetic measures to get reinforcements to Korea? Did they call for speed and resolution in organizing against the world menace of Soviet aggression? Not that could be noticed.

Strachey made a stirring call to Englishmen not to surrender social gains to defense needs. Socialist business as usual was his prescription. Shinwell deliberately falsified the United Nations mandate under which General MacArthur was ordered to proceed

north of the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea. He said that MacArthur had brought all the trouble by exceeding his orders.

Britain's responsible military leaders proved good backbiters. They specialize in biting their allies, not their enemies.

Yet no one ought to be surprised at these attitudes. Last March Strachey's ideological inclination was brought into question by Lord Beaverbrook's London Evening Standard, which said that Strachey was a Communist who had never disavowed communism. This was denied by Attlee and Strachey, who asserted that Strachey had broken with the Communists in 1940, when Stalin was supporting Hitler's war with Britain.

The letter to a magazine which Strachey cited as proof of the break was not very convincing evidence. If there ever was a break, it is difficult to reconcile it with statements made by Strachey as late as October, 1945, after the end of World War II, which were published then in his book, "Socialism Looks Forward." In chapter 12 Strachey said that the proof that socialism works was that Russia had triumphed in the war "without the assistance of a single Russian capitalist or landlord." In the windup of a panegyric to Communist Russia, he wrote:

"But, somebody may say, isn't Russia a pretty tough sort of place? What about the purges and the shooting and the lack of civil liberties and the trouble with the peasants, and consequent food shortages, which we used to hear so much about in the British newspapers before Russia became our ally?

"Yes, Russia is pretty tough. Things have happened there which I, for one, most passionately hope may never happen in Britain. But let us never forget this. It is very largely we and the other capitalist states of the world who have made Russia tough. First we made war on her; then we subsidized all the Russian landowners and capital owners who had been turned out to make war on her; then we drew what was called a 'sanitary cordon' around her; then we boycotted her; then we refused her all credits; then we refused to make common cause with her against the Nazis, hoping they would attack her. And now people are surprised because she is very tough, pretty rough, depends on nobody but herself, and trusts nobody but herself.

"Russia has been through unspeakable difficulties and sufferings, of which the German invasion was only the last; but she has been through them, and has come out one of the strongest nations on earth. This giant strength of Russia is built on the concrete foundations of a Socialist economic system. So when you hear people say socialism 'won't work,' just whisper the words, 'Like the Russian Army?' "

Nobody so sympathetic to the cliches of Communist propaganda, and no one with such a vast admiration for the Soviet system and Soviet military power, could ever put his heart into the job of preparing a defense against Russia. A man with this outlook would be better equipped to greet an invading Russian army as liberators bringing the New Jerusalem.

Of Shinwell, the best that can be said is that he has an almost identical view. He was a great shouter for the second front to relieve Russia in World War II, once suggested by implication that the Churchill war cabinet harbored "subversive thoughts" about the Soviet ally, and again stated, "The effect of the Russian resistance to Nazi aggression on political thinking in this country is very great." He and Attlee have been agreeable to retaining Strachey, and they have defended him.

How can any American expect British military assistance in a war against Communist aggression when men like this control the political decisions governing the British military establishment? To them Russia is the Socialist fatherland.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, since American foreign policy is a principal topic of discussion, I believe Members will be interested in reading a historical review and summary of the present United States foreign policy and Stalin's world-conquest program prepared by the Women Investors Research Institute, Inc., which follows:

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND STALIN'S WORLD CONQUEST PROGRAM

Ever since Dean Acheson first proposed the Marshall plan in 1947, the people of this country have been led to believe that the objective of our foreign policy is to halt the spread of communism in the world and end the threat of Communist world domination.

Analysis of our present foreign policy—particularly as set forth by Mr. Acheson in his radio talk November 29—reveals that such a policy cannot either halt the spread of communism in the world or end the threat of Communist world domination since, it ignores the very heart of Stalin's program to conquer the world.

Stalin's plan for world conquest is not original. It is a combination of tenth century Russian plans to conquer eastern Europe and Genghis Khan's plan to rule the world.

RUSSIA'S FIRST INVASION OF EUROPE

Russia's tenth century plan called for bringing all of Europe from northernmost Russia to the Mediterranean and east of the Danube under its control. Historical records establish that hordes of Russian pagans flowed down through eastern Europe in a drive to the Mediterranean—slaughtering, raping, conquering all intervening tribes and countries.

The Greeks—seeing their Byzantine Empire threatened by advancing Russian pagan hordes—sought to stem the tide by bringing about a temporary unity of western European countries in an effort to build up military forces of sufficient strength to turn back the Russian advance.

That attempt to unify the forces of western and central Europe against the threat of Russian invasion met with little more success than the present North Atlantic Pact unification plan to halt Russian domination of the same area is presently meeting.

That Russian invasian of western and central Europe finally was halted by the invasion of the Middle East and Russia by Genghis Khan—the Tartar-Mongol "Living Sun"—who also had his plan for world conquest.

CHINA INTERRUPTS GENGHIS KHAN PLAN

Starting from northern Asia—Genghis Khan first conquered Manchuria, then northern China and the plains of western Asia. With this area under his control and using the mass manpower of Asiatic barbarian hordes, he pressed on through southern Asia—conquered the Turks, passed the Caspian Sea by its southern shore and invaded Georgia (birthplace of Stalin) and the Caucasus to the southern steppes of Russia.

His advance was halted there by trouble in China. More than a decade elapsed before he succeeded in liquidating Chinese war lords who believed that China should be ruled by the Chinese. With China once more under his control, the Khan was able to return to his conquest of Russia and the linking of that country to his world empire.

Genghis Khan made Russia a political dependency of Asia. Stalin plans to make Asia a political dependency of Russia. The Khan believed that once the natural resources and mass population of Asia, the Middle East, and Russia were linked together, he would be able to compel the rest of the world to bow to his rule. Stalin evidently entertains the same belief.

The Khan's descendants were unable to keep the Chinese under control and once that control was lost, the encircling chain was broken and the Khan's dream of world rule was ended. But Russia—regaining her freedom from Asiatic rule—did not forsake her dream of ruling all of Europe east of the Danube to the Mediterranean.

STALIN COMPLETES RUSSIA'S EASTERN EUROPEAN PLAN

Russian rulers made innumerable attempts to bring that dream to fulfillment. It remained for Stalin—who believes he is the reincarnation of Genghis Khan—to make the Russian dream an actuality through the Yalta, Tehran, Potsdam agreements. The ailing President Franklin D. Roosevelt—with no known record of objection from his political adviser, Alger Hiss, or his military adviser, Gen. George C. Marshall—gave Stalin, at Yalta and Tehran, practically all of the eastern European countries that Russian rulers had sought to conquer for centuries and President Harry S. Truman later approved the Yalta-Tehran agreements at Potsdam. (For a complete listing of countries given Stalin under the Yalta-Tehran-Potsdam agreements, see our Special Report No. 500, Analysis and Historical Review of the Marshall Plan, released March 24, 1948.)

Czechoslovakia was the only country in the old Russian plan which was withheld from Stalin in those agreements. A glance at a map shows that Czechoslovakia—if it remained outside Stalin's control—could become a corridor through the Carpathian Mountains through which an attacking force could pour into the Ukraine, thereby cutting Stalin off from his all-important Balkan oil supply and all possible chance of linking Russia with Asia. It is not surprising, therefore, that Stalin seized Czechoslovakia when he was ready.

STALIN'S GENGHIS KHAN PLAN

Stalin won more at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam than fulfillment of the Czar's dreams. He also was given Manchuria, North Korea, and the Kurile Islands—all necessary for the next phase of Stalin's plan for world conquest—the Genghis Khan plan—conquest of Asia, the Middle East, and the linking of Russia with Asia so as to completely encircle the world.

Stalin's next move was a series of diversionary tactics in Europe to divert world attention from Asia. With this accomplished, he began to build a huge munitions plant and arsenal in Siberia—east of the Ural Mountains—protected by his control of Manchuria, North Korea, and the Kurile Islands.

His next move was to organize Red Chinese forces in Manchuria to drive Chiang's Nationalist forces from China. Chiang fought valiantly against Stalin's Red Chinese forces but was forced to flee to Formosa when his supplies from the United States were cut off by Dean Acheson and Gen. George C. Marshall when Chiang refused to accept Mr. Acheson's plan for including Chinese "agrarian" Communists in the Chinese Nationalist Government.

Stalin's control of Asia then was almost complete. It faced two threats. Control of South Korea by non-Communist forces and the occupation of Formosa by the remnants of Chiang's Nationalist army. As long as all of Korea and Formosa remained outside the Soviet control-orbit they constituted loaded pistols pointed at Stalin's planned

line of march through Asia and the Middle East, linking them to Russia to complete his world-encirclement plan.

His first move to eliminate these twin threats was to order the invasion of South Korea by North Korean Communists. That plan seemed about to succeed when it was wrecked through the genius of General MacArthur and the courage of American soldiers fighting under the spider-web flag of the United Nations.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AIDS STALIN?

But again the foreign policy of our State Department apparently saved the day for Stalin. Simultaneously with ordering American troops into combat in Korea, without the consent of Congress although it was in session, Mr. Truman, evidently on the advice of the State Department, ordered the United States Seventh Fleet into the waters of Formosa Strait.

Up to that time Stalin had been compelled to keep a large force of Chinese Communist troops stationed in the Foochow-Canton area opposite Formosa to prevent an invasion of the China mainland by Chiang. The advent of the United States Seventh Fleet in the Formosa Strait changed that situation.

That fleet took up its Formosa Strait position under orders from Mr. Truman to, 1: Prevent an invasion of Formosa from China, and, 2: Prevent an invasion of China from Formosa.

Under that order—it no longer was necessary for Stalin to keep Red Chinese troops in the Foochow-Canton area to prevent Chiang's invasion of the mainland. He was able to move these troops—reliably reported to number about 300,000—from the Foochow-Canton area to Manchuria for special training under Russian officers and for new equipment, including winter clothing.

It is believed that the Red Chinese troops now opposing United States troops in North Korea are those which the advent of the United States Seventh Fleet, under the above-cited order, enabled Stalin to move out of the Foochow-Canton area.

If North Korea is returned to Communist control and Chiang is compelled to remain on Formosa until Stalin is ready—without United States opposition—to invade that island and liquidate Chiang's forces—Stalin then will be ready to continue his march through Asia and the Middle East to complete the link to Russia and his world encirclement program.

With that encirclement completed—and his only real opponent, the United States, bled into bankruptcy and impotency through continued heavy spending and manpower losses—Stalin will then be in a position to compel the entire world to bow to his rule. Genghis Khan—the "living sun"—will have returned once more to power.

Can Stalin's world encirclement plan be halted?

STRATEGY OF FREEDOM

It can—but not through Mr. Acheson's "strategy of freedom" plan.

That plan is designed only to strengthen and develop western Europe and Africa. It not only fails to strike at the heart of Stalin's plan—conquest of Asia—but it gives him Asia as the Yalta-Tehran-Potsdam agreements gave him eastern Europe and Manchuria.

Mr. Acheson declared in his November 29 talk that his plan is "rooted in our traditions." His audience assumed he meant the plan is "rooted" in the traditions of the United States.

Study of that plan reveals it to be "rooted" in the traditions of Cecil Rhodes.

Cecil Rhodes, son of an Anglican preacher, amassed millions by a monopoly of South African gold and diamonds. He left the greater part of his huge fortune for the specific purpose of advancing the British Empire expansion program. Key to that program was the development of the immense wealth of Africa.

According to William Stead—his secretary and official biographer—Rhodes set forth in his will that his money was to be used "to establish a secret society in order to have the whole continent of Africa settled by Britons * * *, in the end that Great Britain is to establish a power so overwhelming that wars must cease and the millennium realized."

Stead relates that Rhodes discussed his plan with Lord Rothschild who replied, "This is all very well if you can get America to join—if not, it amounts to nothing." Whereupon, Mr. Stead relates, Rhodes changed his will, rewriting the phrase "settled by Britons" to read "settled by the English-speaking nations," and then established the Rhodes Scholarships as the secret society which was to aid in carrying forward his plan.

Mr. Acheson's strategy of freedom plan is not new. It is a rewrite of the Rhodes plan with one major change—the United States is to pay the entire cost—in men and money.

Cecil Rhodes dreamed of British Empire—not of Stalin. His plan did not envision the reincarnation of Genghis Khan in Stalin and the revival of the Genghis Khan plan for world control.

While State Department planning indicates a deep knowledge of the Rhodes plan for world control—it also appears to indicate a woeful lack of knowledge of the Genghis Khan plan. Otherwise—why should all State Department planning to end the threat of Communist world control persistently ignore the heart of the Khan plan—control of Asia? Why should all State Department world planning be designed to enable Stalin to take Asia without opposition since conquest of Asia practically assures success of his world-conquest program?

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY BLOCKS CHIANG?

Reliable reports indicate Chiang is ready to strike at the heart of Stalin's plan with an invasion of China. He is reported to have 500,000 men on Formosa ready to invade China—with a fifth column of about 1,000,000 ready for action inside China as soon as he begins that invasion.

He is prevented from carrying out this plan by that portion of Mr. Truman's order to the United States Seventh Fleet which directs it to prevent an invasion of China from Formosa and by immediate lack of needed supplies, plus the assurance that supplies will continue to flow to him—even after Stalin is forced to withdraw his Red Chinese troops from Korea.

It is believed by those who know the situation that if Chiang invades China, Stalin will be compelled to recall his Red Chinese troops from Korea and from Tibet; that he will be compelled to halt his flow of supplies to the Red Chinese in the Indochina area, thereby relieving the United States of the financial and military burden of aiding France in that area.

It would appear that—with Chiang's successful invasion of China—Stalin would be compelled—even as was Genghis Khan—to abandon his world-encirclement program and concentrate his efforts on an attempt to reconquer China.

Victory in China for Chiang could result in a period of peace for the world.

Victory in China for Chiang could result in completion of his world-encirclement program.

Chiang cannot begin his invasion as long as those now in control of the State Department continue to dictate our Far East-Asia-China policy.

CAN ACHESON PROGRAM STOP STALIN?

Since Mr. Acheson's strategy-of-freedom program includes no plan to halt Stalin's march through Asia—can it halt his world-encirclement program with its threat to world peace and individual freedom?

Can Mr. Acheson's failure to include Asia within the sphere of his strategy-of-freedom program be interpreted by Stalin as an indication that the United States is ready to trade off Asia in return for a temporary peace in Western Europe?

Such a trade may be acceptable to Western European countries—particularly to Britain and France. Indications daily are increasing that those two countries oppose any United States aid to Asia—apparently fearing that such aid can only result in a curtailment of the aid now flowing from this country to continue and support their tottering Socialist governments in power.

It should be remembered that socialism—the Red twin of communism—is, as Lenin aptly described it, "the primary stages of communism." In view of this, can such a program as that now advanced by Mr. Acheson halt the spread of communism even in Western Europe since its objective apparently is to make socialism secure in that area of the world?

If Mr. Acheson's strategy-of-freedom program is accepted as the foundation of our foreign policy—will it not only enable Stalin to continue his present program of satellite-troop action throughout the Middle and Far East and finally result in bleeding the United States into bankruptcy—thereby making it an easy prize for Stalin once he has finished his conquest of Asia and completed his Genghis Khan world-encirclement program?

Record Refutes Those Professing Fear of Republican Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Press-Telegram of Long Beach, Calif., carries an editorial in its issue of November 20, 1950, entitled "Record Refutes Those Professing Fear of Republican Isolationism."

To all who know the record of the Republican Party in recent years, and its great accomplishments over 20 years, the editorial offers little new information, but the editorial is especially timely now and illuminating for those who may have been influenced by techniques of deceiving propagandists.

I ask unanimous consent for insertion of the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD, and recommend its reading by seekers of the truth.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD REFUTES THOSE PROFESSING FEAR OF REPUBLICAN ISOLATIONISM

There is variance in the reaction of foreign diplomats to the results of the recent United States election. Those from the Far East have taken heart. Those from the European Continent indicate fear that the Republican victory will give impetus to isolationism. The latter viewpoint has been stressed in recently printed editorials in France and Britain, and it echoes alarmist allegations from United States sources disappointed at the result of the voting.

Such fears of isolationism are not justified in fact. They spring in part from differences in interpretation of the meaning of the term, in part because the word has been used as an epithet for political purposes, and mainly because the record is too often ignored or distorted.

In refutation of the charge of Republican isolationism, go back to the Eightieth Congress, which was Republican and which has been so harshly criticized by President Truman.

The Eightieth Congress enacted the Marshall Plan legislation and the military aid to Turkey and Greece program. This same Congress enacted the Vandenberg resolution to advance world cooperation and improve the workings of the United Nations.

In the Eighty-first Congress Republican Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, a member of the Appropriations Committee, authorized a resolution designed to strengthen the United Nations within its existing framework. Appearing before the Foreign Relations Committee, the Secretary of State testified in favor of the resolution, but the supposedly internationally minded Democratic majority did not pass it.

The administration has set up Republican Senators TAFT, WHERRY, and BRIDGES as the king pins of isolationism. The truth is that the Senators not only favor continued assistance to Europe, but they insist that interest in the Far East is imperative to the strategic defense of this Nation.

TAFT, WHERRY, and BRIDGES are among that considerable group of Republican Senators, not forgetting KNOWLAND and SMITH of New Jersey, who didn't want to kiss China goodby and who did not want to see Formosa taken over by the Communists.

It has taken only a few months to vindicate their judgment, for now the Chinese Communists (once called agrarian reformers by certain State Department friends) are locked in battle with United Nations forces in North Korea.

Last year Senator SMITH and Senator KNOWLAND, after extensive trips to the Far East, spoke out courageously of conditions as they saw them. Senator KNOWLAND has returned this fall for another look and his pronouncements will be interesting. In spite of administration jeers, TAFT'S, SMITH'S, and KNOWLAND'S statements gave the public vital knowledge at a time of danger and contributed resoundingly to the administration's defeat this November.

How many remember the Morgenthau plan which proposed to turn Germany into a completely agricultural state? GOP leaders in the Senate and House of Representatives succeeded in preventing the further dismantling of German industry. The same Republican Members of Congress in a coalition with southern Democrats have insisted that Spain and Western Germany—and all friendly countries willing to combat communism—be given a helping hand in the mutual struggle for survival. Now, what is the meaning of isolationism? Quite evidently it depends upon who is doing the name calling.

Not too long ago, the British Labor Government in an official pronouncement criticized the Schumann plan because it would retard the nationalization of some industries in their own and other countries. Doesn't that seem a little isolationist under some interpretation of the term?

Consider Winston Churchill, Pandit Nehru, and other internationally known leaders. No one calls them isolationists because they propound the views they consider to the best interests of the citizens of their countries. That is quite proper. They speak for their own nations. It should be equally logical to expect our duly elected Representatives to present views and plans for the welfare of the United States. Few people would deny that the United States has been interested in the welfare of the world. However, it is not being materialistic to want American leaders to think of Americans first. That is what GOP leaders expect to continue to do.

They do favor assisting European defense and economic aid within our resources. These same leaders believe that the aid given must be justified by other nations' desire to help in their own defense as well as the common defense of all in a time of peril.

The record doesn't substantiate fears of GOP isolationism. It does indicate that the GOP leadership will insist on careful scrutiny of expenditures and a realistic foreign policy that keeps America strong while discharging its obligations as a member of the world community.

No Deals in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, under date of December 6, the Philadelphia Inquirer published a very able editorial entitled "Save Our Troops: No Deals in Korea, No Appeasement," which I think could be read with very great value by every Senator. I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

SAVE OUR TROOPS: NO DEALS IN KOREA, NO APPEASEMENT

No deals. No appeasement. No surrender.

That, in this newspaper's opinion, must be the backbone of American and United Nations policy in handling the crisis in the Far East.

Because of the overwhelming force of the Chinese Communists sent hurtling into Korea, the United Nations troops there have been thrown back with large losses and face military disaster.

Grave decisions must be made quickly on the course we now should adopt.

But there is no reason for panic.

It is no disgrace for 200,000 troops, or less, to be pushed back by 1,000,000. Battles have been lost before and retreats made inevitable. Because we have to give up Pyongyang does not mean we have to give up also everything the United States and the United Nations have stood for in Korea.

It may be necessary to withdraw our forces from Korea before the Chinese by sheer weight of numbers shove them into the sea. But there is no reason for them to retreat on their knees. They have fought valiantly and well; if they are to be evacuated, they can regroup elsewhere as part of the mightier military organization that events and the Communist menace compel us to construct.

Britain was not dishonored at Dunkerque, nor America at Bataan. Because they vowed, in both instances, to return. They did not hand France or the Philippines irretrievably to the enemy. They gave ground only to come back.

The dishonor was at Munich, where groveling statesmen sought to buy peace from Hitler by selling out an ally, and where the evils of appeasement were made so plain that no man should ever forget them.

There would be dishonor and futility in seeking now to repair the Korean crisis with a patched-up program of appeasing Communist China and her back-room puppeteer, Soviet Russia.

The possibility has been discussed of prevailing upon Mao Tze-tung to order a cease fire in Korea and to halt the Chinese advance at the thirty-eighth parallel or some other line while dickering continues over the future of the Far East.

In return for such an agreement, it is suggested, the United States would remove the Seventh Fleet as the protecting screen for Formosa and leave the Chinese Nationalist forces on that inland to the tender mercies of the Communists, and the Mao regime would be voted into the United Nations.

Should the United States and the UN allow itself to be blackmailed into a deal like this, nothing but catastrophe could follow. No advantage would be gained in Korea, because even if Mao would halt his advance temporarily to grasp other concessions, he would take over the whole of Korea at his leisure.

The Communists did not respect the thirty-eighth parallel before: Their advance beyond that line is what set off the war. They proved that they want all Korea as part of their over-all plan of conquest, and no appeasement gesture at this time will change their minds. Blackmailers and gangsters never stay bought.

Given right-of-way in Formosa, the Communists would not only destroy the last organized Chinese resistance to their power, but they would take over a base that is one of the most important points in America's defense chain in the Pacific.

They would be in perfect position to swallow Indochina, kick the British out of Hong Kong and walk into Thailand and Malaya. Appeasement now would strengthen them for later on, with violent repercussions across half the world in Europe, where Russia, its Asiatic enterprises made secure by the Chinese puppets, could proceed to further conquests either by force or by deals, in the well-known Hitler pattern.

We did not give up when half our fleet lay on the bottom at Pearl Harbor. There is no reason to give up because of a military set-back by overwhelming numbers in North Korea. One defeat does not mean that we should abandon the UN commitment to protect the Korean people from Communist aggression, and write off the graves of our dead who fell to make that commitment good.

Fall back if we must, evacuate the Korean battlefields to keep our remaining troops out of the Chinese meat grinder, but let it be another Dunkerque, not another Munich.

No concessions to the Communists, no agreements with an enemy who will never keep his pledge, no surrender. If we quit Korea, let us leave with honor—until the day we can return.

National Maturity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the word "isolationist" is frequently applied as a term of reproach to critics of our foreign policy by those who apologize for it. They seem to regard this as a retort courteous which completely disposes of any statement that might otherwise prove difficult to answer.

For those who have resorted to this evasion, there may be food for thought in a letter written by John Hanna, a distinguished professor in the law school of Columbia University. It was published in the New York Herald Tribune under date of November 18, 1950, and entitled "National Maturity."

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MATURITY

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

Isolationist ranks high as a question-begging epithet. What should induce reflection is the number of persons who are often so tagged although they have an obvious and high competence in world affairs. When such persons question American foreign commitments, it is not because they believe the oceans and distance are adequate protection from enemies, or that the United States should be defenseless against aggressors. What they ask is that American policy be defined in terms of American interests, which, considering American purposes and practices, do coincide with the best future of that part of the world which is dedicated to freedom.

The historic American policy as enunciated first by Washington is that the United States should not become a party to foreign quarrels and rivalry. That does not mean our interests may not be global or that to maintain these interests we need no allies. What it means is that we should accept associates on the basis of our own needs and not mix on either side of age-old conflicts. The record of both world wars shows the disasters that can come to the United States from abandoning our historic principles. Unrealistic sentimentality characterized us in both wars. Our people were moved by foreign and our own propaganda to grotesque error regarding both our allies and our enemies. This bleacher mentality dissipated our wealth and power to ends as harmful to the people of our allies as to ourselves and our enemies. Wilson's tragedy was that understanding much of this truth, he yielded to the very waves of sentiment he had deplored. Roosevelt's tragedy is that he ignored every aspect of Wilson's statesmanship and duplicated all America's blunders of a generation earlier.

The historic fact is that from 1917 to 1941 practically no major participation of the United States in world affairs benefited either ourselves or the rest of the world. Since 1941 the bad features of our policy have largely canceled the praiseworthy aspects. The principles of Washington are as valid today as when the Republic began. A return to these principles is not isolationism. It is a mark of national maturity.

JOHN HANNA.

NEW YORK, *November 17, 1950.*

The New Problem in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, when the Korean trouble started, no one, including our military, thought that the Communistic hordes of Red China would eventually close in to attack on the Korean peninsula. We are faced with that situation now.

H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune in Gary, Ind., outlined some real common sense regarding our oriental problem:

THE NEW PROBLEM IN KOREA

The attack of the Red Chinese has changed the whole character of the war in Korea and forces this country and the UN to adopt a new policy. The first problem is the survival of our Army. With a million Chinese soldiers attacking 175,000 Americans and supporting allies, a new line must be established which can be maintained against the hordes thrown against our men.

The problem is a new one for us but it is not a new one in war. The Germans had to face it in Russia when their armies were submerged by oceans of Communists who kept coming no matter how many were killed. The establishment of a well-planned defense line in depth can probably do the job, but we may not have time to plan and construct it properly. Therein lies the danger, for a soldier can kill only a limited number. Eventually his gun becomes too hot to handle or jams and he is overrun.

Nevertheless there may be ways out of the difficulties facing us and now that we know what the problems are, it is a fair supposition the Red hordes will be stopped somewhere. After that has been done we shall probably have to make a deal with the Red Chinese. Whatever the deal is called, it will be appeasement, but it will be necessary if we do not want to fight a war with China—and we do not.

It has been assumed until this attack that Communist China would not do what she has done. It was believed that Mao would not be the tool of Russia but would act in China's interest. But Mao may think he is acting in China's interest. Who knows what goes on in a Communist's mind?

Well, someone should have known. There are probably more Americans who have lived in China and know the Chinese intimately than any other people. They should have been able to predict China's course. But we don't use such resources. We just blunder along and take what comes. This time the cost of blundering will be very high. Indeed, there is no certainty it will not be complete disaster.

Saving the Army is a military job, and MacArthur should be given a free hand. But if that job is accomplished, we still will have to bring some completion to the Korean adventure unless enough new military forces can be rounded up to drive out the Chinese. Indeed, the Chinese angle has been the weakness of the adventure. Had we united Korea, it would still have been necessary to make an accommodation with China.

From the start we should have realized that some agreement with China would be required under any circumstances. That is, we should have required an agreement. China would not. She could have waited until we withdrew and then have sent in her armies as she has now.

So when we talk about an end of the adventure we mean an agreement with China. But China has said the only agreement she wants is for us to get out. Possibly we can do better than that; but unless we intend to fight and defeat China, we shall undoubtedly have to appease her. It is better to face this fact than to go on talking about saving our honor.

The fact is, we face a terrific defeat which can only be prevented by a very large increase in our military power in Korea. But no such power is available. We don't have it, and if we did we might not be able to transport it to Korea in time to be effective. Therefore, it is no time to talk platitudes nor to discuss impossibilities.

Never at any time was there any contemplation of having to defeat a million Chinese in addition to the 300,000 North Koreans. We haven't the power, unless it is in the atom bomb. Unfortunately, military men do not seem sanguine about using the bomb in the Korean terrain.

The Gravity of the Korean Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Let's End Korean Dispute Before the Entire World Is Aflame With Terrible War," written by Fred C. Christopherson, and published in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader of December 5, 1950. The editorial deals with our foreign policy. The Daily Argus-Leader is the largest newspaper published in the tri-State area of the Midwest.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S END KOREAN DISPUTE BEFORE THE ENTIRE WORLD IS AFLAME WITH TERRIBLE WAR

(By Fred C. Christopherson)

The powers that be in Washington are engaged in fateful conferences this week—conferences that will influence the history of the world and the destiny of mankind.

These conferences are being held at a tragic time in history. Never before, in truth, has the United States faced a crisis so grave. Our future is at stake. The way ahead may be just a long road of blood, sweat and tears—a road so long that no person now alive will reach its end. But that need not necessarily be the road we take. Whether we do or not depends upon the courage, the wisdom and the common sense displayed in Washington.

THE PEOPLE UNDERSTAND

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, said over the week end that the American people do not appreciate the gravity of the situation.

Whom does she think she's kidding? The American people understand it very well, indeed. It seems they have a better appreciation of it than those who are in charge in Washington.

President Truman took time off Saturday to attend a football game in Philadelphia. It was, no doubt, a pleasant and a thrilling outing. But he shouldn't have been in Philadelphia Saturday. He should have been in Washington with the day devoted to conferences with the Department of State, with leading Members of Congress, with able thinkers in and out of the Government, with our UN representatives and perhaps informally with men from the British, French and other embassies.

To assume that the President knows all there is to know about the foreign situation is an extraordinary assumption. Of course he doesn't. And he should have been spending all of the week end, not just a part of it, in preparation for the momentous conferences now under way.

When Senator SMITH says that the people don't realize the mess that exists, she is firing in the wrong direction. Obviously there are men in Washington who don't comprehend it.

WHERE WE ARE

The big question still is: Where do we go from here? To obtain an answer, let's first understand where we are.

The position in which we have been placed and the route that we are now following, in the opinion of the Wall Street Journal, is "an endless road."

Hanson W. Baldwin, distinguished military critic of the New York Times, says: "Today we are involved in precisely the type of war which we can never win, a land struggle on the Asiatic continent in a theater where no decision is possible against the hordes of Asia. * * * We must face the situation as it is today and try to devise a strategy that will extricate us from our present completely untenable position."

Alan C. McIntosh, thoughtful editor of the Luverne, Minn., Star-Herald, discusses a recent sneering reference by Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, to "isolationism" and the attitude of those who wish to reexamine his policies.

"There is a distrust of Acheson in the Midwest," says Editor McIntosh, "that is hard to describe—it reaches a point where it becomes a nausea of fear that something is terribly wrong. A reexamination of American foreign policy is overdue. When a man has a record of as many wrong guesses as the Secretary of State, it does not behoove him to rebuke those who question the course he charts for the ship of state."

This attitude of the Midwest, McIntosh explains, is one of realism and not isolationism.

TODAY'S REALITY

And now what is realism in respect to our world situation? Today the United States stands virtually alone in Korea, fighting a potential army of millions of Asiatics close to their home base. We must transport our men and our supplies across 8,000 miles of water. The Asiatic leaders consider their manpower expendable and will not hesitate to sacrifice the lives of a million soldiers or 2,000,000 soldiers, if need be, to stop us.

Perhaps we can lick China and Russia, too, on their home ground. Military Expert Baldwin, however, says it is a type of war we can't win.

Technically today we are not engaged in an all-out war with China, and, it seems, we should not and must not take a step that would precipitate such a war. If we drop the atomic bomb in Manchuria or in China, we will be at war with China. If we enlist the services of Chiang's army, we will be at war with China. If we make a thrust directly at Moscow, we will, of course, be at war with both China and Russia.

TWO ROADS AHEAD

And let's not deceive ourselves into believing that a game of bluff will produce results. We are dealing with wily Orientals and they are not easily fooled.

In respect to "where do we go from here," this question arises: What are the alternatives?

Along one road—the road we are now following—lies war and destruction. It points the way to a world aflame with no end in sight insofar as today's vision can see. Even if we should defeat China and Russia, what would we do then? What would we have accomplished? We would have acquired and developed hatred on a global scale and we ourselves would be on the brink of collapse.

That road is not a pleasant one.

The other road is the road of realism. It is a path based upon a program of getting out of Korea with as much grace as we can and as little loss of life as possible. If a buffer state would be the answer, let's agree to it.

When a smart man learns that he has started out on the wrong road, he changes his route. Nations, it seems, should be equally smart and ready to revise their programs as the circumstances suggest.

We can battle it out to the bitter end in Korea, of course. But, as and if we prepare to do so, let cold realism tell us what such a program means—a world-wide war, death, devastation, suffering, and utter despair. The sensible course is to get out of Korea as quickly and as satisfactorily as we can.

We Cannot Support or Fight the Whole World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Let's Quit Playing Atlas," which appeared in the Topeka State Journal, Topeka, Kans., December 1, 1950. The Topeka State Journal is one of the leading newspapers of the State of Kansas. I believe this editorial is a true appraisal of our position today in the world and that the writer has placed his hand on the pulse of the times and reflects the present thinking of many folks of the great Middle West.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S QUIT PLAYING ATLAS

It is hard to see how anything could be more wildly insane than to allow this Nation to be sicked or sucked into a war nobody wants, a war we are not ready to fight if we did want it, and a war we might have to fight alone if we were ready.

We can neither support nor fight the whole world. We ought to get that through our grandiose heads. The Government at Washington ought to realize it. Sadly, and it may be tragically, there are few signs that the Government, if Mr. Truman personifies it, realizes anything of the kind. The President's 500-word prepared statement and his reckless press conference on the Korean situation showed that much.

Harry Truman, however well he must have meant, went off half-cocked in a cock-eyed crisis. He allowed himself, at a terribly serious moment when the entire globe would be hanging on his every syllable and inflection, to be jockeyed into one of his typically hasty, half-thought-through-sound-offs. He has this Nation threatening now with the atom bomb, against a fanatic creed that would like nothing better than to rally the rest of the world against us for doing just that. And how easy it would be to rally that world, already sullen and resentful about America and America's master-race airs.

This Nation of 150,000,000 people simply cannot police the whole world. It cannot underwrite and guarantee the freedom of all peoples. Already governments ruling 800,000,000 persons—a third of the world—are marshalled against us. Other hundreds of millions as in India are sitting ducks for the same fanatic false promises that gained the first 800,000,000. And we do not even know who our friends are. We have no real assurances that the war-weary, war-whipped populations of Europe would follow us through a holy crusade. Only a few of them extended or were able to extend even token support of our trial crusade in Korea.

The American Government has gotten out too far. Our leaders should promise only, henceforth, what we can do and deliver without gutting ourselves. A great many people in this country have come to feel that, no matter how right we may be, or righteously indignant, we should consider a gradual withdrawal as gracefully as possible from Asia, where our presence is misunderstood, and try to live our lives in a fortress America. The crisis in progress is unmaking sincere internationalists and creating just as sincere isolationists by the minute, to use those unfortunate labels. The world has shrunk, to be sure, and we would not wish to retire to a fortress America, preferring to mingle in a friendly way with all; but if that is what we are forced to do to survive, that is what we are forced to do. Political isolation is a reluctant choice, but it is far preferable to overinvolvement leading to the horrors of war.

The A-bomb should not be used, is our opinion. We should save it for self-defense only, and keep our hands clean before the judgment seat of history and the Divine Intelligence. Let the Chinese Nationalists—they still want to send troops to fight the Chinese Reds—take over in Korea, if they will, or let us help them to open guerrilla hostilities on the mainland. Then let us bring our men home and gird to the defense—the fight to the death if necessary—of our own homes and our own freedom. We have tried hard, our very best, to live in good will and on terms of good faith with the world. It can't be done at this stage of humanity's evolution. War would not solve anything; war would not stop communism, which, anyway, like any tryanny, contains the seeds of its own eventual self-destruction.

Let's face the ugly truth about the world and about ourselves, and then let's act on it as a united people, unafraid and unbeholden to anything but the right as we see it. Let's keep one island of liberty in a hate-diseased world. This is difficult but not impossible, and certainly it is not foolhardy. America should quit playing Atlas.

"We Are Not at War; the Action We Have Taken Is Police Action," Said President Truman in June About the Korean War—The Korean War Has Become One of the Most Bloody in the History of the United States According to the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, like an ostrich with his head stuck in sand, like a small boy whistling when he hurries past a cemetery at night, President Truman told the American people on June 30 that the Korean affair was nothing more than police action. He was so dead wrong. Just as wrong as when he

said the United States Marine Corps was nothing more than the police force of the Navy.

The Korean War, according to the latest report of the Defense Department, has become one of the most bloody in the history of the United States. More American men have died and more have suffered casualties than in the Revolutionary War, the Mexican War, the Spanish-American War, and the War of 1812.

Up to Friday, November 24, American casualties in Korea were 29,996 with 4,993 dead, and 4,439 missing in action, and this was before the disastrous attack upon our Armed Forces by Red China. If this is police action then the Revolutionary War, the Mexican War, the Spanish-American campaign, and the War of 1812 were just a slap on the wrist.

Somebody must be wrong, and it looks as usual to be none other than President Truman. This Nation cannot long afford such faulty judgment from the Chief Executive.

The following is a report of the suffering, privation, and desperation of the United States Marines at Hageru, North Korea, by war correspondent Jim G. Lucas:

BUCKY DIED 5 MINUTES AFTER WE LEFT HAGERU

(By Jim G. Lucas)

WITH THE MARINES AT HAGERU, NORTH KOREA, December 6.—The kid corporal from New Boston, Tex., wanted to talk. It wasn't easy because he had been hit in the face with a mortar shell.

"Whenever a wounded man froze to death," he said, "we left him along the road. We couldn't carry our dead. All the trucks were filled with food, ammunition, and wounded.

"It was tough. Everybody in an outfit this size knows everybody else. But we had to do it. That way we made room for more wounded guys who had been trying to walk it.

"I really can't tell you, Mister, how many got killed. Most of us, I imagine."

But the kid said he was lucky. He is going out. The plane was taking off in a few minutes. Others would have to walk it—22 miles to Yonpo.

"There's never been anything like it, Mister," he said. "I'm not complaining. In the Marines the big brass like General (O. P.) Smith will walk right along with you and the Commies would rather shoot generals than anyone else.

"Anything's better than staying here. But we ain't fooling ourselves. Those that get out alive will be lucky. Me, I've had mine.

"All I've got to worry about is this face that'll scare girls from Dennison to Galveston. Them other guys will be lucky if they ever see a girl again."

The corporal was in one of the two Marine regiments that fought their way out of Yudamni. The last of them got to Hageru last night. It's taken 48 hours for them to travel 17 miles. Every mile has been hell. Every mile has been massacre.

I had talked to the kid's commanding officer a few minutes before. I'd known him around Inchon and Seoul—a tall, good-looking youngster with a bright future. No one doubted he'd be a general some day. He is now on the verge of a crack-up. He couldn't remember dates or names. Three times he broke down and cried.

Yudamni is a hamlet along the west bank of the Chosin Reservoir. The Fifth and Seventh Marine Regiments were sent there on November 27. They'd been hit by overwhelming Communist forces as soon as they arrived.

One company was surrounded for 5 days by elements of at least three Chinese divisions. A handful of survivors staggered back to Hageru last night.

"They hit us before we even had time to dig in," said a sergeant with a bleeding face wound. "That first night we fought from 11 until 6:30 the next morning. We killed a hell of a lot of them, but they kept coming."

"We burned everything we couldn't take along," said a marine combat correspondent from Decatur, Ill. "Our tents, packs, and food. We kept our rifles and tried to get out with our artillery and tanks. Some slid into ditches and we'd stop to destroy them.

"They killed 18 of us first, 200 yards out of Yudamni. God, it was awful. They were on all sides and as fast as we moved a mile they closed in behind. And that wasn't the worst of it. There must have been two whole divisions ahead of us trying to keep us from getting out. We had to fight them ahead, from both sides, and the rear.

"There was no point in hitting the ditches. The Communists had mined them. There were hills on both sides of that little road and they had mortars, machine guns, and rifles every inch.

"The guys at Hageru sent a helicopter for our wounded but the Gooks got it. Damned thing burned a hundred yards from me and the pilot burned with it. I saw my best friend get his. He was wounded too bad to jump from the truck, so when he stood up they shot him in the head. We laid him out in the snow and put another guy on his litter."

We were ready to get airborne and the Air Force captain warned the takeoff would be rough.

The kid from New Boston mumbled through bandages: "Ever ride a six-by-six (combat truck) with a mashed-up face?" he asked. "I did—48 hours of it with Gook mortars landing everywhere. And they tell me this'll be rough."

We were airborne now. "Peg o' My Heart," the good old C–47 which had flown coal to Berlin, suddenly rocked. Up in the cockpit Capt. Harry C. Aderholt, of Birmingham, Ala., swore.

"Gooks just tried to lay a mortar in on us," he said. "It hit just under the left wing."

Back in the ship the kids were settling down. Even the mortar hadn't scared them.

"What the hell is another mortar?" a marine from Henderson, N. C., asked bitterly. "That's all we've seen in the last week."

Fifteen minutes later "Peg o' My Heart" let down at Yonpo. The kid from New Boston had found another Texan—from Livingston. They were already planning liberty in Dallas and Fort Worth.

But a big Negro corporal from Ashland, Va., was worried. "What's the matter, Bucky?" he asked one of the guys at his side. He added: "The kid ain't spoke once."

Bucky would never speak again. He died 5 minutes after we left Hageru.

Federal Court Finds Jenkins Act Constitutional

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, 1949, Congress passed a bill known as the Jenkins cigarette tax bill. This is Public Law 363 of the Eighty-first Congress.

Up to that time quite a number of persons and companies were shipping cigarettes into States which had a State cigarette tax law and they were shipping them in such a manner as to evade the State tax law. As a result many States have lost many thousands of dollars that they would otherwise have received. These shippers were, in effect, bootlegging their product so as to evade the State tax. This bootlegging business was carried into many of the States with the result that approximately $30,000,000 annually was diverted from the States. The State of Ohio was losing about $750,000 a year; New York and Pennsylvania were losing more than a million dollars a year. Other States were losing proportionately. Ohio has a 2-cents-per-pack tax while Oklahoma and Louisiana have a much larger tax. The Jenkins bill was drawn to prevent this unfair practice. As a direct result of this Jenkins Act, Ohio's treasury has already been increased by at least a half a million dollars.

This evasion was effected in much the same way by all these shippers. The State laws provide that a tax stamp must be placed on each pack of cigarettes by the seller and there is a penalty for failure to affix this stamp. In some States there is a penalty for a person to have in his possession a pack of cigarettes upon which the State tax stamp has not been affixed. Most of the big mail-order shippers, such as Sears, Roebuck, cooperated with the States and would arrange with the State tax officials to pay the State tax on all their shipments into the State. These bootleggers sometimes openly solicited sales through newspaper advertisements. Many of them had salesmen who quietly solicited sales in factories and other places where a number of men would be employed. They would have large shipments made to themselves, frequently, for distribution among their customers. In many cities the post office would, at times, be full of cigarette shipments, all to be distributed without payment of the tax. This became a disgraceful racket. The Jenkins Act, if enforced, will end this dishonest practice.

The Jenkins Act requires that any person selling or disposing of cigarettes in interstate commerce, whereby the cigarettes are shipped to other than a distributor licensed by or located in a State taxing the sale or use of cigarettes, shall each month forward to the tobacco tax administrator of the State into which such shipment is made certain information, including the name and address of the person to whom the shipment was made and the brand and the quality of the cigarettes shipped. Violation of the act is a misdemeanor punishable by fine of not more than $1,000, or imprisonment of not more than 6 months, or both.

When this law was passed, most of these bootleggers went out of business for they appreciated that their business was a dishonest business and very unfair to the thousands of tobacco stores that were complying with the law and selling no cigarettes except those upon

which the lawful tax was paid. A few, however, hated to give up their lucrative business and proceeded to defy the law.

As a result of this defiance the respective State tax authorities proceeded to enforce the law. It then became a contest between the law and the law breakers.

Finally the matter got into the United States court on an action brought to test the constitutionality of the act. The attorneys in the case were the same who argued the case before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. The style of this case is United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Consumer Mail Order Association of America, et al., plaintiffs, against J. Howard McGrath, individually and as Attorney General of the United States, defendant; civil action No. 1560–50.

This case was decided by the United States Court on November 30, 1950. It was tried by a three-judge court and the decision was unanimous. The judges were Circuit Judge Fahy and District Judges McLaughlin and Matthews.

In its opinion, written by Circuit Judge Fahy, the court says:

The plaintiff, Consumer Mail Order Association of America, is in the nature of a trade association to which the other plaintiffs belong. The latter allege that they are engaged exclusively in the business of selling cigarettes in interstate commerce. They sue J. Howard McGrath, individually and as Attorney General of the United States, for a declaratory judgment that the act of Congress of October 19, 1949, known as the Jenkins Act, is unconstitutional and for an injunction against its enforcement.

The court goes extensively into all of the spurious arguments made by Counsel Thurman Arnold which are the same arguments made by him before the Finance Committee of the Senate. The court rejects all of the arguments made by Mr. Arnold and his associates and supports completely the arguments made by me before the Senate Finance Committee.

The following are a few quotations from the written opinion rendered by these three Federal court judges:

We find no constitutional infirmity in the Jenkins Act. By its terms it applies to "Any person selling or disposing of cigarettes in interstate commerce whereby such cigarettes are shipped to other than a distributor licensed by or located in a State taxing the sale or use of cigarettes."

The act being constitutional, equitable relief by injunction must be denied in any event. But we think it is within our discretion under the Declaratory Judgment Act to decide the constitutional question, as was done in *United Public Workers et al.* v. *Mitchell* (330 U. S. at pp. 93–94).

Some of these plaintiffs, believing the act to be unconstitutional, are violating it, while others, fearful of the consequence of violation, are restricting their operations, regulated by the act, until the issue of constitutionality is settled.

The use of the commerce power to aid the several States in this manner is valid.

The fact that it (Congress) has adopted its rules in order to aid the enforcement of valid State laws affords no ground for constitutional objection.

The complaint seeks a declaration that the statute is unconstitutional without regard to its particular application to a particular State. We need not, in this general attack upon the act, go further than to point out that State policy in this area of taxation may validly be the basis for Federal regulation of interstate sales or shipments.

While it is beyond dispute that the exercise of the commerce power by Congress is subject to the requirements of the fifth amendment—*Currin* v. *Wallace* (306 U. S. 1, 14); those requirements are generally satisfied where the means of the regulation of commerce are appropriate to a permissible end.

Even if the prohibition imposed in the exercise of the commerce power results in the destruction of property rights * * * there is no deprivation in violation of the due process clause of the fifth amendment unless the regulation imposed is unreasonable. *Wallace* v. *Hudson-Ducan & Co.* (98 F. 2d 985, 991). Here, the Jenkins Act does not require the full disclosure of the plaintiff's customer list to anyone. The taxing authorities of each State receive only the names of those customers who are residing within the State's borders. There is no showing that plaintiffs will be harmed by the disclosure of these segmental lists to competitors. In these circumstances it cannot be said that the requirement is unreasonable or inappropriate to the permissible end of Congress to prevent the use of the facilities of interstate commerce in evading or violating State laws. The right of a mail-order concern operating in interstate commerce to maintain the absolute secrecy of its customer list is subject to the right of Congress, in the exercise of its commerce power, to require the partial disclosure of that list to State authorities.

In *Utah Fuel Co.* v. *Coal Comm'n* (306 U. S. 56), the Supreme Court sustained the power of Congress to go even further in the exercise of its commerce power by requiring the submission of detailed business information and by authorizing its disclosure to a group among whom were competitors of the informant.

Congress may prescribe the "rule by which commerce is to be governed," *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat, 1, 196). The breadth of the power has been frequently expounded by the Supreme Court in recent years.

Finally, as to the contention that the act forces a resident of one State to submit to the jurisdiction of a second State, it is the power of Congress, not of any State, which requires the information to be submitted. The act imposes a condition upon the use of the facilities of interstate commerce, and neither obedience nor violation of that condition subjects the plaintiffs to the authority of any State.

This is the final paragraph of the court's written opinion:

For the reasons stated with respect to the several plaintiffs, judgment is granted for the defendant, and the complaint accordingly is dismissed.

This means that the United States court finds the Jenkins Act to be constitutional in every respect and that the case brought by these cigarette bootleggers should be dismissed.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the United States court has sustained the constitutionality of the Jenkins Act. This law will put an end to a very unfair and dishonest business practice and will protect honest business against dishonest business. It will also transfer about $30,000,000 per year from dishonest channels into the State treasuries where it can be used for schools and roads and many other worthy projects which the States must finance.

Medical Profession Takes Initiative Providing Private Funds for Medical Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago at a meeting of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, its president, Dr. Elmer L. Henderson, issued a challenge to the medical profession to take the initiative in raising private financing and assistance for certain medical schools, rather than seeking Federal subsidies. In response to this challenge, the American Medical Association appropriated $500,000 as a nucleus of a fund to be raised for such aid of schools throughout the Nation.

There is constant agitation that the Federal Treasury be opened up and all medical schools subsidized, whether they are State-supported or privately endowed. It is obvious that such contention is motivated by the fact that some schools are in need of some kind of assistance. This is an issue which must be met and will be met by the American people.

The medical profession is to be commended for taking the initiative in this cause. This is no token but a real and progressive step toward meeting this need. With the American Medical Association actively behind this movement and providing this amount of money as a nucleus of an adequate fund to be raised, I am confident that it will be a success.

The board of directors of the American Medical Association voted unanimously to make this contribution and place the association behind this movement. Dr. Louis H. Bauer, chairman of the board, issued a statement to the association's house of delegates and a release of the action taken, which, I believe, deserves the attention of the House membership and the people of this country. Because of its importance and the importance of this problem, I include the statement in the RECORD:

CLEVELAND, December 6, 1950.—The board of trustees of the American Medical Association is pleased to announce to the house of delegates that it has appropriated a half million dollars out of its national education campaign fund, which was raised to defend medical freedom, for the aid and support of medical schools which are in need of additional financing.

This fund will be given to the medical schools for their unrestricted use in their basic training of future physicians.

This appropriation to aid the medical schools has been made possible by the widespread public cooperation which the profession has received from the American people in its campaign against compulsory health insurance. The fight against socialized medicine must go on until this issue has been clearly and finally resolved, but the pressure for regimentation of the medical profession has greatly lessened, due to the

magnificent public support which we have received.

The board of trustees, therefore, feels that it is keeping faith with the American people, who have given medicine such a splendid vote of confidence, when it contributes this amount to the medical schools of the Nation.

There is a growing public awareness that Federal subsidy has come to be a burden, not a bounty, for it is bringing intolerable increases in taxation, and is dangerously increasing Federal controls over our institutions and the lives of our people.

American medicine feels very strongly that it should not seek Federal aid for medical schools, until all other means of financing have been exhausted. The board of trustees announced yesterday its belief that funds for this purpose could be obtained from private sources—and as practical evidence of our sincerity of purpose, this appropriation has been made as the nucleus of a fund which we hope will be greatly augmented by contributions from many other sources.

The board hopes that this action will become a stimulus to other professions, industries, businesses, labor groups, and private donors to contribute to this very important cause of protecting and advancing the interests of medical education and the public health.

The American Medical Association urges all its members to contribute individually to this cause, and we hope that doctors will take the lead in securing contributions from other sources.

Furthermore, the American Medical Association invites attention to the fact that it has been spending about a quarter of a million dollars a year for many years past to advance medical education through its Council on Medical Education and Hospitals and other departments. This appropriation, voted today, for an entire new purpose, is in addition to nearly $285,000 already budgeted for this work during 1951.

The Nation's medical schools are of the greatest importance to every American citizen and the AMA has had the advancement of their standards as one of its main objectives for over 100 years. The board of trustees feels that if all other organizations and individuals will render support of this worthy cause in accordance with their financial ability that not only will the financial security of medical schools be assured, but that their freedom will be protected.

You Can't Do Business With the Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am pleased to enclose an editorial by a brilliant writer of my district. I feel that it is timely to give some of the background of Mr. Fred C. Koch, who wrote the editorial which I am including with these remarks.

Mr. Koch was born in Russia. He was born in a community that had been established by Catherine the Great of Russia. In the nineteenth century she had persuaded many people of German descent to colonize in the fertile valleys of the Volga River. Mr. Koch's forebears were among those who traveled from Germany to settle in Russia. They were promised many things, among them the privilege of maintaining their own language, their own schools, their own churches, and they were also promised that they would not have to serve in the military forces of Russia. Toward the end of the nineteenth century this latter promise was infringed upon and members of these Colonies were pressed into Russian military service. Because of this and other reasons these good peope looked to America and many of them came to settle in eastern Washington. They have become great citizens. They have an understanding of world affairs, not exceeded by any other Americans. They appreciate the full meaning of American liberties. Because of this background, Mr. Koch's writings carry a fuller meaning. During the war and immediately following it Mr. Koch served in the Office of War Information. For a considerable time he was attached at Berlin and helped in the reestablishment of the German press. It was during this service in Berlin that the event occurred upon which he bases the following editorial:

For the past 2 days there has been a ringing in my ears.

It rises to a crescendo every time I read the headlines from Korea and hear the latest news flashes about this mess into which our supposedly astute foreign-policy experts have blundered, pushing before them the torn bodies of thousands of fine American boys who should be at home finishing their school years.

This ringing is not really a ringing. It's more like a voice, faint, distant, ominous, prophetic.

It's the voice of a schoolboy, a university boy, a young chap about 19 in whose home I sat one Sunday afternoon in December of 1945. He had been in the Army only a few months before this time, but now he was back in school, at Heidelberg University, Germany.

I can't recall this boy's name offhand. I'd have to look it up. But it isn't important. Meanwhile I'll just call him Helmut.

Helmut, as I said, had only recently been in the army, the German Army. For a 19-year-old, I found him possessed of an amazing political consciousness and social understanding.

The purpose of my visit with Helmut, who was as strange to me as Joe Stalin's sleigh driver, has nothing to do with this story, but it was out of the story that this schoolboy's words struck me with a force I have not been able to forget in these past 5 years, these words that ring in my ears now every time I hear and read the news of gaping holes in American lines in Korea.

Helmut said:

"You have destroyed us, but you have not yet won the war. You have not destroyed communism, the enemy that is poised to destroy you."

The war that destroyed Helmut's army was won finally by the might and weight of American production. Yes; by American production of planes, ships, tanks, guns. It was won, too, by military strategy—and with the blood of American boys.

But this new war—this war against communism—is something else again. We've lost more of this war since VE-day through bunglers, dupes, internationalists, illusionists, and traitors in and connected with our Government than we have lost in Korea.

For this new war is one that has been waged by the Kremlin long before Helmut's army was destroyed, and it has been waged with an oriental cunning that, with the help of the Alger Hisses, made dupes of our delegations at Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, Moscow, and wherever else we sat down with the Russians to plan a future world of peace.

Our military strategists are one thing; our political strategists are something else again.

They have steered the country into a mess out of which even the military strategists may not get it without a price too fearful and awful to contemplate.

Our fumbling State Department has lost move after move in the international game with the Kremlin, and by now they have committed America's resources and manpower to a prospect that portends a global struggle which could bleed the country white before the Red army of the Soviet even makes its first strike.

This course to doom was laid partly through stupidity, partly through fantastic idealism, partly through sincere but erroneous motives—and in a large measure through the infiltration of so-called red herrings into high places of Government where they influenced vital decisions and stole information and plans that have already been of valuable assistance to the grand Red scheme.

Helmut was not the only schoolboy back in December 1945 who believed that the war was not over—and that very shortly we would have to fight for our lives against communism.

There were thousands of American 19-year-olds who knew that too. How they knew it, I don't know. Perhaps they were not yet so encumbered with intellectual weight as to have their common sense blunted—a condition that seems to throw our experts off the track time and time again.

It took only the average brand of American horse sense to see what Helmut saw and what so many of our boys saw. But up there in those high places they had their heads in the clouds, apparently. They had their heads in the clouds while Stalin had his feet planted firmly on the ground.

Right now our politicians are haggling around the United Nations Security Council table with a bunch who so far have demonstrated their chief interest in the UN to be what they can get out of the American taxpayers' pockets. Certainly a very few have shown anything but token assistance in a war that is purportedly a United Nations war against aggression.

Meanwhile our military leaders, who will have the sole responsibility for saving this Nation from doom, are hamstrung by words, bickering, indecision, and delay foisted upon us by these international panhandlers.

American boys are dying in Korea. Let Americans decide—at once—how best to save them. Tell the delegates from Afghanistan, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Egypt, Siam, Yemen, and all the other countries that have nothing to offer in this fight against Communist aggression except their hands stretched out toward the American Treasury—tell them to go home and come back after this job is done. Only a very few are an asset in a war for survival anyway. About 90 percent of them (my guess) are a liability to an all-out war effort on our part.

If bombing of Manchurian bases will save several divisions of our own troops, let's get the United Nations off our backs and give MacArthur the authority.

It's already been proved that when it comes to action, the United Nations boils down to a one-man show anyway—an American show. The American taxpayer foots the bill and sends his boy to fight—everywhere.

So, let's let American generals make the decisions—and send the international panhandlers home and Mr. Acheson back to his State Department.

If we're going to lock up that fancy building for the duration where the bickerers of the United Nations meet, it might be a good idea to lock up the State Department too.

The way things are turning out today, they were more hindrance than help to us during and after the last war—and they could mess the deal up again.

And now our administration is calling upon the American people for more sacrifices.

Well that's at least a compliment.

In the years since this new thought of being a world savior came into its ascendancy in the White House—which goes back to 1932—the American people haven't been asked to make sacrifices. The leaders went right ahead and sacrificed them and their future—at Yalta, at Tehran and at Potsdam.

They did these things when they should have known what Helmut and thousands of American schoolboys knew at that time: You can't do business with the Soviet.

Tribute to William Harvey Riffey, a Confederate Soldier, by Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], then a Member of Congress from the Seventh District of Virginia, delivered on February 15, 1941, at the funeral of William Harvey Riffey, a Confederate soldier. The gallant subject of this eulogy was the great-grandfather of my friend, Bernard W. Chill, honorable citizen and a leading lawyer of the State of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT THE GRAVE OF A CONFEDERATE VETERAN

Departed friend, as I stand today beside your open grave my heart is filled with tender memories of the first and only time I ever saw you; of the clear light that shone from the windows of a noble soul; of the gay braveness with which you carried the weight of 97 winters. When you clasped my hand last summer at Lantz Mill you clasped the tendrils of my heart. In that touch you gave me the inspiration of personal contact with a glorious past of which you had been an honored part. I placed my arm that day around your frail shoulders in affectionate acknowledgment of what you symbolized to me. It has never been withdrawn.

As your friends stand here today to do honor to your memory, our tears will not soften a firm resolve that by no conscious act of ours will your fond hopes for the future of democracy, the future of the country you loved, and the ideals for which you fought be turned to ashes. Through nearly a whole century of honest, upright living you have built a monument by which we will be taught to remember not where you died but where you lived. To me you will always live as I knew you last summer when I thought of you as Webster said of the veterans of Bunker Hill: "Venerable sirs, you have come down to us from a previous generation." And what a glorious generation of fair women and brave men; of ideals and the courage of conviction. Your life span covered the most trying period of our history, yet you were never false to a trust nor faltered in the face of danger. But over and above all else you clung to the old Rugged Cross and exchanged it at last for a crown.

As we commit your frail remains to Mother Earth, we rejoice in knowledge of the fact your immortal soul has already taken wings of the morning to join that of your beloved leader, Stonewall Jackson. As he lay mortally wounded in the simple farmhouse at Guinea Station, his dying whisper was: "Let us cross the river and rest in the shade of the trees." May you, too, oh departed Confederate friend, throughout all eternity, rest in the peace and quiet of the shade of the New Jerusalem.

Fly the Flag—Ex-Marine Jack Murphy Started Nation-Wide Campaign To Fly the Stars and Stripes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest and most patriotic movements I have heard of is the successful campaign to fly the flag started by Jack Murphy, past commander, Chicago Detachment No. 1, Marine Corps League.

The effect of this campaign, which was started in July of this year, has been to make Chicago the most American-flag-decorated city in the United States. Practically every large downtown building in the Chicago Loop now flies the American flag every day. It is an inspiring sight and indicates the high regard and respect that the great city of Chicago has for the American flag.

Mr. Murphy has been rewarded for his efforts by special recognition by the mayor of Chicago and the Kiwanis Club, as recently recorded in the Illinois Marine:

FLY-THE-FLAG CAMPAIGN GROWS

Kiwanians throughout the Midwest are cooperating in a fly-the-flag campaign inaugurated in July by the Marine Corps League, Chicago Detachment No. 1. The campaign is designed to induce property owners and managers to fly the Stars and Stripes from flagpoles attached to their buildings.

In support of the campaign the city's mayor issued a proclamation, which reads as follows: "The American flag is the symbol of the principles and ideals of freedom and justice for all mankind for which thousands of courageous young Americans in our Armed Forces are fighting today to preserve. In view of this, it is most important that the American flag be displayed as a constant reminder to all of our citizens of their obligations as Americans and as an example to private owners and managers of buildings to do the same."

Under the slogan, "The only red we want is the red we've got in the old red, white, and blue," the campaign is fast reaching across the Nation. Kiwanis Clubs are urged to render leadership to this movement.

APPOINTMENT FROM FAGAN

The following appointment was received by Mr. Murphy recently:

"DEAR JACK: In recognition of your interest and service to the benefit of the Marine Corps League and your marked achievement in your patriotic campaign in Chicago to fly the flag exemplifying a true American, I herewith confirm your appointment as a member of the National Americanism Committee, Marine Corps League, to serve concurrently with my administration with the following members: Lewis E. Ballard, chairman, 108 Hamilton Street, Albany, N. Y., and Jack Brennan, member, 65 Lender Street, Jersey City, N. J.

"Semper fidelis,

"MAURICE E. FAGAN,
"National Commandant."

Every city in the United States would do well to emulate the action taken by Chicago by taking up the campaign of "fly the flag." There never was a time in our history when we needed such good old-fashioned American patriotic inspiration.

Mr. Murphy is to be commended for his persistent patriotic efforts to stimulate greater recognition of the American flag. It would seem proper that the Congress should adopt a resolution urging greater public display of the American flag. I am preparing such a resolution, which I intend to introduce in the Eighty-second Congress.

Shortage of Military Doctors, Nurses, and Medical Technicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a year ago the Senate unanimously passed a bill which had been very carefully drafted to meet a most critical situation. I refer to S. 1453, a bill to provide urgently needed assistance to the schools which train America's doctors, dentists, nurses, and public-health experts. That bill was completely bipartisan. It was and is endorsed by all of the professional groups concerned, with one single exception.

The bill should have passed in 1949. The terrible change in world affairs which has since occurred makes its immediate passage by the House a matter of grave national concern. Yet, because of the opposition of a powerful group which puts self-interest before that of our war wounded, this measure, on which the entire Senate of the United States is agreed, has not yet been brought before the House.

We in the Senate well know how important are the matters with which our colleagues in the House have been kept so busy. We can well understand how important measures can be overlooked because of the pressure of others which appear even more immediately important. Nonetheless, I believe that those of us who are aware of the existence of a condition which threatens our entire defense effort, and which can be corrected by action of the House, are under great moral obligation to call such a situation to the attention of our colleagues.

Therefore, I should like to read into the RECORD a few short paragraphs from an advertisement which appeared in today's Washington Post, and I should like to ask unanimous consent that the entire advertisement appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The opening words of this advertisement read as follows:

If all-out war comes soon, America may be short of bombs, tanks, guns, and trained personnel to use them. But there's another shortage that would be an equally grave menace to our national safety. It's the shortage of doctors, nurses, and medical technicians.

Because of this lack, atom bomb victims would die unattended. Mothers would perish for want of a physician's help in childbirth. Epidemics would ravage the country.

To meet the emergency, the United States Senate last year unanimously passed a bill to provide Federal aid for medical education—and thereby provide more doctors. It was a bill that had the support of both major parties, of university presidents, and of most of the medical schools themselves. It might not have been just what the doctors ordered—but it was what the Nation needed.

Today, that bill still awaits action by the House of Representatives.

This, Mr. President, is the situation. It can be corrected if the House takes action in the few short weeks left in this Eighty-first Congress. If that action is not taken, a prolonged delay before the Eighty-second Congress can act is inevitable. Therefore, in the names of America's wounded, and in the light of the grave emergency confronting this Nation, I respectfully urge that the leaders of both parties in the House of Representatives see to it that immediate consideration is given the measure so ably discussed in Collier's.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of December 8, 1950]

WHO'S TO BLAME FOR THE DOCTOR SHORTAGE?

For war—or peace—our need for physicians is critical. Yet a powerful lobby is blocking passage of a bill that would enable medical schools to turn out many more doctors. Learn the bitter truth about the doctor shortage—in today's Collier's.

If all-out war comes soon, America may be short of bombs, tanks, guns and trained personnel to use them. But there's another shortage that would be an equally grave menace to our national safety. It's the shortage of doctors, nurses, and medical technicians.

Because of this lack, atom bomb victims would die unattended. Mothers would perish for want of a physician's help in childbirth. Epidemics would ravage the country.

To meet the emergency, the United States Senate last year unanimously passed a bill to provide Federal aid for medical education—and thereby provide more doctors. It was a bill that had the support of both major parties, of university presidents and of most of the medical schools themselves. It might not have been just what the doctors ordered—but it was what the Nation needed.

Today, that bill still awaits action by the House of Representatives. What happened?

You'll learn the whole shocking story in today's Collier's. You'll learn how the American Medical Association and its omnipresent lobby has again and again blocked passage of this sorely needed legislation. You'll learn how one powerful organization can, and has, flouted the wishes and the welfare of an entire nation.

Just how far are we lagging behind in the production of new doctors? Says Albert Q. Maisel, in Collier's:

"In 1910, our medical schools graduated 4,440 students, producing one new doctor for every 20,000 of our population. By 1940, the number of graduates had increased to 5,097, but the growth of population had far outstripped the increase in doctors. In that year, we produced only one doctor for every 26,000 of our people. In 1950 our physician output mounted to 5,553. But once again, it did not keep pace with population. We produced this year only one new doctor for every 27,000 people."

So it's evident, even by peacetime standards, that we need more doctors. The outbreak of the Korean fighting, of course, intensified the crisis. Says the Collier's article:

"To meet the needs of a 3,000,000-man force, the armed services will have to drain from civilian life substantially more than 5,000 physicians and proportionately large numbers of dentists, nurses, and technicians. * * * Any further expansion of the armed services will require additional levies against our already short-handed civilian health personnel."

Yet, so vigorously has the AMA continued to fight the medical-education measure, it has never even been brought to a vote in the House of Representatives. It is still in committee.

The chairman of the executive council of the Association of Medical Colleges reports that 47 of its member schools favor the bill and only 16 oppose. He disavowed the action of the AMA as "taken independently of our association—and without a poll of our membership."

Why then has the AMA balked a measure so widely favored, so obviously in the interest of the profession, as well as of the public? Before you answer that, better read Our Alarming Doctor Shortage, by Albert Q. Maisel, in Collier's, on all newsstands now.

IT'S NOT "SOCIALIZED MEDICINE"

The article discussed on this page sets forth a serious national problem that, in another all-out war, would become a national catastrophe. The country's medical schools must have money in order to expand and to reduce the sometimes prohibitive cost of medical education.

There is strong public and professional support for financing an expansion program with Federal funds. But the leaders of the American Medical Association are against the idea. So far they have blocked the passage of legislation which would make such a program possible. Collier's thinks that their stand is wrong. We appreciate the association's great contributions in maintaining high professional standards and protecting public health and safety. Yet in this case their attitude seems narrow, and their case weak.

Federal aid to medical education is not socialized medicine. While the danger of general war and atomic attack against our civilian population exists, we hope that the AMA leaders will withdraw their opposition. The Senate has already passed a bill which would provide money to end the doctor shortage. If the AMA continues its fight in the new Congress, we trust that the lawmakers will have the courage to enact the measure anyway in the interest of urgent necessity. (The Editors of Collier's.)

COLLIER'S,
The Crowell-Collier Publishing Co., New York, N. Y., Publishers of Collier's, the American Magazine, Woman's Home Companion.

Southern California Citizens Demand That Truman Be Impeached and Acheson Be Ousted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, responding to my statement in the House on Monday, December 4, that Truman be impeached and Acheson be ousted as Secretary of State, I have received a flood of telegrams, letters, and cards from citizens of southern California.

I have also heard from all parts of the United States expressions of the same views which indicate that the people are aroused, angry, and have lost what little confidence they had in the Truman administration and Acheson's foreign policy.

I received the following telegram from Mrs. Edith Lehman which expresses the sentiments of thousands of women in southern California:

Hon. GORDON L. McDONOUGH:

Fifteenth Congressional District and all the women of southern California do heartily applaud your request for impeachment for President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson. The resentment here is growing to overwhelming force day by day. I am convinced that thousands of women are willing to stand on street corners with petitions to be presented to Congress and Senate calling for such impeachment and demanding that in the face of impending world chaos the American people feel entitled to and demand American representation. May I personally add that this telegram reflects the feeling of the Crenshaw Republican Women, the Southwest Republican Men's Club, and the various women's organizations which I contact as vice chairman of the State Central Committee. Most sincerely my congratulations on your courageous stand.

EDITH ALBAN LEHMAN.

The following are additional wires from citizens of southern California:

Please continue your demand Truman be impeached. He is tool of pro-Communist advisors. Please urge full-scale cooperation with Chiang and Chinese guerrillas. Nationalist China is absolutely key to world survival. Chiang, with American support, can roll-back Red tide, then destroy Soviet Union.

ROBERT H. WILLIAMS NAJOR MIRES.

Congratulations on good work. High time someone took action.

LELAND M. FORD.

Impeach Truman and oust Acheson and clique.

Mr. and Mrs. ROY THOMAS.

Friend McDONOUGH go ahead with impeachment of Truman. Our city is with you.

M. MACFARLANE, M. D.

I have just finished writing a letter to President Truman demanding that our State Department be cleaned up and that Secretary Acheson be fired. I urge you to do all in

your power to correct these disgraceful blunders including the election of Harry S. Truman to another term as our President.

L. E. PATRICK.

I was delighted to read your statement in this morning's Examiner relative to the impeachment of President Truman. Most emphatically he should be removed from office, and Acheson with him.

CHARLES C. CONROY.

Being a loyal American mother of an American boy, I quite agree that it is high time that we the American people put a complete stop to Harry S. Truman's bungling in our affairs and put someone in office who knows and understands more clearly this business of protecting this wonderful country of ours.

ALICE B. MCCLURE.

Just read your article in the Examiner about the impeachment of the President and Acheson. Why can't we have action? Please act and let's get them out.

Mrs. G. LAMMERT.

It was a great source of satisfaction to read of your demand of the impeachment of our President, Harry S. Truman, and I feel that you were voicing the thought of 130,000,000 of our 150,000,000 American men, women, and children.

STANLEY PRESTON.

I was reading your views on Truman's impeachment. More power to you.

CLAY S. KINNEY.

Read your speech in this morning's paper. You are right. Truman should be impeached. Keep up the good work.

M. KALOVAT.

More power to you in your American call for the impeachment of the President and Secretary of State Acheson, and I would include the entire Cabinet and many civil employees who are Pinks and incompetent and unnecessary, as per the marvelous Herbert Hoover report.

J. MARSHALL WATKINS, Sr.

Your impeachment approach to the current mess is being well received out here. Many of us feel that 1952 may be too late to save the situation. Keep up the good work.

GEORGE F. MEREDITH.

As one of your constituents, I want to commend you for your statement on the incompetence of the present administration. I am sure there are many others who feel the same. Keep up the good work.

T. D. BRADBURY.

From Seattle, Wash.:

We desire to thank you for recording President impeachment. You should have a pat on the back for this action.

Mrs. FRED THOMPSON.

From Detroit, Mich.:

I have been saying for 2 years that that political accident has been guilty of malfeasance and violation of his constitutional oath time and time again. Now there is sufficient power in the House with coalition to do the trick. Mr. we must get that guy out of the White House. He will completely wreck us in the next 2 years. Press your demands and don't let up.

EDGAR M. ROBBINS, Sr.

From San Diego, Calif.:

Your charges before the House relating to the President are in line with popular thinking, but you did not complete the job.

Everyone knows that Russia is building a modern navy of many carrier task forces, and that Belgium and other European nations are assisting by shipping steel and copper to Russia. When that project is completed in a few years there will be a war of deadly proportions, which the Russians have long planned—and bringing our Nation under aerial attack, which is not yet possible except by isolated attempts.

Yet there is no ultimatum to declare economic boycott by our administration. That, to my way of thinking is ample grounds for impeachment of the administration.

The Reclamation-Park Service Squabble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. G. E. Untermann, director of the board of examiners of the State of Utah of the Utah Field House of Natural History at the Vernal State Park, Utah. It is a timely article, entitled "The Reclamation-Park Service Squabble."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RECLAMATION-PARK SERVICE SQUABBLE—WILL THE DAMS RUIN DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT?

(By G. E. Untermann)

In the July 22 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, noted author Bernard DeVoto, a former Utahan now residing in Cambridge, Mass., asks the question, "Shall we let them ruin our national parks?"

Mr. DeVoto, in his well written Post article, opposes the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation on the principle of opposition to both private and public invasion of a National Park Service area. However, his heavy artillery is leveled specifically at Dinosaur National Monument in which Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman has recently authorized the construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams. There can be no doubt that the Dinosaur National Monument controversy prompted Mr. DeVoto to make his eloquent defense of national parks as a whole.

Unlike Mr. DeVoto, the writer is not an author of national prominence, but he has lived in and adjacent to Dinosaur National Monument for 30 years. He has been ranger at the monument for several years, and with his wife, also a geologist, and former ranger-naturalist at Dinosaur, has mapped the geology of the more than 300 square miles which constitute the present great area of the monument. Our knowledge of Dinosaur National Monument has been gained from intimate, detailed, on-the-spot experience which has given us an opportunity to know this region better than probably any living persons. If a salesman should know his product, as he is admonished to do, then certainly an author should know his subject to properly write about it. When that subject is 2,000 miles away, as was the case with Mr. DeVoto, sitting in Cambridge, Mass., writing about Dinosaur National Monument, way out in Utah and Colorado, it is difficult to know all one should know about the material upon which one is expounding. Nor does a hasty visit to the area, or digging through musty files, give one adequate information to properly discuss such an involved subject. Had Mr. DeVoto given such superficial research to the material which has gone into his splendid books, as he has apparently given to the Dinosaur National Monument discussion, those books would not be the excellent works of American literature which they are.

The title of Mr. DeVoto's Post article implies that the Bureau of Reclamation is out to destroy our national parks, for "ruin" infers "total destruction of value or usefulness." Such an appellation will not apply to Dinosaur National Monument, for the construction of both dams will affect only 20 percent of this vast area. Fully 80 percent is unaffected by either dam. Dinosaur Quarry and vicinity, Jones Hole, Wild Mountain, Pearl Park, Zenobia Peak, Five Springs, Douglas Mountain, Happy Hollow, Vale of Tears, Blue Mountain, and many other areas, are so far removed from the river canyons that no actual streams can be seen. And what is the nature of the 20 percent of the monument which will be modified by the construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams? It is principally inaccessible canyon country wholly unknown and unknowable, in its present state, to the general public. Probably less than 100 persons have seen this portion of the monument and they had to risk their lives to do so. Many of those who ran the angry rapids in specially constructed boats were too busy saving their own necks to bother about the scenery. A few additional parties have seen the canyons from the air. It is not even possible to drive to the rims of these canyons as no roads lead to overlooks. In fact, there are no roads. In only a relatively few places would overlooks be feasible. For the greater part of any rim drives which may be later constructed, no river views would be possible. Only the canyons could be seen, not the rivers themselves. The average visitor to Dinosaur National Monument is only aware of the Dinosaur Quarry area which is accessible to him. Unfortunately, due to lack of funds, this area is in a very limited state of development, and proves disappointing to many visitors. He does not see the canyons and has no way of getting into them. The canyon portion of the monument is as remote as the moon so far as the traveling public is concerned.

The construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams, with their resultant still-water bodies, will create picturesque lakes on the Green and Yampa Rivers, slightly more than 100 miles in extent. For the first time the canyon areas will become safely available to the public. Mr. DeVoto contemptuously refers to these unique placid lakes as "millponds" and odiously belittles them in comparing them with the violent turbulence of a white-water stream. A cobra-like hypnotic spell seems to come over those who so heatedly defend roaring waters, and like the cobra, it lures many of them to their death. Maj. John Wesley Powell poetically named Lodore Canyon and Echo Park, but being a realist as well as a poet, he also named Upper and Lower Disaster Falls, Hell's Half Mile, and Whirlpool Canyon. Sentiment is a fine thing in its proper place, but realism makes for longevity on these streams. No one has a healthier respect for the rampaging Green and Yampa Rivers than those who have run them.

It has been our observation, over a period of years, that the stanch defenders of these wildly rushing streams are the last ones to risk their own necks running the canyons in boats. They agitate for the preservation of these terrifying waters for others, but want no part of them for themselves. One of the principal purposes of the national parks is to protect and preserve the areas under their administration for the enjoyment of all the people. The few intrepid boatmen who have so far flirted with lady luck on the Green and Yampa Rivers do not constitute all the people. They represent a very small minority and are the first to acknowledge it. The great mass of the traveling public, those who make up the bulk of the visitors to our national parks and monuments, would just as soon go over Niagara Falls in a barrel as to run the rapids and whirlpools dashing through the canyons of Dinosaur National Monument. Nor could many afford to see the canyons in this manner if they wished. Only experienced boatmen can come through them alive. The fare per passenger for these expeditions varies from $100 to $400, depending upon how many of the canyons are run. The thrilling experience is worth the money but this sort of adventure does not appeal to the multitudes. A boat trip on the canyon lakes, on the other hand, could be had for a few dollars and would be enjoyed by everyone.

Mr. DeVoto leaves the impression that Lodore Canyon will be submerged under 500 feet of water, the inference being that the inspirational value of this great canyon will be destroyed. Actually, the only place where the water will be 500 feet deep is right at Echo Park Dam. The rapid drop in elevation in both Lodore and Yampa Canyons quickly reduces the upstream depth of water in them. Lodore Canyon walls will be reduced in height by only one-tenth, and in the Yampa Canyon the depth of still water is reduced to zero before the upper end of the canyon is reached. Here several miles of rushing river will remain, wholly unaffected by the dam. The depth of water in Split Mountain Canyon will be less than half as great as in any of the canyons above Echo Park, inasmuch as the height of Split Mountain Dam is only 245 feet. The grandeur of these areas will be little affected by such minor changes.

With reference to the canyon lakes which the dams will create in Dinosaur National Monument, Mr. DeVoto states: "No one will ever drive 2,000 miles [Atlantic coast visitors] to row a boat; no one will ever seek recreation in a national park except for * * * the unique experience of awe and wonder that an untouched wilderness spectacle provides." (Mr. DeVoto dogmatically presumes to speak for everyone.) As a member of the National Parks Advisory Board, he surely must have heard of the one and a half million visitors who annually swarm over Hoover Dam and Lake Mead, many of whom drive more than 2,000 miles to "row a boat" in temperatures up to 120°. Apparently millions of Americans do not share Mr. DeVoto's violent antipathy for the works of man or his hatred for the Bureau of Reclamation. It can be assumed, then, that millions will also flock to the Green and Yampa Canyon lakes to row a boat, to fish, bathe, and enjoy water sports in cool, delightful temperatures, amid spectacular scenery which they will have been enabled to see for the first time, because quiet water has at last made it accessible. For those who feel they must have wilderness untouched by the hand of man, 80 percent of Dinosaur National Monument alone remains as nature, the sculptor, left it. In addition, for the simon-pure nature lover, there are hundreds of thousands of square miles of primitive areas and untouched wilderness in western America for those who insist on nature in the raw. It remains untouched mainly because only with difficulty can anyone get in there to touch it.

Alternate sites have been proposed for Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams, outside the monument. Mr. De Voto, in his Post article, refers to the testimony of Gen. U. S. Grant III, who suggested downstream sites as substitutes. In recognition of Utah's 100 years of irrigation, we have a saying to the effect that "a good Mormon can make water run up hill." But even the best Mormon could never push water as far up hill as would be required by General Grant's alternate downstream cites.

Since the Colorado River agreement of 1922, it has taken the upper-basin States 26 years to agree upon a division of water among themselves. Utah's share in this division is 23 percent. In order to use the water allocated to her, dams must be built where it can be taken out of the river and diverted to State use. Nature has provided limited sites and they must be utilized to the best advantage where they are. The Dinosaur National Monument damsites have proven the only satisfactory locations for the dams, for several reasons. Water stored back of these dams would lie in deep, cool canyons where evaporation losses would be at a minimum. It is poor engineering to store water in flat, open areas where the sun can beat down on shallow reservoirs and dissipate their contents through excessive evaporation. Any other sites than those in Dinosaur National Monument involve an additional loss of several hundred thousand acre-feet of water annually by exaporation alone. The upstream site mentioned in Mr. De Voto's article, is subject to excessive evaporation losses and is also threatened with salinity, which would ultimately make the water unfit for domestic use. The power developed at Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams is nearest the power market demand of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, revenues from which are the principal means of repaying the cost of these projects. Opponents of western reclamation, like Mr. De Voto, attempt to create the impression that the taxpayer's money is being poured down a bottomless hole. These projects are self-liquidating. The Federal funds which build them are loans, not gifts. If we can give billions to foreign lands without much prospect of a return, surely we can lend money for the development of our own American West when that money is repayable.

At mass meetings held in the summer of 1936, in Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., fully 2 years before the monument was increased to its present size, officials of the Park Service gave assurance to the people of these areas that the enlargement of Dinosaur National Monument, to include the river canyons, would not interfere with the future development of power and irrigation projects on the Green and Yampa rivers, Secretary of the Interior Chapman's decision in favor of the Bureau of Reclamation, in the Dinosaur National Monument controversy, honors this commitment. National Park Service Director Newton B. Drury, has sportingly agreed to cooperate with the Bureau of Reclamation in fully developing the recreational possibilities of the area.

While both the National Park Service and the Bureau of Reclamation are members of the Interior Department family, Mr. DeVoto finds it extremely difficult to say anything civil about his sister agency. He would have us believe that the Bureau of Reclamation is underhanded, treacherous, and a dyed-in-the-wool villain. Only the Park Service plays a virtuous role in his story. Reclamation withdrawals, Mr. DeVoto implies, have been illegal, unpublicized, and tricky. The writer's personal observation has been that the cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service has been excellent in all those instances which have come to his attention. The personnel of both agencies have worked beautifully together. Furthermore, a number of Reclamation withdrawals preceded and had prior right over National Park jurisdiction in certain areas. It was the Park Service which invaded the domain of the Bureau of Reclamation rather than the Bureau having invaded National Park Service areas.

Nor is the Park Service entirely with clean hands when it comes to publicizing its own expansion program. Has Mr. DeVoto conveniently forgotten the attempted National Park Service "land grab" involving the proposed Escalante National Monument of Utah? Several years ago an oil company map showing the proposed Escalante Monument came to the attention of the Governor of Utah. It was the first time he had ever heard of the proposal to set a vast area of his State aside as a new national monument, and this in a State which already has nine national monuments and two national parks. The public learned of it only after certain adverse publicity nipped the project in the bud. Now the proposed Escalante National Monument no longer appears on any map, and things in the State of Utah are serene.

Planning of the Bureau of Reclamation, for the most part, is a long-range program. It attempts to anticipate both power and water needs of the future. With the tremendous population growth of the United States of America, and its heavy westward migration, it is necessary to provide for these new demands. After what has happened in New York City, with its critical water shortage, a shortage so critical that you had to ask for a glass of water in a restaurant, it should no longer be difficult for an easterner to appreciate the need for conservation of water resources. These resources are far more limited in the West than they are in the East, so that our need for conservation is greater. Belated steps to augment its water supply are now being taken by New York City, but the full effect of this program may not be felt for another 10 years.

Archaeologists of some future day may find an abandoned city on the present site of New York, and ponder the question of why it was deserted. Poor planning and a cycle of dry years could make this more than fiction. From 1050 A. D. to 1300 A. D., a great civilization in our American Southwest abandoned the whole northern portion of the plateau region, left large cities with multistoried dwellings and vanished into the dimness of the past. This was the culture of classic pueblo time, referred to by archeologists as Pueblo III or the Great Pueblo period. It was the time when these people were at the height of their civilization and has been dscribed as "the stage of large communities, great development of the arts, and growth of intensive local specialization." It makes one stop and think how aptly this describes the civilization of our own time. Why did these great people vanish? No one knows all the answers, but the long droughts of this period are thought to have been the principal contributing factor to their mysterious disappearance.

The more widely scattered our power developments are the more secure will America be. During wartime, especially, is it disastrous to have industry centralized and present the enemy with a sitting-duck target which neutralizes our struggle for survival. Decentralization of industry is the accepted thing, not only as a war safety factor, but because it decentralizes populations as well, and makes for better living than can be enjoyed under crowded conditions. And how are we going to decentralize industry and population if we don't have the power and the water to support them?

Mr. DeVoto would have us cease building dams and generating electric power because atomic energy may make it obsolete in 25 years. He does not ask us to stop digging coal or drilling for oil, though it is well

known that atomic energy has been proposed as substitutes for fuels. He only wants us to stop building dams. (They spoil his scenery.) But what about water? Even the wildest Buck Rogers scheme has never suggested that atomic energy was going to replace water for either domestic use or irrigation. The Atomic Age will still see the Bureau of Reclamation engaged in a needed construction program.

As a parting shot Mr. DeVoto cannot resist taking a last crack at his sister agency, in the Department of Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, by again accusing it of destroying the national parks and making them so undesirable that neither he nor his grandchildren will any longer want them. (How bitter these family quarrels can become.) Does conservation mean setting an inaccessible area aside and keeping it that way? If no one can see these natural wonders, because they cannot be reached, then for whom are they being preserved?

Mr. DeVoto need have no fear. The West will always abound in vast areas where both he and his grandchildren can climb the dizzy heights and exclaim in breathless ecstasy, "Ah wilderness!"

Is GOP Strength Sign of Isolationism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is GOP Strength Sign of Isolationism?" published in the Provo (Utah) Daily Herald, on November 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS GOP STRENGTH SIGN OF ISOLATIONISM?

All over Western Europe, the political pundits were getting wrinkles in their foreheads over what they thought was going to happen in the new United States Congress.

They weren't very sure what it would be, but they didn't think they'd like it.

And as they peered again at the election results, which by now are pretty much history, they kept seeing a nasty word: "Isolationism."

It's time they took another look.

While they were indulging in a little self-pity, the newly elected United States Republicans were saying things that made isolationism look as dead as the Bull Moose Party.

Said victorious Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, otherwise known as Mr. Republican:

"Anybody is an idiot who calls anybody else an isolationist. How can we be isolationists when we are involved in wars and treaties and every kind of international relationship?"

Said Senator-elect EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, when asked by the United States News and World Report if he saw any outcropping of isolationism in his State:

"I think people are beginning to think about their country and its survival and that they do want these (foreign aid) programs thoroughly explored and investigated. They want to see what we're getting for our money."

That seems to wrap up the sentiments of all the others, too.

Nobody (not even the men in the Kremlin, who would like to) can read the end of Marshall plan aid in such statements.

But they should be able to see that United States help is not going on and on, like an inheritance from a nice old uncle, while western Europe does nothing in return.

The French, for instance, are scared they won't get enough arms from that nice Uncle Sam to help them build up strength against another uncle, this one a villain named Joe. But the French won't go along with the nice uncle's idea that we ought to use the Germans as part of the defenses of western Europe.

The British are piqued because they think the nice uncle has no right to object if Marshall plan aid is used to promote nationalization of British industry.

And western Germany is so busy with a boom in civilian goods industrial production much more than anybody expected it would be when the Marshall plan was to end in 1952.

All over the Western World, as a matter of fact, the dollar famine seems to be over. We're buying more abroad than we're selling, and we're paying higher prices, too.

For a long time, the official name for Marshall plan has been the Economic Cooperation Administration. It now begins to look like the cooperation could work both ways. A lot of ECA countries are putting money in the bank which they could use for a little self-support. A lot of ECA countries have vital raw materials we need, which, it seems reasonable, we ought to be able to get in some way without handing out more dollars or, in some cases, gold.

As a result of the election, the nice uncle's Congress appears bent on looking into these points in a businesslike way.

If that be isolationism, let the pessimists make the most of it.

W. Stuart Symington, Chairman, National Security Resources Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, two great magazines have recently published almost identical articles regarding the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, chairman of the National Security Resources Board, one of the finest and ablest and most efficient officers of our national government and one of the most perfect gentlemen I ever knew. He is courteous to the *n*th degree, honest, highly educated, and worthy. Mr. Symington was formerly Secretary of Air, and is now chairman of the National Security Resources Board. They are very fine articles about Mr. Symington. He deserves every word which may be said in his praise.

I ask unanimous consent to place one of those articles that appeared in the Reader's Digest of December 1950 in the Appendix of the RECORD. I think all of us know Mr. Symington. He is a grand man, and he is making us a grand chairman of the National Security Resources Board. He made a wonderful record as Secretary of Air.

I think the permanent RECORD ought to contain one of these articles, and I hope there will be no objection. I ask unanimous consent to put this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYMINGTON: BOSS OF THE HOME FRONT

"There are three big jobs in the Government now, besides the President's," says Clark Clifford, former assistant to the President. "They are Acheson's, Marshall's, and Symington's." This being approximately so, it is pertinent to ask whether W. Stuart Symington is a good man for his job—that of mobilizing America's resources for an increasingly hot war. He is still more or less a stranger in national life.

Among the important things to know about the Chairman of our National Security Resources Board are what he is not. For instance, although he is known as a member of the President's "Missouri gang," he is no more from Missouri than, say, Ferenc Nagy, former premier of Hungary, is from the Virginia farm where he has lived recently. Likewise he is neither the socialite scion of a rich family nor a playboy. He does, however, have style. He is immensely handsome in a rugged way, and a superior athlete. He has a quick, searching, elastic mind, direct and logical. His social behavior is as effortless as his golf swing, and as effective. If he tells a story, dances the Charleston, or testifies before a committee, the action carries a certain innate air of distinction, as if this were, indeed, the right thing to do and the right way to do it.

Symington's job as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board can be defined in a general way as that of an assistant president in charge of coordinating the home front, its human and material resources. The Board, made up of the Secretaries of Defense, State, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and the Treasury, was created in 1947 at the time the Armed Forces were unified. It is not an operating agency but a staff agency: it plans and supervises. Thus, when Congress authorized a system of priorities, allocations of strategic materials, standby price and wage controls, and regulations of agricultural and power production, authority to operate the law was delegated to the Departments of Commerce, Interior, and Agriculture, which have the staff and facilities to do so. Their chiefs meet as NSRB board members to iron out any conflicts, and it is part of Symington's job to arbitrate such conflicts. In case of failure to agree, he makes the decision. His authority is subject to reversal only by the President.

Five years ago Symington was merely a successful manufacturer of electric fans and small electric motors. What put him where he is today?

W. (for William) Stuart Symington III was born on June 26, 1901, in Amherst, Mass., the second child and first son of William Stuart Symington II and Emily Harrison, both of whose southern families were ruined financially by the Civil War. Stuart's father was a professor of Romance languages at Amherst College. When children began to accumulate—six all told—W. Stuart II decided to give up teaching and study law at New York University law school. The necessities of life came from his tiny savings and the small amounts he could earn from doing translations. After the law degree the family moved to Baltimore, into a home which has been described by one member as "definitely on the wrong side of the tracks." Thereafter the older children often were farmed out to friends and relatives who could furnish some of the amenities lacking in their own household.

Stuart was a gifted child. His older sister Louise remembers, "Stuart did everything well from the beginning." At 10 he asked

for and got the Encyclopedia Britannica for Christmas. And what he learned he liked to show off. "He wasn't a comfortable person to be around," says one of his contemporaries. "As a matter of fact," another recalls, "he was pure poison."

At the time Stuart was growing up, his father's six brothers, who also lived in Baltimore, were reestablishing the family fortunes in a substantial way. Stuart thus was exposed to wealth and the kind of life it bought. His cousins went to private schools. He and his brothers went to public school. "Sometimes we were poor," Stuart says today. "I mean poor. And I wanted to do the things the others could afford to do."

He set about effecting this in the most direct ways he knew. He had a paper route; one summer he sold bottled spring water from his coaster wagon; another year, when he was 15, he worked on a lathe turning shell casings for the Russians (it was 1916). The summers of his college years he worked as a cub reporter on the Baltimore Sun, covering sports and local politics, and he continued to read insatiably.

In 1918 he managed to get in the Army for a few months before the war ended. By then his father's law business had taken a turn for the better, and there was enough money to send him to Yale, where he played on the tennis team, reported for the News, got satisfactory grades, and was an all-round campus success. Then one holiday, while visiting his Yale roommate in Washington, he met Evelyn ("Eve") Wadsworth, whose father was Senator JAMES WADSWORTH,, of New York. She was lovely, charming, and talented, but most important, as Stuart reported to his family, "She's a girl who can think." They were married in 1924.

Stuart's education in human values really began in his first post-college years. He had a job with an uncle's company in Rochester, N. Y., as an apprentice molder—heavy work at long hours. There in the murk and smoke of the foundry, as he grew to know the dust-caked figures who were his fellow workers and teachers, he began to realize something about the lives and aspirations of ordinary men.

His marriage, too, had complex effect on Stuart's life. In Eve he had a wife whose tact and intuition smoothed his impatience with people, and whose own patience endured even the long evenings of their early marriage when he was off at night school, studying higher mathematics, metallurgy, and electrical engineering. The marriage also brought him his first and lifelong hero, his father-in-law. James Wadsworth, a leading political figure in that Republican era, is a man of great wisdom and integrity, combined with humor and tolerance. Admiration for him and his concept of public service was important in shaping Symington into the kind of public servant he is.

But meantime Eve's parents and her assorted relatives and friends were rich. Symington's boyhood urge "to do what the others could afford to do" was not magnified a hundredfold. For 7 years, with his uncle's companies, he steadily widened his experience, at increasingly bigger salaries. But he was not getting rich.

"I realized early in life," he recalls, "that the only way to make real money is to get in on the ground floor of something and build an equity." His chance came in the radio business. Independently he had entered the radio-parts field, and soon he talked his uncles into a $500,000 investment in the Colonial Radio Corp. He merged his parts business with it, became president and a substantial stockholder, and proceeded to build it into one of the biggest companies of its kind. Thereby he made his first, and fairly large, fortune. Soon afterward he had a chance to do a similar job on the Rustless Iron & Steel Co., owned by his friend, Charles Payson. He took a stock option as part of his pay and so reinvigorated the company that when it was sold later his holdings made him really rich.

It was during this interval, when he was doing some of the hardest work of his life, that he acquired his reputation as a "playboy." He and Eve and their two small sons, William Stuart IV and James Wadsworth, had moved to New York in 1933. As handsome, well-off, personable young people, they were immediately in demand socially. Eve was naturally gay, and Stuart had long since mellowed. "We had a lot of fun," he recalls. "No one ever liked better than I did to spend an evening at El Morocco. We could be up all night and go right on to play tennis the next morning. Age has taken care of that."

Another thing that happened was that Eve suddenly became a celebrity. At a night-club charity party she had helped fill out the entertainment by singing a few songs. She was so good that shortly she was being booked into such places as the Waldorf's Sert Room, earning a reputed $1,000 a week as a "society singer." Stuart was a proud and devoted fan. "I suppose that added to the playboy idea," he says.

With his fortune now secure, Symington could have indulged any fancies he chose. But, as Clark Clifford has said of him, "inertia to Stu is like bubonic plague to other people. He can't stand still. He wants and needs a challenge at all times." Soon he was looking around for something to organize, and within the year came the job that indirectly was to land him in Washington.

The Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co., of St. Louis, manufacturers of electric fans and of small motors such as are used in fans and refrigerators, was a good company that needed a complete overhaul by a new management. Friends nominated Symington for the job, and in 1938 the family moved to St. Louis.

Symington by this time had worked out a standard procedure for curing sick businesses. His methods were all applied at Emerson Electric, with suitably electric results.

By 1940–41 the defense program was beginning to bite into the domestic economy, and Symington looked around for something of a military nature to which he could convert. He decided Emerson could build bomber turrets, and he bombarded Washington with requests for a contract. By the end of the war he was turning out turrets at a rate in excess of $100,000,000 a year.

Naturally there were many production problems, and at one point the situation was so muddled that the House "watchdog" committee under Andrew May started an investigation. Later, Senator Truman, head of the corresponding committee in the Senate, talked at length with Symington and was deeply impressed. He left Symington with the heartening and, as it turned out, accurate opinion that "it isn't you who ought to be investigated, it's the people who wanted you to be investigated."

In 1945 Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder suggested Symington as a good man to head the Surplus Property Board, and President Truman readily agreed. Surprised and flattered, Symington accepted. He has been in Washington ever since.

As Surplus Property Administrator, he was charged with disposing of many billions' worth of Government property, from GI toothpaste to huge manufacturing plants. The administrative machine had been clogged by frequent disagreement within its three-man board. At Symington's insistence, he was given sole executive responsibility, and the agency began to function smoothly.

Later the President offered him the post of Assistant Secretary of War for Air. Symington knew and liked many of the Air officers through his turret-building experience and he believed in air power. He took the job, and when Air was given its own identity under the Unification Act, he became the first Secretary of the Air Force.

He fought for Air Force objectives—especially the 70-group program and the B-36 superbomber—with all his characteristic energy and persuasiveness. But by last January he had come to feel that neither he nor the Air Force had much to gain under economy-bent Louis Johnson's rule, and was receptive, therefore, when the President offered him the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board.

The post seemed tailored for him, and he for it. The chairmanship had been vacant 15 months. There was a big job of revitalizing and reorganizing to do. Symington spent 2½ weeks reading up on what the Board had done and should be doing. Then he started moving people around the checkerboard and began recruiting from the outside. He simplified office functions and procedures. By the time the Korean crisis came along, the NSRB was a going concern.

Korea suddenly lifted the NSRB's functions out of the area of theory into that of immediate and urgent fact. Symington's life since then has been practically a nonstop series of meetings to attend, committees to recruit, reports to read and listen to, surveys and plans and negotiations. Undoubtedly he enjoys it. "He's like a good horse," one of his friends has said, "always ready for the next fence. Of course, the best horses sometimes break their necks that way."

Probably Symington has a spill or two ahead of him in his present job. But he is a great executive, by almost universal acknowledgment one of the best in the administration. He has enthusiasm, intuition, persuasiveness, directness ("an instinct for the jugular," as one of his staff says)—and he has learned to be likable. "The thing I'm proud of," he said recently, "is the ability to get along with all kinds of people"—a justifiable pride, considering his early ability to antagonize people.

From two seasoned political philosophers, Wadsworth and the late O. Max Gardner—Symington has learned to understand the processes of practical democracy, to realize that it is fallible and often inefficient, and that such flaws go along with the idea of freedom. He has learned also that Congressmen and Senators are, on the whole, intelligent and sincere people whose views deserve honest respect, and that the way to earn their respect is to be direct and factual with them. As a result, Symington's relations with Congress are marked by an almost unheard-of mutual cordiality. Those relations will count during the next months, while the defense program, still new and ill-defined, gathers momentum and mass.

The central issue is whether we should rearm merely enough to make the Russians think twice before attacking us or enough to fight and win a war with them if it comes. There are many degrees of opinion as to what should be done. Symington's is: "We've got to get strong quick. If we don't, they're going to hit us when they have enough bombs." Until there is a decision, the size of Symington's job—how much mobilization? How many controls?—will remain indeterminate.

If there is all-out mobilization or something approaching it, the present system of delegating controls to the Cabinet departments probably will end, and special agencies such as the late WPB and OPA will be formed again, with someone at the top to coordinate them. "If that should happen," Symington says, "I don't know whether they would want me or somebody else to run it. That's unimportant." But if he were asked to stay, to face this highest jump in history, there is no doubt whatsoever what his answer would be.

Recapitulation of Past Speeches and a Backsight on AMA To Be Considered in the Light of Its Present-Day Preachments—Part 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the following speech is the fifth in a series of broadcasts and was delivered over radio station WOW, on October 27, 1950, and is shockingly enlightening as to the contributions which the old AMA balking horse of true medical progress has practiced in the past which disagree so tremendously with its present-day mouthings. The speech is as follows:

In previous broadcasts I have explained many times that I favored President Truman's health plan as contained in one Senate and two House bills, except that I was against the provision requiring total payment of 2 percent on a $4,800 salary, and favored an amendment which would require a payment of 2 percent on a salary not to exceed $3,000 or $3,600. The reason I favor this amendment is because it would permit private insurance companies of every kind, fraternal and otherwise, to still stay in the health insurance field and continue to prosper. I am also against that part of chapter 7 of the President's health plan which provides for compulsory health insurance, because that would require a duplication of insurance programs for railroad, packinghouse, public power and utility workers, veterans of World War I and II, and many other employed persons who already have satisfactory health programs, and persons having private insurance policies to their own liking.

I want to repeat again that I have been opposed always to socialism, socialized medicine, and compulsory health insurance, and that there is no program pending in the Congress to establish socialized medicine. In this campaign I have learned that the minds of some doctors are like the pupil of the eye, the more light you throw on it the more it contracts. If those doctors who continue to diagnose S. 1679 as socialized medicine have no better diagnostic skill in their medical practice, then I say, God help their patients.

I called attention previously to the fact that my opponent permitted his free mail privilege, to the tune of 112,000 speeches, to be used by labor-baiting New York City interests, thus depriving the Post Office Department of at least $3,360 in revenue; that my opponent carried two sleepers on his congressional payroll who were Omaha lawyers, when they were supposed to be clerks in his Washington office and that these two men drew during the 6 years my opponent was in Congress a total sum of $5,904.89; that my opponent gave away to a member of the other body and to two Congressmen, one, an Iowan, all of the yearbooks and other books accumulated for the benefit of the Second Congressional District and also disposed of, to persons unknown, all of the farm bulletins, pamphlets, and other minor Government publications which were allocated to him for the people of the Second Congressional District; and that my opponent by this means made it difficult for me to fill orders for Government books and publications.

I also told my listeners about the antagonistic record which my opponent had as far as agriculture, labor, veterans, and the people, generally, of this district are concerned; that I had served the people of this district including agriculture, labor, and veterans fairly and well and did not vote against one law beneficial to agriculture, labor, and veterans, except the runaway, bankrupting, and fantastic veteran pension bill, which would have bankrupt the Nation; that I kept my promises to the people and also followed out the promises made in the Democratic platform; that I was not a rubber stamp for the administration or the President or anyone else, but in matters which were not covered by the Democratic platform, I felt duty-bound to exercise my own judgment and consequently voted for the Spanish-American War Veterans assistance bill and voted to pass it over President Truman's veto; that I supported S. 87, the bill which gave the postal workers who were veterans of World War II, an added increase in seniority salary and voted to pass it over the President's veto; that I voted for the communistic control bill and voted to pass it over the President's veto. I also voted against the Kerr natural gas bill and tidelands oil bill which would have syphoned money which the people of the State of Nebraska were concerned in, back to selfish interests.

I want to assure you that no one has ever tried harder to be fair to the masses of the people and endeavor to give them a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, instead of a Government of, by, and for selfish interests.

Since the AMA is spearheading the reactionary Republican Party all over the Nation, in this campaign, and the Republican Party is not running this year and seems to have gone into hiding or gone out of business entirely, I will address my remarks now to the American Medical Association's record on health legislation, because there is no one else left to fight this campaign against me.

The American Medical Association, in its multi-million-dollar advertising campaign, boasts it has convinced the American people that "no country on earth can surpass America's leadership in medical care and progress." It is generally true that American medicine leads the world, but four out of five Americans today need financial help to meet serious illness. One out of every two babies dying today could be saved; one out of every three mothers dying in childbirth dies needlessly; 25,000,000 lives are blighted by disability or physical impairment.

While public health has made great forward strides during the past several decades, practically every measure designed to bring the benefits of American medical progress to all Americans has been fought, and fought bitterly, by the American Medical Association. Here in brief, is the record of the American Medical Association as it pertains to the health and welfare of the average American.

1. A generation ago, the AMA opposed the requirement that all cases of tuberculosis be reported to a public authority—the foundation of all tuberculosis control methods. Reporting of tuberculosis is accepted today as a vital health and community safety measure. (See Is Your Health the Nation's Business (Army GI roundtable sessions).)

2. The AMA fought compulsory vaccinations for smallpox. (Malmberg, Carl, One Hundred and Forty Million Patients, p. 191; Rorfy, James, American Medicine Mobilizes, p. 77, pp. 114–115; Dr. Michael M. Davis, American Organizes Medicine, p. 177.)

3. The AMA attacked provisions for immunization against diphtheria and other preventive measures against contagious diseases by public health agencies on the ground that it would hurt the economic interests of private physicians. (Dr. Ernst Boas, as quoted in Malmburg, One Hundred and Forty Million Patients; also additional sources cited in paragraph above.)

4. The AMA denounced workmen's compensation as "socialism." (Malmberg, One Hundred and Forty Million Patients, p. 209.)

5. Organized medicine's ruling body unanimously opposed the National Tuberculosis Act a week before Congress unanimously passed it. Is Your Health the Nation's Business? (Army GI roundtable sessions.)

6. The AMA opposed the first bills to grant Federal aid to the States to reduce infant and maternal mortalities. When Congress passed the Sheppard-Towner maternity welfare bill in 1921, the AMA house of delegates labeled the act "Federal bureaucratic interference with the sacred rights of the American home." Again, in 1930, the same body condemned the measure as "unsound in policy and tending to promote communism." (Journal of the American Medical Association, July 5, 1930; 67th Cong., hearings before the Committee for Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H. R. 2366, 1921. On opposition to all Federal grants: Journal of the American Medical Association, May 4, 1935, p. 1616.)

7. The AMA opposed the Social Security Act, passed in 1935. The Journal of the American Medical Association declared: "The Social Security Act is designed to work a revolution in the social and political relations of the people and of the several States to the Federal Government." In 1939, on behalf of the AMA board of trustees, Dr. Morris Fishbein condemned old-age and unemployment insurance as a "definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism." (Garceau Oliver, The Political Life of the American Medical Association, p. 139.)

8. Organized medicine opposed the creation of public venereal-disease clinics. Again it saw an invasion of private practice and an economic threat to doctors. (Reid, Louis, Health Insurance, p. 170; Health Inventory, January 1934 issue of Survey Graphic, p. 39; Index and Digest of Official Actions of the American Medical Association, statement by the judicial council, 1922.)

9. Organized medicine opposed—and still does—the creation of free diagnostic centers for tuberculosis and cancer. These are viewed as further steps to socialized medicine. (Dr. C. C. Little, Jackson Memorial Laboratory, Bar Harbor, Maine, as quoted by Albert Deutsch.)

10. Organized medicine fought the American Red Cross plan of 1947 to set up a Nation-wide reserve of civilian blood banks. The AMA castigated the Red Cross for "pushing socialized medicine." (Medical Economics, February 1949.)

11. The American Medical Association has displayed varying degrees of hostility to the development of medical research and knowledge by such great foundations as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Rosenwald Fund, the Commonwealth Fund, the Milbank Memorial Fund, the Twentieth Century Fund, and the American Foundation. It has termed these efforts, which resulted in tremendous health gains for the people, "lay interference" and "intrusion." (Rorty, James, American Medicine Mobilizes, p. 78, p. 111 ff.)

However, these obstructive tactics by the AMA over a period of several decades in opposition to the spreading of the benefits of American medicine to the average citizen are as nothing compared with its strong opposition to every major piece of health legislation introduced during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

12. Federal aid to medical education, passed unanimously by the Senate in August 1949, was the most important piece of health legislation before the House in 1950. In 1949, after Senate hearings on the bill, AMA representatives agreed the medical schools were in a dire financial emergency; they also agreed there was a serious shortage of doctors in this country.

However, in 1950, the AMA opposed Federal aid to medical education and succeeded in bottling it up three times in the House. The AMA action was directly contrary to the stand of the majority of the country's medical school deans, the American Hospital Association, the American Dental Association, the Armed Forces, and a large number of the country's public health administrators. Dr. Joseph C. Hinsey, president of the Association of American Colleges, reported to the House that 47 of the 63 medical school deans who had answered an association questionnaire were solidly behind Federal aid to medical education. The deans pointed out that only 5,000 medical students were being trained each year, not enough to replace even the doctors who retired or died each year. Because of inadequate funds, they reported, they were rejecting 9 out of 10 applicants. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 13, 1950, p. 10116 ff.: August 30, p. 13904 ff.)

Despite all these protests, and despite the recent passage of medical draft in order to get enough doctors for the limited demands of the Korean conflict, the AMA continues its opposition to Federal aid to medical education.

13. In its advertising campaign, the AMA trumpets its support of voluntary health insurance as the American way. For 15 years, the AMA attacked voluntary plans as "socialism, communism—inciting to revolution"; Blue Cross was dismissed "as a half-baked scheme * * * the mechanization of medical practice"; restrictive laws against group health insurance were pushed through in 25 States by the AMA. (Restrictions on Free Enterprise in Medicine, the Committee on Research in Medical Economics, April 1949.)

Has the AMA attitude changed? In 1950, the AMA cut the heart out of a plan to assist the organization of voluntary insurance plans sponsored by unions, cooperatives, and other lay consumer bodies. It sticks to its old stand—all plans must be approved by the country or State medical societies, the self-same societies which, for years, have blocked consumer-sponsored plans.

14. The AMA also opposed the school health services bill (S. 1411) passed by the Senate in 1949. AMA representatives testified that to treat sick children, without first subjecting their parents to a means test, would be unwise. The AMA's stand was taken in the fact of overwhelming testimony from sources of medical experts on the poor health of the Nation's children—500,000 have orthopedic or spastic defects, 500,000 have rheumatic fever, 175,000 have active tuberculosis, 1,000,000 have defective hearing, 4,000,000 have visual defects, 20,000,000 have dental defects, etc.

15. The AMA also opposed the permanent disability section contained in the social-security bill (H. R. 600) after it had been approved by the House. The AMA representative stated: "The program proposed in H. R. 6000 will adversely influence the patient's desire for recovery." Yet back in 1933, the AMA said exactly the reverse. It supported disability insurance "as it has distinct influence toward recovery and tends to reduce permanent disability."

16. Federal aid to local public-health units, title V of the Truman health program, was passed unanimously by the Senate in August 1949. It has since been condemned by AMA spokesmen because it would have permitted grants for work in chronic diseases and such other fields as might be considered necessary by the Surgeon General. This, AMA spokesmen said, might allow broadening of public-health services beyond limits the AMA considers acceptable. This testimony was given in the face of contrary testimony from many leading doctors and public-health officers which indicate alarming shortages in the public-health picture, one county in three in the United States does not have a full-time public health department, and 40,000,000 people live in these counties.

17. President Truman sought last year, and again this year, to make the Federal Security Administration a regular Government department, as recommended by the Hoover Commission. The AMA organized flying caravans of doctors who lobbied in Washington against the bill. The bill was defeated.

18. The Defense Department requested Congress to pass a bill to give Government medical care to dependents of men in the Armed Forces, with particular reference to the situation of the men fighting in Korea. The American Medical Association blasted the proposal as "impractical and harmful to national defense."

19. In a recent issue of Ripley's Believe It or Not (the $1,000 if it isn't true column), there appeared the statement that Dr. Agnaz Semmelweis (1819–65), of Vienna, was hounded into an insane asylum for suggesting that doctors should wash their hands.

I sincerely suggest at this time that Omaha doctors should not come into the forum of public opinion with a trumpeting of elephant lies but with clean hands and not hands stained with inordinate greed and piggish selfishness.

Are you people going to believe the leaders of the AMA now, in the light of their most reactionary record in the past? The present campaign is a spearhead and a cloak and shield for the reactionary selfish and greedy Republicans and Democrats who should be thrashed verbally by everyone and driven into the political woods for all time to come.

Their campaign is a campaign of lies. The authorities whom they cite and quote are liars. I am sure I have diagnosed their cases properly when I say that they are pathological and psychopathic liars.

Please help me to thwart the objectives of these evil men.

Combating Crime in 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a speech delivered by the Honorable deLesseps S. Morrison, mayor of New Orleans, before the American Municipal Congress in Washington, D. C., on December 4, 1950.

This address sets forth some of the progress that has been made combating organized crime in the United States during the last year. The noteworthy progress is the result of a combination of efforts of Federal agencies, State and local enforcement officers, and the United States Congress. It will be recalled that last year when Mr. Morrison was president of the American Municipal Association he first suggested the creation of a special committee in Congress to explore the interstate crime picture with the view of further Federal legislation to help with the problem.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In September of 1949, the American Municipal Association became the first governmental organization to express its interest and concern over the existence and problem of organized crime and gambling on a Nation-wide basis.

By direction of the AMA board, Carl H. Chatters, on September 20, 1949, petitioned the United States Department of Justice, setting forth the problem and asking for cooperative action by all levels of Government, with the Attorney General coordinating the proposed program. This was the kickoff for all that has happened since.

Shortly thereafter, we further advanced our plans at the AMA convention in Cleveland in December of 1949. Our delegates heard an expert description of syndicated rackets and crime by Virgil Peterson, executive director of the Chicago Crime Commission, and resolutions were adopted setting forth a course of action.

Not long afterward, in early 1950, Attorney General McGrath called the first conference of organized crime ever to be held in this country. Our president, Mayor Quigg Newton, of Denver, was elected temporary chairman and then chairman of the executive continuing committee. Other AMA representatives were Mayors Bowron, of Los Angeles, Cobo, of Detroit, Darst, of St. Louis, and myself.

The statement which I had the honor to present for AMA contained 10 concrete recommendations—incidentally, there were the only specific recommendations for action presented to the Attorney General's conference.

In the light of what has happened since, I wish to summarize briefly what AMA proposed: We asked for development of a coordinated master plan of action on the whole system of Nation-wide rackets at the Federal, State, and local levels. We strongly supported the Kefauver bill, then awaiting an appropriation. We proposed legislation to outlaw interstate transmission of race results for illegal purposes and to prohibit interstate shipment of slot machines and other gambling devices.

We suggested directives and legislation, if necessary, to permit the FBI to lend aid and information to State and local officials—beyond the cooperation that already existed. We asked for amendments to immigration laws to permit revocation of citizenship of naturalized aliens at any time after discovery of fraud or perjury in naturalization proceedings.

AMA also recommended complete and continuing tax investigations of income of known racketeers and hoodlums, and most important—we proposed that the hitherto closed income-tax records be opened to Federal and local investigators in the cases of known police characters and ex-convicts. And throughout it all, we offered the services of AMA as a coordinating agency for intercity exchange of information and action.

You all know the results of these recommendations. They certainly prove that we were on the right track. There were many at first who scoffed—who impugned our motives and who criticized this new venture into the field of fighting cooperatively against syndicated crime. But succeeding developments have proved our case. The bill to ban interstate shipment of slot machines, on which Mayors Bowron, Devin, Woolfarth, and I testified, is expected to be finally passed by Congress in the next few days. This is an important forward step.

Senate concurrence in a conference committee report and Presidential approval will make it a law. The companion bill—the most important one—interstate transmission of gambling information—already approved by the Senate Commerce Committee, is pending on the Senate calendar.

The Kefauver committee, established last May with a $150,000 appropriation, has been extremely effective and has accomplished a great deal already.

Out of the hearings of the Kefauver committee investigation there have emerged six vital facts:

1. The existence of wealthy, predatory, highly organized racketeering-gambling combinations controlled by a handful of bosses has been proved. So has their effect on local law-enforcement officials in certain areas.

2. For the first time, a highly organized effort at all levels of Government and with citizen support is being waged to contain and defeat the potent, organized forces of the underworld.

3. In addition to the proved existence of national operators, and their tie-ups with public officials for operating privileges, we see evidence of another key point: the investment by racketeers of money in legitimate business for the triple purpose of disguising illegal operations, attempting to obtain respectability, and provide sound investment nest eggs for their retirement from the rackets. This desire for respectability, with its attendant contributions to charitable and civic causes, in itself deserves a further study.

4. The problem of local law enforcement is complicated by the directing and financing of the racketeers behind the scenes and beyond the jurisdiction of local officials.

5. The public hearings, Presidential cooperation by opening income-tax records to the Kefauver committee, resignations, convictions, and focusing of public attention on these dramatic events—all this has caused a definite trend in national and local thinking. The people in cities and towns all over America are awakening. This revival or return to the old and true values on which this Nation was founded is indeed a healthy, wholesome, and wonderful thing. It is by far the single most important thing that has resulted from the long train of events set off by this association's first interest in the problem of interstate crime and its effect on government at all levels.

6. Today, when a citizen in any city places a bet with a local bookie or buys a lottery ticket, he knows that his transaction is more than a local matter. He knows that the local gambler is but an end product of a huge and efficient industry whose direction and financing extends far beyond his city limits. It is therefore imperative that all the people and their public officials appreciate this fact.

Here, let me reiterate what AMA has always stressed—that participating in this national, cooperative movement for good does not relieve the local official in any way of his duty to enforce the laws of his community.

However, for the first time, the honest, conscientious municipal official who is frustrated and handicapped by national gambling bosses or local satellites operating just beyond his jurisdiction—today has a powerful ally of his own. In small cities, as well as large, municipal officials must consider themselves partners in a national effort to expose and overcome those whose continued activities compound and make more difficult their local enforcement problem.

In conclusion, we have in 1 year come a long way in a significant and effective fight in our Nation's history for the establishment and maintenance of good government. I believe this association should be proud of its part in this fight.

But the fight is not yet won. The enemy is definitely damaged, and he is on the run. But he is accomplished at concealment and diversionary tactics. He no longer carries guns or talks out of the side of his mouth. He dresses well, is seen with the right people, is advised by high priced legal and public relations counsel; and he is a smart, resourceful, tenacious fighter who knows no rules. It is important to note that only one of the high echelon of his number has thus far been convicted—Frank Erikson, the national bookmaker.

The other major figures—the Costellos and Kastels, the Capone heirs, of Chicago, and Florida, the Dragnas and Cohens, of California, the Binaggio heirs, of Kansas City, and their associates and allies in half the States of this Nation must be exposed, punished and emasculated of their influence. Whenever possible, they should be deported, to join their associate, Luciano, in Italy.

This fight cannot be relaxed for one moment. It must be carried forward aggressively on every front. New Federal legislation, the continued activity of the Kefauver committee, strong law enforcement at all levels, and the maintenance of citizen interest can wipe out a monopolistic, antisocial, economically unhealthy, and undemocratic industry founded on greed, human frailty, terror, special privileges, and corruption.

I urge the American Municipal Association to give its continued support to this fight and to the magnificent work being achieved by the Kefauver committee.

The Omaha Doctors' First Newspaper Advertising Barrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1950, the so-called Healing Arts Committee, which it was represented, was made up of doctors, dentists, druggists, pharmacists, nurses, optometrists, chiropodists, and others, opened up their first newspaper barrage in the Omaha World-Herald by running almost a full page advertisement on page 16 of the evening issue. These advertisements were as follows:

Who runs America? the Congress? the President? or you and the man next door?

There then appears a drawing of an eagle on the wing with head turned to the right, which, according to Roman tradition, indicates honor, and underneath that head, indicating honor, three stars and five black squares appear. Just what the black squares are for I do not know, but as to the three stars that must be in honor of Three Star Hennessy, a truly fine, old brandy, which perhaps inspired the writing of the following advertisement:

Running America is the joint job of 150,000,000 people. It's the biggest job in the world today—keeping it running for liberty and for freedom. And the whole world's watching to see whether Americans can do it.

In much of the world today, the people have resigned from running their own countries. Others have been quick to step in—first with promises of security—and then with whips and guns—to run things their way. The evidence is on every front page in the world, every day.

FREEDOM COMES UNDER ATTACK

The reality of war has made every American think hard about the things he's willing to work and fight for—and freedom leads the list.

But that freedom has been attacked here recently—just as it has been attacked in other parts of the world. One of the most serious threats to individual freedom has been the threat of Government-dominated compulsory health insurance, falsely presented as a new guaranty of health security for everybody.

THE PEOPLE WEIGH THE FACTS

In the American manner, the people studied the case for socialized medicine—and the case against it.

They found that Government domination of the people's medical affairs under compulsory health insurance means lower standards of medical care, higher payroll taxes, loss of incentive, damage to research, penalties for the provident, rewards for the improvident.

They found that no country on earth can surpass America's leadership in medical care and progress. They found that able doctors, teachers, nurses, and scientists—working in laboratories where science, not politics, is master—are blazing dramatic new trails to health for Americans—and for the world.

THE GRASS ROOTS SIGNALS CONGRESS

In every community in the Nation, people stood up to be counted on this important issue. Thousands of local women's clubs, civic groups, farm, business, religious, taxpayer, medical, educational, and patriotic organizations spoke out—giving the great United States Congress its unmistakable grass-roots signal from home.

And ever watchful, ever sensitive to an alert people, the Congress saw that signal, and heard the people speak out, loud and plain. That's democracy in action. That's the American way.

Today among the 10,000 great organizations on militant public record against compulsory health insurance are: General Federation of Women's Clubs, American Farm Bureau Federation, National Grange, Veterans of Foreign wars, National Conference of Catholic Charities, American Protestant Hospital Association, American Legion, National Association of Small Business Men, United States Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Retail Grocers, National Retail Dry Goods Association, American Bar Association.

Doctors of this Nation are grateful that the people refused to be wooed by the fantastic promises of this un-American excursion into state socialism. Doctors of America are dedicated to serve their fellow citizens at home and their comrades in uniform, wherever service to this Nation may take them. And the thing they stand ready to fight for—to sacrifice for, to die for—is not the alien way of life of socialism, but the prideful security of a free and self-reliant people.

The voluntary way is the American way.

Throughout the Nation, free men and women, working and planning together, are finding the American answer to every question of medical service, care, and cost. Hundreds of voluntary health-insurance plans are in healthy competition—sponsored by doctors, insurance companies, hospitals, fraternal organizations—by industry, agriculture, and labor.

Today in America 70,000,000 people are protected by voluntary health insurance.

Throughout the Nation, families are insuring themselves against the major costs of illness at reasonable, budget-basis prices. Voluntary health insurance takes the economic shock out of illness. Protect your family now.

For information, ask your doctor or your insurance man.

An American's greatest heritage is the right to learn the facts and to speak his mind. Maintained with honor and used with sincerity that right will guarantee forever that—

You and your neighbor run America.

Physicians of this community participated in paying for this space.

American Medical Association, National Education Campaign, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

This advertisement at the top shows an eagle in flight with head to the left,

which according to Roman tradition indicates dishonor.

The voluntary way is the American way.
We salute American medical progress.
The voluntary way is the American way.
PHEBUS SURGICAL CO.,

Here is our prescription for a healthy community.

Then appears the sign of an ancient apothecary: the mortar, pestle, and RX.

Filling prescriptions is an important part of our business. But today, for a change, we are taking the liberty of writing one—after long and careful thought. Here it is:

Purchase voluntary health insurance.
Preserve the American medical system.
Protect freedom all along the line.

Lewis and Smith Drugs, Self-service, 314 South Fifteenth Street, Redick Tower Building.

The voluntary way is the American way.

What's wrong with freedom?

Then appears a sitting eagle, head to the left, perched on a shield upon which are three stars and five black stripes like a polecat.

Our business is selling merchandise—the best we can buy—at the most economical price to you. It's a good business, and we like it.

But being in business in America is more than skillful buying and selling. It's the exercise of a fundamental right—freedom to venture, freedom to plan, freedom to succeed by serving best.

All freedoms stand or fall together. That's why we take our stand today, with the doctors of America, for the voluntary system. At home and abroad it's worth defending.

Seiler Surgical Co., Medical Arts Building, 111 South Seventeenth Street, Omaha, Nebr., AT 5825.

The voluntary way is the American way.

Is your health in your budget?

Then appears a poised lead pencil and a sheet of paper with four check marks on it. Just an advertising agent's doodle, no doubt.

More than likely! * * * the voluntary way is the American way. We've seen medical progress the voluntary way. And that is the only way.

Free America has no place for socialized medicine.

Cris Rexall Drugs, Fiftieth and Dodge Street.

The voluntary way is the American way.

Then appears a replica of a surprised owl.

It's wise to insure your car, your house, your life. It's just as wise to insure your health. Find out about voluntary health insurance, the budget-basis way of meeting the costs of medical care.

Omaha's insurance counselors, The Harry A. Koch Co., Howard at Eighteenth Street.

The voluntary way is the American way.

We salute American medical progress.

"We" is emphasized with doodles with a flourish.

We are pleased to place our name beside those of other liberty-loving Americans who throughout the Nation today reaffirm their adherence to the principle of traditional American enterprise and initiative. We believe firmly that in all fields—from industry to the arts, from agriculture to medicine—America has proved to the world that the voluntary way is the American way.

Blackburn Pharmacy, 3909 Cuming.

Hess Surgical Appliances: Trusses, surgical supports, surgical hose for varicose veins, 322–329 Sunderland Building, 403 South Fifteenth Street, Omaha, Nebr.

Next eagle in flight with head to the left.

The voluntary way is the American way.

The voluntary way is the American way.

Then appears a picture of two quiz kids, one designated as a druggist and one a doctor, both standing on a giant blank prescription, which indeed is appropriate.

An American heritage: An American's greatest heritage is the right to learn the facts—and to speak his mind. Maintained with honor and used with sincerity—that right will guarantee forever that you and your neighbor run America. Preserve the American medical system.

We are proud to be engaged in a business so vital to your health. To this end, all drug products used are of the purest—closest cooperation with all medical science maintained.

Then appears that ancient apothecary's symbol again.

John O'Brien, druggist and chemist, 1700 Douglas Street, phone AT 4900.

Healthy, wealthy, and why?

Next is a fiery torch held high in a good right hand.

America is the healthiest great nation in the world. Americans live more abundantly than any people in the world. Why?

Not because somebody passed a law. But because the founding fathers were wise. Because they turned away from dependence on Government. Because they believed that real security is based on individual initiative.

Americans today believe that, too. That is why America is the symbol of human freedom—the bulwark of world liberty.

The strength of America is the product of creative, free initiative. America's health is the best in the world. A free medical profession will keep it so.

Freely, without compulsion, over 70,000,000 Americans have secured the best medical care in the world through voluntary insurance, prepaying the major costs of illness.

The price is low—the care is best. Your insurance program can be tailored to fit your needs and budget.

Don't wait till illness strikes—call today.

E. E. Blue Howell, city manager, Woodmen of the World.

Associates: Ira L. Couch, Ted Holmberg, Sig Sorensen, 216 Insurance Building, Seventeenth and Farnam Streets, JA 5223.

Then appears eagle in flight with head to the right.

The voluntary way is the American way.

This next advertisement is introduced by an eagle in flight carrying a shield upon which appears five stars and five black polecat stripes.

The voluntary way is the American way.

We have faith in you, in ourselves, in America.

We believe that most Americans are capable of paying their own bills, planning their own budgets, and mapping their own futures; that most Americans prefer to solve their problems—medical or otherwise—by means of self-reliance, free choice, and voluntary methods; that most Americans will work and fight to preserve freedom, both at home and abroad.

W. A. Piel Co., two locations for your convenience: Medical Arts Drug Store, Seventeenth and Dodge, JA 1866; Dundee Store, Forty-ninth and Dodge, GL. 7200.

To each of these advertisers I sent the following letter, which was never acknowledged or answered:

I saw your advertisement in the evening Omaha World-Herald of October 11, 1950, in which you stated approvingly, among other things, that "the voluntary way is the American way."

I wish to congratulate you for the stand which you have taken which is in accord with the position I have taken all of the time with reference to this matter, gross misrepresentations to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Like yourselves, I am now and have always been against socialism, socialized medicine, and compulsory health insurance, and even though there is no congressional legislation now pending in the Congress seeking to set up socialism or socialized medicine, I am against any such proposed changes in our form of government, and if there was only one vote cast in the House of Representatives against socialism and socialized medicine, it would be my vote.

I have been consistently opposed also to compulsory health insurance, not because some people seem to think it is a trend toward socialized medicine, but because in many instances it would be an unnecessary insurance duplication and would also, in other instances, be unfair to private insurance companies.

It would be an unnecessary insurance duplication, in my opinion, as far as the following groups are considered: The veterans' of World War I and II, the railroad workers, the packinghouse workers, the metropolitan utilities workers, the Omaha public power district workers, and also other workers having a worth-while company health program for workers.

It would be unfair also to private insurance companies by taking away from them perhaps, insured persons holding policies of insurance in the Blue Cross and Blue Shield, and policy holders in other insurance companies, fraternal and otherwise, who have satisfactory health and accident insurance coverage already.

I am and have been against compulsory health insurance and a supporter of a voluntary-health-insurance plan, erroneous statements to the contrary, notwithstanding. If there must be a Federal voluntary-health-insurance-plan to take care of those who might be regarded as too great a risk for private insurance companies to service, make it a voluntary and not a compulsory matter.

I also believe that in the cases last mentioned, voluntary insurance, payment by the worker and his employer should not be 2 percent of a maximum salary of $4,800, but perhaps 2 percent of a total not to exceed $3,000 to $3,600 in salary, so as to give private insurance companies a chance to continue in business after such a worker has become health-insurance conscious.

From the hearings before the congressional committee, no insurance company objected to such a plan and I believe that even the American Medical Association might favor such a plan.

I also think that every other fair-minded person will support voluntary health insur-

ance and oppose all changes of our Government to a socialistic one, and will also oppose socialized medicine and compulsory health insurance.

Please pardon me for saying it, but to my way of thinking, the unfortunate thing about your expensive advertising program to stress a well-known and remembered truism, that "The American way is the best way," is that you did not use this money to build and aid local clinics, health centers and hospitals, and to fight arthritis, cancer, cerebral palsy, diabetes, epilepsy, heart diseases, multiple sclerosis, poliomyelitis, rheumatism and rheumatic fever, social diseases, tuberculosis, jungle rot, and many other human physical and mental ailments, some of which appear to have medical science completely baffled for the time being.

Once again congratulating you for the expressions contained in your aforementioned advertisement, I remain the only Democratic Congressman in the House of Representatives from Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Kansas, and Nebraska.

Yours very truly,

EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN.

Commitments to Foreign Nations Made by a President Without the Knowledge or Consent of the Senate Are Not Binding Upon the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a reason for a reexamination of our foreign policy is convincingly set forth in an article by George Rothwell Brown in this morning's Washington Times-Herald. It follows:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

America's most humiliating and bitter military disaster, the seeds of which were sown at Yalta by a President of the United States, in a secret betrayal of our ally China to Communist Russia, has left the fate of the United Nations hanging in the balance.

If this debacle continues to grow worse an aroused opinion at the Senate, where ranks without regard to party are closing in the interest of a stronger nationalism, the whole question of the withdrawal of American membership in the UN may be demanded at any time.

It must not be forgotten that the United States joined the United Nations, whose birth was presided over at the San Francisco conference in 1945 by Alger Hiss, the general secretary, when Congress and the people were ignorant of the deadly terms Stalin had dictated to Roosevelt at the Crimean conference earlier in that fateful year.

It is clear in the light of subsequent disclosures that the United States Congress was induced to subscribe to the UN charter by fraud and false pretenses.

The ratification of the UN charter ranks in magnitude of national tragedy with America's entrance into the European war in 1917, when it broke with the historic tradition of Washington and Jefferson, no entangling alliances.

Having ratified the charter in ignorance of the secret surrender Roosevelt had made at Yalta to Stalin, the Senate would be on firm moral and legal grounds in demanding the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations.

It is necessary to go back into history less than 6 years to establish the fact of the fraud and trickery by which the American Congress was led into the morass with which Russian communism has now engulfed us.

On March 1, 1945, Roosevelt in a dying condition, addressed a joint session of House and Senate to give his report on the Yalta Conference from which he had just returned.

To disarm his audience in almost his opening sentence he assured them that he was speaking in all frankness. Those were his words. We now know he was not speaking frankly, but the contrary.

Towards the close of his address President Roosevelt uttered these misleading words about the Yalta meeting:

"Quite naturally, this conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe and not with the Pacific war."

That statement was a falsehood, and constitutes the fraudulent basis upon which Congress was induced to join and finance the United Nations, which Roosevelt on this occasion explained briefly, saying that it would be organized a month later at San Francisco.

Roosevelt concealed from Congress the secret deal he had made with Stalin, by which he betrayed Nationalist China, and conceded to Communist Russia, our open enemy today in Asia, the southern half of Sakhalin island, the Kuriles, the nationalization of Dairen, the lease of Port Arthur, and a sell-out in Manchuria.

He began the Korean war.

James F. Byrnes was Roosevelt's principal adviser at Yalta.

But this treacherous agreement with Stalin was kept from him. Byrnes and Admiral King were ordered home.

Alger Hiss remained at Yalta, and stood at Roosevelt's side as the shameful bargain was sealed by the President.

Byrnes knew nothing of this deal until the secret papers were made available to him when he became Secretary of State in Truman's Cabinet after Roosevelt's death. He has since, in 1947, revealed it.

Alger Hiss knew that Roosevelt had been tricked by Stalin at Yalta—to use the least opprobrious word.

Congress did not.

It is entitled to a new look at Lake (God save the mark) Success.

The Significance of the Bicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the magnificent address of a great American, Thomas J. Tobias, president of congregation K. K. Beth Elohim, Charleston, S. C., and first chairman of the bicentennial planning committee, at the banquet celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of the Jewish community in Charleston, Francis Marion Hotel, Charleston, S. C., November 20, 1950. The subject of Mr. Tobias' speech was the significance of the bicentennial.

Mr. Tobias and I have been lifelong friends. We attended high school and college together. His forebears are numbered among Charleston's aristocracy. He is truly the scion of one of America's great pioneering families, and I take genuine pleasure in submitting herewith, under leave to extend my remarks, the address of such a noble man for the benefit of future generations:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BICENTENNIAL

I have been asked to tell you something of the background of this bicentennial so that we might understand why we feel this celebration has significance, not alone for the Jewish community here, not alone for Charleston, but for all Americans.

You might well ask why the historical anniversary of a comparatively small Jewish community in a comparatively small southern city has meaning for the busy millions who make up America.

For one thing, you can count on the fingers of one hand the Jewish communities of this Nation which are as old as Charleston's. Just as surely as other groups date their beginnings from a comparative handful of original settlers, so can the American Jew, whatever the time of his arrival, look back to roots as deep as any who make up this land of immigrants.

This bicentennial dramatizes the long and continuous life of the Jew in America. It is also a salute to the American spirit which has made possible a long and fruitful life in this country of ours.

It can be said that the secret strength of America lies in the unique manner in which peoples of many origins who have come to these shores early or late have had the freedom and opportunity to contribute physically, intellectually, and spiritually without being crushed into a mold of uniformity. E pluribus unum (one from many) is an appropriate motto for America. The content of our national heritage is fed from many springs and not dependent on a single source for its power and destiny.

The local events of this bicentennial celebration are the culmination of a lot of planning and a lot of work by a lot of people.

With a restraint unusual in the celebration of such historic anniversaries, the Charleston Jewish community has chosen to date its beginnings not from the first mention of a Jew in this city in 1695, but rather from the founding of the first Jewish organization in Charleston, in this case, the Hassell Street congregation, Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim, in 1750.

There were those who saw in this bicentennial a broader concept than the commemoration of this historic anniversary of a single institution. They recognized that the founding of Beth Elohim some twoscore years before the birth of the United States itself marked the beginning of organized Jewish life here. So this bicentennial has the unique quality of being celebrated as the jubilee of an American Jewish community and not alone as the historic milestone of one congregation.

I might say that in joining hands to bring this concept to life, the Jews of Charleston have themselves achieved something historic. Here the traditional individualism of the Jew everywhere is linked to the traditional individualism of the Charlestonian. There is the well-known maxim that the only thing two Jews ever agree on is what a third Jew should give to charity. Often we Jews of Charleston cannot agree on that.

Another notable feature of this celebration is the cooperation and help volunteered by so many non-Jewish individuals and organizations. It is a tribute to the friendly relations which have existed so long in this city of ours, and will be remembered with appreciation and pride. Charleston Jews have never lived isolated or in a vacuum but have been part and parcel of their city—sharing in

civic activities and responsibilities from early times. Charleston has always welcomed the participation of its Jewish citizens and aided their causes.

The spirit of the bicentennial is symbolized in the various events which climax this week.

We have seen the publication of the Jews of Charleston, by Charles Reznikoff and Dr. U. Z. Engelman, which tells in its 343 pages the long and honorable story of the Charleston Jewish community set in the background of the general community. At a public book review held last week at the Free Library, a distinguished panel of reviewers declared it to be both an interesting and a valuable contribution to the history of Charleston and America.

Many of you saw this afternoon the impressive dedication of a plaque in city hall park to the brilliant young Revolutionary patriot, Francis Salvador, who served in the Provincial Congress which set up this State, and was the first Jew in the Western World to hold important public office and the first to die for American independence. He stands as a fitting symbol of Jewish participation in the creation of this State and Nation. The cooperation of city officials, patriotic organizations, and our own General Summerall, the speaker, in placing this memorial to Salvador beside other historic monuments in city hall park is dramatic evidence of Charleston's recognition of the contribution of this gallant young American patriot, who was also a Jew.

Tomorrow night there will open at the Dock Street Theater for a series of performances an original play with music, written and produced by Sam Byrd. It is an absorbing dramatization of Charleston's history and its Jewish community. Its mood is gay and amusing and brings history to life in an amazing way. For Those Who Live in the Sun is a play which every Charlestonian should see.

On Friday night, the religious aspect of this celebration will be observed with a joint service of the four Jewish congregations of the city to be held at Beth Elohim synagogue, with the noted Dr. Alla Hillel Silver, as speaker.

During the week exhibits of paintings, ceremonial objects, books, and documents are being shown at the Gibbes Art Gallery, the Charleston Museum, and the two libraries of the city.

National attention has been attracted by this celebration. Yesterday, the Church of the Air featured the bicentennial on its national CBS program, with Mayor Morrison and Rabbi Tarshish as speakers. Numerous articles have appeared in publications throughout the country.

While the visible events of this celebration symbolize much of its meaning, a brief glance at some of the things which help make up the heritage and tradition of the Jew in Charleston, and his relations with his neighbors, further points up the significance of this historic anniversary.

I first want to pay tribute to a man who had most to do with establishing here the climate of religious freedom which early attracted Jewish settlers, as well as French Hugenots, and others seeking that basic human right. He was John Locke, the great English liberal philosopher, who as friend and adviser to Lord Ashley Cooper, chief of the Lords Proprietors, drafted the original constitution of this colony. While Locke's draft never became the law of the land because of provisions which ran contrary to frontier conditions, its spirit of liberty and tolerance became a tradition which has endured until today. We have too long neglected to honor John Locke. I salute his memory at this bicentennial banquet. He helped start Charleston off right.

In the year 1695, just 25 years after Charleston was settled, and 15 years after the tiny settlement moved from across the Ashley to its present location, Governor Archdale tells us of the first Jew here of whom we have written knowledge. We do not know his name. We only know the service he performed. When some captive Spanish-speaking Florida Indians were brought before the Governor, he writes: "I had a Jew as an interpreter." So through the aid of this unknown early Charleston Jewish citizen who spoke Spanish the Governor was able to gather information from these Indians. The Jews of Charleston, through the dim curtain of history, had begun to play their part in the life of the community.

Let us skip now to the year 1756, when there came to Charles Town from London aboard the *Charming Nancy*, a Jewish merchant of indigo, no longer young but filled with ability, energy, and courage. His name was Moses Lindo and he carved an honorable niche for himself through his contributions to our colonial prosperity. Indigo, planted with success by that remarkable woman, Eliza Lucas, was, next to rice, the greatest source of revenue in the colony. It was Lindo who, through his knowledge and skill, helped make the Carolina dyestuff acceptable in world markets through proper sorting and grading and setting of standards. Carolina indigo brought more money in world markets after Lindo graded and placed his stamp upon it. He was appointed by the Governor surveyor and inspector general of indigo for the province upon recommendation of the leading planters and merchants. Lindo himself profited little from his great service. His estate was appraised at only £1,200 at his death in 1774.

If we look at the period of the American Revolution, we find that the Jews of Charleston gave their lives and their property to the fight for liberty along with their fellow citizens. Francis Salvador was most conspicuous, but there were many others.

One Revolutionary soldier exemplifies the words of the World War II song, Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition. Abraham Alexander had been serving for some years as rabbi of Congregation Beth Elohim when the Revolution came. He promptly volunteered and was commissioned a lieutenant of dragoons, serving with distinction in Sumter's brigade, one of the most active in the Revolution. He successfully combined the talents of a minister and a soldier.

We find a touch of humor in an eighteenth-century advertisement which shows one of the early Jewish settlers here as proprietor of the "Irish Coffee Shop in Broad Street." Some say this laid the foundations of the intimate fellowship between the Irish and the Jews of Charleston, reflected today in the roster of the Hibernian Society, which lists about as many Cohens as Connolleys.

An incident in the year 1790, small in itself, is not without significance as an item in the heritage of the Jews of Charleston. Christopher Knight, a delegate to the State constitutional convention, grateful for the support of some Jews of this city, sent Beth Elohim congregation 50 guineas to "serve the poor or be of any use in respect to the congregation." The trustees wrote Knight expressing the congregation's appreciation of his good intentions, but returning the gift, which, they said, could not be accepted "as it may be suggested at some future period that the members of our community were to be bought."

This incident might well be placed alongside another. The Charleston Courier of October 1, 1832, contained a letter signed by 84 Jews of the city taking exception to charges that the Jews sought representation as such in the State legislature and were united for a particular candidate.

"We will not support any man for office," the letter said, "who is not selected by the public for himself, his character, and his talents. * * * We discountenance the idea of selecting an individual for office, either of profit or honor, upon the grounds that such individual belongs to a particular sect, with the view of securing or influencing the suffrage of such sect."

In this day when the practice of bloc voting in many parts of the country offers a threat to democratic suffrage, these incidents seem to have a significance which extends beyond the borders of Charleston.

In 1794, at the consecration of the Hasell Street synagogue (later destroyed by fire to be replaced by the present building in 1840) the ceremonies were attended by General Moultrie, the Revolutionary hero, then Governor, together with civil and military leaders of the State and city, and the occasion was saluted as evidence that the prejudices and weaknesses that have for ages disgraced the human character were here wearing off and that the Jews of Charleston bid fair to flourish and be happy.

Only a few years later Gen. Christopher Gadsden presented the congregation with some rare Hebrew books from his library. In 1843, Christopher G. Memminger, the distinguished Charleston lawyer who later became Secretary of the Treasury of the Confederacy, when retained in a congregational lawsuit, refused any fee for his services since all served the same God.

In 1842 there occurred another interesting episode of interreligious fellowship. Just before Christmas a collection was made among the members of Beth Elohim in aid of the Protestant Methodist Church on Pitt Street. The letter in acknowledgment read in part:

"We shall ever retain a lively recollection of the friendly interest shown by our fellow citizens for our welfare, to none of whom do we more cheerfully acknowledge our indebtedness than to the descendants of the ancient worthies from whom we received the light of revelation and the oracles of God."

Masonry, with its emphasis on the brotherhood of man, strongly appealed to the Jews who elsewhere were so long excluded from the general brotherhood. The Supreme Council of Scottish Rite Masonry was founded in Charleston in 1801 and four of the nine founders were Jews. They were members of local lodges as early as 1753.

I wish to cite an instance of what might be called an inherited habit of philanthropy. Mordecai Cohen was one of Charleston's great philanthropists of the early nineteenth century, whose contributions to the Charleston Orphan House over a period of 45 years are memorialized with a plaque in the orphan house. Only a few years ago Mrs. Isabel Cohen Doud, Mordecai Cohen's granddaughter, willed to the College of Charleston some $200,000, its largest single bequest.

We can instance many other individuals, episodes of civic and patriotic service and actions of honor and fellowship in the long intertwined history of Charleston and its Jewish citizens.

The parade of incidents from the past is not given to exalt the role of the Jew in the history of Charleston above the contribution of its many other groups. Even in the year 1800 when Charleston had the largest Jewish population of any American city of the time, there were only 500 Jews living here. They have always been a comparatively small group in the general community. It has taken 200 years to achieve this bicentennial. The Jews of Charleston have the right and the obligation to tell of their experience both as Jews and as Americans.

In bringing these remarks to a close, I think it appropriate to read from a historic letter. When George Washington was inaugurated as the first President of the United States in 1790 the Jews of Charleston wrote him

a letter of congratulations. In his reply, Washington said in part:

"The liberality of sentiment toward each other which marks every political and religious denomination of man in this country stands unparalleled in the history of nations. May the same temporal and eternal blessings which you implore for me rest upon your congregation."

The spirit expressed in Washington's letter to the Jews of Charleston has endured. Jews have lived here in peace and security for more than 200 years, in harmony with their neighbors, and in full and active participation in the life of their city, their State, and their country.

Today, when men of good will are seeking ways and techniques for peoples everywhere to live together in justice and in peace, Charleston stands as a living demonstration that this can be done. The bicentennial of the Jewish community of Charleston celebrates the working of the American heritage over a period of two centuries in one American city. It has value and meaning to all of us here in Charleston and for all America.

The Importance of Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the Jewish community of Charleston, S. C., there assembled a group which had the distinguished privilege of hearing one of America's great naval officers and statesmen—Admiral Lewis Strauss.

It is unnecessary to gild the lily. Nevertheless, I want the records of the Congress of the United States to contain for future generations what this great American said at that time.

The subject of Admiral Strauss' address was on the importance of standards.

This outstanding American has held important positions in the Department of the Navy during World War II under the late illustrious James Forrestal. Because of his great mind and tremendous capacity for leadership and his extraordinary vision, he quickly was elevated from the position of commander to the rank of rear admiral—a feat almost without precedent. Subsequent to the cessation of hostilities he served with great distinction on the Atomic Energy Commission. At the present time he is head of the Rockefeller Foundation.

I consider it an honor to know this great American. I consider it a privilege to be his personal friend. My people are grateful that they were able to listen to his words of wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the address of Admiral Strauss. It follows:

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF STANDARDS

"Man doth not live by bread only." (Deuteronomy viii: 3.)

"Those who would treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the other." (Viscount John Morley.)

"Men of character," wrote Emerson, "are the conscience of the society to which they belong." From which it easily follows that a community of character may become the conscience of the Nation of which it is a part.

These are days of astonishing material progress. We have everything—and too much of a great deal of it, except peace of mind. We have new drugs and antibiotics, new vehicles, new weapons, and a new source of energy. The catalog of novelties is a long one. When we lay aside our newspapers, hover, and switch off the radio and television, then in the few remaining minutes between prayer and sleep—a good many of us wonder why we are not supremely and sublimely happy. It could be because we have everything material yet fear that we are losing the nonmaterial—the nonmaterial and most essential ingredient of the good life—a good conscience.

A good conscience, individually and communally, is bound up with the maintenance of standards. South Carolina's great statesman, John C. Calhoun, put it thus: "In estimating the power of a community, moral as well as physical causes must be calculated." What are the moral causes, the standards, that are important? The answer to that question is appropriate to the occasion which we are celebrating this evening because an examination of them can be made "in vivo" as the biologist would say, within the life and history of the proud and vigorous 200-year-old Jewish community of this historic city.

The value of physical standards is debated by no one. They are so much a part of our daily lives that we take them for granted. Civilized communities could not exist for very long without them. Business could not be conducted without fixed, and reliable, and recognized standards of weight and measurement. These cannot be permitted to vary from region to region within the country. The inch, the acre, and the pound and all the rest must not only be the same everywhere but must be the same, tomorrow and the next day, as they were yesterday. We go to great lengths to insure this. Standards are not left to the judgment of an individual or to custom. They are the subject of international agreement to which the civilized people of the earth subscribe and in vaults in the capital of this Nation rest our jealously guarded bars of metal and other shapes which are the standard originals of the duplicates that every man may possess and use.

Now, as it happens, no one may handle or even touch these physical standards. By so little as the heat of the body or the moisture of a fingertip, they would alter their accuracy and no longer be what they were.

In this respect only, they resemble the nonmaterial and far more important standards upon which civilization largely depends and without which a government of free men is impossible. But no vault can contain our standards of probity in political life—of responsibility in communal affairs—of integrity in private careers—of philanthropy—or of patriotism. And these standards, also, cannot be touched, handled, weighed or measured.

We know one other thing about them. They cannot exist in the abstract—in the cold stratosphere of pure ethic. They require a living belief by men in a Supreme Being—religion if you will. As George Washington said, " * * * reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Religious principle derives from the Bible, which was the inspiration for American democracy, and those Jews, who helped settle what were these bare shores more than two centuries ago as well as those who followed in later years brought the Bible with them as did the other colonists. Engraved upon their hearts among its other precepts were the words of the Prophet Jeremiah who defined the duties and responsibilities of citizenship in these classic sentences: "Build ye houses and dwell in them, and plant gardens, and eat the fruit of them, take ye wives and beget sons and daughters * * * and seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to go * * * and pray unto the Lord for it; for in the peace thereof, ye shall have peace."

There is no better testimony of the adherence to such standard than the devotion of this community to the interests of the State and of the Nation. From the yellowed and aging documents of colonial history springs afresh the gallant figure of Francis Salvador whose memory we honored this afternoon when General Summerall, a great patriot and soldier of our own day dedicated the tablet which commemorated Salvador's service in the First and Second Provincial Congresses and his heroic death in 1776. The first Jewish soldier to give his life for American liberty, Salvador was the spiritual progenitor of a long list of sons of this community who fought, and who died in the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the War Between the States, the war with Spain, and in the World Wars. There were Maj. Raphael Moses, of the staff of General Longstreet—but one cannot name them all and one should not single them out. The list is too long for recital and the most recent names upon it would touch wounds as yet fresh and unhealed. But their names are not forgotten—the memory of the brave and the good is "like honey in the mouth."

In times of war and national emergency, the flame of patriotism naturally burns brightest. What of the conduct of this community in the day-to-day traffic of national and local affairs? Is the standard of political probity consonant with the standard of patriotic fervor? I give you an example. In 1832 it was rumored that the Jewish community of Charleston wished to be represented as a religious sect in the Legislature of South Carolina. Upon hearing this, a committee, styling themselves Eighty-four Israelites, and possibly comprising most of the heads of families in the city, issued a statement from which I now quote: "We discountenance the idea of selecting any individual for office, either of profit or honor, upon the ground that such individual belongs to a particular sect, with a view of securing or of influencing the suffrages of such sect. * * * While we are sensible that there are gentleman among us who would do no discredit to any station, public or private, we will not support any man for office who is not selected by the public for himself, his character, and his talents."

A repudiation of improper politics has perhaps never been stated more vigorously, courageously, and succinctly. Let us now examine another standard.

The civic standard of philanthropy needs no exemplification in a community known for its generosity. The ancient precept "separate not thyself from the community" has been the touchstone of this standard, and time and again the congregations that comprise this community have engaged in the Lord's work of aiding the less fortunate of every sect and race. This standard has been more handsomely observed as the community has grown and prospered but it is of venerable precedent, and while the fact is primarily of historic interest, I note that on the wall of the Charleston Orphan House which adjoins this building a tablet memorializes one Mordecai Cohen who departed this life in 1848 and of whom it is recorded that for 10 years he faithfully fulfilled the duties of commissioner of that institution and for 45 years (he must have begun in 1803), contributed annual donations to the comfort of the orphan inmates. Congregation Beth Elohim also contributed liberally as an institution toward the maintenance of that nonsectarian home.

I have cited the foregoing details, not out of an antiquarian interest, but to recall our minds to, and refresh them with, the virtues and standards that make this democracy great. It is because such examples are neither rare nor unique that we have flourished—are what we are. Let us not confuse standards, however, with standardization.

In years gone by it was in vogue to describe the United States as a melting pot—a great cauldron into which people of every nation, creed, and race were poured. The fused product was supposed to be a new breed of man—the American—combining all the best features of all the raw material.

The fallacy of this doctrine of the melting pot is that it suggests the standardization of all Americans. Such uniformity is not obtainable and would be undesirable even if it could be achieved. There is no typical American. Thomas Jefferson, Roger Williams, Robert E. Lee, Judah P. Benjamin, Woodrow Wilson, and Louis Brandeis, for examples, were unalike and all were great Americans. Each was a member of some different religious or cultural group. From the diversity of talents and traditions springs our national vigor. And the unifying and cementing force is the common respect for the standards which lift men above themselves. Jefferson is identified with public enlightenment and science, Williams with religious liberty, Lee with duty, Brandeis with justice—who can say that one is more important than another. The list could go on and on.

A word in conclusion. This community of Jews was fortunate in the site of their settlement. South Carolina was unique among the British provinces. Under Locke's constitution for this colony, not only was freedom of worship guaranteed but no slightest civil or religious disability was inflicted upon minorities—or has ever been. Thus the first Jewish congregation was freely organized here in 1750, 200 years ago. It was already more than a quarter of a century old when it addressed its famous letter to Gen. George Washington in these significant words: "Various extensive and invaluable are the benefits which your fellow citizens have derived from the glorious Revolution, which, under Providence, you have been the principal instrument in effecting. [To us] it has secured the inalienable rights of human nature—all the privileges and immunities of freedom, and has placed within [our] reach, peace, plenty, and the other blessings of good government. To the equal participation and enjoyment of all these, it has raised us from the state of political degradation and grievous oppression, to which partial, narrow and illiberal policy and intolerant bigotry has reduced us in almost every other part of the world. Peculiar and extraordinary reason have we, therefore, to be attached to the free and generous constitution of our respective states."

And here each succeeding generation in their houses of worship has reaffirmed that attachment—a dedication to the principles and standards that have become the spring and the source, the focus and the pattern for communities throughout the length and breadth of this land.

Our American Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and an editorial from the Detroit Times of December 5, 1950:

DETROIT TIMES, *December 8, 1950.*
Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: Here is an editorial which appeared on page one of the December 5 issue of the Detroit Times. I am sending it to you in the event that you might not have seen that issue of our newspaper.

Mr. Hearst directed all his editors to print the editorial. It reflects his opinion and, he said, he believes it reflects also the opinion of most Americans.

I thought you would be interested in knowing that this editorial caused more comment among Detroit Times readers than any other article we have printed since the outbreak of the Korean war.

The reaction was unanimously favorable. We were besieged by congratulatory telephone calls for 2 days.

We received more letters than we have been able thus far to tabulate and—what is unique in newspaper experience—the deluge of comment contained not a single adverse criticism.

I am,
Respectfully,
JOHN C. MANNING,
Editor.

[From the Detroit Times of December 5, 1950]

OUR AMERICAN DUTY

The blundering and disloyal foreign policies of the New Deal are taking this country into complete disaster—both military and economic.

Our sovereignty has been impaired by making us a virtual vassal of the United Nations, which disrupts our councils, and seeks to fly its mongrel flag over our public buildings.

Our wealth is dissipated to support socialism abroad and to defend alien peoples who are not willing to defend themselves.

The lives of our young men are being sacrificed in a desperate war which our purported allies are not trying to help us win on the battlefields and are conspiring to make us lose in the mazes of diplomacy—and duplicity.

For our own survival, it is imperative that we extricate ourselves from these destroying situations at once.

Without even inadequate support from others in the United Nations, we are fighting almost alone against massed hordes on the Asian Continent.

Continuing the war means only the slaughter of millions in a quixotic American attempt to conquer a vast and distant population.

First and foremost, therefore, this country should withdraw its Armed Forces from the invasion areas.

We should get our troops out of Korea as quickly as possible.

We should come home to our own country, reconstruct our defenses, and give heed to our own security and welfare.

This might be a defeat for the New Deal, which is responsible for our dismal plight.

It would not be a defeat for the United States, but merely an act of self-preservation.

Secondly, we should get out of the United Nations.

That organization has not sustained us in the war that we undertook in its behalf.

Instead, it has interfered with our operations.

Furthermore, it is conniving to admit the enemy into a privileged membership where the enemy could dictate peace terms.

Accordingly, the United Nations should let Red China in—and leave the United States out.

Then let the United Nations see how it gets along.

This country has maintained the United Nations since its inception, with no return in loyalty or gratitude.

So let those who run the United Nations pay for the United Nations—and fight its wars.

Finally, we should end our unrequited efforts to support and supply an ingrate Europe.

Even England, our supposedly stanch ally, has not genuinely backed us in our solitary United Nations war, nor assisted us elsewhere.

On the contrary, Marxist England formally recognized the Chinese Communist Government, and collaborates with Marxist France in preventing a European rearmament.

Europe has intimated it no longer wants our martial help.

This is Europe's attitude. Let Europe look out for itself, and see how Europe gets along.

Since, obviously, we stand alone, we should have the wisdom and the courage to act alone.

For our duty is to protect our own people and to foster our own Nation.

Will Samsons of the GOP Pull the Temple Down?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal for December 9, 1950:

WILL SAMSONS OF THE GOP PULL THE TEMPLE DOWN?

The Republican Party is on the very brink of a dangerous action. Next Tuesday is the deadline. On that day all GOP Members of the Senate will meet to decide if they should demand the dismissal of Secretary Acheson as an official act of party policy.

The threat of such a move is most serious. The proposal has been considered by the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate, but the 11 members could not quite decide to take the leap. They referred final decision to the full GOP Senate membership. Meanwhile, even Republicans who have been less hostile to State Department policy are showing a tendency to jump aboard the tumbril. Representative HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, a former Republican national chairman who tried to lead his party along the middle of the road on foreign policy, has introduced a resolution in the House demanding the ouster of Acheson. Senator IVES, of New York, has suddenly gone into a war dance, screaming for the Secretary's scalp.

This hysteria can do infinite harm. The Republican New York Herald Tribune warns of the shocking effect such an action would have on world opinion at a moment when "the Secretary is in the midst of negotiations of the most delicate and far-reaching kind." The paper calls attention to "the single-mindedness with which the British Nation has backed its own envoy," Clement Attlee, in his mission to Washington. Think of the impact on American opinion of Winston Churchill, who vigorously opposes the Labor Party on domestic issues, led a Conservative Party movement to denounce and destroy

Attlee at the moment when he is negotiating on the gravest issues in Washington.

The Courier-Journal has supported Dean Acheson as a man of courage, character, and ability. Even if we did not have faith in him, however, we would regard an official Republican effort to blackjack man out of office at such a moment as an act of shocking and dangerous irresponsibility.

The drive against Acheson is completely negative. What other man would Republican critics put in his place at this juncture, who could command unified national support? What foreign policy would the destroyers of Acheson have the Nation pursue? Many of them who were candidates in November stormed for a "tougher" policy of dealing with the Soviets, while insisting that they represented the party that would certainly keep us out of war. There is no unity of thought on a constructive foreign policy within the Republican Party today. It bids fair to unite only on a course of pure destruction.

Republican strong men seem bent on pulling down the temple of foreign policy over our heads in order to crush one individual, Dean Acheson. Surely there are sober Republican leaders who have not been stampeded by bad news from Korea. Surely such leaders realize that the course of events in Asia and the rest of the world cannot be magically changed by the removal of one Democrat from office. Surely such leaders see that official Republican repudiation of Acheson would leave America standing naked before the world as a nation at war with itself in a moment of infinite danger. Governor Dewey has taken a lead in his statement that "this is not the time for further criticism" of the administration's far eastern policies, with which he has vigorously disagreed in more normal times. It is to be fervently hoped that other Republican leaders will make their voices heard in the wilderness before Tuesday.

The Right To Know—Tell Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of December 8, 1950:

THE RIGHT TO KNOW—TELL CONGRESS

The Senators who demand that President Truman obtain the Senate's "advice and consent" before making any agreements or understandings with Prime Minister Attlee are looking out for their country's interests.

They don't want any more Munichs or Yaltas—any more hole-in-the-wall, secret agreements for which American boys must later die on foreign soil.

They want to know in advance what further commitments are proposed—and so do the American people, already paying a high price in blood and treasure for decisions by "heads of states," without consent of the governed.

An end must be put to the assumption that the prerogative of the President to initiate foreign policy includes ignoring Congress in concluding binding agreements that this Nation subsequently must carry out at whatever cost to it.

The trend of the Attlee-Truman "talks" is lost in double talk.

Attlee's "blood - is - thicker - than - water" speech to the National Press Club was a masterpiece of diplomatic obfuscation.

Great Britain and the United States, Attlee says, are united in a determination to stop Communist aggression but differ as to the place where "emphasis" is to be put.

The leader of a nation only now emerging from the tragic consequences of Munich ought to have learned there is only one way to stop aggression. That is to stop it. Appeasement won't do it.

The British, for mercenary reasons, were willing to shake the bloody hand of Mao Tze-tung, as soon as he gained military control of China. The American people were not.

Attlee now defends his course in Peiping as facing reality. The reality was a heavy British investment in China, and the Crown Colony of Hong Kong, where British subjects have been doing a whale of a business importing and transshipping vital materials for Red China and Russia. At one time Russia was getting more Malayan rubber by this route than the United States was obtaining.

Yet in order to protect its commercial interests Great Britain has been trying to get China's seat in the UN Security Council for the Commies and now wants to sell out the UN by dickering with the Chinese Reds, while they are pressing their aggression in Korea and the UN forces are being pushed back.

The British frame of mind has been clearly revealed in recent statements by British statesmen at home and in last week's debate in the Commons. What it amounts to is this:

Give the Communists all of Asia if they want it, if by so doing they can be persuaded to go on buying and selling with Great Britain.

Attlee says geographical facts must be considered. That's true. Great Britain faces the enemy in only one direction. At its back is the Atlantic Ocean and the might of America.

The United States faces two oceans, with an enemy glowering at it across both of them.

Yet the British—Churchill and his followers, as well as Attlee and his—are determined to convince the United States that its salvation lies in putting all its eggs in the European basket.

The Chinese Communist regime is now fighting in Korea to destroy a state set up as a UN protectorate. That's aggression in any man's dictionary. The Reds have flouted every principle of the UN Charter.

Yet the British Government, while professing to be of one mind with the United States is opposing aggression everywhere, actually condones and abets it in Korea.

Where does that leave the UN? Where does it leave the United States?

The British have talked about our responsibility to assume world leadership. When they get a taste of it, and it doesn't follow the line of their self-interest, they denounce it and seek to depart from it.

Any compromise with Stalin and Mao while the Commies have us on the run in Korea means the end of the United Nations for any useful purpose.

Aggression will have been rewarded.

The fate of Europe at the hands of a vastly strengthened Stalin will then have passed beyond our power to save it.

The American people have a right to know if this is what is being cooked up for them and their children and their children's children before it is signed, sealed, and delivered.

"Truman Doctrine Has Failed"—Lippmann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, friends of the President will not say that Walter Lippmann is an isolationist. However, in an article today he calls the Truman doctrine a failure and a great mistake, which it is, of course. As part of my remarks, I am including the Lippmann article:

WITHDRAWAL AND REEXAMINATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

Mr. Attlee's talks with Mr. Truman will have achieved all that is possible at the present moment if they have averted any of those irreversible decisions which are threatening to break up the Atlantic alliance in Europe and the United Nations front in Asia.

Mr. Attlee came to Washington not only as the Prime Minister of Britain, but as the spokesman of the Commonwealth and of our allies in continental Europe. The reason he came so suddenly is that throughout the world our friends are afraid that to the defeat in Korea we might react blindly and impulsively rather than with foresight and deliberation.

Mr. Attlee came because our allies were afraid, not without provocation from here, that we might jump out of the North Korean frying pan into the fire of a far-eastern war. Were we to do that, the governments which might feel in honor bound to follow us would not be able to carry their peoples with them. Our only ardent ally would be Chiang Kai-shek. The great objective of Soviet diplomacy would then be achieved. The United States would be isolated from its allies and all its power and influence diverted up the bloody blind alley of a far-eastern war.

While the armies are retreating in Korea, the right thing to do and the best thing to do about all the larger questions of policy is to make no irreparable decisions—no far-reaching promises and no wide-ranging threats—under the stress of emotion and in order to relieve, not our hard-pressed army, but our own feelings. Until the military position in Korea is settled one way or another, we cannot reasonably, and in prudence we should not tie our hands by making concessions or by making threats. The time for critical decisions about a larger war or a larger settlement will not come until General MacArthur has consolidated a line inside Korea or has evacuated his forces from Korea.

It cannot possibly help General MacArthur and his troops to enlarge the war. They will not be better off if in addition to the Chinese ground armies they also have to contend with large elements of the Soviet air force and of the Soviet navy. Nor can the military position be retrieved or much improved by conceding now things which would be elements in any general negotiation.

My own view is that our paramount and immediate preoccupation should be the preservation of our forces, and that our aim should be to effect an orderly withdrawal to Japan. Then, with salt water between us and the Chinese-Soviet masses, there will again be a military equilibrium between the

infantry of the Asian mainland and the naval and air power of the United States.

Then, and only then, it seems to me, will it be possible to carry out that reexamination and revision of our global policy which is imperative if we are to avert the disruption of our alliances and the disintegration of the Atlantic community. The defeat in Korea is a warning which, if we heed it, may yet prove to have been our salvation, that the course which we took with the Truman doctrine is based on a fatally wrong estimate of our adversaries, and of our friends, and of ourselves.

Then, too, and only then, I fear, can we repair and restore the fearful damage which our institutions have suffered as a consequence of that great mistake. For our inability to make good the global promises of the Truman doctrine precipitated the fearful quarrel within the Nation and between the parties over where our limited forces should be committed.

In the course of that quarrel the constitutional system for the conduct of United States foreign policy has been so seriously shaken that it is no longer clear where, if anywhere, resides the authority to conduct the foreign relations of the United States. This has caused a profound crisis of confidence, as it would in any nation where the people no longer knew where to look for leadership in time of trouble.

Be Alert—Red Sabotage Threat and Double Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by Fendall Yerxa and Odgen R. Reid, written for the New York Herald Tribune, Inc., and published in the New Orleans, La., Item of December 7, 1950, as follows:

RED SABOTAGE THREAT—REDS AIM TO INFILTRATE STRATEGIC INDUSTRIES

(By Fendall Yerxa and Odgen R. Reid)

The national committee of the Communist Party recently ordered all State party committees to conduct an intensive concentration drive to place party members in heavy industry.

Subversive infiltration of key labor unions is now a top priority.

The national order directed, for example, Communists in New York to join the auto and machine tool unions, those in Ohio to concentrate on the rubber workers, those in California to infiltrate the steel and auto unions.

Communist influence in these and other unions had been beaten down in the last 3 years.

SECRET SQUAD

At about the same time a secret squad of 25 men, known only to the party organizers of the machine-tool industry, was sent into the Midwest to strengthen the grip on this industry.

Earlier, the top leadership of the California district of the party met to study the status of the sabotage concentrations throughout the State.

It was decided that these concentrations must be in areas where they could carry out effective work.

DISCUSSED STRIKES

The meeting discussed the best means for the promulgation and prolonging of strikes and work stoppages, how best to agitate labor disturbances, and finally the ability of their activitists to conduct wide-scale sabotage "should the international position call for it."

Due to the mounting public awareness of the Communist conspiracy, top functionaries on the west coast met within the last 2 weeks to caution members within the ranks of labor above all else not do anything overtly that could bring charges of sabotage against them.

The leaders reiterated, however, that the situation might be drastically changed in the near future and through acts of direct sabotage "we Communists then will have to stand up and be counted."

During the last week at a west coast party meeting a Communist waterfront leader outlined what United States labor could expect from the Russians.

He said "The Soviet Union plans to continue warfare of the Korean type in order to drain United States manpower," adding optimistically that this tactic will eventually turn the people against the Government and they will then be ready to accept the opposition program of the party."

The party is unrelenting in its fight against the opposition of labor leaders in the AFL and CIO. The CIO United Steelworkers of America, one of the bitterest and most successful foes of communism in the labor movement, staged a steel strike last year.

Just before the strike was scheduled to start, the Communirt Party chairman in an eastern State steel region met with units and clubs in the industry.

"Our job," he told them, "is to start a real militant Marxist strike, and begin taking the strike out of the hands of the incompetent labor leaders."

Communist persistence in labor infiltration is based on precise tactics. Orders issued to a Communist club in one of the Nation's largest steel mills in Pittsburgh at one time demonstrated how Communist "fractions" fervently espouse the progressive aims of the union itself, and use them to hoist the political and economic doctrines of communism.

They called for a course of action to achieve greater unity, centering upon the steelworkers union and the CIO.

They urged full support to the 14-point program of demands adopted by the wage policy committee of the steel union, and for backing of the CIO legislative program on housing, rent control, veterans' needs, health program, FEPC.

USED AS BASE

Using the union's program as a base, the club was ordered to campaign to increase Communist Party membership among the most advanced workers in the mill itself, and among the most advanced workers and other section of the people in the community.

To this end, the directive said, each comrade in the club should cultivate a group of the most active, intelligent, and disciplined workers from his shop, department, or union for party building.

The club was ordered to hold frequent Sunday house affairs and forums for propaganda purposes, and to work out with the concentration clubs the issuance and distribution of leaflets at the gates where comrades work.

Regular club meetings were called for every Friday evening, with the executive of three members to meet on alternate Fridays.

By these and other tactics entire unions or their locals have in the past succumbed to Communist control. How effective they can be was revealed with startling effect in 1941, when the Hitler-Stalin pact was in effect, and Communists were engaged in a program of labor sabotage to slow down America's defense program of aid to the enemies of nazism.

The most notable example was the 76-day strike of a CIO United Auto Workers' unit, local 248, under Communist leadership at the Allis-Chalmers Corp. plant at West Allis, Wis., which started on January 22, 1941.

STRIKE PROLONGED

This one carefully planned strike, engineered on the flimsiest excuse, agitated by a nucleus of 50 Communist Party members in the local, was prolonged through rioting, bloodshed, fogging of issues, and threat of personal violence until shortly before Hitler's march into Russia.

The 150-member Communist Party flying squadron in the plant threatened to wreak personal violence on anyone who opposed their designs. Through these tactics, the Communists succeeded in:

Tying up $45,000,000 of defense contracts.

Stopping production on 25 badly needed new destroyers by holding up delivery of their turbines.

Crippling the Ford Motor Co.'s aircraft-engine plant, just then completed, by stalling delivery of essential turbines.

Delaying production of aircraft and parts at Bendix Aviation Corp. and Ingersoll-Rand Co. plants by withholding delivery of Allis-Chalmers vacuum pumps and electrical equipment.

Holding up aircraft-testing operations at Wright and Langley Fields, dependent on Allis-Chalmers for compressors and switch gear units.

Stopping the expansion of aluminum production at the Aluminum Corp. of America and Reynolds Metals Co., which had orders with Allis-Chalmers for production equipment.

The weapon of labor sabotage—the crippling of production in vital industries by fomenting disturbances—has been blunted in recent years by organized labor's vigilant house cleaning.

"There is no question but what the Allis-Chalmers strike was a Communist blow at national defense," says Walter P. Reuther, present president of the UAW.

GONE NOW

But, he adds, "Those people are gone. There could never again be another Allis-Chalmers case. Labor itself has driven the Communists out of most of their power centers in the unions."

But despite the victories of anti-Communist forces, there are still at least three national unions capable of causing major damage through strikes and slow-downs.

Expelled from the CIO for cleavage to Communist Party policies, they still have strong influence in the electrical industry, control of much of the mining of important nonferrous metals, and they dominate a large part of the shipping industry on the west coast and in Hawaii.

FIVE OTHERS

Five other international unions, also expelled from the CIO, are potential trouble spots, though in lesser degree.

One of the three unions with major sabotage potential is the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. Charged by the CIO with taking direct orders from the Communist Party's top leaders, the union today holds approximately 240 contracts representing workers in the mining, smelting and fabrication of copper and nonferrous metals produced in the United States.

Major companies involved are the Anaconda Copper Co., International Nickel, and the American Smelting & Refining Co.

SHIPPING INDUSTRY

Another potential danger spot is in the west coast shipping industry. Here, Harry Bridges' International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, combined with the International Fishermen and Allied Workers of America, was driven out of the CIO in 1950 for Communist adherence.

The ILWU, an affiliate of the Moscow-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions, claims 85,000 members, covering almost all west coast longshoremen and warehousemen in large cities.

This union could, by a general strike, stop almost all west coast shipping. In combination with WFTU, it could cripple much of the shipping of the Atlantic Pact nations.

In time of war, or intensive defense preparation, shipments of war materials may be handled in this country as they have in the past, by Army troops.

Furthermore, in addition to the pressure of public opinion, such a strike would again face opposition from other strong anti-Communist unions, such as the AFL Teamsters and the Seafarers' International Union.

Also strong on the west coast is the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, its 6,500 members found by a CIO investigating committee to be Communist dominated.

This union is faced by the threat of a "raid" by Seafarers in event of a dangerous strike. Its membership is subjected to Coast Guard screening under the new Port Security Act before they can be assigned to ships.

ELECTRICAL UNION

Strong Communist influence in the critical electrical and electronics industry has been whittled down. Last fall the CIO expelled as Communist dominated its United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America.

It was replaced with the International Union of Electrical Workers.

In subsequent representation elections, the IUE defeated the ousted UE by more than two to one in major plants.

However, the latter still represents about half of the production workers in some 40 General Electric Co. plants, and about 17,000 members in 20 Westinghouse Electrical Corp. plants where the IUE has 44,000.

STRONG POSITION

This strength in the anti-Communist IUE would make it more difficult for the UE to stir up a successful political or sabotage strike in these industries.

But it is in the position to substantially hurt the defense effort through the use of the sabotage strike weapon.

One other ousted union, the American Communications Association, represents 9,000 to 10,000 communications workers. Their ability to run off a sabotage strike in wartime is problematical because much of their crucial work can be carried out by supervisory workers.

TWENTY-EIGHT THOUSAND SCATTERED

There are approximately 28,000 Communist Party members well-scattered among American trade-unions, including those under right-wing leadership.

Many of them, single-handed, could try to precipitate "economic" or "grievance" issues which could lead to a strike, and are in the position to carry out physical sabotage on vital machinery within their shops, or to wreak damage on large war plants by arson or explosives.

Weeding such suspects out of their jobs, even when they are known and their outright discharge is desirable, can be a problem for company officials.

An attempt to discharge a worker on the charge that he is untrustworthy is apt to meet resistance even by loyal union leaders.

Seldom are union officials in on the loyalty investigations, and they demand to be convinced that a suspect's discharge is really sought for loyalty reasons—that such a charge is not being used as a mask to get rid of a worker for legitimate union activities.

OFFERS ANSWER

To this problem, Walter Reuther, out of his long experience in fighting communism, furnishes a possible solution.

The UAW president believes an answer might be found in a regional organization of review boards, made up of management, public representatives, and, most important of all, a representative from labor itself.

These boards, he believes, could review individual cases in closed session if necessary, and recommend that persons be removed from critical areas and placed elsewhere.

RIGHTS PROTECTED

"By this method," Mr. Reuther says, "qualified labor representatives could go before the union membership and say quite frankly, 'we have reviewed all the aspects of this case, and we are satisfied that this man should be removed, not because of his union activities, but because he constitutes a threat to security.'

"With labor itself supporting the move, it would be more difficult for the Communists to stir up dissension over side issues, and furthermore civil liberties and the rights of the affected person to make his living in a less critical post would be protected."

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include another article from the New Orleans Item, of December 7, 1950, giving a partial list of Red double talk, as follows:

HERE IS PARTIAL LIST OF RED DOUBLE TALK

"Aesopian language" is ideological double talk in which Communist communications are written.

The name derives from the method devised from Aesop, the Greek slave, to criticize his masters without appearing to be disrespectful.

With Aesopian language of confusion, Communists can issue orders and policy statements without disclosing their traitorous meaning to anyone but indoctrinated. Communists, who clearly understand them.

Aesopian language does not lend itself to literal translation of words and phrases. Nevertheless there are a few expressions that can be interpreted.

Mass organization—front organization established by Communists to further their own ends, or non-Communist organizations undermined and usurped by Communists.

Trotskyism—ultra-radical communism, an epithet often used against party heretics of any hue.

Chauvinism—loyalty to any creed other than communism.

Right deviationism—Belief in nonviolent development toward socialism.

Socialism—Sovietization.

Historic mission—revolution.

Dropped out of the party—sent on a secret mission.

Visitors—Russian officials.

Members at large—members who do not belong to any unit organization.

Activists—rank and file members.

Functionaries—leaders.

Fraction—unit for infiltration of a mass organization or union.

Concentration work—mobilization for sabotage or subversive missions.

Friends—a broad term often used in speaking of Soviet secret police.

Pulaski Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a speech which I delivered at a most impressive meeting at Ware, Mass., on Pulaski Day when many leading Polish-American organizations and citizenry in general in Massachusetts joined in a magnificent tribute to General Pulaski and the Polish cause.

It should be clear to every thoughtful person that a large number of splendid, good, and loyal Americans are deeply aroused about the continued suppression of the Polish people. Other nations also have been and are being oppressed and overrun by the puppet forces of the Soviet Union. Other nations are the victims of subtle, or not so subtle, penetration and infiltration. Freedom itself is in grave jeopardy. These issues can never be compromised. They must be fearlessly met. They must be met now if we are not, by appeasement and Fabian delay, to suffer the destruction of our liberties and the emasculation of the free world.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of various Polish-American organizations, and fellow citizens and friends of the radio audience, it is a high privilege indeed for me as your Representative in the Congress of the United States to join you in this most impressive celebration of Pulaski Day.

It is fitting that we should join together here this afternoon in such large numbers to pay our heartfelt tribute of respect and affection to such a great Polish patriot and such a great friend of our own country, and also by our presence and declarations rededicate ourselves with high courage and unyielding resolution to the exalted principles and the lofty purposes by which he lived and died.

Let me heartily congratulate all those who are responsible for these noteworthy exercises. There has never been a time in the history of our country when the need for stalwart Americanism, high ideals, and dauntless spirit was greater than it is today. Everywhere liberty is under challenge by ruthless dictators. Everywhere freedom is being assailed and attacked by power-crazed tyrants. Everywhere conspiracies are being carried out against democracy and justice, and unless we move quickly in defense of our priceless free institutions everything will be lost.

How inspiring it has been to me to observe the reactions of our Polish-American friends to the dangers of the present. On every hand, through the Polish-American Congress, through many organizations of persons of Polish blood, through countless leaders, you have taken up the battle against totalitarian dictatorship and in defense of the principles of America.

I cannot find words adequately to compliment you upon the sterling patriotism and tireless unselfish devotion which you have displayed in fighting against the great menace of human slavery which is presently overshadowing the world. It has been a high privilege for me to have taken part in this campaign to preserve the American way of

life and to redeem the cause of freedom throughout the world.

Not long ago, on the eleventh anniversary of the iniquitous attack upon Poland, I spoke in the House of Representatives to remind the American people of the tragic events which led up to the betrayal of Poland, and to serve notice upon the Soviet Union that true Americans would not cease to agitate the sacred cause of Poland until Poland had again taken its place as a self-respecting member of the world community of nations.

We cannot possibly measure the unspeakable infamy by which the noble Polish people have become enslaved, the first in the then free world to feel the bitter sting of the tyrant's lash in World War II. At the time Poland was a brave, free nation embracing a peace-seeking, liberty-loving, devoted Christian people with the rich tradition of loyalty to human freedom. It was brutally assaulted by international brigands and racketeers who disregarded all the laws of God and man and broke all the express terms of existing and valid nonaggression treaties in order to encompass the liquidation of a democratic Poland and ruthlessly confine its people behind the iron curtain.

There was no color of legality to this shameful act. Poland at the time was a member in good standing of the League of Nations and a faithful ally of France and Great Britain. Her people had struggled long and sacrificed bitterly to establish their free government. Yet without provocation and without warning Hitler's bestial hordes attacked defenseless Poland on September 1, 1939, just as the Soviet-led, Moscow-directed forces of North Korea attacked the helpless democratic-minded people of South Korea about 3 months ago.

As I said in my speech on the floor of the House, the duplicity and treachery behind this savage attack on Poland constitutes one of the blackest pages in world history. As a result Poland was put on the carving block and cut up between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. Instead of protesting and nullifying this unconscionable act as all decent-minded nations should have done, it was ratified and approved virtually in its entirety at the Yalta conference. Thus our own country became a party, at least so far as the Russian Government and the rest of the world was concerned, to the dismemberment of Poland and the enslavement of her people by the Soviets.

But I have taken the position, and I will continue inflexibly to take the position that this action which is deprecated by all real freedom-loving Americans never had the official or legal sanction of this Government. It was a mere executive agreement never ratified by the United States Senate. As such it is illegal, unconstitutional, and not binding upon the United States. No American official was authorized to agree to the shameful abandonment to a cruel enslavement by the Soviets of our warm friends, faithful allies, and noble people of Poland. We must never cease our activities until we have canceled and annulled the provisions of that incredible and unconscionable document.

You are fully aware of the current world situation. One great aggressor against freedom has been despatched by force of arms and in that glorious victory boys of Polish blood rendered a magnificent service second to none. But has that fact stopped aggression in the world. It has not. Hitler is gone but a new and more widely spread and subtly organized aggressor lifts his ugly head and casts a cloud upon freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. Hitler has been liquidated, but Stalin has taken his place preaching the gospel of hate against his fellowman and carrying the torch of rebellion, insurrection, and conspiracy to the far corners of the earth.

It is the everlasting credit and glory of the Polish people that they have never willingly surrendered their rights, they have never forfeited their freedom, they have never bowed to enslavement, they have never ceased their resistance to tyranny. To the contrary, this brave, courageous people is still asserting the sovereignty of their nation, still working for liberation from Russian bondage, still ready to sacrifice to recover the liberties which were stolen away from them by a shameless perfidy and ruthless armed might. The united nation of Poland stands today before the whole world proclaiming its independence to all, reiterating its determination to strive and fight until its freedom has been regained.

We welcomed our Polish allies during the war, we are proud of their loyal, unswerving allegiance to the ideals of democracy and freedom which we ourselves profess. We are grateful for their loyal support of our cause and for the association which we have had with them in fighting against the common enemies of freedom.

So today, in the name of that freedom, in the name of our American democracy, in the name of the justice of the living God whom we revere, in the name of our Nation and in the name of every decent principle of civilized man, let us reiterate our loyalty to Poland and her sacred cause of liberty. Let us express our determination that she will soon be liberated from the oppressor and be restored to her place among free nations.

Let us renounce and reject once and forever the unconscionable agreements by which she was consigned to Soviet domination. On this great anniversary of one of her immortal heroes, let all true Americans rally to her side, encouraging her leaders and her sons and daughters who are still fighting to recapture their liberty, pledging our assistance to them in their struggle for independence, offering our friendship, our support, our help to them in this hour of their great trial.

And so, my friends, let us accept this mighty challenge that has been flung from the Kremlin against the very existence of the democratic way of life. Let us maintain an armed strength here in our Nation that will keep our country secure and that will enable us through union with other freedom-loving nations in the United Nations and elsewhere to move speedily to the protection of democracy and freedom and justice and human liberty.

And may the day soon come, pray God, when peace may dawn upon this sorry world. When the evils of totalitarianism shall be removed forever. When Poland is freed from the chains of slavery and restored to her rightful status as a free and independent nation.

With courage in our hearts let us be rededicated today to the great and noble purposes of Pulaski and go forward fearlessly to establish a genuine lasting just peace on this earth.

Address at Dinner in Honor of Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address at dinner in honor of Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock:

Dr. Murdock, Madam Chairman, and ladies, we are gathered together tonight in honor of Myrtle Cheney Murdock, wife of JOHN MURDOCK, Representative from Arizona in the Congress of the United States, who has made one of the most outstanding contributions of recent years to the recorded history of this great country of ours. This she has done with a devotion, a consecration, which adds a quality to the work itself as rare as it is beautiful.

Myrtle Cheney Murdock, we who are gathered here, thank you with all our hearts for your beautiful book which will preserve for our children and their children's children the story of a simple man of Italy—a man of great genius, who considered it the supreme privilege of his life to give himself for 25 years to the beautifying of the great Capitol Building of his adopted country.

Many books have been written presenting the lives of the world's leaders, artists, legislators, revolutionists, patriots. Few authors have been able to make the intangibles of a life so positive, so real, so precious as you have done in your beautiful book. In these pages Constantino Brumidi, forgotten artist, passionate seeker after freedom, loyal citizen of the country he sought in his great need, lives once again.

This has not been a simple task. It is one that has required the same quality of consecration and service that were his. You have had to seep yourself in Constantino Brumidi. You have had to immerse yourself in the material made available to you about his life and works. This you have done with a truly beautiful and receptive spirit few of us know.

How magnificent has been your reaction to the challenge of your own artist's soul to paint a true and ardent picture of the man to whom we as Americans owe so much. Thanks to your eagerness to have justice done, recognition is at last being given the great artist who refused work which would have brought him national acclaim and financial ease, saying: "I have no longer any desire for fame and fortune. My one ambition and my daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country on earth in which there is liberty." You have used consummate skill and deep humanity in the doing.

As one of those privileged to serve the people of this country where liberty still lives as a Representative in the Congress, I thank you from my heart. Today's children and their children's children have been given a priceless gift by your long years of consecration.

Those who come to the Capitol will no longer ask unanswerable questions. They will be told, possibly before they even come, of the political refugee, a man who, at the age of 50, began the work of translating the principles upon which these States became a Nation into visible symbols of rare beauty, for all the world to see.

They, too, will be grateful.

I cannot refrain from my own heaviness of heart that one of Mr. Brumidi's most accessible murals is no longer in the place where he painted it. Upon orders of the then superintendent of construction, in the all-too-short period of 6 weeks the Cornwallis-Washington scene became a part of the then new "Hall of the House of Representatives." For nearly a century it has been in the House Chamber. Now it is gone. I have not had opportunity since our return to ascertain what has been done with it. I trust that the information given me by the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. Lynn, before the Congress recessed in September, that it was to be rebacked and transferred to a suitable spot was accurate.

Ladies, this beautiful book of Mrs. Murdock's is very timely indeed, for there is a spirit abroad which has no regard for tradition, no consideration for the fact that the farther out the branches of a tree reach the more secure, the deeper must go the roots.

To me, the complete remodeling of the two Chambers in the Capitol because the

roofs above had become unsafe have a tragic significance. For over 90 years, the laws of our great Nation have been made in those two Halls. Perhaps they were not beautiful in modern eyes. Perhaps those comfortable chairs were needed both in the gallery and on the floor. Perhaps the beautiful stained-glass seals built into the old ceiling interfered with the House acoustics. Yet—I would have you go to that Chamber and see its present ceiling with what has been called an NRA eagle in the center and its glaring hidden lights. The excuse for it all was, first of all, the insecurity of the roof above, and then the poor acoustics.

I am informed that the material of which this new ceiling has been constructed is one of the modern sound improving products full of holes that absorb sound. But even these holes are lost under eight coats of paint.

And the beautiful old stained-glass seals? They are boxed up somewhere, awaiting the designation of State delegations as to their disposal.

Oh—there are State seals in the present ceiling—plaster seals, painted in crude colors, quite unrecognizable as cheap in appearance as the new ceiling lights—rosettes that you can find duplicated in almost any new motion-picture house.

Yes; I feel bitterly about this whole remodeling business which was brought to the House for action as a rider on an appropriation bill. With two or three others from both sides of the aisle I protested it as strongly as I could. But it was of no use. I continued the battle to retain the lighted stained glass seals—I pressed for the preservation of the Brumidi mural and did not accept defeat even when the workmen took over in 1949. Later I was forced to.

Yes; there will be a certain dignity in the remodeled hall, even though the gallery and the ceiling cannot but reflect a confused atmosphere of both boudoir and cinema.

Let us hope the glare of the lights will be corrected, for I can assure you we found it quite intolerable last session. Let us hope also that the eight coats of paint on the sound-absorbent ceiling will not defeat the entire acoustical purpose of the change.

I can assure you that I shall salute the ghost of the Cornwallis-Washington mural each day that I am privileged to serve the people of our beloved country as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Tonight it is my privilege to express my gratitude and that of thousands upon thousands to this lovely woman who is our honored guest. Thanks to her one thing is certain: If by another grave error of judgment of the importance and the value to our future are the visible evidences of our past, congressional committees should take steps that would cover up or destroy the beauty that exists in the Capitol because a humble refugee consecrated the last 25 years of his gifted life to filling the building with beauty, there is a poignant record of the man and his work, wrought by one who has written in the preface of her book:

"I am simply the wife of a western Congressman who has been stirred by the patriotism of the Italian refugee-artist, Brumidi; by his exquisite decorations on the walls and ceilings of our Capitol Building of the United States; by his persistent effort in the face of blinding criticism; and finally by the lack of recognition characterized by his unmarked burial place."

Yes; Myrtle Cheney Murdock, you are indeed all that your response to these things indicates. Yours is a beauty-loving soul with a deep reverence for man's capacity for—and his need of beauty in his long trek from unconscious perfection to perfected consciousness.

Was it perhaps out of the deep anguish of those days in 1943 that your heart learned beyond all shadow of possible doubt that life is an endless stream of beauty if we but make it so?

Was it this knowledge that challenged your gallant heart to search out the life and works of this man from Italy—and give to the people of this our country an unforgettable, indestructible account of beauty?

Whatever the source of your desire, whatever the urge of soul that inspired you, we, and all who come after, do most earnestly thank you.

Tighter Censorship Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. NOLAND
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in reading the partisan press it is often coincidental how a question asked on one page of a newspaper is well answered on another page. Following are two articles from a Washington newspaper:

TIGHTER CENSORSHIP NEEDED
(By Peter Edson)

Events in Korea are creating demands for a tighter code of military censorship. There never was a war in which one side told so much about what it was doing while the other side was so secretive.

United States communiqués have revealed troop movements and troop positions. Result has been that the Communist forces haven't needed an intelligence service. One agent, sitting in New York or Washington and reading the papers, could easily have cabled back to Manchuria or Moscow all the Red generals might want to know.

Every American punch has been telegraphed ahead to the enemy. Advance notices were put out when the United Nations forces crossed the thirty-eighth parallel and when the last offensive was started—the one that was to win the war. Except possibly for the handling of the Inchon invasion, the element of surprise has been almost completely lacking in American major operations.

Contrast that with the Communist operations. They have told nothing. Even the Chinese Communist troops have not been told the truth about whom they were fighting, nor what for. While there is no desire to establish this kind of iron-clad censorship over UN operations, it has given the Reds tremendous advantage.

Press and radio correspondents at the front and at General MacArthur's headquarters in Tokyo have operated under what has been called voluntary censorship. The code of instructions, as issued at Eighth Army headquarters in Korea, contained this key paragraph:

"This is not an uncensored war any more than the last war was uncensored. The only difference is there is no military censorship. The Supreme Commander expects the correspondents to impose self-censorship and to refrain from publishing matter that violates security, endangers operations, gives aid and comfort to the enemy, and weakens our war effort."

Before his departure from office, Defense Secretary Louis Johnson sent a cable to General MacArthur's headquarters, directing him to establish military censorship at Tokyo and in the field. Then at the end of the directive was a sentence to the effect of, "Your opinions on the foregoing are requested."

The request took all the punch out of the directive. Word came back to the Pentagon that its censorship suggestion was very interesting, but that Tokyo thought the present system was working out very well as it was. So nothing was done.

In final analysis, any directive to establish tighter censorship must come from President Truman. In World War II, the Office of Censorship under Byron Price was set up just 5 days after Pearl Harbor. It provided for voluntary press and radio censorship, too, but there were much stricter rules for the military to follow.

Also, there was censorship of mail and all telecommunications. Preliminary planning for reestablishing this type of censorship has begun. There has been reluctance to impose these controls. Realization that this is a war, and not a simple police action, will make tighter censorship necessary.

WHITE HOUSE ORDER REPORTED MACARTHUR GAGGED

The White House was reported today to have called upon Gen. Douglas MacArthur and the entire Far East command to make no further comments on the progress of the Korean war.

It was reported the message was phrased as a request and addressed to all military commanders in the United States and overseas. But it was reported to have been so worded that General MacArthur, or anybody else receiving it, would interpret it as an order.

No official reason was given for the cease-talk directive, but it was assumed to be an outgrowth of resentment expressed by the British and the French at statements which General MacArthur has made to the public of this country and Europe through newspaper correspondents.

In particular, General MacArthur has irked Europeans by his statements that the war in Korea is global in nature and that if the free world fails to meet the challenge of communism there, it must fight it out on the battlefields of Europe.

The directive had not been confirmed as of noon today by the White House.

Our Enemy Isn't China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by William Philip Simms taken from the Washington Daily News, which analyzes the Chinese situation very well. It follows:

OUR ENEMY ISN'T CHINA
(By William Philip Simms)

(NOTE.—For 40 years William Philip Simms covered world affairs, the last 30 of them as foreign editor of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. Now in semiretirement, he writes only when he feels the urge. The worsening situation in Asia has drawn him back to the typewriter to produce the liveliest, most penetrating analysis we have seen of the political and military crisis now facing us.)

Under no circumstances should the United States let itself be sucked into an all-out war with Communist China.

China is not our enemy. China, as such, is not attacking the United States. Soviet Russia is.

Russia is using China as a weapon against us, just as she used Red Korea. Her aim is to wear us down until she can wade in and finish us off.

We should not fall for so transparent a trick.

Through the United Nations if we can, but directly if we must, we should tell Stalin once and for all that we won't be played for a sucker.

We are already in a shooting war with Russia. It is foolish and dangerous to pretend otherwise.

The war is global and we are everywhere on the defensive. Russia is on the offensive.

SEVENTY BILLION DOLLARS ONLY A STARTER

Already, since VJ-day, this war has cost us $70,000,000,000, for Greece, Turkey, Korea, the Marshall plan, armaments and whatnot, and that seems only a starter.

From now on our own defense program may cost us almost that much each year. The annual bill will be far bigger if we get involved in a real war with China.

And having won such a war—if we won it—we would still be confronted by Soviet Russia and her other stooges. Beating China would be like cutting off one tentacle in a battle with a monstrous octopus.

Russia is the real instigator of the world-wide plot against America and other democratic nations. Until we have an understanding with Russia—not with Red Korea, Red China, or any other mere Soviet agent—this disastrous business will go on and on.

I am not talking of a preventive war. I am talking of a genuine understanding, one way or the other, with the world's prime trouble maker, Russia.

We should stop pretending—as we have been, in and out of the UN—that we don't know what Russia is up to. We should make it absolutely plain that we do know, and that we won't tolerate it forever.

RUSSIA HAS STARTED WORLD WAR III

Let's quit kidding ourselves. Russia has started world war III. The question is whether we can stop it before its flames consume everything. And that question's answer can't be found in Korea, China, Indochina, India, Greece, Turkey, or anywhere else but Moscow.

The fact that Russia is directing Koreans, Chinese, and others to do her dirty work only makes her own guilt greater.

That's why we should tell Russia bluntly that, if she forces us into a major armed conflict, we will carry the fight direct to her instead of slaughtering her poor dupes, the Chinese coolies.

Russia, of course, doesn't care how many Chinese might be killed. Lenin and Stalin murdered millions of Russians to build their own power.

The Kremlin probably would be glad to see American forces killing millions of Chinese and dropping atomic bombs on Chinese cities. That would weaken China, make her more amenable to Moscow, and deplete our stock of bombs.

VICTORY WOULD BE WORSE THAN WORTHLESS

So a successful war against China would not advance the free world's cause 1 inch. And who can guarantee that it would be successful? All-out war with China—a country of 450,000,000 people—could last for many years, cost us tens of thousands of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars. And when we won it, if we ever did, the victory would be worse than worthless.

Red Russia's aim today, as always, is to foment wars, revolutions, and civil strife in all non-Communist countries, meanwhile staying clear herself and husbanding her own strength.

That's why Stalin gave Hitler the green light in 1939. He hoped that Germany, Italy, and Japan would fight England, France, and America until both sides were exhausted, leaving Russia to take over the world.

And that scheme might have worked, if the Nazi and Communist rogues had not fallen out.

Today, save for Russia, America is the only really great world power. Only America blocks the Kremlin's way to world domination.

So Stalin is sicking everybody he can on to America, bent on wearing us down while Russia, safe on the sidelines with 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 fresh troops active and in reserve, awaits the hour for striking at us with almost complete assurance of success.

WHAT WE SHOULD TELL RUSSIA

These are the facts that America and other free nations need to face. And they should face them boldly in the UN and lay them on the table in the Kremlin. If Russia forces us to choose between the peace we want and a war we do not seek, we should tell Russia:

"We will not fight your puppet China. We will use all the strength we have, and all the added strength we can build, against the Russian source and center of this conspiracy against the world."

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio talk made recently at the invitation of the Polish-American Congress. It follows:

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I bring warm personal greetings to my American friends of Polish descent in Connecticut and throughout the country.

At the same time I speak to all other citizens who perhaps do not realize what a huge wrong has been done to a country and to a people who were our staunch allies in the last great conflict and with whom we in America have had an historic tradition of friendship and mutual help.

In this trembling hour when America and the free nations of the world stand in mortal peril, in this critical period when international conditions threaten another world conflict every American should be made aware of what happens when millions of free people are handed over to the miseries of a police state.

First, let me tell our fellow Americans briefly the tragic facts in the recent history of Poland. Five years ago last February a conference among President Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Josef Stalin was held in the Crimea.

This conference resulted in what we call the Yalta agreement. This agreement was not a treaty. It was never presented to our Senate for ratification. It was only an agreement between the three heads of the participating Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia.

Here is what the Yalta agreement did to Poland:

It made Stalin a gift of more than 47 percent of that unhappy country. It enabled Stalin to change what remained of helpless Poland into what is virtually a province of Soviet Russia. Soviet officials, parading in the guise of Poles, now govern Poland in accordance with Moscow's instructions.

The Yalta agreement contained some pious statements to the effect that "free and unfettered elections" should be held in Poland as soon as possible. Stalin has made only scant pretense of living up to the Yalta terms. Moving into a country of 35,000,000 people who were betrayed with the help of the United States, Stalin has never acted in Poland except to the advantage of the Soviet Union. It is quite obvious now that his motives at Yalta were simply to acquire possession of Poland for military, political, and economic purposes. Poland is the "keystone of the European arch." The Kremlin was determined to possess that keystone. To our shame we cooperated in giving him his wish.

To make Yalta possible we abandoned the Atlantic Charter. We ourselves acquiesced in an act of aggression against our historic friends. Now in 1950 we need as never before to restore the confidence and friendship that has for so long existed between the Polish and American peoples.

Among the nations which Russia was permitted to subjugate none contains a more proud and a more independent and spirited people than Poland. To the eternal credit of the Polish people they have refused to bow to the will of the Kremlin. Only recently we heard that the Polish Army was still defiantly marching to mass on Sunday morning in military formation as part of its regular exercises. Poles have never been submissive. The flame of freedom burns as fiercely in the Polish breast as in the American.

During World War II Poland suffered greater devastation than any other country. Out of a prewar population of 35,000,000, Poland lost 6,000,000 which is more than the combined battle casualties of Great Britain, Russia, and the United States. How ironic it is that Poland which was the first nation to fight Hitler and which suffered the most in the war that followed should have been denied even a part in the postwar settlement which determined its territorial status.

How tragic that Polish schools and colleges and the Polish legal system are being so ruthlessly transformed to suit the Soviet pattern. The traditional freedom of thought which bred one of the world's finest cultures is being threatened every day. How long can even the great vitality of the Polish spirit continue to stand up against the Kremlin's steady policy of repression and terrorization? This question is of particular significance to us in America because many fine citizens of Poland have, through the years, come to our country to lend their talents, their industry and their loyalty to the development of this great Nation and to become a precious part of the social fabric of America. It has a particular significance because, through the years, there have existed strong cultural and political ties between the people of America and the people of Poland. It has a particular significance because during World War II the members of the Polish armed forces fought with heroic determination to vanquish the common enemy. They fought with conspicuous valor in the skies over England. They fought at Narvik. They fought on the Maginot line. They fought with stubborn fortitude in Tobruk. They fought in the terrible hell of Monte Cassino. On the slopes of this Italian town alone 3,600 of these brave men gave their lives. They gave their lives and in so doing they saved the lives of many of the Britishers, in the Eighth Army of General Alexander; they saved the lives of many Frenchmen in the army of General Juin. The gave their lives in a common cause. But they have not reaped the fruits of a common victory. In the eloquent and tragic words which form the title of the book written by the former Polish Ambassador to the United States, Jan Ciechanowski, they suffered "Defeat in Victory."

Now that the future of America is so obviously threatened by the menace of Soviet aggression it is imperative that Americans be made aware of what Soviet ruthlessness and Soviet cruelty really can mean. I have repeatedly tried to call the attention of Americans to what has happened in Poland as a lesson in the brutality and callousness of Red Russian policy. This summer I drew attention again to the Katyn Massacre which

is one of the grossest crimes of modern history.

Twelve thousand Polish officers and men were put to death in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk in the U. S. S. R. in 1939 or 1940. Last January I attempted to get the Secretary of Defense to make public to Americans the documents dealing with that unconscionable massacre. I was informed that it would be unwise to disclose the facts at that time. Again in July I wrote to the Secretary of the Army informing him that in view of the recent developments in Korea and the tense situation in many other areas of the globe, I believe that it is paramount that the American people and the people of every country be officially and fully informed of this Polish tragedy which was perpetrated by men of the Soviet Army. Informed persons claim that the time of the deaths and the Russian-manufactured ropes binding the hands of the slain Poles prove that the slaughter could only have taken place when the Red armies controlled the area.

The American people have, as have all peace-loving people, been reluctant to accept stories of atrocities since so many reports have eventually been proven groundless. But here we have such an extraordinary case of the mass murder of thousands, a case which, I understand, has been thoroughly investigated not only by competent American officers, but also by Swiss neutrals and the German military. I believe it would be a service to the American people and to the interests of the United States as well as to the cause of freedom everywhere if these reports were now released for the judgment of mankind.

However, it is not only to the martyred dead but to the martyred living that American public opinion should be directed. There is another pressing problem of which our people in America should be made fully aware. On September 1, I wrote to the Attorney General of the United States to urge that this problem be solved without further delay. My reference was to the 18,000 Polish veterans now living in Europe who under the terms of Public Law 555 are entitled to be admitted with their wives and children to this country. I worked hard for that law. The Congress enacted it on June 30 of this year. Yet through maddening red tape and delay the provisions of the law are not yet being carried out.

The admission of these heroic Polish veterans is authorized only until June 30 of next year. Our Government authorities must move without further delay to make sure that these 18,000 men who fought as our allies will in accordance with the expressed intentions of the Congress come to this country before the law expires. I shall continue to press the authorities to speed action on this important matter.

As I told the Congress when I urged passage of that law, these Polish veterans have given ample proof that they deserve to become citizens of the United States. Their skills, their vitality, their love of honor, their hatred of slavery, their indomitable courage, their spiritual fervor, will constitute a mighty contribution to American life. The ideals which have sustained them during their long years of combat and loneliness, of pain and privation will help America in her hour of trial. They will inject into our national bloodstream the kind of physical, mental, and moral attributes which we associate with our own beloved land.

This is a way in which we are making atonement for the wrong that we committed at Yalta. By this gesture to our gallant wartime ally we give additional recognition to the cause of freedom. Thus we partially redeem our solemn pledges. By this means we reassure the Polish people as to our intentions and in so doing help ourselves to achieve that enduring peace with freedom so devoutly desired by the American people.

May this act of the American people be only one of many by which we will, in the fullness of time, restore the confidence of the people of Poland and aid them to regain the freedom for which they long and to which their contributions to the common cause of humanity so richly entitle them. In Poland's noble 1,000-year history, this suffering nation has endured martyrdom many times. Yet the Polish spirit refuses to be crushed. The admiration of America for this gallant Polish spirit and the conscience of America over the betrayal at Yalta must manifest themselves decisively in Poland's behalf.

The Airplane—Our One Hope for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the news in the daily papers conveys the crisis into which we have suddenly been plunged.. The threat of a third world war is a very sobering fact.

Whatever happens in Korea, the United States must hasten preparations to defend itself and to help its allies of the free world.

Those are the words in Newsweek of a distinguished general who has served the United States and the cause of democracy in two World Wars. He is Gen. Carl Spaatz, USAF, retired.

General Spaatz was Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force until his retirement in June 1948, when he was succeeded by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg. He is one of the heroes of our armed services, and a veteran who can speak with wisdom based on long experience. No man alive today knows better than General Spaatz what air power has accomplished, and what can be accomplished with air power.

In his article in the current issue of Newsweek, General Spaatz writes:

Perhaps we can learn from defeat in far Northern Korea the lesson which victory in the Second World War and in Southern Korea failed to teach us in a convincing way. Simply stated, the lesson is this: The United States must rely primarily upon air power, in which it excels, rather than upon manpower, in which it is excelled by its enemies, actual and potential, when compelled to take the offensive to protect its essential interest.

Mr. Speaker, General Spaatz is well aware that in the face of the present danger we must build up both our Army and our Navy. We must husband our manpower and our resources. But, in words of General Spaatz which any thinking American must readily appreciate—

The United States, even if fully supported by its western allies, will never be able to place enough men in the field to match the manpower available to eastern Communist powers.

Our superiority to oriental manpower is our air power. If we should be forced to fight China as a result of the Chinese Communist invasion of Korea, we should not try to conquer China by a war on land. It would be far wiser to destroy strategic targets in China by air until the Chinese were convinced that further resistance was futile.

The German will to resist was destroyed by air power; so was the Japanese. The Chinese will to resist could also be so destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, the superior quality and weight of American air power, offensive and defensive, is our one hope for victory, and for survival if a struggle between freedom and slavery lies ahead. As General Spaatz warns us:

Slavery may win if we consent to meet it on its own terms with its own methods and weapons. But it cannot win if we use the means and weapons in which we are unbeatable.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by Gen. Carl Spaatz, United States Air Force, retired, in the December 11, 1950, issue of Newsweek.

The article is as follows:

It is too soon to foresee the immediate consequences of United Nations and United States reverses in Korea. If a defense line can be established and defended against the oncoming hordes of Red Chinese along the waist of the peninsula or somewhere below it, disaster can be averted. If the military situation can be stabilized, diplomatic negotiations can proceed.

And this does not seem impossible unless UN troops are in an even more desperate predicament than dispatches from Korea indicate. Mountainous terrain in all Korea is favorable for defense The air is still under UN control. So are the seas at both ends of the land front. A large enough force to man a defense line in considerable depth and enough equipment to hold off even an infinitely more numerous enemy seem to be getting out of the northern debacle.

However, it is possible that all of Korea will be lost. Such a loss would be a major disaster to United States arms. But so was Pearl Harbor and so were Kasserine Pass and the Bulge. Yet we survived them. Whatever happens in Korea, the United States must hasten preparations to defend itself and to help its allies of the free world.

Perhaps we can learn from defeat in far Northern Korea the lesson which victory in the Second World War and in Southern Korea failed to teach us in a convincing way. Simply stated, the lesson is this: The United States must rely primarily upon air power, in which it excels, rather than upon manpower, in which it is excelled by its enemies, actual, and potential, when compelled to take the offensive to protect its essential interests.

This does not mean that the United States can disband its Army; on the contrary, it must build a considerably larger ground force than it now has. Its allies also must rearm rapidly. Neither does it mean that the Navy can be reduced. What it does mean is that the Army should be used to supplement and implement air power. And the Navy should be used primarily to keep sea lanes open, but also to exploit opportunities for coastal bombardment and limited aerial penetration, the functions it has performed so well in and around Korea.

No American soldier should ever be used to invade China or any other part of the populous Orient except to accomplish the limited objective of securing air bases. The reason for this is obvious. The United States even if fully supported by its western allies, will never be able to place enough men in the field to match the manpower available to eastern Communist powers. Conversely, no

eastern Communist power is far enough advanced technologically to match the United States in air power or to protect itself from American air power.

If this country is forced to fight China as a result of the Red Chinese invasion of Korea, it should carry the fight to the Chinese by air. Strategic targets—industries, communications, and transport—should be pounded from available bases until the Chinese are convinced that further resistance is futile.

Japan was beaten by air power based on the Marianas in the last war. Germany was in the process of crumbling even before the Normandy invasion, and eventually would have fallen of its own weight of industrial rubble if this pounding had continued. China could be beaten in the same way. So could any nation subjected to continuous bombing from the air. Use of the atom bomb would hasten capitulation but wouldn't alter essentially the process of capitulation.

The same strategy should be used against Soviet Russia if war with the homeland of the Reds becomes unavoidable. Here the problem would be complicated by the existance of a large and presumably strong air force, supplemented by antiaircraft and radar installations, and by more distant bases. Moreover, the Russians might be capable of retaliatory bombing of American targets. But these complications would be overcome by the superior quality and weight of American air power, offensive and defensive.

In the struggle between freedom and slavery which lies ahead, and in which we are in fact already engaged, slavery may win if we consent to meet it on its own terms with its own methods and weapons. But it cannot win if we use the means and weapons in which we are unbeatable.

Letter to the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith excerpts from a letter I sent to the farmers in my district during the month of December:

DEAR FARMER: On the 7th of December, 9 years ago, our country faced one of the greatest perils ever before seen in the history of our Nation. Today we again see war clouds boiling up over the horizon even more darker than those we faced at that time. We as Americans, wanted neither the first, second, or now a third world war which can only bring misery and suffering to many millions of people. We had no choice in the two former occasions and today Moscow, and Moscow alone, holds the key to peace. We have tried every honorable way possible to maintain peace but these have been unheeded by the Communist tyrants of Moscow.

If we are forced today to bear arms with our Allies to the full strength of our country, the American farmer will be called upon to do a job much bigger than any in the past. He will be forced to operate with less manpower and have shortages in much needed fertilizers. I would suggest that you experienced farmers advise the less experienced farmers as to the necessity of oiling and repairing farm machinery because it will probably be very difficult to replace due to the war effort. As great as these adversities may be, I am confident they again would show a record which could be praised as well done when the end should come.

We must stand together and fight together to defend the things we love in America. The task before us is a great one and one in which there is no turning back when American lives are being lost on the field of battle. We are fighting as our forefathers for liberty and justice; and this we will attain as they did, against any foe.

Mr. Speaker, recent events have pointed out clearly the crisis we are now facing throughout the world. There can exist no longer any doubt as to the sacrifices we must make to build up our fighting strength. It will be a job for all of us, and one in which we will all have to contribute our share of the hardships. By God's help we will succeed. I urge the prayerful call of all our Members upon a power that is greater than ours.

Dr. James W. Fifield, Religious and Civic Leader of Los Angeles, Denounces Socialism and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a time to invoke impeachment proceedings on two high officials, namely President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson, it is now.

This is the first time in our long and glorious history that we have been led into a position of being subject to the whims and caprice of an unfriendly foreign power, Russia.

Never before in our history have leadership and wisdom in high places been so lacking, and the Government been rendered so impotent as it is in this critical period due to the mistakes of the administration.

We cannot afford to allow the present administration to further demoralize and degenerate this great and powerful Nation. From all sides the people are clamoring for action.

Letters, post cards, and wires are coming to me from all parts of the Nation urging the removal of Truman and Acheson.

The following news story from the Los Angeles Herald-Express quoting Dr. James W. Fifield expresses the views of most of the people I have heard from. It follows:

DR. FIFIELD DEMANDS UNITED STATES BREAK WITH RUSSIA

A demand that the United States break diplomatic relations with Russia had been made today by Dr. James W. Fifield, Jr., who told his congregation at the First Congregational Church that this Nation had been betrayed by President Roosevelt at Yalta and by its leaders since.

"By next May," he said, "the Comintern will control 1,200,000,000 of the 2,000,000,000 persons on earth." He asked that the present United States leaders be repudiated.

"At Yalta," Dr. Fifield said, "the President (Roosevelt) drunk or sober, gave to Stalin more than Stalin had ever dreamed of asking."

Stalin was described by the pastor as "the foulest dictator and antichrist" in history. "He has killed 15,000,000 souls, and now I am informed that there are 10,000 murders daily in China. Mao Tse-tung is second only to Stalin in ruthless brigandry and murder."

DENOUNCES SOCIALISTS

These, he said, are the men our national leaders have helped by supplying Soviet Russia with vast amounts of matériel.

He demanded that Russia be thrown out of the United Nations, or the United States should withdraw from the United Nations.

Terming "Socialists" the advance guard phalanx of the Reds, he said:

"Clean out the fifth columns—Socialists as well as Communists. Clean them out of our churches, unions, magazines, newspapers, schools, businesses and our Government."

Communists should not be allowed out of jail on bail while American boys are dying in Korea, he said.

TRACES MORAL DECAY

He advocates revolt of rebels and arming of any nation that will fight Russia.

Much of the blame for the moral decay of the day should be placed on every man and woman for being overcredulous in their faith in their leaders, Dr. Fifield said in the sermon, he declared "has been clamoring to be preached for 19 years."

"We have traded our birthright as the favored Nation of the world," he continued, "for a mess of pottage, and the pottage stinks."

This Nation, he said, has made commitments—such as the one with Korea—"that we couldn't keep, and each failure has been a betrayal."

Manila Newspapers See Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska Significant to America's Position in Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to present an editorial from the Philippines Herald of December 5 and an excerpt from an editorial from the Manila Bulletin of December 8.

The editorial from the Philippines Herald follows:

HAWAII STATEHOOD AND THE PHILIPPINES

The people and the Republic of the Philippines have a stake in the issue of Hawaii statehood.

Legislation to admit Hawaii and Alaska as States is now before the United States Senate.

It has passed the lower House of the United States Congress by an overwhelming vote. It has been given a strongly favorable report by the United States Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It has been heartily endorsed by Republican and Democratic Senators alike.

But though the people of the United States are strongly for the Hawaii and Alaska statehood bills, the United States Senate may not act favorably at this session. Much "must" business is before Congress, particularly that relating to the war in Korea and the

defense of the free world. And a few Senators, mostly from the southern part of the United States, seem opposed to admit two more Territories as States at this time.

Without presuming to tell the Congress of the United States what to do, we feel it is appropriate for us to express the deep concern of the Philippines in the passage of this legislation. There are 60,000 Filipinos living and working in the Territory.

We would view passage of the Hawaii statehood bill by the United States Congress at this time as another demonstration of the extension of the principle of democracy to the Pacific area.

To the United States we are forever grateful for making good on the pledge to give independence to the Philippines. By that act the United States not only endeared itself to our country but answered the argument of the Communists that the United States is aggressively and greedily imperialistic.

Favorable acion on the Hawaii measure would be hailed in the Philippines as another evidence of that principle of human freedom and political democracy for which we are all fighting today.

It would show the propagandists of Russia and China and North Korea that the American people admit to full political kinship the Territory of Hawaii, with its strategic position and its half million people of many races living peacefully and progressively together as Americans.

The excerpts from the Manila Bulletin editorial follows:

The issue of statehood for Hawaii-Alaska is still before Congress and the Territories have hopes of its passage. Consolidation of American interests in the Pacific in face of the international threat is a sharpened reason for its consideration.

Inflation—A National Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted to me, I am including in this short statement an article by commentator Frank R. Kent.

Inflation is a deadly peril, and has already caused untold financial injury to many who can least afford to be injured in that respect. One group that I am thinking about is the group in the armed services. It was my privilege to be a member of the subcommittee that wrote the pay bill that increased the pay of everyone in the armed services. They have already found that their present increase pay buys less than the pay they had during the recent world war. This is a concrete result of inflation.

It it unfortunate that the President, who was given the authority by this Congress, prior to its taking recess last fall, has not seen fit to invoke any of the authority given to him. We have been asked to extend rent control, and I voted for it, and, yet, the President, who had the power, refused to do anything about any other phases of our economic system, which might halt or delay the inflationary trend, now in full swing.

Mr. Kent points out that one certain individual seems to be the dominating influence with the President in preventing any steps from being taken to regulate inflation. Since Mr. Kent is an eminent and experienced commentator, I assume that the source of his information is reliable, and that his statement is a statement of fact. The following is the article referred to:

WRITER BLAMES KEYSERLING FOR TRUMAN'S INACTION

(By Frank R. Kent)

What is happening abroad to our military forces and in New York to our diplomatic forces (to say nothing of the Attlee-Truman conferences here) is so much more dramatic and colorful that naturally they obscure what is happening to our economic situation at home. But they are not really more important.

For our military and diplomatic power wholly depend upon our economic strength and solidity. That is basic. Without economic strength there can be neither military strength nor diplomatic force. There are several other facts accepted by reasonable men. One is that inflation is perhaps the chief national peril. Uncontrolled, it can be as devastating as a lost war. Uncontrolled, it can lose a war.

Inflation cannot be successfully combatted by doing one of these things. They all have to be done. And they should be done at the beginning of the defense program, not in the middle and certainly not after wages and prices have begun really to soar. In brief, delay can be ruinous. There has never been a denial of B. M. Baruch's oft-repeated assertion that failure to face the facts in the last war resulted in its prolongation by 6 months at an additional cost of $100,000,000,000 and many wholly unnecessary causalties. Last summer these realities were so generally accepted that before Congress adjourned it not only gave Mr. Truman everything he asked with which to fight inflation but some things, including the vital power to regulate wages, for which he had not asked at all.

Since then the administration has played a double-faced game—ineffectually attempting to restrain inflation by credit controls while directly encouraging inflation by aiding wage boosts. In consequence, wages have gone on a rampage. Strike after strike has been called. Raise after raise has been granted. Time after time the Government's weight has been on the labor side and time after time industry has raised prices to meet the wage boost, which is thus passed on to the consumer, thereby directly promoting inflation. The result is that by the end of October prices had reached their highest peak and the cost of living had broken all records.

Why has Mr. Truman with full knowledge and warning failed to exercise the power voted him to control the inflation against which he so earnestly preaches? Why has he let nine billion be added to the cost of his program? Why, against all reason and experience, has he permitted himself to be persuaded that labor and industry will voluntarily keep down wages and profits? Why, with the costly lessons of War I and War II clearly before him, has he not acted? It is true he has appointed a long string of mobilizers and stabilizers, including a wage stabilizer. But, up to date, they have not mobilized or stabilized anything at all.

Nor, judging from the way the new wage stabilizer talks, are they likely to stabilize anything for quite a while. Apparently he is not even sure wage control is necessary. It is fair to say that in this uncertainty he reflects the administration attitude, which in the field of economics is anything but certain about anything. What are the reasons for this extremely costly uncertainty? Those with the best foundation are, first, that Mr. Truman and his political advisers are still in such fear of the professional labor bosses with whom they are politically linked that they dare not take a step to which they are opposed.

The second reason is the fancy arguments of Leon Keyserling, chief of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Though Mr. Keyserling's views of the current inflation problem are held by exceedingly few recognized economists and directly clash with those of Mr. Baruch and practically every other man of experience, he seems not only to have impressed Mr. Truman but to have swept all the mobilizers and stabilizers off their feet. Though their instinct is against the Keyserling philosophy, they do not know enough or cannot talk fast enough to argue with him. Hence, in this great national crisis we find ourselves being economically directed by a man who thinks the size of the debt is unimportant, that inflation can be controlled without wage and price control, that nondefense expenditures should go up and not down.

RFC Loan to the Kaiser-Frazer Sales Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following statement from News Bulletin of November 6, 1950, and also an Associated Press dispatch. The above-mentioned follow:

[From the News Bulletin of November 6, 1950]

NEW RFC LOAN OF $25,000,000 TO KAISER-FRAZER NEEDS INVESTIGATION

The announcement that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has authorized an additional loan of $25,000,000 to the Kaiser-Frazer Sales Corporation to mature November 7, 1951, should be the subject of careful congressional investigation.

It will be recalled that over a period of 10 years the Kaiser companies have had a virtual pipe line into the United States Treasury and its lending agencies. The Kaiser companies have at times owed as much as $192,000,000 to the Government.

On September 20, 1950, it was announced that Kaiser would pay off a $94,000,000 Government loan on the steel plant at Fontana, Calif., and that he was contemplating an expansion of steel making facilities for which new Government funds, in the possible amount of $500,000,000 might be sought.

In a news item of April 14, 1950, the United Press announced that Kaiser-Frazer lost $30,329,351 in 1949. On December 12, 1949, the Wall Street Journal in a feature story headed—Kaiser's next bout reported in part:

"Challenger Henry J. Kaiser is doing his road work for a return bout with the auto industry heavyweights.

A new light car will be his heavy punch, he hopes. But he intends to go into the ring swinging with the big Kaiser and Frazer autos again, too—and learn to land them in a lower price bracket where they'll hurt his opponents more.

"In the coming match, Kaiser has a new partner, the Federal Government. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is giving Kaiser-Frazer a $44,400,000 transfusion."

The Wall Street Journal story recites also how stockholders who plunged some $53,000,000 into Kaiser-Frazer's war chest before a single auto was built, watched the common stock plummet from a high of more

than $23 a share to a 1949 low of less than $3.

Yesterday Kaiser-Frazer stock which was quoted on the New York Curb Exchange on Monday at $5.50 advanced to $6.50 per share.

Henry J. Kaiser is a builder and a genius when it comes to planning for the future. Yesterday at a press conference he reportedly said that plans for future expansion requiring approximately $300,000,000 can be financed without further resort to RFC. However this may be, the Congress ought to have a quick look into RFC's lendings to Mr. Kaiser's enterprises.

PAUL O. PETERS.

RFC LENDS KAISER ANOTHER $25,000,000

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation today granted another $25,000,000 loan to Kaiser-Frazer Co., to help it maintain auto output and get into defense production.

Simultaneously, Henry J. Kaiser announced the auto-making concern plans to open a plant in the San Francisco-Oakland area to make military products and is getting ready to go into shipbuilding.

The RFC attached a number of conditions to its new $25,000,000 credit, requiring Kaiser-Frazer, among other things, to:

1. Hold the prices of its cars to the present level unless RFC gives written consent to an increase.

2. Cut production to 600 cars daily—half Kaisers, half Henry J's—by January 1. Production already has been reduced to 800 cars daily from 1,400 daily before October 12.

3. Make conscientious efforts to obtain defense work and give it priority over the production of autos.

Excerpts From a Letter From a Reserve Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that quite a number of the Members of this House have received letters similar to one from which I am inserting excerpts here. As halting, as tardy, as incomplete as our manpower mobilization has been, equipment mobilization has been even worse. Slightly overage equipment is better than none at all, but the existing policy has been to get rid of all surplus materials at great financial sacrifice. I hope the additional billions for defense will be more wisely spent than many of our past billions have been.

The anonymous excerpts follow:

We have more equipment now than the last time I wrote, but it's still awfully short of what we should have. We have our six 240-mm. guns, but only one M-6 tractor to pull them with. It takes two M-6's to pull one gun, so you can see where we are getting with the big guns. Of about 36 radios we should have, we have 3, so that is coming along about as well as the guns.

Morale has been up and down a number of times. The preelection announcement of the point system for enlisted reservists made the boys feel pretty good for awhile, but like a lot of things, it, too, seems to have been forgotten.

It's quite disgusting to talk to other units and find that they are as short of everything as we are, and then reflect back to the days of war surplus sales when the items we are short of were sold for less than junk value.

It's also hard to understand that there isn't more activity in getting production and mobilization under way, the way we are involved in Korea right now, and will be for a long time to come. Russia could move in on Europe and we'd be helpless to oppose her. We haven't the European or English Armies to give us time as they did until 1941, so we'd better quit kidding ourselves and get down to business.

I think if anyone made a survey of what is available in our army camps today in the way of trained troops and equipment, they would be amazed and completely scared. I know that we out here certainly are from what we have seen and heard thus far.

Certainly, more than a few people in Washington should be made to account for the situation we find ourselves in today. Of course, it's probably second-guessing, but it seems so much of this could have been so easily prevented—what with the things we should have learned from past experience.

The Pause of Confession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. George Sokolsky, which points out why we have lost so much prestige in recent years, namely, through our own sins. The article follows:

THE PAUSE OF CONFESSION
(By George E. Sokolsky)

We have lost a military war; we are losing a diplomatic war. Let us pause to confess. For unless we cleanse our minds of the barnacles of untruth, we shall suffer even greater disasters.

The truth can no longer be hidden. It is exposed by the retreat in Korea and by that strange palaver in the United Nations. A world should have arisen to our defense, and we should be standing shoulder to shoulder with all freemen. It has not happened.

Years have been wasted. Wealth has been wasted. Lives have been wasted.

It is false to blame Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He was not present at either Tehran or Yalta. He did not set the stage for our defeat. He did not give Soviet Russia $11,000,000,000. He did not open the door to agents and spies who stole our atom bomb and other devices of defense. He did not coddle Chinese Communists.

He must not be made the scapegoat for the errors he did not commit. If his judgment concerning the manpower of Soviet China was faulty, he has already answered that he took no steps without the approval of our Government and the United Nations.

Blaming this man or that will not avail us now. For the blood of our sons demands an answer to a question asked as far back as 1942 by Alfred Noyes, the British poet, in his book The Edge of the Abyss:

"How can we build a stable world again, or find any security for our children, or believe in any of the higher values that make life worth living, when the very foundations of all real belief have been shattered or sneered out of existence, in the intellectual and spiritual collapse of western civilization?"

It is a question that goes deeper than party politics or whether someone would have made a more able Secretary of State than Dean Acheson. It is a question that goes deeper than the events of yesterday or the conversations of heads of states worried about their majorities. It goes to the heart of our problem, which is that we have confused ourselves. We are paying a bitter price for permitting ourselves the luxury of the lie.

Noyes, in these same essays, says:

"The chief characteristic of the intellectual world during the last 50 years is its gradual loss of the old simplicity and integrity which went so deep—went right down to the roots of life with men like Milton and Wordsworth in literature, or Abraham Lincoln in statesmanship. This deep integrity of spirit has been replaced everywhere by a shallow cynicism, a spirit of mockery, sometimes clever mockery, but nonetheless a shining surface with nothing behind it."

This shallow cynicism and mockery is in our daily lives. May I recall such a figure as Charles Lindbergh? Do you remember how he was driven from public life and ridiculed? Was Lindbergh mad when he feared the opening of the world to Russia?

Do you recall how when certain American newspapers dared to question the wisdom of policies that have produced our defeat they were branded as Fascist? Are you ready to say that their warnings did not warrant consideration?

I watch men hopping on the tailboard of anticommunism these days. Those hoppers dare not risk the rising anger of a people betrayed. Like pickpockets, they melt into the crowd and shout, even louder than all others, "Down with Stalin."

Their shouts are a mockery. For decades now they have devoted themselves to the destruction of their own people, and now, when the consequences of their infamy are upon us all, they move over. Nothing will cleanse them but open confession.

We shall not go under. We are still a good and a strong people. But the thousands of American bodies that lie under Korean snows must be atoned. They must never be forgotten. On their tombstones should be the words: "A victim of cynicism."

The politicians have had their day. Now the American people must speak out loud and clear. And they should take count.

Only if a joint committee of the Congress—the best men in Congress—study truthfully and nonpolitically the causes of our defeat, reexamining every step that led to it since 1933—only so we can prepare a votive board where he who has it in his heart to confess, can do so under oath and in public.

Powers of the Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 6, 1950.*

DEAR COLLEAGUE: One of the most important recent legislative reforms was the bipartisan action taken at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress to limit the power of the Committee on Rules to bottle up legislation favorably reported by the regular legislative committees of the House.

Regardless of which party may be in power, the spectacle of 7 Members—or even less—out of 435 assuming power to prevent the other Members of the House from having a chance to vote on a proposition that has been

fully and carefully considered by the proper committee with legislative jurisdiction would be a discredit to democratic government in America.

Yet, a quiet movement is now under way to restore the Rules Committee road-block by depriving the chairmen of other committees of their present power to call up a rule if the Committee on Rules fails to act within 21 days.

In other words, it is proposed that the Members of the Eighty-second Congress again delegate to a few men the authority to decide finally even what legislation shall be brought up for debate.

I first presented this problem to all Members-elect of the Eighty-first Congress in a letter dated December 10, 1948 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 12, p. A5).

I again sound the call to arms, and invite Members of both parties to join in holding the gain we have made for democratic procedure, and for effective representative government.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN P. EBERHARTER.

Futility, Frustration, Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, if George Washington were leading our country today, I am sure he would repeat his words quoted in the editorial of the Glendale (Calif.) News-Press of December 7, 1950. It is a tragedy that we have not had his counterpart nor anyone approaching him since Abraham Lincoln.

At all events our present position in the world is so bad that while we cannot withdraw from our present international commitments we must forge ahead on the right road without too much regard for other countries, trusting that such other nations as may will follow.

Ours is a position of world leadership perforce. Wishing that a George Washington were leading us will not accomplish that tragically needed fact, and the only answer is for each one of us to do his level best until that leadership appears. The editorial from the News-Press follows:

FUTILITY, FRUSTRATION, DEFEAT

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, my fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake. * * *"—From Washington's Farewell Address.

Now that the Korean incident has given the United Nations its first opportunity to demonstrate its strength and effectiveness in an emergency of major magnitude, and the results of this demonstration are beginning to appear, an increasing number of thoughtful American citizens are beginning to think that possibly the Father of His Country was not so far wrong, after all, when in his Farewell Address he earnestly and solemnly warned the Nation against entangling alliances with foreign powers.

The Korean episode, you will recall, was, at first, only a police action by the United Nations to halt an aggression by North Korea against its twin nation, South Korea. But it was the United States that supplied the initial force that attempted to turn the invaders back. And up to the present tragic hour a vast majority of the pitiful white crosses on the battlefields of the Korean peninsula mark the graves of American boys.

And when the crowning hour of crisis came and an overwhelming flood of Chinese Communist troops swept across the Manchurian border, the United Nations, in both the Security Council and the General Assembly, were bogged down in bitter and wordy debates over long-deadlocked issues and had not even a suggestion for meeting the new and more crucial problem.

The first reaction of member nations was criticism of the acts and decisions the United States had taken, under pressure of its enforced responsibility. The second reaction brought various suggestions for compromise and appeasement—any and all of which, if adopted, will result in the humiliation of the United States in the eyes of all of its enemies and will leave the entire Korean situation, from the viewpoint of every nation or people involved—excepting only Red Russia—worse than it was before the United Nations intervened.

The tragic record of futility, frustration, and defeat is not to be charged against any individual or nation. There may have been and most probably were, individual and national blunders and failures of discretion and duty. But the over-all cause of the calamity is inherent in the nature of international alliances and common undertakings by peoples and nations whose interests, objectives, ideals, habits of thought and traditional attiudes are divergent and often antagonistic.

It is these basic differences that are responsible for the bitter, heart-breaking delay as diplomats debate, denounce each other and entertain each other at banquets—while soldiers on the frozen fields of Korea fight against the greatest odds soldiers ever tried to stand against, conduct dismal retreats and rear-guard actions, or try to fight their way out of traps and encirclements by swarms of savage, drug-frenzied foes.

The sooner we get out of Korea—the sooner we get out of the United Nations, and the sooner we start working, earnestly, intelligently, and industriously on our own national problems, including the building of a military establishment capable of defending our Nation against any enemy, the better it will be for us and for everyone else whose welfare we cherish.

No nation on earth ever had so great an opportunity to solve, directly for itself, and indirectly for all mankind, the problem of a just and equitable and righteous social and economic order as has the United States—spreading across the heart of one great continent, with friendly nations on both borders, and friendly nations on the other great continents of the hemisphere, with a population made up of the best sons of all races on the earth, with the best form of government and the best—even if the shortest—tradition of individual enterprise, individual self-direction, and individual self-responsibility.

With the energy and genius that have marked our citizenry in the past, with wise leadership and united devotion to the task that remains before us, we and our children and our children's children can build on this continent a shrine of freedom, a mecca for free souls of other lands, and a tower of light and inspiration, which, in truth, may spread the light of liberty and justice, humanity, and good will throughout the earth; and to all the inhabitants thereof.

The national policy we urge herewith does not spring from nor imply any surly revolt nor any selfish withdrawal from the atttiude of friendship and community of interest and objectives of world peace and world-wide welfare which formed the inspiration and the aspiration out of which the United Nations had its birth.

It does not imply any lessening of our national friendship for the peoples of the Eastern Hemisphere, nor any renunciation of our duties and responsibilities for the safety and well-being of other members of the universal human family with whom our destiny is linked in the grand adventure of human progress and evolution.

The policy here indicated is suggested in the firm and well-considered belief that our own efforts—and the honest efforts of every other nation will be more effective, better managed and pursued with greater energy and singleness of purpose if our own Nation—and every other nation—acts as an independent, self-directed entity, free from the hampering complications, compromises, delayed decisions, and frustrated purposes that are bound to result—and do result, as is now so completely demonstrated—when many nations try to act as one.

Acting on its own initiative and with unfettered hands, the United States, in past decades, has given too many practical demonstrations of its international friendship and good will to have these qualities questioned now.

The Press and Excess Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the press of the country is becoming fully aware of the weakness and ineffectiveness of the so-called excess-profits tax which passed the House. It is a lame-duck bill, the putative father of which was the CIO. It will be interesting to see if another body in the great crisis in which this country finds itself will return a bill to the House which will raise the necessary revenue, eliminate the inequities, and avoid the punishment which the House bill sponsors sought to inflict upon the corporations and their stockholders. Let us hope that the enemies of free enterprise are not in the saddle.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting two editorials in the Appendix of the RECORD, one from the Washington Post of December 11, 1950, and an editorial which appeared in the New York Times Saturday, December 9, 1950. The editorials follow as mentioned:

[From the Washington Post of December 11, 1950]

EXCESS PROFITS

The $3,000,000,000 of additional revenue that the excess-profits-tax bill passed by the House is expected to yield (at the present level of profits) is a billion dollars less than the amount requested by the President. It is a very moderate over-all levy—in view of the huge aggregate volume of current corporation earnings remaining after payment of existing taxes. The question at issue, however, is not whether to tax corporation earnings more heavily, but whether to obtain the additional revenue from a limited proportion of all corporations in the form of an excess-profits tax or by an across-the-board percentage increase in the corporation income tax. With few exceptions, spokesmen for industry favor the latter method, which could be adjusted to meet changing

revenue requirements, as an alternative to a much higher rate of tax on excess profits paid by a small percentage of companies. Under the House bill, for example, it is estimated that only 18 percent of all nonfinancial corporations would be subject to excess-profits taxation.

The strongest argument in favor of an excess-profits tax in lieu of increases in the ordinary corporate income tax is that a flat rate increase would create hardship for corporations whose profits are declining and firms that have not benefited from the defense boom. Nevertheless, a uniform tax increase spread over all business profits would be less disruptive in its effect on business and much less likely to interfere with industrial expansion than a tax imposed on a part of corporate earnings arbitrarily defined as excess profits.

The Ways and Means Committee was fully aware of the defects of the latter method of taxation. This was shown by its incorporation in the House bill of extensive relief provisions. These include a $25,000 minimum credit designed to relieve small corporations from payment of the tax, liberalization of World War II methods of computing average base-period earnings, allowance of higher returns on invested capital under the alternative, optional invested capital formula, and the setting of a ceiling of 67 percent on total taxes—regular and excess profits—collected from any corporation. Complicated special provisions have also been introduced. Relief is provided for rapidly growing companies with low base-period earnings. New corporations that began operations during or after the base period may be given credits equal to the average rate of return for their respective industries in the base period. Preferential treatment is accorded regulated public utilities that would virtually exempt them from payment of excess-profits taxation—a provision that, according to Secretary Snyder, would result in a substantial loss of revenue and cause the Federal tax system to "lose its effectiveness for equitably distributing tax burdens." Mr. Snyder also harbors doubts as to the justice of the preferential treatment accorded corporations engaged in the mining of strategic minerals.

To be sure, the House bill is an improvement on the excess-profits-tax system of World War II. However, the attempts to provide more adequate relief for hardship cases and the adoption of a base-period-earnings credit equal to 85 percent of the average for the three best out of 4 years (1946–49), instead of 75 percent as urged by the administration, will lower the yield. To obtain the $4,000,000,000 of additional revenue recommended by the President, therefore, the rate of the excess-profits tax, set at 75 percent, would either have to be increased, or the base-period-earnings credit reduced, with the result that the incentive to wasteful expenditures inherent in this system of taxation would become all the greater. Secretary Snyder has tentatively suggested that one way to prevent corporations subject to excess-profits taxes from cheating the tax collector would be to permit the Bureau of Internal Revenue to disallow unnecessary and unreasonable expenditures for tax purposes. This is a pernicious proposal. For it would give the Treasury such extraordinary powers of control over the spending policies of privately owned corporations as to constitute an intolerable and dangerous invasion of the field of private enterprise. Yet no one has suggested any other feasible plan for preventing the waste that is inevitably encouraged by heavy taxation of excess profits.

Apparently Congress is all set to pass some kind of excess-profits-tax bill at the present session. But it is to be hoped that any changes made in the House bill by the Senate will be in the direction of liberalizing rather than stiffening its provisions. That will, at least, leave the way open for consideration by the incoming Congress of alternative methods of raising still more revenue from corporation taxes. Considerably more than three or four billion dollars will eventually be needed from this source to help cover the costs of the defense program. The answer to the question of how much depends upon the (1) cost of the defense program, still a matter of conjecture, and (2) the decisions reached in regard to increases in other taxes.

Certainly the bulk of the huge amount of revenue that will unquestionably be needed to finance a pay-as-you-go policy or an approach thereto, cannot be obtained by taxation of profits. It will have to come from an expansion of excise taxes—a potentially prolific source of revenue—and increases in individual income taxes. These are the kind of taxes, moreover, that curb consumer spending and so arrest inflation. Taxes on corporations produce revenue, but if they are inequitably distributed, they are more likely to stimulate inflation than to discourage it.

[From the New York Times of December 9, 1950]

WAR PROFITS VERSUS HIGH PROFITS

Representative REED of New York, discussing Secretary Snyder's version of a wartime profits tax, charges that the administration "has disregarded its own fiscal advisers in favor of a plan advocated by the labor unions." In our judgment there is some circumstantial evidence to support Mr. REED's charge.

It is important that everyone should understand clearly the philosophy of the new bill. For if it is not challenged we may find that we have unwittingly and quite unnecessarily accepted, under the emotional stress of threatened war, a principle of taxation which is thoroughly evil, and which can come back to haunt us long after the world has returned to the ways of peace. Stated simply, this is the principle that for purposes of taxation private industry may be treated as a public utility—that the Government may step in at any time, in peace or war, and announce that it is going to expropriate all profits above what in its immediate wisdom it decides is a fair return.

Such an impost is a libel on the term "war profits tax." A genuine war-profits tax is a tax on windfall profits, to which no one has any claim in equity in time of war. But a tax directed at what a capricious Government may decide are abnormal profits, totally unrelated to war, is a vicious tax in at least two vitally important respects. In the first place, it strikes directly at the profit variable, which is the element that determines the movement of investment under the free-enterprise system, and that, along with the price variable, keeps that system in balance. In the second place, it discriminates between companies according to the degree of their profitability. The fallacy, and the reckless injustice, of this lies in the fact that all taxes must be paid, in the last analysis, not by corporations, which are purely legal entities, but by the shareholders as individuals.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the question of how heavily corporations should be taxed is not at issue here. Even among those who oppose an intelligently conceived war-profits tax there is no disposition to quarrel with the excess-profits tax because of the size of the tax burden it represents. As a matter of fact, the sponsors of the Republican counterproposal to the administration's plan (which consists of a combination general-profits tax and a true war-profits tax) maintain that these measures would actually produce $200,000,000 more than the latter.

Billions Escaping Tax Collector Through Unfair Tax Exemption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to a glaring inequity existing under our tax laws, an inequity that will be tremendously aggravated by the passage of an excess-profits tax. I refer to the tax-free status of what is known as section 101, corporations. In the excess-profits-tax law of World War II there was a clause that specifically exempted all section 101 corporations from the provisions of the excess-profits tax. That specific exemption of section 101 corporations is again included in the excess-profits tax now under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I can find no possible legitimate excuse for the exemption of various tax exempt organizations and corporations from the proposed excess-profits tax, or for that matter for the continued exemption of them from the normal and surtax rates imposed upon their taxpaying competitors. Our present normal and surtax rates amount to 45 percent of the total profits of a taxpaying corporation. That makes an extremely high taxpaying differential between section 101 corporations and taxpaying corporations. Under the terms of the proposed excess-profits tax, we are going to increase that differential to 67 percent of all profits made. This just does not make sense. This inequity in our tax laws should be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I shall insert as a part of my remarks a letter that I have received from Mr. William L. Clayton, of Houston, Tex.

Mr. Will Clayton is an elder statesman whose judgment and opinions are held in high esteem throughout the Nation. He has had an illustrious career in business. He has served his country with distinction both at home and abroad. He has been a recognized leader of the Democratic Party, but even more he has served democracy with credit and honor.

His views are not to be discounted, therefore, when he declares that the income-tax exemption of certain competitive forms of business is being abused and should be canceled. His criticism of the tax exemption of cooperatives is based on competition which he has encountered in his own business—and I might add, Mr. Speaker, that if the very substantial business of Anderson, Clayton & Co. is bothered by the tax-exempt operations of cooperative competitors, the plight of smaller companies faced by the same situation may well be understood.

I welcome the sound advice that comes to me from so wise a counselor as Mr. Clayton, and I am placing his letter in the RECORD so that his opinions may be available to all of my colleagues in the Congress. In 1951, without any further

delay, the income-tax exemption of the cooperatives, the mutuals, and similar organizations and corporations must be ended by proper legislation. Simple justice demands such action and, as Mr. Clayton says, a very large sum of revenue will be added to the Treasury's receipts for the national defense. Mr. Clayton's letter follows:

ANDERSON, CLAYTON & CO., INC.,
Houston, Tex., November 29, 1950.

Hon. NOAH M. MASON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MASON: I am sure you are thoroughly familiar with the fact that a very large sum of money, probably running into two or three billions of dollars, is eluding the tax collector through the improper use of so-called charitable and educational trust or foundations, through abuse by so-called cooperatives of tax exemption provided by law and by other similar methods.

Recently Anderson, Clayton & Co. had an opportunity, which they did not take advantage of, to sell their 50,000 acre farm in California to a so-called charitable, tax-exempt foundation. I understand the biggest cotton producer in California recently sold a substantial part of his holdings to this foundation. I have also been informed that the Campbell wheat farm was sold to the same foundation.

Furthermore, we are more and more finding ourselves in competition with tax-exempt, so-called cooperatives in the gin, oil mill, and compress business.

For example, cottonseed are now selling at $100 per ton and more. Suppose one of our cottonseed-oil mills can make a profit before taxes of $10 per ton in manufacturing and merchandising the products from a ton of cottonseed. The corporation tax on this is now 45 percent. This leaves us a net profit of $5.50 per ton. But our cooperative competitor has a net profit of $10 per ton due to his tax-exampt status. He thus has nearly twice as much profit as we have with which to expand his facilities or build a new mill. Morever, the so-called cooperative is not compelled to distribute profits to their member stockholders but can retain the entire profit for expansion.

This just isn't right.

With increased corporate taxation the advantage in operating as a cooperative will be so great that more and more commercial activities of all kinds will be done on that basis, squeezing out tax-paying elements and depriving the Federal Government of much needed revenue.

Many so-called cooperatives are going into the petroleum business in a big way.

When a tax-exempt charitable or educational foundation owns stock in a commercial coporation, the dividends on such stock accruing to the foundation do not pay an income tax. No one objects to this. But the corporation itself must pay the corporate income tax before the stockholders can get a dividend. This should be true of every commercial undertaking operated by a tax-exempt foundation even if such undertaking is not incorporated.

Suppose, for example, one of these foundations owns a building or a farm which it operates in its own name and not in a separate corporation. It seems to me that before any profits on such undertakings could accrue to the tax-exempt foundation, such profits ought to be subjected to the regular corporation tax which would have been paid had such enterprises been conducted in corporate form.

Hoping you will give this question your most careful consideration, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

W. L. CLAYTON.

Effect of Tariff Policies on the State of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very interesting brief prepared by the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, located in the Marine Exchange Building, in Milwaukee, and received this morning from its distinguished executive vice president, Mr. Robert A. Ewens. The subject of the brief is the effect of the United States tariff on the State of Wisconsin, and the occasion of its release is the International Conference on Tariffs meeting at Torquay, England, in which the United States is now participating.

Mr. President, I have on many occasions commented on this tariff problem. I have pointed out that we of America recognize that trade, of necessity, must be a two-way street. I have pointed out that we are anxious to be good customers of the world and good sellers to the world. I have pointed out, however, that a reckless free-trade policy followed by the United States Government, far from helping foreign nations, could actually inflict grave harm upon them in the long run, because anything that endangers American prosperity and stability cannot help but hurt other countries.

In the brief sent to me by Mr. Ewens, he reports the considered judgment of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association on the very adverse effects that can accrue if our Government persists in a reckless tariff-slashing policy. The brief cites instances of harm to the United States motorcycle industry, the pulp and paper industry, the leather products industry, veneer plants, hosiery, sheet-metal works, rubber footwear, and so forth. I have previously mentioned practically every single one of these industries as offering a good illustration of harm that can develop from ruthless tariff slashes.

Now, Mr. President, we are all aware that under present circumstances, we are confronted in many instances by a shortage of goods rather than by a surplus; therefore, to a considerable extent, we cannot now perceive the long-term consequences of tariff slashes because the war crisis has made supply-and-demand conditions very abnormal. This does not mean, however, that we should forget that some day we hope to be in a state of enduring peace and stability. The long-range factors of supply and demand, of high-cost labor against cheap labor will again prevail. I urge therefore the serious consideration by my colleagues of this excellent statement by the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association.

Lest it be assumed that Wisconsin is thinking solely in terms of competitive imports, I should like to point out that we of Wisconsin are a great exporting State also. We pride ourselves on the high-quality goods which we ship to the far corners of the world. Our desire for foreign markets, however, does not obscure in our eyes the fact that we have here at home in America the greatest consumer demand in all the world. Moreover, we recognize that the building up of export industries at the price of destruction of certain essential domestic plants is hardly the sort of situation that is desirable from a national defense or any other viewpoint, like that of economic health.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of this brief prepared by the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association based upon the polling of its members.

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPACT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE ON THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

THE NATIONAL PICTURE

When international relations culminate in a crisis which can be solved only by military action, the industrial capacity of a Nation becomes its greatest asset. American industry has proved in two wars that its unrivaled ability for mass production has weighted the scales of warfare overwhelmingly in favor of this Nation. Our industrial strength was not achieved by accident. It represented the outgrowth of individual initiative, ingenuity, and inventiveness on the part of millions of Americans who were encouraged to advance by Government policies which for more than a century included protection for domestic industry through reasonable tariff regulations.

Increasingly in recent years, United States industry generally has been obliged to develop without the benefit of these protective tariffs. Despite the fact that foreign governments, even before World War II, subsidized their manufacturers in the export market, our industry was able to compete with these foreign-made products largely because the quality of their merchandise offset lower prices of competitors.

This minimum tariff American policy has no precedent on the part of any other major world power in modern history. While the intent of the reciprocal trade treaties of recent years in the eyes of the United States Government, was ostensibly to encourage healthy international trade, the program actually laid the groundwork for developments which is placing this country's industrial might in jeopardy. This is particularly true at this time when the United States Department is participating at Torquay, England, in an international conference on tariffs, which is expected to further lower protective barriers so that some 2,500 manufactured items can freely flow in greater volume from foreign nations into the United States.

At a time when this Nation is in a state of semimobilization, such additional imports can do much to ease the strain on the civilian economy, and from this standpoint, the immediate effects of further reduction in tariffs may be constructive, if inflationary aspects are ignored. We are concerned, however, with the greater problem that will arise once the present emergency passes. At such time, it will be possible to sell at retail from American store shelves foreign merchandise at a price much below the cost of actual production only of similar articles made in American factories. This situation

will apply to every State in the Union, and will result in considerable loss of employment for persons now engaged in industrial work. In Wisconsin alone, the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association has been informed by some 100 manufacturers who employed 55,608 persons at the start of 1949, that further reduction in tariffs will work a serious hardship on them in normal times. In a peacetime economy. Wisconsin factories employ about 8 times that number of workers, or approximately 450,000 persons. We have made no attempt to survey all these plants. The findings listed on subsequent pages, however, serve to indicate that the anticipated experience of the quoted companies will also be the lot of the firms who were not surveyed.

The present Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, is well aware of the impact that a wholesale free-trade program will make on American industry. He has chosen to ignore this threat and its consequences to the United States if a weakened industry is called upon again after the present emergency to arm a free world. As stated in the September 2, 1950, issue of Collier's magazine, Secretary Acheson has blandly proposed that Congress set up a fund to train for "new jobs" millions of American workers and to pension off with cash grants the thousands of manufacturers who are expected to lose their jobs or businesses as a result of a flood of competitive goods produced by cheap foreign labor.

Wisconsin industry is well aware that numerous trade associations have protested in vain against the State Department's present policy on duties. On behalf of its members, however, the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association feels it would be derelict in its duty if it did not call this dangerous situation to the attention of the Congress which must rightfully determine whether the jobs of millions of Americans and their futures, must be placed upon the altar of free trade as a sacrifice to idealism, and whether the security of our Nation is to be imperiled without careful consideration of the consequences that will arise from sapping industry's vitality.

The industrial revolution endowed England with productive capacity which for centuries permitted it as a small nation to determine world events. When England allowed its industrial might to falter as a result of ill-advised Government actions and the drains of two world wars, its place in the sun began to fade. America today stands at a crossroads—one way we remain strong; on the other hand, by lowering tariffs, we pave another section in the road down which England is now riding.

THE WISCONSIN ECONOMIC SCENE

For many months considerable attention has been focused on the fact that huge imports of Swiss watches, unhampered by equitable tariffs, have undermined the domestic watch business in the Eastern States to such an extent that the training and employment of skilled craftsmen in this industry is seriously threatened. Since these workers are essential to military production in that they produce scientific instruments, the danger to our defense is self-evident.

In much the same fashion an unrealistic approach to this problem by the State Department has imperiled the stability of the motorcycle industry, whose role in a war economy needs no elaboration here.

Milwaukee is the home of the Harley-Davidson Motor Co., which is the largest producer of motorcycles in this country, E. V. Gumpert, export manager of that corporation, reports that Harley-Davidson has already filed a brief with the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the United States Tariff Commission. Further, oral testimony was given before the committee, but no relief has as yet been obtained from a duty rate of 10 percent on motorcycles and 15 percent on parts. The problem is amplified by Mr. Gumpert as follows:

"In March 1950, imports of motorcycles from England amounted to slightly over 73 percent of our domestic production, which means that for every four motorcycles we made, England brought in three. In April, this percentage was 44; in May, 56. Devaluation of the British currency has made it possible to offer British mortocycles in this market at prices approximately 25 to 30 percent below prices we can hope to meet.

"If (at Torquay) our Government should agree to reduce these rates by 50 percent, which is the maximum permissible, the new rate on motorcycles would be 5 percent and on parts 7½ percent. That is practically free trade, and it would mean that still greater quantities of English motorcycles would be sold in this market in competition with us. With increased inflation in this country, prices of American products are bound to go up, and these higher prices, coupled with practically free trade and a 30 percent devalued currency in England, make competition extremely difficult.

"At one time we exported between 30 and 40 percent of our total production, and various sections of the British Empire were our biggest market. Now we cannot sell a single motorcycle in the British Empire, with the exception of Canada, where we are on a quota basis. Throughout the balance of the British Empire, we are completely barred; the governments refuse to issue import permits because they say they are short of dollars and their good people should buy British motorcycles. This is an excellent means of completely barring competition. As a result of these restrictive measures, our exports now amount to approximately 10 percent of our production and will remain around that figure until such time as we are again able to sell in the British Empire. That time may never come. Meanwhile, our market is being flooded with thousands and thousands of British motorcycles each year, and still our Government is playing with the thought that we ought to reduce the duty by an additional 50 percent to still further increase these imports."

Wisconsin's second largest industry, paper and pulp, which directly employs more than 32,000 persons and probably twice that number indirectly, is also most vitally affected by the Torquay conferences. Already subjected to severe competition because of lowered import levies, this industry is now faced with the prospect that out of 21,921,000 tons of paper produced annually in this Nation, 13,001,000 tons of the production are involved in negotiations at Torquay, which may lead to further drastic cuts in rates. Moreover, of the grades not being considered at Torquay, many have already been subjected to the maximum reductions in duty permitted under present law. These grades include 1,000,000 tons of fine paper, 2,400,000 tons of wrapping paper, and 775,000 tons of newsprint, the latter being on the duty-free list.

We can all remember that during World War II, the slogan was "Paper has gone to war," and efforts were made to conserve its use so that vital military and essential civilian activities might not be hindered. Obviously, then, the paper industry, which aside from producing its normal product, turned out vast amounts of armaments and allied military products in World War II, is a critical one.

To contentions that industry may be complaining before it is hurt, the paper industry points to history to confirm its fears for the future. In 1913, when newsprint was placed on the free import list, Wisconsin had 13 paper mills making newsprint. Today it has one.

The more than 50 companies engaged in this industry have made previous representations concerning this matter to the State Department, but they too have been rebuffed.

The veneer industry of Wisconsin, with more than 3,000 direct employees, is in a similar position. It should be pointed out in this respect that of the 15 companies in this industry, only 1 employs 1,000 persons; the remainder are small and medium-sized businesses which are in no financial position to withstand long periods of intense competition for domestic markets. Moreover, in World War II, these companies were called upon to supply their products for a multitude of military items, including British mosquito bombers. This industry cannot meet the much lower labor costs of veneer producers in Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Japan, and other foreign countries. Moreover, foreign imports are competing for a well-saturated domestic market and, consequently, employment in this industry will be particularly sensitive to any increase in imports. Further details concerning the plight of this industry may be obtained from Robert N. Hawess, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

While Wisconsin is not one of the largest producers of apparel, it is a leading manufacturer of leather products and hosiery. Edward Gerhardy, president of the Hansen Glove Corp. of Milwaukee, reports that his company has experienced extremely serious competition in the knit wool glove field from Japan, which today is shipping to this country 40 percent of the total number of dozens of gloves that are consumed in the United States. Prices, of course, are absurdly low because of the extremely low labor rates abroad.

"We are also beginning to feel the competition from Europe in the cotton fabric glove field," Gerhardy continues, "and any further reductions in tariff would so seriously affect our volume that it would probably necessitate our closing one or two of our factories, which at present are located in the smaller communities of Wisconsin. These production units have become some of the mainstays in the economic lives of these communities, and a cessation of our operations in these towns would seriously affect their economic position."

This company, too, reports that its national trade associations have protested without effect, over the Torquay proposals.

The Pfister & Vogel Tanning Co., one of the leading tanners of the State, points out that thousands of persons are employed in the various tanning plants in the State and they face the prospect of some job losses, the extent depending on the severity of the tariff reductions at Torquay and the length of the present emergency.

Erhard H. Buettner, president, declares that "competition from foreign countries in the field of leather has increased considerably in the past 1 to 2 years, and is expected to make further headway under present tariffs. The low labor cost in foreign countries is largely responsible for their ability to undersell in the United States despite our present duty rates. If tariffs were reduced further, the importation of leather would be speeded without a question of a doubt."

The Holeproof Hosiery Co. discloses that imports of hosiery during the first 6 months of 1950 were valued at $1,682,000, an increase of 58.9 percent over the like period of 1949. Admittedly, these imports are not now causing much difficulty, except in the case of wool hosiery from Canada and the United Kingdom, but the company feels that if tariffs were further reduced, some weakening effects on the industry are bound to be felt.

In the field of rubber footwear, the La Crosse Rubber Mills Co., La Crosse, has found that serious competition already exists in the domestic market because of lower import levies, and feels a further reduction could easily put this industry out of business.

In the highly essential metal industries, the situation is as yet indefinite, but stiff

competition in some lines is already an actuality without any further advantage accruing to foreign nations.

Here is what H. F. Millmann, chairman of the board of Geuder, Paeschke & Frey Co., Milwaukee, a typical producer, has to say on the subject:

"We make a very varied and diverse line of sheet metal wares and, therefore, cannot give a categorical answer as to whether our volume is affected by imports. We do distinctly feel foreign competition in the line of milk shipping cans, sizes 20 to 40 quarts. Germany is offering German manufactured cans at prices 15 to 20 percent under our selling prices. Our selling prices return a very meager profit as it is, probably because the industry is overequipped. Our investment in facilities and equipment and presses for making milk cans is large and most of it is not suitable for any other purpose. Unless we get sufficient tariff protection, that division of our business is apt to suffer a constant loss and will be liquidated. It seems to us most unstatesmanlike to supply Europe with funds to buy machinery and otherwise equip themselves to produce various and sundry items and, by virtue of lower labor costs, ship such goods to the United States to harass our manufacturers and working people, if we permit them to do so by inadequate tariff protection."

Other reports might be added covering other industries, but the foregoing offers ample proof that the Torquay conferences and reduced levies which may result from them pose a threatening spear at the heart of Wisconsin's industry.

Documented evidence for entire industries in the Nation have provided similar proof that not only industry, but its workers too, as well as the merchants, have a vital stake in these deliberations that transcends partisan politics.

The Congress has here a problem that involves not only the welfare of the Members' constituents, but the vitality of the Nation's economic and financial systems. A solution too long delayed may provide our enemies with more comfort than they could obtain from many divisions of trained military forces.

Operations of Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the News Bulletin of December 11, 1950.

SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FROM OCTOBER 17, 1933, THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 1950—REPORTED LOSSES TOTAL $2,473,139,523

Reported losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the period from October 17, 1933, through October 31, 1950, total $2,473,139,523 according to the latest calculations submitted to Congress.

As of October 31, 1950, the Corporation had $2,898,405,000 invested in commodity loans and price-support inventories. Cotton under loan accounted for $905,460,000 and wheat for $1,003,318,000. Nonbasic commodities totaled $621,310,000. On October 31, 1949, the amount outstanding in loans and inventories was $3,148,577,000. The inventory reductions and the reduction in commodity loans can be attributed to the rapid increase in wholesale commodity prices during 1950.

In 1933 the index number of wholesale prices of all commodities was 65.9 for the average. However in October 1933 it stood at 71.2. As of October 1950, the wholesale price index stood at 169.6. Thus the Corporation has been playing with dollars in an inflationary market.

In the 7-year period for which the report was compiled it appears that $263,691,250 was realized from transactions under the cotton loan programs and $185,872,485 from dealings under the general commodities purchase programs. These gains, however, were offset by losses among which were:

Irish potatoes	$414,534,712
Eggs	91,548,715
Wool	92,207,035
Peanuts	67,739,511
Dried milk	23,522,406
Butter	16,614,893
Grain sorghum	26,213,180
Sugar beets	16,517,269
Wheat	58,844,089

The loss on building grain bins for farm storage of commodities was $10,027,621. The bins which were for the storage of wheat and corn are scattered throughout the West Central States. The reported losses on corn totaled $54,630,041.

Although the Commodity Credit Corporation reportedly lost more than $92,000,000 in the wool transactions, it appears that as of October 31, 1950, the inventories totaled but 41,000 pounds of wool on which a value of $23,000 was placed.

Over $2,000,000,000 of the reported losses from operations was credited to the wartime consumer subsidy program.

PAUL O. PETERS.

Power Study for New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Power Study for New England," published in the New York Times of Sunday, December 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER STUDY SET FOR NEW ENGLAND—SURVEY BY SIX FEDERAL AGENCIES WILL INCLUDE SEAWAY PROJECT AND NIAGARA RESOURCES

WASHINGTON, December 9.—Representatives of six Federal agencies announced plans today for a $6,000,000 study to determine what could be done to ease water and power shortage in New England.

The study, authorized by the 1950 Flood Control Act, will include a reappraisal of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, increased power production from Niagara Falls, and New England's Passamaquoddy tidewater power project abandoned in 1941 as unfeasible.

Agencies named by President Truman to make the survey are the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Commerce, the Federal Power Commission, Division of Army Engineers, and the Public Health Division of the Federal Security Agency. The State Department will participate as a nonmember representative to handle international phases.

The study is an outgrowth of complaints from New England States and New York that lack of adequate power and water has caused many industries to move where these natural resources are available. Officials said the survey, which will be reported to the President for transmission to Congress, will be completed in about 2 years.

Governors of the States involved have been invited to sit in on the program. The overall aim of the survey will be to find out how to stimulate industry, conserve soil, improve forests, develop navigation, and assure adequate power and water supplies.

The decision to resurvey the possibilities of the Passamaquoddy project was reached after an international joint commission recently said it was "feasible from an engineering standpoint." The committee's study will be directed principally to determining whether it is feasible economically. It has been estimated that the cost of a thorough survey would be $3,500,000.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram which was sent by Mr. John J. Sattler, commander of the Department of North Dakota, Veterans of Foreign Wars, to President Truman.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 4, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

We feel that our Nation is in the most critical and dangerous situation that it has ever found itself in our history. We recognize that the decisions to be made at this time are dependent upon much information that only those in high positions in our Nation are possessed and that it may be difficult for all of us who do not have this information to understand all of those decisions at the time they are made. We wholeheartedly support and are in favor of a permanent peace at any and all cost. However, we strenuously object to any appeasement for a temporary peace which will lead to inevitable war.

We strongly feel that all ultimate decisions should, if possible, be made by the United Nations and all action, if possible, taken by the United Nations, as that Organization must be retained as the world guaranty of permanent peace. However, we feel that this Nation should place squarely before the United Nations in no uncertain terms the imperative and unalterable necessity of backing up its original decision to act in Korea to stop Red aggression, because, if the United Nations negotiates a temporary appeasement peace, they have sold their birthright for a mess of porridge and have relegated themselves to a mere debating society and can no longer justify their existence.

We recognize and fully appreciate and sympathize with the delicate and vulnerable position in which France and England find themselves in the event of total war. We fully appreciate that in the event of total war their peoples face the potential possibility of unfathomable destruction. However, we feel that they must be told in no uncertain terms that we cannot countenance another Munich, and we feel that the only

hope civilization now has to prevent total war, as slim as that hope may be, is to stand firm and unalterable behind the original decision of the United Nations to stop Communist armed aggression.

We feel that already the United Nations has waited too long. We do not have days but only hours to avert military disaster and the slaughter and torture of 100,000 American boys.

We feel that our Nation has financed the democratic nations of the world against communism and we have been in full accord that we should do so. However, if we are going to finance the democracies of the world, we feel those democracies should mobilize at once so that we do not have to fight alone. We feel that from a military standpoint the only practical immediate hope of saving the situation in Korea is by the immediate amphibious landing of the Chinese Nationalist troops now stationed in Formosa. We urge upon you, Mr. President, to use every influence of our Nation to have the United Nations immediately order the Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa into action; tomorrow will be too late; and in the event that this action is not forthcoming by the United Nations at once, that the United States of its own volition take steps to put in action in Korea the Chinese Nationalists now stationed in Formosa.

We strongly urge that Russia be told in positive terms that unless she withdraws her stooges from the battle lines and discontinues using satellite nations as Communist gun fodder, the United Nations will strike directly at the Soviet Union and with the atom bomb, if necessary.

JOHN J. SATTLER,
Commander, Department of North Dakota, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Good Government Is the Greatest Blessing Any Country Can Vouchsafe to Its People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in the course that our country has followed in dealing with the countries of the Old World, many thoughtful citizens of this country have come to feel that those responsible for Government policies and the plans that are being followed in dealing with the people of the countries of Europe and Asia, are erroneous and detrimental to the best interests of the American people in particular, and to all the people in general.

There is submitted herewith a letter from a citizen of Idaho for the consideration of my colleagues:

POCATELLO, IDAHO, *December 8, 1950.*
COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: In this dark hour, all thoughts are turned toward Washington, D. C., our Nation's Capital. We listen eagerly for something that will give us hope, and all we hear is discord.

There never was a time in the history of this Nation when there was greater need for united leadership than now, but if we are to judge by what we see and hear, there never was a greater dearth of this leadership.

Why cannot something be done? The boys are dying—fruitlessly dying, while we at home are enjoying every worldly comfort and discussing what effect this act or that word will have upon our chances in 1952.

It seems time to lay aside the politician's garb and don the statesman's robes. Our country is in grave peril. It will give little comfort to anyone, after the damage is done, to attempt to place the blame on someone else.

You, sir, may be fortunate in not having a son in Korea, but if you did I know that my son, who is there, would be better looked after. To allow this session of the Congress to conclude without every necessary thing being done to avert another world crisis would be a major tragedy.

There should be no Democrats nor Republicans in Congress at this time, but 531 patriots working unselfishly to protect our most cherished heritage—our liberty.

May God give you divine wisdom to see the right, and courage and a will to do it.

Very sincerely yours,

W. E. GEE.

Show-Down With Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Show-Down With Friends," published in the Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, Oreg., on December 4, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOW-DOWN WITH FRIENDS

These are bitter times. They call for straight thinking, straight statements, and straight shooting.

We believe, therefore, that the United States must have an immediate show-down, not only with its avowed and fully identified enemies, but with its supposed friends. And we believe that the show-down with our friends should come before the show-down with our enemies. In fact, it must be that way.

Since that historic day, June 25, 1950, when the United States decided it could retreat no longer from Communist aggression and must stand and fight in Korea (under the UN banner) most of the members of the United Nations have gone along with us.

They praised America's courageous stand, said it gave the UN a new lease on life, told the United States to go to it, promised their support.

When things have gone well, they've been all for us. But when things have gone badly, as early in the Korean war, they've jittered. (Except British and Turks who are fighting, not carping.)

Now that things are going disastrously once more, with an entirely new war in our laps, they're hedging again, second guessing, criticizing our leadership.

That's the record.

Britain, for example, now wants to broaden the high command on a more representative UN basis. More than 100 Laborite members of Parliament threatened withdrawal of Britain's token forces in Korea unless the United States consulted Britain as to the possible use of the A-bomb. And Prime Minister Attlee, in a hurried trip to Washington, seeks to amplify Britain's views.

The French think we're sowing the seeds of a European war in Asia.

All Europeans think in terms of their own interests and their own safety.

All this propounds some serious questions:

What could we expect from our allies if we were involved in an all-out war with the Soviet Union?

How much real help could we reasonably expect from our friends in the Western Hemisphere—except from Canada, of course? Virtually none.

Could or would the Scandinavians come through? We know Sweden would not.

Would France and Belgium and Holland really fight if the Soviet armies swept across Europe? Frankly, we don't know.

Would Communist-ridden Italy help? It would not.

Would the western Germans, whom we've befriended and defended, fight with us? Recent elections indicate they wouldn't.

Would India aid? Not likely.

What does that leave us? The British, naturally. They exercise the prerogatives of a relative. They criticize us freely and expect us to do things for them and in their way. But when an outsider moves in they stand at our backs.

Who else is there, besides the Canadians and Australians?

This sounds like a brutal appraisal.

But we believe it is simply realistic. At least the burden of proof is upon our allies.

Our fighting men are dying by thousands in Korea. Our latest casualty list is more than 31,000 killed, wounded, and missing.

Who's fighting the war—despite token aid from 12 of our allies? We are.

Who's supposed to provide the money and equipment and troops to protect western Europe? We are.

And who is criticized when things go wrong? We are.

If our allies want a broader military high command in Korea, we're for them. Let them supply it—and the troops and munitions and money to go with it.

We're getting a little impatient with allies who talk a good game and like to coach, but want us to provide the uniforms, do all the blocking, carry the ball—and collect the lumps.

So we think a show-down is in order—with our friends first.

Then with our enemies.

What's Wrong With Labor Leadership?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter G. O'Donnell from the New Leader of November 27, 1950:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH LABOR LEADERSHIP?

The labor movement is really moving through a profound evolutionary process. Union-management relationships are changing so rapidly that labor lawyers and labor economists hesitate to write books on the subject for fear that they will automatically become dated. A new and still nebulous body of law is evolving, with the aim of regulating the relations of labor and management toward each other and toward the public; and the outcome of this strategic economic development is bound to determine for a long time the structure, efficiency and equitability of our economic system.

Although the fundamental traditions and liberating purposes of the labor movement remain essentially the same, the changing institutional pattern of power and the increasing social effects of union activities have so altered the operational situation that new methods and functions—and a keen ethical sense of social responsibility—are required of union leadership today.

ROUGH-AND-TUMBLE GLADIATORS

In the old days, labor leaders were like gladiators, locked in rough-and-tumble combat with stubborn employers, most of whom refused to bargain collectively until forced to do so. Blocked by the restrictive provisions of an antiquated legal code, these early labor leaders had to fight relentlessly for every gain, generally without benefit of legal support, and sometimes in derogation of arbitrary legal formalities. This extremely adverse situation bred its type: the belligerent, strong-headed, leather-lunged fellow with heavy jaw and bulging muscles, whom some have since deemed it fashionable to stereotype and ridicule. But without the fighting qualities and courage of the old-line labor leader, trade-unionism would never have progressed.

With few exceptions, the old-fashioned labor leaders have grown up with the labor movement and have adjusted themselves to the modern era by developing a wider social vision and concomitant new methods. Among them there is now a more sensible appreciation for the public consequences of union activities. Keeping in mind that organized labor is still a minority of the working force, and that attention is directed to every public move made by a labor leader, the importance of breeding a new kind of labor leadership—one that is socially acceptable, dynamic, and can see beyond the immediate interests of the union membership—becomes obvious. It is only by being something more than a leader of labor that the modern union official can further the purposes of trade-unionism and extend its constructive influence into the affairs of the community.

The changed situation vis-à-vis the trade-unions, in which problems of increasing complexity and scope are constantly arising, is producing a new type of labor leader. Some of his features are already evident. He possesses well-controlled fighting qualities, moral courage, quiet persistence, a flexible intelligence. Soft-spoken and cool in debate, he is usually armed with legal logic, with the facts of economics, and with up-to-date psychological techniques for guiding group activity.

Thanks to New Deal legislation, organized labor is no longer as frustrated by hoary legal statutes as it once was, nor so completely the outcast of the courts. Protection of the right to organize and bargain collectively—as provided in the Wagner Labor Relations Act (before Taft-Hartley) and the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and in related legislation restricting the use of the injunction in labor disputes and exempting unions from the antitrust laws—have given labor a workable measure of equalized legal and economic influence with management. As a result, collective bargaining, one of the most essential institutions of free enterprise, has grown more effective as a mean of improving the conditions of the workingman and the processes of industrial coordination.

THE NEW PATTERN

Through the years of economic recovery and war, labor and management became more cooperative, and trade-union membership grew in numbers and in power. But the new pattern of more fairly balanced power between labor and capital, however workable, appeared offensive to certain managerial interests which had become accustomed to a continual preponderance of power on their side. Instead of being satisfied with an orderly up-and-down movement of counterbalancing but cooperative forces, management wanted the teeter-totter always tipped in its favor, and every time the weight of organized labor put management "up in the air" it yelled for help against the growing power of labor. This reaction culminated in the Taft-Hartley Act—which impartial economists, arbitrators, and legal experts who have observed the actual effects of it on collective bargaining agree has impeded, confused, and disrupted the orderly processes of bargaining, and has reduced labor relations more and more to a problem for litigation and decision by courts and governmental agencies. In short, the Taft-Hartley law and similar types of State laws are pushing labor relations into "statism" and unions into politics—with a vengeance.

Not only has the legal status of labor improved over what it was many years ago, but its economic strength has grown because key segments of the economy are so well unionized that labor's decisions, demands, and achievements are affecting the whole structure of our interdependent economic society. This explains the new widespread interest in labor, and motivates the growing social responsibility of labor leaders. No longer can individuals or groups afford to act in economic affairs as if they alone exist; at times, true, their interests may coincide with the general welfare—but on other occasions group demands may require modification or self-restraint to accommodate larger social needs. The strategy of the labor movement should embrace the broadest interests of society, working toward full employment at high levels of production under relatively stable conditions favorable to the creative effort and welfare of all.

A VITAL FUNCTION

Labor relations are no longer a gladiatorial contest before an amused but disinterested public, but are a most vital function in our economic structure which, when disrupted, can profoundly affect the social and economic fabric of the Nation. Such disruption may involve the chronic indigestion produced by obsolete building codes or the acute paralysis of a general strike. However, no one can expect an economic system to function painlessly, and some disturbances—even strikes in public utilities and the civil service—being symptoms of deeper disorders and injustices, may warrant a collective withholding of labor services as a last resort.

If the decisions of labor unions are to be made with reference to the interests of society at large, it is important that their membership as well as their leadership have an understanding of economics and other social sciences in addition to a practical grasp of immediate problems. Thoughtful unionists should, for this reason, consider the need for establishing a national labor institute to train labor leaders scientifically. Most institutions of higher learning conduct special courses for the training of industrial and business personnel, but very few provide facilities for educating young men for the difficult responsibilities of labor leadership. Yet the function of the leader of labor is rapidly becoming as vital as that of the businessman and industrial manager, and is likely to increase in importance as collective bargaining expands in the direction of union-management cooperation. Education has always needed the support of the labor movement; now the labor movement needs the support of education.

The nonpartisan business unionism of Samuel Gompers served to advance the labor movement during his heyday; but today, labor is in politics for keeps. The reason for this is clear. Labor made its greatest gains when formerly restrictive laws pertaining to its rights were reformed. When people in a movement which relates so directly to their personal welfare, as does labor, become convinced that government policy is the key to realizing the purposes of their movement, they are impelled to engage in politics on a partisan basis. More and more, labor-management issues are being transferred from the bargaining table to the realms of law and politics.

SPECIALISTS NEEDED

This legal-political process, from which a new labor-management pattern is evolving, requires of its participants a great deal more than skill in collective bargaining or ability to exert organized pressure. In fact, the functions of labor leadership have so expanded that, in the larger locals, in the State and national federations, and in the national and international unions, these functions can be effectively performed only when distributed among specialists. The most a small local can do is choose leaders versatile enough to meet the new demands of an efficient, modern union; but even on the local level it has become necessary to organize auxiliaries such as educational, public relations, and political action committees. A rapidly growing segment of labor, aware of its enlarged social, economic, and political responsibilities, is providing specialized services to fulfill those responsibilities efficiently. More than 50 national and international A. F. of L. unions have an educational director, a research director, or both; nearly all the large CIO unions are similarly staffed. Most unions have a legal department, and an increasing number are employing economists, statisticians, public-relations directors, and specialists in workers' education.

The labor leader in this age of specialization, fully aware of his new scope, is more than a representative of the interests of his union—he is also an executive who coordinates and directs a staff of specialists who assist him in administering union policy. In his capacity as executive he embraces the functions of an entrepreneur, a salesman, and a statesman. The labor leader who tries to perform the whole job of union administration himself will either do it poorly, or kill himself trying to do it well; even an outstanding labor leader would have to neglect, say, public relations, education, and research in order to attend to pressing matters like grievances, contracts, and organization drives. A function like political action alone is not merely a problem in how to organize union members for effective political expression of their interests; it is also a matter of preparing the workingman for acts which will extend his influence further into the community, and of securing the support of nonlabor elements for policies designed to improve the general welfare. Successful political action, in this broader sense, involves marshalling the services of experts in public relations, workers' education, and economic research—areas where labor is most in need of improvement.

RECONCILING INTERESTS

Organized employers, in trade associations, chambers of commerce and manufacturers' associations, are using the techniques of economics, education, and public relations extensively to help them state their position on public issues in an effort to reconcile their interests with society's. This approach is legitimate, and not always antilabor; but unless it is balanced by other viewpoints equally well articulated, it may produce a strongly conservative bias in the community and thus obstruct the labor movement's progress.

Evidence of this systematic drive on the part of employers, which columnist Thomas L. Stokes has called the "conservative counter-revolution," can be found on every side. Millions of dollars per month are being spent in a campaign to resell the free enterprise system to the American public. Of course, labor is for free enterprise—but for everybody—and collective bargaining is one of the cornerstones of genuine free enterprise. But free enterprise is a phrase with many

meanings and, unfortunately, for some whose fervor reaches fanatic proportions at mention of those holy words they mean freebooting. Interestingly enough, the free enterprisers are selling employers and business executives on the idea of getting out of their offices and into community life; as a result, some employers have even gone to as far as organizing tours of school children and teachers through their plants. Organized labor might follow this example with profit.

The World Crisis Stems From Many Errors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Salt Lake City Tribune under date of December 7, 1950, written by Holmes Alexander, a well-known national columnist. The title of the article is World Crisis Stems from Many Errors.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD CRISIS STEMS FROM MANY ERRORS

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Depending on how you look at it, Capitol Hill reaction to the Korean setback has been (a) an orgy of blamesgiving or (b) a sober willingness to reexamine the causes of our plight. This column is based on an interview with an administration Senator who is as close to the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon as anybody in Washington.

WHO'S TO BLAME?

He believes that—

1. It was a mistake to go to Korea and it is a mistake to stay there.

2. The decision to intervene in Korea was primarily a tragic popularity bid by President Truman who hoped to outsmart his Republican critics.

3. Everybody is in part to blame for our desperate predicament—the President on his guilty motives, the business leaders who called for tax reductions in a time of crisis, and mercurial American public which demanded disarmament in 1945 and shouted for action as the cold war intensified from 1948 onward.

4. We must now appease communism, abandon Asia, stall for time, and rearm in the realistic knowledge that we have lost the first battle of world war III and must go all out to win the last one.

LOSS OF FAITH

These opinions, which I am reporting and are not my own, go a long way toward revealing the disunity, lack of confidence, and loss of faith which prevail in the Capital City. These are not praiseworthy qualities, but they serve one useful purpose. They combat the old wives' tale that, having made one's bed, one must lie in it. If we lie much longer in this one, we shall certainly die there. The mood in which the Senator delivered those opinions was not defeatist by any means. It was a mood that called for understanding, for change.

We should understand, better late than never, that the cheers which greeted Mr. Truman's bold act of last June drowned out solemn military warnings. The Senator of this interview presided at some secret hearings, and sat in on many more, where the Joint Chiefs of Staff plainly stated that Korea was useless to occupy and impossible to defend.

OPINIONS OVERRULED

These opinions were overruled by the President. It is as simple as that. He reversed both his Secretary of State and his military advisers—all of whom might properly have resigned in order to alert the country. We went into Korea on the gamble that neither Russia nor Red China would fight us there. If either or both did fight us, the A-bomb was known to be our last resort—and still is. But the fate of the Korean campaign was always in Communist hands, not ours. Mr. Truman was playing his luck.

The President, far more experienced in politics than in military matters, was right about one thing. His popularity rocketed skyward as a result of his bold action. He was acclaimed abroad and at home. His Republican adversaries, particularly in the Senate, were covered with confusion as his action rebutted charges of appeasing communism and bypassing the United Nations. Is this the kernel of his Korean decision? The Senator under interview thinks it is. "I'll say this much," he said. "If the Republicans had not been hammering on Harry Truman, he'd never have gone to Korea. Blame him for it; yes. But blame the Republicans for driving him into it."

There from a close friend and adviser is one of the most pungent judgments ever made of Harry Truman. He wanted to be popular. He wanted to confound the political opposition. How much more infantile can leadership be?

EVERYBODY TO BLAME

As for the Senator's general statement that everybody is partly responsible for the fix we are in, that is surely a matter of the leadership we've chosen. If the American public has been wrong about Russia, the best proof is that we elected Presidents who recognized the Soviet Union as early as 1933 and expected to live in peace with Russia as late as last spring. If it was a mistake to believe in peace and prosperity, the mistake was made when we elected a President who promised these things in 1948. These are errors which we might as well confess and try to do better next time.

As for the rest, we lost the battle of Asia when Mr. Truman lost his gamble that neither Russia nor Red China would fight in Korea. Even if we stabilize the MacArthur line and defend it all winter, we must still win the last battle of world war III—the battle of Russia. We won't win it by carping criticism.

Military Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter by Arthur E. Farmer, addressed to the New York Times, under date of April 11, 1950. The letter has just been called to my attention, and I think it should be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 16, 1950]

MILITARY COURTS—PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF ACCUSED HELD NO THREAT TO DISCIPLINE

(The writer of the following letter served in the Judge Advocate General's Department. He is now chairman of the Committee on Military Law of the War Veterans Bar Association.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the Times of April 9, C. Bradford Welles says: "As a teacher and as an officer, I am familiar with the complaint that military justice is not justice. I agree. It is not and should not be."

Mr. Welles "justifies" this conclusion by assuming that justice is incompatible with discipline and that the decent administration of justice to men and women in the Armed Forces will "endanger the fabric of discipline which alone can secure victory."

Fortunately, the officers and administrative officials who are responsible for the leadership of the armed services do not appear to agree with Mr. Welles. There have been major differences of opinion respecting the requirements of a Uniform Code of Military Justice. But these differences have all been based upon conflicts in ideas as to the means by which justice may be insured, and not upon any doubt that the fundamental purpose of the court-martial system is to guarantee to every member of the services charged with an offense an impartial trial, with all the constitutional safeguards found in civilian life which can be afforded the accused under the exigencies of military service.

Notwithstanding the unanimous view that the court-martial system must be a system of justice, opponents of the proposal to eliminate the right of the commanding officer to appoint the courts argued that such a provision would subvert discipline and interfere with the armed services' primary duty of winning wars. Answering this contention, Senator MORSE recently stated upon the floor of the Senate:

"The best answer I can give is the statement of one general who testified before the War Department Advisory Committee on Military Justice that—

"Discipline is maintained by many means, outstanding of which is the proper administration of justice. There is no such thing as a choice between maintenance of discipline and proper administration of justice by the courts-martial system. Justice is administered through courts martial in the interest of maintaining proper disciplinary standards.

"Those of the Members of the Senate who have served, not in the exalted ranks of the generals and admirals but in the lower echelons of the military, naval and Air Forces, know that nothing will arouse the resentment of the men and women in the services as quickly and in such degree as the feeling that one of their number is receiving a raw deal from a court martial, and they will also know, as the rest of us must realize from our human experience, that a resentful individual is an inefficient individual and one who is far less amenable to discipline than those who have faith in their superiors." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 3, 1950, p. 1432.)

In this statement lies the basic refutation of Mr. Welles' contention. The Army realizes, if Mr. Welles does not, that men can be led but cannot be driven, and that the fundamental requisite for leadership is the leader's ability to inspire confidence. It has explicitly so stated in one of its field manuals. Men and women trained in the American tradition will not accept injustice as a necessary implication of discipline, and will

refuse their confidence to officers who work on the contrary assumption.

Expediency is never a valid excuse for injustice. A stinging sense that a court martial has given a member of their unit a raw deal will do more to subvert discipline and destroy morale than those slight delays which may be inherent in giving a man a fair trial—the process which Mr. Welles refers to as legalism.

ARTHUR E. FARMER.

NEW YORK, *April 11, 1950.*

Current World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Sunday, December 10, I was interviewed on the subject of the current world crisis by Mr. Don Passante over Station WNJR, Newark, N. J. In this interview I expressed the belief that if the world-wide forces of freedom are to prevail we must stick to our friends and stick to our principles, and we must speak for those principles in truly inspiring terms to all the peoples of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that this interview be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. PASSANTE. Senator SMITH, will you tell us what in your judgment are the most important steps to be taken in the present world crisis?

Senator SMITH. I would answer that, first of all, by saying what seems to me the general duty of all of us, the American people and free peoples everywhere. That duty, as I see it, is to stick to our friends and stick to our principles everywhere in the world. I think we must keep in mind that over-all duty as the guiding principle of our actions in all these problems that beset us today: Stick to our friends and stick to our principles.

Mr. PASSANTE. Why do you put it in just that way, Senator? Do you think there is danger that we may abandon friends or principles?

Senator SMITH. I wish I could say confidently that I thought there was no such danger, but I am inclined to think there is. To my mind, that is the greatest danger we face. That is just what the Communists want to bring about—they hope that each of the free nations will become so fearful of Communist aggression against itself that the morale and cohesion of the free world will fall apart and that every nation will try to save its own skin at the expense of the rest. The Communists are waging a war of nerves as well as a war of weapons in the hope of breaking our unity. We have to resist that war of nerves just as much as the war of weapons. We have to stick together and keep our heads.

Mr. PASSANTE. Senator SMITH, you have more than once publicly opposed the idea of a preventive war by the United States against Russia. Do you still feel the same way?

Senator SMITH. Very definitely. I know some Americans have sincerely argued for a preventive war, but in my judgment it would be a tragic error to start a conflict which might cost millions of lives both here in America and throughout the world at a time when we still have a chance to save freedom without a general war. On the same basis, I personally oppose the use of the atomic bomb unless and until we are forced into a total war.

If we are to preserve the unity and the common moral purpose of the free world, there are three courses which we must follow:

First, we must make crystal clear to the whole world our unflagging desire for peace. If war should come, we must be ready to fight it; but we ourselves must never yield to the temptation to be the warmakers.

Second, we in America must take the leadership in supporting freedom everywhere in the world, for large and small nations alike, in Asia as well as Europe. There has been pressure on us, of course, to abandon Asia with the idea of building up Europe. In my judgment that would be folly. The fight for freedom is a world-wide proposition. I am hopeful that our friends in Europe can be brought to see the matter in that light and join us in a world-wide effort to maintain the institutions we value. If we aim high I know we can find the strength to follow through.

My third point is that we must not appease anywhere in the world. We have had to retreat in Korea and we may well have to retreat some more. But don't forget we had to retreat at Bataan and still we won the Japanese war. No matter where the battle lines are, we must always be prepared for sweat, blood, and tears to save our principles, and we must refuse to enter into any unmoral agreements for expediency or under duress. As soon as we begin to compromise our principles, as soon as we begin saying that what was wrong yesterday is right today simply because it is backed by superior might, the unity of the free world will dissolve and the United Nations as a force for peace will cease to exist.

Mr. PASSANTE. Then, Senator SMITH, if you rule out preventive war and at the same time you reject appeasement, how do we proceed from there? Do you think there is any basis for negotiation with the Russians or the Chinese Communists?

Senator SMITH. That depends on them. Thus far they have shown very little disposition to negotiate in good faith. At the same time, on our side we would never rule out the possibility of honorable negotiation. We should explore every possibility through our diplomatic channels, because when the diplomats give up then the war is on. But I repeat, we must never entertain the notion of some Munich-type settlement by which we agree to what we know is morally wrong.

Mr. PASSANTE. One further question, Senator SMITH. Are you still hopeful that the Communist powers actually will negotiate on terms we can accept without a general war?

Senator SMITH. In other words, you are asking whether I still have hopes that a third world war can be avoided.

Mr. PASSANTE. Yes, Senator.

Senator SMITH. I think the Communist leaders in Moscow will negotiate only if they are faced with superior force in the free world. They showed that in the case of the Berlin blockade in 1948.

Therefore the great problem for us now in order to avoid war, and I want to emphasize this above all, is to build up the strength of freedom all over the world as fast as we possibly can. That means military production, it means sacrifices for all of us at home, and of course it means sacrifices for the other free nations, including Europe, who are having to turn back to military affairs just as they had begun to get back on their feet through the European recovery program. But if we see the need and if we stick together on a world-wide basis, we can do the job.

Last of all, but equally important, we must develop new means of breaking through the iron curtain and bringing the message of hope and freedom to all the people who are now under Communist subjection. That includes the Russian people. We must convince them that we are their friends, that we want peace and free communication and understanding with them. If we can get that message through in a powerful enough way, then we will add the good will of the Russian people and the captive peoples to the power of the free world.

Mr. PASSANTE. We know how concerned you have been with that problem, Senator SMITH, and we know that our Government's world-wide Voice of America program owes its existence to the Smith-Mundt Act which you initiated in the Senate more than 2 years ago. Do you think the Voice of America is doing an effective job today with its world-wide "campaign of truth"?

Senator SMITH. Yes; I think it is doing an increasingly good job. We greatly increased the size of its operations by a new appropriation this year. Yet nothing we have done so far is good enough. We still have the obstacle of Russian jamming. It is becoming more and more difficult for radio programs, printed material, and individual people to get through the iron curtain. We have that problem, and we also have the problem of how to express our ideals in terms which will have powerful meaning for people everywhere.

We cannot afford to neglect any means which will make a contribution to this effort. I have suggested the idea of a Voice of Freedom to inspire human beings everywhere with loyalty to the great heritage of our free civilization. Not only America but all free nations must enlist in this great effort. There is a vital place in it not only for governments but for private groups and individuals like you and me. It may be that the United Nations can help us in this work, because it is the principles of the United Nations which are at stake today.

This is something for all of us in America to think very hard about. As we build up our military power it must go hand in hand with the power of our moral principles, and our ability to speak for those principles in terms which will inspire all the peoples of the world. If we can do that, I am confident that we can save the peace and save freedom. That, as I see it, is the God-given destiny of free America.

The Hiss Verdict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me and an editorial entitled "Hiss Verdict Upheld," published in the Washington Post of December 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

The unanimous decision of the circuit court of appeals in New York, upholding

the conviction of Alger Hiss, brings close to a conclusion this notorious espionage and disloyalty case which is certain to rival in history—if not exceed—the transgressions of Aaron Burr.

As acting chairman of the subcommittee in the House of Representatives in the Eightieth Congress which undertook the investigation of Alger Hiss, which heard the shocking testimony of Whittaker Chambers, and which disclosed the documentary evidence leading to the indictment and conviction of Hiss, let me say it is good to know that the long-continued activities of Hiss in his connivance with the Communists are about to be abruptly ended by his impending incarceration.

The attached editorial from the Washington Post is especially interesting because the Post was one of those newspapers in America which in its cartoons and editorials lambasted our committee viciously when we were investigating Alger Hiss. Speaking from the vantage point of writers and cartoonists entirely devoid of the actual facts in the case, it is perhaps understandable that the early position of the Post was to defend Hiss and to denounce the committee which was serving the public interest by trying to amass the evidence required to disclose his treacherous activities. In all events, I congratulate the Post on the attached editorial which indicates that unlike the tragic example of Dean Acheson it is now entirely willing to "turn its back" upon the Communist agent it had mistakenly defended in its earlier policies.

Now all that remains is for Herb Block to draw some cartoons which in their attack upon characters like Hiss will be at least partially as passionate and pertinent as those he drew to attack the men and the committee which were responsible for the exposure and the conviction of Alger Hiss.

Like the editors of the Post, I have often marveled at the iron nerve, the disciplined emotions, and the stubborn silence of Alger Hiss in failing to come clean now that we are in a life-or-death war with world communism. He could tell much if he would which would help America even at this late hour. He could give us many names of people in and out of Government whose identity as spies or agents of Russian communism would help save the lives of American boys now dying in Korea. As the Post so clearly points out, by so doing Alger Hiss might at least make it easier to live with his fellow citizens when his term is over and with his conscience in the meantime. By making such disclosures now—just as Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley did long ago—Alger Hiss could at least do belatedly a constructive service for the country which has done so much for him but which he has never done anything to defend in time of war.

However, it was indeed a strange cabal of characters that were associated with Hiss in the Communist conspiracy of which he and Chambers were a part. Apart from Chambers who freely confessed, and Henry Julian Wadleigh who turned state's evidence when it was made clear to him the statute of limitations would prevent his arrest, the others in that sad story of deceit and treachery have followed the code of gangland and refused to talk. Some like, Noel Field have fled the country and disappeared entirely from public view; some like Lawrence Duggan and Harry Dexter White have carried their secrets to the grave in premature deaths; some like Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, and many others have pled constitutional immunity against having to testify with self-incriminating evidence; some like Donald Hiss, brother of Alger, and law partner of Dean Acheson, have been protected from investigation by the fact that when the Democratic Congress took over from the Republican Eightieth Congress, they put the House Committee of Un-American Activities entirely under new controls and leadership and refused to continue the investigations of the Chambers' testimony which the Republican Eightieth Congress had begun and which had led to the conviction of Alger Hiss. The Democratic high command was so upset by this conviction, they even removed from the House Un-American Activities Committee two prominent Democratic Members who had served on the subcommittee which brought about the Hiss conviction.

Thus we are involved with war against communism but many who can and should tell the country the names of operatives in and out of government whose machinations helped so greatly to involve us in the present situation will not talk and the appropriate committees of Congress up to date have failed to force out the evidence by the necessary vigorous investigations required to produce it. Up to date, no name supplied by Whittaker Chambers has demonstrated innocence once indicated by the Chambers testimony, but many named by Chambers have never been submitted to the same careful and comprehensive investigation and public hearings without which in the case of Alger Hiss, the indictment and conviction of this notorious character would never have been secured. It is unfortunate indeed that the appropriate committees of Congress have not courageously completed the work they so nobly started.

[From the Washington Post of December 9, 1950]

HISS VERDICT UPHELD

The circuit court of appeals in New York has done nothing to solve the mystery of Alger Hiss, but it appears to have removed any lingering doubts as to the fairness and legality of his conviction. Attorneys for Mr. Hiss pressed every conceivable challenge to the jury's verdict and Judge Goddard's conduct of the trial. At no point does it appear that they came close to convincing the circuit judges that there was any material weakness in the verdict. As Judge Harrie B. Chase, who wrote the opinion, and Judges Augustus N. Hand and Thomas W. Swan, who concurred, are eminent men of the law, their unanimous conclusion seems to establish the guilt of Mr. Hiss with about as much certainty as can be attained by the judicial process.

It is not the function of an appellate court, of course, to try a case over again. But the court did thoroughly comb through the record and found that "there was independent evidence sufficient as a matter of law, if believed and so considered by the jury, to substantiate the testimony of Mr. Chambers in compliance with the rule in perjury cases as to both counts." The opinion also analyzes enough of the testimony to indicate that it would have been very difficult for the jury to have arrived at any other verdict. No doubt Mr. Hiss will ask the Supreme Court to review the case, but as that Court hears cases only in the interests of clarifying the law it may see nothing in a petition from Mr. Hiss that demands its attention.

There is every indication also that Mr. Hiss prefers to go to prison as a man of mystery, stoutly protesting that he never betrayed his trust as a State Department official. That, of course, is his privilege. At no point in our judicial process is a man required to confess or to testify against himself. Yet this cool and cynical perjurer ought to realize that his one chance of softening the attitude of the American people toward himself is to come clean and tell all he knows about the Communist spy ring that was apparently operating with his connivance. That service to his country would not in any degree wipe out his guilt or minimize the despicable nature of his offense, but it would doubtless make it easier for him to live with his fellow citizens when his term is over and with his own conscience in the meantime.

One More Question, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following article appearing in the December 16 issue of America, national Catholic weekly, entitled "One More Question, Mr. President:"

ONE MORE QUESTION, MR. PRESIDENT

(By M. Amrine, E. A. Conway, S. J., and M. S. Levine)

(A Catholic, a Jew, and a Protestant explore some of the moral implications of President Truman's stated position on the use of the atom bomb. Father Conway, associate editor of America, is joined by Murray S. Levine, chairman of the New York Committee on Atomic Energy, and Michael Amrine, former education director of Brookhaven atomic laboratory.)

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your reply to questions at your press conference on November 30 about the use of the atom bomb and also in the clarifying statement issued later the same afternoon from the White House, you stated that there has been active consideration of the use of the bomb since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea.

You issued your clarifying statement to make it certain that there is no misinterpretation of your answers at the press conference. In search of further certainty we beg leave to ask one more question:

In this active consideration of the use of the atom bomb is due attention being given to the moral questions involved in its use? Or, to rephrase the query, does our Government consider the question of how the bomb is to be used just a military question?

This point arose during one exchange at your conference, and your answer was explicit—and, as the indirect transcript testifies, very swift. We believe half the panic abroad arose from the not unwarranted fear that the bomb might be used as swiftly.

After you had replied to a questioner that there has always been active consideration of the use of the atom bomb, since it is one of our weapons, the following exchange ensued, according to the Washington Post:

"Question. Does that mean, Mr. President, use against military objectives or civilian?"

"Answer. Mr. Truman, interposing said * * * that it was a matter that the military people will have to decide—that he was not the military authority that passes on those things."

After confusing press reports had spread the impression abroad that you had authorized General MacArthur to use the bomb in Korea, your clarifying statement was issued in which it was explained that:

"Only the President can authorize the use of the atom bomb, and no such authorization has been given. If and when such authorization should be given, the military commander in the field would have charge of the tactical delivery of the weapon."

That last sentence, it sems to us, Mr. President, itself needs clarification. Does it mean that you decide only the "if and when" and that "the manner of its use will be subject to determination by the military commander in the field"? We hope that this interpretation, found in a Washington Post editorial obviously trying to put the best possible construction on your remarks, is another misinterpretation. The atom bomb is not immoral in itself. It is the manner in

which it is used that determines the morality or immorality of atomic bombing. Do you actually intend to leave to the harried judgment of a field commander the choice between, say, the bombing of military installations, which is legitimate, and the terror-bombing of civilians, which is not?

Please do not misunderstand us, Mr. President. We do not ask the United States to give up its atomic weapons, nor even to give the impression that they would not be used. We agree with the Washington Post that it would have been irresponsible folly on your part to renounce categorically the use, under any circumstances, of our most potent weapon, and that you were well advised to emphasize that it is a usable weapon, not a museum piece. What we do seek is a clearer explanation of the circumstances in which it would be used, and the assurance that you and your civilian advisers will dictate not only the if and when, but the circumstances themselves.

We fear, Mr. President, that unless you retain such control, military expediency alone will be the sole criterion. In this connection we quote from a masterly document opportunely published just 3 days before your press conference by the Federal Council of Churches, entitled "The Christian Conscience and Weapons of Mass Destruction." The basic fear of the drafting committee, which included, besides a score of eminent Protestant theologians, three prominent laymen who had been associated with atomic projects, is that the United States will follow the philosophy of total war, or war in which all moral restraints are thrown aside and all the purposes of the community are fully controlled by sheer military expediency.

The committee voices a warning that all of us should heed as we move ever deeper into conflict:

"We must recognize that the greater the threat to national existence the greater will be the temptation to subordinate everything, all civil rights, the liberty of conscience, all moral judgments regarding the means to be used, and consideration of postwar international relations, to the single aim of military victory. * * * Just as death is preferable to life under some conditions, so, too, victory at any price is not worth having. If this price is for us to become utterly brutal, victory becomes a moral defeat. Victory is worth having only if it leaves us with enough reserves of decency, justice, and mercy to build a better world and only if it leaves those we have conquered in a condition in which they can ultimately cooperate in the task of setting forward God's purpose in creation. Hence the way we fight and the means we use are of crucial importance. Military expediency * * * cannot be the sole test, but must be subordinated to moral and political considerations."

The military commander in the field cannot be expected to give proper weight to those considerations. It is just because his sole test is military expediency that the moral choices involved in atomic bombing cannot be left to him. Upon those choices may well depend the whole future of our civilization. Therefore, says the Federal Council's committee: "The National Government must not yield to the military its own responsibility for the immediate and the postwar consequences of the conduct of the war."

Undoubtedly this consideration influenced Congress in 1946 when, after long and serious discussion of military versus civilian control of atomic energy, it passed the Atomic Energy Act. Do we misinterpret that act, Mr. President, when we observe that it seems to invest you with wider responsibility for the conduct of an atomic war than you seem to have acknowledged either in your press conference or in your clarifying statement? We refer specifically to the section which gives you supreme authority over the atom bomb:

"The President from time to time may direct the Commission (1) to deliver such quantities of fissionable materials or weapons to the Armed Forces for such use as he deems necessary in the interest of national defense."

That, Mr. President, is an extremely broad grant of discretionary power, as you—and we say it sympathetically—must be only too well aware. In another field it would undoubtedly be subject sooner or later to review by the Supreme Court for official interpretation of the intent of Congress. But this grant of power is unique, in the sense that the decision you make under it will be final, subject to no review excepting history's.

As we read the act, it empowers you to turn the bombs over to the military to be used in the way you—which in effect is you and the National Security Council—deem necessary. In other words, the law seems to give you responsibility not only for the if and when, but for the how this weapon is used. It would, therefore, seem inconsistent with the letter of the law if you were to delegate to a military subordinate part of that decision which by law devolves upon you. We have already noted that it is just the part of the decision most fraught with danger to the ultimate purposes of our foreign policy Even if it would not be inconsistent with the letter, would it not be inconsistent with the spirit of the law, with what seems to have been the obvious intent of Congress, and with the tradition of the American people, who have always guarded the primacy of the civilian over the military in matters of national defense?

We have asked more than one question, we admit. But they boil down to this request. Will you, in the way you deem best, further clarify your atom-bomb policy? The questions we have raised are real questions which are bothering, we believe, not only ourselves but millions more at home and abroad. Only you, Mr. President, can allay the fears your press conference caused in the minds of your fellow men.

Subversives Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Job for Congress," published in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

A JOB FOR CONGRESS

One of the first jobs Congress should take up when it returns to Washington is a review of the so-called Internal Security Act which it passed in such haste over a Presidential veto before the Members rushed off to the hustings in their respective States.

This act, a major portion of which is known also as the Subversives Control Act or McCarran Act, has been in effect long enough, even in a matter of weeks, for people to appraise some of its shortcomings and the disturbances it has caused.

One effect, the hardship it has laid on a large number of legitimate travelers to America whose visas were suddenly canceled for reinvestigation, is largely past and cannot be rectified.

A similar effect is showing up in postponement of final naturalization ceremonies for groups of applicants who have complied with all prior requirements for citizenship but who now must be screened to determine if they belong to any organization that is * * * required to be registered under the act.

Since it is a matter of months if not years before the newly established Subversives Control Board can determine what organizations are required to register, the naturalization process would appear to be practically suspended for a while, keeping in alien status a number of desirable potential citizens as well as any undesirables.

Seth W. Richardson, chairman of the examining board, declares himself to be of an open mind but intensely curious as to whether the criteria and methods legislated for identifying Communist-front or Communist-action organizations are workable. This will take some time to judge after the Department of Justice has prepared its voluminous cases against the American Communist Party and a long list of related or suspected groups.

But already the Attorney General has had to step in with a ruling to modify the operation of the law where it was excluding from the United States persons whose connection with Fascist or Nazi organizations was only a nominal one in childhood or under duress many years ago. These may be given only temporary visas.

It is not desirable to depend on administrative modification to correct inequities in a law, for administrative discretion can also be abused. Congress should complete its job.

More than an administrative judgment is involved, for example, in determining whether President Truman was right in protesting that the list of defense activities required to be published under the law would be a convenient checklist for saboteurs.

The United States has had a great deal to learn about how to curb Communist or other totalitarian activities effectively, and that learning process did not end with the passage of the McCarran Act.

The Problems of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Junction City (Oreg.) Times for December 7, 1950. The editorial is very interesting. It sets forth some sound grass-roots philosophy, and contains a practical lesson which should be heeded by all of us, in this great period of crisis in our country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

A farmer settled in raw country. Over a period of years he built up a good farm, built good barns, equipped it well, and ridded out all the weeds and brush, even to the wild mustard in the fields. He acquired position and prospered, and also a few holdings in another part of the county.

But as the years went by he began to spend more and more of his time telling the other farmers how they should run their places, what organizations they should belong to—in fact, it got to the point that he began

cr'ticizing his neighbors' fences, livestock, machinery, and even the way the children acted. He even began trying to settle all the neighborhood quarrels—his way, of course.

The sad part of the story is that by his eagerness to be all things to all men he let his own place go down, the neighbors' scrub stock got to running with his good herds and due to hard-luck stories he gave away much of his good seed corn. After a long series of borrowing funds against future crops he found himself heavily in debt, his family dissatisfied, and even the hired help finding fault, careless in their work and indifferent to his plans.

Meantime a Johnny-come-lately had come into the picture and was not only running a pretty big place himself but leasing or otherwise taking over the operation of many other smaller outfits in the county and nearby. There was much distrust of this newcomer—both his methods and the way he treated his help and his attitude toward his neighbors was open to suspicion. It became increasingly apparent that he was out to grab everything worth grabbing by fair means or foul. And the question all of the neighbors were asking was, "What's the old pioneer going to do—take care of his own place and bring it back to its former good condition, or just go on as he is and still try to outfox this newcomer, and maybe lose everything seeing as how his own folk's don't altogether trust his good intentions any more."

The problems of nations are just the problems of people, multiplied in size but basic in principle.

Congress and Our Municipal Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Congress and Our Municipal Governments," by Hon. W. Cooper Green, mayor of Birmingham, and president of the Alabama League of Municipalities. This very able and timely address was delivered by Mayor Green at a dinner given in Washington on the evening of Monday, December 4, 1950, by the Alabama delegation to the American Municipal Congress. The dinner was in honor of Alabama's two United States Senators and the Members of the House delegation in Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND OUR MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS

This is in many ways a most unusual get-together. I doubt if there has ever before been such a meeting in Washington—a meeting where duly elected spokesmen for home-town governments back in Alabama have come to Washington to personally express appreciation to you, our spokesmen at the national level, for the fine job you have done for Alabama people—and for our local community governments.

It is altogether fitting that we should take time out from our day-to-day running of our home-town governments and appraise the relationship existing today between our local and Federal governments, and compare that relationship of today as against the situation 20 or 30 years ago.

It is also very appropriate that we, as local government officials, let you, our leaders here in Washington, know what your actions here have meant to the well-being and progress of our local communities—your home towns and those of your Alabama constituents.

I have perhaps stepped ahead of my prerogative as president of the League of Municipalities in making this talk, or giving you this message. Perhaps it should have been made by our distinguished chairman of the league's Committee on Federal City Relations, the lovable mayor of Mobile—Ernest Megginson. But, somehow, I felt that what I have to say may reflect the thinking of most of us in local government. So, I'm sure Ernest will pardon me if I step into his field and speak briefly on Federal-city relations in this interesting period in our Nation's history.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GROWS UP

There are those in our country, even in our own State of Alabama, who argue that the Federal Government has grown and grown in recent years, and because it has grown so remarkably that everything is going haywire—that everything is out of balance, governmentally speaking. I'm going to say to you people here tonight something that may sound strange for one connected with local government. I'm going to tell you that the Federal Government has not grown as fast or as much out of proportion to its size of 20 years ago as has our State government and most of our city governments. Those who harp about the size of the Federal Government never mention the great increase in serviceability of that Government, or the increased good that Federal services have done for our people. They talk only about cost in dollars and cents and the number of Federal employees. Because it costs more to run our Federal Government and takes more people to run it, the opponents of the Federal Government say the situation is all bad. I want to say a few words tonight in opposition to that viewpoint.

In my home-town afternoon paper, issue of a week or so ago, there appeared a full-page advertisement signed by an organization which claims that its purpose is to develop and promote a better understanding of the American way of life. The advertisement pointed out that in 1949 "your Federal Government spent over 12 times as much as in 1929—$3,000,000,000 in 1929, over $40,000,000,000 in 1949." It then pointed out that in 1949 the Federal Government "hired over 3 times as many civilian employees as 20 years ago—500,000 civilian employees in 1929, 2,000,000 civilian employees in 1949."

Now, let's see what the facts are; the facts as distinguished from propaganda against our Federal Government. I'm defending the Federal Government tonight because those who attack the Federal Government would just as quickly attack our city and town governments. They're against almost everything that all governments do. Then, too, we officials and people back in the local communities are a part of the Federal Government just as much as we are a part of the local city or town government. The relationship between the Federal and home-town governments is so close that when someone jumps on one or the other, it's like some individual jumping on your brother or cousin. We just naturally resent an enemy jumping on our folks—our kinfolks, so to speak. So, our Irish gets up. It gets up when we see and hear reckless individuals and organizations going about lambasting the Federal Government because it happens to be big. Sure, it's big. It serves 150,000,000 people. No other nation in the world today serves daily as many people in so many worth-while ways.

Getting back to the advertisement that appeared in my home-town newspaper about the size of the Federal Government's expenditures in 1949, as compared with 1929 expenses, let me say what Senator JOHN SPARKMAN has already so ably stated—that 70 percent of the annual budget of the Federal Government goes for payments on debts of two World Wars, veterans' payments, benefits, and services, and to prepare to avert in the future the costly errors of unpreparedness that preceded the last World War. That leaves 30 cents in each Federal dollar to be spent on domestic or normal Federal services. That's 4 times—not 12 times—what the Federal Government was spending in 1929 for Federal services. Is there anyone in this room tonight who doubts that the Federal Government is rendering more than four times as many services today as against 1929 for our people? When we realize what twelve billion Federal dollars is getting for us today in the way of Federal services and benefits, we wonder what $3,000,000,000 was spent for in 1929 when there were no old-age and survivors insurance program for the millions of our wage earners, no farm benefits, no expansive soil conservation program, no program to electrify rural and urban homes, no rural telephone program, no extensive development of our rivers and inland waterways, no flood-control measures to speak of, very little in the way of interstate road building, no airport program, no slum clearance and low-cost housing programs, no Federal-aid hospital program, no free school-lunch program, no Federal aid school-building program, very little in the way of vocational education federally supported.

Yes; the Federal Government for $3,000,000,000 in 1929 was doing a few things for our people. It provided lighthouse service for our merchant shipmen and fishermen, limited forest fire prevention services, planning of waterways projects, a limited Federal road program. There were some funds expended for vocational education. But the principal service that you and I looked to the Federal Government for in 1929 was the postal service. We did not then, as now, expect aid for small-business men. If there was any Federal aid for businessmen, it was for the great monopolies, not for the little fellow who needed the helping hand of his Government. We did not then as now look to the Federal Government for protection of bank deposits. The 1929 Federal Government to which so many of our citizens now like to point as the model government was the Government that allowed big business to squeeze to death little business, let our banking system drift into ruin and bankruptcy.

And, while the Federal Government is 4 times—not 12 times—bigger than in 1929, our State government in Alabama is 6 times bigger today than it was at that time. The figures gathered from our State comptroller show that just a little more than 20 years ago the State's revenues were $32,000,000. During the past fiscal year they were $191,000,000. Compared with 30 years ago our State government is 24 times larger today—in just 30 years, mind you. But the enemies of the Federal Government in Alabama never mention that. That would be too fair. In our city governments our expenditures have increased in about the same proportion.

So, my friends, after we eliminate the war and defense and veterans' costs from the Federal budget, our Federal Government has not grown to the same extent in the past 20 to 30 years as have our State and local governments.

WHY DO THEY GROW?

The thing that has made the Federal Government four times larger in 1950 than it was in 1930 and 1920 is the same thing that has made our State and local governments larger—an ever-increasing demand on the part of those who pay for government for more and more services and benefits from government. In the full-page advertisement that recently appeared in my city's afternoon

newspaper, to which I referred a moment ago, appeared this comment: "About 25 cents out of every dollar earned by the people goes for Federal, State, and local taxes." What does that outlay get for the people? I've already mentioned some of the gains—social security, hospitals, schools, roads, rural electrification benefits, farm income improvement, airports for an expanded transportation system, police protection, protection from fire damage and loss, sanitation services, and all sorts of other services. Total up all these services and benefits and they exceed in value anything else the dollar buys for people. There was a time—not too many years ago—when the head of the family in figuring the annual family budget always listed a sizable outlay for a case of typhoid fever, or yellow fever, or diphtheria, pneumonia, scarlet fever, measles, or any one of a dozen other maladies that could strike the family each year. The family doctor bill was certain to be costly. Today, as a result of public spending for improved public health, these diseases which used to strike annually every family, are almost unheard of—certainly they are today indeed rare.

Government is doing today for the people what they cannot as individuals do for themselves. The people, in other words, are collectively doing for themselves what they cannot individually do for themselves. Those who oppose Government's costs seldom, if ever, oppose the benefits of Government. We used to have a State senator down in Alabama who served 24 years in the senate. I've heard him say many times that he never failed to vote for an appropriation bill, but he wanted it understood that he had never voted for a revenue or tax bill. He was for the popular side of government—the spending for useful and needed services—but he was against the unpopular side, the raising of revenue for the payment of these services. There are lots of men in Congress today like that and there are officials in our State and local governments with the same point of view. But, it's to the everlasting credit of you men and to my colleagues here from the local governments that we've had the intestinal fortitude and the intellectual honesty to recognize the fact that things of real value to our Nation and to our localities cost money, and we've designed the revenue structure needed to provide the funds for rendering the long list of daily services of Government that mean so much to people.

With a huge debt hanging over from two world-wide wars and the enormous debt caused by outlays voted for benefits and services to war veterans, it is going to be difficult for our National Government to reduce its annual budget. We know that, but we hope that you men who represent us here will be ever mindful of the fact that the Federal Government has the taxing power to a much more extensive degree than we have in the States and local communities. So, it will be very helpful indeed in the financing of the State and local governments if you will help to design a pattern of Federal support of a lot of services now borne exclusively by the States and local communities, or develop a satisfactory system of grants-in-aid to help us do a better job of performing at the local level for the benefit of all our people. We know that by your past actions and votes you have indicated the strongest type of friendship for our governments and have demonstrated a pronounced interest in and sympathy for us in our battle with the problem of meeting the demands of a local populace for expanded services of all types. Let me urge that you extend your thinking and efforts in the general direction of greater cooperation between the Federal and local governments in solving some of the more difficult problems of Government financing and providing services in response to increased local demands.

YOUR VALUABLE EXPERIENCE

I cannot think of our delegation in Congress without thinking how fortunate we people in Alabama are to be so ably and so well represented here in the Nation's Capital. I think our good friend, Ed Reid, has expressed in a few of his choice words the way most of us feel about our congressional delegation. This is what he wrote in a guest editorial appearing recently in the Lee County Bulletin:

"Alabama has a fine set of men in the Congress. They're doing great work individually as lawmakers, and collectively as our State's spokesmen in the greatest legislative body in the world. But, every one of them could be a better Congressman, or a better Senator, if our people would let him be. There's not a one of them who is not in better position than any of his constituents to know at all times how his vote could be most effective in the national interest. But, every single member has to try to weigh the sentiment of the 'folks back home' on every issue upon which he must vote. Actually, they have the very best experts on all issues right at their call there in Washington. They hear testimony by knowledgeable and trained experts, but they have to listen to second-rate opinions and viewpoints from the 'folks back home' because, after all, it is the 'folks back home' and not the War Department or State Department experts on foreign affairs who send the Congressmen back to their seats—if indeed they get back to Washington for continued service after casting a series of votes, every one of vital interest to local people."

In this editorial, Ed Reid pointed out in a very clear way the importance of seniority, or long service, in the Congress on the part of our delegation. This is the way he expressed it:

"The greatest investment our people here in Alabama have is in the experience gained by the members of our delegation in Congress through years of service in Washington. Those who know the mechanics of legislation, and the processes through which bills pass before being defeated or passed, realize the value of ranking positions on important committees in Washington. I was never so much impressed by this fact than when I was called to Washington by the national organization of municipal governments back in 1937 to assist in the sponsorship of a bill to amend the Glass-Steagall Banking Act of 1933. There was a provision in the original act which prevented banks belonging to the Federal Reserve System, or which were members of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, from paying interest on daily bank balances of public bodies. It was considered a good provision from the point of view of banks, but an unfavorable one from the standpoint of public agencies. When spokesmen from cities in New York and California who, because of the great wealth of those States, became more interested in the provision than those of us in the poorer States, they found after reaching Washington that an Alabamian—Hon. Henry B. Steagall—was head of the committee before which the bill was pending. That was when I was called into the picture. It was then that I first became impressed with the value of our delegation in Congress. All of our Members were outstanding members of powerful committees. The director of the California League of Cities visited the Alabama delegation Members with me, following which visits he remarked: 'I now see why the South has exerted such a considerable influence over the passage of our Nation's laws. You people have sent your representatives here and kept them here long enough that they are in positions of great prestige and influence.' There's no question about it, we profit here in Alabama by reason of our long-established practice of sending good men to Congress and keeping them there long enough for them to acquire positions of power and influence."

I agree wholeheartedly with this viewpoint expressed by Ed Reid. I was counting up the years of service of you members of our congressional delegation the other day. I was impressed when I discovered that you 11 men have a total of 108 years of experience in Congress—an average tenure of nearly 10 years—this despite the fact that we have 6 Members who have been here less than 5 years each. This is a wholesome situation. You younger men have been able to draw on the rich experience of the older Members of the delegation, and those of you who have been here a longer time can benefit from the fresh viewpoints brought here by the newcomers. But I hope the time will never come when our Alabama people turn our Congressmen out of office before they have been here long enough to acquire the experience needed to render distinguished service to our State and her people.

FEDERAL-CITY RELATIONS INCREASE

A few weeks ago we set up inside our League of Municipalities a committee to be known as the Committee on Federal-city Relations. In appointing the members, I wrote them as follows:

"For quite some time we have been planning to set up a special committee to be known as the Committee on Federal-city Relations. Our reason for this is to have a committee to devote its entire efforts to the study of proposed Federal laws of interest to municipal government. The volume of such legislation has increased session by session until now there are actually more measures before the Congress each session affecting municipal government interests than there are in the State legislature. In other words, Congress and what Congress does each session is equally, if not more, important to the municipal governments than is the case with what the Alabama Legislature does each time it meets."

That's how important we consider the relationship between our Federal Government, on the one hand, and our municipal governments, on the other. As chairman of that committee, I have designated Hon. Ernest Megginson, the able mayor of Mobile. Two outstanding municipal officials from each congressional district were named to work with him. They are: First district, Hon. N. B. Fields, mayor of Demopolis, and Hon. W. W. Andrews, mayor of Jackson; in the second district, Hon. Travis Cosby, mayor of Opp, and Hon. Carroll Lawrence, commissioner of Troy; third district, Hon. Forney Renfroe, mayor of Opelika, and Hon. Grover Ray, mayor of Headland; fourth district, Hon. Wallis Elliott, mayor of Talladega, and Hon. Ralph Nicolson, mayor of Selma; fifth district, Hon. Roy Wallace, mayor of Gadsden, and Hon. James E. Cameron, council president of Alexander City; sixth district, Hon. W. H. Nicol, commissioner of Tuscaloosa, and Hon. J. W. Oakley, councilman of Centerville; seventh district, Hon. George Hiller, mayor of Jasper, and Hon. John W. Hendrix, mayor of Oneonta; eighth district, Hon. Elmer Vinson, mayor of Athens, and Hon. Wilford Lynn, commissioner of Sheffield; ninth district, Hon. L. A. Goolsby, mayor of Pleasant Grove, and Hon. Jap Bryant, mayor of Bessemer.

Most of these men are here tonight. They want you to know that it shall not be their purpose to try to tell you how to vote on various proposals of interest to municipalities. They will, however, from time to time, offer recommendations that are based on the public interest—not their personal interest—in all pending municipal measures. They want to help you to study more carefully all legislative matters and government policies that relate to the welfare of local government and local people. When you have their studies and suggestions, you will be able to act with more information and knowledge on our problems.

In a report that recently was issued by Chairman Megginson and his Committee on Federal-city Relations, the great volume of

legislation considered by the Eighty-first Congress of interest to our municipal governments was discussed with our 234 member-municipalities. This report fully indicated the importance of Congress and its actions to our local governments.

I cannot close my remarks without thanking you for all that you have done here at the Federal level to help make our Alabama municipal governments sounder and more serviceable, and to thank you for coming here this evening and allowing us to discuss with you the importance of a strengthening of the bonds of cooperation and effort on the part of the Federal and municipal governments. Our ties of personal friendship are always strong, and our greatest hope is that our official or governmental relationship shall always be just as strong. You are our national spokesmen, and as long as you are here we know our interests, the interests of our local community governments and local people, are being fully safeguarded and well represented.

I thank you.

A Bad Week for the Big Lie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a manuscript of a broadcast by Mr. Charles M. Hulten, of the State Department, in charge of our Voice of America program. The broadcast was delivered recently at Valley Forge, at a program honoring the State of Oregon.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BAD WEEK FOR THE BIG LIE

The Communist strategy of the big lie has suffered a number of bad blows in the past week in Germany and the United Nations. In Eastern Germany an attempt to whip up a propaganda campaign charging American planes with dropping incendiary bombs on East German grain fields has just bogged down in confusion. The campaign began a few days ago. The usual inspired stories appeared in a number of Communist papers. And then evidently something happened. ADN, the Communist news agency, withdrew a dispatch it had sent out earlier giving details of the alleged fire-bomb incident and sent a warning to its subscribers not to use the story.

What caused the fumbling in the East German ministry is not clear at this moment. Perhaps officials of the ministry got their signals crossed with Moscow. Perhaps they remembered that during the war, Dr. Goebbels made an identical charge against the British Air Force, and they thought the resemblance a bit too embarrassing. Perhaps, even, they read some of the back numbers of the East German press, which have been warning locomotive crews to observe more care, because sparks from their engines were setting grain fields afire. Or perhaps they realized they had made a bad mistake in identifying the marking of the American planes allegedly involved in the incident since the United States Air Force does not even have the type of planes mentioned.

Whatever the reasons, it is evident that the technicians of this latest big lie are taking time out to straighten themselves out.

Meanwhile, to the rest of the world, the difficulties in which the Communist strategists of the big lie find themselves are encouraging. The fire-bomb campaign was obviously planned as a successor to the late and ill-fated potato-bug story. That big lie was a major effort. But it, too collapsed under the weight of its contradictions. The people of Eastern Europe were well aware that the potato bugs which American planes were accused of dropping had long infested their farmlands. And when jokes began to circulate about this campaign in the various countries of Eastern Europe, the propagandists suddenly saw the light. They knew they were beaten and called the campaign off.

To most people, the implications of the difficulties which these big lies have met are important. Despite the iron control of all the sources of information behind the curtain, Communist propagandists are having a difficult time convincing their skeptical peoples that black is white.

Another prominent Communist—Mr. Jacob Malik—is also finding this out. Mr. Malik has been trying to tell the world with little success that the United States is guilty of aggression in Korea. But unlike his Eastern European comrades who control the press and radio of their countries and don't have to worry about anyone talking back in public, Mr. Malik has to work under a great handicap. He is in the unhappy position of having to prove his lies with facts. This he has found impossible to do ever since he assumed the presidency of the Security Council and began to give his upside-down version of events in Korea. For the facts in Korea speak for themselves.

As American delegate to the UN, Warren Austin has pointed out two times this week, it is the North Korean troops that are invading the Republic of Korea. It is the North Koreans and those who support them that are responsible for the bloodshed. And it is the North Koreans and those who support their aggression who can stop the bloodshed at a moment's notice.

After driving home these self-evident facts, Mr. Austin summed up the situation in Korea with a simple analogy, which is worth repeating.

"A man's house," he said, "has been attacked by a band a bandits, who have occupied most of its rooms and driven him and his entire family into one corner while reinforcements * * * are on the way. At this point, a powerful patrol of the invaders suggest 'peaceful settlement of the question'; he says the shooting should stop and the police should go back to headquarters. The invaders would remain in possession of most of the house. They would hold on to their weapons. The householder and his family would be left in their corner, nearly disarmed and wounded * * * does this proposal appeal to the household as 'peaceful settlement.' What will the community think of a police force which accepts such a proposal?"

And Mr. Austin answered his question with these words:

"The United Nations has undertaken to protect the Korean people from aggression and to help the Korean people attain freedom of unity and peace. The 'peace' resolution proposed by the Soviet resolution is the kind of peace that ensues when the innocent victim lies dead and still."

These words are going to be heard throughout the world. They are going to echo in the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union despite the effort of the Communist governments to suppress them. And Mr. Malik is going to find that his attempt to counter the truth with the big lie will have as little success as the potato-bug campaign or its close cousin, the incendiary-bomb fable. The truth, as Communist propagandists have been finding out lately, is a tough opponent to beat. This has indeed been a bad week for big lies and big liars.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Real Displaced Persons," written by Marie T. Gerhard, and published in the April 1950 issue of the Magnificat, a Catholic monthly magazine. I invite the attention of all Senators to the article. In my judgment, the author says more about the Volksdeutsche, the problems which confront them, how they have been mistreated, and the attitude toward them of our State Department and the administration than any other article I have read on the subject. Miss Gerhard is an outstanding writer on the subject, and I invite the attention of all Senators to the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL DISPLACED PERSONS
(By Marie T. Gerhard)

Do you know the difference between a displaced person and an expellee? Such a conspiracy of silence has been prevailing in the public press that you are indeed exceptional if you can make this distinction.

Broadly speaking, a DP is a displaced person of any other nationality or racial origin than German. An expellee, in contrast, is an individual only of German origin, who for that reason is excluded from the medical care, food, clothing rations, and immigration privileges granted the former group.

The latter comprise approximately 15,000,000 unfortunates who were displaced by the Potsdam agreement and by countries of southeastern Europe. Signed by the United States, Britain, and Russia, the Potsdam pact stipulated in part: "The transfer to Germany of German population or elements thereof, remaining in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary will have to be undertaken."

Though their forefathers had settled this territory before the discovery of America, 15,000,000 citizens were made destitute by one stroke of the pen. Having fought nazism, this multitude was also a tangible threat to communism. Nevertheless, they were informed, "Take only what you can carry. You have an hour to get out of here."

Torn from their loved ones as finally as if death had parted them, these hapless victims were flung into unheated cattle cars. Like refuse they were dumped upon a land unable to provide for its own 60,000,000 inhabitants.

What had been left behind—homes and farms, food and clothing—all was seized by Communist vultures.

During the mass expulsion men were beaten, women were violated, children were taken by the legs and hurled against trees. As a result, 3,000,000 perished or were never heard of again.

Of the 12,000,000 surviving, 7,600,000 were scattered between the American and British zones of Germany, 4,000,000 in the Soviet zone, and 350,000 in Austria. Had they been on a desert island they could not have been more isolated from their dear ones.

A number were housed in ramshackle army barracks with leaky roofs and air holes for windows. Bunks were laid in tiers so that

six people were and are sleeping in an area less than half the size of your bedroom.

The natives were ordered: "All you can keep of your home is one or two rooms. From now on seven or eight 'guests' will share the rest with you."

The situation is still desperate. In Western Germany alone there is a shortage of roughly 5,000,000 dwellings.

War atrocities grow pale in comparison with the tortures which have been inflicted upon these outcasts. As Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, so ably expressed it:

"Never in the course of inhuman events has any group of people been so ruthlessly treated as the so-called expellees, who augment their daily prayers with a supplication that somewhere on earth a place can be found where their sole crime, the stigma of being of German ethnic origin, will be pardoned, so that they may once again raise their faces skyward and breathe an air not polluted with bigotry, abuse, and the stench of rotting bodies of their miserable friends and wretched relatives."

The DP bill of 1948 has been propagandized to make us think that equal benefits are given the displaced persons and the expellees, when nothing could be further from the truth. Sole care of the DP's and problems concerning their immigration have been placed in the hands of the International Refugee Organization, whose constitution specifically excludes, in a class with quislings and war criminals, those of German ethnic origin.

This means that had your family lived for generations in Poland, for example, the protest might be: "Your great-grandmother was a German, so you're automatically disqualified."

The Langer amendment of the DP bill of 1948 permits 13,000 expellees to be admitted to this country yearly under the German quota. But even this has been sabotaged. With the IRO screening all individuals seeking entrance to the United States, only 300 visas have been granted these uprooted souls.

The Senate Judiciary Committee, in whose hands the law was placed for revision, has been taunted for apparently closeting the act. Its chairman, Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, Nevada, has been pilloried by practically every newspaper in the country. This stanch American and his colleagues have withstood the unbelievable pressure of a million-dollar lobby. The committee has thus tried to obtain fair treatment of the victims of Potsdam.

Representative ED GOSSETT, Democrat, Texas, who has served on the Immigration Committee for 12 years, is reputed to know more concerning this question than any of his 435 confrères. In a hearing before the Immigration Subcommittee he stated:

"I want to commend as patriotic citizens and good public servants those who may be sitting on this bill. In my opinion, future generations will rise up to call them blessed."

In October 1949, the legislation was voted out of the committee—an almost unheard-of thing in parliamentary procedure. When discussed on the floor of the Senate, shortly before adjournment, it was obviously a complex problem. There was no alternative but to send it back to the committee.

Remember that America signed the decree which ultimately displaced these grief-stricken throngs, and when this terrible crime was perpetrated, she did not raise a single cry on their behalf.

These doomed creatures are not begging for even half a loaf; all they ask is a crust of bread.

We recognize that the knots won't be unraveled until the evicted millions are returned to their homes, and that where dismantling leads, disintegration follows. A partial solution, however, lies in our absorbing some of the outcasts.

Now that Congress has reconvened, the DP bill is on the agenda.

Must we not, then, alert our Congressmen and our Senators, imploring consideration of these millions of expellees—the forgotten people of the world?

Our holy father recently announced to a congressional delegation:

"Clearly it is too late and too futile merely to be shocked and righteously indignant. The plight of millions who must now answer to the hideous appellation of expellees is no longer simply a subject of humiliation and regret. There is more here than even a stark challenge for Christian compassion.

"Our prime anxiety—as we are sure it is yours deep down in your hearts—touches the judgment of history and of history's Lord on the fulfillment of that gravest duty of man to man and of nation to nation, which calls for respect for the image of God in even the weakest and most abandoned of His children."

The Right of Congress To Declare War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in view of the tragic turn that events have taken in Korea and the continued lack of any clear-cut, constructive program advising the American public as to this country's goals in Asia, it seems to me that an editorial, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, is especially pertinent.

Unless Congress safeguards energetically its right to declare war, we shall have taken a long and perhaps irretrievable step toward the totalitarian forms of government which operate to glorify the politicians of a country but which inevitably bring bloodshed and hardship to the people.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHT OF CONGRESS TO DECLARE WAR

Is the United States at war in Korea or isn't it? Are we to consider the action in the Orient just a police action?

These questions lead up to an extremely important question. If we are at war, how did we get into it? Who acted to put the United States into war?

The question is not whether we should be in Korea or not. It centers around the making of the decision about whether we should or not.

Who made it?

In this case, action did not come from Congress. The decision was made by the President.

Is this the way it should be? Does the President have authority to move the country into war or is that a matter reserved for Congress?

Actually it is the function of Congress, so stated in the Constitution.

But the President, performing as he did in respect to Korea, could place the United States in a position where war was inevitable.

That was never the intention of the founding fathers when they delegated certain police authorities to the President.

And the American people, we are sure, have no desire to change the Constitution in respect to the declaration of war. If this matter were placed before the voters of the Nation today, we are sure that they would vote overwhelmingly to keep the Constitution as it is—to reserve to Congress the right to declare war.

The President may say in explanation that quick action was required in Korea, if we were to act. But Congress, too, can act quickly. Its Members can respond as readily as the President to an emergency. That has been demonstrated time and time again. When Congress delays on such a matter, it is because question has arisen—a question of sufficient validity to create doubt about the wisdom of a course.

It would be well for Congress to reexamine the situation in this respect. If the Nation is to go to war, Congress, and not the President, should make the decision.

But we are at war in Korea and significant decisions have been made without congressional action.

Our troops entered Korea without authority from Congress. And the decision in respect to crossing the thirty-eighth parallel, surely a matter that should have been aired, was made by the President and not by Congress.

Before long we may be confronted with similar decisions. What are we to do when we reach the Manchurian border? The President or the Congress?

The whole matter becomes particularly significant in view of the results of the November 7 election. One important conclusion to be drawn from that election is that the people are dissatisfied with our international policy. Such dissatisfaction is more likely to be reflected by Congress than by the President.

Let's see that Congress moves into its proper role in the decisions that lie ahead. So far no dictatorial powers have been vested in the President.

Health Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Health Services," published in today's issue of the Washington Post. The editorial refers to a bill which would assist the States in the development and maintenance of public-health units. The bill was originally introduced by me, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in the second session of the Eightieth Congress. It was introduced in the Eighty-first Congress by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and myself. The bill has passed the Senate and is now pending

before the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives. I wish to call the editorial to the very careful attention of all Senators. It expresses the vital need for such legislation in these times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HEALTH SERVICES

There was urgent need for Federal financial aid to State and local health departments long before the threat of a major war became acute; the need is now underscored and clarified by the importance of such departments in the mobilization of civil defense. They would be the country's principal refuge in case of atomic or biological warfare attack. We believe, therefore, that the House should act on the local public health services bill, which the Senate has already passed, during the present session. The bill has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and is now in the Rules Committee.

State and local health departments are woefully inadequate. Some 40,000,000 Americans live today in areas where no local full-time public health departments exist; and it is estimated that nearly a hundred million others have only inadequately staffed departments available. The cost to the country in time lost from productive effort and in the incidence of preventable or controllable diseases is much too high. The cost in lives and human suffering in the event of widespread aerial attacks on the United States would be incalculable.

The civil defense report of the National Security Resources Board recommended that "in each State, the State health officer should be placed in charge of all civil defense health and medical services; and cities should appoint local officers in the same manner." The report pointed out also that "special measures must be taken to enable civil defense organizations to deal with the problems arising from atomic, biological, and chemical warfare. * * * The effects of these special weapons are of such a nature that defense against them becomes primarily the responsibility of the health and medical services."

But the plain fact is that in many areas there simply is no such defense at all. And it is highly possible that war production plants and other vital installations will be dispersed into just such areas, with large concentrations of war workers clustered around them. Many cities which might become bomb targets are lamentably lacking in health facilities. The problem is not one on which the country can afford to defer action.

Importance of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by George V. Denny, Jr., president of Town Hall, New York. In the editorial Mr. Denny discusses very effectively, I think, one of the great problems which confront us here in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When will we learn that we endanger our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor when we try to play games with gangsters?

When the Bolsheviks seized control of a political instrumentality called "a sovereign state," they had all the attributes of gangsters and have never changed their nature to this day. Although they have cloaked themselves (with our help) in the raiment of national sovereignty, they have been as ruthless with the people behind their national boundaries as with those they have conquered.

We have tried with all the resources at our command, and with the help of a vast majority of the members of the United Nations, to persuade them to accept the extension of the principle of the law to the world community, but we have failed. It should be clear to all the free peoples of the world and to millions behind the iron curtain that gangsters have no place at a conference table, and have no intention of allowing the methods of conference and democracy to succeed. They have made a mockery of democracy and freedom wherever they have been able to extend their rule, and they will continue to do so as long as we continue to play this diplomatic game of striped pants with them.

They are our enemies and the enemies of freedom-loving peoples everywhere. They began their war against us long before World War II, a war to destroy our influence, to discredit us and to turn the minds and hearts of the rest of the world against us and everything we stand for. These weapons may well prove to be far more effective than guns, tanks, and planes, especially if we allow this to continue with the puny opposition we've been using against them.

While we make elaborate and colossally expensive preparations to "contain communism" and to meet old-fashioned aggression (the Atlantic Pact), waiting for armies to cross national boundaries, the enemy moves into every free country with its invisible fifth columns and trains its local agents to take over. We're doing just what the men in Moscow want us to do—break our backs economically trying to "contain" them by arming and feeding the rest of the world.

How can we, a nation of 150,000,000 people, possibly "contain" a dynamic and ruthless force of 800,000,000 people thousands of miles from our shores? We can't do it through the United Nations as presently constituted, for the enemy is now at the council table. He speaks with a powerful voice and other nations tremble. Where can they turn for help? Alone they are powerless. Jan Masaryk knew this; so do the people of Tibet.

We must face the unfortunate fact that the basic assumption on which the present structure of the United Nations was established is false. That we are living in one world, and therefore must have one world organization composed of all nations, was and is untrue. Actually, we are living in two worlds politically—and the United Nations is a political organization—two worlds which are diametrically opposed to each other in all basic assumptions and philosophies of life. We did not create these two worlds, but we closed our eyes to the fact of their existence in 1945 and invited the enemies of freedom to become part of a great and noble concept, giving them power to wreck it.

The time has come for us to organize a real United Nations, consisting of those who have demonstrated their desire and ability to live and work under law to stop our common enemy before he destroys us one by one. We cannot do it alone, and it will be suicidal to try. Our very survival as a free nation depends upon our ability to recognize that we can never have a secure peace until the power of the men in the Kremlin is checked or destroyed.

This does not necessarily mean a hot war, but it does mean that the free peoples now outside the iron curtain must form a real united front against Moscow-inspired aggression and fight with all of their combined resources a psychological, political, and economic war that will stop the gangsters' march of conquest. We still have the preponderance of power—militarily, economically, and politically. We have the resources to beat them at psychological warfare, but we must organize these resources and make them effective before it is too late.

Yes; we must keep up our military defenses, but this is not enough. We must create a world law backed by force great enough to negate the power of our enemy. Ultimately the Russian people wil have to throw off the present tyranny with the help of the free people of the outside world. But, above all, let's stop playing games with gangsters now and recognize them for what they are—the enemies of law and order. Suppose the people of Chicago had "recognized" Al Capone and made him a member of the city council because he had de facto control over part of that great city. Gangsters are gangsters, whether they control a small-time mob or a government. If we fail to see this, we will deserve our fate. "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

The Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Paul G. James, attorney, Des Moines, Iowa:

EMMERT, JAMES, NEEDHAM & LINDGREN,
Des Moines, Iowa, December 5, 1950.
Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR PAUL: Am sure that you want to hear from your friends in this tragically critical hour. It looks from here as though we were confronted with the gravest crisis in our entire history.

There are some very few things which seem to be clear beyond all possible controversy:

1. The sole responsibility for this crisis, and all of the continuous series of crises, since the conclusion of hostilities in World War II, rests upon the clique in the Kremlin; and corollary thereto, it is equally clear that the incidents, in Berlin, Greece, Indochina, and Korea, are all Kremlin inspired and directed. We, therefore, cannot accomplish anything constructive or conclusive unless and until we meet and determine the issues there. And in so doing, we must make it abundantly clear that our sympathies are with the Russian people in their enslavement, and that our problem is their problem, how to free them and free mankind from the same menace.

2. The United States cannot stand alone, and battle the Kremlin alone, or practically so, in Asia, Europe, and the rest of the world, dissipating our manpower, and our resources fighting satellites of the Kremlin, while our real enemy is conserving both to strike us down after having so dissipated our strength. Britain and France in particu-

lar must be made to clearly understand that we will march along together, side by side, as full partners, but we will not participate in any such blood-letting alone, as we are suffering at this hour.

The conduct of the British and French Governments in this crisis has been reprehensible, publicly voicing disunity and demands for appeasement, giving aid and encouragement to the Kremlin. Many were the disagreements between Roosevelt and Churchill, but they confined them to private negotiation. If the British and the French do not propose to stand up to the common foe with all their might, we shall have no alternative but to pull out. We can, and we will, defend this hemisphere. But we cannot defend the entire world alone, or with half-hearted help, much less, carping public criticism.

3. The Chinese people are and have been our warm friends, ever since the days when we declined to take the Boxer indemnity except to use it for educating their youth. We made a dreadful mistake in falling for the Kremlin's propaganda that the Chinese Nationalists were independent agrarian reformists, and in turning Chiang Kai-shek to the wolves. Correction of that mistake will exact a dreadful price. Dr. JUDD was a voice crying in the wilderness, but he was right, and I have supported his position to the best of my poor ability. The Chinese are a poor, poor people. We are in large part responsible for their betrayal to the Kremlin. And while under the control and the influence of the Kremlin unable to obtain any semblance of the truth, we must be careful to establish that even in this hour we hold not them, but their betrayers, accountable. Again, we must make clear that we know, and we understand, and that the guilt and the responsibility and punishment will be inflicted upon their betrayers—not on them.

4. The American people spent billions of dollars to perfect the A-bomb as a weapon. As a weapon, it was created to save the lives of countless thousands of American youth which would otherwise be required to be sacrificed. The question is not if it shall be used; but against whom and where.

Recognizing the Kremlin as the instigator and supporter of all of the recorded, and many unrecorded, sinister, and deliberate acts of aggression, and recognizing the fact that the poor Chinese are but dupes, and victims of Kremlin lies and propaganda, it would seem quite clear that A-bomb No. 1 should go direct to the source of all the evil that besets mankind; and that we should demonstrate to all the world that our hearts and our sympathies go out to the peoples of the world everywhere, including Russia, who are enslaved and deceived.

5. This is the time—now—to fix the responsibility, and the accountability, and to demand that the men in the Kremlin come clean or else. Let us not dissipate our strength and our resources upon the innocent victims of their tyranny and deception. Let us put the finger upon the source of all of the evil and the trouble of this tragic hour. Let us demand their prompt direction and instructions to the Chinese to halt hostilities, and withdraw from battle, and that they, and all other nations, submit all differences to the United Nations for settlement.

We can keep the masses of India, and of China, both, on our side, if we unerringly put the finger on the Kremlin, and unswervingly demonstrate our devotion to the masses of the people of China, and of Russia, too, for that matter.

We can only hope and pray that we shall not suffer a Dunkerque, or a double Dunkerque in Korea. But if compelled to withdraw it should be made with a declaration that we will not kill, and we will not punish the Chinese people, even though in this hour of Kremlin deception and domination they have been led to harm us.

6. Somehow we must find ourselves a great leader. From the time of Moses, and through the hours of our own great crises from the days of Washington and Lincoln, and in World War II, a Churchill—great leaders have been provided with the power and ability to challenge the great moral and spiritual resources of the free people of the entire world. The tragedy of this hour is that no such leader has appeared; and worse, that every potential leader is under fire from some important quarter. It is certainly a perfect set-up for our enemy, and nothing could be more gratifying to our enemy. It would almost seem to have been designed and sponsored. It must stop. Rattling the bones of our many mistakes will but help to destroy us, and lend aid and comfort to the enemy.

7. If there must be war, let it be war with the only real enemy—the only responsible enemy. Let us not deceive ourselves, nor hypnotize ourselves into the belief that we are accomplishing anything by not pointing the finger at the gangsters in the Kremlin for fear it may make them mad. We can no longer play the part of dupes and self-deceptionists. It is cowardly not to place the responsibility where everyone knows it is, and beyond all doubt. We destroy our own sense of integrity. We accept the role of hypocrites. We lose our own self-respect, and the respect of intelligent people everywhere by so doing. The world needs honest, fearless, courageous, consecrated leadership—or we shall perish.

May God guide and direct us all.

Yours as ever,

PAUL G. JAMES.

Korean Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith a letter addressed to the Hutchinson News-Herald by Hon. J. N. Tincher, my distinguished predecessor who ably represented the Seventh Kansas District in Congress from 1919 to 1927. Although Mr. Tincher voluntarily retired from Congress and has devoted most of his time and energy to the legal profession in recent years, he has maintained a keen interest in public affairs and I am happy to have this opportunity to place his views on the current far eastern situation before the Congress and the country.

WESTERN FRONT,

Hutchinson News-Herald,

Hutchinson, Kans.

GENTLEMEN: I have been reading the News-Herald religiously. I notice that Drew Pearson and your good editor are inclined to oppose MacArthur. To my mind, MacArthur is not to blame for anything. Maybe his intelligence department couldn't tell him how many Chinese soldiers were ready to attack us from Manchuria. But we didn't appropriate any money to MacArthur to fight that attack. We appropriated it to the War Department. We were appropriated to care for the defense. Mr. Acheson never asked MacArthur what to do, he and our Commander in Chief have told him what to do. Any disposition to make the American people forget that this war is against and with Mr. Acheson's pets is short-sighted. I don't believe MacArthur had any right to think that the State Department's and the President's pets, to wit: the Chinese Communists, would attack us en masse.

Everything has been done by our Government, not MacArthur, to convince us that we were not in any danger from the State Department's pets. They are still protecting them. They won't let MacArthur or anybody else use the Chinese Nationalists to fight them. Although to the best information that I can get there are a good many thousands of men in the Chinese Nationalist Army that want to go into Korea and fight. They should. But our State Department and our Commander in Chief, who has the last word, always, apparently don't want them to hurt the Chinese Communists. In other words, they want our American soldiers to go past them on the road to Korea through the mud, it's now the snow and the ice, and have the battles instead of them having it; all this at our expense.

MacArthur can't talk back to you fellows, as he is in the Army. He can't criticize his Commander in Chief or the Secretary of State, who criticizes him, according to Pearson, so bitterly before the Senate committee. He has to keep still and fight with what he has, as he is told. I will always remember MacArthur, despite any faults in the past, as the fellow that had to leave the Philippines but who remarked that he would be back.

If there is any satisfaction to an American citizen in blaming MacArthur, I can't understand him. My sympathies with the Chinese Communists are not very strong, as between the Chinese Communists and the Nationalists, I would take the Nationalists.

I think something ought to be done. We have a few Members of Congress who still have the nerve to say what it is. The first thing would be to clean the State Department, starting at the head, of Communist sympathizers and Hiss admirers; and the second thing would be instead of knocking men like MacArthur to give them some authority. The Republican Congress is perfectly willing to give the administration all the money that is necessary but I don't think it is right for the State Department to o. k. shipments of munitions freely from this Government when they know that the Chinese Communists are going to use those supplies to murder American boys. I quit Congress, Jack, voluntarily. I'm afraid if I were there now, I would be disagreeable, and would certainly raise some disturbances.

I don't get to read Fulton Lewis' column, but I do listen to his broadcasts once in a while. He deals in facts, like the shipment of these war materials. Why don't you get his column back. Pearson doesn't like MacArthur, apparently, personally. Anyway, MacArthur wasn't afraid to go to the front and see how it looked, and while he may have some faults, the unwarranted murder of American soldiers in Korea can't be blamed on MacArthur.

I try to read to keep up with things. Up to the very day that MacArthur was ordered to fight in Korea, I had thought that Dean Acheson would never consent to our Government having a friendly pact with the Chinese Communists or any part of them, and I personally think that our Secretary of State was the man that was fooled by what the Commies are doing. Of course, the Army Intelligence would know that there were so many residents of China, but it was the State Department that knew, or thought he knew, that the Communist faction wouldn't cross him.

This may be a long letter, and I doubt that you print it, you seldom ever print my western-front ideas, but I have the satisfaction of offering it to you.

Yours truly,

J. N. TINCHER.

President Truman's Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], who is not present at the session of the Senate today, regarding a discussion of President Truman's point 4 program by him and Bert Andrews, the chief of the Washington Bureau of the New York Herald Tribune, which was broadcast December 2, 1950, from Station WMAL in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the statement and broadcast were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. WILLIAM BENTON, OF CONNECTICUT

I appeared as a guest of that distinguished Washington correspondent, Bert Andrews, chief of the Washington Bureau for the New York Herald Tribune, in a broadcast on Station WMAL, in Washington, December 2, 1950. This broadcast centered around President Truman's point 4 program to build up and develop the backward areas of the world as a means of checking the spread of communism. In my talk I pointed out that the blue-print for the President's program was developed some 10 years back by my friend Nelson Rockefeller when he was the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. I served with him at that time as one of his assistants. Indeed Mr. Rockefeller pioneered in this area, and did much to help our neighbors south of the border to improve their methods of agriculture, and further encouraged them to improve the administrative systems of their government, as well as showing them how to build and operate better factories.

I feel we are not doing enough with President Truman's program, especially in the light of the small $26,000,000 fund appropriated for this purpose. The British, through their so-called Columbo plan, largely patterned after ours, are planning to spend $5,200,000,000 for a point 4 of their own throughout Asia. I would also like to stress that far from being an economic program, point 4 can very well prove to be one of our most dynamic propaganda weapons in the world fight against communism.

BROADCAST BY BERT ANDREWS AND HON. WILLIAM BENTON, OF CONNECTICUT, OVER WMAL SATURDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1950

Mr. ANDREWS. The United States is involved in a grim conflict in one particular area of the world, Korea. The battle is being fought with bullets. In many other areas it is being fought with words. The real problem, of course, is how to match and defeat the tactics used by Soviet Russia and Russian satellites and sympathizers. With me tonight is a United States Senator who has very strong ideas on how we can combat Russian propaganda. He speaks from a background of wide experience. He is Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut. Mr. BENTON was appointed in 1949 to fill the place left by the resignation of Raymond E. Baldwin. He was elected on November 7 for the remainder of that Baldwin term which expires in 1953. As a young man, Senator BENTON made an enviable reputation and considerable money in the advertising business. Later he took a number of jobs in which he could serve his country. For a period he was Assistant Secretary of State. Then he went into politics and he is now in the Senate. He is a strong backer of the Marshall plan, which would bring the free nations of a large part of the world into unified action against Communist ideas, but he is an equally strong proponent of what he calls a Marshall plan of ideas and he has been working for it in the Senate. Senator BENTON, I know that your advocacy of this plan and of the so-called point 4 program was a major issue in that election in Connecticut. But tell me, honestly, do you think the average person understands what point 4 is supposed to do?

Senator BENTON. Well, I don't think, Mr. Andrews, that the average person knows any more about it than the fact they recall that President Truman called it bold and new in his inaugural address in 1948. Of course, it wasn't new and it never has been bold. Point 4 was, in fact, originated by Nelson Rockefeller when he came to Washington about 10 years ago as Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. He brought me along with him as one of his assistants.

Mr. ANDREWS. I remember that.

Senator BENTON. It was one of my first Washington jobs. Mr. Rockefeller pioneered in trying to show the South American countries how to raise more crops, build and run better factories, improve the administration of their governments, and all those things we have in mind when we talk about helping the peoples of the world to improve their standards of living and to raise their productivity.

Mr. ANDREWS. Of course, I agree. Mr. Rockefeller did a lot of his planning, and his vision at that time was somewhat stymied by the war and the shortages that were forced on us at the time.

Senator BENTON. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. You have emphasized that this isn't exactly a new approach, but what do you mean it isn't a bold one?

Senator BENTON. Well, Mr. Andrews, our present appropriation for point 4 is $26,000,000. As I recall, that was put through with only a couple votes to spare in the Senate.

Mr. ANDREWS. Just two, as I remember it.

Senator BENTON. You may remember that the Republicans in the Senate voted 25 to 8 against point 4. It was only after a prolonged debate and great effort that the sum was raised from $15,000,000 to $26,000,000. Senator WAYNE MORSE testified before the Thomas subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, when it was holding hearings on my Senate resolution calling for the Marshall plan in the field of ideas to which you referred in your introduction. Senator MORSE said that point 4 should receive $100,000,000 and I agree with him. I think it needs that much just to begin with. The British, during this past week, laid out a program for the Commonwealth for Asia that exceeded $3,000,000,000 and is a counterpart of our point 4.

Mr. ANDREWS. Then your argument is that the United States, with its small appropriation of $26,000,000 has made only a very small beginning on what ought to be a very big proposition.

Senator BENTON. That is it exactly, Mr. Andrews. The British plan could only be described, as I have mentioned, as a version ow point 4 and it is just for Asia. Mr. Rockefeller invented the technique in Latin America and the British now propose to develop them on a vast scale for Asia. Incidentally I regard Mr. Rockefeller's appointment as chairman of the new Board on point 4 an appropriate and constructive one and no one else in this country is as well fitted for this job.

Mr. ANDREWS. Well, I may say, Senator BENTON, that I agree with you on that because I was here when Mr. Rockefeller first came down, and I know how hard he worked and planned the steps that he wanted to take in South America.

Senator BENTON. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. But why do you think, in view of the fact that this isn't new, it has been discussed? Why do you think, Senator BENTON, that there is so little general understanding of point 4 and why is the program so much in your mind?

Senator BENTON. Well, let's take the lack of understanding first. One reason is that point 4 has been presented to the Congress almost wholly as an economic program. The request for the money when before the Senate Appropriations Committee was made by the Economic Divisions of the State Department. One distinguished Member of the Senate told me they didn't make a good enough case to justify $5,000,000.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think it was Senator WHERRY.

Senator BENTON. Yes; it was. Now, of course, point 4 is very important economically. Our three best customers before the war were the three most highly industrialized countries, Germany, Japan, and England. Three-quarters of the peoples of the world don't get enough to eat. And you can't sell American goods to people who don't have enough produce or money to get enough to eat. There may be 450,000,000 people in India, but they can't buy as much as the 12,000,000 people of Canada. Thus point 4 holds the promise on the economic front of developing better customers for our farmers and manufacturers.

Mr. ANDREWS. Before we make Canada mad, I think they claim 14,000,000 people, Senator BENTON. But I take it in general that there is much more to this point 4 program than mere economics; is that your argument?

Senator BENTON. Yes; and the economic side isn't as important or as easy for the Congress to understand. The big angle on point 4 is that it is potentially the most powerful propaganda weapon at our disposal. Further, it is a propaganda weapon wholly consistent with the temperament and background of the American people with our long record of things we have done through our churches and philanthropies to help the suffering peoples of the world and our going to their aid whenever disaster overtakes them.

Mr. ANDREWS. You were saying, Senator BENTON, that point 4 program is a powerful propaganda weapon as well as an economic weapon. I think we all know that the one big question is this: Is it a type of propaganda that will offset the methods used by Soviet Russia to sway nations to its type of thinking?

Senator BENTON. Our American people, Mr. Andrews, don't understand very much about these Russian methods. They hear that the Russians call us war mongers, imperialists—that's a favorite word for us. Yes, they know that the Russians preach a doctrine of hate against us but there is another side to the Russian propaganda coin which they don't know so well. Let's turn the coin over for a moment. On the other side the Russians are appealing with a great deal of skill to the legitimate hopes and legitimate aspirations of the suffering and starving people. They are appealing with a hundred tons. They give them the 1950 version of Marx's "You have nothing to lose but your chains," so join with me.

Mr. ANDREWS. I suppose that you have the recent successes in China in mind, for one thing, when you talk that way Senator BENTON.

Senator BENTON. The victories of the Chinese Communist armies is much more of a propaganda victory than our American people realize. Traditionally the Chinese land-

lord took 60 to even 75 percent of the produce of the Chinese farmer. The farmer had to support his family and pay his taxes out of 25 to 40 percent of his produce. He didn't get enough to eat. For years the Communist propaganda preached, follow us, follow the Communists and get rid of these landlords, these fellows who are exploiting you.

Mr. ANDREWS. And you think that that hard treatment of the landlords and the Communist invasion against the landlords, that is one reason the Nationalist forces were unable to stop the sweep of the Communist armies.

Senator BENTON. There is no doubt about it and it is a pattern we find in country after country, right now in India they are following the same pattern.

Mr. ANDREWS. I am afraid we can see that coming.

Senator BENTON. In many sections of China the Communists walked through as though they were going through tissue paper. Their words had won the battles without the need for bullets. Now what can we, the United States, offer the starving and oppressed peoples of the world? Well, we can offer them point 4. We can say to them we Americans aren't just a rich self-satisfied country telling you to go out and be like us, we know that you should have more food, better homes, better medical care, education for your children. We don't just promise these things the way the Communists promise them, we're going to help you get them through point 4 administered by your government and ours and the United Nations and its agencies. We shall help you toward broader horizons and a better world for you.

Mr. ANDREWS. Well look, Senator BENTON, that is an aspiration that we all hope for but do you really think you can do this job with $100,000,000 a year?

Senator BENTON. If we could, we could certainly solve most of our problems. All I think we can make is a beginning. We've got to train people, we've got to experiment, we've got to learn how to do it. As Jimmy Yen's farmer's management education movement in China shows, educating a Chinese farmer is a long-term job. You even have to teach him to read. Now, any money we spend, however, should be judged in contrast to our military expenditures. Your Herald Tribune, this morning, Mr. Andrews, reported that President Truman has requested a total of $41,000,000,000 for annual military expenditures. Senator MORSE and my proposed $100,000,000 a year for point 4 is only one quarter of 1 percent of that military total. I would be prepared to spend more as soon as we learn how to do it. If we discover, as Mr. Rockefeller and I are sure we can discover, that this point 4 is a way to develop a world climate which will encourage the forces of freedom and democracy and thus let us bring down our military expenditures then certainly we ought to step up point 4 expenditures rapidly.

Mr. ANDREWS. And so you look upon the point 4 expenditures as money that might provide some insurance for us and for the world?

Senator BENTON. That is a good analogy, but let us call the $41,000,000,000 that we are putting into the Army, Navy, and Air Corps an insurance policy. We hope that it will be that which enables us to avoid war, that if you are spending $41,000,000,000 on a fire insurance policy it is surely worth more than one quarter of 1 percent to try to figure out ways to try to reduce the risk of fire and cut down on the premium which may otherwise bankrupt you.

Mr. ANDREWS. I haven't checked your figures and I am afraid I don't have time to go into mathematics.

Current Case Involving Railway Conductors and Railroad Trainmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, under date of September 18, 1950, to Mr. W. P. Kennedy, signed by Mr. L. W. Horning. I offer the letter for the Appendix of the RECORD because of the fact, as Mr. Horning says in a letter of September 25 to me, from which I now quote:

NEW YORK CENTRAL SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., September 25, 1950.
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Chambers, Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You no doubt will remember the writer of this letter as having participated in the 1941 railway labor case, of which you were Chairman of the President's Emergency Board; also, having seen you several times since then. At present I am chairman of the eastern carriers' conference committee handling the current 40-hour-week case involving employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

I note you caused to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 19, 1950, at page A6667, a letter which President Metzman of my railroad addressed to all New York Central System employees, under date of August 24, 1950; also copy of letter, dated September 1, 1950, written by President W. P. Kennedy, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to Mr. Metzman.

I will enclose copy of letter, dated September 18, 1950, which I have written to Mr. Kennedy in answer to his letter addressed to Mr. Metzman under date of September 1, 1950.

There are, as you know, two sides to every story, and in my letter to Mr. Kennedy I have set forth some of the facts in this case. I hope you will be good enough to have my letter of September 18 also inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you in advance and extending my kindest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

L. W. HORNING.

Mr. President, I always insist upon being fair in these matters. I would have inserted the letter earlier if I had been here and if the Senate had been in session. This is the first opportunity I have had to insert in the RECORD the letter from Mr. Horning to Mr. Kennedy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK CENTRAL SYSTEM,
New York, N. Y., September 18, 1950.
Mr. W. P. KENNEDY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: Mr. Metzman has referred your letter of September 1, received here on September 8, to me as the officer of our company designated to handle such matters. I am sorry that you let yourself sign such an abusive and intemperate communication. Tirades of this character are a poor substitute for the facts, and here are the facts as I understand them:

1. The no-strike assurance. Mr. Metzman's authority for the statement, that you called the strike within an hour after assurances were given that there would be no strike, was the statement made by the President of the United States and the three separate memoranda of the White House conference made by Messrs. Loomis, Mackay, and Oram. If your later telegram to the President is correct, it means that those three and Dr. Steelman, the President's assistant, lied. I do not believe that they did.

2. You complain of what you describe as Mr. Metzman's "injecting" himself into this controversy by posting on the bulletin boards a notice addressed to employees of the New York Central Railroad, and you say that other railroad presidents and Mr. Metzman should have attended the Washington conferences. As you well know, the work of handling labor problems with the numerous brotherhoods who represent the employees, including protracted negotiations, mediation, and hearings, has long since become a full-time job for personnel executives of the railroad, and if railroad presidents were to undertake that work there would be no time for their many other duties and responsibilities. The point is that the railroads of the country are represented by the committee that holds full powers of attorney and is therefore authorized to speak and act for all railroads represented by them. No railroad president would have authority to speak for more than his own individual road. Furthermore, the Railway Labor Act expressly provides that representatives, for all purposes of the law, shall be designated by the respective parties "without interference, influence, or coercion by either party over the designation of representatives by the other; and neither party shall in any way interfere with, influence, or coerce the other in its choice of representatives." Perhaps you have forgotten this provision of law.

3. You say that the second paragraph of our bulletined circular "creates the impression" that a recommendation of an emergency board is final and binding. Our circular neither says nor implies anything of the kind. The law relies upon public opinion to enforce the reports and recommendations of emergency boards, and I am told that when the Railway Labor Act was being considered by Congressional Committees the representatives of railroad labor expressed the view that refusal of either party to abide by the recommendations of an emergency board would be "unthinkable." So far as I know, in every national case the railroads have accepted the recommendations of Presidential emergency boards but it has now become almost chronic for union leaders, including those of your own brotherhood, to repudiate the findings of these Presidential boards.

4. You complain of Mr. Metzman's appearance before congressional committees in support of the Donnell bill, which would prohibit railroad strikes against decisions of emergency boards appointed by the President of the United States. Legislative agents of railroad brotherhoods are constantly lobbying in Congress, frequently literally hundreds at a time, and it is difficult to understand your indignation that railroad officers should dare to appear at hearings of legislative committees and tell their side of the story.

5. In the matter of adjustment board awards which you refer to as "decisions," the New York Central has not refused to apply awards of the National Railroad Adjustment Board but we have declined in some cases to let your representatives be the sole judge of what such awards mean.

6. Your reference to patriotism and to the fact that the unknown soldier was not a railroad president is gratuitous. Most railroad presidents, just like most presidents of railroad brotherhoods, are beyond combat age. In World Wars I and II, hardly a family in America was without some participation in the Armed Forces; and, similarly, although fortunately on a smaller scale, the present Korean conflict has tapped a cross section of our national life.

7. You describe the findings of the President's Emergency Board as "unjust and unfair and unacceptable" and charge the railroads with attempting to "bait" you into acceptance by offering an additional 5 cents per hour, and so forth. As you well know, this proposed 3-year settlement with cost-of-living adjustment was made by the President's Assistant and was accepted by the railroads but rejected by you.

You refer to the promotion and development of harmonious labor-management relations. The management of the New York Central has a long record of consistent efforts in that direction, but cooperation between management and labor is not a one-way street. The letter of September 1 which bears your signature and abusive statements which have appeared in your brotherhood's newspaper do not contribute to harmony.

Finally, you indignantly resent what you describe as an attempt to dislodge the affection and regard which the membership has for your brotherhood. We have no such purpose in mind, but candor requires me to say that, conversely, your letter is a palpable attempt to "dislodge the affection and regard" which we think our employees should have, and do have, for the company that affords us our livelihood.

I note that you forwarded copies of your communication to the New York Central general chairmen of your brotherhood, and I take it that you would wish me to send copies of this reply to them.

Very truly yours,

L. W. HORNING.

Christmas Leave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Vernon Denman, chairman, local board 13–77, Selective Service System, Des Moines, Iowa. Mr. Denman has been a member of a local selective service board since the beginning of World War II and has done much to boost the morale of inductees from his board. I believe the suggestions set forth in his letter merit the attention of the Defense Department.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
LOCAL BOARD 13–77,
Des Moines, Iowa, December 9, 1950.

Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I should like to protest with all the force at my command at the curtailment or near cancellation of the promise that boys in service could return home for Christmas.

Last night we sent 54 boys to Camp Sheridan, Ill., and just a few hours before their departure, news came that only a few would be granted leaves and that those who would be allowed to come home would have not to exceed 72 hours' time in which to make the round trip, and a more dejected and disappointed group of lads and parents could not be found. I do not mean to say there was a lessening in their patriotism, not at all, but just a terrific let-down in their spirits.

This is the first time in more than 10 years that I have been going to the trains with the boys that I have been unable to answer their questions or question, "Why can't I come home for Christmas, as promised?"

Please, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, do all in your power to reinstate the Christmas-leave promise and help to restore the confidence and morale that has been lost as a result of the unfortunate and untimely pronouncement.

Respectfully yours,

VERNON DENMAN.

Hungry Horse Power

REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune of Tuesday, November 21, 1950, there is a story headlined "No Hungry Horse Power Guaranteed to State, Counsel Tells Commissioners." Under this headline was a story from Helena quoting one Forrest E. Cooper, of Lakeview, Oreg., counsel for the Interstate Association of Public Land Counties, to the effect that Hungry Horse Dam would not guarantee one kilowatt of power for use in Montana. Furthermore, Mr. Cooper states that while western Montana would obtain immediate payroll benefits during the Hungry Horse Dam construction once this work was finished, these benefits would vanish and might in fact, create an unemployment and relief problem for a time.

I do not know who Mr. Cooper is and this is the first time I have even heard of him. I do, however, want to emphatically deny his allegations and raise the question, just who is this outsider representing? His statement to the Montana Association of County Commissioners is a tissue of lies and what his purpose is in putting out these falsehoods is something which I do not know. The gist of Mr. Cooper's statements are to the effect that there is nothing in existing law guaranteeing power from the Hungry Horse project for use in Montana. Obviously Mr. Cooper is not aware of the facts relating to the use of power generated at the Hungry Horse project. However, for the record and so that the people of Montana will know the truth and so that there will be no doubt in anyone's mind as to the use and guarantee of Hungry Horse power in Montana, I want to quote from the first section of the Mansfield Act authorizing construction of the Hungry Horse Dam:

To provide for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of irrigation and reclamation of arid lands, for controlling floods, improving navigation, regulating the flow of the South Fork of the Flathead River, for the generation of electric energy, and for other beneficial uses primarily in the State of Montana but also in downstream areas, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to proceed as soon as practicable with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed Hungry Horse Dam (including facilities for generating electric energy) on the South Fork of the Flathead River, Flathead County, Mont., to such a height as may be necessary to impound not less than 1,000,000 acre-feet of water.

The Hungry Horse Act does not require that there be sold in the Montana area any particular amount of the total system power made available by the Hungry Horse project so long as that area is given preference to the power generated at the Hungry Horse project itself. The Bonneville Power Administration as marketing agent for Hungry Horse power has worked out a formula for giving Montana the primary benefits referred to in the act. In brief, the formula provides that the amount of power generated at the Hungry Horse plant during the draw-down season of a critical year, or one-half of the total power developed at Hungry Horse and at downstream plants from Hungry Horse storage, whichever is less, will be made available for sale in Montana. Such an amount of power obviously will meet the geographical preference requirements of the Hungry Horse Act. On the basis of this formula the amount of power to be reserved for use in Montana will be approximately 198,000 kilowatts. This is considerably in excess of the power that would be available to Montana if the project were operated on an isolated basis. Firm power from the project operated isolated would be 90,000 kilowatts.

Of the 200,000 kilowatts allocated for the primary benefit of Montana, the following amounts have been committed:

First. Fifty thousand kilowatts of firm power to the Montana Power Co. for a period of 5 years. The first 25,000 kilowatts would be available from the earliest Hungry Horse production in 1952.

Second. Thirty-seven thousand kilowatts of interruptible power for the Harvey Machine Co. in 1951, which will become firm in 1953, assuming generation and transmission facilities are kept on schedule.

Third. A second allotment of 74,000 kilowatts of interruptible power for the Harvey Machine Co., when generation and transmission facilities are available, probably in 1952.

Fourth. Two thousand kilowatts of firm power on a requirements basis to REA financed cooperatives in western Montana. By 1956 this total is expected to be 6,000 kilowatts.

Fifth. Twenty-five thousand kilowatts of interruptible power in 1951 to the Victor Chemical Works for use at Silver Bow, Mont.; 17,000 kilowatts of this will become firm in 1952, with 8,000 kilowatts interruptible.

Sixth. A commitment good until January 1, 1951, of 25,000 kilowatts for the Montsanto Chemical Co. in 1953. The latest reports from this company indicate that it expects to take up this option by the January 1, 1951, date.

The contract with Montana Power Co. is renewable for 1-year periods after the

5 years, with such renewals being negotiated 3 years prior to the expiration date of the contract. The industrial and REA contracts are on a long-term basis, usually 20 years.

It is obvious, therefore, that the right of Montana to the power generated at Hungry Horse is adequately stated and adequately protected, inasmuch as not only does the authorizing act contain this protection but the commitments of power in the form of contracts definitely implement the requirements of the law itself.

It is also interesting to note that, despite the fact Hungry Horse will not be completed until October 1952, all of its power has already been committed.

Mr. Cooper evidently came to Montana and appeared before the Montana Association of County Commissioners with the purpose in mind of criticizing Hungry Horse and its beneficial uses in and for the State of Montana. By what and whose authority he speaks I do not know, but I do know that he has told unqualified falsehoods which were given publicity in my State and which should be answered. It is obvious that the right of Montana to the power generated at Hungry Horse is adequately stated in the Mansfield Act and adequately protected, because not only does the authorization act contain this protection but the commitments of power in the form of contracts definitely implements the requirements of the law itself.

Mr. Speaker, I have just completed checking the statements I have made with the Bonneville Power Administration so that there can be no doubt as to their accuracy.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a copy of the news story carried in the Great Falls Tribune of Tuesday, November 21, 1950:

NO HUNGRY HORSE POWER GUARANTEED TO STATE, COUNSEL TELLS COMMISSIONERS

HELENA, November 20.—Montana has been too lax in the protection of its water resources in the opinion of Forrest E. Cooper of Lakeview, Oreg., counsel for the Interstate Association of Public Land Counties.

Here for a 2-day conference with officers of the Montana Association of County Commissioners, Cooper said it still may be possible, through interstate compact negotiations, to padlock the barn from which the horse was stolen.

Centering his attention on Hungry Horse Dam in northwestern Montana, which soon will be producing power, Cooper said not one line in the law authorizing its construction and maintenance guarantees 1 kilowatt of power for use in Montana. He recalled recent articles in Portland and Spokane publications praising Hungry Horse because of the benefits these communities would receive after its completion.

Cooper compared this situation with that found on the Colorado River in connection with construction of Hoover Dam.

"In 1934," he said, "Nevada had little use for power but reserved 18¾ percent of the output of the Boulder Canyon plant for use at any time the need developed.

"When the war came, the Government established a magnesium plant at Las Vegas. It was sold as war surplus to the State of Nevada which, in turn, leased sections of the big plant to several nationally known concerns.

"Now, with the need for power definitely established, Nevada has served notice on Los Angeles, which has been using the State's share, that the State will take delivery on a definite date. It's all being done according to agreement in advance and without the necessity of lawsuits."

Cooper said western Montana obtains an immediate benefit from the payrolls during the Hungry Horse Dam construction but warned that when the work is finished these benefits vanish and may, in fact, create an unemployment and relief problem for a time.

He urged that Montanans look forward to the needs for power and water that would exist if the State had three times the present population and to make plans now whereby it will be possible to recapture the use of electricity and water that may, presently, be put to better use in downstream States.

Submitted to the county commissioners and livestock men today by Cooper was a draft of a proposed bill to be introduced in Congress in an effort to stabilize the livestock industry dependent on the public range.

He said the measure would safeguard grazing privileges now existing on national forest and Federal grazing district lands for 5 years and would authorize permits, and renewals, for 10-year terms.

Existing methods of determining grazing fees would be unchanged pending a thorough economic study of the livestock industry in the 11 Western States by three Federal agencies and their subsequent report to Congress.

Nothing in the proposed law, Cooper said, would limit the power of the Government to discontinue grazing rights on any unit to prevent injury to the land nor to restrict the right to hunt and fish on Federal acreage.

The commissioners' association officers, members of its public lands committee, and representatives of the livestock industry spent most of the day discussing means of putting more land on the tax rolls.

It was pointed out that payments by Federal and State agencies in lieu of taxes usually are considerably less than what adjoining privately owned lands produce to meet the expense of local government. And such payments are of no value to a county or a school district when it seeks to float a bond issue because the bonded indebtedness limit is determined by the taxable value of property on the assessment rolls.

Officers of the commissioners group here today were Frank E. Dougherty, of Elliston, president; Clyde J. Dygert, of Hardin, vice president; N. W. Edwards, of Collins, secretary; and William A. Brown, of Helena, counsel.

Campaign Morals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], who is not present at the session of the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by him regarding an editorial entitled "Campaign Morals," which appeared in the New York Times, together with the editorial.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. WILLIAM BENTON, OF CONNECTICUT

An editorial entitled "Campaign Morals" was published in the New York Times at the height of the recent campaign, and unhappily applies not only to my State of Connecticut, but to many other States throughout the country. I read this editorial to many of my audiences during the campaign. I fear the Times editorial is correct in its observation that "So complete is the character assassination in some cases that those who reach public office will have lost the confidence of the voters who put them there."

This is not a new phenomenon in American politics. It was well known to George Washington and the founding fathers.

[From the New York Times]

CAMPAIGN MORALS

The political campaign of 1950, in city and State and apparently elsewhere too, is certainly one of the dirtiest of recent years. The violence of exaggeration and epithet is appalling. In many cases it is simply impossible to credit much of what the candidates charge, and the insuperable difficulty is to know what to believe. The competition for sensation is so bitter as to become a disease that feeds upon itself.

What will all this come to? Many decent people must become so disgusted with this phenomenon of democracy that they will stay away from the polls. More than a few candidates themselves must emerge from this nightmare of immersion in billingsgate thoroughly ashamed of themselves, their self-respect shattered. So complete is the character assassination in some cases that those who reach public office will have lost the confidence of the voters who put them there. The most serious result of all, perhaps, is that if this sort of thing continues it will become increasingly difficult to get decent men and women to stand for public office because of the unjustified abuse suffered en route.

We have no ready cure for this condition, much as we deplore it. When a candidate conducts a decent, moderate campaign and loses, then his supporters condemn him roundly for not putting up a hard fight. We cannot ask a candidate to keep silent about germane matters that deserve exposure. But the wild swinging of punch-drunk orators in the final phases of the campaign is not blameless and can do only harm. When almost everyone is calling everybody else a liar and a thief, the result becomes a stand-off. There is, then, no black and white of reputation in the public mind, only a muddy gray.

Not much time remains to learn self-restraint, but that is the prescription called for. The order would have to come from the top, in each campaign camp, and pass on down to the speech writers, to end this rivalry in self-debasement.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include

therein a speech by Mr. Julius Epstein, secretary of the American Committee for Investigating the Katyn Massacre.

This speech was recently delivered on the Justice for Poland radio program, which is sponsored by the Western Massachusetts Branch of the Polish-American Conference. It is a vigorous, forthright statement, which should commend itself to the entire American people.

KATYN AND THE VOICE OF AMERICA

In 1943, I was working as editor for the Office of War Information. Among my duties was the reading of the Nazi press. One day I came across an issue of the Volkischer Beobachter, Hitler's own newspaper. In that issue, a protocol was published, signed by 12 international scientists at Smolensk, U. S. S. R., stating that the Polish officers whose bodies had been found by the German Army in the woods near Katyn, had been murdered by the Soviets in spring, 1940. The scientists' protocol enumerated all the reasons which had led the members of the commission to this conclusion.

I was immediately struck by this protocol. Although I was well aware that this protocol was published by Hitler's and Goebbels' newspaper Der Volkischer Beobachter, a newspaper, which besides Stalin's Pravda and Izvestia, of course, had probably carried more lies than any other newspaper in the world, I immediately had the impression that this time Goebbels was not lying, simply because the truth was on his side.

Had not the Polish Government in exile in London asked the International Red Cross for an investigation on the spot? And did not the German Government declare that it was willing to allow such an investigation? And was not the only reason that such an impartial investigation did not come to pass, the fact that Stalin did not permit the International Red Cross to carry out such an investigation? Was it not clear that Stalin would have welcomed such an investigation if he were innocent? Those were the thoughts which convinced me in a few minutes that the protocol printed in the Volkischer Beobachter told the truth about the massacre of Katyn. There were outstanding scholars among the members of the commission, among them Professor Naville of the University of Geneva, a Swiss, and therefore, a citizen of the neutral nation in World War II.

From that moment on, I have never lost my interest in Katyn. I read all books, articles, pamphlets I could lay my hands on regarding this subject. I studied the memoirs by diplomats and statesmen like Jan Ciechanowski, former Polish Ambassador in Washington; Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, Prime Minister and Vice Premier of Polish Governments in London and Warsaw; Arthur Bliss Lane, our former American Ambassador to Poland, and many others. I studied the Polish memoranda about Katyn, but also those made public by the Germans and the Soviets. When I thought I knew enough, I decided to write an article on Katyn. Since it was my idea that an American committee for the investigation of the crime should be formed, I wrote to some of the members of the so-called European Medical Commission who investigated the crime on the spot and whose protocol I had read in the Volkischer Beobachter. I asked them three questions: Whether there was any pressure by the Germans before, during, or after the investigation; whether they still believed in the Russian guilt; and whether they would be willing to appear before an American committee and testify in public. I got some very encouraging answers from some of the members of the medical commission. They wrote me that there was not the slightest pressure from the German side, neither before, nor during or after the investigation, that they still believed in the Russian guilt, and that they were willing to come to the United States as soon as they were invited.

This was good news, indeed. I mentioned this correspondence in my article at the end of which I suggested that an American committee should be formed for the investigation of the crime.

As you know, this committee has been formed under the presidency of our former Ambassador to Poland, the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane, author of the outstanding book, I Saw Poland Betrayed. The committee made its debut at the Waldorf-Astoria on November 21, 1949. There, Ambassador Lane delivered a speech about Katyn and the formation of the committee and Max Eastman who was presiding at the press conference read Mr. Lane's letter to the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Vishinsky. Mr. Lane's speech as well as his letter to Vishinsky are documents of great value. The world press in this hemisphere, as well as in Europe and other parts of the world, treated them as such, and many newspapers and periodicals printed the full text of both documents. However, the Voice of America, the propaganda and advertising agency of our own State Department, did not care to broadcast either Mr. Lane's speech or his letter to Vishinsky. It was neither the first nor the last time that the Voice of America refused to broadcast the truth about Katyn.

Let me tell you more about it.

It was on February 10, 1949, that I first offered a script about Katyn to the Voice of America. It took the Voice about 10 weeks to answer my offer. At last, on April 20, Mr. Charles W. Thayer, then head of the New York offices of the Voice, answered my letter. He bluntly rejected my offer with one sentence. He wrote, and I quote: "We have decided against making use of the material at this time." That was all. No reasons were given, no explanations advanced, why the Voice did not want to avail itself of the tremendous material gathered in a long and thorough research. The material I had offered to the Voice contained many facts never made public before.

About 7 months later, when I made preparations for the press conference of the American Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Massacre, Inc., I again approached the Voice. As I mentioned before, the Voice of America did not care to make any use of the two documents made public by Mr. Lane. Some of the language editors, however, expressed personally their regret that they were not allowed to broadcast Mr. Lane's speech and his letter to Vishinsky. As they told me, they did not get the green light from Washington to broadcast those documents. Again, we were completely at a loss to understand the Government's attitude, for which no valid reasons were given. And what reasons could they have given for not broadcasting Mr. Lane's speech and his letter to Vishinsky, for not broadcasting these great documents at least to their most interested audiences, the Poles, the Russians, and the Germans?

In the spring of 1950 Count Joseph Czapski arrived in the United States. Count Czapski is well known, not only among the Poles. He is a writer and painter, and he is also a survivor of the massacre of Polish officers on Russian soil. He has widely written about Katyn and his own experiences to General Anders' representatives in the Soviet Union. The Voice of America, well aware of Czapski's importance, invited him to address his Polish compatriots. Count Czapski was anxious to get the truth about Katyn across the iron curtain. But who can describe his disappointment when he was told in the New York offices of the Voice that he couldn't even mention the word Katyn? I had the privilege of having luncheon with Count Czapski an hour or so after his conversation with Voice officials. I shall never forget how furious he was. I could not comfort him. The only thing I could do, was to tell him about my own experience with the Voice in connection with the Katyn massacre.

To evaluate correctly the very strange behavior of the Voice in respect to Katyn, we should never forget that the only thing broadcast by our Government were Stalin's lies of 1943 and 1944.

It is an undeniable fact that our Government has never told the truth about Katyn. From 1943, when the story broke, up to this very day when the cold war against Stalin has already become pretty hot in Korea, the Voice of America is suppressing the truth. Wouldn't it be about time to break this habit?

It may, therefore, be a good idea if you, my listeners of today, wrote short letters of protest against the suppression of the truth on Katyn by our Voice of America. The letters should be addressed to the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

Your letters may do some good. They may even change the attitude of the Voice of America.

Whatever the success of your letters may be, the truth will become known as always truth prevails against lies. No government in all the world is powerful enough to kill the truth. The real Voice of America, the people's voice, will carry the truth about Katyn around the world.

Rearmament and United States Policy in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address regarding rearmament and United States foreign policy in Europe, by Gen. L. D. Clay, at the Southern Governors' Conference meeting at Charleston, S. C., November 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure and an honor to be here tonight. South Carolina is so close to my home State that to be here is almost the same as to be home again. Moreover, I could receive no greater honor than to speak to the assembled Governors of the Southern States and to be introduced to them by Governor-Elect Byrnes.

It was my good fortune to know Justice Byrnes during the war years and for 4 months to serve as his deputy. I saw him daily, always seeking the right decision, wisely conscious of political implications in the broad sense of public responsibility but not in terms of party politics. Later I was to serve under him when he was Secretary of State and to meet him at a number of important international conferences. Frequently in Germany I would be asked what governmental experience I had and my reply was always "4 months working for Justice Byrnes was a liberal education in government." I learned not only to admire him as one of our few truly great men, but Mrs. Clay and I also formed a lasting and deep affection for Mrs. Byrnes and him.

In speaking to you on national security in relation to the world situation, my sole justification is that I spent 4 years in charge of the Army's war production program and then 4½ years in Europe. I have learned that foreign policy and national security go hand in hand. Today the objectives of our immediate foreign policy are well established. It has become easy for all of us to feel that they are a reflection of the views we have always had. Of course, this is not true. Foreign policy must be flexible. The policy of today is a direct outgrowth of the events of the immediate past, and the policy of tomorrow will be influenced by the events of today.

To look back for a moment, when Germany surrendered in May 1945, we placed our faith in the United Nations and determined that we would find a way to work in friendship with Russia. Somewhat as a result of these policies, but also in response to public demand, we proceeded forthwith to demobilize our fighting forces. Today we recognize that our efforts to make the United Nations fully effective and to cooperate in friendship with Russia failed. Even though these efforts failed, it does not prove the policy wrong. We would not occupy the position of moral leadership which we hold in the world today if we had not made the effort to win Russia's friendship and to bring success to the work of the United Nations.

Many of our statesmen who endorsed and supported this program because they believed it right had misgivings as to its success. I remember well the deep concern over the future expressed by Justice Byrnes when he returned from Yalta where he had become aware of Russia's ruthless and ambitious desire to expand.

I had the opportunity while in Europe to watch the events which changed our foreign policy to our present concept. This change has come about during the last 5 years as a result of many important decisions. Secretary Byrnes first recognized the need for change if communism was to be stopped, and several of the most important decisions which brought about the new policy were made when he was Secretary of State. For instance, at Potsdam the Soviet government wanted to share in the control of the Ruhr and to obtain large quantities of capital equipment as reparations. Within the American delegation, some favored the destruction of German industry as a punitive measure and others because they believed it essential to prevent Germany from again becoming a threat to world peace. Still others believed that a divided Germany could not be an aggressive threat but that the division of Germany would prove troublesome to the world. Moreover, the destruction of Germany's productive output not designed for war purposes could not help but lower the standard of living in West Europe as a whole. The American delegation did agree in principle to the transfer of substantial amounts of capital equipment from West Germany, much of which was to go to Russia. However, Secretary Byrnes, cognizant of the inherent dangers, resisted the Russian effort to participate in the control of the Ruhr and made the delivery of reparations to Russia subject to Germany being administered as a whole.

In early 1946, it became clear that Russia had no intent to remove the barrier line which it had placed between east and west. Our effort to end the division of Germany had failed. However, Russia had violated the Potsdam terms and thus we stopped the further delivery of heavy equipment to Russia in accord with these terms.

This was the first firm display of intent by the United States. It was met as anticipated with outbursts of indignation from Russia. If this decision had not been made, the Soviet Union would have increased its own industrial capacity while the economic disorder which would have occurred in west Germany would have made fertile soil for the growth of communism.

Shortly thereafter, Secretary Byrnes became convinced that there could be neither appreciable economic recovery nor progress in building the form of democratic government in a Germany divided into four zones. Thus, he invited each of the other occupying powers to amalgamate with our zone. There resulted the Anglo-American zone to which the French zone was added later. This made possible the increase in productivity in West Germany which was essential to the economic recovery of Western Europe. It led to the establishment of a West German Government of limited sovereignty. The people of West Germany had hope that they would be received again among the countries of Western Europe and faith that their destiny was to the West and not to the East.

In the fall of the same year, Secretary Byrnes chose Germany as the place to state, in a speech at Stuttgart, in terms that could not be misunderstood, that American troops would remain in Germany as long as the troops of any other foreign powers were there. I still believe this to be the most important single statement of American policy made since the end of World War II. It received far more attention at the time in Europe than at home. It was our promise of security to millions of people who had seen first-hand the Communist expansion which had dominated Eastern Europe and who knew not where it would stop.

These decisions were made with the approval of both major political parties. Other great democracies had for years kept foreign policy out of party politics. In this country, Secretary Byrnes was the first to see the necessity for a bipartisan foreign policy and to take steps to bring it about. No greater contribution could have been made. Today, the heat of election campaigns just ended threatens the continuance of the bipartisan policy. To all thinking Americans there can be no place for party politics in the development of foreign policy. There can and should be honest differences of opinion with respect to its execution.

These early decisions accepted by both major parties marked the real change in policy which established our intent to prevent the further expansion of communism through its use of the threat of force as a means to a political end.

Later, when General Marshall was Secretary of State, we extended military aid to Greece and Turkey and embarked on a program of financial aid to those countries in Europe who were willing to work together in the common good. Still later, when Mr. Acheson was Secretary of State, we signed the North Atlantic Pact and promised military aid to the free countries of Europe who were willing to rearm in the cause of freedom. Thus, we established our present European policy.

As I understand this policy expressed in simple terms—perhaps oversimplified—it provides economic and military assistance to most of the governments of Europe which are now free from alien domination so that they may remain free, and encourages them to work together to develop sound economies individually and collectively while concurrently improving their capacities to defend their freedoms. We have announced our intent to maintain the position which we now hold, and to continue and increase our armed forces in Europe to defend this position as long as necessary. We have provided and continue to provide financial assistance under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act in the understanding that the nations receiving this aid are working together to improve their economic status. We have become a party to the North Atlantic Pact, thus for the first time pledging our military resources in common defense against aggression. We have started the shipment of arms to help the countries of Western Europe to rearm.

This policy expresses the realization of the American people that we can no longer live alone. We have no selfish purpose. Our people want to keep freedom alive in the world and they believe sincerely that when the full strength of the free countries is restored their influence will be such that communism can no longer threaten to enslave the world.

Thus, the objectives of our foreign policy are worthy of the best traditions of our people and deserve their full support. However, how long can we wait for their accomplishment? We have extended liberal financial assistance to Western Europe for several years, yet we still do not have a Western Europe prepared either to defend itself or even to contribute materially to its own defense. Meanwhile, world conditions have deteriorated. While we do not call it war, we are engaged in a struggle in Korea which has cost us more casualties than any wars in which we have been engaged except World Wars I and II and our War Between the States. We know not where trouble will start elsewhere. In Western Europe and in the United Kingdom, instead of renewed determination to get ready, we hear increasing talk of possible appeasements.

Of course, all of us who have seen Europe in recent years know that the funds made available under the Economic Cooperation Act created the hope in Western Europe which doomed further political exploitation by the Communist Party to failure. There has developed a closer cooperation among the Western European countries not only in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation but also in the Council of Europe, even though decisions in these bodies require the unanimous consent of governments. Moreover, five countries did place certain of their armed forces under a common chief of staff. The planning for military cooperation among the North Atlantic Pact countries is proceeding under the promise of American aid. Perhaps progress measured in terms of past history is unbelievably fast; measured in the light of present world conditions, it is slow, dangerously slow.

Economists determined that neither the funds made available under the Economic Cooperation Act nor counterpart funds would be used to develop productive facilities for military weapons. They believed such use would have retarded economic recovery. I am not sure that this argument is sound. The reasonable use of productive facilities for armament purposes need not adversely affect the soundness of the over-all economy. In Europe and in this country, prosperity has been achieved even when substantial portions of national productive output were used for military purposes. Whether sound or not, we must recognize that precious time has been lost in strengthening Europe.

Economic recovery was not an aim in itself but only a part of a broad program to restore the great, free countries of Western Europe to their proper places in world affairs. Henceforth, there must be full coordination in the use of all funds made available to Western Europe whether for military or economic purposes. They must be used to insure accomplishment of our objectives.

Perhaps military progress is being made which we do not know about. Still, is it not timely that we do know definitely and specifically what Western Europe is doing to rearm, and when we may expect positive results? Unless we can be sure that rearmament is taking place, should we not ask ourselves if any of the money being used to strengthen Europe could be employed more effectively in increasing our own strength? There is nothing more important to the success of our fight for freedom than to have

the wholehearted support of the Western European nations. Their support is worth the expenditure of great sums by the United States. However, in expending these sums, we have the right to ask and to be assured that their expenditure will bring results.

Another question which concerns all of us is the part Germany is to play in Western Europe. There are reasons for other countries to be apprehensive over the rearming of Germany. However, the present Western German government has favored its return to the family of Western European nations and has indicated a willingness to play its part in such an association. We cannot expect an enthusiastic desire on the part of the German people to rearm. They have suffered severe punishment from war. Moreover, they have not yet been told that they are expected or even that they will be allowed to rearm. It has been suggested that they would be permitted to place some troops in a European fighting force on a limited and inferior basis. Even today those in Germany who advocate rearming are termed "militarists" while those who are opposed are termed either "cowards" or "traitors to freedom" who would trade with Soviet Russia.

I believe the people of Western Germany to be opposed to communism and to want freedom and association with the peoples of Western Europe. It is late now for a clear-cut decision to be made and announced which will be received with enthusiasm in Western Germany. It is even later if the decision is to rearm Germany, because months are required to recruit, equip, and train effective forces. However, if this is the decision, and the fight if it comes is to include the defense of Western Germany, then I believe we may obtain effective participation. In any event, we cannot expect wholehearted support in war from those who join us as second-class associates. Let us lose no further time.

Perhaps it is oversimplification again to say that in the world of today there is only one real threat to world peace, and that all those who are willing to join together to oppose this threat can contribute to world peace and are welcome associates. However, this seems to me the realistic viewpoint.

I have not had the opportunity to serve in Asia and am not qualified by experience to speak about our Asiatic policy. I wish that I fully understood what it is with respect to Formosa. I would like to know that we have determined that under no circumstances will we permit Formosa to be taken by Communist China and its soldiers either killed or forced to enter the Communist army.

There appears to be substantial differences in view among the free countries with respect to the treatment of Communist China. The United Nations has ruled that our forces will not enter Manchuria, which was sound in principle. Moreover, they ruled that our planes will not cross the border to attack troop movements, supply centers, and the airports used by enemy aircraft engaged in attacking our forces. It looked as if this action had accomplished its purpose since for this or some other reason the opposition of the Chinese Communists had not reached the proportions anticipated, although the events of the last few days may prove otherwise. Nevertheless, there was risk in this decision, largely to our troops. In limiting the range of activity of our airplanes, we made it possible for the enemy to group men and materials freely which has increased the efficiency of enemy operations with consequent increase in casualties among our own troops.

This was a decision of the United Nations. However, we must remember that its effect is to be borne almost entirely by our troops.

I hope that nothing that I have said may be construed as favoring a preventive war. Frankly I do not know what preventive war means. No matter how war comes, once it comes we have entered again into a world conflict which will result in the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives and in untold suffering and misery to millions. Such a war would not end the struggle between communism and freedom. The defeat of Russia would not necessarily destroy communism. We must bring about a proper balance in military strength which will make war unprofitable to any aggressor and hope that in the stable period which will follow that the advantages of freedom will become clear and that there may be even a return of reason to the madmen who now threaten world peace.

We may have time now, but accomplishment is urgent. Russia has not been ready for war, as otherwise world war III would be with us now. Nevertheless, as more and more satellite troops are pushed into action we are coming dangerously close to major war. Our great strength as a Nation is such that we can prepare to defend ourselves from direct attack for some years to come. However, we know that the destruction of freedom anywhere may lead to its eventual destruction everywhere. We do not want to limit our defense to our own shores. We want to feel that we are preparing for the defense of freedom and that we will be joined by all others who want freedom. The right of any people to be free cannot always be guaranteed by other peoples. It comes to a people only when they are prepared to sacrifice and to fight for their freedom. No matter how much we may wish to do so, we can defend freedom elsewhere only in common cause and common purpose. It is time now to determine those countries and those peoples who are prepared fully to join us in the mutual defense of freedom and at the same time share with us all of the sacrifices which may result. We cannot delay our decisions or divert our effort to obtain the support of those who are unwilling to declare their intentions now.

In order that we may play our part, we have embarked on an extensive program of rearmament. We must improve our own strength and also the strength of the free people who are willing to use our aid and their own efforts in common cause. We are prepared to expend large portions of our national income to produce war equipment. What is even more immediately upsetting to our economy, to gain time we must divert substantial portions of our peacetime industrial output into military purposes. There will result some reduction in our standard of living, which because of large inventories will not be felt for some time. We may have to carry this program on for many years, but this we must not do at the expense of our standard of living.

We must expand our industrial output rapidly to provide not only for defense but also to maintain our present standards. We should reduce our output of consumers goods as little as possible, cutting off first those expenditures which are not immediately necessary but which call for productive output and scarce materials. If we increase our productive output rapidly we must expect some inflation. We should not be too alarmed if it is kept within bounds and relatively consistent with the rate of expansion in productive output. The more we pay as we go, of course, the less the inflation. We must apply brakes as required, but we should apply them gently. The sudden application of all braking power might seriously retard productive expansion, even though it did make possible the meeting of our immediate defense needs. The American people will accept gladly controls needed to direct scarce materials into war production. However, they want controls which will not limit or retard our efforts to expand production and which will have as their purpose to distribute and not to maintain scarcities.

Somehow it seems to me that the problems facing our economy and our Government officials who are concerned with it are more difficult now than in wartime. This comes about because our effort for defense is not the all-out effort required by total war. This makes it as essential to have a bipartisan policy for national security as for foreign policy and for the honest differences of opinion which come about to concern only the execution of this policy.

The cost of our Armed Forces is very high. This comes from a pay scale designed to attract volunteers during a period of prosperity. The Congress should give prompt consideration to universal military service in which the compensation can be less because it does not need to be designed to attract volunteers and because the service is rendered by all as an obligation of citizenship. The conditions of today would require a period of service sufficient to maintain a well-trained Army—perhaps at least 2 years. There would also be required a permanent cadre composed of those who would remain in the armed services as a career to provide the older and highly trained men needed to add stability.

To you who face the problems of State government, these are not new questions. The world situation of today has made national security of greater importance than at any time in our peacetime history. Moreover, the term national security somehow does not seem fully descriptive. Major war cannot come to the world anywhere in which we would not be involved. Therefore, since we want peace, we must now think in terms of international security. We, and those who believe as we do, must proceed with utmost dispatch to raise and equip the fighting forces which may make peace possible, but which, if war does come, will bring early victory.

Throughout the free world we are accepted as a leader because the free peoples know they have nothing to fear from us. We are determined to be worthy of our leadership. We may have many differences among ourselves as we progress toward realization of a free world. However, Russia would be ill-advised if it believes that these differences shall ever cause us to fail or to falter in the cause to which we are committed.

Yugoslavia Backs Appeal on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of December 7, 1950:

YUGOSLAVIA BACKS APPEAL ON KOREA—ENDORSES REQUEST OF 13 ASIAN NATIONS THAT THIRTY-EIGHTH PARALLEL BE NOT CROSSED BY REDS

The Yugoslav Government wholeheartedly supports the appeal on Tuesday by United Nations representatives of 13 Asian nations to Communist China and the North Korean regime to announce publicly that their forces will not cross the thirty-eighth parallel.

The first announcement of the Yugoslav position on this appeal came yesterday in an address by Dr. Ales Bebler, permanent Yugoslav delegate to the United Nations, who spoke in the afternoon at a luncheon under auspices of the Churchman Associates, Inc., at Town Hall, 123 West Forty-third Street.

"This is our last chance for a peaceful settlement which could last a while," Dr. Bebler declared. "That is why our Yugoslav delegation backs so heartily the move of the 13 Asian nations last night."

DANGERS IN KOREAN SITUATION

If the Chinese Communists and North Koreans tried "to occupy the entire peninsula of Korea, they might create such an international tension that if it did not result in war between the United Nations and the people of China, it would add so much to international tension that we would come closer to a new world war," he said.

"This is a great horror for us all," he continued. "This is the great need for which the United Nations has been founded. This is the great thing for which we must fight. We hope humanity will not have to go through the new experience of a world war."

The office of the Yugoslav delegation to the United Nations made public last night an official statement on the Yugoslav position, saying:

"The Yugoslav delegation to the United Nations backs wholeheartedly the appeal made last night by 13 Asian delegations to the Governments of the People's Republic of Korea and of the People's Republic of China to declare that their armed forces will not cross the thirty-eighth parallel.

"We feel that such a step is the best way to prevent the Korean conflict from spreading. The world has had ample opportunity to see that the Korean problem as a problem of unification of the Korean Nation cannot be solved by the use of armed force and that every attempt to do so leads further toward a general war. This has always been the attitude of the Yugoslav delegation."

RECALLS VISIT OF CLERGYMEN

In opening his address, Dr. Bebler took note of the presence of three members of a group of Americans composed of clergymen who visited his country in 1947 as guests of the Yugoslav Government. He told them that "your visit when our country was considered part of a world hostile to the United States took great courage to find out the truth about Yugoslavia and tell that truth to the United States."

The three at the luncheon were the Reverend Dr. Guy Emery Shipley, who was the group's spokesman, the Reverend Dr. Phillips Packer Elliott, who presided at the luncheon, and Dr. Edmund Devol, physician, and the group's only lay member.

Dr. Bebler echoed the plea of Dr. Joza Vilfan, deputy foreign minister of Yugoslavia, who preceded him as a speaker, for "more behind-the-scenes, more tête-à-tête conversations, more undramatic, calm, and factual analysis" in a search for urgent solutions of world problems by the United Nations.

Dr. Vilfan emphasized the activities of the United Nations in economic and social spheres. He said the "age-old problems of mankind, health and sickness, knowledge and ignorance, prosperity, and poverty," had for the first time in history been taken up in the Economic and Social Council and the secretariat "with the help of the world's best experts, with the idea that these problems have to be considered as the common problems of the international community, for which a common solution must be found."

Tito's Brand of Communism Seen Lesser of Two Evils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an excellent news article which appeared in the columns of the Andover Townsman, Andover, Mass., on December 7, 1950, entitled "Tito's Brand of Communism Seen Lesser of Two Evils." I respectfully request permission to insert this item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time, since the House is today considering the passage of H. R. 9853, which is a bill to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia. This write-up by John Fisher is a sincere and pointed reason or reasons which I know may assist the membership of the House in voting for the passage of this legislation. It is an excellent statement with a truthful analysis of our present situation now existing between the United States, Russia, and Yugoslavia. The article abovementioned follows:

TITO'S BRAND OF COMMUNISM SEEN LESSER OF TWO EVILS

A life preserver for sinking Yugoslavia will continue to be a subject of debate, despite the suspicion and hostility toward Tito expressed by influential congressional leaders and many others.

Already stopgap famine aid was sent by President Truman even before the short session of Congress convened. But in addition to this food, western manufactured goods and eventually modern military equipment will be required to support Tito in his struggle for survival.

The time has come for a realistic appraisal of our attitude toward this controversial figure.

A great many Americans are perplexed over the question of assisting an avowed Communist, who not so long ago imprisoned a Catholic archbishop and whose flyers shot down American planes. Public opinion recoils at many of the brutal features of the Belgrade dictatorship—and justly so.

But a nation in jeopardy often must choose the lesser of two evils. Many wise statesmen maintain that Yugoslavia must not be examined separately. It should be considered in relation to the whole Communist problem with Russia as the motivating force of this anticapitalist system.

WEAKENING GRIP OF SOVIET

Unpalatable as all forms of modern Marxism are to democratic idealists, none could immediately endanger American survival were it not for the dread power and the determination to destroy the United States held by the leaders of the Soviet Union. These baleful men alone have the military might to menace the free world.

Any policy that weakens their grip is a measure of national security for the United States. Judged in this light, we stave off war—or in the event of war add 32 Yugoslav divisions to our side—if we hold Tito's head above the waves.

Were the American public better briefed on the Russian attitude toward Tito, it could more readily understand why he should not be allowed to go under.

For several years it has been one of my editorial duties to read the world Communist press and to keep tabs on Red broadcasts. In both mediums the Tito clique—as Titoists in all countries are described—is second only to the United States as the target for Russia's most vehement hatred.

The United States of America is the one force now able to block Russian domination of the entire world. Tito—and the anti-Russian nationalism which he inspires—is the most serious internal threat to Soviet domination of Communist satellites.

TITOISM CROPS UP EVERYWHERE

Stalin knows that he dare not attempt to liquidate the United States unless he can be sure of a solid alliance with China, Poland, and other countries behind the iron curtain. He knows from recent startling experience that local Titoism—which placed national self-interest above Russian imperialism—cropped up in nearly every Communist Party outside the Soviet Union and, despite re-education programs and bloody purges, still persists.

For example, Fritof Lager, secretary of the Swedish Communist Party, in a recent report to Moscow, admitted that Tito clique agents were poisoning the minds of Swedish Communist intelligentsia. Henrich Fritz, member of the Austrian Politburo, also reveals that vile dens of Titoists in Vienna pour out streams of anti-Soviet literature on dollar subsidies received from Americans.

So long as Tito keeps on his feet, anti-Soviet Communists everywhere will be encouraged to balk Russian selfishness; a selfishness whose most sinister manifestation is military agression.

It infuriates Russian Communists to have Tito maintain that they, the Russians, are Marxist heretics because they contravene Marx's principles to respect the rights and independence of small nations. Such charges undermine the faith of non-Russian Reds everywhere.

UNITED STATES AID ANGERS MOSCOW

Moscow also explodes in anger every time the United States moves closer to Yugoslavia. The Kremlin calculates that without our aid, Tito might not be able to ward off famine, resulting from this year's crop failure, and the consequent economic depression in which revolt could succeed.

The drought, the worst in Yugoslav history, and the inflation of the dinar have seriously curtailed the peasant contributions to the nation's food supply. According to Belgrade official figures, the corn harvest is 35 percent below that of 1949 and sugar is even lower. Fodder is so scarce that farmers are slaughtering their cattle and selling the meat in the black market. Even Tito discloses that grain bins will be bare by February.

When it was announced that the United States would ship emergency food, Russian propaganda declared that Tito had deliberately planned to ruin the peasants and that now, by accepting American grain, he was purposely binding Yugoslavia to the "war chariot of the American imperialists, who will profit to the extent of millions of dollars from the starvation of the Yugoslav people. This is the foul crime for which the Yugoslav people will call their hangmen to account."

RUSSIAN AGENTS AT WORK

An ominous consequence of the crop failure has been a revival of organized revolution. Numerous conspiracies already have been nipped in the bud by Rankovic's hard-boiled secret police.

Belgrade accuses several captured outlaws of being members of the Soviet Army. Although anti-Communist nationalists, as well as pro-Soviet Reds, deny this particular charge, there is no doubt that Russian agents along the border and inside the country are instigating revolt.

"Our goal," frankly admits Pero Popivoda, writing in the official Cominform paper, "is to overthrow the counterrevolutionary, Fascist Tito clique."

In an effort to justify rebellion by proving the Tito brand of communism is spurious, Popivoda alleges that Tito, during the war, schemed with British and American agents to get rid of orthodox communism. "Due to the foul and criminal actions of Tito and his Anglo-American instructors," he adds, "more than 10,000 of the prewar party membership of 12,000 were killed."

"Because of this Fascist terror, the leadership of the Communist Party fell into the hands of spies, assassins, and imperialist

hirelings. The people realize that Yugoslavia can be wrested from the clutches of imperialists only by overthrowing the Fascist regime."

So it's either support Marxist Tito or see him replaced by another Communist sworn to enmity against the United States.

Let the Punishment Fit the Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the defeat of our Armed Forces in Korea, the greatest military defeat in our history, is the undeniable result of Secretary of State Dean Acheson's persistent and fallacious policy and defunct judgment of appeasement and containment of communism in China which has brought the greatest humiliation and loss of prestige the United States has ever suffered.

No one can today accurately appraise or estimate the terrible drastic future this defeat portends for the United States and the rest of the world.

Acheson stands indicted as a complete failure in the performance of his duties and in the execution and administration of his great responsibility as Secretary of State before the American people.

Acheson has been aided and abetted, supported and encouraged by President Truman, who has directed and approved his actions and who is responsible for his appointment and his remaining in the important office of Secretary of State. President Truman is, therefore, equally responsible for the greatest humiliation and military defeat this Nation has suffered in the Korean War, which President Truman declared and committed the United States to prosecute without the consent or approval of the Congress.

We Members of Congress cannot permit this faulty judgment and demoralizing, degenerating administration of the executive branch of our Government to continue. The people of this Nation have exhausted their patience. They are angry, they are fearful of the survival of the United States as the great and powerful Nation it has always been and as it emerged the greatest Nation in the world following World War II.

We Members of Congress, responsible as we are to the people of the Nation, must give heed to their demands. Let us not forget, and let the day never come when this Nation is not governed by the consent of the governed. That means that we are the responsible representatives of the people who sent us here by and with their consent and approval.

That also means in my opinion that we should demand by resolution that President Truman speedily remove Dean Acheson from the office of Secretary of State and if he fails to do that, that impeachment proceedings be instituted to remove both Acheson and Truman.

The people of this Nation will hold the Congress responsible if this is not done. They will not be satisfied with anything less.

Fascism and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest of our younger American authors is Peter Viereck, associate professor of history at Mount Holyoke College. A historian of the first rank and the 1949 winner of the Pulitzer prize for poetry, Dr. Viereck is also a brilliant writer of books and essays on political subjects.

With the permission of the House, I am inserting as a part of my remarks, first, an article by Dr. Viereck which appeared on October 26, 1950, in the New York Herald Tribune and, second, a letter dated November 3, 1950, from Dr. Viereck to the editor of the same newspaper.

The article and letter are as follows:

FASCISM AND COMMUNISM—PROFESSOR VIERECK SAYS BOTH MUST BE FOUGHT IN AMERICA'S POLITICAL WARFARE

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The time has come for press and pulpit to speak out an unpopular truth, evaded by those who depend on votes and popularity. The blunt fact is that too many Americans are forgetting the central emotional and intellectual experience of our era; the crusade—let us not be ashamed of so uncynical a word—the great crusade against Nazi inhumanity. This tiny, almost invisible moral flaw is a focal infection poisoning our body politic.

It is likewise poisoning our relations with Europe. The Communist big lie, that America backs only reactionaries or Fascists, has not convinced Europe's non-Communists. But it has left them with the uneasy feeling of a wife whose husband is accused of infidelity. Though believing nary a word of it, she craves constant reassurance. We have not sufficiently reassured a Hitler-ravaged Europe of our anti-fascism. This is the greatest weakness in our psychological warfare. It undermines the Atlantic Pact and is used by Communists to neutralize two different non-Communist groups:

1. First, the herd of defeatists, the non-Communist—sometimes capitalist—appeasers of Russia. Their democratic indignation against the sole arsenal of democracy, their virtuous lament about "reactionary America" with its imaginary "Fascist witch-hunt against liberals" is an impertinence concealing a loss of nerve. Their sophistry of equating Russia and America as equally imperialistic is an unconscious alibi-in-advance for panicky futile neutrality; perhaps even for lucrative collaboration with an awaited Red army.

2. The second group is Europe's finest—the graduates of the anti-Nazi underground, whose gallantry a dozen Marshall plans cannot repay. As shown by Mayor Reuter's role in West Berlin, these influential leaders can raise the anti-Soviet morale of Europe overnight. Only their prestige and magnetism can inspire the needed self-sacrifice for our side. But first we must win their full trust. In the New York Herald Tribune of October 1 this was stressed in a sensationally important letter from Count Max Salvadori, the famous underground hero who parachuted behind Mussolini's lines and whose voice of urgent warning represents millions of his fellow veterans of the underground. The Voice of America must do more to persuade them of our fidelity to the anti-Fascist sacrament that united them and us before 1945. Our foreign policy must also take them into account by reversing our decision to end denazification trials in Germany. (I refer to the underground of genuine democrats, not to those who served Hitler obsequiously so long as Russia was his ally. The proper adjective for Communists is not anti-Fascist but Stalinist Fascist.)

In 1945 General Patton forced undemocratic Germans to see with their own eyes the skeletons in a local concentration camp. In 1950 democratic but forgetful Americans ought to force themselves to think of these skeletons. Only five brief years ago nazism was still gassing innocent millions and turning their fat into soap, their gold teeth into foreign exchange. When American soldiers put a stop to this pastime, so that Western Europe today is free, did they "die in vain" for "stupid idealism?" So says the new school that blames today's Soviet menace on our war with Germany. But Russia's ideology and growing strength made her expansion inevitable in any case. Only our learning the price of isolationism and appeasement the hard way against Hitler has educated us into our timely Atlantic Pact and Korean intervention against Stalin. If, through too narrow a version of anticommunism, America now minimizes its anti-Hitler war, it minimizes the noblest and wisest act in its history. "Who," to echo the chant of the Charles Beard school, "got us into war?" As a historian, I wish the answer were:

"It is we, the American people, who got ourselves in. We got in because we happen to be human beings and, therefore, prejudiced against tyrants and torturers. Because we are the product of 2,000 years of Christian and Hellenic traditions, compared with which Hitlerism was an obscene word scrawled on the walls of civilization, which had to be wiped off. Because we are our brother's keeper. Because—despite Hitler's and Stalin's appeasers—this small globe can no longer be half-slave, half-free."

Unfortunately for America's claim to greatness, the above is not a sufficient answer to why we got in. We had no choice but to fight because Japan attacked us, and Germany declared war. * * * Suppose Japan had not attacked. Further, suppose our isolationists had won our elections and had accepted their humble niche in a Hitler-ruled world, as some anti-Communists now advocate. Our Nation would have disintegrated, morally and materially. Evidence of this is the partial disintegration that was already taking place before Pearl Harbor restored American unity. The issue of 1939–41 was how to halt, before too late, the "mein kampf" program of Germany, mistress of the globe by the victorious sword of a master race. How did America react to this issue?

On the one hand, America's anti-Fascist majority guarded the light in those three dark years. But let us unflinchingly recall the other, more embarrassing aspect of our own country. While Paris fell and London reeled, a propaganda machine, ironically named America First, was advocating neutrality toward monsters whose mass murders were unequaled in history and whose victory would hardly have left America unmolested. (The majority of isolationists and America Firsters were men of personal integrity, unjustly slandered as Nazis. Nevertheless what counts historically, as with Henry Wallace's 1948 campaign, is: Who was the real gainer from their misdirected love of peace?) With

a nudge of vulgar knowingness, our largest circulating newspapers advocated the realism of making a deal with the wave of the future, otherwise known as the bitch-goddess Success.

It was as if the vermin of a thousand drains had crept up into the sunlight and were basking there. A fifth-column magazine, legally circulated, advertised a new kind of blackjack, quaintly called the kike-killer. German bundists held joint meetings with nativists Ku Klux Klan to make the world unsafe for democracy. An un-Christian cleric, with a radio and newspaper audience of millions, was caught plagiarizing whole passages of Goebbels, but went right on inciting to pogroms and civil war, publishing the Elders of Zion forgeries and threatening American democracy with what he called the Franco way. (Had Hitler won, had we entered too late to stop him, then these terrorists might now be ruling the United States.) One morning the police discovered—have we forgotten this too?—that a Hitler-worshiping gang of dead-end kids, frenzied by Christian-front propaganda, were stocking a secret arsenal of bombs and dynamite against Jews and Communists. Meanwhile, the Communists themselves, during the Hitler-Stalin pact, outshrilled Hitler in calling our leaders anti-German warmongers.

In retrospect, all these forgotten realities look like a surrealist dream. Surely this was not our own lifetime. Surely these stories are the quaint papyrus of some little comic-opera kingdom that died of its own sordidness and silliness a dozen centuries ago. Meanwhile, 5,000,000 victims were roasting in the crematories. * * *

Today whenever Americans pardon Nazi criminals in Germany or award an official Library of Congress prize to a Jew-baiting Fascist traitor (as if poetry were exempt from ethics!) or elect to public office racist agitators, then Europeans tend to assume the motive is lack of democracy or even is facism. Their assumption is incorrect. America's real sin is a subtler one: indifference. In our vast anti-Fascist majority, this postwar indifference to fascism stems not from lack of democracy, which America practices sincerely, but from what Dante calls moral sloth.

Moral sloth is hardly an auspicious atmosphere for effective anticommunism. Only the spirit that stopped Hitler can stop Stalin. Anti-fascism is creative humaneness, the answer of human dignity to brute force. A rebirth of the anti-Fascist spirit will be the salvation of the west, the answer to Spengler's pessimism. The sacrament of 1939–45, its exaltation and dedication, must not become mere lip service to freedom; it must again, in Wordsworth's phrase, be "felt along the heart." Without it, we can preach our anti-communism to Europe and Asia "with the tongues of men and angels" and yet have no more effect than "a sounding brass," "a tinkling cymbal."

When a Fascist Franco or a domestic Nazi like Gerald K. Smith, a charming Vichy diplomat, or an efficient Nazi general step forward with an expectant smile to offer us their services against Communism, coyly impresarioed by those patriots of the yellow press who were isolationist toward Hitler and interventionist toward Stalin, then let public opinion—no longer amused—thunder back at the whole crew of them: "Crawl under your stones again; we do not want you!" Memories of the battle against Fascist appeasement by America's bipartisan interventionists in 1939–41 must today reunite conservative and liberal America as the battle of Agincourt united England on St. Crispin's Day:

"He, that shall live this day, and see old age,
Will yearly on the vigil feast his friends
* * *
And gentlemen in England, now a-bed,
Shall think themselves accursed they were not here;
And hold their manhoods cheap, while any speaks
That fought with us upon Saint Crispin's day."

For life in human society is an unending St. Crispin's Day, no meaningless vanity of ego and mean-spirited self-interest, but a battle where every slightest political act is a responsibility of infinite moral significance.

PETER VIERECK.

HARWICHPORT, MASS., *October 19, 1950.*

THE ETHICS OF EZRA POUND

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The position of really serious, non-Philistine opponents of the Bollingen Award gets so misrepresented in most periodicals that the following must be stressed: None of us (with one overpublicized exception) was impugning the committee's motives nor indicting all modern poetry. For us the issue is whether, as some "new critics" believe, form and technique can be considered apart from content and meaning. Thus, in the Atlantic Monthly, October 1949, I protested vigorously against articles absurdly accusing the Bollingen committee of Fascist sympathies and concluded: "The sympathies of the committee were not with Pound's politics but with the widely held unhistorical and unpsychological argument that artistic form can be considered apart from its content and moral meaning."

No thought control; there must be no censorship of Pound's right to publish anything whatever. But must he also get a government-connected prize for it? Perhaps yes, if it were for his brilliant, earlier, more distinguished works. Unfortunately this honorably motivated award was solely for one book: his Pisan Cantos.

Poems of esthetic intention must be judged only esthetically, regardless of their author's politics. But Pound's prize-winning Pisan Cantos are not intended as purely esthetic. Theirs is a political message that Mussolini was martyred and World War II caused by Jews: "the goyim" (non-Jews) "go to salable slaughter" for "the yidd * * * David rex the prime s. o. b." This is politics, not serious poetry, and hence not exempt from America's ethical, nonesthetic condemnation. Whether from a fashionable coterie-protected poet or a mere "low-brow" Gerald K. Smith, such influential racists propaganda against World War II must be protested by those to whom a simple human compassion for Hitler's millions of tortured victims is the deepest emotional and moral experience of our era. What, indeed, is our very necessary zeal against communism but this same heart-breaking distress over inhumanity?

PETER VIERECK.

HARWICHPORT, MASS., *Nov. 3, 1950.*

Tito Says He'll Back UN Decision in Event of Conflict With Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of November 7, 1950:

TITO SAYS HE'LL BACK UN DECISION IN EVENT OF CONFLICT WITH RED CHINA

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, November 6.—If complications arising from the Korean War should result in an outbreak of hostilities between the United States and Communist China, Marshal Tito said this evening, Yugoslavia will adhere to any United Nations definition as to which was the aggressor nation and will abide by the ensuing action voiced by that international body.

Yugoslavia's Premier was definite in this assertion. In an interview with this correspondent, he said that it was still difficult to assess the attitude on Korea of Mao Tse-tung's Chinese Communist government. He added that not even the United States appeared to have adopted any precise stand yet; that he was not in a position to gage the accuracy of reports from Korea or to evaluate the scope of the situation.

The marshal was asked what his country's stand would be should a deteriorating situation bring about hostilities between the United States and Communist China. He replied:

"My attitude is, of course, the same as that of our delegation to the United Nations. If such a situation as you mention should develop, we would take a stand against any and all aggression. I should not like to be misunderstood. It is the United Nations itself which must decide who is the aggressor. Our stand will be the same—that of the United Nations. We will adhere to that body's decision."

Marshal Tito recalled that his country had agreed to recognize the Chinese Communist Government and had evinced a desire to exchange envoys with Peiping. There had been no reply from China, but he said he could judge from the Communist Chinese press that Mr. Mao's attitude was not very friendly. To this he added:

"We know why. It is the same in the case of all countries having a close relationship with the Soviet Union. They all have a uniform policy on Yugoslavia, because Soviet policy toward this country has not changed, and they cannot have an independent view."

Internationally speaking, these statements by Marshal Tito have an exceptional importance because, as he commented, Yugoslavia remains a truly Communist state based upon the tenets of Marx and Lenin, although opposed to the efforts by the Soviet Union to revise those precepts. Furthermore, it may be recalled that Yugoslavia, with 32 divisions, has the largest army in the part of Europe outside the Soviet orbit.

TITO WOULD KEEP OBLIGATION

The marshal was asked whether Yugoslavia would be prepared to earmark certain of her armed forces to be placed at the permanent disposal of the United Nations to combat aggression when and where it might occur.

"This means a matter for the future," he replied. "When our country undertakes an obligation, it keeps it. Our country is not very enthusiastic about symbolic help, because it means nothing and can only lead to trouble. I can only confirm Kardelj's stand at the United Nations. [Dr. Edward Kardelj, Yugoslav Foreign Minister, has supported United Nations decisions on Korea.]

Marshal Tito continued:

"The character of aggression must be defined. We are on the side of those countries that oppose aggression as formulated by the United Nations. Thus our stand is clear."

During the interview, which lasted an hour and a half, Marshal Tito spoke with complete frankness on a wide variety of subjects. His views were expressed in Serbo-Croatian and translated by a government interpreter, but it was evident that the Marshal's knowledge of English is now fairly considerable.

He looked healthy and fit, unworried by the cares occasioned by the Cominform's political war against Yugoslavia, its economic blockade, or the difficult food situation caused by this year's drought.

Wearing a gray army uniform with red stripes on his trousers, and no decorations, he talked with great cordiality and openness.

The discussion took place in his home in a Belgrade suburb, an unpretentious villa. Coffee, plum brandy, and Macedonian cigarettes were served. Two dogs, an Alsatian that he got from the retreating Germans during the war and a bird dog, wandered about the antechambers. Beside his desk stood a bust of Lenin—and none of Generalissimo Stalin.

Aside from expressing his views on the far eastern crisis, the marshal made the following points:

1. Yugoslavia has no desire to retain the Greek children who were brought to the country during Greece's civil war, and Belgrade hopes that the International Red Cross can supervise the return of those children desired by their parents.

2. Yugoslavia has no territorial claims upon Greek Macedonia, nor does she desire frontier alterations, but she would wish to see certain minority rights granted to the Slavonic elements in that territory.

3. If it is in the interest of international relationships and will not cause unrest among Yugoslavia's internal population, the Belgrade government will release Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, at present imprisoned as a war criminal. The possibility of releasing the cleric exists now. He might be sent to a monastery, or there could be another solution, but he would not be permitted to serve as a prelate in the country.

4. Yugoslavia is ready to purchase arms from the western powers for national defense, and in an emergency would ask for material aid wherever she could obtain it.

5. Despite Moscow's propaganda, Yugoslavia does not consider that the Marshall plan has been catastrophic for Europe; instead, it has afforded great help to certain countries, such as Italy and France.

6. While the tempo of the Yugoslav revolution has in no sense slowed, a broad new amnesty of political prisoners will soon be forthcoming.

TRANSIT TO GREECE HOPED FOR

Of relations with Greece, Marshal Tito said:

"Railway communications between the two countries have not yet been established, but it is not our fault. We have sought to restore them, in order to use our free zone in in the port of Salonika. I hope this matter will soon be settled with the Greek Government."

Talking in extreme temperate terms of Greece, Marshal Tito indicated that he was anxious for a settlement of the outstanding questions. He would like the Red Cross, with ite great reputation, to handle the repatriation of Greek children whose parents wish their return. It is necessary for the Red Cross to supervise this, he said, because of the Cominform's propaganda allegations that Yugoslavia is turning over to "Fascist reactionaries" children whose parents were in Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and other lands under Soviet control.

"As far as Macedonia is concerned, we have not asked for, nor do we consider requesting, revision of the existing order. We do think of the Slavic minority in Greece. It does exist, and we cannot allow that subject to be forgotten—first, for reasons of principle; and second, because the Cominform, especially Bulgaria, continually attacks us on this issue. But we have in mind no territorial claims. In contrast, Bulgaria, with the full knowledge of the Soviet Union, has pretentions on Yugoslav Macedonia."

On Albania, he said:

"Press reports that Soviet experts and instructors are being sent there are based upon fact. But they cannot create a large army there because the country is too small. They are certainly strengthening Albania's economy for their own purposes. Albania continues to behave provocatively upon our border and to shoot across at our patrols. Furthermore, Tirana is making plain again its designs on the Kossovo and Metchije regions of Yugoslavia."

On the question of Austria and Greece as neighbors, he declared:

"We are ready any day to normalize relationships. They are not bad right now with Austria, and are improving daily. We hope the same will occur with Greece and I think that will be soon, although to date there has been little understanding on the part of Athens."

Complete Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass.:

RUSSIA'S REAL AIM

The Russians mean to conquer us.

They have been announcing that intention in their writings for a long time, just as Hitler did in his book, Mein Kampf. Unhappily, too many of us have not wanted to face this brutal truth.

Now events in Korea and elsewhere in the world are compelling us to accept it as the great cardinal fact governing our lives.

Russian talk of peace is meaningless. It is contradicted by Communist action in Korea and Communist action in the United Nations. When the chips were down on a UN resolution that would have promoted early peace in Korea Russia voted "no."

The Kremlin has no idea of negotiating a lasting peace or any other kind of settlement that would hamper its plan for global conquest. Russian leaders believe Communist society represents the wave of the future and that we in the west are a dying civilization. So frevently are they convinced of this that they are never troubled for long by individual reverses. They believe time works for them.

Obviously that doesn't mean they're content to sit back passively and wait for us to crumble. They exert a constant pressure against us, probing for weak spots. That's why they went into Korea in the first place; they had it marked as a soft point.

It should be abundantly plain to every American, furthermore that every Soviet success emboldens Moscow to more daring adventures.

Most important of all, it brings nearer the day when Soviet rulers may be willing to undertake a decisive phase in their struggle with the West. No men undertake a war unless they think they have a good chance to win it. The critical moment is the one when they at last believe their prospects are bright.

Knowing all this about the Russians, what must we do? First, we must divest ourselves once and for all of wishful thinking about the likelihood Russia will change its objectives. The Kremlin's purpose is unalterable—to destroy us—and everything it does serves that end and no other.

We must then resolve to do everything possible to compel Russia to postpone the decision that means general war. That means a high state of military preparedness for ourselves and our Allies, real protection both for America and the crucial industry of Western Europe. It means accepting controls, sacrifices, hardships at home.

We do not have much time to make up our minds to do this. The areas of the world left to free men are diminishing. Our chief military advantages—the A-bomb and a strategic air force—also are diminishing relatively as Russian power gains.

The price of failure to do all these things now—while the Russians presumably are still deferring the big decision—will be wholesale war.

We might get it anyway. It might come through accident or Soviet miscalculation of our strength and theirs. Or Moscow might conclude that a long stalemate induced by our growing power would ultimately work to the ruin of Communist leaders. They might in desperation choose a war of doubtful outcome rather than risk their necks at home by waiting too long.

These eventualities we cannot guard against. But in duty to ourselves and free people everywhere, we must behave as if accident and mistake will not govern. We must act to show the men in the Kremlin that they cannot win. Or to put it a better way, that we will not be defeated.

Masonic Address by Hon. Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address I delivered at Landmark Lodge, No. 76, Ancient Free Masons, at the one hundredth anniversary meeting of the lodge, in Charleston, S. C., December 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight we honor ourselves by gathering here to honor some of the early craftsmen who helped to build the noble structure of Masonry in South Carolina.

It is a noble structure, and we, who are the beneficiaries of the work done by these pioneers, may sometimes forget the debt of honor and gratitude that we owe to them. It is most appropriate, therefore, that we take time out from our busy activities and responsibilities to pay tribute to the services of the members of Landmark Lodge, No. 76, Ancient Free Masons, which was organized 100 years ago tonight.

Celebrations of this sort are only partially successful if they only look backward and contemplate what has been done in the past.

It is equally important that, as we honor and admire the accomplishments of our predecessors we draw inspiration and courage from those accomplishments as a part of our own equipment to carry on the work they have pioneered. We can honor them, of course, by taking part in this celebration and in discussing what they have done for Masonry in South Carolina, and particularly in considering the unfavorable conditions they often encountered; but we can pay to them a more sincere tribute and prove ourselves more worthy to wear their mantle by basing our future activities and efforts upon a firmer understanding and appreciation of the

loyalty and devotion that characterized their services and made of their achievements the record we are here to pay tribute to tonight.

There has long been controversy as to the origin of Masonry. In the eighteenth century, and in the first half of the nineteenth, Masonic writers laid great stress upon the possible origin of the society in the remote ages of the past. Later research has tended to show that most of these claims to the legendary antiquity of the order are without definite historical basis, but they are interesting. Besides, there may be some truth in some of them, because there are many facts in human history that cannot be definitely established by scientific methods, but neither can they be definitely disproved.

Among these legendary claims to the ancient origin of the Masonic fraternity is one to the effect that the history of the human race was the story of Masonry, beginning with the migration from the Garden of Eden. Others have claimed that the society is the successor of ancient mysteries coming from the oriental peoples. Another theory is that the rites of Masonry played a part in the construction of the Temple of Solomon. Still others have held that the order had its beginnings in the civil strifes in Great Britain in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

The Encyclopedia Americana says that the consensus of reliable historical opinion affirms that the premier Grand Lodge of England, organized on June 24, 1717, "is the mother of all regular Masonic lodges of the three craft degrees, and, therefore, peculiar interest centers in the landmarks, legends, and authentic narratives pertaining to the English rite itself, as well as the American rite, the daughter thereof, so to speak."

Regardless, however, of the antiquity of the origin of Freemasonry, it is a fraternity composed always of men of leadership and influence in their communities—men who contribute to the upbuilding and advancement of the educational, religious, and cultural interests of their communities.

In taking part in activities of this sort, it is to be noted that members of the Masonic fraternity always utilize the outstanding Masonic quality of fraternity. Masons recognize the value of cooperation, of working together in undertakings that are for the good of all. They are, therefore, always to be found supporting the leading movements designed to contribute to the improvement of conditions and the development of their home towns and their States. These activities they carry on, not as Masons, but as citizens who have adopted the high principles of Masonry and have made them a part of their equipment for doing their share in civic undertakings—equipment that lifts them above the level of selfish and mercenary motives.

The first lodge of Masons in South Carolina was organized in Charleston on October 28, 1736. This was just 19 years after the organization of the premier grand lodge in England, which is referred to as "the mother of all regular Masonic lodges of the three craft degrees." For many years there were two grand lodges in South Carolina. One was the Grand Lodge of the Most Ancient and Honorable Society of Free Masons, and the other was the Grand Lodge of Ancient York Masons for the State of South Carolina. Between these two organizations much discord and dissension developed, which did neither any good.

One of the outstanding incidents growing out of this rivalry occurred in connection with the visit of George Washington to South Carolina in 1791, shortly after he became President. On his arrival in Charleston the Grand Lodge of Ancient York Masons wrote him a letter expressing respect for his public and private character, as well as the relation in which he stood with the brethren of the society. The letter contained this concluding paragraph:

"With fervent zeal for your happiness, we pray that a life so dear to the bosom of this society, and to society in general, may be long, very long preserved; and, when you leave the temporal symbolic lodges of this world, may you be received in the Celestial Lodge of light and perfection, where the Grand Master Architect of the universe presides."

No such recognition was accorded General Washington by the Ancient and Accepted Masons. And after Washington's death in 1799, a civic procession in his honor took place in Charleston, in which 250 members of the Ancient York Masons took part, but there is no record of any recognition of Washington as a Mason by the Ancient and Accepted Masons.

Albert G. Mackey, for many years an officer of Landmark Lodge, in his History of Freemasonry in South Carolina, refers to the bitter feud between the Ancient and Accepted Masons and the Ancient Yorks, pointing out that each denied the legitimacy and the regularity of the other, and that each grand lodge fostered a hostile feeling toward the other. And Mackey expresses the view that the failure or refusal of the grand lodge of Ancient and Accepted Masons to participate in the ceremonies in honor of Washington is to be attributed to the fact that he was an Ancient York Mason, and that his masonic claim was not recognized by the Ancient and Accepted Masons. They mourned him as citizens, but could not admit his right to masonic funeral honors. In this, Mackey holds, they were consistent. Neither the fear of unpopularity nor the persuasions of patriotism would permit them to abandon the ground they had taken, along with their mother lodge in England, that all Ancient York Masons were irregular and clandestine.

The masonic feuds in Charleston played a part also in the visit of Marquis de Lafayette in 1825. The marquis had been informed of the differences, and avoided offending either of them by pleading lack of time to accept or take part in any ceremonies in his honor.

This rivalry between the two grand lodges was directly responsible for the organization of Landmark Lodge, No. 76. It became so bitter at times that prominent members of each faction recognized the necessity for a reconciliation and union of the two as the only means of preserving effective Masonry in South Carolina. An effort was made to effect such a reconciliation as a result of which a special communication of the grand lodge was held on December 11, 1850, at which a warrant of constitution was granted to John Alexander Gyles, Theodore S. Gourdin, and William Allston Gourdin "to open and hold a lodge to be designated as Landmark Lodge, No. 76, under our jurisdiction, at Charleston, in the State of South Carolina, or within three miles of the same." It was to be a lodge "to which all Masons might look for guidance and instruction in the true and undefiled work of the craft."

The new lodge faced a delicate situation in undertaking to compose the differences that divided Charleston Masonry for so many years. It was highly successful during its first 10 years, but when the War Between the States broke out most of the members of Landmark took part in the conflict, from which many never returned. A dispensation was obtained in 1862 which permitted the lodge to suspend for 2 years, and as the temple was within range of Union shells, the records and other effects were sent to Columbia for safekeeping. They were stolen or burned when Sherman entered and destroyed Columbia.

In July 1865 a few members who had survived the war undertook to restore the lodge. They were denied a dispensation to reopen the lodge until dues to the grand lodge were paid. The amount involved was between $60 and $70, a sum which the members could not pay. A loan was arranged, the dues were paid, and Landmark Lodge was restored to active life. It has continued to thrive and prosper to this good hour.

It may be of interest to refer briefly to some of the changes that have taken place in South Carolina during the hundred years since Landmark Lodge was organized. In 1850 the population of the State was 668,507; it is now more than three times that figure—2,117,027. Charleston in 1850 had a population of 42,984. Two years earlier, in 1848, the city's population was 26,461—a gain of 62 percent in 2 years. That rate of growth has not been kept up, as we all know.

In 1850 South Carolina had only very limited industry. There were 18 cotton mills employing about 1,000 workers, and the census of 1850 shows a decrease in the number of employees.

As of July 1 of this year, there are 283 textile mills in the State of South Carolina, employing 137,416 people.

Other industries that have flourished in the State since the blot of reconstruction was removed include pulp mills, brick making, lumbering, foundries, refineries, and fisheries. The growth of cattle raising and dairying is rapidly transforming agricultural conditions in the State.

The improvements in the living conditions of our people in the past 100 years have probably been more pronounced than in any similar period in our history. In 1850 our people had no telephones, no electric lights, no electric refrigerators, no automobiles, no radios, no television, nor many other conveniences that have become commonplace with us. Neither the State government nor the Federal Government had done anything toward providing the people with roads, and provision for public education was quite limited. There was no Government development of power for the benefit of the public, no rural electrification, no Federal land bank, no insurance of bank deposits or building and loan shares, no insurance of loans for building homes, no unemployment insurance, no social security. These and many other benefits now enjoyed were unknown and undreamed of when Landmark Lodge, No. 76, was organized.

It may be appropriate at this time to make a brief reference to some of the developments going on in these dangerous days as they relate to our city, our State, our Nation, and the world. In so doing, I am recognizing the fact that we, as Masons, are interested in broader fields than those pertaining to Masonic affairs alone.

As I am sure everyone in South Carolina is aware by now, the Atomic Energy Commission has anounced that it has selected this State as the home of its great new production plants to be designed, built, and operated by the du Pont Co.

This is important news, not only for South Carolina, but for our neighboring States and for the entire southeastern United States as well.

The construction of this vast new production facility on a 250,000-acre tract in Aiken and Barnwell Counties will make South Carolina one of the most important atomic energy centers in the United States—and, therefore, in the whole world.

What this will mean to South Carolina in future years—when at least part of the almost limitless potentialities of atomic energy have been fulfilled—can only be guessed at now. But it is nevertheess safe to say that we have been peculiarly fortunate in having been given this opportunity to play—at this very early stage in atomic energy development—so important a role in so vital and promising an enterprise.

What the new plants will mean to South Carolina in the more immediate future is somewhat easier to imagine. The magnitude

of the building job to be done here can be visualized when one realizes that the Congress has already appropriated $260,000,000 to start construction at the new site. Just how much more will be spent on construction it is not possible to say right now, but I can assure you it will be considerable.

This building job—and the operational job that will come afterward—will mean new opportunities for employment and new opportunities for South Carolina businessmen. It is expected, for example, that at the end of 6 months 8,000 construction employees will already be on the job at the new site.

But aside from the obvious material benefits that will accrue from having this great production enterprise in our midst, I, as a South Carolinian—especially in these perilous times—am proud of the contribution our State has been given the chance to make, not only to the possible future well-being of our country, but to its defense as well.

It is, I believe, a well-accepted fact that the future realization of the potentialities of atomic energy for good will be at least partially governed by the activities to be carried on at the South Carolina plant of the Atomic Energy Commission, but—far more important than this—the very future of democracy and the American way of life may well also be at stake. For the materials to be made in that plant, while having a possible future peacetime application, can also be used in our defense—and perhaps decisively so—against the evil forces of tyranny and aggression now loose in the world.

This raises the question of just what it is that the Government plans to do in its new Savannah River plant. Secrecy of necessity in these times surrounds much of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission. It is partly because of this, I suppose, that some people have a misconception of what is to be manufactured in the new plant.

The new plant has been called a "hydrogen bomb" plant. Without violating any security provision, I can say that this definitely is not true. The new plant will not make bombs—either hydrogen or atomic. What the plant will do, like the great production plants at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Hanford, Wash., will be to make atomic energy materials that can be used either for bombs or for peacetime power production purposes. The plant will be so designed that, if hydrogen bombs are proved to be feasible, it will also be able to make materials that can be used in them.

It is unfortunate but true that whenever a huge enterprise such as the new Savannah River plant is undertaken some people are bound to be inconvenienced or worse. There are, for example, some 1,500 families living in areas in Aiken and Barnwell Counties—many of whom have lived there all their lives, as did their fathers before them—who will have to move to make way for the production facilities.

I profoundly regret that this has to be done, but I can assure you that the Government will take every possible step to see to it that the lives of these people are disrupted as little as possible.

In this connection I would like to make clear to anyone who is directly involved that relatively few properties in the area will be affected in the immediate future. Almost all the townspeople and farmers who are not located in the zones designated as areas I and II in the maps publicized last week should not, according to present plans, be affected before the end of 1951 and should therefore go about their normal business, including the growing of crops.

Both the Atomic Energy Commission and the du Pont Co. have representatives here in the South. They are here to get the new project underway and to do it with the least possible disruption to the lives of the people living in this area and the least amount of confusion, delay, and frustration in the handling of people who wish to apply for employment or do business with the new project.

Among the Government agencies taking a leading role in the helping of people who must move because of the new site development is the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture has had a representative in the vicinity of the new site now for a week or more, and he is setting up a system whereby people who live in the affected areas may receive information on other areas they might wish to move to and may have assistance in making applications for loans.

As an example of the type of assistance the Department of Agriculture is undertaking to give, I have been told that lists are being prepared of those persons who will have to be relocated and who will require assistance. These files will contain information on just what type of land and housing each person will need at his new location. As a corollary to this, the Department of Agriculture is also obtaining listing of places in Aiken and Barnwell counties and adjoining counties which are suitable for evacuated families to resettle in. Until announcements are made about these listings, people wishing information about the availability of homes and lands in adjoining areas may contact their local county agricultural agents. They have offices in the county seats.

I have also been assured that the people in the affected areas who normally handle farm loans have been alerted to give the most help possible to people who will be required to move because of the new atomic energy plant. The procedures for folks now living on the affected areas and who desire funds for the purchase of new lands elsewhere are these:

1. If the farmer has credit of substantial equity, he may apply for a loan for the purchase of new lands to the National Farm Loan Association office serving the territory in which he wishes to relocate. The name and address of this representative may be obtained from the Farmers Home Administration county supervisor in the county seat of the home county of the applicant.

2. If the farmer does not have credit of substantial equity, he should apply for a loan to the Farmers Home Administration county supervisor in the county in which he wishes to relocate. The county supervisors for Aiken and Barnwell Counties will know the names and addresses of the county supervisors in other counties.

The Department of Agriculture is also gearing its loan agencies to be of help to those people in the affected areas who may need to borrow funds for operating expenses during the moving period. People wishing to apply for loans for operating purposes may apply to the Production Credit Association or the Farmers Home Administration, or, of course, to their local banks. Information on loans from both the Production Credit Association or the Farmers Home Administration may be obtained from county supervisors.

There is one thing about this project right now that everyone should keep in mind and that is that this is a very early stage in its development. For example, it has not yet been decided what sort of facilities will be erected to house the construction workers on the reservation. The Atomic Energy Commission has made up its mind that it will not build a Government town for permanent employees such as Oak Ridge and Richland, Wash., and that is one of the reasons that the South Carolina site, where there are neighboring towns, was selected for the new plant. The Atomic Energy Commission as of now also does not know what concessions, if any, it will be necessary to award in the reservation area.

Because at present we are in a very early stage in the plant's development, it is important to guard against acting in a financial way upon rumors and erroneous reports. I have been assured by the Atomic Energy Commission that as new plans develop, the people in the affected areas will be kept advised. It is only common prudence, I believe, for everyone affected by these plans to obtain accurate and authentic information from the Atomic Energy Commission, the du Pont Co., or the Corps of Engineers before they take any kind of action that involves prices or property.

In addition to this information I have sent to every newspaper and every chamber of commerce in South Carolina an up-to-date list of the names of officers representing both the Atomic Energy Commission and the du Pont Co. In addition to listing each officer, his position and address, the list also provides other pertinent information concerning job applications, contracts, and subcontracts, concessions, land acquisition, and housing. This information will be corrected and brought up-to-date as frequently as possible.

I have taken some time to give you as much information as is presently available on this new plant. While we, as South Carolinians and Americans, are pleased to have this gigantic new industry in our State, we must at the same time pause and consider the urgency of this project. We must not overlook the basic need for which it is being constructed.

While we have every hope that the product of this plant may ultimately be used to further raise our standards of living in a peaceful world, the primary aim at the moment is to produce as quickly as possible an arsenal of superior weapons and matériel with which to protect ourselves against our enemies.

That is why we are finding ourselves confronted almost daily with more stringent controls of all kinds over our domestic economy in order to build plants such as this one. At the same time we maintain a constant flow of matériel and troops, it is necessary to divert many peacetime goods and services into military channels.

As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I sat with other members for almost endless days and nights when we considered and passed the Defense Production Act. This act is the basic legislation which provides the authority for complete mobilization of business and industry if it should be required.

Since the passage of the Defense Production Act, I have been elected chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production which was authorized in that act for the purpose of reviewing the use of the authority granted by the act. I have been in close touch with the administrators and department heads who are charged with administering the law.

Just before leaving Washington I held a conference with officials of the National Production Authority. I was anxious to learn more about their present thinking with particular reference to any changes in their present system of priorities and allocations. The NPA is currently operating on the basis of requirements of military need as advised by the Munitions Board.

You businessmen who deal with any goods which require any strategic materials, for instance, are aware that NPA has thus far controlled priorities and allocations on a system of across-the-board percentage cuts. Just for example, one of the more recent orders last week was a restriction on the use of aluminum for civilian production.

Beginning January 1, a manufacturer who uses aluminum will be allowed 80 percent of the amount he used during the base period of January 1 to July 1, 1950, for any products destined for civilian use. Now, beyond that restriction the use of his allotment of aluminum is left entirely to the

manufacturer. If he wishes, he may use his entire supply for the manufacture of one item, or he may proportion his supply and continue to manufacture his entire line in a lesser quantity if he so desires.

Perhaps an even more dramatic example is the case of copper. We found very recently that copper was being used at a rate of 115 percent of the available supply. The additional 15 percent may be a little startling at first, but I think you can readily see that this excess could come only from stockpiles and inventories. The last order with reference to copper issued by NPA directed a 20-percent cut and made certain types of copper available only for military use. Now, there are two examples of the manner in which NPA is presently attempting to supply the needs of the military with the least possible disruption of our civilian requirements. Up until now this system has been adequate for the purposes of limited mobilization. We must realize, however, that in the event of an all-out mobilization drastic changes must necessarily be made.

In my opinion there can only be one solution. We will be forced to enter into a program of end-product limitation. Secretary Sawyer has told me that the people at NPA are already working on such plans so that they will be available at any moment should our military requirements dictate such action. Of course, after that the next logical step will be a controlled materials plan. In that event NPA will have the sole responsibility of doling out material for specifically approved products.

It was originally thought that it would not be possible to plan and administer a controlled material plan earlier than July 1, 1951. However, I have just been advised that because of this advance planning by the NPA staff, if it should become necessary the program could be put into effect by the end of the first quarter of next year.

I asked these officials if they had any primary goals or objectives. I was curious to know how they felt about administering the authority of the Defense Production Act. I was told that they have set their sights on three goals, and I was pleased, as I believe you will be, with the sincerity of purpose which they have set for themselves. They list their objectives in this order:

1. Assurance that the Military Establishment has available in the necessary amounts an adequate stockpile of materials in short supply. This would include such metals as nickel, steel, copper, zinc, chrome and cadmium and such nonmetals as benzine, rubber and soda ash.

2. Make sure there is an equitable distribution of the available supply of critical materials.

I was assured that this goal is intended primarily for the protection of the small-business man who all too often in the past has found himself either unable to obtain a just proportion of critical materials, or even unable to obtain any of the supplies he needs to continue in business.

3. Encourage increased productivity. This is nothing more than an effort to obtain greater production from existing labor and machinery. It would be the means by which we would greatly increase our existing production capacity.

I think these three goals could well be summed up by comparing the NPA to a switchman on the railroad. The switchman has orders to clear the track and give the right-of-way to a military train. His orders also direct him to feed the civilian train from the sidetrack into the main road as quickly as the military express has cleared his block.

Of course, it is impossible to tell you what demands will be made upon you as an individual or upon your business or even upon your family tomorrow or next week or next month. We can only take advantage of any time that we may have to lay our plans wisely and pray that they will never be needed.

In the maelstrom of confusion that now envelops the world, with peoples everywhere uncertain, apprehensive, and terror-stricken, the remedy, the way out, is no direct or well-marked path.

Your Government is dealing with powerful forces that it cannot accurately evaluate. We do not know their ultimate objective. We do not know to what extremes they will go to accomplish their designs.

Any sane person who has ever seen war close up wants no more of it, will use every effort and resource to avoid it. But the final decision is not in our hands.

For my part, I will use every honorable device to avoid a widespread war. There are hundreds of men and women in and out of the State and Federal Government who are striving as I am to keep the armed conflict from spreading. If these efforts meet with success, then the peoples of the earth can, without fear, face their immediate future with hope and confidence and employ their labor and talents for the betterment of all mankind.

I have already expressed my hope that South Carolina's atomic energy plant may soon be devoted to the production of this vast new force for the peacetime use of our scientists, our doctors, and our engineers. Rapid strides are being made in the development of this enormous new energy.

Last July it was reported to the Congress that American atomic energy production operations are proceeding at the highest rate in history, and production of the fissionable materials U-235 and plutonium—which in the long run determine the number of weapons that can be made—set a new record for the first 6 months of the year. This means that a general speed-up all along the processing line has been achieved and the Hanford and Oak Ridge plants are operating more efficiently.

We in South Carolina have now been given the opportunity of helping to swell this American atomic might even more.

I hope you share with me the confidence I have that in this vital field of atomic energy our country is growing steadily in readiness for whatever may come. I pray that the day may come when we may convert our atomic swords into atomic plowshares. But meanwhile I thank God we have the atomic swords with which to defend ourselves from the forces of atheism and darkness.

Hon. Bertrand H. Snell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I know that you, sir, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and all his old friends left in the House, will be glad to see this editorial which follows from the Odgensburg Journal in northern New York about our old friend, Bert Snell. I see Bert every few months in Potsdam. At 80 he is still hale and hearty, takes an active interest in the affairs of the country and reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD religiously. He has more or less retired from active business but keeps his office in Potsdam and whenever I can find him there I, naturally, seek his advice.

Many of you older Members have often inquired how he is. It has been difficult for me to tell him of all your messages so I now ask you all to salute a great statesman and a great American on his eightieth birthday.

Bert Snell became a Member of the House November 2, 1915. He was appointed a member of the House Rules Committee December 1917, and was made Chairman of Rules in January 1924. He succeeded John Garner as minority floor leader January 1932, and served as same during the Seventy-second, Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses.

The editorial follows:

THE NORTH COUNTRY HONORS BERT SNELL ON HIS EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY TODAY

Northern New York honors its most distinguished citizen today when Bertrand H. Snell is 80. In his lifespan Bert Snell has won distinction in public life and in many fields of business. His life is a monument to the fundamental, but now sadly neglected, virtues of ambition, hard work, imagination, and thrift. Most men would be content to have become a national figure in politics, and one of the three or four who ran the country, or to have built a successful lumbering, power, cheese, oil business, or engineering college. Bert Snell did all of these things.

He was born in Colton 80 years ago today. He graduated from Colton High School, and Potsdam State Normal School in 1889, from Amherst College in 1894. In Amherst at the same time were several young men who were destined to go far in later life. Among them were Calvin Coolidge, Dwight Morrow, Harlan Fisk Stone. Coolidge became President of the United States, Dwight Morrow a Morgan partner in his thirties and Ambassador to Mexico, Harlan Stone Chief Justice of the United States.

In the same year he graduated from Amherst Mr. Snell got a job as a bookkeeper with the Racquette River Paper Co. Eight years later he resigned as secretary and general manager of the company, and at that time sold his interests to George W. Sisson. He then entered the lumber business and organized the Canton Lumber Co., with which he was actively identified until 1908. In 1910 he purchased a power site at Higley Falls, on the Racquette River, where he spent 3 years in developing a hydro plant, one of the first water-power developments in the Northeast, and the only one owned and operated by one man. It was later leased to the Aluminum Co. of America to supply power to their Massena plant, and subsequently purchased by them. In 1907 Mr. Snell became associated with the Phenix Cheese Co. in New York City and was vice president until 1917, when he was elected president and general manager. He retired from the firm in 1925, when he sold his interest to the Kraft Cheese Co., and the company became Kraft-Phenix. He had built Phenix Cheese from a small company into one of the biggest in the world.

In 1915 Mr. Snell was elected to Congress after his historic battle against the late Maj. William Daniels, of Ogdensburg and Halbert Stevens, of Malone. He rose to be chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, minority leader, and would have succeeded as Speaker of the House had he not retired in 1938. He was permanent chairman of the Republican national conventions which nominated Herbert Hoover and Alf Landon for President. For many years he was one of the three of four most powerful men in Washington and long dominated the Republican Party in New York

State. He could have had the nomination for Vice President of the United States almost any time and could have been nominated for President if he had really wanted it.

He retired from Congress to devote his attention to his oil-producing business in Kansas which he built from nothing into a large and prosperous company and which he sold 3 years ago to Phillips Petroleum Co. Mr. Snell was always deeply interested in his home town of Potsdam and in Clarkson College and State Teachers College there. He was president of the board of trustees of Clarkson for many years, and now heads its finance committee. He gave Snell Field and $150,000 for Clarkson to buy the State teachers' college building. Always a builder, he was largely responsible for the growth and development of Clarkson from small beginnings into the important place it holds today among the engineering and business schools of the country.

Bert Snell has always been generous of his time and money to help his home town, and he had much to do with making Potsdam the beautiful small city it is today. He has always been a good citizen and a constructive builder for his community. Potsdam and all of northern New York can well honor today its son who has achieved so greatly and who has brought so much honor to this north country.

"United States Air Force Combat Cargo Wing Dropped Out of Air To Help Marines Escape From Changjin Reservoir Trap in Korea"—News Dispatch From First Marine Division at Koto, Korea

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the war that is now taking place in Korea has proven beyond all doubt that each generation of American youth gives birth to its own heroes, men who give dramatic exhibitions of the bravery of American troops in battle action.

The Friday papers of December 7 carried one of the most thrilling stories of the rescue of United States marines from their encirclement by the Chinese Reds that has come to my notice in the entire Korean campaign.

Mr. Speaker, it was a news dispatch by Marguerite Higgins to the New York Herald Tribune. Miss Higgins, as you will recall, is the young lady newspaper correspondent who was dismissed from Korea some several months ago under the assumption that no woman could stand the vicissitudes of life under fire in the front lines. Dissenting from that opinion, General MacArthur, upon hearing of the order, countermanded it immediately.

This news article, headed With First Marine Division at Koto, discloses that Miss Higgins did not alone remain in Korea, but as of last Friday, was in the very midst of the fighting, working in and around the First Marine Division, which was then bearing the brunt of the bloody attack being leveled against our forces.

In describing her flight in the second seat of a fighter-bomber, several hours after the Marine spearheads had emerged from the mountains, Miss Higgins told of flying over the reservoir area where one could still see marines sitting on the strip at Hagaru:

The biggest battle ahead is to wrest the dam from the enemy and to hold the ground around it so that the engineers can lay the bridge brought in by the Air Force. Without the bridge—

Miss Higgins continued—

the marines would have to leave behind their vehicles and most of their heavy equipment.

The 8 spans of the 16-ton bridge—

Miss Higgins went on to say—

were dropped to the embattled marines by eight Flying Boxcars of the Three Hundred and Fourteenth United States Air Force Combat Cargo Wing. This—

She said—

was the world's first air drop of a bridge and was only one of the many fantastic feats marking the desperate effort to bring to safety the bruised remnants of the badly mauled leathernecks.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard no story coming out of Korea that could possibly thrill the imagination of the membership of this House quite as much as this story telling of how our American fliers had dropped an 8-span, 600-foot aluminum bridge capable of carrying the heaviest tanks and guns used by our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I would not be fair to myself, in paying homage to our great Air Force and our Marine Corps, if I did not tell of the fact that this tactical bridge equippage is of a type and construction designed by the United States Corps of Engineers, which corps, as the dispatch sketchily recited, laid it across the reservoir.

This action, to my mind, typifies the tremendous coordination and the complete unification of the armed services that has been brought about in these last 18 months, not alone in the administration but in the combat forces of our armed services.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no man can say that it does not prove to the *n*th degree the splendid tactical support that has been afforded by the United States Air Force to all of our ground troops in Korea, our Army as well as to our Marine Corps.

Well, Mr. Speaker, at any rate, our marines got the bridge that was dropped to them by the Air Force fliers on Friday last and they got out of the trap, crossed the reservoir, and I am happy to note that today's papers tell of their arrival now at the Hamhung beachhead after their epic escape from Chinese encirclement.

Mr. Speaker, I wish every man and woman in these United States could read the thrilling news dispatch written by Marguerite Higgins of the New York Herald Tribune, and particularly do I hope that my every colleague in this House will read it. It is because of that fact that I now ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a news dispatch from Korea, reading as follows:

[From the Washington Post of December 8, 1950]

SIXTEEN-TON BRIDGE IS AIR-DROPPED TO HELP MARINES CUT WAY OUT

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WITH FIRST MARINE DIVISION AT KOTO, December 7.—Undaunted leathernecks today completed their escape from the Changjin Reservoir trap and broke a bloody trail through snowy mountain passes to Koto, nearly halfway to the coastal plain.

"It was bad," said Maj. Gen. Oliver P. Smith, division commander, "but not so bad as we expected."

Under an umbrella of fighter planes swooping and diving to protect the lead and tail of the 10-mile-long caravan, the marines, with tactics similar to those of the pioneers, fought their way into this bleak plateau city, streaming in from 5 this morning until 10 tonight. Here they joined other Marine and Army units with whom they will attempt the final plunge to the sea.

To help in this final escape through a wall of Chinese, the Air Force today dropped an entire treadway bridge. It will replace a dynamited span across a dam about 3 miles down the road—a dam still in enemy territory.

The world's first air drop of a bridge was only one of many fantastic feats marking the desperate efforts to bring to safety the bruised remnants of the badly mauled leathernecks.

Outstanding in the day's activities was the evacuation by fighter-bombers of the wounded from the tiny sod strip at Koto.

The strip is being lengthened by night by Marine bulldozers in hopes that twin-engine C-47's will be able to land Friday. But today Marine torpedo bombers, L-G's, and helicopters removed more than 250 wounded and frostbite cases.

Just as the Marine commanders had promised, the leathernecks came out of their fight as an organized unit bringing with them all important equipment, their wounded, their dead, and even a band of 200 Chinese prisoners of war. The enemy tried to block their path with a series of ambushes and roadblocks involving attacks with white phosphorus mortars, machineguns, and rifle fire.

Even as spearheads of the caravan reached Koto early this morning, the Fifth Marine Regiment still at the Hagaru plateau on the top of the Changjin Reservoir was fighting a stiff action to repulse Chinese attempts to annihilate the rearguard. The Chinese attacked at night and stabbed through outer defenses but were thrown back at dawn when air cover came.

Flying over the reservoir area at 9 a. m., one could still see marines on the strip at Hagaru setting afire surplus ammunition and exploding three wrecked airplanes. Flames shot into the sky, casting a bright haze over the unrelieved gray-black plateau that curves up into rugged snowy peaks.

Only 2 hours later with the marines a mile out of Hagaru, columns of Chinese had already moved in and could be seen from the air boldly rummaging through the ruins.

As a propaganda move the marines left behind in Hagaru nearly a hundred wounded Chinese prisoners of war whom they had provided with best medical equipment and care available.

"We are hoping," said Col. Ray Murray, of the Fifth Marines, "that this may induce the Chinese to treat our prisoners with increased kindness."

Hundreds of North Korean citizens of Hagaru packed up and came along with the marines, according to Col. Bankson L. Holcomb, Marine division intelligence chief. "They came up to us and actually asked us to burn their homes so the Chinese could not get them."

This correspondent flew to Koto in the second seat of a fighter-bomber several hours after marine spearheads had emerged from the mountains. Despite casualties which compared to the past week were moderate, morale had risen since I talked with marines at Hagaru.

"If we got this far," said First Lt. F. C. Trumble, of Los Angeles, "I know we can make the rest. At least, a hell of a lot of us can."

With an estimated Chinese division still facing them, the marines will consider themselves out of a trap when they reach Sangtongni, about 17 miles away, where the mountains end and the coastal plain begins.

Since leaving the reservoir the marines have covered yesterday and today approximately 10 miles of mountain roads.

The biggest battle ahead is to wrest the dam from the enemy and hold the high ground around it so the engineers can lay the bridge. Without the bridge, the marines would have to leave behind most of their vehicles and heavy equipment.

The eight spans of the 16-ton bridge were dropped to the embattled marines by eight flying boxcars of the Three Hundred and Fourteenth Combat Cargo Wing. They were directed to the drop zone by ground controllers. The marines reported that the spans were received in "good shape."

At Koto, where General Smith was on hand to direct proceedings, special warming tents were set up to thaw out the marines, most of whom had walked or ridden at least 12 hours in snow and ice. A bright noonday sun kept temperatures well above zero and as a result frostbite cases were fewer.

A fighter-bomber standing on its nose at the end of the runway was testimony to the hazards of the operation which the Marine fliers undertook today. Their flights from Koto to the coast took about 30 minutes per round trip.

When the last fighter-bomber, which holds nine wounded, took off at dusk, many loaded ambulances were still waiting on the fields. Capt. Alfred F. Caleb, Jr., of New Orleans, who himself flew 10 round trips, observed: "It was terrible to see the look of disappointment on the faces of the wounded when we said we could not make another trip today."

TWO HUNDRED CHINESE SURRENDER TO ENCIRCLED MARINES

WITH FIRST MARINE DIVISION, December 7.—The marines encircled on Hagaru Plateau were amazed 2 days ago when 200 Chinese walked in and surrendered for no apparent reason.

They explained that they were "tired of the war," their feet hurt, and they had not eaten for 3 to 5 days.

One came in barefooted with feet frozen solid like refrigerated meat. "Why did you let yourself get in that condition?" he was asked.

"Because," he answered, "I knew that after my feet froze I would no longer feel pain."

Address by Dr. Ruth M. Steese at Dedication of Soldiers' Monument, Mifflinburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Dr. Ruth Miller Steese, past State president of the American Legion Auxiliary of Pennsylvania, and national chairman of the Committee on Historic Shrines of the Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States. The address was delivered at the dedication of the Soldiers' Monument at Mifflinburg, Pa., on November 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"In remembrance of those who gave their lives and as a tribute in honor of those from Mifflinburg and vicinity who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during all wars."

To dedicate this memorial of stone, bearing those highly significant and thoroughly understandable words, permanently engraved in bronze, is an esteemed privilege on this very thought-provoking occasion.

The occasion and the time are alike deeply significant. Almost 175 years ago in this, our very own State, a small band of American patriots, dauntless, fearless, courageous young men, met in Philadelphia, wrote, signed, and adopted the Declaration of Independence, which became in reality the birth certificate of the United States of America. These men were businessmen and farmers, doctors and lawyers, all men who thought strongly and loved deeply those ideals which in time were to be captioned our peculiarly American ideals.

This particular group of men demonstrated a wisdom and a courage without equal in all history. They were neither evasive nor indecisive. There is absolutely no form of appeasement to be found in the Declaration. When these men, our founding fathers, signed this famous document they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and most important of all, their sacred honor, to the cause of American independence and freedom.

In the War for Independence which followed and which came as a direct result of the signing of the Declaration our forefathers fought for their dream for America. They were not interested in making these newly born United States of America into a mighty and great world power; they were never interested in her material wealth and success. But they were interested in her to the point that they were willing to fight for her freedom, for the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. They were willing to fight for the preservation of that so well portrayed in the old Pilgrim theme:

"Ay, call it holy ground
The soil where first they trod.
They have left unstained what here they found—
Freedom to worship God."

The War for Independence was not a world war as we visualize them today, but it was a war with very definite international results for that war caused peoples everywhere to think in terms of liberty, equality, and democracy.

The signers of the Declaration of Independence, those immortal names which constitute America's first roll of honor, are long since dead, but their immortal words echo today just as strongly as they did 175 years ago. Let us listen to them once again:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The years passed, and less than 100 years ago, our Nation was torn asunder by the War Between the States. Brother was alined against brother, and the fate of this youthful Nation was at stake. Once again men rallied, this time to save the Union and the principles upon which it was founded. From that war with its horrors and its bitter lessons, came another challenge, another challenge equally applicable to us today, here in Mifflinburg—right now. For from that war with its sacrifices and casualties, came the necessity for the national cemetery at Gettysburg—and the words of the man of destiny, Abraham Lincoln, will echo down through the halls of time—

"We cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract.

"It is for us, the living—to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

Yes; the birth and preservation, and the rebirth of freedom, have ever been a challenge to those who went forth to fight and to give their lives.

Again, time passed on, and we entered World War I, whose conclusion we mark in a well-termed Armistice, today.

We entered that war, following the challenging message of our then war President, the late Woodrow Wilson, who in the House of Representatives, in April 1917, uttered those never-to-be-forgotten words:

"It is a fearful thing to lead this great, peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.

"To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace that she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other."

We ended that war with the armistice of 32 years ago, that war was to be the war to end all wars and make the world safe for democracy.

And again time marched on, and less than a quarter of a century later—within the memory of every one of us, we were involved once again. Why—because once again, we realized that every principle upon which we had been founded and for which we had fought in the past, had been jeopardized. We knew that liberty itself had been crucified, law had been overthrown, and the little peoples of the world had been enslaved, robbed, and murdered. Once again we fought for the inalienable rights of mankind.

And time marched on. What of today. What of the events of the last few months. Another world crisis, more deadly, more inhuman, and more uncivilized than ever before, is upon us under the name of the Korean crisis. No one can foresee the outcome. But we do know—and oh, how we know, that our very own boys, the sons and daughters of this community are serving, some within the territorial limits of the United States and some on foreign soil.

This brief outline of some of the ranking events of our national history serves to remind us of those to whom we refer when we silently and reverently read these significant words, "in remembrance of those who gave their lives and as a tribute in honor of those from Mifflinburg and vicinity who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during all wars."

"Those who gave—and those who served"—who is there except the Great Commander in Chief who can call the roll of all those who fought at Valley Forge and Bunker Hill? Where is the complete roster of those who struggled for days at Gettysburg? The honor rolls of Chateau-Thierry and the Argonne are alike incomplete, while the hills and the valleys, and the depths of the seas treasure the priceless but unmarked remains of the men and women of World War II. The story of Korea is the bloodiest page of our national history, and who is there among us who would not say that those, our men in Korea, those our very own men from Mifflinburg and vicinity in Japan and Korea, this very day, are there for one purpose—to help preserve the one Nation which is the hope and dream of the entire world—to help preserve for posterity, the inalienable rights of mankind.

On this day, November 11, 1950, when we here publicly dedicate this beautiful memorial—when we briefly review the past—when we thoughtfully and purposefully live the present—and as we look with wonder and hope into the future, we should do so with a personal feeling of the deepest responsibility. Today, when we quietly call the roll of the hundreds and the thousands of men and women who have answered the call and given their lives, when we consider the hundreds and the thousands who will have to answer a similar call in the future, let us remember this one fact—there is no call that the soldier hears, absolutely no call that he hears—that does not call as persistently and consistently to the civilian behind the lines, to the civilian back home who supplies the soldier's needs. Soldier and civilian have been cast together in the role of the defenders of this, our native land.

Let us on this Armistice Day, consider and ever remember that we, you and I, are the blood brothers of our American soldiers in Korea and on the various war fronts today.

It is always all too true, that it is the soldier who must always meet the challenge, it is he who must carry on, who must march on, and must fight on, if need be till he fall, and there is nothing that can match the resolute courage of our American soldier as he faces death in defense of this our country and her ideals, as he faces death for you and for me.

And yet, our American soldier was not born to this destiny; he was not ordained to this destiny. That soldier, fighting for you and for me, over there or here at home, is just the boy who lives next door, just the boy from our own home, just a typical, young American lad molded from typically American clay. He is not a superman. But if he is great—and thank God, so many thousands of them are, it is because he has been face to face with a great crisis—he has been face to face with a mighty challenge, and he, our American soldier, has met the test.

And so as we meet here today, we the representatives of Mifflinburg and vicinity, people representative of every way of life, let us quietly remember and consider that merely to honor those who have and will serve is not enough. What we need today, in this year of 1950, is the soldier's patriotism translated and transplanted into civilian patriotism and action. Someone has said that the noblest memorial to a hero is not reverence to his dead bones, but a reproduction of this heroism in a new generation.

Today, we see before us, this beautiful boulder taken from our very own mountains, with its bronze hewn from deep down in our own American earth, all planted into our own American soil, with the evergreens pointing to the heavens and telling the age-old story of life and of death, of death and of resurrection.

As we in this solemn service, dedicate this memorial, typical of the material wealth of America to the youth of America which has ever fought for the preservation of the idealism which is America, we should remember and ever consider that it must be for us, a day of consecration, of personal rededication to the greatest task remaining before us—a 1950 version of Abraham Lincoln's rebirth of freedom.

Today, as in the days of 1776, we can say with Thomas Paine:

"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country, but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheaply, we esteem too lightly; it is dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange, indeed, if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated."

Are we the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot, or do we face today and the future with the determination of the men and the women who have answered the call to service—who have gone forth to fight for us—and never to return.

I ask you to think on these things, as we now, seriously and solemnly, reverently and prayerfully, with an ever-present consciousness of the Divine presence, dedicate this beautiful boulder, with all its historic heritage, with all its prophetic significance, grounded in the very soil of America, lifting its head to the skies in the heaven, everlastingly, "in remembrance of those who gave their lives, and as a tribute in honor of those from Mifflinburg and vicinity who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during all wars."

Peiping's Expansionism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Peiping's Expansionism," which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, December 8.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEIPING'S EXPANSIONISM

In both words and deeds the Chinese Communist regime is showing a belligerent self-confidence. Its attitude toward the United Nations has been arrogant from the beginning. Its reaction to the British overtures in the matter of recognition has been little short of contemptuous. Its treatment of the United States has been frequently provocative. Coupled with those attitudes there is now the evidence of a program of very considerable expansionism. Communist China is pushing out—into Korea, into Tibet, against Indochina. Pressure positions are being set up whose impact will be felt in India, Burma, and Thailand.

Some of this expansionism, with its strong overtones of xenophobia, might possibly be ascribed to the more or less expectable explosive character of a new, or newly awakened, nationalism. But it is China's tragedy that the developed strength of this revolutionary China is being used at the direction of a foreign power. China is not expanding on behalf of a new China but on behalf of the Soviet Union. That course is as unhealthy for China as it is dangerous to the rest of the world.

It has several times been suggested that Communist China's expansionist ventures to the south may have been designed by the Russians as compensation for the northern and western areas of China that have been put under Russian control by the regime of Mao Tse-tung. This explanation is not adequate for the Korean venture. In the latter case the Chinese Communists are obviously taking a dangerous course of action whose benefits, if it is successful, will accrue to the Soviet Union and not to China.

What should not be lost sight of is the close ideological identification of Peiping with Moscow. The Russian leadership, the North Korean guerrillas and the Chinese Communist divisions are all part of the same force, and it is that force, not China, that is in explosive expansion. It will probably be proved to the Chinese, eventually, that on balance China has lost vastly more to Russia than she has gained from Russian help to the Communist regime. The Chinese Communist leaders will eventually go down in history as the men who sold out their country to the foreigners, in this case the Russians, rather than as those who rescued China from foreign imperialism.

Must Think of Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on December 6, 1950, there appeared in the Topeka Daily Capital an editorial entitled "Must Think of Ourselves."

Here is an editorial which analyzes bluntly and realistically the situation which we find ourselves in, not only in Korea, but in relationship with our allies.

The Topeka Daily Capital is owned by a distinguished former Senator from the State of Kansas, Arthur Capper; and it is most helpful to have the views of this great daily paper in the Midwest on this vital question which is troubling the minds and hearts of millions of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUST THINK OF OURSELVES

Twice the United States has sent troops to Europe to save England from an enemy. It was argued on those occasions that this was actually in the interests of the United

States, since if Britain had been conquered the United States would be next to fall.

This may have been correct. No one knows. But what everyone does know is that saving the world for democracy was a goal never achieved.

The fortunes of the English-speaking nations are bound together, and unquestionably we have much to gain by keeping the British afloat. To an even larger extent, however, the British have everything to gain by supporting the United States.

Now we find ourselves at a point of conflict with the British on the vital issue of how to oppose communism effectively. With the British giving at least lip service within the UN, we sent troops into Korea to put down Red aggression. The British had pledged themselves within the UN, as had the United States, to protect free peoples everywhere in the world. In theory, so had more than 50 other nations.

However, each nation has its special problems and objectives. The small, virtually defenseless countries have had to aline themselves on one side or the other. Some have looked to the United States and Britain to supply the concentrated strength to fight off communism. Others have decided that the Reds in time will dominate the world, and they have allowed themselves to be included within the Communist orbit.

The intervention of the UN in Korea was hailed as a showing of UN determination to resist aggression, and it may have encouraged some wavering countries to believe that they would be protected if and when the Communists invaded their territories.

Back in those brave days when there was so much talk of the blue UN flag rising to take its stand against the Red banners, a great deal was said of international unity. But, it has developed since, it was to be a one-sided unity.

Many of our allies seemed perfectly willing to continue the battle against Communists in Korea as long as American troops were being used, with little help from other nations.

Now, the Chinese Communists threaten to annihilate or at least to push the UN forces completely out of Korea. And instead of rallying to the cause to which they dedicated themselves, the British and French and some of our other allies instead wish to settle by appeasement.

It is not clear whether the British wish to give the Chinese Communists everything they want, but it is apparent that they have something like a "peace at any price" program in view.

If the United States withdraws its forces to the thirty-eighth parallel as some of the appeasers have suggested, there is no assurance that the advancing Chinese Communists will stop at that line.

If the United States agrees to the admission of Red China into the United Nations, as the British and French ask, American prestige would be gone in the Pacific. Furthermore, Russia would have one more powerful ally in the United Nations set-up.

And if the United States allows the United Nations to dictate when and where the atom bomb shall be used—if it is to be used—this will be the final surrender on the part of this country to interests elsewhere.

Britain and France of course want the United States to fight for those countries in Europe, and to abandon the Pacific to the Communists. This would expose our own country to future attacks from the back door, by way of Japan, Formosa and the Philippines.

Perhaps it would be best to pull out of Korea. It would have been better if we had never gone into that country in the first place, since we received only light support from our allies.

But if the United States does withdraw, it should not be for the purpose of sending our troops and military supplies to Europe to assist allies who show a shocking unwillingness to help us.

If defense is a mutual enterprise, it should work both ways. If this system breaks down, the United States—for its own protection—would seem to have no other course but to defend itself and allow the Europeans to look after their own interests.

This may be isolationism, but the British and French and some of our other friends in Europe are attempting to isolate themselves from the problems of the Pacific—no matter what this may cost the United States.

It is hoped that our Government will not permit Mr. Attlee to dictate what shall be done and that, instead, our spokesmen including the President, will make it clear to him that the time has come to consider American interests.

While the American people hope to continue to cooperate with our allies for mutual benefit, the practice of placing American sacrifices first and American salvation second must be stopped.

If we can't work together, then we must work separately.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "A Parent Speaks Out," published in the Idaho Daily Statesman, of Boise, Idaho.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PARENT SPEAKS OUT

We are taking the liberty in today's editorial column of printing a letter to the editor which we have just received. Ordinarily, we would have held it for publication in the regular Sunday section for that purpose, but there is in this letter, we believe, a great deal for statesman readers to consider without delay.

It was written by a Boise parent with a son in Korea. And that being the case, it is, we believe, remarkable for the tone of restraint in which it is written, and for the sensible analysis of a critical situation which it presents:

"It has been my unfortunate lot during the past several months to be in a state of mind which has caused me to observe keenly the unconcern, indifference, and apathy of the public in general relative to the conflict in Korea.

"It is saddening to realize this condition has prevailed in the National Capitol and in the minds of our leaders.

"Business and politics, both national and world-wide, have had priority.

"For five long months our boys in Korea have been fighting without rest, and over 31,000 casualties have been incurred.

"No thought has been given relative to procurement and supply to their commander of additional troops for reasonable and essential relief, nor for possible reserve.

"These boys have withstood tropical heat and now bitter cold, they are battle weary, their physical and mental condition is at a low ebb, they are trapped, harassed, and hopelessly outnumbered due to restrictions and handicaps imposed on their commander.

"There is no aid available for them from their own country, and they are through dire necessity to be left to their own pitifully inadequate resources to fight to an inevitable defeat, huge casualties and possible capture by the enemy with subsequent transportation to confinement and a living death.

"At long last the men in Washington have taken cognizance of the situation and are in process of talking, conferring, appropriating money and planning an all-out war, consummation of the same to be some time in the future.

"At-once action, however, must be delayed in a number of plans or projects pending approval of our moral supporters, fellow members of the United Nations, and after heedful consideration of the disapproval of Communist delegates.

"In the meanwhile time is fleeting, every minute, every hour means life and death to those in Korea.

"History records the fact that Nero fiddled while Rome burned; in a like manner inaction is the tempo in Washington, while our men are dying in Korea.

"I believe today that our men in Korea are to be sacrificed to attain the same results occasioned at Pearl Harbor, namely—a disaster so vast the Nation will be aroused and the too-little-too-late program of armed might will be approved unconditionally.

"The only known at-once aid available to our boys in Korea is the offer of Chinese Nationalist troops, which offer was spurned by the men in Washington.

"Troops of other allied nations are fighting in Korea, Nationalist China is a member of the United Nations, why their aid was refused is incomprehensible.

"If for fear of incurring the wrath of Red China and declaration of war therewith, that reason is now invalid.

"A request is made herewith to those reading this letter that they send at once telegrams to Washington, urging and demanding acceptance of the offer of Chinese Nationalists troops to be used at once in aid of our forces in Korea.

"This may not win the war, but would at least restore a part of the confidence of our boys in their home folks' efforts in their behalf, and revive in small measure their lost hope."

This letter, as printed, will go directly from The Statesman offices to the Idaho congressional delegation.

This Is It—Let's Face It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit herewith a most timely editorial from the Chronicle Star of my home town, Pascagoula, Miss.

This editorial reflects sound thinking and I recommend it for the consideration of the President and his advisers. The Congress gave the President powers for across-the-board controls at the last session. I hope that he will now use them without further delay. Otherwise, ruinous inflation faces us and will result

in further playing into the hands of the Kremlin if we do not take immediate and drastic action to stop it. The editorial follows:

THIS IS IT—LET'S FACE IT

In pussy-footing around the issue of establishing domestic controls, the President and Congress are doing a disservice to the United States in what is probably the hour of its greatest peril.

At this point there is little use in rehashing and blaming. Mistakes have been made, both by the incumbent Congress and President, his advisers, and those that preceded them. Ever since the end of World War II we have been fighting a "cold" war. Last July it became a "hot" war when the Korean action opened. Call it a "police" action if you wish, but the casualty lists out of Korea stamp it "war" in our estimation.

We are fighting Russia and we know it. Perhaps we made a mistake when we went into Korea. Perhaps we didn't. History will answer that for future generations. The Russians would like nothing better than to involve us and the United Nations in a long, exhaustive struggle with the Chinese hordes that would bleed us white and make us ripe for plucking at a time of Russia's choosing. That, obviously, is the Communist plan.

In the United States we have largely been following a business-as-usual policy while the struggle on which our survival hinges mounted to the point where we are teetering in the edge of a third world conflict for which we are not ready.

We have the atom bomb, but not much else. We know also that Russia has it, but not in what quantities. But the fact that Russia does have it largely offsets our only equalizer.

In the present struggle lies not only the answer to whether or not there will be freedom in the world, but also whether or not we will survive as a nation.

Credit controls on the purchase of new automobiles, or the extension of rent controls for a 90-day period are not the answer.

We are in a struggle that will be long, bitter, costly, and bloody.

We think the American people largely realize that. We sometimes think Congress and the President don't. Bombast and hot air based on political prejudices do not help but actually damage the situation in denying and undermining unification of purpose.

Facing a bitter war for survival, we are actually having difficulty in passing an excess-profits tax to drain off war-swollen profits.

The only answer to the inflation we are witnessing, which is now almost at the runaway stage, is control of the domestic economy, as unpleasant as it may be—controls that will go all the way down the line. The steel industry grants a pay raise and then passes on to the public a price rise in steel that will return them threefold the amount paid in increased wages. On the strength of the steel raise automobile prices go up, refrigerators, washing machines, and every other item containing steel. Then, rightfully, comes the demand for more wages on the strength of the increased cost of living. It's a vicious spiral that has no end unless the brakes are applied through controls.

We are lagging on the home front, while the fires of war are mounting around us. We don't believe there is any justice in youngsters dying on a frozen Korean battlefield while we continue our business-as-usual policy and ride the wings of rampant inflation.

There will be more young men dying during the coming years. Their sacrifice can at least partly be matched on the home front. It is high time that the people, Congress, and the President take some steps in that direction.

Choose the Fortress America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 12 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, an editorial from the Topeka State Journal under date of December 4, entitled "Choose the Fortress America," appears to me to be most timely at this hour. I believe it will express the feelings of us all as we ponder the grave situation with which we are faced in the Korean war. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHOOSE THE FORTRESS AMERICA

Those persons in this country who are spoiling for world war III on a get-it-over-with basis seem to be saying there are only two possible choices. Either we choose war or appeasement, they say.

Don't be misled into that way of thinking. No sane person could want total war. No honorable person should consent to appeasement, which approximates moral surrender to the evil forces which threaten our lives.

There is a third choice which is neither war nor appeasement. We can choose to keep America strong, standing stoutly and immovably on our principles, making no deals and preserving here an island of liberty, a tower of strength, upon which the future may lean with hope in our survival. We should withdraw our forces from Asia and after that from Europe.

We have got to face the fact that it isn't what we might wish to do that counts most right now, but what we are able to do and keep on doing far into the long future. We have got to face the fact as a nation that we have neither the resources nor the manpower either to prop up or to fight the world. We should not play the sucker and we must not play God. We are not a master race and we are not invincible. War would not stop communism in other continents, any more than appeasement would stop it. Our choice then if we wish to keep liberty alive is to do just that—keep it alive. We should keep America too strong economically, militarily, and morally to be attacked and we should be contemptuous of all expedient bargains with communism or any ism. America must not commit suicide to please her enemies.

The get-it-over-with school of patriotism should consider the probable cost of any world war III in terms of the known cost of World War II, for the next should be more ruinous to both sides than the last.

Tallies made by international agencies, the American Government and university researchers show that in the last war 49,000,000 persons were under arms for the Allies, against 21,000,000 for the Axis. The total loss of life on both sides, civilian and military, was 22,000,000, with 34,000,000 wounded and unknown millions more crippled mentally or emotionally.

The cost of World War II in human terms was the greatest waste, but consider too the material cost. Over $1,116,000,000,000 were spent on this orgy of hate, resulting in the destruction of one tyranny only to pave the way for another which is worse. Property damaged or destroyed in World War II was valued at $231,000,000,000. The cost to the American people alone was $330,000,000,000. And it is now estimated that the cold war has cost the American people another $100,000,000,000 to date, with dozens of countries calling on us for more, more, more.

The get-it-over-with school is advocating that we kill our Nation. We would have to establish a tyranny in this country to wage any world war III to a military conclusion. We would have embraced in some form the same evil we set out to defeat. The process was begun in World War II and world war III would complete it.

Do you want that? Or as the lesser of the evils from which we are given as a nation to choose, will you choose a fortress America? The voice of the people must be raised in demand, and quickly, for they are being led straightway to doom.

Future Pacific Peace Tied to Fishing Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, during the negotiations of the terms of the Japanese peace treaty, the subject of the American Pacific fisheries should be an important matter for consideration. I am inserting herewith in the RECORD two excellent editorials dealing with this subject which recently appeared in the Seattle Times. They are as follows:

FUTURE PACIFIC PEACE TIED TO FISHING RIGHTS

Another strong plea for adequate protection of American Pacific fisheries resources has been made by Edward W. Allen, of Seattle, chairman of the International Fisheries Commission and an authority on international law. Speaking at the dedication of the University of Washington's new million-dollar fisheries center, Allen declared that in drafting a peace treaty with Japan the leading fishery nations of the North Pacific have an opportunity either to create international good will or to court trouble that will threaten the future peace of the nations bordering the Pacific Ocean.

If, as has again been proposed recently, the United States and its Pacific allies go ahead with plans for concluding a Japanese peace treaty without Russian obstruction, the question of the coastal fisheries on both sides of the ocean must be made a matter of specific provision in the covenant.

As Allen pointed out, the American and Canadian fisheries of this coast—sardine, herring, coastal tuna, halibut, salmon, and others—already are being utilized to the optimum degree, and in some instances more, by American and Canadian fishermen. Intrusion of the Japanese into any of these fisheries would offset agreements between the United States and Canada which now assure perpetuation of these resources against depletion.

On the other hand, the Japanese have their own coastal fisheries which are entitled to protection against foreign encroachment. The treaty, when it is drawn up, should guarantee the rights of Canada and the United States, and of Japan as well, to the fisheries of their respective coastal waters.

The present worsening of world international relations may make the question of an early treaty with Japan somewhat hypothetical. Yet it might serve useful purpose to expedite the treaty, to give Japan freer status, as an anti-Communist nation. In

any case, the American State Department in its negotiations—whenever they begin—cannot afford to ignore the advice of the chairman of the International Fisheries Commission.

SETTLE IT NOW

Meeting in Seattle, the Pacific Fisheries Conference has gone on record emphatically favoring full guaranties to protect American Pacific fisheries when a treaty of peace is concluded with Japan. The conference asserts there is an element in the State Department "that seems eager to have this treaty signed without any reference to fishery limitations."

To omit such a provision from the treaty would be sheer folly. What better opportunity could be offered for reaching full agreement with Japan on this issue? Why wait until Japan, freed from its "unconditional surrender obligations," is in a position to haggle over a question which need not even be subjected to negotiation?

Japan is entitled to its own fishery resources; the United States and Canada to theirs. As the Pacific Fisheries Conference contends, the treaty should settle the matter once and for all.

Isolationism Lingers in Our Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement before the annual dinner of the Association of Immigration and Naturalization Lawyers, Hotel Pierre, New York City, Saturday, December 9, 1950:

ISOLATIONISM LINGERS IN OUR IMMIGRATION POLICY

Because the whole subject of immigration and naturalization has been of the most special kind of interest to me for as many years as I have been in Congress, I am particularly pleased with having been given this opportunity to talk to you. It is a great comfort for me to talk to a group like yours on this subject because I know I will not be talking into a vacuum and that I will not, consequently, be restricted to limitations placed on me necessarily by a lay audience.

I am convinced that the whole subject of immigration and naturalization must be approached through the broad fundamental concept that the free movement of people, just as the free movement of trade and the free movement of goods and capital, is the functional part of international relations. National legislation pertaining to immigration has been regarded always as an integral part of the rules of conduct indexing every nation's attitude toward international policy. This concept is even more applicable to our legislation since the United States has, since its birth, been regarded not only as a place of asylum and sanctuary for people seeking freedom, but also as the land of opportunity for those who were unable to find economic security in their native lands. No immigration problem can be properly approached until we understand that the opening or the closing of our doors to immigration is a reflection of this Nation's attitude toward world problems.

Our immigration policy has always been considered by the rest of the world as the most expressive indication of our readiness—or our unwillingness—to cooperate with the community of nations. Admitting the refugee, the destitute, and the valiant who came to our shores to search for new opportunities meant to the outside world that we were ready to cooperate. Closing our doors has always been interpreted by other nations to be another barricade behind which we retreat to isolation. Unless Congress takes cognizance of this fact all the efforts of the United States to win friends and influence nations must diminish to that extent. To be a leader in the United Nations and to pursue our present immigration policy is to play an irreconcilable and contradictory role.

Indicating through speeches and declarations that we are an integral part of the rapidly shrinking free world, and at the same time imposing new restrictions in the field of immigration, is sheer hypocrisy. If we want to cooperate and not isolate ourselves from the rest of the world, we have to realine our tariff policy; we have to encourage the free movement of capital; and we have to foster the free exchange of goods. And—by the same token—we cannot hamper, but we must encourage the free movement of people.

I have tried to sketch for you a few ideas in order to give you a picture of my basic point. I firmly believe that our immigration policy is intimately connected with and should be in line with our international policy. This, however, is not an avowal of an indiscriminate "open door policy"—a policy which would be completely unrealistic. Domestic problems of manpower, employment, production, consumption, and available space must, most certainly, be included in our approach to our immigration policy.

To leave these factors out of consideration would make no more sense than blinding one man to give another sight.

I do, however, advocate a sound national immigration policy consistent with and worthy of our position in the world. I cannot escape the fact that we are far from achieving such a policy. We are operating under two old and obsolete basic statutes, the acts of 1917 and 1924, upon which a shaky structure of amendments has been superimposed throughout the years. Both statutes, together with their amendments require most urgently a complete revision—not cosmetic surgery—but true rehabilitation.

That act of 1917 was enacted during the First World War. What prompted the legislators to curtail immigration and to provide for immigration quotas was the fear that destitute masses of population would want to leave war-ravaged Europe and swamp this country with millions of newcomers. Legislation based on fear is never good legislation.

The act of 1924 was enacted at a time when isolationism was riding high. It was enacted shortly after this country had refused to join the League of Nations created by Woodrow Wilson, and when it had turned its back on the problems of the world of which we are a part. Legislation based on blindness to reality is likewise never good legislation.

New conditions created by the Second World War have prompted more of us to plan and hope for immigration legislation in better keeping with this Nation's international participation. The antique acts of 1917 and 1924 are anachronisms. Instead of recognizing this, however, we keep moving in ever-constricting circles because once again we are being pushed backward by fear. I specifically refer to the eight sections—sections 22 through 30—of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The eight sections of the act of September 23, 1950, are not only a classic example of the defects of hasty legislation passed in the confusion of the last hours of a congressional session, on the eve of an election. It is more than that, and it is worse than that. But, it is also an example of legislation that backfired.

In discussing these sections of the Internal Security Act, I wish to make it clearly understood that by no stretch of the imagination am I defending or apologizing for political ideologies which throughout the years have caused untold human suffering. In pointing out the unworkability of these sections, I am concerned primarily and exclusively with individuals as individuals and with the effects of these statutes upon the conduct of our foreign affairs.

You live with this new legislation and each one of you, I know, is familiar with the hardships and the inequities that they have set loose. They feed on human error and human fears. They feed on the helplessness of the young caught in Fascist and Nazi clutches. They affect the servicemen's German brides who in their youth belonged to Hitler youth organizations. They affect Italians who at the age of 10 were members of the Fascist youth organization. They affect German businessmen sent into Washington by the ECA because they were members of trade organizations affiliated with the Nazi Party. German immigrants are denied admission because with millions of other Germans they were collectively incorporated into the German labor front. Spaniards and Argentinians, without consideration for their individual worth, are being trapped in the net of these sections. In other words, the basic fallacy in these sections is the same kind of fallacy that is tearing the world apart today—the fallacy that people are not individuals but categories.

These sections define totalitarianism so very broadly that practically anyone who has ever been a citizen of any totalitarian country may run afoul on one or more of its provisions.

For instance, it forbids entry to persons who have distributed or disseminated totalitarian literature. That could exclude anyone who ever worked as a newsboy or as a bookstore messenger in Italy, Germany, Austria, or Spain. It might even subject to deportation an alien who had worked in any American public library, since the works of Josef Stalin and Adolf Hitler are included in the books circulated by them.

The departments charged with the enforcement of the new law have been placed in a truly unenviable position. On the one hand, should they show leniency, even in hardship cases, they could certainly expect criticism, alleging lax enforcement or even violation of the act. On the other hand, they are immediately put under pressure to admit certain persons because they are relatives of American citizens, or because they are famous artists, officials sent by friendly governments, or because they are imigrants who, having been granted immigration visas, have sold their belongings, liquidated their affairs, and have no place to which to return.

In this predicament many stop-gap decisions have been made, not all of them fortunate. As, for instance, the decision to admit temporarily persons applying for permanent residence, thus destroying their long-awaited visas or even destroying reentry permits duly issued to aliens returning to their unrelinquished domiciles in the United States.

It would certainly be preferable to base the interpretation of the excluding provisions of the Internal Security Act on existing judicial and administrative construction and rulings as they have accumulated through the years—unchallenged. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that excluding provisions of the act of 1917 and the act of October 16, 1918, were based on what both statutes defined as "membership

in or affiliated with" certain organizations. Now, the new statute of September 23, 1950, in spelling out the names and enlarging the lists and the definitions of the proscribed organizations, has retained without change, the language "members of or affiliated with" such organizations. The preservation of this language was intentional, because the Congress did not want to destroy the existing jurisprudence.

I could refer you to a great number of decisions interpreting constructively membership and affiliation, but I am certain that you know most, if not all, of them. The basic thought underlying this jurisprudence is, briefly, that membership has to be voluntary, active, and effective and that affiliation has to occur knowingly, willingly, and voluntarily.

It appears to me that if the Congress wanted to eliminate from our midst the subversive element, the active advocates of totalitarian forms of government, it did not want to close our doors to those immigrants or visitors who, as children, had to wear fancy shirts of various colors or who, as adults, under threat of imprisonment, or of starvation, or of violent death, nominally joined the many auxiliaries of the totalitarian parties. The Congress wanted to close our doors to those who as Nazis or Fascists, actively, knowingly, and willingly helped in the perpetration of the most appalling crimes ever recorded in human history and who—if permitted to live among us—would undoubtedly spread the totalitarian poison of hatred and intolerance. In my opinion, and I repeat it once more, the Congress certainly wanted the administrators of the law to look at the record of the individual himself, and not to classify him automatically as the component part of an objectionable group.

But, the Communists who are singled out to be actually hurt by this new law have not been hurt at all.

The intelligent and sound interpretation of our 1917 and 1918 deportation laws, combined with the interpretations of the 1940 Smith Act has provided completely adequate bars for members of truly dangerous subversive groups. The spelling out of the name of the Communist Party in the new law did not change anything. Long ago our administrative regulations effectively construed the language of existing statutes and barred Communists from entering this country. Those who have entered it have done so surreptitiously, and they are, of course, liable to deportation. Energetic enforcement of the existing laws would certainly permit us to get rid of the undesirable element.

The enactment of this ill-advised and untimely bit of legislation dramatizes the need for the broader reform of our entire immigration system. I will not hesitate to call it an urgent and imperative need. The obsolescence of our statutes has become more obvious, and the step backward taken by Congress on September 23, 1950, makes the whole situation simply untenable.

I have, therefore, recently accelerated the work on a revised, comprehensive immigration and naturalization code. It is probably too early to impart to you all the details of this proposed legislation, but I would like to give you several salient points of our still incomplete draft.

Frankly, we do not intend to depart at this time from the principle of national origin and the quota system. Many of us would like to see some reconstructive work done in these two antique pillars of our immigration policy. But the existing realities, the necessity of lining up enough votes in Congress for the passage of such law, forced upon us the decision of deferring an attempt at a departure from these two basic principles.

However, within the framework of the principle of national origin and of the quota system, we intend to provide for as much selectivity as possible. We intend to provide for a special top priority, or preference, for aliens possessing certain skills. We intend to strengthen and to extend the principle of preservation of family units. We propose to grant nonquota status to alien spouses—and that means spouses of both sexes—of American citizens and to grant nonquota status to all alien children under 21 years of age, of American citizens.

This would include the Chinese children omitted in the act of 1946, which granted nonquota status to the Chinese wives of American citizens.

The existing discrimination against women will be removed. A female permanent resident would confer first preference status upon her husband just as such male resident confers it today.

Further, we want to correct the unfairness contained in section 4 (a) of the 1924 act which grants nonquota status to the wives of American citizens regardless of the date of marriage, but which grants such status to the husbands of American citizens only where marriage took place before January 1, 1948.

We also want to correct the unfair provision of section 12 (a) of the 1924 act which permits a wife accompanying her husband, to be charged to the quota of her husband if the quota of her own country of birth is exhausted and if her husband's quota would be more beneficial. This provision would be amended to grant the husband the same benefit if the quota to which he is chargeable is exhausted and his wife's quota is current.

Section 4 (d) of the same act grants nonquota status to the wife and minor unmarried children of an immigrant entering the United States as a minister of any religious denomination, or as a professor. This provision assumes that there are no women ministers and no women professors. Of course, it has to be amended so as to eliminate this discrimination.

We intend uniformly to define the term "minor child" as applicable to children under 21 years of age so as to correct certain misinterpretations stemming from the various State laws.

Of course, and I probably don't have to add this, we intend to incorporate into the proposed legislation the entire Judd bill repealing the remaining racial restrictions and providing for immigration quotas for Asian and Pacific people.

We intend to simplify the procedures under which aliens temporarily in the United States might have their status changed to that of permanent residents and we certainly intend to do away with the cumbersome "pre-examination" procedure and with the 24-hour duration trips to Canada or to Mexico.

Procedures governing the admission of visitors, businessmen, students, artists, and tourists, will be improved and by that I mean simplified. As far as possible, we want to revise the famous long questionnaires, which even the most desirable visitor has to fill out in many copies and on many occasions, before his passport is adorned with the consul's stamp and signature.

As you can see, this is quite a job cut out for us. I don't expect easy sailing with this project. I know, though reasonable as many of the proposals will be, the opposition will be strong and perhaps at times bitter. But the job must be done, and nobody understands that as well as you do.

I want you to know how much I have appreciated your help in the past and that I know I can look forward in the future to your usual intelligent and constructive appraisal of the forthcoming immigration work in Congress.

The Truman Excess-Profits Tax an Economic Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, two articles, one by David Lawrence and the other by Samuel W. Bell, appeared in the New York Herald Tribune December 12, 1950, each referring to the proposed excess-profits tax. It is evident from these articles that the defects and snags in the Truman proposal are becoming more and more obvious to the legislators in both branches of the Congress.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting these articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks:

BUSINESS URGES STRAIGHT RISE IN TAXES UPON CORPORATIONS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, December 11.—American businessmen are urging higher taxes as a means of paying for the rising costs of defense, but they want straight increases in corporation taxes instead of excess-profits taxes.

This is because the increase in corporation taxes will bring in more revenue to the Government and will be more equitable to all kinds of business.

The excess-profits tax, on the other hand, will not affect adversely a great number of corporations with a large amount of invested capital or with a high average of earnings in the base years from 1946 through 1949. The principal reason why some of the larger companies, too, prefer a straight increase in corporation taxes is because of the complicated procedures under the excess-profits taxes, which make them difficult for the taxpayer to calculate, producing litigation, and expensive for the Government to administer.

MIDDLE-SIZED BUSINESS

The major part of the opposition to the excess-profits-tax legislation, however, is coming from middle-sized businesses. These are the businesses which make up the greater part of the membership of such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce. Thus, W. Stuart Symington, chairman of the National Security Resources Board, in a copyrighted interview in United States News and World Report recently said:

"I went out recently to talk before the National Association of Manufacturers. That's a good organization and it's a lot different from what it was years ago. Over 53 percent of their current membership employ less than 100 people; and over 84 percent employ less than 500 people—and 500 is considered a definition of small business. Their president has some 200 production workers up in Keene, N. H. I was much impressed with that aspect of the change in NAM."

The definition of small business at 500 employees is a significant one. Most people think of small business as the filling stations or small retail stores with a few employees. But middle-sized business is the backbone of the American competitive system. It is the middle-sized business which is trying to compete with the so-called "oligopolies," as Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee calls the leading three or four companies in an industry.

There are only a few hundred of these leaders even if all the industries are totaled up. Certainly the bulk of the membership of both the United States Chamber of Commerce or the National Association of Manufacturers, running into many thousands, is middle-sized or small business. Yet the demagogs who are anxious to bring about a system of state socialism in America and who are doing everything they can to undermine the American competitive system by encouraging concentration of business in a few companies, charge any groups of business as big business and use terms such as "selfishness' and "greed" to upbraid all groups which oppose fair and inequitable systems of taxation.

The excess-profits tax is a benefit to a special group. It is a special privilege, because it permits the more successful companies—the leading ones in each industry—to pay a lower rate for every thousand dollars earned than do the less successful businesses.

LOBBIES FOR PROFITS TAX

The excess-profits tax would not have any standing in Congress at all except for the drive put on by the labor organizations and their lobbies here. The idea back of the drive was to get the excess-profits tax passed so that the larger businesses especially would reduce their resistance to wage increases. During the last few weeks these same labor organizations have cried out against price increases and have called for rollbacks of prices but not a single labor union has called for a rollback of the big increases in wage scales given since the Korean crisis began.

Wage and price stabilization by the Government have been overdue since last summer, and if the excess-profits-tax law is passed, the controls should become effective immediately as one means of offsetting the inflationary pressures that will ensue. The labor groups have already gotten theirs, so there is little danger of a rollback. The new wage and price stabilization agency will, of course, be empowered to take care of wage inequities, which is but another name for wage increases.

The excess-profits tax passed by the House will do far more damage to small as well as middle-sized business than any of the previous wartime laws, because the provisions are far more inequitable and damaging to competitive enterprise.

SENATORS HIT SNAG IN EXCESS-PROFITS DRAFT—COMMITTEE HOLDS A SECRET SESSION, GETS NOWHERE IN REVISING HOUSE BILL

(By Samuel W. Bell)

WASHINGTON, December 11.—The Senate Finance Committee, meeting behind closed doors, ran into a snag today in its first attempt to frame an excess-profits-tax bill on the basis of the $3,000,000,000 measure recently passed by the House.

President Truman, in his recommendations to the lame-duck session of the Eighty-first Congress, asked for excess-profits taxes estimated to yield at least $4,000,000,000 in the first year, retroactive to July 1.

The Finance Committee, whose members are on record in favor of enactment of an excess-profits tax at this session, held its first executive meeting after a week of hearings.

Except for the labor spokesmen, all the witnesses appearing before the committee, representing business and industry, opposed an excess-profits tax. If the Government really needs revenue for national defense, they argued, it should resort to an additional increase in the regular corporation-income tax. This, they added, would provide more revenue and impose less handicaps on industrial expansion.

Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado, ranking Republican member of the committee, who is pledged to the enactment of an excess-profits tax before the present Congress dies January 3, acknowledged that the committee faced a difficult job.

"However, we hope to complete a bill by the end of this week," he said, after a 3-hour session of the committee.

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, committee chairman, announced there was "nothing to report" after today's adjournment of the committee's secret session.

Death Knocks on Freedom's Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, when crisis mounts on crisis and tragedy stalks our forces around the world, the "man in the street" at home is conscious of our peril if the leaders of Government are not. I have received a letter from a constituent, Mr. William Roy Johnston, of the Danville Metal Stamping Co., Inc., Danville, Ill., expressing the grave concern of the people at home over the danger of drifting toward the abyss of world war III.

Mr. Johnston encloses some clippings of pertinent articles taken from the daily press reports in the Danville Commercial-News and a reprint of a timely editorial from the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial-Appeal. Groping as we all are for a path of strength, he urges that these articles be brought to the attention of every Member of the Congress. Under permission granted by the House of Representatives, I am including them in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are:

[From the Danville (Ill.) Commercial News]

LEGION CHIEF WARNS UNITED STATES COULD LOSE

HERRIN.—National American Legion Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., said Sunday the atomic bomb should be a military weapon and not a diplomatic weapon.

Cocke told the fourteenth annual session of the Egyptian Past Commanders' Club that MacArthur should be empowered to use the bomb when a military target presents itself. Neither diplomatic nor humanitarian aspects should stand in the way of its use, he said.

America should realize that war is a matter of survival and "it's extremely possible we could lose," Cocke said.

He urged clear thinking in the present crisis, asserting "the Russians have cataloged the American people well; the greatest dangers we have to face are fright, fear, panic and shock."

[From the Danville (Ill.) Commercial News]

ATTLEE LIKELY TO ASK TRUMAN TO TURN BACK ON MACARTHUR

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—It is not likely that Prime Minister Clement Attlee will be able to avoid asking President Truman to turn his back on Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He represents not only the United Kingdom but unofficially all of Western Europe and free Germany as well.

MacArthur is neither hero nor superman to Western Europeans. Many of them already regard him as an architect of disaster. Western Europe wants an end to the Korean War one way or another—but an end to it. They fear American and United Nations strength diverted there in prolonged fighting would expose Europe to easy Communist conquest.

The British Government and large elements of the British people have become distrustful of American Far Eastern policy and of MacArthur's leadership in Korea.

MacArthur and the leaders of Western Europe are poles apart. President Truman is on the spot if not in the middle. MacArthur's position is clear. Of Europe's go-slow demands in Korea, he said in a message to Hugh Baillie, president of the United Press:

"If the fight is not waged with courage and invincible determination to meet the challenge here (in Asia) it will indeed be fought and possibly lost on the battlefields of Europe.

"Any breach of freedom in the East carries with it a sinister threat to freedom in the West."

Last August he prepared but suppressed at Mr. Truman's request an even more emphatic statement of Far Eastern strategy. It said in part:

"Nothing could be more falacious than the threadbare argument (of) those who advocate appeasement and defeatism in the Pacific."

Neither Attlee nor his friends in Western Europe would agree that they advocate either defeatism or appeasement. But by MacArthur's widely proclaimed standards their ideas would represent a tremendous retreat from what the general calls invincible determination to meet the Communist challenge.

Mr. Truman must make the ultimate decision on what American policy shall be. But the United Nations has first chance to say how the democratic world shall react to the entirely new war in Korea.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial-Appeal as reprinted on the editorial page of the Dansville (Ill.) Commercial-News]

DEATH KNOCKS ON FREEDOM'S DOOR

When General MacArthur was winning in Korea he was the Western World's hero. Today he is a bum to some of those who yesterday were praising him.

When the United States intervened against Communist aggression in South Korea, the anti-Communist world lauded it for its high idealism and courage. Wordily was it acclaimed as the great white hope for peace. But that was June and love was in the air.

This is December and Red China is pouring her faceless hordes across the Yalu from the frozen plains and hills of Manchuria. And chill is over everything.

The frost reaches into the stilled heart of the American riflemen—dead where a Communist bullet left him.

And the chill of the great Red fear has reached to the hearts of those who have been claiming our friendship, our largesse and our support.

So have we come to a time of grim and terrible counting.

The United States is at war with communism's geopolitical heart—Russia. If it is not so officially it is so in fact and it is war to the death. There is no middle ground. There can be no appeasement. There is no turning back.

Those who are not with us are against us. And those who have said they were with us have done too little, in civilization's behalf. For it is civilization's survival not merely our freedom, which is at stake.

There was hardly a major newspaper in Britain which failed to editorially lambaste MacArthur. That from them.

There isn't a so-called ally in the United Nations which will stand up and in the great

anger of righteousness, say to the Chinese Red delegates, "This is enough. Get out."

History records no greater obscenity than this spectacle of Red Chinese accusing the United States of aggression.

Meanwhile the Red hordes roll on and United Nations forces—such as they are—fall back and back.

They may have to leave Korea—if they can. "Ah," say the foolish ones, "they can't do that; we can't lose face."

Lose what? You don't lose what you've already lost.

If only withdrawal can save those troops, then withdrawal it must be that an end can be put to this terrible tragedy.

Or we can, through strategic bombing, lay waste to every city and community in Manchuria—or make desolate the great centers of China proper.

Atom bomb or fire bomb. What does it matter if this scorching must be done? And it should be done if that will save American soldiers now trapped before the Red juggernaut.

For our allies—Britain, France, and the rest—let them put up or shut up. And "put up" means troops in force rather than token forces—a battalion here—a skeleton brigade there. The situation needs divisions—needs them more desperately even than the laggards say they need our dollars.

So Western Europe is still the focal point for potential Russian assault. That's what the chancelories of Europe are saying.

They would let freedom die in Korea. And with it 125,000 American fighting men.

Let them think again. There could be such a thing as giving top defense priority to Western Hemisphere security.

Because there could be direct attack here across the roof of the world.

While the sands of western civilization's era run out, there is continued dalliance in Washington—gross ineptness, if not worse, in the State Department, supineness of leadership in the White House and lack of mobilization administrative experience in the Defense Department.

The debacle in Korea is still a "police action," according to the White House mind to which everything else bureaucratic, military and civilian, is geared.

Small minds, indeed, plot the future in this most dangerous of all American hours.

Perhaps a greater confidence—a greater cooperation—would have been inspired among our allies had Washington made it plain that it would muster all which is potential American might and use it if necessary to maintain Western prestige and position in the Orient.

But it didn't. The appeasing and timid minds prevailed and now come the Red harvest of indecision—of too little—too late.

And the clock ticks on.

And death knocks on freedom's door.

United States Stands Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents have sent me letters and some of them have enclosed the editorial which is entitled "America Stands Alone" and which reads as follows:

United States Forces—feebly supported by demoralized South Koreans and mere token brigades from UN powers—are fighting desperately to avert complete defeat and disaster against an overwhelming number of Chinese Communists.

What was believed to be a victory march into North Korea turned out to be a deadly trap in which uncounted thousands of Americans were caught. The fate of many of them is still in doubt.

General MacArthur, who about a week ago, was exuding confidence and optimism, leading the American people to believe the war in Korea was all over but the shouting, could voice little optimism at the week end.

We are fighting an undeclared war with Communist China, MacArthur told press correspondents, and our divisions are outnumbered by seven to one.

What the enemy may lack in fire power—and they don't lack for much—they have made up for in such masses of expendable troops that their drive has been irresistible.

Our adventure in Korea, so blithely undertaken, has become an American tragedy.

President Truman ordered American troops to meet the North Korean Reds and secure South Korea from Communist conquest, in the name of the United Nations. It was described as a United Nations police action, and was approved by the UN. That was about as far as the UN went, however. It has backed up our effort with words, but with neither men nor material in sufficient strength to be of any effectiveness.

Why are our forces in Korea outnumbered seven to one? Why does ignominious defeat and the prospect of all-out war with China and Russia confront us? Because our so-called allies in the United Nations betrayed America and betrayed the Organization dedicated to preventing aggression and maintaining peace.

American boys are dying, freezing, and undergoing torture in Korea because the nations sworn to take united action against the aggressor have broken their pledge and deserted.

In the hour of greatest peril to the survival of freedom in the world, the so-called United Nations have washed out on their obligations. Their failure to act constitutes confession of moral and physical cowardice of the worst order.

That is why the Americans have been overwhelmed.

The other United Nations countries could, if they had been willing to stand by their word of honor, evened the scales against the Communists. Instead, they prefer to let Americans die while they utter monotonous platitudes.

Prime Minister Attlee has flown to Washington to confer on the Korean crisis. More words; more subterfuge. Mr. Attlee will counsel moderation and forbearance. He will counsel appeasement—anything to save Britain's skin and particularly the rich crown colony of Hong Kong.

We may have no choice but appeasement, because we are alone in the world, surrounded by outright enemies or faithless friends.

We should get out of Korea and forget Asia. We should let the Asiatics write their own ticket to Hades, if that is what they want. We should let Britain worry about Hong Kong and the French save themselves, if they can, in Indochina.

It's time to abandon the role of the Great White Father to all the world. Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson may glory in that role, but the people do not. It never has got us anything in the way of friendship or help in time of need, and never will.

If it is to be that America must come to grips with the arch-conspirator of communism—Soviet Russia, then let's conserve our strength for the real test of survival and choose the battleground. The whole Korean affair has been a Stalin booby trap from the very beginning. Moscow calls the tune and we dance. It ought to be the other way 'round.

Jewish War Veterans' Challenge to the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by Henry Albert, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the U. S. A., who is one of the distinguished leading citizens of my home county of Queens, New York:

JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE U. S. A.

Hon. WARREN R. AUSTIN,

Chief of the United States Mission to the United Nations, New York, N. Y.

DEAR AMBASSADOR AUSTIN: We address ourselves to you on behalf of the more than 100,000 members of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

Our organization was formed 55 years ago by American veterans of the Jewish faith who served in the War Between the States. Like our fellow American veterans of all faiths, we hold war in utter abhorrence. That is why our organization reposed its prayers and its hopes in the formation of the United Nations organization and has observed with great pride our country's leadership in continuing efforts to establish a just and lasting peace.

We share with our delegation to the United Nations the deep-seated conviction that genuine peace and security for the humble people of the world cannot be bought with the false coin of appeasement. Thus, we have witnessed with sympathy the patient efforts of our United Nations delegation to convey to the representatives of the Soviet Union the truth about our country's policies and objectives. With deepening dismay, we have seen each fresh attempt at reasoned explanation countered by a renewed vilification of our country's motives and repeated charges of aggressive intent by what the Soviet representatives have been describing as "the ruling circles of the United States."

Sir, it is this characterization that has impelled us to write to you. We construe it to apply to those who speak and act for our country in its relation with the rest of the world. In the United States such powers are delegated. They cannot be seized; they can only be conferred by an electorate which alone has the right to determine who shall speak and act for the United States and how these powers shall be exercised.

The Soviet representatives know this to be the truth, just as they know that access to this truth has been denied to the ordinary citizens of their country. They must therefore know full well that when they impute aggressive intentions to "the ruling circles of the United States", they draw an indictment against millions of Americans.

Among these, the Soviet representatives must know, are 14,000,000 American veterans of the Second World War. The blood of hundreds of thousands and the toil of uncounted millions more of the American people was given freely to hasten the liberation of mankind from the terrible yoke of Nazi and Fascist oppression.

This, too, is a fact that is being denied the ordinary citizens of the Soviet Union. It is being denied, as well, to the people of China, who, together with the people of the Soviet Union were, not so long ago, the grateful beneficiaries of these sacrifices.

How, then, can the representatives of the Soviet Union justify the denial of these truths in a world which desperately needs

to summon up again the spirit and will for mutual respect and dependence that saw the freedom-loving nations through the dark hours of the Second World War?

We ask this question of the Soviet Union representatives: What motives impel the ruling circle of the Soviet Union to reiterate the falsehood that those who were the devoted friends and allies of the Russian people yesterday are their enemies today? What is the meaning of this vast and monstrous insemination of hatred if not to engender a blind will to destroy those whom the Russian people are not permitted to know or understand? What other conclusions can be drawn but that the instrument of the program, which has been used to liquidate all who dared to harbor independent thought or private faith is now being applied on a world scale?

The ruling circle of the Soviet Union deludes itself and cruelly deceives the Russian people if it counts on bogus peace petitions to veil Soviet aggression from the gaze of the millions of people who have come to recognize the relationship between the Russian dove and the Trojan horse.

This relationship is becoming plainer each day in direct proportion to the mounting aggression of international communism.

Like the camarilla of Nazis and Fascists who dreamed of world dominion, the ruling circle of the Soviet Union overestimates the number and worth of those who are ready to betray the free democracies. For the traitors are being rooted out and their betrayals are being dealt with by free courts.

We who address ourselves, through you, to the representatives of the Soviet Union include descendants of men who fled Czarist Russia to escape the genocidal fury of the pogroms.

We say to the Soviet representatives:

In the 30 years of your rule you have demonstrated by abundant example that only in America, and in democracies like America, can those who once knew tyranny and oppression look for a future of freedom and justice. Man's hope for a secure and peaceful world remains in the hands of the free nations.

This we believe, and we challenge the representatives of the Soviet Union to make known to the ordinary citizens of their country our conviction that only the leaders of the Soviet Union stand in the way of security and freedom for all mankind.

Kudzu, Cooperation, and Know-How in Clay County, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, kudzu has been truly called the foot-a-day vine. It really grows, under favorable conditions, a foot a day, after it gets its start. Its crowns or joints that are clipped and used for planting, and the vines and other crowns which come in them at regular intervals have been found to be one of the best water storage systems and natural dams for soil-erosion prevention. Gullies that once were torrents after every heavy rain, taking off the top soil, have been filled and the torrents completely stopped. The roadside drainage ditches that used to be considered essential have been largely abandoned in fields that are covered with kudzu and the drainage becomes adequately provided by the thirsty kudzu vines as the rain water is turned onto the land instead of off it into ditches. Corn has been successfully planted in fields along with kudzu. The kudzu kills off the grass or weeds which might otherwise take away sustenance from the corn, and stores dew and rain and shades the roots of the corn stalks, increasing the size and productivity of the stalk.

From the time the demonstration area of 50,000 acres was established in 1935 by the Soil Conservation Service under the leadership of Carl Morgan, soil conversationist, the cooperation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, the county farm demonstration agent and Extension Service all through the years has been excellent and the vast majority of the farms in Clay County have been sold on the benefits of scientific agriculture. Having seen the transformation of the landscape of Clay County from a picture of bare red clay hills and gullies to young forests, verdant pastures, improved row crops, and thousands of acres of kudzu at work wiping out gullies and killing erosion, I asked George M. Burns, expert of the Soil Conservation Service, affectionately nicknamed "Kudzu" Burns, to write an article giving the high lights of the history of Clay County agriculturally during the time he has lived there. He has very graciously done so and it is my pleasure to extend these introductory remarks by including the article he has written. I only wish that it were possible to include the pictures he sent with his article; and that every Member of the Congress could see the luxuriant growth of kudzu on the banks of the driveway from Connecticut Avenue down to the Kennedy-Warren garage, right here in Washington, which appears dead now, of course, but which will come to life with the spring.

The article follows:

(By George M. Burns, Soil Conservation Service, Ashland, Ala.)

I have watched a farming miracle unfold in Clay County, Ala., during the last 22 years. Land that was dying 22 years ago is restored to productive health. Its proper use and treatment provide income from several crops and farm products instead of one. Our people are living better. Our children have better schools and a chance to attend full time. We have much more money in our two banks.

These changes resulted from the sweat and toil of farm people and the down-to-earth help of paid agricultural workers. We had the support of businessmen, bankers, school people, civic club members, county officers, and others.

In my mind, three dates mark milestones in these changes.

The first date is 1928, when the Lineville State demonstration farm was started. There I came face to face with the same hard row that Clay County farmers were hoeing. On this farm our hill land had been whipped with cotton, and was washed and gullied. Bottom land was wet and overgrown with alders and willows.

The second date is 1935. That year a Soil Conservation Service CCC camp was opened at Ashland. It was named Camp Hobbs, in honor of Congressman SAM HOBBS who always has been and still is extremely interested in soil and water conservation because it helps people on and off the land.

The third date is 1939. Farmers that year organized the Piedmont Soil Conservation District and took over responsibility for their own conservation program. Clay County is one of five counties in this district.

My part in this work has been as manager of the demonstration farm for 7 years, as a conservation farm planner in the CCC camp, and, since the district was formed, as work unit conservationist for the Soil Conservation Service in the Clay County part of the district.

All through the years we have had wonderful teamwork by agricultural agencies. Our county agricultural workers council meets once a month to study what we need to do during the next month or so to help farm people. Then we work together to do it.

You will know how far we've advanced when I tell you where we stood a few years ago.

When I went to Clay County in 1928, we were growing cotton on about 32,000 acres. We know now that most of that cotton was on land too steep or too poor or too badly eroded for row crops. As our land washed away under cotton, we put more of it under mortgage in order to live. Every year we had to back off from more land because the gullies got too big to cross. You know what all that meant to farm families, and to merchants in Ashland and Lineville.

By 1935 we had made the demonstration farm a model of the best land use and conservation we knew at that time. The cropland was terraced and in a high state of cultivation. The bottom land was cleared, fenced, and in a good pasture sod. The farm had about $4,000 in the bank.

Few changes had been made on other farms in the county. We had State money to terrace the demonstration farm, for clearing, for fencing, for fertilizer, for lime, and for seed. Other farmers didn't.

The cotton acreage had dropped from 32,000 acres to about 18,000 by 1935. Erosion, low prices, and acreage controls were mostly responsible for that.

Our two banks had $478,287 on deposit in 1935, and $348,327 on loan.

Our public schools had terms of 6 or 7 months, instead of 9 months. That's all we had money for. Every school had a recess of about a month to let the children pick cotton.

Our farms had no improved pasture. It was considered a waste of money to put fertilizer on pasture.

We had no perennial hay crops. I suppose every farmer pulled corn fodder to feed his work stock and cut a little tops or hay for his milk cow. Any man who failed to pull fodder would have been considered shiftless by his neighbors.

Without pasture and perennial hay, we had little or no income from livestock.

Those were lean times.

All of us are proud of what we have in Clay County in 1950. Of course we know that we still have a long way to go before every acre is used properly and given the conservation treatment it needs.

Our farmers planted only 4,050 acres of cotton this year. That's less than one-fourth of the 1935 acreage. Yet, our 1950 cotton allotment was 9,335 acres. Most of the crop this year is on land suited to cotton.

Our two banks have $3,304,569 on deposit, and $903,689 on loan. We now have nearly $7 on deposit for every $1 in the bank in 1935. Our bankers are lending money with livestock as collateral now.

Every public school has a 9-month term. County Superintendent M. G. Satterfield told me the other day that he saw no reason for any county school to turn out for cotton picking this fall. Last year, some of the

schools turned out a half day every day for about a month.

I know of 14 rural churches that have been rebuilt in the last few years, and of at least 10 that have been remodeled or improved.

We have about 10,000 acres of improved pasture. County Agent W. H. Cowan and I estimate 8,000 acres of cover crops are being planted this fall for winter grazing and soil improvement.

We have around 20,000 acres of perennial hay crops holding and building the land and feeding livestock. We have 13,000 acres of kudzu, 6,500 acres of Sericea lespedeza, and 500 of alfalfa. Fodder pulling has almost disappeared.

We have 10 grade-A dairy farms and 165 grade-B dairy farms. Their milk sales at Talladega and Dadeville will bring between $130,000 and $150,000 to our county this year. One farmer is selling $800 worth of milk a month and buying only $20 worth of feed. He grows the feed and hay where cotton used to be planted.

County Agent Cowan tells me that at least 100 farmers have one or more registered dairy animals. Five years ago, six farmers had registered dairy cattle. We have a good many registered beef-type bulls. Five farmers are growing registered beef cattle for sale. Our hog production is picking up.

We are planting fewer acres to corn now than in 1934, but our acre yields are about doubled. In 1934, we had 33,093 acres of corn in the county and averaged less than 12 bushels an acre. This year the yield may be as high as 25 bushels an acre from 30,000 acres. Last year we actually made 21.6 bushels to the acre.

We have many paying crops that we did not have when I came to Clay County. They include: Kudzu, sericea, crimson clover, Kentucky 31 fescue, Ladino clover, Caley or wild winter peas, bicolor lespedeza for bobwhite food, blue lupine, crotalaria, hairy indigo, and button clover. Each is fitted into whole-farm soil and water conservation programs. More than that, they are paying off in grazing, or hay, or seed crops for cash, or a combination of all three. SCS nurseries provided the seed or planting stock that started most of those new plants.

Seed production is putting folding money in farmers' pockets. Last year more than 10,000 pounds of sericea seed worth 25 cents a pound were harvested. We have a $37,000 seed cleaning plant in the county.

Looking back over the years, I consider highly significant the changes we have made in the approach to conservation farming.

Our Lineville State Demonstration Farm was a good demonstration of soil-conservation work on uplands and drainage and pasture planting on bottomlands. We had many field days for farmers to see what we were doing, but on-the-ground work directly involved only one farm.

When CCC Camp Hobbs was opened by the Soil Conservation Service we could work on any farm whose owner agreed to cooperate with us in a complete soil and water conservation program. In exchange for the farmer's cooperation we gave him technical, on-the-ground help with his erosion and land-use problems. We gave him seed, trees, and other planting stock, and the labor of CCC boys. Kudzu and pine trees were two of the tools we used to tie down thousands of acres of badly eroded and gullied land. Terraces were built on the better cropland. Soil building rotations were started. Kudzu was planted in outlets to take terrace water without washing. Land suited for pasture was fenced, cleared of scrubby trees and brush, fertilized, limed, and seeded.

The work of Camp Hobbs has meant thousands of dollars to Clay County farmers in the past 15 years. It will continue to pay off as long as the conservation work is maintained. But the initiative came from a Federal agency which required farmers to cooperate with it in order to get complete-farm conservation plans, planting materials, and labor.

Working through Camp Hobbs, we learned that many different measures were needed in various combinations to hold and improve the land. We learned from practical experience that each acre must be used according to its capability and treated according to its needs. Camp Hobbs trained SCS technicians who have helped countless farmers since that time.

But most important, I think, is that the work through the CCC camp proved to farmers that erosion could be controlled and land improved at a profit.

Farmers liked the new way of farming. And we had a complete change in our approach to soil conservation when farmers organized the Piedmont Soil Conservation District.

Five farmers were named supervisors to direct the local soil and water conservation program. O. L. Cotney of Lineville was one of the first district supervisors, and still serves on the board. He and other supervisors called on local, State and Federal agencies and local people to work out the district's conservation program. Then the supervisors asked the United States Department of Agriculture for help from all its agencies who could contribute to the district's own program.

After Camp Hobbs was closed, we of the Soil Conservation Service continued to work in Clay County helping farmers plan and carry out whole-farm soil and water conservation programs. We gave and are giving the farmers technical, on-the-land help, and the landowners are applying the measures themselves. The PMA, formerly the AAA, has helped to pay for a part of the cost of some of the measures.

But we of the Soil Conservation Service were and are cooperating with the locally organized and controlled soil conservation district which represents the farmers of the county.

My work with Clay County people has been and is pleasant and satisfying. I'd like for you to go back with me to a few of the many things that have given me great pleasure.

One day I met W. E. Carpenter, president of the Farmers and Merchants Bank, on the street in Lineville. "You've ruined one of my best customers," Mr. Carpenter told me jokingly. "J. P. McCain used to borrow from me all the time. Now he has a bank account."

Mr. McCain was one of the first farmers to start a complete-farm soil conservation program. He worked hard at it. But even he was a little reluctant to plant kudzu. He put it on a hillside at the back of his farm where it couldn't be seen from the road. At least 750 farmers and agricultural workers have gone to the back of his farm in a single year to see how that kudzu was making hay and grazing on steep, gullied land.

Kudzu was one of the first plants that we found that could wrap up the old red gullies in a blanket of green. The SCS nurseries gave farmers thousands of kudzu crowns. We bought crowns from the older plantings. Then we tried growing kudzu from seed.

Back about 1938 I remember that Mr. Carpenter received and locked up in his bank vault 100 pounds of kudzu seed shipped in from Japan. Twenty 4-H and FFA members made a note to the bank and took the seed to grow into kudzu seedlings. Every note was signed by a member of the Lineville Lions Club. And I remember that every note was paid on or before the date due. Those boys grew 350,000 kudzu seedlings that year—enough to tie down 700 more acres.

The 4-H and FFA boys are still helping. This year they are growing about 375,000 bicolor lespedeza seedlings for wildlife plantings.

Clay County became known as the Kudzu Capital of the World. Publisher C. L. Proctor puts this slogan on the masthead of his Lineville Tribune, "World's leading kudzu-growing county."

We're proud of our kudzu. But we're just as proud of all the other plants and all the other measures that go to make the complete farm-soil and water-conservation program we have in Clay County.

We've had visitors here from 8 foreign countries and 25 different States to see and study our soil- and water-conservation work.

Congressman HOBBS has been a regular visitor through the years. Two years ago, while looking over conservation work in the county, I heard a farmer remark, "This is the first time I ever saw a Congressman in the middle of a kudzu field." I've known Congressman HOBBS to visit as many as 32 soil-conservation farmers in a single day.

The opportunity that soil-conservation farming opens for our children is one of the greatest sources of pleasure. I remember that the Reverend W. R. Ingram, Baptist minister and farmer in the Barfield community, told me that soil conservation helped put his younger children through college.

When I went to Clay County in 1928, farmers along Fox Creek near Lineville were trying to drain the bottomland without success. Under soil-conservation district leadership, this drainage job finally was completed. Thirty farmers worked with the district to improve drainage on about 1,000 acres. The SCS loaned a dragline to the district supervisors for use on the project. Our technicians designed the drainage system. The Production and Marketing Administration paid a part of the cost.

Before the drainage project was revived by the district, J. J. Clark was trying to sell his 240-acre farm. His best land, about 67 acres, was along the creek and too wet for use. After the job was finished, Mr. Clark told me, "That 67 acres is worth more to me than the rest of my farm." He quit trying to sell the place.

Soil-conserving measures and crops on the rolling land in Fox Creek watershed keep the drainage ditches from filling up with sand and silt.

James Hutchinson's success is a pleasure for all of us who have worked with him. A tenant farmer who owned only a pair of mules, Hutchinson was helped by the Farmers Home Administration to buy 86 acres in the High Pine community in 1943. I found 50 acres of idle land on his farm when I helped him make a conservation plan. T. T. Reagan, the FHA man, told me the other day that Mr. Hutchinson is paying off his FHA loans at the rate of $108 every 2 weeks. That's half of his milk check. Some of the best pasture on his farm was idle land 7 years ago.

Yes; I've watched a farming miracle unfold in Clay County, and helped it along where I could.

Today I can agree with District Supervisor Cotney when he says, "We'll see more changes in Clay County in the next 10 years than we've seen in the past 10."

Our Alarming Doctor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article entitled "Our Alarming Doctor Shortage," which appeared in

Collier's magazine of December 16, 1950, is must reading for every Member of Congress:

OUR ALARMING DOCTOR SHORTAGE—WE DESPERATELY NEED PHYSICIANS, YET THE LEADERS OF ORGANIZED MEDICINE WON'T LET CONGRESS ACT

(By Albert Q. Maisel)

(This article sets forth a serious national problem that, in another all-out war, could become a national catastrophe. Few will bother to deny the present shortage of medical personnel. Few will deny the actual and potential dangers of such a shortage. Few will question its obvious solution. The country's medical schools must have money in order to expand and to reduce the sometimes prohibitive cost of medical education. There is strong public and professional support for financing an expansion program with Federal funds. But the leaders of the American Medical Association are against the idea. So far they have blocked the passage of legislation which would make such a program possible. Collier's thinks that their stand is wrong. We appreciate the association's great contributions in maintaining high professional standards and protecting public health and safety. Yet, in this case their attitude seems narrow, and their case weak. Federal aid to medical education is not "socialized medicine." And as long as the danger of general war and atomic attack against our civilian population exists, the argument that Federal aid may lead to Federal control of medical education is academic, to say the least. We hope that the AMA leaders will withdraw their opposition. The Senate has already passed a bill which would provide money to end the doctor shortage. If the AMA continues its fight in the new Congress, we trust that the lawmakers will have the courage to enact the measure anyway in the interest of urgent necessity.—THE EDITORS.)

A tiny group of well-intentioned men has placed your health, and even your chances of Atomic Age survival, in the most serious jeopardy. These men mean you no harm. Indeed, they are the leaders of the American Medical Association, an organization sincerely dedicated to fighting disease and saving life.

Yet they must shoulder major responsibility for a shortage of medical personnel which is constantly becoming more critical. They are the one big obstacle in the path of congressional efforts to meet that shortage with Federal aid to medical education—a solution which has the backing of most medical school deans, of leading university presidents, of both Republicans and Democrats, and (by a unanimous vote) of the United States Senate.

The bill which embodies this solution was drawn up with the advice of AMA representatives; time after time it was modified to meet their objections, and in its present form it represents almost precisely what they wanted in the first place. Nevertheless, the American Medical Association's leaders have fought the measure to a dead stop in the House of Representatives.

By so doing, they have made it entirely possible that wounded American soldiers, in the future, will receive some second- or third-rate substitute for the marvelous medical services that saved tens of thousands of lives in World War II. Because of what they have done and what they have prevented from being done, civilian atomic-bomb victims may perish untended. Mothers, lacking a physician's help, may die in childbirth under the ministrations of incompetent midwives. Plagues and epidemics, which we all thought banished forever, may return to claim millions of victims.

These are not the dire and gloomy forebodings of neurotic alarmists or scare-peddling sensationalists. They are rather the considered private predictions of shocked and worried experts who, ever since the end of World War II, have been trying to get the organized medical profession to take steps to overcome a growing shortage of physicians, nurses, dentists, and public-health technicians.

Behind their shortage lies the fact that our medical and other health-education schools cannot expand for lack of funds. Many of them are so deep in the red that they may even have to fold up entirely.

The shortage of physicians has been recognized for years. In May 1945 for example, Dr. Victor Johnson (then secretary of the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals) testified before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs that, while we would need 35,000 more physicians after World War II, our training program was geared to provide us with an increase of less than half this number by 1948.

Despite this warning of a growing shortage of doctors, even for civilian needs, we demobilized our medical schools, along with everything else, when World War II ended. Financial difficulties, and a desire to improve the quality of training, led college after college to cut back its student roster, often by as much as 20 to 30 percent. Instead of training more doctors than ever before, we began to train fewer. Our nursing, dental, and public-health schools all moved in the same direction.

AMA SECRETARY MAKES A FORECAST

In October 1947 Dr. Donald G. Anderson, the new secretary of the AMA council, stated, "We are prepared to contend that the maximum deficit that could possibly be forecast for 1960 does not exceed 15,000 physicians."

Anderson's words were couched in terms designed to minimize the problem. Yet they amounted to a startling admission. For according to the 1950 American Medical Directory, there are about 200,000 physicians for more than 150,000,000 Americans; an average of 1 doctor for every 750 persons. Since this includes doctors doing research and other work not directly connected with the care of patients, the actual number of persons per general practitioner is estimated to run as high as 1,500. Taking 1,000 as a conservative figure, what Anderson was actually saying was that approximately 1 in every 10 of us would be without doctors in 1960, or that all of us would be averaging 10 percent less medical service than we needed and were willing to pay for.

A similar situation of chronic shortage has been developing in the other health-service professions.

We have only 280,500 professional nurses. Right now, without allowing for the expanding needs of the armed services, 74,000 more are required. But enrollments in our schools of nursing have dropped to less than two-thirds of the wartime peak.

We have 75,000 practicing dentists. By 1960, the United States Public Health Service reports, we will need at least 95,000. But our dental schools can't train enough, unless their capacity is substantially increased. A continuing deficit of at least 5,000 dentists looms.

The same is true for nursing teachers, doctors of public health, sanitary engineers and all the other groups of specialized health technicians. Far from overcoming these deficits, we have been falling ever further behind in training new medical personnel.

In 1910, our medical schools graduated 4,440 students, producing one new doctor for every 20,000 of our population, By 1940 the number of graduates had increased to 5,097, but the growth of population had far outstripped the increase in doctors. In that year we produced only one doctor for every 26,000 of our people. In 1950 our physician output amounted to 5,553. But, once again, it did not keep pace with population growth. We produced this year only one new doctor for every 27,000 people.

Worst of all, our schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing and public health find themselves in a deep and growing financial crisis. Their costs have been mounting, but their income has not nearly kept pace.

This country's 79 medical schools, for example, had a total budget last year of more than $61,000,000. They had to spend an average of $2,577 for every student. But their tuition fees averaged only $548. Income from research grants, endowments, State appropriations, and all other sources still left a gap of more than $10,000,000.

More than three-quarters of the 44 privately owned medical schools have been operating at a deficit. Even a number of the tax-supported State schools have been running into the red. According to the American Medical Association, only 8 schools reported, a year ago, that they did not stand in urgent need of additional operating funds to meet essential costs.

The same situation has been hog-tying our other health education schools. Dental colleges, with an average tuition fee of $500 a year per student, have had to find $2,000 per year to cover the cost of educating each person. The schools of public health, with tuition fees averaging only $440, have actually been spending an average of seven times as much per student.

Even the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, when it surveyed the sorry situation of the medical schools more than 2 years ago, found that they needed an additional $15,000,000 a year to support their operations and nearly $200,000,000 of capital funds to construct urgently needed facilities.

In the words of Herbert Hoover, "Our medical educational system is woefully inadequate for the conduct of our national defense and our Federal hospitals for veterans and others. And it is doubly inadequate for the needs of the people generally."

In the event of all-out war, no other nonindustrial bottleneck will do more to endanger our chances for victory than these shortages of medical personnel. For we shall need more doctors and nurses than ever before in our history.

Our armed services will be compelled to drain the home front of tens of thousands of doctors. But home-front needs will be infinitely greater than they were in the past.

WHEN WAR RAVAGES THE HOME FRONT

Listen, for example, to the carefully weighed words of Dr. P. J. Carroll, dean of the School of Medicine of Creighton University in Omaha. "In the event of another world war," Dr. Carroll warns, "we shall not be able to leave the civilian population without adequate medical services as was done during the last war. There was no conflict or even a threat of conflict within our borders. The next war will be different. Our large cities will be enemy targets and a large part of our population will be evacuated. It will be necessary to disperse our civilian population in small concentrations, away from military installations. The greater the dispersion of our people the greater will be the need for more physicians."

It is this dilemma—the need for more doctors and nurses for the services, coupled with a multiplied need for the same doctors and nurses at home—that is giving sleepless nights to the experts of the National Security Resources Board and the other agencies whose duty it is to prepare for both mobilization and civil defense.

They have no hope of really solving the problem in the sense of having enough doctors and nurses both to meet all military needs and fully to protect civilian health. Our chance to achieve that goal has been frittered away in 5 years of inaction since the end of World War II.

The best they can hope for, today, is to arrive somehow at a formula that will equalize the shortage, a scheme that will go as far as possible toward taking care of military needs without leaving us utterly stripped of medical resources to meet ordinary civilian needs—plus the tremendous medical demands of atomic or bacteriological defense.

The experts have one other hope. Given a few years of even partial peace, the training of large numbers of doctors, dentists, nurses and technicians might be started—if the program got a great shot in the arm.

Faced with this alarming situation, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, bitterly split between proponents of national health insurance and those who fight it as "socialized medicine," decided in the spring of 1949 to separate the problem of medical education from its long-stymied omnibus National Health Act. This, the Senators felt, might lead to something they all could agree on to aid the medical and other health education schools.

A bill was drawn up to provide Federal subsidies ($500 per student in the case of medical schools) to help meet current operating deficits. Additional sums were to be available for any school that increased its roster. And to aid the schools in expanding their physical facilities, grants of $5,000,000 a year were to be allotted for construction and equipment.

This bill was sponsored not only by such Fair Dealers as Senators JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, and CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, but also by two outstanding Republicans, Senators ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, and FORREST DONNELL, of Missouri. The Hoover Commission backed its principles. President Truman got behind it. The Association of American Medical Colleges anxiously urged its passage. Most of the State-owned medical schools supported it. The privately owned medical schools were almost unanimous in their endorsement.

Nevertheless, anxious to meet all possible objections, the Senate committee followed up its public hearings with a week-long series of conferences with representatives of the American Medical Association and the other health professions.

At these meetings, under the chairmanship of Lowell J. Reed, vice president of Johns Hopkins University, every conceivable objection to the original draft of the bill was freely raised and discussed.

A CONCESSION TO MEDICAL OPINION

The original measure, for example, provided for an advisory council representing the health professions, to be appointed by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator. The representatives of the American Medical Association, however, objected to giving this much influence to Oscar Ewing, the administrator, whom they deeply mistrusted as a leading advocate of compulsory health insurance. Instead they asked that the measure provide for Presidential appointment of the Advisory Council. This change was made.

The early draft of the bill provided a ceiling of 50 percent on the proportion of the budget of any school that might be met by Federal subsidies. This ceiling was designed to preserve local interest in supporting medical education and to prevent the Federal subsidy from dominating the picture. Under the formulas for subsidy, the richer and larger schools would never approach the ceiling. But the representatives of the medical schools and of the universities felt that the 50 percent figure was essential if adequate help were to be given to the most needy schools.

The American Medical Association representatives, extremely fearful of so great a Federal participation in the support of medical education, held out for a ceiling of 30 percent. Ultimately the Senate committee compromised at 40 percent.

Still wary of Federal influence, the representatives of the AMA asked that the Advisory Council be granted a veto power over the actions of the Surgeon General in administering and alloting the subsidies. The medical school deans and the other educators, who long have handled research grants administered by the Surgeon General, felt no such apprehensions. But, to keep the peace, they agreed that the bill should be changed to require the Surgeon General to promulgate regulations only "after obtaining the advice and recommendations of the Council."

Going even further to allay the AMA representatives' fear of Federal domination, the conferees recommended empowering the Advisory Council to make reports directly to Congress. This provision was designed to prevent any possibility that a politically motivated Administrator might muzzle the Council. Any conflicts between the representatives of the medical professions and the Administrator would be brought right out into the open. Once again, the safeguards sought by the AMA were written into the Senate bill.

With the sole exception of the 40-percent compromise, every change requested by the representatives of the American Medical Association at these closed-door conferences was incorporated in the committee's final version of the bill—and the bill was sponsored by every Senator on the committee, with a single exception.

To protect the schools against bureaucratic interference with their teaching programs or their methods of operation, the bill contained rigid prohibitions against Federal "direction, supervision, or control * * * with respect to personnel, curriculum, or instruction."

When the measure was reported on the floor of the Senate in August 1949 a routine objection was raised to its immediate passage by unanimous consent. At this juncture both Senators PEPPER and TAFT, long bitter opponents on most other questions concerning the public health, stood up and urged their colleagues to support the measure. Two weeks later, when the bill again appeared on the calendar, it passed unanimously.

FEARED TACTICS OF LOBBYISTS

The worried deans and directors of the medical, dental, and nursing schools breathed a sigh of relief. For, they figured, if the American Medical Association were opposed to the bill its powerful Washington lobby would have shown its hand in the Senate, would have blocked this measure (as it had blocked many others) in committee or, at a very minimum, would have forced a debate and a counting of noses on the Senate floor.

For the AMA lobby is powerful indeed. It operates through two channels. Officially the AMA is represented by Dr. Joseph S. Lawrence, director of its Washington office. But the real power behind the scenes is the California publicity firm of Whitaker & Baxter which, for the last 2 years, has been directing the American Medical Association's well-heeled national education campaign—aimed at preventing passage of the administration's compulsory health insurance program. Lawrence and Witaker & Baxter are registered with Congress as lobbyists.

Many of the medical school deans, unversed in the intricacies of politics, felt so certain that the aid to medical education bill would easily pass the House that they authorized the enrollment of larger classes than their schools had handled at any time since the war. The number of freshmen admitted to medical schools jumped, in 1950, by 5.3 percent over the preceding year.

AMENDED TO MEET OBJECTIONS

In the House, the Biemiller bill, a duplicate of the Senate measure, again received bipartisan support. Representative HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, former Republican National Committee chairman and long-time opponent of socialized medicine, joined with Democratic Congressman ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, of Wisconsin, in sponsoring amendments to the original House bill to make it meet the AMA objections brought forth in the Lowell Reed conferences. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce promptly reported favorably on the altered bill.

By then, late in the session, it was necessary for the House Rules Committee to speed action on the measure if the whole House was to vote on it without delay. This procedure promised to be routine.

But suddenly the applecart was upset.

A small group of insurgent members of nurses' organizations in Georgia and North Carolina, and the owner of a private hospital in the latter State, got the impression that the measure would somehow set up the American Nursing Association as an accrediting body for all nursing schools—and thus force the closing down, for lack of accreditation, of some of the less qualified schools in the southern States.

On behalf of this group, Representative ROBERT L. (MULEY) DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, protested to the Rules Committee. The sponsors of the bill offered to amend the measure to overcome this objection. That satisfied DOUGHTON, and he withdrew his protest.

But the Biemiller bill had, by then, been labeled "controversial." The Rules Committee, fearful of setting a precedent that would throw a host of other controversial measures onto the House floor in the last 2 weeks of the session, withheld its approval. The bill was held up until Congress could meet again, in 1950.

Even after Congress adjourned, the American Medical Association's opposition had not crystallized. Early in December 1949, the House of Delegates of the AMA met in Washington and approved a report of its council on medical examination and hospitals which declared that, "While the council is not entirely satisfied with the bill, it does incorporate several modifications suggested by the council's representatives and it is a distinct improvement over any other bill for Federal aid to medical education that has been introduced."

The report added, "The council is aware that Federal aid to medical education creates definite hazards to the continued freedom and independence of the medical schools. With few exceptions, however, the medical schools and their parent universities have expressed the opinion that, unless additional aid is provided, medical education in this country cannot achieve its full development. The legislation which has been passed by the Senate contains safeguards that should protect the medical schools from unwarranted interference in their affairs by the Federal Government."

SUDDEN CHANGE OF SENTIMENT

Less than 2 months later the AMA completely changed its tune. At a conference of its national education campaign, Louis H. Bauer, M. D., chairman of the board of trustees, stated the AMA's position on pending legislation. The aid to medical education measure was added to the long list of bills which the AMA opposed.

Said Bauer, "As the bill is presently drawn, we feel it would give the Government a foot in the door—in fact, probably 2 feet in the door—for Federal control of medical education. There are certain very drastic amendments which will have to be made to that bill before we can approve it."

The strategy behind this shift in position was explained by Clem Whitaker, head of Whitaker & Baxter, who called the aid to education measure a "fringe bill" which, he said, "masked hidden threats."

"Instead of being confronted with the task of defeating a revolutionary program of Government medicine, embodied in a single proposal, or in companion bills," Whitaker continued, "we are now faced with a series of measures—disarming in language but dangerous in their provisions—some of which must be beaten and some drastically changed or amended."

In the face of this attack, the House sponsors of the aid-to-medical-education bill tried to go even further than did their Senate colleagues in meeting AMA objections. The Senate compromise which set subsidy maximums at 40 percent was dropped and replaced by the figure of 30 percent, which the AMA's representatives had originally asked for.

The clause guaranteeing academic freedom from Federal interference was revised and enlarged, at the suggestion of the AMA's Dr. Donald G. Anderson, so that every detail of protection could be carefully spelled out in the bill itself.

The provisions governing the promulgation of regulations were altered, again in keeping with earlier AMA suggestions. In the latest version of the bill, the professional Advisory Council would have to approve any regulation of the Surgeon General before it could take effect.

The AMA's friends on the House subcommittee kept it working over revisions until late last May, in what Representative BIEMILLER characterized as a stalling-twisting-turning-conniving policy of compromise and then oppose the compromise. Finally, with subcommittee approval won at last, the Biemiller bill came before full Interstate Commerce Committee on June 19 only to be defeated by a one-vote margin.

On June 25, employing a parliamentary device, BIEMILLER got the matter again before the Commerce Committee in the form of a new bill incorporating all the amendments that had been tacked onto the old one. Once again he lost out by a single vote. The committee decided not to consider the bill until after August 8, when—as it then appeared—Congress would have adjourned and gone home.

But the outbreak of the Korean war did two things. It changed plans for adjournment, and it served to highlight the urgency of drastic action to get medical education into high gear. When the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, our armed services had 5,844 physicians on their rolls. They needed about 1,550 more.

The Army, whose need was the most desperate, sent out a call to 3,000 Reserve lieutenants and captains in the Medical Corps, requesting their return to service. Only 200 replied, and of these only 15 volunteered.

By mid-August it became apparent that voluntary enlistments of physicians and nurses would never begin to meet the service's needs, even for a limited mobilization. The Defense Department found itself compelled to run to Congress for the hurried passage of a doctors-draft bill. First on the list were 7,500 young doctors and dentists who had received their medical education at Government expense while deferred from active military service during World War II. But the draft bill was not limited to these men alone. It authorized the President to order a general registration and induction of physicians up to the age of 55 and of dentists through the age of 45.

To meet the needs of a 3,000,000-man force, the armed services will have to drain from civilian life substantially more than 5,000 physicians and proportionately large numbers of dentists, nurses, and technicians.

Thus the initial stages of the crisis anticipated by the proponents of the aid to medical education bills are already upon us.

Any further expansion of the armed services will require additional levies against our already short-handed civilian health personnel. All-out war, on a global scale, will require well over 42,000 of our youngest and most active physicians.

Facing up to this crisis, Representative BIEMILLER led a strenuous campaign in Congress all through last July and August to get the aid-to-medical-education measure reported out to the House. Day after day he read into the RECORD endorsements of the bill's passage: By Dean George W. Bakeman, of the Medical College of Virginia; by Dean Murray Kinsman, of the University of Louisville; by Dr. A. C. Ivy, vice president of the University of Illinois; Dean Willard C. Rappleye, of Columbia University; Chancellor Robert Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, and many others.

HOW MEDICAL SCHOOLS VOTED

Dean Joseph C. Hisey, of Cornell University, chairman of the executive council of the Association of American Medical Colleges, wrote that a poll of its membership showed 47 schools favoring the bill and only 16 opposed. He disavowed the action of the AMA as "taken independently of our association * * * and without a poll of our membership."

The deans of all the schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health in Massachusetts, including Harvard, Tufts, and Boston University, declared, "We are convinced that the present desperate plight of our professional schools, not only in Massachusetts, but throughout the United States, has already interfered with the quality of professional education and is preventing the development of adequate medical and health personnel for the country.

"We make this statement," they add, "in full awareness of the position recently taken by the American Medical Association. We vigorously oppose that position."

Despite this campaign, the AMA opposition once again carried the day. On August 16, the Biemiller bill, which President Truman had characterized as "the most vital health legislation before Congress," was tabled in the Interstate Commerce Committee by a 9 to 8 vote.

Protesting this action, Dean James S. Simmons, of Harvard University, called it a tragic mistake and a crippling blow to the Nation's military and civil preparedness program.

Scores of similar protests flooded in upon Congress. But, last August 30, the House Interstate Commerce Committee again decided to table the program. Shortly thereafter, Congress recessed.

Despite this tendency on the part of Congress and the AMA to look the other way, the grave problem of medical shortages still exists, and the pressure is mounting for some action to solve it. Among those plugging for such a move is Bernard M. Baruch. "I am not in favor of socialized medicine," the famed adviser to Presidents said recently, "but the medical profession has got to do something to meet the needs of the masses. The first way is to increase the output of doctors."

Thus it appears certain that the next Congress will find itself confronted with the same hot potato—unless some alternative method of enlarging our health training schools can be discovered.

But are there any alternatives?

Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, has offered one suggestion: a change in premedical education. If this were eliminated or cut down as a requirement for entering medical schools a few hundred doctors might graduate a year or so sooner—if the schools could find room for them as students. But, since the real bottleneck causing the doctor shortage lies in the medical schools themselves, Dr. Rappleye's proposal does not touch the core of the problem.

SUGGESTS ABOLISHING INTERNS

Dr. William Lee Hart, dean of the University of Texas' Southwestern Medical School, has proposed the abolition of internships and their replacement by a year of apprenticeship under older doctors. This proposal is certain to meet the stiffest opposition from both the American Medical Association and the thousands of hospitals whose entire setup is dependent upon a continued supply of interns. But even if adopted, it would merely shift young physicians from the hospitals, where they are sorely needed, into doctors' offices.

The most likely alternative to Federal subsidies for medical education is the idea of a voluntary fund to raise money, free from Federal control. The American Medical Association has long toyed with this idea. Last January, a National Fund for Medical Education was actually incorporated under the honorary chairmanship of Herbert Hoover. Its board of trustees—from Winthrop Aldrich to George Whitney—is diamond-studded with leaders of industry, finance, and banking. Its objective is worthy. Its personnel is top-notch. If ever a fund-raising plan were capable of achieving its full potential, this would appear to be the one.

Yet, what is that potential? In its prospectus, addressed to leading industrialists, the fund detailed the medical schools' need to overcome a $10,000,000 deficit. But it proposed to raise, through voluntary subscriptions, only $1,000,000. The balance, the prospectus conceded, would have to come from the Federal Treasury.

TO PRESERVE ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The best the fund could hope for was that private sources for support might be "stimulated" so that "there will be created a balance under which the academic freedom essential to scientific medical education will be preserved."

Thus, the voluntary fund-raising organization turns out to be, at best, only a partial supplement to Federal aid; a 10 percent counterweight rather than a full-fledged substitute.

There may be still other ways of achieving the necessary expansion of medical and health education. But if there are, 5 years of searching by the medical schools themselves and by the American Medical Association have not turned them up.

Thus, Congress, when it meets again, will have the old doctor-shortage headache on its hands once more. To the pressure from the President, from public-health officials, from the universities, and from almost all of our schools of health education, there will now be added a further tremendous pressure from the Defense Department, made acutely aware, by the Korean crisis, of the weakness in our medical armament.

Whether the American Medical Association can buck this tidal wave remains to be seen.

But one thing is certain. Unless immediate steps are taken to solve our chronic and growing shortage of medical, dental, nursing, and public-health personnel, your health—and that of your family, your neighbors and your sons in the services—will be jeopardized for years to come.

Secretary Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Lowell Mellett column and the Washington Sunday Star editorial which appear

below may help those who have lost perspective to regain it:

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 9, 1950]

ACHESON IS UNFAIRLY CHOSEN FOR ROLE OF SCAPEGOAT FOR DISASTER IN KOREA

(By Lowell Mellett)

The past week has not been one we are likely to remember with much pride. This is so, not because of the tragic turn of events in Korea where our troops have had to give way before the overwhelming numbers of the enemy. Indeed, there is cause for great pride in the heroic behavior of the troops themselves. But the day will come when we surely will hang our heads in shame as we remember the conduct of many of our leaders on the home front. This has particular reference to certain members of the United States Senate.

It is not strange that the shattering impact of the military reversal should have caused them to become jittery. That can be condoned. Most everybody was affected the same way. But it is another matter when they take cowardly refuge behind confusion of their own creation and endeavor to escape their share of responsibility for the situation we are in. That is what these Senators are doing.

EVERYBODY TO BLAME

When the war was going well in Korea, when it had become clear that the North Korean armies could and would be driven out of South Korea, an important decision had to be made. Should we stop at the thirty-eighth parallel or carry the conflict on to the Manchurian border? The decision was made to go the whole way. The result everybody knows: The present disaster.

There is no point now in arguing the wisdom of the decision made. It is quite possible that Red China, which had threatened to enter the fight if we passed the thirty-eighth parallel, was prepared to enter it whether we did so or not. The size, the organization and the equipment of the armies she has thrown against us suggest long planning and preparation.

Wisely, or unwisely we precipitated the immediate invasion. If unwisely, who is to blame? Everybody. Not President Truman, not Secretary Acheson, not General Marshall and not General MacArthur. General MacArthur could not have proceeded without the sanction of his superiors in Washington and he had that sanction. President Truman could not have authorized General MacArthur's action without the approval of Congress and there are few in Congress dishonest enough now to say they disapproved. And beyond Congress there was the sanction of the United Nations, despite some dissenting voices.

MUST HAVE SCAPEGOAT

Yet these Senators must have a scapegoat to turn attention from themselves and, naturally, they have undertaken to make Secretary Acheson that scapegoat. A long campaign of abuse and misrepresentation, stepped up to an extreme in the effort to win the congressional elections, had prepared him for the role. How little he actually merits it and how unfair it is to bestow it on him will be realized by anybody who thinks back a few weeks.

It has been only a short time since Mr. Acheson was being charged with interfering with General MacArthur's conduct of the war and specifically with trying to tell General MacArthur that he must stop at the thirty-eighth parallel. This the Secretary, of course, denied and he was supported in his denial by the President. Both backed the General. If that was a mistake, they are guilty. But it ill behooves their present critics to say so, since it was they who were shrillest in demanding that we do just what we did.

Yet now these same Senators insist that the President ask for Mr. Acheson's resignation. Joining the clamor, Senator IVES says we must have some one in whom we can have confidence. Senator IVES, however, does not and cannot assure us that his frantic colleagues would not set themselves to destroy, as fast as they are able, any confidence the country might have in any man that could be named.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of December 10, 1950]

MR. ACHESON: RIGHT OR WRONG?

The Republican contingent in the Senate will decide this week whether the demand for Secretary Acheson's resignation is to be made a party matter. The Senators should think long and carefully before coming to their decision.

Those who are clamoring for Mr. Acheson's official scalp have an argument which runs something like this: The Secretary of State has lost the confidence of the American people. Therefore, he must go. It doesn't matter whether the things that are being said about him are true or not.

The Star thinks that it does matter.

If Mr. Acheson has failed as Secretary of State, if he is responsible for faulty decisions that have been injurious to the country, then there can be no argument. He should be replaced. But this is not something that should be taken for granted, or that should be believed merely because somebody says that it is true. Where is the evidence? What decisions are the critics talking about?

Again, if it is true that Mr. Acheson no longer enjoys the confidence of the people, if it is a fact that he has become a liability rather than an asset, then the President may have to replace him. In a time such as this, national considerations should come first. But these "ifs" are big "ifs." Where is the proof that the people have lost confidence in Mr. Acheson? Some have, without doubt, but what about the majority? The speeches of Senators, who may or may not be influenced by partisan motives, are not necessarily in harmony with the sentiment of a majority of the people in this country.

There is another point that should be considered. Glib arguments to the contrary, the difference between doing the right thing and the wrong thing is something that does matter. If Mr. Acheson, on the whole record, has done a creditable job as Secretary of State, and the Star believes that he has, the right thing to do is to support him. The wrong thing would be to throw him to the wolves for the sake of a harmony which probably would be both illusory and of brief duration.

This country is going through a period of great trial. The temptation to do the expedient thing is strong. But when we have passed through whatever lies ahead, all of us will feel better in our hearts and in our consciences if we can look back and say that we have tried to do the right thing, that we have not permitted any one to stampede us into accepting the doctrine that the difference between right and wrong is something that doesn't matter.

Address of Hon. Frank Pace, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present an able speech delivered by the Honorable Frank Pace, Jr., Secretary of the Army, at Asbury Park, N. J., on Saturday, October 7, 1950. It follows:

I am extremely happy to be here with you tonight, for this occasion gives me an opportunity I have looked forward to for nearly 2 months—an opportunity to tell a more complete story of our military effort in Korea during the dark, bitter days that marked the opening weeks of this historic campaign.

I can think of no more appropriate group to hear this story than an organization such as yours, made up of veterans of other dark and bitter days. I am especially happy that this story also can be heard in homes throughout America tonight, for it is a proud record of American heroism which all Americans need to know. But I tell this story also for the light that this whole grim experience sheds upon our present situation, and our future problems.

First, I would remind you that when the powerful Communist armies of North Korea brutally attacked the free and independent Republic of Korea, without warning and without provocation, history paused momentarily at a crossroads. This lawless aggression was a brazen challenge to the authority and force of the United Nations. If allowed to pass by, unchecked and unpunished, it would have provided an open invitation for a series of such aggressions throughout the world. These eventually would have destroyed peace and security for all of us and our friends, delaying for another generation, and perhaps forever, our dream of a lasting and universal peace.

The United Nations rose promptly and memorably to this challenge. It condemned the aggression, ordered it stopped, and called upon all member nations for support of its order. In one of history's most thrilling moments, the free nations of the world, large and small, pledged their arms, their resources, and their hearts in support of the United Nations order.

But this unfortunately was not enough to stop the invading Communist armies. Living by force, they respect only force—and force was required to stop them. The lightly armed troops of the Republic of Korea, trained and equipped only for internal security, were falling back rapidly, suffering appalling losses.

In the face of this crisis, our Nation gave everlasting proof that a democracy can move quickly and decisively to meet grave problems. The United States, by far the most powerful of the free nations, and the only one with any military force within range of the Korean action, without hesitation threw in air and sea elements from nearby Japan. Our aircraft and our ships quickly gained complete control of the skies and the seas in the fighting zone, giving courageous support to the sorely pressed South Korean ground forces. But the inevitable truth of warfare became quickly apparent—that it takes an army to stop an army.

Our divisions on occupation duty in Japan were not equipped or manned for this type of action. They were at reduced peacetime strength levels, and, because of overseas rotation policies, they included, as they always do, a certain percentage of newly arrived recruits. Despite the fact that these units had not completed the requisite cycle of training after having been relieved of their diverse and scattered duties of military government in Japan, they moved without delay into the Korean conflict. We knew that they would face grave difficulties, calling for the utmost in courage, skill, and leadership. But we sent them in unhesitatingly, in accordance with our solemn obligation to the other nations united with us in the cause of restoring the peace.

The first to arrive were two rifle companies and a weapons company of the Twenty-

fourth Infantry Division. These 700 lightly equipped American soldiers were loaded into planes on a few hours' notice on July 2 and were flown through driving rains to Korea. They went into action on July 4, flinging themselves into the face of an entire division in the full momentum of its unchecked advance.

I cannot tell you their whole story. Only the handful of these men who are still living could tell that story, and the chances are they never will attempt it. I can only tell you that they held their first established position for seven terrible hours against fantastic odds and then withdrew only because they had run out of ammunition.

Within the next few days the remaining combat elements of the Twenty-fourth Infantry Division were rushed into the lines, and within another week the Twenty-fifth Division was committed, but we were still greatly outnumbered and outgunned.

The horror and the heroism of those first 2 weeks can never be known, but the results were an inspiration to the entire free world. These few thousand American soldiers fought superbly through one of the most bitter, the most vicious, the most difficult campaigns in our military history. Even the green, incompletely trained, recent arrivals became toughened veterans overnight. Although outnumbered 15 to 1, they held back this powerful enemy, delaying him and forcing him to redeploy his forces. They gave ground grudgingly, buying precious time with their courage and their blood, so we and the other United Nations could gird ourselves for the decisive counter strokes that came later.

At the beginning of the third week, on July 18, the First Cavalry Division completed in record time the first amphibious landing by United States ground forces, and our torn and battered lines were again bolstered.

Meanwhile, our stand had permitted the shattered remnants of the South Korean Army to regroup, reorganize, and reequip themselves for the battle. This they did with amazing speed, and by mid-July they had five divisions—more than 50,000 veteran fighting soldiers—back in the lines. From that day on they have fought fiercely and well, with outstanding success.

That these defeated and exhausted men could be welded so quickly into an effective fighting force is an everlasting tribute to the Korean nation. It is also, I believe, a measure of what may be expected from all Asiatic peoples when given the means and the opportunity to fight for the freedom they have sought so long.

I also want to give long-overdue credit to a little-known group of United States Army officers and men whose contribution during those early days was outstanding in every way. I refer to the Korean military advisory group, the so-called K-MAG, made up of 500 officers and men who had been stationed in South Korea for nearly a year assisting the new Republic to organize and train its security forces. Scattered among various units of the South Korean Army, these men caught the full force of the initial attack. They remained with their respective South Korean units as long as the units existed as such. They helped them reassemble and reorganize, and when those units reentered the battle our K-MAG officers and men went in with them. They are still with them. The contribution of those men has been little publicized, but it has been immeasurable.

Thus, largely through the extraordinary efforts of a few thousand United States Army officers and men, backed up by superb air and naval support by American and other United Nations planes and ships, we were able successfully to complete what has been called by many experts one of the most brilliant delaying actions in military history. Precious time was bought with reluctantly surrendered space, and by August 3, just 30 days after our first units went in, we had withdrawn successfully to the Naktong River line, where a firm perimeter could be established. True, it was a 120-mile perimeter held by only three battered American divisions and five understrength South Korean divisions, but the line held.

A few days later the Second Infantry Division and the First Marine Brigade arrived from the United States, along with other Army units from outlying Pacific garrisons. On August 7, with this build-up of the reserve strength we had needed so long, we staged our first major counteroffensive. This powerful drive by a large Army force, supported by the 3,000 newly arrived marines who performed in the best traditions of the corps in their first Korean battle test, was a complete success.

Since then there has been much heavy fighting and many brave men have died, but we have been in firm control of our position. I need not describe the very recent, very thrilling victories we have enjoyed, but I will remind you that they were made possible only by the incredible 30-day stand of a few thousand American soldiers who enjoyed no military advantage on the ground except great ability, raw courage, and unqualified devotion to duty.

Now, what have we learned from this narrow escape, when history literally turned on the superhuman efforts of a few brave men?

First, I want to say proudly that Korea has proved that America's peacetime Army has been extremely well trained, and that the quality of its officers and men is of the highest. This was amply demonstrated by the job they did in the face of superior forces and more powerful weapons.

Second, Korea has proved that the Army's new weapons development has been sound. When they finally arrived for the acid test of battle, our new bazookas, our improved tanks, our recoilless rifles, our new ammunition—all proved more than a match for the best that the Communists could throw against them.

Third, Korea has proved that teamwork among the three services has been developed to an all-time high under unification, as evidenced in this first great test. Joint maneuvers, common doctrines, unified command—all have paid off in battle.

Fourth, we have been reminded again, as we have repeatedly been reminded throughout history, that wars must ultimately and inevitably be fought and won on the ground, with two opposing soldiers pitting their skills, their weapons, and their courage against each other for a piece of contested soil.

Finally, Korea has proved, with chilling certainty, that Communist imperialism now is ready to resort to open aggression to accomplish its ends, and that moral appeals must be backed up by armed strength to oppose its purposes.

Realizing this, we now know what we must do to meet this type of threat: We must be ready to meet swift, premeditated, and ruthless aggression at many potential danger spots in the world. This means we must have far more extensive armed forces than we had previously intended. It means we must at top speed help our friends and allies to prepare themselves against this threat which is poised along their borders. It means that we must build up such an armed strength throughout the free world that aggressors will not dare risk the consequences of attack upon a peaceful neighbor. It means, above all, that we must not permit the end of the Korean emergency to dilute our determination to build strength for freedom.

Every American must recognize this lesson. You veterans, in particular, who know so well that war is a dirty, sickening, destructive thing, must take the lead in assuring that our democracy is unfailing in its efforts to avoid war. We must insure that the fate of our Nation, and other free nations, will never again rest so precariously on the desperate efforts of a few gallant men. Freedom is a blessing we all enjoy. Its protection is a responsibility we all must share.

"O Ye of Little Faith"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following splendid editorial appearing in the Boston Post of December 6, 1950, entitled "O Ye of Little Faith":

"O YE OF LITTLE FAITH"

It will be 9 years tomorrow that the word was flashed to Franklin D. Roosevelt in his White House study that Pearl Harbor had been bombed and Harry Hopkins, who was present, cried aloud: "This is it."

For more than a year the war had been on the horizon of America. In retrospect, the vivid events, rolling nearer and nearer, made it inevitable. But we, recalling World War I—the vain sacrifices and the duplicity—refused to think that again we would be engulfed.

The days that followed December 7 were glowering and the nights fringed with flame. Pearl Harbor, the Philippines, and Wake—across the islands of the Pacific as if they were stepping stones there marched to the shores of Australia an unstoppable, relentless, cruel, and vainglorious Asiatic horde.

Then they turned on Alaska, alarming mainland America. The threat to the west coast was realistic. A mighty fleet and a blooded army which had conquered China with all her vast multimillions shook America as it had not been shaken since the first Battle of Bull Run.

But in those black mornings, the long, black mornings before the sun came up, men shone like beacons—Devereux with his magnificent handful of marines, Colin Kelly obliterating a Nipponese dreadnaught, MacArthur making the Japs pay bitterly for every rod they bought as they slithered through the jungles of Bataan and "Skinny" Wainwright, as rocklike as Corregidor until his tattered battalions could fight no longer.

They are history, golden and imperishable. But fresh chapters are now being made by statesmen speaking sharply, deftly, defiantly or deferentially, according to the moment's mood or the side they are on, at Lake Success and Flushing Meadows.

And chapters, too, are being added by other statesmen, hurrying on errands across the Channel to 10 Downing Street, or across the Atlantic to Washington, where they hold the eyes and ears of men and women world-wide who asked for the palm of peace and have been handed the burning stone of battle.

But it is against the back drop of the cold, hard hills of Korea, snow on them and the temperature striking far below zero, that the sands in the hourglass of mankind drip these critical nights and days.

Outnumbered five to one, facing hordes as fanatical as the throngs of Tojo—the valiant South Koreans, the unbroken Americans, the hard-bitten British and the tough Turks—engaged in a vast, tactical retreat, move back to new lines of defense.

It has not been a rout. They still are armies, regiments, battalions, platoons, and squads. They ride their excellent armor or

pause to slow down their pursuers with unshaking guns. They have not asked to be evacuated. They have not thrown their weapons away and run for it.

On the eve of Pearl Harbor, remembering that from there we went on to win the greatest victory that ever crowned the arms of a nation, let us keep faith in the United Nations, in our Allies and, particularly, in the men who at the moment bear the brunt of the battle, lest in a later day, when they shall stand victorious they will not look at us and say, "O ye of little faith."

Why Feed the Flames of Inflation With a Fake Excess-Profits Tax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 11, 1950, there appeared in the New York Times an article by Edward H. Collins with reference to the excess-profits tax.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks:

ECONOMICS AND FINANCE—THE EXCESS-PROFITS TAX: THE SENATE'S RESPONSIBILITY

(By Edward H. Collins)

As the House last week was approving the administration's version of an excess-profits tax with minor modifications, the Senate Finance Committee began hearings preliminary to writing a companion measure.

On Wednesday during the testimony of a spokesman for an industrial group Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, broke in to offer this witness and other critics of the excess-profits tax a friendly admonition. Business, the ranking Republican member of the committee suggested, would do well to consider the wisdom of reconciling itself to the enactment of an excess-profits tax. Senator MILLIKIN'S views were seconded by Senator WALTER GEORGE, the Finance Committee's chairman. "Even if business could get Congress to drop the excess-profits tax in favor of some alternative form of tax at this time," observed the No. 1 tax authority of the upper Chamber, "it still might get an excess-profits tax on top of all that."

In the opinion of the present writer business would do well to heed the counsel of these two veteran Senators. It is not only sensible advice; it is advice from a sympathetic quarter. Business, in this instance, as in too many others, has shown, it seems to this column, a singular, if unintentional disregard for public sentiment. It is unfortunate that Congress went off the deep end emotionally and politically on the excess-profits tax before adjournment last September. The fact remains, however, that it did, and that the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee in consequence are under a mandate to produce such a tax, either now or early in 1951.

This alone should have persuaded the committee that the only course was to accept the inevitability of the excess-profits tax and to concentrate on seeing that the country got a measure that was an improvement over its predecessor of World War II. Since September, of course, the whole timetable of war preparation has been telescoped, and with it the whole wartime fiscal program. If there is one thing that now seems certain it is that before the present emergency has passed into history we shall find it necessary to pull all the stops so far as the raising of revenue is concerned. It is not going to be a question of this tax or that tax, but of this tax and that tax.

But if the spokesmen for business have erred in their judgment in this case (and even that, of course, is a matter of personal opinion) there is nothing in their performance of which they need feel ashamed. They have opposed the excess-profits tax, yes; but they have opposed it openly and honestly out of a sincere conviction that there were simpler, more effective and more equitable methods of taxation available. They have given earnest of their good faith on this point by proposing or supporting alternative plans which would have involved the acceptance of substantially higher tax burdens.

The worst that can be said of the record of business on the excess-profits tax is that it has shown a lack of political "savvy." But when we stand its performance alongside that of the administration this deficiency almost takes on the luminous quality of a positive virtue. For in its approach to this problem the administration has demonstrated that even in dealing with matters of vital national financial policy in the very shadow of war it continues to place its political obligation to the labor unions above the interests of the Nation as a whole. This is a gravely disturbing conclusion to have to reach, but the simple, unavoidable fact is that on the face of the record no other conclusion is possible.

The tax plan introduced by Secretary Snyder, written into legislation by the Ways and Means Committee, and passed by the House last week is the same plan that union leaders have been demanding every time the tax question has come up since 1947 when it was put forward on the pretext that it would prevent the inflation then threatened by the introduction of the Marshall plan. Indeed, though it is perhaps generally forgotten, Mr. Truman tried once before to carry out the wishes of the unions with respect to this measure. It was one of the items included in the catch-all anti-inflation plan thrown into the lap of Congress on July 17, 1948. But, no one entertained the proposal seriously at that time, it being universally assumed that it was just a preliminary to the Presidential political campaign then getting under way.

The role of the wartime excess-profits tax is the desirable, but strictly limited one of recapturing wartime windfall profits. Because this is so, you don't approach the writing of such a tax with the idea of raising some preconceived amount of revenue. As the New York Herald Tribune well stated it recently, you decide what you mean by profits in excess of normal, choose tax rates that won't be oppressive or encourage wasteful spending, and then estimate the yield. Then if you need more Federal revenue you'll have to add other types of taxes, for you have already tapped excess profits.

In trying to adapt the concept of the wartime excess-profits tax to fit an arbitrarily predetermined figure, the administration has either deliberately or mistakenly stretched it to the point where it has become a wartime tax applied to peacetime profits. The implications of this fact go far beyond the matter of the immediate inequities that it produces. This legislation, if permitted to stand in its present form, will set a precedent whose long-term consequence to the economy could well be not merely serious but disastrous. That is the principle that the Government may at any time, in war or in peace, establish a fair return for our private industries and thereupon proceed to expropriate in the name of an excess-profits tax everything above that figure.

North Pacific Flour Mills Still Running Below National Output

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the North Pacific flour mills is one which calls for possible consideration and action by Congress. Very clearly, it calls for relief through action by the Department of Agriculture through the Commodity Credit Corporation. Thus far such relief has not been forthcoming. For the information of the Members of the House, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following data dealing with the situation:

NORTH PACIFIC FLOUR MILLS STILL RUNNING BELOW NATIONAL OUTPUT

Production of what flour from mills of the North Pacific area, comprising Washington, Oregon, and North Idaho, continued to fall behind the national output during October, according to statistics released by the Bureau of the Census and by industry leaders.

While flour mills nationally operated at 74.5 percent of capacity during October, Earl C. Corey, Inc., of Portland, Oreg., reported operation of mills in the Pacific Northwest as follows:

	Percent
Washington and Oregon port mills	68.8
Washington interior and North Idaho mills	47.3
Oregon interior mills	71.4

By contrast, flour mills in South Idaho and Utah operated at 94.4 percent of capacity during October, while mills in California operated at 86 percent of capacity, Corey reported.

The North Pacific Independent Millers contend this loss of production is caused mainly by a dislocation of the agriculture support price formula on wheat, which makes it impossible for them to compete with mills of the Intermountain and California areas in markets which for many years had been served chiefly by Pacific Northwest mills. A second cause is the loss of Asiatic markets due to war conditions and cut-price competition from other countries.

The rate at which this decline has hit the North Pacific milling industry is indicated on the tables which follow. The trend has caused unemployment of nearly half the area's cereal workers and has resulted in an acute shortage of mill-feeds needed by the poultry and dairy industries.

Summary of wheat flour production in Pacific Northwest

State	Average monthly production [1]				Percent change
	1947	1948	1949	1950 [2]	
	Thous. of 100-pound sacks	*Thous. of 100-pound sacks*	*Thous. of 100-pound sacks*	*Thous. of 100-pound sacks*	*1947-50*
Washington	1,053	983	794	776	−26
Oregon	618	491	419	387	−52
California	405	333	363	384	−5
Utah	308	309	304	313	+1
National	25,458	23,261	19,529	18,748	−22

[1] Based on monthly reports of Census Bureau.
[2] Averages for first 9 months.

Relative rank of Pacific States in national flour production [1]

[Figures in columns below indicate comparative rank of States indicated in flour production for years shown. Note decline of Washington and Oregon, steady rise of Utah, California, and Colorado]

	Washington	Oregon	Utah	California	Colorado
1927	5	13	23	12	18
1930	7	11	19	13	16
1935	7	9	21	13	18
1940	7	10	20	14	19
1945	7	10	21	12	14
1947	8	11	21	13	12
1949	9	11	15	13	12
1950 [2]	9	11	13	11	12

[1] Based on monthly reports of Census Bureau.
[2] Averages for first 9 months.

May God Grant Us Some Real Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Record-Herald, Washington Court House, Ohio, for December 8, 1950:

MAY GOD GRANT US SOME REAL LEADERSHIP

Millions of Americans, honest, patriotic, God-fearing people, today are looking toward Washington, D. C., with an anxiety closely bordering upon dread and alarm.

They are desperately afraid of what they are seeing. In their eyes our wonderful country has drifted into a crisis which easily can lead us into disaster such as none of us dare to let ourselves contemplate.

We are totally agreed that down at Washington, D. C., we need strong and resolute leadership; a determined and purposeful policy that will command confidence and respect. Instead we see weak and vacillating, day-to-day, twists and turns, which bespeak indecision, incompetence, and lack of fortitude. We hope that somehow and from somewhere this leadership will be forthcoming. We certainly need it.

Today the pathetic lack of confidence in national administration leadership is almost appalling. We seek to find stanch, unselfish, and patriotic guidance, but there is nothing outstanding of this character found among those who are in direct control of our ship of state.

We see an administration wrapped up in "cronyism," vital responsibilites, in many cases, in the hands of crack-pots, too many officials whose first concern seems to be the satisfying of pressure groups and political pals.

Are we on the verge of finding our country let down by a crowd that we made the mistake of electing 2 years ago upon promises of plenty of subsidies and a false prosperity joy ride of inflation with easy money based on increased indebtedness and deficit financing, a joy ride none of us seemed to know how we could pay for, and many apparently cared less?

Even more dismaying is the situation in a million American homes, where fathers, sons, and brothers stand on the brink of active participation in the anguish of another great war in which we are not quite sure what we are to fight for.

Must we continue to listen to the blandishments of two or three European countries which take all we can give them without even showing a spirit of willingness to help themselves or to show a determined attitude toward their own protection against the march of communism?

Are we about to enter a period of 2 or 3 years of appeasement and deals which will only prolong the short time before we have to come forth and make a definite decision as to where we stand and whether we are going to meet the issue squarely? Maybe appeasement can hold off trouble until after the next election, but it will not solve our big and pressing problems.

Do we have a policy other than one of a 24-hour makeshift variety?

If so, what is it and in what direction are we being carried? The people have a right to know these things by action and straight talk, not by honeyed phrases and obscure statements.

The day of "playboy" politics of the Wallgren, Vaughn, and Harriman variety should be put out of the picture completely and immediately. So should this business of profits as usual for political favorites along with a superabundance of leisure and amusement for everybody, encouraging evasion of responsibility, lack of thrift and waste without penalty.

Seemingly our only hope lies in the new Congress in January, but many unfortunate things can happen before then.

When are we going to quit whitewashing and fooling around with the dark pinks, if not Reds, identified with our national administration?

When will we stop shipping, or allowing to be shipped, strategic supplies to Red China?

When are we going to tell England and other countries either to play ball with us and quit supplying Chinese Reds, who are killing our boys? Perhaps we should stop the flow of money and supplies from American taxpayers that the English Labor Government keeps demanding from us.

We are tired of half-baked decisions made one day and rescinded the next.

The time is here for Americans to show some of that old spirit which never permitted us to bow our heads in humiliation while some other nation told us what we had to do if we didn't want to get run over.

Maybe we need public meetings in every town hall and schoolhouse. Maybe we need a million telegrams poured into Washington, D. C. Maybe we ought to show Washington, D. C., by telephone, by letter, by telegram, or personally that we mean business and that business is the preservation and safeguarding of our country.

The American people must, and soon, begin to make themselves heard in thundering tones. We are past the time of half-hearted political decisions. We are a strong united people if we have the right leadership.

May God grant that such leadership soon will be forthcoming.

Stop This Communist Swindle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Prof. Nicolas de Rochefort, of the Graduate School of Georgetown University, in answer to the hypocritical and insidious Stockholm peace appeal inspired by the Soviet Union:

AUGUST 25, 1950.

DEAR FRIEND: The Soviet propaganda campaign becomes more and more intense, and is more and more specifically directed against the United States. It presents a character of efficiency through an appeal to emotionalism that one does not find in the past American counterpropaganda. It constantly appeals to the masses; it is specifically directed toward the masses, and, therefore, its repercussions and effect are far greater.

Such a strategic propaganda effort is particularly shown in the campaign for peace, launched by the Soviets at a pro-Communist Congress in Stockholm, and which is making rapid progress in the entire world. This campaign is developing with considerable success in the United States.

It seems to me that it is necessary to combat this campaign of insidious lies by appealing to the same social group as does the campaign for peace, the masses. In order to achieve this result, I have composed an appeal to the American people, the text of which you will find joined to this communication.

This appeal is planned to be circulated throughout the entire United States in order to receive as many signatures as possible. The signatures, I feel, should come from persons representing every area of the American social structure, from the American Legion to the A. F. of L. and the CIO.

But I hope that the very first signatures will be those of the members, professors, staff, and students of our school. Our dean, Gerard F. Yates, S. J., has given his wholehearted support to this plan. I have also received the official support of the State Department, which believes that this is the first attempt to explain communism and its tactics to the masses ever conducted by a private group of persons. The State Department further feels that this campaign must progress very rapidly, in order that it may have its maximum possible effect by the first week in October—the culminating date of the communistic campaign for peace. I should appreciate very much your signature to the text of the appeal, so that Americans may join together in exposing these insidious Communist lies, as manifested in the campaign for peace.

NICOLAS DE ROCHEFORT,
Professor of Political Science, the Graduate School, Georgetown University.

STOP THIS COMMUNIST SWINDLE

A Moscow-fathered petition for peace is presently being circulated throughout the world. It is a fraud and a fake, but in the countries subjugated by Soviet Russia, it is treason to refuse to sign it. Unfortunately there are many naive persons here in the United States and elsewhere who have signed after little or no scrutiny, believing it quite natural and commendable to proclaim one's love of peace and to denounce war.

The text of the Soviet sham contains a veritable pledge to support communism and the Soviets against all comers—even one's own country. Such is the basic element of any swindle—to deceive, to confuse, to defraud. The U. S. S. R. and Communist units throughout the world work for dictatorship everywhere, and their methods do not stop short of war. From the coup of Lenin in 1919 in Russia, when a democratically elected National Assembly with a strong anti-Communist majority had just been elected, to the Communist coups in very similar circumstances in Hungary and Czechoslovakia after World War II, communism has meant the rule of the usurpers and tyrants, pretending to speak in the name of

the masses whom they despise, and whom they have enslaved.

We denounce the Stockholm petition as a contemptible fraud. The peace that it demands is a peace on Soviet terms. A veritable pledge to support communism and the U. S. S. R. against all comers, even against one's own country, is concealed in its intentionally obscure text.

Yet, loathsome as this deception is, the hypocrisy of its sponsers is even more intolerable. How dare the minions of the Soviet Government demand peace, when that government alone stands in the way of it?

Soviet Russia planned, unleashed and continues to suppport the aggression in Korea. Soviet Russia barred the United Nations commission from North Korea and demands North Korean representation at the United Nations. Soviet-dominated North Korea ignored the cease-fire order of the UN Security Council. Only after this did the United States by United Nations direction undertake security operations in invaded South Korea. But meanwhile Mr. Malik uses his position at Lake Success to the advantage of the rebels against international law.

The long and careful preparation of this aggression on the part of the Soviet Government is proved beyond all doubt. It appears in the quantity and quality of weapons placed by the Soviets in the hands of North Korean Communists. The subtleties of the solemn diplomatic procedure prevent the Western Powers from naming at the UN tribune the real aggressor—U. S. S. R. But silence cannot change the reality of things. The innumerable tanks and guns used by the North Korean violators of the peace are Russian-made. The North Korean officers are for the most part Russian-trained.

We proclaim that the U. S. S. R. has violated world peace. The U. S. S. R. is guilty of the bloodshed in Korea, of the murder of the defenders of the peace. And now the Soviet aggressors circulate a petition for peace—to serve their own rapacious ends. Those who sign it are knaves or fools. Criminals must be prevented from committing their crime; fools shown the folly of their ways.

At this moment thousands of misguided persons in this country, unaware of being led by Moscow agents, are demanding the recall of American troops from Korea. But does one demand the withdrawal of police from the scene of a crime?

Rather let the American people, and the free people of the world, sign this petition, demanding that the Soviet Union stop the aggression in Korea, withdraw the Communist troops, and cease threatening the peace of the peoples of the world.

We, the undersigned professors and students of the Graduate School of Georgetown University, make this appeal to all the peace- and freedom-loving men and we ask the entire American people to take the initiative in this world-wide manifestation for a true and lawful peace.

The Korean Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an open letter which I addressed to the Honorable Warren R. Austin, United States Representative to the United Nations, under date of December 5, and his reply of December 9.

Delegate Austin's quiet confidence that progress is being made in solving the Korean crisis should bring new strength and courage and hope to the free peoples of the world. The above-mentioned follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 5, 1950.

Hon. WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Representative of the United States to the United Nations and United States Representative in the Security Council, United States Mission to the United Nations, Lake Success, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. AUSTIN: I am being bombarded with letters from constituents—the majority of whom I know personally to be responsible, patriotic citizens—demanding that United States troops be withdrawn from Korea, that our Nation return to extremely nationalistic policies in foreign affairs, that we in fact withdraw from the United Nations. Many of these letters are written by frantically worried wives, parents, and other relatives of boys now fighting in Korea.

Frankly, I believe that the United Nations itself is largely responsible for this rising tide of unfavorable public opinion. I refer specifically to the exceedingly dilatory manner in which your organization is acting in the face of the Chinese Communist aggression aimed directly at UN fighting forces.

Obviously, the delegates from the freedom-loving nations can do nothing to end Russian obstruction in the Security Council, under existing rules of procedure. And yet, the delegates from the free countries have permitted nearly a month to be frittered away in meaningless deliberations within the Security Council since being officially notified of the Red aggression.

Stop this senseless waste of precious time. Act and act now—before it is too late—through the vetoproof General Assembly. Brand this barbaric aggression for what it is. Authorize the Commander of the UN forces to use every weapon, every man, and every means available to achieve honorable peace. Yes, I refer to atomic weapons, to Chinese Nationalist troops, and to obstacles that prevent strategic bombing of supply bases. Let the world know that the United Nations will not tolerate offenses against mankind, will not comprise sacred principles, will not appease the blood-thirsty bullies in the family of nations. Make it clear for all to see that the United Nations is truly a powerful force against evil.

In this connection, let me respectfully suggest that it is high time the help of Almighty God be invoked in UN deliberations. I am aware that your rules of procedure do not make such provision—for fear, I suppose, of offending the delegates from godless nations. But I have never heard of a better recipe for the promotion of peace and understanding among the nations and peoples of the world than is contained in the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount. The world's problems would be solved with little difficulty if the precepts laid down by the Great Teacher who wrought and taught on the shores of Galilee were observed faithfully by men in high places.

I write this letter because I fear that the very existence of the United Nations is at stake in the present crisis. A continuation of the present confusion, ineptness, weakness, and futile gestures will inevitably result in the tragic dissolution of what I consider the greatest experiment in international cooperation ever attempted by man. Believe me, sir, I support the United Nations with all my heart and strength, because I believe that within its structure is contained the world's best hope for achieving a just and lasting peace. If we fail in this mighty endeavor, it is my considered judgment that mankind will undergo a blood bath that will mean the end of our civilization as we know it today. God forbid this disaster.

With expressions of high esteem and kind regards, I am,

Faithfully,

HENRY O. TALLE,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York City, December 9, 1950.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TALLE: Thank you, from the bottom of my heart, for your fine letter of the 5th.

Please acquit me of undertaking to debate with you the various points to which you refer. I have had thousands of letters throughout the past few months, many of which indicate the impression that futility, ineptness, and confusion prevail. I would be derelict in my duty if I did not say to you that you need not be discouraged. The apparent slowness of procedure in the Security Council does not mean lack of progress. While a great deal of time is consumed in long speeches in various languages which require many translations, liaison is in progress which is not disclosed in television, radio, or press. The great and complex problems with which we deal are not really solved in the debates and by the votes, either in the Security Council or in the General Assembly. They are solved in the hearts and minds of men. From your own experience, you have a better perception than your letter writers of the work that must be done among 60 nations of different traditions and customs and tongues, in order to arrive at harmony.

You speak of faith in Almighty God to help our deliberations. I am glad to have you mention this. I know that we could not make progress at all without the help of God, but that, too, works quietly, in the hearts and minds of men.

Much negotiation and hard work out of sight of the public is going on all the time. We are constantly at work preventing proliferation of numerous ideas on each problem and the loss of that sound agreement, or assent, which consolidates cooperation upon a single effective solution.

So it is with the immediate crisis. What appears to be "delegates from the free countries (permitting) nearly a month to be frittered away * * *" is not as it appears.

The first step required us to consolidate our forces which were believed to be pulling apart because of numerous different propositions for the solution. This has effectively been done, and will be consummated in a vote in the General Assembly on the six-power resolution.

I cannot take more of your time in this letter. I hope you will feel less depressed about the appearance of things. We now feel confident that we can pull together the free countries in a strong unity, and after that first step has been taken, more definite, specific solutions will be possible.

I wish to encourage you to express your views to me at all times.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WARREN R. AUSTIN.

An Educational Project That Deserves the Support of Every American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, an educational project has been launched in the National Capital by a group of clear-

thinking newspapermen, magazine writers, and authors, that deserves the support of every American citizen. I refer to the educational plan designed to give our people a clearer picture of the work of this great Congress and its Members, introduced by the Committee for Congress, which proposes to use Your Congress magazine, radio, television, motion pictures, and other informational and educational media to explain the functions of Congress more intimately. It is desired to give the widest possible publicity to this endeavor, and I request the publication of the following correspondence:

DECEMBER 4, 1950.

MR. HAL J. MILLER,
Editor, Your Congress Magazine,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: I read your letter of November 27 with considerable interest; and I am pleased to know that the Fourth Estate is actively interested in selling the Congress to the people of America.

While time does not permit me to go into this matter in detail, I do want to mention that this field is a virgin one. I am sure you and your group can render valuable service.

I will appreciate your keeping me advised of developments, and, in the interim, advising me of any manner in which I may serve you.

Sincerely yours,

CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of Congress,
Third District, West Virginia.

COMMITTEE FOR CONGRESS,
Washington, December 5, 1950.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAILEY: I can't begin to tell you how grateful we were to receive your letter of December 4, expressing your support of our effort to get more specific, factual material out to our people, into our schools and colleges, on how Americans can work more closely with their Congress and its Members.

Your letter is typical of messages of commendation we are receiving from Senators and Congressmen of all political allegiance.

You had phrased your letter so graphically that I think it would be extremely helpful to the whole effort of the Committee for Congress if it could be reproduced in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

You can depend upon it that we will call upon you for actual help in this endeavor—in fact we must have the participation of every Member of the House and the Senate if it is to succeed.

Yours truly,

HAL J. MILLER,
Editor, Your Congress Magazine, Executive Director, Committee for Congress, Sponsor of Congress Study Councils.

Following are a few of the many letters of commendation regarding the education program of the Congress Study Council received by the Committee for Congress:

NOVEMBER 29, 1950.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Thank you for your letter of November 27 and the enclosed copy of the current issue of the magazine, Your Congress.

I read with interest the statement as to the objectives of the publication and of the Committee For Congress. It seems to me that your objectives are very meritorious, inasmuch as I think there is a great need for a full understanding of the workings of our Government on the part of everyone. This is particularly true in the present trying international situation.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BENNETT,
Member of Congress,
Second District, Florida.

NOVEMBER 28, 1950.

DEAR MR. MILLER: This will respectfully acknowledge and thank you for your communication of November 27, in which you enclosed copy of the publication, Your Congress Magazine. You state this publication is dedicated to creating a wider appreciation and understanding of the vital work of the Congress and the Government of the United States.

Certainly, this is a most laudable undertaking and I am confident that these lofty objectives of your mazagine will serve a very useful purpose.

With good wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

F. ERTEL CARLYLE,
Member of Congress, Seventh District, North Carolina.

NOVEMBER 29, 1950.

DEAR MR. MILLER: I wish to thank you for your nice letter and magazine. I have enjoyed looking over it and think there is no doubt that there is a great need for the type of magazine you have indicated you will publish. If I can be of assistance in giving you information, I will be glad to do so. As a former professor of political science, quite naturally I would be interested in a project such as you have discussed.

Sincerely yours,

M. G. BURNSIDE,
Member of Congress, Fourth District, West Virginia.

NOVEMBER 28, 1950.

DEAR MR. MILLER: You are to be commended for your undertaking. Every individual should read Your Congress Magazine.

Any criticism of Congress, whether constructive or destructive, is a reflection upon the people, because our Representatives in Congress are chosen by the people through a democratic process.

With kindest regards and all good wishes for success, I remain,

Most sincerely yours,

VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress,
Seventh District, Oklahoma.

NOVEMBER 30, 1950.

DEAR MR. MILLER: It seems to me that the thought in issuing this Congress Magazine is a very fine one and should result in much benefit in acquainting the country with the work of the Congress and the responsibilities resting upon its membership. With sentiments of esteem and regard, I am,

Yours very truly,

CLYDE M. HOEY,
United States Senate.

We would appreciate receiving a copy of Your Congress Magazine.

RUTH FINE,
Librarian, Bureau of the Budget Library.

Please put us on the mailing list for Your Congress Magazine.

HAZEL E. ARMSTRONG,
Librarian, Indiana State Teachers College Library, Terre Haute, Ind.

Please send information regarding the periodical Your Congress Magazine, and your educational program on behalf of Congress.

Yours truly,

SISTER M. CATHERINE JOSEPH,
Immaculata College, Immaculata, Pa.

Stop Appeasing, Warns Jacobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. NOLAND

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a newspaper article from the Indianapolis Times. The thoughts contained in this article are especially appropriate at this time.

DEAR BOSS

(By Dan Kidney)

STOP APPEASING, WARNS JACOBS—HE MEANS WITH ALLIES AS WELL AS OUR ENEMIES

WASHINGTON, December 11.—"The time is now here to end appeasement—not only of our enemies but of our allies."

That was the reaction to the Truman-Attlee statement of Representative ANDREW JACOBS, Indianapolis Democrat, as he paused in the midst of packing his files to return to law practice after a single term here.

The war and what to do about it will be with Mr. JACOBS, even though he was defeated for Congress by Republican Charles B. Brownson. His 18-year-old son, Andy, Jr., is in the marines.

During his single term in the House, Mr. JACOBS won considerable acclaim as an independent thinker and colleagues on both sides of the aisle have praised him from the floor.

When asked what he thought of the White House communiqué which was issued after the talks here between Prime Minister Attlee, of Great Britain, and President Truman, the homespun Hoosier philosopher-statesman said:

"It was a 5,000-word rewrite which changed nothing at all."

Upset by attitude

He then took up the matter of appeasement and declared he had been upset by the attitude of the United States delegation to the United Nations.

"For fear of offending our allies, such as England and France, we have pursued a policy of appeasement unworthy of our own great moral aims if we are to succeed in world leadership," said Mr. JACOBS.

"The late Gilbert Chesterton once said, "It is easier to die for one's country than to tell her the truth." That, in my opinion, is the road we have been following with our allies in United Nations.

"From the very outset, we should have said to Great Britain that imperialism of any sort, including her own, is outmoded in the modern world. To France we should say "Give up the colonialism which you are seeking to continue in Indochina. That would leave Russia alone in the new imperialist business, and we could point with scorn to her retrogressive aggressions."

Losing propaganda war

"Instead, we haven't said what we really feel, so the Communist countries, under Moscow direction, have been winning the great world propaganda war."

Mr. JACOBS said he saw nothing in the Truman-Attlee statement about the British giving up trading with Communist China through Hong Kong, and that this is the sort of Allied appeasement that is being paid for in American lives.

"We should have had United Nations commissions in Korea long before the war started, investigating stories about rice speculation by the Rhee government and anything

else that we knew was wrong," said Mr. JACOBS.

"Entrance of the Chinese Communists into the conflict is a new matter for us to deal with, of course. But a rereading of history will reveal that long before communism was born the Chinese were fighting to repel any foe from the Korean Peninsula. They were doing that before the foundation of Jamestown was laid in 1625. Their present actions are not new, only new to us."

Voted against aid

"Knowing that much of history, I declined to vote for Korean aid and was against involvement there except under the United Nations banner. I knew we had no stanch friends in the Orient and were completely unprepared to fight over there."

Mr. JACOBS is hopeful that a cease-fire order can be brought about and the whole Korean matter settled without further war and bloodshed.

"The United States must stand for justice and be its advocate always in United Nations councils," he concluded. "It is never too late to do the right thing. We have merely been silly, while Russia has been sinister and vicious. I do not believe we will offend our real allies if we tell them frankly that we are not merely buying alliances, but want their support for the free world on the basis of justice and of truth."

Industrial Strength and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in this RECORD, I am including an address by T. S. Petersen, president of the Standard Oil Co. of California. I have read the speech carefully. I agree with what Mr. Petersen says and I commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

What a strange and paradoxical situation—the same Government that is asking industry to rebuild our sinews of war is, at the same time, trying to tear apart the system that built these industries. Apparently the Department of Justice is undertaking to make a sin of efficiency, a crime of success, a felony of size—and a corpse of private enterprise.

In view of the current critical world situation I would earnestly recommend that the Attorney General take another long look at the suit he has filed against seven major oil companies in California, and then withdraw it so we can get on with our national defense preparations—unhampered, unfettered, and free to do the job that lies ahead.

It is a pleasure to see so many of our Sacramento friends on this occasion and I must say that Bill Haines and I and everybody else in our organization appreciates the fact that you have taken the time to come here today.

Next week the petroleum industry of the United States celebrates its annual oil-progress week, so my appearance here today is somewhat in the nature of a curtain-raiser to the main show. If you are not familiar with it, I might explain that the purpose of oil-progress week is to show the American people how the oil industry operates to serve them. Refineries, laboratories and other facilities will be thrown open to thousands of visitors and oil men will take to the road and talk to whatever group will listen to them—even as I am doing here today.

I am not going to attempt to cover the complexities and the general achievements of the oil industry in serving the public, but rather to talk about perhaps the most important thing confronting our Nation today—national defense. As the military saying goes, the battle is the payoff, so the ability of our country to defend itself is the payoff. Thus, in speaking of the progress of the petroleum industry, I should like to discuss a very related and pertinent subject, Industrial Strength and National Security.

INDUSTRIAL STRENGTH AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Since the outbreak of the Korean war, we have been doing some clearer thinking about a lot of things. As a Nation we suddenly realized that the great differences between our disarmed defense establishment and the war machine of the Soviet Union and its helpers had to be corrected in the shortest possible time.

Moreover, it seems a matter of sober fact that many years of preparedness loom ahead of us, whether we have cold war or hot war, or that ultimate of tragedies, the third world war. As a nation, we are facing the fact that we must be strong and continue strong if we are to resist the tide of aggression and oppression that has swept over so much of the world. Indeed, it is no longer a necessity for resistance only, but a more positive determination to take whatever steps are necessary to preserve human and individual liberty.

So with the attack on Korea we started immediately building up the manpower of our Army, Navy, and the Air Force—to say nothing of the Marines. And, at the same time, the Government started placing orders for those highly specialized kinds of military equipment necessary to fight a mechanized war. Contracts went to concerns like General Motors, and General Electric, and du Pont, and the big aircraft companies, and the big oil companies.

More of these orders are going out every day. This is imperative. No modern fighting force can be any better than the tools it is given to fight with.

Now, if these orders to the big and capable producers of such weapons are natural and logical, it would also seem natural that the Government should take pains to see that these producers could remain sound and strong. They should be able to carry out every assignment that might come their way in the course of the critical days ahead. In other words, it would seem the height of reckless bad judgment, while passing out these orders, to send out crews with sledge hammers and cutting torches to break up the assembly lines and carve up the factories and seal off the doors and gates by which capacity operations are maintained.

Yet, strangely enough, some people in Government for some time have been carrying out policies that work toward just that kind of result.

While money and effort have been poured into building up our national strength on the one hand, some elements in Washington are seeking to break up many of the larger companies and industries that make up the bulk of our production capacity. The tools in their hands are numerous, but the most dangerously used has been the ideologically conceived antitrust suit. We in the west coast oil industry face such a suit and so do General Electric and du Pont, which I mentioned a moment ago as among those to whom the military services first turned.

I am an oil man, not a military or political expert, but I think I know a glaring inconsistency when I see one. That's exactly what these antitrust suits against big business amount to. If you remember where the tools of war came from last time, you can rest assured they must come from the same places this time, only a lot more of them.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force were the pillars of our fighting strength, and those pillars rested on the solid foundation of the Nation's industrial capacity.

As a matter of fact, our comparative situation today is somewhat like the situation back there on the eve of World War II. Then, as now, we had a small army, with inadequate equipment. We didn't own many airplanes. Our combat ships had begun to get out of date and were embarrassingly low on fire power. We didn't look as though we could be of much account in any kind of a war.

So Tojo and Hitler jumped us. And promptly, all eyes turned to the only source from which fast production in quantity could be hoped—big business.

The story, or at least the rough statistics of it, is familiar to you. The Armed Forces asked for 50,000 planes, more as a brave gesture than actual hope. They got 300,000. The Navy asked for ships and sea-going craft of all kinds. It got 77,000 of them. The Army asked for tanks, and got 86,000 of them. It asked for artillery weapons and got a third of a million.

And because it was, from start to finish, a motorized, mechanized, horsepower war, they all asked for oil, and they got 5,000,000,000 barrels of it from domestic production, and another three quarters of a billion barrels from American wells abroad.

Those are the figures. And what made them possible was swift, expert mass production—the knowledge and experience of big business, which was given the biggest share of the responsibility for getting the job done.

Hitler knew about horsepower as the determining force in modern war. He had set himself a schedule of massing horsepower for military use—20,000 tanks and 20,000 planes. It was them an unheard of total of horsepower for mobility and striking power. And when he had it, he put it to work.

But as Charles Kettering recalled with grim confidence in the Spring of 1942, Hitler, in his careful calculations, hadn't tagged quite all the bases. He overlooked the fact that while America looked like a big, soft, easy-going country, our high standard of living was based solidly upon a system of harnessed, applied horsepower. This was what Americans had demanded of their big industries, and the industries had given it to them. And, in giving it to them, the industries had to grow up to the size and capacity necessary for the job.

So it was possible for Kettering, in that dark spring of 1942, to say with absolute conviction: "Time will show that the Axis picked the wrong opponent when they picked the United States to fight a horsepower war."

Three years later Hitler perished in the rubble of Berlin, and a few months afterward the Japanese war lords bowed in surrender.

The production that made victory possible was not a job for men inexperienced in thinking in big terms. It was a task for those to whom big jobs were routine, men and industries whose survival in fields of intense competition depended upon serving up miracles in minmums of time and lost motion.

The job couldn't have been done without the science of mass production—the capacity not only to build intricate weapons, but the flexibility to produce them in whatever quantity was wanted; by the hundreds, thousands, or millions. The capacity to build them well, and to build them quickly. The capacity to take the specifications of a four-engine bomber like the Liberator—with its half-million separate parts and 30,000 sepa-

rate assemblies—and turn out the finished product at the amazing rate of one an hour.

We came into the last war with a daily production of 40,000 barrels of 100-octane aviation gasoline, and had shot past half a million barrels a day when the fighting ended. When Hitler marched into Poland we had just topped a production rate of 2,000 military planes a year. At the high point we were pouring them out at better than 100,000 a year—bigger, faster, more rugged planes by far than those at the beginning. Starting from scratch we mass-produced everything from K-rations to cargo ships.

This was the industrial ability that got rolling at such fantastic speed that the Government had to put the brakes on it while the war was still in full swing. It was the knowing how that prompted Winston Churchill to observe, on Thanksgiving Day of 1944: "In 3 or 4 years the United States has in sober fact become the greatest military, naval, and air power in the world." It inspired Marshal Stalin himself to hoist a glass to American industrial production, without which, he said, "the United Nations never could have won the war." Rest assured that Stalin hasn't forgotten those words.

World War II brought into the open, for all the world to see, this astounding adaptability of American industry to the purposes of modern military production. But even the most severe demands made upon the American industrial plant in World War II did not bring out the full power of the system. We were just getting ready to shift into high gear when the opposition folded. If we had ever pushed the throttle to the floor board the result would have been something to behold.

In the shadow cast by the Korean outbreak we can be thankful that the effort last time did not represent our full power.

It is as certain as tomorrow's sunrise that if the present grim situation explodes into an all-out conflict we must have far more strength even than it took to turn back the Axis Powers in World War II. We face a stronger enemy, and the face of warfare itself has changed radically since then. We know this, because we have had previews of some of the weapons with which the next war will be fought.

The atomic bomb was a triumph of American industrial techniques, made possible by harnessing the power of dozens of great industrial concerns, together with the skills of the scientists in a team devoted to a job that had been viewed as superhuman. And that was a job taken on in addition to the other tremendous mass-production assignments handed big business as its share of the war effort.

Nobody knows what a future conflict might be like, but even atomic war will still be a horsepower war. There will have to be great bombers to transport the bombs, and great engines to power the bombers. There will have to be swarms of pursuit craft and fighters flying faster than the speed of sound to challenge the enemy's bomber fleet when it comes. We will need, once more, great fleets of ships to transport the men, machines, supplies, and fuel to those far bases from which we can most effectively fight the enemy. We will have to have fast vehicles for the land forces, and swift, mechanized artillery. For Korea has proved that a war in this decade, as in the one just past, will have to be fought on the ground as well as in the air.

In all categories the output of horsepower will have to be far greater than last time, because the trend is toward greater and greater speed, and the requirements of horsepower increase as speed increases.

These are the things we know about—these are the challenges that we can expect to face. And no one can say what new miracles, what unforeseen wonders of ingenuity and mass production we shall have to achieve to meet the new challenges that a new war always brings.

That production will come from those who have the capacity for it, be it from the automobile industry, the aviation industry, or steel.

You would get the fuel from the only industry in the world that is versed in the fueling of that kind of massed machinery—the American petroleum industry. And so with the guns and submarines and steel and electrical equipment, and all the rest of the stuff that goes into the fighting of a modern war. Only big business, American big business, has the organizational skill, the resources, the technique to produce on that scale.

I do not mean to imply that big business can carry the whole load on its own shoulders—that wasn't the case last time and under our system it won't be the case in any future time. However, in big business we have the shape of the things we may need.

No large business stands by itself; every big corporation is simply a focal point in a group of enterprises, linked to all the others in a condition of mutual dependency. They all have hundreds or thousands of suppliers.

For example, the Cadillac branch of General Motors has been given a big order for tanks. Cadillac will build those tanks and send them off its assembly line. But into the building of them will go parts from 600 other firms, large and small. It's the same with almost any other complex operation you can name in the realm of big industry. The bigger the business in general, the wider the scope of its dependence upon smaller firms for specific collateral jobs. And, of course, this dependency is mutual—the smaller firms make their own profits from the goods produced for the big fellows.

The assembly line, viewed in this way, is something more than a runway along which flow cars or tanks or airplanes. It is an industrial network covering hundreds of miles, often reaching into the far corners of the land, with the big outfit in the center responsible for the teamwork and the finished product, but every last member playing an indispensable role in the game.

So when I speak of the prowess of big business I am not speaking only of the capacities of the 50, or 100, or 200 biggest industrial corporations in the country. I am actually talking about the whole American industrial system, with all of its elements, large and middle-sized and small. They are all joined together in this business system of ours. They pull together in beautiful teamwork when there is a man-sized job to do. Stalin could copy our atomic bomb, but I do not think he could duplicate this industrial system in generations of whip-cracking and master-minding.

Because the efficiency of this highly intricate, delicately balanced production system stems from the freedom in which it has developed. Free people, free to buy where and what they chose, automatically have sought out the firm that provided the best goods for the lowest cost. Under this system of natural selection, inefficiency was constantly weeded out, while efficiency was constantly encouraged to flourish. It could never be that way under a system of political selection, and a look around the world will prove that it isn't that way now.

The bonus that the American system of freedom puts on efficiency does not mean that efficiency can only come with bigness. What it does mean is that in each field of enterprise, the most efficient firms will develop automatically to whatever size will best suit the particular purpose. Big business would be sadly out of place in those fields where high quality can only be obtained through the individual, personal handicraft of the worker, or where demand will never be sufficient to require the great bulk and expense of mass-production equipment. But small business would be equally out of place in those fields where the demand is for vast quantities of products of standard quality and performance, and at minimum cost.

That's how it has worked in this country, and it has been a system that has worked overwhelmingly to the benefit of the Nation, in peace and in war. It has also worked for the benefit of small- and middle-sized businesses, which have been winning an increasing share of the Nation's total trade over the past couple of decades.

It is a powerful, prolific, incredibly bountiful system, but it is not a tamper-proof system. Rugged as it is, its balance is as delicate as any other great, smooth-functioning, complicated mechanism. You can't interfere with its basic structure, and expect its performance to continue normally.

This is exactly what some elements in our Government have been trying to do, and if the effort prevails, the results are clearly predictable.

On this, I can speak with intimate, personal knowledge, as a consequence of the antitrust suit recently filed against Standard Oil Co. of California and six other of the larger west coast companies. The suit is a hodge-podge of synthetic and baseless charges, all leading up to the theory that the seven companies taken as a whole are too big and hence must be broken up.

Well, the oil industry always has been one to plan ahead for the future. In peace, it fuels and powers our high-riding economy and in war it has always been able to provide the necessary amounts of petroleum. In the last 5 years, the industry has expanded enormously, so that today it is in the best shape it ever has been to meet any national emergency. This accomplishment has been made possible by the competitive activities of the 34,000 companies and individual operators who comprise the industry. They range in size all the way from the single-rig wild-catter, to the large integrated companies, who handle petroleum and its products all the way from the well to the consumer.

In giving credit to all who comprise the very complex oil industry, I must be realistic and say that I think there were many things involved that could have been done only by the big, integrated companies.

Exploration and oil-field development in wilderness areas remote from available markets is one example of what they have done. Offshore drilling, a very costly operation, is another. Pipeline and tanker construction demand large outlays. Modern refinery units that accomplish chemical miracles on a vast scale are multi-million-dollar jobs. So is research, which, by and large is done by the bigger companies. The results of this research benefit the industry as a whole and the public, too, in new and improved petroleum products. Integration provides the flexibility that has been a distinguishing characteristic of the oil industry.

The suit hits directly at the principle of integration in the oil industry. At the same time, it is integration that has made possible the really large-scale transportation, processing, distribution, and marketing of petroleum and its products, at lowest cost. These operations fall naturally into a single, unified, and flexible sequence.

As the war in the Pacific developed, the military services turned to us and the other larger companies for the flood of petroleum products we could supply because of our size and the extensive nature of our facilities. Yet, this size and our operation of these facilities are called wrong by the antitrust suit.

I spoke of the tremendous expansion of the oil industry in the past 5 years. I do not think it could have been accomplished

had we been working under the rules the Antitrust Division seeks to apply to enforce the theory that bigness is automatically badness. Nor do I think that we could repeat that expansion on the west coast in the future if we and the other defendants were to be dismembered.

We are not the only targets of this attack on bigness; many of our other basic industries have suits pending against them or threatened. The action against General Electric, for instance, proposes to cut down the volume of electric-light bulbs GE would be allowed to make. It is held to be a crime to make the kind of product the people seem to want.

In whatever degree the fragmentation of our great industries is carried out, those elements of efficiency that are gained through bigness will be diminished. The economies resulting from mass purchasing materials will dwindle. The great research divisions devoted to seeking new techniques will be shrunk or broken apart and their efficiency impaired. The concentrations of capital that make possible extensive exploration and experimentation in new fields will be divided, and their capacities curtailed.

But most vital of all, the very processes of mass production will be in important respects thrown radically off stride, and their efficiency nullified.

There are many reasons why the American people can't afford to tolerate this kind of governmental interference at this time, or any time.

The very least effect of it would be to slacken the tempo of the whole economy. For it is a body blow at the very heart of our productivity—which at this time in history means also the security of the free world. If the effort were to succeed, some part of the productive efficiency of every firm affected would be lost, directly or indirectly. Goods wouldn't be produced so well, so cheaply. The consumer, faced with reduced value at higher costs on all the items where big industries are the producers, would reasonably curtail his buying. Production would automatically drop off as buying slowed, and that contraction would have its damaging effect upon employment, and the momentum of money. There is no surer way to start the downward spiral toward economic depression than this kind of arbitrary tinkering.

Moreover, if the Government says that a given company is too big, it's also saying to the consumer: "You're buying too much of this fellow's stuff; you've got to start buying where we tell you." Sometimes in our history, when rank instances of freeze-out monopoly have developed, drastic action has been necessary. But in the current series of antitrust actions, monopoly is simply made a synonym for size. It is verbal black magic. Monopoly is evil. Size is monopoly, therefore size is evil. It's all so simple if you start out with the preconceived notion that bigness is automatically badness. However, bigness is part of the American way of doing things and if it is wrong, so is that American way. If the American people are to be denied the right to build, through their selective patronage, the kind of enterprise of whatever size that can give them the best for their money, then they are going to be stripped of one of their basic freedoms.

These things—economic welfare and the freedom of the consumer to govern the economy—are always important; without them this country would be doomed to collapse over the long run. But important as they are, they become secondary in times like these when the very existence of the Nation is directly threatened.

The main thing now is to have ready at hand those things that we must have to defend ourselves—the material things, but quite as important, the continuing capacity to produce these material things. The security of the Nation is directly tied in with the security of business.

The great industries have not been marking time in the years since the close of the last war. Like the oil industry, other industries have expanded tremendously and are ready and eager to perform the miracles of which they are capable if given the occasion and the freedom they need. The steel industry's capacity is greater by 10 percent than at the midpoint of World War II, and still expanding. The automobile industry, already diverting some of its plant capacity to war order, is still turning out cars at a rate exceeding 6,000,000 per year. And so on through the roster of the giants.

Each of these industries, these masters of mass production, has proved its ability to turn out the weapons of war in the same high quality and matchless abundance as it turns out the implements of our peacetime living.

Together, they make up the only answer to the massed power of foreign aggression, and a convincing answer it is.

But they can't do the job without the strength and efficiency that come with bigness. They need it for the job ahead.

I don't know, precisely, what's behind the philosophy opposing big business, whether it is politicians hungry for power, or economic dreamers with collectivism on the brain, or just the busybody's instinct of meddling.

But whatever it is, the American people should insist that it be knocked off, and fast. We've got a war on our hands abroad—a war that may at any time blossom into the roughest, toughest life-and-death struggle our Nation has ever fought—and one war at a time is about all we can afford.

Advice by Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted to me, I enclose a short editorial, written by Mr. Baruch on Thanksgiving Day, 1950.

As he points out, communism and inflation are threatening the existence of the American Republic. Inflation has caused such stupendous losses to many people that it is shocking. The value of the dollar has been depreciated so much in the past 10 years that hundreds of billions of dollars of purchasing power have been lost by the holders of life insurance policies. The buyers of our war bonds have also taken tremendous losses. The purchasing power of the dollar today, when some of the 10-year bonds are becoming due, is, in round figures, a third less than it was when the bulk of these bonds were bought in the early forties and up to 1945. The gross loss in buying power has been about $85,000,000,000. Furthermore, the end has not been reached. It seems like every group is dead set on getting all they can with no regard as to what the final outcome will be.

Now we are facing a very serious military threat to our security and even to our existence. I believe we should have some type of war controls promptly, or otherwise inflation will keep going down the merry road that leads to bankruptcy, which has been the lot of several other nations. Mr. Baruch has had a vast experience in handling economic and fiscal problems under war conditions. He knows whereof he speaks, and I think it is well that we listen and perhaps follow a man of his experience. The editorial follows:

AN EDITORIAL

(By Bernard M. Baruch)

On this Thanksgiving Day, rereading the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount, I find them still basic to human happiness and well-being, and I am thankful.

Contemplation of the Constitution and of our institutions and freedoms confirms my belief that we have the best Government in the world, and I am thankful.

Restudying addition, subtraction and division, I still think they are correct, and I am thankful.

As I view the wait-and-see, business-and-politics-as-usual attitude toward the menace of communism and its chief ally, inflation, I wonder whether we are gaining anything while we are losing our souls.

Freebooting is not a good substitute for free enterprise. Nor are appeasement of pressure groups and profiteering good substitutes for the profit system.

If we do not accept temporary denials and restrictions we will be exchanging our heritage as a free people for a mess of pottage of fictitious and fleeting prosperity.

If we lose, we lose forever the building of a peaceful world.

Shall "we nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of man"?

W. Kingsland Macy versus New York World-Telegram Corp.

REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I am asking the privilege to publish in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of a complaint that I have just filed in the New York Supreme Court in an action for libel. I feel that my colleagues, in particular, and others might be interested in having this sworn information before them.

This action arises out of one of the unconscionable lies used against me in the last campaign, and I propose to scotch it forthwith. However, I have chosen to do so within the dignity of the courts instead of resorting to ineffectual and degrading denials. I intend to prosecute this case with all the vigor at my command in order to shed some light on the dark recesses where such reprehensible schemes are spawned. This will undoubtedly have a wholesome public effect generally.

SUPREME COURT, COUNTY OF NEW YORK, W. KINGSLAND MACY, PLAINTIFF, v. NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM CORP., DEFENDANT

Plaintiff complaining of the defendant by William Power Maloney, his attorney, alleges—

1. At all times hereinafter mentioned, the defendant above named was and still is a domestic corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

2. At all times hereinafter mentioned, the defendant was and still is engaged in the business of publishing, distributing, and circulating a newspaper known as the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, which newspaper has a wide circulation in and about the city of New York, its environs and elsewhere, including the counties of Nassau and Suffolk, in the State of New York.

3. The plaintiff herein is a member of the United States House of Representatives, having been duly elected from the First Congressional District of the State of New York in 1946 and reelected in 1948, each time by a large majority. Plaintiff has, for many years, been active and prominent in the political business and civic affairs of New York State and the Nation, having among other things served as chairman of the Suffolk County Republican Committee for more than 24 years, as chairman of the New York State Republican Committee for 4 years, as a delegate to the National Republican Convention held in 1928, 1932, 1940, 1944, and 1948, as a member of the Constitutional Convention of the State of New York, as a regent of the State of New York for more than 10 years, a position which he still holds, as a trustee of the Seamen's Bank for Savings in the city of New York for more than 15 years, a position which he still holds, as a director of the Southside Bank of Bayshore, New York for more than 10 years, a position which he still holds, and plaintiff has been for many years and still is actively associated with the publication of various newspapers having a wide circulation in Suffolk County, N. Y.

4. At the time of the publication of the false and defamatory matter as hereinafter set forth, plaintiff was the Republican candidate for reelection as a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the First Congressional District of the State of New York at the general election to be held on November 7, 1950, and was conducting an active campaign for reelection as the defendant well knew.

5. On the 18th day of October 1950, the defendant herein, did falsely and maliciously publish in its said newspaper, the New York World-Telegram and The Sun, issued on that day, of and concerning the plaintiff, and did cause to be circulated by means of the said newspaper in the places aforesaid, the following false and defamatory matter, to wit:

"HANLEY LETTER USED AT SPA TO AID MACY—SUFFOLK LEADER DEMANDED SENATE NOMINATION FOR SELF

"The now famous Joe R. Hanley letter was used at the GOP State convention in Saratoga Springs last month to further the Senatorial ambitions of Representative W. KINGSLAND MACY, Republican boss of Suffolk County.

"This was learned today from unimpeachable Republican sources as the letter's disclosure continued to generate impassioned oratory. * * *

"Went to party leader

"Top GOP sources disclosed that when Mr. MACY received the Hanley letter he immediately went to top Republican leaders then attending the Saratoga Springs convention, and demanded that he be nominated for the Senate.

"Mr. MACY, a bitter foe of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey's leadership of the party, has long held senatorial ambitions. * * *

"At this point it was learned, Mr. MACY attended a conference of Republican leaders. Governor Dewey was not present. At the meeting Mr. MACY proposed he be nominated for the Senate. He agreed that Governor Dewey should run again, but that Mr. Hanley run for reelection as lieutenant governor.

"According to several persons present at the meeting, Mr. MACY threatened to make the Hanley letter public if he failed to receive the Senate nomination.

"Deal is turned down

"But, these sources said, Mr. MACY was told there would be no such deal.

"'All right,' one Republican leader told him, 'go ahead and make the letter public and we will tell the story of how you were using the letter.' * * *

"Mr. MACY, apparently irate at the treatment accorded his request, failed to sit with the Suffolk delegation, of which he has been leader for nearly two decades, on nominations day."

6. The said words and statements as hereinabove set forth were and are wholly false and untrue.

7. By the words "the now famous Joe R. Hanley letter" set forth in paragraph 5 hereof, defendant intended to and did refer to a letter addressed to plaintiff by one Joe R. Hanley, then and now lieutenant governor of the State of New York, dated September 5, 1950, and reading as follows:

THE SENATE,
STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, September 5, 1950.

DEAR KING: After further consultation with my oculist and another who has called in for consultation, I have been forced to the position that I dare not gamble on my future.

Today I had a conference with the Governor in which certain unalterable and unquestionably definite propositions were made to me. If I will consent to take the nomination to the United States Senate, I am definitely assured of being able to clean up my financial obligations within 90 days, so that I would be clear for the first time in 20 years of my life. I am assured of an adequate living compensation if elected, in a perfectly legal and unquestionable way. Also I have an iron-clad, unbreakable arrangement whereby I will be given a job with the State which I would like and enjoy (I have been told what it is) at sufficient compensation to make my net income more than I now have. This removes all the gamble from the picture and will enable me to face the future with confidence and the knowledge that even if I lost my eyesight, I would still have a comfortable living and be able to do the duties evolving upon me.

After long and painful deliberation and in consultation with my whole family, I have reached the conclusion that I cannot afford to gamble with my future, as things now are. Therefore tomorrow morning I am going to announce that, if the delegates will nominate me for the office of United States Senator, I will accept.

I am not talking with you because, to be perfectly honest and frank, I have neither the courage nor the strength to do so. I feel very deeply that I have somehow let you all down and perhaps I have. If you feel bitter, I can understand why, but I can assure you that within a short time you will receive from me every cent that I owe you, and at least you will note that part of the investment.

I shall always think of you with nothing but admiration and love. You and Mr. Gannett have been wonderful and the only bright spot in the whole terrible picture is that I shall be able within a reasonable time, to pay you both in full.

I am humiliated, disappointed, and heartsick, but in fairness to myself, to you to whom I am indebted, and to my family, I can do nothing else. Please try to see this in the fairest light possible.

Every gratefully,

JOE.

8. By the words "GOP State Convention in Saratoga Springs last month" set forth in paragraph 5 hereof, defendant intended to and did refer to the convention of the Republican Party of New York State held at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., on September 6 and 7, 1950, for the purpose of nominating candidates for the offices of Governor and United States Senator among others, at which convention Thomas E. Dewey was a candidate for the nomination for governor and Joe R. Hanley was a candidate for nomination as United States Senator.

9. The so-called Hanley letter, a copy of which is set forth in paragraph 7 hereof, was published in full or in part in various and sundry newspapers published in New York City and numerous other cities throughout New York State and the Nation on October 16, 17 and 18, 1950, and quoted by various and sundry local and national radio news commentators on those days, and was widely read and discussed by the public at large, and charges were made repeatedly on the radio and otherwise by the Democratic candidate for governor, coincidentally with and following the publication of the said Hanley letter, which charges also received widespread publication in various newspapers published in New York City and elsewhere, that the said Hanley letter constituted an admission by the said Hanley, that he had been a party to a corrupt agreement with the said Dewey, whereby, in consideration of Hanley withdrawing his candidacy for the Republican nomination for Governor in favor of the nomination of the said Dewey and accepting for himself the Republican nomination for United States Senator, the said Dewey would arrange that all of the personal debts of said Hanley amounting to many thousands of dollars, would be paid.

10. The defendant in and by the publication aforesaid, meant and intended to charge and did charge that the plaintiff herein employed and made use of the said "now famous Joe R. Hanley letter" mentioned in the said publication in an attempt to obtain for himself the Republican nomination for United States Senator under threat of making the said Hanley letter public if he did not receive the Republican nomination for United States Senator and the defendant in and by the publication aforesaid, meant and intended to charge and did charge that the plaintiff in fact and in effect had attempted to extort the nomination for United States Senator from the Republican leaders and the delegates at the Republican State convention held at Saratoga Springs as hereinbefore stated under threat of making a public disclosure of the contents of the said letter and the corrupt agreement between the said Dewey and Hanley therein referred to; that the plaintiff had attempted to blackmail the said Republican leaders and delegates to the said Republican convention into nominating him for the United States Senate, and the plaintiff was unfit to hold public office.

11. The false and defamatory matter set forth in paragraph 5 hereof was known to the defendant to be false and untrue, and was published by the defendant with actual malice toward the plaintiff with the intent and for the purpose of injuring plaintiff in his reputation, in his feelings, and in his official capacity, and accomplishing his defeat at the election to be held on November 7, 1950, and in reckless disregard of the rights of plaintiff.

12. That by reason of said publication aforesaid, the plaintiff has been injured in his good name, fame, credit, and reputation, both as a man and in the various public and private positions, callings, and lines of endeavor followed by him, and in his feelings,

mind and body, and has been held up to ridicule and contempt of his friends, acquaintances, and the public, and has suffered loss of prestige and standing in his community and elsewhere, all to his damage in the sum of $250,000.

Wherefore plantiff demands judgment against the defendant in the sum of $250,000 together with the costs and disbursements of this action.

WILLIAM POWER MALONEY,
Attorney for Plaintiff, Office and Post Office Address, 8 West Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.

Verified December 8, 1950.

Filed New York County Supreme Court on December 8, 1950.

Revised Constitution and Bylaws of American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS) Represents Great Record of Veterans Patriotic Service Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on November 6, 1945, on page A4736, volume 91, part 13, of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-ninth Congress, it was my privilege to there extend my remarks and to include therein the constitution, bylaws, and list of elected officers of the AMVETS. It was the first constitution and bylaws of this organization of distinguished veterans of our great Nation.

Now it is my privilege and honor to again be asked to include the revised constitution and bylaws of AMVETS in these remarks.

In the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I was reelected on November 7 to represent for a third term, I have personally observed the strong patriotic, unselfish relationship and public service in the best interest of our great Nation and its national defense and security, furnished and rendered by the leaders of AMVETS there as well as throughout the State of California.

I am very proud of the fact that on the walls of my congressional office here at our Nation's Capital is a plaque presented to me by the Long Beach, Calif., Post 13, Amvets, in 1949 on which is inscribed, "Presented to CLYDE DOYLE for loyal service to AMVETS.

Inasmuch as this patriotic organization is made up entirely of veterans of World War II, it appears to me as a very valuable, constructive act on the part of the national officers of AMVETS to furnish this copy of these amended documents for the reason that it not only fully and specifically informs all Members of Congress of the high purposes and aims of the organization, but it in like manner informs all readers of the methods used to carry out these high purposes.

I again have the honor and privilege of commending the entire membership and its worthy leadership for carrying out these high aims and purposes as set forth in article II of the constitution, which is herewith submitted:

CONSTITUTION OF AMVETS AS AMENDED SEPTEMBER 10, 1950, BY THE SIXTH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION

PREAMBLE

We, the American veterans of World War II, fully realizing our responsibility to our community, to our State, and to our Nation, associate ourselves for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States; to safeguard the principles of freedom, liberty and justice for all; to promote the cause of peace and good will among nations; to maintain inviolate the freedom of our country; to preserve the fundamentals of democracy; to perpetuate the friendship and associations of the Second World War; and to dedicate ourselves to the cause of mutual assistance, this by the grace of God.

ARTICLE I—NAME

The name of this organization shall be AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II, and it shall be hereinafter referred to as AMVETS.

ARTICLE II—AIMS

The aims and purposes of this organization are as follows:

1. To serve our country in peace as in war; to build and maintain the welfare of the United States of America toward lasting prosperity and peace for all its inhabitants.

2. To encourage, in keeping with the policies of our Government, the establishment of a concrete plan to secure permanent international peace and to assist in the maintenance of international peace.

3. To inspire in our membership a sense of responsibility, and to develop leadership for the preservation of our American democratic way of life.

4. To help unify divergent groups in the over-all interest of American democracy.

5. To train our youth to become purposeful citizens in a democracy with full knowledge of the responsibilities as well as the privileges of citizenship.

6. To cooperate with all duly recognized existing veteran organizations in the furtherance of the aims of World War II veterans.

7. To insure the orderly return of the veteran to civilian life by protecting his rights as an individual while he is still in uniform.

8. To expedite and assist in the rehabilitation of the veteran by maintenance of employment services, sponsoring educational opportunities, and providing counsel on insurance, housing, recreation, personal problems, hospitalization, and veterans benefits.

9. To act as a liaison agent between the veteran and the Government.

10. To provide an organization to encourage fellowship among all veterans of World War II.

11. To keep the public forever reminded that the veterans of World War II fought or served to preserve peace, liberty, and democracy for their Nation.

ARTICLE III—ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. AMVETS shall be organized with a national headquarters, located at Washington, D. C., and a department in the District of Columbia and in each State and Territory of the United States. Local posts shall be formed within such departments, and intermediate administrative groups may be created by the national executive committee and the department executive committees, to function within their respective jurisdiction where such action is deemed advisable.

SEC. 2. The national headquarters shall be composed of the national officers, both elective and appointive, and the members of the national executive committee. It shall be the duty of the national officers to advance the cause of AMVETS, to carry out its aims and purposes and to provide the machinery for realization of the plans and policies established by the mandates of the national convention and the national executive committee.

SEC. 3. The United States is divided into the following districts:

District I: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey.

District II: Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, and the District of Columbia.

District III: South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Oklahoma, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas.

District IV: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

District V: Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming, Colorado, and Montana.

District VI: Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and California.

ARTICLE IV—MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. Any person who served in the Armed Forces of the United States of America, or any American citizen who served in the armed forces of an allied nation of the United States, on or after September 16, 1940, and before the legal termination of World War II, is eligible for regular membership in AMVETS, provided such service when terminated by discharge or release from active duty be by honorable discharge or separation. No person who is a member of, or who advocates the principles of, any organization believing in, or working for, the overthrow of the United States Government by force, and no person who refuses to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, shall be privileged to become, or continue to be, a member of this organization.

SEC. 2. Honorary memberships shall not be granted after the adoption of this amendment. In lieu thereof, certificates of merit may be awarded by a suitably inscribed award given to those rendering distinct service to the community and to veterans of World War II. Such awards may be made by posts, internal administrative groups, State departments, the national executive committee, or national conventions. Awards by posts and internal administrative groups must be approved by department executive committees.

ARTICLE V—NATIONAL CONVENTION

SECTION 1. A national convention shall be held annually, prior to October 1, at a time and place fixed by the previous convention, or by the national executive committee, and shall constitute the legislative body of AMVETS. If the convention fails to select a national convention site, the national executive committee shall so decide.

SEC. 2. The national convention shall comprise the following delegates:

(a) Each local post shall elect one delegate and one alternate.

(b) Each department shall choose one delegate and alternate at its convention, to be held at least 30 days prior to the national convention.

(c) Each member of the national executive committee shall be entitled to one vote at the national convention, but the national commander shall vote only in case of a tie.

SEC. 3. Each delegate shall be entitled to one vote. Alternates shall have all the rights and privileges of their delegates, except they shall vote only in their delegate's absence.

SEC. 4. No post or department delegates shall be seated at the national convention unless the respective posts or departments which they represent shall be fully paid up in all their accounts with the national headquarters, and their accounts duly audited and membership certified 30 days prior to the national convention. No post or depart-

ment delegate or alternate shall be permitted to register as such without a membership card or other satisfactory evidence identifying him as a member of the post and department from which he is registering.

SEC. 5. Two hundred of the voting delegates registered at the national convention shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE VI—NATIONAL OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The national convention shall elect a national commander, one vice commander at large who shall be a woman, finance officer, provost marshal, judge advocate, and a surgeon general. Each district in meeting assembled at the national convention shall select a nominee for the office of national vice commander, which nominations shall be acted upon and ratified by the convention. No elected commander or vice commander shall succeed himself or herself in office unless they are filling such office by succession or election to a vacancy occurring between national conventions, provided, however, that the national commander elected at the national convention in September 1949 at Des Moines, Iowa, shall be eligible for reelection at the national convention held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 1950.

SEC. 2. All the elective national officers shall be members of the national executive committee.

SEC. 3. The national commander, with the consent and approval of the national executive committee, shall appoint a service director, a legislative director, a public relations director, a membership director, and an executive director, whenever vacancies occur in such offices. The national commander with the consent and approval of the national executive committee shall also appoint and have the power to remove a national inspector general, a national historian, and national chaplain.

SEC. 4. (a) No salaried appointed officer may be discharged without the approval of the personnel committee which shall be composed of the national commander, the two immediate past national commanders, and two members chosen by the national executive committee at the first meeting of the committee following the annual national convention. Salaries of elective and appointive officers shall be fixed by the personnel committee, subject to the approval of the national executive committee.

(b) The national commander shall have power to suspend any appointed officer for cause and to appoint an acting officer to perform the duties of the suspended officer until the next meeting of the personnel committee. At the time of such suspension the national commander shall set forth in writing the cause for such suspension and shall forward this to members of the personnel committee and the suspended officer. Such written cause shall constitute the complaint upon which the personnel committee shall pass in determining whether the suspended officer shall be removed from office. An appointed officer shall not receive salary during the period he is suspended from the performance of his duties.

(c) Hiring, firing, and establishment of salaries of all national headquarters employees shall be vested in the executive director. An appeal from the decision of the executive director may be taken to the personnel committee, provided this section shall not apply to service officers.

(d) An elective officer may be removed from office only by a two-thirds vote of the national executive committee after written charges against such officer shall have been preferred and furnished by registered mail to the officer concerned and to the members of the national executive committee. A full hearing shall be held by the national executive committee on charges preferred by an elected national officer or by three members of the national executive committee. Such hearing shall be held within 30 days after the charges are preferred and mailed.

(e) Procedure for removal from office of elected officers shall be prescribed by the national executive committee upon recommendation of the national judge advocate.

SEC. 5. A candidate for public office shall resign his national elective office. A national officer in AMVETS shall not hold any paid public office. National officers elected at a national convention shall be installed in office at the same session at which they are elected, but their terms of office shall coincide with the fiscal year as herein provided.

SEC. 6. The national executive committee shall, at its initial meeting following each national convention, establish the line of succession to the post of national commander in the event of a vacancy in that office, from among the national vice commanders.

SEC. 7. In the event a vacancy occurs in the office of the national vice commander other than the vice commander at large, the departments within the respective districts shall hold an election to fill such vacancy. If no election is held within 30 days of notification to the departments by national headquarters of the vacancy, the national commander shall fill the vacancy by appointment, subject to approval by the national executive committee.

SEC. 8. In the event of a vacancy in any elective office other than the national commander or the national vice commanders, the national commander shall fill such vacancy by appointment subject to approval of the national executive committee.

ARTICLE VII—NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SECTION 1. The administrative power between national conventions shall be vested in the national executive committee, which shall be composed of the national commander, the retiring past national commander, the seven vice commanders, all other national elective officers, and one national executive committeeman from each State and Territory, to be elected by the respective departments in annual convention. An alternate shall be elected by each department to serve in the absence of disability of the department committeeman. Each of the above members shall be entitled to one vote, and in case of his absence or disability to participate in the proceedings of the committee, the duly elected alternate may cast his vote. The national commander shall vote only in case of a tie.

SEC. 2. Each national executive committeeman shall take office upon the adjournment of the department convention at which he is elected, and serve until his successor is duly elected and qualified. Each such national executive committeeman shall serve for a term of 2 years, one-half of the departments electing committemen each year.

SEC. 3. Members of the national executive committee shall be delegates to the national convention, each entitled to one vote.

ARTICLE VIII—DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. Effective upon adjournment of the fourth annual national convention, each State or Territorial area of the United States shall constitute a department and shall be chartered as such provided they have a minimum of five chartered posts and a minimum of a total of 200 members within their State or Territorial area. The minimum requirements must be constantly maintained to preserve this status. New departments shall be chartered by the national commander upon the approval of the national executive committee. Each department shall submit a copy of its department constitution and bylaws to the national judge advocate for approval and any amendments to such constitution and bylaws shall likewise be submitted to the national judge advocate at each convention. The recommendations of the national judge advocate shall be submitted to the national executive committee for its approval. Each department shall conduct its own convention, to be held not less than 30 days before the annual national convention, at which time it shall elect a department executive committee, and delegates to the national convention and national executive committee.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of each department to aid in the organization of local posts, and to carry out the plans and policies delegated to it by the national headquarters in adherence to the provisions of this constitution.

ARTICLE IX—POST ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. Local posts may be formed by 10 eligible individuals, by making application to their department, and if there be no organized department, by making application directly to the national headquarters. If the department approves, the application shall be forwarded to the national headquarters and a charter shall be issued.

SEC. 2. Posts shall be governed locally by their own officers chosen according to their own constitution and bylaws. They shall be subject and subordinate, however, to the jurisdiction of the national and department headquarters; and any provision of a department or post constitution found to be in conflict or contrary to the provisions of this constitution, shall be null and void. Officers of posts and departments shall use the equivalent titles provided for national officers in this constitution.

ARTICLE X—FINANCES

SECTION 1. All national finances of AMVETS shall be under the control of the national executive committee, which shall delegate sufficient general and specific authority to the finance committee to carry out the usual duties of the office. The finance committee shall make periodic reports at all stated meetings of the national executive committee, and an annual report at the national convention. Revenue shall be derived from annual dues and other sources approved by the executive committee. The regulation of annual dues shall be set out in the bylaws.

SEC. 2. An annual budget shall be submitted for approval at the first annual meeting of the executive committee. It shall be prepared by the retiring finance committee, who shall have received proposed budgets from the retiring heads of national departments, and shall have consolidated the same. In the event that the budget is not approved, a finance committee shall be appointed, consisting of three members of the executive committee, by the new national commander, to prepare such budget for presentation to the executive committee.

SEC. 3. The finance committee shall consist of five members, one of whom shall be appointed by the retiring national commander, one by the incoming national commander, two will be elected by the national executive committee and the fifth will be the national finance officer. The finance officer will be the chairman of this committee.

SEC. 4. The fiscal year shall be October 1 to September 30.

ARTICLE XI—DISCIPLINE

SECTION 1. Disciplinary rules relative to local posts shall be prescribed by the departments.

SEC. 2. The national executive committee, after notice and hearing before a subcommittee, may cancel, suspend, or revoke the charter of any department for good and sufficient cause to it appearing. Procedure for such action shall be prescribed by the national judge advocate. In the event of the cancellation, suspension, or revocation of any charter of any department, the suspended body shall have the right of appeal to the next national convention.

SEC. 3. In the event of such action, the national executive committee is empowered to take over the operation of the department

whose charter is suspended or revoked until the next department convention, but is bound by the constitution and bylaws thereof. At the next department convention, new department officers must be selected to carry on the work of the department.

ARTICLE XII—POST TRANSFERS

SECTION 1. Any member in good standing may change his post or department and may join a new post without repaying the current annual dues.

SEC. 2. Such transfers shall be subject to the approval of the posts and departments involved.

ARTICLE XIII—AUXILIARIES

SECTION 1. AMVETS recognizes a subsidiary organization known as the AMVETS Auxiliary.

SEC. 2. (a) Eligibility for membership in AMVETS Auxiliary is limited to the mothers, wives, daughters, and sisters not less than 18 years of age, of regular members of AMVETS, and mothers, widows, daughters, and sisters not less than 18 years of age of deceased veterans of World War II who would have been eligible for membership in AMVETS. The term "mother" shall be construed so as to include any female member of the family of, or any female guardian of such person or deceased veteran who has or is exercising the care and responsibility for the rearing of such person or deceased veteran.

(b) Any member of the auxiliary who has been duly recognized as a member of the auxiliary under the provisions of section 2 (a), article XIII, shall be allowed to remain a member of the auxiliary so long as she remains a member in good standing.

SEC. 3. (a) The auxiliary shall be under the control of the national commander and the national executive committee provided, however, that nothing contained in this section shall in any way remove the jurisdiction hereinafter given to National, State, and Territorial departments over corresponding units of the auxiliary.

(b) Each State and Territorial department auxiliary shall be under the jurisdiction of State and Territorial department whose name it bears. Each State and Territorial department auxiliary shall be identical in geographical limits within the respective State and Territorial department of the AMVETS and shall be known and identified by the same name.

SEC. 4. (a) Every auxiliary shall be affiliated with an AMVETS post, and carry the corresponding number of that post.

(b) No auxiliary to any post shall be formed until approved by two-thirds vote of the members present at a stated meeting, due notice of the proposed formation having been given the entire membership of said post 15 days prior to such meeting.

(c) Each local auxiliary shall be under the jurisdiction of the post whose number it bears.

(d) No auxiliary shall be formed when no post exists.

(e) On and after January 1, 1949, any auxiliary not affiliated with an existing AMVETS post shall not be recognized and shall surrender its charter and such properties it may possess to the duly recognized auxiliary officer or officers.

SEC. 5. (a) A post may, by vote of two-thirds of its members present at a meeting following a printed or written notice mailed or delivered to each member of the post in good standing at least 10 days before said meeting, vote to disband its auxiliary, such notice to show contemplated action and the reason therefor. Following such action by a post, this action shall be certified to and forwarded through the State department of AMVETS with proper notice in writing, to the national auxiliary liaison officer and to the national commander, who shall direct the cancellation of the charter of the auxiliary only after investigation by him that it is to the best interest of the AMVETS to do so.

(b) In case of the discontinuance of a post by voluntary surrender of its charter or by a forfeiture of the charter, or by annulment of the charter, the status of its auxiliary, if any, shall be determined by the national commander, but if allowed to retain the charter, its name will be changed, if necessary, within 90 days so that it will not appear to be an auxiliary to its former post.

(c) The national commander may direct a suspension or cancellation of the charter of any auxiliary upon recommendation of the department commander having jurisdiction, when it is shown that the auxiliary has become a detriment to the post.

SEC. 6. In the event of a surrender, cancellation or forfeiture of an auxiliary charter to a post, all moneys, official records, property, and other paraphernalia shall be surrendered to such officer or officers as the rules and regulations of the national auxiliary provide; however, in case such auxiliary is reinstated or recognized within a period of 3 years, such monies, papers, etc., originally forfeited by such auxiliary shall be delivered to such reorganized or new auxiliary in connection with the charter.

SEC. 7 (a). The national president of the auxiliary within 30 days after her induction to said office shall transmit to the national commander a complete itemized report of the financial standing of the national auxiliary for the information of the national commander and the national executive committee.

(b) All books and records of the national auxiliary shall be made available to the national commander or national executive committee on request for either examination or audit.

SEC. 8. We recognize a new subsidiary organization, a fun and honor organization, of the AMVETS Auxiliary to be known as Sackettes on the national, department, and local level.

ARTICLE XIV—SAD SACKS

SECTION 1. AMVETS recognizes a subsidiary organization known as AMVETS Sad Sacks of American Veterans of World War II.

SEC. 2. Membership in Sad Sacks shall be limited to members in good standing of AMVETS.

SEC. 3. Sad Sacks shall be governed by a constitution and bylaws approved by the national executive committee.

ARTICLE XV—PUBLICATIONS

SECTION 1. All publications bearing the name AMVETS, published by the national organization, State departments, posts, auxiliaries, Sad Sacks, or any other branch or affiliate of AMVETS shall be under the supervision of the national executive committee, which shall delegate sufficient general and specific authority to the publications committee to carry out the necessary duties. Copies of all such publications shall be sent to the chairman of the publications committee.

SEC. 2. The publications committee shall consist of three members, one of whom shall be appointed by the new national commander, one by the retiring national commander, and one elected by the national executive committee. The new national commander shall designate the chairman.

ARTICLE XVI—AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1. This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the total authorized delegates present at any AMVET national convention. Proposed amendments for action of the national convention must be submitted by a deparment convention, department executive committee, or the national executive committee to the national commander, and by him and/or the proposing body to the several departments and members of the national executive committee, by mail, at least 30 days prior to the convening of the next national convention. This constitution may, however, be amended by any national convention without notice, by unanimous vote.

BYLAWS OF AMVETS

ARTICLE I—NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SECTION 1. In case of death, removal from office or resignation of a national executive committeeman, his duly elected alternate will serve the unexpired term of said committeeman. Each department shall elect an alternate national executive committeeman. In the event of the absence or disability of the national executive committeeman to participate in the proceedings of the national executive committee meeting, the duly elected alternate shall cast the vote of the said national executive committeeman.

SEC. 2. Stated meetings of the national executive committee shall be held as follows: One immediately preceding the national convention, one immediately following the national convention, one in the month of November and one in the month of April. Special meetings may be held upon reasonable notice at the call of the national commander. The national commander shall call a meeting of the national executive committee upon the written request of the national executive committeemen from at least 25 percent of the organized departments.

SEC. 3. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum of the national executive committee.

SEC. 4. The national commander shall name such committee as he shall deem advisable, subject to ratification by the national executive committee at its next meeting succeeding the appointment. Such committees shall serve during the pleasure of the administration appointing them, and shall terminate upon the inauguration of a new national commander. No provision of this article shall be construed to prejudice the reappointment of the national executive committee.

SEC. 5. The national finance committee shall be charged with the preparation of the annual budget, and the handling of funds, subject to the approval of the national executive committee.

SEC. 6. The national executive committee shall approve the appointment and employment of proper officers for the administration of the affairs of AMVETS and prescribe their duties and compensation.

SEC. 7. Any national officer may receive compensation for his authorized activities on behalf of the organization, such compensation to be fixed in amount by the vote of the national executive committee.

SEC. 8. All questions affecting the eligibility for office and conduct of national officers shall be referred to and determined by the national executive committee. All questions affecting the eligibility for office and conduct of the national executive committeemen, department officers, or members of department executive committees may be referred to and determined by the executive committee of the department involved.

ARTICLE II—DUTIES OF OFFICERS

SECTION 1. National commander: The national commander shall be the executive head of AMVETS, with full power to enforce the provisions of the national constitution, the national bylaws, and the will of the national convention and national executive committee. He shall be the chairman of the national convention and the national executive committee. He shall appoint all necessary committees, subject to the ratification of the national executive committee, and shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 2. National vice commanders: The national vice commanders shall act as representatives of the national commander in all matters referred to them by him, and shall upon his request preside over the meetings

of the national convention or national executive committee, and perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 3. National executive director: The national executive director shall be charged with the administration of the policies and mandates of the national convention, the national executive committee, and the national commander. He shall supervise the activities of all divisions at national headquarters, issue such directives as may be necessary to departments and posts, act for the national commander during his absence from national headquarters, and perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office. He shall serve at the pleasure of the national commander and the national executive committee. He shall be the personnel officer for all employees at national headquarters.

SEC. 4. The national finance officer: The national finance officer shall be custodian of the funds of the national organization. All checks disbursing the funds of the national organization shall be signed by two or more persons as designated by the national executive committee, and the finance officer shall make reports of the condition of the national treasury when called for by the national commander or national executive committee. The national finance officer shall furnish a surety bond as hereinafter prescribed. He shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 5. National judge advocate: The national judge advocate shall advise the national officers and the national executive committee on all legal matters, including the construction and interpretation of the national constitution and bylaws, and shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 6. National service directory: The national service director shall be the service and welfare officer of the national organization. He shall be responsible for the proper handling of claims of veterans and their dependents or survivors before the Veterans Administration; employment problems; prosecution of rights under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and Selective Training and Service Act; civil-service questions, and other legislation concerning veterans' affairs; and the answering of individual requests for assistance or information from members, posts, and departments. It will be the duty of the national service director to formulate a rehabilitation program and to direct the activities of staff members charged with implementing the program. A part of this program will be the formation of a staff of trained national service officers and their assignment to the various regional offices of the Veterans Administration.

SEC. 7. National legislative director: The national legislative director shall be responsible for preparing the national legislative program in accordance with the mandates of the nationa convention, the national executive committee, and the national legislative committee. It is his further responsibility to draft the necessary bills in connection therewith and to cause such bills to be introduced in Congress and actively urge the consideration of legislation thus proposed. He shall at all times be fully informed when hearings are to be held on bills in which AMVETS is interested and be prepared to present testimony before the committee or committees handling such bills. It shall be his duty to maintain close liaison with Members of the House and Senate in order to secure the enactment of the AMVET program. He will make every effort to cooperate fully with other groups favoring proposed legislation which is supported by AMVETS, and it shall be his responsibility to maintain adequate legislative information when requested by individual members, posts, or departments of AMVETS. He shall serve at the pleasure of the national commander and the national executive committee.

SEC. 8. National public relations director: The national public relations director, under the direction of the national commander, shall be responsible for the planning, formulation, and development of a public relations program, including publicity, organizational publications, etc. He shall be responsible for efficient and proper liaison with all public relation media—press, radio, newsreels, periodicals—and all forms of advertising. He shall serve at the pleasure of the national commander and the national executive committee.

SEC. 9. National chaplain: The national chaplain shall perform such divine and nonsectarian services as may be necessary, adhering to the appropriate ceremonial rituals, and discharge the other duties incident to the office.

SEC. 10. National historian: The national historian shall compile from year to year all records of historical value and interest for the national headquarters of AMVETS. He shall also assist department and post historians so as to coordinate and unify the work of these officials, and perform such other duties as the national commander and the national executive committee shall prescribe. He shall serve at the pleasure of the national commander and the national executive committee.

SEC. 11. National provost marshal: The national provost marshal shall maintain order at all meetings and conventions. He shall perform such other duties as may be requested by the national commander.

SEC. 12. National surgeon general: The surgeon general shall perform such special duties as are assigned by the national commander, as well as the usual duties incident to the office.

SEC. 13. National inspector general: The national inspector general shall be the investigating officer of the organization. By direction of the national commander or the national executive committee he shall make any necessary investigations pertaining to grievances, disciplinary cases, fraud, or dishonesty within the organization, charges of conduct unbecoming an AMVET and shall be empowered to have access to all records, financial and otherwise, of all department or post officers or members when necessary for the carrying out of his duties. He may be compensated for his actual expenses in carrying out these duties, subject to the approval of the national executive committee.

ARTICLE III—CHARTERS

SECTION 1. A department executive committee may suspend, cancel, or revoke a post charter and such action shall be final and conclusive, unless an appeal is taken to the national executive committee within 30 days from the date of said suspension, cancellation, or revocation. Action taken by the national executive committee upon appeal shall be binding, pending appeal to the next national convention.

A post charter which has been thus suspended may be reinstated by action of the department executive committee if the post purge itself of the offense within 60 days of its suspension. If the delinquency is not cleared to the satisfaction of the department executive committee within 60 days, appropriate action shall be taken by that committee to effect revocation or cancellation of the charter.

In the event that a department fails or refuses to discipline a post after the national commander has requested such action, it is violating the rules of the constitution and bylaws. After demand has been made upon said department for action, the national commander may suspend the charter of such post by notice, accompanied by written notice, a copy of which shall be forwarded to the department and the national executive committee. The determination of whether the charter shall be cancelled shall be considered at the next meeting of the national executive committee.

SEC. 2. Any post failing to meet the obligations imposed upon it by the constitution and bylaws, or ceasing to function for 6 months as a post of AMVETS or voluntarily ceasing to function as a post, or merging with one or more other posts, or refusing or failing to pay the department and national per capita dues within 60 days after collection by the post, shall, upon order of the department executive committee, surrender its charter.

SEC. 3. Upon revocation, cancellation, or suspension of the charter of a post in any department of AMVETS, said post shall immediately cease operation, and upon revocation or cancellation shall turn over its charter and assets to its department commander or department executive committee. The department executive committee is authorized, empowered, and directed by and through its duly authorized agent to take possession, custody, and control of all records, property, and assets of said post. So much of the said assets as are required for the purpose shall be applied to any indebtedness of the said post: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed as requiring any department to take over or to assume any financial responsibility of such post. Said department executive committee may provide for the transfer of the members of said post to other posts of their choice, subject to the approval of such other posts. At the request of the individual member involved, where no other post exists in the same area, he may become a member at large within the organization.

SEC. 4. The national executive committee shall provide a uniform code of procedure to be followed in the revocation, cancellation, or suspension of post charters, and a method of appeal to the national executive committee.

ARTICLE IV—DISCIPLINE OF POSTS AND POST MEMBERS

SECTION 1. Each post of the AMVETS shall be the judge of its own membership, subject to the provisions of the constitutions and bylaws of the national and department organizations.

(a) *Provided, however,* That when the conduct of any member of AMVETS is such that it in any way will reflect discredit or invite criticism of the organization, or who belongs to or joins any group, organization, or party that is not compatible with the aims and principles of AMVETS, the department commander shall immediately bring the matter to the attention of the post of which the individual is a member. If the post fails to act and protect the name of AMVETS, the department executive committee may suspend the charter of the post involved, pending a hearing and final action by the department executive committee.

(b) In the event that the department executive committee fails to act in accordance with paragraph (a) of this article, the national executive committee may suspend the charter of the post involved, pending a hearing and final action by the national executive committee.

SEC. 2. Members may be suspended or expelled by a post, upon a proper showing of cause. Written charges, which shall be furnished the member involved at least 15 days prior to that date set for the hearing, shall be based upon disloyalty, neglect of duty, dishonesty, and conduct unbecoming a member of AMVETS.

SEC. 3. Any member who has been expelled has the right of appeal to his department executive committee, according to the provision in the bylaws of such department. The decision of the committee shall be final with the right of appeal to the department convention.

SEC. 4. Membership shall be on a fiscal year basis and shall run from January 1 through December 31. A member whose dues have not been paid 30 days after the expiration of a year's membership shall be suspended and if not paid within 60 days of expiration date, his membership and all his rights and privileges shall be forfeited.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this article shall be construed to limit in any way the powers conferred by section 1 of article III of the bylaws.

ARTICLE V—MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. Membership in AMVETS constitutes membership in the national organization of AMVETS through post affiliation and/or membership at large. Hereafter all AMVETS shall, prior to their acceptance as members, pledge allegiance to the United States of America and its Constitution, and certify that they have read, or have had read to them, the AMVETS declaration of principles, and that they accept and subscribe to the same, and they shall not advocate or belong to any group or organization advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force.

ARTICLE VI—MONEYS AND COLLECTIONS

SECTION 1. All national, department, and post officials handling AMVET funds, shall be properly bonded with a good and solvent bonding and surety company, acceptable to the United States Treasury, as surety to cover the average amount of AMVET funds handled by such individuals in a single year. In case of delinquencies in the payment of amounts due department or national headquarters, action shall be taken at once by the proper officials to bring about an immediate and complete settlement. The bonds provided by national officials shall be approved by the national executive committee, and those provided by department and post officials shall be approved by the department executive committee. The blanket bond carried by national headquarters covering post and department officers shall not include the officers or employees of any corporation, business or other enterprise operated by and within the post or department. A separate bond covering such operation shall be carried by the post or department involved.

SEC. 2. No contracts involving expenditure in excess of $1,000 of national AMVET funds shall be negotiated without inviting a reasonable number of competitive written bids, and where the required products are of equal quality the contract shall be awarded to the lowest bidder.

SEC. 3 (a). Any contract entered into by any post with any individual, firm or corporation, providing for a division of profits, shall first be submitted to the department judge advocate for approval. If rejected by him, an appeal may be made to the next department executive committee meeting. Its action shall be final.

(b) Wherever post club rooms are maintained and operated for the convenience and pleasure of its members and the name of AMVETS or its insignia are displayed or used, a board of trustees shall be elected from among the members of the post to supervise its activities, operation and finances.

SEC. 4. All posts and department accounts shall be kept in accordance with a uniform accounting system established by national headquarters. The accounting system forms are to be provided by national headquarters to the posts and departments at a nominal cost.

SEC. 5. The minimum annual membership dues shall be $4 payable to the post, of which sum $2 shall be forwarded to national headquarters, $1 to the department headquarters and $1 retained by the post. Dues above the minimum set forth here shall be fixed by the post and/or department. Where no department exists, $3 shall be forwarded to national headquarters and $1 retained by the post. Of the $3 sent to national headquarters, $1 shall be set aside in a separate fund pending the establishment of a department. Members at large will remit the minimum dues direct to national headquarters, of which sum national will retain $3 and $1 will be returned to the respective department. Where no department exists, national headquarters will set aside the $1 for return when a department is formed. Any veteran who is eligible to join AMVETS and who is in full time attendance at a university, college or trade or technical school under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (GI Bill of Rights) and Public Law 16 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, may join any post for a $1.50 membership fee per year, of which 50 cents shall be remitted to national headquarters, 50 cents to department headquarters and 50 cents retained in the post. The method of forwarding dues to the national headquarters shall be prescribed by the national convention or the national executive committee. All members on active duty shall be permitted to retain their membership without charge.

SEC. 6. All contracts to be executed by the national headquarters shall be approved by the national executive committee and signed by the national commander and attested by the national executive director.

ARTICLE VII—DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. The word "he" wherever it shall appear in either the constitution or bylaws of the AMVETS shall be construed as referring to both sexes.

ARTICLE VIII—RESTRICTED USE OF ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. AMVETS, or any component part thereof, shall not be used to promote the interest of any individual who is a candidate for public office, or to promote otherwise, any individual, organization, political party, faction, or product Any violation of this provision shall be sufficient cause for disciplinary action against the offending member, post, or department

ARTICLE IX—MEETINGS

SECTION 1. All business meetings of this organization shall be conducted under Robert's Rules of Order.

ARTICLE X—NATIONAL FLOWER

SECTION 1. The national flower shall be the four-leaf white clover, meaning "think of me."

ARTICLE XI—DIVISION OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

SECTION 1. There is hereby created a division of international affairs of AMVETS. The division shall be composed of three directors, one of whom shall be the executive director, and the other two shall be associate directors. The directors shall be appointed by the national commander with the consent of the national executive committee.

SEC. 2. The directors shall serve at the pleasure of the national commander and the national executive committee.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the directors to be informed on matters of international affairs, perform research and investigation in such affairs, inform the national executive committee and the membership of the organization of all matters found to affect the peace, and make recommendations thereof, and provide representation at any peace conference, subject to the approval of the national executive committee. Funds shall be provided upon approval of the executive committee for the operation of this division.

ARTICLE XII—ACCOUNTING FOR MONEYS

SECTION 1. All moneys received by this organization shall be strictly and accurately accounted for, and a report shall be made available annually to all members, showing the sources of all such income and the expenditure thereof. All posts, departments, and national accounts shall be kept in accordance with a uniform accounting system as established by national headquarters.

ARTICLE XIII—POLICY

SECTION 1. The policy of AMVETS shall be fixed (a) by the national convention as reflected in the resolutions adopted; (b) by the national executive committee when not in conflict with convention mandates; and (c) by the compilation of the result of periodical polls of posts on current issues. Departments, posts, subsidiaries, and auxiliaries shall be notified by national headquarters of policy so fixed.

SEC. 2. No member of AMVETS shall represent or purport to represent any department, post, auxiliary, or subsidiary of AMVETS in opposition to, or other than in complete consonance with policy so determined and notified.

ARTICLE XIV—AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1. These bylaws may be amended by any national convention by a majority vote of the total authorized representation thereat, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted through the national executive committee by mailing or delivering the same to it at least 30 days prior to the convening of the next national convention. The said bylaws may also be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of any national convention without prior notice.

SEC. 2. No proposed amendment shall be submitted through the national executive committee or considered by the national convention, as provided in section 1 of this article, unless said proposed amendment shall have been first submitted by a department convention, department executive committee, or national executive committee.

Human Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an excerpt from Drew Pearson's the Washington Merry-Go-Round, appearing in today's Washington Post:

HUMAN RELATIONS

You don't usually expect the chairman of a Democratic National Committee dinner to be a philosopher on human relations. Nor do you expect many big-business men to be working Democrats. But Dwight Palmer, president of the General Cable Co., happens to be chairman of the big Democratic dinner in New York this week, and when he received a letter from an Indiana Democrat calling him a Negro-loving, prolabor Rooseveltian, Palmer wrote back:

"My job is running a company that employs about 7,000 people, and we have plants in Perth Amboy and Bayonne, N. J.; Rome, N. Y.; St. Louis, Mo.; Los Angeles and Emeryville, Calif. For a long period of time I have been interested in bettering human relations by opening up jobs and up-grading people, based solely upon merit, regardless of race, creed, or color.

"The America of the early days, when the Anglo-Saxon strain dominated everything, is no longer with us. The influx of foreign-born from all parts of the world has made America what it is today. Each racial and religious group brought with it some of the best of its Old World talents and ideals. And

these all dumped into the melting pot have developed a Nation that is strong, democratic, and outspoken with all the freedoms that go to make up a true democracy.

"We have two Jews as vice presidents in our organization. Another vice president is of Italian parentage. We have Protestants and Catholics in the management group, and we have Negroes serving as foremen, department managers, and in our laboratories.

"It so happens that I was born in St. Louis, white and Presbyterian. It took me quite a while to free myself of some of my prejudices and discriminations. Put my feeling is that I have to see what I personally can produce in the way of doing my share to get people to understand each other better."

The Republicans Lost Again—As We Predicted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a radio address delivered by Episcopal Rector Rev. Charles Granville Hamilton on December 3, 1950, at Aberdeen, Miss.:

It is recorded of an old and false prophet "but he lied to him" (I Kings 13: 19). It is still true of some more recent commentators and columnists.

The Democratic Party won the 1950 election. It did better than in the previous three off-year elections. The Republican gains in the Senate in those elections of 6, 9, and 12, shrank to 5 this year, while their congressional gains of 80, 50, and 55 also went down to 31.

Twenty-one of the twenty-two million 1948 Republicans voted in 1950, whereas only nineteen of the twenty-four million 1948 Democrats voted in 1950. As usual, millions of Democrats failed to vote in an off year. Some do not realize how important Congressmen are; some were never taught it; and some did not like the big brass in Korea, Spain, and Germany.

Republican gerrymandering requires Democrats to get more votes to win an even number of Congressmen.

Our predictions came true again as they have in the last four Presidential elections. In 1946, the caterpillars voted to have no more butterflies; in 1948, the people spoke with no uncertain voice; and in 1950 they are still for the Democratic Party.

Mr. Republican of Ohio did not gain votes in Ohio. Two hundred thousand less Democrats voted, while the normal Republican vote got out. Either races for State offices or religious prejudice cost Joseph Ferguson many Democratic votes, not taking into consideration the great volume of free advertising which his opponent received. Mr. Republican's friends probably spent more money than most candidates for President have spent. Labor in Ohio may have had one dollar to each twenty which the Republicans had. Mr. Republican remains a symbol of the ignorant who believe what they read in the newspapers, of the haters of the poor who are glad that they are not Christians, and of the frustrated neurotics who see in him a symbol of a return to the nostalgic days of 1910.

In Senate races labor purged in Maryland and Missouri. The Marylander lost because he supported the Taft-Hartley law, because he opposed FEPC, and because his Governor put a sales tax over on the people. No governor who put over a sales-tax law has ever been reelected.

The billion dollars which the Republicans may have spent on the election came partly from fat cats, from friendly corporate interests, probably the "Chiangese" lobby, and partly from the gambling racket. The Kefauver investigation of Nation-wide gamblers caused angry gamblers to retaliate with money and other help to the Republicans.

In Illinois, gambling interests were not averse to the election of DIRKSEN, the distillers' friend, over his opponent. Exposure of Republicans in gambling rackets in Idaho did not keep them from winning. The gambling machine which controls California politics did not want Democrats. Nevada elected a Republican Governor because his opponent was accused of being honest. Luzerne gamblers of Pennsylvania helped in a Republican victory where more votes were counted in many precincts than there were people living in them. Governor Dewey seems to have double-crossed his own candidate for mayor by joining up with Jim Farley and the shady money which elected a man who, up to date, has never hurt gamblers. The foolish political moves of some self-appointed Democratic bosses helped Governor Dewey. Some Mississippi Democrats should be named as missionaries to introduce their gubernatorial and senatorial primaries into New York.

Liquor interests won in Oregon and Arkansas, with probably fifty dollars to each one the opposition had. Legalized gambling was turned down by voters, which does not hurt gamblers where the governors leave the State wide open.

Horatiusism from Wisconsin lost in most States—even in the old home State. Every county where it waxed wroth, gave less votes for the Republicans. In Connecticut, victories were chalked up notwithstanding the efforts of the "big wind" and the "big voice." Fourteen of the eighteen Democrats who voted against the McCarran atrocity were easily reelected. In Connecticut the Republicans used television pictures of Stalin during the campaign and in Maryland a composite fake picture of the Democratic candidate for the Senate and Earl Browder was shown. The greatest loss was that scholarly man from Utah. Other serious losses were of capable "Mr. Good Common Sense," from Pennsylvania, and HELEN DOUGLAS, Mrs. WOODHOUSE, JOHN CARROLL, ANDY JACOBS, ANDY BIEMILLER, and GENE O'SULLIVAN. Lobby money did not beat Representative BUCHANAN. In the Oklahoma senatorial race the capable Democrat was elected over an oily, clerical clown. Three senatorial candidates in Connecticut, Missouri, and New York were elected even though they believe in freedom of speech.

The Republicans have forgotten that one of their generals forgot to give winter clothing to freezing soldiers as well as to find out how many men they were fighting, while the other Republican general is head of the university with the most Communist sympathizers. The election results were encouraging to the Stalinites. Isolationism is still alive among the Republicans, and our foreign policy can grow worse as a result.

There are some clear conclusions. The American people like President Truman. They do not want the Republican Party in power nationally. They do not believe that the Republican Party is, next to the dog, man's best friend. The Republican Party will never win another national election. The Democratic Party has won 10 of the last 11 elections and will win again in 1952. The truth is hard to get into the press. Education has failed to educate many voters in Northern States, which spend much on schools, and on what Government is all about and the American way of life, but it doesn't seem to soak in. The people of America are still Democratic nevertheless.

Unity and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an address by Mr. Harry Polk, president of the National Reclamation Association, at the recent convention of that association in Spokane, Wash.:

Mr. Chairman, friends of reclamation, this is one of the happiest moments of my life.

We are assembled in a State which was among the first to recognize the benefits of reclamation; a great State whose people have not only continued to make irrigation pay increasing dividends through the years, but have consistently kept pace with demands placed upon it through an unprecedented migration of population to the Pacific West.

Blessed with the inexhaustible fountainhead of water supply from the mighty Columbia, an abundance of electric energy for an ever-expanding industry has been supplied, and with it, water that will soon flow out over a million acres of arid land onto the world's largest single irrigation project.

And we are met in a great metropolis of the West, where industry, as in Seattle, Portland, and other western centers of population, is taking fullest advantage of this huge natural water resource.

And here we have a people whose kindly hospitality can best be measured in terms equally comparable to the development of which they have long since become a part. From the time Spokane representatives first invited us to come back for our second meeting in their city in 14 years, nothing has been left undone to make this, our 19th annual convention, the most successful of all time.

As president of our association, I want to acknowledge the splendid cooperation and teamwork so effectively demonstrated by the Chamber of Commerce of which Otto Warn is president, and our own "Old Faithful" Jim Ford is secretary-manager, in planning for this event. We know it is no easy task; we are well aware of the many trying difficulties you faced, especially with the loss of one of your larger hostelries by fire. But there has been no problem which you have hesitated to tackle. You said, "Come on; we'll take care of you." And you've done a magnificent job. So, to you, Mayor Meehan, Mr. Warn, and Jim Ford, and all your working partners, I know that every delegate within the hearing of my voice would want to join with me in saying, "Thank you."

This has been a significant year for reclamation.

Since our last annual conference in Salt Lake City, a lot of water has gone over the dam.

We have seen Congress, for the third successive year, vote a third of a billion dollars to reclamation alone, besides the $200,000,000 appropriated to the Corps of Engineers for flood control projects in the 17 reclamation States. These are impressive figures. They mean that our water resources program is continuing to win annual favor at the hands of Congress in excess of a half billion dollars a year.

Since that last meeting we have seen an unheralded and undeclared war being fought on foreign soil again bring disruption to our program, as it did during World War II—with all construction on new undertakings suspended through Executive order, and later substantial reductions made in funds already voted by Congress to carry on the water-development program.

We have for the third time unfortunately been unsuccessful in our effort to liberalize the basis of authorization for new irrigation projects and repayment features of the existing law affecting reclamation.

We have seen water shortages grow more acute on some of the older projects with the consequent demands for supplementary water supply becoming more and more pronounced.

We have witnessed regions and States becoming more and more zealous in their claims to an equitable share of water from streams within their borders.

Disputes in terms of negotiated contracts with water users have stalled progress in getting projects completed and irrigation under way.

Through the year we have noted how hydroelectric power has become a more and more dominant issue because of the necessary aid it must provide for the building of multiple-purpose projects—especially in the writing of a formula prescribing just how power is to serve as a paying partner with reclamation expansion.

These and other problems with which we are confronted and going to increase the responsibility of the National Reclamation Association the coming year. Just how we shall meet them, more than ever before, is going to supply a standard of measurement for fixing the valuation on our organization for the further advancement of our western empire.

As your president, one who has served in various capacities and is now about to step aside, I feel it my duty to speak quite frankly on these points. In doing so, I should like to have you believe that what I might say, is prompted solely through the hope that our thinking might be directed in channels that may best serve the cause of sound reclamation development.

Commenting on administrative affairs of our own association, I am most happy to again be able to point to the sound financial condition of our treasury. As of today, with 2 months still left in the fiscal operating year, 14 States have met their quotas in full; 11 have made advance payments on next year in considerable amounts. It should be remembered, too, that most every State accepted all the way from 10 to 20 percent voluntary increases at Salt Lake City in order for us to expand our operations, both in the field and at the Washington office.

And in connection with finances, I should like especially to direct your attention to a factor which is all too often overlooked. As you well know, our operating funds come almost exclusively from States and individual membership dues, together with substantial contributions from business concerns whose operations are so closely linked with western agriculture. (I hope the good Congressman from our host State has satisfied himself on this point.)

But in addition to our working budget, States, civic organizations, State reclamation associations, and numerous individuals make contributions that often go unnoticed. They send delegations to Washington, they pay expenses of committee members to distant points for conferences, and assist in many other ways. These contributions are just as realistic to our operation as the respective State quotas, and I feel they should not go unnoticed.

On the efficient operation of the Washington office under our secretary-manager Bill Welsh, I do not need to comment; the excellent manner in which he has accepted and discharged his responsibilities speaks for itself. I do want to make particular mention, however, of the work of Mr. Welsh's new assistant, Merl Peek, since he was employed as a result of action taken at Salt Lake City a year ago. He started work in Washington January 1, and this is the first opportunity we have had to evaluate the experiment. Besides being of invaluable help in Washington, for the past 5 months, Mr. Peek has been on a tour of the Western States, conferring with water users, studying projects, attending State association meetings and helping to establish better public relations with business firms.

One of the things he has learned in his visits is that water users in general, and those interested in water development, would like to make more use of national reclamation association headquarters, but they repeatedly commented that the office was too far removed from their homes. Being discussed here, I am told, is the feasibility of establishing an office at some central point in the West, such as Denver or Salt Lake City. Other similar organizations have adopted such a practice and with apparent effectiveness.

While we should not act with haste on any such proposal, there is to warrant its consideration, at least to the end that a committee of which the chairman of the Budget and Finance Committee should be a member, be set up to make a through study of the idea and report at the next annual conference.

Methods also are being considered by which State organizations might become more closely associated with the parent organization, to the end that we effect a closely knit over-all organization of western reclamation folk to give increasingly effective service to the cause to which we have dedicated ourselves.

Under that provision in our new constitution which accords to your president the privilege of assigning duties to special committees, I named two new groups for studies the past year, which have been especially active and which, along with our other committees, have done most commendable work. One was the small projects committee, for which I prevailed upon John Bliss, State engineer of New Mexico and immediate past president of the Association of Western Engineers, to direct its activities. Those working with Mr. Bliss on the committee were men who had either directed outstanding programs within their own State, or had indicated special interest in the field of small projects.

The committee had three meetings. It has given serious study to a special program that in years past has been too much neglected by the National Reclamation Association. I have read the report which the committee will make to this convention, and I commend it to your serious consideration. I am hopeful that some of that report may be implemented into a resolution which may carry us forward toward greater realization of achievement in this field which is of such vital interest to every one of our reclamation States.

Then there is another committee from whom you are to hear a special report this afternoon—the basin development committee. We as an organization for a number of years—since the aspect of basin-wide development of our rivers was first conceived—have contended vigorously against proposals of valley authorities patterned after TVA, but we need a positive program; we need a definite affirmative answer to those who advocate centralized control over our water resources. The interagency committee, made up of both Federal and State representatives, was a constructive approach, but it lacked authority for decision and action. It had no legal status.

Interstate compacts, with agreements on division and allotments of the water in streams, has been a most significant move in the right direction, and the ratification of such compacts, followed by establishment of an interstate commission composed most entirely of State representatives, so significantly achieved for the Upper Colorado River Basin, has dealt another real knock-out blow to valley authorities.

In these notable advances may well be found in large measure at least the answer to valley authority proposals, but in the light of repeated pronouncement of policy by present officials within the Federal Government, including no less than the Secretary of the Interior, and some of his top subordinates, that centralized Federal control of the major river basins of the Nation shall remain one of their chief objectives—certainly there is still need for vigilance, need for a broad positive approach to this question.

The vigorous and continued opposition by the National Reclamation Association has contributed materially to stemming the tide of regimentation and socialistic control over our water resource development, and with equal pride such organizations as the Pacific Northwest Development Association, Washington Development Association, the National Water Conference, the Mississippi Valley Association and State reclamation groups, can well lay claim to an educational program—especially here in the Columbia Valley—that has had most telling effects. But the job remains unfinished. We are still in need of an over-all positive program—a program which we can embrace with unity and enthusiasm and pronounce to the President, the Members of Congress, and to the Nation, as the program of the National Reclamation Association. It offers a challenge equal only to that expressed by your first president, when upon the founding of this great organization by men of wisdom and vision, he was able to go to the President of the United States and say: "At last the West speaks with one voice."

Great care was exercised in the naming of the basin development committee. Again men of vision, men of determination and action, with deep devotion to the West were needed. Fortunately I was able to get your first president, that capable leader, Marshall Dana, to head up the all-important group. One member was selected to represent each of the major river basins. They went to work. If you had attended their sessions as I did, I am sure you would have been equally impressed with the serious approach made to the problem. You will have an opportunity to judge the product of their efforts when the chairman submits his committee's formal report. I hope that from it at least may be found a pronouncement of principles on which we as an organization representing the thousands of water users in the reclamation States, may be able to stand firmly, unitedly.

Departing somewhat from precedent, I asked that members of the resolutions committee be selected ahead of the meeting of the State caucuses this year, and that the committee assemble for at least a full day's session prior to the opening of the convention. The obligations of this group of 17 men have in past years been crowded and such limited time that it not only proved a man-killing task, but did not permit sufficient consideration of important subjects deserved. It was believed that the extra day, provided a sufficient number of resolutions were laid before the committee, might greatly relieve the pressure on members and materially enhance the completed task. May I acknowledge my personal appreciation and that of the board of directors.

With the passing of the day of simple irrigation development in the West—the day when both engineering and financing were comparatively of slight difficulty—where construction costs were for the most part within scope of ability of the farmers on any given project to repay—it became necessary to find other means of cost-participation if the reclamation program was to move ahead.

Then came the multipurpose type of development, followed by the basin-wide approach. What individual water users could

no longer do, because of increased construction costs and complexity of engineering problems, other recognized benefits to the region might well contribute.

Power rapidly became a working partner of further irrigation development, and nowhere is it better exemplified than right here in the Pacific Northwest, from the waters of the mighty Columbia, the Snake, and the Willamette Rivers. Let me hasten to add that, whatever may be the situation in other areas, I have had it brought most conclusively to my attention that in the Pacific Northwest there exists today a definite shortage of firm power, which actually threatens to make necessary the application of rigid restrictions of electricity for private or municipal use. That, in spite of the fact that here we have the greatest single power energizing project in Coulee Dam that exists in the entire world.

Then, if dams on our western rivers were to provide protection from floods, that cost should be recognized, as should also the harboring protection for wildlife and establishment of recreation centers—each as regional or national benefits, to be paid for from the Federal Treasury and not chargeable against farmers on the land.

It was only natural that through this widened scope of development would come new problems of allocation of costs and administration of projects.

In the rapidly changing scene came of course a greatly stepped-up program—a program where single projects, considered on a basin-wide level—such as the Columbia, the Missouri, and the Colorado, and require more than a decade to build, ever they would be completed. What a far cry from the projects of 20 years ago, which would be investigated, designed, and brought into operation in a period of 2 or 3 years.

Yes, this new conception of design and construction to have the reclamation program continue to move forward is the answer to those who look with askance on our problems that have grown in multiplicity and that challenge our ability to solve.

An economy-minded Congress, facing an ever-increasing national debt and a critical need for a rapidly expanded defense program, is starting to look with much more scrutiny on all appropriations, and especially funds furnished for development of a region which for the most part is foreign to their own individual geographical conception and personal interests.

There are those, too, who, when they see us taking exception to increased centralized control and championing the cause of advocates for more local self-government, contend that, in proportion to our demands of the Federal Government shall we have to expect increased exercise of control over our living economy.

I am one of those who have in the past contended for greater local autonomy—call it States' rights, home rule, self-government, or what you will—and I shall continue to do so. It is my contention, too, that there is full justification in seeking Federal assistance in the expansion of reclamation in the West, and that it by no means follows that through the granting of that financial aid, there should come any added subservience to Government, or any increased degree of submission to any Federal bureau or agency.

Let me give you my reasoning on this. To begin with, the natural resources which are being turned to good for our people and for the Nation, belong to the West. They are of titular possession to those who braved untold hardships in exploring, settling, and developing a vast region of this United States whose resources have added countless millions to the over-all economy of our country.

Then, funds we seek for development are only loans or advances after all. Had we an organization big enough in character to properly organize and operate a financial agency, it is entirely within the realm of practicability that bonds could be issued and sold against the development we propose, bonds which would, over the years, provide a sound investment, repaying completely the entire issue to those who had made the advance.

It is my conviction that States might well assume added responsibility, not only in further asserting their individual rights but in accepting construction responsibility wherever possible for the development of their water resources. This is especially true in the expansion of the small-projects program. It has been demonstrated in a number of instances that large savings can be effected through the construction of both water and power projects by private enterprise, and through State agencies, and I suggest for your consideration, programs carried out so effectively by the States of Montana and Utah in this particular field.

Some engineering authorities with experience in both Government-directed and privately constructed projects contend that, except for extensive, multipurpose, basin-wide development, even some of the larger undertakings might well be built through access to open money markets. This would carry with it the removal of interest dodges, provide capital on which both interest and Federal taxes would be paid, and at the same time, effect substantial savings. Certainly it would assure control on the local or State level.

It has become a habit for us to turn to the Federal Government with a get-all-we-can attitude because the other fellow is getting his. If we are to be saved from an economic crash in this country, I cannot help feeling that a return to individual self-reliance will prove as great a factor in preventing such a crash as any other one thing, and I believe that applies to the building and operation of reclamation projects as much as any other phase of our economic life.

The banker who loans money does not exercise control over the borrower's living economy so long as payments are made promptly. It is only when his customer falters, or fails to meet his obligations, that the money lender begins to take over—and justly so.

The Federal Government is merely the lender for our development. If our reclamation program is carefully planned, then soundly constructed and operated, every dollar will be returned to the Federal Treasury. It is this misconception of exercising control because of putting up the money that Federal agencies today are abusing their prerogatives. We who prize our freedom and defend the right of individuals to govern themselves have contended against this unjustified usurpation of Federal authority, and we shall continue to do so, based on the simple theory that officers of the Federal Government, be they located in Washington or elsewhere, should be our servants and not our masters.

It does necessarily follow, however, that to avoid any failures to meet our obligations to have reclamation projects, be they big or small, justify their building, they must be planned, surveyed, and designed with exceeding care, constructed efficiently and economically, and then operated effectively. I am convinced that reclamation can be justified on the basis of the contribution it will make to the Federal Treasury itself, even disregarding, if you must, the good that will come to our western people.

Need I call your attention to projects all over the West, where the funds have been advanced by the Federal Treasury to build, and increased payments through income taxes alone have many times repaid the total cost of these projects?

Total agricultural returns from crops grown on Federal reclamation projects since the enactment of the Reclamation Act 48 years ago are more than $6,000,000,000 or approximately four times the total investment in reclamation. During recent years, however, the gross crop return has exceeded $500,000,000 per year. In other words, the crop return every 3 years equals the total amount of money which the Federal Government has invested in reclamation. Another interesting disclosure is the fact that the income tax from reclamation areas has amounted to a total of $1,600,000,000 or the equivalent of the cost of all Federal reclamation today, and these payments are naturally in addition to the repayments by water users.

A noted agricultural economist, Dr. John Lee Coulter, did a special study for us recently on the question of "Why More Irrigation?" Here are some of the things we learned—that our population in the United States passed the 100,000,000 mark July 1, 1915; then, during the 35 years since that date, our population has increased to in excess of 150,000,000 persons—a jump of 50 percent in that 35 years.

According to the 1945 agricultural census, total lands available for crops were 507,000,000 acres in 1920. Only 512,000,000 acres were available for crops in 1945. In other words, the acreage of tillable lands, including improved pasture and hay land, increased only 5,000,000 or less than 1 percent in the past 25 years—while our population has increased 50 percent in 35 years.

Prior to 1920 the farms in America were producing enough to feed all our people and an excess was being exported to western European countries. Since 1925 imports have exceeded exports every year except during the recent years of World War II and the present recovery.

Mechanization of our farms has reduced the number of farm animals by one-third—from 30,000,000 in 1920 to less than 10,000,000 today. During the period of 1915 to 1950 we plowed up 35,000,000 acres of the finest grazing and hay land in the Great Plains area and turned them into raising wheat. This reduction in farm animals and the resultant reduction in acreage to support them has permitted the shifting of some 60,000,000 acres of improved pasture, hay, and grazing land to the production of food for human beings.

Advanced methods of farming, improved feeds, use of fertilizer and other scientific advances have helped to bolster the production of food products for the ever-increasing population. Nevertheless, especially during the drought thirties, there was a significant loss of topsoil and fertility throughout the Great Plains from wind erosion. Consequently it is more important than ever now that conservation, reclamation, and irrigation be added to an improved agriculture to insure adequate food supply.

Even though we think in terms of a high living standard and plenty for all, 25 to 30 million people in these United States today are living below our medium standard.

We should not let ourselves be blinded by the fact that we have taken care of an increasing population by plowing under grazing and hay lands, by reducing cotton acreage, by mechanizing farm operations, and adoption of scientific farming methods. Most of these changes cannot be repeated. Some have led to excess erosion, depletion, and loss of tremendous acreage, nor can we depend on a continuation of the favorable weather enjoyed during the past decade.

This special observation turned up by Dr. Coulter should also be thrown in here: In 19[illegible] agricultural census showed that 512,000,000 acres of land were available for growing crops. Included with this total 21,500,000 acres are under irrigation. Bureau of Reclamation facilities are capable of serving two and two-thirds million acres with a full water supply and about the same number with supplemental water. In addition, more than a half-million acres of Indian lands are served under existing facilities. It is estimated that our available water supply will serve about 16,500,000 acres not now irrigated

and furnish additional supplies to some 9,000,000 more acres in need of supplemental water.

And whatever may be the facts today as to our food and fiber supply, we are pitifully negligent if we do not look to the future. Then what of further demands on our agricultural plant? We must recognize the dynamic character of our mounting population. Not only are requirements steadily increasing year by year on the present per capita basis, but the rate of population growth is right now in excess of 2,000,000 yearly. Projected into the future, this means an addition of 50,000,000 in the next 25 years, or a national population of 200,000,000 by 1975.

If it now requires 2½ acres of harvested crops per capita, at the present rate of consumption, well may the question be asked—Where are we going to secure 125,000,000 additional acres of good productive land to feed 50,000,000 more people in the next 2½ decades?

In 1950, the total acreage of wheat and corn in the entire country amounted to only 135,000,000 acres. Where, I ask you therefore, are we to secure 125,000,000 additional acres of good farm land, or even 75,000,000 acres? As a matter of fact, agricultural experts are hard put to even see 10,000,000 acres unless it be in the watering of arid lands in our Western States.

The Water Resources Policy Commission is to make its recommendations to the President December 1. Perhaps it is fortunate we are meeting in an annual session before the results of this committee's studies are made known. The principles which should guide our own determination of policy are fundamentally the same. They have been reiterated year after year in resolutions. We should be prepared to assert those principles with renewed vigor, should they in whole or in part happen to be in conflict with the Commission's findings. We shall not add to our stature by merely assuming a "me too" attitude of complacent acceptance of any policy fixing group, shall we say, for the sake of expediency.

One of the things we are going to hear much about in this convention—and with which the Columbia Basin area is currently justly concerned—is the so-called Basin Account with its related application of the interest component. They are both most important factors in the economic justification or feasibility of basin-wide projects. Some kind of basin-wide accounting is essential in our new concept of development of all of a river's multiple resources transcending State lines.

In a realistic evaluation, the interest component should be recognized as a subsidy, pure and simple, to be obtained through operation of the power features from different units of a given project. It became a subsidy or direct aid to irrigation only by interpretation of law (the Solicitor's Opinion) and not through any legislative act of Congress.

Any objection I hold to the use of the so-called "interest component" has never been its actual application to the building costs of Reclamation projects, but rather to the method employed in its use. So far as I know, Congress has never authorized its application. We have seemed to place ourselves in a position of fear, lest, if Congress be asked to approve what is being done, they might turn thumbs down. I am in fullest accord with Federal subsidy to whatever extent it is necessary to build worth-while reclamation projects—projects that meet the rigid test of economic feasibility—subsidy that will be paid back to the Government many times over. But let us ask for those subsidies on a basis of economic justification without fear or apology, with full understanding by the Congress, in support of a program that is sound, and for the good of all.

And in justification of subsidies—besides the economic features to which reference has always been made—may I point out another salient factor. It is most significant to me that the $7,000,000,000 expended by the Federal Government throughout these United States from the time the program was first instituted in 1824 (125 years ago) on water conservation and related works, our 17 western Reclamation States—while receiving only 35 percent of the total expenditures, will repay 72 percent of all the reimbursable money—or a ratio of more than 2 to 1 over other sections of the country. Five of these western States even show such notable repayment assignments as in excess of 95 percent of all funds expended on water resources by the Federal Government in their respective States. These are the States of: Arizona, 98.6 percent to be repaid; Wyoming, 97.3 percent; Utah, 96.4 percent; Idaho, 96 percent; and Nevada, 95.5 percent.

Yes, generation and sale of hydroelectric power remains a salient factor in further development of irrigation because of the necessity for finding a way to meet the ever-widening gap between that share of the cost which water users are able to pay and the total amount required for getting water supply onto arid lands. Conflicts have arisen in different areas, but it centers for the most part around two major questions:

1. Just how the revenue from sale of hydropower be applied to the cost of building irrigation projects.

2. How far should the Federal Government go in development of the so-called public power.

Should the basin-account method be employed for the pooling of funds in a basin like the Columbia, or the Missouri? Should the interest component be applied directly as a subsidy to irrigation development, or should rates be established to compensate for such interest obligations?

Should the Federal Government be permitted to expand its activities in the power distribution field to the end that transmission lines be constructed in given areas without regard to existing distribution facilities built with private capital or where private enterprise stands willing to construct any necessary expansion of transmitting facilities?

Should the ambitions of our Federal Government go on uncurbed by permitting such practice as in the Southwest, where, when specifically denied the use of funds to build transmission lines and steam plants by the Congress, it teams up with REA and goes right on doing what Congress specifically directed should not be done?

Should the Federal Government insist on taking ownership and management of power plants built and paid for by private irrigation districts just because they happen to come within the scope of consideration for supplementary water supply?

Should Federal agencies usurp the power of local self-rule or should the jurisdiction of States and local governmental entities be recognized as was the intent of the founders of our country?

All these questions are among those you will hear discussed during our sessions—and by men far more able to discuss them than myself. From these presentations I hope will come enlightenment that may make it possible for us to be more confident, more firm, in whatever conclusions we reach, Let it be crystal-clear that any defense we offer for private utilities is done solely on a basis that they are part and parcel of a private-enterprise system which we champion, and not because of any particular chosen segment of that system, or of any punitive obligation our organization might conceivably be under.

The President of the United States himself is credited with saying that he would be happy to have private power companies handle the transmission of Government-produced hydroelectric power whenever they can do as good a job as the Federal Government. Private utilities should take him at his word and rise to the occasion of that challenge. Congress should, at the same time, make a declaration of Federal power policy in keeping with fair appraisals of the capacities of private enterprise and the ever-increasing needs for more electric power. Private industry must stand ready to meet its full responsibility and measure up to what may reasonably be expected.

In connection with the authorization of any new power development, particularly as a defense measure during the present world crisis, we should be continually vigilant, lest some project, definitely containing potential irrigation factors, be authorized and constructed without specific provision for later development of the irrigation features of the given project as soon as practicable.

If the National Reclamation Association has any justification, certainly it is found in our obligation of service to water users, those who operate irrigation projects—the men on the land, as Marshall Dana will tell you. Sometimes it occurs to your president that our anxiety to secure construction of projects is not matched by our desire or determination to protect the interests of those in whose hands rest the fate of those projects, success or failure.

Here, too, we have witnessed in the past few years, as attention centered more and more on the basin-wide aspect, a tendency to impose upon operators restrictions indicative of unwarranted Federal control. Witness that, in spite of completion of several large reservoirs within the authorized Missouri Basin plan, save for negotiation on a very small municipal water supply unit, not one repayment contract has been successfully negotiated to this date—and it has been six years since the Pick-Sloan Plan was approved by Congress in the 1944 Flood Control Act.

Only uncompromising insistance by the Bureau of Reclamation for terms to which water users could not possibly comply, such as on the Frenchman-Cambridge project in Nebraska, the Owl Creek in Wyoming, and Heart Butte in North Dakota, seem to have been responsible for this situation. Our association through resolutions and otherwise should seek to remedy this situation as promptly as possible.

Expressions of public opinion become more and more pronounced that people of this Nation are not willing to accept greater regimentation of their economy. It is becoming plainer day by day that they want no superimposed governmental agency controling our destiny—no CVA's or MVA's—they want individual rights and the private-enterprise system to be kept inviolate. They frown upon those who would take lightly their obligations of office or cast aspersions upon men who place the highest premium on loyalty to American traditions in government.

From such expressions of public sentiment the Department of Interior, with which the future of reclamation is so incumbent, might well take another look, lest there remain in that arm of the Federal Government any individual whose loyalty to socialistic philosophies be placed above that of his own country—and let us not forget that the unmistakable pronouncement of such public opinion places upon the National Reclamation Association even greater responsibilities in the development and control of our water resources—responsibilities for protecting the rights of States and local governmental units against any further usurpation of their rights by Federal authorities.

I have faith that we will meet this test, because I have an abiding faith in America, faith in the West, faith in the people who are still willing to preserve our free form of government and the individual rights of every freedom-loving citizen.

We should remember that while men risk their lives in battle lines, we at home have the very deep obligation to see that they are not deceived over what they fight to protect. We need to maintain a strong, a solvent Government—a balanced economy—a contented citizenry.

Proper guarding and sound development of our natural water resources will make as significant a contribution to these obligations as any other single undertaking to which we could employ our talents.

As we go into the 20th year of our existence for the National Reclamation Association, one of the most pressing needs of our organization is the establishment of a unified attitude and approach toward our common objectives. Differences of opinion are healthy for anybody; they make for sounder conclusions always—but those differences must of necessity come into final focus of unity to gain our ends; when we march into battle, we must be of one mind, pressing toward one common goal, if our objective is to be won.

Ability to reconcile differences provides a real test of one's true capacity for public service, his ability to adjust himself to ever-changing conditions in a changing world.

It was Thomas Jefferson, that great defender of liberty, who once said, "I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and institutions, but laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind as that becomes more developed, more enlightened, and as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered, and manner and opinions change, with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times."

And so it is with us. Times and customs change. We must be able to adjust ourselves to those changes which will make for a greater west and a greater America.

A Reservist's View of the Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. NELSON

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter received from a soldier constituent, because I think it gives enlightening information at first hand on the way our Reserve program is being handled. I have omitted the name of the constituent so that he may incur no difficulties.

The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For quite some time I have been considering writing you a letter, hoping to bring to your attention a few of the past and present conditions which have confused and still are confusing me in my tour of Army duty.

To begin with, I and many of my companions in the Army today are members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps. Many of us enlisted because we were given to understand that the Reserve Corps was to be a pool of highly trained and skilled personnel from which the Army would draw its technicians and specialists in the event that this country was ever required to fight another war. Many of us were married, had families, and believed that the Enlisted Reserves was just the place to keep us informed on what was going on in the Army so that, should we be needed, we would be ready to serve in the best way we knew how.

Secondly, a great number of the Enlisted Reserves were assigned to units. These were units of the same branch of the service in which they had served before. Many of their friends and fellow workers belonged to these units. They felt that by joining these units, they would at least have the comfort of being with someone they knew, should their units be called to active duty.

Now comes the one and only gripe or complaint that I have to register. Why weren't the Organized Reserves called as units, so that each man could be assigned to the work for which he was trained, without a great deal of additional training, hardship, and, in some cases, broken hearts and spirits?

We were first of all disbanded as units, assigned to inactive groups, then assigned to volunteer Reserve groups. After this we were called for physical examinations and, before we had a chance to get our second wind, were told to report for active duty. Some of your Massachusetts colleagues have been investigating this for the past 3 or 4 weeks, mostly because of the fact that the enlisted Reserve group that was called from that State had so little time to get their personal affairs settled before leaving for camp. This is the group that you probably have read about in the Boston papers, who threatened to charter a bus and go a. w. o. l. if they were not granted a few days at home before leaving this camp for overseas. I happened to be assigned to the same company as these men and it was largely through their efforts that I was able to get a few days at home myself, although most of the boys from Maine who were called did get a longer period of time to close up their personal affairs than the boys from Massachusetts.

There are a great deal of other things that puzzle me. Some of them I may be all wet on, but others seem to be happening to the other reservists in this camp, and also in other camps where reservists have been trained.

Most of us were recalled as specialists or technicians, but when we arrived here at Camp Breckinridge we were assigned to infantry training units and plainly told that we were cannon fodder and that we were headed for Korea, or any other hot spot where the cold war got too hot.

Many of us had had no previous infantry training, and many others, including myself, had never had training with any of the Army weapons, yet we were given 96 hours of basic infantry training as a refresher course. A refresher course, in my way of thinking, is learning something that you have forgotten; it cannot refresh your memory if you never knew it before.

Many of us attempted to get assigned to this post or to any other post where we would not be too far from home. Although there is a crying need for trained technicians and specialists right here on this post, the men were sent to Korea, or to some other overseas post. In some cases the commanding officers of the various units on the post attempted to have us transferred to their units but were told by higher headquarters that this was not possible. Myself and five others were called to the post hospital, interviewed by the adjutant, and asked if we would like to be assigned. We were all former members of the medical department and he told us that he was short of trained personnel and would get us transferred as soon as we made up our minds whether we would like it here or not. Nothing came of it, but 2 weeks later we were assigned to the post hospital on special duty and four of us spent 2 weeks cleaning out empty buildings. The nurses and doctors assigned to the hospital are asking for trained help and they are getting men from various branches of the service who have only seen the inside of a hospital or dispensary as patients. The above I know about because it actually happened to me, and, if what I hear is true, it has happened to others from other companies and other branches of the service. Why is the Army sending its trained men overseas and spending a lot of time and money taking men out of various units and training them in some other specialties when there is such an acute shortage of manpower in this country and so few trained and skilled specialists? An example of this is happening right here at the post hospital. A nurse is assigned to teach the new men assigned to the hospital for duty, yet there are literally hundreds of trained medics on the post who could do the jobs without any training. I should say, were on the post, because most of them have been transferred to parts unknown.

I am not intending for this letter to be a complaint, the Good Lord knows that you receive enough of them from other people. These are some things which I have had on my mind for quite some time. I thought at first that it was just like before, the old Army game, but now I begin to think that maybe something else is behind it all. I went home for a few days in November and during my trip I met a lot of people and talked to a lot of people. I also met a large number of soldiers, both officers and enlisted men. I find that the same thing is happening in other camps. It is not the fault of the officers commanding our companies, regiments, or divisions. They have cooperated with us as much as they were permitted to in granting leaves, furloughs, passes, and many other things that we have asked for, but when it comes to assignment of personnel at the job which they should be doing, no one on this post seems to have the authority to do that. Someone is creating a lot of confusion. Every day we read in the Army Times or other Army publications that certain changes for the good of the Army are being made, or are to be made, yet in the next issue these changes have been suspended or postponed. We are told that if we have had a long period of prior active service and have families, we will not be sent overseas. We read about this in news dispatches from Washington, yet men are being sent overseas who have spent 4 or 5 years there. We read about men being deferred from the draft for minor physical ailments, yet we have men in our company and some who have been sent overseas who were receiving compensation from the Veterans' Administration before being recalled to active duty. This is another point worth remembering; a great number of reservists were called to active duty and given the flimsiest of physical examinations. As soon as they arrived in camp they were given examinations by the Army doctors and discharged as soon as the paper work could be completed. Another waste of time and manpower.

Although all the things that I have mentioned above are happening and will continue to happen, the morale is good. We have been pretty low sometimes but always manage to get back up to where we can face another day. There are a large number of men going a. w. o. l., but most of them are scheduled for overseas shipment and that is about the only way that they can get home to say good-by to their wives and families before leaving. Very few of them failed to return in time to go out with their shipment group.

It is the opinion of a large number of us that someone is fouling the Army up. Who it is, we don't know, but we do know that should the Communists attempt to create confusion and unrest, dissension, broken morale, and loss of spirit in the Army today, they would be using just about the same tactics that have been used to confuse us. We don't think it is the Communists, but,

whatever it is, they are doing a beautiful job.

I believe that you must have read about enough of this, if you could go this far. You can use this letter for whatever it is worth, and if you want to, you can read it in Congress. It may help the people of this country realize what they are up against. Ey the time it reaches you I may be on my way overseas, or to some other camp, although I am not yet on orders to ship out.

Yours for peace,

——— ———.

An Additional Advertising Blast by Omaha Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, part 7 of the Omaha doctors' "lie and smear" advertising campaign is as follows.

On October 31, 1950, the following advertisement appeared in the Omaha World-Herald:

MR. WAGE EARNER, DO YOU WANT ANOTHER DEDUCTION FROM YOUR PAY CHECK?

The proposed compulsory national health insurance (socialized medicine) would mean another payroll deduction.

WHAT IS IT?

Compulsory national health insurance is politically controlled medicine. It is not insurance by any stretch of the imagination.

WHO RUNS IT?

The Government will through the Federal Security Agency. This agency will collect the tax (another deduction from your pay check), control the money, set the rules, determine the service, direct doctor and patient participation, and dominate every citizen's medical affairs.

WHAT DOES IT COST?

Estimates of tax economists and medical experts range from $6,000,000,000 to $18,000,000,000 a year.

WHO PAYS FOR IT?

You do, whether you want it or not. Every wage earner will have to pay through another payroll deduction.

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS?

The sponsors use such vague terms as "when funds are available," "insofar as possible," and "when facilities permit." The only positive thing is that it guarantees a new payroll tax and less take-home money for you.

IS IT GOOD FOR AMERICA?

No; because in every great nation that has tried it—Germany, Russia, France, and Great Britain—the results have been: second-rate medical care; decline of medical education and research; invasion of the patient's personal privacy; political control in place of medical direction; a new hierarchy of government administrators; a growing-bigger-by-the-day tax burden, and the extension of control over other professions.

Make no mistake. Government-sponsored compulsory health insurance is socialized medicine. You will be the one to suffer. If you value your health and your liberty, fight to keep bureaucratic politics out of medicine, your American medicine that has made America the healthiest great Nation in the world. Fight by electing to Congress a Representative that will fight to keep socialism from the American scene.

This ad paid for by the Healing Arts Committee. Dr. M. C. Howard, chairman; doctors, Dr. J. Phil Redgwick; nurses, Claire J. Siemsen, R. N.; technicians, Rita Gillespie; dentists, Dr. C. H. Schroeder; druggists, W. E. Shainholtz; optometrists, Dr. W. F. Noland; chiropodists, Dr. H. G. Wieseman.

Vote for HOWARD BUFFETT for Congress on November 7.

On November 1, 1950, this advertisement appeared in the Omaha World-Herald:

Blue Shield, the doctors' own plan for surgical-medical care, observes its sixth anniversary by announcing new, more liberal surgical and medical benefits.

These expanded benefits will be offered to employee and community groups enrolling after October 31. The new program will replace all existing memberships beginning January 1, 1951, as payments fall due. The new benefits follow:

In-hospital medical care is increased from 30 days to 70 days per admission, and the benefit payment is increased from $3 per day to $4 per day.

Benefit payments for numerous major operations are increased from $150 to $200.

Benefit payments for numerous other services have been increased.

The schedule of benefits also includes a number of services not formerly listed.

Increased benefits for some types of radiation treatment for cancer.

The following is a brief summary of the other benefits which Blue Shield membership provides:

1. Benefits for setting of fractures and dislocations.
2. Allowances for minor surgery in the doctor's office.
3. Benefits for blood transfusions, pathological services, and electrocardiograph. (In-hospital medical care cases only.)
4. Allowances for X-rays for accident, in-hospital care and surgical cases.
5. Benefits for maternity and obstetrical care after 10 months' continuous family membership.
6. Allowances for anesthesia.
7. The amounts listed in the schedule of benefits will be accepted as full payment for services by Blue Shield participating physicians if the member's annual income does not exceed $2,600 (if married) or $1,800 (if single).

OUR RECORD OF SERVICE TO NEBRASKA

The Blue Shield plan was organized November 1, 1944, by the Omaha Douglas County Medical Society, and was approved later by the Nebraska State Medical Association. Because of outstanding service to its members, the plan has grown steadily and rapidly until today it points proudly to this record: Number of members, 140,631; services rendered, 61,506; amount paid to date for members' services, $2,010,190.

Smart people know a good thing when they see it.

Membership in the Blue Shield plan is available to persons working in firms where there are four or more employed. For full particulars write the Blue Shield plan today.

Blue Shield endorsed by your doctors, has been awarded the seal of acceptance by the American Medical Association for excellence of contract. More than 80 percent of the premium dollar is returned to subscribers in service benefits.

THE BLUE SHIELD PLAN.
OMAHA, NEBR.

The Relation of Foreign Affairs to the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. W. R. POAGE, Member of Congress, ranking member of the House Committee on Agriculture, delivered before the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation at Dallas, Tex., December 13, 1950:

THE RELATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the American Farm Bureau Federation myself, I want to thank the people of Dallas for their splendid hospitality; as a citizen of Texas, I want to extend to all those from other sections a hearty welcome, not only to the great city of Dallas—"Big D," as we say—but I want to urge you to visit the black prairies, the red hills, the high plains, and the irrigated valleys which, with the people who inhabit these areas, make of Texas the No. 1 agricultural State of the Union. You will be mighty welcome wherever you go.

The Farm Bureau has done much for farm people in Texas, just as it has for farm people across America. Down here in Texas we think we are especially fortunate to have Walter Hammond as our leader. He is a great American by any standard, and more and more people are coming to know it each year. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, I am always happy when Walter appears before our committee as a representative of the farmers of my home State. He is one of the great group of men and women, many of whom are here today, who have contributed so much to the wonderful progress that has been made in the standard of rural living in recent years.

It has only been in the last half century that we have begun to recognize agriculture as one of the most complicated, as well as one of the most vital activities of civilized man. When I was a boy, I lived in a typical agricultural community in central west Texas, 30 miles from the nearest railroad. I can well remember that every boy with any ambition at all looked forward to preparing himself for some type of urban activity. We thought that when a man failed at everything else, he could turn to farming. So long as rural people held agriculture in such low esteem, is it any wonder that city folks called us hayseeds? Until this viewpoint was reversed, there was indeed little opportunity on the farm, and I am inclined to believe that possibly the greatest service which farm organizations like the Farm Bureau have rendered was to give the world, and particularly the farm people themselves, a better understanding of the dignity and the complexity of agriculture as a profession.

Were it not for the fact that I know our farmers are today among our best informed citizens, I should be most reluctant to attempt to speak on the relations of foreign affairs to the American farmer. Most of us realize that just now anything that involves the foreign relations of our Government vitally affects every group, but I doubt if most of us realize how generally our relations with foreign countries are misunder-

stood and how likely is anyone who speaks on the subject to be misinterpreted. There is, therefore, a general reluctance on the part of public speakers to touch on this subject. I believe, however, that this is no time for silence. I would not invite or encourage desertion, but I believe real unity of purpose can only be obtained by frank discussion and understanding of our problems. I believe that our farmers, better than some other groups, know that the world has grown small. Today it requires far less time to travel from Dallas to Bangkok, Johannesburg, or San Paula, or for that matter to any spot on the face of the globe than it did to travel to the capital of this State when Neely Bryan built the first cabin in what was to become this commercial center of the Southwest. Yes the world has grown exceedingly small. Space must today be measured in hours of elapsed time, not in miles or leagues. Even a short generation ago, we first reluctantly admitted that we might be influenced by European affairs, but we were smugly confident that we would never have more than an academic interest in the economy or the government of Siberia, Korea, Ceylon, or Iran. Today the very mention of Siberia and Korea bring up most unpleasant pictures. Possibly we better become equally well acquainted with Ceylon and Iran, and that promptly, if we would avoid similar unpleasant familiarity a little farther down the line. And the American farmer may have a much closer relationship with those events than he realizes.

Let me give you an illustration of what I mean. I visited the Middle East just a couple of months ago. I found it to be a land of abject poverty, of exploitation of the masses and of scanty and undeveloped natural resources. In short, I found it dangerously ready in many respects for a communistic revolution. It still contains some of the strongest anticommunistic sentiment in the world. I therefore don't mean that the Middle East is lost, but it will be lost if we fail to try to understand its problems. I doubt, however, if I would have gone to the Middle East or learned much about these problems myself had I not had them forced on me. Early in September I went to Dublin with the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, my good friend, Hon. HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina. Along with seven other Members of the House and Senate we constituted the American delegation to the Interparliamentary Union, a meeting of representatives from the parliaments of the world. During the course of debate a delegate from Ceylon rose and pointed his finger toward the American delegation and said, "You have food to give to any man whose skin is white, but you have none for starving people who are black or brown." He continued and charged that our agriculture program was deliberately designed to keep the price of food so high that the people of Southeast Asia could not buy it. He then went on to say that there were 600,000,000 starving people on our side of the iron curtain. He closed with the communistic line that "as between starvation and communism, we will take the latter."

Obviously, the American delegation could not let such a challenge go unanswered. After a caucus, I was selected to answer the charges. I answered his last charge first because I realized that it was merely an expression of the common but fatal lack of understanding of the choices available to them which has led people in various parts of the world to embrace communism. A people can take both communism and starvation, but they cannot choose between them. The acceptance of communism has never saved any people from starvation. It is true that democracy cannot alone guarantee an adequate standard of living, but communism can and does give rather definite assurance of want. The people of South Asia do not have the choice which the gentleman from Ceylon posed.

It was, I felt, a rather simple matter to point out that our gifts of food have never been based on the race or color of the recipient. We have given food and other necessities to distressed people all over the world including those of Japan and India. True, we have recently extended greater aid to the people of Western Europe. This fact grew out of the emergency nature of their need and the fact that the terrible war damage in that part of the world was incurred as a result of a conflict in which we were a participant. Certainly Ceylon and India have suffered no comparable interference with their own productivity.

Probably the question as to our price structure was the most difficult to answer. It was difficult because I realized that this man from the other side of the earth could hardly be expected to understand a program which is so generally misunderstood at home.

Under our system farm production is dependent on the hope of reasonably high prices. Our farm program is intended to strengthen the hope of an adequate return to the producer. In short, the American method of getting production is to hold out the hope of rewards to the producer. This is the antithesis of the communistic method. Communism, which our friend from Ceylon threatened to embrace, seeks to secure production by assigning goals and punishing those who do not achieve these goals.

I have never been in Russia, but I was in Yugoslavia some 2 months ago. I recognize that vital differences exist between Yugoslavia and Russia. For purely military reasons I approve the aid extended to the Yugoslavs. Were I in Washington today I would vote for it. In order that my appearance here might not jeopardize this aid I arranged a pair before I left. I do not believe that Tito will even take a stand with us except to the extent that he feels it is to his own advantage, but I am convinced that we will do well to make it to his advantage to at least remain neutral. If the Yugoslavs never fire a shot, the existence of 32 divisions on the Russian flank will surely tie down a very considerable Russian or satellite army which would otherwise be free to attack us. All of this does not, however, blind me to the fact that the drought is not the only reason for a famine in Yugoslavia. I think that the substitution of the threat of punishment for the hope of reward has had as much to do with Yugoslavia's present unfortunate food shortage as has the weather.

There are only two ways of securing the production of food anywhere in the world. One is the American way—the democratic way—the way of free enterprise, the hope of rewards proportionate to the production. This is the system that has worked. It is the system that enabled America to serve as the bread basket of the democratic world during and following two World Wars.

The other system is the Russian system, the system of all dictators, the communistic system, the threat of punishment in case of failure to produce. The Communists assign quotas. They say, "Bring in 200 bushels of wheat. We don't care how you get it. Grow it. If drought, flood, or grasshoppers come, that is your hard luck. If you can't grow the wheat, buy, beg, borrow, or steal it, but deliver the 200 bushels or to jail you go." That system has never gotten the desired results, and I don't believe it will. I, therefore, pointed out to the gentleman from Ceylon that an abandonment of our price structure could only be expected to reduce our total food production. That only by increasing, not decreasing, the total food supplies of the world could he expect to ever get greater amounts of food for Asia. I reminded him that possibly the fundamental fallacy in the whole communistic philosophy was the assumption that the unfortunate people of the world would have more simply by destroying the prosperity of the more fortunate. It is easy to make the rich poor by destroying all wealth, but the poor can only be made rich by widening the opportunities of all.

To those of us who enjoy most of the comforts and many of the luxuries of life, as you and I do, the promises of communism are so hollow and so obviously false that it is difficult for us to understand how great masses of people can accept them. In fact, I doubt that any substantial portion of the people of any country has even believed in communism, but I can well understand how the hopeless masses of many eastern and even some European countries might conclude that they had nothing to lose with a change, any change, and therefore, attempt to try the glittering promises of some self-seeking, would-be commissar or just plain fellow traveler.

To fully appreciate the possible acceptance of these promises you should visit some of the poor nations of the world. Probably one-half the people of the world are today wondering where they will get tomorrow's food. To these people the phrases "freedom of speech," "human dignity," "democratic processes" and the like have very little meaning. Actually I wonder if much of our difficulty in dealing with people the world over does not spring from our general failure to understand just how basic and how primitive are the needs of such a large part of the world's population. Certain it is that if we are to halt the advance of communism, we must not only stop its aggressive leadership with the same naked force which those leaders themselves use, but we must at the same time offer the people of all lands real hope of improving their physical welfare. We must teach them that only by having more for all, can any group long have more for itself. We must make the people of the less favored sections of the world know that we cannot feed and clothe them. If we sent all the food America can produce to southeast Asia, it would not be enough to provide for that section of the world alone. We must teach these people how to help themselves. We can and should assure them of our cooperation—our help in developing their resources, our willingness to share our knowledge and experience with them, but we must at the same time make it plain that they are to be working members of the team—not mere mascots for us to feed.

Since the close of World War II, we have given away billions, in grants, loans and credits. We have been motivated by a sincere desire to speed recovery everywhere. Of course, we hoped that our action would help the United States, and it has, but the direct beneficiaries have been the people of distant lands, particularly of Europe, although we have spent billions in China, Japan, and the Philippines. We have sought no exclusively selfish benefits, except to the extent that we have hoped that America, like all the rest of the world, would gain from a prosperous, rebuilt, and peaceful world. We loaned England nearly $4,000,000,000 in the hope that it would prime the economic pump. Then we offered ECA—the Marshall plan. This has been the greatest example in recorded history of unselfish international assistance. The tragedy is that it has not been a real cooperative enterprise as its name implied.

We tried to cooperate, but we seem to have forgotten that cooperation is a two-way street. I think the ECA program has on

the whole been very well administered. It has assisted in the rebuilding of European industry which provided jobs for idle men and women. It has enabled millions of Europeans to earn their own food rather than receive it as a dole, but in our proper anxiety to keep this a recovery, not a relief plan, we have failed to make the masses of the people understand just how it aids them. The French worker is likely only to see that he is today paying far more francs for a loaf of bread than he ever paid before. In these circumstances, he is not likely to be overcome with appreciation for the fact that American dollars given to his government made it possible for him to have a job to earn the francs and for a long time at least made it possible for him to have a job to which the bread was made—and I am not so sure that all of you here today who have sold cotton, pork, or wheat for export through the ECA have realized that your market price was closely dependent on the economic cooperative program.

ECA has bought breathing space for us and has undoubtedly justified itself on this ground, if no other. It has, in addition, assured millions of American farmers of a good export market. It has not, however, been able to bring about the fundamental changes in European thought and practice which are essential to any lasting stability. True, most of us have recognized the unenlightened employer-worker relations of European industry. We have seen the unwarranted power that is so often exerted over European governments by selfish vested interests. We have questioned the cartel system which eliminates competition while at the same time maintaining low wages, high prices, and higher profits at the expense of all the people. We have been shocked at the widespread tax evasion that exists in so many countries. We have tried to secure a correction of these evils. We have pointed out our own experiences, but we have not felt we could require domestic reforms as a price on our assistance.

In this, I feel we have been in error. I have felt and still feel that we should put American aid on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Doubtless, some of the countries of Europe would at this time "leave it." I believe that the time has come when some of them could get along very well on their own resources. I know of no better way of testing them. Of course, we have no right to require antitrust laws or tax reforms beyond our own borders, but neither does any other people have a right to demand American aid. If they want our aid, let them give evidence that it will be put to the most effective use.

I strongly believe that we should seek to make our aid a part of a cooperative program every here we can. There are very few cases where something of value could not move to the United States. I know that there are instances where a whole people has suffered loss or disaster. In such cases I would give direct relief. I would have my country go to the aid of distressed people anywhere in the world, and I would ask no repayment. Just as you would extend aid to your neighbor whose house had burned or whose family had suffered an automobile accident, so should our country extend a helping hand in case of physical disaster. If, however, the crisis is monetary, why not apply the same economic principles that apply between neighbors? If your neighbor needed your corn but found he was without cash with which to buy it, might you not expect to sell a few calves rather than to ask you to give him the corn? If he had nothing else, you might take some turkeys even though you did not need turkeys just at that time. It seems to me that this is the principle we should apply to nations. We should take whatever a country has to offer in return for our aid. I would not be too demanding. I might take a few chips and whetstones, but I would rather take something and close the transaction than to make a grant or a loan that I knew the borrower could not repay. I know of no surer way of making enemies than to loan people money which they cannot repay. It is much better to buy something which we don't particularly need than to get someone under financial obligation to us—in other than a normal business transaction.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. I was recently in Iran (old Persia). While I was there the United States was negotiating the making of a loan of $25,000,000 to the Iranian Government. At the same time, the Soviet Union was negotiating a trade agreement involving about the same amount. The Russians proposed to buy the entire Iranian rice crop. They were seeking to get it just as cheaply as they could. On the other hand, we asked nothing in return for our $25,000,000 except an I O U. Maybe we would get our money back some time because Iran is one of the few countries which has a dependable income from oil royalties, but surely we could not hope to make a profit from the transaction. Which one of these negotiations do you suppose held the spotlight of local attention? The Russian trade agreement, of course. It meant a market for the farmers' rice; the American loan was purely academic. I cannot but believe that it would have been better for us in every way if we had bought the rice crop, even though we might have had to pay far above world price to get it. Not only would we have had something that we could use to help people in some other part of the world, but we would have built far more lasting friendships in Iran than we can with a $25,000,000 loan or gift.

Every one of us knows from our own everyday experience that individuals take a greater interest in those undertakings in which they have an investment of time or money. That is why large corporations like to get their stock widely distributed, particularly in the hands of those who work for or buy from the corporation. That is the reason so many modern farm management plans try to give to the man who does the work a share along with the owner in livestock as well as crops. What is true of individuals in this respect is true of nations. Those nations who have contributed most to the defense of free society are the ones which feel they have a stake in collective security. Those that have made no contributions are prone to feel that it is not their responsibility. I think we as a nation have been all too ready to accept responsibility which we should have asked others to assume. We have acted as an indulgent parent who does all the work rather than ask the children to assume responsibility. It may be easier at the moment for mother to make the biscuits than it is to teach Mary, and it may be easier for dad to milk the cows than it is to corral Henry, but Mary and Henry will not make the self-reliant citizens they should if they continue to avoid their share of home duties. I am convinced that we would have more numerous and more reliable allies if we would make every nation we can put something into the common effort to stop communism. In practical terms, let Spain send us mercury; let India send bamboo, if she has nothing else, but let us get something.

Some nations will have no products to contribute, but these very nations can often contribute the most valuable resource of all—manpower. In the Far East nothing is so cheap as human beings, but we need not go that far to find millions of unemployed young men who would, I am convinced, be delighted at a chance to get a job in the United States Army.

More than a year ago I visited Europe and was greatly impressed with the necessity of promptly providing some strong military force which could reasonably expect to stop a Russian invasion on the ground. I recognized, as I believe many people are now beginning to recognize, that we can expect little real support from the people of Western Germany, France, Belgium, or of other European countries unless we can hold out to them th prospect of actually preventing invasion. It is not enough to tell these people that we will return and liberate them after a period of Russian occupation and after the destruction of all of their industrial and transportation facilities by our rear-guard forces as we fought our way to the Atlantic.

Of course, it is impossible for the United States to provide the needed manpower without placing our own country on a 100 percent war footing and drafting men who are needed on our farms and in our factories. At the same time there are literally thousands of unemployed Germans of military age, who could not hope to secure a better job than a place in the United States Army. I, therefore, suggested that we should immediately enlist in the United States Army as many as 25 divisions of German Nationals for the defense of Europe, and approximately a similar number of Japanese for the defense of Asia. I suggested that these recruits should be volunteers, that they should be paid by the United States Government in their own national currency (which would be purchased from their local government, thereby creating dollar buying power just as effectively as if we had made a gift of dollars).

We could maintain these Germans in Europe and Japanese in Asia at a far less cost to our Government than is involved in supporting a like number of American troops in the same areas.

Of course, we cannot abandon the build-up of Armed Forces in the United States. This will continue to be necessary, but I do suggest that these European and Asiatic forces would be of tremendous value to us in furnishing a hard core around which to build the defenses of Western Europe and of eastern Asia. Until such a nucleus is established, and until it is strong enough to offer a reasonable prospect of being able to stop aggression, no amount of diplomatic nicety is going to induce the people who are adjacent to the Red army to risk their own national existence on any kind of North Atlantic, United Nations, Western Europe, or other joint defense force. There is no way whereby we can give other free nations the needed assurance of effective strength than to place a substantial armed force in both Europe and Asia.

Surely the terrible events of recent days should convince the most skeptical that we must use whatever resources are at hand. The manpower of Western Germany and Japan is at hand. We should use it, not only for our own defense, but for the defense of Germany and Japan themselves.

When I first made this proposal more than a year ago, it met with such favorable response at the hands of the members of the Armed Services Committee that I was encouraged to hope that the committee would take positive action. I realize that matters of this kind are more effectively initiated by the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter. The committee, however, took no action. About 4 months ago, I, therefore, introduced a bill, authorizing the President to accept enlistments of nationals of other countries particularly the nationals of Germany and of Japan.

The proposal has so far failed to receive the support which I believe it merits. Undoubtedly, it is not perfect. I am sure others can offer constructive criticism, but the pressure of events is such that we do not have further time for deliberation. This is not a new proposal. It was made 15 months ago. It is not one on which it is necessary to

make new or original research. It has been actively discussed for more than a year. As I see it, this is one of the first and one of the most simple things we should do. Not only does it offer us a much needed source of manpower. It also would go far toward tying to our cause the very people who would supply this manpower.

Just now every American is distressed and sick at heart as a result of the catastrophe which has befallen both our arms and our diplomacy in Korea. Never did America suffer a defeat of such magnitude. It is no time to seek a scapegoat. It is not a time for recriminations. There has been too much of that. Too many people in their endeavor to fix responsibility have overlooked the Communists. They are the real cause of our present plight, and we should realize it. Even here no impassioned denunciation of Asiatic treachery will improve our situation. Only a cool and sober appraisal of our situation and the courses open to us can aid in bringing about an improvement.

The question of where to fight must, of course, be left to our military commanders. However, the question of whether we will fight or whether we will abandon the entire Korean Peninsula is, it seems to me, a decision which the American people themselves must make. Our Nation, not simply the generals, made the decision to go into Korea last June when the Communists of North Korea first started on the path of undisguised aggression. The President properly took the responsibility of resisting this aggression. The Congress supported him and provided funds. The United Nations condemned the acts of the Communists. I think it is fair to say the American people overwhelmingly approved the action taken. In those early days our forces were not only greatly outnumbered; they were confronted by greatly superior equipment—tanks, artillery, the like. They were forced back, mile by mile, but they fought for every town and for every pass. Conditions were rough, but the decision to fight had been made by the people, and our boys never questioned it. They fought against great odds and finally won a great and glorious victory over the North Korean Communists.

Now we are engaged in a second war in Korea, still against Communists, but this time they are from China. Our forces are more numerous, but our foes have multiplied many times. We are again greatly outnumbered, but we do have the superiority of equipment this time. We now have rather adequate supplies and lines of communication. We still retain control of the air. We now have great superiority in large tanks and artillery. We may again be forced to fight from one or more small beachheads, but our soldiers have held beachheads against odds before, and I am convinced that if the American people say, "hold," they will do so now.

This is the terrible decision that you and I must make. If we say, stay, it may result in appalling loss of life, but if we say run, we are faced with the question of how will we avoid more disastrous retreats in Europe, and an even more staggering loss of life.

Faced with such a grave choice, I shall not attempt to speak for anyone other than myself, but decisions must be made. Before our country can make a decision, our people as individuals must make their own separate decisions. I, therefore, give my personal views only in the hope they may help others clarify their thinking.

My feeling is that we cannot honorably withdraw from Korea, except under fire from the enemy. We have set our hand to the defense of Korea from Communist aggression. Are we now to repudiate our promise of aid because the undertaking becomes more difficult than we had anticipated? If we now leave the people of South Korea to their fate, how can any people be expected to place any reliance in our promise of aid? Surely the prestige of the United States would sink to an unbelievable low. But it will be argued that we should not let any matters of prestige stand in the way of saving American lives, and I agree, but I must call your attention to the fact that when we voluntarily withdraw from Korea, we cannot step back into the position of comparative safety we occupied last June. As a Nation, we might continue to exist, but we would be left without a dependable friend or ally. The United Nations could never survive such a retreat. British Prime Minister Chamberlain thought that he had achieved peace for our time when he walked out on Czechoslovakia. Actually, he but laid the groundwork for the most serious defeat and the heaviest loss of life Britain ever suffered. I don't think we can save ourselves by appeasement, and I am sure that such a course would be as disastrous to the only organization we now have for collective security as was the timidity of the European nations in the 1930's to rebuke Japanese and Italian aggression through the old League of Nations.

It would mean the end of the United Nations, but it would mean more. It would mean that we would immediately be faced with the necessity of retreat from Europe. The American people would undoubtedly demand such a retreat if they were convinced that we had met with military disaster in the east, and indeed I would myself feel that it was then futile to try to hold on there. Russia would be presented with the concrete evidence of our inability to resist communistic arms, the evidence which she has sought so long and so hard to give to the people of Europe. The Berlin airlift would be forgotten. The collapse of the Greek revolt would be avenged. The will of the fighting Turks would probably snap. Surely Iran and the Middle East would readily make concessions to avoid a military decision.

Our difficulties in Japan would be multiplied. Communism would undoubtedly sweep Indochina and spread to India and Indonesia. Even if Russia did not immediately move into Europe two-thirds of the world's population would be arrayed against us in a matter of months. I do not believe we, as a nation, could long survive. I must, therefore, urge a continuing fight on the Korean Peninsula.

But you ask, how can we hope to carry on war with the 450,000,000 Chinese? Not by land invasion of China. The Japanese are merely the last of many who have tried that and failed. No; we would be forced to use the means available to us. These means include control of the sea and the air. They include the knowledge that the present Communist government of China has foes at home as well as abroad. I think we can confidently assume that there are today hundreds of thousands of guerrillas in China. Whether they are really Nationalists, or just plain bandits, matters little for our present purpose. With a little encouragement they will harrass the government. They will make it extremely difficult to restore the economy of that war-torn land. The truth is that it is entirely probable that the Communist rulers of China have embarked on the present Korean war on the old principle of all dictators, that when all other efforts fail to bring unity to a bankrupt nation, it is time to involve the country in a foreign war. Fortunately for us, Chinese economy is in a desperate plight. Fortunately for us, China's industry and transportation are wide open to attack from the air, and from guerrilla bands. There is only one railroad line from Canton and South China to the rest of the country. It should not be too difficult to keep it cut. China's seaports are all vulnerable to blockade. We have a powerful fleet in eastern waters now. I would use it to stop all Chinese trade by sea. This would, for practical purposes, leave the Chinese Reds with no source of outside supplies except from the U. S. S. R. and that would be dependent on a few and very long transportation lines.

China has a mutual assistance pact with Russia. There are many who sincerely fear that were we to bomb Chinese cities or railroads with the American Air Force, the Russians might intervene. Personally, I believe that Russia will enter the war any day she feels it to her interest to do so and that she will not do so until she feels it is to her interest regardless of any obligation to the contrary and that, therefore, the mutual assistance pact need not deter us from taking any action the military situation suggests. Personally, I would send the American Air Force to bomb the war industries of Manchuria and the American Navy to blockade Shanghai, but if it is felt that we should not do this directly, the Russians themselves have shown us how efficiently third parties may assume responsibility. Surely no one could not object to supplying Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek with the needed planes and ships to harass and blockade the Chinese mainland.

In the meantime, our forces could hold on in Korea while we build up a new army in Japan. True, we cannot divert sufficient manpower from the United States to match the Chinese forces in Korea, but we can enlist Japanese in the United States Army, and we can equip and train them in a minimum of time. Many of them are veterans, who have fought the Chinese before. We can send them to the relief of our troops now in Korea more quickly than we can train and send boys from the States, and with the numbers we can reasonably expect to make available from Japan, we can hope to again sweep Korea free from Communistic domination.

This, my friends, seems to me to offer the only practical hope of preventing both military and moral bankruptcy not only in the United States but in the entire democratic world.

I realize that what I have had to say has been of a somber vain, entirely out of keeping with the ordinary character of a farm bureau meeting, but these are somber times. If this country is to survive as the great free land we love, we must have the benefit of the best thinking of our farm people. The country's fate is in your hands, my friends, in a much more real and definite manner than many of you have yet realized. I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to discuss our common problems with you, and I hope to be able to meet with you again in the not too distant future under far more cheerful circumstances.

The Physically Handicapped and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 13 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a timely statement by Secretary of Defense Marshall, urging the employment of the physically handicapped. This statement appears on page 16 of the December issue of Performance, a Department of Labor publication devoted to the physically handicapped.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

(By George C. Marshall)

Both as Secretary of Defense and as an associate member of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, I strongly endorse the program for the selective placement of physically handicapped persons in industry and Government. I urge American industry—management and labor—and all communities in need of productive human services to recognize the availability and the qualifications of those physically handicapped and to find work for them. I consider such a project an indispensable element in our national defense program.

We are engaged in a great preparedness effort. Military strength is a compound of men, money, and munitions and of the three the first is by far the most vital. By men I do not mean just human beings for if our survival merely depended on numbers we would lag far behind many other countries. What I do mean is men of training and discipline in our Armed Forces, and men of skill and talent in their support, men who can produce weapons in the quality and quantity that modern war demands, and who can earn the billions of dollars that are required to sustain the military effort.

Such men may not be endowed with all the physical qualifications that we require of the combat soldier. But their capabilities are strong weapons in our arsenal of democracy and reliable tools in our productive economy which we must exploit fully. We are using such physically handicapped men and women in many industries to replace those who have joined the services and to take up positions made necessary by the increased needs for production. In the armed services we have thousands of disabled persons, especially veterans, on civilian jobs and in certain categories of military assignments. Their work habits and their attendance records have proved at least equal in production and dependability to those of the nonhandicapped.

The physically handicapped can contribute to the economic and military strength of our country. It is not only good business to employ them. It is the human way that should be a part and parcel of our democracy.

No Time To Waste Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial entitled "No Time To Waste Manpower," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star.

It is gratifying to note that a newspaper in the Nation's Capital sees fit to call attention to the continued extravagance here—particularly in the use of Federal personnel.

I know the Members of this House are pleased to see, too, this recognition of the outstanding public service being performed by the Subcommittee on Overstaffing in the Federal agencies, headed by the conscientious and energetic gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN BELL WILLIAMS. The editorial follows:

NO TIME TO WASTE MANPOWER

The high cost of calculating the high cost of living is revealed in the amazing report on the Bureau of Labor Statistics just issued by the House Subcommittee on Overstaffing in the Federal Agencies. The charges by the investigating group of wasted manpower in this and other nondefense agencies indicate that there is room for a lot of additional belt-tightening in the executive establishment.

As a result of an on-the-spot survey and of subsequent testimony by employees and responsible officials, the report said, it was found that the prices and living cost division of the Bureau is grossly overstaffed, that some employees have been forced to falsify work progress reports, that the efficiency rating system has been misused, and that employees who sought relief from the conditions have been threatened with punitive action. One employee charged: "When I entered on this job there were so many clerks that there was not enough work to keep more than a third of us busy at any one time. There was no one in supervision who knew anything about the work. When I made inquiry about what was supposed to be done, no one seemed to know. Supervisors sat and talked all day. I was told to write personal letters, and so forth, just to appear busy in case some of the officials came in the room. In the meantime, on the daily progress reports, I was told by my supervisor to elaborate on my progress reports." Another employee said: "There were weeks at a time when there was no work to do in our office. * * * I was forced to charge all these unused hours to a 'project' on which I was doing absolutely nothing."

The subcommittee declared the overstaffing was freely admitted, but attributed to a miscalculation as to personnel needs for a major revision of the Consumer Price Index. Congress appropriated a million dollars for this revision in the 1950 fiscal year. The report asserted that a substantial part of the appropriation was dissipated through gross overstaffing, inferior planning, untrained supervision and improvident administration. A companion report accused the Treasury Department of being overstaffed in some of its branches and a previous report criticized conditions in the Federal Security Agency.

Extravagant use of personnel was condemned by the Hoover Commission, which found wasteful practices existing in nearly all agencies of the Government. But that was nearly 2 years ago. That there is still flagrant waste in some of the offices, especially in a period of national emergency, is simply inexcusable. One thing is certain. If the agencies do not take action voluntarily to remedy conditions, the next Congress is going to crack down as never before, when nondefense appropriations are under consideration. For this is no time for such irresponsibility in Federal bureaus as is described in the findings to date of the civil service subcommittee headed by Representative JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi.

Fantastic Absurdity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, there has just come to my attention the editorial published in the Washington News, of Washington, D. C., under date of December 9, 1950, which I think is timely, and which I submit, as follows:

DIPLOMATIC ABSURDITY

The inability of President Truman and British Prime Minister Attlee to agree on a common policy toward Communist China overshadow the constructive accomplishments of their joint conference.

And it is idle to say that the two Governments do not intend to let differences on this point interfere with their united effort in support of their common objectives.

Public opinion will decide that question and American public opinion is in no mood to be trifled with.

Americans are most concerned at the moment with the fate of their troops fighting with their backs to the wall in Korea. Those troops are under attack by the forces of Red China. To assume that the American people will accept what appears to be Britain's attitude toward these Red aggressors is a fantastic absurdity.

According to the statement issued by Messrs. Truman and Attlee, "the United Kingdom has recognized the Central People's (Communist) government and considers that its representatives should occupy China's seat in the United Nations," and the United States is opposed to that. On its face this would seem to mean that despite the fact Red China is at war with the United Nations, Britain still feels that the Communists should be seated in the UN in place of the Chinese Nationalists, who are willing, even eager, to join forces with us against the Communist attack.

How can any right-thinking American be expected to agree to that?

President Truman, of course, has properly refused to agree to it.

Moreover, the joint statement declares that the American and British Governments are in complete agreement that there can be no thought of appeasement or rewarding aggression. That is sheer hypocrisy at a time when Britain insists on seating Red China in the United Nations.

The Chinese Reds have a gun pointed at the United Nations. To seat them in that organization under such circumstances would be nothing but appeasement, and an act of such cowardice that it would destroy the best hope of a threatened world.

No nation could respect the integrity of the United Nations after so abject a surrender of principle.

The joint statement also declares that the future of Formosa should be settled by the United Nations. If that means this question will be presented to the United Nations after Britain has been successful in seating Red China in the UN, it follows that the intent here is to deliver Formosa to the Communists as another contribution toward appeasement.

Formosa is under the Government of Nationalist China—a Government recognized by the United States. The 450,000 Nation-

alist troops stationed on that island represent the only substantial anti-Communist force in all Asia, outside of the American forces there. Should we take any chance of surrendering this force to communism in order that Britain may maintain its trading post at Hong Kong, through which it ships strategic goods to our enemies?

It is vital to the security of the United States itself that Formosa be in friendly hands. Under similar circumstances in Europe, would Britain be willing to give Gibraltar to the Reds, or buy their favor by granting them a base in Belgium? Formosa was used as the springboard for the Japanese attacks upon the Philippines and Pearl Harbor.

That part of the communique dealing with the atomic bomb—by our layman's interpretation—means that President Truman retain full control. The President stated he hoped it would never be necessary to use the bomb, and that it was also his desire to keep the Prime Minister at all times informed of developments which might bring about a change in the situation. On such eventuality, we trust the British will not misconstrue plain words and claim they have a right of veto.

American-British understanding and cooperation are as vital to one nation as the other. But that relationship cannot be maintained on a one-way street.

If Britain persists in its appeasement of communism in China, it will be difficult to convince many Americans that there is any point to supporting Britain in opposing communism in Europe. The unity of the whole anti-Communist front has been endangered by this absurdity.

The Holy City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 13 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Holy City," published in the Washington Post for December 8.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLY CITY

Much water has gone over the dam since the General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for internationalization of the entire area of Jerusalem exactly a year ago. Many of those who supported the proposal did so on the basis of emotion rather than of fact. First, neither Israel nor Transjordan, the two powers sharing control, would stand for it; second, the resolution flouts the representative principle; and third, it plays right into the hands of Moscow. The Russians, who have the biggest foreign stake in Jerusalem through the holdings of the Russian Orthodox Church, would, of course, sit on the government of Jerusalem—doubtless in more ways than one.

The second thoughts are expressed in the Swedish resolution which was submitted yesterday to the present General Assembly. This simply restricts internationalization to the holy places, and includes all the safeguards necessary for the protection of the great religions affected, Christian, Jewish, and Moslem. The only exceptions from control, which would be exercised by a UN commissionership, would be strictly Moslem and Jewish shrines. Here is a solution resting upon reason. Israel most probably will accept it, and doubtless Transjordan will acquiesce in it. The trouble with Transjordan, as with other Arab states, is that in no political problem can there be any positive stand so long as the Arab League is acknowledged as a unifier on all matters relating to Palestine.

If this resolution is accepted, it would mark the first step in the pacification of the Middle East. Accordingly it deserves the strong backing of the United States. Peace in the Middle East is avowedly our aim, though a doubt sometimes arises, as in the case of the fuss made of the secretary general of the Arab League, Azzam Pasha, who came here recently. The Arab League simply stands for a holdout, for a perpetuation of a state of war, for a racial grouping, and for a negation of constructive solutions. This country needs to pursue in the Middle East a policy of pacification along a truly geographical line, so that reconstruction could begin in real earnest. Time is as important there as elsewhere.

Time for Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 13 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time for Unity," published in the Washington Post of December 9, 1950, which discusses the proposed demand for the resignation of Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR UNITY

The Republican Policy Committee's refusal on Thursday to adopt as an official objective of the party Senator IRVING IVES' resolution demanding the resignation of Secretary of State Acheson has the virtue of giving time for some badly needed sober second thought. The resolution is to be submitted to the whole Republican Senate conference on Tuesday. It would be impossible to select a more inopportune moment for pressing this sort of partisan issue, and we are especially surprised to note Senator IVES' part in it. The imperative need in the present crisis is not for recriminations but for unity.

The strength of free men lies in their ability to draw together in emergencies. A splendid example of this ability has just been furnished to us by the British. Prime Minister Attlee's mission to this country won the instant and unqualified support of the opposition leader, Winston Churchill. There was no thought in Britain of using the tragic turn of events in Korea for narrow partisan advantage. There should be no thought of it here—either in respect of General MacArthur or in respect of Secretary Acheson. These men are on the firing line. There will be time enough later on to assess the responsibility for errors of policy which have brought us to the brink of disaster in the Far East. And when the assessment is made, there is not the slightest doubt that a heavy measure of guilt will be ascribed to many of those now crying for Mr. Acheson's scalp.

If the Republican Party as a whole should insist upon the ouster of Secretary Acheson, it would place itself under a plain obligation to define the foreign policy, especially in relation to China, which it thinks the country ought to pursue. Is it in favor of an all-out war to be waged on the Chinese mainland? Does it desire the abandonment of western Europe? What is its conception of bipartisanship? The Secretary's assailants, themselves divided, have hitherto found it much easier to carp than to offer constructive proposals. The replacement of Mr. Acheson by some fresh and less controversial personality may in due course prove desirable in the interest of national unity. But unity will certainly not be achieved by making him a scapegoat for misfortunes to which his critics were major contributors.

Use of Tax Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 13 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "It's Fun To Spend," which appeared in the Oil City Derrick, of Oil City, Pa., on Saturday, December 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S FUN TO SPEND

Do you wonder what's happening to a lot of those tax dollars that should be going into building up America's military strength? Get this:

Recently the Government awarded a $286,000 contract for permanent visitors' facilities and exhibit building at Shasta Dam, Calif. The structure will contain an auditorium, observation decks and exhibit rooms. This is being done despite the fact that excellent accommodations now exist for those who wish to see the dam and power plant.

This is a minor example, but a typical one, of the reckless waste of Federal funds that is going on all over the country—in spite of deficits, in spite of the continuing demand for higher taxes, and in spite of the unpredictable expenditures for the military forces and for other purposes in connection with the grave international situation.

Governmental waste is always bad—in a time of national peril it is criminal.

A Note on Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 13 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on December 4 there appeared in the Emporia Gazette an editorial by W. L. White, editor of that famous newspaper.

"Young Bill White" as he is known in Kansas, has had the courage and the daring to say what he believes, based upon his observations in many places in the world.

I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking editorial be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as I think it is worthy of being read and reread many times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NOTE ON WARS

(By W. L. White)

Last summer just as the first American troops were entering Korea, the Gazette in an unpopular editorial referred to that peninsula as a "military booby trap," arguing that the vast mainland of China and Manchuria to which Korea is attached had long ago been piddled away to communism by the short-sighted leadership of George Marshall and Dean Acheson. We therefore could not hope to defend Korea in the event of a major war.

Six months have gone by, and now where are we?

Well, the Communists have again broken our battle line and our troops are again on the run.

The total number of Americans killed, wounded and captured in Korea to date makes this the fourth bloodiest struggle in our Nation's history—surpassing in casualties the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War.

And the goal of it all? Well, it seems there should be free elections in Korea. But why did we wake up to the value of free elections so late? Why, when we were powerful, did we not insist on free elections in Poland, in Hungary, in Rumania, in Yugoslavia, in Czechoslovakia, in East Germany, and in the Baltic states? Why did we sit stupidly by while Communist terror strangled freedom in all this vast, rich, civilized area and then, having stripped ourselves of arms, why do we suddenly begin to shriek for a free election in Korea, a backward country which, in all its 3,000 years of history, never has had free elections nor seemed particularly to miss them?

But you forget political considerations. Last Spring Republican Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY had aired his charges against Owen Lattimore, including a number of which Dr. Lattimore was probably innocent. The martyred St. Owen of Lattimore was declared politically pure and ideologically virginal by MILLARD TYDINGS and the other Senate Democrats, and promptly sat down to write of his Ordeal by Slander. But the country was uneasy. For obviously much had been smothered under whitewash or suppressed, including the smelly Amerasia case.

So the White House was perturbed because St. Owen's public beatification and noisy canonization might have a backwash in the fall elections, and put the control of Congress in doubt.

At this moment there came what seemed to be, from the political standpoint, the Heaven-sent opportunity of Korea. It promised to be a quick, popular little war against a weak enemy, and in behalf of the true, the beautiful, and the good. The unbearable vulgarities of JOE MCCARTHY would be drowned out by bugle and drum. Who then would dare say the Truman administration was not firmly anticommunistic? And so into Korea were sent not Dr. Lattimore, not Dean Acheson—but the little American draftees from Japan. The frailties of our statesmen were to be glossed over by the blood (in modest quantities) of our sons.

We are therefore now at war in Asia, and furthermore, our outnumbered soldiers are now hightailing it down the valleys of Korea in the most humiliating spectacle the American flag has ever flapped over since the battle of Bull Run. How did we get into it? Somewhere in the bookcase you surely must have a copy of that half-forgotten document, the Constitution of the United States. Pull it out and in the fine type you will find that the Congress and only the Congress "shall have power to declare war and make peace."

But don't be old-fashioned. That cumbersome contraption of representative government was set up by those old fuddy-duddies, our founding fathers. A congressional debate on whether or not to go into Korea would have meant weeks of delay; in the end Congress might have decided to stay out altogether. In these swift, modern times, after a rag-tag and bob-tail Supreme Court has made a joke of the Constitution, no one thinks of Congress, but looks instead for dynamic, flashy showmanship from the White House. And remember also that, in the crisis of last June, time was of the essence; it was important that without delay we instantly and immediately dive head foremost into the gaping mouth of that oriental meat grinder. Because that lovable old character, Marshal Stalin, was waiting patiently to turn the crank, any delay would definitely inconvenience him and Russians are, as our leaders have cautioned us, inclined to be irritable and suspicious, and to misunderstand our motives.

Readers of this column will remember that the Gazette was in favor of standing up to Stalin as early as 5 years ago when our truly magnificent armies were still intact, and when Harry S. Truman was a happy fellow-traveler who had not yet discovered the horrid Soviet menace. In view of this fact the writer presumes now to list five guideposts to a future American foreign policy. These are:

1. Since we are now pitiably weak, we should for the moment avoid hopping carelessly into wars which we cannot hope to win.

2. We should not concentrate all our forces in one distant isolated spot. Almost everything we have is now packed into Korea; if hell should break out in Europe, we have left only the Eighty-second Airborne Division to put between Stalin's 300 divisions and the Atlantic Ocean.

3. We should avoid wars to capture regions which are strategically worthless and which, if we won them, would be a future liability.

4. When we are losing a war in a distant area, we should not be offended when a nearby ally offers help. (Stalin is winning this Korean war without the loss of a single Russian life, whereas Dean Acheson virtuously turned down Chiang Kai-shek's offer to send 200,000 anti-Communist Chinese fighting men into Korea; Mr. Acheson felt this might offend those peace-loving agrarian reformers, the Chinese Communists.)

5. Until we are stronger (should Moscow allow us the time to get stronger) we should try to cut to a bare minimum the number of wars we enter solely to win local American elections.

The writer feels that we are now entering a period of terrible stress, in which, if this Nation and all Christendom are to survive, we will need the same steady wisdom, solid character and firm courage that our people had in Lincoln's day. As a flabby, rich, and stupid Nation we cannot hope to survive. We can no longer continue fat, dumb, and happy, babbling that this is the century of the common man, electing to high office any grinning dummy who will pledge himself to bribe us with paper dollar subsidies paid out of our own public Treasury, stupidly believing that if the Kremlin cannot be appeased, then it can be quickly licked in a bloodless, push-button war.

If we are to come through the next grim half of this twentieth century still a republic of free people we will need all of our courage and brains. We cannot hope to survive the storm with a government which is by the nincompoops, of the bird brains, and for the greedy dim wits. Because of its follies such a government will surely and deservedly perish from the earth, and all the sane and all the brave will be crunched in the wreckage of its crash.

Advice From Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop from today's Washington Post:

ADVICE FROM WINSTON CHURCHILL

Certain aspects of politics are like certain diseases, which are so painful even to think about that healthy people rarely mention them. But if a man or woman has cancer, it must be mentioned by the doctor who makes the diagnosis and prescribes the operation. And if a nation is in imminent peril of catastrophe, painful things must also be said by leaders who have courage.

No leader in the Western World has greater courage than Winston Churchill. No one any longer will lightly disregard the voice of the great old man, who almost singlehanded saved the cause of freedom from the menace of nazism; who was the first, after the war, to see the larger menace of the new Soviet imperialism. And it is time, now, to face up to the real future of the advice he has been giving for the past 2 years.

It was just about 2 years ago that Churchill began a remarkable series of speeches of which the last was delivered on November 30. In all these speeches, whether on the public platform or in debates in the House of Commons, he has said the same things.

First, he has ascribed to the Kremlin an ambition of world empire. On November 30, he told Parliament:

"(Despite) enormous increases of power and territory (the Soviets), show no sign of being in any way satiated, satisfied, or even contented, and we can perceive no limits at present to their aims."

Second, he has flatly stated that the Soviets were only being restrained from launching a third world war by the American advantage in atomic weapons. At Llandudno in 1948, he said: "Nothing stands between Europe today and complete subjugation to Communist tyranny but the atomic bomb in American possession."

Third, he has more and more openly confessed despair of matching the Soviet power by ordinary means, at least in the crucial time before our own advantage in atomic weapons will be too greatly impaired by production of atomic weapons in the Soviet Union. In the last speech, in which this despair is total, he said:

"While it is right to build up our forces as fast as we can, nothing in this process will

in this period deprive Russia of effective superiority in what are now called 'conventional arms.' All it will do is give us increasing unity in Europe."

Fourth, he has repeatedly advocated negotiations with the Soviet Union on the highest level. In the most powerful and terrifying of all these speeches, when he told the House of Commons last July 7 that "We are more defenseless than we have ever been," he also said:

"A peaceful settlement may (yet) be reached with the Soviet Government if a resolute effort is made on the basis not of our present weakness but of American atomic strength. This is the policy which gives the best chance of preventing a fearful war and of securing our survival should it break upon us."

Here, however, so awful, so awe-inspiring is the subject, that even Winston Churchill has not spoken plainly. There is plenty of internal evidence of his real meaning, such as the critical reference, in the last speech, to the assurances to the Kremlin that "the United States would not fight what is called a preventive war." There is his further remark that on this basis the war, if it comes, and God forbid, will come at the moment of the (Soviet's) choosing. But his real meaning, which he has stated frankly enough in many private conversations, is only broadly implied in his speeches.

This meaning is that the Kremlin should be given a straight choice by the United States and Britain, between peace now and war now. The high and secret processes of diplomacy would be employed, under the Churchillian prescription, to offer Stalin a world settlement on honorable terms, and to warn that our atomic bombs would be used if the settlement were refused. This, indeed, is the only conceivable way to seek a settlement "on the basis of * * * American atomic strength."

It is dreadful that the wisest leader of the west should have been driven, only 5 years after a great victory, to advocate such an expedient. It is obvious that the most careful consideration should first be given to the kind of world settlement to be proposed, to the probable Soviet response and, above all, to our atomic strength's practical value. But it is also certain that if the odds on an early war at a "moment of the Soviets' choosing," are already two or three or four to one, as they undoubtedly appear at present, Winston Churchill's advice at least deserves to be honestly and carefully canvassed.

Arab States Bulwark Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a timely address was made today at the National Press Club by the Honorable Abdel Rahman Cizzam Pasha, Secretary General of the League of Arab States. The subject matter of his address presented facts that all American people should know and understand. He stated an eternal verity when he said that we should not be deceived by the concept that arms alone can decide the issues in the present world crisis.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a verbatim copy of the address:

The world situation requires from us all, and particularly from the gallant people of the United States of America, that we focus attention on both the visible and invisible implications behind the present world crisis. Troubles are accumulating and the clearing of these troubles requires both energy and mental activity.

Gentlemen, it looks as if the world has definitely been divided into two camps. One is carrying the banner for the proletarian class and the other for a nonclass concept; but actually there are two active forces upholding these ideologies, while a vast section of mankind in Africa and Asia stands undecided and perplexed, as this vehement contest about what is right and wrong is going on. If we allow ourselves to be deceived and resigned to a fate that only arms can decide the issue, we will not survive. I believe that never in the history of mankind has violence ever been able to extinguished the torch of right or to conquer definitely an ideal which is justified by its moral force and its necessity to prevail.

We should, therefore, discard every attempt to resort to force as a decisive factor in ideological differences. In my opinion, permanent peace cannot be achieved by the sole maintainance of armed forces or the accumulation of material powers. Such a belief is a fallacy. What is really required is to maintain peace by an equilibrium of diverse forces, including forces of strong conviction and faith, so as to make the existence of peace not only dependent on military victories but on moral and spiritual victories, which make them enduring and permanent.

If we can bring about that equilibrium, then every side will endeavor to convince the other side by logic, appeal, and persuasion. Then the only chance that remains for a victory of one ideology over another will emanate from its real value and its real contributions to human progress and human peace.

In the meantime, what can we do to make war useless to the aggressor? I think we should put our faith not only in our production of war material but in human virtue, wisdom, and judgment. To attain this objective we must build up centers concentrating and radiating ideas all over the world. These centers may vary in their approach and outlook as to their beliefs and ideas, but will always meet with the universal concept that all people are equal and that class conflict is a disruption of the family. In these centers will be grouped people who have between them certain affinities and some common inheritance and common belief. They will be able as autonomous concepts within the universal concept to struggle harder and more efficiently to resist subversive ideas. These centers should be encouraged everywhere in the Old World and the New World, in Asia and Africa as well as in Europe and America.

I think that there are in existence radiating centers of culture and of spiritual concept outside the actual Communist sphere in places like Egypt, Pakistan, India, and Indonesia. These centers can be fortified by the support of a clear, outspoken defense of human liberty and welfare by the people of the United States, a people known for their love of freedom and benevolence.

In Europe and America there are similar centers of thought propagating moral and spiritual ideas. They may be along different lines, but they will meet with those of Africa and Asia on the common ground of equality of races, equality of classes, and equality of opportunities. Then, and only then, the aggressor, if any, will have to seek some cross-breeding of ideas which will introduce a totally new attitude which will culminate in the suppression of what is essentially wrong.

So much for the moral side of the picture. To deal with the realities of the moment we are facing an immediate huge catastrophe. What is wanted is time to get a breathing space to turn that violent prevailing attitude of mind toward a conciliatory one. Thus, we should have a truce. We should not think only of war or appeasement, because appeasement amounts to moral abdication and to treating the sypmtoms of a disease without in fact touching the disease itself. Such a course will set up precedents which can have only disastrous consequences in the settlement of other problems in Europe, Africa, and Asia.

The immediate procedural step for a long-term policy is to have a temporary truce on the Korean war front and on the mental front everywhere. We must find ways and means to enable the leaders of the two opposing camps, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, to meet under the auspices of the United Nations and the pressure of world opinion and to work out an honorable and just settlement or at least a modus vivendi as an alternative to war. They may then be able to illegalize war as a means of settling differences of ideology and national interests, thus discovering a common ground for further concerted actions. Disarmament, partial or complete, might provide an assurance that that common ground will be maintained. They might further agree that the United Nations can be reconstructed as an arbitrator, representing world opinion, whose decisions will then be accepted and implemented.

Before ending this talk it may be useful to call your kind attention to conditions which are making for instability and encouraging violence in an important area of the world known as the Middle East.

The people of this area have inherited and inspired great civilizations and great spiritual ideas. They are receiving wave after wave of propaganda from east and west. They are told by the west that they are backward, underdeveloped, and in need of European tutelage and protection. They are told by the east that they are exploited, enslaved, and despised, and should revolt against western domination. In fact, they are receiving no genuine friendship or sympathy or understanding from either side.

In spite of these strong currents they still stand adamantly for their faith and heritage. It is true they are more inclined toward western thoughts, but they refuse to be the vassals of the west. Although opposed to the material creed of the east, they feel impressed by its support to their human dignity and national inspirations.

I have complete faith in the wisdom of our people, but I fear that they may, under that dual pressure, become indifferent and disinterested. The consequences of such a state of mind in the Middle East as an eternal center of spiritual ideas, will have tremendous repercussions in Asia and Africa. While the east is well led by forces which have combined ideological with material energies and is penetrating deeply in Asia and Africa, the West, with no real moral leadership and by attempting to harness old concepts of imperialism to new concepts of nationalism, is but confusing the peoples of the Middle East and trying dangerously to harmonize the nineteenth century tutelage with sovereign

rights and the principles of self-determinaton of the twentieth. While maintaining a masterly attitude of superiority over these middle eastern peoples, curiously enough the west is paradoxically attempting to secure the voluntary cooperation of those long-subjected peoples.

This confused approach cannot appeal to the hearts and minds of the Arab and Moslem peoples. The only resistance to communism that is being shown at present by the masses of the people in the Middle East stems from their religious faith. It is high time for England, France, and particularly America to reconsider their attitude toward the Middle East and to try some note which will have resonance in the hearts and minds of 70,000,000 Arabs and 300,000,000 Moslems, extending from China to Morocco. If they do not, the west will lose their support in that ideological contest; and the east, through a persuasive, strong, and well directed mental penetration may get, ultimately, the upper hand.

Our people are now standing between the devil and the deep sea, and they may find their salvation either in complete passiveness of noncooperation or in an impulsive indignation, dominated by distrust and dissatisfaction.

All imperialistic powers have no chance at present for a moral lead of Asiatic and African people. The only country in the western camp which can still have a chance of an appeal to the hearts and minds of oriental masses is this country, the United States of America. Its past history and relations with the oriental world is an example of fair-mindedness and human good relations. They have known the United States through the last 150 years, as good businessmen, teachers, doctors and missionaries.

They recognize America as a Nation which stands for freedom and fair play; and in spite of recent blunders the Middle East has not lost faith in American good will.

However, in order to pull the Middle East out of that confused state of mind and from that attitude of indignation and distrust, the United States of America should present herself to the oriental world in her true light, and with a moral leadership that will never sacrifice principles for expediencies. This alone will afford a possibility of constructing a formidable radiating center of thoughts and principles around which hundreds of millions of Moslem peoples would rally in harmony with western idealism.

Not only can the Middle East contribute, as it did in the past, to spiritual and ideological forces to balance power in the moral field, but it can also contribute in the material balance with its huge potentialities of manpower, space and production. It can also be organized as a rallying center for material power to counteract material aggression. These material forces of the Middle East are being neglected and allowed to disintegrate by the intervention of outdated European imperialist powers, pretending to be able to fill with isolated military bases, the vacuum of defense in the Middle East, thus misleading themselves and others. The actual truth is that their military occupations and military bases in the Arab world, while far from filling a vacuum, are in themselves creating a vacuum which can only be filled by the material resources of its people and their faith in themselves and their power.

Our people for a number of years have been extending to America their hands for mutual friendship and vast moral and material cooperation. It is for this country to take it or leave it. Upon her decision depends to a great extent the stability, security, and prosperity of the Middle East and the Moslem world.

The Price of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address of Harry C. Withers, executive editor of the Dallas Morning News, before the Dallas Rotary Club:

THE PRICE OF PEACE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In the belief that all facts concerning the international crisis should be laid before the American public, and at the request of several hundred listeners who heard Harry C. Withers, executive editor of the News, address the Dallas Rotary Club Wednesday noon, the News herewith reproduces the text of Mr. Withers' remarks.)

It was suggested that I discuss today the responsibility of the United States as the acknowledged leader of the free nations of the world.

Such discussions inevitably involve events which run so swiftly and become so confusing that no man I know can analyze them satisfactorily. Only an arrant fool would pretend to have the answers.

Eight years ago I said from this forum that when World War II was over we would live in a different world. Some of my friends asked me then what I meant. Well, we are living in that different world now. I ask them what they think it means.

THE FOUR HORSEMEN

The most frightening fact of the times is this: The infamous four horsemen of the apocalypse—war, famine, pestilence, death—have been joined by a fifth horseman—communism. Its declared objective is to destroy the United States.

Our diplomats at Lake Success or our generals in Korea may win a temporary respite, but nothing except a united America, armed to the teeth, can defeat that objective.

Are the men who now hold our national destiny in their hands capable of uniting America? Will they let France or Britain, or even the United Nations, say whether 100,000 American boys shall be slaughtered by the heathen hordes of Red China?

I believe Truman would prefer to tell the diplomats to step aside so our soldiers can fight this war. But he has listened to the wrong people so long that he now finds it extremely dangerous to do what he would like to do.

It is the custom of Americans in such critical times to rally behind our chosen leaders. I think it is not disloyal even in these days to ask if our leaders can be trusted to preserve America's security without destroying its freedom.

SOME STRANGE THINGS

And if they can be trusted, are they competent? They have done some strange things to us since they came into power; things that strained our faith in their integrity; things that we ought not to hide now when our hearts beat with the strongest impulses of Americanism.

Although every normal American schoolboy knew 6 months ago that the Chinese Communists were our enemies in Korea, we have been shipping critical war materials to them, some of them as late as last week.

While communism is enslaving helpless nations in the Eastern Hemisphere, our leaders resist efforts to find out what Communists are doing to us in Washington.

It has been charged by some critics that even while our troops have been fighting in Korea there has been a feud between our State Department and our supreme military commander.

I do not believe Dean Acheson is a Communist. I think that prior to the invasion of Korea he was unduly influenced by the friends of Communist China. His course since that invasion has been opposed to communism.

ESSENTIALLY A THEORIST

Essentially Acheson is a theorist who at long last has come to the stage of action and is baffled. He lacks the forthrightness the present situation demands. The world waited with bated breath for his speech last week. He told us nothing we didn't know. We needed from him then words of iron and steel, words that would bring comfort to our men on the bloody battlefield, words that would unite the people of America in a firm purpose to face our dangers and overcome them.

It has been clear to most other observers that Russia's strategy is to involve the United States in war with other nations until we are so weak that she can step in safely and deliver the mortal blow.

Because of our blunders in China, Russian strategy is succeeding and we are losing the fight.

We whipped the North Koreans only to be faced by hordes of Chinese Communists who, we were once told, were simply agrarian reformers.

Korea has cost us $10,000,000,000 and 30,000 casualties and the end is not yet. Russia has not lost a man or fired a shot. She is conserving her manpower and building her war machine.

CAN HAPPEN ELSEWHERE

What has happened in Korea may happen in Iran, in Turkey, in India, in Western Germany or in any spot upon the globe where Russia can persuade one of her satellites to provoke America to resist aggression against free nations.

If we are committed by our policy to give what aid we can to the victims of aggression we may have to fight a series of isolated wars that will whittle us down to Russia's size economically.

When we are at war we are prepared to say with Stephen Decatur: "My country, may she always be right; but right or wrong, my country."

To say that is not to forego our freedom to criticize the things she is doing wrong. It is that freedom you are permitting me to exercise today.

America's defense of freedom throughout the world has made me proud to be an American. If we had not protected Greece and poured billions of our treasure into western Europe, communism now would rule the Eastern Hemisphere.

MORE MONEY DUE

In the last 3 years we have spent $30,000,000,000 to help put other nations on their feet, plus ten billion to save Korea. And we are about to appropriate billions more for our own protection and theirs.

Let us not pat ourselves on the back for that. How could we survive if the rest of the free world should fall before communism's aggressions? We would have to live at the point of a Russian gun the rest of our lives.

I am proud of the speed and resolution with which our Government acted in the Korean show-down. It came upon us like another Pearl Harbor. Our defenses were down, our strength was dissipated, our warnings were shrugged off as a red herring.

We had turned a deaf ear to MacArthur to listen to Owen Lattimore. MacArthur had repeatedly warned us that more troops were needed to maintain our position in the Far East.

On July 17, 1949, Lattimore said: "The thing to do is to let Korea fall but not let it look as though we pushed her."

In January, 1950, the House defeated the Korean aid act after the State Department insisted that military aid not be provided as such in the bill.

FOSTER QUOTED

On June 13, 1950, William C. Foster told the Senate: "The trend of events in South Korea is more favorable than it has been any time since liberation of the country in 1945."

That is the kind of advice we were getting 2 weeks before the Reds caught us flatfooted. It was Pearl Harbor over again and we are looking for a scapegoat.

Truman's quick response to the situation warmed our hearts, ended the cold war, cleared the atmosphere and inspired our patriotism.

Our cause is armed with justice and dedicated to freedom, not for ourselves alone, but for peoples everywhere who look to us for salvation. We are acting by authority of the United Nations. Fifty-two of the fifty-nine members stood with us against the Russian aggression. We should give Acheson credit for that.

At the risk of being tiresome, let me review briefly the events that have involved us in this situation.

Russia agreed at Potsdam in July 1945, to declare war on Japan and agreed that Korea in due course would become a free and independent nation.

TERMS REVEALED

It also was agreed there that Russia would accept surrender of Japanese forces north of the thirty-eighth parallel and the United States would accept the surrender south of that line.

On September 8, 1945, General Hodges accepted the surrender south of the thirty-eighth. By that time Russia had occupied all of North Korea and immediately banned all travel between the two zones.

At Moscow in December 1945 the United States, Great Britain, and Russia agreed that a free government should be set up in Korea.

Then Russia set about to sabotage the agreement. Every proposal for a free election throughout all Korea, Russia held an election in North Korea, permitting only Communists to vote. It barred the United Nations Commission from entering North Korea.

In September 1948, South Korea, containing two-thirds of the population of all Korea, held a free election, organized the Korean National Assembly, elected Syngman Rhee as president and took over the reins from the United States military government.

In September 1948, North Korea set up the Democratic People's Republic of Korea which was promptly recognized by Russia. Russia then began to train Korean military forces made up largely of Chinese Communists.

RULED LAWFUL

In December 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations declared the government of South Korea the only lawful government in Korea. The vote was 48 to 6.

Russia reported the withdrawal of all its troops by the end of 1948. It left an army of satellite troops. The United States withdrew its troops in June 1949.

There were frequent exchanges of fire and armed raids across the thirty-eighth parallel until June 25, 1950, when the North Koreans launched an attack all along the line of the parallel, starting the aggression which plunged the United States into another war.

Against tremendous odds we drove the North Korean Reds back into Manchuria. A month ago it seemed that we had won freedom for Korea. We knew Russia had incited the invasion of South Korea and armed it, but we nursed the vain hope that our victory would deter them for a while from further aggression.

Then they unloosed the fifth horseman and supplied him with a vastly superior force to snare the United Nations in a death trap.

More than 90 percent of those are American boys. What is the obligation of our leaders toward those boys? Is their loyalty in this crisis owed first to the United Nations or to the United States? Our natural impulse is to say: Use every weapon we have to save them from death or capture.

MUST BOMB BASES

That means, of course, authorizing MacArthur to bomb the enemy's supply bases in Manchuria and to use the atom bomb if he thinks it advisable. Maybe it would be silly to use the bomb in Korea, but it could hardly be sillier than to tell MacArthur to stop the Reds but not to bomb their rear.

Attlee, the head of a Socialist government, seconded by Pleven, the head of a Socialist government, has come here to persuade Truman, who has led us along the road to socialism, not to do anything to the Chinese Reds which might incite the Russian Reds to start a war.

They have already started it. If we come to Russia's terms on Korea, they may stop it, but that would be surrender on our part and merely would postpone the day of final reckoning. I see no chance for world peace until Communist Russia either wins world domination or is so soundly defeated that her people will renounce communism and liquidate its apostles.

What do the American people want to do about it? An overwhelming majority of them want to protect those boys with every resource at our command.

TOTAL WAR COMING

It may mean total war—but that's coming, anyway. It may mean terrible retaliation. It may mean universal military training. It will mean greatly increased taxes. It will mean Federal control over most of our human and material resources. We are willing. We are ready. We are not afraid.

That is, most of us are willing and ready. Unfortunately there are some groups enjoying liberty in this country who still favor appeasement of Russia. A few of them hope for Russian victory.

Since Chinese Communists entered the battle these groups have held more than a hundred rallies in Washington, in New York, in Hollywood, demanding that the United Nations get out of Korea, demanding that the United States reverse its foreign policy, demanding, in effect, that we let communism have its way.

These groups are a threat to our civilization. They are a menace to the general welfare. They are serving Russia and betraying this country.

There is no place for them in this land. This is no time for traitors or their fellow travelers. We know who they are. We know their apologists in our own Government.

MUST SHUT DOOR

We need to shut the door against them. We need to ferret out their aiders and abettors. We need to open every record in the State Department to expose the Communists on our Federal payroll. If Senator McCarthy has done nothing else he has made it clear that someone in Washington is afraid of what the records might show.

The Senate investigation to detect alleged Communists in Government service was rigged to protect them rather than to expose them. The people repudiated that whitewash by defeating Senator Tydings. Now it is up to the people more forcibly than ever. They should tell the Congress to outlaw communism, to throw fellow travelers out of Government jobs, to punish as seditionists those who advocate violent overthrow of our Government.

They should assure the patriotic men who occupy the pulpits of the country that parishioners will no longer support the pulpiteers who counsel compliance with Russia in the name of either pacifism or religion.

Parents should no longer send their boys and girls to colleges and universities where in the name of academic freedom, intellectual crackpots seek to destroy faith in our constitutional Government and in the integrity and virtue of our democratic philosophy.

FREEDOM MAY CRUMBLE

Unless we as individual Americans do these things, our fundamental citadels of freedom will crumble and fall or become the plant forums for the apostles of Russian dictatorship.

Then we, too, like the people of the captive nations behind the iron curtain, shall become the helpless slaves of the Kremlin, subject to the orders of the American commissars, deprived of our property, of our suffrage, of our free speech, of our chance even to know the truth.

This is a living danger to America which can be dispelled only if we act with courage and intelligence and make known to our leaders that it is the purpose of America to fight for individual freedom, not only here but throughout the world.

You have neglected your rights as a citizen. Employ them or you will lose your freedoms eventually. If you lose your domestic freedoms you won't be happy in your job and you can't enjoy your material profits.

If we lose the struggle with Russia you won't be running your present business, but you will be doing the things the Politburo of the American Soviet tells you to do.

NOT TOO PLEASANT

The kind of speech I have made here does not please me any more than it does you. I have heard speakers say that criticism of our Government and even of Russia should stop; that we have a beautiful world and should be talking about our blessings instead of our dangers.

I cannot agree with them. I do not think it is war mongering or unfair politics to lay the facts on the table and interpret them fairly and honestly. Unless the people are informed they cannot act intelligently and unless they are interested they will not act at all until it is too late.

Your American citizenship is the finest charter of human freedom known to man. Unless you cherish and exercise it you deserve to lose your freedoms.

Every one of us, whether employer or employee, is a soldier in the line, defending our form of government and our homeland. There is no territory behind the lines.

This is a great land in which we live. Let each of us do his part to keep it free.

Editorial From the Junction City (Oreg.) Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include

the following editorial from the Junction City (Oreg.) Times of December 7, 1950:

A farmer settled in raw country. Over a period of years he built up a good farm, built good barns, equipped it well, and ridded out all the weeds and brush, even to the wild mustard in the fields. He acquired position and prospered, and also a few holdings in another part of the county.

But as the years went by, he began to spend more and more of his time telling the other farmers how they should run their places, what organizations they should belong to—in fact, it got to the point that he began criticizing his neighbors' fences, livestock, machinery, and even the way the children acted. He even began trying to settle all the neighborhood quarrels—his way, of course.

The sad part of the story is that by his eagerness to be all things to all men he let his own place go down, the neighbor's scrub stock got to running with his good herds and due to hard-luck stories, he gave away much of his good seed corn. After a long series of borrowing funds against future crops he found himself heavily in debt, his family dissatisfied and even the hired help finding fault, careless in their work and indifferent to his plans.

Meantime a Johnny-come-lately had come into the picture and was not only running a pretty big place himself, but leasing or otherwise taking over the operation of many other smaller outfits in the county and nearby. There was much distrust of this newcomer—both his methods and the way he treated his help and his attitude toward his neighbors was open to suspicion. It became increasing apparent that he was out to grab everything worth grabbing by fair means or foul. And the question all of the neighbors were asking was "What's the old pioneer going to do—take care of his own place and bring it back to its former good condition, or just go on as he is and still try to out-fox this newcomer, and maybe lose everything seeing as how his own folks don't altogether trust his good intentions anymore."

The problems of nations are just the problems of people, multiplied in size but basic in principle.

Farsighted Leadership Needed To Restore Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Press-Scimitar of December 5, 1950:

WE ARE ALREADY AT WAR, AND OUR JOB IS NOT TO PRESERVE PEACE BUT TO RESTORE PEACE; IT TAKES FARSIGHTED LEADERSHIP, A SOUND PLAN, AND PLAIN, ORDINARY GUTS

The world situation would not seem so confusing if people would quit speculating about the grave risk of war and accept the fact that war began on June 27, when the United Nations moved against Red aggression in Korea.

The problem now is how to win that war and restore peace.

That demands a plan and the will to see it through.

First, there should be no more talk of peace overtures to Moscow until the free world can talk to Russia on terms of military equality.

Immediate mobilization of all of America's resources of war is therefore necessary.

All of our foreign-assistance programs should be consolidated into a rearmament program, from which those nations unwilling to accept that formula and make reasonable contributions to it would be eliminated. This will separate the dependable from the undependable among our allies.

Spain and Western Germany should be invited to join in the defense of Western Europe on a basis of absolute equality without further quibbling. The urgency of the situation will not permit any more pussyfooting on these issues.

The manpower of these two countries is an absolute must.

In Asia, our wartime relationship with the Chinese Nationalist Government should be restored, so that the 500,000 troops in Formosa will be available for any emergency. Japan should be rearmed and included in anti-Communist alliance with Nationalist China, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, the Philippines—and India and Pakistan, provided they want to go along.

We should pull our forces out of Korea unless they can be reinforced and prepare to meet Russia on grounds more advantageous to us if Moscow insists on a military show-down.

Russia may not want that.

She may have been getting away with a colossal bluff.

But we can't afford to call that bluff until we are prepared for the worst, if that is what it has to be.

To be so prepared, everything must be subordinated to a supreme mobilization effort.

The requests Britain is making for a share in our stockpiles of strategic goods should be entertained only where they will not interfere with our own rearmament program, and then only to the extent that they will contribute directly to a common defense program. Business as usual cannot be maintained in the face of the present threat to civilization.

The free world has enough manpower to withstand this threat, if it is mobilized, trained, and armed. It has most of the world's steel and oil and capacity for industrial production.

All that it lacks is determined, far-sighted leadership, a sound program, and plain, ordinary guts.

We must look to the Truman-Attlee conferences to produce these things if peace is to be restored. The President can count upon the wholehearted support of the American people in insisting on such a plan.

Speak Out, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Baltimore Sun, Baltimore, Md., December 13, 1950:

SPEAK OUT, MR. PRESIDENT

The country hopes that the meeting at the White House this morning will dissolve the cloud of indecision under which we are living.

The meeting has been called by the President, and it is a bipartisan meeting. Its purpose is to help the President make up his mind on the declaration of a national emergency. It is the culmination of a series of meetings which the President has been holding this week with his advisers.

Why a proclamation?

There is no point in rearguing the question whether we should or should not have gone into Korea. We are there. Maybe we shall stay. Maybe we won't. But whatever the decision reached on that point by arms or by policy, the day of calling our current enterprise a police action is long since over. Practically the whole of our fighting force is engaged in this single and far from successful operation. Yet the aggression which took us into Korea is only one element in the appallingly perilous situation that confronts the free world.

The free world is all but unprepared to meet this peril. For 6 months, this country has talked rearmament and done very little to rearm. It is 20 months since the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty. Yet the North Atlantic community has still to begin to erect those defenses which it was the purpose of the North Atlantic Pact to bring into being.

In the nations of Western Europe, as in this country, it has been talk, talk, talk, so far as the actual preparations for defense are concerned.

But while the talk has been going on, and as though time to prepare were limitless, dangerous things have been happening to our domestic economy. For the talk has stimulated a boom—not the kind of boom which comes with a big defense effort, but a purely civilian, comfort-loving boom. New houses, television sets, household refrigerators. New cars. Luxuries in incredible variety. It has been a nervous and apprehensive boom, caused by people who, when anxious, obey their reflexes and think first of themselves.

This boom has clogged our factories. It has driven up wages. It has driven up prices. To sum it up, at the very time when heads should be steady and the economic machine should be kept as stable as possible, we find ourselves in a sharply rising inflationary spiral.

This inflation would be bad enough if the prospect were peaceful. With the grim prospect which actually confronts us, it is tragic.

To sum up, the 6 months since the fighting started in Korea—when Mr. Bernard Baruch called for a swift application of wartime controls—have been 6 months of frenzied productive activity in this country, devoted largely to the production of things other than those we need most.

No one can look seriously at the situation of this country today without admitting that things have gone badly wrong—and that strong medicine will be needed to put us on the right track.

Nor can there be much doubt as to the nature of the medicine. There must be powerful direction from the center. Voluntary action will not do. If we are to rearm—and all-out rearmament now offers the only hope of peace—we need price controls. We need wage controls. There must be the power to allocate materials, the power to allocate manpower. First things must be put first.

The President already has almost all the power to act that he needs. He has an arsenal of powers left over from World War

II. He has other powers specifically delegated to him by Congress this fall.

But he does not have quite all the powers that he needs—or at any rate is not sure of them. To be sure of them, he must first proclaim what is no more than the truth, namely, that there exists a state of national emergency.

But over and above this technical reason for making the proclamation there is another and still more important reason. He owes it to the people. He owes it to them as proof that his own mind is made up. He owes it to them to declare unmistakably that the period of the cold war is over, and that the one hope of averting a third world war is to settle down now to the task of building the defenses of the free world and building them well.

Letter From Frederick Brack, of Norwalk, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter dated December 9, 1950, which raises some very interesting questions and which I feel will interest my colleagues. The letter follows:

NORWALK, CONN., *December 9, 1950.*
Hon. ANTONI N. SADLAK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SADLAK: First of all permit me please to congratulate you upon your reelection to office, for I believe that you are on the job truly doing your best in the interest of the people you were elected to serve.

Please also accept my thanks for the books I received from you on the Utilization of Farm Crops about hearings before subcommittees some of which I read with interest and much concern.

Frankly speaking I am amazed at the great volume of all these hearings, time and money spent in putting it all into book form print and so forth, and then we fail to get any apparent result or benefit.

Of what good are all these hearings if the remedy is not applied at the source to bring about the desired and just improvement in the interest of all the people?

According to all reports food in general has never been more plentiful and yet the cost is the highest and still rising.

Just today, Saturday, December 9, when we did our weekly shopping in one of the large First National stores, where prices are supposed to be as low as anywhere, top of round meat was $1.09 per pound. Porterhouse steak was 97 cents per pound. Lamb chops were $1.09 per pound. Slice of ham was $1.20 per pound. Eggs were 83 cents a dozen. Coffee was 79 cents per pound. Butter was 73 cents per pound. Nearly all the fish is expensive, and so it is with most everything else.

We have been reading and hearing a lot about Government action to correct all this for a long time now, but we fail to see and experience any improvement.

In my humble judgment there is too much pussyfooting in placing the responsibility where it belongs and applying the remedy. It would be a blessing to our representatives in office and to our people as a whole if a law were passed to do away with lobbying in Washington, D. C., as soon as possible and let our Representatives do their own thinking, in the interest of all our American people, instead of selfish interests, some of which we read about occasionally.

It is like in the United Nations meetings. One nation has applied the veto 47 times, calls us war mongers and will not agree to anything in the interest of world peace. The Second World War ended over 5 years ago and we all now know that because of the Russian attitude it has and still is costing the American people billions of dollars in taxes to pay for it all the world over with no end in sight.

Can't the diplomats and particularly our own representatives in Washington see the hand writing on the wall?

I pray to God that some of our representatives will have the vision and courage to immediately do something about putting our house of state in order first and then give the Russians just 1 week to decide whether or not they will cooperate in the best interest of all the nations. If they will not, then I say, Stalin and his gang deserve what Hitler and Mussolini got and the sooner the better, to get this world mess cleaned up.

Unless this action is taken, I fear Lenin and Stalin's hopes that the United States will spend itself into destruction, will truly come to pass, for we are very much on the way to it right now.

Who is responsible for the present war and allowing ship loads of war material to Red China, resulting thus far in the killing of over 6,000 of our boys in Korea and the placing of over 20,000 in hospitals?

Whoever is responsible, deserves to be placed in the front firing line in Korea, for they surely are not sincere Americans who believe in the Golden Rule.

All my business and professional friends feel just as I do and wonder why the procrastination at the helm.

I wish it were possible for everyone from President Truman all the way down the line to read this letter, for I believe it to be the feeling of the great majority of our people.

Very truly yours,
FREDERICK BRACK.

The State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent letter from a constituent of mine on the state of the Union:

WALDEN, N. Y., *December 8, 1950.*
Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Goshen, N. Y.

DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: Because it is an old American custom for the President of the United States to present at each opening session of Congress a message on the state of the Union, I feel that we, the people who are the blood and bone and sinew of America, we, the people who live in little houses along the little streets should address our Congress assembled on the state of the Union.

Our streets in our little towns don't end any more at the city limits; they keep right on going into Europe and Asia and even the Far East. That's a long way. Some of us in our town find it a little hard to believe this is really true. America itself is so much wider than our lives—the whole world, we can't imagine. And so we may seem reluctant to accept all the responsibilities that come with broadening horizons. But you Members of the Congress on the Hill in Washington, you can see how far our streets really extend, how close our future is linked to the world. This is your great responsibility. Here of all places there is no room for petty politics.

Never in our history have we had such magnificent opportunity for great leadership; never have we had such a need for men who can and will rise to statesmanship. If the people along my street in our town are reluctant to accept this great responsibility it is because we are confused by all the plans and counterplans—the claims and counterclaims. We are not little unimportant people—no people on earth are any more. But some of the problems have become so big, so involved that we can't understand them.

We do not understand why with all the food and all the money and all the help we have given scores of countries overseas we have failed so miserably to win their friendship. We can't understand why the United Nations is so disunited in action. We do not understand why there is so much scornful talk of communism in America and yet no laws against it. Why we should spend lives and billions to stop communism and yet go out of our way to appease its leaders around the conference table.

We can never inspire the confidence of other nations. We can never expect them to believe in us until we know what we believe ourselves. We can never hope to lead the world toward peace until we cease running in all directions.

Is it any wonder that the people in our town are confused? What is America's foreign policy, where has it gotten us? We are tired of hearing your endless reasons why the world is torn apart. If the Congress knows the reasons, then let's have an end of them. We're tired of politics, indecision, vacillation. We want positive productive peace.

We have tried compromise and politics and diplomacy for a long while, now is the time for decision; for statesmanship and leadership. The people in our town, along our streets, tired as we are, still believe with all our hearts in America, in democracy and in you, our representatives in Congress.

The state of the Union, we are told, is linked with the state of the world. If this is true, it is rather obvious, it is not good. The hour has come for Congress to accept its full responsibility.

The State Department needs an immediate cleansing. From the Secretary of State to the bottom of the ladder a clean sweep should be actuated; thus, we the people of our little town respectively present our message on the state of the Union.

With best personal regards, I remain
Respectfully yours,
ROBERT B. HOUGHTALING.

No Heart for the Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include an editorial by C. A. Hummel, editor of the Jeffersonian, a weekly newspaper of Jeffersontown, Ky.:

NO HEART FOR THE TAXPAYER

Another one of those "biggest" has been chalked up for Texas. This time it's the biggest profit—a profit of nearly $60,000, on surplus war material purchased from the Government for just $6.89. An east Texas farmer was the lucky speculator who put it over on Uncle Sam's agents for disposing of surplus property.

Looking over the surplus property list for bargains, the farmer noticed that bids were being asked on 168 aircraft computers. Supposing aircraft computers would be small cardboard computers that might be useful in calculating land areas, he bid a little less than 5 cents apiece, for the lot. His bid of $6.89 accepted, he telephoned the San Antonio depot to send his purchase by parcel post.

But, to his amazement, he found that he had become owner of 168 unused electric fire-control instruments, technically known as parallax computers, which had cost the Government about $7,200 each. Protesting that he did not want the property, he was told that he would have to go through with the bargain. And he did, though it cost him $4,000 to have his stock of computers crated, stored, and then shipped to his farm.

In business now, with a heavy inventory of what could become rather dead merchandise, this trading farmer turned to Uncle Sam again as a prospective customer. And why not, since Uncle is about the biggest user of those contraptions? His letter to the Air Force in Washington brought, within a few days, officers from Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, to take a look at the merchandise. Why yes, they were interested and a trade was made, with Uncle Sam's representatives agreeing to buy the computers for $63,000. And this time a bargain it was for "Uncle Shylock." The pesky things had cost the Government $500,000 when bought the first time.

Talk about a big corporation having no heart. Where is the heart—not to mention the mind—of big Government?

Souvenirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I ask permission to include therein an editorial entitled "Souvenirs," which appeared in the Palm Beach Post-Times on December 7, 1950, and which editorial was written by Hon. Charles Francis Coe, the editor and publisher of said paper.

It will be recalled that Mr. Coe received national recognition and an award from Freedoms Foundation, Inc., for the most constructive and outstanding editorial of the year 1949.

The following editorial enjoins upon us the duty of taking an inventory of our national assets and to reexamine the fundamental principles of Americanism:

SOUVENIRS

There comes a time in the lives of men and nations when the attic must be ransacked, old trunks cleaned out, trash of the years discarded to make room for new accumulations. In his front page cartoon of today Mr. Enright portrays Uncle Sam in the process.

Deep in the dust of our history he digs up an old banner. Coiled on the face of the flag is a rattlesnake and the inscription is "Don't tread on me." That was a message served oppressors by our early Americans. That was a fair warning, fairly given, and nobly supported. That passed into our sacred archives, a souvenir of its times, a milepost of human dignity, a clarion call to the souls of free men in the making. As the fruits of its thinking spread, people became accustomed to the warning, rather than consecrated to the substance which enabled that warning. Having struck true richness of gold, they ceased mining, leaving it to the natural forces to wash the gold from the lode into their palms. Slowly the gold of liberty bogged in the inertia of a heedless, busy people.

Now comes the threat to all of the gold in freedom. Now Uncle Sam, marshaling his assets by a review of history, comes upon a souvenir resounding indeed. He rediscovers in the attic of history that which never was and never can be, safely called a relic. The price of liberty is constant vigilance. Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute. A house divided against itself * * *. In union there is strength. Don't tread on me. These were never cliches. They attracted an emptiness through repetition of a parrot-like nature in the gesture of the elementary schools, but actually they were and are pregnant with continuing liberty for these States united. It is well that we review the past, assort the treasures of our trove, renew acquaintance with the rugged virtues which sprouted and nurtured our homeland. It is well, indeed.

Nothing else will preserve us. Nothing else will suffice as warning against the predatory forces intent upon our destruction. Nothing. These are the simple virtues of free men. These are the fortifications behind which grew freedom of worship, freedom of speech, habeas corpus, the secret ballot, government of, for, and by the people. These are America. That which blatantly bellows from a bureaucratic bedlam is not America. That which sings a litany of lost energy, shrivelled ambition, innocuous inertia, something for nothing, that is not America. The preachments of a villainous departure from the firm and rugged precepts of our origin are proving traitorous. The record speaks eloquently for itself.

We are one of two things. Either we are Americans in the spirit and the flesh or we are wanderers into realms strange to Americans and repugnant to every impulse which made Americans. Uncle Sam does right well to lift from his treasure chest souvenirs of his own historic past. Nowhere else will he find the things which birthed, clothed, and fed him from the first cry of newborn human freedom, to this dire challenge to the blood of all who trod before us that he might grow great.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to a very objective and comprehensive statement made by Mr. Edward Hilliard, an investment banker and broker in the city of Louisville. Mr. Hilliard has for years been a serious student of fiscal matters. His remarks which follow were delivered on November 29 in Louisville, Ky., before the Harvard Business School Club of Kentucky. In these days when our national well-being and security are threatened not only by war but also by economic collapse due to inflation, Mr. Hilliard's observations are most timely. I recommend the study of Mr. Hilliard's views by every Member of the House. His remarks follow:

INFLATION

(By Edward H. Hilliard)

The United States has the disease of inflation in a big way. The value of the dollar has declined to 53 cents as measured in our purchasing power. In the black market of Bombay it has apparently declined to 35 cents. Unless we stop confusing the disease and its symptoms and start treating the disease itself, that value will certainly decline further. Emission of inconvertible money in the form of currency and bank deposits is the disease. In the last 11 years, largely by selling Government bonds to banks, we have increased our currency from $7,000,000,000 to $28,000,000,000 and spendable bank deposits from $50,000,000,000 to $160,000,000,000.

Next to war, inflation is the greatest tragedy than can happen to a nation. War at its worst brings out some noble qualities in man—courage, loyalty, and generosity. Inflation is just the opposite. It makes honest men dishonest, destroys savings, life insurance, and pensions, makes saving wrong and spending right, makes speculators out of all businessmen, demoralizes our national economy, and destroys the effectiveness of our war effort. In the present instance, inflation may readily result in our defeat by Russia.

Inflation is not a general price advance. Price advance is merely one of the symptoms or results. As Webster says:

"Inflation is a disproportionately and relatively sharp and sudden increase in the quantity of money, or credit, or both, relative to the exchange business," coming among other ways, "in times of financial difficulty by governmental issues of paper money. * * * In accordance with the quantity theory of money, inflation always produces a rise in the price level."

In other words, inflation produces a decline in the value of money.

Inflation is emission of money. Emission is the underlying cause of our trouble. Decline in the value of money is merely the first of four results. The second is suspension of specie payments and disappearance of the metallic money formerly used as a standard; third, further emissions of paper of necessity because depreciated paper will not buy what the Government needs; and fourth, the washout—paper money becomes valueless or practically so. Emission, decline in value, suspension, further emission and washout. Sometimes suspension precedes decline in value but the result is the same.

History is full of examples. In 300 B. C. Lysias blamed the corn factors for price advances just like Mr. Truman blamed the speculators here. Diocletian in A. D. 300 used price controls just as we do here. In France there was the John Law Mississippi Bubble and in England the East India Co. We had our colonial emissions and the continental currency, the latter leaving the expression "Not worth a Continental" when that currency went to zero. The Assignats of France in 1790, secured by real property at the rate of five to one, the best secured irredeemable paper currency ever issued, and its successor the Mandats, went out at zero in spite of the fact that "just a little" was originally issued. There was the wild Aus-

trian inflation of 1811, and then Germany, Austria, Greece, France, and others (many of them two or three times) of this last 50 years. Emission, decline, further emission suspension, washout. Dishonesty, increase in racial tensions, destruction of the value of savings, insurance policies, endowment funds, the complete pauperization of the poor who always have the paper money when it becomes valueless. There were dozens of other tragic results.

If inflation is so terrible, and there are so many examples in history, why do we stand for it? For two simple reasons. First, we fail to distinguish between the disease and its symptoms. We ignore the tubercle that is eating the lung and treat the cough. We continue the printing of money and pass laws about price controls. Second, the early phases of inflation are pleasant. The emission of paper currency puts prices up, stimulates trade, increases profits, increases incomes faster than expenses, and makes every man think he is smart. Like the patient in the early stages of tuberculosis, the fever actually makes us feel better. But usually not for long. We here in this country may right now be passing out of this pleasant phase. Expenses are catching up with income for many people. Recently issued statistics show that over one-third of the families in the United States are now drawing on savings for living expenses. Another symptom showing we are nearing the end of the pleasant stage is the confusion in high circles between cause and effect. The emission of paper money forces prices up and forces businessmen to borrow money. Borrowing is a result not a cause but businessmen are now being charged with being the cause of inflation. Emission increases costs of Government itself and creates deficits. Emission is the cause, deficits a result. My guess is that we will shortly hear the historic charge that deficits cause emission. This confusion tends further toward the treatment of symptoms. The disease itself is ignored and continues on its progress.

The fact that we have the disease is incontrovertible. We have had the emission—an immense increase in money. We have had the first effect—the decline in the value of our money. We have had the second effect—the suspension of specie payment and the disappearance of the metal we have always used as money. It is neither possible to convert our paper into gold nor use that paper as the means of purchasing gold at a higher price than the nominal conversion value. We are about to witness the third result—further emissions because of war and the higher prices brought on by the earlier emissions.

Will we have the fourth and last stage? We must immediately stop treating symptoms and hunting hodges. Further emissions will further depress the value of the dollar. We must stop these emissions as far as humanly possible.

First. The Treasury Department should cease acting as an instrumentality for carrying out social objectives of any party. It should recognize that its duty is to "Prepare plans for the support of credit of the United States" as provided in the Statute of 1789 under which it operates. The Treasury Department should openly and boldly come out against policies which are destroying the value of our money. These policies are primarily expenditure of money on objectives not connected with our war effort.

Second. As a means of preventing further decline in the value of the dollar the United States Government should ration itself as well as its citizens. It should immediately stop spending and lending on objectives not connected with our war effort. This reduction in Government expenditures will cause some unemployment but that unemployment will shortly be taken up by the war effort. Reduction in Government spending and lending will cause a reduction in demand by civilians for the very things which the Government must buy for our war effort.

Third. In order to force further reductions in civilian expenditure, excise taxes should be increased and broadened.

Fourth. The market for Government bonds among individuals must be reestablished. So that as few bonds as possible need be sold to banks. Government bonds must be made more attractive to individuals both from the standpoint of safety and from the standpoint of return. Reduction of Government expenditure on nonessentials will tend to reestablish confidence in Government bonds and other fixed income investments. But that is not enough. The income on Government bonds must be increased to attract individual buying. Because of the difficulties of raising the interest rates on Government bonds, tax exemption, as objectionable as that may be, should be offered to the holders of maturing "E," "F," and "G" bonds, who elect to extend their holdings and to purchasers of new offerings of letter and coupon bonds, with the provision that no individual may hold more than a fixed amount of tax-exempt issues.

Unless we recognize the magnitude of the crisis and start at once treating the disease of inflation at its source, this inflation will follow the course inflations have always followed. And what will that do to social security? How will that old man feel if you take away from him a social-security payment of $1 that will buy a pound of beef and give him back at 65 $1 that will buy 1 ounce of beef?

Penal laws about prices and controls are laws treating the cough while the disease continues its course. "In the battle between printed money and price controls, printed money always wins." The value of our printed money will be determined by the financial policies of the United States Government, and not by price controls and penal laws. The value of our money is going down and penal laws about prices and controls will do no more good than they did in our revolution. As Pelatiah Webster said about paper money at that time—

"It is not more absurd to attempt to impel faith into the heart of an unbeliever by fire or fagot or to whip love into your mistress with a cow skin, than to force value into your money to penal laws."

The time is short. Next to joining our fighting forces, there is nothing more patriotic that a citizen can do than fight the policies that are now destroying the value of our money. It is up to us.

Rights and Dangers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of December 12, 1950:

RIGHTS AND DANGERS

The 10 amendments called the Bill of Rights were added to the Constitution of the United States 159 years ago next Friday.

They were framed and adopted to guarantee civil liberties—to protect a people who had known the tyranny of English kings from arbitrary and tyrannical acts of their own new Government.

As the anniversary nears, court decisions based on these amendments are raising grave questions as to the power of the people and their Government to protect the United States from traitorous acts of persons serving the interests of a hostile foreign power.

The Supreme Court held yesterday that a witness cannot be punished for refusing to answer grand-jury inquiries about connections with the Communist Party. This because the fifth amendment says "no person * * * shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

Communist Party membership has not been made a crime. But the opinion written by Justice Black affirms that one admitting employment by the party, or intimate knowledge of its workings, might reasonably fear criminal prosecution under the Smith Act.

This decision apparently means that courts, congressional committees, and Government agencies, as well as grand juries, cannot require persons to answer questions about Communist connections or activities, and that many persons facing contempt penalties for refusing to answer such questions must go free if they claimed the right to avoid "self-incrimination."

The Smith Act is the Federal law, making it a crime to teach or advocate violent overthrow of the Government, under which 11 top leaders of the Communist Party were convicted in October 1949.

Those convictions have been upheld by a New York Federal court of appeals in an opinion written by Judge Learned Hand. The case of the Communist Party leaders, who contend that the Smith Act denies liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, is now before the Supreme Court for final decision.

Last week the same court of appeals, in another opinion by Judge Hand, set aside Judith Coplon's conviction for stealing Government secrets and transmitting them to a Russian agent.

"The guilt is clear," that opinion said. But, it added, "the conviction cannot stand," for Miss Coplon was deprived of "due process of law"—another right guaranteed by the fifth amendment—when the FBI arrested her without a warrant and when the Government failed to prove that evidence used against her had not been obtained by wiretapping.

However, Judge Hand pointed out, it is within the authority of Congress to narrow in cases of espionage, sabotage, and other heinous crimes the legal protections by which Miss Coplon had profited:

Somehow, we must find a way to preserve for loyal persons the liberties shielded by the Bill of Rights and at the same time safeguard our country from the agents of a foreign enemy who would destroy all freedoms. That is an imperative challenge to all the wisdom good Americans can apply to the problem.

Bromfield Sights Need for Reexamination of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article by one of my constituents

and my very good friend, Louis Bromfield.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is time for those in control of our Government to give to the people a clear picture of what is going on. I join in the thoughts of Mr. Bromfield and many of the people it is my honor to represent that our program is muddled, confused, and inefficient.

It is time for us to learn the truth, not only of our foreign policy, but our own program as it affects the United States.

Let us have a reexamination, forget politics, and prepare to defend the freedoms that have made this Nation great.

The article follows:

BROMFIELD SIGHTS NEED FOR REEXAMINATION OF GOVERNMENT

(By Louis Bromfield)

Since Secretary of State Acheson has given us a new and rather meaningless word, "reexaminist," it might be well to give it some real meaning.

In a gust of stilted British humor Mr. Acheson launched the word as a term of opprobrium, only to find that it became a word with overtones of common sense, intelligence, and respect.

There is no doubt that the whole of our foreign policy, whatever that may be, will be reexamined and the examination will probably run into the field of vast expenditures for foreign relief of one kind and another which have been made during the past 4 years.

The citizens of the Nation are certainly entitled to know exactly how and where was spent some forty-three billions of their money and whether we should, as Mr. Truman proposes, continue to pour out such astronomical sums indefinitely.

Certainly Congress should endeavor to find out how long we can afford such whole floods of outgoing dollars without sinking our own Nation.

Congress should likewise reexamine the whole of the ECA which, since the announced departure of able Mr. Paul Hoffman as Director, is rapidly congealing into a fixed and permanent organization of second-rate bureaucrats, all intent upon making a temporary agency into a permanent affair which will keep them indefinitely on the staggering Government payroll.

We might reexamine the whitewashed Amerasia case and the Socialist government of Great Britain, supported by American taxpayers, while it blocks European defense and cooperation and carries on appeasement deals with Red China.

But there is plenty of reexamination long overdue in fields outside the realm of foreign policy.

We, the people, through our Congress, might well ask what has become of the findings of the Hoover Commission, set up to bring some order into what is the biggest and probably the worst-run business in the world—the United States Government.

It might also examine the question of why, although the whole of the Nation is for greater economy in government, the number of Government employees continues to increase more and more rapidly.

It might inquire why the number of public servants attached to Mr. Truman personally and the White House has been quadrupled, all at fat salaries several times the income of the average American family.

Congress should certainly attempt to find out what became of another fifty billions of taxpayers' money which has gone to the Armed Forces during the past 4 years and why nothing has come of it but a general state of unpreparedness.

It should ask why at the moment Army camps are filled with reservists and draftees sitting around with nothing to do while the Army goes on drafting men and calling up Reserves. It might go into the problem of a genuine unification and coordination of all the Armed Forces.

And Congress might well go into the delays and the dodges of the Department of Justice in following up the investigations of the Kefauver committee by active prosecutions, when actually interest in the race-track business extends right into the Department itself.

It might inquire into the resentment and anger of many big shots on the Democratic National Committee over the activities of the Kefauver committee.

Some prominent Democrats, with a total lack of decency and morality, have bitterly claimed that the revelations of the Kefauver committee defeated their candidates in the recent election. I think the people would be very interested to know just how much certain figures in the present administration and the national Democratic organization are tied into the crime rings that function from one end of the country to the other.

And Congress might well look into the Treasury Department and find out the truth or falsity of the reports of Governor Warren's committee in California that deals had been made on income taxes between criminal elements and employees of the Department of Internal Revenue.

Apparently while the Justice Department and the Treasury Department have been combing small taxpayer's accounts and those of reputable corporations and citizens, leaks in taxes from the criminal elements have piled up during the past 3 or 4 years of several million dollars.

There is plenty to be reexamined in Washington. What kind of an administration have we? Why does everything seem to be muddled, confused, and hopelessly inefficient and even corrupt?

There is plenty to be "reexamined" in Washington and the new Congress has both the power and authority to do it. It seems certain that the great majority of citizens would like nothing so much as a good wholesale reexamination of the whole degenerating picture in Washington.

Examined bit by bit, it is a shocking picture.

Several Congressmen might well make great future capital and indeed whole careers simply by bringing about more of the reexamination which Mr. Acheson attempts so gayly to laugh off.

Railroad Retirement Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a speech made by Thomas Stack, president, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., at Cleveland Auditorium, Cleveland, Ohio, on October 27, 1950.

Due to unrestricted inflation during the past few years, which continues to reduce the purchasing power of the dollar, it becomes more evident every day that legislation should be passed by this Congress to increase railroad retirement pay to the great group of railroad men who have so faithfully carried on railway transportation so vital to the commerce of our country and its economic stability.

The need for such increase in railroad retirement is further pointed up by the action of the Eighty-first Congress in increasing social security by approximately 75 percent for the other workers of the Nation.

Mr. Stack's speech follows:

Honorable Members of Congress, officers and members of the National Railroad Pension Forum, ladies and gentlemen, my message tonight is one of utmost importance, not alone to the railroad employees of the Cleveland area, but to this Nation's rail workers, in discussing some of the defects of our railroad retirement system and what we are attempting to do to remedy same. So far you have been led to believe that we have a wonderful retirement set-up, with protection for ourselves and families from the cradle to the grave, and our Retirement Board has exemplified these statements with elaborate charts and figures showing benefits have been paid in the millions of dollars to railroad workers. Such statements are hard to understand or comprehend where the interests of the individual are involved and many of us labor with the illusion that we are paying for security that we and our families will one day enjoy. And, so you have never been informed of the many injustices of our Railroad Retirement Act, solely because no one has ever pointed them out.

The new social security law—H. R. 6000—was passed in the Eighty-first Congress and increased benefits under that act some 77 percent, so that now the ratio of benefits eclipse that of our rail worker. In order to explain this remark, let us consider two men aged 60 years who work until they are 65 years old—one under the Railroad Retirement Act and another under industry covered by social security. The one under railroad retirement pays in tax 6 percent of his earnings—matched by another 6 percent by the carrier, or a total of 12 percent of his earnings, while the one under social security will pay 1½ percent of his earnings matched by another 1½ percent by his employer, or a total of 3 percent, or 9 percent less than the railroad employee, and assume both men earned an average of $300 per month in this 5-year period, the railroad man would receive a pension of $24 per month, while the man under social security—if he had a wife also 65 years old—would receive $120 per month.

Now we know that insofar as the tax is concerned, both go into the Federal Treasury and the surplus, over the current payments and administrative costs of both funds, are used by the Federal Government for current expenses. Both funds are equally sound; both are underwritten by the United States Government, and as long as we have a dollar, the Government will pay the obligation—whether it be social security or railroad retirement. This should spike the theory of some, that our railroad retirement law has a superior financial structure.

During the past year we have received some hundreds of letters from widows of employees asking us to check on their pensions; since they receive such small sums they could not believe same to be correct. Some were lawyers representing these widows who spoke with ridicule of the act and

asked some information and advice. Let me advise that widows' pensions are not based on the same formula as retirement benefits. In the first place, they are based on earnings since January 1, 1937, and in the amount of $250 per month maximum. They are arrived at by using a money factor determined by 40 percent of the first $75 and 10 percent of the remainder; this is increased by 1 percent each year since 1937, which will amount to 14 percent January 1, 1951. This amount is usually about one-third of the pension her husband would receive, had he lived to get same, and is payable to the widow when she has reached the age of 65 years; hence when the Retirement Board advises those widows they are entitled to pension of $25 or $30 per month, they naturally feel something is wrong, which accounts for the deluge of letters on this subject.

Let us reflect for a few minutes on some of these cases taken from our files. Here we have a Baltimore woman, widow of a railroad man who commenced service with the carrier in 1905 and died in 1941 while on the job. The Retirement Board advised that she was entitled to regular monthly payments of $30.64. However, they rereferred to section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act which provides in substance that all she could receive was the amount in excess of the total insurance benefits coming to her under social security, and they advised her further that inasmuch as she would receive in her own right $23.71 from the social security her railroad-retirement benefits would be reduced to a monthly figure of $6.93. To make matters worse, they reminded her that she had been paid a burial expense for her husband's funeral and part of this would be deducted each month from her railroad-retirement check and that she would receive $4.34 per month until the funeral expense, which was considered a loan, was satisfied.

Case No. 2 covers a Chicago woman whose husband worked for the Railway Express nearly 50 years; he retired November 1949 and died in March 1950. His pension amounted to $107 per month; she worked under social security during the war and asked for the lump-sum benefit—as she knew in the Eightieth Congress we had legislation passed to insure and guarantee each employee that should they die before reaching retirement age their beneficiary would be entitled to 4 percent of their earnings since January 1, 1937, to December 31, 1946, and 7 percent thereafter—not to exceed $300 maximum salary per month, which is the maximum amount on which we pay tax. She was advised by the Board that since she was over 65 years old the lump-sum channel was closed to her; and they further advised that she was not entitled to the burial expense in view of immediate benefits payable; as a matter of fact she had great difficulty in getting a loan to pay the funeral expenses, and afterward waited several months to get a reply from the Board on the many letters she wrote them on this subject. Finally, through the efforts of your forum she did get a reply that she was entitled to $34.89 per month—but again, there was a big BUT—because she was entitled in her own right to $21.43 under social security, this amount would have to be reduced from her retirement annuity and she would get $13.46 a month, under section 5, paragraph G (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act. So you can see that many of us are today paying for security we will never hope to enjoy unless the present act is materially changed. I might say that our present retirement pensions average about $83 per month, which will not suffice to meet the present economic conditions.

While our Forum has only 5 bills in the House of Representatives and 2 bills pending in the United States Senate, there are 43 bills on railroad retirement before the Interstate Committee of the House on which BOB CROSSER from your Cleveland area is chairman. This gentleman, who poses as the friend of the railroad man, serves special interests and will not permit any hearings on this important legislation. By their works we should know them. It is to explain this gentleman's indifference to our much-needed legislation that I have today appeared in this district. To refresh your memory for the November election, while we are not political, we certainly must put into office those more favorable to our cause. Letters and petitions have been sent to this man from all over the country, and even an acknowledgment was denied.

In the Senate we again ran into similar difficulty with Senator LUCAS, from Illinois, the Democratic whip, and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, the subcommittee chairman, again serving special interests and refused to bring up railroad retirement in this session of Congress. The latter fortified himself with figures which to say the least were created by the application of the astrological slide rule that can increase or decrease to please the computer's convenience and purpose and showed, while we have two and one-half billions today in the reserve that the liability was close to $20,000,000,000, which, of course, would mean that everyone who had credits from the Retirement Act would demand same overnight and the railroads of the country would cease to exist. He concluded his remarks with a threat, that should the act be liberalized the tax would have to be increased on the employer and the employee. Of course, no insurance company uses such methods in arranging their affairs.

I would rather choose to meet those gentlemen with facts and one does not have to be a professor of economics at any University to use those facts open to all railroad employees. This act became effective January 1, 1937, with a tax of 2½ percent on the employee, matched by a similar amount by the carrier, and in the first 10 years of operation we paid an average tax of 3 percent, matched by another 3 percent by the railroads, and we accomplished in this time a repayment to the Federal Government of $500,000,000 loaned the retirement account to establish it during its infancy; we took on our pension rolls some 48,555 pensioners who never paid 1 cent into the fund and gave them a pension (many of those are no longer with us). It was a charity gesture on our part to help those poor souls; we shall never regret it. The great Lincoln at one time said, "God loves the poor, otherwise He would not have made so many." In the first 2 years of operation we had the greatest influx of pensioners we ever had and ever expect to have and we put into the reserve fund during this period almost $1,000,000,000 on an aggregate tax of 6 percent (just half of what we pay today) when we pay 12 percent or 6 percent by the employees and a similar amount by the carriers. Coupled with this though is the fact that we do not have an honest dollar in the country today; that is a dollar that would buy 100 cents' worth as it did in 1937, as inflation has given us 52 cents buying power on the 1950 dollar.

The idea behind pensions is to give to faithful employees security so that they will not suffer from want in their declining years. Earlier retirement with adequate pensions would help prolong the life of many employees and give a little sunshine in our declining years; it would restore both hope and confidence to these already on pension who are at present facing a very dark future.

I just read an article that appeared in the Topeka Daily Capitol under date of October 10, 1950, in which a statement was used by the Collector of Internal Revenue for the State of Kansas in which figures were broken down for the first 9 months of 1950 and showed there was collected in the State of Kansas under the Retirement Act $13,661,-876.87, while under social security, taxes were collected in the amount of $10,105,175.68; in other words while the output on social security was almost twice that of railroad retirement, there were more taxes collected from those under railroad retirement than under social security in the State.

We have today two very important bills pending before the House committee and companion bills in the Senate. One, H. R. 7063 by Democratic Congressman OVERTON BROOKS from Louisiana to increase rail pensions 25 percent and companion bill by LANGER in the Senate, S. 3134, for the same purpose. We have H. R. 4282 by Democratic whip PERCY PRIEST from Tennessee, and companion bill S. 1379 by JOHNSON in the Senate to retire all employees at 60 years with 30 years of service (not compulsory) and eliminate discrimination between male and female employees as exists at present. As stated before, we have only 7 bills in the Senate and House, but there are 50 bills pending before that body—43 in the House and 7 in the Senate—all pertaining to increased benefits under our retirement system, put in by various Congressmen and Senators at the suggestion of their railroad constituents, which shows the keen interest manifest on this topic, as never before were so many bills put into the various committees of Congress on one subject—such as, railroad retirement.

Early in the first session of this Congress in 1949 I went to Washington and tried to secure sponsors of our bills by those holding key positions with the administration. This accounts for the fact that many of our bills were sponsored by Democratic leaders. However, it was called to my attention by one of our leading Senators that should we press for passage of our retirement bills while the social security bill, H. R. 6000, was pending we might be taken under social security. This gentleman showed me the Hoover Commission report in which it was recommended that both Federal civil service and railroad retirement be taken under the social security, and he advised me he had a tentative agreement with the Federal employees that they would not press for action until the social security bill had passed the Senate. I asked this gentleman when he expected action on social security. He advised that it would pass the House in the first session and come to the floor of the Senate not later than March 15. On March 15, 1950, I was again back in Washington and testified before the Senate Finance Committee holding hearings on the social security bill. I pointed out on this occasion the vast discrimination between proposed social security and railroad retirement system. So impressive were the briefs that a member of the committee—Senator HUGH BUTLER from Nebraska, and former construction engineer for the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railway, asked permission to put those briefs in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during this period. Now social security passed the House in the first session of this Congress in 1949, but bogged down under the leadership of Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, in the Senate. This man I used to call my friend was head of the policy committee of the Senate and Democratic whip, and it was under his leadership that the social-security legislation did not pass the Senate until August 17, 1950, and, of course, is now law.

I was back again in Washington on August 18 and made a desperate effort to get action on our bills. I interviewed some 115 Congressmen and 32 Senators favorable to our cause, but I found the Congress in the utmost confusion—with tax bills, appropriation bills, omnibus bills, Communist bills, and the

Korean War scare taking the play away from all other legislation. To make matters more acute the House went into a series of recesses with only a guard there to open and close the sessions every third day until the Senate completed its business the latter part of September. While the hope for action before January 1 is slim, we are doing everything possible to secure hearings on our retirement bills after the November election so that we could get them on both floors of Congress before this Congress adjourns in December. It is a violation of democratic principles if we were denied the courtesy extended to all Americans in this wonderful country of ours.

I would like to state with authority tonight that 90 percent of our memberships comprise members of the various crafts of the Brotherhood and that only some of those leaders who instruct CROSSER are opposed to us apparently on the grounds that we are invading the field of labor. For 11 long years those who criticize us did nothing to remedy the situation, although they now admit many inequalities in connection with the act, but as far as they were concerned the retired worker was the forgotten man and now with lip service they are trying to impress him with the great interest they have in retirement benefits. One of those leaders sent out 2 weeks ago a letter to his cohorts in which he tried to leave the impression that I was a racketeer. This man is the most despised labor leader of them all; he dictates to CROSSER and to DOUGLAS. Never since the days of Al Capone have we had a dictator and czar of this caliber—throwing his weight around Washington and hiding behind the skirts of politicians to deprive you of just benefits and yet has impressed you as a friend. He voted himself $35,000 a year salary with a pension of $16,666.66, supplemented by a railroad retirement pension, and he does not have to wait until he is 65 years old to take it either. I had four sons in the service; one lost his life in France, to try to exterminate the dictators of Europe, and yet we coddle this third-grade student at home.

In closing, dear friends, I want to impress upon you the sincerity of purpose behind this organization. We need a forum to protect your interests and police pensions from here out. It is my wish that this organization shall continue to flourish many years after I am gone so that never again shall our railroad employees be singled out as guinea pigs for the experiments of the philosophers of socialistic ideas. I have 38 years of railroad service; I will be 60 years old next month; I have dedicated the rest of my life to this worthy cause. The Good Book tells us "No greater love hath a man than to give his life for his fellow man." I am doing God's work in trying to help the poor railroad worker who individually is unable to help himself. I am not alone trying for the material success of the Forum, but looking forward to the great beyond when that Judge of Justice one day will say to me "Come, you faithful of my people, possess the kingdom prepared for you."

I thank you.

A Blistering Indictment of Politics as Usual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter written to me by Charles R. Chidester, of Torrington, Conn., wherein there is set forth what I believe to be a consensus of opinion shared by a majority of our citizens.

In time of crisis "politics as usual" has no place. The fate of not only 150,000,000 Americans is in the balance but the future of humanity may well depend on the strength of America.

The letter follows:

TORRINGTON, CONN., *December 7, 1950.*

Congressman PATTERSON: We have raised two generations of boys to be diplomatic pawns, political sacrifices, and American heartaches. They have known nothing but Government by emergency. They have been indoctrinated with the thought and example of profligate spending, a never mind tomorrow we will take care of you. What is pathetic is that the "We" were careful not to translate who "We" were. The administration was going to be good enough to give the people back their own money, less of course the usual administration cut.

The people of the country have been accused of cynicism and sophistication where the old ideals of Americanism were concerned. Why shouldn't they be when their Government has adopted an attitude of "What's in it for me" policy to obtain vote getting continuance in office? Buy the farm vote with subsidies; buy the labor vote with a Secretary of Labor who does not represent the entire working people of the country but only its pressure powerful unionized minority; buy large portions of the general public by public housing, public power, public medicine, extravagant public political patronage. The question wasn't whether it was good economics or good government, but how many votes will it deliver.

I can understand why such Democratic figures as Al Smith, Jim Farley, Jim Byrnes, Senator Byrd, and Raymond Moley quit active participation in the welfare party. It had become the captive of the Frankfort group of Socialists, the Pollyannas of the welfare state. The group who could buy it for you wholesale.

The administration followed the same line abroad and set up a world WPA; again it was added to our bill. Although we had a Monroe Doctrine for our side of the water, we ignored its basic concept in dealing abroad. The administration thought they could buy respect and friendship abroad. They didn't predicate their help on any self-help quota. They used our money to support and maintain a Socialist government in Britain, while the British traded our rehabilitation goods to Russia. They agreed to demolish factories in Germany so the Germans became less self-sufficient and needed more help. They supported factions to influence politics in France, Belgium, Greece, and the Near East. They only succeeded in ineffective meddling that created ill-will that was capitalized upon by the Soviet.

Did they succeed? Today we are still owed enough money from World Wars I and II to liquidate our own national debt. To those whom they gave the most in money and war-torn dead, can we now depend? Look at the implied threat of England and France today to appease Red China or we will not be able to stand with you. The same old tune of "your danger is in Europe; you should rearm us and fight for us there."

Can we afford to continue to impoverish our natural resources, to devaluate our dollar, to sacrifice our greatest asset of all—the youth of our Nation—to these leeches? Are we going to turn the other cheek again while 150,000 men are being slaughtered by the Chinese Soviet—Mr. Acheson's agrarians? Is the me-first appeal of Europe more pressing than the lives of these men? Can we continue to fight a war, with one hand tied behind us, waiting for tea diplomacy at the United Nations? The mothers of the boys in Korea don't think so.

A record of many years standing shows where Acheson and his crowd stand. They have deliberately misled the American people long enough. A policy from Moscow couldn't have been more successfully confusing. Five months after the Korean war started our Commerce and State Departments are still allowing materials economically and aggressively important to Red China to be shipped to them. What constitutes treachery to our leaders? Are our elected representatives so blind and uninformed as not to know this? Does the remains of our Korean Army have to fight not only Red China but the Commerce and State Departments, plus the political decorum or indifference of our legislators?

President Truman has said that Acheson would continue in office as long as he did. These are times when the confidence of the American people is essential to our preservation as a free country. If Mr. Truman ties his destiny with a man suspect, there are constitutional ways to dispose of both these men. It is past time for politics as usual.

When Mr. Truman was voted full power to control wages and prices for an all-out defense effort, he chose to wait until after all major unions had their pay boost and until elections were over. This choice of political expedience over moral and economic necessity will saddle the coming generations of our youth with additional billions of taxes. Mr. Truman's refusal to take advice on the qualifications and principles of some of his major political appointments has led to questionable and costly economic programs. Surely Mr. Truman is not an indispensable man if he persists in ignoring conclusive evidence of treacherous associates.

It is pathetic to note that the best qualifications a man can have for a major administration appointment is to be defeated by the electorate of some State where the voter has expressed no confidence in his ability. Let's have more Americans in politics and less politics in America.

Let's make it plain by congressional action that the next country to go to war against us can expect no mercy during the war and no help or rehabilitation after it is over. Let's quit playing Uncle Sap.

CHARLES R. CHIDESTER.

Psychological Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting article which appeared in the November issue of the Reader's Digest by Constantine W. Boldyreff, a professor of Russian in the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.:

WE CAN WIN THE COLD WAR IN RUSSIA

(By Constantine W. Boldyreff with O. K. Armstrong)

Despite the war in Korea and the certainty that the tyrants who rule the Soviet Union have a blueprint for further aggression, I believe that a major conflict with Russia is not inevitable.

World war III can be prevented by an immediate and vigorous psychological attack

aimed at the enemy's weakest spot—smoldering opposition of the Russian people against their oppressors in the Kremlin. Despite two generations of indoctrination, despite the relentless efforts of the dread secret police to crush all hope of freedom, there is bitter resentment against Stalin's slave regime. If that latent opposition can be aroused and organized, Stalin and his fellow conspirators will not dare provoke war. Once the opposition in Russia gets rolling, it can never be stopped.

I write as one who has lived a life of active opposition to the Bolshevik regime. After World War I my father, Lt. Gen. Vassily Boldyreff, commanded the White Russian Army in Siberia resisting the Bolsheviks. I was then a cadet. My father was captured and liquidated. In 1930 I helped to organize the NTS (National Alliance of Russian Solidarists), an underground organization secretly working in Russia today toward the revolution we know must someday free our people.

We who have chosen freedom must warn that the democracies are fast losing the cold war. Many well-meaning people presume, as did Trygve Lie, secretary-general of the United Nations, that if leaders of both sides will sit down together their differences can be settled by discussion and compromise. That is not true. Marxist communism is a militant, proselyting doctrine, based upon struggle. It carries inspiring promises, it creates zealots. But it cannot permit liberty of thought or action, it cannot tolerate opposition. Therefore it can never be appeased. It must be defeated.

Our need is to understand the enemy's plan of campaign. Stalin wants war—but not for Russia now. He wants war to strengthen his position internally and bleed the United States white. Here in Stalin's own words is the fundamental principle for Communist strategy of world conquest: "War leads to the weakening of the positions of capitalism in general. It approximates in its effect a proletarian revolution."

So Stalin has devised the diabolically shrewd plan to set the world afire with wars, fought by his puppets under Soviet-trained leaders, while keeping Russia officially neutral. By this means Stalin can enjoy all the privileges accorded honest diplomacy while his stooges stand in the United Nations and damn peace-loving peoples in barrages of propaganda aimed to win the underprivileged millions of the earth.

That was the pattern in Korea. It will be the pattern in Formosa, where Stalin hopes to draw the United States into war with China. It will be the pattern in Germany, where American guns may blaze away not at Russians but at Soviet-supported Germans.

Stalin does not fear the feverish arming of the United States, the diversion of manpower from normal production, the use of resources and the vast expenditures for implements of war. That fits his plan of bleeding the United States white. But one thing he does fear—a revolt of the Russian people.

The masters of the Kremlin dread most a movement that will show their victims how to shake off Communist control. The Achilles' heel of Soviet rule has always been in Russia. Between 1921 and 1941 there were more than 30 revolts, rebellions, and active plots against the Bolshevik regime. Most of these, spontaneous and disorganized, were doomed from the start. But they indicated unmistakably the hatred of the people for their oppressors.

When Hitler's armies invaded Russia in 1941, the people greeted them as liberators. In less than 5 months millions of Russians surrendered to the Germans. By 1942 an organized anti-Bolshevik revolution under the leadership of Gen. Andrei Vlassov was on its way. But Nazi atrocities were more than even desperate anti-Communists could stomach, and the powerful force of Russian patriotism switched from combating the regime to defending the homeland. After the war, hundreds of thousands of Russian prisoners of war and displaced persons refused to return to the Soviet Union.

Today the people of Russia hate the Communist regime more than ever before. Victory in World War II brought no relief for them. Instead, life became more difficult. Authentic reports from the underground indicate the fury and intensity of recent selective purges, comparable in their violence to the bloody carnage organized in 1937–38. There are about 15,000,000 prisoners in concentration camps; hardly a Russian family but has lost at least one member as a victim to Bolshevik cruelty. No one, not even party members and public officials, is free from the haunting fear of arrest.

The people of the democracies need quickly to enlist these allies in the only campaign that spells sure defeat for communism—the war of ideas. These are the weapons we can equip them with:

1. Active and open encouragement.

Neither the size nor the significance of the Russians' opposition to communism has been understood by the free nations. Escapees from the Soviet Union are forced to live wretched, hunted lives in Western Europe, Greece, and Turkey. The democracies have failed signally to encourage and to help these refugees. Yet they are passionate partisans of freedom—our best allies. Most of them have staked their lives to escape communism and will stake them again to destroy communism and liberate their enslaved people.

Assurance should be given the anti-Communist forces within Russia that by every means their hands will be strengthened. Announcement of a plan of assistance for all working in the underground would fire these patriots with hope and determination.

It cannot be urged too strongly that Russians be equipped and encouraged to conduct their own psychological war. The weakness of the Voice of America is that it sends propaganda from America. Its effectiveness would be immeasurably multiplied if its broadcasts were by, of, and for Russians.

Criticism by a foreigner can be misunderstood and resented by the sensitive national. Verbal attacks upon the Red army are harmful because it is Russian, not Bolshevik. The people are proud of its victories. Unfavorable comparisons of standards of living can be misinterpreted as boastful superiority. It should be made clear that the people are being robbed of their birthrights of freedom and truth, but comparisons must be made in the spirit of kindness, sympathy, and understanding.

2. A campaign of truth.

The people of the Soviet Union are famished for authentic news and ideas from the outside world. Russian leaders of liberation should be equipped immediately to speak loudly and clearly to the masses over the heads of their dictators. They must use every occasion to assert:

That credit for Russia's war record belongs to its people, not to Stalin and his gang.

That the Western World does not blame the Russian people for the Kremlin's peace-wrecking tactics.

That all free people share the aspirations of the Russian people for freedom and are eager to help them earn it.

That Soviet propaganda which brands the United States and its associates as aggressors bent on Russia's destruction is fantastically false.

That, above all, the free peoples seek the friendship of the Russian people, and once the Communist menace has been conquered, this friendship can be established on a lasting basis.

How can we get this message across in a major psychological offensive? First method is the radio. Let the Voice of America be augmented by the Voice of Free Russia, with a ring of radio stations all around the U. S. S. R.

Second method is the use of leaflets, newspapers, and other publications, printed both inside and outside of the homeland. Those from outside can be sent in by aircraft and balloons. No government could do this in time of peace, but private agencies can. Mystery planes, sowing the truth, can invade the Soviet skies. Hundreds of patriotic fliers are ready to risk their necks in this service.

Printed items, particularly those that give news of and encouragement to the opposition, have a tremendous impact upon the minds of the Russian people. The fact that they are forbidden to read counterpropaganda makes it all the more sought after. Try as they may, the secret police cannot grab all the leaflets or arrest all who possess them. Moreover, nations denied freedom of press and speech become huge whispering galleries, through which suppressed facts and ideas quickly spread. We know that within hours after the Voice of America announced Mrs. Kasenkina's jump from a Soviet consulate window in New York all Moscow was buzzing with the story.

3. A program of action.

Psychological warfare is effective only when it calls for constructive effort. Foremost in our campaign should be a plan to strengthen all elements of opposition both in the satellite nations and within Russia itself. Workers in the underground require the kind of external help only free peoples can give them—money, equipment, moral support.

Thousands of recruits are available for infiltration into Russia. Underground agents should be prepared to select and urge members to penetrate into key positions in the Communist Party. They should establish close contact with those already in such positions and give them the ideological ammunition they need.

Activities that bring the anti-Communist opposition to public attention should be greatly multiplied. A new form of underground organization least vulnerable to the secret police has been developed—unknown to each other, single fighters, inspired and instructed by leaflets, act individually but uniformly in the effort to attain common aims. They signalize their existence to other anonymous fighters by painting the NTS symbol—a trident—on walls and sidewalks, perhaps with an appropriate slogan. With the mounting confidence sure to follow such a full-scale psychological offensive, the tide of results will rise.

One basic aim of our campaign is to overcome the Russians' fear of the MVD, the secret police. By ruthlessness and cruelty, the Politburo has nurtured the idea that its agents are invincible and invulnerable. Our task is to prove that a myth. Already we have shown that, like the Nazi Gestapo, it can be duped and misled.

Nicolas Sinevirsky, an NTS member, joined the military branch of MVD for several months and returned to this side of the iron curtain. A book about his experiences was published by Possev, the Russian anti-Communist newspaper of Western Germany. This paper is receiving clandestine circulation in Russia and the satellite countries, with devastating effect upon MVD morale. By incessant repetition, by overt acts, the vulnerability of the MVD must become an accepted fact in Russia.

The men of the Kremlin know that once their grip loosens at home their stooges in the satellite nations will also lose their power. And with that loss there can be no more wars fought by Communist-dominated masses. Then the revolt will gather strength and sweep the Russian homeland.

Here is a task to which the best efforts of free nations can be dedicated. The support

of their governments is necessary. But the movement toward freedom has always come from the people. Churches of all faiths, labor organizations, educational and civic groups, all can help to equip our liberation forces with the weapons of truth and action. Victory in the psychological war will mean peace. Its loss could mean that all that has been gained in human rights from the Magna Carta to the American Constitution will go down into chaos and enslavement.

A Further Advertising Barrage by Omaha Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the following advertising material makes up part 6 of my exposé of the tactics of the Omaha doctors in the last congressional campaign.

On November 1, 1950, the Omaha doctors ran the following advertisement in the Omaha World-Herald and other papers.

At the beginning of the article appears the symbol of United States freedom—the bald eagle with a shield carrying three stars and five black stripes and three arrows in the left claw and an olive branch in the right one.

DECLARATION

AN OPEN LETTER TO MY PATIENTS

Legislation has been introduced into Congress at this session which is the first step in bringing about a system of socialized medicine such as England now has. This socialized medicine scheme has been put up by the present administration in Washington. They call it "compulsory national health insurance" which means that you must pay for it whether you want it or not.

This scheme would destroy the personal relationship between patient and physician, would make impossible absolute choice of physician in time of illness, would lower the quality of medical care, and would allow political control of the physicians, dentists, pharmacists, nurses, hospitals, and everyone else who looks after the sick.

And it means more expense—another compulsory deduction from your pay check, less take-home pay, and more hidden taxes.

On election day, November 7, we ask you to vote for a man who will fight this menace to the American way. Vote for HOWARD BUFFETT for Congress in the Second District.

Sincerely,

Payson S. Adams, M. D.; John A. Aita, M. D.; Frank J. Anderson, M. D.; Harley E. Anderson, M. D.; Lawrence L. Anderson, M. D.; Leo Anderson, M. D.; Walter Armbrust, M. D.; Don E. Baca, M. D.; Stanley M. Bach, M. D.; J. L. Bader, M. D.; C. F. Bantin, M. D.; E. W. Bantin, M. D.; John Baptist, M. D.; M. W. Barry, M. D.; Frank R. Barta, M. D.; Meyer Beber, M. D.; F. O. Beck, M. D.; Leon Becker, M. D.; R. R. Best, M. D.; J. Dewey Bisgard, M. D.; Albert S. Black, Jr., M. D.; R. W. Blanchard, M. D.; Rodney W. Bliss, M. D.; Charles M. Bonniwell, M. D.; Joseph J. Berghoff, M. D.; Elton P. Bozarth, M. D.; James D. Bradley, M. D.; John G. Brazer, M. D.; John H. Brush, M. D.; J. L. Bryngelson, M. D.; Donald J. Bucholz, M. D.; B. C. Burns, M. D.; Louis S. Campbell, M. D.; S. J. Carnazzo, M. D.; W. A. Cassidy, M. D.; Nancy Catania, M. D.; Julius Christensen, M. D.; J. H. Christlieb, M. D.; George Clark, M. D.; F. S. Clarke, M. D.; A. David Cloyd, Jr., M. D.; Robert Cochran, M. D.; Joseph J. Comine, M. D.; Earl A. Connolly, M. D.; Lyman J. Cook, M. D.; J. W. Courtney, M. D.; Michael Crofoot, M. D.; A. R. Cimino, M. D.; Edwin Davis, M. D.; Edwin Davis, Jr., M. D.; Herbert H. Davis, M. D.; J. Allan Davis, M. D.; J. Calvin Davis, M. D.; L. A. DeLanney, M. D.; Henry De Long, M. D.; Byron Demorest, M. D.; W. H. Dendinger, M. D.; Carmelo Do Stefano, M. D.; Joseph Dolezal, M. D.; James P. Donelan, M. D.; A. G. Dow, M. D.; D. A. Dowell, M. D.; John E. Downing, M. D.; Theodore Drdla, M. D.; J. F. Drozda, M. D.; Lowell F. Dunn, M. D.; Henry L. Dworak, M. D.; Richard Egan, M. D.; R. E. Eggers, M. D.; Harry Elston, M. D.; Gregory L. Endres, M. D.; W. E. Engdahl, M. D.; Neill J. Everitt, M. D.; Chester Farrell, M. D.; Robert F. Farrell, M. D.; David Findley, M. D.; James Finegan, M. D.; Thomas Fitzgerald, M. D.; Robert J. Fitzgibbons, M. D.; John C. Follman, M. D.; Earl M. Forster, M. D.; Miles E. Foster, M. D.; R. W. Fouts, M. D.; Marvin B. Francis, M. D.; Charles Frandsen, M. D.; Muriel Frank, M. D.; Albert E. Freed, M. D.; John J. Freymann, M. D.; J. F. Gardiner, M. D.; John W. Gatewood, M. D.; John Leo Gedgoud, M. D.; J. H. George, M. D.; Allan G. Gilloon, M. D.; Guy Goodrich, M. D.; A. Greenberg, M. D.; M. M. Greenberg, M. D.; Arthur Greene, M. D.; John J. Grier, M. D.; Maurice Grier, M. D.; Lloyd Groshong, M. D.; Joseph F. Gross, M. D.; Thomas J. Gurnett, M. D.; Ray O. Gillies, Jr., M. D.; W. O. Haney, M. D.; W. N. Hahn, M. D.; Lynn T. Hall, M. D.; W. R. Hamsa, M. D.; Charles R. Hankins, M. D.; Clifford H. Hansen, M. D.; G. M. Hansen, M. D.; C. C. Hardy, M. D.; T. T. Harris, M. D.; J. D. Hartigan, M. D.; Clarence M. Hartmann, M. D.; Harry C. Henderson, Jr., M. D.; Phil H. Henderson, M. D.; George F. Hennegan, M. D.; J. A. Henske, M. D.; Harland T. Hermann, M. D.; J. M. Heumann, M. D.; Leo T. Heywood, M. D.; Charles Hickey, M. D.; F. C. Hill, M. D.; L. C. Hilsabeck, M. D.; L. E. Hoel, M. D.; L. C. Hoffman, M. D.; W. J. Holden, M. D.; Edward Holyoke, M. D.; Harley Hotz, M. D.; M. C. Howard, M. D.; C. D. Howard, M. D.; Allen J. Hruby, M. D.; Leo V. Hughes, M. D.; Wyane Hull, M. D.; William E. Hungerford, M. D.; H. B. Hunt, M. D.; Sven Isaacson, M. D.; Frank J. Iwerson, M. D.; Donald Jackson, M. D.; Herman Jahr, M. D.; C. S. James, M. D.; Harry Jenkens, M. D.; Werner Jensen, M. D.; A. C. Johnson, M. D.; George Johnson, M. D.; Herman Johnson, M. D.; J. A. Johnson, M. D.; Morris B. Johnson, M. D.; Wesley Jones, M. D.; J. H. Judd, M. D.; G. J. Kadavy, M. D.; Henry Kammandel, M. D.; J. Whitney Kelley, M. D.; William E. Kelley, M. D.; William T. Kempf, M. D.; James Kelly, Jr., M. D.; Terence Kempt, M. D.; John C. Kennedy, M. D.; Bernard Kenney, M. D.; Kenneth Kimball, M. D.; E. J. Kirk, M. D.; Frank Klabenes, M. D.; John R. Kleyla, M. D.; Z. N. Korth, M. D.; W. Riley Kovar, M. D.; W. E. Kroupa, M. D.; Leroy W. Lee, M. D.; Henry Lehnhoff, Jr., M. D.; G. B. Lennox, M. D.; Raymond G. Lewis, M. D.; Robert S. Long, M. D.; Robert E. Lovgren, M. D.; J. F. Lucas, M. D.; Ralph Luikart, M. D.; Edwin Lyman, M. D.; E. L. Mac Quiddy, M. D.; G. Prentiss McArdle, M. D.; J. S. McAvin, M. D.; Harry H. McCarthy, M. D.; J. D. McCarthy, M. D.; S. McCleneghan, M. D.; Arnold McDermott, M. D.; Harry E. McGee, M. D.; J. W. McGee, M. D.; Millard McGee, M. D.; Leon S. McGoogan, M. D.; L. D. McGuire, M. D.; A. R. McIntyre, M. D.; C. W. McLaughlin, Jr., M. D.; Charles McMartin, M. D.; W. J. McMartin, M. D.; Aaron M. McMillan, M. D.; J. W. McNamara, M. D.; Charles Madson, M. D.; Stephan Magiera, M. D.; Louis L. Mahar, M. D.; Samuel Mangimelli, M. D.; R. E. Marble, M. D.; Charles Marsh, M. D.; James Martin, M. D.; Paul J. Martin, M. D.; R. T. Mauer, M. D.; William H. Melcher, M. D.; Clinton Millett, M. D.; R. H. Miller, M. D.; Earl Montgomery, M. D.; W. B. Moody, M. D.; C. F. Moon, M. D.; Louis E. Moon, M. D.; Clyde Moore, M. D.; Ralph Moore, M. D.; Haskell Morris, M. D.; W. Howard Morrison, M. D.; Paul N. Morrow, M. D.; R. A. Moser, M. D.; G. Kenneth Meuhlig, M. D.; Wilbur A. Muehlig, M. D.; A. E. Murphy, M. D.; Albert V. Murphy, M. D.; Charles M. Murphy, M. D.; J. Harry Murphy, M. D.; F. J. Murray, M. D.; Nathan Muskin, M. D.; Floyd C. Nelson, M. D.; C. J. Nemec, M. D.; Ed C. Nemec, M. D.; Harold N. Neu, M. D.; Oliver C. Nickum, M. D.; F. W. Niehaus, M. D.; John F. Nilsson, M. D.; John R. Nilsson, M. D.; W. J. Nolan, M. D.; William F. Novak, M. D.; A. J. Offerman, M. D.; J. J. O'Hearn, M. D.; Leland J. Olson, M. D.; Gerald C. O'Neil, M. D.; James O'Neil, M. D.; L. D. O'Dell, M. D.; Maurice L. Pepper, M. D.; George F. Pinne, M. D.; L. T. Placek, M. D.; Joseph A. Pleiss, M. D.; Stanley E. Potter, M. D.; Payton T. Pratt, M. D.; S. W. Prichard, M. D.; Paul H. Priest, M. D.; D. T. Quigley, M. D.; W. T. Rance, M. D.; John A. Rasmussen, M. D.; Paul S. Read, M. D.; William J. Reedy, M. D.; J. P. Redgwick, M. D.; B. M. Riley, M. D.; C. E. Robertson, M. D.; Charles M. Root, M. D.; Ralph O. Ruch, M. D.; William L. Rumbolz, M. D.; H. C. Russum, M. D.; Adolph Sachs, M. D.; Earl C. Sage, M. D.; Geraldine Satrang, M. D.; L. E. Sauer, M. D.; John R. Schenken, M. D.; W. H. Schmitz, M. D.; George A. Schmidtmann, M. D.; R. D. Schrock, M. D.; F. J. Swertley, M. D.; Nathaniel Scott, M. D.; W. L. Shearer, M. D.; Philip O. Sher, M. D.; C. J. Shramek, M. D.; R. F. Sievers, M. D.; E. E. Simmons, M. D.; Francis L. Simonds, M. D.; J. E. Simpson, M. D.; Jules A. Slunicko, M. D.; E. J. Smith, M. D.; Richard D. Smith, M. D.; Thomas T. Smith, M. D.; Joseph E. Sobota, M. D.; W. W. Solomon, M. D.; A. F. Srb, M. D.; Herbert Staubitz, M. D.; R. J. Stearns, M. D.; A. A. Steinberg, M. D.; Jack M. Stemper, M. D.; Maurice E. Stoner, M. D.; W. R. Strickland, M. D.; W. L. Sucha, M. D.; C. M. Swab, M. D.; Samuel Swenson, Jr., M. D.; S. A. Swenson, M. D.; Joseph P. Swoboda, M. D.; Robert C. Therian, M. D.; John H. Thomas, M. D.; C. Q. Thompson, M. D.; Dorothy H. Thompson, M. D.; L. W. Thompson, M. D.; Warren Thompson, M. D.; Charles A. Tompkins, M. D.; Carl F. Tranisi, M. D.;

C. R. Trimble, M. D.; James W. Va-Verka, M. D.; J. G. Vetter, M. D.; Donald Vroman, M. D.; E. M. Walsh, M. D.; John Walsh, M. D.; Carl Walvoord, M. D.; Chester H. Waters, Jr., M. D.; H. A. Wigton, M. D.; Robert S. Wigton, M. D.; M. P. Williams, M. D.; Perry T. Williams, M. D.; Russell R. Williams, Jr., M. D.; Donald J. Wilson, M. D.; W. D. Wright, M. D.; Raymond J. Wyrens, M. D.; George A. Young, Jr., M. D.; G. A. Young, M. D.; Richard H. Young, M. D.; Raymond Zukitis, M. D.

Vote for HOWARD BUFFETT for Congress on November 7.

Paid for by Healing Arts Committee, M. C. Howard, M. D., chairman.

On November 2, 1950, the following purported news item appeared in the Omaha World-Herald:

DOCTORS PRODUCE 311 SIGNATURES

The Second Congressional District healing arts committee Thursday produced the signatures of 311 Omaha doctors in an open letter to their patients.

Dr. Maurice C. Howard, chairman, said: "This should be answer enough" to Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN'S charge that "only crackpots" are opposing him "in our fight against socialized medicine."

The declaration to patients states:

"This socialized medicine scheme has been put up by the present administration in Washington * * * and you must pay for it whether you want it or not.

"This scheme would destroy a personal relationship between the patient and the physician. It would make impossible the absolute choice of a physician in time of illness.

"It would lower the quality of medical care."

Dr. Howard said the names of the signers will be made public.

On November 6, 1950, the following appeared as a news item in the Omaha World-Herald:

THIRTEEN MORE DOCTORS SIGN OPEN LETTER

Thirteen more physicians Monday added their names to the more than 300 who already have signed the "open letter to my patients" declaration against socialized medicine.

They are Drs. J. E. Bleicher, J. A. Borghoff, J. J. Borghoff, H. H. Boyne, H. H. Brinkman, Alfred Brown, Oscar Carp, Frank Eagle, J. Milton Margolin, Morris Margolin, Dan Miller, Don Nilsson, Max Raines, and M. Steinberg.

Out of Crisis, a Spirit of Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times magazine section of December 10, 1950:

OUT OF CRISIS, A SPIRIT OF UNITY—AGAIN OUR DEMOCRACY DEMONSTRATES ITS GENIUS FOR BURYING DIFFERENCES IN A COMMON CAUSE

(By Cabell Phillips)

WASHINGTON.—The Eighty-first Congress came back to Washington 2 weeks ago in a pervading feeling of pessimism. On the part of the Democrats there was a feeling of bitter disillusion and hopelessness. Their Senate majority had been whittled almost to the vanishing point, they counted among their casualties at least four of their strongest leaders, and there was widespread feeling that their party had been repudiated. On the part of the Republicans there was jubilation, but their triumph was tinged with vindictiveness. Policies were to be reexamined, whitewashes were to be scraped off, and certain prominent necks were to be guillotined at whatever cost of decorum and our posture before the world. In this climate the spirit of national unity was smothered.

With the change in war news came a dramatic change of mood. Recriminations were hastily deleted from speeches. Republican as well as Democratic leaders were summoned to the White House and emerged with almost humble promises of cooperation with the President. Secretary Acheson was treated with rare deference as he laid the grim facts from the Far East before closed sessions of the Foreign Affairs Committees. Arrogance and disillusion were gone. In their place was anxiety and the realization that our Nation hung on the brink of another Pearl Harbor or Bataan.

Out of that cataclysm national unity was reborn. At least it was for this lame-duck Congress. Perhaps it was, also, among all the people of the country, but one cannot yet be sure. Public opinion moves with ponderous and unpredictable steps.

And therein lie the great questions of this hour of our national destiny. Are we as a people ready to lay aside the hostility and suspicions we carried with us to the polls on November 7? Are we ready to quit trying to place the blame for our predicament and stoning the scapegoats and to turn to the infinitely unpleasanter task of extricating ourselves? Are we willing to submerge our separate remedies and accept the single remedy of our national leadership? Are we, at last and at this moment, buffeted and chastened enough to pull on the tough armor of national unity?

National unity seems particularly difficult to come by in democratic societies. Perhaps it is because, in normal times, we lay so little value upon it. Our very structure of government makes almost a virtue of dissent. We have glorified the independence and integrity of the individual man to the point where he instinctively resists herding. We have fought two bloody wars again the fanatical excesses of nationalism and are dedicated now to the doctrine of internationalism. Of patriotism we have a plenty. But national unity is something more than a lump in the throat at the sight of Old Glory waving in the sunshine.

National unity is a composite of both emotional and rational impulses. There are three three conditions to its realization.

1. There must be, first, a common desire. It may be a desire induced by need, by avarice, or by some danger, but it must be translatable in terms of the individual citizen—a desire that he experiences personally and intensively.

2. There must be a common faith, faith in both the chosen leaders and the selected means. This faith must be given often at the sacrifice of one's own judgment and interests. It need not mean the abandonment of the right to oppose, but it does deny the right to obstruct. No commander is going to win a war whose officers veto his strategy and pick their own targets while the bullets are flying.

3. And there must be a common courage, a shared determination to pay the price and to endure the suffering that the winning of the objective demands.

How do we as a Nation measure up today with respect to these three imperatives of national unity? What elements do we have at hand, and what are we lacking?

For the long run our common desire is for a world at peace. But the short run and urgent goal is for a safe release from the debacle that seems to face us in the Far East.

At no time since our involvement in Korea began have our people been as shocked over what seems to be an almost inevitable disaster. This feeling is personal and intense. Thousands of American families have sons and fathers who are either dead or maimed or who stand in hourly peril. There is added now the dread that the fighting will spread and be prolonged. We, and the rest of the world, are tortured by the thought that a third world war has been triggered.

Our reaction is universal and unalloyed by any divergent loyalties or partisanship. In the past we have had important minorities whose sympathies, for reasons of nationality or ideology, were directed in part at least toward our enemies. It is difficult to believe that in this conflict anything more than an infinitesimal group of native Communists are so treacherously inclined.

So our common desire for peace is induced by that most powerful of all motives, awareness of danger, a grim knowledge that cuts across all boundaries of race, nationality, and belief.

Our common faith must, of necessity, be placed in our chosen leaders—the President and his chief civilian and military subordinates.

As individuals, we may neither respect nor fully trust either those leaders or their policies. Without question that is the perplexity of a great many Americans today with respect to the Truman administration. But that administration was put in power by the mandate of a democratic majority.

That mandate placed in their hands the conduct of our military and foreign affairs. We may rightfully question their wisdom and try to influence their decisions. But once those decisions are made, we are all, under the rules we live by, equally obligated by them.

We must accept the premise that our leaders are acting to the best of their abilities and to no other purpose than to protect our national interest. Any other premise in time of crisis would lead to anarchy.

Mr. Truman has demonstrated dramatically that he can command a large share of the people's faith. One such occasion was his stunning election victory in 1948. Another was his courageous and instant response to the first Communist aggression in Korea last summer. In each case there was an outpouring of public confidence in his leadership.

Conversely, there have been plentiful instances of a palpable lack of public confidence. The recent election showed the cumulative effect of many of these disagreements, specificially in the conduct of far eastern affairs, the presence of Dean Acheson in his Cabinet, and the alleged softness of his administration toward Communists in Government. And by an odd and ironic twist, there is developing as this is written some clamor against his retention of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in command of the military operations in the Pacific.

But men alone cannot be the sole repositories of our faith. We must believe, too, in the broad moral principles that motivate them and their policies. These may elude us unless we search for them, for the philosophy of our stand in the world was never more complex than it is today.

History has shattered the protective, insular shell within which we grew to maturity. The cozy warmth of our material and political self-sufficiency has been stripped away.

We stand naked to the same harsh winds of conflict that lash all the other peoples of an interdependent world. Figuratively, but inevitably, each of us is chilled by the snows of Korea and starved by the famines in India.

Faith is a nebulous and unstable quantity. It comes by invitation, not command; but fear and the need of a common defense are powerful stimuli to its coming. The evidence is that it is reviving for President Truman and his program now.

Certainly the Republican dissenters in Congress, with only a few notable exceptions, have given him their fealty. Senators TAFT and WHERRY, among others, have promised to submerge their disagreements over policy and to abate their accusations for what has happened while granting him all the authority he needs to meet the emergency.

The public must follow this lead if we are to have the faith that will sustain us in the months ahead.

Of common courage in times of stress we always have had an abundance. There is no reason to think it is less plentiful now. This is not only the physical courage to face danger on the battlefield; it is the moral courage to make the hard decisions and to accept the big and little sacrifices in which all emergencies abound. Congress has not shied from its responsibility to enact the hated economic controls nor the huge appropriations and revenue measures which our situation demands. Nor has there been any substantial outcry from the people who must shoulder these burdens.

Courage is stimulated by the magnitude of danger. The prospects a fortnight ago, with the fighting seemingly about over, was that we would slacken the pace of our defenses. The temptation to relax and "reexamine" would have been overpowering. We might have lacked the common courage then to continue to prepare for a danger we could no longer see but the comfortable illusion of safety has now been dispelled.

National unity is not, of course, the exclusive property of the democracy. It, or rather its pretext, is sine qua non of the dictatorship as well. But unity in a slave state is only incidentally a matter of loyalty; it is essentially a product of discipline. It is exacted in the way that taxes and military service and production quotas are exacted. To withhold it is to invite swift retribution. "Deviationism" is synonymous with treason.

But these impulses exist, and having no escape hatch through honest debate and controversy, build up seething pressures beneath the surface. Molten lava needs only a tiny fissure in the earth's crust to burst forth as a volcano. Unlike a democracy where national unity has a tough and resilient vitality, in a totalitarian state it can never stumble and rise and walk again. The dissolution that finally overtook German nazism and Italian fascism was utter and complete.

Winston Churchill has written eloquently of the way the British people, paralyzed by apathy and indecision in the early months of the last war, suddenly closed ranks under the hammer blows of the Nazi air blitz to give one of the most magnificent demonstrations of national unity in all history. There are comparable chapters in our own story—the two world wars, the early years of the New Deal, when destitution was the common enemy, and again last June, when Communist aggressors burst over the borders of the free world.

We have the capacity for united action and it is inconceivable that we will not use it again. We have a desire for victory and peace and we have the requisite courage. But have we the common faith?

National unity at this hour is not simply a question of whether we follow an elected official named Harry Truman and the policies of his administration. We don't all have to become Fair Dealers overnight in order to achieve a united front. We must distinguish between the individual and what he symbolizes. In the deepest sense our loyalty is bestowed not upon the man who chances to be in office, but upon an abstraction, the Presidency. We could not have endured the crises of 40 national elections if this were not so.

But we have endured those 40 bloodless uprisings as well as dissensions and disasters of a more grievous sort. And always, with but the one exception of the Civil War, we have closed our ranks, buried our differences, and faced the common enemy with a common will.

It is a peculiar genius we have that enables us to squander our greatest moral resources in this fashion and yet somehow to rally it in time to avert the ultimate catastrophe. That is a matter of exquisite timing and reflexes. Let us hope they are as keen as they need to be.

Further Publicity Given by the Omaha World-Herald for the Campaign of Lying Omaha Doctors

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, part 8 of the Omaha doctors' lie and smear campaign is as follows:

DOUGLAS COUNTY DOCTORS PLAN BATTLE AGAINST SOCIALISM—NONPARTISAN GROUP BACKS BUFFETT

Douglas County physicians and members of allied professions are set to throw their hard punches in the battle against socialized medicine.

Completion of their organization was announced Saturday.

The committee of 12 physicians has evolved into nonpartisan doctors' committee, headed by Dr. J. Phil Redgwick.

This committee in turn becomes part of the greater healing arts committee with Dr. Maurice C. Howard as chairman.

Dr. Howard, a Democrat, also is president of the Omaha-Douglas County Medical Society. But the new organization is entirely independent and nonpartisan.

Working under him also will be the chairmen of the dental, nursing, pharmaceutical, hospital, optometrical, chiropodist, and allied professions such as insurance and legal groups. Each group also will have a wives' division.

Said Dr. Howard:

"The healing arts committee looks forward to a positive, constructive crusade to elect HOWARD BUFFETT to Congress November 7 and thus defeat the trend to socialized medicine.

"The doctors have learned they don't have to be engulfed in the tide of socialism. We can buck it. This is political action based on good citizenship.

"It will be a hard-hitting campaign, but strictly above belt, based on good political sportsmanship in the best American tradition. Wide interest already has been displayed. But our aim is 100 percent backing by all medical allied groups."

Said Dr. Redgwick:

"We're taking off our kid gloves, rolling up our sleeves, and we're going all out to defeat the trend of socialism in America by first defeating socialized medicine.

"We want to settle this once and for all so we can get back to our medical practices.

"The Socialists have made this a political issue; the doctors didn't start it. We are meeting that challenge by standing up and speaking in behalf of the Nation's health and the care of our patients.

"We are to solicit support for the candidate on the merits of his position regarding this issue rather than because of party. HOWARD BUFFETT is against socialism. We are for HOWARD BUFFETT.

"The committee feels the care of the sick is not a party issue, but should be the grave concern of both Republicans and Democrats."

Mr. BUFFETT, a Republican, former Representative, is opposing Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, a Democrat, in the Second District.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 6, 1950]

MED STUDENTS IN VOTE RALLY—ANTI-SOCIAL-MEDICINE TALK GIVEN

A special bus awaited outside the University of Nebraska College of Medicine Thursday noon.

Inside the college a large register-and-get-out-the-vote rally broke up. Medical and nursing students, not previously registered and who had a few moments to spare, walked straight to the specially chartered bus.

Thus began the first group registering in the healing arts committee's drive. The bus drove directly to the election commissioner's office, then returned the students to their school.

HEAR SAXTON

The students and faculty previously had listened to Robert Saxton, deputy county election commissioner, and Merrill Smith, Lincoln, executive secretary of the Nebraska Medical Association.

Mr. Saxton, a Democrat, explained the mechanics of registering and voting.

Mr. Smith stressed the need and went on to attack the socialized medicine and Brannan plan proposals.

"Socialized medicine is the entering wedge to communism in the United States," he asserted.

IT'S NOT NEW

"Socialized medicine isn't new. It was tried as far back as the Roman Empire."

Other rallies are planned by the healing arts committee.

The nonpartisan committee received its start from a committee of 12 physicians who decided to do something about combating socialized medicine and defeating Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN.

Now it is spreading to include the allied arts and professions.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 12, 1950]

BUFFETT CLUB SEEKS VET AID—DEVOE SAYS MAKERS OF PEACE "FUMBLED"

"We believe almost every young veteran in Omaha will join with us in the 'Veterans-for-Buffett Club,'" Chairman Donald B. DeVoe said Thursday.

Speaking to the veterans' group, he said:

"Only a few years ago we left our families and homes to fight a war. * * * We won the war. We made this country the strongest nation on this earth.

"The men in Washington were in a position to have dictated almost any kind of peace that we desired. But they fumbled the ball.

"Why should we again call on the fumblers? It's time some one else carried the ball."

Peter Marchetti, elected membership drive chairman, said: "This is our third meeting. We have more than doubled our membership each time.

"Why don't we pledge ourselves each to bring five new members to our next meeting?"

The group is supporting Republican HOWARD H. BUFFETT for Second District Congressman. He is opposing Democrat incumbent EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN.

MEDICOS LIKENED TO DON QUIXOTE

Activities of the Omaha Healing Arts Committee in the 1950 political campaign were likened to Cervantes' Don Quixote and Squire Sancho Panza by Democratic Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN Wednesday night.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN cast Dr. Maurice Howard in the role of Don Quixote and Dr. J. Phil Redgwick as Sancho Panza. He said they are "locking medical horns with nonexistent socialism and socialized medicine."

He reiterated previous declarations that the Truman health program is not socialized medicine.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 13, 1950]

GOP OPENS VOTER DRIVE—WILL COMB CITY TO GET ALL REGISTERED

Douglas County Republicans tonight will begin their drive to register more Omahans as voters.

Plans announced by Chairman William H. Thomas call for the most comprehensive approach yet taken by the Republicans.

So far, Mr. Thomas said, 703 volunteers are ready to go.

The plan is to make each volunteer responsible for a small area. Then each worker would be given a list of all persons registered in that area.

The workers, Mr. Thomas said, will call at every nonregistered home.

WILL CONSULT OTHERS

They also will try to visit all Republican-registered home dwellers to see if any members of the family have neglected to register.

The same approach will be used in the 10 days prior to the November 7 election to try to get out the vote.

First assignments and lists will be given out at an eighth ward meeting tonight. The lists have been copied at the election commissioner's office and are accurate up to October 1.

Volunteers also will receive Republican information to pass on to those they visit.

OTHER MEETINGS TO FOLLOW

Mr. Thomas said that in the past the Republicans have tried similar strategy for getting out the vote, but this is the first time it has been attempted on registration.

Other ward meetings will follow tonight's, with the last of the assignments probably being made next Wednesday night, he explained.

In the period ahead of this year's primary election Democratic machinery to boost registrations was rolling well before the Republicans woke up. But the GOP late drive was successful, and the efforts of the two parties, along with those of the nonpartisan President's round table, have brought a record registration.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 13, 1950]

WAR PARTY IS VOTE ISSUE—BUFFETT GIVES ANSWER TO O'SULLIVAN

Do you want a war party to stay in control of this Government?

That is the real issue this fall, HOWARD H. BUFFETT, Republican candidate for Second District Congressman, said in a speech Thursday night.

"In the last 33 years we have had three different Democratic Presidents," he asserted. "Each of them has involved us in a foreign war. Each of them solemnly promised peace."

Mr. BUFFETT answered two personal charges made by his opponent, Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN.

ANSWERS CHARGES

To the charge that on leaving his congressional office in Washington in 1948 he stripped it bare of pamphlets, former Congressman BUFFETT said he left the office in the same condition as did his predecessor, a Democrat.

All the pamphlets and booklets Mr. O'SULLIVAN wants easily can be had for the asking in Washington, Mr. BUFFETT said. He added: "One department has a stack 52 feet high."

Of the charge that he carried Victor E. Spittler on his pay roll, Mr. BUFFETT said many Congressmen keep one employe back home to aid constituents. Between 1943 and 1946, he said, Mr. Spittler did the work without pay.

SLAPS NEPOTISM

Mr. Spittler finally was paid an average of less than $125 a month over the period he was on the payroll, Mr. BUFFETT said, adding:

"But Mr. O'SULLIVAN didn't say anything to you about his practice of nepotism in his own office. Nor did he tell you that he put his son-in-law on his congressional payroll in 1949 starting at $269 per month.

"Mr. O'SULLIVAN'S son-in-law is not a sleeper, but a singer, and went east to take singing lessons. Now that is enough of this sideshow. I promise we are going to keep such nonsense out of our campaign."

DOCTORS' GROUP EXPANDS ITS SCOPE

The healing arts committee is expanding again—this time to take in the entire Second Congressional District.

This was announced Friday by Dr. Maurice C. Howard, chairman.

The nonpartisan committee has as its aim the defeat of socialized medicine. It is working for election of HOWARD H. BUFFETT as Second District Congressman. It is opposed to Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, the Democrat who supports the administration's health program.

Dr. J. Phil Redgwick, head of the nonpartisan doctors' division, said he has written the 33 physicians living outside Omaha in this congressional district.

He urged not only that they cooperate with the doctors' committee but also that they spearhead organizations in their own communities that would include members of all allied professions.

These outside groups all would be tied in with the central organization headquartering in the Medical Arts Building.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 14, 1950]

DOCTORS' BILLS HIT SOCIALISM—URGE CLIENTS TO VOTE FOR BUFFETT

At least 25,000 persons in the Omaha area received inserts with their doctor bills this month urging their support aganst socialized medicine.

Dr. Maurice C. Howard, head of the Second Congressional District Healing Arts Committee, said this Saturday:

"We have received an excellent reaction," said Dr. Howard. "Many persons have complimented us for our courage in sending out our stand on socialized medicine along with our bills."

ISSUE PUT SQUARELY

Dr. Howard said the only unfavorable reaction he personally received was in an anonymous letter. He said he is not even sure it was from one of his patients, because it discussed a case he did not handle.

Many of the inserts say:

"The issue of socialization has been put squarely before the people of our country. Legislation seeking to socialize medicine has been introduced to the present Congress and is now being held in committee.

"The present Congressman from this district (Democrat EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN), in a speech before Congress on March 13, 1950, took the position that he was in favor of the pending compulsory national health plan, which is socialization of your health.

BUFFETT OPPOSES PLAN

"'I am absolutely against it.' Former Congressman HOWARD H. BUFFETT is on record and has always worked against such socialistic legislation. May I suggest you vote for him?"

The note also tells where and when persons can register.

Dr. Howard said many physicians also are writing personal notes and letters to their patients as well as talking to them about the subject.

"Future mailings," he said, "will run much higher than the 25,000 sent the first time.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 20, 1950]

DOCTOR WARNS OF PENDING BILL—OMAHA PLEDGES FIGHT ON LEGISLATION

There is no doubt in the minds of the public that S. 1679, now pending in Congress, is socialized medicine, Dr. M. C. Howard asserted Thursday night.

"And the medical profession of Omaha and the Second Congressional District are determined to continue their fight against socialism and socialized medicine," he said.

Dr. Howard talked to 150 persons attending the second congressional district healing arts committee meeting in the Medical Arts Auditorium. This is the committee that supports Republican HOWARD H. BUFFETT and opposes Democrat EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN for Congress.

INCREASED TAXES

Socialized medicine, Dr. Howard explained, is "medical treatment provided or controlled by a government and subsidized by increased taxation."

S. 1679, introduced April 25, 1949, has been read twice and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is conducting hearings, Dr. Howard said.

Title 7 of this bill, he continued, would provide "for compulsory health insurance, politically controlled by the Federal Security Administrator."

The Security Administrator, he declared, would: "Set the rates, collect the tax, control the money, determine the availability of services, and generally dominate the patient and doctor in this program."

WHO PAYS?

"Who pays?" said Dr. Howard. "Every wage earner and self-employed person pays by forcible deduction a certain percent from his pay check.

"No benefits are guaranteed, but many political promises are made. The sponsors use such vague terms as 'when funds are available,' 'insofar as possible,' and 'when facilities permit.'

"Services could be restricted at the whim of the Administrators—but there is no tax limit.

"The only guarantee is a new payroll tax."

Other speakers and the subcommittees they represented are: John O'Brien, druggists; Mrs. Edith Laushman, nurses; Dr. J. Phil Redgwick, doctors; Dr. Elmer Bay, dentists; Dr. N. F. Nolan, optometrists; Dr. W. G. Wiseman, chiropodists; Miss Elizabeth Sallers, office secretaries; Miss Rita Gillespie, technicians.

Inventory Speculation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, a recent editorial in the New York Times follows:

INVENTORY SPECULATION

Last week we had occasion to comment approvingly on a communication directed by Chairman McCabe of the Federal Reserve Board to the member banks of the Reserve System. In this memorandum Mr. McCabe emphasized the need to screen loans carefully. "Commercial banks," he wrote, "should advise borrowers to avoid overstocking of inventories and to postpone unnecessary business expansion."

That editorial drew from one alert reader this comment:

"The Federal Reserve Board's purpose, apparently, is to discourage inventory speculation by businessmen. That, it seems to me, is a laudable objective. On the other hand, it is hardly surprising if the businessman finds himself a little bit at sea when two Departments of the Government appear to be giving two directly opposite kinds of advice. I recall reading in a trade publication recently of a statement by one Government economist to the general effect that inventories were 'a better speculation than gold.'"

Our reader's recollection is accurate. On November 1 the trade journal of the garment industry, Women's Wear, carried a statement by a well-known Government economist that encouraged businessmen in that industry, at least, to borrow up to the hilt to expand their inventories. The economist was Louis J. Paradiso, chief statistician of the Office of Business Economics. Mr. Paradiso was quoted as saying:

"Those inventories you're holding are as good as gold. They are better, in fact, if you can afford to carry them until about March of next year. Present price increases will look mild compared with what's likely to develop in the second quarter of 1951."

We agree with our reader that these two Government statements on inventories constitute a striking example of inconsistency. Yet who will say that, taken together, they are inconsistent with the administration's over-all policy to date with respect to inflation—namely, to be tough when being tough involves no political risk or inconvenience, and to look the other way at all other times?

"Inspiring Guide in the Conduct of Our Own Lives," a Tribute to Hon. Raymond S. McKeough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, no one was more respected and beloved during the period of his distinguished service in this House than the Honorable Raymond S. McKeough from the district in Illinois which I have had the honor to represent in the Eighty-first Congress. As a member of the Maritime Commission he continued in equal measure to hold the great respect and deep affection of his associates and coworkers as well as to establish himself in the public opinion of the Nation as one of the great statesmen and towering forces of integrity in the public service.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will be pleased and heartened to learn of a gathering of more than 100 men and women who had been associated with our former colleague in the important work of the Maritime Commission. They gathered in the offices of the International Claims Commission, of which Mr. McKeough now is a member, as a delegation representing the entire personnel of the old Maritime Commission to present to the Honorable Raymond S. McKeough a scroll on which was printed against the background of a Liberty vessel the following richly deserved tribute:

HON. RAYMOND S. MCKEOUGH

(Printed against the background of a Liberty vessel)

We, the friends and associates of the Honorable Raymond S. McKeough, of Chicago, Ill., who served as member, United States Maritime Commission from October 16, 1945, to May 23, 1950, when the Maritime Commission ceased to exist, do hereby dedicate this scroll to him in gratitude and warm affection, as an expression of the deep regard and admiration in which we hold him as a friend of the people and as a public servant of the finest type, whose integrity, concept of public duty, and ideals of fair play will remain with us as an inspiring guide in the conduct of our own lives.

Notwithstanding trying conditions and often in the thankless but vital role of the dissenter, never discouraged and always strengthened by his fine sense of humor, he ably and courageously served the United States Government and the American merchant marine.

May he long continue in good health and happiness to serve our country.

Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, the Padre of the Good Neighbor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to present a report on the record of my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of Americas. It would appear, from this report, that my friend has acted as an apostle of good will and friendship, especially in the Western Hemisphere.

The report follows:

DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING, THE PADRE OF THE GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY

Dr. Joseph F. Thorning is the product of a New England mother and a Viking father. The former came from Springfield, Mass., while the latter, Mr. C. M. Thorning, now hale and hearty at the age of 80, worked as a shipbuilder on several boats that still sail the Great Lakes.

Born at Milwaukee, Wis., on April 25, 1896, Joseph Francis Thorning received his early education at Marquette Academy, Holy Cross College, and St. Louis University. While at St. Louis, Dr. Thorning was invited to prepare a series of articles on international friendship for the national review, America. This series led to his election as chairman of the Europe committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace. This group published Dr. Thorning's studies, in collaboration with Prof. Parker Thomas Moon, of Columbia University, on National Security and International Peace. Shortly thereafter, in 1931, Joseph F. Thorning was awarded a doctorate in sociology, economics, and political science by the Catholic University of America. His doctoral dissertation, Religious Liberty in Transition, is regarded as a classic book of reference, according to Carlton J. H. Hayes, formerly Seth Low professor of history in Columbia University and wartime ambassador to Spain.

In 1931, Dr. Thorning, now associate editor of the quarterly, Thought, was asked to serve as European correspondent of America and as special correspondent of the NCWC news service.

These assignments took Dr. Thorning to the United Kingdom, where he developed his interest in international studies at Oxford University, under the direction of Sir Alfred Zimmern. Another of his friends at Oxford was Francis de Zulueta, regius professor of civil law. He also exchanged views with Father Martin D'Arcy, celebrated Thomistic scholar at Oxford.

Oxford University furnished a splendid headquarters for research and writing with the opportunity to make frequent excursions to European centers of learning. Among the universities which Dr. Thorning visited were the Sorbonne, the University of Salamanca, the University of Fribourg (Switzerland), Munich, Bonn, and Heidelberg. At Geneva Dr. Thorning was invited by officials of the National Broadcasting Co. to give a trans-Atlantic address, a novelty at that time, on the so-called World Disarmament Conference. One of his associates on this program was Judge Michael Francis Doyle, now chairman of the electoral college of the United States. In this period, Dr. Thorning acted as a special contributor to the Commonweal.

Returning to this country, Dr. Thorning was appointed special lecturer on sociology and acting dean of the Graduate School in Georgetown University by the Very Reverend W. Coleman Nevils, S. J., one of the most famous presidents of Georgetown. It was at Georgetown that Dr. Thorning began his series of conferences with Father Edmund A. Walsh, regent of the School of Foreign Service. As a result, these two intellectuals, Dr. Thorning and Dr. Walsh, have often been described as "the two leaders who for 20 years understood the nature of the Soviet Union and the mentality of the Soviet hierarchy." When Father Walsh was asked by the general of the Jesuits to prepare a volume on the cause and cure of Marxism, he entrusted the pivotal first chapter of the positive side of this study to Dr. Thorning. In this chapter Joseph F. Thorning explained the celebrated papal encyclical, Forty Years After, by His Holiness, Pius XI.

While at Georgetown, Dr. Thorning formed his friendships with Ambassador J. H. Jefferson Caffery (first career diplomat to hold the blue ribbon post at Paris, France); Ambassador Walter Joseph Donnelly, who has had brilliant service in many American republics, including Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Peru, Costa Rica, and Venezuela; and the Honorable H. Freeman Matthews, now United States Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs.

In 1937, by appointment from his excellency the Most Reverend Michael J. Curley, archbishop of Baltimore and Washington, Dr. Thorning became chairman of the department of social studies in Mount St. Mary's College, Maryland, and professor of ethics in Mount St. Mary's Major Seminary. At this

post, he wrote the well-known monograph A Primer of Social Justice, with a preface by Archbishop Curley.

In May 1938, at Budapest, Hungary, it was reported in the New York Times that Dr. Thorning established a world record by broadcasting, over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., the story of the International Eucharistic Congress, in seven languages. Then, as in 1937, Dr. Thorning visited all the battlefields in the Spanish civil war, interviewing leaders on both sides. When he returned to the United States, Dr. Thorning was described by Archbishop Curley as one of the greatest authorities in the Nation today on Spanish affairs.

Once more in Europe in the summer of 1939, the Maryland educator traveled throughout the Balkans. World War II broke out while Dr. Thorning was a guest of the Bishop of Nice on the French Riviera. Upon his return to America, he predicted the fall of Adolf Hitler. Years previously, in a series of articles in America, Dr. Thorning had furnished the first systematic, scientific exposé of Hitler and nazism (1931). Indeed, his piece on Five Years of Hitlerism had been featured by the Religious Press Service and the National Conference of Christians and Jews in 1938. Upon the conclusion of the Spanish civil war in 1939, he was awarded the rank of knight commander in the Order of Isabella the Catholic. His articles on Spain and other European countries had been publicized from Bombay, India, to Brisbane, Australia. One result was that the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil, upon the death of Prof. Percy Alvin Martin of Stanford University, unanimously elected Dr. Thorning as its one honorary fellow in the United States. At the same time, he was nominated as a director of the American Peace Society and a fellow of the American Geographic Society.

Throughout the summer of 1941, Dr. Thorning served as director of the first inter-American seminar to South America, with headquarters at the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru. The next year, he established inter-American seminars at the National University of Mexico and the University of Habana, Cuba. One result was a unique distinction: Dr. Thorning was awarded the honorary degree, doctor of divinity, by the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution. It was the first award of its kind to a North American. Simultaneously, the Republic of Ecuador conferred its national decoration, the Order of Merit. This decoration was given at the hands of His Excellency, Galo Plaza, then Ambassador and now President of the Republic.

For seven consecutive years Dr. Thorning has been invited by the United States Congress to deliver the invocation to start Pan-American Day in the Capitol. On these occasions, he has been described by the Senators and Representatives as a great American and a man of God. He likewise was asked to give the prayer in the Congress in connection with the visits of His Excellency, President Eurico Gaspar Dutra, of Brazil, and of His Excellency, President Gabriel González Videla, of Chile. Frequent reference to Dr. Thorning's addresses and articles is made in the United States Senate and in the United States House of Representatives. Naturally enough, he is a trusted friend of the Honorable Edward G. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, as well as of the Honorable Thomas G. Mann, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for the same section.

In February 1948 Dr. Thorning was a guest of the Republic of Venezuela for the inauguration of Don Rómulo Gallegos in Caracas. Recently, the Venezuelan Government, through its able Ambassador in Washington, Dr. José Rafael Pocaterra, has announced that former Postmaster General James A. Farley and Dr. Thorning will be awarded the national decoration, Francisco de Miranda, founded in honor of the precursor of South American independence. In the meantime, Dr. Thorning has been promoted in the Order of Isabella the Catholic from the rank of knight commander to that of supreme officer, with the grand cross.

As associate editor of World Affairs, Dr. Thorning has his offices in the Capital. His book reviews are a feature of both the Americas and World Affairs. Furthermore, he has just completed the manuscript of a new book to be entitled "Miranda: World Citizen." This has an introduction by President Galo Plaza, of Ecuador, and a preface from the pen of the Honorable Sumner Welles, former United States Under Secretary of State. Mr. Welles and Dr. Thorning often exchange views on Central and South America.

As a guest of the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Francis P. Matthews, Dr. Thorning made the midshipman cruise to Europe on the battleship, U. S. S. *Missouri*, flagship of Task Force 61. In this capacity he was invited by Rear Adm. Allan E. Smith, United States Navy, commander of the task force, to preside as chairman at the daily 2-hour seminar on conditions in France, the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, and the Iberian Peninsula. When the *Missouri* and other ships in the task force held an official commemoration at sea of the Japanese surrender anniversary, Dr. Thorning, by unanimous choice of officers and men, was invited to give the benediction.

In February 1950, as a guest of the Republic of Haiti, Dr. Thorning attended the international exposition celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the capital, Port-au-Prince.

On June 19, 1950, at colorful ceremonies near the Organization of American States, Dr. Thorning gave the invocation, dedicating the beautiful bronze figure of José Gervasio Artigas, champion of Uruguayan independence. This program, heard on the Voice of America, included speeches by Ambassador Alberto Dominguez Cámpora, of Uruguay; Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, secretary general of the Organization of American States; and the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson. Few inter-American functions are complete without his presence.

Plight of Nonsubsidized Air Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from Mr. Ralph Cox, Jr., president of Ocean Air Tradeways, which helps to point up the plight of the nonsubsidized air carriers. This is only one example of many cases existing in America today and the American people should be made aware of what has taken place.

Many veterans of World War II at the termination of hostilities were encouraged to buy Government surplus cargo and passenger planes and enter the air-transport and cargo-carrying fields. They did so without subsidies and pioneered new services and in many cases new routes of travel. Once it was seen they were able to make a go of their operation and develop successfully new methods of service, they became prey for attack and control by others who were interested in seeing them removed from a competitive field.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the letter received by me is included in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

OCEAN AIR TRADEWAYS,
New York, N. Y., December 5, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: This company is an independent nonsubsidized air carrier, also known by the rather uncomplimentary designation by the Civil Aeronautics Board, as a large irregular air carrier.

We are a veterans' group composed of former military aviation personnel and we started commercial flight operations in March 1946 carrying passengers between New York and Miami.

During the last 4 years we have managed to perform a public service carrying passengers and cargo, domestically and overseas, at rates considerably below the scheduled airlines, but within the financial reach of many thousands who could not otherwise afford air transportation. Our operation in the past and present has been and is in strict accordance with the CAA safety regulations.

This company has the dubious distinction of having been served with the first Federal court injunction preventing its transportation of passengers overseas between the United States and foreign countries as an independent air carrier.

American financial aid to the extent of several hundred thousand dollars, however, was recently given to a French nonscheduled airline in Paris, known as TAI. In other words, our tax money is used to harass and persecute free American enterprise through bureaucratic enforcement agencies, and at the same time subsidize, not only our equivalent nonscheduled air carriers in foreign countries, but also the large scheduled foreign air carriers which seriously compete with the American scheduled carriers, necessitating even greater subsidies to them.

History does not show that Great Britain, during the past century at the zenith of her merchant marine power, so lavishly and recklessly donated surface craft to foreigners to compete with herself as America has done in the field of air transportation.

We, of the so-called nonscheduled air industry, desire no favors, no subsidies, no kind words, or no help from the United States Government; our heritage, our Constitution, and our successful American free-enterprise system entitles us to unmolested economic freedom in pursuing success in this new field which is so badly in need of unhampered pioneering development.

United States Air Force recent statistics show that 40 percent of the reserve air strength in the United States lies within the nonscheduled air carriers who are now faced with the latest CAB directive limiting their flights between two points to three trips per month. During the last 6 months the CAB has permanently put out of business, by cancellation of their operating certificates and letters of registration, dozens of our fellow carriers, some because they operated too frequently, others because they did not operate frequently enough, and still others because they did not have aircraft available since they had been forced to liquidate or lease out their planes for fear of violating the CAB restriction known as the "frequency and regularity" ruling.

Congress never intended the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to be twisted in its application to discriminate between American citizens the way the Civil Aeronautics Board has done. Actually the act charges the Civil Aeronautics Board with the responsibility to develop American air transportation to the highest possible degree for the benefit of all

American citizens, primarily stressing national defense. It would seem that the Board's intentions are just the opposite.

In spite of these many economic sanctions and road blocks hurled at the nonscheduled industry by its own Government, it was able to throw into the pool of badly needed aircraft for the Korean airlift over 30 four-engine long-range overseas combination passenger and cargo C–54 aircraft with completely trained operating and maintenance personnel. One of Ocean Air Tradeways' aircraft, NC–68736, a C–54, few 523 hours in one 30-day period between Japan and the United States, shattering all known records, both military and civilian.

Since our only recourse to prevent annihilation of this industry by the Government is through legislative action, it is therefore urgently requested that you support H. R. 9184, without amendment, the air mail subsidy separation bill, to prevent further growth of subsidized monopoly and let the people know how much they pay for transportation of their air mail and how much they pay for subsidy which goes to support powerful lobbies and wasteful uneconomic air operations, which serve a chosen few rather than all the voters. This bill is directly in keeping with the Hoover report recommendations for better government.

Respectfully yours,

OCEAN AIR TRADEWAYS,
RALPH COX, Jr., *President.*

Further Smear Campaign of Omaha Doctors as Publicized by the Omaha World-Herald

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, part nine, a continuation of the Omaha doctors "lie and smear" campaign is as follows:

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 18, 1950]

POLITICAL FOES HOLDING FIRE—BUFFETT, O'SULLIVAN ON SAME PROGRAM

Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN and his Republican opponent, HOWARD H. BUFFETT, appeared on the same platform Tuesday, but stayed clear of direct attacks on each other.

In the question period, Mr. O'SULLIVAN denied he is for socialized medicine.

He said: "There isn't a doctor this side of the hot place who can show me where I was ever for socialized medicine or a compulsory health program.

"There is no bill for socialized medicine now in Congress, and there never will be."

NEVER ACHIEVE PEACE

Mr. O'SULLIVAN argued that he always had been against socialized medicine, and that "I refuse to take the issue now." He said he called the doctors evil old men only "because they lied about me."

Mr. BUFFETT, who left before the O'SULLIVAN remarks, stressed two points:

1. The Democratic Party has never been able to achieve peace.

2. It has shown terrifying inability to remove subversive elements from government.

Through all history, he said, the great enemy of freedom of the individual has been big government.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 22, 1950]

REPUBLICANS GOT DOCTORS—O'SULLIVAN AGAIN FIRES SHARP WORDS

(By Harold Andersen)

NEBRASKA CITY, NEBR.—Second District Congressman EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, of Omaha, declared Friday night that old reactionary Republicans have got doctors to spearhead the campaign against him.

Addressing a Democratic rally, Mr. O'SULLIVAN declared:

"I'm against socialized medicine and compulsory health insurance, and I've said it and said it until I'm sick of saying it.

"But they (doctors) won't believe me."

TELL LIES

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said any one who tells a lie is evil, and "that's why I called them (doctors) evil men."

He is against compulsory health insurance, he said, because it would duplicate many insurance policies now in force. He said he is for only seven sections of President Truman's national health bill.

The Democratic candidate said he tried to appear before a doctors' meeting to tell of his opposition to socialized medicine and compulsory health insurance, but declared "old seven-hundred-dollar-a-day-plus Fouts" opposed his appearance.

BUFFETT REACTIONARY

This apparently was a reference to money received by Dr. Roy Fouts of Omaha for X-raying prospective draftees.

Doctors are so cheap, Mr. O'SULLIVAN said, that rather than use letters with 3-cent stamps, they are enclosing literature against him with their bills.

Of his Republican opponent, former Representative HOWARD BUFFETT, of Omaha, Mr. O'SULLIVAN said:

"He was the most reactionary man that was ever in Congress."

HE'S TERRIBLE

"He's not for the farmer, he's not for the veterans, he's not for labor. He's terrible."

He said that Mr. BUFFETT while in Congress allowed the reactionary Committee for Constitutional Government to use his free mailing privilege to distribute 100,000 copies of an antilabor speech.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN also rapped the World-Herald as the most reactionary newspaper west of the Chicago Tribune.

DOSEK OPTOMISTIC

"I assure you I need your help," he told the crowd.

Walter R. Raecke, Democratic candidate for Governor, did not address the meeting. He was attending the Ak-Sar-Ben coronation at Omaha.

Edward A. Dosek, Lincoln, candidate for lieutenant governor, told the rally:

"I think all Democrats will be elected this year."

[From the World-Herald of October 22, 1950]

DOCTOR RAPS AT O'SULLIVAN—CAUGHT IN ANOTHER, HOWARD ASSERTS

Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN has been caught in another one, Dr. M. C. Howard, chairman of the Second Congressional District Healing Arts Committee, asserted Saturday.

Said Dr. Howard:

"This makes twice in 1 week.

"O'SULLIVAN said last Tuesday there is no socialized medicine bill pending before Congress. We showed that S. 1679, embodying the President's program, is now pending before Congress.

"Friday in Nebraska City, O'SULLIVAN said that he is against compulsory health insurance because it would duplicate many insurance policies now in force and that he is for only seven sections of President Truman's health bill."

SEVENTH VITAL

"How many sections or titles, as they are called, are in the President's bill? Exactly seven."

It is that seventh section that is all-important, said Dr. Howard.

THE BILL AT A GLANCE—S. 1679, H. R. 4312, 4313

Its seven titles provide aid to—

1. Train more doctors, dentists, nurses, hospital administrators, and others.

2. Advance medical research (diabetes, arthritis, rheumatism, etc.).

3. Expand hospital building programs.

4. Help rural and other shortage areas; assist farmers' experimental health cooperatives.

5. Expand State and local public health services;

6. Increase State maternal, child health, and crippled children's services; and

7. National health insurance to cover your medical bills.

Dr. Howard's exhibit from the pamphlet Mr. O'SULLIVAN circulated * * * shows seven sections in the President's national health bill.

"It is the one that provides for compulsory health insurance which O'SULLIVAN said he opposes," Dr. Howard declared. "It is compulsory because there would be payroll deductions for every one and because the Federal Security Administrator directs the entire program."

As for the other six sections Dr. Howard said they follow the pattern the doctors themselves have set.

ALREADY PROVIDED

"The American Medical Association through its 12-point program and the Nebraska State Medical Association through its eight-point program have cooperated in having most of this already enacted—better maternal and child programs, cancer detection and research, extensive polio research and treatment, etc.," Dr. Howard said.

Dr. Howard continued: "O'SULLIVAN also might be interested in knowing that a recent survey showed that 90 percent of the employed groups in Omaha already are insured for health and medical care.

COSTLY DUPLICATION

"The Government program would only be a more costly duplication of the same service and every one would have to pay for it."

Residents of the Second Congressional District should know, Dr. Howard said, that last year Mr. O'SULLIVAN sent out in franked envelopes 5,000 letters and pamphlets advocating the President's health program.

"These pamphlets," said Dr. Howard, "were prepared and made available by a well known left-wing organization—The Committee for the Nation's Health."

A cartoon preceded the following wording which showed a doctor on a bicycle pedaling down a line of numbered patients with their mouths open taking their temperature and commanding, "Say ah-h-h."

Socialized medicine will result in mass medical treatment—the treatment of your illness is not a mass proposition.

[From the Omaha World-Herald]

DOCTORS USE LAUGH APPEAL—CARTOONS EMPLOYED TO ELECT BUFFETT

The nonpartisan doctors committee also is taking to the lighter side in trying to defeat socialized medicine through electing HOWARD H. BUFFETT to Congress.

It is the cartoon approach.

Many doctors have purchased a series of signs for display in their offices. There also

is a little booklet entitled "Who Laughs Last?" that tells a picture story.

Dr. J. Phil Redgwick, committee chairman, explains: "Sure there are a lot of laughs, but there i also a serious message.

"Our volunteer workers are mimeographing copies of the cartoons and they will be on display in the waiting rooms of doctors and dentists and available for others who want the series."

One cartoon for example, shows a man with a large stomach who has just been through the line under the socialized medicine program. On his stomach is stamped: "Government inspected."

Czech Council's Chicanery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the December 2 issue of America, national Catholic weekly, entitled "Czech Council's Chicanery":

CZECH COUNCIL'S CHICANERY

In offering editorial endorsement of the Crusade for Freedom, America (September 16, p. 618) expressed its concern that the officers of the National Committee for Free Europe, Inc., the organization sponsoring the crusade, "have been dismayingly slow in realizing that in Eastern and Central Europe they are dealing with peoples whose culture is rooted in religion and, in large measure, shaped by Catholicism." Now that the crusade is over and all who managed to find a freedom scroll have affirmed their belief in divinely bestowed human rights and pledged themselves to resist aggression and tyranny everywhere, let us look at the Free Europe Committee again. It is worth looking at. It has been entrusted by the State Department with the high responsibility of shepherding the groups of political exiles from the iron-curtain countries who constitute informal governments in exile. Living in those countries are 55,000,000 Catholics, one-seventh of the total membership of the church.

The officers of the Free Europe Committee, all genial, if superannuated, gentlemen, will undoubtedly be distressed by any reference to religion. They were disturbed when America pointed out (July 29, p. 438) that the musical theme chosen to introduce the first broadcast to Czechoslovakia by their transmitter, Radio Free Europe, was the official hymn of the Czechoslovak National Church, a hymn without significance except for its religious tendentiousness, a church without significance except for its political purpose—a purpose revived today by the Soviets—to destroy Catholicism.

It will then, admittedly, distress the gentlemen of the Free Europe Committee to learn that the supplement to Report on Czechoslovakia, No. 14, published by their research and information center, offers a chummy comparison of Catholicism and communism as equal instruments of intellectual enslavement. Edited by Dr. Miloslav Kohac, former chief of the Czech National Socialist Press in Prague, an agency of a persistently pro-Soviet political party, the Report complains that the Communist ideology has put the Czech tongue and its users in a mental deep freeze: "The stereotyping of expressions makes all thinking easier and obscures it, so that it excludes thinking altogether." Dr. Kohac thinks his point might be made clearer by example, so he continues: "This is in imitation of the Catholic method." He is referring to the historic method by which Catholics—and, indeed, many Protestants—learn their faith, the question-and-answer method of the catechism. It is a stultifying method of imposing deceptions, in Dr. Kohac's view: "He [the Catholic believer] has no notion of his own on the subject; he only accepts the illusion which has been laid down for him."

The National Committee for Free Europe cannot disavow responsibility for such abusive talk, the single result (and purpose?) of which is to alienate Catholics in America and—more important—behind the iron curtain. The NCFE's supervisory (and subsidizing) role empowers it to effect changes in the Council for Free Czechoslovakia, a group claiming to represent all democratic political forces in exile but in reality a clique of central European anticlerical, dogmatic Marxists, opposed (currently) to communism but pledged to perpetuate the frantic—and futile—nineteenth century fight against religion in its institutional form and social effects.

A special correspondent of the New York Times, beginning a four article survey on October 4 of the iron curtain political forces in exile, innocently reported general admiration for the unity and harmony in the Czech council. Within the week, on October 9, Joseph Lettrich, representing Slovakia, one of the two partner nations in the council, had resigned. Stormy but inconclusive meetings of the executive board were held on November 4–6 and 18 to see whether the National Socialist clique could continue to pose as a government in exile. There is no reason to doubt their arrogant ability—nor the Free Europe Committee's continuing gullibility.

The National Socialist clique has succeeded in denying trade-union and agrarian interests any influential voice in the Council. It has succeeded in keeping off the Council the elected representatives of the Christian Democratic group, elected by the Catholic People's Party in exile.

What is the source of the influence that can promptly produce docile politicos, radio entertainers, and comforting companions who play the National Socialist game? How account for the easy arrival of Dr. Ladislav Feierabend, an economist posing as a peasant leader, whose declared mission is to destroy politically Dr. Josef Cerny, a Catholic, head of the Agrarian Party and heir to the strongest party in Czechoslovakia?

After the last war many Americans noted with surprise that the countries liberated from the Nazi tyranny chose Christian Democratic Parties to lead them. It should not have been surprising: Christianity is the mold and mind of European civilization. After Eastern Europe is liberated from Soviet tyranny, like forces of Christian Democratic inspiration will come to the fore. Why, then, should America short-sightedly place its main bets on discredited, non-Communist socialism as "the wave of the future"?

At the close of their annual meeting on November 19, the 180 Catholic bishops of the United States declared: "It is of primary importance for our people to realize that human freedom derives from the spiritual nature of man and can only flourish where the things of the spirit are held in reverence. Our present principles of action need to be evaluated in the light of that truth." Accepting the Liberty Bell at Independence, Mo., on November 6, President Truman likewise affirmed: "Our concept of freedom has religious roots." Copies of the President's speech should have been delivered to the State Department—and to its annex, the National Committee for Free Europe, Inc.

"Scare Words" Index

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that during the next few years the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Members of Congress will have occasion to hear many gravely spoken scare words which in reality will be as false as the hair on some people's heads or the teeth in the mouths of some people.

In order that the splendid information passed out by the Democratic National Committee relative to the utterances of "scare words" and authorship may be perpetuated for other readers and lawmakers, I wish to present the following index of "scare words" for publication in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Scare words" index

Following is an index of material contained in the "scare words" document. This recap gives the when, what, and who of the statements in short form so that you can find them in the book when you need them for speeches or other causes.

When	What	Who
	GENERAL PROPHECIES OF DOOM—(P. 1)	
1932	Grass will grow in the streets	Herbert Hoover.
1934	American civilization is in danger	Republican National Committee.
1935	Dark hour of reckoning close at hand	American Liberty League.
1936	America is in peril	Republican National Committee.
1937	Tear down democratic institutions	American Liberty League.
1938	Disaster	Republican National Committee.
1939	National bankruptcy * * * civil war	Mr. Republican.
1940	New Deal sapping its (America's) strength	Republican National Committee.
1944	Economic life being destroyed	Do.
1945	Lead only to ruin	Republican Congressman.
1946	Mixture of fascism and socialism	Herbert Hoover.
1947	Road to chaos	Carroll Reece.
1948	Nation regimented	Mr. Republican.
1949	Socialize all	Do.
1950	Disaster and ruin for our country	Republican National Committee.

"Scare words" index—Continued

When	What	Who
	AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION (P. 13)	
	Federal Farm Loan Act, 1916 (p. 14):	
1916	Nothing could work greater injury to agriculture	Republican Congressman.
	Bill is ridiculous	Do.
	Vicious pork barrel	Do.
	Atrophies community enterprise	Do.
	Paternally socialistic	Do.
	Frazier-Lemke Farm Mortgage Act, 1934 (p. 15):	
1934	Demoralizing, dishonest legislation	Do.
	Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, 1936 (p. 15):	
1936	Do not sell (farmer) into slavery	Do.
	It is communistic	Do.
	Determination to regiment agriculture	American Liberty League.
	Contrary to American system of government	Do.
	Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, 1937 (p. 16):	
1937	Means Russianization of agriculture	Do.
	Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (p. 17):	
1938	Convert farmer into serf and peasant	Republican Congressman.
	Compulsory control over American agriculture	Do.
	Regimentation	Do.
	Nefarious thing	Do.
	Spirit is Fascist	Do.
	Beginning of the end of our kind of government	Do.
	Regiment and destroy American agriculture	Do.
	BANKING LEGISLATION (P. 20)	
	Federal Reserve Act 1913 (p. 20):	
1913	A radical and dangerous reversal of policy	American Bankers Association.
	Cannot stand tests of common sense	Commercial and Financial Chronicle.
	Will prove inoperative and impracticable	Lyman Gage, former Secretary of Treasury.
	It will destroy business	Republican Congressman.
	A crime against our institutions	Do.
	May result in chaos	Do.
	Tear up by the roots the entire banking system	Do.
	Socialistic and dangerous	Do.
	It is unjust and un-American	President of Association of Small Bankers.
	Will cause a panic and the collapse of our banking system	Prof. Joseph Johnson.
	Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, 1933 (p. 24):	
1933	Will destroy the entire banking system	Gov. Alf M. Landon.
	Lays a needless burden on sound banking	National Association of Manufacturers.
	The whole of history is against bank guaranties	Frank R. Kent.
	ELECTRIC POWER (P. 25)	
	Hoover Dam, 1928 (p. 25):	
1924	Economically wasteful	R. H. Ballard of Southern California Edison Co.
1927	Masked approach toward communism	B. J. Mullaney of People's Gas Light & Coke Co., Chicago.
1928	First long stride toward communism	Republican Congressman.
	Muscle Shoals (p. 27):	
1928	Revolutionary * * * subversive	Do.
	Leads straight to state socialism	Do.
	Grand Coulee Dam (p. 29):	
1934	National economic planning commonly goes wrong	National Association of Manufacturers.
1935	Moral and civic larceny	Republican Congressman.
	Socialistic government	Do.
	Power nobody can use	Do.
	Purpose is to move the population	Do.
	Socialistic dream	Do.
	No one to sell power to except rattlesnakes, coyotes, and rabbits	Do.
1936	Defiance of God's mandate	Do.
1937	Mad indecent program	American Liberty League.
1939	Wrecks the farmers	Republican Congressman.
	Tennessee Valley Authority, 1933 (p. 33):	
1933	Experiment is socialistic	Do.
	Patterned closely after one of Soviet dreams	Do.
	Sending good money after bad	Do.
	The Russian idea	Do.
	A dangerous direction	Do.
	Socialism	Do.
	Un-American and Russian	Do.
	Unfair competition	Do.
1934	Communism	Do.
	Economic waste	National Coal Association.
1935	Crazy, cockeyed scheme	Republican Congressman.
	Rural Electrification Administration, 1935 (p. 41):	
1935	Political expedient	Hudson Reed, United Gas Improvement Co.
1936	Increasing interference of government	Republican Congressman.
	Socialization	American Liberty League.
	Federal electric power projects (p. 42):	
1934	Means ruin	McCarter of Edison Electric Institute.
1936	Socialistic experiment has run riot	American Liberty League.
	Steps toward socialization	Do.
	COAL—GUFFEY COAL ACT (P. 44)	
	Guffey Coal Act, 1935:	
1935	Step toward socialization of industry	Do.
	Would drive the American flag from the seas	Do.
	HOUSING (P. 46)	
	United States Housing Authority, 1936 (p. 46):	
1936	Detrimental to American civilization	Walter Schmidt of National Association of Real Estate Boards.
	Will create communism and chaos	Jacob Pedersen of Council of Real Estate Association.
	Beginning of end of our country	Bronx Borough Taxpayer's League.
	Wagner-Steagall Slum Clearance Act, 1937 (p. 47):	
1937	Not the building that makes the slum: it is the people	Charles Eidt of Real Estate Owners Association, New York.
1939	Undiluted socialism	National Association of Real Estate Boards.
	Nothing but socialism	Rufus Lusk of National Home Builders Association.

"Scare words" index—Continued

When	What	Who
	INCOME TAX (P. 49)	
	Income tax, 1913:	
1870	To repress productive energies	Republican Congressman.
	Will increase burdens on laboring people	Do.
	Pernicious	Do.
	Unfair	Do.
1894	Demoralizing influence	Do.
	Faulty, inequitable, unjust	Do.
	Wicked and sectional measure	Do.
	Atrocious, illy constructed, and badly ventilated	Do.
	Outrageous indignities imposed upon citizens	Do.
	Communistic, socialistic, populistic	Joseph H. Choate.
	Terror to all business and enterprise	Republican Congressman.
	Oppress the poor people	Do.
	Socialism, communism, devilism	Do.
1913	An attempt to punish success	Do.
1936	New Deal has prostituted taxing power	American Liberty League.
	REGULATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE (P. 60)	
	Interstate Commerce Act, 1887:	
1882	Persecution	Wayne MacVeagh, Pennsylvania R. R. Co.
	Temptation to venality and corruption	Emory A. Storrs.
1886	Will only aggravate the situation	President, N. Y. L. E. & W. R. R.
1887	Unconstitutional	Republican Congressman.
	Would demoralize business, cripple commerce	Do.
	A failure and delusion	Do.
	Demand of socialists	Do.
	LABOR LEGISLATION (P. 63)	
	General opposition to union labor:	
1903	True Americans should denounce methods of organized labor	National Association of Manufacturers.
	The spirit of labor unionism means socialism	John Kirby, Jr.
1904	Unions officered by anarchistic men	F. C. Nunemacher, National Association of Manufacturers.
1912	Samuel Gompers worst enemy of honest labor	John Kirby, Jr.
	Anti-injunction and 8-hour day legislation, 1903-13 (p. 66):	
1903	Anarchy and despotism	David Parry, National Association of Manufacturers.
1904	Socialism, anarchy, and confiscation	Do.
	This is socialism	John Kirby, Jr., National Association of Manufacturers.
	Workmen's compensation and employer's liability (p. 71):	
1905	Tendency in labor union toward being "babied"	C. W. Post, National Association of Manufacturers.
1906	Extremely vicious, monstrous	Benjamin Warfield, Louisville & Nashville R. R.
	Socialistic motive	Hugh L. Bond, Baltimore & Ohio R. R.
1908	Accidents will happen	Albert Harris, New York Central R. R.
1911	Purely socialistic	Robert Cary, New York Central R. R.
1923	Schemes to Sovietize business	The Weekly Underwriter.
	The right to strike and picket (p. 76):	
1910	Who can imagine peaceful picketing?	John Kirby, National Association of Manufacturers.
1920	Attack by the forces of radicalism	Stephen Mason, National Association of Manufacturers.
	Closed shop (p. 77):	
1910	Open shop is principle of industrial freedom	National Association of Manufacturers.
1923	The Red banner of socialism	S. W. Utley, National Association of Manufacturers.
	Children's Bureau, 1912 (p. 78):	
1912	Merely to make positions	Republican Congressman.
	Misguided humanitarianism	Commercial and Financial Chronicle.
	Minimum wage (p. 79):	
1913	Against the established order	John Kirby, National Association of Manufacturers.
1914	Encourages incompetence and rewards ignorance	James Emery, National Association of Manufacturers.
1915	Pure socialism in its origin	National Association of Manufacturers.
1924	Vicious measure transplanted from foreign soils	John Edgerton, National Association of Manufacturers.
	Child labor laws (p. 82):	
1924	Fatal tendencies	Do.
	Socialistic in its origin	John Emery, National Association of Manufacturers.
	Norris-LaGuardia Act (p. 83):	
1932	A long march in the direction of Moscow	Republican Congressman.
	Railway Labor Mediation, 1934 (p. 83):	
1934	Interferes with liberty of employees	Do.
	Company union is a good union	Do.
	The Wagner Act, 1935 (p. 84):	
1934	Revolutionary	Commercial and Financial Chronicle.
	A national labor union monopoly	National Association of Manufacturers.
	Will bind industry, trade, and commerce into servitude	Steel leaders.
	Union domination over American industrial life	National Auto Chamber of Commerce.
	Chaos in relationships	Durable goods industries.
	Walsh-Healey Act, 1936 (p. 85):	
1936	Regimentation	Republican Congressman.
	Likely to cause more strikes	Do.
	Fair Labor Standards Act, 1937 (p. 86):	
1937	Restrictive of individual initiative	American Liberty League.
	Planned economy	Do.
	The road to economic hell	Republican Congressman.
	Will destroy the labor movement	Do.
	Paving way for absolute enslavement of labor	Do.
	Bolshevism or communism * * * socialism, nazism, fascism	National Association of Manufacturers.
	Distress, misery, and despair	National Publishers Association.
	Power of life or death over every industry	Southern States Industrial Council.
1938	Will create unemployment	Republican Congressman.
	NATIONAL DEBT (P. 60)	
1933	Sword * * * over the head of business	Do.
	Day of reckoning * * * will not be long deferred	Do.
1937	Ruining the country	Harry P. Fletcher, later chairman, Republican National Committee.
1934	Toboggan of inflation * * * to certain crash	Republican Senator.
	Going over the precipice	National Association of Manufacturers.
1935	Nation-wide distress	Do.
	Spending down * * * suicide roads	Herbert Hoover.
1936	Cruel fate	Republican Congressman.
	National bankruptcy	American Liberty League.
	Spending * * * threatens disaster	Do.
	Socialistic experiments	Do.
1939	Widows and children * * * in sore straits	Republican Congressman.
1940	Danger to our institutions	JOE MARTIN, chairman, Republican National Committee.

"Scare words" index—Continued

When	What	Who
	NATIONAL DEBT (P. 90)—continued	
	Pure Food and Drugs Act (p. 94):	
1906	Man's liberty * * * put in peril	Republican Senator.
1905	No compromise with the scamps	The National Druggist Magazine.
1906	Paternalism and socialism	Republican Senator.
	Securities and Exchange Commission (p. 95):	
1934	Would greatly deflate the securities industry if * * * not destroy it	Richard G. Babbage, Real Estate Board of New York.
	Will force out of business * * * more than 6,000 firms	Broker-Dealers of Baltimore.
	Arbitrary bureaucratic control * * * cripple legitimate business	Merchants Association of New York.
	Driving the security business underground	Edwin F. Chinlund, Controllers Institute of America.
	Enterprise in strait-jacket	National Association of Manufacturers.
	Regimentation	Republican Congressman.
	Iron hand of compulsion	Do.
	Centralized bureaucratic control	Do.
	Complete Government control and domination	Do.
	Brake on recovery	American Bar Association.
	Sheppard-Towner Act—1921 (p. 100):	
1921	Federal machine * * * loot the Treasury	Republican Congressman.
	Paternalism, socialism, state medicine and sentimental politics	Illinois State Medical Society.
	Infringement of the rights of States	Constitutional Liberty League of Massachusetts.
	Will increase bastardy	Republican Congressman.
	Paternalistic * * * socialistic * * * bolshevistic	Do.
	Socialized democracy	Do.
	Born out of purely socialistic brains	Do.
	Nationalization of medicine	Do.
	Socialistic scheme	American Medical Association.
	Social security (p. 105):	
1930	Ultimate socialistic control of life and industry	National Association of Manufacturers.
1935	Abandonment of private capitalism	American Bar Association.
	Undermine the fabric of our economic * * * life	Illinois Manufacturers Association.
	Make confirmed beggars of our States and cities	Frank L. Peckham, vice president, Sentinels of the Republic.
	Arbitrary Federal * * * control	National Association of Manufacturers.
	Brink of bankruptcy * * * into the abyss	American Medical Association.
	Will weaken fiber of the American people	Ohio Chamber of Commerce.
	Incalculable harm to * * * population	Do.
	May end progress	Republican Senator.
	Greatest single threat to recovery	Republican Congressman.
	Will increase unemployment	Do.
	Will stop recovery	Do.
	Wreck the Nation	Do.
	Enslave workers	Do.
	Threaten(s) * * * our institutions	Do.
	Breaking down the independence of the States	Republican Senator.
1936	Fraud on the workingman	Gov. Alf. M. Landon.
	Woman suffrage (p. 113):	
1853	Unsexed women	James Gordon Bennett.
1913	Fanaticism will flourish	Carl Bauer.
1912	Radical step	President William Howard Taft.
1915	Excess of emotion	Ex-President William H. Taft.
	Repugnant to instincts	New York Times.
	Socialism, feminism, woman suffrage	Man Suffrage Association.
	Social revolution at the ballot box	Do.
	Force (women) * * * into politics	Republican Congressman.
1950	Democracy stinks	Herbert U. Nelson, National Association o. Real Estate Boards.
	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND ANTITRUST LEGISLATION (P. 115)	
1910	Blight spreading all over * * * business	Commercial and Financial Chronicle.
1914	Lockstep directorate	New York Tribune.
	Permanent inquisition	Commercial and Financial Chronicle.
	Fraught with grave danger	National Association of Manufacturers.
	Successful businessman ostracized	The Manufacturers Association of Montgomery County, Pa.
	Undemocratic and Un-American	Commercial and Financial Chronicle.
	Radical program	Do.
1915	Utterly impossible	Ex-President William H. Taft.
1920	Persistently inquisitorial	National Association of Manufacturers.
	FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS	
	Federal Road Act (p. 118):	
1916	Opportunity for * * * States to reach into Federal Treasury	Republican Congressman.
	Bureaucracy and indefensible centralization	Do.
	Humbug	Do.
	Paternalism	Do.
	Increased paternalism	Do.
	Wrong, vicious, unfair	Do.
	Injustice and impracticability	Do.
	Treasury * * * is practically empty	Do.
	Governmental paternalism	Do.

Internal Security Bill of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter which I recently wrote to a friend explaining my opposition to the Internal Security Act of 1950. The letter is as follows:

DEAR FRIEND: I am glad to send you the following analysis of my opposition to the Internal Security Act of 1950.

First let me say that no vote I cast in Congress has ever put party above country. My vote on the anti-Red bill was in no sense a partisan vote.

I regard this bill to be so bad, so dangerous, so thoroughly unconstitutional, so very unwise, unsound, and ill-advised that I had no other choice than to vote against it.

Lord knows, no one in the Congress has been more active, energetic, vigorous, or more outspoken, not infrequently the position of party notwithstanding, against the Communists than I have been.

But it is a misnomer to call this bill a Communist-control bill. It might well be better termed a thought-control bill, or an opinion-suppression bill, or a belief-stifling bill. In my opinion, it would help rather than hurt the Communists. It is opposed by all our Government intelligence agencies which state that the bill would seriously damage the security and intelligence operations for which they are responsible.

Here are just a few reasons why I voted against this bill:

1. It requires the publication of a complete list of vital defense plants, laboratories, and other installations and thus serves notice on our potential enemies where these essential services are located. This provision is absolutely indefensible. Of itself, it would warrant opposition to the bill.

2. It compels the Department of Justice and FBI, in order to carry out its unworkable registration provisions, to waste valuable time, energy, and money and disclose sources of information which are invaluable in the

war against internal communism and efforts to protect the national security.

3. It prevents the great assistance we now receive from many aliens regarding intelligence operations.

4. It destroys the long-established American principle of asylum for political refugees. It would bar public men, businessmen, and students from admission to the United States on visits from Spain and several other nations with similar government, thus antagonizing governments that are presently friendly to us.

5. It facilitates the naturalization of subversive aliens.

6. It gives to Government officials almost unlimited power to control and restrict and prohibit the exercise of free speech, opinion, belief, and conscience and would enable them to harass sincere citizens for the mere expression of their views. In this country we punish men for their crimes and not for their thoughts which this bill seeks to do.

7. It would require the Attorney General to assume the impossible task of producing concrete legal evidence that men have particular ideas or opinions. Under this provision sincere and honest persons striving to ameliorate sweatshops, promote the public health or housing legislation might well be brought under the broad sweep of this measure.

As I stated substantially in my House speech this bill is patterned after the totalitarian police slave state and, in principle, is hostile to the spirit and letter of the American Constitution and, in fact, repugnant to our free institutions.

It would be aimed at men like you and me who are never afraid to speak out our minds and some bureaucrat in Washington could very easily, under its terms, move to take punitive action against us if they should disagree with our expressions of opinion or belief. You can appreciate that such a latitude would enable such a bureaucrat to conduct witch hunts, star-chamber proceedings, lettres caches, and every other type of unconstitutional indignity upon men and women intent upon serving the Nation.

We have on the statute books laws against treason, espionage, sabotage, advocacy of overthrow of government by force and violence. Perhaps they need strengthening in some particulars. I am anxious to strengthen them, if necessary. But first I want to see existing laws along these lines enforced vigorously, impartially, and fearlessly. I want to see Communists and Communist sympathizers driven out of the Government and out of high places in American political, industrial, educational, and social life. But, in my opinion, we cannot and must not place restraints upon free expression of opinion and belief. Such a course would be to play into the hands of our enemies by negativing the democratic forms and embracing the very totalitarian forms we seek to defeat.

It is estimated by the Department of Justice that it will require at least 4 years to effect the registration of Communists and, of course, many will escape because they will be constantly resigning from the Communist Party, going underground, changing the names of their organizations, and the like. To work this out administratively presents a colossal and impracticable task. I doubt that it can be done at all in any satisfactory way.

This measure would put the Government into the business of thought control and opinion control. It would suppress the free press and the free dissemination of literature so vital to democracy. It would require the Attorney General to deport any alien running a well stocked bookshop containing books on government and economics, politics and sociology written by Spaniards, Yugoslavians, certain South American citizens, and others. In its restriction of Russian literature it would be doing irreparable damage to our own intellectual life and the growth and spread of vital information necessary to an understanding of the purposes, aims, and activities of Marxian communism. To complete the job of tearing down our structure of free thought and free press and free individual activity under the Constitution we should only have to resort to the Hitlerian mass destruction by burning all books and literature emanating from Communist circles, or explaining Communist doctrines. Such a result would be the complete negation of our freedom, and a total surrender to a febrile national hysteria.

There are other provisions concerning naturalization and immigration which I will not discuss in detail but which are equally obnoxious to thoughtful Americans who respect the Constitution.

I hope you will study this bill carefully. If you do so, you will conclude, I think, as I have, that it is one of the most dangerous measures ever presented to the American Congress. I had no choice but to oppose it, and I am very proud that I did, even though I stood alone among the Congressmen from New England.

With usual regards and good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

End Irish Partition Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, to include therein an excellent article on the military implications of the partition of Ireland by Mr. Samuel Crawford. It appeared in the November issue of the Catholic Home Weekly, Ave Maria.

This is a very thoughtful, penetrating analysis of the whole question of partition and it effectively points up the desirability of uniting the Irish now, not only because this is morally, politically, and militarily desirable, but also because it will contribute so much to unified defense of Western Europe.

I hope and urge that our Government will soon take action concerning this vital question and move to impress upon the Government of Great Britain the urgency of establishing unity, amicable relations and wholehearted cooperation between all segments of the Irish people based on democratic principles. Our British friends should be advised that we expect them to cooperate with us in marshalling all our resources and strengthening all our allies in order successfully to oppose the Communist threat to the free world.

It is somewhat inconsistent that the British Government should recognize Red China, whose armed forces are presently slaughtering American boys in Korea, and at the same time refuse to move to unify and strengthen the noble Irish Nation, whose sons and descendants in such overwhelming numbers have stood so gallantly and at such great cost and sacrifice, by the cause of freedom whenever it has been assailed. It is very difficult for Americans to understand the British viewpoint in any event, nor can we understand the viewpoint of many of our so-called friends and allies. They talk ad infinitum in the United Nations about freedom, democracy, and the other attributes of the free way of life. They vote to check aggression and to accept the leadership of American arms in enforcing the decrees and orders of the United Nations but, when the chips are down, and real sacrifices are at hand, they send very little help.

I hope that there will be a change in this attitude and that henceforth we can rely upon Britain and our other friends and allies to join more wholeheartedly with us in our efforts to stem the ominous tides of communism and disruption which are sweeping across the earth. An immediate ending of the partition of Ireland would be an excellent way for them to begin a genuine policy of cooperation and effective support of democratic aims. The above-mentioned article by Mr. Crawford, follows:

THE PARTITION OF IRELAND

(By Samuel Crawford)

In the United States Senate on July 31, Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE advocated American mediation between Ireland and her neighbor, Great Britain. Ireland, the Senator reminded, was an Atlantic nation "possessing strategic terrain and valuable manpower." Senator LODGE declared that the United States "should use its good offices to promote whatever adjustments are necessary between Ireland and Spain and their neighbors, so that they can help the rest of the non-Communist world." In the case of Ireland the problem to be adjusted is, of course, partition, by which six counties of northeast Ireland are cut off from the rest of Ireland and still occupied by Britain.

Let it be noted at once that partition, this source of grave international friction, exists in an area of peculiar sensitivity, an area that, strategically speaking, has been called part of the United States. This global concept of national territory has been enunciated with soldierly directness by the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, Gen. Omar Bradley. He was asked, "What now constitutes the United States of America in defense terms?" "The reply to this question was definite and quotable," says Wythe Williams in the Birmingham (Alabama) News of June 13, 1950. "Here is the reply as outlined by the chairman of the Joint Chiefs:

" 'In defense terms, the United States of America now embraces Japan, the Philippines, Alaska, Greenland, all of North, Central, and South America, the islands of the Caribbean, Western Europe, England, Ireland, and the Azores. Over this vast portion of the world the responsibility of guardianship is now largely in our hands'."

Since the Korean crisis the number of responsible newspaper columnists who have seen the inherent fallaciousness of partition as a solution in Korea has been on the increase. Said Dorothy Thompson in the Evening Star (Washington, D. C.) for July 15, 1950: "We are ostensibly fighting to * * * drive the North Koreans behind the thirty-eighth parallel, thus reestablishing the untenable status quo which made the aggression possible."

For years eminent Catholic churchmen have left no doubt as to where they consider right lies as regards the partition of the historic Irish nation. For example, His Excellency the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston, said in his

cathedral last year: "Ireland is destined to be totally united and completely free. The policy of attempting to divide the Irish nation—the policy of artificially splitting for political purposes a people whom God has united on every other level—is one of the mistakes which all the logic of peace, security, and good order will speedily correct." Again the same archbishop, on August 3 this year, declared: "The Irish people, wherever they may be, are the champions of Christianity in a world menaced by Asiatic communism. * * * The end of partition will bring a breath of hope to enslaved nations everywhere" (Boston, Mass., Herald, August 4, 1950).

Among non-Catholic ecclesiastics a bishop of the German Evangelical Church, Bishop Otto Dibelius, has also brought us back firmly to first principles. Referring to the Korean War, Bishop Dibelius stated at Toronto: "People must realize that it is impossible to divide a nation by unnatural frontiers or an iron curtain. Such a country will always desire to come together again and be united."

The New York Times of July 13, 1950, reported Bishop Dibelius' statement under the opposite captions: "Bishop sees Korea as lesson for UN—Dibelius finds German picture exactly comparable with nation too long divided." It will be ironic if the public in the democratic countries eventually come to realize the evils of the 5-year-long partition in Germany and take steps to reunite it but fail to realize the evils of the 30-year-long partition of Ireland. That would be a strange though not unusual inconsistency.

The sands are running out. We are getting perilously close to the date when world war III will rip across the world like a knife through silk. If the problem of partition is not settled peacefully around the council table while there is time to talk it may be too late to settle it so for a long time. The consequences of continued delay will not be merely paper injustice. At the very best they will be—

1. For the loyal Nationalists of northeast Ireland: continued oppression in the British police state under the British flag;

2. For Ireland as a whole: internal stress and friction with the nearest neighbor, Great Britain;

3. For the western democracies as a whole: the loss of Ireland's cooperation in actual warfare—the absence of a unified Ireland's full cooperation in defense and attack—the lack of what Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE recently called strategic terrain and valuable manpower.

Selective indignation can be very misleading. It is selective indignation which causes so many well-intentioned people to turn a blind eye to tyranny in one place, while campaigning vigorously and with much citing of scripture against tyranny elsewhere. German totalitarianism was vanquished in World War II—with the assistance of Russian totalitarianism. A blind eye was turned in that direction and the obvious lesson regarding Soviet capabilities and intentions was not drawn from the assassination of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. For these other countries were in the Russian sphere of influence. One must not ask awkward questions. And now Russian totalitarianism threatens the world with world war III. The six-county police state with its Special Powers Acts is, forsooth, in the British sphere of influence. Is the attitude of the great democracy of the West (which to its everlasting credit still recognizes diplomatically the countries of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania) to be one of nonintervention so far as Ireland is concerned? Are we just to shrug our shoulders in polite aloofness? Such an attitude is hardly in keeping with the crusading zeal of a great nation which has the will and the way to show practically that it loves justice and hates iniquity.

It may not be out of place to go back to first principles. I have contended that it will make for concord and peace among the nations if Ireland is reunited. Expediency counsels judicious intervention by an honest broker such as the United States, in the interests of world peace. But this should not blind the detached observer to the fact that the case for the unification of Ireland rests also on principle. If a pickpocket swipes John Doe's billfold any honest citizen may possibly chase after him for the sound reason that as long as the criminal is at large he is a general source of trouble to the neighborhood—no one knows whose turn it will be next. But do not blame John Doe if he gets active not on general altruistic grounds but for the particular selfish purpose of getting back his own property. After all, he has a right to his own property in strict justice.

If John Doe impetuously shouts "stop thief," a third party would sound rather ridiculous if he were to buttonhole John Doe and say: "Look here, old chappie, beastly noise that, what. We really don't like people shouting in this neighborhood, you know. What, you say, your billfold was swiped, old man? Too bad, of course, but really you know the chap who took it may be making good use of it, what. But please—no shouting here." If the thief, not a third party, were to try and sell John Doe that line, the latter's feelings can be imagained, but hardly described.

The principle on which Ireland's case for reunion rests is a principle well understood in America, if not always elsewhere. It is the principle of national self-determination. The essence of democracy lies in the right of a people freely to determine how they are to be governed. The unit for self-determination is the nation. Ireland through a nationhood of 2,000 years has that right. Ireland through 700 years of resistance has that right. Partition is the denial of the right to self-determination. It is a refusal to accept the majority will of a people. Abraham Lincoln's words at Indianapolis in February 1861, are pertinent: "On what rightful principle," he asked, "may a State, not being more than one-fiftieth part of the Nation in soil and population, break up the Nation and then coerce a proportionally larger subdivision of itself, in the most arbitrary way? What mysterious right to play tyrant is conferred on a district of a country, with its people, by merely calling it a State?"

Partition was imposed by the British Government with the misguided support of a Tory group in northeast Ireland against the passionate protest of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people. Established by force, it is maintained by force, and by the shameless manipulation, with British connivance of electoral boundaries within the cut-off area. Perpetual interference in a nation's internal affairs by an outside power is contrary to the rule of law among nations. Partition gravely injures economically, politically and culturally, both parts of Ireland.

Counting heads there are roughly two-thirds of the voters in northeast Ulster in favor of partition and one-third in favor of unity so that a change-over of one-sixth of the total electorate plus one man would give a majority for unity. Thus with the present slow and steady turn-over of informed opinion, with the kinsmen of William Orr and Harry Munro and Henry Joy McCracken returning to the allegiance of their republican ancestors of 1798, one might expect that in the foreseeable future the problem would automatically disappear. However, the gerrymandering of the electoral boundaries prevents any such simple solution. As the population in favor of a unified Ireland grows the electoral boundaries are again altered to insure a permanent local majority of members of Parliament opposing the unification of Ireland.

The unnatural manipulation of electoral districts in order to give a facade of respectability to Tory machinations and to insure a permanent parliamentary majority in favor of the British occupation has been brought to a fine art in the six counties. Take County Fermanagh. In all Ireland there are 32 counties. Fermanagh is one of the 30-county block which wants Ireland to be one national entity. Now in Fermanagh at the last general election for the Six County Parliament in February 1949, the Nationalists polled 15,000: they won one seat. The Tories polled 13,000: they won two seats.

Derry city founded by St. Colmcille, is as one might expect, Nationalist by a substantial majority, 29,000 to 18,000. But the resources of civilization were not exhausted. To deprive the Nationalists of the Parliamentary seat, the city electoral division was rearranged. Part of the city was omitted altogether. Then the city boundaries for Parliamentary elections only were stretched 8 miles into the county to gather enough Tory votes to eclipse the Nationalists in the truncated city itself.

The same pattern of gerrymandering appears in the elections to local bodies. In district after district it is made impossible for the Nationalist majority to elect a majority of the local representatives. Tyrone is typical. In Tyrone where the Tories are only 40 percent of the population they polled nearly 66 percent of the representation on the county council.

The detached observer is aware from time to time of an Irish educational program against partition directed at men of good will in countries like the United States where there is a functioning democracy. The detached observer is, however, entitled to ask what are the Irish in Ireland doing about providing a solution for the problem. One reply is this—if the British would just get out the problem would solve itself. There is much truth in this contention. But exactly on what lines would the most probable solution be? The leaders of the greater part of the country are prepared to accept a Federal solution under which the reserved powers at present exercised by London would be transferred to an all-Ireland Parliament, while the Belfast area would retain local autonomy with much the same powers as at present. Such a solution would appear to be not only a reasonable one but a feasible one.

The hand of friendship has been extended by the leaders of Irish-Ireland for many years. On February 9, 1939, the then Taoiseach (Prime Minister) Mr. Eamon de Valera could say in the Unity debate in the Irish Senate, "My hand has been out always and never for one instant, though sometimes we had to put up with a good many rebuffs, did I fail to have my hand out." The responsible Cabinet Minister in the present government, Mr. Sean MacBride, Minister for External Affairs, has stated:

"While we are determined to reestablish the unity of Ireland and to ensure that the will of the Irish people will prevail in their own island without outside interference our fellow countrymen in the six counties have nothing to fear from us. We will guarantee them in a united Ireland complete religious and democratic freedom and are prepared to give them any reasonable safeguards that may be necessary to allay any fears real or imaginary that they may have."

At Downpatrick, County Down, recently Mr. MacBride pointed out that in an All-Ireland Parliament the present Six County Parliament would wield much influence and might well participate in an All-Ireland Government. Mr. MacBride said: "The advent of Six County representatives in an All-Ireland Parliament might well result in a government wherein the present-day partitionists would participate."

It is regrettable that the realism and reasonableness of successive Dublin adminis-

trations have not found an echo in the northeast of Ireland. Free Ireland has no Communist Party and no Communist problem. A strong united Ireland would be a stout shield for the west in the present ideological struggle against atheistic communism. The present set-up of divided Ireland weakens Ireland and weakens the democratic world. Thus the welfare of millions of persons is endangered by the prejudice of a small group of politicians in northeast Ulster and in England. There are times when moral pressure can justifiably be brought to bear on obstinate groups in the interests of whole peoples; and surely this is a case in point.

The Primary Function of Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the reversal our forces have encountered in Korea is as unexpected as it was avoidable. We have had almost 6 months to limit the battlefield, and build up our own advantage. Instead, after winning notable victories, we are suddenly confronted by an overwhelming force of Chinese Communists, who may indeed be able to drive us off the Korean peninsula.

I am not one who cries for anyone's head, or who ventures to blame any one leader, political or military, for the current debacle. I will speak out, however, in support of the air power that could have made our early victories secure, that would have stabilized the situation, and that we still must employ if we are not to go down to defeat in a third world war.

With air power the battlefield can be isolated, and from behind a strong defense line the attack can be carried to the enemy. In Korea, in place of following this doctrine of the proper use of air power, we dispersed our troops, made them vulnerable to Chinese Communist treachery, and abandoned the advantages we had previously gained.

Mr. Speaker, one writer on air power who fully understands the doctrine and proper employment of air power, is Gill Robb Wilson. He is fair, he is objective, and he never confuses the issue. In his column, The Air World, in the December 1 issue of the New York Herald Tribune, Mr. Wilson has written:

> Reams have been written about the use of air power in Korea and principally about close support tactical air power. There is a danger in this which must not go unnoted. The danger is that in enthusiasm for the auxiliary use of air power we forget its primary function and neglect to hew to the principles of that function. * * *
>
> Fundamentally, the genius of American air power is to prevent the necessity of great pitched battles by our armies against overwhelming numbers of Asiatic Communists. Failure to utilize this genius literally brought disaster in North Korea. Kindred failure on future battlefields well might cost the survival of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Gill Robb Wilson's timely warning that we are not only misusing our air power, in which we alone have superiority to the Chinese Communists, but are endangering the future of the entire free world.

The article is as follows:

Measured by American air-power doctrine the campaign in Korea since the Inchon landings has represented earthbound strategy, which if followed in a third world war would assure defeat.

By the criteria of air doctrine the United Nations would have established a strong defense line across the narrow waistline of Korea from Pyongyang to Wonsan. Then from behind this line air power would have been thrown to exploit the area north to the Yalu River and advance made only when air power could assure that it had the situation under relative control

Had Red China elected to advance against the UN defense line through the mountains in winter and in the face of attacking air power her task would have been enormous. Had Red China chosen not to advance she would have been in the field with a vast army to no purpose. In neither case need the UN have modified its stated objective of proceeding ultimately to the Manchurian boundary.

FORCES DISPERSED

However, in place of following the air doctrine of isolation of the battlefield, which was brilliantly accomplished prior to the Inchon landings, the UN forces were dispersed across a battlefield which was not isolated and ran head-on into the Reds from across the Yalu.

No military commander on earth better knows his science than General MacArthur, and no one ever has employed air power better than he.

What accounts for the moves which led to the last fateful situation of UN forces is unknown at this writing. Was it a calculated risk which backfired due to breakdown in intelligence? Was it international political pressure overriding military science? Was it extraordinary ill fortune in weather which disrupted reasoned timetables? Was it incalculable partisan activity such as the Soviets have featured on other battlefields?

Any of these or none or all together may have conspired to produce the end result of disaster. With this we are not concerned. Our concern is that our forces were made vulnerable to Red China treachery of undeclared war because a cardinal doctrine of the function of air power as a primary force was violated.

FORGET PRIMARY FUNCTION

Reams have been written about the use of air power in Korea and principally about close support tactical air power. There is a danger in this which must not go unnoted. The danger is that in enthusiasm for the auxiliary use of air power we forget its primary function and neglect to hew to the principles of that function.

The advantage of close-support aviation as had by our ground forces in Korea would never be had by either side in like degree in a major campaign of a third world war. Our aviation could provide such support in Korea only because it had scant opposition aloft, and did provide it only because the situation was so desperate. Tactical air power in Korea was basically on a rescue mission for most of the campaign prior to Inchon.

Ordinarily, ground forces would not be caught in such desperate straits. If Army commanders get to calling upon air power for such routine use we shall shortly have frittered away our air forces in an auxiliary capacity. This would mean the end of American air supremacy and bring the United States to the dilemma of matching manpower with the Soviet Union.

Fundamentally, the genius of American air power is to prevent the necessity of great pitched battles by our armies against overwhelming numbers of Asiatic Communists. Failure to utilize this genius literally brought disaster in North Korea. Kindred failure on future battlefields well might cost the survival of the free world.

Extension of Aid to Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House to provide $38,000,000 to relieve hunger and starvation in Yugoslavia is one that presents a complexity of thought as a result of the political situation that exists throughout the world today. It makes decision difficult. A vote either for or against the bill is equally open to serious question.

The desire to relieve suffering and hunger is basic and fundamental in our Nation. It has found expression all through our history as a nation. It has been extended to all types and kinds of people. We have never drawn any distinction as to race, color, or creed, nor to the type of government under which the peoples we have helped lived. Human need has been the criterion that has guided our course.

On the other hand our Nation is unalterably opposed to communism. Yugoslavia is a communistic nation and ruled by a dictator. Should our dislike for communism prevail over a desire to extend help to a people in need of food? This is the question presented for decision. For myself I am willing to vote for the bill on the assumption that the need exists and that the moneys will be spent to relieve hunger.

However, there is another element it seems to me that can properly be taken into consideration in making a decision, but it is based on expediency rather than any fundamental principle. I refer to the statement that has been made during the debate that Marshal Tito has 30 to 33 divisions that could be thrown into a war against Russia. Whether this would be done no one can say, but the thought that they might be so used, is based upon the known antagonism that now exists between Tito and Stalin. The most that can be said is that the giving of the relief provided for in this bill is expected to create a friendly feeling upon the part of the Yugoslavian people and its leaders toward our Nation in the event of war with Russia. No one will doubt that we need all the friends we can get from any source. It is my opinion, with this effort to obtain help from Yugoslavia in return for the relief we will extend under the provisions of the pending bill, that it might also be well to take some appropriate action that will insure help to us from Spain and Nationalist China. There is no doubt that both of these are opposed to communism and would be

glad and willing to assist us in the event of war with Russia. It is only a gamble whether help would come to us from Yugoslavia in a conflict with Russia. It is a certainty with respect to Spain and China. Why do we discard or neglect a certainty and accept uncertainty? I hope we will soon adopt a realistic policy in this matter of building up friendships that can be depended upon to stand by our side in the hour of need.

A Plea for National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 14 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on the evening of December 12 I made an address in New York City at a dinner of the Democratic National Committee. My address was a plea for national unity. I called upon both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party to forget about 1952 and to think and act only in terms of the security of our country and the peace of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN BEFORE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE DINNER, TUESDAY EVENING, DECEMBER 12, 1950, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY

I am glad to be here tonight and to see so many old friends.

But tonight is not the time for small pleasantries or small politics. These are times for sober thought, for prayerful reflection. These are times for action, but not for hysteria and not for panic. Ill-considered action could be as dangerous as no action at all. A false step, even a false word, can lead to disaster.

At no time since the founding of our Republic has our country been in greater danger than it is today. The military situation in Korea is still shrouded in doubt. Our thoughts must turn to the gallant military forces of the United Nations, who are so courageously fighting against unprecedented odds. Our hearts and our unending gratitude go out to our valiant soldiers and marines who are seeking to reestablish a stable line of defense against the organized horde of Chinese Communist invaders who so treacherously fell upon them.

No one can, as yet, predict with assurance what the course of battle may be. I hope and pray that the front will be stabilized and that the fighting in Korea will come to an end on terms which we can accept with honor. But it would be the utmost folly under present circumstances not to recognize the critical situation with which we are confronted.

While I have pointed out to you that the immediate situation is shrouded in doubt there are some things that in the past weeks have become abundantly clear.

First, whatever the fortunes of war, it is clear that we will make no dishonorable compromise with an aggressor. To do so would run counter to the spirit of our freedom-loving people. To do so would dash the hopes which we have not yet abandoned of building, through the United Nations, an effective system of collective security.

We cannot compromise the basic cause for which we fight. We cannot compromise the unity of the free world or the principle of respect for the liberties of our sister nations.

Second, we must recognize that the military situation in Korea is only part of our danger. It is only part of our problem. The danger to our national survival, to the cause we fight for, to the cause for which our forces in Korea have made measureless sacrifices, is world-wide. There are imminent threats in Iran, in Indochina, in Malaya, in Burma, in the Philippines, in Germany, in Yugoslavia, and in all of Western Europe. In our concentration on Korea we dare not forget these other threats.

We dare not undertake any action which would split and shatter the unity of the free world, so precariously forged and tempered with the blood of our sons in Korea.

Third, it is clear that Communist Russia has set no limits on its ambitions. And now that it can no longer count on advancing its aim of world dominion through subversion, it is willing to embark on a mad career of flagrant and unprovoked aggression. It makes no difference whether Mao Tse-tung is the puppet or the partner of Marshal Stalin. It makes no difference whether the North Koreans invaded the Peoples Republic of South Korea under orders from Peiping or Moscow. In either event the Kremlin stands publicly branded by its conduct in and out of the United Nations as the spearhead of a conspiracy, aimed at all the values that free men and women everywhere hold dear.

Finally, it is clear that we have now taken the measure of the menace which confronts us. And we shall do whatever may be required to fend it off.

The task ahead will be difficult in the extreme and will require great sacrifices. We would far rather devote our energy and our great industrial capacity to improving the standard of living and the well-being of men and women both at home and abroad. The choice, however, is not of our making. Ruthless men in the Kremlin seem bent upon dragging the civilized world into a holocaust of another war. While we shall continue our struggle for peace in every way open to us we must prepare to meet their challenge of war.

Nothing less than mobilization of our manpower and our resources on a great scale, both militarily and economically, will any longer suffice. The balance of power which has shifted so gravely against the free world must be restored. This is the only way which offers any hope of avoiding a general war. But, more than this, it is the only way of avoiding defeat in case war comes in spite of all of our efforts.

The only things that really count now are the survival of this Nation, the lives of our fighting men overseas, and the freedom and unity of the peace-loving world. We cannot hope to attain these things unless we have unity. Any other course will lead to disaster.

We must demonstrate our determination to preserve the area of freedom and to build it into a bastion from which the cause of freedom may make new advances. This awakening of the United States to a sense of danger and to the need for sacrifice will, I am convinced, prove contagious. As we assume ever more vigorously the leadership of the free world we will find a growing company of ready followers. The nations of Western Europe, in particular, which suffered so bitterly in two World Wars, have been hesitant, as we have been, to face the facts and to draw from the facts the necessary conclusions in terms of action. Surely this is understandable. But I suspect that in measure they have been waiting for us. Without us, their cause was, in any event, lost. With us their cause becomes a hopeful one. By taking stern and formidable measures I am convinced that we shall galvanize the rest of the free world into taking stern and formidable measures as well.

In our idealism we found it hard to believe that any group of men, to satisfy their mad ambitions, would be willing to plunge the world into an orgy of destruction just at a time when the advances in modern technology have made it possible to spread the good things of life over an ever-widening area. In our love of justice we have sought to build a world of justice and of law. We shall continue to do so in and out of the United Nations against a background of constantly growing strength. For there is some slight hope that the Kremlin will have a change of heart when it takes stock of the immense power of the freedom-loving peoples arrayed against it.

But we are now fully awake to the danger which confronts us and we will not by compromise lessen our efforts to strengthen ourselves and our allies and friends abroad. Under these circumstances the outcome can no longer be in doubt. As in the case of every despotism, there are weaknesses in totalitarian Russia which give promise of its ultimate defeat. The structure of a tyrannical government is built upon the unrest and disaffection of most of its subjects. Communism and a foreign dictator were imposed upon the peoples of Eastern Europe. They were never freely accepted. This is a factor of the utmost importance which I believe will assert itself increasingly as the Western World arms. And all history teaches us that in the long run evil must capitulate to good, falsehood to truth, and the minions of a slave state to the spirit of free men on the march.

If we are firm enough and wise enough, we will avoid catastrophe. But a household divided against itself can be neither firm nor wise nor strong. We have the right to expect unity in the free world. But beyond this we have the right to expect—nay, to insist upon—unity in world affairs at home. If ever there was a time to merge our differences in a common cause, that time is now. United in determination as well as in action, our cause and the cause of freedom in the world will prevail.

Unity not only can be achieved, it must be achieved. But it cannot be achieved if one group or another seeks to make political capital out of national danger. It cannot be achieved if we are asked to sacrifice the cause we fight for as the price of unity. It cannot be achieved by insisting on the sacrifice of this official or that official on the public block of unjust and undeserved attack.

And so with all the earnestness of my heart and soul I call upon both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party to forget about 1952 and to think and act only in terms of the security of our country and the peace of the world.

The overwhelming majority of the American people today demand true national unity. Those who do not accede to that demand at whatever cost to personal pride or political prospects will break faith with our people and with the hopes of all mankind.

Make no mistake about this: All the values every man holds dear are more desperately threatened today than at any time in the long history of man's struggle for freedom. Faced with this tragic fact, there must be no question about the manner in which we Americans will conduct ourselves. Marshaled solidly behind the President of the United States, either through peaceful means if this is possible, or by war if this is forced on us, we shall see this thing through to ultimate victory. United in a common cause, our high

purpose of security and peace in the world will win out and we will find our way through this dark day into the light which lies beyond. Divided we face ruin and possibly slavery. May God give us strength and wisdom and faith.

The Rugged Path Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 14 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there appeared in the December issue of National News an article entitled "The Rugged Path Ahead," which was taken from an address by Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, made before the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce. I have read this article, I have found it very interesting, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RUGGED PATH AHEAD

(By Erle Cocke, Jr.)

What I am about to say here may come as a shock to some of you. My purpose is to shock you. My words can serve no better purpose than to wake up all the people.

There are certain grim facts which every American must recognize today as the ABC's of American survival.

Soviet Russia is our deadly enemy.

Soviet Russia is also the deadly enemy of human freedom everywhere.

Soviet Russia is pursuing a master plan for world conquest.

The war lords of Soviet Russia are using communism only as a tool of world enslavement. It is the most effective tool ever used by any dictator, because it the most versatile tool ever invented. It can be made to mean so many different things to so many different classes and masses. That is why communism has been so successful in creating Red fifth columns everywhere. But we must never forget that the driving urge behind communism is Russian imperialism.

Finally, every American must realize that the United Nations cannot save us from the perils of communism. But a strong America can save the United Nations.

Only a strong America—which means an America safe to be with—can serve as the international rallying point for free men and women everywhere in a united and a successful resistance to expanding world communism.

This is the logic behind the American Legion's 1951 peace-through-strength program.

In fighting for American strength for peace by compulsion—and that is the only way in which we can make sure of peace—the American Legion asks:

1. Enactment by Congress without further delay of a universal military training law as the manpower framework of a modern American defense establishment plus immediate total mobilization of our Armed Forces to a full war footing. We need the full draft to meet our immediate peril. We need universal military training for the long pull as the most effective and least costly system of maintaining necessary national preparedness. The American Legion believes we are on the brink of world war III. We believe that only our immediate total mobilization will discourage Communist leaders from starting a total war.

2. Strengthening of our own internal security through the strict enforcement of the new Communist-control law to the end of at least immobilizing every Communist beachhead in the United States. If we are going to have to fight Soviet Russia, we don't want to be faced at the same time with the necessity of fighting a vicious Red fifth column at home.

3. Curtailment or elimination of every possible public and private nonessential expenditure.

From now on national security must have first call upon our national wealth. Our Government must take the lead in drastic reductions in all nondefense costs. Our people must follow the Government's lead.

American dollars must become fighting dollars. They will have no business for a long time to come, jingling as spare cash in individual pockets.

We can never shrink from the cost of the defense of our freedom, however stupendous it may be. The only alternative is life upon our bended knees as slaves of an alien dictator.

It is part of Soviet Russia's master plan to increase the cost of our defense to ruinous proportions in the hope we will spend ourselves into disaster. Joe Stalin is counting on our economic bankruptcy. He believes fondly this is the surest and safest way of destroying America without the firing of one Russian gun by a Russian soldier.

This is a threat which can only be met by American willingness to undergo unprecedented individual and collective sacrifices. The American way of life has always been luxurious. We shall have to settle for an American way of life that can remain free only if it becomes frugal.

This is the rugged path that stretches ahead of all of us. We are facing record taxes, increasing Government controls, and growing civilian shortages. There is no relief in sight. If we escape total war in the immediate future, we shall face years of continuing international tensions and recurring national emergencies. We cannot pass this sternest of all tests of our patriotism on a basis of politics as usual, business as usual, pleasure as usual, and spending as usual. All of us must return to the old-fashioned American virtues of hard work, thrift, and sacrifice. We must not tolerate shirkers in our midst.

There are, I am sorry to say, not only shirkers in America today but actually men who call themselves Americans, and yet who, for a "fast buck," are willing to sell out our country.

I am referring to merchants, brokers, exporters, and shippers who are trading with our enemies. They consider it clever to find loopholes in our laws and in our export-license regulations to carry on commerce with Communist nations. These men may be within the law, but they are traitors to America. They should be dealt with as enemies.

This unscrupulous trading with Red China is particularly perfidious at this time. We are living in fateful hours. Red China has intervened in North Korea. The Kremlin gang's most fervent desire is to embroil us in a large-scale war with Red China. We have nothing to gain in such a war. Russia has everything to gain. We cannot match China's manpower. China is not our real enemy. Soviet Russia is.

An all-out war with China can only bleed us to the point where the big Red Army of Soviet Russia can flatten us like a steamroller. We could kill millions of Chinese and drop A-bombs on Chinese cities. The net result would be that we would only weaken China to make her more amenable to Moscow direction, lose countless precious American lives, spend hundreds of billions of dollars, and deplete our stock of atomic weapons. In the end, if we did win such a war, what would the victory profit us? We'd still have Soviet Russia to deal with.

Red China is only a symptom of world disease. The intelligent approach to any problem and particularly to the problem of survival is to determine the exact cause of the problem and deal with the cause.

The time for that resolute and drastic action has come.

The sooner we serve notice on Soviet Russia that we will not fight any more satellites which she elects to "sick" on us but shall hold Moscow responsible for any further aggression and use all of our strength to destroy the breeding place of world trouble, the better off we will be.

It is useless to make threats unless we can carry them out.

But this is a threat which our survival demands. We must build our strength to make such a threat good. That demands immediate mobilization of our Armed Forces to full war strength; immediate enactment of UMT; a tough policy toward all Communists and traitors at home; and a full realization and patriotic willingness to bear the burden of sacrifice which this "operation survival" requires.

We must condition ourselves for the most savage period in all of our history. But how many of us have given serious thought to the twilight which is descending on our American way of life? How many businessmen have discussed this at lunch—instead of business as usual? How many of our civic, fraternal, professional, business, labor and other groups have pondered the immediate perils that beset us all? How many of us have made our opinions known to our Members of Congress?

Let's make it clear to the world that we are united on a resolute program of peace through strength.

America is a Nation of free Americans. Here the individual counts. We are living in a land of the free because it has always been the home of the brave.

We can keep it that way—all of us together, with God's help. We can do it because the most important part of the word "American" always has been found in the last four letters which spell "I can."

A Serious Hour in the Nation's History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 14 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial written by Dr. George Lang, professor of philosophy at the University of Alabama, and district governor of Rotary for the district of Alabama, addressed to his fellow Rotarians. The letter is captioned "As if," and contains a beautiful and timely message.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS IF

Fellow Rotarians, I have written the November governor's letter as if all were well with the world, as if we were trying to promote our program of vocational service and community progress without let or hindrance in the security of peace and in the confidence of unrestrained purpose.

But all is not well with the world. Time is running short with us. Even before this letter reaches you destiny may have ordained us to a death or life conflict, whether by divine decree or by connection of causes and effects. And the governor's letter may seem, if you read it at all, as but an echo of a distant past when men thought of freedom as an achievement, and of peace as the triumph of modern man's knowledge and will.

But yesterday, we had high hopes of tomorrow's plans for tomorrow was quite certain to come; we rejoiced with those who had reason for rejoicing; we wept with those in sorrow. At our luncheon table but yesterday we held familiar conversation about our town, our city, our Nation; we talked of Christmas and taxes. We observed that we needed playgrounds for the children, parks, schools, and camps. We talked of colleges and churches; of farms and garden plots, of camellias and cotton; of commerce and industry. We sang Old McDonald Had a Farm touchingly, or lifted harmony to heights of perfection in Sweet Adeline; we teased the fellow next to us, and we applauded lustily for the speech of the day not remembering what the speech was about; we knew that all was well with the world and we were on top of it.

And in the evening we turned homeward from desk or shop to the family circle; rest, and the benediction of comfort, the protection of government, the security of the freedoms that proclaimed the worth of the individual and the dignity of man. We reflected that we had much to be thankful for.

Was it just yesterday? And is it not true today? And why so serious as you look at your son or neighbor's son, saying:

"Not in all our history as a Nation and a Republic (how precious that word "Republic" sounds just now); have we faced so serious an hour. All that we prize as values in our social organization is threatened with extinction. The foundations are shaken."

Yes; emotions will spring forth to put nervous thoughts into nervous language. Somewhat of fear will possess us. We are human enough to want to blame someone at a distance for the mess. It was the brass hats, the Government, the British, and I know not what enemy sowed the seed of our disaster as fancy weaves its fabric of rationalization.

But the hour is serious. It is no time to behave like children playing in the street. We must not let the child's mind tell us what is in our environment; we must think with the mind of maturity, with a man's mind. For the child, being a child, without reproach, falsifies its environment; it makes the environment unreal; it does not see things as they are. As men we must put away childish things and see our world realistically.

We are not hopeless, nor yet in despair. The Russians and the Chinese have miscalculated though we have underestimated them as foes. For if war must come these enemies of human decency will meet liberty-loving freemen from all the corners of the earth, not less American freemen, who love liberty more than life itself, men who will fight to the death for the land of their birth and upbringing, and for their institutions. Hear again the voice of Winston Churchill and take courage:

"The uniform success which had attended their arms (the Japanese), had inflamed their martial spirit, and began now to engender a mood of unwarranted exaltation, and a belief that the Western Powers had not the will to fight to the death. This belief was soon to cost them dear."—The Hinge of Fate.

Whence had the Western Powers this will? Let Wordsworth answer:

"Thou hast great allies;
Thy friends are exultations, agonies;
And love, and man's unconquerable mind."

Very cordially,

GEORGE LANG,
District Governor, 238.

Mr. Acheson's Troubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 14 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Mr. Acheson's Troubles," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post this morning. It is a very thought-provoking article, and I am asking that it be printed in the RECORD in order that others may read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. ACHESON'S TROUBLES

(By Walter Lippmann)

If and when the President decides to reorganize his Cabinet, the new Secretary of State will do well to examine the great reason why Mr. Acheson lost the confidence of the people.

That reason is, so it seems to me, that Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson chose not to face candidly, not to debate openly, and not to make Congress and the people judge decisively the great issues of foreign policy which arise out of our conflicting interests in Asia and in Europe. Honorable men can and do differ on these issues. But though there is much to be said on both sides, a choice and decisions which follow from it have to be made. All the choices before us are hard ones. In all of them the risks are great and for all of them many of the consequences are incalculable.

If ever the Nation needed, if ever its responsible leaders needed, the clarification and the assurance that can be had in this country only from thorough and honest debate, it is here.

But what actually happened was that Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson chose to finagle the issues rather than to face them and to decide them. They refused to argue it out openly with Senator KNOWLAND and the others of his party.

They tried instead to smother the dispute by conceding bits and pieces here and there when the heat became too great, hoping that somehow they could "fob" off the opposition without adopting its policy.

As one might well have foreseen, as indeed Mr. Acheson was warned in ample time by disinterested and friendly observers, the result of the finagling was to infuriate and not to placate the opposition. Holding their convictions passionately, the attempt to deal with them cleverly rather than openly lent enormous support to the false and malicious charges against Mr. Acheson and the State Department. For the performance in respect to China and Formosa was sufficiently insincere to make it plausible to many people that this must be due to hidden and secret sinister influences.

The insincerity was not due to sinister and hidden influences. It was due to the fact that Mr. Truman, who is a professional politician, and Mr. Acheson, who is an amateur politician, tried to play politics with a question of the highest national significance. They sought to deal with General MacArthur and Senator KNOWLAND and the Republicans in Congress as if a great issue in foreign policy were like an appropriation or a tariff bill that could be compromised and logrolled. This, I submit, is the cause of Mr. Acheson's troubles. Thus it may be possible to satisfy Senator KNOWLAND on an appropriation bill—to take an imaginary example—by conceding to him so many post offices in California. But, given his convictions, which are ardent and sincere, you will insult him rather than satisfy him with the equivalent of two or three post offices on Formosa for Chiang Kai-shek.

In foreign affairs when the stakes are life and death the attempt to make policy by the method of the pork barrel will lead—as indeed it has, though not yet irreparably—to disaster abroad and to disunity at home. The Truman-Acheson course in the Far East has combined the worst features of the two conflicting policies and it has gained none of the advantages of either. They have continued to recognize Chiang—though they have disowned him. They are negotiating with Mao—though they do not recognize him. They will not let Mao into the UN—but Mr. Wu is sitting in the Security Council debating with Mr. Austin and negotiating with delegates of a very large number of nations in the UN.

In this attempt to placate everybody at home a little, they have lost the confidence of almost everybody. And so while the attack from the opposition continues to be fierce and unrelenting, their supporters continue to be silent.

It is impossible, I believe, for Mr. Acheson to repair his fundamental mistake which was his refusal to confide in the people—his refusal to debate the great issue, and if his real views could not command general support in Congress, his failure to resign. The position he has been in since last winter has been terrifying to contemplate—that of the principal adviser to a President who has little knowledge of his own in these matters, and himself so vulnerable that the problem of dealing with his domestic critics must dominate his judgment of the problems abroad.

The mere possibility, which can never be wholly excluded from the minds of people who know what's what here and abroad, that the gravest decisions might be dictated in part by the need to placate his critics, are shattering to the nerves of an ever-increasing number.

The initial mistake is for him irreparable in that no man can win back the confidence of the people, once in great matters that must have their assent he has failed to confide in them.

The new Secretary of State will have to go back to the people and he will have to earn their support, not for himself but for a coherent policy which is designed, is measured, and is tailored to defend with the means which we can command the vital interests of the country. There is no use his thinking, no matter how eminent and popular he may be at the outset, that he can form such a policy or unite the Nation behind him if what he offers them is a little of everything that seems to have votes behind it.

Investigation of Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 14 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement prepared by me regarding the assistance the American Bar Association is rendering in combating organized crime.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION HELPS COMBAT ORGANIZED CRIME

I wish to call your attention to the assistance extended to the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce by the American Bar Association.

During the last meeting of the American Bar Association here in Washington I had the pleasure of addressing the section on criminal law. The meeting was devoted to a discussion of the menace of organized crime. The Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, and the distinguished Governor of Illinois, the Honorable Adlai Stevenson, also addressed the meeting. The speeches of these gentlemen, as well as my own, and the introductory remarks of the chairman of the section, Mr. Arthur J. Freund of St. Louis, were inserted in the RECORD of September 19, 1950. During the course of my remarks I indicated that our committee would welcome the help of that section and the members of the bar generally. In response the following action was taken by the board of governors:

"The board of governors recommends to the house of delegates the appointment of a commission of seven members to cooperate with the Special Committee of the United States Senate to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce in making a study on the subject of the need for modernization of rules, procedure and practices in the field of criminal law, the steps which are being taken to codify and bring up to date criminal codes, the efforts which are being made to plug loopholes in criminal procedures and eliminate outmoded and archaic practices and procedures whereby violators of the law escape prosecution, the adequacy or inadequacy of public offenders acts, the methods of and practices in sentencing, the tendency on the part of the legal profession to withdraw from the practice of criminal law, together with the reasons therefor, etc. Upon this commission there are to be represented the section of bar activities, the conference of bar presidents, the national conference of commissioners on uniform State laws, the section of judicial administration, the junior bar conference, the section of criminal law and the conference of chief justices. Each of these sections or groups which are asked to cooperate should be requested to give their full cooperation in manpower and assistance in the work of the commission.

"The commission is to employ such executive secretary as they desire, and there shall be given to the president and the chairman of the commission authority to solicit funds for carrying on the work from such foundation as they jointly approve."

The foregoing recommendation was approved by the American Bar Association and the following commission has been appointed by its president:

Robert P. Patterson, chairman, 1 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y.; Howard L. Barkdull, Union Commerce Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio; Philip S. Habermann, Wisconsin Bar Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison 3, Wis.; Bolitha J. Laws, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Washington 1, D. C.; Walter P. Armstrong, Jr., Commerce Title Building, Memphis 3, Tenn.; Arthur J. Freund, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis 1, Mo.; Laurance M. Hyde, Supreme Court Building, Jefferson City, Mo. Advisory member: James V. Bennett, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, Washington 25, D. C.

The above commission held its first meeting in my office on October 27, and discussed plans for its future activities.

It is a source of considerable gratification to our committee to have the cooperation of this distinguished commission. We feel certain that the commission and members of the bar generally will have a number of useful suggestions for our committee. In addition, we hope that all the various State and local bar associations will be advised of the work of this commission and submit any suggestions or comments they may have which might further the work of the Committee on Organized Crime. Our hearings and investigations up to date have developed a number of interesting problems on which we would like to have the views of lawyers, judges, and law enforcement agencies, as well as private organizations devoted to the study of prevention of crime and delinquency and allied problems. Our committee will certainly be happy to give any such studies and suggestions the most careful consideration.

Citizens' Pensions: An American Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 14 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Emily Cuyler Hammond entitled "Citizens' Pensions: An American Plan," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, September 30, 1950.

This article discusses in some detail the defects of our present system of social security, and also mentions briefly the alternative plan which I proposed, which would provide universal eligibility to all the aged with insufficient incomes, and at only a moderate cost in taxation to the economy as a whole.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENS' PENSIONS: AN AMERICAN PLAN—SENATOR BUTLER PROPOSES SYSTEM WHICH WOULD GIVE PROTECTION TO RICH AND POOR ALIKE

(By Emily C. Hammond)

Social security has been the New Deal trump card and the Republicans' bugaboo for 15 years. The New Deal aparently gave the voters their hearts' desire: The golden guaranty of individual security in old age. And the voters were grateful for the blessings to come. What could the Republicans do? How could they offer more? They could not depreciate the value of security. They certainly could not shoot Santa Claus. So they went along.

Accordingly, a sinister old racket crept into American politics to take the place of free beer before elections. The Romans had a name for it: Bread and circuses. Bismarck added a new wrinkle. He taxed the people to give them the feeling they were paying for the crumbs he tossed them, and called it social insurance. President Roosevelt imported Bismarck's idea from the Weimar welfare republic and rechristened it social security. But by whatever name, it is a political bribe, pure and simple. It is the stock in trade of the welfare state, but it is not social and it is most definitely not security.

Public charity in the guise of the federally aided, State administered old-age assistance programs has not decreased as was expected but, even taking into consideration population growth, has increased by leaps and bounds. Stimulated by free Federal money, it has gone up from a total of 107,000 persons in 1933 to 2,760,000 in 1949, or an increase of 2,480 percent.

Thus today out of 11,500,000 men and women over 65, around 3,000,000 technically unqualified for insurance are receiving old-age assistance—that very public charity from which we were struggling to emancipate ourselves. Only about 2,000,000 are receiving old-age and survivors insurance as a right. Of these, some 250,000 are receiving supplementary old-age assistance after going through the mill of the means test because their insurance is insufficient.

The social security amendments of 1950, as they passed the Senate, still neglect millions of Americans, particularly the most needy. Old-age and survivors insurance rights continue to be denied not only to around 9,000,000 of the present aged but to between 15,000,000 and 20,000,000 gainfully employed workers, including those most likely to be in need in the future such as marginal domestic servants, migratory farm labor and sharecroppers. That adds up to between 25,000,000 and 30,000,000 forgotten votes—enough to swing an election.

Everybody is for security—let there be no mistake. If the handout statists had succeeded in giving true security, the Republicans' worst fears would undoubtedly be realized. The Democrats would be in the White House forever.

However, there is a wide divergence of opinion as to the wisdom and ethics of how it should be attained. Also, the complexities of the Social Security Act are such that few understand its economic unsoundness, its capricious formulas or its consequent innumerable injustices, much less how it will work for them personally.

People confidently expect at 65 to receive the promised pension. It never occurs to them that calamity might befall them, that they might be taken ill and be unable to continue to work in covered employment the full prescribed number of quarters and so be ineligible for benefits. They think security means that Uncle Sam will take care of them no matter what happens. Many are apt to take social security so much for granted that they make no provisions whatsoever for security themselves and continue in old age to cheat on charity.

The high-salaried cynics know full well that their social-security taxes are too small to buy annuities on an actuarial basis unless they pay these taxes during their whole working lives. They realize that the employer's contribution is passed on to the consumer in higher prices and it is the public at large that pays the employer's half of the bill. Nevertheless, they shrug and say, "We're on the road to socialism anyway, why shouldn't I take my share of the loot?"

The lower wage earners for the most part learn the hard way either through their own experience or that of someone near to them,

that social security for them was an empty promise. They see old folks in need receiving too little or nothing because of some incomprehensible technicality. Their reaction is one of disappointment, bewilderment, or bitter disillusionment.

This is not to say that nobody gets anything out of social security. Actually it is a vast, federally operated slot machine at which you must pay for the privilege of earning a living in most employments, whether you like it or not. If you are lucky, you may hit the jackpot. If you are unlucky you will lose everything you put in.

The Democrats and the Republicans alike of this Eighty-first Congress have really outdone themselves in an effort to make the game attractive. Old-age and survivors insurance coverage has been extended to some 10,000,000 formerly excluded individuals; benefits have been increased between 85 and 110 percent, and eligibility has been tremendously liberalized. Any one 65 years old or over today is qualified for old-age and survivors insurance benefits if he or she has a credit of six calendar quarters—3-month periods—in covered employment.

While 9,000,000 of the present aged remain beyond the scope of social security, a few lucky ones who have had the coveted six quarters are chosen to be taken within the fold. While marginal domestic servants, migratory farm laborers, and sharecroppers are out, some of the richest men and women in the country, among other self-employed, are chosen to be in. While benefits in the lower wager groups are raised from $10 to only $20, benefits for the higher salaried people shoot up from $45 to $80—whether the recipients need it or not. Under what is called the new start, however, every one over 62 years of age in covered employment on the effective day of the law can make a killing whether his wages be high or low.

A farmer, for instance, can work as a farm hand for a neighbor for a year and a half at $17 a month, pay a total social-security tax of $4.50, retire at 65 to work on his own farm and draw $20 a month for life. If his wife is the same age, the two of them, with the normal life expectancies, can hope for a total of $4,826. Of course, "that ain't hay" for only $4.50; but the indisputable bonanza is for the high-salaried professionals.

For instance, a self-employed lawyer of 62 or over can, under the new law, take a $30,000-a-year job with a corporation; work for a year and a half; pay a total of $81 in social-security taxes; quit to return to his private law practice and, after 65, collect $80 a month from the Government for life. If his wife is 10 years his junior, and he lives to be eighty-five and his wife to be eighty-six, their combined prize will amount to $31,920. This one is a handout in anybody's language. It has neither actuarial base nor sociological excuse.

At the same time, Uncle Sam's giant slot machine which awards such windfalls to some is rigged against youth. The youth of today, who will pay social-security taxes at a mounting rate during all of their working lives, could do as well or better by buying a policy from a private insurance company. And the youth of tomorrow will be burdened by back-breaking taxation. It is estimated that the system will cost $2,082,000,000 in 1951 and mount to $10,919,000,000 by the year 2000.

The Eighty-first Congress really tried to discover a formula that would protect the excluded 25,000,000. It failed dismally for two reasons: First, because old-age and survivors insurance tied to the payroll tax, was designed to give security to regular wage earners, not to the people as a whole. Second, because at the present scale of jackpots for the wealthy and consolation prizes for the needy, if every one were covered, the expense would be prohibitive. No politician would dare ask for the taxes involved.

It is for these two reasons that the demand is growing for a new approach. Senator TAFT has called the present system a fake, certainly not insurance, and unfair to millions of worthy American citizens. He voted, he said, for the amendments merely as a temporary measure until a universal, pay-as-you-go system could be perfected. Senator MILLIKIN and a number of other Republicans have said virtually the same thing. Southern Democrats voice similar sentiments in private.

In the House Ways and Means Committee, Representative CARL CURTIS wrote a scathing minority report tearing the present system to shreds and demanding study of pay-as-you-go.

In the Senate Finance Committee, Senator HUGH BUTLER wrote the minority report and offered a concrete, constructive program of his own.

Senator BUTLER proposes to scrap the present dual old-age and survivors insurance-pauper's assistance system and substitute a universal pay-as-you-go citizens' pension plan, which would give protection to all Americans, rich and poor alike, but pay benefits only to those whose incomes drop below a given minimum.

Citizens' pensions would be administered without the abhorred means test. Through the mechanism of the income tax, if an individual 65 or over estimated his income for the year ahead at $600 or less, he would receive a citizens' pension of $50 a month. For every $50 more of annual income, the citizen's pension would be reduced by $1 a month, so that at about $3,000 it would taper off altogether.

The program would be supported by an income tax of about 3 percent on the first $3,000 of income—instead of the present payroll tax and sundry other hidden taxes—earmarked for old-age security to secure pay-as-you-go economic soundness. It is estimated by Mr. George Immerwahr, former chief actuary of old-age and survivors insurance that this would effect an ultimate saving of $5,000,000,000 a year over the present system.

Thus, says Senator BUTLER, "the important problem of old-age protection would be solved in a manner that would neither bankrupt the Nation nor humiliate the recipients."

Such a program as this would be American as opposed to the carbon copy of the German system that brought the German people to their knees. It would be democratic, nondiscriminatory, and just.

Whosoever accepts the challenge and adopts a platform of true security can count on 25,000,000 forgotten votes and really go to Washington. Whether the Republicans seize this opportunity or a constitutional coalition of all opposed to the hand-out state, it better be soon, before more of our American aged suffer insecurity, and our American economy cracks from the burden of unnecessary hand-outs.

The United States Air Force in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 14 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have before me an article written by a native South Carolinian, Ansel E. Talbert, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Monday, December 11, 1950. Mr. Talbert is chief of the New York Herald Tribune bureau in Tokyo, and is president of the Aviation Writers Association of North America. During World War II he held the rank of lieutenant colonel, and served with the Eighth Air Force. His account of our Air Force in Korea is very interesting. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THUNDERJET GOES INTO ACTION ON KOREA FRONT—UNITED STATES PLANES RAIN ROCKETS ON FOE—CREWS LIVE IN TENTS AT KOREAN AIRFIELD

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

WITH A JET AIRCRAFT GROUP IN KOREA, December 10.—The United States Air Force today, for the first time, threw its most heavily armed jet fighter, the F–84 Thunderjet, into combat in Korea to aid the embattled United Nations ground forces in their attempt to establish a firm new defense line.

The Thunderjets struck with rockets and bombs at the Communist troops along the battle line. Although reports from the ground front were anything but encouraging, there were no signs of defeatism or discouragement today at the snow-swept air base from which the recently arrived Thunderjets are being serviced and operated.

The constant whine of powerful jet engines being run at full throttle in the cold winter air was intermingled all day with sounds of hammering as Americans and Koreans rushed construction of new buildings. The group's personnel for the most part are living in winterized tents and accomplishing maintenance and repair at open parking strips in defiance of below-freezing temperatures.

The Thunderjet is a sleek but sturdy monoplane powered by a single turbo-jet engine. It has a speed in excess of 600 miles an hour and a much longer range and combat radius of action than any other jet fighter in squadron service with the Air Force. The plane can be loaded with as many as 32 5-inch rockets for attacks on tank and transport columns, and the rocket mounts retract into the wings after the rockets are fired.

F–80'S USED PREVIOUSLY

Until today the F–80 Shooting Star, the first jet plane ever purchased in quantity by the Air Force, has been the only jet used by the Air Force in Korea, although the Navy has been operating Panther jet fighters from its aircraft carriers.

By a stroke of bad luck, the F–84's were grounded by a minor engineering "bug" at bases in the United States just before the Korean war started. This defect has been corrected, and the Thunderjets are now being turned out in large numbers by the Republic Aircraft Co., of Farmingdale, Long Island. The number at this base will be more than quadrupled within the next few days.

A joint effort by the Air Force and the Navy brought the first Thunderjets to Korea. The planes in this new task group are from the Twenty-seventh Fighter Escort Wing, based at Bergstrom Field, near Austin, Tex. The wing, part of the Strategic Air Command, is commanded by Col. Ashley B. Packard, of Douglas, Ariz.

Colonel Packard received orders to proceed to Korea almost exactly 1 month ago. His pilots flew their planes to San Diego and they were loaded on fast Navy aircraft carriers which immediately started across the Pacific at forced draft. The pilots and ground crews were ferried to Japan by the Military Air Transport Service.

TEXAS FLAG FLIES

Preparation of the Thunderjets for action was begun as soon as they arrived on Decem-

ber 5. The first Thunderjets were flown from Japan to this Korean base, from which present operations are being conducted, and they have been over the enemy lines on test flights since the day they first arrived.

The Twenty-seventh Fighter Escort Wing officially has been made a part of the armed forces of the State of Texas, and the Lone Star flag flies at all flagpoles at this base, together with the Stars and Stripes and the blue banner of the UN. High-heeled Texan cattlemen's boots are much in evidence among the group's "jet jockeys."

These men include veterans of the American Eagle Squadron of the Royal Air Force that fought during the Battle of Britain and of the Royal Canadian Air Force which at one period before America's entry into World War II had more Texans in its ranks than did the United States Air Force. Almost all the crack Air Force units from both the European and Pacific theaters of World War II are represented.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 14 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter I have received from Arlo I. Pierce, commander of Emerson-Hovey Post, No. 168, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Portsmouth, N. H., enclosing a communication of the post to President Truman. I ask that the communication to the President also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

EMERSON-HOVEY POST, No. 168,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Portsmouth, N. H., December 8, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: We, the members of the Emerson-Hovey Post, No. 168, VFW, in meeting duly assembled, take cognizance of a motion of a brother post, Concord Post, No. 1631, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and by motion of our local post endorse wholeheartedly the action of the Concord Post, and wish our chosen representatives in the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives made aware of our sentiments. Enclosed is a copy of the Concord Post's letter to President Truman which expresses our sentiments.

We request that the chairmen of the Foreign Relations Committees in the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate, and the chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces be advised of our sentiments.

We shall be very grateful for your personal acknowledgment of this letter.

Respectfully yours,

ARLO I. PIERCE,
Commander.

"HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The President of the United States of America, The White House, Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the members of Concord Post, No. 1631, VFW, in meeting duly assembled, take notice of the following facts and wish you to know how we and millions of others feel about current world problems.

"1. We recognize our duty to God and country.

"2. We realize we are living in trying times.

"3. We love peace and we know we are not enjoying it.

"4. We know our duty to our fighting men.

"5. We do not want one American, or friendly person, needlessly sacrificed.

"6. We trust you realize 'friendly person' does not include those who might only qualify under technical and diplomatic terminology.

"7. We do not like the expression 'anything short of war.'

"8. We have all served our country in foreign areas in the past, and would, if necessary, do it again.

"9. We remember efforts at appeasement, compromise, and expediency, and we dislike them all. To compromise with evil is evil.

"10. We feel we have been lulled into complacency, and we don't like it.

"11. We hate to see Uncle Sam taking so much nonsense from 'Uncle Joe.'

"12. We still believe 'fear itself is the only thing to fear.'

"13. We still like the expression 'liberty or death.'

"14. We believe our leaders in the field must have and deserve our complete support.

"15. We believe a 1-week tour of duty for our diplomats, bearing arms in a front-line assignment with orders to hold their fire, would be impressive.

"16. We know no peaceful nation will ever willingly say they desire or are ready for war.

"17. We know many weak nations fear the bully when they consider facing him alone.

"18. We believe every nation that dislikes 'Uncle Joe's' tactics is worthy of our friendship.

"19. We feel a lot of weak nations will survive if they have the will to live.

"20. We have helped a number of nations with their problems and we do not believe that the party helped should dictate our policy.

"21. We cannot conceive of cooperation as a unilateral affair.

"22. We place a high value on our American ideals and human life, but such values should not be permitted to encourage a real or potential enemy.

"23. We know it would be naive to believe 'Uncle Joe' was not calling the shots in every troubled area.

"24. We realize that the Russian Government hates God and the United States of America.

"25. We know we intend to keep what we have, and we are not looking for anything except honorable peace in the world.

"26. We know 'Uncle Joe' wants every material thing we possess.

"27. We know 'Uncle Joe' will take what he wants when he is ready to do so.

"28. We think 'Uncle Joe' hasn't mentioned all of his problems.

"29. We know 'Uncle Joe' hates the truth and will seldom be guilty of using it.

"30. We believe a threatened punch in the nose is the only language a 'bully' respects or understands, and then only if he feels it might be delivered.

"31. We do believe the A-bomb is a valuable possession.

"32. We believe 'Uncle Joe' shares our opinion but not our stockpile.

"33. We feel 'Uncle Joe' knows we have his address.

"34. We would convince 'Uncle Joe' we like action rather than words.

"35. We think it foolish to lead 'Uncle Joe' or his hirelings to believe we would not make tactical use of the bomb.

"36. We believe 'Peace on earth and good will to men' might be attainable if 'Uncle Joe' were told we can and might postmark objects in our possession for delivery in Russia.

"37. We dislike being sold 'down river' in an exchange of pretty words while the 'guts' of men are being exposed in Korea.

"38. We consider 'honey' and 'sugar coating' and 'salve' and platitude are poor taste.

"39. We believe 'guts' on the home front are as becoming to character as they are to those risking their all in combat.

"40. We request a display of 'guts' on the part of our policy makers that will convince our fighting men that they do not fight in vain.

"41. We pray God will send courage and wisdom to our leaders regardless of party labels.

"(This communication to President Truman sent by telegram December 4, 1950.)"

The Truman-Attlee Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 14 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors of the resolution referred to in an editorial published in the Washington Daily News on December 7, 1950, I am gratified to note the editorial support of the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Daily News editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE'S VOICE

A resolution introduced by 20 Republican Senators cautions President Truman to undertake no commitments with Britain, which are not subject to Senate review in treaty form. This is a proper assertion of the Senate's right to a voice in the conduct of foreign relations.

During World War II President Roosevelt drifted into the bad habit of negotiating with other governments on a personal basis in a manner certainly never contemplated by the Constitution. He not only neglected to seek the "advice and consent" of the Senate, but he also often bypassed his own State Department as well.

The agreements made at Cairo, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam included political commitments which were in no sense essential to conduct of the war and were clear evasions of the Senate's right to share the treaty-making power with the President.

This secret diplomacy has continued to operate since the war, to the practical exclusion of Congress, particularly in the Far East.

We may be dealing with a question of life or death and in a representative democracy the people have a right to know what is going on. Then, if they are not satisfied with the measures being taken, they can suggest alternatives.

If the President expects to have public confidence, he must take the people into his confidence and conduct our international relations in the manner provided by the supreme law of the land.

Destroy Human Ambitions and the Incentive To Produce, and You Destroy America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Eighty-second Congress is already behind the eight ball. I do not believe that at any time previous during the last 75 years has a new Congress faced a public with any more questions in its public mind than does the Eighty-second Congress. Unless the tide is changed; unless the course which we have been traveling is changed; unless the administration and the Congress obtains a better grasp of the affairs of this country, I shall not be at all surprised to see one of the greatest political revolutions—and by this I mean a revolt at the voting booth—ever seen in this country in the 1952 election. Personally, I am more interested in having this form of government of ours and the liberty of our citizens and the institutions we have constructed preserved, than I am to see a great political revolution. Mr. E. F. Hutton, of New York City, has issued a timely and constructive statement which I now submit for the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Hutton addressed his remarks to the Eighty-second Congress. Mr. Hutton's address follows:

Gentlemen, I have been watching the passing show without bitterness, but with a keen sense of apprehension and sadness—the trend to socialism. I have read and listened to many Government professors—expert economists, intellectualists—in language and written statements—far afield from our way of life and constitutional law, far afield from that which God gave to our Republic, which is truly the fruits of the inventive, venturous, and valorous minds of productive men.

This country was sired, conceived, and birthed as a republic, not as a democracy. He created man for His purposes—to be free and to be of service to his fellow man. God created man for the purpose of the political state, says socialism—which means, "I am their goods and chattel. You, the state, are all there is."

Socialism is the outstanding issue of the day. You, men of the House and Senate, elected to administer our laws, should explain just what it will do to our citizens and not for them. One's judgment is no better than his information.

Would you, gentlemen, like to be socialized—become hired hands of Government, and your rights, as lawmakers, destroyed? Such would be the fate of our institute of medicine, including dentists.

Let it never be said that our Eighty-second Congress surrendered its prerogative—"the right to be right"—to any other branch of Government. Power usurped is never voluntarily reinstated.

Thomas Jefferson had the vision to anticipate what could happen. Read the words: "A single step taken beyond the boundaries specifically drawn around the powers of Congress is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible to any definition."

The laws of the United States are the framework of your duties. These laws are made by the legislative branch, enforced and carried out by the executive branch, inspected and interpreted by the judiciary branch. That is how it should be, according to our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Reviewing the past, it would seem that "all men are not angels," including those outside of Government. The greed for dollars has eclipsed the mighty spiritual value of God. It is well we think and revalue life as it is today.

In my book, there are, in the House and Senate, a host of men of integrity—both Democrats and Republicans—worthy of the name, and well fitted to administer our way of life, based upon constitutional law, who believe in Government by law, not by decree, who believe in the reclamation by the Congress of the powers constitutionally vested in the Congress, and who are against administrative bureaucracy, directives, and decrees—quasi judiciary—which is attempting to become the ultimate lawgiver.

You, gentlemen, of the House and Senate—Republicans and Democrats—realize that all freedoms, material and spiritual, reside within our Constitution and Bill of Rights. This priceless possession should not be in the hands of any executive, administrator, committee, bureau or department, whether under a Republican or Democratic administration.

Our American risk capital system made possible the growth and the wealth of this Nation, composed of all kinds of business activities. Our young Nation of free people filed intention of going into business with the Declaration of Independence. Our corporate charter is the Constitution and Bill of Rights. Its basic products are liberty and freedom for all people. So the tally board of assets and liabilities in our own history must be proof of the wisdom of freedom—our way of life.

Why change our form of government to a mandate to socialize America—which means political control by bureaucracy of our business activities. To socialize industry, is to cripple industry in order to expand socialism.

Surely you gentlemen fully realize the incentive to produce made possible the system that produces more and more goods, at less and less cost, so that more and more people can buy them. That's America. Destroy human ambitions and the incentive to produce, and you destroy America. That is a simple truth and one cannot, by calculus, trigonometry or algebra, prove otherwise. The incentive for free production by free people is so vital that if destroyed America is finished.

The answer is in the hands of the Senate and House—you, gentlemen, who are the guardians, trustees, and administrators of the future destiny of America, under constitutional law. Keep the people free, and we will produce as free people, fight as free people—rather than as vassals of the state. Protect any further whittling away of the charter of freedom, according to your sworn oath of office.

"I, ———, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me, God."

That being your oath, you men should demand government by law and oppose government by and through bureaucracy. Keep alive and vigorous our risk capitalistic system—the incentive to produce and buy and sell in competitive, free markets, which makes possible the tax milk to support government. Kill it and government becomes your employer. Then human ambitions become stultified and retard the future. Then administrative bureaucracy pulls the strings and we bounce like puppets in a Punch and Judy show—those who pull the strings are hidden behind the curtain. Then proud and strong men become cringing beggars. Then and only then they destroy the incentive to produce. We, the people, become employees of the state. Then and only then, we in America will have a dictator. Some one man's tongue becomes the law. God forbid that day shall ever come—when as General Eisenhower states: "One thing we must fear—the decay of our freedom through our own neglect. * * * By every step we take toward making the state the caretaker of our lives, by that much we move toward making the state our master."

I am only an amateur. I do not presume to be an expert economist, political scientist, or attorney at law. I don't profess to know it all. I am certainly not a writer. I am just a businessman; but my thoughts and heart are more wrapped up in America than in business in these times. That is why I feel impelled to say to you, "There must be others in America who think and feel as I do and want to do what I am doing here. Speak up without fear of reprisal. Do the best you can with your thoughts. Become articulate." They say silence is golden. Today silence is cowardly and suicidal. And that's all there is to it.

Our National Leadership Is Weak and Uncertain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my desk an article the author of which I do not know. This article is pointed and well-written. While I do not approve of every sentence in this article, I do approve of most of it, and I think it would be interesting to the readers of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article is as follows:

THE FUTURE DIMLY SEEN

The dismay in America is historic today. We can go to few dates in our history which compare with it. We have a feeling that we have created the present crisis by abject blunders, by neglect of normal prudence. Our leaders have not been tough enough. They have not looked at our ultimate and possibly final enemy with clear, masculine eyes.

Someone, some group, will pay. It is the way of the world to seek retribution. This, despite the fact that the Russians have telegraphed their intentions since 1917. World conquest was on their agenda more than 30 years ago, and still is. The enemy has builded strongly for a bid toward the world domination he seeks. The hour is approaching—12 o'clock is near in our chronicles—when the great test will be made. It will probably come sooner than later. The American people know this. They are years ahead of their Government. They are at the ground level, and their bitterness is growing.

No solitary blame can attach itself to Mr. Truman, as President, but the leftish liberals and the clever intelligensia will soon suffer. The disaster in Korea will transform itself into more strength—and a profound reassessment of American values. America will return to the ways of strong men and women either in a victory over Russia in the field, or in the underground after defeat.

We can lose world war III. As a matter of fact, we are probably in a far more perilous position with the unified despotism of China spreading over Asia and the Pacific. Russia can turn the 450,000,000 Chinese into a scourge worse than the Huns, and probably cannot stop them once they are started.

America will return to Spartan times, either before victory or after defeat. The future holds little in store for present values, for the loose moral tone and the license permitted in the name of liberty. Character and not cleverness must finally prevail.

The solemn duty that we have nowadays to have fun, to be constantly entertained, to select good fellows instead of good men for high places, will be replaced by the necessity for fortitude. Duty, that short and forgotten word, will return to common usage.

We can trace the skein of ease and softness through almost every facet of American life to illustrate the path we have trod and the remedy needed. But let us turn to the military, for that is destined to be our chief preoccupation for a long time to come.

We all knew, or have been told, ever since Russia said she was going on the warpath, that the traditional foot-soldier, or infantryman, would be the final deciding factor in a world struggle. Infantry is the queen of battles. Our graduates of West Point know this, and have told us about it since the First World War.

So we have neglected our infantry. We have decorated regiments, divisions, with glittering histories. Where are they now? On paper, with the flags stacked in closets with their battle streamers shrouded. The American public, in some queer manner, has the notion that the No. 1 Clever Boy is the one who is exempted, and does not have to get into uniform. The No. 2 Clever Boy is the lad who makes a quick commission in the Navy or Air Force. He makes sure of his comfort, not through any individual precociousness, but because he gets credit at home for being smarter than the lad who gets drafted into the line outfits.

Foreign troops who have faced our men say that the shock of battle, which has long been concealed from our boys, is the worst thing that Americans first have to contend with. They never were told how tough they had to be. But they got tough, and brought home the wisdom of battle. Then the Army junked the infantry by not standing up strong enough for the one final weapon. The atomic bomb, as anyone knows, is a weapon against civilians.

Trace the decline of the infantry, of soldierly Americans, and you trace the slackness and neglect which has gotten us into the fix that we are in today. The country which holds its first line of defense in contempt naturally becomes a prey. Let's face it.

The Casualties Are 90 to 1 and Present Foreign Policy Is Suicidal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a most enlightening and informative article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on December 15, 1950, entitled "Balance Sheet of United States Aid and Help Given to Us in Korea."

The article states that James P. Kennedy, former United States Ambassador to Britain, submitted facts and figures to his audience when he addressed the University of Virginia Law School Forum. Kennedy is quoted as urging the United States to pull its armies out of Europe and Asia and build up its defenses in this hemisphere. Kennedy said:

Our present foreign policy is suicidal, and we have suffered 90 times the number of casualties that other nations have suffered in Korea.

The article as published in the Chicago Daily Tribune follows:

BALANCE SHEET OF UNITED STATES AID AND HELP GIVEN US IN KOREA

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., December 12.—Former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy today offered the following "balance sheet" of aid given by the United States to other countries and the aid they are giving the United States in the Korean War:

UNITED KINGDOM

Aid received and allocated: $5,861,000,000 since the war, and $30,387,000,000 during the war, plus $2,000,000,000 in 1951.

Aid given in Korea: 6,000 ground troops in Korea and in Korean waters, 1 aircraft carrier, 4 cruisers, 1 aircraft maintenance ship, 7 destroyers, and 8 frigates.

FRANCE

Aid received and allocated: $2,581,000,000 during war, $3,717,000,000 since war, plus $3,170,000,000, military aid requested in 1951.

Aid given in Korea: Infantry battalion of 1,000 men, 1 patrol gunboat and medical supplies.

NETHERLANDS

Aid received and allocated: $145,000,000 during war and $1,021,000,000 since war.

Aid given in Korea: 630 infantry and 1 destroyer.

BELGIUM

Aid received and allocated: $68,000,000 during war and $599,000,000 since 1945.

Aid given in Korea: Infantry battalion of 1,000 men yet to arrive, air transport and 400 tons of sugar.

TURKEY

Aid received and allocated: $35,000,000 during war and $259,000,000 since 1945.

Aid given in Korea: 1 infantry combat force of 5,000 men and serums and vaccines.

CANADA

Aid received and allocated: $6,500,000 credit.

Aid given in Korea: 350 men now fighting in Korea, 1,000 more en route, and 10,000 in training for service, 1 air transport squadron of 12 planes, and 3 destroyers.

GREECE

Aid received and allocated: $79,000,000 during war: $1,138,000,000 since 1945.

Aid given in Korea: 700 to 800 men, arriving this week, and 6 planes.

AUSTRALIA

Aid received and allocated: $17,000,000, chiefly in credits, evenly divided in war and postwar.

Aid given in Korea: 1,000 men, plus reinforcements, 1 RAAF squadron of 40 fighter planes, 2 destroyers and 1 frigate, medical supplies, food.

SWEDEN

Aid received and allocated: $5,000,000 during war and $57,000,000 since 1945, of which $40,000,000 was in grants.

Aid given in Korea: 1 field hospital unit.

NORWAY

Aid received and allocated: $31,000,000 during war and $193,000,000 since 1945.

Aid given in Korea: No fighting men. Some merchant ships.

NEW ZEALAND

Aid received and allocated: No credits listed.

Aid given in Korea: 1 combat unit, 2 frigates, and 200 to 300 tons of dried peas.

DENMARK

Aid received and allocated: $176,000,000 since 1945.

Aid given in Korea: 1 hospital ship, medical supplies, and 500 tons of sugar.

ETHIOPIA

Aid received and allocated: $1,000,000.

Aid given in Korea: $100,000 and offered 1,000 men which have yet to be accepted.

ICELAND

Aid received and allocated: $9,000,000 since 1945 and $1,000,000 during war.

Aid given in Korea: 125 tons cod liver oil.

INDIA

Aid received and allocated: $163,000,000 during war and $45,000,000 since.

Aid given in Korea: No troops, 1 field ambulance unit, 400,000 jute bags under negotiation.

Address of Hon. William M. Boyle, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee dinner, Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, December 12, 1950:

We are meeting tonight at a serious and solemn hour. At this moment our Armed Forces with the forces of other countries of the United Nations are fighting heroically.

Because the security of our Nation is at stake we do not meet solely as partisan members of a political party. Instead we gather together as Americans to join hands with all other Americans to pray, to work, to fight for the security of our country.

Your meeting in this spirit of patriotism and unity is a tribute to the leader of the Democratic Party, our great President, Harry S. Truman.

He has the courage, determination, and the will to confront the dangerous forces that would seek to destroy us. I know that all patriotic Americans, regardless of political affiliations, will join together to cooperate with him.

The Congress and the President need continuous and outspoken support from all loyal Americans for the steps which must be taken.

The danger to our security has been growing increasingly clear as the enemies of freedom drive relentlessly on.

Thus we gather, not to celebrate, not to achieve political aims, not as representatives of any partisan group, but as Americans who are concerned about the problems which confront our Nation and the world.

I know the feelings with which thousands of families, in every part of the country, have waited for news of their loved ones. They have been fighting to win for us the right to live in security and peace.

I, too, know these feelings.

We must all be worthy of the sacrifices that are being made for us. We are worthy

when we stick to our jobs. We are worthy when our farmers, working men and women, in fact every citizen, puts in the productive energy which has made the United States the greatest nation in history.

Today, civilization wavers between a better life than we have ever known, or a world of total slavery. As we stand at this crossroad let us realize that the battle for the survival of democracy will not of itself be resolved. This struggle for the world now being waged is a contest to the finish, because the triumph of brutal aggression would spell the doom of freedom.

In this battle for life let's look up with confidence to what we have and to our capacity for engineering the triumph of good over evil.

Not many decades back the founders of this Nation reached above the rule of tyranny and with divine guidance brought down a segment of that power from above—and gave to man the power to rule himself.

They gave vitality to the thoughts of philosophers and statesmen. They launched democracy by instituting a government which derived its right from the consent of the governed. In so doing we recognized that man—the individual man—was first, and that the state existed but to protect his rights. We openly acknowledged that man was greater than the state, because the state has no immortal soul.

This is the hour in which we proudly point to our heritage as Americans. Those who pioneered this great Nation were ready and willing to make any sacrifice for the good of the Nation and its people. In the same way we in our generation must meet whatever demands are made upon us for the sake of our country.

No sacrifice will be too great for patriotic citizens to make for the security of the Nation. When the security of this Nation is at stake there is no time for partisan politics.

Patriotism must come before politics and before profits.

The hour has passed when men may think in terms of pettiness. Selfishness, envy, and greed must not be a part of the thinking of mankind if we are to save America, preserve our freedom, and give hope to a staggering world.

Now, more than at any time in the past, the need is for steady nerves, for resolute purpose, for calmness of judgment, and firmness of action. Above all, we need a single-minded unity in our determination to preserve our national integrity and our way of life against any attack.

Certainly we must refuse to listen now to the shrill voices of discontent and disuntiy. Those individuals who seek to sow distrust and to divide us should feel the full weight of public condemnation.

I can no longer refrain from plain speaking about the small group whose words are aimed to divide our country in time of peril. I believe the people of this country will rise up in wrath against these narrow selfish men who put partisan advantage ahead of the safety of their country.

While politics in a partisan sense is out, politics in the highest meaning of patriotism and service to mankind should be continued and advanced.

The Democratic Party will hold intact the progress we have made for the benefit of the farmers, workers, business and professional men, and women and for all the people of this country.

The Democratic Party will continue to be the party of the people, as it has been since the days of Thomas Jefferson, and as it has advanced under the stirring leadership of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman. But, in so doing, the Democratic Party will cooperate with all Americans for the good of the country.

Let no one outside of the United States be misled by the clamor of our election campaigns into thinking that Americans are so divided that they cannot unite for the security of our Nation.

When the votes are counted, both sides, Democrats and Republicans, take their gains and losses in accordance with the will of the majority of the people.

Totalitarian dictators, who make a farce of elections by forcing their subjected people to vote as they are told, find it difficult to understand how free people may vote against a man and yet, when he is elected, support him. These dictators miss the whole point of democracy. They underestimate the hidden wells of strength that feed life and courage to our people.

I believe each of our two great parties has an important part to play in maintaining our free way of life in these times.

That is why I intend to stick to my job as chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

I intend to do the best I can to help make sure that democracy works at home while the free world looks to the United States to help bring victory and peace.

The fundamental issue of the moment—the fight between freedom and Communist slavery—is part of the continuous progress in the government of men. In this fight our country, by the grace of God, stands a free, prosperous, and strong nation.

This is an hour in which men with firm convictions renew their belief in the democratic way of life—indeed, in the faith in Almighty God. The faith of our fathers must be found in our hearts, in our minds and souls, as we stand steadfast today in support of our leaders.

As America has no desire for 1 inch of territory, as we fight to preserve the decency of mankind and the freedom of the world, so we who are a part of the Democratic Party have no desire for partisan political advantage as we join hands with loyal Republicans to give America its greatest strength.

If we will stand as loyal Americans we can survive the terrific ordeal which faces us. And, when the clouds of the crisis have cleared away, we will continue to have the right and privilege of perpetuating a government which will be the servant of the people. That is made possible by our traditional two-party system.

We realize that no nation ever had greater responsibility for the future of the world. American democracy is the hope of the world. If the light of freedom were to be extinguished here, future generations would know only slavery. Accordingly, as the responsibility of world leadership is ours, let us, Americans, all Americans, go forward with unity of purpose.

Let us not leave to the future a task which we ourseves must face. If we are to accomplish this end it cannot be done by mere feeble words or petty bickering. It cannot be won by indifference. It cannot be achieved by delegating the task to someone else.

It can only be gained by constant, positive, individual action on the part of each of us, working together.

Without this approach we struggle in vain, because the strength of policy, the power of government itself, is only as strong or as weak as you and I make it.

This year is the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the election of Thomas Jefferson as President of the United States. As Democrats we can take justifiable pride in the fact that he founded the Democratic Party. We can take pride in keeping our party strong and vigorous. We can be proud of the Democratic program for the benefit of all the people of America.

America will win through this period of danger. I pray God that the day will soon come when the blessings of peace and prosperity will be made secure to every person in this land, and when the bountiful production of all the great industries of the world will be fully available for the peaceful advancement of mankind instead of for destruction.

These are our objectives. I ask all Americans to join with us tonight in the spirit of the words of Thomas Jefferson: "Let us unite with one heart and one mind."

Unemployment Situation in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have been asking about the unemployment situation in Connecticut. I am, therefore, including the latest report from the Employment Security Division of the Department of Labor of the State of Connecticut. The release follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION

JOBLESS CLAIMANTS SHOW LITTLE CHANGE AT 13,241

The number of jobless claimants for unemployment benefits in Connecticut rose slightly for the second consecutive week. The number applying for benefits was 13,241 for the week ended December 9 compared to 13,141 during the previous week.

Women claimants numbered 7,452 or 56 percent of the total.

A year ago there were 41,068 claimants of whom 36 percent were women.

INITIAL CLAIMS RISE

Initial claims, which start a new period of unemployment, rose to 2,771 from 2,395 the previous week.

A year ago there were 6,227 initial claims.

BRIDGEPORT HIGHEST NUMBER

Bridgeport still led the State in the number of claims with 2,556 followed by New Haven 1,747 and Hartford 1,368.

LAY-OFFS AND HIRINGS

Lay-offs were reported in the following industries: Garment 50 seasonal and 177 partials, textile 115 and 25 were for lack of material and 25 week on week off, electrical 20 and 25 lack of material and 60 partials for lack of material, building supply 41 lack of material and 55 renovation of plant, and plastics 20 lack of material. There were 75 scattered lay-offs.

General hirings were reported by various plants throughout the State.

BY AREA

The Ansonia area reported a lay-off of 27 on a part-time basis.

In the Bridgeport area, an electrical firm laid off 20 and a garment company put 150 on a part-time schedule. Seventy-five people were affected by scattered lay-offs.

In Manchester a textile plant laid off 25.

In the Meriden area, an electrical manufacturer laid off 25.

A textile printing company in Middletown laid off 110 for lack of orders.

The New Britain office reported that an electrical firm placed 60 on a part-time basis for lack of material.

In New Haven a building-supply company laid off 41 for lack of material.

The New London area had a lay-off of 55 while a building-supply plant was renovated.

A Norwalk garment manufacturer reported a seasonal lay-off of 50 and an auto accessories firm rehired 20.

In the Waterbury area, a plastic company laid off 20 for lack of materials. A textile plant started a week-on-week-off schedule which will affect about 25.

Self-Respect or Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. BURKE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

SELF-RESPECT OR APPEASEMENT

The events of this week and the next in Washington can very likely shape the lives and deaths of all of us. The safest thing for an editor to do is ignore the whole thing. If he writes at all, he should probably do the smart thing and talk big, tough, loud, and patriotic. If he comes out for appeasement, he is going to be a very unpopular guy.

Since I can't play it safe, however, and don't feel like playing it smart, I am probably going to be unpopular.

The question in Korea boils down to this: Do we get out of Korea, losing pride, prestige, and self-respect, or do we begin world war III now?

Of course, it's easy to be a big-shot hero behind a desk in Oak Harbor, Ohio, beat my chest publicly and roar: Appeasement, never. We'll hold the line: We'll fight to the finish before we give in to the Commies. We've never been licked and we're not going to be now. I could spout all that hoopla and probably get credit for being a real 100 percenter.

It's easy to talk big in Oak Harbor, to tell everybody publicly what we are going to do and what we should do and that we aren't going to take anything from anybody. The only thing is: Who is we? The big talkers here aren't the ones who are being wiped out in Korea. The bullets aren't flying around here. The ones who cry for a last stand, a fight to the finish and all that aren't the ones who are out there now in the process of making that stand. Talk is cheap when you don't have to carry a gun to back it up.

So, for this reason, I don't chose to talk big about what we should do.

I think, maybe right now, it's better to look at the situation from the standpoint of what we can do.

Let's take the side of the drum thumpers and flag wavers, for a minute. Let's say we refuse to accede to possible Chinese terms of backing down to the thirty-eighth parallel and maybe clearing out of Korea completely. Let's say we tell the Chinese where to head in and start world war III rolling.

In the first place, what forces we and other UN countries have in Korea at the present time will take an unbelieveably savage beating; while they will probably not be wiped out completely, losses will be so staggering as to shock this Nation and the world at large. This isn't my theory on it: It's what the military experts around the UN halls believe.

That's the first thing that will happen. The next thing is this: We will go to war with China—and Russia—in a state of woeful unpreparedness. Our draft machinery has not turned out enough trained men to throw into the framework of total war. A large part of our Navy is still in mothballs. Our industry is far from geared to a level of wartime production. We will go to war at a time when our pants are practically off and those of our enemy are pretty well anchored around the hips.

What is more, we will be at war without much popular support from the rest of the world's nations. So we have a stockpile of atomic bombs? So where de we drop them in Korea to be effective? Where in China? Korea has no large cities of a size to warrant dropping a bomb for strategic purposes. China has large coastal cities. But once the bombs are dropped and the cities wasted, the people can move inward and fight on. And in China the people are used to living on the march, living off the land, living hard and fighting back. During World War II, the Chinese Communist armies furnished the bulk of resistance to Japan's armies in China. And through a brand of guerrilla fighting that military experts consider about the best in the world, they wasted, immobilized, and rendered important the armed might of Japan in China.

China is huge, nearly as huge as Russia. Together they form a land mass almost impossible to defeat in a military sense. The land itself is large enough to absorb and snuff out invading armies. And as the attackers' supply lines grow longer and longer, Chinese lines grow shorter, more concentrated. Their striking power grows in intensity as they retreat into the land and wage guerrilla warfare.

And if we use the bomb, except as a last resort, we can't kid ourselves about it. The rest of the world will not be for us. We'll be alone. We'll stand condemned by the world today and by history forever.

That's the picture, objectively, as it will more than likely be if we move for war today rather than appeasement.

I don't like that word, "appeasement." Since Munich it has had a rotten sound. I don't know of anyone else who likes it either. Still, we're faced with it, or with its alternative, total war now, today.

That's why, despite my dislike of the word and what it stands for I find myself in favor of appeasement. I could disguise it under pleasanter titles. But a spade is a spade.

If world war III is inevitable—and I don't completely believe that it is—then let's go into it geared and ready for it. The price of appeasing China is time. All right, let's pay the price.

By paying it, we save the remnants of our own Armed Forces now being slaughtered in Korea. Knowing what is coming, we can begin to prepare for it. We can swing into wartime production, move into a wartime economy, we can step up the draft quotas, begin training men, civilians, cities and counties in the practice of bombing and atomic defense. We can get ourselves ready for the inevitable so that when the hour comes, we'll know what to do, how to behave, how, when the show-down comes, to win.

That's the essential thing. To win when it is necessary.

The British have a nice saying about this sort of thing. England has lost many battles, they say. But they've always won the last one. And that's what we've got to do.

When the show-down comes, the last battle, the big one, we've got to be ready to win it.

Even at the cost of appeasement today.

Address of Arthur V. Burrowes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL J. WELCH
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a speech made by Arthur V. Burrowes, editor of the St. Joseph News-Press, before the Sedalia, Mo., Business and Professional Women's Club, on December 7:

Call me the devil's advocate if you will. But I am offering a defense, if one be needed, of that much maligned, much slandered, much berated, but to my mind very capable, efficient, and profoundly patriotic, Department of State as headed by the Honorable Dean Acheson.

Department of State is one of the four original cabinet departments of this country, the others being Treasury, War, and Justice. The first three are officially governed by Secretaries, the fourth by the Attorney General of the United States. The Navy Department did not come until 10 years later. War and Navy are now subordinate sections of the Department of Defense. Our original Post Office Department was a subsidiary of the Treasury Department, and did not rate a Cabinet member until 1829 in the administration of Andrew Jackson.

Department of State from its infancy held sacred the revered traditions and through the years has kept the faith and fought the good fight. When State was created our heritage had been the early covenants of freemen, the tiny seeds at Jamestown and at Plymouth. Our heritage had been the despairing winter at Valley Forge—blackest of all our history, excepting perhaps alone that day of infamy spoken of by Franklin Delano Roosevelt—that day we commemorate today, the 7th day of December of the year of our Lord 1941.

Our heritage has been the glory of Yorktown and of a gallant ally, not a democracy, mind you, such as we speak of today when we denounce despotism and dictatorship. Except for that gallant ally, America might not have won her independence. And who was that ally? It was reactionary Bourbon France, so decadent that less than a decade after the treaty giving us our independence, and less than 40 months after our Constitution was adopted, that Bourbon King and his pretty queen were guillotined and the Red Terror overcame poor France, to remain until there arose the man on horseback, the Little Corporal, the Corsican, Napoleon Bonaparte.

Our first Secretary of State, named by President Washington, was Thomas Jefferson. Mr. Jefferson, as he is affectionately called to this day in Taylor County, Va., was to become President and buy from that same Napoleon the vast territory out of which has been carved the sovereign State in which we reside.

It is significant how many of our first Cabinet members, our premiers, our Secretaries of State were destined to become President. Jefferson was Washington's. Madison was Jefferson's. Monroe was Madison's. John Quincy Adams was Monroe's (and it was he who drafted the historic document that bears the name of his chief—the Monroe doctrine). Van Buren was Jackson's. Buchanan was Polk's Secretary of State.

Even more significant is the roster of mental giants who were Secretaries of State and towered above their chiefs. The first Adams

had for his Secretary of State John Marshall, later to be Chief Justice of the United States for 35 years. 'Twas the monumental John Marshall who defined the Constitution, who made it a living, breathing thing, who made it the bulwark of our present Government. Well might Old Liberty have cracked tolling his demise, for with his death there passed almost the last of the great American Constitution builders, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, and Thomas Jefferson. Two yet survived, he who was to be the great expounder of that same Constitution, Daniel Webster, and then the savior of the Constitution and the savior of the Union, our first martyr President, Mr. Lincoln.

I have mentioned the significance of the giants who have been Secretary of State and who did not attain the Presidency. In some instances their names are still household words but only the student can recall their contemporaneous Presidents. Of course we know that Henry Clay was premier to J. Q. Adams. Who can name the President Daniel Webster served? Or John C. Calhoun? Or James G. Blaine? Or John Sherman, brother of the famed Civil War general? Or Richard Olney? Or John Hay? Or Elihu Root?

It is amazing to ponder how many Secretaries of State we have had who would make, or had the background to make, excellent Presidents. Edmund Randolph, second Secretary, immediately succeeding Mr. Jefferson, was brilliant, almost a genius. So was Edward Livingston, who served Jackson. So was Edward Everett who served Fillmore. So was Seward, Lincoln's chief rival for the Republican nomination in 1860. Mr. Lincoln wisely named Seward premier.

It has been my privilege to know the last six Secretaries of State and I might say parenthetically when I make my annual pilgrimage to Washington, I get more from the State Department than from the White House. These Secretaries, the last six, have been Henry L. Stimson, Cordell Hull, Edward R. Stettinius, James F. Byrnes, George C. Marshall, and the incumbent the Honorable Dean Acheson.

At the risk of starting a controversy I want to say I consider Dean Acheson an abler international diplomat, a more profound thinker in foreign policy than any of the other men I have met and heard in Washington—Stimson, Hull, Byrnes, Stettinius, and Marshall. Probably closest to Mr. Acheson in mental prowess I consider the former Under Secretary, Mr. Sumner Welles, who served so ably in the administration of Mr. Roosevelt.

Dean Acheson is a product of Yale and Harvard. Not that I consider this an open sesame. But I have talked with classmates of his from both institutions—Mr. Acheson is 9 months older than I. Mr. Acheson was Under Secretary of the Treasury in the FDR honeymoon, being named 2 months after Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated. He previously had been private secretary to Louis Brandeis, one of the all-time noblemen of the United States Supreme Court. But Mr. Acheson stayed only a few months in Government, resigning before 1933 was run out. Friends have told me that he could not see eye to eye with the administration on its fiscal, its financial policy.

Anyway, Mr. Roosevelt, though differing radically from Mr. Acheson, kept his eye on him and brought him back as Assistant Secretary under Hull, then as Under Secretary under Mr. Hull's successors.

It has been my pleasure to meet and hear Mr. Acheson on a number of occasions. Last April after listening for 2 hours to Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, bitterly assail the State Department and especially Mr. Acheson, I 2 nights later heard Mr. Acheson both on the record for an hour and off the record for more than an hour. My faith in Mr. Acheson has never been shaken.

I think at this critical time in the international affairs of this Nation, this free people of 165 and more years, that it would be an international tragedy—and it could happen—for the President to remove his Secretary of State.

Some day the world will know Dean Acheson for what I consider him to be—a great diplomat.

Keep in mind this: The Secretary of State does not lay down international policy. One man and one man alone, neither a Cabinet officer nor Houses of Congress, has that right. Our international policy is the mandate, if you please, of the President of the United States.

I am not here to defend either Mr. Truman or his predecessor. Only now are we beginning to understand the international policies of Cleveland, of McKinley, and of the first Roosevelt. We are too close to the Wilsonian era to appraise justly and judiciously the merits of our international policy that was coincident to if not partly responsible for leading us into World War I. Certainly this soon after we cannot begin to say that the long planning of lend-lease, of our policy toward Japan were always right. We do know that Mr. Truman inherited a highly explosive diplomatic package. But we will be in our graves long before the historian will say he has handled it for weal or woe.

I do say and hope you will agree with me that nothing would please the Kremlin more this very week than for Mr. Truman to discharge Dean Acheson and in effect repudiate, not what Mr. Acheson has initiated or inaugurated, but what he has merely carried out as the wish of a chief.

Sumner Welles once told us editors at a briefing at State in Washington that always a Nation's foreign policy is based on the utter, the extreme, the complete selfishness of that nation. This is true of every nation in the world, and it is true of America today, was true in every one of our 165 years of freedom.

What is our foreign policy? We are an independent Nation and want to stay so. We attach highest importance to individual freedom and intend to keep ours.

We are a peaceful people and intend to get rid of wars and war threats.

We have the highest standard of living in the world today, and we want to raise that so that everyone in the most backward state will have a chance to earn a decent secure living.

We are a friendly people. We have no traditional enemies. We want no war. We want to be at peace with all nations—and that includes Russia.

It is the job of the Government to promote these national interests. That is as clean-cut as it was the job of Mr. Jefferson to buy the Territory of Louisiana, for thereby we eliminated fear of France or Spain. It is the job of Government as it was the job of Secretary Seward to buy Alaska to get it away from Russia. It is the job of Government as it was John Hay's to promote the Open Door to the Far East under William McKinley. It is the job of Government as it was that of Charles Evans Hughes to conduct the disarmament conference, futile as that gesture yet turned out to be. It is the job of Government as it was that of Henry L. Stimson in the Hoover administration to demand sanctions against Japan for Chinese invasion.

Had the American people been brave in that era 20 years ago and had Britain stood pat, China would not have been invaded by Japan, there might have been no war between the United States and Japan, there might have been no Red China. Had Secretary Stimson had his way—but who of us saw it then? China might have been saved from bolshevism as the Marshall plan seems to be saving Western Europe from Red ravages.

I want now to get away from history of statecraft and defense of Dean Acheson, that much misunderstood gallant gentleman of Christian culture, and talk about something close to my heart.

We are where we are today, in this daze, this haze, in this vale of tears because we have forsaken God. America and the world will never get back to peace and right living until she abandons the false gods, the golden calves. Let us forget the power and the pelf and recite Kipling's Recessional lines:

> "Lord God of Hosts be with us yet,
> Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Too long have we forgotten Him, who made us and who made us for one purpose.

What is, after all, our purpose on this earth? The answer is as old as the words of the Master in ancient Galilee by the Lake of Gennesaret: God made us know Him, to love Him, to serve Him in this life and to be eternally happy with Him in the next. That, and only that, is the be all and then end all here. All else is trivial.

I am not a minister or priest but a hard-boiled newspaperman who thrilled at the handshake of Franklin Roosevelt in the White House one week and cringed like a child 3 weeks later when I sat for 2 hours between midnight and 2 a. m. and saw the execution, by hanging, of five Nazi prisoners of war in the military prison at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., a few miles down the river from St. Joseph, and I talk now as editor, not preacher.

What this world needs is prayer. Let us learn once again to pray and pray as we did in childhood when at our mother's knee we learned "Now I lay me down to sleep, I pray the Lord my soul to keep."

In my church there is a beautiful prayer, short, and I often have regretted the ritual of the Mass requires that it be in Latin, for too few of us follow the Latin.

"Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, dona nobis pacem." That means "Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, give us peace."

From the rising of the sun to the going down thereof that simple prayer is said every day, for at some hour of the day that ancient rite, the Mass, is being said somewhere on this earth and pious men and women are striking their breasts in humble supplication to the God of our fathers known of old.

And why should we not pray? It was not a Catholic but the world renowned Anglican poet laureate of England, Alfred Lord Tennyson, who wrote these lines from the Idylls of the King. In the Passing of Arthur he said: "Pray for my soul. More good is wrought by prayer than this world dreams of. Wherefore let thy voice rise, like a fountain for me night and day, for what are men better than sheep or goats that nourish a blind life within the brain, if, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer both for themselves and those that they call friend, for so the whole round earth is every way bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

Prayer can save the world. Prayer can convert Red Russia from the grip of the anti-Christ. Prayer has saved Christian civilization before so that men, abhorring war, could spend their lives in peace and tranquillity.

And now, I close with lines from one of my favorites? The lines are known to you all, I am sure. Let them be our philosophy of life, our modus operandi, our aim and our purpose.

"So live that when thy summons comes to join the innumerable caravan that moves to that mysterious realm where each shall take

his chamber in the silent halls of death, thou go not like the quarry slave at night, scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed by an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

Continuation of the Omaha Doctors' Lie and Smear Campaign Publicized Through the Omaha World-Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, part 11 of this series of the Omaha doctors lie and smear campaign as publicized through the Omaha World-Herald is as follows:

[From the Omaha Evening World-Herald of October 23, 1950]

DOCTORS CITE GAINS IN CARE—HOWARD ANSWERS POINTS IN MEDICAL BILL

Omaha and Nebraska doctors have distinguished themselves in improving medical care in all the seven fields covered by S. 1679, the socialized medicine bill now pending before Congress, Dr. M. C. Howard declared Monday.

Dr. Howard is chairman of the Second Congressional District healing arts committee which has challenged Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN because of his backing of the bill.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN has circulated a pamphlet which lists the aims of the bill:

1. Train more doctors, dentists, nurses, and hospital personnel.
2. Advance medical research.
3. Expand hospital building programs.
4. Help rural and other shortage areas; aid farmers' health cooperatives.
5. Expand State and local public health services.
6. Increase State maternal, child health, and crippled children's services.
7. National health insurance.

ANSWERS BY SECTIONS

Dr. Howard's answers by sections:

"1. Omaha is an outstanding medical center with two top-flight medical schools. They graduate 150 doctors annually, and make possible the building of new hospitals and expansion of present hospitals.

"The new veterans' hospital was built in Omaha on account of the two medical schools. The faculties of Creighton and Nebraska medical schools will make up the staff * * * veterans may be assured of the highest quality of medical care.

"St. Joseph's Hospital has completed a $2,000,000 addition which will accommodate another 175 patients. St. Catherine's Hospital has completed a $1,000,000 addition to accommodate 75 patients. Methodist, Clarkson, Lutheran, Douglas County, and Immanuel Hospitals have made additional facilities available. The hospitals are rapidly expanding their training programs."

POLIO STUDY GAINS

"2. Numerous research projects are being carried out at Creighton University and University of Nebraska medical schools. Experts are studying the use of radioactive isotopes in leukemia. Progress is being reported in the study of the polio organism. Extensive research is being carried out in the diagnosis and treatment of cancer. Numerous cases of 5-year survivors of cancer who have been treated with X-ray and radioactive substances are being reported.

"3. Answered in first paragraph.

"4. One hundred seventy-five doctors have been located in small towns and rural communities through the Nebraska Medical Association and its Rural Health Committee, the medical schools, and the Omaha-Douglas County Medical Society. Voluntary prepayment hospital and medical care plans have been made available to these areas."

IMPROVE MILK SUPPLY

"5. The Omaha-Douglas County Medical Society for more than 20 years has worked to establish a city-county health unit. This is now an accomplished fact. * * * The current program of mass chest X-rays is being carried out through the cooperation of the society. Immunization against diphtheria, whooping cough, lockjaw, and smallpox are continuously under way * * * cooperation has been extended to the health unit in improving milk supply, inspection of eating and drinking places, and other good public health measures.

"6. Extensive maternal-child health programs have been under way for many years. * * * Nebraska and four other States enjoy the lowest maternal mortality rates in the Nation. Nebraska holds the same position in infant mortality."

SET FOR EMERGENCIES

"Child health and crippled children's services are available in the new Children's Memorial Hospital; the 65-bed pediatric department at St. Joseph's; the Hattie B. Munroe Home; the Rheumatic Heart Clinic in connection with the University of Nebraska Medical College; the Dr. Lord School for Crippled Children, and the pediatrics departments of the other hospitals.

"7. The Omaha-Douglas County Medical Society in cooperation with the Physicians Bureau has established an around-the-clock emergency telephone service which makes available emergency medical care to everyone.

"It has been estimated conservatively that between $2,000,000 to $2,500,000 in free medical care has been rendered in Omaha annually for the last several years * * * in the clinics and dispensaries of the medical schools, at the hospitals affiliated with the schools, at Children's Hospital, County Hospital, and the Hattie B. Munroe Home. This service has been rendered by the members of the Omaha-Douglas County Medical Society and the Omaha medical profession."

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 25, 1950]

DOCTORS TARGET OF O'SULLIVAN—CITES BANKRUPTCY, AID OF GOVERNMENT

Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN charged Wednesday that doctors and hospitals are causing bankruptcy, that private medical schools can no longer pay their way, that hospital facilities are inadequate, and that pharmacists in Omaha are underpaid.

He held up the President's health program as a remedy in attacking recent statements by Dr. Maurice C. Howard.

Dr. Howard heads the Second Congressional District Healing Arts Committee, which is fighting to defeat socialized medicine and for the election of Republican HOWARD H. BUFFETT, Mr. O'SULLIVAN'S opponent.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said that Dr. Howard, in listing what the doctors and medical fraternity had done generally in the Omaha area, had not pointed out that the new veterans' hospital was built by Federal money, that "Creighton Medical School no longer can pay its own way," and that Federal money helped pay for additions at St. Joseph, St. Catherine, and other Omaha hospitals.

Also, he said, Dr. Howard did not list the following:

1. "In 85 percent of the bankruptcy cases filed in the United States the past year excessive doctor and hospital bills are listed as the main liabilities."
2. "Thirty-three counties in Nebraska have no hospital facilities.
3. "There are a score of Nebraska cities and towns which have had no doctors or dentists in several years."
4. Johns Hopkins University "lost $900,000 last year which has to be made up by popular subscription; most of the remaining private medical schools are in the same fix."
5. "Nurses generally are out of sympathy with his program, and underpaid pharmacists in Omaha drug stores are on the verge of revolt."
6. "Employees of the Union Pacific have been under a system of socialized medicine almost since the inception of the railroad to a greater extent perhaps than England today. Union Pacific employees find $4 taken out of their pay checks each month. When they get sick, they cannot pick their own doctor, their own hospital, or even their own apothecary."
7. "He [Dr. Howard] and his colleagues have fought every effort to produce more doctors and medical services in this country."

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 25, 1950]

VOLUNTARY HEALTH PLAN GROWTH TOLD

"The growth in America of the voluntary health insurance system has been one of the most spectacular economic developments of our time," Dr. M. C. Howard asserted Tuesday.

He made the statement at a meeting of the Second Congressional District Healing Arms Committee, which is opposing the reelection of Democratic Congressman EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, a supporter of the proposed national health insurance law.

"A recent survey reveals that more than 90 percent of employees groups in Omaha are now covered by hospital and medical insurance plans," Dr. Howard said, "so the problem of health insurance for the people of Omaha has already been solved."

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 26, 1950]

DOCTORS USE SHORT TALKS—STRESS FIGHT AGAINST SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Now come the 2-minute interview to play its role in the doctors' fight against socialized medicine.

To see how it works, step into the office of Dr. James Bradley, 1118 Medical Arts Building. He had just finished a medical consultation with Mrs. Charles Nye, of 2101 South Sixty-second Street.

Then Dr. Bradley says:

"I would like to discuss with you for 2 minutes a topic of vital importance to you and to me. It is compulsory national health insurance, or socialized medicine."

SECOND-RATE CARE

"Socialized medicine would mean another tax on your paycheck which would eventually amount to a 6- to 8-percent increase in taxes to carry out the services promised in the socialized-medicine bill, Senate file 1679.

"This socialized medicine would produce second-rate medical care.

"It would make assembly line medicine a reality.

"Personal relationship between the patient and physician would be lost.

"There would be a great decrease in quality of medical care and service. The cost would be greatly increased."

VOTE FOR BUFFETT

Then Dr. Bradley adds:

"I urge you to fight state socialism in America by voting for HOWARD BUFFETT for Congress, who has always fought State medicine and State socialism."

The 2-minute interview has become standard with Omaha doctors—whether the patient visits them, or they visit the patient in his home or at the hospital.

Said one physician: "I have talked to more than 150 persons in this manner. Only 2 have said they are not willing to go along.

"I have also urged my patients to talk this important subject over with their friends across the backyard fence or over a cup of coffee."

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 27, 1950]

ANOTHER WHO DARES

Since socialized medicince is much in the news these days our readers may be interested in a brief quotation from a recent sermon by Omaha's Archbishop Bergan. In addressing the new Catholic Doctors Guild, he said:

"You doctors realize better than I that your profession is in danger. It is being attacked in many quarters, even high in Government circles, in the present-day tendency toward State absolutism. Lobby after lobby and law after law is being fostered, and after many years of slumbering—this could not happen here—the medical profession has finally awakened to its own danger and is courageously and intelligently presenting its case."

Physicians and surgeons who dare to oppose socialized medicince have been described by Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN as "practice-mad doctors," "hypocrite doctors," "golden-calf worshipers, and otherwise evil men."

Those phrases would hardly apply to Archbishop Bergan. Mr. O'SULLIVAN will have to think up some new ones.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 27, 1950]

DOCTORS MUST TELL STORY—THAT'S WAY TO DEFEAT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Doctors cannot tell their story by telepathy, the editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association said Thursday.

"They must take a greater responsibility as a citizen and enter more into community affairs," Dr. Austin Smith told a dinner session of the Omaha Midwest Clinical Society.

To defeat socialized medicine the doctor must report without heat or rancor what his profession has accomplished under the present system, he said.

The tall, calm, Canadian-born doctor gave this example:

"We hear cries that the supply of doctors is too small. We hear that only by the opening of a great number of new medical schools can we solve the health problem."

GRADUATES INCREASING

"But do you know that every year the medical schools graduate 2,000 more doctors than the number who die or retire? That is certainly keeping pace with our population gains."

It is wrong, he said, to speak of how many doctors are allotted to areas. Medically speaking, county lines and State lines do not exist.

The fact that there are counties which do not have doctors does not mean they have no medical care," he pointed out. "The automobile and airplane have taken care of that."

Because of technical advances doctors are providing more service, he said. Any given 1,000 doctors today can give one-third more medical care than 10 years ago, he said.

RECOVERY EARLIER

"Time was," he said, "that when a patient had pneumonia all you could offer was sympathy. You waited for the crisis and then for the recovery. This sometimes took months."

Today, he said, with penicillin you can nip pneumonia in hours. The patient is on his feet sooner, with fewer complications. He is back at his job earning money quicker, and everybody is better off.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 28, 1950]

DOCTORS TELL EARLY PROGRAM—AIDED PUBLIC HEALTH LEFORE CIO FOUNDED

State and county medical societies had an excellent program to improve the health of Americans long before the CIO was organized, Dr. J. Phil Redgwick asserted Saturday.

The chairman of the nonpartisan doctors committee said his group had these answers to specific charges against local medical societies made in a CIO health committee advertisement Friday:

Charge: They (the medical societies) fought Federal aid to States which would reduce infant and maternity deaths.

Answer: "For more than 15 years the Omaha-Douglas County Medical Society has cooperated in an extensive maternal-child health program that has brought Nebraska in a class with four other States as enjoying the lowest maternal mortality rate in the Nation. Nebraska holds the same position in infant morbidity and mortality."

Charge: They opposed vaccination against diphtheria and other contagious diseases by public health authorities.

Answer: "The local society for years has cooperated with the Omaha Health Department in active immunization programs against diphtheria, smallpox, and other diseases."

Charge: They fought against reporting of communicable diseases and public health services to control TB, and still oppose free diagnostic centers for TB and cancer.

Answer: "For years the local society and profession, through cooperation with the Nebraska Tuberculosis Association, visiting nurses, the clinics and dispensaries of Creighton and the University of Nebraska medical schools have carried on extensive free detection and treatment programs for tuberculosis. The mobile X-ray truck now in active use in South Omaha is one result. Nebraska now has one of the lowest incident rates for tuberculosis in the Nation.

"Free cancer detection and treatment centers are available at the two medical schools, St. Joseph's Hospital, University Hospital, and other places."

Charge: They fought against setting up free venereal disease clinics.

Answer: "Long before CIO, many free venereal-disease clinics were in operation in Omaha."

Charge: They fought workmen's compensation laws.

Answer: "Both local and the Nebraska Medical Association cooperated very actively in making these laws effective in this congressional district and State."

Charge: They fought group medical practice.

Answer: "The Omaha-Douglas County Society and its members always have cooperated with medical practice groups in this area."

Charge: They fought the Red Cross blood-bank plan.

Answer: "The society and its members participated very actively and have been very instrumental in making the Omaha Red Cross blood bank an outstanding success."

Charge: They fought voluntary insurance plans.

Answer: "The Omaha-Douglas County Medical Society in June 1944, established and placed in operation the voluntary Blue Shield Medical Care Plan before the CIO became health conscious."

Charge: In the last session of Congress an AMA lobby blocked Federal aid to medical schools and other Federal aid programs.

Answer: "The AMA and its component medical societies have been active in the enactment of legislation to assist medical education without the scourge of Federal domination."

Retired Railroad Workers Victims of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it has been repeatedly brought to my attention that the retired railroad workers in our Nation are the victims of a rabid inflation.

Again and again I have heard the pleas of the retired railroad men and women who, with a great degree of justification, decry a deplorable inequality between Federal pension legislation affecting them and Federal pension legislation affecting other retired persons.

Railroad employees do not fall under the provisions of the general Social Security Act. Many years ago the Congress set up for workers in the rail industry a special retirement program into which the workers and their employers have contributed funds throughout the years. Under the Social Security Act, established years later, some elderly persons receive benefits who never made contributions into a retirement fund. Benefits received by retired rail workers who have contributed into such retirement fund for years certainly are not in keeping with similar benefits under the social-security program.

One of the most important factors in maintaining the railroad retirement fund after the establishment of the social-security program was the fact that it was necessary to salvage and recognize the credit toward retirement benefits that had been built up by railroad workers through prior service. The general system of old-age insurance under social security does not recognize prior service.

How, then, can the benefits derived from a contributing plan like the railroad retirement program compare so poorly with benefits derived from noncontributing plans?

It takes neither the mathematical talents of the actuary nor the deep contemplation of a practiced logician to recognize that an injustice does exist. And when an injustice affecting hundreds of thousands of our older people is so perceptible, so flagrant, and so tragic, a correction of the grievance becomes necessary and urgent.

The men and women who are now retired under the Railroad Retirement Act—and those facing such retirement—have lost much of the security that they had naturally expected as part of the return for their services during active careers. Some of these people have spent three, four, and even five decades in railroad employment and for much of that time received wages considerably smaller than those being paid to other skilled workmen. These workers looked ever forward to the day when the contributions that they were making into the retirement coffers, plus the matching funds provided by their employers, would provide a small but sufficient income during their twilight years. But now, these retired people who have contributed so much to the building of our Nation and its vital communication links are finding that soaring prices have turned their retirement-pension dreams into a bitter disappointment.

Inflation which began during World War II has pushed the essentials of life almost beyond the reach of many of these people who must subsist on these meager pensions.

In January, I introduced H. R. 7063, a bill designed to increase by 25 percent the benefits under the railroad retirement program. While I am afraid that this amount is not enough to replace the buying power lost through inflation, I know that it will help to alleviate some of the hardships of these unfortunate pensioners.

A quarter of a million retired railroad workers are awaiting an equitable adjustment by their Congress.

Twenty-second Annual Scholarship Fund Dinner of Yeshiva University—Address of Hon. Charles H. Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is the address of Hon. Charles H. Silver, chairman of the committee of sponsors, at the twenty-second annual scholarship fund dinner of Yeshiva University held on Sunday, December 10, 1950, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Yeshiva University is a great institution of learning in my community, training its students for leadership in these very troubled times. Under the direction of Dr. Samuel Belkin, president, and Hon. Samuel Levy, chairman of the board of trustees and their fellow officers, the board of trustees, the executive staff and faculty, the university plays an outstanding role in the spiritual life of American Jewry and in the intellectual and scientific advance of the whole American community. The university possesses the same privileges and rights as all the ancient seats of higher learning and bestows the same degrees as all the distinguished and accredited institutions of higher learning in the United States. It is widely known for its work in the fields of theology and education as well as in the scientific field of mathematics, and a great effort is now being made in a community sense to establish a medical school in the university.

The address of Mr. Silver follows:

My friends, it is my very great pleasure to welcome you for the third consecutive year. It is an honor to be identified with the activities of Yeshiva University and in a sense, you who are present share with me this honor, for together we have shown our deep faith in Yeshiva by supporting it, not only in a financial way but by our encouragement and wholehearted cooperation.

I am, however, a little disappointed this evening. I had hoped to make an important and thrilling announcement to you about the proposed medical school. Unfortunately, I cannot properly do this because a statement by official sources cannot be made at this moment.

I ask your indulgence and I promise you now that when official action is taken, I will write a personal letter to each one who is here this evening giving you the happy tidings so that you may rejoice in this great first step toward the realization of our dream—a medical school for Yeshiva.

We mark this evening another milestone in the life of Yeshiva University. We are here gathered in a time of turmoil and insecurity throughout the world. It would be foolish for anyone to predict what the future hold for the civilized world. The forces that control our thinking and our actions are so confused that it would seem that they are not within the power of an individual or group of individuals to fully understand.

But we are all agreed—and by that I include every civilized man and woman on the face of the earth—we are all agreed, I say, that we want peace.

It seems so simple to have peace. It is so much easier to love than to hate. On all sides, we hear the preaching of brotherhood and friendship and cooperation, and no one in his right mind would want it otherwise. But with all our achievements in science and scholarship and invention, we stand today on the brink of another great war which may destroy all of us.

Please do not mistake my meaning, I do not yield to anyone in my high admiration for the marvelous progress that has been made, but we must be realistic. The strides in technology have made this world a more convenient place in which to live. But I ask what progress have we made toward destroying forever the motives and actions which bring slaughter and misery to the world. That is the question we are all asking ourselves.

And yet we are unwilling to pay a price for peace that will make slaves of us. We will insist, and I think reflect the feeling of all Americans of all faiths and creeds when I say that we will accept only one kind of peace—and that is a peace that is based on the freedom of the individual. Let us not forget that when the right of human beings to live their lives as freemen is lost, then everything is lost, including honor and decency.

When our founding fathers wrote that immortal document, the Declaration of Independence, they had in mind only one thing—the survival of the individual. They did not plan from an economic standpoint for they knew that would take care of itself. They laid down the principle that all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, they recognized the right of every one to worship God in his own way.

We, as Jews, wanderers over the face of the earth for centuries, found in this country a haven where we could set up and foster our houses of worship, our schools and our universities. As good Americans we have been loyal to the country of our adoption or birth, but we have also stood steadfast in keeping alive our traditions and religious life. Our watchword has always been not only to friends but to our neighbors, and, indeed, to the whole world, "Peace be unto you."

And so tonight Yeshiva dedicates its dinner to peace. It holds up the torches of love, compassion, and understanding. You will see shortly a beautiful pageant in which this ideal is unfolded through the medium of a stirring dramatic presentation and inspiring music.

And so I greet you in the spirit of universal peace. The young men who emerge from Yeshiva University are being grounded not in the arts of warfare but rather in a better understanding of what makes a richer and nobler life. They shall spread the gospel of brotherhood; we Jews have been preaching that gospel and philosophy down through the ages.

But these young men also understand that in planning for a happier world they must hold their heads high and not yield to the attempts to break down the dignity of the individual. As loyal Americans and as Jews we have never wavered. We have shown the world that we will stand up and fight for the principles of freedom. The new Republic of Israel has demonstrated to mankind that basically we are a democratic people and will stand firm against the attempts of the masters of the slave states to make slaves of us all.

Although the Republic of Israel has been a member of the United Nations a little more than 2 years, this new member of the democratic society of nations has played an important part in the struggle of our free world against those who would destroy it. The program which Israel has inaugurated to uphold individual freedom and peaceful progress is beginning to make itself felt.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder recently pointed this out in an address on Israel, and I quote: "The most inspiring thing about the rehabilitation program is the high goal which has been set for individual, community and national effort. The leaders of Israel have taken up the challenge of proving that in the east, as in the west, ever-increasing benefits for the common man can be combined with political freedom and protection of human rights."

In this struggle for peace the faculty and students of Yeshiva will march shoulder to shoulder with those of other institutions of learning on the road to a just peace. Since we know the road; let us all follow, come what may. It is a duty we have to ourselves and our children. We cannot afford to lose the most precious possession that we have—the freedom of the individual.

Yeshiva University is a great institution of learning of which we, as Americans and Jews, all are proud, but in a larger sense it is also a symbol of our democratic way of life. It is a living and potent answer to those who would seek to destroy the very foundation on which this republic has been built.

Democracy in this country and indeed through many parts of the world is now on the march. The path which it travels can have no turning. It leads straight to human decency and love of fellow men. We Americans of the Jewish faith will not falter, for we know in our hearts that democracy will live so long as men cherish the ideals of our founding fathers.

And when the forces of democracy have triumphed, we shall stretch out our hands in friendly greeting to the peoples throughout the world who have thrown off the yoke of their masters. We shall not speak of victories nor will we gloat over our triumph.

For it will be victory of truth and justice; instead of being written in letters of blood it will be written in lofty and inspiring words and phrases from the hearts and minds of peace-loving men.

Additional Smear-Campaign Tactics of Omaha Medicos as Publicized by the Omaha World-Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall now present as part 10 in this series, the following publicity appearing in the Omaha World-Herald, relating to additional smear-campaign tactics of the Omaha medicos:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of October 18, 1950]

DRUGGISTS AID HEALTH BATTLE—JOIN DOCTORS TO FIGHT SOCIAL MEDICINE

Omaha druggists Tuesday night lined up with the medical profession in opposing compulsory health insurance.

Some 175 druggists from Omaha and Sarpy, Cass, Otoe, and Washington Counties, attended the special meeting at the Medical Arts Building called by the drug service committee of the healing arts committee.

The committee is out to defeat socialized medicine by electing Republican HOWARD H. BUFFETT and defeating Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN.

Elmer Lindberg, secretary of the drug service committee, told the druggists:

"It is a despicable thing when people will capitalize with cynical cruelty on the ills of the people."

FACTS IGNORED

"There is a group which would use the needs of people as an excuse for turning over the most wonderful medical care in the world to a bankrupting Federal bureau," he charged.

"They ignore the fact that from the day of Bismarck, when he put Germany under socialized medicine, the quality of German medical service declined."

HOWARD BUFFETT, Republican candidate for Representative from the Second District, said:

"If the people go to work they can turn back socialism."

DONATIONS ASKED

He indicated those in favor of compulsory health insurance think people don't know how to spend their money wisely for medical care.

A donation from every drug store was asked by W. E. Shainholtz, who was chairman. The money will go to the healing arts committee to help pay for radio time and for printing, used to fight the administration's health plan.

"We're up against a tough combination with lots of money," commented Mr. BUFFETT.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of October 18, 1950]

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE ASSAILED

The South Omaha Optimist Club Tuesday heard three doctors denounce the proposed compulsory health insurance law.

Dr. L. W. Lee said the cost to a person with an income of $5,000 a year likely would be 10 percent of that income, aside from all other taxes.

He said he feared hospital privileges would be abused to the point where it would be impossible for many bona fide patients to get in.

Dr. John H. Brush declared the proposed law was vague in most of its terms.

Having just returned from a trip to Britain, Dr. Edwin Davis reported the doctors there are dissatisfied with the health insurance set-up.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Morning World-Herald of October 18, 1950]

DRUGGISTS AID HEALTH BATTLE—JOIN DOCTORS TO FIGHT SOCIAL MEDICINE

Omaha druggists Tuesday night lined up with the medical profession in opposing compulsory health insurance.

Some 175 druggists from Omaha and Sarpy, Cass, Otoe, and Washington Counties attended the special meeting at the Medical Arts Building called by the drug service committee of the healing arts committee.

Elmer Lindberg, secretary of the drug service committee, told the druggists, "It is a despicable thing when people will capitalize with cynical cruelty on the ills of the people."

FACTS IGNORED

"There is a group which would use the needs of people as an excuse for turning over the most wonderful medical care in the world to a bankrupting Federal bureau," he charged.

"They ignore the fact that from the day of Bismarck, when he put Germany under socialized medicine, the quality of German medical service declined."

HOWARD BUFFETT, Republican candidate for Representative from the Second District, said, "If the people go to work they can turn back socialism."

DONATIONS ASKED

He indicated those in favor of compulsory health insurance think people don't know how to spend their money wisely for medical care.

A donation from every drug store was asked by W. E. Shainholtz, who was chairman. The money will go to the healing arts committee to help pay for radio time and for printing used to fight the administration's health plan.

"We're up against a tough combination with lots of money," commented Mr. BUFFETT.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of October 9, 1950]

DRUGGISTS PLAN ATTACK ON SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Omaha druggists and others closely associated with them will rally against socialized medicine at 10:30 p. m. October 17 at the Paxton Hotel.

The announcement was made Monday by Sam Ban and Wilbur E. Shainholtz, cochairmen in charge of arrangements. HOWARD H. BUFFETT, Republican candidate seeking to regain his Second District Representative position, will talk.

Mr. Ban said the druggists plan an extensive nonpartisan campaign within the framework of the healing arts committee program.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Morning World-Herald of October 10, 1950]

DRUGGISTS PLAN ATTACK ON SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Omaha druggists and others closely associated with them will rally against socialized medicine at 10:30 p. m. Tuesday, October 17, at the Paxton Hotel.

The announcement was made Monday by Sam Ban and Wilbur E. Shainholtz, cochairman in charge of arrangements. HOWARD H. BUFFETT, Republican candidate seeking to regain his Second District Representative position, will talk.

Mr. Ban said the druggists plan an extensive nonpartisan campaign within the framework of the healing arts committee program.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of October 17, 1950]

CHIROPODISTS JOIN IN FIGHT—GROUP ENLISTED TO BATTLE SOCIAL MEDICINE

Chiropodists officially came into the Second Congressional District Healing Arts Committee fold Tuesday.

Dr. H. G. Wiesman was selected chairman of the nonpartisan chiropodists committee, which like other affiliates of the healing arts group has as its aim the defeat of socialized medicine and the election of Republican HOWARD H. BUFFETT to Congress.

Dr. M. C. Howard, healing arts committee chairman, told the chiropodists:

"We doctors are not at all surprised to find ourselves the political targets of a smear campaign as launched by our Congressman, EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, in his radio address of last week.

"FOLLOWS PATTERN

"Our present Congressman is only following a pattern set up for him by the national socializers."

Dr. Howard said Mr. O'SULLIVAN would have Nebraskans believe hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent against him in Omaha.

"It is probable that these large sums which our Congressman reels off so glibly stem from his intimate association with Washington from whence come all these astronomical figures," Dr. Howard said.

PLAN SOCIALISTIC

The President's omnibus health program, which Mr. O'SULLIVAN supports, is socialistic, Dr. Howard said, because the Government proposes to—

Collect the tax (another payroll deduction).

Control the money.

Determine the service.

Set the rate.

Maintain the records.

Control not only the medical profession but hospitals—both public and private—dentistry, nursing, and allied professions.

Direct both the citizen's and doctor's participation in the program, through administrative lines from the Government in Washington, down through State agencies and local communities.

"It is in these local committees that your health affairs can become a matter of public gossip, as has happened in England," Dr. Howard declared.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of October 17, 1950]

BUFFETT IS CALLED "ABLE FOE OF REDS"

HOWARD BUFFETT "has become one of the ablest foes of communism and socialism both in this country and abroad," Arthur Renstrom, chairman of the Committee To Combat Socialism and Communism, said at a meeting of that group Tuesday.

The Republican candidate for Second District Congressman "has given the pink crowd in Washington so many headaches they have done everything they can think of to smear him in every way possible," Mr. Renstrom said.

The Committee To Combat Socialism and Communism is another of the groups formed to support Mr. BUFFETT and to try to defeat Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of October 19, 1950]

DOCTORS' WIVES IN VOTE DRIVE—OFFER TRANSPORTATION TO REGISTRY SPOTS

The wives' division of the non-partisan doctors committee had the first motorcade of the political season rolling Wednesday.

First stop was St. Joseph's Hospital, where nurses and other employees were offered free transportation to the election commissioner's office to register to vote.

Mrs. L. W. Lee will head the registration motor corps committee with members donating their services, cars, and time. The purpose, she said, simply is:

"To assist the people by transporting them to the election commissioner's office to register, so that they are eligible to vote on November 7 for HOWARD H. BUFFETT for the continuance of the American way of life and against socialism."

Her cochairwomen are Mrs. A. J. Hruby, Mrs. Maurice C. Howard, and Mrs. J. Phil Redgwick.

A second committee has been formed to provide transportation to the polls on election day. Members of this committee are:

Mesdames Harold Neu, John D. Hartman, Arnold McDermott, Frank R. Barta, Chester Farrell, Thomas Gurnett, Zeno Korth, Joseph Drazda, Frank Mnuk, Harry McCarthy, and Miss Marcella Riley.

All of this activity is part of the campaign by the Second District healing arts committee. Its aim: To strike a blow against socialized medicine by electing Republican BUFFETT to Congress and defeating Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of October 19, 1950]

STICKERS ARE USED TO SUPPORT O'SULLIVAN

President Gordon Preble of the Nebraska Federation of Labor exhibited samples Thursday of what he said is one of the answers to the Democrat problem of combating the healing arts campaign.

Little stickers are being given members to attach to their doctor bills when they pay on them, he said. They read:

"Through the efforts of Congressman O'SULLIVAN I am better able to pay on this account."

Doctors have been writing their patients urging them to help fight socialized medicine by supporting Mr. BUFFETT. They report favorable reaction.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of October 19, 1950]

"NO ALTERNATIVE TO O'SULLIVAN ATTACK"

"Dentists and doctors are not politicians and have no desire to take part in politics but attacks by men like Congressman O'SULLIVAN leave them no alternative."

This assertion was made by Dr. Maurice Howard, general chairman of the Association of Healing Arts, before the dental division of the association Wednesday night at the Fontenelle.

"Payroll deductions that are not voluntary and very indefinite as to amount should awaken the workers to the danger of statism," Dr. Howard said. "The worker already has a considerable chunk removed from his check; any more would be ruinous."

Dr. C. H. Schroeder, Dr. Elmer Bay, and Dr. A. R. Sofio discussed plans to work for the election of HOWARD BUFFETT as Congressman.

Organization of the dental unit of the Second District Healing Arts Committee was completed at the meeting. Dr. Schroeder was selected chairman of the dentists group.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of October 19, 1950]

DR. NOLAN HEADS OPTOMETRISTS GROUP

Dr. W. F. Nolan will head the newly formed nonpartisan optometrists committee, it was announced following a meeting at the Athletic Club.

Like other units of the Second Congressional District Healing Arts Committee, Dr. Nolan promised that his group would go ahead with aggressive plans to send HOWARD BUFFETT to Washington.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of October 19, 1950]

NEW GROUP GIRDS TO ELECT BUFFETT

Another associated group of the Healing Arts Committee is ready for action in the fight to beat socialized medicine and elect Republican HOWARD H. BUFFETT to Congress.

It is the newly formed drug service committee.

Wilbur E. Shainholtz Thursday was announced as chairman, following a meeting of the druggists and their allies. He is also president of the Omaha Pharmaceutical Association.

Elmer Lindberg, president of a drug-store system, was elected secretary.

The executive committee has 17 members, broken down into four divisions, each with a chairman, the first listed. They are:

Pharmacy: John O'Brien and Sam Ban, drug store operators, and W. A. Jarrett, dean of the Creighton University College of Pharmacy.

Drug travelers: W. C. Sharpe, C. S. Schiltz, R. F. Arthurs, J. D. Crabtree, G. H. Sheffield, and E. F. Hassler, all drug-firm representatives.

Creameries: Myron Westcott, Vaughn L. Ashenbrenner, Robert Fitzpatrick, and Wells Weatherwell.

Wholesalers: A. N. Dow and Howard Jensen.

The drug service committee has scheduled a general meeting of all druggists and all allied groups for 10:30 p. m. next Tuesday in the Medical Arts auditorium. Their plans for joining in with the Healing Arts campaign will be announced then.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of October 20, 1950]

GROUP RAPS AT O'SULLIVAN—"ORGANIZATION OF VETS FOR AMERICANISM"

The veteran's committee now supporting Republican HOWARD BUFFETT for Congress will become a permanent organization, Chairman Donald DeVoe said Thursday noon at an open meeting in the American Legion Club dining room.

Mr. DeVoe, a Democrat, said this will be "an organization to fight for Americanism." In the coming election, he said, it means opposing Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN.

"This continues to be the fastest growing organization in town," said Charles Peters. "It is truly nonpartisan. We have regular Democrats, Southern Democrats, and Republicans all working together to fight for the American way."

"NOT ACCIDENT"

Speaking to the group, Mr. BUFFETT said "it was not an accident" that a noted Washington newspaperman called Representative O'SULLIVAN "the great reservoir of hogwash."

Mr. BUFFETT predicted that Mr. O'SULLIVAN's attacks against him would become more vicious "as he becomes more desperate."

"Why doesn't he talk about the issues?" Mr. BUFFETT said. "Perhaps this incident from his own record will give you a clue.

"VOTE FAVORED REDS

"On June 22, 1949, Congressman O'SULLIVAN voted to kill an amendment to keep Communists off public-housing payrolls.

"Fortunately there were enough patriots in Congress to pass the amendment by better than a 2-to-1 margin, but Mr. O'SULLIVAN voted against the amendment to bar from public payrolls those who propose the overthrow of our Government by force or violence.

"Imagine it."

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of October 22, 1950]

O'SULLIVAN IS ON THE RUN—VETS GROUP DECLARES HE'S INCONSISTENT

Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN is on the run, Chairman Donald B. DeVoe told the Veterans Committee for Buffett meeting Thursday at the American Legion Club.

"One night he exclaims on the radio against socialized medicine," said Mr. DeVoe. "The next night he attempts to sell the Truman health program, which includes a provision for compulsory health insurance—the first step in socialization of medicine.

"One night he cries out against the evil men engaged in medicine. The next night he proclaims the doctors are his friends."

SKIPS REAL ISSUES

Another night, continued Mr. DeVoe, Mr. O'SULLIVAN says his opponent, Republican HOWARD H. BUFFETT, is against the farmer.

"But," Mr. DeVoe declared, "Mr. O'SULLIVAN forgets that on March 7 he said in Congress: 'I am for the Brannan plan and I think it is the only solution.'

"How can he claim to be a friend of the farmer when none of the Nebraska farm organizations have seen fit to back the Brannan plan?"

Mr. DeVoe said the Democrat's failure to deal with any of the real issues in this campaign is alone sufficient, we believe, to cause his defeat.

VOTES LIKE MARCANTONIO

Why, he asked, doesn't Mr. O'SULLIVAN explain:

How American boys were allowed to fight in Korea without modern weapons?

Where did the $45,000,000,000 appropriated for national defense go?

Why he defended the State Department, which we fear is honeycombed with pinks?

The reasons behind the recent cut in your pay check by imposition of higher taxes.

His near perfect record of voting with VITO MARCANTONIO on important issues.

WILL GET PAMPHLET

"According to Mr. O'SULLIVAN," said Mr. DeVoe, "the real issues in this campaign are such things as the number of pamphlets left in the congressional office when Mr. BUFFETT turned it over to him.

"And the thought occurred to me that as long as Mr. O'SULLIVAN feels so badly about not having pamphlets in his office, we should take occasion to give him one."

That one, he explained, will be in the form of 65,000 pamphlets put out by the Veterans Committee for BUFFETT and largely based on Mr. O'SULLIVAN's statements and acts in Congress.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of October 22, 1950]

O'SULLIVAN BEWAILS ATTACKS UPON HIM

Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN said Friday that "I wouldn't let some of these doctors take my temperature."

Speaking to the student bar association at Creighton University, he said: "I have been the doctor's friend. I see no reason for this assault upon me."

Mr. O'SULLIVAN spent considerable time reading from the proposed national health bill, which the Second Congressional District Healing Arts Committee contends is the first step to socialized medicine.

He said he is not for socialized medicine or a compulsory health program and charged the World-Herald "is another falsifier" along with the doctors.

Yugoslavia Grant Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have given very careful consideration and reflection to the question involved in this measure of an additional proposed gift of $38,000,000 to the Government of Yugoslavia.

Our Nation has already lavished many millions of dollars upon that country in efforts to alleviate hardship and rehabilitate its national economy. As recently as November, we sent thirty-one millions to Tito supplementing fifty-five million which we had sent him in 1949. On neither of these occasions was it contended that there was an emergency existing in that country because of food shortages and the evidence presented in this instance is indeed most inconclusive on that point. In fact the production figures show a favorable situation regarding basic crops. Although the funds or the equivalent which we have so generously dispatched to Tito up to this time amount to almost $500,000,000, there is no satisfactory showing whatever, in my opinion, that present conditions in Yugoslavia are such that we should be impelled for solely humanitarian reasons to make this additional gift.

In the past I have supported many proposals for grants and gifts by our Nation to many other nations, with the thought in mind that by furnishing needed relief and rehabilitating their economic strength, our own Nation might be joining with other democratic-minded people in checking communism, strengthening the forces of democracy throughout the world and acquiring friends among the nations who would stand by us loyally, as we have stood by them, in the event of emergency and war. Although we have spent literally billions of dollars in efforts to relieve and rehabilitate foreign nations and in outright grants of money, foodstuffs, clothing, medical supplies, and other necessities for the alleviation of privation and suffering in many countries, the results of our humane benefactions have been extremely disillusioning.

As the result of our almost unstinted help, many foreign nations have made very substantial economic recovery. Great Britain has found it possible to terminate Marshall-plan aid and other countries have vastly improved their economic, social, and political conditions. That is gratifying. On the other hand, it is very sad to note that many nations greatly benefited by our generosity have not up to this point rallied to our support in the current Korean crisis in any substantial way. While they have given a certain glib lip service in the United Nations to our cause, they have furnished very little concrete material support in terms of manpower, equipment, or weapons of war to aid us in combating our enemies in the Pacific. It is a sobering but incontravertible fact that only a few of the nations receiving our aid have moved to help us in any way. The number of foreign troops assisting us in Korean operations is relatively meager and no one could honestly call the assistance we have been receiving from them either wholehearted or effective.

While this failure on the part of our friends and allies to move to assist us in this grave crisis is a source of bitter disillusionment to the American people, the fact that some of our friends have recognized the Chinese Reds in efforts to protect their commercial interests in the Far East is even worse. These same nations are now strongly urging that the United States accept the policy which they have laid down of appeasing the Chinese Reds, the Soviet Union, and Communists elsewhere in the world, and be willing to pay any price for peace, regardless of our interests, our security, our prestige and self-respect, and the dire threat visible now to every thoughtful person of Communist-world domination.

I am of the firm conviction that the American people will never accept such a spineless and dangerous policy. Our freedom is at stake. Our liberties are endangered. Our security is threatened. These great issues which affect our existence as a free nation and our very destiny in the world, as well as the safety, well-being, and happiness of our people, can never, and will never, be compromised. Liberty means too much to Americans to hold it too lightly. We are determined to defend those liberties, whatever the cost, and, if I gage accurately the will and spirit of the American people, we will never be swerved from that course.

But let no one mistake our motives or our purposes. We desire peace as earnestly as any other people in the world. We are not seeking and we are not inviting global war. We have no chip on our shoulder. But we proposed to defend our country, without and within, against aggression and conspiracy. We will defend America against all those who would destroy it and we do not propose, great Nation and great people that we are, to crawl on our bellies in abject fear and supine surrender before the forces which are moving through all parts of the world seeking with evil and malignant design to destroy us and to blot out freedom and civilization.

The evidence is before us as a result of the ill-fated experience in Korea and it is clear, unmistakable, and convincing. It illustrates with a brilliant light the proposition that we have not been able, despite our grandiose unstinted benefactions, despite the billions we have poured out to help others, despite the unprecedented generosity which our Nation has displayed, to purchase the friendship of other nations or other peoples, with money, with gifts, with grants and subsidies. The stark realities of the moment demonstrate that fact with irresistible effect.

It is clear to me that we must reappraise our situation at home and in the world and remobilize our own resources of manpower, industrial strength, and over-all productivity on the supposition that from this time forward we must rely principally on our own strength. We must be sure that we have this strength in terms of organized manpower, modern weapons, equipment, ships, tanks, planes, and other matériel to be able to safeguard our own shores against any developing contingency as well as fulfill any commitments of a legitimate nature affecting our interests which we may have concerning the cause of human freedom.

If this bill contained certain conditions and reservations, and if I believed, as I do not, that it was required for humanitarian reasons to relieve hunger and starvation, I might be disposed to support it. I would not render this support because I believe it possible to purchase the friendship or active help and cooperation in war or peace of Dictator Tito. His career, his background, his affiliations, his political ideology, his monstrous and iniquitous persecution of helpless, God-fearing religious people certainly do not inspire my confidence. I am certainly not impressed with some of the statements made on this floor that we can have in him a faithful, dependable ally in future world policy. Nor am I much impressed by the assertions made here concerning the importance of his military neutrality or assistance in the event of war. I am impressed very little, indeed, concerning his ability to stand off Soviet military pressure once it should be exerted against him.

Nor am I anxious, directly or indirectly, to traffic with Communist governments of any kind. Communism seeks world control. Insofar as I am concerned, that means that Communist governments wherever they exist are potential enemies of my own democratic Nation. If certain conditions were met as I have outlined them above regarding the humanitarian need for this assistance, I should still demand further provision in this bill requiring Tito:

(a) To agree to release Archbishop Stepinac and all the religious and other persons in Yugoslavia presently suffering persecution because of their religious convictions and practices.

(b) The Dictator Tito immediately order the return of the thousands of Greek children which were by his forces most cruelly and heartlessly kidnaped away from their parents and their native homes.

(c) That Tito agree to support the principles enunciated by the United Nations relating to basic human rights.

If Dictator Tito were willing to comply with these conditions and could make a showing of real emergency, existing or impending hunger and privation, I would be willing to give further consideration to this measure. Since it is obvious from this debate and what has transpired on the floor that there is no possibility of these terms and conditions being written into the bill, I am constrained to cast my vote against it.

Let me say in conclusion that I do not believe it to be wise national policy in an hour of such grave peril and crisis for this Nation to undertake further relief programs throughout the world

which will result in spreading its substance, dissipating its strength, wasting its resources in futile efforts to purchase the friendship of other nations at the expense of the American taxpayers and at the risk of further strengthening the very forces of communism which are working toward the destruction of the United States and our precious free way of life.

Ten Pillars of Wisdom—Or Just Something That Makes Sense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, there is ample evidence all about us to the effect that only a few of our people really understand the flow sheet of our productive economy whether it be of foods, fats and fibers, or of manufactured goods. Great stress is now being placed before the managers of American industry to the effect that they must "sell" the American way to Americans here in the United States. I happen to be one of those who believes that our industrial management has been selling goods but that it has not been selling the enterprise system upon which we must depend for our production.

The General Electric Co. has recently made a valuable contribution in the form of Ten Pillars of Wisdom and in the hope that it will be read by millions of people, I herewith submit it for the RECORD:

TEN PILLARS OF WISDOM—OR JUST SOMETHING THAT MAKES SENSE?

1. The material things we want just can't come free to us out of thin air. They have to be produced by somebody, at a cost.

2. Government doesn't produce anything. So, when government gives something away to its people or to others, it must first take that something away from its people.

3. Our jobs come from customers. The only real job security is customer security. That's because in our system, where the customer is free to choose one or another or none out of the many products offered, sales and jobs depend on getting and keeping the customer.

4. This customer security, or job security for the worker, is attained only when management succeeds in guiding workers and investors toward accomplishing the things which the customers want done, while avoiding the things customers don't want done.

5. The amount of money in the bank or in the pay envelope doesn't measure the true material welfare of any one of us. The only real measure is how much that money will buy.

6. Wages are the biggest cost in any product. Wage increases across an industry or the whole country—which are general for everybody and not in proportion to the added productivity resulting from increased ingenuity or effort of the individual—simply raises costs and prices, as our experience has shown. Such general wage increases do not add to the welfare of the worker.

7. The "greatest good for the greatest number" simply means, from a material standpoint, the most goods for the greatest number, and that means the greatest productivity per worker.

8. All productivity comes from muscular and mental human energy being applied to natural resources, such as coal, iron, copper, tin, oil, lumber, farm land etc. How much productivity we accomplish—how much material welfare we have—depends on the availability of natural resources and on the degree to which our human energy is multiplied by the quantity and quality of the tools we use.

9. We cannot increase the natural resources and human energy available at any one time. We can increase the tools available, if we offer an attractive reward. Tools are bought with the savings of people who temporarily deny themselves some needs or comforts or pleasures. They risk their savings in the hope of being rewarded in the future with a small part of the extra productivity of the tools bought with their savings.

10. There are the most tools per worker—and each of those tools is most productive—where there is a worth-while urge for individuals and groups to compete for the favor of millions of citizens who are individually free to buy and sell and work and vote as they please. These millions of economic decisions, made daily by these millions of free individuals, result in a far higher material well-being for workers and all citizens than can be attained in any state-planned society where those decisions are made by a handful of economic czars, regardless of how well-meaning, sincere, and intelligent those czars may try to be.

Among the truths we live and work by, these 10 ideas seem to be basic. They seem particularly worthy of our examination right now when we are seeking the shortest, soundest path to the highest level of living we can enjoy—while having at the same time to defend ourselves from enemies within and without.

GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.

United States Must Sell Freedom Idea To Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. First of all, I want to commend two of my colleagues, Dr. WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, and Mr. BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, for the effort they are putting out in a national barnstorming tour in behalf of a sound foreign policy for the United States. I am pleased to include with my remarks a news write-up of Dr. JUDD's speech made at Seattle recently and carried in the Wenatchee Daily World of November 28. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the write-up carries the subheading of Dr. JUDD's cousin, Willa Woods Hiltner, daughter of the late Rufus Woods, famous editor and publisher of the Wenatchee Daily World. Mrs. Hiltner's mother is a cousin of Dr. JUDD's. I think the write-up is very ably done. It is a clear presentation of the message Dr. JUDD delivered to the people of the State of Washington. Mrs. Hiltner's article follows:

UNITED STATES MUST SELL FREEDOM IDEA TO SURVIVE, DR. JUDD SAYS

(By Willa Woods Hiltner)

"We've got to start selling the idea of freedom-under-law, and selling it hard, if we are to survive, Dr. WALTER JUDD told a forum audience in Seattle Tuesday evening, Dr. JUDD, Republican Congressman from Minnesota, and BROOKS HAYS, Democratic Representative from Arkansas, are on a national barnstorming tour in behalf of a sound foreign policy for United States.

"The Communists know the value of an idea," JUDD said. "They have been successful in selling lies. We can be more successful in selling truth. But we have to start.

"The basic struggle in the world today is between two ideas: 'Man is an animal' vs. 'Man is the son of God.' According to the Communist concept, there is no morality. Human life is of no value. They think no more of killing off a million people than of squirting DDT on flies.

"How can we get along with this other world? We don't have to agree with them to get along with them. We have to get a set of traffic rules that are too dangerous to break.

"It is futile to dream of a world of no conflict. What we must do is learn to deal with it. We can't ignore the opposing idea. We can't give in. We can't buy it off, for it is a religion. What can we do?

"We must expand and organize our area of freedom. From 1776 to 1931, that area steadily expanded. Since 1931, it has been contracting rapidly."

STOP COMMUNISTS

"For 500 years Russia has been on the march.

"But she is more dangerous under the commissars than under the czars, for she has learned new and deadly techniques. Now she has an organization in every country. She has learned how to get Chinese to fight Chinese, Koreans to fight Koreans, Germans to fight Germans.

"We must stop that expansion. Three and a half years ago we started to build up resistance in Europe. It wasn't perfect, but there was some hope if we did, no hope if we didn't.

"At the same time we sold out our friends in Asia. We refused to help China because she didn't meet our standards. We sent our greatest soldier, General Marshall, to China to insist that they take Communists into their Government.

"We are paying the price for this today, as our boys die in the freezing Korean winter.

"But we can't be overwhelmed by our difficulties. We have got to build up the free world to assume the burden of being the policemen. We can't do it alone.

"We know now that Russia came into the UN, not to help peace, but to disrupt Therefore, we must—

"1. Improve the United Nations, so that the monkey wrench of the veto can't cripple it, as it does now.

"2. Improve the police force, so that trained international soldiers will be ready at every trouble spot.

"3. Strengthen regional organizations of the free countries within the framework of the UN.

"There are some who worry about our 'sovereignty,' but what sovereignty are they talking about when it's Russia who calls the turn. We didn't choose the Korean war.

"Under a world organization we would gain sovereignty, rather than lose it.

"We get peace from order, not friendship. We don't have to be friends with Communists to live in the same world with them. We have tried alliances as a means of peace. They haven't worked because each side is expected to send soldiers without having a part in the policy-making.

"We have tried a debating society, which was the League of Nations. That's too slow.

"We now have a combination of both. It's a step in the right direction, but must go farther.

"To have peace we must have order.

"To have order we must have justice.

"To have justice we must have the machinery.

"To have effective machinery we must have people who believe.

"So we are back to our war of ideas.

"Our present danger is that we—

"1. Fail to underestimate the nature of the enemy and underestimate his ruthlessness.

"2. Fail to understand the nature of our own system.

"The best may win automatically in the long run, but in the short run it's the strongest. And it is our lifetimes that we are concerned with, not 20 centuries from now."

United States Does Not Quit Easily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present a very good editorial published in the New Orleans Item on December 9, 1950:

DESPITE DEFEATISTS UNITED STATES DOES NOT QUIT EASILY

As the shadows lengthen in Korea, as our heroic forces wearily give ground before the Red masses, the voices of doom and despair rise across the Nation.

The brickbats are beginning to fly. The hindsighters, the opportunists, the fearful are having their day.

So it has been in every dark hour in the history of man. George Washington was the target at Valley Forge. Lincoln in the Civil War. Churchill when Singapore and Tobruk fell. Roosevelt after Pearl Harbor.

Today, the cries are aimed at President Truman and General MacArthur:

"Get out of Korea now. * * * Asia means nothing to us anyway. * * * Keep out of Europe. * * * Drop the UN—just a debating society of foreigners who want our money. * * * Quit giving milk to the hottentots and prepare to defend our own shores."

The words have a familiar ring. (Roosevelt and Churchill were meeting 9 years ago this month.) If the crisis worsens, and it well may before it improves, we can expect the howling to grow in volume and venom.

In peace or war there is, of course, a legitimate area of review and criticism. Neither statesmen nor generals are infallible and the public welfare is served by a constant scrutiny of their words and deeds.

But a basic difference exists between this type of criticism and the defeatist recriminations we are hearing from some quarters today.

Despair is contagious. It has a way of infecting loyal Americans who should know better.

BYRD'S VIEW

As a case in point, take a man whose integrity and ability we have some regard—Senator BYRD of Virginia.

The Senator made a speech last Tuesday in which he said, "Our mistake to start with was going into Korea." Another mistake, he said, was the UN's crossing of the thirty-eighth parallel.

He called the Korean conflict nothing but a civil war between the two halves of that country, and observed "we can't go about the world making Democrats out of people who don't want to be Democrats."

And, finally, the Senator declared, "we will be very fortunate" if Korea can be evacuated in time to save American lives.

Unwittingly, Byrd gives comfort to our enemies. Vishinsky and his puppet from Peiping miss no chance to tell the world just what the Senator told America—we had no business in Korea, have none now, and should get out.

We may have to get out, just as the British in the last war had to evacuate Greece. But it will be for lack of men and arms—not for lack of having business there.

For Senator BYRD and those who share his views, we should like to review the chronology of Korea.

On June 25, the Russian-inspired North Koreans invaded the southern republic. The UN's Security Council ordered a cease-fire, then called on its members to meet the aggression. President Truman publicly pledged aid to the South Koreans.

On June 27, it was announced this country had ordered air and naval units to Korea and the Seventh Fleet to Formosa, had also appealed to Russia to recall the invaders.

In Washington the House rose en masse and cheered the news and Senators of both parties added their acclaim. Senator LODGE (Republican, Massachusetts) hoped Mr. Truman "would not shrink from using the Army" if the "best military judgment" dictated it.

NO DISSENT

When the President subsequently informed legislative leaders, both Democratic and Republican, of the decision to commit ground troops, there was no dissent. Instead, newsmen reported a wave of pride surging through the Capital because we were putting precepts into practice.

Where was Senator BYRD then? Where were the other politicians, commentators, writers who now preach a philosophy of fear?

These distributors of gloom must not be allowed to prevail. If they had their way, we would be standing alone, denying our strength to other freemen and their strength to us.

This is a time for courage, for resolve, for hard work, and sacrifice—not for the counsel of defeat.

If we are eventually forced out of Korea it will not be with apologies to the Communists for interfering in "civil war."

It will be with our rear guard in action, and with a word to the freedom-loving people of Korea that we will not forget them.

If Korea arouses the determination of the free world to resist, if it leads to courage and thence to strength, it may go down in the history books as the trumpet call that saved civilization.

This was implicit in the inspiring communique issued yesterday afternoon by President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee, following their week-long talks. From their words and the course of action they projected, it is plain that America and Britain do not quit as easily as Senator BYRD.

The World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, during World War II Stalin was dictator over 300,000,000 Russians. Today, 5 years later, he is dictator over 900,000,000 people. He has surrounded Russia with satellite nations, puppet nations, iron-curtain nations, and so Joe Stalin today sits in Moscow like a big fat spider in the center of his web. He pulls a string and the flames of war break out in Korea, and we have to send our boys there and spend three or four billion dollars to put out the flames. Then he will pull a string in Indochina, in India, in Siam, in Turkey, in Greece, in Yugoslavia, or in Berlin, and the flames of war will break out, and again we will have to send our boys and spend billions of dollars to put out those war flames. After 3 or 4 years we will be exhausted, bled white, and Stalin, without losing a man of his own, will then be ready to take over.

Mr. Speaker, during these same 5 years we have spent $100,000,000,000 to contain communism, to keep it from spreading. This we have been calling a cold war. Our cold war has been under the management of Dean Acheson, Alger Hiss, Owen Lattimore, Dr. Jessup, and others. Isn't it about time to change our cold war leaders, to place someone in charge of our interests in Asia that knows something about the situation there, someone like Gen. Douglas MacArthur? We should get rid of Acheson, the man who got us into the present mess in Asia, and rely on the advice of General MacArthur.

The situation in Korea today is very critical. It has become that way because we have placed General MacArthur under the orders of the United Nations, and the UN refuses to follow his advice; they prevent MacArthur from bombing the Communist Chinese troop concentrations and war supplies in Manchuria. General MacArthur is being ordered today to fight with one hand tied behind his back, an impossible position to be in, and American boys are dying as a result of it. This is the result of our State Department's "panty-waist" foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article to the press written by the Honorable Henry C. Luckey. Mr. Luckey will be remembered as a former Member of Congress who represented the First Congressional District of Nebraska so ably in the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses. The article follows:

TO THE PRESS

Where are we heading? After having fought and won (?) two World Wars in the span of one generation, we are now told by our Government that we are confronted with a situation of unparalleled danger and that no one can guarantee war will not come.

As we scan over daily papers we realize the truth of this statement. We are on the brink of an abyss that may engulf us and destroy our civilization as we now under-

stand it. With the atomic bomb, the airplane, and the atheistic-communistic ideology spreading, we are slithering down the road to Armageddon.

The masses are confused and bewildered and wonder how this all came to be. They ask who are the fuehrers in high places that brought this impasse about? They have a right to ask. They are the ones to pay the cost of war, their boys will have to die on the battlefields, they will have to dig out of the rubble when their cities have been bombed, and they will become the slaves when the war is lost.

The man on the street is beginning to wonder whether or not we were lied into war. He knows little of history—but neither do our statesmen and our diplomats for if they did they would or should have been realists and charted their course according to the lessons taught by history. As it was—prejudice, bias, ignorance, lust for power, cupidity, egotism, imperialistic expansion, secret diplomacy, materialism and moral collapse—all played a part in bringing about this catastrophe.

There were some who, for years, shouted, like a voice crying in the wilderness, "Get the facts, learn the truth, and act accordingly," but to no avail. The present world crisis should arouse all of us from our mental lethargy and start us in search of truth in order that we may avoid in the future the mistakes made in the past.

Those who seek truth and light in this welter of confusion will find the following books helpful:

Soviet Russia and the Far East, by David J. Dallin; Russia's Race for Asia, by George Creel; The Nightmare of American Foreign Policy, by Edgar A. Mowrer.

Those who are interested in learning what part political horseplay contributed to our present debacle will find Norman Beasley's Politics Has No Morals, very helpful.

America's Second Crusade, by William H. Chamberlin, is especially to be recommended. He is an outstanding scholar and writer, the author of a number of books on Russia, in which country he spent many years. His book is not only diplomatic history, it is judgment of that history as well. It should receive the highest circulation and should be reviewed before clubs and organizations throughout the country.

Since it is just off the press, it may not as yet be found in book stores but it can be purchased from the publishers at $3.75—Henry Regnery Co., Chicago 4, Ill. Its careful perusal will throw much light on the maze and confusion in which we find ourselves today. It is a "must" book. Buy it, read it, then donate it to your city library.

Sincerely yours for truth and sanity in these confused times,

HENRY C. LUCKEY,
Member of the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Sessions of the United States Congress.

RICHMOND, CALIF., *December 1, 1950.*

Letter to Trygve Lie on World Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 12, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a letter written to Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, by the secretary of the League of Arab States, Abdel Rahman Azzam. The letter presents a challenge that the world today has failed or refused. I am sure the west does not want war. As to Russia, if we are to believe the writings of Lenin and Stalin, there is every indication that world revolution calls for the use of force, and that is war. Under such circumstances there may be no common ground, no climate favorable to a friendly discussion between Russia and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include the letter referred to:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 6, 1950.*
His Excellency, TRYGVE LIE,
Secretary General, United Nations,
Lake Success, N. Y.

EXCELLENCY: The world is passing through one of the most critical periods in human history, and it is time for every man to do his duty to get it over that dangerous critical period and to contribute his little bit for the survival and peace of the human race. Every obstacle in the way of this survival must be overcome, and that is why I feel it my duty to express my humble opinion to you, Mr. Secretary General, and through you to the United Nations.

I am impelled to do this by my feeling that it is a duty, although I cannot claim that my proposals are necessarily the best for a way out of the present world crisis. As a matter of fact, for a long time I have been concerned over our too hasty way of dealing with world problems under the impulses of the moment and the temporary reactions to the press and the radio and the news and commentaries given by them hour after hour.

We have become gradually absorbed in the temporary outward appearance of things and are not meditating deeply on the real causes and the treatment of the real malady. Therefore, I think, Mr. Secretary General, that if the world is given a chance to breathe easily and to think deeply and to relax and meditate, we may see with more clarity and find that many things to which we attach very great importance have, in our eyes, shrunk to their real proportions.

The Korean problem and what it has brought, and the crisis coming out of it, is only a symptom of a deeper unrest and an overwhelming agitation of the human heart and mind. If we are going to think only of two alternatives, namely, war or appeasement, then we will have either war as a result of an appeasement, the same symptoms of Korea surging up in Indochina, Malaya, the Middle East, north Africa, or the middle of Europe. Therefore, in treating the problem of Korea we have to treat the whole world problem and ultimately to discover the evil and cure it.

I believe that the world for many generations has been passing a social and a conscience crisis, and unless we treat the social conditions of mankind in a way that gives equal chances to races and individuals, and unless we treat the heart and conscience of man to give him spiritual convictions, we will have neither our physical or spiritual existence satisfied; and we will live in emotion and agitation and dissatisfaction in which conditions, reason, and sound judgment will always be overlooked.

So, Mr. Secretary General, if this is true, I think the first steps that should be taken now, on the occasion of the Korean crisis, is that we should not only attempt to make a cease fire on the war front but also a cease fire on the mental front. We should, for example, have at least a month's truce in Korea and 3 months' truce in what they call the cold war everywhere.

At least in the United Nations we should stop having that respectable gathering of the intelligentsia of the world making of its rostrum a mouthpiece for propaganda and for everybody condemning everybody else and selling only his goods. We should stop the United Nations from becoming a market place for bargaining of votes or for gaining temporary victories of one bloc against another bloc. We should have peace first in this world center, and in that period of peace be able to meditate about the real troubles.

Our next step should be to discover where we could all agree and to enlarge on that, and thus establish a common ground from which to develop human cooperation. For example, we may discover that our resolve for the maintenance of peace establishes this common ground that we must have peace and should not think of any solution for our troubles except under the patronage of peace. We may also discover that we must have criteria to judge the veracity or fallaciousness of any problem that presents itself. In these criteria—equality of the human race, of individual human rights, of class equality—we may also discover that the moral principles of justice which have stood the examination of thousands of years are still ultimately the best criteria; and that this life is not only material and that the human race in a capitalist or in a Communist regime cannot live without moral values and spiritual guidance, and that we should, therefore, give the spiritual side of life its everlasting value.

For an approach toward that common ground it may be found necessary that the representatives of the leading powers of the world, particularly the United States of America and the Soviet Union, should be asked by the United Nations to meet and pledge as a result of this meeting to offer a basis of agreement from which to develop the common ground for humanity as a whole. If this requires any assistance from the United Nations, a chosen committee from the United Nations, whether as persons or as states, should be authorized to help bring about that contact between the leading men on a neutral ground in Asia, Africa, or Europe, and to help before and during this contact to pave the way toward a proper approach to the problem and a common basis of agreement concerning it.

There are certainly two definite concepts and ideologies leading the world today. This is not exceptionally new because the world has always had separate religious and ideologies without necessarily clashing swords for the survival of one or the other.

Human intelligence, conscience, and interest, given the time, will decide the issue between ideologies. What is wanted is to avoid war, not by appeasement nor by a preventive war, but by complete and resolved determination to avoid war as a means of settling human differences, and to try with a big resolute heart and tolerant mind to have a United Nations reconstructed on its Charter as a court of justice to whom every member and every nation can bow respectfully to its decisions.

Mr. Secretary-General, I must confess that in mentioning all this to you, I may not have brought anything new to you, but, as I said before, I felt that I must express my feeling, which I am sure is shared by millions of Arabs and Moslem brothers all over the world.

I have the honor to remain,
Yours sincerely,

ABDEL RAHMAN AZZAM,
Secretary-General, League of Arab States.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

wish to include herein two letters that I have received from Mr. W. E. Harber, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in reply to the criticism of the proposal of the RFC to transfer and consolidate some of their activities:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, December 8, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANE: This is to acknowledge your letter of December 1, 1950, quoting the telegram you received from the Honorable Paul A. Dever, Governor of Massachusetts.

In order to continue the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on a self-sustaining basis, it has become necessary to increase the Corporation's income and reduce administrative expenses to the extent practicable and, at the same time, to continue to render the best possible service to the public.

The Corporation has recently increased its interest rates on business loans from 4 percent to 5 percent per annum in an endeavor to operate the business loan program on a self-sustaining basis. The Corporation is working on a plan which should make it possible for the RFC to reduce administrative expenses by a substantial amount. The proposed plan would decrease the Corporation's present administrative expenses and would result in the operation of the business loan program on a self-sustaining basis.

All the 31 loan agencies of the Corporation will be continued. There will be no curtailment in the existing functions of the Corporation and it is anticipated that services now available to the public will be improved.

The Boston office of the RFC will, along with the other agencies, suffer a cut in its personnel and administrative expenses. However, there is no intention on the part of the Corporation to close the Boston office or to in any way change the functions which are now handled in the Boston office. The principal plan of the Corporation is to consolidate the bookkeeping in 11 regional offices. The loan activities of each agency will be continued as they have been in the past.

Let me assure you that the Corporation will give every consideration to the continuance of the RFC in Boston on a scope which the area merits and which will give Massachusetts and New England parity with other parts of the country.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. HARBER,
Chairman.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, December 13, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: On November 28 we publicly announced that a plan was being formulated which should make it possible for RFC to reduce administrative expenses by approximately $5,000,000 and that generally the savings would result from the consolidation of certain of the Corporation's administrative and fiscal activities.

Following this announcement many rumors have been circulated with respect to the effect which the program will have upon our loan agency offices located throughout the country. The RFC board feels that you should be informed of the factual situation.

All of our existing 31 loan agencies will be continued and it is probable that additional offices may be opened.

The board feels that under our present workload administrative expenses with respect to our lending activities can be substantially reduced in each of the foregoing offices and at the same time the service rendered by those offices can be improved.

The plan is to consolidate the bookkeeping and other fiscal activities in 10 or 12 of the loan agencies and a substantial savings can be accomplished by this move. The board wishes to emphasize, however, that the lending and related functions will not be transferred or consolidated but will be retained in each loan agency office.

It is hoped that these comments as to the facts may clarify erroneous impressions, if any, which may have been created.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. HARBER,
Chairman.

Unite on What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have the consent of the House to insert, along with these remarks, an editorial which appeared today in the Washington Daily News.

It is a timely editorial, and although I do not agree with all of the conclusions of the writer, I do agree, and I am sure all of the Members of this body will agree, with that portion relating to our able former colleague, the present distinguished junior Senator from Texas.

The editorial follows:

UNITE ON WHAT?

Twenty-five hundred persons attended the Democratic National Committee's dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York.

Cabinet members, Democratic Congressmen, governors, mayors, other office holders, and party leaders were among them.

At $100 a plate and up, the diners contributed almost a quarter-million dollars to carry forward the committee's preparations for the 1952 presidential election campaign.

And then they applauded appeals for a suspension of partisan politics and for complete naticnal unity in this time of danger.

"I call upon both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party," said New York's Senator LEHMAN, "to forget about 1952 and think only in terms of the security of our country and the peace of the world."

"When the security of this country is at stake," said National Chairman Boyle, "there is no time for partisan politics. * * * I believe the people of this country will rise in wrath against these selfish, narrow men who put partisan advantage ahead of the safety of their country."

The sentiments are lofty. But the earthy implication is plain—that unity means unquestioned acceptance of the Democratic administration's policies; that critics of those policies are selfishly endangering America.

There is no Democratic monopoly on patriotism or wisdom. And, fortunately, there are Democrats wise and brave enough truly to put partisanship aside and face the facts about the administration's policies.

One of these—LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas—was speaking in the Senate at Washington as the guests assembled for the national committee's dinner in New York. He knew what he was talking about. He heads the Senate committee charged with the duty of keeping watch on the Nation's preparedness effort. And he described that effort as dangerously inadequate.

For six costly months, Senator JOHNSON said, America and the whole free world have been at war with international communism, and survival is at stake. Yet:

"Our Government has been planning and acting from day to day and hour to hour. Faced with the task of girding this Nation for a struggle that may outlive us all, we have committed ourselves only to a policy of not committing ourselves.

"We in Congress have been told—and we have apparently accepted it as wise—that we must be more afraid of doing too much than of doing too little. What is the result? For the common defense we have thrown up a chicken-wire fence, not a wall of armed might.

"We have had 6 months to find out where we are going and when we are starting. But we have not done so. The American people are tired of and they are fed up with double-talk in Washington. They are anxious to unite.

"But they cannot rally around a vacuum. They cannot give unified support to policies that do not exist."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 14 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Seaway to the Midwest," which was published in the November 1950 issue of the Eagles' national magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAWAY TO THE MIDWEST—THE VITAL INTERESTS OF AN ENTIRE CONTINENT ARE WRAPPED UP IN THE PROJECTED AND MUCH-DISCUSSED ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

(By Walter Monfried)

Of all the great rivers of the earth, the St. Lawrence is the only one which cracks a continent apart, says a famous naturalist, Henry Beston. Go north of the St. Lawrence and soon you enter the wilderness akin to the forbidding Arctic regions. South of the river stretch the green fields and hills of a temperate zone.

But if the St. Lawrence divides our continent, it likewise binds and unifies it. Nowhere else on earth has nature provided so vast and useful a waterway into the heart of a continent as the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes combination. The St. Lawrence, broad and majestic, loaded with the lore of centuries of high adventure, is a solid business asset to the two great nations whose border is formed by it in part. The noble old Eagle city of Quebec can accommodate the biggest ships that sail the ocean. Upstream, bustling Montreal, another Eagle pride, claims to be the largest inland port in the world. Its waters can hold big ships, too—not the biggest, but big enough for big jobs. Montreal is the world's foremost wheat-exporting port.

For hundreds of years, foresighted men of Canada and the United States have longed for a water route that could take ocean-going vessels from the far west lake harbors—Chicago and Duluth, for example—out to the deep St. Lawrence and hence to the Atlantic and all the world. The dauntless explorer Jacques Cartier, who discovered the

St. Lawrence for white men in 1536, never had more than a hazy idea of the waterway empire which he claimed for France. He thought he had reached China and so he named a series of rapids Lachine. But the brave Frenchmen who followed in later generations—Champlain, Radisson, Joliet, Marquette among them—saw the advantages more clearly. Three centuries ago they persuaded the French Government to build canals and deepen the stream around Lachine and International rapids. The result was a passageway 2 feet deep. That was enough to float the long canoes around the turbulent river rapids.

After Canada joined the British Commonwealth, the sea-minded Canadians and Englishmen realized the waterway's value more fully. The canals were deepened and widened, and the locks expanded. From the 1850's to the 1870's, the new fast rising cities of the Great Lakes sent to Europe hundreds of vessels loaded with Midwest grain, lumber, leather, and foods. Then that trade fell off as the railroads provided faster service to the east coast.

But the dream of a waterway for ocean craft never died. From the 1830's on, Canadian politicians and publicists agitated for it in pamphlets and speeches. In 1902 American and British leaders were proposing conferences to work it out. In 1913 a long step was taken when the United States Senate unanimously approved the resolution of Senator Townsend, of Michigan, requesting the President to enter into negotiations with Great Britain with the view to securing an international agreement for cooperative improvement of navigation in the boundary waters of the United States and Canada. The movement has grown year by year. Conferences have been held, agreements have been reached, and every President from Woodrow Wilson to Harry Truman has advocated such a project. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, is an open supporter, even though the railroad and navigation interests of his own State are opposed. The issue comes up perennially in Congress. The Senate has approved the job by a majority, but the necessary two-thirds approval has been lacking.

It was recognized that 1950, with its elections, could see no furthering of the plan. But the Great Lakes harbor officials and Canadian friends of a deeper waterway have high hopes that 1951 may see definite action. Patriotic organizations of all sections of the United States are lining up behind it. The Fraternal Order of Eagles is one which is advocating the project.

Nature already has given the two nations 95 percent of the 2,400-mile waterway which could accommodate ocean-going vessels. And man already has contributed two vital improvements. The MacArthur locks at Sault Ste. Marie, between Michigan and Ontario, were built in 1942 at a cost of $9,000,000. The Canadians have supplied the invaluable Welland Canal, which can carry heavy ships over the 326-foot drop from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario. The Canadians have worked for over a century to circumvent that enormous drop represented by Niagara Falls. The fourth Welland Canal was undertaken in 1913, and 18 years later it was officially opened after $160,000,000 had been spent. The locks which lift and lower ocean ships are among the biggest anywhere. They are 820 feet long, 80 feet wide and 30 feet deep. A ship can go through the entire series of 8 locks in less than 6 hours, as compared with the 18 hours for the old canal.

The chief bottleneck in the Lakes-to-ocean waterway now occurs in the 113 miles of the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Ogdensburg, N. Y. The series of rapids here is bypassed by canals and relatively small locks, which cannot accommodate the large ocean-going ships. These locks are 260 feet long and 14 feet deep. Not much has been done to modernize them since the 1880's. Ships of about 3,000 tons can now go through. The advocates of the seaway declare that locks of 800 feet length and 27 feet depth are necessary to take care of 10,000-ton vessels.

No one denies that the improvement between Ogdensburg and Montreal would mean a huge and expensive task. It would cost hundreds of millions of dollars for each nation. About 20,000 men would be needed for 4 years of work, it has been estimated. And from the dozens of giant turbines in the completed job, millions of horsepower of electric energy would be available for the farms and home and industries of the Northeastern States and neighboring provinces.

It is a shameless injustice that this project was not carried out years ago, declares Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, one of the leading supporters of the seaway. He and the other backers say that it would carry more shipping than the Suez or Panama Canals and would bring the benefits of low-cost transportation to more than 50,000,000 Americans of the Middle West—one-third of the Nation. The cities of Chicago, Milwaukee, Duluth, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Buffalo, and others on the Great Lakes would be busy ocean ports. The strong currents of the St. Lawrence could generate several times the electricity of even a giant dam such as the Russian Dnieper. New York State and New England States and Canadian Provinces would each save millions of dollars on electricity bills a year, we are told.

The electric-power interests, the coal and railroad and ocean groups have opposed the project out of mere selfishness, the seaway advocates declare.

In the interest of fair play, let us look at the arguments presented by the Association of American Railroads. This group asserts that the benefits from such a project have been highly exaggerated in view of the immense cost. "The channel would have no real resemblance to the vision of a great natural deep-water channel conjured up by the term 'seaway'," the railroad men say.

"During virtually half the year no ship can enter or leave the St. Lawrence on account of ice," the railroad spokesmen argue. The friends of the seaway answer that the seaway would be operable about 8½ months each year, because vessels could start their sailings from Europe several weeks in advance of the movement of the ice out of the St. Lawrence River. Normally the river is open from April into December. "An 8-month season has not spoiled the development of Great Lakes transportation, which is the cheapest transportation known in the world," Great Lakes harbor leaders claim.

Who would pay for this costly digging job? The railroad men argue that the treasuries and ultimately the taxpayers of the United States and Canada would foot a bill of hundreds of millions or possibly more than a billion. Friends of the seaway reply that the legislation before Congress calls for payment by a reasonable system of ship tonnage tolls to be worked out by the two nations.

In the last few years, the seaway's value to the defense of Canada and the United States is stressed more and more. Generals Marshall and Eisenhower and other military leaders have urged the project. The cities of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts are more vulnerable to attack. American success in any future emergency may depend, more than before, upon better access to the machinery and food produced in the Middle West.

The seaway friends also point out that the Second World War cut heavily into the Nation's natural resources, iron, petroleum, and lumber. In future efforts to rearm, it may be necessary to import such raw materials from friendly foreign nations. The seaway, if in use, could carry huge volumes of the supplies to the Middle West industries.

"Two World Wars have been fought and a great peacetime economy has been built largely on the iron ore reserves of the Mesabi range in northern Minnesota," Norman W. Foy of the Republic Steel Corporation says. "But we cannot fight a third world war and we cannot indefinitely expand our peacetime production with Mesabi ore. There will come a year, not far away, when Mesabi ore output will fall short of meeting the needs of our industries on the Great Lakes."

American steel companies now control rich ore deposits in Venezuela, Liberia (Africa), and Labrador. "The Labrador ores can be used efficiently only if the St. Lawrence seaway is built," he asserts. "Labrador ore brought to the river by rail and thence through the St. Lawrence to inland steel mills would insure—as nearly as anything can be insured in wartime—a steady supply of ore such as we had while fighting World War II." Incidentally, little Venezuela is building a seaway for its ore.

The St. Lawrence seaway issue, obviously, is bigger than any single industry or any single region. Our entire continent and hemisphere are wrapped up in it.

The Case Against Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the mail which I am receiving indicates that the people are not only indignant but infuriated over the communistic game which Secretary Acheson has been playing with the Communists. There is overwhelming evidence to show that our boys have fought, bled, and died as a result of the coddling and appeasement of the Communists by Secretary Acheson.

A very revealing article has just appeared in the Freeman under date of December 11, 1950, which states chronologically some of the charges brought against Secretary Acheson as they have appeared in congressional speeches and in the public prints.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting the article to which I have referred as part of my remarks:

THE CASE AGAINST ACHESON

The diplomatic fiction that the war in Korea was a small local affair has been demolished by open Chinese aggression which threatens disaster to General MacArthur's forces. And Secretary of State Dean Acheson has at last discovered a fact which has been common knowledge outside the never-never land of American diplomacy: that the aggressor behind the Chinese Communist is Soviet Russia.

So now it can be told: We defeated the puppet of a puppet in Korea; we are now fighting the puppet; and in both cases the real enemy has been the puppeteer, who of course is Stalin.

"Pardon my firmness," the Secretary of State was saying in effect on November 29, in a broadcast speech which sounded as if it had been written in a second-hand cliché factory. He spoke at a moment when American boys were dying, when the American Army was facing annihilation, and when General MacArthur urgently needed authorization to aid his imperiled forces by bombing

installations and troop concentrations behind the Manchurian border. The general could wait; American diplomats at Lake Success would continue to argue with the Chinese Communists over who slapped whom, while Mr. Acheson warned the fathers and mothers of the dying that Communist China's brazen act holds grave danger for the peace of the world. One might think the Secretary regarded the full-scale war in Korea as just another local skirmish.

Mr. Acheson's speech of November 29, made at a time when swift action to support MacArthur was desperately urgent, was completely silent on this urgency. It sounds like a filibustering speech calculated to divert the attention of the American people and the world from the military paralysis due to UN inaction.

Has there been any basic change in American far-eastern policy, all Mr. Acheson's bold clichés notwithstanding? Or are there still, between his statements of defiance, hints of further appeasement?

As long ago as the autumn of 1944, the man who now admits that Soviet Russia is out to conquer the world had become the head of the pro-Russian group in the State Department. Former Assistant Secretary Adolf A. Berle testified to this fact before the Committee on Un-American Activities on August 30, 1948, as follows:

"As I think many people know, in the fall of 1944 there was a difference of opinion in the State Department. I felt that the Russians were not going to be sympathetic and cooperative. Victory was then assured, though not complete, and the intelligence reports which were in my charge, among other things, indicated a very aggressive policy not at all in line with the kind of cooperation everyone was hoping for, and I was pressing for a pretty clean-cut show-down then when our position was strongest. * * * The opposite group in the State Department was largely * * * Mr. Acheson's group, of course, with Mr. Hiss as his principal aid in the matter. I got trimmed in that fight and, as a result, went to Brazil, and that ended my diplomatic career."

The opposite group went on to get many another good and patriotic American in the Department, while Mr. Acheson's principal aide, Alger Hiss, went on from one important post to another until he became the organizer of the San Francisco Conference to set up the United Nations, and one of President Roosevelt's chief advisers at the fatal Yalta Conference.

They got Under Secretary Joseph Grew, who resigned in the summer of 1945 and was immediately succeeded by Dean Acheson. When Patrick Hurley returned from China in November to demand dismissal of the pro-Communist State Department men in China who were turning over his secret messages to Moscow, it was the Ambassador's resignation that was accepted. The pro-Communists stayed, and Dean Acheson sat down with Gen. George Marshall to write the instructions to bring about a Kuomintang-Communist coalition government in China—instructions which Marshall vainly followed for a year.

By October 7 of 1945 the Daily Worker, whose Washington correspondent on June 7 had called Acheson one of the most forward-looking men in the State Department, chortled in its joy:

"With the assistant to Assistant Secretary of State James C. Dunn, Eugene Dooman, who was chairman of SWINK, the powerful interdepartmental committee representing State, War, and Navy, and former Acting Secretary Joseph Grew out, the forces in the State Department which were relatively anti-imperialist were strengthened."

And the Daily Worker's uptown echo, PM, declared that "What the Government seeks now is to develop a diplomacy based on better appreciation of what the Soviet wants."

That was what the Government developed, and that is what the Government has continued in the Far East down to the present debacle.

When Acheson, after 2 years at his private law practice, returned to the Department as Secretary in January 1949 he was sold to the American people as representing continuity in foreign policy. Precisely because this was true, those who realized that our foreign policy pointed to disaster were dismayed by the appointment. There was also objection from those who felt that it would be unbecoming, to say the least, for a man whose law firm was registered with the Department as representing several foreign governments to be dealing with those governments as Secretary of State. But the main objections were based on Acheson's previous record in the Department.

Since that time Acheson's completion of the China sellout, his publication of the infamous Government white paper whitewashing the Department's Red China record, his public denunciations of Chiang Kai-shek, his appointment of Philip Jessup and Dean Rusk as makers of Far East policy, his proposals—after having virtually turned Asia over to communism—that we pour money and arms into any borderland Korea where Stalin might choose to have his puppets attack, his public and official declaration that he would not turn his back on the convicted perjurer Alger Hiss—all these actions had aroused great public uneasiness even before the Korean adventure, and had prompted two Democratic legislatures (Texas and Mississippi), and various other organizations and individuals to call for the Secretary's dismissal.

Some of the charges brought against him are here briefly summarized from congressional speeches and the public prints.

1. He has been the chief architect of the policy which has brought us, in 5 years, from the unconditional victories of 1945, and sole possession of the atom bomb, to the verge of national ruin.

2. Under his guidance, we acquiesced in the conquest of one-third of the world by Communist imperialism.

3. He and his clique encouraged a weak Communist rebellion in China, armed and directed by Russia, to take over the heartland, or key to all Asia; today, in consequence, Americans are dying for a toehold in Korea, a peninsula attached to the China Mr. Acheson's Department helped to push into Russia's arms.

4. On July 31, 1946, Mr. Acheson wrote to Alfred Kohlberg, of New York, a letter which was published in which he said: "General Marshall * * * is exerting every effort to fulfill the American Government's desires by bringing the two major Chinese political factions peacefully together to form a united and representative government."

5. After the legitimate government of China had been forced to flee to Formosa, Secretary Acheson recommended abandonment of that island. His Department, on December 23, 1949, sent out secret instructions to all diplomatic and consular personnel to promote the view that Formosa was doomed and expendable.

6. Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, on March 20, 1947, Mr. Acheson said there was no danger of a Communist defeat of Chiang Kai-shek. In his letter to the President of July 30, 1949, prefacing the White Book, he says that "no amount of aid could have saved Chiang." These statements are typical of the quality of Acheson's statesmanship.

7. On August 24, 1949, in answer to Congressman WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, Mr. Acheson denied that Vice President Wallace had made a written report to President Roosevelt on his return from China in 1944. Since then, Mr. Wallace has released portions of two such reports.

8. In issuing the white paper on China, on August 5, 1949, Acheson declared that all important documents were included. Twelve cables called for by Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley when testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1945, were omitted and are still secret.

9. He has approved the Chinese Communist demands for hostages to guarantee Americans leaving Red China.

10. He paid Communist China to get Consul General Angus Ward out, and then only after a newspaper campaign had aroused public opinion.

11. Under questioning by a Senate committee before his confirmation as Under Secretary of State in 1945, Acheson stated that Russia should have a share in the administration of Japan.

12. He sponsored the Hiss brothers unreservedly to Assistant Secretary of State Adolf Berle, to whom Whittaker Chambers had mentioned them as Soviet agents. In 1946 he used his influence with the FBI to save Alger Hiss; he publicly and officially refused to turn his back on Alger Hiss after 20 jurors had found him guilty of perjury about espionage.

13. He acted as counsel for Lauchlin Currie, former administrative assistant to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, when Currie appeared before a congressional committee, charged by both Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley with having aided their espionage network.

14. On April 18, 1947, without investigation, he cleared John Carter Vincent, chief of the vitally important Far Eastern Division of the State Department, of charges of procommunism filed by a United States Senator. In his letter he professed complete ignorance of official published Communist programs for world-wide conquest, especially in the Far East.

15. Acheson headed the American delegation in the formation of UNRRA, where he insisted on the veto to please Russia, and according to former Polish Ambassador Jan Ciechanowski, steadily supported all Soviet demands. Thus he rendered the United States impotent to control or investigate UNRRA, although this country supplied the overwhelming bulk of its funds.

16. As head of the State Department unit arranging for the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, Acheson secured the appointment of Alger Hiss as Director of the Division of International Security in charge of American preparations for the UN, as adviser to Secretary Stettinius and President Roosevelt at Yalta, and as first Secretary General of the UN.

17. On July 20, 1946 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9714), Mr. Acheson stated that there were no Communists in the State Department, and that only one had been fired for that reason. The first statement proved to be untrue.

18. In spite of documented charges of softness toward communism against Ambassador Philip Jessup, Mr. Acheson has made him top American foreign policy adviser both in Europe and Asia.

19. Speaking in welcome to the "Red Dean" of Canterbury at Madison Square Garden, November 14, 1945, Under Secretary of State Acheson said:

"Never in the past has there been any place on the globe where the vital interests of the American and Russian peoples have clashed or even been antagonistic—and there is no objective reason to suppose that there should * * * be such a place. * * * We understand and agree with them that to have friendly governments along her borders is essential both for the security of the Soviet Union and for the peace of the world."

20. Acheson recognized Tito's Communist government of Yugoslavia on December 22,

1945, without demanding the free elections provided for at Yalta.

21. Against the advice of Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane in 1946, Mr. Acheson approved a loan of $90,000,000 to Communist Poland, then represented by Donald Hiss of the Acheson law firm.

22. The Lilienthal Atomic Energy Committee was appointed in October 1946, on Acheson's recommendation, without the knowledge of his superior, Secretary of State Byrnes, or of Bernard Baruch, who headed our Atomic Commission to the UN.

23. Acheson fronted for the Acheson-Lilienthal atomic energy report, which proposed turning over atomic secrets to Russia on promise of peaceful uses, but without inspection.

24. On May 1, 1946, Acting Secretary of State Acheson announced that invitations to attend the Bikini A-bomb tests on July 1 had been extended to the Soviet Government.

25. On December 16, 1945, Under Secretary Acheson received Juan Negrin, head of the Communist group of Spanish loyalists. He refused to receive Fernando de los Rios, head of the anti-Communist group. Four days later he received Milton Wolff, commander of the subversive Abraham Lincoln Brigade and Congressman VITO MARCANTONIO, and promised them, according to the Daily Worker, to intervene with Franco on behalf of two condemned Communists.

26. Everybody except Mr. Acheson has known all along that the Communist forces in China and North Korea were armed and directed by Russia; that American prisoners are executed by order of Russia, exactly as Polish prisoners were executed in the Katyn Forest. Yet Mr. Acheson permitted Chinese Communist delegates to accuse this country of aggression in Formosa while American soldiers were still waiting for permission to fight the enemy with all means at MacArthur's command.

It must be said that President Truman, in approving and defending the policy and behavior of the ruling State Department clique, has made himself ultimately responsible for them, for the policy, and for the debacle to which it has led. It is also true that his responsibility is shared by a majority in Congress, and by a large majority of the newspapers. Those who have not protested against the errors which have resulted in the enslavement of one-third of the world and the terrorization of the rest of it, must share in the responsibility for those errors.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Julius Applebaum, president of the Brooklyn Bar Association, which appeared in the October issue of the Brooklyn Barrister:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

(By Julius Applebaum)

In writing this Presidential message, the problem is choice rather than lack of subjects.

WAR DUTIES

That people of thought and stability the world over are deeply concerned with the imminence of global war is a sad commentary on civilization. Some contend that it is useless or too late to review the past and determine who and what forces are at fault for the failures or betrayals resulting in the present condition. I do not subscribe to such view. I firmly believe that we cannot save the Nation and the world's future generations from destruction unless we avoid the betrayals and the failures of the past and unless we adopt and adhere to sound and just principles in the future. It is in that respect that the bar owes a sacred duty. Whether its voice in the past was not sufficiently heard or whether its voice was not sufficiently loud and courageous, is still to be determined.

Since peace and order in the world are essentially based on agreement and law, the lawyers are best equipped and primarily responsible for proper guidance. There never was a time when there was greater need for a courageous bar to rise above petty political considerations or affiliations to its full responsibility to the Nation and to the world.

A GREAT STATESMAN'S VIEW

Some years ago, I was at the office of a man whose services to the people of this State and of this Nation are a matter of history. During the last two decades and throughout the world, regret has steadily mounted that this Nation had not made more use of his extraordinary ability as executive and statesman, his fine, native intelligence, his unswerving truthfulness, and his unquestioned honesty. During a respite from our business conference, we chatted on extraneous subjects. He knew of my interest in improving the judicial system and the judiciary. He said to me: "Applebaum, the curse of the judiciary is the practice of frequently picking men for the bench not because they are outstanding, qualified lawyers but because the leaders want an Irish Catholic, a Jew, a Protestant, an Italian, or a Pole to round out the ticket for political expediency." I agreed with him.

The place. Empire State Building.

The man: Alfred E. Smith.

What applies to the judiciary applies with almost equal force to every other office of Government. Good government and the people suffer either when there is discrimination against a qualified man by reason of his race or religion or when the selection of a man is made solely because of his race or religion. The latter selection is no compliment to the man or to his race or religion. Moreover, if votes of citizens of any race or religion can be procured or purchased by naming an unqualified member of their group to appease or to please them they demonstrate that they are not qualified for American citizenship. Such practice should be fought with equal vigor as discrimination. Both are un-American—both destructive of our Government and institutions. Lawyers can and should condemn both practices.

TWO FOUL BLOWS

Throughout its history, our court of appeals has maintained the finest judicial tradition and has been held in the highest esteem throughout the country by bench and bar. One of the foremost qualities has always been the total absence of cliques or blocs among its members, a characteristic that has been destructive of high reputation elsewhere.

Within the past week of this writing, two foul blows were struck at the court of appeals.

First. When the name of one of its distinguished members was suggested for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination, one Louis Hollander, purporting to speak for the CIO Political Action Committee, made the statement that that jurist's record showed antilabor and racial basis. Mr. Hollander's statement was shocking and baseless.

Second. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey's reference to and his own comments on the Hollander attack in his, the Governor's, public announcement stating the reasons why he would be a candidate for reelection, was an act of statesmanship of very low quality.

I say that the attack was upon the court rather than upon the jurist in question, for he, by a life devoted to high ideals and to able and honorable public service, had immunized himself from such petty attack. Prejudice or bias against labor or against any group or against any race or religion is foreign to his character and to the life he has lived.

Spain's Repudiation of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF RFPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following inspiring address of the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., Archbishop of Boston, to officers and leaders of the Holy Name Society, on Sunday, December 3, 1950:

Each year at this time I meet with you so that we may take stock of the past and make our prayerful plans for the future.

This year we meet under particularly sobering circumstances. When last we assembled I begged you to pray for the church. I pointed out to you some of her enemies' designs upon her welfare here in America. You will remember that I quoted to you the drunken, but very ominous attack made upon the church by a national radio commentator and I pointed out the relationship of his drunken talk to the sober campaign against Catholic schools, Catholic charities, organized Catholic life of every kind as of this time a year ago. I asked you to pray for the church.

Today I ask you to pray for America. We may well doubt whether she has ever been in greater need of prayers at home and of friends abroad than she is this week. The common people of America, by their charitable efforts, their travels, their letters, gifts, and good deeds of every kind, have done everything possible to make friends for us in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere. Organized efforts by the Government have been directed toward the same end, particularly through gigantic relief programs and constructive measures like the Marshall plan.

But some diplomats have diminished the effectiveness of these efforts by the manner in which they have seemed willing to use these means of influencing friends in order also to alienate friends and to create enemies. We must pray that our leaders, finally awakened to the dangers in which our Nation stands, will put an end to this foolhardiness and make the friends we badly need among people who have long desired to be our friends.

I refer particularly to nations like Spain and Portugal. It is an appalling piece of hypocrisy which talks of relief to starving Yugoslavia and yet seeks to starve Spain. It is contemptible politics, contemptible morality, contemptible diplomacy, and, at the moment, contemptible patriotism, to subsidize the Communist regime of Tito and to refuse the hand of friendship to the one nation in Europe which has been resisting communism for 20 solid years, years during which some of our leaders were ready and willing to appease the Reds.

I have never made any public pronouncement of any kind concerning Spain. People who have spoken up in tribute to the Spanish people's heroic overthrow of the

Communist conspiracy have been labeled Fascists, reactionaries, and enemies of human freedom. Name calling of that kind is not as common, or at least not as public as it used to be before the Reds embarrassed their sympathizers here in America. The critics of Spain and the friends of communism have grown more cautious for reasons which are shrieked in the headlines this week. We would be fools, however, foolish citizens and foolish Catholics, if we supposed they have changed their minds.

Communists and Communist sympathizers never change their minds. They change their line, they change their tactics, they change their addresses, they change their names, they change their countries and their contacts, but they never change their minds.

They are seeking now in America what they sought in Korea a year ago, in China 2 years ago, in Hungary 3 years ago, in Yugoslavia before that, and what they successfully obtained in all these places, sometimes with our help or connivance. It is the same thing that they sought in Spain 15 years ago and which the Spanish people flatly refused to give them. For that refusal Spain has been paying ever since.

One would not mind if the reprisal against Spain had merely come from those who admit that they sought the destruction of Spain, from acknowledged Communists and Red sympathizers. But the reprisals have been directed against the Spanish people and are directed to this very day by men who claim that they speak for us, for America and for democracy.

The reprisals against the Spanish people have taken many forms—the positive form of constant repetition of lies about Spain by men in high places and low; the systematic spread through the liberal press, some non-Catholic pulpits, and certain lecture halls of the Communist propaganda concerning Spain. The reprisal has also taken the negative form of a cold-blooded, calculated effort to freeze the Spanish people out of organized society; to ignore their contributions to the security of the Western World; to deny their right to be heard and to be helped; to starve them into the repudiation of the Government forced upon them by the same international communism which is now forcing upon us days of frenzied planning and nights of tortured sleep. For it is no longer Spaniards, but Americans who are being blown to bits as part of the plan first made clear in Madrid, Barcelona, and the Austrias 15 years ago.

The gesture to offer token help to Spain recently made by the Congress is a tardy recognition of our debt to Spain, but it is a welcome one. If we have so many millions of dollars and tons of supplies to give to Tito, whose men shot American soldiers, whose "kangaroo" courts have outraged the spiritual brethren of millions of American people, whose orators have slandered American ideals and policies, then surely it is proper that we aid the Spanish people. They first bore the brunt of the savagery we are now beginning to taste in the Far East. They first sounded the alarm we are now attempting to echo. They gave their blood, their valor, and all else they had to fight back an enemy whose existence we denied until he turned on us.

We are told that we must help the Communists of Yugoslavia because they are defying the savage threat of Soviet imperialists. We might, therefore, conclude that we should even more gladly help those non-Communists who have not merely defied but have defeated the savage threat of the same imperialists within the borders of Spain.

We are told that it is in our Nation's interest to keep Soviet power out of one of Europe's most strategic areas. We might, therefore, conclude that we should help even more a nation which has been the object of Soviet designs against all the European peninsula, the first nation in which an armed effort to establish Soviet power was made and successfully frustrated.

We are told that the continued independence of Yugoslavia is of great importance to the security of the United Nations and to its partners in the common defense against the threat of Soviet aggression. We might, therefore, conclude that the same is true of the continued independence of Spain, the first nation the Soviet attempted to subjugate.

We are told that aid to Yugoslavia is a part of our effort to educate those parts of the world still hovering between democracy and communism concerning the evils of the latter and the merits of our system of government. In the case of the Spanish people that work of education is more than half done. They are the one people in Europe who do not need to be told the evils of communism. There is not a single town in all Spain; there is not a single family, not one, in all Spain which has not learned this lesson in the bloody school of Communist violence. There is not a single town in all Spain which hasn't tasted what communism has to offer. There is not a single diocese which does not have its list of martyred priests, nuns, and devoted laity. If our relief programs have for their partial purpose to provide education against communism, than the Spaniards have qualified for their place among our disciples—and their qualifications have been increased, not diminished, by the lies told about them here in America and among the United Nations during the past 15 years.

There must be very few people left who do not now realize who started these lies and who has kept them going and why. We may well thank God, as Catholics and as Americans, that the tide is beginning to turn and that we now may hear the truth about Spain; the truth about what Spain suffered from communism; the truth about what Spain did to prevent the spread of communism; the truth about what Spain can still do to prevent the spread of communism; that truth about Spain's place in Christendom and Spain's place in the Western World.

It may now be possible, at long last, to inquire and publicize the truth about Spain as told by our American Ambassador there during the recent war, Prof. Carleton Hayes. His book Mission to Spain received a systematic soft-pedalling from the fellow travelers and Red sympathizers who were so much more powerful when it was first published than they are now—thanks to the persistent, patient patriotism of men like Tom Murphy and those who have exposed the friends of communism in the Government bureaus, in the entertainment world, the publishing field, education and social circles, and political action.

We are told that even though Tito tramples both faith and freedom under foot, still we should give him aid since, as Christians, we are bound to love even our enemies. This kind of talk always reminds us of the warning of the poet that the Devil can cite Scripture for his purpose. It is true that Christians are commanded to love their enemies. But that commandment does not require them to treat their friends with contempt; to starve their neighbors merely because they are not enemies; or to turn friends into enemies so that they may be eligible for our affection and aid.

If moral or humanitarian consideration require that we forgive Tito, then they certainly require that we forgive Spain whatever fancied case against the Spanish people we are told exists. They also require that we welcome Spain, a tried and tested foe of communism, a proven friend of Christendom, into whatever alliances of mutual benefit are being concocted in the present effort to turn back the tide of communism.

Certainly we are bound to make friends with our enemies; but no less certainly we are bound to make friends of our friends; to build on whatever foundations for friendship may exist; to pay due tribute to those who have proved themselves our friends by suffering at the hands of enemies who were practicing to turn on us.

I hope that you men will express your American and Christian satisfaction with the actions of those representatives who have helped make possible aid to Spain. I hope you will make clear to those who seek to prevent aid to Spain that their line is wearing thin, and that those who know where the real evil lies in the world at the moment are weary of that line, weary unto death.

So, too, the mask is off in China, and for that, too, we should be grimly grateful. We shall hear less talk about agrarian reformers in China, now that the agrarian reformers have beat their plowshares into swords with which to slay our sons and brothers. We shall hear less about agrarian reformers, but we must not forget who they were who tried to sell the agrarian reformers to us.

Catholics and Americans, we have earned the right to be particularly indignant about what is happening in China. It is just a little less than 2 years ago that I spoke to a Holy Name Society communion breakfast in St. Bridget's Parish, Sunday morning, January 9, 1949. At that time I ventured to speak about China. The very people who are now telling us what scoundrels the Chinese Communists have proved to be, were then telling us that non-Communist Chinese were scoundrels for not abdicating in favor of the Chinese Reds.

At that time the representatives of free China were being forced out by the Red Fascist Chinese Communists—while we did and said little to prevent the destruction of free China and the rise of Communist China. We used to be told: "Don't get excited about China. Wait and see. Red fascism may overrun China, but it can never beat China down." Well, it did beat China down * * * and we stood by and held its coat while it did the brutal job. We waited * * * and we have seen. We have seen what we now see. Having beat China down, it proposes to beat us down and all the world with us.

At that time I begged your prayers for China. Speaking to the Holy Name Society that morning I said: "There is something very strange about the general moral paralysis and ominous silence in the face of what is happening in China. The apparent moral paralysis is preventing any effective action in behalf of the free Chinese people and their legitimate government. The ominous silence bids fair to prevent public discussion of one of the most cynical, sinister, and dangerous developments in the march of Red imperialism across the prostrate forms of liberty-loving nations. Both the moral paralysis and the disturbing silence about what is happening in China flows from a dangerous form of defeatism, a defeatism on the part of our leadership which will cost China dearly in the next few months and for which America herself will have to pay an appalling price both at home and abroad before the final chapter of Red fascism has been written."

The prophecy has been fulfilled with sickening speed. At that time I asserted that as Catholics and as Americans we should lift our voices and cry out in protest against the general indifference to the fate of China. I said that we should demand clear commitments, honest reports, a policy of realism in the face of what was happening to faith and to freedom in China. Millions of people all over America felt the same way.

They were told that free China would have to come to terms with the Communist rebels. They were told to forget what no one should ever forget, namely, that wherever you find a Communist you find a spy, and wherever you have a spy, you have a traitor. We were

told that China should invite known traitors and avowed spies in its government, and do this as the price of retaining the loyalty and support of our part of the world.

At that time an honorable policy toward China would have been relatively easy. A free China was still possible. Three-fourths of China, outside of Manchuria, was still under the control of free China. The government of the free Chinese had been able to hold its own for many years. With our help then, it could have held its own indefinitely.

We were then fed lies about China by the same liberals and other friends of Red fascism who were lying to us about Spain. Propaganda against the leaders of free China received free rein in our forums, press, universities, and other channels of public opinion. They were the lies we were told about Hungary and the lies we were told about any other nations against which the Red Fascists had designs.

When we refused to help free China we forfeited the friendship of God knows how many millions of people whom we helped drive to despair. The price is now being paid in Korea. It is a bitter price, bitter and bloody, but it will be cheap if it rips the mask once and for all from the face of hypocrisy, concerning who are and who are not the friends of our way of life. It may prevent our having to pay a like price in Europe as a result of refusal to retain and increase the friendship of the Spanish people.

When anyone tells you we should not aid Spain, find out where he stood 2 years ago on aid to China. Find out where he—or she, for that matter—stood on Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop Stepinac, Poland, Greece. Find out where they stood on Tito.

What is the practical point of all this? Are we warmongers? Are we disloyal to our own leadership? Whoever makes such charges, knows he lies. We do not seek violence and we have never lifted our voices for war. But we do ask for equity, justice, and charity in the distribution of things which make for peace. We never ask for revolution against constituted authority; we are the last ever to ask such things. But we do ask for realism in the policies of constituting authority toward those who are the agents of revolution, the enemies of authority. We people have to pay as we have to pay when wars come. None have more sons than we. None lost so many in proportion. None have more motives, natural or supernatural, for seeking peace.

You will remember with what resentment we Catholics used to read the accusations of the liberal press or hear the charges of Dr. Oxnam and others that we were attempting to foment a holy war against an imaginary enemy in the east; that we were using religion to gain political objectives when we protested with all our power against the violence of the Red regimes; that we were putting property rights above human rights when we called upon our leaders of the world to protest against Communist aggression, brutality, and administration by extermination.

You will remember how that phrase "holy war" was continually thrown in our faces.

You will remember how impotent we were to persuade our neighbors that the anti-Catholic line was also antidemocratic because it was pro-Communist. It was hard to make people believe that then because those who made no secret of their anti-catholicism still pretended to have no real part with communism. They asserted that they were Socialists at most—agrarian reformers, political liberals, social dreamers, kindly men. They were frank to say that they opposed catholicism, but they pretended that they were no less militantly opposed to communism. They used to shout—their speeches of 3 and 4 years ago are still in the files of the public press—that it would be no escape from communism to fall into the hands of catholicism. They even asserted that, in a choice between the two, they would rather have communism.

These people have, I repeat, changed their line a little lately. They have not, I repeat, changed their minds. They are still anti-Catholic and they lose no chance to prove it. They are still pro-Communist, even when they are obliged to wait in silence the day when it will be safe again to say so.

Nor are they entirely silent about it. The other day Bertrand Russell, who was awarded the Nobel prize, if you please, declared that the only thing he hates on earth is the Catholic Church. He then repeated the alleged parallel between communism and catholicism which used to be drawn by Dr. Oxnam. He made it perfectly clear that, as between the two, he preferred Red fascism.

The exasperating part of all this is that such talk is not considered anti-Communist, antidemocratic, or anti-Christian. As a matter of fact, most of those who indulge in it pretend that it is not even anti-Catholic, though it must be said of Mr. Russell that he is not guilty of this particular hypocrisy. He frankly proclaims that the Catholic Church is the only thing on earth that he hates. Do you think Nobel prizes would be awarded to people who said like things about Jews, Protestants, Quakers, Scientists, or other religious, racial, or like groups?

What must be our reaction to all this? The Catholic approach to the problem of organizing a peaceful world is now what it has always been, despite the verbal attacks of the anti-Catholic or the violence of the Communists. It was restated effectively and beautifully by Monsignor Sheen in the first issue of a new publication called World Missions. He pointed out how Catholic missions are in great degree the home of humanity. One of the primary purposes of our foreign missions is to build not one world but rather one humanity, the one humanity which must exist before a united world is possible. One world is a political and economical concept. One humanity is a divine concept, something only God's grace can achieve. Monsignor Sheen put it well when he said, "The Catholic point of view is that humanity is made one, as a body is made one through a soul. When the Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles, their discordant elements were fused into one body, and even one mind. The confusion of tongues was undone, and the poor divided speech which men had inherited from Babel's bricklayers now became one language and one mind.

"The purpose of the missions is not to unite the world in one political system or to make other countries all believers in a particular form of democracy, but to allow them great political diversity with unity in spirit. When the early Church received the pentecostal outpouring, her members shared their property in common. This was the creation of one economic world, but the spirit was first. The Communists assume that if men share property, that therefore they are one in spirit. The fallacy is to assume that if four men divide an apple, they become brothers. Rather the Catholic position is that if they are first made brothers in Christ, then they will share the apple. The Catholic who regards the Chinese and Japanese, and Indians, and others, as his potential brothers, will translate this act of faith into positive mission aid, that they may become actual brothers in Christ, to the end that there may be one world because there is one humanity."

Catholic foreign missions are the greatest single spiritual ally to the cause of genuine democracy. Those who love the one, love the other. Those who hate the one, hate no less the other. It is no accident that even as we read in the daily press of the young men murdered for democracy, so we read in the letters from the mission fields of the brave boys and beautiful girls martyred for the foreign missions. The other day a Columban father wrote: "We are receiving very bad news from Korea these days. A few weeks ago Father Garrity found the body of Father Tony Collier. He had been shot to death on June 27. We have just now been instructed to say our masses for Monsignor Pat Brannan and Fathers Curran and O'Brien, who we must presume were put to death on September 26, though their bodies have not been recovered. This still leaves Monsignor Tom Quinlan and four other priests still missing."

The letter is typical. A year ago it would have been of interest to only us Catholics. Now all Americans are beginning to get the point.

Wherefore, this afternoon I join in the resolutions your committee presents to this assembly. But I ask that either by formal resolution or by informal conviction you leave here united in: (1) Gratitude that at last token action has been taken to encourage the Spanish people in their repudiation of communism; (2) satisfaction, not complacent, but realistic, that at last the mask is off in China, as it long has been in Spain; (3) recognition that the cause of Catholic missions deserves a first place in the prayers, interests, and loyalties of all Holy Name men.

Men of the Holy Name Society: I repeat, pray for America. Pray for our President. Pray for his advisers, military, diplomatic, and political. He is faced with decisions such as few men in all recorded history have had to make. Pray that he will be God's instrument, our President, and God's man.

The Great Gerrymander of 1952

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, today, from an unimpeachable source, to whom I swore secrecy, I got the real lowdown on the congressional reapportionment plan for 1952 in New York State.

If this is true, and I am given to believe it is, there is a sinister, yet influential cabal in Albany, already at work, bent on carving up our Thirty-seventh Congressional District into little pieces and committing it to the political slaughterhouse.

They vow to make dear old Broome County the insignificant tail of a tremendous new district which will stretch clear across the State almost to Buffalo.

The Broome area, which contains the Triple Cities has become one of the most populous and important sections of upState New York. It is unbelievable that those now conspiring in our State capital would go to such lengths as I will shortly describe to relegate our distinctive community to a second- or third-class category by placing Broome County at the extreme end of an elongated geographical shape and leave us with no voice, no influence and nothing in common with distant and exotic subdivisions they will throw us into.

Broome County is large enough and important enough to compose a single

congressional district. Why should we be compelled to bow to the whims, the prejudices, the jealousies of lesser areas 200 miles distant just because caprice and double dealing are now uppermost in the minds of a certain Albany clique?

I for one resent this insult and I am going to do everything within my power to stop it. I hope our State representatives will be able to peer behind the curtains of corruption and smash this plot before it gets anywhere.

These wreckers should leave the Thirty-seventh Congressional District as it is, or nearly so. Broome and Chenango, for instance, have more in common than almost any two counties in the State. I should know, because I have enjoyed the great honor of representing them both for the past six terms in this House.

Their real objective, of course, is to change Broome County from a center of civilization into a political nonentity by putting her into this monstrous jumble of counties they hope to call a district. Actually, their present scheme would make the proposal half as big as the State itself.

While I am not sufficiently fortunate to be informed of the actual counties that will go into this crazy quilt, I do know they want to gerrymander us into an area which will encompass the home of another Member of Congress, and I have already heard him mentioned.

My friends in Broome County will likewise be interested in learning that some other counties of this proposed new pocket borough, of which Broome is the hind end, lie in strange new territory which never has had and never will have anything in common with the valley of fair play.

The wiseacres will, of course, claim that I am being sectional in my complaint that Broome is to be made the tail of the kite instead of the center of the new district. If they do, I will freely admit it.

But any fair-minded person and certainly everybody from Broome County will stoutly maintain that ours is too important, too principal, and too large a section of the State of New York to bow to the petty desires of cabalistic carvers and submit to the humility they are forcing upon us.

In short, I am strongly opposed to the radical departure from decency now prompting the plotters who want to gerrymander Broome County into political oblivion and cut up our present Thirty-seventh Congressional District into unrecognizable strips of no man's land.

Those who believe in our present system of representative government realize that to make our congressional districts any larger than they now are, renders our American system impossible to practice. It is physically out of the question for any one person to adequately represent more than the present number of people in the average bailiwick.

Then, too, continually revising our congressional districts causes general confusion on the part of the people. They are never familiar with their representatives in Congress, in spite of our constitutional admonition which declares that the House, in particular, should be close to the people.

Throwing everybody into new boundaries causes a Member of Congress to become completely dependent upon political bosses instead of the rank and file. He does not have time to get acquainted with the people, before an election, and must look askance to the chosen few of any section if the people themselves do not know him.

New York State is making the mistake of its history, if the legislature consents to follow the course being charted by the gang I have mentioned. Larger congressional districts will put an end to direct representation. We may as well revert to electing Members at large throughout the State, because they will be as far removed from the people under these new proposals.

Newspapers have it that an attempt will be made to delay a decision on the new districts until the fall of 1951. They infer that the plotters do not want to reveal their gutter work until almost on the eve of the 1952 elections.

Oh, I suppose some of the fair-haired will be "tipped off" as to what new territory they will have to campaign in. I am taking no chances, however.

If the legislature refuses to make public the congressional districts by early 1951, I will have to campaign in every up-State county next summer and am making my plans accordingly. I will also have to blanket the entire State of New York with wave on wave of franked speeches in order to have my name familiar to the voters.

Frankly, I am taking no chances, because I know only too well the chicanery, the deceit, the shadow-boxing, and the skulduggery which are profuse behind the dark curtains hiding the pompous motions, the nefarious saws, and the deadly knives of the gerrymanderers.

It will take a lot more energy to campaign over a radius of 200 miles to the north, the southeast, and the west of Broome County, but I am prepared to do it. These "birds" are not going to gerrymander me out of Congress if I can help it.

It will take a lot of paper and envelopes to cover the same territory in which I will have to ring doorbells. But if the meat-ax politicians in Albany refuse to make known our several new congressional districts and who is thrown in with whom, I will have no alternative.

Granted there will be a lot of wasted motions traveling in every direction up-State to campaign, but the pocket-borough craftsmen offer me no choice.

Let us hope that right thinking men will be able to prevail upon the councils of ignominy, and produce, before the normal term of the legislature adjourns next spring, the geographical answers of where our new congressional districts begin and where they leave off.

And once again, let us hope that Broome County will be the center, not the tail end of whatever the masterminds of gerrymander conceive.

Excess-Profits Tax—"Special Privilege" Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an editorial by Mr. David Lawrence which appears in the December 15, 1950, issue of U. S. News and World Report:

"SPECIAL PRIVILEGE" WINS

(By David Lawrence)

Where were the liberals last week when the House of Representatives voted to give special privileges to big business?

Where were the liberals who have told us for years now that fair competition is the cardinal principle of the free-enterprise system?

Where were the liberals who have alined themselves for decades behind the slogan of Thomas Jefferson—"Equal rights for all, special privileges for none?"

Where were the liberals who have prated so eloquently for the last several years about the need for protecting small business in America?

The truth is the so-called liberals abandoned their faith—they allowed themselves to be deceived by the mere title of a piece of legislation without really examining its substance.

Because it was called a tax on excess profits they superficially thought they had done their duty—they had soaked the rich.

But, as it turns out, they have soaked the weaker competitors, the marginal competitors, the middle-sized businesses, the new businesses, and they have reimposed the pro-monopoly rule of tax rates which has twice been enacted in America under the guise of a wartime revenue producer.

For the new tax bill simply means that the more successful competitor will pay out fewer dollars in taxes than the less successful competitor.

It means that the company with the largest amount of accumulated capital will pay less taxes than the company with the smaller amount of capital.

It means that the company which has earned the largest amount of profits for the 4 years from 1946 through 1949 will be given an advantage of a lower tax rate—lower than that which a company that has earned less profits in these 4 years must now pay.

It means that the company which has struggled through the reconversion period after World War II and earned no profits at all or just broken even shall pay high tax rates as a penalty for its misfortune. It means that these struggling companies must be prevented from accumulating out of their earnings any reserves to meet subsequent competition with the larger companies. It compels the banker to turn down the smaller company which will have so little left out of profits annually hereafter that it cannot pay off in 5 years, for instance, the money it may need to borrow for better plant or equipment.

To all this the glib answer will be made by defenders of the bill that there are effective relief provisions available or that growth problems are dealt with equitably in the proposed law, or that credits are to be given to certain businesses earning less than $25,000 a year. It is the group between $25,000 and $100,000 which will be hardest hit. They

will pay in many cases a higher rate per thousand than the companies earning $1,000,000 a year.

If the liberals in Congress believe in the efficacy of so-called relief provisions they can easily debunk them by calling for the actual records of what happened after World War I and after World War II in the application of these same provisions.

Can anybody in Congress find that the relief provisions and growth clauses which were in the law during World War II resulted in any real equalization? Can there be any denial that the smaller and weaker competitors paid taxes at a rate higher than the bigger companies in their respective fields?

With some well-intentioned but futile changes, the ambiguous phraseology of the World War II law now is being inserted in the provisions of the new bill.

This means that the well-entrenched and well-heeled can be happy again. The struggling competitor who has been told this is a land or real competition in which the Government presumably interposes no barriers and obstructions to free enterprise will grieve at the hypocrisy of modern politics, but he will be helpless.

Small wonder that the stock market has taken in its stride the passage of the new tax bill. Small wonder that even the Republican leaders of the conservative school in the Senate are talking of hastening the passage of the House bill with some minor changes.

There is only one fair way to tax—across the boards. Every corporation should pay the same rate of taxes on every thousand dollars of profit earned. Plenty of revenue can be collected by a straight increase in corporation tax rates without the tricky devices of average earnings and investment capital bases.

The excess-profits bill is no hardship for the monopolists but it spells the death knell of middle-sized business. Smokescreens have again deceived the liberals in both our political parties. They have passed not an excess-profits bill but an excess-penalty bill.

Let us not hear honeyed words again from President Truman about the little man and his friend the Democratic Party. The administration wrote the new tax bill and put it through the House. Are there any liberals left in the Senate?

A New Aristocracy: The Russian Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Roy L. Deal. He is a lawyer of Winston-Salem, N. C., formerly a special agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation, superior court judge, and colonel, JAGD, AUS. He has studied many of the publications on the Bolsheviks since the revolution of 1917. This article is a revision of speeches he has been making since his return from the Army in 1946.

There is no such thing as communism. There are only Communists. To speak of "communism" implies a set of principles or theories or an ideology. These the Communists do not have. There is only a group of some five million men in Russia who call themselves "Communists." They have no ideals or principles; they have no ideology. They are in truth but a self-perpetrating aristocracy of about 3 percent of the Russian people, who have arbitrarily seized power.

The Communist Party in Russia is a closed party. Its discipline is strict and severe. New members are chosen from the youth for their ability, skill, and ruthlessness in advancing the cause of the Communists.

The members of the Communist Party in Russia constitute the most ruthless, powerful, and efficient group of men in the world. They are the only political party, and the other 97 percent of the people of Russia cannot belong to the Communist or to any other party because there is no other. These 5,000,000 Communists permeate all government, and all industry and agriculture, holding the key positions. How the Communist aristocracy in Russia is organized within itself is a deep secret. How and when they decide to purge members who do not come up to their standards of efficiency and discipline is also a secret. But their method of internal organization must be powerful.

These 5,000,000 brilliant men, efficiently organized for ruthless action, without conscience, without principle, have as objectives the perpetration of their group in Russia and the encroachment of their group over the whole world.

They are accomplishing this skillfully. They have four chief weapons of attack: one, the communistic or socialistic principles of Karl Marx which they use as bait; two, the appeal to the selfishness and greed of the less prosperous classes of the world against those who are better off; three, resort to military force through satellites, and their own army only when sure of success.

But the Russian Communists are vulnerable to their own methods of attack in a greater degree than are private businessmen in free countries. The peoples of the world should know that the Communists are the wealthiest and the most powerful hereditary aristocracy the world has ever seen. The peoples of the world should constantly have brought before them pictures and stories of the beautiful resorts of the Communists on the Black Sea, their beautiful estates near their great cities and factories; that the Communist Party member has wealth and privilege infinitely above that of the ordinary worker; and that such aristocracy, having now been in power for 33 years, is becoming hereditary because so large a proportion of the new party members are the children of the original party members.

Call the attention of the people to the fact that the greatest ambition in life of anyone born in Russia would be to obtain a Communist Party card, and that once he has obtained it, he has acquired for himself and his posterity all the special privileges, both economic and political, that greed and avarice could wish to grasp.

Again, imagine the Russian system transplanted to America. If there are 150,000,000 Americans, on the same proportion the membership of the Communist aristocracy in America would be limited to about 4,500,000. How would the average American worker like to have a privileged group of 4,500,000 aristocrats ruling him politically and economically, and possessing and enjoying all of the wealth of the state through control of the state, wth the further likelihood that their children will be given every preference in becoming party members over the children of the mere workers or nonparty members?

The people should know that where the Communists are in power, it is a closed party; only where they are not in power is it an open party, welcoming all to the fold. But once power has been acquired, it immediately becomes quite clear that many who thought they were party members were really not. The recent purges in the Eastern-European countries prove this. If and when the Communists take over in America, what a surprise it is going to be to some of our American Communists to learn that their cards are the wrong color, or have not been properly countersigned, or something.

The Communists are conquering the world largely through the appeal to the greed and envy of the masses. That same weapon should be turned against the Communists because they are an aristocracy which has all privilege, economic and political.

In our fight against the Russian Communists these facts should be driven home at every opportunity. Thousands of illustrations are possible. Names of young Communists who got into the Communist aristocracy by birth, such as the son of Stalin, now a lieutenant general in command of the Russian air forces, should constantly be brought before the people. Pictures of the limousines of the privileged Communists; pictures of their villas and estates; their special food stores; pictures of their parties; pictures of their fine clothes in contrast to the shoddy clothes of the workers—everything to arouse understanding on the part of the workers of their inferior lot and of the special privileges of the Communist aristocracy. In fact, we should quit referring to communism, or even Communists, but we should constantly refer to the Communist aristocracy. Nobody likes an aristocrat, unless he thinks he is one.

And it should be pointed out that we probably would not have an independent Communist aristocracy in America. Look at Yugoslavia. Tito tried to establish his Communist aristocracy independent of the Russians, and he got excommunicated, with the whole Communist world against him. He'll be assassinated some day, as was Trotsky. The Russian Communist aristocracy does not trust the Jew, because he is truly international-minded, and so the Jews now amount to little in the Russian Communist aristocracy. The Negroes would serve no better. I challenge any Negro anywhere in the world to prove that he has a card to membership in the Russian Communist Party.

The Communists have no faith in God or religion; they believe that man is greedy and selfish and full of envy. They know that this greed, selfishness, and envy are magnified a hundred-fold in the group, and so they appeal to groups and minorities to arouse their envy against those who have been more successful in our free enterprise. They conceive that they have established a world aristocracy limited in membership to the Russian Communist aristocrats; that they have put into practical operation the plan of Plato's Republic; that they being the most efficient, ruthless, and able group in Russia, should control not only Russia, but the world. Like Plato, they dismiss democracy with a laugh because "democracy is government by those least qualified."

The Russian Communist aristocracy, by reason of its power, efficiency, and ruthlessness, is the greatest danger the world has ever faced. Can a democracy protect itself against it? Up to now we have signally failed because we have failed to understand and to make the people of the world recognize the Communists for what they are—a powerful, privileged, select, perpetual aristocracy of combined economic and political power. Let's tell the world about it.

The Communists pretend to the world that their bible is Karl Marx's Das Kapital, and that they believe in the principles of socialism. Not so; their bible is Plato's Republic—in a debased form. Read the Republic again with this idea in mind. You will identify the small, coherent, efficient group

of guardians as the members of the Communist Party—the superior men who, because of their superior efficiency, should and will rule the state. You will identify the iron curtain of the Communists in that ancient Greek's story of those who, having been permitted from infancy to see only shadows on a blank wall, mistook the shadows for reality, and reality for shadows.

In the hereditary feature now developing in Russia's new aristocracy, the Communists have departed from Plato's plan. His guardians were not to marry or have families, but only mistresses. This, too, the Communists started to follow in Russia in the early days of the revolution. By "arrangements" rather than marriage, unrestricted divorce, and children being wards of the state, they sought to destroy the family. But human nature rebelled, and the family came back, with the inevitable tendency toward passing the party card on to the next generation. All aristocracies in the past have become hereditary and all hereditary aristocracies have become decadent, but that may take many generations.

Our leaders have not been able to cope with the Communists because of their tendency to think of them as a political party, or to think of Russia as a country ruled by a one-man dictator, Stalin. They are neither, and they act like neither a political party nor a dictatorship. They are a ruling class of superior men, disregarding all objectives but their own perpetuation in power. Being a small percentage of the people, they must hold on to and expand their power or die. Therefore, they cannot compromise. Like the Nazis (another group of "superior" men), they must win or die.

In their use of twisted words and distorted ideas, which are their most useful weapon, they have nearly always won against our people. We have permitted them to select the words with which to misstate our ideas, and then we dumbly use their words ourselves. No trial lawyer will permit the opposing attorney to state his case for him; he has sense enough to know that he must state his own case or lose.

Let's examine some of their words and slogans which we, in our sweet innocence, have adopted. "Capitalism" and "capitalists." Why, the very word "capitalist" brings up a vision of a fat Wall Streeter in high hat, money bulging from pockets, with his feet on the necks of the masses. In truth, the Communists and the democracies both practice capitalism, or the accumulation of wealth with which to produce goods. They preach state capitalism, and we, private capitalism. They suppress the fact that under their state capitalism a privileged 3 percent own the state, and thereby the wealth. We do not emphasize enough that under our private capitalism the majority of the people have a share of capital wealth.

The Communists say that they are establishing a classless society—all men belonging to one class, the workers. That's closer to the truth than they usually are. They really have reduced their society to two classes: the 3 percent ruling class, and the 97 percent regimented workers.

But our writers and diplomats continue to refer to Molotov and Vishinsky as "representatives of the Soviet Republic" or "representatives of Russia." To call them "representatives of the Russian ruling class" or "apostles of the superior 3 percent of the Russian people" or just plain "3 percenters" suits me better.

What a grand ring has the slogan "dictatorship of the proletariat." That sounds as if the 97 percent making up the masses ruled the state, but no, the 3 percent rule the 97 percent. This dictatorship is of the proletariat, not by and for it.

"Exploitation of the workers" by capital has a sadistic, ugly ring. But state capitalism (controlled by the privileged 3 percent) can do far more exploiting than can private capitalism in a free society. There are no true labor unions or strikes in Russia.

The superior Communists seem to work on Machiavelli's theory that "it is impossible to underestimate the intelligence of the masses."

The Russian Communists have been appallingly successful in world politics.

Five years ago any American who prophesied that by 1950 we would be at war with our historic friends, the Chinese, would have been called a wild man. Within 5 years from now any surviving American, looking back to 1950, will ask, "How could our leaders have been so insane in 1950 as to fight the Chinese?"

It was clear from the beginning that the Communist invasion of South Korea was a trap planned by our only real enemies, the Russian Communists. They planned from the beginning to throw their dupes, the Chinese, at the right time into the war. This they timed with extreme skill, to make it look like an act of spontaneous defense by the Chinese for fear of invasion by us.

If we fight the millions of trained Chinese soldiers, supplied with arms by the Russians, we will be bled white (as were the Japanese) while our real enemy, the Russian Communists, will grow relatively so strong we will be helpless before them.

If we use the atomic bomb against the Chinese, the rest of the world throughout all history would condemn us.

We should announce that we will not fight our friends, the Chinese people, and that we will even withdraw entirely from Korea to avoid it.

The psychological gain with the Chinese would largely offset the loss of face in retiring from Korea. But, regardless of loss of face, we must get out or lose our Nation.

Ten years ago, any American who prophesied that by now we would have destroyed Germany and Japan and built up the Russian Communists to the greatest world power, would have been called a madman. But we have done just that.

These appalling errors have been made and are being made because our leaders have not understand the nature of the Russian Communists.

Since 1941, we have acted and reacted almost exactly as the able and skillful Russian Communists have expected us to, or have planned for us to.

They planned to get us into war with the Chinese, so here we go.

We must conserve and build up our strength—not dissipate it. When we use the atomic bomb, let it be against our only real enemies, the Russian Communists.

Let us at least understand the facts and bring them clearly and truthfully before the people. Understanding by the public is the breath of life in a democracy.

More on the Lie-and-Smear Medical Campaign of Omaha Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is part 12 in the lie-and-smear campaign series of the Omaha doctors:

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 28, 1950]

AMA ASSAILED BY O'SULLIVAN--GROUP TRIED TO BLOCK HEALTH LEGISLATION

Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN Friday night charged the American Medical Association had tried to block all major health legislation for more than a decade.

"Since the AMA is spearheading the fight for the Republican Party all over the Nation * * * it looks like the Republicans have gone underground with the Communists," he said.

He insisted that he never had favored socialized medicine. "If the doctors who continue to diagnose the President's health program as socialism have no greater skill in their profession, God help their patients."

He and Walter Raecke, of Central City, Democratic candidate for governor, spoke at the third annual dinner of the Douglas County Democratic Club at the Paxton Hotel.

FOR REACTIONARIES

"The present campaign is a cloak and shield for reactionary Democrats and Republicans," Congressman O'SULLIVAN said.

"With my more than 30 years of service to the downtrodden, I am better suited to serve in Congress than my opponent, who never did a worth-while thing in his life," he added.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of November 5, 1950]

DISTRUST HELD FOR O'SULLIVAN—DOCTOR SAYS CHANGED STAND AFTER ELECTION

Doctors have reason to distrust Democrat EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, who seeks reelection to the House of Representatives, a physician stated Saturday night.

Dr. F. O. Beck gave the reason at a rally at Mount Olive Baptist Church, 3010 R Street.

Dr. Beck said Mr. O'SULLIVAN told the doctors before the last election that he was opposed to socialized medicine. However, Dr. Beck charged, Mr. O'SULLIVAN reversed his stand after being elected.

TWO OTHERS SPEAK

Two other Omaha doctors spoke at the rally sponsored by the healing arts committee.

Dr. W. L. Rumbolz said socialized medicine would be another step down the road to complete socialism.

He said the medical profession has deteriorated in every nation which placed it under a socialized system.

COULD MAKE MORE

Dr. John O'Hearn declared: "We're fighting for the individual freedom of every human being in the United States. Today we're fighting Mr. O'SULLIVAN."

He said doctors could make more money under the proposed socialized medicine plan, but "yet we don't want this thing."

Approximately 50 persons present were urged to support Mr. O'SULLIVAN'S opponent, Republican HOWARD BUFFETT.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of November 6, 1950]

MEDICAL PLAN NOT ON BALLOT—BUT DOCTOR URGES VOTE FOR BUFFETT

The way to register your ballot against socialized medicine is to vote for Republican HOWARD H. BUFFETT for Congress, Dr. J. Phil Redgwick said Monday.

"Socialized medicine has become so much a part of the Second Congressional District campaign," the nonpartisan doctors committee chairman said, "that some persons probably will expect to find a socialized medicine proposal on the ballot.

"Of course, it will not be on the ballot. But you will find the name of HOWARD BUFFETT on the ballot. And there is no question of how he stands on this important question."

USES BIG LIE

As for his opponent, Representative EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, Dr. Redgwick said, "His campaign has been characterized by the Hitler technique—that is to tell the big lie and

keep repeating it in the hope the people will believe it if repeated often enough."

In this campaign "the big lie" has involved the socialized medicine issue, Dr. Redgwick stated.

In a recent radio address, the doctor said, and later in a printed pamphlet, Mr. O'SULLIVAN stated, "I am now and have always been against socialized medicine; there is no bill pending in either the Senate or House creating socialism or socialized medicine."

SENT 5,000 LETTERS

"That statement," asserted Dr. Redgwick, "is a deliberate falsehood."

In September 1949, Mr. O'SULLIVAN mailed 5,000 letters to his constituents—doctors, dentists, hospitals, etc.—in franked envelopes at Government expense, Dr. Redgwick said.

"These letters," he continued, "contained a pamphlet prepared by the committee for the Nation's health. This is a well-known left-wing organization," he said.

Dr. Redgwick said the pamphlet contains a picture of Senate file 1679, the socialized medicine bill. "The pamphlet," he continued, "explains in detail the administration's seven-point health program."

ONLY SEVEN SECTIONS

"The seventh point," Dr. Redgwick said, "provides for compulsory health insurance. In September 1949," he continued, "Mr. O'SULLIVAN stated that he is favorable to the administration's health program and a few weeks ago at Nebraska City the Congressman said he is for only seven sections of President Truman's national health bill."

"Now, the day before election," Dr. Redgwick said, "a large ad paid for by Labor's League for Political Education states also that Mr. O'SULLIVAN is against socialized medicine and compulsory health insurance.

"Here again is unmistakable evidence of 'the big lie' technique being used to deliberately deceive and confuse the voters in this important election."

ANY CONTROLS LEAD TO MORE—SHAFTON SEES THREAT IN MEDICAL PROFESSION

If the Government can take control of the medical profession, there is nothing to stand in the way of its controlling any other profession or industry.

Giving a layman's point of view on compulsory health insurance, Attorney Edward Shafton Friday might gave this as one of his reasons for supporting Republican HOWARD BUFFETT for Congress.

Mr. Shafton spoke at the Second Congressional District Healing Arts Committee dinner at the American Legion Club.

"Every time an additional power is given to our Government concerning the conduct of our daily lives, we find ourselves closer to being dominated by that Government."

RIGHTS FOR BENEFITS

"The people in America must remember that every time they receive a benefit from the Government, they in turn give up a right and a privilege," he warned.

Mr. Shafton listed as his personal reasons for opposing socialized medicine:

1. I believe in free enterprise and do not believe the Government belongs in business.

2. It will destroy the keen initiative of the men in the medical profession.

3. The science of medicine will be destroyed.

4. I want to select the doctor, nurse, and hospital of my own choosing.

5. I don't want my case history to become public record.

BUFFETT SPEAKS

Mr. BUFFETT, who spoke briefly, said, "If the planners can overwhelm the medical profession, they figure other groups will be a pushover.

"I think they have met their match in Nebraska."

Other speakers were Dr. Maurice C. Howard, Dealing Arts chairman, and Dr. J. Phil Redgwick, Non-Partisan Doctors Committee chairman.

BAN ON BUFFETT BY UNION MEMBERSHIP

The record of HOWARD H. BUFFETT, Republican candidate for Congress, "is an open book, and any attempt on his part to discuss issues would be a waste of his and our time," President Al Witzling of the Omaha Federation of Labor (A. F. of L.) said Saturday.

Mr. BUFFETT had said in a talk that union leaders had refused him the opportunity to appear before them and discuss the issues.

Said Mr. Witzling:

"Mr. BUFFETT knows as well as we that communications are read at union meetings and acted upon by the membership.

"The labor leaders have no control over the votes of the membership, and the fact that he was not asked to appear before any of the unions shows that it was the decisions of thousands of union members—not just the so-called labor leaders."

Mr. Witzling also said that Mr. BUFFETT's statement that labor leaders tried to defeat him on orders from Washington was silly.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 4, 1950]

HEALTH LETTERS SHOW SWITCH—NOW RUN 3 TO 1 AGAINST COMPULSORY PLAN

KANSAS CITY, MO.—Congressional mail now is running 3 to 1 against compulsory health insurance, Clem Whitaker, director of the national education campaign of the American Medical Association said Tuesday.

Mr. Whitaker spoke before the the twenty-eighth fall clinic of the Kansas City Southwest Clinical Society.

Two years ago, he said, congressional mail favored compulsory health insurance 2½ to 1.

"The doctors of this country can be very prideful citizens for what they have accomplished in stopping the inroads of state socialism in America," Mr. Whitaker said.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 26, 1950]

HOSPITAL PROTESTS O'SULLIVAN CHARGE

Frank McDevitt, chairman of the Advisory Board of St. Catherine's Hospital, Thursday contradicted Representative EUGENE O'SULLIVAN's statement on Federal help to hospitals.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said Wednesday that "Creighton Medical School no longer can pay its own way" and that Federal money helped pay for additions at St. Joseph's, St. Catherine's, and other Omaha hospitals.

Asserted Mr. McDevitt:

"That about St. Catherine's Hospital is absolutely as wrong as it could be. We received absolutely no funds for the addition at St. Catherine's Hospital."

A spokesman for the nonpartisan doctors committee said:

"The addition at St. Joseph's Hospital cost $2,000,000. All the financing was completed and arranged before we had any Federal help. Then we were given $65,000 on a $2,000,000 project."

[From the Omaha World-Herald of October 29, 1950]

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SPARK SOCIALIZED MEDICINE PLOT

Dr. M. C. Howard Saturday outlined "the conspiracy to enact a socialized medicine law."

The Healing Arts Committee chairman said the story is printed in the remarks of Representative Forest A. Harness, of Indiana, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, 1948.

Reporting on "our most dangerous lobby," the Congressman said the subcommittee which he headed "has uncovered startling evidence of attempts by Federal officials to make big government bigger and to extend by another vast grant of power the authority of the state over the lives of all of us."

The Congressman said his committee found Government employees back of the campaign to pressure Congress into passing a national compulsory insurance law. He said the campaign was planned inside the Government, on Government time, and "supported by the Government publicity and propaganda machine."

"Confronted with these facts, our committee—Democrats and Republicans—voted unanimously to expose them and to turn the evidence over to the FBI and the Department of Justice for prosecution under the law which forbids Federal employees to use Federal funds to influence legislation."

The committee's investigations, Mr. Harness said, showed "the headquarters for the drive for this scheme is in the Federal Security Agency in Washington.

"The FSA is already a vast social-service establishment with 35,000 employees.

"To increase pressure for the scheme, Federal job holders helped to set up two organizations—the Physicians' Forum and the Committee for the Nation's Health—and have been active in both."

The Physicians' Forum's chairman is Dr. Ernest P. Boas, "who has been identified by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a member of eight Communist-front organizations," Mr. Harness said.

"The heads of both the New York and Washington offices of the Committee for the Nation's Health are formally registered with the Government as paid lobbyists," Congressman Harness said. "Chairman of the committee and one of its principal founders is Michael M. Davis, formerly employed by the Social Security Administration."

Dr. Howard pointed out that the Committee for the Nation's Health supplied the 5,000 pamphlets that Democratic Congressman EUGENE O'SULLIVAN, of Omaha, mailed to his constituents in September 1949 "in franked envelopes at the taxpayers' expense."

Dr. Howard's committee is supporting Republican HOWARD H. BUFFETT for the seat held by Congressman O'SULLIVAN.

Out of Crisis, a Spirit of Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Out of Crisis, a Spirit of Unity," published in the New York Times Magazine of December 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUT OF CRISIS, A SPIRIT OF UNITY—AGAIN OUR DEMOCRACY DEMONSTRATES ITS GENIUS FOR BURYING DIFFERENCES IN A COMMON CAUSE

(By Cabell Phillips)

WASHINGTON.—The Eighty-first Congress came back to Washington 2 weeks ago in a pervading feeling of pessimism. On the part of the Democrats there was a feeling of bitter disillusion and hopelessness.

Their Senate majority had been whittled almost to the vanishing point, they counted among their casualties at least four of their strongest leaders, and there was widespread feeling that their party had been repudiated. On the part of the Republicans there was jubilation, but their triumph was tinged with vindictiveness. Policies were to be reexamined, whitewashes were to be scraped off, and certain prominent necks were to be guillotined at whatever cost to decorum and our posture before the world. In this climate the spirit of national unity was smothered.

With the change in war news came a dramatic change of mood. Recriminations were hastily deleted from speeches. Republican as well as Democratic leaders were summoned to the White House and emerged with almost humble promises of cooperation with the President. Secretary Acheson was treated with rare deference as he laid the grim facts from the Far East before closed sessions of the foreign affairs committees. Arrogance and disillusion were gone. In their place was anxiety and the realization that our Nation hung on the brink of another Pearl Harbor or Bataan.

Out of that cataclysm national unity was reborn. At least it was for this lame-duck Congress. Perhaps it was, also, among all the people of the country, but one cannot yet be sure. Public opinion moves with ponderous and unpredictable steps.

And therein lie the great questions of this hour of our national destiny. Are we as a people ready to lay aside the hostility and suspicions we carried with us to the polls on November 7? Are we ready to quit trying to place the blame for our predicament and stoning the scapegoats and to turn to the infinitely unpleasanter task of extricating ourselves? Are we willing to submerge our separate remedies and accept the single remedy of our national leadership? Are we at last and at this moment, buffeted and chastened enough to pull on the tough armor of national unity?

National unity seems particularly difficult to come by in democratic societies. Perhaps it is because, in normal times, we lay so little value upon it. Our very structure of government makes almost a virtue of dissent. We have glorified the independence and integrity of the individual man to the point where he instinctively resists herding. We have fought two bloody wars against the fanatical excesses of nationalism and are dedicated now to the doctrine of internationalism. Of patriotism we have a plenty. But national unity is something more than a lump in the throat at the sight of Old Glory waving in the sunshine.

National unity is a composite of both emotional and rational impulses. There are three conditions to its realization.

1. There must be, first, a common desire. It may be a desire induced by need, by avarice, or by some danger, but it must be translatable in terms of the individual citizen—a desire that he experiences personally and intensively.

2. There must be a common faith, faith in both the chosen leaders and the selected means. This faith must be given often at the sacrifice of one's own judgment and interests. It need not mean the abandonment of the right to oppose, but it does deny the right to obstruct. No commander is going to win a war whose officers veto his strategy and pick their own targets while the bullets are flying.

3. And there must be a common courage, a shared determination to pay the price and to endure the suffering that the winning of the objective demands.

How do we as a nation measure up today with respect to these three imperatives of national unity? What elements do we have at hand, and what are we lacking?

For the long run our common desire is for a world at peace. But the short run and urgent goal is for a safe release from the debacle that seems to face us in the Far East.

At no time since our involvement in Korea began have our people been as shocked over what seems to be an almost inevitable disaster. This feeling is personal and intense. Thousands of American families have sons and fathers who are either dead or maimed or who stand in hourly peril. There is added now the dread that the fighting will spread and be prolonged. We, and the rest of the world, are tortured by the thought that a third world war has been triggered.

Our reaction is universal and unalloyed by any divergent loyalties or partisanship. In the past we have had important minorities whose sympathies, for reasons of nationality or ideology, were directed in part at least toward our enemies. It is difficult to believe that in this conflict anything more than an infinitesimal group of native Communists are so treacherously inclined.

So our common desire for peace is induced by that most powerful of all motives, awareness of danger, a grim knowledge that cuts across all boundaries of race, nationality and belief.

Our common faith must, of necessity, be placed in our chosen leaders—the President and his chief civilian and military subordinates.

As individuals we may neither respect nor fully trust either those leaders or their policies. Without question that is the perplexity of a great many Americans today with respect to the Truman administration. But that administration was put in power by the mandate of a Democratic majority.

That mandate placed in their hands the conduct of our military and foreign affairs. We may rightfully question their wisdom and try to influence their decisions. But once those decisions are made, we are all, under the rules we live by, equally obligated by them.

We must accept the premise that our leaders are acting to the best of their abilities and to no other purpose than to protect our national interest. Any other premise in time of crisis would lead to anarchy.

Mr. Truman has demonstrated dramatically that he can command a large share of the people's faith. One such occasion was his stunning election victory in 1948. Another was his courageous and instant response to the first Communist aggression in Korea last summer. In each case there was an outpouring of public confidence in his leadership.

Conversely, there have been plentiful instances of a palpable lack of public confidence. The recent election showed the cumulative effect of many of these disagreements, specifically in the conduct of far eastern affairs, the presence of Dean Acheson in his Cabinet and the alleged softness of his administration toward Communists in Government. And by an odd and ironic twist, there is developing as this is written some clamor against his retention of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in command of the military operations in the Pacific.

But men alone cannot be the sole repositories of our faith. We must believe, too, in the broad moral principles that motivate them and their policies. These may elude us unless we search for them, for the philosophy of our stand in the world was never more complex than it is today.

History has shattered the protective, insular shell within which we grew to maturity. The cozy warmth of our material and political self-sufficiency has been stripped away. We stand naked to the same harsh winds of conflict that lash all the other peoples of an interdependent world. Figuratively, but inevitably, each of us is chilled by the snows of Korea and starved by the famines in India.

Faith is a nebulous and unstable quantity. It comes by invitation, not command; but fear and the need of a common defense are powerful stimuli to its coming. The evidence is that it is reviving for President Truman and his program now.

Certainly the Republican dissenters in Congress, with only a few notable exceptions, have given him their fealty. Senators TAFT and WHERRY, among others, have promised to submerge their disagreements over policy and to abate their accusations for what has happened while granting him all the authority he needs to meet the emergency.

The public must follow this lead if we are to have the faith that will sustain us in the months ahead.

Of common courage in times of stress we always have had an abundance. There is no reason to think it is less plentiful now. This is not only the physical courage to face danger on the battlefield; it is the moral courage to make the hard decisions and to accept the big and little sacrifices in which all emergencies abound. Congress has not shied from its responsibility to enact the hated economic controls nor the huge appropriations and revenue measures which our situation demands. Nor has there been any substantial outcry from the people who must shoulder these burdens.

Courage is stimulated by the magnitude of danger. The prospects a fortnight ago, with the fighting seemingly about over, was that we would slacken the pace of our defenses. The temptation to relax and reexamine would have been overpowering. We might have lacked the common courage then to continue to prepare for a danger we could no longer see, but the comfortable illusion of safety has now been dispelled.

National unity is not, of course, the exclusive property of the democracy. It, or rather its pretext, is sine qua non of the dictatorship as well. But unity in a slave state is only incidentally a matter of loyalty; it is essentially a product of discipline. It is exacted in the way that taxes and military service and production quotas are exacted. To withhold it is to invite swift retribution. Deviationism is synonymous with treason.

But these impulses exist, and having no escape hatch through honest debate and controversy, build up seething pressures beneath the surface. Molten lava needs only a tiny fissure in the earth's crust to burst forth as a volcano. Unlike a democracy where national unity has a tough and resilient vitality, in a totalitarian state it can never stumble and rise and walk again. The dissolution that finally overtook German nazism and Italian fascism was utter and complete.

Winston Churchill has written eloquently of the way the British people, paralyzed by apathy and indecision in the early months of the last war, suddenly closed ranks under the hammer blows of the Nazi air blitz to give one of the most magnificent demonstrations of national unity in all history. There are comparable chapters in our own story—the two World Wars, the early years of the New Deal, when destitution was the common enemy, and again last June, when Communist aggressors burst over the borders of the free world.

We have the capacity for united action and it is inconceivable that we will not use it again. We have a desire for victory and peace and we have the requisite courage. But have we the common faith?

National unity at this hour is not simply a question of whether we follow an elected official named Harry Truman and the policies of his administration. We don't all have to become Fair Dealers overnight in order to achieve a united front. We must distinguish

between the individual and what he symbolizes. In the deepest sense our loyalty is bestowed not upon the man who chances to be in office, but upon an abstraction, the Presidency. We could not have endured the crises of 40 national elections if this were not so.

But we have endured those 40 bloodless uprisings as well as dissensions and disasters of a more grievous sort. And always, with but the one exception of the Civil War, we have closed our ranks, buried our differences, and faced the common enemy with a common will.

It is a peculiar genius we have that enables us to squander our greatest moral resources in this fashion and yet somehow to rally it in time to avert the ultimate catastrophe. That is a matter of exquisite timing and reflexes. Let us hope they are as keen as they need to be.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of visiting a number of farms in my district, and to learn for myself the value of some of the programs for which we in Congress have appropriated funds and written legislation. What I saw on those farms made me proud to feel that I had had some small part in bringing these advantages to my constituents and to farmers in all parts of the country.

The farms I visited were all ones where the farmer had received loans from the Farmers Home Administration so that he could operate his farm, become an owner of his own farm, or to construct new buildings on his land. In every case the borrower was a farmer who, through no special fault of his own, was unable to obtain credit from the usual sources, and would not have been able to operate, buy or build without this assistance from Government.

Yet the outstanding thing I saw on these farms was not only the work of the Farmers Home Administration but the evidences of good cooperation among agricultural and other Government agencies. I saw Government workers teaming together to help farmers, and as a result of this cooperation, the farmers were prospering, were taking an active part in their community affairs, were becoming good customers of the local merchants, and were greatly improving the agriculture of their county.

On the farm of Maxie Pierce in Vermilion County, for example, I found a veteran of World War II who had returned from military service, married a school teacher, and signed a contract to buy the 91-acre Pierce homesite where he had grown up as a boy. But Maxie contracted for a little more than he realized, because he had not had much farm management experience, and his term of military service came during a period when farm technology was making rapid steps. Maxie was rusty on his farming, had not kept up with modern methods while in service. Could the Government help him learn how to farm well enough so he could make the payments on that farm?

It could, and it would.

Maxie first contacted the Vermilion parish service officer, Charles LeBlanc, who explained to Pierce the benefits of on-farm training programs which had been provided for veterans under the GI bill of rights we in Congress helped pass. Then LeBlanc introduced Maxie to Paul A. Bourgeois, the veteran on-farm training instructor, and Pierce was enrolled in a class which would help teach him some of the farm-management methods he had forgotten or never learned because of his military service.

Through Bourgeois, Maxie also met and learned to use the services of Murphy Veillion, Vermilion County agent, who has given Pierce many additional suggestions on ways to farm in the parish, crops which would bring best results, or ways to handle livestock. And from the county agent, Pierce came to know and learn how to use the services of PMA Field Agent Lynn Landrenau and Farmers Home Administration Supervisor Leonard Hollier.

Landrenau and the PMA helped Pierce with problems of pasture improvement by furnishing fertilizer, seed, and lime. FHA Supervisor Hollier and his agency helped Pierce work out a balanced farm and home plan, and provided him with credit and on-farm instruction to do the job the plan outlined. For example, the plan showed that Pierce had the best opportunity to succeed if he increased his livestock and poultry holdings. To do this he needed more pasture. The FHA loan enabled him to buy the necessary livestock and poultry, and to finance such parts of his pasture-improvement program as were not covered by PMA payments.

The farm and home plan prepared by FHA called for some changes to be made in the home end of the farm, too, and Mrs. Pierce entered the picture then. As a 4-H leader at the Mouton Cove school where she taught, Mrs. Pierce was already well acquainted with Miss Constance Escude, the county home demonstration representative. When Supervisor Hollier suggested that Mrs. Pierce and Miss Escude get together to work out home problems, there was no problem in working out this arrangement.

One of the things Mrs. Pierce was most interested in was a new home. Working in her old home—a country cabin—would never be easy or particularly successful. And Miss Escude pointed out that the same agency which had loaned the Pierce family money to buy livestock and poultry would also loan them additional funds to build the new house the family deserved. The Pierces went back to Supervisor Hollier with a question as to whether this could be done or not, and again the answer was yes. Late in 1949 we in Congress had written into the Housing Act of 1949 a provision for loaning farmers money to build, repair, or remodel farm structures, and the FHA administered this program. Hollier did arrange a loan for the Pierce family, and on my visit to this farm I saw both the old house where the Pierces were still living and the new one almost completed, where they will be living before the end of 1950.

In building the new home, the extension county agent showed the Pierce family some housing plans well suited for that part of Louisiana, and the Farmers Home Administration also showed some plans they had developed for the same purpose. The Pierces selected some features from both, and the Rural Electrification Administration helped to work out wiring plans for the selected structure.

Let us see, that makes seven different Government people or agencies who helped Pierce and his wife—the Veterans' Administration, the Office of Education's on-farm training instructor, the county agent, the home demonstration agent, the PMA field agent, the REA specialist, and the Farmers Home supervisor. And because of their cooperation I saw the Pierce family with a new home, modern in every respect, and almost ready for them to move into. I saw a farm being operated efficiently by a farmer who needed training and help to make it operate that well. I saw a home managed as we would want our homes to be managed.

Maxie has already built his cattle herd to 12 head, and in addition has a registered Brahma bull to improve it. He has a fine laying flock of 300 hens. He has good equipment, a well-developed pasture, good crops. In addition to the new house there is a new poultry house Maxie built himself from material sawed off his farm. Not only his home but the poultry house, too, are equipped with running water and electricity. Mrs. Pierce has a sanitary sewage disposal unit, an electric range, an automatic hot-water heater, and a deep freeze among her many new home improvements.

Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt on the case of Maxie Pierce at some length to demonstrate how the farm program works, to tie in the activities of the several agencies involved, and to show the splendid unselfish cooperation and teamwork existing among the local heads of and all workers in these agencies, both in the office and in the field. But, Mr. Speaker, the case of Maxie Pierce is not any more spectacular than all the other families I visited on the ground. Rather, it is merely an illustration of the success of the program. Time will not permit a full discussion of each case, but mention must be made of all of them.

For instance, in Vermilion Parish I also visited the prosperous farm of Bernard LeBlanc, who was the first man to receive a farm housing loan in that parish.

I enjoyed talking with Clyde Boudoin, a successful dairyman, who, with the help of friends in the community, was building a new home on his farm.

Because of his untiring energy Edier Bares has paid up his loan in full. He is now one of the large rice farmers near Abbeville, equipped with the best up-to-date mechanical farm implements, including a deep well running into thousands of dollars to construct and serving not only his own farm but irrigating rice fields surrounding his property.

Without disparagement to the others, I must say that I have never seen a finer and more comfortable and well-appointed farm home than that of Whitney LeBlanc. The whitewashed barns, the strong fences on his farm bespeak the determination, thrift, and industry of Whitney LeBlanc and his helpful wife. It is no wonder that they own one of the finest herds of dairy cattle which has come to my observation.

Mr. Speaker, what I have said about Vermilion Parish holds true for St. Martin Parish. Keen competition for successful administration of the program exists between Leonard Hollier of Vermilion Parish and Owen J. Resweber, County Supervisor of the Farmers Home Administration in St. Martin Parish. I must refrain from judging the results because I come from St. Martin Parish and might be tempted to exaggerate the fine work of Mr. Resweber, in cooperation with the other agencies I have previously mentioned. Then too, prior to being elected to this body I was attorney for the Farmers Home Administration in St. Martin Parish for some 15 years and I naturally have come in closer contact with Mr. Resweber and all of his very competent force, in the office and field.

In company with Mr. Resweber and with Alexis Delahoussaye, Adelma Cormier, and Robert Champagne, members of the local board, I also visited borrowers in St. Martin Parish. Mr. Ephis Chataignier, Mr. Victor Russo, and Mr. Andre Delahoussaye were born and reared on farms. They experienced the drudgery of share-croppers until the Farmers Home Administration made it possible for them to acquire their own farms. To me the thrill and independence of private ownership these three are experiencing was perhaps the most impressive part of my tour.

Yes; we also visited Junius Lee, a Negro tenant and operating loan borrower. Junius Lee's children are afforded all the facilities of the spendid educational system in my parish, where we draw no distinction in opportunity for work, for private ownership, and for education. Let that be a lesson to a certain misinformed few who would change a way of life and grapple with problems they know nothing about.

To me, one of the keys to the success of the families I visited was the Farmers Home Administration, who loaned these families the money to make their improvements possible, and who helped to show them how to do a better farm and home-management job. Many of the services provided by other agencies would be of lesser value to these farmers unless some way was provided for the family to get the money needed to put their plans into effect. Take the on-farm training program, for example. Thousands of veterans are being graduated from this training program each month, ready to begin careers as farmers. Their training has been good, and they assuredly could do the job. But they need money to buy a farm of their own, or to stock and equip one they might rent. Most of these graduates, however, have not been able to save up enough money during their military service or their training periods to make the necessary down payment on a farm or to qualify them for bank credit. The Farmers Home steps into this breach and provides the credit the families need. They do more—they help the borrower past the first "rough spots" of his farming by working out sound farm and home plans for him, and by visiting him on his farm to help with specific problems.

Mr. F. L. Spencer, Louisiana State director of the Farmers Home Administration, gave me some figures which show how much this program has helped Louisiana farmers, and in reading them I am again proud that I had some small part in helping to make it possible. Let me cite them for you.

The Farmers Home Administration in Louisiana makes two kinds of loans which help farmers operate their farms, and three kinds which help buy farms or improve farms they own. Of the operating loans, the usual type are made to farmers to help them obtain the seed, feed, livestock, equipment, or fertilizers needed to adjust their farming programs to a more economical basis. The second type are emergency loans made to persons who have suffered some major farm disaster, and need credit to continue in production during the following year. Most of these operating loans are repayable in up to 5 years, and the borrower is charged 5 percent interest on the unpaid portion. In Louisiana the Farmers Home Administration had loaned $45,367,528. They made 158,626 loans to Louisiana farmers to make adjustments; and had loaned an additional $634,993 as production-disaster loans. Of this amount loaned, by September 30 the agency had already collected $38,073,819, and since they are 5-year loans, much of the balance has not yet come due. Considering that these are loans made to families who are unable to obtain credit from other sources, this repayment record is exceptional.

The FHA is also collecting on old loans made by the Emergency Seed and Feed Loan Division of the Farm Credit Administration for operating purposes, although these emergency loans are no longer made. In Louisiana 232,794 loans of this type were made, $20,657,136 loaned, and $19,487,133 already collected.

Real-estate loans of three different types are made. One of these is a direct, 100-percent loan made by the agency to a farmer to enable him to buy a family-type farm of his own, or to enlarge or develop one he already owns to family-size. It also insures similar loans made by private lenders where the borrower is able to make a 10-percent down payment; and for the past year it has been authorized by Congress to make housing loans such as the Pierce family used to build their new home.

In Louisiana, the agency has loaned $11,246,126 to 2,198 farm families to enable them to buy farms of their own. Of the recent loans made, 100 percent have been to veterans. It has also insured $217,620 in loans to 36 Louisiana farmers, where the loan was made by a private lender. It has made 186 loans during the past year to Louisiana families to build new dwellings and other farm buildings, or to remodel existing buildings, and these loans have amounted to $1,280,780. During the year, 817 Louisiana farmers applied for these housing loans, and many of these applications are now being approved.

The real-estate loans have been well repaid, too. Borrowers have up to 40 years in which to repay their loans, and no part of the program has been in operation more than 12 years. The insured mortgage program did not become effective until 1948 when we in Congress made some changes in the original legislation passed in 1946, and so this program is only about 2 years old in actual practice. Yet $6,264,394—about half of the total loaned—has already been repaid. Almost 1,000 of the borrowers have repaid their loans in full—thirty or more years ahead of schedule. For example, Benny Knight of Lafouche Parish repaid his farm purchase loan in 7 years although he might have taken 40. And over in Lafayette Parish Eddie Menard took over a farm in 1947 on which many people said he would starve, using an FHA loan to finance his purchase, and now he has boosted his net worth by $10,000 in 3 years, and he has repaid 8 years' payments already in the 3 years he has operated it. Mr. and Mrs. Adelma Cormier, of Breaux Bridge, repaid their farm purchase loan in 8 years instead of 40, and today have a widely diversified farm program which includes sugarcane, cotton, cabbage, and shallots as crops, and an excellent soil-conservation program to preserve their land for the future use of Rodney, their 17-year-old son, who as a member of the Future Farmers is making a good record for himself as a prospective successful farmer of the next few years.

His loan repaid, Cormier is now helping other farmers in St. Martin Parish obtain the same advantages he has received. One reason the FHA loans have been so successful in Louisiana is that, before any loan is made, a committee of three local farmers must approve the prospective borrower. For the past 2 years Cormier has been one of these three committeemen for the parish, and he not only helps approve applicants but also visits the farms of borrowers to pass on to them some of the lessons he has learned during his 10 years of farm ownership.

But, Mr. Speaker, just as Louisiana is well above the average of the Nation in collections, so the parishes in the Third District of Louisiana and especially the parishes of Vermilion and St. Martin

are above the splendid State-wide record. Let me illustrate:

Following is a table showing the total amount loaned under the production and subsistence loan program and the total amount collected on these loans from July 1, 1946, to December 12, 1950, in St. Martin Parish:

Year	Total loans	Collected
July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947	$46,738	[1] $52,026.49
July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	29,705	[1] 46,557.68
July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949	43,145	42,540.57
July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950	52,225	[2] 35,263.96
Total	171,813	176,388.70

[1] The reason the figures representing amount collected during 1946-47 and 1947-48 is larger than the amount loaned is because loans which were made prior to the 1946 fiscal year had installments maturing during the next 4 years.

[2] This figure represents the amount collected on 1949-50 loans as of Dec. 12, 1950.

Approximately 500 farm families received operating loans from July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1950. The record of St. Martin Parish in respect to other types of loans is equally impressive. And here is the record of Vermilion Parish:

Operating loans under Farmers Home Administration from Dec. 31, 1946, through Dec. 10, 1950

Total amount of loans	$222,276.00
Total amount of collections	$218,576.09
Approximate number of families assisted	450

I wish to point out in the above, that of the amount loaned, there is a sizable amount that has not yet matured, as in some cases the payments on farm equipment, dairy cows, and so forth, has been scheduled over a period of 3 or 4 years.

Farm ownership loans

Total amount of loans	$251,512.00
Total amount of collections	$190,373.95
Total number of loans	34
Number loans paid in full	14

Nineteen of the 20 unpaid loans are well ahead of schedule. The other loan is $171.17 behind schedule. This is due to changing crop conditions, and the farm had to be completely reorganized to meet these changing conditions.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in dark and uncertain days. Gentlemen may cry peace, peace, but there is no peace. We are in a shooting war in Korea and the conflagration could suddenly engulf the earth. We will continue to hope and pray that time will soon bleach the darkness and uncertainty into light and peace, but in the meantime we must be prepared for any eventuality. The answer to communism is free and competitive enterprise and private ownership of property by all heads of families. Give me a community with the greatest number of farmers owning their own farms, and I will show you a community with the greatest amount of prosperity, contentment, and civic pride. It is such communities I was privileged to visit recently and that I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States.

More Power for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Charles E. Wilson, president, General Electric Co., entitled "More Power for America," before the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., December 5, 1950:

MORE POWER FOR AMERICA

(By Charles E. Wilson)

There is probably no better way in which I can indicate my regard and my honest respect for the institution of the National Press club, and the hard-working individuals who compose it, than by proceeding immediately to my subject without indulging in any compliments, pleasant though that might be for me. One of the things I bore away with me from my War Production Board days is that talk in Washington is not cheap, as is commonly supposed. It can be very costly. I should like to use as much restraint as possible in spending it here today. Please accept my apology, also, for reading what I have to say, but we shall be dealing largely in facts, figures, and estimates based on careful research, and it will be to your advantage that I do not trust these to my memory.

My subject is electric power. It was said last May that in the United States today the political setting is conducive to rising economic activity, our policy being one of maximum employment at home plus economic rehabilitation and the improvement of security abroad. The role of our Government, in the implementing of this policy, has continued to grow, as you know, and one of the effects has been to increase the pressure on private business. Business has complained and fought back against that pressure, but happily in the process it did not dare to relax and it fought back with its best weapons—intelligent and courageous expansion, continued scientific and economic research, improved communication with its employees and its public, and greater productive efficiency. Courage, in this case, was not mere words, but the investment of billions of dollars for new plants and machines.

With the summer came the shock of Korea and the first clear glimpse of the calculated and malignant forces of aggression. That shock set off—authentically but a little late as usual—our present national security program, and the effects of implications of it are mounting by the hour. This is a curious kind of hot-cold picture, as newsmen well know, with all of the planning by Government and business that we associate with a full-scale war effort, but with no full-scale war. We have the tragedy of 30,000 casualties, and so far not even an official denunciation of the guilty parties, but it is not a full-scale war. But there is war enough to intensify certain important issues—the issues of manpower, materials, and productivity. Perhaps we are being given an extraordinary opportunity, not granted last time, to count our money, our men, our resources, and our facilities.

And so we come to electric power, which is at the same time a vital material or commodity and a dynamic instrument or tool by which it is possible to increase our productivity. It is a two-edged sword, or a double-bladed plowshare, as you please, and while this dual quality adds to its value, it also tends to trip up the statistician and the unfamiliar administrator. Not for one moment do I feel that members of the press also would fall into these traps, but so that we can all start even, let me just run through the bare fundamentals—the blocking and tackling of the subject, so to speak. The basic power unit is the watt; a kilowatt is a thousand watts; and a kilowatt-hour is the using up of a thousand watts of electricity for an hour, which is what you do if you burn 10 100-watt incandescent lamps for an hour, at a cost of a few cents. Electric generating equipment is rated in kilowatts—a 25,000-kilowatt turbine, for example—while electric current is produced and sold in terms of kilowatt-hours.

Certain of our Government bureaus have been among those claiming that as we crank up our defense program and bring it to speed, we are going to have a serious power shortage, unless something drastic is done to prevent it. Spokesmen for the private utilities say this isn't so. In Government parlance, that "something drastic" usually means more public power projects. You might rightly conclude that the gentlemen on both sides of this question are interested parties. Perhaps the electrical manufacturer is also an interested party, but with this difference: he is the fellow who has to make the machines, regardless of who operates them, and he is therefore interested primarily in getting the facts. If his facts and his surveys and his estimates are wrong, he is likely to go out of business. It is the judgment of the manufacturer that I am offering you, therefore. Here is that considered judgment; let me give you the conclusions first, and then go back and pick up the reasons:

We believe the electric utility industry has done an excellent job of forecasting, planning, and preparing to take care of the country's power requirements. The electrical manufacturing industry has also forecast and planned very carefully; it has provided the facilities and it has produced the power supply equipment needed. There is today enough power to meet present needs with a safe reserve margin. There will continue to be enough power to meet anticipated needs if the equipment—now on order and planned—is built and installed as scheduled, despite a shift to a partial war economy. There will be, in our judgment, no power shortage unless one or more of the following things happen:

1. If major war production projects, such as aluminum plants or special new bomb projects, are heedlessly located in sections of the country where power can't be made available to them.

2. If the present manufacturing facilities for utility power supply equipment are diverted to other purposes, thus delaying production schedules of equipment already on order.

3. If the materials necessary to producing this equipment are not made available as a vital part of the over-all defense program.

What is our basis for this thinking? First off, let me say that we must believe this, in the General Electric Co., because all of our production planning and budgeting are based on these figures. We estimate that all defense expenditures will increase from the $12,000,000,000 of 1949 to about forty-six billions in 1952, dropping back to about forty-one billions in 1953. We are assuming full

employment, capacity operation of all industry, and continuing industrial expansion through 1953. We have factored in all the plans and commitments for war production that are known, plus a heavy production of civilian goods. We are assuming some lengthening of the workweek. In estimating power requirements we are here considering what practically amounts to a wartime level of industrial activity.

On the basis outlined here we find there is indicated for 1953 a power load, or total demand, of 416,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. This is 43 percent higher than in 1949. We estimate the peak load, or the largest demand that will ever be made for electricity at a given time, to be 77,400,000 of kilowatts in 1953, or 37 percent higher than in 1949. Incidentally, on a comparable basis, these figures are within 1 percent of the figures recently published by the Edison Electric Institute, although we arrived at them independently. These are the dimensions of the demand that should be made upon us.

With the power-generating equipment that has already been scheduled by the electrical manufacturing industry through the first half of 1953, and assuming that the suppliers of power are permitted to install the additional capacity they have planned for the last half of that year, the Nation will have a margin of reserve generating capacity 20 percent above the estimated load peak in 1953. I think you will find this fact important: in order to wipe out this margin of reserve, we would have to see a growth of the electrical load through 1953 almost double (actually 95 percent more) the increase of 87,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours we have estimated for this 1950–53 period.

Incidentally our estimates of power requirements are based on median hydro conditions—drought would cut the margin of reserve capacity but would not wipe it out. Of course, some people think we have an answer for that at Schenectady, too, as we can always call in our artificial rainmakers. Seriously, if it were not for one or two regions that are low, we would realize our objective of a 25 percent reserve margin in 1953 instead of 20 percent.

Suppose war production should be expanded beyond the levels forecast here—would there be sufficient electric power to support the added manpower available? Let us assume that we retain a reserve of 5 percent of electric utility generating capacity, to take care of breakdowns, and devote all the rest of the estimated 1952 margin to increasing production. This is using the horse to invoke the cart, if you follow me, but in that case industrial production would be at a level which would require 5,700,000, or 38 percent, more manufacturing employees than today's high level, working 42 hours a week. And if they work 45 hours a week, the peak in the last war, we would still need 4,300,000, or 30 percent, more people. The labor force is growing approximately a half million a year. We are already in a situation of almost full employment, and, according to the figures in last week's United States News, adding less than another 3,000,000 will achieve peak defense production planned for the end of 1951. Simultaneously we are driving for a 3,000,000-man fighting force. It would appear, therefore, that manpower—not electric power—would be the bottleneck in such an emergency.

In this connection it is worth noting that although the electric industry must have enough generating equipment available to meet the peak demand, even if it lasts but minutes or hours, this capacity is not needed for a large part of a normal one-shift day. Much of it can be put to work for many more hours. For three shifts the capacity is theoretically tripled, although from a practical production standpoint a third shift never actually delivers its theoretical quota. Also, total power demand does not increase in proportion to the amount of power going into defense production. A substantial part of the added defense demand comes about automatically as a result of the diversion of manpower and materials; either of these is more likely to cause bottlenecks.

There is not time enough here to discuss the relation of power to the production of aluminum or steel. Aluminum, which requires about a million kilowatts of installed capacity to produce a billion pounds a year, is still not in my judgment going to be any threat to our present or potential power-production resources. The steel industry has also done a fine job of providing needed capacity and is on the way to improving that job. I think the important thing to remember—and it seems to be the thing so often overlooked in Government planning—is that there are really no absolute limitations on our ability to produce in peace or war; the limitations are relative ones—the relation of manpower and materials and facilities and electric power to each other.

So far we have talked about the dimensions of the power demand and the ability of the electric companies to meet it. Here are some figures from the manufacturing point of view. Our industry will ship to these companies in the 3 years 1950 through 1952, based on orders already scheduled, 21,300,000 kilowatts of electric generating equipment. In 1953 they will need another 7,000,000 kilowatts, and the industry will supply that.

To cover utility and other needs, including industrial and export, we will have manufacturing capacity of 11,000,000 kilowatts in 1952, and General Electric alone will be able to supply 5,200,000 kilowatts. Our capacity for large steam turbines alone has gone up 60 percent in the last 10 years, thanks to a new $30,000,000 turbine plant, covering 20 acres of land at Schenectady, completed in 1949, and which I thought for a time might be dubbed "Wilson's folly." Today General Electric can produce more electric generating equipment than the entire industry produced before the war, and twice as much as we produced before the war.

Let me give you just one more figure, because it leads into a statement I made in the beginning. In World War II General Electric alone produced 28,000,000 horsepower of ship-propulsion equipment, which is equivalent to 45 percent of the total installed capacity of our electric companies at the beginning of this year. You will recall that, in forecasting that there would be no power shortage, I stressed the fact that one condition would be that present facilities for building generating equipment for utilities must not be diverted to other purposes. The program I have outlined does not provide generating equipment for the Navy and merchant marine, for portable power units, or other special uses. This is an extra job. To make this equipment requires a different kind of plant, and it must be planned well in advance of specific demands for production. If it is not built in advance, it will be ready too late and will cost more. For example, to obtain the same production facilities in a 2½-year period instead of a 4-year period a plant of 2,300,000 square feet would be needed, instead of one of 750,000 square feet. The only way to meet such a demand is to provide entirely new facilities for it, not to divert existing facilities scheduled to meet the demands of the electric companies. General Electric is prepared to establish these facilities—in fact, we presented such a plan last week to the Navy and Maritime Commission.

It is my hope that I have been able to shed some light on this tremendously important subject of electric power, and its role in the unfolding picture of American productivity and American security. It is especially important that you people here understand and share my convictions in this. I have tried to give you some reasons, in these facts and figures, for putting your confidence in the ability and vision of a great American industry. By the very nature of our business, electrical manufacturers and electric utilities have always had to be out ahead in the drive to achieve greater productivity for the United States. We always have been—we were in the last war—and we are today. We intend to stay ahead.

FACTS AND FIGURES RELATIVE TO MR. WILSON'S STATEMENT

Anticipated defense expenditures

[GE estimates, in billions of dollars]

	Total defense expenditures	Combat material (hard goods)
1950	14.2	4.5
1951	33.0	17.5
1952	46.0	25.0
1953	41.0	21.0

Estimated industrial production

[Federal Reserve Board Index, 1935–39=100]

	Index
1949	176
1950	197
1951	220
1952	230
1953	225

Load, peak, reserve

Estimated power load for 1953, 416,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours (43 percent higher than 1949).

Estimated peak load for 1953, 77,400,000 kilowatts (37 percent higher than 1949).

Estimated reserve generating capability over 1953 peak, 20 percent.

Power-load growth

[In billions of kilowatt hours]

	1940	1943	Percent increase	1950	1953	Percent increase
Large light and power sales	59.6	106.7	79	139.0	175.0	26
Small light and power sales	22.4	28.2	26	50.2	62.8	25
Domestic and rural sales	25.3	31.6	25	74.7	101.5	43
Total generation	145.0	221.0	53	329.0	416.0	27

Estimated increase in industrial production from 1950–53 is 17 percent, compared with 92 percent from 1940–43, while the growth in power sales relative to production is expected to be substantially greater than in World War II.

Capacity for manufacture of generating equipment

The industry is turning out generating equipment of all kinds at a rate of 6,855,900 kilowatts per year in 1950, of which 6,074,000 kilowatts is for private utilities.

Capacity for 1952 is 11,000,000 kilowatts (5,200,000 kilowatts is General Electric) with 8,316,000 kilowatts scheduled as of October 1. Open capacity is 700,000 kilowatts for large steam turbines (10,000 kilowatts and up), 840,000 kilowatts for hydroelectric machines, and 1,260,000 kilowatts for small steam turbines (under 10,000 kilowatts).

(Source: EEI Survey of Manufacturers.)

Large steam turbines scheduled for shipment

[10,000-kilowatt and up]

	For United States utilities	For export and industrial	Total
	Kilowatts	*Kilowatts*	*Kilowatts*
1950	4, 913, 500	373, 500	5, 287, 000
1951	4, 939, 500	1, 265, 500	6, 205, 000
1952	6, 686, 000	272, 500	6, 958, 500

This information (from EEI Survey) plus scheduled shipments of hydroelectric equipment, plus estimated shipments of steam turbines under 10,000 kw and internal combustion generators, indicates that total shipments of generating equipment to utilities in 1950–52 will be as follows:

	Kilowatts
1950	6, 270, 000
1951	6, 550, 000
1952	8, 480, 000
Total	21, 300, 000

From Pearl Harbor to Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by William Henry Chamberlin, from the Human Events, showing clearly how the policy which caused Pearl Harbor, led to our present defeat in Asia. The article follows:

[From Human Events of December 13, 1950]

FROM PEARL HARBOR TO KOREA

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The calendar sometimes inflicts strange ironies. December 7, 1941, was the date of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. This was not a bolt from the blue or an act of mental aberration. It was the result of a long diplomatic deadlock, during which the United States had been inflexible and uncompromising in its demand that Japan withdraw completely from China.

A virtual commercial blockade of Japan had been enforced since the end of July. The proposal of the moderate Japanese Prime Minister, Prince Konoye, to come to the United States and seek a basis of accommodation in personal talks with Roosevelt had been brushed aside. A proposal for a temporary modus vivendi which Hull had considered during the last days of November was never presented to the Japanese.

There are two highly impressive witnesses for the proposition that the Pacific war, of which the first shots were fired at Pearl Harbor, was a conflict over China. Roosevelt, at a dinner of the Foreign Policy Association in 1944, said:

"We could have compromised with Japan and bargained for a place in a Japanese-dominated Asia by selling out the hearts' blood of the Chinese people. And we rejected that."

His bellicose Secretary of War, the late Henry L. Stimson, confirmed this Roosevelt statement. In his diary for November 25 Stimson reported on an important council held by Roosevelt, composed of Hull, Knox, Marshall, Stark, and himself, at which the question was how we should maneuver them (the Japanese) into firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves. In his book of memoirs, On Active Service, Stimson flatly asserts:

"If at any time the United States had been willing to concede to Japan a free hand in China there would have been no war in the Pacific."

So the propaganda pattern which was sold to the American people before and after Pearl Harbor presented a highly melodramatic picture of an incredibly wicked Japan and a virtuous, wronged China. America was to be the white knight, the Sir Galahad, who would rescue China from the molestations of Japan. Utterly blot out Japan—so ran the argument at that time, and peace and stability would reign forever in the Orient, and American missionary effort and trade in China would flourish like the green bay tree.

The final coffin nail had surely been driven into this compound of happy illusions on December 7, 1950. For this tragic and ironical anniversary found the greater part of the American combat army trying desperately, in sheer self-defense to shed the hearts' blood of some hundreds of thousands of the Chinese people who had poured in to attack them in Korea.

At the time when the Chinese Reds were launching their Pearl Harbor against the United States and against the United Nations, the Chinese Communist delegate to the United Nations, Wu Hsiu-chuan, was delivering a tirade against this country in the Security Council of the United Nations which exceeded in violence the language used in Japan's declaration of war 9 years earlier. One need only cite such phrases as the following:

"I am here to accuse the United States Government of the unlawful and criminal act of armed aggression against the territory of China, Formosa. * * *

"All these acts of direct aggression against China by the United States aggression forces in Korea are an insolent provocation which the Chinese people absolutely cannot tolerate."

II

The wheel has come full circle. Nine years after the Pearl Harbor attack we are paying a terrific price in the lives of our fighting men and in a sense of national humiliation and confusion for the long succession of blunders committed in the Far East by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Among the more obvious of the blunders were: (1) fighting a war with no more intelligent aim than the destruction of Japan; (2) giving Stalin a strategic and economic stranglehold on China at Yalta; (3) writing off our Nationalist friends and encouraging our enemies in China (despite the doleful results of pursuing the same policy in Eastern Europe), and (4) forcing General MacArthur to fight a war in Korea figuratively with one hand tied behind his back.

Anyone who believes that it is possible to charm or appease the Chinese Communists into being friends of the west should have been finally undeceived by the contents and tone of Wu Hsiu-chuan's speech. Hatred of the west, arrogant truculent assurance of a world-conquering mission dripped from every period. Wu's reference to solidarity with the peoples of Japan, Vietnam (Indochina) and the Philippines showed that Chinese Communist ambitions, like Soviet Communist ambitions, are insatiable and unlimited.

In the light of this speech, and of the accompanying forward surge of the Red Chinese hordes in Korea one may recognize that there was far more truth than American public opinion ever recognized in the Japanese claim to be resisting Chinese communism and Soviet imperialism. A Japanese Army on the Amur, holding the line against the Soviet Union, Japanese strong points on the mainland, serving as a barrier against Chinese communism would look pretty good, from the standpoint of American national security, today.

But the consequence of Mr. Roosevelt's crusading war in the Far East was to destroy the valuable potential element of check and balance which Japan represented as against Russia and China. And there is a wise old Greek saying to the effect that one thing even the gods cannot achieve is to make the past as if it had never been.

III

The alternatives which the Chinese Pearl Harbor places before the United States are extremely difficult. There is the possibility of surrender to the blackmail represented by the injection into the Korean War of hundreds of thousands of Chinese trained troops, humorously described as "volunteers." Mr. Wu has stated his terms for unconditional surrender with brutal frankness: withdrawal from Korea, surrender of Formosa, admission of Communist China to the UN.

Acceptance of these terms would mean the dissolution of Chiang Kai-shek's Army in Formosa and the probable collapse of guerrilla resistance in China itself. Yet it is remarkable how many individuals who professed to be shocked to the depths of their moral sensibilities by suggestions that Hitler and Stalin should have been permitted to fight it out or that the United States would be well advised to go slowly with all-out support for China in 1941 are apparently ready to run up the white flag of surrender to Mao Tse-tung.

The Chinese Communists are openly making war on the United Nations. Yet the Secretary General of the United Nations entertains the Chinese Communist delegates and does his best, without much visible success, to appease them. The Chinese Communists are trying to cut to pieces British troops in Korea. Yet the British Government does not react even to the point of breaking off diplomatic relations.

American troops are fighting a desperately uneven defensive struggle in Korea. But they are compelled to fight with the immense handicap of not being allowed to bomb enemy supply lines in Manchuria. After Pearl Harbor in 1941 there was no international forum in New York where Japanese and other Axis representatives could blackguard the United States as much as they wished. But there have been no restrictions on the activities of Mr. Wu and Mr. Vishinsky. How long the American people will put up with a situation which combines the worst features of both war and appeasement remains to be seen.

IV

This amazing effort to act as if Red China were not making large-scale war on the Western World is accomplished by the argument that Europe claims priority over Asia in defense plans and that we have neither the means nor the desire to commit mass armies to the Chinese mainland. But this overlooks the possibility of resisting Chinese Communist aggression by methods which would not bleed western manpower white nor impose a heavy burden on the American economy.

This is true even if complete evacuation of Korea should become necessary. China can be blockaded. Its centers of military concentration, industry, and communication can be shattered by air attack. Chiang Kai-shek can be encouraged and aided in using Formosa as a base for raids and descents on the

China coast. Anti-Communist guerrillas can be helped. Japan can be rearmed. If Chinese "volunteers" can appear in Korea, why not Japanese?

It is obvious that the flood tide of aggressive Asiatic communism can be stemmed only by Asiatics. Our repeated failures to give a fighting chance to our potential friends in Asia, to the South Koreans before last June, to the Japanese, to the Chinese Nationalists, is calculated to raise the old question: Stupidity or treason?

Probably there is nothing in prospect in Asia but defeat, disaster, and disagree until the State Department is put in charge of someone with wits enough to realize that a regime which throws a million men in battle array against you is really waging war, and firmness enough to make a clean sweep of "experts" of the Owen Lattimore type of thinking.

American and UN prestige could survive a forced military withdrawal from Korea. They could not survive the futile humiliation of surrender to military aggression, of appeasement of Stalin's Chinese gauleiters, of what might amount to a super-Munich. Will to resist Communist aggression in Europe or anywhere else would rapidly evaporate under the influence of such a surrender.

National Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address delivered last night by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, at the dinner of the New York County Lawyers Association, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of December 15, 1950]

TEXT OF GOVERNOR DEWEY'S CALL FOR NATIONAL MOBILIZATION

We meet at a tragic moment in the history of mankind. American troops defending freedom have suffered a terrible catastrophe. Our prestige is at a low ebb and world communism has gained a great triumph.

We stand almost naked before the world. Right now, aside from four partly trained National Guard divisions, there are only 10 divisions of the United States Army. Two are in Germany. Seven are facing dreadful odds in Korea, and in all continental United States there is just 1 division ready for combat—not enough to defend a single American city.

The only apparent reason Soviet Russia has not already launched total war is fear of atomic bombing. We do not know how much longer she will be afraid of that. Our country—the free world—the very idea of human freedom are in deadly, immediate danger.

For 4 years I have been saying to all who would listen to me that this crisis was rushing toward us at headlong speed. I have been saying—and have been sneered at for saying it—that national unity was urgently necessary because we faced great perils.

LEADERSHIP FOR SURVIVAL

Three years ago in this very room before another great audience of an equally nonpartisan nature, I forecast in detail what has since happened in China and what is happening today in Korea.

I now say again, tonight, that unless our Nation develops a quality of leadership and a capacity for effective action which have thus far not appeared, I do not believe we will survive.

Surely it must be plain—at last—even to those who will not see—that world communism under the leadership of Soviet Russia is waging ruthless war against the whole free world. Surely it must be clear—at last—that only far more decisive action by the United States will make it possible to stem the Soviet tide.

Surely the dreadful danger must now be clear to those nations who are wobbling in their will to resist Soviet aggression or are running for the illusory cover of neutrality. There can be no neutrality in this world—for long. We shall all be brave and strong and remain free or we shall be timid and weak and become slaves.

I am not concerned tonight with how we Americans got into this desperate peril. I am not concerned tonight with why some other free nations are losing their will to resist. I am desperately concerned with where we go from here.

I. ABANDON OUR ILLUSIONS

First of all, let us finally and forever abandon all those comfortable illusions which have allowed our country to sink to this perilous point. Our Government and our people have been living in a dream world based on self-deception. That deception was not even "Made in Russia" because Stalin has never concealed his purpose of conquering the world any more than Hitler did. He has written in time and time again just as Hitler did. But everybody refused to believe it.

The cold fact is that the Russian war machine has never been demobilized. Nearly one-half of Russia's total economic productivity has been devoted to military purposes. Without shooting a gun or losing a man since the end of the war, but through propaganda, bribery, falsehood, coercion, satellite troops, and treason, Russia now rules 800,000,000 people, or one-third of world.

Let us get rid once and for all of the idea that Russia wants less than the whole world.

How to meet the challenge

Let us also get rid of the stupid idea that we can sit down and do business with Stalin while we are weak and he is strong. Nation after nation tried it with Hitler and was swallowed up before the war. Nation after nation has tried it with Stalin and they, too, have been swallowed up. It is time we listened to the mute testimony of the leaders of those nations from their tortured graves.

Let us get rid of the idea we can stop Russia by appropriating billions of dollars, setting up new Government boards and then continuing wage rounds as usual, price increases as usual, and politics as usual. Only all-out effort, all-out sacrifice, and all-out use of the brains and skills of this country, backed by an abiding faith in the justice of our cause, will give us a chance of survival.

If, at last, we Americans will get out of our dream world, bury every one of our false illusions forever and gird up our loins to meet this terrible challenge, then we will have taken the first step toward survival.

II. THE ARMED FORCES

Second, our Armed Forces should at the earliest possible moment be brought to overwhelming strength. The day for temporizing, shilly-shallying, and compromise is long since gone. Only four divisions of our National Guard have even been called into service. There are 25 divisions of the National Guard and 2 armored divisions which could have been called to the colors months ago.

I know perfectly well, and this is no secret from the Russians, that our National Guard has barely enough arms for training purposes to say nothing of any arms to fight with. I know perfectly well that these divisions are at half strength at most, but until something is done they will remain without arms and at half strength.

They should be called to national service tomorrow morning.

This is just a beginning. Universal military service of at least 2 years should be required of every young man to give us at least the foundation for the Armed Forces we need. It should be enacted now—this month—not next month.

An Army of 100 divisions

By the swift acceleration of the draft, the United States Army should be brought to a strength of not less than 100 divisions and our divisions are nearly twice as large as Russian divisions.

At the earliest possible moment, the Air Force should be brought to at least 80 groups.

The United States Navy should be taken out of moth balls and recommissioned without delay.

In a world of brute force, there is freedom only for the brave. If we are not prepared to fight for our freedom, then we shall surely lose it. If we are prepared to fight, we still could win. If we are strong enough and have strong friends, we may hope that communism will stop and count the cost of further aggression. We may even hope to bring Russia to her senses and so bring peace to the world.

III. PRODUCTION

Third, even if we mobilize all possible fighting manpower we shall still be outnumbered by the hordes of Russia, to say nothing of Red China and the other satellites. But fortunately manpower alone is not the decisive factor in modern war.

In modern warfare victories are not won, merely in the fighting lines but also on the production line. We can beat Russia 5 to 1 in production, but we can't save our freedom with automobiles or washing machines. Nothing less than immediate economic mobilization of our country will meet the threat that faces us.

American boys must never again be sent to fight tanks with rifles. It is a national calamity that even now, 6 months after Korea, we still do not have a military requirements program and those responsible must in due course be called to a stern accounting. Meanwhile, an avalanche of contracts for production should be let immediately and if we do not have the blueprints a lot of people ought to be fired tomorrow morning.

As a beginning, to provide the arms for defense this country and the free world need, we should set an immediate goal of 25 percent of our productive capacity for defense production.

Centering of responsibility

This whole program should be placed forthwith in the hands of one single authority with wide powers to organize the whole productive resources of this Nation. This authority can only be administered by one single boss. We have had our fill of hydra-headed monsters, of interagency quarreling, of procurement boards that didn't procure, of committees and commissions.

To avoid the dreadful waste of manpower and the stalemate of interagency quarreling,

the Economic Mobilizer should have not only full supervision of production but of economic controls and of civilian manpower.

For the job of Economic Mobilizer we need to draft the ablest business executive in our country. He should be given a free hand to pick his assistants, full power and the unlimited backing of the President.

This man should be responsible only to the President and should report only to a single, joint committee of the House and Senate. He should not spend half his time, as is so often the case today, reporting to committee after committee of both Houses.

This mobilization of our productive forces is the heart of our struggle for survival. In the face of the crisis that confronts us, it is only the American genius for production that will give us the margin of strength to prevail against our enemies.

IV. THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

4. We must not deceive ourselves—this defense program will cut harshly into the living standard of every American. Today we have virtually no unemployment in the country and our industrial plants are running at full capacity. We must take steel—a lot of it—aluminum and copper and other vital raw materials that are now being used to make automobiles, radios, television sets, and washing machines. We must use those materials to make guns, ships, airplanes, tanks, and atomic weapons.

That means that there will be less goods for civilian consumption—a lot less. There will be fewer automobiles or no automobiles, few radios and television sets or none, fewer washing machines, less of nearly everything.

But at the same time the Government will be spending billions of dollars to pay for arms and to pay the wages of workers who make those arms. That means one thing—inflation.

What has happened in just the 6 months since Korea? Key raw material prices have jumped 35 percent; the average of all wholesale prices is up by 10 percent and the cost of living has climbed to an all-time peak.

Inflation could wreck the defense program. In 1945 a 30-caliber carbine cost $35.50; now it costs $64. A 60-millimeter mortar 5 years ago cost $300. Today the price tag is $554, a jump of 85 percent.

Inflation is eating away the defense program of our Government just as it eats away the buying power of your family's income.

I cannot emphasize too strongly this point: price ceiling and wage freezes will mean nothing unless we have the courage and the good sense to attack the cause of inflation and not merely the results.

Pay-as-you-go financing

The only effective way to deal with inflation is to finance our rearmament program on a pay-as-you-go basis. We cannot save our freedom and also keep our personal comforts and luxuries. Let us remember that even then we will have more than any other people in the world.

Government services must also be sharply cut down. Every dollar of nonessential Government spending—Federal, State, and local—must be cut to the bone. We must take a hard look at all subsidy programs, at every kind of Government expenditure designed to raise prices or calculated to increase costs. Many things that would be desirable in other times must be put aside in this emergency.

Industry and labor must avoid increasing costs. This is no time for profiteering or for featherbedding. Corporation profits must be taxed heavily. An excess-profits tax should siphon off any profits in excess of normal, arising out of the defense effort. Individual income taxes must be raised up and down the line, and in this connection we have to remember that the larger incomes already bear taxes running up to 91 percent. Disagreeable as it may be, the spending power of America which has to be siphoned off is not in the hands of a few rich people but in the hands of all of us.

Excise taxes on luxuries and every kind of tax which tends to discourage spending and encourage savings should be a part of our program. We must crack down on credit expansion all along the line. If Government is compelled to borrow to finance part of this program, those borrowings should be financed out of the people's savings.

But we cannot and must not borrow the savings of our people as we did in the last World War and then pay them back in 57-cent dollars. Inflation must be stopped now and stopped hard.

V. MANPOWER

Fifth, in all this effort we must rally the total resources of our Nation and the greatest of these resources are the men and women of America.

We should establish at once general registration for national service, including all Americans, both men and women, above the age of 17. The crisis that we face is total. If war should come it will come to young and old. It will come to our towns, our villages, and our cities as well as to our armies. We must be prepared for total defense now, not when it would be too late. The Nation must be able to call upon every American.

VI. OUR WORLD OBJECTIVES

If we do all the things I have outlined, we will still need strong, powerful friends elsewhere in the world. Today most of the free nations want to be our friend. But they are afraid we do not mean business or don't know how to provide leadership. Nothing will make them rearm and nothing will give them the will to fight if they do rearm, without a new degree of strength and leadership from this country in world affairs.

So, sixth, our Government should state its aims and objectives specifically for all the world to see and know. The time is long past for pretty generalities. Our Government must decide the areas in the world we intend to help defend and say so.

Let me be specific. We have shilly-shallied on Formosa four times in the last 11 months. I recognize that we have difficult problems with our friends concerning Formosa and that there is a deep division of opinion in the United Nations. But let's realize that if both Korea and Formosa should be lost then Japan is probably lost, too.

For 30 years the prime objective of Russian foreign policy has been to get the industrial might of Germany and Japan added to Russia's masses so then she could be sure to conquer the world.

Add to this the fact that Indochina, Burma, and Thailand are the rice bowl of the Orient. If the present Soviet conquests continue in these areas, Japan will wither on the vine from starvation and so will Indonesia. If the Communists go on down through Malaya, there go our rubber and our tin.

The time for wobbling on our major foreign policy objectives is long since past. Unless we are going to shrink within our own borders and wait to be conquered by a Communist world, we must boldly make decisions that will keep friends for our cause both in Europe and in Asia.

Right now I want to suggest that we get rid of some more of our illusions. We are in a desperate struggle to decide whether the whole world is going to be taken over by savages. In that kind of a struggle I propose that we should stop being fussy about who will help prevent it.

Accepting those on our side

I want to know who has divisions and who's willing to fight on our side.

Turkey has the biggest army in Europe and they will fight. We know that in case of war the British Commonwealth will fight and they have the third greatest air force in the world as well as a lot of divisions and a great Navy. These and other nations are now fighting by our side in Korea while France is waging a hard fight in Indochina. Many other nations in Europe, the Near East, in Asia, and in the Americas stand ready to fight for freedom and we should encourage them to the limit.

Now I propose that we stop bickering among ourselves and make friends with everybody who has the will to fight and the combat divisions to put in the field. If they will fight on the side of the angels I am willing to welcome them as allies whether I agree with their domestic policies or not. I want to keep human freedom alive on this earth.

To be specific: Tito has 30 divisions and we think he will fight on our side. We know Franco will fight and he has 22 divisions.

Now let me get a little tougher. We think we know that the Germans and Japanese would fight under some kind of arrangement, whether under American leadership, or otherwise, we should enlist them in the world struggle against their ancient enemy.

I made what I thought was my final appeal to keep the Chinese free and on our side a year and a half ago. But I'm going to try once more. Even today, there are still Chinese, millions of them, not only dozens of divisions on Formosa but hundreds of thousands of guerrillas on the mainland who will fight communism. I say, let's make sure they are able to fight and harass and sabotage and do the things to our enemies that are being done to us.

VII. ECONOMIC AND MILITARY AID

So, seventh, that brings me to the Marshall plan aid for Europe. The present phase of our struggle with world communism has flared in Asia. But we must keep in clear sight the fact that Europe is still a greater prize the Communists are after. We have used our economic resources through the Marshall plan to help Europe get on its feet. Now we face an urgent situation that requires Europe to rearm at once.

Since before there was a Marshall plan I have been demanding that it be used to bring about a United States of Europe, unifying her 270,000,000 people in the greatest force for peace on earth. I say again for what is probably the last time it will be useful: We should continue Marshall plan aid but only upon condition that (1), we actually get a united defense of Europe and its full rearmament; (2) that we get the European economic barriers torn down; and (3) that Europe move to political unity so her great strength can be mobilized on the side of freedom.

Moreover, our military aid should be extended only to those countries who demonstrate their willingness to fight on our side.

VIII. THE OFFENSIVE

8. Let me remind you once again that we must abandon our defensive mood. Defense never prevails against powerful attack. We must stop letting Russia have a monopoly on initiative. With a limited perimeter she can, through satellites, continue to attack the world at one point after another and bleed us white, without shedding a drop of Russian blood. Then she can conquer a prostrate free world with her 200 divisions.

We should launch the kind of moral and political campaign which can take advantage of the fatal weaknesses of dictators who attempt to rule 800,000,000 people with an iron hand.

America will never wage a preventive war. But we cannot sit idly by and allow the free

world to be bled to death by the oriental torture of a thousand cuts.

To save our country we must start turning this thing around. From the outside every despotism looks hard and formidable. Inside they are rotten. Let's get busy and exploit the rottenness of Soviet Russia. Let's make our propaganda offensive mean something.

Maximum of retaliation

Where Russia sends 1 movie showing they are saving the world, let us send 10 good ones.

Where they send a million dollars on sabotage, let's spend $2,000,000 on sabotage.

Where they have the best spy system in the world, let us, for heaven's sake, get twice as good a spy system instead of practically none at all.

All this calls for the kind of brains and the kind of tough support for good brains in action, the kind of quality and integrity that only devoted freemen can give to the cause.

I am sure that with real leadership the American people will respond—every one of them—to the sacrifices that are necessary if we are going to survive.

The hour is very late—I do not know how late. Whether we still have a day or a year or 2 years, not a second should be lost. Our Government, our people, the United Nations, and the spokesmen of the free world must rally now.

If we respond with all our strength, with all our hearts, and courage, I do not know what it will cost in toil and tears and treasure. But I do know we will save our souls, and with God's help we will save our country and the cause of human liberty.

Editorial Tribute to Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 15 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the December 1950 DFL News carried a fine editorial on one of our esteemed colleagues, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I share the admiration of this periodical for the Senator from Minnesota, whom I consider one of the most valuable Members of this body. Time and time again he has demonstrated his keen insight and brilliant mind in the study of complex legislative issues. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOKS, EDITORIALS, COLUMNS, AND MARINES

With our preoccupation with State and local politics, and as familiar as we are with our fireball Senator, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, we may sometimes lose sight of his real genius.

Fortunately, however, those concerned with the national scene have not only noticed Senator HUMPHREY, but they have come to respect him, and, in some cases, fear him. In all cases they know him.

In recent days his name has popped up four places: A national best-selling book about politics, an editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a syndicated columnist, and the Marine Corps League, who commended the Senator with a medal.

The Marine Corps League had this to say about HUMPHREY:

"For meritorious service in the field of legislation, on rehabilitation of Marine Corps personnel and Marine Corps veterans. For the protection of the marines engaged in Korea, by the introduction of a bill to insure the combatants rights, as a member of the Armed Forces engaged in action other than those stipulated by a declaration of war. By his earnest interest in the protection of the rights of the families of the members of the Marine Corps Reserve recalled to active duty. For his cosponsorship of a bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

The syndicated columnist was Holmes Alexander, from Washington. Here is what he said, speaking of big events in Congress:

"The airtight logic and fearless delivery of Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, against the McCarran bill. Speaking for nearly 2 hours and answering questions for another hour, HUMPHREY was superb. He never defended communism. He never questioned the Government's right to self-protection against subversives. But he came out against legislative man traps and snoop-group smear-fests.

"His speech contained more genuine Americanism than was heard elsewhere throughout the long and bitter debate.

"There is little doubt that HUMPHREY would have carried the day against the McCarran ('I've got him on my list') bill in almost any other political climate. But with a war on and an election pending too many on-the-fence Senators were moved by the thought that if the McCarran bill didn't catch commies, it would at least catch votes back home. HUMPHREY did not win his fight but he did show himself a man for a' that."

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, one of the more honored newspapers in America, saw fit to list the 10 greatest men in the United States Senate. Among the 10 great was the Senator from Minnesota, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

In their many-barbed book Truman Merry-Go-Round, Robert S. Allen and William V. Shannon cited HUMPHREY as working against boodle grab bills. They said he ripped the pretense from Senator BYRD'S "One thin tenuous claim to self-justification" as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

They concluded that "HUMPHREY is an excellent influence in the Senate, where the liberal forces have so long lacked a brilliant spokesman with general popular backing."

So it seems that, on a national level, our Senator is attracting attention. And that's fine. Just as we knew it would be. But it wouldn't hurt anything if we whooped it up a little more for him on the local scene.

The Crusade for Home Ownership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Henry A. Bubb, delivered at the fifty-eighth annual convention of the United States Savings and Loan League, Washington, D. C., Wednesday, November 29, 1950:

THE CRUSADE FOR HOME OWNERSHIP

(By Henry A. Bubb)

In Chicago a year ago, you people paid me one of the highest tributes that has ever been mine, when you elected me to the presidency of the United States Savings and Loan League. Tonight I come before you, first, to give an accounting, as it were, of my stewardship of this high position and, secondly, to leave with you some thoughts I have as to the future of ourselves and this great business.

It is hard for me to express to you adequately the experience that has been mine during 1950. I said a moment ago that this was a great business; it is impossible to have a clear impression of just how great it is or what an outstanding job it renders to the people of the United States until you have traveled, as I have, the length and breadth of this country and seen with your own eyes the contributions this business is making everywhere. When you get the broad view, one that is uninterrupted by regional or State boundaries, then you begin to realize that we are all part of an enterprise that is dynamic in its nature, its character, and its usefulness.

As we near the end of another year, it must be apparent to you, as it is to me, that the problems and troubles we face in the coming year are certainly more forbidding than those of a year ago. At this fifty-eighth annual convention—the largest, finest, and best attended convention we have ever had—we are, however, given the chance to pause and catch our breath before going on to meet new and fresh challenges, whatever and wherever they may be. To my mind, it is not without some significance that this opportunity to rededicate ourselves to the principles of thrift and home ownership should take place in the historic setting of our Nation's Capital in the very shadow of Washington's Monument. The savings and loan business, after all, has as its foundation the same philosophy that guided our founding fathers when they were devising what was then a radical notion, a government that would be of, for, and by the people.

This past year, from the point of view of our business, has been one of the most eventful we have ever witnessed. In practically every month, there have been important matters of legislation affecting us before the National Congress. In retrospect, I think, as I said in a letter to George Bliss, the able chairman of our legislative committee, that 1950 has been one of the most successful and noteworthy years in legislative endeavor on behalf of the United States Savings and Loan League. It would be less than fair not to give credit and thanks at this point, to the efforts of our fine legislative committee and its very able and hard-working chairman, to our expert and highly intelligent staffs in Chicago and Washington, to our State league people, and, finally, to the many individuals within the business who gave unselfishly of their time and effort in order to further our legislative program.

COMING OF AGE

After a year as your national president and after having visited nearly every section of the country, one of my major convictions is that, at last, this business is coming of age. It is coming of age in a way and manner befitting one of the great financial businesses of our time. In many places, savings and loan executives have become the key men in civic undertakings. A prime example of this is your next president, Walter J. L. Ray, who has an outstanding record of civic endeavor in Detroit. In many other places, our people are known as the best

sources of public information on thrift and housing. Most of us are making an attempt to get away from the humdrum of everyday routine, to give ourselves time for more significant enterprises. In short, we are beginning to develop a type of community leadership from within our business that is in line with our size and strength.

Our business has thrived on performing a valuable service that is available to everyone. Probably more than any other type of financial business, our roots are right in the heart of the communities in which we live, and this loyalty to our friends and neighbors has enabled us to become the custodians of the savings of more than 10,000,000 people, and the vehicle by which many millions of American families have been able to buy and own homes. I am sure that you are as proud of this magnificent record as I am.

AWARENESS OF SOCIALISTIC TREND

In recent years, and particularly 1950, we have begun to develop a much more militant attitude against the plans, programs, and philosophies which affect us adversely. One of my most gratifying experiences as president of your United States Savings and Loan League was the exceptional response to our tough aggressive little socialism pamphlet which we put out last spring. More than two and a half million copies were distributed and so far as your officers were able to determine, the reaction was almost unanimously favorable.

To my mind, the attitude of a growing willingness to fight back against socialism in our business was long overdue. For nearly two decades, most of us have had the notion that we shouldn't mix politics with business. What has happened, of course, is that the politics were mixed in anyway, not to the advantage of the businessman, incidentally, and it has been only recently that we have discovered that we were played for a prize chump. Unfortunately, not all businessmen are yet willing to fight back. But I say to you that we in the savings and loan business—a business of the people—are able and willing to stand up and fight for the things we believe, and certainly we intend to do so in the months and years ahead.

Three weeks ago yesterday, the American people went to the polls and chose our National Congress for the next 2 years. From the returns, it would appear that the make-up of Congress until 1952 will be somewhat more conservative or, if you choose, somewhat less radical than it has been since 1948. Today if you ask any political analyst, he will have about a dozen reasons in less than a dozen seconds as to why the election went the way it did. If you will excuse a somewhat personal expression, it is my belief that a majority of the American people are sick of Reds in Government, of inflation, of public housing, of the Brannan plan, of the waste of taxpayers' money for socialistic panaceas, and that the people now realize it is not worth a war in order to promote "continued world prosperity." They have also found out that when you vote for a class-hatred candidate who favors robbing Peter to pay Paul, you'd better watch out what kind of a guy you pick up with.

For the first time in as long as I can remember, a considerable number of the members of one of our great parties were willing to stand up and define the issues in everyday language, say why socialism is wrong, and stick by their guns. I am glad to say that these included a handful of conservative Congressmen in the outlying districts in the great Democratic stronghold of Chicago, who campaigned vigorously against public housing—and won. These also included conservatives from Kansas, from down-State Illinois, from Ohio, from Colorado, and the other States, who brought the issues of socialized medicine and the Brannan plan out into the open—and won. If there is any lesson to be learned from the recent campaign, and certainly from the "me too" farce of 1948, it is that you can only win respect and votes by fighting for your convictions and principles. These are the only things that really matter; if you don't have them, you don't have anything. It probably goes without saying, that you may not always be able to win on principle all the time, but I'd sooner lose than sell out my ideals, and so would you, and so would every thinking American who is not a coward and who understands what his American birthright of freedom really means.

At the moment, because of the overshadowing uncertainties of our international crisis, it is difficult to ascertain the precise meaning of the recent elections to our business. While it is safe to assume that Congress may not be quite so eager to socialize our business, I urge you not to hold out the same hope for the Government housing crowd in Washington. They are trying as best they know how to put us out of business, and I do not think for a minute that one election set-back will alter their plans. They never give up; in fact, the result of the 1950 election probably will give them incentive to rush along their socialistic program as fast as possible before more people get wise to them.

We will make, I fear, a grave and tragic mistake if we sit back and say: "Well, everything is all right for at least 2 years." You can be assured that the energetic disciples of socialism will be on the job day and night, preaching to everyone they can reach. It is, in my judgment, sheer nonsense to think that because a few more conservatives have been named to Congress the sweep toward socialism has been stopped. The timetable has been disrupted, of course, but perhaps only temporarily. Unless the tide of reaction is reinforced, unless it continues to gain momentum, I see little reason for long-pull optimism. We cannot afford to relax; we cannot afford to lose the initiative. Freedom is an elusive thing; while it can be lost overnight, it requires a constant vigilance to make sure it is preserved.

The preservation of freedom for the individual—freedom to make his own way, freedom to work as hard or as little as he will—is the great challenge of the twentieth century man. Felix Morley said recently that it was the love of liberty more than a century ago that ignited a drive in Western Europe for a new liberalism—a philosophy of opportunity and freedom for the individual. Since that time we have seen this original conception of liberalism steadily degenerate until it has come to mean, to many persons, a disguise for tyranny. To forestall any further infringements upon the rights of the individual is the most compelling task we face. Let us realize, however, that this type of endeavor is a long-term project; the mission cannot be accomplished overnight and may not even be accomplished in our lifetime. But it is a task—a responsibility—that cannot be evaded or delegated, unless you will be faithless to yourself, your children, your country, and your God.

OUR PRINCIPLES CHALLENGED

In the long crusade that lies ahead of us, for that is what it really is, there is, to my knowledge, no force better equipped to lead this drive for a revival of principle than our great business. The reasons for this come, as I said earlier, from our association in the tremendous private-home-ownership movement in this country. I think our institutions can appropriately, in all modesty, claim a major share of the credit for the dramatic surge upward in home ownership during the past decade. We now have more than 22,000,000 home-owning families in the cities and towns of America, nearly twice as many as we had in 1940. Thanks to this growth in home ownership there is now, for the first time, a clear majority of home owners over tenants. The political and economic consequences of this development are enormous. It means, first, that a substantial majority of American families have a big stake in the future of America—their homes—and that they will insist on an orderly development of their lives and those of their children. It means, secondly, that home ownership has come within reach of men in all walks of life, union men and nonunion, white-collar workers and industrial personnel. Finally, it means that the home-ownership movement in the years just ahead can be nurtured into the most effective and potent force for basic political conservatism that exists in the country. Truly, the 1950's can become the decade of the home owner when his voice is the dominant voice in the shaping of our national economy and Government.

There is no element in American life other than our business which can perform the vital task of stimulating the continued growth of private home ownership. Fate is entrusting to us this assignment, which has no equal in importance or significance on the present American domestic scene. We have a rendezvous with destiny, and my appeal to you now is to gird yourselves for the most challenging, most compelling, and most fascinating job of our time.

GROWTH ESSENTIAL TO SUCCESS

To do this job—to meet our obligations—I would urge you to participate in a 10-year crusade for home ownership during the 1950's. Whatever has been done before will appear slight by comparison before the wonderful progress that can lie ahead if we will but seize the opportunity which presents itself. To do his part in this great an dramatic undertaking, the best thing a savings association and cooperative bank man can do is to double or treble the size of his business as rapidly and soundly as possible. As a first step, my recommendation to you here tonight is that each of you go back and present to your directors an ambitious program of expansion covering the next 5 years. There is no reason why our savings associations should not eventually finance up to 70 percent of the construction loans that are available in your community. There is no reason also why our institutions should not be able eventually to attract at least 50 percent of all the new savings that are available in your community. Certainly you should be constantly impressing your directors and your people with the fact that continued expansion is the national policy of your business in order that our country can successfully destroy the assault forces of socialism and that the carrying out of this policy is the direct responsibility of everyone associated in the business.

If we pursue this deliberate plan of expansion with all the ability and energy at our command, it will mean by 1960 a doubling in size of our total resources from the present $15,000,000,000 to more than $30,000,000,000. It will result in an increase in the percentage of home ownership among our urban families from the present 53 percent to more than 75 percent. That is the avowed goal of our business. With 75 percent home ownership neither the Communists nor the Socialists will ever win here. Finally, this expansion will make possible a doubling in the number of the 2,000,000 World War II veterans who have already bought homes under the GI home-loan program. These veterans are the flower of our Nation's manhood, and an ever-growing number of them should be in the vanguard of private home ownership.

If these objectives seem at first glance to be somewhat impractical, let me remind you

that the odds were very small in 1940 that we could have doubled home ownership in the ensuing decade, even without a 4-year war tossed in. But the fact is—and let us never forget it—that the shining ambition of every decent American family is to own a home of their own, and so long as we foster and encourage that ambition to the best of our abilities, then we are living up to the responsibilities that are ours, and we are doing the job that has been assigned us in this great crusade of liberty.

Let us always remember, too, that the people who save money are those who do not ask for aid from the Federal Government, and the more of them we have on our side, the better our chance of survival. Let us remember that to the people who have worked hard and saved long to buy a home the policy of Government ownership of homes is just as repugnant and distasteful as it is to us, and the more of them we have on our side, the better off we are. Let us remember, finally, to make a consistent effort to enroll young people in our Nation-wide family of savers and homeowners, keeping in mind always that in their hearts and minds and actions lies the hope for tomorrow.

OUR POLITICAL OBLIGATION

As your president during the past year, my principal aim has been to instill in our people an acute awareness of the need for taking a more active part in politics. Since the election dozens of letters have come to my office telling of the efforts of savings-association men to elect candidates—either Republicans or Democrats—who were opposed to public housing and other aspects of the welfare state. It is a measure of great satisfaction to me, as it should also be to you, that more and more people in our business are awakening to the dangers that confront us. In many areas, where the key issue was socialism versus a return to fundamental principles, I am confident that our people played an important role in repudiating the champions of collectivism.

The success of our political efforts thus far is small to what it can be if we persist and persevere in these activities in the days ahead. During the next 2 years, we will have the chance to consolidate our forces against socialism and then expand our gains at the presidential election in 1952. As I have said, we can make what is possibly the greatest contribution to the cause of individual justice and freedom by keeping the trend of home ownership surging forward. History will testify as to how we meet this challenge, as individuals and as a business, and as to our determination to make sure that the chalice of opportunity—our most precious heritage—is held aloft to be passed on to our children and grandchildren.

Our job ahead is not easy. On the contrary, at times it will be taxing and exhausting. But it can, I think, be kept stimulating and adventurous if we approach our work with the fervor of missionaries. In a sense, we are missionaries. We need to be fired by faith in the righteousness of our cause. We need a zeal that is spiritual in its origin. For, in the final analysis, this is a religious struggle, in which our objective is to insure that the individual, created in the image and likeness of God, shall not be submerged into a godless state. Let us apply ourselves to this mission in the years ahead, in the wisdom and knowledge that only in the pursuit of principle is the freedom worth having.

As I have said to many of you before, this freedom is a priceless thing. It is the thing that has made this country different from all the other nations of the world. It is the thing that has made it possible for people of all classes and incomes to own their homes. And it is in the light of this freedom that we will go forward to make sure it is preserved for the generations to follow.

Address by Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall, of Colorado, at National Reclamation Convention, Spokane, Wash., November 16, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman ASPINALL, of Colorado, gave a very informative address before the National Reclamation Association at Spokane, Wash., last month. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I herewith include the text of the address.

The gentleman from Colorado comes from the district formerly represented for so long by the Honorable Ed Taylor, who in the later years of his life was chairman of the Appropriations Committee of this House. Both of these men, representing the western part of the State of Colorado where so large a proportion of the precipitation occurs, have naturally taken a vital interest in the matter of water utilization including irrigation. For this reason the address of Congressman ASPINALL, which follows, is of special interest:

Mr. Toastmaster, members and guests of the National Reclamation Association in annual convention assembled.

It is a distinct and much appreciated honor for anyone to be requested to address such a gathering as this. But it is even more so when the one so honored is but a freshman Congressman. I am glad to advise the officers and members of this association that, to me, this appearance is one of the highlights of my first term in the National House of Representatives. It has been a pleasure to work with the representatives of your association, especially on congressional committee work, and I can assure you that I look forward to a continuing personal enjoyment in our work together.

In the spring of 1904, as a 7-year-old boy, I moved from the verdant covered hills of Ohio to the semiarid lands of Colorado. I experienced my first eastern Colorado dust-storm before I was 8 years of age. I can remember, as if it were only yesterday, seeing the sand and top soil start covering up the tumbleweed and wire fence, and then, continue the drifting until the three-wire fence was entirely covered. As a schoolboy I saw one of the first reclamation projects ever authorized come into fruition—namely the Uncompahgre project of Western Colorado. During my college days, the Grand Valley reclamation project was completed. Since that time my family and I have been entirely dependent in our agricultural pursuits upon the waters delivered through the facilities of such project.

This last winter, when the longest tunnel of the Grand Valley project collapsed—after but a little over 30 years of operation—it was only natural that in my office all other work and activities were sidetracked to help secure the necessary authorizations and procedures for the rebuilding of the tunnel. It was most gratifying that this rehabilitation project gained national interest because of the united efforts of all concerned and the speed of the work which made possible the saving of crops on 30,000 acres of land.

I recite this personal history for the sole purpose of advising each of you that I personally understand some of the values of the work in which we are engaged.

On the marble-bordered walls of the beautiful rotunda of the stately and gold-gilded capitol building of the State of Colorado, there appears the following saga to water:

"Here is a land where life is written in water.
The West is where the water was and is
Father and son of old mother and daughter.
Following rivers up immensities of range
and desert thirsting the sundown ever,
Crossing a hill to climb a hill still drier,
A different name from last night's camping fire
Look to the green within the mountain cup;
Look to the prairie parched for water lack;
Look to the sun that pulls the ocean up;
Look to the cloud that gives the oceans back;
Look to your heart and may your wisdom grow
To power of lightning and to peace of snow."

I understand that I do not need to argue the cause of national reclamation in this group. Yet, I am sure that it is the first duty of those of us who are pleased to call ourselves friends of reclamation, that we understand fully; not only the successes and benefits which have come to us heretofore, the great possibilities of continued successes and benefits, but also that we now recognize what appears to be the opposition and road blocks which may be thrown into our paths in the future.

We have come a long way since the 17th day of June 1902.

Few of us remember that the work in the interests of reclamation was originally assigned to the United States Geological Survey, later it was given over to the Reclamation Service, which Service is now called the Bureau of Reclamation.

Originally the cost of construction work was to be repaid in 10 equal annual instalments, the payment of such instalments to begin with the completion of the project. No interest was to be paid on the money. In other words, receipts from the sale of public property in the Western States were to be used for the building and development of the agricultural resources of the Western States. In 1914, the period of repayment was extended to 20 years. In 1924, a plan was adopted wherein no limit was set on the time of repayment, but the criterion of repayment was changed to the ability of the land to pay. Originally the payment was to be 5 percent of the gross annual crop return averaged over a period of 10 years. In 1926, the act was amended to provide for repayment in not to exceed 40 years. Since that time, with the approval of other acts of Congress, as well as by action of the executive department, the time of repayment has been extended in many instances to a hundred years or more.

It is only natural that the opponents of reclamation have come to look with more and more distrust upon what appears to be the ever-changing policies toward the repayment of moneys used in the construction of reclamation projects. This opposition can easily be determined and the necessary steps taken to combat it. On the other hand, where opposition arises within

the ranks of the friends of reclamation itself, then we have a much more difficult situation with which to cope.

Originally the reclamation program was concerned with the use of water for irrigation only. Of late years, the multiple-use program has brought into the picture the development of power, the furnishing of municipal water, the questions of navigation, public recreation, etc., all of which problems, of course, are to be found within the contents of what has been known in this present session of Congress as H. R. 1770, the technical provisions of which it is not my wish to discuss in this talk.

I do not have the time or the desire to argue the matter of these advanced uses of reclamation. I accept what appears to be the prevailing thought and law in this respect as such is laid down in the recent case of the United States against Gerlach Livestock Co., in which it was held inter alia, as follows: "* * * Thus the power of Congress to promote the general welfare through large-scale projects for reclamation, irrigation, or other internal improvement is now as clear and ample as its power to accomplish the same results indirectly through resort to strained interpretation of the power over navigation." In other words, it can be said that Federal reclamation, as we now have it today, is in the interest of the general welfare of the United States. It is not merely in the nature of, or limited to, a plan for extending financial aid to private beneficiaries under a reclamation project. This line of thinking and the development made possible under it, of course, not only provides for additional benefits, but it also provides for further differences between the proponents and opponents of reclamation, and, even more dangerous, for differences between the advocates of a strong reclamation program.

Recently I have endeavored to secure information which might bring to our minds the fact of the enormous growth of this reclamation child which was born in 1902. Much of this information, which we should have for the early years, is lacking. It is interesting to note that in 1902 an appropriation of $165,000 was made; in 1907, or the fifth year, appropriations totaling $54,780,000 were made; in 1942, or the fortieth year, appropriations totaling $102,201,600 were made; and, in 1950, or the forty-eighth year, Congress appropriated for such purposes a total of $361,522,734. Such figures tend to show the rapid growth of this favored governmental institution of the West. Yet, when we are advised that the all-time total appropriations for Federal reclamation is only $2,418,683,963, and that the estimated total cost of the present Korean incident alone is $10,000,000,000, then we can easily see how little in fact has been done in the building for an integrated peacetime economy in the great West as compared with the expense of what is known as a minor incident in foreign matters. Information which would give to us an over-all total in dollars for combined authorizations for reclamation is not possible, largely because of the fact that the Bureau has in recent times departed from the procedure of asking for fixed authorization amounts and would rather secure permission to build a project without stating its fixed cost. I know that I am safe in saying that this procedure is frowned upon by the Members of Congress, and especially by the committee having jurisdiction. It is recognized that with the fluctuations in cost of material and labor, that it is impossible to prepare an estimate for the cost of the project which migh be good for an indefinite time in the future. On the other hand, surely it should be possible to give to Congress a definite idea as to the costs of a project and provide for the use of a formula which would make allowances for the possible decrease or increase of costs in labor and material. Such procedure would not only help to lessen the criticism of some of our eastern critics of reclamation, but it would also tend to do away with the necessity of reauthorizing or amending old authorizations.

This brings up the question of "sick projects." Although we have authorized but two projects of any consequence during the present session of Congress, yet we have reauthorized many of the old projects that have proved to be unfeasible under the original authorizations. When it is necessary to reauthorize a project or to amend an old authorization, and to write off a part of the original amount charged to the users, we simply give additional material for the fire which our opponents keep trying to build under us.

The record of accomplishments of the last 2 years in reclamation matters is not such as to bring to us too much optimism in determining what may happen during the next decade or so. The record of the Eighty-first Congress shows that we have, in addition to legislating for some sick projects, authorized:

1. The construction of the Weber basin project in Utah in the amount of $69,500,000. However, the Presidential approval of such authorization is so qualified that it is very doubtful that this authorization will be of much value to those sponsoring the project;

2. The construction of certain canals in the California Central Valley project;

3. The construction of the Palisades Dam and power project on the Snake River in Idaho;

4. The rehabilitation of the private irrigation district at Vermejo, N. Mex. These authorizations in themselves are, I believe, well under $150,000,000. The present Congress also gave its consent to four river compact agreements. This last mentioned procedure costs the Federal Government nothing in construction and but very little in administrative expense.

All of us are aware of those who oppose a militant and comprehensive reclamation program. However, in order to bring them to our thinking at this time, I shall briefly enumerate the following groups:

1. There is the group which is resident of those communities where a great deal, if not most, of the construction work has already been accomplished and at least a great deal of the water, subject to beneficial use, is being used. In order to be perfectly fair, one should admit that in many instances those of this group have been able to secure construction and use of their projects without too much help from the Federal Government, although in most instances Federal aid has at least built the foundation for the facilities which they have.

2. There is the group which desires the construction of large projects and does not favor the building of smaller units. This group is particularly difficult to cope with, inasmuch as the officials of the Bureau itself seem to be consistently favoring large jobs over small ones.

3. There is the group composed of those people who for some reason or other, mostly known to themselves, attempt to thwart the program of reclamation as we understand it in favor of valley authorities. Personally, I do not feel that there is an all-out-and-out conflict between valley authorities and compact agreements. But here again in the supporters of valley authorities we find those who favor large undertakings rather than smaller individual projects.

4. At the present time we are hearing a great deal from a group which may be labeled the "nature-lover contingency." This group is composed mostly of easterners who, living in an almost entirely developed East, now appear to desire to have the West left as a wilderness for a playground for a large segment of our population. This is a most difficult group to oppose, inasmuch as most of us love the beautiful things of nature and are not especially desirous of the destruction of natural wonders or man-made works of the past.

5. There is the group which thinks in terms of public power and its possibilities first and irrigation and reclamation second. I know that each one of us appreciates the additional problems that have been brought to our attention because of the development of the multiple-use project. It is very easy for members of this group to so operate that they divide us in our mutual ambitions to have an integrated program.

6. There is the group which lives east of the 17 Western States and the members of which continually suggest that already there is an overproduction of agricultural products and that the financial security of the agricultural East and Middle West is in danger. Although it is admitted that the population of the United States has increased 50 percent in the last 35 years and that the center of our population continues to move westward, yet these opponents of reclamation consistently contend that if there is to be any future development of the agricultural possibilities of the West, it should be left until the time when there is a need for a further production of agricultural products.

7. Then there is the group that favors the carrying out of most of the work by the Army engineers. In this respect, it is interesting to note that since the development of the flood-control programs and reclamation development programs in the 17 Western States, a little less than $2,500,000,000 has been spent for reclamation, of which amount a trifle less than one and a third billions has been repayable. In the 34 nonreclamation States a little over $4,500,000,000 has been spent in a program of reclamation (flood control) and only a trifle over one-half of a billion has been repayable. It is to be hoped that these two great agencies of the Government, i. e., the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, may become more and more cooperative.

There should be a definite line of demarcation between policy making and administration. Our form of government is so arranged that Congress itself has the policy-making authority and should accept such responsibility always. The Department of Interior and the Bureau and their personnel are administrators and should never trespass upon the powers of the legislative body, even by the dragging of their feet, to gain ends which would not come to them through the regular differentiation of powers. This, of course, is likewise true of the relationship of the Bureau of the Budget and Congress. The question of final feasibility of a project is a matter of policy to be determined by Congress after study by competent engineers. As to whether or not a project, after having been determined to be feasible by the Bureau of Reclamation and congressional action, fits into the national economy should very definitely be a matter for the budget to decide. However, the procedure which sometimes appears to be followed by the Bureau of the Budget and which hampers and embarrasses reclamation programs, and all too often permits the bartering of influences and pressure on related projects, is, in my opinion, not good for the national economy, let alone the reclamation program. Also, we have interdepartmental jurisdictional squabbles and jealousies. These not only cause unnecessary delay but, at the same time, they tend

to create a distrust in the minds of the general public.

All that I have said and implied leads up to but one thing, and that is that the program of national reclamation has now arrived in perilous times, not only because of existing international situations but also because of opposing thought and programs at home. Friends of reclamation should and must present a united front when dealing with their opposition.

Your association has gained throughout its years of experience a trusted position with most of the proponents of a strong reclamation program. Your record with Congress has been largely one of help and strength. In a land where the majority are expected to determine the policy, it surely is not asking too much of any organization when it presents its program to a national legislative body, that the program formally decided upon by majority action of such group will be sponsored wholeheartedly by the whole group. Not desiring to be critical of any personalities, I do wish to leave this thought with you, that you cannot expect too favorable legislative action by a committee unless you present a 100-percent position before such committee at the time it considers legislation in which you are interested.

Matters of reclamation and reclamation policy are most technical. The ordinary layman understands but a small part of the problem: the securing of money, the engineering (and here, may I say, not too much of it), the construction of dams, canals, and power plants and the releasing of waters to the canals and power to the transmission lines. Other than this, he does not know and he does not care to know what else may be necessary. The fine technical matters and policies are left to the expert to study and determine. There are not too many such experts in the legislative committees, let alone in the legislative bodies as a whole.

I would suggest further that in your work before the State and National legislatures, that you and your representatives pay particular attention to so-called legislative etiquette. As a rule, one gains favorable consideration in any matter only after arousing the interest of the one who is uninformed, or poorly informed. I think that it is equally safe to say that most people are charitable and if approached correctly will give freely of their time and capabilities of consideration. In legislative circles we find just human beings the same as we do in other places, and if the etiquette of the situation calls for certain people to be considered, then naturally that is the better policy to follow.

There are today two great jurisdictional experiments being studied and tried to a limited extent in the reclamation areas of the West. I refer, of course, to the so-called valley authorities and compact agreements. I think it behooves the members of your organization to watch these developments very closely for the possible determination of whether one is superior to the other as a general policy, or as a special geographical policy, or whether it is possible for both to exist effectively within the same over-all program.

Man has worried for ages over the question of water, its possession and its use. With the development and growth of nations these problems have, as a rule, become more vexatious and difficult of solution. Now today, in this country of ours, with the advent of the airplane and its conquest of the skies, there are those who believe that most of the vexing problems confronting those of us who give allegiance and service to reclamation programs can be solved by a short journey into the ether with the scattering of a few chemicals among the clouds. Some will suggest that this new curative program foretells the solution of our problems. Personally, I am not so confident of the thinking of these modern rainmakers. On the other hand, it behooves each and every one of us to be able to adapt ourselves to new and changing situations and conditions.

In closing I wish to repeat the last two lines of the saga which I first gave you:

"Look to your heart and may your wisdom grow
To power of lightning and to peace of snow."

Democracy Can Be Strengthened in Middle East by Help to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following resolution approved by the executive board of the Independent Order Brith Abraham, 37 Seventh Street, New York, of which Mr. Louis Weissman is grand master and Mr. Adolph Stern is grand secretary. The Independent Order Brith Abraham is one of the largest of American Jewish benevolent organizations:

Resolution urging grants-in-aid for Israel

Whereas the President of the United States, the State Department, and Congress are working diligently to keep the peace of the world; and

Whereas peace can best be maintained by strengthening the economy of smaller and weaker nations which are struggling to maintain the democratic precepts of life; and

Whereas the State of Israel has demonstrated a devotion to the principles of democracy and has proven to be the bulwark and barometer of democracy in the Near East since its inception; and

Whereas the State of Israel has brought to fulfillment in our own time the highest hopes of redeeming large masses of Jews from suffering and homelessness and placing them on the road of human dignity; and

Whereas the State of Israel's future program calls for the redemption of hundreds of thousands of Jews from lands where their political and economic status is precarious and their right to live freely as democratic Jews is restricted and denied: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Independent Order Brith Abraham, one of the largest American Jewish fraternal orders in the country, call upon the American Government for grants-in-aid to the State of Israel for the best interests of the United States and as a partner in the struggle for democracy. Such grants-in-aid will help Israel alleviate itself of its desperate financial situation and help the new-born state continue its noble work in relief, rescue, resettlement, and rehabilitation of the thousands of refugees who are daily migrating into Israel. We are confident of Israel's capacity to achieve economic and self-sufficiency if she obtains grants-in-aid to carry through her constructive, humane, and democratic program for peace and security.

LOUIS A. WEISSMAN,
Grand Master.
ADOLPH STERN,
Grand Secretary.

Mr. Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, as and of some 17 years and plus experience as a Member of Congress with you, under five or six Speakers, the memory of man "to the contrary notwithstand," I would like now, nonpartisanly, to say to you that none of those under whom I have ever served so well justified the confidence and esteem for fairness, integrity of ruling, knowledge of parliamentary law, according to precedents, power to control, persuasively, what otherwise might have been mob, as have you.

Unless, of course, it might have been JOE MARTIN, for whom both you and I have the highest regard and greatest respect, Sam, I tried to be nonpartisan, but I slipped.

So, Mr. Speaker, may you live so long as you wish, and have all you wish so long as you live—if there may be anything to add to the great record you already have made. So long.

What Are We Waiting For?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the Senate of the United States on December 12 the junior Senator from Texas, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, delivered an inspired address on the national preparedness program entitled "What Are We Waiting For?"

In his forthright and hard-hitting remarks, Senator JOHNSON said that the national policy of wait and see must end, and end now. This speech, refreshing in its frankness and inspiring in the bold program outlined by Senator JOHNSON, has received much favorable comment in the press of the Nation.

I commend to Members of the House two articles from the Washington Star of December 14 dealing with Senator JOHNSON'S remarks. One is an editorial by the Star entitled "Call to Arms," and the other is a column by the noted analyst, Gould Lincoln, headed, "'Wait and see' policy due for change shortly." The Washington Star's comment that Senator JOHNSON'S remarks make sense is one that will be seconded by the people of the Nation. The above-mentioned articles are as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of December 14, 1950]

A CALL TO ARMS

An urgent alarm, coupled with a call to arms, has been sounded by the newly formed committee on the present danger.

This committee, composed of 25 civilians who have played leading roles in public and

private life, minces no words in describing the menace to this country. It says that our very survival is threatened, that the aggressive designs of the Soviet Union are unmistakably plain, that our allies are weak and that we are far from sufficiently mobilized to meet the danger.

It insists that our only chance of averting a war of world dimensions, or of assuring victory if that kind of war should come despite our efforts, lies in taking these steps:

1. Raising a total United States armed force of "at least" 3,500,000 men.

2. Two years of military service, including military training, for all young men upon reaching the age of 18 or upon graduating from high school. This would be a supplement to the Selective Service Act.

3. Expansion of the program for equipment and supplies far beyond the goals already announced.

4. Submission to economic controls more exacting than those now in effect.

5. Sharp reduction in Government spending for nondefense purposes.

In short, the committee calls for the conversion of the United States into a kind of armed camp—an armed camp in which we could expect to live for an undetermined number of years to come. The committee does not mean by this that we can withdraw from the world and hide behind our own borders. Quite the contrary. But it does mean that the "good old days" are over in this country if we wish to stay alive.

Some of the specific proposals of this group are open to question. The call for an armed force of at least 3,500,000 men may be too low. And it certainly is not clear how we could proceed with a universal military service program at a time when we are hard pressed for the means to build, through Selective Service, the 3,000,000-man armed force for which the President called in September.

The committee has promised detailed recommendations in this respect, however, and they should be awaited. Its main purpose at this time has been to bring to the American people an adequate picture of their danger and to impress the people with the urgency of taking suitable steps to meet it. On this score the committee has done a good job. The Star is by no means certain, however, that it might not have done better.

The members of this committee say that they do not "accept the idea that war with the Soviet Union is inevitable—unless the Soviet so wills it." There is here, at least, a note of reservation. The statement is by no means as unqualified as that of Averell Harriman, who, in addressing the American Farm Bureau Federation on Tuesday, declared: "In spite of everything that has happened, we must not accept the inevitability of another world war."

The Star would like to know why, in spite of all the evidence to the contrary, so many people refuse to accept the inevitability of war. It is true, of course, that another world war is not literally inevitable. Presumably nothing is. But in the face of the mounting evidence, why do we keep harping on that theme?

Only about 6 months ago the President was saying that we were closer to peace than at any time in 5 years. When are we going to wake up and look the facts in the face? When are we going to tell the people that the odds favor war, and not peace? Surely this unwarranted emphasis on peace has had a lot to do with our snail-like pace toward preparation for war. And the more we encourage a hope for peace that is not justified by the facts the harder it is going to be to persuade the people to make the sacrifices that they are told must be made if we wish to survive.

The Star agrees with Senator JOHNSON, chairman of the Senate Military Preparedness Subcommittee, that there has been altogether too much "adolescent nonsense and double-talk" about this matter. He says that we are already at war with the Communist world—that "we are not getting ready for war—we are in it."

This is an attitude that makes sense. And we would get along faster with the grim business in hand if we would stop talking about arming to preserve peace and begin to think in terms of arming to fight the war that has already begun for us on one front, and which we should expect to have to fight to a finish on a world-wide scale before we are through.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of December 14, 1950]

"WAIT-AND-SEE" POLICY DUE FOR CHANGE SHORTLY—KOREA SETBACK AND LIVING COSTS FORCE ADMINISTRATION HAND

(By Gould Lincoln)

Maybe we are going to change. Maybe we are going to do something about all-out mobilization, both military and economic. If so, two happenings are responsible—rather than any far-seeing ability among the powers in Washington. The first is the overwhelming attack by forces of Red China in North Korea. The second is the rapid rise in prices and the cost of living in the United States. Before the congressional elections, military mobilization was soft-pedaled—and the administration dodged the imposition of economic controls, although Congress had given the President authority.

For months there have been appeals to the National Government for greater effort to put this country in a state of preparedness to meet military attack and to prevent disastrous inflation. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, Democratic member of the Armed Services Committee, has prodded constantly, and so has Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts, Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Now, it appears, their hopes for all-out mobilization are to be gratified.

SIX COSTLY MONTHS

Speaking in the Senate on Tuesday, Senator JOHNSON said that the wait-and-see policy of the administration had delayed adequate preparation for six costly months, although this country and the free world have been at war all that time against the Communist aggressors.

"Faced with the task of girding this Nation for a struggle that may outlive us all," said Senator JOHNSON, "we have committed ourselves only to a policy of not committing ourselves. For the common defense, we have thrown up a chicken-wire fence, not a wall of armed might."

Senator JOHNSON'S complaint was that there has been no one to tell the American people where we are going. His considered judgment, he said, was that no problem of preparedness should be of more immediate concern than the present state of public confidence. "The American people have not lost faith in themselves or in their country," he continued, "but the American people are fed up with double talk in Washington." He told his colleagues the American people are anxious to unite, but, he said, "they cannot rally around a vacuum. They cannot give their unified support to policies that do not exist."

The Texas Senator commented on a strange situation for Americans to find themselves in. He said:

"We are in a war, but all our effort is seemingly directed toward staying out of the war we are already in. This is adolescent nonsense."

PEOPLE'S CONFIDENCE HIT

The administration's policies seem almost to have been designed to break down the confidence of the American people. The people have been told for a long time that nothing could be done about Communist China—even though it imprisoned an American consul general and held him for 6 months. They have been told that we cannot fight Communist China after she attacked the United Nations forces in Korea—although there were plenty of ways and means to that end—without an Army invasion of China. That's a new thought for Americans. They have been given the impression that the United States cannot fight a war with Communist Russia, with a chance of success. All this is calculated to give the American people an inferiority complex—which Americans have never suffered before.

The time has come—in fact it came a long time ago—when this country must have a global policy, in which we—not Communist Russia—must decide where we shall fight and where we can fight, as the Texan insisted. And turning to the need for prompt mobilization of the country's economy—as well as of its manpower—Senator JOHNSON called attention to the fact that on November 28 the wholesale price index reached an all-time high—171.7. That represents an increase of 12.3 percent since April. To illustrate the short-sightedness of the administration's "wait-and-see" policy in the economic field, Mr. JOHNSON said that the tax dollars that would have bought 100 miles of field wire before the Korean War would buy only 85 miles in September—and only 78 miles in November. He added that the tax money which would have bought 10,000 barrels of fuel oil before Korea would buy only 6,500 in September—and only 4,700 barrels in November.

He spoke of "tax money" and its purchasing power merely because these are materials which are needed in the defense program. And must be bought by the Government. Private citizens, however, can get no more with their dollars. The time is overripe to do something about this.

ECA Procurement Authorization for Materials in Short Supply in the United States Total $16,825,000 in 11-Day Period—Scarce Aluminum, Copper, Rubber, and Steel Included

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, when we know from reports that ECA material is being transshipped to Russia and Red China, it might be well for the people to ponder over the logic of the shipment of much-needed material for our own industries' use to ECA to distribute in other countries. If these shipments make any sense at this critical time, I cannot see it.

The information assembled by Paul O. Peters, of Washington, D. C., is an exposé of administration short-sightedness and of an indifferent Congress of which the public should be made aware.

Under leave to extend, I am including as part of my remarks the statement prepared by Mr. Peters to which I have referred:

ECA PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION FOR MATERIALS IN SHORT SUPPLY IN THE UNITED STATES TOTAL $16,825,000 IN 11-DAY PERIOD—SCARCE ALUMINUM, COPPER, RUBBER, AND STEEL INCLUDED

At the very time when American industrialists and businessmen are scouring the markets for supplies of critically needed

aluminum, copper, steel, and synthetic-rubber products, in the 11-day period between November 23 and December 8, 1950, procurement authorizations for Marshall-plan goods issued by ECA totaled $16,825,000. In a previous bulletin it was recited how a total of approximately $895,000,000 had been authorized for such products from the commencement of ECA through October 31, 1950. (See Bull. No. 235.)

The latest reported procurement authorization, the countries which will receive the commodities, the original sources, and the amounts involved are shown by the table following:

Authorization date	Destination	Commodity	Origin	Amount
Nov. 24, 1950	Austria	Copper and copper products	United States	$200,000
Do	do	Ferro-alloys	Japan	150,000
Nov. 29, 1950	Denmark	Tin plate, terneplate, black plate	United States	800,000
Do	do	Zinc and zinc base products	Latin America	100,000
Do	Germany	Rubber and products, excluding natural	United States and Canada	1,000,000
Do	do	Copper and products	United States	1,000,000
Dec. 5, 1950	Denmark	do	Canada	52,000
Do	Greece	Aluminum and products	do	100,000
Do	Italy	Miscellaneous iron and steel manufactures	United States	644,000
Do	United Kingdom	Aluminum and products	Canada	5,515,000
Dec. 6, 1950	Germany	Copper and products	Latin America	1,100,000
Do	Greece	Miscellaneous iron and steel	United States and Canada	100,000
Do	Norway	Iron and steel mill materials	United States	100,000
Do	Portugal	Copper and products	do	28,000
Dec. 7, 1950	Belgium-Luxemburg	Rubber and products, except natural	United States and Canada	500,000
Do	French North Africa	Rubber and products	United States	452,000
Do	Germany	Aluminum and products	Canada	[1] 1,200,000
Do	Netherlands	do	do	750,000
Dec. 8, 1950	French North Africa	Copper and products	Latin America	410,000
Do	Netherlands	do	Canada	285,000
Do	Portugal	Tin plate, terneplate, and black plate	United States	1,367,000
Do	Indonesia	do	do	865,000
		Miscellaneous iron and steel	do	107,000

[1] Plus $1,200,000 matte.

Joe Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to say when I came into these Halls some 18 years ago, in a hurry and in order to be sworn in, I was led up to the dais by one by the name of Bert Snell, God bless him.

Previously, he had arranged with your predecessor, Speaker Rainey, that I should be presented at a given hour as a Representative-elect from Vermont without any certificate of election official. As Bert Snell presented me and I was about to be sworn in, one unknown by the name of JOHN RANKIN, came rushing down the middle aisle saying, "Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object," and then he asked some questions about did anybody know whether or not I had been elected, and so forth. Whereupon, the Speaker said:

Well, I have in front of me a telegram from the Governor of the State of Vermont stating that Mr. PLUMLEY had been elected, and I have another from the secretary of state of Vermont saying that Mr. PLUMLEY has been elected, and I have a congratulatory telegram from his Democratic competitor in the election, and I also have a telegram from the Governor and the secretary of state saying that the official credentials will be immediately forwarded.

Whereupon, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] said he withdrew his objections.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I took the oath of office.

Naturally I thought Vermont should at once have a voice in the proceedings for I came down here because I belonged to the so-called brain trusters, having just resigned as president of Norwich University. But to my very great embarrassment, I found that I had to first convince Bert Snell I had something to say and then he had to convince the Speaker that what I had to say was worth listening to and then eventually someday the Speaker would tell Bert Snell that he would recognize me for 3 minutes and that I could extend my remarks.

Great God of all liberty and lives, what a change in procedure. Despite all the rules and regulations and the recommendations of the committee to change procedure, but whether for better or for worse, it is not for me to say for time alone will determine it and the wisdom of the change in parliamentary procedure and the temptation to recognize those new-born in Congress who never have taken a political bath.

However, Mr. Speaker, in passing I would like to pay tribute and my respects to one with whom many times I have diametrically disagreed and differed.

I doubt if either of us has lost any stature in the mind of the other by reason of our differences for we both come from New England and while we fight over an issue, our friendship never is in the crucible and when the issue is determined, it is over.

The man to whom I refer and to whom I pay my respects and affectionate tribute is one JOE MARTIN. It has been said that "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown." But Joe has worked up to that point where he would reject wearing a crown although his head has "lied" uneasy.

"Suavitor in modo and fortiter in re"—"Only to those who have mixed with him in a death battle mentally know how tough he is in fiber," how great he is in the mental measurement of any situation, political or national, and how broad is his capacity to almost instantly diagnose any situation which confronts him or the country. Of course, his New England shrewdness helps.

JOE MARTIN'S lot over these last years has not been an easy one. He has borne a terrific burden. Did anybody ever hear him say so? Did anybody hear him complain with respect to the load on his shoulders which has grown heavier and is more heavy now than ever? No sir, Mr. Speaker.

Resolutions of the Department of Montana, American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two resolutions adopted at the midwinter meeting of the Department of Montana, the American Legion. The resolutions indicate the members of the Montana American Legion are aware of the danger facing our country, and prepared to do something about it. The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved by the midwinter conference in executive committee meeting of the American Legion, Department of Montana, December 10–11, 1950, That we condemn the failure of the State Department of the United States to deal adequately with the shameful advance of communism throughout the world, believing this failure is due fundamentally to the lack of knowledge, as well as the outright refusal of the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, to deal adequately with the problem, and therefore request that the President of the United States take notice of our lack of confidence and immediately remove the head of the State Department, Mr. Acheson, and others in the Department responsible for the present situation.

It is further the mandate of this meeting that copies of this resolution be sent to the two Senators and two Congressmen representing Montana, and to the President of the United States.

RESOLUTION

Whereas there faces the American people today a clear and unmistakable danger of defeat due to unpreparedness; and

Whereas there appears to be a reluctance upon the part of our leaders to recognize this danger and to take all necessary steps to correct the situation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Montana, assembled at its midwinter conference at Helena, Mont., December 10 and 11, 1950, That the department commander immediately request the President of the United States take the necessary action to place the whole economy on a full-mobilization status, including not only elements of the Armed Forces and their Reserve components, but also a full mobilization of industry, manpower, and natural resources to the end that our Nation shall be able to back up our ideals with sufficient force to preserve them; and be it further

Resolved, That our congressional delegation actively support the necessary legislation to attain such full mobilization and preparedness, including enactment of universal military training legislation.

Joseph P. Kennedy Says: Get Out of Korea, Leave Europe To Europeans, Arm the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following condensed version of a speech by Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy, delivered recently before the University of Virginia Law School Forum:

JOSEPH P. KENNEDY SAYS: GET OUT OF KOREA, LEAVE EUROPE TO EUROPEANS, ARM THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

(What should our foreign policy be? In a speech on Tuesday before the University of Virginia Law School Forum, Joseph P. Kennedy, former United States Ambassador to Great Britain, gave his views. Here is a condensed version of his speech.)

Lincoln in his famous Springfield speech said: "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."

Where are we now? Beginning with intervention in the Italian elections and financial and political aid to Greece and Turkey, we have expanded our political and financial programs on an almost unbelievably wide scale. Billions have been spent in the Marshall plan, further billions in the occupation of Berlin, Western Germany, and Japan. Military aid has been poured into Greece, Turkey, Iran, the nations of the North Atlantic Pact, French Indochina, and now in Korea we are fighting the fourth greatest war in our history.

WHAT KIND OF FRIENDS

What have we in return for this effort? Friends? We have far fewer friends than we had in 1945. In Europe they are still asking for our dollars but what kind of friendship have we bought there? Is Western Europe determined to preserve for itself those ideals of democracy that we have been preaching? Put to the test now as to whether she will arm herself effectively, even with our aid, to deal with the Russian threat, is she showing the kind of determination and the kind of will that amounts to anything?

Plans for economic unification have fallen apart in the light of nationalistic difference. French military power is only a shadow of its former self, and a strong minority of Communist sympathizers keeps France in endless political turmoil. The military strength of Britain is one-fourth of what it was in 1946 and she shows every inclination to avoid the heavy burdens that would be involved in rebuilding it. West Germany, to date, has revealed no disposition to develop effective military strength. Italy is hopelessly ineffective and Greece can hardly police her own small territory. Where is there in all Europe any buffer against a massed Russian onslaught? Worse than this, where is any determination to create such a buffer?

In the Middle East we have oil but no friends. Iran, Pakistan, even Egypt, seek neither our protection nor our influence. In Asia, China, whose friendship with us seemed deep-seated and enduring, is now massed against us with men, powerful armies and new vengeful hatreds. Indonesia, Malay, Indochina, are in revolt or heavy with discontent at the influences we represent. India is showing signs of succumbing to influences other than ours, more indigenous and more palatable to her desires. In Korea we are spending thousands of American lives to accomplish some unknown objective. Assume we stop the Reds somewhere across the belt of that peninsula, are we to continue fighting there indefinitely?

RUSSIA'S STRENGTH

On the other side of the iron curtain are massed manpower and military strength of a type that the world has never seen. Divisions which total in the many hundreds and which we know are well equipped and have the capacity to fight, can be thrown into battle anywhere on that great land mass that stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They are backed by planes of high quality and great quantity. Russia's navy includes a powerful fleet of submarines, and in all probability she too has the atomic bomb.

To engage these vast armies on the European or the Asian continent is foolhardy, but that is the direction toward which our policy has been tending.

That policy is suicidal. It has made us no foul weather friends. It has kept our armament scattered over the globe. It has picked one battlefield and threatens to pick others impossibly removed from our sources of supply. It has not contained communism. By our methods of opposition it has solidified communism, where otherwise communism might have bred within itself internal dissensions. Our policy today is politically and morally a bankrupt policy.

I can see no alternative other than having the courage to wash up this policy and start with the fundamentals I urged more than 5 years ago. It is absurd to believe that the United Nations can lead us out of this situation. The veto power alone makes it a hopeless instrumentality for world peace. The unwillingness of half the world to want world peace makes impossible effective organization to impose any such peace. In short, our chief source of reliance must be ourselves and we cannot sacrifice ourselves to save those who do not seem to wish to save themselves.

GET OUT OF KOREA

A first step in the pursuit of this policy is to get out of Korea—indeed, to get out of every point in Asia which we do not plan realistically to hold in our own defense. Such a policy means that in the Pacific we will pick our own battlegrounds if we are forced to fight and not have them determined by political and ideological considerations that have no relationship to our own defense.

The next step in pursuit of this policy is to apply the same principle to Europe. Today it is idle to talk of being able to hold the line of the Elbe or the line of the Rhine. Why should we waste valuable resources in making such an attempt? If the weakened European nations wish to hold that line and demonstrate a determination to do so, it may be that we can afford them some help. But to pour arms and men into a quixotic military adventure makes no sense whatever. What have we gained by staying in Berlin? Everyone knows we can be pushed out the moment the Russians choose to push us out. Isn't it better to get out now and use the resources, that would otherwise be sacrificed, at a point that counts?

The billions that we have squandered on these enterprises could have been far more effectively used in this hemisphere and on the seas that surround it. Had we the defenses in Iceland today that one-hundredth of the money spent in Berlin could have built, we would have purchased safety with our money rather than added danger. We need defenses in this hemisphere, in Canada, in the Caribbean and in Latin America. After all, these are our neighbors whose security is inevitably tied up with our own. We have no reason to believe that cooperation on their part will not be forthcoming and we can, and should insist upon it.

MAKE COMMUNISM COSTLY

People will say, however, that this policy will not contain communism. Will our present policy do so? Can we possibly contain Communist Russia, if she chooses to march, by a farflung battle line in the middle of Europe? The truth is that our only real hope is to keep Russia, if she chooses to march, on the other side of the Atlantic and make communism much too costly for her to try to cross the seas.

It may be that Europe for a decade or a generation will turn communistic. But in doing so, it may break of itself as a unified force. Communism still has to prove itself to its peoples as a government that will achieve for them a better way of living. The more people that it will have to govern, the more necessary it becomes for those who govern to justify themselves to those being governed. The more peoples that are under its yoke, the greater are the possibilities of revolt. Moreover, it seems certain that communism spread over Europe will not rest content with being governed by a handful of men in the Kremlin. French or Italian Communists will soon develop splinter organizations that will destroy the singleness that today characterizes Russian communism. Tito in Yugoslavia is already demonstrating this fact. Mao in China is not likely to take his orders too long from Stalin, especially when the only non-Asiatics left upon Asiatic soil to fight are the Russians.

This policy will, of course, be criticized as appeasement. No word is more mistakenly used. Is it appeasement to withdraw from unwise commitments, to arm yourself to the teeth and to make clear just exactly how and for what you will fight? If it is wise in our interest not to make commitments that endanger our security, and this is appeasement, then I am for appeasement. I can recall only too well the precious time bought by Chamberlain at Munich. I applauded that purchase then; I would applaud it today. Today, however, while we have avoided a Munich, we are coming perilously close to another Dunkerque. Personally, I should choose to escape the latter.

WE PAY THE COST

Finally people will say this policy is turning our back on the United Nations. To do

this there are two answers. Firstly, we cannot bear substantially the whole burden of the United Nations. In Korea, we have nine times as many troops in the field as all the United Nations put together. We have suffered ninety times the number of casualties that all the other United Nations have suffered, excluding only the South Koreans. And note the billions that we have advanced these nations as against the help they are giving us in Korea.

Secondly, we must recognize that the United Nations is not at present a vehicle to enforce peace. If half of the world does not wish it to operate in this fashion, as is true of Russia and China, it is idle to pretend that it can operate in that fashion. The United Nations still has a purpose for voluntary organization and as a forum in which to air international issues. Looking at the United Nations in that role, the admission of Red China or any nation presents wholly different issues than are presented if we look upon the United Nations as a type of governing body, with governing powers. But half of this world will never submit to dictation by the other half. The two can only agree to live next to each other because for one to absorb the other becomes too costly.

A REALISTIC APPROACH

An attitude of realism such as this is, I submit, in accord with our historic traditions. We have never wanted a part of our peoples' scrapes. Today we have them and just why, nobody quite seems to know. What business is it of ours to support French colonial policy in Indochina or to achieve Mr. Syngman Rhee's concepts of democracy in Korea? Shall we now send the marines into the mountains of Tibet to keep the Dalai Lama on his throne? We can do well to mind our business and interfere only where somebody threatens our business and our homes.

An Atlas, whose back is bowed and whose hands are busy holding up the world, has no arms to lift to deal with his own defense. Increase his burdens and you will crush him, or attack him from behind and he cannot turn. This is our present posture. It strangles our might. The suggestions I make would unleash our strength. They would, I am sure, give considerable pause to the strategists and planners of the Kremlin. They would—and I count this most—conserve American lives for American ends, not waste them in the freezing hills of Korea or on the battle-scarred plains of Western Germany.

1951 Resolutions of Poweshiek County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask permission to include a set of forward-looking resolutions recently adopted by the Poweshiek County (Iowa) Farm Bureau, and I especially call attention to items 2, 3, 16, and 17:

1951 RESOLUTIONS, POWESHIEK COUNTY FARM BUREAU

1. We affirm our allegiance to the United States, the Department of Agriculture, the Extension Service, and the Iowa and American Farm Bureau Federations. We will cooperate with them to the fullest extent.

2. We pledge full support of the United Nations organization and the program upon which they have launched.

3. We favor a permanent bipartisan farm program that gives equal consideration to producers and consumers. We recommend that this program be administered by locally elected farmer-committeemen up to and including the State levels and decisions concerning this program be made locally.

4. The need of more soil-conservation practices in Poweshiek County is becoming increasingly evident each day. Recognizing the extreme value of soil-conversation work, we urge that the appropriation for technical assistance from the State Soil Conservation Service be increased.

5. We favor the principles involved in the present county assessor law, but are dissatisfied with the present application. We recommend that the county board of review appoint a local three-man board in each township to assist and advise the board of review in arriving at an equitable evaluation.

6. We favor the 100-percent collection of the State income tax because it is a fair and equitable tax on all, and the revenue thus obtained to be used as a replacement for property tax as far as possible.

7. We favor increasing State aid to schools with the objective of equalizing educational opportunity and we urge an equalization of the tax burden.

8. Because of local tax inequalities, we still believe that all income-producing property held by nonprofit organizations should be taxed as other property. We suggest that the county treasurer publish a list of tax-exempt property.

9. We urge that the check-off plan for creating funds to promote the sale of dairy products be increased through the entire month of June.

10. We want a spur road system which will put every farm family on an all-weather road.

11. We favor an amendment to the present school reorganization law which would allow petition by local districts for reorganization.

12. We recognize the valuable training being given our rural youth through 4-H club work and vocational agriculture and homemaking schools. We feel that every rural boy and girl should have an opportunity for the training afforded by these programs.

13. Realizing that agriculture and labor have many common problems, we urge that Farm Bureau and labor cooperate to secure a better understanding.

14. We favor an enactment of legislation which would simplify the transfer of property and make ownership more certain.

15. We recommend that no change be made in the method by which we select representatives and senators to the State legislature.

16. We definitely are not in favor of a social-security program to cover any of the people in agriculture.

17. We believe we should strive for efficiency in existing Government agriculture agencies, and that the program of these agencies should be coordinated to eliminate overlapping.

18. We commend the Farm Service officers and manager and the general and special insurance agents for their work and the efficient operation of their groups.

19. The various cooperative associations in the county have made a successful and valuable contribution to agriculture. We pledge continued support and assistance to these organizations.

20. We recognize the value of the publicity and support which the papers of the county have given during the past year and express our appreciation to them for their fine cooperation.

21. We reaffirm all resolutions of former years not contradicting the foregoing resolutions.

How Can We Prevent Strategic Materials From Going to the Soviet Bloc?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following transcript of a radio-television broadcast made by Hon. J. VAUGHAN GARY, of Virginia, and myself under the auspices of the American Forum of the Air, over the networks of the National Broadcasting Co., on Sunday, December 3, 1950:

HOW CAN WE PREVENT STRATEGIC MATERIALS FROM GOING TO THE SOVIET BLOC?

(By Hon. CARL HINSHAW and Hon. J. VAUGHAN GARY)

ANNOUNCER. How can we prevent strategic materials from going to the Soviet bloc?

The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the Continental Room of the Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, D. C.

Mr. Granik is on a brief vacation. He has invited Ernest K. Lindley, Washington editor, Newsweek magazine, to be his guest moderator.

Now, Mr. Lindley.

Moderator LINDLEY. The current December issue of Reader's Digest, one of America's leading magazines, has stirred its millions of readers with an exciting article entitled "When Are We Going To Stop Helping Russia Arm?" written by O. K. Armstrong and Frederic Sondern, Jr.

I would like to quote from that article. "During 1950 the merchants and industries of Western Europe will have contributed, legally, almost a billion dollars' worth of machinery and materials to the war potential of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

"Factories in the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Switzerland, and even Western Germany—many of which have been rebuilt or retooled with the help of ECA dollars—continue to provide ball bearings, lathes, drill presses, special steels with which the plants of Magnitogorsk and Kuibyshev turned out guns, tanks, and warplanes.

"To this flood of material going to Russia legally, there will have been added much more which is smuggled across borders. Some of it comes from the United States. * * *

"It would seem that the new Congress and the public should have a careful look at the extent of our military aid to Russia."

So the American Forum of the Air, in cooperation with Reader's Digest, presents a discussion of this vitally important subject by two distinguished Members of Congress, Congressman CARL HINSHAW, Republican, of California, and Congressman J. VAUGHAN GARY, Democrat, of Virginia.

Gentlemen, as you know, both Houses of Congress, through committees, have been investigating this question of export controls; from the facts turned up by those investigations, plus your own knowledge, would you say that our Government should tighten its controls over the export of strategic material to the Soviet Union, China, and other Soviet or Communist-dominated countries?

What do you say, Representative HINSHAW?

Congressman HINSHAW. Mr. Lindley, I think that before we get too deeply into this subject, we ought to understand some basic facts.

In the first place, export controls can be exercised for two general purposes, the first of course being that of preventing the draining away from our own country, for example, of those materials which may be in short supply, and are needed by our own country.

The second general reason is that an implementation of foreign policy may be for the purpose either of granting certain countries preference, let's say, or for preventing certain countries or blocs of countries, from receiving those materials which they may use in the way of making war.

Now, the first general purpose, that of making sure that our own materials are not drained away, is one that we can exercise as a sovereign Nation, without any complaint from anyone. The second one is an act of cold war, and we have been engaged in that act of cold war against the Soviet bloc for approximately 2 years. It has been intensified, of late, and particularly since the time that Korea started.

Now, I think that we ought to understand what we are doing and what we are talking about. We are talking about something that is in the realm of war, and it is a very, very important thing.

I think that as time goes on—and according to the morning papers, certainly—we are finding it necessary to tighten these controls to the point that it amounts almost to an embargo. That indeed is an act of war, and I think it should be well understood by anyone.

Moderator LINDLEY. I believe this newest tightening applies particularly to Communist China, Hong Kong and the other ports of entry into China, does it not?

Congressman HINSHAW. Yes; it does, as I understand the morning papers, but that is a part of the Soviet bloc, and it is the same thing, whether it is going to them or to the entire bloc, all-inclusive.

Moderator LINDLEY. Representative GARY, would you accept Mr. HINSHAW's definition of the purposes of export control?

Congressman GARY. Yes; but I think we have got to go one step further. I think we have got to consider the classifications of the controlled materials. This question of strategic materials, as he has stated, is a tremendously important and far-reaching question. It is an exceedingly broad one.

Now, for example, you have got first the control of materials produced in the United States. That is relatively simple. We have been controlling that for some time under the Export Control Act, and under that act we absolutely control the shipment of strategic materials to all countries.

Moderator LINDLEY. Just what do you mean by strategic materials?

Congressman GARY. There is where we get into another classification.

First, for example, we will take the highest classification. It is that of arms, munitions, implements of war, and atomic energy materials. Now, that is no problem at all. There are no arms, munitions, implements of war, and atomic energy materials at the present time going into the Soviet Union from any of the other countries. They have been well controlled—and I don't think there have been any evasions, any illegal shipments to amount to anything, in that field.

Next, you have your highly strategic materials, such as machinery and precision tools.

Now, our Government has stopped the shipment of those into the Soviet Union under the Export Control Act.

Third, you have what are known as the less strategic materials. Now, they are materials which do not aid directly in the war potential, and yet they do have some strategic value. There has been a lot of laughter about the question of duck feathers. But, after all, that is no joke. Duck feathers may be used for warm clothing for aviators and to that extent they are strategic, and yet they are used for many other purposes.

Now, with respect to the less strategic materials, our policy has been not to attempt to embargo them, to stop them altogether, but to limit the quantities, in the first place, because some materials, if they are shipped in small quantities, make very little difference. On the other hand, if you ship in large quantities, they may become a war potential. So we have tried to limit the quantity in the first place, and then, in the second place, we have tried to see that when those goods are shipped to the Soviet Union from our own country or from any other country, we get in exchange materials which we need in this country.

Moderator LINDLEY. Let me ask there: Is this worth while? Are we getting anything in return, or is this just a one-sided thing, insofar as we are shipping some strategic materials, perhaps the less important ones, to the Soviet bloc, and permitting our allies to do so? Is it a one-sided thing? Are we just losing on that, or are we getting something in return?

Congressman HINSHAW. We have been getting some things in return. We have been getting a great many bales of high-priced furs from Russia for example, such as mink and sable and that sort of thing. I suppose that has great strategic value to the United States, but I can't see just how.

Moderator LINDLEY. I suppose they are equivalent to duck feathers, except that they are more expensive.

Congressman HINSHAW. I never heard of our warming our aviators with mink and sable.

Moderator LINDLEY. What about our allies, though?

Congressman GARY. There is the problem. The problem is, as I have said, that while we absolutely control the shipment of strategic materials from this country, and we can stop all strategic materials from going, but suppose we do stop these strategic materials from going from the United States, and at the same time the other nations, the other free nations, are shipping materials into the Soviet Union? Now, obviously you haven't accomplished a thing.

So what we have been trying to do is to agree with the other countries on a definite program, so that we would stop the war potential materials from going in, and that has been pretty will agreed to.

Congressman HINSHAW. May I suggest, Mr. GARY, that we have been not trying to agree with the other countries; we have been trying to get them to agree with us. After all we feel that way about it, but they do not seem to feel that way about it because, as you know, most of those countries, in Europe, certainly have trade agreements with Russia, and if they violate those trade agreements they feel that they are being subjected to unnecessary pressure. Therefore we, in spite of what we might be able to do, have not been able to get them to agree to go along with us on any common list of strategic materials, because much of those common lists are contained in their trade agreements. You have got to get them to——

Moderator LINDLEY. You would agree then that this Reader's Digest article is essentially correct in saying that large amounts of materials that are of high strategic importance, including ball bearings, lathes, drill presses, special steels, and so forth, have been going to the Soviet bloc from Western Europe?

Congressman GARY. Well, it is greatly exaggerated, because the total shipments of all goods into the Soviet Union last year, the total exports, were only eight hundred and sixty-one and a half million dollars, which is less than the billion referred to, and all of that is not strategic materials.

Moderator LINDLEY. I think this is the figure for the entire Soviet bloc.

Congressman GARY. Well, yes.

Moderator LINDLEY. For Eastern Europe?

Congressman GARY. Yes, Eastern Europe. The entire European bloc.

Moderator LINDLEY. But are you satisfied with that situation?

Congressman GARY. No, no; by no means.

Moderator LINDLEY. What shall we do, then?

Congressman GARY. By no means. But let me answer this, in return:

You were asking a few moments ago as to what materials we were getting from Russia and her satellites. Now, we have been getting such materials as iron, manganese ore, steel ingots, copper, nickel, bauxite, and other materials, machine tools, tank cars, locomotives, electric equipment, lumber, asphalt, crude oil, diamonds, gasoline, and many other items.

Congressman HINSHAW. You mean to say we have been getting that stuff from Russia?

Congressman GARY. I mean that the United States and the other countries, free countries, have been getting that material.

Congressman HINSHAW. Well, that is mostly the free countries that you are talking about. The United States hasn't received all that stuff.

Congressman GARY. The United States has very little trade. Within the first 6 months of this year, the United States has only shipped strategic materials into the Soviet Union to the extent of a million and a quarter.

Congressman HINSHAW. Yes; but let's consider that these Western European countries all have trade agreements with Russia, which we let them go ahead and make willy nilly, and they are in constant trade with Russia, whereas we have practically shut off our trade in the last few years. Now, if they are going to do the trading, and they are also receiving ECA money and materials from the United States, that is hardly fair to us, is it?

Congressman GARY. Well, the Congress took occasion to correct that situation at the last session, as you know, Mr. HINSHAW.

Congressman HINSHAW. Almost, but not quite.

Moderator LINDLEY. What to do? Can you explain that?

Congressman GARY. Yes; I have the amendment here.

Moderator LINDLEY. Please don't read the whole amendment.

Congressman GARY. No; I am not going to read the whole amendment. But it is the amendment known as the Cannon amendment, which was written into the Appropriation bill last year, in which we made a provision that if any country to whom we are giving aid deals with the Soviet Union in a manner that will injure our defense or be detrimental to our national defense, then the National Security Council, which is composed of the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, which is the organization in this country set up to handle our war activities—if that council says that the trade is dangerous to the United States, then they can stop the aid to that country.

Moderator LINDLEY. Have they done so in any case?

Congressman GARY. This act was passed just before Congress adjourned—I think in October.

Moderator LINDLEY. Do you think there are any cases in which that action should be taken now?

Congressman GARY. I think that they have been negotiating to such an extent in Europe that I think they are reaching agreements which are very, very satisfactory.

Congressman HINSHAW. Let us take a look at that 1 minute, because the minute you try to put that sort of pressure on those

countries they are going to have to abrogate their trade treaties with Russia, and if you force that position, then of course you are going to force war, actual war in Europe, just a little bit closer than it already is.

I understand that what we need at this point is time. We have lost a good deal of time because we have miscalculated on whether or not the Soviet Government could produce an atomic bomb in so many years. We miscalculated by 2 years, and consequently we need time at this point.

Moderator LINDLEY. Would you say also, Mr. HINSHAW, that if our European friends in Western Europe are cut off from Soviet or Communist sources, we in turn would have to supply additional aid through the Marshall plan or the defense funds to Western Europe? Are they getting things out of the Soviet zone that we would have to supply if they didn't get them there?

Congressman HINSHAW. They are getting some, Mr. Lindley, but I think they are more interested in selling materials and goods of various kinds to the Soviet Union than they are in receiving very much from them, except in a few categories.

Moderator LINDLEY. The trouble isn't worth anything to them.

Congressman HINSHAW. No; it is a matter of trade. They have to set up some kind of trade and that trade means they have to take something for what they give. But they are also trying to rebuild the European economy, and that European economy is something that requires trade between the various countries, in order to maintain itself.

Moderator LINDLEY. Mr. Hinshaw, from your viewpoint as to the American Government, have its various agencies been sufficiently zealous in watching this problem and in trying to stop this flow of strategic materials to the Soviet bloc?

Congressman HINSHAW. I think they have, within the appropriations that have been made available to them. I know from the testimony given before my own committee, that the appropriations for the Export Control Division have been cut from $5,000,000 to $2,000,000 in the last few years, and out of that $2,000,000, $800,000 of it has to go to the Customs Bureau for their part of the business, leaving $1,200,000 with which they can exercise the controls. That is far from adequate if they are going to really exercise export controls. They are going to have to be put back on a full-fledged basis, and I understand that since September, some time, perhaps in October, they have been restaffing the Export Control Division of the Department of Commerce.

In view of the circumstances that have been going on for the last 2 or 3 years, it seems to me that we should have been longer-sighted and maintained their efficiency by giving them the number of people—and intelligent people—that are required, to do this very difficult job.

Moderator LINDLEY. Would you agree with that answer, Congressman GARY?

Congressman GARY. I agree with that, but I want to say this in addition:

We were discussing just a few moments ago the shipments of these goods from other countries in Europe. Now, it has never been the policy, as I stated at the beginning, to stop all trade with Russia. We have tried to stop the highly strategic materials. That has been about 90 percent accomplished. In other words, these other countries have stopped shipping approximately 90 percent of the items that appear on our list.

The other 10 percent are items which are in disagreement. We think they are strategic and the other countries do not. We have been trying to convince them of the strategic value of those materials. And I understand that those negotiations have been, particularly within the last month or two, very satisfactory.

Moderator LINDLEY. Now, gentlemen, let us take a question from the audience.

I believe I see Congressman ROGERS of Florida. Do you have a question, sir?

Congressman ROGERS. I would like to address a question to my colleague and comember of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I might say he is an able member, and we so regard him, Mr. HINSHAW.

Do you know of any instances where strategic war materials in short supply have been shipped to Russia or the satellites, and if so, can it be justified under any circumstances and on any grounds?

Congressman HINSHAW. I don't know of any incident where these materials have been shipped directly under export permit from the United States; but I do know of instances where we have shipped to other countries, such as Great Britain, or some other country in Europe, and that these materials have been transshipped in that country directly to the Soviet Union.

There are other instances in which they have made trips around the world with the material, in order to avoid the various controls that have been exercised in various countries.

Congressman GARY. As a matter of fact, the in-transit shipments have been a tremendous problem, that is true. And, as a matter of fact, there has been very little effort to control in-transit shipments up until recently.

Congressman HINSHAW. That is the most difficult thing, to control them all, because once it has been put into the bottom of some ship going out of one of our harbors here, that ship may carry a foreign flag and we have no way, except through espionage, to find out what happens to it.

Congressman GARY. Exactly. But in-transit shipments are covered in this order issued today by Secretary Sawyer, of the Department of Commerce, with reference to China.

Congressman HINSHAW. That is true, but it is going to take a tremendous corps of investigators to look into the hold of every ship that comes into the country.

Congressman GARY. It will probably take more money than you advocated a few minutes ago.

Moderator LINDLEY. Let us hear what question Congressman REDDEN from North Carolina has.

Congressman REDDEN. I should like to address the question to my colleague, Congressman GARY.

It is perfectly apparent that trade could be resumed among all of the nations if we had peace in the world. My question is:

If the Korean incident can be settled by seating Communist China in the United Nations and removing our naval blockade of Formosa, do you favor that?

Moderator LINDLEY. That question is perhaps a little on a tangent to our subject, but it is such an important one that if you gentlemen would like to answer it, I think the audience would be very much interested.

Congressman GARY. I don't see that seating China in the United Nations has anything in the world to do with this trade situation.

At the present time, while we may not like to admit it, and while no war has been declared at the present time, we are actually at war with Communist China, and I would certainly not favor, under those circumstances, seating them in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Moderator LINDLEY. Do you have a brief answer, Mr. HINSHAW?

Congressman HINSHAW. My friend, the gentleman from Virginia and also the gentleman from North Carolina who has asked that question, understands full well that in aiming at export control in any degree whatsoever where that export control is aimed at a given country or bloc of countries, that in itself is cold war. And we must recognize that fact and not be misled or set to looking in some other direction because Communist China in and of itself is only a part of a Soviet bloc, and if you affect apparently one part of the Soviet bloc you affect the whole thing. I do not think it makes a bit of difference whether Red China is seated in the Security Council or not, because Soviet Russia has been seated in the Security Council for a long time, and still, for the past 2½ to 3 years they have been exercising stringent controls against the export of strategic materials to that country. Therefore, I do not see that this Formosa thing or Korean thing or China thing has anything to do with it whatsoever.

Moderator LINDLEY. I see another gentleman with a question.

Question. I have this question which I should like to direct to Congressman GARY:

Do you think it would be advisable to impose sanctions upon friendly foreign governments who might refuse to enter into agreements with the United States prohibiting exports of strategic materials to the Soviet Union, and would you advocate the withholding of ECA aid to such country that so refused?

Congressman GARY. I think I stated that the Congress has passed a law, or has placed an amendment in the appropriation bill, which will do just that.

Now, it will not stop the aid for one shipment of goods by a friendly country into the Soviet Union, but if they persist in a treaty which we deal inimical to the interests of the United States, then we will withhold funds, and I think we should withhold funds.

Moderator LINDLEY. Do you want to answer that too, Mr. HINSHAW?

Congressman HINSHAW. I point out that by so doing we must consider the fact that we are going to limit the number of allies we might ultimately have. Certainly the countries that are closest to the Soviet Union and its satellites are in a very dangerous position, and I am glad I don't live in any of them.

Congressman GARY. Well now, let me say this: No one has been more friendly toward the foreign aid program than I have, but I think the time has come when we want to know whether these people are allies. And if they are going to deal in trade with the enemy in a way that is inimical to our interests I don't think they are very friendly allies, and I think the time has come when we should take steps.

Moderator LINDLEY. At least they are not very effective allies.

Congressman GARY. They are not the kind of friends I want.

Congressman HINSHAW. Let me say this, Mr. Lindley: One ought to visit these countries and be close to the people, Switzerland and Finland and some other countries like that, and see how they feel about the situation. Those people are sitting right on a keg of dynamite, and they want to know when it is going to happen and what we are going to do about it when it does happen. They are under the gun.

Moderator LINDLEY. They are in effect saying: "If you want us to stop this trade, are you going to protect us?"

Congressman HINSHAW. That is right.

Congressman GARY. But CARL, bear in mind, I don't think that is necessary at the present time, because, as I stated a few moments ago, the recent negotiations with those countries, or conferences with them, have been very satisfactory, and they are coming along and coming around to our point of view, so I think the question is largely academic.

Congressman HINSHAW. Those that do, you want to credit with having an awful lot of guts.

Moderator LINDLEY. The next question?

QUESTION. My question is directed to Representative HINSHAW:

Is not the American citizen who attempts to ship scrap iron and rubber and so forth to Russia or its satellites more to blame than the American Government?

Congressman HINSHAW. Well, that is a question of the foreign policy of the United States and the implementation of that foreign policy. There are persons in the United States who have no regard whatsoever for the interests of the United States, and protecting those interests when it comes to the exportation of goods, because they are interested in making a profit.

Those people, I think, should be condemned. There are others shipping goods from the United States because they know perfectly well if they aren't shipped from the United States they can be gotten from some place else, and they think that we are entitled to that trade.

Moderator LINDLEY. We have time for one more brief question and answer.

Question. My question is addressed to Congressman HINSHAW:

Can the United States, within the United Nations, more adequately deal on an international scale with the export of materials used in any form for war?

Congressman HINSHAW. Within the United Nations, the gentleman says.

Of course, the United Nations has been subject to the veto which has been exercised by Russia some forty-odd times.

Now it is proposed to let Communist China in and let them exercise the second of five votes in the form of a veto. I don't think that is a very good piece of business.

Moderator LINDLEY. Gentlemen, I know we have many more questions, but we just have time for brief summaries by our speakers.

First, your summary, Representative HINSHAW.

Congressman HINSHAW. Mr. Lindley and ladies and gentlemen, I think that if we are going to exercise effectively this export control over certain strategic materials, whatever definitions may be applied, that it is going to require the complete cooperation, certainly, of all of the Atlantic Pact nations. Otherwise I do not see how an effective control can be exercised. We can salve our own conscience by refusing to permit strategic materials to go from our own country. That doesn't prevent the Soviet bloc from receiving those materials from some other country. If you are going to make it a complete thing, then you are going to require complete cooperation from all of the friendly nations of our own country.

Moderator LINDLEY. Thank you, Representative HINSHAW, of California.

And now, your summary, Representative GARY.

Congressman GARY. Mr. Lindley, I think it is very evident from the discussion that we have had here that this is a very difficult problem, and I trust that some of the people listening to this program have gotten the impression that the United States has not done such a bad job in handling it. Frankly, I think the departments have done a very excellent job.

Now, some things have happened which we would rather had not happened, but thus far, taking it step by step, realizing the seriousness of the imposition of controls, we have imposed controls when they are needed. And right now, when the Korean war broke out, we imposed controls, absolute controls then, insofar as Northern Korea is concerned. In this morning's paper controls against China were announced.

So I think we have the framework for handling this situation, and I believe we can leave it to our department heads to administer it.

Moderator LINDLEY. Thank you, gentlemen.

Montana State University's New President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we of Montana are very happy that Dr. Carl McFarland, one of America's outstanding lawyers and one of Montana's most famous sons, has accepted the offer of the Montana Board of Education to become president of Montana State University.

As a distinguished alumnus of Montana he is well aware of the opportunities and the problems which confront him as he assumes his new duties. As one who has known him for some time and who admires his character and integrity, I can say that Montana is fortunate indeed in bringing him back home.

Mr. Speaker, my congratulations to Montana for its choice, and my thanks in behalf of Montana to Carl McFarland for his acceptance of the presidency of Montana State University.

Under leave to do so, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a news story from the Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., on Dr. McFarland's appointment:

MCFARLAND ACCEPTS UNIVERSITY POSITION

HELENA, December 9.—Dr. Carl McFarland, Washington, D. C., attorney and former Assistant United States Attorney General, will be the next president of Montana State University at Missoula. His acceptance of the post was announced Saturday by Gov. John W. Bonner.

Bonner said McFarland telephoned acceptance of the State education board's offer.

McFarland, 46, will return to his alma mater when he succeeds Dr. James A. McCain, who resigned to become president of Kansas State College last July.

When McFarland will take over his new $10,000-a-year job will be reported by letter, Bonner said.

UNANIMOUS AGREEMENT

Bonner announced Monday the education board had agreed unanimously to offer the presidency to McFarland, ahd the faculty at Missoula approved.

The governor told the Associated Press Saturday: "I am exceedingly happy that Dr. McFarland accepted. He will be the first university alumnus to be made president of the university.

"It certainly speaks well for Montana when distinguished persons like Dr. McFarland are beginning to head important Montana institutions. I hope this trend continues.

"This represents a new era in Montana in that her men and women and boys and girls are beginning to stay in the State or return to it."

McFarland's appointment leaves open three greater university system positions which were vacated this year.

The chancelorship has been vacant since Dr. George A. Selke resigned to take a Federal education position.

President F. A. Thomson of the Montana School of Mines, Butte, resigned on orders from his physician to live at a lower elevation.

The State education board fired President G. H. Vande Bogart of Northern Montana College, Havre.

FACULTY PLEASED

"The faculty and staff of Montana State University are very pleased that Dr. Carl McFarland will become president of the university," Dr. R. H. Jesse, acting president, said Saturday. "The faculty expressed to the Governor and to the State board of education its desire to have him as its leader and its great confidence in his qualifications and abilities.

"Following Dr. McFarland's 4-day visit to the campus during homecoming in mid-November, this desire and confidence was reiterated and reemphasized. An eminent lawyer, an able student of history and political science, a scholarly writer, a successful teacher of law, and an enthusiastic alumnus, the new president is preeminently fitted to carry forward the great achievements and the high traditions of the State university."

GRADUATED IN 1928

Dr. McFarland attended the university from 1924 to 1930 while he was completing work for three academic degrees. He was graduated with a bachelor of arts degree in 1928; in 1929 he received a master of arts degree in political science, and in 1930 his bachelor of laws degree. In 1932 he received the degree of doctor of juridical science at Harvard University. He is a graduate of Great Falls High School.

Mrs. McFarland, the former Patricia Regan, of Missoula, also is a graduate of Montana State University. She received a bachelor of arts degree in journalism in 1932.

After finishing his work in the Montana State University School of Law in 1930, McFarland, who 7 years later was to become Assistant Attorney General of the United States, served for a year as law clerk to the justices of the Montana Supreme Court. From Helena he went to Harvard University to study for his doctorate.

Returning to Montana in the fall of 1932, he became a member of the law firm of Toomey & McFarland in Helena, now Toomey, McFarland & Wagner. In the spring of 1933 the Montana Supreme Court made him its commissioner for codification of the Montana statutes but in September of that year granted him leave to go to Washington, D. C., for a tour of duty in the Department of Justice.

There he shortly became head of one of the sections preparing cases for presentation to the Supreme Court of the United States and later first assistant in the Antitrust Division.

In 1937 the late President Roosevelt appointed Mr. McFarland Assistant Attorney General in charge of the largest division of the Department of Justice, handling all matters relating to lands, oil, and interior affairs. He resigned early in 1939 to enter the practice of law in Washington in partnership with former Attorney General Homer Cummings.

BOOKS, LECTURES, TEACHING

In 1934 Harvard University published Mr. McFarland's book on Judicial Control of Administrative Agencies, growing out of his doctoral dissertation written at Harvard in 1931–32. Recommendations made in that book relating to the Federal Trade Commission have since been adopted by Federal statute. In the same year the American Bar Association gave him its first Ross award for his writings on constitutional law.

Three years later, in joint authorship with the then Attorney General Cummings, he published Federal Justice—Chapters in the History of Justice and the Federal Executive. It was the first and remains the only full-scale history of any of the Federal departments of Government and, as such, is now a

standard work of reference in university and Government circles respecting the history and organization of the United States Department of Justice.

Mr. McFarland was invited to lecture at the University of Michigan and at Cornell in 1942. In 1946, in recognition of his distinguished services, New York University dedicated to him its annual volume surveying American law for the year 1945. He lectured at New York University in 1947 and 1948, in the latter year on the occasion of the centenary of David Dudley Field, famous New York lawyer who wrote the codes of law originally adopted in Montana. For the last 2 years he has been a regular lecturer at the University of Virginia.

In 1946, at the request of the Milk Industry Foundation, he wrote a volume entitled "Milk Marketing Under Federal Control." In 1947, in collaboration with Dean Arthur T. Vanderbilt, who now is chief justice of New Jersey, he produced a volume entitled "Cases and Materials of Administrative Law," now widely used in law schools. He also is the author of numerous articles in professional and educational journals.

PROFESSIONAL WORK

Since 1940 Mr. McFarland has been chairman of various committees of the American Bar Association. In 1946 he became the representative of the legal profession on the planning committee of the Library of Congress. In recent years he has been one of the five lawyers representing the professions in the National Conference of Lawyers and Certified Public Accountants. He also has been a member of the house of delegates, which is the governing body of the American Bar Association.

He was the principal draftsman of the Administrative Procedure Act, which became law in 1946 without a dissenting vote in either House or Congress.

In 1946 the association awarded him its thirteenth gold medallion "for conspicuous service in the cause of American jurisprudence" and he is today the only practicing lawyer to hold that honor. The other dozen recipients were teachers, editors, and jurists, including such men as Elihu Root, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and Charles Evans Hughes.

Since 1946 Mr. McFarland has headed the law firm of McFarland & Sellers in Washington. The five partners include two Montanans. The other is Grant W. Kellcher, of Butte. The firm is general counsel for organizations of such industries as livestock, milk, cotton, and automotive supplies. In litigation it also represents such organizations and corporations as the Brotherhood of Railway Engineers, the Brotherhood of Railway Firemen, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Union Carbide & Carbon Corp.

During the present year Mr. McFarland concluded litigation on behalf of the Indians of Colorado in which he secured the entry of the largest money judgments ever awarded in the Court of Claims against the United States, aggregating in excess of $30,000,000.

HONORARY DEGREE

On the recommendation of the faculty of Montana State University, the State board of education authorized the faculty to confer upon Dr. McFarland the honorary degree of doctor of laws, which was done at the spring commencement in Missoula in 1949. At that time Mr. McFarland gave the commencement address, for which he took as his topic the University Abroad, describing what Montana State University graduates of the depression years were doing in various parts of the United States.

Strikes, Costs, and National Security

REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, most of us are amazed and indignant because of the railroad strikes now going on. Apparently, certain segments of organized labor will defy this Government regardless of the consequences to this country. In time of national emergency, no group within our country should be allowed to imperil the Nation's welfare. Strikes in time of national emergency should be made unlawful.

Adding insult to injury, segments of railroad labor are, at this very time, undertaking to high pressure a railroad-labor bill through this Congress, a bill giving them additional powers to those already possessed. Railroad labor representatives are walking congressional corridors endeavoring to high pressure Members of Congress into passing their bill while some members of their organization threaten the Nation's economy and security.

Let me remind this Congress that strikes, slow-downs, the 40-hour week, the hoarding of labor by industry, abuses of cost-plus contracting by industry, and similar un-American activities, added a hundred billion dollars onto the cost of World War II. That means a hundred billion dollars onto the terrific debt we are now compelled to carry. Nothing could be more preposterous and unreasonable than to require American boys to die for this country, and yet to permit these same abuses to go on.

Mr. Speaker, have we become so morally and spiritually bankrupt as to place profits and politics above patriotism? Are votes and the questionable support of pressure groups to be considered as of primary importance in this time of crisis?

Mr. Speaker, I understand that a majority of the Republican members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee are determined to bring to the floor of this Congress the above-mentioned railroad union shop bill. For their benefit, and for the RECORD, I wish to insert just here a copy of an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post:

WILDCAT SWITCHMEN

Whatever merit there may be in the wage demands of the railroad switchmen, they are taking a poor way to enforce them in their wildcat strike in Washington and two other metropolitan terminals. The strikes already are impeding war shipments. The impounding of mail and inconveniencing of passengers just before Christmas—and at a time when a national emergency impends—is hardly calculated to warm public sympathy.

Actually, it may well be that the imminence of the national emergency proclamation is what precipitated the strikes—strikes which have all the earmarks of being organized in John L. Lewis fashion, despite statements of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainment to the contrary. The rail union is fearful that wage controls will be clamped on before its now ancient wage dispute is settled. It is worth noting, of course, that an emergency board appointed by the President some time ago recommended an increase which the trainmen and other unions declined to accept.

As a matter of fact, the strikes demonstrate one of the drawbacks to Government operation of the railroads. The Government seized the lines in August after a similar strike, and the Army is exercising nominal control through railroad managements. The unions complain that under this system managements continue to receive normal returns from railroad operation, whereas union members are forced to remain on their old wages, and there is no compulsion on managements to settle. Hence the union feeling of "What have we to lose by striking?"

The answer, of course, is that they are losing any public sympathy that is left. The rail unions themselves are clearly out of order in refusing to abide by the emergency board recommendations after managements had agreed to them. There is a theoretical case for impounding profits as well as fixing wages when Government seizure is in effect; it might make managements more anxious to settle before seizure, though it would be another step toward Government control of the railroads that ultimately would be as repugnant to the unions as to management. But the unions can hardly expect to obtain such a change in the law, or even create a climate for voluntary pay concessions, when they are brazenly flouting the machinery of the Railway Labor Act.

The fundamental fact is that the present strikes, wildcat or not, are strikes against the Government. The Government already has obtained a court order here and in Chicago for the men to go back to work. It remains to ask for an injunction in St. Louis also, and for contempt proceedings to be instituted if the strikes are not promptly called off. This is a time when there is no conceivable justification for an arbitrary stoppage of the Nation's transportation system.

Bill of Rights Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day in the annals of our Nation. Exactly 159 years ago—on December 15, 1791—the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States were ratified. These 10 amendments are known as the Bill of Rights, and December 15 of each year is, consequently, known as Bill of Rights Day. This year, perhaps more so than in any other recent year, we should take note of this anniversary by rereading and studying these amendments in order to fully grasp their meaning in our day and how best we can apply them to our daily life.

Unfortunately, we have reached a stage where the freedom of expressing

unpopular views, the freedom to disagree and to criticize constructively—freedoms which have made America strong and American democracy the hope of all honest, decent, and liberty-loving people throughout the world—are today threatened by international tension and are under direct attack by the evil forces of communism from without and by disruptive elements in our own midst who are unwittingly playing into the hands of the Communists.

The evolution of our civil liberties over these many decades since the adoption of the Bill of Rights 159 years ago and the practical application of these rights to our daily life throughout this long period have always been a source of pride to the people of this Nation. At the same time, we are the envy of most other nations not so much for the things we have preached as for the way in which we practiced these teachings.

I am afraid that lately we depend too much on preaching and talking about our democratic concepts, while forgetting to live up to them. In the times of tension and hysteria in which we live we think too often of the momentary benefit and overlook the future of our country and our people. We must not lose faith nor courage nor confidence in our future. We must aspire to come out of the present crisis morally and spiritually strengthened. That can be accomplished by adhering to our principles of true democracy. Among these principles the Bill of Rights should be foremost in our hearts and minds.

Spend It To Defend America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, a proper discharge of my responsibilities to my country requires me to support this enormous appropriation.

I confess I do so with reluctance.

I hesitate, not because of the vast amount of money involved. I am satisfied that our people will make all sacrifices needed for the real defense of our country. No, Mr. Speaker, my objection springs from my fear that we will continue to provide men, armaments, and billions to pursue foreign policies in Asia and elsewhere in the world which I believe have led us into our fearful dilemma, and will lead us into tragedy if we persist.

This morning, the Republican conference urged the resignation of Mr. Acheson, the Secretary of State, because the country has lost all confidence in him, his department, and his policies. But his removal, when it comes, is no cure-all. Acheson will be replaced by another, be he Democrat or Republican, who inevitably will carry out the orders of the President.

What is needed to avoid catastrophe is a complete reconsideration of our whole foreign policy, particularly in Asia. I have always opposed it. I oppose it more bitterly than ever. I shall devote myself to the task, however difficult, of helping to change it.

Led Into War!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona Tribune of December 1, 1950:

LED INTO WAR!

Clearly indicative of the major interest of the people of Altoona, phone calls the last 2 or 3 nights have been pouring into the Tribune news room, all asking about the war situation.

To newspaper people, nothing shows so clearly the trend of public interest as the calls which come into us.

Sunday and Monday night, the calls were about the blackout, "When shall we have power?" "What's the weather forecast?"

But, now, the calls run like this, and these are typical, actual inquiries received in the newsroom: "Has war been declared?" "Is it true that Russia has declared war on us?" "When are they going to drop the bomb? I heard on the radio they were talking about dropping it within the next day or two." "Is it true MacArthur has surrendered to the Chinese?"

Thus, we have a picture of the growing tension of our people as 100,000 American boys fight it out against odds in Korea and while our blundering statesmen in Washington scratch their heads and wonder what next to do.

Beyond any question at all, the American people will unite solidly behind their lawful leaders when the time of emergency comes. But, as it approaches, we maintain our right to call for new leadership, new and able men to lead us in the critical and terrible period perhaps which lies ahead.

America is losing confidence in its leaders. Nothing could be plainer. The people, in their own way, are repudiating them. When election time comes again, we can elect a new President, and we hope a more able one.

But, in the interim, Mr. Acheson, the Secretary of State and all his advisers, and all Mr. Truman's advisers on foreign affairs, should be fired.

It is a terrible thing for a people to be led from one war directly into another through inept leadership and then be forced to put up with such incapable men during the greatest trials a nation can endure—the trial by war.

A veteran Washington correspondent sends us a confidential letter every now and then. In it, he says, "There has not been since the early twenties such ineptitude, such lack of foresight and imagination, and such downright boneheadedness as exists in Washington at times.

"For even though two members of the Harding Cabinet were scandalous performers, men like Hughes, Hoover, and Mellon offset them. The fact is that we have not had such a brilliant set of Presidential advisers in the intervening 25 years."

As for Mr. Acheson, "he gave the Russian and Chinese Reds the green light in the Far East when he told us at the Press Club in a carefully written speech that the fate of Korea was of no consequence to us. He framed the policy which led to withdrawal of support from Chiang Kai-shek and, up to now, the failure to reinforce him in Formosa. He invited the Reds to attack on June 25."

And, on General Bradley, Chief of Staff, the correspondent writes: "Bradley failed to tell Truman that we did not have the stuff to hold and to retain Korea if the Chinese Reds engaged in all-out resistance. He approved the Korean intervention, even though it left us defenseless at home. To make it worse, he told the world in a public speech that, save for the atom bomb, we were militarily helpless. What an invitation to Russia to attack Europe, Indochina, or the Middle East, while we are tied up in Asia."

On Secretary of the Treasury Snyder: "He fights the Federal Reserve on lowering of interest rates, thus firing inflation, only to change his mind in 2 months."

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan proposed a politico-economic plan that caught Truman's fancy because it seemed to mean both farm and city votes, but almost every Democratic candidate had to disown it for its economic unsoundness.

And now, we are engaged in battling China, pitfall of nations, death trap for millions. In the last week, American casualties have totaled more than another thousand men.

The plain facts are that we have not had men brilliant enough to outsmart the Russians in this bitter postwar dueling.

Our leaders have not been a match for the shrewd and evil men of the Kremlin.

If they have been no match in peace, why should we think they would be a match in war?

As war approaches America must have new and better leadership.

Surplus Populations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director, War Relief Services, NCWC, New York City, at the United States Displaced Persons Commission regional resettlement conference dinner meeting, November 20, 1950, 6:30, Hotel Pfister, Milwaukee, Wis.:

It is a fact of history that civilizations are menaced by that group of people which does not share in the spiritual or material benefits of the civilization in which they live. Time and time again, the dispossessed classes have been used eventually as part of the destroying process which toppled regimes, empires, and whole civilizations. Often the government or civilization which replaces that which was destroyed turns out to be little or no improvement. Often the result of revolution is a shorter or longer period of despotism.

The essential fact is, however, that any larger mass of dispossessed peoples is a constant threat to the equilibrium of a country or a continent.

Following upon the cataclysm of World War II, large groups of innocent men, women, and children in Europe were deprived of home and homeland, and of any hope for a normal future. It is not our purpose here to go into the reasons for the fact that so many people were left dispossessed and without rights after a war fought for such high aims. It is our purpose rather to start from the facts as they are, and work out some plan of rectification that will preserve such social, political, and economic equilibrium as is left to us.

There is one new feature in the newly dispossessed that no other dispossessed classes (commonly known as the proletariat) possessed. The new dispossessed include large numbers of skilled workers, small farmers, and proprietors of the middle classes who suddenly found themselves stripped not only of possessions but of their role in society. In addition, professional people—doctors, teachers, scientists, agronomists—are counted in the number of the newly dispossessed.

This meeting has been called together primarily to discuss the present problems and the future plans for one group among the newly dispossessed, the displaced persons. It is due to the cooperative efforts of far-seeing people, such as are gathered here for this meeting of the Displaced Persons Commission, that a work of rescue without parallel has already been accomplished for DP's. Since the passage of the first Displaced Persons Act, which went into effect on July 1, 1948, more than 190,000 displaced persons have been resettled all over the United States.

I know, and you know, that in the first months of resettlement many unexpected problems have arisen in connection with individual DP's. We know that the injustice of their plight rankles in many of them, and we know that a camp existence of several years' duration has a demoralizing effect. We must always remember that the bread of exile is very bitter bread and that the first 6 months of a DP's resettlement present emotional hazards into which we settled people can have little real insight.

It is our experience that after the first 6 months or so, when the DP has recovered from his first few months of being drunk with the new freedoms and new opportunities of America, there is a rapid readaptation to the American scene. For every one DP who excites some unfavorable comment by leaving a placement suddenly there are 10 DP families who settle down to making a real contribution to American life.

The immediate concern of all organizations concerned with DP's is the admission to this country of about 200,000 additional persons. These include 116,000 IRO displaced persons still eligible under the DP Act, as amended, 18,000 former Polish soldiers from England, 10,000 Greeks, 4,000 refugees from Samar, 2,000 refugees from Venezia Giulia, 5,000 DP orphans, 500 recently arrived political refugees, and about 45,000 ethnic Germans known as expellees. The new DP Act also allows for the admission of 5,000 European orphans under 10 years of age as nonquota immigrants.

The finding of home and job opportunities for displaced persons who must be admitted to the United States between now and July 1, 1951, is a tremendous challenge both to voluntary and governmental groups in our country. Should the finding of sufficient home and job opportunities between now and the expiration of the act be accomplished (and I must admit here and now that I have serious doubts on the feasibility of this because of the time element involved), we still have to meet courageously and charitably the problem of the hard core of displaced persons for whom no resettlement opportunities exist anywhere in the world.

Religious voluntary agencies are working very closely with IRO in finding permanent homes for the aged, the physically handicapped, and the chronically ill. It is far harder to find satisfactory solutions for such groups as the uneconomic units (widows or widowers with children), and for the specialists who are banned from immigration seemingly because of their gifts and training. The hard core group numbers only about 100,000, and we are hopeful that a combination of intelligence and compassion can be brought to bear on this group so that none will be left without a satisfactory solution for his future life.

In order to take full advantage of the present legislation for IRO DP's assurances will be needed for about 50,000 additional persons before the expiration of the act. This assumption is based on the fact that the active assurances presently in process will make possible the entry of about 60,000 persons.

May I ask everyone here to consider what action he can take individually, or can propose to the group which he represents, to try to reach the necessary number of assurances. Whether we belong to labor groups, to employment services, to agricultural agencies, to local government, or to voluntary organizations, we should here and now resolve to take specific steps so that job assurances for 50,000 people can be ready for processing by next spring.

The people who remain in the DP camps are ordinary people like ourselves—except that they have had the misfortune to be rendered destitute and incapable of resolving their own future without our help. I know this help will be forthcoming from such people as yourselves, because your very presence here shows your deep and active concern for the welfare of displaced persons.

As I said earlier, the work of rescue accomplished with regard to the displaced persons is a triumph of free democratic action motivated by the highest of religious and humanitarian principles. There is still some real work to be done to complete this triumph. You and I would not like to see so glorious a work fail and peter out because of lack of a final big push. The time for that push in the United States is now.

The only reason that hundreds of thousands of displaced persons have not been left in Europe to form a homeless and rightless proletariat is because of the magnificent cooperative effort of the free governments and the free voluntary agencies of our free West.

There still remain, however, other groups, even larger in number than the displaced persons, whom our planful help has not reached. Though this meeting was called precisely to discuss displaced persons, I appreciate very deeply the opportunity it presents to talk to this special picked, dedicated, group of people about the larger problems of resettlement and emigration which present themselves to us at this time.

The largest group of dispossessed people in Europe at the present time are men, women, and children of German ethnic origin, who, in the early days of our present peace, were driven from their homes in such areas as the Sudetenland of Czechoslovakia, Danzig, and Silesia, as well as Hungary, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. Close to 12,000,000 of these expelled people now find themselves in a truncated Germany.

The Western Federal Republic of Bonn has to cope with 8,000,000 of this total number of expellees. Their presence places an almost impossible burden on the public relief system of the Western Federal Republic. Forty percent of all public relief goes to support the orphans, the broken families, and the aged among the expellees. Though the expellees form about 16 percent of the population of the Bonn Republic, they make up close to 50 percent of the unemployed.

One of the most acute problems is that of the expelled farmers, many of whom have been settled in urban areas where they are unable to find productive work because of their lack of training and skill. Even after the completion of the land reform in Germany there would not be enough acreage in the country to give them a start in agriculture. A total of 44,744 ethnic Germans are included in the present United States displaced-persons legislation. You will see immediately what a small fraction of the total expellees this number represents. However, even syphoning off so small a group would serve as a help in the total problem, and, more importantly still, as a sign of hope to the remainder of the expellees that their problems were at least being recognized on an international scale. I feel that the area in which we meet would be a most propitious one for the resettlement of these ethnic Germans, and I would ask you to search about among the farming communities for the requisite home and job assurances.

The expellees are already referring to themselves as "the fifth estate." The fourth estate as you know from history referred to those workers on whose backs fell the heavy burdens of taxation that eventually helped drive them to revolt. The fifth estate then would seem to signify a subproletariat whose lot is more bitter still in that they do not feel themselves to be sharing productively or otherwise in the civilization of which they formed the lowest rung.

Perhaps the most pressing problem among this subproletariat called the expellees are the half a million young people between the ages of 15 and 25 who are without jobs or job training. These young people, old enough to understand the indignity of their lot in the barracks and hovels of strange towns and villages, but too young to appreciate the cataclysm that has come to all Europe, can look forward only to nothingness. There are no places in the schools for them to learn a trade; few jobs are opening up for them in an economy that has not even jobs enough for adult breadwinners.

These young people look backward to the day-by-day destruction and systematic cruelty of the war years, and to the inhumanity and chaos of the eras of peace. It would not be surprising if out of this immense mass of youth without hope there should emerge a cold, dangerous nihilism. Since they have seen the depths, they might come to fear nothing, to reverence nothing, not even life itself.

The future of the West will have to count with these young people, either for good or for ill. Up to now the world has shown them by all methods possible that it does not want them, nor does it want their intelligence or their skills. They have been driven from their homes and driven out of participation in the business of living.

We who are deeply concerned with true peace and equilibrium in the West will have to turn our minds to economic solutions within Germany that will absorb in a productive way these forgotten young people. We must concern ourselves, too, with international plans for a syphoning off through immigration individual expellees so that those who remain behind will be able to make a livelihood.

In addition to the displaced persons and the expellees, there are the refugees who have so recently escaped from tyranny in the East that they are not included in any immigration schemes. These refugees escaped at the risk of their lives. They expected a warm reception and true refuge in the West. Thousands of these refugees are herded into the camps that have been set up all along the iron curtain from Trieste through Uelzen.

These individual refugees are becoming disaffected and are tempted to despair. They represent the most democratic, the most freedom loving, the most daring and courageous of the peoples behind the iron curtain. It is our duty to show them that they belong with us, that they are part of

our free West by sharing with them the freedom of our Western World—in particular the freedom of movement which we call immigration.

I will mention in passing one other group of people whose problems are amenable to solution by immigration, namely, the surplus population of the Italian Peninsula. The Italians may be surplus to the Italian Peninsula, but they are not surplus to the world. There is plenty of room for these industrious people (who have already shown their gifts as colonizers) in the undeveloped areas of the world. There are some pessimists that tell us that there are too many people in the world. We cannot agree with this thesis. From the earliest years of history men have moved about the world in a continual search for a proper place between mass numbers and the world's resources. This adjustment has created new tools, new foods, and new technologies.

Only when man's institutions have prevented a free flow of people and goods have artificial human surpluses been created. I have mentioned to you today several examples of these human surpluses in Europe, the displaced persons, the expellees, the iron-curtain refugees, the surplus population of the Italian Peninsula. I could mention other surpluses in the Far East, but that is beyond the scope of our discussion today.

If the free flow of peoples is impeded at this time, we will allow tension to develop among the dispossessed that may have dire consequences for the stability of the entire free world. Let each one of us who have been privileged to attend this splendid meeting take away a resolution to help in the establishment of true peace by contributing in some measure to the resettlement of families who, in their present environment, cannot assume the functions of a productive life.

As leaders of government, of farm organizations, of labor organizations—not to mention public and voluntary agencies of welfare—you have already demonstrated your love and concern for the "little people" of this great country of ours. These dislocated ones we have been talking about are the "little people" of the world. Let us encompass them within America's all-embracing charity.

But we must give some real evidence of our concern. Ours must not be merely a talking interest, a mere expression of our sympathy for those who suffer because of the dislocation that is all about us.

There are many studies under way. The ECA, the ILO, the technicians of the Foreign Ministers Conference, we are told, are all studying this whole question of surplus populations. Missions have even been sent to South American countries to study the possibilities of large-scale immigration to that area. Enormous funds are being placed at the disposal of these agencies of government. Their efforts are an encouraging sign of the ever-growing interest of the leaders of our Government in this great problem whose solution is basic to the establishment of peace throughout the world.

Perhaps some kind of office or agency in our Government is now necessary in order to coordinate these various efforts so that the best results may be achieved. What form this agency should take naturally it is not mine to say, but it seems that it is something to which a great deal of thought might be given.

The thing that I would most like to urge is that all of us, whether we be of the religious and voluntary groups, of the State commissions or of the agencies of government dealing directly with these people—that we all ask ourselves how best can we direct our efforts to accomplish an objective so significant to the future peace of the world.

Mr. Prohoc Speaks His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a thoughtful special column, Mr. Prohoc Speaks His Mind, written by Henry Gillen, of the Boston Post, and appearing in the Boston Post of December 10, 1950:

MR. PROHOC SPEAKS HIS MIND

Mr. Truman dropped a bomb. Ten days ago, when in a press conference, President Truman, in answer to a question, said that the United States was "considering" the A-bomb, he rocked the world. All over the globe there was immediate alarm. Abroad and at home, he was censured publicly and privately for having made a colossal blunder, for making an outright demonstration of ineptness that was appalling.

The ferment which Mr. Truman stirred up all stemmed from misunderstanding. It was not a misunderstanding of what the President said about America's intentions as to the use of the bomb. It was a misunderstanding of the bomb itself. Instead of being regarded as a military weapon which the United States had manufactured to defend her in wartime, it suddenly took on another aspect.

It became in the eyes of the world the skeleton in the closet, the two-headed calf in the barn that children should not see, or the family ghost that on Allhallows Eve stalked through the castle, headless and mourning for a Lochinvar who had been dispatched by the Ninth Earl of Whoople several centuries before. Everybody knew that the United States had an A-bomb—in fact, stockpiles of them. But some thought that they should not be mentioned.

That ostrich-in-the-sand attitude was just what the Kremlin has demanded. The lying "Stockholm resolutions" for peace which Russia had concocted and sent around the world to be signed by dupes are based on the premise that the A-bomb should be outlawed. If Red Russia could only render the A-bomb ineffectual, she would have no more hesitation about going to war with America. With her prodigious manpower and snorkel-breathing subs, she feels that she could match us before our massive air fleets laid waste her cities with the blockbusters that made mincemeat of Berlin.

Mr. Truman snuffed out that one. He sent the word to the Politburo that America had no intention of putting our most formidable weapon in the Smithsonian Institution. We made the bomb to defend ourselves and if worse came to worst, we would not hesitate to use it. We didn't want to use it. We are not a destroying people. But we believe that we have a right to survive in a world gone mad, and we intend just that.

Instead of pulling a blooper, Mr. Truman made a 10 strike. He reminded the world that while Uncle Sam might at times resemble that jolly old fellow Santa Claus, he also could climb into khaki overnight and give a good account of himself in a battle to live.

The repercussions to his declaration were swift and awesome. The French and the English immediately went into a huddle. England sent its Prime Minister to Washington posthaste. Some 11 nations with Asiatic ties appealed to China to stop its notorious aggression in Korea and solve the moot question diplomatically. But something more important happened.

Europe suddenly decided that it would have to defend herself. After months of dawdling with the idea of an integrated military defense that advanced only on paper, the shocking thought arose that freedom's fireman, Uncle Sam, might be too tied up in Asia to defend with vast overseas armies those bastions which Europe herself should fight for because they are in Europe.

It stirred the inhabitants of the British Isle, France, the Benelux, and the Scandinavian countries into the belated frame of mind that it was time to marshal armies in case Russia overnight started marching.

There were other ripples from the stone dropped in the millpond by the President. Mr. Attlee publicly disavowed that England had any intention of appeasing China, Russia, or any Reds who seek concessions by holding a gun to the head of the peace-loving world. He further emphasized his point with a ringing declarative that England's flag would fly through the gathering night by the Star-Spangled Banner.

But the greatest result was that France dropped her opposition to German soldiers participating in the defense of their homeland and Europe. Thereby she lifted the gates on one of the greatest supplies of fighting manpower in Europe and cleared the way for international armies which would stand in the path of any Russian attempt to blitzkrieg Europe as Hitler did.

The immediate reaction of the moment's foe, China, to the A-bomb pronouncement was General Wu's retort that threats would not move Red China. One wonders. Centuries ago, the Chinese armies went into battle beating gongs and setting off firecrackers. The purpose of such melodramatics is attested by the Chinese in their own histories. They hoped by employing noise to frighten away their battlefield enemy. In some instances, especially against other Chinese, it worked.

It would take a psychologist of standing to say ipso facto that a nation which employed such outlandish tactics has a quirk in the make-up of its human beings. If the Chinese believed noise would frighten off an enemy might the same weapon not be turned against them? Psychologically, they might be ripe for it.

It can be argued against such a theory that the noise weapon was used in less-enlightened days and it has no place in modern warfare. Yet the Chinese armies still employ it. Stories from the fronts in Korea where the Chinese have been bearing down describe how their armies go into action by blowing bugles and clashing cymbals, and the men in arms set up weird and terrible cries. That appears to be an Asiatic trait. United States marines on embattled Pacific islands during World War II recall now how the Japs charged with outlandish and terrible screams. At first it was thought that they were stirring themselves up to charge into certain death. Since then marines have come to believe the Japs thought they would frighten away America's sea-soldiers.

A few A-bombs brought Japan, most warlike nation in Asiatic history, to her knees pronto in 1945. Perhaps the Chinese cannot take it either. We do not recommend it. We agree with President Truman that the A-bomb is a great and terrible weapon. But when the moment comes that the survival of America is dependent on its use, there is only one answer. America is considering it and our foes, deploring it, at the same time respect the fact that with it we are not a push-over. If it were not for that fact things might be worse.

Let's Stop Kidding Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking editorial from the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Independent, of December 6, and commend it to the attention of my fellow legislators:

LET'S STOP KIDDING OURSELVES

The time has come for the American people and the administration in Washington to stop kidding themselves. We can no longer afford to promulgate and augment the delightful theory that we can win friends and influence people in the international society of nations by endlessly doling out our substance in an attempt to buy friendship.

Call it isolationism if you will. Call it what you may. It all adds up to the same thing. We're facing a fight for our very survival and in spite of the billions we've spent in an attempt to win allies, we have few friends who are going to come to our defense.

We may as well acknowledge the fact and act accordingly. If we are going to survive we'll have to be armed to the teeth. And until we are, everything else must go by the boards.

Last week President Truman asked Congress for an emergency appropriation of $18,000,000,000 to help rebuild our military department. This is only a drop in a bucket compared with the regular budget the military leaders will ask for the next fiscal year.

That's all to the good. But if we are to be properly armed and prepared for any eventuality we can't afford frivolities. This is not the time to spend billions for foreign economic aid and billions more in a vain hope of winning allies.

Perhaps in a less critical moment we could afford to play the role of international do-gooder. Perhaps we could afford billions to feed the starving Hottentots and bring the glories of President Truman's point 4 program to the underprivileged peoples of the world. Perhaps. But this is not the moment.

The time has come for us to spend more money and more effort on our national defenses and less in mending our international fences.

During the last few years the left-wing hierarchy within and without the Federal Government has expounded an ear-tingling slogan. It says you can't fight ideas with bullets. It's a fine theory. It makes good listening over cocktails or after-dinner liqueurs.

But the men who are on the receiving end of the bullets right now—the American troops falling back in Korea, who never have a chance to sip cocktails or liqueurs—know that ideological theories of government make a damned poor armor when the hot stuff is flying their way.

What peace have we gained by playing international big brother to the rest of the world?

We spent billions of dollars and much of our blood to save the Soviet Union from Germany. Where are our friends in Russia today?

We spent billions of dollars and much of our blood to save China from Japan. Where are our friends in China today?

We spent billions of dollars and much of our blood to rescue Czechoslovakia and the Balkans from the Nazi yoke. Where are our friends among them today?

We still have friends in Greece, we hope. At the moment it serves the purposes of Tito and Yugoslavia to be our friends, but no one knows for how long. Let's not kid ourselves. If worse comes to worst, we're not even sure of Great Britain and France.

Perhaps it is impossible to destroy ideas with bullets. But in a world caught between two major ideologies, and seething with unrest, nothing succeeds in winning friends and influencing people like strong military power and the ability and willingness to use it, if necessary.

Today there are many nations in the world engaged in the business of international fence-sitting. Our concepts of freedom and democracy mean little to them. No matter who wins, they want to be on the winning side. We can't buy their friendship through international uplift programs. But we can win their friendship and respect if we have the military power to assure them we're going to come out on top of the heap.

There's no use kidding ourselves about who is going to fight our battles. We are. And let's not forget it. And to fight those battles it is vital that we spend every cent we can raise to arm ourselves with the necessary guns and planes and ships.

In converting our billions from foreign economic aid to our own military strength we may divorce ourselves from some nations we now count as our friends.

If so, so be it. The chips are down. As they say in the army, it's time to separate the men from the boys.

The American Pacific Fisheries and the Peace Treaty With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the intense interest of the people of the Pacific Northwest in having the peace treaty with Japan contain provisions dealing with the American Pacific fisheries is made quite evident by two editorials appearing in the Alaska Weekly of December 8, 1950. I insert them in the RECORD herewith for the information of the Members of the House. The above-mentioned editorials follow:

[From the Alaska Weekly of December 8, 1950]

TIME TO ACT IS NOW

News reports last week from Washington, D. C., indicate the "quart of milk for every Hottentot" boys in the State Department didn't read the November 8 editions of our daily newspapers. Those editions carried the news of an election which most people are agreed was a complete rejection of the bumble-headed thinking which has characterized the actions of the State Department.

Now some of the State Department "experts" tell us we should sign a peace treaty with Japan, which we will concur would be a good idea. But, as revealed in our editorial of October 27, they say "they haven't time to deal with fisheries or other commercial matters" in the peace treaty.

This again demonstrates a complete and utter lack of understanding on the part of the State Department of either the importance of the fishing industry to the Pacific coast or the practical situation in regard to our resources and future peace in the Pacific.

Actually, all that is needed to protect American and Canadian fishery resources is a simply reciprocal provision providing that until otherwise agreed the Japs will stay out of American fisheries and American vessels will keep away from Japanese waters. Another point these planners in the State Department should recognize is that such an agreement is not a commercial treaty at all. The Japanese dealt with fishery matters in treaties with Russia in 1905 and in 1925.

ALASKANS REMEMBER WHEN

Alaskans, more than any others, remember the tense days of 1937 and 1938 when the Japanese with their factory ships, destructive gear and utter disregard for all sound conservation practices came into Bristol Bay and scooped up all the red salmon for miles around. We want no repetition of this situation.

The woolly thinkers of the State Department should recognize that the fisheries under discussion—salmon, halibut, tuna, herring and sardine—have been discovered, developed, cared for and conserved by the people of this continent and belong to them. They are a vital resource and should not be forgotten until we no longer have bargaining power with the Japanese. Now is the time to protect our own possessions, not give them away.

We cannot overestimate the value of the fishing industry to the Territory and the Pacific Coast generally. To allow the Japanese to dip into the savings account of American and Canadian fishermen would imperil an investment of more than $350,000,000.

Even more important, it would endanger the livelihood of 50,000 men directly employed by the fishing industry and an additional 175,000 men in transportation, processing and wholesale trade.

There is no parallel between the importance of fishing to Alaska and any other single industry to any other region. It is more vital to the economy of the Territory than lumber is to Oregon, oil to Texas, apples to Washington or any single commodity to the great agricultural States of the Midwest. Cripple that industry, as certain "thinkers" in the State Department would have us do by a gross sin of omission, and at least half the white and native population would be forced to leave. There simply would be no other source of income for them.

NO TIME FOR MUSHY THINKING

This issue is too serious to be left to the mushy thinking of State Department pink-tea intellectuals. The hard realities of the picture are that Japan has no alternative but to agree to reasonable restrictions in the peace treaty. At this juncture we would not be dealing with her on a basis of equality as a sovereign nation. In order to get a peace treaty and be restored to her place in the family of nations she will take about what she gets and like it. That fact does not justify the taking of undue advantage but it most certainly justifies our insistence upon our demonstrable rights.

Once the treaty is signed and ratified the situation will be entirely different and the time to stop this foolishness is now. Now we have the opportunity to settle for once and for all this question. Fisheries matters must be settled in the peace treaty or before it is signed. Any other action would be sheer folly.

[From the Alaska Weekly of December 8, 1950]

CLARIFYING THE LEGAL ISSUE

Those opposed to the inclusion in the Japanese peace treaty of restrictions on Japan's activities in Canadian and American

fishery areas may be depended upon to raise questions as to precedent as established by international law. The following excerpt from a speech recently made by Edward W. Allen on the subject of international law and fisheries is therefore unusually timely.

Mr. Allen is not only a recognized authority on fisheries problems but is equally well-known in the field of international law, having occupied the position of chairman of the committee on international law of the American Bar Association.

It has been stated that international law is a mixture of the practical and the altruistic. Perhaps it is simpler and better to say that, generally speaking, international law is an attempt to apply common sense to international relations—to be just and reasonable but not to be silly or gullible.

In this light we may approach the most imminent international situation which confronts the fishing industry of the Pacific coast—the matter of a Japanese fishery treaty. What is the situation and how can it be handled in conformity with international law?

TWO TYPES OF PHILOSOPHY

It is well known that there are two types of philosophy in this country, both inside and outside of Government circles. There are those who believe that it is neither isolationistic, unreasonable, or immoral to maintain the integrity of American industry so that this country will really be able to give the world at large sound and effective leadership. Then there is the Henry Wallace type of philosophy which apparently conceives that the way to create a happy world is to sacrifice American industry to foreigners.

PRACTICALITY RATHER THAN THEORY

The practical situation is that the Canadian and United States fisheries of this coast—sardine, herring, coastal tuna, halibut, salmon, and others—are being fished to their optimum or more by the fishermen of these two countries; that the intrusion of Japanese fishermen into these fisheries would not increase production on a continuous year-to-year basis; that for their fishermen to come clear across the Pacific Ocean would only be possible because of their low standards of living and would, therefore, necessarily tend to reduce the standards of living of our own fishermen; that they already have a greater fish poundage production out of their own coastal fisheries than we have from ours; that our prewar experience was that Japanese fishery operations were destructive and inconsistent with sound fishery conservation; that the Japanese could substantially increase their own coastal fishery production if they would apply proper conservation measures; and that, if they should come over and deplete our coastal fisheries, it would probably result in our own fishermen going across the ocean to raid the Japanese coasts, a reciprocity of the type that no one wants.

THE LEGAL SITUATION

The legal situation is that peace treaties historically have dealt with many subjects other than a mere paper peace; that Japan itself in its two peace treaties with Russia of 1905 and 1925 specifically incorporated fishery provisions; that there is nothing in international law to prevent any two (or more) nations from making treaties restricting fishing by their own nationals and vessels; that there is nothing in international law to prevent Japan from entering into a perfectly simple yet effective and reciprocal treaty that, until otherwise agreed, its fishing vessels will stay out of the coastal fisheries of Canada and the United States and, in turn, these two countries will keep their fishing vessels out of Japanese coastal fisheries; that this can readily be done and should be done as a part of the peace treaty or at the same time.

A BASIS FOR BUILDING GOOD WILL

If the leading fishery nations bordering the Pacific Ocean take timely steps to avoid disputes in that most fertile field for conflict—coastal fisheries, other fields can be investigated with more deliberation, and some treaty procedure can be evolved for dealing with the noncoastal fisheries as research may, from time to time, indicate necessity.

It is announced in the press that a Japanese peace treaty is imminent. If, as indicated, international law permits inclusion of provisions such as have been discussed, there is perhaps nothing better that could be done to create that international good will across the Pacific that is desired by the citizens of Japan as well as by those of Canada and the United States. International law can and should facilitate such sound diplomacy.

To neglect this opportunity is to court trouble and to threaten the future peace of the Pacific. International law can be misused to obstruct progress, but it can also be developed to keep abreast of world conditions and to promote world peace.

We Must Stop Trading With the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the morning newspapers, today, carried a United Press dispatch from Seoul which quotes American artillery officers of the Second Division as saying that they have seen and examined American-made rockets which have been fired at American troops by the Chinese Communists.

How did these American-made rockets get into the hands of the Chinese Communists? Who shipped them to the Communists?

These United States artillery officers are quoted as saying that these American-made rockets used by the Chinese are of a type that the American forces have not been using in Korea. These Army officers say the marking on these rockets and on the boxes containing them indicate they were manufactured in the United States of America as late as June of this year.

The statements of these Army officers should be thoroughly investigated by the appropriate Government agencies and investigated promptly. If these rockets were furnished the Communists by any American supplier, he should be punished. So also, should any Government official who has aided and abetted any such shipments of weapons to the enemy for use against our troops.

We are now being called upon to appropriate billions for defense and will be asked, during the Eighty-second Congress, for even more billions to arm ourselves and our allies. Nearly all of us, including myself, are in favor of arming ourselves and our allies to the hilt to protect our country and the free world against aggressor, outlaw nations.

Yet, even now, as we arm ourselves and supply millions to arm our allies, we must deplore and should seek to stop forthwith these allies and our own people from selling war goods to our enemies.

It is a deplorable truth, that many of those whom we have been and are supplying with arms have been selling war supplies to Russia and her satellites.

In 1949, according to Commerce Department figures, the nations of Western Europe to whom we give Marshall plan aid and arms, sold to Russia and her satellites $1,098,905,000 worth of goods.

Not a small part of these goods were potential war supplies, including such items as iron, steel, lead, copper, zinc, rubber, tin, ball bearings, and barbed wire.

Here are some of the things the United Kingdom sold to Russia and her satellites in 1949:

War supplies sold to Russia and her satellites by the United Kingdom in 1949

Ball- and roller-bearing parts	$243,600
Iron, steel	12,140,800
Steel bars and rods, not alloy	1,736,000
Bars and rods of alloy steel	504,000
Hoops and strips	422,000
Railway and tramway construction	708,400
Barbed wire	420,000
Cable and rope	425,600
Nonferrous metals	4,062,800
Aluminum and alloys	618,800
Brass and other alloys of copper, etc	1,142,400
Electrical goods and apparatus	6,806,800
Machinery	45,172,400
Electrical generators	11,986,800
Electrical machinery, other than generators	2,864,400
Machine tools	5,138,000
Vehicles, including locomotives, ships, etc	13,361,600
Rubber tires	229,600
Chassis for motor vehicles	1,660,400
Total	109,644,400

All sales of this kind to our enemies should be stopped.

During 1949 France sold to Russia and her satellites these items:

War supplies sold to Russia and her satellites by France in 1949

Chemicals	$2,530,142
Rubber and rubber products	1,678,616
Steel-mill products, hot-rolled, etc	4,198,881
Steel-mill products, cold-rolled, etc	3,087,703
Aluminum, crude, etc	360,245
Aluminum alloys	408,688
Lead and lead alloys	316,349
Metal manufactures	2,046,376
Machinery and apparatus	10,272,238
Machinery, electrical	2,015,230
Transportation equipment	8,281,011
Optical, surgical, photographic materials	$1,113,145
Total	36,308,624

All such sales should be stopped.

During 1949, Belgium sold to Russia and her satellites these items:

War supplies sold to Russia and her satellites by Belgium-Luxemburg in 1949

Arms	$6,400
Iron, cast iron, and steel	19,782,840
Copper	11,028,820
Lead	1,583,160
Zinc	3,003,780
Tin	941,060
Base metals and alloys	1,387,360

War supplies sold to Russia and her satellites by Belgium-Luxemburg in 1949—Con.

Boilers, machinery, appliances, etc	$7,937,880
Electrical machinery and apparatus, etc	5,840,660
Railway and tramway rolling stock	430,600
Chemical products	1,709,540
Explosives, fireworks, matches, etc	1,447,960
Rubber and manufacturers items	942,600
Total	56,042,660

All these sales should be stopped.

We, the United States Government, are not without sin in carrying on this unholy trade with the enemy.

During the first 6 months of this year the United States purchased about $3,500,000 a month of goods from Russia, mostly the luxuries of furs and canned crab. During those same months, the United States sold Russia about $100,000 a month in American goods. In short, by this unholy trade with the enemy, who even now is killing our troops, we, each month, are supplying that enemy by this trade with more than $3,000,000 in American dollars or American dollar-credits, which she employs to buy war supplies from other nations supposedly allied with us.

We must stop this unholy trade with the enemy and insist that all nations allied with us do likewise. Unless we stop this trade with the enemy, the whole effectiveness of our rearmament program will be weakened.

The failure of the State Department to stop this trading with the enemy is just one more reason why that Department should undergo an immediate and thorough housecleaning.

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some individuals who call so loudly and continuously for unity fail to realize that unity never comes until there is voluntary agreement upon a policy.

All too long a group of internationalists, many of whose sincerity and patriotism cannot be questioned, have assumed that they are all-wise, that they are the sole guardians of the people's welfare, of the national security. When, day by day, it becomes evident that the implementation of their policy calls for the sacrifice of millions of American young men—let us not mention the economic loss—even these self-satisfied individuals should begin to understand that to get unity in this Nation, they will be forced to consider the wishes and the judgment of others.

From the Washington Times-Herald of this morning comes an editorial which might be helpful to them, if they will read it:

SOME INTERNATIONALISTS APPEAL FOR UNITY

Two overlapping groups of internationalists world savers issued calls for unity the other day, describing liberty and peace to be in dire and immediate peril. One resolution emanated from the trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the other from a self-appointed "crisis committee."

The Carnegie outfit, as will be remembered, is the crowd of puttyheads that adopted Alger Hiss as its president after he had finished his business of assisting Russia by espionage in the State Department and by steering Roosevelt into Stalin's clutches at Yalta. The resolution was drafted by a committee of three, among whom was General Eisenhower, who stopped his armies so that the Russians could take Berlin and Prague. Mr. Hiss and General Eisenhower had something to do with the emergence of the present peril.

The resolution was moved by John Foster Dulles, the bipartisan Republican who now works in the New Deal State Department. Dulles was in Korea just before the Communists started their invasion last June. He was free with promises that America could be counted upon to help the Republic of Korea hold the line of the thirty-eighth parallel against any Communist incursion. Within a week we found ourselves in a war in support of Dulles' pledge.

The war has turned very sour, but Dulles has the crust to offer resolutions which have the effect of commanding the people to have confidence in Dulles. He has been one of the principal shapers of the New Deal foreign policy that has presented the country with a first-class disaster.

General Eisenhower, in a supplementary pronouncement, said that Americans are frightened "because we know that the opposing group [Russia] moves at the will of one man or a small group of men," while "we know we are disunited." The general's formula for unity thus appears to be the same as that of the totalitarians: Blindly obey the leader, meaning Truman, who has scarcely enough wit to button his own suspenders.

The "crisis committee" deplores what it views as destructive criticism. It states that "we are opposed to the use of political pressure for the ouster of Secretary of State Acheson. A national emergency is no time for punitive political expeditions or for singling out scapegoats."

This last is very generous to Mr. Acheson. He's no scapegoat, shouldered with an undeserved blame; he's the fellow who worked up the foreign policy that got us in this jam.

TRYING TO HIDE THEIR BLUNDERS

The remarks about punitive expeditions and scapegoats are a trifle comic, for one of the signers of this particular manifesto is former Justice Owen Roberts, of the Supreme Court, who was chosen by Mr. Roosevelt to be chairman of a special commission to saddle the blame for the Pearl Harbor disaster on Admiral Kimmel and General Short.

We note among the names of the signers those of Gov. Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois, a character witness in behalf of Hiss, and a number of veteran internationalists, among them Will Clayton, former Under Secretary of State for economic affairs, who mopped up in cotton under the Marshall plan which he sponsored; Robert P. Patterson, Roosevelt's Under Secretary of War and Truman's former Secretary of War; Paul G. Hoffman, who spent the Marshall plan money, and Dr. James T. Shotwell and Clark L. Eichelberger, who have devoted many years to preaching the gospel of internationalists.

It can scarcely have failed to occur to these people that our sad condition and the enormous casualties in Korea are the direct result of the doctrine of foreign intermeddling which they have consistently propagated. They cry for "unity" behind their blunders, hoping thereby that their guilt will escape detection.

If the people want to know the authors of their misfortunes, they can get a good cross-section by reviewing the names attached to these two statements. The official policy of committing the United States, with 6 percent of the population of the globe, to set everything right in the world, even though we utterly lack the means to do it, would never have been decreed except for the propaganda of this crowd and the gullible people who accepted their infatuated notions.

A Tribute to a Real American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to a man in the best tradition of Texas and the United States. This man had less than a complete grammar-school education, yet through resourcefulness, he has built a great fortune which he magnanimously has dedicated to the people of his State for better education and health. This man is Mr. Hugh Roy Cullen, of whom you have all heard.

Mr. Cullen's fortune is based on oil and gas production, a great natural wealth of Texas. Mr. Cullen has the imagination, courage, and the managerial ability needed to develop and maintain optimum production. He has in his oil fields the highest minimum wage of any oil producer. The Labor Messenger, of Houston, Tex., on August 5, 1949, headed a front-page editorial Friend of all Houston: Hugh Roy Cullen. The first two paragraphs were:

The Labor Messenger herewith extends a bouquet of flowers to a distinguished Houstonian—Hugh Roy Cullen.

To some people it may seem out of character for a labor paper to toss orchids to a fabulously rich man. A moment's thought should convince them it is not. On the contrary, in this instance, at least, it is an appropriate gesture.

What has Mr. Cullen done with his money: He has established a $160,000,000 Cullen Foundation which is the basis of the great new Medical Center in Houston. Mrs. Cullen and he have also given 13 beautiful buildings to schools, both white and Negro, and to hospitals of four different religious denominations—Methodist, Baptist, Espiscopal, and Catholic.

Mr. and Mrs. Cullen have made these great gifts for the education of future generations. His credo is expressed by the following quotation from a speech his grandfather, Ezekiel Cullen, made in 1839 before the Third Congress of the Republic of Texas:

It is declared to be an axiom in political science that unless a people are educated and enlightened, it is idle to expect the continuance of civil liberty, or capacity for self-government.

Answer to Tidelands Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an article from the New Orleans Item quoting a statement from Hon. Bolivar Kemp, Attorney General of the State of Louisiana, in regard to the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court decision in respect to the confiscation of the tidelands of Louisiana, Texas, and California, and other States, to wit:

KEMP GIVES ANSWER TO TIDAL RULING

Here is the text of Louisiana Attorney General Kemp's statement on the United States Supreme Court's decision to require States to account for money they have collected for tidelands leases:

"The decree just entered by the Supreme Court is wrong and unjust for the following reasons:

"It would divest Louisiana of her fee simple right to the marginal sea and its resources, without a trial of the issue of title and without permitting Louisiana to offer evidence of her title thereto, undisputed for 136 years.

"No matter how you look at it, this is sheer confiscation—a seizure of property without trial on the merits.

HAVE CONFUSION

"At the same time, the Court does not attempt to vest fee simple title in the United States and indeed, it is in its decree the United States actually abandons all claims to fee simple title. So who has title to the marginal sea now? Apparently no one. The Court would take it away from us, but does not have the courage to give it outright to the United States. All we have is a hopeless confusion.

"On this state of facts, the Court apparently expect the sovereign State of Louisiana to pay money to the United States. But no Louisiana official is presently authorized by law to pass over any money to the United States unless the Louisiana Legislature votes some appropriation. How could the United States expect to collect from the sovereign State of Louisiana? Would it send its Armed Forces to Louisiana, invade our borders, march into the capitol at Baton Rouge and there seize the great seal of the State of Louisiana and put it up for sale at public auction to apply on the judgment?"

SOME SUCCESS

"While our battle has been an uphill one, we have been successful to this extent: that the decree now entered has saved the State of Louisiana the sum of $36,000,000 as against the claim of the United States in that the Government asks that we pay all sums since June 23, 1947, and the Court directed that only those moneys collected since June 5, 1950, be accounted for.

"At that time when oil is needed so badly for preparedness, the Federal Government through its own calculated effort is bringing stagnation to the oil fields on the coasts of the various States.

"I have today talked with other members of the tidelands committee of the Attorneys General Association and they are strongly of the opinion that the new Congress which meets January 1 will recognize the boundaries and the rights of the various coastal States by appropriate legislation."

American Public Scorns Wanton Attack on J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, recently, as is well known, there was published a book by one Max Lowenthal entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation." Neither its literary style nor its contents commended it to public esteem. In fact, such attention as it has attracted derives only from the eminence, patriotism, integrity, and extraordinary ability of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, whom it wantonly and unjustifiably attacks.

I include as part of my extension of remarks comments upon this book from the New York World-Telegram Sun, the Brooklyn Tablet, the Manresan, of Annapolis, Md., the Detroit Free Press, and the Washington Times-Herald, which reecho the views of very many other book reviewers and commentators on the current scene, set forth in many other publications:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of November 30, 1950]

UNFAIR BOOK ABOUT G-MEN

Max Lowenthal's book, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, has attracted more attention than, in our opinion, it deserves.

It is primarily a voluminous compilation of all the criticisms publicly uttered against the FBI since its creation, with no balancing evaluation of the criticism, and with little space or weight given to the FBI's solid accomplishments and to favorable comment thereon even from the same sources Mr. Lowenthal quotes as critical.

For instance, the book includes numerous quotations from editorials in the Scripps-Howard newspapers concerning isolated actions of the FBI—all critical. Nowhere do we find any favorable Scripps-Howard comment about the FBI and its director, J. Edgar Hoover. Yet our offhand recollection is that Scripps-Howard's editorial appraisals of the work of the FBI and Mr. Hoover have been about 10-to-1 favorable. That's probably a better rating than these columns have given any other Government agency or human institution.

We cannot believe the FBI's good reputation will be damaged by this book. No other unit in the executive branch of the Government is as secure in the confidence of the public and of Congress. The same goes for its director, Mr. Hoover. And for the good reason that the confidence has been well earned.

Mr. Lowenthal is a well-heeled New York lawyer who has been in and out of Washington over the last 30-odd years, in various official and unofficial capacities. He has never made any secret of his active dislike for Mr. Hoover and the whole G-men set-up Only thing new is that he has written a book about it.

One item of news interest in the book is Mr. Lowenthal's confirmation of an oft-repeated rumor that President Truman rejected a suggestion from military advisers that Mr. Hoover be appointed head of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). But that reflects no discredit on Mr. Hoover. To the contrary, the discredit goes to Mr. Truman who missed an opportunity to make something of the CIA.

It is well known that the CIA, under a succession of administrators, has not been worth its salt—and we're not here downrating able Gen. Bedell Smith, present CIA chief, who has not been in office long enough to warm his seat. But the obvious fact is that the CIA will never amount to anything until it gets a permanent chief of the caliber of Mr. Hoover and builds a staff of operatives of the G-men's caliber.

[From the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Tablet of December 2, 1950]

ATTACK ON FBI HEAD AROUSES RESENTMENT—MAX LOWENTHAL'S BIASED VOLUME WILL BE ANSWERED; AUTHOR ACCUSED OF ASSOCIATION WITH COMMUNISTS

WASHINGTON, November 28.—The Capitol is agog over a bitter attack on the Federal Bureau of Investigation—the highly respected FBI—by one of Washington's men of mystery who have had a part in influencing Government action in recent years.

The author of the book is one Max Lowenthal. He is also one of the company of David Niles, Harry Hopkins, and others who were never elected to any office but who seem to have played a tremendously important role in Government administration.

The volume—it is entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation"—is so obviously partisan and unfair in its treatment of the head of the organization, J. Edgar Hoover, that it would not be surprising if the FBI leader should receive a congressional award and the Bureau increased appropriations. In addition, the Congressmen will probably take Lowenthal apart, particularly to check on reports that he has been playing the Communist game. Meanwhile, his alleged friendly relations with President Truman will probably be given a public airing.

The book, a complimentary copy of which was found by every Member of Congress on his desk, treats the FBI as a secret police organization which is, or can grow into, an arm of terror. It has within its pages every unfavorable public comment ever made about the FBI and its Director, going back many years before Mr. Hoover had any connection with it, but receives its strongest blows for its harassment of Communists.

According to Lowenthal, Mr. Hoover seemingly has done very little good; the book reeks with adverse criticism of him—minimizing, when not suppressing, everything in his favor and deemphasizing all his magnificent work against spies, counterfeiters, saboteurs, etc. Facts, figures, reports, comments, and quotations are by implication slanted against the FBI. It is a smart smearing job which will please Moscow and should draw from the Kremlin a "Well done, my man; well done."

Some of the material seems to have been lifted from Albert E. Kahn's High Treason—the Plot Against the People. Kahn, of course, is an undaunted writer and speaker for Communist causes. The publishers—William Sloane Associates, New York—claim the volume is unbiased, objective, and refer to the author as a conservative; the man who wrote the blurb didn't know the author's record.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 1, 1950, Representative GEORGE DONDERO, of Michigan, exposed the record of this man of mystery, Lowenthal. He identified him as a graduate of the Harvard Law School, where "he came under the influence of another man who through the years has manipulated the Charlie McCarthy in Government office," namely, Felix Frankfurter.

Lowenthal's "skill and technique are unparalleled," he said, and his "record is one of attack on any American institution which stands foursquare for the American way of

life." Mr. DONDERO continued: "In the thirties, Lowenthal concentrated upon weakening our internal security by aiding an all-out Communist attack against the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In 1940, Lowenthal sent out anonymous memorandums, smearing the FBI, which fact can be attested to by many Washington newsmen, hoping to head off the FBI in its fight to protect our shores against the menace of communism and fascism at a time when the Nazis and Communists were allies.

"Lowenthal has worked diligently and deviously, but always relentlessly, to destroy the effectiveness of the FBI in its efforts to protect our country from the emissaries of godless communism.

"He has always realized the FBI is the one agency he could not penetrate or intimidate. He has long known it was the one agency which blocked his efforts to completely undermine our internal security."

Mr. DONDERO then identified Mr. Lowenthal with many pro-Communist groups and listed "a few of his intimates" with unquestioned pro-Soviet records.

PRESIDENT'S FRIEND

People here are also discussing Lowenthal's relationship with President Truman. Jonathan Daniels in The Man From Independence identifies him as the man who changed the President from what has been called the realistic thinking of Pendergastism to the rarified liberalism of the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis. The author sets him down as a friend and adviser of Mr. Truman and states it was largely due to him that Mr. Truman permitted his name to be used for the office of Vice President. He also states Mr. Lowenthal has received considerations from the administration.

Mr. DONDERO covered the latter point in the following statement in his address of December 1:

"By pulling strings he acquired the title of adviser on disposal of Jewish property to Gen. Lucius Clay, head of our military government in Germany. Within a matter of weeks he was known as the general counsel to General Clay and had as an assistant, George Shaw Wheeler, the American traitor, Communist, and renegade who shocked all America when he denounced the land of his birth and asked Communist-controlled Czechoslovakia for asylum. * * *

"Within a matter of weeks a change occurred in Germany. The usually accurate Human Events for September 25, 1946, reported, 'It may be mere coincidence, but since Mr. Lowenthal's appointment General Clay has permitted leaders of the Soviet-sponsored SED (Socialist Workers Party) to address mass meetings in the American zone of occupation.'

"This was the opening which the Russians were awaiting because it gave them the opportunity to sponsor a Communist Party under our protection. A few weeks later the commentator, Walter Winchell, warned on his Sunday night program that as a result of Lowenthal's activities a rift had occurred between the American and British zones."

[From the Annapolis (Md.) Manresan of November 1950]

BOOK REVIEW

This is not exactly down our ally because we do not go in for book reviews. However, we are happy to take a crack at this one and with gusto. As we go to press, November 20, 1950, we find a long article in the New York Times of today, page 20, calling attention to a new book, entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation." A study. By Max Lowenthal (William Sloane Associates, $4.50).

The book, 559 pages, is an attack on Director J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As such the book condemns itself. We know nothing about the author, except what we have read from time to time in the papers. But we do know much about Mr. Hoover and the wonderful men and women of the FBI. They can take it—the smears along with the cheers. The American public knows, respects, trusts, and loves Director Hoover and the FBI. It will take more than a minor critic to undermine the FBI. If you feel that you have $4.50 to spend, then spend it on the poor at Christmas time. Our congratulations to Director Hoover and all the men and women of the FBI.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press of December 2, 1950]

GOOD MORNING

(By Malcolm W. Bingay)

BOOSTING HOOVER

I have just read a book attacking the Federal Bureau of Investigation which turns out to be the highest compliment ever paid J. Edgar Hoover.

The book is written by a very famous lawyer, indeed; one always referred to as noted with a long and distinguished record.

Now it stands to reason that a man who is one of the most brilliant lawyers in America would most certainly have the ability to prosecute a case so that there would be no doubt of guilt.

That is why, in my opinion, J. Edgar Hoover is given the finest endorsement ever presented any public official in our times. In a book of 559 pages the author, Max Lowenthal, is unable to find anything wrong with Hoover—although it isn't because he doesn't try.

There is no question about Hoover being thoroughly hated, especially by the Communists. Pravda and the Daily Worker devote most of their energies to cursing him.

And most certainly he has been cordially hated by the hatchet men of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

This is because he has refused to play politics.

Born in Washington and a resident of that city he has never been allowed to vote, has never had anything to do with any political party, and has lived up to the high principles of the Bureau as expressed in the law creating it: that it shall have nothing to do with politics.

The extremely left-wing New Republic defends Hoover against Lowenthal's attacks in this manner:

"Credit to Hoover when credit is due might have given it (the book) a better balance. The director of the FBI has instilled a fine esprit de corps in his organization. He has kept it apparently free from venality—although some of his former agents have not been above profiting from their employment under him.

"He had the good sense to resist congressional efforts to saddle him with the responsibility of passing on the loyalty of Government employees. His treatment of alien enemies in World War II was discriminating and just. He had no part in, and, indeed, opposed the Army's mass evacuation of Japanese Americans from the west coast in 1942."

Here we see the inability of a radical reviewer with a fixation of mind to say a decent thing without a feline dig. The New Republic hints that there is something venal in the fact that former members of the FBI "have not been above profiting from their employment under him."

An FBI agent has to be highly educated. He has to be physically fit. He has to be an expert marksman. He has to pass a high intelligence test and prove his courage before being accepted by Hoover.

All appointments to his staff are free from political pull.

Such an agent gets about the same annual pay as the ordinary factory worker.

Naturally there comes a time when he has to consider his family and their future. He resigns and takes a position in industry or law * * * anything honorable that appeals to him—even to writing his memoirs.

And this, it is hinted, is venal.

Starting with FDR himself, what member of the whole Roosevelt administration did not profit—and how—from association with the administration? If any of the Truman ménage has not done likewise it may be due to an inability to read and write.

These are the snide rides a courageous and altruistic patriot has to take because he has fiercely refused to play any kind of politics.

Though offered as high as $100,000 a year by corporations because of his abilities and integrity, he has refused and lives on his Government pay of around $10,000.

He has never accepted a penny for any of the articles he has written. Like some high priest of a holy cause his vision is beyond money.

The people of America owe J. Edgar Hoover an unpayable debt. He has inspired generation after generation of youths with high ideals and his school has educated the police departments of all America in the science of crime detection.

The Roosevelt and Truman politicians hate him as much as the Nazis did and as the Communists now do.

I know of no recommendation that could be higher.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of December 3, 1950]

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

Morris L. Ernst, a noted liberal who once held other views, now regards the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, as able guardians of individual liberties.

Ernst has set forth his thoughts in the current issue of Reader's Digest, basing them on a lengthy and exhaustive study of the FBI. He finds it currently the victim of a smear campaign.

Max Lowenthal, President Truman's tutor in liberal thinking, is also the author of a book about the FBI. We have already examined it in some detail. Lowenthal's version blames everything but the national debt on the FBI and Hoover. He is fearful that Hoover is bent on stomping out individual liberties in the U. S. A. The book in general fits perfectly as part of the anti-FBI smear campaign to which Mr. Ernst refers.

Lowenthal has had these ideas about the FBI for a long time, and on several occasions he has openly assailed the Bureau.

Lowenthal once served as chief counsel for the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, when then Senator Harry Truman was in charge of a subcommittee investigating railroads.

It was this mid-30's investigation that launched Mr. Truman on the road to the White House. Later, in World War II, a watchdog committee for military spending was set up by the Senate, and Mr. Truman got the nod to head it.

He already had a reputation as an investigator, which was made under Lowenthal's tutelage while chairman of the Commerce subcommittee. From there, Mr. Truman bounced into the Vice Presidency and finally the Presidency, with Lowenthal bouncing right behind him.

It isn't often that a Presidental intimate has such strong views about the chief investigative agency of the Government as does Lowenthal. The President keeps piling more and more antispy work on the FBI and praising its operations.

Even so, Lowenthal manages to maintain his strong dislike for the FBI and still keep the Presidential ear. It's a neat trick.

Ernst admits he once feared the FBI and its power. He says:

"Those who feared the Bureau—as I once did—will be glad to know the facts. The FBI is unique in the history of national police. It has a magnificent record of respect for individual freedom. It invites documented complaints against its agents. It has zealously tried to prevent itself from violating the democratic process."

Ernst acted as attorney in hundreds of cases involving civil liberties in which FBI agents were active. These chiefly involved Japanese and German nationalists who were rounded up at the start of the war. Of these he says:

"A few of the 16,000 persons then arrested became my clients. I defended them before hearing boards and was able to help free some of them. In every case there were fair hearings, with every consideration being shown to the defense.

"And although I was the lawyer for certain acquitted suspects, I must admit that Mr. Hoover had a justification in picking up my clients; there was cause for suspicion, and no injustice was done."

So Mr. Ernst has had some first-hand experience with the FBI. Furthermore, when he became really worried, he went to the FBI and talked it all over with Director Hoover. The above comments ensued.

Lowenthal has yet to appear anywhere around the FBI, but his book contains 590 pages of criticism of it.

Lowenthal is particularly incensed over wire tapping and loyalty cases that involve the FBI. Ernst notes something Lowenthal lightly skips over—that the Communists work furtively and zealously against our freedom and our ideas of decency.

"Something had to be done about this and the FBI had to do it," Ernst writes. "What was the task? To bring the facts up from the underground so that all the people can know what is being plotted."

Ernst gives Hoover an "A" for effort on this score.

Lowenthal simply shudders in print and asks us to shudder with him. He also criticizes the FBI for keeping thousands of anonymous messages, tips, and unsigned notes in its files.

Ernst points out that Maj. Gen. Bennett E. Meyers, former Air Force purchasing officer, was started to prison on the basis of an unsigned note to the FBI.

Scores of Communists also can ruminate about the value of information of this nature as they languish in jail or contemplate an early trip to one, at the Government's expense.

Resolution of Republican Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted this morning by the Republican conference:

In this critical hour, confidence of the American people in their leadership is essential to our security.

It is completely obvious that Secretary Acheson and the State Department under his leadership have lost the confidence of the Congress and the American people and cannot regain it.

Recognizing this fact, we earnestly insist for the good of our country that Acheson be replaced as Secretary of State and that there be a thorough housecleaning in the State Department and changes in the personnel and policies responsible for this lack of confidence.

Scapegoat or Blunderer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, citizens of the Third Congressional District of Iowa have lost whatever confidence they may have had in Secretary of State Acheson.

Many weeks ago I publicly called for his removal from office for it was evident then that the stupidity and blundering of the State Department and the administration had destroyed any usefulness he may have had.

The thinking of a vast majority of Iowans is well summarized in the following editorial from the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier:

ACHESON: SCAPEGOAT OR BLUNDERER?

Rumors persist, despite denials, that Secretary of State Acheson will resign soon. Although his supporters may defend him stoutly against accusations of incompetence, they cannot deny that he has lost the confidence of the country. Demands for his resignation have come not only from Republicans but also from important Democratic Congressmen.

Acheson's friends insist that he is merely being made the scapegoat for military disasters in Korea, that the public merely wants to cut off somebody's head because the Russians have maneuvered us into an unwanted and unpopular war.

On the other hand, severe indictments can be brought against Acheson which prove that he, while not entirely to blame for the present situation, played a dominant role in the tragic blunders which led the country into this debacle.

First. Acheson was a leading State Department advocate of appeasement of Russia long before he became Secretary of State and must bear his share of blame for the consequences of that appeasement.

Second. Acheson was a member of the State Department clique which deserted Chiang Kai-shek in the critical period following the war when the Nationalist leader might have established his control over China. Instead, the State Department enforced a truce while an effort was made to require Chiang to take the Communists into his government. History will record that this maneuver paved the way for the eventual triumph of the Communists in the civil war.

Third. Acheson publicly proclaimed as Secretary of State that Korea would not be defended and this undoubtedly led the Communists to conclude that we would let South Korea fall in a civil war as we let the Chinese Nationalists be defeated.

Fourth. Acheson was Secretary of State when the critical decision was made to revise the previous policy and go to the aid of the South Koreans. This was a mad gamble unless there were reasonable assurances that the Chinese Communists would not enter the conflict. As far as the public knows, moreover, no effort was made to determine what the policy of the Chinese Communists was going to be. As Secretary of State, this was Acheson's responsibility.

Fifth. Acheson based American policy in the Orient on the belief that the Chinese Communists could be split off from Russia and that they would follow a policy independent of the politburo. This has been proved exactly 100 percent wrong.

Sixth. Regardless of the justice of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S charges, Acheson has had a "soft" attitude toward Communists and extreme left-wingers in Government service. He violated the public trust by publicly asserting that he would not "turn my back" on Alger Hiss, the convicted perjurer.

Surely all this is reasonable justification for demanding Acheson's dismissal. No doubt many of the criticisms result from the increased wisdom of hindsight; but in any case the Secretary of State is exposed by developments as a blunderer. We know of no way to judge the abilities of a Government official than by his success or failure; and Acheson—insofar as Asiatic policy is concerned—has been a failure.

Mohawk Valley Formula for Strikebreaking Used by Reactionary Republicanism To Win Elections as Well as Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to call the attention of the Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the Mohawk Valley strikebreaking formula as set forth in the case entitled "The Matter of Remington Rand, Inc., and Remington Rand Joint Protective Board of the District Council Office Equipment Workers," Case No. C–145, decided March 13, 1937, which case is to be found in the decisions and orders of the National Labor Relations Board, volume II, pages 626 and 664 to 666, inclusive.

I direct attention to this strikebreaking formula, because I feel sure that the reactionary Republican Party whose political conduct is always in step with big business, has been using this strikebreaking formula in political campaigns against the people and their interests, in the same manner as it has been used by big business against employees who sought to gain their rights from greedy, selfish, and un-American interests. It might be well for liberal Democrats and Republicans who are alined against reactionary Republicans and Democrats in a fight to preserve our country and our form of government and the rights of the people to study this strike-breaking formula and see how it has been used in past political campaigns. Many liberal Democrats and Republicans agree with me that this is the key to long past as well as more recent political campaigns which brought about the defeat of men who should have been permitted to serve the people, and it behooves all right-thinking Americans in future campaigns to follow the labor-union plan in breaking the Mohawk

Valley formula. A definite manual has been prepared by labor unions to offset this pernicious formula if same is being used either in whole or in part.

This formula, as taken from the aforementioned report, is as follows:

First. When the strike is threatened, label the union leaders as agitators to discredit them with the public and their own followers. In the plant, conduct a forced balloting under the direction of foremen in an attempt to ascertain the strength of the union and to make possible misrepresentation of the strikers as a small minority imposing their will upon the majority. At the same time, disseminate propaganda, by means of press releases, advertisements, and activities of "missionaries," such propaganda falsely stating the issues involved in the strike so that the strikers appear to be making arbitrary demands, and the real issues, such as the employer's refusal to bargain collectively, are obscured. Concurrently with these moves, by exerting economic pressure through threats to move the plant, aline the influential members of the community into a cohesive group opposed to the strike. Include in this group, usually designated a citizens committee, representatives of the bankers, real-estate owners, and businessmen, i. e., those most sensitive to any threat of removal of the plant because of its effect upon property values and purchasing power flowing from payrolls.

Second. When the strike is called raise high the banner of law and order, thereby causing the community to mass legal and police weapons against a wholly imagined violence and to forget that those of its members who are employees have equal rights with the other members of the community.

Third. Call a mass meeting of the citizens to coordinate public sentiment against the strike and to strengthen the power of the citizens committee, which organization, thus supported, will both aid the employer in exerting pressure upon the local authorities and itself sponsor vigilante activities.

Fourth. Bring about the formation of a large armed police force to intimidate the strikers and to exert a psychological effect upon the citizens. This force is built up by utilizing local police, State police if the governor cooperates, vigilantes, and special deputies, the deputies being chosen if possible from other neighborhoods, so that there will be no personal relationships to induce sympathy for the strikers. Coach the deputies and vigilantes on the law of unlawful assembly, inciting to riot, disorderly conduct, etc., so that, unhampered by any thought that the strikers may also possess some rights, they will be ready and anxious to use their newly acquired authority to the limit.

Fifth. And perhaps most important, heighten the demoralizing effect of the above measures—all designed to convince the strikers that their cause is hopeless—by a back-to-work movement, operated by a puppet association of so-called loyal employees secretly organized by the employer. Have this association wage a publicity campaign in its own name and coordinate such campaign with the work of the "missionaries" circulating among the strikers and visiting their homes. This back-to-work movement has these results: It causes the public to believe that the strikers are in the minority and that most of the employees desire to return to work, thereby winning sympathy for the employer and an endorsement of his activities to such an extent that the public is willing to pay the huge costs, direct and indirect, resulting from the heavy forces of police. This back-to-work movement also enables the employer, when the plant is later opened, to operate it with strikebreakers if necessary and to continue to refuse to bargain collectively with the strikers. In addition, the back-to-work movement permits the employer to keep a constant check on the strength of the union through the number of applications received from employees ready to break ranks and return to work, such number being kept secret from the public and the other employees, so that the doubts and fears created by such secrecy will in turn induce still others to make applications.

Sixth. When a sufficient number of applications are on hand, fix a date for an opening of the plant through the device of having such opening requested by the back-to-work association. Together with the citizens' committee, prepare for such opening by making provision for a peak army of police by roping off the areas surrounding the plant, by securing arms and ammunition, etc. The purpose of the opening of the plant is threefold: To see if enough employees are ready to return to work; to induce still others to return as a result of the demoralizing effect produced by the opening of the plant and the return of some of their number; and lastly, even if the maneuver fails to induce a sufficient number of persons to return, to persuade the public through pictures and news releases that the opening was nevertheless successful.

Seventh. Stage the opening, theatrically throwing open the gates at the propitious moment and having the employees march into the plant grounds in a massed group protected by squads of armed police, so as to give to the opening a dramatic and exaggerated quality and thus heighten its demoralizing effect. Along with the opening provide a spectacle—speeches, flag raising, and praises for the employees, citizens, and local authorities, so that, their vanity touched, they will feel responsible for the continued success of the scheme and will increase their efforts to induce additional employees to return to work.

Eighth. Capitalize on the demoralization of the strikers by continuing the show of police force and the pressure of the citizens committee, both to insure that those employees who have returned will continue at work and to force the remaining strikers to capitulate. If necessary, turn the locality into a warlike camp through the declaration of a state of emergency tantamount to martial law and barricade it from the outside world so that nothing may interfere with the successful conclusion of the formula, thereby driving home to the union leaders the futility of further efforts to hold their ranks intact.

Ninth. Close the publicity barrage, which day by day during the entire period has increased the demoralization worked by all of these measures, on the theme that the plant is in full operation and that the strikers were merely a minority attempting to interfere with the right to work, thus inducing the public to place a moral stamp of approval upon the above measures. With this, the campaign is over—the employer has broken the strike.

Robert Fay Rockwell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our deceased friend and former colleague, Robert Fay Rockwell. I served with Bob on the Public Lands Committee when he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and have known him ever since he became a Member of Congress. I always considered him one of the finest men I ever knew. Often I commented to him that he was appropriately named, in that the "rock" in his name signified his stability. It was indeed a shock to me to hear of his passing.

The Lack of Humanity and the Inordinate Greed of Certain Omaha Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, there was a time in our land when the American medical profession was regarded highly by everyone. That time was when people could call a doctor and he would respond with the same alacrity with which a clergyman would go to the bedside of the sick or dying. That day, however, has passed as far as many present-day members of the medical profession are concerned. In fact, to these men, medicine is no longer a profession, but a cruel, greedy, money-making racket.

One can visit most any community in this country and see a beautiful house being erected and upon inquiry he is told that that house is to be the future home of the successful money-making doctor. If he chances to see a beautiful and expensive automobile upon the streets and asks a passer-by who is the owner of that automobile he will most probably be told that it is the automobile of one of the successful money-making doctors. If he sees a convertible automobile speeding down the street and inquires who is the owner of same, he most probably will be told that it belongs to the successful money-making doctor's son or daughter. If he chances to see a town car decked out in the most attractive, stunning pastel shade and is curious to know the ownership thereof, he will probably be told that that car belongs to the successful money-making doctor's wife.

In calling attention to these matters I do not do so in an envious way, but merely to direct attention to the fact that many present-day medical men are not known for their charity or personal goodness, or great medical skill, but are known only because of the display of wealth which they make and the feverish energy with which they pursue and gather in the dollar and pile up that wealth of this world which the Nazarene and his Apostles so roundly despised.

I sometimes wonder what has brought about this from Dr. Jekyll to Mr. Hyde change in medical men.

We read about the New Hampshire doctor who was charged with a mercy killing, about a midwestern doctor who was a woman killing abortionist, about

a western doctor who was a kidnaper and extortionist, and about all the other public offenses which are laid at the doors of some medical men. We ask ourselves what is happening to doctors as a class. We try to find the answer and learn that the teachings which they received in the medical schools were not that which is most conducive to the training of people who will occupy eventually a place in the second highest profession known in the world—the profession of medicine which is next to the ministry.

We learn that no one could become a medical student for some few years last past unless he was a quiz kid. He must excel in the subjects required for premedical training. Class leaders are the only ones who are eligible now in medical schools. Of course when scholastic standing is the sole and only test, it is almost certain that various types of perverts will be admitted into the medical schools because great knowledge and great ability to learn without moral guidance, moral balance, moral training, and healthy bodies is the very spawning grounds for perversion. Instead of requiring that a man have the proper training of the mind and heart, medical schools today require proper training of the mind only. Instead of selecting good mechanics and wholesome people with a heart, they welcome with open arms the wan, slight, cold-eyed quiz-kid type with all of their strange ideas, cruelties, and tendencies to be unnatural.

Many splendid Omaha doctors would never have been doctors at all if the present-day standards for admission to medical colleges had been in force. Many of the old-time doctors were persons who did hard work, others were excellent mechanics, and still others, though they did not excel in scholarship, possessed that which enabled them to become real doctors in the truest sense of the word.

Something must be done to keep the quiz kids out of the medical profession. Something must be done to remove the liars from the medical profession. Something must be done to remove the trickster from the medical profession. Something must be done to remove the greedy, selfish money makers from the medical profession. Something must be done to clean up the whole sordid present-day medical mess. It is sad to reflect that some doctors have become so deaf to the call of their country by reason of greed and selfishness that Congress had to draft them into the military services for the first time in this Nation's history.

I want to give you a few samples of what some Nebraska doctors have done to debase their profession and to lose the respect of many decent thinking people.

The first instance I want to call your attention to concerns a very prominent woman who was on her way to Lincoln, Nebr., by automobile and had a heart attack. The driver of the automobile stopped at the first town he reached after she had suffered this heart attack and brought this stricken woman to the home of the leading doctor, arriving there at about noon. The patient was admitted into the doctor's house and was seated in the living room and was noticeably suffering a great deal of discomfort and pain. The doctor was eating his noonday meal in an adjoining room, and refused to leave the table until he had finished his meal, consequently this woman received no treatment whatsoever until the doctor had satisfied the craving of the inner man. No appeal to this doctor was heeded by him. He sternly announced, "Wait until I finish eating."

The second instance was that of a man who worked as a meat cutter in South Omaha, Nebr. His wife became ill and was taken to a local hospital. Inquiry was made by the doctors and the hospital as to the husband's financial standing. They were told that he had about $4,000 in the bank. The wife was treated for a period of time, during which time the $4,000 was drained away from him and then the wife was brought back home, not better but much worse because of the treatment she received. The interest of the doctor and the hospital ceased when the money ran out. Now this man with his life savings taken away from him by the doctors and the hospital can struggle along the best he can until death claims his spouse.

The third instance relates to a neighbor of mine. For 27 years he carried on a barbering business in the neighborhood, and for almost the same length of time his wife operated a beauty parlor in the rear of the barber shop. This couple lived very frugally and became the owners of a nice brick home in a plain but excellent residential section—they had it finely furnished, they had a new automobile, they had the most up-to-date equipment in their barber shop and beauty parlor, they had money in the bank and bonds. One day this man realized that he was not feeling very well. He went to a big-shot doctor, who later was connected with the so-called Healing Arts Committee. After making a financial disclosure he was taken to a local hospital. He passed through the hands of about seven or eight specialists. He was given X-ray treatments and otherwise treated for a period of several months. All of the cash in the bank was paid to the doctors and to the hospital, and all of the bonds were sold and the proceeds paid to the doctors and to the hospital; the home was sold and the money was paid to the doctors and to the hospital. In fact, practically everything these people had except their barber shop and beauty parlor was disposed of and channeled into the coffers of the doctors and the hospital. Finally there was no more money left. Then this man was loaded into an ambulance and was deposited in a room in the rear of the barber shop, where he remained for a couple of weeks and then was returned to the hospital for a few days prior to his death. His doctor complimented the wife of this man for the promptness in which she paid every bill, and when there was no more money left he and a doctor cohort threw off about $300 from the remaining bills—thus manifesting for the first time any spirit of generosity or decency. This man was buried and his wife is now struggling on to make a living, starting again almost from scratch. Is it not a pitiful thing to think that doctors and hospitals could wipe out 27 years of savings of a husband and wife in less than 7 months' time? These doctors claimed that this man had a cancer. They did not seem to know that nature oftentimes throws a wall of tissue around a tumorous cancer and entirely isolates the cancer. They gave this man deep X-ray treatments in an intense way and cooked the tissue which had the cancer contained and permitted it to spread throughout his entire body.

I would certainly like to sue these doctors, because they took this money practically by duress. Most anyone would give everything they possessed to save a loved one and these doctors knew that only too well.

I sometimes think that some doctors are worse than some undertakers I have known in my lifetime who excelled in bleeding the last dollar out of bereaved relatives on the pretense that a fine burial was the last thing they could do for the dead.

The fourth incident which I shall direct your attention to is a happening which occurred to a remote neighbor of mine. Their young child had convulsions. A neighborhood doctor was called who was a child specialist and he refused to treat this child or even view it in the home. He insisted the child be taken to a hospital and a short time after this refusal on the part of the doctor, the child died.

These instances are not isolated ones. There are many more similar occurrences which could be called to your attention. You all know how heartless a great number of the present-day doctors are. A radio entertainer made the statement that you could not go to some doctors with a splinter in your finger and have him do anything for you unless you first hit the sheets in a hospital. The doctors seem to be in league with the hospitals and channel all of their patients, who show any ability to pay, into the hospitals. They refuse to make house calls any more and you are fortunate if they even send a beginner. The hospitals pack sick people in wards in violation of all health regulations and charge handsome prices for a bed in a place where other reeking, sick people are confined. Hospital rooms in some instances cost as much as $30 and $50 a day. I wonder if it is not about time for the people to organize into groups and refuse to leave their more pleasant homes and go to a hospital room or ward to be neglected just to please a doctor and make it easy for him to call on all of his patients at once.

Many people complain about labor unions being closed organizations but they do not have one thing on the doctors. They will not permit sufficient numbers of students to receive medical education because that would lessen their incomes.

I believe that the corrupting of the doctors was brought about by insurance companies who write compensation and liability and other insurance policies.

They certainly taught the doctors how to lie both in and out of court.

I have had doctors take the witness stand and testify that a man's injury really helped him because he needed rest and the fact that he got rest would prolong his life, therefore the injury he received was a blessing in disguise.

A partial solution of this grave medical situation, of course, would be to train and graduate more doctors of not the quiz-kid type but the normal—the human type. This will not cure the present-day conditions, however.

I feel that the tax authorities of this Government should go through the books of these successful doctors with a fine-toothed comb, and I am sure if they would do so that they would catch them cheating on their income-tax returns. If that situation was discovered the doctors should be prosecuted and sent to prison, not merely penalized in money. All doctors who commit perjury should be prosecuted. In fact, there is a crying need today for bigger and better doctors in all penitentiaries.

In conclusion I want to call attention to a newspaper release which appeared recently in the press which tells a sad story:

MEDICAL PEARL HARBOR

The Committee for the Nation's Health claims the American Medical Association has opened the way to a "future medical Pearl Harbor" by opposing Federal aid to medical schools. It is said AMA's recent stand in favor of private, rather than Federal support for medical schools is a conscience sop for AMA's obstructionist tactics—a high pressure publicity gesture to drown out the almost unanimous demand for immediate * * * passage of the medical education bill.

Housing for Eskimo Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, every day I receive letters from people in my district demanding constructive action in connection with the war in Korea. People recognize that we have a tough struggle ahead and that down the road to the future lie many obstacles.

They realize that if this Nation is to survive there will be blood and sweat and tears. They are ready for sacrifice—every American. Every American I know is ready and willing to do his share, to lower his standard of living, to sacrifice luxuries if it will help to stem the tide of Communist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, while people are demanding forthright action by their Government and while they are asking that their Government take a realistic view of the dangers which confront us, we find that the Government in some instances is completely oblivious to realism.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most asinine things I have run across is a press release from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated December 2, 1950.

Mr. Speaker, this press release reveals that while there is a call for mobilization, while stringent controls are being applied on building construction and all forms of activity close to the American people we have one agency proudly announcing a new program for housing Eskimoes. I have often been critical of the administration and of the numerous Federal employees whom I felt were contributing little to the welfare of the country—doing nothing in some cases but living at the public trough. Perhaps some officials might still condone such ridiculous goings-on. But today we are in a war, mind you, that may well determine whether we ourselves are to have roofs over our heads.

Mr. Speaker, this is another example of the Government calling upon the people for sacrifice but, by its own actions, showing that it, itself, is unwilling to sacrifice. It continues to employ hundreds—perhaps thousands—of employees and spend thousands of dollars to look into the housing conditions of Eskimoes, a condition that has existed for thousands of years and a condition which I will wager the Eskimoes are perfectly willing to continue for I can't imagine an Eskimo being any more happy about bureaucratic interference with his housing and home problems than most Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything against the Eskimoes but I note that while we here in this country are being called upon to accept less of certain strategic materials, the Eskimo who conforms to bureaucratic edict can get corrugated aluminum roofing for his house. This at a time when we desperately need critical materials in the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I can only scratch my head in wonder at the antics of the administration. In the hope that some of the other Members can help me out of this fix, I ask that the full text of the following press release be included in my remarks:

HOUSING AND
HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
December 2, 1950.

BETTER HOUSING FOR ESKIMO FAMILIES

Many Eskimo families in isolated and more primitive sections of Alaska are now living for the first time in warm and sanitary homes. These homes are made possible under the remote dwelling program conducted by the Alaska Housing Authority with the sponsorship of the Housing and Home Finance Agency under special provisions of the Alaska Housing Act.

Under this program an Eskimo can obtain a loan not to exceed $500 for construction or improvement of his home. Out of the proceeds of the loan, FHA supplies the materials required. The borrower may receive material enough to construct a 14- by 17-foot dwelling, using 2- by 4-inch lumber for rafters and joists and 1- by 6-inch tongue and grooved lumber for floors, siding, and sheathing. Aluminum corrugated roofing is placed over the ceiling sheathing. Asphalt-treated insulation 1 inch thick is used under the flooring and on the inside of walls and ceiling. Each dwelling has two windows, 36 by 30 inches in size. This type of construction provides a dry home much easier to keep warm and sanitary than the original dwelling which usually has only a frequently damp dirt floor.

Further Sinister Activities of the Omaha Doctors During the Past Congressional Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Omaha doctors, combined with the alleged Healing Arts Committee to Combat Socialism and Communism, put out a green-colored dodger upon one side of which was published an article which I had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 13, 1950, entitled "More About This Socialized-Medicine Scare."

On one half of the opposite side of this dodger is a cartoon picture which is labeled "O'SULLIVAN," and I am purported to have said, "Hey, Doc, you're an evil old man." Then there appears the following:

They say that our national health insurance plan is socialized medicine, like the British plan is, when that is as false as most any old doctor's United States income-tax returns, and the hypocrite doctor knows it full well.—O'SULLIVAN.

Of course, it's hard to believe. But read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yourself. To the doctors, dentists, and others who are trained in the healing arts: Every doctor, dentist, nurse, and assistant interested in preserving the high standards and ethics of the medical profession should read this amazing speech made by the Second District Congressman. It seems incredible that any public servant in America would be guilty of such irrational thinking. To spread such a tirade in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD discredits the people of Nebraska.

Sincerely,

Robert Schrock, M. C. Howard, J. B. Christensen, E. J. Kirk, Warren Thompson, Ralph Luikart, E. C. Sage, Wm. L. Shearer, Herbert H. Davis, Edwin Davis, James Wm. Martin, James J. O'Neil, E. L. McQuiddy, W. L. Sucha.

(Published by the Nebraska Committee to Combat Socialism and Communism, Art Renstrom, chairman; John Eckert, secretary-treasurer.)

On the remaining half of this page appears the following reading matter, some of which was stressed by large type:

If you believe that socialized medicine is wrong, then you should get your assistant to work, your wife to work, your friends to work, and yourself to work to elect HOWARD BUFFETT to Congress. BUFFETT knows that the American people are the healthiest people in the world. He knows this because of the ability and character of the thousands of men and women who have devoted themselves to a lifetime of service to humanity through the medical professions. Prevent the spread of communism and socialism by

electing men who have a proven record against these evils.

This throw-away sheet was given wide distribution throughout the congressional district.

In all statements which were sent out, approximately one-half of the Omaha doctors who opposed me by claiming that I was for socialized medicine, the following printed material was inserted:

To My Patients:

The issue of socialization has been put squarely before the people of our country. Legislation seeking to socialize medicine has been introduced in the present Congress and is now being held in committee. The Congressman from this district, Mr. EUGENE O'SULLIVAN, in a speech before Congress on March 13, 1950, took the position that he was in favor of the pending compulsory national health plan, which is socialization of your health.

I am absolutely against it. How do you stand?

You must be registered to vote. October 27 is the last day for registering. Absentee ballots can be had now by calling JAckson 7555, or write to Herman E. Kuppinger, election commissioner, Douglas County Courthouse, today.

The following telegram was sent to all doctors in the Second Congressional District:

Refer to sample letters you have received. Bring sufficient number of letterheads with copy of sample letter to the seventeenth floor, Medical Arts Building. We will return.

HEALING ARTS COMMITTEE,
J. P. REDGWICK, M. D.

The sample letters which the foregoing telegram referred to were as follows:

(Attached are two sample letters suitable for direct mail to your patients. Choose 1 or both and supply us with as much of your letterhead stationery as you would like copies of the letters. We will have it run off on a letterpress, which looks like a typewritten letter. Bring your order to this office and your order will be returned to you promptly.)

MY DEAR PATIENTS: You and I have been friends for some time. I believe that I have served you and yours faithfully and well with sincere understanding, in your hours of need. I would now like to discuss with you, compulsory national health insurance, a subject of vital importance that is of particular concern to you, as well as to me. I do not know, whether or not, you are aware of the scheme called compulsory national insurance (socialized medicine) that the present administration is endeavoring to enact into law at this time.

This scheme would destroy the personal relationship between patient and physician, would make impossible absolute free choice of physician in time of illness, would lower the quality of medical care. I believe that you want to preserve your present relationship with the doctor of your own personal choice, and that you want to continue to enjoy your present high quality personal medical care.

You, personally, will not be given the opportunity to vote for or against this law, but, your Congressman will have the power to vote for or against this proposed "socialized medicine" law. I would like to suggest that you vote for Mr. HOWARD BUFFETT on election day, November 7. Mr. BUFFETT has consistently opposed socialized medicine, compulsory national health insurance, and all forms of state socialism.

This is so important to all of the people of America, and to you, and to me, I ask you as a personal favor to vote on November 7 for Mr. HOWARD BUFFETT for Congress and to urge your family, your friends and acquaintances to vote for him as well. Let us stop the trend toward state socialism in America. The voluntary way is the American way.

With best personal regards and sincere thanks for your cooperation in this most vital important matter.

Sincerely yours.

MY DEAR PATIENT: In this country we have always kept the care of the sick out of politics. We want it to stay that way.

Your doctor's job is to look after your health—not your politics. But when politics may affect your health and the care of the sick, it is your doctor's duty to speak up.

Now a socialized medicine scheme has been put up by the national administration in Washington. They call it compulsory national health insurance. That means that you have to pay for it whether you want it or not.

Whatever name it is called, it leads to the same thing—political control of the doctors, dentists, pharmacists, nurses, hospitals, and everyone else who looks after the sick. It means inferior treatment. Under this scheme the confidential relationship between a doctor and his patient will be a thing of the past. And it means more expense—another compulsory deduction from your pay check, less take-home pay, and more hidden taxes (cigarette tax, etc.).

On election day, November 7, we ask you to vote for HOWARD BUFFETT for Second District Congressman. Mr. BUFFETT is against this scheme. He knows, what all of us know, that politics and medicine don't mix.

Sincerely yours.

The following letter was also sent to every doctor in the Second Congressional District:

NON-PARTISAN DOCTORS COMMITTEE
FOR AMERICAN MEDICINE,
Omaha, Nebr.

DEAR DOCTOR: The issue in the congressional election here in district No. 2 is clear-cut so far as medicine is concerned. We are lucky that is so. Now we can carry on the campaign to defeat socialized medicine on clean-cut lines which the people can understand.

Not only is O'SULLIVAN on record for socialized medicine but he is on record against the doctor personally.

Now we doctors have many friends throughout district No. 2 who are ready and willing to help us. But as doctors we must take the lead in this battle. We must be in the very forefront of the fight. We are organized and ready to go into action with a well-defined and hard-hitting campaign.

Whether Republican or Democrat, it is our duty to elect a man to Congress who will vote against socialized medicine. It's as simple as that. On a nonpartisan basis we can and should support BUFFETT, not because he is a Republican but because he is against political medicine.

Many Democrats, including Dr. R. E. Robins, vice president of the AMA and a national Democratic committeeman, believe the President's compulsory program is contrary to the principles that gave birth to the Democratic Party. Florida clearly demonstrated this stand. In their Democratic primary this spring Republicans and Democrats alike "canned" PEPPER, the arch exponent of the welfare state. The people elected SMATHERS, a fearless young Democrat who openly and firmly opposed socialized medicine. Nationally and locally Drs. O'Hearn, Carnazzo, and Howard, all old-time Democrats, publicly expressed their sentiments in this direction.

The most important single mission of the campaigns in Florida, Pennsylvania, and New York was a thoroughgoing letter-writing job, personal letters beamed to the doctor's patients on his own letterhead, over his signature, in his own envelopes. Their blueprint is our model. Make it your program, too.

The members of your medical society speakers bureau, as well as the members in print on this committee, are out on the firing line in this battle. Let's no longer indulge in the safety of inaction and the bliss of inertia. This is the hour for positive action on the part of every practicing physician. Don't plan to do it in the future. The future is now. Do it now.

It is too late now in other countries.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL REDGWICK,
Executive Director.

The following three letters were then sent to all the doctors:

IF YOU WANT TO SAVE YOUR NECK, THIS IS ONE WAY TO HELP

SEPTEMBER 12, 1950.

THE 12 COMMITTEE MEMBERS

St. Joseph's Hospital: L. D. McGuire, W. L. Sucha, Adolph Sachs.

St. Catherine's Hospital: James F. Kelly, George N. Johnson.

Immanuel Hospital: Herbert H. Davis, Julius B. Christensen.

Methodist Hospital: John R. Schenken, Howard B. Hunt.

Clarkson Hospital: Edwin Davis, Warren Thompson.

Doctor's Hospital: Roy Fouts, Joe Swoboda.

DEAR DOCTOR: We are out to beat O'SULLIVAN, in whose published statement doctors are referred to as "evil men."

Our present Representative from the Second District give 100 percent endorsement to the Truman programs, including socialized medicine.

We have selected 12 members of our profession to solicit funds to defeat O'SULLIVAN. You are one of them to work at the hospital specified above. Will you accept, and also donate, as well as solicit? The time is short.

In our solicitation of the physicians of the Second District, we could use a printed statement as follows:

1. Please accept my contribution of $_____ enclosed.

2. I do (do not) desire to have my name added to the roster of the committee.

3. I estimate that I can secure _____ votes for our American cause.

Sincerely yours,

EARL C. SAGE, M. D.

P. S.—The best method is the "personal touch."

P. P. S.—Lutheran Hospital: E. J. Kirk, Allan Hruby.

OMAHA, NEBR., *October 11, 1950.*

DEAR MEMBER OF THE HEALING ARTS PROFESSION: It was exactly 1 month ago (September 11, 1950) when I was sucked in to raise money to defeat O'SULLIVAN. This was on a Monday.

On Tuesday, September 12, 1950, special-delivery letters went out to 12 physicians asking them if they would help me solicit funds. Hence the name, "Committee of twelve." There was the same number of disciples. Mike Crofoot came back with the best retort: "We have the 12 apostles placed, but are wondering, who is Jesus?"

On Wednesday, September 13, 1950, letters of solicitation went out to the Omaha-Douglas County Medical Society. (Miss Franta tells me there are 358 active, paying members, about 20 honorary members, 35 associate members, and about 10 M. D.'s who will start paying dues on January 1, 1951.) Miss Franta and I stuffed, stamped, and sealed these envelopes. The letter cost $9.

Those letters have brought in funds which go to four digits. You, as yet, have not contributed, so we see no reason to tell you the exact amount. These funds are in the Omaha National Bank and we pay our bills as soon as they are presented.

Friends of ours, not in the medical profession, have given liberally. One Wahoo, Nebr., physician, Mason Lathrop, gave $50. So far, some of our members have given nothing.

Radio time costs $12.50 a minute on some stations, and on others it costs $25 a minute.

How many minutes, hours, and even days do you think some of us are donating to the cause, as well as our cash?

'Nuf said. May we hear from you?

Please make checks payable to Earl C. Sage, chairman, 1234 Medical Arts Building, Omaha, Nebr.

Thank you.

EARL C. SAGE, M. D.

NONPARTISAN DOCTORS COMMITTEE

Omaha, Nebr., October 16, 1950.

DEAR DOCTOR: Our letter-writing campaign, which has proven to be the most effective single tool in the Florida campaign to "can" Senator PEPPER, is under way right here in your own district No. 2.

Time is short. These must be in the mail by October 23.

All over Florida was heard this comment: "You know, my doctor wrote me a personal letter asking me to support Mr. SMATHERS." All were impressed with the fact that any doctor would take the time to write a personal letter.

Bring the letter of your choice and your letterhead stationery to the above headquarters at once. We want this response to match your financial response, which is fast approaching 100 percent.

We feel this is the most constructive single thing we will do to elect BUFFETT and thus defeat socialized medicine once and for all, so we can leave the political arena into which we have been dragged by the socializers, and get back to our medical practices.

Sincerely yours,

J. PHIL REDGWICK, M. D.

Executive members: J. Phil Redgwick, chairman; Dr. Adolph Sachs; Dr. W. L. Sucha; Dr. Geo. N. Johnson; Dr. H. Davis; Dr. J. P. Swoboda; Dr. E. J. Kirk; Dr. M. C. Howard; Dr. L. W. Lee; Dr. Ed Davis, Jr.; Dr. J. R. Schenken; Dr. R. W. Fouts; Dr. Earl Sage; Dr J. J. O'Hearn.

Of course there was other material distributed by these political cantankerous doctors, but it was more or less repetition of their previous campaign of lies.

One Hundred and Fifty-ninth Anniversary of Bill of Rights, December 15, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly appropriate that we remember that today is the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Bill of Rights. Call it a commemoration day, if you wish; call it by any name you wish. It does not alter the importance of our remembering that we as Americans will lose our identity as a freedom-loving people if we ever neglect to exalt the first 10 amendments to our own Constitution. These words, in their own text, speak more eloquently and enduringly than any words I may try to use to speak about them. So my remarks to you, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, will be relatively brief.

Some have called our Bill of Rights our prayer book.

Just which declaration of the individual and group rights of man is most important in the world's history is still a matter of controversy in the minds and hearts of some people. Some say the Declaration of Independence; some say the Treaty of Paris, ending the Revolutionary War; some say the adoption of the American Constitution itself; some say the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine; some say the Emancipation Proclamation by our great Abraham Lincoln; some the war for freedom and democracy, which is believed to still be going on. My own belief is that the first 10 amendments to our own Constitution adopted by the United States of America on December 15, 1791, speak more loudly as the real soul and spirit of our own Constitution. Without the first 10 amendments, the Constitution with the original 7 articles, is largely emphasizing the protection of material things, to wit: the protection of material property.

It was Thomas Jefferson who is said to be the spearhead of that large number of our forefathers who were so shocked by the fact that the Constitution itself as promulgated in 1789, did not include any of the 10 provisions now described as our Bill of Rights.

The relative importance of these ten amendments were described by Thomas Jefferson himself when he declared, "The Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government."

Today we are in an ideology conflict with conspiracy of communism which is founded upon the rejections of the Divine in the human experience. The spiritual is eliminated and communism is militant against even the thought of God, and the denial of the divine in man's being is emphasized.

Many of our forefathers came to our eastern shores in search of opportunity for freedom of independence and freedom of opportunity to worship God and to manifest the value of the souls of men as they might desire it.

On this day of commemoration and observance of the Bill of Rights, it is well for us to again emphasize with vigilance and vigor that we as American people rededicate our lives and souls, our beings and our property to the proposition that the international conspiracy of aggressive communism against the things of the spirit; against the inspiration of the divine; against the individual dignity and independence of man himself—shall not prevail.

Mr. Speaker, not because you and my colleagues do not have in mind the substance of these ten amendments to our own Constitution, which now constitutes our Bill of Rights, but because it refreshes our minds, our souls, our spirits, and our devotions to the great principles for which we in America stand and for which we as Members of Congress are challenged and committed to legislate—I remind you that the text of this American Bill of Rights, adopted by the First Congress of the United States called to meet in New York City on March 4, 1789, was ratified by the various States and became a part of our beloved Constitution on December 15, 1791. The text follows:

FREEDOM OF RELIGION, SPEECH, AND THE PRESS: RIGHT OF ASSEMBLY AND PETITION

Amendment 1: Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

Amendment 2: A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

QUARTERING OF SOLDIERS

Amendment 3: No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

REGULATION OF RIGHT OF SEARCH AND SEIZURE

Amendment 4: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

PROTECTION FOR PERSONS AND THEIR PROPERTY

Amendment 5: No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb, nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

RIGHTS OF PERSONS ACCUSED OF CRIME

Amendment 6: In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be conformed of the nature and cause of accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

RIGHT OF TRIAL BY JURY IN SUITS AT COMMON LAW

Amendment 7: In suits at common law where the value in controversy shall exceed $20 the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of the common law.

PROTECTION AGAINST EXCESSIVE BAIL AND PUNISHMENTS

Amendment 8: Excessive bail shall not be required nor excessive fines imposed nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

CONSTITUTION DOES NOT LIST ALL INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

Amendment 9: The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

POWERS RESERVED TO THE STATES AND THE PEOPLE

Amendment 10: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

New Federal Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the following enactment by this Congress of the Defense Production Act, President Truman has acted expeditiously in setting up new agencies created by this and certain other recent laws.

I am informed by the Coordinator of Information, Cecil B. Dickson, there are many Members of Congress seeking information on how to contact the chiefs of the new agencies in the interests of their constituents.

The Coordinator prepared a listing of the new agencies and chief officials with their office addresses and telephone numbers. Under unanimous consent, I insert this listing in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members:

NEW FEDERAL AGENCIES

Economic Stabilization Agency, Fourth Street and Adams Drive SW., Temporary E Building, code 135: Alan Valentine, Administrator, room H-383, Temporary E, phone: extension 2344; Joseph L. Miller, Director, Public Relations Division, room H-367, Temporary E, phone: extension 3243.

Office of Price Stabilization, Michael V. DiSalle, Director, room 8-317 Temporary E, phone: extension 3215.

Wage Stabilization Board, Cyrus S. Ching, Chairman, room 8-305, Temporary E, phone: extension 2231.

National Production Authority (Department of Commerce), code 164: William Henry Harrison, Administrator, room 5800, Commerce Building, phone: extension 4423; W. Howard Chase, Director, Public Information Division, room 5111, Commerce Building, phone: extension 4464-4465.

Subservice Activities Control Board, Lafayette Building, 811 Vermont Avenue NW., code 1253: Seth Richardson, Chairman, room 419, phone: extension 804-805; Arthur Merritt, Chief, Division of Information, room 715, phone: extension 90.

Federal Civil Defense Administration, Rochambeau Apartments, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., code 1221; Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., Administrator, room 726, phone: extension 2245; Jack De Chant, Chief, Public Affairs, room 715, phone: extension 2233.

Technical Cooperation Administration (Point 4), 1901 D Street NW., State Annex No. 9, code 191: Dr. Henry G. Bennett, Administrator, room 2005, phone: extension 2162; Ben Hardy, Public Relations Officer, room 2212, phone: extension 3015.

Defense Transport Administration, Interstate Commerce Commission Building, Twelfth and Constitution Avenue, code 151: J. K. Knudson, Administrator, room 4136, phone: extension 6516; Clarence Barker, Administrative Assistant (Publications), room 5108, phone: extension 3513.

Petroleum Administration for Defense (the Department of the Interior), New Interior Building, code 181: Bruce K. Brown, Deputy Administrator, room 6654, phone: extension 3831; William J. Dougherty, Director of Information (Interior), room 7214, phone: extension 3171.

Defense Solid Fuels Administration (the Department of the Interior), New Interior Building, code 181: Dan H. Wheeler, Acting Administrator, room 6412, phone: extension 4426; William J. Dougherty.

Defense Power Administration (the Department of the Interior), New Interior Building, code 181: D. Loring Marlett, Acting Administrator, room 5459, phone: extension 5237; William J. Dougherty.

Defense Minerals Administration (the Department of the Interior), New Interior Building, code 181: James Boyd, Administrator, room 4614, phone: extension 4815; William J. Dougherty.

Defense Fisheries Administration (the Department of the Interior), New Interior Building, code 181: Albert M. Day, Administrator, room 3156, phone: extension 4717; William J. Dougherty.

Office of Defense Manpower (Department of Labor), code 177: Robert C. Goodwin, Executive Director, room 5106, phone: extension 780; Herbert Little, Director of Information, room 3218, phone: extension 24.

Bill of Rights Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, today marks the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Bill of Rights commemorating the day in 1791 on which the first 10 amendments to the Constitution were finally adopted. We are still engaged today in the struggle to validate these rights through appropriate legislation, broad public acceptance, and community cooperation. Yet the vitality of the first amendments to the Constitution is best shown by the fact that the struggle for civil rights can be waged fully in modern terms under the provisions of these amendments. There is commended to the Members on this day a rereading of the first 10 amendments of the United States Constitution which are appended, a rereading of the universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations which is also appended, and an interesting analysis on the status of civil rights in the United States contained in a study by the American Civil Liberties Union which has been widely distributed entitled "Fact Sheet for Bill of Rights Day." It shows how much still remains to be done within the framework of our own constitutional democracy on this subject. Its importance is emphasized by the momentous world struggle between us and communism, which is really a struggle for the civil rights, also called the human rights of the individual. The above-mentioned follows:

Amendments: The first 10 amendments were adopted December 15, 1791, and from what is known as the Bill of Rights.

Amendment 1: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment 2: A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

Amendment 3: No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment 4: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment 5: No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment 6: In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committeed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

Amendment 7: In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

Amendment 8: Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment 9: The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment 10: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS APPROVED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS PLENARY MEETING ON DECEMBER 10, 1948

PREAMBLE

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world;

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people;

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law;

Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations;

Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom;

Whereas member states have pledged themselves to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge: Now therefore

The General Assembly, proclaims this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and educatio to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of member states themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

Article 1

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status.

Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional, or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing, or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3

Everyone has the right to life, liberty, and the security of person.

Article 4

No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Article 5

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 6

Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 7

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 8

Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile.

Article 10

Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11

1. Everyone charged with a penal offense has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guaranties necessary for his defense.

2. No one shall be held guilty of any penal offense on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offense, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offense was committed.

Article 12

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 13

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

2. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14

1. Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

2. This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from nonpolitical crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15

1. Everyone has the right to a nationality.

2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

Article 16

1. Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality, or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage, and at its dissolution.

2. Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

3. The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 17

1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion, or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.

Article 19

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference, and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 21

1. Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

2. Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

3. The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22

Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international cooperation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social, and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23

1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

2. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration insuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

4. Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24

Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25

1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing, and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age, or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

2. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and asistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Article 26

1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

2. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

3. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

Article 27

1. Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enoy the arts, and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary, or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28

Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29

1. Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

2. In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order, and the general welfare in a democratic society.

3. These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 30

Nothing in this declaration may be interpreted as implying for any state, group, or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

Rising Prices Eat Up Three Billion Defense Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following newspaper article by Earl Richert in the Washington Daily News of December 15, 1950:

AND STILL NO CONTROLS—RISING PRICES EAT UP THREE BILLION DEFENSE DOLLARS

(By Earl Richert)

Rising prices since last June 25 have eaten up enough of our defense dollars to—

Outfit and equip 10 infantry divisions.

Buy 300 B–36 bombers, enough for 10 B–36 bomber groups.

Buy 2,250 F–80 jet fighters, enough for 30 jet fighter groups.

Buy enough tanks for 10 armored divisions.

All this could be had at today's prices for $3,000,000,000—and that, by conservative estimate of military sources, is just how much inflation and rising prices have melted away the purchasing power of the defense dollar.

In other words, we would have been able to buy this much more with the money Congress has voted and is now voting had prices been held to their pre-Korea levels.

What the military is now preparing to spend $30,000,000,000 for could have been bought for $27,000,000,000 at pre-Korea prices. (The $30,000,000,000 is a rough estimate of the amount that will be spent for procurement, research, and development, and other items directly affected by rising prices out of the $42,000,000,000 already voted and now being voted by Congress for defense.)

The military, like the individual, has found its dollars constantly melting away in purchasing power as the months go past.

Specific instances were cited this week by Chairman LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, of the Senate preparedness subcommittee.

The money which would have bought 100 miles of field wire before Korea would buy only 85 miles in September and only 78 miles in November.

The money that would buy 10,000 barrels of fuel oil before Korea would buy only 4,700 barrels in November.

The money that would have bought 1,000 truck tires before Korea would buy only 830 in September and 720 in November.

The money that would have bought 10,000 pairs of khaki trousers before Korea would buy only 7,600 in November. Money which would have bought 10,000 pairs of wool socks before Korea would buy only 8,500 in October, and even fewer today.

OTHER EXAMPLES

The military can buy only 690 pairs of surgical gloves now with the money that would have purchased 1,000 pairs before Korea; and only 72 space heaters for Navy barracks with the money that would have bought 100 before Korea.

Take an expensive item—about $50,000 apiece—like height finders for the Air Force. The money that would have bought 10 of these before Korea now will buy only 7. And the money which would have bought about 1,000 yards of jute burlap before Korea now will buy only little more than half that amount.

Over-all, wholesale prices—the level at which the military buys in most instances—have gone up nearly 10 percent since the Korean war began. But, as Senator JOHNSON's examples showed, the prices of scores of items affecting goods which the military must buy have gone up much more.

COMPARISON

Following is a list comparing prices of some defense materials as they stood in June, when some leaders such as Bernard M. Baruch called for price controls, and on December 13:

Commodity	June 23 price	Dec. 13 price	Percent increase
Lead, per pound	$0.11½	$0.17	48
Rubber, per pound	.282	.66½	133
Tin, per pound	.764	1.39	83
Copper, per pound	.224	.224	8.9
Zinc, per pound	.157	.182	16
Wool tops, per pound	2.00	3.35	67½
Steel scrap, per ton	37.50	42.50	13
(At Chicago)			
Cotton, per pound	.338	.419	24
Rosin, per 100 pounds	4.85	8.50	71
Hides, per pound	.258	.378	46
Shellac, per pound	.35	.465	33

America's Shame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier needs no comment on my part except to extend my compliments to the editor for having the courage to put into print some of the things that need to be said:

AMERICA'S SHAME

It is with a feeling of deep depression and shame that the American people discover the true nature of the man who holds the post of Chief Executive in these desperate times.

He is a man without sense of dignity or restraint as a result of the high office he holds. He publicly uses the cheap invective of back alleys to give vent to momentary anger over what he considers a slight to his family or himself. American politics has had its lurid moments in the past; but never has a Chief Executive sunk so low in public utterances or revealed so petty and vindictive a character.

How can the public at home have confidence in a man who calls a columnist an s. o. b., who declares that the Marine Corps—with men dying in Korea—has a propaganda machine comparable to Stalin's and who threatens to punch a music critic in the nose because of unfavorable comments on his daughter's singing? In his latest outburst, the President spoke of the music critic's "lousy" review, asserted that the critic would need a new nose if he (Truman) met him and declared that "Westbrook Pegler, a guttersnipe, is a gentleman compared to you." That is the President of the United States speaking.

These are no momentary outbursts of petulance resulting from a sudden lapse of temper since they have not been retracted except in the criticism of the marines. They show a man contemptuous of the rules of decent courtesy and careless of the responsibilities of his office.

May God give him strength to rise to the level of statesmanship required in these perilous times.

The Hour Is at Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include a radio broadcast made by me on the morning of December 15, 1950, in advance of the President's speech. The broadcast follows:

THE HOUR IS AT HAND

One hundred and seventy years ago, this new Nation in a new land became the heir and the hope of mankind's oldest dream: The dream of freedom—that was the United States of America.

Eight generations of Americans have been the faithful and successful guardians of that dream. Now, in this year 1950, it has become clear that our generation shall have to determine whether this dream can survive.

Ours is a struggle between freedom as against Communist slavery.

Red fascism and communism are birds of a feather and the twin enemies of our America.

We must continue to prosecute Communists who advocate the overthrow of our country by force, and convict them as we have done with the 12 in New York.

There must be no thought of appeasement or of rewarding aggression.

No one here in Washington of responsibility in the Government, in the Congress, or in either Republican or Democratic Party has the slightest desire to appease Communist China. And no one in any of these categories here ever did want to appease Communist China or has the slightest thought of taking any steps which would properly be subject to the label of appeasement. It isn't news to say that President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee have ruled appeasement out of their consideration. It was never in their considerations.

It has been proven time and again that appeasement doesn't pay. It did not prevent World War II. It cannot stop future wars. Our only honorable and practical course is to demonstrate anew that we shall not be the victims of intimidation, that we intend to stand for the right and to follow a resolute course.

We must not allow the Soviet Union to dictate our military policy. Let's run our own policy. Let's not have a crisis military policy. Let's have a stable, long-range policy that can ride over periodic crises without all this commotion and disturbance.

The Godless Russian Red hordes know no laws and have no restrictions.

Let us remember that the United Nations forces were sent into Korea on the authority and at the recommendation of the United Nations.

The United Nations forces have the advantage of superior air power and naval support, but on the ground they are confronted by a heavy numerical superiority.

The Russians are the biggest bluffers in the world. They will try and have tried to steal

us blind at the conference tables. Personally, I don't think they have the atom bomb in a stage advanced sufficient to make use of it. We must seize the initiative and force issues. First of all, by total mobilization of the Army, Navy, Air Force, the Marines, and industry on the assumption that there will be war in 4 years. Just as soon as we are strong enough we should demand outlawing of war. If Russia rejects the proposal, as she did with the atomic bomb, we make it crystal clear that we will take retaliatory measures against aggression and violation of agreement.

Ever since the Bolshevik revolution of 1918, the Soviet Union has been an armed camp. The population has had periodic purges, regimentation, campaigns of terror, and oppression, costing untold millions of Russian lives. If we could get their people to revolt from within the Reds might be overthrown.

Stalin has proved that he intends to conquer the world, that he will use whatever means are at hand to do it, that he will use war whenever that is the most expedient course.

The United States and United Nations have stated that they will resist his attempts, that they will stand by the principles of the United Nations and fight aggression.

Unless either of these powerful forces surrender their intentions, world war III is inevitable. It is bound to come. We must face this fact.

Stalin and his satellites are at war with United Nations. In spirit, they are not, and never have been, part of United Nations. The United Nations will never succeed as long as they remain in it.

Their tactics prove that they are using the world organization only to subvert the purpose for which it was formed.

When German and Japanese armies surrendered in late 1945, there was an immediate and irresistible demand in the United States for immediate demobilization of the victorious armies. In 1946, most of the great American war machine was taken apart and discarded.

Incidentally, I was not a Member of Congress in 1946 and 1947 which were the 2 years the Republicans were in absolute control.

It was during this same year 1946 that Soviet Russia quickly disclosed its acquisitive and imperialist inclinations.

If the United States had maintained its armed strength intact, then the United States would have been in a physical position to contest the initial advances. But the United States had not maintained its physical position intact. On the contrary, the United States had become less potent.

The administration wanted to resist Soviet imperialism sooner and more vigorously than it did. But Republican power politics prevented it.

As soon as the chaos of demobilization had given way to some minimum reforming of the United States Armed Forces, the United States did begin to resist Soviet imperialism.

President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee have reviewed together the outstanding problems facing our two countries in international affairs. The objectives of our two nations in foreign policy are the same: "To maintain world peace and respect for the rights and interests of all peoples, to promote strength and confidence among the freedom-loving countries of the world, to eliminate the causes of fear, want, and discontent, and to advance the democratic way of life."

The President has stated: "For our part, we are ready, as we have always been, to seek an end to the hostilities by means of negotiation."

We recognize that adequate defense forces are essential if war is to be prevented.

The President, after conferring with the Big Four Democratic leaders in Congress, indicated a state of national emergency should be declared.

Many months ago on the floor of the House, I recommended all out mobilization and overall controls, retroactive to May 15, 1950.

Furthermore, as each National Guard unit is mobilized, we should have immediate replacements and training units at all times; likewise, as Reserve units are called, we should have further replacements of each individual and group in order to maintain a full Reserve.

During the duration of this emergency prices have increased greatly. There is one group that needs immediate attention, and that is the aged. These deserving old people should be paid at least $20 more monthly from the Federal Treasury, otherwise they will suffer unduly for the lack of food, clothing, shelter, medicine, and the necessities of life. This should continue until the emergency is over, or until prices decline, or until a more adequate, direct Federal old-age pension system is inaugurated.

The first thought of the Congress, the Government, and the first thought in every man's mind must be the defense of the country. The President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended that we should have Armed Forces of 4,000,000. Congress favors this. As long as Russia is a threat, our preparedness expense will run high. The people will not be lulled into a sense of false security.

You and your neighbors are the strength of your Government, the strength of these United States in every period of crisis. With this calm strength, we can and will overcome the present threat, great as it is, to the peace and security that is our goal.

The President could not have picked a better man to place in charge of the Office of Defense Mobilization than Charles Wilson, of General Electric. He knows how to get the job done.

This is not a war of ideas. That dangerous illusion must be killed. This is primarily a war of bullets, bombs, tanks, guns, planes, and armies.

We should consider former Senator Josh Lee's plan—draft wealth with men.

Congress will likely enact universal military training, as outlined by unanimous vote for Association American University in session, but will likely be compelled to also invoke universal military service because of the international situation at this time.

We should improve selective service, use young men found unfit for active duty in the field service in the Department of Defense for whatever other duties might best contribute to the national interest. We should expand the ROTC in schools and give our young men a training of high moral standards similar to that given at West Point and Annapolis.

Stalin sees Europe weak and divided, apparently ripe for taking by the 165 divisions he controls west of the Urals. However, United States atomic superiority makes him hesitate. We should threaten him with the use of the atom bomb, unless the Red invasions stop. Mao sees Asia falling apart. Its pieces offer rich prizes for his armies of 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 men. Western powers, with less than half a million in the Orient, already are being pushed out by Communists.

On hundreds of occasions I have pointed out the possibility of further aggression. The aggression in Korea is but a plot compared with possible aggression by the Reds in Iraq, Iran, Saudi-Arabia, the island of Bahrein, Alaska, Germany, Japan, and other places.

Western Europe is the great prize of Russian strategy. Here are the shipbuilding facilities, aircraft factories, arsenals, large cities, resources, and manpower for great armies that someday may try to conquer America. These are defended now by only 19 divisions.

Iran and Iraq, which supply most of Western Europe's oil, are wide open to invasion. Stalin wants that oil, as well as the oil in Saudi-Arabia and the island of Bahrein. You will recall that 11 Members of Congress, of which group I was a member, viewed these countries first hand 5 years ago and warned that Russia wanted these rich oil fields.

Tibet is being taken over by Mao. That will give Communists a downhill drive into India, with 325,000,000 people, and into Pakistan.

Korea, if lost, leaves Japan open to attack. United States has 100,000 combat troops in or near Korea; Britain has 85,000 soldiers in or near Korea and Malaya. Communists are pushing them out, or they have been or are being evacuated.

Indochina, if lost, opens way to conquest of Thailand, Burma, Malaya, and Indonesia.

France, with 150,000 soldiers in Indochina, is losing.

Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines form a strong chain which can prevent the spread of Communist aggression beyond the Asiatic mainland. As islands, they can be defended from invasion by a strong fleet, including carrier-based air power. If we breach the chain by giving up one link to the enemy, we have abandoned the means of arresting the spread of Communist aggression.

Military authorities and State Department officials point out that it is absolutely essential that we prevent the Communist aggressors from obtaining control of Formosa. That island was wrested from the Japs by American manpower and American blood. For us to allow it to be turned over to our enemies would be cowardly. We would be breaking faith with those Americans who died fighting in World War II, and those who are now fighting and dying in Korea.

Formosa is but 250 miles from the Philippines and 600 miles from Japan. In World War II, the Japs used Formosa as a base for operations and staged the invasion of the Philippines from there. What the Japs did, the Communists might also do.

On Formosa there are almost 300,000 to 600,000 well-trained Chinese troops who are loyal to the United Nations and friendly to the United States. They are willing to fight and die to prevent the triumph of communism. Defense officials, the President, and Congress should weigh the possibility of using these men.

It will be necessary for Congress to increase defense appropriations and manpower for the armed forces. Yesterday we passed another large supplemental appropriation bill for this purpose.

We must increase our supply of strategic raw materials of which we are short.

Completion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization plans for Western Europe's defense should be formally announced soon. Then, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower will be appointed supreme commander, and the United States will speed up the flow of arms to Europe. The United States should and will devote much time and energy in the Pacific to strengthening Japan and the Philippines. The question of rearming Japan and Germany must be carefully weighed and a prompt decision reached.

The rate of construction of freight cars, pipelines, essential defense plants will be speeded up early in 1951, requiring production cutbacks in autos, and many other civilian goods.

Defense orders will grow so rapidly that the Government will take complete control of allocations of steel in a short time.

There will be acute shortages of skilled manpower for production of electronic and other specialized types of military equipment in the first half of 1951.

We will actually need 200,000 machine tools per year. The Munitions Board is

readying plans to put back into 100 percent defense work more than 70 percent of 450 industrial reserve plants—those owned by the United States of America but sold under a contract requiring them to convert to defense production in 120-days' notice.

In order for agriculture to properly perform we must be assured of our fair share of steel and other necessary materials, after defense needs have been met. For many months I have been working toward that end, urging officials of the National Production Authority and the Secretary of Agriculture to see that our farmers' needs were met.

More than a year ago, I felt that I foresaw the likelihood of an all-out war, and I recommended at that time on the floor of the House of Representatives to the Agricultural Committee a much greater acreage and production of cotton.

Agriculture will play an important role in any preparedness or defense program. Oklahoma is both an agricultural and oil State, therefore it can and will do more than its part.

We must keep our powder dry, otherwise international disaster will be our reward.

We must take our fleets, submarines and planes out of mothballs and place them in fighting order without delay—We need to expand our jet-plane facilities and speed up our atom-bomb production. A number of Congressmen, including myself, have visited the atom-bomb plants, which has caused us to appreciate the value of same during the present international situation.

This means that military preparation must have No. 1 priority in United States and every free nation. All else is secondary and must be subordinate to it.

The United States Government must face facts. It must tell people that they face another world war and must make complete preparation for it.

It is the only possible hope of preventing world war III (by forcing Stalin to change his plans) or of surviving that war when it finally comes. Half-way measures will not work.

We must establish a Federal civil defense structure to provide means and leadership to coordinate State and local civil-defense measures.

The UN should consider the creation of an international force.

The point 4 program for helping backward nations will be increased, but only if it does not interfere with military aid.

Stalin's Red Russia should be ousted from the United Nations as soon as practicable. The UN today is not a United Nations organization. It is a group of nations whose desire for unity to bring peace, freedom, and justice to the world is frustrated and defeated at every turn by Stalin and his stooges. Every session should open and close with prayer.

Complete economic boycott of Russia and its satellites should be instituted by United States to weaken Communist governments as much as possible, impair their war-making ability, and encourage disaffection from Moscow.

Free nations must start to subvert Stalin Russia. Voice of America should give more hope to the people it reaches. China is the best place to start subversion of Stalin. Just as his conquest of China had great psychological and military effect, his loss of this huge territory would have an equally bad effect—in Asia and all the world.

The Communist regime in China is unpopular. There are wide-scale insurrections. There are well over a million guerrillas in China proper. The free world should take advantage of these conditions and similar conditions in all Communist-controlled nations.

A coalition of all anti-Communist governments, similar to anti-Fascist alliance of World War II, must be formed.

We may need a 90-group Air Force. I voted for a larger Air Force many months ago. We need to enlarge our Navy attack-carrier force to at least 25. We need at least 500 submarines, 40 cruisers, a half dozen more battleships in commission for training purposes, and about 30 light and escort carriers. We need to modernize carrier aviation and make truly modern, flush-deck-type aircraft carriers. We need to increase the size of our Marine force. It takes all the components.

Many Members, like myself, have consistently voted for a full preparedness program at every opportunity.

But there always has been, and still is, a very serious question about the proportion of American energies and resources which can wisely be used to punish aggression by China in a world in which China is the secondary, not the primary, aggressor. If Russia is the real opponent, then it is a matter of elementary strategy that proposed western maneuvers always should be tested against the question: Does this weaken or strengthen the position of the west against the Russians?

It is no longer a question whether we will choose to talk to the Chinese. They have the military whip in hand. It is a question whether they would talk with us or the United Nations. Prospects are negligible that they would. But if by remote chance talks should take place, the American purpose in those talks would be to reserve as much American strength as possible for the continuing struggle with the primary antagonist, Russia, instead of spending it in struggle with a secondary antagonist, China.

We should deplore the present efforts by many snipers to make capital of our country's crisis. A distinction must be made between sober, constructive criticism and partisan advantage seeking.

Everything we do or say today, as individuals or groups, or as political organizations, should be measured by the yardstick of how our words might affect the whole international situation. This does not mean that criticism of our Government or our foreign policy must be suppressed or throttled. But it does mean that there is a new and important obligation upon all of us to exercise the utmost responsibility now that America is operating on a world stage.

It is quite clear since 1945 that Red Russia has attempted to crack the common front of freedom wide open at every opportunity. The Soviet Union has been successful in many instances of cutting off the good will and support of the world's people from America.

As your Representative in Congress I intend to continue to devote my full time to the service of my district, State, and Nation. At no time during my service as your Congressman have I ever had any other interest than that. I realize that many public officials, including myself, have been unduly criticized, but I always try to remember the words of Lincoln, and I quote:

"Duty as seen by Lincoln: 'If I were to try to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference.'"

Our national needs are far greater than those of myself or any individual.

We Americans have a national emergency without precedent, which cannot be met by confusion, division, or hysteria, but through a clear and accurate understanding of the danger and of our strength to meet it, and by a sober sense of our individual responsibility.

We can develop the enlightened and inspired unity on which our future as a free people largely depends.

We share a common danger and a common hope with all the free people of the world.

We should decentralize our strategic Government offices and defense plants, moving them away from the larger cities.

The military capabilities of the United States and the United Kingdom should be increased as rapidly as possible. The same is true of other United Nations members. The President has stressed this.

It is absolutely necessary that we prevent materials and items of strategic importance from flowing into the hands of those who might use them against the free world.

The Secretaries of Commerce, Defense, and State have already taken remedial action to see that this be done.

War production should be around the clock—24 hours a day.

America, as a Nation, and you and I, as individual American citizens, must rededicate and reconsecrate our lives at this time.

The need is for steady nerves, for calmness of judgment and firmness of action, and, above all, unity in our determination to preserve our national integrity and our way of life against any attack.

Certainly, we must refuse to listen now to the shrill voices of discontent and disunity from certain radio commentators which always arise in a time of national crisis. Their motives are clear, if you will read their bitter, vindictive, and irresponsible words on the editorial pages and in the columns of some of our metropolitan newspapers, and hear them on the radio, you will know that most Americans loathe their tactics and discount their lies and distortions. But their steady hammering, their constant distortion of truth, their daily repetition of lies, could have the cumulative effect of weakening our Nation and its position in the world. We can combat these vocal saboteurs of unity by seeing that the people know the truth and that they have the opportunity to recognize this campaign of distortions for what it is.

We must spread the burden evenly and absolutely prevent excessive war profiteering.

I have recommended to Congress and suggested to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Veterans' Administration that hereafter a straight $10,000 gratuity be paid to the family of a veteran upon his death, in lieu of the insurance. This will reduce paper work, simplify payments, and assure every veteran's family of being cared for. At the present time many do not take out any insurance.

In the circumstances which confront us throughout the world our nations have no other choice but to devote themselves with all vigor to the building up of our defense forces. We shall do this purely as a defensive measure.

Only Congress Can Declare War and Make Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in presenting to this body a transcript of a speech by a former Member. I am speaking of a radio address made on radio station KISD, in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on December 3, 1950, by

former Republican Congressman C. A. Christopherson, of South Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, I have long sought the advice and counsel of Mr. Christopherson. He is a grand gentleman and in South Dakota, he is considered as an elder statesman.

Mr. Christopherson is an astute student of political science and international affairs. Mix in this wealth of knowledge with his good common sense and you can understand why his advice is worth while and worthy of consideration by every American.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following to the attention of every Member of this body. An important message vital to all of us in these grave times is contained therein.

ONLY CONGRESS CAN DECLARE WAR AND MAKE TREATIES

There is an old saying, among the rural folks, that a rooster "fights best in his own barn yard." Anyone who has lived on a farm has seen the rooster bristle up to strange birds coming into his flock, and fight with courage and determination to destroy or drive the intruder away.

We are now in this Korean war, learning the truth of that saying. The North Koreans are fighting with a vengeance and utter disregard of life, which points to the problem of the stranger who has come in to settle differences. We are learning that to carry on a war 7,000 miles away, is a task more devastating to us than it is to the enemy we are trying to discipline, who is fighting on his own ground.

This Korean war points to a phase of our national procedure which is dangerous, to say the least—a direct violation of our Federal Constitution, which contains the following paragraph, one of the powers granted to Congress, viz: "To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water."

The framers of our Constitution, profound students of government, possessed the knowledge that in foreign lands high officials and military men had the say of when the nation should go to war. People had no say in this important step. Realizing this, our founding fathers caused to be inserted in our basic law the words I have quoted, placing the power to go to war solely in Congress—the representatives of the people.

This provision of our Constitution has been observed, beginning with the declaration of War of 1812, and since, until this Korean war. Yes, I know they say it was "police action" by the United Nations. Who ordered General MacArthur to send troops pronto from Japan to Korea? Not the United Nations, I am sure. If they did they have more control of us than they have of other members of the UN, in that to all others they sent out word that the North Koreans had invaded South Korea, and a mild request for all to come in and help.

Congress was in session; the matter could have been laid before Congress and had consideration there immediately. But Congress was bypassed and some Washington authority ordered MacArthur to take the steps he did.

I have often, during the summer and fall, as the war and its problems developed for us, pondered what Congress would have done with this foreign potato if President Truman had submitted it to that body. I realize that it is useless to be figuring on that now, but I have some doubt if Congress would have approved of our going in and shouldering the full responsibility, as we have and are doing. Especially so, as not only some of our high officials but Members of Congress had expressed doubts about our attempting to defend Korea. But that body was not given the opportunity to determine this question. All that Congress has been asked about the matter is to appropriate the money with which to meet the extraordinary cost of the war.

The plain unvarnished facts are that we have now been in a costly war in Korea for more than 5 months, without any declaration of war by Congress, notwithstanding the specific provision of the Constitution which I have quoted.

Regardless of what Congress would have done with this if submitted to it, the step taken is a dangerous one to our welfare and security.

For the last 18 years, the practice has arisen whereby the executive branch of our Government finds ways in which to bypass our basic law, thereby setting at naught the provision written therein by our wise and learned founders who sought to safeguard future generations from rule by a "clique of self-centered officers" who may be entrusted with power.

Going to war is the most serious step a people can take; a step that should never be taken until our legislative branch of the Government has had the opportunity to consider and determine whether the exigencies are such as to justify such a drastic and dangerous step. The word "dangerous" is a mild designation, for it has been said that war is the "cancer" upon civilization. With the present destructive instruments of war, that is just what it is; and it is my belief that no nation can engage in a full-scale war 7,000 miles from home and escape the dire consequences of an economic collapse in the homeland. We hear frequent reference from high officials for "maintaining military strength" but nothing about our financial stability. Recently James Byrnes, the well-known statesman of South Carolina, said on this subject, "Our first defense is a solvent American economy." Those are words our officials charged with responsibility should ponder seriously.

In other ways our executive officials are bypassing Congress. Only recently a delegation from France came here seeking aid for France to maintain its colonial rule over the French Indochinese. When they went home they had the promise of $6,000,000,000, if necessary. So far as I know, this was never submitted to Congress. Later that body will be asked to appropriate the money. The question of aid to France is for our participation in a French Indochinese war; definitely one for Congress to determine before any commitment is made. If this practice continues, we will soon have here the centralized government we decry abroad and which we are expending ourselves to suppress. Let us hope the incoming Congress, the Eighty-second, will have heard enough during their vacation on the home front; observed the trend in the recent election, to the extent that it will retrieve its constitutional functions, and display a degree of independence that will say to the White House and other branches of the executive department, that it will not tolerate any further invasion of its field. That commitments of huge sums for foreign purposes will not be approved simply because a promise has been made. That such will only be approved, if meritorious, regardless of commitments made by high officials without authority from Congress. It is time Congress begins to function in its own right; break the White House influence and exercise independence on Capitol Hill.

We are now engaged in a costly war; one which if continued may break us financially. But our officials seem to be sailing along with an utter disregard of consequences. As for instance, President Truman, last winter, before we were in this war, submitted what he termed his point 4 program, which has for its purpose raising the standing of living in all backward nations. That of course may take in the entire world, in that we hold to the belief that no people have the standard of living that we enjoy. Congress very generously appropriated the sum of $34,500,000 to inaugurate this program.

A few days ago the President appointed Mr. Henry G. Bennett, of Oklahoma A. & M. College, to set in motion this program. Now that this costly war is on, would it not seem sensible to forget about this standard of living for people in all other parts of the world and think of our own situation? Who will help raise our standard when we find ourselves in the whirlpool of insolvency, toward which we are, with indifference, floating? Ere long Mr. Bennett will have a staff of helpers numbered in thousands, traveling about the world, telling people in other lands how many bathtubs they must have; how to mix and bake their bread, and so forth. Have we not learned by this time that foreigners do not want our advice nor our standard of living? They are living their life as they want it; have done so for a thousand years or more. All they want of us is our money and, if we are so anxious to get rid of same, the foreigners will be pleased if we will send same to them, minus the advice. They will be happy with that arrangement, but incensed at us for presuming to tell them how to live.

As I have been attempting to keep in touch with the many involvements and complications that are befalling us, I have come to the conclusion we as a people have one pronounced weakness, great as we are. It is this, we never seem big enough or courageous enough to admit a mistake. That is especially true of our officials in charge of our foreign affairs. Perhaps, when our President submitted his point 4 program, it may have seemed to have some merit. But, now with the war, which will absorb every nickel and dime we can spare, it seems prudence would suggest that this is no time to try to expend our dwindling resources in an effort to change the mode of life of some near 2,000,000,000 people; let this point 4 sleep until some more favorable time. But no, having once proposed same it must be carried out regardless of changed conditions. To do otherwise might be construed as a mistake in the first place.

Similar analysis can be applied to the much advertised Marshall plan, which in my opinion has primarily made many foreign people dependent upon us. But whatever may have been the necessity for its inauguration in the first place, that necessity has been overcome by the war and the money we are spending abroad for war supplies at a high price. Foreign people are making money from us on account of the war. This is evidenced by the fact that we are losing in adverse trade balances near a billion and a half dollars, in gold, each year. But no, having proposed this plan, it must go on, regardless of what becomes of us here at home. You will recall that Mr. Paul Hoffman, in what I believe was his last appearance before a congressional committee, on this Marshall-plan help, in response to a question, said, in his opinion it must be continued for an indefinite number of years. He should have added, "Just so long as we are gullible enough to continue to shell out; Europeans will never say quit."

Our foreign involvements are more serious than any before. The Korean war took a surprising adverse turn, pointing to the fact we are fighting on unknown terrain, against forces well organized who resort to tricks and ways unknown to us. We have considered our adversaries stupid; have said so pub-

licly. Time we come down to earth and realize we are fighting forces that if they cannot lick us on the field of action, can exhaust us in manpower as well as economically. Then what shall we have gained; who in all the lands of the world will help Uncle Sam? None, and what is more, many are now chuckling at the predicament we find ourselves in. Better try some sane and level diplomacy; bluff and display of arms do not seem to get us anywhere.

In the meantime, may we all offer fervent prayers for our bewildered, fearless forces, who have been surrounded in an unknown land, by fighters that spring up, in front, rear, and both sides, in numbers they cannot stop. It is a tragic fate that has befallen our soldiers, because of stupidity or lack of knowledge on the part of our swivel-chair leaders.

Address of Hon. William M. Boyle, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an address by the Honorable William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, delivered at the national committee dinner in New York City on December 12, 1950:

We are meeting tonight at a serious and solemn hour. At this moment our Armed Forces with the forces of other countries of the United Nations are fighting heroically.

Because the security of our Nation is at stake we do not meet solely as partisan members of a political party. Instead we gather together as Americans to join hands with all other Americans to pray—to work—to fight for the security of our country.

Your meeting in this spirit of patriotism and unity is a tribute to the leader of the Democratic Party, our great President, Harry S. Truman.

He has the courage, determination, and the will to confront the dangerous forces that would seek to destroy us. I know that all patriotic Americans, regardless of political affiliations, will join together to cooperate with him.

The Congress and the President need continuous and outspoken support from all loyal Americans for the steps which must be taken.

The danger to our security has been growing increasingly clear as the enemies of freedom drive relentlessly on.

Thus we gather, not to celebrate, not to achieve political aims, not as representatives of any partisan group, but as Americans who are concerned about the problems which confront our Nation and the world.

I know the feelings with which thousands of families, in every part of the country, have waited for news of their loved ones. They have been fighting to win for us the right to live in security and peace.

I, too, know these feelings.

We must all be worthy of the sacrifices that are being made for us. We are worthy when we stick to our jobs. We are worthy when our farmers, working men and women, in fact, every citizen, puts in the productive energy which has made the United States the greatest Nation in history.

Today, civilization wavers between a better life than we have ever known, or a world of total slavery. As we stand at this crossroad let us realize that the battle for the survival of democracy will not of itself be resolved. This struggle for the world, now being waged, is a contest to the finish, because the triumph of brutal aggression would spell the doom of freedom.

In this battle for life, let's look up with confidence to what we have, and to our capacity for engineering the triumph of good over evil.

Not many decades back the founders of this Nation reached above the rule of tyranny and with divine guidance brought down a segment of that power from above—and gave to man the power to rule himself.

They gave vitality to the thoughts of philosophers and statesmen. They launched democracy—by instituting a government which derived its right from the consent of the governed. In so doing we recognized that man—the individual man—was first, and that the state existed but to protect his rights. We openly acknowledged that man was greater than the state—because the state has no immortal soul.

This is the hour in which we proudly point to our heritage as Americans. Those who pioneered this great Nation were ready and willing to make any sacrifice for the good of the Nation and its people. In the same way, we in our generation must meet whatever demands are made upon us for the sake of our country.

No sacrifice will be too great for patriotic citizens to make for the security of the Nation. When the security of this Nation is at stake, there is no time for partisan politics.

Patriotism must come before politics and before profits.

The hour has passed when men may think in terms of pettiness. Selfishness, envy, and greed must not be a part of the thinking of mankind if we are to save America, preserve our freedom, and give hope to a staggering world.

Now, more than at any time in the past, the need is for steady nerves—for resolute purpose, for calmness of judgment and firmness of action. Above all, we need a single-minded unity in our determination to preserve our national integrity and our way of life against any attack.

Certainly we must refuse to listen now to the shrill voices of discontent and disunity. Those individuals who seek to sow distrust and to divide us should feel the full weight of public condemnation.

I can no longer refrain from plain speaking about the small group whose words are aimed to divide our country in time of peril. I believe the people of this country will rise up in wrath against these narrow selfish men who put partisan advantage ahead of the safety of their country.

While politics in a partisan sense is out—politics in the highest meaning of patriotism and service to mankind should be continued and advanced.

The Democratic Party will hold intact the progress we have made for the benefit of the farmers, workers, business and professional men and women, and for all the people of this country.

The Democratic Party will continue to be the party of the people as it has been since the days of Thomas Jefferson, and as it has advanced under the stirring leadership of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman. But, in so doing, the Democratic Party will cooperate with all Americans for the good of the country.

Let no one outside of the United States be misled by the clamor of our election campaigns into thinking that Americans are so divided that they cannot unite for the security of our Nation.

When the votes are counted, both sides, Democrats and Republicans, take their gains and losses in accordance with the will of the majority of the people.

Totalitarian dictators, who make a farce of elections by forcing their subjected people to vote as they are told, find it difficult to understand how free people may vote against a man and yet, when he is elected, support him. These dictators miss the whole point of democracy. They underestimate the hidden wells of strength that feed life and courage to our people.

I believe each of our two great parties has an important part to play in maintaining our free way of life in these times.

That is why I intend to stick to my job as chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

I intend to do the best I can to help make sure that democracy works at home while the free world looks to the United States to help bring victory and peace.

The fundamental issue of the moment, the fight between freedom and Communist slavery, is part of the continuous progress in the government of men. In this fight, our country—by the grace of God—stands a free, prosperous, and strong Nation.

This is an hour in which men with firm convictions renew their belief in the democratic way of life—indeed, in their faith in Almighty God. The faith of our fathers must be found in our hearts, in our minds and souls, as we stand steadfast today in support of our leaders.

As America has no desire for one inch of territory—as we fight to preserve the decency of mankind and the freedom of the world—so, we who are a part of the Democratic Party have no desire for partisan political advantage, as we join hands with loyal Republicans to give to America its greatest strength.

If we will stand as loyal Americans, we can survive the terrific ordeal which faces us. And, when the clouds of the crisis have cleared away, we will continue to have the right and privilege of perpetuating a government which will be the servant of the people. That is made possible by our traditional two-party system.

We realize that no nation ever had greater responsibility for the future of the world. American democracy is the hope of the world. If the light of freedom were to be extinguished here, future generations would know only slavery. Accordingly, as the responsibility of world leadership is ours, let us, Americans, all Americans, go forward with unity of purpose.

Let us not leave to the future a task which we ourselves must face. If we are to accomplish this end it cannot be done by mere feeble words or petty bickering. It cannot be won by indifference. It cannot be achieved by delegating the task to someone else.

It can only be gained by constant, positive, individual action on the part of each of us, working together.

Without this approach we struggle in vain, because the strength of policy, the power of Government itself, is only as strong or as weak as you and I make it.

This year is the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the election of Thomas Jefferson as President of the United States. As Democrats we can take justifiable pride in the fact that he founded the Democratic Party. We can take pride in keeping our party strong and vigorous. We can be proud of the Democratic program for the benefit of all the people of America.

America will win through this period of danger. I pray God that the day will soon come when the blessings of peace and prosperity will be made secure to every person in this land, and when the bountiful production of all the great industries of the

world will be fully available for the peaceful advancement of mankind instead of for destruction.

These are our objectives. I ask all Americans to join with us tonight in the spirit of the words of Thomas Jefferson: "Let us unite with one heart and one mind."

Ohio Vote Law Needs Clarification

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, it was my extreme privilege to join this august body in a time of great national emergency. And to have shared in the deliberations and decisions which enabled American arms to emerge victorious in World War II has been a matter of great personal satisfaction.

Because it now appears that my service on behalf of the Fourteenth Ohio Congressional District may be temporarily interrupted by the irregularities beclouding a clear-cut decision in that district's 1950 elections, I take occasion today to express my deep regret that such an interruption should occur when this Nation is faced with crisis of even greater urgency.

I express the belief that this cessation of service will be only temporary and of short duration, for the issue has yet to be determined. The election in the Fourteenth Ohio district is under contest. And before a final determination has been made, thorough and exhaustive investigation of the irregularities claimed will have been concluded by two committees of this House.

The contest in my district is based upon patently illegal procedures on the part of several county election boards and the secretary of state of Ohio in ignoring the clear mandate of the Ohio Constitution on the equitable rotation of the names of candidates on an election ballot.

Attention of the House committees was brought to bear on these irregularities because of the contention of the Ohio State Supreme Court that it does not have jurisdiction, even in the face of a clear-cut violation of the State constitution, because the contest relates to the election of a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Studies of several competent and nationally known election analysts show plainly that the positional disadvantage suffered by this contestant had an important bearing on the outcome of voting in the Fourteenth Ohio District.

My confidence that I shall soon return to your midst is based upon the spirit of fair play so dear to the heart of every American and my confidence that the citizens of my district will want to see their representative to this body selected on a fair and equitable basis in accordance with the rules of the game.

I am inserting in the RECORD at this point several newspaper items that explain the illegal rotation of ballots that occurred in the Fourteenth Congressional District:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of December 8, 1950]

OHIO VOTE LAW NEEDS CLARIFICATION

(By Clem Thompson)

WASHINGTON.—A strange flaw in the workings of the Massachusetts ballot in Ohio has just been revealed by the defeat of Representative WALTER B. HUBER, Akron Democrat, and his protest of the election. Certainly, as the Akron Beacon-Journal has pointed out, it calls for clarification of procedure by the Ohio Legislature. Worse than that. It appears to this correspondent, after careful study of the figures, that Representative HUBER was defeated and WILLIAM H. AYRES, Republican, was elected only because of the flaw in the use of the ballot.

It arose this way: The new constitutional amendment adopting the Massachusetts ballot for Ohio, provided for rotation of the names of candidates for an office on the ballot. It declared that each should be at the top of this group "substantially an equal number of times."

But suppose you have eight men running for State representatives and three for Congress, as was the case in Summit County. When you print your ballots, how do you rotate the names of each office? They took the matter to Ohio's secretary of state, Charles F. Sweeney.

Mr. Sweeney searched the law and came upon Ohio 4785–80 dealing with primary elections. This provided that the number of ballots to be printed should be divided by the largest number of candidates for any one office and that the quotient would be the number of ballots printed in each series.

Take it this way: Summit County was to use 600 books of ballots. It had eight candidates for State representative. Divide 600 by 8 and your quotient is 75.

That means that on your first series of 75 ballots Candidate A (for State representative) would be at the top of the list for that office. On the next series he would go to the bottom. Candidate B would move up to the top, and so on. Each of the eight would be at the top an equal number of times.

But what about the three running for Congress? Well, every time they stopped the press to change the list for State representative, they also changed the candidates for Congress.

They made eight different press runs on the ballot, as we saw above. But you can't divide three into eight and come out even. So in Summit County one candidate for Congress was at the top three times, another was at the top three times. What difference did that make? You will see.

Lorain County, in the same congressional district, has voting machines. It would have been easy to rotate all candidates evenly. But Lorain followed the same system at Summit. It worked out even worse. Lorain's largest number of candidates for any office was four. Its machines, therefore, were set up in four series—a different candidate for State representative at the top for each series.

Again you cannot divide three into four and come out even. So one candidate for Congress was at the top twice out of every four machines. This was AYRES. Another was there once, Robert G. Brenneman, Independent. The third was also there once, HUBER.

Because Lorain County has voting machines, figures are available there to show how each candidate ran when in each position. Presumably the same effects were felt in the other three counties of the congressional district, where paper ballots were used.

Keep in mind that in the race for Congressman AYRES was at the top 74 times in Lorain County, second 37 times, third 37 times, HUBER was the top 37 times, second 37 times, and third 74 times.

An independent, Robert Brenneman, virtually unknown, was at the top 37 times, second 74 times, third 37 times. We'll ignore him from now on except to point out that when he was at the top he got an average of 31 votes; when he was at the bottom, he got an average of 4. He illustrates that position plainly drew votes.

Strangely, however, both HUBER and AYRES ran better when their names were second on the list than when first. Only third place apparently was costly.

When listed first, AYERS got an average of 148 votes; when second, 156 votes; when third, 92.

HUBER got, when first, 126; when second, 137; first, 73.

Now each of them should have been in each position 49 times. Suppose we shift them about to come out that way. Here, admittedly, we run into speculation. We presume, for instance, that if you take a man out of top position and put him in third, he will then get the vote which he actually averaged when in third position.

At the election AYERS was actually in first position 74 times. To cut him down to 49, we shift him from first to second 12 times and from first to third 12 times.

On a shift, first to second, he gains 8 votes to the precinct or 96. On the shift, first to third, he loses 672. His net loss is 576.

Leave HUBER last 49 times. Shift him to second 12 times. He gains 768 votes. Shift him to first 12 times. He gains another 636 votes. His net gain is 1,404 votes.

AYRES' loss and HUBER's gain, added, total 1,980. HUBER lost the election by 1,921 votes. Presumably, then, if each candidate had been in each place an equal number of times, HUBER would have won by 59 votes.

And that adjustment is for Lorain County alone. Presumably it should be made for the other three counties also.

HUBER protested to Ohio's Secretary of State against certifying the election of AYERS, on grounds the election was illegal because candidates' names did not head the list in substantially an equal number of times. His protest, however, was ignored and AYRES' certificate filed here with the Clerk of the House Monday.

HUBER has said he will protest to the House against the seating of AYERS, a process that requires 7 or 8 months, at least, for adjudication. The last unseating was in a New Hampshire election in 1939, on grounds of error in the count.

Whatever the result of the protest, it seems clear that Ohio had better clarify its law.

[From the Akron Beacon-Journal of November 22, 1950]

BEHIND THE FRONT PAGE

(By Robert H. Stopher and James S. Jackson)

BALLOT

Regardless of the outcome of Representative WALTER B. HUBER's demand for a congressional investigation of the November 7 election in the Fourteenth District, the legislature can be expected to plug a loophole in the State's election laws which HUBER's protest has revealed.

Besides asking the House Committee on Elections to probe the Fourteenth District vote, the Akron Democrat has asked the secretary of state to order another election here and meanwhile to hold up certification of

Republican WILLIAM H. AYRES as Congressman-elect.

HUBER's protest is based on the fact that in all four counties in the district his name appeared in the bottom position on the ballot oftener than it was at the top.

Instructions from the secretary of state were followed by boards of elections and ballot printers in all four counties. (An interesting coincidence, by the way, is the fact that the ballots for Summit and Portage Counties were printed by Craftsman Press, a company in which Democratic Chairman Clarence E. Motz has an interest.)

The instructions were based on the section of Ohio law (4785-80) which prescribes the method of rotating candidates' names on the ballot in a primary election. This section says:

"The names of candidates on all such primary ballots shall be printed in rotation. The whole number of ballots to be printed shall be divided by the greatest number of persons whose names have been duly presented for any office and not withdrawn, and the quotient shall be the number of ballots in each series of ballots to be printed as follows:

"The names of candidates shall be arranged in alphabetical order and the first series of ballots printed; then the first name shall be placed last and the next series printed, so shall the process be repeated until each name shall have been printed first.

"The ballots shall then be combined in tablets by collecting one from each series of ballots in regular order, and so repeating, so that no two of the same order of names shall be together."

HOW IT WORKED

In Summit County, the whole number of (books of) ballots to be printed was 600.

The greatest number of persons whose names had been presented for any office was eight—four Republican and four Democratic nominees for State representative.

Six hundred divided by 8 gave a quotient of 75—the number of ballots in each series to be printed.

After 75 (or a multiple of 75) ballots had been printed, the press was stopped and the name of Candidate A for State representative was moved to the bottom of the list. At the same time the name of WILLIAM H. AYRES was moved to the bottom in the Congress list.

After 75 more ballots had been printed, the press again was stopped, Candidate B for State representative was moved to the bottom and at the same time the name of Robert G. Brenneman was moved to the bottom in the Congress list.

This process was repeated until all eight candidates for State representative had had an equal number of turns at the top of the list. But AYRES, who started out at the top of the Congress list, occupied the No. 1 position in three of the eight series—that is, on three-eighths of all the ballots printed.

Brenneman also was at the top through three series, but HUBER, starting out at the bottom, was No. 1 in only two series or on one-fourth of the ballots.

In Portage, Medina, and Lorain Counties—where the trouble was caused by the difficulty in reconciling three congressional candidates with four candidates for State representative—the disadvantage to Huber was greater. In those counties his name was at the top of the list one time out of four, in the middle once, and at the bottom twice. AYRES was at the top twice, in the middle once, and at the bottom once.

CONSTITUTION

The new constitutional amendment providing for the Massachusetts ballot says candidates names shall be rotated so that each appears in every position "substantially an equal number of times."

However, the secretary of state chose to base his instructions to election boards on the more specific statute which governs primary elections.

Whether HUBER wins or loses on his protest, the new legislature is likely to revise the law to prevent future arguments about rotation.

It may be necessary—in order to have names rotated evenly in all contests—to put ballots through the printing press twice, maybe three times. This, a printer estimates, would increase the cost of ballots by at least 25 percent.

NOTE.—A special congressional election—in the event HUBER succeeds in invalidating AYRES' victory—would cost between $60,000 and $70,000.

Official vote count	Summit	Lorain	Portage	Medina (county)
AYRES, WILLIAM H.	62,283	20,343	10,721	9,521
Brennerman, Robert G.	3,142	2,971	622	511
HUBER, WALTER B.	71,663	15,138	9,808	4,338

Johnny Moore, Colington, Saw First Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Aycock Brown:

JOHNNY MOORE, COLINGTON, SAW FIRST FLIGHT

(By Aycock Brown)

The 17-year-old muskrat trapper who just happened to stop by Kill Devil Hill on the morning of December 17, 1903, while returning from the shore of the nearby fresh ponds, was amazed at the story Wilbur Wright told him.

In the Wright brothers' camp was a well-supplied kitchen. In it was a box filled with eggs. Seeing so many eggs put a questioning look on the youth's face. Pointing to a couple of chickens scratching in the sand near the kitchen door, Wilbur reportedly said:

"See that little black hen out there? She lays six eggs every day. That is why we have such a good supply of them."

Then Wilbur returned to a queer-looking object on a single track nearby where his brother Orville was doing some last-minute inspection before they started the engine which started the propellers to spinning. In the meantime, some men from the life-saving station over on the beach had arrived. One of them was standing near a camera which the 17-year-old boy had noticed one of the flying-machine men had set up a few moments previously.

As the engine on the plane increased, one of the men (Orville) climbed aboard and lay flat on his stomach and the engine increased more. There was a man at either end of the machine's wings. A third person cut a line which had the thing anchored and it moved down the one track rail increasing speed as it went. As it neared the end of the rail the thing left the ground and for 12 seconds it was in the air—not very far from the ground, but in the air.

Johnny Moore, that was the 17-year-old boy's name, had seen these same two men on several occasions, especially the previous year, flying their giant kites, some of which he had been told were large enough to haul a person into the air. But on that December morning, 47 years ago come next Sunday, the contraption that Johnny Moore watched with great interest was not a kite, it was a glider with propellers something like the propellers of the new fangled gas boats he had seen. And the thing took off under its own power.

If Johnny Moore was amazed at the story about the hen which laid six eggs daily, he was even more surprised, and so were the shouting men, that the flying machine had taken off under its own power. It was when the little group of men gathered happily together after the first take-off that Johnny Moore is credited with saying, "Danged if she hain't flew."

Today, 47 years later come Sunday, Johnny Moore, only living witness of that first flight, will be a guest of honor at the annual first flight celebration which Maj. Al Williams has arranged for Sunday morning at the great Wright Memorial atop Kill Devil Hill. Later Johnny Moore and his wife, Chloe, who live on nearby Colington Island—will be guests at the annual first flight anniversary banquet in the Carolinian Hotel dining room.

My America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a column by Harry Boyd, entitled "My America," appears every day in the Greenville (Mich.) Daily News. Mr. Boyd's comments for December 12, in my estimation reflect the views of many citizens throughout the Nation, and for the bentfit of those who have not seen this column and the observations contained therein before, I include it as a part of my remarks:

MY AMERICA

(By Harry Boyd)

Much as it may irritate the tender hides of the Achesons and their chronically outraged champions, I look for the next session of Congress to be the reexaminingest setto that has been staged on Capitol Hill since the boys first voted themselves pensions.

Personally I think a little earnest national introspection will be good for our souls.

The stimulus for it, of course, came out of the November election results.

Analysts with more woman's intuition than I've got have read all sorts of meanings into those results. Some say the voters plumped for a more isolationist foreign policy. Some say they were demanding a more belligerent foreign policy.

For my part, I don't know what the voters were clamoring for. Except one. I have a pretty good idea of what my vote was intended to mean, so far as foreign policy is concerned.

I wasn't insisting that we pull out of the international political melee, I wasn't urgent that we get into it with all 4 feet and raise more of a rumpus.

Mainly I was suggesting that somebody undertake to find out what we're trying to do in there.

After that's cleared up, maybe how we ought to go about doing it will be more obvious than it has been up to date.

I freely grant that the seventh inning is a little late to be pausing to apprise ourselves of the object of the game. But better late than never, I always say.

The seeming inconsistency of the maneuvers of the last year has me punch-drunk. We cuss Stalin, play footsie with Tito, snub Franco, coddle Mao Tse-tung, soft soap Nehru, scold Attlee, and scuttle Chiang.

We break our backs to gain yardage in Europe and we give it away in Asia.

We ship stuff to Korea to shoot at the Reds and ship stuff to Russia for the Reds to shoot at us.

We send foreign nations money to build the set-up they want and reformers to persuade them to want something else.

We blow hot; we blow cold; we blow lukewarm. When otherwise unoccupied, we just blow.

What I'd like to know is what goes on here. Are we embarked on a program of national defense or world evangelism or what?

It makes a difference in how we should dress for it.

I have an uneasy feeling that instead of just trying to get along with other nations without getting hurt we are trying to make them over. And that strikes me as biting off a mighty big piece to chew.

I have misgivings about sending washed-up New Dealers overseas to bribe the Greeks and other nations to go in for new dealism.

I question whether we can put over abroad social reforms we still aren't sure we haven't bungled at home.

And it's debatable whether taking a closer look at all these scattergun enterprises should be called reexamination. The record isn't clear that they were ever examined in the first place.

Let's Put First Things First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, what our Nation needs most today is national unity—no individual or group of individuals should place personal—or party aggrandizement above national welfare. My thoughts on this matter are best expressed by an editorial under the caption "Let's put first things first," which appeared in the Clarksburg News, Clarksburg, W. Va., editor, Mr. H. G. Rhawn, on December 14, 1950.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the above-mentioned editorial:

LET'S PUT FIRST THINGS FIRST

From the President of the United States right down to Mr. Average Citizen, the time has come, it seems to us, to put first things first. Nothing in the frightful picture of world affairs is quite so disheartening as the lack of unity among our people.

So many people, both among the leaders in government and those in private life, seem to be pulling not only in opposite directions, but in all directions. Our President has caused himself to be lampooned by what are his too human, too outspoken outbursts. His firm conviction and the solemn resolve of all our people to stand unflinchingly against Russian aggression is the issue which comes first. In that aim and objective we must all unite quickly.

Today there are too many discordant, petty, and carping notes, too many who create their own realities out of second-hand knowledge and urge their own course of action. Hurl your war of words at Stalin, not at American leaders. He is the enemy, not Acheson, not Truman, not MacArthur, not McCarthy, not Johnson, not Marshall. Let's back our leaders. That will be putting first things first in a grave crisis.

President Gordon Gray's Inaugural Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following inaugural address of President Gordon Gray, of the Consolidated University of North Carolina, which was delivered in the coliseum of North Carolina State College in Raleigh, N. C., at noon Tuesday, October 10, at final exercises of the 3-day program. Exercises were held Sunday at Woman's College at Greensboro, and Monday at the University at Chapel Hill. The address is as follows:

Unfortunately the management of our Nation and the conduct of our affairs today cannot be dictated by traditional forms and procedures. Some of the easy protections of the past afforded by geography principally are not now with us.

It seems evident that no longer can an institution of learning have truly cloistered halls. Nor can there be any such thing as an isolated village.

The mechanical genius of man has been able so to compress time and shrink space that we find ourselves all world citizens. The inhabitants of the State of North Carolina from Manteo to Murphy might easily, except for the convenience of the Post Office Department, be domiciled with United Nations at Lake Success insofar as the impact of world events on their lives is concerned.

Any meaningful reference to the world at this moment in history must be a reference to what we know as the free world, for, indeed, there are two worlds living physically if not peacefully side by side.

This is the principal fact of life which unhappily must serve as the backdrop for all of our living, planning, hoping, praying.

It is vital that we as North Carolinians and as Americans have an awareness of our national obligations, capacities, and commitments, as well as those on the State and local level. Our country now has by reason of circumstance attained a position of world leadership which expresses itself in military, economic, political, spiritual, and psychological terms. This necessity to assume leadership arises not only out of our great physical and human resources but from the illimitable reserves of our spirit as a people and from our growing democratic institutions and forms and from our own peculiar cultures.

While we recognize that our institutions and cultures have made us great, we do not seek to force them upon any other people of the earth; yet they continue to serve as the basis for courage and determination of the freedom-loving people everywhere.

We must preserve them as the hope of the free world.

We must continue to accept the responsibilities of leadership, which means that we must be strong economically. We must maintain an adequate military posture and assist our friends in building up their military strength in an effort to deter aggression and avoid the immeasurable consequences of a world war III. Our diplomatic leadership must be sound and just and our economic statesmanship enlightened.

We must communicate to the free people of the world and to those who aspire to become free the meaning of the democratic dream; we must make clear that it is our desire that the democratic dream be not just an idea, but a way of life.

This leadership must be firm and yet must be sensible. We should at all times appraise our commitments and assess them against our capabilities, for to overcommit would present the tragedy of weakness born of attempting to share our strength.

Americans and southerners and North Carolinians must understand these things.

For the reason that the world as we know it is divided against itself, it is vital that the elements of the free half of the world move toward the basis of mutual trust and help. We must understand one another, but we must also interpret the meaning of the kind of world in which we find ourselves.

Other generations have faced other threats from totalitarianism of various sorts. The crucial fact of our time is that there are now two worlds—one dominated by communism and the other led by the spirit of freedom.

There should no longer be any question in the minds of any of those who believe in the dignity of the individual and in what we know as freedom that communism is an enemy of both. Indeed, it should be clear to those with open minds that communism is committed to the denial of both, as well as to the extinguishment of religion except where expediency dictates a certain amount of lip service to religion.

Recent events have indicated that, where subversion and infiltration do not promise success in accordance with the Soviet time table, then there will be Soviet encouragement of military aggression. This probability, long suspected and now proven, demonstrates that communism, in its self-generated dynamism, considers that the aim justifies any means.

It should be clear to those who accept as we do the essential dignity of man, the search for truth, freedom of inquiry, and the right to worship, that to encourage communism is to abandon these things and to embrace its dogma. Indeed, believers in truth and freedom and those who have true faith must enlist themselves in the cause of combating communism.

There has been much talk about freedom. Indeed, my own use of the word has been prolific. May I suggest that freedom in its true meaning is the sense of an alternative; the opportunity to make a choice.

This, of course, implies in some cases a right, in some cases a power, in some cases a privilege. But these manifestations of freedom must in every case be accompanied by an obligation, a duty or a responsibility.

The sense of an alternative, therefore, must carry with it the awareness of the consequences of electing the alternative. This is our price for freedom, voluntarily paid.

Communism discourages alternatives. The restraints we know as duties, obligations, and responsibilities are imposed by individuals upon themselves or by the influences of a free society upon its members; in the Communist state they assume the form of force, wielded by the state.

We are in a decisive struggle for the loyalties and hearts of men; a struggle between Stalinism on the one hand, and the forces of

kindness and decency and humanity and character on the other.

Because a university in its very nature is committed to preserve what communism would destroy, it would seem that the very weight of its free influences would render impotent any Communists it might unwittingly, or otherwise, be harboring. It would not seem that an individual, or even a small group of them could harm an institution or endanger its reputation, because of counteracting pressures.

But the closed mind will not yield, and the Communist mind is a closed mind. And for the reason that, often, this insidious influence does not manifest itself, the counteracting pressures cannot come into play. The healthful rays of sunlight have little effect upon the underside of an anchored rock.

Frequently academic freedom, which must be preserved at all costs, has been used as a cloak to give a sort of immunity to Communists and their side-car passengers. I cannot believe that firmness toward Communists, prudently exercised, violates the principle of unfettered research, and the pursuit of truth. I cannot believe that any university must reach into the ranks of those who are disloyal to American principles to develop a dedicated, independent faculty.

My own position should be made very clear. We shall not provide asylums for those who would extinguish the lights of liberty. Indeed, Communists are not welcome at any of our three institutions.

We shall not knowingly allow any campus to become a workshop, or laboratory, or training ground for the operations of those who are committed to the destruction of American cultures and institutions.

This having been said, it must be added that in our institutions, as should be the case everywhere, we shall approach the problem sensibly and with restraint. We shall not be governed by hysteria. We shall not persecute the innocent, nor malign the clearly misunderstood. And we shall be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt.

I have perhaps overdwelt on this matter. Communism, to the extent that it does exist in our institutions, is far from being our major concern. Deal with it, we will. But we in the Consolidated University must not become overabsorbed with it.

America Must Not Stumble Into War With Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star of November 22, 1950:

AMERICA MUST NOT STUMBLE INTO WAR WITH RED CHINA

Has the American Government—the President, members of his administration, and Members of Congress of both parties—lost its way in world affairs?

Unless the Star's editors completely misunderstand public reaction, this question is torturing the thoughts of most Americans.

Here they stand, at the brink of the most senseless war in all American history—war against an Asiatic people with whom they have no real quarrel—war in which torrents of American blood and mountains of treasure might be spent without the prospect of settling any meaningful issue, much less of gaining anything of tangible value.

In these circumstances, which are nothing short of desperate, the men the country has elected and appointed to guide its affairs twitter in Washington and at Lake Success. Not a single voice sounds a clear "Arouse and beware!" to the Nation.

In the capital, politicians of both parties backbite and rant over old issues, and appear content to let a do-nothing, lame-duck Congress mumble through weeks in which firm and timely decisions might make the difference between life or death to a million young American men.

The President, who a few weeks ago minimized the dangers of his Korean adventure by calling it a police action, whistles nonsense into the wind about enacting a domestic program in which the country, smelling a national disaster in Asia, has lost immediate interest.

At Lake Success, God Save us, the delegations at a United Nations that was to remake the world, huddle and bleat like sheep stalked by wolves as they await the arrival of Chinese emissaries who, presumably, will say what ransom, what tribute America must pay to extricate its young men from a Communist deadfall. As if the initiative to save the situation could come from that direction!

Can anyone point to another hour in the country's history when boldness and imagination were more imperatively required, or when the inspiration for a dramatic stroke of state was so lacking?

What the country needs, lest more and larger mass awards of purple hearts are to be photographed, is a recess from small-mindedness—an adjournment of politicking for the next election—a holiday from recriminations over past blunders.

This Nation must not stumble into an Asiatic war.

For as many days, weeks, or months as it takes to break the stalemate into which American policy has fallen, the country wants all its Government's energies bent to that single purpose.

A Message to the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, many loyal and patriotic Chinese-Americans in this country have suffered as a result of the aggression of Communist China. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement released today by the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association of Washington, D. C.:

A MESSAGE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

We, the members of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association of Washington, comprised of the citizens of Chinese descent and Chinese Nationals in the District of Columbia, deeply feel it is our responsibility in this world crisis to respond with everything at our command to defend the democratic principles that have been uprooted in China. We stand wholeheartedly behind the United States Government and with all the free peoples of the world as they engage the menace of communism.

Since the land from whence we sprang has already been poisoned with despotism of the most autocratic and vicious kind, we know full well the great danger that lies in the thunder clouds that surrounds us all and this kinship with a lost land inspires us to work perhaps a little harder than others to ward off the threat to the liberty of the world.

The Communist despots who have by the force of arms seized control of great areas of China are undertaking a nefarious campaign to mislead the Chinese people into believing that their source of hope is Russia. We in the United States who have the good fortune to experience life under a true democracy can vouch for the sincerity of the United States in its long-standing friendship with and generosity to the Chinese people; we know that China must ultimately look to the United States, as she has in the past, for guidance and assistance to revive national spirit, to regain national honor and to eventually rebuild herself along the democratic principles of free government.

The Communist engine of despotism has placed a gun in the back of many Chinese and compelled them to fight against the forces of the United Nations. We hope and pray that this condition of servility which is as alien to Chinese philosophy as it is to American tradition will be quickly cast off.

We hope that the people of the United States will understand that the Chinese would never take up arms against the United States; they are only coerced to do so at the instigation of the misguided, selfish, and lawless bandits who are steering the plot to sacrifice China to the avarice and idiocy of the international Communist conspiracy. We, who hear the liberty bell ring out hopeful tidings upon the air, have faith in America—faith unswerving and high, faith in the wisdom and the fairness of the American people. No pro-Communist propaganda however skillful and efficient can change our firm belief that the preservation of democracy is worth our every sacrifice.

We pledge our unqualified support and cooperation as Americans first and as people who have a profound knowledge of the real menace of communism and despotism. We make this pledge with a keen sense of humility and with a fervent hope that the American people will understand the peculiar delicacy of our present position.

THE CHINESE CONSOLIDATED BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON,
Rev. C. C. HUNG, *Chairman.*
WING WONG, *Executive Secretary.*

Is This Our Last Hour?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star.

This is a forthright expression, and I believe it represents the thinking of a much larger segment of the American people than those charged with the leadership of the people seem ready to admit.

The measures which are being taken in our effort to avert destruction are the uncertain, indecisive steps of leaders moving in a haze of disbelief. There is with us still the refusal to admit that

things are as bad as they certainly are; to acknowledge that the forces of communism are on a march which holds for them, at the moment, a real promise of complete victory.

Full mobilization would give us our only chance to confound the Kremlin's plan to crush the United States at the time the Kremlin appoints. I cannot believe that the American people are not ready to make the necessary sacrifices. When shall we emerge from this never-never land of selective controls and wait and see? The Kremlin never had it so good. The editorial from the Evening Star follows:

IS THIS OUR LAST HOUR?

"Is this the hour of our Nation's twilight, the last fading hour of light before an endless night shall envelop us and all the Western World? That is a question which we still have in our power to answer. If we delay longer we can expect nothing but darkness and defeat and desolation. If we answer the challenge with courage and confidence, and with the ability of which we are capable, we can, I am sure, triumph over our foes."

It was in these words that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas summed up an address to the Senate this week—an address which deserves a great deal more attention than it has received. It was a talk which deserves attention because Senator JOHNSON was addressing himself to the most urgent question of our time: What must we do to survive?

There are men—men of ability and integrity—who advocate something less than a total all-out effort. General Marshall spoke for them when he testified on December 1 before a House committee. The Secretary of Defense wants a greater effort. But he does not favor an all-out war mobilization at this time. He fears that if we go to total mobilization the Communists might then ease up and leave us in a difficult position. General Marshall is worried about the reaction of the people in that situation. He is concerned with the matter of cost. In short, he is against an all-out wartime mobilization until we clearly have to do it.

Senator JOHNSON takes the stand that that time is now—that the need is clear and will never be clearer while we still have a chance to survive.

The Texas Senator is in a position to speak with some authority on this question. As chairman of the Senate Military Preparedness Subcommittee, he has seen at first hand the hesitations, the uncertainties, the fumblings of the rearmament program. And he has come away from that experience with this conviction: "I say that the policy of 'wait and see' must end, and it must end now. For what are we waiting? What do we expect to see tomorrow that we cannot see clearly today—or could not see (when the Korean war began) on June 25?"

What Senator JOHNSON sees is this:

"First, we are at war. We are at war not merely with Communist China, but with all the military strength and both the physical and human resources behind the iron curtain. We have been at war for 6 months. We may well be at war for 10 or 20 years more.

"Second, our primary and immediate goal in this war is survival. This is a bleak, disturbing reality. In other wars, our goal has been simply victory. Now, however, we must make our survival certain before we can hope for victory, because we cannot be confident of survival.

"Third, we are not getting ready for war. We are in a war, but all our effort is seemingly directed toward staying out of the war that we are in already. This is adolescent nonsense."

The Star believes that these are facts, and that no rational appraisal of the rapidly mounting evidence can lead to any other conclusion. It is possible, by an emotional process of wishful thinking, to arrive at some other conclusion. If one resolutely turns his face away from the evidence, if he merely shrinks from the 34,000 American casualties in Korea, if he will not look through his mind's eye at the Russian jet fighters which have appeared in some force over the Korean battlefield, if he ignores the words of Russia's Mr. Malik, if he closes his ears to the Communist threat to drive our armies into the sea—if a man will do these things he can make himself believe whatever he wishes. But he cannot convert a state of war into a state of peace. And such a man will never be ready to take the steps that must be taken in the interests of our self-preservation.

What should be done? This question cannot be answered with any absolute assurance. Senator JOHNSON has some definite opinions. He says that first, and above all else, we must have a long-range global plan of strategy for the war to which we are committed. We must not let the Russians decide where we shall fight and where we can fight. We must not fall into the tragic error of squandering our young men in futile, indecisive little wars before the real enemy is even directly engaged. Second, we must fully mobilize for military service all of our available manpower—that if we do not do this we will be weaker by next June than we were when we went into Korea in June of this year. Third, he calls for immediate mobilization of our economy, including tight controls, and an urgent drive to organize and greatly increase our productive capacity.

There are others who say in all earnestness that we should not go this far now. They give reasons for their stand. They say that the necessary plans have not been made, that the machinery has not been set up, that the need is not finally clear. One might ask why, after 6 months of war, so little planning has been done, so little machinery is ready. But that serves no useful purpose. We have to go on from where we are and do the best we can.

Those who would move slowly are gambling on the time factor. This must be so, for certainly if we should find ourselves at war with Russia tomorrow they would urge all possible haste.

But how much reliance can be placed in this assumption that we will have the time required? Some of these people thought that the Russians, at earliest, would not get the atom bomb until 1952. They got it in 1949. Our military planners once looked to 1954 as the period of greatest danger. Now they have moved that date up to 1952. Will they be saying in a few weeks or months that next spring or summer will be the critical time?

Let us think a moment about this. Every hour of delay is a gamble with the life of the Nation. If the Russians should strike before we have had time, at our present pace, to get ready, the problems that bother us now, the difficulties which loom so large, will seem trivial by comparison. We will not be worrying then about the cost or about the psychology of the people. We will be much too busy burying our dead, caring for our wounded, and trying to save what is left of our country.

Time is not, and never will be, on the side of those who waste it. As it is, there may not be enough time left. Even so, is it better to do too little or too much? We have trifled to long with the security of this country, with all the beliefs and the traditions and the things that are dear to us. Opportunity is slipping away. How shall we answer if we are called up on some desolate tomorrow to explain why we did not make the most of it?

Vision and Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Austin American, Austin, Tex., dated December 15, 1950.

There is now a virtually unanimous admission of the peril facing this Nation and the sacrifices which must be made, not only on the battlefront by our young men, but on the home front as well. Much of this call to arms is now being voiced by Monday morning quarterbacks. A notable exception to the hindsight prognosticators is our colleague and friend, HOMER THORNBERRY, of the Tenth District of Texas, who cared not for the wails of business as usual or politics as usual, but went to work months ago to prepare the people's case against communistic aggression.

The editorial is as follows:

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK—"FULL MOBILIZATION," THORNBERRY PLEA

The emphatic telegram of Congressman HOMER THORNBERRY this week, supporting mobilization of manpower and resources to meet the Nation's peril was a reiteration of what he said back in the early days of the Korean invasion.

Congressman THORNBERRY's message commended the stand taken by the Austin business community urging immediate steps for full mobilization of manpower and industry and reaffirmed his advocacy and support of these measures for national preparedness.

But the Austin district Congressman had been working at that all through the perilous days of North Korean aggression, of United States and United Nations decisions to resist aggression.

An Austin businessman has a letter from Congressman THORNBERRY, written months ago, which even this soon seems prophetic, and which in unmistakable terms defines his attitude as a national lawmaker.

THORNBERRY said in that letter: "In my judgment, the Korean situation goes very deep, much deeper than some seem to realize. In fear that we are confronted with two serious enemies—communism and inflation.

"I feel that we must be militarily strong if we are to meet the threat of communistic aggression. Thousands of men are being called to make very great sacrifices. I feel that sacrifices must also be exacted from others of our society if we are to meet the equally dangerous threat of inflation.

"I have expressed many times, publicly and in private, the firm belief that we must have full mobilization of all our resources—not just of the men who are called into our military service and their families. * * *

"From the best information available to me, I am convinced that any half-way measure, any vacillation, any weakening on our part, will destroy us all—not only those of us of the present generation, but our own children. No one who sits at my desk and reads the letters from the men who are now fighting in Korea—and from their families who seem to be left to the mercy of rising prices and limited income—can think we should do business as usual or play politics as usual.

"If we are to gain any lesson at all from our experience in the last war, it is that we cannot have effective control against inflation if we are to impose controls only on part of our economy. I do not believe in making an exception of any special group. I have voted for imposition of controls on prices, wages, and credit—clear across the board. Not only did I vote against the special exception to which you refer, but against all amendments which have exempted other groups. * * * We must cut nonessential spending to the bone and enact profits tax which will prevent undue profits by any group at the expense of our all-out effort to preserve our Nation."

And Congressman THORNBERRY followed this up with this statement in a speech in the House of Representatives last August 15, when he was opposing a bill for nondefense spending:

"Our first duty during these days is to cut nonessential spending to the bone, so that we can send bullets, guns, tanks, and airplanes to our men in Korea."

The sense of national peril is acute here in Texas. Some have come to share it only recently. It is reassuring that the Representative of central Texas in Congress has had the vision and the foresight and the realistic purpose to go down the line for total mobilization from the beginning.

Perverts in Federal Agencies Called Peril to United States Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of December 16, 1950:

PERVERTS IN FEDERAL AGENCIES CALLED PERIL TO UNITED STATES SECURITY—SENATE PROBERS REPORT RUSSIAN SPIES SEEK UNSAVORY FACTS ABOUT OFFICIALS

(By Bert Wissman)

Homosexuals and other sex perverts should be kicked out of Federal jobs and kept out because they are poor security risks and easy prey for blackmailer spies, a Senate investigating committee said in a strongly worded report yesterday.

Russian spies here are under orders to dig out unsavory facts about high United States officials so the knowledge can be used to force disclosure of information valuable to the Soviet, the report stated.

"One homosexual can pollute a Government office," said the Senate investigating subcommittee which probed employment of sex perverts in the Government.

NO ESTIMATE ON NUMBER

The subcommittee sharply criticized the State Department and other agencies for following a head-in-the-sand attitude which has permitted sex perverts to continue in Federal jobs even after their sexual immorality is known.

The subcommittee, headed by Senator HOEY, of North Carolina, stated it is not possible to determine accurately how many perverts are employed in the Government.

But it cited nearly 5,000 known cases within the last 3 years.

Of the civilian agencies, the State Department showed the largest 3-year total—143—of whom 106 had been fired by the time the investigation started. In the 7-month period ending last November, 97 sex perverts suspects were uncovered in the Veterans' Administration alone, the report revealed.

URGE HARSHER TERMS

Legislators stressed that many violators in the District have been able to escape by forfeiture of $25 collateral or less, and proposed enactment of legislation to strengthen Washington sex statutes to provide stiffer fines and jail terms for such offenses.

The disclosure that Russian spies have been ordered to seek out perverts in Government jobs as prime targets for blackmail was contained in the testimony of D. Milton Ladd, assistant to the FBI director.

The subcommittee reported also that United States intelligence officials had advised them Nazi and Communist agents have attempted to gain information from employees of our Government by threatening to expose their abnormal sex activities."

Ladd told legislators that the Communists, without principles or scruples, have a program of seeking out weaknesses of leaders in Government.

He said the FBI has information of unquestioned reliability that orders have been issued by high Russian intelligence officials to their agents to secure details of the private lives of Government officials, their weaknesses, their associates, and, in fact, every bit of information, hoping to find a chink in their armor * * * upon which they might capitalize.

The subcommittee investigation revealed 4,964 cases of perverts in the Government from January 1 to November 1, 1950, of which 4,380 were in the Armed Forces uniformed personnel and 574 in civilian Government agencies, almost all of the latter in the Washington area.

Of those in the civilian agencies, 382 cases were found after last April, when the clamor for investigation was building up, a fact which HOEY said indicated Federal personnel officials were doing little or nothing about the situation until the spotlight of publicity was thrown on the problem.

The discharges from the Armed Forces for perversion maintained a more even keel over the 3-year period, indicating the military have been more aggressive in weeding out such individuals, HOEY stated.

Of the 574 cases discovered in civilian agencies, 213 were allowed to resign, 207 were fired, 85 were cleared, and 69 cases are pending, the report said.

The subcommittee recommended:

1. Thorough investigation of all complaints of perversion.

2. Strict enforcement of regulations which call for firing of perverts as immorals, something which the legislators charged has not been done in the past.

3. Creation of a board of review to hear appeals of persons discharged for sex perversion.

The subcommittee said its investigation of the handling of sex-perversion charges by District police disclosed glaring faults, both with enforcement by the police and with sex statutes as they now exist.

It recommended that the penalty for indecent exposure, or committing any lewd, obscene, or indecent act be upped to a maximum $500 fine and 6 months in jail and that the practice of permitting forfeiture of collateral be dropped.

PROSECUTION CHANGE

The legislators also recommended that prosecution of sex cases be taken from the corporation counsel and given solely to the United States attorney.

Legislators also urged tightening of language covering solicitations because it determined that such solicitations frequently occur at places not covered by the specific terms of the act as it is presently written.

Late yesterday, HOEY introduced a pervert-control bill containing the subcommittee's legislative recommendations.

The State Department was cited as a glaring example of how homosexuals find their way from one Government job to another because the real reason for their discharge is not noted with the CSC. Of 91 homos discharged by the State Department between January 1947 and January 1950, some 23 found new Federal jobs, the report said.

PROBERS LIST PERVERTS IN UNITED STATES EMPLOY

Following is a departmental breakdown of sex perversion statistics on civilian agencies of the Government. The first column represents the agency total from January 1, 1947, to November 1, 1950; the second column the number resigned or dismissed; and the third the number cleared.

	Total Jan. 1, 1947, to Nov. 1, 1950	Resigned or dismissed	Cleared
Agriculture	32	31	0
Battle Monuments Commission	0	0	0
Atomic Energy Commission	8	5	0
Budget Bureau	2	2	0
Civil Aeronautics Board	2	1	1
Commerce	49	41	4
Displaced Persons Commission	2	2	0
District of Columbia	7	7	0
Economic Cooperative Administration	27	19	6
Export-Import Bank	0	0	0
Federal Communications Commission	3	1	0
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	0	0	0
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	0	0	0
Federal Power Commission	2	2	0
Federal Reserve System	0	0	0
Federal Security Agency	22	13	5
Federal Trade Commission	1	0	0
General Accounting Office	13	12	0
General Services Administration	19	8	2
Government Printing Office	2	2	0
Housing and Home Finance	10	8	2
Indian Claims Commission	0	0	0
Interior	31	16	10
Interstate Commerce	2	2	0
Justice	7	5	1
Labor	6	5	0
Botanical Gardens	0	0	0
Congressional employees	4	1	0
Library of Congress	15	10	0
Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	0	0	0
National Capital Housing Authority	0	0	0
National Labor Relations Board	2	2	0
National Mediation Board	0	0	0
National Security Council	0	0	0
National Securities Resources Board	1	1	0
Office of Housing Expediter	1	1	0
Panama Canal	0	0	0
Philippine War Damage Commission	0	0	0
Post Office, District of Columbia	8	5	0
Railroad Retirement Board	3	3	0
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	3	2	1
Securities Exchange Commission	1	1	0
Selective Service	0	0	0
Smithsonian Institute	2	1	0
State Department	143	121	10
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	1	0
Treasury	23	20	0
Civil Service Commission	18	18	0
Motor Carriers Commission	0	0	0
Tariff Commission	0	0	0
Veterans' Administration	101	43	43
War Claims Commission	1	1	0
White House	0	0	0
Total	574	420	85

69 cases still are pending.

A Change of Tune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of December 17, 1950:

A CHANGE OF TUNE

It used to take only the appearance of a British Prime Minister in Washington to send internationalist morale soaring, but Mr. Attlee was no shot in the arm. The events in Korea have been too dismal; and in Western Europe the mood bears a closer resemblance to that of a debating society whose members are scoring nice points at each other's expense than it does to an area living under Stalin's suspended sword. There is only a pretense at preparing a defense.

The accumulating evidence seems to have impressed some of our erstwhile internationalists with the thought that we have been given the bag to hold in Korea, and that the same gift, only larger and emptier, is to be expected if there is aggression in Europe.

Thus Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has been heard from again, this time to the effect that the British are shirking (have not made an adequate contribution in manpower to the Korean forces).

More startling, however, is the new Walter Lippmann. This syndicated oracle, who not so many years ago set forth the thesis in a book called United States Foreign Policy—Shield of the Republic, that the United States for more than 75 years was protected by the British Navy, is now hinting broadly that our allies have run out on us.

In appraising the prudent and wise policy we should pursue under these circumstances, Mr. Lippmann finds inspiration in the counsel that Prime Minister Gladstone gave Queen Victoria in 1869. Gladstone urged a thrifty use of England's power and credit when the common trasactions and general interests of Europe were involved.

"England," he said, "should keep entire in her own hands the means of estimating her own obligations upon the various states of facts as they arise * * * as it is dangerous for her to assume alone an advanced, and therefore an isolated, position in regard to European controversies, that, come what may, it is better for her to promise too little than too much; that she should not encourage the weak by giving expectations of aid to resist the strong * * *; that she should seek to develop and mature the action of a common or public or European opinion as the best standing bulwark against worry, but should beware of seeming to lay down the law of that opinion by her own authority. * * *"

"I do not know," remarks Mr. Lippmann, "whether in the tiresome jargon of our day this would be called isolationism or appeasement. But a great empire was governed and a long peace was achieved when it was deemed honorable to be that prudent and that wise."

The example which Mr. Lippmann now cites for our guidance is remarkably different from the formula he offered in 1943 when his book was published. He held then that since 1900 American foreign policy was insolvent because we had not developed sufficient power to balance our overseas commitments. Mr. Lippmann's prescription to attain solvency was to bring our overseas commitments and our power to enforce those commitments into line by entering an alliance with Britain and Russia. Seven years later even Mr. Lippmann cannot regard his own ideas of that day as wise or prudent. He has made a complete turnabout, at the risk of being called an isolationist.

Facts at length drill themselves into the most obdurate skulls. So now Mr. Lippmann quotes approvingly from Gladstone: "Is England so uplifted in strength above every nation that she can with prudence advertise herself as ready to undertake the general redress of wrongs? Would not the consequences of such professions and promises be either the premature exhaustion of her means, or a collapse in the day of performance? Is any power at this time of today warranted in assuming to itself this comprehensive obligation?"

These arguments will not be precisely new to those who read this page. They appeal to internationalists because the predictable consequences of overreaching the Nation's means have been realized. There is yet time to avoid the same debacle in Europe that has already rewarded an incautious adventurism in Asia.

Italy, a country 30 percent Communist, is impotent militarily. The English social revolution has reached the point where soldiers no longer will follow the aristocrats, but where England has not yet been able to produce a new model army on the Cromwellian pattern composed of lower class professional soldiers. France is disaffected to the point where General de Gaulle fears an uprising or a collapse which will put the country in the Communist camp.

By thrusting ourselves forward everywhere we have succeeded in bringing this Nation closer to complete isolation that it has ever been—a result which the internationalists feared and which, ironically, they themselves have brought about.

It Would Be Worth Trying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, of Fairmont, Minn., dated December 5, 1950:

IT WOULD BE WORTH TRYING

There is a growing feeling among the people who pay the bills and do the actual fighting, that it is about time we cultivate the friendship, good will, and understanding of Canada, Mexico, and South America, and let the warmongers of Europe and Asia wither on the vine.

The two Americas have everything we can possibly need, and we can live in peace, plenty, and considerable security so long as we are a united, friendly people.

Were we to spend a fraction of what we have thrown away in Europe, it would no doubt be surprising at the amount of genuine good will and understanding we could promote on this and the South American continent.

The people who pay, and the people who do the actual fighting should have something to say about it. They are entitled to a chance. Our diplomats and statesmen, based on past experience, haven't done too well.

If We Are Going To Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis News of December 16, 1950:

IF WE ARE GOING TO SURVIVE

Millions of Americans, regardless of politics, heard the strong and resolute words of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, Thursday night with the hope that President Truman in his address to the Nation Friday would speak with the same inspiring boldness.

The President fell short of that mark. Like Governor Dewey, he called all Americans to rally in unity and sacrifice to the cause of freedom. But where Dewey's call was clear and ringing, the President's was muted. The President has gained stature over the indecision of the last 6 months, but he has yet to rise to the "real leadership" of which Dewey spoke—the leadership to which "the American people will respond— every one of them—to the sacrifices that are necessary if we are going to survive."

President Truman showed little of the toughness, realism, and sense of grim urgency that moved the leader of the opposition party to call for an all-out program of military and economic mobilization. The President accused the rulers of the Soviet Union of trying to undermine or overwhelm the free nations, one by one, and being willing to push the world to a brink of a general war to get what they want. Dewey, with clearer vision, warned that world communism under the leadership of Soviet Russia is waging ruthless war against the whole free world.

The President, still speaking of peace when there is no peace, clings to the everything-will-be-all right hope that there is no conflict between the legitimate interests of the free world and those of the Soviet Union that cannot be settled by honorable means. Dewey says: "Let us get rid once and for all of the idea that Russia wants less than the whole world," and "We shall all be brave and strong and remain free or we shall be timid and weak and become slaves." In the light of the events of the last year, which view is hope, and which hard fact—and which represents the considered judgment of the American people?

While Mr. Truman speaks approvingly of the puny measures taken to date and, in a mood reminiscent of the "on hand and on order" of another day, of what we shall have produced a year from now—and what, Mr. President, will happen if the blow falls before then?—Governor Dewey says: "The hour is very late—I do not know how late. Whether we have a day or a year or two years, not a second should be lost." Where the Governor urged the summoning of the full resources of 100 National Guard divisions, President Truman calls two more making a total of six, to active service. Where the President says that we need the help of other free nations, Governor Dewey realistically welcomes the support of all who will fight in the cause. "In the kind of struggle I propose," he says, "we should stop being fussy about who will help to prevent it."

He would lay it on the line to our Allies with the condition that Europe break away from its petty barriers and bickering, and

with the understanding that "our military aid will be extended only to those nations who demonstrate a willingness to fight on our side." And he would carry the fight to Russia, fighting fire with fire, and striking behind the rotten facade of the Soviet Union with the same weapons by which the Kremlin seeks to weaken the free nations.

On both the military, diplomatic, and home fronts, one program is positive, the other piecemeal.

Despite the contrast, however, the President has moved toward the view represented by Governor Dewey and reflected in the country. At long last, he is turning—if somewhat too slowly—toward all-out mobilization. He proposes to do something about inflation—dealing not only with its symptoms through limited and selective price controls but with its causes as well. At long last, he has ordered a cessation of all nonmilitary Government spending except that which contributes to the defense of the nation. At long last, also he has struck at the hydraheaded bureaucracy of economic mobilization by concentrating responsibility and authority in the hands of the able Charles E. Wilson, president of General Electric.

There are notable gains, and it is significant also that both the President and his opponent in the last election speak, if in different tones, in much the same voice. The American people are pulling together, and they are willing to pull much harder than they have yet been asked.

The two speeches add up to this, too, for the average American: As Governor Dewey warns, "we cannot save our freedom and also keep our personal comforts and luxuries." Or, as the President truly says: "All of us will have to pay more taxes and do without things we like. Think of this, not as a sacrifice, but as opportunity, an opportunity to defend the best kind of life that men have ever devised on this earth."

The testing time for America is here. God grant that we shall not fail.

The Unfinished Revolution in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMOND CHATHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have publicly recommended that we recognize the Peoples Government of China—a government that controls practically all of the mainland of China and would control Formosa except for the intervention of the United States—mind you, not the intervention of the United Nations.

The people of China have always been conservatives; and when the Chinese Communists promised them food and peace, they readily accepted the new regime. For many years under the Nationalist Government they have been subjected to graft, corruption, and greed. The present government of Chiang Kai-shek has lost all control. A similar situation might have arisen during the days when we threw off the yoke of England if the royal agencies had moved to Long Island and some outside government had said to our victorious Revolutionary forefathers, "Stay off your own Long Island." We would have felt as the mainland Chinese feel today. A small group of rabid Chiang supporters have completely misled us in backing a lost cause.

I commend to my colleagues a press release by Dr. Sherwood Eddy, dated November 5, 1948—over 2 years ago. This great Chinese expert has called the turn to an uncanny degree. Why it has not been fully publicized in the present crisis is a mystery to me.

The group of Chiang supporters are among the leaders of the get-Acheson movement. He has realized what Dr. Eddy prophesied, and events have proved he was right. The Chinese people will never follow Chiang. The supporters of Chiang will not admit they were wrong and are trying to put the blame on a great Secretary of State. These gullible people are doing the Nation a great disservice—promoting disunity.

I appeal to you to read Dr. Eddy's article—read what he says about Chiang, about the Communists, about the Chinese people.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Eddy's article in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNFINISHED REVOLUTION IN CHINA

(By Sherwood Eddy)

At the beginning of our long journey across Asia we found a new Japan, completely disarmed, in the midst of a unique and apparently successful experiment for the reconstruction of a new democratic, peaceful nation out of a recently conquered military foe. Next we visited the new Korean Republic, where our old friend Syngman Rhee had been chosen as President in the first elections ever held in Korea in 3,000 years. It is true that the Communists are trying to assassinate him. It is also true that the Korean people, following an age-long tradition accentuated by the Japanese occupation, are still sadly divided in fractions, both in church and in state. But as the southern Koreans have now achieved their political independence, I believe they will slowly, perhaps with many humiliating lessons, build an abiding and united Christian democracy.

In China, we have arrived in a dark hour, when the Government is apparently on the verge of falling. We can see nothing that can now save it. The failure of the National government, however, will be in some respects like the fall of the 24 dynasties in China's more than 4,000 years of history; and this massive civilization will go on under a new leadership. On our arrival in China we proceeded immediately to the capital city of Nanking in order to seek full and unhurried interviews with cabinet members and the principal leaders of the Government. We were invited to tea with President Chiang Kai-shek and Madam Chiang; we also spent some hours with our Ambassador, Leighton Stuart, who is the most sympathetic and understanding representative America ever had in China. We had interviews with the Vice President, Chen Li-fu, who controls the Kuomintang Party and who is called the head of the reactionary C. C. clique; and we met or interviewed some 50 Chinese leaders, foreign experts, and missionaries. We tried to see everyone who could give us essential information, but we shall quote no one. The situation is far too delicate and full of dynamite.

During the last year in Europe and Asia, my wife and I have visited defeated countries, occupied countries, liberated countries; but China is the first nation we have visited that is in the midst of an awful civil war, and that on a scale far more colossal and cruel than was ever experienced in the United States. We found, as we have said, a new Japan and a new Korea, and we shall find a new India, but there is no new China. Instead, there is a vast unfinished revolution in China—far deeper and slower, larger and longer than any other revolution in the world. Four hundred and fifty million of the most conservative people on earth, most of whom are illiterate peasants still living under conditions comparable to those in the feudal Middle Ages, cannot be transformed in a day or in a generation.

It may be said that potentially China's revolution began the day that Robert Morrison, the first Protestant missionary, stepped ashore in Canton in 1807. All unconsciously Morrison introduced into China's static civilization three dynamic and disruptive forces—the dynamic of a new religion and the disruptive forces of a new nationalism and of an industrial revolution, the latter to be produced by western capitalism and trade. The great Chinese revolution entered upon its second stage of material destruction in the peasant revolt of the Taiping Rebellion (1851–64) that swept away 20,000,000 people in bloody slaughter. This stage of negative material destruction was resumed in the last spasm of the old order during the Boxer uprising in 1900, and will be completed by the Communists as they conquer successive areas. The revolution became articulate when Dr. Sun Yat-sen set up the republic in 1911 and declared its ideals in the three principles of the people—nationalism, democracy, and livelihood.

The revolution became militarily supreme while Chiang Kai-shek united China during the anarchic war-lord period and during her 8 years of indomitable resistance to the Japanese. By VJ-day, however, when China, exhausted and demoralized by war and the Japanese occupation, was liberated, the revolution had ceased or had been betrayed by the reactionary leadership that dominated the Kuomintang. Today Chiang Kai-shek is proving utterly incapable of leading China into a completion of the constructive phases of the revolution. The generalissimo continues to give military orders, but there are almost none who will obey them. The Government, which has become too largely a police state, with its spies in every college and institution in China, has lost the confidence and moral support of the people and has incurred the deep hatred of the students and other radical elements of the population. One reason for this is that Chiang has ordered so many of the students to be put to death. Tragically it is now the Communists and not the reactionary Kuomintang who demand the completion of the revolution on the lines laid down by Dr. Sun Yat-sen. This, however, is only the first stage of the total revolution that may ultimately follow the Russian blueprints as in other lands.

A plot has been formed that may falsely claim to fulfill General Marshall's year-old efforts to unite all parties in a genuine coalition government. Li Chi-shen was to be the puppet president, and Mao Tse-tung, the Communist leader, as vice president, was to play the part of Stalin in the government. The "Christian" general, Feng, was on his way to China to lead all the revolutionary armies when he perished in a fire on a Russian ship. Old Chu Teh may now lead the forces. The Communists may advance under this plan of a nominal coalition, offering positions to Chinese leaders who will collaborate with them, as did the Japanese, or, throwing off all pretense, they may drive back the Government forces and set up a ruthless dictatorship, as they have done in other countries.

The Government is not only threatened by repeated military defeats in many places in

North China, but by widespread moral and fiscal deterioration. When Chinchow fell (beyond the Great Wall), and then Mukden, the Government lost its control of the corridor to the north, and all north China was threatened.

We flew this week to Peiping and Tientsin, now on a small island surrounded by Communist forces that can take these cities almost at will. That would bring them, however, into conflict with the foreign powers, which they may wish to avoid or postpone. The Communist plan thus far has been to surround cities, cut off their food supply, and let them starve. Mukden is now starving, and dead bodies lie unburied in the square and open streets, to be eaten by hungry dogs, while the Communists pour in to capture the city. As I write, Peiping is crowded with pitiful refugees, with airplanes and carts hourly bringing in their famished human freight. I have never seen such terrifying hunger nor such pressure of an overcrowded population upon the bare means of subsistence.

The new currency has already failed. It is impossible for the Government to master or maintain it when it is spending four times as much as the income it received. This itself causes wild inflation, with untold suffering to millions of people. The old currency has fallen till one United States dollar would purchase from twelve to fifteen millions in inflated paper. A week ago I bought the new currency at 4 to 1, but today in the black market it would buy only 10 to 1. Frantic police measures will not hold it, just as the Confederate money could not have been held after the defeat of the South.

After a lapse of 13 years I again met President Chiang Kai-shek in this tragic hour. Seeing the widespread failure of the Government and its impending doom, I felt only a deep pity for him. Chiang has long believed, as have many others, that he was China's man of destiny who alone could save his people from "the wicked Communists." He seems to be unaware that he has already lost the long war with them, though he is now beginning to be haunted by the fear that his career will end in failure. He is apparently as completely blind to the significance of the mighty ground swell of the social upheaval of revolution that is rising irresistibly all over China as were the Bourbons of France, or the Romanoffs of Russia, though it would be unjust to compare him with either of these effete dynasties.

Yet Chiang will go down as one of the great names of Chinese history. In my opinion, Chiang is a far stronger man than the dreamer, Dr. Sun Yat-sen. I knew them both. Chiang's wife is beautiful and brilliant, but, as she well knows, her husband is a greater character than she. He is a far stronger man than the little Emperor of Japan, whom I met last month. Yet most Japanese would gladly die for their Emperor as the symbol of the nation; but the Chinese, like the Koreans, tear down their leaders rather than support them. Dr. Nitobe told me years ago that individually the Chinese rise above the Japanese in ability, but nationally the Japanese succeed where the Chinese fail. The Japanese are monolithic, or like a solid block of cement; whereas, as Dr. Sun Yat-sen himself said, the Chinese are like a heap of sand—divided in their extreme individualism.

Cynics may sneer, but I found that President Chiang Kai-shek had deepened in his personal religious experience—however blind he may be to the social implications of religion. I found him even more a man of prayer, more cheerful and healthy than I had ever known him. He begins and ends each day in prayer, and prays many times a day. I am not ashamed to say that I pray for him daily, as I assured him I would. The last of the Czars, however, was also personally pious; and even Ivan the Terrible had spasms of repentance and of religious austerity, but the personal religion of the Czars seemed to have no bearing on the social welfare of the people. Chiang, on the other hand, is deeply concerned in the welfare of his people—up to his lights. The man who knows him best says: "Chiang is proud, stubborn, and conscientious—a dangerous combination." Judged by his reactionary book, China's Destiny, I thought he had a Confucian rather than a Christian conscience—until I learned, to my relief, that the book was written by a ghost writer, Tao Hsi-hseng.

A quality that troubles me more in Chiang's character is his abysmal and willful ignorance. There are now only two persons who ever dare tell him unpleasant truths—and that very rarely, for he flies into a rage. The sad fact is that, though Chiang has done more to unite China than any other leader in modern history, he has failed to fulfill all the three principles of the people. Try as he has, he has been utterly unable to solidify this "heap of sand," these individualistic Chinese people, into one cohesive, patriotic nation. In Chiang's military training in China, Japan, and Russia, he never saw, conceived, nor obtained the ability to create a genuine democracy. And especially, he could not or would not provide the people's livelihood in economic justice for the peasants, nor prevent the high tide of graft and corruption that now permeates all except the highest ranks of officials in China. Therefore the Chinese people claim their immemorial right of revolution (derived from Mencius) against him.

The most disturbing fact of all is that, if and when Chiang falls, there is absolutely no one in China who can take his place, or who can hope to unite this vast amorphous people. I say this after wide consultation with Chinese and foreign leaders both in south and in north China. He has himself tried to eliminate every possible rival. And no triumvirate, nor group, nor committee could succeed him, for the Chinese have never learned to cooperate and work loyally together as equals. That leaves only the Communists.

Despite the iron curtain, upon the testimony of many witnesses we are forced to admit that in several respects the Communist areas in the north are better governed than the areas of the now reactionary Kuomintang in the south. Just as Lenin quickly did in Russia, the Communists almost immediately wisely distributed the holdings of rich landlords to the tillers of the soil, as Dr. Sun had urged. The Communists stopped the graft, because they shot the grafters. They tried to improve the lot of the peasants and have won their loyal support in areas governed by the Communists. All this poor Chiang Kai-shek has never succeeded in doing. I saw the officials in Nanking, who have a ton of paper plans for distributing the land—after they defeat the Communists. But that day will now never come. For such a government as the present National Government never can defeat them materially or morally.

I saw the generalissimo launch his new life movement in the Province of Kiangsi in 1934. This movement aimed at the reform of China through personal virtue. I saw Chiang when he had plenty of money, airplanes, and a large army of over half a million men, directed by some 40 German military advisers—including the generals who built up Hitler's Reichswehr. I saw Chiang trying to conquer the Communist commander, Chu Teh, when the latter had a tiny force of only 10,000 fanatical fighters using arms torn from the hands of Chiang's forces. Even then Chiang was able only to starve them out but was never able to crush them. Now that, according to General Marshall, the Communist armies number over 1,000,000, and control a population of over 100,000,000 in north China, they certainly are not being beaten and I fear cannot be beaten. Just as the gigantic armies of the nominally Christian czar were unable to crush the handful of Lenin's morally superior revolutionaries—even though they were atheists—so it is in China today. Just as the flaming zealots of Islam were able to sweep over nominally Christian countries, so the zealots of atheist communism are often able to overcome even true but feeble Christian communities in Russia, China, and Northern Korea today. Even though America has been pouring into China from all sources over a billion dollars a year for the last 3 years, the Chinese Government has not been able to conquer. Many of the American arms we provided for Chiang's armies are now in the hands of the Communists, and more will be in their hands soon. Even if the United States sent an army of several million troops to China, Russia, next door, could send far more. It will be fatal if we are involved in China's civil war. Britain's foreign minister, Ernest Bevin, said to me in London last year: "I do not talk war, nor expect war, but if it arises it will come where you fall foul of Soviet Russia over China." Increased American aid to China may well prove an invitation or challenge to Russia to back the Communists more openly and powerfully than she ever has done, and that in turn might lead to war with Russia—world war III.

The policies of William C. Bullitt and of Congressman WALTER JUDD if followed will fatally involve the United States in China's civil war and ultimately in world war. The more money we pour into China, the more we seem to earn their ingratitude, and the more are the Communists able to brand us as China's enemy No. 1—the wicked American imperialists. Many of China's intellectuals stand on the side lines, completely irresponsible, blaming in turn the United States and Chiang Kai-shek as the scapegoats for all China's ills. They have never formed effective liberal parties between the reactionary Kuomintang and the radical Communists, especially since Chiang Kai-shek banned the Democratic League, which General Marshall thought was one of the most hopeful parties. But the intellectuals cannot shirk nor deny their responsibility for China's present woes. They were one of the causes of China's failure.

The Chinese Government troops, under the present system of graft which grew enormously during the Japanese occupation, do not have and have never had the morale of the Communist troops. Chiang's troops have met defeat ever since September 23 and have lost several hundred thousand men, the cream of the Nationalist armies—the bulk of 39 divisions trained and equipped by the United States during the war. The Nationalist soldiers were too long robbed by their officers, as recorded truly in the Stillwell papers. I had personally witnessed the graft and robbery of the Government forces for nearly 20 years before Stilwell recorded it, and long ago I personally laid the condition of the worst provinces and divisions of the army before Chiang Kai-shek. The 450,000,000 of China, however, are bound by their age-long traditions. Chiang, steeped in these traditions and aware that "face" must be saved, never dared dismiss even the worst offenders, but had to provide other jobs for them lest they gang up on him or assassinate him. Alone he could no more prevent the graft of China than King Canute could stay the tides of the sea. I hope to show this in my next report.

If anyone doubts this dark diagnosis of China's desperate state—with which the majority of the Chinese and foreigners I have met in Nanking and Peiping agree—let him read the truest book yet written on this sad country, The United States and China, the Harvard Press. China is probably at the moment one of the darkest countries in the world politically, and she is sinking into yet deeper darkness. After examining many witnesses from the Communist areas—whose evidence I hope to record in my next report—I must say that until the Communist

flood engulfs this unhappy land, China is the most favorable field in the world for Christian evangelism among students. Even though the Communists seize power and establish their police state of terror and bloodshed, which may last long, it will still be only temporary. Many of the churches will survive as they have in Russia and in Northern Korea. No more than Emperor Nero in Rome, can Stalin or Mao Tse-tung crush out religion or Christianity. We are having crowded meetings—thousand or more attending each night in every place, and there will be large and lasting results in the 13 cities which we are now visiting from Peiping to Canton. I hope to describe these meetings in my next report, together with other more hopeful features of the situation. China will go on forever, and a greater and freer China will yet emerge than Dr. Sun Yat-sen ever dreamed of.

PEIPING, *October 28, 1949.*

The Truman Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of December 17, 1950:

THE TRUMAN EMERGENCY

A national emergency exists, so Mr. Truman's speech writers tell him. If there is an emergency, it is Truman himself and his foreign policy. His speech makes it abundantly clear that he intends the country to have more of the same that produced the debacle in Korea. The next step is to add a prospective defeat in Europe to that in Korea.

Mr. Truman sees the European commitment as a one-way street. While Europeans refuse to exert themselves in their own behalf, Americans are to consign their sons to the custody of Mr. Truman's army, to have ever greater taxes heaped upon them, and to do without a lot of things because production is to be diverted to implements of war.

Do you hear Britain, or France, or Italy, or anybody else proclaiming an emergency? You do not. Do you notice all of them rushing their young men to the training camps? Hardly. Do you hear them preaching higher taxes and civilian hardships? Not on your life.

It should be elementary that this country can't save people who refuse to try to help themselves. All we can expect is another fearful military defeat if Russia chooses to take up the gage that Truman has cast down. His speech was virtually an invitation to the Soviets to move. He confessed our weakness. He told how long it would take to start getting war production—not very substantial production at that.

There is nothing to stop Russia taking what she wants, east or west, except for the atom bombs we have in stock. She may not even fear those too much, for she is supposed to have, by now, an effective radar warning screen and a large air force for defense. She is so spread out that we can't cripple her by a massive stroke, even if the bombardiers were lucky enough to center on all of their targets.

There is danger, all right, but it is danger to the nations that are refusing to proclaim any emergency. There is little we can do for them; there is nothing that they will do for themselves. But this doesn't add up to an emergency for the United States. We are in no greater peril than we were all through the last 5 years. We might have a few atom bombs dropped on us, but if we can't protect the continent and its outposts after having spent $89,000,000,000 on defense in the last 5 years, and with $45,000,000,000 more dedicated to that purpose this coming year, then Mr. Truman and his Secretary of Defense ought to be impeached and his service chieftains court-martialed.

The only emergency America faces is in proportion to the degree of risk it assumes in Europe and has assumed in Asia. Mr. Truman isn't proclaiming an emergency in the United States; he is proclaiming that the United States is assuming France's emergency, England's, Italy's, Yugoslavia's, Korea's, and any others that may exist anywhere.

Korea has taught him nothing. He is leading the Nation toward additional gigantic defeats on other foreign battlefields. If he is not checked, our fighting forces will be slaughtered abroad, until at last this country, within its own borders, stands defenseless.

Nero, Bring Back the Fiddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, of Fairmont, Minn., dated December 12, 1950:

NERO, BRING BACK THAT FIDDLE

While our boys in Korea are retreating, what do you suppose occupied the Senate of the United States Friday, December 8, 1950? A bill (S. 4236) to provide for the development and regulation of methods of weather modification and control.

And they're not joking. The bill was twice read by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The official title is "Weather Control Act of 1951."

Shades of the late F. D. R. Imagine the Government regulating the weather and having to write your Congress for rain.

Imagine the New Deal or the Fair Deal seizing control and inflicting drought on all Republican areas; cyclones, hurricanes, thunder, and chain lightning on Taft in Ohio, Youngdahl in Minnesota, Warren in California.

Contemplate the stark tragedy that might follow an act of the State Department sending all the available moisture overseas to help the people in the uninhabited and underdeveloped portions of the earth. Imagine our fertile, verdant fields in normally Republican Iowa being turned into a Sahara.

It is to weep.

Since the time of Christ and probably a long time before, the Almighty seems to have done pretty well in handling the weather. But not now. The Fair Deal, slap-happy at the turn of events in Korea, in China, in Formosa, on the home front, in Germany and France, seeks yet another buzz-saw to back up to.

Nero was a piker, and our friend whose name lives in history because he wept believing there were no more worlds to conquer, hadn't even made a good start.

Somebody pinch us, quick. We must be dreaming.

Veterans' Loans in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on August 21 last, I inserted in the Appendix—page A5945—a statement on loans made to veterans by the Wisconsin department of veterans' affairs.

This morning I received a letter from Mr. John P. Cullen, manager of United States Veterans' Administration office No. 30, at Milwaukee, furnishing me with information corrective and explanatory of the previous insertion. I ask permission to insert Mr. Cullen's letter herewith.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that in furnishing me with the information on which the August 21 insertion was based, Mr. Gordon Huseby, director of the Wisconsin department of veterans' affairs, meant not the slightest criticism of the Veterans' Administration office at Milwaukee. Mr. Huseby recognizes, as I do, that Mr. Cullen has done, and is doing, a fine job for Wisconsin's veterans. Wisconsin veterans are fortunate in having men of the caliber of Gordon Huseby and John Cullen to direct the State and Federal agencies which administer the veterans' programs in Wisconsin. If there is any rivalry at all between the two, it is not a personal rivalry. Rather, it is a healthy and friendly contest of doing the most, in the most effective and efficient manner, for the veterans of the Badger State. The letter follows:

REGIONAL OFFICE No. 30,
Milwaukee, Wis., December 11, 1950.

Hon. GLENN R. DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: On page A5945 in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 21, 1950, the following extension of remarks by you was published:

"Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have just received information from Gordon A. Huseby, director of the department of veterans' affairs of the State of Wisconsin, that the Wisconsin department of veterans' affairs, in 9 months, has either completed or committed funds for 1,271 housing loans for a total of $1,905,600. This represents a remarkable record for the first 9 months of operation of this work.

"It is interesting to note how this record compares with the record of Federal agencies in making loans to veterans and other individuals. During the first year of its operation, 1935, the Federal Housing Authority completed 255 loans in the State of Wisconsin. During the first year of its loan operations, 1945, the Veterans' Administration completed 628 loans in the State of Wisconsin.

"As Mr. Huseby aptly put it in a letter dated August 16, 1950: 'I think our record will stand on its own.' "

It is believed that the correct figures and circumstances with regard to Veterans' Administration loan guaranty activities for the year 1945 will be of interest to you. You appreciate, I know, that during most of that year the majority of veterans, including yourself, were still in service. During 1945 we received a total of 987 applications for loan guaranties. Of this number, 868 were approved, 81 were declined or withdrawn and

the balance of 38 were pending at the end of the year. Having received only 987 applications, we could hardly, during our first year of operation, have exceeded the 1,271 housing loans completed or committed during the first 9 months of the State loan program. It will also be appreciated that our applications covered not only those for home loans but also those for farm and business loans.

I thought you would wish to have this information and I think that the loan guaranty record of the Veterans' Administration regional office for Wisconsin during the year 1945 can also stand on its own.

Yours sincerely,

J. P. CULLEN,
Manager.

If We Are To Come Through the Next Grim Half of This Twentieth Century Still a Republic of Free People, We Will Need All of Our Courage and Brains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under consent heretofore approved by the House, I am submitting a timely editorial by W. L. White, my fellow townsman, and distinguished editor of the Emporia Gazette. The editorial contains food for thought and is worthy of your reading. It follows:

Six months have gone by and where are we?

The total number of Americans killed, wounded, and captured in Korea to date make this the fourth bloodiest struggle in our Nation's history—surpassing in casualties the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War.

And the goal of it all? Well, it seems there should be free elections in Korea. But why did we wake up to the value of free elections so late? Why, when we were powerful, did we not insist on free elections in Poland, in Hungary, in Rumania, in Yugoslavia, in Czechoslovakia, in East Germany, and in the Baltic States? Why do we suddenly begin to shriek for a free election in Korea, a backward country which, in all its 3,000 years of history, never has had free elections nor seemed particularly to miss them?

But you forget political considerations. Last spring Republican Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY had aired his charges against Owen Lattimore, including a number of which Dr. Lattimore probably was innocent. The martyred St. Owen of Lattimore was declared politically pure and ideologically virginal by MILLARD TYDINGS and the other Senate Democrats, and promptly sat down to write of his ordeal of slander. But the country was uneasy. For obviously much had been smothered under whitewash or suppressed, including the smelly Amerasia case.

At this moment there came what seemed to be, from the political standpoint, the Heaven-sent opportunity of Korea. It promised to be a quick, popular little war against a weak enemy, and in behalf of the true, the beautiful, and the good. The unbearable vulgarities of JOE MCCARTHY would be drowned out by bugle and drum. Who then would dare say the Truman administration was not firmly anticommunistic? And so into Korea were sent not Dr. Lattimore, not Dean Acheson—but the little American draftees from Japan. The frailties of our statesmen were to be glossed over by the blood (in modest quantities) of our sons.

We are therefore now at war in Asia, and, furthermore, our outnumbered soldiers are now hightailing it down the valleys of Korea in the most humiliating spectacle the American flag ever has flapped over since the Battle of Bull Run. How did we get into it? Somewhere in the bookcase you surely must have a copy of that half-forgotten document, the Constitution of the United States. Pull it out and in the fine type you will find that the Congress and only the Congress shall have the power to declare war and make peace.

But don't be old-fashioned. That cumbersome contraption of representative government was set up by those old fuddy-duddies, our founding fathers. A congressional debate on whether or not to go into Korea would have meant weeks of delay; in the end Congress might have decided to stay out altogether.

Readers of this column will remember that the Gazette was in favor of standing up to Stalin as early as 5 years ago when our truly magnificent armies were still intact, and when Harry S. Truman was a happy fellow-traveler who had not yet discovered the horrid Soviet menace.

In view of this fact the writer presumes now to list five guideposts to a future American foreign policy. These are:

1. Since we are now pitiably weak, we should for the moment avoid hopping carelessly into wars which we cannot hope to win.

2. We should not concentrate all our forces in one distant isolated spot. Almost everything we have is now packed into Korea; if hell should break out in Europe, we have left only the Eighty-second Airborne Division to put between Stalin's 300 divisions and the Atlantic Ocean.

3. We should avoid war to capture regions which are strategically worthless and which, if we won them, would be a further liability.

4. When we are losing a war in a distant area, we should not be offended when a nearby ally offers help. (Stalin is winning this Korean war without the loss of a single Russian life, whereas Dean Acheson virtually turned down Chiang Kai-shek's offer to send 200,000 anti-Communist Chinese fighting men into Korea; Mr. Acheson felt this might offend those peace-loving agrarian reformers, the Chinese Communists.)

5. Until we are stronger (should Moscow allow us the time to get stronger) we should try to cut to a bare minimum the number of wars we enter solely to win local American elections.

The writer feels that we are now entering a period of terrible stress, in which, if this Nation and all Christendom are to survive, we will need the same steady wisdom, solid character, and firm courage that our people had in Lincoln's day. As a flabby, rich, and stupid nation we cannot hope to survive. We can no longer continue fat, dumb, and happy, babbling that this is the century of the common man, electing to high office any grinning dummy who will pledge himself to bribe us with paper-dollar subsidies paid out of our own public Treasury, stupidly believing that if the Kremlin cannot be appeased, then it can be quickly licked in a bloodless push-button war.

If we are to come through the next grim half of this twentieth century still a republic of free people we will need all of our courage and brains. We cannot hope to survive the storm with a government which is by the nincompoops, of the bird-brains, and for the greedy dimwits. Because of its follies such a government will surely and deservedly perish from the earth, and all the sane and all the brave will be crunched in the wreckage of its crash.

Vermont Society Honors Hon. Charles A. Plumley, of Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday evening, December 6, the Vermont State Society of Washington held a meeting in honor of the Honorable CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, who is about to retire voluntarily as Representative at Large for the State of Vermont. As a near neighbor and warm friend of our distinguished colleague from Vermont, I desire, under leave to extend my remarks, to include an account of this meeting written by one of the members present. I am sure it will be of interest to all Members of the House who hold Mr. PLUMLEY in such high regard:

A HISTORICAL VERMONT EVENT

After the bountiful repast and the election of officers had been had, the master of ceremonies called on GEORGE AIKEN, pardon me, I mean Senator AIKEN. Among the other things he said was the first radio speech he ever made was in support of CHARLES A. PLUMLEY as a candidate for Congress. He went on to say he never regretted he made the speech although at the time there were a lot of people very ready to cut his throat.

Then Mrs. Dale, the widow of the late Senator Porter H. Dale, paid a wonderful tribute to Mr. PLUMLEY's father and to Mr. and Mrs. Plumley and the family, all of whom she had known over long years so intimately. In conversation, she said, "The Plumleys really are and have been a part of Vermont. Charlie's father and mother were both educated in Vermont. He and his wife were both born and educated in Vermont. Their children are graduates of Vermont universities and colleges. In short, she said, they are Vermonters from the roots up."

The gracious lady outdid herself.

I just couldn't see how Mr. PLUMLEY could take it the way he did although I noticed that he was blowing his nose once in a while.

Then they called on Col. Jack Crowley, who once was a candidate against Mr. PLUMLEY for nomination to Congress. His tribute to Mr. PLUMLEY was what might be called a jewel.

Then they called on CHARLIE to speak in rebuttal. That he was deeply moved by all the things that had been said was very evident. He came back at them, however, by saying that, "It is not every man who has an opportunity living to attend his own funeral." He said he didn't like these things although he came because he had been invited as a guest despite the fact that his experience over the years had shown that such observations and celebrations were the end of one's official connection with either the State or the Government and ordinarily spelled an end which he did not anticipate for he was not superstitious. Then he told them the story about the lady who had a very jealous husband. She was being solicited by a book agent on the thirteenth floor of an apartment house. Just about the time she was all ready to buy the books she heard the key turn in the lock of the door and she said to the book agent, "You better get out of here quick because my husband is intensely and insanely jealous." The salesman said he would hide in the closet, to which the housewife replied there was no closet. She said, "The only thing for you to do is jump." "But," he said, "this is the thir-

teenth floor." To which she replied, "Don't be superstitious."

Then in response to what Senator AIKEN had said about his first radio speech, Charlie said he recalled a day before George was ever a candidate for office and when he was operating the Aiken florist business at Putney. As he was in a hurry to make a delivery at Brattleboro, he was stopped by the police, who said, "Don't you know, George, you're exceeding the speed limit?" and George said, "I don't know whether my speedometer works or not." Whereupon the police officer said, "Haven't you any governor in the car?" to which George, later governor of the State and a very distinguished United States Senator, as we all know, said, "No, the governor is in Montpelier, what you smell is fertilizer."

Thereupon George, pardon, the senior Senator from Vermont, read the following letter from RALPH FLANDERS, the junior Senator from Vermont:

"CHARLES PLUMLEY is a Vermont institution. More people in our State have shaken hands with him, have known him, and like him, than is the case with any other of our citizens.

"That we like Mrs. Plumley, too, does not have to be stated. In fact, if it were possible for us to like anyone more than we do Charles, it would be his good wife to whom Vermonters in exile here in Washington are glad to pay a tribute of praise.

"The Honorable Charles is an institution not only in Vermont but in the House of Representatives. Having been there since 1933, he would naturally know a lot of people and have a lot of influence. But he has far more of acquaintance and influence than comes by his service of 18 years. The place he holds did not drop into his lap. He made it.

"He has always represented the old Vermont traditions. He thinks our thoughts and speaks our language. We are glad to feel sure that he will spend his days of retirement in our State, in his home town, though we are willing that he should go South during mudtime, if not before.

"To Mr. and Mrs. Plumley, Mrs. Flanders and I, unable to be present, join with you in extending our admiration, affection, and hearty good wishes.

"RALPH E. FLANDERS."

If anything could have "floored" the sole Representative from the State of Vermont, this should have done it. But, after a moment or two of hesitation, he rose in rebuttal to say:

"Sometimes I think I am a moron, but I think I know enough to take a hint. I think it is time for me to proceed. I am not like the boy who left his girl's house so early that his friends asked him why; to which he replied, 'Well, you see, she and I were sitting on the sofy—we were sitting kinda together-like and kinda talking. Her folks had all gone to bed. I was trying to get up my courage to move up a little toward her when she turned out the light. Don't you know I knew enough to take a hint—and so I left.'

"But," said PLUMLEY, "I just can't leave, and now, formally, and speaking for myself and Mrs. Plumley and for the record, we are deeply appreciative of all the kind things which have been said and done for us over the years we have enjoyed our membership in the Vermont Association.

"We appreciate the flowers, verbal and otherwise, for they are the sweetest things God ever made for they show thoughts that words cannot express and, as somebody said:

" 'I sometimes think that never blows so red
The rose as where some buried Caesar bled.'

"There are occasions and events to which only the heart responds. Words find their inadequacy because they are not opportune and cannot be spoken.

"For some 17 years we have been members of this association; have enjoyed your hospitality; been your neighbors—never unappreciatively.

"Now we come to the end of a long road for that in an official capacity we shall not longer enjoy your sufferance and your tolerance, nor your wholesale good will which so always has permeated all the meetings with you.

"That does not mean that old acquaintance should be forgot and we swear eternal friendship to all of you and those who have preceded you. I could reminisce, but I remember that La Rochefoucauld said once, 'Everyone complains of his lack of memory, but no one of his lack of judgment,' and that somebody else said that 'Nothing is more common than a fool with a strong memory'; so admittedly and of necessity I am going to shut up right now, period. I am not sure in which class I fit.

"You know it has been said also that people with good memories seldom remember anything worth remembering, but on top of that comes another who says memory is the power to gather roses in winter.

"I have listened with great interest and great pleasure to all things which have been said, deserved and undeserved. I would like to say to you Vermonters that I am not a quitter. Possibly had I recognized the situation in futurity which confronted me as of a year and a half ago, I might have still been a candidate for office because of my alleged information and a lot of things accumulated by experience over the years. The Government will always have the benefit of anything I know.

"Nevertheless, I thought, and still think, that some younger man should bear the burden of the responsibility for carrying out the ideas and the ideologies for which I have stood over the years as I have undertaken as your sole Representative to represent the State of Vermont.

"It will take a lot of that intestinal fortitude only born of those who are born to inherit that fearlessness, minus foolishness, which is only to be found, still—and I don't mean quiet, but I mean yet—in a few of the States of this Union, of which Vermont stands out predominantly, to undertake and to preserve from complete communization, socialism, and destruction the ideals of democracy for which our founding fathers fought, and I have incessantly undertaken to maintain.

"What a horrible situation obtains in Korea, and world-wide, civilian and military; in what an awful situation the United States of America finds itself as it confronts world war III, which is now already in progress. I declare no responsibility for it can be attached to me nor to the representatives of the State of Vermont.

"I am not much at poetry, but the following occurred to me and I wrote it:

"I WONDER

"As once I wandered at eventide alone
In rain-drenched garden paths through flowers and weeds,
I wondered if any day and sun would ever follow to atone
For all the wind and dark had done; to which no heed in world at large
Is paid by those who idly pass to waste both lives and time and money never earned,
Lightly burdened by thought or care of whence these came or what a burden some must bear
To save us from the catastrophic flair
For reckless, wicked waste of things they claim do make men great!

"Still stand I wondering what will be their fate—
The fate of those who measure not nor calculate
The depth to which by ill-considered recklessness with lives of other people's sons, and dollars, not their own,
They have condemned those generations yet unborn
To travail such as other age has never known.

"But I found respite, if not relief, in that which my friend Hurd said who put me in my place poetically and otherwise when he wrote:

" 'The scythe that severs life lays waste the world:
The hate which cumulates to wrath is hurled
Against the peace which trembled like a flower
Upon the stalk of hope. The fatal hour
Has struck. * * * Is this the end
Of Hope? The ultimate for which men spend
Their years in never-ending toil and sweat?
Is this the doom to which our days curvet
Like moths unable to resist the light
Whose flame is death?'

" 'Thus fell the boasted might
Of Nineveh and Troy * * * thus Carthage fell * * *
And Babylon. Shall future centuries tell
A similar story of our rise and fall
To depths too deep for resurrection? Call
The roll of systems grown obese and weak
From glutton: apply the pure critique
Of reason to historic facts and know
The ageless truth that nations cannot sow
The retroactive earth with hate and reap
The fruits of love. Oblivion lies deep
Upon the names of tyrant men and states.
Be not deceived, for time reiterates
The unlearned lessons of the fruitless past.

" 'The slashing scythe cannot destroy the vast
Insistency within the root. The ground
Grows quick with promise: without audible sound
Or visible motion, life thrusts toward the light
Like secretive grass that grows despite
The devastation of the scythe. Madmen sow
The soil with steel, indifferent to woe
Implanted: ignorant of Nemesis.
Tomorrow is a deep and dark abyss
Into which the cruel and unjust
Will slide and vanish. Empires fall to dust—
Democracies will follow if they dare
To break eternal faith with man—despair
Is fertile soil for change. Lay waste the earth—
Apply the blade to beauty and to mirth—
Reduce each city to a cluttered grave—
Destruction is not final if we save
A single fibered root of freedom. Now
Is not forever! Wait! Somewhere, somehow
The severed stalk of liberty shall rise,
Grow green, and flower under friendlier skies.'

"So, as my valedictory to this association which I have loved, I would like to leave you with the thought in your mind that I said to you that once I stood in admiration before the tomb of Shakespeare in the church at Stratford; another time I stood in awe before the tomb of the mighty Napoleon in the Invalides at Paris. Often I have stood in suspense before the tomb of the Father of our Country at Mount Vernon. Last Sunday I went again to the tomb of Lincoln. I wanted a message from him to give to you tonight. His spirits seemed to say: 'Go tell my fellow Americans and particularly Vermonters, in these days of stress and conflict everywhere, to be brave and have no fear. Tell them to stand by any man who stands right; stand by him while he is right and part from him when he goes wrong. Tell

him that we here highly resolve * * * that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.'"

The Need for Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a column from the Washington Post of Monday, December 18, 1950, by Messrs. Joseph and Stewart Alsop. I believe that their thoughtful discussion of our need for allies warrants the attention of the Members of the Congress:

THE NEED FOR ALLIES

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

A new, extreme isolationism is being born of the defeatism that now horribly pervades this confused city. No leading figure has as yet dared to give public voice to this important trend. But all over Washington, in the lobbies of the Senate and House, among the more tremulous policy makers, and even in the recesses of the military staff the same subterranean muttering is going on.

Our allies cannot be depended on. We have not the power to carry the burden of world leadership alone. We must contract our "commitments" (the new catchword). We must abandon first Asia and then Europe to their fate. We must retire into our own hemisphere, which we can defend. So goes the story. It makes even Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, who at least proposed a Monroe Doctrine for Europe, look like a rabid one-world man.

The simplest way to see the poisonous falsehood of this reasoning is to have a look at the effect on the value of our only major military asset, the stockpile of atomic weapons. To put the cart of conclusion before the horse of proof, the atomic stockpile which is our only security will lose almost its whole value, if the above-outlined program is blundered into or adopted.

The causes are plain enough. In the first place, plutonium and even hydrogen bombs, no matter how numerous they may be, or how great their destructive power may be, have no value whatever locked up in a cave in Kentucky. They must be delivered to their destined targets, or at least they must be possible to deliver, in order to fulfill their purpose. As of today and for a long time to come, the value of our atomic stockpile must therefore be measured by the capabilities of our strategic air arm.

The strategic air arm is presently composed of 14 groups, of which four are B–36 groups designed to strike targets in the Soviet Union from bases in this hemisphere, and 10 are medium-range groups equipped with B–29's, B–50's, and B–47's. Improvements in Soviet air defenses in recent months have considerably depreciated the worth of the B–36 groups, since so many other characteristics had to be sacrificed to build great range into this airplane. Hence the medium-range groups, which are all to be equipped eventually with the admirable B–47, must be regarded as vitally important.

The worth of these medium-range groups in turn obviously depends upon the availability of bases for them. By the tricky method of refueling in the air, they can in theory reach targets in the Soviet Union from airfields on this side of the Atlantic. But in practice, even the enthusiasts frankly admit that the efficiency of the strategic air arm will be hopelessly impaired if these medium-range groups, which now comprise over two-thirds of the total force, are denied bases overseas.

At the moment, the necessary overseas bases are available and ready. They comprise the large airfield complex that has been built up in eastern England; another important complex in the British-controlled north African region of Cyrenaica; a vital, very advanced base on the British-controlled island of Cyprus; bases now abuilding in French North Africa; and airfields used by us as transport bases in Tripoli and at Dahran in Arabia. A glance at this list reveals what is now rapidly becoming almost the central fact in the strategic situation of the United States.

We may control the atomic stockpile, but our allies, and particularly Great Britain, control most of the bases we need to give the atomic stockpile any value.

There are a thousand other reasons, of course, why the program of abandoning our allies to their fate and withdrawing to our hemisphere is a quick way to national suicide. Some of them will be examined in a subsequent report. Meanwhile, the significance of the situation outlined above ought to be faced by every American. We have gone on smugly for 5 years, supposing the atomic bomb was ours to use or not to use, as we alone saw fit. We have gone on smugly for 5 years, neglecting our own defense and the defense of the free world, and relying for security on this magical weapon.

But we have been wrong. When Prime Minister Attlee told Parliament the other day that he was sure we would not use our bombs without consulting the British Government, his promise was doubly guaranteed by the facts of geography and the ranges of our airplanes. If now, in the hour of peril, we abandon our allies, we cannot hope that they will not abandon us. And thus, those American leaders who are secretly advocating this course today, and will no doubt publicly advocate it tomorrow, are in truth proposing that the United States freeze its only military asset, the atomic stockpile, which is also, at the moment, the only defense of the free world.

Would Bomb Shelters Become Traps?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, of Fairmont, Minn., of December 6, 1950:

WOULD BOMB SHELTERS BECOME TRAPS?

There is talk of spending around $3,000,000,000 for bomb shelters in the United States.

Maybe it's a good idea, but it would appear Congress should go pretty thoroughly into the plans before saddling such added expense on the American taxpayer.

While details of construction, and perhaps location of such shelters could not be made public in too great detail for security reasons, to the uninitiated it would seem that bomb shelters might well turn out to be traps instead of shelters, in case of attack.

What more could an attacking armada ask than to have its victims bunched in one place?

Liberty Shall Not Cringe in the Face of Brute Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, in 1950 the Southland answered the call to arms, just as it has done in every war in which this Nation has engaged itself. It has again demonstrated its willingness to sacrifice in order that our common country remain free, independent, the land of hope.

In this connection it is a privilege for me to include as a part of my remarks, an editorial by my friend, W. W. Gunter, editor of the Mountain Eagle, Jasper, Ala., in which Editor Gunter expresses the sentiment that America must unite and make the sacrifices which the times call for in a spirit of true patriotism:

THE SOUTH IS DEPENDABLE

How strange it is that in this most wonderful of all ages, with its manifold conveniences and opportunities, that there should exist in the world today powerful nations who choose to scatter the flames of war over the world in a coordinated effort to impose their totalitarian form of government over all the people of the world.

While the free nations of the world are facing a danger unprecedented in the history of nations, the old, romantic South stands ready again to make any sacrifice necessary along with the rest of the Nation in order that this Nation shall remain free and independent.

The southern people are noted for their cheerful disposition and for their courage under difficulties in the past. During the darkest days of the Revolution, southern soldiers, poorly equipped, remained cheerful and hopeful. And thus it was with the heroic Confederate soldiers as they filed their weary ways through the mountain passes of Tennessee, North Carolina and South Carolina, and fell in line in the Valley of Virginia; it was not with dread and fear pictured on their faces but with gay songs of their beautiful Southland and their wives and sweethearts left behind. Neither are their descendants discouraged today.

Through two great wars, descendants of Confederate soldiers from the Southland have gone out and fought side by side with sons and daughters of other States on the battlefields of Europe, in other lands, and the islands of the sea, and many of them never returned with their victorious comrades.

Insofar as the southern people are concerned, the great sacrifices made by this Nation in the past shall not have been made in vain, that liberty shall not cringe in the face of brute force, that through the coming years the Statue of Liberty shall continue to stand there in New York Harbor, looking forever toward the east, serving as a beacon light to the people of the world who seek the blessings of liberty.

Free Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Washington Post, Saturday, December 16, 1950:

IRELAND AND ATLANTIC SECURITY

On April 18 of this year I had the honor to address the Overseas Writers Press Club at Washington on the subject of Ireland's place in the North Atlantic defense scheme.

At that time I urged the vital necessity of a sound political background to military planning, indicating from recent history (World War II) the disasters inherent in the failure of politicians to provide the military command with a realistic basis for their plans and operations. On such occasions the overlooking of some political factor not readily apparent to the military mind causes military action to be based on faulty premises.

I fear this has once again proved true in Korea both when the North Koreans attacked initially and when the Chinese invasion completely altered the military basis. Absence of a sound political background to military operations normally causes initial deployment of unduly weak forces within effective striking distance of a superior enemy. In such circumstances, I suggested, a wise commander should have in mind the worst possible case as well as the best possible case.

Fortunately reverses in Korea do not directly threaten the safety of the powerhouse and main base of the free world, the United States, to the degree that a similar series of defeats in northwestern Europe, resulting in the overrunning of the British Isles, would compromise American security.

Whoever the American designated to command in the northeastern Atlantic theater, he must remember that he cannot afford to ignore the worst possible case; indeed he must initially face the fact that that case already obtains, since there is nothing to prevent Russia from reaching the Atlantic coast and the Channel within 3 weeks of his assuming command and, should that occur, Russia will not repeat Hitler's unpreparedness for a trans-Channel operation. Russia's object will be the expulsion of America from Europe.

Initially the best he can hope to achieve will be the retention of the eastern Atlantic islands, Iceland, Britain, Ireland, and the Breton and Iberian peninsulas. It will be more important politically and strategically to arm and integrate Spain than to rebuild German forces. French "national redoubts" in Brittany and on the Garonne should have priority over a new Maginot Line, and a united reintegrated Ireland is vital to the over-all concept. Indeed his headquarters could better command from Limerick than from London or Paris.

Much as Americans will sympathize with those European nations in the Atlantic Pact for whom military security cannot at present be provided we must none of us sacrifice the substance for the shadow; for complete defense of the Western European zone must remain a shadow until there are at least 50 efficient combat divisions deployed in Germany.

The retention of Britain must be the keystone of our immediate planning. Britain is perfectly able to guard her own southern and eastern coast line, but her situation would be gravely weakened were Russia to secure a footing in central Ireland in conjunction with an invasion of Britain. Russia might well invade Ireland by air with impunity at the most critical moment for Britain. Free Ireland, outside the Atlantic Pact, and excluded from participation in the pact, because of her dispute with Britain over northern Ireland could not at present dispose of a Russian airborne invasion.

Thus a divided Ireland becomes the Achilles heel of Atlantic Pact strategy and will remain so for at least two more critical years. Alternatively, an integrated and reunited Ireland, defended by Irishmen in conjunction with the United States of America, provides an absolutely secure base for the defense of the Atlantic fringe of Western Europe, which is all of Europe our means will allow us to defend with certainty.

In this context the defense of Ireland becomes of greater importance to the Atlantic community than the defense of London. It is the bounden duty of the high political chiefs to give their military chief a clear-cut political background against which he can plan realistic strategy. He must be free to deal with Ireland, Spain, Portugal, and France as well as with Britain without cramping political restrictions.

ERIC DORMAN O'GOWAN,
Brigadier, British Army (Retired).
COOTEHILL, IRELAND.

Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial comments of Mr. Claude N. Swanson, editor of the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, of Fairmont, Minn., in the issues of December 5 and 7, 1950:

Before we go to making any further deals with Socialist Britain and helpless France, we'd best find out what we are to receive in return for the billions of good, hard-earned American dollars we've dumped in their laps. If they are not interested in helping themselves, what use is there to give them further aid at the expense of the American taxpayer. What we need now is help, not a couple of millstones around our necks.

The Nation will never be able to go forward in the war effort so long as Acheson remains in our State Department. Not only do the American people lack confidence in him, but his record of handling our foreign affairs to date is nothing in his favor. Besides, his close friendship with Alger Hiss, and other out-and-out Reds that burrowed into the State Department should make him a class-A subject for the skids.

The average American is not too concerned about a Government-provided pension, or other forms of security at the expense of the taxpayer. But he is concerned about the right and privilege to whittle out his own security, to be able to save for a home and for ultimate retirement and travel. He isn't interested in welfare projects thought up by an army of visionary, impractical swivel-chair nuts who ought to be out earning their own living.

Let Congress demand a full and above-board accounting of what is transpiring between President Truman, Secretary Acheson, the State Department and Socialist Britain's Clement Attlee. The American people don't care to have Yalta repeated. We want no secret commitments. If we can't be trusted, chances are it isn't good for us.

It's getting about cold enough for that luscious, peppery, steaming hot bean soup. With every bean preserved in its individual shell, the delicate flavor sealed in; the broth concocted of pure water, made savory with just the right amount of juice of slow-cooked ham hocks, bacon rind, a bit of parsley and seasoning to taste.

Let's kick Acheson and his fellow travelers out of the State Department and get people in there in whom the American people can have unquestioned confidence. Then we can start all over again with a united, unwavering front.

The Alabama Department of Aeronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement of the origin, composition, and policies of the Alabama Department of Aeronautics, taken from Alabama Aviation News:

THE ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF AERONAUTICS

ESTABLISHMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

The Alabama Department of Aeronautics was first established as the Alabama Aviation Commission by the 1935 Legislature through Act 493 (Senator Will Walton), approved September 13, 1935. It began operations on October 23, 1935. The 1943 legislature, through Act 248 (John Chichester), broadened the responsibilities of the Commission to include control over the safety of all aeronautical activity in the State.

In 1945 the Commission became a major agency when the legislature with Act 402 (Senator S. L. Toomer), created the Alabama Department of Aeronautics to replace the Alabama Aviation Commission. It was activated as such on October 16, 1945.

AIRPORT AMENDMENT

An amendment to the State constitution to authorize the State to engage in or assist airport construction, operations, etc. (Act 419—Henderson, Bradford, High, and Chichester), was authorized by the 1945 legislature, was approved at the general election on November 5, 1946, and was proclaimed part of the constitution on November 14, 1946.

AVIATION GASOLINE TAX ALLOCATION

The 1945 legislature passed an act allocating all revenue from the aviation gasoline tax to aeronautical purposes (Act 367—Chichester). Refunds were authorized to municipalities owning or operating public airports and the balance was assigned to this department.

ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN

The department consists of the Alabama Aeronautics Commission, which is the governing body; the director of aeronautics, who is the executive officer; and the staff. The commission consists of seven members. Five are appointed by the governor and two are statutory, these being the director of the highway department, and the director of the department of public safety. The appointed members serve a 4-year term on a staggered basis. Each of the appointed members is, or has been, a pilot and aircraft owner. The

director is appointed by the commission, subject to the approval of the governor, when initially appointed, and serves an indefinite term dependent on satisfactory service. Members of the staff must be, and are, selected from the State civil-service register in accordance with State law.

AERONAUTICAL JOB CLASSIFICATIONS

In June 1947 specific aeronautical job classifications were established for the department for the first time. These classifications fully cover administrative, aeronautical and engineering needs and will enable the department to keep pace with new activities as they arise and to render broader and more effective service.

EXPERIENCE OF PERSONNEL

The present director, who has served since 1935, is an overseas Air Force veteran of both World War I (France), and World War II (England), as a pilot and operations officer. He has been active in aviation since 1917. Every male member of the staff, with one exception, is also an Air Force veteran of World War II and one is also a veteran of World War I.

SERVICE AGENCY

At all times this department has considered itself as a service agency and has recognized that its primary considerations must be those of service. That has been its policy, and that has also been its record, all through the years back to 1935, when it was first established.

SERVICES RENDERED

This department feels that its service to Alabama aviation must cover the entire field of civil aviation and all the needs of Alabama aviation. In this connection its service has involved more than 300 distinct types of operations.

BUSINESS AGENCY

From the time of its establishment, in 1935, this department has been permitted to operate as a business agency, on a nonpolitical basis. It has, likewise, endeavored to operate as a business agency on a careful, effective, economical basis. All of the Commissioners, those of the present as well as those of the past, have all been businessmen, as well as pilots and aircraft owners.

To substantiate this, our budget requests for 1949–50 and 1950–51 were less than our 1948–49, when others were asking for increases; our expenditures for 1948–49 and 1949–50 were less than budget authorizations, and during the present fiscal year, 1950–51, there will also be substantial savings. When budget requests are submitted for fiscal years 1951–52 and 1952–53 we again expect to further reduce our expenses. Meanwhile, our service has not been impaired.

PROGRAM

This department is not operating aimlessly on a day-to-day, free-wheeling basis. Since it was changed from a minor agency to a major department in 1945, it has a definite operating program, with at least 22 major objectives. These constitute an orderly, progressive, and productive program to meet both current and future needs of Alabama aviation.

A Time To Take Heart and Renew Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, of Fairmont, Minn., dated December 5, 1950:

A TIME TO TAKE HEART AND RENEW COURAGE

Memory of the living does not go back to a time when our Nation faced a more turbulent road ahead than it does right now, but this is not a time to lose heart; nor is it a time to give up.

It is a time, instead, to take heart, for the people are aroused as never before to the utter inadequacy of certain officials in high places, and before long they will be relegated to the scrap heap and men with courage and vision, unquestioned patriotism, and a devotion to our form of government will take their place.

Then, and not until then, will we pull out of the miasmal fog that has beclouded our world relationship for these many years.

We have no one to blame but ourselves for the condition that exists. With less than one-half of our qualified voters taking time to go to the polls, slightly more than 25 percent of these have put men in office who believe that charity should begin—not at home—but overseas. We have thrown away billions to buy friendship, and, now that friendship is needed, we find our beneficiaries looking out the window.

American Fishing Industry Should Be Protected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in the years prior to the late war, Japanese fishermen landed enormous hauls of fish from the ocean waters off the Pacific coast, from Alaska to Mexico, and then after packing this fish, often in floating canneries, dumped large quantities of their canned fish on the American market.

American fishermen and cannery workers could not compete with the low living standards and low wages of the Japanese workers. At a result the American fishing industry of the Pacific coast suffered grave injury financially and in employment.

The Japanese, by their attack on Pearl Harbor, blew themselves out of the American market, and to meet the demand for fish food the fishing industry of the Pacific coast was enormously expanded until it now employs about 50,000 people. Huge American investments have been made since Pearl Harbor in canneries and in fishing boats and gear. These investments and this employment will be irreparably impaired if the Japanese are permitted to resume their prewar practices of fishing anywhere they please off the Pacific coast and again engage in operating floating canneries off our shores for the packing of fish. These practices by the Japanese, if resumed, will again as in the past be the source of new international misunderstandings and disagreements that will disrupt rather than cement ties of friendship between the United States and Japan.

It is therefore vital that the State Department in negotiating a peace treaty with Japan bind the Japanese Government to respect the interests of the United States fishing industry to the end that the stability of the American industry will not be undermined, its fruitful source of employment destroyed and the likelihood of international misunderstandings be increased.

I append to these remarks an editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, of Seattle, Wash., one of the largest and most influential newspapers of the Pacific Northwest, setting forth the need for protection of the American fishing industry being made a part of any peace treaty negotiated with Japan. The Post-Intelligencer editorial follows:

THE FISHING INDUSTRIES

The American State Department has indicated an intention to write a formal peace treaty with Japan at the earliest possible date, a commendable intention from the standpoint of the many vital American interests involved.

But the restoration of normal relations with Japan does not require or justify the renewal of Japanese economic and commercial practices which depleted and all but destroyed the American fishing industries in our own waters before the war.

It is a matter of bitter memory to the labor and management elements of the entire Pacific fishing enterprise of the United States that the Japanese veritably mined the great fisheries of the Northeast Pacific Ocean, extending from Alaska to Mexico, in the prewar years.

With total disregard of the program of conservation to which American and Canadian fishermen adhered, the notorious and infamous Japanese floating canneries were bringing one of the Western World's richest sources of food to the point of extinction when the Pacific war intervened.

One of the first of the many acts of wisdom by General MacArthur as administrator of occupied Japan after the war was the restriction of Japanese fishing activity to prevent resumption of the wasteful and ruinous violation of American and Canadian waters in a manner that had previously amounted to deliberate plunder.

Any peace treaty concluded with Japan should include a permanent agreement to make this safeguard of our own fisheries an irrevocable part of the understanding upon which the future peace and prosperity of the American people must be based.

The American fisheries in the Pacific constitute a combination of industries valued at more than one-third of a billion dollars.

They provide a means of livelihood for more than 50,000 men.

But above and beyond that, they are an indispensable source of food to all of the American people.

It would be a mockery if our victory over Japan in the Pacific war should be nullified by our failure to make the Pacific fisheries secure against Japanese invasion and despoliation.

It was of little avail for American and Canadian fishermen before the war to husband the Pacific fishery resources upon which they depended for employment, when the Japanese fishing fleets turned our conservation program to their own profit.

It would be of no avail whatever for the United States and Canada to practice conservation in the vast fishing grounds of the Northeast Pacific Ocean in the future if the Japanese once more had opportunity to exploit the waters without restraint.

The impending peace treaty offers a perfect occasion, and perhaps the only occasion, for binding the Japanese Government to an agreement to respect one of the most vital

of American interests in the Pacific, and that agreement should be one of the inviolable conditions of permanent peace in the Pacific.

Proposed Removal of Secretary Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement which I made yesterday, December 17, on the subject of the demand by the Republican caucuses in the Senate and House for the removal of Secretary Acheson.

I also ask consent to have inserted immediately following my statement the following editorials: Editorial from the New York Times, December 16; editorial from the New York Post, December 16; editorial from the Washington Post, December 17; editorial from the Washington Star, December 17; article by Anne O'Hare McCormick which appeared in the New York Times, December 18.

There being no objection, the statement and newspaper comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 17, 1950.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, IN SUPPORT OF SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON

The partisan resolution demanding the removal of Secretary Acheson which was adopted by the Republican caucuses of both Houses of Congress has done our country a great disservice.

It can serve only to disrupt and confuse our people and our allies in this critical hour when the need for unity and determination is absolutely essential if we are to survive.

As for our enemies, the attack on Secretary Acheson and on American foreign policy has played directly into the hands of the Communists who have long regarded the Secretary of State as the chief spokesman of our Government's policies which block the Kremlin's aim to enslave the free world.

Secretary Acheson has handled the world relationships of our country with great skill and determination in the face of an indescribably difficult situation. Full credit should go to him for executing the policies which have bulwarked the free nations in their quest for peace and security.

He successfully implemented the Greek-Turkish aid program. He was largely responsible for the acceptance of the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, the principle of military aid to Western Europe, and the decision to combat aggression in Korea and elsewhere with all the power of our great human and material resources. Finally he has consistently led our efforts to strengthen the United Nations as a great agency of peace and security.

I hope that this latest partisan attack will not handicap him on his present mission and in his difficult task of welding the nations of Western Europe into an effective line of defense. Failure at this time would be tragic.

Last Tuesday night I made a Nation-wide plea for unity. I concluded my address with the following words:

"Unity not only can be achieved, it must be achieved. But it cannot be achieved if one group or another seeks to make political capital out of national danger. It cannot be achieved if we are asked to sacrifice the cause we fight for as the price of unity. It cannot be achieved by insisting on the sacrifice of this official or that official on the public block of unjust and undeserved attack.

"And so with all the earnestness of my heart and soul I call upon both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party to forget about 1952 and to think and act only in terms of the security of our country and the peace of the world."

I renew that plea with all my force and earnestness.

[From the New York Times of December 16, 1950]

THE ATTACK ON MR. ACHESON

At a moment when a grave international crisis imposes on this country a state of national emergency calling for the widest possible national unity, the Republican leadership in Congress has seen fit to serve on President Truman a formal demand for the removal of Secretary Acheson. This is a partisan maneuver as unprecedented as it is irresponsible. It can only disrupt the growing national solidarity on the measures necessary to meet the perils facing us, throw both this country and our allies into confusion regarding our policies, and thus provide aid and comfort to our enemies.

Like every mortal, Secretary Acheson is not without fault and has made his share of mistakes, especially in attempting to support a bankrupt far eastern policy for which his predecessors must bear the prime responsibility. But he is also one of the first in our Government who, in advance of many of his critics, recognized the real nature of the Soviet threat, warned against it, and helped achieve the revolutionary change in our foreign and defense policies in the direction of firm resistance to Communist aggression.

Mr. Acheson supported before Congress the first concrete step in such resistance—the Truman doctrine, which provided aid to Greece and Turkey. He was the first to expound the idea of foreign economic aid that grew into the Marshall plan, which saved Western Europe from the Communist tide. He was among the first to emphasize that a policy of resistance had to be backed by strength, and it was he who negotiated the revolutionary North Atlantic Pact and initiated the measures for the rearmament of Western Europe, including Western Germany. Finally, when the chips were down and Communist armies began to march in Korea, he was one of the first and stanchest advocates of resistance.

In these circumstances it is more than irony that the Republican leadership in Congress should have chosen to attack him with allegations of appeasement and softness toward communism.

[From the New York Post of December 16, 1950]

THE KNOW-NOTHINGS TAKE OVER

In our political annals December 15, 1950, will be remembered as one of the most wretched days of partisan infamy. On that day Republicans in both the Senate and House voted to plunge their knives into the back of America's Secretary of State at perhaps the gravest diplomatic moment in our history.

They didn't tell the country how they would have averted the present crisis if they had ruled our foreign policy; they could hardly pretend to do so because so many of them had voted against even minimum measures of military and economic defense in Korea and other places. Neither did they offer their formula for the solution of the problems we face; they could not do so because they could not agree among themselves as to where we should go from here. They neither urged that we declare war nor told us how to wage peace. All they could offer the Nation at this critical juncture was a demand for the execution of Dean Acheson. On this point the Communists abroad and at home have been way ahead of the Republicans. They have been crying for Acheson's head for many months and they will dance in the streets if the Grand Old Party succeeds in destroying him.

There were thoughtful Republicans in both Houses who refused to support this cynical and vindictive attack against the man who is laboring day and night to achieve an honorable peace. But they could not make their voices heard amid the clamor of the know-nothings. It was a tragic day for the country and for the GOP—the day on which the irresponsibles assumed full command of the party which calls itself the loyal opposition.

[From the Washington Post of December 17, 1950]

BLOW TO UNITY

The most critical aspect of the Republican call for the dismissal of Secretary Acheson is that it comes from a partisan source. It is undoubtedly true that a substantial segment of the American people would like to see Mr. Acheson replaced. The Republicans in Congress and many nonpartisan observers have lost no opportunity to let the President know their attitude, and it is reasonable to assume that the President has been weighing the question of whether a change of leadership in the State Department would do more harm than good. But this in no way excuses the Republicans from making a partisan issue of a matter that is vital to our security at this critical moment.

Of course, the President does not need to take any notice of this minority protest from Capitol Hill. The anti-Acheson resolutions were adopted only by the Republican caucuses of the House and Senate, not by Congress itself. And even if Congress had presumed to urge the dismissal of a Cabinet member, the President would be under no obligation to heed it. The entire executive power is vested in the President, and members of the Cabinet are responsible only to him. Mr. Truman is likely to respond to this pressure much as Lincoln did when congressional critics demanded the resignation of Secretary of State Seward during the Civil War.

In many respects the campaign against Seward is comparable to that against Mr. Acheson. Seward was resisting the demands of the extremists in Congress for immediate abolition of slavery and a purge of all Democratic generals from the Army. For this he was denounced as the evil genius of the administration—the mesmerist and the unseen hand who was preventing the President from doing his duty. When a group of New York Republicans waited on Lincoln to demand Seward's dismissal, he told them flatly: "There is not one of you who would not see the country ruined if you could turn out Seward."

In December 1862, shortly after the battle of Fredericksburg, the Republican Senators met secretly and adopted a resolution calling for partial reconstruction of the Cabinet. But instead of broadcasting their lack of confidence in the Secretary of State at a critical moment, a committee went to the White House to present the senatorial view to the President. Learning the nature of the mission, Seward hastily sent his resignation to Lincoln, but, after a skillful maneuver that brought in also the resignation of Secretary of the Treasury Chase, a favorite of the Senators, the President declined to accept either of them. Seward's critics had

overplayed their hand, and the net result was to strengthen both his position and that of the President before the country.

Whatever may be the effect of the present Republican gesture on the future of Mr. Acheson, it has certainly rendered a disservice to the country. Senator ALEXANDER SMITH hit the nail on the head when he declared that the action his fellow Republicans in the Senate were rushing toward might mislead the world as to the fundamental unity of the American people. That demonstration of disunity was made worse by the fact that it came just before Secretary Acheson departs for Brussels to attend the meeting of the North Atlantic Council.

In a last-minute effort to avoid the inevitable interpretation that will be placed on the incident abroad, the Senate Republicans added to their resolution a paragraph by Senator TAFT pledging our fullest cooperation with the President and the administration in a united effort to meet by the most effective means the present national crisis. If this stood by itself, it would be a commendable and patriotic expression. But as a postscript to the demand for the scalp of Mr. Acheson, who, of course, is part of the administration, it seems to be meaningless, insincere, and contradictory. An offer by the minority to cooperate with the party in power on condition that the minority be permitted to purge the President's Cabinet is not cooperation but the opposite. There is no way to disguise this blow to unity in a time of national peril, and it will be difficult indeed to undo the damage it has done.

[From the Washington Star of December 17, 1950]

A RECKLESS GESTURE

Republicans in Congress may be correct in saying that Secretary Acheson and the State Department have lost the confidence of Congress and of the American people.

If it is a fact that this is so, however, the reasons behind it are not those implied by the Republicans in their resolution calling for the dismissal of Mr. Acheson and a housecleaning of his Department.

The implication is that the policies pursued by Mr. Acheson and the personnel of the State Department are responsible for this alleged loss of confidence.

But the real explanation is the "get-Acheson" campaign which began as a preelection partisan maneuver and which was marked by a measure of distortion and falsehood which seldom has been equaled. Without doubt the campaign was effective. Without doubt it shook the confidence of many Americans and offered them a convenient scapegoat. It presented an easy method of rationalizing the accumulated fears, discomfitures, and disillusionments which have been a part of the postwar period.

If it were the Acheson policies which lost the confidence of the American people, the Republicans in Congress should have named them—spelled them out, as indictments of the man to be punished. But of course this could not be done. For Republicans in Congress, or most of them, have supported these policies, helped to implement them by the expenditure of billions of dollars approved by Congress. The Republicans leave unmentioned the specifications of their charges. They continue the tactic of the smear which supported the preelection campaign against Mr. Acheson and which culminated in the resolution.

What they have done now is apt to have a far more injurious effect on the country than on Mr. Acheson. Lacking the determination and integrity which are a part of his character, Mr. Acheson would doubtless welcome the personal release from heavy responsibility which his resignation would bring. It may be that the Republicans in Congress have made his position intolerable as it is and he may have to go.

But if he does have to go, the circumstances of his going will offend the conscience of the country. It will mean that an able public servant has been hounded out of office by accusations that for the most part are unnamed and unproved, accusations which are given color only by a dangerous sort of irresponsibility that suggests hysteria.

The action of the Republicans, taken on the eve of Mr. Acheson's departure for one of the most vital conferences in our history, ties his hands. His own strength and conviction may loosen those bonds. But the disservice which has been rendered the interests of our country in this critical period by the reckless action of the Republican minority is yet to be measured in full.

[From the New York Times of December 18, 1950]

ABROAD—ILL-TIMED BLOW TO AMERICAN DIPLOMACY

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The Republican Members of Congress who assumed the grave responsibility of weakening the position of the United States in one of the most momentous conferences held since the war must have been so angry over our defeat in Asia that they lost all realization of the risk of defeat in Europe. They are reported to have debated whether to delay the demand for the resignation of Secretary Acheson until after the Brussels parleys, so evidently a few among them took some thought of the consequences of their action on the defense policy which today's meeting was expected to decide and set in motion. In spite of that consideration, however, they went ahead; in order to knife the Secretary of State they were ready to cut the ground from under American diplomacy in the most dangerous moment in our history.

Anybody who knows anything at all about the temper of Europe today trembles to think of the effect of this episode on governments that are already sorely beset by serious opposition to American leadership. All the continental regimes have to combat a popular aversion to arming and a keep-out-of-war-at-any-cost attitude. The Congressmen who advertise to the world their lack of confidence in Mr. Acheson, and by clear inference in the foreign policy of the United States, are most critical of Western Europe's reluctance to give full support to the American defense program. They forget that the Europeans feel, or try to feel, that we are going too far too fast—"pushing them toward war," or even "leading them into war," as many conservatives say in unconscious parroting of the Communists' line.

PROVIDING A GOOD EXCUSE

Now all these critics of our lead will find a good excuse for more delay. They will say that we are divided, that the course urged on them by Mr. Acheson is not all-American policy. They will plead the uncertainty of our course as a reason for moving more slowly. The crux of the European situation is that no country is able to defend itself without our help, and if there is strong doubt about our position the pull in the opposite direction, the tendency to give up the unequal fight, will grow and spread.

At present all that stands between Western Europe and Soviet aggression is a reservoir of confidence in American power. This confidence grows with every sign of strength on our part and is the point around which the armies will be rallied—are now being rallied, in fact—to protect Europe—and ourselves. The President's proclamation of emergency is a call to action intended to mobilize force abroad as well as at home. But when the official voice of the Republicans, or what will be interpreted as such in other countries, suggests at the same time that the country is divided, and that its spokesman at Brussels speaks only for one party, they play the game not only of the Russians but of all the waverers and defeatists on the other side.

In a moment of mounting peril in the west, there is something dangerously childish in the attempt to find a scapegoat for our reverses in the east. As far as China is concerned, the disaster was prepared for before he took office, and in Korea is largely due to a military weakness which he has been laboring to correct. And Korea is certainly no argument for scuttling allies because they are not doing enough to help us and themselves. The American dead on the beaches of Hungnam are a bitter warning that we cannot win alone. Victory in the fight against the terrible force ranged against us can be achieved only if the entire free world is armed and ready for the struggle.

The purpose of the Brussels Conference is to speed the arming. It was called to translate a paper organization into a real Atlantic defense force. Mr. Acheson is there to hurry up the process. His is the job of bridging the impasse that still exists on the terms of German rearmament. The decisions to be taken are of fateful importance for war or peace, and it is obvious that the American representative is severely handicapped by the vote of no-confidence that heralded his arrival.

IN DEBT TO VANDENBERG

The irresponsibly timed move of the Republicans, counteracted abroad in some degree by Governor Dewey's strong support of the Emergency Act, reveals how much the administration and the people of the country owe to Senator VANDENBERG. Since the war, thanks largely to his wise leadership, there has been no serious disunity on foreign policy. There is no real division now; the differences on China go deep, and the unreasonable feeling against Mr. Acheson grows out of it, but the people as a whole are ready to go as far as necessary in supporting the policy which the Secretary has developed. The emergency program is accepted with extraordinary unanimity.

If proof were needed of the value of this policy and this program it is furnished by the Soviet note accusing France and Britain of violating their treaties with Russia in moving to rearm Germany. Moscow is piling up threats of action if Western Germany is armed, and it is foolish to pretend they mean nothing; the thing Russia dreads most is the inclusion of Germany in a system of western defense. And the United States is certainly in weaker position than it was to push this program. It will not be surprising if developments in Washington and elsewhere strengthen the hand of those who favor a meeting with Stalin and desire to postpone the question of German armament until the Big Four makes one more attempt to negotiate a German settlement.

At Last We Face the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fairmont Daily

Sentinel, of Fairmont, Minn., dated December 1, 1950:

AT LAST WE FACE THE ISSUE

With President Truman's firm stand, as expressed at a news conference in Washington Thursday, a matter of public record the entire Nation can present a united front from here on out in prosecuting the war to a successful close.

The President's statement Thursday was the first out-and-out admission that we are engaged in something more than a police action in Korea. It has been recognized for what it is, and what it has been since it started—war.

Now that the administration has publicly recognized it as such, the issues are no longer confused.

No longer can there be any excuse for temporizing.

No longer can there be any question on the part of our people whether or not we are for war. We are at war.

We will be called upon to pay more taxes. Let's pay them.

We will be called upon to buy war bonds. Let's buy them to the full extent of our ability.

We will be called upon to serve in the Army, the Navy, the Air Forces. Let us hope enough of us will be called, and in time, for time is of the essence.

We will be called to serve on the home front, to set up civilian defense, to sell bonds; to gather scrap iron and rubber. Let's not lag.

There will be bandages to sew.

There will be innumerable duties to perform to get the war effort under way, and all of these duties must be performed before the enemy can get ready—if possible, before he can strike.

Upon the degree and promptness of our response will depend whether or not the enemy will be able to bring war to our shores, to our cities and homes.

At last we squarely face the issue, recognize it for what it is, and we—all of us—will have a chance to do something to help. Let us not be too concerned about whether or not we will make peacetime profits for the duration of the war. Let us rather be concerned with hastening the day of victory—for without victory—it will not be a question of profit or loss, but one of survival.

Federal Assistance to Local and State Public Health Units

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from Dr. Ernest L. Stebbins, president of the National Health Council, which sums up the great need and support for H. R. 5865 to provide Federal assistance to local and State public-health units.

It is interesting to note that the American Medical Association—the only organization in opposition and the one which has successfully blocked the bill's being brought out on the floor—is a member of Dr. Stebbins' group.

Other members include practically every major health group in this country.

With permission to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the communication from Dr. Stebbins, with his enclosures:

NATIONAL HEALTH COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., December 13, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW BIEMILLER,
Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: Herewith are copies of Dr. Howard Rusk's column Civil Defense Plans Placed in Operation in Many Areas, and an editorial Another Defense Bill, both of which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, December 10. Enclosed also is a copy of Another Health Bill, an editorial in the Washington Post of Monday, December 11. The views expressed point directly to the need for passage of the local health units bill, H. R. 5865, now awaiting action by the House Rules Committee.

The health protection aspects of the civil defense program add urgency to the long-standing need for such legislation. Public health workers and citizens throughout the country have been working to establish and maintain those community health services which only a local health department can provide. To date, the task is far from done; about one-third of our citizens are without this vital health protection. In H. R. 5865, Congress has the opportunity to supplement State and local resources with the limited assistance necessary to complete the job. In so doing it will make a significant contribution to national security.

As president of the National Health Council, I urge the immediate passage of this legislation. The board of directors of the council are on record in support of this bill. In addition, the following national agencies are supporting H. R. 5865 or the principles embodied in the bill: American Academy of Pediatrics; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Heart Association; American Parents Committee; American Public Health Association; American Social Hygiene Association; American Veterans' Committee; Association of State and Territorial Health Officers; General Federation of Women's Clubs; Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth; National Advisory Committee on Local Health Units; National Congress of Parents and Teachers; National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis; National Grange; National Health Assembly; National Organization for Public Health Nursing; National Tuberculosis Association; National Young Women's Christian Association; Spokesmen for Children; Young Men's Christian Association, International Council.

Again, I urge you in the public interest, and in view of the fact that this legislation has already been passed by the Senate as S. 522, to exert your influence to secure enactment of H. R. 5865 before adjournment of the Eighty-first Congress.

Sincerely yours,
ERNEST L. STEBBINS, M. D.,
President.

[From the New York Times of December 10, 1950]

CIVIL DEFENSE PLANS PLACED IN OPERATION IN MANY AREAS—ONLY SIX STATES HAVE COMPLETE COVERAGE, BUT OTHERS SPEED HEALTH PROGRAMS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

Paralleling the stepped-up tempo of military and industrial mobilization, steps have now been taken to move civil defense from a "standby basis" to an actual operating program. Since its organization in 1947 the National Security Resources Board has been responsible for developing plans for our civil defense in case of national emergency.

Now, in view of the present international tension President Truman has appointed Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., former Governor of Florida, as Civil Defense Administrator. In accordance with plans, the responsibility for civil defense will now be carried out by this new agency, as the Resources Board is a planning and coordinating rather than an operating agency.

Recognizing fully the all-important role of health and medical services in civil defense, the Board has been preparing a comprehensive official Federal guidebook of medical and health problems fundamental to civil defense. Leading authorities in all specialized aspects of health services have assisted in preparing the manual, which is now completed and in the Government Printing Office.

As W. Stuart Symington reported to the President in September, all planning done on the health and medical aspects of civil defense is based on using State commissioners of health as directors of civil defense health services, and local health officers as directors of local civil defense health services. This plan has been accepted as a most practical and effective administrative mechanism, but unfortunately nearly 30 percent of our citizens live in communities in which there are no full-time local health services.

COMPLETE COVERAGE IN SIX STATES

Only six States in the Nation now have complete local health services coverage in all counties. They are Maryland, Delaware, New Mexico, South Carolina, Alabama, and North Carolina, which added its final county recently.

There is almost complete coverage in California, Michigan, Florida, and Virginia. Kentucky, Louisiana, and Tennessee have organizations for nearly every county, but have many health officer vacancies.

In New York the State committee on Tuberculosis and Health of the State Charities Aid Association has announced a program to foster the development of county health departments next year, but at present there is no locally operated, full-time public health service in the rural areas, and even the smaller cities in 44 of New York's 57 up-State counties.

Steps toward remedying this situation were taken last year when the Senate, with bipartisan sponsorship and wide public support, unanimously adopted a bill authorizing Federal grants-in-aid specifically for local public health departments. The act provides Federal funds for at least six minimum functions of a local health department; Vital statistics, communicable disease control, maternity and child-hygiene services, environment sanitation, public-health laboratory services, and public-health education. Significantly, now there is the extra "bonus" in that it will provide the keystone for local civil defense planning for health services.

ACTION HELD UP BY WAR

Endorsed enthusiastically by 60 such groups as the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, American Medical Association, the National Grange, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, an almost identical bill was passed by the House of Representatives during the Eightieth Congress. This year, when the bill reached the House, the Korean war had broken out, and it was shelved because of what were considered more pressing matters.

Events of the last few weeks, however, have shown clearly the need for all-out action in planning our civil defense, and that local public-health services will be the foundation of the medical hospitalization and health aspects of civil defense.

As Dr. William P. Shepard, president of the American Public Health Association, said recently, "Public-health services are the administrative backbone of civil defense. The immediate development of such services is not only requisite to the safeguarding of the health of the Nation in normal peacetime,

but is given even greater urgency by the current demands for the establishment of adequate civilian defense against possible acts of aggression, including atomic, biological, chemical, and other devices of warfare directly affecting the civilian population."

That there is urgent necessity for immediate action by the House of Representatives is clear. One-third of the Nation is without the administrative organization for providing even normal local health services, let alone those necessary for civil defense. The provision of those services is as essential to our civil defense as weapons are to our fighting men.

ANOTHER DEFENSE BILL

Following the appointment last week of a new Civil Defense Administrator, the National Security Resources Board presented Congress with a $3,100,000,000 plan for civil defense. Listed by the President as a "must" for the present short session, prompt action will undoubtedly be taken on this measure.

As Dr. Howard A. Rusk points out elsewhere in this newspaper today, there is another bill currently in the House Rules Committee which is equally a "must" if we are to make full plans for medical and health services in civil defense. This is H. R. 5865, for Federal aid to establish local public health services. Its immediate passage is essential, for civil defense plans call for the administration of medical and health civil defense services by State and local public health officers. Added to the usual essential health services, there is need for special measures to enable civil defense organizations to deal with the problems arising from possible atomic, biological, and chemical warfare. These problems are primarily the responsibility of health and medical services, but today 40,000,000 of our citizens live in communities where there are no local full-time health services.

H. R. 5865 would help remedy this by giving Federal grants-in-aid for the development of local health services. Prior to the Korean war this bill was unanimously passed by the Senate on the basis of its peacetime merits. Today, the bill takes on a new significance if we are to be prepared to meet all the possible eventualities in civil defense.

[From the Washington Post of December 11, 1950]

HEALTH SERVICES

There was urgent need for Federal financial aid to State and local health departments long before the threat of a major war became acute; the need is now underscored and clarified by the importance of such departments in the mobilization of civil defense. They would be the country's principal refuge in case of atomic or biological warfare attack. We believe, therefore, that the House should act on the local public health services bill, which the Senate has already passed, during the present session. The bill has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and is now in the Rules Committee.

State and local health departments are woefully inadequate. Some 40,000,000 Americans live today in areas where no local full-time public health departments exist; and it is estimated that nearly a hundred million others have only inadequately staffed departments available. The cost to the country in time lost from productive effort and in the incidence of preventable or controllable diseases is much too high. The cost in lives and human suffering in the event of widespread aerial attacks on the United States would be incalculable.

The civil defense report of the National Security Resources Board recommended that "in each State, the State health officer should be placed in charge of all civil defense health and medical services; and cities should appoint local officers in the same manner." The report pointed out also that "special measures must be taken to enable civil defense organizations to deal with the problems arising from atomic, biological, and chemical warfare. The effects of these special weapons are of such a nature that defense against them becomes primarily the responsibility of the health and medical services."

But the plain fact is that in many areas there simply is no such defense at all. And it is highly possible that war production plants and other vital installations will be dispersed into just such areas, with large concentrations of war workers clustered around them. Many cities which might become bomb targets are lamentably lacking in health facilities. The problem is not one on which the country can afford to defer action.

Dependence of the People on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject We Must Be Strong, delivered by me at Dallas, Tex., on December 13, 1950, before the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members and guests of the American Farm Bureau Federation, I am delighted to be with you today and I feel highly honored at the privilege of speaking to you at your annual meeting here in Dallas. I appreciate the opportunity it gives me to exchange ideas with you.

These are grave days. They call for clear thinking and courageous action. They call for the best that is in every one of us. No one can say what the future holds for us, but we know that many vexing problems and uncertainties are crowding in upon us. With all the wisdom—with all prudence—with all the faith we have—we must face these extraordinary responsibilities and herculean duties.

We have faced dark days before, but even darker days lie ahead. In large areas of the world the light of freedom has been extinguished, and those who reap by such darkness now seek to cast the whole world in shadow by trampling everywhere the one sure light by which free men must guide their steps.

It will not happen. The light will continue to burn—the freedom-loving nations of the world will see to that, for they realize we cannot long endure in darkness. But to keep the torch of freedom burning, we must be prepared to defend and protect it. And when I say "We must be prepared," or "We must be strong," I am not thinking alone of cannons and cruisers, bombs and bombers, rockets and jets, tanks and half-tracks. Nor am I thinking alone of meeting military force with military force. Herman Goering is often quoted as having said "Guns will make us strong; butter will only make us fat," and where has this wisdom got Herr Goering today?

There are other fronts. We must be prepared, we must be strong on all fronts. First and foremost, we must have food. "The history of the world is the record of a man in quest of his daily bread and butter," said Van Loon in his Story of Mankind. If our Nation is to remain powerful, it must be supported with a healthy, progressive, and productive agriculture. A prosperous society cannot long exist on a depressed agriculture. It may think it gains temporarily, but a people cannot bleed farmers continually without themselves contracting the anemia which has been produced.

And how dependent we are on a strong agriculture in this country. When some 85 percent of our people live in towns and cities, it would be easy to wreck our whole economy by a short-sighted farm policy.

That some 15 percent of our population is able to produce an abundance for the 85, presents the most convincing proof that we are on the right track. Just stop and think. With practically no increase in the amount of land being tilled, farm production has been increased about 40 percent in the past 15 years. The total farm production in 1950—despite a poor cotton crop—is coming out only slightly below the 1948 all-time high. And it is 24 percent higher than the 1941 production.

In connection with modern farming, a constituent said to me one day, "You know, Senator, it used to be that anybody could farm—about all that was needed was a strong back and a weak mind, but nowadays to be a successful farmer a fellow must have a good head on his shoulders and a college education; first, so he can understand the advice given out to him everywhere he turns by the city men and the Government, and then so he can select and use that what'll do him the least damage."

Farm output per man-hour is now about twice what it was 40 years ago. Fewer people are required to produce the food and fiber we need. More people can do other things. Back in 1940 we had about 30,000,000 people living on farms. Now there are only about 27,000,000. During that same period our population has increased about 19,000,000.

Despite this reduction in the number of people on farms and the tremendous increase in population, the per-capita consumption of food is up some 10 to 12 percent over the 1935–39 levels.

Not only are we eating more but we are eating better. Our people are eating more meat, more eggs, more dairy products, more fruits and vegetables, and more fats and oils.

And as we face the uncertainties of the future most of our bins and cribs are full. Before the harvest of the 1950 crops we had more than 400,000,000 bushels of wheat in the carry-over, and approximately 850,000,000 bushels of corn. I wish I could say the same for cotton. I attribute our cotton shortage, in a large measure, to a law now on the books that made mandatory the allocation of 2,500,000 acres that were not planted, and that could not be made available to farmers who begged for larger acreage allotments. That law must be revised.

There are reserves in the soil for continued high production. Conservation programs made possible by provision of Congress have not only helped farmers step up their production, but have also aided them in building up their land for even greater production in the future.

Along with provisions for conservation, farmers have been given hope and faith in the future of agriculture through price-protection programs.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am proud of the part I have had in these contributions to better farming in this country. I have always been a strong and ardent advocate of the conservation of our natural resources, and in giving to farmers the price protection

they must have if they are to continue to produce in abundance.

It is not an accident that our agriculture is in the strong position it is today. You, of the Farm Bureau, know that. It was the leaders of your organization—along with other farm leaders—who fought so long, and so valiantly, to keep our agriculture from sinking into the state of poverty and economic slavery prevalent in so many countries of the world.

It is a real source of gratification that I have been able to represent our farmers on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and in the halls of Congress in that fight, and I intend to keep right on fighting. A sound agricultural economy is one of the best and strongest weapons we can forge against communism. A country that produces freely an abundance of food and fiber need not fear communism. We must carry on the fight and be vigilant.

Enemies of the farm program, who fought it because they said it would not work, are now using its success as the reason we should do away with it. Some argue that because conservation has given the Nation the assurance of continued abundance, and because farmers are not afraid to produce abundantly, we should now chuck the whole thing out the window. They say that farmers should stand on their own feet, little realizing that the American farmer is not only standing on his own feet, but is also contributing mightily to the continued strength and prosperity of our flourishing national economy.

Back in the days of Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and John C. Calhoun, when 85 percent of the people lived on the farms, it was comparatively easy for a farmer to pretty well stand on his own feet. Food for the family was produced on the farm. The clothes were made from material spun and woven on the farm. Most of the simple tillage tools were made on the farm. Little left the farm. Little came back.

But today, when 85 percent of the people live in towns, well, who gains most from the help given farmers in conservation and price supports? The question would seem to answer itself—it is that 85 percent of our people—and yet, this very minute, when we need to step up production all along the line, there are some who would abandon the farm program.

Let us see who would be affected. Follow your cotton crop through from the producer to the consumer and see how many people depend on that commodity. Take it from the time the farmer hauls it to the ginner. Of course a whole new world of intricate and complex industry has developed for the use of the seed alone, but let us follow the fiber itself. There is baling with the burlap and ties. There is the machinery to press the cotton. There is the warehousing, trucking, sampling, grading, weighing, storing. The cotton market is a business in itself. Then there is the transportation, with all its many phases and complexities. There is the dyeing, the spinning, the weaving. There is the marketing of the cloth. Then there is the cutting, sewing, and buttons, and braid. And it does not end there. There is the wholesaling and retailing of the finished product. And there are so many products from cotton.

Then when we consider that cotton is just one of the crops—important, believe me, but just one of the many important farm crops—we begin to realize the vital interest everyone has in agriculture.

Some 65 percent of the new wealth created annually in this country has its origin in agricultural and forest production.

Back in the days of Daniel Boone, a farmer would wear out his land, go broke, move on west, or move to town, and the ripples from his action moved out only a little way from where the pebble touched the surface of his self-sufficient world.

Today, although the individual may be lost in the complicated exchange of interdependencies, what the boll weevil does to one man's crop will touch in some small way the lives of millions. And what the boll weevil does to many farmers affects the whole economy tremendously.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, if we are to continue as a strong Nation, the guardian of the light of freedom and democracy, our agriculture must continue prosperous and strong.

And, now, when we are face to face with the stark realities of aggression, we must keep our farms productive and our farmers free from the fear that abundant production may be their undoing. If we ask farmers to increase production, it is no more than right that we give them assurance that the increases will not ruin their markets.

In stepping up the national wheat acreage allotment to 72,000,000 acres, and calling for a 16,000,000-bale cotton crop, and for increased acreage of corn, the Secretary of Agriculture is on the right track. In clearing the way for increased cotton production by removing allotments and marketing quotas he is recognizing the need to make sure there is enough food and fiber.

We need a big cotton crop next year. It was wise to waive any production controls which might have jeopardized our chances of getting it. When the time comes to reallot acreage, I wish to say, however, Congress and the Department of Agriculture, if they would prevent the upset of our agricultural crop distribution, must give full consideration to the interests and needs of the older production areas. These regions have produced cotton for many, many years, and in a lot of cases cotton is still the only crop which their farmers can depend on for income. The emergency must not be permitted to result in injustices for these people.

Right now farm production at the highest possible level, whether in cotton or other essential commodities, will do more than provide us enough of these essentials. It will help to hold down prices all along the line, for an abundant production is one of the most effective weapons we have with which to fight inflation.

Also adequate supplies of agricultural products will go a long way toward holding back the need for allocations and controls. It is when there is not enough to go around that strategic materials have to be allocated and their use controlled.

And, again, I would like to emphasize that there are no materials more essential—more strategic, if you please—than the food and fiber produced on our American farms. That we have on hand abundant supplies of most commodities, and our plant is in good shape to keep on producing them, makes them nonetheless strategic—even though this very condition may cause some to overlook their importance.

The production of food and fiber is paramount in the whole defense production program. That is why the farmer must be represented at the front table when such strategic materials as steel and rubber and gasoline are being considered. Food and fiber are essential, not only to those who man the guns, but also to those who make them, from the mines through the factories.

The Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture has been given the job of looking after the interests of farmers in the national defense effort. Already an established and operating agency, the PMA includes practically all of the units and services which made up the War Food Administration in World War II. It has retained many of the same officials who handled emergency programs during that period. There was no need to create an entirely new administrative agency, as was necessary in a number of other Government departments. The assignment to PMA of basic food and agricultural responsibilities, under the Defense Production Act, was a natural and desirable step. It is a farm-minded agency which has shown itself to be efficient, and familiar with the farmers' problems.

The fact that the same commodity and functional branches which handle the normal farm program services are taking on the additional defense activities, means that farmers and industry groups can continue to work with the same units and the same men with whom they have been dealing right along. The same field offices and committees will be the ones to contact on defense problems.

PMA has set up a few coordinating offices and staffs to direct the over-all operations and to maintain working relations with other agencies and groups. These include an Office of Materials and Facilities, an Office of Requirements and Allocations, a price staff, and a group to watch the manpower situation. They are already working actively on the many special problems agriculture must face as our national mobilization goes forward.

The special job of those in charge of materials and facilities will be to act as a "claimant agency" for agriculture when any priorities are being established for the use of strategic materials and services. They are there to keep reminding everyone that farm production is defense production. If farmers are to hold production at the high levels needed, they must be assured, insofar as it is possible to do so, against crippling shortages of materials and facilities. They must also be given protection against the danger that the very production we are asking will not some day break farm prices to ruinous levels. This, of course, involves the question of sound price supports.

And right here I want to get one thing straight about our price-support operations. In handling price supports on the six basic commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, peanuts, and rice—the Commodity Credit Corporation shows a net profit on the group as a whole from the beginning of operations in 1933 down to the present day. We should remember this when we hear indiscriminate criticism of farm programs.

When you consider the fact that not a penny has been lost on the basics in 17 years and then think about what the price-support programs have meant to farmers and to the country as a whole, you begin to realize just how important and useful the farm program has been, and still is. Accompanied by acreage allotments and marketing quotas when necessary, the supports on storable commodities have helped to give us the abundant and balanced production which today puts agriculture in one of the strongest positions of the entire national economy.

Price supports for the basic crops have proved themselves. They are sound and effective. I have advocated price-support legislation, and I shall continue to do so. The record speaks for itself.

However, when it comes to price supports for potatoes and eggs, and some of the other perishable crops, that is another story, and I think we need to take another look at our present methods and operations.

Our only serious problems in carrying out price supports have been with these perishable or semiperishable commodities. This has been the Achilles heel of the price-support program. Heavy losses in trying to support potatoes and some other commodities in this group have been the basis for almost all of the criticism which has been directed at the farm program.

Many proposals have been advanced to handle supports for perishables. One plan was presented by Secretary Brannan on behalf of the Department of Agriculture. Without question, insofar as concerns ultimate ends and purposes, the Secretary was on the right track. He was seeking a solution for a problem that we all admit is serious, and was striking directly at the great

weakness of our recent operations. We must find some way of getting rid of surpluses which are acquired under the present type of support operations for perishables, or we must find some other method of support.

Personally, I do not think that the plan proposed by the Department would be practicable. The cost would be exorbitant. It would certainly tend to depress the price for the commodities involved. It would take away the incentive for farmers, like good businessmen, to seek the best possible market and price for their crops, and the loser would be the taxpayer. The Government, in other words, would make up the difference between the average market and the support level anyway. Unable to get a fair price in the market place, the farmer would instead be dependent upon uncertain annual appropriations for his income. If Congress should fail to provide the funds, the farmer would be left holding the bag.

But it is not enough to disagree with or challenge the proposed program. As Secretary Brannan himself has suggested, we should all try to develop a better program—a sounder approach. If we do not find a solution—and soon—there is real danger for the whole farm program. We cannot go on piling up surpluses when people are paying high prices for the very perishables which the Government is holding. As a way out, Congress might even decide to go back to the original farm support program—limiting price support to the basic storable commodities.

I do not presume to have a complete answer to this question today. I do think, however, that we should explore the possibilities for much wider distribution of surpluses to people who need and can use them. The school-lunch program has been a splendid outlet. But how about the thousands and thousands of people who are receiving old-age or other forms of direct financial assistance from the Government? Could they not be given nutritious, wholesome surplus foods in place of some of the cash they are now receiving? Further, have we pushed vigorously the opportunity to barter some of our surpluses for strategic materials which are available abroad? When I and other Members of the Congress took the lead in granting Government agencies special barter authority, we had high hopes that important outlets for United States' surplus crops would be developed. Government agencies are not prone to cooperate one with the other. Some seem to do their job with the least effort, no matter what the cost.

When we have done all we can to find ways of moving surplus stocks, we should also study other methods of giving the producer of perishable commodities the protection of sound programs. Marketing agreement and order programs give farmers an opportunity to stabilize their markets by limiting the quantity and quality which will move to market during any period. The advantages of these types of programs, and the opportunities for broadening their now limited application for different commodities should be fully explored. We must not be content with a merely "critical" approach. We must find the answers lest our whole farm program hit the rocks.

Getting back to protecting our soil, the uncertainties we face for the future serve to emphasize the importance of conservation—of taking care of our tillable land. There is only so much. And, unless we do take care of it, this land will be an expendable resource the same as coal and oil and steel. When the current supply is used up, we will run out.

Back when 85 percent of our people lived on the land, we have this comment from one of the early conservationists:

"When our forefathers settled here, they entered a land which probably never had been ploughed since the creation; the land being new, they depended upon the natural fertility of the ground, which served their purpose very well, and when they had worn out one piece they cleared another, without concern to amend their land, except a little help by the fold and cart dung."

Today, when the land gives out, we cannot very well load our belongings in a covered wagon and go out and take up another tract of land. The land we have—from which must come the food and fiber for now and for the future—is under our feet.

Jarred to consciousness by a tragic depression and also floods and a dust bowl, our farmers have made progress toward safeguarding the future of this country by cooperating with one another in carrying out conservation measures. But we are not doing nearly enough.

Every year floods come down our rivers and destroy our crops—our property—and our people. We have found a way to control these floods and at the same time provide hydroelectric power to improve the living standards of our people, and to provide water for parched land. Let us continue to harness these forces further and put them to work.

Back on the watersheds our farmers and ranchers can do much to alleviate our flood loss by carrying out conservation practices that help to keep the soil and water from going down the river.

Congress appropriates funds to assist farmers in carrying out conservation practices because it is felt that such a program is in the best interest of the entire Nation. The terraces the farmer constructs, the cover crops he grows, the dams he builds, the pastures he improves, all contribute to making our agriculture stronger. They add to our soil and water resources. They build our food production potential. They give the Nation a greater assurance that there will always be enough to eat.

But, as I said a moment ago, we may be misled by the abundant harvests of the past few years into thinking we no longer need to keep these programs of conservation going.

That mistake could be fatal. A short time ago I traveled through most of the countries of Europe and Asia which are outside the iron curtain. And I assure you this lesson of conservation was brought home to me in some of these areas.

Much of the danger threatening us today stems from the desperation of peoples suffering from lack of the basic necessities of life, and the fear of losing those basic needs. They accept the hazards and hardships of war because they fear something worse than war. Hunger, and fear of hunger make people desperate.

We must never let our land go as some of these countries have done. In Persia I saw the ruins of ancient civilizations—the ruins of nations whose rulers professed to have all the answers. There, where the twin rivers—the Tigris and Euphrates—once brought wealth and power to the people who farmed and built their cities, there now are only silt-choked canals and desolation.

It is estimated that this valley known as Mesopotamia once supported a population of some twenty-five or thirty millions. Now a scant 3,000,000 eke out a meager existence. The whole of ancient Persia at one time could support 105,000,000 according to some historians, now a bare 15,000,000 can exist.

This warning comes from one of our leading soil scientists. Observing what happened in Rome, he says:

"A few (too few) Romans began to see that if the great Roman Empire was to last their agriculture must thrive. These men tried to get their countrymen to see the need for more careful treatment of their farms so that Rome might continue to have strong country folk at home. But apparently it was too late. Roman farms had become country estates, worked by slaves who had little interest in the land, and owned by city dwellers who rarely saw them except to collect the rents."

Nor must we lose sight of the fact that conservation is good business. Every dollar our Government spends on conservation and conservation practices comes home to roost in the Federal Treasury, and with interest. I mean hard dollars and cents interest, not just the benefits that accrue to our country as a whole or a region or section containing a conservation project.

Let me give you a few examples. There are seven western projects—the Salt River in Arizona, the Yuma project area in Arizona and California, the Boise project in Idaho, the Yakima project in the State of Washington, the Shoshone project in Wyoming, the Sun River project in Montana, and the Lower Yellowstone developments in Montana and North Dakota. The total cost of these was in the neighborhood of $134,000,000,000, yet during 1948 alone these seven projects produced to the Treasury tax revenues in excess of $80,000,000. Since 1916 these seven have contributed more than $400,000,000 to Uncle Sam. Would any of you like to get in on the ground floor of investments like that?

It is gratifying to see the changes that are taking place in this country. Terraces curving across the fields are holding back the moisture—keeping the soil on the farm—and increasing production. Contour strips are cutting down the ravages of sheet erosion.

Grassland farming is doing much to heal the gullies of farms that have been cottoned, corned, and wheated to death.

There is not enough of it yet, but we have made a start. We must keep going. Erosion must be checked. Our lands must be kept fertile and productive.

Nearly 3,000,000 farmers are cooperating in the agricultural conservation program. More than three-fourths of our farms are in soil conservation districts.

Since 1936, farmers cooperating in the agricultural conservation program have seeded 51,000,000 acres of soil-conserving pasture; built a million dams; used 250,000,000 tons of lime, 24,000,000 tons of superphosphate; established and turned under 255,000,000 acres of green manure crops; contoured 130,000,000 acres; and planted 825,000 acres of trees.

That has helped to give us that 40 percent increase in farm production. It wasn't that alone, any more than it was hybrid corn or improved insecticides. It was all these things working together in a sound farm program. And most of all it was the faith of our farmers. With price supports and assistance in conservation, our farmers have had the incentive to forge ahead.

Our agriculture is strong because we have been working together to make it strong. I think you can be justifiably proud of the part your organization has had in developing this strength. Your leaders were at the forefront in developing a national farm program. I am doubly proud of the part I played. When I first came to the Senate in 1937 I was on a Senate agriculture subcommittee that held hearings throughout the country. Those hearings formed the basis for our present program. Ten years later, I again served on a similar committee and I can assure you it was music to my ears when I heard farmer after farmer say: "Senator, we are satisfied with the program. Do not change it unless you can devise something better."

The continued support and cooperation of farmers and farm organizations is necessary to keep these farm programs working and our agriculture strong.

Before closing my remarks, I want to emphasize that farmers have a direct responsibility in making price support and other farm programs a success. This means that they must be ready to make adjustments in production when these are clearly needed. When the Department of Agriculture recently announced that price supports on

eggs were being discontinued for 1951, it did so because action a year ago to lower the support price and call for lower production had not worked. Production went up, instead of down. Egg producers should have realized that it does not pay to produce for Uncle Sam. There will be no support for Irish potatoes in 1951, and for the same general reasons. Too little production adjustment; too many potatoes. The Government could not go on indefinitely providing the only market for a big percentage of our annual potato crop. Please let me stress here that the same fate awaits those who insist on pursuing a similar course. Farmers should know that they themselves must do a little policing of their own activities. They cannot hope to have price supports unless they are willing to accept Government regulations.

These cut-backs in price-support programs were necessary under the circumstances, but they point to a lesson which we should all learn. I repeat, responsibilities must be accepted. Solutions must be found for our more troublesome price-support problems, if we want to keep the farm program itself intact.

These are grave days. There is no escape from the future that is bearing in upon us. But with courage, with wisdom, and with untiring efforts we can solve not only our farm problems but also those broader issues which challenge us today.

Let me conclude with this little prayer I have picked up somewhere:

"O Lord, grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change; the courage to change the things I can—that should be changed; and the wisdom to know the difference."

Heavy-Handed Diplomacy Miffs Latin UN Delegates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Heavy-Handed Diplomacy Miffs Latin UN Delegates," published in the Washington Star of yesterday. I do this because I believe that the article itself speaks of something which should be corrected; and it is also in order that the people of the United States may know that, as of this moment, and at this particular time, we have at the head of the Inter-American Section of the State Department, Mr. Edward G. Miller, who in my opinion does not believe in all of the things of which the article speaks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEAVY-HANDED DIPLOMACY MIFFS LATIN UN DELEGATES—UNITED STATES IS LOSING PRESTIGE WITH NEIGHBORS BY FAILING TO ACCORD PROPER CONSIDERATION

(By Edward Tomlinson)

NEW YORK.—Along with all of our other international misfortunes, we have been gradually losing prestige among some of our Latin American neighbors in the United Nations, if not yet their vital support. This is at a time when every single one of their 20 votes in the General Assembly (nearly one-third of all the votes in that now powerful body) is of great value and importance.

In this critical time some of the most powerful of the Western European countries have faltered in the face of Communist aggression. Behind the scenes, if not openly, several of them have actually advocated appeasement of the Chinese Reds in Korea.

Although in the beginning of the Asiatic conflict, the Latin-American governments presented an unwavering united front with us, today delegates from several of the larger southern republics fail to give us enthusiastic aid in our diplomatic battles at Lake Success. While none has openly voted with our enemies on major issues, several have joined with certain south Asiatic countries in taking the middle road. At least one of the principal South American nations, Argentina, has often refused to take a stand or has abstained from voting on controversial measures.

After talking with a large number of people on the scene, it appears that this regrettable situation is due to a number of causes.

First of all there is a general lack of appreciation on the part of the American public of the strategic importance of the vast world to the south. Even many high officials in Washington itself seem unaware of the weight of these 20 nations and 150,000,000 people in world affairs. There is no question about the concern of Assistant Secretary of State Edward G. Miller and his staff in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs in the State Department. But here at the United Nations, there is apparently a sad neglect of the Latin delegations, if not an outright ineptness of many of our diplomats in dealing with them.

INDIFFERENCE CHARGED

Even one of our own representatives expressed to me the greatest anxiety over this new development. "Lately," he said, "a large number of the Latin Americans here seem to find themselves more at home in company with their colleagues of the Arab States, India, and the countries of southeastern Asia, than they do with representatives of the United States."

The head of one South American delegation which has always stood stanchly with us in every debate told me that this is not only true, but it is unfortunately largely your own fault. "Your leaders here," he said, "seldom take us seriously. They are indifferent to our views on the most important questions, even when they ask us for our support of their position." He went on to explain that when voting time approaches they often send out runners calling us to action, and we are supposed to jump through the hoop like good little boys and go down the line with Uncle Sam.

"Of course," he admitted, "we have to be on your side against armed aggression. We are not only pledged to do so, in the Hemisphere Defense Pact, in the Charter of the Organization of American States and other inter-American documents, but our faith is bound up with yours. We live on the same continents with you. But," he added, "we wish you would not always make it so evident that we have to be with you."

AN ILLUSTRATION

The entire Latin-American contingent in the United Nations is still talking about one recent incident in which our representatives failed to show proper deference toward our neighbors. It was an incident that played directly into the hands of the Russians, and one which the Soviet propagandists have exploited to the fullest.

On the evening of December 4 the chief of the Colombian delegation to the General Assembly, Dr. Roberto Urdaneta Arbelaez, his country's Minister of War and chairman of the important Committee Number One or the Political Committee of the General Assembly, gave an important dinner to his fellow delegates at a fashionable Fifth Avenue hotel. It has become a tradition for each delegation to tend such a dinner sometime during the Assembly meetings. The Colombians were giving one of the very last dinners of the present Assembly. On this occasion everybody showed up except the representatives of the United States. Naturally the 20 Latin-American delegates attached considerable importance to it.

VISHINSKY GETS IN A BLOW

Unfortunately the Colombian dinner happened to fall on one of the first critical days of the Korean crisis and at the last minute our people sent regrets saying in effect that they were too occupied with the fate of our armies in the Far East and they could not attend. But Andrei Y. Vishinsky attended, flanked by the most prominent members of his staff. When the guests were seated the garrulous Russian looked around and expressed surprise that no North Americans were present. He even displayed a knowledge of the fact that the peoples to the south of us usually refer to us as North Americans, instead of using the all-inclusive term "Americans," as we do. At any rate, the Colombians explained that unfortunately the United States delegation was desperately busy with the disastrous problem which had just arisen in Korea.

"We, too, are very busy," Vishinsky trumpeted, "but we take time to accept and show our appreciation of the friendly hospitality of our fellow delegates from so important a Latin-American Republic."

Significantly enough, the Colombian Government is one of the several in Latin-America which does not maintain diplomatic relations with Moscow. Indeed, it is one of the most anti-Communist of all the regimes on the South American Continent. It is the one country next door which has ordered a large contingent of troops and its newest and largest warship to the Korean front. Naturally, none of these facts had been overlooked by the Russians.

MORE THAN SOCIAL FUNCTION

Our Latin neighbors do not understand how we overlook the fine points of diplomacy and hand our enemies such splendid opportunities for their propagandists.

Maybe large dinners should be dispensed with in such times, but they are not. In fact, these gatherings are important adjuncts of the United Nations. Furthermore, it is interesting that these spokesmen for the various governments usually get together at private dinners to exchange opinions free of heated debate and away from the glaring spotlight of publicity. Often some of the most important problems are ironed out on these occasions. Such gatherings are also important listening posts.

From the standpoint of pure self-interest, even in the midst of tragedy and disaster, we can well afford to keep in mind the importance of our relations with the people whose friendship, and whose vast resources of minerals, metals, and other raw materials, we shall desperately need in the near future, if we are to maintain the power and prestige of the Western Hemisphere against communism.

Socialized Medicine Is No Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by William L. Hutcheson,

general president, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, and vice president of the American Federation of Labor, before the joint session of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association and the third annual conference of the AMA National Education Campaign, in Cleveland, Ohio, on December 7, 1950:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE IS NO BARGAIN

(By William L. Hutcheson)

(NOTE.—Mr. Hutcheson, due to illness, authorized the reading of his address to the convention by his assistant, Mr. Peter E. Terzick, editor of the Carpenter.)

I am against socialized medicine. So is the organization which I have the honor of heading. At the twenty-sixth general convention of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, held in Cincinnati last September 1, 300 delegates, representing better than 54 percent of the total membership, voted down a resolution to support the national health program. This probably does not jibe with the feelings of a good deal of the rest of the labor movement because much of the pressure for "free" medical care is coming from labor organizations. But it does reflect my sentiments and the sentiments of our recent convention.

Saving a dollar has never been distasteful to me. In fact, I like to get as much for my money as the next man. That is one of the reasons why I oppose socialized medicine. It is no bargain. It looks cheap the way the backers present it, but when you dig down under the fancy layer of propaganda frosting you find that it can be mighty expensive. The British people have already discovered this fact. The July issue of International Labour Office contains some very interesting data on the operation of the National Health Service in Britain. I quote a few lines of that report:

"The total (gross) cost of the National Health Service in 1948–49, the first year of operation, greatly exceeded the original estimate. This was £265,000,000, as against a revised estimate of £368,000,000, with a net cost to the taxpayer of £278,000,000. The revised estimate for the year 1949–50 was £450,000,000 as against an original estimate of £352,000,000. For 1950–51 the cost is estimated at £484,000,000; in 1946 when the bill was passed, the service was believed to cost £167,000,000 a year."

In case you don't understand what the International Labor Office is, I can best explain its functions by quoting a bit from its preamble:

"The International Labor Office is an association of nations, financed by governments and democratically controlled by representatives of governments, of management, and of labor organizations.

"Its purpose is to promote social justice in all countries of the world. To this end it collects facts about labor and social conditions, formulates minimum international standards, and supervises their national application."

The ILO's publication, International Labor Review, is published in the United Kingdom. As an international organization, ILO's findings are supposed to be strictly impartial.

Getting back to the report: if I read it correctly, service that was supposed to cost £167,000,000 per year when the plan was set up in 1946, costs £484,000,000 per year, and the end is not yet in sight. By my old-fashioned kind of arithmetic that is an increase of better than 345 percent and I am sure my poor old mother, who always made a dime do the work of a quarter, would not consider that kind of proposition any bargain.

I know! I know! The Socialists claim that money is of no consequence in the matter of national health—getting the poor the same quality and quantity of medical care as the rich can get under private enterprise is the advertised objective of the national health program. That sounds fine, too; but on page 57 of the ILO report, I find the following sentences:

"Survey of the distribution of doctors by boroughs shows that certain wealthier districts (of London) have an average of one doctor for 1,261 patients, while in the inner East End there are 2,472, or twice as many patients, per doctor. For a group of southern boroughs, the average is 2,897."

If that isn't the "one horse and one rabbit" recipe transferred from the meat-pie maker's kitchen to the national health program, then I need new reading glasses. I have tried to figure it from all angles but the answer I always come up with is that the lumbago, shingles, and bellyaches of London's South Siders get only half the attention that similar ailments get in the swankier districts. For all the planning that has been done, there is still an uneven distribution of doctors in London. If the backers of the national health program are to achieve their objective of equal health protection for all, the next step must be to tell doctors when and where and how they are to practice. Therein lies my greatest fear of socialization.

Socialization and death have one thing in common: you cannot be either a little bit socialized or a little bit dead. It is whole hog or nothing. After 2 years of the national health program, London doctors still have preferences as to where they want to practice. By compulsion of one kind or another, somebody is going to have to shoo doctors away from the fancy neighborhoods into the tenement districts or the program will wind up where it started. When the government is given authority to tell one group or one profession where and how its members are to work, no other group or profession can be safe for long.

If the day ever comes to America when Uncle Sam usurps the power to dictate to doctors under a health plan, it will be a sad day for carpenters. Adequate housing is still an unsolved problem in this country, especially for the poor. If it is logical to nationalize the medical profession to get more medical service for the poor, it is equally logical to nationalize the home-construction industry to get roofs over the heads of the lower-income groups.

I do not know much about doctors, but I know quite a bit about carpenters. They are an independent lot. They want to work where and how they please. The first bureaucrat who told a carpenter he had to work in Little Rock when he wanted to work in Lancaster would be gumming his food for lack of teeth. Carpenters want to be free agents; free to work where they want to; free to negotiate the terms of their wages and working conditions through collective bargaining; yes, even free to leave the industry and try their luck at something else if the spirit moves them.

They will retain these freedoms only so long as all other groups retain theirs. Socialization is like a wolf with a tapeworm; once it starts gnawing, it never can stop. Socialized medicine would only be the first bite out of our free enterprise system; it would not be many years before the carpenters would be feeling the teeth of socialization on the seats of their overalls. Any way you look at it, socialized medicine is no bargain and the carpenters want none of it.

I know that the backers of the national health plan in this country resent the term "socialized medicine." They have all sorts of arguments to prove that doctors and patients will remain free as the air under their program. They make a strong case. Perhaps if human nature were less ornery and less avaricious, an idealistic health program might work out all right. But so long as people have preferences, so long as Park Avenue has more appeal than Hell's Kitchen there will be an uneven distribution of doctors under any plan that does not contain compulsion. And once compulsion enters the picture, the rights and freedoms of all citizens stand in jeopardy. To me, it is as simple as that. For 40 years, I have fought communism tooth and toenail because I do not want anyone pushing me around. I certainly do not want to put my head into a socialization noose voluntarily when the results can be as undesirable as communism.

I have always respected the medical profession for the fine contribution American medicine has made to human welfare. As I watched your battle against regimentation during the past 2 years, I have added to that respect. The physicians of this country have shown that they are willing to fight for their conviction. I salute you today not only as doctors but as crusading citizens as well. We in the labor movement have our own cross of regimentation to bear. The fight you are making is part of the same war. It is a war against concentration of authority in a few hands in Washington. As a veteran of 40 years in the labor movement, I know what it is to fight for human rights. I am happy to take my stand beside you.

Sale of War Goods to Communist China by British Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in the midst of the desperate struggle of United States and United Nations armed forces in Korea, it will shock our people to learn that Great Britain has been selling war materials to Communist China in large quantities as recently as 6 weeks ago.

The sordid details of the efforts of our supposed major ally to profit by a war in which its own soldiers had suffered some casualties, and United States forces had suffered tragically, are revealed at first hand from London in a dispatch from Howard Norton, of the London bureau of the Sun, published in the Baltimore Sunday Sun of yesterday, December 17.

As an instance of British failure to cooperate in keeping strategic products from Communist China, for instance, the Norton article tells of October shipments of copper to China from the United Kingdom nearly 3 months after Hong Kong had stopped such shipments and more than 7 weeks after the British Government itself had invoked a ban.

In simple justice to our beleagured fighting forces in Korea, and in order that the Senate and our people may be fully informed of the facts of the situation, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Baltimore Sun of yesterday be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

It indicates, more clearly than any arguments here could do, the necessity for the inquiry asked for in my resolution, S. 365, of recent date, that would include investigations as to shipments from anti-

Communist countries, as a basis for renewed negotiations looking toward complete stoppage of such indefensible aid to the Communist nations which are intent on destroying not only the United States but all free nations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of December 17, 1950]

WAR GOODS SOLD TO RED CHINA BY BRITISH FIRMS DESPITE BAN

(By Howard Norton)

LONDON, December 16.—The latest figures available here reveal that Britain was still selling war materials to Red China in large quantities as recently as the end of October.

One of the most important items needed for war—copper—was being sold to China in big amounts more than 50 days after such sales were banned by the British Government, these figures show.

Whether British exporters continued their apparent defiance of the copper-export ban after the end of October will be a secret of the board of trade until the November trade figures are released later this month.

EXPORT PICTURE

But in the meantime, here is the picture of what Britain has been sending to China as revealed in figures already available:

Since January 1, the United Kingdom exports to Red China have amounted to $7,054,000.

Copper shipments alone account for more than half of that total, or $3,676,000.

Sales of copper to China became so heavy as the war grew hotter in Korea that the Hong Kong government finally put its foot down. It banned all copper shipments from that colony to Red China on August 8. Then on September 11 the British Government in London imposed a similar ban.

Yet, in the month of October, United Kingdom exporters sent $182,000 worth of copper to the Chinese.

That was more copper than the British had sold to China in the entire first 10 months of 1949.

And the October shipments of copper were still being shipped from the United Kingdom 84 days after Hong Kong had stopped such shipments, and 51 days after the British Government itself had invoked a ban.

An official of the British Board of Trade said tonight he could not think of any explanation for this situation.

ONE OF FIVE CATEGORIES

Copper, however, was only one of five categories of war goods which Britain sent to China in large amounts in October. Others were:

1. Machinery, including transformers and other electrical machinery, textile machinery, and various kinds of instruments. October machinery exports came to $126,000, bringing the year's total in this category to $1,055,000.

2. Chemicals: October exports alone totaled $170,800, or nearly half of the year's total chemical exports to China, which amounted to $401,200.

3. Iron and steel manufacturers: October exports came to $184,800, or about 25 percent of the year's total exports in this category.

AIRPLANES SHIPPED

4. Vehicles, including airplanes: October shipments totaled $25,200, and the first 10 months' shipment $249,200.

The British Board of Trade insists that Britain now has placed China under the same trade restrictions as those on Russia and her satellites.

Yet in the month of October Britain's exports to China amounted to a total of $702,800.

And more than one-fourth of that total consisted of copper—one of the most vital war materials.

VALUABLE IN WAR PLANS

All of the remainder, except for $14,800, represented goods that might easily have great value in preparations for war.

Though the United Kingdom's exports to China in October amounted to only one-third of the September exports, they were still eight times larger than her exports to China in October of last year.

But the United Kingdom is not the only part of the Empire carrying on a relatively heavy trade in war goods with Communist China.

MALAYA SENDS RUBBER

Malaya, in 9 months through September, sent Chinese $7,101,000 worth of rubber.

And Malaya's total trade with China for that period came to more than $8,300,000.

Figures on Malaya's October trade with China are not yet available here.

Between January and the end of September, Australia sold $40,000 worth of wool to China and about $500,000 worth of assorted exports.

CANADA SENT MATERIAL

Canada in September of this year sold Chinese $38,000 worth of brass bars, $5,000 worth of copper wire, and $6,000 worth of chemicals.

But Canada's trade with China dropped from $12,000,000 in the first 9 months of 1949 to less than $2,000,000 in the same period this year.

Of all units of the British Empire, Hong Kong has closest ties with China and does most extensive trade. And records show that a large portion of this trade is in war materials.

FIGURES ON HONG KONG

Between January 1 and the end of September this year—the latest figures available—Hong Kong sent the following amounts of war goods to Red China: $13,000,000 in rubber; $6,000,000 in copper and copper products; $7,000,000 in iron and steel; $4,300,000 in machinery; $1,700,000 in electrical machinery and appliances; $2,300,000 in vehicles and transport equipment; $9,500,000 in petroleum products; $14,000,000 in chemicals and pharmaceutical products.

It should be noted, however, that all of these exports were sent before China began to show signs of entering the Korean war.

Figures for trade since September have not reached London. But the Hong Kong commissioner here reports that on August 8 Hong Kong put a ban on export to China on most kinds of machinery, big Diesel engines, petroleum, chemicals for making high explosives, any steel-hardening material, arms, and ammunition, airplane parts, heavy vehicles, copper, radio tubes, and machines for making radar equipment, and cables.

British officials here admit privately, however, that it is politically impossible to embargo trade between Hong Kong and China.

They take the realistic view that Hong Kong's 2,000,000 people have got to live, and the only way they can live is by trading with China, and the only way they can trade with China is to sell China commodities she wants.

Therefore, inevitably a lot of Hong Kong's trade with China is going to be in war goods.

COULDN'T MAKE LIVING

To restrict too severely exports of war goods from Hong Kong to China would cut the colony's exports below the point where its people could make a living, the British believe.

And to do that would be inviting revolution among the vast Chinese population of Hong Kong.

Moreover, if Hong Kong ceased to be of value to the Chinese Reds as a source of war materials from the western nations, the British believe it is likely the Communists might decide to take the island over.

Thus, to the British mind, Hong Kong's shipments of certain war materials to Red China are simply part of the cost of defending the colony.

And those shipments are likely to continue on a limited scale.

Truman Doctrine Forcing an Armed Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Truman-Acheson policies have brought the United States to an impossible situation. Is this the kind of leadership that instills unity and confidence? It has failed miserably and those who are responsible should resign in the civilian and military departments as well.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, in his column today, points out the weaknesses in the Truman doctrine. I am including it as part of my remarks:

THE CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The feeling of being in great peril, which in Washington at any rate is so general, is primarily, it seems to me, a crisis of confidence. The country has long been divided approximately along party lines on the fundamental question of where are its vital interests and how are they to be protected and promoted. This division has brought an unprecedented violence into our public life. And it has subjected our strategical decisions and our diplomatic actions to the vagaries of private emotion and to the pressures and the intoxications of mass movements.

Thus the Nation has been denied the guidance and the comfort which come only from an accepted doctrine, from a common conviction, and from fraternal agreement on the first and last things of the Nation's existence and its destiny. In place of a national doctrine of American security we have had the Truman doctrine. And so, contrary to the considered judgment of every American soldier and statesman who ever studied the question and was competent to judge it, virtually all of the American Army and all of its reserves were sucked into a peninsula of Asia in the presence and in defiance of overwhelmingly superior forces.

Our people have been shaken by this demonstration of misinformation, miscalculation, and misjudgment at the highest levels of decision and command. Deep in their souls there is the question, which will have to be answered, as to what is being done, what can be done about that. The young men will come forward. The weapons will be turned out. The people will work and they will pay and they will go without. But what they must know is that their biggest efforts will be directed ultimately by men who will not sacrifice their better judgment to their impulses, or to appease their domestic critics, or to be applauded in the next day's newspapers, or because they are bewitched by slogans, or because they are too timid to be rational.

Confidence and unity cannot be restored merely by allowing or inviting a few men to resign. Nevertheless I think that after a

defeat of this kind there should be some resignations, not to make scapegoats of honorable men but, as in the case when a captain runs his ship aground, in order to remind all who come after how serious it is to err when the stakes are life and death.

But those who come after will continue to err unless the country can reach by general agreement a strategical doctrine which fits its geography, its resources and its limitations, its genius and its traditions. I do not think myself that our ablest strategists and experts in foreign affairs would find it difficult to formulate a national doctrine—were they undisturbed by the clamor of lobbyists and of propagandists and of the ideologists. Nor is there much doubt, I believe, that their doctrine would be in harmony with what the great mass of the people believe intuitively and by common sense.

The central principle of the doctrine would be that North America is an island, a continental island to be sure, but still in relation to the Old World an island. The people of North America can never meet on even terms the armed masses of the Eurasian Continent. It is nonsense to suppose that the smaller number can encircle and contain the larger and that this can be done across two oceans.

The true American doctrine—both in defense and in offense—is to recognize the limitations of and to exploit the advantages of our island character—our inferiority in manpower, our superiority in technology and in production, the oceans of sea and air around us which offer us the means of a flexible defense and of a highly mobile offense.

If what I am told by men who have been out in the country is correct, and what, as nearly as I can judge from some good samples the letters pouring into Washington signify, it is this: After Korea, what the people want is to increase the military power of the United States and to get out of entanglements like Korea. There is little doubt, I think, that the main tide is running in the direction of an armed isolation.

It has not yet run all the way or nearly all the way to that. The lessons learned in the two world wars are not forgotten. But the tide will, in my opinion, run even stronger and stronger toward armed isolation if the inflated globalism of the Truman-Acheson policy is not deflated. The movement toward armed isolation could take the form either of a demand for withdrawal from Europe and Asia—which is, of course, what the Kremlin wants more than anything else on earth—or it could take the form of a preventive war waged without the support of any of our allies and, in fact, in the belief that, while our allies would be overrun and would perish, they can be treated as expendable.

Our allies abroad will be well-advised, therefore, for their own security as well as for our own, to work with and not against an American withdrawal from the overextended commitments of the Truman doctrine.

Is the UN Prayer Room Vetoed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor:

IS THE UN PRAYER ROOM VETOED?

(By Carlyle Morgan)

At a time when millions of Americans are turning to prayer in order to find the poise and the wisdom with which to meet one of the world's most portentous crises, perhaps no stranger question could be asked than this:

Should the United Nations headquarters now rising over the East River in New York City include a room for prayer and meditation?

Most people thought the answer had already been given, and that it was a resounding yes, uttered by peoples who by experience had learned the true relation of prayer and freedom, prayer and peace.

But is the answer to be yes? Or has it, ironically just in time for Christmas, been changed in the last few days to a veto? If it has not been so changed there is apparent danger that it will be. In that danger lies a challenge to all the peoples of the UN.

But perhaps the challenge is sharper to some than to others and lays a heavier responsibility upon them to state their views clearly and loudly enough to be heard.

A prayer room was already planned for the UN buildings. The general architectural idea of the room has been sketched out. It looks a bit grim on paper but might easily be relieved by a few alterations, and maybe it wouldn't be grim at all when completed. On the contrary, the design might well prove to be inspiring and as forward-looking as the UN buildings themselves.

But it isn't the shape, size, or any physical concept of the room that now appears in question, but whether there should be a prayer room at all. The obstacle is understood to be a clash of religious concepts—and not as between the religious communities of the world on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other, but a conflict between religious groups professing Christianity.

Those who recall how the United Nations Conference at San Francisco opened with some moments of meditation, accommodating all faiths, and rallying to the UN the deepest feelings of most of mankind, will surely be astonished that the same sort of accommodation cannot be worked out in the vast headquarters of the UN.

Almost nothing is being said, so far, about the reasons for the disagreement over the prayer room. And unless those objecting to the room wish to make their position clear it might be difficult for anyone else to do so satisfactorily. But it need not be difficult at all for those who favor the inclusion of a prayer room in the UN buildings to make their voices heard. Perhaps they cannot do this through the national delegations to the UN, or through the official groups responsible for the building of the UN headquarters. But they could do it through the press, in articles or letters to editors and writers, through radio discussion, in statements from pulpits and wherever men speak their minds freely and fearlessly.

If the UN buildings cannot have one prayer room, then should they not contain two? To speak of more than two seems unnecessary. If that is the case, a separate room for the dissidents ought to meet any legitimate objections.

There is no place in the discussion of this question for bigotry, for recrimination, or for condemnation. There should be the largest-hearted, willingness all round to find a means of embodying in the UN buildings a testimonial of most of the world's reliance on prayer for freedom, for justice, and for peace.

Only recently at the order of UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie a meditation room was opened at Lake Success in answer to pleas from numerous religious organizations whose members felt the need for prayer in the present world crisis. Reports that a similar room, long planned and supposedly agreed upon, may not be provided in the new UN buildings must be all but unbelievable for many, many people.

It may be that the voices of these very people can clarify the confused situation behind the reports. If there is some misunderstanding it will melt away under open discussion. But the prayer room planned for the UN headquarters should not be lost through ignorance of existing disagreement over it—in a word, through sheer default on the part of those who want it.

Happy Talk on a Silent Campus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a great educational institution located in Washington is quite often lost among the ponderous governmental agencies that go to make our Nation's Capital. Gallaudet College holds a unique position in the educational field in that it is the only college for the deaf in the world.

I commend an article that appeared recently in Collier's magazine for December 23, 1950, titled "Happy Talk on a Silent Campus" to the consideration of my colleagues.

HAPPY TALK ON A SILENT CAMPUS

(By Gordon Schendel)

COURAGE IS A COMMON CHARACTERISTIC AT GALLAUDET, THE WORLD'S ONLY COLLEGE FOR THE DEAF

The Blues had the ball; it was fourth down, 8 yards to go. In their huddle, the players gesticulated swiftly; then they trotted back to position. The quarterback signaled, his hands flashing. But when the sprawling players had untangled, the outweighed Blues were short of the mark.

As the players surrendered the ball, three blue-sweatered girls spun to their feet and motioned to their fellow students in the bleachers. As one, the spectators stood. And following the cheerleaders' graceful gestures, they responded in unison—not with yells, but with sweeping, rhythmic motions of their hands. The Blues and their subs on the side lines grinned at the encouragment, though no sound had been uttered.

They would not have heard sounds. For the team, the cheerleaders, and the enthusiastic rooters all were students at Gallaudet College in Washington, D. C.—the only college in the world for the deaf.

Dr. Leonard M. Elstad, Gallaudet's president, turned to me and commented: "Few people realize it, but the football huddle was invented at Gallaudet in 1880. From necessity, of course. And, incidentally, at indoor games like basketball the students give regular shouted cheers. Indoors, the team can feel sound vibrations through the floor."

Gallaudet was beaten that day by Wilson Teachers College, also Washington. But by any standards it did well to hold the score to 18–0. For Gallaudet, with an annual enrollment of some 200, is the smallest of the 15 colleges in the Mason-Dixon Intercollegiate Conference; it usually has barely enough men available to form a second team for practice.

While it is outranked by the other conference schools in size, Gallaudet is far from being the youngest in tradition. It was founded in 1864 as the National Deaf-Mute College, through an act of Congress signed by Abraham Lincoln. Some time later, its name was changed to honor the man who started the first free public school for the deaf in this country: the Reverend Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet. It was the Reverend Thomas Gallaudet who started this Nation toward its present world leadership in the education of the deaf; the school named after him has brought such education to its highest peak. For, since its first class met, Gallaudet College has turned out a steady procession of graduates who—despite their handicap—have been highly useful citizens, not only of this country, but of others as well.

One reason for this is the rigidity of its entrance requirements. The bulk of Gallaudet's students represent the top graduates of American State schools for the deaf, selected through a stiff competitive examination. Except for foreign students and about 70 others who pay $700 annual tuition, all are awarded Federal scholarships, which include dormitory space and food.

Congressmen as directors

Gallaudet is a Government-subsidized institution of learning—like Howard University for Negroes, also located in Washington. The President of the United States signs all diplomas; a United States Senator and two Members of the House of Representatives are always on its board of directors. (Representative HOMER THORNBERRY, a Texas Democrat who is one of the present directors, is himself the son of deaf parents.)

The college shares its 100-acre elm-shaded campus—and its president—with the Kendall School, which trains deaf children from preschool age through high school, and serves as the college's practice-teaching laboratory. All classes are held in a cluster of Victorian buildings, dominated by the clock tower on the ivy-hung chapel.

Upon my arrival at the school, Dr. Elstad suggested meeting some of the students before attending their classes. On the way, he discussed the principles on which Galludet operates.

"The public may wonder," he began, "why the deaf need a special college when the blind have none."

He pointed out that blind students can attend any college because they can hear lectures, engage in class discussion, and have texts read to them. But those deaf students who are dependent on sign language can get nothing from lectures or discussions; even those expert at lip reading have great difficulty.

"Instructors forget they must face such students while speaking. Even then," Dr. Elstad emphasized, "lip reading is 50 percent guesswork. Many words have identical lip movements, and some have virtually none."

In other respects too, he said, deafness is a greater handicap in getting an education than blindness—as was recently stated by Helen Keller, blind and deaf from infancy.

This is because deafness involves more than just a lack of hearing. A child born deaf not only is cut off from hearing any words and—unless specially trained—from speaking them, but also from knowing words and thinking in words. Therefore, he is largely isolated from the world. On entering a school for the deaf at the age of 5, he is 4 years behind a child with normal hearing in both language and everyday knowledge. It takes years to bridge this gap, no matter how bright he is, for he must be taught the mechanics of lip reading and speech, and he must acquire a vocabulary before he can begin to study regular school subjects.

Naturally, the situation may be somewhat different for deaf children whose hearing was normal at birth. About two-thirds of the deaf, Doctor Elstad told me, are victims of such things as scarlet fever, meningitis, measles, typhoid, whooping cough, mastoids, falls and blows, and the high temperatures which sometimes accompany a few other childhood diseases.

I got some idea of what may be accomplished by education when we reached the college-operated snack bar, the main between-classes gathering spot for the students. There, two pretty girls were selling drinks. In a row of booths, a score of youngsters were conversing animatedly in sign language. A jukebox was thundering away, and three young men stood with their hands pressed to it, obviously enjoying the music. They were "hearing" through vibrations; Doctor Elstad said couples often danced to the music, feeling its rhythm in the wooden floor.

He called over several students, in turn. In talking with them, he used the combined method which is the accepted language of the college: that is, he spoke in a normal voice and simultaneously "said" the same thing in sign language.

Although the students at Gallaudet prefer to use sign language among themselves, all are able to speak. (The terms "deaf-mute" and "deaf and dumb," I learned, date from a time when the deaf used only sign language—not because their vocal cords were defective, but simply because they hadn't been taught to speak.)

Among those with whom we chatted was Victor Galloway, 22, a tall, good-looking senior from Atlanta, and president of the Student Self-Government Association. He watched my face intently as I spoke, and said that while he often met persons whose lips were hard to read, the difficulty decreased after he knew them better. Victor was planning to become an industrial chemist—a field described by Dr. Elstad as particularly suited to the deaf, since it requires concentrated work rather than much conversation.

We also spoke to Victor's attractive fiancée, Gertrude Scott, of Washington, D. C., and to Dorothy Busch, a blue-eyed blond senior from Alexandria, Minn. Gertrude, who had recently been chosen Gallaudet's most popular coed, was majoring in education and hoped to teach in a State school for the deaf. She told us that she, her sister, and her brother were also born deaf, as were their parents. All three children had attended the Kendall School; nothing but sign language was used in their home.

I found that all the students took their handicap in stride and could laugh at consequent complications. Dorothy Busch, who was studying to be an interior decorator, told about being nearly run down by a taxicab in Washington. She hadn't heard the driver's horn, and he'd been forced to slam on his brakes. She said he was very rude—she read his lips—and, after cursing her roundly demanded sarcastically: "What's the matter, are you deaf?"

"It was a pleasure for once," she said, "to reply, 'Yes, I am!' "

After Dorothy left, Dr. Elstad told me she was among the less than 5 percent at Gallaudet who benefit slightly from a hearing aid, but that she, like those few other borderline cases between deaf and hard-of-hearing, prefers not to wear it at college. (By definition, the deaf, of whom there are 100,000 in the United States, are people whose hearing is nonfunctional for the ordinary purposes of life; the hard-of-hearing, numbering an estimated 15,000,000, are those whose hearing, although defective, is still functional with or without a hearing aid.)

How teachers are trained

Dr. Elstad suggested the college's normal department—which operates in conjunction with the Kendall School—as our next stop. Here prospective instructors of the deaf, most of whom can hear perfectly well themselves, learn while teaching the Kendall children.

A majority of those who instruct the deaf in this country and Canada are graduates of the Gallaudet normal department—including Dr. Elstad, who took the course after getting a degree from St. Olaf College in his native Minnesota. The department enrolls 10 potential teachers annually for its 1-year course. All must have bachelor of arts degrees; they attend Gallaudet under a Federal scholarship, and receive a master's degree for the year's work. (Deaf students wishing to teach are not required to take the normal course; their bachelor of arts from Gallaudet qualifies them.)

As we approached the department, Dr. Elstad explained the instruction techniques taught there. Beginners in Kendall School, he said, like those in other schools for the deaf, are taught lip reading and speech exclusively; the supplementary sign language is used only after the pupils reach high school, to speed up the education process.

As a matter of fact, he added, educators of the deaf have long disagreed over whether "finger-talking" has any place in the classroom at all. In some places it isn't used even in high school, on the theory that it does little to prepare deaf children for a world of hearing people. At one time Dr. Elstad was an exponent of this theory. He changed his mind after noticing that even at schools with strict bans on sign language, the youngsters picked it up outside—indicating their emotional need for this clearer and quicker means of communication.

In the normal department, Dr. Elstad turned me over to Hugo Schunhoff, head of the department and principal of the Kendall School, who joined the Gallaudet faculty this year. He previously had served on the faculties of the Minnesota, Illinois, and Texas State schools for the deaf, and had taught lip reading and speech in various Army hospitals. Like Dr. Elstad, he has normal hearing.

Professor Schunhoff took me first to the preschool class, composed of 15 3- and 4-year-olds brought from home for 2 hours a day to learn the beginning principles of lip reading and speech. Among other things, all the children are exhaustively tested to see if they retain enough hearing to profit from the use of an electric amplifier. In one corner of the classroom a small redhead wearing earphones was taking such instruction.

Across the room, a tiny, elfin girl was being taught basic vocabulary words with visual-aid cards. As the student teacher showed her a card picturing a ball and spoke the word, she had the little girl watch her lips; then she placed the child's hand alternately on her throat and lips to feel the muscular movements made in speaking. Over and over this was repeated, until the child succeeded in making the correct lip and throat movements for "ball." But as she was unable to hear her teacher's voice, she made no sound.

The teacher then worked to get her to use more force. Finally, after many earnest attempts, the tot managed a barely audible, whispered "baah."

SLOW BUT STEADY PROGRESS

The rest of the class, seated at a table, was encouraged by the other two teachers to name objects shown on cards. Responses were discouragingly few. However, the children had been attending school only 5 weeks. Professor Schunhoff said that at the end of the school year the average 3 or 4 year old will have learned to lip read about 50 words, and to speak 20.

The next class, consisting of 5 year olds who spend the full day in school, could speak and write short sentences. The teacher told a small boy to run across the room, to fall, to pretend to cry. To prove he understood entirely through lip reading, she moved her lips silently. Then, as the boy acted out

his part, a little girl wrote on the blackboard: "He ran. He fell. He cried."

The class couldn't have been this advanced without preschool training. Lacking such training, many deaf children entering school at 5 or 6 don't even know they have a name; nor do they know that other people or things have names. Even children whose education is well begun sometimes have odd misconceptions.

One boy was 7 before he learned animals couldn't talk. No one had thought to tell him—he'd seen people talk to their pets, and his storybooks teemed with "talking" animals.

From the age of 5 up, Kendall children sleep on campus, except over week ends. I asked whether such early separation from parents didn't entail difficult adjustments, and Professor Schunhoff smiled.

"Adjustments are harder on the parents. In fact, one mother was considerably hurt when she found her small son, home for the week end, happily packing his bag to return to school—on Saturday night."

Classes were changing again as I returned to college hall. However, the noisy bedlam usually heard in corridors at such a time was completely lacking. Many students were conversing—but through sign language and lip movements. I had the momentary illusion that I was deaf, not they.

Gallaudet's curriculum is broad for an institution of its size. Courses are offered in five basic fields. Education, home economics, literature and languages, mathematics and science, and social studies. There also are courses in library science, drafting, and journalism.

A course in modern poetry, taught by Robert Panara, himself deaf, was my first stop. Panara seated me in the semicircle of 20 students before him and explained that they were currently studying Robert Frost's poems. He then read selections while the class watched his lips and occasionally checked a line in their open texts. When Panara called for interpretations of passages, the students volunteered eagerly.

"In general," Panara explained after class, "the deaf are much more fond of poetry than the average hearing person. You see, poetry, with its rhythms, is their substitute for music."

Debating a marriage problem

Next I visited a class in sociology, taught by Dr. Powrie Doctor. Dr. Doctor, who has normal hearing, is highly enthusiastic about his work. For my benefit, he directed class discussion to the question: Are there social pressures involved in marriages between deaf persons and persons with normal hearing?

Richard Babb, of Huntington Park, Calif., opened the discussion by saying he believed such marriages were unfair to the deaf mate. "When a deaf and a hearing person marry," Babb argued, "each already has his own friends. These groups won't mix well. Each partner will want to mingle with his own, causing friction."

Jerome Freeman, of Indianapolis, Ind., suggested that the deaf partner in such a marriage might command less respect from his offspring. "If the father were deaf," he explained, "the children would know they could 'get away with more' with him."

Then blond Peggy Stack, of Sullivan, Mo., advanced the view—speaking, and also using the sign language and manual alphabet, as had the others—that while a marriage between a deaf boy and a hearing girl wouldn't be good, she thought one between a deaf girl and a hearing boy all right.

"For," she explained soberly, "the boy should be the boss."

The class howled with laughter.

Another interesting class was that on sign language. This is a required course for normal department students, who—not being deaf—usually have no previous knowledge of the subject. It was taught by Dr. Elizabeth Peet, a tiny lady who is considered the world's leading authority on sign language. Dr. Peet represents the third generation of a family of famous educators of the deaf. Seventy-six years old, she retired shortly after my visit, having taught at Gallaudet for half a century. (In recognition of her long and distinguished service at the college, Dr. Peet, who also had been Gallaudet's dean of women, was chosen "Dean of the Year" last summer by the Association of Deans of Women in American Colleges and Universities.)

She told me that the sign language as used today was largely developed in France. However, Egyptian hieroglyphics and even cavemen's picture writing were forms of it. American Indian tribes used a sign language for intertribal communication.

Once, when a group of Indians visited Gallaudet, they and their deaf hosts found their respective sign languages sufficiently similar to converse easily. In fact, the sign language of the deaf is an international language. This was demonstrated at the "Deaf Olympics"—the Sixth International Games for the Deaf, held in the summer of 1949 in Copenhagen, Denmark. Results of each event were announced in several languages for hearing fans, and also relayed in sign language. And the deaf of all countries understood, regardless of the nationality of the individual who did the "signing."

Sign language is near universal, Dr. Peet says, because it is so logical. Most of its symbols, therefore, are easily understood by hearing people. For example, the idea of "a baby" is expressed by cradling one folded arm on the other, as if you were rocking a baby to sleep. And "to think" is expressed by touching your temple, while maintaining a thoughtful expression. The gesture of "washing" one hand with the other, done slowly with a pleased expression, means "I'm content." The same gesture made rapidly means "Brrr, it's cold."

Some signs date from centuries ago, like that for "woman"—which is a thumb drawn down the right cheek, denoting a bonnet string. The sign for "man" is made by raising the right hand to grasp the brim of an imaginary hat. For "boy" or "girl" you very logically make the sign for "man" or "woman," then with outstretched hand indicate a person of small stature.

Double talk in sign language

Certain signs are humorous in their ingenious suggestion of what is meant: The sign for "monkey" is made by scratching your ribs with both hands, as a monkey scratches for fleas. There is, also, some unintended humor: For "insane," a finger is pointed at one's temple and revolved in a circle; and virtually the same sign means "government."

There is slang, too, in sign language, and students at Gallaudet constantly develop snappy additions to their campus argot. One day Dr. Peet saw a boy make a strange gesture to a friend in the corridor, and asked its meaning. After marked hesitation, he said it was slang for "good morning." So, a few minutes later the dignified Dr. Peet playfully greeted her class with the new expression—made by abruptly pointing the index finger like a pistol.

"Everyone looked startled," Dr. Peet recalled, smiling, "then burst into laughter. The grinning culprit confessed the sign really meant 'phooey on you.'"

Next, I called on Prof. Elizabeth Benson, who teaches speech and lip reading and who this year succeeded Dr. Peet as dean of women. During the war Miss Benson, who has normal hearing, served in the WACs, teaching speech and lip reading at the Army hospital for deafened soldiers at Chickasha, Okla.

At the moment she was tutoring Albert Bedard, of Baltimore, who had lost his hearing at 12. Losing it at that age, theoretically he should have been able to speak quite well in later life. However, as often happens, Albert's speech had deteriorated somewhat during the 10 years he had been unable to hear his voice. Specifically, he had fallen into the habit of dropping the letter "d." Miss Benson, therefore, had him speak words like "dart," "day," and "deed" after her, while watching her lips.

Outside the classroom, students at Gallaudet are strong on extracurricular activities. They publish an excellent newspaper, the Buff and Blue; a quarterly literary magazine, the Clerc Issue; and an impressive yearbook, the Tower Clock. Sports include football, basketball, wrestling, track and cross-country racing, baseball, tennis, archery, volley ball, and golf.

Despite the school's small enrollment, it has won several conference championships in basketball, track, and wrestling.

These athletic triumphs have been won despite an additional little-known handicap suffered by many of its athletes. In most cases of deafness the sense of equilibrium, lodged in the semicircular canals of the ear, is defective. Deaf athletes compensate by "orienting" themselves with the ground—as long as they can watch it. Obviously, when they must look up at a ball they are at a disadvantage.

The college has the usual student organizations—including fraternities (nonresidential; all students live in dormitories—where, incidentally, they are awakened mornings not by bells but by the lights being switched on), sororities, YWCA, and similar groups.

The dramatics club, coached by Prof. Frederick Hughes, himself deaf, puts on at least one three-act play each season, and has presented several Gilbert and Sullivan operettas sung in sign language. Its 1942 production of Arsenic and Old Lace so impressed Howard Lindsay and Russel Crouse, famous producers of the hit, that they invited the club to present its sign-language version on Broadway, substituting for the professional cast. New York critics were highly complimentary.

Sunday evening chapel sessions are addressed by visiting clergymen—Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish. The session I attended was conducted by the Reverend James Fortune of Durham, N. C., and Episcopal missionary to the deaf, adept at using the sign language while speaking.

The largest share of Gallaudet graduates wind up in the teaching profession. The next largest field is publishing and printing; quite a few alumni own newspapers. Many become industrial chemists. Others go into Government work, as statisticians.

Graduates who have won fame

Among the successful alumni are the famed etcher-engraver, Cadwallader Washburn, George T. Dougherty, chief chemist and metallurgist for United States Steel, and Charles Neillie, scientist credited with devising the plan to use planes to dust forest areas with insecticides.

Dr. Elstad, president of the school since 1945, has ambitious plans for a bigger and better Gallaudet—one capable of accommodating 500 to 700 students. There are approximately 25,000 boys and girls in schools for the deaf in the United States, and hundreds of those eligible for a college education will be barred by the limited capacity of Gallaudet.

When Dr. Elstad says this year's record enrollment of 224 taxes existing facilities, he isn't exaggerating. He and his wife have turned over the third floor of their home to four students, two fellows and an instructor. The student roomers all are deaf boys from foreign countries — Sweden, Transjordan, Israel, and China. The Government's Office of Education—a part of the Federal Security Agency, which super-

vises Gallaudet, has approved plans for an entire new college plant. As Dr. Elstad points out, Gallaudet's campus encompasses far more ground than is needed. Under the plan the school would sell its 100 acres of valuable real estate and build on perhaps 35 acres elsewhere in the city. The Korean war, however, has postponed congressional action on the project.

Dr. Elstad also has other projects in mind. He would like to inaugurate a daily television program for the deaf in sign language. And he would like to make a "movie dictionary" of sign language, to be shown at schools for hearing students, to create a better understanding of the deaf.

It is important for the public to have the right attitude, Dr. Elstad emphasizes. The deaf already have. They admit they have some special problems, but they minimize them. They don't want sympathy or privileges. When, some time ago, Texas exempted the deaf from the State poll tax, they agitated to have the measure rescinded—they wanted to pay like other people.

Rather than being morose about their lot, the deaf frequently will tell you lack of hearing is at times a blessing. It enables them, for instance, to work in noisy surroundings without the distraction that lowers the efficiency of hearing people. They suggest Thomas Edison may have achieved greater success because of his deafness, which left him free for complete concentration on his inventions.

Typical of the attitude of Gallaudet is that of the freshman who wrote in the yearbook:

"Deafness isn't a handicap. It's just an obstacle. And everybody has an obstacle to overcome—that's life."

The War We Are Losing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "The War We Are Losing" by Dr. George Gallup. His speech is particularly pertinent to our information program, and I think it will be of interest to the Senate.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

If one were to make a careful study of the opinions of the inhabitants of this globe, I am sure that he would come inevitably to the conclusion that, in the present war of ideas, the United States is losing badly.

Only the famous remark of Vinegar Joe Stilwell adequately describes the situation. In the world-wide struggle to sell our ideals and ideas we've taken a hell of a beating.

Compare our position today with Russia's. How many nations of the world are willing to send their troops into a war against Russia or her satellites merely at our bidding and without the support of our own Armed Forces? How many millions of fanatics do we have on our side—ready and willing to die to advance our cause in all nations of the world? How many hundreds of millions of people in Asia and in Europe passionately tie their hopes of a better life to democracy?

The most important struggle during the next 50 to 100 years will be the struggle to win the minds of men throughout the world.

Even the greatest victories on the battlefield will mean nothing unless we win the war of ideas.

Suppose the present war in Korea should develop into world war III. Have you any conception of the problem we would face at the end of this war if we had to police hundreds of millions of hostile people—unless we had first won over to our point of view a large segment of the population of these lands?

Suppose we were to succeed in liberating the satellite nations, and, as a consequence, insisted upon their setting up democratic election machinery. What do we do if the people of these nations take full advantage of our democratic processes and promptly vote in a Communist regime?

Or, take still another situation. A nation like Korea emerges from war in a state of economic ruin. Demands on the United States for money and goods cannot be easily disregarded because of the ever-present threat of communism.

Think of the nasty situation we might find ourselves in some day if governments of many nations important to us manage to stay in office only by means of the economic aid which we provide. What a temptation to demand help on every conceivable occasion—with the constant threat that unless we do give and give generously these nations will surely go Communist.

The worst folly is to assume that everywhere in the world the superiority of our system of government and our way of life have been clearly established. The truth is that many people in countries allied to us in Western Europe see little advantage in democracy as opposed to communism—certainly not enough to warrant fighting to save their homelands from Communist domination.

An American reporter, in a dispatch from Korea, told this story. One Korean had asked another about the importance of a United Nations' victory in his country. The reply was that if you are a blade of grass it makes little difference whether you are eaten by a cow or a horse. In this Korean's mind, and in the minds of millions more, it makes little difference who wins.

Another type of self-delusion is that the world judges us solely by our actions. Since actions are supposed to speak louder than words, followers of this theory hold that we need do little more to win the support of mankind than to carry on in our accustomed way.

Perhaps in an ideal world, a world in which every person is well educated, a world in which the press and radio are absolutely free to report fully and objectively all sides of every case to all people, a world in which men search constantly for truth, this would be the case. Unfortunately, this kind of world seems pretty far off and meanwhile we find that even such simple and generous acts as the Marshall aid plan become so distorted by Russian propaganda that even many of our European friends think that we were glad to appropriate this money for the purely selfish reason of building up and monopolizing foreign trade.

What do we do about this situation? First, we must develop a wholly new concept of the vital importance of this goal of winning the minds of men.

Prime Minister Nehru, of India, in a recent interview, singled out one of our basic weaknesses. He said that in dealing with world problems, people of the United States were inclined to think only in terms of armed force, or in terms of money. To put it more bluntly and less diplomatically, we try to get our way by threats or bribes. In Nehru's opinion, we have overlooked the natural aspirations of people in other areas of the world, and we have neglected to give them a better understanding of our own point of view. In short, we have neglected the route of reason and persuasion.

It is true that this country has begun to recognize the necessity of selling our point of view to the world and, in fact, the last Congress increased the appropriation for our international information program to $100,000,000.

That sum may seem like a lot of money but, in my opinion, no successful businessman in this country would undertake to carry out such a program as is needed to offset Russian efforts with an appropriation of less than $5,000,000,000.

Do you know anyone in this country who would contract to tell hundreds of millions of people in Europe and Asia the story of democracy as often and as effectively as the Communists tell their story—for a lesser amount?

Is there anyone in this country who, for a lesser sum, would agree to reach the millions of people of Western Europe who are either Communists or Communist inclined, with a daily message effective enough to offset the missionary efforts of five to ten million party workers, and to conteract the influence of scores of Communist owned and controlled newspapers?

I have no criticism whatsoever to make of our present information program, and specifically of the Voice of America. In fact, I know of no department of our Government which has spent its funds more intelligently and frugally. Edward Barrett is doing a fine job.

The trouble is that we have given our information section an assignment which is impossible with the funds available. Figuratively speaking, we have asked this Department to convert millions of people to our point of view by sending out penny postcards of the Brooklyn Bridge. We have sent our forces into this new type of warfare armed only with pea-shooters and BB guns.

If the job could be done as easily and as inexpensively as we have assumed, then a lot of hard-boiled American business leaders have been squandering hundreds of millions of dollars on advertising. If any person in this Nation can sell products or ideas anywhere in the world for substantially less than the great companies of this country have been spending, then fame and fortune await him.

In the field of military operations we try to equal or to excel the fire power of the enemy. That is the safest formula, in my opinion, for winning the war of ideas. We must equal and excel the efforts of the Communists. We must reach more people, more often, and more persuasively, than our enemies.

At this point, you—and a few Senators—may well say: "Yes; but where do wet get the $5,000,000,000? The taxpayers of the Nation are already overburdened, and the worst is yet to come."

There is certainly no denying this fact. Yet, I should like to be so bold as to suggest that the $5,000,000,000 should come out of our present economic aid program and from our defense budget.

I believe that after certain minimum requirements are met in our defense program the safety and future of this Nation can be insured to a greater extent by winning converts to our way of thinking than by adding to our stock of arms.

By the same line of reasoning, I believe that after we have given a certain minimum of economic aid to other nations additional amounts will not return the same increment of good will to us or strengthen our cause as much as the same amount of money spent in winning the minds of the people of these nations.

I am not here advocating direct help or subsidies. Give a Hottentot a quart of milk, and the first day he is grateful. The second

day he begins to question your motives. The third day he says you are stingy and should give him two quarts. The fourth day—or the fortieth—when you can no longer afford to give him any milk, he says you are a liar and a welsher because you promised to give him milk the rest of his life.

Certain help in the way of machinery, tools, and technological information may be absolutely essential to bolster up a flagging economy, or food may be required in a period of famine, but nothing more should be given or promised in the way of economic subsidies.

Proof that this is not necessary is to be found in Russia's policies today. Russia has sold millions of people her doctrines—yet Russia usually takes away goods and products from nations she overwhelms. Certainly Russia does not follow the policy of giving substantial aid to those nations which come under her domination.

How should the $5,000,000,000 be spent?

May I repeat that the colossal task of winning over the world to our way of thinking is so important—and will require so many years and so much effort—that a new department in our defense set-up should be created. It might be called the Department of World Relations and it should be staffed with the best brains of the country, drawn from the fields of publishing, broadcasting, public relations, and advertising.

Our program must be based upon truth. Herr Goebbels and his many imitators in Russia today have shown that big lies constantly repeated eventually come to be accepted. But truth, repeated as constantly, can be even more convincing and devastating.

The art of persuasion has never changed. Success grows out of a complete understanding of the hopes and aspirations of the people one tries to influence and the sympathetic desire to aid these people in reaching these goals.

Nothing is more boring than to talk about one's self—a sin which we have committed too often in our information program in recent years. The typical person, be he an illiterate peasant or a member of the intelligentsia, has usually one question only to ask—"What's in it for me?"

And, gentlemen, that is the question which we must answer.

Here is a peasant in Italy, a farm worker in France, an impoverished and hungry native of China—all of whom have been offered land and a better way of life if they turn Communist.

How do we win in this competition? Certainly we won't get very far by telling these poverty-stricken people and the hundreds of millions like them, that life in America is wonderful; that workers here own cars, homes, refrigerators, television sets, and everything else.

Their answer is likely to be, "So what? How do we get to America, and what do we do to get these things when we get there?"

No; our problem is to show how democracy and our form of economy actually will raise the standard of living in their own country; and how, along with a higher standard of living, they can enjoy the freedoms which man has fought to gain over the centuries, and which would be denied under communism.

To tell this story to the great masses of people of the world we must use every means of communication. Especially we must use those media which are best suited to reach the illiterate, because it is this group which has proved to be the most susceptible to Communist propaganda the world over.

A friend of mine who was stationed in Iran during the war told me this stock of Russian propaganda efforts in that country. He told about Russian mobile motion-picture units which toured the country showing the peasants how Russia would improve their standard of living. The motion pictures showed how agricultural practices in Iran could be improved, how the wonderful farm machinery made in Russia would reduce the labor of the farmer, how the building of dams would increase greatly the areas of the country which could be put into crops.

Can you imagine an approach more effective than this in winning converts to communism?

Motion pictures obviously should play a great part in our own selling program. We should produce pictures to show how the advances made in this country can be utilized in other nations. More important still, pictures can show how the aspirations of other nations parallel our own.

The Garibaldis, Masaryks, the Sun Yat-sens, all got their inspiration from this land of ours. The revolution that began in the early days of this country is the only real and lasting one in the world. Communism, as is often pointed out, is merely a counter-revolution.

Motion pictures are needed to counteract Communist propaganda. People need to know what the technique of the big lie is and what a world dominated by the Russians would really be like.

I believe that we should provide picture books, and many of the textbooks for the children of the world—not only to make certain that the youth of all nations is not indoctrinated by Russian philosophy but to share our knowledge with the people of the world, and to make certain that our ideals are known to everyone. If the Chinese Communists have found that comic books are effective in spreading Russian propaganda, then we should make certain that we distribute far more, and far better comic strips to tell our story.

We should support newspapers throughout the world which daily give the truth about world events and which present our point of view. How else can the people of many countries ever achieve any understanding of our point of view in world affairs. The Communists have scores of newspapers in the highly populated areas of the world. Can we afford to overlook their influence on large segments of the population of these areas?

We should encircle the globe with a radio network which will give everyone who chooses to listen—even the people inside Russia and the satellite nations—an opportunity to hear our side of the case. And if the people do not own receiving sets, then we should do everything we can to see that they have them.

We must bring students and leaders to this country by the tens of thousands to let them see for themselves what we think and how we live. Likewise we must send thousands of teachers and technologists abroad to make certain that people have first-hand evidence of our willingness to help them help themselves.

All of this may sound like a very ambitious program. But dare we undertake less?

Do we dare let Russia continue to tell the world that she alone wants peace and that we want war?

Do we dare let Russia continue to parade as the sole protector and friend of the masses of people of the world?

Do we dare let Russia claim that only through communism can the lot of the common people be improved in Asia, Africa, and South America?

Do we dare let Russia continue to picture us to hundreds of millions of people as imperialists—as the great exploiters of mankind?

If your answer is "No," then we must face up to the job that has to be done—the hardest, toughest selling job that any nation of the world has ever faced—against the greatest odds—and for the greatest stakes.

Victories in Korea—or anywhere else in the world—will be completely empty, in fact dangerous, unless first we have won a victory over the minds of men.

United States of America Against State of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the reply by defendant to plaintiff's memorandum on proposed decree in the case of United States of America versus State of Louisiana, pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

There being no objection, the reply was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1950. No. 12, original]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, v. STATE OF LOUISIANA, DEFENDANT

REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSED DECREE

The memorandum filed by the plaintiff "in regard to Louisiana's objections to the proposed decree," portrays a complete absence of any legal basis whatever for the position in which the United States now finds itself. Said memorandum further shows that the proponents are on the defensive and are at a loss to justify their proposed decree under the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States. We submit that it compels the conclusion that there is now no case or controversy before this Court and that the complaint should be dismissed.

Point 1. The issue of fee simple title has been eliminated by the Court from this case

The Solicitor General states that there is no basis for Louisiana's objection to including in the proposed decree the sentence that, "the State of Louisiana has no title thereto or property interest therein." But his assertions, we submit, are fully answered by the fact that this Court in its decision herein on June 5, 1950, definitely stated that this litigation "does not turn on title or ownership in the conventional sense."

That the issue of title to Louisiana's submerged lands and resources was not decided by the Court in this case is further shown by the Court's refusal to grant Louisiana a trial on the issue of title to its marginal seabed and the lands and resources therein, after the Court had stated that (1) Louisiana in her answer had denied that the United States has fee simple title to the lands, minerals, or other things underlying the Gulf of Mexico within her boundaries; (2) had set up affirmative defenses that she is the holder of fee simple title to all said lands, minerals, and other things; and (3) that Louisiana had also moved for trial by jury on the ground that this action is essentially one to recover possession of real property, that is, the soil and resources of the marginal sea off Louisiana and so is essentially an action at law in which the State is entitled to a jury trial under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

So, the Court eliminated the issue of title.

Point 2. Moreover, plaintiff has now specifically abandoned all claims to fee simple title

The plaintiff has now actually abandoned, in its proposed decree, the very claim to fee simple title to Louisiana's tidelands and mineral resources—the marginal seabed of Louisiana—which plaintiff made in its complaint.

Paragraph II of its complaint alleged as follows:

"At all times herein material, plaintiff was and now is the owner in fee simple of, or possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Gulf of Mexico."

But paragraph 1 of the decree proposed by plaintiff carefully omits the claim to fee simple title disjunctively made in the complaint merely asking that this Court decree that—

"The United States is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto, possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Gulf of Mexico."

So the plaintiff, having now abandoned its claim to fee simple title, the question of who has fee simple title is not before the Court in any respect whatever, and cannot be the basis of any decree.

Point 3. The California decree is no precedent whatever in this case

The California decree is no precedent whatever for the decree in this case, because there, California, in effect, consented to the entry of a decree which was proposed by the United States as plaintiff which stated that California had no title to the property. The decree in the California case was to that extent, therefore, a judgment by consent.

We submit that whatever the effect of that decree may be for California, it does not bind Louisiana at all. Louisiana has never consented to any such stipulation. She has always stood, and will ever stand, ready to submit evidence of the widest character portraying her fee simple title to and right to possession of the area involved, undisputed for more than 136 years.

Point 4. There is no case or controversy regarding the constitutional paramount rights, powers, and dominion of the United States over the marginal sea within Louisiana's boundaries

There is no possible controversy over anything in this case except fee simple title. Even the Solicitor General himself said so, specifically, in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on October 4, 1949.

He then stated that the Government's claim to the tidelands and their mineral resources was based on the claim of title, and that if the United States did not have title, it was not entitled to them. See Hearings before said committee, pages 56, 180.

The Court's decision in this case definitely eliminated the question of fee simple title by holding that this litigation did not turn on title or ownership of the property in question. Necessarily, therefore, the question of title cannot be revived by the suggestion on page 5 of memorandum in support of the proposed decree that the United States should have fee-title and ownership or proprietorship to the lands under navigable waters within Louisiana's boundaries.

And there never has been any controversy over the constitutional paramount rights, powers, dominion, etc., of plaintiff over the marginal sea off Louisiana; for Louisiana has never denied them, and she has specifically admitted them in this litigation. Hence there are no conflicting claims of governmental powers here, as there were with California (332 U. S. 1, 25); here there simply is no case or controversy whatever before this Court which could be used as the basis for a decree; and the complaint should be dismissed.

The supreme or paramount character of the rights, powers, and dominion of the United States within its delegated governmental sphere has been the recognized law and jurisprudence in this country since at least 1819, when this Court, through Chief Justice Marshall, in *McCullough* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 403) held:

"If any one proposition could command the universal assent of mankind, we might expect it would be this—that the government of the union, though limited in its powers, is supreme within its sphere of action."

It is not amiss to point out that, so far as we have been able to ascertain, the phrase "paramount right" arose in the leading case of *McCready* v. *Virginia* ((1876) 94 U. S. 391). In that case the Court held:

"The principle has long been settled in this Court that each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction, * * * (cases cited). The title thus held is subject to the paramount right of navigation, the regulation of which, in respect to foreign and interstate commerce, has been granted to the United States" (pp. 394, 395).

However, if a case or controversy could now be manufactured in this case with respect to paramount rights, power, or dominion of the United States, where none exists because of the fact that Louisiana has never denied them, but to the contrary has consistently admitted them; then, in that event, Louisiana's objections to paragraph 1 of the proposed decree would be appropriate. Louisiana's objection was merely that the following words should be added to the proposed paragraph: "To the extent of all governmental powers existing under the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States."

Unless the executive branch of the Government is arguing that this court should decree its powers over and beyond those conferred by the Constitution, we submit that the words of constitutional limits, quoted above, would be essential. But again, we must point out that there is no issue before this Court as to paramount rights, power, dominion, etc., of the plaintiff over the seabed within Louisiana's boundaries, and hence there is no basis for a decree on that subject, either.

Point 5. Plaintiff now asks this Court to clothe it with the very power that Congress has specifically refused to grant, and thus to extinguish the separation of powers embodied in the Constitution

Plaintiff now asks this Court to empower what Congress has specifically refused to grant. The effect of the argument is to seek to extinguish the separation of powers embodied in the Constitution.

Plaintiff's position in its proposed decree insofar as it seeks an injunction is necessarily based on an assumption that plaintiff has fee simple title to lands under navigable waters within Louisiana's boundaries. We have shown above that that issue was eliminated by the Court; that plaintiff has now specifically abandoned, in its proposed decree, all claim to fee simple title; and that the issue of fee simple title is not now before the Court to become the subject of any decree.

From a different approach, however, perhaps nothing portrays plaintiff's utter lack of right to an injunction, accounting, etc., and the fact that it does not have fee simple title, than the action of Congress. For Congress has specifically refused to grant the plaintiff power to explore, lease, etc., the area involved. And from this we must infer that even Congress has firmly recognized that plaintiff does not have fee simple title to the area involved.

Further, plaintiff, having applied to Congress for the necessary legislative authority to lease, explore, take out, etc., the minerals in the marginal sea, and having been specifically refused such authority only 3 years ago, now asserts that the judicial power, through this Court, may do what the legislative branch of the Government has specifically refused to do. It needs no argument to demonstrate that this Court does not possess the legislative power assigned by the Constitution to Congress.

We may point out that plaintiff has placed itself in this feeble position through its own efforts. Not having fee simple title to the marginal sea bed, and having now even abandoned all claims to fee simple title, plaintiff nevertheless wants to stop the oil-drilling operations of Louisiana and its lessees. That such a cessation of operations would be disastrous to the national economy and the present grave emergency is something of which this Court may take judicial notice. In an effort to avoid these catastrophic consequences plaintiff now grandiosely asserts that the Secretary of Interior will permit the oil-drilling operations to continue on such terms and provisions as he may see fit to grant, and that he should be considered by this Court, therefore, to possess the very authority to explore, lease, operate, etc., which Congress refused to purport to grant to him.

Thus, plaintiff nonchalantly asserts that, to be sure, Congress has enacted no such legislation, and that it has been held that the Mineral Leasing Act of February 12, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended, does not apply to submerged lands of the type here involved,[1] but that regardless of the absence of any act of Congress, the Secretary of the Interior stands ready to authorize continued production of minerals from the States' tidelands and has full power to make "interim arrangements" to protect and preserve the lands and resources "adjudged" to the United States, and he points to an Executive order, No. 9633.

---

[1] "After the Supreme Court decision in the California case, the question whether the Mineral Leasing Act applied to those areas became material. On August 8 and 28, 1947, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior and the Attorney General, respectively, held that the act did not apply to the submerged coastal areas. Accordingly, on September 8, 1947, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management denied the applications pending in that Bureau, and on October 6, 1947, the Secretary of the Interior denied the applications pending in his office.

"There is no reason to think that the legal conclusions of the Solicitor and the Attorney General, and the consequent administrative actions denying all the then pending applications can be successfully challenged in the courts."

(Statement of Solicitor General, p. 30, pamphlet, Submerged Lands, Government Printing Office, report of "Hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U. S. Senate, 81st Cong., 1st sess.," bills S. 155, S. 923, S. 1545, S. 1700, and S. 2153.)

Oil and Gas (act of February 25, 1920), secs. 13 and 14, 30 U. S. C. 221–236; oil shale, 30 U. S. C. 241; phosphate, 30 U. S. C. 211–214; sodium, 30 U. S. C. 261–263; potash, 30 U. S. C. 281–287; sulphur, 30 U. S. C. 271–276.

By act August 7, 1947, 30 U. S. C. 352, the Secretary of Interior was authorized to lease for oil and other minerals "acquired lands of the United States," to which the mineral leasing laws had not been extended; but it was provided: "That nothing in this chapter is intended, or shall be construed, to apply to or in any manner affect any mineral rights, exploration permits, leases, or conveyances nor minerals that are or may be in any tidelands, or submerged lands, or in lands underlying the 3-mile zone or belt involved in the case of the United States of America against the State of California now pending on application for rehearing in the Supreme Court of the United States; or in lands underlying such 3-mile zone or belt, or the Continental Shelf, adjacent or littoral to any part of the land within the jurisdiction of the United States of America." The mineral leasing laws were not only not extended to the marginal sea, but Congress positively asserted that the Secretary of Interior should not exercise such authority under the law.

Parenthetically, plaintiff can point to no "adjudging" of the tidelands and their mineral resources to the United States, because that would imply a holding that the United States has fee simple title thereto, contrary to the decision of this Court that title was not the issue in this case and to the fact that plaintiff has now actually abandoned all claim to fee simple title. And it is contrary, by analogy, to the Court's decree in the California case, where the United States was specifically denied proprietary rights in the tidelands and their resources, and which is a legal adjudication that the United States does not have fee simple title to the California marginal sea area.

In apparent support of the Secretary of Interior's alleged power, the Solicitor General cites statements made to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, by the Attorney General and Solicitor for the Department of the Interior during the committee's hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 195, Eighty-first Congress, which resolution proposed to purport to confer interim authority in the Secretary of the Interior to administer the mineral resources in the States' tidelands.

But Congress did not enact Senate Joint Resolution 195. It died aborning in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs after a thorough hearing in August 1950. The Congress of the United States undoubtedly refused to enact such legislation because it would thereby have adopted a policy of nationalization and confiscation of property, wherever the constitutional paramount powers and dominion of the United States extend, and that is everywhere in the United States.

Plaintiff's argument that, Congress having specifically refused to grant the authority sought, the judicial power should decree it has far-reaching implications. Such a contention would destroy the separation of powers around which the Constitution is constructed, extinguish the role of Congress, and transfer the legislative power to the judicial branch of the Government.

The United States Constitution, article I, section 8 provides:

"The Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States * * * to define and punish * * * offense against the law of nations; and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

The Supreme Court of the United States throughout its history on many occasions consistently has held that—

"In the United States, sovereignty resides in the people, who act through the organs established by the Constitution." *Chisholm* v. *Georgia* (2 Dall. 419, 471); *Penhallow* v. *Doane's Administrators* (3 Dall. 54, 93); *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 404, 405); *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 356, 370).

And:

"But until Congress has acted, the courts of the United States cannot assume control over the subject as a matter of Federal cognizance. It is the Congress, and not the judicial department, to which the Constitution has given the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States. The courts can never take the initiative on this subject." *Transportation Co.* v. *Parkersburg* (107 U. S. 691, 700, 701).

And, again, in *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240), this Court held that there was no power over a natural resource in the Federal authorities which Congress "does not assert by affirmative legislation" (p. 266).

As against the suggestion of the Solicitor General that an executive order be given the force of legislation, to bypass Congress, it is well to refer to the statement made by an Associate Justice in *Adamson* v. *California* ((1947) 332 U. S. 46, 67 S. Ct. 1672, 1682) that—

"We must be particularly mindful that it is a Constitution we are expounding" and that the guidance of the past "bids us to be duly mindful of the heritage of the past, with its great lessons of how liberties are won and how they are lost."

Conclusion

Louisiana reiterates its pleas and supporting memoranda herein and submits that the complaint should be dismissed for the following reasons:

1. This Court refused to permit Louisiana to submit her evidence in proof of her fee simple title to and right to possession of the area involved, undisputed for more than 136 years. It eliminated the issue of fee simple title. Now, in its proposed decree, plaintiff has specifically abandoned the very claim to fee simple title which it made in its complaint. Accordingly, the whole matter of fee simple title is not now before this Court to become the basis of any decree at all.

2. There is not, and never has been, any case or controversy before this Court with respect to the constitutional paramount rights, dominion and power of the plaintiff over the area involved; and we defy the plaintiff to conjure up the slightest scintilla indicating any such thing. Indeed, we may say frankly that the hullabaloo raised by the plaintiff over its paramount rights in, power and dominion over the area involved is sheer nonsense, wholly without substance, and that there is no case or controversy between the United States and Louisiana to provide a basis for a decree on that subject.

3. In the face of the foregoing, by seeking, nevertheless, to have this Court clothe plaintiff with the very authority to explore, lease and take out the minerals in the area involved, which Congress specifically refused to grant to it, plaintiff raises a contention with vast implications. It would necessarily destroy the separation of powers and disrupt our system of government.

If this Court should now sustain the contention of the Solicitor General that an Executive order on judicial decree should be substituted for the constitutional legislative prerogative of Congress, then it might well follow that an Executive order might be written to abolish the Congress altogether. Or the Solicitor General could then ask for a judicial decree suspending the constitutional powers of Congress.

4. Finally, what plaintiff apparently seeks as a practical matter, if we are to be frank about it, is "nationalization"—confiscation by the Federal Government—of the lands, minerals, etc., underlying the navigable waters within Louisiana's boundaries. But that claim has no legal basis; we submit, therefore, that it has no standing within the walls of the Constitution and the tradition of this Court.

The pending petition for rehearing should be granted and the complaint should be dismissed; or the case should be restored to the docket for argument on the proposed decree and Louisiana's objections.

Respectfully submitted

BOLIVAR E. KEMP, JR.,
Attorney General, State of Louisiana.
JOHN L. MADDEN,
Assistant Attorney General, State of Louisiana.
L. H. PEREZ,
New Orleans, La.
BAILEY WALSH,
F. TROWBRIDGE VOM BAUR,
Washington, D. C.
CULLEN R. LISKOW,
Lake Charles, La., of Counsel.

Provisions of Law Which Would Become Operative Upon Proclamation of a National Emergency by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following provisions of law which a preliminary study by the Department of Justice was indicated would become operative upon proclamation of a national emergency by the President:

I. PROVISIONS AS TO WHICH THE JOINT RESOLUTION OF JULY 25, 1947 (61 STAT. 449, 451–454) TERMINATED THE STATE OF WAR AND THE NATIONAL EMERGENCIES THEN EXISTING

Act of February 26, 1925 (43 Stat. 984): Provides that the Secretary of War, upon his sale thereof, shall attach such conditions as shall ensure use by the United States of the railroad of the Hoboken Manufacturers' Railroad Co. (owned by the Port of New York Authority) in the event of war or other national emergency.

Act of April 12, 1926 (44 Stat. pt. 2, p. 241): Government authorized to assume absolute control, for military purposes, of the municipal aviation field on land leased to Tucson, Ariz., in case of emergency, or in event it should be deemed advisable.

Act of May 29, 1926 (44 Stat. pt. 2, p. 677): Exchange of land is authorized on condition that other party agrees that Department of War may assume control of airfield near Yuma Ariz., in case of emergency, or in the event that it should be deemed advisable by the Secretary of War.

Subsection 2, page 1292, of act of May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1292): Secretary of War may transfer specified land to city of Little Rock, Ark., upon condition that the Secretary of War may require the city to turn over complete control of the Little Rock Municipal Airport to the United States in time of national emergency.

Act of May 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1387), as amended by Public Law 97, Eighty-first Congress: Deed by United States to Charleston, S. C., of certain land shall provide for authority of President to take it for use of War Department in the event of a national emergency.

Section 3 of act of June 21, 1938 (52 Stat. 834): Deed shall provide the right of the President to take over Hoboken Pier Terminal property in event of a national emergency for use by the Department of the Army.

Act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 781): Time for examination of accounts of Army disbursing officers is extended to 90 days in time of war or during any emergency declared by Congress or determined by the President and for a period of 18 months after such war or emergency (31 U. S. C. 80a).

Section 18 of act of February 2, 1901 (31 Stat. 752): Authority for the Surgeon General to appoint as many contract surgeons as necessary in emergencies (10 U. S. C. 107).

Act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 862) as amended: Time for administrative examination of monthly accounts of disbursing officers of Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard is extended in time of war or national emergency (31 U. S. C. 80b).

Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 580): Navy enlisted men on furlough without pay for the unexpired portion of their enlistment are subject to recall to complete the enlist-

ment period in time of war or national emergency (34 U. S. C. 191).

Act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 629): Authorizes enlistments in the Navy or Marine Corps to be extended in time of war, or national emergency declared by the President (34 U. S. C. 181).

Act of March 22, 1943 (57 Stat. 41): Jurisdiction of naval courts extended to certain persons outside of the United States in time of war or national emergency (34 U. S. C. 1201).

NOTE.—Repealed by section 14 (s) of Public Law 506, Eighty-first Congress, effective May 31, 1951.

Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 591):

Authority of Secretary of the Navy to call retired enlisted men into active service in time of war or when a national emergency exists (34 U. S. C. 433).

In time of war or national emergency commissioned and warrant officers of the Coast Guard on the retired list may be called to active duty (14 U. S. C. 240, 310 (as enacted by Public Law 207, 81st Cong.))

Act of April 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 86): Concerning the rate of pay in certain circumstances of retired officers of the permanent grade or rank of rear admiral recalled to active duty in time of war or other national emergency (34 U. S. C. 428).

Article 65 of the AGN (40 Stat. 393), as amended by 40 Statutes 708, 43 Statutes 1088 and 52 Statutes 1175: Service on naval courts martial by reserves, etc., when actively serving under the Navy Department in time of war or during the existence of an emergency (34 U. S. C. 1200, art. 65).

NOTE: Repealed by section 14 (n) of Public Law 506, Eighty-first Congress, effective May 31, 1951.

Section 10 of the act of June 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 395): Provisions of act of April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 591), authorizing contracts upon a cost-plus basis in certain cases, are to be applicable to naval public works and utilities projects in the Fourteenth Naval District during the period of any national emergency declared by the President to exist.

Section 18 of act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 853): Authorizes transportation and subsistence on naval vessels at Government expense of such persons as the Secretary of Navy may authorize during the existence of war or national emergency as declared by the President (34 U. S. C. 474).

Section 10 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 332): Authority to the Secretary of the Navy to revoke the lease of the floating drydock and water-front accessories at the New Orleans naval station in case of national emergency declared by the President.

Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 479): Authority of the Secretary of the Navy to revoke the lease of the United States naval destroyer and submarine base at Squantum, Mass., in case of a national emergency declared by the President.

Joint resolution of April 11, 1898 (30 Stat. 737): Permits the erection of temporary forts or fortifications in case of emergency when, in the opinion of the President, the immediate erection of any temporary fort or fortification is deemed important and urgent without complying with formalities and procedures ordinarily followed (50 U. S. C. 178).

Act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1109): Authority to close Fort McHenry Military Reservation in Maryland in case of a national emergency and use it for military purposes (16 U. S. C. 440).

Section 1 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 724): Suspension in event of declared national emergency of provision that natural features of Barro Colorado Island in Gatun Lake, C. Z., be left in their natural state for scientific observation and investigation (48 U. S. C. 1381).

Section 4 (b) of act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended: Regular working hours of laborers and mechanics employed by the War Department to be 8 hours per day or 40 hours per week during a national emergency declared by the President with authority in Secretary of War to prescribe regulations governing hours in excess of 40 to be compensated at not less than time and one-half (5 U. S. C. 189a).

Section 606 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1104): Subsection (c) authorizes the President to suspend or amend rules and regulations of the FCC applicable to any or all stations in the United States, to cause the closing of any station and the removal of its equipment, or to authorize its use and control by the Government upon just compensation to the owners upon proclamation by the President that there exists war or a threat of war or a state of public peril or disaster or other national emergency or in order to preserve the neutrality of the United States (47 U. S. C. 606).

Section 4 of act of July 15, 1918 (40 Stat. 901), as amended: Makes unlawful without prior United States Maritime Commission approval various actions with respect to domestic shipping facilities including its transfer to foreign ownership or registry, when the United States is at war or during any national emergency, the existence of which is declared by proclamation of the President (46 U. S. C. 835).

Merchant Marine Act of 1936: During a national emergency as proclaimed by the President, he may suspend the provisions of this section (requirements as to United States citizenship of officers and crew and requirement that alien crew members be declarants) (46 U. S. C. 1132 (h) (a) sec. 302, 49 Stat. 1992).

Authorizes the Maritime Commission to terminate charters of public vessels whenever the President shall proclaim that the security of the national defense makes it advisable, or during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President (46 U. S. C. 1202 (d) (b) sec. 712 (49 Stat. 2010)).

Authorizes Maritime Commission to requisition or purchase vessels whenever the President shall proclaim that the security of the national defense makes it advisable or during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President (46 U. S. C. 1242 (a) (c) sec. 902 (49 Stat. 2015)).

Section 1 of title II of act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220): Whenever the President by proclamation or Executive order declares a national emergency to exist by reason of actual or threatened war, or disturbance or threatened disturbance of the international relations of the United States the Secretary of the Treasury may make rules and regulations, governing the anchorage and movement of vessels, foreign and domestic, in United States waters, and may inspect and in certain contingencies take possession and control of such vessels. Within the Canal Zone, the Governor of the Panama Canal is delegated similar powers (50 U. S. C. 191).

Act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 551): (a) The Coast Guard Reserve may be called or continued on active duty in time of war or national emergency declared by the President (14 U. S. C. 753).

Act of March 4, 1917 (39 Stat. 1192): In case of national emergency the President may suspend provisions of the 8-hour law as to contracts with the United States subject to provision for the payment of overtime (40 U. S. C. 326).

Section 6 of act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1011): Authorizes the President to suspend the provisions of the act which relate to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractor and subcontractor on public buildings in event of a national emergency (40 U. S. C. 276a-5).

II. PROVISIONS ENACTED LATER THAN THOSE DEALT WITH IN PART I, ABOVE

Act of June 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 191): The Secretary of the Army may refuse to accept resignations of enlisted men in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or Congress (10 U. S. C. 628).

Section 13 (g) (2) (E) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended by section 2 of the act of July 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 679): Disposition of all surplus airports, airport facilities and equipment, disposed of under the Surplus Property Act, must in general be made subject to the condition that the United States shall have the right to use, control and possess them during any national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress (50 U. S. C. App. 1622 (g) (2) (E), 50 U. S. C. App. 1622 (g) (3)).

Section 1 of the act of August 5, 1947 (61 Stat. 774): The Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of the Navy may each lease nonsurplus property under their control respectively, but, irrespective of the terms of the lease, it shall be revokable by the Secretary of the department concerned during a national emergency declared by the President (5 U. S. C. 626s–3, 10 U. S. C. 1270, 34 U. S. C. 522a).

Sections 103 (a) and (b), 114 (b) and (c), 203 (a), of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 799, 811, 816): Limitations on the number of admirals of the line of the Navy, generals in the Marine Corps, and admirals of the Staff Corps of the Navy do not apply in time of war or national emergency declared after the effective date of this act (34 U. S. C. 4 (a) and (b), 34 U. S. C. 626 (b) and (c), 34 U. S. C. 5).

Section 304 (n) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 840): The termination by this provision of the authority to make temporary naval appointments under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603) shall not be held to impair the authority to make temporary appointments under that act during any future war or national emergency (34 U. S. C. 211a (n)).

Sections 413 (a) and (b), 415 (a) and (b) of the same act (61 Stat. 876): Statutory limitations on the number of naval and marine officers, respectively, are removed in time of war or national emergency declared after the effective date of this act, and such designations in time of war or national emergency may be made down to the rank of captain or colonel, respectively (34 U. S. C. 211d (a) and (b), 34 U. S. C. 623b (a) and (b)).

Section 424 of the same act (61 Stat. 879): The statutory limitation on the number of temporary commissions which the President may issue in the Navy Medical Corps do not apply in time of war or (sic) declared national emergency (34 U. S. C. 21).

Section 430 of the same act (61 Stat. 881): The statutory limitation on the number of retired admirals who may be serving on active duty does not apply in time of war or national emergency declared after the date of approval of this act (34 U. S. C. 211e).

Sections 503 (a), 504 (b), and 515 (b) of the same act (61 Stat. 885, 887, 907): The statutory limitation on the number of Army officers above the grade of major general applies until a national emergency is declared [after July 1, 1948] (10 U. S. C. 506a (a), 10 U. S. C. 506b (b), 10 U. S. C. 506d (b)).

Section 514 (f) of the same act (61 Stat. 906): The operation of any statutory provisions prescribing mandatory retirement or separation of Regular Army officers may be suspended by the President in time of emergency declared by the President or by the Congress and in time of war (10 U. S. C. 941a (f)).

Section 515 (e) of the same act (61 Stat. 907): The President is authorized to issue temporary commissions in the Army of the United States, to continue during the emergency or war in which the appointment was made and for 6 months thereafter, in time of emergency declared by the President, or by the Congress, and in time of war (10 U. S. C. 506d (e)).

Joint resolution of August 8, 1947 (61 Stat. 921): The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order 8843 except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution (12 U. S. C. 248 note).

Section 2 (c) (1) and (e) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (62 Stat. 21), Section 3 (a) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, Public Law 110, Eighty-first Congress: Purchases and contracts for supplies and services made by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the United States Coast Guard, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the Central Intelligence Agency, need not be made by advertising if determined to be necessary in the public interest during the period of a national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress (41 U. S. C. 151 (c) (1) and (e)) (50 U. S. C. 403c).

Section 6 of the act of February 28, 1948, amending section 210 (k) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (62 Stat. 44): Any commissioned officer of a professional category of the regular corps of the Public Health Service may be recommended to the President for promotion to any higher grade in that category, whether or not a vacancy exists in that grade, in time of war, or of national emergency proclaimed by the President (42 U. S. C. 211 (k)).

Section 10 (b) of the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commission Officers' Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 299): The President may suspend the operation of any statutory provisions relating to promotion of officers in the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of emergency declared by the President or by the Congress, and in time of war (33 U. S. C. 853i (b)).

The act of June 19, 1948, amending paragraph 5 of section 3A of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930 (62 Stat. 504): Any Member of Congress who, during any war or time of national emergency as proclaimed by the President or declared by the Congress, leaves his office to enter the Armed Forces, shall for the purpose of this provision, be deemed to continue as a Member of Congress during such military service (5 U. S. C. 693–1 (5)).

Section 6 of the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1065): The right, title, and interest of any lands, together with improvements thereon, which are conveyed under section 5 of this act (authorizing the Defense Homes Corporation to convey certain real estate in the District of Columbia to Howard University), shall revert to the United States upon a written finding made by the President prior to July 1, 1963, that the property is needed by the United States in connection with a national defense emergency (42 U. S. C. 1575, note).

Section 1e of the act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1230): The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey a certain part of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., to Okaloosa County, Fla., for recreational purposes, subject to a condition that in the event of a national emergency the Secretary shall have the right to take over that property in his discretion for such use and for such length of time as the emergency shall require (not codified).

Section 507 (b) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 893): The President may suspend the operation of any provision of law pertaining to promotion in time of emergency declared by the President or by the Congress and in time of war (10 U. S. C. 559a (b)).

Section 1 of the act of May 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 276): Personnel whose transportation the Secretary of one of the military departments may assure in accordance with the authority of this act include during any period of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President, personnel working with private plants engaged in the manufacture of material for those departments (5 U. S. C. 189c, 5 U. S. C. 415d, 5 U. S. C. 626n).

Section 302 (c) (1) and (e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law No. 152, Eighty-first Congress:

Purchases and contracts for supplies and services may be negotiated by the heads of executive departments and agencies without the advertising required by section 303 of this act if determined to be necessary in the public interest during the period of a national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress (41 U. S. C. 252 (c)).

The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may order any retired Coast Guard commissioned officer or warrant officer to active duty in time of war or national emergency. Enlisted men may be so ordered by the Commandant of the Coast Guard (14 U. S. C. 240, 310, 359 (Public Law No. 207, 81st Cong.)).

Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, an enlisted man may be detained in the Coast Guard beyond the term of his enlistment during a period of war or national emergency as proclaimed by the President, and, in the interest of national defense, for a period not to exceed 6 months after the end of the war or the termination of the emergency (14 U. S. C. 367 (a) (4) (Public Law No. 207, 81st Cong.).)

Any law removing for the duration of a war or national emergency proclaimed by the President any restriction contained in any then-existing law as applied to the Navy, shall, in the same manner and to the same extent, remove such restrictions as applied to the Coast Guard (14 U. S. C. 652 (Public Law No. 207, 81st Cong.)

Any member of the Coast Guard Reserve may be ordered to active duty, in time of war or national emergency declared by the President to exist, for the duration of the war or until the termination of the emergency as declared by the President, and may be continued on such active duty for such duration and 6 months thereafter, notwithstanding that the term of appointment or enlistment may have expired (14 U. S. C. 752, 753 (a) (Public Law No. 207, 81st Cong.).).

The sum of $150 for the purchase of uniforms, in addition to the normal uniform allowance, may be paid to Coast Guard Reserve officers upon first reporting for active duty, in times of war or national emergency. Enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard Reserve may be issued articles additional to the normal Reserve issue, upon first reporting for active duty in time of war or national emergency (14 U. S. C. 759 (Public Law 207, 81st Cong.)).

Section 8 of the same act (Public Law 207, 81st Cong.), amending section 7 of the act of July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 717): Any commissioned or warrant officer on the retired list of the Navy or Marine Corps may be ordered to active duty during the existence of war or of a national emergency declared by the President to exist, and he shall be entitled to promotion on the retired list as if such services had been rendered continuously on the active list.

Section 402 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress: For the purposes of disability retirement in the uniformed services, any disability incurred in line of duty during the serviceman's active services in time of war or national emergency shall be considered to be the proximate result of the performance of active duty (37 U. S. C. 272 (a)).

Section 3 (b) of the joint resolution of March 7, 1947, (61 Stat. 10) as amended by the joint resolution of July 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 1212):

The Maritime Commission (now succeeded by the Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration, Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950) may terminate any arrangement into which it has entered, pursuant to this resolution, regarding ocean transportation service to Alaska, whenever the President shall proclaim that the security of the national defense makes it advisable, or during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President (46 U. S. C., 866, note).

Article 71 (b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, act of May 5, 1950 (not in effect until May 31, 1951 (sec. 5 of the act)): The Secretary of the military department concerned may commute a court-martial sentence of dismissal of an officer, to reduction to any enlisted grade in time of war or national emergency (50 U. S. C. 658).

Section 3 of the act of June 30, 1950, Public Law 593, Eighty-first Congress: The conveyance of a specified part of Camp Joseph T. Robinson, Ark., to the State of Arkansas, shall contain the provision that the United States shall have the right of reentry upon and use of that property, whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency to exist.

Section 1206 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended by the act of September 7, 1950, Public Law 763, Eighty-first Congress: The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide war-risk insurance to appropriate persons during any time the United States is at war or during any period of emergency declared to exist by the President (46 U. S. C. 1286).

Section 4 (c) and (e) of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, Public Law 783, Eighty-first Congress: The Secretary of Defense shall not permit property, acquired under this act and permitted by him in accordance with the act to be used by persons or organizations, to be used in any way which will interfere with their use for the administration and training of Reserve components of the Armed Forces, or in time of war or national emergency by other units of the Armed Forces of the United States or any other use by the Federal Government. The same requirement shall apply to facilities acquired or improved by any State with funds contributed by the Secretary of Defense in accordance with section 3 (b) or (c) of the act (50 U. S. C. 783).

The Rosenberg Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an important article entitled "The Rosenberg Inquiry," written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop and published in the New York Herald Tribune of yesterday. The subheading of the article is "The Alsops show how 'Red' cry can serve to blackmail Senators."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROSENBERG INQUIRY—THE ALSOPS SHOW HOW RED CRY CAN SERVE TO BLACKMAIL SENATORS

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Although the Senate Armed Services Committee has now unanimously cleared Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg of the

charge of being a Communist, the incident should not end there. The Rosenberg case means, in fact, that a new sort of American underworld has now gained the power to trouble the policy and impede the Government of the United States of America. Something ought to be done about it, as any honorable American who reads the whole story will heartily agree.

To begin the story at the beginning, Anna Rosenberg, the victim of the charge of communism, is a splendid proof of the occasional truth of what used to be called the American dream.

A self-made woman, foreign-born, Anna Rosenberg has made for herself such a position that great corporations pay great sums for her advice, and leaders of America are proud to be her friends. One of these friends, Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, asked her to serve as his Assistant Secretary in charge of manpower problems. Mrs. Rosenberg sacrificed a staggering income in order to accept, simply because she feels passionate loyalty and gratitude to the adopted country that has done so much for her.

The name of this remarkable woman, then, was sent by Secretary Marshall some weeks ago to the Senate Armed Services Committee. At this moment, when the appointment became known, subsequent testimony indicates that a meeting took place in Washington between the professional anti-Semite and tinpot amateur Fascist, Gerald L. K. Smith, and a certain friend of Smith's, Benjamin Freedman.

Freedman describes himself as an excommunicated Jew. His character may be best gaged by a suit for criminal libel which he rather inexplicably brought, a little while ago, against Bernard M. Baruch, Thomas J. Watson, of International Business Machines, and other well-known men. Before the astounded magistrate threw out his suit, Freedman had publicly, if somewhat irrelevantly, charged the prominent New York jurist, the leader of the Jewish community, Judge Joseph Proskauer, with conspiring with Cardinal Spellman to exclude him from the Catholic Church.

At their Washington meeting, Freedman and Gerald L. K. Smith discussed Mrs. Rosenberg's nomination as Assistant Secretary of Defense. Evidently spurred on by Smith, Freedman then sought out the New York lawyer, Hallomb Richardson, who has served as counsel for another tinpot amateur Fascist, Joe McWilliams. Richardson, in turn, put Freedman in touch with another character called Ralph De Sola.

De Sola is a former Communist living on the dim fringes of the public relations business. His last job was with an organization called the Society for the Preservation of Patriotic and Religious Music. Some indirect light is perhaps cast on De Sola by a suit his former employer, the society, brought against the Metropolitan Opera Co., the Texas Oil Co., and the American Broadcasting Co. In the course of this suit, the society charged the defendants with Communist leanings, because they were implicated in a broadcast of Giuseppe Verdi's opera, Don Carlo.

At Freedman's behest, De Sola prepared an affidavit stating that he and his former wife had sat next to Mrs. Rosenberg at a meeting of the John Reed Club in the late 1930's, and that fellow Communists had then told him she was a party member. A little later, Freedman handed over this affidavit and some other similar material to representatives of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY and the news commentator, Fulton Lewis, Jr. Freedman has testified that he did not know these men, but that their reliability was guaranteed to him before they called for the papers by Gerald L. K. Smith.

Somewhat later, Freedman returned to Washington, went to the office of Representative JOHN RANKIN, and there prepared a circular letter to the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, repeating De Sola's and other charges. Thus the cry of "Communist" was raised. Although Freedman was utterly unknown to them at that time, the committee held up Mrs. Rosenberg's confirmation and began hearings.

A typical sample of the testimony against Mrs. Rosenberg was De Sola's claim that his former wife and a certain James Magraw, another public relations man, would fully corroborate his charge. When called to the stand, both Magraw and the ex-Mrs. De Sola denounced De Sola as totally undependable, and described his story about Mrs. Rosenberg as the purest fabrication. The general character of the attack on Mrs. Rosenberg was such, in fact, as to lead the extreme-conservative Republican, Senator HARRY CAIN, of Washington, to talk about perjury indictments.

All this may seem very comical. But in the first place some names that crop up in this extraordinary history belong to men whom many Americans regard as paladins of the free society. And in the second place this squalid business has occupied a great deal of the time of some of the most important men in Washington at a moment of dire national peril. The Senators were frankly afraid to let the matter drop, because of the power that the cry of "Communist" now has. The lesson is simple. Just because we caught a glimpse of the Communist lower depths in the Hiss case, we really need not yield to blackmail by the lower depths of the other end of the political spectrum.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of yesterday, December 17, an article regarding the St. Lawrence seaway, written by Francis P. Douglas. I have read the article twice, because it contains much good, sound information relative to the St. Lawrence seaway. I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in order that others may read it, because we need to take action relative to the St. Lawrence seaway project in the new Congress which convenes in January.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—SPONSORS OF PERENNIAL PROJECT BELIEVE IT MAY BE APPROVED AS STEP TOWARD DEFENSE

(By Francis P. Douglas)

The St. Lawrence seaway, first considered by Congress 55 years ago, will be before Congress again in the coming session and veteran supporters believe it has a better chance of success than ever before.

The reason is twofold: Dwindling iron ore reserves in the Mesabi Range at the head of Lake Superior. Steadily mounting dangers from Communist imperialism, to use President Truman's term.

American steel producers even now are importing iron ores from abroad—7,400,000 tons last year. They are developing sources in Venezuela and even across the Atlantic in Liberia. Those sources mean many perilous sea miles in case of attack by a nation with submarines.

The big source of the future is expected to be Labrador. Canadian ore would be loaded in vessels at Seven Islands, near the mouth of the St. Lawrence River. With the St. Lawrence seaway completed, the ships from Seven Islands could deliver the ore to the ports of the Great Lakes.

Alternatively the ore would go by ship to Baltimore and Philadelphia. But according to the National Security Resources Board, with the outbreak of hostilities it would become immediately imperative to start construction of a route which would avoid that 1,400-mile sea haul.

Without the St. Lawrence seaway completed, the most practical route in event of war, according to the NSRB, would be by water to Montreal, by the Canadian railway to Kingston, on the Canadian side of Lake Ontario, and thence through the lakes.

This development would involve the construction of unloaders at Montreal and of dock facilities for loading lake boats at Kingston. Even with wartime priorities the job would require 18 months or more.

A seaway reaching 2,300 miles from the ocean to Duluth seems a stupendous task. But the extraordinary part of the project is how much has been done gradually in past years. The main problem now is the bottleneck represented by the 114-mile stretch from Ogdensburg, N. Y., to Montreal. From Montreal to the sea there is a waterway 32.5 feet deep.

DOUBLE-BARRELED PROJECT

One of the long-time supporters of the project, Representative DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, said he will present again to the Eighty-second Congress a resolution to provide for carrying out the project. He introduced one of several measures for this purpose in the present Congress.

The present crisis in Korea makes the need of the seaway more apparent than ever, according to Mr. DINGELL.

"I think there's a good chance of it going through, but it's going to take a lot of work," Mr. DINGELL said. "The center of the problem is the necessity of defense and the decline in the iron ore at the head of the Lakes.

"Unless the St. Lawrence seaway is developed and there is a steady flow of iron ore to feed the maw of the steel mills, some of the Great Lakes cities are going to become ghost towns."

Representative DONDERO, Republican, of Michigan, who introduced a similar resolution in the Eighty-first Congress, also said he would present his measure again. Prospects of its adoption are brighter than before, he said.

The project, of course, is a double-barreled one of water transportation and hydroelectric power. The Army engineers have estimated the whole job would involve an outlay of $803,000,000 on the basis of 1948 costs; it would be more now. The navigation facilities would cost $429,000,000 and the power plants $374,000,000. The United States share of the total would be $573,000,000, the Canadian share $230,000,000.

The power project would be near Massena, N. Y., in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence. It would be the second largest single-dam power project in the world, exceeded in size only by Grand Coulee Dam. It would produce almost 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year.

The power would be distributed through New York and New England with the exception of Maine, in northern New Jersey and northeastern Pennsylvania. In emergency, power could be transmitted to Washington and Chicago.

The Security Resources Board said this about the importance of the seaway and power project to national security:

"It is needed to assure a high-grade, rapidly expansible iron ore supply from nearby

foreign sources—ore which in an emergency could be moved to existing consuming centers over routes inside the continent. It is needed to supply substantial additional quantites of electric power and to augment the capacity and flexibility of our transportation system."

Much has been written and figures given without end on the ore situation in Minnesota. The NSRB report summarizes it this way:

SECURITY PROBLEM

"In recent years the Lake Superior region has supplied approximately 85 percent of the total iron-ore requirements of the United States. Since the beginning of 1940 we have shipped from the Lake Superior region a total of 770,000,000 tons of ore. Of this total nearly 600,000,000 tons came from open-pit mining operations, an amount which, by common agreement, is about equivalent to the entire remaining reserves of direct shipping and easily treated open-pit ores. * * * Twenty years from now production cannot be even half as large as at present.

"Steady production of ore from year to year over the remaining life of the Lake Superior reserves cannot, of course, be maintained. * * * Furthermore, as each year passes, the remaining reserves become more difficult to mine. * * * The rate and extent to which the country grows less and less able to supply its needs from domestic sources and thus becomes more and more dependent on foreign ores becomes a grave security problem."

Secretary of the Interior Chapman told a House committee last spring that the high-grade iron ore now being developed along the Quebec-Labrador border amounts to 400,000,000 tons.

The ore is held by the Iron Ore Co. of Canada. Its president is George M. Humphrey, president of the M. A. Hanna Co. of Cleveland. Associated with the Canadian interests and the Hanna company in the project are the Armco, National, Republic, and Wheeling Steel Corps., and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.

Mr. Humphrey announced last month the completion of a $200,000,000 financing program and the letting of contracts for the building of a 260-mile railroad from the ore deposits to the port of Seven Islands. The ore, to become available in 1955, will move to American furnaces in the Youngstown and Pittsburgh areas by boat and rail via Montreal, with some to be shipped via Baltimore and Philadelphia. It is said the delivered prices will compare favorably with those for ores from the Lake Superior region.

MUCH DREDGING REQUIRED

How much already has been accomplished toward the goal of a 27-foot seaway is indicated by the fact there is at least a 25-foot channel all the way from Duluth to Ogdensburg.

In the channel between Lakes Superior and Huron the MacArthur lock was opened at Sault Ste. Marie in July 1943. It is 800 feet long, 80 feet wide, and has a depth of 31 feet. There is dredging to be done in the St. Marys River and also in the Straits of Mackinac, which connects Lakes Michigan and Huron, to increase it to 27 feet.

In the Detroit area dredging must be done to deepen the channel through the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and the Detroit River, a distance of 88 miles.

Connecting Lakes Erie and Ontario is Canada's Welland Canal of 28 miles. It has a depth of 25 feet although the locks, 800 by 80 feet, provide a depth of 30 feet.

The St. Lawrence begins at the outlet to Lake Ontario. A Federal project already adopted by Congress provides for deepening the river to 27 feet for the 68 miles to Ogdensburg. This is the Thousand Islands section of the river.

The next stretch is the 46-mile International Rapids section from Ogdensburg to St. Regis on the New York side of the river and Cornwall on the Canadian side. Canada built a canal around the rapids in 1890, but it is only 14 feet deep and the locks are small. This would be kept, but the United States would build a new channel with three locks 800 by 30 feet and 30 feet deep.

Finally there is the 68-mile stretch from St. Regis to Montreal, entirely within Canada. Navigation now is through side canals with locks only 14 feet deep. Five new locks would be built of the same dimensions as those in the International Rapids section.

The project was approved by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941, just before Pearl Harbor. It never came to a vote in the House.

Since then a new feature has been added to make the whole subject more attractive—the seaway is planned as self-liquidating. The power development would pay for itself through the sale of electricity.

In the case of the seaway, tolls would be charged; and Commerce Department experts estimated potential traffic at between fifty-seven and eighty-four million tons of cargo a year with revenues between $36,000,000 and $49,000,000. Secretary of Commerce Sawyer estimated that with interest charges at 2½ percent the project could be paid in 53 years at $19,000,000 a year. Again this is on the basis of 1948 costs.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial pertaining to the St. Lawrence seaway, entitled "Should Delay No More," which appeared in the Suburban List. The Suburban List is a weekly newspaper published at Essex Junction, Vt. Its editor is Milo C. Reynolds, who for many years was a very courageous member of the Vermont Public Service Commission.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD DELAY NO MORE

The need of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is becoming more and more apparent.

The other day Stanley Woodward, United States Ambassador to Canada, stated his Government recognizes the urgency of this project and plans to press for its adoption by Congress in 1951. Canada also recognizes the urgency of the St. Lawrence power project.

It is not only needed as an economical sea route into the heart of the continent but also to give lower costs and more abundant power for industrial development.

Certain interests have prevented the adoption of this project for many years. Their line of talk has usually been that it will come some day, but not now. If ever there was a time when more electric energy was needed, it is now.

Some of the opponents take the position that the St. Lawrence seaway would hurt their business. Those interests have got to recognize that projects in the interest of the public good cannot be held in abeyance in order to protect present concerns.

What business and industry have got to do is to grow up with the times, meet new conditions and adjust their policies to the needs of the public.

What a great cry went up when typesetting machines were introduced. It was said that thousands of printers would be put out of jobs. Just the contrary has resulted.

The typesetting machines have so advanced printing that thousands more printers are employed today than were ever thought of during the old times of hand-set composition.

That same principle must apply to improved conditions and the development of resources for the public good and a higher standard of living.

Projects like the St. Lawrence seaway cannot be held back in order to protect concerns which will not grow up with the country's progress.

Doing things today the way grandfather did is entirely out of the picture.

Let's Make It Clear to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is tragic the number of our boys, classified as green troops, who had to lose their lives in Korea because they lacked the fundamentals of real military training.

Philip Saginario, of my home city of Paterson, was the first lad from my district to be returned home a casualty from Korea. He had been working as a clerk in an office in Tokyo when he was given a gun and rushed to Korea for immediate action. As I viewed his right arm, shattered beyond repair, he said:

Congressman, I never had any combat training and I was determined that if my capture appeared imminent, I was going to blow my brains out with my own gun. I had in mind, of course, what our fanatical foe had done to so many of our GI's and southern Koreans who believed in liberty.

This lad of 18 was graduated from Eastside High School 18 months ago.

I have before me a recent issue of a Camden, N. J., newspaper with a Korean casualty list. There is Pfc William L. Clifton, 19, who enlisted last March and joined the First Cavalry Division in Korea in August. There is Pvt. Elwood H. Graham, 17, who enlisted last May 15, later joining the same division. There is Pvt. Raymond W. Hamilton, 18, who left junior high school last April to go overseas and become a member of the First Cavalry Division. There is Pfc John McKeown, 21, who enlisted last April, going to Japan in September and soon thereafter joining the First Cavalry Division in Korea.

It was on June 1, 1945, that I first addressed the House on the necessity of some sound, sane, democratic form of universal military training for our American youth, a system which could be integrated with schooling and training for later use in civilian life. I recall the day I made my remarks I held in my hand a clipping from the San Francisco Chronicle referring to the program of the

Soviet Union, then training millions of its youth, 15 and 16 years of age, in combat training.

I am impressed by the following editorial captioned "Let's make it clear to youth" in today's edition of the Newark Star-Ledger:

LET'S MAKE IT CLEAR TO YOUTH

It is admittedly difficult to foresee all the facets of the military manpower problem, but we should not defer too long a decision bearing upon youth's future in the emergency.

The draft age now begins at 19, but there is much talk of lowering it to 18. This would mean that high-school students could expect to enter the armed services immediately upon graduation.

If that action is necessary, then the drafted youths should be offered more than merely military training. Occupational and professional training should be open to such youths as can qualify. We should not make the costly mistake of unnecessarily stunting the development of a whole generation.

If fighting on a world scale breaks out, the youngsters will have to be denied such educational opportunities. But as long as we are merely in the preparedness stage, we should not allow recruitment to deprive youth of all educational opportunity.

If we are to protect the future of our country, we should devise our recruitment and manpower policies to do a minimum of harm to the training of youth for its peacetime future. Above all, we should strive to minimize youth's unrest and bewilderment by adopting a clear-cut policy and making its essentials speedily known and clearly understood.

For the Common Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, Communist aggression in Korea and the contempt towards the free nations of the world evidenced by the Communist terms for peace in Korea, can leave no question in the mind of anyone concerning communism's intentions towards the world. The only answer to such an attitude is force, and military force today, as always, must be based on a background of trained fighting men.

For this reason I believe it very timely to recall the report to the Nation by Secretary of Defense Marshall, made as he relinquished the Office of Chief of Staff on September 1, 1945, entitled "For the Common Defense."

It included a powerful appeal for universal military training, as to the necessity of which I am in hearty agreement.

I ask unanimous consent that relevant portions of General Marshall's report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE

To fulfill its responsibility for protecting this Nation against foreign enemies, the Army must project its planning beyond the immediate future. In this connection I feel that I have a duty, a responsibility, to present publicly at this time my conception, from a military point of view, of what is required to prevent another international catastrophe.

For years men have been concerned with individual security. Modern nations have given considerable study and effort to the establishment of social-security systems for those unable or unwise enough to provide for themselves. But effective insurance against the disasters which have slaughtered millions of people and leveled their homes is long overdue.

We finish each bloody war with a feeling of acute revulsion against this savage form of human behavior, and yet on each occasion we confuse military preparedness with the causes of war and then drift almost deliberately into another catastrophe. This error of judgment was defined long ago by Washington. He proposed to endow this Nation at the outset with a policy which should have been a reasonable guaranty of our security for centuries. The cost of refusing his guidance is recorded in the sacrifice of life and in the accumulation of mountainous debts. We have continued impractical. We have ignored the hard realities of world affairs. We have been purely idealistic.

We must start, I think, with a correction of the tragic misunderstanding that a security policy is a war policy. War has been defined by a people who have thought a lot about it—the Germans. They have started most of the recent ones. The German soldier-philosopher Clausewitz described war as a special violent form of political action. Frederick of Prussia, who left Germany the belligerent legacy which has now destroyed her, viewed war as a device to enforce his will whether he was right or wrong. He held that with an invincible offensive military force he could win any political argument. This is the doctrine Hitler carried to the verge of complete success. It is the doctrine of Japan. It is a criminal doctrine, and like other forms of crime, it has cropped up again and again since man began to live with his neighbors in communities and nations. There has long been an effort to outlaw war for exactly the same reason that man has outlawed murder. But the law prohibiting murder does not of itself prevent murder. It must be enforced. The enforcing power, however, must be maintained on a strictly democratic basis. There must not be a large standing army subject to the behest of a group of schemers. The citizen-soldier is the guaranty against such a misuse of power.

In order to establish an international system for preventing wars, peace-loving peoples of the world are demonstrating an eagerness to send their representatives to such conferences as those at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco with the fervent hope that they may find a practical solution. Yet, until it is proved that such a solution has been found to prevent wars, a rich nation which lays down its arms as we have done after every war in our history, will court disaster. The existence of the complex and fearful instruments of destruction now available make this a simple truth which is, in my opinion, undebatable.

So far as their ability to defend themselves and their institutions was concerned, the great democracies were sick nations when Hitler openly massed his forces to impose his will on the world. As sick as any was the United States of America. We had no field army. There were the bare skeletons of three and one-half divisions scattered in small pieces over the entire United States. It was impossible to train even these few combat troops as divisions because motor transportation and other facilities were lacking and funds for adequate maneuvers were not appropriated. The Air Forces consisted of a few partially equipped squadrons serving continental United States, Panama, Hawaii, and the Philippines; their planes were largely obsolescent and could hardly have survived a single day of modern aerial combat. We lacked modern arms and equipment. When President Roosevelt proclaimed, on September 8, 1939, that a limited emergency existed for the United States we were, in terms of available strength, not even a third-rate military power. Some collegians had been informing the world and evidently convincing the Japanese that the young men of America would refuse to fight in defense of their country.

The German armies swept over Europe at the very moment we sought to avoid war by assuring ourselves that there could be no war. The security of the United States of America was saved by sea distances, by allies, and by the errors of a prepared enemy. For probably the last time in the history of warfare those ocean distances were a vital factor in our defense. We may elect again to depend on others and the whim and error of potential enemies, but if we do we will be carrying the treasure and freedom of this great Nation in a paper bag.

Returning from France after the last war, with General Pershing, I participated in his endeavors to persuade the Nation to establish and maintain a sound defense policy. Had his recommendations been accepted, they might have saved this country the hundreds of billions of dollars and the more than a million casualties it has cost us again to restore the peace. We might even have been spared this present world tragedy. General Pershing was asked against whom do we prepare. Obviously that questions could not be answered specifically until nearly 20 years later when Adolf Hitler led the replenished armies of defeated Germany back into world conflict. Even as late as 1940 I was asked very much the same question before a committee of Congress. Not even then could I say definitely exactly where we might have to fight, but I did recall that in past wars the United States forces had fought in Latin America, in France, in Belgium, in Germany, in Russia, in Siberia, in Africa, in the Philippines, and in China, but I did not anticipate that in the near future American soldiers would fight in the heart of Burma and in the islands of the vast Pacific, and would be garrisoning areas across the entire land and water masses of the earth. From this lesson there is no alternative but that this Nation must be prepared to defend its interest against any nation or combination of nations which might sometime feel powerful enough to attempt the settlement of political arguments or gain resources or territory by force of arms.

Twice in recent history the factories and farms and people of the United States have foiled aggressor nations; conspirators against the peace would not give us a third opportunity.

Between Germany and America in 1914 and again in 1939 stood Great Britain and the U. S. S. R., France, Poland, and the other countries of Europe. Because the technique of destruction had not progressed to its present peak, these nations had to be eliminated and the Atlantic Ocean crossed by ships before our factories could be brought within the range of the enemy guns. At the close of the German War in Europe they were just on the outer fringes of the range of fire from an enemy in Europe. Goering stated after his capture that it was a certainty the eastern American cities would have been under rocket bombardment had Germany remained undefeated for two more years. The first attacks would have started much sooner. The technique of war has brought the United States, its homes and factories into the front line of world conflict. They escaped destructive bombardment in the second World War. They would not in a third.

It no longer appears practical to continue what we once conceived as hemispheric defense as a satisfactory basis for our security.

We are now concerned with the peace of the entire world. And the peace can only be maintained by the strong.

What then must we do to remain strong and still not bankrupt ourselves on military expenditures to maintain a prohibitively expensive professional Army even if one could be recruited? President Washington answered that question in recommendations to the first Congress to convene under the United States Constitution. He proposed a program for the peacetime training of a citizen army. At that time the conception of a large professional Regular Army was considered dangerous to the liberties of the Nation. It is still so today. But the determining factor in solving this problem will inevitably be the relation between the maintenance of military power and the cost in annual appropriations. No system, even if actually adopted in the near future, can survive the political pressure to reduce the military budget if the costs are high—and professional armies are very costly.

There is now another disadvantage to a large professional standing army. Wars in the twentieth century are fought with the total resources, economic, scientific, and human, of entire nations. Every specialized field of human knowledge is employed. Modern war requires the skills and knowledge of the individuals of a nation.

Obviously we cannot all put on uniforms and stand ready to repel invasion. The greatest energy in peacetime of any successful nation must be devoted to productive and gainful labor. But all Americans can, in the next generations, prepare themselves to serve their country in maintaining the peace or against the tragic hour when peace is broken, if such a misfortune again overtakes us. This is what is meant by universal military training. It is not universal military service—the actual induction of men into the combatant forces. Such forces would be composed during peacetime of volunteers. The trainees would be in separate organizations maintained for training purposes only. Once trained, young men would be freed from further connection with the Army unless they chose, as they now may, to enroll in the National Guard or an organized reserve unit, or to volunteer for service in the small professional army. When the Nation is in jeopardy they could be called, just as men are now called, by a committee of local neighbors, in an order of priority and under such conditions as directed at that time by the Congress.

The concept of universal military training is not founded, as some may believe, on the principle of a mass army. The Army has been accused of rigidly holding to this doctrine in the face of modern developments. Nothing, I think, could be further from the fact, as the record of the mobilization for this war demonstrates. Earlier in this report I explained how we had allocated manpower to exploit American technology. Out of our entire military mobilization of 14,000,000 men, the number of infantry troops was less than 1,500,000 Army and Marine.

The remainder of our Armed Forces, sea, air, and ground, was largely fighting a war of machinery. Counting those engaged in war production there were probably 75,000,000 to 80,000,000 Americans directly involved in prosecution of the war. To technological warfare we devoted 98 percent of our entire effort.

Nor is it proposed now to abandon this formula which has been so amazingly successful. The harnessing of the basic power of the universe will further spur our efforts to use brain for brawn in safeguarding the United States of America.

However, technology does not eliminate the need for men in war. The Air Forces, which were the highest developed technologically of any of our Armed Forces in this war, required millions of men to do their job. Every B–29 that winged over Japan was dependent on the efforts of 12 officers and 73 men in the immediate combat area alone.

The number of men that were involved in the delivery of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima was tremendous. First we had to have the base in the Marianas from which the plane took off. This first required preliminary operations across the vast Pacific, thousands of ships, millions of tons of supply, the heroic efforts of hundreds of thousands of men. Further, we needed the B–20's and their fighter escort which gave us control of the air over Japan. This was the result of thousands of hours of training and preparation in the United States and the energies of hundreds of thousands of men.

The effective technology on the military structure is identical to its effect on the national economy. Just as the automobile replaced the horse and made work for millions of Americans, the atomic explosives will require the services of millions of men if we are compelled to employ them in fighting our battles.

This war has made it clear that the security of the Nation, when challenged by an armed enemy, requires the services of virtually all able-bodied male citizens within the effective military-age group.

In war the Nation cannot depend on the numbers of men willing to volunteer for active service, nor can our security in peace.

In another national emergency the existence of a substantial portion of the Nation's young manpower already trained or in process of training would make it possible to fill out immediately the peacetime ranks of the Navy, the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserve. As a result our Armed Forces would be ready for almost immediate deployment to counter initial hostile moves, ready to prevent an enemy from gaining footholds from which he could launch destructive attacks against our industries and our homes. By this method we would establish for the generations to come a national military policy: (1) which is entirely within the financial capabilities of our peacetime economy and is absolutely democratic in its nature, and (2) which places the military world, and therefore the political world, on notice that this vast power, linked to our tremendous resources, wealth, and production, is immediately available. There can be no question that all the nations of the world will respect our views accordingly, creating at least a probability of peace on earth and of good will among men, rather than disaster upon disaster in a tormented world where the very processes of civilization itself are constantly threatened.

The decision in this matter is so grave in consequences that it demands complete frankness on my part. Therefore, I must say that many of the objections which have been made to universal military training appear to be influenced by ulterior motives or to ignore completely the tragedies of the past and present which we are seeking to avoid for the future. They often seem to give undue importance to restrictions on our freedom of life, trivial in comparison with the awful tragedies we are seeking to avoid, and the great blessings we hope to secure for succeeding generations.

The timing of our decision on the question of universal military training is urgent. The officials of the State Department have been strongly of the opinion that a decision in this matter prior to the final peace negotiations would greatly strengthen the hand of the United States in securing acceptance of a genuine organization to handle international differences.

The terms of the final peace settlement will provide a basis for determining the strength of the regular or permanent postwar military forces of the United States—air, ground, and naval—but they cannot, in my opinion, alter the necessity for a system of universal military training.

The yardstick by which the size of the permanent force must be measured is maximum security with minimum cost in men, matériel, and maintenance. So far as they can foresee world conditions a decade from now, War Department planners, who have taken every conceivable factor into consideration, believe that our position will be sound if we set up machinery which will permit the mobilization of an Army of 4,000,000 men within a period of 1 year following any international crisis resulting in a national emergency for the United States.

The Regular Army must be comprised largely of a strategic force, heavy in air power, partially deployed in the Pacific and the Caribbean, ready to protect the Nation against a sudden hostile thrust and immediately available for emergency action wherever required. It is obvious that another war would start with a lightning attack to take us unaware. The pace of the attack would be at supersonic speeds of rocket weapons, closely followed by a striking force which would seek to exploit the initial and critical advantage. We must be sufficiently prepared against such a threat to hold the enemy at a distance until we can rapidly mobilize our strength. The Regular Army and the National Guard must be prepared to meet such a crisis.

Another mission of the Regular Army is to provide the security garrisons for the outlying bases. We quickly lost the Philippines, Guam, and Wake Islands at the beginning of this war, and are still expending lives and wealth in recovering them.

The third mission of the permanent Army is to furnish the overhead, the higher headquarters which must keep the machine and the plans up to date for whatever national emergency we may face in the future. This overhead includes the War Department, the War College, the service schools, and the headquarters of the military areas into which continental United States is subdivided to facilitate decentralized command and coordination of the peacetime military machine. This was about all we had on the eve of this war, planners and a small number of men who had little to handle in practice but sound ideas on how to employ the wartime hosts that would be gathered in the storm. Had it not been for the time the British Empire and the Soviets bought us, those plans and ideas would have been of little use.

The fourth and probably the most important mission of the Regular Army is to provide the knowledge, the expert personnel, and the installations for training the citizen-soldier upon whom, in my view, the future peace of the world largely depends.

Of the citizen-Army, the National Guard is in the first category of importance. It must be healthy and strong, ready to take its place in the first line of defense in the first weeks of an emergency, and not dependent upon a year or more of training before it can be conditioned to take the field against a trained enemy. It is not feasible under the conditions of peace for the National Guard within itself to provide the basic, the fundamental training which is an imperative requirement for its mission. Therefore, in my opinion, based on a long and intimate experience with the Guard from 1907 until 1941, the essential requirement for such a system under modern conditions is universal military training from which to draw the volunteers for the ranks of the Guard. Without such a firm foundation, I am clearly of the opinion that a sufficiently dependable force for our postwar needs cannot be maintained.

The second important component of the citizen army is the Organized Reserve through

which full mobilization of the Nation's resources to war footing is accomplished. At the start of the present war, the reserve was almost entirely an officer corps, the regimental and divisional groups lacking a practical basis for mobilization. The contribution of this component was therefore largely one of individuals, but of wide extent and great importance. The depleted officer ranks of the Regular Army were filled by the reserve, the countless new staffs and organizations were mainly composed of reserve officers, the great training camps for men inducted through the Selective Service System drew in the beginning on the officer strength of the Reserve Corps. The officer candidate schools from which our present Army acquired its vital small-unit leadership were staffed by reserve officers. These officers were largely veterans of World War I and graduates of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. Pitifully small appropriations had limited training to a brief period once in every 3 or 4 years and so few numbers of troops that the limited training the reserve officers received had little relation to actual battle.

This lack of troops with which reserve officers could acquire practical experience in command and staff work was the most critical limitation. There was no enlisted strength in the reserve force. There was little connection and understanding between the Officers' Reserve Corps and the National Guard—which had an enlisted strength—and the number of enlisted men in the Regular Army was so small that it was impossible to qualify reserve officers by training with regulars. Especially in the dense centers of population there were few regular troops. Yet here were located the largest groups of reserve officers. Even had funds for transportation to the areas where regular troops were stationed been available, and they were not, the few troops on the regular rolls would have been completely submerged under a deluge of reserve officers. For example, the strength of the Officers' Reserve Corps in 1938 was more than double the number of regular soldiers in combat units in the continental United States.

Only by universal military training can full vigor and life be instilled into the reserve system. It creates a pool of well-trained men and officers from which the National Guard and the Organized Reserve can draw volunteers; it provides opportunities for the guard and reserve units to participate in corps and Army maneuvers, which are vital preparations to success in military campaigns. Without these trained men and officers, without such opportunities to develop skill through actual practice in realistic maneuvers, neither the Regular Army, the National Guard, nor the reserve can hope to bring high efficiency to their vital missions.

Though ROTC graduates composed 12 percent of the war officers, its most important contribution was the immediate availability of its product. Just what we could have done in the first phases of our mobilization and training without these men I do not know. I do know that our plans would have had to be greatly curtailed and the cessation of hostilities on the European front would have been delayed accordingly. We must enlarge and strengthen the system. It must be established on a higher level, comparable to the academic levels of college education in which the young men of the ROTC are engaged. All this is made easily possible if the student has participated in universal military training, and at the same time the length of the course can be shortened by 1 year. He would enter the ROTC as far advanced as his predecessors were after 2½ years of the original 3-year course. He would have completed his elementary training—the military equivalent of his grammar school and high-school courses—and would be prepared for college work, that is for training as an officer, a prospective leader of men. The product of such an ROTC would provide the National Guard and the Organized Reserve with an officer corps of exceptional character.

An unbroken period of 1 year's training appears essential to the success of a sound security plan based on the concept of a citizen army.

It is possible to train individual soldiers as replacements for veteran divisions and air groups as we now do in a comparatively short period of time. The training of the unit itself cannot be accomplished at best in less than a year; air units require even more time. The principle is identical to that of coaching a football team. A halfback can learn quickly how to run with the ball, but it takes time and much practice and long hours of team scrimmage before he is proficient at carrying the ball through an opposing team, utilizing the aid of the 10 other men on the team. So it is with an army division or combat air group. Men learn to fire a rifle or machine gun quickly, but it takes long hours of scrimmage, which the Army calls maneuver, before the firing of the rifle is coordinated with the activities of more than 14,000 other men on the team.

All men who might someday have to fight for their Nation must have this team training. The seasoned soldiers of our present superb divisions will have lived beyond the age of military usefulness. The situation will be similar in the peacetime army to that which obtained when we began to mobilize for this war and all men had to have at least a year of unit training before we had divisions even fit for shipment overseas.

The training program would be according to the standards which have made the American soldier in this war the equal of the finest fighting men. It would be kept abreast of technical developments and the resulting modifications of tactics.

Throughout the training a strenuous program of instruction would have to be followed, but it would not be possible in peace to carry on the work under the tremendous pressure we now follow in wartime. Athletics, recreational opportunities, short week ends, and other vacational opportunities such as at Christmastime, would, of course, be necessary. However, if the Government is to be justified in the expenditure of the funds involved, a vigorous schedule should be enforced; otherwise we would produce a half-baked product which would fail to command the respectful attention of the nations of the world, and therefore negate the primary purpose of the entire system.

To those who fear the Army might militarize our young men and indoctrinate them with dangerous conceptions, to those who express doubts of the Army's capacity to do the job, I submit the evidence of our present armies. The troops have been trained sufficiently to defeat a first-class enemy. Their minds have not been warped; quite the contrary. The American people are satisfied, I am confident, that their armies are, in fact, armies of democracy. They know that the men composing those armies are far better physically than they otherwise would have been; that their general health has been better than at home, except for these serving in the tropical jungles. The officers who trained our armies were largely citizen-soldiers. They did have the initial guidance of Regular officers, but only 2 percent of the entire officer corps was professional. Only slightly more were of the National Guard; 25 percent were products of the Officers' Reserve Corps; 12 percent more were men commissioned direct from civil life because of certain professional qualifications. The great majority of the officers came up from the ranks, 59 percent of the total, which guaranteed the democracy of the Army.

To those who consider the introduction of a system of universal military training an imposition on democracy, I would reply that in my opinion it would be the most democratic expression of our national life. Whatever my limitations may be in judging this matter, I submit the evidence of the proposal of our first President.

Washington's program provided for universal training of all men arriving at the age of 17. The citizen-militia was to be divided into three classes, men from 17 to 21, known as the advance corps, men 21 to 46, known as the main corps, and men from 46 to 61, known as the reserve corps. All of the peacetime training would have been concentrated in the advance corps, but eventually all members of main and reserve corps would have been graduates of the training program. The militia bill was first introduced in the third session of the First Congress. It was considered in the House on March 5, 1792, and as finally enacted contained no element of any of Washington's recommendations. It was so emasculated when finally adopted that the Representative who introduced the bill himself voted against its passage.

It appears probable that had the bill been approved by Congress, the United States might have avoided much of the war making that has filled its brief history. The impressment of American seamen would not have been regarded as a harmless pastime in the early 1800's, nor would the Kaiser have been so easily disposed to avenge the death of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand in 1914 with a world war, nor Adolf Hitler have been quite so quick to break the peace, if over these years the United States had been recognized by the warmongers as a nation immediately to be reckoned with.

The peacetime army must not only be prepared for immediate mobilization of an effective war army, but it must have in reserve the weapons needed for the first months of the fighting and clear-cut plans for immediately producing the tremendous additional quantities of matériel necessary in total war. We must never again face a great national crisis with ammunition lacking to serve our guns, few guns to fire, and no decisive procedures for procuring vital arms in sufficient quantities.

The necessity for continuous research into the military ramifications of man's scientific advance is now clear to all and it should not be too difficult to obtain the necessary appropriations for this purpose during peacetime. There is, however, always much reluctance to expenditure of funds for improvement of war-making instruments, particularly where there is no peacetime usefulness in the product.

The development of combat airplanes is closely allied with development of civil aeronautics; the prototypes of many of our present transport planes and those soon to come were originally bombers. Many of the aeronautical principles that helped give this Nation the greatest Air Force in the world grew out of commercial development and our production know-how at the start of this war was partially the fruit of peacetime commercial enterprise. Since many vital types of weapons have no commercial counterpart, the peacetime development of these weapons has been grossly neglected. Antiaircraft weapons are a good example. The highly efficient antiaircraft of today did not materialize until long after the fighting began. The consequent cost in time, life, and money of this failure to spend the necessary sums on such activity in peacetime has been appalling.

There is another phase of scientific research which I think has been somewhat ignored—the development of expeditious methods for the mass production of war matériel. This is of great importance since it

determines how quickly we can mobilize our resources if war comes and how large and costly our reserve stocks of war matériel must be. Serious thought and planning along this line can save millions of tax dollars.

We can be certain that the next war, if there is one, will be even more total than this one. The nature of war is such that once it now begins it can end only as this one is ending, in the destruction of the vanquished, and it should be assumed that another reconversion from peace to war production will take place initially under enemy distant bombardment. Industrial mobilization plans must be founded on these assumptions and so organized that they will meet them and any other situation that may develop. Yet they must in no way retard or inhibit the course of peacetime production.

If this Nation is to remain great it must bear in mind now and in the future that war is not the choice of those who wish passionately for peace. It is the choice of those who are willing to resort to violence for political advantage. We can fortify ourselves against disaster, I am convinced, by the measures I have here outlined. In these protections we can face the future with a reasonable hope for the best and with quiet assurance that even though the worst may come, we are prepared for it.

As President Washington said in his message to Congress of December 3, 1793:

"I cannot recommend to your notice measures for the fulfillment of our duties to the rest of the world, without again pressing upon you the necessity of placing ourselves in a position of complete defense, and of exacting from them the fulfillment of the duties towards us. The United States ought not to indulge a persuasion, that contrary to the order of human efforts, they will forever keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms, with which the history of every other nation abounds. There is a rank due to the United States among nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness—if we desire to avoid insult we must be ready to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful institutions of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 1, 1945.*

Our Burned Fingers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Burned Fingers" from the Omaha Morning World-Herald of December 15.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

OUR BURNED FINGERS

If the official communique told the whole truth, the Messrs. Truman and Attlee, at their celebrated conference in Washington, confined themselves to an exchange of resounding platitudes and cliches.

There are those, however—and Senator KEM, of Missouri, is one of them—who contend that the communique was designed to conceal more than it revealed. Senator KEM relates that the Honorable Mr. Attlee later held a press conference at the British Embassy in Washington for British journalists only, and that from the published reports of this meeting he concludes that "Mr. Attlee got everything he came to the United States to get."

Specifically, Senator KEM has the impression that Mr. Attlee obtained from the President a number of side agreements. That is one of the reasons why the Senator is proposing a Senate resolution demanding that the President make a full report on the conference, and tell the Senate whether he made any agreements at all with the Prime Minister.

The framers of the Constitution thought they were quite explicit about the way such matters should be handled. They said treaties should be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

But long years afterward a President of the United States discovered that it was possible to make agreements with foreign powers without calling them treaties—and at Cairo, Tehran, Yalta, and on a warship in the Atlantic, he did so. Those agreements were not legal under the Constitution, but they were honored nevertheless. And they were in large measure responsible for the postwar troubles which have befallen the Republic.

President Truman's penchant for jotting down his thoughts is well known.

The fact that some of the things he jots down are quite irresponsible is also well known.

The conclusion is obvious:

The Senate should demand that any agreement or understanding of any sort reached by the President and the Prime Minister should be submitted for advice and consent.

And by the same action the Senate should make quite clear to His Majesty's government that the Republic of the United States will not consider itself bound by any side agreements which may have been reached.

Our American fingers have been burned once, badly. And once is enough.

Futility of Efforts To Buy Friendship of Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it is becoming more evident each day that we have not succeeded in buying friendship abroad with our gifts of dollars. For some pointed thinking on that subject, I commend an article by Mr. George Sokolsky which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of December 19. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Very late the Government has been forced to recognize that it is engaged in a war and that the Nation needs to be mobilized for its defense.

This should have been done on August 15, 1945, when our present troubles were already apparent. Instead, on that date, this country threw its strength to the winds and engaged in a round of palavers and of buying friendships which has wasted our heritage.

Invaluable equipment was dumped, sold, and permitted to be stolen, as in the Philippines, and now we have to start all over again.

The appointment of Charles E. Wilson of General Electric to the responsibility of the management of supply is an acknowledgment that more than paper planning is needed. Wilson is tough and will hold the economic line with hardihood, depending, of course, on how much effective authority is delegated to him. If he is in reality subordinated to the White House economists, his office will be decorative. No man can do a good job if his boss is everlastingly changing his mind about policy.

The mobilization of manpower and of production is, however, insufficient. That alone will not win.

It is necessary also to re-examine the policies of this Nation which brought us our present discredit and to remove from public office the bunglers.

The dismissal of Dean Acheson is essential. As long as he remains, most Americans will have no confidence in the conduct of our foreign relations. In no other country could a public servant survive Mr. Acheson's just unpopularity.

In a manner, Dean Acheson has become a symbol of the men of Yalta—those officials who participated in the arrangements for our defeat by Soviet Russia. It is unsound to question their loyalty; it is not unsound to impugn their judgment.

Men who over so long a period have always been grievously wrong have no place in the national leadership. They should go and forthwith. Their presence in the Government imperils the morale of the people.

Not only should Dean Acheson go, but Philip Jessup and Dean Rusk and any other architects of our misfortunes as are involved in this need for the deposit of policy in hands that are trusted. As long as they remain in the State Department, no pleas for unity, no matter by whom uttered, will have public support.

And we need to mobilize our friends and allies. We now know that money does not buy friends or allies. When they no longer need your money, they dislike you as a creditor. Machiavelli said what I have in mind so much better than I can:

"In general of men * * * they are ungrateful, fickle, false, cowards, covetous, and as long as you succeed they are yours entirely; they will offer you their blood, property, life, and children * * * when the need is far distant; but when it approaches they turn against you.

"And that prince who, relying entirely on their promises, has neglected other precautions, is ruined; because friendships that are obtained by payments, and not by greatness or nobility of mind, may indeed be earned, but they are not secured, and in time of need cannot be relied upon."

Precisely that has happened to us. Joseph P. Kennedy, in his recent speech, emphasized the fact that we hardly have a real ally in the world and he suggested that we get out of Europe and Asia and devote ourselves to our Latin American neighbors. It was too angry and limited a plan, but was nevertheless an inevitable response to the challenge of our isolation.

Certainly, those who once called such as Joe Kennedy, isolationists, now witness the spectacle of the United States as a country perforce isolated by her erstwhile allies to whose support she had twice come in war. They pleaded for aid and we gave it and now they flirt with our enemies.

But it is not good enough to admit such a failure of our policy. This country needs at this moment a Disraeli, a Talleyrand, to reverse its policy and to move back to the au-

thority in the world to which our strength entitles us. Such a person is not in sight; yet he must exist among us who have been so rich in talent everywhere but in Government.

Earl Blasts CIO Leaders for Korean Policy Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an account in the Oregon Farmer Union of a speech by Stanley Earl, former CIO Oregon executive secretary:

EARL BLASTS CIO LEADERS FOR KOREAN POLICY STAND

Stanley Earl, formerly executive secretary of the Oregon CIO, directed a bitter blast at the American labor movement for its policy of whitewashing the sins of the Truman administration's handling of the Nation's foreign affairs. Speaking before the Salem Farmer-Labor Council meeting at the Farmers Union Hall in Salem, November 27.

Earl resigned as executive secretary of the Oregon CIO to accept appointment as labor adviser with the ECA (Marshall plan) in Korea. He served 10½ months and was driven out by the North Korean invasion on June 25.

"One of the biggest disappointments to me," said Earl, "on my return to the United States was the reception I received by labor. If what I had to say about the rottenness of the Korean regime was true then I should have had support from the CIO and the American Federation of Labor. The CIO has just completed its national convention. Not a thing has appeared in the press except that the CIO will ask bold new steps from ECA. That is not enough. CIO leaders should go to Truman and demand a revaluation of our policies in accord with the original conception of the Marshall plan."

Earl revealed that on his return to the United States he was met by labor leaders who told him that even though what he had to say was true about conditions in Korea he should, nevertheless, "shut up" because "we are in a war." He went to Washington and was cold-shouldered by CIO leadership, which did everything it could to suppress the story he was trying to tell the American people about the collaboration of high American officials and the military government in Korea with the rotten regime of Syngman Rhee. Rhee, who had been repudiated by his own people in a free election on May 30, a few weeks before the invasion, has now been installed as dictator over all of Korea under the auspices of General MacArthur.

POLICE-STATE METHODS

Earl told about the police-state methods which he encountered in Korea.

Free trade-unions did not exist, newspapers which dared to criticize the government were suppressed, reporters were arrested. There were 9,000 prisoners in one Seoul prison; of these, 6,000 had been imprisoned a year and a half because of their political views.

The police attended all public meetings, and if any remarks were made critical of the Korean Government of Rhee the speaker was subject to "interrogation," which Earl said was a refined sort of torture. Several of his friends, all labor leaders, and all non-Communists were executed on the day of the Korean invasion merely because they were known as leftists. These leftists had been responsible for driving the Communists out of the labor movement in South Korea, Earl said. He declared that in his 10½ months of residence in Southern Korea he did not meet or know of a single Communist.

"It takes just so much suppression before communism begins to grow because of the people's dissatisfaction," he said. "It was not necessary for the Communists to produce any chaos in Korea. There was enough chaos produced by President Rhee.

"I sent a letter to Washington and to Dr. Bunce, chief of our Korean mission, pointing out some of these facts and urging that something be done about it. That letter was written May 24, 1950, a month before the invasion, but nothing happened. I think it is time now that the people of the United States knew some of these facts."

TIME TO WAKE UP

"The situation in Korea could have been prevented and the present war prevented. When I speak of the corrupt, rotten government of Syngman Rhee, I mean just that. The kind of government that we were supporting was known to everyone including our own Ambassador, Mr. Muccio. It was known to all Asiatics. It is time for our Government to wake up and decide that countries that we help with our dollars and manpower should be worthy of our support."

Earl declared that a similar situation is developing in Indochina and that if the American people do not watch out they will soon be asked to send manpower to support the same kind of a rotten regime in Indochina.

"In Korea it was our policy to support any group fighting communism. We are doing the same in supporting Franco in Spain," he said. "Of course, Franco is fighting communism, but as a Fascist he is creating the Communists. Hitler fought communism. So did Mussolini."

Earl predicted that arms given to police states like that we are now supporting in Korea will eventually fall into the hands of the Communists as the people have no place else to turn, since we have deserted them.

"We have a pretty hard row to hoe," he said, "trying to win back the confidence of the Asiatics. A lot of Koreans and a lot of Europeans, too, are coming to the conclusion that it is better to be occupied by Communists and live than be liberated by the United States and die."

Earl said that he had recently had a letter from Korea and that not a single factory is standing in Seoul. He also said that Korea cannot be defended militarily. It is a physical impossibility if the Chinese or the Soviet Union decide to make Korea untenable for us, he said.

INTERNAL REVOLUTION

Earl also declared that if the Communists had not invaded from North Korea there would have been an internal revolution in South Korea without any Communist invasion.

"I don't speak idly when I speak of police terrorisms," said Earl. "Don't you think it is time that our Government lifted its own iron curtain on countries where we are pouring in dollars and men. Isn't it time we started dealing with people instead of with Cabinet members, brass hats, big-land owners, and big-business men. Our Senators and John Foster Dulles should have walked down some of the side streets of Seoul where they could have seen babies dying from malnutrition at the same time that they were being entertained at a big state dinner by President Rhee. Rhee was exporting 100,000 tons of rice to Japan annually so he could get hold of fourteen million American dollars. While he was exporting this rice, thousands of Koreans were dying of starvation.

"When I returned to the United States," said Earl, "I was met by some high-place labor leaders who said, 'Maybe it's true but don't say it. It will aid the Communists.' But the people aiding the Communists are those at Washington, D. C., who are refusing to give the American people the facts. The people who should have done this and who should have forced exposure of these facts were the CIO and the A. F. of L."

Ireland and Atlantic Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Washington Post of December 16, 1950, written by Eric Dorman O'Gowan:

IRELAND AND ATLANTIC SECURITY

On April 18 of this year I had the honor to address the Overseas Writers Press Club at Washington on the subject of Ireland's place in the North Atlantic defense scheme.

At that time I urged the vital necessity of a sound political background to military planning, indicating from recent history (World War II) the disasters inherent in the failure of politicians to provide the military command with a realistic basis for their plans and operations. On such occasions the overlooking of some political factor not readily apparent to the military mind causes military action to be based on faulty premises.

I fear this has once again proved true in Korea both when the North Koreans attacked initially and when the Chinese invasion completely altered the military basis. Absence of a sound political background to military operations normally causes initial deployment of unduly weak forces within effective striking distance of a superior enemy. In such circumstances, I suggested, a wise commander should have in mind the worst possible case as well as the best possible case.

Fortunately reverses in Korea do not directly threaten the safety of the powerhouse and main base of the free world, the United States, to the degree that a similar series of defeats in northwestern Europe, resulting in the overrunning of the British Isles, would compromise American security.

Whoever the American designated to command in the northeastern Atlantic theater, he must remember that he cannot afford to ignore the worst possible case; indeed he must initially face the fact that that case already obtains, since there is nothing to prevent Russia from reaching the Atlantic coast and the Channel within 3 weeks of his assuming command and, should that occur, Russia will not repeat Hitler's unpreparedness for a trans-Channel operation. Russia's object will be the expulsion of America from Europe.

Initially the best he can hope to achieve will be the retention of the eastern Atlantic islands, Iceland, Britain, Ireland, and the Breton and Iberian Peninsulas. It will be more important politically and strategically to arm and integrate Spain than to rebuild German forces. French national redoubts in Brittany and on the Garonne should have priority over a new Maginot line, and a united, reintegrated Ireland is vital to the

over-all concept. Indeed his headquarters could better command from Limerick than from London or Paris.

Much as Americans will sympathize with those European nations in the Atlantic Pact for whom military security cannot at present be provided we must none of us sacrifice the substance for the shadow; for complete defense of the Western European zone must remain a shadow until there are at least 50 efficient combat divisions deployed in Germany.

The retention of Britain must be the keystone of our immediate planning. Britain is perfectly able to guard her own southern and eastern coastline, but her situation would be gravely weakened were Russia to secure a footing in central Ireland in conjunction with an invasion of Britain. Russia might well invade Ireland by air with impunity at the most critical moment for Britain. Free Ireland, outside the Atlantic Pact, and excluded from participation in the pact, because of her dispute with Britain over northern Ireland could not at present dispose of a Russian airborne invasion.

Thus a divided Ireland becomes the Achilles heel of Atlantic Pact strategy and will remain so for at least two more critical years. Alternatively, an integrated and reunited Ireland, defended by Irishmen in conjunction with the United States of America, provides an absolutely secure base for the defense of the Atlantic fringe of western Europe, which is all of Europe our means will allow us to defend with certainty.

In this context the defense of Ireland becomes of greater importance to the Atlantic community than the defense of London. It is the bounden duty of the high political chiefs to give their military chief a clear-cut political background against which he can plan realistic strategy. He must be free to deal with Ireland, Spain, Portugal, and France as well as with Britain without cramping political restrictions.

ERIC DORMAN O'GOWAN,
Brigadier, British Army (Retired).
COOTEHILL, IRELAND.

Eulogy of Ensign Jesse L. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there was published in the Washington Times-Herald of Sunday, December 17, 1950, in the Untold Story, by Roscoe Simmons, an account of the death in Korea of Ensign Jesse L. Brown, of Mississippi, the first colored officer of the Navy to lose his life in any war of this Nation, and the only colored naval aviator to see action in Korea.

Ensign Brown met a heroic death. The circumstances attendant upon it should be recorded for the information of all our people throughout the country, it seems to me, as yet another indication of the part which Negro citizens of the United States are playing in the defense of their country today, and of the ready acceptance of their services by their compatriots, regardless of race or color.

I ask unanimous consent that the story from the Times-Herald be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNTOLD STORY
(By Roscoe Simmons)

The death of Ensign Jesse L. Brown of Hattiesburg, Miss., who died fighting in the air over Korea for his country, adds another name to the long and distinguished list of colored Mississippians who, for first one thing then another, achieved a place in the history of American freedom.

Also, Brown's is another picture on the walls of men of color, who, in life or death, proved worthy of the opportunities of their country and the friendship of their white countrymen.

In his heroic death Brown had the tender attention of a white fellow officer, Lt. (jg) Thomas J. Hudner, of Massachusetts. Flying a Navy fighter, Brown was hit over the Chosin area. Brown made an emergency landing known only to the elements. Hudner, flying and fighting on the same mission, saw Brown touch ground and began circling the field as protection against enemy attack.

Brown waved his arm as a sign of life but made no attempt to escape from his plane, although it had started burning. Hudner knew that Brown could not free himself and, chancing his own life, landed in the same field. He leaped from his plane and ran to the aid of Brown, but it was too late. Brown was dead.

BODY FLOWN OUT

Lieutenant Hudner radioed for a plane to come for Brown's body and stood by until its arrival and the lifeless form of a comrade was aloft and bound for a camp of friends and fellow warriors.

This is but the continuation of the story, which will never be completely told of the unbroken and fateful relations existing between two people, the great whites who invented the Union and their colored people, which is as old as the first page of American history.

A poet of the American scene wrote well when he said:

" 'Tis the heart and not the face
Where God His wondrous works doth trace."

The United States Navy feels that the bravery and loyalty of Ensign Brown adds to its long cherished glory. Not only was Brown the only colored naval aviator to fight in Korea, but also the first colored officer of the Navy to lose his life in any war fought by the Union.

Capt. Robert Smalls offered his life when he ran the ship *Planter* into the Federal lines at Charleston, but he was then only a seaman, a man seeking freedom. He lived to become a captain in the Navy and a Member of Congress, where for 20 years his heroic and modest qualities won the admiration of his countrymen.

While the records of the Army have been enriched by the exploits of colored soldiers, going back to Washington, Warren, and the Revolution, the Navy has long been tight as to its personnel. This has been due more to jealousy of its prowess than to simple prejudice. But when the Navy bars went down they fell all the way.

UNDER NATIONALITY ALONE

However, since 1813 colored men have figured in the Navy. In the beginning they were not enlisted under color, but went in under nationality alone. Under tough sailing and fighting they made a name.

In 1814 1 out of every 10 fighters on the fleet that crawled into the Great Lakes to back Croghan at Mackinac were colored men. Dr. Parsons, the noted Navy surgeon, was their historian in early years.

"There seemed to be an entire absence of prejudice against the blacks as messmates among the crew," he wrote when surgeon on the *Guerriere.*

In 1813 Commodore Perry—then captain—protested to Commodore Chauncel against "a motley set—blacks, soldiers, and boys," sent him by General Harrison, later President. Chauncel rebuked Perry.

"You will find," he wrote, "that color does not affect their qualification. They are not surpassed by any seamen we have in the fleet."

Soon Perry was exclaiming: "They seem to be absolutely insensible to danger." These men received the surrender of Barclay when he came aboard the *Niagara.* He looked at his conquerors and wept.

SPURRED BY WOUNDED MAN

Commander Nathan Sharler, of the *Governor Tomkins,* told the story of John Johnson, the colored sea fighter who uttered one of the great sayings of American gallantry. A 24-pounder struck Johnson full hip, taking away the lower part of his body, in a sea engagement January 1, 1813. John cried to his mates: "Fire away, my boys; no haul a color down."

Near Johnson lay another colored sea fighter, John Davis, torn to pieces himself. Commander Sharler wrote: "He fell near me, begging me to throw him overboard," so all hands might be devoted to the task. Look the world over but our colored people will find their greatest heroism under the Stars and Stripes.

UN Should Brand Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "UN Should Brand Reds," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, and reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp. of Dover, Del., in the Washington Post of December 18, 1950:

UN SHOULD BRAND REDS

Belated action by the United Nations General Assembly to put on its agenda a resolution calling upon the Chinese Communists to get out of Korea spotlights the slow and hesitant way in which the UN has dealt with this threat to world peace.

It is more than a threat to world peace. It is a threat of complete failure of the United Nations as an organization and an idea, putting the world back many years in its search for a sensible, peaceable way of ordering affairs among nations.

Yet with such tremendous issues at stake, the United Nations has tried to keep up the pretense that aggression by Chinese Communists is different from aggression by North Korean Communists, and that it would be unwise to do anything that might annoy the Red government of Mao Tze-tung.

The wishful theory that Mao, or his bosses in Moscow, could be made to see reason by kid-glove handling in the United Nations should have been abandoned weeks ago. Certainly, now that Soviet delegate Andrei Vishinsky has blasted the latest proposal of 13 Asiatic nations for a halt at the thirty-eighth parallel, the delegates from the free nations ought to conclude that there's nothing to be gained by refusing to face the fact of Chinese Red aggression.

Even with upward of half a million Chinese troops in Northern Korea, and more pouring across the Manchurian border, Vi-

shinsky sticks to the fantastic lie that the armed forces of Communist China are not fighting on the side of North Korea.

That shows what Russia and her stooges have been trying to do in the United Nations. By dealing in lies so stupendous as to defy all reason, they have eliminated any chance that a reasonable compromise could be reached.

It is a fact that the Chinese Communist troops have been fighting in Korea for more than a month. They have not been fighting simply against the United States, as they put it, but have been opposing a United Nations Army acting under United Nations orders.

But it was not until last week that the Security Council got around to voting on a resolution asking them to get out of Korea, and assuring them, at the same time, that their own legitimate interests would be safeguarded. It was obvious from the start that Russia would veto this move.

The delay in pressing for Security Council action was bad enough. It was worse that time was lost in presenting the same resolution to the General Assembly, where the veto cannot block it. But worst of all is the refusal, even now, to name the Chinese Communists as aggressors, and to demand firmly that they get out.

No realistic person expects the Reds to obey any UN mandate that they don't like. A strong resolution from the General Assembly at this late stage probably would have little effect on the fighting in Korea.

But the UN has to maintain the principles it stood up for so courageously at the beginning of the Korean war. It could survive a military defeat in Korea, if that should come, but it could never survive a compromise of the very principles on which the world organization was founded.

The 51 nations which voted recently to take up the question of Chinese intervention know that it is deliberate, naked aggression. They know that the Chinese Reds and their Russian backers are defying the will of a majority of the nations of the world. They know, too, that there will never be any collective security if the free nations refuse to take a stand on the principles that have brought them together.

It is time the members of the UN recognized that the fate of the world organization and its hopes for the future depend on how it meets the question of the Chinese in Korea. At least there should be no more delay in branding the Chinese Communists as aggressors, and telling them to get out.

America Girds for the Task Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM B. FUGATE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Speaker, the Roanoke Times is published in Roanoke, Va., and circulates throughout my district. It has always been forthright in its editorial policy. In the Sunday issue of December 17 the Roanoke Times featured in its editorial column an article entitled "America Girds for the Task Ahead." Clearly, implicitly, and convincingly the proposition is presented.

On Friday night, December 15, the President of the United States had spoken to the people here and throughout the world on the gravity of the world crisis and the importance of preparing American defenses. The discussion of the subject is so illuminating that I believe it in the national interest that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article is as follows:

AMERICA GIRDS FOR THE TASK AHEAD

Proclaiming a state of national emergency, the President of the United States yesterday called on individuals and communities alike to make whatever sacrifices are necessary for the welfare of the Nation.

The response should be enthusiastic, unanimous, wholehearted.

Only the extreme gravity of a world crisis and the imminence of a war for national survival would justify the drastic step taken yesterday. It means a radical change in our way of life and a lowering of living standards for the American people, not for just a few months but for years to come.

That is not pleasant or agreeable to contemplate. But far less pleasant and much more disagreeable would be existence in a world dominated by communism. And that is the grim alternative to paying the price that the administration asks the country to pay in order that America may become strong and remain free.

Realization of the distasteful and unacceptable alternative should impel the American people to accept cheerfully and without grumbling the inevitable sacrifices that lie ahead, sacrifices that must be made by all of us as our individual contribution to national safety and indeed national survival in a time of critical danger.

A third world war is not inevitable, and Mr. Truman was at pains to make that clear in his radio broadcast to the Nation Friday night. But a third world war, involving a death struggle between the two mightiest Nations on the globe, is a distinct possibility that has been brought unmistakably nearer by the events of the past month in Korea, where Chinese Communist hordes, undoubtedly at Moscow's instigation and with the Kremlin's connivance, are attempting to drive General MacArthur's forces into the sea.

With Russia's sinister purpose and inexorable determination to extend Communist rule throughout the world becoming clearer all the time, the only possible course for America to pursue consistent with national safety is to arm to the teeth and gear its economy to a scale which will make it possible to bear the heavy burden that must be borne by this country for an unforeseeable and undetermined period.

Accordingly we are entering an era of austerity that will call for a change in the habits of all of us. Taxes are going to be far heavier than ever before, civilian production for the most part is definitely out of the picture, wage and price controls are not far off, and more and more young men are going to be called up for military service in the months immediately ahead.

None of this is pleasant to contemplate. But all of it is vitally necessary if America is to survive. And because it is vitally necessary, the American people must accept resolutely and willingly the hard and disagreeable tasks ahead, tasks which are essential for their survival as a Nation under existing world conditions.

Higher taxes, longer hours of work for many, fewer civilian goods for all, military service for more than 3,000,000 young Americans who will be called away from their jobs or studies to don the uniform and submit to Army and Navy discipline for an indeterminate period—this is not a prospect to be viewed enthusiastically but it is one to be accepted cheerfully in the realization that the world crisis makes it absolutely necessary.

We must embark on this course, as the President pointed out Friday night, "not as a sacrifice, but as an opportunity to defend the best kind of life that men have ever devised on this earth." Viewed in that light, the job ahead becomes a challenge—a challenge to which the American people can be counted on to respond in a spirit worthy of their great forebears and glorious traditions.

It is not going to be easy, but neither is it going to be unendurable. And if preparedness pays off and another world conflict with all of its frightful cost in human slaughter, human suffering, human sorrow and human treasure is thereby avoided, the price we are being called on to pay will be small indeed. On the other hand, if war comes despite all our efforts to avert it, we shall be better prepared to defend our liberties and those of the free world—and for that reason, too, the price we are being called on to pay will be small indeed.

Realizing that "world conquest by Communist imperialism is the goal of the forces of aggression that have been loosed upon the world" and that "the increasing menace of the forces of Communist aggression requires that the national defense shall be strengthened as speedily as possible," the American people must meet the crucial test of their stamina and hardihood that is at hand. On how they meet it may well depend the answer to the question of whether this Nation is to survive or perish.

Resolution of Housing Authority of Breckenridge, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the Housing Authority of the City of Breckenridge, Tex., has taken an action which I think should be of particular interest to Members of Congress. It is with considerable pride and great appreciation that I place in the RECORD, a resolution unanimously adopted by the housing authority, in which, I am informed, they were joined unanimously by the City Commission of Breckenridge.

Through its housing authority and city commission, these citizens have asked Federal officials to suspend the allocation of money heretofore approved and that the money be applied to training our citizens and arming our men to fight and protect our freedoms against world aggressors.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of responsible citizenship necessary to cut out all nonessential expenditures not directly connected with the defense preparedness. The people should demand, and the Congress should have the courage, to review all authorized domestic commitments and drop everything, which under close scrutiny, fails to contribute to the war effort.

Conservatively, there must be at least $4,500,000,000 now authorized which can be canceled. As we look for new sources of revenue, these billions are at our fingertips. We need to review immediately past actions taken by this Congress in light of the circumstances which have developed. It would give a lot of people encouragement and greater confidence that the Congress of the United States will not spend one dime except in behalf of the tremendous efforts which all of us know lie ahead.

While we call upon people at home to retrench and prepare for sacrifices, the real place to start retrenchment is right here in Washington.

The housing authority and the City Commission of Breckenridge, Tex., have given us an example of a community which says that they are willing to forego their town's improvement by reason of the conditions the country faces and that the funds allotted to them be used to protect this Nation in order that they may continue their plans when they can do so in safety.

Would that other localities and citizens everywhere take this view and that this Congress and every agency of Government forget all else in order that our energies, our resources, and dollars be channeled directly into our national defense efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution to which I refer is as follows:

Whereas the United States of America is today in greater danger than at any other time in the history of this democratic nation; and

Whereas the forces of communism and world aggression threaten to engulf the world and wipe out the fires of freedom; and

Whereas the American people will be required to give of their time and money to rebuild the protective barriers against this world threat; and

Whereas the economic stability of the United States is a factor in the defense of America and the world; and

Whereas a great amount of money has been allocated to the city of Breckenridge, Tex., for the building of needed low-rent houses; and

Whereas notwithstanding the great need for these houses, it is the belief of the citizens of Breckenridge, Tex., that social welfare projects are secondary to the loss of freedom for the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Housing Authority of the city of Breckenridge, Tex., at this regular meeting of the Authority this 4th day of December 1950, when the forces of communism threatened our very life existence, That the Housing Authority of the city of Breckenridge, Tex., go on record as asking the Federal Public Housing Authority to suspend the allocation of money to be spent on peacetime housing and that this Federal money be applied to training our citizens and arming our men to fight and protect the freedoms of our people against communism and world aggression.

M. M. MACHEN,
A. E. SWEENEY,
Chairman.
R. W. CHAPMAN,
Vice Chairman.
H. M. VEALE,
R. D. SMITH.

Attest: VIVIAN SHEFFIELD.

Iowa Leads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Iowa has long been the Nation's greatest single producer of corn and hogs.

To these firsts in productivity from the rich soil of Iowa, cultivated by the finest farmers in the world, there has been added in more recent years, the greatest single State production of chickens, eggs, oats, and popcorn as well as the greatest number of pounds of cattle marketed and the highest butterfat sales.

To this imposing list must now be added another first—Iowa now leads all other States of the Nation in the slaughter and packing of meat.

The Iowa Development Commission has just issued a bulletin which I believe my colleagues will find quite interesting, especially those from the State of Illinois, which has long been regarded as a great center of the meat-packing industry. The bulletin follows:

IOWA NOW LEADS THE NATION IN MEAT PACKING VOLUME

Iowa is now leading the meat packing field, the Iowa Development Commission pointed out today.

For the second straight year the volume of livestock slaughtered by Iowa packing plants is running larger than in any other State.

Federal estimates show that during the first 10 months of 1950 Iowa packers handled 11.7 percent (by live weight) of all the cattle, calves, hogs, sheep, and lambs processed in the Nation. (The estimates do not include farm butchering.)

Last year Iowa packing companies handled 11.5 percent of the meat processed in the Nation.

With the 1949 and 1950 reports, Iowa has stepped ahead of Illinois, which previously was the top meat packing State.

Illinois' meat packing operations have followed national trends very closely. When the United States volume of livestock slaughter dropped 10 percent between 1947 and 1948, so did Illinois'. It has accounted for 10.6 or 10.7 percent of the Nation's meat processing since the United States Department of Agriculture started to publish slaughter figures in 1946.

Iowa meat packers, although they took a bigger drop in the 1947–48 slump, have been coming back ever since at an impressive rate.

In 1949, for instance, Iowa packing plants increased their operations by 670,000,000 pounds, from 3,478,613,000 to 4,148,928,000 pounds of live weight. Iowa's share in United States livestock slaughter rose from 9.7 to 11.5 percent, and the Tall Corn State nosed Illinois out of the top standing.

This year Iowa's meat packers seem to be buzzing along at a similar rate. In the first 10 months of 1950 Iowa packers handled more meat than they did in the full year 1948, and they are 200,000,000 pounds ahead of the January-October period in 1949.

(The totals: 3,482,000,000 pounds in 10 months, 1950; 3,281,000,000 pounds in 10 months, 1949.)

Illinois' 10-month total is 2,000,000 pounds less than in 1949: 3,103,410,000 pounds this year; 3,105,393,000 pounds last year.

Illinois still has the largest beef kill in the country, but its margin over Iowa is becoming smaller. In 1948 Illinois packers killed 662,000,000 more pounds of beef than Iowa plants did. Last year Iowa was 340,000,000 pounds behind, and so far this year Illinois plants are only 290,000,000 pounds ahead in the beef department.

Iowa also has been gaining on her eastern neighbor in pork packing. In 1948 Iowa packers handled 417,000,000 more pounds of pork than Illinois plants did. In 1949 the Iowa total rose to 790,000,000 pounds more than the Illinois volume. So far this year Iowa packing plants are 701,000,000 pounds of pork in the lead.

Iowa now ranks first in hog slaughter, second in sheep and lamb slaughter, and third in cattle slaughter. Minnesota is the third ranking hog packing State, and California is second in cattle slaughter. In total meat packing operations, Minnesota habitually ranks third and California fourth.

Iowa has 20 federally inspected slaughter plants, 5 of them in Sioux City. Illinois has 28, of which 17 are in Chicago. Minnesota has 11 plants operating under Federal inspection, and California has 58, of which 19 are in Los Angeles.

Dr. H. Trendley Dean, Veteran in United States Public Health Service, Keyman in Program Raising Standards of Dental Health in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is with much pleasure that I call attention of the Members of Congress to the remarkable achievements in the field of dental health in America and the world of an Illinoisan, a native East St. Louisan, Dr. H. Trendley Dean.

It is only natural that I should join my fellow townsmen in the great feeling of pride they share in Dr. Dean. His work has honored not only himself but the community in which he was born, its schools and its citizens.

No one man has contributed more to raising the standards of dental health than has Dr. Dean. As the keyman in research which has led to the use of the fluoride process, Dr. Dean may be responsible for future generations of Americans being free from dental troubles during most of their lifetime.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a story of Dr. Dean's career which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on Sunday, December 17, 1950. The article follows:

FORMER CITY RESIDENT IS DENTAL RESEARCH LEADER

WASHINGTON.—If your teeth and your children's teeth last longer, look better, and stay healthier you can thank a former East St. Louisan and the Federal agency that he directs, the National Institute of Dental Research, located in a suburb of Washington, D. C.

This contributor to the Nation's health is tall, friendly, pipe-smoking Dr. H. Trendley Dean, a member of one of the oldest East St. Louis families and a veteran of 30 years in the United States Public Health service.

Dr. Dean is the nephew of John M. Trendley, retired Illinois Central chief clerk who lives at 617 North Twenty-second Street. He is the grandson of the late Capt. Henry Trendley and the great-grandson of John Trendley, one of the founders of the old Wiggins Ferry that operated between East St. Louis and St. Louis long before the Eads Bridge was built.

Back in the days when Nineteenth Street was the city limits, Dr. Dean was born on

the 160-acre Trendley farm which extended from Nineteenth to Twenty-fourth Street and from State Street to the L. & N. tracks. He was the son of William W. and Mrs. Rosalie Trendley Dean.

SERVED IN FRANCE

After attending St. Patrick, St. Joseph's, and Park Schools, Dr. Dean entered St. Louis Academy and then St. Louis University. He was graduated from the dental school in 1916 and licensed to practice in Illinois and Missouri. He entered private practice in Wood River but the following year left to enter the Army, serving as a dental officer from 1917 to 1919 in the United States and in France.

Dr. Dean then returned to Wood River and in 1920 was president of the Alton Dental Society and commander of the Wood River post of the American Legion. The following year he entered the United States Public Health Service and advanced in rank until in 1945 he was a dental director, the equivalent of a colonel in the Army. He served at various hospitals from New York to California but since 1931 has been assigned to the National Institute of Health at Bethesda, Md., near Washington. He has been Director of the National Institute of Dental Research since 1948.

The former East St. Louisan has written chapters in a number of books and also more than 50 articles in scientific, public health, dental, medical, and engineering journals. He also is prominent in professional organizations. He is a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, chairman of the Washington section of the American College of Dentists, an associate editor of the Journal of American College of Dentists, a member of the committee on research and standards of the American Public Health Association and for 2 years was secretary of the American Dental Association's committee on dental-health survey.

Dr. Dean also has served as president and a trustee of the International Association for Dental Research; president of the Association of Military Dental Surgeons of the United States and as the United States vice president of the Federation Dentaire Internationale.

GETS GORGAS MEDAL

During World War II he was assigned as a colonel to the European theater, where he served with the Office of Military Government. He has been a lecturer at both the Army and Navy Dental Schools and has received a number of awards, including the Gorgas Medal and Award of the Association of Military Surgeons in 1949, the John M. Godell prize, and the Jarvie Fellowship Medal, awarded by the Dental Society of the State of New York.

For his services in World War I Dr. Dean received the Army commendation ribbon and the Victory Medal with one clasp. During World War II he earned four ribbons.

Dr. Dean and his wife, the former Miss Ruth Martha McEvoy, will celebrate their thirtieth wedding anniversary next September. They have three daughters: Ruth Celestine, assistant woman's club editor of the Washington Evening Star; Dorothea Virginia, who teaches in the nursery school of Hull House, Chicago; and Mary Harriet, who is in library technical work in Texas.

PLAYED BASEBALL

Once a soccer and baseball player in East St. Louis, Dr. Dean now plays tennis and rides horseback for recreation. He and Mrs. Dean particularly like to ride in the hunt country of Fairfax County, south of their home in Arlington, Va. Dr. Dean learned to ride Army style while assigned to the cavalry at Fort Riley, Kans., during World War I.

A recent issue of a dental magazine devoted an article to Dr. Dean, referring to him as a "key man occupying a top position in this history-making program, and helping to make some of the history himself," and commenting that he is "unusually well equipped to guide the destiny of the new National Institute of Dental Research."

The magazine traces Dr. Dean's interest in public health to his World War I service, when he examined and treated thousands of American soldiers.

"Like all born researchers," the magazine stated, "Dean determined to learn all that he could about the basic causes of dental caries and periodontal disease. He had a professional's regard for treatment and care, but he also had a researcher's vital curiosity about the fundamental causative factors which produced so much poor dental health. And he wanted to play a part in striking at dental disease by coming to grips with it at its source."

Dr. Dean in his first meeting with the 12 national leaders who constitute the National Advisory Dental Research Council remarked:

"Our research institutions are devoting more than 100 times as much money to medical research as to dental research. That million-dollar figure for dental research represents about one-tenth of 1 percent of the amount paid to dentists for remedial services. But the one hundred and ten millions devoted to medical research represents more than 6 percent of the amount paid to physicians for medical services."

Dr. Dean now directs expenditures for intramural studies at the National Institute of Dental Research amounting to $212,000 a year. Research grants to 19 institutions are making possible 36 separate projects at a cost of about $200,000.

"All of these activities reflect the most comprehensive approach and the first coordinated attack yet made on dental disease," the magazine points out. "This realistic program makes it possible to use existing dental research facilities, to create needed new facilities, and to integrate these varied efforts."

Dr. Dean in discussing the program of the institute he directs said:

"We are making it possible for the total resources of dentistry to be applied to the tremendous problems of dental diseases on a scale never before possible. This is, in a very real sense, dentistry's own program, with dentists participating in policy making and in program planning; with dentists supervising and directing research projects; and with dentists doing actual research projects themselves.

"I'm no prophet, but I believe the institute's work will help to achieve a balance between the prevention phase of dentistry and the care and treatment phase, an imbalance which has too long been the profession's chief weakness as a medical science. Only during the last 10 or 15 years has dentistry felt the impact and stimulation of basic research. Development of this neglected field—fundamental to a successful control program—may, and in all probability will, markedly change the practice of dentistry a generation hence, and perhaps before."

Dr. Dean's contributions to dentistry were summarized as follows in the dental magazine article:

"Here is an excellent example of a man who is not a prisoner of professionalism but, through a breadth of vision and sound understanding, is able to relate the separate interests of several groups to the larger interests of the whole community, and to join all of these several interests in a democratic partnership of public and private endeavor whose fruitful efforts promise to make history for both dentistry and public health by raising the standards of dental health in America."

Quite a career for a boy born on a farm at the East St. Louis city limits, isn't it?

Let Us Not Forget the Old Folks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, with the mind of the Congress so engrossed in our pressing national emergency, I trust the Members of the House will not overlook entirely the issues that are so important to many of us with regard to the problems of our elder citizens. I speak with particular reference to the subject of reasonable security for them.

Perhaps the question of social security and pensions has progressed further, both in the Congress and throughout the Nation during the interim of the Eighty-first Congress than it has during any similar period of our history. I believe this is true, and for this we are truly grateful. I believe also that this Eighty-first Congress, in addition to giving more thought and study to this subject, has also provided more improvements in our legislation to provide security for our elder citizens than any previous Congress since the Social Security Act was passed way back in 1935. For this, too, we are happy and thankful.

THERE IS MUCH YET TO BE DONE

In spite of all we have accomplished, and regardless of the fact that we have given months of time and study to this subject during this session, our work in this field is far from complete. Instead of fully correcting the faults of our system, Mr. Speaker, we stand today face to face with the same inherent weaknesses in our social-security system that existed when this session of Congress began. We started out with high hopes that the job this time would be complete. We expected that Congress would delve into this subject with such thoroughness and determination as to remake the entire system into a system that would fully provide adequate, equitable social security. The faults of the system, at least many of them, had been long recognized. Years of actual experience had developed great inequities and discriminations. The plain fact that even where the best application of the system was being made its inadequacy still stood out in shocking relief. And, Mr. Speaker, that which concerns me most today is, these same inequalities and inequities still exist. There is no uniformity of application. Citizens in one State do not receive the same amounts in benefits, under public assistance, as citizens of another State. In fact, in many States there is a wide variation in amounts being paid in different parts of the same State. The same humiliating property qualifications, often referred to as needs tests are still indulged in. In fact, I fear that most of the primary objectionable features that existed in our system to provide for our deserving and needy elders, at the time this Congress opened, are still in the system as we face the days leading to our adjournment. I do not

propose to enter into a technical analysis or discussion of this subject here. In fact, I feel that no useful purpose would be served if I should attempt to do so. But, Mr. Speaker, I do want the record to show that we are not through with this subject. That those of us, Members of the House of Representatives, who have been working in this field through the years, are still alive, interested, and working. The objectives for which we have sought during these years are still live issues both in Congress and throughout the Nation. We are still convinced, Mr. Speaker, and let me say more than ever convinced:

First. That this Nation can well afford to provide a reasonable pension for every citizen old enough to retire.

Second. It should be a Federal pension paid by the National Government direct to the citizen, equal in all the States.

Third. Citizens owning property should share in the benefits with those who have no property.

Fourth. A reasonable pension would not seriously contribute to inflation. Persons whose incomes are as little as twenty to thirty dollars per week do not seriously contribute to inflation.

Fifth. There is great need among our deserving elder citizens for adequate legislation to provide such a pension.

Sixth. The work of our joint, or bipartisan, voluntary committee, working for these objectives should be continued in the forthcoming Eighty-second Congress. We shall welcome the cooperation and assistance of every Member of the House, regardless of party and regardless of the stand or views that may be held on any other subject, to join hands with us if you concur in our objectives.

Permit me also to say for the record, Mr. Speaker, that many of us have made some very sacred commitments to our constituents on this issue. How many times have many of us promised our people we would favor and support legislation of this nature? Perhaps the recent campaign was a new high record when it comes to campaign promises for pensions. I believe it was. I believe, too, the American people favor a reasonable, uniform, and honorable old-age pension to take the place of what we call old-age assistance. I feel they expect us to enact such a pension law. I am sure many of us, myself included, have solemnly and sincerely promised to work for the enactment of such a pension law. I for one, and I am sure there are many others, Members of this House, meant it when we made those promises. I want the record to show before this session concludes that I am conscious of my commitments, and that I mean to carry out to the letter the commitments I have made. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the volunteer committee that has worked so well together during this session will be reformed immediately when the new Congress convenes, and our studies and work will continue to go forward. Members will be notified of the first meeting, and I trust that everyone who is interested and who can possibly arrange to do so will unite with us in the very beginning and stay right with us until our work is finish.

I should also at this time, Mr. Speaker, extend to every Member of the House who worked with us so well in this session, my grateful and sincere appreciation. I know Representative VAN ZANDT, chairman for the minority, joins me in sincerely thanking each and every one who has worked so untiringly and with such full cooperation during the many meetings and conferences that we have held on this subject during the 2 years of this session that is now coming to a close. We acknowledge and thank the Committee on Ways and Means for the months of careful study and analysis that they have given to this subject. As I stated before, Mr. Speaker, the Eighty-first Congress has been outstanding in the time, thought, work, and consideration that it has given this subject. I say also, that the amounts of the benefits that have been provided have also been substantial. For all of these things we are truly thankful. But in spite of it all, Mr. Speaker, certain facts remain. They must continue to engage our thoughts and attention. The great study, work, and attention we have given have brought many of us to these very important conclusions. One is that we do have certain inherent weaknesses in our system. Two, that these weaknesses have not been corrected. They are still with us. Three, we should continue our work until we do have operating in the United States of America the kind of a system to provide security for our elder citizens that will do the job and do it correctly; a system of which all citizens, both old and young, can accept as adequate, honorable, and fair. It is to this end that our work will be dedicated in the future as it has in the past. It is for this cause that I call upon every Member of the Congress who concurs, to remain united in our voluntary committee to continue our studies and activities, and with continued cooperation I am sure victory can be won.

Serving the Nation Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, as proof that we in Texas have a deep appreciation of the extraordinary services being rendered the Nation by our junior Senator, LYNDON JOHNSON, I desire to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram entitled "Serving the Nation Well."

It has been said that "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country and in his own house." I take pride in asserting that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, whose warnings we have heard here on the floor since the fall of Germany and Japan, is certainly not without honor in his own State, for his vision and his courage have caused the people of Texas to elevate him to the Senate. That he is performing such splendid service, while not unexpected, is certainly gratifying to those of us who have for many years observed his zeal and his fortitude. Indeed, LYNDON JOHNSON is now receiving the laurels he has so richly earned. We may expect his rewards to increase with his years of public service.

The editorial follows:

SERVING THE NATION WELL

The urgent appeal made by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, on the floor of the Senate last week for more speed and determination in the Nation's rearmament program is not to be dismissed as idle political talk. The warning words he uttered were neither irresponsible nor uninformed. For Senator JOHNSON, as chairman of a Senate "watchdog" subcommittee on preparedness, is perhaps as well informed as any man in Washington on the real state of our preparedness—or lack of it.

A growing sense of crisis is apparent in Washington. It is evidenced by President Truman's emergency message to the Nation by radio. It is implicit in Secretary of Defense Marshall's statement that "all-out war can be initiated by a single word from the other side." It is reflected in the joint statement of a group of Republican leaders, after a White House conference, that "a dangerous emergency exists."

The increasing sense of emergency may be due largely to the gloomy outlook in Korea and the growing indication that the deliberate aim of the Communists may be to draw us into full-scale war. But the realization that we are ill-prepared for such a conflict, if it should come, undoubtedly has been heightened by the revelations of Senator JOHNSON and his able subcommittee since the group began its work last July.

In that time the subcommittee has delved into various phases of the defense program and the economic activities backing it—such things as the supply and development of weapons, the stockpiling of critical materials, the availability of essential agricultural products. Some of the reports it has issued on the basis of these investigations have been stingingly critical, charging carelessness and complacency in such matters as the disposal of surplus war plants and the stockpiling of materials vital to the preparedness effort.

It found, for example, that even after the Korean outbreak brought an acute scarcity of aviation gasoline, one Government-owned plant for producing an essential ingredient of aviation gasoline was disposed of without any provision for its recapture by the Government in the event of need, and another was sold to be dismantled and salvaged. In the face of prospects for a 3,000,000-man armed force, the committee said in another report, the Nation has no wool in its stockpile, no wool in inventory, and less than enough wool in sight through domestic production.

So far in its reports, the Johnson subcommittee has not hesitated to be blunt or to point the finger of blame. But it has not been critical merely for the sake of being critical, nor has it been content to denounce policies without having something to offer in their stead. In some cases, as in its recommendation that Government-owned synthetic rubber plants be reactivated as quickly as possible, it already has got results.

In an article by Henry F. Pringle, Pulitzer prize-winning biographer and distinguished journalist, in the December issue of Nation's Business, the investigating group is credited with being something exceptional among congressional committees. It is described as following closely the rule laid down for it by Chairman JOHNSON at the beginning—to be blunt but not unfair, zealous but not persecuting, helpful but not uncompromis-

ing. Some astonishment is expressed that the committee, contrary to practices usual among congressional committees, has been as willing to hand out praise where it is found to be merited as to place blame where it is found to be deserved.

The tone of the article strongly implies the belief that the subcommittee is making good on its promise of seeking to accelerate, in and out of the Government, the slackening tempo of the postwar period to the pace realistically called for by world events. Such an appraisal is strong evidence that Texas' junior Senator and his committee colleagues are pursuing their task with vigor and impartiality, rising above partisanship and politics to spur the Nation to gather its strength for what could turn into a struggle for survival.

The Johnson subcommittee has pointed out that in some areas of the defense effort demobilization still is taking place at a time when speedy, aggressive mobilization is the imperative need. If the chairman and his colleagues of the preparedness group succeed in reversing this tide, in speeding and coordinating the mobilization effort, it will have rendered a highly patriotic service and will have confirmed the judgment of Texas people in sending Senator JOHNSON to the Senate.

As Mr. Pringle cogently pointed out, such a committee as Senator JOHNSON's can save money running into the billions by bringing about correction of waste and inefficiency. But more important, it may be the means of stirring the laggard and apathetic into the action that may mean the difference between weakness and strength and not inconceivably could mean the difference between victory and defeat.

The American Medical Association, Under the Whittaker & Baxter Advertising Regime, Should Be Investigated for Their Pernicious Lobbying Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Lobbying should give close attention to the past and present political activities of the American Medical Association and its subordinate groups and subsidiaries throughout the Nation.

A definite pattern was laid down and followed in the various States except California. I have been informed that California was made an exception because Governor Warren had advocated previously a very comprehensive State health program, which as far as scope and benefits were concerned fairly eclipsed the Truman health program, and Republicanism operating under the medical smoke screen did not want to embarrass their former vice presidential candidate, and so orders were issued perhaps for Whittaker & Baxter and the American Medical Association to lay off of California. It was quite easy for Whittaker & Baxter to lay off, as they had handled previously a number of campaigns for Governor Warren and California Republicanism, and owed their very American Medical Association jobs to extreme right-winged Republicans.

The organized doctors in other States north of the Mason and Dixon's line took the forefront instead of the reactionary wing of the Republican Party, which went underground politically during the last campaign. I have good reason to believe that the AMA'ers were not interlopers but took over the Republican leadership by prearrangement. The Republican right-wingers for some time have been aware of the fact that they have lost caste almost entirely with the people generally, and searched about to enlist the political aid of some widely distributed group of people which had not lost entirely up to then, their influence and respectability as far as the majority of the voting public was concerned, and by a lucky stroke of political fortune hit upon the organized medicos. The idea first began to take shape when Dr. Fishbein got his walking papers from the American Medical Association and the childless man and wife combination, then composed of Papa Whittaker and Mamma Baxter of the Whittaker-Baxter Advertising propagandists, took over Papa Fishbein's duties. This organization won its spurs in California by conducting a number of lie and smear campaigns for California Republicanism which is controlled largely by greedy and selfish private utilities, oil, gas, railroad, real estate, and other truly Fascist groups. As usual bad things come high financially and this was no exception to the rule as far as the services of the Whittaker-Baxter combination is concerned as the following figures on file in the office of the file clerk of the House of Representatives, room 521, of the House Office Building discloses:

On April 2, 1949, this advertising firm filed, under Public Law 601, a statement in which was recited the financial terms of their contract with the National Education Campaign of the American Medical Association. Pursuant to these contractual provisions, Whittaker and Baxter were to receive $8,330 per month for a period of 2 years, for a total contract price of $199,920. The contract further provides that "48 percent will constitute reimbursement for necessary expenses and one-half of the remainder as compensation for activities contemplated."

Following this contract, Pappy Whittaker and Mammy Baxter got in free-wheeling gear with their lies and smear and although there never was any socialized medicine bill pending in the Congress, they wheezed loudly that there was such a bill. Although President Truman's health plan was not by the greatest stretch of the imagination socialized medicine they croaked frantically that it was just that. Although compulsory health insurance no more resembled socialized medicine than the Whittaker-Baxter advertising programs resembles legitimacy and decency in advertising, they screamed wildly that they were synonymous.

The names of the publications authored by these well-trained lie and smear campaigners according to their statement submitted to the House of Representatives along with their lobby report are:

First. Free America Receives an Exciting Invitation From Doctors.
Second. It's Your Crusade, Too.
Third. Your Cooperation Can Help.
Fourth. The Boys in Room 1106.
Fifth. Medical Progress Versus Political Medicine.

Editorially the League Reporter of December 11, 1950, had this to say editorially about the campaign of the American Medical Association:

THE DOCTORS' PRESCRIPTION

The doctors' lobby, which teamed with real estate brokers, gas company executives, and newspaper publishers to smear all liberals in the recent political campaign, reports whopping expenditures for the first half of 1950.

The American Medical Association (AMA) has filed with the Clerk of the House a report showing it gave $545,450 to its press agents, Whittaker & Baxter, during the first 6 months of the year. This included $50,000 in fees to Clem Whittaker and Leone Baxter.

When an organization representing such a small proportion of the population can spend money like that, the need for funds by trade-union groups and other progressives is emphasized once again.

Labor's League is convinced liberal candidates will win when the people understand the issues. But it takes education to show them what the issues are. And education takes money.

The AMA understands that. That's why it is forcing doctors to cough up $25 a year to twist those issues.

Members of Congress and the general public were privileged to be given a "quicky" peek behind the bloated medical front, when a few days ago the alleged coordinating committee, national education campaign, and the board of trustees of the American Medical Association printed and distributed a most expensive booklet entitled "Main Street Speaks Out for American Medicine and for Freedom."

The following quotes are taken from this pamphlet:

From page 1, title page:

For the first time in American history businesses, industries, trades, professions, and individuals combined to make common cause for the freedom of one profession—American medicine. In October 1950, more than 65,000 persons in all walks of life, throughout the Nation, spent $2,000,000 to say through radio and the public press: "Thumbs down on Government medicine, or any other step toward socialization in this country."

From page 2:

The doctors' gigantic advertising campaign, during October, reached virtually every American who could hear or read—not just once, but several times.

Media:	*Audience reached* *Circulation*
10,300 newspaper and Sunday supplements	115,630,437
1,600 radio stations	108,205,034
55 national magazines	55,202,080

The purpose of the project was to demonstrate publicly that rank-and-file citizens stand with medicine in its fight for freedom.

The cost of the advertising program, totaling $1,100,000, was borne by doctors in every community in the Nation.

From page 3:

MAIN STREET SPENDS $2,000,000 TO SAY: "ON THE ISSUE OF COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE, WE STAND WITH AMERICAN MEDICINE"

Doctors believe that the medical problems of a patient—or of a nation—should be solved by medical people, not by politicians. They know that such problems are much nearer solution here in the United States than in any country where the government controls and directs medical affairs. Doctors invited other Americans to express their own convictions publicly by way of radio and in the advertising columns of the newspapers. Tens of thousands accepted the invitation, joined the huge project and responded with public affirmations of their own.

THE RECORD SPEAKS FOR ITSELF

Number of individual advertisers taking part, 65,246. These firms bought space in their own local newspapers or time on radio stations to express their conviction that "the voluntary way is the American way," as opposed to compulsion.

Inches of advertising space bought by participants, 1,186,594. This is in addition to the newspaper advertising space sponsored by doctors in their own Nation-wide schedule.

Total amount expended by participating advertisers, $2,019,849. Included in this total are expenditures for 35,362 radio spots, direct mail, posters, billboards, and television programs, carrying the message for freedom in medicine, paid for by nonmedical businesses, industries, and professions. This amount, spent by the public to demonstrate its confidence in the medical profession and its faith in freedom, totaled nearly twice medicine's own advertising expenditure to present the basic message.

Participating in the survey of thousands of newspapers, magazines, and radio stations were the following agencies, to which the appreciation of the medical profession is extended: Advertising Checking Bureau, Inc., Western Newspaper Union, National Editorial Association, many advertising agencies, whose friendly counsel was invaluable, and International Business Machines Corp. (As this report goes to press, 1,240 newspapers remain to be checked.)

From page 4:

HOW AMERICA ANSWERED THE ROLL CALL

People in every geographical area, every economic bracket, every type of work, joined in simultaneously—at their own expense—to advertise their views on the issue of compulsion versus the voluntary way. The main conclusion that can be drawn from such overwhelming response is that Americans are thoroughly aware that the socialization of one profession means eventual socialization of others—and that they don't want any part of the process in America.

Businesses, professions, industries, and trades which advertised their views

Type of business:	Number participating
Automobile dealers	1,266
Banks, brokers	1,665
Dairies	1,068
Dress shops	56
Drug stores, retail	10,621
Drug wholesalers and manufacturers	27
Dry goods stores	384
Groceries, meat markets, bakeries	993
Hospitals and clinics	559
Hardware stores, lumber yards	709
Insurance, general; agents, brokers	4,755
Insurance, life; agents, companies	819
Insurance, health and accident; companies, agents, brokers	2,624
Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans	67
Other nonprofit medical-hospital plans	13
Manufacturers (shoes, woolen, tiles, uniforms, etc.)	611
Men's furnishings	257
Moving-picture theaters	17
Pharmaceutical associations; State, county, local	44
Physicians, dentists, nurses	6,936
Restaurants and fountains	607
Public utilities	192
Medical societies; State, county, local	261
Organizations: Civic, women's, veterans, service clubs	286
Dental associations; State, county, local	26
Not classified: Cleaners, jewelers, garages, beauty shops, music stores, lawyers, labor groups, etc	30,383
Total	65,246

All advertisements, International Business Machines cards, figures, and reports from which this survey is taken, are in the files of International Business Machines Corp. and the American Medical Association.

On pages 6 and 7, the following businessmen and newspapers were cited as having "stood up to be counted":

J. D. Battle, executive vice president, National Coal Association, Washington, D. C.

Roy's Body & Fender Co., Hammond, Ind.

Fred R. Waldron, executive vice president, the Morris Plan Co., Terre Haute, Ind.

A. W. Peake, president, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Chicago, Ill.

David Karelitz, advertising manager, United Cigar-Whelan Stores Corp., New York, N. Y.

Bob Allen, clothing store, East Street, St. Louis, Ill.

Justin Dart, president, Rexall Drug, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.

New York Medicine (official publication of the Medical Society of the County of New York).

C. I. Weaver, chairman, the Ohio Fuel Gas Co., Columbus, Ohio.

H. E. Rogler, president, First National Bank, Vandalia, Ill.

H. G. Zelle, president, Missouri Insurance Co., St. Louis, Mo.

Lon C. Hill, president, Central Power & Light Co., Corpus Christi, Tex.

Carl N. Jacobs, president, Hardware Mutual Casualty Co., Stevens Point, Wis.

Fireman's Fund Insurance Group, San Francisco, Calif.

J. F. Douglas, chairman, finance committee, Carnation Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

Shipman Surgical Co., 313 University St., Seattle, Wash.

Henry Zentner, president, the Oshkosh National Bank, Oshkosh, Wis.

Isenhart Furniture, Wenatchee, Wash.

H. P. Hood & Sons, Dairy Products, Boston, Mass.

C. J. Roesch, executive secretary, Texas Pharmaceutical Association, Austin, Tex.

Martin's Garage, Freer, Tex.

Judd C. Benson, president, National Association of Life Underwriters, New York.

Charles W. Bishop, assistant to vice president, Chrysler Corp., Detroit, Mich.

W. W. Campbell, president, National Bank of Eastern Arkansas, Forrest City, Ark.

George M. Clark, president, Pioneer Bank, Chattanooga, Tenn.

Sioux Valley Bank, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

Louis B. Round, president, Pennsylvania Power Co., New Castle, Pa.

W. P. Anderton, M. D., secretary, the Medical Society of the State of New York.

William L. Hutcheson, president United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.

Meyersdale Republican, Meyersdale, Pa.

Herald, Park Ridge, Ill.

Dr. William M. Gambrell, president, State Medical Association of Texas.

Dr. Frank J. Holroyd, president, West Virginia State Medical Association.

Chronicle, St. Clair, Mo.

Edwin A. Goodwin, publisher, Michigan State Digest, Lansing, Mich.

Glen Jones, publisher, Messenger, Troy, Ala.

Drug Trade News, October 30, 1950.

The American Press.

Frank Smith, Associated Medical Care Plans.

A. L. Kirkpatrick, manager, insurance department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.

Publisher's Tab, NEA.

Editorial, Hearst Newspapers.

Don Eck, general manager, National Editorial Association, Chicago, Ill.

Frank A. Freeman, Publisher's Auxiliary.

Milwaukee Sentinel, Milwaukee, Wis.

Mrs. Drury Hinton, president, Woman's Auxiliary-Medical Society, Pennsylvania.

Times, Manchester, Tenn.

Ed Dannelly, editor, Andalusia Star-News, Andalusia, Ala.

On the back page this item appears:

Dear fellow doctors and friends of medicine: We take pleasure in transmitting to you this brief booklet summarizing the results of medicine's national advertising campaign, and reporting that our advertising objective has been fulfilled far beyond our expectations.

Today, all the Nation knows that American medicine does not stand alone. Everywhere new allies have taken determined public stand beside us.

We believe this simultaneous action by tens of thousands of people in every part of the Nation, speaking out in behalf of freedom for one profession, is a record of great, new significance, not only to medicine, but in the field of advertising and public relations, and in public affairs and Government as well.

On behalf of the profession, we should like to acknowledge deep gratitude to those legions of Americans who have recognized medicine's campaign as a basic crusade for freedom.

Our great appreciation goes to those who by advertising their views to the public give tangible evidence of their confidence in American medicine and in the continuing crusade for the voluntary way of life.

Coordinating Committee, National Education Campaign and the Board of Trustees, American Medical Association: Elmer L. Henderson, M. D., president, American Medical Association, Chairman, Coordinating Committee, Louisville, Ky.; Louis H. Bauer, M. D., Chairman, Board of Trustees, American Medical Association, Vice Chairman, Coordinating Committee, Hempstead, N. Y.; John W. Cline, M. D., President Elect, American Medical Association, San Francisco, Calif.; R. B. Robins, M. D., Vice President, American Medical Association, Camden, Ark.; William Bates, M. D., Philadelphia, Pa.; F. J. L. Blasingame, M. D., Wharton, Tex.; Gunnar Gundersen, M. D., La Crosse, Wis.; Edwin S. Hamilton, M. D., Secretary, Board of Trustees, Kankakee, Ill.; Leonard W. Larson, M. D., Bismarck, N. Dak.; Walter B. Martin, M. D., Norfolk, Va.; Edward J. McCormick, M. D., Toledo, Ohio; Thomas P. Murdock, M. D., Meriden, Conn.; Dwight H. Murray, M. D., Vice Chairman, Board of Trustees, Napa, Calif.; George A. Unfug, M. D., Pueblo, Colo.; George F. Lull, M. D., General Manager, American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill.

I contend that the very conspirators themselves have exposed their own foul conspiracy and may rightly take their place with the ravens—the only birds who foul their own nests.

They Critically Prattle and Babble While Patriots Die and Old Joe et al. Rejoice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed difficult for one to believe that men who have been privileged to be born, live, and be honored signally in this great country of ours would become so politically benighted that in this hour of peril they would insist upon exercising to the full their right of freedom of speech against our President and the members of his Cabinet. I do not advocate that freedom of speech be curtailed in any way but I do claim that common decency and true Americanism should prompt some people to correct their talking behavior.

If there ever was a time when speech was silver and silence was golden it is now as far as speaking about supposed mistakes upon the part of the leadership of our country is concerned.

I have observed men, who should be and doubtless are real patriots under ordinary circumstances, fairly chortle with glee when Secretary of Defense Marshall is characterized as a sick old man with a memory so bad that he forgot where he was the night before Pearl Harbor, who assume a puritanical mien when someone denounces and questions the loyalty and patriotism of Secretary of State Acheson; and who seemingly look with approval upon those pygmy minds who bend every effort to make President Truman's trying task more difficult by goading him with telegrams and letters and indirectly seeking to take over the duties of the office of Chief Executive and Commander in Chief.

I sometimes wonder, if when these misguided men are concocting their almost fiendish doings, they ever stop to think that old Joe Stalin and his satellites are also enjoying their doings immensely. I wonder if these people realize what an unpatriotic disservice they are doing at this time to this Nation and its people.

We are preparing to oppose an enemy which is the most sinister ever known to civilized man. This is no laughing or criticizing matter as far as patriotic Americans are concerned. This is a serious and somber moment in the lives of every American. I cannot understand why men to whom have been delegated serious duties and responsibilities should discharge them in a way and manner injurious and detrimental to the Republic.

The right of free speech is a great right but it is not superior to the privilege of being truly American and really patriotic.

Everyone should respect their superiors. People have given to President Truman and he in turn has delegated to others in Government, great responsibilities and burdensome duties. How can this Nation hope to have its juveniles respect law, authority, and position when some of the honored oldsters are setting such a bad example of disrespect for authority, for the rules of common decency, and for the very fate of our country.

I now wish to call your attention to several newpaper articles which I think are well worth reading and seriously considering:

On December 18, 1950, the following editorial appeared in the CIO News:

LET'S CUT IT OUT

We had hoped that the brickbat-throwing season in Washington would come to an end as the international situation became more serious—but we hoped in vain.

We had hoped, too, that the mud slinging which accompanied this year's political campaign would end with the election—but it didn't.

Those who began yelling "Get Dean Acheson" in an effort to influence the election outcome are still at it—and in some respects the situation is now worse than it was a few months ago.

The latest Judo twist goes this way:

"It makes no difference whether Secretary of State Acheson is innocent or guilty of the charges made against him; he should be fired because he no longer has the confidence of the American people."

Those who peddle this phony line act as if Acheson, instead of Joe Stalin, provided our No. 1 problem.

They act as if the battle against the State Department is as important as the battle against the Reds in Korea.

It's disgraceful—and it ought to stop.

It ought to stop because it's wrong, because there is no justification for the "get Acheson" drive and because our internal squabbling is demoralizing to our own Government and to our allies.

And, furthermore, there's no indication that a new Secretary of State—if one were selected—would get any better treatment than that accorded Acheson.

ANNA ROSENBERG ALSO IS VICTIM

Latest victim of the brickbat throwing—other than Acheson—is Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, selected a few weeks ago as Assistant Secretary of Defense, who was accused of having attended Communist meetings at some time in the distant past.

The Senate Armed Service Committee has some very important work dealing with the Nation's security which should be handled, but it spent much of last week looking into the accusations against Mrs. Rosenberg.

The evidence against her—if indeed it was evidence—was provided by a fellow who says he was an ex-Communist. He said he had seen Mrs. Rosenberg at the meetings.

She flatly denied the charge. Senators examining FBI records said they contained nothing to back up the accusation. And the committee cleared her by unanimous vote.

Mrs. Rosenberg has a long and good record of public service. There is nothing in it to indicate that she is one of those subversive elements about which some of our lawmakers love to rave and rant.

Maybe those responsible for the charge against Mrs. Rosenberg were actually out to get her—but there's a growing suspicion in many quarters that Secretary of Defense Marshall, who wanted her as an assistant, is the real target.

One of the objectives of the Reds right now is to disrupt the operations of our war-defense set-up. They must be getting a kick out of seeing somebody else do the job for them.

THE JUDO VOICE CARRIES POISON, FEAR

A great exponent of judoism on the newspaper fraternity says President Truman should be removed from office unless the administration sanctions use of Chinese Nationalist troops in Korea. The United Nations alone has that right. If President Truman or the United States did so, it would be unauthorized aggression.

In the light of the statement, it is interesting to read the following article in the Catholic Commonweal, a widely read Catholic weekly, by Associate Editor Francis Downing:

The voice of Judo is abroad in the land; it is now, as it was in the beginning, a poisoned and fearful thing. It went on forever making unproved charges, forever irresponsible, forever merely free of libel; it went on exploiting the insecure, the anxious, the confused, and the afraid.

It went on attacking Alger Hiss, assaulting Mr. Acheson, attacking perverts, attacking unnamed Communists, attacking Yalta, praising MacArthur as if he were God and Judo had invented him; it went on, the voice, and it harassed the discontent, and it assigned guilt, and it called names, and it laid the blame; and it talked to the emotions, and it was like balm and it assuaged. In every case where it made foreign policy an issue it won.

It told no truth, and held no answers, but won. It is like the taste of pennies in the mouth; it fills me with fear.

We have known demagogues in our political history, but this is a special kind—an evil kind, a deliberate kind; it adds falseness to the already false.

It represents the other side of the election coin. It is the spurious and the counterfeit.

It would be legal tender nowhere in any world where reason was and where intelligence was operative. Yet men took it as though it were legal tender and had value and was clean and bright and new and had been minted honestly.

It Is a Tribute to the Ingenuity and Courage of Our Airmen That More Than 15,000 United Nations Casualties Have Been Flown to Safety From the Battlefields of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, outside of the Berlin airlift, an operation carried on for more than a year, and which affected the lives of several million persons, history has seen no air operation comparable to the evacuation of our casualties out of the Korean battlefields.

It is because of the heroism and courage displayed by our airmen that I submit to the consideration of the membership of this House, the following editorial from the Evening Star.

The editorial reads as follows:

AIR RESCUES IN KOREA

It is a tribute to the ingenuity and courage of our airmen that more than 15,000 United Nations casualties have been flown to safety from the battlefields of Korea. Several types of planes—particularly the helicopter—have been engaged in the operation. Exposed most of the time to enemy fire, and in many cases landing in areas entirely surrounded by Chinese Communists, they have carried out their missions of mercy in a way that lends a kind of new, humanizing dimension to the grim art of warfare. In effect, through their continuing rescues of the ill, the frostbitten, and the wounded, they have saved

roughly the equivalent of a division of troops. But more than that, wholly apart from the military significance involved, these machines and their daring crews have come as ministering angels to brave young men who otherwise, being trapped and unable to fend for themselves, might have died in great suffering or been sent off to await some dark fate in faraway prison camps. That they have been brought to safety is one of the very few heart-warming aspects of the bleak Korean story. All hands responsible for it deserve the highest commendation.

Excess-Profits Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, when the recent excess-profits bill was on the floor, we had no opportunity to make any amendments nor will we have when the conference report is returned.

We know that the tax problem is just starting and that, immediately after the Eighty-second Congress convenes, the Ways and Means Committee will start to survey the whole problem of taxes. I am submitting for their perusal and consideration a plan suggested by Prof. Charles H. Porter, formerly of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He presents some ideas worthy of consideration, and I am asking that they be inserted in the RECORD so that all those interested may have a chance to study them:

EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

(By Charles H. Porter)

Excess profits are the extra profits made by a company as a result of war mobilization over and above the profits that company would have made in a world at peace.

There is no perfect formula for determining excess profits.

We must strive to devise a formula which will not confuse profits due to superior efficiency or due to added investment with profits due to war.

Since the end of World War II, corporations have spent hundreds of millions in expanding and modernizing plant. Much of this plan has been completed so recently that it has been producing for only a fraction of the postwar years, and some of it is not even now in production. These millions of dollars of added investment would be earning profits in 1951 even if there were no war or mobilization for war. In many cases the actual pretax profits of the expanding companies, though greater than in the base period, will be smaller than they would have been if there were no war. The normal rate of return on added investment differs between industries. The determination of an invested capital base and the adjustment of it for change, involving the effective date of change as well as the amount of change, are difficult.

The old excess-profits tax resulted in many claims for adjustments and refunds. Some of these were not settled for several years, and there may be some which are not yet settled. How many of these settlements were inequitable in a matter of opinion. There is no question but that the settlement negotiations consumed an enormous amount of time and energy on the part both of employees of the Department of Internal Revenue and of the executives of the corporations involved.

We need, therefore, an excess-profits formula which is based on the relation between the 1951 profits of each company and the profits of that same company in the base period and which makes proper allowance for the expansion of the company but does not require a determination of the dollars of invested capital.

The following formula is suggested for consideration. It is far from perfect. There are valid objections to it. The question is whether the imperfections in it are less important than the imperfections in the old excess-profits tax or in other suggested formula.

(A) Determine the total pretax net income for the entire base period, subtract all interest and dividends received or included in net income, add all interest paid or accrued, add the total of individual salary payments in excess of $3,000 per annum; i. e., the difference between total payroll and social-security payroll.

(B) Determine the total social-security payroll for the entire base period; i. e., the total payroll less individual salaries in excess of $3,000 per annum.

The ratio of the first amount (A) to the second amount (B) is the normal peacetime profit ratio for that company. Apply that ratio to the wartime social-security payroll to determine the dollars of normal pretax profit of that company for the war year. Actual profits—adjusted by interest, dividends, etc., as for the base period—in excess of this amount are excess profits.

(NOTE.—The increase in the social-security maximum salary from $3,000 to $3,600 requires an adjustment. Which figure is used is comparatively unimportant so long as the same limit is used for both periods. It may be easier to adjust the 1951 figure to $3,000, the need being known at the time, rather than to correct the figures of all base years.)

Some alternative method should be authorized for companies having losses or subnormal profits in the base period, e. g., Waltham Watch.

Even though the suggested formula should prove after study to be satisfactory for manufacturing companies or department stores, it would still be necessary to devise an alternative formula for banks, insurance companies, and other financial institutions and for personal service companies.

The underlying assumption is that for any one company the number of employees and payroll will increase in proportion to increase in capital invested in plant and that the volume of business and of profits will vary with the number of employees. There will, of course, be a substantial difference between good and bad years, but, whatever formula is used, we have to use the average of a base period as a yardstick. For any one company, is not the ratio of profits to payroll more nearly constant than any other easily determined ratio?

Among the apparent advantages are:

1. The excess profits of any company are determined by a comparison with the prewar profits of that same company.

2. Because both interest expense and interest income are excluded, no adjustment need be made because of substitution of stock for bonds or other changes in sources of capital.

3. Because the date when additional capital invested in plant begins to earn a return coincides with the date when additional employees are needed to operate such plant, these profits will not be confused with additional profits earned on old plant because of the war.

4. Since the purchasing power of payroll dollars, inventory dollars, and dollars invested in receivables are at all times on the same level, increased payroll for the same number of employees will parallel the needed increase in capital invested in inventories, etc.

5. The use of social-security payroll rather than gross payroll will deter a company from increasing the salaries of executives on the theory that the Government will pay 85 percent (?) of the increase.

The ups and downs of the social-security payroll more nearly parallel the ups and downs in business activity and profits than do the ups and downs of the total payroll, because many executives receive the same salary in good times and bad.

6. It avoids the assumption that the normal rate of return on additional invested capital is the same for all industries. This, of course, varies with the risk factor and whether the industry is stable or highly cyclical in character.

7. The use only of amounts already definitely a matter of record will greatly simplify the determination of excess profits both for the corporation and for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

8. In the old excess-profits tax the effort to give some protection to companies expanding normally allowed an invested capital base which actually gave a "free ride" to companies which were slipping, which had large unused capacity, and whose increased profits were due entirely to the war. Since the profits-to-payroll ratio adequately protects companies expanding normally, the alternative tax based on invested capital can fairly be made stiffer than before and would recapture true excess profits.

Among the disadvantages are:

1. Companies would be penalized which have greatly increased the degree of mechanization in their operations, thereby increasing their invested capital while reducing their payroll; e. g., some coal companies. Such companies could use the alternative method available to companies with subnormal prewar profits.

2. Companies manufacturing new products for the Army might require a greater than normal percentage of high-salaried engineers and other experts. Their salaries in excess of $3,000 would be included in excess profits.

3. Companies with unused capacity in base period would get a "free ride." Outside of the aircraft industry, such industries are rare. If these or others work on military orders, their prices and profits are subject to renegotiation. Whether the Government recovers excess cost to it through excess-profits tax or through renegotiation is immaterial.

4. An increase in rates of pay on cost-plus contracts would increase the proportion of total profit not defined as excess profit. Since it is almost impossible to reduce rates of pay once granted, a company doing this would know that it would lose in the long run, and if it had other contracts not on a cost-plus basis, it would lose immediately.

Interest and dividends received are properly excluded from excess profits. (Except for financial institutions to which this suggested formula is not applicable.) Interest is usually that received on Government bonds and in any case is such a small percentage of the capital invested in interest-bearing bonds or notes that it cannot be considered excessive. Dividends received are paid from the residual income of other corporations which have already paid a tax on excess profits, if any, and have paid all other taxes. The transfer of these already taxed profits as dividends to a second corporation does not make them profits due to the war and therefore excessive.

The profit-to-payroll ratio is preferable to a profit-to-sales ratio because a company operating at capacity can greatly increase its sales volume by subcontracting. Increased profits to the prime contractor resulting from wartime subcontracting are certainly due to the war and should not be exempted from an excess-profit tax.

Even if the apparent advantages of the proposed formula outweigh the apparent disadvantages, the next step is to compute for

several typical companies the "normal profit ratio" for the probable base years and apply it to the estimated payroll of 1951. Will this figure compared with the estimated pretax profit for 1951 result in an excess-profits tax, and if so, should it or should it not?

Woman Gets First-Hand Data on Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article regarding socialized medicine by Jessie Fant Evans, able Washington Star staff member. This article, based on an interview with Dr. Elizabeth Webb Wilson, noted woman actuary and author, is, in my opinion, must reading for Members of Congress. It follows:

[From the Washington Star of December 3, 1950]

WOMAN GETS FIRST-HAND DATA ON MEDICINE IN ENGLAND

(By Jessie Fant Evans)

Challenging statements in regard to the British socialized medicine program are made by Dr. Elizabeth Webb Wilson, internationally known woman actuary and author of a recent book on compulsory health insurance. Dr. Wilson, a former resident of this city, is here for a series of economic conferences. She holds a doctor of philosophy from Radcliffe College, wears a Phi Beta Kappa key and won her bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees at George Washington University, as well as the GWU alumni achievement award.

She says: "The British compulsory, socialized medicine program is costing 3 times what the government anticipated it would. Both doctors and patients are at the mercy of regulation by bureaucrats. For instance, a physician in Great Britain cannot now move his office into the next block, take on an assistant, or go on an extended vacation unless his petition to do so is approved by the local council, representing the Ministry of Health."

She also quotes Lord Horder, the King's physician, as saying, "The progress of British medicine has been set back 100 years by the National Health Service."

MADE SECOND SURVEY

Dr. Wilson attended the centenary of the British Institute of Actuaries in London in 1948 and was the only woman granted the privilege of speaking before it. She subsequently made an intensive 3-month study of the socialized-medicine program. She recently returned from another 3 months' follow-up survey of how it is working.

"I have never been so intensively occupied in my life," Dr. Wilson told me. "I visited high and low in my efforts to get accurate answers to four questions: 1. What is happening to the economy of the country because of the service? 2. How are the inevitable controls acting on the liberties of physicians and patients? 3. How is it affecting the quality of medical care? 4. What do people think of it?"

With regard to the first two questions, she stated: "Britain is spending between 4 and 5 percent of her national income for the service. This is more than 10 percent of the taxes she collects. Workers pay only a small part through payroll deductions. The rest comes from income- and sales-tax collections." She quoted Sir Hubert Henderson, British economist, to the effect that "expenditures for the national health service are peculiarly inflationary."

COST EXCEEDS ESTIMATES

According to Dr. Wilson, before the service started its advocates expected it would cost about £152,000,000. In its third year £464,000,000 have been appropriated and possibly the estimate may be exceeded. She pointed out that this is not a complete accounting, since there has been no hospital expansion, although there are 90,000 in London waiting hospitalization. She also claims there are no new nurses' homes, although there are 40,000 nurses needed, many of whom could be secured if housing were available.

"Inevitably, when the bill is presented, it will be higher than the £500,000,000 set as the danger line by Dr. Ff. Rogers, British medical economist," she stated.

"Naturally," Dr. Wilson continued, "the pressure from the exchequer for economy is resulting in more and more controls. Already doctors, dentists, and pharmacists are regimented by the fact that Minister of Health Bevan is to all intents and purposes the only employer of their professional skill. As such he has cut renumeration of the dentists and pharmacists to less than was promised before the service began. The general practitioners, too, are contending Mr. Bevan has never paid them their due. The result is that both English family doctors and Scottish pharmacists are threatening to leave the service."

She called attention to the threat last October of the British Medical Association to pull 19,000 doctors out of the Labor Government's free medical treatment program unless their pay raise is significant.

With the Ministry of Health owning 96 percent of the hospitals, specialists are chained to their posts as definitely as if shackles were visible, she quoted from the Martin report.

"GROCERY STORE" MEDICINE

In answer to question 3 her examples are the hurried prescription as a pallative instead of a cure, the cursory examinations, the patients' demands for specific drugs—"grocery store" medicine, the doctors call it.

In conclusion she summed up her reply to her fourth question to this effect: "I interviewed 300 people whose opinions I did not know in advance. A majority were from the lower income groups. Much to my surprise I found that three out of four did not like the service. They criticized the quality of care and resented its cost to their government and thus to them in taxes."

In pursuit of information she visited a factory in Birmingham which turns out small household appliances. Here she talked with each worker. "Then," she said, "I sat in a doctor's surgery, or office, as we would call it, situated in a factory district. He saw 90 patients in 3 hours, some of whom had to wait more than 2 hours for about 2 minutes of his time. I talked to hairdressers, station porters, waitresses, people, in queques before restaurants and in crowds awaiting a glimpse of "Winnie" (Winston Churchill), and the news of Princess Anne's birth."

Dr. Wilson was a guest at the Queen's garden party. She had tea and dinner with the Prime Minister and Mrs. Attlee and their family at Checquers, and she was the first woman to have luncheon in the offices of the Friends' Provident and Century Insurance Co., of which J. Douglas Pringle, one of Britain's prominent industrialists is president. Lady Frank's father, Mr. Tanner, is chairman of the board. She sat between these two distinguished gentlemen.

Hire the Handicapped—It's Good Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert the article which won second prize in the national contest of the President's program on Employ-the-Handicapped Week. This was written by Miss Anne Manning, a student at St. Xavier's Academy in Providence, R. I. The prize-winning article follows:

HIRE THE HANDICAPPED—IT'S GOOD BUSINESS

(By Anne Manning)

Seating himself behind his huge mahogany desk, Mr. Stapleton spoke to his associate.

"You know, I have been contemplating hiring several new workers in the plant, and it came to my mind that lately there has been considerable mention of hiring handicapped persons in industry. Just why is such stress being placed on vocational rehabilitation today?"

"Well," responded his colleague, "it seems since Pearl Harbor five American civilians have become disabled for every disabled American soldier. At least 1,500,000 men and women in the civilian population have some disability which constitutes a barrier to their fullest mental, physical, social, vocational, and economic usefulness. And their number increases by 200,000 a year through accidents and illness or from congenital causes. These Americans have as much right to be independent and self-supporting to their fullest capabilities as they have to freedom of speech and worship. The only way is found through the vocational rehabilitation programs operated by the States with the assistance of the Federal Government which urge businessmen and employees like yourself to provide an opportunity for these disabled persons to advance."

"Yes; I see that, but what about efficiency? A plant like this could not run without it. Certainly one who is handicapped cannot be as efficient as an able-bodied person."

Stapleton's voice betrayed his doubts.

"Services such as counseling, training, and retraining, and physical restoration to remove or reduce the handicap are offered the disabled person. He is trained usually in one field at which he may be particularly adept. Studies have shown that handicapped persons prove to be just as efficient or even more efficient than the nondisabled."

"Is there not more convincing proof of their efficiency? Do many large concerns hire physically handicapped persons?" Businessmen are fond of statistics.

"Why, surely. Several nationally known companies hire many disabled persons and testify favorably as to the quality and quantity of their work. Some employers, such as George Barr & Co., recruit their employees almost wholly from the disabled group. Of the 142 employees in this firm, 127 are deaf, blind, orthopedically disabled, epileptic, cerebral palsied, arthritic, or mentally deficient. Ninety-five percent of the Minneapolis Artificial Limbs Co. are orthopedically disabled. The Ford Motor Co. has made it a practice to employ handicapped workers in its plants in proportion to their number in the population within the area surrounding the plant. As of October 1944, this company employed 11,300 handicapped workers."

"You mentioned quality and quantity of work. Just what indication do these companies have of their satisfaction?" Stapleton settled back in his chair.

"Although few studies have actually measured relative efficiency of handicapped and nonhandicapped workers, there are innumerable testimonials to the efficiency of the handicapped as compared to that of the able-bodied. In fact, companies such as Caterpillar Tractor, Walter Kidde & Co., Consolidated Vultee, the Minneapolis Honeywell Regulator Co., and others, indicate that the production rate of the handicapped is as good or better than that of the able-bodied. Also, two companies, the Barr Co. and Minneapolis Artificial Limb Co., whose employment policies are to hire a large proportion of physically disabled, state that handicapped people are eager workers, capable of maintaining their efforts when the job fits them, over as long or longer periods of time."

"Yes; but that brings us to absenteeism. Is it not possible that a handicapped person is more apt to miss more working hours than the able-bodied worker.

"During the war, stress was laid on the absentee record of the employees because of the necessity of maximum production and absenteeism records are still one of the most important components of successful management. Four of the companies I previously mentioned all reported that the handicapped had fewer absences than other workers. However, the largest number of studies showed no appreciable difference between absenteeism of handicapped and nonhandicapped workers. In the study made by Cincinnati Occupational Research Association, handicapped workers were reported losing around six man-hours per month which did not vary significantly from the five to eight man-hours lost per month for all causes by industrial employees reported to the War Manpower Commission for the period June 1943–April 1944.

"Similarly, the survey made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics showed 93 percent of the employers believed handicapped had equal or better absenteeism records while of the 97 employers reporting to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, 95 percent believed the handicapped had equal or better than average absenteeism records."

"I imagine there is more danger of accidents where a disabled person is concerned. "Can they be insured?"

"One of the biggest hurdles for the handicapped is the belief held by many employers who have not yet given them a trial, that they are more prone to accidents. In a study made by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, 98 percent of the employers said the handicapped had either the same or lower accident rate than the able-bodied. Another questionnaire revealed that 96 percent of the handicapped lost no time due to accidents. The most convincing arguments for employers as to the low-accident rate of the physically handicapped comes from the organization that has to pay for the accidents.

"The Association of Casualty and Surety Executives in February 1944, stated that it is the policy and practice of member companies of this association not to advise employers against employment of disabled persons. The initial rate for workmen's compensation insurance is governed by the industrial classification involved. The physical defects of such workers are not considered in the formulas for determining that rate and no higher rate is charged because of employment of physically disabled persons. Nor is such employment prohibited in any way by the terms of workmen's compensation insurance policies. Does that answer your question on insurance?

"Yes; completely. But, finally, does the physically handicapped employee require any special considerations? Just how should the employer treat him?

"The belief that the handicapped require special considerations or modifications of the job to suit their needs, all of which entail additional cost, is frequently an obstacle to their employment. Evidence indicated that such special considerations are necessary. Two Minneapolis studies stated that 98 percent of the handicapped do not expect favors. The same studies showed it was unnecessary to modify the job in any way for 85 to 90 percent of the handicapped workers.

"Employers should follow the Golden Rule in dealing with the handicapped. Do for these workers as he would have others do for him if he were physically impaired. He should acquaint him with his new surroundings and the company's history, rules, and policies, introduce him to his fellow workers. A few minutes of warm conversation will weld a friendship and secure a good, reliable worker.

"Another thing I haven't mentioned is that the handicapped who are jobless are supported by Government funds. After rehabilitation, tax consumers become taxpayers bringing successful economic results. You will see the importance of vocational rehabilitation, why such stress is laid on it, why it is good business if you keep in mind three things. First, our disabled civilians generally are capable of becoming self-sustaining and contributing citizens of their communities; secondly, our handicapped workers, once they have received the essential services of vocational rehabilitations, make safe, steady, and productive employees; and third, the investment of public funds in the rehabilitation of our disabled civilians produces social and economic returns of great value.

"Well, you have sold me on the idea. No one could ask for better reasons for employing the physically disabled. Now I know that hiring the handicapped is good business."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brass Tacks, Washington, D. C., Federal Security Agency, June 15, 1949.

Efficiency of the Impaired Worker, Washington, D. C., Federal Security Agency, June 1946.

Vocational Rehabilitation for Civilians, Washington, D. C., Federal Security Agency.

Supervising the Physically Impaired, New York, N. Y., National Conservation Bureau, 1945.

The Physically Impaired Can Be Insured, New York, N. Y., Association of Casualty and Surety Cos.

Sales Talk to Employers, Washington, D. C., Disabled American Veterans, revised July 1947.

Nation Is Aroused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a telegram which I just received from one of the outstanding Democrats of southern California:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *December 15, 1950.*
Hon. NORRIS A. POULSON,
House of Representatives:

Governor Dewey's clarion call last night sounds the keynote of an awakened America. We have been frustrated with abstract idealism. Petty politics and appeasements intrude while large issues encroach relentlessly. Further procrastination is madness. Since Korea the people have been waiting for definite realistic leadership. Charity begins at home. In the words of Emerson "of what avail is the plough or sail or land or light if freedom fail." The above telegram was today sent to the following: Gov. Thomas Dewey, Gov. Earl Warren, Senator Richard Nixon, and Senator Robert A. Taft. Also to President Truman, Washington, D. C.

G. E. ARBOGAST,
Chairman of the Board,
Newbery Electric Corp.

What the United States Must Do To Be Prepared—All-Out Action Recommended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended an interesting letter to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune on this subject, the author of which is my brother, Benjamin A. Javits, whose recent book, Peace by Investment—Funk & Wagnalls, 1950—further expands the concepts set forth in this letter:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 6, 1950.*

DEAR SIR: Total war hangs over us. Although the American people are walking around with a collective hole in their stomachs—that hollow feeling that comes with impending doom—our finest hours are still ahead of us. The democratic process makes us appear to hang back, but our people have never flinched and are not afraid now.

We have one enemy—the Kremlin.

I believe the initiative is still with the United States, but we have only weeks, not months, and certainly not years.

This war has been going on for 36 years since 1914 with fascism, nazism, and now communism.

Ours is a social and competitive capitalism; the capitalism of France, England, etc., is monopoly capitalism. Some countries have a combination of socialism and monopoly capitalism.

We must do within 12 months to 2 years at the most what it would ordinarily take 10 years to do. Russian bombs may fall here in 1951.

In this crisis we have failed diplomatically and politically. Only industrially do we excel and since our kind of industry is the real base of military success we can win ultimately in a test of arms. Leon Keyserling, your own editorial policy, the Magazine of Business, and others, have pointed out that there is only one primary approach for us and that is to out-produce the rest of the world. It is, therefore, essential that among other things we dedicate at once to doubling production of this country so that we do not have to have a military dictatorship even temporarily. We shall be able to supply some of our civilian needs and, therefore, save many of our liberties.

The rulers of Red Russia have no other business but war. Russia has been preparing for 26 years for an all-out war of destruction. They actually started war against us in 1947 by way of Greece. They gave us definite notice during the last war of their intentions; they insisted on getting everything, knowing everything they could possibly get from us about our industrial processes, etc., and not giving us the slightest bit of information from behind their borders.

We must get ready industrially for an all-out war, and beyond that we must be ready to meet the needs of the people around the world with our productive power so that the disinherited of the earth may have a chance to live—the Russian system only offers them a chance to die. The world wants hope above food. We can win by giving hope.

We are not helpless even now. We have 10,000,000 trained veterans here. These can become the hard core here of any army we need to consolidate the foreign victory over communism in company with those who have more at stake than we have—the British, the French, and all the other peoples of the world.

I therefore suggest the following plan of action:

1. Declare the United States in a state of siege.

2. Mobilize and make subject to draft all men and women from 16 to 60.

3. Raise the workweek to 48 hours minimum.

4. Cut all union or featherbedding rules and red tape in order that production go full speed ahead.

5. Set a target: To double the productivity of the American production machine for necessary goods by building new plants, improving old or going all out on efficiency.

6. Eliminate all luxury operations whether in goods, services, education, and so forth.

7. For the period of the emergency, tax all profits above a reasonable return on capital and provision for obsolescence, depreciation, depletion, research, or other essentials.

8. Set price and wage controls. Allocate materials and manpower. Bring in additional manpower from Britain, Italy, and Germany, if necessary, after proper screening. We might even bring over enough of these to make armies out of them here.

9. Appropriate $50,000,000,000 for doubling our capacity to produce within 12 to 24 months and for civilian defense, or disaster.

10. Appropriate $50,000,000,000 for additional weapons of war, especially air weapons—offense and defense—to protect us against air attack.

11. Appropriate $100,000,000,000 for aid and development on a businesslike long-term basis for foreign peoples to raise their standard of living and to give them greater assurances of food, clothing, and shelter. Set up an enlarged World Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Export-Import Bank, or World Bank Fund, with or without United Nations support, to carry out this program.

12. Statement by business leaders calling for full mobilization and telling the world that American business is owned by Main Street, not Wall Street; that American business has the same social objectives that any people's government has; that we have a social capitalism and competitive capitalism which sums up into a consumer's economy; that we have democratic elections in practically all big business just as we have political elections; that the fundamentals of American business are constantly higher purchasing power in the hands of workers, constantly lower prices, constantly improved working conditions; no child labor; freedom, peace, security, and prosperity for all; that the right to own privately is a sacred right and applies equally to intangibles (religion and opinion) as it does to tangibles (homes, insurance policies, stocks, bonds, etc.), and that American business is the living example of that philosophy.

13. We stand ready at any and all times to trade and deal with the U. S. S. R. and the other countries now in the Soviet bloc once they stop infiltration, aggression, international libel and slander, and show by their acts an intention not to hamstring the UN and to respect human rights.

Very truly yours,

BENJAMIN A. JAVITS.

Congressional Immunity and the Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER C. HUNT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD of an article entitled "Congressional Immunity and the Citizen," written by a distinguished member of the bar, Nathan Boone Williams, and published in this month's issue of the District of Columbia Bar Association Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL IMMUNITY AND THE CITIZEN

(By Nathan Boone Williams)

The expansive scope of the field of Federal Government which has developed within recent years over the activities of the citizen presents a number of vital and interesting questions of constitutional law and public policy.

It is the traditional and accepted right of free men to paddle their own canoe when they so wish, so long as they respect the equal right of others. Or, as was so pungently stated by Justice Brandeis of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 478 (1928)):

"The makers of the Constitution * * * sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men."

Liberty is not license. Mankind is not free to do as he might desire, or as he might will. He is only free to do what he ought to do in just and decent regard for the equal right and obligations of other men. Only by the acceptance and practice of this principle has mankind made his tortuous and zigzag way from jungle savagery to our present cellophane civilization, a thin and transparent veneer, through which evil and predatory inclinations frequently burst.

Liberty is the keystone in the arch of the temple of free government, liberty under law is the luxury of disciplined minds.

The immunity provision of section 6 of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States protects Members of Congress for any speech or debate in either House. The source of this constitutional principle has a long and interesting history tracing from efforts to free Members of deliberative bodies from attack or coercion from any source outside their chambers.

Said James Madison:

"I have always considered the right of self-protection in the discharge of the necessary duties as inherent in legislative bodies as in courts of justice, in the State legislatures as in the British Parliament, and in the Federal Legislature as in both. In the application of this privilege to emerging cases, difficulties and differences of opinion may arise. In deciding on these the reason and necessity of the privilege must be the guide." (Madison's Writings, vol. 4, p. 221.)

The distinguished American jurist, Joseph Story, wrote:

"No man ought to have a right to defame others under color of a performance of the duties of his office. And if he does so in the actual discharge of his duties in Congress, that furnishes no reason why he should be enabled, through the medium of the press, to destroy the reputation and invade the repose of other citizens. It is neither within the scope of his duty nor in furtherance of public rights or public policy. Every citizen has as good a right to be protected by the laws from malignant scandal and false charges and defamatory imputations, as a Member of Congress has to utter them in his seat. If it were otherwise, a man's character might be taken away without the possibility of redress, either by the malice, or indiscretion, or overweening self-conceit of a Member of Congress." (Story's Commentaries, fifth ed. by Bigelow, book III, ch. 12, sec. 866.)

Despite numerous and recent examples of scandalous abuse of the immunity privilege by some Members of Congress, we are not presently concerned therewith, but, rather with what may be done to protect the citizen from "the malice, or indiscretion, or overweening self-conceit of a Member of Congress."

An example of current and widespread attempted protection of constitutional immunity is the insertion of scandalous matter in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as alleged "extension of remarks." When words are spoken in debate, others are afforded an opportunity to challenge untrue or intemperate statements. When words are found in a formal report, such report relating to a matter under consideration or review by either House, such report is subject to examination of the entire membership of Congress. Such formal reports, together with testimony taken by a committee of either House in inquiry concerning a constitutional subject of legislative interest, together with words spoken in speech or debate, must embrace the full limits of congressional immunity under the Constitution.

Extension of remarks appearing in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are frequently reprinted bearing the label: "Not printed at Government expense." Such designation is only a half-truth. These reprints are printed at a charge by the Government Printing Office on the request of Members of Congress. Such charge covers paper and presswork, but the expensive part of such publication—composition—is rarely, if ever, taken into account. These reprints are then mailable under frank without the payment of postage, a device widely used for propaganda purposes. By such technique individual calumny may be, and frequently is, accomplished at the expense of the public purse.

The idea that the king can do no wrong has followed us from the days of kings and serfs. The acts of public officials, whether tortious or other, being the acts of Government through their agency, must be made instantly reviewable, despite the ancient concept, "The king can do no wrong."

Government, whether popular or other, is but the agency whereby society as a whole undertakes in its own interest certain necessary activities. Society as a whole should willingly assume the burden for the tortious or corrupt acts of its own agents and employees. When it does so, it will open the only really effective way whereby corrupt acts can be challenged by the damaged citizen.

Government, whether municipal, State, or National, must assume full responsibility for the wrongful acts of its agents and employees in the administration of their trusts, if we are ever to secure the full measure of trustee responsibility which good government requires and decent respect for the rights of the citizen demands.

Congress has seen fit to partially meet this problem by the enactment of the Federal Tort Claims Act, title IV of the Reorganization Act of 1946.

Under that law money damages only on account of damage to or loss of property or on account of personal injury or death,

caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment are recoverable against the Government.

Such is the generally accepted rule of law as applied to the agents and employees of business concerns. Corporations have also been held for criminal offenses, such as sending obscene matter through the mails, criminal libel, obtaining money under false pretenses, extortion, and many other offenses against the statutes, both State and Federal. For a rather full discussion of this phase, see Corporate Criminal Liability, the Lawyer and Law Notes, fall issue, 1950.

With Government increasingly engaging in various forms of business enterprise, we can ill afford to longer neglect to apply the rule of honest responsibility for the acts of even those employees personally protected by constitutional immunity. They are our agents. We chose them. We must accept responsibility for their tortious acts against the rights of the citizen. They are trustees of the rights, privileges, responsibilities, and immunities conferred upon them by the suffrage of the citizens.

The Minneapolis Tribune said recently:

"The immunity enjoyed by Members of Congress is a public trust to be exercised conscientiously—not a license to be abused on the chance that it may make political capital."

Henry Clay said:

"Government is a trust, and the officers of the Government are trustees; and both the trust and the trustees are created for the benefit of the people."

When statutory regulation concerning the acts of trustees is absent it is high time that the omission should be cured by appropriate legislation. Such legislation has been proposed by Senator LESTER C. HUNT, of Wyoming, who on September 1, 1950, introduced S. 4113 providing for civil suits against the United States by persons suffering damage as a result of defamations committed by Members of Congress in the course of their official activities. The measure is restricted to the recovery of money damages occasioned by libel or slander.

This is a carefully written measure and would seem to merit the careful study of members of the bar, a group so vitally responsible for the maintenance of the principles of constitutional government, and, of whom Alexis de Tocqueville wrote:

"I cannot believe that a republic could subsist at the present time if the influence of lawyers in public business did not increase in proportion to the power of the people."

Shortsightedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent issue of the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass.:

The National Munitions Board's failure to stockpile raw wool during the past few years when experienced men were urging this policy is now opening the way for much criticism of the Government agency. Tuesday's Boston Post carried the following editorial directed at the situation: "Boston, one of the world's great wool reception centers, and the New England textile cities where wool has long been processed into warm clothing material, will not have to indulge in any idle "I told you so" recriminations to bring home the results of the Munitions Board's refusal to stockpile this strategic item. The dispatches from Korea's fighting fronts are far too eloquent in that direction. So, too, is the urgent request of the Army that the Agriculture Department purchase 30,000,000 pounds by next October. That acquisition is going to cost a lot more than it would have in 1948 and 1949, and there are indications that we will have to compete with Russia for it in the world's market. It is a bit of shortsightedness upon which no American can look with equanimity."

The Medical Profession on Election Day Won a Pocketbook Victory for Themselves at the Expense of Our Government and Its People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that while the American Medical Association in good old cock-a-doodle-do fashion is crowing loud and long about having saved the medical profession from bureaucratic bondage, that a Nation-wide appeal is being made through the press to have something done on a national scale to relieve the medical shortage which our country is facing at this critical hour.

In view of the fact that an emergency has been declared by our President, and it is a real emergency as all of us must admit, I cannot see why it would not be proper and right for the President, as the Commander in Chief to order members of the Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Coast Guard, with proper aptitudes and educations, to be trained for the medical, dental, nursing, pharmacy, and other professions. An abbreviated, concise course could be given in a short period of time and the instructors could be drafted for that purpose from the Nation's manpower pool. In that way the medical quiz kids could be bypassed and the throttle-hold of the AMA and its members could be torn loose from the throat of public health needs. These newly trained military men could later, after proper legislation, take their places as professional men in civil life and the conspiracy against the health of the Nation would be broken.

I now invite attention to some of the recent newspaper publicity:

An eastern newspaper carried this news item:

ARCHBISHOP RAPS CRITICS WITHOUT CURE

BOSTON.—Too many who oppose socialized medicine have no substitute program for God's elect—the neglected sick poor, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, asserted at the midcentury meeting of the Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Nurses here.

"It is perfectly acceptable to me for Catholic doctors and nurses to oppose socialized medicine," Archbishop Cushing said, "but it is one thing to oppose a constructive program without a constructive substitute program. It is another thing to oppose socialized medicine and to come up with a program which will meet the needs of the sick poor."

The practice of medicine is a vocation, he continued, and the American Medical Association should give us a little more of the Christian charity which inspired in the days of old the doctor of the horse and buggy who answered a call at any hour of the day or night, who thought nothing of the bill but of the patient.

The League Reporter, of December 18, 1950, made this editorial comment:

PAYING THE DOCTOR

The doctors' lobby, the American Medical Association (AMA), fights a purely negative battle.

It is against national health insurance, which it labels socialized medicine. It has teamed with the realty lobby to fight public housing. It has teamed with the insurance lobby to fight disability insurance in the social security laws. It has teamed with the private utility lobby to fight public power.

But what the public wants from the doctors is an answer to such questions as these:

How can I pay the doctors' bills for a long illness—leukemia, for instance—of my child?

How can I pay the hospital bills for an accident—the loss of a leg, for instance—to myself?

The American people are not fooled by double talk. They want specific answers to specific problems.

They want to be able to pay for their illnesses and accidents themselves. They don't want a poorhouse system whereby they have to depend on charity. And they don't want to have to use up the savings of a lifetime.

The best way to guaranty that they can pay their own way is through a system of national health insurance. If there is a better answer the AMA should come forth with it instead of damning, attacking, and criticizing.

The League Reporter had this to say newswise:

YOU WOULD HAVE OWN MEDIC WITH HEALTH PLAN

Do you wonder just how national health insurance would work for you?

The following points should cut through American Medical Association (AMA) propaganda against the plan. All the points are in your favor.

1. When you or a member of your family needs medical care, you would call or go to the doctor of your own choice.

If your doctor found you needed hospital care or the service of a specialist, you would be entitled to such care (hospital care for 60 days).

You would also be entitled to:
Laboratory and X-ray services.
Costly medicines.
Home nursing, within limits.
Dental care, within limits.
Eyeglasses and appliances.

2. You and your family would get these benefits if you were employed, a farmer, or were in business for yourself. You would make small regular payments out of your income into a Government insurance fund, just like social security.

The payments made by people on wages and salaries would be matched by equal payments from their employers.

You would be eligible for these benefits also if you were retired under social security or a Government retirement plan, or if you were receiving public aid and your contribution was paid by a local or State agency.

3. The health insurance fund would be distributed to local communities by the States. In your locality, a board made up of representative citizens and doctors (the doctor members to be selected by the doctors themselves would handle the funds and determine the method of payment.

4. Your doctor, specialist and hospital would be paid out of the fund handled by the local committee—instead of your paying them directly.

That's the only difference from the present method. Your medical bills would be paid on an insurance basis rather than individually on the "catastrophe" basis.

Another leading labor paper printed the following:

COLLIER'S TAKES AFTER AMA

The American Medical Association got it in the neck from an unexpected source last week.

In its December 16 issue, Collier's, a weekly magazine which by no stretch of the imagination could be termed proliberal, took the AMA to task for the organization's continued opposition to Federal aid to medical education. The article was written by Albert Q. Maisel.

"There is strong public and professional support for financing an expansion program with Federal funds," the article said. "But the leaders of the American Medical Association are against the idea. So far they have blocked the passage of legislation which would make such a program possible."

Maisel said the AMA must shoulder the responsibility for the shortage of medical personnel which is constantly becoming more critical. He wrote:

"They (the AMA) are the one big obstacle in the path of congressional efforts to meet the shortage with Federal aid * * * the solution which has the backing of most medical school deans, of leading university presidents, of both Republicans and Democrats and (by a unanimous vote) of the United States Senate.

"By their action in fighting the measure to a dead stop in the House of Representatives they have made it entirely possible that wounded American soldiers in the future will receive some second- or third-rate substitute for the marvelous medical services that saved tens of thousands of lives in World War II."

The magazine declared that Federal aid to medical education is not socialized medicine. It added: "As long as the danger of general war and atomic attack against our civilian population exists, the argument that Federal aid may lead to Federal control of medical education is academic, to say the least."

The unsuccessful efforts of Representative BIEMILLER, Democrat of Wisconsin, to get the measure before the House after the Senate had passed it were told. Despite the bipartisan support of Representative SCOTT, Republican of Pennsylvania, former Republican National Committee Chairman, the measure was bottled up in the Interstate Commerce Committee.

Two efforts by BIEMILLER to have it brought to the House floor for a vote proved unavailing when the motion was defeated by a one-vote margin on both occasions.

"Finally," Maisel said, "the AMA came out openly against the bill. Early in 1950, Louis H. Bauer, M. D., chairman of the AMA board of trustees, stated that aid to medical education was now added to the long list of measures meeting AMA opposition."

Bauer said the bill "as presently drawn * * * would give the Government a foot in the door * * * for Federal control of medical education. There are certain very drastic amendments which will have to be made to that bill before we can approve it."

The AMA's friends on the House subcommittee kept working over revisions until last May.

"Despite the tendency on the part of Congress and the AMA to look the other way," the article continued, "the grave problem of medical shortages still exists and the pressure is mounting for some action to solve it."

Bernard M. Baruch was listed as one of those demanding that something be done. He is quoted as saying he is not in favor of socialized medicine (which usually means compulsory health insurance) but believes the medical profession has got to do something to meet the needs of the people. He declared the first way is to increase the output of doctors.

The Collier's article concluded with the observation that "unless immediate steps are taken to solve our chronic and growing shortages of medical, dental, nursing, and public health personnel, your health and that of your family, your neighbors, and your sons in service will be jeopardized for years to come.

"If the AMA continues its fight in the new Congress, we trust that the lawmakers will have the courage to enact the measure anyway in the interest of urgent necessity," it added.

The Senate-passed bill would provide $250,000,000 in Federal aid. Against that figure, the AMA has announced it is donating $500,000 to the Nation's 79 accredited medical schools. BIEMILLER termed the contribution a "Trojan gift" intended to obscure the "selfish motives" of the AMA.

He said the donation would bring merely "fatal indecision and inaction." Noting that AMA has been alone in its opposition to such legislation, Maisel declared: "It has claimed time and again that the financial crisis in our medical schools could be met with private aid. Yet all efforts to obtain such aid have failed. That $500,000 contribution does not change the situation in the slightest."

The Washington Post on December 11, 1950, printed the following item:

HEALTH SERVICES

There was urgent need for Federal financial aid to State and local health departments long before the threat of a major war became acute; the need is now underscored and clarified by the importance of such departments in the mobilization of civil defense. They would be the country's principal refuge in case of atomic or biological warfare attack. We believe, therefore, that the House should act on the local public health services bill, which the Senate has already passed, during the present session. The bill has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and is now in the Rules Committee.

State and local health departments are woefully inadequate. Some 40,000,000 Americans live today in areas where no local full-time public health departments exist; and it is estimated that nearly a hundred million others have only inadequately staffed departments available. The cost to the country in time lost from productive effort and in the incidence of preventable or controllable diseases is much too high. The cost in lives and human suffering in the event of widespread aerial attacks on the United States would be incalculable.

The civil defense report of the National Security Resources Board recommended that "in each State, the State health officer should be placed in charge of all civil defense health and medical services; and cities should appoint local officers in the same manner." The report pointed out also that "special measures must be taken to enable civil defense organizations to deal with the problems arising from atomic, biological, and chemical warfare. * * * The effects of these special weapons are of such a nature that defense against them becomes primarily the responsibility of the health and medical services."

But the plain fact is that in many areas there simply is no such defense at all. And it is highly possible that war production plants and other vital installations will be dispersed into just such areas, with large concentrations of war workers clustered around them. Many cities which might become bomb targets are lamentably lacking in health facilities. The problem is not one on which the country can afford to defer action.

The following articles appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, December 10, 1950:

CIVIL DEFENSE PLANS PLACED IN OPERATION IN MANY AREAS—ONLY SIX STATES HAVE COMPLETE COVERAGE, BUT OTHERS SPEED HEALTH PROGRAMS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

Paralleling the stepped-up tempo of military and industrial mobilization, steps have now been taken to move civil defense from a stand-by basis to an actual operating program. Since its organization in 1947, the National Security Resources Board has been responsible for developing plans for our civil defense in case of national emergency.

Now, in view of the present international tension, President Truman has appointed Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., former Governor of Florida, as Civil Defense Administrator. In accordance with plans, the responsibility for civil defense will now be carried out by this new agency, as the Resources Board, is a planning and coordinating, rather than an operating agency.

Recognizing fully the all-important role of health and medical services in civil defense, the board has been preparing a comprehensive official Federal guidebook of medical and health problems fundamental to civil defense. Leading authorities in all specialized aspects of health services have assisted in preparing the manual, which is now completed and in the Government Printing Office.

As W. Stuart Symington reported to the President in September, all planning done on the health and medical aspects of civil defense is based on using State commissioners of health as directors of civil defense health services, and local health officers as directors of local civil defense health services. This plan has been accepted as a most practical and effective administrative mechanism, but unfortunately, nearly 30 percent of our citizens live in communities in which there are no full-time local health services.

COMPLETE COVERAGE IN SIX STATES

Only six States in the Nation now have complete local health services coverage in all counties. They are Maryland, Delaware, New Mexico, South Carolina, Alabama, and North Carolina, which added its final county recently.

There is almost complete coverage in California, Michigan, Florida, and Virginia. Kentucky, Louisiana, and Tennessee have organizations for nearly every county, but have many health officer vacancies.

In New York, the State Committee on Tuberculosis and Health of the State Charities Aid Association has announced a program to foster the development of county health departments next year, but at present, there is no locally operated, full-time public health service in the rural areas, and even the smaller cities in 44 of New York's 57 up-State counties.

Steps toward remedying this situation were taken last year when the Senate, with bipartisan sponsorship and wide public support, unanimously adopted a bill authorizing Federal grants-in-aid specifically for local

public-health departments. The act provides Federal funds for at least six minimum functions of a local health department: Vital statistics, communicable disease control, maternity and child hygiene services, environmental sanitation, public health laboratory services, and public health education. Significantly, now there is the extra bonus in that it will provide the keystone for local civil-defense planning for health services.

ACTION HELD UP BY WAR

Endorsed enthusiastically by 60 such groups as the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, American Medical Association, the National Grange, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, an almost identical bill was passed by the House of Representatives during the Eightieth Congress. This year, when the bill reached the House, the Korean war had broken out and it was shelved because of what were considered more pressing matters.

Events of the last few weeks, however, have shown clearly the need for all-out action in planning our civil defense, and that local public-health services will be the foundation for the medical, hospitalization, and health aspects of civil defense.

As Dr. William P. Shepard, president of the American Public Health Association, said recently, "Public health services are the administrative backbone of civil defense. The immediate development of such services is not only requisite to the safeguarding of the health of the Nation in normal peacetime, but is given even greater urgency by the current demands for the establishment of adequate civilian defense against possible acts of aggression, including atomic, biological, chemical, and other devices of warfare directly affecting the civilian population."

That there is urgent necessity for immediate action by the House of Representatives is clear. One-third of the Nation is without the administrative organization for providing even normal local health services, let alone those necessary for civil defense. The provision of those services is as essential to our civil defense as weapons are to our fighting men.

ANOTHER DEFENSE BILL

Following the appointment last week of a new Civil Defense Administrator, the National Security Resources Board presented Congress with a $3,100,000,000 plan for civil defense. Listed by the President as a must for the present short session, prompt action will undoubtedly be taken on this measure.

As Dr. Howard A. Rusk points out elsewhere in this newspaper today, there is another bill currently in the House Rules Committee which is equally a must if we are to make full plans for medical and health services in civil defense. This is H. R. 5865, for Federal aid to establish local public health services. Its immediate passage is essential, for civil defense plans call for the administration of medical and health civil defense services by State and local public health officers. Added to the usual essential health services, there is need for special measures to enable civil defense organizations to deal with the problems arising from possible atomic, biological, and chemical warfare. These problems are primarily the responsibility of health and medical services, but today 40,000,000 of our citizens live in communities where there are no local full-time health services.

H. R. 5865 would help remedy this by giving Federal grants-in-aid for the development of local health services. Prior to the Korean war this bill was unanimously passed by the Senate on the basis of its peacetime merits. Today the bill takes on a new significance if we are to be prepared to meet all the possible eventualities in civil defense.

"Me Too" Dewey Now Military Expert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, since the disclosure of the military debacle in Korea, the airways have been loaded with gratuitous advice on national defense policy, largely from the mouths of men whose judgment is limited by lack of information and any real understanding.

I refer particularly to the radio speech delivered a few nights ago by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, on the occasion of a bar association meeting in the Nation's metropolis.

While I would be the last to deny Mr. Dewey's sincerity and his belief that he is well qualified to answer every question and solve every problem now afflicting the military leaders of this country, I cannot help wondering where he acquired his wisdom and his expertness on military affairs.

Thomas E. Dewey is not a soldier, and he never served in the Armed Forces of the United States in any way that would qualify him to hold any opinion that necessarily is sound on those matters which are peculiarly the province of the professional soldier.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, who has tried earnestly to understand and properly to evaluate the military information supplied the committee by the Army, Navy, and Air Force chiefs, it appears to me that Governor Dewey came out with a series of national defense proposals, manifestly absurd by reason of their unreality, with respect to the international situation and to the possible means by which we can combat the deadly peril which confronts the American people.

This purely political and quite ill-advised radio speech, I believe, was inspired by Governor Dewey's itch to get back into the national political arena; his desire once more to serve as Republican standard-bearer in the 1952 presidential election.

Furthermore, this speech, I am reliably informed, was written for Governor Dewey by no other than John Franklin Carter, who uses the pen name of Jay Franklin. It is well known to those of us, who took the trouble to find out, that Carter long served as a New Deal camp follower and a White House smear-pot during the Roosevelt administrations. He wrote many speeches for Roosevelt, and later on he wrote speeches for Harry S. Truman. Now he turns up in the employ of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

Small wonder, then, that Dewey's radio speech lacked the realism and common sense even of some of the wilder pronouncements emanating recently from the White House. Dewey's speech revealed him finally and completely as a captive of the New Deal and the self-styled Fair Deal. It was me-too-ism reduced to the ultimate degree of absurdity. Every real Republican should be able to understand now, why it was that the last two Republican national conventions were controlled, secretly and behind the scenes, by Democrats, Wall Street, international bankers, and fellow travelers.

Governor Dewey proposed, as the opening gun in his 1952 nomination campaign, that 100 Army divisions, presumably numbering 12,600,000 men, should be mobilized at once. He proposed that universal military training should be put into effect immediately.

Now as a humble student of military affairs, I should like to ask Governor Dewey how he would provide for the upkeep and training of such a force on short notice. Has he forgotten, or does he not know, that today in American training camps, thousands of drafted men lack uniforms, and are waiting for the guns, tanks, airplanes, and all the other tools of war, which they should now be learning to use? What little we had was sent to Korea. And all this, in spite of the fact that Congress, in the last 5 years, has appropriated $50,000,000,000 for maintenance and expansion of our armed services.

Does Governor Dewey fail to understand that war production—the manufacture of arms and munitions—is our first need? The men to wield those weapons can be called and trained quickly enough, when the weapons have been produced. Why in God's name should we take millions of young men away from production, and sequester them in training camps, where they could do nothing but sit and wait? And why should we take other millions of boys away from school, and put them in training camps, all to the same purpose?

It strikes me that Governor Dewey would do well to keep silent on things concerning which he so evidently knows little. He would do well to let the military decisions be made by those men who have spent their lives as professional soldiers, and whose ability has won for them places of responsibility in the high command. If anybody knows what should be done in this desperate emergency, those men should know. Their word should be taken, and nobody—nobody at all—should presume to make political capital out of the Nation's need.

That Governor Dewey for long has been, and is now, a captive of the New Deal, the Wall Street internationalists, and the left-wing ideologists, is explicit in his record.

He first came to political prominence as a New York prosecutor. Nobody denies that he did a good job. It made him the idol of the millions in his adopted State. Therefore, it was only natural that they should make him governor. In Albany he continues to build up an outstanding record as an administrator. But his ideology always has been, and still remains, that of his Wall Street New Deal internationalist masters. He is the Charlie McCarthy of that group which recognizes no loyalty, except to its own political and financial interests, which are not confined to the shores of America.

It will be recalled that in the 1944 Presidential campaign, when Dewey first became Republican standard bearer, he subscribed almost entirely to the Rooseveltian New Deal program. He let himself be cajoled, on the fanciful pretext of preserving national security, into keeping his mouth shut on the issues created by Roosevelt's disastrous blunders, with respect to the conduct of the war, and the secret commitments which paved the way for the war now in progress.

It will be recalled, too, that in 1948 Dewey again refused to discuss the real issues of the campaign. He resorted to a campaign policy, which failed to point out the postwar blunders, at home and abroad, and the manifest corruption, if not actual treason, in some segments of the Truman administration. He lost the election by default.

Now he wants to try it again. And you may be sure that every inch of him—including the 2 inches he has added by wearing elevator shoes—belongs to the New Deal. Dewey is running for President again. Make no mistake about that. His New Deal internationalist masters want him to make a third try for the Presidency, that the present gang may continue in power.

If the Republican Party fails to keep its collective eye open, and fails to squelch this new manifestation of me-too-Deweyism, we are going to have him on our necks again and again and again.

If anyone doubts Dewey's ambition and his New Deal ideology, let them recall the Lincoln Day dinner speech he delivered less than 3 months after his defeat in 1948. The Governor of New York came to Washington, and in a long and windy address, berated his fellow Republicans for refusing to subscribe to his own me-too-ism. He said then, in effect, that this refusal caused his defeat. The answer to that, of course, can be found in the results of the 1950 congressional elections.

The English on Dean Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 27, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert an excerpt from the Economist, one of the most highly esteemed journals of the English-speaking world, and one which has always sought to strengthen Anglo-American relations. The following paragraph appeared in the November 18, 1950, issue:

But the methods of campaigning pursued by the Republicans this year—actively pursued only by a minority but silently acquiesced in and turned to account by virtually the whole party—have cast upon every Republican gain in this year's election a light that, in European eyes, is inevitably sinister. For months the Republicans have been conducting against the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, a campaign that, from this distance, has seemed to be as scurrilous as it has been irresponsible. Mr. Acheson is regarded in the outside world not merely as a good Secretary of State, but as one of the best that the United States has had in modern times—and this not because he has shown any undue partiality to his country's allies, but because, together with his predecessor and former chief, General Marshall, he has given to American policy a consistency of purpose and an intellectual foundation which have brought new hope to the free world. It may be that distance makes it impossible to see his defects of bearing when under congressional inquiry, but distance also makes it impossible to see why such superficial niceties should weigh for anything in the balance against the world stature of a real statesman. Do not the Republicans see, in hurling their charges of incompetence and misfeasance, on grounds that carry utterly no conviction abroad, that they are undermining the very foundations of that confidence in the consistency and trustworthiness of American policy on which rests the hope of defeating comunism without war? That such a campaign, not merely of dragging foreign policy into party politics but of spattering it with mud, should be tolerated by the leaders of a great party, must seem to many of America's most affectionate friends to be bad enough. But that it should be rewarded by the electors is found by many of them to be downright alarming.

National Sojourners Oppose World Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a great patriotic organization, the National Sojourners, are engaged in a crusade against the campaign to impose world government upon the people of the United States. As part of my remarks, I am including an article by Col. Albert G. Hulett in opposition to that movement:

WHY WE SHOULD OPPOSE WORLD GOVERNMENTS

(By Col. Albert G. Hulett)

United World Federalists, and its kindred groups are currently appealing to the emotions of our citizens, our business and professional men, the members of State and National legislatures, Government employees, organized labor, churches, civic groups and veterans' organizations, using the alluring bait that "here and now" is eternal peace, security, prosperity, and a future Utopia for all. Recently the writer listened to one of these UWF spellbinders addressing a Rotary Club, and was astounded to hear him declare that UWF did not advocate the demise of national governments except as to their right to declare and wage war, and that the proposed world government would not, in fact, in any way alter your everyday life and mine.

Could anything more deceptive and untruthful be imagined by anyone who has read the pronouncements of UWF and Union Now? Hypnosis and autohypnosis (self-hypnoses) are realities, as every physician and psychologist knows. It is wholly possible to induce autohypnotism of whole populations—as has been revealed so clearly in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, Falangist Spain, and Napoleonic France. It appears possible that some adroit psychologist has now assumed direction of UWF propaganda with this objective in mind. The oft and clearly stated features of the proposed world government, as advocated by UWF, have been broadcast in their own official publications and in countless editorial commentaries in the daily press of this country. And these have not been retracted, despite this speaker's avoidance of them. It would be useful that we study how these proposals will inescapably affect the individual security, freedom, initiative, welfare and happiness of each of us. So let us start with individual rights and prerogatives.

The present unprecedented success of the United States and of its citizens has stemmed from our Constitution and its Bill of Rights. Upon our joining the world government, that Constitution will no longer operate, and whatever our individual status may be will be determined by the imposts of that world government, by majority vote of its parliament in which our representation will be—upon a population basis—a trivial minority. So we shall be regimented for the benefit of the majority, and any attempt to retain more prosperity or liberty than obtained elsewhere in the world will be ruthlessly suppressed. We may incline to the declaration, "We would resist such injustice." Now, would we, and how? Let us remember that all military forces are to be done away with, except a single world force serving that single government.

Next, let us consider that world armed force. Equipped with it, the proposed world government would be in actuality a military despotism wherein its edicts and demands upon the peoples of the world would be accomplished by the threat, or actual use, of that armed force. Yes, we would have world peace but it would be the sort of peace experienced by the people of Israel during their long years of captivity. Do we want that sort of peace? Again, since the United States is the richest Nation in the world and possessed of the greatest manufacturing and industrial potentials, who but the United States would equip and maintain that world army? As indicative thereof, just note who produced the war material for the allied nations in World War II, and who is (gratuitously) providing the armament for Western Europe today. Hence, a large part of our industry would be diverted to military purposes, and do you doubt for a moment that such would vastly cripple our commercial progress and warp our way of life? What is the intent of our founders, or is it yours and mine, that the proper destiny of the United States is to be the arsenal of a world despotism?

Again, let us consider economic trends of the past two decades and envision what remedy UWF would proffer. In this period we have watched the skyrocketing of taxes and of the living-cost index, the decline of purchasing power of money, the confiscation of estates and inheritances through special gift, inheritance and capital-gains levies, and the downward move of investment income to the point where trusts, annuities, pensions, life insurances and savings funds, are seriously embarrassed and their annual earnings and dividends greatly reduced. These things are ominous and we worry over them and yearn to find a way out. So we are vulnerable to a proposal for a complete change of scene— any change. What solution does this world government proffer? Let us see what is proposed:

"All national and international debts shall be cancelled and title thereto shall revert to the world government which shall also take possession of whatever gold, silver, currency, and natural resources may exist in any country at the time of joining; also, it shall have

direct taxing power upon individuals anywhere and also the right of entry, and inspection, anywhere, and to punish violators of its laws and decrees."

Now, with such program completed, we shall be able to cease worrying about our life insurance, annuities and pension plans, our bonds and cash reserves, all of which constitute our present guaranty of future benefits; neither need we be concerned over social security, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, retirement plans in industry or even about retirement pay for the Armed Forces or for other governmental services, nor need national or State taxes concern us. And why? Because, after the wholesale confiscations prescribed for this world government, these equitable and hard-won provisions for our safety will no longer exist. And—in passing—may I insist that these messianic UWF planners do not even exhibit the finesse of stipulating that we should be rebated the sums we will already have paid into these projects, nor that such sums be credited to us against future world government taxes to be imposed. Do you and I favor such a pattern of future dependency, penury, and misery for ourselves and our loved ones? If so, then go out and work for UWF now.

Furthermore, if we are soon to scrap our Army, Navy, and Air Force, why then spend another nickel upon them—and thus deplete the hoard this world government is to acquire? Does it make sense to advocate billions of military expenditure in one breath and then, in the next, propose that this armament be scrapped? And why send billions in material to Western Europe for scrapping there? Yet certain high-ranking officials in our National Government, and certain Members of both Houses of the Congress—amongst whose duties are the pursuit of these military plans and projects—are members of UWF and, upon being questioned, have declared that they couldn't see where their two allegiances conflicted. We elected many of them, and—unless we ponder well—we'll be doing it again.

Unless the world and its people plan to live upon a socialistic, communistic system of rationing of everything, wherein the individual is but a pauper and pawn of the state, we must have a stable and sufficient currency or medium of exchange, so the citizens may maintain themselves, and provide for future contingencies. But, if all national and private wealth, all securities, and all resources are to be taken away from us, and national wealth and financial resources as well, wherewith shall such necessity be had? Ah, yes. But that UWF spellbinder declared that their proposals "would not in any way alter your daily life."

And, in the fool's paradise of UWF, how can you or I, or anyone, engage in any private enterprise? And how finance it, make profit by it, or maintain it? Any such venture would have to be underwritten by world government, since it would alone have the credit facility. And do you imagine for a moment such government would reach down to you or me and aid us in this manner? Just note what is happening in the militaristic states of Russia, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, in re private enterprise. Is such not a warning?

Another clear but (I believe) purposely glossed-over feature of this world state is its requirement that "all class, racial and religious divisions and discriminations shall be abolished." (If this is not Marxian, what is it? Yet that recent speaker firmly avowed that those in UWF are not Communists, Socialists, or Fabians.) If that program be enacted, then the world government will control religions and inevitably suppress them, and likewise will terminate all fraternal orders, secret societies, trades-unions, business organizations, civic and patriotic societies, as being "enemies of the state." Do we want such oppressions?

One has often heard the adage which declares: "Give a boy a putty-blower and he will use it—perhaps first to knock off your own hat." Would it be otherwise did we give to this world government such over-all powers AND the force with which to employ them? Except in these United States, wherein our unique Constitution and the compulsion of public opinion through the ballot prevents, has there ever been any country possessed of a large military force wherein control of that force has not been usurped by those who used it to despotically control and exploit its people? And, in many such instances, there have been supposedly effective laws in existence which promised to prevent such happening—just as promising as the regulations UWF is now advocating to make this World Government Army immune to cabalistic capture. Can we—if mentally adult—imagine that ANY such measures would prevent such catastrophe? And, do we hold in mind the fact that, did such occur, there would be no other military force in the world to rescue us from it?

The greatest fault and weakness of United States citizens is their idealism and their yearning for peace and good-will. If such ideals be appealed to and their fulfillment promised, they will readily fall for ANY such project, no matter how fantastic or dangerous. In such ecstatic emotional state, our citizens fail to analyze and inquire ere they give support to such schemes. Time and again in the past we have committed just such errors. Happily, in each such instance we have possessed the means and wisdom to correct our mistake. In this present matter we shall not have that opportunity, because another of the specifications of UWF is that: "Nations may elect whether to join this world government but they shall not have the right to secede therefrom, after joining." Hence, should we enter and then discover that my analysis be correct and that we have erred therein, that world armed force would be sent to keep us in subjection and in membership. Do we want to invite such calamity? But, that spellbinder declared that national governments would not be changed except as to declaring and waging war. Was he truthful?

So, let us assemble the facts and think well upon them. Let us relate these truths to as many of our citizens as possible and speedily. Let us dare UWF, and their fellow travelers, to now maintain that they have not advocated these horrible propositions to the American people, and in the printed page; or to prove to us and to all that any world government, based upon such provisions, would be the answer for humanity, or would be better than these United States.

Let us expose these two-faced proposals for what they truly are, and thus enlighten the well meaning but duped citizens of position and wealth who to date have been supporting this proposal. Then, and only then, will our citizens, our legislatures, our Congress, and our civic leaders identify this scheme for what it really is, "a plan for the extinction of the United States in favor of a world despotism in a manner like that whereby Czechoslovakia was lured behind the iron curtain."

Armed conquest of these United States would be costly and uncertain; its disintegration by subversive and economic infiltrations would require years and involve world confusions; however, the quick and voluntary surrender by this Government of its sovereignty with its resources and potentials intact, is something worth scheming for—if the plotter be un-American!

Even the Greek gods on Mount Olympus fell short of so grandiose a plot. Yet it can happen here, unless you and I prevent.

Hon. Robert Fleming Rich, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, when the Eighty-second Congress convenes on January 3, 1951, two familiar features will be missing. One is the friendly smile of the Honorable ROBERT FLEMING RICH and the other his oft repeated question: "Where are you going to get the money?"

For almost 20 years "BOB" RICH, as he is affectionately known to all the Members, has arisen on the floor of this House and raised his voice against extravagance in Government and the need for Federal retrenchment. His words have reechoed throughout the Nation.

Primarily a businessman, he has looked upon the operations of this Government from the viewpoint of successful business.

His criticisms have been sharp and severe. Thrift, saving, and retrenchment have been his guiding lights.

Now, he is about to leave us, and many and deep will be the regrets in his passing. His friends are innumerable, and whether or not one agreed with his business and political philosophy, all who knew him admired and respected him for his honesty, courage, and candor. Warm-hearted, impulsive, and generous to a fault, he will leave a large void in this House.

He retires to devote his entire time to the management of his successful business enterprises.

We, of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation, will miss him greatly. He was a friend to each of us, always willing and anxious to help, kind, generous, and thoughtful and we wish for him every success and happiness in the remaining days of his useful and helpful life.

Requirements for Labeling Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 20 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, a portion of the recent testimony of Mr. Jerry Voorhis, of the Cooperative League of the United States, before a special House committee. This testimony deals with proposed requirements for labeling bread. This is of special interest to people of my State because of the fact, brought out in this testimony, that full labeling might result in the use of more dried milk in the baking of bread. This result would be

good for the consumers of bread and also for the dairy industry in this country. I am not enough of an expert to comment on all the aspects of Mr. Voorhis' testimony, but I think it is worthy of attention by the Congress.

There being no objection the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Products carrying the cooperative trademark are fully labeled, not just to meet the requirements of the law, but to meet the considerably more stringent requirements of the cooperators for whom the store serves as a purchasing agent, just as any large manufacturing business employs a purchasing agent. Cooperators and noncooperators who patronize cooperative stores are enabled to buy on specifications, written for the protection of the buyer, to give him a practical measure of what his money is buying. This, of course, is the universal practice insisted upon by all buyers of producer's goods. We cooperators believe that the same practice should be extended to buyers of consumers goods and that the law should further, not obstruct, the education and the protection of the consumer at the point of purchase.

Cooperatives supply more than 350 different products under their own open-formula label. The co-op store managers vouch for the popularity of informative labeling.

When this background of cooperative policy and practice is understood it becomes obvious that the Cooperative League and its members and affiliates are bound to support the proposal which is being considered at these hearings. That proposal as I understand it, is to amend the present food and drug law to enable its administrators to determine and certify, in advance of their adoption by the manufacturer, the harmlessness to human health of chemicals used in the manufacture or processing of food, insecticides, and fertilizers.

I mentioned fertilizer. Until little more than 15 years ago fertilizer manufacturers put everything in the bag, including just plain dirt. Farmers had no idea what they were putting into their soil to produce better crop yields. When they began to form their own cooperatives, they demanded better quality. Thus to prove to the skeptics, they used open-formula labels. Co-ops were the first to list the analysis on the fertilizer bag. They have applied the same principle to feed and seed. Today practically every company in the business lists the ingredients on the tag. It seems ironical that consumers know exactly what they mix into their soil, feed to their livestock and poultry, but are denied the right—except through cooperative efforts—to know what is contained in the food they purchase for their families. The committee will undoubtedly be interested in seeing some of these labels to note the simple, effective use of the open-formula labels.

Not only should the consumer be given the maximum protection of the law and its administration—he should also be equipped and educated to protect himself. Precisely that is the purpose and effect of the open-formula labeling which the cooperatives practice, and which we believe should be made mandatory on all producers and distributors of foods, insecticides and fertilizers.

With all due respect to the Food and Drug Administration—and I have the highest respect for the integrity and competence of its administrative and technical staff—history has shown that it is not possible to determine beyond any possible doubt the harmlessness of a given chemical. I have only to cite the example of agene or nitrogen trichloride, the chemical which was used for 30 years to bleach and condition flour until the summer of 1949 its further use was prohibited by the Food and Drug Administration.

We cooperators believe that the consumer should be told, and we tell him. Our Co-op Triple Rich white bread is made with unbleached flour, 2 percent wheat germ, 8 percent milk solids, and 6 percent high-protein soy flour, and the wrapper so states in plain lettering. And because it illustrates clearly both the position of the League with respect to the problem before this committee and the present defects of the law as we see it, I ask your permission to sketch briefly the history and purpose of its development.

Triple Rich, frankly, was not our idea. It was the idea of Dr. Clive McCay, professor of animal nutrition at Cornell University, and formerly chief nutritionist for the Navy, who has testfied before this committee. Its purpose, as Dr. McCay saw it, and as we saw it when Dr. McCay, himself a good cooperator, secured the help of the Ithaca Cooperative in introducing it to American consumers, was to improve both the nutritional value and the consumer acceptance of the white bread that constitutes approximately 95 percent of the bread consumption of the American people. Neither he nor we set out to make money by producing and selling another expensive tea bread, bought only by the minority of middle class and upper middle class people who can afford it. These people aren't dependent on bread for their vitamins and minerals, but poor people are, especially poor children and poor old people, for whom white bread is really the staff of life.

Dr. McCay proved in his laboratory that rats could live and grow on a diet of Triple Rich bread alone, whereas they pined and died when they were fed ordinary white bread, whether it was enriched or not.

In its March 1950 issue, Harper's magazine printed an article about Triple Rich entitled "Bread, and the Stuff We Eat," by James Rorty. The article drew the largest mail response received by any Harper's article for many years. When the letters were read it was pretty clear that American consumers' concept of what white bread ought to be was considerably different from the kind of bread they were getting.

As a result of this correspondence, hospitals and school lunch departments all over the country began adopting Triple Rich. Commercial bakers became interested—scores of them, including some very big ones. Eight large baking companies are now producing Triple Rich for the New York City schools and for a growing market among public and private hospitals and other institutions. One of these companies, the makers of Bond Bread, is about to introduce Triple Rich to the general consumer market in the New York area, and I am told that when it goes on sale it will be fully labeled like our Co-op Triple Rich with the quantities of the ingredients it contains. Triple Rich is already being sold, fully labeled, at 15 cents a loaf—12 cents on sale days—by the Mohican Stores, Inc., a large eastern chain store organization.

It sounds as if Dr. McCay were well on his way toward accomplishing his objective, which, again, was to improve the nutritional value and the consumer acceptability of the staff of life. There can be no question that both improvements were needed. With respect to just one ingredient—milk solids—the Bureau of Agricultural Research has reported that white bread averages only 1½ percent whereas the National Research Council urges at least 6 percent, and Triple Rich contains 8 percent.

The more milk solids the better the bread. The Bureau of Dairy Industry says so, the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics of the Agricultural Research Administration says so. Even the bakers say so, but they're not saying how much milk solids their products contain, and the Food and Drug Administration doesn't require them to. Until it does, it is obvious that the consumer is buying blind and is frequently cheated. And when the consumer is prevented from buying as white bread a product that does tell him how much milk solids and other nutritious ingredients it contains, I submit that the law is being perversely utilized not to protect the consumer but to his detriment.

The consumption curve on flour and bread has been going down for decades. The farmer, the miller, the baker, all need badly a staff of life that people will eat more of, as they eat more of Triple Rich.

Presumably the Food and Drug Administration is in sympathy with Dr. McCay's objective and would like to further it. Yet today, the Food and Drug's projected white-bread standards stand squarely across the path of progress that Dr. McCay has charted, and that both the co-ops and progressive baking companies and chain stores are trying to follow.

The Food and Drug Administration says Triple Rich isn't white bread, despite the testimony of a half-million American families that are buying it as white bread, liking it, and coming back for more. If the projected standards are permitted to go into effect, it will not be legal to distribute Triple Rich in interstate commerce as white bread or enriched white bread. It is too good. It contains 8 percent milk solids, 2 percent wheat germ, and 6 percent soy flour, whereas Food and Drug Administration says the top limits are 3 percent soy and 1½ percent for wheat germ.

Triple Rich can be sold outside the white bread and enriched bread standards, says the Food and Drug Administration, if it is properly labeled, as one of the numerous overpriced "specialty" breads that make up the 5 percent of American bread consumption outside the standard white loaf. That solution, of course, would completely defeat Dr. McCay's objective, which is the co-op objective, to improve the nutritional value and the consumer acceptance of the staff of life generally in the whole trade. The Cooperative League rejects that solution. We don't want the impact of a really nutritious bread to be limited to a small field of competition.

Eight national organizations with over 20,000,000 members have joined in protesting against the artificial ceilings on the quantity of nutritious elements which can go into a loaf of bread, white bread, or enriched bread. The organizations which have protested to the Federal Security Agency and the Food and Drug Administration are the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the International Association of Machinists, United Automobile Workers, National Farmers Union, National Grange, National Association of Consumers, and the Cooperative League.

We are hopeful that the Food and Drug Administration will change its mind, remove its irrational ceilings on honest food ingredients, and permit Triple Rich which half-a-million people are already buying and eating as white bread, to be sold as white bread in interstate commerce. The Food and Drug Administration, to put it mildly, has far more important responsibilities in protecting the public than the setting of maximum standards of quality.

The important point I want to emphasize here is that, regardless of a Government agency's conception of what a consumer expects of a food item, by and large the consumer detests the use of chemicals in foods as substitutes for nutritious, wholesome, natural ingredients which improve flavor and quality. The consumer has little to gain in

purchasing a product containing questionable ersatzes if his life is to be endangered or he will suffer ill effects. It may well be that many of our common illnesses today are caused by the things we eat or fail to eat.

Another important point is that, through the use of hundreds of chemicals and other substitutes, farm commodity surpluses are piling up. Lard, wheat, eggs, and dried milk have been purchased by the Government in large quantities to keep farm income up where it belongs. I am informed that if bakers would increase the use of one item alone—dried milk—to 6 percent in bread, there would soon be no surplus. True, if bakers would use more of the other commodities, instead of chemical mixtures, both farmers and Government would benefit—but the consumer would stand to gain most because of the added wholesomeness in bakery goods.

The position of the Cooperative League is first that the administration of the law in the instance cited is against the public interest. Second, that the law should be amended to require the full quantitative labeling of bread and other food products.

I have discussed the question of bread in detail because this example serves to clarify the general principles involved with respect to the problems of controlling the use of chemicals in food products and in fostering their improvement in the interest of the consumer. The same principles in modified form are encountered in the closely related fields of insecticides and fertilizers.

Returns From Postwar Ship Chartering Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Maritime Board will shortly break out 25, and perhaps eventually as many as 50, vessels from the reserve fleet for bareboat charter to American citizens to meet the new demands for large scale movement of coal and grain to ECA nations. On Monday of this week, the ECA Director of Transportation testified before the Board concerning the extreme shortage of tonnage and the inability of the privately owned fleet to move the necessary cargoes in time. Moreover, there is now pending an application for a long-term charter of tonnage for the intercoastal trade. I wish to call to the attention of the House the magnitude of the financial return to the United States Treasury from the postwar ship chartering programs, a return unmatched by lease or sale of any other war surplus material.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include the following:

MEMORANDUM ON THE FINANCIAL RETURN TO THE UNITED STATES TREASURY FROM THE POSTWAR SHIP-CHARTERING PROGRAM

The financial return to the United States from the postwar ship-chartering program constitutes an unparalleled recovery of funds expended in a war effort.

Charter hire accruals (unaudited) for the WSA interim bare-boat-chartering program and for the chartering programs of the Maritime Commission and the Maritime Administration from July 1, 1945 through June 30, 1950, are as follows:

Basic charter hire accruals	$357,736,909.66
Additional charter-hire accruals	72,060,191.14
Total accruals	429,797,100.80

An indeterminate but very large proportion of the accrued basic charter hire and all of the additional charter hire was derived from United States citizen charterers who chartered approximately 33,700 ship-months.

In addition, charter to aliens, of which the British program comprised a high proportion, consumed an uncertain amount, but, at the outside, no more than 8,000 ship-months. More than 80 percent of the total ship-months consumed in the chartering programs by citizens and aliens was with Liberty ships. Much of the remainder was with Victory ships.

If the useful life of a vessel is taken to be 20 years, roughly 175 vessels were expended in the ship-chartering programs through June 30, 1950, for which nearly $430,000,000 were paid. Thus over $2,450,000 was collected in charter hire for each ship-life consumed in the program. This return is nearly four times the $639,000 statutory sales price of the Liberty ship, nearly 2½ times the $1,050,000 statutory sales price of the C2, and nearly 50 percent greater than the $1,650,000 statutory sales price of the C4.

The extent of the financial recovery from the ship-chartering programs may be better appreciated by a comparison with the return from the postwar ship sales program.

Through September 30, 1950, accrued ship sales receipts are:

695 vessels sold to United States citizens	$704,204,672.92
1,113 vessels sold to aliens	919,178,601.25
Total receipts for 1,808 vessels	1,623,383,274.17

The average return per vessel from the ship-sales program was $898,000, only 37 percent of the return per vessel-life consumed in the ship-chartering programs.

The 695 vessels sold to United States citizens brought only twice as much return to the United States as the 140 odd ship-lives consumed by United States charterers, despite the fact that 192 of the vessels sold were large, fast, modern tankers and most of the remainder were C-type vessels.

The $2,450,000 received per ship-life consumed in the chartering programs represents more than 150 percent of the average war cost of a Liberty ship and nearly 100 percent of the average war cost of an AP2 Victory ship.

Contrasted with the average rate of return of 27.3 percent of acquisition cost secured under the Surplus Property Act, the rate of recovery from the ship-chartering programs is nothing short of phenomenal.

THE REAL CHARTER RATES

The basic charter hire rate for vessels in the offshore trades (and if earned for the coastwise and intercoastal trades as well) is fixed at 15 percent per annum of either the unadjusted statutory sales price or the floor price of the vessel as determined under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, whichever is higher.

Because the unadjusted statutory sales price is higher than the floor price for all types of vessels with the exception of the C3, N3, and C1–M–AV1, charter rates in general exceed 15 percent per annum of the floor prices which are the prices at which many of the vessels were sold.

The basic charter hire rate for a C4 vessel is equivalent to 16 percent of the floor price of the vessel. For the AP2 Victory ship, it is equal to 16.7 percent. For the Liberty ship, the charter rate is 17.6 percent per annum of the floor price. (See table below.)

Additional charter hire is payable by American charterers if, after payment of basic charter hire and fair and reasonable overhead, cumulative net voyage profit exceeds 10 percent of the capital necessarily employed at the rate of 50 percent on the first $100-per-day profit, 75 percent on the next $200, and 90 percent on all above $300 per day.

Accrued additional charter hire between July 1, 1945 and July 1, 1950 totals $72,000,000. This entire sum was paid by United States citizen charterers as no additional charter hire was assessed against alien charterers regardless of the profits made. In fact, preferential basic charter hire rates were given and are being given today on vessels chartered to foreign nationals. The rate applicable to vessels chartered to Philippine Nationals at the present time approximates only 10 percent of the floor price of the vessels.

It is impossible to separate out from the grand receipts of over $357,000,000 in accrued basic charter hire, the portion which is attributable to foreign charters. We do know, however, that over $50,000,000 was derived from charters under the Land-Leathers Agreement with Great Britain.

Thus, at a minimum, United States citizen charterers, on the average, paid a surcharge equal to 23 percent of the basic charter hire rate. (This percentage is derived by dividing the $72,000,000 in additional charter hire paid by United States citizen charterers by $307,000,000 which represents the highest possible amount in basic charter hire paid by American operators.)

There are vessels on charter today, as for instance the *Dartmouth Victory*, which have been on charter continuously since July 3, 1946. Now rounding out 4½ years of charter service, such vessels have returned to the United States nearly 75 percent of the floor price in basic charter hire, and, on the average, over 17 percent of the floor price in additional charter hire. Thus the United States Treasury has been the recipient of nearly the full floor price, additional charter hire is still being collected, and the Government retains full title to the vessel.

CHARTERING POLICIES OF FOREIGN NATIONS

In Great Britain, Government-owned or controlled vessels are chartered on the open market on the basis of sealed bids. The British Ministry of Transport has established a policy of not entertaining bids which do not assure the Government of a 10 percent return on the value of the vessel at the time of chartering.

The terms and conditions of the British Government charters are those of the ordinary commercial contract and there is no sharing of profit as in the United States.

The Dutch Government is chartering Government-owned Liberty vessels at the rate of 2 florens per deadweight ton per month when the survey is for the charterer's account and 2½ florens when it is not. At the official rate of exchange of 3,805 florens to the dollar, Dutch charterers are paying $5,400 and $7,100 per month respectively for Liberty vessels. American charterers are paying just under $8,000 per month exclusive of additional charter hire and the survey is for the Government's account on delivery and for the charterer's account on redelivery.

Statutory sales and floor prices, basic charter-hire rates, and rates of return on floor prices from chartering, by type of vessel

Type	Statutory sales price (unadjusted)	Floor price	Monthly basic charter rate	Annual rate of return on floor price
				Percent
Ec2-S-C1	$639,000	$544,506	$7,987.50	17.6
C1-A, C1-B	970,000	912,859	12,125.00	15.9
C2 (cargo)	1,050,000	957,818	13,125.00	16.4
C3	1,230,000	1,280,730	16,009.13	15.0
C4	1,650,000	1,547,338	20,625.00	16.0
VC2-S-AP2	979,000	879,157	12,237.50	16.7
VC2-S-AP3	1,065,000	1,005,431	13,312.50	15.9
N3	380,000	468,817	5,860.21	15.0
N3-M-AV1	393,000	484,726	6,059.07	15.0
C1-M-AV1	640,000	693,862	8,673.28	15.0
R1-M-AV3	875,000	857,285	10,937.50	15.3
R2-S-BV1	1,720,000	1,562,749	21,500.00	16.5
C2-S (reefer)	1,725,000	1,553,093	21,562.50	16.7

NOTE.—Additional charter hire is payable (after payment of basic charter hire and the payment of the charterer's fair and reasonable overhead) in the event the voyage profits exceed 10 percent of the capital necessarily employed under the following rates: Cumulative net voyage profit in excess of $100 per day—50 percent; cumulative net voyage profit in excess of $100, but not in excess of $300 per day—75 percent of such excess over $100 per day; cumulative net voyage profit in excess of $300 per day—90 percent of such excess over $300 per day.

Source: Data on statutory sales and floor prices and on basic charter hire rates furnished by the U. S. Maritime Commission, Bureau of Government Aids, and reprinted in S. Rept. No. 2494, 81st Cong., 2d sess., p. 298.

WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
Member of Congress, First District, Pennsylvania.

Veterans' Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON C. JONES
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 18, 1950

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to comment upon H. R. 9911. This bill is one of the most important bills of its kind coming before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, since I have been a member of the committee. The question of insurance has been an enigma before the committee for some time. We have all been impressed with the fact that the program for insurance of GI's has been costing more than it should without recurring benefit to the veterans or the Government. Furthermore, we have been impressed with the fact that many GI's have not been protected by death insurance. Some because of carelessness, but most of them because of the cost of insurance added to many other expenses made it financially impossible for them to carry it.

So, when H. R. 9911 reached the committee, it seemed to solve the problem that has been constantly and continuously bothering us for some time and was referred to the subcommittee headed by Representative J. E. NOLAND, of Indiana, which immediatly went to work on the bill. The committee worked very diligently and ably on the bill, holding a number of hearings in order to get the bill in good shape and I want to commend this committee and especially its chairman for the fine job it did in producing what I believe is a satisfactory bill to all concerned.

The subcommittee reported the bill back to the full committee and after careful and thorough discussion the Committee of the Whole reported the bill to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

It provides in substance that on and after June 27, 1950, each person in the Armed Forces is insured against death in the amount of $10,000 without any cost to the person. This protection covers the period from induction into service and 90 days after separation from service. If it develops that the person is injured in service to such an extent as to make him uninsurable at normal commercial rates, he may obtain a policy of the national service life insurance. The effect of the bill is to bar future entrance to the United States Government life insurance and the national life-insurance programs after enactment of this act, but any person having one of these policies may continue it in force, or if he has a lapsed policy, he may reinstate it upon a showing of good health.

Who are the beneficiaries under the policy? The beneficiaries are limited to the members of the immediate family and paid in monthly installments of $92.90 each over a period of 10 years. This indemnity cannot be assigned for benefit of creditors and is exempted from taxation.

The Bureau of the Budget recommends the approach employed in this bill and believes that its enactment at this time would be desirable and consistent with the sound long-range program for servicemen and veterans' benefits.

It has been estimated by the Comptroller General that had this program been in effect during 1940 through 1949, the cost to the Government would have been reduced by approximately $587,000,000. This bill is a practical efficient one and should be passed by the Congress as it sets up a protection in case of death for every GI without any cost to him and at the same time saves the Government the enormous expense over a period of years of collecting and receipting premiums paid and naturally reduces the cost of the insurance program in case of death by substantial figures as above stated. And, last but not least, it gives a protection of $10,000 in case of death to every GI in the service of his country, which continues through the period of induction into the service and 90 days after separation from same.

Wheat and Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address by E. J. Bell, administrator, Oregon Wheat Commission, at annual banquet of the Oregon Wheat Growers League at The Dalles, Oreg., December 9, 1950:

WHEAT AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY

A few months ago I asked a friend in Washington, D. C., for a brief, simple explanation of our foreign policy. "Just what are we trying to do anyway, in our dealings with other nations?" He said, "Why not read the preamble of the Constitution?" After thinking about that for some time, I decided this would be a good place to start in considering the wheat of Oregon and its place in world affairs. So here it is, in case some of us may be a bit "rusty" on our eighth-grade history lessons:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

It may also be helpful to read the first part of a bulletin published by the Department of State in September 1950, on Our Foreign Policy. I hope you get copies and read all of this bulletin but I shall give you here the first few paragraphs:

"Policies are an expression of the national interests.

"That is a way of saying that our policies reflect what we are and what we want.

"During the 175 years since we became a Nation, our national interests have changed in some ways, but their general character has remained constant. Here are some of the values that have persisted all through our history.

"We are an independent Nation and we want to keep our independence.

"We attach the highest importance to individual freedom, and we mean to keep our freedom.

"We are a peaceful people, and we want to get rid of wars and the threat of wars.

"We have a comparatively high standard of living. We want to raise the standard so that everyone in the United States will eventually have a chance to earn a decent and secure living.

"We are a friendly people. We have no traditional 'enemies,' and we want to be on good terms with every other people.

"These are the things on which Americans, with all their different points of view, are most likely to agree.

"It is the job of the Government, as the agent of the people, to promote these national interests."

We can all agree on these objectives. The arguments start when we try to put them into practice. For example, some folks may tell you that we have no business in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Germany, Greece, Turkey, or any other part of the world outside our own immediate borders; that we should live our own lives and let other people live theirs. Maybe that would be the best policy for us, if it were possible for us to live in isolation from the rest of the world; only we never have done it.

From the very beginning of our Nation, the United States has played an increasingly important part in the affairs of the world. Not long after we started as a Nation, pirates along the coast of Africa molested American merchant vessels. Did we tell our Yankee traders to bring their ships back home? No. We sent warships and men over there right away and the infant Marine Corps cut its teeth on the shores of Tripoli. The "blessings of liberty" to our forefathers evidently included freedom of the seas for peaceful commerce. In providing for the common

defense we established the Monroe Doctrine and (with the help of the British Navy) kept European countries from invading the Western Hemisphere. We opened the door of Japan and established markets in China and elsewhere for the wheat and flour of Oregon and Washington. We helped the Filipinos get their freedom from the crumbling empire of Spain and guided them in forming a country of their own. Finally, in your memory and mine we played a decisive part in two world wars. In each of these wars we were unable to keep out, even after doing all we could to remain neutral. During the past 6 months, we have again seen our boys fighting on foreign soil in an effort to protect the security of the United States.

In the world as it is, we cannot "secure the blessings of liberty" by standing in our own doorways with rifles in our hands. It is no more possible for us, as a nation, to live by ourselves in the world of today than it would be possible for us to live behind locked doors in our own homes, if lawless bands went up and down the roads shooting tommy guns. Whether we like it or not, we are an important part of the world. Airplanes and radios have made that world very small indeed; overnight from London to New York, 25 hours flying time from San Francisco to Tokyo.

Now, none of us think that we can do all the fighting for the free world. Just as our pioneers in Oregon needed to band together to protect one another, the security of the United States now depends on the help of a lot of other countries. To be specific, if the Communists take over Korea, Japan, and the Philippines, where would be our next line of defense? And, if the people in those and other countries are really to get up and fight against communistic invaders, they must have something that they think is worth fighting for. Otherwise, we shall have to do the fighting for them.

So, to quote again from the bulletin of Our Foreign Policy:

"We realize that our security consists in a combination of many things. It consists in having superior military and economic power on the side of law and order. It depends on strong and free allies. And it depends also on the good will, the respect, the confidence, and the moral support of decent people everywhere."

Every one of us must take a more active interest in foreign affairs. We must do this because, first, it is essential for our personal protection. Second, it is our sons and daughters who are doing the fighting. Third, our whole wheat industry in Oregon and other Pacific Northwest States depends upon the export market. Fourth, most of the men in the world are farmers and most of the women are homemakers. Neither we nor other farm people across the seas can depend entirely upon professional diplomats to protect our homes from invasion or our children from being sent into battle all over the world.

It is not enough for us to wring our hands and say to ourselves, "What a mess this is," or to cuss out the Government in Washington. Under our Constitution we are the Government, and when we express ourselves in no uncertain terms Congress and the executive branch pay attention.

Now, to make this whole thing a little more definite, I want to talk about wheat in relation to the general nature of our foreign policy. What I have said by way of introduction shows that our dealings with other nations are intended to gain their friendship, confidence, and respect and to promote the best interests of the people of the United States. These two objects are consistent with one another because we cannot hold respect of other people unless we are firm and businesslike in our dealings toward them. In a farming community we cannot hold the respect of our neighbors unless we stand up for our own rights. In the same way, as a Nation, we cannot hold the respect of other nations unless we stand up for our own rights.

Trade in wheat and flour is a good example of how we are not putting these principles into practice. In the world of today wheat is a weapon of war and an instrument of peace. It is important to keep people from going hungry. Since World War II Europe and Asia have used more wheat from the United States than ever before. People who never saw bread have become used to eating it. Most of the movement has been financed, directly or indirectly, by the United States. And the fact that this wheat from the United States was made available has kept revolution from spreading in Western Europe, in Greece, in Turkey, in Japan, in India, and elsewhere in the world.

During this period we had a glorious opportunity to get people in the habit of trading with us. We could have held on to markets we had before the war and could have entered new markets with our flour and wheat. I am sorry to say that we have not done this. Instead, Canadian and Australian millers are getting bakers in the habit of using their brands of flour instead of ours. Bakers in the Philippines, Venezuela, Panama, Haiti, Ecuador, and elsewhere are buying more flour from our Canadian neighbors and less from us. These were markets our millers have supplied for years.

Bakers in Hong Kong and Singapore would like to buy Stateside brands of flour if they could get it at competitive prices. The British Food Ministry, however, licenses all imports and gives a monopoly to Australian and Canadian mills to sell in those markets. The United States buys rubber, tin, and other commodities from that part of the world so those bakers could get dollars if the British would permit it.

India must import food for her teeming millions. She has agreed to buy 38,000,000 bushels of wheat annually under the International Wheat Agreement. Last year she bought all of it from Australia. She tried to buy a lot more from us outside the agreement, but felt her people could not afford to pay our price. Instead, she bought grain sorghums because they were cheaper.

Japan has used millions of bushels of our wheat as long as we gave it to her, but when she has to buy it she gets it from Australia, Pakistan, and Canada. We now witness the spectacle of Japanese mills grinding flour from Australian and Canadian wheat for relief feeding in Korea, while Pacific Northwest mills and mill laborers work only part time and wheat piles up on the ground and in the warehouses of Oregon, Washington, and northern Idaho. And the whole deal is financed by the United States.

How did this situation come about, and what are the remedies?

In all fairness, we must first mention the price-support program. By maintaining a level of wheat prices in the United States we have enabled other exporters to undersell us in the world market. The subsidy under the International Wheat Agreement during 1949–50 cost 54 cents a bushel. This is another way of saying that our prices averaged that much above world prices on the 1949 crop. This subsidy was paid only on wheat sold under the agreement. For sales outside the agreement our wheat and flour were completely priced out of the market. This has given other countries a chance to undersell us in the world market. It has given millers in other countries a chance to establish their brands of flour in markets the United States previously supplied. Loss of these markets may cost United States wheat growers more than the temporary benefit of higher prices on the current crop.

The Oregon Wheat Growers' League has recognized this problem for a number of years. Our approach has been to price our surplus wheat so it can be sold in the world market at competitive levels. This would remove the necessity of acreage restrictions and avoid piling up surplus wheat which now stares us in the face. In return, growers have asked full parity by means of certificates only on the wheat milled for human food in the United States. So far we have not been able to get this plan into action. Many growers have been content to rely upon the Government to support wheat prices and to move the crop before the next harvest. That has come to an end, and we see our surplus wheat piling up in a hungry world while other countries capture our markets and our productive land and efficient mills lie idle.

Meanwhile, our millers cannot wait for Congress to enact a realistic farm program. They must meet their payrolls now, and flour markets, once lost, are very hard to regain. It is important to growers that mills retain flour markets. Once a baker is in the habit of using a brand of flour, he will keep buying it as long as he can get it at anywhere near prices of other brands. It is very important to us in Oregon that our millers continue to sell flour, and we all should be working right now on a program to expand flour sales into new markets. Instead we are losing the fight to hold what flour markets we have had in the past, and that means, in the long run, less sale for our wheat.

Faced with financial loss, millers have asked for a general subsidy on exports to enable them to meet Canadian and Australian competition outside the International Wheat Agreement as well as within it. The Oregon Wheat Growers League has supported our millers in this proposal and all our Senators and Congressmen have been working on it. This request has been denied by the United States Department of Agriculture because they think the cost would be excessive; that not a great deal of flour would actually move, and because they do not want to get into a price war with Canada and Australia. Perhaps we are in a poor position to ask for a subsidy in addition to the present one under the IWA which cost $87,000,000 in the 1949–50 fiscal year; but if our foreign policy means anything in protecting the interests of the United States, we should somehow get our prices in line so as to meet this competition; and this needs to be done soon.

Meeting price competition is just the first thing which limits our exports of wheat and flour. A second very important factor all over the world is shortage of dollars. Japan is a good example. There is a population of 80,000,000 people living on an area the size of California. Even though they produce all the food they can, they still need to import around 3,000,000 metric tons of cereal grains (the equivalent of around 110,000,000 bushels of wheat). The Japanese are a very skillful, industrious people who make a great variety of manufactured articles. The only way they can buy food is to sell these products somewhere in the world; and the country or countries that buy Japanese products are the countries that will sell them the rice and wheat they must have.

It is easier for Japanese to sell their goods anywhere else in the world than in the United States. Because of this, it is easier for her to buy wheat almost anywhere else. Furthermore, there are many things (such as cotton and petroleum) that she can get only with dollars but she can get wheat from Australia and Argentina without using dollars. If she does have dollars to buy wheat, she can get more for her money from Canada because prices there are relatively lower.

Temporarily the United States Army has been furnishing wheat to the Japanese. In fact, most of the extra wheat in Oregon since

1946 has been bought by Commodity Credit Corporation, sold to the Army, given to the Japanese Government, ground in Japanese mills, and the flour sold to the Japanese people. The money paid for this flour is put into a counterpart fund and used to help rebuild Japan. The Japanese are grateful to us for feeding them but they and the other self-respecting people of the world would much rather earn their own living. Unless we buy from them, they will be forced to go elsewhere for the wheat they need.

The same situation prevails in Western Europe only to a greater degree. We have furnished wheat for Western Germany on the same procedure as we used for Japan. We have also provided billions of dollars under the ECA and this program, known as the Marshall plan, has retarded the spread of communism in that part of the world. As Europe gets back on her feet and begins to sell more manufactured products and as she rebuilds her agriculture, she will need less help from us. Because we do not buy from them any more than we can help, European countries are short of dollars. It easier for them to buy wheat from Argentina, Australia, and even from Russia than to buy it from the United States. The only way for them to buy more of our wheat is for the United States to give them more dollars or for the United States to buy more of their manufactured articles. ECA has been instructed by Congress to "minimize the burden on the American taxpayer by reducing the amount of dollar purchases by participating countries to the greatest extent possible, consistent with maintaining an adequate supply of the essentials for the functioning of their economies and for their continued recovery." Backed by this language our representatives encourage European countries to reduce their dollar expenditures and buy wheat elsewhere, wherever possible. These countries are also exerting themselves to produce more wheat at home and thus become less dependent upon imports from overseas.

A third factor limiting our sales of wheat and flour is found in licensing regulations of importing countries. Everywhere we went in the Orient a year ago we found bakers wanting to buy more flour from the United States than their local government licenses permitted, and we found people with a greater taste preference for bread than local government officials were willing to admit. The people of the world can use more wheat than they are now getting and many more folks could be taught to use it. On one side of the Pacific there are millions of hungry people many of whom have a little money to buy a little bread. On our side we have wheat and flour to sell. The chief thing that keeps us all from trading with one another is a bunch of Government regulations.

The net effect of all these circumstances is that the United States supplies only that part of the world wheat market that cannot be supplied from other sources. We shall be lucky to export more than 250,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour during the current marketing year (July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951). This looks small compared with the 500,000,000 bushels we exported in 1948–49. It is larger than our long-time average of 170,000,000 bushels but we can easily produce 300,000,000 bushels or more above our domestic requirements.

A few years ago, we in Oregon supported the International Wheat Agreement. I still think that is a very good thing and we should do all in our power to make it work. That agreement alone, however, will not assure us export outlets in the face of existing price relationships, dollar shortages and import restrictions.

This hungry world can and should use more of our wheat and flour and the United States can and should make it possible for other people to buy it from us. Wherever in the world one finds an Englishman, whether he is a government official or a private trader, he is out there to represent the British Empire and that means he is out there to sell British goods. If all Americans would really represent the interests of the United States to the same degree that those Britishers represent their country, we could sell a lot more of our flour and wheat abroad.

Getting back to our principles of foreign policy, do we really make friends among nations by giving in to them on every turn, or by giving them wheat and dollars? Or can we best preserve the friendship of the world by trading with them on a businesslike basis?

I suggest that the time has come for wheat growers and millers to get together with Government officials and importing firms to insist that we put our foreign policy into practice; that we develop price policies and trading methods that will retain the real friendship of other countries and establish their respect in terms of good business for all concerned. If that means a new look at farm-price programs and a different attitude towards imports, we should be prepared to face the facts.

Report of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAMILTON C. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to state that since becoming a Member of Congress, I have heard many fine encomiums and eloquent speeches made by very able speakers on former Members and Members who were retiring from the Congress after long years of devoted service in the body or had died, which was all and properly fitting. But there has been somewhat of a scarcity of such speeches on very active committees and subcommittes which are functioning at the present time and literally giving their life's blood in major efforts to serve their Nation in vital matters that are brought to them for solution by the world crisis that we find ourselves in.

One of the most impressive of these major efforts is the very fine job done by the Committee on Appropriations headed by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, but especially the masterful job done by the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the National Defense headed by Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, of Texas. I wish to commend this subcommittee for the excellent manner in which the very important appropriations for the armed services are handled and allocated. The committee has done a splendid job in getting right down to the fundamentals in providing a most intelligent and practical program for the masterful strengthening of our armed services. And it has done this with a most illuminating report of the program outlined and the reason for same. It sets forth item by item the real necessities and the philosophic thought behind the program.

To emphasize the point, I shall quote freely from the report showing that the committee had a full grasp of the problem and presented to the Congress a clear and convincing analysis of it, concluding that it was certain without a rapid building up of our military strength that war is inevitable.

The subcommittee report shows the current fiscal year—fiscal year of 1951—we have already provided in the regular bill and in the first supplemental, the sums of $25,000,000,000 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force and for the office of the Secretary of Defense. In this supplemental request, $16,800,000,000 is superimposed upon the previous figure; and when this bill becomes the law, the Department of Defense will have available for the current fiscal year the total sum of $42,000,000,000. I am speaking in round figures in order to facilitate an overall understanding of the sums involved.

Of the $42,000,000,000 appropriated by Congress and available to the Department of Defense, only about $19,000,000,000, less than one-half, will actually be expended out of the Treasury this year. The remaining sums will no doubt be obligated during this fiscal year, and they are essential in order that obligations can be incurred and the program placed under way, but the actual money will not be withdrawn from the Treasury and spent until a much later date.

Now a few quick references to some of the provisions in the bill. It accelerates the antitank and antisubmarine program, so important to the defense of this country. It provides additional funds for the all-important radar fence.

It provides large additional funds for research and development in the field of guided missiles, and puts guided missiles in actual production for use by the services.

Additional funds for research and development are provided, bringing the over-all total for the year to $1,100,000,000.

It provides for a build-up of the United States Air Force from 58 wings to 68 wings, and paves the way for the 84-wing program in the next fiscal year. This action upholds and vindicates those of us in the House who have worked for years for a more powerful Air Force.

Additional aircraft for the Navy is not provided in this measure in view of the previous appropriations for this purpose, but additional ships will be taken out of moth balls, and the funds provided will insure more modern ships and a greater degree of readiness. The Navy will have 1,028 active ships in service.

Tanks in quantity are provided and other Army weapons through an over-all $4,300,000,000 provision for such purposes.

Under this measure the number of men in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and marines on June 30 would be 2,766,000 distributed as follows: Army, 1,264,000; Navy, 684,000; marines, 166,000; Air Force, 651,000. However, plans are now being worked out which will raise all these figures to higher levels and this is clearly required.

The bill provides the Army with $9,200,000,000, which, when added to previous appropriations this year, runs the over-all total to $16,500,000,000. For the Navy the corresponding figures would be three billion and ten and eight-tenths billion; for the Air Force four and six-tenths billion and thirteen and seven-tenths billion.

We all recognize that this is a dangerous world and that from day to day we are in grave peril, but I feel some well-intentioned Americans are unwittingly broadcasting to the world some very dangerous statements. Those who rush into print to say that we are in worse shape than we were the day after Pearl Harbor, those who proclaim that we have nothing to fight with and no defense plans in the event all-out war should strike tomorrow, those who shout from the housetops that we stand naked and defenseless before the world and intimate that the aggressor could bend us to his will in the event of war, those who say that the American people are frustrated, bewildered, and disunited—those who say things like that should weigh their words carefully lest they perhaps convince the aggressor that the free world is ripe for aggression and is waiting only to be plucked. Such untimely declarations when made without reference to other factors might possibly tend to incite the aggressor to full-scale attack. Yet we recognize that a balance in these matters must be found as it is urgently necessary that the American public be frankly informed of the dangers which confront us.

Now is the time to set the record straight. We hate war; we love peace and liberty; we do not want to fight. We are not prepared to wage all-out war at the moment. We do not propose to start a war, and we have no aggressive designs on any nation. If a full-scale war should start tomorrow we would be pushed back on many fronts.

No, no we are not ready for war—far from it—but I hope a recitation of a few fundamental truths will tend to get things in their proper perspective and warn the aggressor lest he be deceived by loose talk and miscalculate the will and the actual and potential might of the United States.

In conclusion, as a united and determined people, let us get on with the job of building up our defenses as effectively and as rapidly as possible. The time may be shorter than we think. Not one hour should be wasted. And as we devote our whole energies to the task of self-preservation and peace we can pray every day for the best while we rapidly prepare for the worst. The quick passage of the bill now before us is a significant part of the job at hand.

May I commend the subcommittee again for a splendid and prophetic job in holding most intelligent and incisive hearings on the subject of the necessary strengthening of our armed services in order that war may be avoided, and bringing to the Congress a clear picture and illuminating report of the huge sums provided and to be provided for vastly strengthening our national defenses, with the accompanying allocation of the funds to the three branches of the services—the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Every patriotic citizen to which this report is available should read it carefully and absorb its salient provisions.

Replacement of Secretary Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lowell Mellett from the Washington Evening Star of December 19, 1950:

TO UNDERSTAND THOSE RESOLUTIONS, ONE SHOULD READ BETWEEN LINES

(By Lowell Mellett)

Reports from European capitals indicate that the resolutions adopted by our House and Senate Republicans demanding the replacement of Secretary Acheson have had a devastating effect among the governments with which we are associated in resistance to the threat of Russian aggression. The news from Washington, according to the dispatches, has been particularly upsetting in Brussels, where other foreign ministers are now meeting with Mr. Acheson to expedite the unification of Western Europe's defenses. The man who had given them leadership up to this point, or had led them to accept the leadership of the United States, is suddenly revealed as one unable to lead or speak with authority for his own people. Or so it seems to some of the statesmen with whom he has to deal.

BETWEEN-LINES THOUGHT

Our friends in Europe probably would be less disturbed if they were able to read between the lines of the two strange political pronouncements. If they could read them as cynical American observers read them, this is what they would find—the between-lines thought being presented in parentheses:

"In this critical hour confidence of the American people in their leadership is essential to our security. (The way to determine whether or not the people have this confidence is to try in every possible way to tear it down and then see if it still stands up. We have done this. We have abused, slandered, ridiculed, and misrepresented Mr. Acheson from the day he took office. That is to say, some of us have, some of the loudest and least responsible of us. The result is that:)

"It is completely obvious that Secretary Acheson and the State Department under his leadership have lost the confidence of the Congress and the American people and cannot regain it. (In other words, we have succeeded in convincing a great part of the American people that whatever mistakes have been made in foreign policy, whether or not they were mistakes in which we joined or even mistakes which we crowded the administration into making, the whole blame rests on Mr. Acheson.)

"NO IDEAS ON REPLACEMENT

"Recognizing this fact, we earnestly insist for the good of our country that Mr. Acheson be replaced as Secretary of State, that there be a thorough housecleaning in the State Department and changes in personnel and policies responsible for this lack of confidence. (In saying this we admit that we haven't the slightest idea of where President Truman can find, as a replacement, a man who can stand up to the treatment we have given Mr. Acheson. And we must not conceal our readiness, 'for the good of the country,' to subject any successor to the same treatment. We have no candidate of our own for the office. Some of us like John Foster Dulles, but Mr. Dulles is a Republican, and even though he thinks much like Mr. Acheson, we'd prefer a Democrat to work on. That also rules out Chiang Kai-shek, a favorite of one wing of our party. He's not a Democrat. As for the general housecleaning, we've got to have that. Having convinced a lot of the voters that the department is simply infested with Communists, the least we could settle for would be the ouster of some clerks and messengers. Our Mr. MCCARTHY would furnish the names.")

There is much more between the lines of the solemn resolutions, but no room for it here. Stated simply, these particular Republicans are against appeasement. Nothing the President could do would appease them.

Pay As You Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF INDIANAPOLIS,
Indianapolis, Ind., December 15, 1950.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JACOBS: The League of Women Voters of Indianapolis is very concerned about the effects of the present emergency on the domestic economy and is fully conscious of the dangers involved in allowing the present inflationary trend to continue unchecked.

It is important that measures be taken quickly not only to check the rising inflation but also to prepare to pay as we go for the increased defense program.

While the credit restrictions under regulations X and W and the September 22 Revenue Act of 1950 were steps in the right direction, it is increasingly evident that these measures will not be sufficient to control the inflationary trend, nor to meet the added defense costs.

Therefore, we favor whatever further tax increases and credit restrictions are necessary to help pay for defense needs and to help skim off surplus purchasing. We also feel that to be effective these measures must be taken immediately.

Respectfully yours,
SHIRLEY N. HARMAN
(Mrs. Charles T. Harman),
President, League of Women Voters of Indianapolis.

DECEMBER 19, 1950.

Mrs. CHARLES T. HARMAN,
President, League of Women Voters of Indianapolis,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MRS. HARMAN: Last October 4, I wrote the President urging price and wage controls at once. I have also spoken for pay-as-we-go taxes, written the President urging such. You may recall I made a speech December 27, 1949, to that effect and was criticized editorially by the Indianapolis Star.

I am in complete agreement with your organization's views expressed in your letter of December 15. I will do all I can, which is indeed very little now. But I shall send a copy of your letter to the President and have it printed in the RECORD.

Very sincerely,
ANDREW JACOBS.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted unanimously by Oregon Wheat Growers League at the twenty-

third annual meeting, The Dalles, Oreg., December 9, 1950:

FOREIGN POLICY

During the past year a number of developments have reduced sales of our wheat and flour abroad. Canadian and Australian millers are selling flour in the Orient and Latin America at prices United States millers are unable to meet. Licensing regulations in Hong Kong, Singapore, and elsewhere exclude United States flour and give a monopoly in those markets to Canadian and Australian mills. These are part of the British Empire to which the United States gives billions of dollars through ECA. Flour purchased with United States funds for Korea is being milled in Japan from wheat produced in other countries.

The net effect of these and other developments is that all available wheat is bought from other exporting countries and the United States supplies only that portion of the world wheat market that cannot be supplied from other sources.

Bakers in the Orient and Latin America are becoming used to brands of flour from other countries. These have previously been established markets for Pacific Northwest flour. Such markets, once lost, will be exceedingly difficult to regain.

It is highly important to wheat producers that our mills be kept running and that we hold and expand markets for our wheat and flour in other countries.

We recommend, therefore, that the Wheat League do everything within its power to get our Government to take a more realistic, businesslike attitude toward promoting sales of United States wheat and flour abroad. Specifically, we recommend:

1. The use of the certificate plan, or export subsidies that will enable our surplus wheat and flour to compete freely on the entire world market, outside of, as well as within, the International Wheat Agreement.

2. Insistence that our wheat and flour be given an even break in licensing regulations of importing nations which we are helping to finance.

3. Requiring that, where the United States Government puts up the money, our flour and wheat be given the preference over flour and wheat from other countries.

Weapons for War Made in United States of America for U. S. S. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Van Wert (Ohio) Times-Bulletin of December 16, 1950:

WEAPONS FOR WAR MADE IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR U. S. S. R.

By way of London comes the information that Russia is building a balanced navy, which includes not only an enormous fleet of submarines, but also four battleships.

What Russia is doing, apparently, is adding to the long list of fighting equipment so generously supplied by the United States, and for which no payments were ever made. It will not bolster an American sense of security to again review this list.

Russia is reported to be especially strong in submarine craft. That fleet had its beginning with a donation of 205 such vessels from the United States, according to the list just announced in England.

During World War II the Roosevelt administration was enthusiastic in arming Russia against any future aggression by Germany. Here is a partial list of what was sent to the Russian Communists:

More than 15,000 fighter planes, more than 7,000 tanks, 51,000 jeeps, 375,000 trucks, 85,000 motorcycles, 8,000 tractors, 8,200 antiaircraft guns, 345,000 tons of explosives, 2,000 locomotives, 11,000 freight cars, 7,700 marine engines, 77 minesweepers, 26 liberty ships, 140 submarine chasers, 105 landing craft, four floating repair ships, in addition to the submarines already mentioned.

Much of this equipment has been passed on to the Chinese Communists. It was used to defeat Chiang Kai-shek forces and is being used against American forces in Korea. And, in case of war with Russia, American boys will be facing weapons of American manufacture, which were given away during a period when Washington policymakers were so dumb—to give them the benefit of the doubt—they thought Russia was yearning to help create a peaceful world.

TIMOROUS ALLIES

Americans awaken to the fact that the billions in gifts donated to this country's "allies" during the last 5 years, and before, is money down a rat hole.

Prior to World War II the western Europeans were hot after this country as an ally, to save their bacon. Failing to get the United States involved, England tried appeasement at Munich. While frantic efforts were under way to get this country into the war, England stiffened its backbone but France, Communist-infested, succumbed. Europe was saved when the Japs, following an ultimatum from Roosevelt, struck at Pearl Harbor.

Now this country has been dragged down to the point where it is compelled to fear Russia, must try to cajole England's communistic government and timorous France not to run out on its benefactor. England and France want to appease Red China, if not Russia. London recognized the Red China Government months ago.

Eisenhower rushed down to the Pentagon a month ago to assume command of the west European defense forces. But no forces appeared to command, and he returned to New York.

Stalin's strategy, like that of Hitler before him, is to divide and conquer. Current developments suggest that the Western World is divisible.

Capitol Cloak Room

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 20 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the 5th of December I participated in the Capitol Cloak Room program over the Columbia Broadcasting System network. I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of that program may be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITOL CLOAK ROOM

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator PEPPER, can a line be held in Korea?

Mr. DOWNS. Senator, should we bomb Chinese cities?

Mr. KENDRICK. Can we defend both Asia and Europe?

ANNOUNCER. Capitol Cloak Room, from the Nation's Capitol, CBS brings you another informal interview with a Member of Congress. Tonight's guest is Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida. Senator PEPPER will meet with CBS Correspondents Griffing Bancroft, Bill Downs, and Alexander Kendrick. First, we hear from Mr. Bancroft.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator PEPPER, welcome to Capitol Cloak Room. A member of the Foreign Relations Committee, you've just made a long tour of Europe and Asia and you've just left Korea a few days ago, so let's start with that. Do you think we can hold a line now in Korea?

Senator PEPPER. Well, I'm glad to see that our leaders have not given up hope. I saw those good fighting men of ours over there just week before last. I was with them in the camps and sometimes in the lines, and I know the stuff they are made of and, if those fellows have any sort of a decent chance, they will hold the line.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, you think they can hold it if the Chinese Communists make this an all-out attack?

Senator PEPPER. Well, of course, it depends on how many troops the Chinese Communists throw in against them and it also depends upon what we are doing to the Chinese while they are crucifying our men.

Mr. DOWNS. Senator, do you have any doubt that the Chinese are not fully committed to this adventure?

Senator PEPPER. Well, one cannot be sure even now what their motive is. There are two or three assumptions that we might well make, but we can't be quite sure which one is correct. We never have been able to be sure what the inscrutable oriental mind is going to do in this situation. For example, this might be the beginning of an all-out puhs on the part of the Chinese Communists at the instance of the Russians to eliminate American and western influence totally from Korea and Formosa and, I think, thereafter Japan. In fact, the whole area of Asia. That would include Malaya and Indochina, and all the other areas where there is western influence today.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, do you think we can stop them?

Senator PEPPER. Well, we can stop them eventually. It would depend at what point we could stop them and how long it would take. The Japs started in 1941. Mrs. Pepper and I were at Pearl Harbor this last week and we saw there the hulls of the *Utah*, having several bodies entombed therein, and we saw the hulls of the *Arizona*, that has over a thousand bodies therein. When they had damaged eight of our battleships and eight of our cruisers by another attack of dastardly character, it looked pretty bad, but eventually we were in Japan a little while ago and we saw, not Japan dictating peace upon the White House steps, as they said they would, we saw American forces in occupation in Japan. It took a long time, but we did it.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, Senator PEPPER, did you talk with General MacArthur and what was his view on this?

Senator PEPPER. Well, I talked with General MacArthur twice. Mrs. Pepper and I had lunch with the General and Mrs. MacArthur on Friday of the week that we arrived there and then I went by to pay my respects and to say good-by to General MacArthur on Monday evening of last week, that is, Monday evening, the 27th. Well, General MacArthur, I think, like our commanders in the field, like all who had to deal with this problem, has had to try to divine what was in the inscrutable thinking of these Chinese Communists and nobody can be sure—for example, when their troops are massed across the Yalu River, whether they are massed

there for defense or whether they are massed there in preparation for an attack. Well, of course, we knew they were up there. General MacArthur has announced that many times, as have his Intelligence officers. We know today that there are many submarines and many airplanes in the Russian area that might be launched against us any time, but I dare say few people would venture to be sure that they are going to do it. We don't know.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, do you think General MacArthur was right in this in launching this offensive?

Senator PEPPER. Yes, I do think he was right. I spent Thanksgiving day and Friday, the day following, at the headquarters of General Walker and up at the lines. On Thanksgiving afternoon, before the attack began Friday morning, at 10 o'clock, I went with General Walker, a great general, and his aides are General Millburn and General Church, and we visited the regimental headquarters of the Nineteenth Regiment and some of the company headquarters and then the next morning I flew over the lines during the time of the advance of our forces. Then * * * saw the tank columns and infantry columns moving forward, our artillery, and the like. The interesting thing was that even that day, with our forces moving forward, approaching contact with the enemy, in the Eighth Army there was a total of only 19 casualties, so, even at the end of the first day, our leaders were not able to determine what kind of resistence they were going to get. They had been sending out patrols for days and even those advance patrols had hardly been able to establish any contact with the enemy. There was considerable evidence to believe that they were steadily drawing back. Now, whether they changed their mind, as they seemed to have, when we crossed the thirty-eighth parallel and didn't attack them, but waited until later or whether they were drawing us in is a matter of opinion. I don't know——

Mr. KENDRICK. Senator, speaking of the thirty-eighth parallel, at the United Nations today, 13 Asiatic and Arab countries issued an appeal to the Chinese Communists to stop when they got to the thirty-eighth parallel. What do you think of the chances of that?

Senator PEPPER. Well, I think that's the kind of weak-kneed appeasement which has been preceded by some other appeasement of the same character and which has contributed somewhat to the aggression that the Chinese Communists are committing today. For example, while we were in Korea and in Japan, we were constantly reading newspaper dispatches, telling us that certain powers, other than the United States, were recommending that we yield and that we not go altogether to the Manchurian border but we have a neutral area there. Well, anybody could see that if we were already willing to concede a neutral area of an indefinite width, that they had gained by their resistance, that they'd probably gain greater reward if they resisted more and by the same logic, if they attacked in force, we'd make yet further concessions to them, but they're exhibiting strength at a crucial time, I regret to say, that a lot of people who haven't seen this thing through have exhibited weakness and if there is anything in the world that these people will exploit it's weakness.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, Senator, that's the military argument. I mean, but there's also a diplomatic argument, one of which is that has been put up and is now being considered, as you well know, that we cannot lick the Chinese nation, we cannot take them on as ground armies.

Senator PEPPER. Well, as I said a while ago, there are people who thought that we couldn't lick Japan after Pearl Harbor, but we didn't quit and we didn't apply to Japan that we'd settle an armistice with her if she wouldn't sink any more ships of ours and we didn't think then for sure that we could defeat Hitler, but we didn't offer a Munich to him as Mr. Chamberlain had done in 1938. We fought it through together without thinking of appeasement and we won. Now, in this case, I think the situation is analogous. The Chinese Communists today are appealed to, we are told, by the press, by a group of 13 nations, as you've just said, headed by whom? Headed by the Honorable Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru.

Mr. KENDRICK. Did you see him when you were out there?

Senator PEPPER. Yes. Yes. Mrs. Pepper and I had a very pleasant lunch with the Prime Minister and talked with him the larger part of an afternoon.

Mr. KENDRICK. What was your impression, Senator?

Senator PEPPER. Well, Mr. Nehru, with all the distinction and credit which he deserves, is in my opinion lacking in reality. He seemed to have no more concept of the danger that his nation and other peace-loving peoples experienced from communism than I have of the prospect of you shooting me at we sit here calmly this evening. He seemed to be totally unaware of the nature of communism and just speaking about the role that India was playing as the western window of Communist China and he thought the Communists of China were like some people, some husbands like to call themselves the misunderstood husband and he was going to be the man who would interpret these misunderstood, kindly intentioned Communists to the Western World.

Mr. DOWNS. Senator, could I interpret your remarks made about Mr. Chamberlain and the certain nations that have advocated the buffer zone and not crossing the parallel, which, obviously, you're referring to Britain, are you comparing Mr. Attlee's mission here to Washington with Mr. Chamberlain's mission to Munich?

Senator PEPPER. No, no. I would not disparage Mr. Attlee's visit by making such a comparison. Mr. Attlee is a very great man and a wise leader and he was an associate of Mr. Winston Churchill and the British Cabinet during the war and I know that he advocated going right through to the finish, which we finally gained, and I can't believe that he would ever advocate or countenance our going back to the days of Chamberlain whom he partially succeeded, but I wanted to just say one other thing about, if I might, about Prime Minister Nehru, with all respect and deference. I noticed a little while ago, when the same aggressive Chinese Communists, without any provocation at all, marched into Tibet, right on the border of India, that Mr. Nehru again, with great sincerity, appealed to the Chinese Communists to stop their aggression upon the little country of Tibet. Did they stop? Well, I wonder why they'd be likely to yield now when they didn't yield to the entreaty to stop invading little Tibet.

Mr. DOWNS. Senator PEPPER, you see no answer to any of this except an all-out war, is that correct?

Senator PEPPER. I don't see necessarily an all-out war, but I do see the necessity of the peace-loving peoples establishing such vigorous unity that ours shall be a superior force and they shall not be able to overcome our unity and our superior force.

Mr. DOWNS. How do we get a superior force?

Mr. KENDRICK. How do we do that? Do we bomb Chinese cities, for instance?

Senator PEPPER. Whether we bomb Chinese cities or not is, in my opinion, a military matter, but we have pursued the most unrealistic course, gentlemen, in this war. I was on board the carrier, the *Philippine Sea*, happened to be on it there at the same time that our distinguished Secretary of the Navy was there, Secretary Matthews, and we saw these helldivers, these dive-bombers, and the jets, go off of the deck of this carrier to their missions, their bombing missions, and then we saw them come back and we heard these men, who had just been under fire from the Chinese Communists on the other side of the Yalu River, tell about having by the limitations of the United Nations to fly along, trying to bomb those bridges in an area where they had a right to go and, without the privilege of shooting back, they were constantly under vicious fire from the antiaircraft batteries of the Chinese Communists on the Chinese side of the Yalu River. Well, these MIGS, these very fast Chinese-jet bombers, that they probably got from Russia, the way the North Koreans got all their other equipment, some of these North Korean prisoners told me the other day over there at Pyongyang, these MIGS would dash out across the Yalu River from the other side and get in a blow, a burst, at our bombers or our jets and before our people could get in position to reply they had darted back across the river and our men were forbidden by the limitations of the United Nations to pursue these planes that had attacked them or silence these batteries that were shooting at them and I saw one plane on the deck of the *Philippine Sea* come miraculously back with half of its wing nearly shot away from these Chinese antiaircraft guns on the other side of the river.

Mr. DOWNS. You think we should carry the fighting into Manchuria?

Senator PEPPER. I think General MacArthur should be authorized to retaliate against Chinese attacks in the way that he and the great military men think is militarily desirable to save these men of ours that they are crucifying over there—

Mr. DOWNS. Would you do that without UN authorization?

Senator PEPPER. No! No! I think all that we'd do, such as all we have done has been * * * should be with the order of the United Nations as our authority for doing it and, by the way, today is a great crisis in the United Nations, but, if the United Nations will remain firm, instead of getting frightened, instead of getting panicky, if we will remember that there's a principle involved in this matter, a very vital principle, of whether the nation can commit violent, atrocious, unprovoked aggression and get away with it or not. I say a principle is inolved. Now, we have stood up, the United Nations have stood up magnificently, the whole peace-loving world, three of them, when on the 25th and the 27th day of June they stood up like men instead of mice and denounced the aggressor and called upon member nations to put the armed strength in the field to throw the aggressor back. Now, what kind of a rule are we going to establish * * * that it's wrong and will be punished, if a small nation like North Korea aggresses, but it's a matter about which they may have immunity and immunity, if it be a large and dangerous and determined nation that aggresses, then we are going to have one rule for the little aggressor and another rule of immunity for the big aggressor.

Mr. KENDRICK. Senator, what happens to Europe while we're concentrating on Asia? That's what Mr. Attlee is here to find out and——

Senator PEPPER. I'm glad you asked that question. That depends on what Europe does to help the peace-loving people in Asia. There's a very great fallacy, I'm afraid, that's fallen somehow into the minds of some of the Europeans. They seem to be afraid that

the United States will dissipate its strength in Asia. That we might call upon them to squander their strength in far-off Asia and leave them unprotected against Russian aggression in Europe. I'd like to say to them, in my humble opinion, the one assurance that Russian aggression will come to destroy them is if nothing is done effectively to stop Russian promulgated aggression in Asia. If Russia, through the Chinese puppets of hers, can get away with stealing and robbing North Korea and South Korea of their liberty, killing and plundering those people, and then all we do is shiver in our boots until maybe they stop, why, then, what can they do but in their cynical way proceed, knowing that if they put up enough force somewhere else that we'll weaken again. Nothing in the world but Munich all over again——

Mr. BANCROFT. Isn't there a practical side to this, though? Can we really accumulate enough strength to defend both Europe and——

Senator PEPPER. Yes, there is a very practical side to it. That's the reason I say that the United Nations should give General MacArthur authority to retaliate against the encroachments of the Chinese and fight the kind of battle that we are qualified to fight. Of course, we are not going to fight a land war with the hordes of Asia. Why, we couldn't win the war if we killed a hundred of theirs every time they killed one of ours. We haven't got enough, no doubt, that we could put in the field there, but, suppose General MacArthur is authorized to bombard by air and naval power Chinese cities and says to the Chinese Government, this de facto Communist Chinese Government, "you're killing Americans and Britishers and Turks and United Nations people by your aggression in North Korea in a land where you outnumber us, we will let you feel how it tastes to be the victims of B–29's and B–36's and jets and——"

Mr. BANCROFT. And atom bombs, too, Senator?

Senator PEPPER. If it became appropriate. I regret very much that the subject of the atom bomb's use has been brought into the Korean situation. Why, there's nothing in the world but a (one word unintelligible) sequence of hills up there, little mountains, as it were, and these people are all concealed ofttimes in the caves and under the trees and the like and scattered over multitudinous mountains and large areas, if you were to drop a bomb it wouldn't kill——

Mr. DOWNS. Well, Senator, can we stay on the peninsula? I mean, right now we are retreating. What is your information? You came back last week, what is your information, are we going to be kicked off, are we going to have to withdraw, are we going to have to make a (interruption) or what?

Senator PEPPER. I started to say, Mr. Downs, a minute ago that in talking to these North Korean prisoners, one of whom was a colonel and the other a full colonel, I said: "What of our weapons did you dislike the most?" and they said, "those jets," which they call the "rascals." That seemed to me the worst word in their vocabulary, the rascals. That's in my opinion what most of them are. But they didn't seem to like these jets. Now, if General MacArthur were turned loose to use these jets in the way that they dislike the most, it might slow them down a little bit over there in Korea, so, of course, if the time came that it became desirable or appropriate from the military standpoint to use the atom bomb, why I think with the knowledge and approval of the President and the United Nations, especially the President, that he should have authority to use it. However, that's our big gun, you know, and you don't waste your big guns on that. That's when you're (faded out). We may have the need for our big guns a little while later, if we find we are in contact with bigger game, so I don't want to squander them. General MacArthur could do a great deal to the Chinese coast with American warships and with jet planes if he had the authority to do it and we could have stopped, no doubt, a great deal of this migration across the Yalu River if General MacArthur had had authority to go bomb those bridges from both ends (interruption) ever get to just one end.

Mr. DOWNS. Senator, if we get pushed off, pushed out of Korea and pushed off the continent, then do you think we can win a war or stop the Communists simply by air bombardment, naval bombardments?

Senator PEPPER. I realize that the plight we're in today is a very dangerous and a very desperate one and that it's going to take all the courage and sacrifice that our heroic men can summon for us to hold that difficult terrain, suprised as we have been by the aggression of a new power. However, if we can hold, remember, we didn't have but a small perimeter down at Pusan, but we held and we counterattacked. We've got superiority in the air and superiority in the sea in our excellent fleet that's out there, so I'm hoping that we can hold a line from which we can counterattack at the appropriate time. Now, I started to say a while ago that I thought this thing might be upon one or two or three motives. One is, it might be an all-out effort to drive all the western nations out of the whole of Asia and eventually out of Japan. Second, it might be just a holding action, to make us exert and exhaust ourselves if possible. That's unlikely, however, or they would have stayed up in the hills where their own defense wouldn't have cost them much and would have cost us a great deal. I think probably the reason that's uppermost in their minds is that they are going to frighten us so much, or force us so hard, as agents of the Russians, as a part of Russian strategy, that we will seek an over-all settlement. In other words, they'll get us around the table in another Munich in which they'll get everything and we'll come out of it with lost opportunity and humiliation. Now, it seems to me that that's probably what they've got in mind, and here these gentlemen from India and these Arab countries, who of all people, need the help of the United States and the strong United Nations members, here they come along on bended knee and say, "Won't you please stop at the thirty-eighth parallel?" Well, suppose they stop. How long would they stay stopped? What forces would hold them there? Would we have Mr. Nehru constantly ready with his (one word unintelligible) Arab and Asian resources to file another petition and entreaty as soon they started to move again? You see how unrealistic that is. Now, you say, "What do you offer?" Well, frankly, I don't think there's any brief answer that anybody can give except a constant enlargement of our strength and power, increase in our unity among nations of good will and peaceful disposition and, above everything else, here at home, forgetting politics and merging our people into the kind of fighting unity that we exhibited during the war that——

Mr. KENDRICK. Well, Senator, that brings up this question. Today, some of the Republican Senators were complaining that they hadn't been let in on what's going on between the President and Mr. Attlee, that they weren't—that their advice wasn't being asked. Is that so?

Senator PEPPER. Well, I know that representatives of the Republican Party, of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Armed Services Committee, certainly, and no doubt, upon other committees, have been kept fully informed of the military situation. Tonight's papers—tomorrow's—tomorrow morning's papers will carry about General Bradley having been up to talk about the military situation with the Armed Services Committee, consisting of nearly as many Republicans as Democrats, as they've been to the State Department. If anybody wants to go down and talk to the President about it, I'm sure that he'd be more than glad to——

Mr. DOWNS. [Both speaking (unintelligible.)] Complaint. They don't complain that they haven't been filled in or briefed on the situation, but that their advice has not been asked.

Mr. KENDRICK. That decisions are being made and they're being informed of the decisions after they are made.

Senator PEPPER. Well, now, these gentlemen know perfectly well the constitutional character of our Government. The division between the executive and the legislative and the judicial, and they know perfectly well that somebody has got to act in the role of President and that that President has got to contact agencies of the Government and such sources of opinion as he thinks wise and they know very well also that that President in our great democracy would allow any of these responsible leaders to come and talk to him about the subject and give their ideas at any time, but, what's he going to do? Are you going to have a committee run the war? I don't think that anybody has suggested that a committee is the way to run a war. Somebody has got to make the decisions, but these gentlemen over there in the Congress have every right to repudiate any action of the President they dislike. They have every right to go give him their advice. He can't sit there all day with the head of the sewing circle.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, Senator PEPPER, do you feel that the American people have been told outright exactly what is happening, how serious the matter is, and what they can do about it?

Senator PEPPER. I think the American people are being told the truth because the American press and radio and television are giving the American people better coverage than they've ever had in any war. As a matter of fact, the military officials have told me here in Washington, since I've been back, since Saturday night, that actually what you read in the newspaper comes fresher from the front lines than they are able to give you in a briefing. Why? One of your courageous reporters over there, and I want to pause to pay tribute to the sacrifices of life as well as limb which have been made by the intrepid newspaper and radio and television reporters that have been covering this war for the American people—more newspapermen, and that includes radio and television men, have lost their lives in this war than lost their lives in the Pacific phase of the European—I mean of the World War II, so I say that we have utterly no censorship of the press. You don't rely upon the president of the Department of Defense, commander of the Army and Air Force, to tell the American people, the press is telling them exactly the dilemma that we face over there today. Now, if the President hasn't been able to penetrate the veil of the future and tell the American people just exactly what he's going to do to eliminate this jeopardy that we face, it's because he's only human and he cannot penetrate the impenetrable veil of the future, which is unknown. President Roosevelt couldn't after Pearl Harbor have told the American people either just what he was going to do, but they knew he was going to fight and he was going to stand for the principles that we believe in as a Nation and

eventually we were going to win and that's exactly what President Truman, in my opinion, will——

Mr. KENDRICK. Well, Senator, all we do down here is report what the various leaders of our Government say and do, and hasn't it struck you that some of the leaders of our Government have been very hesitant to really lay it on the line? I mean, they talk about controls as something that may occur 6 months from now or 9 months from now, but they never really impress the public with the seriousness of the situation.

Senator PEPPER. Well, I think this is true, Mr. Kendrick, and I think you'll understand the reluctance of the Government to impose these governmental controls unless we come to the point of absolute necessity. You remember that we didn't impose a great many of the controls in World War II until a number of months had passed and now if these Chinese Communists had not come into it on the twenty-eighth in such force as they did with their counterattack, why, the Korean war would have been over by now. We'd have been up on the Manchurian border. We have 145,000 troops in their armies as prisoners and there's—as General MacArthur said—the North Koreans had been defeated, and then a new enemy comes in, but we didn't know that they were coming for sure, and why go and impose all these controls and set up a great administrative bureaucracy unless the emergency really demands it and——

Mr. KENDRICK. Don't you think the emergency has arrived?

Senator PEPPER. Well, I don't know but what it's here, and I think probably the next few hours will tell us the gravity of the situation and then, if it goes on the next few hours as it appears, then I think the only thing that the President and the Congress can do it to tell the American people that we are set to the most grim task that we've ever faced in our national history and whatever be the sacrifice, we're going to have to see it through. It'll be blood and sweat and tears for a long way.

Mr. KENDRICK. Well, that's what it has been, Senator, ever since we crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, and isn't it about time that someone in an official capacity, other than we correspondents, tell the people that?

Senator PEPPER. Well, I think we are approaching that, and I believe that the President is going to tell the American people frankly just the nature of the dilemma, but I started to say it's blood and sweat and tears now, but eventually I believe, it's a stronger United Nations and probably the best hope of a permanent peace we've ever had.

Mr. DOWNS. Senator PEPPER, I would like to ask just this one thing about your own personal plans, now that you have been defeated after 14 years in the Senate, do you plan to stay in politics or get back in, or what?

Senator PEPPER. Well, whether a man gets into politics, you know, is not always left entirely to his own discretion or choice. I'm going to become, I hope, a very busy practicing lawyer right after the first of the year, and as a citizen I'll always try to serve my country to the best of my ability whenever the demand comes.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, I'm afraid that's all the time we have and, Senator PEPPER, we certainly do appreciate your being with us here tonight on Capitol Cloak Room, and thank you very much, Senator PEPPER.

Senator PEPPER. Thank you, Mr. Bancroft.

ANNOUNCER. Columbia has again brought you a meeting in Capitol Cloak Room, presenting a Member of Congress through informal interview. Tonight's guest was Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, He was interviewed by three CBS correspondents—Griffing Bancroft, Bill Downs, and Alexander Kendrick.

Maurice Moskovitz, Man of Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Mr. Webster K. Nolan, prominent San Francisco newspaperman, concerning the outstanding achievements in citizenship of another noted San Franciscan, Mr. Maurice Moskovitz. It has been my pleasure to know Mr. Moskovitz for many years, and I am glad to request the privilege of having this well deserved tribute published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Nolan's letter follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *December 9, 1950.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAVENNER: Today I read a dispatch in the wire-report about the awarding of the Government a certificate of achievement for outstanding accomplishment to a Menlo Park, Calif., doctor and professor at Stanford University, for his constructive efforts as a Tokyo army headquarters biological and natural resources consultant.

Right here in San Francisco is an outstanding citizen. Mr. Maurice Moskovitz, who for more than a quarter century has consistently devoted his energies to the betterment of the American way of life.

Sixteen years ago, Maurice Moskovitz initiated and devised the plans for title one of the FHA, the emergency provision of 1934 calling for Government-sponsored loans to property owners for renovation, repairs, remodeling and painting of properties in order to provide farspread and immediate employment to millions of worthy workingmen.

The extraordinary success of that immediate relief plan of 1934, still in force, is historic. You were instrumental in bringing it to the attention of the late great United States Senator Hiram W. Johnson.

The letters exchanged at that time between the White House and Mr. Moskovitz are at hand, notably the exchange of correspondence with the late Mr. Louis McH. Howe, secretary to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as well as many letters from distinguished leaders, Congressmen and major national organizations commending Mr. Moskovitz for his efforts in behalf not only of the unemployed but for the small businessman. Mr. Moskovitz himself is a prominent realtor in this area.

Recently Mr. Moskovitz was appointed a director of the Golden Gate Bridge district and his first pronouncement was that he would strive for cutting in half the bridge toll, which, he said, could be accomplished if that enterprise is operated on a sound business basis.

Since certificates of achievement are in order, as the grist from today's news mill indicates, certainly recognition of the sustained, sound and inspiring efforts of esteemed citizen Maurice Moskovitz ought to be spread upon the minutes of Congress and formal affirmation be sent him in some suitable form.

Sincerely,

WEBSTER K. NOLAN.

Total Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 20 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sure that many Members of the Senate are acquainted with Mary Spargo, who for several years reported for the Washington Post. Miss Spargo now conducts the Vermont News Round-Up for Station WCAX, in Burlington, Vt. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the Round-Up for December 16, which I am sure will be of interest to many people.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. Tonight there is only one real news story in Vermont. Leaders of this State are unanimous in a demand for total, all-out mobilization right now.

Before I give our listeners a round-up of Vermont thinking in the present crisis, I'd like to switch back a minute to 10 years ago. History has a curious trick of repeating itself, and the present situation seems to me to be an almost uncanny parallel of the situation Vermont and the Nation were in during 1940 and 1941.

In what Vermont regarded as the tense days of 1940 I had been doing newspaper work in this State, and then I left to do a similar task in Washington. In Vermont in 1940 there was a deep consciousness of the seriousness of the world situation. War with Germany and Japan was regarded as inevitable. When I got to Washington I was astounded as the lassitude of the Nation's Capital, Washington, it seemed to me, was still asleep.

Some months after I arrived in Washington—on September 17, 1941—several months before the fateful Pearl Harbor attack of December 7, the Vermont State Legislature voted a bonus for the Vermont National Guard, and in so doing declared that a state of war existed.

Everywhere in Washington it was being said, "You Vermonters are a belligerent lot, aren't you? What are you going to do, take on Germany all alone in that little State?"

My answer then was, "It's not a question of belligerency." Vermonters simply are able to recognize the side of a barn when they see it. Being a people accustomed to freedom, they cherish it enough to fight against all odds to keep it. The average Vermonter is a realist, who doesn't shut his eyes when he sees the muzzle of a gun poking around the side of a barn, hoping the gun will be gone when he wakes up.

Today this Nation is up against an antagonist who makes Hitler look like a minor-league player, and once again we find conservative Vermont way out ahead of Washington in looking for measures to defend the freedom of its people.

Here is the score. Governor-elect Lee E. Emerson has already called over Station WCAX for total mobilization, national-service registration, universal military service, wage, profit, and price controls.

Vermont's senior Senator, GEORGE D. AIKEN, says we are at war. He wants all-out efforts in every direction—national service registration, universal military service, and every other conceivable step; nothing will do but all-out methods right now, AIKEN says.

And Vermont's junior Senator, RALPH E. FLANDERS, also endorses total, all-out mobilization for war, provided the term is understood to include mobilization of all our psychological and spiritual resources. And by that, Senator FLANDERS, who has been devoting much study to foreign affairs, wants it to be understood he means a stepped-up campaign for the people of this country to get the voice of democracy behind the iron curtain to the people of Russia and all its satellite countries. That should be, Senator FLANDERS insists, the main job of our State Department right now.

Representative CHARLES A. PLUMLEY is another who says we are at war. He wants to have the democratic nations use every weapon at their command.

Maj. Gen. Merrit A. Edson, Vermont's commissioner of public safety, and head of civilian defense, joins the call for all-out mobilization. Edson, Vermont's only Congressional Medal of Honor winner, does not believe any half-way program will meet this situation.

President William Carlson, of the University of Vermont, is calling for universal military service right now. He was the first college president in the United States publicly to advocate such a step. Dr. Carlson wants to see every young man and young woman in the United States serve this country for 2 or 2½ years when he or she reaches the age of 18 or graduates from high school, whichever comes first.

"We are now at war," Dr. Carlson said today, "and we will have to take every single step we can to survive. This is my position and it is the position of the University of Vermont."

Incidentally, Dr. Carlson, a newcomer to Vermont, comments that Vermonters have a deeper grass roots understanding of world problems than people of many other States. He believes Vermonters in general are better informed because they sit around the kitchen fire talking world issues instead of gossiping about their neighbors.

The Very Reverend Daniel P. Lyons, president of St. Michael's College, was not long behind Dr. Carlson in urging military service.

Today, Father Lyons has a special message for the people of Vermont.

Commenting on President Truman's address to the Nation, Father Lyons said:

"I personally feel that the President is now convinced that it is no longer possible to do business with Russia. Most of us, I am sure, concur in this, for an atheist and a Christian never did stand on common ground. However, I see no reason for any of us to get panicky. There is always hope. While preparing for the worst and hoping for the best as the President said, let us all remember that divine providence still rules the world. If enough people pray for the conversion of atheistic Russia, there shall be peace."

To us in Vermont there is something very heartening in the rallying of all our leaders in a determination to face facts as they are and take every measure to meet the crisis.

Perhaps by the grace of God something of this same stubborn, rocky courage will communicate itself to the groggy, weary, confused leadership of the Nation's Capital.

I cannot forbear from reminding my listeners of the speech made by President Calvin Coolidge in Bennington on September 21, 1928:

"If the spirit of liberty should vanish in other parts of the Union and support of our institutions should languish, it could all be replenished from the generous store held by the people of the brave little State of Vermont."

Recommendations of the People of Kansas on Tax Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 20 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce has submitted to me their recommendations on war emergency taxation for 1950 to 1951. These recommendations have been studied by the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, and this organization, speaking for 2,400 business and professional people of Kansas, reflects through these recommendations the thinking of the people of Kansas on the vital tax issues of the day. I ask unanimous consent that these recommendations be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS ON WAR EMERGENCY TAXATION: 1950–51

First, it is incumbent on the Government itself to take the first necessary step toward sound pay-as-we-go financing by cutting its nonwar spending to the bone, thus following the very advice its spokesmen have already given to the Nation's workers, housewives, and businessmen. The Government should also refrain from initiating new nonwar spending programs during this period when the needs of national defense are paramount, and it should postpone peacetime projects where shortages of labor and material exist.

Moreover, military expenditures should be constantly scrutinized in order to avoid unnecessary and wasteful outlays of funds for these purposes.

In other words, Congress should require the Government to demonstrate a bona fide need for additional revenues before acting to impose new taxes of any kind.

Second, in the event Congress then decides that additional tax revenues are needed to finance the war effort and maintain governmental solvency, the Kansas State Chamber would offer the following recommendations:

1. ALTERNATIVE TO THE SO-CALLED EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

The so-called excess-profits tax should be opposed in principle because it is administratively and economically unsound. Such a tax in peacetime is, of course the first step toward limitation of profits and the destruction of the incentive system. Any possible benefits that may be claimed for the enactment of such a tax are grossly exaggerated. The imposition of a so-called excess-profits tax can only result in increased costs to both the Government and the public generally. On the basis of past experience it has been demonstrated that an excess-profits tax discourages incentive for prudent management and encourages waste and inefficiency in operations to further contribute to the inflationary spiral. This type of tax is bound to penalize small businesses, especially the rapidly growing progressive companies and industries in favor of those that have been laggard or static.

Under any conditions such a tax would be detrimental in promoting the expansion of production so vital to the full development of the defense requirements of the Nation. Even with the application of complicated formulas and the use of various relief devices, it has been almost impossible to develop a fair and sound basis for measuring the normal profits which under no circumstances should be subjected to a discriminatory excess-profits tax.

Any abnormal profits which may be realized from the execution of Government contracts relating to the defense program can be effectively prevented through efficient over-all renegotiation, with the amount recaptured going to the Treasury. Over-all renegotiation has the advantage of allowing losses on some contracts to be offset against profits on the others and does not take away all of the profit incentive as do present repricing policies.

An excess-profits tax is costly to the Government to administer and greatly increases the compliance costs of the taxpayer as evidenced by the thousands of cases unsettled and in litigation under the law in effect at the termination of World War II. No logical basis appears to exist for the adoption of this type of tax when more expedient and simplified means of raising any additional needed revenues from corporations are available.

In lieu of a so-called excess-profits tax, and to avoid imposing too heavy a burden on small business, the Kansas State Chamber recommends a war-emergency tax on corporations in the form of a percentage applied to the combined normal and surtax paid by a corporation.

In the event such a tax is imposed, the normal corporate income-tax rate should be established at 18 percent, with the surtax rate remaining at 20 percent as now provided for the year 1951 in the 1950 Revenue Act. Thus the war-emergency tax, where possible, would be a percentage rate added to the total amount of the normal and surtax computed at such rates.

2. SUGGESTED EXCESS-PROFITS TAX FEATURES IF SUCH A TAX IS TO BE ENACTED

If, despite the many known inequitable and harmful effects of so-called excess-profits taxation, Congress should persist in enacting such a tax, then the measure should contain the following features:

(a) The general structure of the law should be the same as that of World War II, with which taxpayers are familiar. By this we mean that the excess-profits credit should be based on either invested capital or average earnings in a base period, at the taxpayer's option. The law should provide adequate relief provisions patterned after those contained in the former law, but expanded and revised where more equitable treatment can be achieved with less administrative difficulties.

(b) The income base period should be the 4-year period from 1946 to 1949, inclusive, with the growth formula and with the adjustment of one low year, patterned after the law in effect during World War II, with provision for adjustment to net increase or decrease of capital subsequent to the base period.

(c) Normal and surtax should be deducted in determining excess profits. Here again the normal corporate income-tax rate should not exceed 19 percent, as a protection to small businesses, and the surtax should remain at 20 percent as adopted for the year 1951 under the 1950 Revenue Act. Thus we

would have a maximum 38-percent combined normal and surtax rate base from which to compute any excess-profits tax.

(d) Full credit should be given for borrowed capital, with corresponding disallowance of deductions for interest on borrowed capital. The previous law defined borrowed capital as "indebtedness evidenced by a bond, note, bill of exchange, debenture, certificate of indebtedness, mortgage, or deed of trust, and the base included 50 percent of such borrowed capital."

(e) Full credit should also be given for base-period earnings. The previous law allowed only 95 percent of the average base-period income. There is no justification in contending that corporation profits were actually excessive during the years 1946–49, in the light of the expanded economy with sustained high-level employment, production, price levels, and national income.

(f) The credit on invested capital should be at least that provided in the 1940 act which was 8 percent of invested capital.

(g) Accumulated earnings after the effective date of any excess-profits-tax law should be permitted to increase the invested-capital base and should also be permitted to increase the earnings credit.

3. ADDITIONAL EXCISE TAXES

If it should be necessary to raise more revenue than the present system will yield, even if augmented by additional taxes on corporate incomes, then there should be an expansion of the field of excise taxation as a defense measure. Such additional excise taxes should be imposed on all products except food.

4. TAX-EXEMPT ENTERPRISES

The State chamber's position favoring taxation of many types of enterprises now enjoying a tax-exempt status should still stand.

5. TRANSACTIONS TAXES

The State chamber still opposes the imposition of any transactions tax.

Why We Have Good Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 20 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why We Have Good Judges," from the Kansas City Star of Saturday, November 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE HAVE GOOD JUDGES

In the last round-up of election news we note that the judges squeaked through on a "yes" vote of about 7 to 1. This refers, of course, to the Jackson County vote on circuit and higher court judges who hold office under the nonpartisan court plan.

If Missouri still had the old political system for judges they would have been out in the splatter of the campaign since early last summer. In Jackson County none could have been elected unless he had received machine endorsement before the primary. And according to the record under the old system the machine never liked to support a judge unless it had some political strings on him.

After the primary of a political system you would have seen Democratic and Republican candidates for the bench campaigning against each other. Last Tuesday all Democrats would have been elected regardless of relative merit.

The judicial election on the nonpartisan ballot was a very different story. So little was heard from the judges during the campaign that the only danger was that the public might forget to vote on them. Now that they have one-sided approval the judges go into their new terms entirely free from obligation to any politician or anyone else.

When the nonpartisan court plan was new, some of the judges were afraid of it. In the first elections held on the "yes" or "no" ballot, friends of the judicial candidates waged campaigns for their support. But experience with the plan soon showed that there was no purpose in campaigns. When a reasonably good judge asks public approval to stay in office the voters are glad to approve him.

The only real objection to the method is the fact that it virtually assures a judge lifetime tenure. Still, tenure under the plan isn't quite as certain as the life appointments to the Federal courts. We haven't heard that many Federal judges abuse their security. And the over-all effect of the Missouri system has been excellent. The plan needs only a decent retirement provision to make it ideal.

Death of Curtis Longino Waller, Judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Fifth Circuit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 20 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the 11th of July one of the outstanding jurists of this country, one of the noblest and finest men who ever lived, with whom I had once the honor of being a law partner, died. He was Judge Curtis L. Waller, of the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Fifth Circuit. The University of Florida Law Review dedicated its last issue to Judge Waller, and I have the honor to submit those dedicatory remarks at the end of this statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they may be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On July 11, 1950, a judicial sun, in the full luster and glow of noonday brilliance, after a brief flicker and pause, dropped suddenly behind the horizon of life into eternity and immortality. For on that day, Curtis Longino Waller, of the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Fifth Circuit, Florida's highest ranking member of the Federal judiciary, died, after a brief illness, at 63. Into the grave with him went the hearts of a countless host who admired him for the virile strength of his mind and loved him for the grandeur of his character and the noble beauty of his spirit.

Appointed as United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida in 1940, he was elevated to the circuit court of appeals in 1943. His judicial career climaxed a rich and full life which began in Silver Creek, Miss., where his family was rooted and revered, and an uncle was governor.

He took his literary work at Mississippi College and his law degree at Millsaps College. He was a high-school teacher; secretary to the gifted Pat Harrison in the House of Representatives in Congress; an aviator in World War I.

Returned from the war, he immediately gained distinction at the bar of Mississippi. He served in the Mississippi House of Representatives. In 1924 he moved to Tallahassee, Fla., and at once assumed leadership in an eminent Leon County bar.

His counsel was sagacious, his thinking astute and profound. His character, about which all of his life no man ever dared to whisper, won profound respect for every utterance he made to client or court. He was thorough, and when his preparation was finished, sure of his case. He had the genius as a lawyer of catching phrase and homily or humorous rhetoric which endeared him alike to court and jury. His standing at the bar and in the community caused him to be drafted against his will to serve Leon County in the house of representatives in the legislature and to accept appointment as State attorney of the second judicial circuit, for a brief period.

He had an enviable aptitude for the bench, for he had that balance of judgment, that innate sense of justice, that courage of conviction, as well as that saturation in legal principle and precedent, which makes the judge. To a judicial mind he brought a gentleman's code and warm heart. His happy diversion from labor was fishing and he wrote intriguing fishing stories for national sportsmen's magazines. In the camp or in the friendly circle which he so much loved, he had no superior as a storyteller.

He was too faithful a disciple of the law not to follow it but he was too just a judge not to rebel at wrong, even what he thought was wrong law. He believed in social justice and progress and as a citizen he supported liberal men and liberal movements, but when he sat as a judge he was the shield of the individual and woe to those pressing down upon the citizen who fell upon the poniard of his pen. As a district judge he had the faculty to grasp the issues, to rule promptly and forcibly and to dispatch the court's business both quickly and well. As an appellate judge he spurned verbosity, he scorned empty rhetoric and cut through the confusion of fact and word with the lance of a penetrating mind and what Mr. Justice Glenn Terrell called "incisive, pointed, and direct statement."

In one of his dissenting opinions, Judge Waller said: "I hesitate to ascribe to Congress the absurd design to tax a gift to a babe in arms because his estate must be managed by someone sui juris, exercising the powers of a guardian or parent, while a gift to an adult, requiring no managing third party, is tax free. Congress likes adult voters, but surely not that well." *Fondren et al.* v. *Com. of I. R.* (141 F. 2d 422).

But he could put a romantic shaft upon his arrow: In *Crews* v. *U. S.* (160 F. R. 2d 747), he began the opinion of the court: "The beautiful Suwannee River—the mention of which calls to memory a plaintive melody of strumming banjos, humming bees, childhood's playful hours, a hut among the bushes, and a longing to go back to the place where the old folks stay—was the scene of the cruel and revolting crime that provoked the gesture of dealing out justice that is this case."

His judicial reputation was rising all over the country. The law he loved has lost one of its finest and best.

We became friends shortly after 1925 and, until he went away, our lives, like our hearts, were close together.

When he was lowered beneath the gentle pine which is his sentinel in Tallahassee, there came back to my mind the noble words of Antony over the body of Brutus at Philippi:

"His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, 'This was a man!'"

And if we add "and a great and just judge," there is a fitting epitaph for Curtis L. Waller.

Well does the University of Florida Law Review, edited by those destined to become builders of the law, dedicate this issue to one, who in the language Dean Pond once used, "has left in the edifice of the law so many stones bearing his own craftsman's mark."

Congress Should Give Us an Adequate Merchant Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 20 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a very fine and well-written editorial entitled "Congress Should Give Us an Adequate Merchant Fleet," which was published recently in the New York Inquirer of December 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD GIVE US AN ADEQUATE MERCHANT FLEET

One of the major national problems which the Eighty-second Congress, which convenes next month, should tackle and solve is that of the American merchant marine.

The United States should have a mercantile fleet greater than that of any other land on earth, not as a matter of luxury but of vital necessity.

We need such a fleet from the standpoint of economics, defense, and national prestige. It is the duty of the statesmen in our National Capital to guarantee our having a merchant marine in every respect worthy of the United States of America. Yet those men have consistently refused to give due attention to our mercantile shipping needs. The costly lessons taught us by the First World War and since that conflict passed into history, as to the role which our merchant marine should always be prepared to play in national and international life, have gone for nothing, as far as Congress is concerned.

Interesting and instructive information as to our merchant fleet is contained in a dispatch from Washington, December 10, to the New York Times. It tells us:

"A steady decline since 1946 in the amount of United States foreign trade carried in American flag ships was reported today.

"The decline was cited in a statement issued by the Joint Committee for the American Merchant Marine, an organization sponsored by maritime labor and management and the Federal Government.

"The report showed that in 1946, American flag vessels carried 67.6 percent of United States foreign trade; in 1947, 59.8 percent; 1948, 54.8 percent; 1949, 49.8 percent, and in 1950, based on the January–June figure, 46.2 percent.

"The report also called attention to the fact that Russia in 1950 was tenth on the list of maritime nations based on tonnage. Russian merchant ships were numbered at 437 with a gross deadweight tonnage total of 1,824,000.

"The joint committee said that while the United States active seagoing merchant marine was noticeably higher in total tonnage since 1939, 'it is woefully weak in fast modern passenger-carrying vessels quickly convertible to troop transports in event of emergency.'

"It was noted that in seagoing tonnage now being built for the more important maritime nations of the world, the United States 'is at the bottom of the list,' surpassed even by its former enemies of World War II and by the principal recipients of its various aid programs."

American labor and capital, and the American people as a whole, have a vital interest in the welfare of the American merchant marine.

Our present position of the mercantile shipping world is entirely unworthy of this great Nation of ours. It is of vital national importance that the new Congress, at the earliest possible moment, take up the problem of the American merchant marine and that it devise and put into operation a merchant shipping policy that will insure our possessing a mercantile fleet fully capable of serving the requirements of the Republic in peace and war. Such a fleet must outclass, in tonnage and quality, every other merchant fleet in existence.

Notwithstanding the many handicaps under which it is operating (and these include discriminatory measures enforced against it by foreign countries) the American merchant marine is giving excellent service to passengers and freight forwarders alike. It is for Congress to decide whether it will be enabled to play, in the American order of things, the all-important role dictated by common sense and national honor.

Foreign countries cannot be blamed for having such a low opinion of us because of the manner in which the lawmakers in Washington, elected to the House and the Senate by the people of the United States, have treated our merchant shipping policy.

The Eighty-second Congress should turn over an entirely new leaf as far as the American merchant marine is concerned, and insure that the Republic shall possess a mercantile fleet wholly commensurate with its position in the family of nations.

Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the City of Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 20 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is absent on an assignment by the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement regarding the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Detroit. A year-long celebration of that event will commence in Detroit on January 1. As a Senator from Ohio, a neighbor of the State of Michigan, I am personally pleased to join in salute to Detroit and its long history of accomplishments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

January 1, 1951, will mark the beginning of one of the most impressive civic celebrations in the history of this country. The occasion is the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the city of Detroit, the oldest major city west of the Alleghenies. Detroit's two hundred and fiftieth birthday festival will be a year-long celebration of that city's history and a rededication of its human and physical resources for a future of peace and freedom.

Detroit has played a unique role in the history of the United States. It was founded in 1701 by Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac to assure France's control of the great northern territories. Within a few years it became one of the most important ports in the new world. Not only did Detroit control access to the north, but it also was a center for the fur industry from the day of Cadillac until the time of the American Fur Co.

Later, in the nineteenth century, the lumber industry of the Northwest was born in the Detroit area. As the forests slowly receded, Detroit's long climb to its present position as a city of industry began. Detroit is now known as the industrial center of the world, sending its products to the most remote corners of the earth.

Detroit has earned many laurels. It has been called "Detroit the Beautiful," "Dynamic Detroit," and the "City of Destiny." All of these terms are appropriate; but today, faced with the threatening visage of totalitarianism on every side, the title "Arsenal of Democracy" which was earned during the two World Wars, is perhaps most suitable.

We are threatened by an international holocaust of terrible proportions. Our hearts go out to the boys and men fighting on Korean battle fronts to preserve the life and ideals we believe in. Our debt to them can never be expressed, much less paid.

It must be remembered, however, that this is a war not only of man against man, army against army, but also a war of supplier against supplier. In the battle of supplies, America has never been defeated. We have the greatest production potential in the world, and much of the credit for this fact must go to Detroit. Were it not for the factories and people who man these factories of Detroit, the last war might well have ended differently. Fortunately, however, the facilities of that great city have always been ready for periods of crisis.

During the ensuing year, Detroit will commemorate the part it has played in our history. Detroit, a living, working example of our American philosophy, will display to the world the physical and cultural benefits of a free, democratic society and its readiness to serve the Nation.

How Can We Stop the Soviet Union?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said during the past few months which has been indecently critical of our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and so little has been said in

his defense, that perhaps in order to make a true and correct evaluation of this splendid public official, we should take a little time and endeavor now to secure a fair and correct index of the man and his statesmanship by reading the radio address which he so splendidly delivered on November 28, 1950.

I had occasion a few days ago to reread the same more carefully in the December 7 issue of the Machinist and was much impressed by its force and clarity in dealing with the first subject of the hour.

It appears that Secretary Acheson encountered his first bellowing reactionary resentment when he stated in substance that he would still stay by his friend, Alger Hiss, even though he had been convicted by a jury and sentenced by a trial court. As a lawyer, everyone knows, or should know, that if a defendant after conviction appeals a case, which he has a perfect right to do, the presumption of innocence does and should still prevail because the judgment pronounced by the trial court on the jury's verdict is not final in any sense of the word and does not settle definitely the issue of innocence or guilt.

It, however, seems that certain people have neither the ability nor the inclination to give full force and effect to the great presumption of innocence accorded to every accused person not finally convicted of crime. They regard a judgment of a lower court a final judgment, even though an appeal to a higher tribunal has been perfected.

Ordinarily a person is to be complimented if he stands by a friend in his dark hour of trouble, but in Secretary Acheson's case, misguided men seem to follow not the example taught by the Nazarene to lay down his very life for a friend, or the exemplification of true friendship as disclosed by Sidney Carton, in Charles Dickens' book The Tale of Two Cities when he changed places in the death-cell with Darnay, the husband of Lucie Manette and suffered death by the guillotine in Darnay's place and stead.

Some people today in spite of the finer examples of the past, and the better teachings of the present, seem to think that a friend should be abandoned in his great hour of need before his case in the courts of men has been concluded. These people are perhaps devotees of the verse:

What is friendship but a name.
A charm that lulls to sleep.
A shade that follows wealth and fame,
And leaves the wretch to weep.

The speech which I have heretofore referred to is as follows:

HOW WE CAN STOP THE SOVIET UNION—SIX STEPS IN THE STRATEGY OF FREEDOM AS EXPLAINED BY DEAN ACHESON, SECRETARY OF STATE, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, IN A NATION-WIDE RADIO ADDRESS ON NOVEMBER 28, 1950

The questions raised by these acts of (Communist) aggression in Korea go far beyond the contours of this small and remote peninsula. They have to be viewed as part of a world picture. To be fully understood, they must be seen as part of the world-wide operations of the international Communist movement.

The increasing boldness of the international Communist movement, and its willingness to use overt aggression, and to accept the deliberate risk of war, make it increasingly urgent for all American citizens to face squarely the danger that confronts us, and to give vigorous and united support to the measures we must take to meet this danger.

Those who control the Soviet Union and the international Communist movement have made clear their fundamental design. It is to hold and solidify their power over people and territories within their reach, however ruthless the means required.

The danger to the rest of the world created by this design arises out of the belief made amply clear in Bolshevist political writings that the holding of power by the rulers of the Soviet Union requires the complete subversion or forcible destruction of the countries now free of their control.

They are encouraged to act on this belief by the illusion that, in so doing, they are helping along the inevitable course of history. According to the Bolshevist interpretation, history points to the collapse of non-Soviet states and their replacement by Soviet-style and Soviet-controlled states. Conflict is anticipated in Bolshevist theory as inevitable.

The hostility of Soviet intentions, taken alone, would not produec so grave a threat. But the combination of these intentions and Soviet military power creates very grave danger to the survival of free nations and free institutions, a danger which must not be underestimated.

All governments which are now free, and all responsible citizens of free societies must face, with a sense of urgency, the capabilities for conquest and destruction in the hands of the rulers of the Soviet Union.

The problem we have been called upon to solve, therefore, is: What course of action will enable us to maintain our freedom and bring about a peaceful resolution of this world crisis; or, if despite our best efforts aggression does take place, will provide a basis for defeating it?

Our essential purpose is, as it has always been in our history, to preserve our free institutions, so that freedom and justice may survive and continue to flourish.

We wish to do this peacefully, because peace is the climate in which our free institutions flourish best. But we have shown in our history that we hold these values so dear that if we must, we will fight for them.

The course of action we have chosen is to join with our allies in building the strength of the free world—as a bulwark against Soviet aggression.

The purpose of this strength is not aggression. It is the very opposite. It is to deter such aggression.

This involves building military strength, but it requires no less the buttressing of all the other forms of power—economic, political, social, and moral—and the utmost resolution and unity among the free nations of the world.

Over a period of time the rulers of the Soviet Union, confronted by a strong and confident free world, may be obliged to abandon their expansionist aims.

To build the strength of the free world is a hard course. It involves great effort and much sacrifice both by our own people, and by all the people of the free world. It offers no promise of relief from these burdens in the near future. It makes no guarantee of peace. But it is rooted in the principles by which we live, and it offers us the best realistic approach to the problem of peace, and the preservation of our freedom.

The main elements of the strategy by which we are seeking to carry out this course of action—the strategy of freedom—are now well-established as national policy. They have emerged as practical responses to the problems we have encountered, and they have found general support in the Nation.

There are six main elements in the strategy of freedom.

First is the development of an international order for the preservation of peace and freedom, under the United Nations.

The Charter of the United Nations expresses the universal aspirations of mankind, and the organization itself is a symbol of these aspirations.

But the United Nations is also more than a symbol. It is a means through which we can take practical, day-by-day steps toward the building of a stable international community.

As an organization in which most nations participate, the United Nations can also help to bring about the accommodations of interest and the adjustments of differences which are essential to peace in a world of change.

Our action in Korea is intended to support the authority of the United Nations against aggression. In the current session of the General Assembly, we have initiated a number of measures designed to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations action against aggression. We intend to do our full part in helping the United Nations to grow in strength.

The second element in the strategy of freedom is the development of regional groupings, within the framework of the United Nations. To ensure their collective security, free nations are engaged in cooperative defense measures, not possible on a universal basis at the present time.

The keystone of the defense system of the free world is being built in the North Atlantic community, and among the states of the Western Hemisphere.

A whole network of cooperative institutions has been developing among the free nations of the North Atlantic and Western European area, each a practical response to a felt need. The problems they face are extremely complex, but progress has been made toward overcoming ancient national hostilities, and in developing a common will and a sense of confidence in the potentialities of the North Atlantic community, working together as a community.

In this hemisphere, the accomplishments of the Organization of American States in promoting unity of action have been remarkable. Support of this organization is fundamental to our policy.

The essential ingredient in these regional developments has been a sense of community interest among neighbor nations. The development of further regional organizations depends in the first instance upon the existence of this community sense among the people of other areas.

The third element in our strategy of freedom is the rapid building up of military strength at home and among our allies. I stress the word "rapid" because the period of greatest danger is directly before us. Our defense must not only be strong enough, it must come soon enough.

There is only one test of whether our defense preparations are adequate: that is to measure them against a sober calculation of the danger which faces us.

So measured, the defense efforts of the United States and other free nations are inadequate. A greatly increased scale and tempo of effort is required on the part of all free nations to enable them to overcome this inadequacy at the earliest possible moment.

The fourth element is economic cooperation. This has a dual character. It contributes powerfully to the building of our defenses against external attack. It also is an instrument for helping to build healthy societies in which the vitality and the promise of freedom find practical expression—in comparison with which the decadence and

despair of Communist tyranny is starkly exposed.

Although the amount of resources available for economic assistance is limited by the defense requirements imposed upon us by Soviet action, even under the burden of rearmament, free societies can more effectively provide for human well-being and advancement than tyrannical regimes. The productive power of freemen, who are aware of the dangers that face them and who are determined to meet the challenge to their freedom, cannot be matched by authoritarian societies.

With our technical assistance, the resolve of the free peoples of Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East to better the conditions of their lives can become a powerful drive against the age-old banes of poverty and disease and the political instability which often accompanies them. Men everywhere have awakened to the opportunities for progress which modern science and technology have opened. We can help them to help themselves, and it is in our interest to do so.

Our technical assistance is not philanthropy, for here our principles and our self-interest coincide. As the people of underdeveloped areas rise from poverty, not only will our own economy benefit, but also and even more important the real promise of freedom will expose the false promises of Bolshevik imperialism, and the peoples of these countries will grow in their recognition of the common interest and purpose of the free nations.

So far as possible, economic cooperation, like defense cooperation and collective security programs, is being carried on through the United Nations and regional organizations in order to strengthen international institutions devoted to peace and security.

The fifth element in the strategy of freedom is a readiness at all times to negotiate just settlements of international disputes and to find just accommodations of conflicting interests. Our experience has demonstrated that the Soviet rulers cannot be expected to accept fair and equal negotiation so long as they feel capable of imposing their own terms or exacting their own price. Their concept of negotiation is that it should record the facts of power rather than the requirements of justice. We shall not seek to use our power in this way, but as the free world develops strength, the Soviet rulers may find it advantageous to adjust differences equitably rather than to seek to impose their demands.

The free nations must always be prepared to enter into genuine negotiations, and even to take the initiative in efforts to bring about honest negotiation.

If the issues are clear, freemen will not be prey to unrealistic expectations, nor to propaganda abuse of the negotiating process. It is in the long perspective that results may be expected, not in the fits and starts of shifting tactics.

Because our earnest desire is peace, we shall remain constantly receptive to genuine negotiation. With the confidence that comes of strength and the humility that comes from our devotion to Christian principles, we shall be endlessly patient in working for peace. And we shall at the same time be endlessly alert to defend the bases of our national life.

The sixth element in the strategy of freedom is a firm adherence in all our actions, at home and abroad, to the moral values which give meaning to our lives.

We are a young country, an enthusiastic people, and despite our great interest in material progress, we are idealistic.

We do not always present our best side to the world. In our enthusiasm and drive we often do not take care to make ourselves understood, and expect others to recognize us for what we are. We have launched a greatly expanded information program to bring knowledge of ourselves to other peoples, which the President has called the Campaign of Truth.

It is our purpose to carry to all parts of the world the facts about what is happening in America and in the world, because it is a fundamental part of our democratic faith that people, if informed of the truth, will make sound judgments.

What is even more important than what we say to the world is how we conduct ourselves, at home and abroad. The force of example and action is the factor which finally determines what our influence is to be.

If we are to be worthy of the leadership that derives from our power, we must be sure that we are true to the values and principles upon which our society is founded. It is the example of democracy at work, vigorous, healthy, respectful of its first principles, growing in freedom and justice and opportunity, that can inspire ourselves and others to meet the tasks ahead with hope and confidence.

Without this, which depends on every one of us, on the everyday conduct of each citizen, the strategy of freedom would become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.

These are the elements of our national foreign policy of the strategy of freedom. This is the course by which we seek to avoid war and to secure peace.

No one can guarantee that war will not come. The present crisis is extremely serious. Whether reason will prevail is only partly for us to decide. We must hope and strive for the best while we prepare for the worst.

This is a responsibility, not just of a few public officials, not just of the Congress, but of the whole American people. The qualities we must demonstrate—steadiness, moderation, restraint, constancy of purpose, and flexibility in action, imagination, wisdom, maturity—these qualities are possible for us as a Nation only if the American people participate as individuals in striving to make our society worthy of the hopes that free men everywhere have placed in it.

A deep understanding of the forces we are dealing with, and the role we must play, must be acquired by each of us. Every single individual has a share of this responsibility.

The six elements of the strategy of freedom—support of the United Nations, development of regional organizations, the rapid building up of our strength in partnership with our allies, economic cooperation, readiness to negotiate, and a firm adherence to the fundamental purposes and principles of our society—constitute a national policy, not a party policy. They have emerged from a long process of discussion and consideration as the practical requirements of a policy adequate to the problems which confront us. They are rooted in our traditions. They find general support in both parties.

It is right and proper that there should be differences of opinion among us about the execution of this policy, and about questions of emphasis, priorities, application, and administration. No one has a monopoly of wisdom, and the vigor and vitality of a democratic society derives from free discussion and debate and the consent which flows from understanding.

However vigorous our debates may be, it should be made clear to all that our country is united in its determination to hew to the strategy of freedom which is our national policy.

The Nation's peril is our challenge. The united will of the people must be our answer.

Mail Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 20 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of December 14 there appeared an editorial discussing the proposed separation of straight airline subsidies from the cost of transporting air mail. As the Senate knows, there are several proposals to this effect now pending before the Congress. I ask unanimous consent to insert the interesting editorial on this subject in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAIL PAY

What started out as a relatively simple proposal to separate air mail pay from subsidies to the airlines generated an almost unbelievable amount of confusion before the House was through with it. The Heselton bill passed by the House on Monday is weak in some respects, but it meets many of the objectives of the administration and the Hoover Commission. It is obviously a compromise, as the 66–0 vote indicates; however, it does serve to place subsidies to the airlines in the open and apart from reimbursement for carrying the mail. Moreover, Chairman EDWIN JOHNSON, of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, has promised to press for enactment of a similar bill in the Senate, though committee action so far has been blocked by Senator BREWSTER.

Aside from the objections of a few diehards who resisted any separation whatever, most of the discussions centered on how mail pay should be determined. The airlines stood behind the rejected Hall bill, which would have required the Civil Aeronautics Board to fix a reasonable rate without direct reference to cost. A considerable concession was made to this stand in the Heselton bill as finally passed. All reference to cost allocation as between mail, passengers, and freight was eliminated; the bill merely provides that the CAB shall determine "reasonable and necessary cost" plus a fair return to the airlines.

Although this is not as strong as a legislative directive to the CAB on how to appraise costs, it certainly implies that the CAB must go thoroughly into cost analysis. There is no warrant for accepting the present service rates paid to four of the big airlines, as necessarily valid. Studies now in progress in the CAB indicate that the Board will be able to come up with at least average costs for various types of aircraft well in advance of the March 31, 1952, deadline. It will be important in this connection for the CAB to arrange a system of long-term contracts which will facilitate payment without endless litigation.

Quite properly the Heselton bill encompasses foreign as well as domestic operations of American carriers. Despite the feeling of some airlines that subsidies on foreign operations might become political targets, Congress and the public need to know the facts. Another salutary provision of the bill is a restriction on the payment of subsidy to lines carrying the mail. Several cargo carriers which had pleaded for operating privileges on the ground that they would not ask a subsidy later changed their position

and sought to be included. This would have thrown the concept of regulation into a cocked hat.

Whether the separation of mail pay from subsidy will actually save money is a moot question. That, however, is not the purpose of the legislation. Many considerations such as national defense and public necessity enter into the determination of subsidy, and it is well to keep the determination flexible. But subsidies have no real relation to mail pay, and they ought to be justified individually on merit. When subsidies are in the open there, of course, will be the danger that they will become enmeshed in politics, but that is not a valid reason for keeping them hidden. We hope that the Senate will quickly follow the lead of the House so as to give the CAB a start in meeting its enlarged responsibility.

Unique Appeal to Santa Claus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 20 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unique Appeal to Santa Claus," which appeared in the December 11 issue of the Eugene Register-Guard, published in Eugene, Oreg.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIQUE APPEAL TO SANTA CLAUS

Ever since Francis P. Church wrote the famous reply to Virginia O'Hanlon in the old New York Sun, editors young and old have been striving for new and effective ways to express the spirit of Christmas. (Many years ago we decided it is impossible to improve on the story of Christmas as it is related in the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, so we reprint those Scriptures annually.)

In the last issue of the Emerald, before exams and the Christmas holidays, Student Editor Anita Holmes has printed a unique appeal to Santa Claus which we take the privilege of copying:

"DEAR SANTA—TAKE, DON'T GIVE

"Don't give us anything for Christmas this year, Sir Santa. We don't want a Cadillac or a fur coat or a vacation at Sun Valley.

"We only want you to take things away from us this December 25, Mr. Claus. The greatest gift you could deliver would be the removal of some of that which we already have.

"TAKE AWAY DISTRUST

"When you clean distrust from every heart, you'll take war away from our twentieth century. And you'll remove forever that schism separating ours and the Russian world. What a great gift that would be—disappearance of distrust.

"TAKE AWAY POVERTY AND HUNGER AND WANT

"With one sleigh-bell ring, sweep away our slums and empty stomachs and yearnings for a higher standard of living. But don't let anybody tell you that communism will be the eradicator of poverty and hunger and want.

"TAKE AWAY IGNORANCE

"This is a big order, but if you could possibly do it, most other ills would go too. Incidentally, Santa, if you happen to have a spare brownie assigned to this project, he might do away with final exams at a certain Oregon school.

"TAKE AWAY PETTINESS

"Take the smallness out of people. Make them forget their crafty ways, and look to their neighbors rather than themselves.

"TAKE AWAY SELFISHNESS

"Put it back in Pandora's box, and surely you will have removed evil's greatest root. If you can't give us any of these other 'take aways,' please do something about selfishness.

"With it gone, Christmas would truly be here."

Miss Holmes has expresed what millions of people are feeling with the approach of Christmas, 1950. The Scriptures tell us that "it is more blessed to give than to receive" and that has always been interpreted as the spirit of Christmas. But in order to achieve the true spirit of giving, some things need to be taken away from us and Miss Holmes has listed them accurately. We have an idea that this little piece of hers will be reprinted in newspapers from coast to coast and it may become one of the "minor classics" of the season. It carries an idea which may endure long after her authorship is forgotten.

The AMA Shouldn't Lie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, during this fall's campaign, the American Medical Association spent millions of dollars to confuse our public health needs and block all proposals to fill them. There is still an amazing amount of misinformation in circulation on these subjects.

With permission to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I attach an article which does much to put the discussion of these issues on a straight factual plane. It is entitled "The AMA Shouldn't Lie," by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, which appears in the official magazine of the American Federation of Labor, the American Federationist, in the December issue:

THE AMA SHOULDN'T LIE
(By Oscar Ewing)

Serious illness costs more than you can afford to pay. That is, unless you belong to the one American family out of five with an income of more than $5,000 a year; or unless you have no income at all and can qualify as a charity case.

National health insurance would enable you to pay for good medical care by setting aside a portion of your wages each time you're paid, just as you do now to get the social-security protection of old-age and survivors insurance.

Sickness is unpredictable. Your next illness may cost you anywhere from a few dollars to hundreds or even thousands of dollars. National health insurance would operate on the sound American principle of putting aside a portion of earnings as protection for the future. It is simply an extension of social security to cover medical care.

When illness strikes, you would not have to go into debt or onto charity in order to pay doctor and hospital bills. You would not need to put off seeing the doctor through fear of being unable to pay the bill. Seeing your doctor before an illness becomes serious would help him head off disaster and keep you in better health.

In the heat of the recent political campaign, national health insurance was shamefully misrepresented by reactionary groups. National health insurance is not a plan to socialize medicine. The doctors would not work for the government, nor would the Government tell them how to practice medicine. There would be no change in the relationship between patient and doctor—except for the removal of the present dollar barrier. A program which proposes to better the health of every American deserves studied consideration rather than name-calling.

Under national health insurance, 1½ percent of your wages would be withheld and your employer would contribute a like amount, just as in old-age and survivors insurance. These payroll taxes, paid by workers and employers across the country, would help to build up a fund out of which would be paid the doctor and hospital bills of the worker and his dependents.

Let us suppose, for example, you become suddenly ill—a sharp pain in the abdomen. Your wife suggests you had better see a doctor. You aren't held back by the fear of "Can I afford it?" because you've already been paying for the right to medical care through payroll deductions. So you decide to go to see a doctor—or, if you're feeling quite ill, you phone and ask him to drop around.

You can choose any doctor who is taking part in the national health insurance plan. It may well be the same family doctor you've always called, or wanted to call, in emergencies.

Your doctor diagnoses your condition, perhaps after consultation with a specialist, as appendicitis. He sends you to a good hospital, where a skilled surgeon performs the operation. With good nursing care, you are back on the job in a couple of weeks. And you don't have the worry of "How am I ever gaing to pay for it?" The doctor's bill and hospital bill will be paid from the national fund which you and your employer helped build.

It's as simple as that. Your insurance would entitle you and your dependents to home and office calls by your doctor, treatment by specialists, hospital and nursing care up to 60 days, eyeglasses, hearing aids, costly medicines, X-rays, and laboratory tests. It would also cover, to a limited degree, dental care and home nursing.

Fees and rate standards would be established by a board in your own community made up of local citizens and, of course, representatives of the health professions. Strictly professional matters would be decided by local councils of doctors. A Federal board would establish broad standards to assure that the system operated without discrimination and that only accredited doctors and hospitals took part.

Perhaps you are now covered by voluntary health insurance. These plans serve a useful purpose, but they don't pay all your sickness bills. They also cost too much to meet the needs of low-income groups. As a matter of fact, 86,000,000 Americans still have no health insurance protection of any kind.

Operating costs and profits in individual commercial policies run over 60 percent, leaving less than 40 cents from each premium dollar to pay your medical bills. Overhead in the group commercial plans runs about 30 percent. The strictly nonprofit voluntary plans show a better record. But even here the overhead for hospitalization plans (like Blue Cross) runs to about 15 percent of permiums; for surgical-medical plans (like Blue Shield), it runs about 23 percent.

Very few voluntary plans will give you anything like complete protection. Under most plans you must still dig into your own

pocket to pay for the doctor, special nursing, expensive medicines, and anything beyond routine care. Very few plans offer preventive medicine, inoculations, prenatal and postnatal care, medical care at home, or periodic check-ups.

Actually, the Blue Cross hospitalization plan pays only 21 percent of the average family's medical bills. Blue Cross and Blue Shield, providing both hospitalization and doctors' services, pay only 35 percent of the family's medical bills.

National health insurance, however, is only a part of the President's program for raising the levels of America's health. Enabling workers and their families to pay their medical bills will insure greater protection of the Nation's health, but we also need more doctors and hospitals, an extension of public health services, intensified research, and means to return the handicapped to productive jobs.

We have made great strides in the past 50 years in reducing the toll of disease. The average child born this year can look forward to about 20 years longer life than one born in 1900. We have virtually wiped out smallpox, diphtheria, and typhoid fever. In our better hospitals lives of more mothers and infants are being saved than ever before.

We are proud of our progress, but we cannot call it good enough. These figures offer some idea of a few of the problems yet to be solved: at least 8,000,000 of our people are in need of treatment for mental disorders, 190,000 die every year from cancer, 460,000 from heart disease; some 40,000 babies die every year in premature births.

There is a tremendous job to be done for the Nation's children. Half a million have rheumatic fever or heart disorders; another 500,000 have orthopedic or spastic defects; 1,000,000 have defective hearing; 4,000,000 have visual defects; 20,000,000 need dental attention.

Ill health is costing America $27,000,000,000 a year in lost wages and production—$8,500,000,000 in medical and health costs. At a time when we are working to gear the Nation for defense, 1,500,000,000 days are being lost each year through illness. Nearly 3,000,000 persons are totally disabled, their productive ability lost to the Nation.

Of course, we can't hope to solve these problems overnight. But thousands of our deaths are preventable, and much could be done to reduce illness and disability. We could, for example, do a better job if more of the country were brought up to the level of medical care found in the more progressive States. Too often your chances of recovering from an illness depends on where you live. Our best hospitals are found in the large cities, where there's more wealth. These centers also attract the bulk of our health personnel—doctors, dentists, nurses, and laboratory workers.

The distribution of doctors varies as much as 1 for every 500 persons in Massachusetts or the District of Columbia to 1 for every 1,500 persons in Mississippi or New Mexico. In two counties out of every five there is no accredited general hospital. There is no full-time health department in one-third of our counties, in which 40,000,000 people live.

We are making progress, yes; but we still need to extend good medical care to more people who can't get it or can't afford it. We must keep improving our defenses against disease and disability, just as we strengthen our defenses against other threats to America's welfare. Our citizens' health is a vital part of our Nation's strength. That's why, along with national health insurance, the President has recommended other measures needed to fill in the gaps in American medical care.

The Hospital Survey and Construction Act is enabling us to increase our hospital facilities, especially in areas of need. It provides Federal funds to help States and communities build new hospitals and health centers. Since passage of the law in 1946 over a thousand new hospital projects have been started. This is progress, although we really should double our present number of hospitals.

As a matter of fact, only 14 out of every 100 counties in the United States meet the accepted standard of 4½ general hospital beds for each 1,000 of population. Your chance of getting into a hospital when you or someone in your family becomes seriously ill may depend on how rapidly this program goes forward.

We need to extend protective health services by seeing that every county has a full-time health department. Each community can strive to improve its own health services. Often State or Federal aid will be needed.

A good health department serves as the watchdog of your community's health. Among the services it should provide are food and milk inspections, water pollution control, home nursing care, mass case-finding to disclose unsuspected diseases, venereal disease treatment centers, crippled children's services, and maternal and child care clinics. There should be one public-health nurse for every 6,500 persons, but there was only 1 for every 63,700 in 1948. Your own health is more fully protected in a city or county with an up-to-date health department.

You undoubtedly have read about the new treatments that have been developed as a result of medical research. No one could fail to be impressed by the miraculous results obtained from the use of such drugs as sulfa, penicillin, and cortisone. Congress has reflected the public's enthusiasm by providing additional funds for research, notably in cancer, heart disease, and mental disorders.

The National Institutes of Health of the Federal Security Agency have developed into the world's foremost laboratories for medical research. Federal funds are also being used to assist independent medical research projects in American hospitals, universities, and other institutions.

We are still in need of more research in the chronic diseases which attack the aged. We need greater study of the hazards which menace our children and infants.

Federal funds invested in medical research pay human and financial dividends out of all proportion to cost. Yet until recently we were spending more research money on plant and animal diseases than on human diseases. The chance of restoring a member of your family to health may depend on the progress we make in medical research.

It is an inexcusable loss to American productivity to deprive physically disabled persons of jobs because proper medical care or rehabilitation services are not available. With no way to support themselves, these people become a problem to their families and must often rely on public support.

Fortunately, we are making headway in preparing these citizens for jobs through our Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation. In the past 6 years some 280,000 disabled workers have received medical care and training for jobs which match their abilities rather than their disabilities and actual placement.

There remain, however, perhaps 1,500,000 persons who need rehabilitation. More Federal funds invested in this program would be many times repaid, not only in the taxes paid by citizens who become productive workers but in the strengthened morale of these workers and their families.

To operate an enlarged health program, we shall need, of course, more doctors, dentists, nurses, and other health personnel. We shall need 20 percent more doctors. The shortage of dentists is even greater. And we need 42,000 more nurses right now.

A bill was recently passed by the Senate which would enable our medical schools to expand their facilities and which would provide scholarships for deserving medical students. When the bill came up for hearings in a House committee, it met strong opposition from the American Medical Association and was shelved. This seems incredible, in view of the fact that we face a national emergency and must draft doctors for the armed services.

Of course, the AMA will continue to use the bulk of its high-powered and expensive ammunition to fight national health insurance, the heart of the President's program for improving the Nation's health.

Curiously, the AMA is stanchly supporting the voluntary plans, which it once called "socialistic, communistic, * * * inciting to revolution." It has a long record of opposing progressive legislation. It was against old-age and survivors' insurance, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, public-health services to control tuberculosis—and even the reporting of communicable diseases.

In October the AMA alone spent $1,100,000 to fight national health insurance. It will continue to try to make you think that adoption of the President's program would destroy the very foundations of America.

American workers are familiar with these time-worn reactionary devices. They will not be fooled.

The fight to adopt a health-insurance program to meet the needs of all Americans will go on.

Withdrawal From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 20 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a thoughtful editorial entitled "Time To Get Out," appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat for December 11. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO GET OUT

The welcome news is received from east Korea that some 60,000 UN troops, most of them Americans, are being evacuated in orderly fashion from the Hungnam area which fronts the wild terrain where they were trapped for 2 weeks.

This makes much more sense than the Truman-Attlee statement that "Korea will not be abandoned," and the Attlee statement early in the week in London that he has good hopes the UN forces will be able to hold a stabilized line.

It has been clear for some time that the UN's meager forces cannot expel the Communists from Korea. There are too many of them. The odds against us in manpower are probably 10 to 1. Besides, the Reds are fighting in a terrain which they know and in weather to which they are accustomed. And they are bountifully supplied with arms and material by Russia.

So, the realistic view is for the UN to get out of Korea with the least possible loss of men and equipment, mark the campaign off as a military defeat, accept the loss in prestige and face that accrues to the whipping, and deploy our strength to other areas, after which a calmer, more intelligent assessment of the facts can be made.

The first stop is Japan which we can and must make impregnable. The Allied navy and air force which should make Formosa inaccessible from the China mainland, can be used for this defense. And it strikes us as completely irrational even to consider at this time the plan for extending all-out aid to Chiang Kai-shek and assist him in a frontal attack on China proper.

When all our men are out of Korea—and there is bright prospect that they can be evacuated without a Dunkerque—there will be time for President Truman, Secretary Acheson, Secretary Marshall, and the leaders in Congress to reexamine American foreign policy, to reflect on the fantastic extremes to which it has brought us and to consider ways and means of doing the best thing next.

It should be evident to all, including Mr. Truman, that the so-called Truman Doctrine has not worked out as originally conceived. He took in too much territory in his ambition to patrol the globe, stop the Communists in their tracks wherever they appeared and be a kind and generous father to all the peoples of the free world. It brought us to the brink of world war III in the Orient. It revealed that the billions we have spent in Europe have not brought us one friend who will stick with us to the bitter end. Such tenuous alliances as we now have in West Europe are threatened. And it demonstrates that those who are our elected or appointed leaders, have guessed wrongly both as to the enemy's determination and means to carry it through, and our capacity to make good our claim to be the champion of all mankind.

Most seriously, the present debacle has provoked the question as to how far, under the Constitution, the President can go in deciding and implementing foreign policy without the consent of Congress. Ever since Mr. Truman committed our armed services to combat in Korea, it has been said that this was an act of declared war without a congressional act. The result has been confusion and doubt in the public's mind as to our leadership, the concomitant of which is a wavering confidence in the President himself.

Perhaps in the face of an emergency, and if the pressure is eased in Korea, a clearer definition of aims and methods can be obtained. Yesterday's consultation at the White House was a step in that direction.

It is high time the United States knows where it is going and how it proposes to get there.

Perhaps Casey Should Lower the Boom on the American Medical Association and Not the Individual Doctors Who Are Its Virtual Captives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give due publicity to an article which appeared in the Jewish Press, of Omaha, Nebr., on Friday, October 20, 1950, and which was written by Mr. Leonard Boasberg.

It presented to the reading public perhaps an approach to the correct viewpoint which the American people should heed. It points out a great culprit which stalks abroad in our land today holding as virtual captives, the members of the medical profession and seeks to cripple the Nation in this great crisis hour. I predict that the day will come when the name "American Medical Association" and the individual doctors, too, who belong to it, if they do not free themselves from its tenaciously wicked grasp, will be as a hiss and a byword at every crossroad throughout the length and breadth of our land.

The article is as follows:

DON'T TAKE MY WORD FOR IT—PLEASE BE KIND TO DOCTORS, THEY NEED YOUR PATIENCE

(By Leonard Boasberg)

Unless you have a streak of cruelty you'll use your best bedside manner with doctors these days, and you'll tread softly and unbelligerently when you see one coming, averting your eyes as you would, perhaps, for an adolescent girl with a particularly bad case of acne, or for a hunchback, or a leper.

Doctors need all your patience now and perhaps for some time to come, for they're mixed up—whether they will or no—with one of the crassest campaigns of confusion ever perpetrated on the American public, a campaign backed by some of the most unsavory elements in America.

I refer, of course, to the American Medical Association's $1,100,000 (plus $19,000,000 or so in tie-ins) concentrated propaganda drive aimed at convincing us that compulsory health insurance equals socialized medicine, equals socialism, equals communism.

That's tripe, and the AMA knows it. Compulsory health insurance is compulsory health insurance, and it's no more socialistic than compulsory education.

Socialism isn't communism, either, and if there's a doctor in the house who thinks it is, I can only refer him to the history of the world for the last hundred years or so.

Socialists and Communists have been battling each other ever since Karl Marx came out with that melange of fact and nonsense, brilliancy and blindness that he called communism. First thing the Communists do when they take over a country is to liquidate the Socialists, and most Socialists are well aware of that fact. Socialist Britain is our best friend and closest ally in the entire world, fighting side by side with us against the North Korean Communists, and Socialist-minded neutrals—as in India, Israel, and Indonesia—are among our best potential allies.

Send them off into the wild red yonder and we can kiss our liberties good-by.

That full-page AMA ad said that in America 70,000,000 people are protected by voluntary health insurance. Trouble is, they don't mention how well protected these people are or how much this insurance costs or anything about the other 80,000,000 people in America. (A pronational health insurance group, the Committee for the Nation's Health, estimates that only 3,500,000 people are adequately covered by voluntary plans. I don't know one way or the other, but the AMA's wild statistics are somewhat less than helpful in clarifying matters.)

The AMA's medicine men are also praising to the skies the Blue Cross. Somehow, they would be a bit more effective if people didn't remember that only a few years back the AMA was calling THAT socialistic.

I know a good many doctors, and as I've said here before, I've never met a doctor I didn't like. I respect them for their intelligence, I envy them for their knowledge, I honor them for their selflessness—and I pity them for their union.

The bitter truth is that a doctor has about as much chance of opposing high AMA policy as, so I am given to understand, a coal miner has of opposing John L. Lewis.

A doctor—one of the best—told me the other day that if he came out for Congressman EUGENE O'SULLIVAN he couldn't get into a hospital in Omaha. And O'SULLIVAN says doctors are telling him the same thing. All of which is passing strange, because O'SULLIVAN is against compulsory health insurance.

Although I object to the AMA's tactics, I'll defend to the death its right to oppose socialized medicine, which I oppose too, and compulsory health insurance, which I favor now that I've read the AMA ads.

I won't, however, defend its right to passively exclude from its membership doctors who don't measure up to certain standards of color.

Now technically the AMA doesn't exclude Negro doctors. But you can't be an AMA member unless you're a member of a State AMA society, and there's the rub. A few days ago the Medical Society of Virginia again turned down Negroes, and that keeps them out of the AMA.

If the doctors of America, as the AMA advertisements claim, are so "dedicated to serve their fellow citizens at home and their comrades in uniform, wherever service in this Nation may take them," and if the thing they're so "ready to fight for—to sacrifice for—to die for—is not the alien way of life of socialism, but the prideful security of a free and self-reliant people," it seems to me that they could do something about the Negro doctors of America who are barred from the AMA despite their professional qualifications.

It must be embarrassing to doctors—especially Jewish doctors—to notice the company the AMA keeps. One of the AMA's favorites is Fulton Lewis, Jr., latest addition to your local solo's crew of columnists. With George Sokolsky, David Lawrence, Dorothy Thompson, Victor Riesel, Bruce Barton and Louis Bromfield, they need him like a hole in a headline.

Fulton Lewis, Jr., is the man who, according to documents seized from the Nazi Foreign Office by Allied forces in Germany, offered free advice to Adolf Hitler on how to end the war in 1940.

He's the man to whom George Racey Jordan (remember him?) brought that cock-and-bull story about wartime atomic shipments to Russia, a story which, Life magazine declared, no reporter worth his salt could have taken seriously. But Lewis did.

But ghoul writer John T. Flynn, who thinks America is going to hell every time a Democrat gets elected to office, is the AMA's prize package.

America Firster Flynn, one of Merwin K. Hart's buddies, has been identified by Friends of Democracy, Inc., as a leader of America Action, Inc., which it terms a smokescreen organization for Nationalists, pro-Fascists, anti-Semitic, and anti-Catholic hate mongers.

Flynn, in 1945, wrote: "Behind the successful drive to disgrace and remove Gen. George S. Patton from his army command in occupied Germany is the secret and astoundingly effective might of this Republic's foreign-born political leaders, such as Justice of the Supreme Court Felix Frankfurter, of Vienna; White House Administrative Assistant Dave (Devious Dave) Niles, alias Neyhus; and the Latvian ex-rabbinical student now known as Sidney Hillman.

"An honest birth record spelling out the names of the paternal grandfathers of this triumvirate would be interesting even if the educated Christian-American couldn't read it."

Shades of the Chicago Tribune.

Discussing the famous Patton slapping incident, he declared: "What was not reported at the time was that the soldier who got slapped was of Jewish descent and that the general, hot and fatigued and fresh from the the fighting front used the words 'yellow-bellied' or 'yellow streaked,' linking them up with a direct reference to the patient's racial background."

He claimed that Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau and Frankfurter bellowed in the White House and the various breast beaters, world savers, and payroll patriots, safe in their Washington foxholes, howled for the dismissal of Old Blood and Guts.

There wasn't a word of truth in the story and O'Donnell was forced to retract the whole thing.

And that's the kind of a guy whose book the Road Ahead, the AMA wants us all to read.

Oh, doctor.

When He Cometh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a sermon delivered on Sunday, December 17, 1950, entitled "When He Cometh." The sermon was delivered on the Sunday morning following the President's declaration of a national emergency by the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D. D., minister, in the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C. This sermon deserves widespread recognition, and I recommend it to every Member of this body. Dr. Elson's sermon follows:

WHEN HE COMETH

(By Rev. Edward L. R. Elson, D. D.)

"Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God."—Mark 1: 14.

This Lord's day finds us at worship on the first day following the declaration of a national emergency. Several years ago, Robert Merriam wrote a book about the Battle of the Bulge, which he called Dark December. The title of that book has lost some significance. This is dark December. Our days are as dark as they were following the first Battle of Bull Run, if not, indeed, the gravest in the history of our national existence.

But this is also Advent—a time when we look for the shining star and the light of the world. Against the darkness of the hour our Lord's coming shines with a new incandescence. Why did Jesus come into the world? What did He come into the world to do? What was the central purpose of His ministry?

When Peter was growing old, he dictated to his stenographer, Mark, the meaning of the ministry of Jesus and the impression He had left upon his life. You find his account in the Gospel of Mark, undoubtedly the first account of the ministry of Jesus to be written. Having thus reflected in the quiet calm that comes with the years, he concluded, "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God" (Mark 1: 14). That was His message and His mission. That sentence summarized what, according to those who heard Him frequently and knew Him intimately, He came to do. He came preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God.

At the very opening of His ministry you see Him going into the synagogue at Nazareth, taking up the scriptures and reading from the Prophecy of Isaiah: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord" (Luke 4: 18–19). And then He announced, "This day the scripture is fulfilled in your ears." The kingdom of God had come in Him. He was the kingdom in miniature. The man and the message were one. The program and the person were inseparable. The rule of God in the hearts of men—that was the kingdom He proclaimed.

Everywhere He went He revealed God and interpreted God to men. Up and down the country He went urging men to repent and to put God at the center of their lives. It was seeing God, and having fellowship with God that was the burden of His appeal. He bore witness of this truth in Himself. As a lad, who remained in the temple when His parents had gone homeward, He said, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" God was His only concern. When as a man His disciples feared He might be hungry. He exclaimed, "I have meat to eat that ye know not of, for my meat is to do the will of Him that sent me." At last when His work was done and He went to His cross, He cried out, "Father, unto Thy hands I commend my spirit." Everything He was and everything He did was to reveal the perfect God-centered, God-conscious life. That is the meaning of St. Paul's words, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." The theologian, John, put it, "The word became flesh and dwelt among us."

He came not with a set of sociological blueprints, or economic programs, or political theories. He offered no human utopia. He was no Titan who did many things. He did one central thing perfectly. He revealed the life of God in the life of man. Men pleaded with Him to lead a revolution, to command an army, to destroy despotism, to sit upon a royal throne. He was asked to demonstrate His physical power—to turn stones into bread, to throw Himself down from the temple—to use material power. He kept on quietly talking about the kingdom of God and demonstrating it in Himself. Into a world of political intrigue, social ostracism, and cruel slavery, He came preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God. That was His message. That was His chief concern. The kingdom and the King were one.

So He sent out His disciples. They proclaimed the gospel of the kingdom of God. God in Christ had done a mighty work, they said. The King had come. They knew that His kingdom was to be in the hearts of men. It could not be elsewhere until first established there. They said wicked men had rejected this King, had tried to dethrone Him, attempted to destroy Him—but that He lived—that He called men to follow Him—to obey Him. In the name of the King they called for repentance and entrance into the kingdom—the kingdom in which God rules the hearts of men.

That gospel brought an upheaval in social, economic, and political life of a world that was falling to pieces. When men are born into the kingdom of God and the love of God, something happens. Men in the kingdom of God can be slaves neither to institutions or men. That is why the gospel launched the birth of freedom. When men put God at the center of life you can trust men. When a world makes the God of Jesus paramount, then the world can be trusted. It was to preach the gospel of the kingdom of God and to redeem it for the kingdom that Jesus came into the world.

II

Too often we have misunderstood the meaning of the kingdom. We have gotten the sequence wrong. We have tried to bring in the kingdom without the King. We have attempted to frame sociological programs, political platforms, and economic reforms and called them the kingdom of God. Church leaders have said we must do this because it is based upon the Sermon on the Mount. We have mistakenly presumed that the Sermon on the Mount was uttered to a miscellaneous throng. The truth is that the ethical pattern of the Sermon on the Mount was presented to the disciples who had withdrawn from the multitude to a mountain retreat. "And seeing the multitudes, He went up into a mountain: and when He was set, His disciples came unto Him. And He opened His mouth and taught them, saying * * *." The words were spoken to men who recognized and accepted the King and were ready to live in the kingdom of God. They were not spoken to unredeemed, uncommitted men. It is one thing to apply the Beatitudes to the people for whom they were intended. It is quite another to assume that they are yet a national policy. To expect a spiritually mature individual or group to live by these exacting standards it quite a different thing from supposing they are God's will for a spiritually miscellaneous nation. The standards of the kingdom belong to those who acknowledge the King and live in the kingdom.

It is because we have attempted establishing the kingdom without the King that the church shares with the rest of mankind in guilt for the present tragic world. Too many have thought that the kingdom of God is simply a world order without war. The prophesies which Jesus said He came to fulfill and the sermons which He preached all mention something more than the absence of war—they talk about justice, and righteousness, freedom from poverty, sickness, slavery, and especially the emancipation of man from sin.

Some churchmen have said, "If only we can have a world in which peace prevails we will have the kingdom of God." If we can avoid shooting—if we can escape coercion, then we will have the kingdom—mankind will be reconciled.

But do you have the kingdom? Would you have the kingdom even if there were no coercion, no shooting, and only that kind of peace? Do you have the kingdom when there is slavery? Do you have the kingdom when personality is defamed? Do you have the kingdom when truth is suppressed? Do you have the kingdom when international fellowship is obstructed by the imprisonment of millions behind an impenetrable iron curtain? No, peace, in the sense of no shooting, does not guarantee the kingdom of God. The only way to the kingdom of God is to put the King on the throne of the human heart.

The church has been right in insisting that we share food and clothing, medicines and tools with the dispossessed and underprivileged of the world. It has been wrong in supposing that this material satisfaction would bring in the kingdom of God. The church has been right in insisting that international conflicts be resolved by peaceful adjudication through the United Nations. It has been wrong in supposing that such efforts should not be adequately implemented by military force—a judge cannot carry on a trial or accomplish a sentence without coercion—the police force.

Pacifist churchmen and lobbyists have promoted resolutions in church convocations and have so successfully lobbied before the Congress as to inhibit the adequate preparation of our Nation to reinforce United Nation actions and support our own international commitments. They thought the kingdom of God has chiefly, if not only, the characteristics of peace.

A distinguished son of a Presbyterian minister, Dr. Karl T. Compton, in 1947, recommended on behalf of the President's Commission, that we establish immediately a more robust military organism. This Commission said, "We recommend the adoption of universal training because we are convinced that weakness on our part not only involves

our country in grave risks, but also weakens the United Nations on which rests our best hopes for lasting peace. A weak and irresolute America is an invitation to failure. A strong and resolute America is the best guaranty for our safety and for the success of the United Nations." Dr. Daniel L. Poling, Father Walsh, and the scientists and economists on the President's Commission joined in proposing a sturdy and comprehensive program. That was long enough ago to have done something about it.

The President did his part. Others of us, despite our hate of war and the acknowledged moral hazards of extensive military training programs, felt our Nation had no other choice at this period of history.

But the resolutions of church conventions and the pacifist lobbyists prevailed. Twenty churchmen and educators said that the notion that "weakness invites wars" and that therefore the United States should remain strong was a "trite and unbelievable oversimplification of history." In the days when the Commission's report was under discussion, every public opinion poll showed overwhelming public approval of military training. But Congress refused to act. So successful were the pressure groups and the lobbyists, nothing was done. And now we are paying the price. The good intentions of the educators, and well-meaning but mistaken churchmen do not help us now. Young Americans without adequate training or sufficient reinforcements are being killed. They are not helped now by any claim that preparation for military action in this kind of world is "a trite and unbelievable oversimplification of history." The question now is, who oversimplified the interpretation of history?

It is clear now, if it was not clear before that the crisis is more than a clash of ideologies and economic theories, though it is that. We are in danger of being unable to deal with realities, including moral realities. "The United Nations, the United States, the whole free world is threatened by men who have acquired tremendous military power and who do not seem to understand that weakness on the part of their prospective victims is an assurance of peace," said an editorial in the Washington Star last July. That editorial was prophetic.

The church has its own guilt. We have remained silent when we should have spoken. And too often when we have spoken we have said the wrong thing.

We should have asked for repentance—from selfishness, pride. We should have called for even more generosity and more sacrifice—for more missionaries and greater restoration funds. We should have insisted that our Nation share generously with others and assist in their physical reconstruction—even beyond the generous things we did. We should have been more insistent that even Russia participate in that assistance. And we should have insisted that all such assistance be given and administered in the spirit of brotherliness.

To say that this person or that group is now guilty is not true and it is of no avail. Confronted with the claims of the kingdom of God, of christian discipleship we are all guilty. We are all in the same condemnation. We wanted our young men home in 1945. We wanted prosperity, our gadgets, our comfort, and luxury. We wanted peace without the price of peace. We were blind to the irreconcilability of colliding ideologies. We thought Soviet communism wanted peace when it was something else they wanted.

On this advent Sunday, we are called back to faith in the kingdom of God—the kingdom into which men are born again—with new motives and new purposes. The kingdom of God and the kingdom of the United States are not the same thing. We know we are not perfect but we are striving for improvement. The kingdom of God and the kingdom of Stalinism are not the same thing. We know that they are forever irreconcilable. But to faith in the kingdom of God we must cling anew. Advent means that God once entered our fleeting life. We know what He is like and what we ought to become.

There is an eternal purpose toward which all events move. As Lincoln put it, "The Almighty has his own purposes." Even if the worst comes; if civilization becomes a shambles, there will be a remnant of the redeemed. And if we have been an unworthy instrument in establishing His kingdom on earth it may even be that God will raise up another people unto Himself.

We know the kingdom can come. Once it did come in Christ. We see what life can be when God is in it fully.

No matter what comes—God is.

No matter what happens—God is God.

We cannot despair whatever the circumstances. We have seen the King once in history. His kingdom standeth sure. "I am Alpha and Omega," saith the Lord.

Letter to a Soldier in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 20 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to a soldier in Korea read by the Reverend A. Powell Davies, D. D., at All Souls' Church, Unitarian, Washington, D. C., Sunday, December 17, 1950. I do not feel adequate to express myself on this letter, but would prefer to let it speak for itself. It carries a message of the greatest importance to all of us.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO A SOLDIER IN KOREA

DEAR FRIEND: You say near the end of your letter that you do not expect an answer. That is very good of you. Probably you would not complain if I selected from my desk some magazine articles, news-cuttings, reports of speeches, and the like, and sent them to you with the thought that you would find them much more useful than my merely personal opinions.

Let me be honest with you: I have been tempted to do that very thing. But I can't get away with it. You are entitled to a personal answer, a complete and truthful answer. Indeed, if you chose to demand it, you are entitled to such an answer not only from me but from every grown person in the United States.

You say that you do not know what you are doing in Korea—what made it necessary in the first place. You wonder whether any good has come of it. The Korean people, you tell me, both North and South, are much worse off than if the United Nations had never intervened. Millions of them are refugees, walking the winter roads alongside your armies, but with nowhere to go. Uncounted multitudes have died, and the same fate awaits a vast number of survivors. Your best friend was killed. He had a sweetheart, the girl who had waited for him since his senior year in high school. They would have been married this Christmas. He had everything to live for. You ask me what use it was, his dying, and what was gained by such a sacrifice.

I shall try to answer these questions—faithfully and to the best of my ability. But there is something I have to say first. This letter is being written in a warm room, not out of doors in zero weather. My feet have not been frost-bitten. I have not lost several nights of sleep. If I walk down the street I shall see not homeless refugees, but the usual crowds busy with their Christmas shopping. You can see what I'm driving at, I'm sure. It is something that you may have to take into account as you read what follows. You are there where the fighting is; I am not.

The only thing I can say for myself is that I share your protest. I am putting up the same fight against bitterness that you are. With you, this fight is recent and intense; with me it has lasted a long while and I am not so driven by it. But then, as I say, I'm here in America; I might feel just as you do if I were in Korea.

I have to admit that people here are just as you describe them. They do know in a vague, unhappy way that we are being defeated in Korea. Nevertheless, the war is not quite real to them. They see it, so to speak, through a glass, darkly; it does not meet them face to face. Last week, for instance, there was a wildcat strike, tying up the railroad terminals. Under normal conditions this strike might be defensible. In our present situation, it was outrageous. The fact is, however, that the strikers meant no harm; they just don't understand about Korea. It is the same with the automobile manufacturers. Their profits have been large, and that is the way they like them. Perhaps you would, too, if you were an automobile manufacturer. But when the Government asked them to wait and talk it over before putting up their prices, they flatly refused to do it. The war you are fighting has not come close enough to frighten them. It will, sooner or later, but at present, Korean battles seem to be fought chiefly in the newspapers. These people have not seen phosphorus thrown into an ambulance; to them, a Communist is something exposed by the Un-American Activities Committee, not a fanatical soldier, snuffing out the life of your friend.

You must understand that this is America, just the same as always. The people here have not been shocked, as you have, into a grim sense of realities. What most of the people are concerned with, just now, is Christmas shopping. I don't know what you think of that; I don't know what I think of it myself. A few weeks ago, when you thought you might be home for Christmas, it must have been pleasant to imagine all this Christmas shopping. You would have been a part of it, buying presents for your relatives and friends just like the rest of us.

Those long lines of slow-moving vehicles, retreating toward the coast, the rear-guard action, the sudden ambush, the bridges blown up in front of you, the endless trek of refugees—people here don't see them, just as you might not have seen them if you had stayed in America. I do not mean that people don't read the news, but that they don't visualize it. They have not watched the bulldozers push the earth over the graves of the dead; they have not seen blood on the snow.

That is part of the answer to your question. You are in Korea because Americans refused to face realities. If our country had maintained its strength at the end of the Second World War, the entire course of history would have been different. But then, so would America. Millions of the population would have been under arms. The prosperity of these recent years, for whatever it may have been worth, could never have happened. The boys who wanted to

come home—just as you do, now—would, in many cases, have had to remain abroad. Would you have been in favor of these austerities? If you had been in a position of leadership, would you have insisted upon them? If you had, your leadership would have been repudiated. The America of the last 5 years is the America the people have wanted. It is the America they still want.

From what you write, it is also the America you want, yourself. You would like, that is, to keep it that way if you could.

And here comes the point where we need some clearer thinking. It is useless being embittered about the aftermath of World War II. We were unequal to our responsibilities; that is true. But on the other hand, there was a great deal that we did do. We were far from niggardly with our national resources. More than any nation ever did in the past, we gave of our substance to those who needed it. Until we saw that we were being made fools of, we gave as freely to Communists as to all others. Only slowly did our people realize what they were up against. They wanted peace. They thought that most other people wanted peace. They believed the Kremlin wanted peace. This may not have been intelligent or wise, but it was surely not discreditable. Little by little, the truth became plainer; finally, it became too plain to be mistaken, and the people understood.

That is why you were sent to Korea; because a time had come when Communist aggression could no longer be tolerated. It was a dangerous decision—the United Nations intervention in Korea. Even from the beginning, it was evident that the Chinese armies might support the North Koreans. But what was the alternative? To allow the Communists to seize Korea? If we had done this, without a fight of any kind, no nation in the world would have trusted us. It would have been surrender, piecemeal surrender, to Communist aggression. Our loss would have been greater, far greater, that way. And the Communist menace would have come closer to America without our seeing—without the world seeing—in full and final plainness—the brutal purpose of the Kremlin.

That is why you went to Korea. There was no help for it. We had to make a stand somewhere. The United Nations had to make a stand. Besides being a moral necessity, it had become a question of survival. The remaining free nations have no chance whatever unless the Communists are halted.

But you ask a second question. You want to know whether any good has come of it. You are in retreat. You have not achieved the purposes for which you went there.

Here, like yourself, some of what I say must be said in bitterness. For the last 2 years at least, it has been clear that we have needed to rearm—and on a scale sufficient to protect our interests. In my own view, it was clear much sooner, but in any case, after the Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia, it was inexcusable to hesitate. Our military leaders should have known what they were up against, and have provided accordingly. They failed to do it. Their goals were in the future. They should have known the time was then, not 1952. The Congress bears an equal share of blame. In utter blindness, the majority in both Houses insisted upon politics as usual, indeed, upon politics much worse than usual. This was criminal stupidity.

To answer your second question, then, I shall have to say that you might not have been defeated if your leaders had provided what was necessary. This would have meant, however, that you yourself would have needed to leave civilian life much earlier. So would thousands of others. I do not know how you would have felt about that. I just mention it because we have to be honest with ourselves—all of us. The leaders should have known better—that is what leaders are for. Nevertheless, I think they did what the people wanted.

I do not believe, however, that your defeat—even if it turns out to be entirely such—means that the effort was useless. It had to be tried. Some day, it will have to be tried again. There is no chance whatever that the world can remain "half slave, half free." What you have done in Korea has committed us for the future. It is true, as you say, that besides our own losses there are millions of Koreans who are refugees. There are also those who have died. It is a staggering thing to count up all these miseries, to stand and face this awful suffering. Yet, the answer is a clear one. Unless we are willing to surrender to the Communists, we must accept the facts of war for what they are. Our cause is lost already if blood and tears can break our resolution.

As I promised at the beginning, I shall be honest with you. I think that much worse is before us than you have seen in Korea. I think it possible that before long we may be driven out of Europe just as we are now being driven out of Korea. The truth is, you see, that our leaders even now are not realists. They think that 40 divisions, or 60, or maybe 80, can stop the Russians in Europe. This may be so, but for my own part, I admit that I don't see how. We are told that the Germans, the French, the Italians, will put up a strong resistance. Perhaps they will, but there is no reason at present for thinking so. The people of these countries will only fight to win if they believe they can win, and they will only believe they can win if they see United States strength fully mobilized and extended.

This does not mean that we ought not to have an alliance. The Atlantic Alliance is extremely important. But it does mean that until we trust in ourselves rather than in others and are ready to invoke our entire power and our whole might this alliance will not help us. It is America that must save America. American aircraft, American industry, American production, American men and women, fighting for victory in a war of survival. The nations with which we are allied are faint-hearted. War has wearied them. Multitudes of their people have given up; they do not believe in us, they do not believe in anything. They are in despair. These people will only fight by our side if they believe it is the winning side. It is our courage that must save them, not their courage that can save us.

At the present moment, they do not believe that ours is the winning side. They see what most Americans are blind to: that it is not certain that we can even defend the continental United States. They remember what we have forgotten; that wars are not won by dollar appropriations but by force in being; they know that we shall not win command of the skies by airplanes on drafting boards but only by those that we can put into the air. Far better than most Americans, they know how imminent is our danger. They are waiting to see how we use our time—not counted in years, but in months and weeks. They know the time is now.

So I can answer your question in this way: I can tell you that good has come of the defeat in Korea to the extent that we have lost some of our blindness. It is a terrible thing that your best friend had to die for this. But that is the way the world is, and it is uesless being bitter about it. We tried to win a war in Korea without having what it takes to win; if we understand this fact and act upon it, it may save us. But we shall have to do better than we are doing now. We shall have to realize what our people—yes, and most of our leaders, too—seem unable or unwilling to realize. There can be blood on the snow in America, not just next winter but this winter. It is something that the country would wake up to, astonished and stunned, just as it has to Korea. Our civilian defense, our provision for disaster control, are almost nonexistent. Tasks like these, immediate and urgent, are being set aside for squabbles. We are not doing well. I have to tell you this, simply because it is true. But I can also say that we are doing better than we were, largely because of Korea. If we are saved, we shall owe it to your friend who was killed—to him and all who died in Korea. We shall owe it to you, too, and the miseries you are undergoing. This is what you must understand, my friend, and let it melt away some of your bitterness.

You must know that soldiers die not only because there is evil in the world, but also because there is blindness and stupidity. Nor is this all. War comes because people are too hopeful, because they are generous and do not recognize their enemies. It is not a simple matter—this question of how war comes. Much of our trouble in the past has arisen from not knowing this. That is why your church has given you so little that helps you. The churchmen have not understood. They have thought that war was something that could be cured as a thing in itself, instead of as a part of everything that ails us. Some of the churchmen are now trying to decide whether the atom bomb is more immoral than a bomb made of TNT. The only comment on this controversy that would make sense to you or me is that of Prof. Robert M. Hawkins, of Vanderbilt University School of Religion: "Any weapon is inhumane," he says, "and I would rather be blown up with an atom bomb than bayonetted."

He is exactly right. Any weapon is inhumane. War always was, is now, and always will be cruel, barbarous, sickening, and revolting. Atomic energy, because it represents a towering achievement of science, a new dimension of human possibility, is especially repugnant to us when used as an instrument of disaster. We are in the grip of evil necessity and it does no good to disguise the fact. But if we are ever to break the power of this necessity and be free men again, free to build a better, gentler, happier world, we shall have to grapple with reality on its own terms.

That is what your battles in Korea are teaching us. We are awakening—and I hope it is not too late—to what reality requires of us. I say we are awakening, but this is not true of all of us. Some of us, my friend, are sick, spiritually sick, and it is a sickness unto death. In the hearts of some of us, hidden and disguised, there is despair. Those who are afflicted with this sickness are not willing to make the effort, reality is too much for them, the struggle has overwhelmed them already.

It was Dean Inge, whose understanding of history has seldom been surpassed, who once said that "resignation is the disease from which civilizations die." This disease is rampant among us. It takes the form, in many, of a tenacious clinging to hopes and aims that belong to yesterday; of blind resistance to what would save us. Deep in their hearts, they are resigned; if they cannot have the world that pleases them, they are willing to have no world at all. In others, this disease is a renunciation of principle, an inward dissolution of conviction. They do not love freedom, they do not love justice; they have room only for resentment at the harshness of events. I hope with all my heart that what you are doing in Korea will help to cure us of this disease.

One of our Senators, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, stated the matter extremely well in an address to the Senate last week: "Is this," he asked, "the hour of our Nation's twilight, the last fading hour of light before an endless night shall envelop us and all the Western World? That is a question which we still have in our power to answer. If we

delay longer we can expect nothing but darkness and defeat and desolation. If we answer the challenge with courage and confidence, and with the ability of which we are capable, we can, I am sure, triumph over our foes."

That is exactly right. You did not go to Korea, my friend, on an isolated venture. You are the beginning of the main battle. You, together with the rest of us, both there and here, are settling the question of survival. A long night of barbarism or a new morning of civilization—that is the question you are settling.

Some of your more detailed inquiries I have not answered. I am not equipped to speak, for instance, about mistakes of strategy or of generalship. I have opinions about these things but I doubt that I should venture on them in this letter. If we assume, as perhaps we should, that mistakes have been made, we ought to recognize, I think, that the Chinese armies would have intervened in any case. So the result would have been much the same. As to this, the plan followed out was made years ago in the Kremlin.

I was in Czechoslovakia, you know, when the Communists seized the Government of that country. When I returned to America and reported what I had seen and heard, giving it as my conviction that it was a further stage in Soviet aggression, there were many who would not believe it. Yet, we read this week a full admission in the words of their Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Fierlinger. Plans for the new Czechoslovakia, he says, were "made in Moscow" even before World War II ended. "Stalin in the Kremlin," he continues, "with ingenious foresight, drew the outlines of our new Czechoslovakia—(and) a new government was prepared to take over our new state."

I mention this because we must understand that plans have also been prepared for Germany, France, and Italy. This is still in the future. But the plans for Korea, and for Chinese action in Korea, are being carried out. Since we could not have won with the forces we were able to commit, there is not much gain in blaming strategy or criticizing generalship. The Chinese would have come in any case.

Let me say again, we must keep in view the main struggle, the struggle we still can win. If we win that one, victory will come to us in the others, also.

But we must possess the will to win; we must be spiritually fit for the conflict. I confess to you with shame that here in Washington we are not spiritually fit—not yet. But I am not without hope. I think things are a little better. I am glad you like the poetry of Walt Whitman. So do I. Do you remember his lines about America:

"Not for success alone;
Not to fair-sail unintermitted always;
The storm shall dash thy face—the murk of war, and worse than war, shall cover thee all over
In many a smiling mask death shall approach, beguiling thee—thou in disease shalt swelter,
The livid cancer spread its hideous claws, seeking to strike thee deep within;
Consumption of the worst—mortal consumption—shall rouge thy face with hectic:
But thou shalt face thy fortunes, thy diseases, and surmount them all
Shalt soar toward fulfilment of the future
The Soul—its destinies."

I believe that and I know you do. If we are bitter at times, it is a clean sort of bitterness and washes away some of the heartache. But the fact is that we believe—and deeply—in freedom and justice and a decent world, and we know that the power to win that world is in us—and in the people of our country.

I await eagerly the news that you are safe. When you are back in this region, come and see me. Meanwhile, write me again if you feel like it. And don't be gentle. Tell me what you really think. We in America will only be saved by the truth that hurts.

With every best wish,

Yours very sincerely,

A. POWELL DAVIES.

Study of Congress Needed by American School Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Trentonian, daily newspaper of Trenton, N. J., on December 7, 1950, published a column by Harman W. Nichols, the distinguished United Press correspondent, describing the study program of the Committee for Congress, which seeks to make better study facilities available in our schools and colleges about the actual work and functions of Congress and its Members.

Because of the worthiness of this endeavor by a group of experienced Washington newspapermen to strengthen our representative form of government with a better knowledge of the Congress of the United States, I am pleased to request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD publication of this column, along with a query about it from one of my constituents.

Complete information about the educational program of the Committee for Congress, and its Congress Study Council, which plans to use Your Congress Magazine, and all available educational and information media, press, radio, television and motion pictures, to carry the story of Congress to students in and out of school, can be obtained from the Committee for Congress, 1060 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., ME-2214.

The column and the query follow:

(By Harman W. Nichols)

WASHINGTON, December 7.—It's a crying shame that the school children in Bee House, Tex., Farmer City, Ill., and Ulrich, Mo., don't know the first thing about how our Congress does its work.

A youngster wrote in the other day and wanted to know in which room in the White House the Supreme Court meets.

Well, maybe we can straighten this all out.

We now have a nonprofit, nonpolitical group known as the Committee for Congress. It's a brand new thing and has on its board of directors a flock of veteran newspapermen and commentators who have observed the goings-on in Washington for many years.

OUTFIT IS NOT PHONY

The outfit is not phony. It doesn't expect to pay any big dividends to stockholders, but it is putting out a little publication called Your Congress Magazine, at 1060 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

The idea is to educate the public on what goes on here.

Hal. J. Miller, the moving force behind the project, is a familiar figure on Capitol Hill. He and his wife, Virginia, did a lot of research. They found that there wasn't a single high school in the country which dug into the inner workings of Congress. At least, not to the point where the students—or public—had an inkling of how a congressional committee works.

Or what comes out of a conference (a vague term, at best). Or what a Senator or Congressman is supposed to do besides say "Here" when the Vice President, who is President of the Senate, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, calls the meetings to order.

SUPPORTED BY CONGRESS

The committee has the backing of many Members of Congress. Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Florida, said:

"There is great merit to the program—and a need for the full understanding of the workings of the Government. This is particularly true in the trying international situation."

Representative F. ERTEL CARLYLE, of North Carolina, said he thought the new committee would serve a very useful purpose.

NO INFORMATION AVAILABLE

Representative M. G. BURNSIDE, of West Virginia, a former professor of political science, pulled out the stops and said that although he tried to teach his students the fundamentals of how Congress acts, he never was able to. No information from Washington available.

One Representative who doesn't want to be named blamed the press for the lack of interest in Congress.

"The newspapers and radio poke so much fun at Senators and Congressmen that a lot of Members crayfish into their shells and don't fight back," he said.

"This new program by the Committee for Congress sounds like a good idea. Maybe some of us now can stick our necks out and fight back."

The column was accompanied by this written memorandum from Carl Schielke, 23 Jarvis Place, Trenton 8, N. J.:

DEAR MR. NICHOLS: Please forward my name to the Committee for Congress so that I can subscribe.

Some Newspaper Criticisms of the Advertising Campaign of the American Medical Association and Its Selfish Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the October 15, 1950, issue of the Des Moines (Iowa) Sunday Register published in its open forum the following letter concerning the advertising of the American Medical Association during the last political campaign:

A READER TAKES ISSUE WITH MEDICAL SOCIETY ADVERTISING—SAYS HE AND NEIGHBOR ARE NOT RUNNING AMERICA

To the OPEN FORUM EDITOR:

A short time ago there appeared in the public press an announcement that the American Medical Association would spend a large sum of money on advertising against public health insurance. The first ad appeared October 8 in This Week magazine,

page 4, entitled, "Who Runs America?" and ends with the statement: "You and Your Neighbor Run America." I take issue with this. My neighbor and I do not run America. Who does? The lobbyists, such as the American Medical Association, who have millions to spend for advertising and influencing lawmakers.

Perhaps if my neighbor and I had an equal amount of cash to spread around among the elected personnel of Government, we might have an equal voice in running America. As it is, we have just two votes, my neighbor and I, pitted against the millions of dollars worth of influence at the disposal of the American Medical Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the American Bar Association, to mention but a few. To cite an example of the influence of these powerful lobbies, look what happened to the cost of living after controls were removed at their behest.

WEIGHING THE FACTS

The ad says "the people weigh the facts." I wonder if the people ever get any facts to weigh. I'm sure the AMA and their millions are not going to present both sides of the question. For example, will they tell us how much AMA restricts medical training unfairly? Will they dare tell us how much of the Nation's wealth is controlled by insurance companies? Would they dare tell us how much the assets of the insurance companies increased from 1910 to 1930? From 1930 to 1940? ($20,000,000,000 and an average of $3,000,000,000) yearly from 1940 to 1950—by approximately $60,000,000,000 to date?

The point is, that their assets doubled in 10 years. If these assets were controlled by the people (who weight the facts), there would be adequate funds to insure everyone against failure in health. The ad says "hundreds of voluntary health insurance plans are in healthy competition," etc. My neighbor and I want to know why the duplication of effort. Why not have one over-all system similar to GI insurance?

HEALTH INSURANCE

The ad also says "70,000,000 Americans are protected by voluntary health insurance." My neighbor and I want to know why the other 80,000,000 of Americans can't afford the same protection; what happens to the rest of the insurance companies' assets? So voluntary health insurance takes the economic shock out of illness does it? Would the benevolent AMA please explain why it is that whenever an insured "victim" is treated, the physician's fee invariably matches the amount of insurance?

My neighbor and I therefore ask the American Medical Association to get down to earth and tell the truth in their monster advertising campaign. Tell the people just what they have against health for everyone, tell them why they obstruct and object to the educating of more doctors, explain why there is a shortage of nurses, and adequate hospital facilities. Could it be that they do not want us to know?

LLOYD R. FISH.

MOLINE, ILL.

The League Reporter, which is the official publication for Labor's League for Political Education, in its December 11, 1950, issue carried the following news items concerning the selfish activities of the American Medical Association:

MEDICAL PROFESSION ABUSES LEAD TO NEED FOR HEALTH PROGRAM

Why is national health insurance necessary? You've heard lots of answers to that. The American Medical Association (AMA) pours millions of dollars into its lobby fund to give you answers—false ones.

The reason is simply this: The medical profession is not cleaning up its abuses. Whenever a powerful group touches the lives of thousands of people, it must provide an adequate service for them, or it will be done by a group who will.

In this way abuses in the sale of stocks led to the establishment of the Securities and Exchange Commission. And abuses by huge financial operators of subsidiaries led to the Holding Company Act.

The medical profession will have to be guided economically by a national health insurance program, so everyone can have adequate medical care.

The medical profession has the knowledge to cure most of the ills of every American. But only one out of every five persons is able to take full advantage of these benefits.

There are 40,000,000 people living in communities without full-time health services. Thirty thousand more doctors are needed. There are only one-half the hospital beds that are needed. Forty percent of the counties, with 15,000,000 citizens, have no hospitals at all.

With national health insurance you would have needed X-rays immediately. Your financial situation wouldn't first be investigated. Your health would come first. There are about 325,000 people dying each year who could have been saved had they received prompt diagnosis of their ailments and proper treatment.

If you needed a doctor after midnight, you wouldn't have to wait until morning to see one. National health insurance would mean available doctors at all times.

If you needed glasses, the optometrist wouldn't check first to see how many dollars you had in your pocket. Under national health insurance, you would receive them promptly.

Hospital costs may be $20 a day for a serious illness or accident. Such costs can lead easily to a bill of $1,000 or more. How many families can afford to pay this high cost of health?

With national health insurance, everyone would be covered to receive medical care. Those who couldn't be insured because of joblessness would be eligible for treatment through insurance payments made for them by a public agency.

The program would provide services to prevent disease as well as to diagnose and cure it.

Specialized treatments, eyeglasses, and dental care would be equally available under the plan.

The AMA, while ignoring the glaring abuses of the medical profession, lamely tries to label national health insurance "socialistic," or some other unpopular term, in an effort to disguise its real purpose.

The only alternative the AMA gives is the insurance plans which are limited in coverage meet only part of the costs and make no provision for preventive treatment.

BISHOP HITS AMA HEALTH PLAN FIGHT

Methodist Bishop Gerald Kennedy, of Portland, Oreg., says no one in England, not even the doctors, would do away with that country's health-insurance program.

Following a recent visit to England, Bishop Kennedy reported that the Labor and Conservative Parties are fighting over who should get credit for first thinking of the plan.

Bishop Kennedy also attacked the assinine tactics the American Medical Association (AMA) is using to fight national health insurance.

"One thing is certain," added Bishop Kennedy, "one way or another, we are due for a change. Things are going to be improved because the public will demand it, and the AMA cannot prevent it no matter how large a slush fund it raises in an effort to stand pat."

MEDIC RIPS INTO DOCTORS

"The doctor who has a license to practice medicine and joins a county medical society is usually fixed for life.

"Unless he is convicted by a court of some criminal offense, he can continue to enjoy the rights and privileges of responsible doctors even though he, himself, practices overcharging, neglect of patients, and nonsupport of organized medicine."

That's a doctor talking. Those comments are from a speech by Dr. Hamilton W. McKay, of Charlotte, N. C., to the annual meeting of the Southern Medical Association on November 14 in St. Louis.

Dr. McKay was president of the Southern Medical Association, the Nation's second biggest medical group, during the past year. Only the American Medical Association (AMA) itself is larger.

"If the people cannot convince themselves that organized medicine is taking vigorous steps to correct its own shortcomings, they will insist that the initiative for action be transferred to other hands," Dr. McKay went on to say.

"He (the doctor) simply does not know that it isn't enough to do a good scientific job; he is a bungling novice in the art of human relations with his patients, who are, after all, his greatest assets and medicine's stock in trade. * * *

"Our competence is being weighed against the American standard of competence in other professions. Our charges are being weighed against the budgetary demands of other services which are essential to life in America."

AMA KEEPS YOUTHS FROM M. D. TRAINING BY OPPOSING AID

"Are we to haul down our flag and permit the American Medical Association (AMA) and the other reactionary interests of this country to continue to utilize the present international crisis as a smoke screen for their selfish policy of scarcity in medical personnel?"

That important question was asked by Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing in a speech at a meeting of the Harlem Interracial Platform on November 26 in New York City.

"The time has come to remind the doctor-politicians of their Hippocratic oath—which binds them, morally at least, to teach the art of medicine to all who desire to learn it.

"Those who would limit medical education in this time of scarcity are honoring their ancient and honored oath in the breach rather than the observance."

For 2 years the AMA has opposed legislation being backed by the A. F. of L. and other liberal groups to give medical schools some money from the Federal Treasury so they could train more doctors.

DOCTORS STOP CO-OP BY USING LAW WHICH ALLOWS MONOPOLIES

Remember those American Medical Association (AMA) ads that the daily papers ran last October?

Remember how they talked about "liberty," "freedom," and "the voluntary way"?

"Just how free is the free enterprise organized medicine is talking about in its current * * * propaganda campaign has been graphically demonstrated in Staunton, Ill.," reported the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on November 18.

"There a group of citizens wanted to establish a cooperative hospital which would have provided, among things, prepaid preventive medical care to the members of the cooperative.

"But this inevitably would have affected Macoupin County doctors' pocketbooks, and the physicians would have none of it. They

have prevented the cooperative from operating, with the help of an Illinois law which not only permits medical monopolies, but makes them mandatory.

"The legislature at Springfield decreed last year that no medical service plan corporation can be formed unless a majority of the trustees are doctors.

"And to rivet the control of organized medicine over such plans, the law also says that none can be formed unless a majority of the doctors in the area to be served agree to participate. * * *

"The law says, in short, that doctors, and only organized doctors, shall decide what fees are to be charged and how much or how little service they must provide their patients.

"A very strange sort of free enterprise this."

PAPER TELLS DOCTORS TO CORRECT ABUSES

"A timely warning to the medicos has come from one of their profession, Dr. Hamilton W. McKay, of Charlotte, N. C. * * *

"Dr. McKay's advice is sound and sensible. This newspaper has opposed the Truman health insurance plan—but not without repeatedly urging the doctors themselves to take the lead in correcting conditions that prompt support for that plan."

That's what the Pittsburgh Press said about Dr. McKay's speech in an editorial published on November 18. The Pittsburgh Press, a Scripps-Howard paper, is about as liberal as the Chicago Tribune.

Attacks on Acheson Are Beyond Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a timely discussion by Gould Lincoln, noted political writer, concerning the current controversy over attacks on Secretary of State Acheson and his policies. This article, which appeared in the December 19 issue of the Washington Star, follows:

ATTACKS ON SECRETARY ARE DECLARED BEYOND POLITICS

(By Gould Lincoln)

The retirement of Secretary of State Acheson, under his own steam, seems the way out of the present controversy over the conduct of our foreign policies. You can argue until the cows come home whether President Truman or the Republicans in Congress are responsible for the unfortunate situation which sees Mr. Acheson representing this country at the Brussels Conference of the North Atlantic Pact Nations, under the shadow of a vote of "no confidence" by large majorities of the Republicans in the Senate and the House. But the situation is there, and something should be done about it.

The Republicans in Congress argue that the Secretary of State had lost the confidence of the American people—and that this was shown by the elections held in many States in November. They contend, indeed, that the election results were a mandate to get rid of Mr. Acheson, and that Mr. Truman stubbornly insisted on retaining his Secretary of State. They say further that they waited for more than a month before they unlimbered their guns and in party conference demanded the retirement of Mr. Acheson. They were unwilling, they continue, to compromise with principle or to see the will of the people disregarded.

DEMOCRATS ANXIOUS, TOO

It is admitted that a majority of Democratic Senators have been as anxious to have Mr. Acheson retired from office as have the Republicans. Some of them were saying recently that they wished Mr. Truman had changed his Secretary of State well before the election—and if he had done so, Democratic candidates would have had a better chance on election day.

President Truman got rid of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, when there was great public pressure against Mr. Johnson on the ground that he had failed to keep up the defenses of the country. There were plenty to say, and did say, after the resignation of Mr. Johnson, that Mr. Truman had eliminated the wrong man, and that he should have let out Mr. Acheson. In the state of temper of the voters last summer and fall, if Mr. Truman had held on to Mr. Johnson, as well as Mr. Acheson, as he had said he intended doing, the election results might have been even worse for the administration.

The argument made against the action of the Republicans in Congress on the Acheson matter cries to the heavens that this is no time for a divided country, with the war clouds rolling up faster and faster; that to undermine the effectiveness of a Secretary of State about to confer with our North Atlantic allies against Communist aggression is to play into the hands of the enemy, and break down the confidence of our allies. A great deal depends, however, on whether it is wiser to have the confidence of the American people in a Secretary of State, at this critical period, or more advantageous to make it appear to our allies and enemies abroad that the people are solidly back of a man in whom many Americans have no confidence.

FINAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Truman, as Chief Executive, is finally responsible for the handling of our foreign relations and for our foreign policies. To a degree, therefore, it can be argued that it is really immaterial who is his Secretary of State—his messenger boy; that it makes little difference whether the Secretary of State be Dean Acheson or Chief Justice Vinson (who has been mentioned many times as a successor to Acheson) or another. Mr. Truman is the final arbiter, with all the decisions in his hands. Under such a hypothesis, Mr. Truman may contend, if he wishes, he is justified in keeping Mr. Acheson if he desires to do so.

However, the Secretary of State is the first officer of the President's Cabinet. Not only is he expected to advise the President wisely on foreign affairs and policy, but it is his duty to deal directly with foreign nations. Whether justly or unjustly, Mr. Acheson has been held responsible by many Americans for a policy in the Far East that has resulted in the strengthening of the Communist grip on China and the Korean war. It was this belief that aided the Republicans in the November elections, and helped to swell the totals by which Republican candidates were elected to the Senate. It has been obvious for a long time that a bipartisan foreign policy—such as that which prevailed during the Second World War and even 2 years ago—would be out of the question if Mr. Acheson remained as head of the State Department. His retention by the President was a challenge to bipartisanship.

The charge is made that the Republicans have seized upon Mr. Acheson as a whipping boy for the President himself, since there is no way to get rid of Mr. Truman before the elections of 1952, except through impeachment proceedings, and it is not practicable to impeach a President because of disagreement with his foreign policy. Their attack on Mr. Acheson, it is charged further, is pure politics. It goes, however, far beyond partisan politics, in the opinion of such men as Senator IVES, of New York, and impinges on the safety and future of the people.

Is National Unity To Be Subordinated to Political Interest of Republican Party?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith the following article written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop entitled "Decline of This Republic," which appeared in the Washington Post, December 20, 1950:

DECLINE OF THIS REPUBLIC

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

Anyone interested in finding out about the decay of American politics, should read the real story behind the Republican resolution demanding the dismissal of Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson. These reporters happen to believe that Acheson must be sacrificed, so that the country's Government can work again. But this by no means lessens the shock of the stories that have now seeped out of the House and Senate Republican conference chambers.

As to the House, what happened was about what you might expect. In the party steering committee, retiring Representative JAMES WADSWORTH, who sometimes seems to be the last American politician to care very much about national interests, was alone in warning that it was not helping to stab the Secretary of State in the back just before a major international conference. In the larger meeting of all the House Republicans, they took no vote. The anti-Acheson resolution was passed by a sort of unanimous howl, or yell, for blood.

The proceedings in the Senate, as might also be expected, were both more complex and vastly more meaningful. In brief, the Senate Republican steering committee, headed by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT of Ohio, had prepared a resolution much milder than the violent condemnation of Acheson howled through in the House. But Senator TAFT made no move to defend his handiwork when substitution of the House resolution was immediately proposed by Senator JAMES P. KEM, of Missouri, whose foreign and defense voting record is virtually indistinguishable from the unlamented VITO MARCANTONIO's.

Senator TAFT instead reserved his opposition for another substitute offered by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, and a number of other Republican moderates. This resolution made no mention of Acheson by name. It called only for changes in Government to promote national unity. And it particularly emphasized restoration of bipartisanship and consultation between leaders of all parties in this time of dire national peril.

On this resolution, speaking, of course, within the Republican family, Senator TAFT revealingly remarked that he disliked the whole idea of consultation. When the Republicans were consulted, he pointed out with perfect logic, they shared in the responsibility for what was subsequently done. But when they were not consulted, he continued, they could praise or blame the administration, particularly blame, as the outcome might suggest was most advantageous.

In short, in the view of Senator TAFT, which found much favor with his colleagues, national unity was to be subordinated to the political interests of the Republican Party.

Without TAFT to fight for it, the original steering committee draft resolution had few friends. The substitute of the moderates received only 15 votes in the conference. But a further issue was raised when Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, another man with a foreign and defense voting record like KEM's, proposed a further amendment to the House resolution. The Capehart amendment demanded that Acheson's replacement as Secretary of State should be pure and unsullied by any contact with the development of American foreign policy in the last 5 years.

This was, of course, a naked attack on all responsible bipartisan-minded Republicans like Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, John Foster Dulles, and Paul G. Hoffman. Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, one of the guilty men, pointed this out to Senator CAPEHART. Senator CAPEHART replied simply that confession was good for the soul, and that the sooner the Republican Party got back to outright, all-out, unqualified isolationism the better it would be.

CAPEHART was at least beaten, and a sweetening mention of national unity was at least added to the Senate resolution to please the moderates. In this form, the retirement of Acheson was ringingly demanded.

Among the Senators so voting, a large majority, of course, knew that their action would arouse the Missouri mule in President Truman and make Acheson's retention more likely; these men indeed would be deeply disappointed if the President followed their advice and deprived them of their political target. A large majority among the Senators voting also realized that they were embarrassing national policy at the Brussels meeting. And, finally, a substantial minority among the Senators voting, including the loudest bellowers about Acheson's "softness toward communism," possessed foreign and defense policy records almost indistinguishable from the editorial lines of the Daily Worker.

Outstanding Americans Praise Hays-Judd Speaking Tour in Behalf of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to general attention a splendid and timely project of two distinguished Members of the House of Representatives from opposite sides of the aisle.

The gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. BROOKS HAYS, and the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. WALTER JUDD, are at this time engaged in a Nation-wide joint speaking tour in support of the United Nations and bipartisan efforts to strengthen it.

They conceived this project weeks ago before the gravity of the world crisis had been fully revealed. The need to demonstrate the vigor of nonpartisanship on fundamental foreign policy was never greater. By their joint work in building support for a stronger UN, these two men have earned the praise and gratitude of the Nation.

No Members of Congress have been more ardent in their support of the UN than Mr. HAYS and Dr. JUDD. Earlier in this Congress they introduced a resolution to declare it to be a fundamental purpose of our foreign policy to strengthen and support the UN, and confer upon it powers sufficient to repel aggression. One hundred and eleven Members of the House and twenty-three Members of the Senate joined with them in cosponsoring this resolution. Their action was prophetic, for a crisis has arisen which can only be fully met by a stronger UN. Belatedly, the UN has begun to acquire some of the strength Representatives HAYS and JUDD sought to give it almost 4 years ago. For their foresight, and their heroic faith in the ultimate achievement of a rule of law in international affairs, we are all grateful to Representatives HAYS and JUDD.

The public response to the Hays-Judd tour has been gratifyingly favorable in every city in which they have spoken. In addition, a group of outstanding Americans has taken occasion to express some of the gratitude they feel to these two great exponents of international sanity and order. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of a letter addressed to our distinguished colleagues by over 100 leading citizens:

DECEMBER 3, 1950.

Hon. BROOKS HAYS,
Hon. WALTER H. JUDD.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: The announcement of your forthcoming speaking tour, in support of the United Nations and efforts to strengthen it, comes as a heartening demonstration of the continued vitality of nonpartisanship on basic foreign-policy questions. As American citizens concerned for the welfare and security of our Nation, we recognize that the future of the United States is inexorably bound up with the future of the United Nations.

It is vital for the preservation of democracy and freedom that every American citizen understand the pressing need to equip the United Nations with the power to prevent war. Your speaking tour will bring understanding of the issues to wide audiences. You are making a great contribution to the future peace of the world.

We commend the high statesmanship of your undertaking and wish you every success in your efforts.

(The above letter was signed by the following:)

Samuel K. Allison, director, Institute for Nuclear Studies, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Morris Abrams, president, Curtis Industries, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

Philip Werner Amram, attorney, Washington, D. C.

Paul Shipman Andrews, dean of College of Law, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

Francis Biddle, former Attorney General of United States, Washington, D. C.

Mildred Riorden Blake, advertising writer (on leave), Young & Rubicam, New York, N. Y.

Henry Brandis, Jr., dean, University of North Carolina Law School, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Henry B. Cabot, civic leader, Boston, Mass.

Cass Canfield, chairman, Harper & Bros., New York, N. Y.

Will Clayton, former Under Secretary of State, Houston, Tex.

Henry Chalfant, assistant secretary, National Supply Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Rufus E. Clement, president, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.

Everett R. Clinchy, New York, N. Y.

Randolph P. Compton, limited partner, Kidder, Peabody & Co., New York, N. Y.

Allan W. Eister, associate professor of sociology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex.

John Fischer, editor in chief of general books, Harper & Bros., New York, N. Y.

The Reverend Roscoe Thornton Foust, rector, Church of the Ascension, New York, N. Y.

Edward C. Fritz, Dallas, Tex.

Harry D. Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College of the City of New York, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Marc J. Grossman, attorney, Cleveland, Ohio.

Harold J. Glickman, attorney, president of City Club, Cleveland, Ohio.

Oscar Hammerstein II, Librettist, producer, New York, N. Y.

Frances A. Hand, New York, N. Y.

Florence J. Harriman, former United States Minister to Norway, Washington, D. C.

The Reverend Donald Harrington, minister, the Community Church of New York, N. Y.

H. J. Heinz II, chairman, United States Council of International Chamber of Commerce, president, H. J. Heinz Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Carter C. Higgins, president, Worcester Pressed Steel Co., Worcester, Mass.

Harry B. Hollins III, former partner, H. N. Whitney & Co., in New York, Oldwick, N. J.

Sarah T. Hughes, judge, Fourteenth District Court, Dallas, Tex.

Robert Lee Humber, attorney, author of the Humber Resolution, Greenville, N. C.

Norman E. Isaacs, managing editor, St. Louis Star-Times, St. Louis, Mo.

W. P. Kennedy, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio.

Benjamin H. Kizer, former Director UNRRA in China, Spokane, Wash.

R. C. Knickerbocker, Dallas, Tex.

Paul A. Lay, commercial artist, Dallas, Tex.

Mrs. Henry Goddard Leach, civic leader, New York, N. Y.

Sidney Lee, Dallas, Tex.

Lewis B. Lefkowitz, Dallas, Tex.

Ralph Lindstrom, attorney, Los Angeles, Calif.

John D. McCutcheon, president, McCutcheon & Co., St. Louis, Mo.

Thomas H. Mahony, attorney, chairman Catholic Association for International Peace, Boston, Mass.

Charles A. Merrill, city editor, Boston Globe, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Thomas Parran, former Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service; dean, Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Walter D. Malcolm, attorney, Boston, Mass.

Allen Maxwell, editor, Southwest Review, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex.

Cord Meyer, Jr., author, lecturer; junior fellow at Harvard University; honorary president, United World Federalists, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. Migel, former vice president, American Silk Spinning Co., Westerly, R. I.

W. A. C. Miller III, president, Artisan Metal Works Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

H. J. Muller, biologist, Bloomington, Ind.

Lewis Mumford, author, Amenia, N. Y.

The Right Reverend G. Ashton Oldham, president, Synod Province II, Protestant Episcopal Church, Albany, N. Y.

Grove Patterson, editor in chief, Toledo Blade, Toledo, Ohio.

Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War, New York, N. Y.

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, Denver, Colo.

A. J. G. Priest, attorney, New York, N. Y.

Roger L. Putnam, president, Package Machinery Co., Springfield, Mass.

A. K. Oliver, chairman, Pittsburgh Consolidated Coal Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Stewart C. Rand, lawyer, Boston, Mass.

Philip D. Reed, president, International Chamber of Commerce; chairman, General Electric Co., New York, N. Y.
Howard C. Robbins, former dean, Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York, Washington, D. C.
Ruth Bryan Rhode, former United States Minister to Denmark, Ossining, N. Y.
George M. Sidenberg, Jr., Santa Barbara, Calif.
Gordon Simpson, attorney, Dallas, Tex.
James T. Shotwell, New York, N. Y.
Ralph W. Sockman, minister, Christ Church, New York, N. Y.
Duncan M. Spencer, chairman, Fiduciary Trust Co., New York, N. Y.
C. M. Stanley, partner, Stanley Engineering Co., Muscatine, Iowa.
Rex Stout, author, New York, N. Y.
Raymond Swing, radio commentator, Washington, D. C.
Herbert Bayard Swope, former executive editor, the World; consultant to Secretary of War, New York, N. Y.
Channing H. Tobias, executive director, Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York, N. Y.
Henry W. Toll, attorney, founder and executive director of agencies for interstate cooperation, Denver, Colo.
H. St. G. Tucker, former presiding bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church; former president, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, Richmond, Va.
Clifton M. Utley, commentator, the National Broadcasting Co., Chicago, Ill.
The Reverend Lance Webb, minister, University Park Methodist Church, Dallas, Tex.
Charles Weston, banker, Boston, Mass.
W. L. White, writer, newspaperman, Emporia, Kans.
Lloyd C. Wicke, bishop, the Methodist Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Robert N. Wilkin, judge, United States district court, Cleveland, Ohio.
Abraham Wilson, attorney, New York, N. Y.
Raymond Wittcoff, manufacturer, St. Louis, Mo.
H. E. Yarnell, admiral, United States Navy, retired, Newport, R. I.
Stanley A. Weigel, attorney, San Francisco, Calif.
Lynn White, Jr., president, Mills College, Oakland, Calif.
Byrl A. Whitney, director, Educational and Research Bureau, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio.
Luther W. Youngdahl, governor, State of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.
John H. Crider, editor-in-chief, Boston Herald, Boston, Mass.
Jerome C. Fisher, attorney, Cleveland, Ohio.
Carl D. Friebolin, judge, civic leader, Cleveland, Ohio.
Bishop G. Bromly Oxnam, Methodist Church, New York City.
Mrs. Marion C. Blossom, civic leader, St. Louis, Mo.
B. D. Zevin, president, World Publishing Co.
Albert Guerard, Brandeis University.
William Green, president, American Federation of Labor.
Ralph Lowell, Boston, Mass.
Robert A. Millikan, Pasadena, Calif., scientist.
Mary Roberts Rinehart, writer.
Ben M. Cherrington, Denver, Colo.
Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT (Arkansas).
J. W. Spang, Jr., Boston, Mass.
Harry Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Minneapolis, Minn.
James W. Havighurst, attorney, Cleveland, Ohio.
Douglas Campbell, Jr., St. Louis, Mo.
Henry F. Chadeayne, comptroller, General American Life Insurance Co., St. Louis, Mo.
Charles A. Collidge, Boston, Mass.
Geneva Drinkwater, educator, St. Louis, Mo.
John Carl Dunlap, Kansas City, Mo.
Charles B. Edison, executive, St. Louis, Mo.
Adrien J. Falk, president, California Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, Calif.
Edward C. Foote, insurance executive, St. Louis, Mo.
Kenneth M. Holaday, St. Louis, Mo.
Charles A. Lee, professor of education, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
Joseph P. Waddock, attorney, St. Louis, Mo.
Raymond W. Miller, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
John J. Mahoney, director, civic education project, Cambridge, Mass.
Stratford Lee Morton, St. Louis, Mo.
Grace C. Mounce, St. Louis, Mo.
James W. Mull, Jr., University City, Mo.
F. R. Von Windegger, chairman of the board, Plaza Bank of St. Louis, Mo.

Agriculture Is Contributing to Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article published in the Missouri Farmer, Columbia, Mo., entitled "Agriculture Is Contributing to Our Foreign Policy," by F. L. Moritz:

AGRICULTURE IS CONTRIBUTING TO OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(By F. L. Moritz)

Foreign relations and affairs, to an average Missouri farm family, is something that is decided upon in Washington by the State Department and instrumented by career-conscious diplomats. This generally accepted conclusion is not far from fact, but with one exception.

This exception is the interchange of "grass root" diplomats between the United States and 16 free nations participating in the Economic Cooperation Administration's program of exchanging international information. These "grass root" diplomats of whom we speak are just plain people even as you and I.

They are sincere, hard-working, curious citizens of their nations, dedicated to gaining a knowledge and understanding of American agriculture. They are visiting these United States to get an inside viewpoint on our way of life. They are observing technical methods used in agricultural production, studying agricultural extension programs, participating in group discussions, attending farm youth group activities, visiting farm organizations and practicing democracy while living with farm families in every State in the Union.

The foreign farmers participating in this exchange of ideas are present in the United States as part of the ECA program and through the International Farm Youth Exchange. Since the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 was signed by the President, nearly 2,000 foreign agricultural specialists and farmers, both young and old, have visited the United States.

Missouri has been host to 37 of these foreign agricultural trainees. Some of these trainees have lived right in your community during the last 2 years for a period up to 3 months in some cases. They have been accepted by leading farmers as a member of their family. They have observed and worked with standard farm equipment, become familiar with our soils and crops, visited local community activities, and have lived as Missourians live.

"GRASS ROOTS" DIPLOMATS

Missouri, too, has sent "grass roots" diplomats to Western Europe in reciprocation. These mutual exchange trainees from Missouri, however, have been fewer in number. Last year, Van Eitel, from Adair County, spent about 6 months as an international farm youth exchange delegate in the Netherlands and in France. This year, Scott Sawyer, a Missouri University agriculture graduate, has spent all summer in Europe and returned to the United States in November.

Scott was one of 42 IFYE delegates representing 26 States who visited and worked on farms in 14 countries participating in the ECA program of exchanging ideas and skills through a two-way traffic system. In addition to IFYE delegates, other farm leaders and agricultural specialists have visited Europe and other continents. A Missouri example is Arnold Klemme, extension soils specialist, who attended the International Soil Congress held at Amsterdam, Holland, and later visited Germany and France observing agricultural production methods. In addition to Klemme, 10 other delegates registered from Missouri at the International Soil Congress.

This transformation from a Nation of isolationists to one of encouraging partnerships with the remaining free countries is twofold in purpose. First, interaction with peoples of other countries will lead to a better understanding and accordingly to a higher standard of living for the world through this exchange of technical skills and knowledge.

Secondly, and this is not in order of importance, this better understanding between free nations accomplished through the exchange of ideas by observers rather than statemen is our strongest bulwark against communism both abroad and at home.

EXPRESSES OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS

Our foreign policy is one expressing our national interests. Our national interests are an increase in standards of living; eliminating the threat of wars; and protecting individual freedom through a democratic form of government.

There never has been a time in the history of our Nation when we could go about the business of promoting our national interests free from the threat of destructive forces. These destructive forces stem from groups both within and outside these United States. These forces have and will continue to try to profit at the expense of the freedom and well-being of our citizens and of people who still remain free from oppression in other lands.

Applying these basic principles on the home front and abroad is what the ECA, in cooperation with extension services and farm organizations, is doing with this two-way traffic system of international information.

Down in Barry County on the Henry Arnaud 80-acre diversified farm is a typical agricultural trainee by the name of Michel Mousnier from Burgnac, France. Michel is a farm lad of 22 who has the equivalent of a high-school education. He also has spent some time in the French Air Academy and a year in the French Foreign Legion in North Africa.

Michel's father owns a farm of 240 acres, half tillable and half in pasture land. They practice diversified farming, owning 100–120 dual purpose beef cows with the majority entered in the Limousin (breed) herdbook. Grain crops are produced following a soil improvement program. Five families, including 10 men, are employed on the farm to do the work.

According to standards in France, Michel's father is a large landowner and could be

classified in the upper middle-class group of farmers. Production per man employed on the farm is low, however, when compared to American standards. For example, Michel spent 3 months on a 250-acre diversified farm in Minnesota before coming to the Henry Arnaud farm in Barry County, Mo.

LEARNS BY DOING

On this 250-acre farm following diversified farming operations, one man and his family do all the required work and management. Here is the major difference between French and American agriculture, Michel observed.

Total production per man in America is at least five times greater than in France. In the United States, 20 percent of the population is engaged in farming and 10 percent of this group produced 90 percent of the food, while in France 50 percent of the population live on farms. This means that the over-all standard of living among the farm population in France is low—almost in the peasant class.

The reason United States farmers are ahead of French farmers in production per man is rather obvious. French farms are not mechanized as are United States farms. French farmers are highly skilled in crop production and soil conservation, but they lag behind United States farmers in putting farm production on an assembly-line basis.

Of course, to think that Michel could go back to put his father's farm on a management and production basis like United States farms is out of the question at the present. These five families now engaged in agricultural production would have to find a livelihood in industrial areas. This would be almost impossible (to any large degree) since France also lags behind in industrial development.

ECA is working on this also with the European Recovery Act. Industrial equipment and technical skills are being exported from the United States to all free nations cooperating with the ECA program. In fact, more ECA money is being spent on industrial equipment and rearmament than for agricultural industrialization and education. France, in truth, is an exporter of agricultural products.

This brings us back to Michel Mousnier again. What is he gaining in the United States that he can take back to France and put to some immediate practical use?

First, he can take back part of our philosophy of life. He can apply immediately our democratic way of doing things. He can use and recommend our individualistic approach in solving current French farm problems. His working knowledge of our agricultural extension service and how it functions can be told at group meetings. His insight on our youth group activities will be valuable when he and fellow workers start organizing similar units.

Michel's observations of farm organization effectiveness in Missouri can be compared to his own French farm organizations to good advantage. Technical knowledge and skills picked up will lead him to greater initiative in confronting relative conditions at home. Many other items of first-hand knowledge that we just take as a matter of course can be used and applied on his own French farm, in his own community and for the well-being of the free French nation.

Michel is getting a splendid opportunity to acquire these pieces of our United States in Missouri as he did in Minnesota. Michel attended the American Royal with Barry County agent, Blake Carpenter. He spent a day with Henry Arnaud at the Barry County Poultry Improvement Day held in Monett in October. He visited the Producers' Creamery Co. at Monett, where the vast fluid milk marketing system in southwest Missouri was explained to Michel. Farm Action Days and Pasture Improvement programs have also been on Michel's scheduled itinerary.

Michel is also learning how we work. In fact, when county agent, Blake Carpenter and myself drove in the front gate of the Arnaud homestead, Michel was busy digging potatoes in the family garden.

Michel has his eyes open for American practices, skills, ideas, and social customs that he can put to use in his own community.

We are also profiting through this mutual exchange of people and ideas. Perhaps the realization that our form of government and our way of life is our most valuable asset is worth all ECA funds now being spent. Technical knowledge—about soil conservation, crop production, research, and so forth—will put us years ahead in our thinking. Europe, incidentally, is about 50 years ahead of United States farmers in soil conservation, crop production, and land-usage programs.

Michel Mousnier and the nearly 2,000 agricultural trainees and observers of American agriculture are going back with a strong faith in our democracy. They will be better prepared mentally to meet the ever-increasing onslaught of communistic propaganda. Their attitude will be fortified with the knowledge that only under a democratic system of government can they have a nation of free people—free from oppression, hunger, and want.

Communism thrives best in a vacuum of ignorance, in a place of want, and always by force. ECA is eliminating through its point-4 program many of these communistic breeding spots. It is costly to the United States taxpayer—more than $11,500,000,000 for the first 3 years. This aid has been in the form of butter and guns, education and administration, industrial equipment, and loans—and men.

Our desire to promote the growth of freedom in the world through the interaction of Michel Mousnier and the Henry Arnaud family in Barry County is only an infinitesimal step in the direction of securing independence for the remaining free nations and showing interdependence necessary between nations to discourage communistic aggression.

Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enclose the following article from the American Federationist, December 1950:

EDITORIALS

(By William Green)

NO MORE APPEASEMENT

A grave situation has grown out of the intervention of Communist Chinese troops in Korea. The United Nations forces, after terrific fighting and bloody sacrifices, reached the thirty-eighth parallel where they rested and awaited orders to subdue aggression in North Korea. Later, when they moved toward the northern border of North Korea, they found themselves opposed by huge armies from Red China.

The United States called upon the Security Council to require the Peiping regime to withdraw its armies and to send representatives to answer charges of aggression. The American delegate said that Red China should be summoned—not invited—a position which reflects American feeling. Our troops have borne the brunt of the battle to defeat the Communist aggressors, armed with Soviet equipment, in Korea, and we cannot dishonor our citizens who made the supreme sacrifice to oppose brutal aggression rather than yield on principle.

The time is long past for appeasement of Communists anywhere. Our Army fought with Nationalist China as an ally in the Pacific battles to defeat Japanese aggression. It was a bloody war, and before it was ended the diplomats had made concessions to Stalin at Yalta that made possible his bringing continental eastern Asia within the Russian orbit. Stalin also demanded and received concessions in Europe that enabled him to place Eastern Europe in his empire.

We liberated Korea from Japanese control. Before its conquest by Japan, Korea had had an independent government for several thousands of years. Then the United Nations permitted Stalin to control half of the country, while we became responsible for South Korea.

The Security Council decided to invite the Peiping government to have a representative attend the meeting of the Council to discuss complaints of armed invasion of Formosa. On November 8 the Security Council extended an invitation to the Chinese Communists to attend the Council's meeting to discuss General MacArthur's documented charges that Red Chinese troops had intervened to aid North Korean forces against the United Nations. The United States representatives on the Security Council opposed the first invitation and argued that the second should be a summons instead of an invitation, but they did not vote against it.

The Kremlin is unquestionably responsible for the present grave situation. The Kremlin has a treaty of alliance with the Chinese Communists. Molotov was sent to Peiping to arrange plans shortly after the United Nations acted to repel the aggression in Korea. Mao Tse-tung has been conferring with other Kremlin agents. The aggressors in Korea have been using the latest Russian weapons during the recent fighting. The Communist Chinese delegation has come to Lake Success by way of the U. S. S. R.

Thus it is clear that our real enemy is Communist Russia. The Kremlin is responsible for the invasions of South Korea, of Tibet and Indochina. The Kremlin interferes with Austrian police, impedes Berlin traffic, manufactures munitions in East Germany and arms the East Germans.

The United Nations is anxious to avoid war with Red China. The United Nations received a request from Tibet for protection against the Kremlin-inspired invasion by Communist Chinese armies. The United States cannot afford to involve all of its forces in fighting Soviet satellites when we are needing to prepare against the real enemy—Stalin and the Politburo. Neither can we afford to aid the United Nations in enforcing its authority if that agency does not carry through to a settlement based on principles of its Charter.

The feeling of the people of the United States toward any foreign policy of appeasement of communism was expressed emphatically in the recent elections and in the large numbers of citizens who turned out to vote. Whatever necessitates conscription of American boys must be based on sound moral principles.

THE ELECTION

Returns from the election were disappointing in that we failed to defeat some candidates hostile to effective unionism. On the other hand, the election was gratifying in that it revealed the preponderance of American citizens who regard defense against the Communist international conspiracy as the major issue before our Government.

Both in the House and in the Senate prominent persons who fell short of direct opposition to Communist agents and machinations were defeated. The House Member

who never failed to follow the Communist Party line was ousted. With our boys dying on the battlefield, American citizens are bitter against that nation which is prepared for war, which instigates aggression, which robs smaller nations of their freedoms and which never honors its obligations. Labor made definite gains in many of the less conspicuous contests.

From this experience a few principles for future action become obvious. The main ones are these: Our efforts to gain legislative acceptance of the functions necessary for effective trade-unionism must be directed and controlled by trade-unionists for trade-unionists, and trade-unions must be the agencies for educating trade-union voters.

The American Federation of Labor has no desire to form a political party or to dominate an existing political party, but party conventions must heed our requests for necessary correction of injustices to labor and grievances from slow and inadequate action against administrative evils.

The American Federation of Labor is not retiring from political activity. It cannot do so in a democracy which expects and permits every group of citizens to provide its own welfare. The American Federation of Labor has been in politics since its organization in 1881, but it has been and is in politics in support of principles of labor and the national welfare and in support of those who have proven themselves friends by supporting our objectives.

The American Federation of Labor is a reasonable, experienced, democratic institution—an integral part of our Nation—deliberately fashioned to operate as a free, democratic institution in a democratic society.

DEFENSE AND CONTROLS

All consumers are conscious of inflation. They get the story of inflation in its destructive effects on the purchasing power of their dollars. Rising prices are the consequence of inflation.

In the last war we were able to conceal the effects of inflation to a considerable extent by controlling prices and wages. But demand left the controlled markets for the black and gray markets—free markets with high prices measuring inflation. After the war, in order to return to civilian production with expansion of facilities to meet new needs, we lifted the controls on prices, wages, and consumer credit. Prices quickly rose to black-market heights, while wages trailed behind.

To the inflationary effect of the low-interest rates maintained by the Treasury were added the inflationary forces of industrial expansion, price support for farm products, our high investments in European recovery, and new peaks in consumer credit. We learned from that experience the primary causes of inflation—cheap, unlimited credit (that is, money inflation) and scarcity of supplies of commodities in proportion to demand.

Police action to defeat aggression in Korea in addition to the rearming of Western Europe in accordance with the Atlantic Pact found our economy at peak levels of production, employment and national income, with no reductions in the national debt. The impingement of war-production demands on metals already made scarce by unprecedented activity in the construction, automobile, and television industries added to inflationary forces. Because defense production limits civilian production, buyers, in order not to be caught short, began purchasing for anticipated needs. And again prices moved upward.

In a short time wage earners' dollars shrank 4 to 5 percent. Unions are trying to recoup the losses in purchasing power suffered by working people and provide against future losses. Not to do so would mean lowered standards of living without retarding inflation.

In August, Congress passed the National Production Act of 1950 and increased income taxes. The Production Act authorizes controls for consumer and real-estate credit. It also authorizes the stabilization of prices and wages and necessary expansion of production facilities. The Federal Reserve Board has curbed consumer credit. Construction activity has slowed down.

In order not to increase the national debt, we should try to pay for defense on a pay-as-you-go basis. Congress, of course, is responsible for appropriate fiscal policies and the Treasury can deal with money inflation or commercial credit. The degree of inflation is the result of policies in all of these fields.

To prevent inadequate defense production, Congress has authorized the President to requisition facilities to expand or increase the number of defense-production plants. Expanded facilities mean increased employment and increased consumer buying power impinging on scarcer consumer goods. The President was given power to proceed by voluntary methods and, when necessary, by mandatory methods. The President was also given ample powers to enforce the act.

Defense production is now about 5 percent of our total economy. New defense appropriations will raise this proportion substantially. What it will be ultimately depends on the plans and policies of the Kremlin. We know defense production will be with us for years. If the international tension stops short of war, defense production must be integrated with civilian production. If war comes, civilian production will be restricted.

In either event, the normal way to deal with American citizens is to give them the facts of need and ask them to accept additional responsibility. As pointed out in the beginning, inflation is the cumulative effect of many forces. Any program designed to deal with inflation must therefore be directed and made effective by these same groups working together on a coordinated program.

Neither the Federal Reserve Board, the Treasury, nor single industries, nor single unions, nor farm groups, acting independently, can control inflation. But meeting together to face facts, to agree upon a program and to allot responsibility for carrying out plans, voluntary industrial agents can organize to control and check inflation. The crux of voluntary controls for the common interests and welfare is inclusive organization for planning and for executing plans jointly.

In the long period ahead we must prepare to guard our free institutions at home and be alert to attacks on liberty throughout the world. Our economy must have flexibility as well as sureness of output. This requires wholehearted cooperation that comes from having a common goal and sharing responsibility. We must keep free from control by bureaucrats who in the long period of defense might become so firmly imbedded in our national life as to make return to free economic agencies well nigh impossible.

The National Production Act requires voluntary controls first. The first step is to organize voluntary groups with authority to cooperate. These groups should work out the machinery of voluntary controls. No effort has yet been made to utilize voluntary controls.

Defense production and war production need the same type of cooperation as inflation controls. Conversion orders should have the benefit of consultation with workers and management in the process of their development as a safeguard against mistakes and friction.

We urge as basic policy the fullest use of voluntary industrial organizations in the policy making for defense production.

Correspondence With the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, by permission of the House, I submit this exchange of correspondence which speaks for itself:

DECEMBER 5, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The present crisis in which we are living is naturally of great concern to every American, and it is in that connection that I respectfully submit a suggestion to which I hope you will agree.

In these times of indecision and unrest it is most imperative that our people become united and solidified in the common cause of the preservation of our accepted way of life. To that end I suggest that you, as President of the United States, call upon the churches of America, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, to set aside a Sunday between now and Christmas, to appeal to Almighty God for guidance and wisdom in what I believe to be the Gethsemane of our existence.

I believe that now is the time for our people to set aside whatever differences of opinion that might exist in a unified effort for ultimate success in our fight to continue the freedom of the free peoples of the world. I believe and suggest that the spiritual leaders of our nations be called upon to set aside a Sunday on which the respective pastors shall urge the people of this country to join in prayer to the God of their belief to give to our responsible officials, political and military, the wisdom and the courage, to arrive at the right and proper decisions. At the same time I believe that our religious leaders should explain to their flock the ideals and principles for which we are fighting, and for which many are offering up the supreme sacrifice.

Certainly we are engaged in a crusade as important as any in which our forebears ever participated. Our modern crusaders, under the banner of the United Nations, are fighting just as hard and as vigorously and as courageously, to gain the Holy Grail of individual liberty and freedom as any knight who went forth in the armor of his time.

I do hope, Mr. President, that you will see fit to concur in this suggestion, and ask the churches of America to set aside a Sunday prior to Christmas, the feast day of the nativity of the Prince of Peace, to call upon God in this fight against a godless ideology. And where should the peoples of the world look for help and assistance in a fight against God except to God Himself.

It is my sincere belief that the psychological effect on the American people and the peoples of the world would be a terrific impact in the cause which we all espouse and in a united Nation to fight the forces of evil which threaten us at the moment.

I do hope I have your concurrence.

Cordially yours,

F. EDWARD HÉBERT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 7, 1950.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HÉBERT: I appreciate very much your letter of the fifth, and I am enclosing you a copy of my Thanksgiv-

ing proclamation, inviting your attention to the windup of that proclamation beginning, "Now, therefore," I think that effectively answers your suggestion.

I am extremely sorry that the sentiments expressed in your letter were not thought of before November 7, when the campaign in your State, Utah, North Carolina, Illinois, and Indiana was carried on in a manner that was as low as I've ever seen and I've been in this game since 1906.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

DECEMBER 8, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am stunned by the contents of your letter of December 7 in reply to my letter of December 5.

It is indeed exceedingly regrettable that you failed to grasp the real purpose and intent of my suggestion, but it is even more regrettable that you saw fit to gratuitously inject political distemper in your reply.

Respectfully yours,

F. EDW. HÉBERT.

Doctors "Bungle," Doctor Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the following editorial from the November 21 issue of the Milwaukee Journal. What it says about the medical profession warrants attention not only from members of the profession, but from the rest of us.

DOCTORS "BUNGLE," DOCTOR SAYS

There is nothing very novel in a warning to the medical profession to mend some of its ways or expect to lose some of its cherished freedom. Such a warning, from a leading member of the profession, the retiring president of the Southern Medical Association, rates as unusual, if not unprecedented, however.

Dr. Hamilton W. McKay, of Charlotte, N. C., didn't mince words.

"If the people cannot convince themselves that organized medicine is taking vigorous steps to correct its own shortcomings, they will insist that the initiative for action be transferred to other hands," he said.

He accused the doctors of "bungling" in their relations with the public and their patients. The profession has been doing "a sorry job" in the matter of self-discipline, he added, depriving the public of the protection it deserves against overcharging and incompetence on the part of certain practitioners.

When laymen say the same sort of thing—as they have, time and again—they are rewarded with scorn, a condescending shrug or haughty silence. The lay critic is reminded that he isn't a doctor and so cannot know what he is talking about. Or he is accused of being simply a mud slinger, ignoring all the fine services and traditions of the profession, especially the unselfish devotion of doctors to their patients.

Dr. McKay, however, speaks as an honored doctor of long experience. Paying tribute to the great accomplishments and advances by his profession, the high standards and fine intent of better doctors all around the country, he courageously points to faults that can destroy public confidence and fetter the doctors.

From such a source, the words should bear weight among the leaders of the medical profession.

How Study of the Work of Congress and Its Members Will Strengthen Our Free American System in Time of Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we have all been following with interest the effort of a group of public-spirited newspapermen to erect another bulwark around our free American system by attempting to broaden public knowledge of the work of Congress and its Members through the Committee for Congress and its program of study.

This is a necessary endeavor in normal times, but it is even more important in time of crisis that we should do everything possible to create a better public understanding of our Congress.

I am pleased, therefore, to request publication in the Appendix of the RECORD, a general outline of study to be followed by the Congress Study Council, using Your Congress magazine as the main source of authentic current information, along with a tentative bibliography, and the statement of registration of the Committee for Congress, 1060 National Press Building, as a nonprofit educational corporation:

COMMITTEE FOR CONGRESS,
NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING,
Washington, D. C.

GENERAL OUTLINE AND STUDY PROGRAM SUPPLIED BY THE CONGRESS STUDY COUNCIL OF THE COMMITTEE FOR CONGRESS, VOLUNTARY, NONPROFIT CITIZEN PROJECT TO STRENGTHEN THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENTAL SYSTEM THROUGH DISSEMINATION OF SPECIFIC INFORMATION ON THE FUNCTIONS, DUTIES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS MEMBERS

It is unfortunate that an amazing amount of misinformation is given to the public about Congress. It is this situation that the study program of the Committee for Congress, working through Your Congress magazine and various other educational and informational media, will endeavor to correct.

Naturally, this misinformation is not always intentional, but it continues constantly in the news columns, on radio programs, in books and magazines, in motion pictures. The study program is an effort to present a true picture of the real facts of the workings of Congress and the work of its Members both in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Basically, the study will attempt to correct the erroneous impression that Federal lawmaking is either a simple process or a secret operation that ignores the public interest.

One reason for general misunderstanding about the lawmaking function and other activities on the Hill is the inability to explain the whole lawmaking process in current news reports and radio and television broadcasts.

Actually, the regular media do not have sufficient space, and the repetition required in order to perform an educational job, would be contrary to elementary publication requirements. History and civic books cover the subject in general yet cannot go into the necessary detail on the actual work of Congress because of the many other subjects that must be explored.

As a result of inability of these media to include the whole picture, people, young and old, get a distorted picture of Congress at work. The result is that the benefits of our representative, republican form of government are often lost to view, and the impression is created that our congressional system is neither efficient in its operation or irresponsive to the public need, when the contrary viewpoint is usually true.

The study program will go into detail in explaining the work of the Congress. It will elaborate in various ways to make it clear how the Senate and House of Representatives pass a law, and it is signed by the President to become law.

The studies will endeavor to bring out for all to understand what Messrs. George H. E. Smith and Floyd M. Riddick in their excellent Congress in Action describe as "the real genius of the American system of government."

It will demonstrate how our committee system requires an inquiry into all aspects of national problems, how selfish interests are brought to light, how every citizen, whatever his occupation, or income, or station in life, has a chance to tell how he thinks a law should be drafted.

It will, in other words, reveal in detail how the elaborate system of checks and balances protects the public welfare. The study will also show that Congress can act speedily in an emergency, and also endeavors to the best of its ability to keep all citizens informed of what it is doing.

It will be shown that Congress tries to act in conformance with wishes of the general public in the best interests of the Nation, acting in response to the will of the people.

Congress is aware that the laws will be respected by a free people only when they are approved by the majority of the people. Congress is a living entity that is close to the daily lives of American citizens. The people themselves, through taxes, support the Government, and are entitled to and have a direct hand in the deliberations and decisions of the legislative bodies.

The Committee for Congress recognizes that in modern days when the United States Government has entered intimately into the lives of every citizen, there is need for all citizens, young and old, to know what is being done by Congress on their behalf.

It is thus essential for our people, in order to understand national and international events, to have a thorough grasp of the lawmaking functions of their Congress, in order that their Government shall work in the best interest of all concerned.

The Congress study program will be served in its initial stages by quarterly publications of Your Congress magazine, to be supplied to schools, colleges, and interested adult groups, including factory groups, unions, women's clubs, service clubs, and others. Members of Congress themselves will be asked to serve as discussion leader when available. The Congress Study Council will, through the magazine, supply a study outline, which will endeavor to keep readers and students abreast of all phases of the work of Congress.

COMMITTEE FOR CONGRESS, STATEMENT OF REGISTRATION AS A NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL CORPORATION

The Committee for Congress has been registered in the District of Columbia as a nonprofit educational corporation. Founding

members of the Committee for Congress are: Joseph Young, newspaperman and author; Duncan Aikman, author; Maj. Gen. Henry J. Reilly, former editor of the Army and Navy Journal; William A. Eddy, businessman; Russell McFarland, magazine writer; Homer Joseph Dodge, newspaperman and publicist; Felix Cotton, nationally known correspondent; Walter Green, newspaperman; and the publishers of Your Congress magazine, Hal J. Miller and Virginia E. Miller.

The permanent membership of the Committee for Congress will comprise leading representatives of all segments of the American economy.

So that all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and the general public shall be fully informed about the organization we append the certification of corporation.

"CERTIFICATE OF CORPORATION, COMMITTEE FOR CONGRESS, SPONSOR OF CONGRESS STUDY COUNCIL, DECEMBER 13, 1950

"(Office of Recorder of Deeds, Washington, D. C.; Marshall C. Shepard, recorder)

"We, the undersigned, all citizens of the United States, and a majority citizens and residents of the District of Columbia, desiring to associate ourselves as a corporation pursuant to the provisions of title 29 of chapter 6 of the District of Columbia Code (1940), do hereby certify as follows:

"First. The name or title by which this corporation shall be known in law shall be Committee for Congress, sponsor of Congress Study Council.

"Second. The term for which it is organized shall be perpetual.

"Third. The particular business and objects of said corporation shall be to protect the free American democratic form of representative republican government by conducting an education program in schools, colleges, and youth and adult groups to develop better understanding among our citizens and peoples of other nations about the work of the Congress of the United States and its members, using Your Congress magazine, press, radio, television, and other educational and informational media.

"Fourth. The number of its trustees, directors, or managers for the first year of its existence shall be three.

"In testimony whereof we have this 12th day of December 1950 hereunto set our hands and seal.

"[SEAL] HAL J. MILLER,
"[SEAL] VIRGINIA E. MILLER.
"[SEAL] WILLIAM A. EDDY.

"'DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, SS.:

"'James B. Montfort, a notary public in and for the District of Columbia, do hereby certify that ———, parties to a certain certificate of incorporation bearing date on the Twelfth day of December 1950, and hereto annexed, personally appeared before me in said District, the said ——— being personally well known to me as the persons who executed the said certificate of incorporation, and severally acknowledged the same to be their act and deed.

"'Given under my hand and seal this 12th day of December 1950.

"'JAMES B. MONTFORT.

"'My commission expires April 1, 1954.'"

CONGRESS STUDY COUNCIL—TENTATIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

The study program on the Congress of the United States, prepared by the Congress Study Council of the Committee for Congress, 1060 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., will utilize the following tentative bibliography, compiled with the generous cooperation and assistance of Miss Elzie Rackstraw and Milton Plumb of the Library of Congress staff, and Julius Cahn, executive assistant to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY:

1. Murdock, Myrtle, M. Cheney, Your Uncle Sam in Washington; Washington, D. C., Monumental Press, 1948 (192 pp.).

2. PATMAN, WRIGHT, Our American Government; the Answers to 1,001 Questions on How It Works; Chicago, Ziff-Davis Publishing Co., 1948 (143 pp.).

3. Riddick, Floyd M., and Smith, George H. E., Congress in Action—How a Bill Becomes Law; Manassas, Va., and Washington, D. C., National Capital Publishers, Inc., 1948 (87 pp.).

4. Alexander, De Alva Stanwood, History and Procedure of the House of Representatives; Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916 (435 pp.).

5. Beard, Charles Austin, American Government and Politics, ninth edition; New York, the Macmillan Co., 1945 (872 pp.).

6. Chamberlain, Joseph P., Legislative Processes, National and State; New York and London, D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., 1936 (369 pp.).

7. Dimock, Marshall Edward, and Gladys Ogden Dimock, American Government in Action; New York, Rinehart & Co., Inc., 1946 (946 pp.).

8. Galloway, George Barnes, Congress at the Crossroads; New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1946 (374 pp.).

9. Johnson, Claudius O., Government in the United States, fourth edition; New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1947 (976 pp.).

10. KEFAUVER, ESTES, and Jack Levin, a Twentieth-Century Congress; New York, Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1947 (236 pp.).

11. Luce, Robert, Legislative Assemblies; Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1924 (691 pp.).

12. Luce, Robert, Legislative Problems; Development, Statutes, and Trend of the Treatment and Exercise of Lawmaking Powers; Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1935 (762 pp.).

13. Luce, Robert, Legislative Procedure; Parliamentary Practices and the Course of Business in the Framing of Statutes; Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1922 (628 pp.).

14. McConachie, Lauros G., Congressional Committees; a Study of the Origins and Development of Our National and Local Legislative Methods; Boston, Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1898 (441 pp.).

15. Munro, William Bennett, the Government of the United States; National, State, and Local, fifth edition; New York, the Macmillan Co., 1946 (887 pp.).

16. Ogg, Frederic Austin, and P. Orman Ray, Introduction to American Government; the National Government, ninth edition, thoroughly revised; New York, Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc., 1948 (902 pp.).

17. Riddick, Floyd Millard, Congressional Procedure; Boston, Chapman & Grimes, 1941 (387 pp.).

18. Riddick, Floyd Millard, the United States Congress; Organization and Procedure; Washington, D. C., National Capital Publishers, Inc., 1949 (459 pp.).

19. Walker, Harvey, the Legislative Process; New York, the Ronald Press Co., 1948 (482 pp.).

20. Willoughby, W. F., Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration; Washington, D. C., Brookings Institution, 1934 (657 pp.).

21. Zink, Harold, Government and Politics in the United States, revised edition; New York, the Macmillan Co., 1946 (1006 pp.).

22. Phillips, William G., Operation: Congress—A Bill Is Passed: Washington, D. C., American University Press, 1950 (16 pp.).

23. Burdette, Franklin L., Lobbyists in Action: Manassas, National Capital Publishers, 1950 (61 pp.).

24. Congressional Directory, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950 (942 pp.).

25. United States Manual, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950 (724 pp.).

26. Style Manual, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1945 (435 pp.).

27. Graves, W. Brooke, Public Administration in a Democratic Society, 1950; Boston, D. C. Heath & Co. (779 pp.).

28. Phillips Legislative History Record.

The National Congress study program of the Committee for Congress, is a nonprofit, citizen endeavor to strengthen our democratic, representative republican governmental system by creating better understanding of the work of Congress and its Members. Individuals or organizations wishing to support or assist the program in any way can do so by writing to: Committee for Congress, 1060 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C., ME 2214.

Republican Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Traveler of December 10, 1950:

REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY

The Republicans in Congress have driven a tank through the remains of a united, bipartisan foreign policy.

Their resolution demanding Acheson's resignation scatters even the smithereens of that policy that were left after Mr. Truman had laid his heavy hand to it.

The timing of the Republican move was perfect, from the disastrous point of view of paralyzing European rearmament.

It came on the very eve of Acheson's departure for Brussels where the Secretary of State was to make a desperate argument for a major European arms effort—now, not next month.

With one stroke the Republicans in Congress have destroyed the standing of this vital mission. Acheson will go to Europe with two strikes on him. The Europeans will not believe that he speaks for America. Nor will they believe that Governor Dewey's stirring call for national unity and full speed ahead on mobilization represents an important point of view, since the congressional Republicans have acted against his urgent advice.

They will remember that the Republican Party in Congress says it has no confidence in our foreign policy. They will recall that the cornerstone of that policy has been aid to Europe in order to make its 270,000,000 people strong enough to defend themselves, with our help. And they will despair.

That despair will have far more favorable consequences for the Kremlin's world dictatorship aims than the unleashing of Red China's legions. It may mean victory in the west for Stalin without even a fight, if it stuns the Europeans into hopelessness that they can survive.

The Traveler has said that if Mr. Acheson's dismissal is the price of national unity in the time of our greatest peril, then he must go. We have said this even though we have no sympathy for the attempts to make any man the scapegoat for a national situation that has so many and such complex reasons for existence.

The Republicans must also pay a price if their actions result in the firing of Mr. Acheson. That price is an absolute end to the divisive discord on foreign policy that has so far been the main Republican contribution in Congress to the meeting of the national emergency.

Governor Dewey said it well 10 days ago when he slapped down the Ives resolution against Acheson. The head of the Republican Party declared that, with the fate of the Free World depending on American strength and unity, "this moment is not the time for further criticism."

The moment Mr. Dewey referred to was the week of the Truman-Attlee talks. The Republicans held their fire then. They let it go at an even worse moment.

The unprecedented Republican action is a cheap substitute for impeachment. If they had a real case against Acheson, or a genuine substitute for the policies that go under his name, they could have presented formal charges against him, and moved constitutionally to oust him from office. With their resolution demanding his removal they achieve the same partisan advantage without taking on the responsibility for their action.

It is this irresponsibility that is the main political threat to our safety. If we would survive as a nation we must put it aside, now and for the duration.

Time To Reexamine Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, since the close of World War II the foreign policy of this administration to contain communism world-wide and to protect any nation in the world in case of aggression, has led us into the Korean and the Chinese Communist war. There is great danger under this foreign policy that we will be called upon to enter into a more devastating war to help the Atlantic Pact nations from Russian aggression.

Such a war may explode in full force within the next 12 months. Russia is in a position to start other wars it being our responsibility under our present foreign policy, to help fight. We are in serious military trouble now in Korea because of the shortage of trained military manpower. We have only a skeleton force now in Western Germany and little or no reserves in this country that can be thrown in any sizable numbers into any conflict that may develop.

Our present foreign policy is to send 200,000 well-equipped soldiers to Europe for the defense of the Atlantic Pact nations and to further supply those nations with more men and supplies of every kind running into a cost of countless billions of dollars.

Certainly the time is here now when the executive department and our military high command and the Congress directly representing the people should make a careful study and reexamination of our entire foreign policy. In the interest of our own people it is our responsibility to make a cold analysis of world conditions and to decide what course in the future we can follow which will best protect the interest of our own people of the United States and secondly our just contribution to other nations.

There is a limit to the load the American people can carry in world affairs. We must be realistic because of the crisis confronting us. If it will serve our best interests we should change our foreign policy before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, at the close of World War II, through the great sacrifice of 12,000,000 American soldiers who had won every victory, they placed in the hands of our executive department the greatest power ever given to the leaders of a nation—the power to enforce world peace. World peace was not only the responsibility of our leaders but it was within their grasp. We were then respected with awesome admiration by the nations and the people of the world.

We had the most powerful Army, Navy, and Air Force the world had ever known, and in addition, we had the atomic bomb.

Through overconfidence, in the Russian leaders, and the work of the Communists in our own country, the representatives of our Government through the appeasement of Russia at the conferences of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, lost the peace of the world.

They gave Russia great power in Eastern Europe, gave away China, and half of Korea to the Communist dictators which brought on the Korean war and war with Communist China.

In this war we have suffered humiliation before the world and the most tragic defeats of American arms in our history.

The administration that at first published to the world that Korea was outside of our defense line and was of no value from a military or strategic standpoint, after changing its policy, a few months later when South Korea was invaded, is now groping about to try to determine what shall be our future policy with reference to Korea and the Far East.

I would like to suggest that if we intend to try to hold South Korea, that the mistake by the United Nations and the executive department of our Government in refusing to accept the military power of Chiang Kai-shek, be corrected at the earliest possible moment.

That we permit the Nationalist Chinese in Formosa to go into the mainland of China with all of the power at their command which is estimated at over 500,000 well-trained fighting troops.

The belief is widely held that such a move by Chiang Kai-shek to the mainland of China would bring to his well-equipped army, a million Chinese patriots who are anxious to fight under his banner to drive Communists out of China.

If the United States Government would furnish a reasonable amount of financial assistance to feed and help to equip such an army, it might be able to drive the Communists out of the territory they have now overrun.

All the members of the United Nations, except the Chinese Nationalist government, were called by its secretary, Trygve Lie to send troops to help the United States in the Korean war. Few responded and the United States has borne the great burden of the battle almost alone. Chiang Kai-shek, a member of the United Nations, offered to send 35,000 troops immediately, and was denied the opportunity to do so. In fact, the President, through our State Department, placed a military embargo against his invading the continent of China which is still effective.

The Chinese people need food more than anything else. Food and some military equipment plus the patriotism of the Chinese people which can still be had by a show of real friendship on the part of our Government can turn the tide of war against the North Chinese puppets of the Kremlin Reds.

It is doubtful if we can maintain a toehold in Korea unless this aid is accepted and becomes effective at the earliest possible date. In fact, unless our policy is changed to accept full support from the Nationalist Chinese government at Formosa, it would be the part of wisdom to pull every American soldier out of Korea and the Far East at the earliest possible moment.

It was never our intention to defend Korea. It was written off as being worthless from a military or strategic standpoint by the State Department. We would have been far better off in the Far East today if we had stayed out of Korea and had taken Formosa into our perimeter of defense. We did not do this because we were still following the Lattimore-Service appeasement policy in the Far East. We did not want to offend the Chinese northern Communists.

Mr. Speaker, what about Europe? If we pull out of the Far East, Russia has avoided being compelled to fight a war on two fronts, will be able to expand her power there without further opposition, and will be able to concentrate all of her efforts on the western front. She can overrun Germany, take possession of the great Ruhr coal mines, and industrial heart of Western Europe adding greatly to her military strength and power.

Recent warnings she has directed to England and France indicate she may be preparing to make such a move. In fact, Russia can extend her control out to the Atlantic against only token opposition. The question is, will she wait 2 years giving the United States and western powers time to build up a strong military defense. It is hardly reasonable to believe that she will.

The concern of England, France, and the Atlantic Pact nations, if Russia is given the excuse to start world war III, is reflected in England's recognition of the Communist Chinese government some months ago, followed by the attempted appeasement of Russia in the Far East. The recognition of this danger was further reflected in Attlee's recent visit to the United States for a conference with the President and his plea that greater help from the United States in supplies, arms, and men should be provided and expedited to the western European nations.

Notwithstanding their realization of the dangerous position they are in they have been slow to agree upon a plan or to begin mobilizing their own economic and military strength.

Those in charge of our Government seem to have failed to inform the nations of Western Europe that we expected them to carry the major part of their own burdens in the defense of their own countries, else they would have made

greater progress building up their own power with the assistance we have given them, both economic and military during th past few years.

I fear we are now making a serious mistake in allowing an American general to be appointed to the position of Supreme Commander of the Atlantic Pact Nations. By such action, with General MacArthur in command of our Far East forces and with an American general in supreme command of Western European forces, we give Russia a propaganda advantage in charging us with being guilty of world imperialism.

An ever greater objection is that it can well give the European nations the impression that the defense of Western Europe is primarily the responsibility of the United States, and secondly, their responsibility.

I think our Government should have insisted that the supreme commander should be picked from the European nations, and the United States name the second in command.

The European nations should be made to understand that they must organize and lead the fight in the defense of their own countries if war comes, and that we would help them to the extent of our ability only when they had demonstrated they were willing to do it.

We have taken the lead with General MacArthur in the Far East with very little assistance from other members of the United Nations organizations and it has largely been our war. We have not been properly supported. Our men have fought against great odds, and have suffered defeats for the first time in our history because of being greatly outnumbered. We have lost much prestige before the world. We should guard against being placed in the same position in Western Europe.

The time has come for a cold analysis and reexamination of our foreign and military policies. The people of the United States and her soldiers in one generation have been dragged into two wars with tragic losses of manpower, and we are now loaded down with an almost unbearable national debt. Through the bungling of this administration and its continued mistakes in our foreign policy, we are now involved in possibly another world-wide conflict.

Russia has been allowed to maneuver us into a position where she can start one war after another until she bleeds us white financially, exhaust our resources and manpower, which could wreck our Nation financially.

Our Government, under the direction of its present leaders, has given away to other nations since the end of World War II some $35,000,000,000. Now we are preparing to give away that many more billions to build up the defense of the Atlantic Pact nations, in addition to levying a tax burden of over $40,000,000,000 this year for defense alone for our own country. There is a limit to the ability of the people, who are the government, to continue to carry such tax burdens.

There is grave danger of spending ourselves into financial bankruptcy. A cold analysis of the European and world situation should be made by our executive department and the Members of Congress before we go so far within the next few months that we cannot turn back.

Unless the European nations proceed to mobilize all of their economic and military resources for the defense of their own countries, we should not go further in helping to underwrite their efforts.

If they do not, we should turn our attention to building up the defense of our own country which can be made so strong we can protect it against any nation or combination of nations. The welfare of our own people is, in fact, and always has been, the first responsibility of the Congress and every official of the Government.

AMA on Aid to Medical Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I attach a cogent editorial from the December 23 issue of America, the National Catholic Weekly. Entitled "AMA on Aid to Medical Schools," it is a direct contradiction of the position taken by the American Medical Association on that vital issue and properly classifies the organization's recent $500,000 contribution for that purpose as a drop in the bucket.

AMA ON AID TO MEDICAL SCHOOLS

At its fourth annual clinical session, held in Cleveland on December 4–8, the American Medical Association came out flatly against Federal aid to medical schools. This is in line with the AMA's fight against socialism. The Federal-aid-to-medical-education bill was passed unanimously by the United States Senate in 1949, with the active support of such anti-Socialists as Senators ROBERT A. TAFT, FORREST DONNELL, and ALEXANDER SMITH. A House version is being cosponsored by Representative HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., former chairman of the Republican National Committee. The Association of American Medical Schools has energetically urged the adoption of the $250,000,000 Federal-help measure. The cost of educating a medical student averages $2,577 a year, whereas tuition averages only $548. That is why President James B. Conant of Harvard, the wealthiest university in the world, has said that the problem "is far too serious to be solved by the universities themselves." Three years ago an AMA authority predicted that the shortage of doctors could not exceed 15,000 by 1960. As of today, the shortage will be made acute by the demands of the armed services, especially when all-out mobilization takes place. As for costs, the AMA 2 years ago estimated that the medical schools needed $15,000,000 more annually for operations, and $200,000,000 for expansion. The $500,000 which the association is going to allocate to needy schools is therefore, on its own admission, but a drop in the bucket.

The National Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, certainly it is the solemn responsibility of every American to face squarely the awesome implications of the state of national emergency declared by President Truman following his address to the Nation.

What he had to say brought little that was new to public attention. Such was not the purpose of the pronouncement. Rather his words were calculated to set the stage for the official declaration that a national emergency exists. There will be few indeed who will dispute it. In fact, there is every reason to believe the American people sensed it last June 27 when Communist forces first attacked South Korea and American troops were sent into action against them on behalf of the United Nations.

The real purpose of the President's address, White House sources indicated prior to its delivery, was to "shock the American people out of a 'business-as-usual' state of mind and to bring home the grim reality of the world crisis." That was probably true. But it is equally true that it is essential to shock the administration out of a "government-as-usual" state of mind. The tragic battle now raging on the narrowing Korean beachhead was shock enough for the public, and from the tone of Mr. Truman's address it is apparent that the Government feels it as well.

There is a national emergency. It has existed for many months. There is neither point nor purpose in reciting the record of the past. Now only the present counts. And the future of the Nation—and the free world—depends on how effectively we act from this moment forward. At last we face up squarely to the task at hand.

With the general pattern of Mr. Truman's words there will be practical agreement. With the program contemplated there must be united support. With one thought, above all others, there must be common accord. That was embodied in the plea to set aside personal desires in order to take up a proper share of the task, measuring performance by the standards set by the heroism of those who are battling so gallantly on the fighting front. Against such a measuring stick, the maximum efforts of the best of us will seem small indeed.

Mr. Truman called for national unity against the Communist threat to world peace. There is national unity on this. But it should be pointed out that national unity is not enough. There must be international unity as well among the free nations and those who would remain free. This means the United Nations. At Lake Success there must be solid evidence of willingness to share the burden so far carried so dis-

proportionately by the United States. In all honesty it must be said that up to this very hour, when the United States has declared a national emergency, the United Nations has failed to keep pace by conceding the presence of an international emergency.

Mr. Truman called for rapid expansion of our military forces. There is national unity on this. It embraces military manpower and military production. This Nation thought the program was started months ago. It was not. Now there must be no further delay. White House appointment of Charles E. Wilson, president of the vast General Electric Co., to handle the mobilization program, is a step in the right direction. He has the know-how and he has the confidence of the public. He will need both to succeed.

Mr. Truman called for higher taxes to put the greatly increased military expenditures as nearly as possible on a pay-as-you-go basis. He pledged reduction as far as possible of nondefense costs of Government to contribute toward the same goal—a battle to curb ruinous inflation. It will serve no useful purpose to recall the familiarity of those phrases or those demands. They were heard months ago. They went unheeded. There can be no further delay. In this, too, there will be the national unity the President asks.

Turning to a purely domestic crisis the President surely was on sympathetic ground when he voiced a militant demand for an immediate end of the scattered strikes by relatively small groups paralyzing the Nation's railroad transportation system. It was as if the pages of history were being leafed back to the courage of Calvin Coolidge's famous "there must be no strike against the public safety." The determination and the wisdom of Coolidge must live again in Washington, and when it does, reason will prevail as well. The Government has the power to meet this crisis, and if it is matched with the courage of our forces in Korea, the problem will be resolved without injustice to the workers involved and without further danger to the public safety.

While the program advanced by the President is heartening in its specific details for swift build-up of the Nation's Armed Forces and sharply increased defense production, it remains vague in the equally vital phase of economic controls. While a Director of Price Stabilization has been named, there is no clear-cut enunciation of policy or program. There is talk only of selective controls—a continuation of piecemeal plans suited only to half-way measures. And half-way measures will not meet a national emergency.

One of the greatest mistakes that characterized the Second World War was tardiness in grappling with inflation controls. Certainly the Nation does not want to see that experience repeated. Most persons with any opinion on the matter agree that the administration should have all the power needed to deal with the matter. That was the reason the Congress voted the power months ago. But the use of all-out controls assumed all-out rearmament, mobilization, and an all-out war economy. Are we yet embarked on such a program? Obviously not.

Most Americans will accept any kind of controls and make any kind of sacrifice if they are convinced that no time and no resources are being wasted with the new defense effort. It is up to the administration to provide that proof. It is the responsibility of government leadership to cite the need and chart the course. In this respect, President Truman's message fell far short of a desirable goal. It is to be hoped that these essential steps will be spelled out more definitely in the shortest possible period. There is no time for further indecision.

General Omar Bradley has said that the protection of our national independence calls for long-range commitments that we are willing to carry out.

A long-range commitment to fight the battle for peace with America's most powerful weapons is the surest guaranty of victory for the Nation. And America's most powerful weapon is not the atom bomb or any other instrument of destruction. America's most powerful weapon is the might of free people fully aroused, fully mobilized, and fully informed as to the responsibilities of the hour. Only under such circumstances will hysteria recede to be replaced by grim determination to pay the price for the preservation of a free world.

Certainly there is a national emergency. But there was a national emergency at Valley Forge, at Gettysburg, at Belleau Wood, Normandy, and Iwo Jima. Each was met in its turn by men of courage and Christian faith. Have we less of either in the present hour?

President Truman's Address to the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of President Truman's address to the country, taken from the New York Times of December 16, 1950:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

I am talking to you tonight about what our country is up against, and what we are going to do about it.

Our homes, our Nation, all the things we believe in are in great danger. This danger has been created by the rulers of the Soviet Union.

For 5 years we have been working for peace and justice among nations. We have helped to bring the free nations of the world together in a great movement to establish a lasting peace.

Against this movement for peace, the rulers of the Soviet Union have been waging a relentless attack. They have tried to undermine or overwhelm the free nations, one by one. They have used threats and treachery and violence.

In June, the forces of Communist imperialism broke out into open warfare in Korea. The UN moved to put down this act of aggression, and, by October, had all but succeeded.

Then in November, the Communists threw their Chinese armies into the battle against the free nations.

By this act, they have shown that they are now willing to push the world to the brink of a general war to get what they want. This is the real meaning of the events that have been taking place in Korea.

That is why we are in such grave danger.

The future of civilization depends on what we do—on what we do now, and in the months ahead.

We have the strength and we have the courage to overcome the danger that threatens our country. We must act calmly, wisely, and resolutely.

Here are the things we will do:

First, we will continue to uphold and, if necessary, to defend with arms the principles of the UN—the principles of freedom and justice.

Second, we will continue to work with the other free nations to strengthen our combined defenses.

Third, we will build up our own Army, Navy, and Air Force and make more weapons for ourselves and our allies.

Fourth, we will expand our economy and keep it on an even keel.

Now, I want to talk to you about each one of these things.

First, we will continue to uphold the principles of the UN.

We have no aggressive purpose. We will not use our strength for aggression. We are a tolerant and a restrained people, deeply aware of our moral responsibilities and deeply aware of the horrors of war.

We believe in settling differences by peaceful means, and we have made honest efforts to bring about disarmament. We will continue those efforts, but we cannot yield to aggression.

Though the present situation is highly dangerous, we do not believe that war is inevitable. There is no conflict between the legitimate interests of the free world and those of the Soviet Union that cannot be settled by peaceful means. We will continue to take every honorable step we can to avoid general war.

But we will not engage in appeasement.

The world learned from Munich that security cannot be bought by appeasement.

We are ready, as we have always been, to take part in efforts to reach a peaceful solution of the conflict in Korea. In fact, our representatives at Lake Success are taking part in just such efforts today.

We do not yet know whether the Chinese Communists are willing to enter into honest negotiations to settle the conflict in Korea. If negotiations are possible, we shall strive for a settlement that will make Korea a united, independent, and democratic country. That is what the Korean people want, and that is what the UN has decided they are entitled to have.

Meanwhile, our troops in Korea are continuing to do their best to uphold the UN.

Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff of the Army, who returned a few days ago from Korea, reported that our military forces there are well organized and well equipped. I am confident that our military forces, together with their comrades in arms from many nations, will continue to give a good account of themselves. They know they are fighting for the freedom and security of their own homes and families.

The danger we face exists not only in Korea. Therefore, the second thing we are

going to do is to increase our efforts, with other free nations, to build up defenses against aggression in other parts of the world. In dealing with the Korean crisis, we are not going to ignore the danger of aggression elsewhere.

There is actual warfare in the Far East, but Europe and the rest of the world are also in great danger. The same menace—the menace of Communist aggression—threatens Europe as well as Asia.

To combat this menace, other free nations need our help, and we need theirs. We must work with a sense of real partnership and common purpose with these nations. We must stand firm with our allies, who have shown their courage and their love of freedom.

The United States, Canada, and the 10 nations of Western Europe who are united with us in the North Atlantic Treaty have already begun to create combined military defenses. Secretary of State Dean Acheson is flying to Europe on Sunday. He and representatives of these nations will complete the arrangements for setting up a joint army, navy, and air force to defend Europe. The defense of Europe is of the utmost importance to the security of the United States.

We will continue to provide assistance to European countries, and to other free countries in other parts of the world, because their defense is also important to our own defense.

The Communist rulers are trying their hardest to split the free nations apart. If they should succeed, they would do staggering damage to the cause of freedom. Unity with our allies is now, and must continue to be, the foundation of our effort.

Working together, the free nations can create military forces strong enough to convince the Communist rulers that they cannot gain by aggression.

Working together, the free nations can present the common front, backed by strength, which is necessary if we are to be in a position to negotiate successfully with the Kremlin for peaceful settlements.

Working together, we hope we can prevent another world war.

In order to succeed, we in our country have a big job ahead of us.

That is why the third thing we must do to meet the present danger is to step up our own defense program.

We are expanding our Armed Forces very rapidly.

We are speeding up the production of military equipment for our own Armed Forces and for our allies.

We have a large Navy. We have a powerful Air Force. We have units around which a strong Army can be built. But measured against the danger that confronts us, our forces are not adequate.

On June 25, when the Communists invaded the Republic of Korea, we had less than 1,500,000 men and women in our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Today, our military strength has reached about two and a half million. Our next step is to increase the number of men and women on active duty to nearly three and a half million.

I have directed the Armed Forces to accomplish this as soon as possible. The Army and the Navy will be able to do this within a few months. It will take the Air Force somewhat longer. In addition to these men and women on active duty, we have about two million more in the National Guard and the Reserves who are subject to call.

As part of the process of achieving a speedier build-up, the number of men to be called up under the Selective Service System has been raised, and two additional National Guard divisions are being ordered to active duty in January.

At the same time we will have a very rapid speed-up in the production of military equipment. Within 1 year we will be turning out planes at five times the present rate of production. Within 1 year combat vehicles will be coming off the production line at four times today's rate. Within 1 year the rate of production of electronics equipment for defense will have multiplied 4½ times.

These will not be weapons for our own Armed Forces alone. They will constitute an arsenal for the defense of freedom. Out of this arsenal we will be able to send weapons to other free nations to add to what they can produce for their own defenses. And in this same arsenal we will provide a large reserve of weapons to equip additional units in our own Army Forces whenever that may be necessary.

Furthermore, while we are working toward these immediate goals in manpower and equipment, we will also expand our training and production facilities so as to make possible a very rapid expansion to full mobilization if that becomes necessary.

We can handle this production program, but it will require hard work.

It will require us to make a lot of changes in our ordinary ways of doing things.

And this brings me to our fourth big job. In order to build the military strength we need, we will have to expand our production greatly. We must also prevent inflation and stabilize the cost of living.

If we are to make the weapons we need soon enough, we shall have to cut back on many lines of civilian production. But we cannot build up and maintain our armed might and the industrial strength underlying it simply by cutting back civilian production. We must produce more—more steel, more copper, more aluminum, more electric power, more cotton, more of many other things.

We must set very high targets and be willing to make an all-out effort to reach them. Workers will be called upon to work more hours. More women and more young people and older workers will be needed in our plants and factories. Farmers will have to set higher production goals. Businessmen will have to put all their know-how to work to increase production.

A defense effort of the size we must now undertake will inevitably push prices up, unless we take positive action to hold them down.

We have already taken a number of steps. We have put restrictions on credit buying. We have increased taxes. I hope that the Congress will enact an excess-profits tax at this session. Still further taxes will be needed.

We cannot escape paying the cost of our military program. The more we pay by taxes now, the better we can hold prices down. I have directed that recommendations be prepared, for early submission to the Congress, to put the increased cost of defense as nearly as possible on a pay-as-you-go basis.

I have also instructed the Director of the Budget to reduce the nonmilitary expenditures in the new Federal budget to the minimum required to give effective support to the defense effort.

The measures I have just mentioned—credit control, higher taxes, and reduced nonmilitary expenditures—are essential. They are our primary defense against inflation, because they strike at the sources of inflation. But as we move into a greatly increased defense effort we must also take direct measures to keep prices in line.

The Government is starting at once to impose price controls upon a number of materials and products. These will be mainly items important to defense production and the cost of living.

In those fields where price control is imposed, the Government will also undertake to stabilize wages, as the law requires.

In the immediate future, a series of control orders will be announced by the Economic Stabilization Agency.

In addition, the Agency will announce fair standards for prices and wages in those cases where mandatory controls are not imposed. I ask everyone concerned not to set prices and wages higher than these standards will allow. If these standards are violated, it will speed up the imposition of mandatory controls, including roll-backs where needed.

As we move ahead with this mobilization effort there will be increased need for central control over the many Government activities in this field. Accordingly, I am establishing an Office of Defense Mobilization. I am appointing Mr. Charles E. Wilson to be Director of this Office. Mr. Wilson is resigning as president of the General Electric Co. to take this job.

In his new position he will be responsible for directing all the mobilization activities of the Government, including production, procurement, manpower, transportation and economic stabilization.

The Government is also moving forward with preparations for civil defense. I have appointed former Gov. Millard Caldwell, of Florida, to be Federal Civilian Defense Administrator.

In addition, I have recommended legislation to the Congress which will authorize the Federal Government to help States and cities in their civil-defense preparations. I hope the Congress will enact this legislation soon, so that the civil-defense work which has already started can be greatly speeded up.

These are our plans for making our country stronger.

As we go forward, we must keep clearly in mind the meaning of what we are doing.

Our freedom is in danger.

Sometimes we may forget just what freedom means to us. It is as close to us, as important to us, as the air we breathe. Freedom is in our homes, in our schools, in our churches. It is in our work and our Government and the right to vote as we please. Those are the things that would be taken from us if communism should win.

Because our freedom is in danger we are united in its defense. Let no aggressor think we are divided. Our great strength is the loyalty and fellowship of a free people. We pull together when we are in trouble, and we do it by our own choice, not out of fear, but out of love for the great values of our American life, that we all have a share in.

In this great defense effort that we are undertaking, things may not always go as smoothly as we would wish, either in Washington or in your home town. But remember that we are building our defenses in the democratic way and not by the iron rule of dictatorship.

Those of us who work in the Government will do our best. But the outcome depends, as it has always depended, on the spirit and energy of our people.

The job of building a stronger America must be done on our farms, in our factories, and in our homes. It must be done by every one of us, wherever we are, and whatever our jobs may be.

Our fighting men in Korea have set an example that should inspire us all. Attacked by superior numbers, and in the bitterest of winter weather, they were resolute, steady, and determined. Their steadfast courage in the face of reverses is one of the most heroic stories in our country's history.

In the days ahead, each of us should measure his own efforts, his own sacrifices, by the standard of our heroic men in Korea.

Many of you who are young people will serve in the Armed Forces of your country. Nothing you will do later in life will be of greater benefit to your homes, your communities, or your friends.

Many others of you will have to work longer hours in factories or mines or mills. Think of this not as longer hours, but as more planes, more tanks, more ships, more of all the things that are needed for the defense of your homes and your way of life.

All of us will have to pay more taxes and do without things we like. Think of this, not as a sacrifice, but as an opportunity, an opportunity to defend the best kind of life that men have ever devised on this earth.

As I speak to you tonight, aggression has won a military advantage in Korea. We should not try to hide or explain away that fact.

By the same token, we should draw renewed courage and faith from the response of the free world to that aggression. What the free nations have done in Korea is right, and men all over the world know that it is right. Whatever temporary set-backs there may be, the right will prevail in the end.

Because of all these things I have been talking about with you, I will issue a proclamation tomorrow morning declaring that a national emergency exists. This will call upon every citizen to put aside his personal interests for the good of our country. All of our energies must be devoted to the tasks ahead of us.

No nation has ever had a greater responsibility than ours has at this moment. We must remember that we are the leaders of the free world. We must understand that we cannot achieve peace by ourselves, but only by cooperating with other free nations and with the men and women who love freedom everywhere.

We must remember that our goal is not war but peace. Throughout the world our name stands for international justice and for a world based on the principles of law and order. We must keep it that way. We are willing to negotiate differences, but we will not yield to aggression. Appeasement of evil is not the road to peace.

The American people have always met danger with courage and determination. I am confident we will do that now, and, with God's help, we shall keep our freedom.

Civil Defense: New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N. Y., December 20, 1950.

Hon. L. GARY CLEMENTE,
Jamaica, N. Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CLEMENTE: I am attaching copies of the statement I made before the Senate Armed Services Committee in connection with the proposed civilian-defense bill.

The last draft of the bill available before I left Washington last Friday still contained a clause prohibiting the use of any of the Federal funds for the purchase of sites for bomb shelters. It also limited Federal participation to 50 percent of the cost of such projects. In a congested community like New York the cost of the site alone will be between 25 percent and 50 percent of the total cost of the project. This automatically reduces the Federal participation far below 50 percent of the actual cost. I doubt very much if the States will find it possible to provide adequate shelters if these provisions are not changed to increase the Federal share of actual cost.

You will see that I strongly urged that shelter funds be used to pay part of the cost of permanent projects that will be useful for defense and in peacetimes. Referring the combined parking garage and shelter program to the RFC is not the answer. Some form of subsidy or grant is essential.

I hope that you will help adjust this law to make it workable in New York.

Cordially,

VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor.

CIVIL DEFENSE: NEW YORK CITY

(Statement by Mayor Vincent R. Impellitteri to Senate Armed Services Subcommittee, Washington, D. C., December 15, 1950)

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your committee to outline to you the importance to New York City of establishing a permanent civil defense program on a national level for the whole of the United States. We realize the importance of being prepared for any eventuality in case our country is attacked. New York City, in our opinion, would become a prime target and we are determined to be ready if such an attack should come.

We are approaching this problem without hysteria and with the knowledge that New York City, like other energetic and advancing communities, must be kept functioning regardless of the possibility of attack. We reject the "take-to-the-hills" and "make-for-the-caves" philosophy. We shall not adopt a policy of dispersion and decentralization. We propose to do everything within our power to see that our city continues as a major port and as the greatest industrial, financial, business, and transportation center of the country. Any other approach would give aid and comfort to our enemies, and impede all-out mobilization of our full strength.

We are happy that a report is being made by your committee looking toward the enactment of Federal legislation to coordinate and aid States and local governments in the civil defense program. The main issues are clear. The strategists are available, and no prolonged, time-consuming studies are necessary. Lack of a definitive, authoritative Federal policy, implemented by Federal law and appropriations, has to date severely handicapped the cities and States. Washington must come forth with policy, leadership, and help.

IMPORTANCE OF NEW YORK CITY TO THE WAR EFFORT

New York City is the greatest city in the world largely because of its port, which in turn has brought great industries to the area. In peace and war, the New York port, which is at the crossroads of the world shipping lanes, sends more ships of all varieties to more world ports than any other harbor in the world. The great part played by the New York port of embarkation during the last war is well known to all. We are proud of that record and ready to renew and expand it if we are told what is wanted and when.

New York City is the nerve center of far-flung industries and business. It is the financial center of the world and our most important gateway. Moreover, many great industries are concentrated within the city upon which millions of people depend for their livelihood. Ours is the center of management and finance.

New York's unique geographical situation requires many bridges and tunnels to connect its various boroughs and provide communication with the surrounding area to the north and south. These bridges and tunnels are part of an expanding, modern arterial highway system. Our population is approximately 8,000,000 and our rapid transit carries to and from Manhattan Island below Fifty-ninth Street approximately 2,500,000 people each day. Our bridges, tunnels, and arterial system move millions of people in and out of the entire metropolitan district with a population of 15,000,000.

Anyone familiar with the factors which make a city function smoothly, including water supply, utilities, transportation, industry, and communications, will not take seriously suggestions that we prepare to evacuate 8,000,000 people. There is no rhyme or reason in such thinking. It would be impractical to reproduce in the open country the public utilities and other services necessary to accommodate the millions of people in this and other large cities. New York will not be abandoned nor can our operations be suspended even for a day.

APPROPRIATIONS

Virtually all State and city officials are looking to the Federal Government to establish the mobilization policy and program to be followed throughout the country. These decisions must be made federally and be guided by a Federal agency, and implemented by Federal appropriations allocated fairly to the States and municipalities on the basis of estimated strategic dangers and needs.

There must be sharp differentiation between emergency disaster relief and long-range permanent construction so planned as to be usable for public purposes in peace as well as for civilian defense in war.

New York, like other cities, must operate on an intelligent budget for operating and capital expenditures. Our powers to levy taxes and incur debt are sharply defined, and limited. The State also is limited in its resources. We cannot plan and budget our program intelligently until we know what is going to be done on the Federal level.

CONTROL AND CARE OF BOMBED AREAS

We cannot make a really accurate estimate of the cost of housing, clothing, feeding, and providing medical attention for bombed areas. If we could predict accurately when and where attacks would be made, our Armed Forces could stop them, and our civilian defense problem would be simplified. Obviously, medical and other supplies required for the care of disaster areas must be stockpiled at various strategic points. These must be rushed to disaster areas as required, much as our Government and the Red Cross handle disasters in peacetimes. The cost of stockpiling must be borne by the Federal Government, and we in our communities must organize to use these materials when they are needed. We have attempted to estimate how much money will be required in our community for this purpose, and the results have varied greatly, depending upon the assumptions made by the estimator. We are not sufficiently familiar with the civilian defense needs to make accurate forecasts, and look to Washington for advice.

We do know that certain materials will be required and should be purchased promptly. The newspaper reports advise that the National Security Resources Board recommended to Congress an appropriation of $632,000,000, subdivided into three separate categories for the purchase of special equipment to augment fire, engineering, transportation, communications, stockpiles of critical materials and medical supplies and for communications and control centers. If our preliminary checks of possible requirements in New York City prove to be anywhere near accurate, this amount will be inadequate if several communities are attacked at once.

SHELTERS

I do not know what type of shelters your committee will recommend. I feel very strongly that it would be a distinct waste to spend $2,250,000,000, as suggested in some quarters, on shelters which would have no peacetime use. It would be impossible for municipalities even with State aid to finance the share of the cost of these expensive projects in the proportions suggested. States and cities cannot stretch their credit to 50 percent of the cost of such work. I strongly urge that you change this provision so that 80 percent of the funds are provided by the

Federal Government with 20 percent contributed by the State and city governments. This is a more realistic approach. I also urge that any bill authorizing such shelters enlarge the definition to include places of assembly, parking garages, hospital additions, and other related facilities which will serve a permanent, public use.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES

The city of New York has a substantial hospital expansion program under way. However, the funds available within the exemption from the debt limit granted by the State of New York will be inadequate to complete even part of the program. Should an emergency occur today, New York's hospitals could crowd in a substantial number of injured persons on an emergency basis. We could not, however, cope with a disaster. Were we on the other hand to expedite our entire planned hospital program and expand it so as to meet the immediate future needs of the city of New York, the emergency needs in case of disaster could also be met. Obviously, as we increase the capacity of our permanent hospitals, we also increase our ability to handle emergency cases. More money must be made available for this program if we are to expedite it and have it serve our people after an attack. Our plans and finances must be adjusted now if we are to meet this emergency.

MASS TRANSPORTATION

Plans have been virtually completed for large-scale additions to New York City's subway system. These plans include a new subway in Second Avenue in Manhattan, a low-level express subway in Sixth Avenue, and other extensions. Funds are not now available to build these subways. It would be entirely feasible to excavate substantial sections of these subway extensions and to use these excavations as bomb shelters. Once the emergency is past, subway sections can be completed and returned to their intended use as extensions of the existing rapid transit system.

PARKING GARAGES

One of our greatest concerns is traffic congestion. This problem is serious anyway. In the light of a possible atomic attack on New York City, it is frightening. I have recently appointed a city parking authority, and they are now finding ways and means of financing construction of parking garages to get vehicles off the streets. Parking garages can be designed and built to serve as air-raid shelters. There are other important uses to which these garages could be put to in connection with civilian defense. Among them is use as temporary accident wards and hospitals. Great flexibility is possible in buildings of this type and they could be located at points of greatest congestion. We need parking garages in New York having 12,000,000 square feet of floor space. We must have Federal help on this program.

I am in complete disagreement with those who have urged that the construction of combined parking garages and shelters be left entirely to cities. If this is done, no program which will meet the need is remotely possible. Funds needed for schools, hospitals, and other essential city services cannot be made available for the construction of parking garages and reduction of traffic congestion. It makes much more sense to build all-purpose buildings with shelter funds.

ARTERIAL PROGRAM

All studies by administrative officials, police, and engineers concerned with emergency transportation have shown that the express highway and parkway system constitutes the best means of ingress, egress, and rapid travel. These arteries can be controlled by proper officials and restricted to military and civil defense vehicles. We have a substantial program, including strategic expressways leading in and out of the city under way and the completion of these arteries is a defense requirement. Additional Federal defense funds should be made available to speed up this arterial program and push it to an early completion. Our contracts are ready to let. We need funds and priorities.

PRIORITIES

Some dislocation of labor working in the construction industry is inevitable. Everything possible should be done to keep this at a minimum. In this connection, I urge you to take the steps necessary to insure that equipment and materials will be available for the defense program once the national administration has fixed it. I am sure you will find that Gen. W. H. Harrison, Administrator, National Production Authority, will agree that if the civilian defense program is approved as essential to the war effort, priorities must be determined accordingly. This will provide relief to labor which is in danger of unemployment, which will shake morale and seriously impede both mobilization and defense.

Justice for Poland—Address of Prof. Frank Nowak, of Boston University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an address entitled "Justice for Poland," which was made recently by Prof. Frank Nowak, of Boston University. The address follows:

The aggression of Soviet communism in Korea is a critical and present danger to the free world everywhere. The long-awaited era of peace which the peoples of the world so earnestly sought and expected since 1945 has not been achieved. It is clear now to all thinking men that we lost the peace at Cairo, Tehran, and Yalta when in the first test case of the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter we demonstrated our insincerity by cynically sacrificing Poland to win the favor of Stalin. This betrayal seriously undermined our moral position in the world and was soon followed by the loss of half of Europe and most of Asia to the Moloch of Soviet imperialism. The war in Korea is a direct result of the betrayal at Yalta and Cairo. It is obvious that tyrannical dictators who respect neither law nor the rights of humanity can never be stopped by a policy of appeasement. Only superior power marshaled by the free nations of the world can stop the expansion of this Communist imperialism.

The mendacity and calculated insults of Jacob Malik in the Security Council of the United Nations reveal the impossibility of a reasonable understanding and demonstrate the nature of the evil which oppresses 800,000,000 of people within and without the borders of the Soviet Union.

The Polish people who fought so gallantly for their freedom and ours during the war are today enslaved, exploited, and degraded; a living monument and reproach to the folly of appeasement. Poland is now governed by the knife, the noose, and the concentration camp of the hangman. The civilized world may well ponder this experience as it prepares to meet this latest challenge to its security in Korea.

The tragic fate of Poland suggests certain definite conclusions regarding both Korea and the future of the United Nations. In Korea we dare not resort to hypocrisy and repeat the blunder made at Yalta. Poland was completely lost by the deal we made with Stalin. Let there be no deal with Stalin in Korea. The blood and suffering of our boys in that far-away land must not be sacrificed in vain. All Korea must be free. A partition of the country along the thirty-eighth parallel would be a repetition of our tragic mistake at Yalta when we accepted the partition of Poland along the Ribbentrop-Molotov-Curzon line with the result that we handed all Poland over to Stalin. A partition of Korea means betrayal, appeasement, disaster, and a further weakening of our own moral and military security.

Last July the free peoples of the world were tremendously heartened and encouraged by the prompt and efficient action of the United Nations in condemning the aggression on the Republic of Korea. The month of August in the Security Council of the United Nations, during the presidency of Jakob Malik, however, brought disillusionment and frustration. It was clearly demonstrated that no United Nations organization can function efficiently as guardian of the peace so long as an aggressor can sit at the table and veto measures designed to curb his lawless acts. Evidently fundamental changes in the Charter of the United Nations are in order, even at the risk of sacrificing universality for efficiency. A United Nations that cannot function with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a member must be made to function without the Soviet Union and without appeasement of aggressors.

A great American President, Woodrow Wilson, when discussing the organization of the old League of Nations, declared that no peace is possible without good faith among statesmen, without a decent respect for the rights of nations, without recognition of the binding force of international law, and without acceptance of the elementary principles of freedom of speech and public press. None of these prerequisites obtains today in the United Nations insofar as the Soviet Union and its puppets are concerned.

The time has come for a return to common sense and a drastic reorganization of the United Nations itself. The free nations of the world who speak in civilized accents of mutual trust and good faith and can reach an understanding as to the meaning of words must have the courage to condemn and expel aggressors. Obviously the Soviet Union, which does not respect law or the rights of its own subjects, cannot be expected to respect the rights of nations in any international organization. Likewise the legal fiction that the Polish, Czechoslovakian, Ukrainian, and White Russian people are represented in the United Nations by Communist stooges of the Politburo, must be drastically revised since it was originally and irrationally accepted as a measure of appeasement of the Soviet Union.

The United Nations can continue to retain the respect of the civilized world only when it finishes with appeasement and returns to the high aims of its Charter. It will again become the hope of mankind and capture the imagination of all peoples, even those living under the iron curtain.

As the United States and the nations of the free world prepare to meet the challenge of Soviet imperialism, it is likely that Poland will again become a touchstone of our sincerity and political acumen. The arming of Western Germany in the name of military necessity and expediency must be so controlled that German militarism shall not raise its ugly head to menace the German people and the surrounding states. Poland must not be made the victim of German appeasement. It is all important that our moral position be unimpeachable. The record must be kept straight. Permanent peace must not be sacrificed for any apparent temporary advantage by betraying the smaller nations of the world.

The leadership of the United States and the United Nations in the struggle with the forces of evil can be maintained only if that leadership is itself worthy of the support of all free peoples. Certainly the record of deeds performed by the free nations of the world will speak louder and be more convincing to all men within and without the iron curtain than all the calculated falsehoods of Communist propaganda. Our future security depends not only on our military strength, but also on the support of the decent opinion of all mankind. Only then can we honestly and effectively call upon the peoples of the world to rally to our cause in defense of the principles solemnly proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter of 1941. Only then can we regain the confidence and loyal support of the peoples of Asia as well in this great struggle for a free world which repudiates imperialism of every brand, whether it be capitalist or Communist imperialism.

Pan American Award for Dr. Ellen Collins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the following report about a relative of Thomas Fitz Simons, one of the Pennsylvania signers of the United States Constitution. Miss Ellen Collins, a member of the noted Counihan family of the Commonwealth, has had a brilliant record in the development of our cultural-relations program. The projects which Miss Collins has promoted are the hope of our youth in the future.

The above mentioned follows:

Miss Ellen Collins was born at Waverly, N. Y., of a family some of whose ancestors signed the American Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America. She was graduated, magna cum laude, from St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg, Md. Besides a bachelor of science diploma, Miss Collins was also awarded a degree in journalism because of excellence of English style. These diplomas were won in June 1939.

As the result of brilliant graduate studies at Columbia University, New York, where she was an honor student of Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes, wartime Ambassador to Spain, Miss Collins was awarded the degree, master of arts, for excellence in South American history. This diploma was granted in June 1940.

In 1941, Miss Collins did further graduate work at the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru, with grade A credits for the degree of doctor of philosophy. At the same time, she acted as executive secretary of the Inter-American Seminar at the University of San Marcos, under the general direction of Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of The Americas and World Affairs. Among the courses which Miss Collins studied at the University of San Marcos were Iberian culture and the history of Hispanic America.

In 1942 Miss Collins was promoted to the post of director of the Inter-American Seminar at the National University of Mexico. Again, grade A credits were earned toward the degree, doctor of philosophy, in Latin-American history.

Because of these achievements, Ellen Collins became the first woman to be appointed to a cultural relations post in the history of the United States. Her commission was signed by Secretary of State Cordell Hull in May 1943. For the next 18 months, she served as assistant cultural relations attaché in the United States Embassy, at Quito, Ecuador. While in Ecuador, Miss Collins became the friend of all the leading people of the Republic, including the Honorable Galo Plaza, now President. She was praised by the Archbishop of Quito as an apostle of Catholic action.

The next promotion was to the rank of Cultural Relations Attaché in the United States Embassy in Caracas, Venezuela. Due to success in this role, Miss Collins was unanimously elected an honorary member of the Venezuelan-United States Cultural Institute, where she also gave courses in the Spanish language and literature. She held these positions in Venezuelan life for 15 months.

Upon her return to the United States of America, Miss Collins was appointed by the Board of Directors of the American Peace Society, oldest peace organization in the country, as the society's special delegate at the seat of the United Nations, Lake Success. Due to the constructive work accomplished in the United Nations, Miss Collins was unanimously elected to the Board of Directors of the American Peace Society and to the Board of Editors of the Society's publication, World Affairs.

Ellen Collins has traveled extensively in Europe, North Africa, South America, Central America, Mexico, and in the Caribbean. She speaks English, Spanish, and French. Everywhere, she has been a champion of truth and justice for Spain. Her articles on Hispanic America have been published in The Sign and in the Catholic Digest, while her book reviews have been a feature of The Americas and World Affairs.

The position of Miss Collins as an expert, or specialist, with respect to Hispanic America was established when she was invited to be listed in Who Knows and What, published by Who's Who In America. Naturally, she is prominently mentioned in the Catholic Who's Who of the United States.

Civilian Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the city of Newark, N. J., under date of December 13, 1950, urging the adoption of H. R. 9710 introduced by my colleague, the Honorable ARTHUR KLEIN, of New York, having to do with the establishment of a civilian-defense program.

The resolution follows:

Whereas there is now pending before the House of Representatives of the United States, a bill introduced by Congressman KLEIN, bill No. 9710, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services; and

Whereas this bill provides for the creation of Municipal Defense Authority to assist municipalities in conducting surveys to determine the need for joint underground garage bomb shelters; and

Whereas this bill would appropriate the sum of $25,000,000 to enable municipalities to make preliminary plans for construction of such facilities, with a further appropriation of $2,000,000,000 to assist in the actual construction of the facilities for approved projects; and

Whereas the city of Newark is desirous of constructing an underground garage under Military Park which can also be used as a bomb shelter in the event of any emergency; and

Whereas we believe that the Federal Government should give financial aid to the city of Newark in securing these facilities which will be useful both in time of peace to relieve our rapidly increasing traffic congestion, and to shelter our citizens in the event of bombings by enemy forces: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, That the Senate and House of Representatives be urged and requested to adopt the proposed Klein bill, and such other amendments as may be necessary, in order to provide sufficient funds to assist the city of Newark and other municipalities in like situations in obtaining the desired combined underground parking garage and bomb-shelter facilities; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the two United States Senators from New Jersey, and to the several Congressmen from New Jersey.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of December 6, 1950:

POPULAR APPEAL OF SEAWAY

Documentary evidence in the form of the lobby report of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, recorded during the past week in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, proves that when it comes to putting up dollars to push the St. Lawrence project, about the only patrons are those seeking a subsidized waterway over which to move their Labrador ore. This brands as balderdash stories about the popular appeal of the proposal.

Last year, and with bombastic publicity, a campaign to secure $250,000 by popular subscription for propagandizing the project was launched under the direction of a Chicago fund-raising organization. That campaign fell flat and the Chicago company (most organizations of this character work on a commission basis) quit. And that's when a small group of steel operators with Labrador ore investments stepped in to try to save the day for the subsidized waterway.

The lobby report, just published, shows that there is practically no financial support back of the proposal except that of those steel operators. As the old saying goes, the crusaders seem willing to "let George do it." Without the support of this small group of steel operators, the scheme would be as dead as some of the lame ducks who returned to Washington. With the support of those operators, to the tune of $40,284.75, in the last 9 months, the proposal is being kept alive. Of the total of $44,358.53 in contributions, listed in that lobby report, only $4,074.09

came from sources other than the six steel operators.

In the same period, the lobby report of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference in Opposition showed a total of $32,480.37 in contributions. Among the contributors were two national organizations, the Association of American Railroads and the National Coal Association. Other contributing organizations were the Anthracite Institute and the Maritime Association of the Port of New York. Contributions this year came from as far south as Louisiana and as far west as Minnesota. Individual contributions were received from 72 members of the Foreign Commerce Club of New York.

Emergency Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of President Truman's proclamation of the existence of a national emergency, issued today, taken from the New York Times of December 17, 1950:

TEXT OF EMERGENCY PROCLAMATION

Whereas recent events in Korea and elsewhere constitute a grave threat to the peace of the world and imperil the efforts of this country and those of the United Nations to prevent aggression and armed conflict; and

Whereas world conquest by Communist imperialism is the goal of the forces of aggression that have been loosed upon the world; and

Whereas if the goal of Communist imperialism were to be achieved, the people of this country would no longer enjoy the full and rich life they have with God's help built for themselves and their children; they would no longer enjoy the blessings of the freedom of worshiping as they severally choose, the freedom of reading and listening to what they choose, the right of free speech including the right to criticize their Government, the right to choose those who conduct their Government, the right to engage freely in collective bargaining, the right to engage freely in their own business enterprises, and the many other freedoms and rights which are a part of our way of life; and

Whereas the increasing menace of the forces of Communist aggression requires that the national defense of the United States be strengthened as speedily as possible:

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do proclaim the existence of a national emergency, which requires that the military, naval, air, and civilian defenses of this country be strengthened as speedily as possible to the end that we may be able to repel any and all threats against our national security and to fulfill our responsibilities in the efforts being made through the United Nations and otherwise to bring about lasting peace.

I summon all citizens to make a united effort for the security and well-being of our beloved country and to place its needs foremost in thought and action that the full moral and material strength of the Nation may be readied for the dangers which threaten us.

I summon our farmers, our workers in industry and our businessmen to make a mighty production effort to meet the defense requirements of the Nation and to this end to eliminate all waste and inefficiency and to subordinate all lesser interests to the common good.

I summon every person and every community to make, with a spirit of neighborliness, whatever sacrifices are necessary for the welfare of the Nation.

I summon all State and local leaders and officials to cooperate fully with the military and civilian defense agencies of the United States in the national defense program.

I summon all citizens to be loyal to the principles upon which our Nation is founded to keep faith with our friends and allies, and to be firm in our devotion to the peaceful purposes for which the United Nations was founded.

I am confident that we will meet the dangers that confront us with courage and determination, strong in the faith that we can thereby secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 16th day of December in the year of our Lord 1950, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-fifth.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

By the President:
DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State.

James Kevin McGuinness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting news story that appeared today in the Washington Times-Herald concerning a great patriot, James Kevin McGuinness. His oration written by Mr. McGuinness and delivered by that able, scholarly, and learned priest, Rev. Edward Carney, O. S. A., National chaplain of the American Legion, were most appropriate. The news story follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

When that great patriot, James Kevin McGuinness, died a little while ago, I reported that he had been whispered out of the motion-picture industry as punishment for giving testimony against the Communist treachery at the 1947 hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Jim never knew whose hand plunged the knife into his back. He was tried in absentia, knowing neither the charge nor the name of his accuser, and, after some remote negotiations with the secret terror, contact was broken and he was done for.

Meanwhile, actors, writers, producers, and others implicated in the treason have gone on to greater wealth and renown. The motion-picture industry professes to have cleaned house but has done nothing of the kind.

Jim was an active leader of the American Legion's fight against treason, having resumed his dormant membership a few years ago when he decided that organization was necessary to wage the counterattack.

Previously he had dropped out as a silent objection to the shameful misconduct of Legionnaires at some of the national conventions in the twenties.

But he always believed in the original principles of the Legion and so, when he realized that the motion-picture industry was infested with actual traitors who were trying to betray his country to Soviet Russia, Jim went back into the fold.

During the same period, Jim also lagged in his religious devoirs. I would not presume to discuss this phase of his life except to make the point that when the issue was joined, Jim fought as a Christian crusader and a gallant gentleman. He was deeply religious now, and, in his dying moment, called to his wife, "Lucie, I am dying! Hand me my prayer book.

Jim was a fine man, a martyr worthy of the same respect that is due the young men who gave their lives in Korea. He fought in the same cause. Had he been 21 or 25 when this war came, and not 57, he undoubtedly would have joined up as he did in 1917 when he fought in France as an infantry lieutenant.

I recently mentioned a beautiful patriotic pageant which Jim wrote for the national convention of the American Legion which was held in Hollywood under a promise by the movie industry to finance a great show in the Hollywood Bowl.

Jim was a political outcast of the movie industry and his script was ruled out. One man even had the effrontery to propose that Edward G. Robinson, the movie actor who had been so mockingly defiant when Jim was fighting the Reds, should be selected for a leading part in the patriotic production under Legion auspices. He was told, however, that Robinson never would be allowed to use the Legion to clear his skirts.

You might savor the beauty of Jim's devotion to his country by reading these few samples of an oration written by Jim and delivered at the pageant by Father Edward Carney, of Lawrence, Mass., the national chaplain of the Legion:

"Humbly reverent, we lay the wreath of sweet remembrance before those, our comrades, who made the last—the utmost payment to establish and preserve the freedom they bequeathed to us as the greatest gift of comradeship and love. We are alive because they are dead. We taste each day the luscious fruits of their sublime generosity.

"We know each day the brightness of the returning sun; walking in the free breeze of a land still free because of those who fell so that we might stand erect, owing no man anything but affection freely given. We see each night the silent brilliance of the stars with their promise of eternity; finding sleep in calm surety that no tyrant can shatter our rest by violent intrusions of our homes and seizures of our persons.

"Because of them, the fallen, we are the living. Because of them, the fallen, we are the free. Because of them we are now able to face the foul tyranny now enslaving half the world and say, clearly and without falter: 'That which was preserved for us by the blood of our brothers is God's gift to his sons. To fail freedom would be to deny divine grace; to betray our country and to foul the memories of our magnificent dead. Confronting the power your evil has assembled, we are unafraid. Freedom is of God and must endure. Tyranny and evil shall perish.'

"The scowling, cynical intellectuals of the left—having cautiously evaded the tumult and the agony of battle—are our enemies no less than the booted hordes who have trampled down the ideals and the goodness of Christian civilization everywhere they have marched."

For those sentiments, Jim McGuinness was whispered out of the motion picture industry in his own country which he had served in battle in France.

Mobile Disaster Emergency Relief Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on September 21 Congressman KEAN described to this group a civil defense plan which originated in his district. I refer to the mobile disaster emergency relief plan set up by the P. Ballantine & Sons Co. in Newark. Mr. Carl W. Badenhausen, president of Ballantine, has provided blankets, stretchers, tools, first-aid kits, flares, portable lights, ropes, and ladders for his organization's trucks in Newark.

I am very happy to report that the Ballantine plan was recently put into effect by the Cody Distributing Co. in Boston. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter by Mayor John B. Hynes, of Boston:

NOVEMBER 16, 1950.

DEAR MR. CODY: May I at this time express my appreciation to you for the splendid interest you have shown in our civil defense program in Boston.

Mr. Malone has informed me that Cody Distributing Co. is ready to place at the disposal of Boston civil defense five Ballantine delivery vans, fully equipped for emergency medical and rescue service in the event of disaster in Boston.

I know that these vans will be most useful to our medical division, and I hope that other trucking concerns will see fit to follow your fine example in preparing to meet any and all emergency needs in Boston.

I am sorry that I will be unable to be with you at the first demonstration program scheduled for tomorrow, but I do wish to extend through you to your personnel my best wishes for success in your efforts in civil defense.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. HYNES,
Mayor of Boston.

Federal Aid To Establish Local Public Health Service Units

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McSWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I was very much honored last week to be asked by the State president and other officials of the Parent-Teachers Association of Ohio to make certain insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing newspaper comments from the New York Times and the Washington Post relative to the proposed legislation for Federal aid to establish local public health service units, known as H. R. 5865. I am glad to include them at the end of this statement.

I hope that my friends at home will be kind and fair-minded enough to read this, my last statement before the Eighty-first Congress, for I am especially glad to have this honor come to me from the Parent-Teachers Association. In my teaching experience in Wooster, Ohio, I wished often that we had an organization of this kind because, I think, it is tremendously beneficial not only to the students but also to the teachers and the parents. Whenever this combination of parents and teachers, which is the most powerful force that we can gather for good in this country, has endorsed a bill, I have been very anxious to cooperate in every way in its passage.

I am reminded of a similar circumstance when Reorganization Plan No. 27 was before the House of Representatives. The purpose of this plan was to unite many scattered health and welfare agencies under one head. It was recommended by the Hoover Commission. I was as anxious, when this legislation was before the Congress, to eliminate waste, duplication in government, and unnecessary expenditure, as I am now when this bill sponsored by the Parent-Teachers Association is being considered. However, after voting for Reorganization Plan No. 27, I found that it was used against me in the campaign by opponents and by the medical group, who said the bill was a trend toward socialism. If there is anyone in the Congress who has voted more diligently against socialistic trends or Communist influence, I would appreciate having his record presented to me.

I accepted membership on the House Un-American Activities Committee, which in itself was an unpopular move, because of my determination to fight every inch of the way against any communistic trend in America and I realized all the time that a communistic trend may be begun by a mild socialistic movement. For that reason, I said to the Parent-Teachers group that if I sponsored this legislation for them, I did not want their organization or my fellow citizens at home to feel it was a move toward a socialistic program. You can imagine my feeling when Reorganization Plan No. 27, for which I voted, was interpreted by the doctors and my opposition as socialistic. I believe that there is no conscientious doctor in the district or in the country, who does not want to improve the situation in health throughout our land. That has been my purpose, too. If misinterpretations and misrepresentations are going to be made about these bills, I think it will tend to make serious-minded men, who want to improve conditions generally for the well-being of our country, hesitate before sponsoring them.

I am sure no one in the land can accuse the Parent-Teachers Association of wanting any trend toward socialism; in fact, I do not think anyone in the land can accuse former President Hoover of wanting a trend toward socialism, yet it was his Commission that recommended and sponsored Reorganization Plan No. 27, which proved so disastrous for me.

Again, I want to thank the members of the Parent-Teachers Association for having selected me to take this responsibility.

The above-mentioned newspaper comments from the New York Times and the Washington Post follow:

[From the New York Times of December 10, 1950]

ANOTHER DEFENSE BILL

Following the appointment last week of a new Civil Defense Administrator, the National Security Resources Board presented Congress with a $3,100,000,000 plan for civil defense. Listed by the President as a must for the present short session, prompt action will undoubtedly be taken on this measure.

As Dr. Howard A. Rusk points out elsewhere in this newspaper today, there is another bill currently in the House Rules Committee which is equally a must if we are to make full plans for medical and health services in civil defense. This is H. R. 5865, for Federal aid to establish local public health services. Its immediate passage is essential, for civil defense plans call for the administration of medical and health civil defense services by State and local public health officers. Added to the usual essential health services, there is need for special measures to enable civil defense organizations to deal with the problems arising from possible atomic, biological and chemical warfare. These problems are primarily the responsibility of health and medical services, but today 40,000,000 of our citizens live in communities where there are no local full-time health services.

H. R. 5865 would help remedy this by giving Federal grants-in-aid for the development of local health services. Prior to the Korean war this bill was unanimously passed by the Senate on the basis of its peacetime merits. Today, the bill takes on a new significance if we are to be prepared to meet all the possible eventualities in civil defense.

[From the Washington Post of December 11, 1950]

HEALTH SERVICES

There was urgent need for Federal financial aid to State and local health departments long before the threat of a major war became acute; the need is now underscored and clarified by the importance of such departments in the mobilization of civil defense. They would be the country's principal refuge in case of atomic or biological warfare attack. We believe, therefore, that the House should act on the local public health services bill, which the Senate has already passed, during the present session. The bill has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and is now in the Rules Committee.

State and local health departments are woefully inadequate. Some 40,000,000 Americans live today in areas where no local full-time public health departments exist; and it is estimated that nearly a hundred million others have only inadequately staffed departments available. The cost to the country in time lost from productive effort and in the incidence of preventable or controllable diseases is much too high. The cost in lives and human suffering in the event of widespread aerial attacks on the United States would be incalculable.

The civil defense report of the National Security Resources Board recommended that in each State, the State health officer should be placed in charge of all civil defense health and medical services; and cities should appoint local officers in the same manner. The report pointed out also that special measures must be taken to enable civil defense organizations to deal with the problems arising from atomic, biological, and chemical warfare. * * * The effects of these special weapons are of such a nature that defense against them becomes primarily the

responsibility of the health and medical services.

But the plain fact is that in many areas there simply is no such defense at all. And it is highly possible that war production plants and other vital installations will be dispersed into just such areas, with large concentrations of war workers clustered around them. Many cities which might become bomb targets are lamentably lacking in health facilities. The problem is not one on which the country can afford to defer action.

[From the New York Times of December 10, 1950]

CIVIL DEFENSE PLANS PLACED IN OPERATION IN MANY AREAS—ONLY SIX STATES HAVE COMPLETE COVERAGE, BUT OTHERS SPEED HEALTH PROGRAMS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

Paralleling the stepped-up tempo of military and industrial mobilization, steps have now been taken to move civil defense from a stand-by basis to an actual operating program. Since its organization in 1947, the National Security Resources Board has been responsible for developing plans for our civil defense in case of national emergency.

Now, in view of the present international tension, President Truman has appointed Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., former Governor of Florida, as Civil Defense Administrator. In accordance with plans, the responsibility for civil defense will now be carried out by this new agency, as the resources board, is a planning and coordinating, rather than an operating, agency.

Recognizing fully the all-important role of health and medical services in civil defense, the board has been preparing a comprehensive official Federal guidebook of medical and health problems fundamental to civil defense. Leading authorities in all specialized aspects of health services have assisted in preparing the manual, which is now completed and in the Government Printing Office.

As W. Stuart Symington reported to the President in September, all planning done on the health and medical aspects of civil defense is based on using State commissioners of health as directors of civil defense health services, and local health officers as directors of local civil defense health services. This plan has been accepted as a most practical and effective administrative mechanism, but unfortunately, nearly 30 percent of our citizens live in communities in which there are no full-time local health services.

COMPLETE COVERAGE IN SIX STATES

Only six States in the Nation now have complete local health services coverage in all counties. They are Maryland, Delaware, New Mexico, South Carolina, Alabama, and North Carolina, which added its final county recently.

There is almost complete coverage in California, Michigan, Florida, and Virginia. Kentucky, Louisiana, and Tennessee have organizations for nearly every county, but have many health officer vacancies.

In New York, the State committee on tuberculosis and health of the State charities aid association has announced a program to foster the development of county health departments next year, but at present, there is no locally operated, full-time public health service in the rural areas, and even the smaller cities in 44 of New York's 57 upState counties.

Steps toward remedying this situation were taken last year when the Senate with bipartisan sponsorship and wide public support, unanimously adopted a bill authorizing Federal grants-in-aid specifically for local public health departments. The act provides Federal funds for at least six minimum functions of a local health department: vital statistics, communicable disease control maternity and child hygiene services, environmental sanitation, public health laboratory services, and public health education. Significantly, now there is the extra bonus in that it will provide the keystone for local civil defense planning for health services.

ACTION HELD UP BY WAR

Endorsed enthusiastically by 60 such groups as the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, American Medical Association, the National Grange, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, an almost identical bill was passed by the House of Representatives during the Eightieth Congress. This year, when the bill reached the House, the Korean war had broken out, and it was shelved because of what were considered more pressing matters.

Events of the last few weeks, however, have shown clearly the need for all-out action in planning our civil defense, and that local public health services will be the foundation for the medical, hospitalization, and health aspects of civil defense.

As Dr. William P. Shepard, president of the American Public Health Association, said recently, "Public health services are the administrative backbone of civil defense. The immediate development of such services is not only requisite to the safeguarding of the health of the Nation in normal peacetime, but is given even greater urgency by the current demands for the establishment of adequate civilian defense against possible acts of aggression, including atomic, biological, chemical, and other devices of warfare directly affecting the civilian population."

That there is urgent necessity for immediate action by the House of Representatives is clear. One-third of the Nation is without the administrative organization for providing even normal local health services, let alone those necessary for civil defense. The provision of those services is as essential to our civil defense as weapons are to our fighting men.

United States Sabre Jet, the World's Fastest Fighting Plane, Bagged a Russian MIG–15 in the First Aerial Combat Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the newspapers carried an Associated Press dispatch which must have thrilled Americans everywhere. It told of a dog fight in the skies over Korea at an elevation of more than 20,000 feet, in which Lt. Col. Bruce H. Hinton, of the United States Air Force, made the first kill in a battle between four F–86 Sabres and four MIG–15's near the Manchurian border south of Sinuiju.

Mr. Speaker, as a Reserve officer in the Navy, I would like to express my admiration for the magnificent work accomplished by airmen in Korea and in all of our fighting services.

But a few days ago, I read an editorial telling of our Air Forces having already flown more than 15,000 of the United Nation's casualties to safety off the Korean battlefields. This later exploit and splendid performance by the most modern of all aircraft, accomplished at a speed of more than 600 miles per hour, is reminiscent of the almost daily reports which we received from all theaters of operation in the air during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly thrilled to see such splendid performance given by our F–86 jets in outstripping the much vaunted sweptback planes of like design flown by the Russian Air Force.

The performance of Lt. Col. Bruce Hinton, in this dramatic fight, is altogether reminiscent of other war aces and heroes of World War II—men like Maj. Dick Bong and Joe Foss, Lt. Col. Francis Gabreski, and others, who, like our own Johnny Meyer, well-known to practically every Member of this House, is now in command of Colonel Hinton's fighting group.

Mr. Speaker, while it is in fact a matter of several months, it seems only but a few days ago that Lt. Col. John C. Meyer, top-scoring, living Air Force pilot of World War II—an ace who destroyed 37 German planes in the air and on the ground—was placidly walking the floors of the House Office Buildings here on Capitol Hill, where, for the last 2 years, he acted as Air Force Liaison Officer to the House of Representatives.

Johnny Meyer's office in the Old House Office Building was on the same floor as my own and not many rooms removed. It was because of these facts that I got to know him well, and came to respect him not alone as a great hero and highly skilled airman—but as a splendid gentleman and officer.

We knew him for his devotion to his country and to his duties in the Air Force. On innumerable occasions I have seen him on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, working at his desk—in neverending endeavor to keep up with the countless thousands of requests made of the congressional liaison group of the Air Force by my colleagues here within this House.

I have, on many occasions, discussed various types of planes, tactics, and aerial operations with Colonel Meyer for, in the matter of fighter planes, he is an expert. As a member of this body, I have great respect for his expert opinion, and I noted, with a great deal of pleasure, that in discussing the bagging of the Russian MIG and its comparison with our own F–86, Johnny Meyer said, in part:

> It's just the finest airplane that I ever flew—it's everything wrapped up in one fast package—it's nice to taxi, warm, comfortable to sit in—and has all the little things as well as all the big ones to commend it to our services.

Johnny Meyer was a tremendous help to me not only for his expert ability in his special field, but in addition he had good common sense on all occasions in reference to all problems. I have missed him, as we all have, but we know that he is performing the work he loved best, so certainly we are proud of his outstanding achievements.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of their love of country, the will to do, and the daring of men like Colonel Hinton, Johnny Meyer, and all others in our fighting forces in Korea, that ours today is a great nation. So long as they live, America will live, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against them.

That all in this body may read of this accomplishment in the air over Korea by our F–86 Sabres—flying under command of a young Air Force officer so well known to all in this House—I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and include in the RECORD the AP dispatch above referred to. The dispatch reads as follows:

SABRE JET, WORLD'S FASTEST FIGHTING PLANE, DOWNS RED MIG–15 IN FIRST COMBAT TEST—FORMER D. C. FLIER CREDITED WITH FIRST KILL WITH NEW CRAFT

AN ADVANCE UNITED STATES BASE, KOREA, December 17.—An F–86 Sabre jet bagged a Russian-made MIG–15 today in the first battle test of America's newest and fastest operational fighting plane.

The enemy jet, aflame, was seen spinning out of control. Lt. Col. Bruce Hinton, of Stockton, Calif., made the kill in a 5-minute battle between four F–86 Sabres and four MIG–15's near the Manchurian border south of Sinuiju.

The other three MIG–15's streaked to safety across the Yalu River into Manchuria.

Returning to his base, Hinton made a victory roll over the runway and the cheering men on the ground knew the answer to a question they had been asking since the Sabres arrived December 15: How would they rate in battle against the speedy MIG–15's?

[Colonel Hinton's wife and two children formerly lived in Washington, at 5509 Parkland Court SE., according to the Air Force. They now live in Stockholm.—Editor's note.]

THE BEST THERE IS

The 6-foot Hinton, 31, was grinning when he climbed out of his plane.

"I caught him and let him have it and down he went," he said. "The Sabre is the best there is."

Reputedly the world's fastest jet not still in the experimental class, the North American-built Sabre has swept-back wings and tail. It holds the world's operational speed record of 670.981 miles per hour—which is not necessarily its actual top performance.

The MIG–15 is fast—over 600 miles per hour—but just how fast isn't known.

Sunday's battle definitely indicated the Sabre is faster.

"I was sure hoping to get an MIG," said Hinton. "Matter of fact, I told the boys just before I took off to get a red star ready to put on my plane."

FLEW "SLOW" TO FOOL THEM

He said the enemy planes were fooled because the Sabres deliberately flew at slow speed, at first.

"We were at 25,000 feet when we spotted them at 18,000 feet, flying level or slightly climbing and going very fast," he related.

"We headed down on them. They started a hard turn to the right, and as we closed in on them we started a harder turn to the right and turned inside of them. We got right in behind them.

"It was then that they let go their wing tanks and shoved on the coal. We dropped our tanks too, and we poured on the coal too. We eased up on them, although they were going like hell. I picked out a target plane, and I closed in gradually on him. When I was in range I let go with a burst.

"I could see the tracer bullets hitting him. They damaged him. I could tell, because he wiggled a bit in the air. I continued firing. The guy started burning and smoking very badly. The smoke decreased and a bunch of flame came out of him and he slowed down.

"He appeared to go out of control. By that time I was within 600 or 800 feet of him. As he went down I had my air brakes on, but he was going too slow for me to follow. The last time I saw him he was out of control on his way down."

CONFIRMED BY COLLEAGUE

Another member of the flight, Lt. Paul W. Bryce, Jr., of Lawrenceburg, Tenn., was the last to see the falling MIG.

"The fellow was at about 3,000 feet and was spinning down, definitely out of control," said Bryce. "I am sure he never was able to pull out of that spin."

The F–86's flew their first mission on the day they reached this base. They encountered no enemy. The next day, December 16, a snowstorm kept them on the ground. On the morning of December 17 they escorted B–29 bombers to the Kanggye area, but met no enemy fighters and only light flak.

It was during the afternoon that they went out to wait and look for MIG's, as one pilot put it.

Col. John C. Meyer, of Forrest Hills, N. Y., is leader of the fighter group.

FRET AT RESTRICTION

He said proudly:

"It's just the finest airplane I ever saw or ever flew. It's just everything good wrapped up in one fast package. It's even nice to taxi, and nice and warm and comfortable to sit in. It has all the little things as well as all the big ones."

Meyer, a leading ace who bagged 37 German planes in the air or on the ground during World War II, fretted about restrictions preventing American planes in Korea from pursuing Communist fighters across the Yalu into Manchuria.

He drew a line in the sand with the toe of his foot, and said:

"It's as though I told you 'I can punch you in the nose, but you can't reach across that line to hit me back.' "

Federal Spending in Fiscal 1951 May Exceed $80,000,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting some facts which the taxpaying public should have an opportunity to examine. It is their money which is being spent; it is their money which is being appropriated. There is no loyal citizen who objects to his dollars going to save the lives of our boys in the service, or to keep this Nation solvent, but they do object to the spending and appropriating of money which is not essential to bring about peace, or to save the lives of our boys.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD the following statement prepared by Mr. Paul O. Peters:

FEDERAL SPENDING IN FISCAL 1951 MAY EXCEED $80,000,000,000

The daily Treasury statement for December 15, 1950, indicates that total Federal spending for the fiscal year 1951, ending next June 30, may total $80,000,000,000. As of October 31, 1950, the grand total of unexpended balances of appropriations from prior years plus authorizations was $13,557,666.,930.10. Regular, supplemental, deficiency, and continuing appropriations raised the total available for expenditure to more than $69,000,000,000 as of October 31, 1950. Presently a second supplemental bill calling for $17,820,000,000 is in progress through the Congress and will be approved before the Eighty-first Congress adjourns sine die. The table following, compiled from the daily Treasury statement for December 15, 1950, summarizes the spending authorizations:

Appropriations, expenditures, and balances, Oct. 31, 1950

Unexpended balances from prior years	$13,557,666,930.10
Regular appropriations, fiscal 1951	17,778,369,758.33
Supplemental and deficiency	11,291,656,760.00
Indefinite and continuing [1]	26,396,688,908.08
Other deficiencies prior years	50,703,988.91
Transfers affecting prior prior year balances	—577,182,014.43
Transfers affecting current year appropriation	$577,182,014.43
Total funds available, Oct. 31, 1950	69,075,086,345.42
Requested second supplemental, 1951	17,820,000,000.00
Possible expenditures, 1951	86,895,086,345.42
Reported budget expenditures, fiscal 1951 to Dec. 15, 1950	17,527,996,852.64
Estimated amount available for expenditure	69,367,089,492.78

[1] The amounts included in this category are based upon the budget estimates of the President released January 9, 1950.

PURCHASING POWER OF DOLLAR CONTINUES DECLINE

In the week of December 8 to 15, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports the daily index number on spot market prices for 28 commodities at wholesale rose from 355.4 to 358 of the August 1939 level, equals 100.

The purchasing power of the dollar thus declined to 27.933 percent of the August 1939 value. This is inflation.

Meanwhile, we continue to ship scarce American commodities to Europe, Asia, Africa, and other parts of the world without due regard to the inflationary effect upon our own economy.

In the Matter of Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an excerpt from a memorial address entitled "In the Matter of Friendship" delivered in St. Louis, December 7, 1919, by my beloved friend, the late Harry B. Hawes, United States Senator from Missouri, and reprinted in the December Conservation Report of the National Wildlife Federation, Carl D. Shoemaker, Washington correspondent.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"IN THE MATTER OF FRIENDSHIP

"All that can be expected of any man is to make the best use of the things that are within his power. Only the contented man is

rich; so we must look for the things that bring contentment. And first of these is to find a friend; and if you find two friends you are indeed a lucky man; and if you find three friends—real friends—then you are a rich and powerful man. In prosperity it is easy to find a friend, but in adversity it is most difficult of all things. No matter how small a man's means may be, if he gives of what he has to his friend it is the same as if it was a great amount. A man's pleasures are insured by sharing them with a friend and his griefs are reduced by securing the sympathy of a friend. The counsel of a friend is the best counsel because it will be true advice; for, when received from a mere acquaintance, it may be so filled with flattery that its value will be destroyed, and faithful and true counsel rarely comes excepting from the true friend. It is said that in youth we have visions and in old age dreams, and the vision and the dream may give us an ideal of perfection; but experience and large contact with men compel us to accept the man who measures in his virtues only to the substantial average. If we view a man as a whole and find him good as a friend, we must not be diverted from the happy average—the everyday, human average—by using a magnifying glass upon his faults or frailties. We must, in order to have and hold a friend, accept him as he is, demanding but one thing in return for our affection—his fidelity."

The above is an excerpt from a memorial address delivered at Christ Church Cathedral, St. Louis, December 7, 1919, by the late Harry B. Hawes, United States Senator from Missouri, and a distinguished conservation leader both in and out of the Halls of Congress. In these troublesome days of world strife and uncertainty, we need the right kind of friends throughout the Nation and abroad. Let us then at this Yuletide season give heed to these words from a man rich in the experience of the world.

Sincerely,

CARL D. SHOEMAKER.

Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, by request, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter written to the New York Herald Tribune on the 13th day of this month by Gen. Donald B. Adams, Mr. Arthur J. Goldsmith, and a number of other distinguished men.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED AGGRESSION—PROGRAM FOR AMERICA TO MEET DANGER IS PRESENTED

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The leaders of the Communist world have clearly shown their intent to attack the free world by military means as well as by subversion and propaganda. It is, therefore, of first importance to realize that both the United States and the United Nations are under planned attack, and to formulate out of the welter of confusion a specific program of action by the United States against the greatest danger which it has ever faced. We, therefore, urge that—

1. The President and Congress proclaim a state of national emergency.

2. The Government undertake immediate full-scale mobilization of the Armed Forces and the industrial economy.

3. We reaffirm our unalterable determination to support the decision of the United Nations to defend Korea against aggression whether or not military necessity calls for the temporary withdrawal of United Nations forces.

4. The United Nations enforce economic and other necessary sanctions against Communist China unless its forces are withdrawn from Korea.

5. We refuse to recognize the Chinese Communist government, and we oppose recognition by the United Nations.

6. We provide economic aid and military supplies to the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa and maintain the United States fleet there.

7. We provide economic aid and military supplies to the anti-Communist forces on the Chinese mainland, French Indochina, and Malaya.

8. We encourage India and Pakistan to strengthen themselves against any contingency, and we provide them with economic and military supplies.

9. We accelerate the negotiation of peace treaties with Japan and Germany, providing for their rearmament under agreed controls.

10. We use all means to bring about the fullest measure of common defense by every member of the Atlantic Pact, giving our utmost support to those nations which fully cooperate in mobilizing their strength, recognizing that the defense of the North Atlantic area is our major strategic interest and responsibility.

11. The Government create a nonpartisan advisory council, representing all segments of the population, including management, labor, agriculture, etc.

12. The executive department regularly consult with the leaders of both parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives in formulating national policy in the current emergency.

13. We intern all Communists and subversives classified as dangerous by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

14. We assist, within the limitation of essential military priorities, all governments and individuals willing to fight Communist aggression.

Gen. Donald B. Adams, Dr. Wm. S. Bernard, George V. Denny, Jr., Charles Edison, Maj. George Fielding Eliot, John Ellis, Christopher T. Emmet, George B. Ford, Rev. William J. Gibbons, S. J., Arthur J. Goldsmith, Robert R. Guthrie, Dr. Alvin S. Johnson, H. V. Kaltenborn, Frederick C. McKee, Hugh Moore, Mrs. Natalie Paine, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Victor F. Ridder, Herbert Bayard Swope, Westmore Willcox, Jr.

NEW YORK, *December 12, 1950.*

The Greed for Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "The Greed for Wealth," by J. K. Wells, of Oklahoma City, Okla.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREED FOR WEALTH

The greed for wealth is undermining the principles of the American people. Avarice, beyond what is necessary to possess all the necessities and some of the luxuries of life, portrays a coarse and depraved mind. Modesty, honesty, chivalry, courtesy, gentility, truthfulness, and patriotism, the highest attributes of a truly great people, have given way to the baser instincts of mankind.

Wealth corrupts legislatures, congresses, and parliaments, dominates executives, and sits upon the throne of justice. It defeats legislation sought to ameliorate the unequal opportunities of mankind and places the burden of government upon those least able to bear it. It exalteth those in high places who are willing to do its bidding and crushes those who dare question its motives.

The scales of justice uphold its nefarious schemes and punishes the poor, the credulous and the innocent—the pawns of wealth—with impunity. It makes a mockery of patriotism and honesty is bound by the circumference of a dollar. The press and platform are not unknown as its hirelings and even the pulpit often is not too severely detached from its environments.

Was the immortal Goldsmith thinking of our present age when he wrote:

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey where wealth accumulates and men decay."

Should wealth be exalted above principle, bigotry above tolerance, and success above righteousness?

Let me ask you, kind reader, is there no more in life than lucre; is there no more in government than greed; is there no more in democracy than depredation?

J. K. WELLS.

This Administration Greatest Hoarder of All Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a release from my office entitled "This Administration Greatest Hoarder of All Time."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 31, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE (Republican, Nevada), today called attention to what he termed, "the Truman administration's stupid practice of buying for the military establishment at inflation prices the same foods which it has been hoarding and is trying to give away." And, he demanded that a stop be put to the wasteful practice.

"While one department of the Government is searching for certain foods to buy at top prices to feed our boys who are being called into military service, another department of the same Government is searching for people—preferably Europeans, but apparently anyone except Americans—to whom to give the millions upon millions of pounds of food, which our Government has been buying and storing to make prices higher," the Nevada Senator said, referring to the huge price support stocks which the Commodity Credit Corporation has been buying and storing.

Senator MALONE said, "This is but another illustration of the wanton waste of taxpayers'

money and the total lack of efficiency in the Truman administration."

"The Government," Senator MALONE said, "has 315,000,000 bushels of wheat and 229,000,000 bushels of corn. The CCC has 192,000,000 pounds of butter, and is buying up more at the rate of 9,000,000 pounds a week; 322,000,000 pounds of dried milk, and is buying up more at the rate of 45,000,000 pounds a month; 104,000,000 pounds of cheese, and is buying up more at the rate of 23,000,000 pounds a month; and 170,000,000 pounds of dried eggs (the equivalent of 32,000,000 dozen), and is buying at the rate of 15,000,000 pounds a month.

"Federal law specifically authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to turn over any surplus food to the military services," Senator MALONE said. "However, during four weeks when the CCC, a unit of the Department of Agriculture, was buying vast quantities of butter, eggs, and cheese to store in caves or give away to make the prices higher, the military services bought in the open market at inflation prices 4,131,022 pounds of butter, 4,910,350 dozen eggs, and 954,664 pounds of cheese."

Erie's Use of Train Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial taken from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 18, 1950:

ERIE'S USE OF TRAIN RADIO

For its pioneer work in applying the modern device of radio to the operation of railway trains, the Erie Railroad deserves congratulations.

A demonstration of train radio in action, at which the members of the Federal Communications Commission were guests last week, must have been truly impressive. It is still more impressive in view of the fact that the Erie is using train radio on 90 percent of its main line between New York and Chicago.

The popular excuse unprogressive railroad men give for their failure to use train radio is that it has not been proved practical. How much more practical does it have to be proved than to be in successful operation as it is on the Erie?

Train radio would have averted many of the terrible wrecks that have occurred in recent years and can make railroad travel far safer in the future.

It is needed for communication between one part of a train and another in these days of mile-long freight trains and very long passenger trains. Wrecks have happened because train crews did not know that the rear of their train had not quite cleared the main track in switching over to a siding, or that several of their cars had been knocked over onto an adjoining track in a minor collision, thus setting the scene for a major disaster.

For communication between one train and another en route, and between trains en route and dispatchers and track-side crews, train radio is needed also. It is the one form of communication available to trains that offers everything required for safe operation. Wrecks have occurred because communication was too slow and too sporadic—radio is instantaneous and continuous. Wrecks have occurred because the message that was sent was not received—radio enables the sender to confirm whether the message has been received or not. Wrecks have occurred because the message, though received, was not understood—radio enables the recipient to ask for a plainer explanation if he does not understand, and for the sender to give it.

Radio is an elastic and versatile safety device. In combination with other safety devices, it should be considered indispensable to the operation of fast trains over congested track. But it is not alone a safety device—it is an efficiency device also.

Factual studies have shown that it will soon pay for itself in reduced operating costs and will then become a source of clear profit for the railroad. By taking a firmer hand in pressing railroads to install radio, the Interstate Commerce Commission would not only be protecting the traveling public against needless maiming and death—it would also be acting for the best interest of the railroads themselves.

What Happened to the $48,000,000,000 for Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a release from my office entitled "What Happened to the $48,000,000,000 for Defense."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 24, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, today demanded an explanation from the administration of why we will lack arms of every classification and why we are short in all elements of military strength, after the unprecedented spending of over $48,000,000,000 on the Military Establishment during the past 4 years. The demand was made in a statement issued by the Nevada Senator.

"The question has been asked previously, but not satisfactorily answered," Senator MALONE said, continuing:

"The American taxpayers, already bled by a spendthrift administration, have a right to know where this money has gone. They say that half of it has gone for salaries; that is no explanation. Salaries for doing what? Certainly not to improve our military strength. The outbreak of the Korean war exposed our pitiful unpreparedness.

"Why such a large proportion, nearly nine billion, for civilian personnel; what did they do?

"The breakdown into major categories of expenditures—all before Korea—shows over $2,000,000,000 spent for commercial travel. Travel for what? Certainly not to improve our military strength.

"Of the forty-eight billion, about ten billion is listed as having been spent for equipment. What kind of equipment? The kind our American boys were handed when they were sent in to battle the Korean Reds?

"Not one dollar of the forty-eight billion spent went for atomic bombs or for anything connected with atomic-energy warfare. That was extra. And not $1 of the amount went for military aid to other countries. These items were extra.

"Where did the money go? Was it wasted? Was it spent unwisely?

"The lack of weapons capable of blasting the Soviet-type tanks of the North Koreans in the beginning, and the absence of tanks as good as these make Americans wonder where our money went.

"Many Americans would like to know why such low proportion went to provide weapons, why we were caught with obsolete planes? We would like to know also, in view of the high percentage spent to keep military personnel on hand, why we ran into a shortage of troops trained for combat? To say that the personnel was elsewhere in the world is not the answer, for, if that were true, why then the draft calls to make up the deficiency?

"The billions spent for the military between VJ-day and the outbreak of the Korean war would have meant that we had strength somewhere, trained for fighting, using the best guns and equipment, but when the Korean war developed we learned we were sadly weak throughout our Military Establishment.

"Now we are threatened with more demands for more money. Producing the aircraft and other weapons which we now lack is an urgent necessity. But it is essential, too, that Americans get ironclad assurances from the Defense Department that the additional billions will provide, instead of military forces hampered by glaring inadequacies, the well-rounded armed might which is the Nation's most imperative need."

Cherokee Indian Wins Plea To Rejoin Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a recent article appearing in the press relating to the plea of a Cherokee Indian that he be permitted to rejoin his outfit in the Marines.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEROKEE WINS PLEA TO REJOIN MARINES

INGLEWOOD, CALIF., December 16.—A Cherokee Indian mother today wrote the letter that will put her Marine sergeant son back where he wants to be—in the thick of the Korea fight leading his "dirty, stinking, and loyal platoon."

Tech. Sgt. Robert J. Ward, 25, a full-blooded Cherokee, was in the bloody fighting until recently. Then his mother wrote Gen. Clifton B. Cates, Commandant of the Marine Corps, that her son was the last of her boys—the other two were killed in World War II. She claimed the right to have her last surviving son put in a noncombat zone.

The mother is Mrs. Glenn Peterson, wife of an aircraft machinist. She is not immediately available for verification, but Sergeant Ward's father is believed dead.

Orders releasing Sergeant Ward to noncombatant duty were sent to him. But he tucked them in his hip pocket and continued leading his platoon up one bloody hill after another.

PUT ON DESK JOB

It took follow-up orders to get him on a desk job in Tokyo.

From there he wrote his mother this letter:

"I'm no hero, but I also have responsibilities to Little Squaw (his daughter) and Bettye (his wife) and you.

"If these people aren't stopped here on their own ground, we will have to share the thing so many have died to prevent their loved ones from sharing—the sight of death in our own backyard; of women and children being victims of these people.

"I went on the warpath for the right to do my bit to keep our people free and proud and now I'm shackled to a useless job.

"I ask you, my mother, to free me so I can once again be free to help my boys.

"They placed their faith in me and I brought them all back and now someone else leads them and I know they need me."

HIS DIRTY PLATOON

"Maybe in a sense I need them, my dirty, stinking and loyal platoon.

"Once I cried before you when I thought I'd lost someone whom I loved very dearly, and once again did I cry when I was told I must leave my men.

"So, I ask you the one thing which your heart does not want to do, release me to fight.

"I pace my room feeling useless, being no good to anyone. I'm no barracks-parade-ground Marine—I'm a Cherokee Indian and I'm happiest being miserable with my own people up on those mountains.

"I know you'll understand that your blessings will go with me into whatever the future holds in store for us.

"Write to the commandant and release me—explain to them as only you can that I have a job to do and that you understand."

INDIAN PERMITTED TO GO BACK TO HIS "STINKING PLATOON"

Gen. Clifton B. Cates, Commandant of the Marine Corps, has granted the wish of Marine Sgt. Robert J. Ward to rejoin his "dirty, stinking and loyal platoon" in Korea.

Technical Sergeant Ward, 25, a full-blooded Cherokee Indian of Los Angeles, was ordered out of the Korean fighting recently to a desk job in Tokyo. His mother, Mrs. Glenn Peterson, of Inglewood, Calif., wife of an aircraft machinist, had claimed the right to have her last surviving son placed in a noncombat zone. Two other sons had been killed in World War II.

But Sergeant Ward, who is married and has a baby daughter, persuaded his mother to cancel her request. In a letter to her he said his "dirty, stinking and loyal platoon" needed him.

General Cates commented yesterday:

"The Marines need men like Tech. Sgt. Robert J. Ward."

Recipe for Happiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, the Reverend Father Camillus Barth, C. P., has forwarded to me what I consider a good recipe for happiness for these or any other times. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include this recipe:

Take equal parts of faith and courage, mix well with a sense of humor, sprinkle with a few tears, and add a helping of kindness for others. Bake in a good-natured oven and dust with laughter. Scrape away self-indulgence and serve in generous helpings.

Mr. Speaker, as Father Barth pointed out, that is good philosophy. I hope all of us, throughout the world, might be guided by it.

Editorial Tribute to the Late Ben J. Sallows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, just last Sunday a very old, very dear friend of mine, Ben Sallows, of Alliance, Nebr., for many years publisher of the Alliance Times-Herald, passed away. His death is a great loss to me personally. It is likewise a great loss to the city of Alliance and to all Nebraska.

Mr. President, I have here an editorial from the Alliance Daily Times-Herald of December 18 about Ben Sallows. Because the editorial expresses so well what I feel, and what all the people of Nebraska feel, I ask to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. Any community or State is most fortunate if it has a citizen like Ben Sallows.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEN J. SALLOWS

"Ol' Ben used to tell 'em."

"He ran the town but most people liked it."

"He did a lot for Alliance."

These and many other similar remarks were heard on Box Butte Avenue Sunday after the news noised around that Ben J. Sallows had died that morning. We would add with the highest of esteem:

"Whatta character."

Here was a personage who was a dozen newspapermen wrapped into one, plus a sixth sense for making money. Ben could write the news or ad copy, set it on the machines or stone, lock up the forms, make up and roll the pages, stereotype from the mats, plate the press, and then print the paper. He carried many a route, too, in his day, and then swept the place out.

He didn't always do these things, of course, but he could—and the boys around the plant knew it and were relieved in the knowledge that the paper always would get out. If Ben had been twins he wouldn't have had to pay social security, for his semiweekly Times-Herald wouldn't have needed as many as eight persons. Ben was the first to learn how to operate every piece of new equipment he bought. And he always kept enough on hand to run a daily, just in case some competitor came in to challenge his twice-a-week operation that gave him more time to spread himself through the publication and more latitude for his investment ventures into other fields.

Because of what some people have called his Midas touch, Ben was able to have all the fun ordinary newspapermen do, and build a sizable fortune at the same time. Twice a week he could seek local or widespread reforms by either pouring vitriol or balm into his editorial crucible (the mixture was usually more v. than b.), and then he could spend the week end out in the financial world. But whenever he wanted to relax he dropped back at the office at night after everyone else had left and busied himself setting up a job that some customer was needing from his printing plant. Any summation of Ben's life must classify him as a printer at heart.

He took the time from his varied activities to help Alliance grow into Nebraska's twelfth largest city. He was western Nebraska's greatest booster for farm-to-market roads, and served the last year of his life as Governor Val Peterson's highway consultant—without ever putting in a bill for the $6,000 salary the post was supposed to pay. He put the first money down for an irrigation well in Box Butte County and spent thousands of dollars of his own money trying to get oil explorations started up this way. He didn't get behind civic projects—he was out front pulling in the harness.

We suspect that the Good Lord broke the mold when he made Ben Sallows. There never can be another quite like him. And, as the people on Box Butte Avenue were saying Sunday, Alliance can be mighty happy that he was allowed to pass this way.

Address of Hon. John J. Rooney, of New York, at the Armistice Day Ceremonies at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me, I include the following address which I delivered at the Armistice Day ceremonies held under the auspices of the Brooklyn Council, Kings County, Department of New York, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Saturday, November 11, 1950, at Veterans' Administration Hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y. The address follows:

The older veterans here will not forget that day in November 1918, "the eleventh day of the eleventh month," when word passed along the lines in France that the armistice had been signed. Few people knew what an armistice was, but every one understood that the fighting was over. At 5 minutes to 11 o'clock on that eleventh day of the eleventh month, firing ceased. There was jubilation in the air, though probably it was not as vociferous as here in New York City where the crowds went wild—the horns blew and the whistles shrieked and the ticker tape and torn up telephone directories made a snowstorm on the canyons of lower Manhattan. Profound thankfulness swelled up in every heart. At last the slaughter was over, the boys could come home, the Nation and the world was rescued from the imperialistic ambitions of Kaiser Bill, and, most of all, the world was saved for democracy and the war to end wars was finished.

There were those who would never come home, but lie forever under the white crosses. But their lives had been sacrificed in a holy and successful cause. We could be proud of them while we grieved for them. We still grieve for them, and we are still proud of them.

There were high hopes for the world springing to life on that autumn day. Now, 32 years later, sadder and wiser, we know that those hopes were not solidly founded in reality. We expected too much, too suddenly, and too soon. The Armistice turned out, in the event, to be only an armistice,

not a real peace. It was an interlude between two eras of dreadful global war.

Again, just in time for the grown-up sons of the veterans of 1917 and 1918 to be of military age, came another and longer and vaster global conflict. Again America participated. For us this time the war lasted almost 4 years. It cost us 313,000 dead and $340,000,000,000. By 1972, it is calculated, the original and subsequently accruing cost of this Second World War will have run to $700,000,000,000.

Once more, however, in 1945, we ended the war victoriously, and with high hopes for the future peace of the world. The menacing powers that by their imperialistic designs threatened the existence of all free peoples, had been virtually extinguished. We would set up an organization that would, humanly speaking, almost guarantee future peace. All the peoples of the world had suffered so from the war, and had seen so dramatically the fate of those who take to the sword in aggression, that they would demand peace for the future. Our allies and ourselves, who had stood together so well to defeat the common enemy, could now stand together for peace. A new era would begin, with the new powers of nature harnessed for the well-being of all.

But now the clouds hang again over the world—east and west. War has taken place in Korea, and the gloomy prospect of a possible global conflict, a third world war, assumes the shape of reality in many minds.

We have learned much, however, out of our bitter experiences and prospects. These are some of the lessons.

First, we know that we cannot isolate ourselves from the struggles and destinies of the rest of mankind. It has been a hard lesson for us Americans to learn. We grew up behind watery curtains of the Atlantic and Pacific. We thought we could mind our own business, if other people minded theirs, and stay out of the world's turmoil in prosperous detachment. We ought to have known better. The United States or the colonies before there was any United States, became involved in every general European war since the middle of the seventeenth century. The peoples of the earth are tied together, and we are of them.

Secondly, we have learned, in the language of a recent writer, that "there is no way of not using power." If we do nothing, if we sit down in inaction, that is using power and determining destinies. Positively or negatively every move we make or fail to make, every word we say, every attitude we strike, has repercussions to the ends of the earth, repercussions which sometimes, like an electric wave, circle round the earth and come back upon us.

Thirdly, we have learned that we have the power. In 1945 we dismantled the mightiest military machine that was ever assembled in human history. Our economic power surpasses the imagination. Our scientific skill, our level of intelligence, the skill of our inventors on the one hand and of our mechanics on the other, the infinite resources that we have in this continent or to which we have access by our command of the sea, constitute a veritable empire, grander than that of Assyria or Rome or Britain.

And we have accompanied this potential with a moral restraint, a humanity, and a generosity without parallel in the history of the world. It never happened before that a great victorious nation, after a bitter war, taxed itself to the point of injury to feed its former enemies and rebuild their economic structures, at the same time renouncing all territorial or economic fruits of conquest. There is grandeur in this. We have given $40,000,000 worth of assistance to other countries since 1945.

We acknowledge our mistakes, our sins, and our failures. Our democracy is far from perfect. But there is no reason why we should not look at the credit side of our national ledger too, and be proud of it. I have no patience with the morbid and exaggerated self-criticism in which Americans sometimes indulge. We should stay as far from it as we should from vainglorious boasting.

Yet, we cannot disguise from ourselves that again we are living in a critical era. The malignant power of Red fascism has arisen to take the place of Germany and Japan in seeking dominance over the earth. But recently, in Korea, we have thwarted one misguided attempt to seize a key point in Asia. There will be other attempts by Soviet Russia, in other parts of the world, whenever the time appears ripe for them. And the ripe time for them will be when we relax and let down our guard. We must be prepared to take action wherever in the world aggression rears its ugly head. We must not delude ourselves into thinking everything will be all right. Once more it is an eleventh hour—this time, for resistance to the new imperialism of Soviet Russia. America must proceed with her arming, whatever the cost to the Nation or the dislocation to individual lives. This we owe to the dead of the Argonne and the First World War, to the dead of Iwo Jima and the Second World War, to the dead of Korea in this year 1950, and to all the future generations of American citizens. We must keep faith with the past and with the future.

A Soldier's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a prayer by Lt. William Reavis Roberts, who was killed in line of duty in a plane crash on March 2, 1944.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOLDIER'S PRAYER

(By Lt. William Reavis Roberts)

Almighty God, Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, be with this soldier in his hour of need. Strengthen my heart that I may have the courage to perform my duties to my country and Thee. Strengthen my mind that I may not lose sight for what I fight. Strengthen my soul that I may not hate my fellow man nor forget the ideals for which my Saviour gave His life.

I beseech Thee, O Lord, to be with my comrades in arms wherever they may be in this world. Cheer them in their hours of melancholy and depression; befriend them when they feel all alone; lighten their hearts when they feel homesick. Share Thy infinite wisdom with them when they lose sight of their goal and wonder for what they are fighting.

We pray, O Lord, not only for our comrades but for the brave men of all nations. Be with them in their hour of need and try to show them their mistake.

We ask Thy mercy for our friends and comrades who have given their lives. Judge them justly and we know they will be in Your greater army, for Thou, O Lord, dost see beyond their seeming callousness. Forgive them of their faults and take them to Thy bosom.

Be with the families of those who are gone. Keep them from becoming bitter. Comfort them when the other boys return.

And now, Father, we ask Thee to make us strong and true, capable of victory and just peacemakers.

Statement Before Twenty-seventh Annual Convention of the Marine Corps League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made to the twenty-seventh annual national convention, Marine Corps League, Wednesday session, September 6, 1950:

Worthy Commandant, chairman, distinguished officers of the Marine Corps League, delegates and ladies and gentlemen, as the chairman just said in so graciously presenting me, my plane was grounded in Wilkes-Barre on the 9 o'clock flight this morning, and I could not get off.

Now I don't mean this to be any disrespect for such a distinguished array of patriotic Americans as this outfit but this was my first 3 or 4 days off this session and believe me, ordinarily if that plane had been grounded and I had such a decent and legitimate excuse, even in the presence of my fellow townsman from Wilkes-Barre, Father Michael J. Haley, I would have used a half dozen white lies to stay in the Poconos and not come down here. However, in view of a newspaper story I saw last night, I thought I better come down or I would die without a blessing. Never let it be said that a poor Irishman from the State of Pennsylvania would run out of a hot spot like this. Not me.

I might say that I had in my time addressed many very interesting audiences, but this is the first policemen's convention that I ever attended. I don't mind getting mixed up with one traffic cop at a time, but 40,000 is too tough for me.

But, seriously, insofar as the leathernecks are concerned, washed or unwashed, I think that actions speak louder than words. I don't think that the Marine Corps needs any advocate or special pleading. I believe that the United States Marine Corps' record remains inviolate, and, if I can borrow a phrase of President Lincoln, "far beyond our poor power to add or to detract."

Now I say further, Mr. Chairman, that the Marine Corps does not need a propaganda organization; but if it does, then I take it for granted that, as usual, the Marine Corps will have the best propaganda organization possible. Nothing unusual about that.

Mr. Chairman, the only "red" that I know of in the Marine Corps was spilled in the woods of northern France and on the sands of Iwo Jima and in the jungles of the Pacific, from the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli.

Mr. Chairman, when the Washington Monument has sunk into the Potomac and when the White House has crumbled into dust, the United States Marine Corps will still be found remaining true to its motto, "Semper fidelis."

I must apologize to this convention. I must apologize to the gentlemen of the press who are kind enough to attend today, in that I have my prepared speech and the copies thereof, a sufficient number, Major Hegarty of the Marines assures me, but it will be found at the Wilkes-Barre-Scranton Airport in a brief case with my shirts.

However, I have had the privilege of speaking on the floor of the House on several occasions in behalf of the Marine Corps and I had intended to speak further in support of the suggestions of that great American, that fine gentleman, my distinguished colleague from Georgia, Mr. CARL VINSON, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the House, in support, I say, of his most recent suggestion that there be three divisions of the Marine Corps at full Marine Corps strength of at least 23,000 combat men to a division and going a little further, adding one full air wing to each division. I believe that was four divisions rather than three divisions that CARL VINSON suggested.

Just 1 week before that on the floor and in a Mutual Broadcasting System broadcast I had suggested six full-strength Marine divisions at a strength of about 23,000 with a separate air wing for tactical support for each division, because you know and I know, because you told me and proved it to me, that Marine air is Marine artillery. That is Marine field artillery, Marine tactical air in support of ground troops. That is why I felt and that is why I suggested that the Corps be developed into six full divisions. Your divisions are 5,000 or 6,000 men bigger than the modern triangular Army division. I repeat—giving you about 23,000 and a wing for each division.

On that question of Marine air I would like to indicate this, that in the invasion of South Korea by the North Korean Communist Army there was demonstrated the ineffectiveness now of close air support under conditions of low visibility. Now, it is embarrassing to say this. I do not like to admit it. I feel very sad that I have to say it to you, but even the Marine Air Corps in low visibility, at zero, even the Marine Air Force, cannot properly conduct tactical air support. And they can't do that at night, good weather or bad weather.

Now, that is something must be done about and the Marines are doing something about that. They are experimenting with and perfecting this newest of new tactical air support tactics with ground troops—night and bad weather tactics as well.

I am advised by the people who know that bad weather conditions or night conditions for this kind of work exist about 40 percent of the time. In other words, out of every 24 hours, 9½ hours are suitable for visual and visible air-ground support. That means that for about 14½ hours of that same period there cannot be such tactical support from the air.

That raises this question: What is going to be done to develop an all-weather system of guiding tactical aircraft to and from targets under actual combat condition? That is a big question. I have told you that the marines are attacking and working with that problem.

The Marines are charged with the development of equipment that is known as special equipment and special technique in the support of amphibious operations for landing troops. That you know. Now, since World War II this development has pushed far ahead into this visible support project. That is going on at Quantico and at other places. At the present time a complete evaluation of this problem has been made and there are specific units identified with that problem.

It is always a money problem. I happen to be on the Committee on Appropriations in the House. I know whereof I speak. You have friends there. You have friends in the House. Many of them time and again during this session know, or at least your officers directly connected with these matters know, in the committees and on the floor, when that fine friend of the corps, that great young Congressman from Texas, MAHON, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Armed Services has assured me and assured MIKE MANSFIELD, another marine and great Congressman, that there was not and will not be the intention of his subcommittee or the full committee to emasculate or destroy or put out of business the United States Corps of Marines.

Now, because of this monetary limitation it may take a little time, maybe 2 years, to complete this new program to full operational control. That is to be expected, but you should know that it is being given high priority in matériel, equipment, and funds to accelerate this development. They can make it operational in 1 year under emergency circumstances and those now exist.

Now, the Army did work in this field. Your airmen know of a Hodge report this year, 1950, when they laid down the requirements for the Air Force for close tactical ground support. They are not doing exactly the same thing or in exactly the same way but there is that goal, there is that understanding and that coordination does exist. That you will be happy to know.

Now, I intended and in my prepared address I devoted several paragraphs to itemizing the specific questions and the answers to this extremely interesting and important to you problem of night and bad weather air tactical support that the Marines are specializing in and developing for ground troops.

I do not care to ad lib or talk extemporaneously from notes on such a highly technical problem. I am not sure I am qualified without having before me a manuscript of which you and I could be sure.

But let us talk about this for a minute. Father, when I go too long you start down that aisle. I know you are going to take up a second collection and I will get out of here. We had the first one.

Mr. Chairman, at the outbreak of these Korean hostilities this country's armed forces were scattered and deployed through many sections of the world. General MacArthur had about 160,000 troops in Japan and our Government maintained a small occupation force—you might call them occupation armies if you want to be courteous—in Germany, Austria, and the Adriatic. That is the Trieste area. The Air Force had bombers in Britain, fighting planes at Weisbaden on the Rhine and at a base in North Africa. Many of you may have forgotten we reestablished that old base in North Africa after it had been abandoned. The Navy had an Asiatic squadron and a Mediterranean squadron.

Never before in a period of technical world peace did we have so many land and sea garrisons and air detachments stationed in a—what would you call it—a posture of war, stationed in danger areas where alert attention was required for the potential, impending war.

Now, I want to quote from a man I never had the pleasure of meeting, but I certainly would like to meet him. He is a newspaperman, B. F. Gordon, and I want to use this quotation from one of his remarks on the marines:

"But a familiar element was lacking. Even a cursory survey of our foreign placements invited the question, 'Where are the United States marines?' The answer was, on the 25th of June 1950, the marines were all home—all 71,000 of them, except a few on temporary naval assignment.

"Now, consequently in the Korean emergency, marines had to be transported across the Pacific and in some cases across the country and then across the Pacific to support General MacArthur and the fact that the marines were ready to go to Asia proved anew the indispensability of the Marine Corps in matters of national defense."

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, I have to add that the marines were confined to marine barracks and drill yards because the marines wanted it that way. They were contained and their ranks reduced because under the Military Act—I thought so and others of my colleagues actually thought so—apparently there was an intention to abolish the Marine Corps.

Marine training as well as Marine tradition admirably equips Marine regiments for occupation, especially at such places like Trieste. I was over there last November.

In large-scale hostilities, Marine companies are best adapted to amphibious operations. The marines proved that in the Pacific war. When it comes to plans and operations only the marines can provide the seasoned officers who combine both Army and Navy education and experiences plus their own specialty. Those I mentioned a few minutes ago.

Now, as a tribute to the 175 years of this outfit, Admiral Vinson has started what I consider is the beginning of the right way and I promise you I will support him and I have every reason to believe that the Congress will support him.

It required this Korean incident to reveal a fact that on June 25 for the first time in our history the United States had armed garrisons or occupation forces in different parts of the world with no marines in them. I construe that to be a complete reversal of an old, established policy in our Armed Forces.

In the old days when armies and navies were small, it was the Marine Corps which made the foreign landing to protect the American interest and actually provided policemen for the Navy at sea.

In the First World War the marines went ashore with the Army in France. And they fought at Chateau Thierry and Belleau Wood.

In the last war the marines, master of amphibious operations, preceded the Army in Guadalcanal and hit all those beaches on Pacific islands that became advance, stationary airplane carriers for future operations—those islands.

At present, Mr. Chairman, Soviet imperialism has made a large Army and a large Navy and an unprecedented Air Force an absolute necessity. And amidst these immense mobilizations the Marine Corps looks numerically unimportant. I have indicated that I have had occasion to suspect there were those who thought that its usefulness was over. In fact, however, when Soviet imperialism is destroyed, and destroyed it must be, then the extended Army, Navy, and Air Force will be restricted to a rational, peacetime basis. Now, in that better day—it will soon come we hope—we still want the Marines to be an elite, mobile agency to help keep order in the world, not forgetting that the Marines as always will be the first to fight and every ready if, God forbid, there is ever another war.

This is very interesting. You are a fine audience. I would like to go on like Tennyson's brook, but I know what conventions are. I know this will develop into an endurance contest. This audience is very polite, very attentive, Mr. Chairman. I never saw Marines behave like this. It is a great, great world.

You know, we have a fellow from my town, Pat Macher, a State senator he was. He was born in this country. His parents were born in Lithuania. He was a very successful businessman and is now very wealthy—a good fellow. He will sit down at home—a beautiful home, he has a beautiful wife—and he will have a great big steak with all the trimmings. He will sit back and loosen his belt and open a bottle of brandy, rock back and forth and say, "Boy, am I glad my old man did not miss that boat." I suppose that applies to a lot of us.

In talking to this audience, Mr. Chairman, it suggested this story. I tell you, I come from the coal fields and the afternoon shift in the coal fields comes off at 3:30 and the streetcars up in Wilkes-Barre start in the square and go out to the coal patches out in the valley. This fellow finishes his shift and comes in and he is sitting in the streetcar and you know those streetcars. In front

they have seats facing forward and in the back they have seats going this way, down the side for 15 or 20 feet, and then they go like that for the rest of the way. The miners usually go in the back. The fellows are dirty and that is where the miners usually sit.

This fellow is sitting there and he had a tough shift and he was tired. He has got his feet up and he is taking a little nap. In comes this lady. She is dressed up like Mrs. Astor's pet horse. She got her nose up in the air and she looks around and says to this fellow, "Why don't you put your feet where they belong?"

He said, "Don't tempt me, lady; don't tempt me."

I got better ones than that. I will see you tonight. Got to keep this clean; it is official.

I just want to say this. I am not going to complete all of these notes. I want to tell you that my family has been in the Marines for a long long time, I guess in about every show we have had. My mother's youngest brother had an awful name for the Marines, Florence McCarthy. Isn't that a tough name for a marine to have? A red-headed guy named Florence. He died with the garrison at Peking after the Boxer show a long time ago. I still have, Mr. Chairman, up in the attic, a white pith helmet they had with a long gold spike in it, with a white chin strap made out of some corrugated cloth down the front and the back like the old British marines. And the overcoat weighs about a ton. It goes way down to the ankle and way down at the ankle there is the marine blue. It has got three tiers of things on it, the capes—three tiers of capes and rows of buttons down the front. You could hardly carry it. I still have those two pieces of equipment of my Uncle Florence—a great guy. So I have a right to be here. You are not doing me any favor. I've got a right.

So may I express to you my gratitude for your invitation. My compliments to you for this convention. I do not have the honor of being a delegate today. Let me tell you this as I close. Every marine can be a Congressman, but every Congressman cannot be a marine.

Resolution Condemning the Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the sixty-ninth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, meeting at Houston, Tex., recently adopted unanimously a resolution condemning the partition of Ireland.

The resolution, which requests the American Federation of Labor delegates to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions to bring the movement for the ending of partition to a successful conclusion, reads as follows:

Whereas the American Federation of Labor in their national conventions of 1949, recorded their opposition to the continued partition of Ireland; and

Whereas history records that whenever and wherever foreign powers have seized countries and attempted to force their rule on peoples has led to nothing but strife and discord, thereby usurping the right of the majority of people to govern themselves; and

Whereas the money of the American freedom-loving men and women, collected through taxes, is being disbursed in the form of European recovery aid to England, which, in turn, is subsidizing minority form of government in Northeast Ireland which is contrary to the wishes of the majority of the Irish people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention of the American Federation of Labor, respectfully request the American Federation of Labor delegates to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions to bring to a successful conclusion the end of the partition of Ireland.

Present and Pre-World War II Status of American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a quarterly report of the Joint Committee for the American merchant marine, setting forth the problems of the merchant marine.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The attached tables show clearly the present and pre-World War II status of the American merchant marine.

The material in the tables is significant in several respects, as follows:

1. The United States flag active seagoing merchant marine is notably larger in number of vessels and in total tonnage than in 1939. But it is woefully deficient in fast, modern passenger-carrying vessels quickly convertible to troop transports in event of emergency. In addition, the once sizable domestic merchant fleet is today less than one-half its pre-World War II size and importance, and even more deficient in the coastwise and intercoastal trades.

2. Among the merchant fleets of the world, the nations which are recipients of American-financed aid programs (Great Britain, Norway, Netherlands, France, Sweden) have larger tonnages of merchant fleets than they did in mid-1939, while Italy and Greece have almost recovered their pre-World War II tonnages. Even Russia, while not in the first 10 maritime nations of the world in mid-1939, based upon tonnage, today is in tenth place. In actual numbers of privately owned vessels, the United States possesses fewer today than it did in mid-1939, although privately owned vessel tonnage is substantially more today than prewar. The latter fact is indicative of the much larger individual size of merchant vessels today compared to 1939.

3. In seagoing merchant vessels tonnage being built for the most important maritime nations of the world, the United States is at the bottom of the list, surpassed even by its former enemies of World War II, and by the principal recipients of its various Government-financed aid programs.

4. The percentage of American imports and exports carried in United States flag vessels continues to decline, in 4 years having dropped 21.4 percent. The losses by American ships in the participation of United States foreign trade have been reflected in substantially increased participation by foreign merchant fleets in this trade, principally by the fleets of nations receiving American aid.

Merchant fleets of the world, 1939–50

[Merchant-type vessels of 1,000 gross tons and over only. In thousands of dead-weight tons]

	Number	Tonnage
MID-1939		
Total	12,655	79,138.6
United Kingdom	2,850	21,857.0
United States (private)	1,236	10,219.7
Japan	1,180	7,145.4
Norway	1,072	6,931.2
Germany	854	5,177.1
Italy	667	3,910.8
Netherlands	537	3,424.6
France	555	2,998.8
Greece	436	2,791.0
Sweden	484	2,033.1
Others	2,784	12,649.9
MID-1950		
Total	10,708	81,812.0
United Kingdom	2,586	22,018.0
United States (private) [1]	1,174	13,991.0
Norway	945	7,567.0
Panama	485	4,984.0
Netherlands	493	3,672.0
France	511	3,595.0
Italy	406	3,382.0
Sweden	539	2,705.0
Greece	227	1,933.0
U. S. S. R.	437	1,824.0
Others	2,905	* 16,141.0

[1] As of Nov. 1, 1950, excludes 194 active Maritime Administration owned vessels of 1,995 dead-weight tons.

NOTE.—Excludes vessels under military ownership.

World merchant vessel construction,[1] mid-1950

[Oceangoing vessels of 1,000 gross tons and over. In thousands of dead-weight tons]

Country of registry	Total	Passenger carrying [2]	Freighter	Tanker
United Kingdom	2,332.7	335.0	723.2	1,274.5
Norway	2,211.8	13.2	300.0	1,898.6
France	808.9	144.4	356.1	308.4
Sweden	570.6	18.6	263.3	288.7
Japan	355.5	-------	283.6	71.9
Denmark	275.1	3.0	111.9	160.2
Panama	269.6	-------	8.5	261.1
Germany	226.3	-------	223.7	2.6
Italy	224.4	136.6	16.5	71.3
Netherlands	189.1	46.6	94.1	48.4
United States	169.1	68.6	10.5	90.0
All others	1,547.9	218.6	394.7	934.6
Total	9,181.0	984.6	2,786.1	5,410.3

[1] Includes vessels on order.
[2] Over 12 passengers.

United States flag seagoing merchant marine

Ships	1939	Nov. 1, 1950
Total active ships	[1] 1,094	[2] 1,330
Domestic trades	775	483
Foreign trades	319	847
Total active passenger ships	134	50
Domestic trades	56	9
Foreign trades	78	41
Total active freighters	608	841
Domestic trades	415	205
Foreign trades	193	636
Total active tankers	352	439
Domestic trades	304	269
Foreign trades	48	170
Inactive ships	306	2,054

[1] Includes 43 Government-owned vessels temporarily on charter.
[2] Includes 191 Government-owned vessels temporarily on charter, of which 129 are time-chartered to MSTS. Also 85 privately owned vessels are time-chartered to MSTS.

Percentage of United States foreign trade carried in American-flag vessels

	Percent
1946	67.6
1947	59.8
1948	54.8
1949	49.8
1950 [1]	46.2

[1] January–June 1950.

Demand for the Removal of Dean Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release from my office on the subject Demand for the Removal of Dean Acheson.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., October 11, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, (Republican, Nevada), today renewed his demand for the removal of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. The demand was made in a major address before the national convention of the American Legion.

He further demanded that ECA aid be cancelled to European nations furnishing manufactured and processed goods to Russia—and that England and France cancel their nonaggression pacts with Russia.

Senator MALONE, a Legionaire himself who has served in many capacities in the Legion, from post adjutant to national vice commander, told the convention delegates in a hard hitting speech that the Legion should furnish the leadership in the determining of America's foreign policy, inasmuch as veterans know best what war means.

The Nevada Senator accused the administration of giving lip service to his bill providing for universal military training and then blocking it when it was before the Senate committee. In support of universal military training, Senator MALONE said it was not war, but "murder," to send untrained boys into battle as was done in the early days of the Korean campaign.

Senator MALONE attacked the Democratic administration for its handling of foreign affairs, national defense, and for its home-front program. The Senator said that we are now helping to arm Russia to wage world war III against us, "through Marshall plan aid which is finding its way to iron-curtain countries."

He called attention to administration actions on the home front and in foreign affairs which, according to the Senator, indicate possible treachery in high places. "On the home front," Senator MALONE said, "the Red plot has been carried on within the administration by a constant attack on American industry. This attack has come through: first, Government regulations so designed as to eliminate venture capital, which made this country great; second, taxes so designed as to eliminate initiative; third, a foreign 'free trade' policy so designed as to curtail domestic production; and fourth, reckless spending on the part of the Government so designed as to threaten our whole economic structure."

Senator MALONE said there was no such thing as a bipartisan foreign policy, and he expressed the opinion that we have no foreign policy, "except that which would provide for our sending our taxpayers' money abroad in every way possible, including financing European socialist governments."

Senator MALONE said, "The United States should immediately establish a definite foreign policy, naming the nations in Europe, Asia, the south seas, and Africa, if any, whose integrity is important to our ultimate safety, notifying the world that we would consider the attempt of any nation to extend its system of government into those areas as dangerous to our peace and safety.

"The Nation should immediately build a national defense organization spearheaded by an air corps and a submarine fleet which would bear silent evidence to the world and to American people that this country is ready and willing to defend its commitments."

Seafaring Unions Call for Immediate Mobilization of Maritime Industry To Meet Any Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of the seafaring unions, which call for immediate mobilization of the maritime industry to meet any emergency.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAFARING UNIONS CALL FOR IMMEDIATE MOBILIZATION OF MARITIME INDUSTRY TO MEET ANY EMERGENCY

Our country and the free countries of the world today are faced with the most critical emergency in history.

Communist aggression is marching almost unchecked through great sections of the world and there can be little doubt in anyone's mind today that unless our country and its resources are fully mobilized for defense and offense as rapidly as possible, we face even graver dangers than those of World War II.

The maritime unions, comprising as they do all of the men who man the merchant ships traveling the trade routes of the world, feel that the urgency of the present situation makes it necessary for all possible steps to be taken to mobilize the all-important marine transportation field, if we are to be prepared to meet the onslaught of an enemy, far more ruthless than the Fascist-Nazi-Japanese hordes of World War II.

The beginning of World War II found the maritime industry in the worst possible state because of lack of planning in Government circles. We had few ships, and no adequate plans for building ships or repairing ships. We were lacking in manpower. Labor representation both before and during the war was practically nonexistent. This same mistake should not be repeated.

Until the latter years of the war our country did not have the fleet that it should have had for the transportation of men, supplies, and materials to the various war fronts of the world. In spite of that, however, the know-how and tremendous production resources of our country, plus the untiring efforts of the men in the maritime industry, successfully carried out the world's greatest transocean movement of troops, supplies, and material. Ninety-four percent of personnel, supplies, and material were carried abroad on merchant vessels, manned by civilian crews.

In World War II merchant seamen demonstrated their courage, ability, and efficiency beyond question. Not one vessel was delayed as a result of labor disputes. Pledges made by the maritime unions at the outbreak of World War II were fully kept. Thousands of seamen gave their lives to assure the successful transportation of great masses of troops, supplies, and war materials to all the war fronts of the world.

In this emergency the seamen now ask only that they be given the opportunity to contribute of their skill and know-how in the shaping of policy to guarantee the greatest all-out mobilization of the maritime industry for defense of our country and the free world.

Our experience in World War II should be taken advantage of. The maritime unions, representing 250,000 licensed and unlicensed personnel on the merchant ships and in the shipyards, urgently recommend to the authorities responsible for gearing our country for all-out defense that the following program be put into effect immediately, to assure an adequate sea transportation force that will guarantee the speedy, efficient transporting of men, supplies, and material to all points in the world where they may be needed:

1. All shipping that is not combat shipping and direct auxiliary shipping for combat ships should be placed under the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Board. Neither the Navy, the Army, nor the Air Force should operate any commercial vessels, either for transportation of troops, supplies, or material. The operators of the private merchant marine, with their vast experience, and maritime labor with its experience, should be called upon for this operation.

If an all-out war should come upon us, manpower in the Armed Forces will be needed to the utmost. Navy operation of commercial vessels would be particularly wasteful. Such operation has always taken excessive manpower, using as it does up to three times as many seamen as are used on a civilian-operated vessel.

These merchant vessels under the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Board would be in a pool, to be used on the basis of the allocations required by the chiefs of the military operations and those responsible for the movement of strategic materials.

2. Appropriations should be made available at once to the Federal Maritime Board for the purpose of surveying and putting into ready condition our entire merchant fleet of 2,000 vessels, now laid up, so that in the present emergency vessels which may be required on short notice will be available and in condition for immediate operation.

3. The appropriations so made available for the Maritime Board should also take into consideration the immediate reopening of ship-repair and shipbuilding yards throughout the country. In this connection a program should be immediately put into effect for building fast combination freighter-troop carrying vessels, to replace in as short a time as possible the slower Liberty-type vessels which form the majority of the present laid-up fleet.

4. Immediate steps should be taken to empower the Federal Maritime Board to institute manpower mobilization plans and training facilities in order to assure an adequate supply of skilled manpower reserve for this expanded merchant-marine tonnage.

Drafting of skilled seamen into the Armed Forces should cease at once. In the opening years of World War II, many thousands of skilled seamen were drafted into the Armed Forces without regard to the needs of the all-important merchant marine. Such lack

of foresight should not be permitted during this emergency.

In connection with manpower training, drafting of seamen, and the many other questions in this phase of emergency mobilization, no planning should be done without the full participation of marine labor and management on the policy-making levels.

The maritime unions feel that no time should be spared in calling together all of the segments of the maritime industry, both in management and labor, for the purpose of getting these plans into active shape.

Any delay in fully mobilizing the all-important sea transportation could prove to be fatal. Therefore, we urgently request immediate adoption of the plans outlined above.

JOSEPH CURRAN,
Chairman, CIO Maritime Committee.

In Defense of States' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release from my office entitled "In Defense of States' Rights."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 10, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican of Nevada, today charged the Truman administration with completely abandoning the fundamental American principle of States' rights, attempting to take legislative powers away from the State governments, and, in a statement issued from his Washington office, he cited "as evidence to back up the charges the attempt on the part of administration leaders to push through, during the closing hours of the recent session of Congress, legislation which would have had the effect of nullifying State laws."

"In this Republic of States," the Nevada Senator said, "the member States have always made their own laws and enforced them, and the Federal Government has not interfered, and yet, in the conference report on gambling device legislation, administration leaders sought to stop gambling in Nevada through stopping the shipment of gambling paraphernalia across State lines in the absence of special legislation. It would be like stopping racing in California, Florida, New York, or Kentucky, through a bill prohibiting the shipment of race horses across State lines.

"The question of whether or not gambling should be legal was not before the Senate. The question at issue was the right of a State legislature, representing the people of a sovereign State to pass legislation within the framework of the Constitution of the United States without being continually badgered by a Congress which has shifted most of its constitutional responsibilities to the executive branch of the Government. That is the principle I defended on the Senate floor for nearly 12 hours during the closing hours of this session of Congress.

"The Federal Government has continued to encroach upon the States for the past 18 years until, unless soon halted, the governors of the 48 States will shortly become merely a board of directors for a President drunk with power.

"The United States Senate is the last open forum in the world. They have so far resisted the control of the executive branch of the Government. The House, however, is absolutely controlled by the majority party and is no longer an open forum. Thirty seconds to 3 minutes is a long time to let a Congressman talk and the Speaker is not compelled to recognize him.

"The Executive has exerted continual pressure to secure cloture through a floor majority vote in the Senate, but cooler heads recognizing that would mean complete domination of the United States Senate by the executive branch has successfully beat off such attacks and maintained the Senate's independence through requiring two-thirds vote of all of the Members of the Senate—64 actual votes to invoke cloture—shut off debate in the Senate.

"The Constitution established three independent branches of Government—legislative, executive, and the judicial—the public is well informed on what happened to the judicial branch. The executive branch has gradually been absorbed by the Communist tinged group through the Democratic Party, therefore, the independence of the legislative branch must be maintained.

"The United States Senate floor is the only place left where a vital principle can be debated until the public is informed. Cloture should never be invoked except in a national emergency and I am glad to say that through the medium of the Senate, Congress is slowly recovering from the rubber-stamp period."

Restrain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter from one of my constituents which appeared in the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, December 13, 1950:

CALLS CRITIC INTOLERANT

To the EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

Thirty years of experience as a newspaperman have made me certain of one thing—it is not what you know, not even whom you know, but largely what you know and do not write that gets you some peace of mind.

In other words, I positively disagree with those who are making so much fuss about the now famous letter of President Truman to that Washington music critic. I mean that, in my considered opinion, the critic—and his editor—are to be censured or pitied for their lack of consideration, of foresight, and of ethics in a profession which I am proud to claim.

Would less harm not have been done had Mr. Critic been "charitable" and not even submitted his "treasured museum piece"? What good to anyone has the publication of (to me understandable) "peave" on the part of our Chief Executive done? If that isn't giving aid and comfort to the enemy, I miss my guess.

Tolerance, I say, is a worthy ideal—but those who know better, seem to me intolerant.

JACK TEPPER.

Reasons for the Immediate Construction of Fast Cargo and Passenger Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum setting forth the reasons, as written by myself, why the Government should authorize the immediate construction of fleet cargo ships and other ships.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM

The following are reasons why the Government should authorize immediate construction of fast cargo ships and passenger ships now under consideration in Washington: National defense is the only consideration underlying all of these reasons.

1. Present deficiency in certain types of ships:

(a) Our dry-cargo fleet consists principally of Liberty ships and, to a much smaller extent, Victorys and so-called long-range cargo ships. Libertys make up far and away the bulk of the total of 11-knot ships which, in time of war, can be used only in convoys whose speed is somewhat less than that. The balance of the fleet is made up of ships whose sea speed by and large does not exceed 15 knots. There is serious question from a military standpoint whether convoys can be used successfully in major war. Current military thinking is that safety lies in dispersal rather than concentration. Dispersal means that a ship must be able to run it alone and to do this the only adequate defense is speed of about 20 knots in view of the current development of the submarine. We have no 20-knot cargo ships. The Maritime Administration has seen the need of providing cargo ships of that speed and has already had plans for such a ship developed. The matter now rests squarely with Congress to permit funds, already appropriated to the Maritime Administration, to be used for this purpose.

(b) Fast passenger ships: We have today only about one-third of the number of passenger ships we had prewar with less than half the carrying capacity. Our deficiency in potential troop-carrying tonnage is too well known to require elaboration. Everyone seems to agree that that is so yet, in 5 years since the end of the war, we have begun only six passenger ships in this country. These ships are large and complicated and require a long time to build. We cannot wait for a major conflict to be upon us if we hope to overcome this serious deficiency that could easily jeopardize our capacity to wage war abroad.

2. Preservation of shipbuilding skills: There is presently so little work ahead for American shipyards there is real question as to the ability of the industry to maintain a nucleus of shipbuilding skills and design and engineering capacity necessary to carry on a wartime shipbuilding program. The industry is in far worse condition today than it was prior to World War II. At the present time there is a heavy exodus of skilled shipyard labor going into other industries with every likelihood that the greater part

of this labor will be forever lost to American shipyards. It is as important to keep in peacetime a healthy shipbuilding industry as it is to train in peacetime the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

3. Help from others: Much has been said in high places about the great reliance we can place on our maritime allies for ships and shipping in time of war. How much real reliance we can place on them, when the chips are down, is indicated by the kind of help we are getting today in Korea. Not one Allied shipyard outside of the United States is beyond easy attacking range of Red-held territory. In the last war the shipyards of the United States had to carry almost 100 percent of the load of both building and repairing. There is nothing in the prospects of world war III to lead one to conclude that there would be any difference in that respect.

If the shipyards of this country are expected to carry the load for all the allies, the Government should have some interest in seeing that there will be, when the time comes, an available industry. Building the ships now contemplated by the Maritime Administration will help make this possible.

Issues in the Connecticut Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert a remarkable letter in the Appendix of the RECORD. It was written by Dr. Paul Rosahn, of 92 Grand Street, New Britain, Conn.

I say it is a remarkable letter because Dr. Rosahn underscores a basic problem of the democratic process when he points out that many members of the medical profession in Connecticut were asked to vote against a candidate on the basis of a single issue when by far the most important issue was not socialized medicine but which candidate was best qualified to work for the peace Americans seek.

It is my belief that Dr. Rosahn has sound advice for the leadership of such special groups, applying, as it does, to everyone with a stake in our democratic Government and a stake in world peace. However, Dr. Rosahn's own actions are a fine example that men vote as they please regardless of how their leaders seek to guide them.

I might add here that in a letter to constituents I stated my unequivocal opposition to socialized medicine.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

NEW BRITAIN, CONN., *November 6, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BENTON: I have received this day your letter of October 30, together with enclosures including a copy of your letter to Dr. Feeney under date of September 8.

This is the eve of election day, and no man knows what tomorrow's results may bring. But I should like to assure you, regardless of the outcome, that I am personally loyal to you and your program. I view with deep concern the policy of rejecting candidates solely on their attitude toward a single issue, in this instance the problem of supply not adequate, but the best possible medical care to the most people at a cost which they can meet. This is a serious and urgent problem, and many different answers by good minds have been given to it. But it is not the only problem, nor at the moment is it the most immediate. Of far greater importance is the issue of peace, for without peace, no medical plan, however ingenious, can function.

It is ironic that with the world on the brink of disaster, members of the healing professions should be primarily concerned not with curing the world of its ills, but with maintaining traditional methods of practice.

It is because of your stand on the important issues of peace and democracy that I endorse you, Mr. BENTON, and hope for your success tomorrow. Whether you are for or against so-called socialized medicine matters little in the face of these larger issues.

Yours respectfully,
PAUL D. ROSAHN.

In Defense of Installment Buying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release from my office on the subject Defense of Installment Buying.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 3, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE (Republican, Nevada), today charged President Truman and the Democratic administration with turning their back on the low-income and middle-income American families and he offered as evidence the new credit curb on installment buying.

In a statement issued by his Washington office, Senator MALONE said:

"Who is hurt by Mr. Truman's curb on installment buying? Certainly not the wealthy families. They do not need to buy things on the installment plan. The installment buying plan has been a great blessing to the low-income and middle-income families. It accounts to a great extent for the high standard of living in America, because it brings into the modest homes from coast to coast the things which make better living.

"Had Mr. Truman and his planners had their way in the earlier years of American economy and free enterprise, America today would resemble those miserable European countries where installment buying and other economic advantages are unheard of.

"The President says he must curb the buying power of American families. One of the reasons given for boosting the already high Federal income taxes, you will recall, to 'siphon off' the rise in wages, was to curb buying power and to prevent inflation—raising wages is only another indirect source for increased Federal taxes. I do not think the American people will continue to stand for this kind of subterfuge and interference with their life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

"Mr. Truman has pretended to be the friend of the American worker, but his credit curb on the middle-income group which he has invoked is as bad a stab in the back as the American worker could possibly receive, and it is absolutely unnecessary. Don't let any of the socialist minded monetary and credit manipulators tell you the war emergency requires this outrageous step against the people. Other steps can be taken which would make this unnecessary. It has no basis whatsoever in sound national economy.

"The simple fact is the war situation is being used as an excuse for this and other steps toward peacetime regimentation and national socialism. It is part of the softening-up process to get us to accept true socialism, which objective is the same as communism, government ownership of property. We have observed the encroachment of socialism, step by step, in our lives but I believe that such affronts as this, to the low-income and middle-income American families, will cause the people to awaken to the danger before it is too late."

Survival Under Atomic Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include information contained in a publication of the National Security Resources Board of importance to the American people.

The theme of the publication is Survival Under Atomic Attack. As the pamphlet states, we can live through an atomic attack if the people know the bomb's true dangers and know the steps you can take to escape them. It is for this reason that I insert this material in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

What I believe to be very important excerpts from the pamphlet follow:

YOU CAN SURVIVE

You can live through an atom bomb raid and you won't have to have a Geiger counter, protective clothing, or special training in order to do it.

The secrets of survival are: Know the bomb's true dangers; know the steps you can take to escape them.

Atom-splitting is just another way of causing an explosion. To begin with, you must realize that atom-splitting is just another way of causing an explosion. While an atom bomb holds more death and destruction than man has ever before wrapped in a single package, its total power is definitely limited. Not even hydrogen bombs could blow the earth apart or kill us all by mysterious radiation.

Your chances of surviving an atomic attack are better than you may have thought. Because the power of all bombs is limited, your chances of living through an atomic attack are much better than you may have thought. In the city of Hiroshima, slightly over half the people who were a mile from the atomic explosion are still alive. At Nagasaki, almost 70 percent of the people a mile from the bomb lived to tell their experiences. Today thousands of survivors of these two atomic attacks live in new houses built right where their old ones once stood. The war may have changed their way of life, but they are not riddled with cancer. Their children are

normal. Those who were temporarily unable to have children because of the radiation now are having children again.

WHAT ARE YOUR CHANCES?

Close to the explosion, your chances are only 1 out of 10. If a modern A-bomb exploded without warning in the air over your home town tonight, your calculated chances of living through the raid would run something like this ("modern" atomic bombs, as used in this booklet, refers to the "nominal" bomb described in the Effects of Atomic Weapons, published in June 1950 by the Atomic Energy Commission):

Should you happen to be one of the unlucky people right under the bomb, there is practically no hope of living through it. In fact, anywhere within one-half mile of the center of explosion, your chances of escaping are about 1 out of 10.

On the other hand, and this is the important point, from one-half to 1 mile away, you have a 50-50 chance.

Beyond a half mile, your chances of surviving increase rapidly. From 1 to 1½ miles out, the odds that you will be killed are only 15 in 100.

And at points from 1½ to 2 miles away, deaths drop all the way down to only 2 or 3 out of each 100.

Beyond 2 miles, the explosion will cause practically no deaths at all.

Injury by radioactivity does not necessarily mean you are doomed to die or be crippled. Naturally, your chances of being injured are far greater than your chances of being killed. But even injury by radioactivity does not mean that you will be left a cripple, or doomed to die an early death. Your chances of making a complete recovery are much the same as for everyday accidents. These estimates hold good for modern atomic bombs exploded without warning.

KILL THE MYTHS—ATOMIC WEAPONS WILL NOT DESTROY THE EARTH

Atomic bombs hold more death and destruction than man ever before has wrapped up in a single package, but their over-all power has very definite limits. Not even hydrogen bombs will blow the earth apart or kill us all by radioactivity.

DOUBLING BOMB POWER DOES NOT DOUBLE DESTRUCTION

Modern A-bombs can cause heavy damage 2 miles away, but doubling their power would extend that range only to 2½ miles. To stretch the damage range from 2 to 4 miles would require a weapon more than eight times the rated power of present models.

RADIOACTIVITY IS NOT THE BOMB'S GREATEST THREAT

In most atom raids, blast and heat are by far the greatest dangers that people must face. Radioactivity alone would account for only a small percentage of all human deaths and injuries, except in underground or underwater explosions.

RADIATION SICKNESS IS NOT ALWAYS FATAL

In small amounts, radioactivity seldom is harmful. Even when serious radiation sickness follows a heavy dosage, there is still a good chance for recovery.

SIX SURVIVAL SECRETS FOR ATOMIC ATTACKS

Always put first things first and—

1. Try to get shielded. If you have time, get down in a basement or subway. Should you unexpectedly be caught out of doors, seek shelter alongside a building, or jump in any handy ditch or gutter.

2. Drop flat on ground or floor. To keep from being tossed about and to lessen the chances of being struck by falling and flying objects, flatten out at the base of a wall, or at the bottom of a bank.

3. Bury your face in your arms. When you drop flat, hide your eyes in the crook of your elbow. That will protect your face from flash burns, prevent temporary blindness, and keep flying objects out of your eyes.

Never lose your head—

4. Don't rush outside right after a bombing. After an air burst, wait a few minutes, then go to help fight fires. After other kinds of bursts wait at least 1 hour to give lingering radiation some chance to die down.

5. Don't take chances with food or water in open containers. To prevent radioactive poisoning or disease, select your food and water with care. When there is reason to believe they may be contaminated, stick to canned and bottled things if possible.

6. Don't start rumors. In the confusion that follows a bombing, a single rumor might touch off a panic that could cost your life.

FIVE KEYS TO HOUSEHOLD SAFETY

1. Strive for fireproof housekeeping. Don't let trash pile up, and keep waste paper in covered containers. When an alert sounds, do all you can to eliminate sparks by shutting off the oil burner and covering all open flames.

2. Known your own home. Know which is the safest part of your cellar, learn how to turn off your oil burner and what to do about utilities.

3. Have emergency equipment and supplies handy. Always have a good flashlight, a radio, first-aid equipment, and a supply of canned goods in the house.

4. Close all windows and doors and draw the blinds. If you have time when an alert sounds, close the house up tight in order to keep out fire sparks and radioactive dusts and to lessen the chances of being cut by flying glass. Keep the house closed until all danger is past.

5. Use the telephone only for true emergencies. Do not use the phone unless absolutely necessary. Leave the lines open for real emergency traffic.

Electric Industry Can Meet Essential War and Civilian Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT CO.,
Allentown, Pa., August 25, 1950.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A few days ago Mr. L. W. Heath, of this company, called on you in Washington and pointed out the fact that the electric utility industry in general and our company, in the area we serve, have adequate electric power capacity to carry any demands which industry will place on us in the future which may arise from the military program. He emphasized, particularly, the very large construction program which we have under way and pointed out the necessity for channeling materials and supplies for power plants and transmission lines to keep our construction program on schedule.

There is no doubt about it that the crux of maintaining industrial output is one of man power and not of electrical power. We have prepared a study on this subject which ties the two problems of power supply and man power together. It is enclosed, and I do hope that you will take the opportunity to study it carefully as it is a complete answer to the question of adequacy of electric power supply now or for any future military program which may be devised.

Sincerely,

CHAS. E. OAKES,
President.

MEMORANDUM: ELECTRIC INDUSTRY CAN MEET ESSENTIAL WAR AND CIVILIAN NEEDS

Electric power will be available to meet all military and civilian needs in the event of a full-scale war. On VJ-day the total power producing capability of the electric industry amounted to 50,000,000 kilowatts. By the end of 1950 it will reach 72,000,000 kilowatts. The expansion program of the industry now in high gear will bring the total capability to around 93,000,000 kilowatts at the end of 1953—an 86 percent increase since VJ-day.

The country has industrial productive machinery capable of providing a substantial increase in war and civilian products. Increased industrial production can be brought about through more hours use of existing industrial machines and equipment. This will be done by absorbing in industry all of the available unemployed civilian labor force of 3,100,000 as well as lengthening the workweek. If still further increases in the military requirements are necessary, cutbacks of civilian production, as was done in World War II, will provide the necessary man-hours.

Stepping up the industrial effort in this manner by more hours of use of existing industrial machines, will simply require more hours of use of existing electric power producing equipment. Estimates indicate that, with complete absorption of those now unemployed and an extended workweek, longer hour use of existing electric generating plants can provide all of the additional power needed—about 45,000,000,000 of kilowatt-hours on a yearly basis and around 35 percent above industry's present record high level operation of 131,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year.

The following sets forth the above facts in some detail:

The latest reports (April 1950) show that industry is now purchasing monthly electric power amounting to 10,900,000,000 of kilowatt-hours.

At the same time the number of people employed in manufacturing, mining, and construction totals 17,500,000, while the number of unemployed totals 3,100,000.

The productive output of industry can be greatly increased by—

1. The absorption of those now unemployed into the industrial force by going to two- and three-shift operation at the present average of 39½ hours worked per week which would increase industry's monthly electric-power consumption to 12,800,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

2. An increase in the hours worked per week from the present average of 39½ to 45½, the maximum reached in World War II, which would further increase industry's power use to 14,700,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Thus, with a present productive effort using 10,900,000,000 kilowatt-hours monthly, production can be stepped-up by more hours use of the existing industrial plant with a monthly use of 14,700,000,000 kilowatt-hours, in turn obtained by more hours use of existing generating capacity, or an increase for war purposes of 3,800,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

A partial war effort utilizing 15 percent of the present industrial effort would entail an addition of only 1,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Therefore, not only can industry's electric-power requirements for a 15-percent partial war effort be adequately met but a very substantial enlargement for war production can be readily taken care of and at the same time

the present level for civilian needs be maintained.

Since the present manufacturing capacity of industry can absorb the present idle labor force, new war production plant construction would probably be limited largely to plants needed to produce new kinds of war materials for which existing plants are not adaptable, or for which no manufacturing capacity is available. The additional electric capacity required in such cases appears to be small when compared to the very substantial electrical capacity additions planned.

The record shows the development of a pattern, such as is indicated above, during World War II when electric power was never too little nor too late. At that time industry was in a more favorable position to expand production than now, as there was a much larger number of unemployed, some 8,000,000, compared to the slightly more than 3,000,000 at present. Expanded employment during World War II reached a peak of 20,000,000 in the manufacturing, mining, and construction industries and reduced the prewar total of some 8,000,000 unemployed to 670,000. As need for increased productive efforts arose, the hours worked per week were raised. This was accompanied by a rise in the electric power supplied for industrial use from around 5,000,000,000 kilowatthours monthly to 9,500,000,000—an increase of about 4,500,000,000. All-out war efforts brought about a total war load of 6,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours, the additional 2,000,000,000 monthly coming through cut-backs in civilian goods .

The presently planned capacity additions are sufficent to meet growth in civilian use with adequate reserves and will cover any increase that might result from stepped-up military needs.

This year the electric reserves of surplus generating capacity total 9,500,000 kilowatts. They can, if necessary, generate more than 55,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. This is in adition to the 45,000,000,000 of kilowatthours mentioned above—a total of 100,000,000,000 above the 131,000,000,000 present industrial use.

The electric power industry is continuing to move ahead, to build and construct, and will build as fast or faster than any other industry may build to increase production. The country can definitely depend upon the electric power industry for all power capacity needed, provided no unreasonable limitations are imposed which would prevent completion of the construction program now well under way.

In P. P. & L. Co.'s service area sufficient electric power will be available for military and civilian purposes. The company has at present more than 800,000 kilowatts available to meet the needs of home, farm and factory. This will be increased to 900,000 kilowatts in 1951 and to over 1,000,000 kilowatts by 1953. Such substantial capacity additions will make it possible to take care of customers' peak loads one-third more than present loads and still maintain sufficient protective capacity reserves.

It seems plain that the problem of increasing the Nation's productive effort is one of manpower—not one of electric power.

Marshall Plan Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial taken from the League Reporter of December 18, 1950:

MARSHALL PLAN BENEFITS

When those who criticize every act of the administration take pot shots at the Marshall plan for aiding our European allies by calling it a "giveaway" program, or "operation rat hole," remember this:

1. Production and trade are higher in Europe than before the war.

2. The Communists have lost a lot of ground there—including valuable footholds in trade unions.

3. We have won one crisis after another in Berlin against the Reds.

4. The Communists were run out of Greece. Red guerrillas once held more territory there there than did all other groups combined.

5. Democracy has replaced dictatorship in Turkey.

6. The people of Europe are in a better position to organize for new efforts to resist the cancer of communism.

If the United States had not undertaken the great aid program formed by General Marshall and Secretary Acheson it is probable that all of Europe now would be under the complete domination of Russian imperialism.

Positive Approach to Foreign Policy: Summary of Senate Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release from my office entitled "Positive Approach to Foreign Policy: Summary of Senate Address."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, in a major address today on the floor of the Senate, submitted a 9-point program which he said was a positive approach to our present serious problem.

Senator MALONE said that we have "the ability to win," but that we must stop pussyfooting and decide on a program of policy.

The Nevada Senator criticized the lack of definite policy on the part of the administration and accused State Department officials of carrying the ball for Communist conspirators. He reviewed what he termed the errors which led to the war situation, and said that we are not going to straighten out a deplorable situation by trying to ignore it.

"Strangely enough, our taxpayers, the fathers and mothers of boys fighting in Korea, have financed the equipment and guns used against their boys by the Communists—as these Communists have been supplied with war-making materials by countries receiving our taxpayers' money through the ECA or so-called Marshall plan," Senator MALONE said.

Senator MALONE said that paradoxically the outlook is more hopeful at this time of crisis than in the past because "the people are at last awakening to their peril, are becoming aware of its causes, and are ready to do something about it."

The things which Senator MALONE said we should do, and can do, at once are:

(1) Clean the Communist associates and sympathizers out of our own Government; (2) require France and England to cancel their separate nonaggression pacts with Russia and their trade pacts with Russia and iron curtain countries; (3) stop supporting colonial slavery in any form; (4) oppose the recognition of Communist China by the United Nations with every means at our command; (5) do one of three things about the war in Asia: (a) Arm and equip Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists and invite them to join us, supplying the foot-soldier power under our direction while we use our air power to destroy the Chinese Communists' means of making war, or (b) arm and equip the Nationalist army and guerrillas and let them do the job, over a necessarily longer period of time, or (c) if neither of these two alternatives are to be followed, then abandon the entire Korean and Chinese areas; (6) build a military force, spearheaded by adequate submarine fleet and Air Corps, and install radar equipment to protect the Western Hemisphere; (7) serve notice on Russia that any move on Europe will be met with aerial attack on their means of making war; (8) protect and strengthen our national economy, and (9) give no more funds to foreign nations as gifts and limit loans within our means to private business in strategic areas on RFC conditions only.

The Role of Central Banking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Role of Central Banking in Our Free Enterprise Society, delivered by Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, at the Alabama dinner of the American Newcomen Society, Birmingham, Ala., December 12, 1950.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost of printing the address in the Appendix of the RECORD will be approximately $246.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF CENTRAL BANKING IN OUR FREE ENTERPRISE SOCIETY

I am here tonight to pay off two of your beloved townsmen—Ed Norton and Thad Holt. I still think it was a miracle that we were able to get Ed Norton to serve on the board of governors. I doubt that it would have been possible without the efforts of Thad Holt. In return for his support of the cause, I had to promise to speak before the Birmingham Kiwanis Club of which Thad is president. As for Ed, before he would take the oath of office, I had to promise him I would accept your invitation for tonight. On a strictly horse-trading basis I am convinced I outtraded them both.

Ed's friends here overwhelmed him with a barrage of glowing press notices at the time of his appointment. I am happy to say from close association with him over the past 3 months that he has more than lived up to your and to my highest expectations.

It is a great honor and privilege to meet again with my friends in Newcomen, and especially here in this delightful setting. The gracious hospitality of your Alabama committee is matched by the heart-warming fellowship which always permeates the inspirational atmosphere of a Newcomen meeting.

It is always a treat for me to have an excuse to come to this part of the country. My admiration for the spirit and rich tradition of the South was nurtured by my early boyhood in Virginia and later on the Eastern Shore. It blossomed into full flower as I spent long periods traveling through all parts of the country as a sales manager and more recently in developing some woodpulp properties in the neighboring State of Georgia.

Believe me, I have an intimate and personal first-hand knowledge of the progress, growth, and future of this highly important part of our great land. Were I ever to lapse in knowledge or accuracy of the facts, I can assure you that Ed Norton would never let me forget it.

As a Newcomen member myself, I harbor a deep and devoted respect for the record of this organization in adding to the common appreciation of the finest in American and British tradition It has sought earnestly and diligently to set forth an objective and nonpartisan analysis of the basic elements—both human and mechanical—that have added to the progress of mankind. Its efforts to knit more closely the friendly ties uniting Great Britain and the United States have found rich reward through the years. Today these two countries are a part of the bulwark in the vital defense line against further encroachment on the freedom-loving peoples of the world. The preservation of all that we hold dear depends largely upon the strength, stamina, and moral courage of our allies and the wisdom, foresight, and initiative of our leaders. I am sure the conferences last week between our President and the British Prime Minister were conducted with the same good will and objectives of this Society.

The tradition of the Newcomen Society is to study the framework of modern society against the lessons of the past. I will adhere to that tradition and confine myself as much as possible to your long-established custom by showing how the lessons of history apply to the subject which I would like to discuss with you tonight.

In the present crisis, two great questions are of supreme importance to our people at home and to adherents of human freedom throughout the world. The first is, How can we build up our defenses to meet the threat of world aggression by the Communist forces? The second is, How can we maintain the value of the American dollar? You can't have a defense program without a sound dollar. I am convinced that you can't have anything that approaches a peaceful world without a sound dollar. Since I am not qualified to discuss the military problems, I want to confine our attention to the second of these important questions which is so much in the center of every citizen's attention these days. I want to show you what the role of a central bank like the Federal Reserve is in the preservation of a sound dollar.

Since the Federal Reserve System has the statutory responsibility of regulating the volume, cost, and availability of money and credit, it is of paramount importance that all of us have a clear understanding of its history, purpose, and its present objectives.

The role of the central bank in this country and in fact other countries of the world has often been a mysterious one. The Old Lady of Threadneedle Street was never fully understood—what lady is?—but for generations the Bank of England has commanded the admiration and respect of the English speaking peoples of the world. I welcome the opportunity to talk to a thoughtful and public-spirited audience like this on this subject, which I feel you want to understand and which is so vital to the preservation of our kind of a free-enterprise capitalistic economy.

Now, first, of all, what do central banks do? You are all familiar with regular housekeeping functions we perform: Supplying coins and currency, check clearing, transferring funds from one section of the country to another, serving as fiscal agents in the distribution of savings bonds and other responsibilities of this general nature. I have in mind, however, the more basic things a central bank does that bear directly upon the functioning, and therefore the future, of the private enterprise system.

All economic societies, except the most primitive, have some form of money. Through a succession of painful and costly experiences society has learned that in a complex and highly organized system centered around personal enterprise and initiative, money does not manage itself.

The flow of money from hand to hand reflects the decision of millions of producers and consumers. But the uninhibited operation of money systems in the past created great problems for those who lived and did business under them. In the days when coins constituted the money supply, heads of state were not above clipping away part of a coin to recapture funds for the royal treasury. After the use of currency became prevalent, differences in the size and value of a great variety of notes circulated by numerous issuing agencies were a source not only of inconvenience but of heavy losses when holders were unable to redeem their notes. All of you are familiar with the old phrase—"not worth a continental." Some of your forefathers had to struggle with an almost worthless currency.

Today our money supply consists only partly of coins and currency and primarily of checkable bank deposits which arise largely from advances of credit. The supply of money, mostly bank deposits, is therefore a far more flexible and volatile factor in our present economy than in earlier periods of history. Under those conditions, we sometimes have too little or too much money in relation to the needs of the economy. Let's be concrete and see what happens if the mixture gets too rich—if we get too much money or credit in the business stream. As the supply of money expands, people are able to buy more, demand increases. "That is good," you say. "Just what we want."

But suppose, as is the case today, the economy is already bursting at the seams. Full employment is reached. In view of the ever-increasing military demands production for civilian consumption cannot be increased although money incomes continue to expand. So the natural consequence is for prices to rise as too many dollars bid for too few goods. Thus, the value of the dollar goes down. Of course, it can work the other way, too. If the supply of money becomes too small or cannot expand in relation to the supply of goods, prices fall as too many goods complete for too few dollars. The result may well be widespread unemployment.

Under a system of private enterprise in normal peacetime conditions, we count on the marketplace to determine what goods are produced. Ordinarily no Government authority dictates the allocation and use of resources. Our production expands or contracts in particular lines of activity in response to signals given by a free market. If the price situation looks right we go ahead; if it looks unfavorable we hold back, or shift into other lines.

Now we have already seen that changes in the supply of money and credit have a direct relationship to prices. Therefore, if money is to have stable value and thus contribute to stability and the steady progress of the economy, the supply of money and credit must be kept in proper relation to the flow of goods.

Central banks then have this primary and challenging responsibility—to influence monetary and credit developments so as to assist in promoting economic stability. I use the word "assist" advisedly, because you realize that other governmental policies such as fiscal policies have an important influence on economic stability. Private enterprise must be able to operate in an economic climate that is as free as possible from the distortions of an unstable monetary system. Only then is there an opportunity for individual businesses—large or small—to go forward with confidence in the spirit of dynamic and adventuresome enterprise. This competitive spirit has made our productive machine the envy of every people of the world and our standard of living beyond any measure of comparison.

The charge upon central banks is a heavy one and it is well worth our taking the time tonight to survey some of the traditions of Anglo-Saxon central banking that are now reflected in the Federal Reserve System.

To understand the why and how of central banks, it is first essential to understand the double-edged character of the most normal commercial bank activity—that of lending money. It is easy to overlook the prime importance of the fact that at the same time banks increase their loans, they are actually creating additional money.

No one who believes in the system of private enterprise would want—except under unusual circumstances—to turn over to a public institution the crucial function of choosing among private business borrowers. The commercial bank in making these choices is helping to determine the business and community leadership of tomorrow. This is a little discussed but most important function of commercial banking. It is a primary justification for a private independent commercial banking system.

On the other hand, the creation (or destruction) of money is fraught with such possibilities for evil, as well as good, that the public interest is acutely involved. The development of central banking tradition reflects the gradual acceptance of the idea that regulation of the money supply must be attuned to, but independent of, the private commercial banking structure. The establishment of a central bank, then, leaves to individual commercial banks, privately owned and privately operated, the responsibility for selecting which of their customers shall be financed out of the total money available for lending by the entire banking system. It leaves to the central bank the responsibility for at least partially determining what that total amount shall be.

While I do not intend to discuss in any detail the techniques of central bank operations, it is important to keep in mind the fact that a central bank functions largely through organized markets in the traditional sense. Its primary tools involve the buying and selling of Government securities—open market operations—and variations in discount rates. More recently there has been added the instrument of changes in reserve requirements. These tools are purely impersonal means of affecting the over-all availability and cost of credit. By affecting the supply of credit under a system of credit money, a central bank also influences the total amount of money in the economy. The mechanism works this way: Tighter availability and higher cost of credit checks the expansion of the supply of money in relation to the output of goods; easier availability and lower cost of credit accelerates monetary expansion in relation to the output of goods.

In very recent times and partly because of special circumstances associated with war and national defense financing, the Federal Reserve System has had added to its tools

certain instruments known as selective credit controls. The Federal Reserve System's regulation W, relating to consumer installment credit, and its regulation X, relating to mortgage credit, are examples of these tools. The System's regulation of margin requirements on loans to buy or carry listed stocks is another example. Instruments of this type affect credit conditions by setting terms for the extension of credit. These regulatory terms bear upon demand and not upon supply. Selective tools can be made to apply only to a narrowly defined credit area. They are therefore not general. Hence, the description "selective" tools. They are in no sense a substitute for the general tools of the central bank. They merely reinforce them.

Historically, in country after country, it has been difficult to decide just how a central bank should be organized and what relation it should have to Government and to private enterprise. The combination of public responsibilities and private functions complicates the problem. Until relatively recently central banks have commonly operated under special charters from their governments as privately owned institutions. I understand that George Washington, for one, owned shares of the Bank of England during the Revolutionary War, and when the war was over collected his accumulated dividends. Today the shares of the Bank of England are all owned by the government. While private ownership has had the advantage of insuring relative freedom from political influences, it has been difficult to avoid the charge that national monetary and credit policy was being determined primarily for the benefit of the private banks rather than in the public interest.

Many governments have made their central banks wholly public owned, either by initially setting them up in this way, or by buying up privately held shares. In this way the emphasis is more directly on the public character of their responsibilities. Even in such instances, however, the central banks have usually continued to function as semiindependent organizations.

The great size and diversity of the United States and of its economy has led to the establishment of 12 separate Federal Reserve banks, which are partly autonomous but are placed under the general supervision of the Board of Governors, appointed by the President for long terms of 14 years each, and responsible to Congress. The Federal Reserve banks carry on the operations ordinarily performed by central banks while general policy decisions, which in most countries are also made by central banks, are vested largely with the Board of Governors and with the Federal Open Market Committee. This latter group is established by statute and provides for the rotating representation of five Federal Reserve banks by their presidents. The Federal Reserve System receives its authority from the Congress and is responsible to it.

Whatever its form of organization, a central bank obviously must be a public institution. Its power must be used in the public interest, and only in the public interest. It must steer a true course between the private financial community on the one hand and the Government on the other.

In the early days some of the supporters of the Federal Reserve System referred to it as the Supreme Court of Finance. This comparison was not strictly accurate, but it did convey the idea of the founders that the Federal Reserve should be independent of both political and private financial interests.

From the very outset attempts to organize a central bank in the United States faced one great hurdle—a healthy distrust of any centralization of power. Failure to renew the charters of the First and Second Banks of the United States can largely be explained on this ground: As federally chartered but privately managed banks, they were suspect because the management was entirely in private hands. Further, there was a general feeling that neither bank represented adequately the frontier interests.

In his famous Report on a National Bank, Alexander Hamilton, who fathered the First Bank of the United States, said: "To attach full confidence to an institution of this nature, it appears to be an essential ingredient in its structure that it shall be under a private, not a public, direction—under guidance of individual interest, not of public policy." History has shown the weakness of this thesis. The First and Second Banks of the United States were both organized on the basis of dominant private ownership and control.

Andrew Jackson's successful fight to prevent a renewal of the charter of the Second Bank of the United States was largely based on opposition to private control. The result of this controversy was to deprive the country of the advantages of a central banking system for nearly 80 years. In the meantime, however, the basic problems of regulating money and credit remained unsolved. The next step—some 25 years after the lapse of the second charter—was to establish the National Banking System. From the standpoint of our discussion, the significant thing about the National Bank Act was that it provided for the regulation of the issuance of bank notes by requiring the deposit of substantial security.

This again failed to solve the problem of adequate monetary control for two principal reasons. First, because checks on deposit became a more important type of currency. While sharp restrictions were put on the issuance of bank notes, the power of the banks to expand check currency was left uncontrolled. Second, repeated experience with money panics subsequently showed that there was such a thing as too little currency, as well as too much, and that there had to be means of expanding the money supply in response to the needs of a rapidly growing country. A succession of money panics near the turn of the century focused public attention on money and credit problems. The panic of 1893 provided the initial stimulus and the panic of 1907 furnished the final push necessary for the appointment of a National Monetary Commission. This body made the most thorough study of monetary and banking systems throughout the world that has ever been made. It submitted recommendations for remedying the defects which were revealed in our system.

The passage of the Federal Reserve Act in 1913 created a system which was unique in the history of central banking. First of all, that act clearly established central banking as a most vital and essential public function in this country. Further, in keeping with the traditional status of such banks, it provided that the Federal Reserve should have an independent status in the Government structure reporting directly to the Congress. This is in accord with the philosophies of checks and balances inherent in our Constitution. Finally, conscious of the danger of rigidity and remoteness in a highly centralized authority, the framers of the act provided for an efficient and effective combination of public and private management. The Federal Reserve System today consists of a Board of Governors which operates through a decentralized network of regional banks and branches in intimate contact with every commercial area in the country.

I repeat what I have said many times that I am thoroughly convinced that the authors of the Federal Reserve Act gave us a monumental piece of legislation—a system tailormade for the economic expansion of our country. The System might be compared to a great pyramid with its base in the grass roots of our economy, and its apex in the Board of Governors. The breadth and strength of the pyramid are in its base, with the member banks and the Reserve banks as elevations in the slope toward the top.

I am more convinced than ever of the truth of that statement. For more than 10 years I served on the board of the Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank, and for almost 3 years more I have served with the Board of Governors in Washington. It has been a great experience to observe the intricate workings of our credit and monetary machine and to view its relationship to the national economy.

I have seen the System adapt itself flexibly to changing economic conditions. I have benefitted by the decentralized organization with its 12 banks, 24 branches, and more than 250 directors who constitute a representative cross-section of the finest our free enterprise system can offer.

Most of you are familiar too with the highly valuable research services of the Federal Reserve, not only the regular services but special studies of regional developments such as those prepared by the staff of the Atlanta bank with the help of the branch offices. I have, as I hope you do, a wholesome respect for the highly professional work of the research organizations of the banks and our Washington staff. The end product of their efforts has established a new level of professional competence in this field. These men have an uncanny understanding of current problems and they have supplied constructive suggestions for future courses of action. In fact, this exceptionally high level of professional competence extends throughout the System's official and staff personnel.

It would be impossible for me here to give proper credit to all those who have had a prominent part in the establishment of the Federal Reserve System. But I would be greatly remiss if I did not note that the lion's share of the credit must go to two Southerners—Woodrow Wilson and Carter Glass. They understood clearly two fundamental propositions:

First, that unless some way was found to regulate effectively the supply of money and credit we were running the risk of destroying the very foundations of the free enterprise system which, in so many of its aspects, embodies a Jeffersonian insistence on the rights of individuals against the encroachments of an all powerful state.

Second, that a Jeffersonian distrust of the centralization of financial power can be met by the recognition of central banking as a public function subject to public control.

To say that central banking must be regarded as a public function subject to public control is another way of saying that a central bank cannot regard itself as immune to the will of the people. This raises a fundamental question which has plagued central bank authorities from the very beginning. In a democracy such as ours we generally think of the will of the people as being reflected through duly elected Members of the Congress and through the executive branch of government. What then should be the relation of a central bank to other public authorities in a democracy determined to preserve the private enterprise system? How are we to reconcile the necessity for public control and yet avoid the danger of domination?

This general question, in its broadest terms, was exactly the question that the liberty-loving founders of our Nation put to themselves when they established our system of government. For example, the architects of that system recognized the public character of the administration of justice. That did not prevent them, however, from setting up a system of courts organized independently of the executive and the Department of Justice.

The Federal Reserve System itself is an example of this conception of public control in relation to other branches of government. The Federal Reserve System was created by Congress. There is not the slightest doubt that it could likewise be destroyed by Congress, or that it would be destroyed or radically altered if it pursued policies against the public interest, as interpreted by the people's elected representatives. But the point I wish particularly to emphasize is that the Congress deliberately sought to insulate the Federal Reserve from predatory and political pressures. It did so because it recognized that there may well be divergent views as to what is, and what is not, in the public interest. It did so, I believe, because of the importance it attached to the responsibility of maintaining economic stability.

Not only is the Federal Reserve System unique in its combination of a public and private form of organization, but it has a unique relationship with the other agencies of Government. Every agency of Government has statutory responsibilities to carry out. Many of their operations inevitably affect the supply of money and credit. Among the agencies that have credit programs and policies affecting this picture are the RFC, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Department of Agriculture, and the various international agencies.

It is only natural that the Federal Reserve with its responsibilities in this field should affect, and be affected by, the actions of these other agencies. That is why it is so important that we strive to attain a higher degree of integration and coordination of all governmental policies which ultimately affect the monetary and credit situation.

The relation of monetary and credit policies, and fiscal and debt management policies is most important of all. These interrelationships have become increasingly important and binding as a result of the tremendous wartime expansion of the public debt to a dominant position in the over-all financial structure.

Fiscal policies are in the final analysis determined by Congress in authorizing appropriations and legislating taxes. Of course the President and the various executive agencies of the Government have a major influence upon these policies in their recommendations for legislation and in carrying out the measures voted by the Congress. The Treasury has a primary responsibility for recommendations as to tax policy, as well as for the collection of taxes. It has important discretionary authority with reference to the management of the public debt. This includes decisions as to the timing and nature of borrowing and of debt retirement. The Treasury also possesses certain monetary powers and it has important responsibility with reference to the international financial operations of the Government. These various Treasury operations have a direct bearing on and are affected by conditions in the money market, with which the Federal Reserve is concerned.

The functions of the Federal Reserve are primarily monetary. As I have said, the system has primary responsibility for influencing the supply, availability, and cost of bank reserves, which provide the basis for the bulk of the country's supply of money and credit. Federal Reserve authorities, by exercising an influence on the cost of availability of reserves, can affect not only the level of interest rates but also the ability and willingness of banks to lend and invest. These policies necessarily impinge upon public-debt operations. Moreover, the magnitude of public-debt offerings (or retirements), the rates of interest paid by the Treasury, and the maturities and other features of the various issues are reflected in the demands for credit and can thereby influence the supply of money and the demands upon the Federal Reserve.

The rates of interest which the Treasury finds it necessary to offer on new issues of securities are to a substantial degree affected by the Federal Reserve's influence on the money market. Obviously, if the Treasury and the Federal Reserve were preoccupied solely with the question of rates, they would sacrifice all other considerations to this end. Both, of course, must take account of the many broad aspects of their respective policies and the effects upon the entire economic structure. Because measures adopted by either agency must be taken into consideration by the other in determining its policies, it is most essential that they unify their efforts and direct their respective policies toward common broad objectives of national policy.

It is most fortunate that public discussion of fiscal, monetary, debt management, and other policies has been on so high a plane. A short time ago I addressed the Committee for Economic Development and was deeply impressed with their recent public statements which grappled in a most constructive way with the problems inherent in administering and coordinating monetary and debt management policies. The search for the right answers that will best serve public interest demands the highest statesmanship on the part of the leaders of finance, industry, labor, education, and government. It is greatly to the credit of the President, Government officials, and Members of Congress concerned with these problems that they have approached them in a broad, nonpartisan and unprejudiced spirit. There has been a most earnest and sincere desire on the part of everyone to find the right solutions that will contribute to the common objective of orderly economic progress.

Today we are engaged in a great defense effort, the purpose of which is to assure the continuance of our way of life. We all agree that it is in the public interest to regard the requirements of defense as having priority over all other activities. I am sure we are agreed that the way of life which we wish to defend is one in which the private enterprise system will continue to play a central role.

I wish to state here and now that in this critical period the Federal Reserve System will use all of its resources and powers in conjunction with the Treasury to assure the successful financing of the defense program. Furthermore, we will continue to wage a relentless fight on inflation. Nothing could be more damaging to our morale or to our ability to back up the military than inflation. Inflation diminishes incentives. It misdirects tremendous amounts of effort into nonproductive areas. It destroys the savings impulse of our people that has been so vital a factor in making our Nation great.

While I have outlined how the Federal Reserve, the Treasury, and the other Government agencies will work to combat inflation, it is, of course, everyone's job. The fact is that unless every one of us, as individuals, recognizes and combats this problem the efforts of our Government will fail. Inflation is a matter that vitally concerns each of us and it can only be avoided if each of us is willing to exercise the restraints and make the sacrifices required.

I have tried tonight to stress the development of the idea of central banking as a means of strengthening the financial stability of a modern national economy. In this country, the Federal Reserve System, a unique "decentralized" central bank, was developed to meet our particular type of highly competitive expanding capitalism. Its purpose is to exert influence through the banking system and the money market, to provide for an expanding economy and at the same time to help preserve the value of the American dollar.

On a number of occasions I have called the Federal Reserve System a great and vital bulwark of the enterprise system which has so enriched this country and made it strong. Our strength at home and abroad rests fundamentally upon the preservation of this system and the integrity of the dollar which symbolizes our strength—and, indeed, our hopes—for the future.

The Real Purpose Behind Attlee's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release from my office entitled "The Real Purpose Behind Attlee's Visit."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican of Nevada, charged today that the British Prime Minister's visit to this country to talk to President Truman was "the next step in the plan of England and France to sell out the American Army in Korea."

"The visit is not prompted by any magnanimous spirit of helpfulness or by any feeling of appreciation for what we have done for them," the Nevada Senator said, continuing: "England and France, the latter also represented by Prime Minister Attlee, have not helped us, other than token help, and have no intention of helping us. The visit is for the purpose of keeping intact the colonial possessions of those two countries through the recognition of communistic China.

"This visit comes with ill grace from a representative of two countries which have been living off the bounty of American taxpayers and yet have done nothing to help us appreciably in our war in Asia. Despite our freehanded pouring of billions of Marshall plan dollars into those countries, is there anyone who thinks that either England or France will help us now? They are calling on us now, through Mr. Attlee, only to protect their investments in Britain's Hong Kong and Singapore, and France's Indochina.

"Because the war in Asia may jeopardize Europeans and their colonial possessions in Asia and Africa, Attlee and those he represents want the war to end at any cost—any cost to us, that is. Attlee will suggest that we end the war. How? By surrendering, after getting a concession or two—by withdrawing from Korea; by leaving Formosa defenseless; by turning our backs on Chinese Nationalists, our only friends in Asia; and by agreeing to the recognition of the Communist regime in China. Attlee is here to perfect the plans for the ultimate recognition of the Chinese Communists. Thus, the end of the war—temporarily—until Russia is in better shape to fight us!

"The leaders in England and France figure that through Attlee and Acheson they will win their point—and they probably will, for there is no evidence that the administration has become any more intelligent than it showed itself to be at Potsdam or a year earlier at Yalta, when every conceivable concession was made to the Reds.

"I prophesy now that we will do exactly what England and France tell us to do, for we still have officials without the backbone to stand up to European leaders. After we

have surrendered, France and England will continue to bleed us financially through our gullible officials, until the bottom of the barrel is reached—and there is a bottom, of course. After the bottom is reached, further aggression on the part of the Reds will throw us into a major war—and we then will have no friends anywhere, for no longer will we be able to buy friendship in Europe and even if France and England were so inclined, they would not fight for fear of endangering their precious hold over their colonies.

"To those who say that the Nevada Senator is rocking the international boat, I say that it is time someone spoke out against all those, regardless of who they are, who would sell out the American people."

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, to the Grand Central Railroad Branch, YMCA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, on November 20, 1950, at the diamond-jubilee dinner of the Grand Central Railroad Branch, YMCA.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great honor to be invited to speak at this notable diamond-jubilee celebration.

We meet to commemorate three-quarters of a century of steady growth, expanding usefulness, and increasing service by the Railroad YMCA.

That is a proud record of achievement. It is deserving of the highest praise and warmest congratulations in which I am glad to join wholeheartedly.

I am happy to be here tonight because your association has reached a significant milestone on the path of progress toward a higher level of spiritual and cultural attainment.

The YMCA is one of the great institutions of our country. It is the embodiment of brotherhood in action.

Its wise and effective leadership in the development of Christian character has made a tremendous contribution to the welfare of our Nation.

The YMCA teaches clean, upright living, tolerance, and good will. It teaches faith in our country and faith in God. It is a powerful influence in building good citizenship and loyalty to the principles of Americanism.

How fortunate we are that the candle of faith—lighted by George Williams and his small group of fellow workers 106 years ago—has grown into a great white beacon for the guidance of the mind, the body, and the spirit.

In many parts of the world its bright light has dispelled darkness and has inspired new hope. It has opened great areas of opportunity and new fields of Christian service.

We are fortunate also that other faiths have followed the example of the YMCA and have established their own organizations that strengthen devotion to religion and advances the welfare of their people.

It is most appropriate on occasions such as this to consider what it means to be an American. It is a proper time to give earnest thought to the duties and obligations of citizenship.

It is likewise a time to measure our shortcomings and to inquire whether we have been faithful to the trust handed down to us through generations of toil, tears, sacrifice, and the shedding of blood.

We must remember that the sturdy, self-reliant, God-fearing pioneers of the New World prized political and religious liberty above life itself.

They did not come here because America would give them security. The wilderness offered only opportunity.

They had the moral strength and the courage to face hardship and peril because here they could build a future of liberty, free from religious persecution, and free from the tyranny of government.

I have been greatly impressed by the statement of a South American visitor who was asked to explain why the material prosperity of the United States had so far outstripped that of South America.

This was his reply:

"The people who settled North America came here seeking God. Those who came to South America were in search of gold."

The United States will live and prosper so long as we continue the search for God in our daily lives.

Our Republic was founded upon a philosophy of human dignity and freedom under God. Its ideals are based on the eternal truths of the Holy Bible.

Far more than any other country, we have been a religious and God-loving Nation. The spirit of religion has guided our statesmen, soldiers, Government officials, educators, and our people.

The founding fathers placed firm reliance on the protection of divine providence in their struggle for independence.

They planned a government on the proposition that "all men * * * are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." Among those rights they listed "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

It is important to note that they placed emphasis on the pursuit of happiness. They realized that happiness can be attained only by individual effort. No government can guarantee happiness.

The whole plan of our Government was to protect freedom of the individual and to provide equal opportunity.

Under that system we have achieved greatness as a nation unparalleled in the history of the world.

We have built a vast empire of industry, commerce, agriculture, and transportation.

We have developed the great natural resources of our country for the benefit of mankind.

We have splendid schools, hospitals, colleges, centers of art and music, and magnificent churches of every denomination.

We enjoy the highest living standards in the world.

Yet with all these blessings, we have tragic faults which should be given earnest and prayerful thought.

Evil influences have grown up amongst us that are undermining the moral structure of the United States.

Too many of our people have forgotten that the true greatness of America is not our material wealth but the spiritual strength and character of our people.

In all walks of life there are men whose lives are ruled by selfishness and greed.

There is law evasion, racketeering, chiseling and other corrupt products of an unholy desire for an easy way of life.

Organized crime syndicates operate across State lines and are taking from the people an estimated $15,000,000,000 a year.

Sinister alliances between the criminal element of the underworld and some law enforcement officers, and other public officials, endanger the lives and safety of our citizens.

Political power wielded by racketeers and gamblers has forced invisible government upon some cities and towns by influencing the election of corrupt officials.

Millions and millions of dollars—taken largely from families who can least afford to lose it—are being used by racketeers and gamblers to purchase political control of many American communities.

Corrupt officials in these towns and cities, bought by tainted millions, are willing to submit to the dictates of criminal elements and to lay aside their sacred oaths to serve in the public interest.

And the most tragic situation confronting us is that so many of our people accept these dishonest practices as necessary evils—a form of wickedness that we cannot escape.

What is responsible for this attitude?

I think the answer lies in a lack of appreciation of our civic duties and failure to recognize the responsibilities of citizenship.

There are so many who give such little consideration to their government, their church or their duty to their fellow men.

One of the shocking developments in American civic life is the fact that many of our citizens, who are thoroughly honest in their private lives, are so indifferent to matters affecting the public welfare.

They forget that bad public officials are elected by "good" citizens who ignore or neglect the basic obligation of citizenship and do not even take the trouble to vote on election day.

Two hundred years ago Edmund Burke, the great English statesman, declared:

"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

Yes—today as in the time of Edmund Burke—evil will triumph when good men do nothing.

That is why I say that every good citizen, every churchgoer, every YMCA member, should take an intelligent, patriotic, and militant part in government.

That means taking part in politics, because clean, honest politics is the foundation of good government. It means working for the election of men of integrity and high character—dedicated to public service rather than personal power or private gain.

It means taking an active interest in community affairs, in State, national and world problems.

It means arousing public opinion to a higher standard of morality, to inspire deeper respect for the law and to assure confidence in the integrity of our officials and our courts.

An informed and aroused electorate could overnight transform corruption into sound government by turning grafting officials out of office.

Corrupt practices which take bread from the mouths of innocent families to enrich criminals and corrupt officials are cancers on the body politic and should be removed by criminal prosecutions and ballot box surgery before the disease spreads further.

The weakening of the moral fiber of our people has been responsible in a large measure for the spread of Communist philosophies in our midst.

That poisonous doctrine has made its influence felt only among those who have turned away from the teachings of the Bible.

Civic responsibility is always weakened where religious teaching is neglected.

What are we Americans to do in order to stop the advance of this destructive and Godless philosophy?

If we are to save America and to preserve our sacred freedoms we must crusade for a return to the fundamental principles of religion and freedom of the individual.

To hold the line against communism at home we must have a strong, courageous, self-reliant, God-fearing people.

We must have a strong, militant church and a strong, solvent government. We must have a total mobilization of all our moral forces in a great crusade for righteousness and patriotic Americanisms.

We must revitalize the teaching of American history in our schools and colleges. We must teach the greatness of the American form of government and the glory of the American way of life.

We have been forced by Communist aggression in Korea into a period when all of us must be prepared for willing sacrifice to build our Nation's defensive strength.

Freedom in the world is facing its supreme test. We must approach the grim task ahead with full realization that we are fighting a war for survival.

It should be perfectly clear to every one that communism aims to conquer and enslave the world, including the United States.

It should be perfectly clear that we face a well organized and strongly equipped force which hopes to overrun and destroy every nation where human rights are recognized.

The future of freedom in the world hangs in the balance and the outcome will be decided by the measure of American military and spiritual strength.

In the situation confronting us selfishness is sabotage. This is no time to think about increased profits. It is no time to demand wage increases. It is no time for business as usual or pleasure as usual.

Nothing less than total victory will preserve the religious ideals of our Republic from destruction by the Godless forces of tyranny and dictatorship.

What is the right course to take as we face this grave threat to our freedom?

I have outlined some steps which, in my judgment, should be part of an American program:

1. We should support universal military training. This will prepare our young men to meet the enemy on the field of battle. It is fair because it places equal military obligation upon every citizen. If we are to preserve our Republic its wars must be fought by the people.

2. We must have total mobilization of all our resources—labor, industry, agriculture and finance, and all our moral and spiritual strength.

3. We must fight inflation and keep our currency sound by restricting credit and by placing controls on prices and on salaries and wages at the same time.

4. All critical materials in short supply, needed for war production, should be placed on a rigid system of priorities and allocations.

5. All Government spending, not directly connected with the national defense should be cut to the bone.

6. As far as possible the cost of war should be paid out of current revenues. Otherwise we may lose freedom of the individual even though we win the war.

7. We must stamp out law evasion, racketeering, black markets, unfair profiteering and drive out of public office all officials, regardless of their party, who conspire with the underworld for votes and political power.

8. We must constantly teach the meaning of the American way of life. The blessings of individual freedom should be compared with the terror and tyranny under which millions of people are enslaved behind the iron curtain of Godless communism.

9. All those disloyal to our form of government and who prefer communism to Americanism should be deported if they are not citizens of the United States. If naturalized, their citizenship should be revoked. Native-born Communists should be placed where they cannot sabotage our military effort, our war production, or our schools and churches.

10. Last and most important, we must have a great spiritual revival based on the eternal truths of the Holy Bible. We must recognize that God stands at the portal of destiny.

Communism denies God. It worships the state.

God-fearing, law-abiding Americans pray for divine help and guidance.

We believe in the fatherhood of God. In that faith lies our hope for lasting peace in the world.

With faith in God's goodness and with firm resolve to serve our country, each of us, in his own humble way, can contribute to victory.

Destruction of the Nation's Economic Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release from my office entitled "Destruction of the Nation's Economic Structure."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 29, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican of Nevada, said today that, with the world situation as it is, Congress is facing the grave and immediate responsibility of preventing the actual collapse of the American economic system.

"We are nearer the brink of economic destruction than most people realize," the Nevada Senator said, "as a result of socialistic legislation, gigantic give-away programs, deficit spending, free trade, and an international policy designed for the international distribution of our wealth, all apparently master minded by friends of communism within the Government."

Senator MALONE continued: "Is it not possible that the cost is more than our economy can stand—the cost of carrying on our domestic governmental functions, including the several highly expensive socialistic programs, plus the war in Asia, plus mobilizing and arming the western nations, plus further financial gifts to so-called Marshall plan countries? There is the grave danger that we may spend ourselves into destruction (which is an avowed objective of Soviet Russia).

"In international dealings, there is the political and military sphere and there is the economic sphere. After World War II we threw away all political and military advantage by hurriedly moving out and giving Russia the strategic areas needed for our defense, virtually inviting the Soviets to move in and take over. Any military bases subsequently established in foreign countries which have become self-sufficient are an asset only so long as the people of those countries are on our side. The people of the countries which have received our money do not have much respect for those who must buy good will. It is a form of blackmail payoff, not conducive to a feeling of trust and security on either side. We may conceivably spend ourselves into destruction only to find that countries we believed would be fighting with us in any shooting war had been made impotent through a capture of the people of those countries in the realm of ideas long before the shooting begins.

"The Congress should use as a yardstick on every piece of proposed legislation this question: Will it serve to reinforce our economic strength?

"We cannot strengthen our national economy if we permit the continuation of administration attacks on American industry. These attacks have come through Government regulations and taxes so designed as to eliminate initiative and venture capital and a foreign free-trade policy so designed as to curtail domestic production. Some of the administration officials are now talking about impending shortages. Such shortages can be charged to the attacks on American industry.

"We cannot strengthen our national economy by spending beyond our means. There is talk now of a $50,000,000,000 military budget, and some place the probable total budget as high as $96,000,000,000 annually. Taxes alone could not provide such a huge sum. (Pay-as-you-go talk by those not suggesting deep cuts is nonsense.) Furthermore, such a program cannot be financed through deficit-financing operations without causing a deadly form of currency inflation which on such a scale would destroy our money and with it our economy. Controls are not the answer; they merely delay the day of reckoning.

"There are two types of inflation: one which merely hurts until adjustment is made; the other which kills. Deficit financing on such gigantic scale as suggested would bring on the deadly type. History shows that invariably, after suffering a long period of this deadly type of economic illness, the economic system of a nation lingers and dies. This signals the end of an epoch. And after long confusion and suffering, accompanied by civil strife and sometimes bloody revolution, a different economic system emerges. (This is what the Communists are counting on here.)

"The United States is today faced with the danger of this deadly type of economic illness. Only the ability on the part of Congress to say 'No' can save it from such a fate. We must cultivate the ability to say 'No' to the designing enemies of the American way of life, and a loud 'No' to the thoughtless administration officials who are continually asking for millions and billions for all manner of things."

Address by Francis Cardinal Spellman to New York State Association of Children's Court Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Francis Cardinal Spellman, on December 1 at a dinner of the New York State Association of Children's Court Judges. I make this request not only because of the subject matter of the address, but also because the language used in the address is so expressive and eloquent. It stamps the cardinal as both a powerful orator and a sensible advocate of better standards in radio programing. I wish to

call especial attention to the paragraph of the address in which His Eminence deals with the problem of radio and television broadcasting.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

In the course of a year it is my privilege, as it is also my duty as servant of God and of man, to attend hundreds of public functions and administrative meetings as well as personal and private conferences. Each one is important. But, while many may equal, none can excel in vital import and possible impact upon our democratic society this Conference of the New York State Association of Children's Court Judges. For, within your hands and your own wise, compassionate hearts you hold the destiny of America's children and their homes.

The children's court is an American institution which, when faithfully administered, is a powerful, protective instrument to help save, not alone America but the whole civilized world. For the child is the heart of the home; the home the core of civilization. Within them rests the world's hope for strength and survival, for, no nation is stronger than its homes; no home stronger than its children. And it was to protect our children and our homes that an intelligent, sympathetic, socially minded group of people, sensitive to the harmful impact of treating the child-offender as an adult criminal, aroused lawmakers and public officials to the imperative need of setting up a separate facility for handling the cases which involved children. It was under their humane direction that our own New York became part of the vanguard of States which first accepted the principle of separate children's courts for child-offenders.

From the turn of the century we have seen this American institution take root and flourish, until now it bears fruit in every State of the Union, and in many other lands. And while there are still imperfections and gaps in the administration of children's court work, no longer can there be the slightest question concerning the obvious merits of the children's court system as it has been developed in the United States.

While the children's court is a distinctly American innovation, it is interesting to note that nearly 250 years ago, in 1704, His Holiness Pope Clement XI set aside a separate hall where boy-offenders could be trained and taught to become useful citizens, without association with hardened criminals. And, throughout the centuries, the attitude of Catholics toward social service has ever been the same, for it is the changeless attitude of the church established by Christ, Who Himself begged us to love one another as He loved us. And by love Christ meant sympathetic, compassionate understanding, patience, tolerance, and above all the just, honorable, and wise ministration of any powers entrusted to man.

I am sure you are familiar with the standards of service provided by the agencies in the Archdiocese of New York, both in the area of preventive work in our youth and youth counselling services; in the splendid work that is done by such volunteer agencies in the court as the Catholic Big Brothers and Big Sisters who work cooperatively and effectively with similar agencies of the Protestant and Jewish faiths, and the programs for custodial care both in our institutions and in our boarding homes. I am sure, too, you are aware that we strive to utilize every scientific and social development that will aid in helping the neglected, afflicted or delinquent child. Expert psychiatric diagnosis and treatment are indispensable in many cases. Medical, surgical, nutritional, and psychological care is often indicated. Yet, to the deep regret of all of us, the lack of financial support and of community-awareness frequently handicaps the court, as well as private agencies, in securing the facilities that are of paramount importance in the rehabilitation of a child.

One of the most important arms of the Children's Juvenile Court is the probation staff. We share with every other agency in the community, the keen appreciation of the necessity of this branch of the Children's Court with a well trained staff, implemented by medical, psychiatric and other specialized services. Yet its functions, too, are often impeded by lack of funds. Surely in these days of astronomical expenditures of public moneys for so many and varied purposes, there can be no real or just basis for neglecting to provide adequate personnel for the proper functioning of the probation, or any other branch, of this health-building, family-preserving life-saving service. Rather instead, when comes that day when a child's destiny is given into the custody of the court, there should be available every facility known to modern study and science for the child's immediate care and rehabilitation. For lack of any one of their needs may be the cause of speeding upon the accursed course of repeated crime and punishment, not only the willful delinquent but the hapless victim of circumstances.

And the union of all the children's court judges in a State-wide association forms an instrument of great power, a noble, spiritual and protective bulwark, a shield which if wisely used can serve to keep families united and save America's children. It cannot be anything less. But, without the assistance of proper, perfected, efficient, sufficient equipment and personnel they cannot, even with the noblest intentions, carry out their obligations.

Today a man's home is no longer his castle, for the locked door no longer keeps out the trespasser. Now, any broadcasting radical may enter the home, and, under cunning disguises, sow the seeds of juvenile bewilderment and delinquency. The moving picture has moved indeed—it has moved from a limited number of public theaters to millions of private homes where crime stories and their horrors add to the infamy of the massacre of the innocents. Eager, impressionable young children with bated breath and fast-beating hearts receive into their immature minds, trashy tales which leave them confused and disturbed. Radio and television programs should be, and some truly are, instructive and inspirational. But many stories heard over the radio, seen on television and read in cheap publications are merely ribald thrillers and have a ruinous effect on our children, engendering in them a dislike for the normal, destroying the influence of parental authority and counsel, robbing the child of the natural protective elements to which he is entitled.

And, while I am not of that school which believes that children must blindly obey their parents, neither do I believe in the new school of social thought that children themselves have founded based on the command to parents, obey your child. I stand unequivocally for one commandment—obey God. The children's courts vested with wide powers over the child and the family should be instrumental in encouraging obedience to the commandment. For power imposes responsibility. But unlimited power and control over others sometimes becomes a danger and a menace to those upon whom it may be exercised, unless it be used with charity, compassion, tolerance, and justice. The world today has too many men who possess authority but who themselves possess neither charity nor morality. And it is my firm faith that only men who first learn to love and obey God have any right to lead or judge or govern others.

In our own blessed Nation great disaster has befallen the American family. I do not need to rehearse for you, judges of the children's court, the terrible evils that arise and run in the wake of the broken home. One of these is the quick and tragic results that encompass the bewildered child of adolescent years who is asked to divide or resolve his loyalties between mother and father in marital conflict, and to accept a new father or new mother while his true mother or father takes on another mate after divorce. And I avow that the faithless parent, who deserts and breaks up the marriage because of attraction to another, or who, by infidelity, insobriety, or selfishness, brings ruin to the home and irreparable harm to the life of the child, not only breaks the law of God, but also fails to observe the very moral principle upon which our democratic society is builded. For home life plays a most important part in the development of civic, moral, and religious responsibility in children.

There are, however, those who would tell us that the whole process of child-character development is exclusively one of environmental adjustment; that there is no moral culpability for a wrong act. With this theory Catholic teachings permit no compromise. This evil doctrine is rarely stated so boldly or baldly. It is more frequently couched in such euphemistic expressions as "the inexorability of environmental forces", or similar cliches of some of the so-called ultra-modern experts in the field of behaviorism. According to this school of thought, there is no reason even to consider morality where a child's conduct is concerned. Spiritual values and religion are regarded by this school as extraneous factors and sometimes even as out-moded or harmful elements in a so-called scientific approach to the problem. These conclusions are perfectly logical if we accept the original premise that the child or the individual is nothing more than a highly developed animal specimen in the process of evolution and change, comprised only of the material, the helpless prey of external forces, devoid of any spiritual faculties, with no capacity for choice or exercise of free will, and with no destiny or obligations beyond the horizon of this life's span.

Aside from the materialism and moral evil of this deterministic philosophy, its baneful results would be perfectly patent were we to train our youth, particularly those who may be burdened with exceptionally difficult handicaps, in the wretched belief that no matter how frequent or how serious may be their transgressions of the law, there is no blame and no responsibility; that misconduct is due entirely to their environment; that the fault lies exclusively with society. If designedly we rule out of the lives of our children belief in God and the obligation of obedience to His laws, if we deprive our young people of the benefits of religious training and the development of moral character, if we fail to impress upon them the sense of personal responsibility to their God, their country and their neighbor, what, I ask you, may we expect of them when they will be called to assume their duties as adults in the community, and themselves take over the problems that confront society?

While I do not absolve parents from their obligations, I plead with all persons who have the opportunity and duty to help in the molding of the lives of young people during their formative years, to insist upon the principles of personal responsibility for wrongful conduct. Thus shall we help to keep today's children from becoming faithless and irresponsible citizens and parents of tomorrow.

Insistence upon this personal responsibility, self-discipline and character development does not mean a harsh or punitive approach to the problems of adjustment of delinquent children. And personally I do not like this canonized phrase "delinquent

child." I would the word be changed to a more hopeful, kinder word, "unfortunate"—for sympathy and patient understanding of the unfortunate youngsters are as essential as the best scientific and social therapy.

Of late year, it has become out-moded with some groups to urge or even to consider, the religion of a child in connection with the expenditure of public funds or the performance of a public function. The God-fearing founders of our country expressed in public documents their reverence for God and the importance of the rights of freedom of religion. When they established the principle of the separation of church and state, their purpose was to protect religion and to preserve the practice of religion. By strange distortion, this is now construed by some to mean the suppression of church by state, and the absolute banishment from the areas of government and public services of all for which religion stands.

Hence, it is gratifying to find an important public agency, the children's court, which officially takes cognizance of, and affirmatively protects and preserves the religious faith of the child. The Children's Court Act assures that in "the care, protection, guardianship, discipline or control of any child, his religious faith shall be preserved and protected by the court." But despite this clear, definite legislation there are some who foster insidious and dangerous doctrines which would destroy religion, the very foundation and basis of respect for law and good citizenship. This pernicious propaganda, my friends, is implanted in the minds and hearts of our growing generation, will demolish our greatest bulwark against the rising tide of godless communism threatening to inundate the world and in this fatful hour, our own beloved America.

For there is always a menace that these fatal theories can seep even into the thinking of well-intentioned persons who, with most sincere motives, may interfere and violate the right of the family to worship God—the right of the family to remain a family. Forgotten or ignored is the fact that the family was not created by any human law. It was brought into being by the Creator from Whom it received its rights, and the family is still the most powerful influence over the child. Its bonds are rooted deep both in the spirit and flesh of its members and its ties must not be broken or uprooted save for the most serious reasons.

I have come before you this night, an American citizen and minister of God, whose measure of devotion to God and country can be judged, I pray, by my life's work. I have tried faithfully to talk to you as a loyal American for the good of all Americans. Now I feel it my duty, before I leave you, to speak to you as a priest of the Catholic Church, loyal also to its teachings which strengthen and sanctify my loyalty to my country. And I speak now only for my own people of my own faith when I state that it is both bold and ignorant of any judge, court officer, or social worker to berate a distressed wife and mother of a large family for the number of children she has brought into the world. Sex is a gift of God. The Jewish law held the procreation of children a blessing. The Christian law under its Divine Founder continued and still continues to respect and uphold that divine mandate. Therefore do I repeat that it is my belief that the modern social worker or judge who advocates birth control to a Catholic parent is but an agent of the moral destruction of the very family that has been entrusted to him to save. And one of the rights that we as American citizens insist on, a right upheld by law, is that each child and each family be supervised by a probation officer of its own religion, for, to place a child under the direction of a probation officer of a faith other than its own is a surrender of the element most necessary to its guidance, a violation and betrayal of both the religious and legal rights of the child.

Yea, within your hands which represent the constitutional laws and rights of our free and democratic Nation, within your hearts which represent God's compassionate, charitable heart, you are among the favored few who hold in your keeping the life and future of America—America's children and their homes. And this night I pray you to follow God's pattern in judging those who come before you, and help America's mothers and fathers and their children to be loyal, God-loving parents and patriots.

The Gray Report Extends Crackpot Socialist Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release from my office entitled "The Gray Report Extends Crackpot Socialist Programs."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 22, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican of Nevada, warned today of what he considers the grave danger to the national economy and the additional tax burden which would be put upon the shoulders of the American people if the Gray Report should be approved by Congress.

The Nevada Senator, in a statement issued through his Washington office, said that some of the recommendations made by Gordon Gray, special assistant to the President, in his Report to the President on Foreign Economic Policy, paralleled some of his own recommendations but that the Gray Report went entirely too far and embodied all the crackpot program of the Socialist-minded State Department.

Senator MALONE suggested that the American people, particularly their representatives in Congress, "read the fine print" before making up their minds about the Gray Report. Senator MALONE, in urging that utmost caution be exercised, called attention to the fact that approval of the report would provide—

1. That we continue sending money to so-called Marshall plan countries for 3 or 4 years after the expiration of ECA without requiring those countries to stop arming Russia, or even requiring that we be permitted equal access to the markets of the world.

2. That our net outflow of capital to underdeveloped areas of the world be in the range of six hundred millions to eight hundred millions each year, this additional money to be taken, of course, from the American taxpayers.

3. That means be found to actually increase the high volume of sweatshop labor exports from foreign countries to the United States to compete with American-made goods produced by American workers with a higher wage standard, this leading inevitably to the lowering of the American worker's standard of living.

4. That the American Government protect the British pound sterling, with its fictitious fixed value, and the external position of the United Kingdom. (Isn't it about time our administration started thinking about protecting the American dollar and the American economy?)

5. That the American taxpayers be called upon to guarantee private investments in foreign countries against the risks of nonconvertibility and expropriation (and this, mind you, without calling upon these countries for any guaranties).

6. That America extend the point-4 program, the foot-in-the-door never-ending foreign give-away program of world-wide distribution of wealth, which could conceivably involve the American taxpayers to the extent of billions and even trillions of dollars.

7. That the United States become a member of the International Trade Organization, whereby the domestic and foreign trade of the United States could be governed by 50-odd countries, through the fixing of tariffs and import fees and quotas of production, the United States having in this ITO just one vote, the same as Cuba or Siam.

Senator MALONE concluded: "These and other features of the Gray recommendations are but a repetition of the same old State Department ideas which the American people have recently repudiated at the polls, to the extent of defeating the administration leaders in the Senate and the others who made excuses for the State Department. I do not know whom the administration thinks it is fooling by trotting out this discredited program, dressed up in different language.

"The economic ruin of the United States is still Stalin's aim. The Socialist element long ago gave up fomenting a revolution in this country and directed their efforts toward the control of one of the major political parties. In this they have succeeded beyond their fondest hopes. With the cooperation of the present officials of the State Department, they are not only wrecking our national economy by removing the floor under wages and investments through their free trade program, but are endangering our national safety through the disposal of strategic areas."

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me at Harrisburg on November 14, 1950, before the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am sincerely grateful for this opportunity to discuss with you the vital issue of universal military training.

It is a distinct pleasure to take part in your program because it reflects your patriotic concern with the future of freedom in our Republic and in the world.

As an organization and as individual members of the Council of Republican Women, you have served our State and our Nation with loyalty and true devotion to the ideal held sacred by every American.

As a Nation and as a free people we are confronted today with problems more pressing than at any other time in our history.

We are living in a time when the highest principles of Americanism must be called forth in the service of our country. The future of freedom in the United States and in the world will be decided by the measure of American patriotism, American strength, and American sacrifice.

We are faced with a situation in which our paramount objectives must be the defense of America, the preservation of the American way of life and the establishment of enduring peace.

In considering a program directed toward those objectives we must first recognize certain existing conditions which are beyond dispute.

1. We are engaged in a struggle for survival as a free Nation.

2. Our enemy is a powerful, well-disciplined force, supporting a philosophy which denies God. Its sole aim is to enslave all mankind, including the United States, under Communist tyranny and terror.

3. We cannot defend America with second-rate measures. The penalty for second best is surrender, the loss of all freedom, or death.

4. Our experience in Korea has given conclusive proof that weakness is an invitation to aggression and could plunge the world into total war that might last a generation or more. At the end of such a war there would be no victory. Civilization would be destroyed.

5. World war III can be averted only by building to its highest peak the full power of American military, industrial, and spiritual strength.

Are we awake to the dangers?

Are we prepared to meet the supreme test?

Let us look back to the end of World War II, just 5 years ago. At that time we were the mightiest Nation of all history in military power. We had the greatest, the best trained, and best equipped Army in the world. Our Navy had command of every ocean. Our Air Force had complete superiority over any potential enemy.

We were at the height of our industrial production. Our farms were providing food for our Armed Forces and our civilian population. In addition we were practically supplying the unfortunate victims of war's destruction in the world.

But we are not a warlike people. We have no ambition for conquest. We turned to the ways of peace. We wanted business as usual—pleasure as usual—and politics as usual. We wanted our boys brought home.

Immediately we began demobilizing our armies, putting our ships into moth balls, and converting our industries to normal peacetime production.

But the Russians took a different course.

Behind the iron curtain the Communist dictators were training armies of greatly increased strength, enlarging their war plants, building more tanks, bombers, and submarines, and producing more food for their fighting men.

In the meantime we were talking about socialistic experiments, proposed by unprincipled politicians, and supported by many well-meaning but misguided economic planners and so-called social reformers.

Many of our people wanted socialized medicine, socialized public housing, and education under the control of the Federal Government. They wanted the Government to guarantee security for everyone. They wanted all authority centralized at Washington even though such concentration of power would rob the people of their individual freedom.

We seemed to think we could buy peace by distributing our strength throughout the world. We tried to attain peace by appeasing Joe Stalin. We thought the spread of communism could be stopped by great appropriations to Western Europe.

What has been the result? By treacherous political maneuvering and by cruel and ruthless aggression Soviet Russia has captured domination over one-third of the world and control over 720,000,000 people in Europe and Asia.

The miserable state of unpreparedness in which we found ourselves at the beginning of the Korean War should serve as a lesson and a warning.

It would be dangerous folly to assume that after victory in Korea we can return to an easy way of life.

It would be dangerous folly to ignore the fact that the enemy of freedom is poised and ready to strike without warning, anywhere, at any time.

When will the supreme emergency arise? Will it be tomorrow, next year, or within the next 5 years? It is not within the power of any of us to answer that question. Only the Kremlin knows the answer.

Every American should understand clearly that we must be fully prepared for a showdown whenever it may be thrust upon us. We must make up our minds that regardless of the outcome in Korea, we must maintain a large armed force for years to come.

Never again must we be caught in a time of crisis with a shortage of manpower trained for war.

To some extent we have recognized the dangers of inadequate preparation. We have extended selective service. We have called out some of the Reserves. Our own Twenty-eighth Division has been called into Federal service and is training to carry on the honored traditions symbolized by the famous red keystone. Other National Guard units are undergoing similar training.

But we know from tragic experience that these hurried expedients are woefully inadequate for a nation as large as the United States and the commitments we have in all parts of the world.

We have paid dearly in every war for our tendency to postpone preparation until the actual outbreak of hostilities.

The vast changes that have taken place in military science—the development of swift communications and weapons of mass destruction—have not altered the basic principle that properly trained manpower is the major deciding factor between victory and defeat.

The plan of national defense, conceived by Washington and his generals, including Von Steuben, the great drillmaster of the Revolution, was based on the principle that the wars of a republic must be fought by the people. The plan submitted by President Washington in 1790 provided that every able-bodied young man should be trained to defend his country.

Washington rejected the idea of a large professional army. He feared such a force might eventually develop into a dictatorship that could seize control of the Government.

Washington and his generals wanted a small, highly trained Regular Army and a well-regulated militia.

That plan is just as valid and just as necessary as it was in Washington's time.

It is the plan advocated by everyone who believes that our Republic must depend upon its great body of citizens for the defense of our freedom, our ideals, and our very existence.

Universal military training is our foremost need today to implement the American plan of defense.

It is a system that is absolutely fair. It should be administered without exemptions except for physical or mental reasons and sincere conscientious objection.

Universal military training is needed to inculcate into the hearts and minds of our young men a deeper appreciation of America.

It is needed to inspire a better realization of individual responsibility to support and strengthen the American system of government.

It will build up stronger resistance to the vicious Communist philosophy which is seeking to destroy all that we hold sacred.

Universal military training is American in origin, principle, and character. It calls for equal service with equal opportunity. It distributes equal responsibility for our Nation's defense among all classes and creeds, the rich and the poor.

In the event of war, which could come like lightning in these troubled times, our young men would not be called upon to fight without adequate training. We would have a great reservoir of trained officers and men ready for immediate action.

Military training does not breed war. On the contrary, it is a powerful agency for peace, with tremendous influence to discourage war.

It has been asserted that universal training would make us a militaristic nation. My own career as a soldier and my close personal association with thousands of veterans convinces me that the veterans would be the first to oppose the development of a military caste in our country.

I know that many who oppose military training for our youth do so with complete sincerity in their hearts because they dread the thought of war.

To them I point out the lessons of history—the casualties which grew out of unfitness—the losses which might have been avoided if those who served in the Armed Forces had been given a better understanding of proper conduct under conditions of hardship and danger.

Such knowledge saves lives. Many veterans are alive today because of the training in self-preservation they received as members of a peacetime military organization .

It is not surprising that the most ardent supporters of military training are those who know the horrors of war.

I repeat, I believe in universal military training as a great instrumentality for peace.

So long as there is danger to peace in the world we cannot afford to be without the military strength to discourage Communist aggression.

Universal military training, if put into effect without delay, will serve notice on Moscow that we mean business.

The risks are too great—freedom is too precious—to leave the future of our country to chance. America must prepare.

Universal military training is the best course to follow for a better America and a stronger America.

State Department Advancing Cause of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a release from my office entitled "State Department Advancing Cause of Communism."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 14, 1950.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, charged today that there

is and has been a diabolical and deliberately conceived conspiracy, "aided and abetted by certain United States Government officials, to advance the cause of the Soviets throughout the world, to discredit the American free-enterprise and competitive system, and to bring on absolute socialism here."

Senator MALONE continued: "It seems impossible that the administration's actions can all stem from ignorance of practical conditions throughout the world. We are in an undertow of world socialism and the taxpayers of America have been led to finance it.

"Our own State Department officials are right now deceiving and double dealing the American people. They are publicly announcing that the United States will vote against the recognition of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations, and at the same time they are working behind the scenes with England to corral enough votes for recognition of the Chinese Reds. Secretary of State Dean Acheson has admitted that his representatives in the United Nations have been instructed not to use the veto against such recognition.

"Add up the facts and the conclusion is inescapable that the President is under the influence of, and the American people are at the mercy of, those who would destroy the American form of government and the American competitive system, which made this country great.

"Here are a few of the cumulating facts:

"1. At Yalta the plan was laid to give the Reds strategic areas throughout the world. Our ailing President, advised by Acheson's friend, Alger Hiss, since proved to be a traitor to America, gave Manchuria to the Reds; gave Berlin to the Reds with no provision for ingress or egress of western nations' personnel; and made other important concessions, including that involving North Korea, none of which were designed in the interest of America and much of which aggravated conditions leading to war No. III (called by the President a police action, notwithstanding the 26,000 killed, wounded, and lost in action to date).

"2. Our State Department had our Armed Forces withdrawn from Korea, in accordance with the Lattimore-Acheson plan, and virtually invited the Reds to take over. When President Truman was forced into repudiating this position, he did not demand Acheson's resignation. On the other hand, he said, curiously enough, that Acheson would remain as long as he was President.

"3. When Acheson and his left-wing friends forced Louis Johnson out as Defense Secretary, they saw to it that the post went to General Marshall who had been Acheson's front man in building up the Communist victory in China and could be depended upon to be complacent toward further maneuvers along the same line.

"4. When MacArthur sent his message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars stressing the importance of Formosa, the State Department leaders, who from all indications had promised Formosa to the Reds, had Truman force MacArthur to withdraw the message.

"5. United States delegates to the United Nations approved the plan of the Security Council to invite the Chinese Reds to sit in a United Nations discussion of the disposal of Formosa, all of which was only a bit of window dressing, for the conspirators had decided long ago that Formosa would be awarded to the Reds. (Quite strangely, the President now says Formosa must be neutral.)

"6. The State Department has favored our sending all kinds of war materials to the Marshall-plan countries which have 96 known trade treaties with Russia and her satellite nations. In other words, our State Department is arming Russia for world war III while helping her to consolidate her gains in Eastern Europe and in China.

"7. On the home front, every possible socialistic step has been taken and a direct attack has been made and continues to be made to wreck American industry through the free trade policy of the State Department. Recently representatives were sent to a Torquay, England, conference the purpose of which was to still further lower the tariffs, which will have the effect of forcing American workers into further competition with the sweat shop labor of Europe and Asia, lowering the American workers' high standard of living. This is all part of the deliberately conceived scheme against the economic life and the safety of the United States."

Senator MALONE concluded: "The shape of things to come is clear. With Acheson, the loyal friend of Hiss and Service and Lattimore, calling the signals, how could the Communist nations lose?"

Address of the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., Archbishop of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 19, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein resolutions recently adopted by the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies and a very profoundly patriotic and moving speech by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston, before the officers and leaders of the Holy Name Society on Sunday, December 3, 1950. Archbishop Cushing is one of the great spiritual leaders of our time.

The resolutions speak for themselves. They will be of interest to every thoughtful American and particularly to Members of Congress, who will find in those relating to political questions, strong and impressive declarations of policy worthy of the most careful consideration.

The address of Archbishop Cushing is brilliant, forceful, and gleaming with genuine Americanism. Profoundly spiritual in tone, it is statesmanlike, practical, and patriotic in its approach.

I am placing it in the RECORD because I hope that it will be possible for every Member of Congress to read it at this time of peril when some are fostering and urging appeasement of those who would destroy our precious freedoms.

ADDRESS OF THE MOST REVEREND RICHARD J. CUSHING, D. D., ARCHBISHOP OF BOSTON, TO OFFICERS AND LEADERS OF THE HOLY NAME SOCIETY, SUNDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1950

Each year at this time I meet with you so that we may take stock of the past and make our prayerful plans for the future.

This year we meet under particularly sobering circumstances. When last we assembled I begged you to pray for the church. I pointed out to you some of her enemies' designs upon her welfare here in America. You will remember that I quoted to you the drunken, but very ominous attack made upon the church by a national radio commentator and I pointed out the relationship of his drunken talk to the sober campaign against Catholic schools, Catholic charities, organized Catholic life of every kind as of this time a year ago. I asked you to pray for the church.

Today I ask you to pray for America. We may well doubt whether she has ever been in greater need of prayers at home and of friends abroad than she is this week. The common people of America, by their charitable efforts, their travels, their letters, gifts, and good deeds of every kind, have done everything possible to make friends for us in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere. Organized efforts by the Government have been directed toward the same end, particularly through gigantic relief programs and constructive measures like the Marshall plan.

But some diplomats have diminished the effectiveness of these efforts by the manner in which they have seemed willing to use these means of influencing friends in order also to alienate friends and to create enemies. We must pray that our leaders, finally awakened to the dangers in which our Nation stands, will put an end to this foolhardiness and make the friends we badly need among people who have long desired to be our friends.

I refer particularly to nations like Spain and Portugal. It is an appalling piece of hypocrisy which talks of relief to starving Yugoslavia and yet seeks to starve Spain. It is contemptible politics, contemptible morality, contemptible diplomacy and, at the moment, contemptible patriotism, to subsidize the Communist regime of Tito and to refuse the hand of friendship to the one nation in Europe which has been resisting communism for 20 solid years, years during which some of our leaders were ready and willing to appease the Reds.

I have never made any public pronouncement of any kind concerning Spain. People who have spoken up in tribute to the Spanish people's heroic overthrow of the Communist conspiracy have been labeled Fascists, reactionaries, and enemies of human freedom. Name calling of that kind is not as common, or at least not as public as it used to be before the Reds embarrassed their sympathizers here in America. The critics of Spain and the friends of communism have grown more cautious for reasons which are shrieked in the headlines this week. We would be fools, however, foolish citizens and foolish Catholics, if we supposed they have changed their minds.

Communists and Communist sympathizers never change their minds. They change their line; they change their tactics; they change their addresses; they change their names; they change their countries and their contacts; but they never change their minds.

They are seeking now in America what they sought in Korea a year ago, in China 2 years ago, in Hungary 3 years ago, in Yugoslavia before that—and what they successfully obtained in all these places, sometimes with our help or connivance. It is the same thing that they sought in Spain 15 years ago and which the Spanish people flatly refused to give them. For that refusal Spain has been paying ever since.

One would not mind if the reprisal against Spain had merely come from those who admit that they sought the destruction of Spain, from acknowledged Communists and Red sympathizers. But the reprisals have been directed at and against the Spanish people, and are directed to this very day, by men who claim that they speak for us, for America and for democracy.

The reprisals against the Spanish people have taken many forms; the positive form of constant repetition of lies about Spain by men in high places and low; the systematic spread through the liberal press, some non-Catholic pulpits, and certain lecture halls of the Communist propaganda concerning Spain. The reprisal has also taken

the negative form of a cold-blooded, calculated effort to freeze the Spanish people out of organized society; to ignore their contributions to the security of the Western World; to deny their right to be heard and to be helped; to starve them into the repudiation of the Government forced upon them by the same international communisms which is now forcing upon us days of frenzied planning and nights of tortured sleep. For it is no longer Spaniards, but Americans, who are being blown to bits as part of the plan first made clear in Madrid, Barcelona and the Asturias 15 years ago.

If we have so many millions of dollars and tons of supplies to give to Tito, whose men shot American soldiers, whose kangaroo courts have outraged the spiritual brethren of millions of American people, whose orators have slandered American ideals and policies, then surely it is proper that we aid the Spanish people. They first bore the brunt of the savagery we are now beginning to taste in the Far East. They first sounded the alarm we are now attempting to echo. They gave their blood, their valor and all else they had to fight back an enemy whose existence we denied until he turned on us.

We are told that we must help the Communists of Yugoslavia because they are defying the savage threat of Soviet imperialists. We might therefore conclude that we should even more gladly help those non-Communists who have not merely defied but have defeated the savage threat of the same imperialists within the borders of Spain.

We are told that it is in our Nation's interest to keep Soviet power out of one of Europe's most strategic areas. We might therefore conclude that we should help even more a nation which has been the object of Soviet designs against all the European peninsula, the first nation in which an armed effort to establish Soviet power was made and successfully frustrated.

We are told that the continued independence of Yugoslavia is of great importance to the security of the United Nations and to its partners in the common defense against the threat of Soviet aggression. We might therefore conclude that the same is true of the continued independence of Spain, the first nation the Soviet attempted to subjugate.

We are told that aid to Yugoslavia is a part of our effort to educate those parts of the world still hovering between democracy and communism concerning the evils of the latter and the merits of our system of Government. In the case of the Spanish people, that work of education is more than half done: They are the one people in Europe who do not need to be told the evils of communism.

There is not a single family, not one, in all Spain which has not learned this lesson in the bloody school of Communist violence. There is not a single town in all Spain which hasn't tasted what communism has to offer. There is not a single diocese which does not have its list of martyred priests, nuns, and devoted laity. If our relief programs have for their partial purpose to provide education against communism, then the Spaniards have qualified for their place among our disciples—and their qualifications have been increased, not diminished, by the lies told about them here in America and among the United Nations during the past 15 years.

There must be very few people left who do not now realize who started these lies and who has kept them going and why. We may well thank God, as Catholics and as Americans, that the tide is beginning to turn and that we now may hear the truth about Spain; the truth about what Spain suffered from communism; the truth about what Spain did to prevent the spread of communism; the truth about what Spain can still do to prevent the spread of communism; that truth about Spain's place in Christendom and Spain's place in the Western World.

It may now be possible, at long last, to acquire and publicize the truth about Spain as told by our American Ambassador there during the recent war, Prof. Carleton Hayes. His book Mission to Spain received a systematic soft-pedaling from the fellow travelers and Red sympathizers who were so much more powerful when it was first published than they are now—thanks to the persistent, patient patriotism of men like Tom Murphy and those who have exposed the friends of communism in the Government bureaus, in the entertainment world, the publishing field, education and social circles, and political action.

We are told that even though Tito tramples both faith and freedom underfoot, still we should give him aid since, as Christians, we are bound to love even our enemies. This kind of talk always reminds us of the warning of the poet that the Devil can cite Scripture for his purpose. It is true that Christians are commanded to love their enemies. But that commandment does not require them to treat their friends with contempt; to starve their neighbors merely because they are not enemies; or to turn friends into enemies so that they may be eligible for our affection and aid.

If moral or humanitarian considerations require that we forgive Tito, then they certainly require that we forgive Spain whatever fancied case against the Spanish people we are told exists. They also require that we welcome Spain, a tried and tested foe of communism, a proven friend of Christendom, into whatever alliances of mutual benefit are being concocted in the present effort to turn back the tide of communism.

Certainly we are bound to make friends with our enemies—but no less certainly we are bound to make friends of our friends; to build on whatever foundations for friendship may exist; to pay due tribute to those who have proved themselves our friends by suffering at the hands of enemies who were practicing to turn on us.

I hope that you men will express your American and Christian satisfaction with the actions of those representatives who have helped make possible aid to Spain. I hope you will make clear to those who seek to prevent aid to Spain that their line is wearing thin, and that those who know where the real evil lies in the world at the moment are weary of that line, weary unto death.

So, too, the mask is off in China—and for that, too, we should be grimly grateful. We shall hear less talk about agrarian reformers in China, now that the agrarian reformers have beat their ploughshares into swords with which to slay our sons and brothers. We shall hear less about agrarian reformers—but we must not forget who they were who tried to sell the agrarian reformers to us.

What must be our reaction to all this? The Catholic approach to the problem of organizing a peaceful world is now what it has always been, despite the verbal attacks of the anti-Catholic or the violence of the Communists. It was restated effectively and beautifully by Monsignor Sheen in the first issue of a new publication called World Missions. He pointed out how Catholic missions are in great degree the home of humanity. One of the primary purposes of our foreign missions is to build not one world but rather one humanity, the one humanity which must exist before a united world is possible. "One world" is a political and economical concept. "One humanity" is a divine concept, something only God's grace can achieve. Monsignor Sheen put it well when he said, "The Catholic point of view is that humanity is made one, as a body is made one through a soul. When the Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles, their discordant elements were fused into one body, and even one mind. The confusion of tongues was undone, and the poor divided speech which men had inherited from Babel's bricklayers now became one language and one mind.

"The purpose of the missions is not to unite the world in one political system or to make other countries all believers in a particular form of democracy, but to allow them great political diversity with unity in spirit. When the early church received the pentecostal outpouring, her members shared their property in common. This was the creation of one economic world, but the spirit was first. The Communists assume that if men share property, that therefore they are one in spirit. The fallacy is to assume that if four men divide an apple, they become brothers. Rather the Catholic position is that if they are first made brothers in Christ, then they will share the apple. The Catholic who regards the Chinese and Japanese, and Indians, and others, as his potential brothers, will translate this act of faith into positive mission aid, that they may become actual brothers in Christ, to the end that there may be one world because there is one humanity."

Wherefore, this afternoon I join in the resolutions your committee presents to this assembly. But I ask that either by formal resolution or by informal conviction you leave here united in: (1) Gratitude that at last token action has been taken to encourage the Spanish people in their repudiation of communism; (2) satisfaction, not complacent, but realistic, that at last the mask is off in China, as it long has been in Spain; (3) recognition that the cause of Catholic missions deserves a first place in the prayers, interests, and loyalties of all Holy Name men.

Men of the Holy Name Society, I repeat, pray for America. Pray for our President. Pray for his advisers, military, diplomatic, and political. He is faced with decisions such as few men in all recorded history have had to make. Pray that he will be God's instrument, our President and God's man.

RESOLUTIONS OF ARCHDIOCESAN UNION OF HOLY NAME SOCIETIES, ARCHDIOCESE OF BOSTON, TO BE PRESENTED AT THE OFFICERS' CONVENTION, DECEMBER 3, 1950, AT BOSTON, MASS.

1. GRATITUDE

Resolved, That the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies, its spiritual directors, officers, and members again offer their affectionate greetings to His Excellency, the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., Archbishop of Boston, and express their gratitude for his kind interest and inspirational leadership during the past year, and be it further

Resolved, That the Holy Name Society members once again present to His Excellency their expression of willingness to participate in whatever movement or action His Excellency may request during the coming year.

2. SPAIN

Resolvea, That the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies commends the Government of the United States in its appointment of an Ambassador to Spain and for its economic aid extended to the people of Spain. It is belated recognition of the Christian spirit of a country, which despite opposition of communistic influences, extended cooperation to the United States in time of war. We realize that this recognition has been granted in the face of an unexplained attitude of some Americans of continued disregard of the possible contribution of Spain, imbued with the Christian spirit of charity and peace, to the peace of the world. It is a spirit which is sympathetic to the liberties and ideals of the United States of America, and which will prove a most valuable ally in the campaign of freedom-loving peoples against the forces

of diabolic communism rampant in the world today.

3. CHINA

While the Archdiocesan Union deplores the extended delay, nevertheless we appreciate the awakening of the American people to the dangers of communism in general.

Our union, moreover, is appreciative that the menace to world peace as represented by the Communist activities in China has finally been unmasked.

We particularly call to the attention of our fellow citizens the fact that this particular menace of communism in China was pointed out in clear and unmistakable language by His Excellency Richard J. Cushing, D. D., Archbishop of Boston, 2 years ago.

We can only urge our fellow citizens at this late hour to hearken at least to the solution proposed by our church and by His Excellency, that Americans of all faiths turn to the only source of justice—Almighty God. May we seek solace for the burden of sorrow and misery that has fallen upon us through our neglect or ignorance by praying Almighty God to bring universal peace.

4. YUGOSLAVIA

Whereas the imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac has become a world-wide symbol of oppression of religion in Yugoslavia; and

Whereas the United States Government has demonstrated an increasing willingness to aid the Communist regime of Marshall Tito of Yugoslavia; and

Whereas it is felt that our aid at this time will serve to bolster this antireligious government: Be it

Resolved, That the Archdiocesan Union strongly protests the extension of aid to Yugoslavia until that country adopts a policy of religious freedom evidenced in part by the unconditional release of Archbishop Stepinac; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the members of the Appropriations Committee, the Senators from Massachusetts, and the Congressmen from eastern Massachusetts.

5. FATIMA

Whereas the mother of God has appeared within our generation to three children at Fatima in Portugal in six different apparitions; and

Whereas the final apparition was accompanied by visible and clearly defined supernatural signs witnessed by thousands of people, including unbelievers and completely disinterested agnostics; and

Whereas the theme of the message of the mother of God was world peace and the conversion of Russia through prayer, and particularly through the rosary; and

Whereas his excellency, the most reverend archbishop, has instituted the public recitation of the rosary each day by means of the radio: Be it

Resolved, That the members of the Holy Name Society do everything within their power to spread the message of Fatima and in particular the archdiocesan recitation of the rosary by participation and by their active financial support.

6. TELEVISION

Whereas the rapid growth of the television industry has already exerted a profound influence on family entertainment habits; and

Whereas, due to this rapid growth, and to improper safeguards by the industry, much indecent and highly objectionable matter has crept into both script and pictures; and

Whereas this medium so directly and so intimately affects the family—especially the children: Be it

Resolved—

1. That the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies deplores the introduction of obscenity and needless brutality in script and in pictures on television programs; and

2. That the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies direct its executive board to express in writing its concern over this situation, addressing letters to the four major networks and the two Boston channels; and

3. That the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies urges upon all its officers and members the need for them to guard their children against the harm which the improper type of telecast may do while at the same time stimulating an appreciation of the potential greatness of television.

7. COLLABORATORS

Whereas many American citizens have displayed an alarming apathy toward the trend of communism in our country; and

Whereas this apathy is particularly shown by those who carry on trade privately with communistic lands, and those who indirectly provide munitions, and by those who rent and provide offices, meeting halls, and store facilities for the Communist Party to meet and to distribute literature and information; and

Whereas the recent statement of the Department of Justice has made clear beyond all doubt the un-American and treasonable nature of the Communist Party and its subservience to Moscow: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies deplores this indifference and lethargy of some of our fellow citizens and urges all patriotic fellow citizens to manifest their dismay and displeasure toward those who deliberately continue to give such aid and comfort to the avowed enemies of America, by discouraging any and all business transactions with these unpatriotic individuals and concerns.

8. IRON CURTAIN

Whereas the people behind the iron curtain—dominated by Communist Russia—through her satellite governments—are subject to all the encroachments on human rights which are characteristic of the dictatorial rule of a police state; and

Whereas they are denied the right of worship through the confiscation of their churches, schools, and imprisonment of their clergy; and

Whereas they are enslaved and denied the liberty of a free ballot to elect governments of their own choice: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention requests, through our Congress, that the Government of the United States, through the Voice of Freedom and every means possible, encourage and assist these people and other countries to regain their fundamental freedoms; and be it further

Resolved, That the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies offers its sympathy and the prayers of its members to those suffering beneath these burdens.

9. AUXILIARY BISHOPS

Resolved, That the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies congratulates our former beloved auxiliary bishop, Most Rev. John J. Wright, D. D., past president of St. Angela's Parish Society, on his appointment as bishop of the new diocese of Worcester, Mass., and two stanch and beloved friends of the Holy Name Society in their installation as auxiliary bishops of the archdiocese of Boston, Most Rev. Eric F. MacKenzie, D. D., of Newton, and Most Rev. Thomas F. Markham, D. D., of Lowell.

10. PUBLIC HONOR TO THE HOLY NAME

Whereas the Holy Name Society is established to honor the name of God in words of praise and actions of virtue, especially by public devotions; and

Whereas such manifestations of love will reap countless graces and other spiritual privileges for the members: Be it

Resolved, That each member of the Holy Name Society make every endeavor to promote more visibly his love for God through constant faithfulness to the wearing of the Holy Name button, through participation in public Holy Name demonstrations, especially the monthly outdoor parish society procession, and through fervent and faithful public devotion in an oral manner on Holy Name Sundays during Mass.

11. REMOVAL OF PARTITION

Whereas a partition, unjustly maintained by a foreign power, divides the nation of Ireland, and separates the people of the north from the progress and Christian culture of the Republic of Ireland; and

Whereas by a process of political gerrymandering, coupled with intolerance, our fellow Catholics in the north are deprived of a full voice in the affairs of state and unjustly excluded from business, educational, housing, and political opportunities; and

Whereas in the partitioned area are the sites of the beginning of Christian civilization in Ireland, the see of Armegh and other religious places of devotion for the people of Irish blood;

Whereas the taxpayers of the freedom-loving American people is being disbursed in the form of European recovery aid to England, which, in turn, is subsidizing a minority form of government, and maintaining a foreign army in the north of Ireland, which is contrary to the wishes of the majority of the Irish people: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Archdiocesan Union will urge our representatives in Congress in matters of distribution of ERA funds, to point out to the Government of England the necessity of remedying this situation immediately for the sake of justice, and to prevent further waste of the American taxpayers' money.

Presented by 1950 Resolutions Committee: Frederick D. Higgins, Sr., of Charlestown; John H. Casey, of Somerville; Edward F. Flynn, Jr., of Swampscott; Donald J. White, of Quincy; Edward F. Barrett, of Jamaica Plain; Joseph Molopepszy, of Chelsea; members ex officio: Rev. Francis F. McElroy, Thomas H. Buckley, of Abington.

(The resolutions committee is deeply grateful to the deaneries and their representatives, as well as the individual members who sent in resolutions to be acted upon. Deaneries submitting resolutions were: Essex, Middlesex North, Middlesex South, Suffolk North, Suffolk South.)

Revolutionary Wartime Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an interesting article written back in 1779, but so appropriate to the present in the light of current discussion of the necessity for economic controls that I am sure Members of Congress will find it revealing. Under permission granted by the House, I am including the article in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article was republished in the November 1950 edition of Faith and Freedom, a monthly journal of spiritual mobilization. The author was Pelatiah Webster, who first published the essay from which the present article was condensed, in Philadelphia in July 1779. At that time, too, our country was plagued

with the pressures of war. The reader will find an interesting similarity between the controls of Webster's time and those of today. The article follows:

REVOLUTIONARY WARTIME CONTROLS—TO FIND GREATER ABRIDGMENT OF LIBERTY AMONG THE FIRST EFFECTS OF INDEPENDENCE WAS A SAD OMEN FOR THIS PATRIOT

(By Pelatiah Webster)

Freedom of trade, or unrestrained liberty of the subject to hold or dispose of his property as he pleases, is absolutely necessary to the prosperity of every community, and to the happiness of all individuals who compose it: this liberty will produce the following effects:

1. Every industrious man will procure all the goods he can for sale; this the way to get most money; and gain is the soul of industry, the hope of reward sweetens labor, and the most righteous have respect to the recompense of reward.

2. Every man will make his goods for market of the best quality he can, because they will bring more money and quicker sale than goods of mean quality.

THE DIRECTION OF PRICE

3. Every man will endeavor to carry to market the most scarce goods because there is the greatest demand and best price for them. All experience shows that the most effectual way to turn a scarcity into a plenty is to raise the price of the articles wanted: witness, among other instances, the most alarming scarcity of saltpeter and gunpowder, in the beginning of the present war, succeeded by the most abundant plenty in less than 1 year, affected altogether by the high price and premiums set on them.

4. Every man will go to market and return in good humor and full satisfaction, even though he may be disappointed of the high price he expected, because he has had the full chance of the market, and can blame nobody; and should he indulge fretting on the occasion, he would be the more ridiculed, and less pitied by his neighbors: and good humor and satisfaction contribute not a little to the happiness and prosperity of communities, as well as individuals; and therefore this is an article by no means to be left out or overlooked in the administration of either public or private money.

IN TIME OF SCARCITY

5. When things grow scarce and dear, every man will use them with the best economy, and make the stock on hand go as far and last as long as possible; or if he is destitute, will buy as little as will just serve his necessity. This naturally preserves the stock on hand from needless profusion and waste, and converts it to the best and most prudent use for the benefit of the community, and naturally tends to ward off high distress or total want, till the high price and great demand, by their natural operation, will bring further supplies to market.

In times of scarcity, every man will have strong inducements to bring all he can spare to market, because it will then bring the highest price he can ever expect, and consequently the community will have the benefit of all that exists among them, in a much surer manner than any degree of force could extort it, and all to the entire satisfaction of buyer and seller; by which the numberless feuds, riots, resentments, and mischiefs which usually attend forced markets, would be entirely avoided; and the market be supplied with all there is to be had. For no principle can draw into market all the supplies which are attainable, so effectively, as the cheerful good will and interest of the owners.

7. In times of scarcity, when all the goods that are to be had are exposed to sale, it is not possible the prices should exceed the degree of scarcity, for when the prices rise very high, they will soon determine whether the scarcity is real or not; for if not real the high price will bring such quantity to market as will soon lower the price; but if real, it is necessary for the above reasons that prices should continue high till supplies are produced.

Restraint of property or limitation of prices will hurt any community and probably produce the following effects, contrary to the above:

1. Every man will have as little to do with the market, and bring as few goods there as he can; for the less goods he has for sale, the less mortification and loss he sustains.

2. Every man will make his goods for market of a bad quality, or at least not the best; for they must all go at the limited price, and he therefore gets nothing for any special care or skill he may bestow on his goods to meliorate or perfect their quality; for example, musty tea, stale flour, black heavy bread, etc.

3. Every man is induced to keep such goods as are most scarce from market; for if he carries them there, he can get no more than the limited price, and stands a chance of a bad hustling in the crowd into the bargain. Whereas, if he can keep his goods from market, the scarcity will soon force a great price, and he has a chance of great profits.

4. If prices are limited, and the owner is compelled to sell at the prices limited, he considers himself injured by every sale he makes for less than he supposes he could have obtained in a free market; that his liberty is taken from him, and he can no longer call his property his own. These are hard feelings to one born to freedom almost perfect, and raised to the expectations of enjoying it in future time, in its highest perfection. These feelings fill the mind with anxiety and resentment, and when instances of this become numerous among the merchants, tradesmen, and farmers, small accidents may blow up the concealed goal, and most fatal effects may easily be supposed to ensue. This is a danger of no small magnitude, for the real strength and establishment of every government consists in the hearty union and satisfaction of the individuals that compose it.

NO INDUCEMENT TO PARSIMONY

5. In time of danger, distress, and difficulty, no man will be induced to any great efforts to supply the market; for an additional danger makes an additional expense upon the goods; but he must take the limited price and no more; he will not consequently combat or risk an increase of danger and expense without any chance of compensation.

6. When things grow scarce, every man will endeavor to lay in great stores if he can do it without an increase of price, and will not think it necessary to retrench his expenses, while he thinks his stock will last through the scarcity; the consequence of which is, that all the scarce articles at market will be scrambled up by a few hands, who will have no inducement to parsimony in the expenditure of them, by which the scarcity and distress are increased and many must be wholly destitute; and as far as this respects the necessaries of life, the consequences must be dreadful.

7. Add to the above, that in times of scarcity and great demand, every man who can possibly conceal his goods will be tempted to do it, in expectation that the great demand will soon break through the unnatural restraint of the limitation, and he shall be able to obtain a great profit in the future sale; and in spite of all the vigilance and force that can be used, many will be able to do this; which I take to be one of the natural effects of any unnatural restraint of trade, which cannot be avoided.

8. In addition to all these, the difficulties which must attend the execution of such an act of limitation, may perhaps furnish not the least objection to it. Must the owner be obliged to sell to every person who applies to purchase, without knowing whether he wants for use or sale? Must he forego previous engagements of his goods in favor of the present demandant? Must he be obliged to sell to every knave and litigious fellow, with whom he would not choose to be at all concerned in any dealing? Who shall judge how much he may reserve for his own use, and whether he may give corn to his cattle and hogs, and how much, and how many of each he may keep, etc. etc.? Must he have his house searched from top to bottom for concealment? Even the lodging rooms of his wife and daughters? I must beg to be excused from any further description of these horrors, which too many know are not mere creatures of the imagination.

9. It is not possible to form a limitation of prices which shall be just, and therefore the whole scheme necessarily implies injustice. The principles on which the just prices of goods are fixed are in a constant state of fluctuation, and therefore the prices must rise and fall with their causes: all experience proves this, and it holds true in the most excessive degree, in times of such publice distress and convulsion as we now experience. And as it is much safer to bind a man in health than a man in convulsions, so it will be safer to limit trade in peaceable than convulsed times. It is not more absurd to limit the precise height to which a ship shall be fixed at a wharf, where the tide is constantly ebbing and flowing. A great force will be requisite to keep the ship from rising or falling with the tide, and a mighty little use to pay for the trouble; besides the probability of very essential damage which the ship must incur by the application of the necessary force; but, indiscreet as this would be judged, it is less dangerous in a calm than in a stormy season.

THE MORAL CONSEQUENCES

10. Another mischievous consequence of this fatal measure, and not the least, I conceive to be its unhappy tendency to corrupt the morals and integrity of the people. To escape the ruinous conseqences of losing in their sales, they are in a manner compelled, but to say the least, they have very strong temptation, either by downright lying, or using little arts, shifts, and cheats, to avoid the sale of their goods to disadvantage. This naturally brings them into the habit, and gives them a facility of inventing and practicing low methods of shaming Abraham, which they never would otherwise have thought of, and which it is infintely detrimental to the public, they ever should learn; instances of this sort might be enumerated without end. But it is needless to give examples, it were better they and their causes should be removed than that they should be repeated.

THE WAY IT WORKED

For 10 months before the late limitations, we had a trade perfectly free, on which two observations are obvious:

1. That any goods at market might be bought for continental money, the speculators especially (as they are called) were fond of receiving it, and no person could be at any loss for any thing at market if he had that money to purchase the goods he needed.

2. That imported goods on an average (which were the only articles speculators dealt in) were 50 percent cheaper on the 25th of May last, than on the 25th of July preceding, i. e., any given quantity of imported goods would buy 50 percent more articles of country produce, or hard money, on the 25th of July, than on the 25th of May last; and for the truth of this, I refer to the merchants' books; from which it follows that the speculators (however numerous and however censured) have not raised the price of the goods they have principally dealt in.

On July 25, 1778, price current of imported goods, at Philadelphia, was as follows: West-India rum, 3 pounds 15 shillings; Mufcovado sugars, 30 pounds; molasses, 40 shillings; pepper, 17 shillings 6 pence; coffee, 9 shillings; cotton, 15 shillings; bohea tea, 60 shillings; Madeira wine, 400 pounds; dry goods about 8 to 1 old prices, and hard money 4 to 1, and price current of country produce, was as follows: For Indian corn, 15 shillings; oats, 12 shillings; flour, 60 shillings; bar iron, 200 pounds. Consequently on July 25, 1778, 1 gallon of West-India rum would bring 5 bushels of Indian corn, 6 bushels of oats, 1¼ hundred of flour, and two-fifths of a hundred of iron, or 18 shillings 9 pence hard money; anybody may easily compare the rest, and they will find enough to prove my assertion with large allowance. Price current 25th of May last was, rum, 7 pounds; sugars, 130 pounds; iron, 800 pounds; tea, 6 pounds 10 shillings, etc. Indian corn, 7 pounds 10 shillings; oats, 90 shillings; flour, 30 pounds (hard money 20 to 1), and consequently 1 gallon of rum would buy no more than 1 bushel of Indian corn, 1½ bushels of oats, one-fourth hundred flour, and two-fifths hundred iron or 7 shillings hard money, etc. These computations are made in the face of the world, and grounded on facts which anybody may disprove if they are not true, or correct the reasoning if it is not just. Now I have only to add—let anybody who is disposed to see, open his eyes, and see who it is that has raised our prices, or which is the same thing, depreciated our money. Is it the speculators who deal only in imported articles? Or the farmers, among whom no kind of dangerous speculation does or can exist? Perhaps it may be replied here that the articles of country produce are extremely scarce, which raises their price beyond the due proportion of other things. If you say this, you say everything and yield everything, viz, that the plenty and scarcity of goods will govern the price. You must admit, too, that the plenty and scarcity of money will determine the value of that also. Why then will anyone pretend to limit either, against the operation of this great principle?

AN INESCAPABLE RECKONING

We are now on the brink of ruin, and the worst disgrace, in danger of loss of liberty hitherto nobly asserted, and subjection to shameful slavery to enemies most cruel and insulting in themselves, and all that heightened in them to madness by the determined opposition we have given to their scheme of tyranny over us. All this danger arises not from our poverty or want, for we have officers and soldiers enough, stores of every kind enough, and zeal, union, and virtue sufficient to insure success; our difficulties arise only from our having too much money.

Every man ought to consider that his proportion of the public debt is as much a debt fastened on his estate, and becomes to all intents and purposes as much a burden and charge on it, as any of his private debts of the same amount, and must as surely one day be paid; is it not better then to pay it now than to have it lie a burden on him, to be paid in future time, which may be called for when he may not be in condition to pay it so easy as now? Every prudent man does this with respect to his private debts, and what reason can be given why the same prudence should not extend to the debt which he owes the public? Can any reason be assigned why the States should not imitate the prudence and economy of a private man, who happens to be involved for a time in great expenditures, which is, to pay up and discharge as much as possible as he goes, and leave as little as possible to be settled in future time?

LET TRADE BE AS FREE AS AIR

To facilitate this, I humbly propose one thing more, viz, to take off every restraint and limitation from our commerce. Let trade be as free as air. Let every man make the most of his goods and in his own way, and then he will be satisfied. Let every man taste and enjoy the sweets of that liberty of person and property which was highly expected under an independent government. It is a sad omen to find among the first effects of independence, greater restraints and abridgements of natural liberty, than ever we felt under the government we have lately renounced and shaken off. Let the laws point out the duty, and be the bulwark of security of every man.

Nothing gives the people such high satisfaction with any system of government they live under, as the actual enjoyment of the inestimable blessings of perfect liberty and full security under it; this will most effectively induce them cheerfully to support it. No burdens will be thought heavy, or difficulties discouraging, which the exigencies of government may require, when every man finds his own happiness involved in the establishment of the state.

Thus, I have offered my best thoughts freely to the public, and with most upright intentions; I hope they may be received with candor. The facts and reasonings are all open to the examination of everyone; if they do not convince, I hope at least they may induce some abler person to sketch out something more perfect and adequate to the great subject.

Military and Economic Problems Confronting the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which a citizen of my State, by the name of Mike Jenney, has sent to a large number of businessmen in the Pacific Northwest in which he discusses public reactions to our military and economic problems as he finds them in carrying out the duties of his work as head of a credit service agency.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PIONEER SERVICE CO., INC.,
Eugene, Oreg., December 1950.

GENTLEMEN: All of the letters that I have tried to write, and have written in the last several years, were easy compared with this one, for the simple reason that things are now moving so fast that when you go to bed at night all you know is that you will have an entirely different set of events and conditions to look at the moment you glance at your morning paper—and even more since the Korean war has been thrown into reverse.

In this letter I am going to try to eliminate mention of the war, because that is a book by itself. I am going to try to give some particular facts to quite a few of you businessmen who do not have a chance to keep up on local conditions as you should—let alone world conditions—because a man has his hands full these days in trying to run his own immediate business.

First, let us clear the decks for action, because, after the 1st of the year, the taxes that you will be paying are going to make you feel out of this world as far as making ends meet. (It is hard not to use the words "war conditions," for our great national debt now is only a drop in the bucket to what it will be if this is the start of world war III.) From what I can read in the latest financial magazines, these taxes are going to come from the small businessmen and private individuals more than from the large corporations. A glance at the December 1 issue of the United States News will show what I mean. Then, employment conditions are going to be tough, because as the Government controls are put into effect and tightened down, men will be leaving your immediate territory to go to other towns.

According to an announcement in the Portland Oregonian of November 29, Edgar F. Kaiser, of the Kaiser-Fraser automobile company, is already set to get back into the shipbuilding business again. If these war conditions continue in a big way, you will have your employees leaving to go to the larger cities where the Government program will go into effect. The automotive trade will be hard hit, due to the curtailment on cars. The building trades will be curtailed a lot, but from the information I have it will take 5 or 6 months to complete the dwellings now under construction. After that, the building trades will suffer, and a lot of men will be laid off, such as carpenters, bricklayers, plumbers, electricians, and common laborers. It is to be supposed, naturally, that these, later, will be absorbed into the Government program of war preparations. But while the Government program is getting under way there will be a lull and quite a lot of unemployment. Therefore, men who are good credit risks now will cease to be such, because their earning power will have stopped. Another hardship, as an effect of this, will fall on the merchants who have become heavily involved in consumer credit; and there will be a lot of repossession of such merchandise as cars, television sets, ice boxes, radios, washers, and other electrical contrivances. Merchants who have been doing an extensive credit business will be hit hard, as a lot of these people will be leaving their present homes and moving into the manufacturing centers of war supplies. In Eugene, and Lane and Douglas Counties—in fact in most of the lumbering territory between Portland and Ashland, Oreg., and between the Cascades and the Pacific Ocean—the lumber industry is not enjoying the good business that it did some time ago. All that is needed to realize this is to observe how the businessmen here in Eugene (which is the lumber center of the world) started in before Thanksgiving decorating their stores and broadcasting their Christmas programs and putting on big sales to help promote business. (Personally, I have heard a lot of complaints from individuals that the merchants were commercializing the season too much, and putting Christmas ahead of Thanksgiving.) But, on the other hand, you can't blame the merchant. I am afraid that after Christmas there is going to be an awful kick-back, because the average person who carries the dinner bucket and works for wages (I mean the unskilled person, like the clerk, the bookkeeper, and the laboring man who doesn't belong to the unions) makes up two-thirds of the population; and this two-thirds is supporting the other one-third—the skilled labor that is organized, such as workers in steel mills and in the automotive and building trades, factories, and lumbering.

For instance, listen to this:

"A boss roller in the steel mill, working with his hands, can earn $15,000 to $18,000 a year. Die-sinkers with an income of $10,000 a year are fairly common in the automobile industry. Top mechanics in big cities, who never thought of college, often are taking home $12,000 to $15,000 a year. Bricklayers on a 40-hour week who are working the year round are making from $6,760 a year up; and the bricklayer who works 50

hours a week for 6 months earns $4,280 a year. Plasterers generally have the same opportunity as bricklayers and get the same wage. A carpenter working full time can earn $8,000 a year."

Now, the reason I am citing these figures is to give you an idea of how labor is organized to fight for higher wages. In reality, you cannot always blame these men in the steel game, and in the automobile game, when you figure the amount of profit these big organizations are realizing. But here is the rub: the other two-thirds of the people (such as clerks, bookkeepers, white-collar workers, and unskilled workers generally), these people are fortunate if they can earn $200 a month, though some of the more fortunate may come under the $250 rap.

Reading the morning papers today (November 29) I see where the high cost of living reached an all-time high October 15; and the latest dope is that it is going to keep on rising. That may be all right for the laborer who is tied in, say, with General Motors in their system of "If living prices rise, wages will rise also," but I would say that the average laboring man, and even the average businessman who is not in position to get a rise in wages, or the businessman who has a fixed salary and is not earning at least $5,000 a year, is certainly up against it.

I wish our lawmakers would get out and circulate among the laboring class of people—the farmers who are not classed as wheat farmers or stockmen, or farmers who did not have a good acreage of sugar beets, as in the Snake River Valley and certain parts of eastern Oregon, as well as parts of Utah and eastern Idaho. I am speaking of the broad area that we ourselves circulate in (Oregon, Idaho, Utah, and Nevada).

When I was in Nevada, a short time ago, and contacting a large number of merchants in the towns of Winnemucca, Elko, Wells, and Battle Mountain, I found that those merchants were having as hard a time to make all ends meet as the merchants here in Oregon in the timber belt. I found that even the gambling houses this year have not been doing too well, due to the fact that the tourists, whom they have to bank on for the biggest part of their revenue, were not spending their money. Naturally, the cattle industry and the mining industry were functioning on high; but when I got into the Magic Valley of Idaho I found that the farmers who were raising beans were getting a good price because there was a priority. Red clover seed was paying a fair profit; but I found that they had to take a good percentage of the profit they made from raising beans to pay for the potatoes they couldn't have dug if it hadn't been for the profit on their bean crop—because it took money to dig those potatoes, sack them, and store them, as many farmers were doing and hoping for a stronger market later on. But when the priority is taken off, it is going to be just too bad for these potato men unless the war increases the demand (which undoubtedly it will).

Over in the Snake River Valley where the row croppers were depending on their potatoes, onions, and lettuce, they were all behind the eight ball. The onion situation was terrible. I have seen thousands of sacks of onions that I don't think were ever marketed, any many acres that were never dug. In one city I saw a big dump-yard of onions, and people were going out there and getting all the onions they wanted. The lettuce situation was bad also; and that goes for potatoes as well. The sugar beets were a life-saver, because they had a good priority. They really paved the way.

Here in the State of Oregon, the lumber industry has had a boom year, but a lot of small mills have suffered—first by car shortage and then by the drop in the lumber market. Of course the lumber business had started in gaining momentum again when the market leveled off; but weather conditions will be hindering; snows in the mountains, and rain and mud will make the logging roads to the main highways almost impassable. Then the curtailing by the Government of the building trade will have its effect, also. When you consider that some 65 percent of the business between San Francisco and Vancouver, B. C., hinges on lumber, you can see what the reflection will be on business in general.

Now, gentlemen, I am speaking for the Northwest. Naturally, the wheat people in Washington and Idaho and Eastern Oregon—I mean the wheat farmers—have really gone to town. Weather conditions this fall in most cases have been ideal for good crops this coming year. Millions of bushels have been dumped on the ground (no storage); and yet the cost of bread hasn't dropped any, nor the cost of breakfast cereals either.

Here is one thing I am going to criticize our Congress for: These men (I don't say all of them, because WAYNE MORSE, GUY CORDON, HARRIS ELLSWORTH, LOWELL STOCKMAN, and HOMER ANGELL, I am sure, have done all they could to get price controls put back to help hold wages and prices of foodstuffs in line), some of these Congressmen worked persistently to block price and wage controls, even when they should have known that people who cannot afford to pay these prices and the high cost of rents are being hurt. For the life of me, I cannot understand why Congress cannot see this. One of these days they are going to ask for a bond drive. The businessmen and the public have already been asked for funds for the Community Chests, the Red Cross, and other charitable causes. I ask you this question: How in the name of common sense can a man with a wife and two or three children buy meat and bread and butter and milk and eggs and (if he is trading in town) the greenery and fruit that are needed for a balanced diet (especially when so many of these people have obligated themselves through the medium of consumer credit and have withdrawn most of their savings, and in many cases all of them)? And take a look at the E-bonds that have been drawn out and put into circulation to buy cars, refrigerators, television sets, washing machines, radios, and furniture. One city recorder told me (he was from one of the towns in the Magic Valley) that virtually everybody in his town had a mortgage on his home. If you will take a glance at the mortgage debt of the people of the United States, it will astound you.

Now, the businessman is on the spot in a big way because his inventory during these war conditions is going to cut, it is going to be harder for him to get the merchandise he needs to sell; and the people he is carrying on his books (I mean the good ones), when they start going bad—well, he is going to have to learn all over again. According to the Morning Oregonian and financial magazines I have read, the Federal Reserve Board is bearing down on the banks to hold down on their loans to the businessmen. That means less money for operating costs.

This is not a pretty picture, is it? Now, with consumer credit considerably over the one billion mark (which means an individual debt of at least $125 for virtually every man, woman, and child), you can see what this inflationary spiral of wages and prices is going to do, and is doing, to the average American family.

I have had big cattlemen tell me personally that they knew the cost of beef was out of line; and I have heard some of them holler their heads off because of the price that they had to pay for a good steak. I asked one cattleman how long these retail prices of beef would last, and he said, "Just as long as people will pay them." We cannot blame the cattleman for what he is taking because it is a condition that the man is forced into. Some of these fellows have blamed this condition on the retail butcher; and, when you talk to some of the retailers, they try to lay the blame on the packer; and the packer, so I have been told, lays it on the stockman who is getting such a high price for his cattle and sheep.

Now, to me there has got to be a source of everything, and I believe in going to the very bottom of this situation and finding out just what is wrong.

One time when I was in Lakeview, Oreg., a big buyer for the steamship lines had just bought the wool clip for 11 cents a pound. I asked him if the grower could make any money on this. He said he thought they made a little. This was before the war. Now, naturally, conditions have changed a lot, but I really doubt if they have changed as much as that.

From what I can gather by reading of these vast food sales that appear in the Portland papers (Portland being one of the high spots in the whole United States), it looks as if there is too much of a spread in prices to justify these prices remaining so high.

Now, talk to the average layman you meet on the street, regardless of whether he is an attendant in a service station, or a clerk in a grocery or dry goods store, or a stenographer (or any of these men who carry the dinner bucket, who are not working with organized labor), and you will find that he is having a terrible time to make ends meet, because after he has bought his food and paid his rent he hasn't much left. And these people who have been buying cars, homes, furniture, and electrical contrivances are having an even harder time.

If you could see the thickening of our monthly credit reports that we issue to some 1,400 business and professional men throughout the States of Oregon, Idaho, Utah, and Nevada, and see the number of delinquent debtors whose names are being turned in to us daily, you would understand better what I am trying to tell you.

You may feel that this picture is quite gloomy, but this is why the Government had to put regulation W back, and why it had to cut back on the building trade. Many of our veterans were paying virtually nothing down on the homes they were buying, and many of our people were being forced out of their apartments and homes and forced to build some kind of a house because the monthly rentals they had to pay were higher than what they had to pay in installments on the homes they were building or buying.

Anyone who gets around over our four States as I do, and as my men do, can see exactly what we see and know it is the truth.

All of our clients that we have organized throughout these four States of Oregon, Idaho, Utah, and Nevada, through the media of our Pioneer Service Co. county and Statewide credit boards, are in a better position to meet conditions because the information that each one is giving the other members through the medium of our State and division office here in Eugene is giving that protection which is going to be invaluable from now on because, undoubtedly, people will be asking for more credit than ever before.

Conditions will get better as time goes on, but we are now in the leveling-off period. One boom is over (this war stopped it cold); but when the Government gets to spending all the money they will need for war production and ships and airplanes, another boom will start. Times should be good in the future; but this period in between is going to cause some business failures because there are just too many in business, as I think you businessmen will agree. To undertand what I mean, all you need do is remember how many vacant buildings there were on your main and side streets during the last war. Your wholesale houses are aware of this fact, and your banks know the danger. If this war turns out to be world war III, the grandfathers and the grandmothers will be called on to take over and run a lot of the

small businesses (as they did during the last war) because manpower and labor will be so scarce it will be pathetic.

Now, I want you to know that this is a true picture of what the future looks like to me. What I have written here is what I have gathered from the biggest and best financial magazines and newspapers, plus my personal contacts and the contacts of my men who are moving about among the businessmen in these four States throughout the entire year.

But remember, gentlemen, every cloud has a silver lining. Our present conditions may clear up more than we expect them to, because past history has proved that we come through in a big way when the chips are down. I think that if all of us American people put our shoulders to the wheel, cut out this political battle (regardless of whether we are good Democrats or good Republicans), and place America first, and take time out to write to our Senators and Representatives back in Washington, giving them all the support we possibly can, as well as our ideas, telling them what we suggest they do, and ask them to cut out these political battles and play ball, remembering that in a time of crisis such as this we are "all for one and one for all," a united America, we will get results.

Now, I want to take this opportunity to thank all of our clients who are members of our Pioneer Service Co. State-wide organizations for your fine cooperation. You have not only been helping yourself during these trying times, but you have been helping to build up an organization of business and professional men and are making conditions better by so doing.

Here's hoping that you will get out your Pioneer service books and service any of your accounts that need it. Keep this information flowing in to our State and division office so we may in turn be able to place this information on our monthly credit reports, which give each businessman a better chance to know whom to loan his money to.

Due to the fact that so many people will be moving around, be sure to watch your skip list, that you receive every month, closely.

Be sure to check your monthly credit reports carefully.

Use our application form for credit card at all times in opening up new accounts.

This is a long letter, but I think after you have read it you will feel that it contains much food for thought.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE JENNEY,
General Manager.

The Battle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following address by Conrad N. Hilton, president, Hilton Hotels Corp., at a dinner meeting of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, at Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, November 21, 1950, at which the conference presented its brotherhood award to Mr. Hilton:

THE BATTLE FOR FREEDOM

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it would be interesting to speculate how the historians of the future will characterize our times. Most of us here this evening will admit that our age must be distinguished by a tremendous onslaught of pagan ideas against our traditional western occidental state of society, and even state of mind. Those future historians cannot fail to see that all of our ideas of peace, of human dignity, of freedom, of all the values considered universal and basic, have been discarded by a great bloc of our human family.

It is in the spirit of that peace, of that human dignity, and of that freedom that we are thoughtfully gathered here this evening in our Conference of Christians and Jews. You have especially honored me tonight, honored me in a fashion that I greatly appreciate, for which I am deeply and humbly grateful.

With you I am eager to promote justice, unity, understanding, and cooperation among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—happy to one day eliminate intergroup prejudices which disfigure our religious, social, and political relations. It will be a day of great thanksgiving when we possess a social order in which the religious ideals of brotherhood and justice shall become the standards of human relationships.

If there is one thing that this world of ours needs today, ladies and gentlemen, it is that ideal of brotherhood and justice.

In 1917 many of us here this evening went off to the wars to achieve exactly that. We were freemen fighting for freedom, fighting for peace, fighting a war to end war forever. I took part in that war and I was in Paris the day President Wilson was driven down the Champs Elysees acclaimed by hundreds of thousands of people. His 14 points were to bring peace to all peoples. Just a few months later he was to die of a broken heart. His 14 points were ignored, even violently opposed, at Versailles.

PEACE ELUDES US

Twenty-five years later our sons went off to successfully fight another battle for freedom, temporary freedom. Again we lost the peace, for we blindly destroyed our mighty arsenal of military power before we had peace firmly in our grasp. We surrendered the opportunity and the power to demand a just and lasting peace. We must ask: To what purpose have we spent our blood and wealth in two World Wars? American boys who were 13 years old on VJ-day (in 1945) are now being drafted for military service. Perhaps it is simple retributive justice that compels us to face the awful prospect of another war; for we have neglected, abandoned, and betrayed those great principles to which we dedicated ourselves for the establishment of peace. We have broken faith with those who fought and died for freedom and who warned us—

"If you break faith with us who die
we shall not sleep."

If we believe what they said, we here tonight know that these boys do not sleep in peace, and we also know that we do not live in peace—and why? Because when the boys had won their victories at arms we permitted the forces of hate, injustice, and appeasement to take the victories from them.

Across the world the boys of two wars have been betrayed. And in solemn truth I say to you, if we allow the forces of evil to refashion the world to their image and likeness, if we let hate, injustice, and appeasement guide us during these next few years, if we break faith with those boys who are now fighting and dying in distant lands, we shall never live in peace again.

Freedom, my fellow Americans, is foremost in our minds and hearts this evening; it is in the minds and hearts of all the world who look to us as the last sanctuary, the last bastion of free men. Since that first dawn when man stood before his Maker, all men have cherished this tremendous thing, this magnificent thing, that makes man a man—his freedom.

FREEDOM AND HUMAN DIGNITY

But what is this freedom? What right have we to it? Why are we unhappy unless we are free men? This is why; because we possess an intrinsic human dignity, an inner majesty, which gives us an appetite, a passion for freedom. But that human dignity is not ours because we are Americans or because we belong to the United Nations nor because we live in the twentieth century. It is not a veneer acquired by education or a national environment. Man possesses human dignity because he is made to the image and likeness of God. This image is found personally in every man; each one possesses it entirely and undividedly. It is this image that makes man different, that makes man a son of God. Without this image man has no free will and consequently neither liberty nor the capacity for liberty.

I am talking with you in this fashion, ladies and gentlemen, because I know you are religious men and women. Powerful adherents of great religions are here assembled in this Conference of Christians and Jews. We know that man has no meaning, no worth, no dignity apart from the image of God in him. It is through each of us, as persons, that all greatness springs; great art, great music, great accomplishments of a nation are born in the mind of the person. It is the person through whom God has chosen to manifest Himself. To many of the youngsters of 1950 this does not mean too much, but if they only knew, as we know, it is the basis of everything they fight and die for; the privilege to remain free men.

Whenever our boys go off to war we should make them aware of what they are doing in defending their liberty. Whether they know it or not they are going out to defend the image of God in themselves, in their families, in their countrymen, and to preserve it for unborn generations yet to come. To wage war for anything less, for economics or politics—especially total war—is monstrous. Edmund Burke once said, "The blood of man should never be shed but to redeem the blood of man." Only then will war ever bring a real, a lasting peace.

GOAL OF HUMAN PROGRESS

Peace, ladies and gentlemen, is more than the absence of war. It is a tranquillity of order, it is security, liberty—religious, political, and economic freedom. Peace permits men to traverse the high seas without hindrance; it permits all people to choose the form of government under which they will live; it permits all nations to dwell in safety within their own boundaries; it is abandonment of force and aggression; it is life with honor, life with the dignity of the children of God. It is both the implement and the goal of human progress. And because we are children of God, and hungry and thirsty for that strange freedom and stranger peace of religious men, we must never again cease our struggles until they are secure forever.

It was for that freedom and that peace we fought in 1917 and we did not get it. For that freedom and peace we are fighting now, we must be ready to fight tomorrow, and this time we had better get it or we shall see the end of our civilization.

This impending assault on human freedom is no new thing, no suddenly erupting danger insofar as history is concerned.

It was in the fourth century A. D. that Attila ravaged Europe in a mighty attempt to impose his dynasty upon the wreck of Rome. Eight centuries later it was the Mongols under Genghis Khan who embarked upon the conquest of the world. And again, the pagan tide was swept back by the defenders of freedom.

Now, after slumbering another eight centuries, the godless hordes are on the march again. They are fomenting trouble and dissension in every land. While the peace-loving nations demobilized and disarmed, they forged a military machine of terrifying proportions. They are endeavoring to add hundreds of millions of Chinese and other nationals to their manpower; they are the masters of the greatest land area of the world and are now arming with terrible atomic weapons. While this juggernaut, dedicated to the expulsion of God and the enslavement of the whole world, is gaining momentum, we have lagged on the road of preparedness and have hopefully pursued the mirage of peace.

NEW CONCEPTS OF WAR

War. Peace. The old notions of war and peace have gone out of the world. It could be that in our time we shall never have war and perhaps never have peace again. When we were younger and all down through history war meant armed hostility with another nation. Peace meant harmony, and friendly relations between nations.

But today are we at war with Russia? Are we at peace with Russia? Are we at war with China, with Poland, with Eastern Germany? Are we at peace with these nations? No, the old concepts of war and peace belong to a world which the Communists have destroyed. Communism is always at war. These evil men of the Kremlin are constantly feeling around the perimeter of their vast world, like a great spider—feeling, probing incessantly for military or political soft spots which will permit them to enmesh the world with their web of tyranny. They are satisfied with fragments of nations or whole nations. They took all of Poland, the Baltic States, all of Czechoslovakia, half of Germany, half of Korea, all of China. What about Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria? We watch as their tentacles grasp for the colonial peoples of Asia, who, weakened by their struggles for freedom, may be a ready prey.

I have said that Communists wage war all the time, not only with guns, bombs, planes, and ships. In fact, the old concept of weapons is no more adequate than the old concept of war, or that of peace.

These dangerous and evil men are preoccupied with the intellectual and moral sabotage of free men everywhere.

They advocate class hatred, treason, and insurrection. Their spies and agents infiltrate into governments, industries, schools, and unions.

As their emissaries to the United Nations, they send trained obstructionists, whose chief mission is to harass, insult, slander, and vilify other members of the Council.

COMMUNISM CORRUPTS, DESTROYS

The essence of communism is the death of the individual and the burial of his remains in a collective mass. While the democracies of the world appeal to an individual's reason and morals, the Kremlin persuades its subjects with the slave camp and grave. To corrupt the minds and hearts of the individual or the nation they would destroy is much more satisfying than the destruction of that nation's factories or ports. They even conscript a part of the population in the very country whose ruin they plan. What evil is this that can make a captive American deny his wife, his children, and his country? What evil is this that can make a captive churchman repudiate his church and his God? What barbarous tortures were used to destroy the minds of these men? To the free nations bordering the iron curtain this is a fearful and terrifying menace. Its spreading, deadly poison has seeped into the councils of our own Nation. The entire diplomatic and political world of honest men seems confused as children in the presence of this monstrous reality. And the insidious thing, the frightening thing is this: It can win even when it is losing.

We have been following the path that is most helpful to the Soviet program. They want to keep us in our present state of imbalance, of war scare, while they go on annexing more countries or half countries, enslaving more and more populations. They want us to impose more and more controls on our free economy. They want us to curtail our most cherished liberties while we live with uncertainty and fear. They want us to live more and more on a constant war footing without being at war, without being at peace.

EUROPE WEARY OF WAR

Ladies and gentlemen, I returned yesterday from a 3 weeks' trip to Europe that took me to England, France, Italy, Greece, and Turkey. Communism and its inroads on the people were constantly on my mind. In the countries I visited, the people are weary and tired of war, and there seems to be a pervading fear, a hopelessness that a deluge of communism cannot long be stayed. Only in England and in Turkey is there a determined will to fight at any cost. In Turkey it is a crime to be a Communist, punishable by 20 years' imprisonment, and they are now proposing a law to inflict the death penalty for anyone convicted of being a Communist. The open defiance of communism by this little nation that lives precariously on the border of the iron curtain is a most courageous and heartening sight.

I wish everyone here this evening could have experienced my feelings when an Italian citizen handed me a newspaper in Rome one day. The head lines in one column said "28,000 American casualties in Korea." In another column was a Moscow date line of November 6 and I quote from it: "The United States Ambassador in Moscow, Alan G. Kirk, today sent a message to Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko, conveying to the people of the Soviet Union the best wishes of the people of the United States on the occasion of the national holiday in Russia." This Roman citizen said to me, "Are your people so blind that they do not know who is responsible for those deaths in Korea? Or if they do know, how can your Government send best wishes to those responsible for killing your boys?"

Valiant little Greece, bled white by her long struggle against nazism and communism, is sustained by her spirit and the help she has received from America. A fine old gentleman in Athens, who lived through the successive invasions of Italy, Germany, and the Communists, told me of the many villages where every man and child had been kidnapped, where some villages had been left with as many as 1,500 women but not a single man, not one child. To this very day they have not been returned to their former homes, and they may never be. He knew the ruthlessness of the Communists; he knew that no crime was too foul when Communists seek to fasten their yoke on a free people. He said to me, "Your people act as children in your dealings with the Communists." And so we have. For five long fateful years we dallied with the belief that Communists could become loyal members of the world family, that their word could be respected and trusted. It seems that we were the last to learn that communism is a deadly peril to free nations.

REARM FREE PEOPLE

This is a crucial time in the destiny of our Nation; in the destiny of all mankind. The remaining free peoples of the world must be strengthened and defended. The infant United Nations must be fostered, encouraged, and stanchly upheld by all of its free members. But this is not enough.

We must speedily rearm Western Europe or it will be taken from us and used against us. We have not a moment to lose. We must give increasing aid to those countries who will bear the first shock of battle.

Should there come a time when this Communist flood overwhelms these free nations, we must be prepared to stand alone. In preparation for that day, there can be no limit to our effort or expense. We must make any economic sacrifice and learn to live a hard and restricted life. We must eliminate all internal expenditures for hand-outs and see how much we can give to our country instead of how much we can get from it. There must be no more appeasement, no more sacrifice of principle for expediency, and never shall we abandon a free nation that stands with us against the common enemy.

In this struggle for freedom, at home and abroad, our greatest weapon, both a sword and a shield, will be our love of and faith in God. To open the hearts and minds of men to this truth will require a mighty river of faith and effort. Each one of us is a drop to swell that river and augment its force.

We are approaching our final hour, our final opportunity to secure the peace that has twice in our lifetime escaped us.

In the grim determination of America to carry the struggle through to the bitter end, I see a new promise, a new assurance, that remaining free people shall not become enslaved. Together if we can, but alone if we must, we will find the strength to meet our common danger and overcome it, for the destiny of our people is to hold high the banner of freedom for all men everywhere.

The Senate on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceedingly able article which appeared in a recent issue of the American Political Science Review, by one of our colleagues, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], entitled "The Senate on Trial."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE ON TRIAL

(By Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senate)

Now that we are knee-deep in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, it is timely to review the record and to ponder the performance of the Senate of the United States since it assembled in Washington on January 3, 1949. I confine myself in this article to the upper House of our National Legislature because it was the Senate which was in the main responsible last year for prolonging the session for more than 11 weeks beyond the July 31 adjournment date fixed by the Reorganization Act of 1946.

The major legislative achievements of the Senate during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress were truly impressive. It authorized the continuance of the Marshall plan, and approved the refinancing of the European recovery program, as well as aid to Greece and Turkey. It voted to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 3 years and to restore its former provisions. It approved the military-aid program to

Western Europe and extended the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. It ratified the North Atlantic Pact and passed several measures designed to strengthen our national defenses. It authorized the President to reorganize the executive departments in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and approved seven reorganization plans, even as it rejected President Truman's plan for a Department of Welfare. It approved the establishment of the new General Services Administration, salary increases for Government executives and employees, and extension of rent control.

During the first session, the Senate also passed several bills affecting the national economy, including a bill to establish a national monetary commission. It enacted a public housing and slum clearance law, approved $300,000,000 a year in Federal grants-in-aid to State school systems, a school construction bill, and passed bills establishing a National Science Foundation, expanding the hospital construction program, and providing local health services. It ratified the international wheat agreement, revised the farm price support program, extended and broadened the crop-insurance program, and facilitated the fixing of fair acreage allotments for cotton. It increased the minimum wage. The Senate also passed half a dozen bills during the session affecting veterans' benefits, created 27 new Federal judgships, and did its part to grant home rule to the voteless District of Columbia. Although the House did not concur in all these measures, it cannot be denied that the legislative output of the Senate during the session, both in quantity and quality, was of a high order of magnitude.

It is not the productivity of the Senate on the side of law-making that I am interested in for this article. It is rather the persistence of certain archaic procedures and the lack of effective party discipline, which make for frequent criticism and serious concern on the part of those interested in maintaining not only the dignity of the Senate but its efficiency and its response to the public will, that concern me. It is not so much its sins of omission alone which bring forth criticism of the upper Chamber, but rather its unlimited debate, its tolerance of dilatory and obstructive tactics, and its frequent absenteeism.

DEBATE IN THE SENATE

One of the least defensible, and to my mind most undemocratic procedures in the Senate of the United States, is that which permits a minority of its Members to prevent a majority from acting. There have been many important cases down through the years in which the Senate, through obstructions to the will of the majority which are possible under its rules, has failed in its duty to enact measures which the people desired and which a majority of its own membership favored. By the devices of filibustering, organized blocs of Senators take advantage of its traditional right of free and unlimited debate in order to paralyze the Senate completely and prevent it from acting on any proposal to which the bloc is deeply opposed. Thus, for 3 decades, filibusters against the civil-rights bills have always been effective in preventing a vote upon them.

When opportunity for debate is so narrowly restricted as it is in the House of Representatives, it is essential that there should be ample opportunity in at least one house of our National Legislature for free speech, free debate, and free amendment. But the power of full and free debate should be used to secure the enactment of wise and necessary laws, not to frustrate the will of the Senate itself. The means to promote the end ought not to be used to defeat the end itself. If four judges out of the nine on the Supreme Court undertook to prevent it from reaching a decision in an important case by endless discussion and by reading extracts from the United States Code and from law treatises, they would probably be severely condemned and perhaps subject themselves to impeachment charges. Yet there have been many times in the history of the Senate when it has been unable to perform its legislative functions because of minority obstruction. Senators with great measures in their charge have been forced to sit, impatient and often angry, while other Senators poured out an endless stream of irrelevant and empty chatter.

The filibuster is an evil. It is the attempt by minorities to prevent the constitutional action of majorities whenever the minority happen not to like it. The Senate has tried twice to limit the practice, first in 1917, and again in 1949. It adopted a cloture rule to limit debate in 1917 after a filibuster against President Wilson's armed ship bill had rendered the Government of the United States helpless and contemptible. But in the 32-year history of this rule it was successfully applied in only four instances out of 19 attempts; to limit debate on the Versailles Treaty in 1919, on the World Court issue in 1926, on a branch banking bill in 1927, and on a bill creating a Bureau of Customs and Prohibition in the same year. Since 1927 cloture has never been successfully applied to debate in the United States Senate.

The failure of the 1917 rule led to an abortive bipartisan attempt to tighten it early in 1949. The Senate Rules Committee, after hearings, recommended an amendment which would have plugged the loopholes in the old rule. This proposed change in the rules precipitated a 3-week filibuster which was finally compromised by the adoption of a new rule on March 17, 1949. Under the new rule, adopted by a vote of 63 to 23, the Senate decreed that after certain preliminaries, 64 Senators—two-thirds of the entire body—can limit and eventually end debate on any question before the Senate, except a proposal to change the rules of the Senate itself. "This issue," writes Senator MYERS of Pennsylvania, "is placed in a separate category of sacredness, and no motion to limit debate * * * can lie against it."

Of the various amendments offered to the old cloture rule, the least liberal amendment was adopted. Under the Senate's new cloture rule, it will hereafter require the favorable vote of 64 Senators to close debate, compared with the requirement of two-thirds of those present and voting under the 1917 rule. The loopholes in the old rule have been plugged, but at a price which makes it wellnigh imposible ever to liberalize the cloture rule. For, as Senator MYERS points out, by decree of the Senate itself, no machinery whatsoever for ending a filibuster on future changes in the rules is now in existence. And, of course, any future attempt to strengthen the cloture rule will run head-on into a filibuster. By giving up the power to filibuster the Journal and the power to filibuster a motion to take up, the Southerners gave up something which the framers of the 1917 rule never intended anyone should have. "The action of the Senate on March 17, 1949, was a retrogressive step," concludes Senator MYERS, "an action designed to make it harder rather than easier to cut off debate when the debate is not for the purpose of persuasion or instruction, but rather for the sole purpose of obstructing and preventing the Senate from disposing—ever—of certain matters before it."

The remedy for endless talk in the Senate is a simple one. The Senate should amend its rules so as to enable a majority of all its Members, or a majority of those present, to limit debate on any motion, measure, or other pending matter, after a period of unlimited debate for a specified number of days, say, 1 or 2 weeks. There is no subject under the sun of which the essential facts and the pros and cons cannot be thoroughly explored and ventilated in a week's or 2 weeks' debate. In the House of Representatives it has been possible since 1789 to terminate debate and bring the matter under consideration to an immediate vote, if a majority of those present and voting so desire, by adopting what is called the "motion for the previous question." This simple remedy has been proposed by many Senators down through the years, including Senators MORSE and MYERS and myself in our time.[1]

There is one other very important problem in connection with any discussion of senatorial debate. It has been said that no music is sweeter to a Senator's ear than the sound of his own voice, and far be it from me to deny that Senators belong to the talking classes. More important, however, than the fact that each session millions of words are poured into the research archives of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the fact that a large percentage of these forensics is irrelevant to the pending business of the Senate. On June 13, 1935, Senator Huey Long, of Louisiana, addressed the Senate for nearly 16 hours. The pending business was a joint resolution proposing to extend the National Industrial Recovery Act. Senator Long devoted less than half an hour to a direct discussion of the business before the Senate. For at least 15 hours, writes George Haynes, historian of the Senate, "nothing was too irrelevant to serve his purpose. He gave recipes for fried oysters and 'pot-likker,' for coffee and turnip greens. Cards from the press gallery brought welcome suggestions: The life of Judah P. Benjamin, the history of Frederick the Great. For hours he expounded the Constitution, section by section * * * it ended at early dawn. It had lasted nearly 16 hours. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it fills about 80 pages."

On June 20, 1936, Rush Holt, of West Virginia, while the Senate was considering a coal-conservation bill, read at length from Aesop's Fables.

During the filibuster fight in March 1949, when the business before the Senate was a motion to consider a proposed amendment to the cloture rule, 15 Senators made extended speeches on subjects entirely irrelevant to the pending business. One Senator spoke on American foreign policy and the military trials. Another made three long speeches on the North Atlantic Pact. A third discussed the appointment of Louis Johnson to be Secretary of National Defense. Still another attacked the Wallgren nomination in a 9-hour speech, and one more spoke at length about Federal publications. No subject was too remote from the business at hand; no parliamentary device could restrain the speakers.

In Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice there is a section providing that "No one is to speak impertinently or beside the question, superfluously, or tediously." But the last time a Senator was called to order for irrelevancy was back in 1848. Since 1872 the practice of the upper House has been that a Senator cannot be taken from the floor for irrelevancy in debate. During the Civil War, Senate debate in secret session on subjects relating to the Rebellion had to be germane and limited, but that was a passing aberration. On the other hand, the House of Representatives has had a rule of relevancy since 1789 and it has been quite strictly enforced. The fact that debate in the lower House must be germane and limited is the chief reason why the House is often ahead of the Senate on the legislative timetable. The simple remedy for irrelevancy in Senate debate is to amend the rules so as to require debate to be germane to the pending business.

Senator O'MAHONEY summed up the case for relevancy in his remarks in the Senate on March 11, 1949. "We are here as Members

[1] S. Res. 322, introduced on August 2, 1950, by Senator MORSE and Senator HUMPHREY, provides for majority cloture.

of the legislative body of the United States," he said, "and the business of a legislative body is to legislate. It is not to spend hour upon hour splitting hairs * * * or talking endlessly about irrelevant subjects. * * * Are we in the Senate impervious to the rule of common sense? Shall the great majority of a body wear itself out because a small minority is willing to exercise its muscles and its lungs * * * in discussing irrelevant questions? * * * A body which cannot govern itself will not long hold the respect of the people who have chosen it to govern the country * * * the time has come when the Senate should demonstrate to the people of the United States and to the people of the world that it can function."

A PREMIUM ON DELAY

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress, which adjourned on October 19, 1949, was one of the longest peace-time sessions of Congress in history. The session drew its weary length along through the hottest Washington summer since 1872, far beyond the July 31st deadline fixed by the Reorganization Act of 1946. The late adjournment can be attributed largely to procedure in the Senate, where there were frequently signs of a "deliberate slow-down" of the legislative process. This was in part caused by the use of only 21 percent of the time available for legislative sessions during January and February, during most of which essential preparatory work was being undertaken. More relevant explanations are to be found in the 3-week filibuster against the civil-rights program in March, in frequently irrelevant speeches throughout the session, and in the unprecedented delay in acting on the annual appropriation bills.

In contrast with the speedy passage of all the general appropriation bills by the House before the April recess, due to certain improvements in the internal organization and procedure of its Committee on Appropriations, the log-jam of appropriation bills in the Senate and in conference reached an all-time peak during the session. All the major supply bills are supposed to be enacted before July 1 of each year when the new Federal fiscal year begins. Those money bills originate in the House and then go for review and revision to the Senate, which had 11 weeks to act upon them before the July 1 deadline. Seven of the ten general supply bills passed the Senate by July 1, but the Independent Offices, Foreign Aid, and Interior appropriation bills did not clear the Senate finally until August 2, 8, and 25, respectively. Half a dozen of the major money bills were not approved until late summer or fall. The delay made it necessary for Congress to pass six resolutions providing temporary funds to keep the Government going.

Two remedies have been suggested for legislative delays. One is the proposal to consolidate all the general appropriation bills into one omnibus measure. This step, which has been adopted in 1950, not only should expedite the appropriation process, but also will give Congress a comparative view of total proposed expenditures and estimated revenues and thus lay the basis for a balanced budget. In the absence of the right to an item veto, however, it does have certain glaring weaknesses.

The other proposal is that of Senator MYERS of a legislative timetable for Congress. His resolution proposes that early in each session the majority leaders of the two Houses, after consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the standing committees, shall prepare a legislative program for scheduled committee and floor action on the major legislation of the session. This program would be revised at monthly intervals. In this way, Senator MYERS hopes hereafter to avoid the familiar end-of-the-session legislative log jams.

ATTENDANCE IN THE SENATE

One of the important problems which any legislative body faces is that of frequent absenteeism on the part of its Members. The Senate, too, falls subject to this criticism. Vice President BARKLEY recently remarked that absenteeism in the Senate grows each year. There are several reasons for this growth in recent years. With the rising burden of congressional business, many Senators are attending meetings and hearings of Senate committees which have received permission to sit while the Senate is in session. Others make calls at various Government departments in downtown Washington on behalf of their constituents. Still others are meeting visitors in the lobbies of the Capitol or escorting them through the halls. Some Senators who have already made up their minds on the bills being debated are hard at work in their offices in the Senate Office Building. A few may be out of town on speaking trips or visiting their home districts to consult with the voters, or on campaign tours. Some, too, may be on private holidays taking rests from the ceaseless grind of legislative work. In addition, a number of Senators may be abroad on committee "junkets" of varying importance. The latter was particularly true during the closing weeks of the 1949 session.

However legitimate the reason for their absence, the net effect of growing absenteeism in the Senate on the prestige of the Senate and on the legislative process is unfortunate. Hardly a day passes during a session of the Senate when several Senators do not ask and receive leaves of absence from its proceedings for a period of time varying from a few hours to several weeks. More than 250 official leaves of absence were granted Senators during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. During 23 business days last March, for example, 29 Senators were absent on leave at various times for a total of 77 days. The records do not reveal how many were absent without leave or continued to be absent after their official leaves expired.

This condition is bound to affect the fate of legislation. Many visitors to the galleries of the Congress do not fully understand or appreciate all the extenuating and frequently reasonable explanations for absences, and the daily sight of empty seats makes a poor impression on them. This must have some effect on their respect for the product of the legislative process. Senator O'MAHONEY has frequently expressed the fear that poor attendance on the floor of the Senate undermines popular confidence in representative government. Furthermore, bills are passed or defeated or postponed with barely a quorum of the Senate present which might be disposed of otherwise with a fuller attendance. On October 15, 1949, for example, the displaced-persons bill was sent back to committee by a vote of 36 to 30, in the absence of 30 Senators whose presence might well have resulted in the passage of this long-delayed measure.

The problem is indeed a crucial one. With the growth of "big government" and the need to solve increasingly complicated questions of public policy, it is clear that the burdens upon Congress and upon Congressmen are great, and perhaps too great. Members of the Senate cannot be in two places at once. They cannot, without the sacrifice of their health or the sacrifice of their political future, pay proper attention to all of the responsibilities which are theirs. Furthermore, as the people of the United States rightfully respond to the increasing number of calls upon them to "write your Senator," legislative officers and Members of Congress find themselves spending an increasing amount of their time replying to letters at the expense of their other duties.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 made an attempt to deal with the problem of absenteeism from the floor by providing that "no standing committee of the Senate or the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate or the House * * * is in session." This was an attempt to supplement the rules of the Senate which provide that "no Senator shall absent himself from the service of the Senate without leave" and that the "attendance of absent Senators" may be compelled whenever a quorum is not present. These attempts to correct the problem, however, have not been in the main successful. The spirit of the rule established by the Reorganization Act is often violated by the pressure of committee business and by the practice of senatorial courtesy; a request of a Senator from leave of absence is never denied. Nor is the suggestion ever seriously made today that section 39 of title II of the United States Code should be enforced. That section provides that the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House should make proportionate salary deductions each day that a Congressman is absent for a reason other than his illness or illness in the Member's family.

THE ANCIENT RULES OF THE SENATE

Underlying the procedural defects which handicap the Senate in the efficient performance of its constitutional functions is a code of rules which has not been revised since 1884. The rules of that far-off day may have been adequate to the parliamentary needs of the legislative process in the leisurely days of the nineteenth century; but the need of a new up-to-date codification has long been evident and often expressed by twentieth-century Senators.

The Senate's code is simple and insignificant compared with the strict and complicated procedure of the House, even though both Houses had a common inheritance in the same ancient experience of the English Parliament. It began with 19 brief rules adopted in 1789. They have been revised only 4 times since then: In 1806, 1820, 1868, and 1884 when the original 19 rules had grown to 40. There has been no general revision of the Senate rules in 66 years, and only two important modifications have been made in the meantime: First in 1917, when the cloture rule was adopted, and, second, in 1949, when the cloture rule was regressively amended. The smallness of its membership, the absolute voting equality of the States in the Senate, the early leadership of the agricultural South, and the western pioneer's deep-set resistance to restraint have thus far combined with the seniority custom to maintain within the Senate Chamber the old order against the new, sectionalism against nationalism, minority against majority rights.

Despite the direct election of Senators by the people since 1913, several factors tend to keep it out of harmony with the popular majority: (1) Its territorial basis of representation with the wide disparities in State population; (2) the practice of assigning committee chairmanships according to seniority of committee service, which has operated in favor of those States which are most conservative in changing their Senators; and (3) the regional concentration of committee chairmanships in New England and the Northeast when the Republicans are in power, and in the South when the Democrats control. These are some of the reasons why the rules of the Senate have advanced at a snail's pace.

The archaic character of the Senate rules is also due to several other influences. Senators have long believed that their rules should be conservative, not creative; weapons for the defense of the minority rather than tools of the responsible majority; devices to promote local sovereignty rather than a more effective legislative system. The constitution makers intended that the upper

Chamber was to sit as a council of revision rather than as an active initiator of the laws—a purpose which, as Woodrow Wilson observed, is promoted by "simple, comparatively unencumbered forms of procedure." The fact that two-thirds of the Members always continue in office makes for a stable and continuing membership which is partly responsible for the decentralizing tendency in the Senate. The rules of the Senate, as a continuing body, remain in force from Congress to Congress without reaffirmation, whereas the discontinuity of the House requires the adoption of a set of rules at biennial intervals. The fact, moreover, that the average age of Senators is 60, and that the Senate is governed by its older members under the seniority rule, gives the conservatism of old age much influence.

Operating both as cause and effect of slow parliamentary progress in the Senate are the large powers of individuals and minorities. Senators often tend to think of themselves as "ambassadors of sovereign states," though state sovereignty has in fact passed away forever. They feel a large independence of one another, of their committees, of caucus decisions and platform pledges. The Senate's smaller number makes each voice and vote correspondingly more valuable. Individual Senators have conducted famous filibusters against the majority will and individual absentees have effected the passage or defeat of important measures and nominations. When party ratios on committees are close, a single defection can defeat a Presidential nomination. Witness the seven to six vote by the Armed Services Committee against Mon Wallgren to be chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Single Senators have held up great appropriation bills until they have been amended to provide for pet projects in their States. In 1903, for example, Senator Tillman of South Carolina filibustered against a deficiency appropriation bill because it failed to include an item paying his State a war claim; the item was finally replaced in the bill. Senate history is replete with similar examples. In a body much of whose business is transacted by unanimous consent, the power of the individual Member is manifest.

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge wrote in 1893 that "the rules of the Senate are practically unchanged from what they were at the beginning." Former President pro tempore Ingalls remarked that "rules are never observed in this body; they are only made to be broken. We are a law unto ourselves." "The rule of the Senate has been its own sense of propriety and dignity," said Senator Anthony. Mutual respect, tradition, custom, courtesy, forbearance, honorable obligation have been the unwritten rules of the Senate over the years.

But many Senators believe that the time has come to modernize their legislative methods to avoid the difficulties faced by our legislative machinery under its tremendous modern burdens. Dr. George B. Galloway has said that "the cookbook of congressional reform contains many recipes." George H. Haynes, historian of the Senate, wrote in 1938 that "a general revision of the Senate rules is much to be desired. There is need of a new codification to bring order and clarity into the patchwork of 50 years. Senate rulings and precedents show many uncertainties and inconsistencies."[2]

A CONSTITUENT'S WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE

The public business is also detained in the Senate, as it is in the House, by the huge nonlegislative workload which the American people impose upon their Representatives in Congress. This burden consists in large part of errand-running for the folks back home. It consists in part of the hundreds of private bills for the payment of tort claims and for suspending the immigration and naturalization laws in individual cases which Senators introduce on behalf of constituents and follow through their committee and floor stages. The Senate spent 2 hours one afternoon last October debating the claim of a war nurse for damages for injuries she suffered in an accident in India back in 1945. Much Senate time and attention is also consumed in the performance of its duties as the board of aldermen for the District of Columbia, which has been deprived of local self-government since 1874. It takes an act of Congress to change a street name in Washington or kill weeds or destroy starlings or do a hundred other trivial chores for the Capital City.

Congress ought to be relieved in the atomic age of these local and private trivia which sap its energies and divert its attention from the great national and international problems of our time. The remedy here, as Senator KEFAUVER has urged, is to stop asking Senators and Congressmen to be our errand boys and to delegate the settlement of private claims and immigration matters to appropriate administrative and judicial agencies, thus completing the evolution begun by the Reform Act of 1946. Home rule should also be granted to the people of Washington. If we want to expedite the public business and see Congress function efficiently, we must, so far as possible, limit national legislation to matters of national importance.

THE NEED FOR PARTY RESPONSIBILITY

A final and formidable obstacle to the efficient dispatch of the public business in the Senate is the lack of effective party government. The American people have long believed that political parties are the principal instruments of democratic government and that the majority party should have the power to govern the country. The Democratic Party won control of the Presidency and both Houses of Congress in the 1948 elections, yet several of its platform pledges have been defeated or frustrated by hostile coalitions on the floor of the Eighty-first Senate. Dixiecrats from the solid South, who sat on the Democratic side of the aisle, ignored their party's program on civil rights and repeal of Taft-Hartley and formed an alliance with northern and western Republicans to defeat these measures and weaken the cloture rule. On many crucial issues the real control of the Senate rested not with the majority party but with this Dixiecrat-Republican coalition.

The internal divisions within the Democratic Party, coupled with the control over legislative action exercised by the standing committees, the diffusion of political power within Congress, together with the long-standing custom of unlimited and irrelevant debate, were heavy handicaps to the development of effective party leadership in the upper Chamber. Although Senator LUCAS was both chairman of the party conference, chairman of the majority policy committee, and majority leader of the Senate, all he could do was cajole, wheedle, and persuade; he could not direct his followers.

As long as varying economic and social conditions produce different habits of thought and regional attitudes in the United States, as long as some Senators feel obliged to subordinate national to provincial interests, and as long as political parties are loose coalitions of dissident elements, so long will it be difficult to achieve effective party government in the upper House. But some progress in this direction can be made, I believe, by strengthening the machinery of party government in Congress. I suggest four steps:

1. Revival and more extensive use of the caucus as an instrument for the formation and promotion of party policy. The caucus is the general assembly of the party in the Chamber. Both political parties have used it effectively in times past. It is the only known means by which the parties may formulate their legislative policies and by which the majority party can execute its decisions.

2. Creation of joint congressional policy committees in each party, with their officers rotating between the members of the two Houses, and with expert staffs to plan legislative strategy and program and to be held responsible for the legislative implementation of party policy.

3. Allocation of the function of making standing committee assignments and of selecting committee chairmen to the party policy committees, the chairmen to be chosen upon the basis of ability and willingness to cooperate in carrying out the party program.

4. Reconsideration of the committee assignments at certain intervals, say every 2 years, so as to allow the shifting of uncooperative members.

CONCLUSION

The United States is the leading democratic world power. Its governmental structure and operation are continually the center of the eyes of the world. The functioning of its national legislature is of general concern. Any successes or failures of our legislative process have world-wide repercussions. The organization and operation of the Senate of the United States must be viewed in that context.

The voters in the several States are responsible for the quality of the membership of the Senate. The Senate itself, however, is responsible for its internal methods and operation. The people of the United States must join with their elected representatives to shape and direct the procedure of the Senate so that it will increase in public esteem and become truly a noble example of efficiency and response to the democratic process.

[2] S. Con. Res. 87, introduced on April 26, 1950, by Senator HUMPHREY, would establish a Joint Select Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, to make a continued study of the organization and operation of Congress. The bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman HOLIFIELD, of California.

Letter to Mr. Vishinsky of Communist Russia and to All the People of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following communication addressed to Mr. Vishinsky of Communist Russia and to all the people of the United States of America, by Paul P. Milling, president, local No. 9, John Wanamaker, RCIA, American Federation of Labor:

Mr. VISHINSKY: It is reported that at the UN meeting in Paris you announced your country had acquired the atomic bomb, developed in the United States of America. This is the first time in modern history that a nation has admitted to acquiring a secret of another nation without its consent. That bomb was developed at an initial cost of $2,000,000,000, paid for by us, the people of these United States. It was not developed as a threat to Russia or as a threat to world peace. It was developed to save

millions of lives as our contribution to winning a war in which you were our ally and we were yours.

If you have acquired the atomic bomb, you probably believe you have our greatest asset. But you haven't. You can, however, acquire our greatest asset without any spy work, without any underhanded techniques. We gladly hand it to you free, and with our blessing. That great asset of ours is the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights.

You, Mr. Vishinsky, with Premier Stalin and 16 others of the Supreme Soviet, hold in your hands the destiny, the lives, and the liberties of over 200,000,000 people. They, literally, are serfs of your Communist state. You cannot give them the atomic bomb. But you can give them the life, liberty, and freedom of spirit that all people can enjoy under our Constitution and Bill of Rights; and you can drop this upon your people and upon the world with greater effectiveness for world peace than the destructive power of our entire stockpile of atomic bombs.

You claim, Mr. Vishinsky, that the supreme Soviet, in governing the lives, the thinking, and the activities of all the people of Communist Russia, desires only to free the world from its political, social, religious, and economic chains. You speak of world freedom as an endowment invented by communism. You are convinced that Marx invented socialism. You seek world revolution for the people's freedom.

Mr. Vishinsky, have you ever studied the United States Constitution?

It is not only a plan for government that has given us all we have, it is a logical pattern for world government because it puts government precisely where it belongs, at the source from which it must forever derive—the hands and the minds of the people. Our Constitution, on which we have no copyright, makes government the servant and not the master of the people. It is more truly socialistic than anything Marx ever wrote, advocated, or dreamed of. It makes all people potential capitalists, but it puts capitalism in the hands of a free people and not in the hands of the state, which uses capitalism to keep liberty and freedom from the people. In all of your damning of capitalism, you damn only free capitalism when you damn the United States.

You must believe in capitalism because the Union of Soviet Russia is the only state on the face of the earth that monopolizes all capital.

We are going to have an election on November 2. We are going to elect a new President, a lot of Senators and Representatives. Three major contenders are seeking the office of President. Hundreds are seeking the other offices. Under our Constitution, the people will vote precisely as they please for these officials, who, under our Constitution, are elected as servants, and not masters, of the people. Some of the candidates are actually making a bid for control over the people. They want superior powers not constitutionally granted to the President. If our people want that, they will vote for it, and get it.

Communism holds, Mr. Vishinsky, that man must be free from the chains of religion and the domination of God. It maintains that all religions for the worship of God are bad for the people and bad for the state. You have displaced God and have set up the state as the supreme authority.

Has your state, in any of its scientific laboratories, ever created seeds which would sprout into food to feed your people? Only God can do that. Have any of your state laboratories managed to upset a single natural law? Can the Kremlin lengthen a day, or shorten a night?

Do you think you can destroy the cosmic longing of all men and women to seek and to worship the source of their being? No. All you can say is "Everyone in Russia owes his life to the state, because the state has not yet seen fit to destroy him for cause." That is not giving life; that is withholding sudden death. That is refraining from liquidation, but always holding over your people the threat of liquidation precisely as the Nazis and the Fascists did it.

To eliminate belief in God, you must change man from a human being into an animal. You must reverse all the forces of evolution and reduce man to the equivalent of a unit in a herd, a hive, or a nest. You must stop man's progress in thinking and action. You must control his mind. You have had some success—temporary success—in this approach. So did Hitler. So did Mussolini. So did the war lords of Japan. So did Nero. They have passed.

Any effort to control the thinking of man is in opposition to the laws of God and of nature, and must fail. You cannot stifle man's inner desire to make personal progress, to increase in importance, to have friends, to have knowledge to have possessions, to have liberty of mind, and freedom of spirit. You cannot kill, no matter how much you suppress, the spirit that nature's God has put into man, to make him human.

What would happen in Soviet Russia if you took the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights and made them your very own? What would happen if you gave to all the people of Russia freedom to worship God in any way they pleased? What would happen if you reopened all the churches, permitted entry and activity of missionaries, and restored all of the religious rights and privileges of Jews, Catholics, Protestants, Greeks, Mohammedans and all other religions.

All of your people would have an inward lift. Pravda, carrying the announcement as news, would be kissed on the streets of Moscow. You, who announced it, would be blest by the people on their knees.

What would happen in Russia if you said to all your people, "You have complete freedom of speech without fear of reprisal?" Your people would go wild with joy, and you know it. Imagine how your people would react to be told that they could work where they pleased, and at what they pleased, without any dictation by the State. What would happen if you offered your people the right of private enterprise, to create a telephone system, a new railroad system, a new broadcasting system, and the right to produce all kinds of merchandise and services? What would happen if you gave your people the right to build and use radios, to listen to world-wide programs, and to uncensored programs of Russian stations? Your people would believe that at long last communism had become a heaven on earth.

You should like the United States Constitution for one particular thing, even if you do not like the rest of it. The United States Constitution provides, within itself, the means of change without revolution and without counterrevolution. We, the people, living under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, can change that Constitution, wholly or in part, and provide for ourselves any other kind of government we want—totalitarian, communistic, planned economy, or no government at all. The Constitution provides for amendment by vote of the majority of the representatives of the people in three-fourths of the States.

So you could appropriate our Constitution and say to your people: "Here is a new plan. Not a 5-year plan. Not a 10-year plan. A 1-day plan. All over Russia we shall have 1 day of complete liberty and freedom. One day of living without fear of reprisal. One day of doing precisely as we like." You would like to do a few things, wouldn't you, Mr. Vishinsky?

You could say to your people, "This bombshell of liberty and freedom is yours for a day, and if you like it it is yours forever, but with this proviso: If ever you don't like it, as a majority, you can vote it out of action and return to any other form you like, without war, without bloodshed, without revolution."

You have the atomic bomb, or so you say. So do we. That makes us equal as to destructive power. But that is not establishing parity. You should be equal also in constructive forces, the only force that nature's God smiles upon and blesses those who use it. The constructive force, far more important than the destructive force, doesn't have to be stolen. It is yours, for all the people of Russia, free. Free. Free. Take it. We are only a people lucky enough to have it. We didn't invent it. We have no copyright or patent on it. Yet it is the greatest force in the world because it frees the creative powers of every man and woman.

In our Constitution is the secret of all our productive success; all of the secret of our happiness, our standard of living, our wages, our short hours—everything we have, even the development of the atomic bomb. (The foregoing article was written in its entirety by Edward F. Hutton.)

As stated in my opening remarks, the poisonous venom of the Soviet delegates continues in 1950. These twin snakes crawl and dig as far as dirt and other filth will permit them. We have exposed them for what they are worth—we will continue to do so. Their counterattack is inevitable. They have already changed the cold war to a hot war by their attack in Korea. They have violated all the rules of peace just as they flagrantly violate rules of war. Yes, they even tied the hands of our gallant prisoners of war behind their back and shot them in the head.

I have said it before and I repeat it again—red fascism and communism are birds of a feather and the twin enemies of our America. We will fight them with our every thought, word, deed and action. In God's holy name, we will win.

Fraternally yours,

PAUL P. MILLING,
President, Local No. 9, John Wanamaker R. C. I. A., A. F. of L.

Are We Worthy of Our Heritage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 21 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine speech by the vice president of Edison Industries, George E. Stringfellow, entitled "Are We Worthy of Our Heritage?"

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE WE WORTHY OF OUR HERITAGE?

I'm highly complimented to be asked to speak before the Masons of the Bell Laboratories. The members of Bell Laboratories are all seekers of truth and light and the results of your efforts have helped to make this a better world in which to live.

For a number of years I was a daily business associate of Thomas Alva Edison who, as you know, was the inventor of the carbon

telephone transmitter without which the telephone would not have been a success. The Genius of Menlo Park often referred to your organization which he once described to me as one of mankind's great benefactors.

However, I wish to talk to you tonight about another subject, a subject which disturbs all people who love liberty and who place their trust in the existence of a Supreme Being.

There is a gloomy outlook today. Defeatism and lack of hope and faith have made their mark on our people. World strife has caused many to lose hope for future happiness and peace. While courageously facing these facts, we must keep our perspective for there have been other somber moments in the history of man when the portents of disaster indicated universal calamity.

"It is a gloomy moment in history," said an editorial in Harper's Weekly 93 years ago. "Not in the lifetime of men who will read this editorial has there been such a grave and deep apprehension. Never has the future seemed so incalculable as the present. In France," continued the editorial, "the political pot seethes and hub-bubs with uncertainty. Russia hangs like a dark and silent cloud over the horizon of Europe. * * * All resources and energies of the British Empire are sorely tried."

That editorial, written 93 years ago, could have been written yesterday and it would have been fairly accurate today.

However, the world continues to progress. Faith and hope continue to stir men's souls and minds. Great economic progress has been made since the Harper's editorial in 1857. We would, of course, be immeasurably better off today than we are if our spiritual gains had kept step with our economic advances. Those dark and foreboding clouds of 90 years ago were dispelled by men of faith, hope, and courage. The same characteristics of faith, hope, and courage will triumph in the future if we keep close to realities and do not substitute false gods for the Great Architect of the universe.

There is an atheistic movement called communism that's spreading throughout the world today like a prairie fire. This atheistic movement substitutes belief in a figurehead, currently Joe Stalin, for belief in God. Communism is embraced by citizens of our country who brazenly tell us that in time of war, if that war were with Red Russia, they would follow the Red flag instead of Old Glory. That, I submit, is an admission of treason in advance of the act.

Loyal and God-fearing Americans cannot read their newspapers or listen to their radios without recoiling emotionally at the very thought that we have in our country an organization whose leaders owe their loyalty to a foreign government, that asserts that belief in God is an opiate of the people and that belief in God must be exterminated everywhere before communism is safe anywhere. That assertion, I think, is a great indictment of any movement whose leaders proclaim that it cannot live in a cool, clean, crisp atmosphere of the Ten Commandments or the Golden Rule.

The enemy of our way of life and the enemy of our fraternity is a formidable foe. It is more formidable than any enemy we have faced in the history of our Republic. This enemy can destroy us if we permit him to divide us as he is attempting to do. For example, there are a number of instances where Communists have infiltrated Masonic lodges. We Masons must ever be on the alert to avoid contamination by this Godless force.

The basic foundation of Masonry, as you know, is faith in the existence of the Supreme Being.

Our form of government was virtually born in Masonic lodges. The Boston Tea Party was engineered by Masons. Paul Revere, on the occasion of his midnight ride, was an officer of his Masonic lodge. A large majority of the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States were Masons. Masons, therefore, in my opinion, have a greater responsibility to keep America American than any other segment of our human family. There are more than 3,500,000 Masons in the United States. If a large percentage of them would emulate Paul Revere and George Washington, we would need have no fear of the future of our country.

Our founding fathers placed their belief in the existence of the Supreme Being. As proof of that, one cannot read the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution of the United States, nor can one read the constitutional debates out of which our Republic was born without realizing that our forefathers recognized that a government of free men must rest upon spiritual values. Was it not Paul who said, "Where the spirit of God exists, there will be found freedom"? Kill the spirit of God in America and our freedom will evaporate overnight.

While the visibility at the moment is poor, the courage of our people is good. Courage and character are the things that made America great. The exercise of these priceless ingredients will sustain us in this hour of peril. It was the courage and the determination of one man that led the world from confusion, despair, and darkness at Dunkirk. Winston Churchill sparked the spirit of freedom and decency that electrified men of honor who conquered those who would have enslaved the world. It was this spirit that helped Washington hold together his little band of patriots at Valley Forge and thus made us a free people.

When Washington's troops retook Philadelphia in the Revolutionary War, instead of engaging in revelry, he and 300 of his key men celebrated their great victory by attending religious services conducted by a Masonic lodge.

A great historian asserts that our civilization can escape suicide only by returning to the more general practice of faith in God. How truly he reflects the basic concepts of the teachings of freemasonry. That is why freemasonry has stood the test of time. That is why freemasonry has been and is a humanizing world force. There has been a spiritual thread which has held masonry together since its inception. It is that spiritual thread, the spirit of hope and faith that can lead us from the gloom of today's outlook to a brighter and greater place in world history.

Our forefathers built on this continent a civilization which for prestige, wealth, and power has no equal in the annals of history. Our material success has brought with it hazards of great magnitude. In our gains we have suffered important losses. We have lost, in a measure that assurance of faith in divine guidance which motivated the pioneers who laid the foundation of America. It was divine guidance that gave them faith and courage to push forward the frontiers of world commerce and thus increased the living standards of all people. Sadly lacking, but not without hope of reviving, are those religious convictions that put granite in the character of our forefathers. We must regain our spiritual losses.

When the peoples of the world recognize God as the Great Architect of the Universe, as we Masons must, when they practice brotherly love; advocated by our fraternity, then and only then will the world withstand the winds of adversity. Then and only then will the dissent and strife melt into a harmonious note, symbolized by the square and compass which we Masons so proudly display. If we are worthy of our heritage, we will emulate our founding fathers and America will remain great.

Speech of Hon. Herbert Hoover on Saving America, the Gibraltar of Western Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, last night I listened to one of the greatest speeches I ever heard. It was delivered by a great American, ex-President Herbert Hoover.

It came like a voice inspired, as did Washington's Farewell Address and Jefferson's first inaugural address, in which they warned us against those very foreign entanglements that are now dragging our country, or have already dragged our country, to the very brink of disaster.

We have just gone through a Second World War in which our boys won the fight, and then saw the victory turned over to the worst enemy civilization has ever known.

We have seen the establishment of this modern Tower of Babel, known as the United Nations, with its confusion of tongues, which was instrumental in inducing our President to send our boys to Korea, without consulting the Congress of the United States, in what he called a "police action," in which our country has suffered the greatest disaster of all time.

Our casualties in that police action have already amounted to more than the casualties in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the War with Mexico, and the Spanish-American War, all combined.

The other members of the United Nations have hung back and waited for the United States to send her boys to do the fighting and dying, and are now expecting us to pay the costs.

Sending our boys into Korea was one of the greatest blunders of all time. I agree with President Hoover. We should bring them home now, build up our own defenses, and strengthen our own country. We should then follow the policies laid down by Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Hamilton, Madison, Monroe, and the other great leaders who founded this Republic, established the Monroe Doctrine, and built the greatest government on earth. In that way we can build the strongest nation the world has ever known, meet our obligations, and lead the world by precept and example into a more glorious civilization with peace, happiness, and prosperity for all mankind.

We may not agree with everything Mr. Hoover said last night, but, taken for all in all, it will go down in history as one of the greatest speeches ever delivered by an American statesman in all the history of this Republic.

The text of Mr. Hoover's speech follows:

I have received hundreds of requests that I appraise the present situation and give my conclusions to our national policies.

I speak with a deep sense of responsibility. And I speak tonight under the anxieties of every American for the Nation's sons who are fighting and dying on a mission of peace and the honor of our country.

No appraisal of the world situation can be final in an unstable world. However, to find our national path we must constantly reexamine where we have arrived and at times revise our direction.

I do not propose to traverse the disastrous road by which we reached this point.

THE GLOBAL MILITARY SITUATION

We may first survey the global military situation. There is today only one center of aggression on the earth. That is the Communist-controlled Asian-European land mass of 800,000,000 people. They have probably over 300 trained and equipped combat divisions with over 30,000 tanks, 10,000 tactical planes and further large reserves they can put in action in 90 days. But they are not a great sea power. Their long-range air power is limited. These congeries of over 30 different races will some day go to pieces. But in the meantime they are cannon fodder.

Facing this menace on the eastern front there are about 200,000,000 non-Communist island peoples in Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and Korea. Aside from Korea, which I discuss later, they have probably 12 effective combat divisions with practically no tanks, air, or navy.

Facing this land mass on the south are the Indies and the Middle East of about 600,000,000 non-Communist peoples. There are about 150,000,000 non-Communist peoples in North Africa and Latin America. Except Turkey and Formosa, these 850,000,000 people have little military force which they would or could spare. But they could contribute vital economic and moral strength.

Facing this menace on the Continental European front there are about 160,000,000 non-Communist people who, excluding Spain, have less than 20 combat divisions now available, few tanks, and little air or naval force. But their will to defend themselves is feeble and their disunities are manifest.

Of importance in military weight at this moment there is the British Commonwealth of 150,000,000 people, with probably 30 combat divisions under arms, a superior navy, considerable air force and a few tanks.

And there are 150,000,000 people in the United States preparing 3,500,000 men into a gigantic Air Force and Navy, with about 30 equipped combat divisions.

SOME MILITARY CONCLUSIONS

If we weigh these military forces as they stand today we must arrive at certain basic conclusions.

(a) We must face the fact that to commit the sparse ground forces of the non-Communist nations into a land war against this Communist land mass would be a war without victory, a war without a successful political terminal. Any attempt to make war on the Communist mass by land invasion, through the quicksands of China, India, or Western Europe is sheer folly. That would be the graveyard of millions of American boys and would end in the exhaustion of this Gibraltar of western civilization.

Even were Western Europe armed far beyond any contemplated program, we could never reach Moscow. The Germans failed with a magnificent army of 240 combat divisions and with powerful air and tank forces as contrasted with the 60 divisions now being talked about.

(b) Equally, we Americans alone with sea and air power can so control the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans that there can be no possible invasion of the Western Hemisphere by Communist armies. They can no more reach Washington in force than we can reach Moscow.

(c) In this military connection we must realize the fact that the atomic bomb is a far less dominant weapon than it was once thought to be.

(d) It is obvious that the United Nations have been defeated in Korea by the aggression of Communist China. There are no adequate forces in the world to repel them.

Even if we sacrifice more American boys to hold a bridgehead, we know we shall not succeed at the present time in the mission given to us by the 50 members of the United Nations.

OUR ECONOMIC STRENGTH

We may explore the American situation still further. The 150,000,000 American people are already economically strained by Government expenditures. It must not be forgotten that we are carrying huge burdens from previous wars, including obligations to veterans and $260,000,000,000 of bonds and currency issues from those wars. In the fiscal year 1952, Federal and local expenditures are likely to exceed $90,000,000,000. That is more than our total savings. We must finance huge deficits by further Government issues. Inflation is already moving but we might with stern measures avoid the economic disintegration of such a load for a very few years. If we continued long on this road the one center of resistance in the world will collapse in economic disaster.

THE DIPLOMATIC FRONT

We may appraise the diplomatic front. Our great hope was in the United Nations. We have witnessed the sabotage of its primary purpose of preserving peace. It has been, down to last week, a forum for continuous smear on our honor, our ideals, and our purposes.

It did stiffen up against raw aggression last July in Korea. But in its call for that military action, America had to furnish over 90 percent of the foreign forces and suffer over 90 percent of their dead and injured. That effort now comes at least to a measurable military defeat by the aggression of Communist hordes.

Whether or not the United Nations is to have a moral defeat and suffer the collapse of its whole moral stature now depends on whether it has the courage to—

(a) declare Communist China an aggressor;

(b) refuse admission of this aggressor to its membership;

(c) demand that each member of the United Nations cease to furnish or transport supplies of any kind to Communist China that can aid in their military operations. Such a course honestly carried out by the non-Communist nations is not economic sanctions nor does it require military action. But it would constitute a great pressure for rectitude;

(d) for once, pass a resolution condemning the infamous lies about the United States.

Any course short of this is appeasement.

WHAT SHOULD OUR POLICIES BE?

And now I come to where we should go from here.

Two months ago I suggested a tentative alternate policy for the United States. It received a favorable reception from the large majority of our press.

Since then the crisis in the world has become even more acute. It is also clear that the United Nations are defeated in Korea. It is also clear that other non-Communist nations did not or could not substantially respond to the United Nations' call for arms to Korea. It is clear that the United Nations cannot mobilize substantial military forces. It is clear continental Europe has not in the 3 years of our aid developed that unity of purpose, and that will power necessary for its own defense. It is clear that our British friends are flirting with appeasement of Communist China. It is clear that the United Nations is in a fog of debate and indecision on whether to appease or not to appease.

In expansion of my proposals of 2 months ago, I now propose certain principles and action.

First: The foundation of our national policies must be to preserve for the world this Western Hemisphere Gibraltar of western civilization.

Second. We can, without any measure of doubt, with our own air and naval forces, hold the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with one frontier on Britain (if she wishes to cooperate), the other on Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines. We can hold open the sea lanes for our supplies. I devotedly hope that a maximum of cooperation can be established between the British Commonwealth and ourselves.

Third. To do this we should arm our air and naval forces to the teeth. We have little need for large armies unless we are going to Europe or China. We should give Japan her independence and aid her in arms to defend herself. We should stiffen the defenses of our Pacific frontier in Formosa and the Philippines. We can protect this island chain by our sea and air power.

Fourth. We could, after initial outlays for more air and navy equipment, greatly reduce our expenditures, balance our budget, and free ourselves from the dangers of inflation and economic degeneration.

Fifth. If we toil and sacrifice as the President has so well asked, we can continue aid to the hungry of the world. Out of our productivity, we can give aid to other nations when they have already displayed spirit and strength in defense against communism. We have the stern duty to work and sacrifice to do it.

Sixth. We should have none of appeasement. Morally there is no appeasement of communism. Appeasement contains more dangers than Dunkerques. We want no more Tehrans and Yaltas. We can retrieve a battle, but we cannot retrieve an appeasement. We are grateful that President Truman has denounced such a course.

Seventh. We are not blind to the need to preserve western civilization on the Continent of Europe or to our cultural and religious ties to it. But the prime obligation of defense of western continental Europe rests upon the nations of Europe. The test is whether they have the spiritual force, the will, and acceptance of unity among them by their own volition. America cannot create their spiritual forces; we cannot buy them with money.

You can search all the history of mankind, and there is no parallel to the effort and sacrifice we have made to elevate their spirit and to achieve their unity. To this date it has failed. Their minds are confused with fears and disunities. They exclude Spain, although she has the will and means to fight. They higgle with Germany, although she is their frontier. They vacillate in the belief that they are in little danger and the hope to avoid again being a theater of war. And Karl Marx has added to their confusions. They still suffer from battle shock. Their highly organized Communist parties are a menace we must not ignore.

In both World War I and World War II (including West Germany) they placed more than 250 trained and equipped combat divisions in the field within 60 days with strong air and naval forces. They have more manpower and more productive capacity today than in either one of those wars. To warrant our further aid they should show they have spiritual strength and unity to avail themselves of their own resources. But it must be far more than pacts, conferences, paper promises and declarations. Today it must

express itself in organized and equipped combat divisions of such huge numbers as would erect a sure dam against the Red flood. And that before we land another man or another dollar on their shores. Otherwise we shall be inviting another Korea. That would be a calamity to Europe as well as to us.

Our policy in this quarter of the world should be confined to a period of watchful waiting without ground military action.

NATIONAL UNITY

There is a proper urge in all Americans for unity in troubled times. But unless unity is based on right principles and right action it is a vain and dangerous thing.

Honest difference of views and honest debate are not disunity. They are the vital process of policy making among freemen.

A right, a specific, an open foreign policy must be formulated which gives confidence in our own security before we can get behind it.

CONCLUSIONS

American eyes should now be opened to these hordes in Asia.

These policies I have suggested would be no isolationism. Indeed they are the opposite. They would avoid rash involvement of our military forces in hopeless campaigns. They do not relieve us of working to our utmost. They would preserve a stronghold of Christian civilization in the world against any peradventure.

With the policies I have outlined, even without Europe, Americans have no reason for hysteria or loss of confidence in our security or our future. And in American security rests the future security of all mankind.

It would be an uneasy peace but we could carry it on with these policies indefinitely even if the Communists should attack our lines on the seas.

We can hope that in time the millions of other non-Communists peoples of the world will rise to their dangers.

We can hope that sometime the evils of communism and the disintegration of their racial controls will bring their own disintegration. It is remote consolation, but twice before in world history Asiatic hordes have swept over a large part of the world and their racial dissensions dissolved their empires.

Our people have braved difficult and distressing situations in these three centuries we have been on this continent. We have faced our troubles without fear and we have not failed.

We shall not fail in this, even if we have to stand alone. But we need to realize the whole truth and gird ourselves for troubled times. The truth is ugly. We face it with prayer and courage.

South Carolinian Reports on the Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of December 20, 1950, by Ansel E. Talbert, now war correspondent, and was on Gen. Jimmie Doolittle's staff in World War II. The above-mentioned follows:

RHEE STEPS UP RECRUITING FOR SEOUL'S DEFENSE—WOMEN, CHILDREN, AGED TO BE EVACUATED; RECRUITS SEEN EAGER FOR ACTION

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

SEOUL, December 19.—The Korean republican government was completing plans tonight for the evacuation of women, children, and aged persons from this capital city. At the same time it called up thousands of military recruits for a fight against the Communist forces.

Partial evacuation will represent a stripping for action, and not necessarily a decision to abandon Seoul to the enemy. A dawn-to-dusk survey by this correspondent in an open jeep over many miles of icy roads around the city disclosed beyond any question the existence of a tremendous mobilization effort by the Government of President Syngman Rhee.

South Korean military recruits with small bundles of personal effects slung over their shoulders were lined up along the roads at many points in formations approaching the density of spectators at a Fifth Avenue parade in New York. Tonight, large groups could be seen warming themselves around campfires scattered across the snow-covered countryside.

SHARP CONTRAST IN ATTITUDE

There was little in the demeanor of the recruits to indicate that they considered themselves followers of a lost cause. A sharp contrast was evident between their behavior and the resigned attitude of the refugees plodding southward from the Seoul and Pyongyang areas or who gathered in groups awaiting transport by truck or rail. (Pyongyang, former North Korean Communist capital, now is held by the Chinese Communists.)

Most of the recruits I saw today gave every sign of being in good spirits.

Further evidence that the United Nations army in Korea is at present anything but a beaten force was obtained during a tour of the areas along roads to the battle front occupied by contingents from the various democratic nations participating in the Korean war. These areas include those occupied by the Dutch, French, Greek, Turkish, Thailand, and Filipino forces.

Several of these national contingents have not yet been committed to action, and this was the chief complaint made by members with whom I conferred. Almost to a man they had volunteered for their present duty, and their reason for being in Korea in general agreed with sentiments expressed by Capt. Cornelius van Marion, of the Dutch unit, who has a wife and four children in Holland.

He said: "Why are we here? Probably because we remember what happened a decade ago when we stayed in our homes and waited to see what Hitler would do. Today the situation is the same, except that Stalin has replaced Hitler. Now we know that it is better to die trying to keep aggression away from our fireside than it is to wait and be shot dead on our doorsteps."

A FRENCHMAN EXPLAINS

Col. Ralph Monclair, Inspector General of the French Foreign Legion, who voluntarily accepted demotion from the rank of general in order to come to Korea as commander of the French detachment, said tonight at dinner in his unheated field headquarters that his action was motivated by a single wish.

He explained: "I have a young son, and some day I want him to be able to say that his father was a member of the first United Nations army.

"This is an army that is trying to carry out the wishes of the democratic nations of the world after they banded together for the first time in history to stop an act of aggression. Even if the effort should not succeed, the attempt is something to be remembered with pride because it is a step toward an ideal that one day will certainly be realized."

The most eager for action of all the contingents is the Greek brigade, made up entirely of volunteers from among military units which cleared the mountainous northern areas of Greece of Communist guerrillas.

Already Awake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News:

ALREADY AWAKE

While some measures to deal with the critical situation, including declaration of a national emergency, were under consideration it was stated at Washington they were designed partially to awaken the public to a realization of national danger.

We don't know where those who made such statements got the idea that the American public isn't awake. It is and has been for a long time; far wider awake than responsible officials whose duty it is to plan national defense measures and then put those plans into execution.

There has been some sleeping at the switch, but that sleeping has been done at Washington.

The National Capital is described as being in a state of confusion, with officials running around in circles trying to get done in a few weeks things that should have been started long ago, and well on the way to accomplishment by this time.

As a matter of fact our Federal Government hasn't even a well-organized plan for marshaling the Nation's strength to meet what could be the greatest test in the history of this Republic.

We haven't a goal to work toward; the Nation's brains and muscle have not been harnessed for a concerted effort; the public has not been furnished with the leadership that could inspire complete unity of purpose.

Through the years when we should have been prepared to defend ourselves, the national administration was depending upon lavish expenditure of money and creation of domestic bureaus and international organizations to halt our deadly enemy, communism.

And during those years our diplomats were depending upon kid-glove tactics to checkmate the strategy of an enemy who is not bothered by ethics, the sanctity of international agreements or the rights of humanity.

Domestic and international policies were wholly inadequate to cope with this ruthless enemy and the task of building up defenses that would give reasonable assurance of our security.

Not only were these responsibilities neglected; the American people were deceived as to the steps which were being taken to protect them and the country from the Communist aggression.

We were told that the national-defense system was in better shape than ever before.

That myth exploded with a loud bang when the Korean war broke out.

We also have been told of the remarkable progress of other undertakings designed to marshal the forces of the anti-Communist world. These claims had not much more foundation than those regarding our armed strength.

Washington has been shocked by startling developments out of some of its lethargy. But still things that should be done to remedy the situation are not being done.

We still have not been provided with the quality of leadership which we most desperately need. Just why has not been satisfactorily explained.

The claim that the people needed to be awakened to the national danger sounds like an attempt of responsible officials to so cover up their own shortcomings.

A Realistic Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of this Nation has been the subject of discussion by men in all walks of life. Never before in the history of our country has this policy so deeply affected more of our people. At this very moment when the world is threatened by another total war it is fitting that our policy toward the remainder of the family of nations be examined and reexamined. Quite frequently men of theology are unable to discuss affairs of state in a realistic manner. Quite frequently men of this segment of our society are too idealistic. It is more than refreshing, therefore, when a theologian can command the thought, attention, and approbation of those vitally affected by our conduct and policies in the field of diplomacy.

On December 14, 1950, Rev. Ralph Meadowcroft, rector of the Grace Episcopal Church, in Charleston, S. C., delivered a masterpiece on the subject of our foreign policy. It was on the occasion of a meeting before the Rotary Clubs of Charleston and of St. Andrews Society. This eloquent address should be made available to more than those immediately privileged to hear it. With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all Americans to read, Reverend Meadowcroft's important contribution on the appraisal of a realistic policy among nations. His remarks will not only inspire but will be a worthy reference to those who work in this vital field during our page in history. It follows:

A REALISTIC FOREIGN POLICY

(By Rev. Ralph Meadowcroft)

Those men and women who crossed the Atlantic Ocean 300 years ago to establish a new home in a new world would be startled to see the phenomenal growth of that which they planted. Their tiny settlements, established so precariously along the eastern strip of this vast acreage, have spread west, and south, and north; population counted in dozens is now numbered in millions; southfield and northfield have grown into the huge granaries of Kansas and Nebraska; cattle on the village common have become the herds of Texas and Wyoming. Out of the hills men have dug coal, iron and copper; from their surface they have cut billions of board feet of lumber, while from deep in the earth they have tapped the oil stored there before the dawn of history. A colossus has grown in this wilderness.

Through these three centuries America has been largely bounded behind her own shores. A few citizens recrossed the ocean to tour or be educated in old Europe, but the overwhelming majority were glad to be done with that cesspool of conflict. Still fewer of our people sailed to the Orient for purposes of trade, for the average American looked upon the Far East as another world, mysterious and unreal as a fantastic novel. For 300 years, except for a few naval vessels which attacked the Barbary pirates, and the battle for the Philippines, Americans in combat were seen only within or upon the borders of our own hemisphere. Then in 1917 Yank and Rebel went to France, and in the silence which followed November 11, 1918, the fulcrum of world power had shifted 3,000 miles westward from London to Washington.

Incredibly, America possessed a man who was ready for this realinement of world balances; indeed, perhaps the only statesman of the time who foresaw both the opportunity and the way to inaugurate a new world dominated by peace rather than war, but America was not ready for Woodrow Wilson, and turning its back upon his funeral, gaily embarked upon the most gigantic spree in history. Even the awful morning-after of the 1930's found us unrepentent and irresponsible, so we drank the sobering medicine of European appeasement, then donned our battle dress to fight World War II.

But a major change has occurred in the world as a consequence of this last conflict. The United States did not emerge as the undisputed big brother of mankind. Now another vast union, also born in revolution, inspired by an ideal of human society, raised in adversity with toil and sweat, unified in its own blood, and unlike our Nation disciplined by the omnipotent rule of tyrrany, has grown to challenge the American way of life. Since 1945 terror has gripped the chancelleries of Germany, France, Britain, Japan, and India. They knew, as Russia knew, that two giants walked the earth and that collision was inevitable. Only these United States, with a strange innocence almost criminal in significance, seemed unaware of the coming encounter. Until last summer a shot was heard around the world, and men became aware that a day had dawned in which the fate of mankind was to be determined perhaps for centuries to come.

Let there be no mistake concerning the decisiveness of this hour. It is not merely a matter who shall be first nation of mankind, the Soviet Republics or the United States. Would to God that was the only issue to be determined. Tragically, that is merely the surface of the matter. Behind and beneath this is the ponderous question whether mankind shall continue to pursue those goals to which it has been reaching forward since written history began, or whether men shall seek a barbaric way of life; industrialized barbarism, efficient and technologized, but barbarism nevertheless. The world has reached the crossroads; it must choose one or the other of those roads.

And let me hasten to say there is no guaranty the right road will be chosen. When the Goths battered through the gates of Rome and destroyed the capitol of the world in flame, 700 years of civilization was eclipsed. The light of Egypt, of Greece, and Rome was extinguished in the fires of barbarism. For more than four centuries Europe lived amid the ashes of her ruin. She might never have been reborn had it not been for the spiritual heroism of the Christian Church and the flickering influence of the Bishop of Rome. In our time we have witnessed another such era of destruction. Many of us can recall those better days prior to 1914 when the British flag symbolized a universal regulation of mankind and when the name Britain was both revered and feared through the seven seas. But in the closing days of 1918 a giant had become impotent and rude men were on the road challenging the rule of law. When Rome collapsed there was no other power to take her place. When Britain became exhausted the United States was ready to occupy the rampart. She has not done so and already much ground has been lost. Now we must prove whether we are worthy to hold our place, or be one of those nations which must pass because it knew not God.

For a Godly nation is not one which is content to sing hymns, say prayers, and go to church; it is one which faces its responsibility. God knows we are not a perfect people. Our national evils, our crime, our exploitation of citizen by citizen cry to heaven. Our concern with material possessions, our test of achievements by earthly standards blot the record of our history. The cry of penitence should resound throughout the length and breadth of the land. Yet, despite our unworthiness, it has pleased that inscrutable Ruler of Destiny to place us in this hour as the people who must lead mankind through the valley of dark shadows into a future where freedom and justice and honesty and man's concern for man can still regulate the peoples and rulers of the earth.

To do this, three things are required. First, we must be prepared for war. We are already at war, under the decisive vote of the United Nations. For 6 months our soldiers have been fighting and dying in that pitiful peninsula which is the Spain of world war III. Now they are reeling back in hopeless defeat, not because of their own failure, but, partly at least, because we wanted to continue life and business as usual at home. Except for a 20-percent increase in income tax thus far we have not matched their sacrifice with a single sacrifice on our part. Through the devious channels of diplomacy, we are at this moment negotiating with the aggressors, and Washington may appease them unless you and I and our fellow citizens deny the opportunity to do so. I do not know, nor do you, whether world war III has begun or is about to begin. I do not know, nor do you, whether we can overawe the Soviet Union. I do know that world war III is almost certain and that while we should pursue every honorable channel of negotiation, we should be prepared for the coming of that war. If the war comes now, we bear a portion of the responsibility because we already have too little and it is too late. We are directly responsible in that we have given to imperial communism the very opportunity it seeks. The Chinese attack in Korea would almost certainly never have occurred if we had shown a more resolute spirit and more determined preparation in the last 6 months.

This condition is created by a refusal, or strange inability on the part of so many, to face the actuality of another global conflict. It is one thing to talk about it, to play thrillingly with its terrifying possibility; it is a totally different thing to soberly face the reality that world war III is dawning. When you insure your home against fire, you do not actually believe it is going to be destroyed. You are simply playing safe: in-

suring against the possibility. Your attitude is a very different one when you telephone the fire department because the house is already in flame. Our attitude has been that of an insurance policyholder; it must become the spirit of the man who sees his house being destroyed. What more signs are needed to stir America from complacency? We have been engaged in cold war ever since hostilities ceased in 1945; now we are fighting a hot war. Must we wait till bombs blast our cities to finally become aroused to the situation? War has begun. It is barely possible its extent can be restricted for a time, perhaps for a considerable time, but war has begun. God save America from blindness. We are already engaged in the early phases of world war III.

The second conclusion which must be accepted is that America leads the struggle against imperialistic communism. There is a price which must be paid for leadership: It is the obligation to lead. When Mr. Attlee flew to Washington 2 weeks ago, Americans feared Great Britain was unwilling to continue marching side by side with this Nation; in which unwillingness France was apparently joined. The awful word appeasement was noised abroad, and many openly spoke of another Munich. What was even more appalling, however, was the sudden retreat into isolationism which for a moment caught hold of many people. It was suggested that as Europe would receive the brunt of the Russian attack, this was Europe's war. And that if they were willing to appease the Russians, we should leave them to their just reward. Fortunately, in the past 2 weeks it is apparent that Great Britain and some of the continental powers are not so spineless as had been feared. But we need to be on guard against our own weakness. This conflict will be the concern of France, Western Germany, Great Britain, and other European powers, but it will continue to be first and foremost our concern. It is our high calling to lead the civilized forces of mankind; it is, therefore, our solemn responsibility to lead them, whether in concert or alone. We are leader, not follower. True, we work in concert with other peoples within the United Nations, nevertheless, it is surely obvious that United Nations as a force for world justice depends upon the leadership of the United States. If your child was drowning, and your friend refused to assist you in rescue, would you stand upon the shore and watch him drown? Even so, we desire the cooperation and association of all nations opposed to imperialist communism, but whether they give us full cooperation or not, we still have a responsibility to the world and to ourselves.

Nor is this only an idealistic obligation. It is basic to our own self-preservation. If the Soviet Union gained control of the Ruhr industrial area in West Germany, and added its productive capacity to that of its own industrial facilities and those of its satellites, in 3 to 5 years it could out-produce us. Under those conditions, a war in 5 years time would probably result in Russian victory and American defeat. Helping Europe is not a Santa Claus policy on our part; it is the inescapable responsibility of our supreme position and an unavoidable necessity for our own self-preservation.

It seems probable the President will declare a state of national emergency, perhaps tomorrow night. That declaration is long overdue. Ceilings on prices and wages will probably be enacted within the near future. They are at least 3 months late. The armed forces are moving to double their strength; they should have done so in the late summer. Taxes have increased; they will increase again. It is right that they should do so. At long last, Washington promises rapid speed-up in armament production; the delay is almost criminal in its neglect.

The third element in a realistic foreign policy is the drawing up of a constructive war program. It is entirely possible, and a condition to be devoutly hoped for, that such a program is already prepared. For security reasons this plan cannot be divulged to the citizens. Yet there are certain factors in the situation which naturally must enter into such a program. Though you and I are not even amateurs in military strategy we can clearly discern those elements. At the moment, we are fighting the first phase of the war in Korea and there we have been completely defeated. It is not a matter of who is responsible; the defeat is a fact which the punishment of a scapegoat cannot expunge. If General MacArthur has failed he should be removed; if he is not responsible, he should be sustained. But what should be clearly realized is that in the global situation Korea is of minor importance. If a line can be held at the thirty-eighth parallel or below, it should be done; if not, our troops should be withdrawn. This will be a serious setback, but, and I would emphasize this, it is not irreparable if we do not appease the Chinese Communists. Under no circumstances must these aggressors be then admitted to membership in the United Nations We should arm Japan as quickly as possible and set her industries to full-scale military operation. The American Navy should be strengthened in the Straits of Formosa and Formosa defended. Nationalist Chinese and Philippine troops should be dispatched immediately to Indochina and Japanese troops added to that area as rapidly as they are ready. This will not be appeasement; on the contrary, it will be a containment of the Chinese Communists within China itself, and possibly Tibet. China will thus become a gigantic fortress, closed off, walled in and neutralized from the rest of the world. It may break apart in civil war, but in any case, will be unable to markedly affect the ensuing contest. They have no navy, so the sea becomes our ally. If we can hold them in Indochina or Burma, their vaunted army of two and a half million men will be reduced to fighting among themselves or against their Russian ally, an event which might in time come to pass.

In Europe the situation is far more complicated. Today and probably for another year, the continent is indefensible. The Russian armies can march to the Atlantic without serious opposition. Such a campaign may be concluded within a few weeks. Therefore, the arming of West Germany, Holland, Belgium, and France should be undertaken with great caution, until we are prepared to equip them completely and with great rapidity. Until that time comes, any army or equipment in continental Europe is for delaying action only and is expendable. I think we must face the grim fact that the Continent, with two possible exceptions, will be closed to us, as it was by Hitler in 1940.

How then shall we strike back? First from Britain by air. The Ruhr, Saar, and Lorraine industries must be totally destroyed even before the Soviet armies reach the Rhine. I desire to say this with deepest solemnity; those American planes now standing ready on British runways, containing their dreadful weapons, must fly. A million or more western Europeans will die within the first week. This is the nightmare of Europe, my friends, and who dares blame them for their terror. Yet it is obvious to them, as it is obvious to us, that those industrial facilities in the heart of western Europe dare not be allowed to function under Soviet dominance. We shall be the most hated people on earth for a time but the price of holding back may well be defeat. This is why President Truman is entirely right in refusing to grant the decision to use the atom bomb to the United Nations. No nation save our own will be able to make that decision. It is a terrifying responsibility but it is one we dare not shirk. We shall have to do it in any case: the sooner the better.

The further strategy of the war will be concentrated in three main areas. Britain and Spain must serve as vast air bases. Both of these countries will be comparatively safe from Soviet troops; Britain because the Russians possess no known means for large scale amphibious operations across the channel and Spain because we can seal the passes through the Pyrenees. Our main ammunition and military preparation area will be North Africa and when in the fullness of time, the free nations are prepared to attack, I suggest it will be in two great prongs. One line will proceed across the Mediterranean through Greece and Yugoslavia, assuming we have been able to hold those countries, into the Balkans, Czechoslovakia, and Russia; the other through Anatolia, i. e. Asiatic Turkey, into the Ukraine. The first prong can neutralize or destroy the huge Skoda armament works in Czechoslovakia and the oil fields of the Balkans, while the second line of advance will attack one of the three main industrial areas within the Soviet Union. It will also cut off the oil supply from the Baku fields in the neighborhood of the Caspian Sea and any supplies the Russians may be securing from the oil districts of Iran and Saudi-Arabia. Both lines of attack will menace Russian occupation of Western Europe and force a partial or total abandonment by the Soviet armies of all territory now west of the iron curtain. Thus Russia will be in exactly the same dilemma we now face in Korea but on a vastly more prodigious scale. By thus crippling the Soviet's ability to replace its military weapons, its vast reserve of manpower will cease to be so menacing. A soldier without a gun is useless in modern war, while a gun without ammunition is useful only as a crutch. The main war effort, as I see it, will not be fought in Western Europe, but as gigantic thrusts into the heart of the Soviet Union.

During this time our own land will also be visited with death and destruction. Our great cities, especially those where war equipment is being manufactured, will know the fury and terror of atomic explosion. We are vulnerable to air attack, especially the industrial triangle marked by Buffalo-Detroit-and-Pittsburgh, which are almost our closest cities to Russia by trans-polar airflight. It is more than probable we shall be seriously crippled in industrial capacity. Yet the final outcome between two so evenly matched adversaries will depend upon the resolution and sacrificial effort of the two peoples. Thus it will depend finally upon you and me and our fellow Americans whether victory shall be ours, and mankind be given an opportunity to rebuild the old waste places and transform the cities of desolation into habitations for free men to dwell in. It is not our problem now what shall happen after war is over. The immediate task is to face the almost certain conflict, to prepare with might and main, and to quit us as free men should. When victory is ours we will tackle the awful tasks of rebuilding a world in which, God willing, barbarism shall not be powerful enough to threaten the citadel of civilization. We enter the future, whatever that future may be, in the sure confidence that we have done all that is humanly possible to maintain peace, that we fight because we are being fought, and can do no other. God help America to prove herself the home of the free and the land of the brave.

Must Reset Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared recently in the Tyler Courier-Times of December 13, 1950, in connection with the splendid work of our junior Senator from Texas, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON:

MUST RESET FOREIGN POLICY

There have been those who have thought of LYNDON JOHNSON as a politician rather than a deep-thinking statesman. Evidence came in Tuesday that they may be wrong in their appraisement of Texas' junior Senator.

JOHNSON called the defense effort to date "adolescent nonsense." He condemned the United States foreign policy of "wait and see" as "insincere and incompetent."

"We must have immediate and complete mobilization," he said. "We must end the double talk in Washington. The American people are fed up on it. They are anxious to unite—but they cannot rally around a vacuum—they cannot give their united support to policies which do not exist. The United States is right now at war. It is at war not only with Communist China but with all the power and strength of the countries behind the iron curtain. Our Government has thrown up a chicken-wire fence when what we need is a wall of iron and steel.

"The present situation bears no resemblance to World War II or any other war mankind has ever known. The magnificent unity at the outset of the Korean crisis is deteriorating before our eyes. Our 6-month waiting period should end. What are we waiting on? We have been underwriting makeshift mobilization with only a vague hope that the real thing would come along, sooner or later.

"We, all of us, in Congress, in the executive branch, in the military, have had 6 months in which to cause the situation to make sense. We have had 6 months in which to give the people some answers, to find out where we are going—and when we are starting. But we have not done so."

JOHNSON, as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has three immediate steps which he proposes. He urges:

1. A long-range global plan of strategy.

2. Immediate full mobilization of available manpower, which he says is long overdue.

3. Prompt mobilization of our economy.

His No. 1 proposal is strictly No. 1 in any national foreign policy. We must first decide on our long-range objective. We have not done this. Less than 2 years ago we had decided that Korea was outside our outer defense chain and moved our Army out of it. Then suddenly President Truman decided we should help the South Koreans, and our men were dispatched there into a battleground prepared by Russia and her satellites. We have so far incurred some 40,000 casualties there. It is practically an impossible position. Of course, it will hurt the standing of the United States to take our men out. But the killing of a few more thousand of them in that spot will serve no good purpose. And when we get down to the realities of the situation, we are, right now, in the process of getting out. We should, of course, save every man possible and every bit of material, destroying what cannot be moved out to keep it out of Communist hands. When we have done that, we should then take an inventory of what we have and how much of the world we can help and still defend our own country. We may have to modify Mr. Truman's glorious purpose of helping oppressed peoples anywhere on the globe.

We should also reexamine the United Nations, whose membership, as of now, contains both the most noble nations and the most cruel conquest-mad nations. Of course, we should never agree for Red China to become a member. But the reason that she would be a bad member is that she is a stooge of Red Russia. So, if it is bad to have Red China in our club, it is much worse to have Red Russia in the peace organization. We should see that Red China does not get in—and should see that Red Russia is thrown out and that the representatives of both leave this country at once and stay out. Russia expects that kind of treatment. That is the reason she is having conferences of satellite nations in Europe. She plans a "united nations" of her own when she is thrown out of the UN and barred from the United States. We must end the disgracefulness of having representatives of other countries come to our country as guests and use this hospitality as a forum from which to abuse our Nation.

The United States also is prepared for the day when the UN is dissolved. The Atlantic Pact is a going concern and can be enlarged to contain nations which are peacefully inclined. The others we do not need on our team, using our hospitality to sabotage our peace efforts.

The President of the United States and a lot of other Members of the Senate and House could do a good turn for their country and for themselves if they surveyed our foreign affairs in just as candid a manner as has Senator JOHNSON and, without attempt to save anybody's face, figured the best thing to do for the United States of America and then did something about it. There will be claims that this is isolationism. But it is not. We are merely saying: Help other peace-loving nations who are helping themselves within the limits of our ability and resources, but keep the interest of the United States first. It has reached the point where we must do this to survive.

Capitalism—Nothing Is Superior Except by Comparison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, we as a Nation and as individuals of that Nation, are now engaged in a no-holds-barred struggle between freedom and slavery; freedom best represented by America, its peoples and its institutions, and slavery forced by the imperialistically minded tyrants of Russia. Currently there is all too much nonconstructive criticism about the shortcomings of capitalism both within and without our boundaries. Far too many of our uninformed citizens are shouting that America is on the road to financial bankruptcy and ruin, a status undesired by all good Americans. For the past 2 years I have been seeking concrete information to confound these critics whether they be well-intentioned or otherwise.

I recommend the study of the following article by Mr. Thomas J. Watson. It is an enlightening portrait of the greatness and strength of free America. To those who would forsake or destroy the economic ideology which has brought us thus far, I voice the challenge for them to bring forth something that has greater possibilities of strength and good. I voice the challenge for them to dare to place the candle of Russia beside this glistening beacon of the evidences of freedom founded upon the dignity of individual man and his right to pursue his own economic ambition. What comparison can be made between the blessings of embodied collective individuals and collectivized masses; between inveterate freedom obtained for us by the unselfish services of past patriots and the invertebrate slavery of the conscienceless robots in Russia? The article explains beyond successful contradiction some of the values of our way of life against which the carping clamor of these prophets of doom cannot prevail. Let them silence their voices forever.

[From the Washington Post of December 20, 1950]

CAPITALISM—NOTHING IS SUPERIOR EXCEPT BY COMPARISON

When we compare the conditions of nations and people in anticapitalistic countries with the security, prosperity, happiness, and well-being of our people under United States capitalism, we appreciate our privilege of living in a capitalistic, democratic country.

The basic principle of the free, capitalistic system which we have developed in our country affords opportunity to the individual who is willing to use his talents to the extent of his ability and desire to produce—to accumulate something for investment in a home, a farm, in savings accounts, bonds and other securities, life insurance, the education of his children, and comforts of life—and become a capitalist.

The following facts give us a deep appreciation of what capitalism has done and is doing for our country and its people.

Private capital in the form of taxes and purchases of United States Government bonds made it possible for us to spend $330,000,000,000 in carrying out our part of the program in winning World War II. This, of course, is unimportant when we consider the loss of life and permanent and partial disability which our youth sustained and which cannot be measured in dollars.

Our participation in World War II has left us today with a national debt of $257,000,000,000, but on the credit side we find that our annual national income, at the current rate, is equal to 90 percent of our total national debt. Of this total national debt, $39,000,000,000 are in Treasury obligations owned by Government agencies, so our next debt is slightly over $218,000,000,000.

The United States free enterprise business system is operating at its highest level, furnishing employment to 62,000,000 people at the highest hourly and weekly earnings ever recorded. Stockholders and corporations, after paying the highest peacetime taxes in the postwar years, have had the highest net average earnings in history from their investment.

Our farmers had cash income from marketing last year amounting to $27,500,000,000, the highest on record.

Total farm assets of our country amount to slightly more than $127,000,000,000, against which there is an indebtedness of only $12,-

400,000,000. Thus our farmers have ownership equity of over 90 percent in their farms.

In nonfarm homes, counting apartment buildings with four or less families, and all valued at a total of $200,000,000,000, our home owners have an equity of $158,000,000,000—a substantial ownership of 79 percent.

Therefore, as a result of the opportunity provided by our free-enterprise capitalistic system, the people of our Nation have a free and clear ownership in their homes and farms of 83.4 percent.

Our people have savings of more than $136,000,000,000 in Government bonds and savings accounts.

An additional $97,000,000,000 are on deposit in commercial bank accounts.

Our men and women have a cash investment of $60,000,000,000 in life-insurance policies.

A high percentage of our working people are provided with unemployment insurance, sickness, accident, and retirement benefits, financed by employers, employees, and Government. Others who are not covered by these plans and who find themselves in need are provided for by governmental and social institutions.

We are increasing our efforts to improve the standard of living of the people in the lower income brackets.

The United States, with only 6 percent of the world population and 7 percent of its land area, under its democratic, capitalistic system, before World War II, produced 47 percent of the world's manufactured goods, but what is more important, 90 percent of that production was consumed within our own borders. Today we are producing over 50 percent of the world's manufactured goods, of which a substantial percentage is for other countries.

Capitalism is backing freedom of worship and providing increasing educational opportunities by constantly giving more and more support to the two things upon which our democratic, cultural civilization depends—spiritual and educational values.

We have a permanent investment in churches and schools of $18,500,000,000 and are spending annually $8,000,000,000 for religious and educational purposes.

Membership in the churches is increasing at a much faster rate than the increase in the population, and in our Sunday schools at an even greater rate.

In the past 30 years elementary-school enrollment has increased 13.5 percent, high-school enrollment 146.1 percent, and college and university enrollment 351.6 percent.

Our public-school expenditures per pupil enrolled have gone up from $48.02 in 1920 to $132.06 in 1947, or 175 percent.

Since 1920 the population of our country has increased 43 percent, and the investment in school and college equipment has increased 571 percent.

Since the beginning of our industrial and scientific development in the early 1800's, the capitalistic system, due to individual freedom, initiative, and ingenuity, has given the world more of the comforts and conveniences of life than mankind had received in the previous 5,000 years of civilization.

Under this system our people as a whole are happy and united, are increasing their capital and enjoying a fuller spiritual, cultural, and material life.

Today our scientific and industrial knowledge and experience in the various fields of peaceful activity are open to the rest of the world, and in this respect we have joined with other like-minded nations in contributing to the technical-assistance program of the United Nations.

No nation, no individual, no venture, no private or public institution, no program for the welfare of people can progress without capital.

It is each individual's duty to contribute to the preservation, protection, and improvement of our democratic civilization on a basis which is sound and fair to all our people.

THOS. J. WATSON,
Chairman of the Board, International Business Machines Corp.

Wages and Prices in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith the English-language version of an article appearing in the January issue of Amerika.

Over the next few months many thousands of Russian people will have the opportunity to study a striking picture of the United States economy at work through the pages of Amerika, the Russian-language publication of the International Press and Publications Division of the Department of State.

An article entitled "Wages and Prices in the United States" graphically portrays the immense gains in the standards of living in this country in the past decade. It shows the Russian people—through graphs and charts—just what commodities an American worker's weekly wage will purchase.

In these days it is of the greatest importance that the Russian people understand the people of the United States, thoroughly and without distortion.

It is my understanding that despite some recent restrictions on circulation this magazine still sells 21,000 copies in the Soviet Union every month and that the copies are passed from hand to hand over long periods of time.

This article, Wages and Prices in the United States, follows:

WAGES AND PRICES IN THE UNITED STATES—MASS PURCHASING POWER IS NOW GREATER THAN BEFORE WORLD WAR II

(By Robert L. Heilbroner)

The John Winters family of California would probably not like to think of themselves as ordinary or average, but in one respect at least they are as average as a statistic. Their economic history during the last 11 years—since the outbreak of war—has been exactly typical of the average American family.

In both 1939 and 1950 John Winters' weekly pay was almost equivalent to the national average for all wage earners. When war broke out in Europe, he was working in a small factory in the Middle Western city of Kansas City, earning about $24 ($1 equals four rubles at the official rate of exchange) a week, enough to support his wife, Julia, and small son, John Jr., comfortably and provide them with a few luxuries, but without much margin for savings. With the rapid growth of wartime industries, however, prices rose, and in 1941 John Winters decided to move out to the Pacific coast, where wages were higher, and shipyards and airplane factories were springing up like mushrooms.

John's was only one of several hundred thousand families that moved to California during the war years, some to work in factories, some to spend their older years in the sunny climate. Cities were very crowded at first, and for nearly a year the Winters shared a house with some relatives of Julia's. But getting a job was easy. Two weeks after they arrived John found work in a big machine shop at a higher wage than he had ever earned.

"It wasn't long," he says, "before I was making $40 or $45 a week. And it was around then that the Government put price ceilings on all kinds of goods. Guess they had to, with everybody earning good money. I started buying savings bonds and putting money away. Came the end of the war, and even though I wasn't making much more than in 1942, I had put away nearly $2,000."

After their early rise, both wages and prices were stabilized during the war by temporary laws. With peace, all wage controls and most price controls were lifted, and in the middle of 1946 a second race between earnings and living costs began. Manufacturers of consumer goods were making up for war-caused shortages, and, under union leadership, workers were insisting that higher production be matched by even higher wages. By 1949 production of most goods had caught up with demand, and some prices began to decline slightly. Only rentals still had to be kept under legal control. Today, with this second round of increases apparently nearly over, John Winters finds that his standard of living is considerably better than it was in 1939.

"I get $56 a week now," he explains, "and that's nearly two and a half times what I got 11 years ago. Of course living costs are up—costs the three of us about three-quarters more to live than it used to. We pay twice as much rent as we did before the war—$60 a month—but we have a nicer place now: Three large rooms and a good kitchen. We save on clothes. Julia doesn't buy such expensive dresses as she did, and she makes some of Johnny's things herself. I get a new suit about once every 2 years; they cost me about $30 these days. And a good pair of shoes will run me anywhere from 5 to 10 dollars. Of course, some things are still pretty cheap, a bar of soap only costs about a dime.

"It's food that has gone up most. We can't get a restaurant meal that's any good for under a dollar any more, so we eat at home most of the time. I guess we spend about $20 a week for food. And then with gasoline, and a movie now and then and vacations, I don't save as much as I'd like to. But I bought a good car 3 years ago, for seventeen hundred in cash, out of our savings, and when we finish paying for the refrigerator we're buying, we may get a television set. Maybe some time next year."

John Winters' story of prosperity is the story of how America has grown in the decade since the outbreak of the war. There are 60,000,000 people in the United States working force, some luckier than the Winters and some not as fortunate. But the change that came to John and Julia Winters happened to nearly everyone.

Together, in 1950, Americans reaped a total income of approximately $210,000,000,000 (840,000,000,000 rubles) as much as they earned during the whole 4 years 1932 through 1935. To put it differently, since billions are intangible at best, the average American family is now enjoying a standard of living—after making full allowance for higher prices and increased taxes—that is a good 40 percent better than prewar. It will be the highest standard of living the Nation has ever known.

It is a standard of living that is fundamentally different from even the best of previous eras of prosperity. For by every economic indicator, this postwar model prosperity is wider spread and more firmly rooted

than ever before in history. What distinguishes today's economic situation is not simply the height of prosperity, although this is unprecedented, it is the strength and stability that have been added to the economic system.

Certainly the economist looking back over the past is struck by the fluctuation of good times and bad which have characterized American history. But viewing what is called the trend line of growth the economist finds that America has approximately doubled its national income—that is, the sum of all individual incomes—every 20 years. One hundred years ago, for example, 7,000,000 workers, working more than 70 hours each week, produced a national income of about $5,000,000,000 (20,000,000,000 rubles). Today the output per man-hours has gone up by over 500 percent. In a century, working hours have been cut to 40 a week, and national income—in terms of the actual goods and services—has gone up about twenty-five-fold.

Not lack of growth, but the fact that growth was uneven, has troubled the Nation in the past. If one or two key industries ran into difficulties there were no buffers, no obstacles to keep a minor economic reversal from snowballing into a major setback. Progress was not a steady upward line, but by jumps—up two steps and back one. Sometimes it seemed as though business and industry had progressed two steps and fallen back three. All this was wasteful of economic potential and enormously destructive of individual and social morale.

The striking feature of the present prosperity is the fact that it is more widely and more evenly shared than at any prior time. National wealth, of course, means nothing except in terms of the sum of individual wealth. Growth does not envelop a country from outside; it comes from within. To say that America has grown and is richer means that its citizens have gained in purchasing power.

To understand what the growth of national income means to all the citizens of the United States, the Nation's economy might be pictured, for the sake of simplicity, like a cross-section diagram. On such a chart, the majority of men and women would not be shown crowded at the bottom of an economic pyramid but clustered in the middle. In fact there no longer is, in the United States, a pyramid, with a large, low-paid economic base, and a tiny peak in the clouds. For example, one of the four large income groups in the United States lies between $2,000 and $3,000 a year. This is the group to which John and Julia Winters belong and where the ordinary workingman with a wage of $56—the national average—will be found. Of course, if his wife works, he is in a higher level, but if, like John, he gets along on his own earnings, this will be his category. There are in this group about 8,000,000 families, more than a fifth of the Nation's total.

The level into which John will move, if he gets a promotion at his job, lies between $3,000 and $5,000. It consists of skilled workingmen, families where two people earn incomes, small shopkeepers, clerks, and many Government employees. This is the largest of the four large income groups and consists of about 13,000,000 families.

Above $5,000 a year—and this is a more than comfortable income—there are 8,000,000 more families, more than the combined populations of Canada and Australia. At the very top of this group are 1,000,000 families whose incomes are over $10,000; this section of the Nation includes Congressmen and doctors, managers of large-scale enterprises, and many trade-union leaders. Very small indeed is the category of astronomical incomes enjoyed by a few Hollywood stars and a handful of extremely wealthy businessmen. Here, of course, the steeply graduated income tax takes its full effect; at the topmost income bracket, income taxes today take 80 percent of all earnings.

At the other end of the scale there are some 10,000,000 families, who earn a cash income of less than $2,000 a year; more than half of these receive over $1,000 a year. Some are farm families whose small cash earnings are compensated for by the food they grow and the houses they own. Others are domestic workers and factory workers in some sections of a few industries like textiles, grain milling and tobacco, which are among the lowest paid occupations in the United States today. Others are the aged or physically handicapped to whose support their local communities contribute. Still others are partially or fully unemployed.

In total it is a very different picture than it was a decade ago. In 1939, three Americans out of four were in the bottom of the four levels described (under $2,000), and now only one in four is in the lowest stratum. Then, only 10 percent of all the population was in the groups over $3,000; today 35 percent are found above this line.

Of course, a dollar before the war was worth a good deal more than it is today. But an enormous upward shift of "real income," or purchasing power, has taken place, even allowing for the rise in prices since 1939. Although in 1950 the average American is paying more for daily goods and services than he paid in 1939 (plus a much higher income tax), he is also receiving (after taxes) more than double the earnings of 1939. All in all, he can buy more with his income than he could in 1939.

A significant factor in the present economic picture in the United States has been a changed pattern of Government expenditure, which has aided in stabilizing earnings. In 1950 total spending of the Federal, State, and local governments came to about $60,000,000,000 (240,000,000,000 rubles). Such public expenditures covered activities as varied as building roads and running the weather service, delivering mail and administering soil-conservation programs, equipping schools and hospitals, and helping to pay for new homes and better education for war veterans.

In more direct ways Government expenditure has helped forestall what might have been the beginnings of a decline in effective purchasing power. By supporting the prices of crops, the Government prevented the disastrous fall in income which undermined the American farmer after World War I. Similarly, as a result of the broad social security program enacted into law in the 1930's, persons who lost their jobs during the changeover from wartime to peaceful industry or due to the slow-down of a particular industry—like other unemployed persons—received a regular weekly income, for about 20 weeks, in the form of unemployment insurance.

Perhaps equally important for the sake of future stability is the kind of growth which occurred in the United States in recent years. There have been dynamic processes working to channel this growth into the middle economic layers, rather than the top. Largely as a result of effective trade-union organization, bottom income groups have been boosted by a general rise in wages—average pay (after taxes) has nearly tripled in two decades. And upper-level incomes have been squeezed down by income taxes.

The economic spectrum has been narrowed—there are fewer rich, fewer poor, and more people in the middle. The 40-percent rise in average living standards which took place between 1939 and 1950 reflects a 51-percent upward movement of the lowest income groups and a much smaller 18-percent improvement for the topmost fifth.

This economic movement toward the middle has worked to the benefit of the Nation as a whole. For it has broadened the mass market on which American prosperity has always been built. This has brought about something close to a mass luxury market. Between 1939 and 1950 this is what happened to consumption of expensive goods: The number of radios in use jumped from 39,000,000 to 62,000,000; the number of electric washing machines from 15,000,000 to 26,000,000; and the number of refrigerators from 14,000,000 to 30,000,000. Television sets are already a mass product—the industry expects to sell 6,000,000 sets this year and is looking ahead to an eager market for several more years to come.

Today there are about 49,000,000 cars operating in the United States—the ratio is one to every four Americans, as compared to one to five before the war. Food consumption is also up—10 percent higher per capita, and better quality food as well. And personal savings—always an index of well-being—are at the highest peacetime level in history, though lower than they were during the war, when a scarcity of many commodities caused a certain amount of involuntary thrift.

And so it is not merely the fact that steadily growing productivity has brought the American people in the aggregate a record personal income of $210,000,000,000 (840,000,000,000 rubles) that builds confidence in the future. It is the far more important fact that purchasing power is better distributed than ever before.

CHART I.—*Real wages (income in relation to cost of living)*

[Index numbers: 1939=100]

Per capita income:	*Consumer prices*
1939: 100	100
1940: 107	101
1941: 129	106
1942: 162	117
1943: 181	124
1944: 189	126
1945: 202	129
1946: 210	140
1947: 220	160
1948: 240	172
1949: 234	170
1950: 242	169

Consumer prices have gone up since 1939, but per capita personal income after personal taxes (which was $536 in 1939 and $1,298 in 1950) has gone up even more, proportionately, making a gain in real income between 1939 and 1950. Nineteen hundred and fifty figures, which are estimates based on the first 6 months of the year, reflect the stabilized prosperity which has been typical of the postwar period.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce and Labor.

CHART II.—*Comparison of employment and income, 1939–50*

	Number of employed	Total personal income (after taxes)
1939	46, 020, 000	$70, 167, 000, 000
1950 (May)	61, 051, 000	195, 000, 000, 000

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce.

CHART III.—*Factory workers' wages*

[Steadier employment+higher rates—better wages]

	Average hours per week	Average wage per hour	Average weekly wage
1939	37.7	$0.633	$23.86
1950 (first 4 months)	39.7	1.424	56.52

Source: U. S. Department of Labor.

CHART IV

This $56.52 weekly wage in 1950 can be used to purchase 1 man's suit, 1 man's shirt, 1 pair of woman's nylon hose, 1 pair of woman's shoes, 4 kilograms meat, one-half kilogram fish, 7 liters milk, 3 kilograms bread, 2 kilograms butter, 4 kilograms potatoes, 2 kilograms oranges, 3 dozen eggs, 1 kilogram coffee, 1 kilogram sugar, 1 week's rent.

CHART V.—*Typical 1950 prices*

MEN'S CLOTHING (LOW-PRICE MASS PRODUCTION ITEMS)	
Overalls	$3.50
Suits	26.00
Overcoat	32.00
Cotton shirt	2.25
Shoes	6.50
WOMEN'S CLOTHING (LOW-PRICE MASS PRODUCTION ITEMS)	
Dress (cotton)	$3.50
Suit	25.00
Overcoat	28.00
Nylons	1.00
Shoes	3.50
FOOD (APRIL 15, 1950—AVERAGE OF 60 CITIES)	
Meat (kilogram)	$1.40
Fish (kilogram)	.95
Milk (liter)	.17
Bread (kilogram)	.31
Butter (kilogram)	1.58
Potatoes (kilogram)	.10
Apples (kilogram)	.26
Oranges (kilogram)	.27
Eggs (dozen)	.52
Coffee (kilogram)	1.69
Sugar (kilogram)	.21
MONTHLY RENT (MEDIAN VALUE, MARCH 1950)	
Urban	$33
Rural	16

Sources: U. S. Department of Labor; Retail Dry Goods Association.

CHART VI.—*Change in living standards, 1939–50*

	1939	1950 (Jan. 1)
Individual homes	15,195,753	22,278,300
Cars	30,615,000	[1] 49,619,770
Television sets	1,000	4,978,000
Refrigerators	15,093,346	26,967,400
Washing machines	13,481,000	26,751,800
Vacuum cleaners	11,467,000	19,760,500
Radios	45,300,000	81,000,000
Books sold in 1 year	193,342,560	[2] 487,216,000

[1] July.
[2] 1949

The increase in private ownership of articles once thought of as luxuries is a good index of America's steadily rising standard of living. 1950 prices of mass-produced items which achieve the largest sales are approximately as follows:

Home	$8,000
Car	1,500
Television set	200
Refrigerator	180
Washing machine	150
Vacuum cleaner	50
Radio	25
Book	2

Soure: U. S. Departments of Commerce and Labor; Economic Almanac, National Industrial Conference Board; Television Magazine; Electrical Merchandizing Magazine; Publisher's Weekly.

CHART VII.—*Distribution of family income, 1948*

Income bracket:	*Number of families*
Under $1,000	$4,100,000
$1,000–$2,000	5,600,000
$2,000–$3,000	7,900,000
$3,000–$4,000	8,000,000
$4,000–$5,000	5,000,000
$5,000–$6,000	3,100,000
$6,000–$10,000	3,800,000
Over $10,000	1,100,000

Better distribution of American income over the years has meant that more than half of the Nation's 39,000,000 families are now in the middle-income bracket of $2,000 to $5,000 a year. Economists have found that the lowest fifth of the population had an increase in purchasing power of 51 percent from 1941 to 1948, while the top fifth increased only 18 percent.

Editors Support Congress Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, educators and editors across the Nation are taking an interest in the worthy endeavor of the Committee for Congress, of 1060 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., to strengthen our Nation with a better knowledge of Congress and its work.

This is a necessary endeavor in normal times, but it is even more important in times of crisis that we should do everything possible to create a better understanding of our Congress.

Some of our friends who are right on the scene here in the National Capital say that it is even difficult for them to understand all the functions of Congress, and for that reason it is even more important that special steps be taken to clarify the work of Congress and its Members. I, therefore, ask leave to insert this material in the RECORD. It follows:

THE MEXIA DAILY NEWS,
Mexia, Tex., December 10, 1950.

Mr. HARMON NICHOLS,
United Press Washington Bureau, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NICHOLS: A few days ago we had a dispatch of yours over the UP wire telling about the Committee for Congress and mentioning a publication called Your Congress Magazine.

Would you please put me in touch with the proper individual on the magazine so that I can subscribe to it—I, too, would appreciate an opportunity to find out what goes on, and perhaps to pass along to our local school officials the fact that a group of newspapermen have such a publication.

I haven't looked into it, but I imagine that our schools aren't doing much to tell the kids what Congress is all about these days.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. (ERNIE) DEANE.

COMMITTEE FOR CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1950.

MR. E. C. DEANE,
Editor and General Manager, the Mexia Daily News, Mexia, Tex.

DEAR MR. DEANE: Harmon Nichols has handed to me your letter of December 10, 1950, in which you made the interesting observation that "I imagine that our schools here aren't doing much to tell the kids what Congress is all about these days."

That observation corroborates our general findings on the subject, but I am afraid that our schools and school officials are not entirely to blame. The fact is, that there is no readily accessible material available that provides in graphic, easy-to-read, and understandable form study material on the specific and actual work and functions of the Congress of the United States and its Members.

It is this hiatus in our educational system that we are endeavoring to correct, through the formation of the Committee for Congress by a group of outstanding newspaper and magazine correspondents and authors, and its Congress study council program. We are producing the Your Congress Magazine on a quarterly basis for the present, and will attempt to supply explanatory articles on how Congress operates, and what it is doing.

We will keep you fully informed on the project as it progresses, and are more than happy that you are interested in it. We have invited Mr. Nichols to serve on the advisory committee, on which leaders of all segments of the American economy will be represented.

We are forwarding requested material and any additional inquiries can be sent to the National Headquarters, 1060 National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C. ME 2214.

With sincere thanks for your interest.

Yours truly.

HAL J. MILLER,
Editor, Your Congress Magazine, Executive Director, Committee for Congress, sponsor of Congress Study Council.

Hon. Lyndon Johnson's Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from Texas, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, recently made a notable speech to which reference is made in an editorial in my home-town paper, that is, the Wichita (Tex.) Daily Times.

This editorial is worthy of reproduction in the RECORD and I offer it for insertion. We should all subordinate profits and politics to the terrible needs of the hour. Senator JOHNSON is to be commended for his efforts to bring our country to a realization of her peril. The Times editorial of December 19, 1950, follows:

HON. LYNDON JOHNSON'S APPEAL

The Second World War brought into our language some phrases we do not like to remember. "Too little and too late" was one of them. "Wishful thinking" was another. Because of them, a good many fine young men who might be alive are dead.

In the present emergency, another fateful phrase has become current in some circles in Washington. "Wait and see." Ever since the Korean trouble began in June there has been those in high places, wishful thinkers, who thought we could afford to postpone arming at full strength, who thought the trouble might be less dangerous than it has become, and who wanted to dally and temporize.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas has paid his respects to the wait-and-see crowd, in language both brutal and bitter; by virtue of the position he holds, as chairman of the Senate Military Preparedness Subcommittee, the Texas Senator knows, perhaps better than anyone else in Washington, how far short of the need our program is, and what egregious folly we are pursuing in thinking we can wait. We are at war, the Senator says, in a conflict in which our very survival is at stake, and we are not getting ready to make war as we must.

The Senator sees our needs as, first, a global plan of strategy; second, full manpower mobilization; third, economic mobilization; fourth, a prompt and emphatic end to the wait-and-see policy; and, finally, hard-driving leadership.

Why have we not moved faster? A partial answer is, politics. Another partial answer has been the inability to realize the temper of the American people. One reason, the Senator suggests, is that we have

been more afraid of doing too much than of doing too little.

The result is that, instead of a wall of armed might, we have what the Senator describes as a chicken-wire fence. And he added:

"This is not World War II all over again. This is a struggle without precedent in human experience. The military concepts and the domestic policies which won World War II are not applicable to this struggle in which we are now engaged. Obviously, we need new approaches, new plans, new goals; just as obviously we do not have them."

In the relatively brief time that he has been a Senator, LYNDON JOHNSON has gained, to a degree almost unprecedented, the confidence and respect of the membership. They have learned that he is no alarmist, no idle talker, and that when he speaks of the preparedness task, he knows what he is saying. He said some things that needed to be said. Congress and the administration must heed his words.

Thou Shalt Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech broadcast by me on December 15, 1950, the day reserved for commemoration of the adoption of the Bill of Rights:

THOU SHALT NOT

The story of the Bill of Rights is simple. It ought to be told again and again. I shall now endeavor to tell it as briefly as possible. It will be recalled that the Thirteen Colonies, or States, as they came to be known, after winning their independence from Great Britain in the War of the Revolution, endeavored to live together for 6 or 7 years in a confederation whose principal governing agency was a Congress composed of Members elected by the several States. That Congress possessed very slight powers and there was no effective executive officer of the confederation. The result was that frictions and misunderstandings broke out among the States. Some of them erected tariff barriers around their borders. Each had its own currency, most of it worthless. Each could regulate practically all its relations with its neighbors. At times those regulations were so severe that an outbreak of violence was threatened. In other words, instead of coming closer together after winning their liberty, the States, to a very alarming degree, began to drift apart. Had this trend persisted unchecked the results would have been tragic. There would have been no American Nation. But in 1787, responsive to a resolution adopted by the Congress of the confederation, a convention met with instructions to study the articles of confederation and to make recommendations for their revision. As you all know, that Convention met, with George Washington as its presiding officer, and with Delegates from the States present—a most distinguished gathering. Before they proceeded far they came to a realization that mere revision of the Articles of Confederation would not suffice. So they went to work to write a Constitution, a basic law upon which to found a Federal Government clothed with sufficient power to manage national affairs. I need not attempt to describe at this time the provisions of that Constitution as submitted to the several States. Suffice it to say that it was a remarkable document and still lives as such. However, a great many Americans of that day had an instinctive dread of overconcentration of power in a Central Government. They feared that such a Government might take unto itself, step by step, a despotic power over the individual citizen. A great many of them insisted that while power should be given to the Federal Government to do certain things it was vital that that Government should be forbidden the doing of certain things which would deprive the citizen of his liberty. They demanded that a Bill of Rights be added to the Constitution.

As the discussion proceeded throughout the year 1788 it was conceded that ratification of the new Constitution by the requisite nine States was very doubtful. As a result, there finally emerged from the debate what might be termed a gentleman's agreement between the contending parties. That agreement provided that immediately following the ratification of the new Constitution and the setting up of the new Federal Government, the First Congress would draft a Bill of Rights and submit it as soon as possible to the several States for ratification as a proposed addition to the Constitution. This agreement was largely responsible for the action of the States in approving the Constitution, confident, as they were, that the First Congress would see to it that the gap was filled. And so it was done. The First Congress submitted the Bill of Rights, containing 10 proposed amendments. Those 10 amendments were ratified with remarkable rapidity, indicating the measure of assurance which they gave to a people who dreaded the growth of despotism.

Now, let us see what those 10 amendments do. Remember, first, that the main body of the Constitution conferred powers upon the Federal Government—powers to be exercised by the Congress, by the Executive, and by the Judiciary—powers which were regarded as necessary for the conduct of an effective Federal Government. By contrast, the Bill of Rights says to that Government: "Thou shall not do certain things to us." For example, "Thou shalt not deprive us of the right to hold public meetings, to speak our minds, or to write out and circulate our opinions. Thou shalt not give preferential recognition to any church or religious denomination nor interfere with the right of an individual to worship as he pleases. Thou shalt not deprive any person of the right of trial by a jury of his peers nor to employ counsel for defense. Thou shalt not put a man under arrest and keep him in jail for months and months without trial. If he is to be brought to trial charged with a crime, it might be as the result of the action of a grand jury submitting an indictment; and the trial must be held promptly, no long delays, and the accused must not be compelled to testify against himself. Furthermore, that same accused, if acquitted by a jury of his peers, must not be tried a second time for the same offense." Compare, if you will, this protection of the rights of the individual in our country with what is going on in communistic countries today and you will realize the vital difference. The Bill of Rights goes on to say to the Government: "Thou shalt not take away from any individual his lawful property without due compensation. Thou shalt not break into the house of a citizen and seize his papers and effects unless a legal warrant, supported by oath or affirmation, shall be issued by legally constituted authority."

These "thou-shalt-nots," and a few others which I need not recite, were intended to protect the individual citizen against reckless attacks upon his life, liberty, or property. And then, finally, to make it absolutely clear that government derives all its power from the people, they ended up the Bill of Rights with the famous article 10, which reads: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people." In other words, "No more power unless we give it to you." That article 10 is the last word, the conclusive "thou-shalt-not," addressed to the Government. With it the story is complete. Down through the years some attempts have been made to trespass upon the sacred right of the citizen. They have failed, but similar attempts may be made in the future. They will fail if we teach our children and our grandchildren the real meaning and the vital importance of the Bill of Rights. I say "teach our children and our grandchildren" because I know, as you all know, that liberty does not survive among a careless, uninformed people. It is earned first by the people themselves. Having earned it, they must watch over it lest it be taken away from them by a higher power. Let this thing be taught over and over again in our homes, our schools, our colleges. Telling an old story again and again may seem unnecessary but the history of the human race demonstrates that the truth cannot be told too often.

Spreading the Blame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the Philadelphia Bulletin:

SPREADING THE BLAME—IT MAY BE THAT THE ISOLATIONISTS THEMSELVES HAVE LOST PUBLIC'S CONFIDENCE

(By Ralph W. Page)

WASHINGTON.—The new coalition of isolationist Senators keeps reiterating that the country has lost confidence in the Secretary of State because he didn't follow their advice.

It does not seem to occur to them that it is quite possible that, on the contrary, the public has even less confidence in them. Certainly I can find no enthusiasm even in Republican circles for the Taft-Dirksen-Knowland ballyhoo.

Their contention has been that we should let Europe stew in its Communist juice—but that we should have given Chiang Kai-shek sufficient aid to defeat the Chinese revolution. That our military commanders were unanimous that this could not be done without either an American army or complete American control and command of the Kuomintang Government is totally disregarded.

Now they say that the reason the Chinese attacked our forces in Korea is because we did not give further aid to the generalissimo.

A much better case can be made, however, for the proposition that we are subjected to this Chinese fury for the sole reason that we did support him.

Following the war all China was in revolt. It was—and is—an agrarian revolution against the old feudal system and corruption. At that time the Chinese people considered America their first friend, and were congenitally hostile to Russia which had consistently encroached upon their territory for a century. Yalta certainly did not en-

dear them to the Russians. For it was demands for further Russian seizures not American encroachments that are criticized.

In this situation the real American problem was to maintain the confidence of the Chinese people and keep their attention focused upon the inroads upon their sovereignty and economy by the Soviets.

Plenty of experienced and informed authorities urged this upon the State Department. But since, unfortunately, the reins of the revolt were in the hands of the Communists, these men and this policy were so pilloried and smeared by the McCarthy technique that it was hardly discussible on its merits. No attention was paid to the salient fact that we were not fighting communism, Chinese style, but Russian aggression.

The pressure was to wage war on this revolution. And in doing so instead of heading off the Kremlin we threw the population into its arms.

For whatever Senators may think of Chiang, the Chinese population considers him anathema.

In other words, we took the wrong side in the Chinese civil war with result we now face.

And it is this policy which the Senators endorsed and which they now follow up by putting the blame on Dean Acheson.

Insofar as it was able, under the din of the smear campaign, the Department was endeavoring to avoid conflict with the Chinese. It was recognized that Chiang was Russian bait and that, in fact, the Chinese would soon discover the evil interest of the Soviets if they were not diverted by fear or animosity toward us.

All this claque about a lack of confidence is pointed in the wrong direction. It should be aimed at the isolationists who started it.

Funds for Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a telegram from Thomas E. Prescott, president of the Passaic, N. J., Chamber of Commerce, concerning a proposal made by the chamber's board of directors on new Federal tax legislation to provide necessary funds for the defense program. The telegram follows:

PASSAIC, N. J., *December 21, 1950.*
Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building:

The board of directors of the Passaic Chamber of Commerce fully recognize the necessity of a $17,530,000,000 defense program on the part of the United States. They also realize that such defense preparations will cost vast sums of money a large part of which must be raised by pay-as-you-go taxation. However, they oppose those forms of new taxation which by their nature or by their designation, i. e., excess-profits tax, tend to become a fixed and permanent part of the tax structure or which serve as a disguise for social and economic reforms. Therefore, it was

Resolved, That the directors of the Passaic Chamber of Commerce favor the imposition of a new Federal tax separate from all other taxes to be officially designated as an emergency defense tax with understanding that funds so raised be specifically earmarked solely for defense expenditures and with the further understanding that this special tax be terminated as and when the current emergency no longer exists. We respectfully urge your action along above lines.

THOMAS E. PRESCOTT,
President, Passaic Chamber of Commerce.

Decision To Send Troops to Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my telegram to the Secretary of State on December 21, 1950:

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.:

Who made the decision to send our Armed Forces into Korea? The Constitution vests exclusively in Congress the power to declare war, but Congress was not consulted.

In the December 13 issue of Human Events, Frank C. Hanighen said:

"From a well-informed source, we have received some interesting hitherto unpublished information about the original, ill-fated decision to land troops on the Korean Peninsula last June. There has always been a good deal of mystery about how the President reached the decision to send ground troops and engage in land warfare. Last summer, this column fathered various bits of evidence and hearsay which suggested that the military chiefs were either opposed or reluctant. (It is now known that they were inclined to adhere to a secret plan which limited retaliation to air bombing and naval blockade.) Generally, it has been believed that the responsibility for the landing was solely that of Truman and Acheson.

"Now comes word suggesting that there was a third partner in the decision. We hear from a usually well-informed source that President Truman paid a secret visit to Gen. George C. Marshall sometime in the 24 hours preceding the afternoon of June 26. According to this information, the President motored to the general's home at Leesburg, Va., about 35 miles from Washington. Although it is not explained why, instead, the general did not come to the White House. The President was reportedly absent from the Capital for about 4 hours. As such a motor journey should have consumed about an hour-and-a-half (down and back), there was ample time for a considerable review of the Korean situation. While our source gives no details about what was said at the meeting, we are justified in concluding that General Marshall urged or approved the plan for landing United States troops in Korea. It would, indeed, be surprising if Marshall's assent was not given, for it is well known that the President has long esteemed Marshall's military counsel. Finally, it was after this secret meeting that the President made the decision of June 26 to undertake the ill-starred Korean landing."

Were these three men who made this decision the same three that George Catlett Marshall wrote to when he said: "With one stroke of the pen, I have disarmed 29 Chinese Nationalist divisions." These were the 29 divisions guarding north China against Communist ingress through the passes in the north. Are these three men the same who decided to disarm our ally, the Chinese Republic? And, if so, are they wise and far-sighted enough today to take over the powers of Congress in dealing with foreign affairs and sending our men into war?

Former Congressman Samuel B. Pettengill, a profound student of our Constitution, and, during 8 years a Member of Congress, Democrat of Indiana, wrote an open letter to the press, urging a stop to Executive assumption of power to declare war and enter treaties not sanctioned by the Senate. He said:

"As soon as the newly elected Congress meets, the United States Senate should at once notify the world that for all time to come no act of a President, past, present, or future, agreeing or consenting to a permanent transfer of territory or property, or the forced migration of millions of people from one foreign power to another, will be recognized as valid by the United States unless and until the same has been ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

"In order to appease Stalin, Mr. Roosevelt repudiated the Atlantic Charter and every principle of international morality by agreeing to the transfer of the property and territory of China and Japan to Russia; he agreed to the transfer of German territory to Poland; of Polish territory to Russia; and God knows what else.

"This business of permitting a few officials to secretly commit American lives and treasure to battle without a congressional declaration of war, of appeasing one ally by transferring to it the territory of another ally, or the property and persons of its civilians, and of making permanent treaties with foreign powers, dictators, or bandits by executive agreement, must end—now.

"It must be intoxicating to three men to carve up the world, but every instinct of liberty and morality must revolt against it."

Mr. Acheson, as a Member of Congress, wishing to live up to the constitutional responsibilities vested in us, I ask for reply to the question: Whose decision was it that sent our troops into the Korean war? Is Mr. Hanighen's statement correct?

RALPH W. GWINN,
Member of Congress.

Dinosaur National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article entitled "This Is Dinosaur," which was written by Mr. Devereux Butcher and printed in the National Parks magazine, October–December issue, 1950, of which he is the editor. May I recommend the reading of this article to my colleagues, as it describes a very interesting national monument, located in the States of Utah and Colorado. The following is the article:

As you reach the summit of Round Top, highest point on the ridge of Blue Mountain, the land drops away suddenly 3,000 feet, and like an eagle, you gaze down on the intricate, magnificent, turbulent landscape of Dinosaur National Monument. Below, and stretching eastward into the blue distance, are the pale canyons of the Yampa River gleaming with the color of ivory in the brilliant light of the midday sun. So snarled and twisted are those canyons that the river's main channel is hardly distinguishable; even at the oxbows near Harding's

Hole, you must look carefully to find it. Nearest to Round Top is Castle Park, where the river makes a wide bend southward and then north. Here the clear, green water of the Yampa is visible until it enters the windings of Bear Canyon, from whence it soon joins the Green River at Pats Hole, a little to the west. The top of the famous Steamboat Rock, at Pats Hole, can be seen above the canyon's south rim, and just beyond, the dark red walls of Lodore Canyon, through which flows the Green River from the north.

You will go down to Pats Hole. A road plunges over the brink of Blue Mountain and enters Iron Springs Wash. Through juniper and pinion pine, it passes the head of Upper Pool Creek Canyon, rambles across sage-covered bench lands to drop into Sand Canyon and on across hot sage flats to wind down through Lower Pool Creek Canyon—red-walled, and grown with boxelder trees and cottonwoods. Here you stop to explore Whispering Cave and feel the cold, refreshing air that pours down through long gashes in the cave's room. The canyon makes an abrupt turn beyond the cave, and there before you, framed by the mouth of Pool Creek Canyon, stands the towering form of Steamboat Rock, symbol of Dinosaur National Monument.

Your destination on this day is the road's end, just below the junction of the Yampa and the Green. In a grove of boxelders, you make camp. The sun is sinking now, and its last rays make the Yampa's north ramparts blaze with the color of flame, while the shadows of advancing night deepen in the canyons. The silence of the wilderness is broken only by the gentle, steady, distant sound of rapids made by the Green, where it emerges from its Canyon of Lodore. A wide, clean sand bar along the river's bank is the ideal place to sleep.

All through the still night there is no sound except the echo of rapids. No air stirs, and the sand bars and canyon walls long hold the warmth of sunny hours. Steamboat Rock stands in massive silhouette against the stars, its top 800 feet above.

Through the Yampa's mouth, the sky becomes luminous, announcing the coming of day. Faintly, very faintly, detail shows on the broad eastward face of Steamboat Rock. Later, from high on the talus at the base of the cliff that forms the angle between the Yampa and Green, you look down on the meeting of the rivers. A rock wren scolds and white-throated swifts chatter as a pair of these graceful birds skim past on vibrant wings, now far below, now high above, and on up, to vanish over the very crests of the lofty crags.

Beyond and above Steamboat Rock, high peaks catch the first rays of the rising sun, and presently, with dramatic effect, the brilliant light shafts down Yampa Canyon, gilding the face of Steamboat. The meadows and boxelder groves at Pats Hole are yet in shade. Now the light reaches the Yampa's clear green mirror pools. Where the sun touches the pale rock of the Yampa Canyon, horizontal striations show on the smooth curves.

A rough dirt road winds its way north in the high country toward Harper's Corner. Beyond the gray sage the land dips a little, and you pass along through junipers and piñons and stop within 2 miles of the tip of the corner. It is hot now, even at this altitude of 7,500 feet above sea level. The sun is brilliant, although clouds hover above the Uinta Mountains far to the west. A trail climbs over several tree-clad hills and brings you toward the ever-narrowing tip of Harper's Corner. When the ridge pitches steeply down on each side, there are sudden and unexpected views east and west through the trees. To the right, and so far down that it all looks like a toy landscape, is Pats Hole. There towers Steamboat Rock, the Green winding around its prow. There is the twisting canyon of the Yampa in view over the knife edge of the rock, and there, easily visible from this high point, is the Canyon of Lodore. To the left is Whirlpool Canyon. Farther on, the ridge continues to narrow, and the trail comes out of the trees. You may go on to the very tip if you wish, but to get there you will cross a neck of rock only 20 inches wide. Here you stand in one spot and, with a slight turn of the head, look down an almost sheer drop of 2,800 feet to the river on each side. Where the river bends around the corner is the place a dam is planned to be built. All of the magnificent wild natural canyons to the right will be submerged under 500 feet of water. Only 300 feet of Steamboat Rock will show above. The superbly beautiful windings of the Yampa will be submerged. Gone will be the bright green pools, the peaceful groves of boxelders, willows, and cottonwoods, and no more will be heard the distant echoing of rapids.

To reach Rainbow and Island Parks, you will take a road west of the monument, winding north, then east through rolling ranch lands and sage-covered range land. Climbing it will bring you to the top of a hill from the base of which stretches the lowlands of Island Park, with the precipitous wall of the Yampa Plateau beyond to the south. Across Island Park flows the Green River, just emerging from Whirlpool Canyon. After the turbulence of the canyon, the river rests awhile, meandering among green islands bordered by big cottonwoods. Soon it is to become turbulent again as it plunges into Split Mountain Canyon. From your vantage point on the hill, you see the spectacular gap of Whirlpool and the forbidding chasm of Split Mountain Canyon.

From the Rupel Ranch in Island Park, you go to the mouth of Whirlpool Canyon by crossing a mile of meadow, and then following the river's sandy shore; and you approach the entrance to Split Mountain Canyon by a road to Rainbow Park, and then following the bars along the river's bank for a mile or more.

At Split Mountain Gorge, to the south, the Green River bids farewell to the monument and its wild canyons to flow peacefully through green farms on its way southward through Utah to its junction with the Colorado. But if the river bids farewell to the canyons here at the gorge, this is where you enter afoot, to explore, perhaps alone, its grandeur and solitude. A road terminates at the gorge, and a rock formation on each side of the river comes down to the water, blocking your passage. You must climb high along the west bank, and follow deer trails upriver. If you go in midafternoon, you will find the red canyon wall, 2,000 feet above you, casting welcome shade across your trail. Below, the river washes the very foot of the cliff, and in places, boils and hisses and rises in waves of foaming rapids. At the bend, you come down to the water's edge and rock-hop, eventually following a series of sandy beaches where the going is easy and restful after the hard climb along talus and cliff. This is the site of another dam proposed to be built inside the national monument. The glorious sense of solitude you are enjoying, the peace and beauty and quiet of the place, may some day soon be shattered by exploding dynamite and the roar of machinery. Rapids will be silenced, and upstream from here, through the length of Split Mountain Canyon, into Rainbow and Island Parks, and on through Whirlpool Canyon to the foot of the dam at Harper's Corner, all will be submerged beneath a reservoir up to 200 feet deep.

For a glimpse of the Green River, at the north end of the monument, go to Maybell, Colo., and from there take the road northwest for 60 miles across the rolling expanse of sage flats and juniper forests to where the river leaves the open country of Brown's Park to plunge through the Gate of Lodore. At road's end, a walk across a small plateau brings you to the brink of a cliff high above the quiet Green. Just beyond is the magnificent Gate of Lodore—the entrance to the awe-inspiring, sheer-walled red canyon. Here the Green starts its turbulent journey through the national monument. This, like the rest of the monument, will some day become a destination for tourists from all parts of the Nation and from foreign countries, if preserved as nature made it. But even here, 15 miles, as the crow flies, from the dam site at Harpers Corner, the effect of the dam would be felt, for the reservoir would inundate the Canyon of Lodore to a depth of 200 feet at this, its upper end.

In the nearby towns they will tell you the monument is inaccessible. Most of the local people believe that, and as a result, few of them have ever seen it. Tell them you have been there, describe what you have seen, and they will look at you as though you had dropped in from outer space.

The area is accessible, but not easily explored. The day before we visited Pats Hole, seven cars had been there. On our way out, we met a sedan full of tourists going in. The wife of a rancher, who lives in the monument down near Pats Hole, has just bought a big new Buick. Every time the lady wants to go to town, she drives that heavy car out over the sandy, rocky road. Yes, Pats Hole is accessible, as are many other parts of the monument, and if you want to see the reservation you can; but don't wait. Those magnificent canyons may not remain much longer as nature made them.

Here's what has happened: In 1938, the canyons were set aside to be preserved in perpetuity as one of this Nation's great and spectacular natural exhibits of undisturbed scenic grandeur. During World War II, engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation entered the area in search of dam sites for water storage and power development. They gave notice, thereafter, that two sites, Echo Park (the site at Harpers Corner) and Split Mountain Canyon, were essential to the water and power development plan for the Upper Basin of the Colorado River system. The Green and Yampa Rivers are part of that system. Since World War II, Bureau of Reclamation engineers have brought their proposal to the people of Utah and western Colorado. From the engineers' representations, the people in the region are convinced that these dams will provide the primary storage and diversion point for irrigation water; that they are needed to provide storage in the Upper Basin to meet apportionment of water to Arizona and California, under the Colorado River compact; and that sufficient power will not be available except by construction of Echo Park Dam. Because of these beliefs, the people of Utah, particularly the communities in the vicinity of the monument, are now clamoring for the construction of these two dams. The "western bloc" in House and Senate hears that clamor, and is ruled by it, instead of by facts.

The facts are: (1) all information released up to now indicates that water for central Utah has been programed to come from Flaming Gorge Dam to be constructed upstream from the monument; (2) that Glen Canyon Reservoir on the Colorado River is the one from which water will be released to States downstream under the Colorado River compact, and this together with water from storage reservoirs upstream, other than the two proposed for the monument, will meet the compact agreement adequately; and (3) that all the necessary power can be generated at dams already proposed as alternates, at sites other than those in the monument.

The Colorado River compact provides that the upper-basin States shall deliver to the lower-basin States 75,000,000 acre-feet of water every 10 consecutive years, and that 7,500,000 acre-feet shall be apportioned each year to the upper-basin States for consump-

tive use. This requires 48,500,000 acre-feet of storage.

Clarifying the compact, Commissioner of Reclamation Michael W. Straus wrote the author, September 19, 1950, in part, as follows: "The 48,500,000 acre-feet of storage is our best estimate of the total amount of storage capacity which will be required to permit beneficial consumptive use of the 7,500,000 acre-feet allotted to the upper-basin States, while at the same time complying with the provisions of article III (d). In arriving at this amount of storage capacity, there must be taken into consideration such items as sediment deposition in the reservoir areas, net evaporation from the reservoir areas, operation of the reservoirs for multiple purposes, and similar items."

Because dam construction within any national park or monument is a violation of the national policy of complete protection of primeval conditions within such reservations, those interested in defending the national park and monument system against commercial and engineering raids, have asked that the two dams be omitted from the upper-basin program. (Let me emphasize: They are opposing only 2 dams of the 20 or more big projects proposed for the upper basin.) Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, therefore, held a hearing on April 3, 1950, in Washington, D. C., so that both sides might express themselves concerning the two Dinosaur Monument proposals. The Secretary had agreed that as a result of testimony presented, he would decide whether or not the policy of the Department would favor the construction of these dams.

Officials of the National Park Service and representatives of conservation, nature protection, and wilderness preservation groups spoke in defense of the long-standing policy of the National Park Service; while officials of the Bureau of Reclamation, mayors, and representatives of chambers of commerce, and Senators and Congressmen from Utah and Colorado spoke for the dams. On June 27, Secretary Chapman's policy-shattering decision favoring the dams was announced.

Immediately following that decision I made plans to go to Utah and Colorado to get, at first hand, the proponent's side of the story. Was all this talk about the need for water based on a real need? Why was there so much demand for power development in a region so sparsely inhabited?

I wanted also to visit Dinosaur National Monument to see for myself whether the area really contained a superb exhibit of nature as some said, or whether it was of inferior quality or perhaps essentially duplicated elsewhere in the park and monument system.

In 6 weeks I traveled 3,700 miles in the two States, and wherever there was opportunity I talked with the people. They ranged from mayors and newspapermen to grocery-store clerks. Conversations showed a great deal of confusion in the minds of the people regarding Bureau of Reclamation plans.

There was a general feeling that this is "a fight between east and west," to quote the local press. Actually, this problem, like dozens of others that have occurred during the past 50 years, is a matter of protecting a unit of the national park system, and, therefore, the system as a whole. People from coast to coast, not just easterners, are striving to defend the monument.

Most people not in official positions thought there were only two dams to be built—the two in the national monument—and that from these would come all the power and water needed. According to the Bureau of Reclamation, these two dams are primarily for power development. Some understood there were other dams planned for the upper basin, but the number of these dams varied from two to three to nine or so. The names of the proposed Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams were familiar to a few. Actually, the Bureau has suggested over 20 projects for the upper basin alone. The Bureau admits that the exact number cannot be determined at this time.

In Utah's Central Valley I found there is desperate need for more water. At Salt Lake City and southward to such towns as Nephi, populations are growing fast and industries rapidly expanding. At Nephi, in the summer of 1949, for instance, the mayor received up to 16 telephone calls a day urging immediate action to get more water. Like the people of New York City recently, they did not have enough water for cooking and washing. No part of our country should remain under hardship like that, if it is humanly possible to remedy. Flaming Gorge Reservoir will take care of this Central Valley need, as the Bureau of Reclamation plans.

One Central Valley newspaper editor said he intended to write an article on the Dinosaur dams. Conversation brought out that he knew nothing about the subject except that the Park Service had expressed opposition to the construction of two dams, which the people of his community thought they needed. He finally admitted he had to read up on it. The Bureau of Reclamation is not planning to bring water to the Central Valley from the Dinosaur dams, but from Uinta Basin streams, and this may be supplemented by water from Flaming Gorge Dam. No one is opposing construction of Flaming Gorge Dam. May I ask how can people know the truth, if the men whose job it is to shape public opinion are themselves ignorant of the facts?

As for any understanding of the national policy governing the national parks and monuments, this I found almost wholly lacking everywhere. In the course of conversation with the mayor of a small Colorado town near the monument, I pointed out that, if these two dams do go in, the many pending threats to other parks and monuments will receive impetus. He said he had heard of no other threats, and asked what they were. When I told him of the Army engineers' scheme to build a dam that would flood 20,000 acres in Glacier National Park, and one that would fill the wonderful caverns of Mammoth Cave National Park, of the Bureau of Reclamation's plan to turn Grand Canyon National Monument and 18 miles along Grand Canyon National Park's boundary into a reservoir by building the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam in Arizona, of eight bills introduced in the Eightieth Congress to permit logging of Olympic National Park's incomparable rain forest, and so on, he said that he considered we had a strong argument against the Dinosaur dams. The general public simply is not informed about these things. Of course, Bernard DeVoto's article in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post has reached a fairly wide audience and has helped to create enlightenment. I am certain that if the public were aware of the constant efforts of exploitive interests to invade and destroy our wonderful national parks and monuments, there would be few if any such selfish efforts made, and the reservations would be forever secure.

At the nearby community of Vernal, in Utah, there is greater interest in construction of the Dinosaur dams than anywhere else. It is true that there are phosphate and asphalt deposits near by, and if power can be made available, these can be mined; but the huge dam planned for Flaming Gorge can provide adequate electricity. It is not generally known, even in Vernal, that from the Flaming Gorge Reservoir, water will be distributed to the central valley, along with water from the Uinta Mountains, some of which will be diverted to Vernal and other communities in that part of the State.

A gas station attendant at Vernal summed up in one sentence all the conversations I had with people in that town. He said, "What we are interested in is a business boom."

In the West, undue emphasis has been given the potential recreational benefits anticipated from artificial lakes. The reservoirs that would flood Dinosaur's canyons are being compared with Lake Mead by some proponents. Reservoirs with fluctuating shore lines provide good fishing in their first years, usually declining thereafter. Fishing on Lake Mead is diminishing today. How long could good fishing, the chief attraction at newly established reservoirs, be expected to last in the Dinosaur lakes? Most people who come to fish at such reservoirs are local people. They add no wealth to local coffers. On the other hand, consider the national parks and monuments—those superb, unmatched areas of primeval nature. They attract people from all over the country, and tourists leave their dollars. National parks are big business. Contrast this with the temporary character of money from dam construction, and the meager benefits that may accrue from reservoir fishing.

The Bureau of Reclamation has come bearing gifts and great promises of wealth. The people concerned should look this "gift horse" in the mouth. Those who advocate turning Dinosaur into a recreational area like Lake Mead should appreciate the fallacy of substituting secondary artificial recreation, that is available in many other places, for primary natural recreational assets that are unique. More than a hundred potential projects are outlined in the Bureau of Reclamation's Colorado River report. These would convert nearly all of the canyons and valleys of the Colorado Basin into a series of reservoirs possessing almost identical recreational potentialities. The Missouri, the Columbia, the Ohio and other big river systems are slated for the same treatment, while the Tennessee is already dammed. How much pulling power will Dinosaur hold for tourists if it should comprise just two of literally hundreds of similar artificial lakes? If Dinosaur is left unspoiled, the unique canyons of the Yampa and Green will remain a superbly magnificent attraction to the people of every State. Such untouched scenic grandeur is becoming progressively scarce. For a fraction of the cost of the two dams, the Park Service could provide facilities to serve the public. When that has been done, the railroads, bus lines and airlines will advertise it and attract wealth to the communities. That the monument is not now ready for the general public and being advertised, is as much, if not more, the fault of the local people than anyone else. Since they are the ones who stand to benefit most in a financial way, and are eager for a business boom, why have they not long ago urged their representatives in Congress to provide the Park Service with funds to develop the area?

Officials of the Bureau of Reclamation are using every means to win local support for the Dinosaur dam sites. That dam construction there would wipe out an area that can someday become one of the Nation's great national parks, and would endanger the future protection of the entire park and monument system, is of no concern to them.

In 1936, when the enlargement of Dinosaur National Monument was being proposed, the Bureau of Reclamation was not considering dams at Echo Park and Split Mountain, but rather had proposed a dam at Brown's Park at the north end of the monument. The Presidential proclamation of 1938, establishing the canyons as part of the monument, includes a specific reservation for this Brown's Park Dam. It is a matter of record that the Bureau of Reclamation did not propose to build the other two dams at that earlier date, that they did not make an investigation of the presently proposed dam sites until 1942, and that, so far as has been

determined, the first correspondence between the Bureau and the National Park Service concerning the Echo Park and Split Mountain sites was written in 1943. It has been asserted that Dinosaur National Monument is subject to the authority of the Federal Power Act because of the Brown's Park reservation in the 1938 proclamation. Mr. Horace M. Albright, a former director of the National Park Service, president of the American Planning and Civic Association and a member of the Board of Trustees of the National Parks Association, submitted the following testimony concerning the Federal Power Act at the Secretary's recent hearing. His evidence read in part as follows:

"Congress by its legislation does not contemplate invasion of these national parks and monuments and it is against the policy of Congress to plan and construct these Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams in Dinosaur National Monument. When Congress had the water power bill under consideration just after the First World War, powers were proposed for the Federal Power Commission that would authorize dams, reservoirs, etc., in national park and monument areas. The bill passed both Houses of Congress, with this broad power included in it."

Congress, on March 3, 1921, amended the Federal Water Power Act to provide that thereafter no permit or other authorization shall be granted for reservoirs or other works for storage or carriage of water within the limits as then constituted of any national park or national monument without specific authority of Congress. The language of the amendment is comprehensive and absolute, and its meaning clear. In any event, all possible doubt as to the purpose of the act would be resolved by its legislative history. In calling up the bill in the House, Representative Esch stated (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 66th Cong., 3d sess., vol. 60, pt. 4, p. 4204):

"Mr. Speaker, the object of the bill is to modify the Federal Water Power Act so as to eliminate from its provisions national parks and national monuments. When this act was originally passed we supposed we had sufficiently safeguarded national parks and monuments so that there would not be constructed therein any water power or reclamation projects. * * * The Secretary of the Interior had great doubt as to the policy of giving to a commission control over national parks and monuments in the matter of water-power development. * * * An understanding was reached whereby the bill was to be introduced at this session eliminating the parks and monuments from the operation of the Federal Power Act, and this bill carries out that understanding."

Since the 1921 act was, by its terms, restricted to areas embraced within national parks and national monuments on the date of the act, it was necessary, until 1935, to include in proposed legislation for establishing or extending national parks or national monuments a provision to prohibit the Federal Power Commission from granting power licenses therein. This is no longer necessary. When the Federal Water Power Act was amended by the Federal Power Act in 1935, the definition of the reservations to which the act was to apply was amended to exclude national parks and monuments, thus removing these areas from the authority of the Federal Power Commission with respect to the issuance of power licenses, without regard to the date of their establishment. The intention of the Congress, by this amendment, to afford unlimited protection to all national parks and national monuments from encroachment of power development, is made undeniably clear by the legislative history. In the report (No. 1318, 74th Cong.) accompanying the bill, S. 2796, which became the Federal Power Act of 1935, it is stated (p. 22): "The definition of the former term (reservations) has been amended to exclude national parks and national monuments. Under an amendment to the act passed in 1921, the Commission has no authority to issue licenses in national parks or national monuments. The purpose of this change in the definition of reservations is to remove from the act all suggestion of authority for the granting of such licenses."

In an opinion by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, dated December 5, 1939, he held: "Any attempt to preserve this authority in the Commission by specific provision in the national monument proclamation would be ineffective since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provisions in an Executive proclamation of this character."

It is true that the above-mentioned opinion of the Solicitor was not promulgated until almost a year and a half after the Dinosaur proclamation was issued. However, it is my understanding that the Department of the Interior has consistently taken the position, since the enactment of the amendatory Federal Power Act of 1935, that the Federal Power Commission is precluded, by the plain terms of that act, from exercising any authority whatever within the national parks and national monuments, and that no further legislative protection for these areas is necessary.

To the people of Utah and Colorado, friends of the national parks would say, by all means get your water and power. Your need is obvious, and you have every right to have that need fulfilled; but be careful you do not wipe out primary existing national values at the same time—values that, if preserved in the national monument, will provide a never-ending source of business to the neighboring communities. Insist that the Bureau explore alternate sites thoroughly for you. Above all, go into the monument. Visit Round Top, Pats Hole, Harper's Corner, explore some the Yampa, Split Mountain, and Lodore Canyons. Compare the area with other parks and monuments, and know what is at stake.

Dinosaur National Monument, in the writer's opinion, is second to no other area of the national park and monument system in its magnificence of scenic grandeur; and its unique scenery is duplicated nowhere else in the system. If the two dams are not built, I would recommend that the area be redesignated a national park and given a name like Green and Yampa Canyons National Park or Lodore National Park. I am convinced the area will become one of our most famous wilderness reservations; and when visitor access and accommodations are provided, will prove a lasting gold mine to northern Utah and Colorado. People in the local communities are in a strong position, acting through their representatives in Congress, to see that the Park Service receives the necessary appropriation to open the area to visitor use; and the local communities should be assisted by the friends of national parks from coast to coast to see that this is done.

Chinese Communist Intervention in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 22 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, on Chinese Communist intervention in Korea, delivered on December 7, 1950, in the First Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, FOREIGN SECRETARY OF THE PHILIPPINES, ON CHINESE INTERVENTION IN KOREA, IN THE FIRST COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 7, 1950

Last October, the General Assembly reaffirmed the wisdom and necessity of the action which the Security Council had taken in June condemning the North Korean regime for its act of aggression against the Republic of Korea. Today, in the same area, we are confronted with armed intervention by Communist Chinese troops against the forces of the United Nations.

The author of this intervention being the regime that now controls the Chinese mainland, it is clear that we are faced with no ordinary armed conflict such as the United Nations has dealt with at one time or another during the past 4 years. This armed intervention is directed not against one country alone but against the United Nations. From the very nature, therefore, of the two sides involved in the hostilities, it is plain that we are dealing with a situation that carries with it the stark menace of total war.

Not since the Berlin crisis of 1948 has mankind stood so close to the brink of war. Therefore I feel certain that the General Assembly will bring to the discussion of this problem a deep sense of the mortal danger which mankind runs unless the United Nations acts speedily and calmly to avert it.

Speaking as I do here for a country that is closer than most to the scene of hostilities, I may perhaps be permitted to state that I bring to this discussion more than our share of this deep awareness of danger. Yet, of course, the danger is common to us all, and if we fail to allay it at the source, it can spread so rapidly in every direction that there shall be neither here nor there, no place beyond reach of the fire that shall consume us all.

Yet, even in this hour of crisis, it behooves us to consider very calmly the facts that have given rise to the crisis and on which we must base our judgment. The facts relative to the act of aggression by the North Korean troops against the Republic of Korea were presented and argued in the General Assembly earlier during the present session. The discussion resulted in the approval by the Assembly of a resolution condemning the North Korean regime for its act of aggression against the Republic of Korea and approving measures for the unification and rehabilitation of the country. In pursuance of this resolution, a relief and rehabilitation program was set up and United Nations forces crossed the thirty-eighth parallel in pursuit of the North Korean forces in order to effect the territorial and political unification of the country.

At the same time, the United Nations and its military commander in the field gave the most solemn assurances that the United Nations forces would respect the integrity of the Manchurian frontier and fully recognize the rights and interests of China in the region. Proof of the genuineness of these assurances was dramatically given by the United Nations forces which, upon reaching the Changjin Reserve near the frontier, not only stopped there but refrained from doing anything to interrupt the flow of power to Manchuria. Even if the Peiping regime had reason in the beginning to doubt the sincerity of the assurances that were given, the conduct of the United Nations forces in an area where the rights and interests of China

were directly exposed to possible interference should have convinced that regime that we are determined to abide by our commitments.

Therefore, the Assembly must note the highly significant fact that the United Nations forces in Korea not only did not offer any provocation to the Peiping government, but went out of their way to prove by their conduct that the assurances of nonintervention would be faithfully observed.

Despite these assurances and the action of our troops in proof of their sincerity, hundreds of thousands of Chinese Communist troops crossed the frontier to fight the armies of the United Nations in Korea.

The General Assembly is now called upon to pass judgment upon these plain and indisputable facts. No case could be clearer. The military developments in North Korea resulting from the continuous flow of Communist Chinese troops across the frontier and their active participation in the conflict have become so grave that the denial of the charge of armed intervention can only be described as a hollow and cynical mockery. The attempt to camouflage these troops as volunteers must be regarded as part of an elaborate fiction which, I am sure, the Peiping government itself does not expect us to believe.

Indeed, the vehemence with which the Peiping representative has defended and praised the action of these volunteers thoroughly betrays the real character of these troops. For it is normal practice for governments to disclaim all knowledge of and responsibility for the acts of its nationals who volunteer for service with a foreign army, and some go so far as to deprive such persons of their citizenship. The Peiping government has rejected such precautions and finds it wholly unnecessary to keep up any pretense whatever. Well-organized, battle-hardened, and well equipped, "Red" Chinese Communist troops are evidently part of the regular army sent across the border on an errand of intervention in Korea.

The excuse that Peiping has given is that the Chinese Communist troops are helping the Koreans to rid the country of "American imperialist domination." This accusation has been made not once but many times in this Assembly in the loud and vehement accents of Russian propaganda. For it has become a familiar tactic of Soviet propaganda to accuse the other powers of the crime of imperialism, thinking thus to conceal from us the real menace which confronts the world—the terrifying menace of Soviet imperialism—this restless, resolute and unquenchable thirst for domination of the world that is without parallel in history.

I say, sir, that you can make this false accusation against so-called American imperialism in Russian, but you cannot say it in Chinese.

You cannot say it in Chinese unless you are speaking in translation from Russian. You cannot say it in Chinese because no Chinese who knows the history of his country and who is aware of the long historic friendship between the Chinese people and the American people can make this accusation without sounding as if he were faithfully parroting the stale phrases of Russian propaganda.

This country, which has never been at war with China, which was the one great power that took no part in the spoilation of China, which has consistently championed the cause of the Chinese people against their traditional enemies—the Japanese, the Russians—which has generously given help to the Chinese people in adversity, I say, sir, that this great country, with such a record, can face the representative of the Peiping regime and shame him into silence.

Nobody claims that the United States of America has been guiltless of imperialism. Having expanded from ocean to ocean in the space of a hundred years and achieved enormous wealth and power in its own right, this country was not immune to the temptations of the era of imperialist expansion that coincided with its growth as a power of consequence in the world. But she was a latecomer in the field. She lacked the natural drive and experience for major undertakings of this type outside her own continental borders. Above all, the inherent idealism of the American people rooted deep in the revolutionary beginnings of their own nation disqualified them from playing the imperialist game with skill and singleness of purpose. They were soon to discover that imperialist adventures were not in the true American tradition.

One such adventure brought America to the Philippines toward the end of the last century. Thus began a relationship lasting four decades that never quite fitted into the classical pattern of imperialism. Instead of oppressing the people, they taught them to cherish freedom. Instead of ruling the country with an iron hand, they trained the people in the art of self-government. Instead of keeping the people in ignorance the better to keep them docile and ignorant, they built schools, libraries, colleges and a state university. Instead of destroying their national consciousness, they developed the people's pride in their own history and traditions. And as for profits, it is a matter of record that America never did make money in the Philippines. Even the American troops that were stationed there never lived off the land or the taxes of the people; they were paid out of the United States Treasury.

As early as 1916, the United States Congress enacted an organic act for the Philippines and gave a pledge to recognize its independence as soon as a stable government would be established. Such a promise on the part of a colonial power was unprecedented at that time, and it is still far from fashionable today. In 1935, the United States passed another law providing for the drawing up of a constitution by the representatives of the people and for the recognition of Philippine independence on July 4, 1946.

The war in the Pacific which occurred at the middle of the transition period provided the severest possible test for the relations between the American and the Filipino peoples. Almost alone among the dependent territories in Asia, the Philippines stood loyally beside the administering power—proof of the wisdom and foresight of American policy.

In 1946, even as my country lay prostrate as a result of the war's devastation, the United States fulfilled its pledge to the letter and recognized the independence of the Philippines. This was done at the peak of American glory and power, at the moment of supreme triumph, when a move to withdraw its pledge and to postpone independence would have been understandable in view of the complete disorganization of the Philippine economy. That would have been excuse enough to conceal any American designs in Asia in the advancement of which the Philippines would have proved immensely useful. Such a move would not have been difficult to justify because at that time the United States had agreed to recognize the territorial claims of the Soviet Union on southern Sakhalin and the Kurile islands as well as its economic interests in the port of Dairen, the Chinese Eastern Railroad and the South Manchurian Railroad as the price of Soviet Russian participation in the war against Japan. Such considerations, however, did not deter the United States from fulfilling its solemn pledge. At the very moment that the Soviet Union was staking its claim at the expense of the Chinese people and was stripping Manchuria of its extensive industrial apparatus, the United States was giving generously of its substance to relieve the sufferings of the war-devastated countries, including China and the Philippines, and was getting ready to set the Philippines free and to implement a program for its economic rehabilitation.

I have dwelt at some length on the contrasting conduct of the United States and the Soviet Union in the same region and at the same point of time because I believe that this is the most effective way to refute the charges of so-called American imperialism in Asia.

I believe that, in the long run, the meaning of this contrast has not been lost to the peoples of Asia, including the great bulk of the Chinese people for whom, in these days of temporary estrangement, we have the strongest feelings of sympathy and respect. It will not be lost to the peoples of Asia who have seen the United States lend the support of its influence and power to achieve the independence of Indonesia, while the Soviet Union stood on the sidelines unwilling to lift a finger to help because she could not make political capital out of a peaceful settlement of the problem.

The resources of the United States have been poured out by the billions of dollars since the war to succor the needy of all nations, to provide assistance to underdeveloped countries, to strengthen the economy of the postwar world. Against this record of so-called imperialist America, we are obliged to set in contrast the nonparticipation of the Soviet Union in similar activities and its total abstention from all forms of international cooperation in promoting the economic, social, and cultural progress of the world.

By setting the Philippines free, the United States inaugurated a series of acts of colonial emancipation in Asia that has included the independence of India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia. We are convinced that this process will continue until the last colony is free. Again, we are obliged to set against this record the record of the Soviet Union—this power which, as a result of the last war for freedom, has swallowed up the three Baltic states of Latvia, Lithuania, and Esthonia, and has clamped the most oppressive chains upon nearly all the states on its eastern frontier. Is the world supposed to learn no further lesson from this contrast: That the United States enjoys the most amicable relations with all its neighbors in North and South America, while the Soviet Union is feared and suspected by its neighbors in the Far East, South Asia, and Europe?

In the face of these historical facts and facts of record, we do not believe that the peoples of Asia, and in particular, the Chinese people, will remain deceived for a long time regarding the motives and policies of the United States and the Soviet Union. We understand fully well that today the Chinese people are not free, that access to the facts has been barred to them by the machinations of vicious and lying propaganda.

Nevertheless, the peoples of the free world must continue to act on the assumption that it is not impossible to hope for a measure of understanding with the Chinese people even at this late hour, to persuade them that their own best interests, though surely not the selfish interests of the Soviet Union, would be served by an attempt to consider with us the possibility of negotiations that might lead to the cessation of conflict in Korea.

The Chinese people are not our enemy. I say this on behalf of a neighboring country that has had relations of friendship with China for hundreds of years. It was in this spirit that my country joined 12 other countries of Asia in an appeal to the Peiping government 2 days ago.

Mr. Chairman, we have now before us a six-power resolution in virtually the same terms in which it was presented to the

Security Council. I recognize that its submission to us in this precise form is justified and even necessitated by the nature of its origin and the procedure under which the question has come before the General Assembly. My government concurs substantially in this proposal. Due regard for the necessity of exhausting every source of peaceful negotiation in order to avert the danger of a third world war must be constantly kept in mind.

I wish to reserve the right to speak again at a later stage of the debate should the circumstances warrant such further intervention.

Japan Forced To Play Passive Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 22 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Japan Forced To Play Passive Role," published in the Washington Sunday Star of December 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN FORCED TO PLAY PASSIVE ROLE

(By Sebastian Haffner)

LONDON.—Surely the oddest thing about the Korean crisis is that the one great power which, apart from China, is most vitally concerned by what happens in Korea plays no part in it at all. That is Japan.

It seems difficult to realize today that up to 5 years ago Korea was firmly and unquestionably in Japanese hands, and that for 15 years, from 1930 to 1945, it has been the basis from which Japanese power had ranged all over Manchuria and North China. No doubt this was an overextension of Japanese power which was bound to be corrected. But a Japanese interest in Korea is, nevertheless, perfectly legitimate, and Japanese concern about Korea is, indeed, inevitable as long as Japan is in any way capable of taking normal care of her own safety and vital interests. Korea in the hands of any other great power is, in a trite but perfectly exact phrase, a pistol pointed at Japan's heart. The least that Japan, if she were master of her own destiny, would be bound to insist on with all her power would be that Korea remained an independent buffer state between herself, China, and the Soviet Far East.

Now, of course, Japan is not at present master of her own destiny, and so profoundly is she conscious of this that she does not even care to take notice of what is happening on her doorstep. With the Chinese flood rolling toward her, she remains as numb as an anesthetized body.

This is not because Japan's physical power has disappeared. Her 90,000,000 people are all there, and they have not lost their political and national cohesion, their technical skills, or their formidable fighting qualities, which only recently terrified the world. There is not the slightest doubt that Japan remains intrinsically one of the great powers of the present day—probably still a considerably greater power than China. Nor is there any doubt that if this power were operative in a normal way, nobody would have to worry about China overrunning Korea.

But Japan's power is, momentarily, self-effacing and withholding itself, in literal obedience to the dictates of her recent conquerors. If Japan wanted to exact a subtle revenge on these conquerors, and to prove the self-defeating absurdity of the short-sighted policy of unconditional surrender, total disarmament and total political emasculation, which they have pursued toward her during the past 5 years, she could choose no more effective method than her present attitude.

UNITED STATES PAYS PENALTY

For it is now proven that American long-range power cannot replace Japanese local power in the Far East and the complete elimination of Japan from the far eastern power constellation has exposed America and her allies to the present humiliation at the hands of China. China is, of course, a smaller power than the United States on any abstract reckoning, but locally she is, as we now see, quite capable of successfully defying the United States, whose centers of strength are 7,000 miles away, and who, moreover, has other areas in the world to take care of. China would not be able to do this if she were locally checked by an independent and armed, albeit defeated and chastened, Japan, who would be inevitably driven by her own vital interests to impose such a check on her. America is now paying the penalty for having, temporarily, deprived Japan of her independence and paralyzed her vital nerve; instead of holding the balance of power between China and Japan, of which she would be perfectly capable, she has to fight China practically single-handed, and at long range a task which overtaxes even her vast power potential.

What is true of Japan in Asia is equally true of Germany in Europe. There is no doubt that German power in the thirties and early forties had become exorbitant and had to be curbed. There is equally no longer any doubt that the western powers with their "unconditional surrender" policy and their treatment of defeated Germany fatally overshot the mark and put Europe at the mercy of Russia. They are now awkwardly and belatedly trying to retrace their steps. But even now they labor under the delusion that they can treat Germany simultaneously as an ally and as a defeated enemy, and that they can have an effective military "contribution to western defense" from a politically humiliated and emasculated nation. They are unlikely to make much progress before they free themselves from this schizophrenia.

The present crisis, of which Korea is the most conspicuous, but by no means the most menacing, part, is the nemesis of "unconditional surrender," and of all that followed. By enforcing the unconditional surrender and the total disarmament of Japan and Germany, the victors of 1945 knocked away two essential pillars of the balance of power in Europe and Asia. But only a balance of power provides a basis of peace in a world in which power is divided among independent nations. The world is today paying a heavy price for having forgotten this elementary truth. It will not find peace before it relearns it.

Dean Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 22 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "These Days," written by George Sokolsky and published in the Washington Times-Herald of December 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

The Republicans have petitioned the President to redress a great grievance against the United States by dismissing Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. The petition will, for the moment, be ignored.

Democrats and others suggest that this is no time to complain about Dean Acheson. They propose that we shall have unity.

If by unity, they mean that no public official is to be criticized even if the blood of our sons is spilled because of his stiff-necked obstinacy and his lack of good sense, then they ask not for unity but for abject acceptance of stupidity as a rule of life.

It would seem that logic would require, if unity is to be achieved, that one who has become so unpalatable to the American people as Dean Acheson is, be retired. Who is this man that unity must depend upon his continuance in office?

Suppose by the laws of nature, Dean Acheson would drop dead, would the United States cease to exist? If it is unity that is required and this man is an impediment to unity, does Mr. Truman mean to tell us that even among deserving Democrats there is not one man who is capable of being Secretary of State, of inspiring confidence and of achieving unity?

If the President were to accept a national rather than a partisan criterion, the number is very large. This Nation is not so bankrupt in personalities that it is limited to one man, to any one man.

Therefore, the plea that opposition to Dean Acheson imperils unity is nonsense. It is Dean Acheson who imperils unity.

His policy in China has proved to be a failure for which we are paying with the lives of our children. His policy in Europe has brought us only associates but no allies. His policy in South America has weakened our ties with our most important neighbors.

He has appeased Soviet Russia until that country has become the mightiest on earth, lessening our influence by a war in which we have been defeated. He has only enriched Great Britain at our expense.

Surely, it is not Dean Acheson, but the United States of America that is important.

In 1943, the United States was a tremendous force in the world, courted by all nations. We were feeding a large part of the world; we were supplying warring nations. We were giving away about $50,000,000,000.

We were giving to Russia $11,000,000,000. We were fighting on a dozen fronts. In Asia, we were fighting nearly alone with Nationalist China as our principal ally. In Europe, our troops were carrying the burden into Germany.

In November, two conferences were held, one at Cairo and one at Tehran, and from December 1, 1943, until today our power in the world has been receding. At Moscow, Tehran, Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, San Francisco, London, and Paris the United States was talked out of influence, power, and authority.

And all the time the American taxpayer was paying for his own destruction. And it culminated in the retreat from Korea and the miserable monkeys insulting our country in daily speeches on our own soil at the United Nations, and they are entitled to do it by treaty. We have come to that.

Now, I do not say that Dean Acheson is responsible for all that. Such an assumption is wholly false. He is not a big enough man to have done so much damage.

But he is also not a big enough man to have arrested the decay of policy, to have

strengthened our moral position, or to have inspired confidence in the people.

Acheson has become a symbol of decay. The American people responded to the symbol that Acheson has become when he spoke on television and radio and chilled his countrymen. It was not the words, nor his immaculate dress, nor his lack of oratory. It was an atmosphere.

The terrifying fact that faces this country is that in this war we are led by many of the same personalities who since November 1943 have been the authors of our failures. What unity can there be in that?

Statement by the Committee on the Present Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 22 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this morning I received a communication from Dr. Vannevar Bush, a member of the Committee on the Present Danger, which apparently is comprised of a very distinguished group of educators and lawyers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD their very fine statement, in my opinion, of the present situation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 12, 1950.*

The acts of naked aggression by powerful Communist forces in the Far East constitute a grave threat to the survival of the United Nations, and a peril to the very security of these United States, which cannot be mistaken, cannot be ignored.

The members of the Committee on the Present Danger, making this statement, believe that the hour is at hand when our country must mobilize its manpower and resources on a scale great enough to meet the real and present danger, and that scale is very great indeed.

We confront the actuality of the assault by vast Red Chinese armies on the United Nations forces in Korea. We confront the condition of military weakness in Western Europe, a condition seriously worsened by recent shocking developments in the Far East. We confront the fact that in these circumstances American power is far from adequately mobilized. We confront the fact that we can find no safety by withdrawal from overseas and by attempting to make the North American Continent impregnable—that would be a counsel of despair and defeat.

Even in this crisis we totally reject the idea of a preventive war. Nor do we accept the idea that war with the Soviet Union is inevitable—unless the Soviet so wills it. On the contrary, we believe that the great objectives of our foreign policy and military policy—working in common with the other free countries in the United Nations—should continue to be the attainment of an enduring peace, looking toward a condition in which the beginnings of world disarmament may be made. But we are convinced that there is no hope of accomplishing these objectives so long as the military position of the free countries remains as weak as it is today.

The aggressive designs of the Soviet Union are unmistakably plain. Its Asiatic ally and satellite has launched an all-out attack upon the United Nations forces in Korea. In Western Europe the ability of the United States Air Force to inflict heavy damage on Russia's strategic centers has been the chief deterrent to a full-scale Communist attack. Radical improvements in defense against air attack, together with growing ability of the Soviet Union to produce atomic bombs, is progressively weakening the effectiveness of this restraint. Unless an adequate supplement for the atomic potential of the United States is brought into existence, the time may soon come when all of continental Europe can be forced into the Communist fold, and the British Isles placed again in even graver peril than in 1940, at sacrifices in blood and wealth that the Kremlin would accept. No scruples of conscience will stand in their way.

In our view, the necessary supplement to our present atomic leadership is an allied force in being strong enough to furnish effective resistance to military aggression. Such a force in readiness to execute the decisions of the free countries assembled in the United Nations would make those decisions respected. That force does not exist. To meet the need, it must be promptly built. To create it the United States must take the leadership. The European nations will make the greater effort required only if the United States takes a firm stand beside them, provides the balance of the equipment needed, and, most important of all, makes a powerful contribution of troops.

Our part will call for greater sacrifices than any our people have yet been prepared for. Since our contribution will include forces in Europe and in the Far East, as well as a strategic reserve in this country, the total program will of necessity be a large one, calling, we believe, for a total United States armed force of at least 3,500,000 men.

Also, the danger of an all-out war is so serious that all of our young men must have military training. But universal military training alone is no longer an adequate solution of the problems which now face us because it does not provide a force in being.

The time has come for a new concept that universal service in defense of our freedom is a privilege and an obligation of our young men. To accomplish this with the least interference with education, with business and professional careers, and with family life, this service should commence at the age of 18 or upon graduation from high school, whichever is later. Two years of such military service, including training, will be necessary, and the program should embrace radically broadened standards of fitness.

We recognize that many detailed provisions interpreting and applying these principles remain to be worked out, and we expect shortly to present concrete proposals.

The above program would, of course, be a supplement to the selective-service law, not a substitute for it.

But in addition to providing military manpower, this country must expand the program for equipment and supplies far beyond goals already announced. This will be a hard task, calling for development of the strongest possible organization to supervise our military procurement here and abroad. It will require submission to economic controls more exacting that those now in effect, particularly in the field of credit, Government and private. It will also render necessary a sharp reduction in Government spending for nondefense purposes.

The doubt is not whether such a program is too arduous. The doubt is whether it is arduous enough. Certainly it is not nearly as drastic as the conditions which make it necessary. The price is high, but we believe it must be paid. It is, in our judgment, the only chance of averting a war of world dimensions, or of assuring victory if, in spite of all our efforts to maintain the peace, the Soviet Union insists upon precipitating world war III. We shall at the least have created strength which may convince the 14 men in the Kremlin that further aggression will not pay.

The Committee on the Present Danger has been formed in the American tradition by civilians acting on a nonpartisan basis. It will enlarge its membership and strive to further the above purposes. To this end we are already studying certain specific problems, and will from time to time make reports to the public dealing with them.

The bitter fact is that our country has again been thrust into a struggle in which our free existence is at stake, a struggle for survival. We have no time to lose.

Committee on the Present Danger: Julius Ochs Adler, Raymond B. Allen, Frank Altschul, James Phinney Baxter, III, Laird Bell, Lewis H. Brown, Harry A. Bullis, Vannevar Bush, Will L. Clayton, James B. Conant, R. Ammi Cutter, Harold W. Dodds, Charles Dollard, Edward S. Greenbaum, Monte M. Lemann, William L. Marbury, Frederick A. Middlebush, John Lord O'Brian, Robert P. Patterson, Howard C. Petersen, Stanley Resor, Robert E. Sherwood, Robert G. Sproul, Tracy S. Voorhees, Henry M. Wriston.

Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 22 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial dealing with the reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government, which appeared in the Wilmington Morning News yesterday morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED IT MORE THAN EVER

Credit the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report with a timely reminder. The job of reorganizing the executive branch of the Federal Government, says the committee in its latest summary, is about half done—and this should mean an eventual saving of about $2,000,000,000. But it needs to be finished.

That is a timely reminder because some might think that it would be a mistake to push this renovation program at a time when the Government is trying to meet a national emergency. The truth of the matter is that the need for efficient governmental machinery is all the greater now "to withstand the shock and strain of continuous economic and military attack."

It would have been better, of course, if the whole undertaking had been wrapped up long before this. Tinkering with the apparatus of Government just when it must take on heavier burdens is not to be recommended as a general practice. But when the apparatus has been demonstrated to be

faulty as well as extravagant it is only sensible to strengthen it before it breaks down entirely.

Certainly it is absolutely imperative to reduce the cost of Government to a minimum at a time when defense outlay will raise Federal spending to near-wartime levels. Every dollar saved will not be another dollar for arms—whatever must be appropriated for that purpose will be forthcoming. But it will be a dollar that will not add to inflationary pressure, and runaway inflation could bring a disaster almost as terrible as military defeat.

The hard part of the reorganization program is still ahead. Dr. Robert L. Johnson, chairman of the citizens committee, thinks that the 50 percent still to be done will be "far more difficult" to accomplish than the first half. But he ought to be wrong. For the need has been made sharper than ever.

Anatomy of the PAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the November 27, 1950, issue of the Freeman by Edna Lonigan:

ANATOMY OF THE PAC
(By Edna Lonigan)

There is obviously something very wrong in Washington that our usual explanations do not cover. The Truman administration spent $214,000,000,000 from July 1945 to July 1950, but we have neither peace nor plenty. We have no military force and no foreign policy adequate to meet the dangers we face. A growing popular awareness of these facts was an important factor in the administration's defeats on Election Day.

All political action has its roots in the sources of political power. Every act in Washington is explainable by what is happening in the election districts. It is changes in the election districts, and in our party system, over the last 18 years, which have made possible the strange new policies of our Federal Government.

In early 1940 the inner stresses within the Democratic Party grew too great, and the party split. Farley, Hull, and Garner were opposed to the third term because, as Farley said, in America new men should be allowed to come up from below. The New Dealers favored a third term because, if Roosevelt retired, they would have nowhere to go. They had little standing or achievements in private life. The New Dealers won; but the bureaucrats, who had not come up through the ranks, could not hold political power. They only precipitated a struggle within the ranks of the "ins" to determine who was going to be the party.

Beneath the old party labels, who is exercising the power now? Obviously the party machine or fraction is much stronger, more stable and more skillful than the New Dealers ever were. This new political machine, which holds together the fragments that make up the Fair Deal and rules the old Democratic Party, is an outgrowth of the CIO's Political Action Committee (PAC).

The PAC was formally organized on July 7, 1943, by the executive board of the CIO, under the guidance of Sidney Hillman. Its purpose, according to CIO President Philip Murray, was to "mobilize the 5,000,000 members of the CIO * * * for effective labor action on the political front." He explained that because of the "deplorable record of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the primary political task today is to weld the unity of all workers, farmers and other progressives, behind candidates, regardless of party affiliations, who support the war program of our Commander in Chief, and enlightened domestic and foreign policies." From the beginning the PAC was vitally interested in the composition of Congress, and in control of policy through control of Congress.

The PAC prgram was well under way in the summer of 1944. At the Chicago convention where PAC helped to nominate him for a fourth term, President Roosevelt was quoted as saying: "Clear everything with Sidney." The PAC supported Truman for Vice President and probable successor, and helped elect a Congress which would carry out the Roosevelt policies.

The new Seventy-ninth Congress followed the Roosevelt-PAC line in foreign affairs, with UNO, UNRRA, Bretton Woods; but on domestic policy it refused to go along with the demands of the PAC spokesmen to keep peacetime price controls and to make deficit financing permanent by voting public housing, socialized medicine and other welfare schemes.

In the 1946 campaign, the PAC arrogantly demanded that the voters defeat all the candidates for Congress who had refused to support its measures and had dared to advocate a free economy. It was roundly defeated by the voters, who were sick of rationing.

After the 1946 campaign the PAC dropped out of sight. Most people thought it was no longer dangerous. What has the PAC been doing since 1946?

Under PAC the local CIO officials became grass-roots political organizers responsible for seeing that every union member and his family were registered and educated to vote for policies the PAC favored. The machinery of the unions was converted to supply trained organizers, and followers drilled in obedience. PAC also supplied a means of political compulsion on the voters because, under the Wagner Act, workers who refused to register on the orders of the shop steward could be deprived of their jobs and their union cards, that is, of their right to work in any other shop in the industry. Under the same threat the workers could also be compelled to make political contributions to the PAC fund. The unions, that is, exercised the power of taxation.

Policy was made at the top and ratified by the locals. There was no place for debate or dissenting opinion, and no way for change to come from below. There was no chance for the members to leave and form an opposition party, because they were tied to the PAC by their jobs. This amounted to virtual disfranchisement of the minority—or perhaps the majority—which did not agree with the policies made at national headquarters.

This new political machine differed from traditional American party organization in several important ways.

Our political system rests on what we call representative government, but the name, as usual, explains only the past significance of the idea. What does "representative" mean; representative of what? A representative political system is one in which local differences are represented, or preserved. Small areas have a spokesman at the seat of government, and, therefore, even if they differ from the most powerful or the most numerous, they cannot be obliterated by a ruling class at the center with its restless drive toward uniformity. Representative government is unity in diversity. It is the form of government which protects all the individual differences in a community because, as Mill put it so beautifully, those differences are precious to anyone who values humanity. It is, of course, the most mature and subtle of all patterns of political organization.

The representative principle is the complete antithesis of the leadership principle, in which one faction becomes supreme, and subordinates all other parts of the Nation to its will. The change from representative government to totalitarian government has its counterpart in the change in the political party, from the representative party reflecting the individual members with all their differences, to the leadership party. In the new party men are controlled in masses by a steering mechanism at the center, which induces them to vote alike, as the leaders wish, and replaces free choice with the plebiscite.

The PAC was then by its very formation a challenge to representative government. Workingmen who could be seduced by promises of social gains into accepting a package of ideas bound together at the center, or compelled to accept them through fear of losing their jobs, were no longer free citizens of a republic.

All this power might not have been so dangerous, except that the new political bosses knew exactly how to use it. Joseph Gaer, official historian of the PAC, tells us in The First Round, that in 1942, out of 80,000,000 voters, only 28,000,000 cast their votes. The PAC leaders knew, as Insull knew, that most voters, whether at the polls or at directors' meetings, are inert. Whoever controls a very small fraction of the votes can control the whole body. With only 28,000,000 citizens voting, an organization which could bring one or two million strategically distributed new voters to the polls could control the whole United States.

Hillman knew that the primaries were even more important than the vote on election day because an outside faction could more easily get control and put its men in, or prevent its opponents from being nominated, so that the voters could not choose them if they wanted to.

Another trifle was noticed by Hillman and his legal staff. The Corrupt Practices Act and the Smith-Connally Act, which governed contributions to political parties by unions or corporation, did not apply to the primaries. The PAC could spend all the money it liked in the primaries, and still be within the law.

With this new weapon Sidney Hillman and his coworkers set to work to turn the flank of the Democratic Party, by defeating every vestige of the Farley-Garner wing and building up a new group of candidates committed to PAC policies.

A Nation-wide political junta of left-wing union leaders able to put 12,000,000 votes and millions of dollars behind policies of their own choosing, and to force their opponents out of public life, would have been threat enough to representative government. But American labor had nothing to do with it.

In January 1944 Earl Browder reported to the American Communist Party that the Soviet leaders had decided to disband it, and replace it with a new political organization including workers, farmers, and other progressives, organized in every election district through the labor unions.

This new party conforms in every respect with the structure of the PAC, announced a few months earlier. What is even more interesting, the Communist Party announced its dissolution a few months later and became the Communist Political Association. The remarkable resemblance between the PAC and Browder's program for the Communist Party was spelled out by the Dies committee in March 1944 in House Report 1311. The Communist Party and its allies raised the usual bitter criticisms of this report, but they did not answer its facts.

Browder said the new policy was to achieve "national unity for the realization of the perspectives laid down in Tehran." These

perspectives included Big Three unity, a postwar economic program for the United States resting on vast foreign loans (especially to Russia), "capital funds for the improvement of undeveloped countries," "full employment," and higher income for "consumers." The new party was not to attack capitalists, but actively to seek cooperation with all workers and farmers, and especially with businessmen, capitalists, and their managers. This power was to be directed to liquidation of fascism in Germany and Japan and of the "reactionary and pro-Fascist circles in the United States." Every single element in the Browder program was incorporated in the PAC program. It has been the policy of the administration ever since.

In 1944 PAC enjoyed a sweeping victory in the fourth-term election of President Roosevelt and of their candidate for Vice President, Harry Truman. They salved Wallace's wounds by demanding that he be appointed Secretary of Commerce, a move that gagged even Roosevelt. Roosevelt died soon afterward. PAC's man was President, and Wallace was close to the President's ear, where he could make his suggestions on foreign and domestic policy.

The most important PAC victory, however, was in Congress. Joseph Gaer lists 12 Members of Congress who were defeated in the 1944 elections with the fullest cooperation of the PAC. They were Dies, Starnes, and Costello, of the Dies committee; Kennedy, Kleberg, Lambertson, Newsome, and Patton, in the House; and Worth Clark, Champ Clark, Rufus Holman, and Ellison Smith, in the Senate.

Another outstanding triumph of PAC in 1944 was obtained in the primaries, particularly in the Southern States, where the small number of voters participating made it especially easy for the PAC techniques to win control. In fact we shall never know the extent of the power exercised by the PAC until we have had a full study of the primary contests, especially in the Southern States.

We know the results in part by the slow but unremitting rise in the number of liberal southerners who have come to Washington to represent the Democratic Party. It is extremely difficult to persuade the southerners that the PAC has so much weight. They know "It can't happen here." They do not yet see what can happen when the power released by WPA, farm payments, NLRB, and the unions falls into the hands of a small group with a military sense of strategy and perfect military synchronization.

What became of the PAC after the Eightieth Republican Congress came in? We can be sure, knowing the forces in control of the PAC, that it went somewhere. The Communists never retreat; they only change tactics. They merely turned off their propaganda. That is a technique the New Dealers knew well. Whenever the comment grows unfavorable enough, just drop out of sight, and people will forget.

Evidence of how far the PAC idea had become embedded in the regular Democratic Party is furnished in a speech by Francis L. McElroy, New York State Democratic campaign manager in 1946. Mr. McElroy declared that the Republican Party in New York State was the rallying point in this country for pro-Hitler forces. "The arguments employed in this campaign by Mr. Dewey * * * are the same deadly, vicious arguments which Hitler and the Nazis used to gain power in Germany," he said.

Mr. McElroy added that the Democratic Party was ready to back its charge that the Republican Party was the rallying point for every un-American organization, every bigot, every treasonable person in the Nation.

That is not the language of the American party system. If you test it by the use of symbols, it is the language of the Browder program of 1944. Because the PAC was so perfectly camouflaged as a labor movement, it was able to win over large strata of the American middle classes—the teachers, religious leaders, skilled workers.

In 1947 various State conventions of the CIO ratified (unanimously) the PAC program in preparation for 1948. So, curiously enough, did various State conventions of the AFL.

What united them? The Taft-Hartley Act. Is that because Taft-Hartley hurt the working people or because it hurt some one else? The act forbade unions to punish their members by loss of their union cards (their right to work in most trades) for any reason except nonpayment of dues. Workers could not be legally punished for refusing to vote as ordered, or for refusing to contribute to a political cause. This put a crimp in the PAC.

The Wagner Act had evidently been drafted with Communist help. Charles Kramer, a friend of Lee Pressman, was in Wagner's office. Lee Pressman, former CIO general counsel, has admitted his Communist connections. Nathan Witt, secretary of the NLRB, was listed as belonging to the same cell. Taft-Hartley put an end to the use of the unions as a political chain gang, under American Government auspices. Except for one thing.

Though Taft-Hartley injured the Communists, it certainly did not injure the workers. Why then did the workers unite against it? Because the Communists executed another strategic retreat. They let go of the prominent offices in the CIO but they still had control of the press, and the policy-making and opinion-forming organs. Then they got their ideas into the opinion-forming agencies of the AFL, especially its League for Political Education.

How could the AFL be captured by the Communist policy makers? It had a great tradition, but in the face of CIO "gains," its leaders thought they had to "do something." And the Communists were ready and waiting to tell them what to do—policies nicely hidden behind the cloak of higher wages, more benefits, but still fitting perfectly the symbols laid down to guide policy making by Earl Browder in 1944.

Labor was now no longer divided. There was no national "Democratic" Party. Where was the resistance to PAC to come from?

In 1948 we did not hear much about PAC. We heard instead of the Progressive Party, which nominated Henry Wallace on a third-party ticket, generally admitted to be the party of the Communists. But was it?

There was a strong belief among the Communist leadership that a third party was a great mistake. Hillman had seen and pointed out the technical difficulties which had made it impossible for even Theodore Roosevelt to set up a third party. He had also shown how easy it was to take over one of the old parties.

What proof have we that the Politburo in Moscow wanted the election of Wallace? Wallace certainly did not poll the total Communist vote. For 8 years they had worked on getting control of a major party. Why give up the Truman party?

In 1948 the New Dealers deserted Truman because they thought his ship was sinking. That merely showed the profound political stupidity of the bureaucracy turned political strategists. The men in the jobs stayed with Truman because they had to. Truman went into the convention with all the Presidential powers—the bureaucracy, the spending powers, and the power of appointment. The local machines had to go with the strongest. When Senator HUMPHREY put through what was virtually the PAC platform in the Democratic convention, and Truman accepted it, he was on his way.

Practically every word of Truman's campaign came, again, from Browder's pattern of 1944, which is the policy of the PAC. Practically every word of his attack on the Eightieth Congress can be found earlier in the pages of the Daily Worker and the People's Daily World.

What then was the role of Wallace and the third party? It was the old Communist dialectic. By setting up Wallace as the left, the Communists could make Truman's platform and speeches look like the center.

The reason Truman and the remnants of the Democratic Party fell into the trap is that after the defeat of the Farley-Hull-Garner group, there wasn't anything there. It is often said that the city machines took over the party. But the city machines do not have a policy. They were simple reflections of whatever were the prevailing ideas, those most likely to win votes on a simple day-to-day basis. The broken fragments that made up the once great Democratic Party—the unhappy Southern Democrats, the office-holders, the city machines which were naturally anti-Communist, the vast hordes of recipients of Government checks, on farms, in schools, in the States, in welfare—could offer no resistance to a small but determined group who knew the laws of strategy in their bones, who knew what they wanted and how to get it, and who had a perfect camouflage.

Of course Truman does not know this. He is wrapped in his silken cocoon. Nothing unpleasant is ever brought to his attention, nothing at all that would remotely suggest that he is surrounded by Communists in sheep's clothing. The hard-headed Americans who still remain in his circle are probably hoping that they will be able to recapture him and the party, and defeat the PAC machine, as Hull, Jesse Jones, Morgenthau, and Walker vainly hoped they could win over the destroyers in Roosevelt's day.

It is no part of the PAC strategy to be content with victory over the Democratic Party. Their aim is one-party government. They turned the flank of the Democratic Party by building up a faction of their own, and waging unremitting war on the leaders of the constitutional group. They expect to destroy the Hoover wing of the Republican Party as they destroyed the Farley-Garner wing of the Democratic Party. Then they would take over the others through "me-too-ism," and victory would be theirs. They are already far along their way.

The Communists have a well-organized leadership party operating within the shell of the old Democratic Party, but directed in military fashion by their secret agents. They were badly defeated in the recent election in a few critical States. But if they are to be decisively defeated, believers in representative government must be prepared for a long struggle. (Already the PAC is talking about broadening its appeal to the voters.) Americans do not like to believe that their relations with Communists in this country come under the rules of war. The Politburo has reversed the great dictum of Clausewitz, that war is politics by another means. To the Communists, politics is war by another means. There is no possibility for Americans to deal with the fifth column in our political parties except by that heightening of attention, intelligence, and devotion that are necessary in war.

Christmas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 22 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD a statement which I prepared dealing with the Christmas season.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON CHRISTMAS, 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, within 72 hours we in this Nation will once again be celebrating the Christmas holiday. I feel that we would be remiss indeed if we here in the United States Senate failed to publicly reaffirm our faith in the great meaning of Christmas unto all the ages and unto all mankind.

The birth of the Master holds for all men the answer to all of the problems which we have faced, are facing and will face. The message "Glory to God in the Highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men," is still the greatest news which has ever come to mankind.

There is a danger that because we are so close to all of the individual legislative trees—the problem of civil defense, taxes, appropriations, armaments, controls—we may fail to see the forest. We may become so lost in material remedies that we may fail to perceive that the basic solution to mankind's problems must be a spiritual solution, a birth in all men of an awareness of their heritage as children of God.

I want to convey my warmest greetings of the yuletide to all my colleagues in the Senate, to their staffs, and other employees of this great and august body.

I pray that out of the Christmas holiday may come a rededication on all of our parts to the principles of the Wayshower. We are told that "with God, all things are possible," and we know that it is "in Him we live and move and have our being." With the recognition of those facts, we will indeed be adequate to the challenge of world peace.

We here on this continent bid a Merry Christmas to all the peoples of the world. We have good will for all men. We seek harm to no one. We pray and will strive for the day when on earth there will indeed by a just, firm, and lasting peace.

Boyhood Background of Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 22 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the boyhood life of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The article was published in the November 9, 1950, issue of the Times-Record, of Doland, S. Dak.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLAND PEOPLE TELL OF SENATOR HUMPHREY'S BOYHOOD BACKGROUND

(By Mrs. W. H. Doty)

Just before election, when Minnesota's junior Senator, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, swung into this territory for a series of political speeches, his Doland friends flocked to hear him and to shake his hand.

People of this community are especially interested in HUMPHREY because many of them knew him as a bright, energetic youngster who went darting about his father's Doland drug store or zooming around his paper route.

EARLY TRAINING HERE

His family moved to Doland from Wallace when he was a small boy, and all of his grade and high-school training was received in the Doland schools.

Whenever he bobs into political limelight, as he has many times in his rapid rise to prominence, people here get an I-knew-him-when gleam in their eyes and avidly lap up anything newspapers, magazines, or radios say of him. Regardless of their political leanings, they are pleased at favorable comments and at least mildly irritated at unflattering gibes.

SOME DISAGREE WITH HIM

Not all of HUMPHREY's former fellow-townsmen see eye to eye with him on his pet policies. In fact, many disagree sharply and say he is far too radical. But in this small town where he lived from the time he could barely toddle until he finished high school, many are genuinely fond of him. They remember him as a fast-moving youngster with lots of ability, a cooperative attitude, and a friendly grin for everyone.

SUBJECT OF COFFEE-CUP CONFABS

The Senator's activities and utterances have prompted many a coffee-cup confab here. Seldom do these lunch-counter discussions end until his boyhood friends have attempted to explain his rapid rise to prominence. The reasons advanced range from "He just got the breaks," to "Well, Pinky always was a darn smart boy."

There may be some truth in both these explanations, but more thoughtful and possibly more accurate ones have come from those more intimately associated with the lad during his 16 years in Doland.

CLOSE FAMILY FRIEND

When Mrs. Don Wolverton, close friend and former neighbor of the Humphrey family, was asked what she considered the most important factor in his success, she gave the following explanation: "I think his parents deserve much of the credit. His father's driving ambition to get ahead and burning aspirations for his family must have made a real impression on the boy. But his mother, I believe, contributed just as much in a quieter, less commanding way. Her stubborn adherence to what she believed was right gave him some ideals he shouldn't outgrow—even in politics."

Before Doland's beloved country doctor, H. W. Sherwood, died in 1944, he noted that young HUMPHREY was "making his mark," and he contended that Hubert, like most other small-town youngsters, had a definite advantage over those of larger towns or cities.

"If a small-town kid has any talent at all, he gets a chance to develop it because it gets attention earlier and the competition isn't so keen," often declared the aged physician, accenting his words with several thumps of his knobby cane.

FATHER'S POLITICAL CRONY

"No one can rightfully say that 'Ubert succeeded just because 'e got the breaks," protested English-born Alfred Paine, former Doland postmaster. "By gosh, 'e made 'is breaks; 'Ubert went places because 'e was 'Ubert and 'e 'ad wot it takes," bristled the gray-haired friend of the family.

Mr. Paine and Hubert's father were political cronies way back in the twenties, before it was popular in this vicinity to be a Democrat.

PASTOR AND SCOUT LEADER

Rev. Albert Hartt, now of Rosholt but formerly pastor of the church HUMPHREY attended in Doland, is positive that the faculty of Doland High School figured prominently in his success.

"The training and inspiration that particular group of teachers managed to give the Doland youth were most unusual," he has declared many times. He can recall many incidents as leader of young HUMPHREY's Boy Scout troop. However, Reverend Hartt has always felt that the gifted Hubert could have done much better with his talents than to go all-out for politics.

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

If you should ask Guy W. Cook of Hot Springs, superintendent of Doland schools at that time, how he accounts for HUMPHREY's record, he would be sure to mention his speech training.

"Learning to speak convincingly as a high-school debater," he told your reporter this summer, "is right where he got his start. Of course," Cook added thoughtfully, "Hubert alway had a good mind, lots of ambition, and an unusual gift of gab."

CAREFULLY FACES AUDIENCE

When HUMPHREY was in the seventh grade, he played the title role in the operetta, Jack and the Beanstalk. His costume simulated the tight-fitting clothing of medieval peasantry, with colorful shoulder puffs and short, bloomerlike overpants.

The beanstalk was a pole with pegs for climbing, camouflaged by artificial foliage and large cloth beanpods. * * * HUBERT nimbly climbed the beanstalk, but as he hurried down at the end of the scene, he caught the seat of his bloomers on a peg. Result: Young HUMPHREY carefully faced the audience the rest of the evening and Ruth Sapp, the girl playing the part of Jack's mother got the giggles and almost wrecked the performance. Ruth is now the wife of Commander W. S. Johnson, U. S. N. They have recently returned home after spending a year and a half on Guam.

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

While Hubert was a student at Doland High School, he took part in all extra-curricular activities. Although he was a tall, skinny youngster, he was wiry and determined enough to do fairly well in athletics and brainy enough to be a straight "A" student, besides doing odd jobs around the drugstore and occasionally indulging in a little horseplay with his pals. He was valedictorian of his class.

PROMINENT SCHOOLMATES

HUMPHREY had several schoolmates who, though not as well known in South Dakota as he, are very successful in their fields. On the debating team with him were Julian Hartt, Methodist minister's son who is now professor of religion in the divinity school at Yale University, and Alvin Hahn, a prominent attorney at Monrovia, Calif. Another member of that debating group was Earl Hansen, a prosperous farmer near Doland.

There are those who say they would prefer Hansen's comparatively carefree life as a successful farmer and solid citizen of the community to the uneasy heights of a top-ranking politician.

Possibly there was some magic in the initial "H" for these four boys, HUMPHREY, Hartt, Hahn, and Hansen, made stiff competition for even the largest high schools of the State.

One bit of HUMPHREY lore tells of an oratorical contest judged by Carl Mundt, then an instructor in the normal school at Madison. The story goes that Alvin Hahn received first place and HUBERT HUMPHREY second. School notes are said to have reported that Mr. Mundt gave the boys valuable criticisms after the contest.

KEEPS UP DOLAND CONTACTS

The Senator's Doland acquaintances are pleased that he takes time out to maintain

his local contacts. His former Sunday school teacher, Edna Holmes, now town librarian, prizes the birthday remembrance he sends each year. Nor does he forget Mrs. Patience Wilkins, who says she used to boss him around just as she did her own children.

"When Hubert joined the gang in our yard, there was always plenty of activity," recalled Mrs. Wilkins. "He was a born leader even then. He seemed to be able to get them all to do what he wanted them to and still keep them happy."

No visit to Doland would be complete for HUBERT until he had gone into a huddle with Deschler Welch, a former classmate and probable partner in several pranks that gave their teachers a few gray hairs.

Doland people will continue to watch HUBERT HUMPHREY with interest and pride. At least a few wish he would be a bit more cautious in his upward climb because, in Doland, even Republicans hope he won't stub his political toe.

War and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 22 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of some remarks on war and inflation which I have prepared for delivery this evening over the NBC radio network.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR AND INFLATION

War is the consummate folly to which mankind has been condemned throughout all written history. It is the scourge of humanity, and leaves only a widening path of terror and destruction in its wake.

As science advances, war becomes more appalling, more all-inclusive, more utterly destructive. World War II far exceeded World War I in the devastation it wrought, and if there should be a third world war, it will drench the globe in a blood bath the horror of which no mind can conceive, save only that everyone who comprehends the devastating extent of the two global conflicts already fought in this generation must know that the sufferings and the burden of a third world war will be borne by generations yet unborn.

It was the comprehension of this fact that led the Government of the United States, even before military victory was achieved over Germany and Japan in 1945, to undertake the establishment of the United Nations. Our national purpose could not have been better stated than it was by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, on the floor of the Senate on January 10, 1945, when he said, "We are fighting to defend America We still propose to help create the postwar world on a basis which will stop aggression for keeps and, so far as humanly possible, substitute justice for force among free men. We prepose to do it primarily for our own sake. We still propose also to substitute justice for force—if we can—in writing the peace which terminates this war."

In that memorable speech which laid the cornerstone of what has been called the bipartisan international policy, Senator VANDENBERG also proposed unity of military action among the United Nations for the purpose of suppressing aggression. "It must mean one for all and all for one," he said, "and it will mean this, unless somewhere in this grand alliance the stupid and sinister folly of ulterior ambitions shall invite the enemy to postpone our victory through our own rivalries and our own confusion."

He went so far as to suggest a binding treaty among the major allies, which of course included Russia, in order to make sure that there would be no new aggression after the peace treaties of World War II had been written. "I know of no reason," said he, "why a hard and fast treaty between the major allies should not be signed today to achieve this dependable end." That was the vision of a great statesman in the Senate who felt that it was necessary for all mankind to work together in unity to achieve permanent peace. We know now that one of the Allies, the Government of Russia, to which VANDENBERG was willing to offer a guaranty to protect it against aggression by a revived Germany or Japan, not only spurned the thought of such an alliance, but itself has become an overt aggressor and, in the words of Secretary of State Acheson, has sought "to break up, by destructive acts, the work of the United Nations."

If Russia should succeed in breaking up the work of the United Nations, or should succeed in securing dominance over that organization, the result would obviously be that a world institution conceived in the spirit of peace would be perverted into an instrument of tyranny over the minds and the bodies of men.

It is the realization of this danger which has prompted President Truman to assert that this country and the other nations of the free world stand in their gravest peril. The people who aspire to govern themselves must stand together, for only in unity can they protect themselves.

If this free world should shrink now to embrace only the Western Hemisphere, if the European peninsula should be overrun by Communists, and all Asia should fall into the Soviet circle, then indeed would this Government and the principles of popular sovereignty for which it has always stood be in mortal danger. For this reason, the President has said that we cannot yield to aggression and will not engage in appeasement, but shall continue to make ourselves strong, to engage not only in military preparedness, but in economic preparedness also.

This is the reason for his summons to national units. This is the reason for his call for sacrifices without which we cannot be ready for the grim test that lies before us.

First of all, it must be understood that, in modern warfare, the home front, in truth and in fact, is the fighting front. It is the fighting front because it would be impossible to build the weapons of defense without the labor of all civilians. A modern fighting force could not exist without the active support of all. Modern warfare is as much economic as it is military. This is a lesson all must learn.

No group or class or individual can hope to make profit out of the program of preparedness upon which we are launched. It takes years before a long-range bomber can pass from the drawings upon the designer's board to the finished plane. Thousands of men must work upon the production of the raw materials which go into that plane. Other thousands must labor upon the fabrication of the commodities out of which the plane is made. Other thousands must put the parts together. Then, in seemingly unrelated industries, are produced commodities like aviation gasoline, without which the plane could not fly, and the materials which are used by the ground forces necessary to keep it in the air.

In other words, modern warfare and preparedness for war is an all-embracing economic enterprise. It calls for the cooperation of all our people because only all our people can produce and pay for the instruments that are needed.

If we are to do this, we must forget all thought of profit. We must be prepared, as the Government is urging, not to promote inflation by resisting taxes, by pushing prices upward, or by advancing wages. Profits, wages, and prices in the United States are at such levels now that fewer injustices would be inflicted by an over-all freeze than by any slower approach to the ceilings which must be imposed.

It has been well said that inflation is the enemy within the gate. An analysis of price increases of items upon the essential list of military procurement indicates that many of them have increased from 20 to more than 50 percent. Rubber tires for the Army in November 1950, were more than 38 percent more costly than in April; boots, 42 percent up; clothing, 39 percent up; parachutes, 51 percent up; mattresses, 65 percent up; and wire rope for the Navy, 100 percent up.

The dollars that we appropriated last fall for national defense will buy far less now to preserve the lives of our fighting men than they would have bought last June before Korea.

In very truth, inflation at home knocks our fighting planes out of the sky more effectively than Russian jet fighters in the hands of the Red Chinese army of aggression. Unless we check it immediately, next year we will be appropriating billions more to buy the military items that could be bought now at present prices.

Military costs are not the only costs affected by inflation. It is rapidly spreading to the prices of every item that the people buy and need. The cost of living at this moment is at an all-time high and it is bound to go higher. As it climbs skyward, the arguments for further wage increases become unanswerable.

When the Soviet Communists first began their campaign to take over China, they used every means in their power to promote inflation because they understood the economic basis of modern society and they knew that by increasing the cost of living, they would undermine the Nationalist Government.

By a united determination to halt inflation here at home, we can take the first and most effective step to protect ourselves against communism. We must be prepared, therefore, to respond in united fashion to the President's call for increased production and for the prevention of inflation. We must be prepared to sacrifice nonmilitary expenditures by Government on the Federal, the State, and the local level. We must be prepared to send the profit dollar to war by diverting profits to the national defense. By every dollar that we increase the debt of the United States we make more difficult the fight for freedom—we make more difficult the survival of the principle of private property.

Political and economic freedom are the ideals for which this country was founded. Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, once said, "I have sworn, upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." Such a tyranny now threatens to take over the world.

Abraham Lincoln, in his immortal Gettysburg Address, called for the united determination of the people to dedicate themselves to the American ideal that "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

This is our test, and the first battle will be the battle fought here at home to halt inflation before it destroys us.

Secretary Acheson's Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, December 22 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD two very interesting letters from the columns of the New York Times of December 20. Both these letters deal with the move to force the dismissal of Secretary Acheson.

It is also interesting and worthy of note that the editor of the New York Times, in a note printed at the bottom of the Letters to the Editor column, states that a preponderance of letters in defense of Secretary Acheson are being printed in that column because the New York Times has received 10 letters in support of Secretary Acheson to every 1 letter critical of him in the present situation.

There being no objection, the letters and editor's comment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY ACHESON'S CRITICS

AIMS OF OPPOSITION EXAMINED, LOSS OF CONFIDENCE CHARGE CHALLENGED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Republican demand for the removal of the Secretary of State at a moment of national emergency has shaken the country and shocked our allies. No responsible statement of reasons adequate to so extreme and unprecedented a step has been offered, other than the claim that Mr. Acheson has "lost the confidence of the country."

Since the country has not declared its views, this assertion must be taken as merely rhetorical. Even as rhetoric it is dubious. If the reaction to the Republican demand in and around Boston is evidence, leaders of American opinion, Republican as well as Democratic, do not share the party's conviction on that point.

What, then, is the case against Mr. Acheson? We must assume, in respect for the Republican Congressmen, that it is something more than the dislike of some Members of Congress for his mustache, his clothes, and the precision of his use of the English language. We must assume, for the same reason, that it is something more than the McCarthyism that Mr. Acheson is soft to communism. You disposed of that insinuation in unanswerable terms in your editorial of December 16. No American in public life has a more consistent record of effective opposition to communism than the Secretary of State.

What, then, is the case? If it is not personal distaste or discredited gossip, what is it? Republican reference is made to far eastern policy in terms which suggest that Mr. Acheson has not been sufficiently hostile to communism in that part of the world.

We are fighting Communist aggression in Korea as the result of a courageous decision taken by Mr. Truman on Mr. Acheson's advice. Are the Republicans complaining that we are not fighting communism elsewhere in Asia as well? Specifically, are they complaining because we are not also at war with Communists in China? Is it their contention that Mr. Acheson has lost the confidence of the American people because he has pursued a policy aimed at avoiding war in China?

The country is entitled to a clarification of their position. It is no secret that there are Republican Senators and Republican publishers who would like to involve the United States in war in China. In the past they have been regarded as an irresponsible minority. Do they now make Republican policy? And is it in submission to their views that the United States must lose the services of an able, devoted and courageous Secretary of State at the moment when we need him most?

ARCHIBALD MACLEISH.

BOSTON, December 17, 1950.

DISUNITY FEARED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I wish to record my entire approval of your recent editorial regarding Secretary of State Acheson.

I have been shocked at the vituperative character of some of the attacks made on both Mr. Acheson and General MacArthur, whatever mistakes they may have made (and who has not made them?). I regard them both as high-minded, patriotic Americans undeserving of such treatment.

As for the Republican resolutions regarding Mr. Acheson, particularly in view of the meeting in Brussels, I can only think of them as an act of unparalleled political folly. The effect in European capitals is set forth in the dispatch of your London correspondent, Raymond Daniel.

What is needed in Washington is less quarreling and more cooperation (this applies to both Republicans and Democrats) and more patriotism. Let's close ranks and "git goin'."

A DISGUSTED REPUBLICAN.

NEW YORK, *December 17, 1950.*

(Space has been given in these columns to a preponderance of letters in support of Mr. Acheson for the reason that our mail has run approximately 10 to 1 in his favor.—Editor, the Times.)

The Great Struggle Is Yet To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the reversal the United Nations forces have suffered in Korea is not a defeat, nor is it the end of a battle. The United Nations forces went into Korea for the high moral purpose of enforcing peace.

The set-back given our advancing forces is most definitely, however, a warning that the road ahead is going to be difficult. As Secretary of Defense Marshall recently told the Congress of American Industry:

We are in a period of the greatest tension and facing the possibility of * * * catastrophe. * * * The country is facing an unprecedented era in American life, and we have to do all in our power to prevent the state of affairs of today, bad as it is, from deteriorating into something dreadful to contemplate—another world war.

Secretary Marshall's warning was spoken almost 8 years to the day after a previous address to the same group of industrial leaders, at their annual dinner meeting, in the same room of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. He was Chief of Staff of the United States Army then, and we had been only a few days less than 1 year involved in World War II. But we had won our first strategic success by the landing in North Africa, and though victory was 2½ years in the future, morale was high, and the miracle of American industrial production had begun to work.

Today, with the situation more grave than it was then, we have made less progress toward creating the strength we shall need for our protection and survival. Moreover we must do more for our allies than we had to do 8 years ago. Secretary Marshall's address to the Congress of American Industry was, therefore, more than a warning of the gravity of the situation. It was a clear statement of what has to be done. This build-up will be from the low state of last June "to a position from which we can at least see the peaks we may have to climb in case of all-out war." And Secretary Marshall warned:

We must get there as quickly as possible, meanwhile rushing our planning for whatever further development will be necessary.

Summing up, Secretary Marshall pointed out that what we must do is not only to resolve the issue in Korea, and prepare for any eventualities that may arise; we must develop a system new to American practice that will be enduring, not a system that will collapse at any surface relaxation in the tension under which we live, and under which we must expect to live until peace and democracy are firmly established in the world.

Mr. Speaker, that is the great task facing the American Congress and the American people—to build the system that will endure in spite of the reverses of a single campaign and will stand us in good stead whatever the struggle that may come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask, therefore, unanimous consent to insert Secretary Marshall's statement of December 8, 1950, on his task, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The remarks are as follows:

Today is very reminiscent of 8 years ago. On December 4, 1942, to be exact, I appeared here in this same room at a meeting of your association to outline the military situation and to urge you to step up the production we so desperately needed at that time to provide equipment for the troops already in action and called to the colors and the millions yet to come—and for our allies as well.

Today the military situation is grave, more grave, I very much fear, than it was even in those most difficult days of 8 years ago. We had then won our first strategic success by the landing in North Africa, but there were years of bitter fighting ahead.

The American tendency to rush from pessimism to jubilant optimism, or the reverse, over the results of a single campaign and even the outcome of a single battle was then manifest and I remember cautioning you that the great struggle was yet to come. Tonight I would caution you that this is the time for a calm determination, a strong resolution to do what seems wise to protect the future security of the free world. It is no time for violent emotions.

In those critical days of that first success we lacked trained personnel to keep our engaged combat units up to strength. We lacked the quantities of matériel to keep

them fully equipped and at the same time we were rapidly and vastly increasing our forces.

On the industrial front the problem of 1942 was quantity production to meet our own needs and those of our allies. We were holding bases and conducting world-wide operations. Tremendous demands had to be made on America's productive resources. The goals set seemed impossible to some. We were confronted, however, with a situation that left us no alternative. Our enemies had been preparing for the day of aggression for decades and had their men lined up and their munitions assembled. We were just recovering from the first shock of hostilities. We were in the process of mobilizing for the supreme effort that modern war demands.

Well, you are fully aware that you made good. You performed a miracle of production. You and labor and agriculture played a dominant role in the victories of 5 years ago.

Today our problems so far as they concern personnel and matériel are much the same as were those of the period I have been referring to. We are not in a world war but we are in a period of the greatest tension and facing the possibility of such a catastrophe, and we are engaged in the heaviest of fighting in the restricted area of Korea. The country is facing an unprecedented era in the American life and we have to do all in our power to prevent the state of affairs of today, bad as it is, from deteriorating into something dreadful to contemplate—another world war.

There appears to be a general agreement on the part of our political leaders and the public that we should build up our military strength as quickly as possible. There are two distinct phases to that process, one pertaining to personnel and the other to matériel. And there is the additional consideration as to what we do to build up the strength of our friends and allies.

The immediate and first step in the program we have decided upon calls for a build-up in manpower from the low state of last June at the time the North Koreans started on their course of aggression to a position from which we can at least see the peaks we may have to climb in case of all-out war. We must quickly reach a high plateau in this mountain range of preparedness from which we can look in all directions, firm in a position of readiness to act in whatever way that may be necessary, rapidly, but deliberately and effectively. The establishment of such a position is not a one-shot affair. In fact the maintenance of that base immediately becomes much the greater task.

What are we asking from the present Congress in the second supplemental deficiency appropriation is the establishment of such an initial base both in men and munitions. We must get there as quickly as possible, meanwhile rushing our planning for whatever further development will be necessary.

Another step in our search for strength lies in our military assistance program. Fortunately, Congress before adjourning last September provided $4,000,000,000 as the second installment of equipment for our allies. We are, furthermore, proceeding with a full program in research and development in all scientific fields, and doing this with the advice and cooperation of the leading scientists in this country, so that our weapons and means of operation will be the best in the world.

As to munitions, that is your field. I am particularly anxious not only that production be gotten under way as quickly as possible and pushed as rapidly as possible but even more concerned to see that we do this in such a manner as to assembly lines, necessary jigs and dies, and things of that nature, so that we can quickly and greatly accelerate production as it becomes necessary. We must have a stockpile of finished weapons but I am equally concerned that we now lay down a system which does not merely produce finished matériel for a stockpile but will enable us quickly and effectively to greatly increase production under forced pressure, if that be necessary.

We have to have in mind that while our great effort today is to maintain the security of our men in Korea and above and beyond that to take every practicable step to maintain the peace of the world, we must do our present job against the background that the best that we can hope for in the immediate years ahead is a prolonged tension. That, as I have just said, is the very best that we can hope for. Therefore, along with the immediate and rapid build-up of strength there must be the development of a system new to American practice that will be enduring, not a system that will collapse at any surface relaxation in the tension I refer to or because our people far distant from Western Europe and the Continent of Asia grow indifferent to the consequences of a relaxation in our measures of preparedness.

I will not elaborate further regarding the necessities concerned with the production of matériel. You are the experts in that field. I must confine myself to the military aspects and requirements of the day. But in closing my remarks, I would like to leave several comments and thoughts in your minds. The Chinese Communist intervention in Korea has placed a very heavy burden on the United Nations. It has deliberately challenged the United Nations. We must recoup this situation and put the United Nations back on the forward path toward world peace.

It is very important to remember that we went into Korea to sustain the United Nations in its great purpose of enforcing peace. Our purpose, therefore, was one of the highest moral principle. We must not be deterred by temporary military reverses.

It must be made unmistakably clear to all the world that we do not waiver in our purpose.

I would particularly emphasize that this is no time for purely emotional reactions. It is a time for determined resolution, a time for unity, and very much the time for calm consideration and the strong example of determination to do what is right for the world, which, of course, includes our own security in that world.

Address by President Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 22 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from a broadcast by Elmer Davis over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co., on December 21, 1950, regarding the recent address by President Hoover.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ex-President Hoover's speech last night had at least the merit of reducing the current controversies over foreign policy to elementary terms. When there is argument as to how much we should do in Asia and how much in Europe, Mr. Hoover boldly proposes that we do nothing anywhere but at home. The war in Korea, he says, is lost; a war in Europe would be lost; so he issues a clarion call to his fellow countrymen to crawl under the bed, shut their eyes, plug their ears, and hope for the best. With some of Mr. Hoover's whereases many citizens will be in agreement; though they may be only straw men that he has set up to knock down. I am confident for instance that the Joint Chiefs of Staff never had the slightest idea of trying to march an army overland to Moscow; or of getting our land forces involved in what Mr. Hoover calls the quicksands of China and India. But his criticism of the shilly-shallying of the United Nations over Communist China would find much agreement among administration officials. It is when he comes down to his be-it-resolved that Mr. Hoover begins to sound like the Hoover of old.

Not another man or another dollar for Europe, he says, until Europe has organized and equipped enough combat divisions to erect a sure dam against the Red flood. In other words, no more help for Europe till Europe no longer needs it. That this would involve a flat repudiation of the North Atlantic Treaty is perhaps the least of its implications. Mr. Hoover appears to realize, though he never explicitly admits it, that this policy would surrender Europe to the Russians. So, he says, let us build up our air and naval forces so as to hold the Atlantic and Pacific oceans—including Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines; we would be generous enough to let the British join us if they wanted to, but we don't need them; safe behind the beaches of New Jersey and California, we can reduce Government expenditure, balance the budget, and all live happily ever after. This, says Mr. Hoover, is not isolationism; indeed it is the opposite. Well, if that's so, they'd better rewrite the dictionaries.

Mr. Hoover admits that this would be an uneasy peace. It would indeed, if communism had absorbed Europe, Asia, and Africa; and the island of the Western Hemisphere stood alone against the resources of the rest of the world. It would be an uneasy military situation and an uneasy economic situation, if the rest of the world outside of Latin America refused to trade with us—as it well might, if it were ruled from Moscow. But Mr. Hoover sees no better hope for us.

It is some consolation to recall that Mr. Hoover never has had much hope for us, since the failure of his endeavor to abolish poverty. He was a defeatist 10 years ago, and he turned out to be wrong; he is a defeatist still, and the same kind of defeatist. He thinks we couldn't win a war abroad so he proposes a program which would insure that any land fighting that might occur would be right here, on our own improved real estate; and that we would have nobody else on our side. Not only his lack of faith in Europe, but his contemptuous language about all Europe except Spain and Germany, is just a surprise Christmas present for Russian propaganda. For Mr. Hoover's views command attention. How seriously they are to be taken, however, depends on how far they are supported by his party; and there his program seems to contain what a Marxist would call internal contradictions.

He would hold Formosa but would apparently conduct no offensive operations against the Chinese Communists; that won't suit the Chiang Kai-shek Republicans. He says the war in Korea has been lost; that won't suit the MacArthur Republicans and it doesn't suit headquarters in Tokyo, which maintains that the Army is undefeated.

Senators WHERRY, BRICKER, KEM, and CAPEHART agreed with Mr. Hoover completely; Senators TAFT and BREWSTER said his views should have the immediate consideration of Congress; but other Republican Senators are by no means prepared to abandon Europe. Governor Dewey declined comment on the speech, saying that his views were expressed in his speech of last Thursday. That speech was in itself sufficient comment, for it was the speech of a man who has faith in the United States.

The administration made no direct reference to the speech; but after the President heard the report of the Secretary of State, just returned from Brussels, he said that the spirit shown by the countries of Western Europe has justified our confidence that they mean business. Let there be no mistake about it, said the President—the unity of the nations of Western Europe and of the North Atlantic area is vital to their security; and to ours.

But we shall have to see how many Americans feel that it would be safer to crawl under the bed, shut their eyes, and hope for the best.

America's Responsibility in Present World Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 22 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] regarding America's responsibility in present world conditions.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR KERR SAYS

WASHINGTON, December 21.—Now is the time to face the naked realities which confront us, to recognize the dangers about us.

Now is the time to accurately appraise what is necessary to meet and match and overwhelm those dangers; to determine that, come what may, we will do all that is required to insure complete and enduring security.

We are at war. Call it cold war, or hot war, or whatever other name you choose.

We did not seek it. We have done everything we knew to prevent each step in the inexorable march of events that has forced the present terrible conflict upon us.

We are still determined to limit the shooting war, whenever and however it may honorably be done.

But we can no longer, not for another precious minute, fight for peace from a position of weakness. Fight for peace, we must, for all we are worth, but from a position of rapidly growing and increasing power.

We have a great determination to win peace, if it is humanly possible. But we have an even greater and grimmer determination that this beloved Nation must and shall survive.

We are face to face with the most brutal and ruthless and awful danger we have ever known. Anything less than our best is not enough to meet it. The cost of victory will be very great, but the cost of defeat would be slavery.

Now is the time to mobilize our vast and boundless strength. We must move rapidly into total mobilization—mobilization of our dollars, our manpower, and all of our mighty forces.

We must also mobilize our spiritual and moral resources. We must fortify our courage and renew our faith. The God of our fathers is still supreme and is available to guide us against the atheistic enemy.

We will not quail in the presence of whatever dangers that may come. We will not falter before difficulties or hardships.

We are the strongest nation on this earth. We, and we alone, will determine the outcome of the global struggle being fomented and whipped up against us. We are resolved to win, but to do this, each American must do his or her part. Some must fight, some must produce, all must work and all must pay.

But first, all must unite. In unity there is strength and security and victory.

Our enemies are working cunningly and hellishly to divide us. They seek with stealth and lies to undermine our confidence in ourselves and our leaders and our country. They laugh in fiendish glee as they see us dissipate any of our precious time or strength in bickering and backbiting and internal strife.

Let us confuse them by treating their schemes with disdain. Let us bitterly disappoint them by repudiating their lies and laughing in their evil faces as we refuse to let them entice us into the trap of disunity.

We have a common foe, we have a common peril. That foe is communistic aggression. That peril is the effort of the men in the Kremlin and of their almost unlimited military manpower to enslave the free world.

We can overcome the danger which confronts us. We can build and maintain the military strength, the united valor, the combined courage, the unfaltering faith in our God and our people that will insure our victory.

The All-American team of all Americans is on the march. Under one flag, as one people under one God, we will meet and rise victorious over every threat and every danger to our homes, our freedom, and our country.

I know we will win. Now is the time.

Alabama Airport Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, in 1935, Alabama had 28 airports. Today there are 110 usable fields in the Alabama airport system, not including military bases.

There is still a great need for airports and air strips for the smaller towns.

As a part of my remarks, I include an article entitled "Alabama Airport Construction," taken from the Alabama Aviation News, published by the Alabama Department of Aeronautics, of which Hon. Asa Rountree, Jr., is director. The article from the Alabama Aviation News follows:

ALABAMA AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION

The Alabama Department of Aeronautics, under the present management, which dates back to 1935, has either arranged or assisted in arranging for over $26,000,000 worth of airport construction, property and facilities. This has developed the Alabama airport system from a small pioneer one into a network of major size, with State-wide coverage.

In 1935 there were airports in only about 28 localities and most of them were substandard in comparison with current specifications. Since that time there have been airports in 97 localities.

One hundred and two new public, commercial, private, and personal fields have been built or acquired; also four commercial seaplane bases. Two new fields are pending. Twenty other public fields were improved. Eleven public fields and six commercial fields, closed during World War II, were reopened. Seven public fields, initially on leased property, have been purchased by the municipalities concerned.

This department has assisted all of them. In its planning and negotiations, it has visited and contacted officials in over 150 localities. Most of these are also contacted regularly from year to year.

Today there are 110 usable fields in the Alabama airport system, not including 16 military bases and auxiliary fields.

With one exception, Alabama's major airport system, as to localities currently requiring or justifying major airports, is now complete. However, it must be recognized and understood that there is, and will be, a continuing need for additional improvements and facilities as operations grow.

In 1935 there were only two class 3 airports and only one had a paved runway. A class 3 airport has a minimum length of 3,600 feet. Today there are 18 major airports, class 3 and larger, with a total of 45 paved runways. Only one of them is without paving.

Back in 1935 only one airport had runway lights. Today 14 have them, including two where installations are now pending.

Alabama's secondary system of airports for the smaller towns still needs considerable attention and many additional projects. As aviation develops, the time will come when every town of any size will have need of at least a single flight strip, not only for its own benefit but also for transient traffic, to facilitate cross-country flying and to provide additional safety. Airfields and landing strips will be just as essential to every community and every area as highways now are.

Specific attention has been, and is being, given to the needs of the small towns and their interests are being anticipated, represented and protected at all times by this department.

A State-wide network of intermediate emergency strips between localities and in isolated areas along principal air routes is also needed for safety. In time, a pilot should be provided with a convenient, nearby, developed landing strip, for emergency use, regardless of his air position. Again, just as highways are needed by every locality and in every area, for local and transient use, so will there be need for airfields and landing strips.

This department has continuously anticipated and planned for the needs of the Alabama Airport System. From the beginning, it has had a long-range master airport plan, covering both current, future, and potential needs. This was one of the first State plans in the country, served as a pattern for a number of States and antedated the first Federal plan by nearly 4 years. It has been, and is being, constantly revised and is kept on a current basis at all times.

With this plan, the department has been in a position to promptly suggest, recommend, and justify projects, for all Federal participation programs: Works Progress Administration (1935–42); Municipal Airports National Defense (1941–45); Federal Aid for Airports (authorized in 1946) and Surplus Military Airport Disposal (initiated in 1946).

The airpark plan, pioneered in Alabama during the Civil Works Administration in

1933–34, by Col. Sumpter Smith, who was lost during the war; Col. Theodore Swann, later the first chairman of the old Alabama Aviation Commission, and Hayden Brooks, now chairman of the present Alabama Aeronautics Commission, has been continued. This plan, adopted for the use of smaller towns, combines recreational facilities with aeronautical facilities, thus making the airport of interest and service to the entire community. It has received national recognition, has been adopted in a number of States, and was presented by the United States delegation to the International Aviation Conference held in Lima, Peru, in 1938.

The Magic of Christmas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I attach the following article from the December 13, 1950, issue of the Pathfinder magazine. The article, written by Pathfinder Publisher Mr. Graham Patterson, I feel, so effectively describes the feelings, hopes, and aspirations of so many of us on the eve of the coming holy season. The Pathfinder article follows:

THE MAGIC OF CHRISTMAS

We are now in the midst of that heaven-blessed season whose magic mellows the mind of man. Christmas comes but once a year, but the world would be a better place if it came oftener—or at least its spirit.

For no one can doubt the transcendent power of the Christmas season. It can be seen everywhere—in the home, on the streets, in public places. In the patience of tired holiday shoppers. In the pleasant greeting of stranger to stranger. In reborn courtesy and friendliness.

Wouldn't it be wonderful if the world were like this all the time, instead of just during the Christmas season? There is no sound reason why it shouldn't be. The universal feeling of good will during these happy holidays proves that man can drop his antagonisms, his jealousies, his intolerance—and be enriched spiritually for it. The Yuletide brings the supreme manifestation of man's finer self. Why can't it be continued throughout the entire year?

Such a happy state could be attained by following the precepts of the golden rule. Do unto others as you would have others do unto you. Treat your fellow men as you would like to be treated.

Our actions are largely a matter of habit. And good habits can be formed as easily as the bad. In the hustle and bustle of making a living, we are too often apt to dispense with the simple courtesies, the little acts of thoughtfulness that we like to receive from others but which we are prone to forget. Yet others appreciate such things just as much as we do, and respond with equal good will. The investment is little, the dividends are great.

Jesus, by His example and teachings, showed the world how man should conduct himself toward his brothers. It has been a far better world because of His teachings. Yet it is discouraging that in not one of the nineteen and one-half centuries that have since elapsed has the world been completely at peace.

The pessimist would conclude that peace on earth, good will to men, is an unattainable utopia; that man is not big enough in mental or spiritual stature to meet the simple standards that Christ laid down.

But such a conclusion is challenged millions of times a day, in millions of places throughout the land, during this joyous season.

No one ever tires of the wonder of Christmas. No one is immune to its blessed contagion. Even old Scrooge, in Dickens' immortal story, finally succumbed to its magic. What other occasion could make the wheels of industry come to a halt, draw families, friends, and neighbors closer together, and give birth to a world-wide festival of good will?

Christmas is truly a magic time. For its magic makes men think better of each other, brings patience and tolerance and understanding and true neighborliness.

That is the miracle of Christmas. A miracle that happens every year, yet seems new every year. A miracle that uplifts man to his highest spiritual level and gives him an encouraging glimpse of the kind of world that was intended to be.

A very merry Christmas to you all.

GRAHAM PATTERSON,
Publisher.

Tribute By Radio Commentators to Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 22 (legislative day of Monday, November 27), 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in recent weeks, two prominent radio commentators, noted for their objectivity and frankness have paid unusual tribute to the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the work he is doing now as chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In a broadcast on November 21, Mr. Edward R. Murrow, distinguished commentator for the Columbia Broadcasting System, paid particular tribute to the frankness and fairness of the reports of the subcommittee of the Senator from Texas which has done such an outstanding job of awakening the Government agencies to the urgency of our present crisis. On December 15, another broadcaster, Mr. Eric Sevareid, paid particular tribute to the speech which the Senator from Texas delivered in the Senate on December 12 warning that the policy of "wait and see" must end.

I believe that these reports by two of our best-known and universally respected radio newsmen should be widely read, and I ask unanimous consent to place transcripts of their broadcasts in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tributes were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

BROADCAST OF EDWARD R. MURROW, CBS, NOVEMBER 21, 1950

Throughout much of our history the chairmen of some Senate and House committees and subcommittees have risen from political obscurity, and achieved national attention, as the result of their committee reports. This business of committees and subcommittees is really the only method we have whereby our elected representatives can check up on how the Nation's hired hands are doing.

There is a Senate subcommittee presided over by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, which can be counted upon to make a lot of news in the future. It has the title of "The Preparedness Subcommittee on Armed Services of the United States Senate." Its job, as I understand it, is to find out how well we are prepared for war, and with what. The committee's second report, released about half-an-hour ago, does not make very agreeable reading. The report states: "It ill becomes Government officials to conduct the public business with less prudence than they would display in operating a charity bazaar. But that has happened."

The committee says, "there has been more progress in paper work preparedness, than in actual performance by some of the defense agencies. And this kind of paper-work preparedness is only flimsy protection against the threat we face." These quotations may sound like just another case of politicians belaboring bureaucrats. But Senator JOHNSON's subcommittee doesn't mind being specific. Our rubber situation is labelled as "far from satisfactory. At present, industry supplies of rubber are far less than those on hand at the time of Pearl Harbor." The Department of Commerce placed limitations on the use of rubber, and then nullified that order by granting a lot of exemptions. Some of our allies are gouging us on rubber prices.

In an earlier report this subcommittee revealed how an individual had bought aircraft computers for $6.89; and how they were subsequently bought back by the Government for $63,000.

Today's report reveals that an alcohol plant in Kansas City was sold without any clause which would permit the Government to recapture it in time of national emergency. At Omaha, Nebr., another alcohol plant that cost the Government better than $7,000,000, the Government agreed to sell for $1,750,000. The subcommittee has doubts about this deal, since a subsidiary of the company that bought it is now pleading financial irresponsibility in the courts. At Cotton Valley, La., an aviation gasoline plant was sold for dismantling without any security clause which would have permitted the Government to recapture it.

This apparently was a case where one Government department didn't inform another of what it was doing, or had agreed to do.

Then there was the matter of surplus sales at Robins Air Force Base in Georgia. An Under Secretary of the Air Force told the subcommittee that all surplus sales by the Air Force had been halted on July 10. The subcommittee looked into the matter and found out that the sales were not stopped until July 25—2 weeks later.

This Preparedness Subcommittee has some pretty harsh things to say about the Munitions Board, the Commerce Department, the General Services Administration, and the Air Force. But it documents its criticism with specific cases of carelessness, confusion, or incompetence.

If congressional committees inquiring into the activities, affiliations, or beliefs of individuals presented such well-documented reports as this one—which of course was inquiring into Government agencies and corporations—then the individual citizen would have more information on which to base conclusion. Of course, it is rather easier to prove, or discover, what a corporation or a Government agency actually did than it is to determine what an individual believes. Certainly Senator JOHNSON's subcommittee believes that our preparedness, particularly in the matter of rubber, is not proceeding with urgency or effectiveness.

The planning of our preparedness is a complex and often confusing thing. Mark Twain once said, "It is easy to make plans in this world (even a cat can do it). But when one is out in remote oceans it is noticeable that a cat's plans and a man's are worth about the same." Senator JOHNSON'S subcommittee apparently agrees with Benjamin Franklin that "A little neglect may breed great mischief."

Good night, and good luck.

BROADCAST OF ERIC SEVAREID, CBS, DECEMBER 15, 1950

The President of the United States has just finished communicating his thoughts to all the people; he has said what he believes we must now do to be saved. It would be in accordance with the practices and precedents of news commentation for this reporter now to attempt to analyze the contents and the meanings of the President's speech. That prerogative will undoubtedly be exercised by all those privileged of personal expression, whether by radio or press, throughout tomorrow, and for some days to come. But, more than in any other speech of his tenure, the President, a few minutes ago, was attempting to reach the minds, not of columnist or commentator, or of any special-interest groups, but of all and each of the American people as private, responsible citizens of the Republic. And it seemed to us that these particular 5 minutes follow a little too closely upon the President's message; we shall not infringe upon the effects of that message, with any kind of analysis or comment, on the President's words, at a moment when most of you are still absorbed with your own reflections about them.

We thought that we could not do better in this special circumstance, than to serve as a relay for some other words, which appear today in the Washington Evening Star. The editors of this sober and responsible journal have done what many of us should ourselves have done earlier this week, and rescued from the oblivion of official records, part of a speech to the Senate by LYNDON JOHNSON, Senator from Texas, who is the chairman of what is familiarly known as the Senate's watch-dog committee on the preparations in motion to assure the safety of this country. Senator JOHNSON had this to say:

"Is this the hour of our Nation's twilight, the last fading hour of light, before an endless night shall envelop us and all the western world? That is a question," he said, "which we still have in our power to answer. If we delay longer, we can expect nothing but darkness and defeat and desolation. If we answer the challenge with courage and confidence, and with the ability of which we are capable, we can, I am sure, triumph over our foes."

The young Senator from Texas occupies the same position with the same responsibilities of goader, of appointed prodder of President and the military, that Senator Truman occupied in the years of the last great war, and it may serve some purpose for you to lay alongside the convictions and proposals of President Truman, those of his young successor as the people's advocate.

Senator JOHNSON is opposed to the cautious approach, the approach suggested by General Marshall and others, who have expressed fears that if we mobilize all out, even though that takes much time, the Russians may pull back from the brink of war and leave us in a dire economic and psychological predicament. JOHNSON is opposed to the idea of waiting to see the course of events more clearly. He believes we see it with perfectly clarity now. And what he sees, and says, is this, in his own words, "First, we are at war. We are at war not merely with Communist China, but with all the military strength and both the physical and human resources behind the iron curtain. We have been at war for 6 months. We may well be at war for 10 or 20 years more. Second, our primary and immediate goal in this war is survival. This is a bleak, disturbing reality. In other wars, our goal has been simple victory. Now, however, we must make our survival certain before we can hope for victory, because we cannot be confident of survival. Third, we are not getting ready for war. We are in a war, but all our effort is seemingly directed toward staying out of the war that we are in already. This," concludes the Senator, "is adolescent nonsense." That is his premise, and given his premise, one of his conclusions is this: That we must not let the Russians decide where we shall fight and where we can fight.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

Proposed Amendment to First War Powers Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, when the bill to extend the First War Powers Act is taken up on January 1, I expect to offer an amendment to meet the objection to the legislation which has been raised by many Members of Congress. They have contended that the grant of power in the bill might authorize the President to create an entirely new department of government. They have referred particularly to the President's often-expressed desire to create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, headed by Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing.

This amendment would bar the President from abolishing or transferring an executive department, or its functions, or from establishing any new executive department. It also would prevent the President from changing the name of an executive department or the title of its head.

This amendment has been submitted to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in the hope that it may be accepted by the committee and recommended for favorable House action.

Although I seriously doubt that the President would have power under the emergency provisions of this bill to create a new executive department, I feel it should be made entirely clear that it is not the intention of Congress to give him that power.

The Congress has already emphatically expressed its disapproval of his plan to make Mr. Ewing a Cabinet official through the device of creating a new executive department. It should be made impossible for the President, whatever his desires might be, to flout the will of Congress in this regard.

On the other hand, it seems to me the constructive approach to the President's request for this legislation is to endeavor to amend it so as to afford adequate protection against arbitrary action, rather than simply to oppose the legislation entirely.

We face a fight for survival as a free nation. All of us in positions of legislative responsibility, regardless of party, should strive sincerely and untiringly to work together to place on the statute books whatever legislation is needed to cope with the gigantic task before us. I shall not be a party to any obstructive tactics to achieve political advantage. By the same token, we Republicans have a right to expect that the President and his advisers will take the same position.

We have been asked to give to the President the same emergency powers which he had in World War II. We are told that he must have this 1941 law revived in order to accomplish the mobilization plans which are so vital to the maintenance of our national security and defense. Whether we happen to be pleased or displeased over the personnel who are now administering our laws is not the question before us. We can deal with that problem at the proper time. Our present duty is to give to the President and executive departments adequate legislative authority to move, and move quickly, although the road of national preparedness, without losing sight of our equally important duty to insure that Congress does not surrender its proper functions under the Constitution.

I believe the amendment which I have suggested should meet the objections to this legislation and should result in favorable action by the House of Representatives.

When To Retire a Pilot?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by including a recent article in the Washington Sunday Star of December 3, 1950, in regard to the retirement of pilots on commercial airlines. The article by Frederick R. Neely I believe will be an interesting contribution on this subject matter. The article is as follows:

SOME COMPANIES PENSION FLIERS AT 60, BUT THERE ARE MANY ADVOCATES OF LOWER LIMIT

(By Frederick R. Neely)

"What'll become of our old airline pilots when they get old?" Years ago this was the topic of much hangar flying when the budding air-transport industry was filling up with handsome, wasp-waisted, hairy-headed, healthy young airmen, but the question went unanswered for want of a satisfactory definition of "old."

Since then the subject has been elevated to the stature of a problem of growing concern in the high offi es of the airlines, the pilots' union and the Government. Here is how it presently stands:

Eight of the 34 United States scheduled trunk and feeder airlines have established cooperative pension plans for their pilots and fixed 60 as the retirement age. The remainder have no such retirement provisions, pleading financial inability to bear their share of the cost desired by the pilots.

The Airline Pilots' Association (A. F. of L. affiliate) has supported the principle of 50 as the age limit beyond which the modern airliner captain should not be required to fly, it being presupposed he has had at least 20 years of service on his airline when he reaches the half-century mark.

The Government, through the Civil Aeronautics Administration, has power to deny renewal of a license to an airline pilot for physical disability, but it has not yet recognized any age limit for compulsory retirement.

A week after this informal action (or on November 13) a 53-year-old airline captain died suddenly from a heart attack in the pilot's compartment of a DC-6 just 15 minutes before he was scheduled to take off from LaGuardia Field, N. Y., for Memphis, with 27 passengers standing by to board the plane. The story, widely published, generated speculation among airmen as to what would have happened to the big four-engined airliner if the captain had collapsed over his controls and jammed them as the plane was climbing out of the field, despite the presence of an alert copilot at his right side with duplicate controls.

Victim of the fatal heart attack was healthy looking Capt. John S. Pricer, with 21 years' experience as an airline pilot for American Airlines and with 21,000 hours in his log. He had been flying for 32 years, having been taught by the Army in the First World War. His preairline flying included 8 years as an Army pilot and a short stretch of barnstorming as a civilian. This was followed by a turn at earth-bound business (newspaper advertising, cash registers, and automobiles), with flying as an avocation, until 1929, when he grabbed the opportunity to become an airmail pilot for an American Airlines predecessor company. In World War II he went back into the Army, flying men and material for the Air Transport Command. His only mishap as an airline pilot came when flying the mail in a single-engined plane 20 years ago this month. Weather closed off all landing possibilities and with fuel exhausted he bailed out. Since 1936 (except for his war service) he and his wife lived quietly on their 30-acre cotton farm near Memphis while he flew the Memphis-New York route. It was to this farm he planned to retire when he reached 60 under American's pension plan.

RESULT OF PILOT POLL

Public interest in this stalemated internal question had not been aroused until the occurrence of two events a short time ago. In Chicago, during the annual convention of the ALPA early in November, the retirement-age question was brought up again and an opinion poll taken among the pilot delegates. They reaffirmed the age-50 retirement-pension "principle" on the theory that the tension, strain, and responsibility of flying the mail and passengers on schedule reduces the life expectancy of a line pilot by 10 years, so that at 50 he is physically comparable to a nonflying normal man of 60.

PROCTOR'S CASE CITED

The 50-year retirement advocates among airline pilots called Captain Pricer's sudden death tragically prophetic. They take the position that the advent of larger, faster, and more complicated airliners and increasingly congested airway and airport traffic, plus the inability of line pilots to enjoy regular eating, sleeping, and rest habits due to flight-schedule requirements and interruptions create mental and physical fatigue which can cause severe damage to the heart and nervous systems. (The CAA's Medical Division has an airline pilot-fatigue study under way, but no conclusions have been reported to support or discount the implication that after 50 an airline pilot becomes a greater health (and safety) risk.)

Airlines with 60-year retirement-income plans and airline pilots who go along with that figure regarded Captain Pricer's death as more of a tragic coincidence and directed attention to the case of Capt. W. H. Proctor, senior pilot of American. On June 1 last he flew a load of passengers out of New York in a DC-6, gently landed it on the Chicago Airport, and climbed down from the cockpit for the last time. He was 59 then. The following day he became 60 years old and also become the first airline pilot to retire under the company's mandatory 60-year rule, which carries with it a small pension.

Captain Proctor had completed 22 years of active airline flying with American on that date. He, like Captain Pricer, was taught to fly by the Army 32 years ago. When that war was over, he went into the real estate and hardware business in Florida and also served as municipal judge of a Miami suburban town. He kept in touch with aviation, though, and when a mail contract was awarded a company since absorbed by American, he signed up as an airmail pilot in 1928. Also like Captain Pricer, he took time off from American Airlines to go to war with the Air Transport Command.

Captain Proctor didn't stay retired for long. He is back with American as "ground instructor."

If the pros and cons of this question of age-retirement and health-hazards were limited to these two nearly identical "over 50 airline pilot histories, the odds would appear in favor of the 60 group as personified by Captain Proctor. Unfortunately, it is not that elementary. Settlement of the problem fairly and equitably to the pilots, the airlines and the public at this period of divergent views calls for a super-Solomonic arbitrator.

OLD ONES SAFER?

He not only would have to deal with tons of statistics on life expectancy, aircraft performance and airline operations, but on questions of pilot pride, personal hardship cases, company-pilot obligations; Government-pilot obligations, national defense and the economic problems of the airlines unable to afford pilot retirement-income protection. He would also need to handle a delicate sentimental situation and take some action to prevent destruction of a delicate sentimental belief held by a cautious segment of the public that the oldest pilots are the safest pilots; fact that they are still alive after flying all through the pioneering years is compelling testimony for that belief. Or, offer conclusive proof that after a certain age, "old" pilots are "unsafe."

There are now about 80 active airline pilots between the ages of 50 and 59 flying regular runs. They are considered by the CAA medical examiners, the airlines and themselves as fit and able for the exacting and specialized task of scheduled airline operations. There also are about 250 in the 45 to 49 age group; nearly a thousand in the 40 to 44 bracket; around 1,500 between 35 and 39 and close to 3,000 who are 30 to 34 years of age. The younger set numbers about 2,100 and they are between 20 and 29.

The average age of pilots voluntarily dropping out of airline service in anticipation of flunking their next physical examination due to an ailment not responding to treatment or who were denied license renewal for physical disability is now 42, according to the ALPA. Airline pilots who have died from natural causes in the past 20 years number 47 and the number killed in airline flying accidents for the same period is close to 300. (These vital statistics are not geared to age groups.)

However, along with tension and nervous strain, they are characterized as "hazards of airline flying" by chief advocate of the age-50 retirement plan by ALPA's hard-driving president and founder, David L. Behncke, of Chicago, pioneer airmail and airline pilot who was reelected to his eleventh consecutive 2-year term at the convention early last month. Dave Behncke has driven many a hard bargain for his "boys" with the Government and the airlines, but so far he has been unsuccessful in driving his pilots into complete agreement on the 50-year retirement deal.

PILOTS' PROBLEMS

Too many personal tangible and intangible problems stand between their endorsement of the "principle" of 50 and their forming a solid front to make it a part of every airline collective bargaining contract or to gain it through legislation. The lack of unity among the pilots—and they've had the matter before them for over 2 years—is attributed in part to those who purchased expensive private insurance and retirement income plans years ago, are still paying on them and therefore cannot afford to participate in any cooperative company plan. Then there are pilots who now participate in company plans established in the last decade who don't want to upset or reduce that retirement protection much as they would like to see the age limit cut to 50 (and a higher contribution toward retirement by the companies). Others around the 50 mark with no protection, and who live in constant fear that their next physical examination will be their last, are indifferent to any long-range retirement planning.

One of the first to establish a pilot retirement income plan is United Air Lines, whose cooperative effort became effective January 1, 1941. Under it, a pilot who joins the plan at age 25 and contributes continuously until he retires at age 60, would receive a pension of $4,700 per year. This is based on a salary figure of $9,000 per year in the latter part of his career.

Pilots long on the United payroll when the plan became effective and who joined it then will have a retirement income of between three and four thousand dollars per year. As an example: A pilot signed up for the plan on January 1, 1941, when his age was 40, and he was earning $9,000 per year. He was employed by the company when he was 28, and so has 10 years of past service (since his thirtieth birthday) under the plan. He continues to earn $9,000 per year and contributes continuously ($56.25 per month) on such amount until he retires at age 60. His total retirement income per year then will be $3,585.

Neither the airline companies nor the pilot groups are to be blamed for the lack of a uniform, industry-wide retirement income plan for pilots. The industry has expanded amid confusion and economic and political upheavals; the future of some companies has been in doubt and pilot careers uncertain. But this problem will never settle itself. Nor can it be allowed to drift much longer without expert, thorough examination and action.

Invitation to Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial appearing in the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star on December 24, 1950, entitled "Invitation to Disaster":

INVITATION TO DISASTER

The fact that Secretary Acheson has seen fit to call upon the National Security Council as a rebuttal witness is a measure of the seriousness with which the administration views Herbert Hoover's call for a retreat from Western Europe. (The Security Council says such a retreat could lead only to surrender or defeat.)

Mr. Acheson and the others have good reason to be deeply concerned with the Hoover speech. For it was an appealing statement—a speech which was bound to evoke a warm and enthusiastic response from millions of Americans. But it was also a speech which may well have contained within it the seeds of our own destruction, and it is proper, therefore, to examine and reexamine it.

When Mr. Hoover said that he spoke "with a sense of deep responsibility," he was wholly sincere. He has passed that point in life when men may be tempted by some hope of personal advantage, when partisanship seems worthwhile merely for the sake of partisanship. In the Star's opinion, Mr. Hoover spoke as an American citizen whose sole concern in these dark times is to serve the best interests of his country. Nevertheless, this newspaper believes that the course which the former President has advocated is a course which, if followed at this time, can lead us only to disaster.

When the speech is boiled down to its essence, Mr. Hoover is saying that we should pull back from Europe unless the western Europeans build for themselves a defense capable of turning back a Russian attack. If anything is certain, it is that Europe, without our vigorous assistance and support, will never erect such a defense. And the alternative, in Mr. Hoover's opinion, is to arm ourselves to the teeth and maintain our own defense, with the Atlantic and the Pacific as our outward bastions.

The first trouble with the advocacy of such a point of view is that it tends to frighten the Europeans into doing nothing. Without our help, they cannot and will not fight in any effective manner. If they do not fight, if they do not erect what Mr. Hoover calls a "sure dam" against Communist aggression, the overwhelming probability is that Russia wil take over Western Europe. What then?

Mr. Hoover does not advocate that we fight in such an eventuality, but rather that, while pursuing our own rearmament, we adopt a wait-and-see policy.

What we should expect to see is a Russian exploitation and development of the skilled manpower and the industrial resources of Western Europe. Instead of having 160,000,000 people alined with us, they would be working for the Russians. Mr. Hoover says there is no more danger that the Russians could invade Washington than that we, with land armies, could reach Moscow. That is quite true. But what about the ability of Russia, once the resources of western Europe are at her disposal, to launch an all-out, devastating atomic attack on this country? All that Mr. Hoover says on this point is that the atomic bomb is a far less dominant weapon than it was once thought to be. Maybe so. But the prospect of living for an indefinite future under the constant dread of an overpowering atomic attack is not an attractive one. At best, it leaves with the enemy the initiative the choice of the time and means of attack. And at worst, it invites the prospect that this country might be destroyed without any effective chance to fight back.

Mr. Hoover seems to think that his proposal offers hope, after the initial preparation, of reduced expenditures, a balanced budget, and freedom from the dangers of inflation and economic degradation. The Star fears that this is the sheerest wishful thinking. We would be faced, for one thing, with a loss of our foreign trade. That might not be too important. What is important is that, as the Russians increased their military strength after the conquest of Western Europe, we would have to increase ours. We would never reach the point where we could sit back and say that we are strong enough, that we do not need more and newer weapons. Instead, we would have to live indefinitely in an armed camp, and that, even without actual war, would sap our resources, cancel out our freedoms, and, finally, bring on the economic degradation against which Mr. Hoover warns.

Mr. Hoover cautions in eloquent terms against appeasement. But that which he proposes actually would be the greatest act of appeasement of all. It is true that if Western Europe does not take every possible step to insure its own defense we probably will have to fall back to the line which Mr. Hoover wants us to occupy. But it would be a ghastly mistake to beat such retreat unless and until it becomes clearly necessary. The sensible thing for us to do is to try by every feasible means to encourage and help the Europeans to stand up to the common enemy. If they refuse to do that, then we must fall back. But let us not abandon this battle until we have really tried to fight it.

Many of the people who respond favorably to Mr. Hoover's counsel are also admirers of General MacArthur. Perhaps this is a good time to recall some advice that he has given.

More than a decade ago, when another ruthless enemy threatened the civilized world, General MacArthur wrote to a friend: "The history of failure in war can almost be summed up in two words: Too late. Too late in comprehending the deadly purpose of a potential enemy; too late in realizing the mortal danger; too late in preparedness; too late in uniting all possible forces for resistance; too late in standing with one's friends."

That is the advice of one of our ablest military commanders. So let us not be too quick to abandon our friends and prospective allies in favor of standing alone.

Depleting Our Essential War Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is of the utmost importance if we are to maintain our payrolls, protect our domestic economy, and insure our national security that the wholesale ECA shipments of copper, so essential to our national defense, be stopped. There is no doubt whatever that much of this copper has been siphoned over into Russia and Red China.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a survey which was made by Paul O. Peters with reference to the shipments of copper to foreign countries:

CIVILIAN USE OF COPPER TO COME UNDER NPA CONTROLS SOON

(By Paul O. Peters)

In Washington it has been announced that within the next few days controls will be slapped on the domestic use of copper, cobalt, and cadmium. It has been generally known for many months that our supplies of copper would not be adequate for civilian demands and an expanded rearmament program. During World War II, the War Production Board reporting on the use of copper in 1944 stated among other things, that under a controlled materials plan direct military and export requirements had absorbed 90, 69, and 71 percent, respectively, of the brass-mill, wire-mill, and foundry-copper and copper-base alloy products.

Recently the price of copper has advanced to 24½ cents a pound, comparable with a price of 29.19 cents, the highest price in 1917.

In spite of the domestic shortages, it appears that over a long period of time it has been the policy of the European Cooperation Administration to issue procurement authorization to the Marshall plan countries for large quantities of copper and copper products to be purchased in the United States, Latin America, and Canada.

Continuation of this policy on the part of ECA may prove highly disadvantageous to the American free-enterprise system, which furnishes the employment and provides the payrolls and profits from which the Government collects the taxes which makes an international charity organization such as ECA possible.

It is a shame to say it, but it appears there are some in the Federal Government and its agencies who actually appear to be dedicated to the proposition of foreigners first instead of America first.

As of October 31, 1950, under the Marshall plan, our taxpayers have been called upon to provide the funds for procurement authorization for copper in the total amount of $325,500,000. Since that time new authorizations have totaled $15,113,000 for copper and copper products of which more than one-third originated in the United States.

The details of the reported procurement authorizations for copper and copper products are shown in the table which follows:

Recent ECA procurement authorizations for copper and copper products, with countries of destination and origin

Date of authorization	Country of destination	Country of origin	Amount of authorization
Nov. 24, 1950	Austria	United States	$200,000
Nov. 29, 1950	Germany	do	1,000,000
Dec. 5, 1950	Denmark	Canada	52,000
Do	Trieste	United States	50,000
Dec. 6, 1950	Germany	Latin America	1,100,000
Do	Portugal	United States	28,000
Dec. 8, 1950	French North Africa.	Latin America	410,000
Do	Netherlands.	Canada	285,000
Dec. 13, 1950	Greece	United States	100,000
Do	Formosa	Japan	5,000
Dec. 15, 1950	Norway	United States	350,000
Dec. 20, 1950	Greece	Latin America	1,050,000
Do	do	United States	645,000
Dec. 21, 1950	France	Latin America	5,000,000
Do	do	United States	3,068,000
Do	do	Canada	1,200,000
Do	French North Africa.	Latin America	570,000
	Total procurement authorizations.		15,113,000

At the quoted procurement price of copper at wholesale the authorizations should be

sufficient to procure about 60,000,000 pounds, or 30,000 short tons, of copper or copper products.

In 1945 the reported exports of copper totaled but 48,563 short tons, and the domestic consumption that year was reported at 1,542,403 short tons. Of the reported domestic consumption in 1945, the uses to which the copper was put is shown by the table following:

	Tons
Cathodes	258,719
Wire bars	562,404
Ingots and ingot bars	275,944
Cakes and slabs	163,023
Billets	108,985
Other uses	10,197
Stockpiles	163,131
Total	1,542,403

At the end of 1945 it was reported the metals reserve held 565,710 tons of electrolytic and fire-refined copper in cathodes, shapes, and "in process copper," all but a small part of which was in the United States, with the remainder in Canada.

Will We Continue Being "Taken for a Ride"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Courthouse (Ohio) Record-Herald of December 20, 1950:

WILL WE CONTINUE BEING "TAKEN FOR A RIDE"?

Only a few months ago we heard Congressman CLARENCE BROWN make this statement before a meeting of the Washington Rotary Club here: "Some day our country will realize that we cannot buy friendship with mere dollars."

How true that statement was is reflected in developments during the past few months and weeks and how often those who heard him must have remembered what BROWN said.

Today we find many of our alleged friendly nations practically blackmailing this Nation for money and other help under threat of going communistic if we do not come across with plenty of money and even send our own soldiers over to protect them. They show little interest in protecting themselves.

We have dropped to a low degree in our acceptance, if not our understanding, of national and political morality.

It has been preached to us by those with vision for years, but we seemed to be cynical about such old fogey talk. We preferred to take a joy ride with the crowd that told us to follow them and get something for nothing. Easy living, plenty of money, even if it was borrowed, and no responsibility was the popular trend.

Now we are beginning to realize that we, or somebody, must pay the piper.

In the last 18 years our Nation's history is filled with incidents, which politics, based on the purchased vote with Government funds or favors, produced. The principles of integrity, soundness, and honest thrift have been discarded. Independence, dignity, and honest effort have been neglected as empty words. Cynicism is the rule rather than the exception.

We see supposedly friendly nations creating situations which they say demand our money, our arms, and other material considerations. Isn't it time to call a halt on some of this foolishness and take a stand of our own. We are more likely to regain respect that way, than to keep patting them on the back and telling them we'll take care of them.

What has happened that caused our leadership to fall to such a low degree? Have we gone so far that we cannot recover our poise, our belief in sound government, and a willingness to save ourselves by following a different type of leadership which tells us the truth about ourselves and makes us face realities?

The chickens are coming home to roost and we are beginning to see how shallow our past 15 years of policy has become. We have helped to produce softness at home and abroad among alleged friends and we are being paid back in discouragement, petty jealousies, bickering, dependency, and in many cases what amounts almost to betrayal.

We need a rededication of ourselves to the principles of those who gave us our Constitution. We need to be made to realize how far we have drifted away from the teachings of the patriotic men who founded our Government.

Have we the will and stamina to do this? We do not have to become isolationists to the point of refusing money or help where we definitely know it is going to be used properly and will do some good. But we had better get off this gravy train notion of throwing money, material, and our soldiers to the four winds.

It will buy us neither help nor friendship.

In the Name of Jesus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio sermon delivered on the Chapel Hour over WBCM on Sunday, December 10, 1950, at 5:30 p. m., by Frederick Andrew Roblee:

"Then they left the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the name"—(Acts 5: 41 (R. S. V.)).

In the name of Jesus! What tremendous chapters in world history have been written in His name and under His banner! In this very critical time let us take courage as we consider again the tremendous story of the Christian witness in the past and today.

After the resurrection, the followers of Jesus went everywhere preaching the gospel and doing good in His name. They discovered that through the faith which He made possible, there was real power. Among the disciples, Paul, most clearly of all, saw that the new religion was not for Jews only but was for every man. Going first to his own countrymen—the Jews—in many cities of that first century Greek and Roman world, he did not content himself merely with trying to win them but turned also to the Gentiles. Thus very quickly Christianity moved out from its Jewish cradle.

WERE CALLED CHRISTIANS

The followers of Jesus, who were derisively called Christians, were first persecuted by the Jews, and then by the Romans. The accusations against the disciples were fantastic. The Romans said that they were atheists and were given to gross immorality and even cannibalism. They were described as "enemies of the human race" and everything possible was done to get them to renounce their loyalty to Christ. Everyone knows of the awful persecutions which the Emperor Nero inflicted upon them, as early as A. D. 64. All that was required of a Christian to escape a terrible death was to plead "not guilty" of belonging to the church and of being willing to burn incense to the gods. Nevertheless in spite of all abuse, the vast majority of Christians remained steadfast in their love for Christ, and the church grew.

Then in the year A. D. 313, a momentous turn came. The Emperor Constantine issued the Edict of Milan which granted freedom of religion and he himself became increasingly sympathetic to the Christian Church. Under his presidency, the famous council of Nicaea was held in 325 to discuss the doctrine of Jesus Christ. The influence of this formulation of doctrine is still strong in the church. By this time, the so-called barbarians were pressing fiercely in upon the frontiers of the Roman Empire which had become weaker and weaker. They were called barbarians then but some day they were to be known as the Germans, the French, the British, and the Italians. These invading hordes simply moved in and took over. The Gothic Chieftain Alaric captured and burned part of Rome in 410. Of course, there was great consternation. Many felt that the bottom had dropped out of everything. Seeking to lay the blame somewhere, the Romans accused the Christians of weakening and undermining the empire. A famous and effective answer to this criticism was given by Augustine, a North African bishop, in his book, The City of God. He rightly pointed out that the purposes of God do not stand or fall with the man-made city of Rome. Dark and tragic as those times were, Christians, in the name of Jesus, sought to win the barbarians, who were really the new European peoples, and in this they were amazingly successful. Augustine and those who followed his leading in being faithful to Christ were the harbingers of western civilizations.

However, there were many mistakes and difficulties ahead. Little by little the bishop of Rome had taken to himself the authority of pope. At first this word which means father was used of any bishop and the bishops of the church stood more or less on an equal footing with another. But the papacy emerged with increasing prestige and power as the bishop of Rome pressed his claim. His authority, however, was never recognized in the east, and the split between the eastern church and the western church became greater and greater. This unfortunate separation between Christians together with the growing temporal power of the popes made for much trouble. Although monasticism, the separating of oneself from the world to live a distinctly religious life, produced many noble and notable Christians, it also stood for a double standard of devotion and service to God. The idea that there are two standards—one for the rank and file of Christian people and another for the more devoted—was and still is far different from the New Testament position of the full responsibility of all. Another great evil of this period was the conversion of people en masse, sometimes at the point of the sword. As the king or feudal lord went, so also the people were supposed to go.

Of course, in the long period of 1000 years following the fall of the Roman Empire in

476, a period which is known as the Middle Ages, there were many notable expressions of love and truth as well as evil and bloodshed. Nor was this period without its courage and its chivalry. The armed fighter of the Middle Ages was the knight on horseback. He was a part of the feudal system but within the limitations and monstrous evils of this system, a knight was often a man of high honor and integrity who had come to his position by the road of hard self-discipline. Tennyson's Idylls of the King and Sir Walter Scott's Ivanhoe unquestionably idealize the situation very greatly but there was and still is about the thought of knighthood that which quickens not only the blood but also the mind and the heart. Even in our times, knighthood has its symbolic place.

THE REFORMATION

By the fourteenth century more and more serious perversions of the gospel had developed. Those who sought reform, such as John Wycliffe, in England, and John Huss, in Bohemia, were often treated very cruelly. John Huss was burned at the stake. But the spirit of God was moving in the hearts of men and the revival of learning and art, known as the renaissance, together with the invention of printing, gunpowder, and the discovery of the New World, opened the door upon a new era. There were many reformers before Martin Luther and by his day the underlying conditions were such that reformation was possible in the church; a reformation that was to shake not only the church but most of Europe to the foundations. In essence the Reformation was a return to the most simple and basic teachings and ways of the New Testament. It stood for the open Bible in the common language. Authority in all matters of faith and life was seen to be the Bible, when reverently and intelligently read under the guidance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The Reformation is a great story in itself. In the name of Jesus, Luther and Melanchthon accomplished much in Germany; Zwingli and Calvin in Switzerland; and Knox and Cranmer in Scotland and England.

The coming of Christianity to America is a very great and wonderful story also. The members of the Church of England settled in Virginia; the Calvinistic Puritans and Pilgrims in New England; the Dutch Reformed in New York; the Baptists in Rhode Island; the Roman Catholics in Maryland; and the Quakers in Pennsylvania. The Scotch and Irish Presbyterians and the Methodists did not localize geographically but spread everywhere. In his monumental seven-volume work, A History of the Expansion of Christianity, Yale historian Dr. Kenneth Scott Latourette calls the period from 1800 to 1914 "the great century" and it was just that for protestant Christianity expanded not only throughout North America but from North America to Latin America, Africa, and Asia. The nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century has been a period of great missionary activity, comparable even to the work of Paul and Peter in the Roman world of the first century. In the name of Jesus, men and women have gone to every part of the earth to preach, to teach and to heal. It is a vast tremendous story, and the end is not yet. Something happened in 1914 that profoundly shook the optimism that prevailed during the early years of this century. With vivid accuracy, Dr. Latourette entitles the last volume of his great work, Advance Through Storm. It was never a more appropriate title than tonight.

ADVANCE THROUGH STORM

What does it mean, today, to advance through storm in the name of Jesus? If we are to understand this century we must see that mankind, for some time now, has been experiencing the birth pangs of world community. Four major factors have combined to make world community both possible and necessary. They are changes in the political, economic, technological, and religious aspects of modern life. World community is not an evil, not something to be feared and prevented if possible, but something in the plan and purpose of God. World community is a vast good but it is coming and can come into existence only with much struggle and sacrifice. Since the turn of the century, the great issue has been and continues to be progress toward world community, or else. Back of the headlines tonight, this is the fundamental issue. The next few weeks may see the end of the United Nations (and with it, that best hope we have for world peace in our time) or, under the awful blows of necessity, this world organization may become the new instrument for effective world cooperation, freedom, and peace. It seems to me that now is the time for all clear-thinking people to stand firm, not only against aggression, but even more for the essential unity of mankind. The most heartening thing tonight is the large measure of such unity and such united action among the peoples and nations which have already suffered so much through the devastation of war.

A hundred years ago, in the midst of a profound internal crisis, Abraham Lincoln said, "This Nation cannot long remain half slave and half free." The same words apply to the whole world tonight. This modern world cannot remain half slave and half free; half starved and half well fed; half pagan and half Christian. It will go in either one or the other direction. The true followers of Jesus have never feared to stand up and be counted on the side of humanity; on the side of truth, fairness, and brotherhood. From the days of William Carey, in India, and David Livingstone, in Africa, modern missionaries in the name of Jesus have been bearers of new life and new hope. In 10,000 needy places in the world the missionary has demonstrated better ways to think, to live, and to make man's life in the world more as God wants it to be. This is no time to pull in but rather to reach out with the Gospel of Christ; reach out to all men, even to the Communists.

Do we stand with Christ or against Him? We cannot really be neutral, you know. We must be for, or we are against. It is not easy to stand for the things He stands for. Peter and the other apostles were ordered not to preach in His name. They were beaten, imprisoned, and tortured unto death, but they rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor for His name. Shall we help to write the story of the second half of the twentieth century in His name? Through faith there is power—sufficient power—in the name of Jesus.

His Three GI "Fathers" Say Farewell to a Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article published in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star on December 25, 1950, by Hal Boyle, entitled "His Three GI 'Fathers' Say Farewell to a Boy":

HIS THREE GI "FATHERS" SAY FAREWELL TO A BOY

(By Hal Boyle)

KIMPO AIR BASE, KOREA, December 25.—Three young American bachelor soldiers wanted to bid their adopted son good-by.

Everybody was earnest and solemn. The three young dads felt it was farewell forever. Their little son they had come to love was too young to realize it was a real leave taking. but he felt the seriousness around him and was bewildered by it.

He is 7 years old—a tiny cherub-faced Korean boy, wearing a neatly tailored GI uniform and a fine warm fur and leather Korean cap. In the center of the cap gleamed two polished letters—U. S.

His three fathers had brushed up the best they could, but they weren't as fresh or as sharply pressed as their son.

This they didn't mind for like any parents, their minds were on their son. They had done the best they could for him. He was a symbol to them of what they wanted most in life—to be married and have happy children. And they were proud of him.

He looked so clean and healthy as he stood there, compared with the hundreds of ragged, shriveled, sick-faced Korean children around him. They were being evacuated by air from the war zone to an island off South Korea. He was one of the lucky among the abandoned kids of wartime Korea. The three GI's had found him alone and uncared for in a land too swept by the disaster of strife to take care of parentless children.

They were glad, and yet their hearts hurt, as they looked for the last time at the small human miracle they had wrought.

"We picked him up in a railroad yard about 3 weeks ago," said the first father, Sgt. John Braman, of Green Bay, Wis. "All he had on was an undershirt and a bunch of rags."

"He had filthy sores all over him," said the second prideful father, Corp. David A. Said, of Belen, N. Mex. "Bet you can't find a sore on him now. Just look at him."

"He brushes his teeth now," said the third father, Corp. Arthur Densmore, of Wilder, Vt. The other two listened respectfully. They agreed that although Densmore is a quiet fellow he had done the most for our boy.

When they had heard about the evacuation of Korean orphans, the three GI's inquired of the chaplain who was organizing it. He told them honestly the boy would be safer with the others. They were worried that if things get worse they couldn't take care of him. So here they stood, still unreconciled to giving him up, taking snapshots of their boy until the plane door closed and carried him out of their lives.

"We call him Syngman Rhee—after the President of Korea—because he said his name was Rhee," said the first daddy. The second one stuffed a big wad of money in the pocket of their child. Corporal Densmore, the quiet one, said nothing. He clicked his camera. I don't think he dared to look up.

A Korean interpreter called to the child in his own language. "Dont forget to brush your teeth."

Tiny "Syngman" Rhee bowed three times to his American parents—one of whom is only 18 years old. He smiled uncertainly.

"What else must I do?"

This was translated. The three men looked the other way. Young men hate to have their tears seen.

"It's better this way," muttered one. "He will be with kids his own age. We were just spoiling him anyway."

"Yeah," growled another. "We might have to pull out and leave him, crying at the end of the runway."

Corporal Densmore still said nothing. He kept staring into his camera and clicking the shutter.

The big transport wheeled out. The fathers started walking off. They turned to look at the plane just once. Then they kept on walking, one reaching down to pick up two stones. He beat them together in his hand as he walked.

The "Defeat" That Means Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I set forth herewith a thoughtful and thought-provoking article by David Lawrence which appeared in the December 22 issue of United States News and World Report. I believe my colleagues will find it helpful at this critical time.

THE "DEFEAT" THAT MEANS VICTORY
(By David Lawrence)

We have been reversed on the field of battle in Korea. We have left behind under the white crosses some of the bravest men of our times.

They have died in a great cause. They have aroused a disillusioned world to the sad fact that hypocrisy instead of sincerity has permeated the policies of certain countries which usually profess Christian attitudes. Alas, from governments pledged under the sacred Charter of the United Nations to uphold law and justice and to resist aggression has come now a craven desire to abandon principle to expediency. This is a worse defeat than we have suffered on the battlefield. For it means a compromise with evil, a willingness to offer up the whole population of South Korea to massacre, to admit that the crime of aggression does pay.

Let us go back to the fateful days of last June, when an aggressor army crossed the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea to invade and attack. The United Nations resolutely declared that our Armed Forces must be mobilized to resist the aggressor. A mission of enforcement was given to General MacArthur—to defeat the aggressor and to liberate all of Korea.

Now it turns out that certain member nations didn't mean what they said. It is revealed that, all during the time that General MacArthur was pressing northward, he was being urged through diplomatic channels—and through sniping dispatches from Europe—not to antagonize the enemy, not to liberate Korea, not to use all the force at his command to achieve a military objective. He was supposed to hesitate somewhere along the way, first at the thirty-eighth parallel perhaps, and then somewhere in North Korea. He was supposed to pause while the politicians of the UN waited to hear the faithless words of the Soviet and Chinese Communists as they were asked to withdraw and pledge themselves to accept UN rule in all Korea. The plea was broadcast. It was defiantly rejected by the Communists.

Instead, the Communist radio warned periodically that MacArthur must not cross the thirty-eighth parallel with his forces and that all foreign troops must leave Korea at once. Some UN members behave now as if these warnings should have been heeded—that MacArthur should have ceased to regard himself as a military commander and should have moved his troops north only with the permission of the aggressors. In reality, our friends in the UN are saying that MacArthur should never have endeavored to complete his mission, which was to liberate all of Korea.

Certainly MacArthur's knowledge of what was happening in a military sense in the north was inadequate. The enemy which was concentrated across the Manchurian border didn't send him word of what was being planned. Should MacArthur, therefore, have refused to test out the enemy's intentions? Would the UN really have been satisfied to halt its forces of liberation indefinitely at the waist of Korea in manifest fear that the Soviet-Chinese Communist alliance might possibly attack us if we ever attempted to finish the assigned task?

General MacArthur had a right to proceed to the Yalu River to complete his mission. His orders, however, prevented him from sending planes to reconnoiter above the Chinese border. When Chinese "volunteers" arrived in North Korea in huge numbers as early as October 19, Communist China had forfeited any right to immunity from either attack or reconnaissance. We had a right on that very date to bomb the bases of supply of the enemy in Manchuria. General MacArthur has described the restrictions imposed on his freedom of action as an enormous handicap without precedent in military history.

Again and again on the battlefield there must be an offensive to probe an enemy position. General MacArthur's advance was a huge maneuver attended with grave risks. It was a maneuver of detection. The revelations which flowed from it reached far beyond the battle zone itself. Most important of all is the detection of a real weakness among the UN member governments themselves.

We are back to 1936, when Britain and France equivocated and the League of Nations faltered as Hitler committed his aggression in the Rhineland.

We are back to vacillation and timidity—to fears of loss of commerce and unwillingness to face resolutely the facts of international life. We are at the low point where immorality breaks the promises that men are supposed to live by.

Like the bolt at Pearl Harbor, our defeat in Korea may turn out to be the stimulus to victory. It will alert the American people and all defenders of principle and morality in the world. For it has revealed where hypocrisy reigns and where morality survives. It has exposed the irresoluteness of our allies in a critical hour. Our troops in Korea have made a painful sacrifice, but they have stirred the conscience of the world—the forerunner of a victory for truth.

Martin Gorski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 8, 1950

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Martin Gorski was a gentleman and a scholar. With his passing the Committee on the Judiciary and the House lost one of its valued and valuable Members. When he was elected to the Seventy-eighth Congress in 1942, we who had the honor of serving as members of the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy investigated his record carefully before we would accept him as one of our members, for that subcommittee must have not only experts in that field but also men who are hardworking and who will assume and perform their duties studiously.

That investigation was bipartisan. We consulted the bench and bar of Chicago, as well as the bar associations of the city and county. We found that he had served as master in chancery of the Superior Court of Cook County, Ill., for some 14 years. In that most responsible branch of the court's work he had to do with equity receiverships which are cases in the State courts most nearly analogous to bankruptcies. His record had been not only spotless but his attention to duty and dispatch of business were remarkable. The bar associations of which he was an honored member, certified that he was there held in high esteem, both for his friendliness and high character.

We had the pleasure of working with him in the intimacy of the Committee on the Judiciary including the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy during the entire time of his service in Congress, until he left us, having been called by his Maker to higher service.

He won the affectionate regard of each of his colleagues soon after he began his work with us and he increased that regard with every month of his service. It was a privilege to know him and to work with him and enjoy his friendship.

Let's Get Out of Korea, Stay Out of Europe, Bring Our Boys Home, Build Up Our Own Defenses, and Save America From Destruction—Speech of Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy, Former United States Ambassador to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, December 21, I inserted in the RECORD a speech of former President Herbert Hoover which I hope that every American will read.

Today I am inserting a speech of another great American, Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy, our former Ambassador to Great Britain, which was delivered before the University of Virginia Law School on December 12. I hope every Member of both Houses, as well as every other American, will take the time to read it.

If we will follow the sage advice of these two great Americans, we can save our country from disaster and make of

it the richest, most prosperous, and most powerful nation the world has even seen.

Mr. Kennedy's address reads as follows:

Lincoln in his famous Springfield speech said: "If we could first know where we are, and whether we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."

It seems to me wise to see where we have come from VJ-day and where we are now. The objectives before us at that time were (1) to work out a just peace, (2) to create means for the preservation of peace, (3) to assist in the rehabilitation of a devastated world. In moving toward those objectives, we assumed in 1945 that they were common to all the Allied Nations. We learned in a short time that this was not the case, but that in communism a force was at work which was intent on dominating Europe and Asia for its own ends. Our problem since that time has been how to deal with this drive of communism.

As far back as March 18, 1946, I set forth in Life magazine what I considered should be the fundamentals of American policy. The first and foremost of these was that we should make and keep ourselves strong. Fundamental to any successful dealing with the world, was the maintenance here in the United States of a high standard of living. Whatever concrete actions might be suggested, to bankrupt this Nation in the pursuit of them, would mean our self-destruction. I was not against generosity—generosity within our means. I supported, for example, our initial $3,000,000,000 loan to Britain. I went further than that. I said in the New York Times of March 4, 1946: "Financial aid to the United Kingdom * * * is and should be an outright gift." But from the start I had no patience with a policy—what has become known as the Truman doctrine—that, without due regard to our resources—human and material—would make commitments abroad that we could not fulfill. As Ambassador to London in 1939, I had seen the folly of this when the British made their commitment to Poland—that they could not fulfill and have not yet fulfilled—a commitment that brought them into war.

I naturally opposed communism but I said, if portions of Europe or Asia wish to go communistic or even have communism thrust upon them, we cannot stop it. Instead we must make sure of our strength and be certain not to fritter it away in battles that could not be won.

But where are we now? Beginning with intervention in the Italian elections and financial and political aid to Greece and Turkey, we have expanded our political and financial programs on an almost unbelievably wide scale. Billions have been spent in the Marshall plan, further billions in the occupation of Berlin, Western Germany, and Japan. Military aid has been poured into Greece, Turkey, Iran, the nations of the North Atlantic Pact, French Indochina, and now in Korea we are fighting the fourth greatest war in our history.

What have we in return for this effort? Friends? We have far fewer friends than we had in 1945. In Europe they are still asking for our dollars but what kind of friendship have we bought there? Is Western Europe determined to preserve for itself those ideals of democracy that we have been preaching—our kind? Put to the test now as to whether she will arm herself effectively, even with our aid, to deal with the Russian threat, is she showing the kind of determination and the kind of will that amounts to anything? Plans for economic unification have fallen apart in the light of nationalistic differences. French military power is only a shadow of its former self, and a strong minority of Communist sympathizers keeps France in endless political turmoil. The military strength of Britain is one-fourth of what it was in 1946 and she shows every inclination to avoid the heavy burdens that would be involved in rebuilding it. West Germany, to date, has revealed no disposition to develop effective military strength. Italy is hopelessly ineffective and Greece can hardly police her own small territory. Where is there in all Europe any buffer against a massed Russian onslaught? Worse than this, where is there any determination to create such a buffer?

In the Middle East we have oil but no friends. Iran, Pakistan, even Egypt, seek neither our protection nor our influence. In the Far East, China, whose friendship with us seemed deep-seated and enduring, has a government which is now massing against us powerful armies and new vengeful hatreds. Indonesia, Malay, Indochina are in revolt or heavy with discontent at the influences we represent. India is showing signs of succumbing to influences other than ours, more indigenous and more palatable to her desires. In Korea we are spending thousands of American lives to accomplish an objective from which the sponsor—the UN—is retreating. Assume we stop the Reds somewhere across the belt of that peninsula, are we to continue fighting there indefinitely?

On the other side of the iron curtain are massed manpower and military strength of a type that the world has never seen. Divisions which total in the many hundreds and which we know are well equipped and have the capacity to fight, can be thrown into battle anywhere on that great land mass that stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They are backed by planes of high quality and great quantity. Russia's Navy includes a powerful fleet of submarines, many off the mainland of southeast Asia, and in all probability she, too, has the atomic bomb.

To engage these vast armies on the European or the Asian continent is foolhardy, but that is the direction toward which our policy has been tending.

That policy is suicidal. It has made us no foul weather friends. It has kept our armament scattered over the globe. It has picked one battlefield and threatens to pick others impossibly removed from our sources of supply. It has not contained communism. By our methods of opposition it has solidified communism, where otherwise communism might have bred within itself internal dissensions. Our policy today is politically and morally a bankrupt policy.

I can see no alternative other than having the courage to wash up this policy and start with the fundamentals I urged more than 5 years ago. It is absurd to believe that the United Nations can lead us out of this situation. The veto power alone makes it a hopeless instrumentality for world peace. The unwillingness of half the world to want world peace makes impossible effective organization to impose any such peace. In short, our chief source of reliance must be ourselves and we cannot sacrifice ourselves to save those who do not seem to wish to save themselves.

A first step in the pursuit of this policy is to get out of Korea—indeed, to get out of every point in Asia which we do not plan realistically to hold in our own defense. Such a policy means that in the Pacific we will pick our own battlegrounds if we are forced to fight and not have them determined by political and ideological considerations that have no relationship to our own defense.

The next step in pursuit of this policy is to apply the same principle to Europe. Today it is idle to talk of being able to hold the line of the Elbe or the line of the Rhine. Why should we waste valuable resources in making such an attempt? If the weakened European nations wish to hold that line and demonstrate a determination to do so, it may be that we can afford them some help. But to pour arms and men into a quixotic military adventure makes no sense whatever. What have we gained by staying in Berlin? Everyone knows we can be pushed out the moment the Russians choose to push us out. Isn't it better to get out now and use the resources, that would otherwise be sacrificed, at a point that counts?

The billions that we have squandered on these enterprises could have been far more effectively used in this hemisphere and on the seas that surround it. Had we the defenses in Iceland today that one-hundredth of the money spent in Berlin could have built, we would have purchased safety with our money rather than added danger. We need defenses in this hemisphere, in Canada, in the Caribbean, and in Latin America. After all, these are our neighbors whose security is inevitably tied up with our own. We have no reason to believe that cooperation on their part will not be forthcoming, and we can and should insist upon it.

People will say, however, that this policy is appeasement and will not contain communism. Will our present policy contain it? Can we possibly contain Communist Russia, if she chooses to march, by a thin, far-flung battle line in the middle of Europe? The truth is that our only real hope is to keep Russia, if she chooses to march, on the other sides of the Atlantic and Pacific and make communism much too costly for her to try to cross the seas. It may be that Europe for a decade or a generation or more will turn communistic. But in doing so it may break of itself as a unified force. Communism still has to prove itself to its peoples as a government that will achieve for them a better way of living. The more people that it will have to govern the more necessary it becomes for those who govern to justify themselves to those being governed. The more peoples that are under its yoke the greater are the possibilities of revolt. Moreover, it seems certain that communism spread over Europe will not rest content with being governed by a handful of men in the Kremlin. French or Italian Communists will soon develop splinter organizations that will destroy the singleness that today characterizes Russian communism. Tito in Yugoslavia is already demonstrating this fact. Mao in China is not likely to take his orders too long from Stalin, especially when the only non-Asiatics left upon Asiatic soil to fight are the Russians.

As I said, this policy will be criticized as appeasement. No word is more mistakenly used. Is it appeasement to withdraw from unwise commitments, to arm yourself to the teeth, and to make clear just exactly how and for what you will fight? If it is wise in our interest not to make commitments that endanger our security, and this is appeasement, then I am for appeasement. I can recall only too well the precious time bought by Chamberlain at Munich. I applauded that purchase then, though not how it was squandered; I would applaud it today. Today, however, while we have avoided a Munich, we are coming perilously close to another Dunkerque. Personally, I should choose to escape the latter.

Finally, people will say this policy is turning our back on the United Nations. To this there are two answers. Firstly, we cannot bear substantially the whole burden of the United Nations. In Korea we have 9 times as many troops in the field as all the United Nations put together. We have suffered 90 times the number of casualties that all the other United Nations have suffered, excluding only the South Koreans. And note the billions that we have advanced these nations as against the help they are giving us in Korea. A recent compilation sets up a very impressive balance sheet.

UNITED KINGDOM

Aid received and allocated

Five billion eight hundred and sixty-one million dollars since the war and $30,387,-

000,000 during the war, plus $2,000,000,000 in 1951.

Aid given in Korea

Six thousand ground troops in Korea and in Korean waters, 1 aircraft carrier, 4 cruisers, 1 aircraft maintenance ship, 7 destroyers, and 8 frigates.

FRANCE

Aid received and allocated

Two billion, five hundred and eighty-one million dollars during war, $3,717,000,000 since war, plus $3,170,000,000, military aid requested in 1951.

Aid given in Korea

Infantry battalion of 1,000 men, 1 patrol gunboat, and medical supplies.

NETHERLANDS

Aid received and allocated

One hundred and forty-five million dollars during war and $1,021,000,000 since war.

Aid given in Korea

Six hundred and thirty infantry and one destroyer.

BELGIUM

Aid received and allocated

Sixty-eight million dollars during war and $599,000,000 since 1945.

Aid given in Korea

Infantry battalion of 1,000 men yet to arrive, air transport, and 400 tons of sugar.

TURKEY

Aid received and allocated

Thirty-five million dollars during war and $259,000,000 since 1945.

Aid given in Korea

One infantry combat force of 5,000 men and serums and vaccines.

CANADA

Aid received and allocated

Six and one-half million dollars' credit.

Aid given in Korea

Three hundred and fifty men now fighting in Korea, 1,000 more en route, and 10,000 in training for service; 1 air transport squadron of 12 planes and 3 destroyers.

GREECE

Aid received and allocated

Seventy-nine million dollars during war, $1,138,000,000 since 1945.

Aid given in Korea

Seven hundred to eight hundred men, arriving this week, and six planes.

AUSTRALIA

Aid received and allocated

Seventeen million dollars, chiefly in credits, evenly divided in war and postwar.

Aid given in Korea

One thousand men, plus reinforcements, 1 RAAF squadron of 40 fighter planes, 2 destroyers, and 1 frigate, medical supplies, food.

SWEDEN

Aid received and allocated

Five million dollars during war and $57,000,000 since 1945, of which $40,000,000 was in grants.

Aid given in Korea

One field hospital unit.

NORWAY

Aid received and allocated

Thirty-one million dollars during war and $193,000,000 since 1945.

Aid given in Korea

No fighting men. Some merchant ships.

NEW ZEALAND

Aid received and allocated

No credits listed.

Aid given in Korea

One combat unit, 2 frigates, and 200 to 300 tons of dried peas.

DENMARK

Aid received and allocated

One hundred and seventy-six million dollars since 1945.

Aid given in Korea

One hospital ship, medical supplies, and 500 tons of sugar.

ETHIOPIA

Aid received and allocated

One million dollars.

Aid given in Korea

One hundred thousand dollars, and offered 1,000 men, which have yet to be accepted.

ICELAND

Aid received and allocated

Nine million dollars since 1945 and $1,000,000 during war.

Aid given in Korea

One hundred and twenty-five tons cod-liver oil.

INDIA

Aid received and allocated

One hundred and sixty-three million dollars during war and $45,000,000 since.

Aid given in Korea

No troops, 1 field ambulance unit, 400,000 jute bags under negotiation.

This is a costly and staggering extravaganza in which we have wasted too much of our substance.

Secondly, we must recognize that the United Nations is not at present a vehicle to enforce peace. If half of the world does not wish it to operate in this fashion, as is true of Russia and China, it is idle to pretend that it can operate in that fashion. The United Nations still has a purpose for voluntary organization and as a forum in which to air international issues. Looking at the United Nations in that role, the admission of Red China or any nation presents wholly different issues than are presented if we look upon the United Nations as a type of governing body, with governing powers. But half of this world will never submit to dictation by the other half. The two can only agree to live next to each other because for one to absorb the other becomes too costly.

An attitude of realism such as this is, I submit, in accord with our historic traditions. We have never wanted a part of other people's scrapes. Today we have them and just why, nobody quite seems to know. What business is it of ours to support French colonial policy in Indochina or to achieve Mr. Syngman Rhee's concepts of democracy in Korea? Shall we now send the marines into the mountains of Tibet to keep the Dalai Lama on his throne? We can do well to mind our business and interfere only where somebody threatens our business and our homes.

The policy I suggest, moreover, gives us a chance economically to keep our heads above water. For years, I have argued the necessity for not burdening ourselves with unnecessary debts. There is no surer way to destroy the basis of American enterprise than to destroy the initiative of the men who make it. We will, of course, continue to have to pay and to pay heavily for our defense. But what have we now in hand for the billions that we have spent abroad? We can no longer afford this luxury; we dare not afford its consequences to our own security. Those who recall 1932 know too easily the dangers that can arise from within, when our own economic system fails to function. If we weaken it with lavish spending either on foreign nations or in foreign wars, we run the danger of precipitating another 1932 and of destroying the very system which we are trying to save.

An Atlas, whose back is bowed and whose hands are busy holding up the world, has no arms left to deal with his own defense. Increase his burdens and you will crush him, or attack him from behind and he cannot turn to defend himself. This is our present posture. It strangles our might. The suggestions I make would unleash our strength. They would, I am sure, give considerable pause to the strategists and planners of the Kremlin. They would—and I count this most—conserve American lives for American ends, not waste them in the freezing hills of Korea or on the battle-scarred plains of Western Germany.

New Deal, International Propagandists Still Assume To Guide Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, following their customary line of imputing a lack of knowledge, sound judgment, and loyalty to all who publicly express the belief that permitting United Nations to exercise the power of involving us in war—although United Nations has not, and apparently, in the future, will not, furnish the men or material to win a war—New Deal and internationally minded propagandists like Mellett, Tom Stokes, Marquis Childs, Drew Pearson, and others, are hard after all those who venture to question their judgment or conclusions.

The Washington Times-Herald of December 27 carried an editorial which called attention to some of this kind of propaganda. It reads as follows:

POLITICS MAKES STRANGE BEDFELLOWS

The propaganda on behalf of Mr. Truman's foreign policy has reached a new pitch of frenzy even as the jerry-built policy itself is falling apart, both at home and abroad. The administration's political speechmakers and its newspaper and radio organs keep telling a restive people to forget the leaking roof and the tottering foundations—that they ought to think themselves happy and snug.

THE KEPT PRESS IS OVERCOME

Applauding their propaganda while lurking discreetly in the background are the corruptionists who are making hundreds of millions of dollars out of the Marshall ECA plan, foreign military aid, and Allied grafts. They, too, continue to represent a fantastically reckless course as the best thing for everybody.

Public opinion has had to battle to make itself heard, but has overcome all resistance and has poured forth a flood of protest that has steadily mounted since the rejection of everything which Truman offered in the November election.

It wants none of the Truman foreign policy calling for the continuous expenditure of America's youth and wealth overseas. At home, it has turned thumbs down on the welfare state, the wanton dissipation of their earnings wrung from the people by the Federal spenders, and the centralization of power in the bureaucracy.

SENSE VERSUS NONSENSE

The policy that the people demand calls for the security and solvency of the United States before everything. They reject the idea that American strength be frittered away in Europe as it has been in Korea. They want the Military Establishment to stand on guard within defensible limits in this hemisphere and its island outposts.

They insist that America not be undermined from within by a prodigal expenditure of its wealth on world saving fantasies and on political stunts to buy up votes and souls in the name of a security that grows ever shakier as the inflation of the currency progresses.

It is the object of the propagandists and the corruptionists to convince the people, against their own good sense, that they really want none of the things for which they are crying, and that Mr. Truman and Secretary of State Acheson know best.

Thus, one newspaper uses the caption "Hoover's policy is deadly" to dispose editorially of the patriotically American ex-President who expressed with entire clarity the people's wishes on foreign policy.

A political commentator of the administration faith says that Mr. Truman has accepted the Republican challenge on foreign policy, implying that the overwhelming sentiment of the people is merely a bit of partisan sniping at an accepted national policy.

Marquis Childs, an inveterate New Deal horn blower, devotes himself to eulogizing John Foster Dulles, the kept Republican in the New Deal State Department, as if the only Republican worth listening to is one whom Acheson leads on a leash.

THE PENTAGON PROPAGANDA

The Pentagon propagandists, marshalled in offensive deployment by Tracy Voorhees, a Wall Street lawyer installed as Secretary of the Army, are working up a campaign in support of further involvement in Europe. Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall harangues a selected audience of industrial, farm, and union leaders on the theme that he can't trust the American people—that they don't seem to want to accept a perpetual garrison state.

He complains that they dismantle the armies after wars and aren't eager to support huge tax burdens year in and year out to maintain the administration's correctional role throughout the world. General Marshall seems to consider this a personal affront. Like Truman and Acheson, he knows best.

Senator DOUGLAS of Illinois has even gone to the ludicrous length of complaining that the press should not have published Truman's self-revealing letter threatening to punch a music critic who did not flatter the President's singing daughter. Senator DOUGLAS says that it disturbs "unity" to print communications in which Truman exposes his own instability and pathetic limitations.

THEY HEAR FROM HOME

Such are the bedfellows who are trying to induce the American people to ruin themselves in foreign adventures. The self-styled "liberals" in their antagonism to the Republic, appear to prefer any foreign government or any combination of foreign governments to our own. They work hand-in-hand with the corruptionists who are cashing in and with the politicians and political generals who rise as the rest of the Nation is prostrated.

They and their newspaper and radio organs soft-pedal Truman's corruption, his vote stealing, his incompetence. But all of these people are hearing from home.

Acheson may have heard from his spiritual home in England, but the Members of Congress have heard from American homes, except, possibly, those in the Hartford convention States and from Aaron Burr's adopted State of New York.

The will of the people will prevail, as it must if America is to be saved.

Fortunately, former President Herbert Hoover, evidently fearful of what might befall the Nation at the end of the road which the administration is following, spoke out. He called attention to the self-evident truth that we cannot, by armed might, force our thought, our ways, upon all the rest of the world, much of which wants none of either.

More recently, the senior member of the other body from Virginia has given utterance to another thought which millions of Americans have entertained for a long—long time. He said that it was time for us to get out of Korea.

Both those at the head of our Armed Forces and some in the State Department have told us that we did not need nor want Korea; that we could not by force hold Korea. Yet, Mr. Truman, by his orders, insofar as he could, committed us to world war III.

Only last night, a member of the other body representing Massachusetts, speaking to a Rotary Club in Boston, said that the United States "couldn't deliver" on its promise to "stop aggression at any place and at any time." He said, "In the future, we must get as strong as possible and as fast as possible." He criticized the "error of making big statements and big commitments without the strength to back them up," and added, "Take the UN, for instance. Where is its force when it comes time to stop aggression? The United States had to put up five-sixths of the UN forces finally. That was enough for Korea, but inadequate for the Chinese Reds. We have promised to stop aggression any place any time, but we can't deliver."

The Americans who, with their lives and their resources, will be required to pay for world war III, do not even know why they are called upon to fight that war. They do not know its purpose. They have no means of knowing whether they can win that war.

They do know that they are now called upon by the administration and the international propagandists to fight, some of them to die—all of them to participate in the cost of that war.

Today, as always, those who pay the least, are loudest in their demands that others do the fighting, the dying, the paying.

Stop Doling Out Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, more and more it is dawning upon the public mind that our economic lifeblood is being drained away by the internationalists who have for a long time been playing into the hands of the Communists.

The article which appears in the December 27 issue of the Pathfinder by Mr. Graham Patterson, its publisher, is directly in point. There is no evidence whatever that this Democratic-New Deal-Fair Deal administration is doing one thing to cut down nonessential Government expenditures at this time of our national crisis. Under leave to extend, I am inserting the article mentioned above, entitled "Stop Doling Out Dollars":

STOP DOLING OUT DOLLARS

The disastrous turn of events on the international scene has brought into sharper focus than ever before the vitally urgent need for every economy by our Government—and the wholehearted loyalty of every citizen.

Early this month, President Truman asked for $18,000,000,000 in additional appropriations, necessitated by our greatly magnified defense needs. We face a grim and costly future, for our defense expenditures will be steadily greater. Even without all-out war, America would of necessity have to make itself an armed camp, and with all possible speed. And it is apparent to everyone by this time that we will have to remain an armed camp—at a staggering cost—as long as Russia is ruled by its power-mad clique of aggressors.

Part of Russia's plan to conquer us is to bleed us dry economically, to make us waste our substance, until financial and economic chaos makes us a choice plum ripe for the plucking. Why, then, should we work in our enemy's interest by continuing unnecessary drains on our financial lifeblood?

It is time to forget socialistic plans, time to stop doling out dollars in handouts, time to stop the incredible waste of the taxpayers' money in governmental extravagance. Taxes are already discouragingly high.

The Tax Foundation of New York recently published a comprehensive review of governmental spending and taxation. It pointed out that welfare programs, modestly started under the goad of depression, paid out more than $5,500,000,000 in 1949, and indications are that greater amounts will be spent in the decade ahead. The programs were not condemned; the point raised was the danger in such expenditures when the people already are under a heavy tax load, and the combined Federal-State-local public debt has reached a frightening $281,000,000,000.

Today a complete overhauling of the grossly padded public payroll is a must. Several weeks ago, a special congressional subcommittee reported that investigation of the Treasury Department and part of the Labor Department disclosed gross overstaffing, falsified work reports, and dissipation of funds. It pointed out as an example of Government extravagance which prevails in obscure places that Coast Guard headquarters, a part of the Treasury Department, has eight admirals on its staff.

In the Bureau of Labor Statistics the committee reported that an appropriation of $1,000,000 intended to revise the Bureau's cost-of-living index was dissipated through "gross overstaffing, inferior planning, untrained supervision, and improvident administration. * * * Some employees were forced to falsify records by signing erroneous work progress reports" and those who demurred were threatened with punitive action.

One Bureau worker testified that he was told to appear busy in case officials appeared, and another said there were weeks at a time when there was no work to do in our office.

Such brazen mishandling of the public's funds is unforgivable at any time, but today it is akin to treason.

The Basis for Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of December 26, 1950:

THE BASIS FOR FOREIGN POLICY

What should be the basis for the foreign policy of the United States?

President Truman, in what has come to be known as the Truman doctrine, says that it should be the containment of communism, that this Nation should fight communism anywhere, and if necessary everywhere, that it threatens the peace.

Former President Herbert Hoover says that the foundation of our policy must be to preserve this Nation and the Western Hemisphere.

There is an important difference between these two points of view. That difference is now being openly and widely debated for the first time in a silent decade.

The two views need not, of course, conflict always or in every particular. To fight Communist power in particular places can be an essential part of our own defense. The defense of the Western Hemisphere does not preclude, and may require, fighting Soviet power outside the Western Hemisphere. The two viewpoints can converge.

There is, moreover, similarity of purpose in the two views. The advocates of containment everywhere advocate it to save America. The objective of the others is also to stop communism from engulfing the whole world, including ourselves. They are all honorable men.

Nevertheless, the difference is vital—not for what is intended but for what results.

The Truman doctrine begins by accepting United States responsibility for defending all parts of the world from Soviet encroachment; this becomes primary policy. In effect, the United States becomes a nation without differentiated frontiers. The frontier becomes one gigantic circle around Russia's present sphere. And since the doctrine is to defend that circle everywhere, the relative values of the various points on the circle become lost. All points become more or less of equal value.

The next progression, an unintended one, is that the responsibility of other peoples to defend themselves gradually becomes secondary.

Their self-defense is, of course, definitely desirable. But since containment everywhere is viewed as essential to our ultimate safety, we soon think we must defend other countries regardless of their own efforts. And the other countries soon begin to think they do us a favor to let us defend them.

At this stage decision becomes confused. Korea, let us say, cannot be weighed on any balance. It is a point on the circle; it is a part of the general responsibility we have assumed; and so we fight for it whether or not it has great value in terms of the larger fight.

So long as the policy is to contain everywhere, there is simply no standard to distinguish among Korea, Indochina, or the Rhine—all become Koreas if the Communists choose to make them so.

From this kind of thinking there is another progression—also unintended but also inevitable.

Unconsciously we begin to make the defense of this Nation a subordinate consideration in weighing any proposed action.

If the policy is to contain everywhere and there is a threat anywhere, what room is there to debate whether to fight this particular threat will strengthen or weaken our own defenses? Unless we are to abrogate the policy there is no choice but to fight the threat anywhere. Action is automatic. The United States has then no choice but to intervene in Korea, or any other place.

The Truman doctrine thus puts the defense of this Nation second in the minds of the men whose trust is the defense of this Nation.

With the defense of this Nation as the paramount policy all this is changed. From this premise the cost of any action would be measured against the gain; the risks of intervention in any Korea would be measured against the risks of abstention.

Men would still differ in judgment. They would still debate the intervention in Korea, the rearmament of Germany, the reinforcement of Europe. All these things would still be difficult matters to decide. Even from the Hoover premise men would differ on the Hoover proposals as to what is best or prudent in a particular place.

But in the debate men would have a common plane of reference—the safety and preservation of this country. There would then be something to measure against, there would be a standard for making value judgments, a balance on which to weigh military and political opinions.

The policy of containment leaves us no choices. By trying to contain everywhere we become vulnerable everywhere and we can be truly strong nowhere. In the name of saving the world this policy deprives us of the freedom to seek out what is best to save America.

The policy of putting the safety of this Nation first is the only one which offers us a way of wisely measuring our strength against the task—or, indeed, offers any way of measuring at all. Therefore, it, and not the policy of containment everywhere, ought to be paramount in the foreign policy of the United States.

It may be argued by honorable men that this reversal of emphasis ignores morality. For in its application there may come a time when the United States, measuring what is best for her own safety, may have to make the harsh decision of abandoning temporarily some cherished bastion. And the greater obligation, it is truly said, is to preserve the world from barbarism.

To this we can only reply that there is in the world today only one power that stands in the way of that barbarism. So long as the United States stands the way is barred. So soon as it falls the whole world will be engulfed.

It will profit neither ourselves nor civilization to risk the destruction of that power in the name of saving civilization. To pursue in the name of morality a course which weakens the power of the United States would be the true immorality.

A foreign policy which puts anything ahead of the preservation of this Nation betrays the Nation and civilization.

Text of Truman's Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article appearing in the Boston Daily Globe of December 25, 1950:

TEXT OF TRUMAN'S ADDRESS

WASHINGTON, December 24.—Text of President Truman's address in connection with the national community Christmas tree ceremony today on the White House Grounds:

"All over our country and in many other parts of the world men, women, and children are preparing to celebrate the birthday of Christ.

"Never before in our lives has a Christmas seemed so important. I am not thinking of turkey dinners and stacks of gifts. I mean the quiet, reverent celebration of the faith, hope, and love—born in a manger in Bethlehem.

"Across all the continents of this world peace-loving people today feel apprehension and loneliness and fear.

"Many have forgotten the humble surroundings of the nativity and how, from a straw-littered stable, shone a light which for nearly 20 centuries has given men strength, comfort, and peace.

"At this Christmas time we should renew our faith in God. We celebrate the hour in which God came to man. It is fitting that we should turn to Him.

"Many of us are fortunate enough to celebrate Christmas at our own fireside.

"But there are many others who are away from their homes and loved ones on this day. Thousands of our boys are on the cold and dreary battlefield of Korea.

"But all of us—at home, at war, wherever we may be—are within reach of God's love and power. We all can pray. We all should pray.

"We should ask the fulfillment of God's will. We should ask for courage, wisdom, for the quietness of soul which comes alone to them who place their lives in His hands.

"We should pray for a peace which is the fruit of righteousness.

"The Nation already is in the midst of a crusade of prayer. On the last Sunday of the old year there will be special services devoted to a revival of faith.

"I call upon all of you to enlist in this common cause. I call upon you no matter what your spiritual allegiance.

"We all are joined in the fight against the tyranny of communism. Communism is godless. Democracy is the harvest of faith—faith in one's self, faith in one's neighbors, faith in God.

"Democracy's most powerful weapon is not a gun, tank, or bomb. It is faith—faith in the brotherhood and dignity of man under God.

"Let us pray at this Christmas time for the wisdom, the humility, and the courage to carry on in this faith."

Counsel of Despair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 6, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Times of December 22, 1950, is timely and apropos. Let us unite for victory—not political victory—but victory for all lovers of liberty.

COUNSEL OF DESPAIR

At a time when the United States is preparing at emergency pace against the danger of a new world war which would imperil our very existence as a free Nation it is right and proper for the American people and their

spokesmen to reexamine our present policies and to scrutinize with an increased sense of responsibility the steps we are taking to cope with the situation. Unfortunately, however, in some quarters—particularly on the Republican side of Congress—this survey is being undertaken not only in a partisan spirit and amid personal recriminations, but also in what former Secretary of War Patterson calls an atmosphere of discouragement, despair, and defeat, betraying little faith in the potentialities of either the American people or the rest of the free world. Beginning with unbridled attacks on Secretary Acheson and the State Department in the tenor of "McCarthyism," part of the Republican leadership is now attempting to launch a fundamental revisionist movement which would destroy our bipartisan foreign policy, abandon the struggle for the preservation of the free world, surrender vast additional areas (including all of Continental Europe) to Communist domination, scuttle our alliances, and retire to a new isolationism based on the Western Hemisphere and a few oceanic bases, which, under such a policy, would not long remain on our side of the struggle.

Quite obviously this movement is a panicky shock reaction to the events in Korea. Under the impact of the United Nations reverses there and of the lukewarm attitude of the General Assembly toward Chinese Communist aggression, some Republican leaders would now abandon many of the measures for which they and a substantial majority of the Republican representation in Congress have voted. In doing so they, who are among the severest critics of Yalta, are willing to contemplate a course which could only lead to a super-Yalta that even Stalin could not have dreamed of at the time. If they have any doubt as to who would be the sole beneficiary of such a course they have only to study Communist propaganda, which is hewing along much the same line.

Neither the world political situation nor the military situation in Korea provides any warrant for such a policy. On the contrary, General MacArthur himself is compelled to inveigh against the artificial nuance of disaster that has been given to a military withdrawal in the face of overwhelming forces. And even if the United Nations forces should ultimately be driven out of Korea this would merely mean that the United Nations has lost the first battle, not the war. For that war is a war against aggression in which the main foe is outside Korea—a foe against whom ample reserves can be mobilized, if necessary, and on a better battleground. That war can be lost, however, by abject fear and by the surrender of both principle and the nations willing to fight for freedom by our side. We are confident that the American people will not deliberately invite such a catastrophe.

Possums: Dumb but Numerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the December 1950 issue of the Missouri Conservationist. This magazine is published by the Missouri Conservation Commission, Jefferson City, Mo.

POSSUMS: DUMB BUT NUMEROUS

(By Frank Sampson, game biologist, furbearer studies)

"An opossum hath an head like a swine, a taile like a rat, and is of the bigness of a cat. Under the belly she hath a bagge, wherein she lodgeth, carrieth, and sucketh her young."

Thus Capt. John Smith records the opossum as native in America in his 1612 description of Virginia.

The editor of this magazine says that the opossum is so well-known to the public that the public knows nothing about it. If this be true, it is about time that we take a closer look at this plodding little fellow who always comes through with the biggest share of Missouri's fur harvest.

In the harvest of possum pelts, as reported by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Missouri ranked at the top of all other States in the 1948–49 season, with 172,789 pelts sold. Arkansas ranked second with 115,920 pelts; Texas third with 91,461 pelts, and Illinois fourth with 79,505. So, for all his reputed laziness, the opossum does deserve a lot of credit even if he neither toils nor spins.

Although his hide isn't worth very much—about 30 cents last year—he provides Missouri fur hunters and trappers with nearly one-sixth of their fur income. With rising pelt prices, it is quite possible that his hide will be worth more this year. Besides his use for fur, his edible meat and sporting qualities make him a fairly popular little beast.

Probably opossums are best known for their so-called trick of pretending to be dead, or "playing possum," when cornered. Yet their well-advertised aversion to fast movement in escaping danger has also given them a reputation for being somewhat less than bright. However this may be, the opossum may not be such a slow-poke all the time. During the past 10 years this fellow has furnished Missouri fur-takers with as many of his pelts as all the rest of Missouri's fur bearers put together. For such a dull-appearing creature this is quite a contribution, and at least speaks well for his multiplication, if not his intellect.

When it comes to multiplying, the opossum gives the celebrated cottontail rabbit a run for her money. A mature female cottontail produces a yearly average of about 17 young in 4 litters. The labor-saving opossum may produce just as many or more young and does it with only 2 litters a year. Recent studies by biologists indicate that opossum litter sizes run from 5 to 14, with an average of about 9 young per litter.

In Missouri it is generally evident that the breeding season begins with mating about the first of February and ends with the weaning of the last litter the fore part of September. Although opossums are rarely given to rushing anything, they do have the shortest gestation period of any North American mammal—only 12½ days. However, this time is made up by the young suckling 6 to 8 weeks in the mother's pouch. And, speaking of pouches—the opossum is the only mammal in this country that raises its young in a pouch, similar to the kangaroo of Australia, which is related to the opossum. Both belong to the order of marsupials.

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY TO THE OUNCE

At birth the young are quite undeveloped and for all practical purposes are still embryos. They weight 1/270 of an ounce each and are so small that a litter of 16 may be nicely accommodate in a tablespoon.

Immediately following birth the hairless, grublike youngsters squirm their way to the nipples in the mother's abdominal pouch by following a trail of milk trickling through the mother's hair. Once arrived in the pouch, formed by folds of skin on each side of the mammary glands, the young fasten onto the nipples (usually numbering 13), which become so swollen inside the youngsters' mouths that they cannot be shaken loose. Some 60 to 70 days later the young have developed hair and may occasionally venture outside the pouch. After a lapse of 90 days the young weigh around 8 ounces and are able to forage well for themselves. By the following February they are mature and ready to produce young of their own.

The adults weigh from 4 to 12 pounds, with males running slightly larger than females, and average about 2½ feet long from the nose to the tip of the tail. The tail, about 12½ inches long, is prehensile, another peculiarity of the opossum shared by no other North American mammal. This ability to wrap the tail around a limb and hang on undoubtedly comes in very handy to the tree-loving opossum. Other peculiarities possessed by the opossum, and found in no other wild mammal on this continent, include a grasping, clawless thumb on the hind foot and the most teeth, numbering 50 altogether.

Like most prolific animals, the opossum probably lives a relatively short time. Although he has been credited with a life span of as much as 8 years, some observers feel that his life in Missouri may be considerably shorter than this under wild conditions. In support of this view, they point out that immediately following a fairly severe winter many opossums are seen with goodly portions of their ears and tails frozen off. Yet in the fall practically all, if not all, opossums have ears and tails in whole and healthy shape. While opossums are known to investigators to be able to regenerate a certain amount of ear tissue lost through such mishaps as the pulling out of ear tags, it is doubtful they can regenerate all lost tissue to original condition or grow a good portion of a new tail.

The presence of opossum meat, probably mostly carrion, noted in several food-habits studies of the opossum, would seem to lend credence to this short-life theory. Such a postulation would indicate a possible life span in the wild that included only one severe winter.

THEY FORAGE IN DARKNESS

Seldom seen in daytime, this animal is a nocturnal prowler like many others of a predaceous nature., Although the 'possum—when he is not being chased—moves scarcely faster than a turtle, he does a lot of rambling around, especially on fairly warm, calm nights in autumn and winter when the moon or stars are shining. At such times he is foraging for food and may travel a circuitous route of 1 to 2 miles before sunrise.

Truly an omnivorous animal, the 'possum will eat practically anything edible. However, food-habits studies indicate that it prefers animal food material, particularly insects. It also consumes fruit and grains and includes in its diet such morsels as angleworms, snails, lizards, snakes, crayfish, slugs, and carrion from any kind of dead animal carcass it may find, including opossum carcasses. While it is commonly taken for granted that the 'possum is somewhat of a chicken thief, studies of its food indicate that this reputation is largely undeserved. Out of 68 Missouri 'possum stomachs taken over a 6-months period, only 3 percent of the total volume of food was found to be chicken, and only 0.2 percent consisted of chicken eggshells. At least some of this could have been carrion.

"For anybody as had any kind of dog, 'possum huntin' is made to order," says an old fellow down on the creek. According to him, "just any little old dog can make a passel of fun out of a 'possum or two—and you can't beat fun." Somewhat more discriminating dog men seem to take the view that a hound with no value for anything else makes a good 'possum dog. Most full-blooded hound dogs, some say, become stronger on 'coon or other game than on 'possums. Certainly there are plenty of mixed breed dogs—shepherd crosses, common farm canines and the like—that love to tree a 'possum. Some southerners favor a bulldog-hound cross, and it is generally conceded that a little hound blood mixed in a dog is to be desired, as it gives the dog a

better nose and might even impart more music to his voice.

Running 'possums isn't much of a chore, as most folks know who have ever treed one. If the 'possums are there, they take up just about the nearest tree, and that is usually a sapling. If they tackle a big tree, they generally get themselves out on one of the lower limbs. Rarely do they run more than "half a quarter." This lack of enthusiasm for the chase is often interpreted as another shortcoming in intelligence. In fact, early observers branded the animal as a silly grinning idiot.

In the early 1900's, a naturalist measured the brain capacity of a 'possum skull by filling it with beans, to compare its equipment with that of a similar-sized raccoon. The opossum's wit-box held only 25 beans, while that of the raccoon measured 150 beanpower.

Those who harvest furs by trapping generally agree that the 'posum can get himself caught in almost any kind of trap set. Probably the majority of 'possum pelts are taken accidentally while trapping for more valuable furs. In his Lives of Game Animals, 1929, Ernest Thompson Seton writes:

THE MOST HELPLESS FOOL OF THE WOODS

"The 'possum is the most helpless fool of the woods * * * and when caught by some hard-gripping steel, it has not wits enough even to get mad; it simply looks bored, scared, and nonresistant. We find in this a melancholy proof that, in the struggle for life, wits count for less than fecundity—a complete, logical application of which principle warns us that Europe will be wiped out by Asia * * * and shall I add a sinister and disquieting thought? This world-winner is a pacifist." (Author's note.—That last sentence could be questioned today.)

Regardless of 'possum-inspired philosophy and of what it takes to catch him, from the numbers of furs sold it would appear that 'possums are somewhat easier to catch than muskrats and at least twice as easy as any other furbearer. At any rate, this seems to be the case for the past 10 years or so, during which time we have enjoyed a relatively high 'possum population.

More recently, however, during the past three seasons, the average take has fallen off about 48 percent from the average harvest for the previous 7 years. This might seem like we have been either harvesting too many or else 'possums are in a low period in their cycle. However, it should be considered that the past 3 years have also seen less activity on the part of fur-takers, due to low prices and due to a closed mink season in 1948–49.

Nevertheless, it is doubtful that reduced trapping activity would account for the entire reduction in 'possum take, which would indicate a lower available population. With the high reproductive potential possessed by 'possums, this is not as serious a matter as it is with low producers like the mink, who is also saddled with a high price on his head.

In comparison with the wearing qualities of other furs, the opossum does not rate very high, but is widely used in jackets, coats and trimming, and ranks among the first six species in importance as a furbearer. It has a durability rating of 37, as compared to a rating of 100 for otter, which is considered the most durable of all furs. Beaver rates at 85, raccoon 80, mink 75, striped skunk 50 to 75, muskrat 35 to 60, and rabbit 5.

SOME THOUGHTS ON EDIBILITY

When it comes to baked 'possum, some folks claim he's a gourmet's delight. Described as very palatable and delicious, the taste of his juicy meat is compared most often to being somewhat like pork, lamb, or mutton.

Refuge Supervisor George Quinn, sportsmen's chef par excellence, has divulged his recipe for preparing 'possum in a most toothsome manner. Says George: "First skin, clean, and trim off the surplus fat of your 'possum. Then parboil him about 1 to 1½ hours in a kettle of water to which have been added 1 pint of vinegar, one diced onion, and two chopped stalks of celery. When tender, take out and bake in oven until nicely browned. While browning, baste frequently with a sauce, mixed to taste, of melted butter, vinegar, sugar, salt, and pepper. Peeled sweet potatoes may be baked along with the 'possum or, if preferred, the sweet potatoes may be candied separately. Serve with barbecue sauce or baste with barbecue sauce on the last couple of bastings."

Doubtless it was while gorged with savory 'possum meat and sweet potatoes—producing a tranquility of mind matched only by the 'possum himself—that someone was inspired to compose the old southern Negro song:

"'Possum am a cunnin' thing.
He rambles in de dark,
Nothin' 'tall disturb his mind
But to heah my houn' dog bark."

The Wrecking Crew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column written by Thomas L. Stokes appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun of December 22, 1950. I hope its perusal will cause some of our colleagues to think twice before making reckless charges in the trying days ahead.

THE WRECKING CREW
(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, December 22.—We pride ourselves on our freedoms—of speech, press, assembly, religion.

In our free-and-easy American way we have come to condone all sorts of reckless, irresponsible—often false and malicious—things that are said in our political campaigns. We even make jokes about it all.

But recent events suggest that perhaps the time has come to reexamine our light and cynical attitude.

Is it time that we exert a bit of self-discipline? The abuses of our blood-won privileges are by a minority and a small minority, which is evidence itself that most of our people exercise self-discipline.

To what noisome lengths such a minority is able to go in these critical times has been exhibited here in the dastardly attack on a patriotic, able woman, Anna M. Rosenberg. It would seem to indicate that the decent majority is lax in permitting ourselves to be misrepresented before the world by a wrecking crew of insidious defamers.

Senators of one of the now most important committees in this crisis—the Armed Services Committee—have been compelled to take nearly 2 weeks to conduct a sort of police court, listening to a lot of baseless insinuations from a strange panel of witnesses, including that type which now has become, with some people, a new sort of hero—ex-Communist.

Because of the important post to which Mrs. Rosenberg was appointed—Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of manpower—the committee felt it must act to protect her. It is suggested that some better way might be found to go about it.

Mrs. Rosenberg has been cleared by a unanimous vote of the committee and the way opened for her confirmation. But the Anna Rosenberg case must not be closed. If we want to clear ourselves as a nation.

There is the obvious legal step of the committee in certifying some of the witnesses for the Justice Department for perjury, which is called for. But there is something much more fundamental. The Anna Rosenberg case was but a surface indication of a poisonous situation underneath. It revealed, by a link the committee discovered, something far more widespread that goes back to the last political campaign.

One witness, Benjamin Freedman, a retired businessman, testified he had bought for distribution 50,000 copies of a sheet called Common Sense aimed at Mrs. Rosenberg. This sheet also put out an issue attacking Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut, chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, which was circulated in his reelection campaign. This is just one item in a collection of such stuff distributed in many States which is being investigated by the Senate Privileges and Elections Subcommittee.

This subcommittee should not rest until it runs down the whole story, finds out who is responsible, and reports to Senate and Nation. Gerald L. K. Smith, we know, was mixed up in the attack on Mrs. Rosenberg. There are others involved in this noxious campaign of the last election.

Report of Hon. Sam Hobbs, of Alabama, to the Committee on the Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FRANK WILSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report by the Honorable SAM HOBBS to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to those of my colleagues of the Committee on the Judiciary who did me the honor of authorizing me to appear as amicus curiae in the case of *Henderson* v. *The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Southern Railway Co.* in the Supreme Court of the United States.

I did my best; and will always be grateful to each of you for the opportunity you gave me.

With fervent thanks!

SAM HOBBS.

IN RE CAUSE NO. 25, IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, ELMER W. HENDERSON, APPELLANT, V. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY CO., APPELLEES, OCTOBER 11, 1949

We, the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, acting by and through the undersigned members, do hereby designate and authorize our distinguished colleague, the Honorable SAM HOBBS, from the State of Alabama, to appear as amicus curiae in the above entitled and numbered cause, and participate in the oral argument.

ED GOSSETT; JOE R. BRYSON; LOUIS E. GRAHAM; J. FRANK WILSON; BOYD TACKETT; J. B. FRAZIER, JR.; DIXIE GILMER; E. E. WILLIS; FRANK L. CHELF; ANGIER L. GOODWIN; EARL C. MICHENER; JOHN JENNINS, JR.; CHAUNCEY REED; FRANK FELLOWS.

Office of the Clerk, October 21, 1949, Supreme Court, United States.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, OCTOBER TERM, 1949, No. 25, ELMER W. HENDERSON, APPELLANT, V. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY CO., APPELLEES—BRIEF OF SAM HOBBS AS AMICUS CURIAE

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The law of this case is clearly and succinctly stated in the briefs for the Interstate Commerce Commission and for Southern Railway Co.

The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives of the United States has never taken a contrary position; nor has the Congress or the Supreme Court of the United States.

The brief nominally filed for the United States is not a brief for that appellee and assumes the opposite position from that taken by those representing that appellee in the lower court.

This amicus curiae adopts the briefs of the attorneys for the other two appellees; and opposes the brief nominally filed for the United States.

QUESTION STATED

The sole question for decision on this appeal is whether or not the appellee carrier's rules regulating its dining-car service, which became effective March 1, 1946, requiring equal but separate accommodations for white and colored passengers, subject the appellant to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever.

Appellant won his case in the lower court when he attacked a former rule of the carrier; so only the rules which became effective March 1, 1946, are attacked in this case and involved in this appeal.

Or, as stated in the brief for Southern Railway Co., on page 12, under the caption "The question presented for decision":

"The appeal brings to this Court for decision the question whether racial segregation of interstate passengers is forbidden by any provision of the Federal Constitution, the Interstate Commerce Act or any other act of Congress, so long as there is equality of treatment of those of different races. The question arises under the rule of the railway whereby the space in its dining cars is divided: one portion for the exclusive use of Negro passengers and the remaining part for the exclusive use of white passengers. It is the operation of the rule of the railway that gives rise to the question for decision; not the segregation statute of the State of Virginia in which State the incident here in question occurred."

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

It is respectfully submitted that the pertinent rules of the Southern Railway Co. are in accordance with the supreme law of the land as declared by the Supreme Court and the lower courts. Not only so, but those rules are wise, for the best interests of all the people affected, and in accord with the highest ethical standard.

The purpose of regulation is not utterly to prohibit. The Southern Railway Co., to all practical intents, operates only in that region where anything more than is required by the rules here under attack would render its attempt to operate its railway system absurd. To adopt the contention of appellant would be the kiss of death and render operation of the railway impossible.

These rules apply to all and should be obeyed by every passenger.

In Holy Writ we read: "Wherefore if meat make my brother to offend I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." 1 Corinthians 8: 13. Why should not both white and colored passengers in interstate commerce be willing to rise to the height of that highest ethical standard? Why should any passenger be unwilling to give that much consideration to his fellow passengers?

The Constitution of the United States granted complete and exclusive power to regulate interstate commerce to the Congress. In the exercise of that power the Congress has repeatedly refused to require more than the rules in question indicate.

ARGUMENT

Judge Coleman, in writing the opinion of the majority in the lower court in this case, said:

"(1) Racial segregation of interstate passengers is not forbidden by any provision of the Federal Constitution, the Interstate Commerce Act, or any other act of Congress as long as there is no real inequality of treatment of those of different races. (2) Allotment of seats in interstate dining cars does not per se spell such inequality as long as such allotment, accompanied by equality of meal service is made and is kept proportionately fair. This necessity was recognized by the Commission in its report on which the order now approved by us is based, when it said (269 I. C. C. 73, at p. 76): 'Should the indicated trend continue, substantial equality of treatment may require the reservation of additional accommodations for Negroes in the future.' To the argument that proportionate allotment of tables is only just and equitable so long as persons may find seats at a table assigned to their respective races, and fails to meet the equality test when there is any empty seat in the dining car which a person of either race is forbidden to occupy, suffice it to say that this argument denies the very premise from which we start, namely, that racial segregation is not, per se, unconstitutional. Since this is true, we fail to see that a situation such as that just referred to produces a result any more unjust or inequitable from a legal approach —which must be this Court's approach to the question—than the no doubt common situation where both white and colored passengers may be kept waiting to secure seats at tables allotted to their respective races, because, for the time being, every seat in the dining car may be occupied.

"For the reasons herein set forth the complaint must be dismissed" (R. 260).

To the same effect is each of the six decisions cited and referred to in the index to this brief and in the Simmons case it is said:

"It must be repeated and steadily borne in mind that the power to regulate interstate commerce is vested in Congress. This power Congress has, within certain limits, delegated to the Interstate Commerce Commission. To what limits the powers of this latter body extend need not be inquired into. The fact remains that neither Congress nor any agency created by it has sought to impose any regulation dealing with the separation of passengers in interstate commerce. The fact that such separation has long been enforced in a number of States by custom and by the rules of common carriers operating in such States is a matter of public knowledge of which the Members of Congress are fully aware. In fact, although efforts have been made over some years to induce Congress to enact legislation on this subject, it has consistently refused to attempt such regulation. There can be no other inference than that Congress has thought it wise and proper that the matter should be left for determination to such reasonable rules as the carriers might themselves adopt and that it considered that rules providing for the segregation of passengers in those sections where they were applied were reasonable ones. By its refusal to nullify the practices and regulations of these carriers in respect to the separation of passengers, Congress has by the strongest implication given its approval to them. This is a field of congressional duty and responsibility. This court cannot invade it and, by usurping the powers of Congress, lay down rules by which this defendant must guide the operation of its business—rules which Congress, in the exercise of power specifically and solely entrusted to it, has refused to lay down." (*Simmons* v. *Atlantic Greyhound Corp.* (W. D. Va., decided Dec. 30, 1947, 75 F. Supp. 166).)

Fourteen times the House has voted against antisegregation proposals.

The views taken by the committee are amply borne out by speeches of Members of the House, as evidenced by their reproduction as appendix A of this brief.

The briefs for the Interstate Commerce Commission and Southern Railway Co. leave little to say. All pertinent cases, the Constitution, statutes, history of this case, and the rules made by the railway have been cited and quoted. To prolong this argument would be but repetitious.

But in behalf of the Congress, whose silence has been thunderous; whose counsel in the instant case has abandoned its defense and espoused the alleged cause of its adversary; for the Congress, to whom alone has been granted by the Constitution the power to regulate interstate travel; it must be said that the trust has been kept sacredly, and administered faithfully, for the best interests of all. The Congress confidently awaits the decision of this appeal, and the verdict of history.

CONCLUSION

I respectfully submit that this case should be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

SAM HOBBS,
Amicus Curiae.

ORAL ARGUMENT

May it please the Court: One in my position would be insensitive indeed were he not to feel deeply grateful to Your Honors for having granted leave to file a brief and participate in the oral argument of this cause as amicus curiae.

This amicus is keenly sensitive and deeply grateful to the members of the highest Court of Earth for the privilege of this great and joyful day.

However, he is well aware that his motion was granted because he had been directed to make it by 14 other members of the House Committee on the Judiciary, constituting not only a majority of the full committee but also majorities of each of the memberships of the two major political parties of whom the full committee is composed.

This case was to be heard originally in November 1949. Committee members were scattered—several in Europe on subcommittee duty—and because of the imminence of recessing no committee meetings were to be held, so there was no chance to have approval by full committee action.

The Committees on the Judiciary, as their names imply, are primarily charged with the duty of representing Congress as keepers of the springs from which flow the stream of administration of justice. So it is hard to conceive how strongly we members of these committees feel the terrible impact of the shock occasioned by the conduct of Philip B. Perlman, Solicitor General, who, with Herbert A. Bergson, Assistant Attorney General, Charles H. Weston and Philip Elman, Special Assistants to the Attorney General, signed what they called "Brief for the United States." In this brief, which they filed in this case, both on the front cover and on page 1, the words "Brief for the United States" appear in all capitals. The caption

and first paragraph of the brief read as follows:

"IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, OCTOBER TERM, 1949, NO. 25, ELMER W. HENDERSON, APPELLANT, V. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY CO., ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND—BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES

"This proceeding was brought by appellant to set aside an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission. As required by statute, the United States was named as a defendant. The case is here on appeal from the judgment of the district court dismissing appellant's complaint, and the United States is a nominal appellee. Since the United States is of the view, however, that the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission is invalid, this brief sets forth the grounds upon which it is submitted that the judgment of the district court is erroneous and should be reversed."

On page 3 under the caption "Question presented" this appears:

"Whether the railroad's dining car regulations, approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, are unlawful because they subject passengers to discrimination and inequality of treatment, solely on grounds of race or color."

For 66 pages the brief goes on, seeking to justify the about-face the Department of Justice had executed upon reaching the Supreme Court, after helping to win the case in the trial court.

And now the Attorney General himself appears personally in the Supreme Court to participate in the oral argument for the only time that he has done so in any case since he has assumed the duties of Attorney General.

Nothing could be more in point than the remarks of Elihu Root in the Senate at the time of the passage of Urgent Deficiencies Act.

Senator Root, who was active in behalf of the bill was particularly explicit on this point. Senator Bristow, of Kansas, raised the question whether the Attorney General would be required to defend an order of the Commission if he believed that the order was not justified. The following colloquy ensued (Forty-fifth CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4104):

"Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I will answer that without any hesitation or doubt. The Attorney General would be bound upon all and the highest considerations of his professional honor and his official duty to defend the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission in all courts having jurisdiction to review it.

"Mr. BRISTOW. Then he would not have any supervisory authority as to whether or not it should be defended?

"Mr. ROOT. Certainly not. It is his business to defend. He is no judge; he is no legislator; he is no reviewing authority."

The whole truth is—though probably I ought not so to state as we wish it were possible to get a clear-cut decision on the demerits of this moot case, or, as some contend on its merits—that if all who have no business here were excluded, the members of the Court would be left alone. Certainly the appellant would have to go, as the sole basis of his meritorious initial complaint was decided by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and again by three-judge trial court, in his favor, holding that the incident of which he complained did constitute discrimination against him, wherefore the rules of the railway were amended to comply with each decision and on the trial before the latest three-judge court, the latest rules of the carrier were approved, and the alleged case was dismissed. It is from that latest decision that this appeal is pending.

Certainly also, the counsel appearing for appellant have no more right than their client has to so appear; while the Attorney General and the Solicitor General have even less.

Again, certainly, this Court is not authorized to legislate; nor to oust the Congress to which was given by the Constitution the sole and complete power to regulate interstate commerce.

This litigation began by the filing of a complaint against the Southern Railway. That was filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Government took no part before the Commission. There is nothing in the Interstate Commerce Act or any other Federal statute that requires or even suggests that the Department of Justice should appear at that time.

The Commission approved the road's rule. It found discrimination in the way the dining-car steward applied the rule. It denied damages.

Appellant first sued in the United States Court of the District of Columbia. Being a resident of Baltimore, Md., he discovered his error, dismissed that suit, and refiled in the United States district court at Baltimore, docket No. 2455.

That suit was brought against the ICC and the United States.

Interstate Commerce Commission answered. The railway intervened and answered. The United States did not file an answer.

The three-judge court disagreed with the ICC because, as the court saw it, the rule did not provide for the Negro space to be assigned exclusively to the Negroes for the full duration of the meal.

The case went back to the Commission, the railway amended its rule making the assignment for that race exclusive for the full duration of the meal, and the ICC found the rule to be in accordance with the act of Congress and approved the same.

Appellant sued again in the United States district court at Baltimore, December 11, 1947, docket 3829. Again the suit was against the ICC and the United States.

An answer was filed for the United States on December 24, 1947, admitting the jurisdiction of the Court and the orders of the ICC which the United States alleged were made in due course of administrative procedure including full and fair hearings at which plaintiff had the opportunity to submit evidence and argument, and then further answered:

"Answering paragraphs 7 through 10, inclusive, defendant (United States) denies the allegations thereof and alleges that the Commission's said order of September 5, 1947, was duly made upon substantial evidence and in accordance with applicable law and was and is in all respects valid and lawful."

The answer concluded:

"Wherefore defendant (United States) prays that the relief prayed for by plaintiff be denied and that the complaint be dismissed."

After the plaintiff's attorney had been heard the defendants opened up with Mr. Dumbald, special assistant to the Attorney General (R. 26–29). He began by saying:

"I should say at the outset that I desire to treat the questions here in issue in this case solely upon the basis of existing law. I do not think the case should be decided upon any principles of moral philosophy or political evangelism or upon these basic doctrines of liberty and free association and the other things which very eloquently and very properly my adversary has rested his case on."

From the foregoing you will see the Department of Justice has changed its position back and forth, as follows:

First, it did not appear at all, which was its privilege.

Second, it did appear by answer and personal appearance before the Court in extensive argument in favor of the ICC's order.

Third, it abandons this position taken before the district court when the case reaches the Supreme Court on appeal. It now takes the position that the ICC's order was all wrong, that the Department of Justice in the trial court was all wrong, and that everyone is all wrong except it and its new associates.

Can anyone be so bold as to challenge the opinion of Senator Elihu Root that lawyers who accept employment from our Government to represent it are "bound upon all and the highest considerations of professional honor and official duty to defend the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission in all courts having jurisdiction to review it"?

The next point that I would make as strongly as I can is that in the Constitution of the United States a more perfect union was created and the Government of the United States therein set up was one composed of three coordinate branches—legislative, executive, and judicial. The first article of that Constitution, in section 8, paragraph 3, which specifies the powers granted to Congress, reads:

"To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

This has been repeatedly interpreted by decisions of this Court to be exclusive and complete, since there is no hint in the Constitution of the grant of any part of any such power to either of the other coordinate branches.

Therefore, with the utmost respect, may I insist that the Congress alone has the power to regulate interstate travel and to legislate with reference thereto. Unless necessary to an interpretation of the Constitution, this Court has no power to write or change legislation of that character.

Please permit me to stress my next point.

Separate but equal treatment is not discrimination. Only supersensitive persons, suffering from an inferiority complex, could so contend. Why should any normal person claim that he or his race is insulted, aggrieved, or branded as inferior, when one race is segregated as much as the other, and when exactly the same food, service, and prices apply to all, and exactly the same accommodations are reserved exclusively for his use, in the same car? In fact, the space reserved exclusively for Negroes by the 1946 rules of the Southern Railway—the only ones here at issue—was the choicest space in the dining cars, nearest the kitchen, assuring the hottest food and quickest service.

God created mankind with racial differentiations in color and physical characteristics, but up to the present time no one has accused the Creator of being offensive. He loves every one of His creatures. His creatures evidently approve of His handiwork, for almost every race has proudly claimed to be superior to all others and lived together in separate areas of their own choice.

Even nations have the same conceit. The Japanese fervently believe that they are the only children of their God.

And of course Germany claimed superiority with a vengeance: "Deutchland über alles."

God must be also to blame for segregation, since in our Bible He is frequently quoted as ordering His chosen people, the Hebrews, who preserved for us the worship of Jehovah, to come out from among all other nations

and be separate. He also, with one tribe, interdicted intermarriage, on pain of death.

Those who know most about the race problem agree with God (Abraham Lincoln, Booker T. Washington, George Washington Carver, Newton D. Baker, and a host of others). Both Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver were my personal friends. I have heard them each speak on this subject many times. I had the honor of reporting the bill creating George Washington Carver Day. I know that each of those two great men also agreed with me fully on this subject.

The southern members of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, including Dr. Frank P. Graham, then president of the University of North Carolina, now a Member of the United States Senate, say (speaking as the minority):

"It dissents, however, from the majority's recommendation that the abolition of segregation be made a requirement, until the people of the States involved have themselves abolished the provisions in their State constitutions and laws which now require segregation." "To Secure These Rights" (pp. 166–167.)

In my written brief, which Your Honors granted me permission to file, in order to avoid duplication, I took the liberty of adopting the briefs filed by counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission and Southern Railway Co. As those briefs cite all the pertinent decisions dealing with the issues involved on this appeal, I will not burden the Court by amplifying the arguments made in those briefs in this argument except to call the Court's attention again to the fact that in the Plessy case (which was decided in 1896) the only dissenting opinion was delivered by Justice Harlan, and he evidently had changed his mind materially by 1899, when he handed down the Court's unanimous opinion in *Cumming* v. *Board of Education* (175 U. S. 28), holding that race segregation under a State statute was not prohibited by the fourteenth amendment. However, in 1910, in the Chiles case, he again was the only dissenter, but this time he was content merely to use the one word "dissenting" and did not care to write another opinion.

And of course there are quite a number of decisions in State supreme courts of similar bearing.

Also I feel obliged to call attention to the fact that Judge Soper, the dissenting minority of the three-judge court that rendered the decision from which this appeal was taken, was the author of the decision in the case of *Day* v. *Atlantic Greyhound Corporation* (171 F. (2d) 59 (1948)), which opinion strongly supports the contentions of the appellees on this appeal.

Although the Interstate Commerce Commission found that the appellant had been discriminated against in the incident complained of, it held that there was no basis for an award of damages, as there was no proof of specific pecuniary loss, to which type of damages the Commission's authority is limited by law. This lack of authority to award damages for such injuries as were there complained of is sustained by the Supreme Court in the Case of *Pennsylvania Ry. Co.* v. *International Coal Mining Company* (230 U. S. 184, 203), and that holding was conceded by appellant in the first court action (R. 68).

The case at bar is ruled by decisions of this Court as stated most concisely in the brief of Southern Railway Co.:

"*Hall* v. *DeCuir* (95 U. S. 485 (1877)): DeCuir, a Negro woman, took passage from New Orleans, La., to Hermitage, La., on a river steamer operating from New Orleans, La., to Vicksburg, Miss. The master of the steamer refused to admit DeCuir to a cabin set aside for white persons. A statute of Louisiana recognized the right of common carriers of passengers to refuse admittance of persons to their vehicles provided such rules made no discrimination on account of race or color, and the statute gave a right of action to recover damages for violation of that proviso. Judgment in DeCuir's favor was affirmed in the State supreme court, but reversed in this Court. In the opinion Mr. Justice Waite said (p. 488):

" 'We think it may safely be said that State legislation which seeks to impose a direct burden upon interstate commerce, or to interfere directly with its freedom, does encroach upon the exclusive power of Congress. The statute now under consideration, in our opinion, occupies that position.'

"And added (p. 489):

" 'No carrier of passengers can conduct his business with satisfaction to himself, or comfort to those employing him, if on one side of a State line his passengers, both white and colored, must be permitted to occupy the same cabin, and on the other be kept separate. Uniformity in the regulations by which he is to be governed from one end to the other of his route is a necessity in his business, and to secure it Congress, which is untrammeled by State lines, has been invested with the exclusive legislative power of determining what such regulations shall be.'

"From the foregoing it will be clearly seen that while the decision in the DeCuir case struck down the State statute as a burden upon interstate commerce, the over-all direct effect of the decision was to uphold the rule of the steamer whereunder the master, Benton, refused a Negro passenger access to the cabin set aside exclusively for white passengers. That the steamer's rule was thus upheld is made clear by the following statement (p. 490):

" 'As was said by Mr. Justice Field, speaking for the court in *Welton* v. *The State of Missouri* (91 U. S. 282), "inaction (by Congress) * * * is equivalent to a declaration that inter-State commerce shall remain free and untrammeled." Applying that principle to the circumstances of this case, congressional inaction left Benson (the master) at liberty to adopt such reasonable rules and regulations for the disposition of passengers upon his boat, while pursuing her voyage within Louisiana or without, as seemed to him most for the interest of all concerned.'

"In *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, (163 U. S. 537 (1896)), another statute of Louisiana was before the Court. It declared that railways shall provide equal but separate accommodations for white and colored races, and further that a passenger failing to observe the segregation requirement might be fined or imprisoned. Plessy was a passenger between two stations within the State of Louisiana. He insisted upon occupying a seat in the coach set aside to accommodate white passengers. He was ejected and imprisoned. The Supreme Court of Louisiana affirmed his conviction. Ex *parte Plessy* (45 La. Ann. 80):

"On writ of error to this Court the constitutionality of the State act was attacked upon the ground that it was in conflict with the fourteenth amendment which prohibits certain restrictive legislation on the part of the States. This Court affirmed in an opinion by Mr. Justice Brown holding that the enforced separation of the races as applied to the internal commerce of the State neither abridges the privileges or immunities of the colored man, deprives him of his property without due process, nor denies him the equal protection of the laws within the meaning of the fourteenth amendment. In that connection, Mr. Justice Brown said (pp. 544, 550, 551):

" 'The object of the amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law, but in the nature of things it could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color, or to enforce social, as distinguished from political equality, or a commingling of the two races upon terms unsatisfactory to either. Laws permitting, and even requiring, their separation in places where they are liable to be brought into contact do not necessarily imply the inferiority of either race to the other, and have been generally, if not universally, recognized as within the competency of the State legislature in the exercise of their police power. The most common instance of this is connected with the establishment of separate schools for white and colored children, which has been held to be a valid exercise of the legislative power even by courts of States where the political rights of the colored race have been longest and most earnestly enforced.

" 'So far, then, as a conflict with the fourteenth amendment is concerned, the case reduces itself to the question whether the statute of Louisiana is a reasonable regulation, and with respect to this, there must necessarily be a large discretion on the part of the legislature. In determining the question of reasonableness it is at liberty to act with reference to the established usages, customs, and traditions of the people, and with a view to the promotion of their comfort, and the preservation of the public peace and good order.

" '* * * If the two races are to meet upon terms of social equality, it must be the result of natural affinities, a mutual appreciation of each other's merits, and a voluntary consent of individuals. As was said by the Court of Appeals of New York in *People* v. *Gallagher* (93 N. Y. 438, 448) "this end can neither be accomplished nor promoted by laws which conflict with the general sentiment of the community upon whom they are designed to operate. When the Government, therefore, has secured to each of its citizens equal rights before the law and equal opportunities for improvement and progress, it has accomplished the end for which it was organized and performed all of the functions respecting social advantages with which it is endowed." '

"*Chiles* v. *Chesapeake & Ohio Railway* (218 U. S. 71 (1910)): Chiles, a colored passenger on the C. & O. Railway, was traveling from Washington, D. C., to Lexington, Ky. At Ashland, Ky., he had to change to another train. Upon boarding it, he went into a car which, under the rules and regulations of defendant in error, was set apart exclusively for white persons. From this car he was required to remove to a car set apart exclusively for the transportation of colored persons. He sued in the State court for damages; judgment on a jury verdict for the defendant was affirmed by the Kentucky Court of Appeals. In an opinion delivered by Mr. Justice McKenna this court affirmed, from which opinion we quote (p. 74):

" 'The complaint of the action of the court rests upon the contention that, as against an interstate passenger, the regulation of the company in providing different cars for the white and colored races is void. There is a statute of Kentucky which requires railroad companies to furnish separate coaches for white and colored passengers, but the court of appeals of the State put the statute out of consideration, declaring that it had no application to interstate trains, and defendant in error does not rest its defense upon that statute, but upon its rules and regulations. Plaintiff in error makes some effort to keep the statute in the case, and says that the trial court, by its ruling upon testimony and by its instructions, confined "the jury only to the lesser motive" of defendant's "wrongful act." In other words, as we understand plaintiff in error, confined the jury to the consideration of the regulations of the railroad company and withdrew from

its consideration in the effect of the statute under which, it is said, the conductor declared he acted. But by this we understand plaintiff in error to illustrate that his rights as an interstate passenger were denied. We are, therefore, brought back to the question what his rights as such passenger were.

" 'The elements of that question have been considered and passed on in a number of cases. And we must keep in mind that we are not dealing with the law of a State attempting regulation of interstate commerce beyond its power to make. We are dealing with the act of a private person, to wit, the railroad company, and the distinction between State and interstate commerce we think is unimportant.'

"In reaching its conclusion to affirm, the opinion cited and quoted with approval from *Hall* v. *DeCuir* (95 U. S. 485), and *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 540), adding:

" 'Regulations which are induced by the general sentiment of the community for whom they are made and upon whom they operate, cannot be said to be unreasonable. See also *Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Company* v. *Kentucky* (179 U. S. 388).'

"*Morgan* v. *Virginia* (328 U. S. 373 (1946)): Irene Morgan was a Negro interstate passenger on a common carrier bus in Virginia. The State statute required passenger motor vehicle carriers, both interstate and intrastate, to separate, without discrimination, white and colored passengers. Upon her refusal to accede to the request of the driver of the bus to remove to a back seat in the vehicle, partly occupied by other colored passengers, so as to permit the seat vacated to be used by a white passenger, she was arrested and convicted of violating the Virginia statute. Her conviction was affirmed by the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia (184 Va. 24). On appeal, this court reversed in an opinion by Mr. Justice Reed holding that the Virginia statute was an undue burden on interstate commerce. In reaching this conclusion, he said (p. 381):

" 'On appellant's journey, this statute required that she sit in designated seats in Virginia. Changes in seat designation might be made "at any time" during the journey when "necessary or proper for the comfort and convenience of passengers." This occurred in this instance. Upon such change of designation, the statute authorizes the operator of the vehicle to require, as he did here, "any passenger to change his or her seat as it may be necessary or proper." An interstate passenger must if necessary repeatedly shift seats while moving in Virginia to meet the seating requirements of the changing passenger group. On arrival at the District of Columbia line, the appellant would have had freedom to occupy any available seat and so to the end of her journey.'

"The decision on this appeal did not turn on any rule of the motor common carrier; on the contrary Mr. Justice Reed was careful to point out in a footnote at page 377:

" 'When passing upon a rule of a carrier that required segregation of an interstate passenger, this Court said, "And we must keep in mind that we are not dealing with the law of a State attempting a regulation of interstate commerce beyond its power to make" (*Chiles* v. *Chesapeake & Ohio R. Co.* (218 U. S. 71, 75)).

"It is not amiss to stress the fact here that Mr. Justice Reed referred to *Hall* v. *DeCuir* (95 U. S. 485), and the soundness of this Court's decision therein (p. 383) and quoted at great length therefrom in a footnote at page 384.

"From the foregoing it will be seen that the decisions of this Court from 1877 to 1946 have uniformly upheld the principle of segregation of white and Negro passengers in common-carrier vehicles, equality of treatment being accorded both races, under appropriate rules of the common carriers."

The chief counsel appearing for appellant, Belford V. Lawson, Jr., has just argued, with tears in his voice, that if this Court should today fail to take the opportunity here afforded, it might be 7 years before they again might get back to this Court.

This is the same argument for immediacy which has been so often made.

All impatient reformers inveigh against "gradualism." They never approve of gradualism.

God does!

God built His universe and stockpiled the necessities for His creatures by gradualism.

"Do it now" is the theme song of every pressure group. But God took centuries to put coal and oil deposits into His Earth; years to make a man!

Bedrock Factors in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted me, I am including in my remarks an editorial printed in the San Francisco Chronicle on December 14, 1950, entitled as above.

This article was sent to me—and I assume to other Members of the Congress—by Mr. Paul C. Smith, editor of the Chronicle. I assume that it represents the thinking of Mr. Smith and members of his editorial staff. It is a powerful analysis of the security situation in which we now find ourselves. Not only does this article clearly point out the predicament we are in but also it suggests how this crisis might be met and solved.

Mr. Smith has earned his right to discuss these menacing problems, involving the very life of the Republic. In the recent war he joined the Navy and became a public relations officer. This did not satisfy his desire to serve his country in time of war. He resigned and enlisted in the Marines and experienced combat service. Some of his ideas and his attitude on the kind of a military posture which our country needs, if it is to survive the challenge now confronting it, were undoubtedly forged in the crucible of conflict when, as a marine, he was engaged in combat. The logic and reasoning in this editorial appeals to me. I commend it to my colleagues who will be called upon to help formulate the broad, strategic concept which we develop and execute to meet the Communist threat now facing the Nation.

This is the editorial:

BEDROCK FACTORS IN KOREA

We have the feeling that a great deal of pressure is building up, within the United Nations and elsewhere, to bring about a negotiated settlement in Korea that will represent, for our side, a compromise with principle and a resort to appeasement.

The idea has a certain appeal, of course. It will be embarrassing to have to pull out of Korea—people will say: "Look, the high and mighty United States has taken it on the chin." That's hard to swallow.

But there are some other things that would prove, in the long run, a great deal harder to take. It would be harder, for instance, to take a final defeat at the hands of the world Communist hierarchy—a defeat enabled by virtue of our having been suckered into an untenable position regarding Korea.

We believe that now is a good and an important time for the United States to try to bring the whole picture into perspective, and to get clear in its own mind what is fundamental and what is not. This newspaper has certain definite ideas on the matter:

We consider, first, that we are already engaged in what will prove to be an all-out, finish fight with Moscow-led communism. The prime objective of America in this fight is to contain communism, to drive it back, to draw its teeth, to expose it, and finally to eliminate it as a world force. This objective is the only one that will serve us under circumstances of an equivalent objective by the enemy. It's his survival or ours, and we are determined it will be ours.

WE ARE IN THE FIRST STAGE OF A LONG STRUGGLE

The shooting phase of this all-out struggle began on June 25. If this contest were a football game, we would still be in the first 2 or 3 minutes of play, with 57 or 58 minutes yet to go. To follow the same analogy, the other side has the ball and has us backed against our own goal line. But the main problem isn't how to prevent his making the first score. The main problem is how to marshal our strength and deploy our forces and outmaneuver the enemy so as to win the game.

A proper appraisal of the elements of that problem raises the question of whether, under any circumstances now conceivable, we ought to remain on the Korean Peninsula at all.

It is suggested in some Washington quarters that we cannot afford to leave the South Koreans with the sense that we have abandoned them. That is truly a grave consideration, but it must be balanced against the gravity of long-range military considerations. We are fortunate in having faced a similar situation in the Philippines—we said we would be back, and we were.

The question then is one of balance—of gaining a little face, perhaps, but of losing opportunity of incalculable value to us in this struggle.

First, as to the military side:

If a deal were worked out whereby we were permitted to remain in occupation of, say, South Korea below the thirty-eighth parallel, we would at the very minimum have to replace all of our troops now on the peninsula, to reequip them largely and, as a matter of fact, to increase our forces considerably in view of the new situation. With half a million Red Chinese sitting across the border, we couldn't settle for a half dozen divisions. We would have to muster a combination of power at least equivalent to the Chinese force, or run the constant risk of being pushed off at China's convenience. That's a costly operation, raising the question of whether it's worth it.

We are impressed with a whole battery of arguments that it is not.

The Korean war, and whatever war in Asia that the Korean war could lead us into, is bound to be primarily a manpower war. We are not in a position to win a manpower war in Asia, the turn of events in the Korean war has demonstrated that. We haven't the men, and such mechanized equipment as we have, or all we could amass, can't be used to good advantage. The great land masses of Asia are inaccessible to our incomparable Navy, and the terrain over which we should be forced to fight would cut any advantage in air power or motorized equipment to a minimum.

Besides, there could hardly be a more oblique and unrewarding approach to the heart of the Communist empire than across the bleak reaches of China and Siberia. Strong

as we are, we could waste ourselves along that route to the point where Russia could whip us with ease.

CHINESE PRICE FOR A TRUCE SURE TO BE SKY HIGH

Furthermore, it is inconceivable that the Chinese Communists, feeling their oats as result of current limited successes, would drive exactly an easy bargain at the conference table. More likely they would say: "Give us Formosa; give us recognition; give us membership in the United Nations."

There's no appeasement involved in sticking to principle and conducting a fighting withdrawal, even if it means quitting Korea.

But there's appeasement—and nothing but appeasement—in knuckling under to Stalin's Chinese puppets in this kind of horse trade.

There was nothing dishonorable in our retreat down the Bataan Peninsula, even in our final surrender. But there would have been something abysmally dishonorable in our saying to the Japanese: "If you'll just leave us alone, we'll give you the Philippines." That's appeasement.

We suggest that the thing for us to tell Communist China at this time, in answer to any horse-trade proposal, is that we will hold China responsible for conforming to the principles of civilized nations and will insist upon her ultimate summary rejection of those principles notoriously espoused by the Communist international conspiracy.

We suggest that the United States make crystal clear to China that we do not accept either the capacity or the right of China to dictate the order of Asia or the Pacific basin, either alone or in conspiratorial association with the Soviet Union. Specifically, we reject emphatically the right of Communist China to occupy all or any part of Korea, or to dictate what American policy shall be as to Formosa, or any other region of the Far East. In short, we should reject any deal that involves selling out the interests of any people, large or small.

It is quite true that we can't make this position stick in terms of the immediate situation in Korea. It is quite likely that, having taken that position, we should then have to quit the Peninsula (and by "we" is meant, of course, those 100,000 hard-bitten, gallant soldiers and marines who have been defending our interests and our honor out there).

COMMON SENSE SHOULD MATCH OUR PHYSICAL POTENTIAL

But the process of quitting the peninsula would be part of the general process of seeking out a line from which we could more ably project our strength and assert our authority in behalf of peace and the rule of law.

We are not prepared to say where that line should be—certainly it would have to extend into Europe, and just as certainly it would have to have a firm base in the Far East. But it would follow that direction dictated by the long-range consideration of doing the whole job—of beating back the main Communist force, the Soviet Union, as the first order of business.

We are as sanguine as to America's capacity to succeed at this long-range job as we are doubtful of the sagacity of trying to keep our precarious foothold on Korea.

As we have suggested, this game is only in its opening minutes. Our great resources have not been tapped, and our weapons of greatest effectiveness have not been employed.

Our manpower is virtually intact. We still have our matchless industrial capacity, capable of turning out more goods in a month than the Soviet Union can produce in three or four. Steel, coal, oil, machine tools—these are the main materials of modern war, and we not only have them in great quantity, we have the knack of coordinating them and putting them to maximum use. If we wanted to buckle down to it, we could, in the course of time, clean up the Korea mess and roll Mao Tse-tung's forces all the way back to Peiping.

But that's what the big boss, Stalin, wants us to do.

That would use up our strength while he was saving his.

We are suggesting that we rally our common sense to match our physical potential; that we play this very earnest and deadly game as conservatively as we can; that we save our Sunday punch for the prime target; that we play to win.

University of Chicago—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I had intended before the completion of my service as a Member of the Eighty-first Congress to speak at some length and under a special order in reply to the remarks of my distinguished colleague and friend from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] on the subject of the University of Chicago. This week, however, while I have remained in Washington and have been in constant attendance at such sessions of the House as have been held and in giving attention to the work of my office until the expiration of my term, the circumstances of the holiday season have prevented the attendance of my colleague from Illinois, as well as many other Members, so that under an agreement by the majority and the minority leaderships Members have not been recognized for either 1 minute addresses or the privilege of the floor under special orders.

I am not quarreling with this arrangement, and certainly I would not wish to be understood as criticizing any man for spending the Christmas holidays with his family. We have been in session almost constantly during the entire year, and certainly Members have well earned the right of a few days at home during the Christmas season. I make mention of the circumstances obtaining only by way of explaining why what I shall have to say in answer to my colleague's remarks about the University of Chicago are inserted in the Appendix as an extension of my remarks.

The University of Chicago is in the district which I now have the honor to represent. John Gunther, in his book, Inside the U. S. A., says of the University of Chicago that "by any reckoning it is one of the three or four most outstanding universities in the world."

Edwin R. Embree, in Harper's magazine of March 1949, said:

A galaxy of Midwestern State universities—Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa—could scarcely have come to their great high standards without the compelling influence of the University of Chicago.

Should not I, or should not any representative honored by selection by the voters of the Second District of Illinois, feel a sense of pride that among the institutions in the home district was a university by any reckoning one of the three or four most outstanding in the world?

I admit that I have had such a pride, and that to the best of my ability I have sought to service with the facilities of my office the scholars and the students at that great school who have written me. I have thought that by so doing I was rendering my bit of service to the cause of education as well as performing the work that I undertook to do when I offered my candidacy to the voters. I have never lost sight of the fact that my State of Illinois was admitted to the Union only on the condition that forever she remain steadfast in her support of popular education. If in Illinois after her admission to the Union, on condition of her steadfast support of education, there had been built one of the three or four outstanding universities of the world, and that located in a district represented by me in the Congress, did I not have the right to feel in this Congress a pride that my State and my district had kept the faith with that far-away Congress that took us into the sisterhood of States on our pledge to promote education?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had on the walls of my rooms in the House Office Building a large framed photograph of the university and the university area, and facing it was another large photograph, one of a large blast furnace with a steelworker silhouetted against the glow of the flames. Those photographs meant something to me, and that something spelled pride in my country, where education and mechanical skill go side by side in the great work of making this a better world for all. I was proud that in my district were some of the best steelworkers in all the world and some of the outstanding scholars of the world, and I felt humble in the contemplation that I was their representative in the greatest deliberative body in the world in what truly may be called the capital of the world.

My assistant was a graduate of the University of Chicago, and one who had made education her life work. I thought that was proper and as it should be for one from a district where was located one of the three or four outstanding universities in the world and from a State dedicated by the terms of its admission to the Union to the cause of education.

I was proud, too, that on the Committee on Banking and Currency where I served were 3 out of 27 who came from the influence of the University of Chicago—the distinguished and beloved gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE], a graduate, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. WOODHOUSE], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], who had taken graduate work there. I am very sure, having in mind the element of partisan fealty, that the zeal of my friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] would not carry him so far as to put the brand of Communist upon the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Iowa from the circumstances of past association and the danger of contamination. As to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, I am not so certain. She voted

for rent control, for public housing, and for social security. That, combined with the circumstance that she did mingle for a few months as a graduate student on the campus of the University of Chicago, will probably damn her beyond any hope of successful defense at my hands.

Which reminds me that during the recent campaign a candidate appeared before a meeting of cultured and refined women in the area of the University of Chicago and when asked what was his definition of Communist, turned to the woman and said, "Do you believe in rent control?" and when she replied affirmatively, propounded the second question, "Do you believe in social security?" and then, when the answer again was affirmative, said, "Then you're a Communist."

So I am afraid the gentlewoman from Connecticut, with the horrible record of favoring rent control and social security as well as having spent a brief but dangerous period on the campus of the University of Chicago, cannot be saved by the likes of me, who is actually proud of a voting record similar to the gentlewoman's and who not only has a brother on the faculty of the University of Chicago but who is the father of three sons who attended not merely the university but its preparatory school, University High.

Since 1935 the university has been the target of, first, those who do not believe in education except for a privileged class on the theory that there will not continue to be a class of manual workers if all are permitted the advantages of higher education; second, those who do not believe in freedom of thought on the theory exploded by Thomas Jefferson that the masses were better off if the few did the thinking and the many did the work; and, third, those, well intentioned and discarding completely the fallacious theories of the first two groups, nevertheless were carried away, through misinformation and appeals to emotions and passions and prejudices.

The investigation of the University of Chicago which my colleague [Mr. VELDE] has stated will be carried on under the authority of the Eighty-second Congress can properly be no concern of mine since I shall cease to be a Member of this body with the adjournment of the Eighty-first Congress. Nevertheless, most of my colleagues will remain here as Members of the Eighty-second Congress, and I think it owing to them to give them at this time such information as I possess on the University of Chicago that later they can place proper evaluations.

Laird Bell is the chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Chicago. The standing of Mr. Bell in our community of Chicago as a citizen of the first quality is so well established that no one has even dared to challenge it. I doubt if Mr. VELDE, in recognition of the fact that the Chicago Daily News gave endorsement to his reelection, as well as that of other Republicans, will question Mr. Bell's standing and his loyalty.

When Mr. Bell speaks for the university it is with the endorsement of a board composed of some of the most distinguished businessmen and public leaders in the Nation. Would my colleague from Illinois say that these men, included among whom is such a one as Paul G. Hoffman, are either themselves Communists or so soft that they permit through inadvertence or intention the breeding of disloyalty in an institution of learning under their responsibility?

Here is the full list of the members of the board of directors of the University of Chicago, with the business connection of each member listed after his name:

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Laird Bell, chairman; Bell, Boyd, Marshall, and Lloyd.

Edward L. Ryerson, first vice chairman; chairman of the board, Inland Steel Co.

Herbert P. Simmermann, second vice chairman, chairman, executive committee, R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co.

Graham Aldis, Aldis & Co.

Charles F. Axelson, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Joseph C. Beaven, president, Standard Milling Co.

William Benton, chairman of the board, Encyclopedia Britannica.

William McCormick Blair, William Blair & Co.

Edward Eagle Brown, chairman of the board, First National Bank of Chicago.

Gaylord Connelley, executive vice president, R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co.

James H. Douglas, Jr., Gardner, Carton, and Douglas.

Cyrus S. Eaton, Otis & Co.

Marshall Field, publisher, Chicago Sun-Times.

Howard Goodman, vice president, Goodman Manufacturing Co.

Arthur B. Hall, Hall & Ellis.

Paul V. Harper, Sidley, Austin, Burgess, & Harper.

Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration.

Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor, the University of Chicago.

Fowler B. McConnell, president, Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Frank McNair, director, Harris Trust and Savings Bank.

John Nuveen, Jr., John Nuveen & Co.

Walter P. Paepcke, chairman of the board, Container Corp. of America.

Ernest E. Quantrell, investment banker.

Clarence B. Randall, Inland Steel Co.

David Rockefeller, second vice president, Chase National Bank.

Paul S. Russell, president, Harris Trust and Savings Bank.

Albert W. Sherer, vice president, McCann-Erickson, Inc.

Herman D. Smith, vice-president, Marsh & McLennan.

David B. Stern, chairman of the board of A. G. Becker & Co.

John A. Stevenson, president, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Frank L. Sulzberger, president, Enterprise Paint Manufacturing Co.

Harold H. Swift, chairman of the board, Swift & Co.

Henry F. Tenney, Tenney, Sherman, Rogers & Guthrie.

Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the members of the board of directors of the University of Chicago, who gave their approval of and endorsement to a statement by Laird Bell, chairman, when another attempt was made in the general assembly of Illinois to hit at the bulwarks of popular education by attempting to destroy a university in Illinois internationally recognized as one of the three or four outstanding universities of the world. Chairman Bell's article, approved of and endorsed by the full board of directors listed above, I shall include in another extension of my remarks.

University of Chicago—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the destruction or the impairment, certainly the embarrassment, of one of the three or four outstanding universities of the world, and one located in the district which I represent, has been threatened, or at least suggested, by a speech on the floor of this House I think my colleagues who remain over in the Eighty-second Congress will find timely these excerpts from a statement by Laird Bell, chairman of the board of directors of the University of Chicago, when a similar attack upon the university was made in the General Assembly of Illinois. If any of my colleagues wish to know the standing of Mr. Bell I suggest that they communicate with the publisher of the Chicago Daily News. If they wish to know what kind of men approved of and endorsed the statement of Mr. Bell I suggest that they consult the list of members of the board of trustees of the University of Chicago which I have included in a previous extension of my remarks.

Excerpts from Mr. Bell's statement of April 11, 1949, follow:

ARE WE AFRAID OF FREEDOM?

A serious question is raised by an investigating committee of the Illinois Legislature, The question is fundamental to democracy. It underlies all scholarship and all thoughtful inquiry. Therefore, it underlies the very purpose of a great university. The question is this: In these troubled times are we afraid of freedom?

ONCE AGAIN

In 1935 the legislature of the State of Illinois empowered a committee to investigate alleged seditious activities at the University of Chicago. Charges were made. Damaging surmises were printed in the public press. The work of the university was interrupted. At the conclusion of the investigation the committee wrote in its report:

"Has the University of Chicago or any of its professors violated either the letter or the spirit of our laws? The answer to this question must be in the negative. * * * Nothing in the teachings or schedule of the school can be held to be subversive of our institutions or the advocation of the Communist form of government as a substitution for the present form of government of the United States." (Majority report issued by Senators Graham and Barbour, June 26, 1935.)

The committee cleared the university. But a university is dependent on the public's appraisal of its contribution, and harm had already been done. Even the generosity of Mr. Wallgren, who contributed $550,000 to the university after the investigation was

closed, did not remove the impression created by the headline charges.

This year on March 1, 1949, a group of students from Illinois universities, including a number of students from the University of Chicago, traveled to Springfield to protest the five bills introduced into the State legislature by Senator Paul Broyles. This they had the right to do. If they were disorderly we disapprove of their conduct. Immediately following this student protest, House Joint Resolution 21 was passed calling for an investigation of the university and stating: "It appears that these students are being indoctrinated with communistic and other subversive theories contrary to our free systems of representative government." This resolution was passed within a few minutes, without customary hearing or referral to committee.

So, once again apparently the university is to be investigated. Once again statements harmful to the university's reputation have been made. We think that the people who have made these statements do not know the facts. Most of the statements are untrue. But the newspaper reader is likely to assume that where there's smoke there's fire. Therefore, this statement is being made. The truth does not lie somewhere between the allegations of irresponsible individuals and our statement of it. The facts spell the truth, and the truth is the opposite of the charges.

There is no Communist professor at the University of Chicago. There is no Communist indoctrination at the University of Chicago in any course or program in its curriculum.

* * * * *

Communism is a term which is used loosely by different people to mean different things. Not everyone who advocates change is a Communist. In times when there is fear of Communist infiltration many persons are afraid of any criticism of things as they are. There is a tendency at such times to put a "Red" label on anyone with whose opinions one may not agree. Universities have as much duty to defend the free expression of opinion within the bounds of legality as they have to prevent what is illegal. If such defense subjects the university to the harassment of a legislative investigation and to the possibility of inadequate or distorted reports of it, we shall nevertheless defend the university's principles with all the vigor we can command.

The trustees and administration of this university are against communism. They are against it because, among other reasons, it is contrary to our free tradition. Communism suppresses ideas. We oppose communism as we oppose all efforts to undermine our constitutionally guaranteed free speech, free press, and free assembly. We oppose communism because we believe in the tradition of individual freedom which men throughout the centuries have fought to preserve. This tradition has been stated by many men in many ways. A few of these statements follow:

John Milton, Areopagitica (1644): "Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties. * * * And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; who ever knew truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter?"

Thomas Jefferson, first inaugural address (1801): "If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this Union, or change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed, as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

* * * * *

Woodrow Wilson, message to Congress (1919): "The only way to keep men from agitating against grievances is to remove the grievances. An unwillingness even to discuss these matters produces only dissatisfactions and gives comfort to the extreme elements in our country which endeavor to stir up disturbances in order to provoke governments to embark upon a course of retaliation and repression. The seed of revolution is repression."

Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Abrams* v. *United States* (1919): "But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market."

* * * * *

Charles Evans Hughes, letter to Speaker Sweet, of the New York State Legislature, reported in the New York Times, January 10, 1920: "If public officers or private citizens have any evidence that any individual or group of individuals are plotting revolution and seeking by violent measures to change our Government, let the evidence be laid before the proper authorities and swift action be taken for the protection of the community. Let every resource of inquiry, of pursuit, of prosecution be employed to ferret out and punish the guilty according to our laws. But I count it a most serious mistake to proceed, not against individuals charged with violation of law but against masses of our citizens combined for political action, by denying them the only resource of peaceful government—that is, action by the ballot box and through duly elected representatives in legislative bodies."

* * * * *

THE TRADITION CONTINUES

Opinions such as these are often unpopular, especially when they are spoken in times of stress. But they have been stated again and again by men who were not isolated thinkers but men of action. It is fortunate that in the midst of our present apprehensions and alarms America does not lack men of the courage to continue the democratic tradition.

ROBERT A. TAFT, The Battle Against Communism, address to the Executives Club of Milwaukee, May 8, 1948: "There has been a good deal of talk of outlawing the Communist Party. Of course, under our Constitution, we cannot and should not make it illegal for an American citizen to think communism or express his opinions as long as he does not advocate a violent overthrow of the Government. We cannot afford, if we are going to maintain freedom in this country, to violate the Constitution. We would be killing the very liberty which it is the purpose of our whole policy to preserve against totalitarian attack."

* * * * *

WHAT ABOUT SPIES?

Today, some men devoted to freedom are worried about spies. They would "get rid of all the Reds" to eliminate the possibility of espionage. We, too, are against spies. But not everyone who is called Red is a spy. And, more important, not all spies announce themselves as Reds. The danger, if any, does not exist with the noisy agitators. The University of Chicago is engaged in secret projects of vital importance to national defense. The university is under surveillance of professional investigators, agents of the FBI and of the military intelligence units. This, we think, is the way to look for spies. The general suppression of Reds is too simple, too amateurish to be effective. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, is against it.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

"The Italian navigator has landed in the New World, and the natives are friendly."

In this cryptic message, so legend has it, the news of Enrico Fermi's successful operation of the atomic "pile" under the grandstand of Stagg Field at the University of Chicago was flashed to Washington on December 2, 1942. It meant that the chain reaction worked, and the first unleashing of atomic energy was under control.

The chain reaction made possible the most terrible weapon in history. It created the greatest economic fact of our time. It opened up endless new vistas for scientific accomplishment.

The work on the atomic bomb took great scientists. It also took great courage. Had it failed, the university might have been charged with the most spectacular boondoggle of all time. Or without the adequate calculations and protections which its scientists provided, the university might have been responsible for blowing up the northern end of Illinois.

The chain reaction is in a sense only a symbol of the working of freedom in ideas. It is no accident that the world's leading scientists wish to work in the free atmosphere provided by a great university. Freedom is the necessary condition of learning and progress.

Its contribution to the successful production of the atomic bomb was but one facet of the university's wartime activity. Its alumni and its staff served valiantly. It provided numerous trained individuals for positions of grave responsibility. Its facilities were mobilized and its activities ranged from interpretation and training in Chinese dialects and the prediction of weather in the Arctic region to the development of numerous protective measures for Armed Forces personnel. The University of Chicago has been honored by the Secretary of War for "contributing materially to the successful conclusion of World War II."

THE MARKET PLACE OF FREE IDEAS

This university was founded and rose to international prominence under circumstances which are possible only in a free and democratic state. Free interchange of ideas, free research, and the right of its faculty members to engage without restraint in the activities dictated by their judgment and their conscience have been protected and encouraged. Out of this freedom have come the renowned contributions of this university to the humanities and to the physical sciences, the social sciences, and the biological sciences.

* * * * *

It was in an atmosphere of freedom that A. A. Michelson, earliest American physicist to win the Nobel prize, measured the diameter of a star for the first time; James H. Breasted, America's first professor of Egyptology, furthered the understanding and reconstruction of ancient society; Robert A. Millikan won the Nobel prize for measuring the charge of the electron; Edgar J. Goodspeed achieved the status of the Nation's foremost New Testament scholar; Arno Luckhardt discovered ethylene gas, used as an anesthetic in millions of operations; Frank Billings demonstrated that teeth and tonsils can be focal centers for the spread of infection; Arthur H. Compton won the Nobel prize for his pioneer work on X-rays; Charles Merriam rose to eminence as a scholar and teacher of American political thought; Arthur J. Dempster isolated uranium 235, the atomic explosive—these men and the host of their distinguished colleagues produced the achievements which have placed this university among the foremost in the world.

* * * * *

It is in that freedom that the men of the university work today to find a cure for can-

cer, to harness atomic energy for peaceful productive use, to widen our knowledge of the social, political, and cultural forces in all human experience, and to train the teachers, the scientists, the scholars, and the enlightened citizens of tomorrow. It is upon that freedom that the future promise of the university is dependent. As Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, wrote in an editorial:

"For it is that environment rather than any dogma that represents the real Chicago story. It is impossible to spend any time on the campus without sensing the vitality of true academic freedom—not the academic freedom which limits itself (instead of being limited from without) to stump speeches or political activity, but the academic freedom which Holmes used to call the open market place of ideas. The spirit of independence, particularly as it applies to research * * * gives Chicago both its dominant characteristics and its chief claim on the future."

To be great, a university must adhere to principle. It cannot shift with the winds of passing public opinion. Its work is frequently mystifying and frequently misunderstood. It must rely for its support upon a relatively small number of people who understand the important contributions it makes to the welfare of the community and the improvement of mankind; upon those who understand that academic freedom is important not because of its benefits to professors but because of its benefits to all of us.

Today our tradition of freedom is under attack. There are those who are afraid of freedom. We do not share these fears. The University of Chicago needs the support of those who believe as we do.

LAIRD BELL,
Chairman, the Board of Trustees,
the University of Chicago.

APRIL 11, 1949.

University of Chicago—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I trust, and I have confidence, that in the mind of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is no lurking suspicion that the Catholic Church is in any way allied with or sympathetic toward Joe Stalin.

The Reverend Father Joseph D. Connerton is the chaplain and counselor of the Catholic students at the University of Chicago. This is what he had to say in a letter to President Colwell, of the university, dated March 25, 1949, when some in the General Assembly of Illinois were so carried away by zeal to do deeds calculated to win publicity and resultant applause that they hit upon the good old University of Chicago as the most convenient target:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 25, 1949.*

President ERNEST C. COLWELL,
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. COLWELL: The recent action of the State legislature ordering an investigation of the University of Chicago because of alleged Communist activities prompts me to write this letter.

I have acted in the capacity of chaplain and counselor of the Catholic students at the University of Chicago since the fall of 1941. Even before that date I had some familiarity with the university. From 1934 to 1937 I was assistant pastor in the Catholic parish in which the university is located. My pastoral duties brought me into contact with many of the students and several members of the staff of the university. I believe I am, therefore, in a position to be able to express an informed judgment about the university.

The accusation or impression that the University of Chicago is a communistic institution or teaches communistic doctrines is an extremely false one. Like any other university worthy of the name, it teaches what communistic doctrine is. But it does not attempt to inculcate or promote or encourage communism.

I know of no Communists on the teaching staff of the university and do not believe there are any. Since my arrival at the university in 1941, the number of Communist Party members among the student body has always been small—I would say never more than a handful. The number of students influenced to the point of becoming fellow travelers or joining a Communist-front organization has also been small. In other words, the amount of Communist activity among the student body of the University of Chicago is no more than occurs at many of the universities or colleges in our country and less than occurs at some. I'm afraid that some people have drawn the very conclusion that the Communists wanted drawn from their agitation and propaganda, namely: that they are stronger and more numerous than they actually are.

As to the delegation of University of Chicago students who visited the legislature at Springfield, one does not need at all to be a Communist or Communist sympathizer to be opposed to the Broyles bills. Many Catholics are apprehensive of these bills, alarmed at their sweeping abridgments of our normal American liberties. We older members of the community might rejoice that there are so many young Americans eager to preserve the freedoms traditionally associated with our American way of life and guaranteed us by the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Illinois.

One of the chief reasons Americans ought to oppose communism is the fact that communism is a totalitarian form of government. A sincere American might easily see in the Broyles bills evidence of a drift toward totalitarianism in our country. I believe that the already existing legal means of guaranteeing the safety and permanence of our free institutions and democratic processes ought to be used wisely and courageously by our governmental executives. Unless and until these means prove inadequate, no further power should be put into the hands of the executives of our Government. And any such extension of power ought to be limited in scope and limited in time.

Communism is an organized movement of the godless; it will be overcome more surely by godliness than by laws. Communism is a moral cancer; it will be cured by moral means more surely than by legal. In the fight against communism the force of virtue and truth will outweigh the force of law. Civil laws can help; but we would make a grave mistake if we would place our complete and exclusive trust in the enactments of men written in a book.

As Pope Pius XII says: "It is only the sacred principles of religion that can moderate within the limits of reason the duties and rights of citizens, can consolidate the foundations of the state and make men's lives conform to the salutary norms of morality, restoring them to order and virtue." He then quotes words from pagan Rome's greatest orator: "High priests, you defend the city more securely by religion than by its surrounding walls" (Cicero, De Natura Deorum III, 40).

As a Catholic priest, I believe it is unnecessary to state that I have no sympathy with Communist doctrine. Neither am I in sympathy with the secularism characteristic of much of our higher education today. But I do believe that an undeserved stigma has been cast upon the University of Chicago by the action of the State legislature in ordering an investigation of the university for communistic activities.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH D. CONNERTON.

University of Chicago—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Canon Bernard Iddings Bell represents the Episcopal Church at the University of Chicago. He is the Episcopalian consultant on education and religion. I am sure that my distinguished colleague who has informed the House that the University of Chicago is a hotbed of communism will be interested to learn that Canon Bell, in a letter to President Colwell of the university, dated March 30, 1949, declared in the name of the Episcopal Church and in his own name, complete confidence in the university administration "to see to it that subversive activities against our Nation are given no chance to do harm."

Canon Bell's letter follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 30, 1949.*

DR. ERNEST C. COLWELL,
President of the University of Chicago.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write merely to tell you how unjust and unfortunate seems this present "investigation" into communism at the University of Chicago. I am an alumnus, as you know, class of 1907; for 42 years I have been cognizant of what is going on hereabouts; during the past 3½ years I have lived and moved and had my being in intimate touch with the quadrangles and with university personnel, faculty, research scholars, the press, the students. I know that, while there are a very few scholars among us who may occasionally give students an impression that they are intellectually "left of center," the University as a whole is not influenced by these persons who are regarded for the most part as what they are, amiable eccentrics. I know, too, that the tiny group of students who constitute the Communist club are more laughed at than anything else. The investigation, with its implication that there is un-American skullduggery going on around here, is too absurd for words.

No one can accuse me, on my record, of any pro-Russian leanings, nor the church I represent here as having the same. Let me say to you then, in the name of that church and in my own name, how entirely we have confidence in the administration to see to it that subversive activities against our Nation are given no chance to do harm.

Yours very sincerely,

BERNARD IDDINGS BELL.

University of Chicago—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Maurice B. Pekarsky, of B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation at the University of Chicago, on March 31, 1949, addressed a letter to President Colwell, of the University of Chicago, which I commend to the reading of my colleagues as timely in view of the recent attack upon this floor of the University of Chicago as a breeding place for communism.

The letter of Rabbi Pekarsky follows:

B'NAI B'RITH HILLEL FOUNDATION
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., March 31, 1949.

President ERNEST C. COLWELL,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. COLWELL: I have followed with great concern the developments in the Illinois State Legislature calling for an investigation of Communist activities at the University of Chicago.

I am confident that the university will be able to meet the test of the investigating committee. But I am gravely concerned about the threat of such investigations, however patriotically motivated, to the freedom of instruction and discussion which is basic to the conception of a university, and to the atmosphere of freedom which is the indispensable prerequisite to the faith and practice of democracy.

During the 9 years of my association with students and faculty of the university, I have had the opportunity to learn something of the spirit and character of this school. It is of course absurd to label the university Communist or to suspect it even remotely of sympathy for communism. The fact that I often read and discuss Catholic doctrine hardly makes me a Catholic. Likewise, the study of communism, as an aspect of the political and economic thought and life in our time, is hardly identical with professing it. Only through an objective study of the forces which shape the political and economic life of nations can we hope to prepare our students to appreciate the peculiar blessings which are ours, and to confirm them in their faith in the democracy which is ours. The interaction of opinions and convictions, freedom of study and research, the right to petition our legislature—these are democratic rights, the rights of all American citizens—students and teachers included.

I am saddened by the dangers to our democratic institutions which the Broyles bill and the investigation committee represent. But I have faith in the university and in the legislature. Sooner or later the representatives of the people are bound to recognize that the preservation of democracy is quite inconsistent with actions threatening the institutions which are committed to its ideals and its method.

Sincerely yours,
Rabbi MAURICE B. PEKARSKY.

BAPTIST OFFICE,
CHAPEL HOUSE,
Chicago, Ill., March 23, 1949.

President ERNEST C. COLWELL,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. COLWELL: In the light of the forthcoming investigation of the University of Chicago by the State legislature, it is fitting that one who works in the atmosphere of the university and directly with its students should register his convictions regarding the university on this issue.

It is my sincere belief that the University of Chicago is doing one of the most effective educational jobs being done in America today. Part of its greatness is its encouragement of all varieties of opinion in its faculty and student body. In spite of this unfettered freedom to think individually about any and all matters, and its open toleration of a Communist club among its students, the university is surprisingly devoid of pro-Communist sentiment. This is a tribute not only to the university but to the soundness of the American democratic faith in the ability of every man to reason for himself and to choose well once he has been given the freedom to hear all sides of controversial issues.

The Broyles bill now pending before the State legislature represents a departure from the tradition of freedom of thought and expression which has been the genius of our democracy. They are more a tribute to the weakness of fear and hysteria to which frail humanity is yet subject than to the strength of that daring faith in man which has helped America to achieve more of the fruits of democratic living than any other nation on earth.

My experience with the students of the Univesity of Chicago in the informal and unguarded hours of voluntary group life during the past 2 years leads me to make two general observations about them: (1) There is a high degree of political and social awareness in the average student. This is something about which any university may rightly be proud. We, who are ministers to students here, like to feel that we are making some contribution toward this type of educational end. (2) In the midst of all this political and social concern, I have met only one pro-Communist student, and he was the head of the Communist club. Though he argues persuasively with his fellow students, he never aroused a mass conversion. It has always seemed to me to be better to allow a person with his convictions to argue openly for them and be refuted by the lack of response on the part of other students rather than to give his ideas the attractiveness of being considered dangerous by banishing their open expression.

I count it a privilege to be working with students in an atmosphere where they feel free to ask me all sorts of questions about communism as well as Christianity and know that my answers are given with the same freedom with which they raise their questions. In such an atmosphere, I feel that my work of securing Christian commitment proceeds by the Christian method of persuasion and not by the Communist method of excluding all alternatives. I hope that we can keep this kind of climate of opinion at the University of Chicago.

Sincerely,
RUSSELL BECKER,
University Baptist Pastor.

Are We Getting Too Hysteria-Minded To Preserve This Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, if the war was going all right in Korea, the public would say, "That's right, go to it—we will back you to a point beyond the limit." But when the other side has scored on us the whole picture changes. The chorus starts, "Hang Acheson (who advised us to keep out of Korea), impeach the President," and then all together on the chorus, "Get out of Asia and stay out." Is that not a fair portrayal of the present situation?

This is hysteria, pure and simple—it is madness—it will help defeat this country sometime if kept up. When an individual is in a tough spot he rarely fails to get through if he keeps his head—if anyone or any nation loses its common sense, defeat is inevitable. If football teaches anything at all, it is coolness and courage. In that game if a player gets slugged in the eye, he can not leave the game to go home and tell his ma. No, sir; he sticks—takes all the other side can hand out—but his team wins.

I am a Republican, I did not vote for the giving away of billions to foreign countries to prepare them for their own protection. If all had voted my way, we would not be in Asia at all. I voted straight through on all of these schemes "No." Now the Republican papers are pounding the President unmercifully—"We should not be in the war. It was Truman who got us in—down with Truman—impeach the renegade."

Well, now. Let us keep our heads in this crisis. Truman could not have done anything that would involve us in war if Congress had not made the appropriations. The people's representatives voted for it, regardless of party. The Republican Members who supported Truman's policy cannot hide now behind the curtain while this condemnation is afoot. Who supported the President?—90 percent of the solid South Dixiecrats and all 95 percent of the eastern seaboard from Maine to Virginia, including Maryland; 95 percent of the solid west coast delegation; Tennessee, Arkansas, Missouri, a large section of Pennsylvania, a section of Ohio, a section of Illinois, Michigan.

What was left—some of the great Central West—but not all of that.

These peoples' representatives, fresh from their districts, voted with the President—Republicans. Did they support the President? Well, look at the record and you will be surprised what a following he had among the Republicans in Congress. A brain has not yet been created that can make a political issue of our involvement in Asia. Both parties are to blame—the people back home are to blame. Regardless of how we got there, we are at war, and we cannot win it—we cannot even begin to win it if we are now to charge each other and everyone else but ourselves for starting it, and spend our time pointing out the men who are supposed to have brought this situation about. I hope we are still Americans. I hope we put the future of our great country ahead of the future of any political party. Since we are in it, there is just one thing for a voter or a representative of this Government to do and that is "get in there and do your stuff to defend the United States of America." Just because we have lost the first round, do not throw in the towel and feebly murmur, "I am licked." That is not the spirit that made this democracy great—

that is not the spirit that has made it possible for us to build the greatest liberty-loving nation on the earth.

If it becomes necessary to change our tactics—as to where we will fight the common enemy; how we can fight him best; the leading military and naval boards will know it and do it.

We forget too quickly our history. Let us turn over the musty pages of the War Between the States. We got licked twice at Bull Run and our Army beat it back across the Potomac in a panic. It was every man for himself and the Devil take the hindmost. Lee and Jackson and the Confederate Army jolted the North so hard that Lincoln and his Secretary of State, Seward, found themselves in a sea of criticism and hysteria. The newspapers demanded the ouster of Seward and the great Lincoln was caricatured as a weak, vacilating creature who should not be trusted to head this Government.

Lincoln stood firm, cool, and collected while this storm of criticism raged.

He kept his head—he kept his Secretary of State, and went about the job of winning the war. Up to that time, no Northern general could move without permission of Congress—McClelland had failed—all had failed as long as Congress directed the war. Lincoln saw we could not win the war that way—he picked out a great general—U. S. Grant, and interviewed him. Lincoln asked Grant to take command of the Northern forces—Grant responded that he would not take it at all if Congress was going to hamper him by orders and counter-orders—Lincoln's answer won the war. He said, in substance, "Grant, you take the command and take the orders from me. Under the Constitution I am the Commander in Chief of our forces, and I am going to exercise that duty. Go to it, and I will back you up."

We are in the same hysteria now, we want to hang Acheson and impeach Truman, in our mad-unthinking haze.

Remember what has taken place in this country before—and remember that cool heads lead the way to victory.

If Truman is wrong—if we never should have started our foreign policy to arm countries—the majority of Congress is just as wrong as the President—and I mean a great majority, too. The Democratic Members who voted with Truman cannot escape the blame; the Republican Members from a majority of the States cannot escape the blame. Maybe the President and the great majority of Congress was right, but we shall never find out if we do not get into this war effort in a united way. We will have plenty of time after the war is over to do the talking we are doing now.

Point 4 and the Path to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I shall be leaving this House with the adjournment of the Eighty-first Congress. During my one term here I have voted for every measure that I thought was leading on the path to peace. I have voted against every measure that I thought was, while sincerely intentioned, capable of becoming a gesture toward war.

There have been three major wars in my active lifetime, and I do not want that to be the pattern of my country. It is not the pattern that we should wish to hold before the young mothers of our land. If we cannot live in peace, and contribute to making this a world of peace, as a people we have failed in the mission under our destiny.

Governments are but the instrumentalities to assist the gravitation of eternal justice upward toward the throne of God. My concept of the destiny of our country and the Government through which it speaks and acts, is leadership in our time in such assistance.

ALTGELD'S MEMORABLE ADDRESS

I have made use of some of the language of one of the greatest of the sons of Illinois, John Peter Altgeld. When the current of prejudice and of passion, of doubt and of unfounded suspicion, was running wild and violent he dared to stand against the current in his faith in the inherent goodness of men and women. He died impoverished and the causes in which he believed seemed crushed. It was a brief time before his death that he delivered his never-to-be-forgotten address at Joliet, Ill., in which he said:

> I am not discouraged. Things will right themselves. The pendulum swings one way and then the other. But the steady pull of gravitation is toward the center of the earth. Any structure must be plumb if it is to endure or the building will fall. So it is with nations. Wrongs may seem to triumph. Right may seem to be defeated. But the gravitation of eternal justice is upward toward the throne of God.

The present situation in world affairs, Mr. Speaker, will not be so terrifying to our people if those words spoken almost half a century ago by John Peter Altgeld form the basis of their faith in the destiny of our country:

> But the gravitation of eternal justice is upward toward the throne of God.

FAITH SWEETENS SACRIFICE

Faith in America—in her destiny to serve as an instrumentality in assisting the gravitation of eternal justice upward toward the throne of God—will dispel confusion. It will give sweetness to participation in the sacrifices ahead.

To fulfill our responsibility, and to remain secure while our plans are developing, we must be strong. That will require large expenditures, which it is prudent should be met on a pay-as-we-go basis. Taxes will be increasingly large and there will be a growing list of things we will have to go without.

If instead of confusion, wherein we quarreled with ourselves and with our neighbors, we have the quiet faith that all is for a purpose in the gravitation through our struggles of eternal justice upward toward the throne of God we will find in our sacrifices the thrill and glow of travelers ascending to the mountain's peak.

BURSTING OF TOMORROW'S SUN

I am not discouraged, Mr. Speaker, because in the darkness of the night I can vision the bursting of the sun on tomorrow's morning. If by our sacrifices we can buy 10 years of peace we will have reached safely another height in man's ever upward climb.

Discontent breeds in poverty, and it is to the eradication of unnecessary poverty that our country has dedicated herself. That is the great undertaking and the great adventure of our generation. It is part and parcel of our national destiny.

AN OLD AMERICAN PATTERN

There is nothing new and untried with which we are experimenting. All that we are doing is applying on a world scale something which worked in our own land.

Capital and know-how went inland from our seaboard and in the development of new areas made new markets for the products of the old areas. So now, when modern means of transportation have made the whole world closer knit than were the original States and the Territories, we are fitting this old tried and proved American pattern onto the body universe.

Our money, loaned on banker-approved security, and our know-how, under point 4, are building in the neglected regions of the earth the foundations for prosperous economies.

Give us 10 years of peace for the development of point 4 and the world-wide broadening of the markets for the products of our factories and there will come to our people a prosperity surpassing any they have ever known or of any of which they have ever dreamed.

If every section of our own United States were in this manner raised to some measure of affluence, benefiting all other sections and harming none, so can it be done on a world level.

WORLD DRIVE AGAINST POVERTY

It is the first time in all recorded history that a world drive has been made on the eradication of unnecessary poverty, with no element of exploitation or desire of territorial dominion.

Merely by helping other peoples to help themselves, through development of their own resources on money loaned by us and with the assistance of our technical knowledge, we broaden everywhere the horizons of human existence, raise everywhere the standards of living, remove the causes of discontent and of wars, and open to us rich markets where now there is only poverty.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the path to permanent peace. It is why I am not discouraged and in the darkness of the night vision the bursting of tomorrow's sun. It is on the road of America's destiny to world leadership, not for privilege, or for conquest, but as an instrumentality for the gravitation of eternal justice upward toward the throne of God.

NO PLACE FOR GLOOM

In the sacrifices that are ahead for all of us I see no place for gloom. We shall be walking not into the night, but out of the night and into the morning of a brighter day than any our old world has

known. It is the one war blessed with the prayers of the mothers of all lands—a war not against a nation, but against a condition—the war to end unnecessary poverty and thus to bring into realization the centuries-long dream of permanent peace.

With faith and courage and with a smile we can face the sacrifices which are the price of the blessings in store for us when the march is ended and the morning has dawned. To us in our generation is given the privilege of being participants in one of the great epochal periods in the history of mankind.

BUYING 10 YEARS OF PEACE

But we must have 10 years of peace in which to build up the economies of neglected areas through the developments we are financing. We are attempting to buy this peace with the staggering appropriations we are making and shall continue to make to be so strong that no one would wish to take the calculated risk of engaging us in another major war.

It would be folly, of course, Mr. Speaker, to minimize the dangers that we face. Unfortunately, the confusion in the minds of men and women is not confined to those of our own country. Neither here nor in Europe nor in the Orient is there a clear understanding of our purpose and our objective. Among many of our own people, terrified by what seems to them international involvements that tax excessively and for uncertain purposes our resources, there is little, if any, conception of the richness ahead, the undreamed-of prosperity, if for but 10 years we can hold the lines for peace against an aggressor bent on world conquest. In other lands, spurred by the active propaganda of the Communists, among many people our point-4 program, intended to benefit ourselves only as first we build the prosperity of other peoples, is confused with the imperialism of a dead-and-gone age, an imperialism that forced the doctrine of race superiority and thrived on exploitation.

In the 10 years of peace we hope our sacrifices will buy, point 4 will prove itself to our satisfaction and to the equal satisfaction of all other peoples. In a world rid of unnecessary poverty, with the good things of life made available to the effort of all men everywhere, there can be no discontent to excite to conflict. The same program that developed the United States of America into the most prosperous nation in the world, with the highest living standard ever known, cannot fail in this larger test.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be in the Eighty-second Congress, but back among my neighbors and my friends in the Second District of Illinois I shall continue to combat confusion and gloom, doubt and uncertainty, unfair discriminations and unfounded suspicions. I shall continue to believe in the inherent goodness of men and women. Even where my neighbor's thinking is not in agreement with my own, I shall not question his sincerity nor permit a difference of opinion to raise in my mind a doubt of the loyalty to country of my neighbor.

While we are marching out of the night, Mr. Speaker, as my humble contribution as one of the unofficial and unranked marchers I shall seek to cheer my neighbor with the vision of the day about to dawn and the brilliant bursting of the morning's sun.

A sense of the privilege of living and of sacrificing in one of the great epochal periods of history, when so intimately close to us will be the feel of the gravitation of eternal justice upward toward the throne of God, cannot fail to give to my neighbor and to me a spring to our steps and a glow to our hearts.

So, Mr. Speaker, may it be with my distinguished and beloved colleagues who remain behind, charged with the great responsibilities that will be given to the Eighty-second Congress.

Herbert Hoover's Advice on Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the splendid editorial appearing below was published in the Times-Star, Alameda, Calif.

Mr. William Werner, the owner and publisher of the Times-Star, has adopted a policy for this paper in keeping with the best traditions of the American newspaper.

It is independent in its politics and approaches the problems of the day with a critical penetrating scrutiny before adopting a policy toward them.

The editorial follows:

HERBERT HOOVER'S ADVICE ON EUROPE

The French have a saying which when they adhered to it won their country empires, and which, when they disregarded it, as in the last war, lost those empires for them.

It is "L'audace, l'audace, et toujours de l'audace." Very freely translated it means "Courage, courage, and always courage."

In listening to Herbert Hoover the night before last, we could not help but be reminded of it. For, though the former Chief Executive's talk was well delivered and well reasoned, it was not the talk which should have been given by the erstwhile leader of a young and vigorous nation.

Instead it was the counsel of an elder statesman in a country that was growing old. It was Byzantine. It was the sort of speech that one might have heard in Constantinople at a time when the hordes of barbarians were pushing in from the east to crush the remnant of the ancient empire of Rome which had moved to the Bosphorous to avoid yet other barbarians.

For like the Byzantines, he counseled a courageous defense of our empire; a waiting defense, a defense that does not lie in attack but rather in the dogged resistance of a people that can hope only to avoid the ultimate of disaster for a while, and not to crush the enemy permanently.

Hoover urged us to abandon all of Asia, with the exception of the islands of Japan and Formosa and some others, to the Communists, and to do likewise in Europe, leaving all its great resources of industry and manpower to be taken over by the enemy if they could not resist, which quite possibly they might not be able successfully to do unaided.

This policy of his could be attacked on a multitude of grounds, but today we shall content ourselves with only one—that of the spirit.

Have we, the people of the United States, so far lost our self-respect that we can let the lands of our ancestors be taken over by the Communists? Are we to let France, from which we have derived so much, fall into the hands of Russia; to let Italy, the seat of the Roman Catholic Church, come under the rule of the Kremlin; to let the British Isles be converted into nothing other than an outpost for our civilization? And all that without having first fought the invaders of those countries until we can fight no more?

We trust not. We believe not. For if we are to do that, then we shall have already thrown away our courage, and that done, with appalling swiftness we shall find ourselves so rotten within that we shall soon become a prey to the enemy from without—to the red specter of militant communism.

This must not happen to us. It is infinitely better for us to go to war for what we feel is right when that right thing is in danger than to wait for a better time. Had we done that when Hitler marched into Austria, or into Czechoslovakia, World War II would not have been fought. It would have been scotched too soon.

And in this present case, if we resolutely let it be known that we shall fight with all our strength on the invasion of western Europe, and do so when the time comes, we shall not regret it.

For our audacity will be that of a free, proud people, which is infinitely more than the courage of creatures who are driven up to the guns of the enemy in hordes for slaughter like so many cattle.

The AMA's Absurd Proposal for Training New Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 20, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I attach the following editorial from the December 27 issue of the Capital Times entitled "The AMA's Absurd Proposal for Training New Doctors":

THE AMA'S ABSURD PROPOSAL FOR TRAINING NEW DOCTORS

In its insensate opposition to any and all efforts of the Government to provide more adequate medical care in this Nation, the American Medical Association has been opposing legislation to give Federal aid to medical schools so that more doctors can be trained to meet the Nation's needs.

The medical schools, cramped for space and short of proper training facilities, have opposed the medical politicians because they realize the urgent need for Government assistance.

The AMA, which has fought every constructive measure to improve medical care, has come up with a plan of its own, which is nothing more or less than a rank fraud. It proposes to contribute $500,000 to help

the medical schools out of their present plight.

This is about 1 percent of what was proposed in Government aid and only 1 percent of a minimum need. Some experts were convinced that even the proposed Government aid was inadequate. But the medical profession proposes to do this badly needed job with only $500,000.

It is obvious that the medical monopoly is not interested in training doctors, despite the widespread and well-recognized shortage of doctors. They are interested in keeping the supply well below the demand to protect their own economic interests.

The half-million proposed by the doctors is only half of what the AMA spent in propaganda in 1 month during the last campaign in their effort to kill the national health insurance program.

"Millions for politics and peanuts for health" should be the new slogan of the AMA.

It is obvious that the absurdly small amount proposed by the AMA to meet a major need is nothing more than a public-relations stunt dreamed up to offset the bad public reaction to the AMA's opposition to the Government proposal. Doubtlessly the idea was conceived by the AMA's high-pressure public-relations firm, Whitaker & Baxter, which is collecting fees in amounts substantial enough to help train a lot of new doctors.

Servicemen and Their Debts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an article entitled "Servicemen and Their Debts," which appears in the January 1951 issue of the magazine Changing Times, published by the Kiplinger Washington Letter Service.

It is a very readable explanation of the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act over which the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has jurisdiction. I believe that all Members of both Houses will be interested in this brief explanation of the workings of this law.

The article referred to follows:

SERVICEMEN AND THEIR DEBTS

Since leaving the Army in 1945, Bill Smith has acquired a family, a mortgage, some life insurance, and a sergeant's rating in the Reserve.

Facing the prospect of a call to active duty, Bill is worried. As a soldier he would get considerably less pay than now. How would his family manage to meet the mortgage payments and insurance premiums?

Would he have to lose the house, and let the insurance lapse?

Probably not. If worst comes to worst, Bill will almost certainly have his mortgage payments eased or postponed, and his insurance kept in force—thanks to a piece of legislation which is called the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

That act, in force during World War II and revived with the postwar draft, was designed to protect citizen-soldiers in exactly Bill Smith's position. As civilians, men take on civil liabilities. They sign leases, buy things on the installment plan, become liable for taxes, take out insurance, mortgage their homes. Then they get the nod from Uncle Sam. And the obligations that they were able to handle as civilians become impossible burdens on a soldier's or sailor's pay.

And so the Relief Act was put on the books to guarantee these men a fair shake. In effect, it empowers the courts and certain Government agencies to stall the enforcement of such liabilities, and to make whatever arrangements are necessary and justified to help the serviceman get off the hook.

If you or any of your family are in the service, or expect to be, or if anyone in the service owes you money or rents from you, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act is something you should know about. A lot of cockeyed ideas are in circulation about it. Now is a good time to get straight just what it does and doesn't do. Here is how it would affect you, as a serviceman:

INSTALLMENT PURCHASES

What happens if you can't meet a payment?

The law applies if you or a dependent paid a deposit or installment before you entered the service, before you got orders to report for draft induction, or before you got orders to report for active duty from an enlisted reserve status.

The seller can't take back the property or merchandise or cancel the sale or take any other action against you without getting court approval first.

If the judge finds military service has impaired your ability to pay, he can postpone the proceedings until you've had a chance to catch up. He can make the seller give back what you've paid in before letting him repossess. Or he can work out any special arrangement—say, smaller payments over a longer period—that is fair to both sides.

MORTGAGES

What happens if the payments are too large for your service pay?

If you signed the mortgage before entering service, or before getting orders to report for induction or active duty, the lender can't foreclose without going to court.

The judge can order him to pay back what you have paid in and then let him foreclose. (That might well be the ruling if you had not yet acquired much equity in the house.) He can postpone enforcement of the contract or work out a new arrangement to satisfy you both. Or he can, in effect, declare a moratorium on payments while you are in service, provided you pay off the arrears afterward.

RENTS

You're off in the service and your family can't pay the rent. Can the landlord evict them?

Sooner or later, yes. But if your rent is $80 a month or less, here's what will happen: The landlord must go to court, no matter what agreement you may have made. The judge can then postpone the eviction for not more than 3 months to give your family time to find other quarters or pay up. He can have a rental allotment deducted from your service pay. Or he can make such other order as may be just.

There is protection for the landlord, too. While both collection and eviction are postponed, the landlord will be protected by the law in case any action is brought against him for failure to meet a mortgage or pay taxes.

LEASES

Before you enlisted or got orders to report, you signed a lease on some property. Can you break the lease?

As a rule, yes, provided you actually occupied the place, either for business or as a home. Write a letter to the landlord notifying him that you want to cancel the lease, and it will be terminated 30 days after the next rent payment is due.

The landlord has a chance, however, to get that rule modified. He can appeal to a court, and if the judge thinks that the abrupt cancelation is unjustified, he is authorized to change the arrangement around a bit—perhaps require that longer notice be given.

LIFE INSURANCE

Will your policies lapse if you can't pay the premiums?

You can ask the Veterans' Administration to keep up to $10,000 of your private life insurance in force while you're in service. If reduced income due to military service really is the cause of your trouble, the request will probably be granted.

The VA then keeps the policy in force by guaranteeing the insurance company that it will get its money eventually, in one way or another. The guaranty will run while you are in service and for 2 years afterward.

If the policy becomes payable while that guaranty is in force the insurance company will deduct the unpaid premiums, plus interest from the proceeds before paying off.

Otherwise, when the guaranty expires, the unpaid premiums become a policy loan, and you are expected to pay it off. If you don't, or if there isn't enough cash value in the policy to cover the loan, the policy will be surrendered, the VA will pay off the insurance company, and you will owe the Government the amount paid in your behalf.

TAXES

You owe some taxes when you go into service, or become liable for some while you are in. What happens if you can't pay?

On property taxes, the court can postpone a tax sale for up to 6 months after you are discharged. If, for any reason, the court does allow the property to be sold, you can redeem it at any time within 6 months after your discharge. This also applies to assessments.

On income taxes, the law flatly postpones the liability while you are in service and 6 months afterward. Then you must pay. Report your situation to the collector before the tax falls due.

Another section of the law says that no State or town can make you pay taxes to it just because you are stationed there on military orders. That covers automobile registration, too. You can keep your regular residence, for tax and car registration purposes, even though you are ordered to live somewhere else.

Those are the main provisions of the civil relief act, but there are many others. If you hold any kind of public-land right—a homestead entry, irrigation aid, a mining claim, or a Federal-land lease—some or all of your obligations to live on the land or work it can be suspended while you are in service. There are provisions protecting you in case any kind of lawsuit is brought against you while you are absent, and provisions protecting insurance policies given as security for a loan.

If you are a serviceman and get into any trouble with a landlord or creditor, you or your wife should check with the legal aid society. Its staff will explain your rights and help you protect them. On life insurance problems, get in touch with the nearest VA office.

And if you are the landlord or creditor in the case, be sure to see your lawyer before you start any action involving a serviceman.

In either case, remember that the law does not allow anyone to welsh on his debts. But it does guarantee that no civilian-turned soldier will suffer just because the Government forced him to take a pay cut.

Some Plain Talk About That Railroad Work Stoppage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in Labor under date of December 23, 1950.

This gives the other side of the recent railroad work stoppages. These stoppages were not authorized by any of the recognized railroad unions but came out of protest for the long delay in a justified upward wage adjustment.

SOME PLAIN TALK ABOUT THAT RAILROAD WORK STOPPAGE—STUBBORN MANAGEMENT STAYS IN DRIVER'S SEAT UNDER GOVERNMENT PAPER CONTROL

The mulish stubbornness of railroad management, and an unfortunate mistake by the Government, led to wildcat work stoppages for which no rail union was responsible. It is difficult to restrain men whose long patience has at last been exhausted.

Daily newspapers gave the public a one-sided picture of the situation, ruthlessly arousing prejudice against rail workers and their unions. Someone should tell the other side, and Labor proposes to do it here, as calmly as possible.

Way back in March, 1949, the conductors and trainmen asked the carriers for something which had already been granted to the million members of 15 nonoperating railroad unions, and which had already become common in other industries—a 40-hour week with no reduction in weekly pay. The two brotherhoods also requested correction of certain injustices in working rules.

It will soon be two full years since those requests were made. Since then, the engineers also asked for rules changes and long-overdue wage increases. The firemen and enginemen launched a move for the 40-hour week in November, 1949. Later they served notice for a wage increase.

All these reasonable and entirely legal requests have been dragging on for months, with the brotherhoods faithfully following the procedures of the Railway Labor Act, and incurring great expense in their efforts to serve the legitimate demands of their members. The unions even agreed to put aside their requests for rules changes, if that would expedite agreement on the wage issues.

Meanwhile, what do members of all the railroad unions see? They see workers in other industries getting wage boosts speedily, and without huge expenses to their unions. They, and their families, see the cost of living going up every day. They see the carriers piling up huge profits.

Now back to the oldest of the rail wage and rules cases, that of the conductors and trainmen. On August 25, 1950—more than a year and one-half after the two brotherhoods began their patient procedure—the Government seized the railroads to avert a strike by the members of the two unions.

The seizure consisted simply of announcing that an Army general was taking control of the railroads, but the same old stubborn managements were left in the driver's seat. They laughed at labor, figuring they now had the workers in a position where they could not strike. In other words, could not exercise their constitutional right to quit work.

If they did strike, they would be charged with striking against Uncle Sam and they would face court injunctions, as has now actually happened.

The Government, when it took control of the railroads, made the fatal mistake of not taking the responsibility which goes with control. If the Government had assumed responsibility for wages, working conditions, and profits, the smile would have been wiped off management's face.

Such real control has been tried by Government and it worked. Uncle Sam really took over the Toledo, Peoria & Western during the last war, when wild actions by the president of that road threatened a rail break-down. For 4 years the Government held the profits of the T., P. & W., and during that period the road had harmonious relations with its workers.

Likewise the Government really took control of Montgomery-Ward and the coal mines, and in both cases labor got fair treatment because management had to deal with workers on decent terms.

In contrast, the present Government seizure of the railroads left all the cards in the hands of management, and those cards have been played in a way to arouse the resentment of the railmen.

For weeks rail workers hoped that justice would come out of the White House meetings between representatives of the operating brotherhoods, rail management, the National Mediation Board, and Dr. John R. Steelman, assistant to the President. But Dr. Steelman, always smiling, always glad-handing, did a miserable job.

He put no visible pressure on the carriers. So management continued to sit in the driver's seat, with Uncle Sam not even acting as a back-seat driver.

Finally here and there groups of workers lost patience. They started unauthorized stoppages. Everyone, even the President, blamed the unions.

The unions were not responsible. They did their part. The Government failed to assume the responsibility which should accompany control. Managements thought the situation amusing and wouldn't yield an inch. That's the whole story.

Lobbying 1950—Direct and Indirect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address which I delivered to the forty-sixth annual meeting of the American Political Science Association here in Washington on Thursday, December 28, 1950.

The address is as follows:

Madam Chairman, fellow panel members, members of the American Political Science Association, a speaker is always thankful when he has an audience that he knows is vitally interested in his subject. I know that you, as political scientists, are vitally interested in the subject of lobbying—what it is, what it means, the problems it raises, the means by which these problems can be attacked. You have shown your interest by the many hundreds of requests for hearings and reports which the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has received from students, teachers, and departments of political science all over the country. Your interest is further reflected in the countless suggestions and expressions of support which you have given our committee. My colleagues on the committee and I have deeply appreciated this response, and we have profited tremendously from it. You have been more aware of what our investigation has sought to do than any other group in the country.

This is, I suppose, as it should be. Lobbying is, after all, one of the great unsolved problems of American political science, and you should be professionally concerned with it. I, too, am professionally concerned with it. As you can guess, the problem of lobbying has been pretty much the star and center of my universe for the past year. The harsh and unavoidable fact is, however, that our enthusiasm is not generally shared. In 1949, for example, the American Institute of Public Opinion reported that fully 45 percent of its usual sample did not know what the term "lobbyist" meant. Furthermore, 60 percent of those polled either had no idea of what "lobbyist" meant or expressed no opinion as to whether or not lobbyists served a useful purpose or represented a bad influence on Congress. Of those expressing an opinion, only 15 percent thought that lobbying might be useful while 25 percent thought that it was bad. Assuming the general validity of these figures, they are a disheartening commentary on the prevailing level of public information about lobbying. I am personally convinced that lobbying can become—if it has not already become—a serious problem in our kind of democratic society. I am equally convinced that it is a problem which cannot be met successfully without a substantial increase in public interest and understanding. How to secure this interest and understanding is something else again.

The general lack of public information about lobbying was one of the great challenges which our committee has had to face. It was also one of the important reasons behind the establishment of our committee in 1949. During the 3 years following the end of the Second World War, there was more lobbying being done than at any previous time in our history. During this same period, the Regulation of Lobbying Act, designed to do nothing more than provide some rudimentary information about pressure-group activity, went into operation. Yet after 3 years of publicity under the Lobbying Act—and this in a period of extremely heavy pressure—almost half the public didn't know what a lobbyist was, to say nothing of who was doing the lobbying or how much it was costing, or whether it was desirable or dangerous. There had not been a major congressional investigation of lobbying since 1935. It was clearly time to strip away the ginger bread and take a long look at the system to see just what made it tick. This is, basically, what our committee has sought to do—without prejudice or emotion, and with as much thoroughness and insight as limitations of time, money, and personnel would permit.

As I look back on the committee's work in the past year, I am more and more impressed with the extraordinary complexity and range of the modern system of pressure politics. It is a system involving the efforts of many thousands of people and the expenditure of literally hundreds of millions of dollars. No single committee of Congress, however long it worked, could have laid the whole pattern bare.

While we do not begin to know all that there is to know about lobbying today, I sincerely believe that the past year's work has given us the basis for more systematic generalizations about the nature and implications of modern pressure politics than we have had in the past. This is my belief. You, as both students and teachers of political science, must render the final judgment on our efforts.

What kind of generalizations can we make about lobbying, 1950 style? I have already suggested one of the most important—that the sheer weight of lobbying activity has increased significantly in recent years. Members of Congress, the press, the lobbyists themselves can attest to this. During and after World War II, there were simply more groups organized to influence the course of government than ever before. Group demands on government have been more numerous, more insistent, better-financed, and more effective than ever before.

To my mind, a continuing increase in groups and in group resources is only a natural consequence of the development of a complex, highly organized industrial society. This may be an unattractive prospect in some respects, but there seems to be no way of avoiding it. But what is more significant than the simple fact of more pressure groups is, I believe, the radical changes which have occurred in pressure tactics. Lobbying has been revolutionized. Today's lobbying and that of 50 years ago have little in common.

Compare, for example, Lord Bryce's description of lobbying in the American Commonwealth with one of the admittedly less classic volumes of hearings held by our committee. In Bryce's day the lobbyist was a political freebooter, trading on his contacts and the marginal honesty of a few Members of Congress. He might be called a kind of primordial 5-percenter, but his activities bear little resemblance to modern pressure-group tactics. Where he fixed and bribed, the modern pressure group demands and threatens. While the old-time lobby baron spoke only for himself and his client, the modern group at least represents itself as the flexed legislative arm of thousands or perhaps millions of voting citizens; nor does the modern group merely represent the passive opinion of its members. It also seeks to shape this opinion, to use it as a means of pressure. Where the lobbying of two generations ago was essentially direct, making up in forthrightness what it lacked in honesty, the major emphasis these days is on indirection—on the use of large-scale public-relations campaigns rather than personal contact—public relations designed to stimulate broad public support for the group's aims. These campaigns feature such techniques as institutional advertising; boilerplating and canned editorials; the use of radio and television; exhortations to write, wire, and phone your Congressman; essay contests; public-opinion polls; and, above all, the distribution of unbelievable quantities of polemic literature of all and every kind.

One of the most significant features of this growing public-relations effort is that it is becoming increasingly long range in character. Not only do interested groups seek to influence public opinion on the issues of today and tomorrow but they are turning more and more of their attention to what they, at least, think will be the issues of 5, 10, or 20 years hence. Thus, the full-page ads which dwell moodily on the havoc an imaginary corps of Socialist planners is w eaking on what they usually call the American free-enterprise system. Not today, not tomorrow, perhaps, but we are left with little doubt that some kind of frightful Armageddon is inevitable.

These groups recognize that the issues of tomorrow will be decided by the mature opinions of today's youth; consequently, they make every possible effort to catch this opinion in the bud. The schools of the country have thus become a special target for long-range pressure politics. Free books embodying the group's views are distributed by thousands; teachers are hounded in numerous ways; and a watchful eye is kept on textbooks in such publications as the Educational Reviewer. The pressure groups have learned well the lessons taught by the public utilities in the twenties and thirties. Now as then, the long-run aim of these groups goes far beyond the conventional brand of lobbying; it is nothing less than the establishment of their views as the ultimate standards of orthodoxy, both in education and more generally. We have yet to see this attempt to capture the mind of the Nation brought to its complete fulfillment. But even now, the implications of this well-planned and concerted effort are rather frightening.

We have already seen too many cases in which honest and thoughtful educators have had to yield precious ground to self-appointed protectors of the public interest. It is no longer education when curricula and course content are tailored to meet the special demands of whatever private groups happen to be most vocal in the community.

No one of these techniques of mass persuasion is in itself entirely novel, nor did they become lobbying techniques only the day before yesterday. You as political scientists and I as a Member of Congress probably regard them as quite commonplace. But once again, you and I seem to be sharing a rather unpopular position. Virtually every organization appearing before our committee and a good part of the Nation's press have taken a contrary view. Lobbying, they say, consists solely of those techniques of direct contact which came to fullest flower in the 1870's and 1880's.

Thus, when we had the temerity to suggest that the systematic distribution of very extreme and one-sided economic and political propaganda might, under certain circumstances, be called lobbying, we were roundly damned as a group of despots trying to subvert the free-press guarantees of the Constitution. Groups like the Committee for Constitutional Government which have by their every deed shown nothing but contempt for our processes of popular government and free education took refuge behind a shifting variety of self-serving labels. Suddenly, from a self-interested pressure group of the most obvious kind, they were transformed into publishers, or educators—terms which they presumed to be more socially acceptable and less open to close examination than so flat a label as lobbyist. I must admit that it has been a great disappointment to me to see this cry taken up by so large a part of the Nation's press. We asked only that groups engaging in certain practices stand up and be counted honestly and openly under the mechanism provided by the Lobbying Act. But this, said the press, is tyranny; neither the people nor Congress have a right to the facts.

Now, I believe that a workable definition of terms is a necessary first step in any logical analysis. Defining lobbying, however, is peculiarly difficult, because the definitions given usually accord only with the special needs of the user. Why define lobbying at all then? Why not simply say that it is a term about which reasonable men may have differing opinions? Actually, the need for definition is not hard to find. Why should an act be classified as lobbying or nonlobbying at all, except that information about the former must be reported under the Lobbying Act? Most of the righteously narrow definitions of lobbying result from nothing more than deliberate unwillingness to accept this responsibility.

After months of investigation our committee finally concluded that any such definition was hopelessly limited and that the only practical criteria of lobbying were a purpose to influence legislative or administrative policy and the expenditure of substantial amounts of money for this purpose.

How do these criteria apply in practice to such activities as institutional advertising or mass pamphleteering? The expenditure of money for these things is easily established, but how do you establish their purpose? It seems to me that the ultimate test is always a negative one. Is it, for example, the intent of the Committee for Constitutional Government, or the Foundation for Economic Education that their books and pamphlets on public issue should have no effect on the determination of thees issues? To ask this question is usually to answer it.

What it all boils down to is this: Organized efforts to influence the governmental process are becoming as broad as our entire system to mass communications. These efforts may be labeled as education or publishing by those to whom the term "lobbying" is unpalatable; but if they meet the tests I have outlined, they are lobbying nonetheless and should be made matters of public information through the medium which the Lobbying Act provides. Lobbying today is group-oriented, and the characteristic approach is to public opinion and through this to public policy. If the principle of publicity embodied in the Lobbying Act is to have any meaning at all, it must be broad enough to encompass this approach.

I believe that our investigation has also provided evidence to support several generalizations relating to money in lobbying and the approximate balance of strength among the great organized groups which today seek to influence what government does.

Success in lobbying has always been closely related to the material and organizational resources of the parties concerned. Under present conditions, however, with so many conflicting voices clamoring to be heard by govern ent, the relationship between these resources and successful special pleading has become almost absolute. All other things being equal, as, of course, they seldom are, "money talks" in modern lobbying to an unprecedented extent. Money alone cannot purchase legislation, but it can provide the means by which public policy decisions can be most effectively influenced. Certainly this does considerable violence to our traditional conception of lobbying as an area in which all the competitors are on a more or less equal footing. It does violence, too, to the belief that the sheer number of conflicting groups provides a built-in guaranty of responsible public policy. To the contrary, the more groups there are, the more certain it is that relatively few of them will be in a dominant position. In sum, our basic theory about the place and control of pressure groups is unrealistic.

Evidence of how this proposition works out in practice is provided in a special study conducted by the lobbying committee. In June of this year, we asked a selected list of approximately 200 corporations, trade unions, and farm organizations to submit on a voluntary basis an accounting of all expenditures relating to legislation made by them in the past 4 years. Information was requested under such categories as: cost of maintaining Washington offices, traveling and other expenses incurred in efforts to influence legislation, costs of advertising services, contributions to lobbying and trade associations, and expenditures for printed and duplicated matter. The corporation replies to this questionnaire are printed in full in a committee document entitled "Expenditures by Corporations to Influence Legislation," with which many of you are undoubtedly familiar. It is sufficient to say here that approximately 150 corporations replied to the letter in one way or another, and in their replies indicated expenditures for the purposes indicated of roughly $32,000,000 since August 1946. This figure is small in relation to the net assets of these corporations, but it is enormous when one considers that over the same period, all pressure groups combined have reported expenditures of only $55,000,000 under the Lobbying Act. Certainly this raises questions as to whether or not the equal rights of all groups to seek legislative remedies are not

slightly hollow. As lobbying, broadly defined, becomes more and more a matter of large scale and very expensive public relations and so-called "educational" campaigns, it is clear that some sectors of society enjoy tremendous advantages over others in the struggle for influence.

Other results follow from the situation I have just discussed. As lobbying becomes more expensive, the pressure group's major financial burdens are and must be increasingly borne by a relatively small number of persons. This is not so much the case with old-line membership organizations such as trade associations, labor unions, farm and veterans groups, and the like. But it is very much the case with the self-styled leagues, committees, foundations, and institutes, which have leaped to the fore of the lobbying picture in the past few years. Virtually every such group investigated by our committee derived its major support from a very few sources. Whether it was the Committee for Constitutional Government on one extreme or the Civil Rights Congress on the other, the reliance on large contributors was similar. Yet these organizations and many others like them claim to speak for thousands of members and contributors. They may do this, but it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that they speak first for themselves and for the few persons from whom the bulk of their incomes are received. Many groups can thus claim to represent an impressive membership, when in reality they are merely the instruments of narrow and private ambition. It is in a way paradoxical that while the pressure groups of today purport to speak for mass memberships and address their appeals to mass audiences, the money still comes from the same old fat cats, whether they be of the right or the left. And it is even more ironic that even these fat cats aren't genuinely paying the bills, for their contributions are usually arranged so that they are either tax-exempt or tax-deductible. In the long run, the people pay.

I think that this year's experience also suggests some tentative conclusions about the growing juncture of lobbying and political action. Although some groups appearing before us—the Committee for Constitutional Government, for example—denied vigorously that they had ever sought to influence the election of anybody, most of our witnesses admitted—as they could not deny—that they implemented their lobbying with purely political activity. Here is just one more symptom of the broadening front in lobbying. Our hearings abound with examples of threatened reprisals, purges, withdrawn support and promises of aid in November. The great groups of today could not think of abstaining from an electoral contest in which they see their interest threatened. Their influence in politics is thus basically negative—that is, they can punish more effectively than they can reward. But this is nonetheless a significant influence, and it is constantly growing and will continue to grow so long as the popular basis of group strength continues to expand.

It is well, however, to ask what sort of effect this nonparty activity may have on our political system. Certainly politics by groups instead of parties is not the way to any kind of responsible party government. And insofar as these groups are narrowly controlled, their exercise of political power correspondingly diminishes the possibility of broadly representative government.

It is also well to ponder the status of these activities under the Corrupt Practices Acts. The basic problem here is one of definition, as it is under the Lobbying Act, and I believe that here, too, the inclusion of any activity under the publicity provisions of the Corrupt Practices Acts should be determined by the tests of intent and expenditure. Such publicity may not be wholly effective, but it is the only tool at our disposal.

I wish that time permitted me to go into some further detail on other aspects of our investigation which strike me as significant. I should like to discuss the growing massed effort of lobbying groups, for example, or the extent of what might be called interlocking directorates among these groups. But the whole picture is so complex and wide-ranging that I cannot hope to do it justice in a brief panel discussion.

I can, however, offer a brief summary impression of what lobbying means, where it is taking us, and what we can do about it. Lobbying is to me a big, a very big business. It involves the full time effort of thousands of people, and the expenditure of untold sums of money. It involves, further, the daily exercise of the personal and collective rights which keep our society relatively open and free. Yet at the same time, large-scale lobbying is a symptom of all the forces which might together pull our society apart at the seams. We talk about and urgently need a moral and practical unity which can help us to keep our sanity in a confused and threatening time. But the reality is one of group fighting group, interest fighting interest—all to wring some privilege or protection from a government which is often powerless to resist. Lobbying represents, in a word, a divisiveness which we cannot indefinitely afford.

What can be done? Above all, strengthen the Lobbying Act, enforce it vigorously, make it an instrument of more responsible public policy. This may not be a final or complete answer, but it is the best approach presently available. Ultimately, we shall have to face the task of reshaping our party system, perhaps along the lines so capably sketched in the recent report of this association's committee on political parties. We shall have to consider means of formalizing group interests in the political process. We shall have to reexamine our tax laws relating to tax exemption and deductibility. Reasonable men may differ as to the form of the remedies but it is clear that we shall have to develop such remedies or face the ultimate disintegration of representative government as we have known it. You, as political scientists, and I as a member of the world's greatest and most harried legislature, face few problems more challenging than this.

Hon. Adolph J. Sabath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD BREEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to invite the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to an editorial published in the Dayton Daily News, Friday, December 29.

The editorial spotlights the distinguished career of a gentleman who has served his district, his State, and Nation for 44 successive years as a Member of this honorable body.

Congratulations and good wishes to Congressman SABATH from all citizens of the Third District of Ohio accompany this editorial.

The editorial follows:

A VETERAN

Congressman ADOLPH JOACHIM SABATH has sat continuously in the American House of Representatives longer than any other man in congressional history. At the age of 84, Congressman SABATH is in his forty-fourth year of service in the House.

It is, in more than one respect, an amazing achievement.

Since 1907, when SABATH first entered Congress, there have been endless tides of politics to sweep the officeholders in and out again. There have been changes in congressional district boundaries, in party fortune, in people's minds.

Through it all, from 22 successive trials at the polls, SABATH emerged ahead. The fact argues an extraordinarily convincing SABATH. It argues an extraordinarily firm and stable electorate. Does no one in his Chicago district ever grow tired of hearing SABATH called "the just"?

ADOLPH SABATH entered Congress when Uncle Joe Cannon was as firmly master there as is another Uncle Joe today in another capital. Uncle Joe Cannon fell. ADOLPH SABATH marched right on. The Woodrow Wilson time was to his taste (SABATH is a Democrat). Even the Harding landslide could not bury him. Speakers rose and fell—Champ Clark, Gillett, Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrnes, Bankhead, Rayburn. Came the 1946 overturn, and MARTIN was Speaker. SABATH stayed right on.

Finally, the pleasantest comment of all on this record-breaking Congressman: his character through it all.

Congress, with its politics, is a toughening environment. Schemes and conspiracies whirl about your head. Temptations batter you. Worst temptation of all, the urge to lose faith in men, to grow cynical, to say that "every man has his price" and try to discover what that price is and pay it if you must.

This Chicago immigrant from Czechoslovakia, this justice of the peace there, this police-court magistrate risen to Congressman kept through it all the character with which he began. No stain, through all these years, has tarnished the name he bears. Was it his modesty saved him? He has put his 84 years of life, more than half of it spent in Congress, into a Who's Who 11 lines.

Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement which I made last Saturday concerning release of a report of the House Lobby Investigating Committee, of which I have the honor of being chairman.

I think that the Lobby Indexes which we have compiled will be of great assistance to the Members of Congress, and urge you all to keep them and use them.

The release is as follows:

Chairman FRANK BUCHANAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, of the House Lobby Investigating Committee, today announced the release of a Lobby Index for the years 1946–49. The index lists over 1,300 organizations and 2,000 individuals who filed reports under the Lobbying Act from its inception through the end of 1949. A similar index for 1950 will be released in the near future.

Chairman BUCHANAN said: "The primary aim of our committee has been to increase the amount of public information about

lobbying. We do not believe in prohibiting or regulating organized attempts to influence legislation, but we do feel they should be carried on in the open. These indexes will provide Congress and the public with a handy guide as to just who does file the lobbying reports required by law.

"The index we are releasing today shows that there is need for greater compliance with the Lobbying Act by organizations rather than by individuals. Our investigation showed that the great bulk of money used to influence legislation is spent by organizations for pamphlets, advertising, and other activities. These activities are brought out in public as required by the Lobbying Act only when organizations themselves file lobbying reports. Reports by employees are of value, but must be supplemented by reports of the organizations which employ them. Our final report, which will be filed early next week, will treat this subject in greater detail."

The Brussels Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a very informative article from the Christian Science Monitor by Joseph C. Harsch:

THE BRUSSELS CONFERENCE
(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—It can be reported that the American delegation which went to Brussels to carry forward the building of a defensible North Atlantic region did not commit the United States to a fixed number of American troops for Europe, or a fixed timetable for their dispatch.

On the contrary, the size and timing of the prospective American contribution to the collective security of the west is planned, contractually, in terms not of fixed time or numbers but rather in terms of a ratio based on what the Europeans do for themselves.

If there is no substantial European effort on its own behalf, there will be no substantial American contribution. What America does send will depend, rigidly, on what the Europeans do for themselves.

There does exist, of course, a general plan involving both what the Europeans will do and what America will contribute. Schedules have been worked out. For example, by X date, France expects to put Y numbers of divisions in Z condition at the disposal of General Eisenhower's new command.

There are also X, Y, and Z factors for Britain, the Benelux group, Denmark, Norway, Italy, and the other members of the North Atlantic Pact.

If all of these European members meet their performance schedules, then there is a contractual obligation on the United States to provide those amounts of dollars, equipment, and military units that have been judged appropriate to the European schedules. But the American commitment comes into operation only in proportion to the performance records of the European countries.

The specific amounts of money, equipment, and men that each member country proposes to provide is, of course, a closely kept military secret. The American delegates wish it were possible to make these schedules public, for to do so would dispel some of the anxiety in this country which arises from ignorance of what Europe is doing, and has promised to do in the future, for itself.

However, to tell the American public would also be to tell Russia. It is agreed among the signatories that the present strength of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization force, and the schedules for expansion of that force, are military secrets which must continue to be kept secret in the interests of the general security of all members.

All that can be told safely is that performance schedules exist, that the American military planners are pleased with the assignments most of the European countries have accepted for themselves; and that if, as, and when proof of performance is forthcoming, America is committed contractually to providing the appropriate American contributions.

This does not mean that we sit quietly on the side waiting to see what Europe will produce by a given date, and then proceed to organize our contribution. Rather, it means that we proceed to raise and equip the troops which will go to Europe at various stages if, in the meantime, the European countries are measuring up to their own schedules.

The American troops do not go, however, if the European countries fall down on their schedules. And the final size of the American contribution will be determined by what the European do for themselves. The immediate American task it to become ready to make the American contribution if, by the time the American contribution is ready, the Europeans have earned the right to it by their own efforts.

It is only right that Americans should be freed from any false fear that their delegates to the Brussels Conference signed commitments unrelated to European performance. There is a schedule of American military aid to Europe. It involves more American divisions to reinforce those present in Germany. But the schedule is not rigid. It is a flexible and variable quantity. It provides for a ratio of United States contributions. The ratio is a secret. It is not a secret that further American aid is conditioned upon the principle of European self-help.

Inside Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to conclude an article by Victor Riesel released by the Post-Hall Syndicate. If the statements are substantially correct certainly a change is overdue.

The article follows:

INSIDE LABOR
(By Victor Riesel)

What this country needs is a good 5 cent phone call. For just a nickel, the Secretary of the Treasury can call Republic 5600 in Washington. That 5 cent piece can cost the Soviet Government hundreds of millions of American dollars—made by selling us slave labor goods, including Christmas tree trimmings.

This slave trade gives the Russian brain trust the solid American currency with which to pay the British and the French merchants for scarce metals, barbed wire, electrical equipment, and other engines of war flowing into Manchuria. And it can be stopped immediately by Secretary of the Treasury Snyder.

But he and his aides have been retorting to queries from Congressmen and myself with the jargon of the old-fashioned brush-off. Only a few days ago Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John S. Graham told two Congressmen:

"Ever since this question was first brought to our attention, the Treasury Department has been actively seeking information (to prove that the Soviet uses slave labor)."

Since Brother Graham can't find the evidence, he should telephone Republic 5600. That's the State Department. They have the evidence. They've been broadcasting it to the rest of the world—names, dates, places, and slave conditions. But if things are tough in Washington and the war budget is too high, I'm for letting the Treasury save its nickel. Here's the evidence, right from the State Department and Commerce Department records:

First, it should be known that where we only bought about $3,500,000 worth of slave goods monthly from Russia in 1949—this more than doubled after the Soviet's Korean and Chinese troops invaded South Korea. In other words, they sold us twice as much stuff to get twice as many dollars to bolster their credit standing with United States bucks in European markets. That's right from United States Government records.

We buy millions of dollars worth of Soviet crab meat. The Treasury Department refuses to close our ports to the stuff. Yet the State Department Voice of America reports the following:

The (Soviet) crab trust at Vladivostok operates ships of about 3,000 tons manned by crews of 500. The crab catchers live a very confined life aboard ship for the 5 or 6 months' voyage to Kamchatka waters. After the trip they live in prison barracks on Deomid Bay during the winter months when they overhaul and outfit the ships for the next season.

The crabs are canned on board ship and sent to England, France, and the United States.

I submit, that's evidence enough Mr. Secretary, that the Treasury Department is violating section 307 of the Walsh Tariff Act of 1930—which says "that our ports shall be closed to slave labor imports."

Now, there are fur merchants, concentrated in New York, who have just signed contracts with the Soviet trusts for the new Russian fur crop due for delivery in February. Odd, isn't it, that some men should deify the dollar and not their country's youth dying on fronts as frozen as the hearts of these dealers in luxuries? But it's odder still that the Treasury Department takes no notice of the State Department's Voice of America disclosures that:

"Three-fourths of the furs from the Taiga region are exported. * * * The formerly independent fur trappers and hunters are now collectivized, they sell to the state at fixed prices. They are paid largely in goods."

This means that the fur trappers are imprisoned on their hunting grounds and are given subsistence foods. That is slave labor.

This country also imports millions upon millions of dollars worth of Stalinist timber. The Voice of America discloses that the Soviet has a syndicate of slave camps, part of which is the Kondopoga combine.

Says the Voice:

"Timber cut by slave labor at the Kondopoga combine was shipped abroad via the White Sea Canal * * * pine and Karelian birch were shipped abroad from the slave-built port of Soroka and the timber was likewise shipped from Archangel and Murmansk."

More evidence? We're buying about $2,000,000 worth of slave-labor materials from

Czechoslovakia—the nation which houses the Skoda works, producing the armaments which United States intelligence officers have found equipping the Soviet Chinese armies. I have a list of 38 Czech slave camps—including the biggest one near Cop, the concentration camp for deportation of slaves to Russia itself.

It took the Commerce Department 6 months to shut off sales to the oriental Stalinists. How long will it take the Treasury Department to slash Red sales to us? There's a lot of shot in that buck they get from us.

Don't Tie Our Hands in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the boys today in Korea could give us some real constructive suggestions on the best military method to save thousands of our GI fighters. Maybe the time is ripe for a few bombs on industrial targets far back beyond the North Korean border. The million Chinese Communists closing in on our boys cannot fight without support and supplies from the rear. H. B. Snyder, of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, set out a thought in the following editorial:

DON'T TIE OUR HANDS IN WAR

In their widely circulated Stockholm appeal for the outlawing of the A-bomb, the Russians did their work well. A good part of Europe already is acting as if the bomb were indeed outlawed.

Even among those who understand the A-bomb is no more immoral than any other weapon of war, there are urgings against its use by the United States unless it has been dropped on us first.

This is strange reasoning from allegedly mature men, Europe's keenest observers, including some satellite diplomats, believe firmly that our possession of the atomic bomb is the one great deterrent to a Russian effort to conquer western Europe.

There's not the slightest doubt that at this stage of our military preparedness the bomb is the only weapon we have which could inflict real damage on the Soviet Union should it march tomorrow. To be barred from using it is to be robbed of an effective club against Russian aggression.

Furthermore, air force officials believe there would be grave risk in waiting to employ the A-bomb. Though doubters continue to turn up, our experts believe the Russians have the bomb themselves. Certainly, to play it safe, we must assume they have and can make at least a dozen or a score a year.

What would it mean to allow the Russians to drop the bomb first? Not only colossal damage to key cities, but possibly the immobilizing, right at the start, of our own A-bomb effort.

The Russians know where our strategic air force is based, where our oil is, where A-bombs are produced. If we're lucky, they don't know where finished bombs are stored.

But it's evident they might, with suicide squadrons carrying either the A-bomb or even just old-fashioned block-busters, do irreparable harm to our key striking force before it could make itself felt. To risk that is to risk total defeat.

Strategic air officers are wholly aware of this peril and it worries them greatly. So, incidentally, does the prospect of internal sabotage which might ground many bombers we'd need to carry the A-bomb to Russia.

Should a war come, our hands must not be tied as to the use of the one great weapon in our arsenal. Those who argue that we should wait are, perhaps unconsciously, arguing a counsel of defeat.

Year of Centennial Opening in Span of New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of January 1, 1951:

YEAR OF CENTENNIAL OPENING IN SPAN OF NEW YORK TIMES—PANORAMA OF PROGRESS SINCE SEPTEMBER 18, 1851, SHOWS ADHERENCE TO THE AEGIS OF ITS FOUNDERS AND THEIR SUCCESSOR IN 1896

(By Meyer Berger)

The New York Times starts its centennial year today. It will be 100 years old on September 18, 1951.

The newspaper was founded by a group that included Henry Jarvis Raymond, of Lima, N. Y., George Jones, of East Poultney, Vt., and Edward B. Wesley, of Albany, N. Y.

Later Times backers included Fletcher Harper, Jr., of Harper & Bros., who had started their magazine in 1850; E. B. Morgan, of Aurora, N. Y., a pioneer in Wells Fargo Express, and Leonard Jerome, former Prime Minister Winston Churchill's grandfather.

Mr. Raymond began his newspaper career on Horace Greeley's New York Tribune, and was one of the most distinguished journalists of the period. Mr. Jones worked in the Tribune business office at the same time. They became friends there.

Mr. Raymond had talked for years of the need for a newspaper that would focus sharply on important news and devote less space to personal feuds between owners of competing sheets, or to crusading for causes in which the owners were personally interested, a common journalistic weakness of the fifties.

He wrote the Times prospectus early in 1851 and Mr. Wesley read his copy on July 4 that year to friends lolling on the sun-warmed ruins of old Fort Putnam at West Point, N. Y. They thought it sound.

The document called for a 1-cent newspaper to be circulated in the cities of New York, Brooklyn, and Williamsburgh. It promised correspondence from intelligent gentleman permanently enlisted in its support.

It also promised full reports on Government affairs, on religious matters, on agriculture, the sciences, industry, and literary reviews and intelligence prepared by competent persons, besides impartial reporting on drama, music, and on the arts generally.

The Times, the prospectus said, "is not established for the advancement of any party, sect, or person * * * will seek to be conservative in such a way as shall best promote needful reform * * * will endeavor to perpetuate the good, and to avoid the evil. * * * Its main reliance for all improvement, personal, social and political, will be upon Christianity and republicanism."

The Republican accent was prophetic; Mr. Raymond was to make history as "godfather of the Republican Party."

The Times founders were committed in the prospectus to try to encourage and advance education, to promote economy, concord and justice in every section of the country; to elevate and enlighten public sentiment; and to substitute reason for prejudice, a cool and intelligent judgment for passion, in all public affairs and in all discussions of public affairs.

Mr. Wesley, a broker, was impressed. He raised $100,000 for the venture, he and Mr. Jones each contributing $20,000. Mr. Raymond had no cash to put up but got a substantial share of stock for his talents and for his enterprise.

The first edition of the Times was put out under physical handicap. New York had about 500,000 residents then and was in a building boom. Carpenters and other artificers were overwhelmed by contracts and a little hamstrung by a shortage of building materials.

CENTURY'S CONTRAST IN EDITIONS

There were no windows or light fixtures in the five-story building at 113 Nassau Street, when Mr. Raymond opened shop there in early September 1851. He and his staff wrote their stories for the first issue in longhand by wavering candlelight and had frequent resort to matches as cool night breezes swooped through the window frames, playfully snuffing the candles' flame.

There was no telegraph at 113 Nassau Street then, and the Atlantic cable had not been put down; but the Times on September 18, 1851, carried proportionately more national and international news than any other New York newspaper published that day, and in the days that came after. It was, perhaps, a little weaker on local items, but that department improved as the staff grew.

Most of the foreign news items had come from London on the Royal Mail Steamer *Europe,* then by rail from Boston. Most of it was at least 12 days old, much of it older, but that was fast for those days and the London representative had put aboard newspaper files from all parts of the continent.

Today more than 1,000,000 words and the equivalent of about 250,000 more in financial tables pour into the Times over communication devices that might have made Mr. Raymond and his contemporaries gape, but the 1851 staff was almost boastfully proud of the speed it had made with the news it got into that first edition 100 years ago.

Most of the foreign items were culled directly from newspapers of the countries where the stories originated, which was then common journalistic practice. Mr. Raymond preceded these with a crisp summary not unlike the current Times front-page feature, World News Summarized.

A good bit of space that first day went to Britain's astonishment over the yacht *America's* defeat of Britain's best in the *Solent.* There was a long piece on excitement in Paris over the pending Louis Napoleon-Prince de Joinville contest, and there were many items from other countries, each impressively headlined with the name of the place of origin.

There had been a fugitive-slave riot in Lancaster County in Pennsylvania and Mr. Raymond's staff had gleaned their facts about it from Pennsylvania and Maryland newspapers.

The almost inevitable weather story had the lead under the headline, New York City, and was offered in neighborly style:

"The weather was the theme upon which we hinged an item for our morning edition, but we have been forced to forego the infliction of it upon the public by the proceedings of the Boston Jubilee which our special correspondent has forwarded to us. Never mind, the President (Millard Fillmore) cannot always be lionizing through the country, and as soon as he returns home we shall endeavor to do this important subject full justice."

Workmen, the local column reported, were finishing the fountain on Washington Square, which only a few decades before had been a public burial ground out in the country. There was a new steamboat service between Manhattan and rural Flushing (fare, 1 shilling) and the city hall fire watcher had sounded the cupola bell twice to bring out volunteer companies. A Broadway omnibus team had fractured a pedestrian's skull.

"A bloomer costume," another local item said, "made its appearance in Sixth Avenue day before yesterday. A crowd of Conservatives manifested their hostility to this progressive movement by derision."

This was all front-page stuff. There was a separate heading for news from Brooklyn, then an independent city, and a note from Long Island about a tomato grown by Mr. Frederick Rowland, of Hempstead, that weighed 2 pounds and 3¼ ounces.

Mostly, though, the Times gave its space to graver news, and prospered because of it. In its second year it went to eight pages, twice as many as it printed throughout its first year, and kept growing in prestige, size, and circulation with advancing time.

Mr. Raymond's formula had worked and there were few departures from it in the newspaper's century of existence. It steadfastly remained pretty much a day-by-day account of human achievement. Its files faithfully trace man's errors as well as his stubborn advance toward better living.

The files are packed with national, and world, history. There is, for example, a comprehensive obituary on Daniel Webster done in longhand by Mr. Raymond himself and a remarkable record of the Civil War, of events leading up to it, of the Reconstruction, and Abraham Lincoln's administration.

The Gettysburg Address was front-paged, but editorially next day the Times thought Edward Everett's speech at Gettysburg more eloquent and more enduring. Most other newspapers similarly misappraised the Lincoln classic.

Mr. Raymond, physically small, had extraordinary courage. One night in July, 1863, after he had editorially called on the law to crush looting bands of antidraft rioters in New York City, they marched on the Times office at 41 Park Row, heavily armed and calling for his blood.

Mr. Raymond and Winston Churchill's grandfather quietly waited for the mob as it poured down from The Bowery whooping and hollering into Printing House Square. Both sat behind the new-fangled Gatling guns ready to spray the rioters, but the hoodlums learned about the guns and swerved off.

When they set fires in the Tribune office across the square, Mr. Raymond sent 16 of his men armed with rifles, to help police drive off the mob.

The Times' account of the shooting of Abraham Lincoln at Ford's Theatre, headlined "Awful event," still brings that sad incident into tragically sharp focus. The editors made one major error that night; they put black borders around all front-page columns, but the President had not died when the edition went to press.

BATTLING THE TWEED RING

When Mr. Raymond died in 1869, Mr. Jones took over. He clung to Mr. Raymond's basic policies, even in costly crucial periods. He attacked the Tweed ring in 1871 when other newspapers closed their eyes to the ring's unholy plundering of New York City's funds, and coldly turned down a $5,000,000 cash bribe proffered by Dick Connelly, a Tweed lieutenant sent to call the Times off.

The Times remained almost uncompromisingly Republican until James Blaine was nominated by the party to run for President in 1884. Then after its warnings that he was unfit for the office of Chief Executive went unheeded, it reluctantly backed the Democrat, Grover Cleveland, who won. From that time on it remained politically independent.

Hard times weakened the newspaper after Mr. Jones' death in 1891. By 1896 its circulation was down to around 9,000 copies a day and the group of Times men who had bought it from the Jones heirs were in despair. The plant that Mr. Jones had built and expanded at 41 Park Row, once the handsomest newspaper establishment in the city, was shabby, its presses needed replacement and the revenue from advertising had faded almost to vanishing.

On August 18, 1896, after the Times had gone bankrupt, it was taken over by Adolph S. Ochs, a young publisher who had purchased the Chattanooga Times in Tennessee and developed it as one of the best newspapers in the South.

Mr. Ochs had arrived independently at the same news principles that Mr. Raymond had conceived but which had somehow faded and withered on the New York Times.

"It will be my earnest aim," Mr. Ochs wrote for the issue of January 19, 1896, "that the New York Times give the news, all the news, in concise and attractive form, in language that is parliamentary in good society, and give it as early, if not earlier, than it can be learned through any other reliable medium; to give the news impartially without fear or favor, regardless of any party, sect, or interest involved * * *."

The new publisher, a printer by trade, used his knowledge of this art to give the Times a neater, cleaner format. He introduced better and more ample business and financial news features, an illustrated Sunday supplement (now the Sunday Magazine) and a weekly section devoted to news and reviews of books.

In 1898, after Mr. Ochs' meagre starting capital had been spent in vain effort to compete with the New York World and the New York Journal, both rich publications which spent comparative fortunes on Spanish-American war coverage, he dropped the price of the Times to 1 cent.

This measure of desperation became effective, on October 10, 1898. The publisher's contemporaries were sure that the move would prove suicidal; that the price drop would lead readers to think that The Times had cheapened in all respects.

Mr. Ochs said: "It is the price of the newspaper, not its character that will change" and when readers realized that this was fact, the Times won thousands of new readers and increasingly greater advertising volume. It moved out front as one of the world's leading newspapers and stayed there.

Times Tower was finished in 1905 and Times Square took its name from it. Eight years later the newspaper needed a large annex in Forty-third Street, west of the Square. Subsequent additions inspired by circulation and advertising gains and for more space for news-handling, the last finished after the close of the Second World War, gave the Times one of the largest newspaper publishing plants in the world.

Since Mr. Ochs' death in 1935 the newspaper's high-quality news traditions has been furthered under his son-in-law, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, the Times today has more than 1,300 correspondents on full or on part-time assignment, and unmatched communications facilities for handling their copy. Mr. Raymond's entire working force had fewer than 50 men. The Times today employs more than 4,000 men and women. In Mr. Sulzberger's regime, the Times has increased its prestige in the news-gathering field which has been reflected in its advertising and circulation growth.

In 1851 the total circulation of New York's 15 newspapers was 130,000 a day. The New York Times circulation, 100 years later, is more than 1,100,000 on Sunday and in excess of 535,000 daily. In 1950 the Times carried more than 39,500,000 lines of advertising the highest amount in its century of existence.

Mr. Raymond's Times used a total of 30,000,000 newsprint pages between September 18, 1851, and September 18, 1852. More than fifteen and one-half times that amount of newsprint was used for one recent Sunday edition, or just one day's press run. The change has been that great.

There have been other remarkable changes in the 100 years since 1851—such changes and mutations as the Times founders could never have conceived in their most fantastic dreaming; yet based, fundamentally, on their original formula for faithful news presentation.

The decision to create a newspaper that would be as complete a human record as possible has endured for 100 years. Historians who pore over Times pages can easily trace a century of mortal progress and recession there. The acorn and the oak come quickly visible to discerning eyes.

On Tuesday, June 13, 1854, for example, the first four columns in The Times told under the headline "Japan opened," what Commodore Perry had achieved in commercial treaty negotiations at Yedo, now called Tokyo.

The article was complete with interesting detail on the Japanese resources, habits, customs, and beliefs, all pretty much unknown to the average reader in 1851. A side story told of the burial of Robert Williams of the United States Marine Corps who had died aboard the U. S. S. *Mississippi* during Perry's visit.

Almost 100 years later a Times man hovered over Nagasaki in a B–29 to report in detail the destruction wrought by an atomic bomb. And now in Yedo the Times has its own news bureau equipped to communicate by telephone, wireless, or cable with the home office off Times Square.

News of Perry's achievement in Japan was 10 weeks reaching the Times. Today news of that country, of Korea, India, China, Tibet, and other Far East places where history is bubbling, gets to the office in split seconds when such speed is necessary.

One hundred years of important human undertakings everywhere on the globe, under its vast waters and in the skies above it, have been fixed in the Times record in printer's ink to cover one century in the Day Book of Mankind.

Centennial Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 1, 1951.

CENTENNIAL YEAR

This New Year's Day has a special meaning for those concerned with the New York Times. With this issue we enter the centennial year of this newspaper's establishment. To be precise, our first issue went hopefully to the public on September 18, 1851. We shall take note of that approaching day on various suitable occasions during the year.

Meanwhile this point in time—this New Year's Day—when all the world is looking forward, with perhaps a little less hope than usual and a little more apprehension than usual, seems also a good occasion to look back. Morning by morning for close to a

hundred years the present and earlier staffs of this newspaper have produced in print the materials of history. Tuesday morning has rarely seemed very different from Monday morning, but all the Mondays and Tuesdays, all the days of the week, all the years, have added up to the most tremendous century in mankind's records.

Eighteen years ago, at the time of the Chicago World's Fair, there appeared a stimulating volume called A Century of Progress. There was reason for that title. There would be reason for it now in many fields. But the phrase cannot be so lightly used today. We have to ask, progress in what? We have to admit that in some fields there has not only been no progress but distinct retrogression. We have to admit that in some respects humanity's expectations, fondly cherished in 1851, have been disappointed. Miraculous achievements in promoting human well-being have been offset by the failure of mankind to organize a just and peaceable world society. Inventions have solved problems—and created them.

Perhaps the greatest achievement of the century has been in its startling improvement in communications and means of travel. There is scarcely such a thing as distance any more. In our new ability to exchange ideas and move from place to place we have a new key to freedom. All races and all nations are now neighbors. Unhappily—and this is the saddest irony of history—this has not made them behave like neighbors.

Let us make an honest comparison between the state of the world—and especially of that part of it known as the United States—in 1851 and its condition now. To extend such a comparison in detail would require a volume. Still, we may arrive at some defensible deductions.

I. THE GOOD OLD DAYS

The American citizen of 1851 really felt himself in the midst of a period of breathtaking developments. He, or his father, had seen the steamboat appearing on the navigable rivers and even crossing the Atlantic Ocean. He had seen steam power widely applied in new factories. He had seen a rapid spread of the steam-powered railroad. The country was even then in the midst of a railroad fever which, between 1848 and 1857, added more than 10,000 miles of line to an existing 6,000. The magnetic telegraph was being rapidly extended. News was beginning to come while it was still fresh. The McCormick reaper, the sewing machine, and the whale-oil lamp were transforming various phases of life. A few people already had in their houses hot and cold running water and even bathrooms. The rotary printing press was about to bring to the masses the newspaper which previously had been accessible only to the few.

This was a period of prosperity and expansion. The United States had just extended its boundaries south to the Rio Grande and west to the Pacific. Beyond the Mississippi and the Missouri there were vast areas suitable for settlement and into which a never-ending stream of hopeful settlers was moving. The gold of California was flowing eastward and out into world markets.

After the railroads reached the Great Lakes and pushed across the Mississippi and even the Missouri a new kind of East-and-West trade sprang up. New banks and great new masses of investment capital were thrown in to deal with this expansion. Farm products and raw materials from the West began to flow eastward, first through such channels as the Erie Canal, but later, in the mid-century period, by rail. Eastern manufacturers found a new market for their goods, which began to move westward. There seemed to be no end to this growth of the Nation.

Labor was sharing this prosperity, although its share would not be regarded today as extravagant. Immigrants building the new railroad lines worked from sunrise to twilight for less than a dollar a day. Yet real wages were on the way up and the length of the working day was on the way down. Ten hours was standard in Government service and 10 hours was the goal toward which labor unions were striving.

The decade of the forties had seen the rise of a great wave of humanitarianism, and the fifties were to see the continuance of this movement until it was swallowed up in the drive against slavery and the vast agony of the Civil War. There was a new sensitiveness to the problems of the blind, of the juvenile and adult delinquent, of the mentally disturbed. All these groups were being treated far more intelligently and kindly than they had ever been before in human history. Democracy was broadening from a mere concept of individual rights to one of individual and community responsibility.

Along with this humanitarian drive there went a great many fringe movements. People came to believe, more or less passionately, in the possibilities of phrenology, mesmerism, temperance, and various species of primitive communism. It may seem strange that so many attempts should be made to improve on capitalism when capitalism was really doing quite well, but such was the case. Many Americans of the mid-century were not patient enough to wait for utopia. They wanted it right away. They were still to learn of the Darwinian concept of change, which a few years later was to affect not only scientific thought but also the idea of human progress and development.

If the people of 1851 compared their condition and their prospects with those of almost any preceding generation, they had a right to be pleased with the world.

II. AND DAYS NOT SO GOOD

But if the citizen of 1851 had been able to compare his lot with ours in 1951, he would have realized that in some respects he was not, comparatively speaking, well off.

The Nation's health by modern standards was not good. Boston about 1851 had a death rate of 24.30 a thousand, New York 30 a thousand. The causes of typhoid, tuberculosis, diphtheria, cholera, scarlet fever, lockjaw, yellow fever, and some other diseases were not even known, and people continued to die of them. Infants and children perished by the thousands of ailments easily preventable today. Cholera followed the California emigrant up the great rivers and across the plains. There were, and continued to be for many years, epidemics of yellow fever in southern cities—and many cases even in the North. The gift of life, which we may think of as bestowed on every child at birth, was more than a third smaller than it is today.

The food of most Americans was inadequate, with few fresh vegetables during the greater part of the year and almost no use of salads. Much of the milk sold in cities was literally poison, killing children instead of nourishing them. The public water supply in countless communities was polluted. We were called, and probably were, a nation of dyspeptics. Patent medicines flourished, as newspaper advertisements of that day attest, and probably added to the national distemper.

Everybody agreed, as everybody does now, that there cannot be a high level of democracy without a high level of education. America was starting to educate itself. During the fifties there was a great spread of academies. Some public high schools were established and quite a few colleges took root, especially in the newer States. In 1851 perhaps 250,000 young persons were attending secondary schools. Yet today, in proportion to the population, four or five times as many are going to secondary schools. As for higher education, American youth has a far better chance to go to college nowadays than it had to go to an often very poor secondary school a century ago. The higher education of professional men, with the exception of clergymen and lawyers, was in 1851 haphazard and imperfect indeed.

Half the adult population was still subjected in many respects to almost feudal restrictions. The first woman's rights convention met in Seneca Falls, N. Y., in 1848, and as the years passed some of the grosser inequities of woman's position were remedied. But it was to take more than two generations to give woman the vote, and perhaps a little longer than that to give her anything like true equality in the day's work outside the home.

This optimistic generation of 1851 had been attracted by a romantic and world-wide peace movement. Queen Victoria in that very year thought that the coming together of representatives of many nations at the Crystal Palace Exposition in London might lead to perpetual peace. But some bad years were ahead. The horrid specter had not been exorcised. The Taiping Rebellion was to slaughter millions in China. The Crimean War was only 3 years off, the Indian mutiny only 6 years off, our own Civil War only 10 years off. European absolutists, after crushing the democratic uprisings of 1848, were setting the stage for future conflict.

Yet the America of 1851 was hopeful to the point of extravagance. It regarded the democratic system as a proved experiment which would sweep the world, on the American plan, as rapidly as it could be brought to the world's attention. Americans thought that the kings and the emperors would fall of their own weight. They also thought that this country had a manifest destiny. We of today are realizing that that phrase was accurately right, but we have discovered that manifest destiny may require sweat and tears before it is realized. The hopes of 1851 have for us now a nostalgic pathos. But hope—the expectation of better and better things to come—was also a tremendous spiritual asset. We can envy them their abundant possession of it.

We may as well face the fact that the Americans of 1851 were easier in their minds than we are. In the simple meaning of the word, and except when personal disaster struck them, when illness, bereavement, and death came among them, they may have been happier than we are. For if there is one thing the century has shown, it is that happiness does not necessarily come from the multiplication of inventions. It cannot come securely without one final invention—a system by which men of different groups and different nations and different occupations can get on peaceably together.

The makers of newspapers must be peculiarly sensitive to this fact. In a hundred years they have seen the development of instantaneous communication with all the world's centers. They have found it possible to spread the printed word quickly over great areas by using the airplane and other devices. They are able to dispatch their reporters in a matter of days—or even hours—to almost any point on the earth's surface. They can multiply their product prodigiously, to almost any desired extent and at almost any desired speed. In the western countries they speak to publics which are almost wholly literate.

But swift and full communication does not of necessity make for agreement. From lands afflicted with a new barbarism come hot and angry words—and black lies.

III. DANGERS—AND DREAMS

This brief glance back over the century may appear to have led us to a gloomy conclusion. That assumption might be justified if the history of the future were to be only a continuation of modern history since 1914, with its wars, hot and cold, its new and ter-

rible doctrines and its frontal attack on the ideals of democracy.

Yet in balancing our ledger we must consider all the possibilities. The conquest of the atom has made war so dreadful that it may destroy all that we call civilization. Yet the control of atomic fission is a stage in an evolution of science that could lead man to the stars. If all that is scientifically known today could be made available to the multitudinous populations of the world without restraint, the earth could truly become almost a paradise. Death could not be abolished, nor would a wise man wish it to be, but a full natural term of life could be lived with joy and great achievement by millions who now never so much as dream what such a life could be. The labor under which men have bent so long and under which countless millions of them still are bowed down could be made easy. The world's homes could be comfortable and healthful. The great ideas of the older civilization and the new could reach everyone.

What we immediately face today is something far different. We face the diversion of vast sums of money and a great part of our raw materials and manufactured goods, of our best energies, toward military preparation. This is purely defensive, but it eats into our well-being just the same. We face at the very best a long period of diminished living standards, during which it will be hard to plan for the future.

But if this is a time of strain, of sacrifice and of fear, it is also a time of opportunity. Free and civilized man has never won his freedom or his civilization without struggle. He has always had enemies. The darker forces of human destiny have always worked against him. Now, perhaps, he is about to reach his supreme challenge. Let us not say this challenge will be the test of battle. Let us not admit the inevitability of another great war. The challenge rather is one of faith. In the midst of all the trials and hardships which will surely come, we must stand firm for our ideals. If free and civilized man believes passionately in freedom and civilization, those values will never vanish from the earth.

IV. THE TASKS AHEAD

The days will continue to pass and again the Tuesdays will somewhat resemble the Mondays. The presses will begin to roar at their stipulated times each night, continuing into the morning. There will be great technical changes in the production of newspapers and other means of communication. We have not reached the end of that road yet. Our ways of living will be altered by events we cannot foresee. The world of a hundred years from now will probably show greater changes than we have been able to detect between 1851 and 1951.

But in certain essentials there has been no change since 1851. Truth, though viciously betrayed, is nevertheless what it was then—and this newspaper will continue to seek it. Honor is what it was then—and we hope never to be false to it. The brotherhood of man was an ideal then—and it remains such. Freedom and justice, compassion and hope, the aspiration toward something higher and better—these come from time out of mind and endure forever.

We do not set foot in this second century with a careless optimism that all will be well. All is not well, and all will not be well. But the challenge to stand by our principles and to advance our ideals remains. We who are engaged in the making of this newspaper have confidence that this generation will not flinch and that the generations which come after us, after we have laid down our tools and closed our desks for the last time, will keep the faith.

Topics of the Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of January 1, 1951:

TOPICS OF THE TIMES

NEW YORK A CENTURY AGO

The New York City of 1851, when the New York Times began publication at 113 Nassau Street, had a population of fewer than 600,000. Brooklyn was regarded as a suburb, although a booming one, with about 150,000 souls. Manhattan, in the 1850 census, had counted 515,547 and so was exceeded in population by only a third of the States. New York State all told had only just passed the 3,000,000 mark. Anything above Fiftieth Street was regarded as country. The Bronx had a population of only about 8,000, and Staten Island of those days had twice as many as the Bronx, while Queens had about 20,000.

It was a time when the city government's expenditures in a year were running at about $2,500,000 and the receipts at about $108,000, a discrepancy not always redressed in later times, when our budget has risen to a billion and a quarter dollars a year, while capital outlays added millions to the total.

TRAFFIC AND STREETS

Streets were constantly being opened, railroads were being built, and the common council was in a steady dither of activity granting franchises, all the while being denounced as conniving crooks. Fifth Avenue was being graded and curb and gutter stones laid between Thirty-fourth and Forty-second Streets. A. T. Stewart was completing a large store on the easterly side of Broadway at Chambers Street to enhance what was already "the most magnificent dry goods establishment in the world." The "mania for converting Broadway into a street of shops is greater than ever."

A shortage of parks was already being recognized; there were, in fact, only 19 in the city, covering 170 acres of land. Now, of course, there are about 27,000 acres of parks in the larger consolidated city of our day.

Yet it was, in some respects, still a slow-moving city. The common council permitted the Hudson River Railroad to "propel their cars from Chambers Street to Thirty-first Street by their street locomotive or 'dumb engine' upon the condition that the same shall not be run at a greater speed than 6 miles an hour, and also, that they shall employ a proper person to precede the trains on horseback to give the necessary warning in a suitable manner of their approach."

HOW THE WORD WAS SPREAD

Fires and an adequate means of giving warning were a major problem. The first iron fire tower in the city (wooden ones had been burning down) was completed in midsummer of 1851. About a hundred feet high, with a stairway to the lookout station on top, it was situated on Thirty-third Street and cost $6,000.

Fire or fear of fire caused horrible tragedies. A false alarm led to a panic in a Greenwich Avenue school in November 1851, and about 50 children were killed because doors swung inward. The law requiring outward opening doors in public buildings dates from that disaster.

GAS AND CANDLES

Gas street lights were going up. But candles were still widely in use in the home. General Garibaldi, the Italian patriot who had arrived in New York in August 1850, spent the following winter on Staten Island engaged in the business of candle-making. The telegraph had been invading the city, and at mid-century poles were being erected along Wall Street and Broadway. At the same time the handsome sum of $2,000 was being spent to work Fifth Avenue from One Hundred and Ninth to One Hundred and Twentieth Streets as a country road.

One, P. T. Barnum, had come upon the scene, and was now enlarging his museum at Broadway and Ann Street at a cost of $30,000. The result was a spacious and elegant saloon which could seat 3,000 persons in comfort. To his already extensive world of curiosities he added a Chinese collection.

The first elevators were being built, portending the skyscraper.

FINE FEATHERS SHOWN

There were some fine mansions. One of these at Fifth Avenue and Ninth Street, which had belonged to the late Henry Brevoort, sold to a new owner for $57,000. James Fenimore Cooper, while staying at the Globe Hotel, wrote to his wife in Cooperstown of things he had been hearing and seeing. A Mrs. Wetmore had appeared at a party wearing a dress, including jewels, that cost $30,000 (in predevaluation currency). Mr. Cooper thought this was doing "pretty well for New York." He found the town is a great arena for the women to show off their fine feathers in.

The common council expressed appropriately its sense of responsibility for promoting international amity by spending $550 to send copies of Audubon's birds and quadrupeds as a gift to France. It was also ordered by the controller to quit feeding itself in the late afternoon at the taxpayers' expense.

President Fillmore and his Cabinet came to New York to celebrate the opening of the Erie Railroad from Piermont on the Hudson to Dunkirk on Lake Erie. And Jenny Lind had been singing at Castle Garden at fees that would have been considered respectable even in our day.

There were about 20 daily newspapers in the city, and obviously they had plenty of news to report.

One Hundred Years on the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of January 1, 1951:

ONE HUNDRED YEARS ON THE RECORD

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The fateful year that opens today marks the end of one century and the beginning of another in the life of this newspaper. Elsewhere on this page is an outline of the changes that have taken place since 1851 in the way of life and outlook in the United States. To the psalmist a thousand years may be as a day, but no millennium of time has been so crowded with events, so shaken by political, social, and technical revolutions, as the past hundred years. Day by day the New York Times has gathered from all

quarters of the earth the news of these happenings. They are now on the record—a record which leads page after page to a world that would have been unimaginable to the readers of the first issue of the paper.

GROWTH OF PUBLIC OPINION

In retrospect it is clear that news is the destroyer of illusions and the ultimate policy maker. That is why a free and responsible press is as essential to popular government as an alert intelligence service is to an army in action or planning action. It is highly dangerous to move in either field without eyes. A century ago very few Americans had anything to do with the formulation of foreign policy. Now it is made by public opinion; practically the whole population takes part in the current debate on a world defense strategy versus a hemispheric program. The latter position is about where we stood in 1851 when the Monroe Doctrine was practically our only definite line of international policy.

The change is due to many causes. The United States was not conscious of itself as a world power in the midnineteenth century. It was the eve of the Civil War, when great internal dissensions absorbed us and foreign affairs and external dangers concerned us very little. Less than 10 percent of the population was foreign-born, and several decades were to pass before great waves of immigration brought the echoes of Europe's problems to our shores.

But the main reason for the difference in participation in foreign policy then and now is that we are better informed. The spread of news, brought to us instantly by new means of communication, makes events the motive force that sets minds and emotions working. The country clamors for firm and clear leadership, but it would take a very tough-minded and persuasive leader to overcome the influence of events—sometimes the most transient events—in deciding popular reactions.

For good or ill, foreign policy today is shaped in public debate. It is plain now that the contests of this century, whether waged against Germans or Russians, are wars of the free peoples against dictatorships and their inevitable drive for more power. It is likewise plain that these wars, though ostensibly won, have narrowed the areas of democracy. On the other hand, where democracy prevails, it is certainly more active and articulate than in the past. Government in democratic states is more difficult just because the people demand a greater voice in it.

In the early days of this paper foreign policy was left to the State Department because it seemed comparatively unimportant. This does not mean, however, that people were not interested in what was going on abroad. At least the Times thought so. For many decades the paper has been noted for its wide coverage of foreign news, but in going through a collection of historic pages one is surprised to find that almost from the beginning it maintained correspondents in London and Paris. The arrival of steamships with European papers was the occasion for first-page reviews of foreign news. News came slowly, often 2 or 3 weeks after the event, but it was extraordinarily comprehensive. In the issue containing the account of the inaugural of President Buchanan, March 7, 1857, the report from Europe filled a column on the front page. October 18, 1859, there were two columns about the uprising at Harpers Ferry and three and a half of foreign news, including the story of an attempted insurrection against the Sultan in Constantinople, a statement of Kossuth on the Hungarian question, a report on the Italian liberation movement, an item about the French Army, and an editorial from the Times of London on the San Juan boundary dispute. Even when the War Between the States was at its height, there was room for reports of European reactions and the Slidell mission to obtain recognition and aid for the Confederacy. And, of course, a full-page spread when the Spanish, French, and British, taking advantage of American preoccupation in the war, formed a coalition to take over Mexico and landed an expedition at Veracruz.

THE NEWS AND ISOLATIONISM

These pages furnish a fascinating glimpse of the mentality and interests of the time. The news was presented in a manner very different from that of today. Sometimes the headlined story of a battle has a small addendum entitled "Later and Better News." But the reader had a good idea of what was going on, at home and abroad, and though the United States did not feel or function as a great power, burdened by the responsibility of world leadership, it was not isolationist in its interests.

The point is that a nation cannot be isolationist if it has the means to see the world as it is. The news, if faithfully reported, is the world as it is, and that reality is the only solid base of policy. This puts a terrible responsibility on any newspaper and a heavy load of new year or new century resolutions on those who have anything to do with starting this newspaper on its second hundred years.

Amendment of Railway Labor Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *December 26, 1950.*
Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: As an Alabamian transferred here from Birmingham, Ala., and district chairman of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks representing 257 such transferred members, I am appealing to you as a southerner to vote and exert your influence against H. R. 7789, which would amend the Railway Labor Act to permit negotiations for a union shop on the railroads. While I and my coworkers here on the Louisville & Nashville Railroad believe in the necessity for unions, as our voluntary membership proves, we do not believe in forced membership in either a union, club, lodge, church, or anything else, feeling that such in any form is un-American and should be left to Russia.

This legislation is being sought by the national leaders, and the opinion of the people has not been asked for nor considered. They seek such power to further their political ideas, which for the greater part are of the FEPC and other civil-rights programs of the North and East variety and which, through the courage and tenacity of loyal Southern representatives, have been thus far defeated. This is evidenced by the avalanche of propaganda with which we have been plagued for the past 4 to 6 years through the papers of the organizations.

Food for thought is that at present there are over 300,000 members of the railway clerks alone, and with the passage of this bill there would be added some 60,000 forced members. With the power to assess each of these members, and the law as written allows this, even as small amount as $5 each, it is easy to see what a powerful force these leaders would have to force the passage of all of the objectionable civil-rights and other socialistic programs. This one feature alone is sufficient to warn any southerner to fight it in every way.

We as railroad employees have made great progress by expression of the freedom of choice and the Railway Labor Act. Keep this act intact as it is and let us continue to do so, but, either progress or failure, let it be as free men and not by orders under force from a few. Help us preserve this freedom.

Yours very truly,

W. T. HARRISON.

Greet 1951 Courageously

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the December 29, 1950, Lake City Reporter, which makes a timely plea for unity and courage on the part of all Americans:

GREET 1951 COURAGEOUSLY

As the new year approaches, with 1951 just around the corner, men and women have a natural tendency to review the past and look ahead while they condition future plans to what they think is in store for them.

In the present condition of world affairs, it is natural for us to be concerned about the possibility of war. Military experts, as a general rule, do not believe that the Russians plan a great war in the next 12 months. Nevertheless, the man in the street knows that the experts are sometimes wrong and are a bit apprehensive that the ambitions of the Soviet will lead to aggression. This, we know, will mean another world war.

There is nothing much that the average reader of the Lake City Reporter can do about the world situation. Of course, we are resolved to support our own government and the free peoples of the world. Regardless of cost, collectively or individually, we will stand up and fight for our civilization which, we know, has presented us with great blessings without which modern life would be a burden and individuals would become slaves.

It might be a good idea for us, as individuals, as we realize our impotency in the face of titanic forces, to resolve to make ourselves more efficient persons and thus more competent for whatever comes to hand. In the process, we should not overlook the spiritual and mental side of the human existence, nor concentrate unduly upon the physical. Man is a balanced composition of faculties not yet completely understood, but nevertheless capable of harmonious blending in the making of good men and women.

The Lake City Reporter cannot guarantee that 1951 will be happy or prosperous but we can say, without qualifications, that if the people of Columbia County, along with the rest of the population of the United States, act intelligently, unselfishly and in unity, there is no peril ahead that cannot be mastered.

We must stand together as we stand losses, experience tragedy and bear grief. This is

no day for selfish behavior and greedy goals. Let us live together with stout hearts, alert minds and unconquerable spirit—there will be no fate that we cannot conquer.

Did the A-Bomb Do Any Good?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in the January 1951 issue of the American Legion magazine, entitled "Did the A-Bomb Do Any Good?":

DID THE A-BOMB DO ANY GOOD?
(By Gretta Palmer)

Where were you on the evening of August 6, 1945? Where were you when you heard the news from Hiroshima?

It is a question every American old enough to hear the radio 5 years ago can answer. Where were you when the A-bomb dropped?

Recently, in a New York hotel room, two men met for the first time. To the question "Where were you on the morning of August 6?" they had the same answer to make:

"Hiroshima. In the plane that dropped the bomb," said Capt. Robert A. Lewis, copilot of the historic B–29, the *Enola Gay*.

"Hiroshima. Breakfasting in the rectory of our church," said Father Hubert F. Schiffer, S. J., one of the few European victims of the bomb.

"For 5 years I have looked forward to meeting someone who saw it from the ground," said Captain Lewis.

"I have wanted for 5 years to meet someone who was in the plane," said Father Schiffer, a German Jesuit priest so badly injured by the explosion that he was able to leave his sickbed only after many months.

"And you are all right now?" the American captain asked.

"Oh, there are 10 or 15 radioactive glass splinters in my back they still don't dare remove," the young priest shrugged. "Don't let that worry you."

"Well," said the pilot, "it doesn't make me feel too good."

The two men whose fates were so oddly linked are both in their early thirties. The priest is here studying labor relations at Fordham University, preparing for his return to mission work in Japan. Robert Lewis is personnel manager of Henry Heide, Inc., the New York candy firm. Both, then, are in the field of labor and its relations. Both of them have also strong convictions as to the need of peace in the world today, and both hope that the bomb itself will prove an instrument for bringing the dread of war so close to statesmen's hearts that peace will be assured.

But the two survivors of Hiroshima share smaller and more intimate memories. That odd taste when the bomb went off, for instance. Neither of them could describe it; neither of them had found anyone else who shared that memory until now. And they had other things to talk about.

Captain Lewis had prepared for the Hiroshima drop for years; since September of 1944, when he was secretly alerted for the biggest project the Air Force will have to do and was briefed at a hush-hush conference in Utah, on how to fly a bomb which the Army officials expected to end the war. The captain, even then, was an expert on the new B–29's, which he had been test-piloting for many months, along with his commander, Col. Paul Tibbets. Captain Lewis met with scientists who told him of the mystic symbols U235 when only a handful of high Government officials knew what they meant. He was trained to drop the bomb before the bomb was even made.

The preparations for the historic flight began in Wendover, Utah, at a flying field whose security precautions were almost neurotic in their exactitude. The town chosen had more Army intelligence men in residence than its peacetime citizens (only 100 men and women, bewildered to know what on earth was going on). No more than two atomic scientists were allowed out of Wendover on any of the experimental flights; certain scientists were judged so valuable they could never fly at all. When secret flights were made—to Los Alamos, N. Mex., certain Air Force officers wore false insignia and took a roundabout route to and from the towns they visited.

The Five Hundred and Ninth Composite Group was the hush-hush outfit's final name; it was activated in December of 1944, trained in Cuba and California. The ship herself came from the factory labelled 6292, but was given the more glamorous name of *Enola Gay* on her fateful mission.

So Captain Lewis had a pretty good idea of what he was going to be doing early in August of that year. "There were times," he said, "when I wanted to go back to Piper cubs. The scientists couldn't tell us whether the bomb dropping would explode the plane or not. They thought a safe distance would be 3½ miles away. Half of them—only half—expected the crew to survive."

Where was President Truman on August 6? He had just left Potsdam where he had been in conference with Marshal Stalin, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and later, Clement Attlee. The President wanted the Potsdam warning to Japan to be dramatized by the dropping of the bomb on August 2. Weather conditions caused 4 days' delay. But every morning for those 4 days the crew of 12 men were alerted at dawn; every day until the 6th the weather closed down. On that morning, however, the skies were clear. The operations officers reported good conditions ahead. The big flight was on.

There were three planes in the group that took off at 3 a. m. that day; the bomb ship, an instrument plane, and a photographic plane which followed them several miles behind. The planes arranged to rendezvous at Iwo Jima, where a substitute plane was awaiting in case trouble should develop en route. Three weather ships had taken off an hour ahead to scout the three targets chosen as possibilities: Nagasaki, Kokura, and Hiroshima. They reported only 40 minutes before the "bombs away" that the weather was best around Hiroshima. It was that slight matter of air currents and wind that thus determined the destiny of 400,000 people—including Father Schiffer.

The priest's preparation for the event of August 6 had been a great deal less elaborate than the captain's: He expected just another day. A German-born missionary, he had been studying in Tokyo since 1935 and had only recently been ordained. The living conditions in Tokyo at that time were difficult; nightly bombings made sleep a near impossibility and the young priest was sent, by his superiors, to the quiet town of Hiroshima for a rest. Here he was to work at the Jesuit Church of the Assumption of Our Lady.

On the morning of August 6, Father Schiffer was quietly reading a Japanese newspaper at his breakfast table when the world went white about him.

("It happened that way up above, too," said Captain Lewis. "The glare when the bomb burst was so brilliant it made the sun seem pale.")

The next thing the young priest knew he was lying down, recovering consciousness and very wet from his own blood. He could neither see nor hear. That frightened him, for in a bombing such as he had known before, there should have been much noise. Then he realized that he was deaf, and also that he was blind.

A few moments later, his senses returned and he gasped at what he saw. The walls, the windows, has been shattered into strange, irregular designs. The furnishings of the room had crumbled to dust. His own clothing had been swept away. His feet were bare. And he was in great pain.

A voice from above, the voice of his pastor called to ask, "Father Schiffer, are you living?" (It was an odd question, he thought, even then: "He would ask if I were wounded unless he half expected me to be dead.")

The pastor and two other priests, who had been upstairs, rushed down to join the gravely injured man. No one understood yet what had occurred. The rectory was earthquake proof, and its walls held. But the church next door had utterly disappeared. And as for the town—

"There is a doctor down that street," the pastor said, and then his voice was still. There was no street. There was scarcely any city. There were only the horrible sights of ruination where men had lived their lives a few hours before.

Father Schiffer was obviously going to die; the pastor spoke accordingly.

"You will soon see the Blessed Mother in Heaven," he told him. "Please tell her that we will rebuild her church on this spot as soon as we can."

Father Schiffer moved a bit.

"Father," he said to his superior, "I think I have a chance of life if I can crawl to the river and get some water. You may be able to give the message to the Blessed Mother before I do."

So he set out for the river. A few hundred yards from the rectory he collapsed and lay there for 12 hours—until help could be brought from the Jesuit novitiate 3 miles outside the town. Then the wounded man was put into a hand cart and jounced over the rutted roads for an agonizing trip. At the novitiate there were no doctors, no nurses. It was the rector who looked at Father Schiffer's back and said, "Why, man, you're full of glass!" Over a hundred glass splinters had lodged in his back, and these the rector cut out, without anesthesia or proper surgical instruments.

That night more than a hundred Japanese patients were also brought to the novitiate, one by one. Some of them were kept as patients for a year or more, and fed out of the Jesuits' own scanty wartime rations. Some of them had been picked up and added to the hand-cart caravan that brought the priest himself.

"Half a dozen times on that ride," he said, "I begged the bearers, 'Let me die here. It's hopeless.' They answered, 'No. We have orders to get you back for a decent Christian funeral. If we leave you here you'll be mixed up with all the other corpses.' The other corpses were all around us where the road should have been.

"I know now," the priest added gravely, "quite enough about what hell looks like to make my meditations on that subject with no prompting from the spiritual books."

All these details of the effects on the earth below were a secret from the Americans in the B–29 until last month, when the meeting between the two men occurred. Captain Lewis has a vivid memory of all that happened in the air after the target was reached, after the "bombs away."

"Then," the captain recalls, "we made a sharp turn to the right, as the scientists had warned us to. We were flying manually by instruments at above 30,000 feet. Forty-three seconds after we had dropped it, the A-bomb exploded, 1,800 feet above the ground. My God, I felt a flash through my whole body * * * the scientists later said it was the ozone effect. Then there were two distinct slaps at the ship about 20 seconds after the flash.

"The light was at my back, but even so it stunned me. It was fiercer than the sun on that bright and sunny day. Yet by that time we were maybe 8 miles from the explosion. We had to get away fast to avoid the bomb effects ourselves. But later we could look back and see the mushroom.

"It looked as if the whole city were covered with boiling smoke. In 3 minutes it got up as high as 30,000 feet. We could see the flames below crawling up the mountains and covering the bridges and tributary rivers. It seemed impossible to comprehend.

"I thought, 'My God, what have we done? If I live a hundred years, I'll never be able to get this moment out of my mind.' I guess I never will. We thought the Japanese might have surrendered by the time we got back to our base. It seemed like something out of Buck Rogers.

"Oh, I had dropped bombs before—10,000-pound bombs. But at 30,000 feet they make tiny little puffs of smoke when they explode. This was different. This was awful. Back at the base I slept for 20 hours. But later I didn't sleep much. I'd lie awake thinking, 'What if the bomb had gone off in the plane? What if we had lost a wing?' Only half the scientists ever expected the crew to survive, remember. Yet none of us had even combat fatigue. It was a small sacrifice to end a war—on the winners' part, anyway. Nobody connected with the bomb had to lose his life.

"But, of course, the loss of life in that city was terrible. We had picked it because it was an important Japanese headquarters—the second imperial command was there."

"Yes," said Father Schiffer gently. "But that was just on paper. Hiroshima was a debarkation point for China, with about 100,000 Japanese soldiers stationed there. But there were no big military installations. It was a city of 400,000 civilians; of those at least 200,000 died."

"Good heavens," said Captain Lewis, "that many?"

"Yes," replied the priest. "The Japanese official figures minimized the loss at the ridiculous figure of 80,000. We knew better."

The pilot nodded. "I could see trolleys and little bridges going up—I don't know how many."

"Forty-two bridges were destroyed," said Father Schiffer.

"Did you hear the bomb coming down?"

"I heard nothing," Father Schiffer replied, "not the plane, nor any impact. That scared me most when I recovered consciousness. I lay there waiting for the next bombs to drop, the way they always had in raids before. The silence was the most appalling thing of all—no screams, no air-raid signals, no fire engines rushing past."

"Did you have any sensation of heat?"

"I don't remember—anyway, it was a very hot day. But when I regained my sight, I looked about and tried to count the fires—there are always fires in those wooden cities of Japan. I counted 16 in the first 10 minutes. By that time it had become very cloudy, but I didn't look up or see the mushroom.

"There was too much to hold my eyes to the earth—blood in the streets and flattened houses with no living men about. It didn't look nice."

"I went back to Japan after the war," said Captain Lewis, "and the Japs in Tokyo had the damnedest reaction to the bomb you ever heard. They seemed grateful for it. They called it 'God's wind' and said it had saved many lives by bringing an end to the war."

Father Schiffer nodded.

"I know," he said. "We thought we knew the Japanese psychology well after 15 years, but their reaction at Hiroshima amazed even us. The survivors there felt their city had been given a unique honor—that of suffering in order to bring peace to the world. They look upon their 200,000 dead as willing victims—as heroes sacrificed for world-wide peace."

"Were the survivors themselves crippled by radioactivity?"

"No," said Father Schiffer, "not unless they had had specific injuries. Many Hiroshima citizens were bald, some for years, but now their hair has been restored. There was no sterility effect, according to the doctors on the spot, and no increase in the birth of abnormal babies.

"The survivors of Hiroshima are scarcely worse off physically today than before the bomb.

"Spiritually, they are far, far better."

"And what do you mean by that, Father?" asked Captain Lewis.

"Well," said the priest, "it is a happy ending. I'll tell you.

"The Japanese Diet has allotted funds to build a University of Hiroshima as a symbol of peace. That in itself is startling. But much more than that is going on.

"Our missionaries there were recently approached by a committee of leading citizens—Buddhists, for the most part. Before the war this city was predominantly Buddhist. Well, these men approached our rector and asked if we would build a 'palace of prayer' for peace right where the A-bomb fell. He was also asked if he would supply lecturers to speak in Buddhist monasteries nearby. Conversions to Christianity are soaring and the 'palace of prayer' is to be built."

The Tokyo newspaper Asahi recently conducted a contest among architects for the best plans for this memorial shrine, and some of Japan's foremost architects competed for the honor of designing the structure. Construction should be under way by the time this article is in print.

Flags of all the countries engaged in World War II will be placed on the altar and prayers will be offered up 24 hours a day, not only for the future peace of the world but for all the dead and wounded of the war. Names of Buddhist, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish veterans are already being inscribed in a Golden Book of Prayer which the Franciscan Adoration Monastery of Cleveland is preparing for the shrine, scheduled for completion on August 15, 1952, to coincide with the Feast of the Assumption.

Already Father Schiffer has built an orphanage at Hiroshima where 65 children are being cared for, and this is to be expanded to a general hospital in time.

And so the effects of the A-bomb on Hiroshima have included things that never crossed the minds of the General Staff in Washington nor of the scientists who discovered how to release the devil that uranium contains, nor certainly of the B-29 crew. For peace and love and prayer will mark the spot forever where the A-bomb fell.

"Will you fly back to Hiroshima when we open our shrine, Captain?" asked the priest gently. "Will you try to borrow a B-29 and land it at the spot you saw go up in smoke before?"

"Will I?" said Captain Lewis. "Will I? If I can do that, and maybe bring a plane-load of candy from America for those kids, I'll never have nightmares again over the damage that we had to do that day. I'll agree with you, the story of Hiroshima had a happy ending."

The New Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to wish for my colleagues in this House and for the Members of the other body all that is good in this new year.

The old year has taken its place with yesterday's 10,000 years. Its record is there for all to read, filled with human aspirations and spotted with mistakes of judgment and of action caused by misunderstanding as well as by apathy toward and ignorance of the great fundamental laws of God's universe.

Yes, we have made many mistakes. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is by mistakes that the individual and the Nation learns and grows. Therefore I do not look into this new year and the incoming Eighty-second Congress with fear and trepidation. Rather do I look forward to a year of great growth in perception, in awareness, in understanding. With such growth we can anticipate a year of fundamental accomplishment.

There is no question but that we face an era of great strain—a time when disciplines will be expected of us as individuals, as a Government and as a Nation. To see clearly we must set aside greed, selfishness, coldness of heart and emotionalism. We must recognize our own need of calm, balanced judgment in all things, of quiet determination to "seek first the kingdom of heaven, which is righteousness and peace." We must sacrifice prejudice, intolerance and fear upon the altar of our country's need for unity in unselfish service to those things which under God can bring peace in our time.

Above all else, Mr. Speaker, we as a Congress need to examine ourselves and the uncharted sea that lies ahead. We must insist upon knowing the goal toward which this Government, in its three parts, is moving at every point. We must know what each step we take involves, and what it may lead to before we take it. We must assume in completeness the responsibility placed upon us as the representatives of the people of these United States.

Only when we know our goal can we legislate with judgment and intelligence. Only when we so consider the grave matters that will come before us daily shall we have the renewed confidence of the people whom we serve. Only such confidence can give us the unity which will make us invincible.

I therefore extend to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Members of this and the other body my good wishes for a most satisfying and constructive new year. I would ask you to join with me in all good wishes to those who share our responsibilities to the country and to the world in the other two departments of Government. It is for us to renew our

covenant of freedom in unity of thought and action to preserve for future generations the freedom under law which responsible citizens of this representative Republic have had entrusted to their watchful care.

And may the Infinite grant us vision, singleness of purpose and a flaming faith in the ultimate victory of light.

Shall We Call Politburo's World War Bluff Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth Club of California is a unique institution. It is a club that seriously studies public questions, and after exhaustive study and discussion of a specific public problem, it makes a recommendation concerning the problem. I believe the slogan of the founder, Edward F. Adams, was "Get the facts."

Also the club attracts as guests, speakers with profound knowledge and big reputations. Since the club was founded, every President of the United States, either before or during his service as President, has addressed the members.

Leaders in practically every field of human endeavor and thought have appeared before this club as guest speakers. Recently the club was addressed by Dr. Robert J. Kerner, Sather professor of history and director of the Institute of Slavic Studies, University of California. He made a powerful address answering the question which is the title of this discussion. Whether we agree with his conclusions and analyses or not, his thoughts are well worth pondering. He has devoted years to a study and examination of our relations with Russia and the problem as to whether the world can attain stable and enduring peace so long as Russia remains Communist.

Two World Wars have been fought and won by the free world, and in each case the hope and the expectation were that world peace would follow. It was lost in 1920 when the United States refused to become a member of the League of Nations. Whether it would have brought peace, no one knows, but I am one of those that thought it was a chance we should not have overlooked.

This time the free countries started early to lay the foundation for a world order that would bring world peace. The United Nations was founded and for 5 years has been struggling to move toward a peaceful world.

Of course, we must admit that we made one terribly bad assumption; i. e., that the free world, and the United States in particular, could work and deal with the Soviets in the same fair, frank, and honest manner that we dealt with other countries not under Soviet domination. We soon found this assumption to be false. Perhaps we of the United States should have realized this from the treatment Russia gave our lend-lease representative and our Ambassador in Russia during the war when we were fighting together as allies and when Russia was struggling desperately for her existence.

The speech of Professor Kerner is so thought provoking, so well reasoned and swecping in its analysis that I sincerely hope it will be read by every Member of Congress. These are the kinds of discussions that really help Congressmen understand some of the staggering decisions they must soon make. Understanding and courage is what brings right decisions. The safety and freedom of this and future generations is at stake in many of the congressional decisions which will be made in the Eighty-second Congress.

Under leave granted me, I here reproduce Dr. Kerner's speech:

The Western Powers offered Russia an enduring peace on the basis of national and vital interests, in other words, real security.

The concessions made at Tehran in 1943 and at Yalta, Potsdam, and Moscow in 1945 were all made with this in view. They were President Roosevelt's great gamble, which we now know has ended in miserable failure, because, after obtaining all these concessions, the Soviet Union embarked on a policy of world revolution after the Conference at Yalta in February 1945.

This change in Soviet policy ended the hope of postwar cooperation and peace.

The Western Powers conceded that the Soviet Union had the right to friendly neighbors with governments of their choosing and with whom it would make alliances.

The new Russo-Polish boundary that it demanded was granted and the Polish Government-in-exile dropped. The Communist-controlled government of Poland was recognized.

DEFENSIVE CONCESSIONS CAN BE USED OFFENSIVELY

The German East Prussian territory around Koenigsberg, which would prevent a new Germany from threatening Moscow, Leningrad, and the eastern Baltic by air, was likewise assigned to Soviet Russia. In Russian hands this grant of territory, for defensive purposes can be turned into an offensive base to dominate Berlin, Paris and Copenhagen with the entrance to the Baltic, if not London itself.

The award of Bessarabia and Bukowina, if used for defensive purposes by Russia, protects Odessa and blocks an invasion route into the Russian Ukraine. If used for offensive purposes and aggression, it dominates the Danube, and constitutes a gateway to conquest of the Balkans.

Soviet Russia's demand for a new treaty to regulate the Turkish Straits was accompanied by the abrogation in March 1945 of its treaty of virtual alliance with Turkey dating back 20 years. The Western Powers conceded that new conditions called for a new treaty, but insisted on an international arrangement, which would not permit Russian domination of the very strategic waterway.

The Western Powers promised Soviet Russia the Kurile Islands. By this concession the Soviet Union secured a Russian-controlled access into the North Pacific, which if used offensively might lead to the domination of the North Pacific and put the Aleutians, Alaska, and Canada in jeopardy.

Add to this, previously held railroad, economic and naval rights in Manchuria acquired before 1905, the right-of-way to create an independent Mongolia, and the right to occupy Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel. Looked at defensively, this would secure Russia access to unfrozen ports and to perfect defense of its Asiatic shores.

From an offensive point of view, Mongolia, a Buddhist country, closely connected in religion with Tibet and with millions of believers in China, India, and elsewhere, could serve as an excellent gateway for the world revolution steam roller in this backyard of Asia.

MANCHURIA USED AS RED CHINA BASE

To use Manchuria, the one great potential basis of China's future industrialization, as a stepping stone to the triumph of Chinese Communists in all China, as it was actually used, is a world-revolutionary action.

The Western Powers also conceded the ominous principle of coalition (bourgeois-Communist) governments in the Soviet Union's neighbors: Poland, Eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and China—everyone, except Yugoslavia, a neighbor. This meant delivering these countries to Moscow; submission to Moscow.

Full status in the United Nations, with three votes in the Assembly and a permanent seat in the Security Council with power to veto anything remotely in opposition to the progress of the world revolution, followed logically.

IF POLICY PEACE, CONCESSIONS SATISFACTORY

Occupation zones in Germany (with Berlin territorially unconnected with the non-Soviet sectors), and in Austria, with vague and undefined and unagreed upon arrangements of reparations from them for the Soviet Union, gave further great advantages.

Any country whose policy was security, defense, and peace based on national and vital interests would have regarded these concessions as satisfactory.

In spite of all these concessions and a world disarmed outside the Soviet Union, there has been a persistent whine, as if some rank injustice had been done to that country.

Communist propaganda harped upon the warlike world surrounding it, with first Britain and now the United States ready to pounce on such an innocent and wronged community of peace-loving citizens as the Soviet Union and its satellites.

SOME CITIZENS AND SCHOLARS SWALLOWED BAIT

And this, some well-intentioned citizens and scholars, and some not so well-intentioned, have swallowed bait, fishhook, sinker, line and pole.

The competent historian in the future will charge that the Soviet Union, more properly the Moscow Politburo, wrecked the hopes of peace beginning in 1945 and will name it as the aggressor in China and Korea, as it was in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Greece and Bulgaria and as the instigator of the third world war, if and when it unfortunately begins.

This leads to another misapprehension, that Soviet imperialism is nothing else than czarist imperialism, and that the Russian people are, therefore, our enemies. This would lead us to the same mistake Hitler made.

Russian soldiers surrendered in millions to the Germans. They wanted to be liberated. They were treated as despised enemies, as so many swine.

This is one of the most important factors, if not the most important, that saved Communist rule in Russia.

CZARS DID NOT SUPPORT SUBVERSION ABROAD

Czarist Russia expanded down the rivers in search of access to the seas.

Czarist Russia followed preponderantly the policy of national and vital needs. It did

not create, direct, and support political parties, in all the other countries to bring about its domination of them.

It is time we return to the view that, should the third world war unfortunately break out, the peoples of Russia will take an enthusiastic part in their own liberation.

The Soviet Empire and its colonies, we must conclude, is basically a far different organism from that of czarist Russia and has a world revolutionary policy, not one of security and national and vital aims.

The Soviet empire and its colonies have a great superiority at present in armed might as respects trained and battle-ready divisions, some 175 at least, in certain kinds of artillery and tanks, in hedge-hopping airplanes, and possible in snorkel submarines. It may have some atom bombs.

It is fatally vulnerable from air attack in its Baku and Ploesti oil fields, in some of its industrial concentrations, in its very inadequate railroad system and in the forced, superficial loyalty of its peoples.

Do you wonder then that the Moscow Politburo has thus far avoided international war but, as Secretary Acheson said, attempts to overthrow by subversive means established governments.

SOVIET PURPOSE TO BLUFF, TERRORIZE

Their purpose is clear: to bluff and terrorize the free world into further fatal appeasements, to soften it for easy conquest, to lull it to sleep with a false peace movement, whose sole objective is to eliminate the one weapon—the atom bomb—that really frightens the war lords of the Kremlin.

By bluff, terror, and pressure on the part of the Soviet bloc and by exported revolutionaries—the Bolshevik termites—they are confident they can finish the Communist conquest of the world without taking the risk, perhaps fatal to them, of international war. At least not until they have so nibbled away at the world, until the rest is isolated and worn out and will be a push-over by a safe use of force from without.

STALIN, LENIN: WAR INEVITABLE

At that time, if they have to, they will resort to the preventive war which Voznesensky let out of the bag in his The War Economy of the USSR: "To prevent the possibility of appearance within the near future of new imperialist aggression against the Socialist homeland at the beginning of a third world war, it is necessary that the aggressor imperialist countries be disarmed, militarily and economically, and that the anti-imperialist countries rally together."

In this light Stalin's statement in 1927 is understandable: "We cannot forget the saying of Lenin to the effect that a great deal in the matter of our construction depends whether we succeed in delaying war with the capitalist countries, which is inevitable, but which may be delayed either until proletarian revolt ripens in Europe or until the colonial revolutions come fully to a head, or finally until the capitalists fight among themselves over division of the colonies."

In recent history the attempt to limit wars to local wars has been a failure.

TRIED TO FENCE OFF FORMOSA

We have tried to call the United Nations action in Korea a local police action. We have tried to limit it to Korea, fencing Formosa out of it and hoping that Communist China would also stay out of it.

Thus England is friendly at Peiping and in Hong Kong where it sells materials useful in war to Chinese Communists. Our merchants and ships until recently did the same thing. British boys are fighting Chinese Communists in Korea.

How much sense does this make?

Question: "Are the limitations which prevent unlimited pursuit of Chinese large forces and unlimited attack on their bases regarded by you as a handicap to effective military operations?" Answer by General MacArthur: "An enormous handicap, without precedent in military history."

The Truman-Attlee conversations must have pleased Stalin and Mao, but they pleased hardly anybody competent to judge such matters. We yielded on the British suggestion to see what can be done to bring about peace in Korea. We continued our stand on Formosa.

We continued post haste to arm, mobilize, and create a war economy. We will continue to believe that anything obtained in that way in Korea is only a truce.

HAVE HELD TO ONE-FRONT POLICY

We have held to the one-front policy which the Moscow Politburo could easily diagnose from public statements, to wit: Europe is more important than Asia.

This is sound so far as the statement that, if Europe goes down, we are isolated. It is unsound in that the problem of Communist aggression is world-wide and must be met on all fronts.

There is sufficient evidence available to take the ground that Stalin at this time—we cannot say the same for a year or two hence—cannot fight except on one front.

To support, equip, and provide for the Northern Korea and Chinese Communist forces at such a great distance from Moscow has been quite a strain for Soviet Russian economy. Stalin would not welcome an all-front war at this time.

WILL WE BE RELATIVELY STRONGER IN 1952?

Will we be relatively stronger than Stalin in 1951 or 1952 than we are now? Was Britain stronger relatively than Hitler in 1939 than in 1936? Was Stalin relatively stronger than Hitler in 1941 than he was in 1939? The answer to these is most probably not in the affirmative.

Competent research blames the outbreak of the First World War on the fact that the British did not make it clear enough and soon enough to William II that they would enter the war.

British appeasements led definitely to the Second World War. In reality, though denied by Mr. Attlee, has not his recent attempt resembled (earlier appeasements)?

MORE LOCAL WARS

For Mr. Stalin it means the Western World is weak—a triumphant local war in Korea can be duplicated in Indochina, Siam, Burma, India, and most of all in Iran (if it is necessary to go that far).

All these are outside the Atlantic Pact.

Attlee-led Europe and Nehru-led Asia present a tempting, but deceptive dish to Stalin. Tempting for further forays, deceptive finally, because they will come to a true realization of the situation sooner or later and then the die will be cast.

These conversations will not prevent a third world war. They may even hasten it. The situation has become a race in time. How much has it advanced the timetable? To 1951?

If we called Stalin's bluff, knowing he cannot fight an all-front war now, there is just a chance that this might prevent such a war.

If it did not, it would not be the cause of the war because all the causes of the war have been counted in by this time by competent judges.

Only Stalin can prevent the third world war, but his terms are submission to Moscow. The free nations, free men everywhere cannot accept submission to Moscow, and what is more they will accept only an enduring peace or go down to ruin trying to get it.

Who blocked agreement on the use of the atom bomb which required efficient international inspection? Who prevented the creation of armed forces for the United Nations to block such forays as Korea and those yet to come?

Who? Who? Who?

Who put pressure upon and converted the governments of Eastern Europe into Soviet vassals? Who almost scuttled the democratic governments of France and Italy?

Who fooled our advisers about China? Who ordered the Northern Koreans into south China? Who ordered the Chinese Communist divisions into Korea after the defeat of the Northern Koreans?

Who will order the next subtle pressure and force into Indochina, Iran, or some other locale? The answer is the same: The Moscow Politburo.

The next step, after the real failure to solve the Korean war which may be expected, is to call Soviet Russia's and Communist China's bluff on a world war.

Neither they nor we are prepared for it. But they have a lot more to lose from an international war than we. You will be surprised at the result.

It will give the world its first chance to look peace in the face since 1945. If it brings war now, we shall win that war and end the menace to freedom.

Forgotten Man in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Daily News of January 1, 1951, and the first of three articles by Clyde Farnsworth on the remarkable record of resistance which the Government of the Republic of China has made both to Japanese and armed Communists attempts to conquer and use China for their respective program of world domination. Little by little, events are discrediting those who were apologists for Chinese Communists and detractors of the Chinese Government. Perhaps the truth about China can soon be given a hearing again in this country. Only then will there be hope that public pressure will force the American Government to alter its disastrous policies of the last 5 years in Asia and thereby perhaps save our own country:

FORGOTTEN MAN

It is ironical that, at a time when the Communists are threatening to conquer all of Asia, the Asiatic who was first to draw his sword against communism is not permitted to fight.

It is just as ironical that, when we are losing a war against communism in Korea for want of manpower, a well-trained army, ready and eager to fight and within easy sailing distance of the front, has not been called on.

Chiang Kai-shek is the man. The army is the huge Chinese Nationalist force now idle on Formosa.

Politics is keeping both out of the war.

Chiang fought and won countless battles against the Reds before 1937 when he was forced to devote his major attention to the Japanese. Against the Japanese, Chiang lost more battles than he won. But he kept on fighting. After Japan surrendered to the Allies in 1945, the Nationalists resumed their war with the Communists.

Chiang lost the support of the United States Government because he refused to make a deal with the Communists.

Some of the details of this amazing story are told by Scripps-Howard staff writer Clyde Farnsworth on this page today.

As a war correspondent, Mr. Farnsworth was a witness to many of these events. Today's article and two more to follow will make it easier to understand why the Communists are winning the war in Asia.

CHIANG'S FOUGHT REDS 25 YEARS

(NOTE.—This is the first of three articles by Clyde Farnsworth answering the question raised in some quarters as to whether the Chinese Nationalists can and will fight. Mr. Farnsworth returned to this country recently from an 8-year tour of duty in the Orient.)

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

Chiang Kai-shek and his armed forces have fought Russian-inspired, Russian-directed world revolution for 25 years.

It was not, of course, a constant clash of arms and shedding of blood. There were periods of armed truce, of recession, or advance, times in which the two sides tried their luck at the council tables. And for eight long years the Chinese Nationalists were preoccupied with their war of resistance against Japan.

But the undercurrents of conflict between the strongest Communist Party outside Russia and the strongest Asiatic force ever brought to bear against world communism were never stilled—from the death of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, whom Chiang succeeded, down to today.

The record shows—and I know from personal experience—that the Chinese Nationalists fought, and often fought well, with the odds desperately against them. And they're ready and eager to go again. It's only a sordid twist of international politics that keeps them out of the war we're in. They would, of course, be on our side.

The Chiang-Nationalists' struggle with communism falls into three periods:

Chiang first purged his government party of Russian and Chinese Communists. He then conducted a successful military campaign against Chinese war lords, brought China greater unification than the country had ever known, eliminated a "Chinese Soviet Republic" in southeast China and harried its army for 6,000 roundabout miles into the Chinese northwest.

Chiang's 1930 offensive was the first of six. The Reds held pronounced terrain advantages in mountain fastnesses.

The Nationalist-Communist struggle of 1930 to 1934 was a war of complete mobility. It was then the Chinese Red leaders developed a new manual of guerrilla tactics, including unparalleled terror against civil populations that aided the Nationalists.

The sharpest statistics on record to show that this was bloody warfare and not an old-fashioned Chinese tempest over teacups—that it produced a Nationalist victory and Red retreat—are the before-and-after population figures in the province where most of the fighting occurred.

The 25,000,000 population of Kiangsi Province was cut in half.

The sixth and final offensive against the outnumbered Reds in 1934 developed into a vast ring around the Kiangsi enclave. Between 90,000 and 100,000 Reds broke out, and one year and 6,000 miles later they arrived in Shensi Province—20,000 strong.

In 1936 Russia obviously ordered the weakened Chinese Communists to lay off their propagandizing for an anti-Chiang, anti-Japan "united front." Russia recognized Chiang's value for the coming war against Japan and demonstrated this by saving his life in a sensational kidnaping episode.

The Japanese also had recognized the growing strength of the Chiang-Nationalist line-up. They attacked in 1937 and Chiang resisted.

Virtually cut off from outside material aid, he resisted for 8 years, exacting 1,000,000 casualties and tying up about 1,000,000 Japanese troops which otherwise could have been used to help block the American offensive in the Pacific.

This was the very minimum of the Nationalist contribution to the defeat of Japan.

During much of the same time Chiang also resisted all pressures, including those of President Roosevelt and Lt. Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, for an integration of Chinese Communist armies with his own and with General Stilwell commanding both. Chiang felt that would be a short-cut to a Communist China.

The Communists meanwhile used the "united front" against Japanese invasion to spread themselves from the north into central and south China and to increase their army from 25,000 to more than 300,000.

Chiang fought the Japanese with one hand and tried to rule the Reds with the other.

His divisions engaged a Japanese seaborne force for 3 months around Shanghai in 1937, blocking the way to Nanking where the enemy hoped to dictate a sudden peace. By the time the Japanese reached Nanking the Government had moved to Hankow, the first of Chiang's withdrawals into the interior.

The Chinese, no match for the Japanese in arms or equipment, had to sell China's space for time in which to set up interior bases.

Yet in April 1938 the poorly armed Chinese gave the Japanese a sound beating at Taierchwang. The Japanese suffered 30,000 casualties by Chinese estimate.

It took the Japanese 4 months to crack Hankow's defenses and they never reached Chungking which was to be Chiang's provisional capital. Changsha, focus of Japanese attempts to establish a line of communications through southeast China, was successfully defended against three offensives, only to yield in 1944 to the fourth.

At Hengyang, farther south, the Japanese were held up 47 days by a Chinese garrison completely cut off from all supply except by air, one of the epic defenses of the war.

There were many other battles, attested to by American observers, and other Chinese victories, but the last Japanese campaign of the war was an attempt to knock out a Chinese-American air base at Chihkiang, western Hunan Province, ended in the most impressive victory for the Chinese, still underarmed.

They halted and finally shattered and threw back a Japanese force of 80,000 men between April 9 and June 3, 1945.

The Communists, with enormous Russian help in the way of captured Japanese arms, won the battle of China in Manchuria.

In the winter of 1947–48, Red Gen. Lin Piao had to mount seven separate offensives against the reduced, outnumbered, outgunned, and overextended Nationalists before he made the northeast a secure base for the conquest of China proper.

The Red's first major successes were Weihsien, in Shantung, and Shihchiachwang in Hopeh, neither a pushover.

The capture of Tsinan, capital of Shantung, after a 10-day battle and the first of the Nationalists' big defections, gave a decisive turn to events. Four months later Tientsin went under and Peiping was not far behind.

On the other hand, Taiyuan, capital of Shansi, closely beseiged for months, fought on and was not reduced until after Nanking had fallen in April 1949.

Peiping was yielded without a fight by Gen. Fu Tso-yi, whom American officials had touted as the best of Chiang Kai-shek's generals, while one of the worst, in their judgment, Gen. Tu-Yu-ming, fought until he was captured in the big battle of Hsuchow. That fight finally decided things north of the lower Yangtze.

About 1,000,000 combatants engaged in this, the greatest battle of China's struggle. Virtually the whole Nationalist force committed was lost between November 9 and mid-December 1948, in the Hsuchow breakthrough and its sequel of outflankings and envelopments.

The following spring, 1949, after a futility of peace-seeking, Nanking, Shanghai, and Hankow were lost, but it took the rest of the year for the Reds to win the strategic centers of south, southwest, west, and northwest China.

The Nationalists were left principally on the island of Formosa, which already had been converted into a base, for retraining of officers and men.

The Nationalists smashed a 20,000-man amphibious assault on Kinmen Island, off Amoy. They defended the Chusan Islands, southeast of Shanghai, against repeated assaults before skillfully withdrawing 100,000 troops to add to the defense of Formosa. And they extricated some of the defenders of Hainon when that island also had to be yielded for Formosa's sake.

Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to point out a patriotic undertaking conducted by a friend and constituent of mine in San Diego.

The Federal Government's delay in assuming adequate leadership and guidance in civilian defense has provided understandable confusion and concern upon the part of municipal officials and private citizens throughout the Nation.

Here and there we are seeing evidence of real leadership and acceptance upon the part of private citizens to take the initiative in civilian-defense organization.

One of the outstanding instances occurred a few days ago in San Diego, when Edward Longstreth, a private citizen with unbounded loyalty to our country and admirable courage in undertaking original ideas, inserted a full-page ad at his own expense in the San Diego dailies which outlined a grass-roots program for development of a workable civilian-defense organization.

Mr. Longstreth's suggestion met an overwhelming acceptance in San Diego. His telephone was swamped with congratulatory calls, his mail was flooded, he was interviewed by the press, the radio, and television, and meetings were held throughout the city to set up block organizations. His great experience again proves what we well know: that American people can be counted upon.

He is now collecting and collating the tremendous response he had to his suggestion. One reaction is already recognizable: there is apprehension among the grass roots lest block leaders be appointed from above instead of elected in the block.

People seem to feel there will be greater cooperation if our usual democratic processes are followed and the neighbors elect their own leaders—

Mr. Longstreth reports.

He is passing his findings along to proper authorities, but for the benefit of my colleagues who have manifested a sincere interest in a proper civilian-defense organization, I am reproducing herewith the copy of Mr. Longstreth's appeal:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union of December 19, 1950]

SAN DIEGO CAN INSPIRE NATION INTO IMMEDIATE CIVIL DEFENSE

In his proclamation of the existence of a national emergency, President Harry S. Truman spoke directly to every citizen in the following manner:

"I summon all citizens to make a united effort for the security and well-being of our beloved country and to place its needs foremost in thought and action that the full moral and material strength of the Nation may be readied for the dangers which threaten us.

"I summon every person and every community to make, with a spirit of neighborliness, whatever sacrifices are necessary for the welfare of the Nation."

In the firm and calm tones of a determined American, President Truman has prescribed the destiny of every citizen in the United States. Every American is to have a post of duty in the imminent war for the world. It will take this totality of manpower and womanpower, from young to old, to insure survival.

Our country, unprepared at this moment save for the A-bomb, is the covetous prey of a Communist clique that has thus far enslaved 800,000,000 people.

From their eastern and western strongholds, Soviet masters are now setting their greatest trap to make slaves of the 150,000,000 Americans who must, as one, prove their love of liberty by their willingness to fight and to die for it.

Before we can muster our military strength to slug it out, man to man, with the Red hordes of Russia, China, and the hammered-and-sickled satellites, American shores and cities will be dented with cruel blows and diabolical sabotage.

While our production brains tune up the industrial machinery that will someday unleash the most gigantic armor of death the world has ever known, and while our youth learn to become scientific killers, the civilian population of America must stand guard on our strategic coast lines and in our industrial cities.

America is at war with Russia, Red China and Communists the world over, including those within our own country. President Truman, speaking for all Americans, has accepted the challenge.

There will be no appeasement, no turning back. Our total war mobilization is under way. We are racing against time and time is not on our side.

We will become locked in mortal and final combat at the evil pleasure of Stalin, now approaching the end of his days, who has sworn to conquer the world in his fading lifetime.

Over our Nation—and every home in it—hangs this uncertain sword of a Red Damocles.

That it will fall—to endanger what is left of the free world—is as certain as the fact that more than one-third of the world has thus far been conquered by Russia since Stalin became the executor of the Marxist plan of world conquest only 23 years ago.

President Truman spoke calmly and soberly because he knows—as all Americans now know—that our Nation is embarking upon a perilous and unknown course which can save our Nation and free the world for a truly lasting peace—or plunge it into the abyss of final darkness.

Victory for free men will come on some distant day from out of the shambles of a smashed world. But it will come only if our civilian population stands united behind the men and women on the production line and the boys who must go away to die.

In the face of sudden attack, from out of the sky or off-shore, every city in America is defenseless today.

San Diego, an industrial heart, a prime target and a mighty seaport funnel to our men in the frozen hell of Korea, today lies vulnerable to attack, easy prey to saboteurs.

We, the civilian population of San Diego, must overnight meet the emergency. We, the civilian population, must without a second's delay, join in the mobilized march to save and to defend America. If an attack should come to San Diego tonight—forever likely until communism has been crushed—our streets would be a maelstrom of confusion, our highways bogged, our communication lines jammed and thus whatever military and police forces might be available, would be rendered impotent.

San Diego is not going to be guilty of this criminal blunder—the blunder of foreign cities in which disorganization of civilian populations contributed to the victory of Red conquerors.

San Diego can make a start toward being ready within 24 hours and by getting ready, with its civilian population, our city can and will become the first in the nation to organize all of its men, women, and children in behalf of America's all-out war effort.

The Red enemy will throw its armored fangs from out of the sky, from off-shore or from within our ranks, in a day or a night when we are least prepared. It could come at any moment; it could come while we take time out to celebrate the holidays.

San Diego's civilian population—as no other city in the Nation—can recruit itself for immediate, stand-by action against attack, invasion, or sabotage. I respectfully submit to our people that this can be done in the following manner:

Let the senior resident in every block, whether man or woman, at once, automatically and patriotically consider himself the chairman of his block. His first immediate duty should be to ask all the residents within his block, from the age of 13 and up, to meet at once for a civil-defense meeting in the living room of his home. At the initial meeting a permanent chairman for the block should be elected and discussion should take place at this charter gathering concerning what positions should be created, who will fill them, and what the duties of each shall be.

Of necessity there will be a secretary, to make detailed notes of each meeting and record the assignments and duties each person is to assume.

There will be the posts of various wardens for each city block, who will be responsible for the alarms concerning various phases of enemy warfare, such as atomic attack, invasion, and sabotage. Each living-room organization in San Diego should make certain that every resident in every block has a specific job to do from now on until the world is free.

Discussions at these meetings will determine, for example, what steps will be taken for caring for the injured; plans, if any, for evacuation; the manner in which all roads and lines of communication will be kept open; the means of combating sabotage and fires; and the protection of our water supply.

After a detailed plan has been worked out for the block, the chairman should send the recommendations of his "living-room committee" to the mayor of San Diego, the Honorable Harley E. Knox, in order that all recommendations can be studied, tabulated, and assessed by the mayor, the city council, the city manager, and the military authorities, and used as the basis of an immediate overall plan for every citizen in San Diego.

Mayor Knox and other city officials can then forward San Diego's civilian-population plan to Gov. Earl Warren, so that in turn our program can be integrated at once into the framework of our State's program to protect and save California.

San Diego, with its civilian population thus mobilized and posts of duty assigned, will not only be doing its vital part in this crucial hour but will be serving as a model for all other cities to become mobilized to the last man, woman, and child in behalf of our country.

Let us begin at once—tonight. Let us tell the world that San Diego, the city of gracious living, can also be a tough and formidable foe.

EDWARD LONGSTRETH.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Topeka Optimist Club, December 29, 1950:

Many people writing me from the First District are deeply troubled at the headlong pace with which we are plunging into another war. They are disturbed and angry to find that after two World Wars on foreign soil to establish peace and freedom, we are now embroiled in another conflict.

"Why are we in Korea?" they ask. "Why must our sons be sacrificed to the warmongers?" and, finally, "Why don't we stay at home and mind our own business?"

These letters touch a responsive chord in my heart. Apparently the world has learned nothing by its bitter experiences. To settle differences by the horrible destruction of lives and nations is insane and criminal, when we know that these problems could be solved by following the principles of Jesus. And so, personally, if I had my choice, America would ignore the war criminals of the world, and live at home in peace and happiness.

Can I have my choice? Can you have your choice? Can America have her choice? Or has not our choice already been taken from us by the Kremlin aggressors of Moscow? Wishful thinking will not answer these questions. Instead, we must first decide whether Russia plans a conquest of the United States. The solution of that problem is the answer to the question of peace and security.

In finding an answer we must remember that the lives and property of ourselves and our posterity are at stake.

Our homes, our farms and jobs, our cities will stand or fall.

Our freedom, our religion, and all the things we hold dear are in the balance.

Our children's lives and future are involved.

It is as simple as that. It is as terrible as that. It is the most tremendous issue the American people will face in the twentieth century.

We must not be blinded by slogans. We fought to "save the world for democracy" in World War I, and to establish the "Four Freedoms" in World War II.

Like "faith without works," however, we have found that ideals, standing alone, are not enough. The sacrifice of our men in war is too great a price to pay for impractical dreams of a better world. We must be realistic, and to be realistic we most certainly must reexamine our foreign policy.

The reexamination of our foreign policy should produce two results. First, we should know and understand our ultimate objective; second, this objective must be within our means to accomplish.

Let us not be ashamed to think first of America, of our own soldiers, of the danger to our own people, of the possibility of bleeding ourselves white in quixotic crusades.

Now, does Russia plan a conquest of the United States?

Some intelligent, patriotic people say "no." They point to Russia's membership in the United Nations, and cooperation with many of its international agencies. The Russian representatives in the United Nations have constantly referred to their desire for peace, and charged that the United States is the warmonger.

They further point to our isolated geographic position, our great Navy, Armed Forces, and unparalleled productive capacity, all of which they believe will prevent any actual attack on our shores.

Some equally intelligent and patriotic people fear Russia's aggressive plans. They point to the writings of Karl Marx, Lenin, and Stalin as blueprints of a Communist-planned world revolution. A review of the history of the Soviet Union discloses that the pattern has been closely followed.

United States Communists have been called to Moscow to receive police state training. Earl Browder and others of his ilk have returned to their homes in America to carry out Soviet orders in furtherance of world revolution. The trial of the 11 Communists in New York brought to light how these traitors are directed from the Kremlin. The same policy has been carried out in France, England, Germany, Korea, and China, as well as the other nations of the world.

Russia has maintained her wartime army and military production, while her former allies of World War II demobilized.

Russia has trained and armed a "people's army" of German youth, with which she constantly threatens our occupation forces in Germany.

These people, including our entire military, remind us that modern methods of warfare make it foolhardy for us to believe we are immune from attack and invasion.

For myself, the evidence of planned and continued Communist conquest is too plain to ignore. I am not willing to gamble the lives and freedom of our people by assuming they will not carry out their threats.

We must consider, then, how the proposed conquest would be carried out. They would do it by attempting to force us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy, by gobbling up the other nations of the world and strangling us, by fifth column internal attack, and finally, by all-out war.

What is our best defense against these attacks? We have the means within our own country to prevent bankruptcy and subversive internal attack. If our Government is threatened by either of these methods it is because of our failure to do our own housecleaning.

If our danger lies in aggressive attack, we do not have the same power to mode decisions. The strength of our enemy, and the power of our defense depend upon conditions outside the boundaries of the United States.

It has been said we can best meet this threat by withdrawing our troops from the world, refusing to be drawn into a conflict, and building up a mighty military machine here at home.

Withdrawal of our troops from Germany, Austria, and Japan would leave these countries at the mercy of the Communists. France and England would be easy victims. Asia and Europe would be overrun by the Reds, and dominated by one police state.

Huddled behind a Maginot line of our boundaries, we would give the enemy the rest of the world for bases from which to attack. We would have no place to meet him, except here at home, where we would wait for his attack on our cities and people. I prefer we should be in a position to have some choice of the area for the fighting.

The best defense is offensive action, carrying the fight to the enemy, stopping him before he reaches you. This can be done by having friends, allies, and strategic bases in other parts of the world. I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion that we must continue our occupation forces for some time to come, and work with our friends.

How can this be done? The United Nations has not proved effective as a sound base upon which to build our international security. The Marshall plan, conceived only as a postwar aid to Europe, cannot give us satisfactory military aid in return for our dollars spent. We can spend ourselves into bankruptcy and still be disappointed when our European friends are needed as fighting allies.

How then can be obtain the help we may need from other countries?

1. Secure allies through the time-tested device of convincing them of our common interests. (As allies, I would include enemies of our enemies, such as Chiang, Franco, and Tito, for as long as their interests are common with ours.)

2. Stop Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) spending now. This aid was for economic, peacetime rehabilitation.

3. Make no loans or grants to foreign countries except on a basis of the concrete military aid that these countries can and are willing to give us in fighting our common enemies.

By this method we would eliminate phony dollar friends, save money, and get value received for expenditures. Our real friends and allies would benefit from our military aid, and not require ECA funds.

4. Cling tenaciously to the idea that war is not inevitable, but also, that peace is not inevitable.

The two World Wars taught us peace is not obtained by appeasement, or by withdrawing from the world. We tried desperately to stay at home then, not to get into entangling alliances, and to mind our own business. The hard, cold fact is that we did not do it. Now we are again faced with the problem. We must stop playing Atlas to the rest of the world. But retaining military bases and alliances are insurance against the possibility of war, and come under the head of minding our own business. Our greatest hope to save our people and property from destruction is to be in a position not to be bluffed, to be militarily strong, which includes all the help from allies we can get, and then stand firm.

Now, what about Korea?

It is my belief that the disaster we are now facing in Korea has its roots in the bungling of our foreign policy. To have fixed an imaginary boundary line between North and South Korea, originally erected for the purpose of collecting the arms of a defeated army, was stupidity. To following this error with the announcement that we would not defend Korea was an invitation to a group, admittedly bent on world domination, to move. To bear out this statement by failing to give military aid to a fledgling republic was to emboss the invitation. Thus, those responsible for the forming of our foreign policy set up the conditions for June 25.

Then the field was reversed. We jumped into the fray unprepared for a major conflict. Thus our position in Korea has been untenable militarily and politically. We did exactly the opposite of our announced policy, and failed to appraise the extent of the military commitment involved.

I have made statements that we must get out of Korea. We should get out now as quickly as possible consistent with the potential dire results which might accompany a hasty evacuation. In my judgment we were certainly in no condition to go into Korea. But now with the vast and terrible involvement of American lives, it might well be inviting overwhelming cost unless we hold the lines for the present.

We are entering a new year. Let us resolve to place our faith in God, keep our powder dry, and face the future intelligently and unafraid.

Time To Stop Talking and Play Our Ace in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Hopewell News, of Hopewell, Va. Its editor, Mr. A. Robbins, Jr., is one of the many millions of Americans who have no difficulty understanding what the Kremlin and its minions throughout the world are up to. He sees through the bald-faced lies by which the Communists accuse us and any other intended victims of the things they themselves are doing or about to do. He sees clearly the folly of imagining we can get out of our present trouble by negotiating an agreement when the other side does not and never did want agreement; its goal is world conquest. Furthermore, he and most other sensible Americans have the courage to look the hard facts in the face and do what is necessary if only their leaders would become as clear-headed and as realistic and courageous. One wonders how long our professionals, "the experts," will continue to be so befuddled by all the multitude of complicating trees that they miss the forest of what our country must do to get Communist expansion in Asia stopped, if we ourselves expect to survive. The editorial follows:

TIME TO STOP TALKING AND PLAY OUR ACE IN CHINA

It is extremely dubious that any good will come from negotiating with the Chinese Communists over the situation in Korea.

The United Nations has been talking and negotiating too long now. The resolution passed by the Political Committee and now before the UN General Assembly condemning the Chinese Red action in Korea has been watered down by changing the word "aggression" to "intervention."

The Russian delegate, Mr. Malik, made it plain in a speech to the United Nations a few days ago that a cease-fire agreement could only be reached if the UN forces were withdrawn from Korea. The Chinese Reds have insisted they must confer on a basis of equality to discuss all major far eastern questions.

Certainly the people of the United States do not wish to see the Chinese Reds granted a seat in the United Nations, with consequent admittance to the Security Council, under circumstances that would undermine the moral force of the UN and eventually wreck it just like the League of Nations was wrecked.

WILLING TO NEGOTIATE

The United States has shown its willingness to negotiate as long as there was the slightest chance of such negotiations leading to anything. But giving in to the present demands of the Chinese Reds would be a holdup of the world community at the point of a gun. It would be appeasement that would weaken the free world and put the Communist dictatorship that much further along the road to domination of the world.

The United States and the United Nations have an ace in the hole that could easily change the entire picture in Asia, and perhaps save the masses of that continent from Communist slavery, if we would only use it before it is too late.

Conditions in Red China are far from stable. Mao Tze-tung, the Red dictator, has weakened his position in many parts of that sprawling country by concentrating many of his best troops in Korea and Manchuria.

HELP NATIONALISTS

The Nationalist Government of China, still recognized by the United Nations and the United States as the legal government of China, has a large army on Formosa. Reports indicate Chiang may have as many as 400,000 fairly well trained and well equipped troops on Formosa. In addition, the Nationalists have a growing guerrilla force of over a million and a half on the mainland. They have a small air force and a small navy.

Reports from reliable correspondents who have been on Formosa and have visited the coast of China, are that with the right kind of help Chiang could land on the mainland and have a good chance of being welcomed by the people. That the guerrilla activity could be soon stepped up to give the Reds a great deal of difficulty and that a large part of South China might soon be recaptured.

Coupled with a strict blockade of Communist China, this action might soon tip the scales in Asia. It may be our last chance to save all Asia from coming under the Communist dictatorship.

ACHESON'S PROPOSAL

While Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain was in Washington conferring with President Truman, Secretary of State Acheson is said to have advocated a "limited war" with China. This would have involved a blockade of the coast, bombing communications in Manchuria to prevent Russia from sending supplies, and helping Chiang land on the mainland.

Apparently Mr. Acheson's proposal did not even get serious consideration, because Mr. Attlee's government has already recognized the Peiping Communist regime as the Government of China and had advocated they be seated in the United Nations in place of Nationalist China. This was said to be the only point of difference between Mr. Attlee and Mr. Truman in their talks. It is a grave point for the British stand may effect the future of the world.

ATTACKED 52 NATIONS

When Mao Tze-tung sent his Red troops into Korea he attacked the United Nations. He attacked the 52 nations who had supported the resolution to stop aggression in Korea. He attacked the 12 nations who have sent men, equipment, planes or ships to the United Nations forces in Korea. Yet the United Nations talks and tries to negotiate.

It reminds us of the time the United States forced Chiang to talk and negotiate with the Chinese Reds. At the end of 1945 the Nationalists just about had the Reds licked. They had captured the Communist capital at Yenan and even had them cut off from the Japanese military supplies the Soviets had captured in Manchuria and were ready to turn over to the Chinese Communists, in violation of treaties and agreements.

So the United States stepped in and ordered a cease fire. Each army was to retain its position at the moment, while Chiang and Mao negotiated a settlement that would have brought into being a coalition government for China. Naturally, the Communists were ready to negotiate. It was to their advantage. So they prolonged the negotiations as much as they could.

BEGINNING OF THE END

Meanwhile they had managed to regroup their armies, get hold of the Jap arms and supplies, and get all set. When the negotiations were no longer useful to the Reds, they broke them off. That was the beginning of the end for China. The United States charged bad faith—not on the part of the Communists, but on the part of the Nationals. We cut off further supplies to Chiang, and the rest is history.

So now we talk and negotiate with the Red beasts who have defied the whole free world, who have slaughtered American boys in Korea, who are but the puppets of Soviet Russia in the conspiracy to enslave the entire world under the Communist dictatorship.

When the Japs went into Manchuria in 1932, the United States proposed action to the League of Nations. The League talked and negotiated but took no action. That was the beginning of the end of the League. In 1936 Hitler defied it by marching into the Rhineland. Then Mussolini defied it by his aggression against Ethiopia. And we had to fight the Fascist dictatorships.

Certainly the people of the United States do not want war. They would be glad if it can be avoided by any honorable means. But negotiation is a two way street. As long as aggressor nations refuse to live up to their international obligations, to honor their treaties and agreements, just so long will the free world be menaced and our security endangered.

We believe the time has come to redeem our broken promises to the Nationalist Government of China and play our ace in the hole in Asia.

Appointment of Director and Assistants to Office of Defense Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, on this New Year's Day of 1951 our countrymen are looking to their Representatives in Washington to lead the way out of the gloom that is about us and bring courage and faith to a fearful and troubled world. There is real reason to take heart and not be bewildered by all the debate and turmoil in world affairs. All Americans agree at least on one thing: that we must be strong and united if we are to meet the challenge presented to us by these troubled times.

Much comfort and renewed faith in the future can be found in the appointment of Charles E. Wilson, president of the General Electric Co., as Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and his selection of Sidney J. Weinberg and Gen. Lucius D. Clay as his assistants. These men are of large caliber, experienced in handling great and complicated problems. They are successful men who have proved their worth; they are men of undoubted loyalty and sincerity, unafraid, confident in the future of our country, and devoted to our system of free enterprise. They are dynamic men of action, prepared to do what is necessary to meet the demands of any situation that may be thrust upon us. They seek nothing but to be of service, and their great reward will be in the satisfaction of work well done. Such men are well equipped to be trusted with our destiny, and our citizens can take heart.

Mr. Wilson and his assistants deserve the full support of the Congress, not only because it is in the interests of our country but also because our countrymen demand it, and I, as one Member of Congress, pledge my support.

Joseph P. Kennedy Says: Get Out of Korea, Leave Europe to Europeans, Arm the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of December 14, 1950:

JOSEPH P. KENNEDY SAYS: GET OUT OF KOREA, LEAVE EUROPE TO EUROPEANS, ARM THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

What should our foreign policy be? In a speech on Tuesday before the University of Virginia Law School forum, Joseph P. Kennedy, former United States Ambassador to Great Britain, gave his views. Here is a condensed version of his speech.

"Lincoln in his famous Springfield speech said: 'If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it.'

"Where are we now? Beginning with intervention in the Italian elections and financial and political aid to Greece and Turkey, we have expanded our political and financial programs on an almost unbelievably wide scale. Billions have been spent in the Marshall plan, further billions in the occupation of Berlin, Western Germany, and Japan. Military aid has been poured into Greece, Turkey, Iran, the nations of the North Atlantic Pact, French Indochina, and now in Korea we are fighting the fourth greatest war in our history."

WHAT KIND OF FRIENDS?

"What have we in return for this effort? Friends? We have far fewer friends than we had in 1945. In Europe they are still asking for our dollars but what kind of friendship have we bought there? Is western Europe determined to preserve for itself those ideals of democracy that we have been preaching? Put to the test now as to whether she will arm herself effectively, even with our aid, to deal with the Russian threat, is she showing the kind of determination and the kind of will that amounts to anything?

"Plans for economic unification have fallen apart in the light of nationalistic difference. French military power is only a shadow of its former self, and a strong minority of Communist sympathizers keeps

France in endless political turmoil. The military strength of Britain is one-fourth of what it was in 1946, and she shows every inclination to avoid the heavy burdens that would be involved in rebuilding it. West Germany, to date, has revealed no disposition to develop effective military strength. Italy is hopelessly ineffective, and Greece can hardly police her own small territory. Where is there in all Europe any buffer against a massed Russian onslaught? Worse than this, where is any determination to create such a buffer?

"In the Middle East we have oil, but no friends. Iran, Pakistan, even Egypt, seek neither our protection nor our influence. In Asia, China, whose friendship with us seemed deep-seated and enduring, is now massed against us with men, powerful armies, and new vengeful hatreds. Indonesia, Malay, Indochina are in revolt or heavy with discontent at the influences we represent. India is showing signs of succumbing to influences other than ours, more indigenous and more palatable to her desires. In Korea we are spending thousands of American lives to accomplish some unknown objective. Assume we stop the Reds somewhere across the belt of that peninsula, are we to continue fighting there indefinitely?"

RUSSIA'S STRENGTH

"On the other side of the iron curtain are massed manpower and military strength of a type that the world has never seen. Divisions which total in the many hundreds and which we know are well equipped and have the capacity to fight, can be thrown into battle anywhere on that great land mass that stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They are backed by planes of high quality and great quantity. Russia's navy includes a powerful fleet of submarines, and in all probability, she, too, has the atomic bomb.

"To engage these vast armies on the European or the Asian Continent is foolhardy, but that is the direction toward which our policy has been tending.

"That policy is suicidal. It has made us no foul weather friends. It has kept our armament scattered over the globe. It has picked one battlefield and threatens to pick others impossibly removed from our sources of supply. It has not contained communism. By our methods of opposition, it has solidified communism, where otherwise communism might have bred within itself internal dissensions. Our policy today is politically and morally a bankrupt policy.

"I can see no alternative other than having the courage to wash up this policy and start with the fundamentals I urged more than 5 years ago. It is absurd to believe that the United Nations can lead us out of this situation. The veto power alone makes it a hopeless instrumentality for world peace. The unwillingness of half the world to want world peace makes impossible effective organization to impose any such peace. In short, our chief source of reliance must be ourselves and we cannot sacrifice ourselves to save those who do not seem to wish to save themselves."

GET OUT OF KOREA

"A first step in the pursuit of this policy is to get out of Korea—indeed, to get out of every point in Asia which we do not plan realistically to hold in our own defense. Such a policy means that in the Pacific we will pick our own battlegrounds if we are forced to fight and not have them determined by political and ideological considerations that have no relationship to our own defense.

"The next step in pursuit of this policy is to apply the same principle to Europe. Today it is idle to talk of being able to hold the line of the Elbe or the line of the Rhine. Why should we waste valuable resources in making such an attempt? If the weakened European nations wish to hold that line and demonstrate a determination to do so, it may be that we can afford them some help. But to pour arms and men into a quixotic military adventure makes no sense whatever. What have we gained by staying in Berlin? Everyone knows we can be pushed out the moment the Russians choose to push us out. Isn't it better to get out now and use the resources, that would otherwise be sacrificed, at a point that counts?

"The billions that we have squandered on these enterprises could have been far more effectively used in this hemisphere and on the seas that surround it. Had we the defenses in Iceland today that one-hundredth of the money spent in Berlin could have built, we would have purchased safety with our money rather than added danger. We need defenses in this hemisphere, in Canada, in the Caribbean, and in Latin America. After all, these are our neighbors whose security is inevitably tied up with our own. We have no reason to believe that cooperation on their part will not be forthcoming and we can, and should, insist upon it."

MAKE COMMUNISM COSTLY

"People will say, however, that this policy will not contain communism. Will our present policy do so? Can we possibly contain Communist Russia, if she chooses to march, by a far-flung battle line in the middle of Europe? The truth is that our only real hope is to keep Russia, if she chooses to march, on the other side of the Atlantic and make communism much too costly for her to try to cross the seas.

"It may be that Europe for a decade or a generation will turn communistic. But in doing so it may break of itself as a unified force. Communism still has to prove itself to its peoples as a government that will achieve for them a better way of living. The more people that it will have to govern, the more necessary it becomes for those who govern to justify themselves to those being governed. The more peoples that are under its yoke, the greater are the possibilities of revolt. Moreover, it seems certain that communism spread over Europe will not rest content with being governed by a handful of men in the Kremlin. French or Italian Communists will soon develop splinter organizations that will destroy the singleness that today characterizes Russian communism. Tito in Yugoslavia is already demonstrating this fact. Mao in China is not likely to take his orders too long from Stalin, especially when the only non-Asiatics left upon Asiatic soil to fight are the Russians.

"This policy will, of course, be criticized as appeasement. No word is more mistakenly used. Is it appeasement to withdraw from unwise commitments, to arm yourself to the teeth, and to make clear just exactly how and for what you will fight? If it is wise in our interest not to make commitments that endanger our security, and this is appeasement, then I am for appeasement. I can recall only too well the precious time bought by Chamberlain at Munich. I applauded that purchase then; I would applaud it today. Today, however, while we have avoided a Munich, we are coming perilously close to another Dunkerque. Personally, I should choose to escape the latter."

WE PAY THE COST

"Finally, people will say this policy is turning our back on the United Nations. To this there are two answers. First, we cannot bear substantially the whole burden of the United Nations. In Korea, we have nine times as many troops in the field as all the United Nations put together. We have suffered 90 times the number of casualties that all the other United Nations have suffered, excluding only the South Koreans. And note the billions that we have advanced these nations as against the help they are giving us in Korea.

"Secondly, we must recognize that the United Nations is not at present a vehicle to enforce peace. If half of the world does not wish it to operate in this fashion, as is true of Russia and China, it is idle to pretend that it can operate in that fashion. The United Nations still has a purpose for voluntary organization and as a forum in which to air international issues. Looking at the United Nations in that role, the admission of Red China or any nation presents wholly different issues than are presented if we look upon the United Nations as a type of governing body, with governing powers. But half of this world will never submit to dictation by the other half. The two can only agree to live next to each other because for one to absorb the other becomes too costly."

A REALISTIC APPROACH

"An attitude of realism such as this is, I submit, in accord with our historic traditions. We have never wanted a part of other peoples' scrapes. Today we have them and just why, nobody quite seems to know. What business is it of ours to support French colonial policy in Indochina or to achieve Mr. Syngman Rhee's concepts of democracy in Korea? Shall we now send the Marines into the mountains of Tibet to keep the Dalai Lama on his throne? We can do well to mind our business and interfere only where somebody threatens our business and our homes.

"An Atlas, whose back is bowed and whose hands are busy holding up the world, has no arms to lift to deal with his own defense. Increase his burdens and you will crush him, or attack him from behind and he cannot turn. This is our present posture. It strangles our might. The suggestions I make would unleash our strength. They would, I am sure, give consideration pause to the strategists and planners of the Kremlin. They would—and I count this most—conserve American lives for American ends, not waste them in the freezing hills of Korea or on the battle-scarred plains of Western Germany."

A Tribute to Albert J. Engel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, with the closing of this session of Congress, our friend and colleague, ALBERT J. ENGEL, of Michigan, will leave us. He does so by his own choice. There is no doubt that he could have remained a Member of this House had he chosen to do so. His service has been so meritorious that he was entitled to the continued support of his constituency. I am satisfied that they would have been pleased to continue it if circumstances had not eliminated their opportunity to do so.

No Member of this House has served more zealously and ably than ALBERT ENGEL. He was continually a searcher after truth. He was never satisfied with merely a superficial inquiry into the facts of a given situation. He was satisfied only when he had pursued every source of information. There is no doubt in

my mind that his aggressive and persistent efforts as a member of the Appropriations Committee has saved this country many millions of dollars. He was an enemy of waste and extravagance. He was likewise zealous and courageous for that which he believed was for the best interests of our Nation and its people.

It has been a pleasure and a privilege to have known and served in the Congress of the United States with a man of the character, ability, integrity, and courage possessed in such a large degree by ALBERT J. ENGEL. As he leaves the House, he may rest assured that he takes with him the high regard, esteem, and best wishes of his colleagues.

Overthrow of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

SCHOOL OF FOREIGN SERVICE,
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY,
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS,
Washington, D. C., December 28, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
United States Representative from Massachusetts, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to extend to you my profound gratitude for the inclusion of my article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This, I believe, is a great service and tribute to those who daily risk their lives fighting an unequal battle for freedom in Stalin's own back yard.

Many Americans have written me about the article. It is heart-warming to learn from their letters that so many people here lend their support to the movement to help overthrow communism by attacking it within its own sphere of influence.

More and more it becomes apparent that communism as an aggressive force cannot be destroyed by military intervention alone. It is equally true that communism, too, cannot conquer the world by sheer force of arms. Both Lenin and Stalin have clearly realized this fact. That is why by all means imaginable—ranging from inspiration to terror—communism stubbornly fights for the control of the mind and the spirit.

What the world faces now, fundamentally is more a revolution than a war in its accepted meaning. This is why revolutionary and not purely military methods are so largely used in this conflict, though, alas, not by the forces of freedom.

And because it is a revolution, it is not necessarily the better armed and economically the more powerful of the two adversaries that will emerge victorious from this battle, but the one who succeeds in swaying the psychology of the greater part of mankind and—regardless of race and nationality—command its will and emotions.

Fear is the principal weapon of communism. It is through fear that Stalin extends his control over the minds of the population on both sides of the iron curtain.

Today the United States is arming Europe. But the weapons alone cannot fight and the men who will have to use them seem to have little faith in their own ability to withstand an onslaught. They have succumbed to Stalin's pressure of fear.

The fighting spirit of the Europeans will rise only if they will come to understand that Stalin's formidable war machine may misfire at the critical moment, that his powerful Red Army may refuse to fight for communism.

But the Soviet machine may misfire, and the Red Army may balk, only if the Russian people realize that the west has no evil designs against them, that it wants to help them to regain their freedom, that it has the necessary moral power to oppose communism.

This appears to be a vicious circle, but it can be broken if we find a sufficiently powerful reagent to dissolve the amalgam of Soviet-inspired fear and lies.

A vigorous psychological attack behind the iron curtain will dispel this psychosis of fear on both sides of the barrier which now divides the world. The reaction of the Soviet Government to the effects of this powerful ideological offensive will display to the entire world the insecurity of the Kremlin regime and the falseness of Stalin's myth of popular support of communism in Russia. This will inspire confidence in the hearts of the Europeans and will strengthen their fighting morale.

Behind the iron curtain this attack will open the eyes of the people and give them courage to fight. Moreover, it will demonstrate to them the great moral power of the Western World and its determination. The very fact that the iron curtain will have been smashed (and smashed it can be) would produce a terrific psychological effect on them, which no Red victories in Korea or elsewhere may offset.

The picture in Asia today is dark, and it will be darker still, as long as a strongly organized Communist force dominates Russia.

The key to world's peace and freedom is in the Kremlin. It must be wrung from the hands of the criminal gang which terrorizes humanity. This can be done only by the Russians themselves, but only if the rest of the world and primarily the people of the United States help them to do so.

Enclosed I am sending for your consideration some mimeographed material which outlines a plan that I have developed in response to many letters from American citizens inquiring as to what they could do as individuals to help eliminate the menace of world enslavement by communism. The plan I suggest makes it possible for every American who is willing, to make a significant contribution to the weakening of communism. Furthermore, it does not require government support. I would be very happy to have your comments.

I would consider it a great favor to have your permission to call on you at your convenience to discuss this matter and give you some first-hand information concerning the work and the needs of the underground.

Wishing you a very happy and prosperous New Year, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

C. W. BOLDYREFF.

DECEMBER 8, 1950.

DEAR SIR: I have received your kind letter just as I was leaving for a lecture tour and was therefore unable to answer it immediately. I now wish to thank you sincerely for your friendly words and for the interest you have taken in my article.

There is much that you, and the many other readers who have written me, can do to rid the world of Communist imperialism by leading the Russian people to freedom. Here is a suggestion which I hope might interest you.

As long as communism rules in Russia, no family in the world is secure from the threat of war and tyranny. But communism cannot be defeated by sheer force of arms; it would only disappear underground and pose behind the myth of martyrdom.

Communism must be exposed by the Russian people—the only people in the world who have known for more than 30 years the evils of this Godless doctrine. And the overwhelming majority of these people are unalterably opposed to it. They are potentially the free world's most valuable ally in the struggle against the poison of Communist ideology.

To rally the Russian people to this struggle, three steps are necessary:

1. Organization of dissident elements in the U. S. S. R. as an active resistance against the regime.

2. Dissemination of a democratic ideology in the U. S. S. R. based on the overthrow of Stalinism and the establishment of free and representative state institutions.

3. Elimination of the Russian people's propaganda-inspired fear and distrust of foreigners.

Obviously, the work of the underground in Russia (steps 1 and 2) must be carried on by Russians. But the success of this work greatly depends on the accomplishment of step 3, the destruction of the myth of capitalistic encirclement." The American people must take the main initiative here.

Most Russians have had no contact with the outside world in the decades since the revolution. Many of them, who hate Soviet rule, have been duped into believing that the free world beyond the borders is so corrupt that it constitutes an even greater evil than communism. The German invasion of Russia during World War II has greatly contributed to the strengthening of this tragical misconception. Thus, the clever masters of the Kremlin strive to weaken the people's incentive to fight communism, and they, disorganized as they are, submit to its oppressions.

The American people, in a sincere, spontaneous, and unofficial effort to reach the Russian people with the truth about American ideals, can expose these Communist slanders, and regain the traditional friendship of the Russians.

I urge the citizens of every American community to prepare an open letter to the Russian people. By distributing thousands and thousands of such letters inside the U. S. S. R. and among the officers and men of the Red army, the underground can strike a telling blow at the foundations of the Soviet regime.

To make their open letter effective, the citizens of each community should include these points:

"We, the citizens of ————, greet the many Russians who, like us, are determined to resist the tyranny of communism. * * *

"We condemn communism as a godless evil. * * *

"We sympathize with you in your enslavement by your oppressors, and will help all your efforts to overthrow them. * * *

"We pledge, as free citizens, that if Josef Stalin should make war upon us all, we will never regard the Russian people as our enemies, provided they use every opportunity to resist communism. That we will help them to turn this war into a universal civil war for freedom.

"We pledge further, that once communism is overthrown, we will uphold the right of the Russian people to choose their own sovereign form of democratic, representative self-government."

Here is what you can do to initiate this appeal:

1. Organize a group of your friends to form the nucleus of a committee to enlist the support of local civic and church groups, by showing them copies of my article and explaining the program I have outlined here.

2. Working with these groups prepare an open letter, addressed to the Russian people in the name of your community.

3. Get your local newspaper to publish the letter, addressed to the Russian people in the name of your community.

4. Establish various points throughout your community where citizens can sign copies of the letter. Put collection boxes at these points for contributions to finance the printing and distribution of leaflets in Russian with the text of your letter with accompanying instructions from the underground to the Russian people on how to organize for an anti-Communist revolution.

5. When you have enough signatures to represent truly the citizens of your community, mail copies of this letter with signatures and the money you have collected to Verlag Possev, Limburg/Lahn, United States Zone, Germany.

Possev is an anti-Communist Russian newspaper, licensed by the United States occupation authorities, and printed in the United States Zone of Germany. The integrity of its directors is unquestionable. All the money which you send will be used to print leaflets with your community's message, and the accompanying instructions from the underground and to finance their distribution behind the iron curtain. Possev will acknowledge receipt of the money and report to you on the number of leaflets printed and the date of their delivery to the underground for dissemination in the Soviet Union.

If you will persuade the citizens of your community to join with other communities throughout the country in appealing to the hearts of the people, you will help to make it impossible for the Soviet regime to launch another world war and will help to free the people of Russia.

Remember that victory over communism depends only on our will and ingenuity. Our ability to reach the hearts and the brains of the Russian people is limited only by the volume of the technical means available. The cooperation and support of the American people will remove all obstacles.

I offer you my sincere thanks.

Yours for freedom,

C. W. BOLDYREFF.

On the Threshold of a New Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Flywheel, a publication of the Rotary Club of Ironton, Mo. Mr. R. L. Barger is the editor. The article follows:

ON THE THRESHOLD OF A NEW YEAR

Another Christmas Day with all the joy it symbolizes to the Christian world has been duly recorded on the roll of passing time and we can now look back to that day of good will and joyous reunions with family and friends. But for the confusion and gloom that overshadows much of a distracted world, made so by the march of a philosophy so deadly to the cause of freedom, we here in America could have truly said we were nearer the realization of the ideal of peace on earth, good will toward men, than ever before. We enter upon the new year with unparalleled prosperity in our own land and a higher standard of living for all the people than has been the experience of any people at any time in the past. We can only hope that we can escape the austerity and sacrifices that is the lot of the peoples of other lands. We know not what a day or month may bring forth, but if we are called upon to defend ourselves and the free world from the aggressive force of world communism, we shall meet the issues in unity and determination that has characterized the attitude of our people for the 175 years of our Nation's history. Then let us enter upon the activities of 1951, not with an attitude of defeatism, but in a buoyant spirit and a supreme faith in our cause and despite heartaches and disappointments that may occur, face the months ahead with an unshakable faith to believe that the supreme power and benign purpose of a Mighty Being is stronger than the will of man and ultimately His purpose will prevail.

A Way To Stop Country X (Russia)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following newspaper article by Marshall McNeil which appeared in the Washington Daily News of January 1, 1951:

A WAY TO STOP COUNTRY X (RUSSIA)
(By Marshall McNeil)

The strategy Atlantic Pact allies might use to stop aggression if it starts in Europe—a three-pronged offensive-defensive action—has been explained by the Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg.

It requires: A naval blockade; strategic bombing; a sufficiently strong holding action on the ground which will force the aggressor to use up his stockpiled arms and munitions.

General Vandenberg never mentioned Russia by name. He spoke only of country X. But his inference was plain.

His views were given to the House Appropriations Subcommittee that handles military supply bills and is headed by Representative GEORGE MAHON (Democrat, Texas).

Representative MAHON asked the general to comment on the belief of Air Force enthusiasts that overwhelming air superiority and overwhelming naval superiority could stop an advance, and on the belief of others that overwhelming air and naval superiority, plus sizable ground forces, could repel even larger ground forces.

KOREA NO TEST

The Air Force commander replied that Korea could not be taken as an example because it has an inviolate border (the Yalu River) and therefore air power could not be fully utilized.

"But," Representative MAHON interrupted, "even if you could use your strategic air power and go far to rear and bomb plants, that would not immediately have its impact on the front lines."

"No, sir," General Vandenberg answered. "Here is the difference. If we are now talking about Europe, where there are no borders that we cannot cross, and we are engaged in a general war, what the proportion of ground forces with overwhelming air and sea superiority would be that could hold a greater number of opposing troops would have to be answered by the Army, I think, because it depends on the terrain and so forth, but surely I agree with the principle.

"The principle is based upon this: The reason the Air Force does not believe that the war can be won solely by the Navy or solely by the Air Force or solely by the Army is this, and I am speaking now for the part that the air is going to play in this—

"Let us take, for example, X country which has overwhelming ground forces but that is relatively poor in its manufacturing capacity. Let us say that the Air Force succeeds in knocking out its potential to fight a war. The army of this X country is smart enough to know that our air potential exists, and as every army does, it stockpiles behind its lines enough for a certain period of time."

SLAVE LABOR

"We knock out the entire supporting industry of that army. It picks up its stockpile and it moves into a country that has a better and more modern facility for producing war material than the country that we have destroyed.

"Obviously, the Air Force then cannot have succeeded in its task of preventing this new country from being overrun. The overrun country becomes slave labor, and their factories and technicians become available to X country and to all purposes X country at least is as well and perhaps better off than before the Air Force destroyed the potential of X country.

"On the other hand, let us suppose that this movement into a defensive line is such that a smaller number of ground forces are going to oppose this great mass of X army. The reason we want a number of ground forces opposing this great mass of X army is to force them to expend their gasoline, their food, their ammunition before they overrun the attacked country. And since they are not able to have them replaced by X country, whose industry has been knocked out, retard the advance to the point that X army runs out of these essentials before it can superimpose itself on the industry of the captured country.

"That is the theory of the air-ground-naval team. You put the blockade in. The Army goes in and causes them to expend their stockpiles and the Air Force knocks out the industrial potential of X country to supply these armies.

"If the Army is strong enough, your defensive line is such that a smaller force, by retreating slowly and causing great casualties and forcing them to use up gasoline and trucks and tanks and ammunition, makes it so hard that they thereby cannot get them from the overrun country.

"Those overenthusiastic air people who say that the air can do it alone have missed that factor."

Let Us Provide an Adequate Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is very discouraging to learn that the conferees on the appropriation bill have agreed to only $16,000,000 instead of $50,000,000 for the construction of new and up-to-date cargo carriers. This House should refuse to agree to any such cut in this all-important matter.

When will we learn our lesson? It seems that the experience gained in two World Wars has failed to teach us that a

fast, up-to-date merchant marine is indispensable. Every military and naval authority has expressed the need of such.

In addition to this we should never overlook the necessity of having an adequate and ready-to-go shipbuilding industry. At the present time this industry is almost ready to give up because of lack of work. We owe it to this industry, so vital to our national defense, and the workers identified with it, to keep it going at a high state of efficiency. Therefore, I hope that the motion to concur in the conference report in this particular will be voted down, and that the sum of $50,000,000 be substituted.

Optimistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., of December 28, 1950:

KOREAN SITUATION NOT HOPELESS

We like to think that the brilliant evacuation of the United States Tenth Corps from Hungnam doesn't auger too well for the eventual success of Chinese arms. For one thing, it showed that numerical superiority is relatively helpless in the face of superior fire power. Undoubtedly, the Chinese and North Korean troops encircling the evacuation area would have liked nothing better than to have decimated the UN forces to minimize their effectiveness when they were redeployed. They would also have liked to capture some of the United States equipment that they have learned to have so much respect for. It would be nice to be able to write home to Peiping that the aggressor Americans had been driven literally into the sea; it would have had tremendous propaganda value.

So, while we don't go too much for the tactical double-talk which labels a compulsory retreat a strategic withdrawal, it seems to us that the Tenth Corps gave the enemy a fine dose of frustration by pulling out when it did the way it did. The fact that the evacuation fleet was able to accommodate some 100,000 civilians, as well as the troops, proved how completely in control of the situation the UN troops were. The departure was practically leisurely, and it must have had the Communist opposition gnashing its teeth in rage.

As has been repeatedly demonstrated, hordes require a lot of lead to discourage, but it is possible to discourage them. The Kremlin talks in terms of bleeding the UN dry in the Far East. When you think it over, this process ultimately becomes a question of who is bleeding whom and, more importantly, who has the most blood. The Chinese have vast reserves of manpower, true, but we can reasonably ask how much staying power their manpower has. The evacuation from Hungnam gives proof of our better mobility. Chinese are made of perishable human flesh just like anybody else. How long can they go footslogging all over Korea in pursuit of an enemy which takes triumphantly to the sea when any given piece of terrain becomes untenable? And there's the age-old problem of supply lines, which must necessarily become thinner and less elastic as they are stretched deeper into South Korean territory. The same strategy which proved the undoing of the North Korean army—the slow, fighting withdrawal and then the end run via the sea—could work again.

Peiping is brandishing a big red fist and threatening the health of the United States forces if they don't leave Korea, but it really isn't advisable to be like a cannon on a popgun flush. The Chinese may yet wind up wearing the barrel they think they've got us across.

A Tribute to Earl C. Michener

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, time brings its changes. Pleasure is mixed with regrets as time moves on. It was a pleasant occasion when, 24 years ago as I became a new Member of the House, I became acquainted with EARL C. MICHENER, then, and for many years before a Member of the House from the State of Michigan. Today, it is an occasion of regret to realize that our long association in the work of the House comes to an end through the departure of my friend and colleague into private life.

It has been not only a pleasure but a distinct privilege to have enjoyed the friendship and helpful assistance of EARL MICHENER through all the years that have intervened since we first met. With each succeeding year my attachment to him as a friend and my appreciation of his character and ability have constantly increased. Humble in spirit, wise in counsel, studious and painstaking in the performance of all his duties, and intensely patriotic in his every endeavor he never deviated from what he believed to be right and for the best interest of his country and its people. He has served faithfully and well. His going from our midst is a distinct loss to the district that has honored him for so many years, and to the country as a whole.

On this day of his departure there is undoubtedly within him a strange mingling of sorrow and pleasure. Sorrow because he breaks ties of friendship that bind like cords, and pleasure in the knowledge that he is honored and respected by the entire membership of the House, and that his district would have continued to send him to the House as its Representative had he so wished.

As EARL MICHENER leaves us today, he may ever rest assured that his memory will linger long and pleasantly with each of us and will be an inspiration for the performance of our duties in the same spirit of devotion that has characterized his entire service.

The Strategy of Counterattack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Washington Star under date of December 31, 1950, and entitled "The Strategy of Counterattack":

THE STRATEGY OF COUNTERATTACK

If, as seems to be the case, we are committed to the policy of letting our enemy strike the first blow, the address which John Foster Dulles had made in New York is—up to a point—an excellent statement of the only rational alternative which remains open to us.

What Mr. Dulles advocates is a policy of preparation for counterattack. This is a policy which accepts a grave risk. It grants the Kremlin all the time it may require for its own preparations, and it assumes, or hopes, that we will not be destroyed in an all-out surprise attack by the enemy. It is a policy which rests on a willingness to pay a fearful price in dead and wounded in our own American cities. It is a policy which leaves to the enemy the initiative and the power of decision. It is a policy which means that we must resign ourselves for the long future to an existence in an armed camp, an existence in which we shall not know from one day to the next when the blow may fall. And, to repeat, it is a policy which puts the very life of this Nation in jeopardy as the alternative to taking the initiative and resolving that we shall be the one to strike if the enemy will not accept a decent, dependable settlement.

Despite these appalling risks, however, the fact remains that this policy of preparation for counter attack is essentially the policy which has been adopted by the administration, and it is the policy which apparently has the support of a majority of the American people. Therefore, it is a policy which needs to be understood and which needs to be pursued with great vigor. On both of these counts, Mr. Dulles, in his address to the American Association for the United Nations, has made a valuable contribution.

Mr. Dulles appeared as a spokesman for that wing of the Republican party which does not believe that security for the United States can be found in a policy of retreat as long as there remains any hope of organizing throughout the free world a strong and determined resistance to the impending Communist assault. He said that his speech was not a reply to the recent proposals made by Herbert Hoover. Nevertheless, it was in some respects an effective answer, in both a moral and a military sense, to the notion that we can fall back and erect a kind of Gibraltar in the Western Hemisphere, which, with some outlying bases, would offer real hope of security. Mr. Dulles stated the matter well when he said it has been proved a thousand times that the defense which accepts encirclement by the enemy will fall apart, and that the mood which plans such a defense carries within itself the seeds of its own collapse.

Mr. Dulles agrees with Mr. Hoover, however, that we cannot and must not undertake to engage in little Koreas wherever the Communists may choose to stir up trouble. He says, and rightly so, that this leads only to weakness at all points and strength nowhere.

But what other choices are there? Mr. Dulles suggests two, neither of which is new. He hopes to build up enough strength around

the rim of the "captive world" to discourage little aggressions and to make them costly if they occur. Second, he says that "if the Soviet Union itself decides on open aggressive war" we must have the capacity to counterattack.

It is at this point, in The Star's judgment, that the fallacies inherent in the policy of counterattack become most evident. It serves notice that we will not strike unless and until the Soviet Union decides on open aggressive war. What is that but an invitation for the Russians and their satellites to embark on Korean ventures wherever it may seem profitable for them to do so? The hope that we can build the restraining strength around the rim of the Communist land mass is at best a slim hope. That strength certainly does not exist now in many of the vulnerable countries, and if it does not materialize—in Iran for instance—are we going to sit back and let the enemy pick off these plums at will?

The main difficulty of those who think as Mr. Dulles thinks may well lie in the state of mind revealed by one observation in his address. So long as the die has not been irrevocably cast for war, he said, "we must assume that righteous peace may yet be possible."

Why should we assume any such thing? Certainly the available evidence points to a contrary assumption—to the assumption that, while we may hope and work for peace, the odds favor war. If we are going to assume, in the fact of the contrary evidence, that a righteous peace is possible, at what point are we going to conclude that the die has been cast irrevocably for war?

Obviously, in Mr. Dulles' view, that point was not reached when the Chinese Communists attacked the United Nations Army in Korea. Presumably, by the same standard of measurement, it would not be reached if the Chinese should strike, let us say, at India, or if satellite armies should march into Yugoslavia, or if an East German army should invade Western Germany.

In short, the theory that we must hold our fire until the Soviet Union decides on open aggression is almost as dangerous and as self-defeating as Mr. Hoover's policy of falling back on the Western Hemisphere.

If we are going to surrender the initiative to the enemy, then we must by every means and at all costs create the greatest power of counterattack of which we are capable. But if we will not use that power unless and until the Russians themselves resort to open aggression, we shall play directly into their hands. Through their satellites and the other means which they employ with so much skill, they can gobble up country after country, and one essential natural resource after another. If we let that happen we will find ourselves just as effectively isolated and encircled as would be the case if we followed Mr. Hoover's recommendations. The time to fight is not when the last hour has struck, but when the enemy's hostile intentions become clear. We must not let devotion to peace and dread of war so paralyze our reason and numb our will that we become incapable of action until the final and possibly decisive blow has fallen.

Do We Abandon Rome?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of December 22, 1950:

DO WE ABANDON ROME?

What is this Europe that Kennedy and Hoover are willing to write off? It is 300,000,000 people. It is the mining and industrial facilities of the Ruhr, the wine of France, the cheeses of Holland, the olives of Italy. It is the Alps and the Riviera. It is the railroads and highways, farms and factories and schools. It is the Louvre and the canals of Venice.

All these are tangible things. They can in a rough way be weighed against the calculated risk of American forces thrown into their defense.

But what of the intangible things, the culture that is Europe's and that was our source? What, specifically, of the Catholic Church?

If communism takes over Italy, the Holy See will suffer a far worse fate than it did under fascism. Mussolini at least gave lip service to the church; communism is a new, intolerant atheism, with an old and unappeasable hatred for catholicism.

The church would, of course, survive. But what of her millions of communicants? The church has outlived many tyrants and will outlive many others. But the loss of Rome would be an unthinkable tragedy, not alone for Catholics, but for everyone throughout the world who stands in danger of communism. With all its great spiritual and temporal powers, the church has fought the world's great fight. Whether we are Catholics or not, it is here our mighty ally.

It is difficult to believe that the Kennedy-Hoover-Hearst school has given full appreciation to the implications of the surrender of Europe to Stalin's hordes. Europe is more than people or geography or works of man. It is the civilization from which we sprang; it is the faith in the dignity and freedom of man.

A Holiday Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the following prayer uttered by George Washington will inspire us to properly meet our challenge:

A HOLIDAY PRAYER

Almighty God, Who has given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will.

Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogance and from every evil way.

Defend our liberties and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Imbue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government; that here may be peace and justice at home and that through obedience to Thy law we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth.

In the time of prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

It's Time To Stop Fumbling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 7, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article:

IT'S TIME TO STOP FUMBLING

Mrs. Sweeney's boy is dying out there! And thousands of mothers' sons. It's time to stop fumbling.

To die bravely in the service of one's country is a glorious thing, a noble destiny that millions of American youths would accept if duty calls. But to sacrifice brave young lives through the unfitness of swivel-chair fumblers is a crime against this Nation.

The United States is at war. It has been under lethal attack for more than a decade. But fumblers, and worse, in our Government prevented most Americans from knowing this fact.

It is sickening to cite the record. But this is a time for facing essential facts unless we are willing supinely to witness the destruction of our Nation.

Enemy agents, with the active aid of traitors stole our formula for making the atom bomb. They looted our State Department of secret documents by the bale. And they scuttled our defenses. These facts, substantiated by the record, were clearly stated by Senators and Congressmen in faithful performance of their duty. President Truman confined himself to a mere retort: "Red herring."

Our traitors and our enemies duped us into rebuffing and hamstringing allies upon whom we could best count to fight effectively against the Red master of the Kremlin. We mean China under leadership of Chiang Kai-shek and Spain led by Gen. Francisco Franco.

The Congress of the United States belatedly appropriated money to aid the Chiang Kai-shek forces and, more belatedly, moved to correct our misguided attitude toward Spain. But President Truman checkmated these moves, well-calculated for strengthening our arms. Up to now he has refused to release the funds Congress appropriated for Chiang Kai-shek's forces, all the while we are spoon-feeding Tito and throwing money into every rat hole in the world.

The President and his advisers say they don't like Chiang because he's corrupt and Truman likewise doesn't like Franco, presumably because he is a Fascist. Forgetting that, in the midst of another fight, we gave all-out cooperation to Stalin. And Mr. Truman openly confessed he likes old Joe, who is somewhat of a totalitarian and also somewhat corrupt.

President Truman is culpable in his failure to fire Acheson out of the State Department.

If your football team had a quarterback who fumbled frequently and especially where it helped your opponents, you would expect him to be benched or you would demand that the coach resign. If a top executive permitted his company's trade secrets to be filched by competitors, he'd be fired.

Acheson should go. Tell your Senators and Congressmen this, if you believe it to be true. Tell them you want no more handcuffs put upon our field commander, General MacArthur, as he was handcuffed during the Red build-up in China and after the victory at Inchon. Tell them you want no more of a State Department so futile and so fumbling as to permit the insufferable arrogance of our Red enemies appearing before the United Nations to charge us with aggression, and, with brazen assurance, to demand that they

be seated in place of China's rightful delegates so that they may debate whether and how our Armed Forces shall fight.

We need an articulate press. With the honored exception of Mr. Hearst's newspapers and a few others, the press has largely failed in its function of correctly informing the people and supplying sound guidance.

This is no time for timidity, no time to be fearful of the smears of Reds or of the contemptuous retorts of their stupid dupes. We Americans want peace, we long and pray for peace, but we must not fear war.

If the United States compromises, vacillates and fumbles now, it will lose this war, and darkness and hopeless misery will settle upon mankind for centuries.

In the face of these stark facts, we must fear only to offend God or to see defeat of our beloved country. You should not fear the atom bomb, but rather pray that you and yours might have so merciful a fate as to die in an atomic burst rather than that you should live to go down with this Nation into the slavery of atheistic communism.

Fred W. Enwright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it often occurs to me that we often take for granted the unifying role which a newspaper plays in the life of a typical American community. If we stop to think of it, as we should, we realize that a newspaper records the life of a city from the birth to the death of the people who come and go through its history. It is a great responsibility to be an editor of a paper and a greater one to be its publisher.

For he can improve a city or neglect it.

Under his leadership, the people can know all the facts, which is the basis of every well-informed and democratic decision that we call by the truly American name of "public opinion."

In tribute to all the publishers of our Nation, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article by Tom McGovern which appeared in his regular column titled "Lynn Heartbeat," in the Lynn Telegram-News on Sunday, December 17, 1950. Tom's column which is a favorite with the readers of this democratic paper, honors the thirty-eighth anniversary as a publisher of that veteran newsman, Fred W. Enwright, of Lynn, Mass.:

ENWRIGHT MILESTONE

(By Tom McGovern)

Sometimes the news is close to home, so close in fact that you can almost reach out and touch it. Today is such a day for it represents another milestone in the life of a man who has closely affected the careers of all of us earning a living at the Telegram-News. The gentleman to whom I refer is Frederick W. Enwright who today is celebrating his thirty-eighth anniversary as a publisher.

Covering an entire side of the editorial room are the copies of every issue of the Lynn Telegram-News (nee Lynn Telegram before its union with the Lynn Evening News) since the first publication on December 17, 1912.

There are red volumes, brown ones, blue ones, and orange ones adorning the shelves of the library. Bound masterfully, they have withstood the assaults of friendly and unkind hands alike who have come to them at varying times for evidence of vindication, prosecution, impeachment, or indictment.

Take down any copy from the shelf and you have the careful documentary review of some era since 1912. There were the good days, the boon days, and the black days. But each day in itself was but another chapter in the life of a fabulous man who with all due respect to the people who are having biographies written about them couldn't begin to compare with this extraordinary character.

It is Sunday morning and the scene is Huntt's restaurant in Central Square. One man's height and general appearance seem to give him a special identity but you would never realize it from the tone of the conversation which is going on at the table.

The man who seems so interested in how many trips the trucks of Sanitary Boss George O'Shea made the previous day, how Eddie Foley's health is faring, what people are talking about politically, why porterhouse steak has risen 11 cents per pound is Frederick W. Enwright. He has just come from the 9 o'clock mass at St. John's Church, in Swampscott, only the previous evening he had supervised the preparation of a 32-page Sunday newspaper, 24 hours prior to that he had gotten $11,000 in cold cash on the line to fill the weekly pay envelopes of about 100 employees.

Most everybody who has ever had any contact with Fred Enwright will agree that he is an unusual man. He is plenty tough, and I personally have felt his sting on occasions, but on the other side he is innately kind, generous, and courteous. I have never gone into Mr. Enwright's office without him rising from the chair to extend a warm hand of welcome to me. That goes for any employee of the plant. If he can be of any assistane he is ever ready to help.

He was 26 when he founded the Lynn Telegram with some years of experience as a reporter on the Boston American behind him. He was immediately marked "taboo" by the people who felt they ran Lynn at the time. There was no need of a Democratic paper they said. By refusing to run advertisements in his publication, by withholding news which actually belonged to the public, they sought to cripple his enterprise. But they underrated the young man.

Even the people who weren't friendly to him started to buy his newspaper to see what effect the boycott was having upon him. They became so infuriated with what he was writing about them that they became individual circulation managers. Soon the "Telly" sales were zooming.

From Lynn, publisher Enwright went to Boston where his Boston Evening Telegram became the leading afternoon paper in the Hub. Spurred on by success, he went to New York and published a paper, the New York Bulletin, which also had a spectacular run.

The publisher's heart was not in these publications, however. When the Bulletin liquidated, he received a small check for $800,000 for his part of the proceeds. Shortly thereafter, the Boston Telegram became a memory and Fred was back to his first love.

People who take newspapers for granted should not. Ask the labor leaders of Lynn how they would like to be operating in a city with only one newspaper. It would place too much power in the hands of one man. That is why labor, the minority groups, the little people, should be grateful that Fred Enwright has kept Lynn a two-newspaper city all these years.

It has meant prosperity for many, many person who otherwise would not be enjoying it. It has given the average voter a chance to run for office, as attested to by the remarkable vote attracted by Councilor Pasquale Caggiana a year ago.

I suppose that sometime today Fred Enwright will reminisce a bit, whether it's at Huntt's restaurant with the boys, at dinner with the Mrs. and daughter Eleanore, or during an afternoon ride with Bill Berube, and he'll laugh at some of the things that have happened since that first edition of the Lynn Telegram reached the streets in 1912. Maybe his face will become stern as he reviews other happenings.

But no matter what comes or goes, the fact can't be questioned that Fred Enwright today in the full bloom of health, looking much younger than his 64 years, seems capable of directing the destinies of this great democratic institution for many years to come. And so I say humbly to my meal ticket, and I speak for all of the rest of us—"Happy Anniversary, Fred."

Launching of Steamship "President Adams" on Monday, October 9, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 9, 1950, the Steamship *President Adams,* built by American President Lines, was launched at the yards of New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N. J. Despite unfavorable weather, the launching was nevertheless a gala occasion. The sponsor of the ship was Mrs. Edward J. Hart, wife of the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The event was participated in by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, by high-ranking officers of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the United States Coast Guard, and representatives of other Government agencies, especially of the Federal Maritime Board. "Launching of the *President Adams,*" in the words of Mr. George L. Killion, president of American President Lines, "conceived in peace and dedicated to serving a peaceful world, has become a symbol of an alert America preparing to meet the challenge of the future."

Addresses on the occasion of the launching, which are included below as part of my extension of remarks, were delivered by Hon. Dan A. Kimball, Under Secretary of the Navy; Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane, Administrator, Maritime Administration and Chairman of Federal Maritime Board; Mr. George L. Killion, president, American President Lines, and myself. These addresses follow herewith:

REMARKS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY DAN A. KIMBALL

A ship launching is always a happy occasion. Everyone experiences some variety of thrill. Those who attend merely as spectators cannot avoid the surge of spirit which takes place as the new vessel slides down the ways and becomes waterborne for the first

time. To those who have cooperated in the building of the ship as company executives, engineers, architects, and skilled shipbuilding workers, the launching is the culmination of months of work. We, of the Navy, have a particular interest in the launching of the *President Adams* because it brings us one step closer to having at hand a fast vessel which we badly need. Launching days are great days, and my only regret is that there are not more of them.

Because of military requirements, the *Adams* and her two sister ships are temporarily going into the naval service. This means a delay in the addition of three important vessels to the American merchant fleet. There is a good reason for this. These vessels may be vital to us in the period that lies ahead.

The Korean campaign is the latest in a long list of events which have made it clear that the free nations under the leadership of the United States must speed up the strengthening of our common defense. The international Communist movement has shown that it does not hesitate to use force to overrun independent nations where it can hope to do so successfully.

Therefore, in the interests of our own defense and that of our friends we find it necessary to delay the pleasures of a maiden trip aboard a new luxury vessel. It is unfortunate that international events have combined to postpone this pleasure, but we can all take comfort in the fact that the *Adams* and her two sisters are to be available for possible emergency use.

Modern warfare planning has developed into an extremely complex science, requiring faultless coordination of many factors. This is because of the logistics requirements of modern armed forces.

Logistics is one of those obscure words which seldom find use except in military circles. Webster says it is the "branch of military science dealing with the moving, quartering, and provisioning of armed forces." We might sum it up by saying that logistics is the art of supplying the means to win a war. Like all other arts and skills, it it effective only when carried out with intelligence and common sense, backed by sound experience. Combat logistics are unglamorous, but most essential to a successful operation.

Statistics are dry, but you may be interested to know that during the time between the onset of Korean operations through September 20, the Navy, through the Military Sea Transportation Service, transported more than 2,600,000 tons of cargo and 185,000 passengers to the Far East, in support of United Nations actions. MSTS shipped to the far eastern theater enough fuel oil, aviation gasoline, motor gasoline, and Diesel oil to fill the Empire State Building three times, and still have a lot left over. I notice that the Under Secretary of the Army, Mr. Alexander, had a scratch pad out the other day and figured that the quantity of rations shipped to our United Nations fighting forces in the Far East would be sufficient to feed the population of the State of New Jersey for 6 weeks on a rather substantial diet.

Comparisons such as these, I think, are effective in bringing home to the average citizen, such as myself, the enormous demands of modern warfare. Thanks to the superior coordination of all branches of the Armed Forces, we have been able to concentrate great military, naval, and air strength in the Far East. The Navy has the responsibility of keeping these forces supplied, whether or not they are engaged in active combat. The Navy must also be ready to provide transportation to these forces, and their equipment, in the unhappy event it becomes necessary to transfer these now seasoned fighters to some other trouble area in the world.

None of us can afford to relax. We have found that the only language clearly understood by Communist aggressors is that of ready strength. I emphasize "ready" when I speak of this armed strength. We have proved to the world that the free nations are equal to the task of coming to the assistance of a weak nation which was about to be overrun by a more powerful neighbor. We hope that our action in Korea will serve as a sufficient demonstration of our willingness and readiness to fight for what we believe in. To date, we have no assurance that this demonstration of proof will be sufficient or lasting. All of us, therefore, must resist firmly any inclination to let down our guard. We should rather determine to pursue vigorously our plans to build up even stronger forces in being, so that while we seek actively for a peaceful solution to world problems through the medium of the United Nations, we can still fight effectively should open warfare be forced upon us.

I congratulate the engineers, the executives, and the skilled shipworkers of the New York Shipbuilding Corp., who have cooperated to build this fine vessel. I commend the enterprise of the American President Lines in causing this ship and her sisters to be built. On behalf of the Navy I should like to assure you that we will take good care of her. Some day, I hope in the not-too-distant future, the *Adams*, the *Jackson*, and the *Hayes* will sail the trade routes of the world with the familiar eagles of A. P. L. showing on their stacks. That will indeed be a happy day for all of us, because by this and other tokens we shall know that our efforts to secure a firm peace in a free world have been successful.

REMARKS OF VICE ADM. E. L. COCHRANE, ADMINISTRATOR, MARITIME ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, AND CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Mrs. Hart, Mr. Hart, Secretary Kimball, President Killion, President Bossert, men and women of the New York Shipbuilding Corp., and distinguished guests, we are gathered here today to witness an event of particular, and to me personally, of very great significance. It is an event symbolic of the deep importance and the great wisdom of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which sets forth so clearly the value to our country, both in time of peace and in time of emergency, of a strong merchant marine under our own beautiful stars and stripes.

This day is dedicated to the thrilling action of launching a fine ship—not to speeches. It is important, however, to note that gathered here to witness this launching are representatives of six great institutions; each of us vitally interested in the building of this ship. First, we have a representative of the Congress of the United States, whose charming wife is to be the sponsor. Second, those of the Navy, which under present plans will operate this ship to serve all three of the Armed Forces of this country. Third, the president of the American President Lines, and many of his staff, through the foresight and courage of whom the building of this ship became possible and to whom we hope that the *President Adams* can soon be reassigned to serve in her peacetime role. Fourth, many of you from this great shipyard, whose effort has been moderately disrupted by the need for a change in the immediate service in which the ship is to be operated. Fifth, the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration, whose sole aim is to further the development and maintenance of an American merchant marine within the laws provided to that end, and sixth, so large a representation of the American people for whose protection and benefit in the final analysis all American ships are provided and who, let me add, stand most of the financial burden.

The close relationship of the United States Navy and the merchant marine in exercising command of the sea is the foundation of American sea power. Manifestly, a great merchant marine is valueless unless the Navy can gain command of the sea, and equally would the efforts of the Navy in gaining such command be fruitless unless there were merchant ships to capitalize on that advantage in exporting our strength and importing our needs from overseas.

As one who has been honored with a life membership in local No. 1, and one who has had over many years great respect and warm regard for the management of this corporation, I should like the privilege of saying a word to the corporation personnel as a whole. We are approaching a period when more than ever labor and management must pull together, each contributing his share to the success of the joint effort.

I am too old a hand in shipyards not to be fully conscious of the complexity of the problems which you face together. Management's problems in providing the means of production, in obtaining and administering the contracts, and providing the necessary managerial and engineering decisions, are complex beyond the imagination of those unfamiliar with the effort. I am clear, too, that those of you at work in the yard are confronted with your problems and that there are many reasons which seem adequate to justify waiting for something else to happen—interruption of compressed air, failure in temporary lights, lack of materials, the need for assistance from some other trade, lack of plans or instructions. Some of these—in fact, perhaps all of them—at some time or another do prevent continued production.

I have only to urge upon you, however, the importance of a will to keep going and by all means the need to recognize the existence of the no-curtailment-of-production clause in the labor agreements. The no-lock-out clause is equally binding. I recognize that you have been meeting in consultation over mutual problems, which is thoroughly commendable, and in my view indispensable to satisfactory operation. I urge upon you, however, not only deliberation but the will to find solutions. That is the American way of getting big things done.

Shipbuilding is a vital industry in the United States. That does not, however, carry with it the right of employment but rather the privilege of working on jobs of national and international value.

Some no doubt believe that since the United Nations' forces have succeeded so gloriously in cleaning out Communists from South Korea that the present emergency is over and that we can all resume a leisurely outlook. That is by no means the case. We are still living in an ominously divided world. This ship is an important element in furthering the interests of our half of that world.

It has been my privilege to attend launchings in this yard for over 40 years. It is my sincere hope that I may be privileged to continue to witness them here for the rest of my active years.

REMARKS OF GEORGE L. KILLION, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES

Ladies and gentlemen, the occasion which brings us together here today is one of great significance. Launching of the *President Adams*, conceived in peace and dedicated to serving a peaceful world, has become a symbol of an alert America preparing to meet the challenge of the future.

The importance of this launching becomes apparent when it is realized that here today we shall witness the official transfer of three modern American flag ships intended for commercial use to the Department of Defense to swell the armed might of this Nation. I am sure we all deplore the necessity for diverting these fine new vessels from their intended peacetime mission, but we of American President Lines are proud indeed

of the opportunity to serve in this time of national and world emergency.

We are proud and pleased that these ships are available, because in their availability for defense service lies proof of the soundness and wisdom of existing Federal maritime legislation as set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The hope of the free world lies in strong integrated public support of President Truman's entire defense program, which calls for a powerful Army, Navy, and Air Force in addition to an adequate merchant marine which serves as auxiliary to all three. As the President said in an address September 9, "The danger the free world faces—from open and brazen aggression—is so great that we cannot be satisfied with less than an all-out effort by everyone." With this I'm sure all of us are in complete, wholehearted agreement.

It behooves us to be strong, and to help keep all our free allies strong, because strength is the greatest assurance of peace in the world today.

We have faith in the future of America and a peaceful world. This faith inspires us to plan a ship replacement program involving the construction of seven additional new vessels. We are proceeding immediately with the study of new designs, and in conjunction with the Federal Maritime Board and the Navy, shall develop plans and specifications to assure adequate coverage of the company's world-wide routes. I am sure this is the spirit in which any other American flag steamship operator and shipbuilder would approach this important problem, just as they unselfishly cooperated with the Government in every previous national emergency. This is the spirit which gives our free enterprise system its virility and justification, and makes America and its system of government the savior of peace and the champion of all free nations.

The new Federal Maritime Board, under the able administration of its Chairman, Admiral E. L. Cochrane, and his worthy colleagues, board members Albert Gatov and Robert Williams, is dedicated to building a strong American merchant marine. Under their leadership, the true importance of a great fleet of American flag vessels designed to transport peaceful commerce and to meet the demands of war, will become fully known. I am sure the lessons learned from having an inadequate merchant marine will not be forgotten.

In this regard, I also wish to pay tribute to the leadership of Congressman EDWARD HART and many of his colleagues, who are a source of real inspiration to everyone working to keep America's merchant fleet dominant on the high seas of the world.

In this time of preparedness, I wish to reemphasize that we are thankful to be in position to cooperate with the Navy, and we know that the Navy will, in turn, cooperate with the American merchant marine in maintaining its rightful place as an important and vital segment of our national economy and national security.

The Military Sea Transportation Service, under the able direction of Admiral William Callaghan, has extended vigorous support to the privately owned fleets operating in the Pacific, and I am proud that these great private fleets were once again in position to supplement the military effort so sorely needed at the beginning of the Korean conflict.

Transfer of the *Presidents Jackson, Adams,* and *Hayes* to the Navy temporarily delays our plans for expanding our 25-year-old round-the-world service.

This growing global service, as well as our other services, continues to be served by fast modern passenger and cargo vessels operating with frequency and efficiency to over 30 ports of the world. We are in the shipping business to stay and we realize that to fulfill our responsibilities both to the trade and to national defense, we must at all times maintain a completely up-to-the-minute modernized fleet.

ADDRESS OF HON. EDWARD J. HART, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I am grateful to Mr. Killion and his associates for this opportunity of participating in the ceremonies incident to the launching of the magnificent vessel, the steamship *President Adams.* And, of course, I am happy that the honor of acting as the sponsor on this gala occasion has come to my wife.

This launching marks another step forward in building a merchant marine worthy of the great Republic whose flag this ship will fly.

While at the time her construction was planned and, yet later, begun, it was expected that this great vessel would be engaged in only those pursuits relating to "the piping time of peace," it has now been decided that upon her completion she will be dedicated to the work of building and maintaining the armed might of America in a distraught and troubled world, whose dream of immediate and lasting concord among the nations has been shattered by the ruthless infidelities and brutalized aggressions of a conscienceless dictatorship. To this decision the American President Lines has graciously and willingly given its acquiescence.

But this deviation of use involved here does not lessen in any degree the delight which supporters of an adequate, efficient American merchant marine derive from what is taking place here today. Nor does it lessen in any degree whatever praise is due those who undertook the addition of this magnificent ship to the American merchant marine.

America has not lost her enthusiasm for peace. It is not as a result of any inglorious designs or ambitions on the part of our own Government that we find thrust upon us the stern necessity of rearming. No; rather do we embark upon this policy with the inescapable conviction that it will enable us more surely to avoid grim-visaged war and to foster and promote the cause of peace. As a nation we yearn, we strive earnestly, for peace, and as individuals our citizens beseech Almighty God that in His merciful Providence He will bring about the universal reign of peace.

What ultimately shall result we cannot tell. But one thing is certain. We in America cannot serve best the usages of either peace or war unless in that service we possess and employ a merchant marine fully adequate to discharge their respective requirements.

From time to time, suggestions emanate from even high governmental quarters, which, however tentative their nature, disturb and alarm the advocates and defenders of an adequate, balanced merchant marine. Not long ago there was projected the view, however informal the presentation, that America did not need a large merchant marine, because, forsooth, in time of national peril, it could depend for its safety and welfare upon the merchant ships of its allies. What arrant nonsense? What dangerous incogitance? Let us look only to Korea to learn that quantity of aid we can be sure of receiving from our allies, especially under present world conditions, when America's fortunes, yes, and their own, are at stake. America must become and remain as nearly self-sufficient as possible in all things, but in nothing more than in the adequacy and efficiency of her merchant marine.

Almost 60 years ago in a message to the Congress, President Harrison said, "No subject, I think, more clearly touches the pride, the power, and the prosperity of our country than (this) the development of our merchant marine upon the sea." The merchant marine has long since come to be recognized in responsible military and naval quarters, as an integral part of our national defense system. Speaking in very recent times before the American Merchant Marine Conference, Admiral Kinkaid had this to say: "Today the merchant marine is not just a ward of the Navy. It is a vitally important part of sea power, without which the armed forces cannot function. The relationship is no longer one-sided. We are just as much dependent upon the merchant marine as it is upon us."

Continuing, he said: "In this progressive age we cannot always look to history for guidance. But in certain basic and fundamental considerations we should do well to examine the past. History has taught us that every nation which has become a leader in world affairs has developed and guarded a strong merchant marine. There is nothing in the present-day situation which would indicate a change. In the past the necessity for a strong merchant marine has been largely economic. Today it is economic, but it is also logistic, two words which are very much alike in meaning."

Can language be plainer than that? We are a practical people. Yet, strange enough, we are often slow to learn the lessons our national experiences should have taught us. Our merchant marine was woefully deficient before the First World War. When that devastating conflict caught us up in its toils we were totally unprepared. Only a quarter of a century later, when catapulted into an even more devastating war, we were found almost equally unprepared. The time factor in each instance was on our side, and eventually, by the expenditure of billions of dollars which forethought would have saved to us, we built the greatest merchant fleet the world has ever seen. Let us not gamble that time will be on our side again, for all that enriches life, all that gives it zest and flavor, is at stake.

Of all the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries who participated in the framing of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Magna Carta of American shipping, I alone still serve thereon. I helped to fashion the declaration of policy which it contains, upon which the Congress placed the stamp of its approval. Let me recall it to your minds:

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States, and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times; (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable; and (d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

I believe in that declaration of policy today as firmly as I believed in it when I helped to write it. And as chairman of the great committee which proposed it to the Nation, I intend to adhere to it as strictly as the Congress, itself, will permit.

To effectuate that policy requires that we must have and maintain a permanent shipbuilding and ship-repair industry that shall

provide steady employment to thousands of skilled workers in the yards and to other Americans in factories throughout our land which will furnish materials, equipment, and supplies.

It means we must have and maintain a stabilized industry, dealing with ships, employing additional thousands on land and on sea. And these ships must be speedy, efficient, and safe, and must provide regular, dependable service for cargoes and passengers to all parts of the world at reasonable, attractive rates.

It means that our flag, symbolizing a free American society of freemen determined to preserve free institutions, shall ripple in the breezes of the ports of the entire world, bringing courage and hope to the hearts of all men who love liberty.

It means in short, that we must have and maintain an American merchant marine ready to serve the Nation and its economy to the uttermost degree in time of peace, and if it must come, in time of war.

These are the main objectives. There should be no further delay in moving toward their accomplishment. Already many of our facilities for building ships have disappeared. Already organizations necessary to the achievement of these objectives have been broken up and scattered. Classic examples indeed of our failure to heed the lessons from experience. At the end of World War I, while our rivals went on building both combatant and merchant ships, we fell back into our spirit of indifference. When events forced us to commence rebuilding, we found ourselves short of drafters and designers. New techniques had been developed with which we had hurriedly to familiarize ourselves. New features had to be incorporated in the designs, and we found ourselves under the necessity of installing these new features without benefit of trial and error experience.

Shall we be so insensible to our national needs as to persist in following the same course again? We need in this country a wide and continuing course of education that will bring home to every American the indispensability of a satisfactory American merchant marine. Too many of our people are indifferent to what has happened, what is happening, and what may happen to that great institution. It was this indifference on the part of our people that resulted before World War I in the disgraceful deterioration of our merchant marine.

At one period of our history American bottoms carried 76 percent of the world's water-borne commerce. Just prior to World War II, that figure had dropped to less than 30 percent. Public indifference in America was one of the great factors in this deterioration. And when Pearl Harbor came, we were compelled, again in haste, to build only cargo ships to the neglect of passenger vessels, with the result that our fighting men were transported to the theaters of war on Victory and Liberty ships instead of troop transports, and too often on ships flying foreign flags instead of the flag of our own country which they were offering their lives to defend.

I know that the shipping industry in America has spent much money and has spent much time in endeavoring to dispel apathy toward the merchant marine on the part of the American public. But the effort must be continuing—it must be enlarged—and it must be more diversified, if it is to attain the success we hope for.

I cannot close without making passing reference to a report respecting the American merchant marine which is said to have been prepared and recently filed in official quarters. It was referred to by Senator JOHNSON, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in a speech inserted by him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 19, 1950. This report, if correctly described, would seek to sacrifice the American merchant marine for the benefit of some of its foreign competitors. It would propose to close the so-called dollar gap, by penalizing and crippling almost to the point of destruction this great and necessary American industry. I do not desire to analyze the plan as I have heard it described, on this occasion. Time will not permit such analysis. But if it shall be my good fortune to be a Member of the Eighty-second Congress, I shall cooperate with Senator JOHNSON to the limit of my ability and energy, and shall use all available means at my command to prevent its proposals from being given any effect whatsoever.

I hope there will be many more days such as this in time to come. I hope that enough passenger vessels, equal to the steamship *President Adams* in capacity and suitability, to meet the obvious needs of our merchant marine, will soon slide down the ways of American shipyards and ride the bosoms of the oceans, harbingers of a happy, self-sufficient, prosperous America, dealing in friendly intercourse, with neighboring and far-flung nations, enjoying the blessings of liberty and peace.

Congressman Smith Calls for Complete Change of United States Foreign Policy and Asks the Administration To Tell America What Lies Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Korean disaster to the United States calls for a sweeping investigation and a complete change in our whole foreign policy. It must be open to all so that we may learn the truth and nothing but the truth. The Kremlin knows every move that is being made in Washington, so why not throw the doors open to our own people so that they too may know what lies ahead for them.

President Truman illegally declared war on the North Koreans, and almost immediately, also illegally, turned the war over the United Nations. This was the first and only real assignment the United Nations had undertaken. The results today are too evident. During the period of time that the United Nations troops, composed of 90 percent or more of American boys, were advancing the United Nations Organization was vociferously and assiduously claiming the credit and proclaiming its prowess by way of radio, newspapers, churches, schools, and every other means which promised publicity. But when the Chinese crossed the Manchurian border into Korea en masse and ruthlessly drove the troops back the war suddenly became the responsibility of the United States. European countries began thinking in terms of nationalism. They were ready to abandon the cause of Korea and let the United States get out as best it could. European nationalism then counseled that the United States ought not to involve itself so deeply in Korea as to become unable to provide those funds and military aid that those nations were expecting.

Commenting with some uneasiness and alarm on the situation in Korea the London Economist of December 9, 1950, says:

> In his speech in Washington on Wednesday the Prime Minister (Mr. Attlee) rose to the height of the great theme of Britain's partnership with the United States in its present peril "We stand by our duty and our friends," said Attlee on his recent mission to Washington, and a critical and hard-bitten, anxious audience of pressmen applauded him.
>
> There is no purpose to be served by trying to blind the fact that the alliance of free nations has suffered a grave defeat. * * * It goes without saying that the authority of the United Nations, so badly damaged by what happened in Korea, must be restored. * * * There is a task which can obviously be conducted only behind closed doors.
>
> The right strategy is not to abandon the continent altogether, but to exercise a strict economy of resources in continental adventures, to defend on the continent only the most vital areas and those where the air and the sea are at a maximum advantage.
>
> The first is to remember that what happens in any one area of the world is only part of a whole, and it is the whole that counts. If there have been retreats somewhere, let them be in places (like Korea) that are less vital; it would be folly to stand in the less important, at the cost of running away in the more vital, just because the less important case has come along first in time.

It is clear that England does not want our troops to be fighting in Korea, but says nothing about the humiliation and loss of prestige it would cause us were we to quit and withdraw, or about the American prisoners in Chinese hands and the fearful price the Chinese will exact from us to ransom those troops and to restore the war damages to Korean cities, and so forth.

Did Mr. Truman counsel with the British Government before declaring war on the North Koreans? Did he have the confidence of the United Nations before he declared this war? If the British Government had agreed to Mr. Truman's purpose to declare war, though this would not make the act legal, it would, however, now put England in a difficult position. The same is also true with respect to the United Nations. And it is difficult to see how Mr. Truman could have taken this step without the sanction of both England and the United Nations. It is assumed, of course, that what conversations, if any, Mr. Truman had with the English Government were through its representatives on the United Nations staff.

The United States is now in the gravest danger of its entire history. Both our domestic and foreign policies have for so long been in the control of men whose range of vision is so narrow and perverse that they have missed entirely seeing and doing what they were supposed to see and to do. It is a falsehood that the forces in Washington are fighting communism. When the politicians in 1933–34 forced the people to transfer ownership and control of all gold to them

in exchange for paper dollars which would thenceforth be exchangeable for no other medium of payment except more paper dollars, this was and this is communism. Political ownership and control of gold by the politicians is the basis of all communism. Continual retrogression in all walks of life in the United States is now in process and will continue in process until we shall be in complete slavery, as is the case in Russia. The United States under gold had climbed to a great height and it will take some time to fall to the level of the totalitarian state, like Russia. Only the return of the gold to the ownership and control of the people can stop this and restore our freedom.

The Republican Party, if it was not destroyed in 1912 was nevertheless seriously and permanently crippled. Theodore Roosevelt with his progressivism ran for the Presidency on an independent ticket, splitting the Republican Party so as to let Woodrow Wilson in.

It was the Wilson administration that passed the Federal Reserve Bank Act which put the banking system in the hands of the politicians in Washington. Here was laid the foundation for later confiscation of all gold by the political authority and the enormous debt and inflation which prevails. The Wilson administration also violated the long-established principle, laid down by George Washington, not to become involved in the quarrels of other nations, when it took us into World War I. It was also under this same administration that heavy loans were made out of taxpayers' money to foreign countries after the war. The Federal Reserve Bank Act, World War I, and the European loans made by the political authority after the war formed the basis of the depression of 1929. Mr. Hoover had very little to do with it.

One of the greatest delusions believed by many of our people is that Franklin D. Roosevelt cured the depression which began in 1929. Let us look at the record. In 1933 there were 12,830,000 unemployed persons in the United States. This was the peak of unemployment. In 1938 there were still 10,300,000 unemployed, and in 1939 there were 9,840,000, which dropped to 8,120,000 in 1940, which was the year we began to make and to ship war goods to Europe. According to the many recoveries made from depressions in the past this is not a very good showing. If nothing at all had been done by politics to relieve the depression it is more than likely that the record would be much brighter. But the point is that it was the war that really put men to work, but this did not correct any of the real evils that were back of the depression. It merely covered them up, and sooner or later we will have to face them. The perpetual war we are now in is one of the evil effects of the "recovery" which we have made. And as this war and retrogression progress there will be less and less for the workers. Only the politicians will benefit.

Sacrificing American Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 28, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, assuming that it may not have been planned that way, nevertheless President Truman's command to our men to fight in Korea might be part of a plan to keep his party in power. It follows the party's methods preceding World War II.

And the New Deal propagandists, following the administration and the internationalist line, are hard at it, attempting to silence everyone who ventures to criticize either the motives or the methods used by the administration.

Unfortunately, as always, the so-called common people are paying the price while commentators like Mellett, Childs, Stokes, and others continue to howl on. All who question their claimed infallibility are branded, if not as disloyal, as being guilty of appeasement.

Mr. Truman and some of these commentators should hang their heads in shame, if there was shame in them, when they remember that all too often they have acted as champions of those who, high in official positions in the executive department, shaped the events which brought us to our present condition.

From Westbrook Pegler comes the following:

FAIR ENOUGH
(By Westbrook Pegler)

As Senator MALONE, of Nevada, puts it in tragic, dramatic terms, the Government of the United States has abandoned an American Army in a crazy venture in Korea. President Truman, on one of his erratic impulses, threw in a few companies of infantry and thereafter sent in the entire American Army on this side of the Atlantic except one division, apparently the First.

Too stubborn to admit his first mistake and pull the survivors off the southeastern beach last August, Truman permitted the Soviet enemy to lure into a major disaster the enlarged force, made up of young American citizens owing no obligation whatever to the United Nations or Korea.

They had been tumbled onto this oriental peninsula without the slightest consultation of the people who really are the United States. It is a fact that the United States has disowned these men.

We don't even refer to them as an army of the United States. More and more they are coming to be thought of by the people at home as an army of the United Nations, which is another futile parliament ostensibly working for peace but actually composed of two warring factions.

Senator MALONE remarked on the phone on December 23: "My Christmas dinner is going to make me sick." That night, in New York, in the Fifties and along Park, Madison and Fifth Avenues, and Lexington and Third as well, young men and women were reeling drunk, squawking and vomiting in a horrifying spectacle while the pictures were still trickling into our papers of American corpses rolled aside on a Korean road and of American soldiers with their little carbines at the ready, warily treading their way of sorrow with ghastly expressions on their tired faces.

About the same time, the President, in his characteristic shysteresque reaction, the trait which prompted him to call Congress into special session and insult the legislative arm before the world in a campaign speech in 1948, made a snarling reference to "confusers" as his answer to Herbert Hoover, Joe Kennedy, and the likes of Senator MALONE.

Not content with that, he got his stooge from Connecticut, BRIEN MCMAHON, to accuse Mr. Hoover of a monstrous act of appeasement when the truth undoubtedly is that the people of the United States are sick at heart of the terrible betrayals by Roosevelt and the rotten Communist cabal in the White House and want to wash their hands of Europe and Asia, both.

This MCMAHON is one of that awful cult in Washington and along the eastern seaboard who, solely for partisan reasons, have stood fast with Truman in his defense of traitors in the Government not only in Roosevelt's time but down to this very hour.

Their traitorous Democratic Party is so precious, the party of Frankfurter and LaGuardia, O'Dwyer, Ed Flynn, Alger Hiss, and Dean Acheson, that their response to any crisis can be calculated accurately in advance.

The facts that Roosevelt and his scheming team of traitors and fools, mercenaries, and poseurs, actually prepared this frightful situation and that Truman aggravated it by his early concessions to Stalin, are brushed aside and honest men with no motives but the purest patriotism are put in danger of prison for sedition for crying out against the doom.

Conjuring the probability that Russia has hundreds of divisions backed by a great quantity of fine planes and a powerful fleet of submarines, plus, in all probability, the atom bomb, Kennedy said it would be suicidal to fight the enemy on the ground in either Europe or Asia. So Kennedy is a confuser.

Like Kennedy, Mr. Hoover said the Europeans had a first responsibility to prepare their own defenses instead of leaning their entire inert weight on us.

That, in the strange mind of MCMAHON, was monstrous appeasement.

Who gave my country a mission to defend against communism two continents whose people have not got the guts to fight against it themselves? Who built up the menacing power of Soviet Russia, anyway? Who, but Roosevelt, with the approval of a thousand reptilian sneaks in and around the White House and planted in the departments, as Alger Hiss was planted, and Lee Pressman, too, by Frankfurter?

Would the Marines and the soldiers in Korea vote to pull out and come on home to organize a real national fighting force big enough and good enough to defend the Western Hemisphere on land and sea and in the air or would they prefer to stay there and take it just so that Truman and his rotten political party shouldn't lose face in the Orient?

Hon. James W. Wadsworth, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the decision of our good friend and col-

league, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York, to retire from the Congress carries with it a real loss for the country and for all of us who have served with him here.

He has had a long and distinguished career.

In the Spanish War, as a member of the New York Assembly for 6 years, as its speaker for 5 years, as a United States Senator for 12 years, and as a Member of the House of Representatives for 18 years, he has made a great contribution to his State and to the Nation.

His wide experience, his grasp of government, and the problems of government, and his strength of character have given him a powerful influence with his colleagues.

He commands the respect of all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle.

His retirement deprives the Congress of one of its outstanding Members.

Undermining Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article by Marquis Childs, entitled "Undermining Free Society," which appeared in the Washington Post of Thursday, December 28, 1950:

UNDERMINING FREE SOCIETY
(By Marquis Childs)

Toward the end of the year now expiring certain incidents occurred which suggest a pattern of grim meaning for the future if they go unheeded. They are linked by the same threat of hate and fear deliberately exploited for political gain.

First, was the use of fraud and deception on a calculated and wholesale scale to defeat Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland. TYDINGS had been chairman of the Senate committee investigating charges of communism in the State Department and he was to be eliminated because he drew up a majority report rejecting the charges. A picture was faked showing TYDINGS talking to Earl Browder, former head of the Communist Party, and this faked picture was circulated throughout the State.

Second, was the plot to smear and destroy Mrs. Anna Rosenberg by false charges of communism. Mrs. Rosenberg's name was before the Senate for confirmation as Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of mobilizing manpower. This plot was anti-Semitic in origin and intention, following the crooked logic of the Fascist-minded who say that all Communists are Jews, and, therefore, all Jews are Communists.

Third, was the effort to drive Drew Pearson off the air and out of the press by the Communist smear. This last was the work of Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin. Significantly in the other two incidents MCCARTHY'S name also figured.

What McCarthyism means is, it seems to me, becoming increasingly clear. There should be no delusions about it on the part of anyone enjoying the privileges of a free society.

It happens to be true, that many of the values of that society have in the turmoil of the past 20 years been debased and even degraded. That is true particularly of the radio, where commercialism has put news and opinion in competition with the show business. One result has been sensationalism and distortion of the news.

But this is not the same as an open attack on the faith and the freedoms on which our society is based. And that, in my opinion, is what McCarthyism adds up to.

At the base of our society is mutual trust in the fundamental good will of most Americans. That trust was shamefully abused by a few Communist conspirators, some of them naive dupes, others consciously doing the will of Moscow. That source of danger has been removed.

From a different angle McCarthyism similarly attacks this trust. The attack is being directed from behind the sanctions of a free society. Thus the statements made by Members of Congress on the floor of the Senate or House are not subject to the laws of libel. A photograph carried in the free press is not detected as a fake even though it bears the label "composite."

Some people appear to have been attracted to McCarthyism because they do not like what is happening in the world and they think that McCarthy will help to restore "the good old days" of the past. This is exactly the mistake that some Germans made about Hitler. They hated the Weimar Republic and everything it stood for and they looked to Hitler to help restore Prussianism. They soon were caught up in the tragedy of their error.

Senator MCCARTHY has been compared to the late Huey Long, of Louisiana. This seems to me hardly a valid comparison. Long launched his meteoric career with a program for making over his own State. While it was utterly corrupt and cost many times what it should have cost, it did give the people of Louisiana new schools, new roads, and so on.

The significant difference is that Senator MCCARTHY has never made a single constructive proposal. Beginning with his intervention in behalf of the German prisoners in the Malmedy massacre, which had as one result the driving of former Senator Raymond Baldwin, of Connecticut, out of the Senate, down to the present, McCarthyism has been a destroying force.

How far this force will go it is impossible to say. Our form of society is peculiarly defenseless in the face of such an attack.

After the November elections Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, is reported to have discussed with some of his close associates ways and means of shutting down or restricting "the McCarthy one-man show." It is certainly a problem for the Republican Party.

But is is far larger than that in its scope. It is a problem for everyone who values freedom of choice in a free society. In the heat and passion of political partisanship it may not be apparent what is really at stake. And when it is finally realized, the values on which our society rests may be undermined. It may be too late.

Hon. Earl C. Michener, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that as a result of voluntary retirement, our good friend and colleague, EARL MICHENER, of Michigan, will not be with us as a Member of the Eighty-second Congress.

He has had a long and useful career in the service of State and Nation.

In the Spanish War, as assistant prosecuting attorney and as prosecuting attorney of his county for 7 years, and as a Member of the House of Representatives for 30 years, he has devoted his life to that service.

EARL MICHENER has always been a leader in the Congress. His ability as a lawyer, his skill as a parliamentarian, and his over-all judgment has made this inevitable.

He has served as a member of the powerful Rules Committee. He has served as chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

We have been close friends over the years and I shall greatly miss our daily association.

I know that we all wish for him and his family health and every happiness in the years to come.

Concession in and Collaboration With Spain Could Strengthen Our Security System Tremendously

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, last summer it was my privilege to travel to Europe as a representative of the Armed Services Committee of the House for the purpose of studying the military defense assistance program—MDAP. I visited seven military assistance advisory groups—MAAG's—in as many countries. It was also my pleasure to visit Spain, which is not one of the signatories of the North Atlantic Pact. But I did so to learn what, if any, advantages there might be for us to obtain some military bases from Spain. I found that the Spaniards were receptive to the idea. The stumbling block was that we had no Ambassador in Spain and consequently we had no one of sufficient rank in Madrid to talk to Generalissimo Franco. An editorial in the Washington Star of December 28, 1950, explains why we have had no Ambassador to Spain.

I believe that the Soviet group in the UN literally rushed us into recalling our Ambassador to Spain in 1945. Our Ambassador was Norman Armour, a man of great ability. Later, when our State Department and UN representatives woke up—they undid this error and are now sending an Ambassador to Spain. This will give us a representative who can talk with Franco and perhaps make some arrangements that would be particularly advantageous to us in the future. My

thoughts on the advantage to us of getting some bases in Spain, as set out in my report were as follows:

SPAIN SHOULD BE WITH US IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DEFENSE SYSTEM FOR WESTERN EUROPE

I visited Spain to gather first-hand information from our military attachés at Madrid and from others. Also, I took the opportunity of talking with most of the members of the Grand Military Staff of Spain. As nearly as I could determine, this organization corresponds closely to the American Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is the group of men who formulate and carry out the military policies of Spain.

Spain is a country with which we should find a way to cooperate, in our effort to build a strong mutual defense system in Europe.

Portugal is in the Atlantic Pact. It has had a dictator for 20 years. We seem to have no difficulty in working with him in developing the MDAP.

We should not let our political antagonisms blind us to such an extent as to prevent Spanish participation in our MDAP for western Europe. When your home is threatened by fire you do not junk the fire extinguisher simply because its manufacturer is not in accord with your politics or morals.

Spain's strategic location is magnificent. It commands the entrance to the Mediterranean. It has the only substantial defense line in western Europe. The Pyrenees, used as a defense line, permit great results to be achieved by a small army. With this range of mountins in our control, and with the cooperation of the country behind them, we could repel a gigantic attack.

As a military matter, Spain is the most strategic air base in the entire world. Operating from the Iberian Peninsula, the air fleets of any nation can sweep all of Europe except the extreme northerly part. It can cover the entire Mediterranean area, the Near East and northern Africa. Such planes would be in reach of the greatest industrial potential in the world, excepting North America, and some of the most valuable natural resources of all kinds in the entire world. No area in the world, in the light of present-day conditions, is as strategically located from the standpoint of defense as the Iberian Peninsula.

With Spain on our side we could control access to and exit from the Mediterranean. That is of crucial importance, and plainly evident. It would also mean that north Africa would be friendly territory. America learned the great importance of that in the recent war. It is sheer nonsense to turn a cold shoulder to a country of 22,000,000 people who could be so helpful to us, if the military storm should break over Europe.

Few actions of the Congress in recent times could ultimately be so meaningful to American defense and the future of the free world as the recent appropriation on behalf of Spain. The strategic implications are so sweeping, the defense potential so stupendous, that all the free world stood to benefit enormously from this effort to breach the unrealistic moat between western nations and Spain.

And yet, during my visit in Europe, the President announced his intention not to permit the expenditure of these funds on behalf of Spain.

This is a shocking abuse of Presidential authority, even leaving aside the grave effects this unwise move has on western defense efforts. As in the case of Presidential withholding of Air Force funds in the amount of $735,000,000 in the 1950 military budget, and as characterized unanimously by the Committee on Appropriations, this type of action amounts to an item veto, which is an unconstitutional act by the President, and so forth.

The editorial referred to is reproduced herewith, and I hope every Member of Congress has or will read it:

ENDING OUR SPANISH ERROR

President Truman's decision to nominate Stanton Griffis as Ambassador to Spain brings to an end one of the least admirable of the policies followed by the United States, in concert with the United Nations, since the end of the Second World War.

The story of that policy is worth reviewing. In December of 1945 Norman Armour, our last Ambassador to Madrid, was recalled. A year later, after the Security Council had rejected a Kremlin-directed attempt to act drastically against the Franco government as a threat to the peace—the charge was patently ridiculous—the General Assembly passed a resolution calling upon all its members to withdraw their heads of missions from Spain—a resolution which the United States fully supported. The move was designed to weaken Generalissimo Franco at home. But it did the opposite. More than that, since it violated the Charter's provision against interference in the internal affairs of any state, and since it could not be justified on grounds of either common sense or morality, it threw an ugly light on the judgment and integrity of the UN itself, as well as individual members.

By 1949, however, events had made clear that this action, besides having failed as regards undermining Franco, was not merely basically fraudulent but altogether absurd—absurd because it was aimed at weakening one of the strongest of anti-Communist countries at a time when the Western World, led by the United States, needed to do everything possible to fortify itself against the mounting menace of Red aggression. So at last year's General Assembly a majority—but not the necessary two-thirds—voted to rescind the 1946 resolution. But our own Government abstained. Largely because of petty domestic political considerations, it could not bring itself to take a forthright position on the issue. It could not do so until this year's Assembly session, when the UN finally got around to reversing itself. As a result, after a lapse of 5 years, we now are going to have an Ambassador in Madrid.

Mr. Griffis, who has rendered distinguished service on special wartime missions and who has more recently filled such posts as Ambassador to Egypt and Argentina, seems well fitted for the assignment. He has the equipment to undo—if anybody can undo it—the harm that has been done by our own and the UN's sorry 1946 decision to deal stupidly with Spain.

Building Air Might

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Marquis Childs captioned "Building air might," which appeared in the December 30, 1950, issue of the Washington Post. The article follows:

BUILDING AIR MIGHT
(By Marquis Childs)
FINLETTER-M'CONE TEAMWORK

In this, the winter of our discontent, it is not difficult to find causes for complaint. The chorus of recrimination rises as though Washington were a wailing wall and the source of all the ills of mankind.

It is therefore news—under the man-bites-dog definition—to report a field in which progress is being made and men are working with a minimum of snafu. Directing the rapid expansion of the Air Force is a team that is pulling together effectively and efficiently to do one of the two or three most essential jobs in the rearmament program.

Secretary of the Air Force is Thomas K. Finletter, a New York lawyer who has served in several previous Government assignments in connection with the last war and its aftermath. As Chairman of the President's Air Policy Commission, he recommended a 70-group Air Force, and the maintenance of an expanded aircraft industry.

He has believed all along that preparedness to meet the threat of Soviet expansion should move at a much swifter pace. Consequently, when he accepted the post last April he was prepared to push as hard as possible for an expansion of air power.

Louis Johnson, then Secretary of Defense, was still plugging for economy in the Defense budget. But this did not inhibit Finletter, who came in with a more or less independent mandate from the President. The retiring Secretary of the Air Force, W. Stuart Symington, had tangled with Johnson repeatedly on the issue of economy versus expansion.

Last February 1 in a speech at Baylor University in Texas, Symington called for a reappraisal of America's Defense budget, pointing to the radically altered situation created by Russia's having exploded an atomic bomb and having built an air force capable of delivering such bombs against American targets. But this served chiefly to quicken the feud with Johnson. Symington felt so frustrated that there was nothing to do but get out.

Without the handicap of having engaged in previous controversy, Finletter came in as a new broom. Moreover, he has a show-me kind of skepticism which is like an X-ray. This was applied in salutary fashion both to military claims and pretensions and civilian red tape and reluctance.

One of Finletter's first aims was to speed up the construction of the continental radar warning system. He was told that the money simply wasn't in the budget for such a speed-up. His answer was that somehow the money would be found.

Finletter's partner is Under Secretary John A. McCone. McCone is a successful businessman and engineer who was also on the Air Policy Commission. He has drive and organizing ability to a high degree without any of the bluster sometimes associated with those capacities.

McCone is pushing through an aircraft procurement program that has begun to get rolling in a big way. Within 2 years the number of air groups will be approximately doubled for a total of 84. This is on the basis of reopening plants that were closed or partially closed at the end of World War II. By constructing new plants it is estimated that 168 groups could be created by the end of 1952.

Already 25 air bases have been reopened since June. Soon the personnel of the Air Force will be nearly double the 412,000 in the service at the time of the Korean attack.

The pride and joy of the team of Finletter and McCone is the big new B–47 jet bomber. Units equipped with the B–47 will be ready by the end of 1951 or perhaps even earlier. While its actual cruising speed and range are still secret, it is known that it will travel at 600 miles and over and carry the atomic bomb at that speed.

Finletter flew in the B–47 the other day. He sat at the controls and reported later that he was a bit startled when the pilot told him to make a 180-degree turn with the plane traveling at hair-raising speed. Be-

yond the B–47 is the B–52, which is an even longer jump into the supersonic world.

According to advices believed as trustworthy as most, the best long-range bomber the Russians have is an improved B–29. They are believed to be working on a B–36 type. But the important fact is that the improved B–29 can carry a Russian atomic bomb to targets in the United States. And the Air Force has never tried to conceal the fact that a certain number of those bombs would get through any defense now in sight.

But the retaliation to be meted out by a greatly expanded Air Force would be terrible. The threat of this retaliation will, it is hoped, keep the peace in the coming critical months while the land power of the North Atlantic nations is being built. If that is the outcome, thanks will be due in no small part to the production drive of the past 6 months. It is an example that could be followed in other fields where defense production has lagged.

Is It Immoral To Strike First if Attack Is Imminent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president, Georgetown University and regent, School of Foreign Service, appearing in the Washington Star under date of December 29, 1950:

IS IT IMMORAL TO STRIKE FIRST IF ATTACK IS IMMINENT?—A STRONG CASE IS MADE THAT THE UNITED STATES IS NOT MORALLY BOUND TO WAIT FOR A BLOW THAT MIGHT CRIPPLE IT BEYOND REPRISAL AND MEAN PRACTICAL ANNIHILATION

(By Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president, Georgetown University; regent, School of Foreign Service)

The President's proclamation of December 16, declaring a state of national emergency, marked the end of what is probably the most amazing and confused chapter in the history of American foreign policy. The official description and recognition of the objectives of world communism by the Presidential decree put the issue, at long last, exactly where it belongs. The final confrontation has been reached between the two great centers of world power whose basic and irreconcilable character was frankly described by Soviet authorities many years ago. They never had a moment's doubt as to the inevitable clash that must ensue.

Lenin knew it and warned his followers:

"We live * * * not only in a state but a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist states (i. e., non-Communist states) for a long time is unthinkable. In the end either one or the other will conquer. And until that end comes, a series of the most terrible collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

After citing this fundamental Soviet doctrine, Stalin once added the laconic remark: "Clear, one would think."

VISHINSKY'S WORDS ARE HOLLOW

In 1927 he likewise declared to a visiting delegation of American workers:

"Thus in the course of further development of international revolution two centers will form on a world scale. * * * The struggle of these two centers for the possession of the world economy will decide the fate of capitalism and communism in the whole world."

The hard core, the stronghold, and arsenal of the non-Communist forces in this conflict with Soviet communism are the United States—a diagnosis which Stalin confirmed in his interview with former Governor Stassen in 1947. Neither he nor any Leninist believes in the continued coexistence of these two opposing worlds of economic thought and moral ideals. The protestations of peaceful intent spoken by Vishinsky in the United Nations are only the actors' lines of a prepared script designed to distract the audience from an approaching Pearl Harbor.

It is for that inevitable, titanic Armageddon that Soviet rearmament has been in preparation since 1945. There is, consequently, a recognizable logicality in Soviet maneuvers, whether on the diplomatic front or in their territorial aggrandizements, which makes Soviet conduct coldly consistent and not an enigma, or a puzzle, as some unhistoric minds imagine. The Politburo has ordred many a zigzag, to be sure, but their over-all strategy reveals the most coherent national policy and effective staff planning observable on the stage of international relations for the past 30 years. Look at a map of the world. Something like 800,000,000 human beings are now directly or indirectly under the control of Moscow—which means approximately one-third of the human race.

NO MORE BATTLE FRONTS

The place of A-bombs and H-bombs in this complex clash of power between east and west is, like the ghost of Banquo, the uninvited guest at every international conference. Ready to scrap the advantage conferred by those ghastly weapons if all other nations would agree to effective controls, the Government of the United States has been blocked by the constant veto of Soviet Russia. Thus, she gains time while the sands run out—till she has a stockpile of atomic bombs. Hence, regretfully but categorically, President Truman announced on April 6, 1949, that he would authorize use of atomic bombs again, should the dreaded necessity arise and if the welfare of the United States and the democracies of the world are at stake. "I hope and pray," he added, "that will never be necessary."

The frightful effects of that dreadful weapon are known by personal observation to the present writer, as he spent some 10 days in the ruins of Hiroshima in 1947 and interviewed many of the victims who survived the tragedy. The ethical problem of employing such a lethal weapon which, by the very nature and intensity of the explosion, will exterminate thousands upon thousands of civilians and innocent bystanders not directly employed in military activities, is not easy to resolve. Discussion of that moral aspect is made intricate and inconclusive, moreover, by the new and inescapable fact of total warfare.

The degeneration in international conduct since 1939 and the evil of total war have produced profound public consequences. There is no longer a battle front in the conventional sense; there is no longer a defined and limited zone of combat occupied by military forces, by men who are expected to run the risks of soldiers, leaving a rear territory inhabited by civilians not subject to the same hazards under the old concept of warfare. Today the total population is involved; the needs of technological developments embrace so much organization for armament and for supply that the battle front has moved into every city, town and village. There is no rear; there is no escape; and there is no shield of legal status. What is of immediate concern, then, is definition and clarification of the issue raised by President Truman's reference to necessity and the welfare of the United States, followed by his authorization to proceed with production of the hydrogen bomb.

Direct assault launched against us by an enemy who is known to have the atomic bomb—and no power would now attack the United States without it—raises one type of question not too difficult to answer. We should have no alternative but to retaliate in kind. A second question is more compelling and it is with this that we are here concerned: Would the United States be justified in launching an immediate atomic attack against an enemy power before it could use that devastating weapon against our cities? Under any hypothesis, the answer is extremely difficult to formulate, both for ethical and historical reasons. Our every tradition and instinct as a people, as well as conscience itself, recoils before such a dread alternative even in self-defense, although few moralists will insist that we must wait until the enemy delivers the first atomic blow. Under the new conditions of the atomic age such an aggression might very well be fatal, not only to a vast number of individuals, as is obvious, but to our entire system of national defense and to our existence as a nation. Clearly, atomic bombs would be used under title of defense only, a claim that would be set up by every nation. Hence, the concept and term "defense" must be clarified, both by definition and through application to concrete circumstances.

The use of force for legitimate self-defense is conferred by the natural law. This moral justification to repel an unjust aggressor by means reasonably adapted and proportionate to the nature of the attack, is the right not only of individuals but of the state as well. In the case of the state, it goes further still; it becomes an obligation, in view of the duty incumbent on government to safeguard the lives, the liberty, and the temporal welfare of citizens vewed individually and collectively. In total war the attack is no longer limited to acknowledged military tragets; it is leveled against whole peoples as peoples.

The problem, then, involves questions relating to the certainty and immediacy of an attack under given circumstances as well as to the special nature of some new defensive weapon. In the evolution of human relationships from primitive to modern and complex, the elements of certainty and immediacy have varied in step with the development of weapons of attack. Primitive man was justified in exercising his right to strike a preventive blow when he saw a bare fist descending upon him at arm's length, or a stone lifted against him. In the course of time he saw an ax uplifted, a dagger drawn, then a sword thrust at him, then a spear leveled, then an arrow fitted to a bowstring. The danger, though moving back in space, was still immediate and certain in time. With the invention of gunpowder, the assailant moved farther and farther away; but no basic change was introduced in the elements of certainty and immediacy of attack. Then, long-range artillery, though discharging explosives from emplacements even out of sight and miles away, could menace life and limb with equal certaintly and immediacy.

DISTANCE MEANS LITTLE

Now comes the age of air power, with military aviation carrying flaming death from bases located 3,000, 5,000 miles away. Aircraft carriers far out at sea, flying mombs, guided missiles, jet bombs, and atomic explosives can now be a certain and immediate menace from ever-growing distances in this era of global-minded warfare. Who shall maintain that the substantive and inherent right of self-defense is canceled out by an accidental circumstance or by the ingenuity of an aggressor in a chemical laboratory?

The Japanese Air Force which bombed Pearl Harbor was carried to a point designated for the take-off by a fleet of war vessels, including carriers, which, we now know, left

the northern Japanese port of Tankan Wan on November 26, 1941, for the attack delivered on December 7. The attacking planes took off from the decks of their carriers at a point approximately 230 miles north of Pearl Harbor. It would be a tortured interpretation of the right of self-defense to deny the corresponding right to have intercepted and destroyed that advancing menace at any point, near or far.

Should history repeat itself and produce a Soviet feint in some remote area of Asia or the Middle East, it will be the signal for those burnt once in the fire of such deceit to keep their eyes fixed on the Northwest and Arctic sector of our American defense system.

AN APPALLING RESPONSIBILITY

If the Government of the United States has sound reason to believe (that is, has moral certitude) that a similar attack is being mounted and ready to be launched against this country from any source, then it would appear that President Truman would be morally justified to take defensive measures proportionate to the danger. That would mean use of the atomic bomb, as no power would launch a surprise attack on the United States without an adequate supply of atomic bombs. Should large numbers of civilians be harmed by American necessity to use the bomb in self-defense, that regrettable effect, not intended as such, would be attributable to what moralists describe as the indirect voluntary. An attack against us would have to be sudden, unannounced, sufficiently devastating, and so widespread in coverage as to cripple our powers of reprisal; the reply to any partial crippling would be so overwhelmingly atomic that no aggressive government could risk the gamble without certainty of success. Losing the gamble under present conditions of warfare would mean practical annihilation.

This argument presupposes, as its crucial premise, accuracy of information, honest information, competent information, and an alert intelligence service. If time permitted, a warning or an ultimatum to an enemy found to be preparing such an attack should be given. But, with or without ultimatum, I personally see no immorality, though much tragedy and horror of consequences, in the Government of the United States choosing the lesser of two evils. Neither reason nor theology, nor morals require men or nations to commit suicide by requiring that we must await the first blow from a power with no moral inhibitions and when, as in the case now under consideration, the attack would surely include bombardment by atomic missiles.

Even Christ himself did not disdain to seize a lash and drive the hypocrites out of the temple. But what an appalling responsibility is now laid on military intelligence, on diplomatic vigilance, and on all related security agencies which gather and analyze information in this atomic age.

General MacArthur Thanks Representative Rogers for Her Prayer for the Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of December 26, 1950:

GENERAL MACARTHUR THANKS REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS FOR HER PRAYER FOR THE TROOPS

WASHINGTON, December 26.—"Whatever the odds against us, we will do our best," Gen. Douglas MacArthur today cabled Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, of Lowell.

The supreme commander's message was in response to a Christmas prayer offered in Congress by Representative ROGERS last Thursday. The Lowell Republican said at that time: "We can unite in sending the men in Korea our prayers, our love, and deep gratitude for what they are doing for us. We can pledge ourselves never for one instant to cease to care for them and to see that their sacrifices are not in vain."

General MacArthur replied today: "All ranks join me in thanks and deep appreciation for your message. Whatever the odds against us, we will do our best.

"MACARTHUR."

The World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NEW PALTZ, N. Y., *December 21, 1950.*
Mr. ED ROSELL,
Care of Poughkeepsie New Yorker,
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

DEAR ED: You have asked for this and I am sending it over. It is hard to refuse the request of a fellow who has always been fair and that's exactly the way I feel after 8 years in dealing with you on various national problems concerning our welfare. I hope however your readers will not think I'm trying to inject my views for any political reason and at a time when my voting power is fast coming to an end.

I firmly believe we are in this world picture today faced with the problem of survival. The fate of 150,000,000 Americans is at stake and also the future of humanity. I believe my record in Congress shows I have always weighed our problems with real concern, thinking first of our national welfare and secondly of the welfare of my own constituents. After visiting war-torn Europe with members of the Postwar Planning Committee, immediately following VJ-day in 1945, I honestly felt that it was the humane duty of America to help those poor unfortunate displaced people to be rehabilitated and to aid in rebuilding their facilities to the point where they could again become self sufficient.

After the Korean war started and these nations which have received so much American aid had the opportunity to really show their appreciation, through the United Nations, my attitude changed. I won't go as far as some commentators, by calling the United Nations a "tea drinking aggregate of diplomats," but we must admit they haven't accomplished much to date. Because of their regulations, one group has been able to veto any constructive program and we have had to carry practically the whole load. Don't think for 1 minute that the parents of the boys who have been fighting in Korea are not aware of this situation. Every true American is pretty much caught up with our furnishing the men, the equipment and the money to fight a war 7,000 miles away, while the diplomats at the UN bicker. There isn't a thing we want in the Far East, nor in Europe, not an inch of land and the whole world knows it. As soon as one voices even such a statement, he is labeled an isolationist. I'm not fearful of such a label—my record shows I have supported every move to stop the spread of communism, and that's been the main motive back of every foreign aid piece of legislation. The situation today has proved that our foreign policy, if there has been one, has been wrong. The present administration has proved that you can't buy respect and friendship with other countries any more than you and I can as individuals. Our money has been used to support a socialist government in Britain and they in turn have traded our goods with Russia. Similar stories are told relative to other countries who have accepted our ECA funds. England and France today want to appease Red China and imply the threat that if we don't go along, they will be unable to stand with us. How long can this continue? How long can the American people afford to be bled white? How long can we afford to deplete our natural resources? How long can we keep devaluating our dollar? And how long can we sacrifice our greatest asset, the youth of our Nation?

I say, the time has come to call a halt. We have been misled—Stalin is laughing up his sleeve at the confusion we are in, with practically not a man lost. Our "powers that be" even refuse to consider the aid of well trained Nationalist Chinese troops to help our boys in the Far East, better to use our American boys for the slaughter. We have lost face in the Far East already and I'm for saving all the boys we can in that area. Likewise I'm for keeping our troops out of Europe, at least till the European countries make a concerted effort to save themselves. Europeans are now telling us, our danger is in Europe. Our danger is here at home. I shudder to think of what could happen. Any individual with the slightest degree of subversive leanings toward undermining our American system, should be treated as a traitor. Our first duty today is to keep America strong, I'll go further and include the Western Hemisphere. When we entered World War I, we first ignored the basic concept of the Monroe Doctrine. Our troubles have increased ever since.

From the time I visited Russia in 1945 when they were supposed to be our friends, I have advocated that America must remain a citadel of strength, as force was the only language the Russians understood. Our President was told this upon our return. That statement was brushed aside with, "I've heard this before, boys, and from now on we will be firm." You know the story. The administration's policy has been one of appeasement. The President's refusal to take advice and his major appointments made purely for political expediency, has been a costly program. The American people have lost confidence, but Mr. Truman isn't going to resign, neither is he going to be impeached. He received the votes of the majority of the people. We, as a Nation, must at this Christmas time turn to prayer and trust that our Chief Executive will surround himself with the best men in this Nation for advice. Call it a tough attitude if you must, but let's make America a citadel of strength and notify the world that if we are ever forced into another world war we are going in it to win—with no mercy for the conquered and no funds for rehabilitation. I shall never sell America short. We have the strength and the where-with-all to maintain our leading world position. We have chosen freedom and with that spirit, if necessary, we must put the fear of God before

the aggressor nations, so not one of them would dare start a war. Let's stop being "Uncle Sap."

This opportunity to express my latest views on the greatest of our national problems is very much appreciated. Although I'm looking forward with a great deal of enthusiasm and pleasure to again running my business in New Paltz, my native town, I shall always have you, my constituents, to thank for a broad and most interesting experience in Washington. It will not be an easy change. I shall miss the contacts with friends in the District and in Washington. I regret that I could not have left office in a world well on the way to everlasting peace. In the early spring, when I announced my decision, we were beginning to have hope. Then came the Korean war. Surprise, disappointment, gloom fell over all of us. I have confidence in my successor and the majority of the Representatives. Recent events will change the thinking of all true Americans. Our mistakes in the past must now be avoided. As Christians we are confident that right will win and as such, all of us must follow daily and extend to the far corners of the world, the phrase so often repeated at each Christmas time, "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

Very sincerely yours,

JAY LEFEVRE,
United States Congressman.

National Commander of Catholic War Veterans Calls for Common Sacrifice in Present Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Donald J. McQuade, national commander of the Catholic War Veterans which appeared in the Catholic War Veterans' monthly paper. The article entitled "Emergency This" follows:

EMERGENCY THIS

(By Don J. McQuade)

It becomes apparent as the critical stages of the present global situation wend their ways, propelled by basic materialistic and atheistic programs of complacency and anti-God idealism, that we, Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, white and black, man and woman have come to the end of the proverbial rope. This endangers, not only our lives but the lives and well-being of our children; not only our religion, but all sound Christian ideals; not only our American way, but the only progressive hope of the suppressed peoples of the world.

We need not go far to find the use of materialistic and atheistic programs; need not analyze the mind of the self-styled atheist; need not question the attitude of our neighbors; but, definitely ask ourselves what we have done with the gifts of liberty, freedom, and justice. Have we used our freedom individually, to stanchly defend and promote true Americanism—as only a private citizen can?—or have we been materialistically complacent in our duties to God, to our country, and to one another.

Throughout history, the severest struggle of mankind has been to obtain liberty in keeping with his dignity as a human being, and so necessary for the fulfillment of his most sacred aspirations.

Yet during the world wars, our people have too often stated openly, "why are we fighting, what do we owe this cause?" Yes, and today, even in face of utter domination and complete destruction of our ideals, at any time, we have been warned, may come the claw of the hammer and sickle to disjoint the links of a free unity, and in its stead, proclaim a slave state, we are still complacent. Where? Not in Poland, it has happened there; not in Czechoslovakia, it has happened there; not in Yugoslavia, there too, it has happened; no, for none of these already conquered territories is there fear, but for the articulate and carefully laid plan of control and domination of these United States.

The iron curtain is not able to keep from our minds, our hearts, and our bodies the sting of terror and loss of ideals that Russia is continuing to expound. But, yet, in face of this peril that could befall us, our people, American people still find themselves liberal with their liberty, free with their freedom and irreligious with their religion; i. e., our Supreme Court upholds godlessness as a part of liberty, and anti-Americanism as a part of freedom, and our churches, during special prayers for peace, continue to be unattended.

The tenets necessary for the period which we are experiencing will go down in history as mere words, if there is not an immediate rejuvenation of the ideals upon which our great Nation was founded. We must vigorously move to restore the faith of our people in God as the Supreme Ruler and the Guarantor of inalienable rights.

However, the news of the hour will not allow us to be presumptuous. At once, we must make ourselves and our families ready for sacrifices that we have never known, to assure for our generation and the generations to come, the continuance of life with inalienable rights.

There is a crying need for the stoppage of the disconcerting decay that is occurring within. Americans must overnight refortify themselves with the knowledge of the principles of Christ, and of our country, and a sincere demonstration of them. Our children must be taught the principles of restraint and discipline; the mother and father, to respect their sacred contract; employers, to take an honest interest in the rights of employees; employees, to take cognizance of the rights of employers; and all of us, to consider and appreciate our basic liberties in the light in which they were bestowed upon us by our Creator.

In complete trust that Americans and other free peoples of the world still have within them the native ability to defend and protect their liberties, we believe that the threatening fangs of terror with which Russia is striking, will give to all of us, who can be called upon to be the world defenders of freedom, a new and invigorated will. Only through sacrifice, sweat and determination and with the help of God, will freedom be restored to suppressed, helpless people, and will freedom be protected in our loved land. Only then can we ourselves enjoy real progressiveness, progressiveness in the fear and love of God, progressiveness in the American way.

Many of us will be recalled to military status. Our leaving will cause certain sadness and sacrifice to our wives and mothers of our children. Our women may be mustered to bolster our defenses. Our industry will be called upon to produce untold quantities; our scientists and technicians will be found working far into the night. Our Government officials will be bound by a deeper sense of responsibilities, and keener consideration of decisions.

No room for profiteers, no basis for strikes, no realm for politics, no place for the weak, no time for the slacker—emergency this.

Air Power and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this House an address made recently at the annual dinner of the Aero Club of Washington. The occasion was the anniversary of the flight of the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk 47 years ago. The speaker was marshal of the Royal Air Force, Lord Tedder, currently in Washington as British representative on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The theme of the speech was the potentialities of air power.

I suggest—

Lord Tedder said—

that the best tribute we here can pay to the men we commemorate this evening is for each one of us during the coming year to do all that lies in our power to insure that the immense potentialities of aviation are fully developed and utilized. If we do, we may enable the free world to acquire unity and strength in time to prevent the crime and folly of another world war.

Mr. Speaker, United States participation in the Korean war revealed at home political animosities, interservice jealousies, and basic misconceptions both of national and military matters that should have disappeared long ago. Perhaps they did not because we are as a nation a young people, strong in our partisanship, intense in our enthusiasm, and determined in our convictions. Because we are the counsel of the British Air Marshal Lord Tedder, a man of mature military experience and a representative of a nation that has remained strong and free for almost a thousand years, may prove of value to us. The British long ago learned that survival must frequently be purchased at the price of change and sacrifice. It is a lesson we too must learn—as a people and in spite of our individual prejudices and loyalties—if we are to retain our freedom in face of the great danger with which we are presently faced.

Lord Tedder observed:

I am sure you do not think for a moment that it was easy for the United Kingdom with its world-wide commitments and its historical tradition to accept in peacetime a firm commitment to provide land forces for the defense of the continent of Europe; still less easy, I imagine, was it for your country to take the revolutionary step of committing your forces far from your own great continent. It has not been particularly easy for the people in the United Kingdom, just when they were beginning to see their way clear from the austerities they had accepted as the price of victory to face the prospect of a return to austerity as the price of peace. I am sure it has not been easy for the Royal Navy to accept the position that they no longer have the lion's share of the United Kingdom defense votes. These and similar sacrifices have been deliberately and willingly accepted in my own and other countries. Still more will be called for and none of them will be easy. Might it even be that

your great industry might accept the, to you, drastic step of producing British types?

These are the words of a statesman and a philosopher. They are reminiscent of the words of another British statesman, one of the great leaders of our time. Speaking at the midcentury convocation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology on his last visit to the United States, Winston Churchill said:

For good or ill air mastery is today the supreme expression of military power.

Lord Tedder understands this, and it is something that the American people must understand. On whether we do understand this or not our future will be decided.

In the address of Lord Tedder an interesting fact is given. There were more British Army casualties during 4 weeks of the battle of the Somme in 1916 than the total British and Dominion army casualties for the last 11 months of the war in Europe, D-day 1944 to VE-day 1945. Thus, even in military operations, air power can save lives.

On the commercial side, aviation produces speed and ease of movement and communication. It makes it possible for national leaders to meet in person, rather than through the unsatisfactory medium of diplomatic correspondence—and so find more easily a solution to the problems of the times. In this way, air power can help to prevent wars.

But above and beyond this, the air is a great levelers, a great equalizer, as Lord Tedder observed, "not in the sense of reducing everyone to the lowest common denominator, but in the sense of putting everyone onto equal terms with each other." Thus aviation takes us a step closer to the fundamental goal of our own Declaration of Independence—freedom and equality for all.

Mr. Speaker, it is freedom of the air and the freedom air power can bring, that must be the goal of all our current efforts. The United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and other activities in which we are engaged have this goal as one of the main aims of their existence. But there is much we can do alone, apart from our cooperation with other nations. If by building a strong air power we can prevent war, insure freedom, and strengthen unity, then let us accept the challenge of Lord Tedder. Let us decide for freedom, democracy and survival. In tribute to those Ohio brothers who first conquered the air, let us do all that lies within our power to insure the development of American air power superior to any other in the world.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Marshal of the Royal Air Force Lord Tededr, at the annual Wright memorial dinner of the Aero Club of Washington on December 16, 1950.

The remarks are as follows:

One not infrequently hears it said that the invention of the aeroplane has proved to be an utter curse to mankind. That view is, of course, based on the use of the aeroplane as an instrument of war and not unnaturally, views are apt to vary with the circumstances. In 1940 and 1941 there were certainly many, many British soldiers, sailors, and civilians who regretted that aircraft had ever been invented; on the other hand in 1944–45 none of us were under any illusion that the reentry into Europe and the defeat of the great Reichswehr would have been possible had it not been for the work done before and during that campaign by the Allied air forces. Your marines, with whom there was I believe a small British marine commando, have just paid eloquent tribute to what the air did for them during their heroic struggle back to the coast. But it is difficult to assess exactly what air power means and perhaps some slight factual indication can be seen when one remembers that the British Army casualties during 4 weeks of the battle on the Somme in 1916 were more than the total British and Dominion army casualties from D-day in 1944 to the surrender in May 1945. People sometimes talk of the good old days before the aeroplane interfered—I don't think they were very good days and I do know that by shortening the last war, air power saved countless lives. I also know that unless we are prepared to meet the hordes of human cannon fodder which are the mainstay of the dictators' power with similar masses of human cannon fodder—a process which goes contrary to all the beliefs and instincts of western civilization—we must have overwhelming air power for our defense. And, since I do not believe that all dictators are fools, I believe that if we have that power, we may yet prevent a major war from breaking out long enough for the world to recover its sanity and avoid suicide. Are we sure we are building up the air power we need?

The other main attribute of aviation which I think immediately comes to mind is that of speed—speed of movement, speed of communication, etc. On that again there are differing views. Some people seem to regard speed as being a good thing in itself. Personally I do not. It can be most inconvenient and confusing and I have had all sorts of clock trouble traveling about this continent of yours.

No, in my view it is not the speed so much as the ease with which, thanks to aviation, it is now possible for responsible people who normally live and work thousands of miles apart to get together within a matter of hours and discuss mutual problems in a direct and personal manner, for which no amount of letters, cables, or intermediaries can provide an effective substitute. Personal contact is the only sure way of attaining mutual understanding, and mutual understanding is the only basis on which unity of interest can be translated into unity of action. The recent conversations which aviation alone made possible between your President and the British Prime Minister will, I am sure, prove to be an important step forward toward real unity of action. This is an outstanding example but one could quote scores of others to show what a vital unifying factor aviation is now and can be in the future.

During my service with the RAF and especially during the past 10 years I have again and again been impressed by the camaraderie, the fellowship, which seems to unite those whose ways lie in the air. In some subtle way the air is a great leveler—a great equalizer, not in the sense of reducing everyone to the lowest common denominator, but in the sense of putting everyone on to equal terms with each other. Rank, nationality, politics, all these and similar distinctions which are usually so apt to appear so important fall back into what I personally believe to be their more correct position of relative unimportance and irrelevance when two or three airmen are gathered together. I have specially noticed this in my relations with airmen of other countries, so much so that I instinctively shrink from using the word "foreign"—it seems out of place to speak of foreign airmen. Moreover, proof that this fellowship of the air is in fact a practical unifying force can be seen in the fact that in the discussions and arrangements aiming at insuring a common security for all of us it has been in the field of air defense that progress has been most easy and most real—simply because airmen think in a common language though nations may talk in different tongues. I believe that the fellowship of the air is doing great work in unifying the free world and can do still greater work—not by breaking down national barriers—if you try and break them down someone is sure to try and build them up again stronger than ever—but by infiltrating through them.

There is no doubt that in the free world there is a very great measure of unity of thought and belief as to the basic principles of freedom. But if we are to preserve our freedom that is not enough. We need unity in action and that must be backed by unified power.

That of course was, and still is, one of the main aims of the United Nations. Unfortunately that organization is still disunited and in the meantime and within UNO we developed the Western Union and are now developing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to provide for an effective unified defense for western civilization. The vital need for such a step was not, I think, fully realized in all quarters until the red light shone in Korea. But even now I often wonder whether people really appreciate what a revolutionary—and consequently what an immensely difficult—thing we are trying to do. Here we are—a collection of 12 nations—each of us intensely democratic, each of us intensely conscious of and proud of our national identity, our national traditions, facing up, in so-called peacetime, to the problem of building up a unified defense which will call for a closer cooperation between 12 nations even than that attained between the British Commonwealth and the United States after 2 or 3 years of war. We are no bunch of satellites doomed to toe a party line emanating from Washington, London, or Paris—or even from Moscow. No, we are a team of very sturdy individualists who, in order to preserve what we believe to be the very first principles of civilization, are prepared to pool our resources, to set aside some of our national and service traditions, to undertake commitments which previously we have steadfastly refused, and even to waive some of what we would normally jealously guard as our national sovereign rights. It will be done—but don't let anyone imagine that it has been or is going to be an easy job. One would have thought that experience of the last war would have made it clear beyond all doubt that the three services, sea, land, and air were utterly interdependent, that in fact they are not three separate services, but three parts of a fighting unity. And yet, though one would expect the strength of national traditions to make unification of defense difficult, I am inclined to think that interservice jealousies and the rigidity of individual service traditions are still, in various countries the greatest obstacles to be overcome.

I am sure you do not think for a moment that it was easy for the United Kingdom with its world-wide commitments and its historical tradition to accept in peacetime a firm commitment to provide land forces for the defense of the continent of Europe; still less easy, I imagine, was it for your country to take the revolutionary step of committing your forces far from your own great continent. It has not been particularly easy for the people in the United Kingdom, just when they were beginning to see their way clear from the austerities they had accepted as the price of victory to face the prospect of a return to austerity as the price of peace. I am sure it has not been easy for the Royal Navy to accept the position that they no longer have the lion's share

of the United Kingdom defense votes. These and similar sacrifices have been deliberately and willingly accepted in my own and other countries. Still more will be called for and none of them will be easy. Might it even be that your great industry might accept the, to you drastic step of producing British types?

The root of the whole problem as I see it is that our freedom is at stake, our national freedom and our individual freedom; for that we are prepared to fight, and to fight to the death. But since another world war, whatever its military result, might well bring the end of our civilization our primary object is to prevent another world war.

Aggressors in the past have of course always had the initial advantage of being militarily prepared; they have also been able to rely on and in fact been enticed by, not only the unpreparedness of their chosen victim but also complete disunity amongst those who would otherwise be willing to help the victim. Remedy the unpreparedness and substitute unity for disunity and aggression won't appear half so tempting. In the meantime it must be made clear to the world that aggression does not pay. The unresolved problem of Korea is a clear warning to us that time is not on our side unless we use it to better purpose in unifying the defenses of western civilization. I suggest that the best tribute we here can pay to the men we commemorate this evening is for each one of us during the coming year to do all that lies in our power to ensure that the immense potentialities of aviation are fully developed and utilized. If we do, we may enable the free world to acquire unity and strength in time to prevent the crime and folly of another world war.

Address by Henry Ford II at National Farm Bureau Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, On December 13, 1950, Mr. Henry Ford II, president of the Ford Motor Co., delivered an important address to the annual convention of the National Farm Bureau Federation in Fair Park Auditorium, Dallas, Tex.

While there are some portions of it with which I do not entirely agree, it is in the main most constructive and helpful.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARSENAL OF HOPE

I am very happy to be here with you this morning.

Over the years, Ford Motor Co. has had warm associations with the Farm Bureau and with all American farmers and farm groups. A cornerstone in the policy of our company since the days of the model T has been "One foot in the factory and one foot on the soil." That policy is as sound today as it was 50 years ago, and all of us in Dearborn continue to live by it.

But since the days of the model T lots of things have happened to this world of ours to draw us even more closely together. And it seems to me an excellent time to take stock right now—at the end of a year which winds up the first half of the twentieth century.

We have lived through two gigantic World Wars—and a cold war which has broken out into another ominous conflict.

It may be trite to say that the meaning of these two wars and what has happened since is that we now live in one world. But that is the simple fact of the matter.

And the result is that today the United States of America has become the arsenal of hope of that one world.

What is going on not only affects the ways in which we may be able to go about our daily lives; it threatens to affect the human freedoms which Americans have always been ready to defend with their lives.

As I see it, three kinds of people all over the world are today looking to the United States as the great arsenal of hope.

First, there are the hundreds of millions of people in nations ruled by ruthless and power-hungry men. These people have lost their freedom. The only way they can recover this most priceless of all human possessions is through thought and speech and action. But they may not think or talk or act freely, under penalty of death. They must think as they are told to think, speak as they are told to speak, act as they are told to act. They are prisoners looking through the occasional slits in the iron curtain toward the hope that is the United States.

Second, there are hundreds of millions of people in nations who believe in human freedom and are still free to maintain their freedom. But they have been so weakened by events of the past two decades that they no longer have the strength to stand up to aggressors who would enslave them. They are weak and need time and help to recuperate. They, too, pin their hopes on us.

Third, there are the millions of people who are free and have been fortunate—people like ourselves. We, too, look to the United States of America as our arsenal of hope. We have confidence in ourselves. We have seen what we as a people can do to meet threats to our peace, our freedom, and our search for happiness. We know what our secret weapon is—the infinite resourcefulness, the infinite creative and productive ability of 150,000,000 free human beings acting together toward a common goal.

It is popular in some quarters to accuse the American people of having become so preoccupied with material things as to have lost a sense of moral and spiritual values.

Such critics miss the point completely.

Of course we are proud of our automobiles and oil burners; our electric refrigerators and dishwashers; our radios and bulldozers; our bridges and skyscrapers. Furthermore, we are never satisfied with them, but seek to make them better and invent new ones. Each, in a way, is a milestone on the road of our pursuit of happiness. Each, in some way, eliminates human drudgery and increases what we like to call our high standard of living.

But we do not forget for one moment that we have these things because we are free to create them.

Life without freedom is being chained to slavish misery—a vicious circle at its most vicious, with each day whittling away a little more of each man's personal hope for bettering himself.

The pursuit of happiness is slow enough and difficult enough under the best of circumstances. Without individual rights to basic human freedoms, no people can embark upon it. And our millions of telephones and deep-freezes and television sets are only a measure, though a very good one, of the ever-widening circle of our moral and spiritual progress.

It seems to me just as wrong when leaders sit back with a smile and tell us that everything is going to be all right. Sure, things are going to be all right, but only if we make them all right. And we need to know all that can be known about what is wrong and what we can do to make it right.

The only way I know of dealing with a problem is to understand it as best I can, take stock on how well equipped I am to deal with it, decide what to do, and then to act. After that—I suspect like most of you—I usually have to start the process all over again. That is, reexamine the situation as it may have changed, and figure out something else to do.

What is the situation?

I don't want to oversimplify matters, but what's going on at the moment, as I understand it, is that another bunch of well-organized and well-equipped gangsters is on the loose and hell-bent on making our One World a world of slavery. They threaten our lives, our properties, our liberties, as well as the lives and liberties of freedom-loving people everywhere. It is no idle threat, either, because organized communism with headquarters in Russia has made itself strong and powerful.

What have we got to do about it?

The answer can be as simply stated. On the one hand, we have to get, and stay, mighty in military strength to guard ourselves against this threat of force. Prudence suggests that we help our friends to get strong, too, so that we won't have to stand alone. On the other hand, we've got to continue progress in our peacetime pursuits. For in the long run we can really lick this situation only by keeping our own economy strong and healthy and progressive.

In other words, we've got to strengthen our right hand to do what we normally have two hands to do. And our left hand must be toughened into a powerful mailed fist that can meet force with force as may become necessary.

Stalin expects us to fall on our collective face on both jobs.

Now it seems obvious to me that if that is the gigantic twofold job ahead of us, we cannot afford the luxury of business and politics as usual; of being just farmers and stockholders and managers and union members, each of us jockeying for special advantage in a highly competitive world. We become once again—as we have in every national emergency—Americans together, a nation of resourceful free human beings bent on justifying once more our confidence in ourselves and the faith of hundreds of millions of others in us.

A striking example of this individual initiative and resourcefulness came to my attention recently.

Charles Lauritsen, professor of physics at the California Institute of Technology, helped our Armed Forces to develop the "shaped charge" idea used in our rocket projectiles. Sitting in his Pasadena home soon after the Korean war started, he learned that our projectiles were failing to pierce the Russian-made tanks operated by the North Koreans. He took off immediately for the Navy Missile Center, deep in the California desert, to find out why. Within a few hours he and other top scientists showed how the difficulty could be remedied. Within 3 weeks from that time the improved projectile knocked out its first tank in Korea.

As I see it, the job ahead boils down to this—in the language of Prof. Sumner Slichter, of Harvard:

"Our conflict with Russia is not merely a competition in arms; it is fundamentally a contest in production—and a long-run contest."

Now, a production race is something I understand. As the most productive farmers in all the history of the world, that is something you understand, too. Americans are production proud, and have a right to be.

"Only the productive can be strong," said Wendell Willkie, "and only the strong can be free."

If that is the guts of the solution—greatly increased production—production for peace as well as production for war to keep the peace—then the world is right in looking to us as the great arsenal of hope. For production is our dish.

And if increased production is the one way out of this serious situation, then maybe we ought to place the military side of it, and the diplomatic side, and all the other sides of our problem in the hands of the best people we can find who are trained in those things—and insist upon a free track and a green light and lots of elbow room to get on with the kind of job we know how to do—raising American production all along the line.

Now, of course, it isn't as simple as that. For one thing, we have to have leadership—the kind of bold, fearless leadership that tells us the truth about changing situations, gives us the score on how we're doing, and tells us what more we have to do. Americans don't like to be told the situation is serious after we lose a battle. We have a right to be told before the battle is fought.

We've got to have organization, too, to keep us from flying off in a thousand different directions. We will undoubtedly have to have rules and regulations and temporary controls—what we have come to call Government controls. That isn't bad in itself. It's as American as apple pie to have organization and controls—if it's done right.

To my way of thinking, government is the servant of all of us. We create governments to do for us as a group what none of us is strong enough to do individually. I get my dander up over Government controls only when the servant starts thinking of itself as the master—when people in Government get the idea that it is their job to plan our lives and order us to do things that we do better ourselves in our own way. And there are things we as Americans insist upon doing ourselves just because it's too dangerous to allow a Central Government to do them for us—though government might even, for a short time, do a better job.

And like all the rest of you, I reserve the right to squawk about the job the servant is doing. I certainly reserve the right to change my mind when the ballot box comes around again. As long as Americans can continue to do that, I'm not going to worry too much.

We at Ford Motor Co. are already having to cut back production because of Government limitations on the use of aluminum, copper, zinc, nickel, and other materials. Our position is simply this: we will willingly and without protest accept emergency regulations and cut-backs in our production schedules whenever it is in the national interest. We ask only that such emergency actions be taken systematically and with full disclosure of their necessity. It would be silly to ask us to lay off men, for example, without a compelling reason; we believe that cut-backs on civilian goods should, as far as possible, allow men to transfer directly to work on military goods.

For if there is one thing we cannot afford in a production race, it is to have men and machinery idle. The same thing applies to you as farmers—the United States cannot let good land and good men go unused, when the free world needs your produce.

There are other hurdles along the production raceway, too.

For example, economists remind us that each year the technological increase in productivity of our Nation amounts to about 2 percent. That is, new inventions, new and improved machines and plants, plus better human effort, enable us to produce 2 percent more each year. On top of that, the labor force normally increases each year by about 1 percent. Taking these two items together, it means that every year, on the average, we increase our ability to produce by about 3 percent.

This is the figure, then, that we must try to step up greatly to win the long and tough production race with Russian communism.

As you see, our ability to do this will depend largely on two things: the size of our labor force and stepping up technological advancement.

The first of these is going to be difficult. Today 61,200,000 people are employed—a near all-time record. Furthermore, millions of our best workers are going to have to be drawn off into military service. This will undoubtedly mean, as I see it, adding increasing numbers of women and older-age employees to the labor force. Even then, we cannot do the job by simply saying, "put more people to work." There aren't enough people to go around.

This points up the importance of doing everything we can to speed up our technology—expanded research and education, more and better plants, more efficient machines and tools, more efficient production methods—the kind of thing in which the American people have always led the world.

I should tell you that we in Detroit take with a large grain of salt the claim of the Russians that they invented mass production—and the automobile—and the airplane—and radio—and television. The only thing the Russians can take full credit for is their use of the veto.

Now to boost our technology and its application is going to take money. Lots of money—year in and year out. A single machine tool, as you know, can cost more than a quarter-million dollars.

Just to take an example, our company budgeted, in 1946, $500,000,000 to be laid out in the next 5 years for plant improvement and expansion and better machines and tools. In that period we have spent, not $500,000,000, but $600,000,000. And we plan to spend a billion dollars more during the next 3 years.

The way we look at it, this program is absolutely necessary just to keep us up-to-date in the constant peacetime competitive race to increase production efficiency.

The normal way and best way to keep such huge sums pouring into technological improvement is through savings and earnings. But this raises some questions.

More and larger taxes are going to have to be raised to pay for building up our fighting strength—a very important half of the whole job ahead of us. And large hunks of those taxes are naturally going to have to be levied against American corporations—American business and industry. None of us quarrels with that. No industrial citizen wants to do one whit less than his full duty during the emergency years ahead.

But, as I see it, the way those taxes are levied is going to make a great deal of difference. The wrong way will not lead to our goal.

As I see it, it should be a fundamental principle that taxes are raised in such a way as to make sure that industry and individuals will have the incentive and the ability to keep on investing directly in our common future—putting their savings and earnings into our constantly increasing capacity to produce. For if it is a tough, long-term production race with Communist war lords that we face, the health and development of our productive capacity is essential to the winning of the long-term peace, no matter what wars we might be dragged into over the shorter term.

Our goal, after all, is not only paying for a war. It is also to keep our economy in so healthy a position that we will emerge from the present crisis stronger than ever.

The dangers and difficulties in the job ahead are clear to all of us. One is serious inflation, which could undermine our whole economy and leave us helpless to do either one of the jobs we have to do.

This trend toward inflation we see everywhere about us. It is the old spiral. Increasing costs force prices up. Higher prices, in turn, necessitate higher wages and higher costs—and the process starts all over again.

Our costs at Ford Motor Co. depend very importantly on wages, and I'm not referring only to labor costs at Ford Motor Co. The cost of materials and supplies—our other major item of costs—reflects the labor costs of our suppliers.

We have always been proud that the name of Ford is associated with high wages. This makes sense to us. High wages mean good markets; low wages mean poor markets.

But wages don't exist in a vacuum.

We have recently negotiated a contract with the United Auto Workers which runs for 5 years—a long time; it's the longest contract we have ever had. The contract has been called by the union "the best contract in the industry."

This contract gives us a real promise of stability, a knowledge of our probable labor costs within certain limits, and other advantages; we think it means the sustained high output of thousands of workers.

Of course, contracts in themselves do not assure stability—but they do represent a firm intention on the part of both parties to keep their houses in order for a long time. And I believe that the possibility of labor peace is very good now.

For one thing, I think that labor leaders are beginning to realize that they have worked themselves out into a pretty lonely, isolated spot. They are in danger of getting themselves into the same bad position that business was in 20 years ago, when too many businessmen were thinking of their own welfare first and the welfare of the Nation second. Aggression tactics of the past two decades on the part of labor have been understandable—but recent events indicate that the American people do not intend to have the terms of their progress dictated by labor unions any more than by businessmen. Neither businessmen nor labor leaders can afford to set their own particular interests ahead of those of the whole community. Nor can farmers—or any other single group.

The other reason for my optimism about labor peace is simply that everyone in the Nation realizes only too well that we cannot win a production race if anyone drags his feet. We, as Americans of good will, simply must find peaceful ways to settle our disputes.

For strikes interfere with production, and nothing must interfere with production, for production is the way out of our difficulties.

But our difficulties and dangers are no greater than have been faced and overcome by other generations of Americans, as we will overcome these.

In closing, let me summarize briefly:

Today the United States has become the arsenal of hope of the "one world" in which we now all live. Hundreds of millions of people look to us; their only hope.

These are dangerous times. It would be folly to sit back and say "Everything is going to be all right." Everything is going to be all right, but only if we make it so. We cannot afford the luxury of business and politics as usual; of being just farmers and stockholders and managers and union members, each jockeying for special advantage in a highly competitive world. We've become once again, as we have in every other national emergency, Americans together, a nation of resourceful, free human beings, bent on justifying once more our confidence in ourselves and the faith of hundreds of millions of others in us.

The essence of our problem as the Arsenal of Hope for the world is production; greatly increased production for peace as well as the defense of a free world. "Only the productive can be strong, and only the strong can be free." We know what our secret weapon is: the infinite resourcefulness, the infinite creativeness and productive abilities of 150,000,000 free human beings, acting together toward a common goal.

If a tough, long-term production race is our problem, let's face it frankly and not try to kid ourselves. Let's organize ourselves to achieve that great goal. Let's ask govern-

ment to call the signals, but call them loud and clear and keep us up-to-date on the score, so that we know what is expected of us. And let's get on with a job we know how to do better than anybody else in the world.

We are not expected to be supermen, just free men. We can do the job better—any job—because we are free men.

Our difficulties and dangers as a nation are no greater today than other generations of Americans have faced and overcome. We have a big chore ahead of us, but with the help of God, we can do it. We can make good as the world "Arsenal of Hope."

Address by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida, Before the Kojunsha Club, Tokyo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] at the Kojunsha Club, which is a distinguished Japanese club of professional men in Tokyo. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President and friends, it is a very great honor and privilege for me to be here today to talk before this distinguished group, which for more than 60 years has been one of the great sources and forces of leadership in Japan. Recalling that my old friend, Mr. Kasai, won the prize for oratory when he was at the University of Chicago, I think I would be wiser if I let him make my speech altogether for me and say nothing to you except to present him to you. But I am delighted to see again here in Tokyo my old friends, Mr. Kasai and Mr. Homma, both of whom I had the honor and pleasure to meet at the Interparliamentary Union at The Hague in 1938.

Japan has always been famous for her hospitality, in the smiles of your people, and in the warmth of the reception which you always extend to those who come to visit your beautiful country. My wife and I have for over 2 weeks been the happy recipients of Japanese hospitality, and it has been truly one of the most delightful periods of our life. Not only the people but the very sun itself has reminded us of Florida in the brilliance of the sunshine and the warmth of the beautiful Japanese sun. We pride ourselves in Florida upon our good citrus fruit, our oranges, and our tangerines. But I must confess I have never eaten tangerines quite so large, quite so beautiful, and quite so sweet as the ones I have just enjoyed today at this table and other places in Japan, and for this persimmon, this beautiful persimmon, I am jealous of it, because it is more obvious every day that my wife likes the Japanese persimmon better than she does her husband. We have a saying in our language that a little learning is a dangerous thing. So I cannot speak with great authority after having been in Japan for only a little more than 2½ weeks. It is our first visit to the Far East. We came through Dublin from the Interparliamentary Union Conference in early September, then came across Europe through Greece and Turkey and each one of the countries in the Middle East, Pakistan, India, Siam, Hong Kong, and China, and then came to the happy climax of our journey here in Tokyo. Naturally the first visit which we made in Japan was to your own incomparable Fuji. After that we visited your ancient and beautiful city of Kyoto, which for so long has been a shrine of Japanese learning and culture and beauty and enterprise. And only over the last week end we visited lovely Nikko and came to understand ourselves why we were advised never to say "Nikko" until we have seen Nikko. Now after having seen these wonderful places I understand my friend, Kasai, was not exaggerating as I then thought he might be when he made his speech of the 2,500 years of the glory of Japan when I first came to meet him at the Interparliamentary Conference in Hague in 1938.

You will understand, of course, that in what I shall say here today I do not in any sense of the word speak for the Government of the United States of America. The one and only spokesman for the United States of America in Japan is Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I want that very definitely and clearly understood. I can say, however, as a Senator and as a citizen of the United States that what I have seen here in the last 2½ weeks has been to me a very stimulating, a very encouraging, indeed a very inspiring picture. And I believe that never in all history have so many and such significant changes occurred as have occurred in Japan since the year 1945. And for the favorable nature of those changes, for the way in which you have adopted a democratic constitution, a democratic government, with executive, legislative, and judicial powers, each one separate from the other; the way you have extended a franchise to your people and given equal dignity with men to your women, and the way you have broadened the opportunities of education and strengthened free enterprise—for all these things I have only hearty and warm and sincere commendation for your great people. I have seen your democracy at work. At Kyoto my wife and I visited a polling place and we not only saw the election officials engaged in the performance of their duties, but we were gratified to see and to learn from the election officials that a few more women than men voted, which is an indication that the women of Japan are taking seriously their political obligations, and I predict that they will have a very large and honorable and responsible part in the strengthening of Japanese democracy in the years ahead. I also talked to educational leaders and have seen the vigor and virtue of your eduactional system, and I have also had an opportunity to visit your courts and to see that you have an independent judiciary as we have in the United States, where every citizen may be assured of a fair trial for his life, liberty, and property, an independent judiciary over which no government official has any control or authority. I have talked to your bankers and businessmen, and I have been gratified to see the degree to which you are recovering from the devastation and damage of the war, and I have heard from your businessmen and from your bankers your plans for expanding your trade to other areas and countries and for building here in Japan a great industrial community which will serve not only Japan and Asia, but all the peace-loving peoples of the world. But, of course, my principal gratification has been that in your constitution itself you have declared the new purpose of the new Japan to be a people of peace and not a nation of war. We ask ourselves, what is responsible for this splendid economic, political, and social progress that we observe in Japan. First, I should say that the progress is due to the attitude of the people of the United States who have not looked upon the people of Japan with revenge or, even though they might have been justified to do so, sought to inflict upon your people retribution. On the contrary, they have thought of the future rather than the past and hoped for a time of cooperation in the promotion of peace and prosperity between a democratic Japan and a democratic United States of America. And the second source to which I attribute that great change which has occurred in your country in 5 years is the leadership and the guidance and the direction of your country by Gen. Douglas MacArthur. It is well known that General MacArthur ranks as one of the greatest soldiers of all times. What I have seen of his great work with you in Japan leads me to the observation that history will say that he was also one of the greatest statesmen of all times. And the third source to which I would give credit for that progress is the splendid cooperation with General MacArthur which has been extended by the people of Japan. I give you my warm commendation for the cordial way in which you have cooperated with General MacArthur in this great program which has meant so much to you in the last 5 years.

So much for the past, the recent past. But naturally you are asking this question here in Tokyo and through Japan—what about the future? You know that General MacArthur and President Truman and the Government of the United States are working towards the early achievement of a peace treaty for Japan and that our country is doing all it can to hasten the day when there shall be a link between Japan and those countries with whom she was formerly at war, a peace treaty which will be just and fair and equitable for all. But the people of the United States also have some questions in their minds which are natural inquiries. First, they ask, how sincere are the people of Japan in what they have said in their Constitution about the principles of democracy? Will Japan continue to be a great democratic country after the peace treaty, or will the people allow their Constitution to be changed and to become again a document that would protect a few at the expense of many or give supreme power over all the people again to a selfish few. In short, will these great splendid democratic institutions which you have seen built in Japan in the last 5 years continue and become stronger after the peace treaty or will you retrogress back into an era which did not express the principles of democracy as do your Constitution and institutions today. So that question Japan will have to answer by its conduct. For myself in what I have seen in the last 2½ weeks I have confidence that your democracy will grow stronger, not weaker, that your people will not allow their sovereignty to be snatched away from them by anybody whoever they may be from without or within your country and that you will stand as one of the conspicuous democracies of the world before all the people of the earth in the years ahead. But the answer will not come from me, of course, but the subsequent conduct and example of the people of your great country. And the next question which arises in the minds of the people of the United States is, With what nation will the future Japan aline herself in the world? Will Japan in the future work with the democratic nations who want peace, who wish to cooperate with other peace loving peoples for progress and prosperity? Will she choose an ally and co-worker among those who will allow one another to be free and raise the standard of living of their people, or will a future Japan aline herself with those nations of the world who offer only war and poverty and misery and slavery for all those who allow themselves to be caught in their evil embrace. That is the problem that the people of Japan of the future will have to face and the decision that they will have to make. Again I say from

what I have observed during my brief stay here I have confidence in the decision that the people of Japan will make. In the first place, under your democratic Constitution it will be a decision made by all the people and not by a very few who may happen for one reason or another to exercise power. And in the second place, the people of Japan are a wise and observing people and they see that those nations that work in the United Nations with the peace-loving peoples are making progress and helping one another and that they are all free and do not fear the other. They will see that those nations that have become satellites to a certain foreign power, which you readily recognize, today are slaves and servants and cannot free themselves from this killing grasp in which they have been caught. Again I say I have faith in the wisdom of the decision that the people of Japan will make. But it is you and not I that will stand before mankind and history to render your decision as to what nations will be your friends and co-workers in the future world. The people of Japan have had an opportunity to see what the United States of America would do even if they were the successful power in a war. Your people have been treated here with fairness and with friendship. Yet what Japanese citizen dares imagine what Japan would experience under the tyranny of a Russian occupation, or even those blandishments and hypocritical propaganda that Russia might offer as an inducement to friendship between that country and Japan in the years ahead?

We naturally expect that you shall have a part in your own defense. It would not be waging war or preparing for war if you were to be prepared to assist in preserving your own security in case you were attacked from the outside. We all recognize under a peace treaty and after a peace treaty you would undoubtedly work with and through the United Nations in the use of any forces that you have, and you would have the assurance that the peace-loving peoples would aid you in protecting your own security as they would expect you to aid them in defense against aggression in which they might be the victim.

In 1945 I sat in the capital of Czechoslovakia and talked to the President of the country, President Benes, with his former Minister, Mr. Jan Masaryk. Both of those great gentlemen told me that they felt it was only proper that being close to Russia as they were they should allow the Soviet Union to dictate their foreign policy, but they had the assurance from Marshal Stalin himself that Russia would never interfere with the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia. In less than 5 years both were dead at the hands of those to whom they had extended friendship and their country was made the tool and pawn of the power that said they only wanted to work with them in external affairs. Japan is far too wise to become a victim of such a betrayal.

What a tragedy we see here so near to Japan. The people of China have enjoyed the friendship of the people of the United States for over a century. When there were others who might have dismembered China it was the United States who said no. It was the United States who withdrew the exercise of certain special privileges that she might have continued to enjoy. It was the United States which since the war has poured billions of dollars into China trying to help the Chinese people, and yet today it appears that those in authority in China are using the Chinese people as tools of a foreign power to try to prevent the restoration of dignity and independence and freedom to the people of Korea. And so the people of China, if they allow themselves to be made the victims of the selfish interests of a foreign power cannot but suffer and make others suffer with her. On the contrary, what would be the future of China if that country were to declare its allegiance to the principles of the United Nations Charter and to the cause of peace and were to disengage themselves from the Soviet Union's grasp and to become the advocates of peace and prosperity and work to restore freedom and independence in Korea instead of interfering with those aspirations? What could China expect? First, they could expect to become a member of the United Nations, and second, they could expect assistance from the United States and United Nations in overcoming the damages of war and improving the living levels of the people, and in addition to that they would have the assurance that the United Nations would also help to protect them against any aggression from the outside. So the Russian way is the dark way of war and misery and poverty, whereas the democratic way is the way of prosperity and of progress and of peace and a better life for that splendid people. Surely the people so long famed for their wisdom will not make the wrong decision in declaring their choice and will before it is too late aline themselves with their friends and not those who are inevitably their enemies.

But I have kept you too long and I will add only this. Some of you may be asking yourselves this question. What will the United States do in the future? Are they in Asia for only a little while? Will they soon draw away and leave us? Are they seeking something of special advantage to themselves by coming to Asia? What are the motives of the United States? I can say to you, my friends, as a Senator and as a citizen of the United States that the people of the United States have come to realize and to understand that we do live in one world. It isn't a world of the west and a world of the east. It is a world of humanity and that a threat of peace in the East is a threat to the security of the United States, and the only way that we can confidently expect to stay out of war is to keep a lawful peace in all parts of the earth, and like officers of the law go with peace-loving people to the redress of any wrong and to the protection of any victim of aggression. Only in that way can we hope to have a lawful, a secure and a peaceful United States and a lawful and a secure and peaceful world. So the United States has not come for a l'ttle while to Asia. We are, through the United Nations and with peace-loving people, going to continue to do all in our power to make really a peaceful and prosperous and a progressive world. They know they lie who say that the United States and the peace-loving members of the United Nations who are fighting today in Asia come for anything other than a peaceful purpose. In the hospitals of Japan I have visited since I have been here, and the last time, only yesterday, there are boys from my State of Florida who came around the world to offer their lives and have given their limbs, maybe their future health, to try to protect the people of Korea. Around the earth from Florida, becoming victims of aggression suggested and initiated by a strong foreign power. What does Florida want from Korea? What does the United States ask? Nothing, except that they be free and independent, that they choose their own officers, they live their own lives, they choose their own way and we all work together for peace. We ask nothing from anybody except the privilege of friendship and cooperation and peace one with another. It has taken a long time to win democracy for the world, and dignity and freedom for the human being, that glorious task has not yet been achieved. Much more blood may have to be spilled before nations shall learn that they are not immune to the rules of law. But the people of the United States are determined that, however long it takes and whatever the cost in treasure and in blood, we will continue to fight in any part of the earth those who are determined to enslave their fellow nations and their fellow men, and we will continue to fight, God helping us, with others of similar sentiment until we do at long last achieve a peaceful and orderly and a lawful world and society of men.

In the Constitutional Convention, wherein the Constitution of the United States was written and prepared, there was behind the chair of the presiding officer, George Washington, the symbol of a sun. On one occasion in one of the dark moments of that Constitutional Convention when the outcome of the convention was in doubt, a very wise member, Benjamin Franklin, of Philadelphia, eighty-odd-years old, arose and said, "Mr. President, as I have sat here in this convention day after day and gazed upon that sun behind the desk of the presiding officer I wondered sometimes whether that sun was setting or whether it was rising." There have been those perhaps among you who in the recent years as you looked upon the symbol of Nippon who wondered maybe whether the sun of Japan was setting or was rising. I have seen here in your faces and in the faces in your people in your institutions, I believe I have heard from the heart murmurs of your citizens the assurance that the sun of Nippon is not a setting but a rising sun, a glorious rising sun of democracy disseminating over the whole area and people of the earth its glow and make its own invaluable contribution to prosperity, progress, and peace for all mankind.

Well, I am most grateful for your generous words and it has been a very great pleasure for me to be here today and I am most grateful for the distinguished interpretation, indeed the eloquent interpretation, which has been given by my friend Mr. Kasai today. I have told Mr. Kasai in case you wanted to do so I would be very glad to have you ask any questions. I realize that you are busy men, but I would be very happy to have you ask questions from the audience and I will answer to the best of my ability.

Sheridan Downey, Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have a friend, Alfonso Mirabel, of Los Angeles, Calif., who, like Senators who were privileged to serve with Senator Sheridan Downey, is devoted to this capable statesman from the far West. It is a matter of deep regret to me personally that illness compelled Sheridan Downey to give up voluntarily his labors for progress in the Senate of the United States. Mr. Mirabel has written a tribute to Sheridan Downey, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Well done," my friend, United States Senator Sheridan Downey, for the distinguished public service as a statesman rendered your State and Nation during the tenure of meritorious achievements as Senator from California.

Those who know of your character and that you have been an outstanding and brilliant legislator can now speak freely and comment on the good you have accomplished.

It is of record that recognition was given you as one of the Nation's foremost authori-

ties on water and reclamation; a legislator with a sound grasp of the problems of labor and business. History has it that you have been a lawyer and man of foresight and vision.

One may now say that Senator Downey as senior Senator from California has fully served all the people of his State and Nation. Having established a record of sensible liberalism, always proceeding in a democratic way, always protecting the Constitution, never to the left or the right, doing the best he knew how for the general welfare.

Quotations from a March 27, 1950, letter are:

"DEAR MR. MIRABAL: I am enclosing the analyses in the United States Senate. I have consistently fought labor's fight. I have not only voted for measures which directly benefit labor * * * such as higher minimum wages, full employment, workmen's compensation, repeal of certain sections of the Taft-Hartley law, etc., but I have worked and voted for such things as public-power development, low-cost housing, the European recovery program, liberalization of the Displaced Persons Act * * * etc.

"In short, my record in the Senate, as anyone who cares to investigate will see for himself, is truly liberal and a progressive record.

"Let me give you one example of the fight that doesn't show up clearly on the record because it has never come to a vote in the Senate.

"In 1945 I joined with Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, and several other Senators to introduce a fair employment practices bill. A series of efforts on the part of Senator CHAVEZ and myself resulted in the bill coming to the Senate floor. Those opposed to FEPC began a filibuster, one of the longest in the history of the Senate. I worked to bring a petition and bringing the FEPC bill itself to a vote. As you know, it takes a two-thirds vote of the Senate to invoke cloture and thus end a filibuster by limiting time for further debate. We were unsuccessful in obtaining a two-thirds vote so were forced to drop our FEPC bill in order to insure passage of other necessary legislation that was being held up by the filibuster.

"However, I have joined with Senator CHAVEZ in every session since 1945, in introducing an FEPC bill. * * *

"I should like also to clarify my position on the public power issue. * * * I have always voted for public power. * * * I have supported TVA and the development of new public power installations, and I was one of the handful of Senators who voted to confirm Leland Olds' appointment to the Federal Power Commission.

"I want to thank you for your interest in my record which I offer proudly.

"Sincerely,

"SHERIDAN DOWNEY."

The letter lists but part of the history of the exceptionally brilliant and splendent magnificence of the record of the senior Senator from California.

Many remember his record for liberal pensions for our senior citizens that have reached certain age in their lives, his support and aid to F. D. Roosevelt's program including lend lease; peacetime draft; pay increases for Army inductees; domestic issues of national housing; full employment social security; aid to veterans of World War I and World War II, GI bill of rights (he was one of the Senators who conceived and sponsored this measure); Federal Employees Act; international control of atomic energy through the United Nations; State rights of tideland oil; establishment of a west coast Naval Academy; aid to Greece and Turkey and other nations threatened by the Communist peril. He consistently fought efforts by other States to divert water belonging to California. To keep gamblers and racketeers and blackmailers out of California was always one of his known battles. He always combated known crimes in the Nation. "Adieu," to one who meritoriously and with excellence served his people in the United States Senate, and will continue to serve his fellow men and the world in his own way in the future.

Fat UN Employee Pay for Doling Out Relief Arouses Arabs' Wrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Miss Dorothy Thompson appearing in the Washington Star for December 30, 1950, entitled "Fat UN Employee Pay for Doling Out Relief Arouses Arabs' Wrath."

This article demonstrates once again how impossible it is for us to purchase good will with lavish expenditures of Government money. The article shows that we are incurring ill will rather than good will in the Arab countries.

The article also demonstrates once again how extremely difficult it is to make any headway toward cutting down the excessive costs of the Federal Government when the executive branch is not really interested in cooperating with congressional efforts to cut down those costs. The excessive salaries discussed in this article are mostly paid for ultimately by the American taxpayer. However, they are actually disbursed by a UN agency and that makes it very difficult for Congress to reach and control.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAT UN EMPLOYEE PAY FOR DOLING OUT RELIEF AROUSES ARABS' WRATH—GROUP SEEN DOING NOTHING TO IMPROVE RELATIONS OF MIDDLE EAST WITH WEST

(By Dorothy Thompson)

EN ROUTE HOME FROM THE MIDDLE EAST.—The United Nations is doing nothing to improve relations between the Middle East and the west. The UN appears as representative only of the Americas, the British Commonwealth and Western Europe. Russia and associates are not in the picture.

The chief UN activity is dispensing relief to nearly 900,000 officially registered Palestinian refugees, living in tent cities. This consists, per person per fortnight, of 11 pounds of flour, about 3 cups of dried beans or peas, 3 cups of rice, 3 cups of wheat and 1 cup of sugar. Pregnant women and children get an extra ration of a cup of skimmed milk per day. When there are fats this ration is reduced. Occasionally a family will get a tin of canned fish. Meat or eggs they never get. The diet is all starch.

The average Arab villager probably seldom has much more. Sanitary conditions are better in most camps than in most villages, I am told. But these homeless Palestinian refugees, who include many persons who have lived at a much higher standard, all hold the UN responsible for their dispossession. What makes them additionally incensed is the bureaucratic manner in which relief is administered and the preposterous scale of salaries paid the western administrators. In fact, I wonder at the incredible docility of western taxpayers.

$10–$20-DAY EXPENSES

UN salaries are scaled to normal home salaries plus a per diem allowance ranging from $10 to $20 per day. The recipients have cars at their disposal, pay no income tax, get cigarettes, liquor, etc., free of customs and way below home prices. The theory is that otherwise no one would serve.

This is nonsense. Many educational, medical, and relief missions have operated for years in the Middle East at very modest salaries. They recruit idealistic- and socially-minded persons anxious to perform devoted service, or the intellectually eager welcoming opportunity for new experiences. The UN makes no such appeal and handing out other people's money becomes, for some, a racket. Why, for instance, should a $40-a-week American stenographer be taxed to pay a United Nations relief and work administration typist a tax-free income of $122 per week in places where living costs are considerably below those in America?

No European UNRWA employee gets less than $6,365 per year. Many of them live on per diem allowances and save their entire salaries. On the other hand native employees, doing the same work, and often more efficiently, receive a tiny fraction of the westerners' pay. An Arab trained nurse gets $45 per month and maintenance. A Swiss nurse gets (with allowances) $608 per month, or more than 13 times the Arab nurse's income. A European UNRWA laboratory technician gets $700 per month—more than an American colonel in regular service and three times the salary of the chief surgeon, a distinguished Arab, in the same hospital.

MORE PAY THAN GOVERNOR

A chief district relief officer gets $1,100 per month, or more than the Arab governor of the province.

The salary scales of all private western institutions are thrown way out of balance as a result. An UNRWA stenographer gets twice the income of a starting full professor at the American University of Beirut. The Quakers, YMCA's, Lutherans, and Catholic welfare organizations pay salaries which enable their people to live decently but austerely, and thus win immeasurably more affection and respect than the UN people.

They also attract a superior type of personality. I have met fine administrators in UNRWA, but the better they are the more they are in rebellion against the whole setup. And whenever one sees a camp showing a little love, sympathy, and comeliness, with gardens laid out, a decent school set up, and even floorless tents protected with low walls against seeping rains, one invariably finds that some voluntary organization has taken the lead in doing its administration.

The economic position of the western UN employee vis-à-vis the native makes the UN appear as another outpost of western imperialism the more glaring when westerners draw fat pay for handing out lean charity.

Power Is Our Best Friend Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Power Is Our Best Friend Now," published in a recent issue of the Farm Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER IS OUR BEST FRIEND NOW

The new year calls for a new look. The Korean reverses have left us gloomy. The immediate future appears threatening. The prospect calls for honest appraisal and clear thinking, not for panicky discouragement.

After all, the United States continues to be by far the happiest, richest, and strongest of nations. We shall have no need to live in fear if we will make wise use of our strength.

Strength means many things. Right now it means military power—armed force so mighty that it must be feared. Military power includes agricultural and industrial ability to produce more and more food and munitions.

Our first national duty, therefore, must be to shape American strength into irresistible armies, navies, and air forces. We cannot afford to continue the now-fading illusion that we can protect America by buying friendships abroad. Impregnable power will bring us better friends than will lavish gifts.

We dare not shrink from the overshadowing fact that Communists intend eventually to conquer the United States if they can. They will conspire within our borders, steal our secrets, lure us into bloody, exhausting wars with their slave countries, trick us into wasting our strength; if they must, and when they dare, they will attack us directly.

We are fighting for survival as a nation, and for every American liberty and privilege we possess. If we use our great strength prudently, we shall win. Their people outnumber us, so we must avoid wasting our men. We should quickly adopt means to organize other anti-Communist manpower, such as Germans and Japanese, under our leadership. We should stimulate counter-efforts wherever possible within China and other countries, even within Russia—especially within Russia.

At home, we should insist that Congress squeeze every possible waste out of government, and spend only for power. Let's pound the lofty nonsense out of the State Department, and put common-sense Americanism in command.

Nor should we permit Government to forget that the greatest asset we have, the one which no enemy possesses, is the free American. Let us not weaken him by a set of second-rate totalitarian controls and restrictions.

Yes, the United States is rich and strong; but not rich enough nor strong enough for any effort not now essential to survival as a nation of free people.

Our National Leaders Should Avoid Arrogance, Belligerency, and a Sense of Infallibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, an open letter to President Truman was read by the Reverend T. T. Swearingen, pastor of the Oak Park Christian Church, in Kansas City, Mo., to the congregation on Sunday, December 24. The letter constitutes a powerful and significant comment on several aspects of the foreign policies now being pursued by the Truman administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This Christmas season brings many things other than happiness, such as the tragic sorrow in the homes of 42,000 American boys wounded, missing, or killed in Korea, and the ghostlike fear hovering over countless thousands of other homes where boys await induction. In the minds and hearts of these millions of Americans are two major questions:

First, what have we bought with these thousands of lives in Korea that has any permanent value; second, is there no better way?

SEE OTHER SOLUTIONS

The average American does not believe that continuing war is the only solution of the Korean situation, or that war with China leading into a third world war is inevitable. He likewise does not believe that democracy can be forced upon the peoples of the world, and for the United States to become an arsenal for that purpose is as stupid as one can expect war to be.

The American people are not opposed to preparation, nor are they unwilling to make great sacrifices. They demonstrated this in two major wars in this century. However, even those sacrifices have brought their disillusionment in the specter of war waste and its twin, our inability to buy peace with the currency of force.

We, the people, are trapped. We rear our sons for life and what they are offered is death. We elect national leaders and their only answer to international problems is the fight-at-the-drop-of-the-hat philosophy. Modern statesmanship seems to be the fine art of making age-old mistakes in newly refined ways. We, the people, are not as interested in saving our State Department's face as we are in saving the present crop of our finest youth and the peace of the world. We want some way, other than war, to be tried. It is never too late for that. Ultimately some kind of peace will be worked out around a conference table. Why not do that before millions are killed instead of afterward? We might take some risks through negotiation rather than all of them on the battlefield.

HOPE FOR RIGHT COURSE

These words are spoken in the prayerful hope that no false sense of national pride will move our Nation in the wrong direction even for good ends. It is the conviction of Christians that right ends will not be achieved by wrong means. When, better than at Christmas, should we be reminded of the age-old teaching that those who take the sword will perish by it?

Every true American respects the high office of the President of the United States and understands, in some small measure, the weight of responsibility which you, Mr. President, must carry. No small part of that responsibility, we believe, is to lead our Nation as a moral and spiritual force in the world, to demonstrate the power of right rather than the rights of power.

We pray that our national leaders, of whatever party, may avoid arrogance, belligerency and any sense of infallibility. That they may be guided more by the needs and hopes of our own citizens and the masses of people of other nations than by the selfish propaganda of their self-appointed spokesman. It is possible that the people of Korea and China do not want to fight us. Why not carry our cause to the people before determining to destroy them?

In the spirit of the Christmas season, may we avoid keeping Jesus forever in swaddling clothes, a baby to cuddle, but never a Saviour to follow, as Isaiah dreamed, with the government upon His shoulders.

Under Cover of War News State Department Selling Out American Economy at Torquay Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release from my office under date of December 27, 1950, entitled "Under Cover of War News State Department Selling Out American Economy at Torquay Conference."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 27, 1950.

"Americans are fighting an economic war as well as a military war and the State Department is the wrecking crew on both fronts," United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, charged today in a statement issued by his Washington office.

The Nevada Senator said that over 100 State Department men are now in England at a conference "which will complete plans for wrecking the American economic system."

"Some of these," Senator MALONE said, "possibly know what they are doing and are traitors, deliberately trying to wreck American industry and bring on communism, while the others are simply following orders from higher up." Continuing, Senator MALONE said: "If the State Department is successful in its war against American industry, the boys now at war in Korea—those who return—will return to a disrupted economic system wherein they cannot establish themselves.

"Under cover of war news, State Department personnel are now in Torquay, England, systematically selling out the American workers and investors by arranging tariff reductions which are a frontal attack on American industry.

"Knowing full well that 'free trade' will wreck American industry because American workers with their high standard of living cannot compete with foreign cheap labor and slave labor, the State Department crew go merrily along with their destructive plans. It is established that the Torquay, England, conference is further reducing tariff and import rates on hundreds of American-made items. Practically every State in the United States will be hurt.

"Rumor has it that the ITO, the International Trade Organization, which has been on President Truman's 'must' list for the past 2 years, has been abandoned in favor of completing the sell-out job at the Torquay Conference.

"Many American industries have already been badly hurt by the free-trade policy of the State Department. Watch factories in

America have suffered; at least one has closed its doors. The American pottery industry is being killed. Makers of knitted berets have given up. Foreign-made cotton string gloves are forcing American glove workers out of jobs. American hatters have been forced to seek other employment. Shoe manufacturers say they cannot compete with foreign-made shoes dumped here at around 90 cents a pair. Seventy-five percent of the mines have closed down. This is only the beginning. Other American industries suffering from the administration's attack are: textiles and textile machinery, woolens and worsted, cotton broad woven goods, silk piece goods, crude petroleum products, aluminum, zinc, lead ores and bullion, sea foods, clothes pins, leather gloves and bags, rolling mill products, and numerous others.

"This destruction has been wrought by the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. The so-called escape clause in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act proved to be no escape to the threatened industries in this country. The so-called peril-point provision is a snare and delusion; in case of a test it would mean nothing, because it provides only that when the peril point is reached the President write a letter to Congress.

"Any stimulation in American industries due to the war emergency is of temporary duration and will not strengthen the peacetime economy. As a matter of fact, it is because of the administration's foreign-trade policy and other attacks on American industry that we must depend upon a war economy for so-called good times; it is because of these administration policies that the American worker and investor cannot now maintain the peacetime standard of living.

"We must take steps to assure a strong America economically, to halt the policy which not only weakens our positions abroad but dissipates our industries at home. This can be done by forcing the administration and particularly its State Department to stop its war against American workingmen and investors.

"The American people should make their voices heard in demanding that the Torquay Conference be stopped, that wholesale tariff reductions be halted to protect our American economy. In the new Congress they should demand that a stop be put to further extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which expires in June of 1951. They should demand that in its place there be established a flexible import fee principle under which American workers and investors—American industry—be protected against the flood of slave-labor products. Only by some such means can the American economic system be saved."

Senator MALONE concluded:

"Let us fight on the economic front for America as valiantly as our boys in Korea are fighting for their ideals. Only by upholding these ideals can we expect to retain the respect of the boys at the front."

Republican Demands for Greater Share in Shaping Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial published in the Springfield (Mo.) Bias on December 13, 1950, written by the editor, George Olds.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Truman evidently intends to pay the least possible attention to Republican demands for a greater share in shaping our foreign policy. Since our foreign policy has quite a bearing on our lives and fortunes, the Republican appeal seems reasonable enough. Particularly when at least half of the people of America, and perhaps more than half, are Republicans, or at least not Democrats.

It is one of the dismaying aspects of our times that millions of Americans have no authoritative voice in decisions that will affect our civilization for decades.

President Truman's cavalier attitude, his sometimes haughty, sometimes breezy, disregard of the technically minority party, is a frightening thing.

There are times when it is permissible, perhaps even fitting, for a President to be narrowly partisan but these hardly are the times. These are the gravest times in our history, and we need every ounce of cooperation, every smidgeon of brains that we can muster, and the Republican leadership, I would say, is not completely devoid of brains.

Think how heartening it would have been to the country, and how helpful to the President's prestige if he had invited Republican leaders to sit in on his conferences with Premier Attlee and the military experts of Britain and the United States. Certainly they were entitled to admittance, certainly the problems under discussion are the problems of all Americans.

The recent election virtually repudiated the Truman administration and a big man would recognize that fact and adjust his policies and methods accordingly.

I am reminded of the story of the Democrat who surveyed the election returns and remarked, "We Democrats took a whale of a licking—thank God."

President Truman, from the very start of the Korean campaign, has acted without the advice and consent of Congress; he has kept even the leaders of his own party in ignorance of his plans and policies. And that way lies madness and disaster.

Governor Dewey's Senate Information Second-Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a release from my office regarding a dispatch entitled "Governor Dewey's Senate Information Second-Hand."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 12, 1950.

United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE (Republican, Nevada) said today that Governor Dewey's statement regarding Secretary of State Dean Acheson did not represent his views or the views of Republicans generally.

"Governor Dewey was speaking for himself alone," Senator MALONE said, "when he suggested that Republicans withhold criticism of Secretary Acheson. His information from the Senate floor is necessarily second-hand. My mail is heavy and the demand of the people is that we continue to expose weaknesses in the administration which are resulting in the murdering of American boys.

"Secretary Acheson has not abandoned his 1949 decision to accept Communist China in the United Nations and to turn Formosa over to the Reds.

"To suggest that United States Senators and Representatives withhold expressing the people's opinions regarding the actions of any Government official is to suggest that we abandon our responsibility to the people who elected us.

"It is our duty to call the attention of the public to what is wrong in our Government. We are not going to straighten out a deplorable situation by trying to ignore it. Part of the trouble we are facing today is due to the fact that the people have not been properly informed as to what has been going on in their Government."

Senator MALONE said that he was not going to join in any plan which would tend to prevent his serving his constituents and the people of the United States as his conscience dictates.

Continuing, the Nevada Senator said: "Our boys are facing the Communists on the war front. It is our duty here on the home front to clean out the Communists and Communist friends in our Government structure. We must set an example at home to be effective abroad. The good citizens of this country do not expect the camp followers and the me-too advocates to dominate their Republican leaders."

Lt. Harry E. Sutton, American Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, there have been many examples of the bravery and loyalty of our Negro servicemen in the past; many times they have gone unnoticed.

The story of a gallant Negro infantry platoon which fought off one of the most threatening approaches to a Communist break-through into the Hungnam beachhead is dramatically told in the New York Times of December 22.

Lt. Harry E. Sutton, who resides in my congressional district, is a fine soldier. He brilliantly led the United States unit when the North Koreans made their attack. Only the greatest bravery and excellent strategy on the part of Lieutenant Sutton and his men made it possible for them to hold the line and finally drive off the enemy.

Too little credit has been given our colored units in the past. I am, therefore, inserting the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the Members of this House may read it, and know of the outstanding contribution being made by our colored troops. I should also like them to know how proud the people of my congressional district are

of this great feat of heroism on the part of Lieutenant Sutton. The article follows:

NEGRO UNIT HAILED ON HUNGNAM STAND—PLATOON LED BY BRONX OFFICER STAVED OFF MOST SERIOUS THREAT TO BEACHHEAD

WITH UNITED STATES THIRD DIVISION IN KOREA, December 20.—A gallant Negro Infantry platoon fought off the most threatening approach yet to a Communist breakthrough into the Hungnam beachhead.

The United States unit was led by Lt. Harry E. Sutton, of 1100 Franklin Avenue, the Bronx, New York, when the North Koreans made their wild charge.

The Red assault disintegrated when each United States soldier was down to his last ammunition clip of eight bullets. That's how close the Communists came to penetrating at least the outer United Nations defense ring.

The savage battle of "Sutton's Ridge" began before dawn Monday. The United States counterattack ended Tuesday noon.

Since then the United States troops have shifted positions. The story now can be told without endangering security.

A famous Third Division regiment was holding part of the hilly eastern flank of the beachhead. Lieutenant Sutton's platoon was assigned to a long, three-humped ridge.

Lieutenant Sutton has been a soldier a long time and an Infantry lieutenant 5 years. He spotted his men in strong points on the three ridge nipples and along the World War I type trenches that civilian workers had gouged in the frozen earth.

He was worried. Fresh North Korean soldiers—reorganized, reequipped, and fanatic—were on the next ridge line over. On his right flank they had strong-pointed a hill that surrounding crags masked from United States artillery.

At 7:45 a. m. Monday the Communists struck. Crawling up the bare windswept ridge came 3 groups of 20 men—1 group on each flank, 1 dead center. Just a small attack, but made by ferocious men who would not stop even when wounded.

The United States soldiers moved back and forth in their old-fashioned trench, picking off the Reds.

"But they kept coming and coming," Lieutenant Sutton said. "All day small groups of them kept coming. We would wipe out this bunch and before we knew it the Reds were back again."

The Communists from the ridge line opposite tried to pin down Lieutenant Sutton's men with fire so the assault groups could reach the trench line. The Reds were firing captured United States Browning automatic rifles, machine guns, and Garand rifles.

Master Sgt. Tyler Collins, of Malone, Fla., stood bolt upright and picked off seven Communists. A bazooka man killed 10 with a single shell. But the Reds kept coming for more than 11 hours. Finally, at 7 p. m., there was a break.

"We have licked them," the GI's told each other, jubilantly.

The Communists began using small arms again from the opposite ridge. There was no assault this time, just the continual bark of snipers' rifles through the long, frigid night.

At 6 p. m. Tuesday the Reds assaulted "Sutton Ridge." From the ridge opposite the center of the line came a fierce wall of fire.

A suicide enemy force struck up the slope against the left flank.

Lieutenant Sutton was not too worried about these two fronts—the massed fire power of United States artillery could hit there.

But from the hill on the right—masked from the guns by the other hills—the main force of the enemy was assaulting in the darkness. The Reds were coming down a precipitious slope, tying short fiber ropes on scrub pines and lowering themselves.

With flashing bayonets they burst into the strong point on the last of the three nipples on Lieutenant Sutton's ridge. The GI's there fought desperately. Later in one foxhole Lieutenant Sutton found two dead North Koreans and the body of the United States soldier who had killed them before he died.

Once inside the trenches, the Reds turned the United States soldiers' own machine guns down the ridge line.

Pfc Elijah Whitley, of Toledo, Ark., replied with his Browning automatic rifle, silencing the machine gun. Along the ridge line Lieutenant Sutton and his men rolled hand grenades down the slope. In the breaking dawn they could see the Communists crumple and tumble down the slope and then see new men replace them. Bodies were strewn crazily on the slopes.

"We gave them everything we had," Lieutenant Sutton said.

That was enough. The last fanatic charge disintegrated.

Reinforcements reached the United States line. United States mortars thumped down on the enemy-held right-hand ridge nipple. Lieutenant Sutton led a counter attack. The enemy was driven off, and Lieutenant Sutton's men again held all of the ridge.

MRS. SUTTON VOICES PRIDE

Holding her 8-month-old daughter, Linda Louise in her arms and flanked by her other child, Harry E. Sutton, Jr., Mrs. Vadnie Sutton could only say last night: "I'm terribly proud of my husband." Through the day she had heard over the radio and read in the newspapers about the heroic exploit of her husband, First Lt. Harry E. Sutton.

Neighbors crowded her small apartment and offered congratulations. Mrs. Sutton, born in this city, said her husband had been with the United States Army for 10 years.

Malone Assails Attlee for Role in Parley Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Malone Assails Attlee for Role in Parley Here," published in the Washington Times-Herald of December 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALONE ASSAILS ATTLEE FOR ROLE IN PARLEY HERE

Senator MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, said yesterday that the visit of British Prime Minister Attlee is a step in a Franco-British plan to "sell out the American Army in Korea."

The visit, MALONE said in a statement, "is for the purpose of keeping intact the colonial possessions of those two countries through the recognition of Communist China.

"They are calling on us now through Mr. Attlee, only to protect their investments in Britain's Hong Kong and Singapore and France's Indochina," MALONE said.

MALONE predicted that Attlee will suggest that we end the war by withdrawing from Korea and Formosa, "turning our backs on the Chinese Nationalists," and recognizing the Communist regime in China.

PREDICTS WE'LL DO IT

"Thus the end of the war, temporarily, until Russia is in better shape to fight us," he said.

"I prophesy now that we will do exactly what England and France tell us to do, for we still have officials without the backbone to stand up to European leaders," MALONE said.

Senator EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, called on the administration to drive out "Communist sympathizers opposed to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek," and then join with Chiang in opening a second front in China.

COULD TURN INTO VICTORY

With the Chinese Communist Armies concentrated in Korea, EASTLAND said, the Korean disaster could be turned into a victory. EASTLAND outlined this plan in a Senate speech.

1. Arm Chiang's Nationalist forces on Formosa for opening a second front on the Communist-held Chinese mainland, and give assistance to the 1,000,000 anti-Communist guerrillas waiting there to join Chiang.

2. Establish a naval blockade of the Chinese coast.

3. Send American planes to destroy the railways on which the Communists must transport supplies from Manchuria and the Manchurian arsenals.

Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, called on President Truman to stop hiding the facts of the Korean crisis from Congress and the American people. TAFT said the President should report directly to the people immediately after his conferences with Attlee.

The People Are Gradually Finding Out the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, eventually the sovereign people of this country will learn the truth with reference to the load they are carrying in the way of taxes to support the United Nations. It will soon become apparent to them that the American taxpayers are furnishing the money and the men, while the United Nations gives the orders that are costing the lives of thousands of our fine boys, to say nothing about the injuries which have been sustained by more than 30,000 of our boys, not under the American flag, but under the United Nations flag.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD a very interesting article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of December 31, 1950:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

A new year is knocking at the door, and another decade goes down in the history books. And it goes down, I might say, as a 10-year stretch of turmoil in which we as a nation managed to demonstrate conclusively the championship title as prize international dolts.

Onetime Ambassador Joseph Kennedy tagged an apt label on the outgoing decade. He called it a period of staggering extravagance. A perusal of the cost accounts for our past 10 years of neighborliness indicates that he's about right.

Mr. Kennedy, I note, asks what the next decade will bring. The best I can do is take a quick look at the past one and, upon recovery from the resulting shudders, hope for the best.

Now that we've got our own Christmas bills to worry about, it probably will seem less than staggering to read that since 1940, as taxpayers, we scattered $51,764,500,000 around the globe. That's billions, and it went to 14 nations in one form or another, and we have a sum total of nothing to show for it.

The British since 1940 got $36,248,000,000 and are coming up for another $2,000,000,000 this year.

France got $9,468,000,000; Netherlands, $1,168,000,000; Belgium, $668,000,000; Turkey, $294,000,000; Canada, $6,500,000; Greece, $1,217,000,000; Australia, $1,700,000; Sweden, $62,000,000; Norway, $224,000,000; Denmark, $175,000,000; Ethiopia, $1,000,000; Iceland, $10,000,000; and India, $200,000,000.

That kind of money ought to make a lot of friends, if handouts can buy friendships. At any rate the United States is going to spend a lot more, probably another $100,000,000,000, to arm Western Europe.

There are a lot of experts who think most of this should be spent in the United States of America, in maintaining and equipping the biggest defense army in history. However, the decision has been made to spend most of it in Europe, and in the next 10 years we will know whether it is right or wrong.

Reports that Soviet armies are being concentrated and huge guided missile platforms are being built for an assault on Alaska and Canada continued to slip through the military secrecy screen. But nevertheless, our security plans called for nothing more than a holding force in the North and in Asia.

Those we have helped in Europe since 1940 with $51,764,500,000 seem to hold the view that Asia is a secondary theater of war and of little concern to them.

Kennedy made this clear with a few statistics revealing the size of European military effort to help us in Korea.

India has sent no troops, one field ambulance unit, and negotiations are under way for 400,000 jute bags.

Ethiopia has offered $100,000 and 1,000 men. Neither offer was accepted.

Denmark sent one hospital ship, medical supplies, and 500 tons of sugar.

Norway sent a few merchant ships, no fighting men. Sweden sent one hospital unit.

Australia has 1,000 infantrymen in Korea, 40 fighter planes, two destroyers, one frigate, and medical supplies.

Greece sent 800 troops, six planes. Canada sent 15,000 fighting men, one air transport squadron, three destroyers. She has 10,000 men in training, earmarked for the Far East.

Turkey has one infantry combat team of 5,000 men in action. Belgium has 1,000 men, en route to Korea, plus 400 tons of sugar and medical supplies.

The Netherlands sent an infantry battalion and one destroyer.

France has supplied an infantry battalion of 1,000 men, one gunboat and medical supplies.

England has 6,000 ground troops in the area, one aircraft carrier, four cruisers, seven destroyers, and eight frigates.

The bulk of all the forces of the countries listed stayed at home. Only the United States stripped itself of fighting men for the war in Korea, to the tune of 100,000 soldiers and marines.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a recent address by David J. Dallin, contributing editor of the New Leader, as one of an excellent series of radio programs sponsored by the Western Massachusetts Branch of the Polish American Congress, Inc. It is well worthy of careful reading, particularly as we start this new year which surely will bring the necessity of sound decisions on the many complex problems facing the world today.

I would like to emphasize one important statement in this speech, which must be constantly kept foremost in the minds of all who have any responsibility for the establishment and preservation of peace. It is: "For our generation Poland remains a moral issue of the first magnitude; there will be no peace until this issue is resolved." Mr. Dallin's address follows:

Poland is one of the gravest of the moral issues of our times. In other contemporary problems, political, economic, racial, or religious aspects prevail, but in the case of Poland the appeal is to the conscience of mankind, and this tragic role has been hers now for over 150 years. Beginning with the Napoleonic wars and continuing during the martyrdom of the nineteenth century, the Polish issue provoked the deepest emotions in the Western World—until the nation was finally restored in 1918. The national status was maintained for only two decades, and then the new war started. Poland again appealed to the conscience when she fell prey to German aggression, again when Soviet troops marched in, when Nazi massacres of her intellectuals became known, when the rumors that 10,000 of her officer-prisoners of war had been murdered in cold blood on orders of the Soviet Government were confirmed. Then occurred the shameful western appeasement of Moscow at the expense of Poland, when London and Washington forgot their pledges and statesmen betrayed their ally in the vain hope of buying peace for their nations by throwing Poland to the wolves. Then history proved that no peace can be bought at such a price. The international tensions of our time and the general expectation of a new war are the reward for the shortsightedness, nay blindness, manifested by western leaders at the end of World War II.

If there should be war, Poland will be one of the great issues. At present Poland is a province of the Soviet empire; deprived of independence, she enjoys as many rights as the allegedly autonomous Bashkirs of the Volga and the Yakuts deep in Siberia; under Soviet domination Poles have the right to praise Stalin in Polish, whereas under the Tsars they had to praise the Tsar in Russian. This is the extent of the difference.

To the oppressive rational system of Tsarist times has been added a new great hypocrisy; old Russia and old Prussia did not claim that their Poles enjoyed self-government and national freedom; today, however, every Pole is obliged, in addition to observing Soviet-prescribed law, to pretend that his nation is free and self-governing, that freedom of press and freedom of religion exist in Poland, and that the standard of living has risen substantially since the sun of the Soviet constitution started to shine on the tormented country.

This hypocrisy of the Soviet leaders and their puppets is morally repulsive. Brutal truth is easier to endure than deceit and lies. The Polish Government, we know, is a Communist government, but it never admits to being such. The Polish Army is run by Soviet generals, but it claims to be purely national-Polish. Polish foreign policy is nonexistent, having been replaced by blueprints and orders from Moscow, but Poland does have a minister with a large staff, diplomatic representatives, and a host of delegates who enjoy greatly their trips to all kinds of international rallies. Poland's political police organization is kept under strict surveillance by Soviet instructors from the MVD-MGB, but it pretends to be independent and to have achieved in 5 years what the Soviet GPU worked at during two decades—false trials, false confessions, and a network of slave labor camps.

This odor of hypocrisy is perhaps the most repulsive feature of the present Polish regime. Among themselves, the Polish leaders, as well as the Soviet bosses, are frank, cynical, contemptuous; they know the truth. Many bitter jokes and pointed anecdotes about alleged Polish independence are in circulation. When I was in Europe last year, a former Soviet officer, now a DP, told me how he was ordered, a short time before the end of the war, to return from the German front, enter a Polish school, don a Polish uniform, and become a Polish commander; he was also ordered to give up his original Russian-sounding name and assume an esteemed Polish family name. When the group of allegedly Polish officers stayed in Moscow, all of them, including the atheists and Jews, were obliged to attend a Catholic Church service, where they had to kiss the cross in the hands of the priest. Almost all of them were Communists. An anecdote was being told about the young officer who, when his turn came, approached the priest and whispered to him, "Excuse me, Father, I can't, I have been a Communist for 4 years now." To which the priest answered, also in a whisper, "Kiss, you fool, I have been a Communist for 20 years."—and the photograph of this ceremony was then sent to Poland to impress the good Catholics.

The same hyprocrisy is at the basis of the most important development in Poland in the last year—the appointment of Soviet Marshal Rokossovsky as Poland's Minister of War and, of course, member of the Politburo of the Communist Party of Poland, hypocritically called Workers Party. Almost all the leading posts in the Polish army have been given ovef to Soviet generals whose names were changed to sound Polish: General Korzhyc (vice minister of defense and chief of staff); General Sivitsky (Korzhic's deputy); General Poplavski (under secretary of war); General Romejko (air force); Torkevich, Pultuzhytski and Strashevski (military district commanders); Sennitski (commander of land forces). About 600 high-ranking Soviet military men became actual commanders in the Polish Army. Simultaneously with the announcement of Rokossovsky's appointment, all Polish Communist leaders suspected of opposition to close ties with the Soviet Union were purged from the government and the army, the first among them being the potential Tito of Poland—Wladislaw Gomulko.

The new set-up was very similar to the old Russian imperial set-up, but since Stalin wished to maintain the appearance of a sovereign Poland, the elevation of Marshal Rokossovsky had to be presented as a unique act of purely personal nature; the reason given for taking this step was that President Bierut of Poland had requested the Soviet

Government if possible to place the marshal at the disposal of Poland and the Soviet Government in view of the friendly relations between the two nations, agreed to comply.

It would be out of the question for Stalin's government to relinquish Poland to the Poles. Poland is Russia's main road to the west, to Germany and beyond, and any Russion government which intends to operate in the west must control Poland. For the right to use this road, Lenin fought a war in 1920; along with German generals he plotted a new war in 1922. In 1939, when Hitler was about to upset the balance of Europe, Stalin's first thought was of Poland, and his first invasion was into Poland. In 1944–45, when Stalin decided to set up his own government in Poland, the first serious cleavage between him and his allies became inevitable. Today, too, Stalin's strength in Europe hinges on his dominance over Poland, and he would risk a war rather than restore Polish independence.

For our generation Poland remains a moral issue of the first magnitude; there will be no peace until this issue is resolved. In a way, history is a race between expediency and lofty principles, between power and conscience, between cynicism and idealism. In the long run naked power has never been victorious; its successes have been temporary and transitory.

And they will be so in the case of Poland. Sacrifices will be exacted, blood will be spilled, bitter fighting will be inevitable. But freedom is certain to win over the forces of darkness and oppression.

Malone Backs Hearst on UN Betrayal of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Backs Hearst on UN Betrayal of United States," published in the New York Journal-American of December 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKS HEARST ON UN BETRAYAL OF UNITED STATES

(By Dan Markel)

WASHINGTON, December 26.—William Randolph Hearst is 100 percent right in his statement in Sunday's New York Journal-American and other Hearst newspapers that United Nations "unity is betraying the interests of the United States," Senator GEORGE W. MALONE (Republican, Nevada) declared.

He said:

"Mr. Hearst should be commended by every right-thinking American for calling the Nation's attention to Britain's rubber shipments to Russia as a prime example of United Nations 'unity.'"

Senator MALONE referred to the signed editorial by Mr. Hearst titled "A Tragic Unity" which said in part:

"I think shipments of rubber to Russia at a time when Russia is supplying arms and much needed equipment to the Chinese armies which are slaughtering the boys from the United States is a fair example of the unity which prevails in the United Nations."

MALONE said British trade with Russia is forcing the United States to pay record prices for natural rubber needed to build our own defense.

Russian purchases with tin have also caused tin prices to skyrocket, he pointed out, adding:

"The British have us on the hip.

"To them Russian gold, produced by Russia's slave labor, is as good as ours, and sometimes they seem to think it is better.

"Britain and her traders are open to the highest bidder.

"As long ago as November 1948, when I was in Singapore on a tour to see what deals our supposed friends were making with the Communists, I found the British shipping sizable quantities of tin and rubber to Soviet Russia.

"They've shipped tin and rubber to Communist Russia ever since.

"They're still shipping while Russian planes and military equipment are killing our boys in Korea."

DECLARED A TRAGEDY

"Mr. Hearst rightly declares 'it is a tragedy that President Truman tolerates such base betrayal of our country and our people by these supposed allies.'

"It is a tragedy that the Senate and Congress allowed themselves to get roped in by schemes to support these so-called allies in the first place.

"There is not 1 of the 16 nations of Europe that has been receiving our largesse under ECA, with the possible exception of Sweden, that has not been selling goods to Russia whenever and as much as they can.

"Months ago I exposed on the floor of the Senate the 96 trade treaties these Marshall plan-United Nations countries have with Russia.

"The British were trading with Russia and planning more trade when Britain applied for its first multibillion-dollar loan, and later, when it came to us for other billions in ECA hand-outs.

"Britain and France had even entered into nonaggression pacts with Russia. Congress, under administration pressure, went right on with its too late to do something about hand-outs.

"The hour is late but not it.

"First we should stop all aid and assistance to any nation that is helping Russia and her satellites consolidate their gains and prepare for world war III.

"We should enter into long-term contracts with Brazil and the other countries of the Western Hemisphere that produce natural rubber for their entire output, even if we must pay a higher price.

"We should produce synthetic rubber to our utmost capacity.

"Then let the British try their squeeze."

Our Power Was Never Greater, Our National Honor Never Brighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, a great many Americans started the New Year with a gloomy outlook, so it was very heartening to read the message from Walter Winchell which appeared in the New York Daily Mirror of January 1, 1951, and which gives us a ray of sunshine.

Walter Winchell has fought for many years against isms which are un-American. In his article, he eloquently and in a few well-chosen words crystallized the issues which seriously concern the American people today, and gave us reassurance that this land of ours still is, and will continue to be, the world's greatest arsenal in the battle for democracy. From this, people the world over who cherish freedom can take heart and know that no ideology foreign to our American ideals will be allowed to flourish—and that we can and will continue to wield our influence in the cause of democracy.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Winchell's article, so that the Members of this House may have an opportunity to read it. It follows:

Mr. and Mrs. United States, things look bad for our country, I know. Many experts who do not know what they are talking about are now as unreasonably gloomy as they once were absurdly cheerful.

The truth is that in the secret history of the world, our final power was never greater, and our national honor never brighter. The fact is our secret weapons are so powerful—that out of common humanity we will not use them—except in extreme necessity. This Nation can defeat any other nation or combination of nations in the world, if it comes to a matter of survival. We not only can defeat the Communists as a nation—we can obliterate the Russians as a people.

In our secret arsenals are enough weapons to remove every Russian city of over 100,000 population from the map. Within easy striking distance of our foreign bases we could vaporize 50,000,000 Russians in one mass bombing. We know what the Russians have in secret weapons—but compared to ours they don't amount to a fourth of July firecracker.

That is also true of Korea. We could burn out the Red Chinese army in Korea tonight—and the only reason we don't do it is that we would not think of killing the 29,000,000 Koreans we are going to liberate. We could incinerate the Kremlin faster than we could free Korea. But the 50,000,000 Russians we could kill—25,000,000 would be children. And it is not our tradition to attack babies.

Stalin knows that the very second the artillery of his field armies rolls west on Europe—something is going to roar north from the Mediterranean. And the black hole in the earth—which was once Moscow—will be the only evidence left of the blackness of his crime.

Malone Hits Tariff Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "MALONE Hits Tariff Policy," published in the New York Journal-American of December 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARGES STATE DEPARTMENT IS SELLING OUT UNITED STATES—MALONE HITS TARIFF POLICY

Senator MALONE charged that more than 100 State Department employees now are in England selling out American workers and investors by making tariff concessions to other nations.

The Nevada Republican said an international trade conference now going on at Torquay, England, "will complete plans for wrecking the American economic system.

"Americans are fighting an economic war as well as a military war and the State Department is the wrecking crew on both fronts," MALONE said.

Representatives of more than 30 nations are attending the Torquay conference. Six other countries are seeking to have a part in any agreement reached.

WOULD KILL TRADE ACT

MALONE called on the Eighty-second Congress, convening January 3, to let the 1934 Trade Agreement Act die next June 30.

He said the administration has been using this law to make tariff concessions which he said have badly hurt many American industries.

"We must take steps to assure a strong America economically, to halt the policy which not only weakens our positions abroad but dissipates our industries at home," MALONE said. "This can be done by forcing the administration and particularly its State Department to stop its war against American workingmen and investors."

MALONE has long advocated a flexible import-fee principle for the United States in dealing with other nations. Such a system would take into account any difference in living standards in setting tariffs on goods coming into this country.

Time: 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Winchell in the New York Daily Mirror of January 2, 1951:

TIME: 1951

Time is a mysterious process moving inexorably from infinity to eternity. Civilization is as ancient as the oceans and as new as tomorrow. A split second holds the past, present, and future. The serene instant when night and day are balanced marks the end of 1 day as well as the start of another. Tomorrow is woven out of the thread of yesterday.

You can appreciate the miracle of time by realizing the millions of years of evolution it has taken to carve the human hand.

It is well to remember that clocks and calendars are not the sole yardsticks of time. They are gadgets designed to regulate our daily existence. Time has no dates or hours.

Philosophers are aware that the yardstick of time varies with the conditions of our existence. A moment of agony is longer than an hour of bliss. A year of slavery longer than a decade of liberty. A million years is only a wink to an astronomer. Yet a decision a diplomat makes in a moment can affect thousands of years of history.

Time's strangest aspect is that nations existing in 1951—live in different ages. Atomic ingenuity mingles with prehistoric hatreds. It is 1951 in Moscow—but the spirit of communism lives in a cave. Politically and spiritually some nations are still in the Middle Ages. Over the roar of jet-propelled planes you can hear the steady throb of medieval tom-toms.

What has humanity got to show for 1,950 years of civilization? Fabulous cities, wondrous machines, incredible scientific accomplishments. There are marvels winging through the skies and flowing through test tubes. Mechanical magic galore. Material miracles that could defy the imagination of angels.

There has been great progress in curing ills of the flesh. Yet the spiritual maladies remain largely unconquered.

Amid humanity's most startling material achievements, a shocking paradox exists. Within the glitter of shimmering cities are grim shadows. In the most modern metropolis you can find luxury and poverty side by side.

Many who live in the same city don't inhabit the same world. Many who live in the same world don't exist in the same age.

The most obvious fact of modern life is also its most crushing problem: Mankind moves forward materially like a rocket while spiritual progress is no swifter than a paralytic turtle. Just gaze at the front pages: Page 1 indicates a global holocaust; page 2 heralds another triumph in the fight against disease.

Time has caused massive geographical changes. The years have changed the shape of continents, the contour of oceans and carved mighty canyons. Vast distances have been shortened. But when will we bridge the distances separating human hearts?

Down through the ages one fact has remained crystal clear: Human progress is never achieved easily or swiftly. There are no short cuts to Paradise. Mankind has moved forward by surmounting obstacles. Every human right is the result of sacrifices.

Progress comes from men of vision, faith, and courage who have dared face a challenge. Humanity never advances to the tune of brass bands. The banners of progress are tattered uniforms; its medals are scars and its only music is the heartbeat of brave humans. Before history is inscribed with ink—it is written in blood.

The agonized cries of the minutemen made possible our liberty—not the lilting strains of Yankee Doodle. What the twentieth century can learn from the past is that only courage and hardship will guarantee the survival of humanity in the twenty-first century.

The club was once a mighty weapon—today it is the atomic bomb. But whether people live in an age of bows and arrows or supersonic rockets—the essential decency of the human spirit has remained timeless.

The human spirit has been powered by a constant striving for a better way of life. Which explains why the Ten Commandments have remained more potent than all of history's tyrants—and their armies.

The immortality of the spirit is mankind's brightest hope—because it insures the inevitable disintegration of despotism. Time can shrivel the skin and still the heart, but the teachings of a Man born 1,950 years ago are everlasting. There is more power in the Golden Rule than in a mountain of uranium. And the precepts of the Bible have done more to unite people everywhere than all the treaties, pacts, and charters. The fundamental religious truths have survived wars, earthquakes, and famines. Catastrophe follows catastrophe, as waves break upon the shore. Yet the storms of human tragedies never wrecked the foundation of spiritual strength. And only upon that foundation can we erect a better way of life.

None should forget this compelling fact of civilization: When compared with the age of the seas, humanity is still in its dawn. There is still time to mold a world where no man lives in fear, and children grow up in peace.

It takes just a modicum of realism to understand that time is neutral. It is not a servant, but must be mastered. It fights on the side that best utilizes it. It takes courage and patience and valor to move onward. A hundred hammer blows may smash a rock. Yet the blow that finally shatters it is no more vital than those that preceded it. Tyranny, like cancer, still hasn't been conquered. Because it is a lengthy struggle is no reason for surrendering. The cure for diseases, which scientists have been working on for centuries, may be discovered tomorrow morning.

The great ally of tyranny is complacency. Time wasted by decent men adds time to the lives of despots. Every human act is a ripple which eventually reaches the far shores of history. For history is the total biography of every man who lives—and has lived.

This Nation's history offers the most striking illustration of the ageless force of justice. The faith that overcame the rigors of Valley Forge made possible the triumph of Iwo Jima. George Washington's flaming spirit burned within Abraham Lincoln and was carried like a torch by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Most Americans have never ceased battling for the ideals that motivated the minutemen. Jefferson's ringing words still find echoes in the hearts of Americans today. The ride Paul Revere started has never really ended.

If there are Americans fighting for liberty in the fortieth century—it will still be 1776.

Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REVA BECK BOSONE
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CAMP POLK, LA., *December 24, 1950.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOSONE: When it became apparent that the Communists had selected force as a means of further expanding their power, I closed my law office in Heber and joined the Forty-fifth Infantry Division, where I had served during the last war. It was most encouraging to find myself among old friends, all anxious to do their best to preserve our Nation. We have really worked hard at it—from about 5:45 to 6 p. m. or 7 or 8 or 9 every day.

Practically all of our officers and many of our noncoms are combat veterans—not anxious to get killed, but determined to protect America. But, Judge, of late a terrible thing has raised its head. Isolationism—first Herbert Hoover, then KENNETH WHERRY have trumpeted the watch-cries of the cult. It has taken a slightly new form—i. e., our Navy and Air Force can save us, we don't have to risk our necks or spend our blessed money.

In the first place they are wrong from a military point of view. If we can't stop the Russians in Europe with all the French and British et al. to help us, we will be in a tough spot at home without their help. Because of the courageous and determined leadership of F. D. R. and Henry Stimson et al. and the 250,000 American men who gave their lives in the last war, we have won

a series of bases remote from our homeland which enable us to meet the aggressors far from home. Judge, I saw the wrecked towns in Italy, France, and Germany. I saw the terror in the eyes of people whose land had been fought over. I don't want this to happen to my home or to my family. And I saw the boxcars of corpses at Dachau and the gas chambers. I don't intend to cower here until they select me for execution next.

We have a great, powerful Nation, with great, powerful friends. Those with courage enough to face the realities of our situation must shout and make themselves heard above the cowardly whimperings of the Hoovers and Wherrys. General Collins knows what we can do. He so testified just the other day.

Isn't it ironical that the Republicans, who were so busy accusing the Democrats of coddling the Communists as long as that served the purpose of helping them to preserve their precious money, now turn out to be the isolationists when it takes courage and sacrifice to deal with the real Communist threat.

I'm writing this rather long letter to you as a personal friend whom I have long respected. I hope it will be of some assistance to you in the performance of your weighty responsibilities during the next few months. I so hope you can stop those cowards from denying us the one real opportunity of protecting our homes and preserving democracy.

Most sincerely,

GLEN M. HATCH, Jr.,
Captain, One Hundred and
Sixtieth Field Artillery Battalion.

Some Thoughts About 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ed Sullivan, from the New York Daily News of January 1, 1951:

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT 1951

(By Ed Sullivan)

When some people in show business, always considered good citizens, permit their names to spearhead heated opposition to a loyalty oath, you marvel at the stupidity which enrolls their names and reputations on such sucker lists.

In a national emergency, when Washington experience has demonstrated that loyalties are questionable, it is for the good of the individual and the country to proclaim his loyalty.

A loyalty oath is no infringement of freedom or liberty.

Rather, it is one of the duties inherent in the citizenship contract, a contract you ratify by accepting all of the vital privileges insured by the Constitution—military protection, education, health services, trial by jury, freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion.

It is tremendously significant that article VI, of the original seven articles of the Constitution, demanded that all national and State officers shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support the Constitution.

When the young Nation protested that the Constitution was not sufficiently explicit as to individual and State rights 10 original amendments were added.

Article I, defining freedom of religion, of speech, of press, and the right to petition, did not alter the necessity for Federal and State officials taking an oath of loyalty. The founding fathers recognized the necessity for such an oath of loyalty, just as we can recognize it in 1951.

In 1951, some people of show business would do well to learn the true meaning of loyalty and patriotism, and never forget the deeper implications.

During World War II, this reporter happened to be at a Marine base, down South, when a division was about to shove off for the Pacific. The speaker was a New Yorker, Monsignor Robert E. McCormick, and he selected as his theme the Marine motto: Semper Fidelis—Always Faithful.

Out of that came his analysis and definition of loyalty and patriotism.

"Loyalty," he told them, "means being always faithful to a lawful government.

"Loyalty comes from a reasoned conviction. It is the result and accompaniment of human reason telling a person to adhere to the laws and customs of his country.

"Loyalty is the basis on which patriotism is founded and without loyalty, there can be no true patriotism.

"Patriotism, on the other hand, is love of country. It adds the emotional element of love and devotion to one's country, to loyalty and obedience to its laws. Patriotism without loyalty is hypocrisy."

The Marines, typified by such men as Sgt. John Basilone, in World War II, and such men as Maj. Gen. Oliver Smith, of Korean fame, in this war, always have had those definitions engraved on their hearts.

In 1951, let us hope that all Americans will need no prompting, when they're called upon to interpret these two often misused terms.

As a newspaperman who is part of show business, in a minute capacity, I'm hopeful that the people of show business will measure up to their obligations as citizens in 1951. Their duty is even greater, because no group is treated with greater affection and respect, and few groups are paid such huge salaries. Actually, only a tiny group of them are indifferent to their responsibilities.

In 1951, let's be sure that this small, dissident group gets in step with the Jimmy Durantes, the Irving Berlins, the Harvey Stones, the Dinah Shores, the Danny Kayes, the Jack Bennys, the Bing Crosbys, the Joe E. Browns, the Eddie Cantors, and the Bob Hopes who have added to the luster of the troupers.

Dulles' Plea for United Countering of Red Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the address made by John Foster Dulles at the dinner of the American Association for the United Nations held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, taken from the New York Times of December 30, 1950:

TEXT OF DULLES' PLEA FOR UNITED COUNTERING OF RED AGGRESSION

WHERE ARE WE?

At the end of the year it is our good custom to pause to think about the past so that we can better plan the future. This year end it is particularly important to do that, and we should be grateful to all who, out of wisdom, experience, and proven idealism, help to clarify the grave issues that confront us.

As we look back we can feel satisfaction because of what our Nation has done. Great dangers still lie ahead, but that does not prove that the five postwar years have been years of failure and futility. There are usually patches of ground fog. But once we lift our vision so that we see the present in the light of historical perspective, it is apparent that the last 5 years have been years of great achievement and that our people have already surmounted great peril.

DANGER OF WESTERN DECADENCE

Nations are like people in the sense that while they may die a violent death they are more apt to die in their beds, particularly as they grow older. The great question of our time has been whether our western civilization had become so old and decadent that it was bound to pass away, giving place to the younger, dynamic, and barbarian society born out of the unholy union of Marx's communism and Russia's imperialism.

For 1,000 years our western civilization had been dominant in the world. It won and held that leadership on merit. It produced spiritual, intellectual, and material richness such as the world had never known before. The fruits of western society were spread everywhere, and men elsewhere wanted to share them, rather than to destroy their source.

However, a thousand years is a long time, even for a civilization, and many had come to feel that western civilization had run its course and had become infected with the same decay as had rotted other great civilizations of the past. The Communists in particular took that view, claiming that the west could no longer produce the vital leadership or creative acts needed to satisfy the material and political aspirations of the dissatisfied masses.

Taking advantage of Russia's defeat in World War I, the Bolshevik Communists seized the political power there, and from then on Russian state power and Bolshevik Party power worked hand in hand to expand their joint control.

The standard technique was not war, but rather intensive propaganda disparaging the west and promising to satisfy all the dissatisfied. Then, when the softening up had occurred, terrorism, subversion, and civil war were used to gain political control. By those methods the state and party steadily enlarged their political control until they had brought under it about 800,000,000 people, or one-third of all the people there are. And still they were rolling on toward their announced goal of a Soviet-designed one world.

Who was there to stop that movement? Many thought that it was unstoppable and a bandwagon trend was getting under way.

UNITED STATES RESPONSIBILITY

At this critical moment heavy responsibility fell upon the United States. We were still a relatively young nation; had not been devastated by war, and were on that account less susceptible than others to the poison that the Communist Party distills. We, if any, could perhaps demonstrate the faith and works needed to rally men to the cause of human freedom.

The whole world watched to see. If, at that juncture, we had sought only to save ourselves that would have been public confession that the Communists were right in the judgment that the west had rotted. The tide of communism would have rolled on irresistibly and we would have been encircled, isolated, and finally engulfed. Only as we sought to help others could we save ourselves.

Our people responded to that challenge by a 5-year record of which we can be proud.

Consider these deeds:

1. We showed, by example within our own country, that social justice could be had without traveling the Communist road of violent revolution and materialism. Through graduated income and estate taxes, and social security and pension plans, our capitalistic society has come to approach, more nearly than the Communist world, the ideal of production according to ability and distribution according to need.

2. Within 5 years the colonial system, which had become a festering sore, has been subjected to orderly liquidation. Over 750,000,000 people have peacefully won political independence. Great Britain, as the principal colonial power, took the lead. Our own direct national contribution has been the granting of freedom to the Philippines and the discrediting of racial discrimination here at home. But in many other ways we have exerted a powerful influence in this whole great process of building between men of different races, creeds, and colors a new relationship of partnership and of equality.

3. Since the end of World War II we have provided, in loans and grants, over $40,000,000,000 for the relief of other people and the reconstruction of other lands, thereby practicing the great commandment that the strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak.

4. We took the lead in founding the United Nations as an organization for recording the moral judgments of the world and developing ways to put power behind those judgments so as to promote collective justice and security. This year, for the first time in all the annals of history, a world organization moved with force to halt aggression and, whether or not that effort succeeds in Korea, the United Nations has revealed possibilities which will inspire further effort. Already, at this 1950 session, the United Nations General Assembly asked all the member nations to maintain armed forces which could serve as United Nations units and it adopted new procedures so that these contingents could be called into service without the paralysis of veto.

NEED FOR CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM

Now, I do not claim for a moment what our Nation has done in these respects has been perfectly done. Our own social changes may have gone so far as unduly to curtail incentive and self-reliance. In some cases, political independence may have been given to peoples who are so inexperienced in the ways of self-government that it will be hard for them to preserve that independence in the face of the diabolically clever apparatus of Soviet communism. Our loans and grants to others may sometimes have provided temporary relief rather than incentives to bold new creations of unity and strength.

Both the United States and the United Nations may have assumed political responsibilities which they did not yet have the power to back up. Policies, themselves good, often lacked efficient and timely execution. There have been grave and perhaps unnecessary setbacks. Almost surely the free world erred in relying too much on potential power, and in not creating enough military strength in being.

There is no occasion for complacency or for whitewash. There is need to expose errors and to point the way to making better use of all the moral and material assets that our people have shown they could provide. Such constructive pressures are needed and I have been among those who sought to create them. Under our political system that is a special responsibility of the opposition party.

But, surmounting whatever may have been the faults and inadequacies of leadership, the deeds of our people over the past 5 years emerge as a testimonial to greatness and to achievement.

THE COLD WAR THWARTED

A year ago, on January 1, 1950, Izvestia's leading editorial welcomed the new year with these words:

"Around the U. S. S. R. the camp of the fighters for peace, democracy, and socialism is growing and becoming stronger.

"The forces of this camp are multiplying day by day. The camp of democracy and socialism today includes the great Soviet Union, democratic Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, Northern Korea, the Mongol People's Republic, the Chinese People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic."

And the editorial concluded:

"Communism is conquering, communism will triumph."

I do not know what Izvestia will say next Monday in greeting to 1951. I do know that, whereas between 1945 and 1950 it was boasting new conquests at the average rate of over two nations a year, there are, this year, no new names of which to boast. That means that the free world has found the way to slow down Soviet Communist expansion by methods short of open war. That is no mean accomplishment.

Communism pitted its youth against what it thought was our decrepitude; its universal creed against what it thought was our isolationism; its revolutionary practices against what it thought was our static mood. It found, to its dismay, a people who, when under pressure, did not decompose into factionalism and frustration. Unitedly, and with unpartisan and bipartisan leadership, they joined in an outpouring of compassion, fellowship, and material succor such as history has never before recorded.

There is scarcely a man, woman, or child in the United States who has not consciously made some sacrifice, out of the highest motives of which human beings are capable. In the process they have ennobled their own character, have given new hope and courage to millions elsewhere and have discomfited the leaders of Soviet communism.

That is not a performance to be belittled; nor is the mood one to be reversed.

We can rejoice in the renewal of the faith that has been the rock of our foundation and out of which have gushed healing waters. We can be confident that that faith, if sustained, assures our capacity to overcome at least one of the twin dangers which, at the end of World War II, confronted us. We are not doomed to die in our beds.

So much for the past. Let us look now to the future. Have we renewed our youth like the eagle's only to be shot at in battle? That might be. That was the risk our people took when they decided not to die from the internal diseases of old age.

The leaders of Soviet communism would have preferred sickness to be the method of our passing. They have great skill in spreading malignant germs and they prefer to practice that art rather than the art of open war where their nation may have quantitative superiority, but has qualitative inferiority. Party leaders have always distrusted the army and the generals, and are reluctant to give them the power that war exacts. If they have to use any army, they would rather use someone else's. Also, so long as they hold the Red Army in reserve to be only a threat, they can still get the advantage of their peace propaganda.

But since it seems that the free world has gained a certain immunity to the Communist Party poison, their leaders must now decide whether to accept one of those waiting periods which Stalin has taught may from time to time be necessary in order "to buy off a powerful enemy and gain a respite" or whether to resort increasingly to open war.

The fact that the free world succeeded, to the degree it did, in slowing up Communist success by methods short of war, automatically increased the risk of war itself.

But risk is not the same as certainty. Just as we surmounted, in recent years, the primary peril of inner decay, so, in the year ahead, we must seek to surmount also the peril of full-scale foreign war. Our search must be for effective deterrents to Russian armed aggression.

The free world starts out with certain assets which, I think we would all agree, are capable of being developed into deterrents of a general war of Russian origin. Since moral factors do not weigh heavily in the Russian scale, we are forced to think somewhat in material terms.

OUR INDUSTRIAL SUPERIORITY

Our inventive, resourceful, and free society has given industrial productivity far greater than that of Russia. In terms of steel, aluminum, electric power and oil, the United States has a superiority of 3 or 4 to 1 over Russia. That ratio of superiority would not, of course, hold if Russia could take the industrial power of the Ruhr and Western Europe and the oil of the Middle East.

So long as there are impediments to that, the free world has an economic power which operates as a major deterrent to open Russian aggression, particularly if we also have the will to forego some of our pleasures and put our economic machine into creating weapons on a mass production basis.

RUSSIAN INTERNAL VULNERABILITY

Already, within the captive world, there are grave internal weaknesses and these could be exploited by skillful opponents. Despotism, when looked at from without usually looks solid and formidable, whereas free societies look divided and weak. Actually, that is an optical illusion. The reality is just the opposite.

Take Russia. Out of its 200,000,000 people, only about 6,000,000, or 3 percent, are members of the ruling Communist Party. The political prisoners number from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000, or twice the total membership of the party. The party itself is shot through with distrust and suspicion and there are periodic purges as between party factions. No one, even in high authority, feels personally safe.

In the case of the satellite countries, the situation is even more precarious. For example, there is much unrest on the China mainland, and in Poland and Czechoslovakia the people are forced to accept officials of Russian nationality because no trustworthy persons can be found at home.

When a few men rule despotically 800,000,000, that is bound to be a vulnerable position. Many of the 800,000,000 are sure to be sullen, resentful, and eager for change. Most of the others will have been so beaten into submissiveness by the harsh discipline of the police state, that they have lost all sense of personal responsibility and could not respond to the needs which war disruptions would impose.

War can be very unkind to rulers who are despots and who have systematically destroyed the individual initiatives of their people. They know that and we can increasingly help them to see the light.

FALLACY OF AREA DEFENSE

When it comes to straight military strategy, the free world seems, momentarily, in a mood of some confusion and without any agreed deterrent program.

The Soviet Union has interior lines. It has concentrated men, tanks, artillery and strategic and tactical planes around the hub of the great circle of its control. The rim starts near the North Pole, swings south along the border of Norway, Finland, Sweden, West Germany, Austria and Yugoslavia; then east along the border of Greece, Turkey, the Arab States, Iran, Afghanistan,

Pakistan, India, Burma, Indochina, and Malaya; then northward close to the Philippines, Formosa, Japan, Korea, and Alaska. From within this vast orbit, a single will can, in secrecy, plot and act to strike any one of many nations with overwhelming force.

It may be possible, by prearranged defense, to make that attack costly, particularly where sea and air power play a role or where, as in Western Europe, there are depth and numbers and military experience on which to draw. But it is not practicable to build up in each one of the more than 20 nations making up this vast frontier of about 20,000 miles, static defensive forces which could make each nation impregnable to a major and unpredictable assault by the Red armies of Russia. To attempt this would be to have strength nowhere and bankruptcy everywhere.

That, however, does not mean that we should abandon the whole idea of collective security and build our own defense area with the help of such other countries as we might pick because of their capacity to be useful to us.

There are, I think, flaws in that thesis. Any nation which at a moment of supreme danger sheds those of its allies who are most endangered, and to whom it is bound by solemn treaty, by common heritage and by fellowship in war and peace, is scarcely in a position thereafter to do much picking and choosing for its own account. It elects a dangerous course, for solitary defense is never impregnable.

It is possible to plan, on paper, and describe in words, what it seems should be an impregnable defense, a China Wall, a Maginot Line, a Rock of Gibralter, an Atlantic and Pacific moat. But the mood that plans such a defense carries within itself the seeds of its own collapse. A defense that accepts encirclement quickly decomposes. That has been proved a thousand times.

A United States which could be an inactive spectator while the barbarians overran and desecrated the cradle of our Christian civilization would not be the kind of a United States which could defend itself.

DETERRENT TO RETALIATORY POWER

Fortunately, we do not have to choose between two disastrous alternatives. It is not necessary either to spread our strength all around the world in futile attempts to create everywhere a static defense, nor need we crawl back into our own hole in the vain hope of defending ourselves against all the rest of the world. We are not bankrupt in resourcefulness.

Around the rim of the captive world the free world can create enough economic and political vigor, enough military strength and enough will to resist so that these areas cannot be cheaply conquered by subversive methods, by trumped-up civil wars or even by satellite attacks.

If the Soviet Union itself decides on open aggressive war, there is only one effective defense, for us and for others. That is the capacity to counterattack. That is the ultimate deterrent.

When I was in the Senate, working for the ratification of the North Atlantic Pact, I took the position that it did not commit the United States to the land defense of any particular area; it did not commit us to action, but action of our own choosing rather than action that an aggressor could dictate to us.

In Korea, the United Nations forces suffer the grave handicap of trying to repel an aggressor within the limited area he selected for an attack, at the time he selected, and with methods of war which are dictated by the terrain and the weather he selected.

Our people have loyally, sacrificially, and rightly backed this historic first attempt at organized suppression of aggression. We have done so despite the fact that this effort involves the inevitable defects of any first endeavor. But we instinctively feel that there is something wrong about the methods and do not want to be committed to a series of Koreas all around the globe.

That instinct is quite sound.

Against such military power as the Soviet Union can marshal, collective security depends on capacity to counterattack against the aggressor. Then the force that protects one protects all, and there is a good chance of deterring aggression.

The United States is not without power in this respect. We have our strategic air force, a stock of weapons, naval power, and potential strength on the ground. Much more of all of this needs now to be brought into being.

Total reliance should not be placed on any single form of warfare or any relatively untried type of weapon. The arsenal of retaliation should include all forms of counterattack with maximum flexibility, mobility, and the possibility of surprise. The places of assembly should be chosen, not as places to defend, but as places suitable for launching the means of destroying the forces of aggression, if aggression occurs.

The United Nations, if it shows that it has the requisite moral courage, should be given the right to determine the fact of aggression so as to insure the Charter goal of armed forces not being used save in the common interest.

In such ways the idea of collective security can be given sensible and effective content.

We cannot be sure that anything we now do will, in fact, prevent the awful catastrophe of a third world war. The final decision will be made in the Kremlin. Perhaps it has been made already. That we cannot know. We face a period that is bound to be one of grave anxiety. But so long as the die has not been irrevocably cast for war, we must assume that righteous peace may yet be possible; and we must work with all the power that lies within us to achieve that peace.

It is not pleasant, at this holiday season, to talk about instruments of death. But events in Korea have shown that peace is not to be found in an unbalance of military power. To correct that balance is a grim necessity. But it is a necessity which also requires that we be vigilant to preserve and not relax the moral safeguards with which military power needs always to be surrounded.

We can rejoice that the United Nations forces in Asia and the North Atlantic forces in Europe are under the command of two men, General MacArthur and General Eisenhower, who have demonstrated, in peace and war, that they put material values second and moral values first. That should be the mood of all people.

It is not easy to do what has to be done without whipping up emotions which are provocative of war. Now, if ever, is the time when our people should preserve the calm resolve which, in moments of peril, is the hallmark of true greatness.

Railway Labor Bill, H. R. 7789

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, circumstances required my absence from Washington on Monday, January 1, 1951. Should H. R. 7789, a bill to amend the Railway Labor Act, come before the House for action, I desire to be recorded in favor of the legislation. If I were present, I would vote for it.

It is possible that a similar Senate bill may be substituted for the above-mentioned bill. If so, I would vote for it.

Malone Warns Against the Gray Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "MALONE Warns Against the Gray Report," published in the Mineral County (Nev.) Independent-News of December 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALONE WARNS AGAINST THE GRAY REPORT

United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, warned today of what he considers the grave danger to the national economy and of the unbearable tax burden which would be put upon the shoulders of the American people if the so-called Gray report should be approved by Congress.

The Nevada Senator, in a statement issued by his Washington office, said that some of the recommendations made by Gordon Gray, Special Assistant to the President, in his Report to the President on Foreign Economic Policy, paralleled some of his own recommendations but that the Gray report went entirely too far and embodied all the crackpot program of the Socialist-minded State Department.

Senator MALONE suggested that the American people, particularly their representatives in Congress, read the fine print before making up their minds about the Gray report. Senator MALONE, in urging that utmost caution be exercised, called attention to the fact that approval of the report would provide:

1. That we continue sending money to so-called Marshall plan countries for 3 or 4 years after the expiration of ECA without requiring those countries to stop arming Russia.

2. That our net outflow of capital to underdeveloped areas of the world be in the range of $600,000,000 each year, this additional money to be taken, of course, from the American taxpayers.

3. That means be found to actually increase the high volume of slave-labor exports from foreign countries to the United States to compete with American-made goods produced by American workers with a higher wage standard, this leading inevitably to the lowering of the American worker's standard of living.

4. That the American Government protect British pound sterling and the external position of the United Kingdom. (Isn't it about time our administration started thinking about protecting the American dollar and the American economy?)

5. That the American taxpayers be called upon to guarantee private investments in foreign countries against the risks of nonconvertibility and expropriation (and this,

mind you, without calling upon those countries for any guaranties).

6. That America extend the point-4 program, the foot-in-the-door never-ending foreign give-away which could conceivably involve the American taxpayers to the extent of billions and even trillions of dollars.

7. That the United States become a member of the International Trade Organization, whereby the domestic and foreign trade of the United States could be governed by fifty-odd countries, the United States having just one vote.

Senator MALONE concluded: "These and other factors of the Gray recommendations are but a repetition of the same old State Department ideas which the American people have recently repudiated at the polls, to the extent of defeating the administration leaders in the Senate and the others who made excuses for the State Department. I do not know whom the administration thinks it is kidding by trotting out this discrediting program. The economic ruin of the United States is Stalin's aim, and with the apparent help of the Democratic administration, progress is being made toward Stalin's goal."

Pulling Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Birmingham Eccentric, Birmingham, Mich., one of the outstanding newspapers of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

The good sense and sound reasoning contained in this editorial is worthy of reading and consideration by every Member of Congress. I commend it to my colleagues. The editorial follows:

[From the Birmingham Eccentric of December 21, 1950]

LET US PULL TOGETHER—AS FREE MEN

Now that the United States Government has declared this Nation to be living in a state of emergency, the voices of many are raised in that old and familiar chorus: "Let us put aside our personal and political differences, and all pull together."

To be sure, in the all-out effort to produce the munitions of defense, the chorus makes sense.

But to expect the American people to follow, without any convictions of their own to be expressed, the leadership of any segment of the general government is merely to submit to a form of voluntary totalitarianism.

We don't expect free Americans ever to do that.

Specifically, we raise the question: What about Secretary of State Dean Acheson? Since he has lost the confidence of a majority of the American people—including Democrats as well as Republicans—are we going to shut up and accept him as perfection merely because the President of the United States wants us to?

The President is an elected official, for a certain term of years. Being human, he will make mistakes, but short of impeachment proceedings, he must live out his term. A Secretary of State is an appointed official, who can be removed at any time by the man who appointed him—the President himself.

Certainly the President knows how much of a debit upon the balance sheet of his administration Mr. Acheson is. Only the President's blind stubbornness keeps Acheson on the job.

And as long as he is on the job, this Nation will not have complete confidence in the motives and acts of Harry S. Truman.

As we plunge into the current tension, more mistakes are bound to be made. Some of them will be excusable, some of them will not.

But more of them will be forgiven if Truman has at his side men and women who are not under public suspicion and dislike—and Acheson, the striped-pants diplomatic intellectual whose handling of Asiatic problems has done much to create our present world mess, will continue to be a tremendous brake on the upsurge of morale of America.

Personally, we do not dislike or hate Mr. Acheson. Were he our neighbor, we'd get a kick out of lending him our lawnmower, or gabbing over the back fence * * * but, by all the gods ever conjured up by the minds of men, we don't believe him presently fit to hold his office, and join millions of other Americans who want him to get off his job.

As we said in the beginning of this comment, the times do call for the need of Americans to pull together.

This we intend to do in every phase of the business of building up a common defense of the weapons of war.

But to expect loyal Americans, whether they be mere citizens or public officials, to abdicate from the protective processes of the free government we are fighting to defend * * * well, that type of elemental existence is reserved only for totalitarian peoples.

The darkest hour ever faced by a free people ought to, somehow, elevate their leaders to heroic and inspired examples of greatness.

To this end we raise our voice in pleading prayer that Almighty God will, in some manner, enter into the head and heart of Harry S. Truman, and make him a figure that will become beloved by future generations of human beings—not only in the United States, but in every land where freedom hungers to live and thrive.

We pray thus not merely to glorify one man, but rather to have that one man rise to the supreme heights of man's earthly estate, thus exemplifying the greatness of our people * * * to the glory of free men "* * * made in the image and likeness of God."

Penetration Program Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Friday I issued a public statement on ways and means of penetrating the Soviet Union in order to create internal dissension there and in the satellite nations. This is an idea which others and I have long recommended, and I am glad to see that at long last it has caught on.

I am particularly gratified by the outstanding response which my latest statement has elicited. So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of my release on this issue, to be followed by certain comments which I have received from Wisconsin. I should like to include a telegram received from one of the most courageous editors in Wisconsin who focused his sights on the Communist menace long before the American public generally awakened to the danger of this threat. I refer to Mr. John Chapple, managing editor of the Ashland Daily Press, Ashland, Wis.

Along this same line, there was printed in the November 1950 issue of the Reader's Digest an article entitled "We Can Win the Cold War in Russia." This article was written by Constantine W. Boldyreff, professor of Russian in the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., in conjunction with Mr. O. K. ARMSTRONG, newly elected Member of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that article, too, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, following my release.

There being no objection, the statement and accompanying papers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES ALL-OUT, WORLD-WIDE PENETRATION PROGRAM AGAINST COMMUNISM—SUGGESTS REVOLUTIONARY STRATEGY BOARD

I have been urging for years that America must give Russia and her satellites a taste of their own vile medicine. For years they have been attempting to foment revolutions within the free western nations. They have shipped arms, money, sabotage materials, etc., to their cohorts in our free lands.

COMMANDO TACTICS NECESSARY

The time is overdue for us to stop following a mere "pantywaist" diplomacy—a mere wordy Voice of America program. We must start using a commando-type program of psychological and revolutionary penetration, including the use of "silver bullets"—money.

I believe that if we follow such a bold program, if we cause the Russians and their satellites as much or more real trouble in their territory as they have caused in ours, we will have staved off to a considerable extent the threat of a third world war. In other words, the more preoccupied the Russians are with their own internal difficulties and disturbances the less they will feel they could rely upon their own and satellite peoples; and to that extent war pressure would be eased. I am recommending this program, therefore, not as a war effort but as a peace effort.

The hundreds of millions of dollars that we would spend to ship arms, sabotage equipment, etc., is but a drop in the bucket compared with the cost of a fleet of modern-day battleships or a fleet of long-range bombers.

RUSSIANS VULNERABLE TO PENETRATION

There are several reasons for such a world-wide revolutionary program:

1. The basic reason is, of course, that the Russians are infinitely more susceptible to this type of troublemaking on our part than we are to troublemaking on their part:

Most experts believe that during World War II Hitler could have won over to his cause millions of Russians, had his army not followed a program of brutal extermination. In the Ukraine, the German armies were initially greeted with open arms as friends

and not as conquerors, but Hitler's policies soon changed that.

Red China is especially vulnerable to agitating of dissension, because there are reported to be over a million guerrillas already in combat there. Russia itself with vast land mass and borders and its 70 nationalities, offers a tremendous opportunity for us. There is scarcely a family in Russia that hasn't had a member or relative liquidated or forced into slave labor. This fact provides fertile ground for our liberal distribution of arms for vengeance.

IT TAKES ARMS TO COMBAT DICTATORSHIP

2. It is a fact that you cannot revolt against a modern type of armed dictator unless you do have arms. The time has come for us to proclaim, "workers of the world, unite; we will give you the arms to break your chains."

3. A third basic reason for this program is that it will be in full accordance with the principles of ideological warfare we are now waging. If we seriously believe in the principles of freedom that we espouse, then it is up to us to help others actually gain that freedom. America would never have originally gained her freedom, had it not been for the splendid material aid of French patriots, rather than mere moral encouragement.

There are those who may be squeamish and who will say that this program which I am recommending and which others have recommended would merely provoke the Russians. On the contrary, I say that there is nothing that will provoke Russia more than our own weakness, our pussyfooting, and our stupidity.

WE NEED A DEMOCRACY INTERNATIONAL WITH STRATEGY BOARD

It is up to us to set up our own type of organization equivalent to the Comintern—the Communist International—which will preach not mere words, but which will give guns to fulfill those words, as necessary. Hand grenades talk louder than hand applause. We dare not lose an additional day. Let us secure the appointment of a commando-type leader with audacity and imagination, to carry out this program. And let there be appointed a board of revolutionary strategy consisting of the ablest experts in military science (particularly guerrilla warfare), experts in ethnic groups, etc., to plan our tactics, logistics, etc. Let this group work with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the State Department on the highest policy level.

From Madison, Wis.:

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We are 100 percent behind your idea of sponsored uprisings in Communist countries."

From Sparta, Wis.:

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am heartily in accord with your expressed idea of giving the Communists a taste of their own vile medicine. We should play their own game and beat them at it. General Chennault's views re assistance and support to guerrilla activities in China apparently are similar to yours, and friends with whom I have spoken believe firmly in accelerating activities to support guerrilla and underground efforts to overthrow the Communists wherever they operate.

"I wish you much success in your legislative efforts."

From West Bend, Wis.:

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Yours is the first sensible aggressive suggestion to come forward in the search for a method of fighting communism. It would effectively nullify the Russian plan of using satellite armies to destroy our forces while conserving the Russian military machine. I hope you keep up this fight to develop an aggressive American foreign policy."

ASHLAND, WIS., *December 29, 1950.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your proposal to strike directly at the criminal conspirators in control of Soviet Russia by assisting the people of Russia in the revolutionary overthrow of their present government. This would bring Russia back into the family of nations and give the peoples of the world an opportunity for lasting peace. It is the most logical proposal yet made to meet and conquer Russia's unwavering 33-year-old campaign to create world revolution and blot out freedom and hope for humanity. The present leaders of Russia betrayed the revolution against the Czar and are criminal usurpers of the Russian peoples dream of a government similar to America's. Your proposal if its gets through the iron curtain will bring the greatest surge of hope in the hearts of the Russian people of anything during this generation.

Respectfully,

JOHN B. CHAPPLE,

Managing Editor, Ashland Daily Press.

[From the Reader's Digest of November 1950]

WE CAN WIN THE COLD WAR IN RUSSIA

(By Constantine W. Boldyreff with O. K. ARMSTRONG)

Despite the war in Korea and the certainty that the tyrants who rule the Soviet Union have a blueprint for further aggression, I believe that a major conflict with Russia is not inevitable.

World war III can be prevented by an immediate and vigorous psychological attack aimed at the enemy's weakest spot—smoldering opposition of the Russian people against their oppressors in the Kremlin. Despite two generations of indoctrination, despite the relentless efforts of the dread secret police to crush all hope of freedom, there is bitter resentment against Stalin's slave regime. If that latent opposition can be aroused and organized, Stalin and his fellow conspirators will not dare provoke war. Once the opposition in Russia gets rolling, it can never be stopped.

I write as one who has lived a life of active opposition to the Bolshevik regime. After World War I my father, Lt. Gen. Vassily Boldyreff, commanded the White Russian Army in Siberia resisting the Bolsheviks. I was then a cadet. My father was captured and liquidated. In 1930 I helped to organize the NTS (National Alliance of Russian Solidarists), an underground organization secretly working in Russia today toward the revolution we know must someday free our people.

We who have chosen freedom must warn that the democracies are fast losing the cold war. Many well-meaning people presume, as did Trygve Lie, secretary-general of the United Nations, that if leaders of both sides will sit down together their differences can be settled by discussion and compromise. That is not true. Marxist communism is a militant, proselyting doctrine, based upon struggle. It carries inspiring promises, it creates zealots. But it cannot permit liberty of thought or action, it cannot tolerate opposition. Therefore it can never be appeased. It must be defeated.

Our need is to understand the enemy's plan of campaign. Stalin wants war—but not for Russia now. He wants war to strengthen his position internally and bleed the United States white. Here in Stalin's own words is the fundamental principle for Communist strategy of world conquest: "War leads to the weakening of the positions of capitalism in general. It approximates in its effect a proletarian revolution."

So Stalin has devised the diabolically shrewd plan to set the world afire with wars, fought by his puppets under Soviet-trained leaders, while keeping Russia officially neutral. By this means Stalin can enjoy all the privileges accorded honest diplomacy while his stooges stand in the United Nations and damn peace-loving peoples in barrages of propaganda aimed to win the underprivileged millions of the earth.

That was the pattern in Korea. It will be the pattern in Formosa, where Stalin hopes to draw the United States into war with China. It will be the pattern in Germany, where American guns may blaze away not at Russians but at Soviet-supported Germans.

Stalin does not fear the feverish arming of the United States, the diversion of manpower from normal production, the use of resources, and the vast expenditures for implements of war. That fits his plan of bleeding the United States white. But one thing he does fear—a revolt of the Russian people.

The masters of the Kremlin dread most a movement that will show their victims how to shake off Communist control. The Achilles' heel of Soviet rule has always been in Russia. Between 1921 and 1941 there were more than 30 revolts, rebellions, and active plots against the Bolshevik regime. Most of these, spontaneous and disorganized, were doomed from the start. But they indicated unmistakably the hatred of the people for their oppressors.

When Hitler's armies invaded Russia in 1941 the people greeted them as liberators. In less than 5 months millions of Russians surrendered to the Germans. By 1942 an organized anti-Bolshevik revolution under the leadership of Gen. Andrei Vlassov was on its way. But Nazi atrocities were more than even desperate anti-Communists could stomach, and the powerful force of Russian patriotism switched from combating the regime to defending the homeland. After the war hundreds of thousands of Russian prisoners of war and displaced persons refused to return to the Soviet Union.

Today the people of Russia hate the Communist regime more than ever before. Victory in World War II brought no relief for them. Instead, life became more difficult. Authentic reports from the underground indicate the fury and intensity of recent selective purges, comparable in their violence to the bloody carnage organized in 1937–38. There are about 15,000,000 prisoners in concentration camps; hardly a Russian family but has lost at least one member as a victim to Bolshevik cruelty. No one, not even party members and public officials, is free from the haunting fear of arrest.

The people of the democracies need quickly to enlist these allies in the only campaign that spells sure defeat for communism—the war of ideas. These are the weapons we can equip them with:

1. Active and open encouragement.

Neither the size nor the significance of the Russians' opposition to communism has been understood by the free nations. Escapees from the Soviet Union are forced to live wretched, hunted lives in Western Europe, Greece, and Turkey. The democracies have failed signally to encourage and to help these refugees. Yet they are passionate partisans of freedom—our best allies. Most of them have staked their lives to escape communism and will stake them again to destroy communism and liberate their enslaved people.

Assurance should be given the anti-Communist forces within Russia that by every means their hands will be strengthened. Announcement of a plan of assistance for all working in the underground would fire these patriots with hope and determination.

It cannot be urged too strongly that Russians be equipped and encouraged to conduct their own psychological war. The weakness of the Voice of America is that it sends propaganda from America. Its effectiveness would be immeasurably multiplied if its broadcasts were by, of, and for Russians.

Criticism by a foreigner can be misunderstood and resented by the sensitive national. Verbal attacks upon the Red army are harmful because it is Russian, not Bolshevik. The people are proud of its victories. Unfavorable comparisons of standards of living can be misinterpreted as boastful superiority. It should be made clear that the people are being robbed of their birthrights of freedom and truth, but comparisons must be made in the spirit of kindness, sympathy, and understanding.

2. A campaign of truth.

The people of the Soviet Union are famished for authentic news and ideas from the outside world. Russian leaders of liberation should be equipped immediately to speak loudly and clearly to the masses over the heads of their dictators. They must use every occasion to assert:

That credit for Russia's war record belongs to its people, not to Stalin and his gang.

That the Western World does not blame the Russian people for the Kremlin's peace-wrecking tactics.

That all free people share the aspirations of the Russian people for freedom and are eager to help them earn it.

That Soviet propaganda which brands the United States and its associates as aggressors bent on Russia's destruction is fantastically false.

That, above all, the free peoples seek the friendship of the Russian people, and once the Communist menace has been conquered this friendship can be established on a lasting basis.

How can we get this message across in a major psychological offensive? First method is the radio. Let the Voice of America be augmented by the Voice of Free Russia, with a ring of radio stations all around the U. S. S. R.

Second method is the use of leaflets, newspapers and other publications, printed both inside and outside of the homeland. Those from the outside can be sent in by aircraft and balloons. No government could do this in time of peace, but private agencies can. Mystery planes, sowing the truth, can invade the Soviet skies. Hundreds of patriotic fliers are ready to risk their necks in this service.

Printed items, particularly those that give news of and encouragement to the opposition, have a tremendous impact upon the minds of the Russian people. The fact that they are forbidden to read counter-propaganda makes it all the more sought after. Try as they may, the secret police cannot grab all the leaflets or arrest all who possess them. Moreover, nations denied freedom of press and speech become huge whispering galleries, through which suppressed facts and ideas quickly spread. We know that, within hours after the Voice of America announced Mrs. Kasenkina's jump from a Soviet consulate window in New York, all Moscow was buzzing with the story.

3. A program of action.

Psychological warfare is effective only when it calls for constructive effort. Foremost in our campaign should be a plan to strengthen all elements of opposition both in the satellite nations and within Russia itself. Workers in the underground require the kind of external help only free peoples can give them: money, equipment, moral support.

Thousands of recruits are available for infiltration into Russia. Underground agents should be prepared to select and urge members to penetrate into key positions in the Communist Party. They should establish close contact with those already in such positions and give them the ideological ammunition they need.

Activities that bring the anti-Communist opposition to public attention should be greatly multiplied. A new form of underground organization least vulnerable to the secret police has been developed: Unknown to each other, single fighters, inspired and instructed by leaflets, act individually but uniformly in the effort to attain common aims. They signalize their existence to other anonymous fighters by painting the NTS symbol—a trident—on walls and sidewalks, perhaps with an appropriate slogan. With the mounting confidence sure to follow such a full-scale psychological offensive, the tide of results will rise.

One basic aim of our campaign is to overcome the Russians' fear of the MVD, the secret police. By ruthlessness and cruelty, the Politburo has nurtured the idea that its agents are invincible and invulnerable. Our task is to prove that a myth. Already we have shown that, like the Nazi Gestapo, it can be duped and misled.

Nicolas Sinevirsky, an NTS member, joined the military branch of MVD for several months and returned to this side of the iron curtain. A book about his experiences was published by Possev, the Russian anti-Communist newspaper of Western Germany. This paper is receiving clandestine circulation in Russia and the satellite countries, with devastating effect upon MVD morale. By incessant repetition, by overt acts, the vulnerability of the MVD must become an accepted fact in Russia.

The men of the Kremlin know that once their grip loosens at home their stooges in the satellite nations will also lose their power. And with that loss there can be no more wars fought by Communist-dominated masses. Then the revolt will gather strength and sweep the Russian homeland.

Here is a task to which the best efforts of free nations can be dedicated. The support of their governments is necessary. But the movement toward freedom has always come from the people. Churches of all faiths, labor organizations, educational and civic groups, all can help to equip our liberation forces with the weapons of truth and action. Victory in the psychological war will mean peace. Its loss could mean that all that has been gained in human rights from the Magna Carta to the American Constitution will go down into chaos and enslavement.

Hunters' Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am going to continue my fight in the interest of national defense by strengthening our home front, agitating for a hunters' corps.

Last week, I presented an amendment to the civil defense bill, which provided a volunteer army of hunters and sportsmen in every community in the United States.

I was prompted to do this by my conviction that hunters in my district at least are patriotic Americans and expert shots and woodsmen. They would make the best of guerrilla fighters in case of invasion.

I received many letters of praise from all over the country and I am taking the liberty of having a typical one submitted with these remarks, which shows the enthusiastic reaction which the Hall amendment received with the public:

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALL: We received the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read your speech. It was very good—all of it. Any person that would vote against what you said must be a Communist or sympathetic with them.

It is as you say, sportsmen are good Americans, whether it be small game hunters or fox and deer hunters. They are out-of-door men, used to all kinds of weather, and are good shots, and they know the country in many different localities. In this country 35 or 40 such men equipped with ammunition and guns, and properly ambushed could make it mighty hot for invading land troops. I know of men in this surrounding locality with their own Winchester rifles 30/06, equipped with telescope sights, could kill an enemy one-half mile away nearly every time he shot. Many of these hunters already have rifles so equipped, just the thing for sharpshooters.

We found many interesting things in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you sent, and thank you.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR CRANE.

DEPOSIT, N. Y., *December 27, 1950.*

P. S.—Would one man go out into a pasture, unarmed, to fight a bull or rhinoceros? Could he expect anything but to be beaten?

The Forgotten Army in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Washington Daily News and a second article blasting the pro-Communist propaganda so skillfully propagated in our country since 1944 that Chinese forces did not or would not fight. How long are American boys to be killed needlessly in Korea because our Government refuses to accept help from those who have fought Chinese Communists longest and know them best?

[From the Washington Daily News of January 2, 1951]

THE FORGOTTEN ARMY

Until the Chinese Reds invaded Korea last October some Americans had been led to believe that Chinese soldiers wouldn't fight.

They know better now.

But what many Americans still may not know is that Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist armies also fought well when they had something to fight with.

That part of the story is told by Clyde Farnsworth, veteran far-eastern war correspondent, in the adjacent columns. It is a story by a man who was there.

Americans are fighting Asiatic Communists in Asia while anti-Communist Asiatic troops are being held out of the fight on orders from President Truman. Read that again, because it doesn't seem to make sense. And it doesn't make sense.

Mr. Farnsworth doesn't go into the politics involved in this situation. But he does present abundant evidence that by and large

the Chinese Nationalists were first-class fighting men.

There are 400,000 to 500,000 of these veteran troops in Formosa now. Early in the Korean war Chiang Kai-shek offered 33,000 of his troops to the United Nations, and more if they were wanted. His offer was not accepted, because the United States and Britain did not want to offend the Chinese Communists.

Now that the Chinese Communists are fighting the United Nations forces anyway, that objection would seem to have lost its force. But the Chinese Nationalists still haven't been permitted to join in the fight. Why? This newspaper cannot answer that. Perhaps President Truman and the British Foreign Office can.

Many people would like to know.

NATIONALISTS HAVE WILL AND CAPACITY TO FIGHT

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

(NOTE.—This is the second of three articles by Clyde Farnsworth answering the question raised in some quarters as to whether the Chinese Nationalists can and will fight. Mr. Farnsworth returned to this country recently from an 8-year tour of duty in the Orient.)

It was never easy for foreign correspondents in China to see actual fighting in the many wars that have beset that country.

But that is not because there was no fighting. It was often savage and prolonged. But distances, lack of transportation, and Chinese reluctance to accept responsibility for foreigners' safety have combined to make front-line reporting difficult.

In my 8 years in China I have seen the Nationalist armies of Chiang Kai-shek not only in battle but overwhelming evidence of their achievements against both the Chinese Communists and the Japanese.

In May 1944, at the very height of a wave of American criticism of the Nationalist command's will and capacity to oppose the Japanese, I saw the jump-off of a Chinese expeditionary force across the Salween River into the Japanese-held Burma border region of southwest China.

This was a brave but ill-equipped offensive by 20,000 troops on a 100-mile river front into the Kaolikung Mountains, a branch of the Himalayas. The Nationalists battled rain, fog, sleet—and Japanese—sometimes above 10,000 feet, an altitude at which airline passengers have to go on oxygen.

These Chinese troops had worked out coolie methods of carrying dismantled 75-millimeter howitzers. They lugged the guns themselves when the going got too tough for pack animals.

I saw their siege of Tengchung, which went on for 2 months until the Japanese defenders were killed to the last man.

Day after day Chinese storm troops tunneled and trenched their way against Tengchung's massive walls and repeatedly made frontal attacks, trying to prop their bamboo ladders in machine-gun crossfire.

I saw the pools of blood on the paddy-field pathways leading from the siege to nearby villages that were packed with wounded and dying men.

In 1945, from the pickaback seat of a P-40 on a fire-bombing and strafing mission of the Chinese-American Composite Wing, I saw the stubborn resurgence of Chinese troops in the defense of Chihkiang, eastern Hunan Province.

This was the enemy's last China offensive and one of the greatest victories of the Chinese Nationalists.

Inquiring the other day in the historical section of the Defense Department where an American official history of World War II is in preparation, with the China-Burma-India volumes still to come, I was told by one of the historians:

"We don't know what the Chinese armies did anywhere in China except on the Salween front where Gen. Joe Stilwell's Y-force (an advisory group) was working directly with the Chinese expeditionary force. American officers were discouraged—you might say not even permitted to go to the fronts in China.

"All we have on the Chinese effort against Japan was what the Chinese told Stilwell's headquarters they were doing and what Stilwell's headquarters thought they were doing."

The fact is, however, that there were American air-ground liaison teams on every active front in China after the American entrance into the war.

The division of opinion in the high command in the United States and a corresponding division of American effort in China had a profound effect on China's war effort.

Out of General Stilwell's preoccupation with the Burma Road and his burning desire to unite and command both Chinese Nationalist and Communist forces stemmed most of the case against Chiang Kai-shek and his generals. The air-ground liaison teams had a different story to tell.

Seven years ago this month I walked into the almost total devastation of the city of Changteh, in Hunan Province, and found that an air-ground liaison team had played a great part in a battle that had passed from Japanese attack, to siege, to retreat—while United States 14th Air Force planes served the Chinese as flying artillery.

A power drive by 100,000 Japanese troops had been broken and turned back, a Chinese division had been virtually wiped out, and three Chinese divisional commanders killed in action.

Correspondents from Chungking, who approached Changteh doubting that there was a war on, were shown the Hiroshima-like destruction of a large and once-prosperous city and mass graves.

They were shown these things by Chinese Nationalists in an area that had received no American aid except air support.

Two or three days later, on the morning of December 24, 1943, the whole group of Chungking correspondents and a few foreign military attachés from Chungking were nearly killed when Japanese fighter-bombers attacked a school building in Taoyuan on the same front.

Near misses shook the building where they had been lodged overnight and where the victorious Chinese had stored tons of captured Japanese arms and ammunition.

In the spring of 1948 I spent 2 weeks with the Fifth Chinese Army on the move through Honan Province in pursuit of Red Gen. Liu Po-cheng and his elusive guerrillas.

At the end of the visit, Gen. Chiu Chingchuan promised to invite me back for a real battle when that seemed probable. I was in Japan when he finally wrote. The general died with his men in a ring of Communist gunfire that caught three armies south of Hsuchow 2 years ago this month.

For an outfit with no fight in it the Nationalist army has had an unprecedented number of generals killed in action or by their own hand in the disgrace of defeat: a farewell note to the Generalissimo, then a pistol at the temple, or a grenade.

I saw Red siege rings tighten about Changchun and Mukden in the Communist victory that turned industrial Manchuria into a base for conquest of China proper.

And Taiyuan, in Shansi Province, where a million soldiers and civilians survived and fought for many months on airlifted food until Communist ack-ack cut their aerial artery.

I saw, from the air, Shihchiachuang turned into a smoking battlefield and one of the first pivots of Nationalist disaster in North China.

I saw planes dropping down at Shanghai with cargoes of wounded from the Battle of Hsuchow. But they made scarcely a dent in the 20,000 wounded who had to be abandoned there when the Reds, with superior fire power, superior strategy and tactics, and, for the first major instance, superior numbers, broke the Hsuchow line.

Months later I saw the sandy grave mounds of Kinmen (Quemoy) Island where Nationalist trops, backboned by units fresh from retraining on Formosa under Gen. Sun Li-jen, wiped out a 20,000-man amphibious attack from the nearby mainland.

I saw enough to know that the Chinese Nationalists fought both the Japanese and the Chinese Communists. And that the loss of the China mainland was the result of a tremendous passage at arms and was not, as some of our Government officials have said, a victory by Nationalist default.

Our Commander in Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent article that appeared in the Lynn Telegram News, of Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, December 24, 1950, by Mr. Clem Norton, a writer with many years of practical experience.

Mr. Norton served the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for a long period of time as superintendent of the State pier, Boston, Mass., with an enviable record of accomplishments. As a member of the school committee he served many terms in the city of Boston. He did much to improve the school system of that metropolitan city and through his arduous work on that board the school children benefited much from his outstanding service.

Mr. Norton has traveled extensively at home and abroad and as a self-educated man I dare say he commands an excellent over-all picture of national and international affairs:

CLEM NORTON SAYS

Here's the story on the war, as of the moment, as I see it. It's the most important thing in your life, and in the lives of your children, so take an interest. Nothing is of such importance. This is one of the great terminal points of all history.

Well, there are two sides, and here they are:

One side says: "Get out of Asia and Europe. Protect Japan, the Philippines, and Britain, if the latter cooperates. Mind our own business. Russia will fall apart if she attempts to take over too much. Democracy won't fall. It's the trend. Russia can't even handle Tito. John Foster Dulles and some of the British leaders are inclined to think that we should get out of Korea. We've given billions in food and money to other nations, but when we ask them to help us in Korea they quit, with few exceptions. The United States has only 6 percent of the world's people, and we just have not got enough boys, enough blood, to fight all over the world, and inflation and a huge debt will ruin us at home. The dollar now will only buy fifty-odd cents' worth of what it would a few years ago. It may go down to a nickel. We've fed Italians and given Italy

billions of dollars, but there are signs in that land reading: "Take your money and get to hell out." If western Europeans have no will to fight, how can we make them? Not a dollar nor a soldier boy should be sent to protect a foreign land against the Russians, unless the said land itself goes the limit, to get ready to fight. This is only common sense. A Chinese army for the first time has licked a white army in Korea, and this means a tremendous loss of "face" and prestige for us in a land where such things count big. Get our boys out of Korea quick, for it's an impossible situation, and most of them may be killed in an impossible war. Industry is not concentrated in Asia, as it is here, so the use of the atom bomb don't mean so much. Then, in China, with its 450,000,000 people, the cheapest thing is human life. These are among some of the arguments that able men such as Herbert Hoover and Joseph P. Kennedy produce. In Asia are over a billion people, half the world's population, who hate the white man's imperialistic rule, and modern science has taught them how to break that chain. Something now is being born into the world. The Asiatic with only a loin cloth is demanding more. If there was no Russia causing trouble, there would still be trouble in the world, on account of changed conditions. The imperialism of the old days has gone. Education, radio, and so on, are wising people up. No longer will a few nations be able to hold most of the "bread and butter" of the world. Most of the raw materials, without which man cannot advance.

OTHER

Then, the other side of the argument goes like this. We must fight communism everywhere that it takes over, and even drop the atom bomb if and when the right time arrives. If we pull out of Asia, and out of Europe, the Russians will take over. By putting up a fight, by sending Eisenhower to boss the western European armies, and to get them ready to fight Russia, when and if, then Russia knows that we will fight. We need European land bases to fight Russia. Our B–36 planes just cannot cross the ocean and deliver the atom bomb effectively. To let Rome fall to the barbarians would be unforgivable. At least we must do all possible to head off such an eventuality. If Russia gets the technical skill and resources of Europe, she will make it very uncomfortable for us in the Western Hemisphere even though we are surrounded by two oceans, for science makes it easy to cross oceans today, with submarines and guided missiles. If we withdraw to this hemisphere, we will fight alone and perhaps die alone. We'll be handing over to the Russians the most precious of heritages, the world's richest prize—America. Then, what will our grandchildren say?

So, let's put up a fight to hold bases in Asia and Europe. Let's stay there as long as we can. We need time to rearm and those boys who died in Korea helped to buy us that time. Herbert Hoover and Joe Kennedy in 1941 said that we couldn't get into Europe in World War II, or if we did, our efforts would not be effective, but they were wrong in 1941, and they may be wrong in 1951.

MY

Now, here's my opinion. I've read and read, studied and studied, talked to leader after leader, and the problem is so complex, so awful in its complications if we lose out, that I'm all for standing with our President, for we either hang together or hang separately. Nobody really knows just who is right in the above arguments, but the fate of our country, the greatest for the poor man that ever was, a paradise on earth, hangs in the balance, and if we allow the golden hopes of man to trail in the dust, we'll be cursed by generations unborn.

The blackjacking of Secretary Acheson on the eve of his going to the Brussels conference, to weaken him before the world when pleading the cause of free men, by a group of Republicans and others who have no agreed war program of their own, was unfortunate. Politics should stop at the water's edge.

And, in this chaos, what can one think of Stassen and Senator KNOWLAND who demand that President Truman abdicate his powers, something that he cannot do, and allow MacArthur a free military and diplomatic hand in Asia. MacArthur, whose judgment has proven to be so wrong time and again. Splitting up his armies in North Korea, so that the Chinese Communists walk right between our boys and slaughter them in the worst defeat in our history. MacArthur, who knew so little about what the enemy was doing, contemptuously disregarding appropriate warnings, and suggesting our boys would be home by Christmas. Say Lincoln, after McClellan's poor judgment at Bull Run, had had a Stassen or a Knowland barking at his heels to keep McCellan on the job, and not to replace him with a Grant. And while all this goes on, Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio commentator, asks Americans to flood Congress with letters to fire Acheson. But I think the "get Acheson" crowd have shot their bolt and missed. But I like Governor Dewey clearing his speech with President Truman, and I dislike Senator TAFT's attitude, that Republicans should criticize and not cooperate with President Truman at this momentous hour.

The British, to a man, stood behind their Prime Minister Attlee when he came to America a few weeks ago, in the cause of peace. Let's stand behind our leaders in the same manner. So, don't bang our President or his assistants until you've read and studied and thought.

And now, to be personal, and perhaps unobjective, but natural. I love the two-fisted way the President fought for somebody that he loves more than himself, his beloved only child, Margaret.

He had attended her concert at Constitution Hall, the night before, and cried, as he always does, when his daughter sings in public and he is present. Clement Attlee, the Prime Minister of England was with him.

The crowd gave Margaret waves of applause, and then, the next morning, the President woke up to find that Paul Hume, 34-year-old music critic, had said that Margaret couldn't sing, that she sang flat, when everybody who knows music and who has heard Margaret sing, knows that the one thing that she does well is to sing in key, something that even Galli-Curci found it hard to do.

Well, the President, in a hand-written note on White House stationery, told Hume that if he met him he would smash his nose and kick him in the stomach, among other things. Now, everybody knows that the President did not mean it but he was acting just as millions of other dads would under similar circumstances. In short, he was natural, and how fatherly.

I like the manner in which the President walked up and down the conference room while defending Secretary Acheson to the press, at a time when the political bloodhound opposition, for no good reason, demanded Acheson's neck. I like the way in which the President broke out in a big, friendly laugh, on the steps of his home in Independence, Mo., at Christmas time, when a small boy asked: "Will you wait until I go home and get my camera?" I like his presiding at two Masonic meetings in Missouri, with his old cronies—and hence, was never too big to be natural.

In short, I believe that if the election were tomorrow, President Truman, because of his warm naturalness, would be reelected with a greater majority than ever. May God bless and protect him, and guide him, for in some unexplainable way, after reading all that the opposition has to say, I think that he's my man. That he's America's man. That he'll save our great Nation for the children to come.

Herbert Hoover—America's Voice of Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, seldom have a free people waited with greater concern for their leaders to set a proper course than in the present hour, charged as it is with peril for America and Americans. So it was only proper that President Truman's recent address to the Nation on the international crisis confronting us should receive thoughtful study. But equal consideration should be given the challenging words of former President Herbert Hoover delivered a week later and coming as a voice of strength in an hour of danger.

Despite the striking contrast between the two messages, a strife-torn world should take due note that reexamination of American foreign policy involves no departure from a courageous—and ultimately victorious—defense of the principles embraced by freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

As the Eighty-second Congress gathers in Washington to face the burdensome problems of the days and years ahead it would be well to weigh thoughtfully Mr. Hoover's words. Patriotic Americans have substantial reasons for heeding the counsel given them with the clarity and the force of a great leader whose stature rises to previously unscaled heights for candor, understanding, and vision. This is particularly so because certain forces within the United States Government and elsewhere will seek to distort his words and his views as representing an abandonment of sacrifices so far made at such frightful cost to advance fundamental cause of human rights.

No foundation exists on which to make such a contention, for Mr. Hoover's words voice only renewed devotion to the righteous cause for which Americans have given their lives from Concord to Korea.

It is true Mr. Hoover's analytical appraisal of the world situation contained a clear warning to the United Nations, and particularly to our allies in Europe, that they cannot expect continuing assistance from the American people unless they show a willingness to help themselves.

We can, with our own air and naval forces, so control the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans that there can be no possible invasion of the Western Hemisphere by Communist armies, Mr. Hoover said.

Continental Europe has not developed the unity of purpose and the will power necessary for its own defense, despite 3 years of American assistance. Minds

of leaders there are confused with fears and disunities. They exclude Spain from their defense councils, although she has the will and the means to fight. They "haggle" with Germany, as Mr. Hoover remarked, although she is their frontier. And Britain is flirting with Communist China.

The United Nations is in a fog of debate and indecision as to "whether to appease or not to appease." At the very least, as the former President asserted, the UN should declare Communist China an aggressor, call upon its members to cease supplying the Chinese Reds with anything that can aid their military operations, and adopt a resolution condemning the infamous Communist lies about the United States. That, surely, is not asking very much.

Mr. Hoover commended President Truman for his resolute refusal to be a party to any kind of appeasement, and the President may be sure of the overwhelming support of the American people on that issue.

The conference at Brussels this week set up what was called a program for a strong, unified army to defend Western Europe against communism. But, until the vacillating governments in London, Paris, and other European capitals move decisively to create their respective forces, they have no right to ask further American assistance. Armed Communists cannot be turned back by blueprints and vague promises.

Mr. Hoover's thesis that preservation of the Western Hemisphere as the "Gibraltar of western civilization" should be the foundation of American policy may be termed "isolationism." It is that only in the sense that a nation could be isolated by events beyond its own control.

If the Europeans cannot overcome their own trend toward defeatism, Americans need not succumb to it. If we are left an island of strength in a sea of weakness and despair, it will be through no fault or decision of ours, but only because we have been deserted by those who have surrendered to apathy and frustration.

America's future is on trial, to be sure, but so too is America's greatest bid for an effective world organization for world peace—the United Nations. Here Mr. Hoover's words are particularly prophetic. For he said:

Whether or not the United Nations is to have a moral defeat and suffer the collapse of its whole moral stature now depends on whether it has the courage to—

(a) Declare Communist China an aggressor.

(b) Refuse admission of this aggressor to its membership.

(c) Demand that each member of the United Nations cease to furnish or transport supplies of any kind to Communist China that can aid in their military operations. Such a course honestly carried out by the non-Communist nations is not economic sanctions nor does it require military actions. But it would constitute a great pressure for rectitude.

(d) For once, pass a resolution condemning the infamous lies about the United States.

Any course short of this is appeasement.

Just as specific, and just as worthy of considered study, were Mr. Hoover's specific proposals for action. They were seven in number. They were—

First. The foundation of our national policies must be to preserve for this world this Western Hemisphere Gibraltar of western civilization.

Second. We can, without any measure of doubt, with our own air and naval forces, hold the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with one Frontier on Britain (if she wishes to cooperate); the other on Japan, Formosa and the Philippines. We can hold open the sea lanes for our supplies.

Third. To do this we should arm our air and naval forces to the teeth. We have little need for large armies unless we are going to Europe or China. We should give Japan her independence and aid her in arms to defend herself. We should stiffen the defenses of our Pacific frontier in Formosa and the Philippines. We can protect this island chain by our sea and air power.

Fourth. We could, after initial outlays for more air and navy equipment, greatly reduce our expenditures, balance our budget, and free ourselves from the dangers of inflation and economic degeneration.

Fifth. If we toil and sacrifice as the President has asked, we can continue aid to the hungry of the world. Out of our productivity, we can give aid to other nations when they have already displayed spirit and strength in defense against communism. We have the stern duty to work and sacrifice to do it.

Sixth. We should have none of appeasement. Morally there is no appeasement of communism. Appeasement contains more dangers than Dunkirks. We want no more Tehrans and Yaltas. We can retrieve a battle but we cannot retrieve an appeasement.

Seventh. We are not blind to the need to preserve western civilization on the continent of Europe or to our cultural and religious ties to it. But the prime obligation of defense of western continental Europe rests upon the nations of Europe. The test is whether they have the spiritual force, the will, and acceptance of unity among them by their own volition. America cannot create their spiritual forces; we cannot buy them with money.

With the policies outlined by Mr. Hoover, Americans have no reason for hysteria or loss of confidence in our security or our future. And in American security, in this critical hour, rests the future security of all mankind.

Surely, the men and women of America, the sons on the fighting front and their families at home, recognize the solid hope for ultimate triumph. The Hoover proposals do not suggest isolationism. They do not relieve us of working to our utmost. They do offer assurance for preservation of a stronghold of Christian civilization. For the American people, in the words of Mr. Hoover, "have braved difficult and distressing situations in the 300 years we have been on this continent. We have faced our troubles without fear—and we have not failed. We will not fail in this, even if we have to stand alone. But we need to realize the whole truth and gird ourselves for troubled times. The truth is ugly. We face it with prayer and courage."

Mr. Speaker, here in the Congress and abroad in the land there must be a rebirth of Christian devotion and grim determination. Only in such an atmosphere can there be final triumph over the forces arrayed against us. Mr. Hoover's forceful words can mobilize us physically and spiritually for victory in that task.

Testimony From Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Times on December 12, 1950:

TESTIMONY FROM ASIA

The Western Powers in general and the United States in particular are placed in a somewhat embarrassing position by the barrage of false Communist propaganda in respect to their imperialism and aggressive intentions. They have given assurances and these are ignored. They can protest against falsehood but they cannot justify themselves in detail without the appearance of self-righteousness.

Into this situation General Romulo stepped on Thursday with an eloquent and detailed answer to the Chinese Communist diatribe against the United States. He made it plain that he was speaking as an Asian for the benefit of other Asians. He recounted his first-hand acquaintance with American imperialism and its fruits in the Philippines. He contrasted American actions, both there and in China, with actions of the Soviet Union "in the same region and at the same point of time," he said, because he believed this was "the most effective way to refute the charges of so-called American imperialism in Asia."

It was this record that he presented to the Chinese Communist representative in these words:

"I say, sir, that you can make this false accusation against so-called American imperialism in Russian, but you cannot say it in Chinese. You cannot say it in Chinese unless you are speaking in translation from Russian. You cannot say it in Chinese because no Chinese who knows the history of his country and who is aware of the long historic friendship between the Chinese people and the American people can make this accusation without sounding as if he were faithfully parroting the stale phrases of Russian propaganda. This country, which has never been at war with China, which was the one great power that took no part in the spoliation of China, which has consistently championed the cause of the Chinese people against their traditional enemies—the Japanese and the Russians—which has generously given help to the Chinese people in adversity, this great country, with such a record, can face the representative of the Peiping regime and shame him into silence."

This is testimony from Asia and it is friendly and welcome at this point. If the Chinese Communists are not willing to ac-

cept the expressions of good faith of the west, the Chinese people, whom they misrepresent, may eventually hear the tones of other voices. This certainly is General Romulo's belief and it is for that reason that he speaks. It will serve the cause of freedom if more and more perceptive Asians will raise their voices to join him in his expression of faith and hope when he says:

"In the face of the historical facts and the facts of record we do not believe that the peoples of Asia and, in particular, the Chinese people, will remain deceived for a long time regarding the motives and policies of the United States and the Soviet Union. We understand full well that today the Chinese people are not free, that access to these facts has been barred to them by the machinations of vicious and lying propaganda."

China's Reproach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., Thursday, December 21, 1950:

CHINESE WILL RUE THE DAY

While we do not wish to seem to be endorsing the my-old-man-can-lick-your-old-man approach to the international crisis, we are pretty well convinced that General Wu is going to one day admit, if he lives to write his memoirs, that the cease-fire proposal was China's last chance to redeem her folly. It is possible to feel a real sorrow for the Chinese people who, because of the cruel and selfish stupidy of their leaders, must postpone for at least another generation any hope of being allowed to use their energies creatively. Instead, they must dissipate such slight reserves of strength as they have to underwrite a psychotic dream of conquest. Debilitated by long economic famine and by the scourge of imperialistic and fratricidal war, they are being herded to another imminent doom.

The seeds of Chinese destruction are in such slight successes as their military overlords are currently boasting about. They have forced society to post them as outlaws and murderers, and society, aroused out of its lethargy, must now take measures. The outlaw is always a tragic figure because he seeks to wrest from society what society would willingly give him. And the outlaw who has no special talent or equipment for it is particularly tragic.

China has been deluded by Russia into believing that rifles are capital goods and that blood can be changed into gold by the alchemy of a thievish war. Russia herself knows better. Josef Stalin and Leon Trotsky quarreled over that very thing in 1925. Trotsky, then Russian commissar for war and a purist of Marxism, wanted to start communizing the world at once. But Dr. Stalin, more of a Fabian Communist, contended that Russia was too anemic and prescribed a protracted regimen of iron. His view prevailed and Trotsky wound up in exile. Russia then devoted 25 years to its fell preparations for world revolution.

Contrastingly, Red China, even before she had extinguished the last sparks of resistance within her own borders, was assigned the very formidable task of engaging the most powerful nation on earth in open conflict. China will, of course, one day find out that she was cynically misadvised by Russia, but that will be of small advantage then.

If the Peiping Government and the North Koreans do not believe they are Kremlin pawns, why do they not make some inquiries as to why they have not been provided with better air and sea support? Russia has a tremendous air force, but few planes have been seen in the skies over Korea. Russia is supposed to have hundreds of submarines, and would not a few of them be able to render effective service, now, in Korean and Formosan waters? The answer is that Russia is interested in her allies in Korea and China only as human roadblocks. Whether they win or lose is of no importance so long as they don't let the fire burn down. Russia is saving her strength for Europe. Eisenhower wasn't appointed a minute too soon.

Nationalism Versus Internationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the speech delivered over the radio the other night by Mr. John Foster Dulles is to be inserted in the RECORD today, by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

I listened to that rambling defense of the so-called United Nations, which is trying to make of itself a super-government and subordinate the American people to its domination, and I must say that, from my viewpoint, it was just about the "Dullest" piece of international wrangling I have ever heard.

He reminded me of the Englishman shingling his house in a dense fog. He said that before he realized it he had shingled out on the fog 25 or 30 feet.

When I hear one of these wild-eyed internationalists who are always branding us nationalists as "isolationists" go on the air and attempt to justify their international policy that is threatening America with wreck and ruin, I am reminded of that Englishman's experience.

In answer to Mr. Dulles, I am inserting at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on nationalism issued by Isbrandtsen, one of the great steamship companies of America, whose vessels, for more than 30 years, have touched every shore and entered every port on earth. Read it, and you will understand the bitterness of the American people over this Korean "police action" as reflected in your daily mail.

This statement is unanswerable, and is in line with the speech of Hon. Herbert Hoover which I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD on December 22, at page A7879, and also with the speech of Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy, which I inserted in the RECORD on January 1, 1951, at page A7909. The statement on nationalism, referred to, follows:

NATIONALISM

National pride is self, home, and country. It is strength and commands respect.

The great debate in this country centers on the question to arm and go all out for war, east and west, or to defend these shores and this hemisphere.

This is not partisanship; it is a grave question that only the citizens of these United States should decide. They do the fighting and make the supreme sacrifice. No man or party of men should gamble with our heritage, barter and trade with our life or death. The foreign and international influences have much to do with our policy or lack of policy.

Many in high places in the legal profession have built up confusions in the interests of their foreign clients to the detriment of this country and its citizens. Self-glorification and a fat fee have done much to confuse our national policies, and left us pro this and pro that. Americanism, nationalism, and national pride lie dormant in fear of persecution by authority, fear of foreign and social recognition. We fear to be different from others. We lack intellectual and moral courage to declare ourselves.

The United Nations, a supergovernment, foisted upon us, has a mandate to deplete our resources, suck our strength, and decide life or death of our people. We have been engineered into an inferiority complex of bowing to our wards and debtors. This lack of national pride was capitalized upon by a foreign directorate to furnish men, money, and material to carry on a war to perpetuate foreign interest at the cost of our own possible destruction or deterioration.

The cry goes out that the United States is in peril and vulnerable. This is a reality. From the United Nations comes the plea we must not quit in Korea. Korea, the graveyard of the flower of our Army. International leaders would risk an all-out war with Asia that they may survive at the cost of American life and treasure. The American people have awakened from an overdose of sleeping pills, hit between the eyes with the realization that the battle of race, creed, and religion became paramount in our way of life. Today we face the threat of annihilation and while the world's advisers put self before service, it was they who led the Horse of Troy into our midst. Europe would sit on the side lines and let us take the blows; America might crumble and the United Nations would become a myth for historians.

The founders of this Republic never intended foreign influences should destroy our institutions, traditions and national honor, nor should they be bartered and traded in and carried out by anyone labeled an American citizen. You are an American, or you are nothing in our way of life. Nationalism is undivided allegiance.

Europe once advised us we did not need a navy, they would defend us. Now comes the plan that we do not need a merchant fleet, they will make our deliveries. It could destroy our sea power, our independence and forever our trade and commerce.

The traditional American policy of requiring free access to the outside world for our commerce, the same reception for our merchant ships abroad as we traditionally grant theirs here—this is our intercourse with foreign peoples.

The average person, while ready in the break-out to take a stand "My country right or wrong," finds it difficult for this same reason of his inherent loyalty to follow the taboos and shiftings of our experts in foreign diplomacy—a buddy today is an enemy tomorrow and around again—disarm him today, put him in arms tomorrow.

We are not a nation of jugglers.

Our greater mental balance in these matters was when our ears were less filled with blarings and blastings before the time, some 35 years ago, when we began concerning ourselves beyond our depth with the political and religious ideologies abroad. That has been all contrary to the traditional policy of this country.

Our earlier way of conducting our own affairs at home should be reinstated—a reformation—so to serve as an example for those abroad to follow if they see fit—we are invincible if we watch and hold on to that way of life—for a better way was never devised. Our founders did not contemplate its corruption.

We should have no less nationalism than the empires of Britain, Russia, and China, the chief ones we are in daily recrimination and disputation with. Each one of these is larger, both in territory and population, than we are—we are only 6 percent of the whole. We do not read about doubt on their part about which flag to hoist on their schools—the UN or their own. They do not keep their treasury open for the world to come and help themselves.

The supergovernment in their own behalf reflects a strong nationalistic doctrine, all the while preaching internationalism for America—creating among the many nationalities of this Nation a confusion and bewilderment to destroy our solidarity in effect accomplishing their own.

The foreign agenda is to take all and give little; this was manifested by the token contribution in the Korean struggle.

We were once called Uncle Shylock. Today we are the undisputed Santa Claus or sucker.

Our State Department, partisan statesmen, and diplomats in their crystal gazing joined with an alien group to change human nature throughout the world. Overlooking at all times the great intercourse of understanding, trade, commerce, and profit without which a nation cannot survive. Peoples throughout the world would rather work for profit than fight for glory and a grave. Nations are built by businessmen; often the diplomat destroys. The average diplomat is guided by an impulse of self, a statesman by realization and vision. A businessman is guided by friendly trade and commerce both at home and abroad—and business alone pays the freight to carry on.

We suggest the return to the delicate art of minding our own business and of telling and insisting that others do likewise—we used to be first-rate at that.

A rereading of the Declaration of Independence, the recreation of a nationalistic spirit with kill-all isms, drop the cloak of hypocrisy, the inferiority complex. Go back to the road of self-determination, self-respect, and self-preservation, the first law of nature.

We have one flag, one country. Let us stop cringing to foreign debtors, wards, and potential enemies.

Let us use the common sense that God gave us.

ISBRANDTSEN.

Way of the Transgressor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 30, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Times on December 12, 1950:

WAY OF THE TRANSGRESSOR

The Chinese troops in Korea are proving that the way of the transgressor is not always hard. If he comes in overwhelming strength, no matter how wrong and wicked he is, he can win victories. The defending armies, no matter how good their cause, can be driven back. The lonely places in the wilderness where brave men died for liberty may be remembered forevermore but the battle—in that time and in those places—may nevertheless have been lost.

In that time and in those places—let us always make that qualification. The battle for liberty cannot be permanently lost, for the hunger for liberty cannot die in human hearts. It has been said that some peoples in the modern world want food more than they want liberty. We need not quibble. A starving man has but one instinct. But the food that saves his life—if, indeed, that food is available under a dictatorial system that treats human life like that of the insects in the dust—will also keep alive his higher yearnings.

We have seen defeat in Korea. We have seen an attempted drawing together of the western world to cope with that defeat. We have seen President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee agreeing on the basic principle that aggression shall not be rewarded. The western world has moved slowly. It has awakened slowly to the crisis. But it is awakening—it will move.

Let us look with unlowered gaze at this defeat. It has resulted from failures in preparation, from errors in execution, from unhappy accidents. But it is an army that has been defeated, not a cause. The cause was good when the first United Nations troops landed in Korea. It is still good. It could not be compromised then. It cannot be compromised now. To compromise would be treason to the wounded and the dead who shed their blood for the undying principle of freedom. We would have honored them in victory. We honor them in defeat.

It is more difficult today than at almost any time in modern history to forecast—or even imagine—the future. The leaders of the free nations want no military adventures. They will continue to hope that even the transgressors and aggressors will recoil from the prospect of universal war.

But they will not abandon as of no avail the cause for which the blood of United Nations soldiers has been spent in Korea. The way of the transgressor, if he follows it far and long enough will end at last at a sign that reads no thoroughfare.

War Record of Navy Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Lawrence R. Goldberg, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., on December 31, 1950:

WAR RECORD OF NAVY GOOD—BRILLIANT AND INSPIRING WORK IS DONE QUIETLY WITHOUT BENEFIT OF PUBLICITY AND SPOTLIGHT

Overlooked in the darkness of the Korean land reverses is the brilliant and inspiring part played quietly, and without benefit of spotlight publicity, by our country's naval forces.

The task that confronted them was a difficult one and became one of major proportions when the size of the naval forces available to oppose the Korean aggression became evident.

These defense forces consisted of nothing more than a small Republic of Korea coast guard, too weak to take any action to prevent movement by sea of forces and supplies for use in operation against the Republic of Korea, including ingress and egress to and from Korean ports of merchant vessels furnishing or likely to furnish assistance to enemy authorities.

DO THE IMPOSSIBLE

In the face of this, and from the very outset of hostilities, our naval forces began to accomplish the almost impossible—doggedly, secretly, without fanfare or communiques, and courageously and effectively.

First they proceeded to effect the waterlift of troops and supplies to Korea, patrol with its aircraft, the water and coastal areas, and then perform escort duties and all necessary coastal patrol functions.

Throughout the offensive actions of the land forces, naval units maintained and continued harassing fire on both coasts—shelling targets susceptible to naval gunfire, breaching roads, and generally interfering with enemy communications. In addition they attacked North Korean water traffic wherever found, and succeeded in destroying practically four-fifths of the vessels originally available to North Korean naval forces and the Communists.

This became of tremendous importance in the wake of the land reverses, and enabled evacuations by water whenever and wherever necessary at a minimum cost and loss of lives.

FIRST CARRIER STRIKE

A new phase of these naval operations got under way on July 3 with the first aircraft carrier air strike. They struck on the west coast of North Korea. Subsequent carrier strikes on the east coast of Korea were made by the British and the United States units. The first amphibious landing by United Nations forces was accomplished on the east coast on July 18 by means of naval action which preceded and continued during the operations.

As the importance of naval action increased, forces were added to the United States units in the foreign waters. Eight nations—British, Australian, Canadian, French, The Netherlands, New Zealand, and United Kingdom fighting ships began to augment our forces.

STOP ENEMY

Carrier strikes of increasing frequency were ranged from strategic targets in the north to battlefield targets in close support of all ground movement. Meantime, a day and night patrol on both coasts was directed and maintained primarily toward the interception of enemy shipping to the south, until—as the dark days of reversals approached—all coastal water movement of enemy troops and supplies was stopped.

Imagine what would have happened to our land forces as the reversals continued to mount up, if the Communists had been able to launch an amphibious attack behind our beleaguered lines.

EVERY REQUEST MET

Every request for shore bombardments by our infantry were granted by our naval forces and these proved of immense effectiveness in destroying military targets, harassing the enemy at night and disrupting coastal land communications.

Even when returning to their bases for logistic support, our naval units performed additional tasks of convoying and escorting shipping to and from those ports under control of our troops. The job of evacuating the sick and wounded from Korea to locations of security and better care in Japan was an around-the-clock task. At no time

was there any enemy naval interference. The bulk of transport shipping was provided by the United States.

FUNCTIONS SMOOTHLY

Of significance is the fact that the entire naval organization was well integrated, at all times, functioning smoothly, and coordinating efficiently with United Nations army and air force units. So high a degree of efficiency did it reach that at all times it was capable of assuming any type of naval mission in Korean waters.

Without a let-up, our naval forces performed all tasks assigned, and, in addition, steadily increased the ranges of application. Naval aircraft operating from ships performed the battle tasks of reconnaissance, spotting for artillery and naval bombardment, strafing and dive bombing of both tactical and strategic targets.

PROTECT CIVILIANS

Shore bombardment of military targets, harassing fire, and destruction of coastal land communications was carried on continuously by our naval craft. All amphibious landings and water lift of troops were conducted by these surface craft. And throughout it all, our naval bombardment forces, both surfaces and air, exercised every precaution to avoid harming civil population—employing every possible means to identify and destroy military targets only.

While reverses on land were shocking to us, our Navy continued to demonstrate its versatility of application by sustaining with undiminishing intensity all operational tasks undertaken. During every enemy major attack our naval aircraft were almost entirely engaged in an all-out effort in close support of all ground action—continuing this day in and day out.

FISHING CONTINUES

Between breaths, these forces continued their operations against transportation facilities, arsenals, military warehouses, and supply dumps and troop concentrations—miles from land. Other naval craft enabled native fishing operations to continue without any more interruptions by enemy craft and destroyed all Communist watercraft in the area.

These included all small transports and freighters, trawlers, junks, and barges carrying North Korean personnel and supplies.

Not once, despite the seasonal typhoon winds and swollen seas, did our Navy stop in its application of its versatile land, sea, and air elements. Among the most outstanding achievements—not including the marvelous work of evacuation when the tide of battle turned—was the amphibious landing at Inchon, port of Seoul.

The initial landings, made by United States Marines, were supported directly by naval and marine aircraft in coordination with gunfire from cruisers and destroyers, followed by bombarding rocket ships. Naval surface units remained on the scene of the landing to render gunfire support as needed and to give antiaircraft protection to the unloading and harbor activities until their presence was no longer necessary.

"MISSOURI" BIG HELP

The United States battleship *Missouri* participated in these activities after a spectacularly long trip, and instantly upon arrival proved of enormous value with her great 16-inch guns.

Noteworthy features of these amphibious operations were the Navy's clockwork coordination, strict adherence to schedule, and the overcoming of natural obstacles, especially in the extraordinary tidal conditions and limited maneuvering room for large vessels.

These activities continued in the face of enemy sea mines introduced by Communist aircraft into the areas of naval operations. Every day, many free-drifting Soviet-made mines were sighted at sea and exploded and sunk by our units.

THOUSANDS OF BOYS SAVED

Unremitting pressure on the enemy by our naval units saved thousands of our boys and reduced the loss in our matériel. At one time more than 350 cargo and transport type vessels were concentrated off the Korean coast—engaged in a do-or-die task—and were able to carry out their mission without a single mishap by enemy action, as a result of the gallant and meritorious work of our Navy.

While this was going on enemy action was concentrated in a desperate effort to break through the naval protection—but without the slightest success. This included the planting and dropping of enemy mines in coastal waters, and the mining was indiscriminate by the Communists without regard to international law or the safety of noncombatants at sea.

REDS DISREGARD LAW

It is a well-established principle of international law that live mines must be moored or otherwise fixed in place. International law specifically forbids the use of unanchored automatic contact mines, except when they are so constructed as to become harmless one hour, at most, after being laid.

As a related matter, it required that moored mines shall be so constructed as to insure that they will become harmless as soon as they have broken from their moorings.

Twenty-five of these mines are now in the possession of United States Navy Intelligence. They were made in Soviet Russia during the past year.

Christmas 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I received through the mail, a short time ago, from Charles Granville Hamilton, rector of St. Paul's Church, Corinth, Miss,, the following verses, which, although perhaps lacking in poetic dignity, brings to the Nation a message long overdue.

I have never met Rector Hamilton personally and made his acquaintance only recently when he sent to me two of his literary efforts, one a sermon in which he stated the benefits and the evils of the hour and the other a radio broadcast in which he analyzed the votes of the last election and proved therein conclusively that in the off-year 1950 the Republicans suffered a signal defeat instead of winning a glorious victory.

The Governor rose with his loaded dice,
And viewed with alarm his favorite vice;
The child was plainly no Angle Saxon,
So Fielding Wright took a plane to Jackson,
A voice whooped out from Badgerland,
I'll write you a story for only ten grand.
By nature's bear-pelt I proudly wear,
On Douay's edition I solemnly swear,
By my thinny thin, skin,
A Red I see in all this din,
Of Yuletide mirth and joy serene
Way up in a tree amid the green,
Re-pubs croaked out let's kill the brats,
Cause they'll grow up to be Democrats.
Alfonsie said 'tis only a strike,
They left their work for an evening hike,
To look at a little ole child in a manger
This union of shepards is clearly a danger.
Others were sure that God would not choose,
To come to the world in a family of Jews.
The shepard said: "We're only human,
If we lived today we'd vote for Truman."
Doc Gallup commented: "Ninety-nine point seven
Agreed there have never been voices from Heaven;
They are but saucers flying and similar things,
Who claims they've heard those rustling of wings?"

Some typical Southland mountaineers
Claimed this starts a new series of years—
"Obviously shepherding makes one obtuse"—
This was the gospel, according to Luce.
On a magazine cover the Man of the Year
Was Herod the Tycoon, strong and sincere.
The Hearst press was headlined: "If God should come,
Would He not bring us a hydrogen bomb?"
Old crusty kept grumbling: O What a pity
To let such DP's enter our city.
And Hollywood grimaced: "A preposterous plot,
And what heavenly choir wasn't so hot."
But Gabriel Heatter for once was right
When he cheerily chortled "There's good news tonight!"

Weary with years of statesmanlike service,
The Un-American Committee was visibly nervous:
Foreigners come without paying a tax—
Immigration officials surely were lax—
Subversive teachings like peace and good will—
Have we no general we can send to kill?
One who knows how to shoot in the back—
The present administration surely is slack.
Dixiecrats yelped: "This good will to men
Fails to specify color and race, where and when."
When he learned that good will was not only for whites,
Walter Sillers walked out against such civil rights.

"To say they were wise men was plainly a mania,"
Said President Stassen of Pennsylvania.
They traded no treasures for a college degree;
They had no press agent, no newsy plea.
No girl friends were with them. The camels they rode
Were not photogenic, nor was their strange load.
DeWolfe was sure that if they were wise
Their gold would have helped some cathedral arise.
The Press was sure that their coming from far
Was proof they were led by some strange scarlet star;
While Goppy-Birds hissed that to waste on a Child
What could balance a budget was certainly wild;
And Pegler was sure that to give to poor Jesus
Would start up New Deals and such awful diseases.
Johnny Flynn tumbled over in glee on his bed
As he heard Herod's horsemen down the road ahead,
And posed Readers' Digest: "Is all this just bait,
Angels, babies, and stars, for a new welfare state?"
Good will is no slogan to win voters with
Was the clear-cut comment of two men with pith
While Herman agreed: No peace do I find
When dear old Georgia's on my mind.

The mongrels bark and the donkeys bray,
Now, as of old, on Christmas day;
But what we remember is more than they.

A Comparison of American and Soviet Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Robert G. Simmons, entitled "Do We Want What They Have?—A Comparison of American and Soviet Democracy."

Mr. Simmons is the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Nebraska, one of the most distinguished citizens of my State. He was for 10 years a Member of Congress, and I might add, a close personal friend of mine for many years. The article appeared in the November 1950 issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this article is so much to the point and so clear an exposition of the tremendous gap between Communist promises and the actual results of communism that it might well be useful for distribution in the magazines and newspapers of foreign countries.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

DO WE WANT WHAT THEY HAVE?—A COMPARISON OF AMERICAN AND SOVIET DEMOCRACY

(By Robert G. Simmons, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Nebraska)

Some months ago I sat in a public meeting in Madison Square Garden in New York. During the evening I heard the President of the United States ridiculed, the Congress damned, our courts scorned, and the Constitution of the United States condemned. I was an observer at a meeting held for the purpose of raising money to aid in the defense of Communist leaders then on trial. I witnessed multiplied hundreds stand with the raised clenched-fist salute of the Communist, while they cheered the head of the visible Communist Party in this country, approved his attacks on our system of government, and pledged in effect to continue the fight in this country until our institutions were remodeled to accord with those of the Soviets.

I asked myself then, as I ask you now, do we want what the Communist countries have?

This country has come tardily, too tardily, to a realization that we face a menace from communism—not in Moscow, or Budapest, or Praha, but in the United States. We shall not meet this challenge successfully by merely being against communism and damning Communists. We should examine their system of government, look at its parts, and decide whether or not we want any or all of it in America, bearing in mind that we are one of the few great peoples in the world who yet have the power to make that decision.

I propose briefly to do that with you as we think about it together.

Our difficulty in understanding what the Communist and Soviet leaders say is that they use our words with their meaning. It is the difficulty which our officials in Washington face in dealing with them. We must first translate our language into their meaning in order to reach a common understanding of their system of government, their ideologies, and even their promises.

Let me illustrate. They speak of representative government and we think of our system where, by open elections, we choose between the candidates of different parties, representing different basic views or governmental policies. We choose between men and plans. The Soviet elector has only one set of candidates and one party, and approves only that which the party submits. That is their idea of representative government.

CONTRAST BETWEEN AMERICAN DEMOCRACY AND SOVIET DEMOCRACY

They speak of democracy, and we think of our own. We fail to recognize the fundamental difference. With us, democracy represents a government where the reservoir of political power rests in the 150,000,000 folk who make up our citizenship where we measure out, guardedly, the power that our officials are permitted to exercise, and where officials are servants, not masters. The Soviet uses our word "democracy," but as meaning a government where the reservoir of political power rests on the closely knit 2 or 3 percent of the people that make up the Communist Party, where the people exercise only those privileges that the Communist Party permits them to exercise from time to time, and where officials are masters, not servants.

They have courts. When they refer to them we think of our own judicial systems with all their independent powers, subject to constitutional limitations and grants of power. We do not recognize the fact that the courts of the Soviet system are but subordinate administrative agencies of the Communist Party.

The Communist speaks of the constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and we think of our own Federal and State constitutions, and somehow think that they have what we have. Our constitutions speak the mandate of the people; theirs, the mandate of the Communist Party. Our constitutions were adopted by action of the people taken for that direct purpose. Their constitutions were promulgated by Communist Party bodies and never were submitted, and it is not intended that they ever shall be submitted, to the people of the Soviet countries for their adoption or rejection. Our constitutions cannot be changed except by action of the people taken for that purpose. The Soviet constitution can be and has been repeatedly changed by action of the creating body. Those changes have not been, and it is not intended that they shall be, submitted to the people of the Communist nations for their approval or rejection. Do we want their kind of a constitution?

SOVIET CONSTITUTION CONTAINS NO PROTECTION AGAINST GOVERNMENT

Our constitutions are either grants or limitations of power to officials of government. Let us make some comparisons there.

Search their constitutions. You will not find there any such provisions as are in our own providing for the writ of habeas corpus, the right of trial by jury, the right of appeal. Neither will you find provisions against ex post facto laws, bills of attainder, or other similar provisions. Those guaranties, and many others are in our constitutions for a reason. They are there to protect people, individual persons, from the abritrary power of officials of government; they serve that purpose in America. The people, individually and collectively, under the Soviet system do not have such safeguards. Do we want to surrender that which we have?

During these last years we have again had cause to examine into our Bill of Rights. If you have not lately read the first 10 amendments to the Federal Constitution, then I suggest that some evening soon you do so—seriously, thoughtfully. You will find no words in the Soviet constitution comparable to the first five words of the first amendment—"Congress shall make no law." There is no such denial of power in the Soviet constitution. Do we wish to surrender that prohibition on the power of governments?

The first of the 10 amendments is, in full: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Some of us call the guaranties of our Constitution inherent rights; some call them individual rights; some call them civil rights; some call them the God-given rights of men that governments must respect and must not invade.

But the Communists tell us that they have similar rights provided for in their constitution. Their provisions are:

"Article 124: In order to insure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the U. S. S. R. is separated from the state, and the school from the church. Freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda is recognized for all citizens.

"Article 125: In conformity with the interests of the working people, and in order to strengthen the Socialist system, the citizens of the U. S. S. R. are guaranteed by law:

"(a) Freedom of speech.

"(b) Freedom of the press.

"(c) Freedom of assembly, including the holding of mass meetings.

"(d) Freedom of street processions and demonstrations.

"These civil rights are insured by placing at the disposal of the working people and their organization printing presses, stocks of paper, public buildings, the streets, communications facilities, and other material requisites for the exercise of these rights."

I shall not here comment upon the difference in meaning of our "Congress shall make no law" and the Soviet phrase "is recognized." Neither shall I dwell upon the "by law" provisions of the Soviet constitution, save to point out that by our meaning that provision is inoperative unless affirmative legislation is enacted.

Rather, let us find out what these so-called guaranties mean in the language of the Communist.

VISHINSKY EXPLAINS SOVIET THEORY OF RIGHTS

I refer now to the Law of the Soviet State by Vishinsky, presently Foreign Minister of Russia, formerly Commissar of Justice, and a recognized authority and lecturer on Soviet law. Vishinsky states that the source of civil rights in that land is in the government "rather than in any myth as to man's natural and inherent rights" (p. 563). So we start with a basic difference in the source of civil rights. If, as they contend, that source is in their social organization, that it gives the rights, then of necessity, the same power can take them away. Do we want to accept that philosophy?

Vishinsky says that lying at the foundation of all the legislation of the Soviet state on the matter of religion is the proposition of having a "negative attitude toward religion, carrying high the banner of militant atheism"; they have "initiated from the very earliest days a planned and decisive struggle with religion"; they aspire "to liberate the conscience from religious superstition" (p. 607). Following these aims, and apparently as an intermediate step to the ultimate accomplishment of "militant atheism" among Communist peoples, all property of churches and religious societies was confiscated and declared to be public property; the religious organizations were denied any legal status; they are permitted the use of special buildings "exclusively for religious

purposes"; they are required to register with the civil authorities in a "special manner"; their right to administrative organizations is limited—"local Soviets supervise the activity of religious organizations" and "religious organizations are forbidden to create funds for mutual assistance, cooperatives, or production units, to organize other than religious assemblies, groups, excursions, libraries, reading rooms, or the like—anything, that is to say, not immediately related to the basic functions of religious organizations" (p. 609).

He summarizes the result of their governmental policy to date in this language: "The struggle with religion is * * * carried on, not by administrative repressions, but by the Socialist refashioning of the entire national economy which eradicates religion, by Socialist reeducation of the toiling masses, by antireligious propaganda, by implanting scientific knowledge, and by expanding education. The mass exodus of U. S. S. R. toilers away from religion is directly due to these measures taken in their entirety" (p. 609).

DO WE WANT MILITANT ATHEISM?

Do we in America want our institutions of government to be refashioned so as to eradicate religion and so as to establish militant atheism as the basic governmental policy? I need but ask you to recall what has happened to religious organizations, priests, ministers, folk of faith in the countries behind the iron curtain. Do we want what they have?

We are told that article 125 guarantees the rights there set out. What do they mean in the language of the Soviet?

Vishinsky says: "Having given the toilers freedom of speech, assemblies, street parades, press, and so on, the Soviet Government explicitly excluded the nonlabor classes from enjoyment of this freedom" (p. 614). Who are the nonlabor classes to whom this freedom is excluded?—and what a contradiction of terms. He answers: "One of the first and most important measures of the Soviet Government in assuring actual freedom of the press in behalf of the toilers was the closing * * * of numerous organs of the counter-revolutionary press" (p. 615). In short, freedom of the press is denied to those who would oppose the policies of the Government.

Vishinsky refers to "our papers" and the law standing guard for the Soviet press by providing "for political-ideological control" of the press "to prohibit the issuance, publication, and circulation of productions * * * containing agitation and propaganda against Soviet authority and proletarian dictatorship" (p. 616). To violate Soviet legislation concerning the press carries criminal penalties. Vishinsky says: "In our state, naturally, there is and can be no place for freedom of speech, press, and so on, for the foes of socialism. Every sort of attempt on their part to utilize to the detriment of the state * * * these freedoms granted to toilers must be classified as a counter-revolutionary crime * * *. Freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of meetings, of street parades, and of demonstrations are the property of all the citizens in the U. S. S. R., fully guaranteed by the state upon the single condition that they be utilized in accord with the interests of the toilers and to the end of strengthening the Socialist social order" (p. 617). Vishinsky says: "The Soviet state * * * does not include freedom of political parties in the enumeration of these freedoms granted" (p. 627), and that "only one party can exist—the Communist Party" (p. 628).

DO WE WANT FREEDOM TO SUPPORT ONLY PARTY IN POWER?

Do we want their sort of freedom of the press, of assembly, of speech, of political parties, in our America—a freedom to be exercised only to support and not to oppose the policies of the party in power? To oppose communism by speech or by press in the iron-curtain countries is a crime. Do we want that to be the law of the United States? Do we want what they have?

But of what avail is it to have guaranteed rights of any kind in constitutions unless there is an agency of Government that has the power to make those rights effective as against the actions of the Government itself? In this country the courts, State and Federal, have the power to say to officials of Government, "These things you undertake to do you cannot do, because the people have denied or not granted you the power that you seek to exercise." Constitutional guaranties are supreme, and effectively so, through the agencies of the courts. If any official of Government undertakes to invade your rights guaranteed by the Constitution, it is not necessary that you go to your State capital and seek out some official and implore him to protect your rights; you need not go to Washington and there seek someone who will undertake to intervene for you. In America the individual has the right, and I emphasize right as against privilege—the individual has the right to go to the court located in his county and there challenge the power of the Government and secure a judicial determination of whether or not his rights are invaded. If it is found that constitutional rights are invaded, the courts have the power to stay the strong arm of the Government itself. That power of the judiciary is the peculiar genius of our institutions that makes constitutional rights effective.

But the Soviet says "We have courts," and they do—but without the all-important power of the courts of America to enforce and make effective constitutional rights of the individual. The courts of Russia are but administrative agencies of the government, subject to administrative direction and control. Lenin is quoted as having said that the courts were organized to force discipline on the working class. The Soviet courts do not have the power to protect the individual from governmental action, but rather are used to enforce administrative governmental decisions. One of their early writers said in effect that a club is a primitive weapon, a rifle an effective one, but the most efficient method for a government to control a people is a court that officials of government control. Such constitutional rights as are recognized in those countries are effective only insofar as the Communist Party and its controlled agencies, including the courts, permit. I need do no more here than call your attention to the procedures, powers, and decision of the so-called courts of the Communist countries which they have permitted to be told to us. Contrast their system with ours. Do we want what they have?

Time does not permit a detailed discussion. I suggest that you seriously weigh the rights that men and women in industry, in the professions, in the social agencies, in business, in any vocation, have in America. Then study and weigh comparable privileges—not rights—in the Communist countries. Finally, after you have summed up—ask yourself, Do you, individually, want what they have in Russia and the Communist countries in lieu of what you now have and can achieve for yourself in America. Do you want what they have?

I can sum up the whole matter in these short sentences. Our constitutional system, our laws, our courts, are designed to protect the individual person and people as a whole from the unauthorized power of government. The Communist system is designed to protect those in control of the government from the power of the people. Therein lies the difference between liberty and the lack of it in an organized society. May I suggest that you study our system and theirs, and that as you do so, you ask yourself these questions: Is there a difference between our system of government and that of the Communists? If so, is that difference in favor of the American system? If so, is it a difference worth preserving? And if so, are you doing all in your full power to maintain and strengthen the institutions of government that are ours?

Those questions I leave with you.

Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, my primary purpose in making these remarks is to awaken in the minds of our civilian population the real danger of atomic attack, also to emphasize the responsibility resting on the leaders of our society in local communities to impress upon their people the necessity of establishing at once a civil-defense program in order to minimize as far as possible a sudden devastating attack against the United States of America. Immediate preparation by volunteers for protection of our civilian population is imperative, but the apathy of our people is interfering with this program in most of our communities and should be corrected immediately, so that in the event of an attack, our civilian morale will be maintained and interference with our production capacity to equip our fighting men will be reduced to a minimum.

It has been reported that the President of the United States has said that Russia had 45 atomic bombs early in 1950. It has also been said that we have 10 times that many atomic bombs. But it would be scant comfort to the people of any of our large cities or ports if the Russians got through with even one bomb, and found our people lacking in adequate civilian-defense preparation. Should Russia decide to strike, we can feel confident she will not give us any advance notice, and that is why it is so vitally important that our civilian population get about the job of planning for our future safety and welfare without a moment's delay.

Casualties among civilians during the next war will, in all probability, far exceed those in the enlisted personnel of the armed services. Facing cold realities, world war III is not only a possibility but a real probability, and atomic bombs could come crashing down on the heads of our civilian population without a moment's warning.

Suppose a bomb were to crash on Baltimore City today—Baltimore is typical of any city in the United States—wiping out some 200,000 to 300,000 of its citizens, a large percentage of our doctors and nurses, destroying our hospitals, our light and power facilities, and abolishing the water system for Baltimore City and the surrounding metropolitan area:

How would we act?

What would we do?

How would we go about protecting ourselves?

Who would try to bring order out of chaos?

Who would coordinate rescuing activities?

Where would we get water to drink?

What could we do to protect ourselves from the hazards of radioactivity?

These are only a very, very few of the questions to be answered, and every community should have well-trained volunteers available immediately to answer any and all such questions.

Congress laid the groundwork for civilian defense by passing the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, setting up the Federal agency to handle civilian defense and outlining the part to be played by the States and the various communities within the States. Our citizens throughout this Nation should immediately follow through this program.

We all know, of course, that it would be foolhardy for the Russians to waste atomic bombs on rural communities, therefore, it is reasonable to presume that they will concentrate their fury on our cities, our ports, our large industrial areas, our oil refineries, and our transportation centers, but the radius surrounding these areas is a matter of conjecture.

Much has been said about the damage resulting from an atomic bomb and how far the effects of the bomb would carry. For instance, atomic scientists say that practically all persons within a half mile of the explosion would meet instant death; of those within a radius of 1 mile from the explosion, 50 percent would be killed; and on out to a radius of 2 miles, where comparatively few would lose their lives. One hears such remarks as, "Well, I live 3 miles from the closest large plant, or from the port of Baltimore, so it is unlikely that my home would be affected." We must realize, however, that a few seconds' mistake in timing might mean that the bomb would be dropped several miles from the proposed target, so those of us who live within an area of as much as 15 or 20 miles from the target might become atomic-bomb victims through an error on the part of some nervous pilot.

I am hopeful that our radar screen will pick up any approaching enemy planes. However, it is almost inconceivable to think that none could get through to their target. Now is the time to get our civilian defense units organized. Now is the time to impress upon our people the danger with which we are faced. Of course, our people would become aroused in the event of attack, but then it would be too late. Bomb shelters cannot be built overnight and neither can civil defense units be trained so that if an attack comes, we may handle the resultant damage with the least possible confusion. Only by such teamwork as exists among well-trained groups can we hope to aid the distressed, fight fires, and restore order in our communities with the least possible delay. And it takes considerable time to train such personnel. That is the reason our people should be made conscious of the critical situation that now exists.

And yet, notwithstanding the fact that we are facing this startling situation and the gravest crisis in all history, our people, in many instances, go drifting on, seemingly indifferent to the possibility of impending disaster. This condition exists only because the leaders in civic, churches, and other endeavors are not doing their duty in impressing upon our people the seriousness of the situation.

Korea has certainly unmasked communism of its propaganda-painted peace-loving pretention. We certainly know now that the Communists will go to war if necessary to attain their objective of world conquest.

The fact that the Soviet Union stood ready to assist Communist China in their push in Korea clearly demonstrates that they are prepared now to risk a war between the free peoples of the world and the Communist-dominated nations. No, world war III is not impossible but a real probability and the sooner our people realize it, the better.

A brief résumé of the military might of Russia in comparison with that of our country should make us shudder:

Russia has 187 divisions well equipped and ready to move immediately, whereas, we have only 14 divisions and 80 percent of these are in the Pacific.

Russia has embarked on a program of building 1,000 submarines and has already completed 360. We must remember that it took only 50 submarines to practically drive Great Britain and ourselves off the high seas in World War II.

We know Russia is stockpiling the atomic bomb and possesses the planes that can leave Russian soil on a nonstop flight and drop the bombs on any eastern seaboard community within 12 hours from starting time.

Russia has more than 50,000 tanks—outnumbering us many, many times.

She has embarked upon a program of building a four-fleet navy, which is certainly cause for sober thought. We are told that the timetable for completion of her full war-footing program is 1952. On the other hand, we have seen ourselves during the past 6 years drift from the greatest military power recorded in all history to being so weak that we are kicked around by Red China, inviting attack and possible disaster. Yes; if these facts were only presented to our people, civilian defense would be of first order in every community.

My friends, in 30 years we have seen communism spread from only a philosophy of Marx to an engulfing threat to the entire world; in fact, the United States is the only Nation today that can withstand the onslaught of communism standing alone.

In the past 6 years we have seen communism spread from the Baltic Sea to the China Sea. In the past 18 months we have seen aggression in West Germany, Trieste, and Indochina. During the same short period we have seen Russia assume control of the Polish Army; we have seen conditions arise in Bulgaria causing the breaking off of diplomatic relations with this country. We have seen one of our planes shot down over the Baltic, murdering 10 of our fine young men. And, finally, we have discovered that they will resort to war to obtain their objective. Yes; communism is on the march and when deceit, intrigue, and subversive tactics fail, judging from past performances, force is inevitable.

Do you think it reasonable to assume that Russia will wait until we arm Europe and prepare for her defeat? Is it not possible that she will feel that in the interest of her own self-defense she should strike before we are ready?

Will Russia stand by and let the leaders of the free nations accuse her of banditry? Is not the exchange of harsh words between the leaders of the world sufficient to convince one that war is possible at any moment?

A bird's-eye view of this horrible situation will certainly convince any reasonable mind that preparedness on the part of our population should be a matter of paramount importance. Our civilian-defense units throughout our country must act immediately.

So, I repeat, let us all do what we can to impress upon our people in every city, hamlet, and town the urgent necessity of perfecting their civil-defense programs immediately. We all must act now.

Further Report on the Medical Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, December 22, 1950, the Washington Post, of Washington, D. C., carried the following startling information:

ONE-THIRD CALLED UNFIT—HIGH REJECTION RATE OF DOCTORS PUZZLES AREA DRAFT OFFICIALS

(By Sam Stavisky)

Army and Selective Service officials are disturbed over the high rate of physical rejection among draft-liable doctors in some sections of the country, it was learned yesterday.

The authorities have been relieved to discover, following a quick unofficial survey, that the national physical rejection rate among the draft-registered physicians, dentists, and veterinarians is only around 17 percent. This figure approximates the physical-rejection rates for the regular 19-through-25 selectees.

But the officials are considerably concerned, in particular sections, with the abnormally high rejection rates such as the Second Army area, which includes the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky.

In the Second Army area, it was learned, nearly one-third of the medical men classified as 1–A and sent up to the 26 area induction centers have been turned back as unfit for duty because of physical disability.

Second Army medical officers are particularly perturbed over the situation because only recently a group of Medical Reserve officers was given a similar physical checkup, and although these men were for the most part 35 to 50 years of age, the rejections

for physical disability amounted to only around 10 percent.

Yet the draft-liable doctors—who are chiefly in the 30-to-36-year bracket, and, like the reservists, were qualified to serve during World War II—are now showing up with a physical rejection rate which is 3 times that of the older men.

There's another comparison that makes the Pentagon unhappy over the Second Army rejection rate for medical men.

The latest available figures for the regular draft shows that only 15 percent of the 19-through-25-year-old selectees is being turned back as physically unfit. That figure is only one-half of the rate for the medical men 30 to 36 who are being disqualified.

No official is willing to suggest publicly what the trouble might be, but privately some of the authorities object to the present arrangement under which the draft-liable doctors are given their preinduction exams by other civilian doctors. Critics of the present examining system insist that the rejection rate would be lower were the exams given by military physicians. It is known that such a suggestion has been urged on Selective Service, along with a proposal to reexamine all cases of physical disqualification among the draft-liable doctors.

On the following day, December 24, 1950, the same newspaper carried this item of news:

SERVICE-SHY DOCTORS FACE LOSS OF RANK—THOSE WHO SPURNED COMMISSIONS MAY ENTER AS PRIVATES

(By Sam Stavisky)

Draft-eligible doctors who have been refusing to become Reserve officers in the Army now face the prospect of getting a lower-rank commission or being drafted as privates, it was learned yesterday.

Dr. Richard L. Meiling, Defense Department Medical Chief, said that by January 15, the Army medical corps no longer will be able to commission any of the draft-liable (priority I) physicians as majors.

After January 15, notwithstanding his age and professional qualifications, the draft-liable doctor volunteering for a Reserve commission will have to accept a captaincy or a lieutenancy, according to Dr. Meiling. And there aren't many captaincies available, either, he added.

The latecomers into the Medical Reserves—who are waiting for the last minute before draft induction to apply for commissions—will find the most desirable assignments, such as staffing the major general hopitals, are unavailable, Dr. Meiling said. They will be assigned instead to the field with the new Army divisions in training.

The Defense Department's Medical Director said that the military authorities were fully cognizant of the fact that a considerable minority of physicians, dentists, and veterinarians in priority I—men who were deferred for training during World War II and who saw less than 90 days' service—has refused to accept proferred Reserve commissions.

Dr. Meiling said some of these reluctant physicians may be under the false impression that by refusing commissions they will escape military service, because the Government has been hesitant about drafting any doctors.

"It can be flatly stated," said Dr. Meiling, "that all physically qualified medical men in priority I, not deemed essential to the national or community welfare in their civilian jobs, will be called into the Armed Forces via the Reserves or via the draft."

Meiling observed that expansion of the Armed Forces to 3,500,000 as ordered by President Truman means that a minimum of 8,000 physicians will be needed to meet the requirements of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, probably by next July.

The recent registration of priority I medical men disclosed 9,000 physicians in this category, of whom 4,000 have already been classified as 1-A.

The Defense Department's medical chief observed that every available physician in priority I must be brought into the service via commissioning or draft, before a call is issued for priority II—approximately 5,000 physicians given draft deferments to continue their training in World War II and who later served in uniform less than 21 months.

Draft-liable physicians volunteering for commissions get $100 a month extra in pay. Those who will be drafted will not only be taken in as privates, with privates' pay, but also will lose the $100-a-month bonus.

"If a physician proves to be so selfish that he doesn't think he ought to serve his country, and won't serve unless he is drafted, then we will have to evaluate him to determine whether or not he has the humanitarian qualifications for treating service," Dr. Meiling said. The drafted physician's military assignment would then be determined by such an evaluation.

Latest available figures show that in the eight-State Second Army area, which includes the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia, that one-third of the physically qualified 1-A physicians have thus far rejected commissions. In the District, out of 16 priority I physicians qualified for commissions, seven have indicated a preference to be drafted.

On December 23, 1950, the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., published the following news item:

DRAFT-REJECTED DOCTORS MAY BE EXAMINED AGAIN—OFFICIALS STUDYING STEPS IF RATE IS FOUND OUT OF LINE

The possibility of reexamining draft-liable doctors in some areas as the result of high physical rejection rates is under careful study by Pentagon officials, it was reported today.

As yet no definite steps have been planned. But one high military source said that if studies now under way show rejection rates to be "really out of line," it is expected that those rejected will be ordered for reexamination, probably at military hospitals.

In the Second Army area, which includes the District, officials said young physicians have been rejected for physical reasons alone at the incredible rate of between 25 and 30 percent. All those ordered for examination either were trained at Government expense during the war or were otherwise deferred to continue medical education. On the national level, physical rejections are running about 17 percent.

RATE HIGH IN DISTRICT

In the District, the rejection rate was even higher. Of 35 physicians ordered up, one source reported, 16 were rejected. It was pointed out, however, that the 35 was too small a number from which to draw general conclusions.

Meanwhile, Second Army officials plan to make a breakdown of the rejection picture, so that officials in the District and seven States covered by the area can be given a clear picture of reasons for the rejections.

MAY CALL BACK RESERVISTS

Reports of the high rejection rates also raised concern among some civilian doctors that the Army might be forced to call back Reservists with wide World War II service in order to meet medical needs. But Army officials said that before that happens steps will be taken to induct young draft-liable doctors who have refused to accept commissions voluntarily. As yet, however, the Army has not passed along a medical draft call to selective service officials.

On the nonmedical draft front, District officials have suspended weekly induction of youths until after the Christmas holidays. The next mass induction will be held January 3.

On December 25, 1950, the Washington News had the following to say in reference to the publicity given the doctors by other newspapers:

"A DASTARDLY STATEMENT"—CIVILIAN MEDICAL EXAMINERS DEFENDED

Dr. Richard Meiling, Director of the Defense Department's Office of Medical Services, has denied an inference published recently (not in the News) that civilian medical examiners are trying to get their fellow doctors out of the draft.

Dr. Meiling called the report "as dastardly a statement as any man could make and damaging to the mobilization effort."

He said that any draft-eligible doctors that are turned down because of physical disabilities have their cases reviewed by the Army Surgeon General's office "regardless of who examines these men."

He said the Air Force and Navy have accepted more volunteer doctors than the Army has even processed and gave this as a reason for the high rate of physical rejection by Selective Service in some areas. So the Army can catch up with the other services, he said, they have agreed temporarily to take no more volunteer doctors.

A spokesman for the Surgeon General said the average rejection figure for doctors over the Nation is about 15 to 17 percent and any rejection rate in local areas is "nothing to get alarmed about. It will eventually straighten itself out."

"The checks and balances in the induction system will smoke out any irregularities," he said, "but I doubt if it's true there are any."

The Second Army area, which includes the District, Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio, has reported a rejection of close to 30 percent.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of any and all accusations and excuses the whole sorry mess, however, adds up to this: That many members of the medical fraternity in the United States received their professional education at the expense of the United States Government; that while they were receiving this education they were spared all of the perils and rigors of shooting wars; that in many instances, the World Wars were over before they were graduated, and they entered private practice and lives of hitherto unknown comfort and even luxury; that they lacked both gratefulness and patriotism when we became involved in the present conflict and would not volunteer to help their fellow Americans in the military service and the great country which made it possible for them to have a profession; that it became necessary for the Eighty-first Congress to pass a law, drafting them into the United States military services; that they waited for their draft call and when examined either were so unfit physically by nature or by design that they could not pass a physical examination; and as a result of their failure to be physically fit were permitted to hobble back to their various lucrative practices.

Is it not a strange state of affairs that these men are permitted by law to attempt to heal others when they cannot or will not heal themselves?

Of course it was the mistake of mistakes to do as was done in both World Wars I and II, to let any grossly physical incompetent ever study medicine or

any other profession during the war years and prior thereto. That is one reason why many medical men and dentists cannot pass their physical examinations now. They were physically incompetent when they commenced their medical studies.

That is one big reason why the medical and dental professions are guilty of such unnatural behavior for the past few years, and is one of the reasons why these professions have manifested such devilish cruelty toward both civilian and military persons.

We should remember that no truer words were ever spoken than those of the Latin scholar who said: "A sound mind in a sound body."

For the past several generations an abundance of sympathy has been extended to the physically handicapped, and I find no fault with such notions, but I do say that these unfortunate people should not be permitted to take over the medical, dental, or any other profession. Neither should they be selected or elected to positions of authority in Government at any level. The physically and mentally fit only should be permitted to enter the professions and have the duties and responsibilities of Government entrusted to them.

I do hope that President Truman will pick able-bodied men and women from the various branches of the armed services and give them educations in the medical, dental, and other allied professions so that our Nation may again have real doctors instead of incompetents and morons at the medical helm in our great country.

Case History of a Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article entitled "Case History of a Smear," written by Arnold Heidenheimer, which appeared in the New Republic for December 25, 1950.

I hope that a perusal of it will cause Members to pause and give full and thorough consideration to similar matters in the days ahead, before rushing in with rash and unfounded charges. The above-mentioned article follows:

CASE HISTORY OF A SMEAR

(By Arnold Heidenheimer)

A month or so ago two old acquaintances met for lunch in Washington. They discussed the request of General Marshall for the appointment of Mrs. Anna Rosenberg as his Assistant Secretary of Defense. Others were interested in Mrs. Rosenberg as the first woman to be recommended for a high defense post. The two friends, Gerald L. K. Smith and Benjamin Freedman, were less concerned with her sex than with her religion.

The two were joined, as Freedman later told a Senate committee, by common aims. They agreed on a common plan. When lunch was over, Freedman, the apostate Jew who had once arranged for shipments of machine guns to the Mufti, returned to New York. Smith, the old time anti-Semitic agitator and Fascist, went to work. Soon Smith telephoned Freedman to tell him that he was sending up two men who wanted the dirt on Anna Rosenberg. He implied, so Freedman testified, that they were official Senate investigators. When they arrived in the middle of the night, however, one identified himself as Don Surine, special investigator for Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, the other, as Edward Nellor, leg man for Fulton Lewis, Jr.

After this meeting Freedman returned to Washington. From the office of Representative JOHN RANKIN he sent a letter to all Senators on the Armed Services Committee volunteering sworn affidavits to prove that Mrs. Anna Rosenberg was a former Communist and a member of the John Reed Club in New York during the thirties. At the same time Fulton Lewis, Jr., began a series of broadcasts predicting that the Rosenberg case would loom larger than the Hiss affair as proof of Communist infiltration in Washington.

The Senate Armed Services Committee had approved her appointment on November 29 after a brief hearing. But with the cries of Fulton Lewis, Jr., victor over their defeated Chairman MILLARD TYDINGS, ringing in their ears, the Senators rushed to reopen the case in a series of closed-door meetings arranged for Freedman and the "witnesses" he had sworn would back him up, which was to mean Ralph De Sola, a former fanatical Communist of Sephardic Jewish background, who had violently turned against his past.

Even before Freedman's initial appearance before the committee, the anti-Semitic press all over the country went into action with screaming headlines. The Jewish conspiracy became symbolized in Anna Rosenberg, who had come to this country from Hungary in 1912 and became one of our outstanding experts on labor relations. Leading the pack was Conde McGinley's Common Sense, which had been saved from bankruptcy by Freedman himself when McGinley earlier this year was hauled into a New Jersey court for resisting the execution of judgment for nonpayment of debts. Common Sense switched from headlines on Yiddish Marxists plot United States of America defeat by U. S. S. R. to shouting about Mrs. Rosenberg's coming from the heart of the Eastern European Yiddish population and alleging that she was guilty of repeated subversive activities in the thirties. Other hate sheets took the cue. The Newsletter, put out in Los Angeles by Robert H. Williams, who still holds a Reserve status in the Army Intelligence, devoted several issues to Mrs. Rosenberg. Forrest C. Sammons' West Virginia anti-Communist league dropped its promotion of the Protocols of Zion to join the campaign. So did the various front organizations of Gerald L. K. Smith who, in a letter to his backers, claimed sole credit for getting Mrs. Rosenberg.

Freedman's appearance before the Senate committee was no novel experience to him. In addition to testifying before Congress on his tie-up with the Committee for Constitutional Government, he has made frequent court appearances—their high point being a suit he brought against Bernard Baruch, Senator LEHMAN, and Thomas Watson, president of International Business Machines, for conspiring with Cardinal Spellman to keep him out of the Catholic Church. Freedman's star witness, Ralph De Sola, was also no newcomer to the witness stand. Testifying against his former Communist comrades has been one of his major activities since 1939, although his latest endeavors have been in the musical columns of the Freeman.

Ralph De Sola's testimony before the committee had consistency and harmony. With a zeal which caused Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican of Oregon, who holds a master of arts in clinical psychiatry, to call him one of the most extreme paranoiacs I have ever seen, De Sola went to work.

"I, Ralph De Sola," he stated in an affidavit, submitted by Freedman, that paralleled his testimony, "solemnly swear and affirm that I was a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America. * * * I was recruited by James Magraw * * * in his company I met Anna Rosenberg and he advised me that this outstanding social worker was a party member, but like many important comrades was kept out of general activity that might expose her to enemies of the Communist Party."

Later, De Sola stated he was told to forget the names of "early party contacts such as Anna Rosenberg * * * as the Communist Party had most important work for these top comrades." De Sola added that he would provide witnesses who would corroborate his testimony. To substantiate his statements, clippings from the Daily Worker and other New York newspapers were introduced, which cited an Anna Rosenberg as having signed John Reed literature and at another time being arrested by New Jersey police in the course of a radical fracas.

The present New York postal directory lists 43 Mrs. Anna Rosenbergs in that city alone. Was the John Reed signer, Anna Rosenberg, the woman whose confirmation was now before the Senate? De Sola swore that she was, and superficial appearances seemed to bear out Fulton Lewis' anticipation of another "Hiss trial."

On the following day Mrs. Rosenberg left her Pentagon office, next door to Secretary Marshall's, to face her accuser. She flatly denied ever having seen him before, and later told newsmen, "I didn't believe anyone who has lived the way I have, who has worked the way I have, could be accused in such a way by a man who admits he was a Communist." Even unfriendly acquaintances of hers thought it unthinkable that a shrewd and ambitious woman who was then deputy director of Gen. Hugh Johnson's NRA, and looking ahead, would be indiscreet enough to engage in Communist activity.

But still it was Mrs. Rosenberg's word against his.

TYDINGS after all was packing his bags down the hall, and MCCARTHY'S aide was coaching the accusers. Chairman RUSSELL announced that the question of mistaken identity is not completely eliminated.

The next witness was Helen Winner, De Sola's ex-wife. Her main contribution was to give further background to Senator MORSE'S analysis of De Sola. He was, she said, completely unstable, and haunted by a mother complex which caused him to blame women, especially successful women, for his own shortcomings. Miss Winner reportedly asked the Chairman to keep her remarks secret as she feared reprisals by De Sola on herself and her children. She described him as a person who goes to great extremes for what he regards as noble reasons. As a former fervent Communist and feature editor of the Worker she had been with De Sola at many party gatherings, but she denied categorically that she had ever seen Mrs. Rosenberg at any of these.

This concluded the fourth day the committee had looked into the matter. When hearings resumed Monday Freedman stuck to his guns in further testimony before the committee. Senator MORSE'S statement that there "appeared to be some organized anti-Semitic forces" behind the attack on Mrs. Rosenberg was the first public hint of the real character of the locked-door proceedings. Some interesting links between Freedman and De Sola also came to the front. Most often mentioned was Hallan Richardson, former attorney for the Yorkville Nazi, Joe McWilliams. Richardson had been Freedman's attorney in the cases aris-

ing out of his support of the Mufti, and he had also been interested in yet another committee which De Sola helped organize to press a suit against the Metropolitan Opera Co., the American Broadcasting Co., and the Texas Oil Co. for their part in the production of Verdi's opera, Don Carlo, which De Sola's group branded as inciting revolution by musical means.

The test of Freedman's and De Sola's repeated accusations came on Tuesday when the committee heard J. B. Matthews, former investigator for the Un-American Activities Committee, deny the role Freedman had tried to assign him. He said that Freedman had been pestering him to testify because he had once stated that Theodore Kirkpatrick, publisher of Counter-Attack, had told him that according to William Harris, a former FBI informer, Anna Rosenberg was a Communist. Matthews, and all the others in the smear link, were to testify that the case was one of "mistaken identity."

The next witness was James Magraw, a rambunctious Irishman who had been De Sola's boss in the WPA writer's project during the late thirties. With not too much academic background, he had, in 1939, refused to give an immediate approval to a book on snakes that De Sola had prepared for publication. Disgruntled, De Sola quit and shortly afterwards testified against Magraw in a subsequent congressional investigation into communism in WPA. Magraw also testified that he had never seen Mrs. Rosenberg at functions cited by De Sola.

By now the case was crumbling so fast that there was a rush to leave the snake expert in the pit which he had dug. Fulton Lewis suddenly discovered that the attack on Mrs. Rosenberg had anti-Semitic connotations and evil sources and indignantly condemned those involved.

On Thursday the committee was called together once more to listen to yet another witness, George Starr, a former FBI man cited by De Sola. His testimony added to the long string of denials. That morning the committee also received another communication from Freedman. He now wanted to file some new testimony. Simultaneously he told the World-Telegram's Fred Woltman in New York that he was putting up $10,000 to clear the Mrs. Rosenberg and to help advertise for the "other woman" to come forward to clear her. "Otherwise," he declared, "this unfair charge will be hanging over her head. I think it is terrible. It's disgraceful that the FBI hasn't produced this other woman." The same day the committee passed on the nomination, 13 to 0.

NLRB Sabotages Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post there is an article entitled "And So I Was Purged," by Robert N. Denham, former counsel for the National Labor Relations Board, in collaboration with Stacey V. Jones. This article, in my opinion should be read by every Member of Congress because it is a fair statement of the manner in which the NLRB is sabotaging the Taft-Hartley Act and thereby defeating the will of Congress in its effort to create and maintain peace with justice for all in the field of labor-management relations.

"And So I Was Purged" gives ample basis for thorough congressional investigation of the NLRB and its apparent efforts to serve the interests of the labor racketeers, with the view of making the necessary changes in the law to make explicit the intent of Congress. The article follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of December 30, 1950]

AND SO I WAS PURGED

(By Robert N. Denham as told to Stacy V. Jones)

A few weeks before the recent congressional elections, I was summarily fired as general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. There is nothing remarkable about the mere removal of a Federal official; people in Government are fired for one reason or another, just as in business. But this case illustrates something important that the public ought to realize: although the President can't change a law passed by Congress, he can attain much the same end by changing the administrators.

My ejection was one move in the campaign that started a little over 3 years ago with the battle cry that resounded in the White House as well as in the halls of labor—repeal Taft-Hartley. If you can't win by a frontal assault, try flanking tactics. The direct attacks have all failed, but the danger now is that, although the law remains on the statute books, it will be completely nullified.

The week before the ax fell on me, President Truman and some 50 officials of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations held a dinner behind closed doors at a Washington hotel. It was described as a simple little social gathering, with no political implications. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, coauthor of the law, commented in an interview that the connection was obvious, and that my removal was the pay-off, another surrender to the CIO Political Action Committee. I have no doubt that it did seal the bargain exchanging my political head for the promise of votes—which did not materialize.

Union officials had been clamoring for my dismissal, both openly and privately, for years. Scarcely a month went by without such a demand from William Green or Philip Murray or one of their centurions. The complaint was never that I was not doing my duty, but that I was doing it too well.

There was an almost comic haste about my removal. In September, on my return from vacation, I was called to the White House and told that my resignation was desired. As a lawyer, I had always believed that the President had full authority to remove me at any time. I wrote the resignation with some care, making it effective at the President's convenience, because I knew that with the office vacant much of the enforcement work would stop. The President accepted it within a few hours, to take effect 2 days later. As my successor was not appointed for 10 days after I left, it was obvious that the hurry was not to get somebody else in, but to get me out.

I believe in the need of the Taft-Hartley Act, and I believe in enforcing it as Congress intended. Decisions and policy statements since my resignation indicate that neither the members of the Board nor the new General Counsel completely believes in either. It is always incongruous to assign people to administer a law who aren't for it.

The Taft-Hartley Act directly affects perhaps 13,000,000 or 14,000,000 union members and their employers. To the rest of the public it is probably only a name derived from those of its chief authors, Senator TAFT and Representative Fred A. Hartley, just as its predecessor, the Wagner Act, is popularly called after its sponsor, Senator Robert F. Wagner.

The Wagner Act was a simple law, passed in 1935, in the depths of the depression, for the frank purpose of helping the unions. The first section of the law declared it to be United States policy to encourage "the practice and procedure of collective bargaining" and to protect "the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing." The NLRB, which the act created, went into full partnership with the unions in a campaign to organize American industry.

The Board's job under the Wagner Act was to prevent "unfair labor practices" by employers which interfered with unionization or collective bargaining, and to supervise elections among employees held to pick unions as bargaining agents. There was no pretense of protecting employers against union skulduggery. It was a lopsided, prounion law. In the dozen years during which it stood unchanged, the unions became bloated with power and arrogant to the point of lawlessness. The public was increasingly injured and increasingly concerned by the abuses which the act encourages—the inroads of communism in labor unions, the picket-line violence, the goon squads that forced men into unions, willy-nilly, the refusal of unions to bargain on the same basis as employers, jurisdictional strikes, secondary boycotts, and featherbedding.

Under pressure from the people for correction of these excesses, the Taft-Hartley Act was passed in 1947. It kept virtually intact all the protection for the employees and unions against unfair labor practices by employers, but added very marked protection for the individual workers, management, and the public against unfair practices by unions. The new law forbade unions to coerce or restrain workers in their right to join or not to join unions or engage in union activity. It made them subject to prosecution by the NLRB and to damage suits by employers if they called strikes for certain purposes. And it forced them, before they could get any help from the NLRB, to open their books to the Government and to their own members, and forced their officers to swear they were not Communists.

Another Taft-Hartley reform was creation of the independent general counsel. Under the Wagner Act the Board had made the regulations, hired the investigators, appointed the lawyers to act as prosecutors, and then sat as judge and jury. Congress decided to separate the prosecuting and judicial functions in the American tradition of a fair trial. The general counsel was to be appointed by the President for 4 years, subject to Senate confirmation. He was to have supervision over all but a few of the NLRB lawyers, and over the officers and employees in the regional offices. He was given complete and final authority to investigate unfair labor practices, issue complaints, and prosecute them before the Board.

The Taft-Hartley machinery is roughly this: A union or an employer files a complaint of unfair labor practice in one of the 20 regional offices. If the case isn't settled informally, a trial examiner is sent from Washington to preside at a hearing. He makes a report, and if either the union or the employer objects to it, the case is reviewed by the Board in Washington. Then if either does not like the Board's decision, it may appeal to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and finally ask for review by the United States Supreme Court.

If the Board wants to enforce a decision it must apply to a United States Circuit Court of Appeals. For an injunction the general

counsel applies to a United States district court.

Why I, of all people, should have been selected by the Fair Deal as the first general counsel I have never understood. I am a Republican. I had been a lawyer for nearly 40 years, and for the last 9 of those years I had been an NLRB trial examiner. I insisted on trying out various formulas under the Wagner Act to afford some relief to employers as well as to the unions, and in consequence I was in almost continuous conflict with the Board. I did not hesitate to dismiss union charges when I considered them groundless. Often the Board overruled me on the dismissals, but whenever such a case was appealed to court I was sustained.

In late June 1947 I told James J. Reynolds, Jr., the Board member who aproached me about the general counsel job, that I was not interested, that it would be a man-killer, and that I would prefer to live on in reasonable peace, with enough time for my family. But he persisted, the Board unanimously recommended me, and in a few days I was called to the White House. There Dr. John R. Steelman, the "Assistant President," told me the President wanted to appoint Republicans to two of the three vacancies created by the new law, and wanted me as one of the two because I had been in Government service for some years and knew the ropes. Dr. Steelman said that if I would stay with it a year or a year and a half and get things running, I would be relieved for less arduous duties.

To the two new places on the Board—which was increased from three to five—the President appointed Abe Murdock, a recently defeated Democratic Senator from Utah, for 5 years, and J. Copeland Gray, a Republican from Buffalo, N. Y., who had served on the Wage Stabilization Board, for the 2-year term.

When the President advised me of my appointment he told me, in the presence of the five Board members, that although he didn't like the act, he would expect me to administer it in accordance with its terms and the intent of Congress. He added that he wouldn't be telling me how to run my job. Incidentally, he didn't.

Things started off with deceptive smoothness in the late summer of 1947. There were certain inconsistencies and blank spaces in the law. To bridge these, I worked out an agreement allocating authority—between the Board and my office—with the two hold-over Board members in Washington. The Chairman, Paul M. Herzog, was in a hospital in New York City. All the administrative and housekeeping authority formerly exercised by the Chairman was given to me, as my operations represented about 85 percent of the agency's activities.

This agreement proved to be particularly obnoxious to Chairman Herzog and became the basis of a long intramural fight, much of which has never before been publicly related. The Board spent much of its energy and time in the first half of 1950, for instance, on efforts to repudiate the agreement.

At the outset, in August 1947, the Board decided it needed a solicitor to advise it on matters of law. There was no provision for such a job, and the Board had no authority to appoint one, but at the members' insistence I assigned from my staff a solicitor and an assistant whom they specifically requested. The first solicitor resigned in about a year, and was succeeded by Ida Klaus, a niece of David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. Shortly after her accession the real trouble started.

When I moved in, the atmosphere of the entire agency was thoroughly Wagnerian. Under the earlier act, which many staff members had been administering for 10 or 12 years, labor was a sacred cow. Most of the staff had come in as crusaders for organized labor, and had never lost the fervor. An employer was regarded as guilty merely because he was an employer.

Under the allocation agreement, about 1,200 employees in Washington and throughout the country reported to me, and about 250 to the members of the Board. One of my first moves was to invite those on my staff who were unwilling to subscribe to Taft-Hartley to get out.

One reform I instituted early was abolition of an extraordinary contract with the union of NLRB employees, signed by the old Wagner Board, which provided that all promotions and changes had to be reported to the union and could be disputed if some union member felt he should have the job. I told the union that I would be glad to post notices of vacancies so that anyone interested could apply, but that jobs would be filled by me, as the responsible Government official, and that promotions would be made by me when and as indicated.

The first difference with the Board involved the Taft-Hartley requirement of non-Communist affidavits from officers of a union and from "the officers of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit." By agreement with the same two hold-over Board members as to what the rule would be, I announced that officers of the A. F. of L. and CIO would have to sign. The air was at once filled with brickbats.

CIO officials protested that not a single CIO union could make use of the law because of the presence of Ben Gold, a Communist Party leader, among the CIO officers. A. F. of L. officials complained that none of their unions could use the NLRB machinery because of John L. Lewis, a vice president, who wasn't a Commie but was too stubborn to sign. My answer to both of them was, "Well, the only thing to do is to get rid of those fellows. That's what the law is for."

They didn't like that, and went to see members of the Board. A day or so later, one of the Board members called to advise me that he hadn't understood what we had agreed upon, and that he would have to withdraw from the agreement. The next day the second member came to say he had understood it thoroughly, but that he would have to pull out, too.

In a few weeks the first case involving the point came before the Board. With Gray, the only Republican, dissenting, it ruled that the A. F. of L. and CIO were not labor organizations, and consequently their officers did not have to sign. The Board has been reversed in two out of three such cases by the circuit court of appeals, and if the Supreme Court likewise overrules the Board, doubt will be cast on many NLRB decisions. These cases affect especially the CIO, which did not meet the requirements until December 1949.

Under the Wagner Act, cases sent up by the trial examiners were digested by a review section which recommended board action. The section had been built up by Nathan Witt and Thomas I. Emerson. Witt has twice refused, before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to affirm or deny membership in the Communist Party, on the ground of self-incrimination, and has been named in testimony by Lee Pressman as having been a fellow member of a Washington Communist cell. Emerson, now a Yale professor, was identified in a report of the same committee as president in 1950 of the National Lawyers' Guild, which the committee called "the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions."

Congress specifically abolished the review section in passing the Taft-Hartley law, but its personnel furnished more than half of the nearly 100 legal assistants, or law clerks, assigned to the Board members as their personal staffs. Thus, the review section personnel turned up as nuclei of what amounted to five little review sections, advising the individual Board members. These people—of whom 18 or 19 are assigned to each Board member—were the only attorneys in the agency exempted by law from reporting to me as general counsel.

There were three ways to kill Taft-Hartley, and all three were tried. First, there was the legislative. Herzog, who dominated the Board, had opposed Taft-Hartley when it was passed, and he supported two later efforts to abolish it legally. The second method was to make crippling decisions—continued interpretation of the law so as to restrict the employer on every count, but not to restrict the union, even at the expense of individual employees. The third was administrative maneuvering, of which my ouster was the crowning move.

Outright repeal was a leading issue in the 1948 presidential campaign, and was used for all it was worth in labor votes. The law had been passed over a Truman veto, and its revocation was a plank in the Democratic platform.

Two sore points with the union bosses were the prohibition of the closed shop—under which a man has to belong to a union before he can get a job—and the authorized use of injunctions to halt that and other specified union unfair practices. Both irked the International Typographical Union, against which we had obtained an injunction for violation of the closed-shop clause.

When the ITU convention that summer demanded that the President investigate Senator TAFT'S unwarranted interference with the executive branch—in inviting during my absence two of my assistants to his office to discuss the ITU case with Chicago publishers—I was called on the White House carpet.

Clark Clifford, then the President's special counsel, cross-examined me as prosecutor, with the President sitting as judge. The President asked me whether I didn't consider Senator TAFT'S action as unfair pressure. My answer was "No," and that we probably wouldn't have recognized it as pressure anyhow, because we were already preparing to do what the publishers wanted—start contempt proceedings against ITU officials. (Later the court found them in contempt.)

I could not help thinking how Harry S. Truman, as chairman of the Senate committee bearing his name, had put the heat on many an official only a few years before.

When the administration hailed the 1948 election as a mandate from the people to repeal Taft-Hartley, the majority board members went to work to help achieve this end. Chairman Herzog, who had been chafing under the loss of the administrative powers he had held in the Wagner days, was the most active.

One characteristic incident was blown up by the columnists into the battle of the bathroom. What happened was this: When the agency was preparing to move into new offices in January 1949, and we were discussing assignment of space, someone asked who was to get the corner office, which had a private shower. J. Copeland Gray, then a board member, remarks innocently to Herzog, "Paul, why don't you and Bob toss up a coin and see who gets it?"

Without a word, Herzog stalked out of the room. I learned later that he was furious that anybody but the chairman would be considered for it, and gave Gray a dressing down for even suggesting the possibility. As it turned out, I was assigned offices at the other end of the hall, and without my requesting it, a shower was also installed for me.

When House and Senate committee hearings were held by the new Democratic Congress, Chairman Herzog testified in favor of Taft-Hartley repeal, and particularly in favor of elimination of my job. The Republican minority in the Senate committee asked that I also be heard. I advocated amendments, but retention of the law as a whole, particularly the provision for an independent general counsel.

The mud flew thick, in and out of Congress. Some of the milder terms used by the unions were "Tuff-Heartless Act" and "Slave Labor Act." I have been called a lot of names myself, but nothing like these applied to me by Senator MATT NEELY, of West Virginia, who was incensed that I had dared use the injunction against unions. He compared my atitude toward the laboring man to that of the Emperor Caligula, "who wished that the Roman people had only one head, so that he could chop it off with a single blow." Borrowing he said, from Martin Luther, he also called me "a devil, a horrid calumniator, a wicked sycophant, a prince of darkness, a real Apollyon, a beast, a horrid imposter on mankind, one in whom there is scarcely any philosophy, and a goat."

Although moderate amendments could have been passed at the 1949 congressional session, the administration insisted on repeal, and got nothing.

The next frontal assault was the President's Executive order of last March, called plan 12, which was aimed openly at me. It would have abolished my job and transferred my administrative functions back to the chairman. The board unanimously supported the plan. Under the Reorganization Act, however, it could be blocked by either House, and the Senate vetoed it, 53 to 30.

Personal relationships in the agency naturally had become somewhat strained, and most communications between the board and me were on paper, but after plan 12 failed, a peace conference was held at my suggestion in the board's conference room, in an effort to work out a basis of operation. This resulted only in my listening to 2½ hours of vituperative criticism.

All pretense at bipartisanship had been dropped by then. The board was thoroughly packed with Fair Dealers. The term of Gray, the only Republican, was allowed to expire in December 1949 without any word to him from the White House as to whether he would be reappointed or replaced. To date, he has received not even a note of thanks from the White House for his 2 years' service. His successor, Paul L. Styles, a Democrat who had once been an ITU organizer, became rather openly labor's man on the board. I was the only responsible official still there who fully supported and defended Taft-Hartley, and I often felt like Horatius at the bridge.

It would seem elemental that the members of a quasi-judicial board should be experienced lawyers, yet in 15 years the NLRB has been pitifully devoid of lawyer members—and I mean lawyers with real courtroom experience, not just attorneys at law. Three of the five present members have been admitted to the bar, but only one has had any courtroom legal experience. He is Murdock, who was county attorney of Beaver County, Utah, and city attorney of Beaver for a total of about 10 years in the 1920's and early 1930's. (The 1930 population of Beaver County was 5,136 and of the city of Beaver 1,673.) Yet this is the board which has frequently undertaken to reverse the Federal courts as well as the general counsel.

NLRB procedure is slow, and while it's starting, grave damage may be done through labor-union practices which the law declares to be unfair. Taft-Hartley, therefore, authorizes the use of injunctions to halt such practices. Sometimes the general counsel has discretion in applying for an injunction, but in secondary-boycott cases the law directs him to act immediately if he has reason to believe such boycotting exists.

Suppose you run a bakery and have a dispute with your employees' union. Picketing of your bakery is permitted; but if the union pickets the people who buy your bread, that is secondary boycotting, and prohibited. If the NLRB general counsel can convince a Federal district judge of the violation, an injunction is issued. These injunctions are not issued lightly, but nevertheless the board has not hesitated to throw out such cases and in effect reverse the judges.

My staff got an injunction against a union that was picketing an upstate New York trucking concern in an attempt to stop it from doing business with another trucking concern with which the union had a dispute. The board threw out the case on the ground that the employer, by belonging to an employers' trucking association, had waived his right to protection from this prohibited secondary boycott. Yet within a month the same board decided that any attempt by a union to waive any of its rights was against public policy and would not be permitted."

In another injunction case, the decision was a masterpiece. Trucks belonging to a small concern with headquarters in New Jersey, and with union employees, were picketed by members of the New York teamsters' local when they made deliveries in New York City, to induce the men on the loading platforms not to handle the goods until members of the New York local were hired by the New Jersey concern. A Federal judge agreed that this was a secondary boycott. But the board said in effect that the trucks were to be regarded as the concern's place of business—not just the headquarters in New Jersey—and that it was all right to picket the trucks wherever they were found.

Many such cockeyed decisions have been reversed when carried to the Circuit Courts of Appeals. Thank God for the courts, but the little fellows like the New Jersey trucker can't afford to appeal. In his case the union, encouraged by the board, drove him out of business within a few months. Until such a case is reviewed and decided by a court, the board's decision governs the handling of similar cases. In a sense, this is legislation.

One inexcusable policy of the board has been its refusal to let small businessmen, their workers and their unions enjoy the benefits of Taft-Hartley. Congress had given me, as general counsel, the final authority to determine whether a case should be prosecuted, but the board took the stand that it didn't have to hear a case unless it wanted to. It was overburdened, and could take only the big ones. This policy has thrown hundreds of cases back into the jungle warfare that obtained before the Wagner Act.

It is the job of the general counsel to present a case when the board applies to a Circuit Court of Appeals to get a decision enforced. Several such cases forced me to act against my basic principles, to defend the indefensible, to stultify myself, and to make the agency ridiculous. I suggested that to insure a presentation fully supporting the board's views, its solicitor present such cases. The board, obviously either to humiliate me or to prove it was boss, insisted that I present them, and I complied. Once I was ordered to defend a decision which criticized me. In another case, the board ordered me to tell the Court of Appeals that both I and the district judge in the same circuit who had issued an injunction had been wrong, and the board had been right.

Frequently the Board tried to dictate to me how to write the briefs which it was my job to file to get the enforcement orders. One such effort brought an exchange of memoranda last summer, whose bitterness was probably without precedent in any Federal agency. It was a paper war, fought up and down the long corridor that separated our offices. I returned shot for shot, and gave no ground. At stake was the basic principle laid down by Congress, of separation of the judge and prosecutor functions in the agency.

The Board ordered me flatly not to file a brief prepared under my direction, but to use an earlier draft prepared by one of my law clerks, which I had seen. It was bad law, and I refused, reminding the Board that under Taft-Hartley I had charge of the legal department. The Board found parts of my reply offensive and complained that I had given hidden instructions to my subordinates. To my own subordinates. I called the Board's attention to its own improper conduct in trying to instruct my subordinates. In one memorandum I suggested that the Board members were being intentionally misled by their legal advisers.

After I filed the brief, the Board's solicitor filed with the court a motion to throw out my brief and substitute another. This I vigorously resisted.

When the Board members and their allies in organized labor discovered that I couldn't be pushed around and wouldn't quit, Chairman Herzog demanded from the White House more concrete support, and evidently it was promised. The Board then undertook to remove some of my powers, by amending the 1947 agreement allocating authority. For example, the Board wanted control of the top personnel in the field offices. That could not be taken directly, for under the law it was exclusively my responsibility. But the Board succeeded by seizing the purse strings—taking over the payroll and other administrative sections at headquarters in Washington, and blocking my appointments.

By this time I was convinced that much of the Board's lack of success in court, and much of its cross-purpose conflict with my office, arose from the legal advice it was receiving from its solicitor, Ida Klaus, so I ordered her recalled. This brought an insulting letter from the Acting Chairman, John M. Houston, saying I had no right to cancel her assignment, and that she had been directed to ignore the order.

When I left on vacation last summer I delivered at the White House an olive branch in letter form. It suggested that the Board drop its attempts to shackle me, and that I transfer to it my staff of about 25 enforcement attorneys. That would have permitted the Board to present its decisions to the courts as it liked, without asking me to support positions which in conscience I could not. I understand that the letter was discussed with Chairman Herzog, but that nothing less than my head would satisfy him. It was on the day I returned from vacation that I was notified I was through.

My successor, George J. Bott, is a Fair Deal Democrat, who was one of my assistants. His published statements indicate that he will do nothing to prevent the Board from turning Taft-Hartley back into Wagner. He has already surrendered much of his independence. He has agreed, for one thing, to withdraw the disputed brief mentioned earlier and file the one the Board insisted on. He has also given up his designation of top personnel in the field, and his right to determine whether to apply for discretionary injunctions.

I lost the battle, but I surrendered nothing. What happened to me as an individual is of little consequence. I merely returned to the private practice of law sooner than I had expected. But what happens to the country is important.

One of our most important Government agencies, exercising wide influence over a large segment of our economy, has been captured by a crew who apparently intend to operate it without heed to the orders of Congress—to substitute government by men for government by laws. The Taft-Hartley Act is being interpreted by a Board which my experience leads me to believe is too partisan to give it fair application. And the Board's subjugation of the general counsel has removed the counterweight which Congress provided.

For the present the only remedy the country has lies in the courts. I am convinced that a real solution requires not only amendments to the law that will make explicit the intent of Congress but replacement of the entire Board, the general counsel and key officials with persons who believe in the act and are capable of applying it.

No Good Word for Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 26, 1950

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article appearing in the January 6 issue of America, national Catholic weekly, entitled "No Good Word for Tito:"

NO GOOD WORD FOR TITO

(By Edward Duff)

"Frankly, no bill that has come out of the Foreign Affairs Committee or before the House has been supported with as little enthusiasm as the measure before us today." Representative A. A. RIBICOFF, Democrat, Connecticut, was describing H. R. 9853, a bill to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia, a measure that his committee had reported out. From the Republican side of the House, Representative H. R. GROSS, Iowa, taunted:

"Virtually every speaker in behalf of this measure has prefaced his or her remarks with an apology and attempted disclaimer for supporting Tito, an avowed Communist and the head of a government as dictatorial, ruthless, and brutal as there is in existence on this earth today."

In the Senate Chamber TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, opened debate on S. 4232 with the dauntless spirit of the Lone Star State:

"If any Senator 2 years ago had suggested that I would today be standing on the floor of the United States Senate advocating $38,000,000 for aid to Communist Yugoslavia, I should have called him to order."

There was no good word for Tito in the discussion of emergency relief for Yugoslavia that opened in the Senate on December 7, and in the House on December 12. The relief bill was passed and sent to the President for his signature on December 19.

Repeatedly describing the measure as a gamble, the Congress decided to hedge its bet that aid to Tito would strengthen America's national defense. Interesting conditions were attached to the gift of food to the people of Yugoslavia. Indeed, Yugoslavia was required to agree to some guaranties before the assistance granted was made available to her. She was required:

1. To provide us with local currency needed for American administrative expenses of the program.

2. "To give full and continuous publicity through the press, radio, and all other available media in Yugoslavia to the assistance furnished by the United States," and more important, to allow us access to such media.

3. To allow us to observe and supervise the distribution by Yugoslavia of the food we are giving. The House report mentioned 12 or 13 American observers, a palpably insufficient number.)

4. To distribute our and all other available food "without discrimination as to race or political or religious belief."

5. To bank local funds to the value of our gift of food "to provide relief to needy persons and to children and for charitable, medical, and such other purposes as may be mutually agreed upon." This is the counterpart funds arrangement in all ECA grants.

6. "To take all appropriate economic measures to reduce its relief needs, to encourage increased production and distribution of foodstuffs within Yugoslavia and to lessen the danger of similar future emergencies." Representative WALTER H. JUDD (Republican, Minnesota) is responsible for this amendment calling on Tito to stop exporting food in a frenzied effort to industrialize his country and to cease forcing collectivization on Yugoslavia's peasants. Said Congressman JUDD:

"When our Government is advocating land reform and wider distribution in many countries and is urging family-owned and operated farms here in the United States, it ought not be helping Tito in exactly the opposite direction in Yugoslavia."

In an effort to make it clear that we are aiding the people of Yugoslavia, not their Communist bosses, another amendment, sponsored by Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut, was attached:

"Nothing in this act shall be interpreted as endorsing measures undertaken by the present Government of Yugoslavia which suppress or destroy religious, political, and economic liberty, and the Yugoslav Government shall be so notified when aid is furnished under this act."

Stringent sanctions were written into the Emergency Relief Assistance to Yugoslavia Act. Every 3 months the Secretary of State is to make a full and detailed report to Congress providing information on whether Yugoslavia is fulfilling the six congressional conditions and what developments are noted "in the attitude of Yugoslavia with respect to basic human rights." The President—or Congress by concurrent resolution—is empowered to terminate all assistance promptly, should it become clear that Yugoslavia is not living up to her agreement or should "changed conditions make the continuance of assistance unnecessary or undesirable or no longer consistent with the national interest or the foreign policy of the United States."

Strengthening America's national defense was the overriding consideration in the minds of the Congressmen. Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, spoke of the aid as "economic warfare." We should spend the money to have "a Communist backfire burning in Yugoslavia," Senator TOM CONNALLY urged. Our gift of food will, it was argued, cost us nothing really, since the money will be taken from appropriated but unexpended Marshall plan funds, according to an amendment of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada. Though the administration had asked for $38,000,000, Senator MCCARRAN rephrased the request to read "not in excess of $50,000,000" to legalize the $12,200,000 already given by ECA under dubious authority.

Our national interest, it was felt, demanded that we support the heresy that had erupted inside international communism, that we should encourage Tito's nose-thumbing at Stalin. It was assumed that the break between Tito and the Kremlin was sincere, complete, and irreparable. It was argued that to have 32 Yugoslav divisions stationed on the Soviet flank was a deterrent to aggression well worth the price—less than one-third the cost of equipping and maintaining an American division for 1 year. The suggestion that our bribe might buy only an immobilized Yugoslav army in the case of a bypassing Soviet invasion of Western Europe was not taken too seriously. It was understood that the Yugoslav army would certainly fight if the country was invaded. Our military leaders, headed by Generals Marshall and Bradley, seemed not too fearful we would be barred from the Adriatic by Tito. They endorsed the aid bill, obviously preferring to have Tito rather than Stalin in Belgrade.

How well the much-publicized 32 divisions of the Yugoslav army would or could fight was disputed. Representative MICHAEL FEIGHAN (Democrat, Ohio) reminded Congress that Hitler crushed a Yugoslav army of impressive numbers in 1 week in 1941. Tito's forces, armed with captured German and Italian equipment and cast-off Soviet matériel, is manifestly no match for the motorized armies of the satellites. Moreover, the morale of the army, which is composed mainly of peasants, reflects the people's hatred of the Communist regime. Representative WAYNE L. HAYS (Democrat, Ohio) could claim to have first-hand information on the point. Our military attaché in Belgrade had assured him that he (HAYS) was the only American who had seen the Yugoslav Army on maneuvers. "Ragtag, bobtailed, ill equipped, poorly clad fighting units," was Mr. HAYS' judgment. In case of invasion they would "murder their officers, take to the hills and fight against Tito and the Communists from without and try to set up an independent government in Yugoslavia." Congressman FEIGHAN argued that we should send a military mission to get the facts that concern our national interest so crucially.

WHY THE NEED?

How real is Yugoslavia's need? Representative CHARLES W. VURSELL (Democrat, Illinois) and others pointed out that $421,000,000 of our money has been poured into that country since the outbreak of World War II. Representative JAMES C. DAVIS (Democrat, Georgia) asked the Library of Congress Legislative Service to check. The report on UNRRA relief (American contribution: 72 percent) declared: "Yugoslavia has received as a gift goods equal in sales value to more than 10 years of its total prewar national budget and to three full years of its gross national income." The report asserted that one-third of the Yugoslav Government's revenue came from the sale of UNRRA supplies in 1946. Since the food given by us to the people of Yugoslavia is to be sold by Tito's regime through regular commercial (nationalized) outlets, Congressmen could well have shown more interest in the prices the Government will fix and the use of ration cards to penalize the antisocial, i. e., democratic, elements.

According to American experts the food shortages due to the drought vary in different parts of Yugoslavia. The grain production for the whole country amounts to 71 percent of the 1947–49 average. How much of the shortage is due to the drought and how much to Tito's policy? John J. Haggerty, the agricultural attaché at our Belgrade

Embassy, estimated that 10 or 15 percent of the fall in production was explained by general economic deterioration and apathy, and the rest due to the drought. Mr. FEIGHAN asserted that food production under Tito had never reached 60 percent of the prewar totals. The Ohio Congressman explained that the regime had dragged a million young peasants from the farms to work in state-owned factories, and pushed collectivization of agriculture in a frenzied effort to prove Tito a better Communist than Stalin. "According to September 1950 figures from the Yugoslav agricultural commission," asserted Congressman FEIGHAN, "there are now 6,970 kolkhozes—collective farms—in Titoland. The vast majority of them—5,650—have been created in the past 2 years, or since Tito fell out with his fellow thieves in the Kremlin." The report of the House Committee on Foreign Relations conceded euphemistically: "Production on privately owned farms is not as low as that on collective farms."

The debate served to spotlight the monstrous tyranny triumphant in Titoland. There was a full airing of the police-state methods of a regime run on terror and maintaining itself by denial of freedom of speech, freedom of elections, freedom of religion. A Congressman told his colleagues of meeting an old lady in Serbia last year whose husband had been visited by Tito's secret police seeking to know why he had not contributed more grain. Before he had a chance to answer, they shot him down in front of his grandchildren. Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR (Democrat, Maryland) reported that the aged aunt and uncle of one of his constituents were jailed for 30 days because they were unable to furnish the Government with their quota of grain. The memory of our fliers ruthlessly shot down when off their course over Yugoslavia was recalled. The fate of the 11,000 kidnaped Greek children was brought up. Tito has returned only 60 or 70, it was asserted. Representative WAYNE HAYS described a scene he witnessed in a Yugoslav school where milk provided free by the UN International Emergency Fund was being distributed. The children were obliged first to sing a song: "Thanks to our great leader Tito for this milk we get today." Will the children have to sing the same song for their supper supplied by American food, three-quarters of which will come from our CCC surplus stocks? Tito's hostility to the free world was recalled. Yugoslavia's was the lone vote to the Security Council on June 27 against the resolution to repel aggression in Korea. As late as June 1 of this year Tito's Ambassador to Washington, Vladimir Popovitch, labeled American foreign policy imperialistic.

RELIGIOUS OPPRESSION

Tito's relentless oppression of religion was spread on the record, particularly by Representatives JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of New York; ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, Democrat, of New York; and MICHAEL FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio. In addition to his persecution of Catholics, Tito was indicted for his imprisonment of American-born Orthodox Bishop Varnava Nastic, of Sarajevo, and his signal for the bombing of Belgrade on Easter Sunday morning 1945, just as the Serbs were coming out of their churches. State Department reports of a relaxation of religious persecution in Titoland today are mythical.

The Emergency Relief to Yugoslavia Act was passed in the interests of our national defense. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reveals that the Catholic War Veterans of America, the Catholic Economic Association, Bishop John F. O'Hara, of Buffalo, and Bishop John Burke, his auxiliary, supported the measure. They took pretty much the same position America has advocated, as expressed by Representative WALTER JUDD: "Whatever weakens the conspiracy that threatens the survival of the United States helps us."

Congressman BOYD TACKETT, Democrat, of Arkansas, opposing the bill, confessed himself "at a loss to know the battle cry for world war III." In the debate the day before he had heard the reminder of the occasion in 1943 when the House rafters rang with cheers for Mihailovitch. Perhaps the international situation is getting less ideological—to use a Churchill expression of 1944. Perhaps that is why the State Department told the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House that it wanted no strings or conditions attached to the aid bill—though we are not chary about conditions on aid to the Philippines. Perhaps that is why much of the congressional debate, derogatory to Tito, would never be allowed to be broadcast to Yugoslavia over the Voice of America.

Rights, Privileges, and Benefits for Veterans and Their Dependents Provided by the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am giving a résumé of legislation enacted during the Eighty-first Congress for the benefit of veterans and their dependents.

The Eighty-first Congress has removed inequities in and liberalized existing laws pertaining to veterans and their dependents to meet present-day conditions, and in many instances has provided original legislation for this purpose. There follows a brief outline of some of the most important legislation on this subject.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

Legislation was enacted to remove the discrimination which existed against a veteran, without dependents, who had recovered his competency after having been hospitalized, or cared for by the Veterans' Administration, so that he will receive, at the expiration of 6 months following a finding of competency, the amount of benefits withheld during the period of such care by reason of a limitation precluding payment to him because of his estate amounting to $1,500 or more—Public Law No. 194, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 1, 1949.

The Congress felt the distinction between these two classes of veterans, that is, a competent veteran discharged from hospitalization, and one that was incompetent but restored to competency following hospitalization, to be unwarranted and that the economic needs of the veteran who has regained his competency were as great as and often more urgent than the needs of the other veterans.

As a general principle established by Congress, compensation or pension is authorized effective from date of discharge or date of death only, provided claim for such benefit is filed within 1 year from such date of discharge or date of death; otherwise it is paid from date of claim. An exception to this rule was provided in a law permitting back payment of compensation or pension in the case of any claimant on the rolls, from the date giving rise to a claim with respect to the disability, death, or attainment of a certain age of a member of the Armed Forces of World War II who could not file such claim earlier because of enemy action. Claim for benefits under the new act must have been filed within 1 year from date of enactment of the law, that is before August 1, 1950—Public Law No. 195, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 1, 1949.

Then there was passed in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress a law that is commonly called an omnibus law because it contains a number of different benefit provisions in one act. It provides that compensation shall be paid at the full 100 percent rate in certain World War I cases which were granted compensation by presumptive service-connection and paid only at 75 percent of the full rate. This act also made more liberal the law and the regulations with reference to payment of compensation for service-connected arrested tuberculosis by providing a total rating for 2 years following the date of arrest and a 50 percent rating for an additional period of 4 years instead of the previous ratings of 100 percent for 6 months following arrest and a 50 percent rating for 4½ years thereafter. These statutory ratings are available to peacetime and wartime veterans. The monthly rates of compensation, however, for peacetime cases are equivalent to 80 percent of the wartime rates.

This omnibus law increased the basic per centum rates of compensation for veterans having service-connected disabilities by approximately 8.7 percent, the new wartime rates ranging from $15 per month for a 10 percent disability to $150 per month for a total disability—prior rates ranged from $13.80 to $138—and the peacetime service rates automatically were increased to 80 percent of the new wartime rates, making the new peacetime rates range from $12 to $120 per month—prior rates ranged from $11.04 to $110.40.

This law increased the wartime rates of service-connected death compensation for a widow with children to allow $105 a month for a widow with one child, plus $25 for each additional child, in lieu of the prior rates of $100 payable to a widow with one child plus $15 for each additional child. Corresponding peacetime rates of death compensation were increased to $84 for a widow with one child, plus $20 for each additional child—prior corresponding rates were $80 and $12.

In the Eightieth Congress, there was enacted a law providing additional compensation to war and peacetime veterans, with dependents, and who were 60 percent or more disabled from service-connected disability, largely on the theory that disability of that degree would seriously handicap a veteran in obtaining and following suitable gainful employment to enable him to support himself and his dependents. The omnibus law

previously referred to extended this benefit to veterans who are at least 50 percent so disabled—Public Law 339, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 10, 1949, and Public Law 436, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 29, 1949.

Another law enacted in the Eighty-first Congress extended from 1 to 3 years the statutory presumptive period for service-connection of pulmonary tuberculosis by providing that if the disease develops to a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 3 years from the date of release from active service, it shall be deemed to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service, in the absence of affirmative evidence to the contrary. This law applies to wartime veterans for service-connected compensation purposes and it served to place World War II veterans more nearly on a parity with the presumption accorded under earlier laws for World War I veterans for this disease—Public Law 573, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 23, 1950.

INSURANCE

A law was passed to make it clear that national service life insurance, which becomes payable by reason of death of the insured on or after August 1, 1946, in any case in which a beneficiary, not entitled to a lump-sum settlement, survives the insured and dies before receiving all the benefits due and payable, the commuted value of the remaining unpaid installments—whether accrued or not—shall be paid in one sum to the estate of the insured and not to the estate of the beneficiary. This law was enacted to clarify the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended—Public Law 69, Eighty-first Congress, approved May 23, 1949.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

World War I and II veterans, or their families, are given preference for admission to low-rent public-housing projects by an amendment to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended. This amendment provides preference in the following order: First, service-connected disabled veterans; second, families of deceased veterans and servicemen whose deaths were service-connected; and, third, families of other veterans and servicemen. This amendatory act also provides a preference to veterans of any war, or their families, regardless of service connection, in the granting of loans for construction or repair of farm homes. It is required, however, that such veteran shall have been discharged or released from service under conditions other than dishonorable. This law also provides certain aid to State low-rent or veterans' housing projects—Public Law 171, Eighty-first Congress, approved July 15, 1949.

Another law enacted in the Eighty-first Congress, increased by approximately $500,000,000 the amount of the authorization to the Federal National Mortgage Association for the purchase of certain home loan mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended.

In the Eightieth Congress special housing assistance was accorded certain seriously service-connected disabled veterans in the nature of a contribution by the Government of not more than 50 percent of the cost of a home and not in excess of $10,000 with which to buy or build a new home, or to remodel an existing home for their requirements. That act was amended in the Eighty-first Congress so as to extend its benefits to veterans entitled to compensation, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, for permanent and total service-connected disability due to the loss, or loss of use, by reason of amputation, ankylosis, progressive muscular dystrophies, or paralysis, of both lower extremities, such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheel chair—Public Law 286, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 7, 1949.

Another housing act authorizes the purchase by the Federal National Mortgage Association of any mortgage guaranteed, after October 25, 1949—the date of the act—by the Veterans' Administration under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act in an original principal amount not exceeding $10,000 per dwelling unit. It also increased to two and one-half billions the amount of commitments, investments, loans, and purchases which the Association may have outstanding at any one time. This, in effect, creates a 100-percent Government secondary market for Veterans' Administration guaranteed first-mortgage loans to finance the purchase or construction by veterans of low- and medium-priced homes. It represents a decided liberalization of this secondary market for guaranteed loans, which before this act restricted the sale by any lender to 50 percent of his eligible Veterans' Administration and Federal Housing Administration loans—Public Law 387, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 25, 1949.

One of the housing acts passed makes more liberal the loan provisions under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, in that it, first, extends the loan benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to the unmarried widows of deceased persons who met the service requirements of the act and died as the result of a service-connected disability; second, provides for the renewal of the guaranty or insurance entitlement initially used for any loan where the security has been taken by a Government agency for public use or has been destroyed by natural hazard or has been disposed of for other reasons not the fault of the veteran; third, extends the permissible period of a home loan from 25 to 30 years; fourth, authorizes the guaranty of loans made by the States on an automatic basis; fifth, increases the amount of guaranty from 50 to 60 percent—but not to exceed $7,500—on loans for the purchase of residential property or construction of a home, provided the veteran has not previously availed himself of the loan benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; sixth, permits the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to guarantee a loan for a farmhouse secured by a first lien on a portion of the farm suitable in size and location as an independent home site—including use of the proceeds of the loan to secure the release of such site from any existing lien—and he is also permitted to exempt a farm-housing loan from the first-lien requirement of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; seventh, requires conformity with minimum construction requirements prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in connection with loans on residential property on which construction is begun after 60 days from enactment; eighth, repeals the secondary-loan provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act effective December 1, 1950, or such earlier time as the Administrator may determine after considering specified factors, but saving prior guaranties and commitments; and, ninth, authorizes, with limitations, direct 4-percent home or farmhouse loans by the Veterans' Administration where the veteran has been unable, otherwise, to obtain a 4-percent loan for which he is qualified under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, the total amount of each direct loan not to exceed $10,000 and such direct lending authority to expire June 30, 1951—Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress, approved April 20, 1950.

The provisions for preference or priority to veterans of World War II or their families, in the purchase or rental of specified housing accommodations was extended to June 30, 1951—unless terminated earlier by Presidential proclamation—in still another law enacted in the Eighty-first Congress—Public Law 574, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 23, 1950.

The Defense Production Act of 1950 authorizes the President to reduce maximum principal amounts, maturities, and the ratio of loan to the value or cost of any type of housing loan in which any agency of the Government participates if he finds such action necessary after considering the effect of such loan on the public industry, the national economy, and defense production. A proviso requiring the retention of a relative preference for veterans is included in the act—Public Law 774, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 8, 1950.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Legislation was passed by the Congress December 18, 1950, having for its purpose the granting of vocational rehabilitation to those veterans disabled as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, who are entitled to compensation at the wartime rates, and who are in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability. This benefit is similar to that granted for World War II veterans. The President recommended legislation of this nature to the Congress under date of December 4, 1950—House Document 728, Eighty-first Congress. The bill was approved by the President and became

Public Law 894, Eighty-first Congress, December 28, 1950.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Certain changes in the education and training provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act were enacted in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1950 in the first sessions of the Eighty-first Congress—Public Law 266, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 24, 1949—but these changes, being temporary limitations and subject to administrative regulations, were incorporated, with significant modification in a later act of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. This later act relates to the qualifications of schools and courses offered by schools, the character of courses, and the conditions under which they may be pursued by eligible veterans, and the determination of fair and reasonable rates of tuition chargeable by institutions. It also includes certain entirely new provisions, notably minimum standards for application by the States in approving profit schools, and a procedure for recovering overpayments of subsistence allowance from schools failing to make prompt reports of attendance status of veteran trainees—Public Law 610, Eighty-first Congress, approved July 13, 1950.

The purpose of another measure passed in the Eighty-first Congress is to preclude the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in the adjustment of tuition rates under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, from reducing the estimated costs of teaching personnel by reason of Federal funds received under the amendments to the Morrill Act and applied by land-grant colleges to teaching costs. This law also contains provisions which prior to its enactment were practiced administratively, namely, to prevent the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the case of any nonprofit educational institution from reducing the amount of tuition in the computation of teaching costs by reason of State or municipal or other non-Federal funds or private endowment or gifts or other income from nonprofit sources received by such institutions—Public Law 571, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 23, 1950.

AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

Public Law 798, Eighty-first Congress, authorizes an appropriation of $800,000 for the furnishing of automobiles for World War II veterans entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs at or above the ankle; and extends to June 30, 1951, the time in which to apply for eligible veterans who have not received the benefit. This law also permits the Government to pay not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price of a vehicle even though the total price may exceed that amount—Public Law 798, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 21, 1950.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, appropriated additional funds for automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans in the amount of $375,000—Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 27, 1950.

SOCIAL SECURITY

A law was enacted in the Eighty-first Congress amending the Social Security Act to provide a wage credit to World War II veterans under the old age and survivors insurance program of $160 for each month spent in the armed services between September 16, 1940, and July 24, 1947, both dates inclusive. Such wage credits would not be provided if a larger benefit or payment would be available without them, or if a benefit based, in whole or in part, upon the active military or naval service of such veteran during World War II is payable by any other agency or wholly owned instrumentality of the United States, other than the Veterans' Administration. The special 3-year survivor protection for World War II veterans is continued, but would not apply if, first, a larger benefit or payment would be available without it; second, pension or compensation is payable by the Veterans' Administration because of the veteran's death: third, the veteran died in service; or, fourth, he was discharged or released from military or naval service after July 26, 1951—Public Law 734, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 28, 1950.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCE

One enactment on the subject of preference in Federal employment grants such preference to an additional class of mothers of veterans not previously covered by law. It provides this right to a mother of a deceased or totally disabled veteran, who has remarried, provided she is divorced or legally separated from her husband, or such husband is dead at the time preference is claimed—Public Law 269, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 26, 1949.

HOMESTEADING PROVISIONS

Loan assistance under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Water Facilities Act to persons who acquire farms by means of homestead entry on public lands or who purchase farms on reclamation projects is provided in a measure passed in the Eighty-first Congress. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans on the security of a mortgage contract creating a lien against the land, rather than on the security of the usual real estate mortgage which was the previous requirement. This requirement was unworkable because these types of farmers were prevented from obtaining such loans in view of the requirement in the law that the loans were to be secured by a mortgage on the land to which they did not have title at time of entry or purchase. Title would be given only after certain period of occupancy and use. Veterans are the only ones who will become eligible for such loans on reclamation project lands within the next few years because of veterans' preference for the limited number of available units—Public Law 361, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 19, 1949.

RETIREMENT PAY

The Career Compensation Act provides that all duties, powers, and functions incident to payment of disability retirement pay, hospitalization, and reexaminations of certain members or former members of the uniformed services, shall be vested in the heads of service departments or in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under regulations promulgated by the President. Under this act and the regulations effective July 1, 1950, payment of disability retirement pay generally, with limited exceptions, of members and former members of the uniformed services is vested in the heads of the service departments. Pursuant to an Executive order issued by the President under this act, all responsibility for hospitalization of members or former members of the uniformed services permanently retired for physical disability or receiving disability retirement pay, who require hospitalization for specific chronic diseases, is vested in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, effective May 1, 1950. However, responsibility for the hospitalization of such persons, for the mentioned chronic diseases, who have been admitted to hospitals under the jurisdiction of the uniformed services before May 1, 1950, may be exercised by the heads of the service departments until October 1, 1950—Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 12, 1949.

At the time of the passage of the Career Compensation Act some officers were in hospitals for various reasons which might lead to retirement. They were allowed a grace period until April 1, 1950, during which time they could elect to retire under the provisions of the retirement laws existing prior to the passage of the act. This period of time was extended to January 1, 1951, under an amendatory act—Public Law 511, Eighty-first Congress, approved May 10, 1950.

WAIVER OF BENEFITS

Provision is made in the National Military Establishment Appropriation Act for 1950 for the availability of funds appropriated for pay, allowances, or travel of any member of the Reserve or National Guard organizations of the Department of the Army and the Air Force, or a member of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve in connection with periods of duty rendered pursuant to applicable law, if the person waives his disability compensation, pension, or retirement pay for the period in question, and if his disability is of such a degree as not to prevent acceptance for active Federal duty—Public Law 434, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 29, 1949. These waiver provisions were extended for a period of 5 years in a later enactment—Public Law 844, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 27, 1950.

MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS

Legislation was enacted to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II—Public Law 598, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 30, 1950.

There was enacted a measure granting protection against unlawful use of the badge, medal, emblem, and other insignia

of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations—Public Law 661, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 4, 1950.

Provision was made for free mailing privileges for members of the Armed Forces of the United States on active duty in Korea or in such other areas as the President of the United States may designate as combat zones or theaters of military operations—Public Law 609, Eighty-first Congress, approved July 12, 1950.

Another enactment provides for an extension until June 30, 1956, of the current $500 payment per annum by the Federal Government to State or Territorial homes for the support of each disabled soldier or sailor of the United States cared for therein—Public Law 823, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 23, 1950.

A law was passed amending the Armed Forces Leave Act to extend until June 30, 1951, the time within which application may be made for terminal-leave pay—Public Law 479, Eighty-first Congress, approved April 26, 1950.

The Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 provides allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services—Public Law 771, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 8, 1950.

One of the laws confers upon veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, suffering from non-service-connected disabilities the same rights to out-patient treatment as are available to war veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities—Public Law 791, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 19, 1950.

In addition, the following measures were passed by the House and were pending in the Senate at the end of the session.

I am reentering them in the hope that we may secure their final passage in the early days of the coming session.

BILLS PASSED BY HOUSE AND PENDING IN SENATE

H. R. 1941: Excludes from the terms "parent," "father," or "mother" under National Service Life Insurance Act any parent who shall have deserted his family for a period of 7 years and who shall remain in such desertion at the time insurance matured—reported in House January 24, 1950; House Report No. 1510; passed House February 6; pending in Senate Finance Committee.

H. R. 2108: Amends the so-called Dependency Allowance Act to provide that dependent husbands of female veterans may be listed as dependents in order for the veteran to receive additional compensation where the veteran is 50 percent or more disabled—reported May 5; House Report No. 511; passed House May 16, 1949; pending in Senate Finance Committee.

H. R. 4617: Provides pensions for World Wars I and II veterans. A sectional analysis follows:

Section 1: Any veteran meeting service requirements and income limits less than 55 years of age who has a single disability of 60 percent or more, or two or more disabilities, one of which is 40 percent or more, making a combined rating of 70 percent or more, and who is unemployable, shall be entitled to $60 a month pension. The same rate applies to a man aged 55 who has disability of 60 percent or more, single or combined, and upon reaching age 60, the disability requirement is reduced to 50 percent. Note: The benefits applying below age 65 are now provided by VA regulation known as extension 5 of the 1945 Disability Rating Schedule. At age 65, the veteran would be presumed to be permanently and totally disabled without a medical examination, and regardless of unemployability, would receive a pension of $72 per month.

Section 2: Provides rate of $100 in lieu of the $60 and $72 rates mentioned above for those veterans who are so helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Section 3: Raises the annual income limitation for a veteran without dependents from the present $1,000 to $1,200. The $2,500 limit for veterans who have dependents is left unchanged.

Section 4: Raises the annual income limitation for widows without children from the present $1,000 to $1,200. The $2,500 limitation for widows who have children is left unchanged.

Section 5: Bars benefits under the provisions of this act to anyone belonging to an organization which seeks to overthrow the Government by force or violence—hearings March 29, 30, 31, April 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 16, 26, 27, 28; reported May 12, 1949; House Report No. 580; passed House June 1, 1949; now pending in Senate Finance Committee.

Note: The original pension bill, H. R. 2681, which was recommitted to the committee on March 24, 1949, by a vote of 208 to 207, provided the following: $90 per month pension for World War I and II veterans on reaching age 65; aid and attendance rate of $120 in lieu of $90 for those helpless or blind; raised the income limitations for widows from $1,000 to $2,000 if without children from $2,500 to $3,000 if with children; placed World War II widows on same basis as World War I widows for purpose of receiving pension.

H. R. 5833: Building trades training under GI bill of rights. Permits work on live projects with full institutional subsistence rates provided training given veterans is on public school property—hearings July 14, 19, 26, 27, 28, August 2, 3, 4; reported by House August 24; House Report No. 1314; passed House August 25, 1949; pending before Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

H. R. 5965: Provides for the construction of veterans' hospitals involving 16,000 beds. Projects to be altered and changed as follows:

Facilities to be altered

Location	Type	Beds	
		From—	To—
Syracuse, N. Y.	General medical	500	1,000
Philadelphia, Pa.	do	500	1,000
Pittsburgh, Pa.	do	750	1,200
Do.	Neuropsychiatric	1,000	1,250
Washington, D. C.	General medical	500	750
Atlanta, Ga.	do	500	750
Cincinnati, Ohio	do	500	750
Cleveland, Ohio	do	500	1,000
Do.	Neuropsychiatric	1,000	1,250
Louisville, Ky.	General medical	500	750
Chicago, Ill.	do	500	1,000
Kansas City, Mo.	do	500	745
Oklahoma City, Okla.	do	500	1,000
St. Louis, Mo.	do	500	1,000

New facilities to be constructed

Location	Type	Beds
New York	General medical	1,000
Harrisburg, Pa.	do	200
Charlotte, N. C.	do	500
Salisbury, N. C.	Neuropsychiatric	921
Americus, Ga.	Tuberculosis	250
Chattanooga, Tenn.	General medical	500
Gainesville, Fla.	Neuropsychiatric	1,000
Greenville, S. C.	General medical	200
Memphis, Tenn.	Neuropsychiatric	1,000
Tallahassee, Fla.	General medical	100
Thomasville, Ga.	do	100
Grand Rapids, Mich.	do	200
Toledo, Ohio	Neuropsychiatric	1,000
Decatur, Ill.	General medical	250
Duluth, Minn.	do	200
Norman, Okla.	Neuropsychiatric	750
El Paso, Tex.	do	500
Houston, Tex.	do	1,000
Mound Bayou, Miss.	General medical	200
Tupelo, Miss.	do	200
Klamath Falls, Oreg.	do	200
San Diego, Calif.	do	200
Columbia, S. C.	do	200
Detroit, Mich.	Tuberculosis	500

Reported August 24, 1949; House Report No. 1315; passed House April 24, 1950, with amendment directing VA to survey possibility of used abandoned armed services hospital; reported in Senate August 4, 1950; Senate Report No. 2249.

H. R. 6034: Authorizes $5,000,000 for establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.—hearings August 10; reported in House August 24; House Report No. 1317; passed House September 26, 1940; pending before Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

H. R. 6374: Substitute 4 basic rates as indicated in the following table for the previous 15 rates of pensions applicable to Spanish-American War veterans.

Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion

VETERANS

Law		H. R. 6374
Rates, 90 days or more service or discharge for disability incurred in line of duty:		
1/10 disability	$28.80	
1/4 disability	36.00	
1/2 disability	50.40	
3/4 disability	72.00	
Total disability	90.00	$90
Age 62	43.20	
Age 65	90.00	
Age 68	57.60	
Age 72	72.00	
Age 75	90.00	
Aid and attendance	103.68	120
Aid and attendance	120.00	

Law		H. R. 6374
Rates, 70 days or more service but less than 90 days:		
1/10 disability	$17.28	
1/4 disability	21.60	
1/2 disability	25.92	
3/4 disability	34.56	
Total disability	60.00	$60
Age 62	17.28	
Age 65	60.00	
Age 68	60.00	
Age 72	60.00	
Age 75	60.00	
Aid and attendance	78.00	78

Law		H. R. 6374
Rates, 90 days or more service or discharge for disability incurred in line of duty; in active service before cessation of hostilities:		
Permanent and total	$60	
Rated permanent and total for continuous period of 10 years or reach age 65 years	72	$90
Over age 62 or the amount being paid Mar. 20, 1933, if less	15	
50 percent disabled	15	
Aid and attendance	None	120

DEPENDENTS

Law		H. R. 6374
Widows and former widows	$48.00	
Wife during service	60.00	
Additional for each child	7.20	
No widow:		
1 child (to age 16)	55.20	
Each additional child (to age 16), total equally divided	7.20	No change
1 child (age 16 or over)	25.92	
2 children (age 16 or over)	38.88	
3 children (age 16 or over)	51.84	
Each additional child (age 16 or over), total equally divided	5.76	

Law	H. R. 6374
No provision	No provision

Law		H. R. 6374	
Widows	$15	Widows and former widows	$48.00
Widow and 1 child	20	Wife during service	60.00
Additional for each child	3	Additional for each child	7.20
No widow:		No widow:	
1 child	12	1 child (to age 16)	55.20
2 children	15	Each additional child (to age 16), total equally divided	7.20
3 children	20	1 child (age 16 or over)	25.92
Each additional child, total equally divided	2	2 children (age 16 or over)	38.88
		3 children (age 16 or over)	51.84
		Each additional child (age 16 or over), total equally divided	5.76

(Hearings by subcommittee Feb. 8, 1950; reported in House Feb. 28; H. Rept. No. 1719; passed House Mar. 6; pending before Senate Finance Committee.)

H. R. 6559: Establishes a floor of $60 a month for veterans of all wars and peacetime who have service-connected tuberculosis and have reached a condition of complete arrest—previously, rate applied only to World War I veterans—reported in House January 25, 1950; House Report No. 1536; passed House February 6; pending before Senate Finance Committee.

H. R. 6560: To increase the monthly disability benefits upon payment of additional premium from the present maximum of $50 per month to $100 per month under the National Service Life Insurance Act—hearings by subcommittee March 14, 15, 16, and 17, 1950; reported in House May 9, 1950; House Report No. 2022; passed House July 17, 1950; pending before Senate Finance Committee.

H. R. 6561: Provides uniformity in Veterans' Administration laws by requiring that the terms "wife" and "dependent" shall include dependent husband, and the term "widow" shall include widower whenever his condition is such that if the wife were living he would be dependent upon her for support—reported in House January 25, 1950; House Report No. 1537; passed House April 3, 1950; pending before Senate Finance Committee.

H. R. 6562: Establishes a statutory award rate of $42 per month independent of other compensation for the loss, or loss of the use, of a creative organ—applicable to veterans of all wars and peacetime—present rate of $30 a month applied only to World War I veterans—reported in House January 25, 1950; House Report No. 1538; passed House February 20; pending before Senate Finance Committee.

H. R. 6673: Provides treble damages against any seller of property guaranteed under the GI bill of rights, who receives a "side payment" above the price determined by Veterans' Administration appraisers—reported in House January 25, 1950; House Report No. 1539; passed House February 6, 1950; pending before Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

H. R. 7534: To create a presumption of service-connection to January 1, 1950, for any World War II veteran who developed the disease of psychosis—reported in House May 10, 1950; House Report No. 2030; passed House June 5, 1950; pending before Senate Finance Committee.

H. R. 7739: To place on a parity with World War II veterans those veterans who served as cadets and midshipmen in West Point, Annapolis, and the Coast Guard Academy during World War I and the Spanish War—reported in House May 9, 1950; House Report No. 2023; passed House May 15; pending before Senate Finance Committee.

H. R. 8236: Permits the accumulation of dividends in the National Service Life Insurance fund on any dividends payable after January 1, 1951, unless veteran requests payment of dividends in cash—hearings by subcommittee on H. R. 5574, similar bill, on March 14, 15, 16, and 17, 1950; reported in House May 9, 1950; House Report No. 2024; passed House July 17; pending before Senate Finance Committee.

H. R. 8576: Authorizes 150 pesos ($75) for burial and funeral expenses of any person who served in the organized military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941—reported in House July 11, 1950; House Report No. 2490; passed House July 27; pending before Senate Finance Committee.

H. R. 8848: Provides for a study to be coordinated by War Claims Commission of the health of World War II prisoners of war—hearings by subcommittee September 15, 1950; reported December 14; House Report No. 3188; passed House December 18; reported in Senate December 22; Senate Report No. 2699.

H. R. 9911: Provides gratuitous indemnity of $10,000 for all servicemen and contains the following provisions: First, on and after June 27, 1950, each person in the Armed Forces is insured against death in the amount of $10,000 without cost to the person; second, protection covers period from induction into active service and 90 days after separation from service; third, if person is injured in service to such an extent as to make him uninsurable at standard commercial rates, he may obtain a policy under the National Service Life Insurance Act; fourth, bars future entrants to United States Government life insurance and the national service life insurance programs, after enactment of this act but any person having one of these policies may continue it in force or if he has a lapsed policy he may reinstate it upon a showing of good health; fifth, beneficiaries limited to members of immediate family; sixth, indemnity paid in monthly installments of $92.90 each over 10-year period; seventh, indemnity cannot be assigned for benefit of creditors and is exempt from taxation—hearings by a subcommittee November 28, 29, 30, December 5, 6, 7, and 12, 1950; reported December 14, 1950; House Report No. 3190; passed House, December 18; pending before Senate Finance Committee.

Appropriations, Second Session, Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, as is customary at the conclusion of a session, I submit a summary of budget estimates and action thereon in the appropriation measures considered and adopted during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. Only five appropriation bills were considered during the entire session, including two supplemental bills primarily for defense items, but not counting the District of Columbia bill which is not a charge on the general revenues.

Budget estimates for appropriations in these bills totaled $74,242,325,361, which were reduced by $1,972,985,794; amounts enacted totaled $72,269,339,567.

Estimates for contractual authority and loan authorizations totaled $3,000,-204,500, against which $3,183,935,000 was approved for these categories of obligational availability. In addition, provision for an over-all cut of not less than $550,000,000 was included in the omnibus appropriation bill, and since this figure was a minimum rather than a fixed sum, total reductions against estimates for all items aggregate not less than $2,339,255,-294.

There follows a tabulation summarizing the amounts in comparative form:

Comparison of budget estimates, appropriations, and authorizations, 2d sess., 81st Cong.

	Budget estimates	Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), law compared with estimates
APPROPRIATIONS			
Urgent deficiency, 1950	$828,611,600	$739,653,500	−$88,958,100
H. J. Res. 476 [1]	159,810	153,810	−6,000
Deficiency, 1950	604,019,731	653,761,609	+49,741,878
General Appropriation Act, 1951:			
Ch. I. District of Columbia (Federal funds only)	12,000,000	10,800,000	−1,200,000
Ch. II. Legislative	87,820,747	69,290,211	−18,530,536
Ch. III. State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	1,185,612,897	1,065,627,962	−119,984,935
Ch. IV. Treasury-Post Office	2,813,379,100	2,757,846,000	−55,533,100
Ch. V. Labor-Federal Security	2,463,008,500	2,272,428,614	−190,579,886
Ch. VI. Agriculture	810,626,946	773,208,924	−37,418,022
Ch. VII. Interior	674,971,505	620,396,325	−54,575,180
Ch. VIII. Independent offices	8,466,982,724	7,996,140,947	−470,841,777
Ch. IX. Civil functions	834,867,500	687,043,270	−147,824,230
Ch. X. Defense Establishment	13,376,865,000	13,294,299,443	−82,565,557
Ch. XI. Foreign aid	4,855,073,729	4,387,373,729	−467,700,000
Total, general act	35,581,208,648	33,934,455,425	−1,646,753,223
The supplemental, 1951	17,302,658,634	17,099,902,285	−202,756,349
Second supplemental, 1951	19,925,666,938	19,841,412,938	−84,254,000
Total, appropriations	74,242,325,361	72,269,339,567	−1,972,985,794
CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS			
Urgent deficiency, 1950	87,650,000	78,885,000	−8,765,000
Deficiency, 1950	15,000,000	35,000,000	+20,000,000
General Appropriation Act, 1951:			
Ch. III. State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	91,036,500	62,325,000	−28,711,500
Ch. V. Labor-Federal Security	161,211,000	154,288,000	−6,923,000
Ch. VII. Interior	44,750,000	36,230,000	−8,520,000
Ch. VIII. Independent offices	578,367,000	531,517,000	−46,850,000
Ch. X. Defense Establishment	1,385,785,000	1,385,758,000	
Total, general act	2,261,149,500	2,170,145,000	−91,004,500
The supplemental, 1951		[2] 57,500,000	+57,000,000
Second supplemental, 1951		224,000,000	+224,000,000
Total, contract authorizations	2,363,799,500	[2] 2,565,530,000	+201,730,500
LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS			
General Appropriation Act, 1951:			
Ch. VI. Agriculture	610,000,000	[3] 536,500,000	−73,500,000
Ch. XI. Foreign aid		[4] 62,500,000	+62,500,000
Total, general act	610,000,000	599,000,000	−11,000,000
District of Columbia Act	1,405,000	1,405,000	
The supplemental, 1951	25,000,000	18,000,000	−7,000,000
Total, loan authorizations	636,405,000	618,405,000	−18,000,000
Total, appropriations, contract authorizations, and loan authorizations	77,242,529,861	75,453,274,567	−1,789,255,294
Over-all cut (General Appropriation Act)		[5] −550,000,000	[5] −550,000,000
Net total	77,242,529,861	74,903,274,567	−2,339,255,294

[1] For certain contingent expenses of the Senate, as set forth in S. Res. 284.
[2] In addition, indefinite contract authorization for the purchase of 100,000,000 pounds of raw wool for armed services.
[3] In addition, not to exceed $150,000,000 for REA loans available upon certification of need.
[4] Public debt transaction for loan to Spain.
[5] Applies only to items contained in General Appropriation Act, 1951.

Unveiling Ceremony in Honor of the Honorable Brent Spence, Chairman, and the Honorable Jesse P. Wolcott, Former Chairman, House Committee on Banking and Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include a transcript of the ceremony incident to the unveiling of portraits of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], chairman, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], former chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

This ceremony, under the direction of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEAN], took place in the committee room on December 12, and a full report of the ceremony follows:

[From the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, December 12, 1950]

Mr. DEANE. The members of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives are appreciative of the fact that you, distinguished Representatives of the Departments, our friends and the ladies, are present with us on this happy occasion.

We are here, as you know, to honor two of the beloved and highly esteemed members of our committee, the gentlemen who sit at the head of the table.

Before I proceed, I would like to read a communication:

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 11, 1950.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DEANE: I am glad to hear that two more pictures are to be added tomorrow to the notable collection of leaders who have served their country in the House of Representatives.

It is particularly appropriate that the likenesses of Messrs. BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky, and JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of Michigan, chairman and former chairman, respectively, of the great Committee on Banking and Currency, should be unveiled at one ceremony.

The duties which they are discharging in these critical times are of superlative importance.

Please extend my hearty felicitations and warmest personal greetings to all who gather for the presentation exercises.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

[Applause.]

Let me repeat, we are indeed happy to have representatives from the White House and the key departmental agencies that from time to time appear before this committee of the Congress.

This is no time to attempt to eulogize these two young men whom we honor today—I think it will suffice to say that those who now serve and have served with them on this committee love and respect them.

Their careers in the Congress run almost parallel, and for that reason it seems altogether appropriate that the committee should choose to honor them jointly. My colleagues who you recognize around the table and in the well, namely: BROWN, of Georgia; PATMAN, of Texas; MONRONEY, of Oklahoma; HAYS, of Arkansas; RAINS, of

Alabama; BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania; MULTER, of New York; O'BRIEN, of Michigan; WOODHOUSE, of Connecticut; MCKINNON, of California; ADDONIZIO, of New Jersey; DOLLINGER, of New York; O'HARA, of Illinois; BOLLING, of Missouri; GAMBLE, of New York; SMITH, of Ohio; KUNKEL, of Pennsylvania; TALLE, of Iowa; MCMILLEN, of Illinois; KILBURN, of New York; COLE, of Kansas; HULL, of Wisconsin; SCOTT, of Pennsylvania; NICHOLSON, of Massachusetts; and whose generosity made possible the pictures soon to be unveiled have delegated to me the very pleasant task of formally presenting the pictures.

The members of the committee requested the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN], and me to arrange with a gifted portrait photographer, Mr. Robert Shoaf, to make the pictures of our chairman and former chairman. We feel that Mr. Shoaf has truly brought out the splendid qualities and peculiar characteristics of our two friends.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] and the gentleman from Michigan]Mr. WOLCOTT] were elected in November 1930. In those days we had the lame-duck session of Congress, and it was not until March 1931 that the gentleman from the Fifth District of Kentucky and from the Seventh District of Michigan enter the United States House of Representatives. Since that time their constituents have kept them on the job constantly. Both BRENT and JESSE sought and were given assignment to the Committee on Banking and Currency and in that special emergency session of the Seventy-third Congress called by President Roosevelt in March 1933 they cut their eye teeth on the Emergency Banking Act of 1933. Since those crucial days up to this time the record will show that under the leadership of these men some of the most far-reaching legislation ever reported from a congressional committee and later enacted into law came from the House Committee on Banking and Currency. You, our guests today, the guardians and stewards of that legislation, can best confirm.

Unlike other major committees of the House we do not work in subcommittees. I think that is one of the reasons that the legislation reported from this committee has been so universally accepted by the House of Representatives.

Our chairman and our former chairman have ridden herd, and at the same time, by virtue of their wise counsel and their shrewd leadership, I feel—and I am sure I speak for my colleagues on the committee—and likewise for you who are guests, so many of whom are the guardians and stewards of the legislation that has been reported from this committee, represents perhaps the most outstanding legislation enacted by the Congress.

And now, Mr. Chairman, may I ask you and Jesse to please stand. [Prolonged applause.]

While these men continue to stand, I would like to say that our committee operates smoothly and efficiently because of another reason—we have an unsurpassed staff. At this time I am asking two charming members of our staff, Miss Helen Long and Mrs. Margaret Battle, to now attempt to wade through the shrubbery here in front and unveil the pictures of the men we are pleased to honor. [Prolonged applause.]

It is a great honor to have in our gathering this afternoon the Speaker of the House and the majority and minority leaders, and at this time I recognize our beloved speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. DEANE, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ex-Chairman, any time I can refer to a Republican as "Ex" I am pleased; I am happy to be here.

I never thought that I would live to see the day when I would see JESSE WOLCOTT unveiled. [Laughter.]

Apparently it was a very kindly photographer. [Laughter.]

Of course, there is a feud between WOLCOTT and me, and there has been for a long time; he thinks he is a fisherman and I don't; but we made pretty good friends out in a neighborhood where things were wet as water. [Laughter.]

I am happy to be here to pay my respects to these two very distinguished gentlemen; BRENT SPENCE is, in my opinion, one of the most lovable characters that I have ever known, and one of the ablest and best chairmen of a great committee that it has been my privilege to know, and that is a great concession, because I, too, was at one time momentarily a chairman of a great committee. [Laughter.]

When the committee is under his leadership, I feel pretty safe about what comes out of it.

And in the 2 years that Mr. WOLCOTT, my well-beloved friend, was chairman of this committee, I knew that the legislation that came out of the committee would be well-considered legislation, and when he or BRENT SPENCE, either one, present a bill to the House of Representatives you may know that they know what is in the bill, and that is the reason we are willing to follow them almost unanimously on most measures.

I congratulate you both for being members of a great committee such as this, and especially for having been fortunate enough to be chairmen of such a great committee. [Applause.]

Mr. DEANE. It is likewise a great honor to have with us the minority leader, Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. DEANE, Speaker RAYBURN, Majority Leader MCCORMACK, members of the committee, and friends of our two distinguished guests of the afternoon, this has really become quite a bipartisan meeting, one that is full of contentment and the fullest amity.

I am glad to pay honor to these two gentlemen who have served for more than 20 years as Members of the Congress and of this great committee. Both are Members for whom I have the highest admiration and respect.

We differ politically frequently on the great issues confronting the country; that is natural, it is human, and it is desirable, because out of the controversy and discussion and debate come compromises and amendments, and, finally, legislation that is in the genuine interest of the people of the country.

We are, as I say, divided in many instances on political questions, but there is one place where we are not divided; and that is, all of us here are for one single purpose, and that is to make our country a better land in which to live.

I am happy to come here and pay my tribute to these two outstanding legislators—men who for the last 20 years have devoted their time and talents in helping in the solution of many grave economic problems. America is a great country, and has great problems, and what we do in a large measure determines not only the future of our country but the future of the world.

We are very fortunate in having two patriotic Americans like BRENT SPENCE and JESSE WOLCOTT in charge of the destinies of this Committee on Banking and Currency which handles so many of our intricate problems.

I look at these two pictures, the one of the gentleman from Kentucky, sedate and serious, like the great statesman that he is, and at that of our beloved friend of Michigan, a little bit roguish, a little bit with an air of "What's coming next." You know we Republicans always have to wonder about that. [Laughter.]

We are not always benefited by the knowledge of what will come next in our life. [Laughter.]

But these are very fine pictures and, I hope, portraits that will be here for many years, not only as an honor and a tribute to two great Americans, but as an inspiration to all others who come to this committee, that they might serve as patriotically and wisely as they have.

Thank you. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. DEANE. Our majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. [Applause.]

Mr. MCCORMACK. Congressman DEANE, Speaker RAYBURN, and—once a Speaker always a Speaker—Speaker MARTIN, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, and friends of the two special guests of the occasion. Like the speakers who have preceded me, I am very glad to be here. I think the best evidence of the deep respect and admiration, as well as the strong friendship that is entertained for and toward Chairman SPENCE and Chairman WOLCOTT, is the very fact that there is such a fine gathering of ladies and gentlemen here today.

I am sure that after this brief ceremony is over both of these gentlemen will always remember the presence of you who are here today, most of you not only officials of various agencies of the Federal Government, but each and every one of you here because of the deep respect that you hold for both of these distinguished legislators and fine gentlemen.

I have served with both of them for the past 20 years, as have SAM RAYBURN and JOE MARTIN. There are many things that all of us could say about them, and every word would be true.

Both of them have been honorable and trustworthy public officials, men in whom the people of their districts have shown their pride and confidence in by repeated reelection, and the people of their respective districts have not erred in their good judgment.

Coming here as new Members, as we all do when we are first elected, they have advanced and advanced, so that not only today but for the past dozen years or so each of them has occupied positions of leadership and prominence in the House of Representatives.

Elected to this committee many years ago, as each of them was, by their respective parties in the House, they have advanced to the time when they each became chairman. Both of them discharged their duties as members of the committee with fidelity, with honor, and with ability. They both discharged their duties as chairmen of the committee in the same way.

I repeat, the very presence today of representatives of the various agencies whose legislation came before this committee is the best evidence of the deep respect in which they are held.

The person who brought about these pictures certainly has brought cut a very fine likeness of both of them. Both are splendid reproductions of our dear friends, BRENT SPENCE and JESSE WOLCOTT, and they fittingly occupy a place in this great committee room alongside that of another great chairman, Henry Steagall, of Alabama, who was chairman of this committee for many years, and whom many of us in the room today remember as one of the ablest and most effective Members of the House ever to serve, and one of the outstanding chairmen of any committee that has ever served in either branch of the Congress during our constitutional history.

I am very glad to be here to join with all of you in honoring these two fine gentlemen, these two outstanding legislators. [Applause.]

Mr. DEANE. There is certainly likely to be, in the mind of the chairman, a tinge of sadness in the fact that his beloved companion slipped away around a year ago, and is unable to participate in this program this afternoon.

I understand that Mrs. Wolcott is present, and I would like her to rise and be recognized at this time. [Applause.]

This concludes our program. I thank you.

Natural Gas for New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from Mr. W. C. Norman, president of the Northeastern Gas Transmission Co., of Springfield, Mass.:

NORTHEASTERN GAS TRANSMISSION CO.,
Springfield, Mass., December 27, 1950.
The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: During the many months that the project to bring natural gas to New England has been pending, I know that you have expressed much interest in seeing natural gas become a reality for this industrially important region.

I am writing to you now because of this interest in natural gas on your part. My purpose is twofold: to report to you the progress we have made since the Federal Power Commission issued a certificate to Northeastern Gas Transmission Co. to build a New England pipeline, and to suggest how you might be of further assistance in bringing the full benefits of natural gas to the gas consumers of New England and your district.

But first, I might reemphasize something you already know—that most legislators have gone on record as having said, in effect, that they favor whatever applicant pipeline company that can get natural gas into New England quickest, cheapest, and best.

Now, about our progress.

The Federal Power Commission issued us a certificate to build a New England pipeline on November 8, 1950. Immediately upon the issuance of this certificate, we placed 10 survey crews in the field, and as of December 31, 1950, we will have completed the survey of the greatest part of the main lines we are authorized to build. Some pipe has already been delivered and all the pipe required for 1951 construction will have been delivered before summer. Pipe will be going into the earth as soon as the snow is off the ground in the spring.

Northeastern will be bringing gas to nearly all the areas of New England it has been authorized to serve before the winter of 1951. This is certainly proof that we are doing all in our power to meet the requirements of getting gas here quickest.

What have we done about providing the cheapest and best gas service?

In meeting these requirements we can best follow the recommendations of the Federal Power Commission in its opinion No. 202. In this opinion the Commission said:

"It is still our opinion, based upon analysis of the economic characteristics and needs of the region, as shown by this record, that the public interest would best be served through fully coordinated facilities free to secure gas from whatever sources of supply are best able to meet the large ultimate demands of New England for natural gas upon the most favorable terms and conditions."

Here, certainly, is the Commission's definition of what is cheapest and best.

In attempting to measure up to this definition, we filed on December 21, an application with the Federal Power Commission, a copy of which is enclosed. The petition, as you will see, proposes by a minimum of investment, to make natural gas available to the entire New England market.

It measures up to the yardstick of getting gas to New England cheapest and best by eliminating an extensive and needless duplication of facilities that would result from the construction of two overlapping lines. The application involves a total investment of about $38,000,000. For only $10,475,000 additional cost we can serve every town which Algonquin proposes to serve at a cost of $30,477,800. If two duplicating lines are built in New England the cost would be about $58,000,000. The consumer would be saddled, through higher rates, with the difference in the resulting costs of duplicated investment, personnel, operating expenses, and taxes. This, in our opinion, is certainly proof that we can get gas here cheapest.

Upon examination of the map, included as part of the enclosed application, you will see that we are in a position to serve the entire New England market with construction of only a relatively minor additional amount of pipeline.

Meeting the requirement of bringing natural gas to New England in the best manner involves several factors. Many areas of New England, as things now stand, have not been certified by the Federal Power Commission for service by us, although we have been willing to serve them. The other pipeline contender, Algonquin Gas Transmission Co., has never wanted to serve many of these areas. Certainly no part of New England where a genuine market exists should be without the benefits of natural gas.

If our application pending before the Federal Power Commission is approved, we can assure these areas of natural gas. But more than that, we can get natural gas to them at least a year sooner than any other pipeline company could. By only minor extensions to our lines, we could bring gas service to many important industrial areas which otherwise may wait until the winter of 1952 or even the winter of 1953 before getting gas.

It is impossible to place too much emphasis upon this need for early service. The demand for fuel and power will increase steadily as our machines of production begin to hum. With natural gas available a year earlier, an important contribution will have been made to the mobilization of New England's strategically important industrial centers for the production of defense armament.

The measurement of best service involves something else important. Because of the seriousness of the international situation, every pound of steel available will be needed for building the weapons of defense. If we are permitted to construct our single, integrated pipeline, 51,000 tons of steel will be saved—for that is the amount that would be required by duplicating and overlapping pipelines.

We believe we have done everything possible to meet squarely the yardstick of getting natural gas to New England quickest, cheapest, and best. We know we have followed the belief of the Federal Power Commission as to the most efficient means of serving the vital New England market.

Because of your past and present interest in bringing natural gas to New England, I have written you this rather lengthy letter.

As you know, the Federal Power Commission, in reaching its final decisions, uses the measurement of public convenience and necessity. It would be most helpful—it would assist in getting natural gas here quickest, cheapest, and best—if you would advise the Federal Power Commission of your desire that New England gas consumers receive the fullest benefits of an adequate supply of natural gas at the lowest possible rates, and if you would follow the progress of our application as it affects your own constituents and all the people of New England.

Respectfully yours,
W. C. NORMAN, *President.*

Guard the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 22, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in this era the United States and all nations are menaced by collectivist trends. In order for Americans to understand and appreciate the inherent evils of this trend, we should more thoroughly acquaint ourselves with the Constitution of the United States, which is the best plan ever devised to assure freedom and liberty to a people. The Constitution is our guarantee that life, liberty, and property shall remain safe and free as long as the form of government contained therein shall survive.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is not outmoded nor does it stand in the way of progress as some social and political experts would have us believe. It is based on the wisdom and knowledge of law as expounded by great men from the time of Moses down through Blackstone and Jefferson and it shall endure as long as time itself. With these thoughts in mind, I commend to my colleagues the following article taken from the January issue of Coronet magazine:

GUARD THE CONSTITUTION
(By William LaVarre)

Americans are plagued today by various political groups that want to change the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution, these groups insist, is outmoded, and must be amended before we can go forward into a bigger and better life. With persuasive arguments, they seek to convince us that a little change here and there would improve and streamline the Constitution.

But what is the truth? The truth is that the Constitution of the United States is a great Gibraltar of human integrity, peace, and freedom, effectively blocking those who would enslave us from achieving their ultimate goals.

As we travel the world, we see constant proof that nowhere else in today's civilization does there exist a Nation as great and powerful as the United States. No other country enjoys our luxuries of strength, wealth, freedom, prosperity, and security. Across the seas, other powers have suffered political and economic defeat; many have become captive nations. How did it happen that the United States, beginning in a primitive wilderness, grew so strong, wealthy, and secure, while so many other nations began to wither and die? Was it just good luck?

The Chinese have an old proverb which says that the success of the longest journey begins with the first step. Our long journey as a nation began with a first step that was both slow and laborious—the creation of a constitutional government for welding 13 individualistic States into a strong humanitarian union. Our first step was taken by the American patriots who wrote out and pledged allegiance to an agreed-upon document that history has proven to be a colossal monument to human wisdom.

The secret of America's strength today lies in the miracle that began 163 years ago, when—on September 17, 1787—delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia signed the first step in our national journey—the Constitution.

"We, the people"—

We, the people of the United States—for a century and a half and in a world of constant antagonisms—have grown into more perfect union, established justice, insured domestic tranquility, provided for the common defense, promoted the general welfare, and secured the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Strength came to us from a strong Constitution, which, like a block of hardest stone, adamantly refused to permit itself to be chipped to pieces, generation after generation.

Had the people of the United States been easily persuaded to amend the Constitution, we would be a very different country today. We would, for instance, have a President who served for life. Decisions of the Supreme Court could be overruled by popular vote. Ministers of the Gospel would be prohibited from holding public office. The President could veto State laws. In fact, States would have been abolished and the Republic divided into four bureaucratic "districts," ruled from Washington. These changes were incorporated in amendments that were proposed and campaigned for by minority cliques in the past.

Some 4,250 attempts have been made to change the Constitution. Many of them were bitterly disputed by past generations of citizens. Looking back on the proposals now, some seem suicidal and many just plain silly. But, at the time, they all attracted aggressive missionaries and spokesmen.

The wisdom of the early American statesmen who sought a foolproof formula to guarantee a growing nation liberty and prosperity is evident today in the fact that—in all 163 years—only 11 actual amendments have been ratified. Twenty-one amendments have been added to the original 1787 text, but 10 were part of the Bill of Rights proposed by the First Congress and are generally considered to be an integral part of the original Constitution. Of the 11 amendments adopted, most of them gave more freedom, more rights, and more responsibilities to the American people.

Realizing that no human document could be perfect, the framers of the Constitution included in the text itself provisions for amending it. But they wisely created a procedure so deliberate that no amendment could be put over by a small, organized group or rushed through on a wave of popular sentiment.

Article V prescribes the two methods of amendment. If two-thirds of the Members of both Houses of Congress consider it necessary, the Congress may take the initiative. Should legislatures of two-thirds of the States request it, Congress calls a constitutional convention to propose the amendment. But in either case, ratification by legislatures or special conventions of three-fourths of the States must be obtained before the amendment becomes part of the Constitution. This is a nation of United States, and the people of three-fourths of them—large or small, rich or poor—have the right to ratify the proposal before it becomes law.

Under the Constitution, the Supreme Court is the official guardian and interpreter of the document. Had the Constitution not contained within itself provision for such a supreme authority to protect the rights and freedoms it proclaimed, we might today be in no better position than the people of other nations that once boasted fine-sounding constitutions.

We Americans have only to look abroad to see how precious the rights and freedoms guaranteed us by our Constitution are in this unhappy world of 1951. We enjoy freedom of religion, speech, press, and peaceful assembly. We are protected from unreasonable searches and seizures, from excessive bail and fines, from cruel and unusual punishment, and from involuntary servitude.

Under the Constitution we still have the right—now lost to millions of other people—to petition the Government for redress of grievances, to writs of habeas corpus (which half the human world no longer enjoys) and to swift and public jury trials where we may confront our accusers and make them prove their charges. And all Americans have an equal voice in electing our public servants; the worker's vote is as powerful as that cast by his boss.

We, the people of the United States, are still free. We have preserved not only the inherited words but the living laws of our Constitution. Just as long as we are vigilant against those who would mislead us into surrendering our national heritage, just that long will we continue to be a free and powerful America.

As Thomas Jefferson said, "When we find our Constitution insufficient to secure the happiness of our people, we set it right." But how rarely have we found it necessary to add an amendment. Thus, as we protect our Constitution, so will our Nation endow us with more power and freedom as individuals. Today, as always in the past, America's Constitution remains the world's most enlightened and magnificent political document.

Veterans' Legislation Enacted by the Second Session of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a compilation entitled "Veterans' Legislation Enacted by the Second Session of the Eighty-first Congress."

This brings up to date a similar list inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 16, pages A6661—A6663.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE SECOND SESSION OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Public Law 453, approved March 10, 1950: Provides for the utilization of surplus Army Department-owned real property at Fort Logan, Colo., as a national cemetery for burial of members of the Armed Forces dying in service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable.

Public Law 456, approved March 10, 1950: Amends the act establishing a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, approved January 3, 1946, as amended, to extend the period for which employees may be detailed for training and research to 280 days in a year. This is for the purpose of increasing their professional knowledge or technical training in fields of medical education, research and related sciences, etc., or their proficiency in medical administrative techniques and which will materially contribute to the medical care and treatment of veterans.

Public Law 468, approved March 27, 1950: Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act—appropriated an additional $720,000,000 for readjustment benefits, to remain available until expended.

Public Law 473, approved April 17, 1950: Authorizes the extension of officers' retirement benefits to certain persons who, while serving as enlisted men in the Army of the United States during World War II, were given battlefield promotions to officer grade and were incapacitated for active service as a result of enemy action.

Public Law 475, approved April 20, 1950: Amends the National Housing Act, as amended, to: (1) liberalize, extend and expand FHA insurance authority under titles I, II, and VI; (2) increase the purchasing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association and remove its power to make advance commitments for the purchase of eligible mortgages; (3) provide for the disposal of war and veterans' housing (Lanham Act housing), and (4) authorize low-interest-rate loans by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to educational institutions to provide housing for their students and faculties. Amends title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, among things: to extend GI-loan benefits to unremarried widows of certain deceased veterans; to extend permissible period of a home loan from 25 to 30 years; to increase amount of guaranty from 50 to 60 percent on loans for purchase of residential property or construction of a home, provided the veteran has not previously availed himself of title III benefits; and to require conformity with minimum construction requirements prescribed by the Administrator for loans on residential property. Repeals the secondary loan provisions (sec. 505 (a)) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, and provides 4-percent loans to veterans under certain conditions.

Public Law 479, approved April 26, 1950: Provides an extension of the time for making application for terminal leave pay. Amends section 5 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (37 U. S. C., sec. 34) by striking out "September 1, 1948" wherever it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1951."

Public Law 487, approved April 28, 1950: Authorizes the Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the lands conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933 (lands within the Ship Island Military Reservation in the State of Mississippi).

Public Law 492, approved April 29, 1950: Amends the act of July 31, 1946, in order retroactively to advance in grade, time in grade, and compensation certain employees in the postal-field service who are veterans of World War II.

Public Law 501, approved May 3, 1950: Extends the time limits for the award of certain decorations. Any decoration, heretofore authorized by the act of Congress to be awarded to any person for any act or service performed while on active duty in the military or naval forces of the United States, or while serving with such forces, may be awarded at any time not later than 2 years subsequent to the date of the approval of this act for any act or service that was performed between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, provided that the written recommendation for the award be made not later than 1 year subsequent to the date of approval of this act.

Public Law 546, approved June 14, 1950: Continues until June 30, 1954, the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and maintain regional offices, etc., in the Republic of the Philippines.

Public Law 571, approved June 23, 1950: Amends Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) by providing that under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act no reduction be made in the computation of estimated costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in any land-grant colleges because of land-grant funds received from the Federal Government. Also provides that no reduction shall be made on account of payments to nonprofit educational institutions from State funds, etc.

Public Law 573, approved July 23, 1950: Provides that active pulmonary tuberculosis developing a 10 percent disability or more within 3 years from the date of separation from actual service shall, in the absence of affirmative evidence to the contrary, be deemed to have been incurred in active service.

Public Law 586, approved June 30, 1950: Amends laws relating to the Military Academy and extends to the Air Force the provisions that 40 cadets shall be nominated from among the sons of World War I and II veterans who have died from service-connected injury or disease.

Public Law 598, approved June 30, 1950: Provides for the extension of the terms of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II.

Public Law 599, approved June 30, 1950: Extends, until July 9, 1951, the Selective Service Act of 1948, which provides that veterans of World War II shall not be liable for induction for training and service until a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress.

Public Law 610, approved July 11, 1950, Veterans' Education and Training Amendments Act—Restricts the authority of the Veterans' Administrator with respect to selection of courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, so as to insure the veteran the right to select a course provided it is not avocational or recreational and is in the same general field of the veteran's occupational objective.

Creates a Veterans' Education Appeals Board to hear complaints of educational institutions.

Public Law 611, approved July 15, 1950: Authorizes revision of procedures presently employed by the Veterans' Administration in the administration of personal funds of patients and funds due incompetent beneficiaries.

Public Law 661, approved August 4, 1950: Extends the law prohibiting the unlawful wearing, etc., of badges, medals, etc., of veterans' organizations chartered by Congress, to recognized auxiliaries of such organizations.

Public Law 734, August 28, 1950: Social Security Act amendments—Gives World War II veterans wage credits under the old-age and survivors insurance program of $160 per month for the time spent in military service between September 16, 1940, and July 24, 1947, unless credited under some other Federal retirement system.

Public Law 779, approved September 9, 1950: Establishes priorities for special induction into the military service, as follows: (1) Persons who received special training and education and who have had less than 90 days of active duty, (2) persons who received special training, etc., and had more than 90 days and less than 21 months of active duty, (3) persons who did not have active service subsequent to September 16, 1940, and (4) persons not included in (1) and (2), who have had active duty since September 16, 1940.

Public Law 791, passed over President's veto September 19, 1950: Provides for outpatient treatment by the Veterans' Administration for veterans for the Spanish-American War, etc., in non-service-connected disease or disability cases.

Public Law 798, approved September 21, 1950: Authorizes $800,000 to provide automobiles at $1,600 appropriately equipped for World War II veterans entitled to compensation for loss of one or both legs.

Public Law 823, approved September 23, 1950: Extends from June 30, 1951, to June 30, 1956, the payment of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for disabled soldiers and sailors (amending act of May 18, 1948; 62 Stat. 237).

Public Law 827, approved September 23, 1950: Authorizes the release of the trustees of Columbia University and the Citizens' Veterans Homes Association of Rockland County, Inc., under the contract for the operation of the veterans' temporary housing project known as Skanks Village in Rockland County, N. Y.

Public Law 843, approved September 27, 1950: Supplemental Appropriation Act—appropriated an additional $375,000 for automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans and an additional $8,614,800 for administrative medical, hospital, and domiciliary services.

Public Law 844, approved September 27, 1950: Permits a member of the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve, to waive receipt of a pension, disability allowance, etc., to which he is entitled because of prior military service, and receive in lieu thereof compensation, including travel and other expenses for active duty.

Westchester's No. 1 Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 1, 1951

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Daily Times, of Larchmont, N. Y., commending the service of the retiring commissioner of public welfare of Westchester County, N. Y., Ruth Taylor.

We who have known Miss Taylor and have worked with her for many years realize what her retirement from active service is going to mean to the county and a great personal loss to all of us individually. The editorial from the Daily Times follows:

WESTCHESTER'S NO. 1 WOMAN

If one were asked to name the woman who has left the greatest imprint of her personality and genius upon Westchester during the last quarter-century, or even the greater part of the half-century, there could be but one answer—Ruth Taylor.

Since 1916 she has been connected with the Westchester County Department of Public Welfare. First, she was assistant to V. Everit Macy, dating far back when he held the office of supervisor of the poor. Then she was deputy commissioner and since 1931 she has been commissioner of welfare.

It is difficult to enumerate all that this one woman has accomplished, either directly or through the help of others whom she has inspired and fired with her own spark of enthusiasm and perseverance. But here are a few high lights:

The mother's allowance law—designed to keep fatherless children in the home; aid to dependent children—a recognition of the public responsibility for the little ones in distress; the children's court law—not initiated here but developed to the practical point where it became a pattern for the Nation. These are three great forward steps in social security which Commissioner Taylor mothered.

During a career which has spanned two World Wars, she has been either in control or close thereto of our county hospitals and county home, for aged and indigent, and county penitentiary at Grasslands and East View. It was under her administration that our magnificent adult tuberculosis building was completed and operated; she has made Sunshine Cottage for youngsters afflicted with tuberculosis a model for the rest of the world to pattern upon.

On top of this, as social security grew, there was placed upon her shoulders the tremendous job of proper, efficient, honest distribution of public funds, running into the millions, for welfare and relief, for care of orphans, for old-age pensions, for family and child welfare, for placement of children in boarding homes, for aid to the blind, and all the other categories of service to the poor, sick—the unfortunates of our troubled world.

For year after year the budget entrusted to Commissioner Taylor has been larger than the budgets of all other county departments combined. She has been directly responsible for the honest distribution of many millions of dollars, from not only the county but also from the State and Federal Governments. The paper work alone in this field has been tremendous.

Much of what Miss Taylor initiated here in Westchester, under the advice and with the cooperation of her predecessors, especially Mr. Macy, and with the guidance of the late William L. Ward, longtime political "boss" of Westchester, has served as the blueprint for State and national pioneering into social service. Gov. Al Smith copied much of the Westchester picture for the State; Gov. F. D. Roosevelt took much of it to Washington.

And now Commissioner Taylor is to retire at the close of business Sunday night. We can hardly find words to describe the loss the county will sustain.

She blazed the way in Westchester, and as mentioned, in State and Nation, for common-sense welfare standards which the taxpayer could afford. She has fought for almost a half century for a wider public acceptance of the philosophy that we are, after all, our brother's keeper. She has stood firm against criticism and has yet been conciliatory in the application of new methods.

Withal, she has been modest, and has spiced her official demeanor with an elfin sense of humor which is delightful. Throughout her whole career there has been evident, in personal and in official acts, a sense of personal love for her fellow men, and especially for children, which has endeared her to thousands. It is not an exaggeration at all to call her the mother of social security here in Westchester, the program which through countless trips to Albany and Washington she nurtured to national status.

It is with profound regret that, speaking on behalf of all of Westchester, we mark her departure from public life.

It is not often that any community is blessed with her kind.

The Commissioning of Communists in the United States Army, 1941–46

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore agreed to, I ask that the following compilation of material entitled "The Commissioning of Communists in the United States Army," be included in the Appendix of the permanent RECORD. This compilation was prepared by the staff of the minority

policy committee and contains its own documentation.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMISSIONING OF COMMUNISTS IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY, 1941–46

Seldom has a greater shock been given to the national sense of security than when it was discovered early in 1945 that, long before the Yalta Conference, the bars had been let down to Communists in the United States Army.

The administration's record for concealment and secrecy is well known. To this day no detailed and forthright account of the genesis of the soft-Communist policy in the Army has been forthcoming from administration sources. Had it not been for an energetic press and some determined effort from Congress, nothing would ever have reached the public at all.

What happened in the Navy is only fragmentarily known. Andrew Roth is an instance. Lt. (jg) Andrew Roth, of Naval Intelligence, was one of the principals in the Amerasia case. On August 10, 1945, the grand jury returned a true bill against Roth, but on February 13, 1946, the Department of Justice entered a nolle prosequi in his case. The Amerasia incident continued to rumble, however, and in 1946 a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary held an investigation in closed session. In the committee report (H. Rept. No. 2732, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) Representative SPRINGER in his minority views made the categorical statement that: "The evidence presented at the hearings disclosed the fact that Andrew Roth, a lieutenant (junior grade) in our Navy was known to be a Communist by the board passing upon and granting commissions in the Navy, and that fact was so known at the time he was recommended for a commission as a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy." Nothing ever happened to Roth and in September 1950 his name appeared on the masthead of the Nation, a weekly New York periodical.

Aside from such instances as the above, the degree of Communist infiltration in the Navy is a matter entirely of surmise. Official records on the subject, if any, are not presently available.

It is the Army with which this memorandum is concerned. It is based upon the available documentary evidence.

Early in 1945 a subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee was conducting an investigation of the war effort. The committee began to hear, from various sources, that numerous persons with Communist affiliations held Army commissions. There were other rumors. According to Helen Lombard, a Washington newspaperwoman: "On January 7, 1945, I got a telephone call from a State Department friend who told me that something of momentous importance was brewing. We met and he informed me that the War Department had just issued a directive removing former barriers against the commissioning of Communists in the highly confidential services of the United States Army." [1]

On February 2, 1945, Representative GEORGE DONDERO, of Michigan, having heard the rumors, wrote the War Department and asked for particulars. He received no immediate reply.

What would have happened to the House committee's investigation cannot be guessed had it not been that the Washington bureau of the Chicago Tribune on February 18, 1945, secured a copy of the secret directive and broke the story the next day, February 19.

The Tribune account stated that the secret directive had been issued December 30, 1944, and had been signed at the direction of the Secretary of War by Brig. Gen. Robert H. Dunlop, on that date acting Adjutant General of the Army. The account directly quoted the very heart of the directive, which was as follows:

"No action will be taken under the reference letter that is predicated on membership in or adherence to the doctrines of the Communist Party unless there is a specific finding that the individual involved has a loyalty to the Communist Party which overrides his loyalty to the United States." [2]

This immediately raised the question as to whether it was possible for a Communist to have a loyalty to the United States which was not overridden by his loyalty to the Communist Party. Since the Communist record in lying, deception, and prevarication, where it will help them reach their ends, is well established, how could the Army be satisfied about which loyalty overrode which?

It was true that, at the moment, the United States was a war ally of the Soviet Union, but it had not been forgotten that the American Communist Party and their fellow travelers employed every propaganda and obstructional device from the day the Nazi-Soviet pact was signed in August 1939 to the day of Hitler's invasion of Russia (June 22, 1941) to keep the United States from making overt moves against Germany.

Among those propaganda devices was the American peace mobilization, directed by Frederick Vanderbilt Field, which picketed the White House up to the moment the German troops moved against the Russians.

Furthermore, the military services had had long-standing regulations rejecting from military service anyone who embraced doctrines advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence. The Adjutant General had declared that the Hatch Act likewise "forces the rejection for military service of all persons holding membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States." The Communist Party record on this score was clear enough. Communists had been advocating such an overthrow for years. Furthermore, the function of the American Communist Party as the obedient and active arm of a foreign power had been well established.

This was not all. The Adjutant General, himself, wrote that—

"Long experience and careful investigation showed conclusively the virtual impossibility of developing actual, legal proof of membershp in the Communist Party on the part of persons desiring to conceal such membership. The Communist Party took action to prevent the Hatch Act being applied to its members in the Army by giving them leaves of absence in such a manner as to constitute at least a suspension of membership in the party." [3]

If all these things were true, then why should a directive state that no action was to be taken on a soldier or an officer who was a Communist, unless it was found that the individual had a loyalty to the Communist Party which overrode his loyalty to the United States? Why should the Army accept Communists at all? And, since Communist membership is hard to prove, why should not the past history of the individual, his background, his affiliations, and close association with Communists be taken as decisive and be sufficient reason for immediate rejection?

The Tribune account (February 19, 1945) went on to say:

"Under the new directive the following posts, some of them highly confidential, are now open to Communists:

"Officer candidate schools, as candidate.

"Aviation cadet training.

"Security and intelligence duties.

"Duties in connection with the information, education, and orientation of troops or the educational reconditioning of troops. (To include training for such duties.)

"Headquarters units of companies (or similar units) and higher organizations.

"Clerical duties.

"G–3 and S–3 duties.

"Duty as an operator of signal communication.

"Instructor or administrative personnel of replacement depots.

"Duties requiring maintenance and repair of confidential or secret equipment.

"Duties affording opportunities to observe confidential or secret equipment closely.

"Duties allowing knowledge of the tactical dispositions of submarine mine fields.

"Signal Corps units providing communication, signal intelligence, photographic, repair or depot supply services.

"Ordnance units providing ammunition or depot supply services.

"Quartermaster units providing gasoline or depot supply services.

"Chemical units providing chemical munitions or depot supply services.

"Duties affording frequent access to secret and confidential matter or opportunity to injure the war effort."

The publication of the Tribune account of the directive expedited a War Department reply to Representative DONDERO's February 5 request for information. On February 20, the day after the Tribune story, Major General Ulio, the Adjutant General, wrote to Congressman DONDERO at great length.

The letter concluded with this passage:

"I am inclosing herewith a copy of the instructions under discussion. The War Department had classified this document because of its firm conviction that public discussion of its investigative procedures could only nullify them and make even more difficult the determination of the loyalty of its personnel. Since the provisions of this document have been publicized, however, the War Department has no alternative other than to remove the classification." [4]

Once the secret directive had got into the public domain, the House Military Affairs Committee resumed its investigation. Open hearings were held on February 27, March 14, and briefly, on July 18, 1945. A closed executive session was held on May 24, 1945. The witnesses were Assistant Secretary of War McCloy, Maj. Gen. Clayton Bissell, Chief of Intelligence, United States Army, and Maj.

[1] While They Fought, by Helen Lombard, New York, Charles Scribners Sons, 1947, p. 308. Miss Lombard discusses this incident of the directive in considerable detail and also the attempted destruction of the Counterintelligence Service's records on subversives, a move checkmated only by the quick action of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

[2] A verbatim copy of the directive follows as exhibit No. 2 at the conclusion of this memorandum. The phrase "reference letter" in the passage quoted above refers to a confidential communication sent to the same officers under date of February 5, 1944, outlining procedure for "the disposition of subversive and disaffected personnel." This communication, which is given as exhibit No. 1 at the conclusion of this memorandum, was set aside by the December 30, 1944, directive.

[3] See letter to Congressman DONDERO, exhibit No. 3.

[4] Letter to Congressman DONDERO, exhibit No. 3. See also Washington Times-Herald, February 22. 1945.

Gen. W. J. Donovan, Director of the Office of Strategic Services. Into the hearings for the final session (July 18) there were introduced for the record the histories of a number of officers who had backgrounds showing long-standing Communist affiliations. The committee also issued a report on June 29, 1945.[5]

This was not the first effort to find out what the Army was doing about Communists in its ranks. Congressional trust in the handling of the Army's files had been severely shaken by the Senate Military Affairs Committee's discoveries in the previous year.

On May 18, 1944, the Senate Military Affairs Committee learned that an order had been issued on May 7, 1944, to destroy the copies of subversive records within the War Department and to remove originals from control of the Department by putting them into the hands of the archivists and consigning them to oblivion.[6]

On May 19, 1944, a member of the Senate committee went to the War Department. Secretary Stimson told the Senator that he had heard of the order for the first time at 6 o'clock the previous evening when he had received a telephone call from Secretary Hull in connection with it. General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, disclaimed all knowledge of the order. Other high ranking officers stated that they were in a similar state of ignorance. Finally the Deputy Chief of Staff admitted that he knew about the directive. When asked why such an important step could be authorized without the knowledge of the Secretary of War or the Chief of Staff, the deputy intimated that the instructions had come from higher up.[7]

It was deduced that "higher up" could only mean the White House, but if the deduction were true, the person at the White House who had issued such an order was not disclosed.

The upshot of these preliminary conversations was the prompt appointment of a subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee which, as promptly, went to the Pentagon to investigate. It was finally established that an order had been sent, in the form of a letter, to Major General Bissell, the head of Military Intelligence. "The most important result (of the Senate investigation) was that the War Department made a pledge not to destroy the files on subversives." [8]

With this episode of the Army's records on subversives in the congressional background, the House Military Affairs Subcommittee went into its open hearings.

The first hearing on February 27, 1945, had as witnesses Assistant Secretary of War McCloy and Major General Bissell, Chief of Intelligence, United States Army.

Mr. McCloy submitted for the record both of the secret directives, that of February 5, 1944, and the one that displaced it on December 30, 1944. In the case of the February directive, one paragraph was excised.[9]

After this Mr. McCloy proceeded to a discussion of the Army's policy. At great length he told of the difficulty of establishing the facts in the case of suspects and how it had finally been concluded that each case must be judged on its merits. Important also was the question as to whether or not it could be conclusively shown that the suspect did, in so many words, believe in the overthrow of the Government by violence.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then, if I understand you, if a man said he was a Communist, or if there was some evidence that he was affiliated with the so-called Communist Party, you would not necessarily hold that that man belongs to a political party that favors overthrow of our present form of government?

"Mr. MCCLOY. We cannot take that position in the light of the great confusion that exists in the judicial tribunals of the country as to whether that is a tenet of the Communist Party or not." [10]

Again, on the same point:

"Mr. MCCLOY. If he said he believed in the overthrow of the United States Government by violence, then we would not commission him. If he said he was a Communist or a member of the Communist Party, we would weigh, with double strictness, the other factors to determine in the end whether or not he ought to be commissioned. That is what we tried to say in the December 30 letter." [11]

To the question: "In this directive of December 30, 1944, you very clearly provide a person might be a member of the Communist Party and still be commissioned as an officer in the Army of the United States?"

Mr. McCloy replied: "Yes; that is so." [12]

Upon the conclusion of Mr. McCloy's testimony, Major General Bissell appeared as a witness. He was asked this question:

"The CHAIRMAN. As I understand you, there is not within your knowledge, any officer of the United States, no man now in the Army holding a commission who is a Communist?

"Major General BISSELL: That is correct." [13]

Almost immediately after this hearing the Chicago Tribune published a dispatch from its Washington bureau, which was, in effect, a reply to the contention General Bissell made at the hearing.

The dispatch read as follows:

"Evidence was disclosed tonight which appeared to contradict the testimony yesterday of high War Department officials that no Communist has been given an Army commission.

"The names of 10 Army officers, about whose Communist connections there can be little question in the light of official records, have been obtained by the Tribune and turned over to a member of the House Military Affairs Subcommittee investigating the Army's recent directive permitting the commissioning of Communists.

"These names were obtained in a brief preliminary investigation which indicated the presence of a large group of Communists holding Army commissions. An Army intelligence officer estimated the number at 'at least 500.'

"The Communist Political Association, successor to the Communist Party, has boasted that it has more than 10,000 members in the military forces. Inquiry indicates that many of these hold highly confidential posts involving what the Army calls sensitive duties." [14]

The dispatch then listed the names of a major, a captain and eight lieutenants along with an account of their communistic connections.

Meantime, the Communists themselves had greeted the open publication of the December 30, 1944, directive with a shout of triumph. The March 4, 1945, Daily Worker published an exultant article by Earl Browder in which the Communist leader declared:

"Appearing before the House Military Affairs Subcommittee February 27, Assistant Secretary of War McCloy and Major General Bissell delivered a deadly blow to the ancient Red bogey. They confirmed the information that the Army has removed the rule, * * * that Communist opinions or affiliations should act as a bar to promotions in the Armed Forces, especially to officers' commissions and special services."

Ten days later, Representative Hugh DeLacy, of the State of Washington, a Congressman whose sympathies and affiliations were well known, introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a "Statement in support of Army order regarding criteria for judging loyalty in granting commissions and in making other Army appointments, March 1945." This statement said:

"With regard to the questions of rendering Communists and Communist sympathizers eligible for Army commissions, we support the War Department position as reported in the press that in granting commissions and making various other Army assignments the basic consideration is not the propriety of the individual's opinions; but his loyalty to the United States."

Many of the signers of the statement had publicly shown their loyalty to the Communist cause over a long period of time.

Among the signers were Paul Robeson, central figure of the Peekskill riot, who has just had his passport revoked. There was Frederick Myers, a member of the New York seaman's branch of the Communist Party. There was Howard Fast who has just finished (September 1, 1950) a prison sentence for contempt of Congress, and John Howard Lawson, who is in prison now for the same offense. Rockwell Kent, more recently president of the International Workers Order, was one of the signers, and so was Donald Ogden Stewart, toastmaster at Communist dinners. The list included Grant Oakes of the United Farm and Metal Workers who was also a director of the Communist Abraham Lincoln School in Chicago. Another Communist-controlled labor boss was Julius Emspak who, a few weeks ago, in July 1950, was cited for contempt of the Senate. There were scores of other names.[15]

On March 13, 1945, the House subcommittee held another open hearing and Major General Bissell returned as a witness. Since at the previous hearing he had replied in the affirmative to the statement that there was no one in the Army holding a commission who was a Communist, the subcommittee's attention was at once directed to this phase of the subject. The chairman read off the list of names which had already appeared in the Chicago Tribune and other papers. General Bissell was then asked to tell the committee what he knew about these men and their political affiliations.

"General BISSELL. The allegations made against these 10 officers in the news stories were not new to the War Department. Except for a few statements, known by the Army to be unfounded, the press stories are, generally speaking, a rehash of information previously available. * * * All 10 officers were commissioned many months before the War Department's December 30, 1944,

---

[5] H. Rept. No. 839, 79th Cong., 1st sess., Investigations of the National War Effort.

[6] See Lombard, previously cited, pp. 302–303.

[7] Lombard, p. 305.

[8] Ibid., p. 308.

[9] See exhibits Nos. 1 and 2 at the conclusion of this memorandum. The excised paragraph was explained as follows (p. 3590, vol. 2 of transcript, February 27, 1945):

"The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask the Secretary if these two directives which he has furnished members of the committee can be offered for the record as they are.

"Mr. MCCLOY. Both of them can be offered for the record, except one paragraph of the February 5 letter, which we would prefer to have deleted from the record if possible. * * * The paragraph referred to is 6 (c) of the February 5, 1944, directive."

[10] Transcript, vol. 2, February 27, 1945, p. 3609.

[11] Ibid., p. 3613.

[12] Transcript, vol. 2, February 27, 1945, p. 3619.

[13] Ibid., p. 3662.

[14] Chicago Tribune, Thursday, March 1, 1945.

[15] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, pt. 10, 79th Cong., 1st sess., March 14, 1945, p. A1194.

directive was issued so that it could have had no possible bearing on the action taken in these 10 cases. Seven of these 10 officers have been commissioned for more than 17 months." [16]

In its March 1, 1945, dispatch, previously cited, the Chicago Tribune had not only listed 10 officers but had given with each name a considerable amount of associational detail. Lt. Irving Goff will serve as an example. The Tribune's dispatch said:

"Lt. Irving Goff, present assignment unknown. He was a speaker at the Communist Workers' School in New York City in 1941 and the Daily Worker publicized his talk. He went on record in the official Communist daily as protesting against the imprisonment of Earl Browder, February 2, 1941." [17]

General Bissell had this to say about Lieutenant Goff:

"Lt. Irving Goff voluntarily enlisted at Washington, D. C., on December 10, 1942, and sailed from the United States early in 1943. While serving overseas he was awarded the Good Conduct Medal. After more than 6 months' service in an active theater of operations, Goff was commissioned a second lieutenant in recognition of his abilities and service. While serving as a commissioned officer he received a commendation for meritorious service while an enlisted man for saving the life of a civilian at the risk of his own. On May 27, 1944, he was promoted to first lieutenant overseas." [18]

Representative ELSTON questioned General Bissell about the names, of which Lieutenant Goff was one:

"Representative ELSTON. You seem to take serious exception to newspaper articles which have set forth the records of certain officers before they were commissioned. Is there anything in any of those newspaper articles that is untrue?

"General BISSELL. Many of them were not true upon investigation.

"Representative ELSTON. Which were not true?

"General BISSELL. I would have to take it up item by item to do that, but these same allegations were made and had reached the War Department, and the War Department had investigated each one of them and found they were not based on fact, or, if the allegation itself were correct, it did not establish disloyalty or did not prove that the individual advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States. * * *

"I investigated all the allegations individually that were made in the press. I do not feel it is desirable or that you would wish to try these officers charge by charge, based on newspaper articles when they are not here to defend themselves. * * * I do not feel I should go into specific questions with regard to the individuals unless they are given an opportunity to defend themselves.

"Representative ELSTON. You have gone into great detail and given us one side of the story. I want to find out whether or not the reports given to the public have been true or not. We simply want the facts, General. We do not want to reflect on anybody, but we want to get the facts. * * *

"General BISSELL. I think your question is entirely justified, but I also think if I go further in answering this line of questioning I will get into what is in our investigative records and you will ask me how I know he said what and immediately the whole value of our investigative procedure is gone. * * *

"Representative ELSTON. You mean you are not willing to submit to this committee the records of persons who have been commissioned in the Army of the United States?

"General BISSELL. The policy of the War Department has not been to make available to Congress the investigative records, the detail of investigative records in the military service." [19]

At this point in the hearing, General Bissell gave to the chairman a letter from Secretary of War Stimson in which the Secretary stated formally that the records would not be given up.[20]

Before this blank wall the subcommittee was brought to a halt. Statements had been publicly made that there were numerous Communist officers in the Army; 10 men were named specifically as examples. The Army stated that they had investigated the statements about these men and then categorically refused to tell the Military Affairs Committee whether or not the charges were true.

In the face of this refusal it was impossible to discover how far the Communist infiltration of the Army had gone. What all the reasons for the secret directive of December 30, 1944, may have been, what influence may have been exerted to let the Communists in, how far they had penetrated into the intelligence service itself, how many sensitive positions they had occupied, whether or not they had transmitted secret information to Russian agents—all such questions were futile in the face of the adamantine refusal to yield up the records. The situation had reached the fantastic stage in which military rules of secrecy, which had been employed originally to protect the Army against subversives, might now be used for the purpose of protecting the subversives themselves who had been able to make their way into the Army.

Such questions may have been futile in the face of the refusal to give up the records, but they were far from idle questions. Since 1945, by slow and painful effort, the fact has been established that the executive branch was infiltrated with Communists.

It is known that Carl Marzani, once of the OSS and the State Department, had previously, under an alias, been a Communist organizer in New York City. For concealing the fact and for violation of the criminal code, he was convicted of perjury and is now serving a prison term.

It is known that, while an employee of the State Department, Henry Julian Wadleigh gave secret documents to Soviet agents, for he confessed it under oath.

The facts about Alger Hiss are known.

The facts about Judith Coplon are known.

Some of the facts about the men who gave secret information about atomic energy to Russian agents are known, for some have confessed and are already under prison sentence. But how far the infiltration in the Army went we do not yet know.

We know that the secret directive was issued and we know that on March 4, 1946, it was rescinded, but the immediate circumstances of the rescission we don't know and we don't yet have the records.

And we do know something about Irving Goff.

1. We know that on February 27, 1945, the Chief of Intelligence of the United States Army affirmed that within his knowledge there was no man then in the Army holding a commission who was a Communist.

2. We know that on March 1, 1945, the Chicago Tribune identified Lt. Irving Goff as an officer with "communistic connections."

3. We know that on March 14, 1945, the Chief of Intelligence refused to say whether his investigations had shown that Lieutenant Goff was a Communist or not.

4. We know that at the Military Affairs Subcommittee hearing on July 18, 1945, these statements about Goff were submitted for the record:

"Lt. Irving Goff, ASN O2055518, Office of Strategic Services, box 2601, Washington 13, D. C. * * * executive secretary of Veterans of Abraham Lincoln Brigade, * * * One Irving Goff, of 2930 West Nineteenth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., signed Communist Party petition for Browder-Ford in 1940. There (is) no such address as * * * 2930 West Nineteenth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y."

5. We know that the Daily Worker on May 29, 1949, identified Lieutenant Goff as chairman of the Communist Party State organization in Louisiana.

During the hearings both Mr. McCloy and General Bissell made much of the fact that a number of the accused officers had behaved with gallantry in action. The implication was that it was unthinkable that a brave soldier could be a Communist.

That is a very singular implication. No more resolute and intrepid men ever lived than Nikolai Lenin and Josef Stalin. They and their fellows engineered a revolution and thereafter set up the Communist International, the purpose of which was the utilization of non-Russian Communist Parties for the defense and aggrandizement of the power of the toilers' homeland.

In obedience to the Comintern's dictates, the American Communist Party shifts its line. If it be in order that American Communists should enter the United States Army to help in the task of this aggrandizement, then the American Communist Party will work to put them there. But American citizens, whose allegiance still is given to the Nation and the society in which they live, would like to know who the persons in the administration were who were responsible for letting down the Army bars to Communists. They are still more interested in knowing right now, when they read the daily casualty lists, realizing that those Americans who die meet their death at the hands of Communists.

EXHIBIT NO. 1

Below is a copy of the directive outlining procedure for the "Disposition of Subversive and Disaffected Military Personnel," sent to commanding officers February 5, 1944. This directive was submitted for the record to the House Military Affairs Subcommittee investigating the war effort, on February 27, 1945, by Assistant Secretary of War John McCloy. At Mr. McCloy's request paragraph 6 (c) was excised.

It was this directive which was set aside by the directive issued December 30, 1944. The December 30, 1944, directive follows as exhibit No. 2.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington 25, D. C., February 5, 1944.

Subject: Disposition of subversive and disaffected military personnel.

To: The commanding generals Army Air Forces, Army Ground Forces, Army Service Forces; commander in chief, Southwest Pacific area; the commanding generals, theaters of operations, defense commands, departments, service commands, military district of Washington; ports of embarkation; base commands; the commanding officers, ports of embarkation, base commands, posts, camps, and stations.

1. Letter, AG 014.311 (8 Jan. 44) OB-S-B-M, 14 January 1944, subject: Disposition of Subversive and Potentially Subversive Military Personnel, is rescinded, except insofar as parts thereof rescind other letters of this office.

2. Responsibility: This letter will govern the disposition in the Zone of the Interior

[16] Transcript, vol. 3, March 13, 1945, pp. 129, 130, and 131.

[17] Chicago Tribune, March 1, 1945.

[18] Transcript, vol. 3, March 13, 1945, p. 133.

[19] Transcript, vol. 3, March 13, 1945, pp. 147, 149, 150, 151, and 152. See also Washington Times-Herald, March 14, 1945.

[20] See exhibit No. 4 at the conclusion of this memorandum.

of subversive and disaffected military personnel. Disposition of subversive and disaffected officers and enlisted men is a responsibility of command which responsibility will be exercised, subject to the provisions of this letter, so as to maintain security, discipline, and morale. The commanding generals of the three major commands are responsible for carrying out the policies and procedures established by this letter and for keeping the War Department currently informed of all general instructions issued thereunder.

3. Definitions: The phrase "subversive personnel" is defined for the purpose of this letter as personnel engaging in, or who, while in the Army, have engaged in, subversive activity of any sort. The phrase "disaffected personnel" is defined as personnel who lack affection for or loyalty to the Government and Constitution of the United States. The use of the phrase "potentially subversive personnel" will be discontinued.

4. When investigation will be made: Investigation to determine whether an officer or enlisted man is subversive or disaffected will be initiated only upon reliable information of sufficient seriousness so that, when weighed against the individual's known reputation and record of service, it compels a grave suspicion that he is subversive or disaffected. The determination in each case as to whether investigation is justified will be made by a responsible officer having command jurisdiction over the individual concerned.

5. When action will be taken: (a) General: Action will be taken only upon verified factual information which positively establishes that the individual concerned is subversive or disaffected. No temporary or permanent action or restriction adverse to the interest of any officer or enlisted man will be taken until such proof has been adduced.

(b) Exception: As an exception to the statements in 5a, persons under investigation for subversive activity or disaffection will not be assigned to:

(1) Officer candidate schools, as candidates.

(2) Aviation cadet training.

(3) Security and intelligence duties.

(4) Duties in connection with radar.

(5) Duties in connection with secret or confidential cryptographic systems or equipment.

Persons under investigation as above also will not be assigned to or retained in organizations or units alerted for foreign service, including Alaska.

6. Permanent disposition. (a) Court martial: In all cases of proven subversive activity by either officer or enlisted personnel, commanding officers will institute court-martial proceedings when legally justified. It is desired by the War Department that investigations for subversive activity, as distinguished from disaffection, be directed primarily at obtaining evidence to support court-martial charges.

(b) Internment: Enlisted men who are enemy aliens and whose subversive activities warrant internment will be discharged into the custody of the Department of Justice. Upon request of the man's commanding officer, the facts in cases deemed to come within this category will be referred to the nearest United States attorney by the commanding general of the service command, in accordance with MR 1-11, paragraph 17. The soldier will be discharged only after notification has been received that the Attorney General has ordered the individual's internment.

(c) (Excised from the record at the request of Assistant Secretary of War McCloy.)

(d) Nonsensitive duties: When investigation or facts otherwise obtained prove that an enlisted man is disaffected but not sufficiently dangerous to warrant transfer to a special organization under the terms of 6c above, he will not be permitted to remain in or be transferred to any of the duties mentioned in subparagraphs 5b 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, or any other duties which afford frequent access to secret or confidential matter or opportunity seriously to injure the war effort. No restriction, for counterintelligence reasons, will be placed on the transfer to overseas installations of men described in this subparagraph. Except for the duties stated in 5b 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 above the determination of what assignments give frequent access to secret or confidential matter or other opportunity seriously to injure the war effort is a function of command. Any lists of sensitive duties prepared by the commanding generals of the major commands for guidance of commanding officers will, however, be submitted to the War Department for concurrence prior to issuance.

(e) Pacific transfers: When investigation or facts otherwise obtained indicate the presence of a reasonable understandable refusal or reluctance on the part of a soldier to bear arms against a particular European enemy and further indicates no disloyalty to this country other than that which can be inferred from his expression of refusal or reluctance to fight, he will be transferred by the major command concerned to an organization likely to have combat duty in the Alaskan or Pacific theater of operation.

(1) The refusal or reluctance to fight a particular European enemy must be expressed.

(2) The presence of close relatives, a background which is not remote, or citizenship in an enemy country will constitute sufficient grounds to cause the reluctance or refusal to be understandable.

The service record of any individual transferred or selected for transfer under this subparagraph will be marked "not available for service in European or African theater of operation."

(f) Officer candidates: No officer candidate will be removed from officer candidate school prior to the completion of his course, or his commission withheld, for counterintelligence reasons, without the concurrence of the War Department.

(g) Officers: Only subparagraph a of this paragraph is applicable to commissioned officers. Commissioned officers who are proven to be subversive or disaffected will, when possible, be court-martialed or discharged or otherwise disposed of under the Articles of War or Army Regulations. If disposition as stated above is not possible, such officers will not be given assignments which will result in security being endangered by reason of their lack of loyalty and in no case will be assigned to or retained in any of the following duties:

(1) Security and intelligence duties.

(2) Duties in connection with radar.

(3) Duties in connection with secret or confidential cryptographic systems or equipment.

7. The commanding generals, domestic service commands, will furnish copies of this letter to the commanding officers of all class I, II, III, and IV installations within the territorial limits of their service commands.

By order of the Secretary of War.

J. A. ULIO,
Major General, the Adjutant General.

EXHIBIT 2

Below is a copy of the Army directive which formally let down the bars to Communists. Emphasis has been added. The document was declassified February 22, 1945, in circumstances described in the foregoing memorandum. The directive was rescinded in 1946.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington 25, D. C., December 30, 1944.

Subject: Disposition of subversive and disaffected military personnel.

To: The commanding generals, Army Air Forces, Army Ground Forces, Army Service Forces; commander in chief, Southwest Pacific area; the commanding generals, theaters of operations, defense commands, departments, service commands, Military District of Washington, ports of embarkation, base commands; the commanding officers, ports of embarkation, base commands, posts, camps, and stations.

1. Reference is made to War Department letter, AG 014.31 (31 Jan. 44) OB-S-B-M, 5 February 1944, subject: Disposition of subversive and disaffected military personnel.

2. (a) Questions have arisen as to the significance, under reference letter, of membership in, and sympathy with the views of, the Communist Party.

(b) The basic consideration is not the propriety of the individual's opinions, but his loyalty to the United States. Membership in, or strict adherence to the doctrines of, the Communist Party organizations is evidence that the individual is subject to influences that may tend to divide his loyalty. However, many good soldiers are subject to conflicting influences. Such influences must be appraised in the light of the individual's entire record. No action will be taken under the reference letter that is predicated on membership in or adherence to the doctrines of the Communist Party unless there is a specific finding that the individual involved has a loyalty to the Communist Party which overrides his loyalty to the United States. No such finding should be based on the mere fact that the individual's views on various social questions have been the same as the views which the Communist Party may have advanced. Except in clear cases, no action should be taken against persons who are being trained for combat assignments and have demonstrated a high degree of ability to serve the United States in that manner, including a willingness to accept combat duty.

3. It is desired that the commanding general of each service command make distribution of this letter to all class I, II, III, and IV installations within the territorial limits of his command.

By order of the Secretary of War:

ROBERT H. DUNLOP,
Brigadier General, Acting The Adjutant General.

EXHIBIT NO. 3

Below is a copy of a letter from the Adjutant General to Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, February 20, 1945.

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: Your letter of February 2 regarding the War Department's policy relating to alleged Communists and Communist sympathizers in the Army has been received and given the most careful consideration. The War Department is very anxious that you should understand fully its position in this matter, and for that reason I am setting forth below a complete exposition of the evolution of War Department policy on this subject. I may add that this information already, has been sent, in substance, to other Members of Congress who also have expressed interest in this problem.

Your letter relates to a secret War Department letter published under date of December 30, 1944. As you may know, before the war it long had been our policy to exclude

Communists and Communist sympathizers from the Army in any capacity. This policy was relatively easy to enforce, since persons of that ideology practically never applied for admission to the Army. Further, under the system of voluntary enlistment the War Department had wide latitude in determining the qualifications and acceptability of applicants.

With the advent of selective service, however, War Department procedure in this matter had to be reconsidered. The Selective Service Act brought about the enforced induction into the Army of persons of all kinds and beliefs. This greatly limited the discretion of the War Department regarding the acceptability of inductees. The provisions of the Hatch Act were carefully considered. It forces the rejection for military service of all persons holding membership in "any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States." This immediately raised a question of fact—the fact of membership. Cognizance was taken of the opinion of the Attorney General that the Communist Party "is an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

It was clear that the burden of proof in applying the Hatch Act was squarely on the Army. Legal proof of membership had to be established. Manifestly this had to be done with certainty, not only as a matter of justice but also to avoid the obvious possibility that action on inconclusive proof might provide an escape corridor to relieve considerable numbers of persons from the hazards of combat service in defense of the United States and might even drive persons seeking to avoid military service into the ranks of the Communist Party. The Hatch Act did not refer to persons of communistic ideology who were not members of the Communist Party.

For the reasons given above, the War Department acted with great care in formulating procedures suitable for the war emergency. As a preliminary measure, pending the determination of proof of actual membership, a policy was established that persons strongly suspected of membership in the Communist Party or who appeared to be consistent followers of the Communist Party line were excluded from sensitive duties and from being commissioned officers. A great number of such cases were investigated and handled with a view to making a final determination. Long experience and careful investigation showed conclusively the virtual impossibility of developing actual, legal proof of membership in the Communist Party on the part of persons desiring to conceal such membership. The Communist Party took action to prevent the Hatch Act being applied to its members in the Army by giving them leaves of absence in such manner as to constitute at least a suspension of membership in the party. It has been held that proof of past membership in the Communist Party is not conclusive proof that the individual thereafter continued to be a member of the party. As a result of these considerations the War Department has found itself in a difficult position legally to take effective action under the Hatch Act.

In the meanwhile, the policy of applying certain restrictions to alleged Communists which was stated in the preceding paragraph was continued in effect. This has been an exceedingly difficult policy to enforce with justice to the individual and fairness to the Government. Long experience in handling cases of this character has convinced the War Department that mere sympathy with a given ideology or suspected membership in a given organization neither legally nor as a matter of abstract justice furnishes sufficient justification for adverse action. It has been found that the only sound, though difficult, solution of this problem is to base action on the attitude and actions of the individual rather than on his alleged connections. For that reason a confidential letter was issued on February 5, 1944, establishing individual attitudes and actions as the basis of restrictive determination. A copy of this letter is enclosed for your information. It will be noted that this letter does not single out any particular organization or ideology but placed the policy squarely on the question of loyalty to the Government of the United States on the part of the individual in question. It is believed that this policy is sound.

During the period from February 5, 1944, to December 30, 1944, it was found that there were difficulties in implementing the policy then in force. Cases continued to be resolved and action taken by subordinate elements purely on suspected sympathy with communism without full exploration of the actual attitude and actions of the individual in question and without establishing legal proof of membership in the Communist Party. Numerous inquiries were received from lower echelons for further clarification of the question of establishing communism with relation to the letter of February 5, 1944. As a result the matter was exhaustively reviewed in the War Department for a period extending over some 6 months before issuance of the letter of December 30, 1944, to which you refer. During the period of consideration the War Department examined the question in detail, with particular attention to the terms of the Hatch Act. Consideration was given to the fact that persons in the Army suspected of, but not proven to be, Communists had not proved to be a source of any difficulty and were loyally supporting the war effort. There seemed little justification, therefore, not to use the services of such persons to the fullest in all capacities for which they were qualified.

This matter is not a closed issue in the War Department. The application of this procedure will be watched with great care and it will be modified as may be shown necessary in the light of experience or in the light of changed conditions. No person, who after thorough investigation by the War Department of disloyalty, has been given access to secret Army equipment or to any vital Army matters. I trust that the foregoing explanation of the position of the War Department in this matter is satisfactory to you and that you agree as regards the practical wisdom of the course of action adopted.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the instructions under discussion. The War Department had classified this document because of its firm conviction that public discussion of its investigative procedures could only nullify them and make even more difficult the determination of the loyalty of its personnel. Since the provisions of this document have been publicized, however, the War Department has no alternative other than to remove the classification.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. ULIO,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

EXHIBIT NO. 4

Below is a copy of a letter from Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson to the chairman of the House Military Affairs Subcommittee, declining to permit the disclosure of files on Army officers who had been named as having Communist sympathies or affiliations. This letter, dated March 12, 1945, was submitted for the record, March 13, 1945.

MARCH 12, 1945.

Hon. R. EWING THOMASON,
Chairman, Subcommittee House Military Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMASON: I am informed that the subcommittee (of which you are chairman) of the House Military Affairs Committee has asked Major General Bissell, Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2, to appear before it tomorrow and be questioned concerning 10 Army officers who have been named in certain press stories as having Communist sympathies or affiliations.

In the course of his testimony with reference to these officers, or other military personnel, General Bissell may be asked to disclose to the subcommittee the military-intelligence files of such individuals or to answer questions with respect to the same. In such event, I have instructed General Bissell to present this letter to you in order that your subcommittee will understand the reasons why I must decline to permit such files to be disclosed or testimony to be given with reference to them.

The reasons do not arise from any desire to conceal anything from your subcommittee. The Assistant Secretary of War and the Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2, have already testified at length as to the War Department's existing regulations and the nature of its investigatory procedures in determining the loyalty of its personnel. The War Department is prepared, as I explain below, to give upon your request further information concerning the loyalty of its officers. But the records of investigations made by the Military Intelligence Division of the General Staff with reference to the loyalty of individual officers are confidential in nature for the use of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff.

The usefulness of the Military Intelligence Division's work is, to great extent, based on the secrecy of its investigations and files.

Military Intelligence investigators must be free to inform higher authority of any pertinent conclusions, whether or not supported by strict proof, and to include in their files hearsay, opinion, and even contradictory evidence.

They would not feel free to do so if the contents of their reports were to be subject to general scrutiny.

Also, Military Intelligence reports are based on investigations not armed with the power of subpena. The testimony of civilians which they contain is usually given only by promise of confidential treatment. If such reports were to be disclosed, the ability of the investigators to obtain confidential information in the future would be seriously diminished if not destroyed.

Furthermore, such files usually contain confidential reports requested by Military Intelligence of and received by it from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other investigative agencies, with the understanding that the same will not be revealed. The War Department does not feel free to break faith with these agencies. To do so would mean that their vital assistance in future investigations of disloyal or subversive personnel would be lost.

Our view in this matter is in accord with the opinion of the Attorney General, expressed in a letter of April 30, 1941, to the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, in which, in declining to accede to a request to produce similar files of the Department of Justice, the Attorney General stated that "all investigative reports are confidential documents of the executive department of the Government" and that "congressional or public access to them would not be in the public interest." Certain portions of the Attorney General's opinion, which he supports with a citation of many precedents and court decisions, are so pertinent that I have attached them to this letter.

In addition to the foregoing, there are considerations here involved peculiar to the armed services, and of especially compelling nature in wartime. The cases of certain

officers will involve not only their own security, and the security of those serving under them and with them, but also our military relationship with our allies in combat areas. Entirely apart from any issue of security, however, there is another serious consideration which exists in the case of all officer personnel. In the course of determining loyalty, the War Department obtains from the individuals concerned and from other sources confidential information concerning the personal beliefs, personal affiliations, and other factors bearing on the loyalty of its individual officers and men. The War Department has always felt a responsibility to preserve the confidence of this information. This position does not rest alone on fairness to the individual. It is of paramount importance to the Army itself that all military personnel shall be assured that confidential information concerning them will not be disclosed, except in the course of proper judicial proceedings and under the constitutional safeguards guaranteed to every American citizen. In any such proceeding, the individual would have the right to be present in person and be confronted by his accusers.

The War Department will welcome from your subcommittee new evidence bearing on any individual's loyalty and will review such individual's case in the light thereof and report its findings based thereon to your subcommittee. The War Department is at all times prepared to state to your subcommittee an individual's military record, and (in accordance with usual procedure) to exhibit in executive session such individual's Army personnel file (201 file). Furthermore, if the Congress desires specific information about any considerable number of officers that this subcommittee will name in confidence to the War Department, the War Department will examine the files of such individuals and supply therefrom to this subcommittee in executive session the data requested, in general form and without reference to particular individuals.

I know that your subcommittee will understand from what I have said that our decision not to turn over the confidential military-intelligence files of individual officers, or to answer questions concerning the same, is solely for the purpose of maintaining the long established confidential relationship of the Military Intelligence Division with the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff, of protecting the future effectiveness of military-intelligence investigations, and of preserving the confidence of all officers of the Army that their individual affairs will not be disclosed, in their absence, without their having opportunity to defend in proper proceedings in accordance with those principles of American justice for which they are fighting.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Status of Irrigation and Reclamation Developments Under the Bureau of Reclamation, 17 Western States, June 30, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement outlining the status of irrigation and reclamation developments under the Bureau of Reclamation, 17 Western States, June 30, 1950.

This statement is a supplement to the report included in the Appendix of the RECORD in volume 95, part 16, pages A6655–A6658.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUS OF IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENTS UNDER THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, 17 WESTERN STATES, JUNE 30, 1950

A little over a year ago, on October 19, 1949, to be exact, I had the pleasure of reporting on the status of irrigation and power development under the Bureau of Reclamation. At that time my remarks along with complete tabulations relative to the program appeared on pages A6655 through A6658 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and in the 1949 reprint of my debates on the Senate floor. Today, I should like to bring you up to date on the reclamation program.

As is well known, the limiting factor on irrigation in the West is the availability of water that can be economically delivered to land that can be made productive through the artificial application of irrigation water. Generally speaking, the limit of irrigation in the West has been placed at approximately 40,000,00 acres out of a total of areas in the 17 Western States of 1,162,000,000 acres.

About 22,000,000 acres are now under irrigation principally through private enterprise, but including about 3,300,000 acres which have been brought under irrigation (full supply) by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Office of Indian Affairs.

In addition to this acreage Reclamation provides supplemental water for over 3,000,000 acres.

The following tabulation shows the significant increases in Reclamation's irrigation program:

Inventory of irrigable acreage in 17 Western States

State	Area of State	Area works were capable of supplying with water, 1940	Irrigated in 1939 other than Federal	Indian land	Constructed works irrigable 1949		Authorized or under construction		Potential 1950		Total
					Full supply	Supplemental [1]	New lands	Supplemental	New lands	Supplemental	
Arizona	72,691,200	844,212	245,537	124,662	324,491	98,774	72,500	22,300	37,000	665,000	1,219,065
California	100,353,920	7,398,576	5,127,254	4,431	103,227	961,864	653,700	509,100	2,772,700	1,771,000	6,771,591
Colorado	66,538,880	3,913,542	3,117,599	9,251	132,661	68,606	109,155	1,458,311	966,000	505,000	3,239,733
Idaho	52,997,120	2,593,534	1,051,631	32,510	451,292	965,124	10,100	850,000	1,012,000	575,000	3,863,516
Kansas	52,552,320	142,409	99,980				224,930	155			225,085
Montana	93,642,240	2,344,390	1,385,040	166,052	339,999	977	1,064,692	372,772	35,000		1,813,440
Nebraska	49,057,920	992,957	352,978		192,714	123,118	1,121,745	73,130	337,000	211,000	2,058,707
Nevada	70,273,280	841,304	745,301	25,710	69,736	67,935			93,000	175,000	405,671
New Mexico	77,767,040	731,990	428,597	18,566	148,331		13,400	6,500	324,000	36,000	528,231
North Dakota	44,834,560	36,522	7,337		27,843		1,289,234				1,317,077
Oklahoma	44,341,120	8,624	3,826		48,000				272,000		320,000
Oregon	61,664,000	1,261,081	827,463	2,086	215,410	194,310	17,000		1,181,000	215,000	1,822,720
South Dakota	48,983,040	121,847	25,161		59,129	6,498	1,090,669	80,697			1,236,993
Texas	168,732,160	1,773,812	966,280		67,000	31,011	130,700	552,000	485,000	185,000	1,450,711
Utah	52,701,440	1,357,714	917,567	60,797	41,164	275,348	76,400	89,100	290,000	251,000	1,023,012
Washington	42,865,280	731,527	167,516	127,866	246,236	191,400	1,067,200		572,000	85,000	2,161,836
Wyoming	62,403,840	1,913,527	1,308,766	31,449	208,126	18,188	447,275	270,035	243,000	119,000	1,305,624
Total	1,162,399,360	27,007,568	16,777,833	603,380	2,675,359	3,003,153	7,388,700	[2] 4,283,100	8,619,700	4,793,000	30,763,012

[1] Includes supplemental water supply under Warren Act and special contractors.
[2] Does not include 200,000 acres, Anderson Ranch.

The Bureau of Reclamation, greatest single agency in the world engaged in the conservation and development of land and water resources is the primary factor in the development of the western United States. This agency was created more than 48 years ago when President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Reclamation Act introduced by the great legislator from our State, the late Senator Francis G. Newlands.

This great organization has invested more than a billion and one-half dollars in reclamation projects which have contributed many times that sum to the wealth of the Nation in taxes. The greatest part of this investment will be repaid to the Treasury of the United States by the water and power users of the West. Every State in the Nation benefits from reclamation dollars which are appropriated annually by the Congress. From Connecticut to California, and from Maine to Mexico reclamation projects create employment and contribute to the economic welfare of these communities. Because it is from the many areas outside the reclamation region that the major portion of equipment and supplies used in reclamation structures are built and manufactured. Benefits to areas other than the reclamation area do not end here with construction materials. The wealth created on these projects automatically causes a demand for millions of dollars worth of clothes, household equipment, farm equipment, and thousands of other items manufactured in the East, North, South, and Central States.

In this connection it will bear repeating that the economy of the 11 States of the mountain and Pacific regions is almost wholly dependent on the irrigation developments that have led to the tremendous growth in population since the turn of the century. It will be irrigation expansion as well as the hydroelectric power developments in multiple-purpose reclamation projects that will

enable the West to continue to grow and to continue to be a major factor in the future development and security of the entire country.

The people of the 17 far-western States which make up the vast arid and semiarid areas are deeply concerned with the Federal reclamation program for complete conservation of water resources for the development of irrigated lands, with the development of hydroelectric power, to assist in repayment of costs and to assure maximum use of the water and land resources. The country at large was likewise concerned with this great reclamation conservation program which was initiated under President Theodore Roosevelt when the Congress adopted the reclamation law of 1902; and it has continued its interest and concern for furthering the reclamation program during the 48 years since the national irrigation policy was written into the Federal statutes.

These figures are, in the main, taken from the Bureau of Reclamation's official crop report, the reclamation program, and from data available in the official records.

The table which is an inventory of irrigable acreage in the 17 Western States with details by States on the reclamation program is as follows:

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

Hydroelectric power is a vital factor in repayment of costs and for pumping in the irrigation development of the Federal reclamation program. Presently installed on Bureau of Reclamation projects are a total of 3,218,400 kilowatts. Authorized for construction are about 4,650,000 additional kilowatts, including the installations of about 1,450,000 kilowatts at Army dams in the Missouri Basin, where the power production will be distributed over transmission lines to be constructed by the Eureau of Reclamation. A tabulation which shows a schedule as of July 1950 for installations through 1957 is as follows:

Summary of estimated schedule of installations in power plants of reclamation projects, existing, under construction, or authorized (through fiscal year 1957)

[Figures shown in kilowatts nameplate capacity]

Region and State	Projects and plants	Ultimate capacity (kilowatts)	Existing capacity (kilowatts) June 30, 1950 [1]	Estimated capacity (kilowatts) to be added during fiscal year							
				1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	After 1957
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Alaska	Eklutna	30,000	0	0	0	0	0	30,000			
Region 1:											
Idaho	Boise:										
	Black Canyon	8,000	8,000								
	Boise River	1,500	1,500								
	Anderson Ranch	40,500	0	27,000							13,500
	Minidoka:										
	Minidoka	13,400	13,400								
	American Falls	30,000	0	0	0	0	30,000				
	Palisades: Palisades	112,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	22,500	45,000	45,000
Montana	Hungry Horse: Hungry Horse	285,000	0	0	0	142,500	142,500				
Washington	Columbia Basin: Grand Coulee	1,974,000	1,424,000	334,000	216,000						
	Yakima:										
	Chandler	12,000	0	0	0	0	12,000				
	Prosser	[2] 2,400	2,400				−2,400				
	Roza	10,000	0	0	0	0	10,000				
	Total region 1	2,516,900	1,449,300	361,000	216,000	142,500	192,100	30,000	22,500	45,000	58,500
Region 2: California	Central Valley:										
	Shasta	379,000	379,000								
	Keswick	75,000	75,000								
	Delta Steam	280,000	0	0	0	0	0		100,000	180,000	
	Folsom	160,000	0	0	0	0	0	53,333	106,667		
	Nimbus	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	5,000			
	Total region 2	899,000	454,000	0	0	0	0	58,333	3,206,667	180,000	0
Region 3:											
Arizona-California	Parker: Parker	120,000	120,000								
Arizona-Nevada	Boulder Canyon: Hoover	1,332,300	1,034,800	0	215,000	0	0	0	82,500		
	Davis Dam: Davis	225,000	0	225,000							
California	Yuma: Siphon Drop	1,600	1,600								
Total, region 3		1,678,900	1,156,400	225,000	215,000	0	0	0	82,500	0	0
Region 5: New Mexico	Elephant Butte: Elephant Butte	24,300	24,300								
Total, region 5		24,300	24,300								
Region 6:											
Montana	Missouri Basin:										
	Angostura	1,200	0	0	1,200						
	Canyon Ferry	50,000	0	0	0	0	50,000				
	Lower Marias (Kenil)	1,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,800
	Tiber	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	2,000			
	Lyon	24,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,000
	Mission	50,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50,000
	Portage	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000
	Yellowtail	200,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150,000	50,000
North Dakota	Missouri Basin:										
	Crosby	48,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48,000
	Des Lacs	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60,000
South Dakota	Missouri Basin: Miller Drop	180,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180,000
Wyoming	Missouri Basin:										
	Bald Ridge	30,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30,000
	Boysen	15,000	0	0	15,000						
	Hunter Mountain	12,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,000
	Sunlight	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000
	Thief Creek	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60,000
	Tongue River	25,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25,000
	Riverton: Pilot Butte	1,600	1,600								
	Shoshone:										
	Shoshone	5,600	5,600								
	Heart Mountain	5,000	5,000								
Total, region 6		811,200	12,200	0	16,200	0	50,000	2,000	0	150,000	580,800

[1] Excluded are the following hydroelectric power plants constructed on Reclamation projects but operated by others:

	Kilowatts
Yakima project (Rocky Ford power plant)	187
Salt River Valley Water Users' Association (8 plants)	70,950
Imperial Valley district, All-American Canal (2 plants)	14,400
Enterprise Irrigation district, Klamath project (1 plant)	500
Deschutes project, additional unit at Pacific Power & Light Co.'s Cove power plant	1,500
Grand Valley project, operated by Public Service Co. of Colorado	3,000
Strawberry Valley project (Spanish Fork, upper Spanish Fork, lower Spanish Fork, and Payson power plants)	1,550
Newlands project (Lahontan power plant)	1,640
Total	93,727

[2] Prosser power plant will be removed when Chandler power plant is built.

Summary of estimated schedule of installations in power plants of reclamation projects, existing, under construction, or authorized (through fiscal year 1957)—Continued

[Figures shown in kilowatts nameplate capacity]

Region and State	Projects and plants	Ultimate capacity (kilowatts)	Existing capacity (kilowatts) June 30, 1950	Estimated capacity (kilowatts) to be added during fiscal year							
				1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	After 1957
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Region 7:											
Colorado	Colorado Big Thompson:										
	Green Mountain	21,600	21,600								
	Mary's Lake	8,100	0	8,100							
	Estes	45,000	0	45,000							
	Pole Hill	33,250	0	0	0	33,250					
	Flatiron Mountain	63,000	0	0	0	63,000					
	Big Thompson	6,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,700
Wyoming	North Platte:										
	Lingle	1,400	1,400								
	Guernsey	4,800	4,800								
	Kendrick:										
	Seminoe	32,400	32,400								
	Alcova	36,000	0	0	0	0	36,000				
	Missouri Basin:										
	Kortes	36,000	12,000	24,000							
	Glendo	24,000	0	0	0	0	0	24,000			
	Fremont Canyon	48,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	48,000		
Nebraska	Missouri Basin:										
	Pleasant Hill	[3] 2,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,600	
	Harlan County (Army Corps of Engineers Dam).	1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,200
Various	Other Missouri River Basin plants.	[3] 118,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118,300
Total, Region 7		482,350	72,200	77,100	0	96,250	36,000	24,000	48,000	2,600	126,200
Total Bureau of Reclamation.		6,412,650	3,168,400	663,100	447,200	238,750	278,100	114,333	359,667	377,600	765,500
Cumulative total Reclamation.			3,168,400	3,831,500	4,278,700	4,517,450	4,795,550	4,909,883	5,269,550	5,647,150	6,412,650
PLANTS CONSTRUCTED AND OPERATED BY CORPS OF ENGINEERS [4]											
Region 6:											
Montana	Fort Peck: Fort Peck	85,000	50,000	0	35,000						
North Dakota	Garrison: Garrison	400,000	0	0	0	0	0	80,000	160,000	0	160,000
South Dakota	Gavins Point: Gavins Point	100,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	33,333	66,667	
	Fort Randall: Fort Randall	320,000	0	0	0	0	40,000	120,000	120,000	40,000	
	Big Bend: Big Bend	120,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120,000
	Oahe: Oahe	425,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	425,000
	Total, Corps of Engineers	1,450,000	50,000	0	35,000	0	40,000	200,000	313,333	106,667	705,000
	Cumulative total, Corps		50,000	50,000	85,000	85,000	125,000	325,000	638,333	745,000	1,450,000
	Total, Bureau and Corps	7,862,650	3,218,400	663,100	482,200	238,750	318,100	314,333	673,000	484,267	1,470,500
	Cumulative total, Bureau and Corps.		3,218,400	3,881,500	4,363,700	4,602,450	4,920,550	5,234,883	5,907,883	6,392,150	7,862,650

[3] Subject to further engineering and economic studies.

[4] Power marketed by Bureau of Reclamation.

Area for which constructed works are capable of providing full water supply increased almost 60,000 acres while the area for which supplemental water is available increased more than 200,000 acres. Project areas under construction or on which work has been authorized increased almost 500,000 acres (supplemental supply).

The importance of hydroelectric power in connection with the reclamation program is highlighted from the financial side, for returns from the production and distribution of power will not only repay the cost of power facilities with interest but will materially assist in the repayment of the construction costs of irrigation facilities in many instances.

For instance, on a project like the Central Valley in California, the irrigation facilities will represent something like two-thirds of the entire construction costs of the project. While power facilities will cost only about one-third of the entire investment, the revenues from power will repay approximately two-thirds of the over-all costs. A similar ratio of the assistance by power to irrigation will prevail, I understand, in the Columbia Basin project and to some extent in the Missouri Basin project where nonreimbursable flood-control and navigation benefits are an essential part of the over-all financial picture.

Reclamation appropriations for irrigation are traditionally repayable without interest by the immediate beneficiaries who are the water users on the various projects. The Flood Control Act of 1944 which authorized the Missouri Basin project sets a new standard on repayment. The investment in power facilities bears interest, of course, but the power facilities that are a part of the irrigation development are interest free. Flood-control allocations in reclamation projects are nonreimbursable under the national flood-control policy just as the Army dams constructed for flood control represent nonreimbursable funds of the Federal Government.

From statistics on the total investments, on construction costs already incurred or presently contemplated by the Bureau of Reclamation in carrying out the program, the following tabulation is a summary:

Total expenditures by Bureau of Reclamation on irrigation and multiple-purpose projects to June 30, 1950	$2,051,303,000
Estimated cost to complete irrigation and multiple-purpose projects under or authorized for construction, including transmission facilities (but not power plants of Army dams)	4,355,351,000
Total estimated cost of completed and authorized projects	6,406,654,000

Thus, the reclamation program, including projects constructed, those under construction, or those authorized for construction represent an investment by the Federal Government of $6,406,654,000. An additional amount is represented by potential projects under investigation or proposed for investigation.

Summary of Plans for Conservation and Development of the Water Resources of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD a review as of December 1950 of Summary of Plans for Conservation and Development of the Water Resources of the United States.

This review elucidates and brings up to date the report inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 6, 1948, and the review by the Corps of Engineers inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 16 pages A6673–A6677.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PLANS FOR CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE WATER RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES—REVIEW AS OF DECEMBER 1950

1. In 1948, at the request of Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, the chief of engineers prepared and furnished a summary of plans for conservation and development of the water resources of the United States. This study summarized the growth of Federal interest in the control, conservation and use of the water resources of the United States. The total estimated cost given for program of water resource development was $57,500,000,000, based on 1947 price levels.

2. Since this study and the cost figure given have been misinterpreted in certain publications, it appears desirable to state the following facts for clarification:

a. The study and cost estimate was prepared and plainly described merely as an effort to show the magnitude and scope of the over-all task of water resource development in the United States. It was not in any sense a program proposed by any Federal agency for the approval of Congress.

b. The study and plans of improvement summarized covered the entire United States and did not omit any geographical areas. Its only limiting factor was that more information on water resource problems and plans was available for some geographical areas than for others.

c. The study was based largely upon river basin studies of the Corps of Engineers, but included available information and cost estimates for work of other Federal agencies, as well as some local work which appeared to form a part of a water resource program. As stated in the study, it did not include all of the plans and programs of these other agencies, and the study pointed out that complete river basin development would include additional measures.

d. The study was limited to river and stream basins and did not include coastal and Great Lakes harbor improvement.

3. The cost estimates given in the initial study furnished in 1948 were considered to be based on 1947 price levels when the Engineering News Record index of construction costs stood at 413.6. As of June 30, 1950, the ENR index had risen to 506.5, indicating a rise of about 22 percent over the 1947 level. This increase in cost would be applicable to all of the estimated costs given in 1948 except the cost of completed work. While details are not available as to the exact amount of work, included in the 1948 study, that has been completed, it is estimated funds expended on such work complete or under construction have been about $5,200,000,000 as of June 30, 1950. Applying the 22 percent cost index rise to the remainder ($57,500,000,000 less $5,200,000,000 or $52,300,000,000) indicates a present estimated cost of $63,800,000,000 for completing the work outlined in the original 1948 study. As pointed out previously this study did not include all works necessary for complete water resource development. The ultimate cost would in all probability be substantially larger, as indicated in the recent studies of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission.

4. The total estimated cost given in the 1948 study of water resource development was based to a large extent upon projects and investigations under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, as follows:

(a) Part representing work under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers or work investigated by that agency in the course of river basin studies	$38,040,000,000
(b) Part representing work of other Federal agencies plus some work by local agencies which appeared to form a useful part of a water resource program	19,466,000,000
Total	57,506,000,000

5. The part of the estimated cost for work under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers has been brought up to date to reflect costs as of June 30, 1950, and progress on works up to that date; and has been expanded to include the improvements of coastal and Great Lakes harbors which constitute an important part of any over-all program for water resource development. The revised estimated cost for work under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers or investigated by that agency is:

Projects complete or in operation	$4,100,000,000
Projects under construction	4,700,000,000
Projects planned	16,000,000,000
Future plans or possibilities	21,400,000,000
Total	46,200,000,000

6. The work summarized above is largely for improvements for flood control and navigation and for conservation of water for related purposes such as the development of hydroelectric power, except that a large part (over 75 percent) of the estimated cost shown under future plans or possibilities is for purely hydroelectric power development. By far the greater part of this power would not be economical at the present time and much of it may not be economical or needed for many years to come. The totals of estimated costs are given merely to illustrate the magnitude of ultimate possibilities and costs. The figures bear no relation to any Federal program.

7. The seriousness of the flood problem in the United States and the need for control and conservation of flood water continues to be emphasized every year by recurring destructive floods. This past year has witnessed a number of such floods throughout the country. Among the most destructive were the floods on the Red River of the North in the spring of 1950 when long continued rains and melting snows on the prairies of that basin caused damages of over $32,000,000 in the United States and even heavier damage in the Canadian part of the basin where the city of Winnipeg was inundated. During the past month of December 1950, floods have caused unusually heavy damages in California and Nevada; and complete estimates of losses in these areas are not yet available.

8. On the other hand, the effectiveness of flood-control works on the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers was proved again in the spring of 1950 when prolonged flood flows were carried to the Gulf of Mexico without damage to protected areas.

Laws Approved and Bills Acted Upon in the Eighty-first Congress Relating to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951 (legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a compilation entitled "Laws Approved and Bills Acted Upon in the Eighty-first Congress Relating to Education."

This brings up to date a similar list inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 16, pages A6710–A6711.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAWS APPROVED AND BILLS ACTED UPON IN THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS RELATING TO EDUCATION

Chinese students:

H. R. 4830. Approved October 6, 1949. Public Law 327. Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1950. Authorizes the allocation of $4,000,000 of ECA funds for the tuition, subsistence, and travel expenses of selected Chinese citizens for study in American schools.

H. R. 5602. Reported in the House July 13, 1949. Makes the same provision as in H. R. 4830, above.

H. R. 7797. Approved June 5, 1950. Public Law 535. Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950. Authorizes the allocation of $6,000,000 of ECA funds for such educational assistance to selected Chinese in the United States.

Elementary and secondary education, financial aid: S. 246. Passed by Senate May 5, 1949. Furnishes financial aid to State elementary and secondary school system in order to equalize educational opportunities.

Federal activities, financial relief:

H. R. 3829. Approved September 10, 1949. Public Law 306. Authorizes $7,500,000 during the fiscal year 1950 for contributions to local school agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools overburdened by defense-incurred enrollments, loss of revenue from Federal acquisition of land, etc.

S. 2317. Approved September 23, 1950. Public Law 815. Authorizes $3,000,000 to be paid to the States for an inventory of existing school facilities and a survey of the need to construct additional facilities. Authorizes necessary sums during fiscal years 1951 to 1953, inclusive, for grants to local school districts for emergency school construction, the need for which has resulted from Federal activities.

H. R. 7940. Approved September 30, 1950. Public Law 874. Authorizes Federal contributions during fiscal years 1951–1954, inclusive, to compensate such agencies for loss of revenue and/or added expense due to (a) the acquisition of property by the United States within their districts; (b) the attendance at such agencies' schools by children residing on, or whose parents are employed on, Federal property, or (c) a sudden and substantial increase in enrollment as a result of Federal activities.

Finnish students: Senate Joint Resolution 3. Approved August 24, 1950. Public Law 265. Provides that future war debt payments by Finland shall be used for the technical instruction of citizens of Finland in

the United States and citizens of the United States in Finland.

Indian education: Various bills make provision for the construction of schools to be available to Indians and non-Indians on an equal basis in specified communities, and for certain other local purposes relating to the education of Indians. They are: S. 170, approved March 17, 1949, Public Law 20; H. R. 4510, approved August 19, 1949, Public Law 256; H. R. 3881, approved September 7, 1949, Public Law 301; H. R. 554, approved October 6, 1949, Public Law 331; H. R. 7431, approved August 17, 1950, Public Law 709; and H. R. 7332, passed by House September 14, 1950.

Iranian students: H. R. 5731. Approved September 29, 1950, Public Law 861. Authorizes $110,000 for the education of certain Iranian students in the United States in accordance with the obligation of the United States arising out of an exchange of notes in 1924.

Labor Extension Act: S. 110. Reported in the Senate March 4, 1949. The Labor Extension Act. Provides for a program of cooperation with the States and private institutions in the dissemination among wage earners and unions of useful information on the workers' contribution to production, collective-bargaining agreements and practices, successful techniques in labor-management relations, labor law and administration, economic history, etc. Prohibits Federal control of the administration, curriculum, methods, etc., of cooperating institutions.

Medical, dental, and related education: S. 1453. Passed by the Senate September 23, 1950. The Emergency Professional Health Training Act. Provides aid to education in medicine, dentistry, nursing, and public health through scholarships and school construction grants. H. R. 5940, a companion bill, was reported in the House October 11, 1949.

National school health services: S. 1411. Passed by the Senate April 29, 1949. The National School Health Services Act. Furnishes aid for the improvement of school health services.

Scientific research, scholarships, etc.: S. 247. Approved May 10, 1950. Public Law 507. The National Science Foundation Act. Establishes such Foundation to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for research and education in the sciences; to initiate, support, and coordinate scientific research and, among other things, to grant scholarships and fellowships for scientific study at accredited nonprofit American and foreign institutions.

Veterans, extension of benefits: S. 672. Passed by Senate August 9, 1949. Provides that educational benefits for World War II veterans may be based on any period of enlistment or reenlistment contracted on or before October 6, 1945.

Veterans, industrial and institutional trade training: H. R. 5833. Passed by House August 25, 1949. Provides, for the purpose of clarification, that public-school courses in vocational training shall be deemed institutional training, rather than training on the job, for purposes of veterans' educational benefits.

Veterans, selection of courses: S. 2596. Approved July 13, 1950. Public Law 610. Make a number of amendments to Veterans Regulation 1 (a), relating to the education of veterans, in order to limit and define the authority of the Administrator to deny or control the selection of courses; to establish rules for the determination of a school's customary cost of tuition, to define full-time course for trade and technical schools, etc.

Veterans' vocational rehabilitation: S. 3499. Reported in the Senate August 14, 1950. Provides that persons qualified to receive vocational rehabilitation under Veterans Regulation 1 (a) [pt. VII] shall be entitled to such training for a period not less than the period of education and training to which they would be entitled under part VIII.

Legislative Record, Committee on Rules, Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 2, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in order to acquaint the membership of the House with the activity of the Committee on Rules during the Eighty-first Congress, under permission granted me heretofore there is listed below the House and Senate bills, concurrent and joint resolutions upon which rules were granted, together with the House resolutions favorably reported to the House. A careful study of this compilation will convince even the most skeptical that the committee was exceedingly active in expediting vital legislation to the floor of the House where the membership was extended the privilege and the right to express itself thereon. Notwithstanding the volume of work and definite action indicated in the list below, considerable difficulty was experienced in the committee in securing favorable action upon a number of requests for rules on legislation of great import. In eight instances where the committee failed to act, or failed to grant a rule requested by the chairman of a legislative committee the so-called 21-day rule was resorted to to bring important measures before the House. This rule was utilized on the following bills:

H. R. 3199, House Resolution 276: Abolition of poll tax.

H. R. 5472. House Resolution 302: Rivers and harbors, flood control.

House Joint Resolution 334, House Resolution 350: United States participation in international organizations.

H. R. 331, House Resolution 217: Statehood for Alaska.

H. R. 49, House Resolution 218: Statehood for Hawaii.

H. R. 4846. House Resolution 321; National Science Foundation.

S. 2105, House Resolution 419: Mining Bill.

H. R. 5965, House Resolution 348: Veterans' hospital bill.

As a result the membership of this House was permitted to express its views and its wishes through a record vote on these important legislative proposals. With the repeal of this democratic process in the rules of the House, adopted by the liberal majority in the Eighty-first Congress, the membership of the Eighty-second Congress will undoubtedly be deprived of this same opportunity and right to pass on critical legislation through a coalition of six or more members of the Committee on Rules who might arrogate unto themselves the power to determine what vital legislation should or should not receive consideration by this great legislative body.

A total of 217 bills and resolutions were acted on by the committee during the two sessions of the Eighty-first Congress.

One hundred and seventy-two rules were granted on general legislation. Eleven House and Senate joint resolutions were granted rules. Sixteen House resolutions were reported favorably. Four House concurrent resolutions were granted rules. Three requests for rules on major legislation were denied, two of which were later brought to the floor of the House under the 21-day rule, while hearings were held on a number of other requests for rules on important legislation which failed of final action.

The following compilation shows the resolution, bill, joint or concurrent resolution number involved, the subject matter of the legislation, the date reported by the Committee on Rules, and the resolution number assigned to the measure:

Rules granted by Committee on Rules, 81st Cong.

FIRST SESSION

H. Res.	Bill No.	Subject	Date reported
74	H. R. 128	Cotton acreage	Jan. 31, 1949
73	H. R. 1660	Prices, stabilization of	Do.
22		Create Small Business Committee	Do.
H. Con. Res. 22		Suspend Legislative Budget	Feb. 3, 1949
66		General investigative authority, Public Lands Committee.	Do.
75		General investigative authority, Education and Labor Committee.	Do.
95	H. J. Res. 84	Freedom Train	Feb. 10, 1949
96	H. R. 2402	Continue War Assets Administration.	Do.
97	H. R. 1661	Export Control Act of 1949	Do.
99	H. R. 2632	First deficiency appropriation bill	Feb. 14, 1949
102	H. J. Res. 92	Maritime Commission Authority	Feb. 9, 1949
110	H. R. 2101	Disaster loans, agriculture	Feb. 18, 1949
124	H. R. 2363	Interstate compacts, fish	Feb. 17, 1949
121	H. R. 199	Immigration quotas	Feb. 10, 1949
44		Panama Canal tolls	Feb. 24, 1949
107		General investigative authority, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.	Mar. 2, 1949
202	H. R. 782	Create Department of Welfare	Feb. 15, 1949
	H. R. 2681	Veterans' pensions (request for rule but not granted).	Feb. 16, 1949
128	H. R. 1741	Guided missiles	Feb. 24, 1949
129	H. R. 2546	Air warning and control system	Do.
130	H. R. 2663	Central Intelligence	Do.
131	H. R. 2216	Under Secretary of Defense	Feb. 17, 1949
139	S. J. Res. 36	Contribution, Palestine refugees	Mar. 1, 1949
138	H. R. 1731	Extend Rent Control Act	Mar. 5, 1949
148	H. R. 1437	Composition Army and Air Force	Feb. 10, 1949
137		General investigative authority, Judiciary Committee.	Mar. 8, 1949
112		General investigative authority, Committee on Agriculture.	Feb. 21, 1949
163	H. R. 1340	Ship cargo, 50 percent United States	Mar. 7, 1949

Rules granted by Committee on Rules, 81st Cong.—Continued

FIRST SESSION

H. Res.	Bill No.	Subject	Date reported
166	H. R. 165	American River development	Mar. 9, 1949
168	H. R. 2023	Oleo	Mar. 21, 1949
169	H. R. 3748	ECA Act of 1949	Mar. 25, 1949
	H. R. 3830	Amend China Aid Act	Mar. 28, 1949
170	H. R. 3838	Appropriations, Interior	Do.
180	H. R. 4016	Appropriations, State, etc	Apr. 5, 1949
185	H. R. 2989	Virgin Islands, incorporation	Mar. 22, 1949
H. Con. Res. 54		Investigate economic problems	Apr. 12, 1949
182	H. R. 4046	Second deficiency appropriation	Apr. 6, 1949
190	H. R. 195	Cigarette tax	Apr. 8, 1949
189	H. R. 2203	Housing census	Do.
114		General investigative authority Post Office and Civil Service Committee.	Apr. 14, 1949
191	H. R. 2032	Repeal Taft-Hartley Act	Mar. 24, 1949
201	H. R. 4080	Unified Code of Justice	Apr. 28, 1949
205	H. R. 3005	Per diem, Federal employees	Apr. 5, 1949
203	H. R. 3559	Organization, State Department	May 3, 1949
204	H. R. 4392	Swiss compensation	Do.
208	H. R. 2682	Amend Commodity Credit Corporation Act.	Apr. 9, 1949
H. J. Res. 196		Lobby investigation	May 16, 1949
212	H. R. 3825	Amend Federal Crop Insurance Act	Apr. 9, 1949
220	H. R. 834	Amend Contract Act	Mar. 2, 1949
223	H. R. 4591	Career Compensation Act of 1949	May, 16 1949
221	S. 937	Noncitizen claims versus United States.	May 19, 1949
206		General investigative authority, Foreign Affairs Committee.	May 18, 1949
H. Con. Res. 62		Lobby investigations	Do.
222	H. R. 3662	Public Buildings Act of 1949	Mar. 23, 1949
215		General investigative authority, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.	May 20, 1949
226	H. R. 4567	Displaced Persons Act	May 16, 1949
230	H. R. 4754	Amend Administrative Services Act of 1949.	May 24, 1949
228	H. R. 4830	Foreign Aid appropriation	May 23, 1949
239	H. R. 2785	UN Children fund	June 6, 1949
234		B-36 investigation, armed services (brought up on floor before favorable report from Rules).	
240	H. R. 4583	Clerk hire	May 12, 1949
248	H. R. 4963	Judgeship bill	June 10, 1949
249	H. R. 5007	Military pay bill	Do.
247	H. R. 2214	Suitland Parkway	June 8, 1949
250	H. J. Res. 228	Physically handicapped	June 6, 1949
257	H. R. 4009	Housing Act of 1949	May 16, 1949
256	H. R. 4322	Amend National Bank Act	May 31, 1949
238		General investigative authority, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.	June 15, 1949
264	H. R. 858	Overtime on overtime	Feb. 17, 1949
258	H. R. 4406	Yugoslav claims	June 9, 1949
259	H. R. 2619	Federal employees leave	May 23, 1949
267	H. R. 2960	Rural telephones	Mar. 9, 1949
266	H. R. 3609	Amend Federal Farm Loan Act	May 27, 1949
265	H. R. 3191	Federal Employees Compensation Act, amend.	June 6, 1949
274	H. R. 1689	Executive salary increase	May 9, 1949
277	S. 1008	Basing point	June 21, 1949
278	H. R. 5187	Fur products	June 27, 1949
279	H. R. 940	Alaska improvements	June 20, 1949
282	H. R. 5208	Navajo Indians	July 1, 1949
280	H. R. 4708	UN participation	May 17, 1949
283	H. R. 5345	Agriculture Act of 1949	July 7, 1949
289	H. R. 29	Tung nuts	July 12, 1949
292	H. R. 3829	Federal subsidy to schools	July 20, 1949
300	H. R. 4007	Experimental submarines	May 18, 1949
H. Con. Res. 102		GAR convention	July 27, 1949
305	H. R. 1161	Conversion, national banks	July 20, 1949
304	H. R. 5738	Cotton marketing quotas	July 25, 1949
924		Committee assignments, Alaska Delegate.	Aug. 1, 1949
298		Lobby investigation, create committee.	Aug. 3, 1949
312	H. J. Res. 207	Haiti Exposition	July 14, 1949
311	H. R. 5526	Presidential duties delegated	July 28, 1949
310	H. R. 1758	Natural Gas Act	Do.
183	H. R. 5856	Minimum wage law, amend	Aug. 6, 1949
322	H. R. 5557	Temporary agricultural workers	July 27, 1949
320	H. R. 4830	ECA appropriations	Aug. 9, 1949
293		General investigative authority, Ways and Means Committee.	Aug. 16, 1949
327	H. R. 5895	Military aid bill	Aug. 15, 1949
335	H. R. 3113	U. S. Tax Court, judicial status	July 28, 1949
326		General investigative authority, Public Works Committee.	Aug. 19, 1949
336	H. R. 6070	Housing Act of 1949	Aug. 22, 1949
	H. R. 5472	Rivers and harbors, flood control (rule denied).	July 6, 1949
342		Suspend rules of House	Aug. 25, 1949
345		Recess resolution	Do.
319	H. R. 4495	Postal employees benefits	Do.
346	H. R. 5931	Reclassification Act, amend	Do.
368	H. R. 5530	Korea aid bill	July 1, 1949
369	S. J. Res. 53	Reforestation	June 6, 1949
372	H. R. 6000	Social security	Aug. 22, 1949
368	H. R. 5330	Korean aid	July 1, 1949
392	S. 1267	Wind tunnels	Oct. 4, 1949
340		Investigate crime, District of Columbia.	Oct. 6, 1949
382	H. R. 2392	Rural rehabilitation trusts	July 8, 1949
388	H. R. 6303	Military Establishment, installations.	Oct. 6, 1949
390	S. J. Res. 134	Amend National Housing Act	Oct. 8, 1949
331		General investigative authority, Banking and Currency.	Oct. 10, 1949
391	H. R. 6305	International Wheat Agreement	Do.
395	H. R. 6281	Capital power plant	Oct. 11, 1949

SECOND SESSION

458	S. 2319	Korean aid	Feb. 1, 1950
457	H. R. 2023	Oleomargarine, conference report	Do.
451	H. J. Res. 398	Cotton and peanut acreage	Jan. 24, 1950
448	H. R. 87	Veterans credits, post office	Jan. 26, 1950
441	S. 88	Amend Bankruptcy Act	Jan. 24, 1950
447	S. 2596	Amend GI training bill	Do.
437	H. R. 6616	Naturalization, former Italian citizens.	Do.
438	H. R. 3001	Admission, skilled aliens	Do.
	H. Res. 133	Amend rules of House	Jan. 13, 1950
480	S. 2734	Navajo and Hopi Indians	Feb. 16, 1950
	H. Res. 475	Reading Farewell Address of George Washington.	Do.
481	H. R. 874	Public Library Extension Service	Feb. 20, 1950
479	H. R. 3105	Vocational education, Virgin Islands	Do.
497	H. R. 7058	U. S. Military and Naval Academies	Feb. 27, 1950
504	H. R. 7273	Civil government for Guam	Mar. 8, 1950
500	H. R. 7402	Middle income housing	Do.
513	H. R. 6567	Borrowing power, Commodity Credit Corporation.	Mar. 15, 1950
518	H. R. 7797	ECA	Mar. 23, 1950
	H. Res. 531	Conference report, Natural Gas Act	Mar. 30, 1950
568	H. R. 7579	Extend Rubber Act of 1948	Apr. 28, 1950
565	H. R. 7941	Amend Federal Aid Road Act	Do.
567	H. R. 5990	Washington-Baltimore Parkway	Do.
577	H. R. 5074	Construction authorization, NACA	Do.
Not filed	H. R. 7219	Acquisition property, Blair House	May 1, 1950
	H. Res. 566	Waiving points of order appropriation bill.	Apr. 28, 1950
66	H. R. 7786	General appropriation bill	Do.
599	S. 2440	Construction authorization, Defense Department.	May 10, 1950
600	H. R. 7764	Construction of naval vessels	Do.
597	H. R. 6826	Extending Selective Service Act	Do.
598	S. 2128	Licenses, royalty fees, patents	Do.
	H. Res. 323	Insecticides, pesticides	May 11, 1950
	H. R. 8276	Rent-control extension	May 25, 1950
619	H. R. 8198	Reorganization of Army	Do.
617		Investigative powers, armed services.	May 22, 1950
630	H. R. 8083	Amending Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, point 4 program.	June 13, 1950
649	S. 2269	Enlistment of aliens in Regular Army	June 12, 1950
639	H. R. 8276	Extension of Rent Control Act	Do.
651	H. R. 7873	Authorize construction of buildings for Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Bureau.	June 15, 1950
666	H. R. 8920	Tax bill	June 26, 1950
678	S. 3336	Constitutional Government for Puerto Rico.	June 28, 1950
679	H. R. 8137	Tidelands oil bill	June 26, 1950
680	S. 3550	Fats and oils	June 29, 1950
681	H. J. Res. 453	United States International Trade Fair.	June 28, 1950
682	H. R. 8594	Reserve components, Armed Forces	Do.
683	H. R. 7439	Dismissal of employees, security reasons.	Do.
684	S. 3527	Amending Federal Reserve Act, purchase and sale of obligations.	Do.
685	H. R. 7940	Federal aid in areas affected by Federal activities.	Do.
696	S. 3809	Amend Mutual Defense Assistance Act, 1949.	July 17, 1950
697	S. 2822	Amend Federal Deposit Insurance Act.	Do.
702	H. R. 6454	Illinois judgeships	July 18, 1950
703	H. R. 6240	Indiana judgeships	Do.
704	H. R. 6836	Delaware judgeship	Do.
705	H. R. 3775	Alaska judgeship	Do.
706	H. R. 5137	Texas judgeship	Do.
707	H. R. 7570	Ohio judgeship	Do.
708	H. R. 7009	Missouri judgeship	Do.
714	H. R. 8569	Texas City tin smelter (S. 3666 passed in lieu).	July 19, 1950
715	H. R. 5967	Freight-forwarders status	Do.
716	H. R. 6277	Russian Railway Service Corps	Do.
717	S. 3520	Production of abacá	Do.
728	H. R. 9109	Amending Agricultural Adjustment Act (cotton acreage).	July 20, 1950
729	H. R. 9038	Presidential authority—budget	Do.
741	H. R. 9129	Amend Federal Property and Administrative Services Act.	July 31, 1950
742	H. R. 8396	Assistance to States in major disasters.	Do.
747	S. 192	Indians, New York State	Aug. 9, 1950
748	H. J. Res. 516	Intercustodial conflicts, enemy property.	Do.
807	S. 3357	Interstate shipment gambling devices.	Aug. 15, 1950
808	S. 868	Dissemination of technical information to American business.	Aug. 17, 1950
809	H. R. 9141	Marketing facilities for perishables	Do.
810	H. R. 9313	Disposal of perishables, agriculture	Do.
811	H. R. 9158	U. S. Code, Food and Drugs	Do.

Rules granted by Committee on Rules, 81st Cong.—Continued

SECOND SESSION

H. Res.	Bill No.	Subject	Date reported
812	S. 2317	Grants to States affected by Federal activities.	Aug. 17, 1950
816	H. R. 8201	Practitioners, Government agencies.	Do.
817	H. R. 8847	Great Lakes shipping	Do.
818	S. 784	First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.	Do.
819	H. R. 8850	Second Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.	Do.
820	H. R. 8677	Maintenance of Panama Canal	Do.
821	S. 456	Airport facilities, District of Columbia.	Do.
825	H. R. 9526	Supplemental appropriation bill (waiving points of order).	Aug. 24, 1950
826	H. R. 9490	Internal security, subversives	Do.
833	H. R. 9320	Regulation air commerce	Aug. 30, 1950
842	H. R. 8920	Tax bill, to conference	Sept. 13, 1950
843	H. R. 9219	Five Civilized Tribes, Indians	Do.
844	H. R. 5506	Palisades Dam and Reservoir	Sept. 13, 1950
845	S. 450	Amend Civil Aeronautics Act	Do.
846	S. 3504	Promote development of improved transport aircraft.	Do.
847	H. R. 9490	Take from Speaker's table and send to conference.	Do.
853	H. R. 9646	Appointment, General Marshall, Secretary of Defense.	Sept. 14, 1950
854	H. R. 9184	Separation subsidy from airmail pay	Sept. 13, 1950
H. Res. 876	H. R. 9763	Extension of rent control	Dec. 5, 1950
874	H. R. 9780	Citizenship—aliens with permanent residence.	Dec. 6, 1950
872	H. R. 9827	Excess-profits-tax bill	Dec. 1, 1950
878	H. R. 9853	Yugoslav loan	Dec. 8, 1950
887	H. R. 9932	Extending War Powers Act, 1941	Dec. 20, 1950
888	S. 3945	Relating to powers of FBI	Do.

House resolutions acted on (81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Res. No.	Author	Subject	Date reported
133	Mr. Cox	Amend Rules of House	Jan. 13, 1950
207	Mr. Keefe	Foods and insecticides	May 11, 1950
323	Mr. Sabath		
474	Mr. Teague	Investigate Servicemen's readjustment Act operation.	Aug. 15, 1950
475	Mr. Smith, Virginia	Reading George Washington's Farewell Address.	Feb. 16, 1950
566	Mr. Sabath	Waiving points of order, appropriation bill.	Apr. 28, 1950
617	Mr. Vinson	Investigative powers, Armed Services Committee.	May 22, 1950
635	Mr. McCormack	Campaign investigation, expenditures.	June 13, 1950
643	Mr. Auchincloss	Investigate South Amboy explosion.	June 28, 1950
646	Mr. Eaton		
673	Mr. Baring	Rescind action in passing H. J. Res. 494.	June 29, 1950